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Abstract: We live in a world where every gesture, word, item, image or action may symbolize something, but the capacity to symbolize, to act and symbol itself involved in society and culture selective court: the myriad of possible symbols, acts of symbolisation, symbolic of relationships only some are marked and certified social and cultural. Each symbol certified office provides a connection with fellow human beings in time and space to live, a lesson of history, geography, anthropology, connected with the cosmos, but at the same time, we require the reading and decoding.
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1 Introduction
We meet with the symbol in literature, symbolics, the communication, the arts, in philosophy, in mathematics, chemistry, in psychoanalysis, in anthropology, in sociology, in social psychology, in advertising, in music, politics, everywhere is talking man. In other words, all the sciences that study man in his various aspects intersect in some way, in their research approach, with symbols. It is this ubiquity has put us in difficulty when they need to address the issue of the symbol: to understand the birth polisemia semantics, the conditions that generate the production of connotations, how they influence the lives of individuals, groups, how it is done through link human earthly level with the celestial, the link between the two plans, the link with contemporaries, the ancestors, but also survivors.

2 Problem formulation and solution
The icon is reduced only to a conventional interpretation is therefore a smooth road, continuous symbol that contains the conventional interpretation of the icon, which is added a subjective interpretation, which implies the possibility to animate the myths, archeforms; is a rough road, winding, full of crossings, the discontinuity, the ups and down. Moreover, the symbol does not erase the reality, not suppress the sign, but adds another dimension, requires a link between humanity and divinity space between facts, items and signs, so it is a binder.

From item to subject, symbol require the presence of an active receiver, excluding the home passivity. This attribute of the symbol determined by Mircea Eliade to say that through the symbol, man finds himself, becomes aware of its position in the universe. In the same direction which is part and Jean Servier, in his invisible man and concludes that it bears the symbol of man to the most hidden depths of the soul primarily through its ability to annex parts of the invisible visible occult, glimpse.

As we stated before, the symbol is present also in the hard sciences: mathematics, physics, chemistry, logic, etc. This involves another question: G. Bachelard emphasizes the poetics of space, that symbol is an innovative character, because not only is content to lead us connotation, resonance, but causes us to different interpretations, the changes in depth. Mathematical symbols, science must remain under the signs, because abstraction of scientific communication does not lead to the birth of the symbol but on the contrary, abstraction empty symbol, creating the sign. In fact, the same dichotomy must be extended within certain dogmatic formulations, official statements of various denominations, which have characteristic value of the symbol, not only signs, expression truths in faith. However, this situation can be an extension: if they dogmatic formulations are considered centers of adhesions and professions of faith, who have the power to transform the subjective point of view, it may qualify for status symbols: symbols of the unity of believers. By accepting this dichotomy of symbols in the world of humanities and science symbols real world, indirectly accept or two ways to construct connotation. While the symbol in the hard sciences is invested since the birth of a connotation that does not allow interpretation does not allow permutations, other kinds of symbols known by different mechanisms that come to have infinite capacity to signify. In fact, their connotation meet human need to understand, shape and, ultimately, to view the
abstract, to transcend beyond what is considered clearly visible.
This connotation is built based on the immeasurable capacity permutabilității signs in different exhibit, by cutting signified item of its existence and the nature of the design to another geography, another history. In other words, the possible combinations, immeasurably more than things in the universe, are ilimitatul of ilim times richer causes new things and worlds, is the wellspring of similarities and correspondences, maintaining their latency inexhaustible driving their eternal renewal and indirectly ours.

Built on the iconic shoulders, the symbolic significance is an augmentation, an iconic hiperbolization of trans-mimetic perception, an iconic phrase damage. In other words, the symbolic impact is articulated by converting a vehicle icon metasens. Topics and iconic syntax are repealed, replaced by a new law decreed another sense, a different connotation. However, the overall significance of an image, which live together the icons and symbols is generated by constant interfering of mimetic signifiers (the icons) and the trasmimeticici. So, reading the iconic and the symbolic element is performed in parallel for, metamimetic item can not conquer the total emancipation from the register activity. Another mechanism of building symbolic significance resulting from mutilation or increased iconic sign (feminization of a male physiognomy, for example). Place these changes is the place of genesis and existence of the symbol. This method enhances the itemivation of Timothy-volitional states: joy, fulfillment, pain, resignation, fear, tritețe, revenge, forgiveness, etc. Cultivating this kind of symbol generated birth symbolism in literature and painting and sculpture of the Baroque-Expressionism.

These two methods of obtaining them adds symbolic connotation, at least one: the operation, fragmentation icon and presentation of a single element of the item dissected, loaded with symbolic valences: for example, presenting only a wing in place of whole birds, presenting only mesh, only the hand, only the leaf, but the wheel instead of the entire, etc.

Although the birth of this kind of symbol is generated by a part of the item icon, a parallel reading of mimetic and is no longer possible for the symbol, the segment became iconic symbol is a form of abstraction. Mimetic geography and history no longer belongs to the original, no longer belong to the original whole which leads to the conclusion that the fragment has no identity iconic than symbolically.

Whatever the mechanism used in the construction of symbolic connotation, decoding it is a very thorny issue: whether in the hard sciences where the symbols are difficult for the researcher gives them permanent symbols same connotation, becoming mere signs of a contingent thing signified where the symbols of the universe the human sciences, researchers are in a real maze, for philosophers, artists, psychologists, etc. create symbols with an unsurpassed polisemantism. The existence of the labor polisemantism requires interpretation, but at the same time, confers a degree of freedom in interpretation, whether intrinsic semantic notion of symbol, its definition. This entitles us to be in unison with the view of G. Shapiro speaks about the multiplication of connotation.

It is clear that the act of interpretation is subject to a double pressure, because on the one hand, the symbol tends to establish the proposed jelly maker connecting the receiver to each other on a common sociocultural background, and, secondly, symbol tends to retain the attribute of infinite metaphor. Faced with this duality, the problem of decoding the symbolic significance seems even more thorny. And yet: in terms of addressing the symbol of communion between creator and receiver code contemporary lecturing mimetic elements in parallel with the symbolic, where we are allowed, recovering connotations originating archetypal images, inserting the symbol in geography, history, sociocultural contamination was not we are faced with any puzzle, we do not face major problems of decoding, the more we face the presence of several scales of interpretation and, by extension, the existence of several levels of reality.

In fact, the existence of its multiple connotations, the symbol helps us prepare and, build, embellish the reality we live in a reality that responds searches expectations, our knowledge, a resized picture of reality value.

3 Symbolic Mathematics and their Forms
In mathematical work we usually take some items to represent others, especially abstract items, and a correspondence, frequently implicit, exists between the representative and the items represented. There are words, symbols or other conventional mechanisms that mean or express something, represent or symbolize something else besides them, and make it publicly understandable.
We believe that communication paradigm could be useful to describe mathematical problems. Starting from the word as data, this communication paradigm conceives phrase analysis as a deductive progression from the class to components and as an identification of the dependencies among the different parts, its components and the phrase as a whole. The basic principle is that the item under examination as well as its components only exists in virtue of their mutual dependencies.

Key notions in paradigm are those of sign relation- which Eco designs as symbolic relation-, expression and content. Those dependencies in which one part designs or denotes some other thing are outstanding cases of dependencies within the components of a phrase. Therefore, the first part (expression level) relations or represents the second (content level), that is, it points to a content which is beyond the expression. It is necessary to take into account the existence of other operational or actuaries dependencies among a phrase's different components in addition to these representational dependencies.

In this paradigm, and in accordance with Saussure's proposals, the word sign is not applied to the expression but to the entity generated by the connection between an expression and content. Expression and content are relational between which the sign relation establishes dependence: a relation cannot be conceived without its terminals, and the terminals are just the final points of the relation, and, therefore, they are inconceivable without it. According to Eco there is a symbolic relation when an expression and content are in correlation. Such a correlation is conventionally established, though this does not imply arbitrariness, but it is universal to a cultural link. On the contrary, the sign is always open to something different. When clarifying the sign that somebody interprets, there is no interpreter who does not slightly displace its limits. The idea of sign is not reduced to the level of expression, but is conceived as the pair (significant, connotation). Furthermore, the relationship between both relational is not reduced to mere equivalence. The sign, therefore, is not just mere correspondence between expression and content; it is not something that stands for something else, but it implies someone who makes a possible interpretation.

We think that symbolic relation could be conceived, at least metaphorically, as a correspondence between sets, supposing three components:
- an expression level (the initial item, frequently considered as the sign)
- a content level (the final item, considered as the connotation of the sign, i.e., what is represented, or meant, what the speaker refers to).
- a criteria or correspondence rule, this is, an interpretative code regulating the correlation between the expression and content levels, establishing the aspect or character of the content referred by the expression.

Any subset of the four forms of primary elements considered can play the role of initial or final items in symbolic relations, which are frequently given by just one of their three components, being the other two implicitly established. Speaking of connotation also supposes that there is an expression and an interpretative code.

The four forms of primary entities considered (apparently, universal, intensive and actional entities) can play both the roles of expression and content in symbolic relations. Hence, different forms of such relations are applicable. Though some of these relations can be clearly interpreted as specific cognitive processes (generalisation, symbolisation, abstraction), in this work we will classify and characterize these relations regarding the level of content (connotation); therefore these forms are reduced to the four described below.

(1) Apparently connotation: Let us call a symbolic relation apparently when the final item (its content), is an apparently item. This form of relation is the characteristic use of signs to name world items and states, to indicate real things, to say that there is something and that thing is built in a given manner. The following examples show this form of connotation:
- When a particular collection of five things are represented by the numeral '5'.
- The symbol Pn (or n!) represents the product n(n-1)(n-2) ... 1
- In the phrase, In the histogram in figure x, which is the absolute frequency of the modal interval? The word 'histogram' refers to another apparently item that is shown in the figure. Also the expressions 'absolute frequency' and 'modal interval' refer to apparently observable items in the figure (a number labelled on the ordinates axis, an identifiable interval on the abscissas axis.
- The expression 'multiplication table' refers to a specific arrangement of numerals.

(2) Universal connotation: A symbolic relation is universal when the final item is a situation - problem or a phenomenology, as in the following examples:
- As a rule, the verbal, graphical or mixed description of a problem-situation. Such a description is a different item of the situation itself.
- The simulation of stellar (i.e., it is possible to represent a variety of probabilistic problems with urn models)

(3) Intensive connotation: A symbolic relation is intensive when its content is an intensive item, as in the following examples:
- In the definitions of a concept, for example, an angle is a pair of rays with the same origin, the word 'angle' refers to an abstract item.
- In expressions such as, Let µ be the mathematical expectation of a random fluctuating ξ, or Let f(x) be a continuous relation. The notations µ, ξ, f(x), or the expressions 'mathematical expectation', 'random fluctuating' and 'continuous relation', refer to mathematical generalisations.

(4) Actional connotation: A symbolic relation is actional when its content is a subject's action. In any calculus process dependencies among the different parts of an operational or actional sequence are established. For example, the expression (2/3)/(12) is pointing (i.e., it means) to multiplying 12 by 2 and dividing its results by 3. Every universal, intensive and actional symbolic relation can be interpreted, furthermore, as a apparently relation and vice-versa, since situations-problems, abstractions and actions are phraseually fixed. We consider, however, very important to distinguish between apparently, universal, intensive and actional symbolic relations to achieve mathematical understanding. This understanding is always partial and can be improved to the extent to which subjects enrich the system of symbolic relations they are able to use for a given class of problem-situations or for a conceptual structure.

4 Conclusion
These mechanisms build some symbolic significance and development have generated different forms of symbols. In other words, they have, along with others, criteria for classification symbols. It is not difficult to prove that they were born many classifications, but none of them met all the conditions not captured all aspects declared to be exhaustive. Moreover, tests of classification symbols have drawn on their anathema, being accused, on the one hand, the trends rationalizatoare and positivist, which led to treat the symbol as a sign, fabrication and explanations of social, religious, and on the Moreover, the requisition advertising imply simplicity reasons and not least, an attitude that shows a single imperialism.
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