

УДК 81:1:316.77

ГОЛУБЕВ Олександр – старший викладач кафедри мовної та міжкультурної комунікації, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, 82100, Україна (alexgolubev108@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7804-823X>

ТКАЧЕНКО Олександр – кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри філософії імені професора Валерія Григоровича Скотного, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, 82100, Україна (tkacenkoaleksandr1928@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0674-0144>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4700.36.154290>

SYMBOLIC CONTENT OF THE LANGUAGE AS THE BASIS OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

СИМВОЛІЧНИЙ ЗМІСТ МОВИ ЯК ОСНОВИ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

***Анотація.** Актуалізація символічного змісту мови як основи міжкультурної комунікації викликана по-перше, тенденцією десакралізації слів і речей у сучасному світі, необхідністю повернення до істинних смислів, зв'язок з якими втрачає сучасна культура. В сучасній культурі поглиблюється процес профанації смислового змісту культурних символів. По-друге, актуальність дослідження мови та комунікації визначає також стрімкий розвиток засобів комунікації, каналів передачі й носіїв інформації тощо. Мова йде про адекватне сприйняття змін форм комунікації, які ми переживаємо сьогодні.*

Метою статті є аналіз символічного змісту мови як фундаментального феномену культури, осмислення її місця і ролі у міжкультурній комунікації.

Методологічною основою дослідження виступають герменевтичний, лінгво-семіотичний, порівняльний, філософсько-культурологічний, релігійний підходи.

У статті наголошено, що завдяки символічному змісту, мова дає змогу пов'язати зовнішнє і внутрішнє, співвіднести не-

видиму ідею з предметністю видимого світу; уявити явища в певній цілісності, що робить його одночасно доступним і нашим думкам, і душі. Мова поєднує практичне з духовним, випадкове з причиновим, вказуючи на трансцендентне. Мова зберігає і транслює ідеї та цінності, які є базовими для розвитку і функціонування культури. Звернення до проблеми символічного змісту мови може допомогти глибше зрозуміти одну із головних глобальних проблем – проблему спілкування, взаємопорозуміння між людьми; може сприяти подоланню відчуження і дегуманізації у сфері міжособистісної та міжкультурної комунікації. Але, на жаль, сучасна людина все більше віддаляється від символічного світу культури і нездатна адекватно сприймати і розуміти символи мови інших народів, і своєї також (як носія національного духу). Люди поступово перетворюються на згустки інформаційних технологій.

У теоретико-методологічному плані, запропоновані матеріали актуалізують необхідність подальшого аналізу й інтерпретації символізму мови в релігійному дискурсі.

Ключові слова: культура, комунікація, міжкультурна комунікація, мова, символ.

Formulation of the problem. Language study, which cannot be reduced to mere description of the diversity of its specific cultural-historical, ethno-cultural manifestations, requires the reference to the ontological and socio-anthropological foundations of human existence. There is growing concern about the tendency to desacralize words and things in the modern world and we feel there is the need for a return to their true meanings, the connection with which the Western culture is gradually losing. Such an interest, in turn, actualizes the symbolically-hermeneutic content of the «language» category.

The relevance of the study of the language and communication is also determined by the rapid development of communication tools, transmission channels and media, etc. The majority of researchers label modern society as informational and communicative with the subsequent changes of communication forms that we are experiencing today. For example, the Internet became a major phenomenon for the language drastically changing human communication. First and foremost, the blogosphere and social networks have primarily influenced the communication within the network itself as well as the state of the language as a whole. «With the approval of the new media cul-

ture of radio (1914), television (1945) and, finally, of the worldwide Internet, the co-existence of people began to be built on a new basis. We live in the post-literary, post-epistolographic and, therefore, post-humanistic world. In comparison with the classical society, we achieve identity with some marginal extra-literate, extra-literary, and extra-humanistic mediums. This does not mean the end of literature, however, it ceases to be the bearer of the national spirit. National synthesis is not carried out on the basis of books and writing. New telecommunicative mediums have been unleashed, which rejects the old model of humanitarian friendliness» [3].

Analysis of recent research and publications. The analysis of modern concepts has shown the complexity of this problem and the diversity of approaches to its comprehension. F.S. Batsevich has devoted his recent scientific publications to the phenomenon of the language as a deep symbolic environment [1, p. 266]. The Ukrainian researcher emphasizes that the definition of the language as «the home of human existence» (M. Heidegger) remains the most penetrating even today. «More and more often in linguo-philosophical and in fact linguistic works, the language steps forward as a deep symbolic environment synergetically associated with the profound manifestations of the human spirit» [1, p. 266]. Whereas in the doctoral dissertation «Symbol in intercultural communication» Y.P. Ten indicates that the characters do not only accumulate socio-cultural experience of the life of a certain community, but also perform a communicatory-informational function, promoting the exchange of ideas and values between people and cultures. «It is through the symbols that the peoples belonging to different languages and cultures can form the semantic space in which the acts of communication and mutual understanding will become most possible» [5].

The monograph «The language as a form of cultural existence and the concept of non-linguistic positivism» is devoted to the problems of the existence of human language in culture [6]. E.A. Tinyakova proceeds from the fact that the symbolic meaning of a language is its spiritual potential and the language, as the basic phenomenon of culture, helps to find the truth in culture. Useful for our study is the author's understanding of the concept of «communication» as the movement of meaning, which is achieved by all languages of culture.

A well-known philosopher B.V. Markov – specialist in the field of philosophical anthropology and philosophy of the language, when asked about how words affect people, said: «It is understandable that it is because they have meaning, and because we, thanks to our thinking, understand it» [3]. Unfortunately, «modern mass media rely on audio-visual signs which do not send you to anything, but have a direct, so to speak, “magnetopathic” effect and literally hypnotize, fascinate people. At the same time, there is no talk of self-reflection about their sense and meaning» [3]. In modern culture, the process of profanation of the meaningful content of cultural symbols deepens further. We share the author’s concern that «This seems to be not only the end of book culture, but also of culture in general, including philosophy» [3].

The purpose of the article is to comprehend the symbolic content of the language as a key phenomenon of culture, to understand its place and role in intercultural communication.

The language of culture is the stratum of the communicative field of culture. In the philosophy of culture, the «language of culture» has been considered in the general context of the symbolic activity of man as «symbolic complexes», «symbolic forms». The language of culture acts as a collection of cultural objects with an internal structure, explicit or implicit rules of comprehension and use of its elements which serves the implementation of communicative processes. The presence of common symbols seems to be the most important factor which ensures the very possibility of constructive communication.

Language structures «immerse» an individual into such a being, the subject of which necessarily manifests himself in the world and realizes himself as the subject of his own self-determination. Therefore, fundamental ontological experience is inseparable from the symbolic level of language, which brings into the social practice the symbolic codes of sacred meaning. «The human language is spiritual and symbolic, the Divine-cosmic creation, the reflection of the eternal Divine Logos in the daily life of the man, in its communication with their own kind» [1, p. 266].

The problem of meaning becomes the central subject of research in the classical philosophy of the language. The symbol is understood as the ultimate generalization of the meaning of a thing. «The classical communicative system represented the language as signs, the strength of which, the degree of their influence on the behavior of people, is not determined by the external form, but by the internal meaning» [3].

According to F. Humboldt, each language has its own «internal form», a specific structure (the grammatical system and the inherent methods of word-formation – for example, «designation method, naming»), conditioned by the «uniqueness of the people's spirit». Understanding the language as the thought forming body, Humboldt emphasizes the dependence of the language upon thinking and its conditionality by each particular language, which includes its own national distinctive classification system, determines the worldview of the bearers of the given language and forms their picture of the world. Speaking of the fact that when mastering other languages the man expands the «range of human existence», Humboldt meant precisely the comprehension by means of language – through «linguistic worldview» – of the pictures of another people's world.

In the XX century, Ernst Cassirer's theory of symbolic forms created a powerful impetus of interest towards the symbol. According to his theory, the symbol is a form in which every manifestation of the spirit finds expression. Characters enter the human world with values and have a functional value. E. Cassirer highlights the following symbolic forms: language, myth, religion, art and science. In these forms, the culture exists and is reproduced, because of them the person can see, understand, reproduce and transform the world.

Ludwig Wittgenstein, unlike Ernst Cassirer, introduced the study of language directly into the context of communicative issues. If for Cassirer the language is a means of objectivization and knowledge of the world, then for the late Wittgenstein the language is connected with the process of interaction and mutual understanding of people, its structures are established through an interactive «game».

In his work «Symbol in the system of culture» Y.M. Lotman focuses attention on the two approaches in understanding the symbol – rational and irrational. In one case, the symbol acts as a sign, in the other – as a memory storage device of culture. We would like to highlight the second approach. The specificity of this approach lies in the fact that the symbol accumulates the values in which it has ever performed – piercing the culture vertically. With its own set of values a symbol passes from one historical epoch to another, where it acquires new semantic comparisons and meanings without losing the previous ones. The symbol acts as a mechanism of memory of culture, «as a message of other cultural epochs (other cultures), as a reminder of the

ancient (eternal) foundations of culture» [4, p. 211]. Y. Lotman states that a symbol is not only a bridge from one level of being to another, but a certain point of contact between the real world and the virtual, the real and meta-real, the earthly and the higher, in addition – the bridge connecting the epoch. Symbols – signs of cultural languages – form a semantic network through which they carry the essence of things, from its deep meanings to today's meanings.

Thanks to the symbolic content, the language can link the external and internal, to correlate the invisible idea with the objectivity of the visible world; imagine the phenomena in a certain integrity, which makes it both accessible to our thoughts and soul. The language combines practical with the spiritual, random with the cause, pointing to the transcendent. Without these broader meanings the universe would be chaotic pluralism and would have no meaning (J. Cirlot). The language preserves and translates ideas and values that are fundamental to the development and functioning of culture. «The language has created a force field between those who once lived, and those who will once die; the language curbs/tames the chaos of nature, eliminates the discord between separate individuals, the inherent breaks of existence and lack of freedom; language creates the world, interconnection and freedom» [2, p. 258]. We often come across symbols and use them, following many generations of people of different epochs and cultures who, in the language of symbols, expressed their state of mind, their outlook, their understanding of the great truths and secrets of being. It is not enough to say that we live in the world of symbols – the world of symbols lives in us (Jean Chevalier).

Let us look, for example, at the symbolic language of myths. Mythological images, if you consider their essential features, are strikingly similar in different parts of the planet, despite the significant differences in the history and culture of different peoples. This allows us to discover universal verses common to all mankind – archetypes. Although Jung's psychological studies in the understanding of archetypes focus on the subconscious (archetypes arise spontaneously, at any time, without external influence), we tend to believe that archetypes, like characters, «live» in the language. Archetypal structures of consciousness, overlapping on the processes of development of human thought, caused a formal and meaningful perception of the primary ideas, rules and, accordingly, the way of people's life. In an ar-

chetyral context, among the archaic ideas, the significance acquired the concept of the presence of the divine, the unity of the universe. These ideas are expressed in a variety of concrete representations about the spirituality of Nature, the perception of people as an integral divine family, patriotism, the priority of collective initiation over personal, loyalty to duty, honor and justice.

Conclusions. In the current situation of profanation of the semantic content of cultural symbols, addressing the issue of the symbolic content of the language can help to deeper understand one of the main global problems – the problem of communication, mutual understanding between people; can help overcome alienation and dehumanization in the field of interpersonal and intercultural communication. But it is worrying that the modern man is further deviated from the symbolic world of culture and is incapable to perceive and understand the symbols of the language of other peoples, even of his own (as the bearer of the national spirit). This is exactly the type of functional consciousness which is exploited by the global mass culture and its impact is very difficult to resist. A culturally-educated, thinking person is not needed by the modern civilization.

Література

1. Бацевич Ф.С. Духовно-синергетична сутність мови: огляд деяких сучасних лінгвофілософських концепцій [Електронний ресурс] / Ф.С. Бацевич. – Режим доступу : <http://old.journ.lnu.edu.ua/vypusk7/visnyk08-39.pdf>.
2. Гатальська С.М. Філософія культури : підручник / С.М. Гатальська. – К. : Либідь, 2005. – 328 с.
3. Марков Б.В. Коммуникация и философия языка [Электронный ресурс] / Б.В. Марков. – Режим доступа : <http://anthropology.ru/ru/text/markov-bv/kommunikaciya-i-filosofiya-yazyka>.
4. Лотман Ю.М. Символ в системе культуры / Ю.М. Лотман // Статьи по семиотике культуры и искусства. – СПб. : Академический проект, 2002. – 544 с. – С. 211–225.
5. Тен Ю.П. Символ в межкультурной коммуникации : автореф. дисс. ... д-ра философ. наук : 09.00.13 [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.П. Тен. – Режим доступа : <http://www.lib.ua-ru.net/diss/cont/277864.html>.
6. Тинякова Е.А. Язык как форма существования культуры и концепция нелингвистического позитивизма / Е.А. Тинякова. – М. : МПГУ, 2003. – 222 с.

References

1. Batsevych, F.S. (n.d.). *Dukhovno-synerhetychna sutnist movy: ohliad deiakykh suchasnykh linhvofilosofskikh kontseptsiï* [Spiritually-sinergistical essence of language: review of somemodern linguophilosophical concepts]. Retrieved from <http://old.journ.lnu.edu.ua/vypusk7/visnyk08-39.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
2. Hatal'ska, S.M. (2005). *Filosofiiia kultury* [Philosophy of culture]. Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].
3. Markov, B.V. (n.d.). *Kommunikatciia i filosofiiia iazyka* [Communication and philosophy of language]. Retrieved from <http://anthropology.ru/text/markov-bv/kommunikaciya-i-filosofiya-yazyka> [in Russian].
4. Lotman, Iu.M. (2002). Simvol v sisteme kultury [A symbol is in the system of culture]. *Stati po semiotike kultury i iskusstva – Articles on the semiotics of culture and art* (pp. 211–225). Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt [in Russian].
5. Ten, Iu.P. (n.d.). *Simvol v mezhkulturnoi komunikatcii* [A symbol is in cross-cultural communication]. (Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.ua-ru.net/diss/cont/277864.html> [in Russian].
6. Tiniakova, E.A. (2003). *Iazyk kak forma sushchestvovaniia kultury i kontseptciia nelingvisticheskogo pozitivizma* [Language as form of existence of culture and conception of unlinguistic positivism]. Moscow: MPGU [in Russian].

GOLUBEV Oleksandr – Senior Lecturer, Department of Language and Intercultural Communication, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Str., 24, Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine (alexgolubev108@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7804-823X>

TKACHENKO Oleksandr – Candidate of Philosophy Sciences, Associate Professor of the Philosophy Department named after Professor Valeriy Skotnyi, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Str., 24, Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine (tkacenkoaleksandr1928@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0674-0144>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4700.36.154290>

SYMBOLIC CONTENT OF THE LANGUAGE AS THE BASIS OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Abstract. Actualization of the symbolic content of language as the basis of intercultural communication is caused, firstly, by the tendency to literalize words and things in the modern world, the need for a return to true meanings, the connection with which the contempo-

rary culture is gradually losing. In modern culture, the process of profanation of semantic content of cultural symbols deepens further. Secondly, the relevance of the study of language and communication is also determined by the rapid development of communication, transmission channels and media, etc. We are talking about an adequate perception of the changes in the forms of communication that we are experiencing today.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the symbolic content of language as a fundamental cultural phenomenon, understanding its place and role in intercultural communication.

The methodological basis of the study is hermeneutic, lingual-semiotic, comparative, philosophical-cultural and religious approaches. In the article it is emphasized that due to the symbolic content, the language allows to connect the external and internal, to correlate the invisible idea with the objectivity of the visible world; imagine the phenomena in a certain integrity, which makes it both accessible to our thoughts and soul. The language combines practical with the spiritual, random with the causal, pointing to the transcendent. The language preserves and translates ideas and values that are fundamental to the development and functioning of culture. Addressing the problem of the symbolic content of the language can help us to understand one of the main global problems – the problem of communication, mutual understanding between people; can help overcome alienation and dehumanization in the field of interpersonal and intercultural communication. But, unfortunately, the modern man is increasingly moving away from the symbolic world of culture and unable to adequately perceive and understand the symbols of the language of other peoples, and their own (as a carrier of the national spirit). People gradually turn into clusters of information technology.

In theoretical and methodological terms, the proposed materials actualize the need for further analysis and interpretation of the symbolism of language in religious discourse.

Key words: culture, communication, intercultural communication, language, symbol.

Одержано 21.08.2018