

УДК 101.8:37.012.01

ORCID 0000-0001-8553-2388

## PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUE AND ITS LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATION: GERMAN AND UKRAINIAN TRADITIONS

N.V. Grigorova, candidate of sociological sciences, associate professor of the Department of German Philology of the National Technical University named after G. Skovoroda

*The article is devoted to the philosophical dialogue regarding as a singular form of the philosophical communication. The ontological dimension of the philosophical dialogue is explicated and typology of its forms is examined. The connection between the dialogical form and linguistic expression in philosophical communication depends on type of the culture, national traditions. In the early Modernity the philosophical dialogue shows the kind of the asymmetric communication with the domination of the mentor style of the verbal expression in accordance with it. The questions from the pupil are usually primitive. The answer in opposite to them shows the best examples of the philosophical rhetoric and argumentation. The change of this role reality occurs in the later Modernity with the establishment of symmetric communication and cultivated verbal expression.*

**Key words:** *philosophical dialogue, language, expression, the role reality, culture, communication, Skovoroda, German idealism, terminology, simulacra.*

Philosophical dialogues take a very important place in the European cultural and educational tradition as a form of spiritual unity and as diversity of expression possibilities both on the general level and in the concrete treatises of philosophical problems. This kind of dialogue has taken a medial position between the oral cultural communication and its representation in Literacy. The analysis of possibilities of this position can open new horizons in the searching for resources of European integration.

This problem field isn't a whole new one in Ukraine because it was researched in its other segments dealing with history of philosophy (M. Bachtin, I. Bychko, V. Gorsky, M. Tkachuk, M. Popovich etc.), with cultural and social anthropology (V. Tabachkowsky, N. Khamitov etc.) and with Ukrainian areal studies (V. Andrushchenko, V/ Skuratywski etc.). The ideas of these authors have contributed to the attempts of conceptualization philosophical dialogue as a soft provider of intercultural communication. Very important for the theory of the

philosophical dialogue are explorations made by V.Höslе [4].

This model was well-known even in the antic Greek tradition. In the European tradition which was in Germany connected with Greek philosophy. In Ukraine it was also used by H. Skovoroda who has created his own life in the dimension of philosophical dialogue [1, 150]. The ontological coordinates of Skovoroda's dialogues are remarkable. The time of these dialogues is always in accordance with biorhythms, but the space can be defined in the symbolic mode. All the features of Skovoroda's dialogues are structured on the European way, what results from intensive students exchange with the Europe during the 18-th and 18-th century. The philosophical terminology was not still formed in the Russian imperia, but as the substitution the theological terminology was used for the philosophical dialogue which had the terms borrowed from sermon.

But this pre-modern tradition was changed in the later Modernity, when the philosophy became recognition as a university discipline in Ukraine too. The philosophical dialogue at that time were both – popular and professional with more dynamic and expression as oral communication, as Literacy and as performance. The role reality of the philosophical dialogue was also transformed and is expressed in the terms of industrial culture. It is very significant that the figures of producer and recipient are more important than relationships of the teacher and the pupil [4, 187]. The linguistic expression of these dialogues shows else some distinctions from the early philosophical tradition with its clear constructions. The German philosophical language was developed in the dialogue with the mysticism. The heuristic metaphors are used often in German philosophical communication. The formal analysis of philosophical dialogues on the borders of the phenomenology (B. Waldenfels) and formal sociology (G. Simmel) allow to separate the constant elements of it from the variables ones. V.Höslе proposed the following taxonomy of the philosophical dialogues: “direct, indirect and mixed ones” which are existing in the “universe of Literacy” [4: 166, 187, 189]. The direct dialogue occurs always between two participants, but their number can be extended for more actors of philosophical communication. The indirect dialogue

includes the historical and cultural dimension; the participants must have a minimal philosophical culture and historical knowledge which are a necessary requirement for the symmetric communication with the presumption of understanding. It can be illustrated on history of the concept “Bildung”, what means both: education and culture in the ontogenetic and phylogenetic senses [5: 26-27]. This concept belongs to the so called monster for translator. It must be mentioned, that indirect philosophical dialogue and its simulacra are existentially important for the intercultural philosophy as its *modus vivendi*.

German was always regarded as philosophical language. But in the intercultural philosophical communication its complexity must be reduced because that is one of the necessary condition for an acceptable translation. Some experienced translators are very skeptical about this possibility: “: “Nothing is to be gained by passing over in silence the radical difference of non-canonical texts. The third world novel will not offer the satisfactions of Proust or Joyce [6:14]. National allegories without their interpretation can stop the intercultural dialogue on philosophical topics. This is a very risky situation. S. Benhabib makes some comments to it and proposed “the critic of humanitarian reason” needed to defend the human rights” [2, 226-227].

Translation can be used also as manipulation in the relations with the “exotic Others”, what may wound the dignity of person and nations. R. Stein unveils this mechanism: We break a code: decipherment is dissected, leaving the shell smashed and the vital layers stripped. Every schoolchild, but also the eminent translator, will note the shift in substantive presence which follows on a protracted or difficult in translation: the text in other language has become almost materially thinner; the light seems to pass unhindered through loosened fibers. For a spell of hostile or seductive “otherness” is displayed. Ortega y Gasset speaks of the sadness of the translator after failure. There is also a sadness after success” [6, 314].

The terminology of German philosophy might be regarded as a kind of translation from Greek and Latin. They have metaphorical elements in their meaning. Therefore it expects from the participant of the philosophical dialogue

probably that abilities which Kant had explicated as power of creative thinking. The contra-metaphors addressed vis-à-vis of philosophical discussion may be also a kind of metaphorical performance e.g. dancing: “Metaphors of dance and movement have replaced the ontologically fixing stare of the motionless spectator. The lust for finality is banished. The dream is of “incalculable choreographies”, not the clear and distinct “mirroring” of nature, seen from the heights of “nowhere”. But I would argue, the philosopher’s fantasy of transcendence has not yet been abandoned [3, 143].

This kind of the mixed philosophical dialogues corresponds to the contexts of the Post-Modernity, where the philosophy is moving more near to literature. The institutional forms of philosophical dialogue are constructing new simulacra of the Greek agora with a new language.

#### Referenses

1. Попович Мирослав. Григорій Сковорода: філософія свободи. – Київ: Майстерня Білецьких. 2008. -256 с. Popovich M. Hrygorij Skovoroda: philosophy of freedom. In: Ukrainian.
2. Benhabib Seyla. Menschenrechte in unruhiger Zeit. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2016. – 281 S.
3. Bordo Susan. Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Skepticism // Feminism/Postmodernism. London: Routledge. 133-156.
4. Höslle Vittorio. Der Philosophische Dialog. München: Beck. 2006. – 494 S.
5. Precht R.D. Anna, die Schule und der liebe Gott. München: Goldmann, 2013. – 351 S.
6. Steiner Georges. After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation. New York: Oxford UP. 1975. –282 p.
7. Young Robert. Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory. Culture and Race . London: Routledge. 1995.

#### ФІЛОСОФСЬКИЙ ДІАЛОГ ТА ЙОГО ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЇ: НІМЕЦЬКА ТА УКРАЇНСЬКА ТРАДИЦІЇ

Н.В. Григорова

У статті розглядається філософський діалог у площині культурно-філософського аналізу як сингулярне культурне формоутворення, яке фіксує певну рольову реальність, яка обумовлена культурною традицією, статусом філософії у суспільстві. Уточнюється типологія філософського діалогу, передумови його трансформації у інтеркультурний діалог змішаного типу, розкриваються відмінності між домодерним і модерним філософським діалогом, який у постмодерній перспективі здатний перетворюватись на відкриту філософську комунікацію, де образно-метафоричний стиль може бути присутнім як в усному діалозі Філософа з Учнем або іншим філософом, так і у площині філософської літературної творчості, де діалог вже розглядається як літературний жанр з відповідними формальними і мовними характеристиками.

**Ключові слова:** філософський діалог, мова, вираз, репрезентація, рольова

реальність, культура, комунікація, Сковорода, німецький ідеалізм, термінологія, симулякр.

## ФИЛОСОФСКИЙ ДИАЛОГ И ЕГО ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИИ: НЕМЕЦКАЯ И УКРАИНСКАЯ ТРАДИЦИИ

Григорова Н.В.

В статье рассматривается философский диалог в плоскости культурно-философского анализа как сингулярное культурное формообразование, которое фиксирует определенную ролевую реальность, обусловленную определенной культурной традицией и статусом, который занимает философия в обществе. Уточняется типология философского диалога, предпосылки его трансформации в интеркультурный диалог смешанного типа, раскрываются различия между домодерным и модерным философским диалогом, который в постмодерной перспективе способен трансформироваться в открытую философскую коммуникацию, где образно-метафорический стиль может присутствовать как в устном диалоге Философа с Учеником или с другим философом, так и в плоскости философского литературного творчества, где философский диалог уже рассматривается как литературный жанр с соответствующими формальными и языковыми характеристиками

**Ключевые слова:** философский диалог, язык, выражение, репрезентация, ролевая реальность, коммуникация, Сковорода, немецкий идеализм, терминология, симулякр.