

The Dialogue between Universalized Dialectics and Logic of Interpersonal Communication: Manifesting the Discourse Reciprocity

Irina Suima¹, Olena Panchenko¹, Vasyl Patsan (Archbishop Eulogius of Novomoskovsk)², Nataliia Vlasenko³

¹Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

²Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Dnipropetrovsk State University of Inner Affairs, Dnipro, Ukraine

³Department of Foreign Literature, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Correspondence: Irina Suima, Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 49107, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine.

Received: May 8, 2022

Accepted: November 30, 2022

Online Published: December 17, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i3.5851

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5851>

Abstract

The aim of the article is to bridge the gap between linguistic segmentations of the dialogue and philosophical integrations of its structure in the course of revealing the reciprocal character of correlation between discourse models generalizing the mutuality of interlocutors' personal positions realized in communicative interactions to manifest singularities in the variety of their verbalized worldviews and dialogicity matrices singularizing the general discursive mutual connection between "the Self" and "the Other" in their communicability manifestations intended to comprehend the Source of being as the Universal Verity. The relevance of the study is determined by both the rediscovery of the communication sense-producing resource in the field of post-non-classical thought and the exposure of the dialogical deadlock denoted by the attempts to rationalize the acceptance of the Inescapable Alterity as a unity core of the Personality at the background of post-metaphysical declaration of limited potential of rational cognition. Combining the methods of hermeneutics and phenomenology with the approaches of structural linguistics and textology in the interdisciplinary area formed by philosophy and philology to problematize the interdiscursivity as an activity of the person's self-manifestation, the research reveals an effect of the disguised discourse reciprocity emphasizing the irreducibility of interpersonal relations in both the theories objectivizing the speech multiple entities by abstracting dialogue-forming intentions and reactions from the subjectivity and the conceptions substantiating the intersubjective understanding diversification as a mode of comprehending the objective truth and the Non-Objectivized Authenticity. The authors prove that the philosophical accents on "the Self" – "the Other" relationship as the primary dimension of the dialogicity argue for transcending the reduced subject's position marked by the linguistically substantiated complex discursive unities distinguished as sequences of stimulating replica and reacting replica, while the linguistic focus on the communicative dialogue intentionality initiates the realization of cognitive limits established in the sphere of philosophizing to objectivize the rationally unmediated communicability.

Keywords: intersubjectivity, personality, dialogicity, discursivity, dialogical entity, communicative activity, speech, mutuality

1. Introduction

The contemporary reflection of the culture as a communicative reality manifests the rediscovery of the sense-producing resource of communication "after Postmodernity" (Schrag, 1999), when the Self realizes the rationally unmediated communicability, manifested in the human appeal to God, as the personality's spiritual core, predicting his or her ability to accept the inescapable diversity of fragmental cognitive experience and axiological landmarks of the Others. Indicating the rise of post-secular thinking from the soil of revising the foundations of post-traditionalist consciousness, such a comprehension of M. Bakhtin's (1982) definition of the true being as a dialogical communion gives the answer to the question, formulated as the demand for valid indicator of the subject's authenticity in the early 20th century, when at the backgrounds of modernist break of the objective truth, substantiated by ratiocentrism, a person faced the challenges of disunity, physical and, most importantly, soul loneliness which indicated the facets of "the main problem of the human being and the philosophy of human existence" (Anđić et al., 2018; Buribayev et al., 2020).

Nowadays, the need to communicate dialogically is realized as a clue precondition of the personal self-definition deprived of both the rationalist illusion of the cognitive self-identity stated as the authentic impersonal form of the subjectivity and the optimistic perception of the technological arguments of the inexhaustible potential of the rationality (Anđić et al., 2021). The globalized multicultural world is filled with qualitatively new means of communicative interaction (mobile phones, satellite communications, e-mail, the Internet and others). With their help, at any moment a person can contact the necessary partner, receive or transmit a variety of information. The range of human capabilities in the field of communication has unusually expanded, but at the same time, the dependence of a human being on the technical media and on those who manage them has tremendously increased (Bakirov et al., 2021; Ryskaliyev et al., 2019). There was a danger of human domination of the global telecommunication system. A counteraction to this can be a return to interpersonal communication, the direct interaction of people. In the 21st century, according to scientific forecasts, communication should reach the highest point of improvement, revealing the depths of the human personality, the integrity of its social and individual being (Kostruba, 2018; Yermukhanova et al., 2019).

To grasp the interpersonal dialogue in its horizontal orientation and vertical direction, the late postmodernist thought forms the different lines of reflecting the communicative coexistence including: the argumentation for the inescapable personally manifested aspiration of humanity to communicate with the Saviour in J. Derrida's (2002) explication of the apophatic way of defining God's name; the attempt to continue "the discourse with God beyond being" in E. Levinas' (1990) ethics of responsibility; the comprehension of interpretative "narrative activity", intended to fulfill the reception of the Sacred symbols, narratively transmitted by the Bible, as a mode of a personality's self-revelation in P. Ricoeur's (1974) "epistemology of a new understanding"; the recognition of Christian ascetic as the landmark of the person's voluntary actability in M. Foucault's (1982) definition of the intents to think otherwise as the initiatives of entering the discursive field "for the constitution of ourselves as autonomous subjects"; the reflective extension of the communication phenomenality in J.-L. Marion's (1991) phenomenological meta-description of the givenness of the personal existence of both the Self and the Other as God's gift.

Denoting the unrealizability of the person's self-manifestation beyond the ultimately authentic communicative experience, eliminated from "the cultural meta-narrations" (Lyotard, 1984), abstracting the foundational principles of being and cognition from the life stories, all these vectors of renewing the interpersonal communication vertical, not comprehended by theocentrically oriented rationalism and hidden by anthropocentric rationalization of its horizon, pave the path for a person, trying to come out of the meta-narrative deadlock of identifying himself or herself with the patterns of the depersonalized monologic subject, by directing him or her to the sphere of narration, transmitting the way of communicating authentically in the dialogical interaction between the Self and the Other to verbalize "the narrative identity" (Ricoeur, 1974) as the primary form of revealing the irreducible personhood.

Such a reflective correlation between intentionality and dialogicity predicts the interdisciplinary – philosophical and philological – dialogue structure explication aimed at the exposition of the discourse reciprocity and performed in this article.

2. Theoretical Overview

The trans-historical configuration of theorizing on the dialogism and dialogical communicative interaction takes its origins in the interdiscursive relations between sophists' discourse pattern, accentuating "a transformation of shared knowledge" (Nystrand, 1986) to expose the mode of manifesting the changeable subjective opinion as the ever-lasting objective truth, and maieutic dialogue frame initiated by Socrates and substantiated by Plato to discover the way of connecting the facets of the Eternal Veracity. To define the dialogicity as a cognitive capacity, Aristotle revealed the reciprocal correlation between these discursivity frameworks defined by him, consequently, as the discourse model based upon the logic of interpersonal communication and the dialogue matrix manifested the universalized dialectics.

The focus on the logical order of the communication predicted the elaboration of the discursivity patterns generalizing the mutuality of interlocutors' personal positions realized in communicative interactions to manifest singularities in the variety of their verbalized worldviews.

The accent on the dialectical development of the fragmental vision into the complete comprehension inspired the substantiation of the dialogicity frames singularizing the general discursive mutual connection between "the Self" and "the Other" in their communicability manifestations intended to comprehend the Source of being as the Universal Verity.

But at the backgrounds of manifesting "the initiative of over-coming the delimitation between rational and spir-itual dimensions of the personhood" (Patsan (bishop Eulogius of Novomoskovsk), 2016) and in spite of "initial evidence of reciprocity in conversation" (Guydish, 2020) the reciprocal discourse construction denoted by the relations between these dialogue models has not been conceptualized as the framework for substantiating a matrix of the dialogical self-definition of the authentic subjectivity as the irreducible non-objectivized personality.

Famous researchers of the dialogue, comprehending its essence, as well as the specifics and conditions of its occurrence, found that in the process of communication along with individualization of a person, his\her socialization is carried out. In this case, the individual is revealed in isolation from other individuals, the personality is revealed in relations with other personalities. The way a person relates to other creatures distinguishes a person from an individual. A person, communicating with other representatives of society, comes into close contact with them. Through appeal to the other people, as well as through an internal and external response to external influences, he\she implements the basic principles of dialogue interaction. In dialogue, as a sphere of communication, the basic existential postulates are realized: life, love, hope, mercy, luck, children, memories and dreams. "In relation to a person, love, hatred, pity, tenderness, and generally all emotions are always more or less dialogical," (Vanhoutte, 2019). As a result of the development of dialectics (originally in antiquity – "the art of conversation, debate" (Vanhoutte, 2019), patterns and methodological means of purposeful dialogical interaction of people can and should be revealed. The urgency of solving this problem is obvious, because it will allow us to identify effective ways to accelerate social, scientific and technological development, aimed at more fully satisfying the constantly growing social and personal needs of people.

In contrast to dialogue, a monologue is more inherently cumulative (unidirectional). This is due to the fact that monologic speech is formed as a result of active speech activity, designed for passive perception. The speech response is a response to the information communicated by the speech situation. The situational conditionality in the dialogue is higher than in the monologue. The monologic form of speech is characterized by an expanded character and represents significant sections of text in size. In terms of content and grammatical form, the monologue coincides with written speech, although spoken language with the predominant function of communication also takes the form of a monologue. This is due to the formal difference between written and spoken language. When we write, usually we have time to make notes, plan the structure of the text, think, remember, change our minds, check with the source (when quoting) and generally polish the language to the option that will satisfy us. The reader sees the final product already. However, in daily communication, where language is used much more often, there is no such a possibility. When we speak, we involuntarily face the listener who is vividly reacting to our words; at least we expect some kind of reaction from him\her. We do not have time to plan what we want to say. We must take into account possible false starts, interruptions, side thoughts, something that sometimes "turns on the tongue", but that we cannot put into words, and many other obstacles. Naturally, under such conditions we resort to various kinds of tricks that are superfluous in writing, in particular, introductory words and expressions. It is important here not to overestimate the difference between spoken and written speech, since many grammatical turns are characteristic of both forms of speech.

A dialogue may look like an exchange of monologues if the speakers alternately do not pronounce one-phrase remarks, but rather large statements, talking about any event, their impressions, experiences or satisfying the interlocutor's request in the description of this or that person, place, action. The dialogue becomes an exchange of monologues and an exchange of greetings or small speeches at official receptions, ceremonies. Expressive monologues in the framework of a dialogue can also be a mumble, a conversation with oneself, an expression of joy, grief, anger. Monological parts are, as it were, "accompanied" by replicas. A single function (information transfer) and a common basis (a single sign system) make it possible for the monologue and dialogue to penetrate into each other. Their main difference today is associated with types of syntactic structures, where "a single one-phrase statement is characteristic of a dialogue, and a monologue is a lengthy non-single statement" (Morris, 2007).

3. Materials and Methods

The interdisciplinary study performed to explicate the discourse reciprocity predicts the dialogic methodology based upon the reciprocal relations between the method of phenomenological meta-description and hermeneutic principles of interpretation, analytical tools of structural linguistic and cognitive arsenal of the intertextuality theory.

The emergence of dialogue is hidden in the depths of centuries. Undoubtedly, it was born at the dawn of mankind at the same time as the formation of a human being as a social being. Many dialogues included in folklore works (myths, epics, legends, sagas) reflect the need for people to communicate already in the first stages of the formation of society. From the very beginning, a person had something that was not found in any animal – his\her inner spiritual world, which wanted to receive external expression and recognition. A person overcame the system of simple signals and created a language. Language was created at every moment of people's lives in the process of their communication, materializing in concrete expressions. In each statement we "embrace, understand, and feel the speech plan or the speech will of the speaker that defines the whole statement, its volume and its boundaries" (Morris, 2007). Only a statement is directly related to reality and to the speaking person. It is determined by its attitude to other statements in the framework of this communication. Outside of this relationship, it does not really exist. To say is to enter into dialogical relations, to express oneself, one way or another, your position in the process of exchange of views. This reflects the duality of a human nature. On the one hand, language is a product of a person's social instinct; on the other hand, individual human instincts do not obey him\her. Therefore, a person is in an eternal conflict between the desire for unity with society and the desire to express

himself/herself. The most obvious is the conflict in the interaction of individuals. Dialogue in the modern philosophical sense is a comprehensive co-participation of a person in the life of another person and at the same time a state of harmonious unity of opposing interests and the orientation of human actions.

4. Results and Discussion

Mankind at various stages of development has invariably addressed the problem of dialogue. The idea of mutual complementarity and harmony of opposite principles goes far back to centuries – to the ancient Chinese teaching on the interpenetrating forces of yin-yang. The center of this harmony in ancient Eastern philosophy was the balance of such quantities as good and evil, which is directly reflected in the linguistic categories of affirmation and negation, agreement and disagreement, which form the basis of any linguistic phenomenon, and first of all, dialogue. The significance of the phenomenon of dialogue was recognized even in antiquity and in Europe. Pioneers of the ancient Greek literary dialogue on philosophical topics, brought to perfection possible at that time, recognized such thinkers as Socrates, Plato, etc. It was in ancient times that approaches to the creation of dialogue as a theory of dialogue appeared. One of these approaches was Socrates's doctrine of an anamnesis, according to which the individual's creative energy and knowledge are in his soul in a state of sleep and awake, awakening, splashing out like water, in the path of which there are gateways. The release of creative energy and dormant knowledge is possible through dialogue, during which the partner's questions initiate hidden opportunities and remove obstacles that impede the free movement of thought. In the course of dialogical conversations one can obtain definitions in which ethical concepts are revealed. The meaning of the well-known "Socratic dialogues" was to eliminate imaginary knowledge or a distorted idea of the subject of dialogue through the disclosure of contradictions and encourage thought to search for truth (Korsunska et al., 2022).

It is known that Socrates did not write down his dialogues, they were passed on by word of mouth, and then recorded in writing by his students, the most consistent of which is Plato. In his writings, Plato practically does not mention himself; however, he gives a very complete and detailed description of the views of his teacher. It is from the records of Plato that we can see Socrates as a skillful participant in dialogue. He, as an experienced strategist, first listens to the speaker's speech to the end, praises him for the value of the stated judgment, and then quietly with the help of leading questions leads him to doubt the truth of his thought. Making the first thesis of the communicant, taking to the extreme the proof of the inconsistency of his opinion, convincing him of the exact opposite, Socrates must make a conclusion from the discussion of the issue, using the words: "Therefore ...", "So ...", etc. (Perdue, 2014). This method of posing questions provokes a critical attitude to dogmatic statements, to the revision of familiar ideas.

In the speech of Socrates, addressed to the interlocutor, general and negative-interrogative sentences prevail. He himself admits this and answers censures on this subject as follows: "... I do not give birth to wisdom. [...] because in no way am I a sage. Speech does not come from me, but always from my interlocutor. I don't know anything else, except for one trifle: to listen to the speech of another sage and, patiently examining it, to understand" (Perdue, 2014). Socrates really strove not only to understand, but also to remember the thought of his partner, so that later on occasion he would remember about it. Often in his speech he quoted famous sages with whom he was personally or indirectly acquainted: Homer, Protagoras, Heraclitus, etc.

The influence of Socrates' exceptional personality on young Plato was, of course, very impressive. Developing the ideas of his teacher, he defended the presence of dialogical elements in the emergence of thought, "repeatedly called thinking a soundless conversation of the soul with itself" (Perdue, 2014), but he understood the dialogue much more widely. For him, this is not only questions and the search for answers, not only the exchange of remarks, but the text in persons. In the skillful dialogues of Plato, one can sense the logically consistent composition and structure of the dialogue as a philosophical genre. Despite the fact that Plato himself does not appear in dialogues with Socrates, he is invisibly present in them. Plato's works are presented in the form of dialogues of various subjects. He describes the atmosphere of the conversation and gives a general statement of the issue of interest to him. Further, through the words of the interlocutors, he offers a solution to the issue, however, by means of certain arguments it is refuted. A new attempt arises to define a concept or solve a problem. At the end, the disputants either come to some kind of common opinion, or disagree with anything, recognizing the difficulty of any definition if it seeks to be accurate knowledge. Through the final thought of each dialogue, Plato expressed his own beliefs.

The fictional idea of the enclosed space in the Greeks reflected the desire to know the world as a whole, nature, space, and then a person. The main means of moral development of man was seen by ancient philosophers in his socialization. In the period of Hellenism (4th – 1st centuries BC), the views of man as a social being were replaced by the subjectivist-anthropological views of the Stoics, and from that moment the question of dialogical relationships lost its relevance and for a long time left the arena of the philosophical polemics.

The revival of philosophical dialogue took place in the Enlightenment, when the literary design of philosophical reasoning in the form of dialogue began to be used more and more, which served as a sure sign of change in the style of thinking

itself. There are tendencies towards synthesis, compromise, and the unification of ideologies on the basis of objective scientific knowledge. These processes were accompanied by a return to anthropological problems. The new philosophy of dialogue turned to reality from the point of view of human relations. At the center of this philosophy was not a lonely human person, but the relationship of “I” and “You”. The dialogue in the philosophy of the 19th century was a reflection of the content of the human world. The turn to the problem of man and the comprehension of human nature through the prism of the relationship of “I” and “You” could not help but contribute to the formation of a new anthropological philosophizing in the late XIX – early XX centuries. This is the most clearly shown in the anthropological dialectic of Ludwig Feuerbach. For Feuerbach, a human being is not an abstract disembodied soul, not just a human individuality, but a living creature in unity with another creature. According to the philosopher, the mental and spiritual world of man cannot exist outside the logic of dialogical discourse. In the pairing of “Me” and “You”, he saw the sphere of emergence of consciousness, and therefore, the possibility of dialogue. Being isolated from other people, a person cannot realize himself/herself as a true human being. As a rational and moral being, person reveals it only in connection, in unity with his/her own kind. After all, “two persons are necessary for the generation of human beings, both physically and spiritually: the community of people is the original principle and criterion of truth and all-community. Even the authenticity of the existence of other things external to me is mediated for me by the authenticity of the presence of another person outside of me. What I see alone, I doubt it, but what the other person sees also becomes reliable for me” (Feuerbach, 1843).

The anthropological principle in the researches of Feuerbach (1843) was a truly new philosophy, different from the philosophy of the materialists. Feuerbach saw in a human being a specific creature of nature, functioning according to his/her own laws, and not obeying the mechanical laws of the natural system. Feuerbach’s refusal to recognize a person as an “isolated atom entering into relations with other people under the influence of external necessity” (Feuerbach, 1843) was also new. He defended the unity of a person with the other person, communication between people as a natural principle of human communion and the essential characteristic of a person himself/herself.

The heritage of Ludwig Feuerbach, as it is known, had a significant impact on the development of the creative thought of his contemporaries: philosophers, sociologists, and also contributed to the development of scientific and philosophical knowledge in subsequent years. Both the fundamental conclusions and the particular comments of the German philosopher played a significant role in the development of the science of speech communication, in particular, in its section related to dialogue. In this sense, for us, for example, Feuerbach’s idea of development as a movement is very important. According to Feuerbach, neither being nor consciousness is possible without change, movement, development. The scientist noted: “Where there is no following each other, where there is no movement, change and development, there is no life, there is no nature” (Feuerbach, 1843). Development as a universal property of being, as an attribute of matter and as a system process is of fundamental importance for dialogue. Its dynamics is an absolute way of being. Feuerbach’s justified idea of development allows a deeper understanding of the essence of dialogue in general and the meaning of its individual elements, in particular. So, for example, analyzing the initiating and reacting replicas in the structure of the dialogue in their independence and at the same time in the interaction, we find that the primary, relatively simple meaning of the first replica is narrow. Those aspects that were not disclosed in it, receive a certain development in the second replica. In the course of further research, we are convinced that the latter, in turn, turns out to be one-sided again in other aspects, and therefore develops in the next replica, which will be a kind of reaction to it. Each subsequent (reactive) remark in the course of the dialogue movement contains all the previous ones, reproducing them at a new, higher level, with a new, richer content. At the same time, all subsequent replicas are anticipated at the initial stage of the development of the dialogue in the initiating replica. There comes a moment when one of the replica reactions combines the thoughts of the foregoing in the synthesis. In our opinion, such a result is inevitable in the dialogue as a structured system in a certain way. The lack of movement of thought of one of the communicants is not a static of dialogue, but the cessation of communication.

Linguistic studies based on an understanding of Feuerbach’s legacy required not only philologists, but also philosophers to seriously develop and specify issues related to the nature of human communication. Thus, developing the idea of the unity of society the prominent philosopher S. L. Frank (1989), in the spirit of an organic worldview, came to the conclusion that society is not just “the amount of individuals, but an organic whole of a higher order” (Frank, 1989).

In the social “We”, the philosopher saw a direct reflection of all-unity in social life. He paid special attention to the aspect of “We” as the unity of “I-You”. In essence, “You” is a reality directed at me. S. L. Frank (1989) wrote that “You” lets us know about ourselves, penetrating us, entering into communication with us, in some way “expressing” ourselves to us and awakening a “lively response” in us. “Any “knowledge” or perception of “You” is a live meeting with him, the crossing of two eyes: the invasion of “You” in us is at the same time our invasion of him ...”. In the meeting of “I” and “You”, there is a self-disclosure for each other of two self-contained carriers of being. At the same time, “my” being, as it were, encounters and recognizes its own being outside itself.

“Invasion”, “penetration” of “You” into “I”, it would seem, implies it – “You” is a third-party existence, independent of

“my consciousness”, given from the outside. However, according to S. L. Frank (1989), this is absolutely not so. He insisted that “You” was originally inherent in me. The meeting of “I” and “You” is an awakening in them of both “a certain initial primary unity”. From this moment begins the maturation and formation of human spiritual being, which lasts all our life. The meeting of “me” and “You” is the phenomenon of “We”. However, in the opinion of S. L. Frank, “We” are not the union of several “I”, “We” are the primary reality in relation to any “I”, this is the original integrity, in which it is possible to highlight the opposite sides. “We” performs a valuable function: it protects and strengthens the basis of a person’s personal life, giving it a reasonable order.

The identification of a person’s true existence, the realization of his unique inner world is possible, first of all, in individual relations with his neighbors. This opinion was shared by the leading representative of German existentialism, Karl Jaspers (1971). In the views of Jaspers on the nature of man and the essence of his being, one can easily see the correspondence with the views of his compatriot L. Feuerbach (1843). However, Jaspers concretizes the type of human relations, reducing them to “un-formally chosen”, “intimate”, “relations of sympathy, friendship, love” (Lycan, 2001). It was in dialogic communication that he, like his contemporaries, saw the path to a truly human existence, through it, he believed that we penetrate each other, empathize, value and love a person without finding an explanation for our feelings. It is in the dialogue that human existence takes on reality (Jaspers, 1971).

The concept of "communication" Jaspers (1971) has always associated with the concept of "personal freedom". Communication is a means of gaining freedom, because outside of it human existence is not possible, and, therefore, there can be no freedom. And just communication allows existence to be “heard”, understood by another person. Understanding is a function of the mind. The latter is able to reveal the meaning of the existence of another person, and his mind is able to “penetrate” into my existence. This allows you to recognize the existence of one and another person as a value.

The world of Jaspers (1971) is, first of all, the world of communication, and the communication is lively and every day, during which people solve urgent problems. From the analysis of existential communication, K. Jaspers moves to more global issues, namely: communication of cultures and nationalities, phenomena of philosophical and religious faith, and others. However, the solution to these problems did not overshadow the main line of thought of the German philosopher. Subjecting special consideration to the problem of dialogic communication, K. Jaspers as a philosopher and psychiatrist interpreted it through different levels of consciousness and considered it a means of self-preservation of the individual. The idea of K. Jaspers gaining freedom by a person in a dialogue was simultaneously developed in the works of M. Buber (1958). However, Buber strengthened the significance and influence of dialogue on a person, and saw other possibilities in it.

The anthropological philosophy of L. Feuerbach had a significant influence on the views of Martin Buber (1958), a Jewish philosopher-anthropologist, a Jewish theologian, and the universally recognized founder of dialogism. The central idea of his philosophy is that a person finds confirmation of his life only in a vital relation to another person. He forms his “I” through meetings with “Thou”, and in these meetings a person’s true life is accomplished. “To live means to be the one to whom you are addressed, you only need to accept, only to hear this appeal,” the thinker claimed (Kenny, 2004).

The dialogical existence of man with man is the sphere “Between” – the meeting place of Me and You. The knowledge of this sphere helps a person to overcome “unprecedented loneliness”, to find a way out of the dead end of loneliness in which the human person found himself in the 20th century. The scientist paid special attention to the comprehension of the key categories of dialogism: “I” and “You”. A person, according to Buber (1958), is dual – “the Self “does not exist by himself or herself, but only in relation to someone or to something. In some cases, it relates to “Thou”, in others – to “It”, so that we always have two different positions of “the Self”, namely: “I-Thou” and “I-It”. The Buberian demarcation of “I-Thou” with “I-It” is of great importance, because it is opposed by objects of cognition indifferent to “the Self” (“I-It”) and the world of a person’s meeting with a different existence, living involvement of “an I” and “a Thou”. The “I-Thou” relationship, according to the concept of the thinker, is an intimate, real human relationship experienced by the whole human being, the basis of which is the whole perception of the other. However, in the act of evaluating or knowing another, this attitude disappears. It reappears in the dialogue thanks to the joint efforts of the communicants, although, according to M. Buber, the fundamental characteristics of the “I-Thou” dialogue are their reciprocity, spontaneity and independence from dialogue partners. In the world of relationships, a person gains his/her freedom and destiny, discovers his/her vocation.

We usually call the exchange of statements “dialogue”, but for Buber, not every language interaction is a dialogue. He believed that a real dialogue could occur in silence. In his opinion, one thing should in any case be present in the dialogue – the mutual orientation of internal action, sincere openness, disposition towards another person. M. Buber (1958) distinguished three types of dialogue: “genuine”, “technical”, “monologue disguised as dialogue”. The last two types of dialogue, as the scientist noted, are much more common than the first. The “technical” dialogue is caused by the need to coordinate the actions of individuals. A “masked monologue” is a kind of discussion, a conversation based on “a desire

to establish oneself in one's vanity, having read the impression made on the person's face" (Buber, 1958). True, "genuine" dialogue is extremely rare, its participants strive to establish a "living relationship", bearing in mind the personality of the other and addressing him as a person. This dialogue is spontaneous in nature, unprepared. This is direct communication, the result of which is unknown and unpredictable; it is fraught with surprises and unexpected turns.

Thus, on the basis of the concept of dialogic being, encompassing the whole world, M. Buber proposed a solution to the problems of the meaning of life, loneliness and the disorder of man in the universe. This decision is a peculiar way out in the world of "I-Thou" relations, in unity with nature, people and their spiritual entities. Confirmation, a kind of reflection and development of the ideas of M. Buber about the dialogic nature of human life, we find in the works by philosopher and philologist Mikhail Bakhtin (1982).

The dialogue phenomenon M. Bakhtin (1982) attached universal significance. He asserted: "To be means to communicate dialogically. When the dialogue ends, everything ends. Two voices – the minimum of life, the minimum of being" (Givon, 1997). He was convinced that the dialogical relationship of people is a phenomenon that permeates all human speech and consciousness, everything that makes sense and significance. Through these relationships, through them, a person gains his place in being. To know a person and her inner life, as M. Bakhtin (1982) showed, perhaps only through dialogue a man from within himself can neither understand himself nor even become himself, only other people see him whole. "... Another's consciousness," the thinker maintained, "cannot be contemplated, analyzed, defined as objects, things," you can only communicate with them dialogically. Thinking about them means talking to them, otherwise they immediately turn to us with their objective side: they become silent, close and freeze into completed object images". M. Bakhtin (1982) criticized the two most common approaches to cognition of man: this is the path of "feeling", characteristic of the "philosophy of life" and the path of objective cognition of mechanistic psychology. In his opinion, the "inner person" cannot be revealed either as an object of indifferent neutral analysis, or by getting used to it. He/she himself/herself must be revealed in dialogue through communication.

As you know, communication between people is carried out using language. Language is necessary for self-expression. Its essence is the result of an individual's spiritual creativity, which through language can convey important information to another, can more accurately express his feelings and thoughts both for himself and for the one to whom his words are addressed. The most complete language as a system is revealed in speech. Language and speech are phenomena of the same order, since the dialogic lines of utterances are erased in speech, but language and verbal communication (as a dialogical exchange of utterances) cannot identify. Language helps a person to show his creative abilities, he only needs a speaker. When the language receives an external expression, "it is cast into the form of a statement" (Givon, 1997), we have a speech, and it already has a double focus: on the speaker as a subject of speech activity and the listener as active participant, object of speech exposure. Thus, speech is an individual manifestation and mechanism of language.

The most perfect and effective, classic form of verbal communication is dialogue. All other options for verbal communication are secondary to it. The real, and not a conventional unit of verbal communication is the statement. It is clearly delimited by the change of speech subjects, ending with the transfer of the word to another. According to the philosopher, "every utterance has an absolute beginning and an absolute end: before it begins – the statements of others, after its end – the response statements of others..." (Coulthard, 1988). This means that every speaker in the process of speech interaction acts both as the addressee, and as the addressee, speaking and listening, the interrogator is the answering one. In communication, we open things for their understanding and practical management. Understanding is inevitably dialogical. However, it does not necessarily come down to resolving the contradictions. Dialogue relations cannot be understood in a simplified and one-sided way, reducing them to struggle, debate, and disagreement. Consent is one of the most important forms of dialogue.

Extraction of dialogical entity from the context is possible due to its syntactic self-sufficiency and completeness of thought; the meaning of the constituent elements is visible in it. Dialogical entity is characterized by the discontinuity of the structure of the internal structure and the heterogeneity of its composition. A distinctive feature of dialogue is its syntactic isolation, expressed in the fact that the second replica is structurally determined by the first and syntactically depends on it, while the first replica in its form is relatively free. This explains the fact that many linguists are trying to identify certain rules for constructing dialogue in the course of parsing the forms of the second replica. The specific of interaction between dialogic replicas consists in their multilateral binding, combining with the help of linguistic means of different levels (phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic). The structural-grammatical principle of the division of the dialogical chain, in our opinion, distinguishes dialogical entity as a formal union of replicas.

However, one should not forget about their semantic interdependence. The interconnectedness of dialogue episodes is provided by thematic content. They (episodes) are always about something, and this is what speaks of their thematic nature.

The fruitfulness of the systematic approach to understanding dialogue is explained, on the one hand, by the widespread

dissemination of ideas and terms of the systematic approach in modern linguistics, and, on the other hand, by the complexity and multidimensional nature of such a phenomenon as dialogue. The dialogue demonstrates a number of systematic indicators, such as the presence of several components united by common relations, the obligatory orderliness of the dialogue, the relationship of mutual influence and mutual complementarity of components. It looks like a temporary world, created to carry out a closed-loop action. It should be noted that due to the interaction of dialogue components, it is an open activity system. No matter how varied the interpretations of the concept of “system”, it always implies the presence of elements, further indivisible components only from the point of view of this system and a network of connections of elements, the structure organizing the system (Chyzmar & Hoblyk, 2021). A systematic approach involves the application of the principle holistic description and explanation of the dialogue in all its forms, as well as the identification and disclosure of its characteristic features and features. The internal orderliness of dialogue allows one to use one of the principles of the dialectical method of philosophy in his research, the essence of which is that the phenomenon of dialogue cannot be understood in an isolated form, it is necessary to take into account the relations of the main components of the dialogical text. A description of the interaction of dialogue replicas and the presentation of its structure is impossible without a preliminary definition of the original units and their structure.

The central link, a cell that has a decisive influence on the essence of dialogue as a system, is a replica. In the linguistic literature on the theory of dialogue there are various interpretations of this term: “a component of speech exchange” (Chappell et al., 2008). By “dialogical remark” the researchers understand “a syntactic unit having its own characteristic features, combined with linguistic connections with the previous statements of the interlocutor”. For the construction of the dialogue, it is not so much the structure of a separate replica that is important as the combination of two adjacent replicas. This is a kind of dialogue subsystem, with the help of which the activities of communicants receive their target orientation, are coordinated and implemented in joint implementation. During the conversation the statements of the communicants are “naturally generated” to each other. Relationships of community and complementarity of replicas, their linearity and heterogeneity, as well as discreteness confirm the idea of the complex structure of the dialogue.

Structure as an attribute of any system gives it a certain strength and stability. It expresses the totality of intra-system connections; therefore, the concept of “connection” is of the greatest interest in system research. Communication is not only relations of mutual conditioning of units of one level of organization, but, above all, relations of mutual conditioning of the speech system and its environment, speech system and its elements, the interaction of opposites in speech systems (Zaimul, 2018). It is clear that communication in oral communication is always present, regardless of whether its speech contains its formal indicators: phonetic, lexical, grammatical. This is due to the fact that the replica as a component of the dialogue combines the meanings of “action” and “reaction” (Zaimul, 2018). However, to determine the exact number of signs of connectivity is not possible due to the fact that they are already detected in the finished speech segment, so to speak, *post factum*.

Connectivity as a necessary property of dialogue, on the one hand, reflects the presence of two communicants in the replicas, and on the other hand, combines the common components of the dialogue into “one whole, which is meaningfully closed” (Chali, 2009). However, semantic closure is not always clearly expressed, and if there is no connectedness of language components in the dialogue, it should be sought in the ratio of their meanings.

Along with connectedness, an integral systemic sign of a dialogical text is considered to be wholeness, a psycholinguistic category, which arises in the interaction of the speaker and the listener in the process of communication. Due to the conjugation of the communicative activities of the participants in communication, the integrity of the dialogue is communicative. The mobility of the speaker's intentions determines the dynamic development of the subject of dialogue.

The “cohesion” of replicas allows us to consider dialogue as a complex syntactic whole. The following definition of a combination of replicas is given: “... a single syntactic whole, parts of which are connected to each other according to certain rules of syntactic dependence, is a communicative unit of dialogue” (Chali, 2009).

Extraction of dialogical entities from the context is possible due to its syntactic independence and completeness of thought; it shows the meaning of the constituent elements. Dialogical entity is characterized by the discontinuity of the structure of the internal structure and the heterogeneity of its composition. A distinctive feature of dialogical entities is its syntactic isolation, expressed in the fact that the second replica is structurally determined by the first and syntactically depends on it, while the first replica in its form is relatively free. This explains the fact that many linguists are trying to identify certain rules for constructing dialogical entity in the course of parsing the forms of the second replica. The specifics of interaction between dialogical entities replicas are their multilateral binding, combining with the help of linguistic means of different levels (phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic). The structural-grammatical principle of the division of the dialogical chain, in our opinion, distinguishes dialogical entities as a formal union of replicas.

The communicants' understanding of each other lies in the observation and exchange of views. We can only partially agree with the opinion of the researcher, because, as we established as a result of the analysis of numerous dialogic unities,

not all participants in communication can come to an understanding and build a successful dialogue based on implications. Even if the degree of foresight, premonition of the interlocutor's opinion is great, it is necessary to coordinate, correlate, compare, and establish similar and different sides of these opinions. Psychological studies of the dialogue highlight its natural cooperation, expressed in the fact that speakers working together create general knowledge. They coordinate the linguistic form and content of their statements in order to provide the listener with understanding. Similarly, scholars who study directly live speech have shown in their studies how speakers work together to prevent or eliminate a problem by coordinating their actions.

The unity of the dialogical text is ensured by the cohesion of its parts with the help of lexical and grammatical means and the coherence of the meaning contained in them. It turns out that in the speech of the two communicants, as it were, the members of one sentence are distributed, the meaning of which is preserved, despite the fact that the syntactic composition of the first replica is made up of at the expense of the elements of the second. In this interaction of replicas, the author sees a specific property of the dialogue – expressive brevity, emotional ellipticity. Outwardly, restoration takes place with a tendency towards minimalism, a limitation of linguistic means for mutual understanding, but with respect to the meaning and informativeness of the replicas, the opposite tendency is observed – what was said above continues, is added, revealed, concretized, or, conversely, summarized in the following words. In our work, along with clarifying the formal-grammatical characteristics of replicas, much attention is paid to determining the semantics of contacting replicas due to the fact that the main function of the language is the communicative function. Now let us consider in more detail the mechanism of action of the replicas that organize the dialogue.

The main mechanism of interaction of dialogue entities replicas is expressed in their change according to the principle of "stimulus-response". The loss of one of the parts of the opposition entails the loss of the meaning of the dialogue or a violation of its natural development. Considering the question of the scientific and logical comprehension of the meaning of dialogue, the attention was paid to its connection with general scientific concepts and categories. The philosophers find the key to its solution in comprehending the dialectical relations between the categories of "part" and "whole". The essence of this approach is that part and the whole are interconnected, interconnected. The basis of their interaction is the principle of integrity, which characterizes in general terms objects with a complex internal structure.

Dialogue research is mainly related to the analysis and description of its varieties, the search for general patterns of formation and functioning of dialogical entity. A differentiated approach to each of them is characteristic of the study of this type of unities from the point of view of both functions in the texts of works and the interaction of speech-thinking tactics and communication strategies. Scientists are united in the fact that a productive analysis of dialogical speech is achievable only if the researcher studies it in close connection with the speech behavior of communicants. It is necessary to take into account factors and conditions associated with the individual qualities of the participants in communication, with their general knowledge, interactions and assumptions. In connection with the appeal of the science of language to the human factor, to a native speaker, the efforts of scientists began to be directed to the study of speech messages, taking into account their impact on the addressee. In the process of communication, it is important to take into account the correspondence factor of the dialogue form of communication of the speech situation and the principle of variability. Moreover, it is precisely the possibility of choosing the option of utterance that provides the functional-pragmatic flexibility of the dialogue. The choice of means of expression of dialogic speech allows the speaker to develop his own style of communication. The study of dialogue gives reason to talk about it as a multifaceted phenomenon. Replicas-stimuli and replicas-reactions, united by a single topic, have their structural and semantic features, as well as their communicative orientation. Given this specificity, certain types of dialogical entities are identified, genres of information transfer, while hidden meanings are not excluded. The basic unit of analysis of a dialogical text is a dialogical entity, as a whole communicative unit, which is a coherent sequence of speech actions that form a kind of complex speech act – an interactive or dialogue action. Success in the study of dialogical chains as units that are relevant for the formation of different types of texts of works into which these chains are included is achieved precisely by referring to the doctrine of speech acts, i.e. speech works that allow you to combine the illocutionary intentions of the communicants, a relatively complete segment of speech and the achieved result.

Connectedness as a necessary feature of dialogue, on the one hand, reflects the presence of two communicants in the replicas, and on the other hand, combines the common components of the dialogue into one meaningfully closed whole. However, semantic closure is not always clearly expressed, and if there is no connectedness of language components in the dialogue, it should be sought in the ratio of their meanings. Along with connectedness, an integral systemic sign of a dialogical text is considered to be integrity, a psycholinguistic category, which arises in the interaction of the speaker and the listener in the process of communication. Due to the conjugation of the communicative activities of the participants in the communication, the integrity of the dialogue is communicative. The mobility of the speaker's intentions determines the dynamic development of the subject of dialogue.

The consideration of the categories of implicitness / explicitness is especially important in relation to dialogue, since they

are the most important factors in the semantic movement of the dialogue. The type of expression of the stimulating meaning of the initiating statement largely determines the structure of the reacting replica. If mutual understanding is established between the interlocutors, and the dialogue develops, then the speaker and the listener adhere to the following strategy. The speaker from the whole variety of linguistic units selects those that most accurately and fully express his thought. The listener knows about the speaker's desire to maximize the accuracy of the statement and takes this into account when understanding. The listener can independently draw conclusions about the hidden meaning of the statement by extracting additional information from the context, background and pragmatic knowledge.

The expressiveness, expressiveness of linguistic means and the emotionality of the content expressed by them give the dialogue, the main form of colloquial speech, a unique brightness, and liveliness. The main idea, the general theme in it can be opened smoothly, evenly, logically correctly, and can be interrupted by extras messages, inserts, comments, emotional outbursts, which violate the sequence of the dialogue. The response sentences are often modal and impersonal-predicative words, since they are semantically able to convey varying degrees of responsive message. A significant role in giving dialogic speech expressiveness is played by its syntax. The main purpose of syntactic constructions is to attract and retain the attention of the interlocutor, emphasizing the transmitted information, enhancing its effectiveness. Against this background, the activation of expressive syntactic formations, as well as structural design, in particular, the growth of independence, stylistically marked linguistic units, seems legitimate. Many of its aspects, in particular aspects of functioning, are studied superficially. The expressive function of syntax – the ability to express the speaker's internal, emotional state – is of particular interest to modern linguistics.

The general desire of dialogic speech for the synthesis of its elements is dialectically combined with its other distinctive feature – analyticism. Very often, the speaker breaks the coherent string of words into several segments for greater persuasiveness. Each of them receives an independent relevance to reality, forms a separate expression, pronounced with special expressiveness, is made out by the corresponding intonation. Between them, pausing is possible, which on the letter is expressed by its graphic indicators – punctuation marks. The basis of such a construction of replicas is the principle of the semantic allocation of the most significant parts of the statement into separate sentences in accordance with the intentions of the speaker. The parcel is in syntactic relation with the corresponding word of the basic sentence. It is carried out with the help of unions and allied words, or *asyndetically*. In addition, adverbs, particles, vocabulary words and whole sentences can perform communication functions. When *parcellation* occurs, truncation of the *parcelate* occurs, which leads to the appearance of elliptical structures. With *de-parcellation*, the next and previous components of the utterance form one logical-grammatical structure. In the works of recent years, various types of *parcellation* have been singled out, the obligatory structural and semantic connection between the supporting and continuing parts is noted. The scope of the stylistic use of this technique in the syntax of modern English is expanding, since its communicative effectiveness is observed.

Solving one of the most acute problems that a person faced in the late XIX – early XX centuries, the problem of loneliness of a person in society, many philosophers sought to prove the need for the development of dialogue interaction. In dialogic relations, according to their opinion, the duality of human nature is realized to the fullest extent, namely, his/her aspiration, on the one hand, for self-expression, and on the other, for understanding and cognition of other subjects, unity with them in the process communication. The main idea that permeates and unites the views of all five philosophers examined by us can be expressed in the following thesis: a human being is realized by a personality only in communication, in organic unity with other personalities. It is no accident that in the writings of Feuerbach, and Frank, and Jaspers, and Buber, and Bakhtin, their echoes with each other are easily traced. However, philosophers do not duplicate one thought, but expand it, deepen, specify and enrich it, considering it from different perspectives. So, Feuerbach saw in the dialogue the scope of consciousness. Frank defended the initial assignment of dialogue for any person. Jaspers' dialogue comes down to informal, friendly relations. Buber firstly introduced the dialogue as a way out of a person from a state of loneliness. Finally, Bakhtin attached universal significance to the dialogue, seeing in it the only way to know a person.

5. Conclusions

The discourse reciprocity is emphasized by the active role of the listener in the dialogue. His/her speech actions not only keep the dialogue “in good shape”, but also contribute to the disclosure of the intentions of the sender of the message and the identification of hidden meanings of his words. But since dialogue is an act of speech-writing of two communicants, one should not forget about the active position of the speaker. The speech of the latter contains signals predicting further thematic development, in a certain way “tuning” the listener “to the desired wave”, prompting him/her both the direction of thought and the means by which he/she can continue it.

So, the main interaction mechanism described above is the first pairwise characteristic of the dialogue. It can be described as addressing – reactivity – dialectically interconnected features of the dialogue. The dialogue generally has a very low tolerance for silence. If suddenly such a moment arrives, and for one reason or another, the initiating remark does not

receive a proper response, the speaker pronounces the so-called “post completer”. This can be an intonationally emphasized repetition of one’s own statement or a special question clarifying the interlocutor’s attention: Didn't you hear me; Are you (still) here; Are you interested in it at all? etc. To avoid such complication of the dialogue, piling up phrases that distract from the main topic, the listener imperceptibly gives the speaker signals of his constant attention. Even if one of the communicants has not yet formulated a response statement, the another indicates his/her desire to continue the conversation with the help of interjections “erm”, “um”, “mm”, “oh”, “hunh”, etc., a deep breath filling the silence. Such inclusions in the fabric of dialogue can occur not only at the junction of replicas, but also when the interlocutors speak at random, occasionally.

Entering into a dialogical interaction with the other people, a person acts as a thinking, creative and sympathetic being, fully realizing his/her universal abilities and needs, able to manifest the immanent entity of his or her “Self” by accepting the Alterity of “the Others” and the Absolute Transcendence of God as the Rationally Inexplicable, but Spiritually Comprehensible Manifestations of the Dialogists. Dialogue, therefore, is always practically transformative, regardless of whether it is performed as an internal discursive activity or as an external discourse.

The philosophical accents on “the Self” – “the Other” relationship as the primary dimension of the dialogicity argue for transcending the reduced subject’s position marked by the linguistically substantiated complex discursive unities distinguished as sequences of stimulating replica and reacting replica, while the linguistic focus on the communicative dialogue intentionality initiates the realization of cognitive limits established in the sphere of philosophizing to objectivize the rationally unmediated communicability. By such a prospect of the reciprocal transformation of discourse models revealing the logic relations of singularities and its matrices establishing and transcending the dialectic trajectory of approaching the Universum of Veracity the contemporary reflection of the dialogicity is inspired to substantiate a framework of the dialogical self-definition of the personality realizing the rationally unmediated communicability manifesting his or her non-objectivization and irreducibility as a true marker of the subjective authenticity.

References

- Andić, B., Cvjetičanin, S., Maričić, M., & Stešević, D. (2021). Sensory perception and descriptions of morphological characteristic of vegetative plant organs by the blind: implementation in teaching. *Journal of Biological Education*, 55(3), 321-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2019.1687107>
- Andić, B., Dragičević, S., Stešević, D., & Papp, B. (2018). *Fissidens fontanus*, a new species to Montenegro. *Lindbergia*, 41(1), 1094. <https://doi.org/10.25227/linbg.01094>
- Bakhtin, M. (1982). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakirov, A. S., Vitulyova, Y. S., Zotkin, A. A., & Suleimenov, I. E. (2021). Internet user's behavior from the standpoint of the neural network theory of society: Prerequisites for the meta-education concept formation. *International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences - ISPRS Archives*, 46(4/W5-2021), 83-90. <https://doi.org/10.5194/isprs-Archives-XLVI-4-W5-2021-83-2021>
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou (translated by Ronald Gregor Smith)*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Buribayev, Y., Khamzina, Z., Belkhozhayeva, D., Meirbekova, G., Kadirkulova, G., & Bogatyreva, L. (2020). Human dignity – The basis of human rights to social protection. *Wisdom*, 16(3), 143-155.
- Chali, Y. (2009). Question answering using question classification and document tagging. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 23, 192-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839510903078093>
- Chappell, C., Craft, A., Burnard, P., & Cremin, T. (2008). *Question-posing and question-responding: the heart of “Possibility Thinking” in the early years*. *Early Years*. Exeter: University of Exeter. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09575140802224477>
- Chyzmar, I., & Hoblyk, V. (2021). E-sports organizations with franchised networks: Formalization of technological and economic development based on optimal operation and upgrade of the hardware. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 187(1-2), 146-162. <https://doi.org/10.21003/EA.V187-15>
- Coulthard, M. (1988). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Longman.
- Derrida, J. (2002). Faith and Knowledge. The Two Sources of ‘Religion’ at the Limits of Reason Alone. In: *Acts of Religion (Translated by G. Anidjar)* (pp. 27-56). New York and London: Routledge.
- Feuerbach, L. (1843). *Principles of the Philosophy of the Future*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/feuerbach/works/future/future2.htm>
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In: H. L. Dreyfus, P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp. 208-227). Brighton: Harvester Press.

- Frank, S. L. (1989) *Light Shineth in Darkness: An Essay In Christian Ethics And Social Philosophy*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Givon, S. (1997). *Conversation. Cognitive, communitive and social perspectives*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.34>
- Jaspers, K. (1971) *Philosophy of Existence*. University of Pennsylvania Press. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812200867>
- Kenny, A. (2004). *A New History of Western Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Korsunskaya, M., Butorina, V., Abdullayev, K., Kravtsov, Y., & Ustymenko, L. (2022). The role of Creative Potential in the Project Management Process for the Implementation of the Company's Strategies. *Review of Economics and Finance*, 20(1), 255-262. <https://doi.org/10.55365/1923.x2022.20.30>
- Kostruba, A. V. (2018). Legal regulatory mechanism of social relations for ensuring dynamics in civil relationship. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 9(5), 1689-1695. [https://doi.org/10.14505/jarle.v9.5\(35\).22](https://doi.org/10.14505/jarle.v9.5(35).22)
- Levinas, E. (1990) *Totalite et infini: essai sur l'exteriorit*. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.
- Lycan, G. (2001). *Philosophy of Language*. New York: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University Of Minnesota Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772278>
- Marion, J.-L. (1991) *God without Being*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, M. (2007). *An introduction to the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Nystrand, M. (1986). *The Structure of Written Communication. Studies in Reciprocity between Writers and Readers*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Madison.
- Patsan, V. O. (bishop Eulogius of Novomoskovsk). (2016). The Reception of the Philosophical Tradition as a Way of Forming American Personalism: The Post-Secular View. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 1, 131-145. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2016/72246>
- Perdue, S. (2014). The big three of Greek Philosophy: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. *International Journal of Philosophy*, 3, 87-96.
- Ricoeur, P. (1974). *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Ryskaliyev, D. U., Mirzaliyeva, A., Tursynbayeva, G., Muratova, E. M., Buribayev, Y. A., & Khamzina, Z. A. (2019). Gender inequality among employees in Kazakhstan. *Lawyer Quarterly*, 9(4), 319-332.
- Schrag, C. O. (1999). *The Self after Postmodernity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vanhoutte, W. (2019). Paolo Virno. Essay on Negation: Towards A Linguistic Anthropology. *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy*, 20(2), 258-260. <https://doi.org/10.46992/pijp.20.2.n.1>
- Yermukhanova, L. S., Kushimov, B. I., Zhexenova, A. N., Turebaev, M. N., Salakhova, N. K., & Mukhanbediyarova, A. Z. (2019). Suicide as a social problem among young people and adolescents in Aktobe city. *Journal of Intellectual Disability - Diagnosis and Treatment*, 7(4), 231-236. <https://doi.org/10.6000/2292-2598.2019.07.04.5>
- Zaimul, A. (2018). Epistemology, Logic and Language (An Analysis of Logic of Language). *International Journal of Philosophy*, 6(3), 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jp.20180603.12>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.