Symbolism of the Philosopheme of Dialogue in Modern Philosophical Discourse

Modern Felsefi Söylemde Diyalog Felsefesinin Sembolizmi

OLEKSII MARCHENKO ⬤ PAVLO KRETOV ⬤ OLENA KRETOVA ⬤
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy

Abstract: This paper aims to define the nature of the existing correlation between the symbolism of speech and the fundamental issues related to the dialogic paradigm in the philosophy of the twentieth century. The concepts of the symbol and dialogue have been considered in the context of transformations in contemporary philosophical discourse. Special attention has been given to rethinking the transcendent potential of the symbol and symbolic structures within the framework of a discursively interpreted dialogue. The issues related to contemporary philosophical anthropology have been interpreted from a perspective of the symbolic as fundamental cognitive guidance. Such essential attributes of the symbol as a multi-panoramic character and transfiniteness have been proposed for consideration. The essential and functional aspects of speech symbolism have been examined in relation to the philosopheme of dialogue, specifically the symbols of time, space, stay, place, and meeting. The fundamental character of using the symbolic structures for a dialogical discourse has been emphasized, as well as its importance to the ongoing search for the basis of modern humanism in philosophy. The study used the methodology of historical and philosophical conceptual analysis, phenomenological and hermeneutical approaches.

Keywords: Symbol, symbolism, dialogue, philosophical discourse, language, speech.

✉ Oleksii Marchenko & Pavlo Kretov
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Dep. of Philosophy and Relig. Sci.
18031, Cherkasy, Ukraine | march_alex@ukr.net & ataraksia@ukr.net

✉ Olena Kretova
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Department of Russian Language
18031, Cherkasy, Ukraine | ekretova@ukr.net

Introduction

The modern philosophy's search for new ways to comprehend a "human situation" (S. Kierkegaard) is predetermined by the exponential development of technologies, primarily in the communicative sphere, under conditions of the rapid socio-cultural dynamics. That necessitates the problematization and comparative consideration of such paradigm approaches in the philosophical tradition of the twentieth century as the analytical philosophy and the philosophy of language, phenomenology, the philosophy of dialogue, the philosophy of life, hermeneutics, the tradition of existentialism, and philosophical anthropology. Tackling an issue of the symbolic character of a language should imply considering a relation between the essence of a symbol and the mechanisms of symbolism and symbolization, first of all cognitive, regarding human consciousness and, accordingly, any forms of dialogism. In general, it refers to the phenomenology of language as a variant of the phenomenology of symbol, interpreted ontologically and essentially rather than semiotically and formally. It is clear that the specified paradigm approaches and traditions are conceptually united by the philosopheme of symbol. Can there be a non-symbolic dialogue and can a symbol be essential for a dialogue rather than simply mediate it? Moreover, is not a dialogue itself the symbol of consciousness, engineered by it owing to its intentionality? How do language and speech (the distinction of lingua and parole by F. de Saussure) now correlate with their own symbolism and with a philosopheme of dialogue and phenomenon? Addressing and outlining these issues predetermine the relevance of the current paper.

The purpose of this article is to tackle an issue about the forms of comprehension of language symbolism in the dialogic approach to philosophizing and to establish the implicit instruments of dialogism concerning the phenomena of symbol, language, discourse, and the life-meaning, ethical issues in contemporary philosophy.

Symbolic Explications of Modern Discourse

One of the issues in contemporary philosophical and scientific discourse is the "atomization" of fundamental knowledge and crisis in humanities, a certain "philosophical secularization" of humanitarian knowledge

(Ch. Taylor). Such a state of things is based on the established traditional fear of metaphysics in modern discourse. However, the search for holistic, holistic knowledge about a person, the world, a person-in-the-world, immanent in philosophy, paradoxically returns to issues related to the ratio of the whole to its parts within its limits, traditional for European logic, ontology, metaphysics, and theology. On the other hand, the issue concerning the additivity, subadditivity or super additivity of a person, the human knowledge and human consciousness and the reality as it is given to a person empirically and on a cognitive level (the myth of the given concept by W. Sellars), as well as the issue on how knowledge is described and transferred within the world view, within which logical and verbal structures, is open.

This, in turn, raises the question of the forms of existence of knowledge, and hence the forms of experience, its reception and representation in the already mentioned, one that claims to integrity, picture of the world. In other words, the twentieth century does not even raise the question of whether it is possible to apply, for example, to the Heidegger's concept of "wahre Existenz", the Wittgensteinian (the late period of creativity) "therapeutic" methods of analytical paradigm in the philosophy of science and language, because such a question would be paradoxical and could indicate the boundaries of language. The impossibility for the discourse to get rid of the metaphor and concept of silence as the non-expressed by a text ("Sigetik" (Schweige-Lehre) by M. Heidegger, or the famous aphorism 7 from the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* by L. Wittgenstein) directly indicates the implicit symbolism of language and speech. Denial of the logo- and phonocentrism in the XXI century leads to the search for escaping the trap of pax postmoderniana by the modern philosophy of science. Its characteristic features are defragmentation, the pathos of postulation of total negation, as well as the total recursion as a model, mode, and form of existence of meaning, associated with the escape from ontological issues or its replacement by more or less successful simulacra. Thus, a symbol in the context of the development of science and philosophy can no longer be interpreted purely functionally or operationally – it has to acquire ontology. J. Searle in his work almost literally reproduces the thesis of Epictetus that person lives in the world of symbols rather than the world of things:

"The future of language essential for the constitution of instituional facts is the existense of symbolic devices such as words that by convention mean or represent or symbolize something beyond themselwes" (Searle 1995, 60). This may indicate the relevance and importance of this philosopheme for modern discourse and the picture of the world. The question is how exactly to interpret a symbol – within the semiotic-subject, Aristotelian tradition, as a sign that indicates what it is not itself, or within the ontological-eidetic Platonic, as a form of transcensus (Aurelius Augustine), or some unity of the idea and image, and, at the same time, as a meaning-generative model (A. Losev), as a structure that forms the logic of the transconscious (M. Eliade), a point of the singularity of meaning, a "portal" to the preverbal chaos of meanings, a "plan of immanence" (J. Deleuze), an element in the grammar of culture (E. Cassirer, S. Langer, A. Whitehead, J. Lakoff). How can one, while remaining within the limits of language, approach them and, after defining, overcome them? Thus, there is a traditional paradox of definition. It regards the structure or, when using the cybernetics term, the architecture of language.

A symbol in the speech and text does not register the ready conventional meaning of the denotation of a nomen (lexeme) and does not indicate it – it initiates forming an associative continuous series (and rows, parallel, symmetrical, and asymmetric) of separate meanings that are common within its boundaries. And this applies to language and speech, text (it actually creates its architectonics) of all styles and all spheres of use – from humanities to theoretical physics and mathematical logic. In our opinion, a symbol is characterized by the transfiniteness and multipanoramic character; it registers the dynamic moment of sense generation, that is, the moment of transition from explanation to understanding, from the meaning to the essence, from the nominal, denotative order of speech to verbal, propositional. A symbol does not only indicate (deixis), by offering an image as a sense-generating model, it also guides, intentionalizes consciousness, by denoting the dynamics factor and generating a "sense explosion", the singularity point of language and speech (in Saussure's distinction), a point of an abyss in the infinity of a semantic thesaurus. In this context, it is important to predicate the continuity of symbolization as a cognitive process.

In other words, while a person symbolizes, s/he leaves his/her own experience. Hence, the presence of a paradoxical intelligible transcensus as the correlate of emotional transcendence, be it the ecstatic, mystical, as in the religious-philosophical tradition from Plotinus to Francis of Assisi, the Hesychasts, or Karol Wojtyla. Linguistic metaphor, characteristic of any language and any discourse, can easily acquire symbolic features, can form the basis of any complex imaginary experiment and description of the "state of things". The symbol in this context can be interpreted as a self-similar fractal structure of language.

Speech, Dialogue and Discourse

It is clear that the very question of the importance of speech for dialogue may seem superfluous given its apparent obviousness. From the ancient tradition of speech as a mode of identification of thought and thinking (Sophists, Socrates, in general, the principle "Speak that I saw you"), through the Christian tradition (Augustine's doctrine of the symbol and symbolism of language (*De doctrina Christiana*)), to modern ways of understanding and explaining the cognitive sphere of man (the rationalism of Descartes, Leibniz, Pascal's irrationalism), there forms the attitude of logophonocentrism, rather ambivalent from the perspective of modern philosophy. Without delving into the contradictory nature of the philosophical description of this phenomenon, we note the following. The obvious presence of language itself (along with understanding the presence of man in it), speech, their mechanisms and forms in the full range of their interpretations, from the "boundaries of the human world" (L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*) to the "home of being" and the "voice of being" (M. Heidegger), or the "universal grammar" (E. Cassirer, N. Chomsky), or the space of development of Lebenswelt (E. Husserl, A. Schutz), indicates the dichotomy of immanent and transcendent consciousness, as well as various techniques to overcome or avoid it. In general, the dialectics of idea and thing, and the issues related to the verbal reflection of the reality of consciousness as it ontologization.

While considering the tradition of dialogism, we note the emphasis, within its boundaries, on the structural or functional aspects of language and speech as a means of dialogue, which inevitably leads to a situation

where an informational, epistemological dimension of the language may make the situation of dialogue impossible. At the same time, however, a participant in the dialogue, according to E. Levinas or J. Lacan, is in the discourse not as a part or concept but as a unique personality, that is, essentially. In such a consideration, the dialogue appears to be essentially antithetical to any sphere of definitions, the semiosphere, as the singularity point, a gap in the length of a description, or a monologue. After all, dialogue (in the tradition of dialogical philosophy) constitutes and transcends a person through the attitude to the Other, which is different from the exchange of information during the act of communication.

Therefore, a language that enables texts that make up the semiosphere and presuppose semiosis does not relate to dialogue directly, but only through speech, more precisely, through an encounter in speech that is experienced as dialogue. In this case, the issue of the subjectivity of language, that is the dilemma regarding its either immanent-personal, essential, ontological, or universal, socio-analytical, structural-functional status, actually appears to be a philosophical-discursive practice of declaring guidelines. For instance: "death of the subject" (J. Deleuze), "death of the author" (R. Bart), "death of the person" (M. Foucault). It is clear that the project of transforming phenomenology into philosophical anthropology, which, for example, is illustrated by the philosophical evolution of Heidegger's views, the personalistic pathos of the philosophy of dialogue and the analytical tradition in philosophy from L. Wittgenstein to T. Nagel and the philosophy of consciousness, in a given context is opposed to the formally-logically orientation of the structuralist tradition in philosophy of the twentieth century. In addition, for example, the mentioned approaches are different from the project of object-oriented ontology (G. Harman) in the XXI century.

The inability of philosophy to eliminate the problem of subjectivity by dissolving it in endless recursion and autopoiesis of texts or self-construction of objects is also evidenced by the concept of intersubjectivity (W. Quine, D. Davidson). It returns the subject to the philosophical discourse not of impersonal texts but the existential speech practices that function as a text outside the modern Cartesian subject-centric guidelines.

However, the inability to formally and logically comprehend both the symbolic depths of culture (no matter how the latter is interpreted – in the spectrum of definitions from the thesaurus to hypertext) and the miracle of meeting the Other (in the version of dialectical theology of the twentieth century, according to K. Bart, with God) within the dialogue returns us to the problem of the symbol. Hence, for example, the interest in the analysis, from a dialogical point of view, of the texts by such a seemingly rationally oriented thinker as L. Wittgenstein: "I will argue that Wittgenstein created a 'strategy of understanding', in which the use of language is not based solely on technical capability or, alternatively, on some mystical ability, but also on mutual understanding that is expressed in agreement on definitions and judgments [...] In his dialogue format, Wittgenstein delineated a triad (meaning-creature-understanding), each element of which participates in meaningful linguistic activity" (Lemberger 2015, 160). A similar intention is also demonstrated by the modern view of dialogism by M. Bakhtin when the emphasis is not on the propositional aspect of the definition in a language but on the structural-symbolic one, which is interpreted as a relation. A dialogic relation needs a language and does not exist inside the system of language. Dialogism is practice-oriented process of negotiation between people and contexts (Linell 1998, 6-8). It is easy to notice how the moment of speech is emphasized, which is interpreted, first of all, as a mode of dialogue, and only then – in the context of a system of formal-logical units and structures. One can say that modern philosophy of man in the face of new threats of dehumanization, associated with new forms of mass electronic communication, requires a return to speech as a starting point, a kind of Cartesian cogito, in the version *Inquam – sum est*.

Moreover, the dialogue implies speech outside the verbal means of expression. Not surprisingly, such an intention actualizes the latest search for a synthesis between science, philosophy, and religion. It is an issue of a certain "ethical resistance to rationality", initiated by the philosophy of dialogue because philosophy refers to unspoken experience, which is the source and beginning of language itself, but which is always inaccessible to language. As Levinas wrote, "[...] the being of signification consists in putting into question in an ethical relation constitutive freedom itself.

Meaning is the face of the Other, and all recourse to words takes place already within the primordial face to face of language" (Levinas 1969, 206). Modern philosophical discourse seeks to return the language of philosophy, appealing primarily to speech, which in turn implies liberation from the limitations of traditional philosophical discourse, since both language and speech are ethical situations appropriate to man and imply dialogue. "Language is the relation where, although we remain absolutely separated, the Other concerns me in such a way that I must formulate an answer that I address to the Other" (Rolfsen 2017, 14).

Thus, we are dealing with a fundamental paradox of speech, which captures the boundary between a systematized language structure and pre-logical chaos of meaning in speech. This chaosmos (J. Joyce) precedes any generative grammar, life forms, language games, family similarities, the myth of the given, and even the subject, the Self, as it is only a manifesto of its existence rather than a form of realization.

The Dialogical Paradigm and Symbolism of the Discourse

It is noteworthy that S. Kierkegaard and E. Levinas use the image of a "cracked whole" in relation to language and the human world (the mythological and archetypal symbolism of the world egg). A series of conceptual metaphors – symbols, from the spherical God of Xenophanes, the logos of Heraclitus, the Stoic egg, the infinite sphere of Nicholas of Cusa, to the Wittgenstein beetle in a box, or, for example, modern problematizations of reality, such as the simulation hypothesis (N. Bostrom), testify to the "ontopoetics" (A.-T. Tymieniecka), inherent in consciousness, thinking. Modern researcher C. Cozma registers this phenomenon as a principle and meaning, that is, in a certain approximation, the essence and method (perhaps, here is an appropriate analogy with the Husserl's distinction of consciousness on the spheres of noema and noesis, which would emphasize their inseparability, or, according to Losev's definition of the symbol, "unity-separation" as unity+severalty, two antithetical features in one noun) at the same time. "In the 'ontopoietic' phenomenology, the logos of life is the vital principle through which 'impetus and equipoise' of life in its plenitude – certainly within the world we get access to know and to comprehend it – are in struggle and at the same time in equilibrium" (Cozma

2019, 69). Multiple rationalities and small narratives (J.-F. Lyotard) are balanced in dialogue, which forces both speech and written discourse to mark the limits of rationality in general, which, therefore, predetermines the transcensus of man. The shell of limited experience and self-description is destroyed in the dialogue in which the human Self appears. "The speech of the Other addressed to us is a condition of language [...] Cognition is secondary to language [...] The decisive moment is the 'event of expression', which, according to Levinas, is the testimony of the Other about himself, possible only as speech" (Yampolskaya 2011, 256-258).

By elucidating, one can get closer to finding out the cultural-symbolic dimension of dialogue. But do the semiotic codes of culture provide direct access to the reality of the Other, inaccessible to me in the total separation and separateness of my Self, thinking and experience? Language and speech, if understood as forms of organization of dialogue and its mediating link, "clarify" and "obscure" the Other at the same time because they represent it indirectly. Therefore, it is the partially-asystemic speech (ontologized, like the glossolalia of the Old Testament prophets) that does not lose its genetic connection with the essence of the Other and has access to my Self, not the majestic, external, object vault of language. In this case, it is by no means an exchange of information in a semiotic sense. The entire philosophy of dialogue postulates the emergence of the Self through relation to the Other.

By participating in a dialogue, I allow the Other to be in all its identity. It is currently argued that the philosophy of dialogue interprets speech as a symbolic process that implies the identity of the addresser and the addressee, who, while not congruent, coincide at a certain point in time in the timing of the meeting. In this sense, the dialogue is carried out as a symbol of the Other, which means nothing but the attitude, which at the same time it is. It is appropriate to mention apophatic symbolism, as defined by the imyaslavie (onomatodoxy) tradition, within which energy symbols on two levels – uncreated and created – allow a person to unite (the first level of symbolism, divine energies) and comprehend (the second level of symbolism, space as a creative symbol) the God's presence. "There is only one strictly defined relationship between essences and energies, which is acceptable for imyaslavie (onomatodoxy) [...] the essence is not known,

beyond reason, beyond word, beyond name, beyond any categories – the unconditional and categorical apophatism. Energies, separated, covered, tangible, they are the appearance of God himself, the symbol" (Losev 2006, 134).

Modern researcher T. Obolevitch wrote in this regard: "So here we are dealing with the antinomy of the immanence and transcendence of God, His knowability and unknowability, or, in other words, the antinomy of the Divine Word-Logos (sacred) and human language (profane). As regards the issue of knowing God, the above antinomy implies that the connection between being and energy is asymmetric: being is more than energy (energies). There are many actions (energies), manifestations, names, while the essence (thing) is one, and no manifestations (names) cover it completely" (Obolevitch 2011, 376). Thus, if the symbols on two levels are the theophany of God, then, because they can be names, they are ontologically involved in both the transcendent God and the empirical world of experience of the subject, including linguistic and speech.

According to A. Losev, the mystical-symbolic and dialectical antinomy of the essence of God and God's energy is a necessary condition for the meeting of man with God. If dialogue is an involvement in the realm of the transcendent for experience and reason, then it is a symbol that is realized in speech, to meaning, to the separation of meaning, and to any verbal or symbolic deixis. It is a kind of pure presence, being-in, fullness to any separation. J. Klochowski, when considering the section "Grammar of eros (the language of love)" from the main work by F. Rosenzweig *Star of Salvation* (1921), clarifies the dialectic of manifested-unmanifested Self. "Where art thou?" (Genesis 3:9), God asks Adam after the fall. "Where there is speech, there is the one who speaks, I who speak. In its self, I am opposed to everything that is 'not I'. I of the speech, following the simple question 'Where are you?', reveals the I who speak. But the one to whom God addresses does not answer, remains dumb, remains alone" (Kłoczowski 2005, 59). And this tragic separation of creator and creature, father and son, God and man (because you cannot order to love or force love) is paradoxically overcome in the event of the meeting, which has a symbolic structure and, in fact, is a symbol: "Such an event occurs at the point of intersection of two spheres: present and eternity, temporality and

timelessness" (Ibid, 60). The relation between time and eternity, motionless and moving, ultimately, space as time, is symbolically connected in dialogue because the Other (and the absolute Other for man is God) eternally waits before the face of the Self until it is seen, accepted, waiting to meet. We now argue about the space-time of dialogue as a symbolic construction, which, of course, reflects the discourse of the dialogic paradigm in philosophy and any speech made by man. By speaking, a person limits himself because s/he points to his individuality, self. But speech is at the same time an appeal, an invitation to dialogue, a hope for a meeting.

Thus, a person in space goes beyond time, and vice versa. That can also be interpreted as a dialogical way to overcome the temporality as a separateness, which is fatal for a person (in the tradition of phenomenology and existentialism). Thus, dialogue as a symbol snatches a person from his/her temporality and can open to him/her the Heidegger's mode of true existence, in which there is a departure from the self to the acceptance, understanding, and awareness of true identity.

That is, the paradox of the symbol interpreted ontologically (not ontically, as such an understanding would mean its dissolution in semiosis), outside its semiotic and deictic functionality, the hypertext of culture and the system and structure of language, is in that it goes beyond finite verbal meanings, avoids any description, not based, in its turn, on symbolic constructs and transferred meaning. Symbol as a relation (in a dialogue, it acts and operates in this way) is predetermined neither by empirical time and space nor by the time-space of culture. It is precisely the symbol that is the means of non-finite going beyond the finiteness of description, and that is exactly why dialogue as an encounter with the Other necessarily presupposes symbolic structures and mechanisms of symbolization. Symbolism, from simple linguistic symbols to complex visual or philosophical ones, from simple typologies of symbolism (Augustine) to complex phenomenological ones (A. Losev), or neo-Kantian ones (E. Cassirer, S. Langer), implies that all symbols are implicitly or explicitly boundary for consciousness. They presuppose the transgression of the Self, the overcoming of the limitations of the self, and not only the generation of a new meaning, but also the attainment of a new, transcendent status of the subject, both in terms of the categories of language-speech and hypothetically as regards

thinking. Dialogue is, in our opinion, a symbolic representation of such a process. The distinction between the symbols of consciousness and symbols of thinking by modern researcher S. Sychova (note the implicit phenomenological guidelines of this distinction) seems to be a restriction of the symbol as a mode of existence, the symbol as a dialogue in which speech is not only the basis of knowledge but also existence. Kant's-Hegel's distinction between mind and reason, transformed into a distinction between consciousness and thinking, is not entirely correct in the case of dialogue, interpreted symbolically, because in it thinking is not rigidly tied to the formal-logical procedures of rationality and language in a speech mode does not appear as the functional of self-awareness, but as its basis and source. If "the world is a text that someone (say, us) reads", then consciousness would be "the text that is compiled in the act of the text itself, the establishment of the text within the text. Consciousness 'sees' through the linguistic text, but not according to the laws of language, but the laws of consciousness itself" (Sychova 2000, 110), as the researcher writes. Such a recursive understanding of consciousness is entirely within the subject-object dichotomy, which the philosophy of dialogue seeks to overcome through the mode of the relationship between the Self and the Other.

Of course, if one considers the Other to be a text only, it completely objectifies it and therefore makes dialogue impossible, which is replaced with appropriation as mastery. Strictly speaking, one can see how a logocentric instruction in language resists the fundamental principle of the dialogic approach – not the essence but attitude. Therefore, when we speak of a symbol in dialogic discourse and a symbol as the basis and form of speech addressed to the Other (not for the purpose of informing but for the purpose of self-determination and self-identification, going beyond our own limitations, including language), we inevitably deal with symbolic constructs. K. Svasyan offers the metaphor of an envelope, continuing Goethe's comparison from a letter to W. von Humboldt: "The symbol [...] is an envelope with a letter sealed in it. The fate of this envelope was strange. We keep it and do not know what to do with it. Some say it is impossible to open. Others – that it is empty. Others – that it is the letter itself. Some generally hope to receive a letter without an envelope. The essence, however, is that the letter is addressed to us and its content is vital. It is in our

will not to open it, to think that the envelope is empty, that it is a letter itself, that letters without an envelope are possible [...] The problem of the symbol has become a *threshold* that opens life as an alternative: either – or. Up to the threshold, life is only explained; after it – it must change" (Svasyan 2010, 222). It is precisely the transfinite and, at the same time, existential power of the symbol, which it exercises within the dialogical relationship between the Self and the Other, enabling dialogue itself, rather than the exchange of information within semiotic codes or rational constructs of consciousness. The symbol, interpreted in this fashion, goes beyond the dichotomy of noema and noesis as it acquires an existential and transcendent dimension, since, by pointing out what it is not, it is never identical with itself and occurs like a dialogue and encounter in speech. What are you? Who are you? Where are you? One could also propose a metaphor rooted in the physical picture of the world within the corpuscular-wave model of the matter if it is represented as a grid of vertical and horizontal lines. In this grid, the intersections of lines are conventionally considered to be corpuscles, and the lines themselves – waves. In such a construct, the symbol is precisely the point of transition and the very transition from one plane to another. The flat image acquires multidimensionality, the unique meaning becomes a polyphony of meanings. That is why it is, in the absolute, a limit for human thinking and, at the same time, deictic for both experience and thinking.

In addition, the importance and relevance of focusing on the symbolic nature of the dialogue, speech, and discourse in general, are determined by the explications of the symbol in social philosophy and sociology. It is known, in particular, that A. Schutz hoped to create a theory of symbol as the most important component of the theory of life: "He demonstrates how experiences of multiple realities constituting the individual's life-world are connected to the paramount reality of everyday life through symbolization to be communicated within the intersubjective life-world" (Dreher 2003, 142). Indeed, if, according to Schutz, one understands the symbol as a means of overcoming the transcendence of the living world, it then elucidates the research intentions by T. Lukman, N. Luhmann, J. Habermas, A.-T. Tymieniecka, M. Eliade, D. Navarre, J. Manussakis, Ch. Yannaras, who emphasizes the role of symbols in the communicative and

media space as the semantic, motivational, value-based triggers of change.

Conclusion

The symbolic nature of dialogic speech, within which the dialogue takes place and which, in fact, is the dialogue itself, predetermines its trans-finite, fundamentally open, and, at the same time, fundamentally non-recursive character. Virtually infinite variability of the meaning generation of the symbol makes it possible to overcome any rational schematism of the consciousness constructs. Thus, dialogism gives the speech a trans-cendent meaning. The speech transcensus of dialogue can be symbolically marked in the discourse, which can mean the removal of the antithesis of language and speech in the procedural meeting of the Self and the Other in dialogue. According to the philosophy of dialogue, this means that the symbol is the meeting place of the Self and the Other, Me and You, and, at the same time, the very meeting. The symbolic dialogue paradoxically overcomes the antithesis of time and eternity, I and You, separateness and totality, completeness, and partialness. In addition, that makes it possible, to some extent, to argue about overcoming the dichotomy of empirical and mental at the level of time and space, through the formation of a specific symbolic continuum of dialogue, its time-space.

The modern philosophical discourse is experiencing transformations arising from the dominance of the paradigm of postmodern philosophy, aimed in the direction of the rehabilitation of metaphysics. The reinter-pretation of metaphysics is seen as a speech intention in the discourse for defining the holistic experience, understanding, and comprehension of the world. It presupposes openness, simultaneously denying the logo-phono-centrism and textual status of the grand narrative. The dialogism and sym-bolism of speech act, in this regard, emphasize the man's situation as a transcendent process and are the essence and the instrument of resistance against a purely instrumental thinking.

References

Cozma, Carmen. 2019. An Insight into Logos and Logos of Life. *Agathos: An International Review of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 10, Is. 1: 59-72.

Dreher, J. 2003. The Symbol and the Theory of the Life-World: "The Transcendences of the Life-World and Their Overcoming by Signs and

Symbols". *Human Studies*, Vol. 26: 141-163.

Kłoczowski, o. Jan Andrzej OP. 2005. *Filozofia dialogu [Philosophy of dialogue]*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo W drodze.

Lemberger, D. 2015. Dialogical Grammar: Varieties of Dialogue in Wittgenstein's Methodology. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, Vol. 3. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1148670.pdf

Levinas, E., Lingis, A. 1969. *Totality and Infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Linell, P. 1998. *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Losev, A. 2006. Iz imyaslavskikh rukopisey [From the onomatodoxy manuscripts]. *Voprosy Filosofii*, No. 11: 128-139.

Obolevitch, T. 2011. *Od onomatodoksji do estetyki. Aleksego Łosiewa koncepcja symbolu [From onomatodoxy to aesthetics. Aleksei Losev's concept of symbol]*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.

Rolfsen, T. S. 2017. *Philosophy and the Ethical Transcendence of Language: A Dialogue between Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida*. Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

Searle, J. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press.

Svasyan, K. A. 2010. *Problema simvola v sovremennoy filosofii: kritika i analiz [The problem of symbol in modern philosophy: criticism and analysis]*. Moskow: Akademicheskii proekt; Alma Mater.

Sychova S. 2000. *Problema simvola v filosofii [The problem of symbol in philosophy]*. Tomsk: Izdatelstvo Tomskogo universiteta.

Yampolskaya, A. 2011. *Emmanuel Levinas. Filosofia i biografia [Emmanuel Levinas. Philosophy and biography]*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera.

Öz: Bu makale, konuşma sembolizmi ile yirminci yüzyıl felsefesindeki diyalojik paradigma ile ilgili temel meseleler arasındaki mevcut ilişkinin doğasını tanımlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Sembol ve diyalog kavramları, çağdaş felsefi söylemdeki dönüşümler bağlamında ele alınmıştır. Simgenin ve simgesel yapıların aşkın potansiyelini, söylemsel olarak yorumlanan bir diyalog çerçevesinde yeniden düşünmeye özel önem verildi. Çağdaş felsefi antropoloji ile ilgili konular, temel bilişsel rehberlik olarak sembolik bir perspektiften yorumlanmıştır. Sembolün çoklu-pa-

Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy

noramik karakter ve aşkınlık gibi temel nitelikleri, değerlendirilmek üzere önerilmiştir. Konuşma sembolizminin temel ve işlevsel yönleri, diyalog felsefesi, özellikle zaman, mekan, konaklama, yer ve buluşma sembolleriyle ilgili olarak incelenmiştir. Sembolik yapıları diyalojik bir söylem için kullanmanın temel karakterinin yanı sıra felsefede modern hümanizmin temeli için süregelen arayıştaki önemi vurgulanmıştır. Çalışma, tarihsel ve felsefi kavramsal analiz, fenomenolojik ve hermeneutik yaklaşımların metodolojisini kullandı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sembol, sembolizm, diyalog, felsefi söylem, dil, konuşma.