

mind as an internal bearer of ideas and intentions to satisfy the conditions of meaningfulness – it is a luxury we cannot afford and assume in case of the Other.

The alien appears spontaneously, provoking us to answer its presence, which is not there. It arises from elsewhere, oscillating on the threshold and calling us to account. Yet the appeal of the Other is unvoiced because the alien is the place where I am not present, a form of some atopia [Waldenfels 2007, p. 9]. Muteness and invisibility are its only possible modes of being given, as it does not have a signifier in terms of de Saussure's sound-image. The Other is never uttered – like many meaningful sentences are; however, it is a silence which is a transcendental condition of possibility of any meaning. The Other by implication holds the variety of all possible worlds. Meaning appears in a situation of a multitude, doubling or even tripling (for a reason, to mean is a ditransitive verb: something₁ means something₂ to somebody₃) – Wittgenstein's private language argument seems to derive from this assumption. Consequently, there is no need to convey meaning and use language if things are immediately and directly introduced to every single mind. In this respect, an empty signifier in postmodernism, which does not depend on a particular interpretation, fails to recognise the very origin of meaning that is born in the in-between interaction between me and the Other, the signifier and the signified.

Karl-Otto Apel offers a transcendental re-interpretation of the Morris triadic schema of sign relations (object – sign – subject). Adding the extra subject to the scheme, he claims that communication between two subjects provides the interpretation of the sign: 'the linguistic signs... become themselves themes of reference in the context of communicative understanding' [Apel 1994, p. 246].

The Other, which infringes the usual cultural continuity, rupturing its syntagmatic chain, is the ultimate co-subject in Apel's terms. It lays the foundation of the culture by asking questions about its meaningfulness. Culture as a sign system exists only for the sake of the Other, and in being responsible/response-able to its calls the culture perpetuates its own sense. Therefore, not only the Other is a transcendental condition of the culture, but also its all-intrusive reference is a pure meaning of the culture. Thus, the most important task of the culture as a sign system is to establish a meaningful connection with everything it sees on its way, allowing for the cavities where the Other can unfold as the Other, and legalising its inevitable right to speak to us and to ask questions.

Works Cited

- 1) Apel, K.-O. (1994). Pragmatic philosophy of language based on transcendental semiotics. In E. Mendieta (Ed.), *Karl-Otto Apel: Selected Essays* (vol. 1, pp. 231-253). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- 2) Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience of the University of Cambridge. (2016, May 4). Scientists develop human embryos beyond implantation stage for first time [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/scientists-develop-human-embryos-beyond-implantation-stage-for-first-time>
- 3) NASA. (2017, February 22). *NASA telescope reveals largest batch of Earth-size, habitable-zone planets around single star* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-telescope-reveals-largest-batch-of-earth-size-habitable-zone-planets-around>
- 4) Newitz A. (2016, June 9). Movie written by algorithm turns out to be hilarious and intense. *Ars Technica*. Retrieved from <https://arstechnica.com/the-multiverse/2016/06/an-ai-wrote-this-movie-and-its-strangely-moving/>
- 5) Searle, J. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3 (3), 417-424. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00005756
- 6) Waldenfels, B. (2007). Experience of the Other. In *The question of the Other* (pp. 1-20). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Роль висловлюваного в концепції символічного інтеракціонізму

Валерія Науменко

Інститут філософії ім. Г. С. Сковороди НАН України (Київ)

Ідеї Джорджа Міда історично утворили каркас концепції символічного інтеракціонізму. Сама назва теоретичного підходу відображає головний предмет дослідницької уваги – вивчення інтеракцій, опосередкованих символічним простором. Поняття інтеракції, на відміну від зазвичай синонімічно вживаного поняття взаємодії, увиразнює інтерсуб'єктивний характер людських взаємин, засадничої включеності індивідуальних дій у наперед задану тканину соціального світу. Дана концепція, продовжуючи успад-