

Zh.M. Doskhozina International Information Technology University, Kazakhstan, Almaty
e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com**EXISTENTIAL COMMUNICATION CONCEPT OF K. JASPERS
AND DIALOGICAL PERSONALISM OF M. BAKHTIN:
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

Abstract: This article extensively considers two main and well-known philosophical concepts of communication in the XX century through way of comparative analysis. The author explores Karl Jaspers and Mikhail Bakhtin`s directions of philosophy, which have been constructed on the base of communication and human interaction.

Modern personalism, axiology and philosophical anthropology are related to the development of dialogue problem that is getting more and more relevant today at the epoch of merging and fragmentation simultaneously. Nowadays, people are tightly close to each other by technological tools, but currently separated in real life. True communication of persons, which includes loyalty and rapport are out of so-called rationalistic society`s views. Time-honored bonds between people are erasing; selfishness is increasing. That`s why existential communication concept and dialogical personalism of the greatest philosophers are still suitable for the contemporary world. These philosophical concepts were focused on searching true communication way and dialogue between people.

Key words: communication, human reason, person, consciousness, existence, human being, dialogue.

Ж.М. Досхожина

Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.
e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com**К. Ясперстің экзистенциалды байланыс тұжырымдамасы және
М. Бахтиннің диалогтық персонализмі: салыстырмалы талдау**

Аннотация: Бұл мақалада компаративистік талдау әдісін қолдану арқылы байланыс мәселесін зерттеуге арналған XX ғасырдың екі танымал философиялық тұжырымдамалары қарастырылған. Автор өзара әрекеттесу негізінде дамыған Карл Ясперс пен Михаил Бахтин философиясындағы коммуникативті бағыттарды зерттейді.

Қазіргі заманғы персонализм, аксиология және философиялық антропология диалогтық мәселемен тығыз байланысты, ол қазіргі дәуірде ерекше өзекті болып табылады, онда бір уақытта қарама-қайшы бірлік пен алауыздық ұғымдары басым болады. Бір жағынан, біз бір-бірімізбен технологиялық инструментарийлердің бірыңғай торабымен «байланыстымыз», екінші жағынан – нақты өмір жағдайында бөлінгенбіз. Адамдар арасындағы шынайы қарым-қатынасты қамтитын рационалистік қоғам деп аталатын ортада адалдық пен өзара түсіністік сияқты қағидалар өз орнын таба алмайды. Адамдар арасындағы мәңгілік байланыстар, эгоцентризм қарқынды түрде маңызды бола бастаған кезде жоғалады. Сондықтан К. Ясперстің экзистенциалды байланыс тұжырымдамасы және М. Бахтиннің диалогтық персонализмі қазіргі әлем үшін өзекті және маңызды болып қала береді. XX ғасырдың кейбір ұлы философтары өз зерттеулерінде шынайы қарым-қатынас пен адамдар арасындағы шынайы диалогты табуға тырысқан болатын.

Түйін сөздер: коммуникация, ақыл-ой, тұлға, сана, экзистенция, адам, диалог.

Ж.М. Досхожина

Международный университет информационных технологий, Казахстан, г. Алматы
e-mail: zhanatdoskhozina@gmail.com**Концепция экзистенциальной коммуникации К. Ясперса и
диалогический персонализм М. Бахтина: сравнительный анализ**

Данная статья рассматривает две широко известные философские концепции XX века, посвященные исследованию проблемы коммуникации, посредством применения метода компара-

тивистского анализа. Автором исследуются коммуникативные направления в философии Карла Ясперса и Михаила Бахтина, получившие развитие на основе интеракции.

Современный персонализм, аксиология и философская антропология тесно связаны с диалогической проблемой, которая особенно актуализируется в нынешнюю эпоху, где одновременно господствуют противоречащие понятия единения и разобщенности. С одной стороны, мы «переплетены» друг с другом единым узлом технологических инструментариев, с другой – разделены в условиях реальной жизни. Подлинная коммуникация между людьми, включающая в себя такие устои как преданность и взаимопонимание не находят более своего места для существования в рамках так называемого рационалистического общества. Извечные связи между людьми теряются, в то время, когда эгоцентричность все более приобретает свою значимость. Именно поэтому концепция экзистенциальной коммуникации К. Ясперса и диалогический персонализм М. Бахтина до сих пор остаются актуальными и значимыми для современного мира. Одни из величайших философов XX века в своих исследованиях стремились к обретению подлинной коммуникации и истинного диалога между людьми.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, разум, личность, сознание, экзистенция, человек, диалог.

Introduction

The revolutionizing effect of K. Jaspers and M.M. Bakhtin's ideas on the socio-philosophical and scientific-theoretical understanding of communication modern problems concludes in the consideration of communication as not some institutions or structures and systems, but as the basis of the theory of society. They were among the first to provide a communicative rationale for ethics, arguing that moral consciousness is the interiorization of communicative interaction's structure. For these authors, the problem of communication and dialogue was seen as a basis for morality and intersubjective understanding.

Materials and methods

As the research's methodological basis, the author used the conceptual apparatus of social philosophical theories, which focus on the problems of constructing social reality through communication processes. Of particular importance for this research is the methodology of ethical-axiological analysis of spiritual culture.

During the communication research, the author used a dialogical approach. The method of analysis and synthesis played an important role in the comparative analysis of the communication theories' contradictions. The ethical-axiological approach to communication study, based on the writings of K. Jaspers and M. Bakhtin, was the main method that had made it possible to uncover the content of this study in full.

Literature review

Based on the topic of scientific article it is impossible not to refer to researchers of Soviet authors such as Mikhail Bakhtin, Genrikh Batishchev and Sergey Averintsev. Investigations of these thinkers are still relevant in modern world and considered as one the main human being studies in philosophy. Especially, the author pointed his attention on the book «Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics» by M. Bakhtin, where he opened the understanding of polyphonic dialogue or polyphonism. «An introduction to Philosophy» and «The Origin and Goal of History» by Karl Theodor Jaspers were founded as central books for full analysis of existence and communication philosophical meaning. In the framework of general communication analysis, the author also considered main Kazakh and Russian philosophers, who explore the problems of culture, ethics and moral. Without these authors a complete assessment couldn't be made.

Results and discussion

Existential communication concept of K. Jaspers

The emergence of existentialism was the greatest philosophical phenomenon of the XX century. There is no doubt that K. Jaspers' call for true existential communication is based on an understanding of the profound loneliness of human beings in an era of weakening of all traditional, religious, national, family, and spiritual ties between them. There is one of the acute problems of real, authentic personal

communication, which includes lack of such human being's environmental aspects as mutual understanding, devotion, fidelity in friendship and love in contemporary rational society. Thus, traditional ties between people are becoming weaker and person's heightened self-awareness and his inner life are getting tenser.

K. Jaspers, unlike other existentialists, tried to build his philosophy based on communication. He believed that communication of people and their connection to themselves were the structural moment of human existence. «Human-animal comparison points to communication as a universal condition of human existence. It constitutes its all-encompassing essence that everything that is a person and that is for a person is acquired in communication» (Gaidenko, 1997: 299). Consequently, human person is impossible outside of communication. The communication process identifies human's essence. Moreover, human freedom is not possible without communication. K. Jaspers wrote, – «My own freedom can exist only when the other person is free. An isolated or isolating being remains a simple possibility or turns into nothing» (Gaidenko, 1997: 301). He characterized the interaction among free individuals as the highest level of communication, preceded by several lower levels. The scientist carried out the typology of communication's various levels through the characterization of human consciousness's different levels.

The first level of consciousness is the empirical «Me» of a person, when he acts as a part of nature. At this level of consciousness, we are dealing with a natural individual, who seeks to meet his needs. Like all living, he is guided by an instinct of self-preservation, seeking pleasure, and avoiding suffering, who are committed to securing his future and his ability to survive. The way in which people communicate at this level requires their survival: they unite in the face of danger, whether from nature or from a hostile people, their unification is not an end, but an instrument, which has exclusively its own utilitarian aims. At this stage of communication, a pragmatic notion of truth is emerging i.e., truth is understood only as a benefit for all. According to K. Jaspers, the principle of utilitarianism is a consecutively executed view, considering a person as an «empirical existence».

The second level of consciousness is self-awareness or «consciousness in general». At this level, a person who is aware of himself as being different from other consciences and from the objects on which his consciousness is directed, discovers

himself as being active and identical to himself in continuum of time. Human «Me» is deprived of any empirical definition in the context of «consciousness in general» condition. It stands as identical with any other «Me», being the representative of some super-individual origin and transcendental subjectivity, which is a possibility for objective existence. This «consciousness in general» acts as a subject of scientific knowledge. Communication of people on the level of «consciousness in general» is carried out through a law, which is recognizable as a fair law by everyone. The equality of all before the law is only the public equivalent for the identity of all «Me» concepts at the level of «consciousness in general»; formal law and formal equality constitute the law's content. According to the thought of K. Jaspers, communication of people based on law and communication of them as scientists in the field of academic research has the same precondition of unity of «consciousness in general».

The next higher level of consciousness is the level of spirit. K. Jaspers defined it as the integrity of thought, activity and feeling. The quest for integrity is the distinctive feature of spirit.

At the level of spirit, each individual acts as a moment in the life of a cohesive unit; that unit, which is presented in the nation and the state, totally determines the place and role of individual. «Communication in the spirit's sphere is the creation of unit idea from the public substance. The individual perceives himself as standing in his own place and having a special meaning within the unit. The individual considers himself as a member of one organism owing to communication. He is different from all others but makes one unity with them according to a certain order», – says K. Jaspers (Gaidenko, 1997: 304). Individuals are connected to each other by identical things as the representatives of «consciousness in general»; therefore, as the spirit's carriers, they are embedded in an organic unity, which is «the identity of different». This type of communication is higher than the connection of empirical individuals through mutual benefit or the connection of people who accept some common law.

Thus, K. Jaspers described three types of communication, three ways of society's organization. First, the organization based on private interest of an isolated individual; second, the organization based on formal law, when everyone is considered only in that dimension, where he is equal to any other; third, the organization of informal communities, based on organic integrity of people, united by national or religious ideas.

K. Jaspers believed that each of these organization types had a right to exist and was quite legitimate. However, he formulated the main aim of existential philosophy as preventing the absolute of any of these three consciousness levels and the respective types of communication. K. Jaspers set down, that these three levels do not affect the deepest nucleus of human, namely existence. Thereby, we came to the concept of existence, which was the center of K. Jaspers's philosophy. What is existence? Why did German philosopher characterize existence as an authentic being? In other cases, K. Jaspers equated existence with freedom, in the way as it was understood by I. Kant. Existence is the autonomy of will or self-being, which is opposite to animal will or dependent being. «Character of human being is a prerequisite of all things», – wrote K. Jaspers (Jaspers, 1991: 442). What is the distinctive difference between authenticity and non-authenticity? The concept of boundary cases is a key to this distinction.

Existence as a nucleus of human is opened with special intensity to the individual in so-called boundary cases. «We are always in a certain situation. Sometimes the situations are changing, and the cases are favorable. If they are missed, they do not come back. I can change the situation. Nevertheless, there are situations that remain essentially unchanged, even if their instant manifestation changes and their all-encompassing power is hidden from my view: I must die, must suffer, must fight, I depend on chance, and I inevitably discover my own guilt. We call these fundamental situations of our existence boundary cases», – wrote K. Jaspers (Jaspers, 2000: 6).

The most striking case of boundary cases, precisely revealing the end of existence, is death. However, K. Jaspers explained that death, as an objective fact of empirical existence was not a boundary case yet. Only if an individual is faced with his or her own death or death of a loved one, then death from an abstract possibility becomes a boundary case. Not only death, but also fatal disease, suffering, guilt, and struggle put an individual in a boundary case. These situations make to realize the internal end, forcing human from the world of everyday life, worries and grief, which are no more relevant. Only by truly surviving the fragility of self-existence, human can discover a transcendental world, more precisely, its existence, which is mysteriously connected to human's own existence. Only transcendental signs detected in this immanent world can illuminate human existence by new meaning, while

indicating depth and significance of existential communication with another (other).

Reason is inseparably connected with existence. «Human reason requires unlimited communication, it itself is the total will to communication» (Jaspers, 1991: 442). K. Jaspers focused on revealing the unity of reason and existence. The problem of reason and existence is the universal and unique problem simultaneously. Theoretically, it is a question of truth: how can we reconcile the universality of truth with its personal character? K. Jaspers tried to resolve the connection of reason and existence problem based on communication, which was the core of his existential philosophy in origin. «Existence comprehends itself only in a community with another existence; communication is the image of truth's discovery in time» (Jaspers, 1991: 443).

Existential communication of K. Jaspers is opposite to «mass communication», where the personality is lost by dissolving in crowd. K. Jaspers also considered truth itself in connection with communication: communication is the instrument for coming to truth; moreover, communication is «in truth»: first, any other truth is realized in communication, I am myself only during communication process – if it is not just a question of living life for nothing, but of fulfilling it... I offer you fundamental philosophical position, conceivable expression, which is rooted in the lack of communication, in the desire for genuine communication and in the possibility of loving struggle, deep connection of self-identity with self» (Jaspers, 2000: 7).

K. Jaspers identified his discourse not as philosophy, but as philosophizing, where openness and active involvement of all participants in existential dialogue were emphasized. Russian philologist S.S. Averintsev characterized K. Jaspers's ideas in the next way: «Communication is the central concept of Karl Jaspers's understanding of the world, it is elevated by him to the rank of philosophical truth criterion and equated with human reason. For K. Jaspers, moral, social, and intellectual evil is, first, deaf to alien existence, inability to «discussion», taking the form of fanaticism, but also superficial and impersonal mass communication» (Averintsev, 1983).

Dialogical personalism of M. Bakhtin

M. Bakhtin insisted on overcoming monological type of thinking as well as other philosophical «dialogical schools». He believed that monologism in culture had led humanity to the conditions of conflicting antagonistic relations in society and to the

End of the World. Because of philosophical monologism, there cannot be any meaningful interaction of human reasons, and therefore no meaningful dialogue was possible. In fact, idealism knows only one type of cognitive interaction between human reasons: the teaching of ignorant and misguided by someone, who is knowledgeable and has true; that is the connection between teacher and student, and therefore only pedagogical dialogue.

The monological perception of consciousness also prevails in other spheres of ideological creativity. Elsewhere, all values are centered on one single host. Any ideological ingenuity is thought and perceived as a possible expression of one consciousness, one spirit. Even if we talk about any group and diversity of creation forces, unity is still illustrated by the same consciousness, for example, the spirit of the nation and history. Everything that matters can be gathered in one whole consciousness and subdued one single idea; anything that cannot be taken into this process is accidentally and irrelevant.

M. Bakhtin claimed that European rationality with its cult of united human reason, and especially the Age of Enlightenment, when the main genre forms of artistic European prose were formed, influenced on the consolidation of monological principle and its penetration into all spheres of ideological life. All European utopia is also based on this monological principle. That is utopian socialism with its belief in omnipotence of persuasion; when there is a single consciousness and a single point of view everywhere (Bakhtin, 1972: 53). M. Bakhtin proposed a fundamentally new solution to the problem. Saving humanity is possible only through polyphonic dialogue.

Polyphonic dialogue or polyphonism presupposes the intrinsic need for a vertical axiological hierarchy for the participants of dialogue. Polyphonic dialog is not just a double event, but also a triple event, that is a triologue. This third event cannot be fully envisaged in advance. In addition, it is getting fuller and richer, when «the participants of polyphonic dialog are open for the vertical value perspective» and they can find their common ground in this comprehensive third. Another feature of polyphony is the desire of participants to find themselves through reflection in another. Finally, the dialogue can be truly polyphonic only in the case of «selfless immersion of everyone in communication, realized in its own value, when dialogue can never be changed into an instrument with its initial desire to righteousness, kindness and beauty» (Bakhtin, 1972: 54).

M. Bakhtin considered the peculiarities of polyphonic dialogue on the example of F.M. Dostoevsky's creativity. He believed that Dostoevsky's novels are filled with a multitude of independent, full-fledged, and different voices and reasons. They are not defined or merged into a monolith of single author's idea. It is like heroes are moving in their own direction, independent of the author's logic. They develop their distinctiveness and specificity while preserving the organic unity of whole. The world of Dostoevsky is «artistically organized co-existence and interaction of spiritual diversity, not formation stages of unified spirit». F.M. Dostoevsky depicted «a person in a person», not just an idea in a person. The idea was only a medium in which consciousness of person was developing. The writer did not interest about life of an idea in lonely consciousness. He was inspired by the interaction of human reasons in the flow of ideas. In doing so, the idea of heroes did not aim «at a rounded and complete system-monological whole. It lived tensely at borders with stranger idea and foreign consciousness» (Bakhtin, 1972: 56).

There is no single dominant thought or systemic unity of ideology, there is a dialogue of ideas and an equal co-existence of worldviews in a polyphonic creation. The result of this approach is not a world of objects, illuminated and ordered by author's monological thought, but a world of mutually illuminated reasons, a world of connected human meanings. Among them, author seeks the highest idea and perceives it not as his true thought, but as another true person and his word.

Author's thought does not play the function of all-pervasive worldview. It is included in general polyphony of the creation as equal consciousness, existing among other similar minds. F.M. Dostoevsky demonstrated a deep understanding of dialogical nature of human thought and dialogical nature of idea. He was able to discover, see and show the true sphere of idea's life. M. Bakhtin emphasized, that idea did not live in the isolated individual consciousness of any person; it also degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, to form, to develop, to find, to update its verbal expression and to generate new ideas only by entering substantial dialogue with other people's ideas. Human thought becomes a true thought, which is an idea, only in living contact with another's thought, embodied in another's voice, that is, in another's consciousness. At the point of this contact of voices and consciousness, the idea is born and lives.

F.M. Dostoevsky represented the idea not as just a subjective individual and psychological concept with a «permanent place» in person's consciousness; no, the idea, according to the writer, was interpersonal and intersubjective; the sphere of its life was not in individual consciousness; it was created and formed during the dialogue between human reasons. The idea was a living process, played out at a point of dialogue between two or more minds. In that aspect, the idea was like a word with which it was dialectically united. Like the word, the idea wanted to be heard, understood, and «answered» by other voices from other positions. Like the word, the idea was like dialogue by its nature, but the monologue was only a conditional compositional form of its expression.

Therefore, F.M. Dostoevsky saw and painted the idea exactly as a living act, played out between consciousness-voices. This artistic discovery of the idea's dialogue nature and any human life, illuminated by consciousness made him the greatest writer of the idea» (Bakhtin, 1972: 57).

Using the dialogue, people not only acquire the truth, but also touch and learn about existence. The dialogue permeates all speech of human, all relationships, and manifestations of human life. Human is the main cornerstone of human world. The other is «the one by which I reconcile my existence. If I do not recognize his partial correctness, do not try to accept that correctness and turn it into a piece of my consciousness, I impoverish myself. When I militarily abolish the view of others, I reject not the idea of others, but the existence of others» (Gurevich, 1992: 94).

The polyphonic dialogue is possible only in the context of «other dominance». «All possible existence and all possible meaning are located around a person who is the center and the sole value» (Batishchev, 1992: 131). M. Bakhtin believed, everything that had been said about a person before, could be explained by language of sociocultural themes. Culture is polyphonic, like a human, who is bipolar. It does not coincide with itself, because its inner world is at least two-faced. So that's why self-awareness of culture is possible. The dialogue of cultures takes place at their borders. They do not mix with each other and do not become one another. They interact antinomically, that is inseparably and unbendingly. Every culture yearns to interact with another culture to be reflected as a mirror to see itself better.

By meeting one another and learning about oneself, individual cultures create a chain of the emerging noosphere.

New meaning, new idea and new vision are emerging on the boundaries of cultures. At the interface of culture, it is getting possible to go beyond the clot of life's reasons and goals inherent in any culture and enter different spectra of values, into intercultural space in which sense of being and certain direction of reason for the first time becomes in origin form. Only through certain cultural meanings, we can enter other cultural worlds. The fruitful dialogue with a different culture and with one's own culture can only be conducted by someone who doubts his or her foundations and meanings. Only intense intercultural communication can lead a person to a new level of contemplation of the world.

M. Bakhtin named his approach social poetry. In contrast to monological sociology that considers a human being as an object, M. Bakhtin viewed a human, who is always in the process of dialogue with past generations, with his own culture and with himself. It is in this sense that social shapes the form of every single and unique utterance, from the simplest remark to the perfect literary language. No one is talking about anything for the first time. Someone, for some reason and with some meaning, has already said every word. Person is always talking to someone and something in the live conversation or in inner speech. The dialogue is irreducible; it is universal.

The central point of M. Bakhtin's dialogical personalism is the impossibility of *I am* concept. There are only two fundamental polar ways: *I am You* (as a genuine encounter) or *I am It* (objectifying the other, immersing it in space and time) with the resulting problem (*I am You*) and (*I am It*). The correlation of *I am* and *the other*, based on complicity during the being process, related to the end of human in ethical and spiritual senses.

Comparison

By consulting this comparative table, a reader can determine similarities and differences between such philosophical ideas as existential communication concept by K. Jaspers and dialogical personalism by M. Bakhtin (See Table 1). The author suggests that type of visual demonstration will be more useful and effective for a reader perception.

Table 1 – Comparative analysis of researched philosophical concepts

Criteria	Existential communication concept	Dialogical personalism
Role of human being	Human being is impossible outside of communication.	Human is the main cornerstone of the world. Human always is in the process of dialogue with past generations, his own culture and himself.
Consciousness meaning	Three levels of consciousness, which do not affect the deepest nucleus of human, namely existence.	Consciousness as a main concept for the idea formation and development. Human thought becomes a true thought, which is an idea, only in living contact with another's thought, embodied in another's voice, that is, in another's consciousness.
Dialogue and communication way	Existential dialogue, which includes openness and active involvement of all participants. The communication process identifies human's essence. Moreover, human freedom is not possible without communication. Communication of people and their connection to themselves were the structural moment of human existence.	Using the dialogue, people not only acquire the truth, but also touch and learn about existence. The dialogue permeates all speech of human, all relationships, and manifestations of human life. Saving humanity is possible only through polyphonic dialogue. Only intense intercultural communication can lead a person to a new level of contemplation of the world.
Existence sense	Existence is presented as an authentic being. It is equated with freedom. Existence is the autonomy of will or self-being, which is opposite to animal will or dependent being. Existence is a nucleus of human.	Existence as a main primordial foundation for polyphonic dialogue, which is possible only in the context of «other dominance». Also, co-existence as a dominant thought or systemic unity of ideology for polyphonic creation.
Role of culture	Culture based on an understanding of the profound loneliness of human beings in an era of weakening of all traditional, religious, national, family, and spiritual ties between them. In this type of cultural framework, person's heightened self-awareness and his inner life are getting tenser.	Culture is polyphonic. Self-awareness of culture is possible. The dialogue of cultures takes place at their borders. Every culture yearns to interact with another culture to be reflected as a mirror to see itself better. By meeting one another and learning about oneself, individual cultures create the sphere of human-nature interaction, where reasonable human activity is the highest value.

Conclusion

The world of communication is so close to the ethical world that all ethical discourse can be transmitted into existential language. The crystallization of existential thought from an ethical point of view is, first, the considering existential structure as a structure of communication; second, the discovery of the constitutive role of understanding; third, the interpretation of human reality mainly as an «understanding being».

Karl Jaspers and Mikhail Bakhtin developed such classical ethical theories as the concept of

existential communication and dialogical personalism, inspired by morality. Because it is in moral form that most matrices of true friendship and true humanity exist. Nothing but morality gives any relations and attitudes the status of moral qualities, virtues and even ideals of behavior. Despite some differences in philosophical concepts of K. Jaspers and M. Bakhtin, we can state categorically that the main purpose of communication and dialogue is to achieve the spiritual community of people, which is valuable and does not care about any benefits.

References

- Аверинцев С.С. Ясперс Карл // *Философский энциклопедический словарь*. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1983. – С. 818.
- Адорно Т.В. *Проблемы философии морали*. – М.: Республика, 2000. – 239 с.
- Апель К.-О. *Трансформация философии*. – М.: Логос, 2001. – 339 с.
- Батищев Г.С. *Диалогизм или полифонизм? (Антитетика в идейном наследии М.М. Бахтина)* // М.М. Бахтин как философ. – М.: Наука, 1992. – С. 129 – 137.

- Бахтин М.М. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. – М.: Художественная литература, 1972. – 468 с.
- Гайденок П.П. Прорыв к трансценденции. Новая онтология XX века. – М.: Республика, 1997. – 495 с.
- Гуревич П.С. Проблема Другого в философской антропологии М.М. Бахтина // М.М. Бахтин как философ. – М.: Наука, 1992. – С. 88 – 108.
- Дунаев В.Ю. Онтологические основания социогуманитарной рефлексии. – Алматы: ИФП МОН РК, 2007. – 399 с.
- Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. – СПб.: Искусство-СПБ, 2000. – 704 с.
- Сартр Ж.П. Бытие и ничто: Опыт феноменологической онтологии. – М.: Республика, 2000. – 639 с.
- Сметанина С.И. Медиа-текст в системе культуры (динамические процессы в языке и стиле журналистики конца XX века). – СПб.: Изд-во Михайлова В.А., 2002. – 383 с.
- Соколов В.А. Общая теория социальной коммуникации: Учебное пособие. – СПб.: Изд. Михайлова В.А., 2002. – 464 с.
- Шалабаева Г. Культура между хаосом и порядком. – Алматы: СаГа, 2007. – 108 с.
- Эко У. Пять эссе на темы этики. – СПб.: Симпозиум, 2002. – 158 с.
- Ясперс К. Введение в философию. – Минск: Изд-во ЕГУ ЗАО «ПроPILEи», 2000. – 191 с.
- Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 527 с.

References

- Adorno T. (2000) Problemy filosofii morali [Problems of moral philosophy]. M: Republic, 239 p. (In Russian)
- Averintsev S. (1983) Jaspers Karl // Filosofskij jenciklopedicheski slovar' [Jaspers Karl // Philosophic encyclopedic dictionary]. M: Soviet Encyclopedia, P. 818 (In Russian)
- Apel K.-O. (2001) Transformacija filosofii [Transformation of Philosophy]. M: Logos, 339 p. (In Russian)
- Batishchev G. (1992) Dialogizm ili polifonizm? (Antitetika v idejnom nasledii M.M. Bakhtina) [Dialogism or polyphonism? (Antithetics in M.M. Bakhtin's intellectual heritage)]. M: Science, pp. 129–137. (In Russian)
- Bakhtin M. (1972) Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo [Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics]. M: Fiction, 468 p. (In Russian)
- Dunaev V. (2007) Ontologicheskie osnovanija sociogumanitarnoj refleksii [Ontological bases of socio-humanitarian reflection]. Almaty: IPhP MES RK, 399 p. (In Russian)
- Eco U. (2002) Pjat' jesse na temy jetiki [Five essays on ethics]. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 158 p. (In Russian)
- Gaidenko P. (1997) Proryv k transcencencii. Novaja ontologija XX veka [The Breakthrough to Transcendence. The New Ontology of the 20th Century]. M: Republic, 495 p. (In Russian)
- Gurevich P. (1992) Problema Drugogo v filosofskoj antropologii M.M. Bakhtina [The Other's Problem in Philosophical Anthropology by M.M. Bakhtin]. M: Science, pp. 88-108. (In Russian)
- Jaspers K. (1991) Smysl i naznachenie istorii [The Origin and Goal of History]. M: Politizdat, 527 p. (In Russian)
- Jaspers K. (2000) Vvedenie v filosofiju [An introduction to Philosophy]. Minsk: «Propilei» publishing house, 191 p. (In Russian)
- Lotman J. (2000) Semiosfera [Semiosphere]. St. Petersburg: Art-St. Petersburg, 704 p. (In Russian)
- Sartre J.-P. (2000) Bytie i nichto: Opyt fenomenologicheskoj ontologii [Being and Nothing: Experience of Phenomenological Ontology]. M: Republic, 639 p. (In Russian)
- Smetanina S. (2002) Media-tekst v sisteme kul'tury (dinamicheskie processy v jazyke i stile zhurnalistiki konca XX veka) [Media text in the system of culture (dynamic processes in the language and style of journalism of the late 20th century)]. St. Petersburg: V.A. Mikhailov's Press, 383 p. (In Russian)
- Sokolov A. (2002) Obshhaja teorija social'noj kommunikacii: Uchebnoe posobie [General theory of social communication: Training manual]. St. Petersburg: V.A. Mikhailov's Press, 464 p. (In Russian)
- Shalabaeva G. (2007) Kul'tura mezhdru haosom i porjadkom [Culture between chaos and order]. Almaty: SaGa, 108 p. (In Russian)