The Ethos of Coexistence in Language – A Philosophical Reading

Dr. Tires Habiba[1], Dr. Ouadah Abdelhamid[2]

[1]Associate Professor (A), Department of Philosophy, Social Sciences Division, Hassiba Ben Bouali University – Chlef, Laboratory of applied philosophy and future studies (Algeria). E-mail: h.tires@univ-chlef.dz

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1897-6434

[2]Associate Professor (A), Department of Philosophy, Social Sciences Division, Hassiba Ben Bouali University – Chlef, Laboratory of applied philosophy and future studies (Algeria). E-mail: a.ouadah@univ-chlef.dz

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5840-6189

Abstract:

In this research paper, we aim to offer a philosophical reading in which we clarify the tremendous importance of language and its role in achieving coexistence and mutual interdisciplinary understanding within a global framework. We stress its human dimensions that transcend the narrow confines of an automatic linguistic function, regarding language as an ontological communicative act that establishes the values of dialogue, diversity, and openness among different identities. This occurs within the context of the relationship between the self and the other and in a cosmic space that expands to embrace all diversity—where language serves as the supporting tool. This study presents and analyzes the key stances of language philosophers who have focused on exploring language issues and the lofty human values associated with it, such as otherness and the culture of global peace (Bertrand Russell, Paul Ricoeur, Jürgen Habermas, Edgar Morin, among others). In our contemporary era, characterized by wars and conflicts among peoples, the search for mechanisms to achieve these values has become an essential imperative.

1.   Introduction:

The issue of language has always been a central and pivotal concern in both ancient and modern philosophy. Human beings have long expressed their existence in this world through the medium of language, using it to communicate their needs and requirements in specific linguistic units. Language plays an important role in formulating and addressing one's epistemological, social, political, and other issues by engaging with various aspects that constitute one's being. Yet, man does not live in isolation; the presence of the other compels him to move beyond the realm of the individual and to embrace the whole. In other words, one must coexist with everyone by means of a linguistic structure that enables communication with all.

Thus, the study of language and its related issues has become one of the most important axes that philosophical thought has dealt with since its inception up to the contemporary period, given that "language, by its very nature, is the representation of thought" (Schäfer, 2010, p. 63). This reflects the idea that linguistic knowledge is linked to a variety of perspectives—from investigating its semantic structures and diverse functions in facilitating communication to examining its relationship with power, ideology, artistic expression, logic, media, and more. Language has come to constitute a kind of authority that can

be harnessed in the service of various human concerns, foremost among them being the quest for understanding and dialogue with the other. This is precisely what philosophers, convinced of the sensitive role language plays, have underscored, as they view the analysis of language as the pathway to understanding existence and the world.

Accordingly, how can language serve as an effective tool in fostering a culture of peace and mutual coexistence among peoples? What are the most important opinions of language philosophers on this matter?

Before discussing some of the trends in the philosophy of language, we can first delve into this human attribute by defining and scrutinizing its meanings and connotations, as well as its relationship to speech and text—especially in contemporary philosophy. For instance, Paul Ricoeur, in his book *Interpretation*, writes of a "space between a tendency that wishes to listen to the truth revealed in language and a tendency that seeks to expose the illusions of language to uncover its facts," similar to the approach taken by the skeptics such as Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud (Radi, 2015, p. 12). These thinkers attempted to offer their own interpretations through the skeptical perspective of their philosophy, and then they examined how to utilize language, speech, and text in the context of mutual coexistence among peoples and the extent to which the self intersects with the other in the linguistic matter.

2. On the Nature of Language:

According to Lalande, language in its true sense is the verbal expression of both internal and external thought—a means by which the intention to speak is conveyed. Here, language contrasts with speech in two respects: firstly, speech refers to the external language produced by the speaker, and secondly, speech indicates the individual act through which language functions via a single utterance or multiple utterances. In this sense, speech is synonymous with tongue; however, it is typically used in a sense that distinguishes between general self-expression in speech and a specific linguistic system defined within a particular community (Lalande, 2001, p. 271).

Through this varied system of the human tongue, a divergence becomes apparent regarding the origin of language and tongue among the world's linguistic groups with their diverse languages and dialects. It can be said that language is a form of communication among human beings, employing a set of symbols and signs to express a series of ideas that traverse the human mind. Julia Kristeva defines it as "the communicative pathway of discourse linking sender and receiver" (Kristeva, 1981, p. 13).

Moreover, language interweaves with our lives in such a way that we often take it for granted. It "characterizes our existence in a manner that we live in it without usually being aware of it, and the difficulties in breaking free from this state to reflect on language become evident—leading Heidegger to seek the help of poets, who are better able to express it. This is why he analyzes Stéphane George's poem 'The Word,' written in 1919" (Radi, 2015, p. 11). Such poetic expression encourages us to reconsider our linguistic words through a creative and intellectual freedom, because "between thought and poetry there exists an inherent affinity, as both commit themselves to serving language and give to it unreservedly" (Ricœur, 1975, p. 396). While thought continuously produces appropriate discourses and expressions, poetry presents them artistically and aesthetically, thus creating a linguistic domain that draws the reader's attention through its multiple poetic uses.

Additionally, what is now known as "information language" has entered our contemporary life in the knowledge and information society, imposing a new type of communicative language that permeates nearly all areas of knowledge and human life—whether economic, political, artistic, or social. Successful investment in today's world is increasingly mediated by it, having ignited a knowledge revolution that has upended traditional modes of interaction and relationships.

3. The Innateness of Language:

Multiple perspectives have been proposed regarding language as a human attribute that requires interpretation and the delineation of its fundamental features. Lenneberg argues that language is an

innate capacity characteristic of the human species, as all humans share specific biological features related to language (such as the dominance of the left hemisphere of the brain). He states, "All humans, without dispute, acquire language regardless of their intelligence levels (except in cases of extremely low IQ among children). All children use language at approximately the same stage of life, and in addition to not requiring formal instruction, it is extremely difficult to suppress language" (Green, 1992, pp. 135–136). This is because language emerges with every human appearance as an effort to express various needs and thoughts. As Saussure remarks, "Thought, before language, is like a formless mass." Language, then, actualizes these ideas in the world, forming expressions that represent a particular stance or opinion on an issue, or a theory that asserts a specific point.

Noam Chomsky's linguistic theory, which has attracted significant attention among psychologists, posits a fundamental assertion: "Every sentence has both a deep structure and a surface structure, and it is impossible for us to match the capacity of language construction in terms of semantic relations if we were to consider only the surface structure – the mere arrangement in which words appear in sentences" (Green, 1992, p. 165). These relationships among linguistic elements form a coherent linguistic unit that serves diverse meanings within the realm of signification. Chomsky even stated, "From now on, I will consider language as a set of sentences (finite or infinite), each of finite length and composed of a finite set of elements" (Ali, 2004, p. 58), expressing its various linguistic domains. In his later works, he stressed the importance of language in understanding the other; our ignorance of another's language may cause us to miss many things. Chomsky has been known as an advocate for peaceful issues, considering that global peace issues can only be discussed through language.

Thus, the innate language—or what is called the "language faculty," "linguistic competence," or "competence" in the mind—is that very capacity which Saussure termed "la langue" or language in the general sense (Chomsky, 2005, p. 41). Consequently, the innate human aspect related to language comprises a set of qualifications and linguistic abilities that enable one to engage in speech through the employment of these mental competences in expressing linguistic meaning as it manifests in reality. However, relying solely on one's innate language might leave one ignorant of the subjects of the other; even when one masters one's own language, one may know little of the other's. This is why Chomsky insists on the necessity of being open to the language of the other, for we coexist, converse, and share one world.

4.   Ordinary Language and Understanding the World:

Language has been extensively studied through the efforts of many philosophers interested in linguistic analysis and its relationship to philosophical and logical studies—such as Gadamer, Bertrand Russell, Moore, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Rudolf Carnap, among others. Paul Ricoeur's long philosophical journey in the field of language enabled him to experience ordinary language by linking it to hermeneutics and emphasizing the role of the self in its relationship with the text, "because the self is what constructs the matter of meaning" (Ricœur, 1965, p. 48). This led Ricoeur to reject the notion that the human self is absent before the text, maintaining instead that "man is a linguistic being who seeks to understand the world" (Gadamer, 1996, p. 515), based on his analysis of language structures that solidify this understanding. In doing so, he distinguished his stance from structuralists who dismiss the role of the self in the process of comprehension.

Ricoeur's journey did not stop with structuralism; he also ventured into analytic philosophy, which allowed him to engage with ordinary language—a language he viewed as:

• A language distinct from other languages, characterized by its symbolic discourse.

• A language that preserves the various expressions emerging from human experience and diverse emotions.

Thus, Ricoeur traversed from existential problems to linguistic issues by passing through both the structuralist and analytic schools, seeking a methodological interpretation open to everything that represents contemporary philosophy.

Philosophers of language have emphasized the importance of analyzing language to reveal certain philosophical and ethical issues. They believe that analytic philosophy is closely related to language, which compels it to focus on issues of mutual understanding through ordinary language. The goal is to clarify the underlying truth in the multiple philosophical problems—given that ordinary words and expressions are used. Accordingly, the duty of analytic philosophy is "to analyze the concepts and perceptions represented by those words and expressions by moving from a vague, composite conception to simpler perceptions" (Yahya, 1993, p. 149). Its aim is to clarify meaning and the precision of the concepts presented, not to substitute one meaning for another or one word for another.

Thus, the analysis of language is the pathway to elucidating knowledge, as it clarifies the various issues a philosopher examines by identifying the causes that could affirm or deny a given matter according to a general criterion. For Moore, the focus of analysis is "the concepts and issues in relation to reality, rather than a mere analysis of words and phrases regardless of their relation to reality" (Mousawi, p. 34). Here, analysis pertains to the examination of philosophical issues rather than a deconstruction of vocabulary and concepts; the core of the analytical process is the intellectual issue and the philosophical solutions it offers, using ordinary and simple language that we perceive in reality.

Moore's perspective on ordinary language reveals that it serves as a criterion for these issues and the meanings it carries. He contended that "ordinary language often errs in expression; it does not provide us with a means to refer to subjects such as 'blue,' 'green,' or 'sweet' except by invoking what we call 'sensations.' This misleads us when we attempt to think about the relationships between feelings and their subjects" (Badawi, 1975, p. 240). Ultimately, he acknowledged the futility of such principles that claim to reveal truth via ordinary language, given its reliance on common sensory expressions.

The discussion on language then leads us to Bertrand Russell's interest in language and its relationship to logic. He emphasized that language plays a significant role in analyzing philosophical issues, making it an ideal language for solving complex problems. "Therefore, it is necessary to articulate the analysis in an ideal language, for it is the only method capable of clarifying meaning" (Gräiling, 2014, p. 50).

The relationship between language and philosophy is profoundly important, as language emerges in various issues and problems addressed by philosophy—such as justice, global peace, and coexistence. Russell maintained that one must examine these issues by understanding the topics raised in philosophical thought and the role of language as a driver and catalyst of human thought, especially regarding the challenge of achieving global peace. He focused on searching for ways to realize the values of mutual coexistence through what he termed "global nationalism" that transcends the narrow scope of national identity in order to make room for a broad, shared human endeavor. He considered that language, and specifically logical language, is one of the crucial mechanisms for reaching that goal.

Russell differed from Moore by asserting that ordinary language can serve as a criterion for the meaning of issues, while Russell's analysis of language shifts toward logical analysis, seeing it as a transition from the unknown to the known. This requires a logical language rather than one based on ordinary language, which he considered too simplistic to convey the logical truth needed by analytic philosophy. His method is "a movement from the unknown to the known—the known that we shall attain through direct knowledge" (Qasim, 1996, p. 96). Thus, he argued against adhering to old philosophical ideas and instead urged us to understand the world anew in a language suited to our logical comprehension of contemporary realities. To understand reality logically, we must not always be led by ordinary language, which can cause intellectual obstacles that hinder reaching sound knowledge. Many of the problems faced by classical philosophy could have been resolved had we resorted to logical analysis, which consistently demonstrates that the issues of traditional philosophy stem from poor linguistic structures (Grilo, 2012, p. 36). He criticizes ordinary language for its imprecision, arguing that its ambiguous expressions and constructions mislead our beliefs with inaccurate denotations. Consequently, it becomes an obstacle to philosophical thought, and we must carefully distinguish between the syntactic form of a sentence and its logical form—since the former does not always correspond to the latter. Often, the syntactic form distracts us from the logical one, causing intellectual confusion and mix-ups (Badawi,

1975, p. 242). Therefore, it is imperative to examine the contents of language by distinguishing between the grammatical form and the logic inherent in the issues, so as not to fall into philosophical conflation.

Russell places significant emphasis on the importance of logic in philosophical matters, describing it as "the greatest savior, because philosophy requires logical demonstration rather than compositions imposed by human conveniences, as pragmatists would have it. Logic studies all possible relations—relations that are free compositions resolved by experience, so that only those relations corresponding to experience are adopted" (Youssef, 1949, p. 140).

Thus, philosophy must attend to logical issues in language as well, since proving any epistemological issue demands a logical demonstration. This is what philosophy seeks in all its discussions, and therefore, a logically complete language is required to accurately convey the philosophical ideas embedded in it. As long as ordinary language mixes the grammatical with the logical, it is prone to ambiguity. This has led to a call for constructing an ideal language for philosophy to ensure congruence between grammatical form and logical form, enabling its use as an epistemic tool in all matters—especially those related to shared human relationships. Despite the linguistic differences between the self and the other, the self can communicate with the other provided there exists an integrated and logical language.

Russell's call for such a language is specific to certain issues. This language should not be limited to daily life; it must also pertain to logic in its constructions and in the way it presents philosophical issues and events.

Russell classifies philosophers into three types based on the relations between words and non-verbal phenomena (Badawi, 1975, p. 244):
A. Philosophers who deduce the properties of the world from the properties of language, such as Parmenides, Plato, Spinoza, Hegel, and Bradley.
B. Philosophers who believe that there is knowledge that cannot be expressed in words, though they use language to allude to this knowledge, such as Bergson and Wittgenstein.
C. Philosophers who maintain that knowledge is solely knowledge of words.

However, Russell tends to neglect the second and third types, focusing only on the first type—because, according to him, through this approach we can infer the properties of the world from those of language. He observes that "philosophical problems arise directly from the distortion of the language of everyday life; hence, he saw the necessity of constructing or building a new language that is more suited to the facts of the world" (Al-Jazairi, 1986, p. 41). Through this, Russell's intention in his call is to examine the language that is appropriate for events and philosophical realities that require attention, since, as he claims, certain philosophical problems occur "as a result of philosophical expressions that have acquired false grammatical forms" (Al-Jazairi, 1986, p. 41).

5. Ordinary Language: From Unity to Integration:

Friedrich Waismann (Wittgenstein's influence) was affected by Russell's idea about language; however, he did not believe in the need to construct a new language, arguing instead that there is only one language—ordinary language—since all languages share logical conditions. For him, the structure or essence lies in everyday language, and the task of philosophy is to expose this structure; that is, to reveal the logic of language. Wittgenstein maintained that there is only one language, and he sought to uncover its depth. This does not mean that he was solely concerned with the language of logic; he also valued language in its general context, and he did not deny the possibility of a meaning connected to the expression of logical language. For him, many philosophical problems are false problems, arising from misunderstanding—stemming from the confusion among issues. Wittgenstein stated, "Most of the issues and questions written about philosophical matters are not false but are devoid of meaning. We cannot answer such questions; all we can do is declare that they are meaningless, for most of the questions and issues raised by philosophers arise from the fact that we do not understand the logic of our language" (Ludwig, 2007, p. 83).

According to him, some expressions mislead us by conveying incorrect meanings while we mistakenly regard them as correct. The conflation of perceptions in language leads to errors. Nonetheless, he does not entirely dismiss ordinary language despite his criticisms of it, nor does he advocate for its complete replacement by a symbolic logical language. "Wittgenstein defends ordinary language by asserting that it is a language with issues arranged as a complete logical system; this makes his position in his *Tractatus* ambiguous and unclear regarding his simultaneous critique and defense of ordinary language" (Tawus, 2023, p. 479).

We are, in his view, compelled to speak in ordinary language because it carries all our preoccupations in this world. Regardless of the circumstances, it is a language that conveys expressions capable of indicating the ideas we hold within us; we express only what language itself contains—that is, we do not go beyond what our language conveys in all its manifestations. After all, "we cannot understand one another without language; we cannot influence people in one way or another without it, and people cannot communicate with each other without speaking and writing" (Ludwig, 2007, p. 336). This underscores the role of language in our shared human life as the means by which we request and fulfill our various needs.

Thus, the aforementioned philosophers, through their respective positions on the issue of language, ultimately return to ordinary language with all its verbal and conceptual content. They do so through analyses that examine linguistic structures and their correspondence with logical meanings.

6. Language – The Common Denominator – from the Perspective of Social Psychology:

From the viewpoint of social psychology, linguistic symbols are artistic, symbolic creations of special importance for the development of children. They embody the methods employed by previous generations within a social group to classify and construct the world for the purpose of interpersonal communication (Tomasello, 2006, p. 26). This indicates that language is a socially acquired attribute, developed through early mutual interaction among individuals—a process that nurtures the language itself. Numerous studies have shown that once children begin acquiring language, they learn new words more effectively within contexts of joint attention and shared social engagement (Tomasello, 2006, p. 124).

The influence of the behavioral school in psychology on linguistic studies is also evident in B.F. Skinner's view, who considered language as a habit acquired much like other habits that a person develops from childhood to adulthood. Skinner maintained that the child is born with a "blank slate" completely devoid of language (Kharma, 1978, p. 114). In contrast, Chomsky refuted naive behaviorist hypotheses about the nature of language, arguing that language is a complex mental faculty and that the semantic relationships within a sentence are structured both vertically and horizontally. He asserted that humans are born with a specific linguistic capacity that enables them to acquire any language in which they live (Kharma, 1978, p. 116). Thus, the language a human acquires depends on the environment into which he is born and his abilities that enable him to do so.

Language pertains to the human species; it coexists with the stages one experiences in society, evolving as one develops. Although humans are endowed with an innate predisposition for language acquisition, ultimately, one requires a community with which to interact linguistically to translate and develop that capacity. This highlights the significance of social relationships in forming language as a participatory means of expression that reflects people's interests and reinforces communication.

7. The Importance of Language in Enhancing Mutual Understanding:

Language has attained a prominent position among language philosophers in the context of analyzing the mechanisms for achieving coexistence and mutual understanding. It is seen as capable of helping individuals break free from cycles of conflict and disagreement, steering them toward dialogue and coexistence. As a human attribute that lies at the core of our cultural makeup, Ferdinand de Saussure acknowledged that no individual is isolated in his linguistic existence from the community. He maintained that "at every moment of his life, a person must present himself as a system" (Schäfer, 2010, p. 38),

because language—as a complete system—enables him to speak within society. In this view, human language has the capacity for creativity and innovation; through it, we realize human existence or, as Martin Heidegger terms it in *Being and Time*, "Dasein." Language is not merely an instrument at our disposal; rather, it is the event that actualizes the highest potential of human existence. Heidegger's perspective implies that human existence is "thrown" into being through language. Interpretations are discursive constructs shaped by language. For this reason, he rejected epistemological reflection on understanding—which he regarded as superficial—since true understanding involves grasping the thing itself as it is, not merely as knowledge. Hans-Georg Gadamer, in his critical philosophical project, stressed the need to revalue language as an intermediary between human beings and Being, facilitating what he called the experience of understanding. He argued that language is a creative force that surrounds both man and all beings, not merely a collection of symbols and forms devoid of the power to express their essence, but rather a medium for sharing, dialogue, and remote communication between open consciousnesses. Gadamer advises, "Change from what you are; be an inquiring self whose only concern is to revise opinions and shift positions until another's understanding and mutual comprehension can be affected. Only then can we affirm the achievement of a literature of dialogue and the birth of a dialogical human being" (Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2007, p. 409).

However, such dialogue must be bound by ethical conditions to be fair and free from prejudices that claim ownership of truth. As Arab (2013, p. 159) notes, "For dialogue to produce understanding and agreement, no participant should dominate or hold a superior position that entitles them to determine the truth or even to settle the discussion."

In this context, dialogue resembles the Socratic dialogue, which rejects arbitrariness and the imposition of opinions "to return to a method aimed at reassessing ideas and beliefs in light of converging opinions and assumptions for the sake of examination and transcendence: understanding means mutual comprehension." (Al-Ma'ani, 2016, p. 80)

This discussion pertains to all the world's languages that, in the final analysis, constitute one universal human language—reflecting a nature that is simultaneously diverse and unified among all people. Edgar Morin, in his book *The Human Identity*, referring to his philosophy of complex identity, argues that although his belief in diversity does not preclude a principle of unified diversity, he warns against a mistaken concept of unity that excludes diversity and difference. He points to the necessity of reconciling diversity with unity. Despite the differences among various cultures, peoples, and nations in language, customs, and culture, there is an underlying unity characterized by a structure that underpins them—most notably, the unity of language. "Although languages are multiple, they represent an essential feature of the human species, through which man is capable of expressing himself" (Edgar, 2009, p. 91).

In this context, the primary function of language is to achieve "mutual understanding" through ethical communication—an understanding rooted in the idea that man is an ethical, linguistic being. As Edgar (2002, p. 93) states, "The ethics of understanding is an art of living that first requires us to be capable of sincere understanding. It demands great effort, for we cannot expect others to treat us similarly if we do not do so ourselves."

Through language, our concepts and ideas are constructed, thereby guiding our behavior toward dialogue that transcends the boundaries of time, space, and differing cultures. It embraces all diversity within a participatory human unity that goes beyond mere mechanistic communication between individuals, capable of conveying and absorbing various values of openness and intercultural exchange. This elevates language to the level of a communicative act with its own ethics, as pointed out by Jürgen Habermas, the philosopher of communication and the public sphere.

Habermas emphasized the importance of internal interaction among selves and linguistic interaction in dialogue, enabling individuals to express themselves, communicate, and act—thus understanding the lived world. As Dieter refers to it, "the lived experience" is achieved not only through

science and technology but also through philosophy, which serves as the interpretative mediator, renewing its connection with the whole and contributing to ethical practice and aesthetic expression. He concludes that no new communicative paradigm representing a new society can be established without critically examining the primary tool of communication—language—whether in terms of self-communication or intersubjective communication, which forms the foundational pillar of social participation (Zaid, 2012, p. 162). Liberating contemporary society from forms of servitude and domination begins with language as a communicative act. As Mahibbel (2007, p. 235) notes, "Strategic interactions are also regarded as interactions expressed through language."

Thus, through work, language, and control, the human species secures its existence within the structures of social work and self-affirmation. Through a shared life mediated by traditions and communicated via a common language, aided by evolving self-identities that continually refine individual consciousness in relation to group standards, a new social order is established (Habermas, 2006, p. 46).

Habermas' project involves infusing rationality into the act of liberation performed by philosophy. This required returning to the very "structure of language" to formulate a philosophical theory derived from a practical rationality that produces communicative discourse. From this rationality, Habermas deduces a transcendental framework for normative structures such as law and ethics, contemplating the possibility of a "global collective identity" to be confronted by contemporary societies—a matter that underlies every dialogue within what is called "public opinion" (Afaia, 1898, p. 59). He asserts that rationality is inherent in our language, and it is this feature that Habermas emphasizes in his debate with postmodernists. He argues that such rationality requires a democratic social order that includes everyone and excludes no one, with the aim not of domination but of reaching mutual understanding (Krib, 1999).

In discussing the role of language in enhancing the values of coexistence and understanding, we cannot overlook the significant contribution of translation. The multiplicity and diversity of languages necessitate translation for understanding the other. Paul Ricoeur is among the foremost philosophers of interpretation who emphasized the role of translation and its importance in achieving mutual understanding and intersubjective communication.

Ricoeur argues that translation essentially involves expressing the same message in another form or phrasing. Therefore, the act of translation is tantamount to the discovery of the other—it unfolds, interprets, reinterprets, and reformulates ideas. The translator transfers a message from one language to another, which remains an integral part of the process of understanding that allows one to approach the meanings of various texts. "The process of understanding is like penetrating the text," a point cleverly noted by Heidegger, who considered understanding as a form of appropriation and even an act of violence. For Heidegger, interpretation and representation together form a unified and necessary aggressive formula… Regarding translation from one language to another, such a strategy can be seen as a form of invasion and consumption to the point of exhaustion (Al-Khitabi, 2010, p. 105).

He raises a fundamental question in light of these observations: Is translation possible or impossible? Do we translate meaning or merely words? In response to these barren questions, he asserts, "Great works throughout the ages have been the subject of multiple translations; hence, translation is a 'challenge'—as Bermann states—where meaning and the authority of translation are at stake" (Ricoeur, *On Translation*, 2008, p. 11).

Thus, translation, as a form of intercultural and linguistic communication among different peoples and races, achieves a kind of cognitive integration. It facilitates the exchange of what was present in the original language and text into a new textual environment, with all its levels and contexts, thereby enabling intellectual and cultural communication across languages. This process creates an interpretative equivalence through which meaning is comprehended and transmitted from one language to another. It also permits a dialogue with the text through the self that strives to understand this multifaceted world through its various languages. This is the role of the translator in his interpretative endeavor. In Ricoeur's view, translation is propelled forward and liberated from mere technical constraints, positioning it within

the broader framework of interpretation. No matter how technical it may be, translation is essentially an interpretative act (Bouali, 2014, p. 200).

Thus, translation becomes a fertile process that conveys the spirit of ideas and meanings, surpassing its role of simply facilitating communication in a different language. As Heidegger remarked, it "aids in mutual understanding at a higher level—a blessed grace for peoples." (Heidegger, 2012, p. 26) Therefore, if translation is an interpretative process that targets parts of texts to reach a coherent whole, it transcends the mere act of communication to address the higher relationship between the self and the other in language and existence.

8. Conclusion:

In conclusion, we assert that man cannot live without language, nor can he coexist in its absence. It is an indispensable element for those who wish to live together. This fact makes human language a dynamic and interactive medium that evolves with the circumstances of human life; it is continuously generated and renewed, allowing the expression of ideas that may not have been articulated before. It is the art of communication and rapprochement for those who desire to live with others. Language, therefore, is renewed by the renewal of human situations within society, urging us—based on an ontological specificity that characterizes "our" being—to listen to the other through language and by means of language.

Thus, language can support a culture of peace in a contemporary world beset by crises marked by violence and fanaticism. We must utilize language and direct its function to support these universal and human values by first fostering a full readiness to communicate with the other through acceptance, and secondly by opening various channels of dialogue to achieve a common human ground that addresses the same concerns among all people.

Bibliography:

1. Gadamer, J. (1996). *Truth and Method*. Ed Seuil: Paris.

2. Kristeva, J. (1981). *La Langage, cet Inconnu*. Paris: Du Seuil.

3. Ricœur, P. (1965). *De l'interprétation*. Paris: Ed Seuil.

4. Ricœur, P. (1975). *La Métaphore Vive*. Paris: Seuil.

5. Edgar, M. (2009). *The Approach, Humanity (Vol. 1)*. United Arab Emirates: National Book House.

6. Afaia, M. N. (1898). *Modernity and Communication in Contemporary Western Philosophy (Vol. 2)*. Lebanon: Africa Orient.

7. Al-Jazairi, M. M. (1986). *The Philosophical Similarities in the Philosophy of Action in Wittgenstein* (Vol. 2). Egypt: Atoun Distribution House.

8. Al-Khitabi, A. A. (2010). "Translation and Interpretation." *Al-Arabia and Translation Journal* (4).

9. Arab, M. M. (2013). *The Philosophy of Interpretation: Confrontation, Foundation, and Transformation* (Vol. 1). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Rawafid Cultural House.

10. Al-Ma'ani, M. K. (2016). *Romantic Hermeneutics: The Da'at Model*. Jordan: Contemporary Book Science.

11. Badawi, A. A. (1975). *A New Introduction to Philosophy* (Vol. 1). Kuwait: Agency of Publications.

12. Bouali, N. (2014). *Paul Ricoeur and Philosophy* (Vol. 1). Algeria: Al Ikhtilaf Publications.

13. Chomsky, N. (2005). *Language and Responsibility* (Vol. 2). (Hossam Al-Bahnasawi, Trans.) Cairo: Zahraa Al-Sharq Library.

14. Tomasello, M. (2006). *The Cultural Origins of Human Knowledge* (Vol. 1). (Sh. Jalal, Trans.) Abu Dhabi: Cultural Consortium House.

15. Gräiling, E. S. (2014). *A Short Introduction to Bertrand Russell* (Vol. 1). (E. J. Al-Farmawi, Trans.) Cairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture.

16. Green, J. (1992). *Thought and Language*. (A. A. Gaber, Trans.) Egypt: The Egyptian General Book Organization.

17. Kharma, N. (1978). *Insights into Contemporary Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 2). Kuwait: Alam Al-Ma'rifa.

18. Radi, M. (2015). *Interpretation, Reading, and Writing: Philosophical Glimpses* (Vol. 1). Jordan: Contemporary Book World.

19. Ricoeur, P. (1999). *Being, Time, and the Secret* (Vol. 1). (S. Al-Ghanami, Trans.) Beirut: The Arab Cultural Center.

20. Ricoeur, P. (2008). *On Translation* (Vol. 1). (H. Khomri, Trans.) Algeria: Al Ikhtilaf Publications.

21. Zaid, A. A. (2012). *A Reading of the Hermeneutic Discourse*. Algeria: Ibn Al-Nadim Publications.

22. Schäfer, D. A. (2010). *The New Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistic Sciences*. (A. A. Hamoud, Trans.) Tunisia: Sinatra House.

23. Tawus, W. (2023). "The Philosophy of Language in Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*." *Al-Hikma for Research and Studies*, 11(02), 479.

24. Ali, M. M. (2004). *Introduction to Linguistics* (Vol. 1). Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadid Al-Muttahida.

25. Gadamer, J. (2006). *The Philosophy of Interpretation: Foundations, Principles, Objectives* (Vol. 2). (M. Sh. Al-Zain, Trans.) Beirut: The Arab House of Sciences.

26. Gadamer, J. (2007). *Truth and Method* (Vol. 1). (H. Nazim, Trans.) Tripoli, Libya: Oya Press.

27. Grilo, A. (2012). *Philosophy of Language* (Vol. 1). (A. Othman, Trans.) Lebanon: Dar Wa Kutub Al-Basa'ir.

28. Wittgenstein, L. (2007). *Philosophical Investigations* (Vol. 1). (A. A. Bin Nour, Trans.) Lebanon: The Arab Organization for Translation.

29. Wittgenstein, L. (2007). *A Logical-Philosophical Treatise* (A. Islam, Trans.) Egypt: The Anglo-Egyptian Library.

30. Mahibbel, A. (2007). *From Structure to Self: Readings in Contemporary Western Thought* (Vol. 2). Algeria: Al Ikhtilaf Publications.

31. Morin, E. (2002). *Educating the Future*. Casablanca: Toubkal Press.

32. Mousawi, A. (n.d.). *A New Introduction to Contemporary Analytic Philosophy*. Dār Homa for Publishing.

33. Habermas, J. (2006). *The Future of Human Nature Towards a Liberal Refoundation* (Vol. 1). (J. Katoura, Trans.) Beirut: The Eastern Library.

34. Heidegger, M. (2012). *Being and Time* (Vol. 1). (F. Al-Maskini, Trans.) Lebanon: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadid Al-Muttahida.

35. Yahya, H. (1993). *The Story of Western Philosophy*. Cairo: Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution.

36. Youssef Karam. (1949). *A History of Modern Philosophy* (Vol. 2). Egypt: Dar Al-Ma'arif.