

Л.М.Корнієнко

L.M.Korniienko

Сумський національний аграрний університет

Sumy National Agrarian University

МОВА ЯК ЗНАРЯДДЯ КУЛЬТУРНОЇ ЕКСПАНСІЇ LANGUAGE AS A TOOL OF CULTURAL EXPANSION

Анотація. У статті автор розглядає проблему використання мови як засобу експансії та підпорядкування. Ця проблема аналізується на прикладі освітньої реформи британського політичного діяча Т. Маколей, спрямованої на англонізацію індійського суспільства колоніального періоду. Результатом політики маколейзму, яка, з погляду автора, використовується і сьогодні, було утворення нового класу англосмовної індійської творчої еліти. Автор, з позиції філософії мови Гумбольдта, дає філософський аналіз погляду критиків політики маколейзму, про те, що англосмовна індійська філософія, мистецтво та культура загалом втратили свою автентичність.

Abstract. In the article, the authors consider the problem of using language as a means of expansion and subjugation. This problem is analyzed on the example of the educational reform of the British politician T. Macaulay, aimed at the Anglonization of the Indian society of the colonial period. The result of the policy of Macaulayism, which, from the point of view of the authors, is still used today, was the formation of a new class of English-speaking Indian creative elite. The authors, from the standpoint of Humboldt's philosophy of language, give a philosophical analysis of the point of view of Macaulayan policy critics that the English-language Indian philosophy, art and culture as a whole have lost their authenticity.

Ключові слова: англосмовна індійська філософія, автентичність, національна ідентичність, Томас Маколей, мовна картина світу.

Key words: authenticity, english-speaking Indian philosophy, language picture of the world, national identity, Thomas Macaulay

Introduction. One of the defining events in the history of colonial India in the 19th century, which influenced the development of the English language in the subcontinent, was the educational reform of T. Macaulay. As you know, Thomas Macaulay (1800-1859), a British statesman, was the author of the reform of the education system under the Governor General of India, Bentinck, the purpose of which was to introduce English into Indian society as the language of education and administration, as well as to create «a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect» [Macaulay 1835: [34]].

The reasons for the necessity of this action were laid out in his work «Minute on Education» of 1835.

Main text. The content of these arguments, as well as the alleged role of the «Minute» in the passing of the English Education Act of 1835, determined the fate of the English and English-speaking Indians for more than a hundred years to come.

Macaulay advocated the systematic replacement of Sanskrit and Persian, then the official languages of the subcontinent, by English in Indian education and administration.

Macaulay's main argument is that English at that time was the language of advanced world science, philosophy, literature, and culture in general. He perceived the existing Indian culture, which was glorious in the past, as a stagnant, outdated, backward phenomenon that does not meet the challenges of modernity, the locomotive of which, according to Macaulay, is European culture. Macaulay offers a model of modernity for India, a modernity that is mediated by the English language. Therefore, he saw in his reformist activity, first of all, a «civilizing mission».

It should be noted that in 1835 the British Crown did not have legal authority in India at that time; Britain's interests were represented by the private British East India Company, which, by the way, had its own army (similar to today's PMCs), which at that time was the largest army in the world. It was with the help of the East India Company that the British colonization of India and a number of countries of the East was carried out. Crown rule in India began only in 1858. The actual language question related, at first glance, to the policy of the Company itself, but its discussion in the British Parliament already suggests that this is a question of the policy of the state-empire, and not only in relation to the Indian subcontinent, but also to other countries and regions that were in the sphere of interests of Great Britain and, as historical experience shows, the foundations of this policy continue to be established today. Therefore, it can be stated that «Minute» does not lose its relevance even after almost two centuries.

A detailed analysis of Macaulay's arguments in favor of the English language is provided by Smith College philosophy professors Bhushan Nalini and Jay L. Garfield in their book «Minds Without Fear: Philosophy in the Indian Renaissance». The book itself is about the history of English-speaking Indian philosophy of the second phase of the colonial period (1858-1947). Representatives of this philosophy are actually representatives of a new class, who were also called «Macaulay's children». Their philosophy is little known and, according to the authors, undeservedly forgotten; today, for example, none of the most important original works of these philosophers are taught either in India or in the West.

N. Bhushan and D.G. Garfield, criticizing Macaulay's argument, believe that the Anglonization of Indian society played an important role in the life of the subcontinent and, even more, it was, paradoxically, of great importance in the national liberation struggle of the Indian people against the British colonizers. As for the Indian philosophy and art of this period, according to the authors, they remain faithful to the Indian tradition and at the same time correspond to the trends of world philosophy and art, are authentically Indian and cosmopolitan modern. One could

agree with the point of view of Bhushan and Garfield, especially after reading another of their anthology books, «Indian Philosophy in English: From Renaissance to Independence». But the fact that «Macaulay's children» themselves do not want to consider the English-speaking philosophy of India as Indian is worth noting. Daya Krishna, one of the most eminent Indian philosophers of the post-independence period, says the following about Indian philosophy: «Anybody who is writing in English is not an Indian philosopher. . . . What the British produced was a strange species - a stranger in his own country. The Indian mind and sensibility and thinking [during the colonial period] was shaped by an alien civilization. [The British] created a new kind of Indian who was not merely cut off from his civilization, but was educated in a different way. The strangeness of the species is that their terms of reference are the West. . . . They put [philosophical problems] in a Western way» [Bhushan, Garfield 2017: 10].

The reason for the denial of Indian authenticity in English-speaking philosophy is that English is a foreign language. As Heidegger was to put it in 1948 in his «Letter on Humanism» «language is the house of being» [Heidegger, 1998: 254]. Vocabulary, a set of lexical resonances, literary history, and perhaps even syntax, encode subtly a way of perceiving and mastering the world. When we study and use language, we live in a certain world.

Language is the most universal significant system, which integrates in the conceptual and figurative system of speech, writing, etc. ethnic worldview in the form of a general. In this respect, language, which is not the only representative of the ethnic, can play the role of a universal feature, as in the linguistic form of national culture is represented in its generality, not just specificity. For example, in our time of mass communications and other global processes that lead to the loss of identity of national cultural features in everyday life and at work, very often the function of national-cultural identification is performed by language. This is due to the specifics of the language form - it is material and ideal, abstract and concrete, figurative and rational at the same time. With such a synthetic functionality, in our opinion, no other element of national culture can compete with language.

Every nation is a native speaker of a certain language, has its own linguistic picture of the world. Linguistic picture of the world – is developed over the centuries, in the process of practical development of reality, human ideas about the world, its experience, fixed, in contrast to theoretical knowledge, not in any systematic and orderly sources, but directly in the living language of the ethnos, in the form of established verbal forms: idioms, inversions, images of folklore, symbols, etc. Linguistic pictures of the world of different peoples differ due to differences in the hierarchy of values that are fixed in them.

According to Humboldt's linguistic theory, which is one of the most productive in the philosophical description of language, the linguistic picture of the world is a way of national representation of the image of objective reality in the linguistic consciousness of any people. Humboldt, based on the key principle of the philosophy of Kant and in general the German classical philosophy of the activity of the subject, formulates a very important idea from a methodological point of view in the approach to the study of language. The idea is that language is not a passive

organ that serves to materialize thought, but is an active principle in relation to the mental activity of a nation, and hence in relation to its vision of the world, ie «language is not a product of activity (Ergon), but activity (Energieia)» [Humboldt 1984].

«Language is a kind of general theory that describes and explains the surrounding reality. With its help a person is given the initial classification and understanding of the phenomena of nature and society, and all this is done largely without subjective and personal preferences and is due to a common condition for it with other people - to be a native speaker» [Shynkaruk, Bystrytskyi 1996]. The language acquired by a person in childhood has a unique meaning for a person, it is called native.

The linguistic picture of the world is not a frozen nomenclature. The connection of words with non-linguistic reality occurs both due to the relationship of some language units with the objects of real activity, and due to the connection of words within the language as a whole system.

In the process of language acquisition, children learn not only the names of objects and actions, but also their ethnic and social meaning. This happens due to the imposition of the linguistic picture of the world of a certain people on reality and the association of semantic units with external objects. Revealing the world of their people to the child, adults, using the methods of taboo and popularization and encouragement of certain actions and deeds, develop in the child one or another attitude towards the objects of the real world. A child's acquaintance with lexical material occurs as the assimilation of value and worldview coordinates. At this stage, the interpretation of the world occurs illogically according to the type of mythical-figurative way of thinking, with the use of binary positions such as «right-wrong», «good-bad», etc.

Later, a person also learns the conceptual and logical method. Those features that determined this or that hierarchy of values in the language picture of the world of a certain nation were transformed in it into certain connections between words, into a certain value coloring of the concepts of living, everyday language. Their assimilation by a person contributes, along with other non-verbal forms, such as a rite, ritual, etc., to the formation of that specific stereotype of behavior that characterizes a representative of a certain ethnic group.

Language is a means of identification for those who possess it, which means a system of symbols, meanings, values around which the human community is consolidated, with clearly expressed, unique features that are unique to it. Through language, each person learns the culture of his people and the relay of spiritual values from generation to generation. By learning the language of his people, a person joins the sources of the unique spirituality of the nation, over time he becomes its bearer and even its creator.

Language is not only an element of culture through which a person learns the values of his nation, language itself is a value, a structural element of national identity. Being a value itself, it can be a means of entering the world of values of national culture. But for this, the language, as well as the culture as a whole, must meet the requirements of the time, the real conditions of the people's life and the

level of people's spiritual requests. Existing in the context of the relevant society, the ethnocultural tradition is designed to provide its adherents with the choice of optimal "responses" to the «challenges» of changing circumstances and adequate to the internal demands of the forms of creative self-realization of individuals. When these conditions are not met, there is a crisis of national culture, which can be aggravated by various external circumstances. But the main reason for the crisis of a certain national and cultural tradition is that the value orientations that make up its background and direct the creative search do not correspond to the personal spiritual aspirations of people, their creative intentions, which are definitely related to the real conditions of social and historical life.

Language, performing a nominative function, covers the whole reality with nominative units (words and fixed phrases), like a mosaic. The presence of large gaps, lacunae, unfilled areas in the language, for one reason or another, forces the individual, the people to look at the world through other people's eyes, and violates the national integrity of spiritual culture. This most often happens with "non-prestigious" languages, which did not have the opportunity to lingualize certain spheres of human cognition and activity, lingualized by "prestigious" languages. We are primarily talking about the sphere of science, technology, production, socio-economic relations, etc.

According to those who criticize the use of English in Indian philosophy, the English language did not develop in the Indian cultural and philosophical environment and therefore encodes completely different ways of asking questions, seeing and answering them. Thus, the presentation of Indian philosophy in English inevitably leads to its distortion. Rabindranath Tagore put the point with characteristic eloquence, in his 1924 lectures in China, «Languages are jealous sovereigns, and passports are rarely allowed for travelers to cross their strictly guarded borders».

According to O.O. Potebnya, language is an activity, an organ that forms thought [Potebnya, 1892]. All human relations to external objects are determined by the way in which these objects appear to him in language. Each nation is defined by the circle of its language, and it can get out of this circle only by moving to another.

Conclusions. If the language is changed - naturally or artificially - the people are also changed, because their conceptual apparatus, their self-awareness and identity are changed. And precisely this is the goal set by Macaulay in his reform - to bring forth a new class that remains Indian in its external form, but not in its content and spirit. The fate of the new class turned out to be somewhat tragic, its representatives became strangers among their own, but did not become their own among strangers. But did T. Macaulay himself understand this. Probably yes. After all, always quoting his words about a class of people, Indians by blood and skin color, but English by taste, thoughts, morals and intelligence, for some reason the first part of his statement remains overlooked, namely:

«We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern» [Macaulay 1835: [34]]. The prospect of being ruled rather than masters of one's land is unacceptable to a healthy portion of any people, but the colonial or neo-colonial rhetoric of politicians casts a shadow over

language that is in one way or another linked to the colonial project, which is itself unacceptable. Therefore, the representatives of the Indian national elite are not against the English language as such, but against Macaulayism as a mechanism of British expansion.