

*Soldatova L. P.,**Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor at the Department of English Language and Communication Department  
Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology  
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University*

## THE FUNCTIONAL ESSENCE OF THE CONCEPT “LANGUAGE” IN THE RESEARCH OF GERMAN SCIENTISTS

**Summary.** This scientific research is devoted to the question of the development of terminology in a historical aspect, using the example of the concept “language”.

The research is a part of the study of understanding the essence and functional essence of the concept “language” in the historical aspect from antiquity to modern times.

The study of the dynamics of the concept “language”, development taking into account the historicism of use and new scientific approaches to understanding the functional essence, is an integral part of the study of the dynamics of the development of language, reflecting the development of human society, culture, etc.

The question arises about the functional essence, which should have the concept “language” of its needs and necessity in additional and interdependent communicative, mental, cognitive, social, and other processes of human life and society, taking into account the use of the concepts in the historic aspect.

There is no single complete and unambiguous definition of the functional essence of the concept “language” at the moment.

The article carried out an information analysis and systematization of the understanding of the functional essence of the concept “language” in the research of German scholars of the 4th period in the history of linguistics (late 19th century – the first third of the 20th century).

The analysis was carried out on the “kernel” information arrays (essential groups) of the concept according to the structure of the explanatory formula of concept content (EFCC). The classification was made by functions, and their systematization was conducted by an analysis according to the main and differential, essential, and specific features to identify common and different.

Based on the received results of the study, the “kernels” (central and most important groups) and secondary elements (dialectically interconnected and together representing the general) of the functional essence of the concept “language” were determined, analyzed, and systematized.

As a result, a complete and unambiguous definition of the functional essence of the concept “language” in the studies of German scholars of the analyzed period in the history of linguistics was synthesized.

**Key words:** language, concept, explanatory formula of concept content, functional essence.

**The statement of the problem.** Language is one of the objective indicators of human existence and consciousness. It is a widespread internationalized concept in all societies; a highly complex developing system that works in unity and interaction with the consciousness and thinking of a human.

The question arises: what functional entities should the concept “language” have according to its necessity and need in communicative, mental, cognitive, and other processes of human life and society, taking into account the historicism of the use of the concept?

A new approach to the study of the concept of “language” is needed, namely, the main generalizing functions that reflect the development of the concept should be highlighted which could be taken as a basis, and they could be applicable in all spheres of human life.

This research is an integral part of the study of understanding the essence and functional essence of the concept of “language” in the historical aspect from antiquity to the present.

The actuality of this study is motivated and determined by the need to analyze developing approaches to understanding essences and functional essences, concepts that are maximally loaded with meanings, which undergo numerous changes in the process of development of man, society, and sciences.

The scientific need is to increase knowledge about the functional essence of the concept “language” in communicative relations in society and the general system of human knowledge in different countries and different historical periods.

**Analysis of the latest research.** For thousands of years, scientists have been analyzing the functional essence of the concept “language” in various aspects for mental, cognitive, communicative, and other processes of human life and society. But there is no common understanding of the functional essence of the concept “language”.

The German scholars who studied scientific studies of “language” mainly focused on scientific achievements and theoretical and ideological mistakes. The scientists partially considered the question of the functional essence of the concept in combination with other questions.

Scholars, who study the functions of the German language, mainly focus on the functioning of language in the structure of social relations and functions of society [1], the function of language in German song lyrics [2], a text classification by language [3], language functions in German TV advertising [4] and others.

Analysis of the functional essence of the concept “language” with the aim of a generalized and unambiguous definition synthesizing was left without attention.

**The article aims** to synthesize a generalized understanding of the functional essence of the concept “language” by German scholars of the 4th period of the history of linguistics (the end of the 19th – the first third of the 20th century) (G. Frege, E. Cassirer, C. Hermann, G. Schmidt-Rohr, F. Nietzsche, K. Bühler, Heidegger M., K. Marx, F. Engels, K. Vossler, F. Mauthner,

F. Panzer, H. Steinthal, H. Bazan, O. Reche, F. Müller, F. Luschan, M. Wundt, L. Weisgerber, A. Bach)

**The object** of the research is the concept of “language”.

**The subject** is the functional essence of the concept of “language” in German scientists’ scientific researches.

**The scientific novelty** consists in the synthesis of a complete and unambiguous definition of the functional essence of “language” based on the research of prominent figures of Germany in the analyzed period.

**The presentation of the main material.**

The concept “language” has the functional essence that is expressed in the “kernel” (the central and most important groups) and secondary elements.

The German prominent figures of the 4th period of the history of linguistics (the end of the 19th – the first third of the 20th century) identified and studied the function of the concept “language” in its details and from different points of view.

– to systematize the “kernel” (the central and most important groups) and secondary elements of the functional essence of the concept “language” according to the structure explanatory formula of concept content;

– to synthesize the full and unambiguous definition of the functional essence of the concept “language”.

**Explanatory formula of concept content (EFCC).** [5]

**I. Elements of the characteristic structure.**

**1. Detection of the existence of the concept, the phenomenon of its essence.**

“Language” is “the **phenomenon of being** (the fact, state, and existence or having objective reality), **social phenomenon**, phenomenon of human culture; **essence** (the most important and essential), **spirit** (a form of manifestation of the spirit), pure actuality (the absolute perfection of God), **mediator** (one who helps lead and build relationships), **culture and/or element of culture** (a part of the culture, a reflection of culture, material and spiritual culture (property) of people, **means and tools**: force (accessing and influencing consciousness), social force (power) (regulating processes) in society, domination (the exercise of power or influence over someone or something), **communication** (the act of transferring information): a social and cultural construct (race) communication, social communication between societies (ethnicity, re-ethnicization), **a creation and/or a creator, use** (the act or practice of employing something)” [6, p. 130].

**1.2. The detection of the existence of the functional essence of the concept.**

The main generalizing functional essences of the concept “language” are presented in a generalized form with “kernel” and secondary elements within the structure.

**1. The informative function.**

The informative function provides thinking, cognition, and orientation in the world. A language includes intellectual activity: to manifest, to convey through acoustic-graphic codes (AGCs), visual or acoustic signs some thought, emotion, or essence, to think, to reason, and to conclude.

**Friedrich Ludwig Gottlob Frege** (1848–1925) (a German philosopher, logician, mathematician, and a representative of the school of analytical philosophy) believed that language served as “*a means of expressing thoughts*” reflected and created by the process of thinking in human subjective consciousness [7].

**1.1. The function of the objective reflection of information.**

Objectivity implies the presence of knowledge about an information array (object, phenomenon), using only facts, and serves as a simple “neutral” message about a fact without a personal opinion.

**Ernst Alfred Cassirer** (1874–1945) (a German philosopher and representative of the Neo-Kantian Marburg School) believed that exactly language “... gives the world a new form, in which the world is opposed to pure subjectivity, and feelings, and sensations” [8, p. 227].

Language, on the one hand, is a support for thinking, on the other hand, is considered an ethnic formation, which determines the meaningful diversity of thinking. Thinking, therefore knowledge of the surrounding world, is determined by a specific language in the form of codes.

**Conrad Hermann** (1819–1897) (a German philosopher) expressed the idea that language is a form of thinking, and knowledge of the surrounding world is determined by a specific language: “... as many different languages as there are, there are so many different types or forms of thinking, and there can be no talk of pure and universal thinking, but only of such, which has its reality in a specific given form of a particular language” [9, p. 215].

**1.2. The function of reflection, knowledge of the world, and a person’s relationship to the world (influencing the methods of a person’s cognition).**

G. Frege explained the ability of language to transfer thought by its dual sensory-rational nature. According to him, language is a unique phenomenon. On the one hand, it is a system of sensory signs (acoustic and graphic); on the other hand, it is associated with a non-sensual essentially thought. Having these qualities, language is able to perform the function of a bridge from the sensory to the insensible [7, p. 167].

Developing Frege’s thought, C. Adenauer referred to fundamental issues of linguistics, such as the origin of language, language in the context of history, language creation, language as a means of cognition, the relationship between language and thinking, etc.

One of the most important theses of C. Hermann’s lingua-philosophical research was the thesis about the relationship between language and thinking (the highest form of active reflection of objective reality), about language as a form of manifestation of human thinking: purposeful, indirect, and generalized cognition of essential connections and relationships of objects and phenomena.

C. Hermann wrote: “The doctrine of language as a bridge from thinking to reality is syntax: therefore, what is contained in it is first of all purely spiritual, specifically internal and subjectively self-conscious,” [9, p. 230], but at the same time, the entire content of language is correlated with reality and correlates with it.

**1.3. The function of information accumulation.**

Information exists in space and time. Information is preserved and transmitted from century to century, from millennium to millennium. Language (as an information code system of a sign or piece of information that indicates something, symbols, signs, and rules for their combination) exists to record, transmit, process, and store (memorize) information in the most suitable form for this purpose.

**Georg Albert Johannes Schmidt-Rohr** (1890–1945) (a German scholar and sociologist, a head of the linguistic sociology department of the SS in the SS-Ahnenerbe) supported the idea that language itself represented a repository of knowledge that influenced cognitive processes: “It is at the same time a force that transmits

the heritage of the people to subsequent generations” [10, p. 409]. (“the people” is “a community, tribe, nation, or other group by virtue of a common culture, history, religion, or the like”) [11].

## 2. The communicative function of language.

The communicative function carries out the process of creating and exchanging information (a message about the state of affairs, information intended for understanding and important for the behavior of the person to whom it is addressed, maintaining contact between interlocutors, and establishing mutual understanding in the communication process to maintain certain relationships in teams with the aim to influence the addressee messages):

- voluntary function serves to express in expressions of will: requests and orders;
- interrogative function serves to ask about a fact;
- appellative function is aimed at inducing some action or regulating actions.

Language gives people the opportunity to understand each other and establish joint work in all spheres of human activity.

**Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche** (1844–1900) (German philosopher, composer, cultural critic, and philologist) studied the history and structure of language and classical languages and had an interest in the genesis of language. He believed that thanks to language and thinking through signs, a person developed consciousness and self-consciousness.

Language, in thoughts, is invented for designating “... the relations of things to human beings”, with the aim of the preservation of the individual, not to grasp “... things in themselves” [12, p. 80].

**Karl Ludwig Bühler** (1879–1963) (a German psychologist and linguist) (distinguished three relationships existing between participants in a speech event: sender, receiver, and “message”). K. Bühler identified three functions of human language: expression, address, and representation: “They (the sender, the receiver) are not just part of what is being said, but they are exchange partners, and that is why ultimately the media product of sound can have its own sign relation to one and other” [13, p. 31].

### 2.1. The function of conceptual activity

E. Cassirer substantiated the functional concept of concept formation and applied it to language. He noted that *language* carries out two types of conceptual activity: qualifying and classifying or generalizing [8].

### 2.2. The function of representation of the speaker (understanding, knowledge of someone, something).

E. Cassirer wrote in his book “Philosophy of Symbolic Forms” that language correlated with representation function that sets the direction of worldview according to the modus of perception [8].

### 2.3. The hermeneutic function (preliminary understanding on which further knowledge of the world is based).

The communication and exchange of state of affairs and information are intended to be understood and important to the behavior of the person to whom they are addressed.

According to **Martin Heidegger** (1889–1976) (a German philosopher known for his contributions to hermeneutics, phenomenology, and existentialism), language performs a hermeneutic function, which consists in the formation of that necessary preliminary understanding which further knowledge of the world is based, describes the circle of preunderstanding, i.e. a preliminary understanding of the truth of being, a being from which there is no need to leave [14].

## 3. The social function.

Language is aimed at creating, maintaining, and regulating social, historical, areal, and other relations between people and society, society and people in society, in society or societies.

### 3.1. The function of connecting people’s lives in society and their relationships in society or societies.

Language as a social phenomenon, built into the existence of a man and a society, finds its place in the system of social actions, such as the birth and development of a linguistic community.

**Karl Marx** (1818–1883) (a German philosopher, economist, political theorist, historian, and sociologist) and **Friedrich Engels** (1820–1895) (a German philosopher, political theorist, historian, journalist, revolutionary socialist, and entrepreneur) emphasized that language exists only in society.

K. Marx was interested in language primarily as a social phenomenon built into the existence of man and society. The revealed social nature of language formed a materialistic approach to language learning.

The affirmation of the social nature of language marked the beginning materialistic view of language, rejecting various kinds of idealistic and religious concepts of language.

According to K. Marx, the functioning and development of language are performed according to certain laws which are determined by external social factors. Language is not an innate, biological phenomenon, not the property of an individual person: “...neither thought nor language forms a special kingdom in themselves... they are only manifestations of real life” [15].

Through ontological and communicative functions, language is integrated into the triad of essential human forces, which consists of consciousness, labor, and language.

The triad: work, consciousness, and language for F. Engels represented an inextricable connection to ensure the life of a person with a society, a society and a person in a society.

It involves the interaction of a person with objects of the external world. This interaction is the reason for the appearance of consciousness and the expression of the results of activity in linguistic form.

F. Engels noted that in the social interaction of people “... they had something to say to one another” [16, p. 10]. As a result, language allows the speaker to express his thoughts, and another individual allows to perceive and take note of them.

**Karl Vossler** (1872–1949) (a German linguist and scholar, a leading romance philologist, and a specialist in literature) identified two main types of community: metaphysical and empirical. In his understanding, members of the metaphysical linguistic community were all people without exception as creatures endowed with feelings, religious faith, and aesthetic taste. He associated the possibility of the existence of an empirical community with the practical interest of individuals in working together with common materials and common tools [17].

For F. Nietzsche, language is an invented tool for the socialization and preservation of the individual and the species, “... uniformly valid and binding designation is invented for things, and this legislation of language likewise establishes first laws of truth” [12, p. 81].

### 3.2. The function of the people’s expressing worldview.

Each nation has its own **picture of the world**, and these different pictures are completely irreducible to each other.

National character, temperament, psycho-emotional spectrum, etc. unique to each people (“a people” is the collective or com-



munity of an ethnic group or nation [18]) and, again, embodied in its – and only its – language. Any other language, except the native national one, even the most related one, is imbalanced with the indicated spheres of human essence, which in one way or another negatively affects the individual development of a person.

**Fritz Mauthner** (1849–1923) (an Austrian and German journalist, writer, and philosopher) noted that in each specific language: “...discursive thinking is always identical with language” [19, p. 1].

This idea was supported by K. Vossler: “...in the bosom of languages lies a kind of predestination, a quiet indication and gentle encouragement to one way or another of thinking” [17, p. 145].

**Friedrich Panzer** (1870–1956) (Germanist, co-founder of the German Association of Germanists): Language, which is “... the expression and creativity of the people of which it is the bearer, a mirror of its originality and the consolidation of its picture of the world”, “... it lives when personal its bearers die generation after generation; therefore, he becomes a transmitter of the ethnic and supports the educator of its spirit” [20, p. 8].

Information expressed in one language can be transformed into another. The differences between the types of thinking determined by language are that any translation often differs from the original and does not completely coincide with it in meaning.

C. Hermann said on this subject: “Certain thoughts can therefore be formulated only in certain languages, but not in others, or by means of these others they can only be expressed imperfectly” [9, p. 213].

That is, a person perceives the surrounding reality under the influence of a specific language. It is necessary to take into account the peculiarities of pictures of the world when interlingual transforming information from one language to another. The translation may not be authentic or even lead to conflict without taking these features into account.

### 3.3. The function of worldview formation.

F. Mauthner believed that language as the collective memory of a people is closely connected with the formation, transmission, and storage of the worldview of the people: “Being the collective memory of the people, language is at the same time a “community or unity of worldview” [19, p. 25].

### 3.4. The function of national cultural reproduction.

Language reflects and stores the totality of the results of human mental activity, including national cultural characteristics. Thanks to language, the continuity of human culture occurs, and the accumulation and assimilation of experience developed over a long time occurs.

**Hermann Steinthal** (1823–1899) (a German philologist and philosopher) considered the social element in the origin and development of language only as an accompanying important circumstance, but not as the basis of human linguistic activity. From his point of view, folk character and nationality can be found in the language [21, p. 49].

F. Mauthner believed that “... it is obvious that the culture and language of a people overlap. Language is the truest mirror image of culture [19, p. 185].

K. Vossler believed that “... every people in its language has its special worldview (Weltanschauung), or better said, the ability to see the world” [17, p. 145].

**Heinrich Banniza von Bazan** (1904–1950) (a German racial scientist, genealogist, and author) noted: “The linguistic community in each case should be especially studied from the point of view

of its relationship with the racial, blood community.” He agreed that the people consolidate in the language the experience of their thousand-year work, but “not “every” person is able to awaken in himself that primordial memory ((Urerinnerung) of the birth and development of his linguistic community, but only the one whose racial heritage of his ancestors extends to the fathers of the distant past who created language” [22, p. 221].

### 3.5. The functions of influence.

**3.5.1. The function of influencing peoples** (“the peoples” are all the persons of a racial, national, religious, or linguistic group; nation, race, etc.) [11].

Language has the power to transmit the ideas to the masses.

G. Schmidt-Rohr considered a language as a force that creates the group soul of the people [23, p. 8].

This force influences the people. G. Schmidt-Rohr put forward the important thesis: it is not blood and race, not the state will or religion, etc., but language “that most strongly determines the soul of the people” [23, p. 8].

At the same time, a certain relationship between the linguistic community and the physical characteristics of the people included in it seems real to G. Schmidt-Rohr. He cited, as an example, studies that tried to prove that different dialects of the same language corresponded to different facial features associated with specific pronunciation features.

G. Schmidt-Rohr agreed that “... alien blood brings a special color to German thinking, but it is precisely from this that such a rich diversity has grown in our German people <...> entire tribes were melted down through a foreign language, despite their blood difference, in a foreign people. The “German-blooded” Lombards became Italians, and the Slavs in the east and southeast of Germany are still becoming Germans” [10, p. 411].

G. Schmidt-Rohr raised the question of whether students of the German language learning to think and feel in German at the same time, “... how much Negroes who speak German are Germans”, and whether a language can deteriorate because it is borrowed from other peoples and races [24, p. 27].

Believing that the spiritual and mental states of peoples are determined by language and race at the same time, he still gave preference to language as “... a more significant and essential factor” [24, p. 27].

### 3.5.2. The function of re-ethnicization.

Language can serve as a tool for changing ethnicity, i.e. alienating, absorbing, and transforming the national character, spiritual, and cultural codes of the nation (societal basis) and, as a result, transform one people into another.

G. Schmidt-Rohr believed that re-ethnicization occurs in such a way that in “physically unchanged people” in whom “something is changing”, namely: “... their spiritual originality (Artung), their ethnicity”, and this change occurs not just anywhere, but at the level of language: “Language is actually the level at which re-ethnicization occurs. It is the explicit or secret goal of all measures in all spheres of life” [25, p. 205].

H. Steinthal suggested that re-ethnicization had occurred several times in human history: “Judging from experience, racial characteristics disappear or are moderated only as a result of physical mixing; the rejection of one’s own language and the adoption of another’s language was probably done in prehistoric times God knows how many times, for reasons of dominance of someone” [21, p. 52].

Re-ethnicization, which is not directly related to racial processes, can be a path to degeneration and collapse of culture.

**Otto Carl Reche** (1879–1966) (a German anthropologist, ethnologist, and “racial scientist”) considered language to be a product of the racial spirit. His conclusion is due to linguistic differences the mental and intellectual tendencies of nations must differ greatly from each other. People fall into a state of mental decay by abandoning their national language. He wrote: “A higher organized language has no reason to accept a more primitive grammar, but a primitive people cannot accept a more developed grammar. <...> A highly developed language, borrowed by a primitive race, is reduced to its spiritual level” [26, p. 258–261].

G. Schmidt-Rohr believed that “...it is necessary to recognize as soon as possible the need to preserve the people by preserving the language since the current processes of re-ethnicization are irreversible” [10, p. 270].

### 3.5.3. The human-creative function (the personal development and formation of the individual).

As a person’s essential feature, language is dialectically closely related to consciousness. Language has a power that influences the individuality of a particular speaker and individual consciousness with the aim to form a particular person as an individual: “Language is most often not only a sign of nationality but often also a force that shapes a particular person in the national spirit” [25, p. 206].

Language is “... a social force; it dominates the thoughts of individual people.” [19, p. 42].

C. Hermann viewed language as “... a force that dominates our very own holistic individual thinking” [9, p. 215].

### 3.6. The function of categorization (dividing and/or grouping people according to a set of certain genetic characteristics).

The term “*rasa*” is derived from the Sanskrit language. In Sanskrit, “*rasa*” literally means “juice” or “essence”. The concept of *rasa* originates from the Upanishads, specifically the Chandogya Upanishad and Taittiriya Upanishad [27].

Racial ideas can be found in the reasoning of famous historical figures from different countries in different historical periods.

It first appeared in Europe at the beginning of the era of great geographical discoveries, in the 14<sup>th</sup> century in Italy and Spain, at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century in France, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in England, and in the 18<sup>th</sup> century it appeared in Germany.

#### 3.6.1. The function of dividing and/or grouping people according to a set of certain genetic characteristics.

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, questions about the “racial theory of language” became very actual and began to worry many famous German figures.

**Friedrich Max Müller** (1823–1900) (German and Austrian anthropologist, ethnographer, archaeologist, and physician) wrote: “It is unscientific <...> to speak of Aryan race, Aryan blood, or Aryan skulls, and then to attempt ethnological classifications on linguistic bases” [28, p. 17].

**Felix von Luschan** (1854–1924) (German and Austrian anthropologist, ethnographer, archaeologist, physician) (racial measurements of skin colors) [29].

1. O. Reche noted in his article “Race and Language”:

1.1. There are two views on the relationship between race and language:

1.2. Race and language are in an organic relationship; There is nothing in common between race and language.

He believed that “... race and language do not always coincide” and the relationship between language and race in the modern world reveals any modifications and variations, “... initially race and language coincided without any exceptions,” therefore, despite subsequent processes of mixing races and languages, language remains “the expression of the racial soul” [26, p. 260–261].

**Max Wundt** (1879–1963) (an anti-Semitic and Nazi German philosopher) formulated the later position of National Socialist “linguistics”: “Language is truly the voice of blood, determined in its sound and temporal parameter by blood. The blood community creates a linguistic community” [30, p. 17].

G. Schmidt-Rohr reasoned more decisively than many of his contemporaries when he analyzed the relationship between language and race. He started open polemics with National Socialist linguists in 1932: “We deny in the most decisive manner the validity of the view that there are languages “corresponding to the essence” of races (*arteigene Sprachen*), blood-related peoples, forms of ancestral spirituality” [23, p. 193].

G. Schmidt-Rohr studied the interactions of race and language carefully and in detail. In his opinion, languages “... travel completely carefree along the boundaries of races, following their own laws of their cultural strength, they unite races within themselves, they give parts of the population to other languages, depending on the cultural and political strength of peoples, but not races. “Pure” races with “languages adequate to their essence” – even if they ever existed – would inevitably split into languages and dialects according to their own law in a n y linguistic life” [23, p. 234].

Schmidt-Rohr argued that “the spiritual and mental characteristics expressed in a particular language are strongly determined by the racial predisposition of the group of people speaking this language,” although “... it is the diversity of races and racial arrays that unites our European peoples into a single whole and together works on the formation of an objective cultural phenomenon, an objective ethnic phenomenon of language” [31, p. 85].

The special essence, the special personality, and the special character of a language are most closely determined, first of all, by the racial characteristics of the creators of this language, the physical and spiritual abilities and inclinations inherited along with their blood. The scientist explained his point of view: “Only race is the creator, and language is only creation – from the point of view of race. Race is initially a deeper layer of the human essence than language” [25, p. 205].

The scientist came to the conclusion: “From the point of view of a particular person, language is to a much greater extent a creator, for the multitude of spiritual forces inherent in it, uniting many races of a people, is more powerful than the special predisposition of a particular person” [10, c. 409].

To the question of whether there are “... languages adequate to the essence of a race,” G. Schmidt Rohr’s answer is: “No,” they do not exist, and the emergence of literary languages of modern European peoples cannot under any circumstances and in any way be explained based on “racial destinies” [23, p. 233].

G. Schmidt-Rohr came to the conclusion: “... under no circumstances should a race be forgotten about the importance of language as a force that determines the unity of the people and conveys the united spirit of the people” because “.. the German people still consists of representatives of many races and racial mixtures which are connected only by a common language” [32, p. 218].

**Johann Leo Weisgerber** (1899–1985) (a German linguist) considered the question of views on language and race not simply in the form of “... how the leaders of a tribe, race rise to language,” but in the form of “... whether language, in turn, is of much greater significance” we understand as the conditions of these relationships” [33, p. 165]. He categorically rejected the attempt to make changes in language from biological conditions: “Biological data and the laws that form races act to participate as a decisive factor as the transition to language” [33, p. 179].

From his research, L. Weisgerber concluded: “Our question, therefore, whether the world of a particular language is interconnected with racial preconditions, should be answered in the negatively” [33, p. 171].

**Adolf Bach** (1890–1972) (a Germanist, regional historian, and linguist) tried to find a moderate interpretation of the relationship between race and language: “We consider it unproven, even incredible that the sound evolution of the German language should be linked to racial conditions. <...> Certainly, highly mentally gifted and strong-willed people will lay down in their language a picture of the world that is different in scope and depth than the people, in whose existence the sensual principles prevail over the rational and volitional principles” [34, p. 286].

H. Bazan believed that the linguistic community could not be considered without a racial background: a true linguistic community bears the integrity of the people; not all those who use language belong to it; some cultivate it as the best heritage; others borrowed it for a time, and they are not able to become the rightful owners ever [22].

### 3.6.2. The function of a unity creation.

Language creates a linguistic community and regulates interpersonal relationships, shapes the behavior and views of people, the creation of community, mutual understanding, and internal unity: “...under no circumstances should we forget about the importance of language as a force that determines the unity of the people, conveying the united spirit of the people’s strength” [32, p. 218].

L. Weisgerber gave preference to spiritual hereditary inclinations transmitted with the native language [35, p. 362]. “... reducing the picture of the world of language to the makings of a biological interconnected group of people will always be crashed by the fact that language is not a quantity of the natural world, but a form of the manifestation of the spirit. As such it has a historical magnitude and envisaged conditions which have importance for the development and fulfillment of the spirit” [33, p. 180].

L. Weisgerber’s reasoning about the relationship between the spiritual inclinations of race and the internal form of language is very noteworthy: “The obvious influence of race on language has not yet been proven at all. In many spheres the influence of race is excluded altogether” [33, p. 179].

Later, G. Schmidt-Rohr concluded: “... if the German people were undermined from within by Negroes and Mongols, and German blood mixed with someone else’s, then this would change the spiritual appearance of the German people, their culture and language” [25, p. 202].

### 3.6.3. The ethnic function.

The ethnic function (ethnic community creation) helps to create a national identity, to preserve the ethnic essence and ethnic existence. The preservation and transmission of special differences and specific features of a certain social group from other communities occurs with the help of language. The fundamental feature

of an ethnosis is ethnic self-awareness, and its clearest manifestation is the ethnonym (the name of people, nationality, or tribe).

G. Schmidt-Rohr in his work “On the Social Effective Power of Language” noted that “... the first and basic level of any preservation of the ethnic (völkisch) essence and ethnic being is blood, the second is the language of the people” [36, p. 7].

L. Weisgerber believed that spiritual hereditary inclinations, as the basis for the formation of certain abilities, are transmitted with the native language [35, p. 362].

### Research conclusions and prospects for further research.

According to the results of the study, we systematized the “kernel” (the central and most important groups) and secondary elements of the functional essence of the concept “language”, which are dialectically interconnected and together represent the general.

From the German scientists’ point of view of the 4th period of the history of linguistics (the end of the 19th – the first third of the 20th century) **the functional essence of the concept “Language”** consists of **the informative function** (accumulation and objective reflection of information, knowledge, and a person’s relationship to the world); **the communicative function** (conceptual activity; representation, and preliminary understanding), and **the social function** (connecting people’s lives and relationships in society or societies; the people’s worldview expressing and formation; national cultural reproduction; influence: peoples, re-ethnization, personal human-creation; categorization: dividing and/or grouping people, a unity and ethnic creation).

Perspectives and future research opportunities are the study of the process of development of the concept “language” in the historical aspect to increase knowledge about the development of understanding of the functional essence of this concept in the historical aspect, to determine the essence, role, and reflection of the functional essence in the life of a person and societies in the 5th period (the 30th years of the XX century until our time) taking into account historicism to predict its further development.

### Bibliography:

1. Ціпіню М. В. Системна структура німецької мови як відображення соціально-культурної ситуації в суспільстві. *Мова: науково-теоретичний часопис з мовознавства*, 2020. № 33. С. 42–47.
2. Januar D., Sari M., Akihary W. Analysis of language functions in German song “Für die Liebe” from berge: sociolinguistics perspective. *Pattimura Excellence Journal of Language and Culture*, 2023. Vol 3. № 1, P. 1–3.
3. Wachsmuth H., Bujna K. Back to the Roots of Genres: Text Classification by Language Function. *Proceedings of the 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, 2011. P. 632–640.
4. Wamese E., Tomasouw, J. Karuna K. Language Functions in German Supermarket TV Commercials. *Erfolgreicher Deutschunterricht*, Vol 1, № 1, 2021. P. 1–11.
5. Солдатова Л. П. Поняття “дискурс”: проблеми визначення. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*: зб. наук. праць, 2013. Вип. 46, ч. 4. С. 32–40.
6. Soldatova L. P. The essence of the concept “language” in the research of German scientists. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Сер.: Філологія*, 2023. № 62. Том 1. С. 127–131.
7. Frege G. *Schriften zur Logik und Sprachphilosophie*. Hamburg, 1978. 224 s.
8. Cassirer E. *Philosophie der symbolischen. Formen* 3, 1923. Teil 1. XII+293 s.



9. Hermann C. Philosophische Grammatik, in: H.-J. Cloeren (Hg.), Philosophie als Sprachkritik im 19. Jahrhundert. Textauswahl. I. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt, 1971. 251 s.
10. Schmidt-Rohr G. Volkstumserhaltung durch Spracherhaltung. *Muttersprache*, 1934. № 49. s. 409–413.
11. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/people>. [Електронний ресурс].
12. Nietzsche F. On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense. In *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's*, 1979. 165 p.
13. Bühler K. Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1934. 434 s.
14. Heidegger, M. *Sein und Zeit*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1927. 438 p.
15. Маркс К., Енгельс Ф. Німецька ідеологія. Зібрання творів. Т. 3, 1988. 589 с.
16. Engels F. The part played by labour in the transition from ape to man. PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements, 1950. 610 p.
17. Vossler K. *Spache und Wissenschaft. Geist und Kultur in der Sprache*. Heidelberg, 1925. 267 s.
18. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/people>. [Електронний ресурс].
19. Mauthner F. Beiträge zu einer Kritik der Sprache. Bd. 1: Zur Sprache und zur Psychologie. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Wien, 1982. 316 s.
20. Panzer F. Volkstum und Sprache. Rektoratsrede, gehalten bei der Stiftungsfeier der Universität Heidelberg, 1926. 22 s.
21. Steintal H. Dialekt, Sprache, Volk, Staat, Rasse. *Festschrift für Ad. Bastian*, 1876. S. 47–52.
22. Banniza von Bazan H. Sprache und Rasse im Völkerschicksal. *Rasse*, 1935. № 2. S. 218–222.
23. Schmidt-Rohr G. Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker. Eine Wesens- und Lebenskunde der Volkstümer, 1932. 415 s.
24. Schmidt-Rohr G. Unsere Muttersprache als Waffe und Werkzeug des deutschen Gedankens, 1917. 50 s.
25. Schmidt-Rohr G. Die zweite Ebene der Volkserhaltung. *Muttersprache*, 1939. № 54. S. 201–207.
26. Reche O. Rasse und Sprache, 1927. S. 258–261.
27. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rasa\\_\(theology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rasa_(theology)). [Електронний ресурс].
28. Müller F. Chips from a German Workshop, 1881. Vol. 4. S. 199–226.
29. Smith J. D. Anthropological View of race W.E.B. Du Bois, Felix Von Luschan, and Racial Reform at the Fin De Siècle, *Amerikastudien. American Studies*, 2002. Vol. 47, № 1. P. 23–38.
30. Wundt M. Was heißt völkisch? Langensalza (Pädagogisches Magazin, Heft 987, Schriften zur politischen Bildung, Heft 16), 1924. 33 s.
31. Schmidt-Rohr G. Rasse – Sprache – Volkstum. *Nordische Stimmen*, 1933. № 3. S. 84–86.
32. Schmidt-Rohr G. Schule und Muttersprache. Deutsche Erziehung im neuen Staat. Hrsg. F. Hiller. Berlin, Leipzig: Verlag v. Julius Beltz, 1935. S. 216–224.
33. Weisgerber J.L. Die Stellung der Sprache im Aufbau der Gesamtkultur. Heidelberg: Winter, 1934. 236 s.
34. Bach A. Deutsche Mundartforschung, ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Eine Einführung, 1934. 179 s.
35. Weisgerber J.L. Die Sendung der deutschen Sprache für die Volksgemeinschaft. *Die deutsche Schule*, 1934. № 38. S. 357–365.
36. Schmidt-Rohr G. Von der gesellschaftlichen Wirkkraft und der WeItläufigkeit der deutschen Sprache. *Muttersprache*, 1939. № 54. S. 6–10.

#### Солдатова Л. Функціональна сутність поняття «мова» у дослідженнях німецьких вчених

**Анотація.** Дослідження є складовою частиною вивчення розуміння сутності та функціональної сутності поняття «мова» в історичному аспекті від давнини до сучасності.

Вивчення динаміки розвитку поняття «мова» з урахуванням історизму його використання та нових наукових підходів до осмислення функціональної сутності поняття є складовою вивчення динаміки розвитку мови, що відображає розвиток людського суспільства, культури тощо.

Виникає питання про функціональну сутність, яку повинно мати поняття «мова» за своєю потребою та потребою у взаємопов'язаних та взаємозумовлених комунікативних, психічних, пізнавальних та інших процесах життя людини та суспільства з урахуванням історизму використання поняття.

На даний момент немає єдиного повного та однозначного визначення функціональної сутності поняття «мова».

У статті були проведені інформаційний аналіз та систематизація розуміння функціональної сутності поняття «мова» у дослідженнях німецьких учених 4 періоду історії мовознавства (кінець XIX – перша третина XX ст.).

Аналіз був проведений за стрижневими інформаційними масивами (істотними групами) поняття за структурою тлумачної формули змісту поняття (ТФЗП), була проведена класифікація за функціями та їх систематизація за основними диференціальними, суттєвими та специфічними ознаками для виявлення загального та відмінного.

За результатами проведеного дослідження були систематизовані «ядра» (центральні та найважливіші групи) та другорядні елементи (діалектично пов'язані між собою та разом становлять загальне) функціональної сутності поняття «мова».

У результаті дослідження було синтезовано повне та однозначне визначення функціональної сутності поняття «мова» у дослідженнях німецьких вчених проаналізованого періоду історії мовознавства.

**Ключові слова:** мова, поняття, тлумачна формула змісту поняття, функціональна сутність.