

<https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2026-30-3-961-974>

EDN: SQSBYT

Research Article / Научная статья

Intonation as a Problem of Subjectivity in Symbolic Forms of Language: A Cassirerian Perspective

Zhuldyz Z. Balmagambetova¹, Tatiyana Yu. Lifanova¹,
Nur S. Kirabaev²

¹*al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan*

²*RUDN University, Moscow, Russian Federation*

 lifanova.tatiyana@gmail.com

Abstract: The research addresses the philosophical significance of intonation in context of Ernst Cassirer's theory of symbolic forms, foregrounding its relevance for contemporary debates on language, meaning, and subjectivity. Although linguistics typically approaches intonation as a prosodic element that adjusts already constituted meanings, its significance for the emergence of subjectivity and for processes of symbolic mediation has not been fully developed. Accordingly, this study aims to reconceptualize the research object as a constitutive dimension of language and a primary site of subjectivation. Methodologically, the investigation employs a theoretical and reconstructive approach, combining close conceptual analysis of Cassirer's distinction between expression ("Ausdruck") and representation ("Darstellung") with a critical synthesis of phenomenological, analytic, and semiotic perspectives on language. This interdisciplinary framework enables a re-evaluation of intonation beyond its functional or descriptive treatment. The central argument of the research is that intonation operates as a dynamic symbolic process that mediates between pre-conceptual experience and structured meaning. The analysis develops three key results: first, that intonation functions as an expressive articulation of affective and pre-predicative experience; second, that it serves as a symbolic mediator transforming subjective states into socially intelligible meaning; and third, that it constitutes a fundamental mechanism of subjectivation, through which the speaking subject emerges within language rather than preceding it. From the authors' perspective, intonation should be understood not as a peripheral or auxiliary feature but as a foundational dimension of symbolic activity. This position challenges representational and propositional models of language and supports a process-oriented account of meaning. The originality of the research lies in integrating intonation into Cassirer's theory of symbolic forms and in demonstrating its philosophical significance for the constitution of subjectivity. The study concludes that intonation reveals language as a temporal, performative, and emergent process, thereby opening new directions for interdisciplinary research in philosophy of language, phenomenology, and cultural theory.

Keywords: expression, meaning, mediator, multidimensional, emergence

© Balmagambetova Zh.Z., Lifanova T.Yu., Kirabaev N.S., 2026



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Contribution of authors. All the authors contributed equally to the conception, preparation and writing of this manuscript.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Statement about data availability. All the data obtained during the study is included in the article being published.

Article history:

The article was submitted on 01.05.2026

The article was accepted on 27.07.2026

For citation: Balmagambetova ZhZ, Lifanova TYu, Kirabaev NS. Intonation as a Problem of Subjectivity in Symbolic Forms of Language: A Cassirerian Perspective. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*. 2026;30(3):961–974. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2026-30-3-961-974> EDN SQSBYT

Интонация как проблема субъективности в символических формах языка: кассиреровская перспектива

Ж.З. Балмагамбетова¹, Т.Ю. Лифанова¹✉, Н.С. Кирабаев²

¹Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

²Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Российская Федерация

✉lifanova.tatiyana@gmail.com

Аннотация. Рассматривается философское значение интонации в контексте теории символических форм Эрнста Кассирера и выявляется ее эвристический потенциал для современных дискуссий о языке, смысле и субъективности. Несмотря на то, что в лингвистике интонация обычно трактуется как просодическая характеристика, сопровождающая и модифицирующая уже сформированный смысл, ее участие в процессах символического опосредования и субъективации до сих пор не получило достаточного философского осмысления. Цель исследования состоит в том, чтобы переосмыслить интонацию как конститутивное измерение и как один из основных механизмов субъективации языка. Методологическую основу работы составляет теоретико-реконструктивный подход, сочетающий концептуальный анализ различения Кассирером выражения (Ausdruck) и представления (Darstellung) с критическим привлечением феноменологических, аналитических и семиотических интерпретаций языка. Такая исследовательская рамка позволяет выйти за пределы сугубо функционального или дескриптивного понимания интонации. Обосновывается, что интонация представляет собой динамический символический процесс, посредством которого осуществляется переход от доконцептуального и аффективно насыщенного опыта к структурированному и социально разделяемому смыслу. Показано, во-первых, что интонация выступает формой выразительной артикуляции аффективного и допредикативного опыта; во-вторых, что она функционирует как символический медиатор, переводящий внутренние состояния субъекта в интересующее субъективно распознаваемое значение; в-третьих, что она является фундаментальным механизмом субъективации, не предшествующий субъекту речи, а формирующийся в самом процессе символического выражения. На этом основании интонация интерпретируется не как периферийный или вспомогательный компонент речи, а как фундаментальное измерение символической деятельности. Такой подход позволяет

критически пересмотреть репрезентативные и пропозициональные модели языка и обосновать процессуальное понимание смысла. Научная новизна заключается во включении интонации в кассиреровскую теорию символических форм и в раскрытии ее философского значения для анализа конституирования субъективности. Делается вывод о том, что интонация обнаруживает язык как временной, перформативный и эмерджентный процесс, открывая тем самым новые перспективы для междисциплинарных исследований в области философии языка, феноменологии и теории культуры.

Ключевые слова: выражение, смысл, медиатор, многомерный, эмерджентность

Вклад авторов. Все авторы внесли равный вклад в концепцию, подготовку и написание рукописи.

Конфликт интересов. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Заявление о доступности данных. Все данные, полученные в ходе этого исследования, включены в публикуемую статью.

История статьи:

Статья поступила 01.05.2026

Статья принята к публикации 27.07.2026

Для цитирования: *Balmagambetova Zh.Z., Lifanova T.Yu., Kirabaev N.S.* Intonation as a Problem of Subjectivity in Symbolic Forms of Language: A Cassirerian Perspective // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Философия. 2026. Т. 30. № 3. С. 961–974. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2026-30-3-961-974> EDN SQSBYT

Introduction: Intonation, Meaning, and the Problem of Subjectivity

The philosophical importance of intonation lies in its ambivalent status within language: it is at once essential to speech and yet often overlooked in theoretical accounts. On the one hand, no spoken utterance is conceivable without intonation; on the other, philosophical accounts of language have traditionally privileged lexical and propositional structures, relegating intonation to the status of a secondary or auxiliary feature. This marginalization becomes especially problematic once language is understood not merely as a system of signs but as a symbolic form that actively constitutes meaning and experience. Within such a framework, a fundamental question arises: what role does intonation play in the formation of meaning and, more radically, in the constitution of subjectivity?

Ernst Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms provides a particularly fertile framework for addressing this question. Cassirer reconceives language as a dynamic process of symbolic mediation rather than a passive instrument for representing reality [1. P. 85–102; 2. P. 112–130; 3. P. 48–57]. In his account, language emerges out of expressive activity and gradually develops into increasingly abstract forms of representation [1. P. 73–78; 4. P. 24–31]. This emphasis on expression suggests that the origins of meaning lie not in purely conceptual structures, but in affective and experiential dimensions of human life [4. P. 32–40].

At the same time, linguistic and philosophical studies of intonation have largely developed in parallel, with little substantive overlap. In linguistics,

intonation has been examined in terms of phonological patterning, pragmatic function, and discourse organization [5. P. 1–15; 6. P. 3–12; 7]. These approaches have shown that intonation contributes to meaning by signaling emphasis, affective orientation, and communicative intention [7; 8]. In philosophy, by contrast, intonation has figured primarily in phenomenological and analytic discussions, where it is associated with embodiment, speech acts, or pragmatic inference [9. P. 210–225; 10. P. 180–200; 11. P. 33–45; 12. P. 98–110].

Despite these advances, a significant gap remains. Cassirer's philosophy does not explicitly account for the vocal and temporal dimensions of language, while contemporary approaches to intonation rarely integrate it into a systematic theory of symbolic forms. As a result, the role of intonation in mediating between subjective experience and symbolic meaning remains insufficiently theorized.

This study identifies that gap as a problem of subjectivity. Although Cassirer emphasizes the expressive origins of language, he does not fully explain how subjectivity manifests itself within linguistic form [1. P. 90–95; 13. P. 205–215]. Intonation, as a dynamic and non-conceptual dimension of speech, provides a privileged site for addressing this problem. It reveals that the speaking subject is not simply expressed through language but is constituted within and through it [14. P. 45–52].

Therefore, the central contribution of this research is to reinterpret intonation as a process of subjectivation within symbolic forms. By bringing Cassirer's philosophy into dialogue with contemporary theories of language, we argue that intonation is not a peripheral feature but a fundamental mode of symbolic activity. This reconceptualization extends the theory of symbolic forms by incorporating temporal, vocal, and performative dimensions, thereby offering a more comprehensive account of language as a site of subjectivity.

To achieve the research goal this study adopts a theoretical — philosophical methodology grounded in conceptual analysis and reconstructive interpretation. Its primary aim is not empirical verification but the systematic clarification of the philosophical status of intonation within Ernst Cassirer's theory of symbolic forms. So, the research proceeds through a close reading of Cassirer's key works, focusing on the dynamic relation between expression (*Ausdruck*) and representation (*Darstellung*), and identifying conceptual resources for reinterpreting linguistic phenomena beyond purely structural accounts.

So, the interdisciplinary methodology integrates insights from philosophy of language, phenomenology, and linguistics/phonology. Selected linguistic theories of intonation and prosody are examined not for descriptive completeness as technical tool, but as analytical one that illuminate the expressive, temporal, and performative dimensions of speech (R. Jakobson, D. Pierrehumbert, D. Ladd, P. Prieto). Phenomenological approaches are employed to foreground embodiment and pre-reflective experience (E. Husserl, M. Merleau-Ponty, M. Heidegger), while analytic perspectives on pragmatics and speech acts inform the discussion of meaning and communicative function (J. Searle, J. Austin).

Such theoretical synthesis brings into dialogue disparate conceptual frameworks to construct a unified account of intonation as a process of subjectivation. This involves identifying tensions and gaps across traditions and rearticulating them within a Cassirerian framework. The analysis is guided by a principle of conceptual mediation, treating intonation as a transitional phenomenon that connects affective experience, symbolic structure, and subject formation.

Literature Review and Theoretical framework: Between Structure and Expression — Reinterpreting Cassirer through Intonation as Symbolic Mediation

In this context, interpretations of Cassirer's philosophy have long been shaped by a persistent tension between structure and expression [15; 16. P. 210–235]. On the one hand, scholars have emphasized his Neo-Kantian inheritance, reading symbolic forms as epistemological structures that organize experience [17. P. 40–60; 18. P. 55–75; 19. P. 85–100]. A parallel expressivist account can be found in Taylor's constitutive theory of language, according to which linguistic articulation does not merely represent experience but actively transforms and constitutes it [20]. On the other hand, more recent interpretations have foregrounded the dynamic and expressive dimensions of his thought, arguing that symbolic forms emerge from pre-conceptual activity [21; 22].

This tension has generated divergent accounts of language in Cassirer's work. Structuralist readings tend to emphasize the logical and conceptual dimensions of linguistic meaning, at times aligning Cassirer with later analytic concerns [23; 15]. Expressivist readings, by contrast, stress the continuity between language, myth, and art, foregrounding the roles of affect, imagination, and symbolic creation [24. P. 120–140]. Yet both lines of interpretation share a notable limitation: neither adequately addresses the material and vocal dimensions of language.

Parallel developments in phenomenology have drawn sustained attention to the embodied character of speech. Thinkers such as Heidegger and Derrida have argued that meaning is rooted in temporality and lived articulation, and that language cannot be severed from its experiential grounding [25. P. 150–180; 26. P. 70–95]. Within this framework, intonation appears as a manifestation of expressive intentionality. However, phenomenological accounts often remain centered on experience as such, rather than on the symbolic mediation through which experience becomes culturally intelligible [27. P. 300–320].

In broader philosophical discourse, meaning is approached through structures of differentiation, discourse, and conceptual formation. These approaches show that meaning depends not only on conceptual content but also on its conditions of emergence and transformation [28. P. 130–155; 29. P. 100–120]. Even so, they often leave the vocal and intonational dimension insufficiently theorized.

Taken together, these traditions reveal a fragmented account of language: Neo-Kantianism develops a theory of symbolic mediation but largely overlooks vocal articulation; phenomenology emphasizes embodiment without fully accounting for

symbolic structuration; structural approaches analyze systems while neglecting expressive genesis. Situated at this intersection, the present approach reconceives intonation as a mediating bridge between expression and structure, experience and meaning. Within a Cassirerian Neo-Kantian framework — further developed in recent interpretations [30–32] — intonation links pre-conceptual affect with conceptual form through expressive articulation, symbolic mediation, and subjectivation, revealing language as dynamic, temporal, and performative, and subjectivity as emergent in articulation.

Analysis: Intonation as a Process of Subjectivation in Language

This section substantiates the aforementioned through the research central thesis that «intonation is a primary site of subjectivation within language». In this respect, intonation should be understood, first and foremost, as an expressive articulation of pre-conceptual experience. Before meaning is crystallized in words, it is already present in the modulation of the voice. Variations in pitch, intensity, and rhythm convey affective states that precede explicit linguistic articulation [5; 6]. This accords with Cassirer's claim that symbolic forms originate in expressive activity.

At this level, prosodic modulation cannot be reduced to semantic content. It gives expression to what has not yet fully assumed conceptual form. This suggests that meaning is not initially conceptual, but rather emerges from a field of affective differentiation. Vocal contouring gives form to that field, rendering it perceptible and communicable.

Second, intonation functions as a symbolic mediator. Although it originates in subjective experience, it is not merely individual. Intonational patterns are shaped by linguistic conventions and cultural norms, which make them recognizable and interpretable by others. In this sense, tonal organization transforms subjective expression into shared meaning. Such a function discloses its symbolic character. That means that prosody is structured as well as expressive, i.e. operates within a network of contrast that organizes meaning. So, this argument justifies that vocal tone properly belongs within the domain of symbolic forms.

Third, intonation is fundamental to the formation of subjectivity to the extent that the speaking subject emerges through symbolic activity, not independently; as much as it articulates the speaker's stance, intention, and perspective. And the subject becomes audible through tonal expression. It is not simply expressed but enacted. Subjectivity thus appears not as a pre-given entity, but as a process of articulation, and tonal modulation is one of the principal mechanisms through which that process unfolds.

Fourth, intonation must be understood as a “temporal form of meaning”. Unlike lexical units, which can be abstracted and stabilized, intonational flow unfolds in time. Its significance is inseparable from its duration, contour, and progression. This temporal structure accords with Cassirer's broader insight that symbolic forms are not static entities but dynamic processes. Pitch movement

exemplifies precisely this processual character: meaning is not given all at once but emerges through modulation. In this respect, prosodic form discloses language itself as fundamentally temporal, and subjectivity as constituted within temporal unfolding [25].

Fifth, vocal modulation introduces a “non-discursive dimension into language”. Although language is often associated with conceptual clarity and logical articulation, intonation resists full conceptual capture. It conveys nuances — irony, hesitation, insistence, uncertainty — that cannot be exhaustively translated into propositional terms. This suggests that symbolic forms extend beyond discursive representation. Tonal variation operates as a mode of meaning that accompanies, inflects, and at times even unsettles conceptual articulation. It thereby extends Cassirer’s framework by showing that symbolic mediation includes irreducibly non-discursive elements.

Sixth, prosodic expression mediates between «individual expression and cultural normativity». Every speaker uses intonational variation in a singular way, yet those variations occur within socially recognizable patterns. This dual structure reflects Cassirer’s view that symbolic forms are simultaneously individual and collective. Tonal articulation thus becomes a site at which individuality is expressed through culturally shared forms. The subject is neither isolated from nor dissolved into structure; rather, it emerges through participation in symbolic systems.

Seventh, intonation enables “reflexivity within language”. Through tonal variation, speakers can mark their stance toward what they are saying — whether they affirm, question, doubt, ironize, or distance themselves from their own words. This reflexive capacity is fundamental to subjectivity. It indicates that language is not merely a medium for conveying thoughts, but a space in which the subject relates to itself. Vocal contouring plays a decisive role in this process by making such relations audible.

Eighth, intonational dynamics reveal the “performative character of language”. Meaning is not simply transmitted; it is enacted in the act of speaking. Prosody contributes to this enactment by shaping how utterances function in context. It is integral to the performative dimension identified in speech act theory, yet it exceeds purely functional accounts by embedding performance within symbolic expression.

Ninth, melodic structuring of speech destabilizes the boundary between “language and music”. Its melodic and rhythmic properties suggest a continuity between linguistic and musical form. This challenges any rigid separation of symbolic domains and points toward a more fluid conception of symbolic activity. In Cassirerian terms, intonation may be understood as a point of intersection between symbolic forms, where expressive and aesthetic dimensions converge.

Tenth, prosodic articulation may be interpreted as a “threshold phenomenon”. It marks the transition from pre-symbolic affect to articulated meaning. At this threshold, subjectivity is not yet fully fixed but remains in formation. Intonation thus grants access to the genesis of symbolic forms, revealing how meaning emerges from expressive life.

Taken together, these arguments establish intonation as a foundational dimension of symbolic meaning and a conceptual bridge across phenomenological, analytic, and Cassirerian traditions. At the pre-predicative level, it operates as a proto-symbolic articulation that organizes affective and perceptual experience prior to conceptualization [9]. In line with analytic insights, it shapes semantic interpretation by contributing force, nuance, and variability to utterances rather than merely modifying them [5]. From a Cassirerian perspective, intonation reveals symbolic forms as dynamic processes of mediation rather than fixed structures [3; 22]. It also redefines subjectivity as emergent within articulation: the speaking subject is enacted through intonational positioning. Temporally unfolding, intonation demonstrates that meaning is event-like and processual [10]. Its variability exposes the limits of formal models [11], while its intersubjective and cultural functions show how meaning is co-constructed and continually transformed [33; 34].

The table below outlines the study’s contribution by illustrating how intonation functions as a philosophical bridge across different theoretical traditions.

Table 1

Intonation as a Multidimensional Philosophical Operator

Dimension	Function of Intonation	Philosophical Implication	Bridge Across Traditions
Ontological	Constitutes meaning as process rather than object	Being of meaning is dynamic, not fixed	Connects Cassirer’s symbolic activity with process ontology
Epistemological	Enables access to pre-conceptual knowledge	Knowing precedes conceptualization	Links phenomenological intuition with symbolic mediation
Semantic	Expands meaning beyond lexical boundaries	Meaning is layered and distributed	Integrates analytic semantics with non-discursive meaning
Pragmatic	Shapes communicative force and interpretive context	Meaning depends on enactment	Extends speech act theory toward symbolic embodiment
Subjective	Produces perspectival positioning	Subject = relational configuration	Unites phenomenological subject with Cassirerian function
Temporal	Organizes unfolding of meaning in time	Meaning is event-based	Bridges phenomenological temporality with symbolic dynamics
Affective	Translates affect into structured expression	Emotion is symbolically mediated	Connects embodiment with cultural form
Intersubjective	Coordinates alignment between speakers	Meaning is co-constructed	Links interaction theory with symbolic forms

End of Table 1

Dimension	Function of Intonation	Philosophical Implication	Bridge Across Traditions
Cultural	Encodes historically shaped vocal patterns	Meaning reflects cultural worldviews	Extends Cassirer into linguistic anthropology
Normative	Balances convention and innovation	Language evolves through variation	Mediates structure vs. agency debates
Performative	Enacts meaning rather than transmitting it	Language is action, not representation	Integrates analytic performativity with symbolic activity
Aesthetic	Introduces rhythm and tonal form	Meaning has aesthetic dimension	Bridges language and art within symbolic forms
Methodological	Serves as a lens for rethinking language theory	Requires interdisciplinary approach	Unifies phenomenology, analytics, and Cassirer
Critical	Reveals limits of formalization	Systems cannot exhaust meaning	Challenges reductionism in analytic models
Meta-symbolic	Exposes conditions of symbolic formation	Symbolic forms are grounded in expression	Deepens Cassirer's theoretical scope

Source: compiled by Zhuldyz Z. Balmagambetova, Tatiyana Yu. Lifanova, Nur S. Kirabaev

Discussion: Bridging Traditions — Intonation Across Phenomenology, Analytic Philosophy, and Cassirerian Thought

The analysis provided reconceptualizes intonation as a mode of subjectivation within the philosophy of symbolic forms, thereby significantly reshaping how language, meaning, and subjectivity are understood. Here, intonation is treated not as a marginal feature but as a core structural element in the formation of meaning. This reorientation affects not only readings of Cassirer’s philosophy but also wider discussions in phenomenology, analytic philosophy of language, semiotics, and cultural theory.

Phenomenological viewpoint is emphasized by the arguments confirming the importance of embodiment and pre-reflective experience, since the voice, in this context, functions as an extension of embodied intentionality. By integrating intonation into a Cassirerian framework, this study shows how such experience becomes symbolically structured. In this view, the voice is not simply an expression of inner states but a means through which embodied experience is shaped into communicable form. This suggests that embodiment and symbolization are not opposed domains, but rather mutually constitutive dimensions of meaning.

In contrast to analytic philosophy of language, which has traditionally prioritized propositional content, truth conditions, and logical form, our theoretical findings challenge the view that intonation is a subordinate feature of language. If intonation participates in the very formation of meaning, then propositional content cannot be separated from its mode of articulation. Meaning does not pre-exist as a fixed conceptual unit; rather, it emerges through the interaction of lexical, syntactic,

and intonational dimensions. This implies a shift from a static, representational model of language toward a dynamic, process-oriented one.

Regarding structuralist and semiotic traditions, the research reveals the limits of strictly structural approaches and points to the need for a framework that integrates both system and process. By introducing variability, fluidity, and contextual situatedness into linguistic meaning, it challenges models that privilege stability and formal organization. Although such models have significantly advanced our understanding of language as a system of relational differences, they often overlook temporality and performance. Intonation shows that meaning is not only shaped by differential relations but also unfolds within the temporal event of speech. Each utterance thus appears as a singular enactment in which symbolic structures are actively realized rather than merely instantiated.

Consequently, these theoretical transformations directly affect how subjectivity is understood. Rather than treating the subject as an already constituted entity that merely employs language, this study conceives subjectivity as emerging within linguistic activity itself. Within this activity, intonation plays a fundamental role by signaling the speaker's attitude and relation to what is said. Through tonal variations, the speaker enacts a particular perspective by adopting a position within discourse. Subjectivity is thus not a stable substance but a dynamic process unfolding in time.

This processual account also underscores the relational and temporal nature of subjectivity. Intonation facilitates interaction by enabling speakers to signal alignment, disagreement, irony, and other social positions. At the same time, each intonational contour reflects a moment in the ongoing formation of the speaking self. Subjectivity is therefore both intersubjective and temporal, continuously constituted within communicative practice.

Finally, the cultural dimension of intonation reinforces its philosophical significance. Intonational patterns vary across languages and traditions, reflecting different modes of meaning-making and subject formation [35]. When understood as a symbolic form, these variations become expressions of distinct cultural logics rather than superficial technical differences. Moreover, incorporating intonation into Cassirer's framework expands the concept of symbolic forms itself. It foregrounds their dynamic, performative, and evolving character, showing that symbolic life is not only structured but actively produced.

In sum, this reconceptualization positions intonation as a unifying principle that integrates embodiment, structure, and cultural meaning, offering a more comprehensive account of language as a site where experience, subjectivity, and symbolic form converge [36].

The table below distills and extends our discussion, focusing on comparative implications and theoretical shifts.

Table 2

Intonation as a Transformative Interface Across Philosophical Traditions

Theoretical Domain	Traditional Limitation	Transformative Role of Intonation	Resulting Conceptual Shift
Phenomenology	Focus on lived experience without full symbolic articulation	Converts embodied experience into communicable symbolic structure	From lived immediacy to symbolically mediated embodiment
Analytic Philosophy of Language	Priority of propositional meaning and logical form	Integrates tone into meaning-constitution rather than post hoc modification	From static semantics to dynamic meaning formation
Structuralism / Semiotics	Emphasis on system and relational structure over performance	Introduces temporality, variability, and situated realization	From fixed systems to event-based signification
Cassirerian Philosophy	Focus on symbolic systems with less emphasis on micro-processes	Reveals symbolic forms as enacted through vocal-temporal articulation	From structural forms to processual symbolic activity
Theory of Subjectivity	Subject as pre-given or structurally determined	Positions subject as emerging through expressive positioning	From substance to relational enactment
Temporal Ontology of Language	Language treated as stable structure	Meaning unfolds as temporally structured articulation	From synchronic structure to diachronic emergence
Intersubjectivity	Interaction treated as exchange of meanings	Meaning arises through coordinated tonal negotiation	From transmission to co-construction
Cultural Theory	Culture reflected in abstract symbolic systems	Culture enacted in vocal and prosodic variation	From representation to performative cultural expression
Normativity in Language	Rules as fixed constraints	Norms emerge through flexible, embodied usage	From rule-based system to adaptive practice
Symbolic Mediation	Mediation tied to conceptual structures	Mediation grounded in affective and performative processes	From conceptual mediation to embodied-symbolic mediation
Epistemology of Meaning	Knowledge tied to explicit representation	Meaning precedes and exceeds conceptual knowledge	From knowledge-as-content to knowledge-as-process
Philosophy of Language (General)	Separation of meaning, subject, and form	Integration of meaning, subjectivity, and articulation	From fragmented domains to unified dynamic system

Conclusion

This study has argued that intonation must be reconceived not as a secondary prosodic feature, but as a constitutive operator in the formation of meaning, subjectivity, and symbolic form. Interpreted through Ernst Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms, intonation appears as a key site where expression becomes articulated, articulation becomes meaningful, and meaning itself becomes the medium through which subjectivity emerges. In doing so, the study addresses a dual lacuna: the relative neglect of vocal and temporal processes in Cassirer scholarship, and the reduction of intonation within philosophy of language to either a technical or merely pragmatic function.

The analytical synthesis presented here demonstrates that intonation operates across multiple dimensions simultaneously — semantic, temporal, affective, intersubjective, and cultural — thereby revealing language as an ongoing process rather than a fixed system. It shapes pre-conceptual experience, organizes communicative interaction, and renders the speaker perceptible as a relational and temporal presence within discourse. Intonation thus does not simply modify meaning; it actively participates in its emergence and differentiation.

Equally important, the study has shown that intonation functions as a conceptual bridge across philosophical traditions. It connects phenomenological accounts of embodiment with analytic concerns for meaning and use, while also extending Cassirer's framework by foregrounding the dynamic and performative aspects of symbolic activity. In this sense, intonation reveals a shared philosophical problem: how meaning arises through the interplay of lived experience, structural articulation, and symbolic mediation.

So, the central theoretical contribution lies in the reconceptualization of subjectivity. Rather than presupposing a pre-existing subject, the analysis demonstrates that subjectivity is enacted through intonational articulation as a temporal and positional process. This perspective expands the theory of symbolic forms, highlighting their processual, event-based character. Ultimately, the study offers a more integrated understanding of language as an embodied and culturally mediated field in which meaning and subjectivity are continuously co-constituted.

References / Список литературы

- [1] Cassirer E. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Vol. 1: Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press*; 1955.
- [2] Cassirer E. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Vol. 2: Mythical Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press*; 1955.
- [3] Cassirer E. The Concept of Symbolic Form in the Construction of Knowledge. In: *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Vol. 3: The Phenomenology of Knowledge*. New Haven: Yale University Press*; 1957.

* Йельский университет имеет статус организации, деятельность которой признана нежелательной на территории Российской Федерации.

- [4] Cassirer E. *An Essay on Man*. New Haven: Yale University Press*; 1944.
- [5] Ladd DR. *Intonational Phonology*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2008. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511808814
- [6] Gussenhoven C. *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2004. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511616983
- [7] Prieto P. Intonational Meaning. *WIREs Cognitive Science*. 2015;6(4):371–381. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1352>
- [8] Ip M, Cutler A. Juncture Prosody Across Languages: Similar Production but Dissimilar Perception. *Laboratory Phonology*. 2022;13(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/labphon.6464> EDN: OKVVL
- [9] Husserl E. *Logical Investigations*. London: Routledge; 2001. DOI: 10.4324/9780203420034
- [10] Merleau-Ponty M. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge; 2012. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203720714>
- [11] Searle JR. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1969. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438>
- [12] Austin JL. *How to Do Things with Words?* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1962.
- [13] Cassirer E. *Symbol, Myth, and Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press*; 1979.
- [14] Zahavi D. *Subjectivity and Selfhood*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 2005. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6541.001.0001>
- [15] Friedman M. A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger. *The Journal of Philosophy*. 2001;98(11):601–611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3649474>
- [16] Beiser FC. *The Genesis of Neo-Kantianism, 1796–1880*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198722205.001.0001>
- [17] Cohen H. *Kant's Theory of Experience*. London: Routledge; 2005.
- [18] Natorp P. *The Logical Foundations of the Exact Sciences*. London: Routledge; 2004.
- [19] Rickert H. Concept Formation and Value-Relation. In: *The Limits of Concept Formation in Natural Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1986.
- [20] Taylor C. *The Language Animal*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2016.
- [21] Schultz W. Cassirer's Metaphysics of Symbolic Forms. *New Vico Studies*. 2001;(19):188–191. <https://doi.org/10.5840/newvico20011915>
- [22] Pringe H. La Filosofía de las Formas Simbólicas como Fenomenología: Cassirer y Hegel. *Anuario Filosófico*. 2026;59(1):167–198. <https://doi.org/10.15581/009.59.1.007> EDN: DEFQDM
- [23] Friedman M. *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger*. Chicago: Open Court; 2000.
- [24] Bühler K. *Theory of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 1990.
- [25] Heidegger M. *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell; 1962.
- [26] Derrida J. *Speech and Phenomena: And Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press; 1973.
- [27] Gadamer HG. *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum; 2004.
- [28] Deleuze G. *Difference and Repetition*. London: Continuum; 2004.
- [29] Foucault M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge; 2002.
- [30] Tetyuev LI. Cassirer and Kant's Critical Ethics: The Problem of Interpretations. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*. 2018;22(1):65–75. (In Russian). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2018-22-1-65-75> EDN: YTYAPZ

* Йельский университет имеет статус организации, деятельность которой признана нежелательной на территории Российской Федерации.

- Тетюев Л.И. Э. Кассирер и критическая этика Канта: вопрос об интерпретациях // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Философия. 2018. Т. 22. № 1. С. 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2018-22-1-65-75> EDN: YTYAPZ
- [31] Belov V.N. Ernst Cassirer. The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. *Voprosy filosofii*. 2003;(12):177–182. (In Russian). EDN: OOONDB
- Белов В.Н. Эрнст Кассирер. Философия символических форм / пер. с нем. Т. 1. Язык. 272 с. Т. 2. Мифологическое мышление. 280 с. Т. 3. Феноменология познания. 398 с. М., Санкт-Петербург: университетская книга, 2002 // Вопросы философии. 2003. № 12. С. 177–182. EDN: OOONDB
- [32] Belov V, Lebedeva A. Post-Neo-Kantianism and/or Transcendental Idealism. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2022;33(1):57–64. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.v33i1.4670> EDN: NWYFJZ
- [33] Tomasello M. *Constructing a Language*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2003.
- [34] Tomasello M. Warum Wir Kooperieren. *Philosophischer Literaturanzeiger*. 2011;64(2):166–171. <https://doi.org/10.3196/219458451164265>
- [35] Windelband W. History and Natural Science. *Theory and Psychology*. 1998;8(1):5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354398081001> EDN: JQAYEL
- [36] Andrzej J. Neo-Kantianism and Neo-Hegelianism. Comments on Neo-Philosophy. *Ruch Filozoficzny*. 2016;72(4):55–69. <https://doi.org/10.12775/RF.2016.038>

Сведения об авторах:

Балмагамбетова Жулдыз Замировна — докторант кафедры философии, факультет философии и политологии, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Республика Казахстан, 050000, Алматы, пр. аль-Фараби, д. 71. ORCID: 0000-0002-8399-0091. E-mail: balmagambetova_z@live.kaznu.kz

Лифанова Татьяна Юрьевна — кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии, факультет философии и политологии, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Республика Казахстан, 050000, Алматы, пр. аль-Фараби, д. 71. ORCID: 0000-0003-2269-1255. SPIN-код: 7325-0528. E-mail: lifanova.tatiana@gmail.com

Кирабаев Нур Серикович — доктор философских наук, профессор, зав. кафедрой истории философии, факультет гуманитарных и социальных наук, Российский университет дружбы народов, Российская Федерация, 117198, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6. ORCID: 0000-0002-0192-6337. SPIN-код: 3579-3794. E-mail: kirabaev-ns@rudn.ru

About the authors:

Balmagambetova Zhuldyz Z. — PhD student at the Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 71 al-Farabi Avenue, Almaty, 050000, Republic of Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0000-0002-8399-0091. E-mail: balmagambetova_z@live.kaznu.kz

Lifanova Tatiana Y. — CSc in Philosophy, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 71 al-Farabi Avenue, Almaty, 050000, Republic of Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0000-0003-2269-1255. SPIN-code: 7325-0528. E-mail: lifanova.tatiana@gmail.com

Kirabaev Nur S. — DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Head of the Department of History of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, RUDN University, 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St., Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0002-0192-6337. SPIN-code: 3579-3794. E-mail: kirabaev-ns@rudn.ru