

BEATA SZYMAŃSKA

***Iki* or are the Cultures Translatable**

The thesis I would like to argue with is a popular conviction that just as it is not possible to precisely translate from one language into another; similarly it is impossible to adequately understand the foreign culture; moreover that it is impossible to describe it using concepts from our native language.

Let's start from Heidegger's problems. In long conversations conducted in Germany with a Japanese philosopher Shuzo Kuki, Heidegger encountered the concept of *iki* for the first time. He wrote about it in a peculiar text entitled "From a conversation between Japanese and an Asker"¹. Although Shuzo Kuki, an expert on philosophy, Western languages and the author of the excellent book devoted to *iki* tried to explain away the concept of *iki*, Heidegger recognized this concept as neither translatable nor explainable in terms of the European thought. It was not only Heidegger who encountered such difficulty. Apart from a couple of other terms derived from the Japanese aesthetics such as *sabi*, *wabi* and *jugen*, the term *iki* is considered as completely untranslatable and what is more not understood by anybody who was not born into and brought up in the Japanese culture. What is interesting is the fact that it was the concept of *iki* which made Heidegger see the problem of the unavailability of another culture.

There will be no detailed answer to the question what *iki* is, besides it is not to be considered now. The problem is whether it is possible at all to adequately answer the question. We already know that the term comes from the Japanese aesthetics. In fact, it is

¹ M. Heidegger, *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, Stuttgart 1959, p.

aesthetics that describes the term characterizing the specific features of the behaviours and the aesthetic sense of geishas. However, not all features but only these that are *iki*. It is the term related to both the clothes and the behaviour, to eroticism, kittenish ways, to specific game taking place between a woman and a man.

In an article devoted to *iki*, Yumiko Matsuzaki² tries to, referring to the analyses included in Shuzo Kuki's considerations, put together all aspects of the term. He comes to the conclusion that, in fact, *iki* is something characteristic of the Japanese culture and it can neither be expressed by some other term nor exhaustively described. Because Yumiko Matsuzaki truly tried to explain what *iki* is (finally to conclude that as a matter of fact it is impossible), it would be better to believe her and give up. However, not all approaches are so cautious.

Many fictional, as well as authentic, diaries were written by people who lived for many years in the cultures that they were interested in. They showed their attempts at "inculturation" as well as all mistakes and mishaps as consecutive steps leading to the better understanding of the culture. The list of such diaries would be extremely long but their reading is a tremendous help for those who, not having the opportunity of direct experiencing the foreign culture, want to know something about it. What was formerly learned only from great travelers and adventurers is now accessible by means of television or feature films about China, Japan, India or Iran, not to mention films depicting the authentic, distant cultures. Also people who did not have the specialist equipment were the experts. Because of their work conducted in places where they lived and where they had to act they acquired an in-depth knowledge about the given culture. Those were missionaries, for example Mateo Ricci, who acted in China in the second half of the sixteenth century or Roberto de Nobili working in the same period, or Ippolito Desideri, who studied the learned letters in the Tibetan monasteries in the eighteenth century. Having a particular mission to fulfill, they did not ask themselves whether it was possible to get to know the language, customs and the way of thinking of the country in which they happened to be. Instead, they only wondered how to do it, working out for themselves unique re-

² Y. Matsuzaki, "Iki game. The analysis of *iki* phenomenon on the basis of Shuzo Kuki's works", *Aestheticism and Criticism*, No.2, Jagiellonian University, Krakow 2002, p. 23–40.

search methods. The beginning of such an activity was always an attempt at living like native inhabitants and at recognizing at least the part of the culture. In other words, it was an individual, personal experience.

In 1983, an American Lisa Dalby published her widely read book entitled "Geisha". She wanted to describe the world of geishas, which was slowly becoming a thing of the past. She tried to understand this singular culture of "the world of delusion" and therefore, for a short period of time, she became a geisha herself. Having been instructed about the necessity of *iki* behaving, she writes about applying it to different situations. She simply illustrates it with examples. The geishas from Fukagawa were famous because they never wore the *tabi*. The sight of the bare feet, whose paleness was emphasized by the blackness of the contours, was extremely *iki*. The strength of the character was thus expressed, the feature much more important for being *iki* than an erotic element present in this custom.

Certainly it is not possible to conclude what *iki* is from this picturesque scene, but we already know something. More examples and explanations would certainly bring us closer to the concept of *iki*.

Yumiko Matsuzaki herself read a paper on a scholarly meeting of the Division of Philosophy of Culture in the Institute of Philosophy at the Jagellonian University of Cracow. She tried to present *iki* using the examples of different situations in which *iki* is manifested. Her audience was a wide group of people who did not know the problem but nevertheless were open and ready to understand this concept. To be precise, let us add that this concept is not familiar to an average citizen of Japan and I think that explaining it to them would be as difficult as explaining to a Polish peasant what dandyism was. Incidentally, this term has much in common with *iki*.

Karl Popper wrote about this gradual approximation of the meaning and also about the impediments that result from the accepted assumption that the attempts at a mutual understanding are destined to fail in advance. He showed that harmfulness of something that he used to call the myth of the framework.

By "the myth of framework" Popper understands the widespread and often unconsciously accepted view that all rational argumentation has to be derived from a certain system of assump-

tions. Hence, the system of assumptions is itself always outside the scope of a rational argumentation. It is expressed in the conviction that all conflicts of views that occur between people who accept different frameworks are futile and pointless because rational discussion can only be carried on within some given system of assumptions. Popper thinks that such a myth is one of the biggest threats of our times, thus undermining the unity of human kind. It is assumed here that the only possible discussion is the one between people who share the same views. Likewise they cannot be free from these views because their assumptions are not to be discussed. The myth of framework leads to one more problem. If everyone is imprisoned in his/her system of framework which is, similarly to languages, distinct, then people of different cultures do not understand each other and, moreover, the mutual understanding is not possible. We are the prisoners of a certain framework and of a certain language. This conviction is, according to Popper, not only false but also harmful because assuming something in advance justifies the rejection of the attempts at opening at something new. This mistake consists here in the belief that it is not possible to change one's own framework.

This is connected with Popper's criticism of the view, which advocated that every new term appearing in our statements has to be defined. According to Popper, in the majority of issues it is not relevant whether a term can be defined or not or how it is defined³. It is enough to check whether what we talk about is comprehensible. The definition is certainly not a means to an end.

It is an important statement, so let us try to draw some conclusions from it.

To understand a culture, which, according to some researchers, can be treated as a language, we do not need to, in the full sense of the word, define all its terms, to give its unambiguous equivalents. Explaining a culture is possible not by means of looking for precise terms but during a conversation, during – as Buddhists say – “*mondo*”, during a never-ending cycle of questions and answers. We, once again, refer to Popper. He notices that, during a conversation that is carried on in an informal way, the explanation of what you understand by something depends not only on the

³ 4. K. Popper, *Knowledge and the Body-Mind Problem*. In *Defence of Interaction*, London 1994, p.

speaker but also on the listener. The interlocutor should ask a question: do you understand now, or not?⁴

The explanation is here a kind of a dialogue, during which a continuous, unceasingly created sequence of consecutive approximations comes into being. The method consists in a gradual presentation of the problem by means of consecutive explanations. In a world that changes so quickly, we will never run out of such explanations. New papers written by conscientious researchers both from the West and those coming from, hitherto, "foreign" cultures appear and show us "outlandish" cultures. Each and every issue can be thoroughly analyzed and in invaluable, explanatory knowledge will be included in the following comments, footnotes which every text, every explanatory conversation, and every discussion is fitted with. Here, in the West, the number of researchers whose knowledge of things is so careful and competent is rising. Their research is an important source of information for the scientists and experts from the so-called grand cultures: China, Japan or India. More and more scholars from the Eastern countries are so well informed about our occidental culture; they know its languages and ways of expression so well that they can tell us about their own literature, philosophy and customs to the point and in such a way that it becomes comprehensible for an average, educated man belonging to our civilization. Each of them is an interpreter, a translator or commentator, who presents the results of his/her own experience of a given culture in an explanatory dialogue.

The knowledge of the subject is changed on a large scale precisely due to the efforts of the specialists. In this sense it seems obvious that understanding of cultures always takes place on an individual level. It may happen, and in fact it did happen, that it is an individual who, through his/her own objective understanding, becomes a translator and – adding new fragments of knowledge all the time – initiates the whole great process of cultures permeating themselves. Later on new people enlarge the newly gained knowledge by their interpretations, new glosses and notes. Thus, nobody who would like to gather information can complain that it is unavailable.

Thus, we deal here with a long-lasting process conducted by the specialists (what is, I think, characteristic). Let us make it clear:

⁴ 5. *Ibid.*, p.

our present knowledge about foreign cultures was and still is created by the experts. It was great anthropologists, the researchers together with their equipment, the creators of new methodology who gave us the knowledge, which now creates the general set of convictions. Bronisław Malinowski, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Claude Levi Strauss not only acquired a new way of approaching that which is foreign but they also had enough literary talent to impart this to us. The science took over the role of former travel novels.

Owing to the work of all those people, today we have such unhindered access to foreign cultures today as would once have been unthinkable of. Every issue, every source text (and almost all important texts in great cultures were translated into English, and the translation process continues) is fitted with the appropriate number of footnotes which make up the next approximation of all the issues that cannot be clearly explained or directly translated. We are becoming the culture of footnotes, approximations and comments. We are here not concerned with boring bibliographical notes but with these pieces of information which (as has been happening since they started to appear in scholar texts) are regarded by the author as something that extends beyond the text but that is essential in order to understand the text fully. Hence, a footnote is a text to the texts, an explanation to the explanation and it can also consist of the comments of many people: the author, the translator, the editor. They all add something to facilitate the understanding of something, or at least meant well. But this structure of a footnote added to a footnote, an explanation to an explanation has been known – we can say without exaggeration – for thousands of years. This is how the philosophy of ancient India came into being – as the comments to the Vedas; this is how the Middle Ages extended the exegesis of the Holy Bible.

Our attention should be directed here to one more way of enriching our knowledge. This time it is about a definition. These are ostensive (deictic) definitions – definitions by indication. Let us remind us here of a general example (at least in Poland). The Eskimo has many more words describing various kinds of snow than in other languages. Although, Polish language knows many of them, but their meaning is comprehended only by skiers and mountain people. Therefore, it is said that their knowledge of snow is not conveyable, because in other languages there are no appropriate

concepts. Thus, it is impossible to define precisely new terms. But you can always use demonstration: "look, it is exactly this kind of snow". Of course, this kind of information is the oldest one in the history of human communication. But here want to concentrate on the fact that the possibilities of direct indication with reference to foreign and distant cultures are nowadays as ample as never before. It is possible to have a direct contact with an object, a behavior, a ritual or a custom. It will lead to an understanding and consequently to an exhaustive expression of meaning in consecutive approximations.

Hence, there is a difference between a simple translation of a term and a description of a state in a given language. It is true that there is always some stylistic clumsiness, too much verbosity, but it seems that it will exist as long as the meaning of a term is not absorbed. Then it often happens that the term is no longer translated but a borrowing appears. Our intuition suggests that, despite the laments of "linguists-purists", it is not possible to substitute "bar" or "inn" for "pub" because it simply does not mean the same thing. The moment we take over a new institution, such as e.g., "pub", from other culture, we take over its name, too. Of course, it happens only when the whole range of the word's meaning has pervaded to a popular awareness. At our disposal we have a long and constantly extended list of meanings of both elements of a language and whole structures of culture. Hence, we can look for still new possibilities of an adequate and exhaustive description. Undoubtedly, new additional explanations, new footnotes written to something that we already know will shortly appear.

As can be clearly seen, the understanding of another culture is not an act but a process and it is essential to be open to what is foreign. But what is the most important thing here is the long-term, which leads to the beginning of the act of understanding. It does not, of course, exclude the emotional aspect. It can be a part of our fascination induced by a different culture; great masterpieces in science and art arose from such feelings. The stimulus to knowing new cultures can also be a deal. So far, our acquainting with foreign cultures took place by means of more or less forcefully articulated deals: conquest, trade, or religious missions. Travelers visiting foreign cultures out of curiosity to acquaint with other cultures and scholars are rather rare exceptions. But it was they who were convinced that getting to know that which is foreign and impart-

ing this knowledge is possible after all. Such a conviction is an indispensable precondition for every attempt at understanding.

It seems that all the theories in which a positive answer to the question whether we are able to get to know what foreign is includes (the essential unity, the human unity, of our grasping the nature of reality emerging during the process of comprehending what foreign is). Many such theories have appeared, but we can try to order them according to similar argumentation included in them.

The most general and at the same time the least explanatory theories are those which refer common biological nature of all people. It can be shortly expressed by means of the statement included in the thesis of famous American neurophysiologist Karl Pribram. If we all have a similar brain then our cultural values have to be programmed alike. On this – as Pribram notices – the oldest and the most permanent ethic principle are based.

The other group of comments evokes the community of reality which moulds similar image of the world. German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey repeatedly and forcibly formulated such a statement about inherent unity of our ways of expressing the world. He stated that the consciousness of all people controls the same world and creates its similar image.

This common basis can also be the basic emotional equipment of a person, which is expressed in an individual but betraying similar experiences of all people. Rudolf Otto sees in it (common for all the cultures) the experience of *sacrum*, expressed in mysticism. It can have a broader dimension and then the whole culture is derived from primeval emotions. It was quite a popular point of view in philosophy at the turn of the nineteenth and the twentieth century.

As a matter of fact it can be reduced to the conviction about the community of human nature but this nature boils down to an experience sphere. The later idea of Freud who traces the beginning of culture to the primeval sense of *quilt*, is a certain version of this kind of views. In Claude Levi-Strauss's works a common structure of unconsciousness appears in connection with the search for common unconscious structures of mind.

All this does not mean that understanding of other people is simple. It is true that more and more people have a direct contact with foreign people because they either live in their own country

or are the neighbours of representatives of foreign cultures. Hence, we could suppose that they can grasp what is essential for their culture at once. But although this kind of contact creates the possibilities to directly experience or/and observe, it does not necessarily reveal the meaning of what is distinctively given. You can not simply understand what you are looking at and what you are experiencing. Polish minorities in Chicago are here a good example. You can meet old people who have lived there and, what is more important, worked their whole lives without learning the language and without understanding the rules of culture other than the ones that they need in order to communicate with the American society to a minimal extent. This results from two things. Firstly, the majorities are reserved and defensively do not want to accept what is foreign. Secondly, they are not able to translate incomprehensible elements of culture into their Polish equivalents because they simply do not know them. Similarly, you are not able to find the appropriate word for an unknown word in a foreign language without a translator or simply a dictionary. From mere vicinity only the understanding does not follow.

Subsequently, it seems that neither tolerance, nor the desire to cooperate, nor acceptance has to follow from understanding. So far, we have been united with foreign people either by trade or by war, sometimes even by missionary goals. But all these relations are not necessarily contradictory. Our attitude to acquaint ourselves or the necessity to understand resulted from this kind of connections. However, it were always a contact with some specific features which enabled a direct bond, even if this was a warlike bond. After all, the latest mass-media interest in Islam culture occurred after the attack on New York. Besides, it happened earlier on. Europe has never been indifferent to the culture of Islamic countries. This culture was known not only because of travel and trade exchange but also because of instructive and very informative war conflicts. Wars were always a good motive to try to understand what is foreign. In this case – the enemy.

It happened that wars were waged on the parties which (from the very beginning) understood each other perfectly well. It suffices to remind us of a long tradition of wars between Protestants and Catholics. A perfect understanding of something that is different may aim at its brutal change, which is perfectly confirmed by the history of colonization. However, the lack of understanding

can only be expressed either by indifference or a fully inquisitive acceptance for something that is simply new, fascinating and exotic.

A belief or rather a postulate saying that the correct attitude to something foreign is an approval (taken for granted, in advance), or love in contact with a person, is quite general and – from a moral point of view – approved of. This belief, which is so beautifully expressed by philosophers of dialogue, includes also an epistemological moment. It is love that makes us open to the possibility of acquainting with the Other; it is love that is the basis for every understanding. This thesis about the acquainting ability of positive feelings, which was so emphasized by Max Scheler, needs to be supplemented. It is not only hatred that “blinds”. Love happens to be “blind”, too, and it can happen that a reluctant attitude towards somebody or something makes us see the disadvantages (or the advantages) not visible with positive attitude. It is applicable both to people and to cultures.

Generally, it can be stated that positive or negative attitude, a subjective element of any cognitive act should not constitute the basic premise in our assessing what foreign is. However, it is not that simple because it applies to a special character of this object, which is a culture. In a way culture is as difficult to describe neutrally as a person, because the description is an objectivization of what constitutes the essence of man and it defines all relations between people. Hence, refraining from assessment requires a conscious effort. However, it is not always possible and advisable. It is not so – and it concerns all the issues connected with the acceptance of foreign cultures – that this acceptance is to encompass these cultures or rather their features which, after a careful analysis, should be considered harmful from a moral and social point of view. Here an assessment and sometimes taking up an active standpoint may prove to be necessary.

Reaching another culture does not have to result from a complete approval of it. It can be an outcome of necessity, fear of being rejected or desiring economic benefits. To cut a long story short, it can be motivated in a number of ways. It does not have to result from rational motives. All attempts at a uniform emotive interpretation turn out to be pointless. It can be justly stated that, as far as an initial motive for understanding can be an emotion of its own; in the course of the process of knowing another culture these

factors should be eliminated in favor of cognitive objectivity. However, never will the understanding of others be free from emotional factors.

The understanding of others should not result in converting what so far has been foreign "into something that would be one's own". "Foreignness" is the essence of understanding. In order to understand you have to absorb what is different but, similarly as it happens during learning a foreign language, neither approval nor negation has to accompany this process. It is accepting that which is different as it is, without the desire to change it or improve it. All in all, postulates and attempts at changing are separate processes, for which understanding can be at least a beginning. However, it requires not only openness but also preparation.

A person poorly educated has more difficulties not only in adapting to the conditions of a new culture (to some extent it is possible, if he/she manages to find for himself/herself an appropriate niche in it) but also in its comprehending and conscious absorbing. Moreover, he/she cannot participate in it actively. Maybe there is some similarity to learning a language in it. We learn the language automatically, unintentionally, it comes to us and even is not "learning" in the strict sense of the word. The second language is a learned one. But we will absorb it much easier if our linguistic awareness is fuller, if we understand our native language better. A person who uses only a very restricted repertoire of vocabulary in his/her native language is not able to master a foreign language to a greater extent, unless it is accompanied by an additional educational process.

The legitimacy of such a thesis is confirmed because small children undergo this process in a different manner. A child learns a second language unconsciously, simultaneously with its native one. Besides, a small child has no difficulties in changing the culture for a different one. Maybe there exists a great similarity between learning languages and cultures. So far, however, there is no developed methodology of teaching foreign cultures.

But there is only one thing that is important. Bringing a culture closer to the receiver from a different cultural sphere requires not only an open attitude but also the desire to overcome the difficulties.

Understanding a culture is not a sudden insight, a flash of revelation; just as learning a foreign language is not a single act but a

process. Similarly, as with understanding a foreign language, a different culture can never be known inside out. It rather consists in picking up its different elements, gradual "spot-lighting" of its manifestations in order to construct a possibly coherent, but not exhaustive whole later.

But we already know that the effort to explain, "the art of foot-notes", is the only way that the contemporary world can choose if we do not want the mistaken conviction about the inability of mutual understanding to change the dialogue of cultures into a hostile confrontation. In a direct connection of so far foreign cultures the conflict is highly probable.

Each culture creates the whole complex of defensive mechanisms and it probably can be stated that every (or almost every) culture includes elements of aggression, which, as it is in case of individuals, is manifested in confrontation with what is different. Many researchers from the field of hermeneutics drew attention to a particular inertia, resistance which both the scientific theories and trends in art as well as whole cultures offer to something that even partially contradicts them. Emerging of new paradigms of science takes place through/by long-lasting refuting of the paradigms so far established. New trends in literature found their places in violent generation disputes. In this Hegel-like vision of the world, progress always takes place in struggle of opposites to the new. So, resistance is at the same time inevitable and assessed as a slowing down progress. Finally, it is regarded as a negative phenomenon.

The situation looks different in case of the confrontation of cultures. The word "confrontation" here is used on purpose. It implies the element of fight, opposition, the desire to reject or even overcome what is different. It is needless to add that this "different" often includes the aspect of what is new. In the history of mankind, meeting with other cultures led to such transformations as emerging within the same culture new thought or artistic trend or even new elements of technology transforming the essence of what has been approved of so far. However, this defensive tendency expressed by the culture regarded as one's own identity is usually assessed positively. The comparison made between a culture and an individual personality seems to be justified. The faster effacement of phenomena between phenomena and quick changes within one's own culture takes place, the stronger unconscious de-

fensive mechanisms towards endangered identity are set in motion.

All cultures are subject to changes. They are threatened by worldly transformations. The transformations that have their own long history. The transformations that, if you can say so, expose what has been established and regarded as own and right with contact with something new. This "new" can, through violence or merely its appeal, threaten hitherto stable structures of one's own culture.

The emerging of defensive mechanisms leads to interpretable simplifications, to creating cultural stereotypes which become established despite the persuasions of more diligently disposed researchers and moralists who warn against black-and-white vision of the world. Apart from the interpretations that call up the unconscious mechanisms which control this kind of subordination of the world, we can here quote certain natural cognitive mechanisms which Gehlen paid attention to when he cited the Gestalt psychology. It is about the tendency to eliminate all the irregularities of what we perceive, about the effacement of the borders of what is blurred and out of focus in favor of distinct, sharply limited, confined forms. It is a mechanism that makes it easier to function in a too cognitively complicated reality, a mechanism that gives sense of an arranged and easily understood world. It seems to be obvious that all attempts at violating such an ordered world meet with opposition.

On the other hand, accepting as a fact that ethical norms, ways of behaviour and aesthetic criteria can – even with a strong cultural strength – be different from ours, undermines unshakable belief in the rationality of our culture; and behaviours established in it lose an existing sense. The negation of what is different results from the acceptance of the model of own culture, which is obvious, and all takes place on an unconscious level. While accepting what is different we need to doubt in an unconditioned binding of internalized models and moral norms. The sense of threat that accompanies it is connected with the fact that we unconsciously feel that we could accept this otherness that is inside us. (Gernot Bohme drew attention to it.)⁵

Let us conclude: otherness is recognized because we already possess its dark and unclear understanding, suppressed by the su-

⁵ 7. G. Bohme, *Antropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*, Frankfurt a. M. 1985, p.

perego and repealing in us as fear and temptation. Were it not for this characteristic pre-understanding, something that is different would not be recognizable at all. Bohme suggests that this peculiar resistance to what is foreign in another culture results from the fact that it is unconsciously regarded as possible, and what is more, desirable but unacceptable in one's own culture.

It is obvious that foreignness includes an implied unaware understanding, because only then it can evoke in us emotional rejection, negation of what we do not want to admit to our consciousness. It can be once again stated that the elements of foreign cultures that are most intensively rejected are not misunderstood, and in their rejection the factor of ethical valuing plays a major role. It can also take the form of a statement that what is different cannot be understood and there is no reason to make an effort in this direction.

However, it is the conflicts between different conceptual patterns that are conducive to setting free from one's own conceptual patterns. The development of civilization shows how fruitful such conflicts could be. Numerous conflicts between the Greek culture and the cultures of the East gave rise to the beginning of the West civilization, which the Greeks were aware of.

As Popper indicates⁶, the situations of confrontations between different conceptual patterns were already described by Herodotus. His numerous travels showed him the diversity of cultures. Popper also writes that Herodotus learned to respect and even achieved the ability to look at the customs and institutions of his own country through the eyes of his barbarous landlords. However, Popper adds that Herodotus was not caught in a trap of cultural relativism, and this observation is for us very significant. It also means that he did not consider that there is no objective truth, but that truth is different for the Greeks, the Egyptians and for the Syrians. This comment is important, among other things, because the last years of this attitudes led to the understanding of inter-cultural relations. Let's notice that with this attitude either confrontational or understanding dialogue is out of question because there is no truth that could be established together.

In the history of civilization we find the confrontations of cultures all the time. They lead to, as many researchers' understanding, the fact that due to the multiplicity and distinctness of cultures

⁶ 8. K. Popper, *The Myth...*, *op.cit.*, p.

our cognition of the world can become richer and fuller when we, overcoming the fear, mistrust and “framework”, reach this richness not only to understand others but also, or maybe first and foremost, understand ourselves. Foolish dreams about the common language which would unite mankind, and also create one common culture, would lead to the fall of this culture. The standardization would lead not only to stagnation but also to a smaller knowledge because only what is different can show us the peculiarity of what is ours.

History, to some extent, determines and limits an individual, giving him/her at the same time the fullness and abundance of taking part in a culture. Similarly, an understanding reference to what is different limits and constraints at the same time, just as all understanding does. However, it also opens new cognitive abilities and a new range of experiences. Last but not least, it shows new possibilities of taking part in the life of own community.