

Explication of the Migrant Writers' Hybrid Identity in German-speaking Discourse

Liudmila Bondareva*

Institute of Education
I. Kant Baltic Federal University
 Kaliningrad, Russia

ORCID ID 0000-0001-9631-0860

bondareva.koenig@mail.ru

Marina Potyomina

Institute of Humanities
I. Kant Baltic Federal University
 Kaliningrad, Russia

ORCID ID 0000-0003-4656-7910

mpotemina@mail.ru

Vera Tkachenko

Institute of Education
I. Kant Baltic Federal University
 Kaliningrad, Russia

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8644-6166

vera_tkatschenko@mail.ru

Abstract. *Linguistic and cultural studies have become the background for the analysis carried out in the article and give a clue to the idea of the national-cultural identity, which is reflected in the texts of German-speaking migrant discourse. The research relies on the work of German scientists who investigate the issue both in line with the traditional interpretation of migrant discourse as an intermediate cultural space of ambivalent nature, and within the framework of the new idea of intercultural Germanism. The research aims at establishing the rules according to which the text embodies the ways for the migrant authors to master the cultural space of German society and fix the forms of their identity. The authors used the general scientific method of comparative analysis and particular methods of linguo-cultural and contextual analysis. The integration of the individual consciousness of migrant writers into a new socio-cultural and linguistic space has got a systemic nature and is implemented in the language. The authors prove the urgency of the semantic opposition “native - alien”, the components of which undergo an individually conditioned transformation and modification through acculturation. The language factor is proven to play the dominant role in the process of acculturation. The authors describe the forms of hybrid identity of German-speaking migrant writers, representing integration (L. Gorelik), cosmopolitan through transidentity (I. Trojanow) and integrated through a retrograde nature (E. S. Özdamar).*

Keywords – *migrant discourse, hybrid identity, opposition “native - alien”, linguistic space, integration*.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the dynamics of socio-political changes in the modern world, the process of intercultural communication has become increasingly intense in recent decades. The process stems from the interaction of representatives of different national communities, while the central problem in this area is the study of “universal variables” in various cultures and their differences from each other, as well as

their abilities to overcome “OTHERNESS” while dividing people around into “native” and “alien” [6, p. 99].

On the one hand, the undoubted fact is that in the conditions of the current multicultural society, commitment to the ideas of openness and tolerance to other views and traditions is constantly declared. However, on the other hand, one can observe a certain apprehension of representatives of a certain national mentality towards the ideas, values and their carriers introduced from outside, which entails revising their own national and cultural identity.

All the above factors are directly reflected in literary communication, which gives reason to consider them as theoretical prerequisites for understanding the nature of intercultural relations in literary texts.

It should be noted that the issues of intercultural communication have become an agenda for modern Germany, which in the second half of the 20th century was transformed into a multicultural society due to the influx of immigrants from a number of European and non-European countries. Due to the fact that in the process of cross-border movements, as I. Tsapenko and G. Monusova rightly point out, people often do not lose their historical roots, native culture, or connections with their homeland and at the same time learn and internalize new cultures, the elements of these interacting cultures mix and merge, which gives rise to new cultural phenomena [22, p. 91]. Changes in the German society affected accordingly the substantive continuum of the German-speaking discourse, which was significantly expanded due to the penetration of new literary layers, which were formed in the mental space of other cultures living in Germany.

According to N.V. Egorshina, this new type of narration allows to summarize and specify a whole range of questions, the answers to which will help to develop ideas about the national-cultural “self” or “personal identity” in the modern multicultural world [4].

Therefore, this study aims to establish the patterns of integrating the individual consciousness of German-speaking migrant writers into the system of moral, ethical and cultural values of German society and identifying the nature of the language implementation of their transformed national identity, which is reflected in German-language discourse.

The undoubted significance of this kind of work lies in the possibility of penetrating into the essence of the interethnic interaction process in the context of

* A part of the study was done at the I. Kant Baltic Federal University in the framework of the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (No. 18-18-00442) “Mechanisms of Meaning and Textualization in Social Narrative and Performative Discourses and Practices”

* Liudmila Bondareva (bondareva.koenig@mail.ru) is a corresponding author.

multiculturalism, which contributes to the elimination of existing and eventual gaps that prevent effective communication.

The main research methodology relied on the general comparative analysis, as well as particular methods of linguo-cultural and contextual analysis, which brought about the relevant conclusions.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In German literary studies, the work of migrant writers was initially viewed as one of the hybrid genre forms within the paradigm of “guest workers' literature” - “migrant literature” - “globalized German-language literature”. H.K. Bhabha and many researchers after him interpreted migrant literature as a kind of space between cultures, i.e. “Intermediate space” (In-between-Space), having ambivalence and inconsistency, since the migrant writer sees himself as belonging to each of the worlds and at the same time “as not a full part of any of them” [2, p. 56].

However, the mentioned intensification of the internationalization and globalization processes, carried out in the modern multicultural space, has influenced both the literary creativity and the ways of its scientific understanding.

In the practice of literary communication, many authors with a migrant background no longer position themselves as migrants or refugees who are forced to acquire other language skills and experience in the new or alien cultural environment. Fluent in German and possessing transcultural experience, they demonstrate, at the text level, their desire to become mediators between cultures, complementing the integrity of the new cultural space rather than disturbing it.

Such multilingual writers now defend their right to be an independent “agent” in German literary space, which would allow them to legitimize themselves as German writers. R. Steinberg points out such authors' attempts to distance themselves from “their” literature are largely due to a number of “certain clichés”, which makes it difficult for them to establish themselves in the literary world [18].

The research of migrant literature resulted in a rearrangement of semantic accents, and, therefore, the dominant concept of cultural identity, which was originally based on the idea of a “homogeneous culture” in mono-national communities, gave way to the concept of “hybrid identity” based on the idea of blurred national identities in “global postmodernism” [9, p. 425]. In the postulated “third space”, the relationships of the elements of “one's own” and “alien” were modeled not as a multicultural interaction or dialectical mediation, but as a harmonious process of interpenetration of the center and periphery, in which the elements are mixed, but not merged [8, p. 220-221].

Thus, attempts by a number of German scientists to view the migrant literature as cultural polylogue has brought about in recent decades intercultural Germanism, which deals with the concepts of “alien”, “dissimilarity”, “collision with another / alien” [11, 17].

Some researchers of German literature see migrant literature as an “aesthetic field for experimentation” [10, p. 8], which focuses on the language and style of migrant writers. At the same time, for example, in the concept of

K. Chiellino, the dialogical nature of the language and the presence of an “intercultural interlocutor” are highlighted as “innovative components” [3, p. 391]. In turn, B. Stratthaus and N. Isterheld criticize these “innovations” because in reality a dialogue arises between multicultural migrant authors and monocultural readers, and it only deepens the gap between these two poles of literary communication [19;12].

The works of M. Kresic [13] and R.-S. Rogobete [16] comprehensively interpret the problems of constructing different linguistic identities, the peculiarities of the influence of the German language on the mentality of migrant writers and the enrichment of the German language after having met other languages and national cultures. The monograph by D. Freist, S. Kyora and M. Unseld „Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen. Räume – Materialitäten – Erinnerungen” (2019) [5] presents the analysis of the experience which the authors and their characters acquired being parts of several cultures, a description of narrative strategies and cultural practices used by multilingual writers for self-design in the conditions of transculturally modified space and time.

In general, the relationship between the identity factor and language is considered by German scientists in the aspects of psycholinguistics [1], sociolinguistics [20] and semiotics [15].

Having analyzed the works of German scholars who study the work of migrant writers, it should be noted that the research outcomes presented in this article are a definite contribution to the development of this issue, since the study was aimed at identifying the systemic nature of the textual implementation of the hybrid identity factor of these writers. At the same time, it was found that the initial semantic opposition “natives – aliens” embedded in the migrant discourse continues to be relevant for authors of different nationalities at all stages of their acculturation. At the same time, the writers of the German-speaking cultural space develop a certain variety of their positions and forms of manifestation of self-identity, which correlates with the conclusions that refer to the above analysis of a number of papers on migrant discourse. The decisive role of the language factor in this process is seen as an important point.

The degree of effectiveness to which the textual realization of the national self-identity of German-speaking migrant writers is studied demonstrates the future prospects of this topic and the possibility of establishing global patterns of discursive representation of such a multicultural experience based on the interpretation of a more extensive textual material.

III. RESEARCH MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

The study was based on the general comparative analysis of the texts of three German-speaking migrant writers who are representatives of different national cultures. When working with each specific text, the authors draw some specific research methods:

- linguo-cultural analysis, which helps to take into account national and cultural specifics in the process of

interpreting the ways of authors' understanding the surrounding reality;

- contextual analysis, providing adequate evidence on the functioning of relevant lexical units in a particular language environment.

One of the authors, whose texts served as the material for this study, is a writer of Russian-Jewish origin, Lena Gorelik, who moved with her whole family to Germany from Russia in the era of rapid political changes in 1992. In her autobiographical book "Sie können aber gut Deutsch! Warum ich nicht mehr dankbar sein will, dass ich hier leben darf, und Toleranz nicht weiter hilft" (2012) she analyzes the process of self-reassessment of life values associated with implanting in "alien" reality, recalls the difficulties of overcoming language and cultural barriers, reflects on the peculiarities of her current attitude and the nature of relationships with others. The writer pays the closest attention to the philosophical interpretation of the concepts of "tolerance" and "migration background", which are the most relevant in the modern multicultural environment. As a result, L. Gorelik makes, at first glance, a somewhat paradoxical, though, in fact, a fair conclusion that handling these concepts in Germany leads to the humiliation of people of other nationalities who continue to remain forever "different" in the context of implied relationships. Here, the author proposes building intercultural relations in German society considering the priority of universal human values and the existence of a single multicultural "we".

Then the research focused on the autobiographical essay "Nach der Flucht" (2017), belonging to a German-speaking writer of Bulgarian origin Ilija Trojanow. The author was 11 years old when his family, fearing persecution by the authorities, made a forced escape from socialist Bulgaria and was granted political asylum in Germany. Talking about his personal life experience from the 3rd person and thus distancing himself from the main character, the writer creates a collective image of a refugee who survived all the forced migration and difficulty of finding a new identity.

The problem of polyidentity in the context of overcoming multi-level linguistic, cultural and social codes is becoming one of the main themes of the short stories collection "Mutterzunge" (1990), created by E. S. Özdamar. In this case, the writer, who belongs to the first generation of Turkish migrants to Germany, is trying to reproduce her own experience in mastering the new physical, linguistic and sociocultural space, placing the heroines of the stories in various life situations and endowing them with their vision of the problems that arose.

IV. RESEARCH OUTCOMES

The research into linguistic material has clearly shown that the starting point of self-identity search in a new social and cultural environment for all migrant writers coincides with integration into the "alien" language space, but this crucial stage is preceded by a phase of familiarization with someone else's external, i.e. physical, objective space. The preliminary, initial assimilation by the authors / characters of the new human and objective environment takes place

within the framework of the semantic opposition "native-alien". During acculturation, the ratio of the structural elements in this opposition begins to be modified depending on the nature and degree of integration of the migrant writer's individual consciousness into the collective mental space of German society.

It should be emphasized that the process of overcoming OTHERNESS, recorded in the analyzed texts, includes several successive stages.

At the first stage, the elements of the basic "one-to-one" opposition are, as a rule, in antagonistic relations, as it happens, in particular, in the pages of the autobiographical narrative of L. Gorelik. The first impression from life in Germany for little Lena is the variety of colors, the "diversity" of colors everywhere in the surrounding reality:

„Als ich aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion nach Deutschland kam, <...> schien das Land, das mein neues Zuhause werden sollte, in erster Linie bunt. Alles schien bunt, die Obstauslagen der Supermärkte, die Blumenwiesen im Stadtpark, die Menschen auf den Straßen in den bunten Kleidern. Am buntesten war der Schulhof. <...>

Im Klassenzimmer war auch alles bunt“ [7, S. 15-17].

The multi-coloured life in a "foreign" society which pleases the eye becomes for the author the first symptom of his OTHERNESS that impedes the acceptance of a "foreign" objective space:

„Dazwischen stand ich, meist verkroch ich mich in eine Ecke, drückte mich am Zaun herum, um die anderen nicht merken zu lassen, was mich so offensichtlich schmerzte: dass ich nicht dazu gehörte. Ich passte nicht in das bunte Gewimmel“ [7, S. 16].

The initial rejection of the autobiographical character by the inner circle is explicit in the text in the description of both her own behavior as a response to this circumstance (verbs *sich verkriechen*, *sich herumdrücken*), and also the behaviour of others („die Lehrerin <...> nahm mich kaum wahr. <...> Die Kinder fanden mich sonderbar, schlimmer aber waren die Lehrer, die mich der Einfachheit halber ignorierten“ [7, S.17]). Of course, the main reason for the current situation was, above all, that the girl from St. Petersburg who could speak no German, understood her disadvantage and began to rapidly master the "foreign" language space:

„Ich <...> übte meine deutschen Sätze. Die Sätze bastelte ich abends mithilfe eines Wörterbuchs und meines Bruders<...>“ [7, S. 16].

The turning point in the author's life is a meeting in a new school with a teacher who warmly supported her during this difficult period and even encouraged her to engage in literary work. But since this teacher spoke exclusively the Swabian German, this very dialect becomes the first "own" German language for L. Gorelik. As a result, in the process of new author's self-identity crystallization, the second stage, accompanied by the transition of the "alien" into the new "native", becomes obvious. However, a little later, while gaining life experience, the future writer discovers that

this new “native” is “alien” for the rest of Germany, who speaks either the national literary German language or other dialects:

„Noch später fuhr ich nach Hamburg, wo <...> die Menschen sich mit „Moin“ begrüßten und auf mein „Grüß Gott“ mit einem „Mache ich, wenn ich ihn sehe“ reagierten, und fühlte mich, als sei ich im Ausland gelandet, unsicher und fremd. So lernte ich Deutschland nach und nach kennen, das mit meinem neuen schwäbischen Zuhause häufig erstaunlich wenig gemein hatte“ [7, S. 22].

It is this fact that discovers a new “native” Germany for L. Gorelik as a country that is historically inherent in a phenomenon of multiculturalism. The text fragment quoted below also draws attention to the frequency of using the pronoun *wir*, which becomes a refrain for the whole narrative and indicates the completion of the author’s full integration phase into the new sociocultural space:

„Wir leben in einem Land, das von seinen historisch bedingten regionalen Unterschieden geprägt ist wie kaum ein anderes. Seien diese nun dialektaler, kultureller, traditioneller, politischer, geschichtlicher, religiöser oder sogar kulinarischer Natur <...>“ [7, S. 22];

„Wir leben in einem Land, zu dem die Vielfalt per Historie dazugehört, in einem Land, das sich nicht zuletzt durch diese zahlreichen Unterschiede wirtschaftlich, kulturell und sozial zu dem entwickelt hat, was es ist“ [7, S. 24];

„Die Diversität, die Heterogenität dieses Landes, die nicht in Frage gestellt wird, weil man es anders nicht einfach kennt, ist nicht zuletzt ein Merkmal Deutschlands. Die Tatsache, dass wir mit dieser Vielfalt nicht nur leben, sondern auf so vielen Ebenen von ihr profitieren, ist etwas, worauf wir stolz sein können“ [7, S. 25].

However, before this final stage of acculturation, L. Gorelik went through another phase of mastering a foreign language space, which was crowned with complete success: “alien” through new “his” private character (Schwab dialect) becomes new “his” global character (national literary German). The results of this process are recorded by the writer as an adult when her first novel was published, which was well accepted both by the critics and the wider audience:

„*Meine weißen Nächte*, so heißt auch mein erster Roman, der 2004 erschien. <...> Irgendwann zwischen den ersten und den zweiten *Weissen Nächten* war Deutsch zu meiner Sprache geworden“ [7, S. 19].

To be fair, it should be noted that at the age of 11–12 L. Gorelik passed several transitional stages while gaining national self-identity, associated with the desire to reject the true “native” so that to replace it with a new “native” and with attempts to combine the old “native” with new “native”. However, the ultimate result of all the described processes should recognize the writer's transition to fully integrate into the German cultural space, and, therefore, the author’s denial of tolerance, which only accentuates the OTHERNESS, and promotes the efficacy and significance

of universal human values within the framework of the “Wir-Deutschland” concept:

„Wir in Deutschland beherrschen von Haus aus einen Umgang mit Vielfalt, von dem viele lernen könnten“ [7, S. 26];

„Ob wir es wollen oder nicht, ob wir es gutheißen oder nicht, gehören sie [foreigners who live in Germany – L.B.], nein, gehören wir zu Deutschland. Wir, mit unserem zweiten (russischen) Pass oder der italienischen Großmutter oder den türkischen Eltern, dem albanischen Geburtsort, der französischen Muttersprache, den südafrikanischen Vorfahren und so weiter. <...>

Wir sind schon lange Teil des deutschen Alltags. <...> das Einzige, was uns miteinander verbindet, ist, dass wir nicht Urdeutsche sind. Die andere Eigenschaft, die uns untereinander, aber auch mit all den „Urdeutschen“ verbindet, ist, dass wir Teil Deutschlands sind.

Dies ist <...> unser aller Deutschland“ [7, S. 28-29].

Integration into the new language space opens the process of self-identity search for Ilija Trojanow. Without any knowledge of German when he entered the school (“Einschulung. Er kann einige Wortbrocken, seine Mutter kann einige Wortbrocken“ [21, S. 19]), the young refugee from Bulgaria faces rejection from classmates. The children laugh at him, which causes a burning sense of shame in the hero, and he decides to learn the language so well that he will never experience this feeling again and thus defend himself against the hostile “alien” that does not accept his environment:

„Als er ein Wort so ausspricht, dass es lustig klingt, ziehen die anderen Schüler Grimassen. <...> Nachträglich kommt es ihm vor, als habe er an diesem Tag beschlossen, die fremde Sprache so zu lernen, dass er sich nie wieder schämen muss. Er ahnt noch nicht, was seine Eltern von Anfang an wissen: Sprache ist Ermächtigung. Wer das Alphabet beherrscht, kann sich selbst verteidigen“ [21, S. 21].

However, having mastered the language, having made it new “his”, young I. Trojanow realizes that he did not belong to the local (“Einheimische”) environment, he was not accepted, become his “local”. They recognize a boy from Bulgaria and do justice to his knowledge, but the author’s non-German name marks his OTHERNESS to Germans:

„Über seinen Namen wird er auffällig. Weil andere ihn über seinen Namen zu begreifen haben“ [21, S. 29].

I. Trojanow concludes that for many years a migrant has been trying to establish himself in a new society as if it were his own, to receive the status of his full-fledged member can never be completed with absolute success, because people around him feel the absence of something essential that unites them all:

„Egal, wie viele Jahre seit seiner Flucht vergangen sind, die Einheimischen kennzeichnen ihn als jemanden, der etwas Essentielles nicht mit ihnen teilt“ [21, S. 17].

As a result, he has a feeling of alienation („das Gefühl des Fremdseins“) in relation to the new “him”. This prevents him from seeing the future and returns to the past, to the abandoned old “him”, makes him think of the country from which he fled, as a paradise lost, and the author/character plunges into nostalgia:

„Der Geflüchtete fastet gemäß den Geboten der Sehnsucht. Er wird Mitglied eines Kults namens Nostalgie. <...> Alles, woran es ihm mangelt, das verschlossene Paradies“ [21, S. 146].

The author understands that having left Bulgaria at a young age and having lost almost every connection with his homeland, having forgotten his native language, he, nevertheless, did not get completely detached from it:

„Der Geflüchtete hat das Land seiner Geburt verlassen, aber er lässt es nie hinter sich. Selbst wenn er behauptet, es interessiere ihn nicht mehr. Selbst wenn er es völlig ignoriert“ [21, S. 82].

The turning point for I. Trojanow is a trip to his homeland, which became possible after the fall of the “iron curtain”. The excitement he had experienced before his arrival turned into disappointment, since childhood memories of life in his hometown, aligned with images of a nostalgic adult, do not correspond to reality. The illusion of a connection with one’s roots, with a house, turns into the understanding that he is also a stranger for this society. Therefore, the writer invented the term *Fremdkehr* to define his return to his homeland (*Heimkehr*), and to state his strangeness when it comes to the old “his”. Here begins the construction of the author’s hybrid self-identity as a product of his individual reflection on his life journey:

„Die Identität wird einem bei der Geburt gegeben, aber sie wird von demjenigen bestimmt, der sie trägt. Sie ist kein Erbe. Ich bin der Vielschichtige...“ [21, S. 196].

A new identity is coined through the synthesis of diverse cultural and language experiences. I. Trojanow becomes aware of this in spiritual awakening, under the influence of which the alienation to both the host country and the country of origin gets ambivalent. On the one hand, it is undesirable, since it is exclusion from society, on the other hand, it is a position that allows an uninterested look to assess the current social events. It builds person’s self-awareness and confidence:

„Entfremdung ist ein Daseinszustand, aber auch eine Technik, Distanz eine wohlbedachte Positionierung. Das Glück sich häuten zu dürfen. <...> Entfremdung ist eine Übung in Demut, die das Selbstbewusstsein stärkt“ [21, S. 231].

Thus, having lost the old “native” self and not having acquired the new self, the author finds himself in a position between two “alien”s. Seeing no opportunity for full integration or reintegration, I. Trojanow resolves this conflict, taking himself from the position “between” to the position “above” both cultures, which leads him to the idea of cosmopolitanism:

Wer nirgendwo dazugehört, kann überall heimisch werden [21, S. 224].

Developing this idea and increasingly affirming it, I. Trojanow extrapolates his idea of the cosmopolitan nature of an individual to all of humanity and sees it as the only truth:

Die Menschheit kann nur kosmopolitisch überleben [21, S. 266].

The Polyidentity in the context of overcoming multi-level linguistic, cultural and social codes becomes one of the major issues of the collection of short stories by Emine Sevgi Özdamar, “*Mutterzunge*” (1990). This collection is an attempt at artistic processing personal life experience of a writer who belongs to the first generation of German-speaking migrants with Turkish roots.

The nameless character of the story “*Mutterzunge*”, the author’s alter ego connects the initial difficulties attributed to some erosion of self-identity, with the language. “Her” German has no cultural background, although she is almost fluent in it:

„In der Fremdsprache haben Wörter keine Kindheit“ [14, S. 43].

The native Turkish language, in turn, gradually becomes alien to the narrator. The words of her mother, spoken in Turkish, are perceived by her “as a well-learned foreign language” („wie eine von mir gut gelernte Fremdsprache“ [14, S. 7]). However, listening to the story of the mother of a young man who is waiting for her execution in a Turkish prison, she also feels that she is moving away from her roots: she thought, “as if she spoke these words in German” („als ob sie diese Wörter in Deutsch gesagt hätte“ [14, S. 9]). The letters and inscriptions are also perceived by her as “well-learned foreign writing” („wie eine von mir gut gelernte Fremdschrift“ [14, S. 9]).

In the Berlin multi-cultural café, the heroine wonders when she lost her native language: “Wenn ich nur wüßte, wann ich meine Mutterzunge verloren habe” [14, S.7]. “Being dissolved” in the new culture is a scary prospect for the heroine. Perhaps that is why she can meet with her second “I”, pro-personality and mother tongue, only in border spaces: in dreams, in trains, crossing the border. Overcoming physical (corporeal), geographic (Turkey-Germany, East and West Berlin), or imaginary (reality-dream) borders, she finds herself in a flimsy space “between two worlds”:

„Stehe auf, geh zum anderen Berlin, Brecht war der erste Mensch, warum ich hierher gekommen bin, vielleicht dort kann ich mich daran erinnern, wann ich meine Mutterzunge verloren habe. Auf dem Korridor zwischen zwei Welten“ [14, S. 11].

Berlin is becoming a division metaphor which can be applied not only to Germany but also to border between “native” and “alien”:

„Warum stehe ich im halben Berlin?<...>Ich werde zum anderen Berlin zurückkehren“ [14, S. 12].

The return to “another Berlin”, according to the concept of E. S. Özdamar, is a return to oneself and one’s roots. According to the writer, there are “East Berlin”, “West Berlin” and “Berlin for foreigners” (Ausländer-Berlin). At the same time, “Berlin for Foreigners” is a temporary space for guest workers, who came here only for work and are planning to return home in a year. Thus, Germany appears to them as a kind of a provisional reserve, temporary shelter.

The heroine decides to go in search of a new language and new identity which she hopes to discover through the linguistic identity of her grandfather, who may help her better understand her mother:

„Vielleicht erst zu Großvater zurück, dann kann ich den Weg zu meiner Mutter und Mutterzunge finden“ [14, S. 12].

Grandfather, who speaks only Arabic, and the heroine, who knows only Latin, could not understand each other without gestures or tell each other their stories. Therefore, the narrator goes to West Berlin to learn Arabic from Master Ibn Abdullah.

This story is further developed in “Großvaterzunge”, where one of the characters, an Arabic language expert, considers it inappropriate to communicate with the heroine – an Eastern woman in German, but at the moment German seems to be their only intermediary language. The narrator begins to realize that linguistic purism, as well as an isolated identity, becomes impossible in modern conditions. Even historically, the native language cannot be learned in isolation from another. As a result, the voices of German Orientalists unwittingly interfere with the process of learning Arabic. („Ich lernte sehr leise, hinter dem Vorhang waren sie laut, ihre Sätze und meine Sätze mischten sich“ [14, S. 23]), and a Turkish song mixes with words in Arabic („<...> dann kam wieder ein türkisches Lied, und das mischte sich in die arabischen Wörter“ [14, S. 30]).

Thus, the binary oppositions “mother tongue – other language”, “reality-dream”, “East-West”, “East Berlin-West Berlin” are the dominant tool for auto- and meta-representations of “one’s own” and “alien” in stories of Emine Sevgi Özdamar.

The painful experience of migration is expressed in the feeling of her heroine of duality, the constant need for (re)constructing her own identity. In the process of cognition of its true essence, the author’s alter ego does not traditionally rely on the “other”, but sees everything through the prism of her figure, which appeared more clearly through the magnifying glass of someone else’s space. The “alien”, therefore, becomes only an intermediary in the knowledge of “native”.

It is obvious that the language factor plays a dominant role in this complex process. Integrating into a “foreign” linguistic space and mastering it, E.S. Özdamar is constantly resuming the search for her native linguistic space, trying to return to her national roots. It results in a form of hybrid identity, which we would call “retrograde integration”. This means that integration into the “alien”, which has become, to a certain extent, a new “friend”, is carried out simultaneously with the reintegration of the author with the

old “friend”. Against the background of a formal adaptation to life in Germany, the writer continues to remain in a state of some internal dissonance, which is reflected primarily in the language field.

Summing up, it can be stated that all three German-speaking migrant authors while establishing their own hybrid identity undergo similar phased development of a new cultural and linguistic space based on the semantic opposition “native - alien”, but each of them has their own motion vector.

If L. Gorelik is relatively straightforward in the process of integration into the modern German multicultural world, then I. Trojanow is more of a variable, a kind of “shuttle” movement between the two poles. But each time the endpoint on both motion vectors becomes the next “point of return” for the Bulgarian writer. Eventually, I. Trojanow turns “above-native” and “above-alien”, finding himself in a state of trans-identity, which is traditionally regarded as a position of cosmopolitanism. In her turn, E. S. Özdamar, a writer of Turkish origin, who wants to integrate into the German language space, shows some fluctuation between retrograde motion vectors towards her own “old” grounds and return to a certain establishment in the new foreign language community.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Understanding the peculiarities of developing a hybrid identity in the conditions of modern multicultural society seems to be the most effective based on the study of the texts of migrant writers who analyze the processes of their own experience in the foreign-language cultural space. It is the language that becomes the main instrument through which the other nationalities integrate into a new socio-cultural reality. The analysis of how migrant writers shape hybrid identity in the framework of German-speaking discourse can serve as a definite impulse for further development of the problem of multicultural interaction in the course of cumulative interdisciplinary research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A part of the research was performed by Dr. Marina Potyomina on the Russian Science Foundation grant (No. 18-18-00442) “Mechanisms of Meaning Development and Textualization in Social Narrative and Performative Discourses and Practices”. We also express our gratitude to the 5-100 Project and the Competitiveness Development Program of I. Kant Baltic Federal University.

REFERENCES

- [1] Behraves, M. (2016). *Migration und Erinnerung in der deutschsprachigen interkulturellen Literatur*. Bielefeld, Aisthesis.
- [2] Bhabha, H. (2000). On Cultural Choice. *The Turn to Ethics*, M. Garber, B. Hanssen, R.L. Walkowitz. (eds.). London: Routledge, 181–200.
- [3] Chiellino, C. (2000). *Interkulturelle Literatur in Deutschland*. Stuttgart, Weimar, Verlag J.B. Metzler.
- [4] Egorshina, N. V. (2002). *Narrativnyy diskurs: Semiolozhicheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekty interpretatsii*. [Narrative discourse: Semiological and linguistic-cultural aspects of interpretation]. Doctor of Philological Sciences Dissertation. Tver. (In Russ.)

- [5] Freist, D., Kyora, S., Unseld M. (2019). *Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen. Räume – Materialitäten – Erinnerungen*. Bielefeld, Transcript Verlag.
- [6] Gnatyuk, O. L. (2010). *Osnovy teorii kommunikatsii* [The Basics of Communication Theory]. Moscow, KNORUS. (In Russ.)
- [7] Gorelik, L. (2012). „*Sie können aber gut Deutsch!*“ *Warum ich nicht mehr dankbar sein will, dass ich hier leben darf, und Toleranz nicht weiterhilft*. München, Pantheon.
- [8] Griem, J. (1998). Hybridität. *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe* / A. Nünning (Hg.). Stuttgart; Weimar, Metzler, 260–261.
- [9] Hall, S. (1999). Kulturelle Identität und Globalisierung. *Widerspenstige Kulturen. Cultural Studies als Herausforderung*. Hörning, K. H./Winter, R. (Hrsg.). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 393–441.
- [10] Hoff, K. (2008). *Literatur der Migration – Migration der Literatur*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Germanistik und Skandinavistik). Frankfurt, Peter Lang.
- [11] Hoffmann, M. (2006). *Interkulturelle Literaturwissenschaft. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart, UTV.
- [12] Isterheld, N. (2017). *In der Zukunft Europas. Zur deutschsprachigen Literatur russischstämmiger AutorInnen*. Bamberg, University of Bamberg Press.
- [13] Kresic, M. (2006). *Sprache, Sprechen und Identität zur sprachlich-medialen Konstruktion des Selbst*. München, Ludicium.
- [14] Özdamar, E.S. (2013). *Mutterzunge*. Berlin, Rotbuch Verlag.
- [15] Posner, R. (2003). Kultursemiotik. *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften. Theoretische Grundlagen – Ansätze – Perspektiven*. Nünning A., Nünning, V. (Hg.). Stuttgart, 39–72.
- [16] Rogobete, R.-S. (2016). Sprache und Identitätsbildung in der Migrationsliteratur. *Annals of the University of Craiova, Series: Philology, English*, Editura Universitaria Craiova 2016, Vol. 1, NXVII: 219–228.
- [17] Schmitz, H. (2000). *Von der nationalen zur internationalen Literatur. Transkulturelle deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur im Zeitalter globaler Migration*. Amsterdam, N. Y. 2009, 21-45.
- [18] Steinberg, R. (2019). Zugehörigkeit, Autorschaft und die Debatte um eine Migrationsliteratur. Saša Staniši und Olga Grjasnowa im literarischen Feld Deutschlands. *Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen. Räume-Materialitäten. Erinnerungen*. Dagmar Freist, Sabine Kyora, Melanie Unseld (Hg). Bielefeld, Transcript Verlag, 181–206.
- [19] Stratthaus, B (2005). *Was heißt die „Interkulturelle Literatur“?* Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades Dr phil. Duisburg-Essen.
- [20] Thim-Mabrey, Ch. (2003). Sprachidentität – Identität durch Sprache. Ein Problemaufriss. *Sprachidentität – Identität durch Sprache*. Tübingen Beiträge zur Linguistik, Janich, Thim-Mabrey (Hg.). Tübingen, 1–19.
- [21] Trojanow I. (2017). *Nach der Flucht*. Frankfurt a. München, Fischer Verlag.
- [22] Tsapenko, I.O., Monusova, G.A. (2017). Integratsionny potentsial etnokulturnogo raznoobraziya v evropeiskikh sotsiumakh [Integration Capacity of Ethno-Cultural Diversity in European Societies]. *Polis. Political Studies*, 4: 90–105 DOI: 10.17976/jpps/2017.04.07 (In Rus.).