

Eurasian Journal  
of Humanities and  
Social Sciences



## Gnoseological Aspects of Philosophical Problems of Linguistics

**Eshonova Dilnoza Abrorovna**

2-course 217-group master  
Foreign language and literature (English)  
Samarkand State Institute of  
Foreign Languages  
+998937288862  
[dilnoza\\_eshonova@mail.ru](mailto:dilnoza_eshonova@mail.ru)

### ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the basic questions that language and linguistics put to philosophy as an activity of determining the essence of things. If all the problems in the philosophy of language are grouped around central contradictions, then the philosophy of linguistics is called to answer questions about how knowledge of language is expressed and how scientific theories are structured. At the same time, the specificity of the philosophy of linguistics is largely related to the specificity of its object.

### Keywords:

Speech, language, asymmetry of a linguistic sign (word, text), iconicity of the signified, picture of the world (everyday and scientific), mutual understanding, method, original object, model object, term compatibility, linguistics.

Problems concerning the most general, constitutive properties of the language itself, the manifestation in the language (and in the process of its study) of the extremely general properties (features) of the objective world, the general laws of the development of nature, society and cognition, as well as linguistic problems, one way or another associated with the solution the main question of philosophy. These are the problems of the nature and essence of language (first of all, its social nature), the relationship between language and thinking, language and society, system and structure in language, its sign character, linguistic meaning, origin, evolution and history of language, idioethnic and universal in language, the emergence and development of the philosophy of language, etc. Philosophical problems of linguistics can be subdivided into 2 cycles: 1) problems of language ontology; 2) the problems of the

principles of the study of language, based on certain theoretical and cognitive attitudes, - the methodological problems of linguistics. The ontological cycle includes, first of all, the problem of the nature and essence of language, understood in an extremely broad sense - as the main means of communication in unity with all specific cases of its implementation (the opposition of language and speech in the spirit of F. de Saussure is only a particular issue within the framework of this complex Problems). Even with such a wide use of the term "language", its interpretation turns out to be ambiguous. First, language is understood as a one-sided, material phenomenon - a system and a set of acts of functioning of material means of communication, which simultaneously serve as a material basis for thinking and some other mental processes in a person. In this case, they talk about language as a material shell of thinking, as a material means

of forming, expressing and communicating thoughts, about language as a special system of connections in the human cerebral cortex (the second signaling system). Secondly, language is recognized as a two-sided, material-ideal phenomenon - a complex unity of many material facts (material means of communication and the formation of thoughts), which together make up language in the first understanding, and a set of ideal facts assigned to them, taken both from the side of the system, in which they enter, and from the side of their functioning in specific processes. In this case, it is spoken of language as the unity of the plane of expression and the plane of content, of language as the "immediate reality of thought" (K. Marx, F. Engels, "German Ideology", pp. 448-449; for a bibliographic description here and below, see. In the work bibliography) and language in the first understanding is considered as a plan of expression. With this use of the term "language", it is possible to talk about the essence of linguistic semantics, about the semantic originality of some languages in comparison with others, about the semantic features of style and other varieties of the same language. It is precisely this understanding of language - as a two-sided, materially ideal phenomenon by its nature - that is characteristic of most Soviet researchers.

Since language is a social phenomenon, its essence is revealed primarily through its relation to society: this relation consists in the fact that, on the one hand, language is a product of social relations (ultimately, social production practice), and on the other - serves to meet the needs of society, language serves it as "the most important means of human communication" (V. I. Lenin, "On the right of nations to self-determination", p. 258). Other aspects of the essence of language are revealed through its relationship to thinking, in the capacity of which it acts as an immediate reality (see Language and thought), through its relationship to the objective world, which consists in the fact that language units from the side of the content plane reflect objects of reality, and from the sides of the expression plan designate them; through intrasystemic relations and connections in the

language itself (see. The linguistic system) and through the opposition and interconnection of the language system as a social fact and its specific speech realizations.

The dialectical-materialistic understanding of the nature and essence of language is incompatible with its interpretation as a purely mental or biological phenomenon, as a mechanical (not associated with consciousness) process or an individual-aesthetic way of expressing the ideal content. The problem of the nature and essence of language is related to the issues of language as a system-structural formation; the degree of independence of the language as a rather complex hierarchical system; about the evolution and development of the language. In accordance with one of the basic provisions of materialist dialectics, it is legitimate to consider language as an integral system, within which all components are interconnected and interdependent. However, it is inappropriate to exaggerate the role of connections and relationships between language units, and sometimes to reduce the units themselves only to bundles of intersection of pure relationships, which is characteristic of relativistic structuralist concepts. The theorist of Danish structuralism (see Glossematics) L. Elmslev believed that "postulating objects as something different from the terms of relations is an unnecessary axiom and, therefore, a metaphysical hypothesis, from which linguistics will have to free itself." In reality, however, the interconnection and interdependence of phenomena does not exclude, but, on the contrary, presupposes the internal specificity of each of them, which cannot be deduced from their relations to other phenomena, from their position in the system. "... The properties of a given thing do not arise from its relation to other things, but only are found in this relation ..." (K. Marx, "Capital", p. 67). "... Relations between things are real relationships arising from the nature of things" (Lenin V. I., "Philosophical notebooks", p. 482) Being in the system, each phenomenon acquires properties that are the result of the interaction of its internal characteristics and the characteristics of other components of the

system, that is, relational, systemic properties that are not reducible to its internal nature, but arising from it. By interacting with their internal characteristics, the components affect the system. Acquiring relational properties under the influence of other components, each component is itself exposed to the system, determined by it.

Solving the problem of the evolution and development of language, most linguists proceed from the fact that language as a product of social relations is ultimately determined in its existence and development by the development of human society, which determines its constant improvement, its progress; certain social types of language (the language of an ethnic group, nationality, nation, literary language, etc.) are also associated with the historical types of the community of people replacing each other in the progressive movement of history.

However, as a qualitatively specific formation that occupies a special place among social phenomena, language also has relative independence in its development and functioning. The specificity and relative independence of the processes taking place in the language is determined by the action of the internal laws of the development and functioning of the language (see. The laws of language development), which underlie the quantitative and qualitative changes taking place in the language. Among these patterns, a special role is played by the dialectical contradiction between the functional purpose of the language and its systemic organization. This contradiction, consisting in the lag of the system due to its stability from the constantly growing functional needs of communication, in the inability of the system means to meet the increased functional needs that arises at a certain stage of development, acts as the main internal factor in the development of the language, the internal source of the changes occurring in it. The foregoing testifies to the need to consider in unity the internal laws of language development and functioning and extralinguistic, primarily social, factors, without which progress in language would be impossible. Considering linguistic progress as

an integral part of the development of society at all historical stages, as a process that captures all aspects of language, Soviet linguistics rejects the narrowed understanding of the progress of language, linking it only with the prehistoric period (romantic-philosophical concepts) or only with limited structural transformations - with the transition from the isolating structure of the word to agglutinateness and from agglutinateness to inflectionalism or from synthetism to analyticism (A. Schleicher, O. Espersen). A special role among philosophical problems of linguistics the question of the symbolic character of linguistic units is at play. Only thanks to the sign of the material side of linguistic units, the conventionality of its connection with the phenomena of the objective world, are abstraction and generalization inherent in thinking possible, since only the lack of similarity of the material side of a language unit with objects allows it to replace a whole class of objects that are significantly different from each other, despite the presence common features, reproducing their single generalized, abstracted reflection (see. Linguistic sign). There is a double approach to this complex problem when it is illuminated from a materialistic standpoint. Linguists, who traditionally call signs only material formations, conditionally replacing objects and transmitting information about them due to a conditional connection with them, recognize a sign character only for the material side of a linguistic unit, considering that the sign of an ideal content means a pure convention of its connection with an object, excludes more or less accurate reflection of the object in consciousness (V.Z.Panfilov, P.V. Chesnokov, V.M. Solntsev, A.S. Melnichuk and others). Linguists who put a different content into the term "sign", namely: a bilateral material-ideal construction, one side conditionally replacing the object, and the other - reflecting it, - consider as a sign the bilateral unit of the language as a whole, in the indissoluble unity of the material and its ideal sides (sounds and meanings), noting at the same time their relative independence from each other and the possibility, as a result, of

changes either one (phonetic change) or another (semantic change) side, or the sign as a whole (G.V. Kolshansky, A. A. Ufimtseva, Yu. S. Stepanov, N. A. Slyusareva and others). In some sign theories of language, the problem is illuminated from the standpoint of idealistic philosophy (see Sign theories of language), which illegally denies the fact of reflection of objective reality in the ideal content reproduced with the help of a sign. The problem of the sign of linguistic units merges with the problem of linguistic meaning, since there can be no linguistic sign without meaning. In the doctrine of meaning, the opposite of materialistic and idealistic approaches is manifested. The materialist concept of meaning is based on Lenin's theory of reflection. With a materialistic interpretation of meaning, the ideal content of a linguistic unit is understood as a reflection of objects and phenomena of objective reality with possible emotional-volitional layers (see Nomination, Connotation), with an idealistic interpretation of meaning, the latter is seen as a pure product of consciousness. The problems of sign and meaning are inextricably linked with the problem of the relationship between language and thinking, language and cognition in general. From the understanding of a linguistic sign as a material unit devoid of similarity with the designated objects, only conditionally correlated with them and therefore capable of replacing a whole class of objects that differ from each other, recreating their single generalized, abstracted epistemological image, the inevitable conclusion follows about the need for linguistic signs (hence, language ) for the implementation of generalized, abstracted thinking, and therefore for human cognition in general. That is why language acts as "the immediate reality of thought", as "practical, existing for other people and only thereby existing for myself, real consciousness" (K. Marx, F. Engels, "German Ideology", p. 448 and 29). The emergence with the help of linguistic signs of generalized and abstracted epistemological images, reflecting only the general and essential features of entire classes of really different things, occurs on the basis of the social production practice of people,

showing the practical equivalence of these things, and therefore their identity in some essential elements inner nature. However, no matter how significant the role of language in the formation and reproduction of logical abstractions, and, consequently, in the cognitive activity of a person as a whole, is, the exaggeration of this role leads to idealism in the teaching of language and cognition. An example of the emergence of an idealistic view of the process of cognition, and through it on social life and the world as a whole as a result of exaggeration (absolutization) of the role of language in the cognitive activity of people, is Neo-Humboldtianism with its two ramifications - European and American (see also Ethnolinguistics, Sapir - Whorf hypothesis ). The main provisions of the neo-Humboldtian concept are as follows: language determines thinking and the process of cognition as a whole, and through it - the culture and social behavior of people, worldview and a holistic picture of the world that arises in consciousness; people speaking different languages perceive the world in different ways, create different pictures of the world, and therefore are carriers of different cultures and different social behavior; the difference in languages also determines the difference in the logical structure of thinking. This concept is based on real linguistic facts - cases of differences in the meaning of individual words and grammatical forms of different languages. However, these semantic differences exist only at the level of isolated linguistic units. Within the framework of the language system as a whole, it is possible to replace the missing units of some areas with units of other areas, and in the speech process such constructions arise, due to which semantic differences between units in language systems are removed. The unity of material practice and the creative nature of speech ensure the unity of the cognitive activity of people speaking different languages, and in this regard, they eliminate the rigid regulation of the social behavior of people by their language. The fallacy of the neo-Humboldtian concept is due to the ignorance of the dialectics of the cognitive and speech process. As for the position on the



differences in the logical structure of the thinking of the speakers of different languages, the basis of its scientific inconsistency is the nondiscrimination of two types of mental forms - logical and semantic.

Logical forms of thinking are universal in their essence and do not depend on the language in which thinking takes place. They are generated by the needs of knowledge and, ultimately, the practical activities of people. Reflecting the extremely general connections and relationships of objective reality itself, logical forms are formed and fixed in the minds of people in the course of centuries of practice. "The practical activity of man billions of times had to lead the human consciousness to the repetition of various logical figures, so that these figures could receive the meaning of axioms" (V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", p. 172). Semantic forms are associated with the specifics of the grammatical structure of languages and therefore are national in nature, however, they can coincide in different languages, but they can be different at different stages of development of one language and even within the same historical section in the same language. The difference in semantic forms does not affect the cognitive capabilities of people, the results of the cognition process. Logical and semantic forms relate to each other as general and separate: logical forms are always realized through specific semantic forms, since "the general exists only in the separate, through the separate" (ibid., P. 318). Logical forms of thinking are embodied in universal grammatical forms (units) of languages. Thus, the concept is manifested in the nominative unit of the language, which combines significant words ("man", "victory"), phrases ("faithful friend", "socialist revolution") and phrasal nominations ("the cause we serve"); a proposition that unites judgment, question and motivation as their varieties is expressed in the formal type of sentence. Semantic forms of thinking are embodied in national linguistic forms. For example, the nominative and ergative types of the sentence structure (see Nominative structure, Ergative structure) are associated with different ways, that is, with different

semantic forms, reflecting the relationship between the subject of the action and the transitional action. The concept of the relationship between the forms of thinking and the forms of language, recognizing the inextricable connection of thought forms with linguistic forms (either with universal or with national ones), is opposed to the doctrine of generative grammar about innate logical structures that precede their linguistic expressions and only through transformations go into syntactic constructions, directly data in the speech stream. Due to the unity of mental and linguistic forms, the imposition of thought forms on visual-sensory material should be simultaneously an imposition of language forms, and, conversely, the imposition of language forms on some ideal content should simultaneously be an imposition of thought forms. The considered philosophical problems of linguistics associated with language as an objectively existing social phenomenon. The range of methodological problems of linguistics, that is, problems associated with the process of learning a language (see Methodology in Linguistics), includes the following: is a language an objective phenomenon, or is it, as a subject of linguistics, formed by the researcher; what are the criteria for the truth of scientific knowledge in the field of linguistics; what is the dialectics of the process of cognition in the science of language, what are the features of linguistic hypotheses, etc. Materialistic linguistics recognizes the subjective-idealistic concept as untenable, according to which language as a subject of linguistics does not exist independently of the researcher, that is, it does not represent an objective phenomenon, but acts only as a construct generated by the process of research itself. The fallacy of this point of view consists in the substitution of the language-object by the metalanguage of linguistics. In contrast to this concept, the doctrine of the objective nature of the existence of language, the objectivity of the laws of its development and functioning, is being developed. With a truly scientific understanding of truth, the truth of a linguistic theory cannot be reduced to logical correctness alone, which is characteristic of

some representatives of structuralism (see Structural linguistics), although logical correctness should be recognized as a necessary condition for truth. The truth of any theoretical propositions of linguistics lies in their correspondence to the objective facts of language, which is ultimately established thanks to practice, which, being a reliable criterion of truth, "breaks into the theory of knowledge itself, giving an objective criterion of truth", and "proves the correspondence of our ideas with objective nature. things that we perceive "(Lenin V. I., "Materialism and empirio-criticism ", pp. 142, 198). The dialectics of the process of cognition in the science of language is characterized by the same features that are inherent in the dialectics of human cognition as a whole. The cognitive process in linguistics is a unity of visual-sensory and rational (logical) reflection, empirical and theoretical knowledge, within the framework of this process, both the ascent from the concrete to the abstract, and from the abstract in thinking to the concrete in thinking are inevitably carried out. The basis of linguistic knowledge, like all human knowledge, is practice. In general, the cognitive process in linguistics is characterized by the well-known statement of V. I. Lenin: "From living contemplation to abstract thinking and from it to practice - this is the dialectical way of cognizing truth, cognizing objective reality" (Philosophical Notebooks, p. 152— 153). The most important feature of the cognitive process in the science of language is inconsistency - its duality, opposition and interaction of different sides, the struggle of opposite tendencies, multistage and multidimensionality.

#### References:

1. K. Marx, Capital, vol. 1, ch. 1 and 3, in the book: K. Marks, F. Engels, Soch., 2nd ed., Vol. 23;
2. K. Marx, F. Engels, German Ideology, ibid., Vol. 3;
3. Smirnitskiy A.I., Objectivity of the existence of language, M., 1954;
4. Elmslev E., Prolegomena to the theory of language, trans. from English, in the book: New in linguistics, in. 1, M., 1960;

5. Abramyan L. A., Gnoseological problems of the theory of signs, Er., 1965;
6. General linguistics. t. 1, Forms of existence, functions, history of language, M., 1970;
7. Panfilov V.Z., The relationship of language and thinking, M., 1971;
8. Budagov R. A., Man and his language, 2nd ed., M., 1976;
9. Solntsev VM, Language as a system-structural education, 2nd ed., M., 1977;
10. F. de Saussure, Course of General Linguistics, in his book: Proceedings of Linguistics, trans. with French., M., 1977;
11. Philosophical foundations of foreign directions in linguistics, M., 1977;