Study on Linguophilosophy of the Past and Present

Sukhrob E. Erkinov

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages Uzbekistan.

E-mail: suhroberkinov628@gmail.com

Abstract

The next work is devoted to the study of the philosophy of language, which is aimed at identifying the characteristic features of the language in general, or a particular language, as well as the word as a linguistic unit. The article discusses how to distinguish between such concepts as linguistic philosophy and the philosophy of language. Thus, linguistic philosophy is aimed at analyzing the problems of philosophy through the study of the semantics of the words of a language through the prism of a logical approach. The purpose of this work: to critically analyze the prevailing opinions, approaches, projects that raise questions of a linguo-philosophical order and require their resolution. Besides, the author gives literary review of famous scientists of old and our time in the field of linguistics, linguophilosophy and linguoculturology. It was also revealed that the philosophy of language is aimed at analyzing the meaning, speech acts, relationships between language units and the language units themselves separately.

Keywords: language and being, linguophilosophy, linguoculturology, cognitive approach, semantics, pragmatics, mathematical linguistics, conventionalistics, concept of eidos.

1. INTRODUCTION

The problems of linguophilosophy, which go back to the analysis of language and being, meaning and knowledge, language and thinking, as eternal categories of life, have never gone unnoticed by either linguists or philosophers. To date, there have been many works related to many issues of a linguo-philosophical nature and covering them from different angles. The purpose of this work: to critically analyze the prevailing opinions, approaches, projects that raise questions of a linguo-philosophical order and require their resolution. This is a kind of study about the linguo-philosophical vision of many issues of the past and the present.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Even in Antiquity, philosophers addressed the most important problems related to language and philosophy. Early philosophers, Stoics, representatives of the Alexandrian period, medieval scholastics, representatives of comparative historical linguistics, philosophers of the twentieth century (when the philosophy of language acquires the status of an independent discipline) - all of them, to one degree or another, left a deep mark on the development of the linguo-philosophical direction.

So, Aristotle is the creator of a coherent logical system, where the patterns of thought construction, their linguistic design are considered in interconnection, based on a system of concepts and a system of statements in their relation to reality [16, 105].

Many questions considered by the philosophy of language, say, how words came to have one meaning or another, go back to ancient times. So, the ancient Greek philosopher Plato in the dialogue "Cratylus" expresses his point of view on this dispute raised by Heraclitus, on the one hand, and Democritus, on the other.

However, this problem has received more detailed coverage in the last two centuries in the works of such philosophers as G. Ryle, B. Russell, L. Wittgenstein, J. Austin, P. Strawson, R. Hare, O. Jespersen and others. Along with this, such problems were raised as psychological concepts in the language, the theory of speech acts, the relationship between logic and grammar, the problems of language and its cognition, etc. were revealed.

The starting point in the emergence of the philosophy of language is associated with the contribution of G. Frege (representative of logical positivism), who dealt with the issue of the relationship between thinking and assertion. He believed that "... sentences express thought as their meaning and have truth values as referents (the conditions under which they are true and the conditions under which they are false)" [16, 107].

G. Frege attributed the representation of facts to the main function of the language and was based on the cognitive approach of visualization of the language. However, his theory has been criticized by many philosophers and linguists. As L. Wittgenstein rightly noted: "... the statement of facts is only one of the many tasks solved by the language, and that the meanings of linguistic units are manifested not in some abstract relations, but in their real use: for a large number of cases, the meaning of a word is the use in language" [6,123].

It is also noteworthy that the distinction between linguistic philosophy and the philosophy of language is often not made. Scientists, first of all, focus their attention on the philosophy of linguistic analysis. Here, the teachings of representatives of analytical philosophy, neo-positivism and logical positivism come to the fore. Moreover, if logisticians are focused on the study of formal languages that are simpler in structure and use the idealization method, then linguists study natural languages that are complex and use empirical methods.

Supporters of another direction - analytical philosophy - believe that only linguistic analysis is the only possible business of philosophy. Moreover, representatives of this school (M. Black, P. Malcolm, G. Ryle, J. Austin, J. Wisdom) gave preference in their studies to colloquial speech, rather than artificially created language, not schemes, but living constructions. Their teaching doomed "research to the empirical description of various types of use of expressions in the language, closed the road to explaining the essence of the language and came, ultimately, to its conventionalist interpretation" [16, 109].

Starting with the research of P. Strawson in the 60s. In the 20th century, there is a turn towards the content side of linguistic philosophy, especially in the field of pragmatics. Let's say this is the illocutionary logic of J. Austin and J. Searle.

In general, the opinion of scientists on the main issues of linguistics from the standpoint of both philosophy and linguistics still causes numerous discussions. For example, this is the relationship between language and thinking, the problem of the origin of language, the superiority of one or another research method, on questions of language units, etc.

One of these debatable problems is the problem associated with the word as the central unit of the language. So, from the position of the linguistic approach, the word will be considered from the point of view of its meaning, and therefore its definition, which consists of numerous semes, will be analyzed here. The philosophical approach, however, brings to the fore the question of the relationship between the word and the concept, it is the latter that will contribute to highlighting the main thing in reality, what distinguishes it from other realities. Both approaches are correct, as they help to see the word both as a symbol that carries information about the reality under

consideration, and as a sign indicating this reality.

At the same time, the concept and meaning also differ in that the first contains a generalized idea of reality, which very rarely changes under the influence of extralinguistic factors (political, economic, cultural, etc.), while the second demonstrates many aspects of reality, and that is capable of change. Thus, the concept enters into the meaning, and the latter changes in accordance with the properties of the concept.

Another important problem of linguophilosophy is connected with the analysis of the relationship between language and being, an eternally vital issue. In the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, "being" is considered as "a category denoting, first of all, existence, being in the world, this being" [25, 56].

So, being is a philosophical category that is reflected in the language. This problem goes back to antiquity. Even Plato and Aristotle raised questions about the relationship between these two principles.

Plato singles out the concept of eidos (the idea of being), which, according to him, is contained in a predicate and is expressed in a verbal-logical form in the form of a judgment. In his monographic study "The Category of Being in Classical Western European Philosophy", the Russian researcher A.L. Dobrokhotov notes: "... for Plato, being is not an ordinary predicate that joins the concept along with many others, but a primary predicate that, by its presence, generates a world of another and, therefore, for the first time separating the essence and its existence." [12, 96].

Another ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle, calling "being" the concept of "existing", notes its diversity and orderliness. The philosopher distinguishes the following definitions of essence: "essence is a separate, single object, essence is a genus, essence is a general, the essence of being a thing, essence is a substratum, or subject." [2].

The difference between the views of the two philosophers on "being" is that Aristotle considers the subject (subject) to be the essence, and Plato takes a different position, considering "being" a predicate of judgment.

It should be noted that the views of German philosophers are of great importance in solving this problem, since it was they who rethought the previous legacy and expressed fresh and rational views. Of course, first of all, these are the views of I. Kant, who reveals the essence of being through empirical reality, sensory experience, i.e. through epistemology. Especially I. Kant considers the modal category - existence. Moreover, the categories of modality, such as: possibility, existence, necessity, contribute to the expression of attitudes towards the process of cognition. I. Kant believes that being "cannot be either a subject or a predicate of a judgment. Being as the positing of a thing or some of its definitions, as a relation, is only a link in a judgment" [13, 799].

If for I. Kant the category of "being" is not fundamental, for Hegel, on the contrary, it is the main one. His understanding of being is close to the views of Aristotle. So, Hegel believes: "Being already in that it is being, generates some abstract field in which this "meager" concept is constantly enriched until it turns into the existence of an absolute personality" [8, 767]. That, being in his theory represents the first and universal subject, which receives a new predicate in the process of its development, and corresponds to the idea.

Later, philosophers of the 20th century saw the solution to the problems of philosophy through the prism of the analysis of language, which accumulates knowledge about the world, nature, man and his needs. Progress in science, the development of semantics, linguistic semiotics, cognitive science, pragmatics, mathematical linguistics and logic have influenced an increase in interest in the philosophical problems of language.

For example, the experience of Edmund Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, who created "scientific teaching" and deals with the peculiarities of human knowledge, is of interest. He is sure that one can perceive the world through one's own consciousness, considering it absolute. "Consciousness," the philosopher notes, "if we consider it "in purity", it should be recognized as a self-contained interconnection of being, namely, the interconnection of absolute being, into which nothing can penetrate and from inside which nothing can slip out" [10, 4]. Language and being are connected through consciousness. In connection with this, the scientist raises the problem of intentionality, arguing that "each word has an "intention of meaning" (direction of a certain sound complex to a specific object)" [11, 74].

In connection with this, the scientist raises the problem of intentionality, arguing that "each word has an "intention of meaning" (direction of a certain sound complex to a specific object)"[11,74].

Of interest in this regard is the contribution of the Russian philosopher A.F. Losev, who repelled in his theory from Neoplatonism, the phenomenological approach and dialectics. He sets out his views in the work "Philosophy of the Name", where he states: "In the word and the name there is a meeting of all possible and conceivable layers of being. Here the quintessence of both human-reasonable and any other human, reasonable and unreasonable being and life is condensed and pumped" [17, 33]. The philosopher believes that the word is a component of being, which is known with the help of thought (mind). However, he believes that one cannot think without words.

True, not all scientists adhere to such an understanding. Let's say that arguments are given of the following order: thinking of a creative nature does not need to be expressed in the form of words. This opinion is shared by a number of world famous scientists: F. Galton, A. Einstein

and others. The similarity of images in our minds is primary in understanding the world around us, and only then, as a result of analysis, these associations are reincarnated into verbal expressions necessary for the communication process.

However, even now in modern works, interest in this problem does not weaken. As rightly noted by I.V. Andreeva: "...our awareness of being is embodied in language. Since the main means of analyzing the essence of the category of being and the way of expressing ideas about being is language (including in philosophy), the necessity of highlighting the linguistic category of being (existence) is substantiated" [1,6].

Language is considered by philosophers from the point of view of its origin, its main and secondary functions, its essence is revealed.

In our opinion, the article by V.A. Vasiliev "Linguistic turn in philosophy" [4, 172-181], which raises questions about the essence of language in general, as well as the reasons for the appearance of the linguistic orientation of philosophical science, associated with its immanent development and social influence. Noting that the linguo-philosophical approach is already observed in the ancient world, the author at the same time emphasizes that language has become an independent object of research since the second half of the 19th century, when intercultural ties intensified on a global scale, communication needs in a particular society increased, and such sciences as psychology, sociology, cultural studies, etc. And thanks to the integration process, such disciplines as hermeneutics, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, psycholinguistics, etc. Philosophical schools were formed, say, existential, analytical, which set themselves the task of considering the language from the position of philosophy, considering questions of thinking, the essence of the concept, etc.

It is noteworthy that the author identifies the following main stages in the formation

and development of linguistic philosophy. Stage 1 - these are the studies of B. Russell and L. Wittgenstein, who raised questions of logic, thinking and language in interconnection with each other. So, in order to avoid paradoxical statements, they proposed to analyze the language from the standpoint of logic. For example, B. Russell, as a philosopher, logician and mathematician, argued that "the Universe is not monistic, but diverse, consists of separate objects-facts. They are reflected in the language, in words, sentences. Facts can be simple (atomic) or complex (molecular). Everything complex is made up of something simple. Our sentences are built in the same way: simple and complex" [4, 178].

L. Wittgenstein rightly emphasized that "each sentence is a sign expression of a fact, and the order of words in it depicts the order of various facts. Scientific language can only express the facts of experience" [6, 439]. In the late period of his activity, he moves away from logistical anatomy and takes the position of a communicative approach to language with special attention to the semantic side of the language and the contradictions that arise in this area and the conventionality inherent in the language, when "the meaning of a word is determined by generally accepted indications of its use" [6].

Stage 2 is represented by the activities of the "Vienna Circle", based on a logical approach to the language and its semantic side. A prominent representative of this trend, M. Schlick, in his work "A Turn in Philosophy" emphasizes that "everything that can be expressed by language is knowable. There are no questions that, in principle, cannot be answered". Calling philosophy the queen of sciences, he believes that it allows propositions to be explained, but it is with the help of science that propositions are verified (verified). He was able to reveal this idea in detail in his work "The General Theory of Knowledge". M. Schlick argues that the

idea that we have can be both true and false. But the essence lies elsewhere, namely: in the meaningfulness of statements, in their modeling and representability. However, this concept had both supporters and opponents. It was called into question "the possibility of verifying all the facts of experience, statements about them, expressed by language." And yet the problem of "logical analysis of linguistic expressions" remained. Philosophy is assigned critical-analytical activity to clarify the meaning, meaning of words, sentences that claim to be true" [4,179].

Stage 3 is associated with the activities of the English researchers J. Austin, G. Ryle, P. Strawson, as well as the work of American scientists M. Black, N. Malcolm, who rely on antinomies in semantics, namely: "the task was to philosophically defend common sense, analysis of natural language phrases, sometimes misleading due to their different semantic interpretations" [18, 54].

The explanation of linguistic paradoxes is connected with the spontaneity observed in the nature of the language, the peculiarities of grammar, but not always with the "ambiguity of the forms of expressions"[18]. Through the context in the process of communication, misconceptions and "linguistic traps" are eliminated. As J. Austin rightly notes in his work "Word as Action", objectivity is achieved through the analysis of the word not as a separate unit, but its place in a specific sentence structure.

J. Austin also raises the issue of ambiguity, when "one word can mean different content, which can also lead away from the truth" [18, 67].

The creator of the theory of speech acts, John Rogers Searle, referring to the philosophy of language, made a clear difference between it and linguistic philosophy. He noted that "the philosophy of language is an independent philosophical discipline, the scope of

which should include the study of phenomena associated with the language as such (and not this or that specific language)" In other words, if, according to the figurative definition of J. Searle, the philosophy of language is this is "the name of the object of study, the title of the topic within philosophy, then linguistic philosophy is, first of all, the name of the philosophical method" [21, 6].

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A special place in the development of linguistic philosophy is occupied by the problem of the existential-hermeneutic approach (the foundation of modern philosophical hermeneutics - the science of interpreting texts - was laid by F. Schleiermacher), whose supporters are M. Heidegger and H.G. Gadamer. Representatives of this direction are repelled in their theory from the teachings of the German linguist and philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt, based on the cultural and historical features of the language. "There will be no vicious circle if languages are considered a product of the power of the national spirit and at the same time try to understand the spirit of the people through the construction of the languages themselves: since each specific spiritual force develops through the language and only based on it, then it cannot have a different design, except as a linguistic one" [9, 11].

The views of Martin Heidegger are reduced to the consideration of the language of living semantic activity, "a reflection of the individual and general cultural, national." All the work of the philosopher Martin Heidegger is permeated with the knowledge of the essence of being, which he reduced to human existence. Heidegger, like a true philosopher, addresses language, remarking: "Language is the house of being." And you only need to learn to "listen" to the language, you need to let it speak in order to hear the "voice of being"

[26, 134]. The philosopher believes that people retain "being" in the language, that you need to be able to hear the voice of being, listening to the language.

In the work "Truth and Method" H.G. Gadamer focuses on three main linguistic features. Firstly, reliance on linguoculturological traditions, as well as on the mentality of those who speak the language and use it in speech; secondly, the meaningfulness of speech; thirdly, the universality of the language [7, 704]. Starting from the interpretation of texts, he comes to the self-knowledge of man and human existence. As a result, language in its oral and written form becomes the main subject of analysis in hermeneutics. Thus, reality is known through language. The scientist believes: "Understanding is not based at all on attempts to put oneself in the place of another or to show direct participation in him. To understand what the other is telling us means to come to an understanding as far as the essence of the matter is concerned. Now we pay attention to the fact that this whole process is linguistic. It is not for nothing that one's own problems of understanding, an attempt to master understanding as an art - and this is the theme of hermeneutics - traditionally belongs to the sphere of grammar and rhetoric. Language is the environment in which the process of mutual negotiation of interlocutors takes place and mutual understanding is gained about the matter itself " [7, 446-447]. This suggests the conclusion that philosophy can consider "being" through those aspects that can be interpreted by language.

Linguo-philosophers of the past made a huge contribution to the study of language from the standpoint of logic through analytical and existential-hermeneutic approaches. The turn of philosophy into linguistics is connected both with the internal structure of the language as a whole, and is dictated by the needs of science, social needs, cultural and national characteristics. Language and thinking help people to know the world and

participate in an active process of communication.

In this regard, the article of the Russian scientist S.A. Pesina on the specifics of philosophical and linguistic approaches to the central problems of language. It clearly distinguishes between the concepts of linguistic philosophy and the philosophy of language. At the same time, S.A. Pesina rightly notes: "Linguistic philosophy studies philosophical problems by analyzing the meanings of words in natural languages and the logical relationships between them. The philosophy of language makes it possible to identify and evaluate the essential characteristics of language and words" [20]. It is especially important that the work raises issues of a debatable nature. These are, say, differences in approaches to the study of the central concept of linguistics - the word - among representatives of the philosophy of language and linguistics.

So, in countries where the problem of bilingualism and more widely (multilingualism) is vital, the issues of bilingualism are of concern to the state, and politicians, and linguists. This is the problem of all the people living in this territory. In this regard, the problem raised by E.B. Taskayeva in her work "Bilingualism through the prism of philosophical reflection" [23, 171-181]. It is known that when interacting, many ethnic groups are forced to become multilingual (they use at least two or more languages in practice). The researcher cites the opinions of many linguists, sometimes contradictory, on the issue raised by her. E.B. Taskaeva relies on a psychological approach. Here, first of all, the nature of bilingualism is considered, indicators of assessing the level of proficiency in a particular language are identified. Moreover, some linguists "consider bilingualism the minimum competence in one of the basic language skills - listening, speaking, reading or writing, while others support the idea of bilingualism as the ability to freely operate in two different languages" [23, 171-181]. In the work from the position of philosophy, namely: starting from the views of the logical direction, an analysis is given of the possibilities and abilities of the speakers of the two languages to think in them and operate both equally. After all, language is a unique means of facilitating the transmission of our thinking and, at the same time, "the only possible form of the emergence of thought itself" [23,171]. If a person is able to think in a non-native language, then he is bilingual. It is able to automatically construct sentences in two languages.

E.B. Taskaeva believes that "an appeal to philosophical methodology forms the prerequisites for clarifying and developing approaches to understanding the linguistic phenomenon in its essence - bilingualism" [23,176].

There are many languages in the world, and naturally there are difficulties in the communication process associated with multiculturalism, migration processes, etc. Therefore, the phenomenon of bilingualism arises, multilinguals appear who speak several languages, for example, in China, India, a network of dialects is very developed, in the USA there are different nations that speak not only English, but also their native language, say, in everyday life, the population of Russia speaks not only in Russian, but also in their national language.

O.S. Akhmanova in the "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" gives such a definition to the term bilingualism - "the same as bilingualism" [3,67]. In the dictionary entry, bilingualism is given a more detailed interpretation: "*eng.* bilingualism, *fr.* bilinguisme, *ger.* Zweisprachigkeit, *span.* bilingüismo. Equally perfect command of both languages; knowledge of two languages used in different communication conditions, for example. Native dialect and literary language (*fr.* diglossie); cf. multilingualism (in 1 meaning), monolingualism" [3, 125]. In explanatory dictionaries, say, in Webster's

dictionary, the term bilingual "denotes a person who can speak fluently two different languages" [34].

Many researchers approach the definition of this term in different ways. For example, L. Bloomfield in his book "Language" relies on the interpretation given above, but believes that it is objectively difficult to establish how fluent a person is in another language [27, 56]. The opposite opinion belongs to the psychologist J. McNamara. He considers "bilinguals are all those who have minimal competence in one of the basic language skills - listening, speaking, reading or writing" [31, 58-77]. Still others believe that a functional approach is needed in the correct interpretation of bilingualism, reliance on cognition and communication [29, 276; 30, 458]. By the way, from the point of view of psychology and neurolinguistics, the phenomenon of bilingualism relies on language codes, when a bilingual is able to switch completely to another language or uses words, phraseological units, proverbs, sayings of a non-native language for him. Moreover, not only the term bilingualism is widely used, say, relative to the language community, but also bilingualism (individual bilingualism). The areas of application of two languages (at work, in conversation with friends, in the family circle) are called domains. Complementarity (complimentarity) comes to the fore here [28, 117-130].

O. Garcia's theory is based on two principles that reveal the mechanism of operating with two languages in the practice of bilinguals. According to the first principle, such individuals have two systems of language in their minds and alternately address them. Regarding the second principle, it can be assumed that in the mind of a bilingual there is a single integrated system of language. Now the study of a foreign language cannot be based on the old methods. To date, studies related to neurolinguistics, based on the processes occurring in the human brain (neuroplasticity, adaptation to the active use of two language systems) are extremely relevant [28,55].

Philosophers and linguists consider one of the main functions of the language to be the function of creating a picture of the world or the "orienting" function. This term is used by the linguist E.S. Kubryakova, who believes that the main task of language as a system of signs is the objectification of information coming to a person from outside, as well as providing all types of information activity [14,37]. In the article "In Search of the Essence of Language" E.S. Kubryakova defines language as "a means of access to mental, mental, intellectual activity internalized in the head (brain) of a person" [14, 69].

Ludwig Wittgenstein, who belongs to the direction of analytical philosophy, offers his point of view on the process of expressing the same meaning by a person through the use of different languages. In his seminal book Philosophical Investigations, he emphasizes that the mental processes associated with understanding and meaning occur with the help of language, namely: language induces such processes [35, 322]. According to him, thought is expressed through words, and language, in turn, is based on thought [35,383-384].

L. Wittgenstein attributed the sentence to the main semantic unit of the language. The word, however, can be polysemantic, and therefore its true meaning is revealed only in the sentence. The scientist cites the fact that two sentences belonging to different languages can have the same meaning. He figuratively gives an example of a shadow, the source of which is a certain fact of reality. Moreover, the sentence represents this shadow, and "the mental experience that accompanies the use of a linguistic sign is mediated by the use of this sign in a particular language system" [35, 232].

Wittgenstein's thoughts on this issue are similar to the ideas of the American philosopher Willard Quine, who in his

work "Word and Object" analyzes the process of children learning the mother's language. The environment itself controls the correctness of children's speech. By the way, Willard Quine also believes that the basic unit of meaning in language is the sentence. With age, children already build their sentences according to the model they have learned earlier. Moreover, children remember words precisely in context [32, 13].

The question of the relationship between language and thinking has always occupied both linguists and philosophers. However, its essence lies in the fact that approaches to this problem are different. So, linguists argue that the main function of language is communicative, at the same time, philosophers prefer to talk about the importance of the thought-forming function of language (language expresses a thought, transmits and forms it).

Most philosophical positions on the issue of language and thinking boil down to the fact that thought is expressed only in language. Let's say they are representatives of analytical philosophy. In this regard, the views on this issue of the British philosopher Bertrand Russell, presented by him in his book "Human knowledge: its scope and boundaries", are of interest. He argued that important language functions are, "firstly, the expression of a person's own thoughts and emotions and, secondly, interpersonal communication" [33, 72-74].

The question of the relationship between language and philosophy is considered from the position of cultural studies in the work of the Russian researcher E.A. Tinyakova "Problems of language as a cultural axis in the history of philosophy". Its author states: "Gradually, the study of human language is increasingly clothed in cultural conclusions. In modern philosophy of the 19th and 20th centuries, the culturological significance of language learning is associated with logical and semiotic approaches to language, the theory of symbolic forms, the theory of values, the philosophical analysis of the

information process, phenomenological philosophy, existentialism, hermeneutics, and structuralism" [24]. Philosophy was the basis for explaining the most important skeletons of the world with the help of language. Through philosophical texts, a picture was formed of the reflection in them of a person's knowledge of reality. Starting from the linguistic monuments of Antiquity, we learn about the life of a person, his attitude towards his own kind, towards nature, towards the meaning of life, etc. Abstract thinking was formed. People could no longer limit themselves to cognition and naming only a single reality, whether it be an object, its attribute or action), they found correspondences between similar realities and faced the need to generate words that have a generalized meaning. Quantity gave rise to a new quality. People appeared in society who skillfully used the language, expressed their opinion about the universe. They were philosophers.

Thus, the sophists (ancient Greek enlighteners) used the means of language in order to prove the truth of their reasoning. For example, Protagoras operated with such logical terms as proof, argumentation, annulment, contradiction. Another representative of sophistry - George - believed that with the help of the word one can convince, inspire, and that it has aesthetic value.

Another great philosopher - Plato - was engaged in dialogue, drew attention to the negative aspects associated with the ability to hide the truth behind a beautiful shell of words (verbal manipulations) and, as a result, lead a person to a false statement, to an illusion. Aristotle managed to reveal the true meaning of the word through the language itself, using definitions, a logical approach.

Religious interpretation of the origin, development and features of the language is noted in the Middle Ages. It was claimed that God endowed people with language. For example, the philosopher Bonaventure argued that knowledge of the

world is possible only through God, but not with the help of language. Therefore, he called for a person to think about God, the Holy Spirit.

However, there were also philosophers who had their own advanced ideas. For example, these are representatives of the Chartres school, who in the 9th-12th centuries sought to comprehend the relationship that develops between the name and the thing, based on grammar. So, John of Salisbury believed that grammar is the cradle of philosophy. Pierre Abelard implemented the method of historical-linguistic text analysis. He argued that the meaning of a word can change, considered the phenomenon of polysemy, variability of words. Also interesting are the views of the medieval philosopher W. Ockham, who lived in the 11th century, who focused on the study of three types of informative terms: 1) a mental term; 2) the spoken word; and 3) the written word. In his teaching, the foundations of the science of context, contextual meaning, and symbolic logic are laid.

And although religious scholastic dogmas prevail in the linguistic philosophy of the medieval period, nevertheless, interest in the grammatical beginning in the language, vocabulary and the emergence of new words and meanings begins to appear and occupy scientists. Their views are directed to logic, which had the goal of "giving clarity to the language and realizing cognitive intentions", to the Latin language, which "was considered the highest level of rationality in fixing meanings about the surrounding reality", to the formation and study of mental structures.

With the onset of the Renaissance, the translation trend flourished, studies of the national characteristics of the native language were carried out, its status in the world increased, and these problems gained even greater scope in modern times. The latter focuses on questions revealing the importance of language in the development of science. Numerous

experiments, the search for truth can be traced in the pre-Humboldtian period in the work of F. Bacon, who proposes to test knowledge with the help of an experiment, T. Hobbes, who deals with philosophical ethics and considers the positive and negative meanings of words, J. Berkeley, who analyzes the emotional and intellectual as two interrelated linguistic sphere and dealing with the "language of nature", J. Locke analyzing the word from the standpoint of the universal, general and singular, i.e. through the prism of philosophical categories. By the New Age, the philosophy of language and linguistics are already taking shape, having points of contact in the study of the semantic principle from the standpoint of logical perception. So, in the Universal Universal Rational Grammar, also known as the grammar of Port-Royal, its authors Claude Lanslo and Antoine Arnault set the task of finding the main "logical structures in the functioning of human consciousness in the historical development of the language as a whole, and not on the material of one specific language"[24].

We should especially emphasize the contribution of the Italian philosopher G. Vico, who promotes scientific research based on the unity of philosophy and linguistics, and who argued that "philosophy without philology is empty, and philology without philosophy is blind" [5, 628]. The scientist analyzed national languages, also put forward the concept of a "common language", dealt with questions of thinking, created the prerequisites for the study of linguistic universals, and brought to attention his theory of three periods in the development of a language. It is the language of the gods, the language of the heroes, and the language of the mind.

The Age of Enlightenment had its own characteristics, namely: translation and encyclopedic work was carried out, knowledge of various sciences was systematized using the language, i.e. the practice of life dictated the corresponding

practical functions that the language performed at that time. The activity of the philosopher Condillac stands out in particular. Wed his works: "Grammar", "The Art of Speaking", "The Art of Thinking", "The Art of Writing", which speak for themselves. He relies in his writings on sensations, on the basis of which linguistic concepts are built. Romanticism also brings innovation: firstly, the circle of language researchers is expanding at the expense of writers and poets (cf. secondly, chanting through the language of nature and the idea of pure beauty. So, the representative of the "Storm and Onslaught" movement I.G. Herder in his work "Treatment on the source of language" believes that the main function of language is to be the creator of culture.

The great German linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt, the founder of general linguistics, made a perfectly fair remark that "language is the spirit of the people, and the spirit of the people is its language." The scientist highlights national self-consciousness. At the same time, he emphasized that common universal laws are inherent in different languages. In the teachings of the German philosopher and linguist, his reasoning about language, which acts as a means by which reality is known, is highlighted, in other words, language makes predictions in cognition.

A big step in the development of linguistic philosophy was the contribution made in the field of comparative historical study of languages by the German linguists F. Bopp, J. Grimm, the Danish linguists R. Rask and J. Bredsdorf, as well as the Russian researcher A.Kh. Vostokov.

And now in modern linguo-philosophical science many of the global problems mentioned above continue to be investigated. As the Russian scientist Boris Narumov rightly noted in his work "Language" of Linguistics and "Language" of Philosophy: "Now it is customary to talk about the ecology not only of the environment, but also of language, information space; Isn't it time to think about the ecology of thought: after all, thinking, especially philosophical, is capable of turning the world upside down"[19,221].

4.   CONCLUSION

Philosophy has had and continues to have a huge impact on the understanding of the subject of linguistics. It is the methodological basis for linguistics.

It is philosophy that contributes to the correct construction of the paradigm of linguistic categorical systems, as well as the formulation of universal linguistic laws and grammatical foundations. Through philosophy, one can comprehend the processes taking place in the minds of speakers, explain deviations from the norm of use at the phonetic, morphological, syntactic, stylistic levels, perceive neologisms that arise in the language, etc.

It is necessary to distinguish between such concepts as linguistic philosophy and the philosophy of language. Thus, linguistic philosophy is aimed at analyzing the problems of philosophy through the study of the semantics of the words of a language through the prism of a logical approach. Philosophy acts as a method of research, and this or that language becomes the material of analysis.

The philosophy of language is aimed at identifying the characteristic features of the language in general or a particular language, as well as the word as a linguistic unit. It is aimed at analyzing the meaning, speech acts, relationships between language units and the language units themselves separately. However, despite the existing differences between linguistic philosophy and the philosophy of language, they are interconnected with each other. For example, in the field of methods, linguophilosophers start from the philosophy of language when analyzing language. At the same time, the philosophy of language is based on the foundations of the language in the field of

phonology, lexicology, morphology, syntax, stylistics, derivatology, etc.

Different opinions, different approaches to considering even the same phenomena do not detract from, but, on the contrary, demonstrate the richness and depth of scientific research. For example, logisticians pay more attention to the analysis of formal languages, and linguists focus on the study of natural languages, representatives of analytical philosophy proclaim the primacy of the study of colloquial speech. At the same time, in terms of methods and their use, logisticians prefer idealization methods, linguists prefer empirical methods, and supporters of analytical philosophy use only linguistic analysis.

One of the most important issues of linguistic philosophy is the problem of the relationship between being and language, which arose in ancient Greek philosophy, but continues to excite people at the present stage. It is known that being is a category of philosophy associated with the existence and consciousness of a person, and therefore this is the central problem of this science. Language appears here, firstly, as a means used to analyze the problem of being and its essence, and secondly, as a means of expression.

In modern science, a question of this order finds its solution based on pragmatic, psycholinguistic and functional principles.

And if the relationship between being and language is an old, eternal problem that seeks its solution in new approaches, then bilingualism (polylingualism) acts as a new problem that has not received an unambiguous interpretation, but is also of considerable interest to linguists, philosophers, and psychologists, and for neuroscientists, and for sociologists. This problem acquires a special perspective from its consideration through the prism of a philosophical approach. We adhere to the definition of bilingualism as the ability of a person to use alternately different systems of language for the purpose of communication and use in the process of thinking.

It is noted that the problems of language and culture in the history of philosophy can be traced from the position of how language affects culture, and, conversely, how culture makes its own adjustments to the language.

5. REFERENCES

1. Andreeva I.V. On the correlation of the categories "Language" and "Being" in philosophy//Language and culture. - 2015 - No. 2 (30). - P.6-15.
2. Aristotle. Works: in 4 volumes (Series "Philosophical Heritage"). - M .: Thought, 1975-1983.
3. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. - M., 1969.
4. Vasiliev V.A. Linguistic turn in philosophy // Bulletin of the Moscow State Linguistic University. Philosophical sciences. - 2017. - No. 1 (768). - P.172-181.
5. Vico J. Foundations of a new science of the general nature of nations. - M., 1994. - 628s.
6. Wittgenstein L. Logico-philosophical treatise. - M.: AST - 2018. - 354 p.
7. Gadamer H. G. Truth and method. Fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics. – M.: Progress, 1988. – 704 p.
8. Hegel G.V. Phenomenology of the Spirit. - M.: Academic Project, 2008. - 767 p.
9. Humboldt V. Selected works on linguistics. - M.: Progress, 1984. - 400 p.
10. Husserl E. Ideas of pure phenomenology. - M.: AST, 1994. - 540 p.
11. Husserl E. Logical research. Cartesian reflections. The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology. – Minsk: Harvest; Moscow: AST, 2000. - 743 p.

12. Dobrokhotov A.L. The category of being in classical Western European philosophy. - M .: Publishing House of Moscow. un-ta, 1986. - 248 p.

13. Kant I. Works in six volumes. - M., 1964. - T. 3. - 799 p.

14. Kubryakova E.S. In Search of the Essence of Language: Cognitive Studies. – M.: Znak, 2012. – 208 p.

15. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. - 685 p.

16. Logacheva E.P. On the prototypes of grammatical terms in the "Organon" of Aristotle // Problems of Linguistics. - M., 1985. - No. 5. - P.104-110.

17. Losev A.F. Name philosophy. - M .: Publishing House of Moscow. un-ta, 1990. - 269 p.

18. Austin J. Word as action // New in foreign linguistics. Issue. 17. - M.: Progress, 1986. - 120 p.

19. Narumov B.P. "Language" of Linguistics and "Language" of Philosophy" // Journal "Logos", 1999. - 221 p.

20. Pesina S.A. Specificity of philosophical and linguistic approaches to the central problems of the language // Bulletin of the Adyghe State University, 2011. - No. 4.

21. Searle J. Introduction // Philosophy of language. - 2nd ed. - M.: Editorial URSS, 2010. - 208 p.

22. Taskaeva E.B. Multilingualism in the modern world: cultural traditions and directions of research // Bulletin of the Siberian State University of Communications: Humanitarian Studies. - 2017. - No. 2. - P. 50–57.

23. Taskaeva E.B. Bilingualism through the prism of philosophical reflection // Ideas and ideals. - Novosibirsk, 2018. - No. 3, v. 1. - P. 171–181.

24. Tinyakova E.A. Problems of language as a cultural axis in the history of philosophy // Analytics of cultural studies - M., 2013. No. 27- cyberleninka.ru

25. Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary / ch. edition: L.F. Ilyichev, P.N. Fedoseev, S.M. Kovalev, V.G. Panov. – M.: Sov. Encyclopedia, 1983. - 840 p.

26. Heidegger M. Time and being. – M.: Respublika, 1993. – 447 p.

27. Bloomfield L. Language. – London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935. – 566 p.

28. Garcia O, Lin A.M.Y. Translanguaging in bilingual education // Bilingual and Multilingual Education / O. Garcia, A.M.Y. Lin (eds.). – 3rd ed. – Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2017. – P. 117–130. – (Encyclopedia of Language and Education).

29. Grosjean F. Bilingual: life and reality. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010. – 276 p.

30. Hamers J., Blanc M. Bilinguality and bilingualism. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 458 p.

31. Macnamara J. The bilingual's linguistic performance — a psychological overview // Journal of Social Issues. – 1967. – Vol. 23, iss. 2. – P. 58–77.

32. Quine W. Word and object. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. – 314 p.

33. Russell B. Human knowledge: its scope and limits. – London: George Allen and Unwin, 1998. – 538 p.

34. Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. Second College Edition. New York: - Simon and Schuster, 1982.

35. Wittgenstein L. Philosophical investigations. – Oxford: Blackwell Publ., 2009. – 322 p.