



PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LINGUISTIC REFLECTION OF THE WORLD

Akbarova Zukhro Akmalzhanovna

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Dean of the Faculty of Preschool and Primary Education,
Fergana State University

DISCUSSION

In the textual and philosophical paradigm of language, the understanding of 'self' and the understanding of 'other' are closely related to the perception of subject and object in philosophy. The contrast between subject and object in philosophy applies to all its branches, but this is especially important in epistemology: the subject of knowledge is man, and the object of knowledge is the world around him. Objective information is information that, in the subject's opinion, directly reflects the properties of the object, and subjective information comes only from the subject's consciousness. Some philosophical concepts believe that all information in the subject's mind is subjective (solipsism, Kant's theory), Plato considers most of the information subjective, but it is related to the object and can be mainly objective, some concepts (empiricism, positivism, rationalism) based and objective view.

The emergence of philosophy is the first attempt by mythological consciousness to objectively explain the world without resorting to animism. The first attempts to determine the cause-and-effect relationship also exist in myth, but myth does not separate the natural world from the human world, in fact these two worlds are incompatible. The first attempts to understand the world as a chain of cause-and-effect relationships were made in the form of describing the actions of different characters who were heroes, people, at the bottom of the mythological consciousness. Moreover, the mythological consciousness began to go backwards as knowledge about the visible and perceived world expanded.

Mythological consciousness is distinguished by animism and hylozoism, i.e., attempts to find an explanation for all natural phenomena arising from their living essence. Weather events are perceived as quarrels of the gods or their reconciliation, various cataclysms are perceived as a result of the actions of people who angered the gods, and so on. Moreover, the mythological consciousness, as a rule, sees a primordial causal relationship without trying to look

for several different causes for the same reasons. In the mythological world, man is dependent, submissive, and in practice has no free will.

The emergence of philosophy is associated with ancient Greece: a period known as the "Greek miracle". This term refers to the period in the history of the country when culture, science and philosophy suddenly began to develop rapidly in politics for no apparent reason. The most effective environment for the development of philosophy turned out to be a policy adopted by democratic governance - in which all ideas were discussed together by the citizens of politics and there was an opportunity to defend and debate their views.

The first philosophers - the "wise men" - were not experts in any particular science: they had the ability to speak and write on any subject, because different sciences were a kind of synthesis. The philosopher was interested in the structure of the universe in general: for example, the early ancient philosophers tried to answer the question of the origin of everything - fire, air or water, to know matter, to answer important social and cultural questions. Philosophy itself was formed as an independent study only in the Enlightenment: a person who had previously considered himself a philosopher could in one way or another come to different philosophical concepts by dealing with other sciences and generalizing their experiences.

Sophia is the understanding of philosophy as wisdom, philosophy as a wise prophet. Episteme is the acceptance of philosophical knowledge as a way of knowing the world and answering all epistemological questions. Techné is the ability and skill to accept philosophy as an art, to study the world, and to make laws. Philosophical knowledge includes ontology (the science of existence), gnoseology (the science of the study of knowledge), epistemology (the science of knowledge), and partial semiotics (the science of symptoms).

The acceptance of one person as another is based on belonging to one of two opposing paradigms: scientism or anti-scientism. These two



terms refer to the opposite tendencies in philosophy: the recognition of science as the basic and all-encompassing way of knowing (scientism) and the such rejection of science (anti-scientism). In the second half of the twentieth century, Scientism prevailed, during which time positivists emerged who called for the analysis of what was given only in direct experience. anti-scientism is clearly manifested in early Christian philosophy (Tertullian - "I believe because it is nonsense") and in the late Middle Ages (Nicholas of Cusa's "About learned ignorance" treatise), where knowledge is the opposite of faith: knowledge cannot cover everything, but faith is able to do this.

In the ancient world, philosophy was understood as the "science of all sciences" and generalized and combined their experiences. In the modern world, when a philosopher cannot physically gather all the knowledge of all the sciences, philosophy plays the role of generalizing personal experience. Man's philosophical understanding speaks of the role of the writer's human experience in the concept he creates: the philosopher is not 100% objective, but he must not achieve this goal: his concept is as interesting as the generalization and objectification of his experience.

In the classical strategy of philosophy, the philosopher seeks to find explanations for different phenomena of the world - the philosopher assumed that he thought of them as a "science of science" to combine different theories and ideas and develop some general ideas based on their analysis. In the future, philosophy acquired the value of a worldview and began to function as a concept that helped man explain the world for himself - it became a set of paradigms to explain the chosen world, rather than a single correct concept. Moreover, in post-classical strategy, the philosophical text is perceived as the opposite point of different texts and the point of intersection of the interactions of different events, which allowed us to think in categories of postmodernism and see various previous trends forming synergies in it.

Plato spoke of essences or patterns - the so-called ideal *eidos* and the things that exist among people are only vague copies of this *eidos*. *Eidos* are located in a "smart place" outside of our planet, and you have to leave the body (die or go into a trance) to see them. The debate about universals was also about the essence of things - but they were called universal and real (realists, for example, Anselm of Canterbury) or just names (nominalists, for example, the Champagne Carpet).

Originally, the word "metaphysics" was referred to as Aristotle's works on existence and was conveyed by the librarian after the treatise "meta" - "physics". Later, metaphysics began to call for various theories that implied a transcendental explanation of reality, involving the interference of

"higher" beings. The closure of metaphysics should therefore be seen as an achievement of science in the New Age, as many events that had no previous explanation received a sound scientific explanation and ceased to be a mystery to their participants.

Philosophical thought often finds expression in reality in very ugly forms that were not conceived by its creator.

Michel Foucault [1] talks about science as a set of typical situations. In such cases, a set of texts called speech, which is multiplied according to the situation, is used. We can talk about a set of medical speeches, a set of social speeches that arise as a result of the accumulation of certain situations. These common cases constitute the methodology of the humanities, in contrast to the empirically based sciences.

Martin Heidegger [1] says the truth is no secret: the information that is open to the world is what is known, what is understood. However, concealment is not possible without concealment: concealment is dialectically opposed to concealment. Concealment can only be worthwhile as opposed to concealment, so both sides are part of a whole - the truth.

As categories of the concept of world, space and time have always been in the field of philosophers' views, but initially they were considered important (e.g., ancient and medieval philosophers assumed that our ideas about time and space were based on objective truth), then they talked about their relativity (and Kant points out [1] that these are the two main categories that contribute to understanding the world and turning the noumen into an event) to complete relativity in Hum and Berkeley solipsism (there is no space and time, they are determined by our consciousness).

Movement in philosophy is any change; change for the better is development. Development can be the result of creationism - creation, emanation - gradually decreasing radiation, preformism - change of forms and composition, emergentism - spontaneous emergence, evolutionism - the result of gradual change. Progress means progress, regression worsens. Agnosticism claims that the world cannot be known.

Solipsists (Berkeley, Hume [1]) argue that the world is fundamentally incomprehensible, and that everything man sensibly perceives is only a product of his consciousness. In the past, Kant spoke of the opposite of something similar and in the familiar form of something - noumen and phenomenon, respectively. Even before that, Nikolai Kuzansky spoke of scientific ignorance - God can only be known by a lack of knowledge about him, by knowing about something that is not clear.

In philosophical understanding, which is reflected in the linguistic representation of the world, self-awareness is inextricably linked with self-



awareness as opposed to “not yourself,” that is, the perception of the boundary between oneself and the world around one.

The world is recognized on the basis of emotional experience and its objectification: empiricism assumes that we derive all knowledge from experience, rationalism relies on the human mind and its objectivity. The disadvantages of these currents are that perception can be disrupted under the influence of various factors; moreover, the individual may not have sufficient experience and knowledge to understand certain phenomena. John Locke was an empiricist who believed that man is born with a “clean board” and that everything in it is shaped by experience, while the rationalist Rene Descartes said, “I think, so I exist.” [1]

Aprior knowledge is something inherent in human birth, aposterior is acquired in the process of gaining experience. John Locke believed that a priori knowledge does not exist in man, his opponent Gottfried Leibniz considered that a priori knowledge exists. In modern science, there is a universal concept of language, which means that ideas about the world conditioned by language are similar in all people in general (N. Chomsky).

The linguistic shift is a phenomenon in twentieth-century philosophy that involves the study of philosophical phenomena from a linguistic point of view. This is Husserl’s [1] phenomenology, which refers to the ingenuity of the universe through metaphor, Wittgenstein’s theory based on the usual repetitive texts, Heidegger’s ideas [1] about the manifestation of truth through linguistic means. The second stage of the linguistic revolution in the middle of the twentieth century was a change in linguistics, in particular the emergence of Chomsky’s generative grammar, which explains the origin of language rather than ready-made phrases.

Language reflects reality not objectively, but through the prism of its categories: therefore, speakers of different languages see the world differently. This was first noticed by linguist Edward Sapir and fire safety engineer Benjamin Whorf [1] (the second came to study the language after he noticed that people were smoking quietly next to empty petrol barrels, as they say “empty” is more dangerous than filled ones). It has become customary to combine their independent but parallel work into a theory of linguistic relativity, according to which each language imposes a certain perception on its carrier of the universe. Speech theory applies to structuralism, which means that a person is bound not only by the coordinates of understanding a particular language, but also by a particular situation in which someone is giving a speech.

Kant [1] himself considered his theory of epistemology to be the equivalent of Copernicus’ coup in astronomy. Copernicus proved that the Earth revolves around the Sun, not the other way around,

Kant proved that our knowledge is a means of shaping and changing the world, not the other way around. In other words, Kant believed that people’s knowledge and experience shape the world and actively change it because our knowledge sees things around us, and noumenons - things on their own - cannot be radically known.

Classical empiricism implies that we assume that we abstract and generalize the emotional experience. Non-classical theories show that

a) knowledge cannot exist at all (agnosticism),

b) everything we know is limited by our perception (I. Kant),

c) what we see and perceive is the result of our imagination (Berkeley’s cross).

Kant believed that man is incapable of knowing anything: we can only know something limited by our own perception. Kant argued that man looks at the world through the spectacles of cosmic time: we only know what we can know. [1] We take anything as an event, but it remains a noumenon - it’s a spontaneous thing.

Truth means that information corresponds to objective truth; it is a category that connects ontology and epistemology. Heidegger [1] saw the truth as the interaction of hiding and not hiding - known and unknown data, solipists assumed that the truth could not be known radically, because the whole visible world is a product of our consciousness. Plato could know the truth, but he believed it by separating the soul from the body and taking it to a “smart place”. Kant believed that the distortion of our ideas about the world because of a priori ideas was so great that the truth could not be known in principle.

Innate ideas are called a priori knowledge, which is inherent in human birth. John Locke believed that man has no a priori knowledge, his rival Gottfried Leibniz [1] believed a priori knowledge. In modern science there is a universal concept of language (N. Chomsky) [2], the concepts of the world conditioned by language, in general, mean that they are similar for all people.

Man is antinomic by nature: there is an insoluble contradiction between the sinful underground and the higher spiritual aspirations. These two beginnings fight like a guardian angel and a tempting demon. That is why Dostoevsky’s heroes are characterized by a dramatic change in nature.

Foucault’s speech [2] is the primary birth before the objectification of thought. Wittgenstein’s language games are reflected in the language of ideas about the world, and define these perceptions in linguistic terms. These two concepts have almost the same meaning, but for Foucault, speech is primarily a method of science, and Wittgenstein’s language game implies everyday knowledge.

Noam Chomsky is a modern man [1], linguist and politician who emphasized that there is a



certain universal language that is common to all mankind. At the present stage it is thought that this universal language is a system of affirmation and denial: so in no language can a word consisting only of consonants be pronounced, in any language a complex sentence can be made, and so on. This confirms that a person has a priori knowledge.

Family similarity is a feature of sign systems that are similar because of the similarity of the objects they reflect and their functionality. This means that languages are similar to each other because the worlds in which people exist are similar, games are similar to each other because they have the same functions in different societies, and so on. Thus, the character acquires meaning not as a result of itself, but as a reflection of certain things.

T. Kuhn called the paradigm a system of scientific knowledge about the world, which was relevant before another paradigm took its place.[1] The accumulation of knowledge and the gradual change of ideas lead to a change in the scientific paradigm. In Foucault's theory, the paradigm is equivalent to an episteme - a unit of knowledge, a system of ideas about the world.[1]

"The main problem of philosophy in the post-positivist era is the application of philosophical theories and concepts of our time (V. Dilthey, author of the theory of pragmatism, believes that all philosophical concepts are the same if they correspond to the subject who adheres to them); discusses the issue of knowing the world as a metaphor (John Lakoff), understanding the world through epistemology through linguistic and textual categories (Roland Bart). It also examines the issue of civilization (Arnold Toynbee), its development cycles, and the causes of change in civilized life (Lev Gumilev introduces the term "passion" to express leadership and aspiration for constructive change in the world and the main engine of civilization change).[1]

The human mind is the main subject of cognition, which objectifies knowledge about the world (rationalism), while at the same time concealing objective knowledge, incorporating into it its own categories and beliefs (Kant). The mind is the basic essence of man (Leibniz) and at the same time is the same organ as the other organs of the body (positivism in its extreme form, John Stewart Mill). [1] In general, the categories of consciousness are directly related to epistemology and epistemology in philosophy.

Nietzsche's words mean that man can decide and do everything himself. Nietzsche's idea of God's death is to argue with the ancient theory of destiny as a predetermined path that does not participate in the creation of mankind. Nietzsche believed that man decides his own destiny, decides for himself, creates himself. M. Heidegger interprets these words as the

beginning of a new era in which action and reaction are determined not by God but by man. [1]

Any speech is called text; in the categories of modern text criticism, it's not even a word, the key is to convey that character and a specific message. The text was studied by Roland Bart and Julia Kristeva as a point of intersection of references, quotations, and allusions to other texts [3]. Intertext is the intersection of several texts: for example, a reference to text in one text in another. The ability to interpret these tips and see the points of intersection is the task of modern science.

REFERENCES

1. Shapovalov V.F. *Foundations of philosophy. From classic to modern.* - M.: Flinta, Nauka, 1998
2. Ivin A.A. *Foundations of the theory of argumentation.* - M.: Vldos, 1997
3. Volchkov A. *The theory of intertextuality and its role in biblical research // Christian reading № 4, 2018*