

PROBLEM OF THE BASIS OF LANGUAGE AND ITS RESOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE

M.A. Kornienko

Abstract. The article reveals the paradigm features of traditional and classical period of the philosophy of language. The article reflects the essence of the approaches to the language, formed in the problem field of classical philosophy. The research defines the specificity of ontological and epistemological approaches in the determination of the nature of linguistic reality. The authors reveal the specificity of the interpretation of the nature of language in the Middle Ages and New Age. The article substantiates the role of the ideas of F. de Saussure, which allowed the philosophy of language to obtain a complete form. The logic of the analytical scheme used of the article is focused on the following idea: growing out of traditional philosophy, the classical tradition and the classical paradigm suggested the study of the phenomenon of language in the horizon of general ontological models. Analyzing the development of the philosophy of language, the author revealed a number of ideas that dominated in the science of language at the initial stage of its evolution. Among these ideas is the extent to how language reveals being, the ontology of linguistic meanings, the interaction of language and thinking as well as the role of the socio-cultural context in linguistic evolution. The article describes the dichotomous relation of ontological and conventional approaches to linguistic reality, which was formed in ancient philosophy. A detailed analysis of the dialogue of Plato "Cratylus" allowed determining the relation between the continuity of ancient philosophy and linguistic philosophy. The study showed that the difference formed in antiquity between ontologism and conventionalism in the approach to linguistic phenomena and medieval opposition of nominalism-realism was in the fact that in the Middle Ages the conventional and ontological approaches were outlined within the biblical tradition; this was the basis of the logic of the scholastics and the logical-philosophical tradition established by John Duns Scotus. It was proved that in the philosophy of New Age, the conventional model dominates the nomothetic one. The fact that in New Age, within the limits of the empirical-sensationalistic paradigm, name begins to be interpreted as a consequence of rational construction on the basis of empirical experience allowed speaking about this predominance. The thesis that growing out of the traditional philosophy of language was also substantiated, the classical paradigm implied the study of language in the horizon of general ontological models of philosophy. Analyzing the role of F. de Saussure's conceptual ideas in the theoretical completion of the classical approach to the problems of language philosophy, the author argues the idea of F. de Saussure's unconditional influence on the formation of research programs in such schools as the ethno-linguistic school, sociolinguistics, the structural-formal school and the school of system- theoretical linguistics.

Key words: language; language revolution; philosophy of language; paradigm; natural language origin; ontological approach; conventional approach; nominalism; realism.

Introduction

In the first third – the middle of the XX century in philosophy the transition from classical philosophy, which considered consciousness as the initial point of philosophizing, to the philosophy oriented to language. This transition was reflected in modern philosophy, as it was reflected in the theory of culture. Language had become the dominant problem of philosophy, theory of culture, science. The transition itself was called the linguistic turn, the language revolution. The linguistic turn found its reflection in the linguistic philosophy of L. Wittgenstein, the phenomenology of E. Husserl, the fundamental ontology of M. Heidegger, neopositivism, structuralism and hermeneutics.

The problematic field of the study of linguistic reality, which formed in the philosophy of language in the period of linguistic turn, has a long history. The language interpreted as a complex, dynamically developing open semiotic system necessary for performing a number of socially significant functions (expressive, cognitive, informational – translational, communicative). In the course of evolution, it became the object of interpretations presented by a number of versions. For example, this number included pre-classical (traditional) and classical paradigms of the philosophy of language, non-classical and modern (postmodern) paradigms of the philosophy of language. The understanding of the substantive differences between these versions makes it possible to determine the specifics of the evolutionary process performed in the philosophy of language, to answer the question what lies at the basis of language, and ultimately realize new intentions of the modern paradigm of the philosophy of language [1].

Methodology of research

The research paradigm is created by the reference to a number of classical sources: the works of Plato and Aristotle, W. Ockham and J.D. Scott, J. Locke and T. Hobbes, G.V. Leibniz, R. Descartes, N. Chomsky and F. de Saussure.

The methodological basis of the study is determined by a set of tasks. The author uses the method of comparative analysis, the potential of historical – cultural and prognostic approaches, as well as the methodology of integrative and system – integrative analysis.

Research and results

The research problem is based on the understanding that the horizon of the ideas of traditional and classical philosophy is dominated by the analysis of the extent to which language reflects being, the ontology of linguistic

meanings, the interaction of language and thinking, as well as the dependence of language on socio-cultural context.

The problem is in the search for the natural language origin. The definition of the essence of linguistic reality depends on a paradigm within the framework of which the research is formed. The basis for the study of the stated problem (the search for the natural language origin) is the dichotomous relation of the ontological and conventional approaches to the definition of the nature of language, formed in the ancient philosophy. Further, the logic of the problem is formed through the medieval interpretation of language, through the concepts of language presented in the philosophy of New Age, finally, through the philosophical ideas of F. de Saussure, which allowed the philosophy of language to obtain a complete form.

It is possible to determine a number of specific philosophical directions for the study of linguistic reality with reference to language as a complex developing semiotic system. In the problematic field of traditional and classical philosophy, the subject of analysis is the degree to which entity can be reflected in a language, the ontology of linguistic meanings, the interaction of language and thinking, the conditionality of the phenomenon of language by a socio-cultural context. For non-classical philosophy, research interest is focused on issues related to the structural specificity of a language, linguistic formalism, the nature of natural and artificial languages, the role of language in human existence. The further development of the philosophy of language formed an appeal to such problems as text, intertextuality, language games; the subject of research interest is shifted here in the direction of the problems of language reference.

The researchers working in the problematic field of the philosophy of language suggest that classical, non-classical and modern stages of the philosophy of language as a science formed the specifics of a subject: language semantics, language syntactics, language pragmatics (the subject specificity of the above mentioned research sections is quite clearly represented by C. Morris: while pragmatics studies the ways to use signs, semantics studies the relation of signs and meanings of these signs; within the limits of syntactic research, the relations between signs are studied).

The philosophy of the language is based on the theory of language origin, which goes back to the Bible, where the version of the endowment of Adam with speech is described. This version was the leading one in the attempt to explain the natural principle of the language, to find the divine originating language and to see the "soul" of it up to the turn of the XVII–XVIII centuries. The authors take as an example the text from the Bible, which gives the explanation of this process. In the Book of Genesis 2:19, the following is written: "And the Lord God created from the land all the animals and all the birds, and brought them to a human to learn how he would call them. And as a human called every living creature, so was its name".

The text says that, calling and giving names, Adam put the Divine content into a living soul; at the same time the name turned into the main affiliation of what received this name. The multiplicity of languages is explained in Genesis 11: 1–9 by the speech of God: “And the Lord said: These are one people and one they have one language only; and this is what they started to do, and they will not be left behind what they have planned to do. Let come down and mix their language there, so that one does not understand the speech of other”. People stopped building a city called Babylon – language was mixed by God in it and scattered over the Earth.

As a discipline the philosophy of language formed several approaches to the definition of the essence of language. In this sense, the distinction between ancient Greek and ancient Indian traditions of language interpretation is of great interest. The sentence in a language is interpreted as structurally formed unit from names (the phenomenon of discreteness of speech of Aristotle), while the ancient Indian tradition proceeds from the interpretation of a name as a consequence of the destruction of a sentence. The sentence is perceived as the initial language structure. From these very traditions, formed in Greece and India, two branches of the philosophy of language originated, which were later developed in such versions of semantic and syntactic analysis of the language as “philosophy of name” and “philosophy of predicate”.

The basic problem of the philosophy of name is the problem of the correlation of a name and an object or object of reality, which takes the form of the problem of establishing the name (*namadheys* from ancient Indian, *onomatophetike* from ancient Greek). The traditional philosophy of language formed a dichotomous attitude of such approaches to the definition of the nature of language, such as ontological and conventional. It was a dispute between “naturalists” and “conventionalists” on the nature of “names”. The basis of the conventional approach to language is the idea of arbitrariness of signs. Thus Proclus, the systematizer of school Platonism, representing the Athenian school of Neo-Platonism, “the last scholar of the school”, reflecting on the position of Pythagoras, stated: not everyone can form names (things), but (only that) who sees the mind and the essence of existence. Names are by nature; names are formed by those who are able to see the “nature of being”. This thesis of Proclus, formulated within the boundaries of the ontological approach, created the possibility of correct or incorrect naming, as well as created the conditions for obligatory comprehension of what was considered the true meaning (etymon) of a name (hence “etymology”), but in the end it allowed comprehending the essence of a subject.

In contrast to the ontological approach, within the limits of the conventional approach, the starting point is the thesis: naming is implemented through the establishment of consent, a contract. Within the conventional paradigm, it is impossible to comprehend the essence of an object by referring to its “correct name”. The “demiurge of names” is a nominee; it is pos-

sible to comprehend the essence of a name. This possibility, however, is reasoned by the coincidence of the image of the nominee – the “demiurge of names” and the space creator.

Plato made great contribution to the theory of the language, Cratylus is considered to be his early teacher, a supporter of the ideas of Heraclitus. Aristotle dates this time period before a meeting with Socrates, in a later tradition (Apuleius, Diogenes Laertius) it is about the period after the execution of Socrates. The eponymously-named dialogue is dedicated to Cratylus from Athens. It is in this dialogue that the source of linguistic philosophy should be seen: in the polarity of the positions of the disputants (Cratylus supported the idea of “natural similarity” of the form of a word and a thing, Hermogenes supported the statement that “what name anybody has established is the right one” [2], Socrates supported the position of naturalists, with his idea “...having found for each case a tool assigned to it by nature, a person must also give a name to product what he creates, not what he wants, but what is intended by nature” [2].

Two of five fragments of Cratylus in the Diels collection are used in the indicated dialogue. The idea of fluidity of the cosmos belonging to Heraclitus was absolutized by Cratylus: there is still evidence that Cratylus said “hissing and shaking hands”. According to the testimony of Aristotle (1010a7) Cratylus only moved his finger and reproached Heraclitus for his statement: you cannot enter the same river twice. This cannot be done once. The possibility of speech in a continuously changing world is excluded.

The “Cratylus” dialogue is sophisticated both in composition and in content. The three participants in the dialogue are Socrates, Hermogenes, the son of Hipponicos and Cratylus, the Heracliteer.

The main question of the dialogue is “Whether it is possible to know the essence of a thing, knowing the name of a thing?”, “Whether names are the means by which things are known?” These questions interested Socrates no less than before they were interesting for atomists and sophists who raised the question of the origin of “names”, the origin of language. It is known that the problems of synonyms, semantics, and etymology raised interest of sophists. It was the sophists who addressed the problems of the meaning of a name, the nature of a name, as they turned to the idea of the connection between human history and the human desire to communicate through the use of a word, the living language (The interesting works of I.M. Tronsky, V.V. Karakulova are devoted to theoretical problems of language. In the study of 1936 “The Ancient Theories of Language and Style” I.M. Tronsky expresses the idea that before a word arises, the name is not once transformed, in particular, by rearranging letters and including inserts).

The positions of Hermogenes (a student of Protagoras) and Cratylus (students of Heraclitus) are compared in a dispute in the “Cratylus” dialogue. Socrates tries to resolve this dispute Hermogenes’ position is based on the

thesis about the conventionality of the names of the human language, determined by arbitrariness, custom, law; Cratylus' position is based on the idea of essential fluid nature of things.

The "Cratylus" dialogue is rather difficult to interpret. It can be explained by a completely free manner of presentation structure, which makes it difficult for the parts of the dialogue to communicate; the dialogue does not contain conclusions; the idea of dialogue is burdened by many linguistic insights, the dialogue includes many interludes. The linguistic insights making the structure of the "Cratylus" more difficult are determined by A.F. Losev as "mind-blowing etymologies", pseudoscientific, ridiculous and fantastic, diverse and sophisticated [3].

The "Cratylus" gives the analysis of the theory of the conditional origin of names (385a-391a). Moreover, it studies the problem of correctness of names (391c-427e) and analyzes the position of relativism in the theory of names (428e-438a); finally, the "Cratylus" contains gnoseological conclusions based on the theory of names (438e-440e).

The structure of the dialogue of Plato consists of two parts. The first presents the dispute between Socrates and Hermogenes (the disciple of Protagoras, who stated that a human is the measure of all things, the language is not created in the truth of things, but arranged as a human). The second part of the dialogue presents the conversation of Socrates and Cratylus, a student of Heraclitus, who spoke about the wisdom of a language, but Socrates proves the opposite. In the dispute between Socrates and Hermogenes, a word is interpreted as "the organ of learning and recognition of the existence". In the second part of the dialogue (439a), Socrates urges not to engage in divination about things by names-words, but to perform more beautiful, noble and faithful activity, and this activity is a look at the truth, a word has become an icon of truth. He also states that it is possible to learn a language as the image of truth.

This is the problem, the meaning of which lies in finding out who is a "teacher" (language or something else). It was also posed in the dialogue of Saint Augustine "About the Teacher". At the beginning of the dialogue, the hypothesis about the impossibility to give a notion of an object without a sign is developed, with the help of language both learning and recall are carried out. The second part of the dialogue softens the assertion through the following affirmation: in the face of truth (namely, life is devoted to the search for truth), signs are powerless; signs do not have the ability to teach. Language is possible because a soul itself is turned to the things which word broadcasts. Learning is possible not by a word, but by the existence of things, by the representation of things in experience. The truth teaches. It is truth that is a teacher, but not the one who says: inner learning comes directly after the reminder of a speaker.

In Cratylus, that part of the dialogue is noteworthy, in which Hermogenes' statement is given: "No name is innate to anyone by nature, it de-

depends on the law and custom of those who are used to calling something like that..." And further: "...I can call any of things with one name, which I have established; you can call with another, which you have given..." [2].

The interesting idea in the heuristic context concerning the interpretation of the "naturalness of words" by Plato himself belongs is expressed by A.B. Solomonik [4]. The author writes that by the "naturalness of words" Plato understands not the consequence of God's intervention (things are endowed with souls), but the efforts of many minds aimed at finding "correspondences between linguistic tools and denoted objects". The author possesses the idea, the essence of which is that the names are signs, and this is the idea of the sign hierarchy and the sign continuum underlying many conceptual constructions of the semantics of the XXI century. In addition, as noted by A.B. Solomonik, another Plato's idea which survived for the centuries is that any language contains words that repeat the phenomena denoted by a word (the linguistic term "echoism") in its sound [4]. They are an example of what Plato understood, speaking of the natural connection of a word and denoted by this word.

As for the position of Aristotle, it is conventional in its essence: "language is the result of an agreement, since names do not arise from the nature of things... speech represents our thoughts, and they represent speech" ("De Interpretatione", "About interpretation"). However, with a new force, the designated controversy proved itself in conceptual constructions of the XVII–XVIII centuries in the context of the ideas of the Reformation. The theory of the Divine Creation of Language in the XVII–XVIII Centuries turned into an idea according to which "the gift of Language affirms the supreme Truth of the close connection between language and the act of Creation" [5]. In the discourse of this theory of the indicated period, a search for a proto-language was carried out, some authors declared Hebrew a proto-language.

The medieval interpretation of the name is specific. In the philosophy of the Middle Ages there is a discussion about the nature of universals, reflected in the dispute between nominalists and realists. Thus William of Ockham believed that what was said or written meant something to be established ("exinstitutio"). In the tradition of realism, the following assertion dominated: to know not by essence, but by name.

The difference between the ancient opposition of ontologism and conventionalism in the era of antiquity in the approach to linguistic phenomena and the opposition of nominalism-realism that arose in the Middle Ages is more profound than it seems. The main difference is explained by the fact that in the Middle Ages the conventional and ontological approaches were formulated within the framework of the biblical tradition. This is the basis of the logic of the scholastics and the logical-philosophical tradition, appealing to the categories of "abstract concept" and "particular concept", the beginning of the use of which was laid by Duns Scotus.

The New Age brings the understanding that, excluding language problems, it is impossible to solve the problems of epistemology (for the first time it was stated by time John Locke [6, 7]. The position of empiricism and sensationalism allowed approaching the problem of name in its connection with the idea of rational design based on sensory experience. T. Hobbes stated that a name is a word arbitrarily taken as a mark [8]. The author of this article believes that in the philosophy of the New Age, the prevalence of the conventional model (the name is given “by establishment”) over the nomothetic model (the name is given “by nature”) is obvious. According to the author the fact that in the New Age, within the limits of the empirical-sensationalistic paradigm, the name begins to be interpreted as a consequence of rational design based on sensory experience, allows talking about this predominance. This prevalence of one model over another later led to the emergence of the idea of the language of science. For example, G.-W. Leibniz spoke about the algebra of universal rational semantics. In the monastery of Port-Royal near Versailles, widely known as the center of education and science, a linguistic theory was created, called “philosophical grammar”, according to which the thinking and speech ability was uniform for all people, and the basis of all languages was a single ideal logical scheme. This theory was presented in the book “General and rational grammar of Port-Royal” (in French: “Grammaire générale et raisonnée de Port-Royal”) by the abbés of the monastery A. Arnauld and C. Lancelot in 1660 [9]. Later, in the philosophy of positivism, the idea of the language of science was the premise of the proposal, the essence of which was in the need to make the language of science free from metaphysical influence).

The schools which influenced the direction of the development of the philosophy of language were created in the XVII–XVIII centuries. This was the direction based on the ideas of Descartes rationalistic philosophy; sensational school was represented by Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Descartes believed that based on innate ideas (ideas of numbers and figures, for example), language was formed. In the twentieth century N. Chomsky wrote his “Cartesian linguistics”, in which he touched upon the influence of Descartes’ ideas on the linguistics of the twentieth century, in particular, this concerned innate grammatical structures, as well as the ideas of formalized codes [10]. The chapter “On Words”, included in J. Locke’s “The Essay on the Human Mind,” contained a statement that words were random, the designation of objects through words was conditional: “Words were nothing but signs of our ideas”. They did not at all reflect the natural connections between specific sounds and certain ideas, otherwise there would be one language for all; they presented arbitrarily chosen notation of ideas.

They were used as clear signs to express ideas. However, the expressed ideas reflected their true and immediate content [6, 7]. The merit of J. Locke lied precisely in the rejection of the biblical version of the proto-

language; since the advent of *The Experience of Human Mind*, linguists had turned to the study of language, based on a specific linguistic analysis, which made it possible to identify a number of linguistic patterns. "The experience of human mind" was in some way the "forerunner of the philosophy of linguistics," confirming the thesis of L. Bloomfield expressed in the well-known work "Language": The conclusions regarding linguistic patterns were possible only on the basis of particular linguistic analysis [11].

Nowadays in philosophical literature it is noted that J. Locke introduced the term "sign" in reference to the term "word" as the basic unit of language. Hence, in this sense, designating signs as "signs of ideas" and designating ideas as direct filling of a sign sense he was the forerunner of F. de Saussure. The idea of double dependence of linguistic signs (on ideas denoted by these signs) belongs to G.-V. Leibniz, a philosopher, mathematician, linguist, who attempted to find a philosophical language that, would play the role of a tool for the analysis of thinking. This language can be used as a guideline in the process of its formation by both logic and mathematical symbolism, a conclusion that is quite understandable if we consider that G.-V. Leibniz was the author of the ideas of differential and integral calculation.

In the context of the classical paradigm of the philosophy of language, linguistic reality becomes the subject of independent study. The ideas of linguistic naturalism arise on the basis of comparative historical linguistics in the classical philosophy of language. A. Schleicher formulated a concept in accordance with which two stages were identified in the development of a language: the stage of formation and development of language as an object of study and the stage of disintegration of language forms, which, according to A. Schleicher, is a manifestation of deformation on the part of the spirit. In the paradigm of the classical approach, the genealogical classification of E. Benveniste languages was developed. The problematic field of the neogrammarian linguistic school included a wide range of issues, the interpretation of which was possible only with the help of the principle of historicism, used by such authors as G. Ostkhov, K. Brugman, D. Delbrück and G. Paul. The last called this principle "the principle of history". This very principle became the basis of theoretical linguistics.

Later, H. Schuchardt proposed the idea of interpreting semantic-etymological evolution as an evolution of "word-things", which led to the weakening of research interest in the phonetic-formal aspect of language and the increase in interest in the philosophical problems of language.

It is necessary to note the essential specificity of the classical approach to language: proceeding from the traditional philosophy of language, the classical paradigm, unlike the non-classical tradition, involves the study of language in the horizon of general epistemological philosophical models.

The theoretical conclusion of the classical approach to the problems of the philosophy of language was presented by the works of F. de Saussure.

His followers C. Bally and A. Sechehaye published material reproduced on the basis of student lecture notes after the death of their teacher. Exactly since that period of the emergence of the ideas of F. de Saussure, the classical philosophy of the language found its complete form. F. de Saussure viewed a language as an integral system, using the analogy with chess game in the interpretation of a language. He considered language as integrity in itself; the elements of the language were called F. de Saussure's figures.

F. de Saussure spoke about the only object that was significant for linguistics – this object was “the normal and regular life of an already established language,” although beyond time the linguistic reality cannot be complete. F. de Saussure distinguished between “internal linguistics” and “external linguistics”. The first was designated in the concept of Saussure as proper linguistics; through the proper linguistics the study of the immanent language system was carried out [12].

As for “external linguistics”, it studied the external contexts of linguistic reality. F. de Saussure, paying attention to the role of the sign in linguistic reality, designated language as a “semiological phenomenon”, – the use of a sign in the structure of language was conventionally reasoned by the fact that “precisely because a sign is arbitrary, it does not know any other law besides tradition, and, conversely, it can be arbitrary only because it is based on tradition”. A linguistic sign was only a unity of the signifier and the signified. F. de Saussure distinguished language and speech as components of speech practice.

F. de Saussure initiated such directions of the theory and philosophy of language as the quest of the Copenhagen school, focused on the ideas of gloss semantics (in Greek: *glossa* – speaking), “immanent linguistics”, “language algebra” (L. Elmslev), originated from the ideas of Port-Royal, in the program of “a priori grammar” of Husserl [13], as well as in the “pure syntax” of R. Carnap. It is necessary to mention the Prague linguistic circle, - in its problem field the idea of semantic oppositions in the structure of the language was initiated (V. Matezius, S.N. Trubetskoy, R. Jakobson). The school of descriptive linguistics, found in the USA, originated from F. de Saussure (L. Bloomfield, Z. Harris, V. Blok, U. Hokket).

The representatives of this school studied speech behavior in the discourse of behaviorism, they studied the speech act as a unity of signal, stimulus, reaction; they proposed a variant of speech distributional analysis. Among the schools and trends whose searches were influenced by the ideas of F. de Saussure were the schools of ethno-linguistics, sociolinguistics, structural-formal school and the school of system-theoretical linguistics [12]. Working in the horizon of a non-classical tradition, each of these schools was focused on a specific range of problems. Thus, the school of ethno-linguistics proposed the concept of linguistic relativity by E. Sapir, G. Pike, B. Whorf.

The school of sociolinguistics (W. Whitney, J. Fishman, U. Meibov) studied a language in a socio-cultural context. The structural-formal school, which arose in France and linked its ideas with the ideas of hermeneutics and the philosophy of structuralism, declared the language an instrument of communication and mutual understanding. The school of system-theoretical linguistics proposed the idea of a semiotic analysis of language systems; language was considered as integrity. According to the analyst of this school, G. Guillaume, in its totality language was a great creation, built according to a general law, the law of coherence (connectedness, parts and whole), private integral systems, which, like any systems, were integrating in relation to their constituent parts, they had their own integrity. A language is a systemic whole, covering the entire length of imaginable content and consisting of systems, each of which referred only to one specific part of the imaginable.

Conclusion

Analyzing the development of the philosophy of language, the author revealed a number of ideas that dominated in the science of language at the initial stage of its evolution. Among these ideas is the extent to how language reveals being, the ontology of linguistic meanings, the interaction of language and thinking as well as the role of the socio-cultural context in linguistic evolution. The article describes the dichotomous relation of ontological and conventional approaches to linguistic reality, which was formed in ancient philosophy. A detailed analysis of the dialogue of Plato "Cratylus" allowed determining the relation between the continuity of ancient philosophy and linguistic philosophy. The study showed that the difference formed in antiquity between ontologism and conventionalism in the approach to linguistic phenomena and medieval opposition of nominalism-realism was in the fact that in the Middle Ages the conventional and ontological approaches were outlined within the biblical tradition; this was the basis of the logic of the scholastics and the logical-philosophical tradition established by D. Scotus.

It was proved that in the philosophy of New Age, the conventional model dominates the nomothetic one. The fact that in New Age, within the limits of the empirical-sensationalistic paradigm, name begins to be interpreted as a consequence of rational construction on the basis of empirical experience allowed speaking about this predominance. The thesis that growing out of the traditional philosophy of language was also substantiated, the classical paradigm implied the study of language in the horizon of general ontological models of philosophy. It was proved that the theoretical conclusion of the classical approach to the problems of the philosophy of language was presented by the works of F. de Saussure; among the schools that studied the unconditional influence of this author were the school of ethno-linguistics, sociolinguistics, the structural-formal school, and the school of system-theoretical linguistics.

References

1. Bibikhin, V.V. (1978) K ontologicheskomu statusu yazykovogo znacheniya [To the ontological status of linguistic significance], *In Traditsiya v istorii kul'tury*, Moscow, Nauka, 231-243.
2. Plato, (1990). Sobraniye sochineniy v chetyrokh tomakh [Collection of essays in four volumes], I, Moscow, Mysl', 860
3. Losev, A.F. (1999). Filosofiya imeni [Philosophy of name], Moscow, EKSMO-Press, 29-204
4. Solomonik, A.B. (2010). Yazyk kak znakovaya Sistema [Language as a sign system], Moscow, Librokom, 224
5. Forster, M. N. (2011). Hegel and Beyond, New York, Oxford University Press, 240
6. Locke, J. (1960). Izbrannyye filosofskiy trudy v dvukh tomakh [Selected philosophical works in 2 volumes], 1, Moscow, Publishing House of Socio-Economic literature, 146
7. Locke, J. (1960). Izbrannyye filosofskiy trudy v dvukh tomakh [Selected philosophical works in 2 volumes], 2, Moscow, Publishing House of Socio-Economic literature, 160
8. Hobbes, T. (1926). Izbrannyye sochineniya [Selected essays], 1, Moscow, Publishing House of Socio-Economic literature, 234
9. Arnauld, A., Lancelot, C. (1960). General and rational grammar of Port-royal, Moscow, Progress, 272
10. Chomskiy, N. (1972) Yazyk i myshleniye (Language and thinking), Moscow, MGU, 126
11. Bloomfield, L. (2010). Yazyk [Language], Moscow, LIBROKOM, 608
12. Saussure, F. de. (1999). Kurs obshchey lingvistiki (Course of general linguistics) Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural.un-ta, 432
13. Husserl, E. (2010). Cartesian meditation, Moscow, Publishing house "Academic Project", 229

Kornienko Mikhail A., Ph.D. (Philosophy), Senior Researcher, Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research, National Research Tomsk State University (Tomsk, Russia). E-mail: snoose@mail.ru

ПРОБЛЕМА ОСНОВАНИЯ ЯЗЫКА И ЕЕ РЕШЕНИЕ В КОНТЕКСТЕ КЛАССИЧЕСКОГО ФИЛОСОФСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

Корниенко Михаил Анатольевич – кандидат философских наук, старший научный сотрудник, Лаборатория междисциплинарных исследований, Национальный исследовательский Томский государственный университет (Томск, Россия). E-mail: snoose@mail.ru.

Аннотация. Раскрываются особенности парадигмы традиционного и классического периода философии языка. Отражена сущность подходов к языку, сформированных в проблемном поле классической философии. Обозначена специфика онтологического и гносеологического подходов в определении природы языковой реальности. Раскрыта специфика интерпретации природы языка в эпоху Средневековья и Нового времени, а также роль идей Ф. де Соссюра, позволивших философии языка обрести завершённый вид. Логика аналитической схемы, использованной в статье, ориентирована на следующую идею: вырастая из традиционной философии, классическая традиция, классическая парадигма предполагали исследование феномена языка в горизонте общегносеологических моделей. Раскрыт ряд идей, доминирующих в науке о языке на исходном этапе её эволюции. Среди них – мера того, насколько представимо в языке бытие, онтология языковых значений, взаимодействие языка и мышления, роль социокультурного контекста в языковой эволюции. Описывается дихотомическая связь онтологического и конвенционального подходов к языковой реальности, сложившаяся в античной философии. Детальный анализ диалога Платона «Кратил» позволил определить отношение

преемственности философии Античности и лингвистической философии. Показано, что различие сформированной в эпоху Античности оппозиции онтологизма и конвенционализма в подходе к языковым явлениям и средневековой оппозиции номинализма–реализма в том, что в Средние века конвенциональный и онтологический подходы были изложены в границах библейской традиции; это было основой логики схоластов и логико-философской традиции, установленной Иоанном Дунсом Скотом. Доказано, что в философии Нового времени конвенциональная модель доминирует над номотетической. Об этом говорит тот факт, что в Новом времени, в рамках эмпирико-сенсуалистской парадигмы, имя начинает интерпретироваться как следствие рационального конструирования на основе чувственного опыта. Обоснован также тезис о том, что, вырастая из традиционной философии языка, классическая парадигма предполагает исследование языка в горизонте общегносеологических философских моделей. Раскрывая тезис о роли концептуальных идей Ф. де Соссюра в теоретическом завершении классического подхода к проблемам философии языка, утверждается идея безусловного влияния Ф. де Соссюра на формирование исследовательских программ таких школ, как школа этнолингвистики, социолингвистики, структурно-формальная школа и школа системно-теоретического языкознания.

Ключевые слова: язык; языковая революция; философия языка; парадигма; природное начало языка; онтологический подход; конвенциональный подход; номинализм; реализм.

Received 15 January 2020