UDC 14

LEONID MOZHOVYI
Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of Philosophy,
Socio-Political and Legal Sciences,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University" (Sloviansk, Ukraine)
e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0003-1810-4054
VIKTORIYA SLABOUZ
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University" (Sloviansk, Ukraine)
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0001-8236-0197
INNA SUSHCHENKO
Student of the Philological Faculty,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University" (Sloviansk, Ukraine),
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net

THE LINGUISTIC TURN AND ITS ROLE FOR PHILOSOPHY AND LINGUISTICS AT THE END OF THE 20TH – THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Annotation. The article is devoted to one of the debatable problems of modern philosophy – the problem of appearing the "linguistic turn" and its influence on political, economic and social sciences. It is proved that the "linguistic turn" itself is comparable in the significance of its claims and the results obtained, perhaps only with the Cartesian turn of the New Age in its philosophical application or the Copernican turn in science, that is why there is no need explicate its significance for the scientific world of the end of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century. It is substantiated in the study that the "linguistic turn" is the bifurcation centre of an established system of existing paradigmatic directions. Such an intellectual explosion results in an uncontrolled chain reaction with a train of divergent consequences, which takes place in our analysis: philosophy, linguistics, philology, history, political, economic and social sciences have been assimilating and developing the latest achievements obtained as a result of the linguistic revolution – the "linguistic turn".

Keywords: analytical philosophy; bifurcation; linguistic turn; linguistic revolution; linguistic philosophy; language "here and now"; paradigmatic directions

Introduction. The interest in language raised in the second half of the 19th century when the transfer from classical science to non-classical one occurred. The period can be characterized by differentiation of knowledge, by the expansion of communicative, ethnic, intercultural, and consequently, language relations. Language becomes an independent subject of research not only of philosophers but also of linguists, logicians, psychologists. Language turns for philosophy and linguistics into a conceptual focus, into one of the most urgent research tasks, at least focusing on it should give philosophical-linguistic problems coherence, organization, and clarity. Moreover, the

track for such theming is already ready – this is the famous "linguistic turn", about which much has already been said. The pathos of the linguistic turn is very clearly formulated by the British analyst Michael Dammit – *the philosophy of language is the philosophy for the most part*.

In the problematic breakthrough, the "turn to language", made by philosophy in the 20th century, one can feel in general the spirit of non-classical philosophizing. Thought and speaking are actually human, opposing nature, inherent in the human community. The problems relating to language have been dealt with since the times of Antiquity, and until the 20th century, the classical analysis of language was spread, which was carried out in "static", "absolute" concepts that "covered" the entire accessible horizon of phenomena. Non-classical philosophizing focused on moving, historical phenomena, on possibility and chance. Along with this, language began to be considered not as an entity, but as existence, activity, and language phenomena – in their specific temporal representation. Thanks to M. Heidegger, language ceased to appear as an object and began to be considered in its connection with the very existence of man. M. Heidegger spoke of language as a "house of being", namely of *being*, and not nothing, which, on the contrary, was associated with lack of language.

Thus, the issue of appearing the linguistic turn in philosophy, its necessity for philosophy, linguistics, and other sciences is still **relevant and urgent**.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to analyse the role of the linguistic turn for philosophy, linguistics and other sciences at the end of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century. The purpose stated determines **the objectives** of the paper: 1) to identify the determining factors of the linguistic turn; 2) to analyse the literary original sources of the famous philosophers and linguists devoted to the problem of language here and now, to the situational conditionality of language.

Scientific novelty. In the study it is made an attempt to prove that if practically all sciences are amenable to some thematization, this can be done only on the basis of understanding language as a semantic field formed by a multitude of centrifugal forces that comprise in their totality what is commonly called the "linguistic turn" as a conceptual transformation of philosophical paradigmatics. The "linguistic turn" itself is comparable in the significance of its claims and the results obtained, perhaps only with the Cartesian turn of the New Age in its philosophical application or the Copernican turn in science, that is why there is no need explicate its significance for the scientific world of the end of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century. It is substantiated in the study that the "linguistic turn" is the bifurcation centre of an established system of existing paradigmatic directions. Such an intellectual explosion results in an uncontrolled chain reaction with a train of divergent consequences, which takes place in our analysis: philosophy, linguistics, philology, history, political, economic and social sciences have been assimilating and developing the latest achievements obtained as a result of the linguistic revolution – the "linguistic turn".

Statement of the main material. It is necessary to differentiate the "linguistic turn" and the "turn to language" as a manifestation of two fundamental interpretations of language in the 20th century coming out of different prerequisites.

The first interpretation belongs to the analytic tradition in the broad sense (the term "linguistic turn" was introduced by the analyst G. Bergmann), the analytic tradition considers a language as its own subject, having meaning, and formulates the problems of language philosophy as problems of reference.

The second interpretation refers to a richer and more complex continental perspective, winding within itself into sub-perspectives, often oppositional, but not binding language to meaning and theming it as an independent reality.

After entering the 20th century, philosophical thought faced with new contradictions, paradoxes, which reflected a different socio-culture, peculiarities of non-classical and post-non-classical science. The latest achievements in natural science were breaking the old ideas about the structure of the material world, they demanded developing new concepts, categories that would more objectively correspond to scientific discoveries. Therefore, it became necessary to analyse the language of science, the conceptual apparatus, which are an integral part of the general process of cognition and development of knowledge.

The appeal of philosophers to the problems of language as an independent subject of research was also determined by the enormous differentiation of sciences. In the classical period, Newton's mechanics dominated, on the basis of which a rigidly determined picture of the world was formed. The methods of mechanics were transferred not only to the study of material existence but also to wildlife, society, and man. Beginning from the second half of the 19th century, this metaphysical-mechanistic approach did not justify itself. Sociology and anthropology, linguistics and psychology, cultural studies and other social and humanitarian disciplines were formed with their specific subjects, research methods, and conceptual-categorial apparatus. Almost all sciences seemed to rediscover the conceptual and linguistic aspects of their subject. Not only the differentiation of scientific disciplines was formed, but also their integration. At the junction of various teachings, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, hermeneutics, semantics, other new sciences arose. Intercultural communications intensified, the importance of linguistics increased. Close attention began to be paid to the identification of semantic expressions of language, its understanding, and interpretation.

The philosophical analysis of language becomes a necessity for the further development of scientific knowledge, social communication. The linguistic turn in philosophy is designated, the representatives of which are not only philosophers but also mathematicians, logicians, linguists. Philosophical schools appear (analytical, hermeneutic, existential, etc.), united by the general task of analysing language as the basis of philosophical research of concepts, thinking, the structure of scientific knowledge, and the demarcation of scientific statements from non-scientific ones.

Phenomenological philosophy showed that in the movement of understanding, consciousness meets the improper, with the other, accepts or does not accept it. This made it possible to consider the relationship between language and speech in their formation, while not abandoning the "motionless" schemes of classical scientific analysis of language. It is very characteristic that H.-G. Gadamer, justifying the universality of the hermeneutic project, linking any knowledge of the world with an unavoidable moment of understanding, and any understanding with language, seeks to discuss the boundaries of linguism. According to H.-G. Gadamer, it is well known that direct involvement in the world is very often expressed in all kinds of pre- and extralinguistic insights, preteritions, and who will deny that the real conditions of human life, hunger, and love, labour, and power, in turn, measure space in which a conversation is made with each other, listening to each other. It is so indisputable that just any such pre-shaping of human speeches and beliefs also requires hermeneutic reflection. The number of well-known philosophers and linguists points to the situational conditioning of language, to its existence "here and now" (Gadamer, 1990).

F. de Saussure actually does not allow considering the relationship between the sign and the object but encourages to engage in words precisely in the context of a social, almost intersubjective reality in which they only exist, acquire and change their meanings.

W. von Humboldt believes that the definition of language can only be genealogical, based on the fact that language, in essence, is something permanent, disappearing at every moment. It is not a deed (done), but an activity. The ontology of essence is replaced by the ontology of existence, and language appears as constantly changing, becoming and decreasing in accordance with the nature of itself and the nature of man. Such an understanding of language is recorded, for example, in the concept of "language game" by L. Wittgenstein.

In the abstract concept of language as an action, its temporal nature, as well as the direct involvement of the speaker in it, is practically ignored. It will be fair to separate communication and conversation: in the first case, everything that a person addresses (both in activity and in utterance) is supposed as an object by this address; in the second, a person turns to the subject, which for himself/herself also means a significant change of position, and, possibly, the essence itself. Language fits into the human world. An appeal to language is a return to the very speaking subject. However, the matter is not limited to a simple statement of this duality: an analysis of a certain phenomenon revealed in language is necessary, namely, how our cognitive apparatus expands and is able to cognize what it does not contain in itself. It is such analytics that leads us to the description of the structure of pre-understanding, anticipation, which, according to Maurice Merleau-Ponty, remains the "place of truth" (Merleau-Ponty, 1989).

L. Wittgenstein proposes to consider statements here and now, in the context of the situation and try to determine on what grounds in relation to this statement one can

talk about understanding, about using a sign, about the meaning of this sign and expression of meaning, about the speaker's position and his attracting experience and knowledge. Thus, L. Wittgenstein comes to the concept of language as a structure in relation to which it is impossible to indicate the legislative instance (neither consciousness nor the refined logical form of language itself). The so-called "language games" involve a complex relationship between the subject and the content of the utterance and knowledge, the non-absolute status of the subject itself, the utterance and the addressee of the utterance, conceivable in continuous formation. L. Wittgenstein, in fact, proposes to abandon the understanding of language as the legislation of nature and consider its laws as laws of freedom (Wittgenstein, 1973).

Of course, such views and approaches to language did not arise by chance. They were caused by a number of social transformations and processes that led to serious changes in all spheres of human life and society. However, social transformation should not be understood too narrowly. This concept applies not only and not so much to individual countries and regions, but to those processes that take place on a global scale, in the space of all social development. From this point of view, it is necessary to look at the processes taking place in today's global society. To outline these changes briefly, it should be noted that they are associated with a fundamental transformation of the nature of labour, and, consequently, the whole life of society. What are these changes? At first glance, such phenomena as cybernetization, informatization, nanotechnologies, global evolution, etc. are immediately evident. Without any doubt, all this takes place, but, in our opinion, their influence on social processes is carried out indirectly through labour, through a change in its nature, and even, perhaps, it is necessary to talk about the post-labour era of the development of society.

Classical types of labour (a person *directly* produces certain products – goods) seem to disappear, which leads to separating and dissociating people. Automata, robots, capable of performing mechanical functions, are replacing people. There appear such automata which can be called factories-automata. A post-industrial, information society is being formed. What is happening, though in a different connection, was predicted by K. Marx: the most important wealth of a person appears – free time. It is it that determines the choice of the activity that a person would like and would be able to be engaged in. Inevitably, the emphasis is shifted to the service sectors of the person himself/herself, to certain types of creative intellectual activity, to enriching the spiritual wealth of the human person and society. Obviously, all this is inevitably associated with the development of the foundations of spiritual activity – *language and speech*. In our opinion, this explains the fundamental linguistic turn in philosophy that has taken place in the 20th century – at the beginning of the 21st century. The linguistic turn in the analytic tradition is a turn from the naive-realistic view that philosophy can explore the world in its substantial and essential sense, to studying how people talk about the world and how people reason about reasoning itself. It is related to this the forefront of the philosophical problem of meaning – the central problem of the theory

of language. It is true when this turn is tried to be explained by the fact that in modern philosophy they have turned from the metaphysics of consciousness to the metaphysics of language, this explanation does not seem to consistent, because the metaphysics of consciousness is simply impossible without the metaphysics of language.

Of course, in all this one can see the pragmatic vector of the development of philosophy. According to R. Rorty, descriptions of reality that are extremely useful in the context of a particular situation are of a positive character: language thereby acts as the basic instrument of the individual's effective action in the world around. In this case, the matter is not about the shortcomings of the linguistic turn in philosophy, when language, from the point of view of analytical philosophers, replaces experience. It is important to understand the origins and positive meaning of this philosophical movement, without giving a transcendental character to language (Rorty, 1967). The change in the nature of labour, discussed a little higher, has given rise to another tendency in the development of modern philosophy, again related to the fact that there is a separation, dissociation, and isolation of people. This happens despite the growing power of various forms of technical communications and means of mass communication. This leads to violations of the mechanisms of forms of communication, to mutual misunderstanding, to contradictions and clashes among people, up to armed attempts to resolve disputes. Therefore, it is no coincidence that the philosophy of communication and communicative action appears as a continuation of the linguistic tradition engaged in clarifying the essence and meanings. It is designed to overcome this disunity, or rather, this is the answer to this state of society. J. Habermas writes in the "Philosophical Discourse of Art Nouveau", "It must be recognized that only discourse connects technical, economic, social and political conditions into a functional network of functional practices, which then serve to reproduce both the discourse itself and this network" (Habermas, p. 281).

The main thing in the theory of communicative action is to achieve agreement, to overcome disunity. V. N. Fure emphasizes, "Reaching agreement should be distinguished from spontaneous unanimity, which can be of very diverse nature; communicative consent should be recognized as significant by the participants in the communication themselves, and not be induced only by external influences. Consent often turns out to be actually forced, but subjectively it is not considered the consent in this case since it is not based on shared beliefs. In other words, the moment of involuntary recognition is fundamentally important for communicative consent, and it is with the procedure of intersubjective recognition of the content of communicative acts that Habermas associates the rational nature of the practice of mutual understanding" (Fure, p. 50). Obviously, without philosophical hermeneutics as a theory of interpretation, it is impossible to solve the problems of the theory of communication, nor to reach a coordinated understanding.

Conclusions. Thus, the development of various philosophical theories, such as the linguistic turn, rational communicative practice, philosophical hermeneutics, in our

opinion, is, along with other reasons, a reaction to a fundamental change in the nature and content of work in the end of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century in philosophy and linguistics.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

Габермас, Ю. Філософський дискурс модерну. Пер. з нім. В. Купліна. К.: Четверта хвиля, 2001. 424 с.

Стенлунд, С. Об ограниченности лингвистической концепции языка. Метафизические исследования. Вып. 1. «Понимание». СПб., 1997. С. 279–289.

Фуре, В. Н. Философия незавершенного модерна Юргена Хабермаса. Минск: Экономпресс, 2000. 224 с.

Gadamer, H.-G. Wahrheit und Methode Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. (Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 1). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990. 495 s.

Heidegger, M. Sein und Zeit. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1987. 450 s.

Husserl, E. Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1965. 107 s.

Merleau-Ponty, M. Éloge de la philosophie et autres essais. Paris: Gallimard, 1989. 308 p.

Rorty, R. The Linguistic Turn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967. 393 p.

Wittgenstein, L. Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. 1973. 114 s.

ЛЕОНІД МОЗГОВИЙ
доктор філософських наук, професор,завідувач кафедри філософії, соціально-політичних і правових наук,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет (м. Слов'янськ, Україна)
e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0003-1810-4054
ВІКТОРІЯ СЛАБОУЗ
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет (м. Слов'янськ, Україна)
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0001-8236-0197
ІННА СУЩЕНКО
студентка філологічного факультету,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет (Слов'янськ, Україна),
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ ПОВОРОТ ТА ЙОГО РОЛЬ ДЛЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ ТА ЛІНГВІСТИКИ У КІНІЦІ 20 ПОЧАТКУ 21 СТОЛІТТЯ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена одній з дискусійних проблем сучасної філософії – проблеми виникнення «лінгвістичного повороту» та його впливу на сучасні політичні, економічні та соціальні науки. Доведено, що сам лінгвістичний поворот можна прирівняти за значимістю своїх домагань і отриманих результатів, мабуть, лише до картезіанського повороту Нового часу в його філософському застосовуванні або коперніканського повороту в науці, тому експлікувати його значимість не представляється навіть необхідним для наукового світу кінця 20-го – початку 21-го ст. У статті доведено, що «лінгвістичний поворот» є таким собі

центром біфуркації усталеної системи існуючих парадигматичних установлень. Подібний інтелектуальний вибух має своїм наслідком некеровану ланцюгову реакцію зі шлейфом наслідків, що доводиться в нашому аналізі впливу «лінгвістичного повороту»: філософія, лінгвістика, філологія, історія, політичні, економічні та соціальні науки асимілювали і розвинули новітні досягнення, отримані в результаті лінгвістичної революції.

Ключові слова: аналітична філософія; біфуркація; лінгвістичний поворот; лінгвістична революція; лінгвістична філософія; мова «тут і зараз»; парадигматичні установлення

ЛЕОНИД МОЗГОВОЙ
доктор философских наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой философии, социально-политических и правовых наук,
Донбасский государственный педагогический университет
(г. Славянск, Украина)
e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0003-1810-4054
ВИКТОРИЯ СЛАБОУЗ
кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков,
Донбасский государственный педагогический университет
(г. Славянск, Украина)
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0001-8236-0197
ИННА СУЩЕНКО
студентка филологического факультета,
Донбасский государственный педагогический университет,
(г. Славянск, Украина),
e-mail: queen_viktotiya28@ukr.net

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ ПОВОРОТ ЕГО РОЛЬ ДЛЯ ФИЛОСОФИИ И ЛИНГВИСТИКИ В КОНЦЕ 20 В НАЧАЛЕ 21 ВЕКА

Статья посвящена одной из дискуссионных проблем современной философии– проблеме возникновения «лингвистического поворота» и его влияния на современные политические, экономические и социальные науки. Доказано, что сам лингвистический поворот сравним по значимости своих притязаний и полученных результатов, пожалуй, лишь с картезианским поворотом Нового времени в его философском приложении либо коперниканским поворотом в науке, поэтому эксплицировать его значимость не представляется даже необходимым для научного мира конца 20-го – начала 21-го вв. В статье доказано, что «лингвистический поворот» является неким центром бифуркации устоявшейся системы существующих парадигматических установок. Подобный интеллектуальный взрыв имеет своим следствием неуправляемую цепную реакцию со шлейфом расходящихся следствий, что доказывается в нашем анализе влияния «лингвистического поворота»: философия, лингвистика, филология, история, политические, экономические и социальные науки ассимилировали и развили новейшие достижения, полученные в результате лингвистической революции.

Ключевые слова: аналитическая философия; бифуркация; лингвистический поворот; лингвистическая революция; лингвистическая философия; язык «здесь и сейчас»; парадигматические установки

REFERENCES

Habermas, J. (2001). *Filosofskyi dyskurs modern [Philosophical Discourse of Art Nouveau]*. (V. Kuplina, Trans.). Kyiv: Chetverta khvylia [in Ukrainian].

Stenlund, S. (1997). Ob ogranichennosti lingvisticheskoi kontceptcii iazyka [On Boundedness of Linguistic Concept of Language]. *Metafizicheskie issledovaniia – Metaphysical Studies, "Ponimanie" – "Understanding", 1, 279–289.* SPb. [in Russian].

Fure, V. N. (2000). *Filosofiia nezavershennogo moderna Iurgena Khabermasa [The Philosophy of Unfinished Modernism of Jürgen Habermas]*. Minsk: Ekonompress [in Russian].

Gadamer, H.-G. (1990). *Wahrheit und Methode Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. (Gesammelte Werke. Bd. 1).* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) [in German].

Heidegger, M. (1987). *Sein und Zeit.* Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen [in German].

Husserl, E. (1965). *Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [in German].

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1989). *Éloge de la Philosophie et Autres Essais*. Paris: Gallimard [in French].

Rorty, R. (1967). The Linguistic Turn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [in English].

Wittgenstein, L. (1973). Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp [in German].

Надійшла до редакції 12.10.2019 р.