

CHAPTER «PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES»

TEMPORALITY OF SOCIAL REALITY AND STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE

Lidiya Gaznyuk¹

Iryna Soina²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-021-6-27>

Abstract. All human activity is associated with the need for interpersonal communication. The need and concern for other people, as for oneself, is a specific feature of the human race, in which biological necessity acts simultaneously, that is, a person's speech and the individuals themselves are necessarily included in the social and humanitarian context. Considering the linguistic reality of social life in the form of a text, we leave the person as the main object of research. Thus, the original text of modern society is formed, which includes the worldview of people and the features of the mental system of their interaction, the way and nature of existence, a kind of sign system in the form of fixed information. The understanding is presented that speech does not reflect the meaning of things and processes of a certain field of activity, but reveals their content and gives meaning within the framework of practical activity. The mechanism of the genetic application of concepts in a certain historical territory and the process of the formation of the semiotic space of social knowledge and the procedure for recognizing its words-signs are substantiated, thanks to which the system of understanding the mentality in intellectual discourse is built. The fundamental problem of the relationship between real time and language is analyzed, the fundamental foundations of the formation of the

¹ Dr. habil. in Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Professor at the Department of Humanities,
Kharkiv State Academy of Physical Culture, Ukraine

² Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian and Foreign Languages,
Kharkiv State Academy of Physical Culture, Ukraine

complete semantic structure of language: an immediate feature – an object – a mediating feature – an indirect feature, taking into account the specifics of human social activity. The existential relations of symbolic-semiotic structures in the plane of interaction of the subject field of signs and the place of the subject with the help of semantics are determined, which provides a differentiated modality of the specified relationship, the structure and levels of meanings, the moments of actualization of the designated and places the terms of the specified relationship in a specific social field of their existence; it is proved that a person acts as a signified and is partially included in the models that form his attitude to the surrounding social being, but at the same time he remains signified, that is, those on whom the formation of these models indirectly depends. The study allows us to comprehend the holistic representation of the linguistic reality of the modern architectonics of social and humanitarian knowledge in the process of globalization transformations of the world in its main dimensions and forms.

1. Introduction

From the point of view of epistemology, the language itself is reflected in time and evolves in it. It is this approach that has been forming in science over the centuries, for example, linguistics has been formed as the history of linguistics, but the basic feature of the relationship between real time and language is the ontological statement that any language can exist exclusively in time. The process of constructing linguistic reality can only be understood by analyzing how it unfolds on the linear axis of real time. We can state that if the linguistic evolutionary process is investigated on the materials of specific languages in a certain sequence, then from the point of view of the ontological approach we consider the general form of the natural existence of language as a world phenomenon, therefore, such problems can be solved within the framework of the philosophy of language: «linguistics has two objects: it is the science of language and the science of languages. Such a difference, which is not always preserved, is necessary: language as a human ability, as a universal and unchanging characteristic of a person, is not the same as there are separate, constantly changing languages in which they are realized» [6, p. 21].

In fact, such a formulation of the problem of the ontology of language forms a new paradigm both in the history of linguistics and in philosophical

thought. Discussion about the movement of language to society and back, change of linguistic codes as a transition from one epistemological group to another, translation from one language to another, etc. runs through the entire history of the philosophy of language.

2. Research methodology and logic

The basic foundations of philosophy begin with Plato's eidos, Leibniz's monad, Kant's «thing-in-itself», Hegel's objective idea, as a deep level of linguistic consciousness in the form of «an object is a common feature»; philosophical Nothingness or linguistically indivisible reality in N. Chomsky's grammar; Kierkegaard's existentialism, Husserl's phenomenology and Heidegger's ontology form an intermediate level of language in the form of a semantic structure «direct feature – object – mediating feature – mediated feature». Representatives of structuralism use language and some of its methods as the basis of a scientific approach to research in the field of humanitarian knowledge, for example, K. Levi-Strauss uses the methods of linguistics in the theoretical ethnography of the spiritual structures of primitive tribes, the proposed methods are applied to the analysis of modernity by R. Barthes, on the human psyche translates linguistic analogies by J. Lacan. The value of linguistic potential in the field of social and humanitarian knowledge reaches a scientific stage thanks to the research of F. de Saussure, G. Guillaume, T. Grimm, V. Dilthey, J. Derrida, J. Kristeva, J. Lacan, A. Rosenstock-Hussy and M. Foucault. The modern methodological foundations of the humanitarian approach in the socio-philosophical study of society are solved in the works of R. Aron, D. Bell, M. Heidegger, J. Coleman, E. Toffler and J. Habermas. F. de Saussure believes that the signified, which by its nature is perceived by ear, unfolds only in time and is characterized by signs borrowed from time: a) it has a length b) this length has one dimension – this is a line. This principle is practically never remembered anywhere, perhaps precisely because it is considered simple, by the way, it is a very essential principle and its consequences are inexhaustible. The whole mechanism of the language depends on it [26], but here F. de Saussure limits the influence of time on the language exclusively to the sphere of the signifier, and language is, first of all, semantics. In addition, the understanding of only the linearity of a language is perceived abstractedly from real time and is considered

an exclusively intralingual phenomenon that destroys the extralanguage ontological foundation of linearity.

3. The linear nature of language and the logical analysis of thinking

The understanding of linearity as such is not associated with the mechanism of correlation of virtual semantic elements on the real-time axis, but is considered as a simple movement in time of language elements in the process of speech communication.

This approach to the definition of the linear character of the language is con-firmed by the thoughts of W. Chafe and C. Fillmore, but they also have certain con-tradictions, for example, saying that it is impossible to imagine that the semantic area has only one dimension, which is similar to the temporal dimensions of the phonetic area, and on the other hand, he distinguishes linear semantic axes «activity – action», «action – goal» and others, considering them polar, that is, limited by two components, while for the temporal phonetic axis there is no such limitation [8, p. 17].

So, we can agree with the proposition that the linear semantic axis is limited by three components, when two opposite semantic axes are a single whole of three components: «the actor – the action – the goal», namely the action connects the goal with the actors, it is this construction ensures the functioning of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of social and humanitarian knowledge. Many linguists believe that the universal basis of a language does not include a linear ordering of elements: «the debate about whether a universal basis of a language is possible was mainly related to the question of whether or not the rules of a universal basis (if any) are asked by the rules of a universal basis (if any) of the linear order of the elements of a sentence. It is widely believed that the universal basic rules specify only the necessary syntactic relations, and the assignment of a linear order to the components of the basic structure is carried out in each language according to its own special rules»[13, p. 370–371]. However, it is impossible to distribute between syntactic relations and the linear ordering of the elements of the sentence. Linearity itself should be understood not as a simple time sequence of the elements of a sentence, but as a way of connecting them on a linear time axis.

Thus, a common universal language base can only be built on a linear, unidi-rectional real-time axis. The proposition that language is a social

phenomenon should be supplemented by the fact that speech is built not only into human society, but also directly dissolved in the universe. Speech characterizes the ways and principles of thinking of a certain cultural and historical period, thus influencing human behavior. The inability of traditional linguistic means to describe new phenomena of social and humanitarian practice gives rise to conceptual and structural misunderstandings in the global system of social coordinates [5, p. 223]. Language ensures the existence of such interdependence as: a person – reality – real time – that is, a person sets the modality of existence, in turn, reality provides its objective content, and time, due to linearity, forms the structure. It is at the intersection of these interconnected vectors that language can be constructed, and the indicated triangle «man – reality – real time» creates the facets of the existence of language.

The very concept of reality is undergoing significant historical transformations in the process of the formation of modern structural and scientific significance. The modern postmodern context testifies to the impossibility of articulating reality as such, suggesting in its place «hyperreality» as a virtual result of simulating the real. Directly the concept of reality comes from the Latin word «material», «real» and at the beginning of its use it served as a synonym for such important categories of scholastic discourse as reality, fundamental principle, reason, and so on, but over time, Duns Scotus notices that everything reveals itself only in the plural of formally distinct realities. In fact, the main function of reality is to provide a dividing line between identity and resolution in what is really similar. Thus, it can be noted that the concept of reality was introduced by Duns Scott, first of all, in order to explain the deep ontological connections both in things themselves and between them. Manifesting the indicated ontological relations with the help of a new filling of the concept of reality, the theologian does not put contradictions in the realistic paradigm, which began to form in the time of Aristotle, thus finally forming the paradigm of objectivity.

In the period of New Time, the process of forming not only ideas about reality as such continues, but the process of cognizing the world in its close connection with the logical-linguistic design, and a critical attitude to the incorrect use of certain linguistic forms is being formed. A classic example is F. Bacon's reasoning about the «idols of the square», when as a result of the violation of the meanings of terms and words in the process

of linguistic communication of people, the search for correct answers becomes impossible. In turn, G. Leibniz wrote: «If there were no symbolic expressions, we would never think about anything and would not reason» [19, p. 406]. T. Hobbes perceives language as a sign system that defines sensory phantasm images [16], and in D. Hume's theory of abstractions, the «word» performs a signal function in the process of a specific sensory representative of a certain general concept.

So, the considered linguistic approaches of the specified intellectual activity build the distinctive features of modern English-language philosophy in the form of an analytical direction. In turn, L. Wittgenstein forms an alternative position to the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, who argued that all categories are relative and have a diffuse nature. Accordingly, a network of such connections is formed that have a center and a periphery. Moreover, the periphery contributes to filling the content of the categories with new meanings, and the mutual penetration of the peripheral spheres of several categories also becomes an essential factor in the transformation of a single semantic field.

An important factor for the development of the methodological foundations of social and humanitarian knowledge is the return to the twentieth century to the hermeneutic approach, which is associated with the works of M. Heidegger. Thus, the hermeneutics of being begins to build, which he identified with the development of a fundamental ontology. H. Gadamer continues the development of the hermeneutic method in his work «Truth and Method» [12]. He defines its basic provisions, proceeding from the fact that a person operates with meanings, and the process of understanding is carried out in a hermetic circle, that is, there is a mutual transition from the whole to the part and vice versa. The hermeneutic circle excludes a beginning. The purpose of hermeneutics is to expand the unity of the learned meaning through concentric circles. For our research, it is important to state that «to understand» means to understand the activity itself, and after understanding the matter, understanding of another's thought appears: «The point is that every portion of the knowledge gained should be immediately used. There is no understanding without the application of knowledge» [12, p. 382].

Understanding is an action and a build-up of hermeneutic experience in the dialectical form of questions and answers; in fact, it is the practice

of reconstructing the essence of the matter in language. Social knowledge cannot exist without constant practical confirmation; in order to form the harmony of life experience, the procedure of application of knowledge must take place. In addition, there is a need for dialogue between people and the requirement for precise language forms. The second important component for this theoretical and methodological process is the development of an interdisciplinary connection between theory and semiotics. The first modern scientist to transform semiotics into a structured science was S. Pearce. His main goal was to create a discipline that harmoniously combined the entire system of sciences. He introduces the concept of «actor» as a subject of semiosis, ensuring the functioning of signs, and it is in this capacity that he acts. The point is that any sign is always the result of the action of an actor, he creates semiotic relations, the opposite poles of which are the sign and its meaning, and they can never change places. There is a certain space between semiotic and real relations, which is overcome by the operation of interpretation. Trichotomy is characteristic of semiosis or the process of functioning of signs: pure grammar, pure logic, pure rhetoric. The first includes exclusively signs, the second considers the relationship between signs and objects, and pure rhetoric establishes the laws of the generation in the intellect of the interpreter of one sign by another, one thought the next.

The work of C.W. Morris «Foundations of the theory of laws», where the main attention was paid to three dimensions of semiosis: syntactics, semantics and pragmatics, which study, respectively, the relationship of signs to each other, the relationship of signs to their objects and the relationship of signs to their interpreters [23, p. 50]. It is this terminology that has been adopted by modern science. Feeling the significant influence of American pragmatism, Morris introduces pragmatic dimensions of semiotics, by which he understands its practical part. But the role of the actor as an interpreter and everything that relates to pragmatics remained incomprehensible. It becomes necessary to introduce values-concepts, therefore pragmatics personifies knowledge in the form of values-concepts. If we consider values not as concepts, then they will be deduced from the limits of conceptuality. Turning to the ideas of modern researchers, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the analysis of values today is closely related to the need for their recognition by society and the determination of their means of achieving goals: «The fact is that goal-setting is a meaningful basis of practice, it

helps a person to form goals as a variant of subjective and the ideal image of the desired and embody them in an objectively real result of activity ... So, values and goals in the system of social and humanitarian knowledge are, first of all, the structure of those values of human skills, abilities and events, which provides the meaning of social experience and knowledge, indicates landmarks, samples, norms that determine the direction of the cultural process. They act as symbols and ideas that express and determine the orientation of people in social reality, within which practical actions of a production-material nature, tools and means of labor, manufactured products acquire meaning, are understood and interpreted by people. Thanks to this mechanism, the same «objective» knowledge and things constantly appear in the real experience of a person during his life, in the system of different values acquire a mismatching meaning.

So, the analysis of the basic constructs of semiotics makes it possible to determine due to such concepts as structure, system, model and code. Thanks to this, we can assert that systemic and structural-functional analysis, which are the basic methodological means of social sciences and humanities, exist only within the framework of semiotics. In addition, Morris believes that «the word «truth» as it is always used is a concept of semiotics that cannot be used from the point of view of one specific dimension, otherwise it should be explicitly discussed» [23, p. 80], – therefore, we cannot relate the concept of truth only with semantics. In his opinion, the concept of truth reaches its meaning only in pragmatics. As you can see, defining three dimensions of semiotics, respectively, three types of truth are determined: syntactic, semantic and the concept of pragmatic truth.

In the standard concept of classical science, it was believed that facts create an empirical basis that, regardless of theory, can make an objective judgment on it. This approach is critically analyzed in the works of K. Hübner. As a result, he proves that the facts of science are always theoretically loaded and are not independent of theoretical knowledge. Accordingly, the situation of inconsistency of the facts of the theory is not an indisputable basis for rejecting it. These methodological approaches are widely known today, but in the middle of the twentieth century they were controversial in the scientific community. The point is that empirical truths are formed thanks to a complex organizational system, which includes not only theoretically proven laws, categories, ideas, but also takes into account

the socio-historical context and socio-cultural conditions of a particular era. It is the consideration of all these components that determines the strategies for the formation of scientific theories.

So, the historical approach opens up a new field of problems, it represents a system of scientific knowledge in historical development, which is constantly influenced by social factors. The knowledge system develops harmoniously as long as the characteristics of reality, which are presented in the scientific picture of the world, correspond to the characteristics of the objects under study, and the methods that are used for this refer to the norms of scientific knowledge. However, fundamentally new objects are constantly involved in the orbit of scientific research, which leads to the formation of paradoxical situations [17, p. 16–17].

K. Hübner defines the heredity of his ideas regarding the Kantian a priori, but notes that a priori assumptions as conditions of scientific knowledge have a historically changeable character and depend on the influence of the sociocultural context. Also A. Einstein believed that theories cannot be deduced from experience, they are created as if from above in relation to experience. The principles of theory are, as it were, inspired by experience, but they are not an inductive generalization of experimental facts, so reality also consists of substances, the properties of which do not depend on the relationship between individual substances (Aristotle and Descartes). While Bohr personifies reality as a relationship between substances, and changes re-veal a certain state inherent in a given reality. In fact, change is what states reality (Kierkegaard and James).

So, according to Einstein, substances determine relations, and according to Bohr, substances are determined by relations. During such a long discussion, none of them was able to unequivocally prove their approach, or refute each other, but it turned out that the «facts» for each of them have a different meaning and manifest themselves in different ways.

The original scientific position was proposed by A. Rosenstock-Hussy, he believed that the objective method of Descartes is suitable only for the natural sciences, and not for the social. For the social sciences, an adequate method is those shoots that are contained in the living forms of human speech. This «grammatical method», in contrast to the Cartesian method, is in fact universal, that is, it is applied to the whole of reality, while the Cartesian becomes only one of the four elements that make up the «grammatical» method. He makes

an attempt to apply the speech method to history, sociology, psychology and theology. In fact, a viable interpretation of any human experience has been proposed. From his point of view, man is a living natural creature that is able to rise above nature thanks to language. It shows that humanity was shaped by four types of language. The language of the tribe sends a person to his ancestors, to what was in antiquity. Temple language (for example, Ancient Egypt) directs a person to the stars, to the world that exists outside of him. The language of philosophy and literature of the ancient Greeks concentrates a person in his inner «I», and the language of the people of Israel, thanks to prophecies, turned a person to his future. As a result, since the spread of Christianity, these four ancient modes of language have been combined into a single whole. A person ceases to be limited to one of certain linguistic types and has the ability to choose any of the material forms. A rhythm was discovered, which gradually begins to form its response to reality, which for the first time appears in the form of an imperative.

In his works, A. Rosenstock-Hussy demonstrates how a person discovers himself through language and how institutions can be analyzed using the grammatical method. He shows how a person reveals himself in four aspects: 1) a person perceives the imperatives of the language, which he hears addressed to him as «You». There is an invitation here to fulfill your future; 2) responding to a request, a person reveals his «I», as the inner unity of his personality; 3) thanks to such creative self-realization and realization of one's unity with the human race, the linguistic form «We» appears; 4) the stage when a person is perceived as a member of a certain professional group, has his own name and stands out against the background of another, then the category «He» arises. So, the four orientations in reality in relation to the past and the future, to the inner and outer world in space, together create the «cross of reality». In this form, the grammatical method can be characterized as cruciform-fundamental, since it interprets reality in the form of a cross. It is language that creates inner and outer space (I and He), how it creates time directed backward, as well as time directed forward (We and You). In addition, Rosenstock-Hussy tries to prove the idea that the church's concept of the Holy Spirit today can be called «the language of the human race». The divinity of man is manifested in his ability to speak and listen, and God is not a supernatural being, but «the power that makes man speak». «To speak means to be in the center of the cross of reality» [25, p. 55].

The logical analysis of thinking is always carried out through the study of its results – the thoughts expressed in the language, therefore logic is at the same time the science of the laws and forms of thinking and of language as a form of existence of thought. Thinking and speech are interconnected in the process of cognition. Logic studies the structure, forms, methods and rules of thinking, while linguistics – the structure and patterns of language functioning. Logically, the most important functions of a language are descriptive and prescriptive (evaluative). Sense first appeared as a theoretical construct, which served as a means of knowing the logical nature of the concept and the linguistic nature of the word. As a term in logic and linguistics, «sense» correlates with «meaning». The word is considered as a carrier of a certain meaning and sends us to the denotation – a multitude of objects or phenomena that are designated by this word. Denotation evokes thought, the meaning of the word, and is associated with the very way by which such a multitude of objects or phenomena are distinguished by indicating their characteristic properties. The meaning (denotation) is associated with a linguistic unit: a word, a sentence; and the sense (connotation) is with the event of speech, the context in which the linguistic units are accepted. Therefore, the meaning of a word is a relatively stable linguistic formation, and the sense is situational, depending on communication. The meaning has a common content for all native speakers, and the sense depends on the personal experience of the speaker (more broadly, the communicant), his education, profession, language environment, age, gender, historical and cultural background, and the like. The sense arises through the comparison of a word as a separate, particular one with a certain integrity or horizon, with what is always already predetermined, is always already meant in any understanding of things, in any relation to them. The logical-semantic aspect of the problem of sense unfolds in the plane of the «sign and the designated», on the basis of which a special science of signs – semiotics, or semiology, was born at the beginning of the 20th century. In his work «On Sense and Meaning» (Gottlob Frege «Über Sinn und Bedeutung», 1892) [14], Frege formulated the difference between sense and meaning, which were identified not only at the level of everyday consciousness, but also in classical linguistics. Meaning (denotation, volume in classical or formal logic) is an object or class, a set of objects that are designated by a concept or statement. Sense (content in formal logic) is the content of thought.

The sense is expressed in speech and becomes the subject of understanding. According to Frege, any name denotes an object that is called meaning and gives out some sense, which in one way or another characterizes the meaning of the name of human speech and denotes objects, actions, qualities or relationships. The main function of the word-sign is the refer-ence. The referential meaning introduces a word or statement into a certain system of logical generalizations that are common to all people. This system is known and un-derstandable to people due to the unchanging content of the center of interconnection of language units. Frege, developing a method of language analysis, began by studying the structure of a word, as a result of which the Frege triangle appeared, the sides of which are sense, meaning and denotation. Each of these constituents of the word introduces it into various communication systems. The sense is in the system «word – speaker (person, I)». Meaning – into the system «word – sign system (speech, world of ideas)». Denotat – into the system «word – objective world». Sense is the content of thought, which is expressed in speech, becoming the subject of understanding. From that time on, the sense began to be called, as a rule, the meaning of a word (statement) in the process of communication, living speech. In the sense, systemic linguistic connections or relations are revealed and an individual, situational meaning arises [4, p. 24]. To a certain extent, this meant the differentiation of the objective-presentive «meaning» of the word and the subjective-communicative «sense». Frege himself believed that sense appears at the level of utterance and is associated with the way of filling the object with meaning. The problem of the logical relationship between a word, its meaning, content (sense) and an object appeared in antiquity. According to Sextus, Empiricus (Σέξτος Εμπειρικός), solved the problem of true and false. Some philosophers associated it with «the designated object, the second with the word, and still others with the movement of thought». The Stoics distinguished three elements: 1) designated – a thing that is designated by a word and evokes an established idea of an object in thought; 2) sign – a word that has a sound expression; and 3) an object that is independent of a person an object of designation. The signifier (sound expression) and the object are bodily, and the signified (sense of the word) is ethereal. That's exactly what is according to the Stoics true or false. The followers of Epicurus (Επίκουρος) took into account only the sign (word) and the object, associating truth or falsity with

the first. The relationship between truth and the movement of thought was established, most likely, in scholastic philosophy [28, p. 153]. Followers of Zeno of Elea (Ζήνων ὁ Ἐλεάτης) interpreted sense as one of the five points necessary for sensory perception, among which: sensory organ, sensory object, place, method [of appearance] and sense. And if there is not at least one of them, then there will be no perception, for example, in conditions of abnormal thought [28, p. 146]. That is, we can conclude that perception is meaningful, and sense appears as a system of interconnections, which include the object of perception. The achievement of scholastic logic was the concept of connotation, which denotes the total or full meaning of a word, both descriptive and emotional. This concept entered semiotics only in the 20 century thanks to the Danish linguist Louis Hjelmslev and often replaces the word «sense», as Frege defined it, with the content generated by speech practice. Connotations (additional meanings) are formed in combinations, meaningful word chains (syntagmas). Connotations are built over the main lexical and grammatical meanings of words. In linguistics, their main function is considered to be the description of the accompanying emotional-expressive meaning of a linguistic unit, in addition to the abstract or descriptive meaning. In stylistics, connotation means additional semantic and stylistic shades that are superimposed on the main meaning of a word in the process of communication and convey expressions of expressive color, a certain tone, colouring.

The system of interrelationships that include a word is called a semantic structure. Since the coordinates of a word in this structure are determined not only by language, text, but also by a person's knowledge, his picture of the world, linguistic-logical analysis enters the problem field of the science of philosophy, acquires methodological significance. Thus, Frege raises the question of the sense and meaning of sentences in the context of the problem of truth as a criterion and regulator of cognition. Thought is the sense of a sentence, not its meaning. «It is the pursuit of truth that makes us move forward, from the sense of the sentence to its meaning», writes Frege [14, p. 226]. We are interested in the true meaning of thought, we want each proper name to have a meaning. A proper name is a word, sign, combination of signs, an expression in which the sense is expressed and by which the meaning is indicated. The meaning of a sentence is revealed only when the meaning of its constituent parts is established. Any declarative

sentence, depending on the meanings of the words of which it consists, can be considered as a name, the meaning of which, if it exists, will be either true or false. At the same time, «for the cognitive value», Frege notes, «the sense of the sentence, namely the thought expressed in it, is no less important than its meaning, that is, the truth meaning» [14, p. 240].

4. Language communications and linguistic practices

In the process of socio-historical development, the concept of «linguistic reality» undergoes significant linguo-semantic transformations, and the situation of the postmodern context emphasizes the impossibility of articulating reality itself, replacing it with hyperreality as the possibility of simulating the real. The specified pragmatics of language, for example, in the works of K.-O. Apel [1] and J. Habermas [15], is investigated as a sphere of various linguistic communications and linguistic practices. J.-F. Lyotard [22; 20] announces a multiverse of «linguistic agonists», L. Wittgenstein [30] proposes a spontaneous rhizomatic proliferation of «language games», P. Riker [24] writes about an open family of heterogeneous hermeneutics and the like.

Thus, it can be noted that the concept of reality was introduced in order to explain the deep ontological connections both in things themselves and between them, manifesting the indicated ontological relations with the help of a new filling of the concept of reality. The formation of the classical scientific concept of reality ends with the ideas of Galileo and Leibniz in the era of Modern times. The non-classical period in science does not recognize reality as such, it personifies a certain network of relationships between different parts of a single whole. Starting from the ideas of Descartes and to the works of Kant, inclusively, the paradigm of subjectivity was formed, but the principle of representation, which for a long time dominated in classical philosophy, is losing its meaning and organizing power, which results in the blurring of the boundaries between reality and its reflections. The classical theory of representation was based on the ideas of F. de Saussure, who, considering language «in itself and for itself», established that speech forms a system, since it consists of formal elements that are combined in certain combinations in accordance with the requirements of the structure.

The structure represents the types of relations that form the basis for the union of units of a certain level. Thanks to the systemic-structural approach,

the question of the correlation between the plane of expression and the plane of content in the language is greatly simplified, and the relationship between them is defined as the association of the signified and the signifier. The latter, according to F. de Saussure, are like two sides of one sheet of paper, and therefore you cannot cut one above them without cutting the other. This situation is refuted by representatives of postmodern French philosophy. Such an objection is especially obvious in the philosophical constructions of J. Baudrillard, for whom there is no reality at all, displayed by signs. In his opinion, symbols reflected reality even before the beginning of the Renaissance, since they were included in symbolic exchange. Signs, on the other hand, are only able to cast a shadow on reality, turning it into a simulation model, that is, into a simulacrum. Therefore, the reverse side of the sign cannot be the hidden meaning of the front. So, it is enough for signs to return to reality with the reverse side – and the opposition between sign and reality will not make sense. Such arguments lead J. Baudrillard to the conclusion that reality itself is just a «procession of simulacra».

The modern postmodern approach focuses on language, text and discourse. The problem of the continuum of the categorical apparatus in the architectonics of modern science is not only a question about the essence of the concept of reality as such, but, first of all, it is a solution to the problem of text and intertextuality, narrative linguistic reference of knowledge, and the like. Turning to Derrida's opinion that a system of categories is a system of ways of constructing being, an attempt to provide meaningful characteristics to the concept of reality becomes identical to the process of linguistic construction.

Thus, language is both a process and a result of structuring by human consciousness of the object-designated continuum of the world on the real-time axis. Turning to the ideas of W. Humboldt, we recall that he considered language primarily the activity of the human spirit, and not the product of this activity [18, p. 70]. The meaning of such activity lies in the fact that human consciousness constantly builds a subject-meaningful configuration that reflects the world on the linear axis of real time.

The modern scientific approach fixes changes in the physical qualities of time, depending on the level that it occupies in the universe, that is, in the macrocosm, speech relies on the physical properties of real time precisely in the macrocosm. Real time, which is the ontological basis of such a language

existence, acquires the character of an instant stop and has such features as linearity and irreversibility. Accordingly, only two types of structures can be built to such properties on a linear unidirectional real-time axis. The first type of structure provides a temporal relationship «earlier – later», that is, one event occurs first, and only then another can occur. Second type personifies the temporal relationship «past – present – future», that is, the first and third events can be related only to the second event. Such mediated relations include two binary asymmetric relations, when the first event is asymmetrically associated with the second, and it is already with the third. In natural human language, such events, located on a linear unidirectional axis of real time, are virtual semantic constructs, an object and its properties, and on the surface are nominative signs and words. The union of transitive and asymmetric relations provides an ontological temporal substrate on which the original semantic structure of the language is based.

The formation of speech begins with the fact that reality is divided in human consciousness into such ideal constructs as an object and a property, and they create an asymmetric structure, since the property depends on the object, and the structure itself is potentially infinite, since one object can be both real, and potential properties are infinite. It is at this stage that the involvement of the time factor takes place, that is, a virtual structure consisting of an object and its general properties unfolds on a linear unidirectional real-time axis, then it becomes actually finite and is stated as a specific linguistic structure [29, p. 283]. It should be added that to the right of the object, sequentially and according to the direction of time, two properties are located, and one of them takes place between the object and the second property, and then all the indicated elements are connected by a transitive connection. As you can see, the initial semantic structure of the language takes on the following form: subject – mediating feature – mediated feature. It is also necessary to add one more component – a direct sign that takes place to the left of the object, that is, in the opposite direction of time.

So, the complete semantic structure of the language has the following form: an immediate feature – an object – a mediating feature – an indirect feature. On the one hand, such a structure is the result of a reflection of extra-linguistic reality, from which it receives its content in the form of a subject-specific connection, and on the other hand, the features are

located on a linear time axis, which leads to their intra-linguistic positional differentiation. In fact, there is a combination of what was determined by reality and what was determined by real time. That is why the structure is stated as specifically linguistic: it reflects reality and at the same time does not de-pend on it.

The initial structure proposed by us is further divided into two parts. Relatively speaking, the first part is the transitive construction «object – mediating feature – mediated feature»; it fixes sentences with all its specific communicative properties, including its characteristic as a logical judgment. The second part of the structure is the asymmetric part «direct sign – object», it already performs a nominative function, that is, it names scattered fragments of reality. It should be noted that the original semantic structure does not just mechanically combine these two parts, but is organically integral, therefore the communication and nomination functions are combined in a deep semantic structure.

In the philosophical approach, very often, as in linguistic semantics, the concept of «subject» is used, but at the same time they abstract from the concept of «signs», this approach is quite legitimate, since it is he who is located both in the center of consciousness and cognition, and in the center language. But here it is necessary to take into account several remarks, for example, the concept of «object» can very often be fetishized, and it cannot be immediately ready-made. The subject appears only after certain logical and linguistic operations. Accordingly, we can conclude that the main task of the philosophy of language is the procedure for comprehending the process of making an object by linguistic consciousness.

Thus, the production of «objects» of the social and humanitarian sphere by the linguistic consciousness occurs due to the linear configuration of the corresponding features in the process of their construction on the real-time axis thanks to the grammar of the natural language. From an ontological point of view, the essence of grammar lies in the production of an object, therefore grammar functions before the procedure of nomination and communication, and already within them the finished object functions. This means that from the very beginning of the existence of the language, the concept of «object – feature» are inseparable. «The essence of a sentence in all languages of the world lies in the deployment of the attributes of an object. Before the recognition of the signs, there could be no question. Any

language, the most primitive, presupposes a clear awareness of an object and its features. Outside of this condition, language itself is not possible. Therefore, any considerations about the fact that at first there was no clear separation of parts of speech in the language seem to us completely unreasonable» [27, p. 238]. Language is a material carrier of social and communicative interaction between people, therefore the fundamental typology of grammar and the fundamental typology of social relations are identical with each other: «Grammar is the self-awareness of language, just as logic is the self-awareness of thinking... By speaking, we strengthen the temporal and spatial axes of our civilization, because we occupy a place in its center, positioning ourselves face to face with its four aspects – its future, its present, its inner solidarity, its outer struggle. And in the face of this specific and dangerous openness to the four spheres of life, our words must establish a certain balance: at each given moment, speech distributes and organizes the universe anew» [25, p. 21].

The predicative structure also unfolds in a different direction, when the speaker, in addition to an indirect attribute, in addition to a qualitative property, also takes into account the relationship of the object to space and time, as well as to the second object – the object. As a result, such a procedure of intentional or modal influence acquires a multicomponent character and breaks down into an initial element or qualitative, locative, temporal, object or secondary elements. In addition, the boundaries between them are blurred by such semantic elements that express reason, purpose, and the like.

5. Conclusions

So, the sentence is built at the intersection of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes, thereby acquiring volumetric linearity, but at the same time it remains three-term. It is also necessary to consider such a basic concept of Husserl's phenomenology as intentionality, which determines the primary sense-forming orientation of con-consciousness to the surrounding world. This understanding has become widely used in modern linguistic semantics, for example, by D. Searle, and in the philosophy of Husserl and Heidegger, intentionality is closely associated with the existence of a person in time. Within the framework of the temporal concept of language, intentionality is defined as the volitional construction by the human

consciousness of objects-signs of configuration, and which reflects the world on the axis of real time. Intentionality is characterized by the fact that the world is divided into an object and a sign, the world and the person themselves are in real time, while time is one-dimensional and irreversible. In fact, in the process of an intentional act, a person separates an object from the configuration of its features, relying on real time, thereby forming such a category as modality. It provides the process of connecting an object and its features on the real-time axis.

Thus, the philosophy of language considers three possible variants of existence in time. Real time gives us a reference point for physical time, on the axis of which the physical world unfolds. Next, we are faced with the type of linguistic time – this is real time, on the axis of which natural human speech unfolds, and intentionality and modality provide the process of uniting the speaking person with the object and its features on the real time axis. As you can see, the linguistic potential is created due to the accumulation of any knowledge of real human communities, indirectly reflecting the deep structures of social life. Within the framework of the language, such knowledge acquires its unique systemicity and consistency, which ultimately determines the relative independence of the laws of the existence of the language, which form the possibility of communication and understanding between different people within a particular sphere of activity.

References:

1. Apel K.-O. (1997) *Transtsendental'no-germenevticheskoe ponyatie yazyka* [Transcendental-hermeneutic concept of language]. *Questions of philosophy*, no. 1, pp. 76–92.
2. Baudrillard J. (2003) *K kritike politicheskoy ekonomii znaka* [To the criticism of the political economy of the sign]. Moscow: Biblion-Russian book. (in Russian)
3. Baudrillard J. (2006) *Paroli. Ot fagmenta k fragmentu* [Passwords. From phage to fragment]. Yekaterinburg: U-FACTORIA. (in Russian)
4. Beilyn M.V., Semenova Yu.A. (2018) *Komunikatyvni praktyky i nominatyvna leksyka v subkulturi sportu / Social sciences: development prospects in countries of Europe at the beginning of the third millennium: Collective monograph*. Riga: Izdevnieciba «Baltija Publishing», pp. 21–38.
5. Beilin, M., Shangaraeva, L., Yarkhamova, A., Mukhametshina, A., & Agol, D. (2018) *National cultural semantics through the prism of phraseological units. Amazonia Investiga*, vol. 7, Núm. 13 (Marzo – Abril), pp. 221–226.

6. Benvenist E. (1974) *Obshchaya lingvistika* [General linguistics]. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
7. Chafe W. (1975) *Znachenie i struktura yazyka* [Meaning and structure of language]. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
8. Chase R. (2001) *Proizvodstvennyy i operatsionnyy menedzhment*. [Production and Operations Management]. Moscow: Publishing house «Williams». (in Russian)
9. Chomsky N. (1962) *Sintaksicheskie struktury*. [Syntactic structures]. *Novoe v lingvistike* [New in linguistics]. Moscow, vol. 2. (in Russian)
10. Chomsky N. (1972) *Yazyk i myshlenie* [Language and thinking]. Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow University. (in Russian)
11. Derrida J. (1997) *Pytannia styliu* [Questions of style]. *Vsesvit*, no. 7. pp. 147–153.
12. Gadamer H.-G. (1988) *Istina i metod. Opyt filosofskoy germeneytiki* [Truth and Method. Experience of philosophical hermeneutics]. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
13. Fillmore Ch. (1983) *Osnovnye problemy leksicheskoy semantiki* [Basic problems of lexical semantics]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike* [New in foreign linguistics]. Moscow, vol. 12. (in Russian)
14. Frege G. (2000) *O smysle i znachenii* [On the sense and meaning]. *Logika i logicheskaya semantika* [Logic and logical semantics]. Moscow, pp. 220–246. (in Russian)
15. Habermas Y. (2001) *Vovlechenie drugogo. Ocherki politicheskoy teorii* [Involvement of the other. Essays on political theory]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
16. Hobbes T. (1964) *Sochineniya. V 2-kh tomakh* [Works. In 2 volumes]. Moscow: Mysl, vol. 2. (in Russian)
17. Hübner K. (1994) *Kritika nauchnogo razuma* [Critique of scientific reason]. Moscow: IFRAN. (in Russian)
18. Humboldt von W. (2000) *O razlichii stroeniya chelovecheskikh yazykov i ego vliyaniya na dukhovnoe razvitiye chelovechestva* [On the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind]. *Izbrannyye trudy po yazykoznaniiyu* [Selected works on linguistics]. Moscow: Progress, pp. 37–298. (in Russian)
19. Leibniz G.W. (1982) *Rassuzhdenie o metafizike* [Discourse on metaphysics]. *Sochineniya v 4 tomakh* [Works in 4 volumes]. Moscow: Mysl, vol. 1, pp. 125–163. (in Russian)
20. Lyotard J.-F. (1995) *Postmodernistskoe sostoyanie: doklad o znanii* [Postmodern state: a report on knowledge]. *Philosophical and sociological thought*, no. 5-6, pp. 16–42.
21. Lyotard J.-F. (1998) *Sostoyanie postmoderna* [The state of postmodernity]. Moscow-Saint-Petersburg: Institute of Experimental Sociology. Aletheia. (in Russian)
22. Lyotard J.-F. (1995) *Zametka o smyslakh «post-»* [A note on the meanings of «post-»]. *Foreign literature*, no. 1, pp. 55–65.
23. Morris Ch. (2001) *Osnovanie teorii znakov* [Foundation of the theory of signs]. *Semiotika: Antologiya* [Semiotics: Anthology]. Moscow: Yekaterinburg, pp. 45–97. (in Russian)

24. Ricœur P. (2002) *Konflikt interpretatsiy. Ocherki o germenевtike*. [Conflict of interpretations. Essays on hermeneutics]. Moscow: CANON-PRESS-Ts; Kuchkov field. (in Russian)
25. Rosenstock-Huessy E. (1994) *Rech' i deystvitel'nost'* [Speech and reality]. Moscow: Labyrinth. (in Russian)
26. Saussure F. (1977) *Trudy po yazykoznaniiyu* [Works on linguistics]. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
27. Serebrennikov B.A. (1973) *Obshchee yazykoznanie. Metody lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy* [General linguistics. Linguistic research methods]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)
28. Sextus Empiricus (1975) *Sochineniya v 2-kh t.* [Works in 2 volumes]. Moscow: Mysl', vol. 1. Retrieved from: http://krotov.info/lib_sec/18_s/sek/sekst_1_2.htm (in Russian)
29. Soina I.Yu., Semenova Yu.A., Goncharov G.N., Petrusenko N.Yu., Kambur N.A., Chervona S.Ph. (2019) Poetic understanding as the initial input of Being-in-the-world. *Amazonia Investiga*. Columbia, vol. 8, Num. 22: 278–286. Mayo – Junio. Retrieved from: <http://www.udla.edu.co/revistas/index.php/amazonia-investiga>
30. Wittgenstein L. (1994) *Filosofskie issledovaniya* [Philosophical research]. *Filosofskie raboty* [Philosophical works]. Moscow: Gnozis, vol. 1. (in Russian)