Azərbaycan Milli Elmlər Akademiyasi M. Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar Institutu, *ISSN 2224-9257*
Filologiya məsələləri № 2, 2024
Səh. 56-65
https://doi.org/10.62837/2024.2.56

SHIKHIYEVA SEVDA NAMAZ
AZERBAIJAN STATE OIL AND INDUSTRY UNIVERSITY
sevda.shikhiyeva.az@gmail.com

LANGUAGE AS AN OBJECT OF MODERN PHILOLOGY

SUMMARY

The end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st centuries is the time when the problem of the status of philology, its structure and place in the humanities became relevant again.

And there are a number of explanations for this.

The turn of the century "coincided" with the transformation of the paradigmatic foundations of the humanities: we mean, first of all, the promotion of the philosophy of sign systems and communications, semiotics, and hermeneutics to the center of humanitarian knowledge, which is especially significant for philology, which is associated with the anthropocentric turn in science and gave rise to post-anthropocentrism, with its integration of cognitive and communicative approaches to the study of language, as a basic characteristic of modern linguistics. The importance of natural language as the basis of knowledge and explanation in the humanities and natural sciences has increased; The role of natural language in social relations and activities has grown, especially in Russia in connection with the socio-cultural processes of the 1989-2000s. N. Chomsky makes a fair judgment: "...language participates in a decisive way in thought, action and social relations" (1, p. 132).

Key words: humanitarian semiotics, hermeneutics, linguistics, preservation of philology, literary text, reunion, fundamental theories, ontology of language, philological theory.

Introduction: This article attempts to consider language as an object of modern philology; it is natural that such a statement actualizes the problem of the relationship between language as an object of philology and language as a subject of linguistics.

The history of philology teaches that at different stages of the development of the latter (2, pp. 3-17), different relationships between its components (primarily linguistics and literary criticism), its different objects (one object), dominate.

We proceed from the fact that modern philology is a set/commonwealth of such sciences as linguistics, literary criticism and folkloristics, which are its components, as well as a number of scientific disciplines, traditional and modern, and distinguished by a more complex structure and arrangement than even in recent times past. The fact is that the unity of philological sciences and disciplines is ensured by the objects of philology, which include language; Homo Loquens and text; disciplines that are generally significant from the point of view of the integration of the components of philology: humanitarian semiotics, philological hermeneutics and text theory, which represent a kind of "general philological" base

of the entire set in content, but above all in methodological terms; The area of interdisciplinary philological knowledge, which includes primarily rhetoric, stylistics, and poetics, is also significant in this regard. In earlier publications, the situation described here in modern philology has developed as a result of the development of its individual sciences and disciplines, the growth of interactions between them, qualitative changes in speech communication and science at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries. Moreover, the unity of man and his language becomes the central meaning-forming category of humanitarian knowledge in general and philological knowledge in particular (3; 4).

1. Study: The problem of language as an object of philology and a subject of linguistics goes back to linguistic traditions, the origins of which are W. von Humboldt and F. de Saussure.

Let us present some of W. von Humboldt's judgments about the relationship between philology and linguistics: philology and linguistics (=general linguistics) are "two different directions in the study of language" (5, p. 169). If philology "starts mainly from surviving monuments, seeks to collect and record them in order to obtain reliable information about antiquity" (5, p. 169), then (general) linguistics "seeks to comprehend language in general" (5, p. 313).

At the same time, Humboldt notes the emerging changes in the understanding of the relationship between philology and linguistics: the concept of philology "very recently, especially in France and England, began to be extended to all studies of any languages" (5 , p. 169).

F. de Saussure stated that philology differs sharply from linguistics (6, p. 44): "Language is not the only object of philology: it, first of all, sets itself the task of establishing, interpreting and commenting on texts. This main task also leads to study the history of literature, life, social institutions, etc. ...its interests lie almost exclusively in the field of Greek and Roman antiquities" (6, pp. 39-40). Language is required by philology in order "to compare texts from different eras, determine the language peculiar to a given author, decipher and explain inscriptions in archaic or poorly known languages" (6, p. 39), while in linguistics "language is an integrity in itself , thus being the starting point (principe) of classification" (6, p. 48).

So, the founders of the science of language, despite all the differences in their initial methodological principles, quite clearly formulated the thesis about the significant differences between philology and linguistics, which determines the different directions of language study in both.

Similar positions were expressed in the first half - mid-twentieth centuries. The most categorical idea about the distinction between philology and linguistics was formulated by G. Schuchardt, who recognized in his "division" of sciences that linguistics, literary criticism and cultural history are separate sciences. "The identity of the research method is much more important than the unification of heterogeneous objects," said G. Schuchardt (7, p. 52). The term "philology" must be abandoned: in other fields of knowledge there is no analogy to "what should be understood by the term "philology"" (7, pp. 51-52). At the same time, the research practice of the time

under review turned out to be clearly richer and more complex than the scientific judgments of specialists. In this regard, the philological works of L.V. Shcherba, M.M. Bakhtin, V.V. Vinogradov, V.M. Voloshinov and others, who focused attention on the work of art and its language, stand out in terms of issues, methodology and methods of working with material , in the language of the writer, which, apparently, greatly contributed to the preservation of philology as a single, but dismembered branch of knowledge and sphere of practical activity. It seems that, for example, the scientific method of V.V. Vinogradov the grammarian, qualified by N.Yu. Shvedova as "a method of objective synthesizing research into the external and internal aspects of a grammatical unit and its intralingual connections (8, p. 6), was formed taking into account his experience in researching a work of art (the writer's style) as a whole. The last third of the twentieth century was marked by the actualization of the problem of the status of philology, which again raised the question of language as an object of philology and a subject of linguistics. An important incentive for addressing the problem of the status of philology was the publication in 1981 of the work of G.O. Vinokur, written in the mid-1940s, "Introduction to the study of philological sciences" (9), where philology is considered from different angles of view, which allowed the author to discover its complex, non-unilinear relations with other sciences, in particular with linguistics. At the same time, as S.I. Gindin rightly notes, domestic researchers of language, "literary creativity" and culture until the end of the 1970s did not even need the concept of philology (10, pp. 123, 128). As for foreign researchers of the same time, according to, for example, lexicographic publications, in many cases philology is considered as a science about language - about language and writing (11, p. 287), mainly about its history and development (12, p. 1057) etc.; The same is evidenced by the materials given in (2).

During this period, virtually every decade brings its own vision of the problem.

The 1970s (S.S. Averintsev, R.A. Budagov, Yu.V. Rozhdestvensky and others) revived the idea of the integrity of philology based on the recognition of its object of text / exemplary literary text, which means the recognition of linguistics, literary criticism, and sometimes folkloristics (in Yu.V. Rozhdestvensky in (13, p. 23) - and a number of other scientific disciplines) components of philology. It was in this decade that S.S. Averintsev, a classical philologist by profession, formulated an understanding of philology that has become popular to this day: "Philology ... is a community of humanitarian disciplines - linguistics, literary criticism, textual criticism, source studies, paleography, etc., studying spiritual culture of humanity through linguistic and stylistic analysis of texts" (14, p. 544).

2. The reasoning process: In the 1980s (R.R. Gelgardt, A.I. Gorshkov, D.S. Likhachev, etc.) attention was drawn to the complexity of philology as a science / branch of science. Thus, Yu.A. Belchikov writes: "...modern philology is a complex science that unites scientific disciplines that study languages, literatures and folk poetry in their history and current state, as well as the most general patterns of

language, literature, folklore as social -historically determined phenomena of human culture" (15, p. 36).

The 1990s - early 2000s - a time of conflicting assessments of the situation in philology: on the one hand, philology is recognized as a "mechanical conglomerate" of linguistics and literary criticism, a "marriage" of literary criticism and linguistics (16, pp. 122-123), on the other hand, the developing integrity of philology is emphasized, and the growth of the specificity of the sciences and scientific disciplines that make it up (17), the range of objects of philology is expanding, including in the works of, for example, I.V. Arnold (18, pp. 380-382) and A.A. Chuvakin (4, pp. 301-302) the word and language are included respectively. So, the idea, dating back to J. Grimm, that language is studied both philologically and linguistically, at the present stage of development of philological sciences, taking into account the above, can be reformulated as follows: language is one of the objects of philology and the subject of linguistics. Let us present - inevitably briefly - the argumentation of this thesis, highlighting the problem of language as an object of philology. If linguistics, like literary criticism and folkloristics, is one of the sciences that make up philology, then we can assume that language as a subject of linguistics is language as an object of philology. This solution suggests itself in accordance with the logic of the traditional version of the relationship between a system and its components: recognition of an object by a system is associated with the presence of interrelationships and interactions between the components of the object. However, there are significant obstacles to making such a decision. First of all:

In the modern science of language, there are actually two different linguistics, one of which goes back to the ideas of Saussure, the other to Humboldt, whose positions are methodologically not close and the implementation of whose ideas in the twentieth century gave fundamentally different understandings of language. Each of linguistics has its own subject of study: language as a system or language as an activity. It is not without reason that N.A. Slyusareva claims that Saussure's concept became the springboard from which numerous directions in the linguistics of our time took off (19); somewhat earlier, V.I. Postovalova stated the fundamental significance of Humboldt's concept for linguistics (20). If this is so, then the question of what understanding of language as a subject of linguistics is identified with the understanding of language as an object of philology will remain not only unclear, but even unanswered. With both - at the same time? It's unlikely: the logic of science prevents this (not only philology will turn into an "aggregate of information" (Hegel), but also linguistics, which contradicts even the so-called common sense), and the entire research practice of the 20th century. and especially of our time.

Their own "non-linguistic" ideas about language are characteristic of other philological sciences, primarily literary criticism, for which language is a component of verbal art (21, p. 1257), as well as philological disciplines - rhetoric, stylistics, poetics, which are actually interdisciplinary in modern philology position. These ideas are outside the scope of linguistics, but are part of philology.

Finally, it is important to note that the assessed position contradicts the entire history of philology as a science and its components.

However, in systems science there is another understanding of the relationship between a system and a component, based on the doctrine of integrity. This understanding corresponds to the modern doctrine of the system, which, according to V.N. Sadovsky, is an alternative to the elemental, mechanistic view of the world that arose with the birth of modern science (22, p. 64): a pre-system object, becoming a component of the system, acquires qualities, properties that ensure its integration as part of the integrity. Therefore, the pre-system object and the object that is a component of the system are not identical.

This is how system-wide conditions arise for distinguishing between language as an object of philology and language as a subject of linguistics. These conditions are adequate to modern research practice in the field of philological sciences.

Discission: Here are just a few concepts: the developing "reunification" of literature and language, recorded by R. Barth back in the mid-1960s (23, p. 463); the spread of traditional literary categories and concepts to the study of non-fiction texts and messages (thus, the concept of poetics was applied by G.Ya. Solganik (24) to the study of journalism) and rhetorical categories and concepts - to the study of texts (messages) of any kind and type and spheres of functioning (25; 26); actualization of semiotic and hermeneutic approaches to solving problems of language / text (27; 28); consideration of the Man Speaking as one of the objects of linguistics (29, etc.); the constitution of Homo Loquens as one object of philology (30), etc. These examples demonstrate the growing integration of philological sciences, which entails the acquisition of properties by language that are different from its qualities as a subject of linguistics. Therefore, language as an object of philology and language as a subject of linguistics are not identical.

The essence of language as an object of philology is derived from its relationship to two other objects - Homo Loquens and text. If, from the point of view of the conjugate, cognitive-communicative approach to understanding language, Homo Loquens is a person who produces/consumes text through language, the text is a product/object of this activity, then language as an object of philology is a tool that is cognitive in nature, ensuring human communicative activity through text. This is the instrumental essence of language as an object of philology. This essence can be discerned and described only if data from semiotics, hermeneutics and text theory are combined.

Let us note in passing that recognition of this position opens up the possibility of a specialized, philological vision of language, for example, in rhetoric, stylistics, and poetics. Thus, for rhetoric as the science and art of speech-communicative influence, language is significant as an instrument that carries out the activity of speech-communicative influence; for rhetoric as the theory and practice of effective / optimal speech communication - as a tool for respectively effective / optimal communication.

Language as a subject of linguistics, if the starting point of reasoning is language as an object of philology, represents a separate reality, which is constructed by special cognitive means in the name of a comprehensive knowledge of the language itself. We do not want to offer a different, meaningful definition of language as a subject of linguistics (and this is not our task). The fact is that any definition of language - at the present stage of development of linguistics - will, be in line with the ideas of Humboldt or Saussure or be based on attempts to combine their views; in this sense, any conceptual definition will not cover language as a subject of linguistics; it will only be able to characterize one of its sides or several sides, taken in relative (and contradictory) unity. And one more thing: this qualification of language as a subject of linguistics corresponds to the tradition laid down by Humboldt (who defined the subject of linguistics as "language in general") and Saussure ("language as an integrity in itself" is the subject of linguistics); in this regard, we do not see any fundamental differences between the authors under consideration. Another thing is important: the development of this tradition leads to an understanding of language in linguistics based on the combination of the ideas of cognitivism and communicativism (post-anthropocentrism). Thus, language as a subject of linguistics is the totality of all its fundamental concepts. To sharpen the situation somewhat, we state that there are as many "languages" as subjects of linguistics as there are fundamental theories of language.

From the above it follows that language as an object of philology can be designated as language-1, and language as an object of linguistics - language-2. The study of language-1 and language-2 is determined by different programs - philological and linguistic. The program for the study of language as an object of philology puts forward primarily the following positions:

• ontology of language as an object of philology;

• philological theory of communication as the basis for the study of language in philology (language: semiotics – hermeneutics – text theory);

• parameters, levels, methods of studying language as an object of philology;

• principles of projection of general philological teaching about language onto particular philological sciences (linguistics, literary studies, folklore) and scientific disciplines;

• language and its place in the totality of objects of philology.

Conclusion: We draw the reader's attention to the issue of the significance of the problem statement and the proposed solutions.

Of course, the main thing that is achieved by discussing the problem of language as an object of philology is to increase the status of philology as a branch of the humanities against the background of traditional, still ongoing reproaches against philology and its components that philology is not one of the fundamental sciences. We believe that the deepening of self-knowledge of science is a sign of its maturity, and the results obtained thereby serve to recognize it as a fundamental science.

The proposed solutions contain additional arguments for preserving the status of philology as an integrity (a set of sciences and scientific disciplines), and not a

"conglomerate", "aggregate", etc. information, which at the present stage of its development has a complex structure and arrangement. Recognition of language as one of the objects of philology and the subject of linguistics with consideration of the principle of relations between them reveals one of the reasons for disputes about the status of philology and philological sciences, primarily linguistics. At the same time, we also receive an answer to the question about one of the reasons for the complex relationships within philology as a branch of science, which G.O. Vinokur drew attention to (9).

The problems of the relationship between language as an object of philology, language as a subject of linguistics and language as one of the objects with which other philological sciences and disciplines deal are put forward; the significance of other humanities for the study of language-1 and language-2, in particular semiotics, hermeneutics, text theory, and, conversely, the significance of language for other sciences.

In this context, the question of methods in philology and philology as a method is also updated.

It is important to note the importance of considering language as an object of philology for modernizing the content of higher philological education (31).

Finally, we emphasize that at each historical period of time the philological sciences, philology as a whole, receive - and this is quite natural - new understandings; We hope that our judgments adequately reflect the modern stage.

REFERENCES

1. Chomsky N. Language and problems of knowledge // Bulletin of Moscow University. Ser. 9: Philology. 1995. No. 4.

2. Gelgardt R.R., Rastorguev V.N. Methodological aspect in the study of the subject area of scientific knowledge and the status of modern philology // // Language and speech as objects of complex philological research: a collection of articles. - Kalinin, 1981.

3. Chuvakin A.A. Notes on the object of modern philology // Man - communication - text. - Barnaul, 1999. Issue. 3.

4. Chuvakin A.A. Communicative and speech situation in modern Russia and some trends in the development of philology // Stereotyping and creativity in the text. - Perm, 2005. Issue. 9.

5. Humboldt V., von. Selected works on linguistics. - M., 2011.

6. Saussure F., de. Works on linguistics. - M., 2004.

7. Schuchardt G. Selected articles on linguistics. – M., 2003.

8. Shvedova N.Yu. Grammar works of academician Viktor Vladimirovich Vinogradov // V.V. Vinogradov. Selected works: Studies in Russian grammar. – M., 1975.

9. Vinokur G.O. Introduction to the study of philological sciences. Vol. 1 // Problems of structural linguistics, 1978. – M., 1999.

10. Gindin S.I. From history to text and from science to art: G.O. Vinokur in thought over the subject and status of philology // G.O. Vinokur. Collected works: Introduction to the study of philological sciences. - M., 2000.

11. Russian-český slovník lingvistické terminologie. Prague, 2000.

12. Cambridge International Dictionary. Cambr. Univ. Press, 2011.

13. Rozhdestvensky Yu.V. General philology. – M., 2009.

14. Averintsev S.S. Philology // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M., 1990.

15. Belchikov Yu.A. History of the Russian literary language and philology // Language and speech as objects of complex philological research: collection of articles. – Kalinin, 1981.

16. Rozhdestvensky Yu.V. On the current situation of the Russian language // Bulletin of Moscow University. Ser. 9: Philology. 1998. No. 3.

17. Stepanov Yu.S. Philology // Russian language: encyclopedia. – M., 2007.

18.Arnold I.V. Semantics. Stylistics. Intertextuality. - St. Petersburg, 2001.

19. Slyusareva N.A. About the linguistic term language – "language activity" // Language: theory, history, typology. – M., 2000.

20. Postovalova V.I. Language as an activity: experience in interpreting the concept of V. Humboldt. – M., 1997.

21. Shapir M.I. Language of fiction // Literary encyclopedia of terms and concepts. – M., 2003.

22. Khalina N.V., Klipenshtein T.V., Gazizova E.S. and others. Hermeneutic analysis: Philological aspects of understanding. – Barnaul, 2010.

23. Barth R. Selected works: Semiotics. Poetics. - M., 2000.

24. Solganik G.Ya. On the poetics of journalism // Functional stylistics: theory of styles and their linguistic implementation: collection of articles. - Perm, 2005.

25. Brovkina Yu.Yu. Brand rhetoric. - M., 2005.

26. Pavlova N.G., Pashkevich T.V., Staroletov M.G. Semiotics and advertising: general scientific and applied aspects. - Barnaul, 2003.

27. Komissarova L.M. Instead of a conclusion // Fundamentals of text theory. – Barnaul, 2003.

28. Sadovsky V.N. Changing paradigms of systems thinking // System research: Methodological problems. Yearbook – 1992-1994. – M., 2002.

29. Krasnykh V.V. "Ours" among "strangers": myth or reality? – M., 2003.

30. Koschei L.A., Chuvakin A.A. Homo Loquens as the original reality and object of philology: towards the formulation of the problem // Philology and Man. 2006. No. 1.

31. Chuvakin A.A. Course of fundamentals of philology: to the problem of modernization of higher philological education // Bulletin of Moscow University. No. 2, Vol. 9: Philology. 2006.

Azərbaycan Milli Elmlər Akademiyasi M. Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar Institutu, *ISSN 2224-9257*
Filologiya məsələləri № 2, 2024
Səh. 56-65

СЕВДА ШЫХЫЙЕВА

ЯЗЫК КАК ОБЪЕКТ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ФИЛОЛОГИИ
РЕЗЮМЕ

Конец XX – начало XX1 вв. – это время, когда вновь актуализировалась проблема статуса филологии, ее структуры и места в гуманитарном знании. И этому есть целый ряд объяснений. Рубеж веков «совпал» с трансформацией парадигмальных оснований гуманитарных наук: имеется в виду прежде всего особо значимое для филологии выдвижение в центр гуманитарного знания философии знаковых систем и коммуникаций, семиотики, герменевтики, что связано с антропоцентрическим поворотом в науке и породило пост-антропоцентризм, с его интеграцией когнитивных и коммуникативных подходов к исследованию языка, как базовую характеристику современной лингвистики.

Повысилась значимость естественного языка как основы познания и объяснения в гуманитарных и естественных науках; выросла роль естественного языка в социальных отношениях и деятельности, особенно в России в связи с социально-культурными процессами 1989-2000-х гг. Н.Хомскому принадлежит справедливое суждение: «…язык решающим образом участвует в мысли, действии и социальных отношениях» (1, с.132).

Ключевые слова: гуманитарная семиотика, герменевтика, лингвистика, сохранение филологии, художественный текст, воссоединение, фундаментальные теории, онтология языка, филологическая теория.

SEVDA ŞIXYEVA

DİL MÜASİR FİLOLOGİYANIN OBYEKTİ KİMİ
XÜLASƏ

20-ci əsrin sonu - 21-ci əsrin əvvəlləri. - filologiyanın statusu, onun strukturu və humanitar elmlərdə yeri probleminin yenidən aktuallaşdığı dövrdür. Bunun üçün bir sıra izahatlar var. Əsrin dönüşü humanitar elmlərin paradiqmatik əsaslarının transformasiyası ilə "üst-üstə düşdü": biz, ilk növbədə, işarə sistemləri və kommunikasiyalar, semiotika və hermenevtika fəlsəfəsinin humanitar biliyin mərkəzinə yüksəldilməsini nəzərdə tuturuq. müasir dilçiliyin əsas xarakterik xüsusiyyəti kimi, dilin öyrənilməsinə koqnitiv və kommunikativ yanaşmaların inteqrasiyası ilə elmdə antroposentrik dönüşlə bağlı olan və post-antroposentrizmə səbəb olan filologiya üçün xüsusilə əhəmiyyətlidir.

Humanitar və təbiət elmlərində biliyin və izahın əsası kimi təbii dilin əhəmiyyəti artmışdır; Xüsusilə Rusiyada 1989-2000-ci illərin sosial-mədəni prosesləri ilə əlaqədar olaraq ictimai münasibətlərdə və fəaliyyətlərdə təbii dilin rolu

artmışdır. N. Xomski ədalətli mühakimə yürüdür: "...dil düşüncədə, hərəkətdə və ictimai münasibətlərdə həlledici şəkildə iştirak edir" (1, s. 132).

Açar sözlər: humanitar semiotika, hermenevtika, dilçilik, filologiyanın qorunması, bədii mətn, qovuşma, fundamental nəzəriyyələr, dil ontologiyası, filoloji nəzəriyyə.

Rəyçi: Filologiya elmləri namizədi, dosent Rəhimə Məmmədova tərəfindən çapa tövsiyə olunmuşdur.