

Original article

УДК 81:130.2:8

doi: 10.17223/22220836/46/6

## THEMATIC HORIZON OF THE STUDY OF LINGUISTIC REALITY: THE CONTEXT OF NON-CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

**Mikhail A. Kornienko**

*National Research Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russian Federation,  
mkornienko1@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** The article defines the specifics of the non-classical paradigm of the philosophy of language, in the problematic field of which the language is presented as a creative process and a form of development of the spirit, spiritual creativity and acquisition the truth. Revealing the specifics of the non-classical stage of the philosophy of language, within the limits of which the language is characterized as creative processuality, the author shows that the energy of the spirit, manifesting its spontaneity in the language, unattainable in its spontaneity, makes the language alive.

It is shown that the philosophy of language as an independent science begins the countdown with the works of W. von Humboldt, while at an earlier stage, language was the subject of analysis in the context of general epistemological issues. The author analyzes the role of F. de Saussure in the development of the philosophy of language, reveals the role of the linguistic revolution in the transformation of the paradigm of the metaphysics of language. It is shown that, starting from the linguistic turn, a new problematic is introduced into the philosophy of language: an approach has been formed in the problem field of non-classical philosophy, within which the language was given the status of an alternative to the Cartesian cogito. It was the linguistic turn that was the stage of transition to the new problems of the philosophy of language, which made the subject of study the contexts and premises of utterances, objectified language structures, the polysemy and everyday functioning of the language, the functions of the language (including political functions). A departure from the epistemological and psychological component of research is associated with a linguistic turn, interest in the meaning and meaning was formed, and the language itself was interpreted as the ultimate ontological basis of thinking. Structuralism, hermeneutics, linguistic philosophy turned to the study of language. As a result of the linguistic turn, philosophical problems acquired a different orientation and began to search for philosophical problems through an appeal to the ontology of linguistic phenomena.

**Keywords:** language, world, linguistic turn, creative processuality, energy of the spirit, spontaneity of language, difference, meaning, linguistic objectivity, paradox of linguistic structure, ontology of language

**For citation:** Kornienko, M.A. (2022) Thematic horizon of the study of linguistic reality: the context of non-classical philosophy of language. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universita. Kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedenie – Tomsk State University Journal of Cultural Studies and Art History*. 46. pp. 73–82. (In Russian). doi: 10.17223/22220836/46/6

Научная статья

## ТЕМАТИЧЕСКИЙ ГОРИЗОНТ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ РЕАЛЬНОСТИ: КОНТЕКСТ НЕКЛАССИЧЕСКОЙ ФИЛОСОФИИ ЯЗЫКА

**Михаил Анатольевич Корниенко**

*Национальный исследовательский Томский государственный университет, Томск, Россия,  
mkornienko1@gmail.com*

**Аннотация.** В статье определяется специфика неклассического этапа философии языка, в рамках которого язык характеризовался как творческий процесс, форма развития человеческого духа, средство духовного творчества и поиска истины. Автор показывает, что дисциплинарное обособление философии языка началось с работ В. фон Гумбольдта, тогда как до этого феномен языка представлял собой предмет анализа в контексте общей онтологической перспективы. Показано, что именно лингвистический поворот представляет собой этап перехода к новому проблемному полю в философии языка, определяющему контексты и посылки высказываний, объективированные языковые структуры, неоднозначность и нормальное функционирование языка, языковые функции (включая политические функции). В результате философия языка приобрела иную направленность и стала искать философские проблемы через обращение к онтологии языковых явлений.

**Ключевые слова:** язык, мир, лингвистический поворот, творческая процессуальность, энергия духа, спонтанность языка, различие, означающее, языковая предметность, парадокс языковой структуры, онтология языка

**Для цитирования:** Kornienko M.A. Thematic horizon of the study of linguistic reality: the context of non-classical philosophy of language // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Культурология и искусствоведение. 2022. № 46. С. 73–82. doi: 10.17223/22220836/46/6

The problematic field of the study of linguistic reality has a long history. Language learning turned into the most important problem of philosophy, the theory of culture and science. Language presents a subject of study of different sciences as a dynamic semiotic system distinguished by rare complexity. Language performs a number of important social functions, among which is the function of communicative, expressive, cognitive, informational and translational nature. During various periods of evolution, the philosophy of language presented the subject of a certain set of problems related to the specific functional purpose of linguistic phenomena. It is reflected in the specificity of the stage of development of the philosophy of language, which followed the completion of the conceptual development of the ideas of classical approach. This is a non-classical approach – the specificity of its paradigm is reasoned by the fact that within this paradigm, a language understood as creative process has become the subject of study.

In the research horizon of the non-classical approach, the problem of language interpretation in the form of creative process as “the form of development of human spirit”, as an “involuntary means” of thinking, a means of spiritual creativity and finding the truth, as a mediator of the “spirit – the objective world”, thanks to language, the objective world obtains indirect form, being presented as the content of the spirit, the language makes thinking about the objective world possible” [1].

In this form, the problem is to explore language as a creative procedural approach. It requires the formulation of a set of research tasks. Among them it is necessary to formulate tasks, the totality of which will help reveal the specificity of the creative nature of language process. Solving these problems, it becomes possible to show the energy of the spirit, which manifests itself spontaneously in the language and makes language alive. This energy is spiritual force, unattainable in its spontaneity.

Within the paradigm of the non-classical approach, the language is presented as a creative procedurality, and not as a given reality.

In the XVIII century Johann Gottfried Herder was the author of the first ideas of this kind – in his work “Study on the Origin of Language” (1772) he called

human a linguistic being, and interpreted language as “a form of development of human spirit”

Later in the non-classical philosophy of language, a problematic field which focused on the study of a language as a sign system with intersubjective semantics was formed. The non-classical paradigm of the philosophy of language was presented in the works of W. von Humboldt, who interpreted language as an “involuntary means” of thinking, a means of spiritual creativity and finding truth. The language was constituted by the spirit; it was a kind of mediator in the system of relations “spirit – the objective world” [1]. Due to a language, the objective world took a mediated form, being presented as the content of the spirit, making it possible to think about the objective world. W. von Humboldt believed that the structure of the language was the basis that determined the picture of the world and defined the language as “an organ forming a thought” [Ibid.].

Starting with the works of W. von Humboldt, including his work “On the Difference of the Structure of Human Languages and Its Influence on Spiritual Development of Humanity” (1830–1835), the researchers who studied the philosophical problems of language tried to look at a language as a conductor between the world and speaking subject. W. von Humboldt defined language as an instrument of thought. The author of the article draws attention to the fundamental difference between this formulation and the translation of the thesis of W. von Humboldt, proposed by Alexander Potebnja – “language is an organ that forms a thought”. It is reflected in this thesis that language is an instrument of thought (in the Humboldt variant, it sounds like “Die Sprache ist das bildende Organ des Gedankens”) that the thought has an instrument, this instrument is language, word, speech, – “das bildende Organ”, is the organ that forms the world [2].

The interpretation of this thesis by W. von Humboldt is given in lectures of V.V. Bibikhin. “A thought,” says V.V. Bibikhin – deals with the world. Language is located between a thought and the world. At the same time, forming the world, a thought, according to Humboldt, is formed itself. Is it possible that the active principle is formed itself? How could a thought have an organ that only gives it a structure, especially since as long as there is no worldview, no mindset? Humboldt does not leave these limits. His thought oscillates between the two extremes, turning back from one to another. When language appears to him only as an instrument of thought, he rushes to recall that this is an exceptional instrument that influences thought. When language is seen by him as the force that determines thought, Humboldt insists that pure thought is free, especially since it is free from dependence on dead forms of language, as soon as the spiritual element can be free. The language here opens its incomprehensible scope, and then it is identified with vocabulary and grammar. Its paradox is accentuated, but it is not clarified” [3].

In the above-mentioned work of W. von Humboldt, the term “Offenbarung” is used, translated as “frankly”, the revelation of spirit. The energy of spirit, which manifests itself spontaneously in a language, makes the language alive, and at the same time this energy of spirit is that spiritual force that in its essence does not allow completely penetrating into it and is unattainable in its spontaneity.

It is W. von Humboldt that can be recognized as the creator of the philosophy of language, who had a large-scale influence on the evolution of the ideas of linguistics of the XIX–XX centuries. In fact, in the works of W. von Humboldt devoted to language, the ideas of the philosophy of language and culture are organically

connected with the ideas of comparative linguistics. This symbiosis is characteristic of such works of the researcher as “On the comparative study of languages...”, “On the difference in the structure of human languages.” He clearly manifests himself in the introduction to the work “On the Kawi language on the island of Java”. According to W. von Humboldt a subject of analysis defining language is presented by creative procedurality, looking at language not as at something created (ergon), but as at the activity of spirit (energy), an “involuntary remedy” by which truth is acquired.

The ideas of the philosophy of language originated from the ideas of W. von Humboldt, and later they formed the basis of psycholinguistics. Among these ideas there are the ideas of H. Steinthal (language is the “instinctive self-consciousness of people”), the idea of J. Baudouin de Courtenay (the actual language exists only psychologically), and finally, the ideas of the young neogrammarians (“the language really exists only in an individual”, the plurality of languages is determined by the plurality of individuals).

In literature, the point of view is accepted, in accordance with which the philosophy of language as an independent science started from the works of W. von Humboldt, while in classical philosophy the language became the subject of analysis in the context of a general gnosiological perspective.

In the middle of the XIX century the theory of language on the basis of the metaphysics of language of W. von Humboldt included a number of areas of analysis, including psychologism, which focused on apperception phenomena; historical study of the language focused on the attempt to find a proto-language basis, the simplest beginning of a language. And then, when it became obvious that the languages of previous epochs were not so simple, structural linguistics appears, rejecting previously formed approaches – psychological, historical, and philosophical. Structuralists indicated that language was a structure, and in this regard a number of questions were formed.

What is a language structure, a reality structure? What is a word as the simplest structure? R. Robins in “The History of Linguistics” called F. de Saussure as “...The key figure in the historical turn from the XIX to the XX century...” in the philosophy of the language [4]. In “The Course of General Linguistics”, the work of the beginning of XX century, which was published for the first time three years after the death of F. de Saussure, in 1916, the attention was drawn to the following conclusions, which constituted the philosophical background of the author’s arguments. Philosophical reasoning of F. de Saussure was the statement about the dichotomous nature of the “language-speech” relation, the statement about a sign as the unity of the signified and signifying, the statement about the need for such sections of language analysis as synchronous and diachronic [Ibid.].

The narrow-linguistic interpretation of a language with the concept of F. de Saussure was replaced by (in this concept in the new interpretation the terms “language”, “distinction”, “signifying” were given, which were further developed in poststructuralism) the attempt to formulate the fundamental principles of a language that defined late development of structural linguistics and due to this – the formation of the structuralism paradigm of the humanities of the XIX century. The basic principle of a language according to F. de Saussure [4] was the principle of difference (distinguishing one element (sound, concept) from another element and representing the “positive” content of a language).

In postmodernism, the following interpretation of the ideas of F. de Saussure was given: the distinction that existed between elements of the sign system provided the process of functioning of this system; the meaning of a sign was reasoned by its relations with other signs, a sign had no external language meaning; the connection between the various components of a sign and the conceptual component of a sign was arbitrary, this connection did not have the property of absoluteness, only in this way the interpretation of the “signified” and “signifier” could be interpreted. Formulating the opposition “language-speech”, F. de Saussure wrote about the following blocks of language objectivity: the signs system of language; speech by which language functions; language proficiency; finally, speech, due to which the ability to master a language and knowledge of a language could be realized. The components of the language-speech opposition expressed themselves in the following terms: while the language used in communication processes manifested itself in a certain set of rules, speech was the embodiment of language; this was realized by phonation, by using the rules, finally through sign combinations [5].

Later, U. Eco in “The Missing Structure” wrote about the paradox of language structure: it was a model formed through a series of simplifying operations; it was these operations that lead to the uniformity of various types of phenomena [6]. What, however, was behind this structure? What acted as a primary, correlated with the previously designated linguistic structure? Answering these questions, U. Eco in “The Missing Structure” introduced the concept of “source space”: “The source space was where being, while lurking, manifested itself, specifying into structured events, but escaping from any structuring of it. A structure as something objective and stable ... exploded ... and that which was no longer structural became decisive” [Ibid.].

The structure “opened ... only through its progressive absence ... Under any structure there was still a structure ... more absent, if it was permissible to express it this way (and so it was permissible to express it). Then the natural conclusion of any ontologically consistent structural research would be the death of the idea of structure. And any search for constants, conceived as structural, if they managed to remain structural, would be a failed search, a pseudograph” [Ibid.]. U. Eco considered the ontological fallacy when the analyst came to the conclusion that the stock of possible non-identity had been exhausted [Ibid.].

Why the work of U. Eco is called “The Missing Structure”? According to the author, this happened because the language “slipped away” from linguistics, re-entered the problematic field of such sciences as ethnography, logic, psychology. V.V. Bibikhin wrote about the reasons for this turn from linguistics. This turn happened at the moment when linguistics decided to take a bold step – decided to consider language as an object. However, the whole being of a language is in looking away from it to the things pointed out by its indicators and to the world that manifested itself in the very presence of a language. Both his vocabulary and grammar belong to the things highlighted by him. The same language even points out to pointing. And where is it? It is left behind the world” [Ibid.].

With the emergence of the philosophy of language, the term “linguistic turn” arises, by means of which the events of the first decades of the XX century are recorded. During this very period the language revolution takes place. While classical philosophy uses the approach in which the mind has the status of an initial

link in philosophy, non-classical philosophy has formed its own approach. In its problematic horizon, the metaphysics of consciousness were criticized, while a language was given the status of an alternative to the Cartesian cogito. If we try to reveal the transformation of the problems associated with the linguistic turn, it can be argued that this turn is associated with a departure from the epistemological and psychological component of research; due attention is paid to such blocks as sense and meaning, the language itself has been declared the ultimate ontological basis of thinking.

The classic basis of the linguistic turn was a series of works, including the “Logical and Philosophical Treatise” by L. Wittgenstein, “The Logical Studies” by E. Husserl, the works on the fundamental ontology by M. Heidegger, the works of W. Sellars and W. van O. Quine. The linguistic turn was not a single phenomenon. In the initial stages, the linguistic turn occurred within the syntactic-semantic paradigm; a linguistic turn during this period was characterized by a departure from the analysis of pragmatic sections of linguistic significance and all that concerned the practical application of language. The representative function of the language was absolutized (and this came from logical positivism). In general, the initial stage resembled the ideas of the New Time, which offered versions of language improvement.

The period linguistic turn, chronologically dated from 1940 to 1950, formed a research interest towards other problems. Among the latter are contexts and prerequisites of statements, objectified language structures, polysemy of a language, ordinary functioning of a language, and various functions of a language (including political functions). During this period, structuralism, linguistic philosophy, and hermeneutics were turned to the study of language. W. Sellars and W. van O. Quine proposed a pragmatic concept of meaning, which compared such functions of a language as the communicative and the representation function, which was declared to be a derivative of the communicative one.

In the non-classical tradition of language research, a new set of problems was formed. Thus if in the classical philosophy of language such issues as general gnosiological and methodological prevail, the non-classical tradition is focused on a different version of the study – within this version the issues related to the ontology of linguistic phenomena begin to be studied. The linguistic turn took place. Due to this turn, philosophical problems found a different direction; more and more often there are attempts to seek a solution to philosophical problems, addressing the sphere of linguistic phenomena.

In the 30s – 60s of the XX century in Great Britain and the United States, a range of problems was formed, which was attributed to as a branch of analytical philosophy by the theorists of linguistic philosophy. Among the designated theorists it is necessary to note J.E. Moore, the founder of Anglo-American neo-realism, who proposed his own method of philosophical study of natural languages; during this period, the theory of linguistic meaning “as usage”, created by L. Wittgenstein, became the subject of fierce discussions. L. Wittgenstein quite rightly can be attributed to the founders of analytical philosophy, including both of its stages, the logical and the proper linguistic [7].

L. Wittgenstein was one of the first who formulated a hypothesis about the meaninglessness of the sentences of traditional metaphysics; he attempted to offer a precise description of a reality, using a certain method of created language;

L. Wittgenstein referred to the rules of logic in order to form the limit of expression of thought with their help in language. The second stage of L. Wittgenstein's philosophy, linguistic one, is connected with the idea of a "language game" [8].

According to L. Wittgenstein through language games, it is possible to eliminate the traps of a natural language, carrying out what can be called the "therapy" of language errors and fallacies. Language games allow transforming incomprehensible sentences, making them clear and understandable; by means of language games as a model or constitution of a text, the semantic use of words becomes definite, and a consistent context of this use is provided. A language game as a model characterizes arbitrariness and at the same time rigor, the construction of a text provides a way to read a text.

Theorists of analytical philosophy turned to the study of the causes of philosophical fallacies, and saw these reasons in "logic", in "deep grammar" of a language, capable to create paradoxical linguistic forms (such is the expression of J.E. Moore: "It rains, but I do not believe it."). L. Wittgenstein proposed a method using which it became possible to eliminate the indicated fallacies [7]. This method was the inclusion of words in the context of language communication ("language games"). In the problematic field of linguistic philosophy, there were several schools. One of them (E. Ambrose, J. Wisdom, M. Lazerowitz) turned the therapeutic role of philosophy into the subject of analysis. The other, the so-called Oxford school of everyday language, focused on the analysis of the ways in which psychological concepts were used, on studying the specifics of "conceptual patterns" of cognition and language, on studying "speech acts". It is no coincidence that the convergence of linguistic philosophy and linguistic pragmatics occurred in the 60s of the XX century.

In the analytical literature, the influence exerted on L. Wittgenstein by the logical-mathematical works of G. Frege and B. Russell is noted. If the influence of B. Russell is expressed in terms of the use of the method of logical analysis of language, then the influence of G. Frege was different [9]. The "Diaries of 1914–1916", which were the basis for "Logical and Philosophical Treatise," differ in their belief in the possibilities of logical syntax and new logic.

Earlier, G. Frege, a German logician, mathematician and philosopher, wrote about the relation of notation, exploring the connection between the meaning of a language expression and the meaning of this expression [9]. L. Wittgenstein also wrote about the difference in the meaning and meaning of language propositions, expressions; it was precisely the concept of the propositional function developed by G. Frege, and the truth value of the semantic meaning and distinction of linguistic expressions created the possibility, according to A.F. Gryaznov it is necessary to move away from the analysis of proposals in the subject-predicate form.

According to L. Wittgenstein natural language has the status of the prerequisite for the formation of "life forms"; representing a form of sociocultural communication. These "forms of life" are subordinated in their functioning to the rules of grammar of language games. "Forms of life" can only "show off", but the understanding of the meaning of the words used in them is possible only through the ability to describe the use of words, and this is possible through the description of joint actions of people using the language: the description should be able to give me everything that I consistently discover".

According to L. Wittgenstein being coincides with the sphere of verbal articulation, “we make the predicates of things that are inherent in our ways of presenting them”. Later L. Wittgenstein analyzes the variability of the procedural actualizations of a language, and this is reflected in the concept of “language games”. The value arises in a specific context; the context of the use of a word is formed according to certain rules. And these rules act as a consequence of the contract of “linguistic community”; they are, according to L. Wittgenstein, “superficial grammar,” while “deep grammar” is also used. Through it, the laws of the organization of language games, the “form of life” are assessed. It is the “deep grammar” that is related to the fundamental structures of being. The concept of L. Wittgenstein is the basis on which the formation of the philosophy of linguistic analysis, called analytical philosophy or the philosophy of everyday language, was later based.

A century ago, in the middle of the XIX century, G. Frege was born in Wismar in the year of the European revolution, whose name is forever connected with logical semantics. The works of G. Frege had a tremendous impact on the research landscape of the non-classical philosophy of language. M. Dummett, whose first publications on the interpretation of G. Frege’s heritage, appeared in the mid-50s of the XX century, believed: “Regardless of whether Frege is an analytical philosopher or not, he was undoubtedly a linguistic philosopher (philosopher of language)” [10]. G.D. Sluga, a student of M. Dummett at Oxford and his opponent, in a monograph in 1980 [11] called G. Frege “the first analytical philosopher”. As an argument G.D. Sluga proposed the thesis that the ideas about the language of G. Frege had a strong influence on Russell, Wittgenstein, Carnap, and they represented various “analytical traditions” [Ibid.].

G. Frege is rightfully referred to those who are at the origin of the branch of modern logic and theoretical linguistics, called logical semantics. The most significant in this sense is the article “On the Sense and Meaning” (1892). If we speak directly about the logical-semantic results, it is necessary to mention the foundations of logical semantics developed by G. Frege. They are enclosed in a generalization of the concept of (own) name by the researcher, which meant the introduction of the term “description” well known today. G. Frege analyzed the concept of equality (identity), relating it to the ratio of the corresponding expressions in meaning and objective value. G. Frege showed the difference in the use and mention of language expressions, the difference in the direct and indirect use of language expressions. Based on the understanding of the essence of this distinction, G. Frege formed such concepts as extensional (“volumetric”) and intensional (“substantial”) contexts, metalanguage, object language.

In the aforementioned work of 1892, “On the Sense and Meaning”, a “semantic triangle” was investigated, fixing the relationship of a sign indicated by the sign of an object (sign value), the knowledge that contains a sign is the meaning of a sign. The relation “sign – meaning – value” is transferred to the sentences (this is a special case of names, signs, meaning). Affirmative-narrative sentences are called affirmative sentences. This distinction between the sense and meaning of a sign largely determined the further evolution of logical semantics, influencing the development of gnoseology, philosophy of language, theoretical linguistics, as it also determined the development of non-classical logical concepts<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> the comment by B.V. Biryukova and Z.A. Kuzicheva to the monograph by G. Frege “Logic and logical semantics” (p. 38–39)



The most effective were the searches of such schools of linguistic analysis philosophy (analytical philosophy, common language philosophy), like Cambridge and Oxford (common language school). The philosophy of linguistic analysis, which emerged within the boundaries of the non-classical approach to linguistic phenomena, made the subject of study the situational context in which the language and its main unit, the component of verbal expression – a word – is born and functions. This analysis, carried out for therapeutic purposes (the treatment of irregular forms of language practice, called generalizing) followed the research of L. Wittgenstein and was based on the statement that the purpose of philosophy is the study of language games.

During the period when the Cambridge school focused on excluding such pathologies as generalization from the language, the Oxford school built its research programs on the ideas of a positive analysis of word usage (“psychological utterances”, “moral utterances”, “speech acts”, their interaction – “verbal field”). In the traditions of logical positivism, the Vienna Circle developed the concept of language as a way of organization (“to be is to be the value of a related variable”, – W. van O. Quine).

The dominant intentions of the non-classical paradigm of the philosophy of language are realized within the limits of linguistic philosophy. The linguistic turn, due to which the non-classical paradigm of the philosophy of language found its completion, brought to life and actualized a number of ontological problems: for example, the problem of translation, the problem of interpretation, the problem of the correlation of signifying and expressing layers of a language, the problem of reference analysis of the structures of word production and usage.

The appeal to the possibilities of linguistic formalism created a situation in which philosophy played the role of the methodological basis of the theory of artificial languages as semiotic systems.

### References

1. Humboldt, W. (1984) *Izbrannyye trudy po yazykoznaniiyu* [Selected Works on Linguistics]. Translated from German. Moscow: Progress. pp. 37–298.
2. Potebnya, A.A. (2010) *Mysl' i yazyk* [Thought and Language]. Moscow: Labirint. pp. 199–235.
3. Bibikhin, V.V. (2007) *Yazyk filosofii* [Language of Philosophy]. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
4. Saussure, F. de (2019) *Kurs obshchey lingvistiki* [General Linguistics]. Translated from French by A.M. Sukhoti. Moscow: Yurayt.
5. Solomonik, A.B. (2016) *Yazyk kak znakovaya sistema* [Language as a Sign System]. Moscow: Librokom.
6. Eco, U. (2004) *Otsutstvuyushchaya struktura. Vvedenie v semiologiyu* [The Missing Structure. Introduction to Semiology]. Translated from Italian. St. Petersburg: Symposium.
7. Wittgenstein, L. (2018) *Logiko-filosofskiy traktat* [The Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus]. Translated from German. Moscow: AST.
8. Wittgenstein, L. (2009) *Dnevniky 1914–1916* [Diaries 1914–1916]. Translated from German. Moscow: Kanon+.
9. Frege, G. (2020) *Logika i logicheskaya semantika* [Logic and Logical Semantics]. Translated from German. Moscow: URSS.
10. Dummett, M. (1981) *The Interpretation of Frege's Philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
11. Sluga, H.D. (1980) *Gottlob Frege*. London: Routledge Kegan & Paul.

### Список источников

1. Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества // Избранные труды по языкознанию. М. : Прогресс, 1984. С. 37–298.

2. *Потебня А.А.* Психология поэтического и прозаического мышления // Потебня А.А. Мысль и язык. М. : Лабиринт, 2010. С. 199–235.
3. *Бибихин В.В.* Язык философии. СПб. : Наука, 2007. 389 с.
4. *Соссюр Ф.* Курс общей лингвистики / пер. А.М. Сухотин ; под ред. Р.О. Шор. М. : Юрайт, 2019. 303 с.
5. *Соломоник А.Б.* Язык как знаковая система. М. : Кн. дом «Либроком», 2016. 224 с.
6. *Эко У.* Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию. СПб. : Symposium, 2004. 544 с.
7. *Витгенштейн Л.* Логико-философский трактат. М. : АСТ, 2018. 160 с.
8. *Витгенштейн Л.* Дневники 1914–1916 / под общ. ред. В.А. Суровцева. М. : Канон+ ; РООН «Реабилитация», 2009. 400 с.
9. *Фреге Г.* Логика и логическая семантика. М. : Изд-во URSS, 2020. 512 с.
10. *Dummett M.* The Interpretation of Frege's Philosophy. Cambridge : Mass, 1981. 236 p.
11. *Sluga H.D.* Gottlob Frege. London, 1980. 321 p.

***Information about the author:***

**Kornienko M.A.** – PhD, senior researcher of Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research, National Research Tomsk State University (Tomsk, Russia). E-mail: mkornienko1@gmail.com

***The author declares no conflicts of interests.***

***Сведения об авторе:***

**Корниенко М.А.** – кандидат философских наук, старший научный сотрудник Лаборатории междисциплинарных исследований Национального исследовательского Томского государственного университета (Томск, Россия). E-mail: mkornienko1@gmail.com.

***Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.***

*The article was submitted 09.04.2020;  
approved after reviewing 26.08.2020; accepted for publication 15.05.2022.*

*Статья поступила в редакцию 09.04.2020;  
одобрена после рецензирования 26.08.2020; принята к публикации 15.05.2022.*