Philosophical-Scientific Foundations of Mental Language in the Formation of Rational Thinking

Barno Rajabboevna Akhmedova

Researcher, Tashkent State Transport University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Rationalism is an idealistic philosophical movement that considers reason as the only source of knowledge, in which reason is the basis of human cognition and activity. Since the rational criterion of truth is accepted by many thinkers, rationalism is not a feature of any particular philosophy. At the same time, there are different opinions about the role of reason in knowledge: from moderate, where reason is recognized as the main means of understanding reality, to radical, where rationality is considered the only main criterion. In modern philosophy, the ideas of rationalism were developed, for example, by Leo Strauss, who proposed using the method of rational thinking not on its own but in combination with acquiring knowledge through leading questions (maivetika). Other representatives of philosophical rationalism include Benedict Spinoza, Gottfried Leibniz, Rene Descartes, Georg Hegel, and others. Rationalism is usually contrasted with irrationalism and sensationalism. The article talks about this.

Keywords: philosophical-scientific foundations, mental language, formation of rational thinking, understanding reality, modern philosophy.

Introduction

The concepts of reason and rationality acquired a different meaning during the Enlightenment [1]. People who criticized feudal and religious institutions and practices, as well as socio-political practices based on reason rather than philosophical emphases, came to be called rationalists, and this type of critical approach came to be called rationalism. Here, philosophical principles become the basis of a new direction in the social order. In this sense, rationalism refers to approaches that take reason as their basis and are based on rational social organization instead of religious social organizations. Kant "What is Enlightenment?" to the question: "This is the use of one's own mind." [2, 3, 4, 5] His answer shows that reason is the philosophical principle of enlightenment. Accordingly, reason, which is the basis of universality, allows for reasonable regulation of social life and applies to everyone.

Language is not a simple and mechanical means of communication; It is a live and dynamic communication tool. At the same time, language is immanent in its presence and existence. This immanence is a more complex issue. The reason why we cannot get out of the labyrinth of dualism of thought-language and language-speech lies in our views on the origin of language. What came first: language or thought, speech or language? Satisfactory because we consider the issue diachronically. No answer; Linguists have developed theories that confuse the world and distract us from the point. Such questions remain unanswered if there is a diachronic approach to human origins. Indeed, "Language or Thought First?" the question is posed from a materialist point of view, which considers the son of man to be an "evolutionary biological species." Because this view distorts the problem of origins, there will never be a correct answer to the questions that such an error brings with it. Therefore, we must consider simultaneously both the problem of the origin of man and the problem of the connection between language and thinking. The synchronic approach rejects evolution, insisting that ready-made components exist simultaneously, and ends the tedious and pointless debate. "Regarding rationality primarily as

philosophical, "Humanization of Rationality" [6] is important.

Methods, Review, and Discussion

Language is a unique phenomenon and system that belongs to every nation - or ethnic group; it is a living organism. The older the speech itself, the older the language. Language is emotions; language is consciousness. An inextricable connection exists between a person's speech, emotions, and consciousness. Language does not consist of mechanical speech and speech material; language is an aesthetic phenomenon consisting of a successful and effective unity of consciousness and speech, thinking, and expressive material. Language is consciousness, language is speech, language is emotion, language is aesthetics, language is the soul itself, language is a miracle, language is a mystery, but it is a mystery that invites the mind in its systematicity and fascination...

Language is a completely natural phenomenon that does not tolerate artificial interference. Languages did not arise by chance or as a result of mechanical processes; existing languages are manifestations of a wonderful phenomenon called language. The phenomenon of language, unique to the human child, is the nucleus that gives rise to the curious phenomenon called tongues. Language is both form and essence, a system-forming force and the system itself. Language is a miracle both as a skill and as a system.

Mother tongue... Mother tongue plays a direct role in forming national and spiritual identity. In the native language, the word (form) and meaning (content) are not separated from each other; that is, it is impossible to imagine meaning without form or form without content. It is the "gluing" of a word, symbol, or material shell to meaning and content (we can also call this the "sandhi" effect) that explains the reason why the native language causes excitement in children and spontaneous interaction with other children. who speak the same language. Linguistic studies studying the role of the first language in the formation of the child's psyche note that in the process of learning the first language, self-awareness and the manifestation of national-spiritual "contours" occur. As we said, the meaning in the native language is combined with the symbols that make up the native language, and the words acquired by the child in an instinctive form consciously reflect the way of thinking, values, views on life, and the person of the nation. to which the native language belongs and acts as a bearer of national-spiritual "ions." Parents who leave their children who cannot speak their native language to foreign languages, especially Russian, should think carefully about this.

The most common and simple definition of language is: "Language is a means of communication between people." But what kind of communication, what form of communication? And finally, language or speech?

First of all, communication between two people can only occur between people who speak the same sign system and the same language. "He can speak the language of the dumb," while others do not understand anything. As a person, he understands without words. Others don't understand a word.

People speaking two different languages do not understand each other. However, two people speaking the same language may not understand each other depending on the diversity of motives or differences in cognitive levels: "The son of a tyrant speaks so poorly that nothing can be understood." The proverb (proverb), "A deaf man knows what is in his heart," is actually not only for the deaf but also for the hearing. That is, the same speech can be understood differently by different listeners. In this regard, the issue of the ability to unambiguously and adequately convey an idea in some areas of activity becomes of great importance. The listening (or reading) addiction should not be overlooked. Thus, the listener is not only the object of the speech process but also a second subject. Nothing will be understood if the

frequencies of thought between the speaker and the listener do not resonate. Or only parts that meet the resonance requirements are understood. Once the listener expects a certain idea from the future, he "understands" it as soon as he sees the similarity and elements of this idea; that is, he actually "caught" what he expected. When repeatedly listening to the same text, if the listener (reader) is in a different intellectual and psychological state, "tuned to a different frequency," other thoughts will arise from this text. Therefore, only speech (or text) can be considered an object. The listener (or reader) acts as the second subject.

The information received by two listeners listening to the same speech can differ greatly. In other words, communication as a process is not limited to speech but also includes stages of its virtual preparation and assimilation. When any thought is expressed in words or speech, the problem arises whether the words or speech correspond to the thought. On the other hand, when a speech that has already been expressed is appropriated by someone else, the question arises of transforming this speech into a new thought and of the correspondence of the thought formed in the listener to this speech. Therefore, the adequacy between the thought that the speaker wants to express and the thought perceived and understood by the listener largely depends on words and speech. The adequacy of ideas is impossible without the adequacy of speech and the thinking of both persons.

There are two important factors to consider here. Firstly, the means of communication of speakers is the degree of their language proficiency. Thus, if one of the people speaks this language poorly, the level of adequacy of ideas will decrease significantly, and sometimes complete inconsistency will appear. Secondly, the language in which speech is expressed and the level of development and richness of this language. Thus, not all languages allow you to convey an idea in all its richness and clarity. A very important question arises here. Language influences the development of public opinion; it will either become an inhibitory factor or contribute to this development.

If a high level of thinking and intelligence development contributed to the formation of a perfect language at some point, then in subsequent periods, the language itself will play the role of state property in raising the nation to a new stage of intellectual development. Social development depends, among other factors, on this wealth's provision level.

The connection between language and thought is undeniable; hundreds of research papers have been written on this topic.

Comparing language and speech, B. Humboldt believes language should be considered an ideal, not a material entity. Speech is a material product of language. Even if we do not accept Humboldt's position on language, it cannot be denied that speech is a process of materialization. But the materialization of what, what will open? What is internal and immanent, and what is revealed through speech in the form of speech? It must be about the material manifestation of thought, judgment, and speech. Humboldt considers language as the basis of thinking superior to it. Therefore, he accepts language as an internal, ideal being: "Language is the organ of internal being, even of this being itself." [7]. You say that "thought itself existed thanks to language." This position is more consistent with Aristotle's position among the philosophy classics. Comparing the views of different philosophers on this issue, F. Bacon wrote: "If the materialists of antiquity considered reason dependent on the nature of things, then Plato subordinated the world to thought, and Aristotle subordinated thought to words."

But what exactly?

To find out what aspects this connection actually reflects, it is necessary to take into account the multi-layered, hierarchical structure of the cognitive process and the difference in the concepts of

"consciousness," "perception," and "thinking." In this case, the difference between the concepts of "language" and "speech" should be considered. The concept of "language" often replaces the concept of "speech" in a broader sense. When talking about speech, the word "language" is often used. However, we are now directly studying this problem; since it is actually about speech, we will use the word "speech" instead of "language" whenever possible (to emphasize the different meanings of the word). "language" more clearly denotes the word "speech!").

"Speech" is a concrete material manifestation expressed through sound and words. Speech is an active form of language, an immediate reality.

In fact, one of the general definitions of language, "language is a means of communication between people," can also be attributed to "speech." On the contrary, this definition is more adequate to the term "speech." "Language" includes "speech" and has a broader meaning. Language is the basis for expressing certain ideas. This is a raw material, a material, a potential opportunity, a treasure, and every time something is taken from this treasure, it is used (but, of course, it never ends because this is a virtual material reality, this is a potential existence, inactivity...). Humboldt also emphasizes this point in relation to language and speech: "True language appears only in speech." Although Humboldt did not say anything about the virtual existence of language, the extrapolation of his arguments leads to this exact conclusion.

Linguistics. After the emergence of linguistics as an independent discipline, prominent linguists separated language from the context of thought to emphasize its relative independence but preferred to study structural relationships. Many successes have been achieved in this field. However, even after linguistics had developed somewhat through relatively independent development, it faced zykholooi, cognitive aspects. Cognitive theory of language, issues related to understanding speech acts, representing knowledge, considering extralinguistic factors, etc., led to the emergence of new aspects in linguistics.

Linguistics took a different path and again encountered a philosophical problem at the highest level. In addition to semantics (semiotics, semiology), which resulted from the previous meeting, new directions arose: linguistic analysis, structuralism, hermeneutics, and others. Manifestations of postmodernism in philosophy appear mainly in issues related to linguistic interpretation.

"Language" is a system used in specific "speech" acts and always covers a wider range than specific speech, which is only partially manifested in individual speeches and potentially exists as a whole phenomenon. In a particular discourse, it passes from potential, passive to active and immediately appears as material reality. (Language is also a material reality, but it corresponds more to the virtual form of reality).

Language is such a river that it never manifests itself directly and completely. When someone takes water from this river with a spoon, someone with a bucket, or someone with fountains and streams, we see these unique phenomena. This unique look also signifies a certain style. If great potential is realized in any form, then this form also expresses the uniqueness of a particular object. We use scientific, philosophical, artistic language, etc., within the framework of natural language. Let's talk. Within the artistic language, several unique styles and lines are revealed.

Language exists objectively independently of speakers, individual speakers, and individuals, as well as when and how they speak. Because this is a mass phenomenon that was formed not by an individual but by the entire nation and passed on to future generations. Its bearers are not only specific people who know and speak this language, but also not their ashes, but the entire society. Not a mass, but a structured social system - society. In this society, the language itself is formed as a social institution; objective real forms of its existence are created, independent of specific people (grammar, dictionaries, books, etc.). If

all representatives of a people speak only this language, then those who fully study and defend it as a phenomenon as a whole, its general features, laws, immutability, features in comparison with other languages, etc. Specialized people appear who study - linguists...

Ideal, fluent speech is usually conducted in one language. But other languages may also participate. Such situations arise either when we do not know the language perfectly (the speech of our "Russian-speaking Uzbeks") or when we quote the original (usually using Latin in poetic examples or terminology). However, we are only using these examples to illustrate another aspect of the difference between language and speech, and in this article, we are only talking about speech within language.

The most suitable model for representing the mechanism of speech expression is an adequate correspondence between two systems, two sets, or, in mathematical language, the intersection (or product) of two sets. Therefore, even if each specific idea does not arise in a vacuum, it originates from or arises from a system of knowledge known to man. Also, the words intended to express this specific thought are not only the objectification of this thought, the transformation of concepts into words and sounds, but are formed from another system, and their volume and meaning are pre-formed and realized in it. a form of isolating a particle suitable for this idea from a certain system of words - language. But, of course, such a choice is possible if we consider language as a discursive system and not just a set of words.

This is not about the transition of a phenomenon (a specific idea) into another form (sentence) or objectification but about the transition to a part (subsystem) within the whole; this depends on the choice of a part that is adequate in its completeness and whether this choice is unique. isomorphic or homomorphic. When choosing such a relationship between (many) elements in the language field, it must be adequate to the nature of the relations in the field of thinking and correctly reflect it.

The process of the historical formation of a language is one thing, that is, the emergence of new words reflecting new concepts, and one thing is to select from an already established language certain words that better reflect a certain idea and turn them into sentences (more precisely), including them in a sentence) other.

The relationship between language and speech is clearly reflected in the diagram. For the construction (structure of thinking) obtained from the first system, an adequate construction (structure of speech) is selected in the second system. If the comparison is made at the level of words and concepts, each element of the first set may correspond to one or more elements of the second set (homonyms).

Conclusion

The choice of words suitable for a concept and the choice of sentence structure suitable for constructing an idea expressing a certain connection between concepts represent different levels of speech activity. At a higher structural level, sentences corresponding to the text are selected. However, this sequence is intended only to describe the levels of the process. In real thinking and speech, the levels of structure range from complex to simple. A person expressing a certain idea or translating a sentence or text already expressed in one language into another must focus on the whole, not the parts, the structure, and the elements. Dividing thoughts into concepts and finding the words corresponding to each idea, or finding the equivalent of each word in the text through the translation process, and after finding the words, they are placed in specific sentences. If we evaluate this as a direct translation. , it finds its expression. immaturity of thinking and speech activity. Mature speech activity from part to whole, not from word to sentence, from sentence to text, but vice versa (more precisely, directly), from text to sentence, including to word. First, the whole picture of the idea must be "animated"; the general structure must be defined, but then attention should be paid to its details. This process occurs in thought (and inner speech), and when it

becomes speech, everything again builds from simple to complex.

References:

1. Дрянных Н.В. Рациональность в структуре познания и деятельности: диссертация ... кандидата философских наук: - Москва, 2004. - 138 с.
2. Bourke, Vernon J. (1962), "Rationalism", p. 263 in Runes (1962).
3. Cassam, Quassim " 3. Rationalism, Empiricism, and the A Priori" isimli makale, içinde bulunduğu eser: Boghossian, Paul ve Christopher Peacocke. New Essays on the A Priori. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
4. Hatfield, Gary "Rationalism" isimli makale, içinde bulunduğu eser: Encyclopedia of Enlightenment, Ed. Alan Charles Kors. Oxford University Press, 2003. 11 Eylül 2006 http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t173.e592
5. Lacey, A.R. (1996), A Dictionary of Philosophy, 1st edition, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976. 2nd edition, 1986. 3rd edition, Routledge, London, UK, 1996.
6. Феррони В.В. Рациональность как проблема и методология в философском дискурсе постмодернизма: автореферат дис. ... кандидата философских наук. - Воронеж, 2006. - 24 с.
7. Гумбольдт В. Основные черты всеобщего типа языка: избранные переводы: перевод с немецкого / Вильгельм фон Гумбольдт; составление, перевод, вступительная статья, примечания Л. П. Лобановой; заключительная статья В. М. Алпатова. - Москва: URSS, 2022. - 455 с.