

PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE AT YUNUS EMRE

¹Ş. Filiz, ²L. Nurpeis

ABSTRACT

The history of Philosophy of Language goes back to the 17th century at most. We know that there were philosophical thoughts and discussions on language in the Ancient Ages and the Middle Ages. However, the history of studies on language as a branch of philosophy is very new. However, the philosophy of language has taken its place among the other disciplines of science and philosophy, which actually existed as a field of science or philosophy in the historical process and were named later. Yunus Emre did not directly put forward the philosophy or theory of language in this respect. Moreover, it would be premature for the 14th century in which he lived to say that he built a systematic and categorical system of philosophical thought. But if there is something that is not premature, it is the language, culture, meaning and propositions in the Turkish language that Yunus Emre uses in his poems, which are directly related to the philosophy of language that we have been discussing for 300 years. We see that he establishes a word-meaning relationship based on an unnamed epistemological and ontological basis. The linguistic studies of grammar, which is the subject of the studies of linguists and men of letters, about how Yunus used Turkish with great sensitivity and mastery seem to have been completed to a large extent. At least, we can learn from such studies how Yunus's Turkish and his ability to use Turkish are reflected in his poems. However, in these studies, the intense attention to how the power of Turkish as a language is reflected in Yunus Emre's poems has ignored the language-meaning relationship.

Key words: Yunus Emre, Philosophy of Language, Meaning, Concept, Culture, Language thesis to the extent of interactiveness.

¹ Akdeniz University,
Antalya, Turkiye

² Sakarya University,
Serdivan, Turkiye

Corresponding Author:
Ş.Filiz, sfiliz@akdeniz.edu.tr

Reference to this article:
Filiz Ş., Nurpeis L.
Philosophy of Language at
Yunus Emre // Adam alemi. –
2022. – No. 4 (94). – P. 3-11.

Жүніс Емренің тіл философиясы

Аннотация. Тіл философиясының тарихы XVII ғасырдан басталады. Ежелгі және орта ғасырларда тіл туралы философиялық ойлар мен пікірталастар болғанын білеміз. Дегенмен, философияның бір саласы ретінде тіл туралы зерттеулердің тарихы өте жаңа. Алайда, тіл философиясы шын мәнінде тарихи процесте ғылым немесе философия саласы ретінде өмір сүріп, кейінірек аталған ғылым мен философияның басқа пәндерінің арасында өз орнын алды. Жүніс Емре бұл тұрғыда тіл философиясын немесе теориясын тікелей алға қойған жоқ. Оның үстіне ол өмір сүрген 14 ғасыр үшін философиялық ойдың жүйелі де категориялық жүйесін құрды деп айту ерте болар еді. Бірақ ерте емес нәрсе болса, Жүніс Емренің өлеңдерінде қолданып жүрген түрік тіліндегі тілі, мәдениеті, мағынасы мен пайымдаулары біз 300 жылдан бері талқылап келе жатқан тіл философиясымен тікелей байланысты. Оның атаусыз гносеологиялық және онтологиялық негізге сүйене отырып, сөздік мағыналық қатынас орнатқанын көреміз. Жүністің түрік тілін асқан сезімталдықпен, шеберлікпен қолданғаны туралы тіл мамандары мен әдебиетшілердің зерттеу нысаны болып табылатын грамматиканың лингвистикалық зерттеулері айтарлықтай дәрежеде аяқталған сияқты. Жүністің түрік тіліндегі өлеңдерінде қалай көрсететінін осындай зерттеулерден білуге

болады. Бірақ бұл зерттеулерде түрік тілінің тіл ретіндегі құдіреттілігі Жүніс Эмре өлеңдерінде қалай көрініс тапқанына басты назар аудару тіл-мағыналық қатынасты елеусіз қалдырды.

Түйін сөздер: Жүніс Эмре, тіл философиясы, мағына, концепция, мәдениет, интерактивтілік дәрежесіндегі тіл тезисі.

Философия языка у Юнуса Эмре

Аннотация. История философии языка восходит к XVII веку. Мы знаем, что в Древнем мире и Средневековье существовали философские размышления и дискуссии о языке. Однако история изучения языка как отрасли философии очень нова. Однако философия языка заняла свое место среди других дисциплин науки и философии, реально существовавших как область науки или философии в историческом процессе и получивших название позднее. Юнус Эмре прямо не выдвинул философию или теорию языка в этом отношении. Более того, для XIV века, в котором он жил, было бы преждевременно говорить, что он построил систематическую и категоричную систему философской мысли. Но если и есть что-то не преждевременное, так это язык, культура, смысл и предложения в турецком языке, которые Юнус Эмре использует в своих стихах, которые напрямую связаны с философией языка, которую мы обсуждаем уже 300 лет. Мы видим, что он устанавливает словесно-знаковые отношения на неназванной эпистемологической и онтологической основе. Лингвистические исследования грамматики, которые являются предметом изучения лингвистов и литераторов, о том, как Юнус использовал турецкий язык с большой чувствительностью и мастерством, кажется, в значительной степени завершены. По крайней мере, из таких исследований мы можем узнать, как турецкий язык Юнуса и его умение использовать турецкий язык отражаются в его стихах. Однако в этих исследованиях пристальное внимание к тому, как мощь турецкого языка отражается в стихах Юнуса Эмре, игнорирует отношения языка и значения.

Ключевые слова: Юнус Эмре, философия языка, смысл, концепт, культура, тезис о языке в степени интерактивности.

Introduction

From ancient times to the present, philosophy has encountered conditions that sometimes decrease and sometimes increase its effectiveness and visibility in the context of its relationship with science, but it has never ceased to be a discipline that guides human thought and actions. In the 19th century, although positivism saw only the literary field for philosophy in the name of science and dazzling revolutions in science, today it seems that there is almost no science that is not associated with philosophy. The philosophical perspective, which started with the human and human sciences and expanded its field, is mentioned together with the positive sciences; Even the studies on Artificial Intelligence, one of the most important branches of information technology, are carried on with philosophy.

With its 300 years of history, such as philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, neurophilosophy, neurology, which are mostly related to positive sciences; It is located exactly at the intersection of fields of literature, culture, history and linguistics.

A number of reasons can be listed for the fact that the philosophy of language studies cannot naturally reflect and represent both sides in a balanced way. We think the foremost of these is that logical positivism, which does not even include "history" in the "science" class because it is not purely empiricist, continues to approach the philosophy of language with the title of experimental "scientific", a controversial field such as the science of history due to its great place in the field of humanities. We can say.

A second reason does not lag behind the first in its importance. Eurocentric approach in science and thought, Turkish thought and philosophy "out of Europe". It still preserves its vitality as a dogma that cannot be changed in the minds of some local-foreign researchers who see it on the coast or on the side.

Our attempt to explore the possibilities of philosophy of language in Yunus Emre makes a contribution to make this politically oriented approach debatable. The history of Western science and thought was conceptually more systematic than Turkish thought; categorical distinctions and

denominations were made; Since these results are taught all over the world, they have become widespread and ingrained. In this respect, the history of Western thought has gained an important advantage.

A Brief History of the Philosophy of Language

Turkish thought and science in its history should be examined with similar processes, even by finding more qualified methods.

Here is Yunus Emre, not only mentioning the magnificence and competence of Turkish, but also exploring the philosophical depth in his poems through the philosophy of language; The effort to seek the possibilities of the philosophy of language should be evaluated in this way.

Here is Yunus Emre, not only mentioning the magnificence and competence of Turkish, but also exploring the philosophical depth in his poems through the philosophy of language; the effort to seek the possibilities of the philosophy of language should be evaluated in this way.

The history of the philosophy of language is new. Although some philosophical issues on language were discussed in ancient and medieval philosophy, these discussions were used to support the ideas developed for the classical problems of philosophy, especially in the fields of epistemology and ontology, and a general theory of language was not developed [1]. It was not in vain that the problems of epistemology and ontology came to the fore in the philosophical discussions on language, especially Plato's adoption of this method [2]. Because Plato, especially in the *Kratylos* dialogue, was aware that the basis of the language problem was the science of knowledge and the knowledge of existence.

John Locke, who is thought to have developed the first language theory in the 17th century, examined the relationship between the meaning of words and thought; he pointed to the place of words in communication. The relationship between word and meaning was also discussed by philosophers working on language such

as John Stuart Mill, Ferdinand Saussure, Gottlob Frege by changing the names of these two sides. Especially today, Frege and Russell literally form the beginning of language philosophy, and thus language philosophy today shows a development related to cognitive science and Artificial Intelligence.

Turkish philosopher Ziya Gökalp, in his article emphasizing the difference between the concepts of truth (*verite*) and *sen"niyet* (reality), says: At that time, our language was not yet capable of expressing philosophical thoughts. Because we had to translate various notions (concepts), which are very far from each other in nature, with the same term. The best example of this halo is the notions of "verite" and "reality". Although these two terms are opposite to each other at many points, it could not be more wrong to translate the two with the same term.

However, Verite and reality are very different concepts. First, although reality is partial in terms of logic, data is universal. For example, the statement (proposition) "man is wise" is a datum. (Every individual of the human species existing outside is a reality). Second, reality is tangible, whereas data is logically abstract. Third, from a metaphysical point of view, although verita is a mental entity, reality is an external entity" [3, p. 116-117].

Yunus Emre uses words corresponding to verity and reality in his poems. In his philosophy, since the meaning precedes and even determines the sign, reality, as a partial sign, is subordinated to the data referential. It is the data that is decisive; is the concept. The word, in other words, the signifier, is the completed and determined. Because reality, as a partial fact, is contained by verita, which means abstract and absolute truth. Accordingly, in Yunus's philosophy of language, truth appears as the most general concept. It is always because of and for the truth that he speaks of realities.

*"If you have come to a patient,
If you have given a drink of water,
Go against it at the time tomorrow,
It is as if the right has drunk your wine"*

[4, p. 374].

In this stanza, "reality" counts as a patient, a drink of water, tomorrow, wine... However, Yunus refers to all these realities in order to point to the truth and to refer to it. What is that truth or veriti? Drinking the right wine. This proposition does not refer to a partial reality, but to a universal truth.

Truth cannot be "identified" in Yunus's philosophy. By its abstract, absolute and universal nature, data does not directly indicate anything like everyday words. If it were, it would be no different from reality. So how are they to be understood and their meanings to be grasped?

Verite as a concept can only be understood through the sets of meanings it contains directly and indirectly. That is, data can be defined by the meanings of the data. This attempt to define, however, is not expected to show the truth concretely, as in the proposition that corresponds to "any object on the table". Because even words that refer to everyday, concrete, partial and individual realities can be defined mostly through other words:

"Are there any undefined words? It depends on what we mean by "identification". If defining a word is to indicate what it means in one way or another, the answer is definitely no: if there is no way to show another person what you mean by a word, you cannot communicate with others through its meaning, and the word can never be part of public language. However, if by "definition" you mean only verbal definition (defining into other words), then it is understood that some words are indefinable" [5, p. 47].

Although Yunus Emre seems to have written his poems in a style and in the folk language, as it is thought, what he really reflects is folk culture. Folk culture is the main source of the meaning sets that he reflects on his poems with linguistic representation. We can realize the power of the words in the mouth of the people with this reflection of Yunus. Montaigne points out that the words that fall into the mouth of the people lose their original value and deep meaning over time: "We do not easily see the power of the words in the mouth of the people. Because these words, which are used as common goods, have fallen to their feet and their beauty has become

vulgar. There are many valuable words and beautiful similes that, after falling into the mouth of the people, their colors became blurred and their beauty faded over time" [6, p. 208]. We do not know whether Montaigne has read Yunus Emre's poems. But if he had come across it, he would have noticed immediately how meticulously Yunus used the vernacular in terms of both style and meaning. For example, the word "looting" refers to an extremely ordinary and deep-seated negative situation. But in Yunus's lines, "looting" takes a very high place, such as giving up temporary realities in the face of God and the eternity of truth. Secondly, Yunus does not sacrifice meaning to words; leads the word after the meaning.

"There is a word

If contempt, glory comes to every person from the word" [7, p. 30-34],

"A word that weeps the face of the one who knows the word,

A word that makes sure the person who says the word does the job" [7, p. 30-34].

In the first two lines, Yunus states that a correct or meaningful word will be good for one's heart; he states that a negative word will alienate people from people and end communication with today's expression.

The second two lines refer to the following truth: Words should be considered and weighed before they are spoken. So that the word is not false. Man's face does not go black. His face turns white [7].

"Come, at least listen to our ahi iysehriya spoken word,

Hezaran gevher dinar is a black earth word" [7, p. 30-34].

"Words with the value of knowledge and wisdom;

It is even more valuable than money,

Pearls and jewels when said at the right place and time" [7, p. 30-34].

Yunus does not forget himself when he warns against the words that do not have the value of knowledge and wisdom in these lines:

"Dervish Yunus, don't say this word crookedly,

A Mullah Kasim comes to pull you to sleep" [7, p. 30-34].

Yunus's philosophy of language is

determined by his interaction with Turkish folk culture.

So, when we analyze Yunus's poems in the context of language-culture relationship, we will see that it is possible to shed some more light on our theory called the Interaction measure thesis.

The concept of culture is used to express all of the customs, traditions and customs that form the feelings, thoughts, beliefs, language and life styles of a society with a series of concrete and intangible values. Philosophical, social, physical and biological anthropology are scientific-intellectual fields that feed the concept of culture. All of them are called philosophical anthropology, and philosophical anthropology has recently been called the Philosophy of Culture. Philosophy of culture, beyond cultural history and sciences, focuses on the cultural structure of any society or various societies, the principles and reasons that play a role in cultural changes. Philosophy of culture examines and analyzes culture from a philosophical point of view; as a result of this analysis, it is about revealing general principles and results related to that culture.

Philosophy of culture is closely related to the discussions around the concept of history led by the German philosophical tradition towards the end of the 18th century. Is history a science? While positivism does not consider it an experimental science, or rather a scientific field, human sciences including cultural science and philosophy oppose it and accept it as a historical science. These discussions are quite detailed and complex, and that is not the subject of my article. However, it is necessary to shed light on a few points that I think will help us understand the language-culture relationship in Yunus Emre's philosophy of language.

It is not possible to talk about culture without the science of history, which we consider right to be accepted as a science. The source of culture is the science of history. The subject and object of history is man; history conveys how the theory-action relationship was established from past to present in the light of knowledge, documents and findings of man and humanity. Since culture is the most

important content of history, it can only be kept alive, developed and transferred to each other thanks to the concept of history, which is a science. Here is the first reason we should trust the concept of culture, its history as a science through it reaches us and those after us. The second reason is that culture is a humanization process. At this point, history is the document of culture, which is the process of humanization.

Possibilities of Turkish Language Philosophy in Yunus Emre Poems

What then are the elements of culture?

The elements of culture are all tangible and intangible values consisting of language, thought, religion, economy, science, literature, art, traditions and customs. In short, cultural elements are everything that belongs to human beings.

Language is the most dominant and decisive element of culture. Culture is the determining factor in this relationship. Just as words are subject to meaning in Yunus's poems, language is generally subject to existing culture. Language culture; word comes after meaning.

The first thing that comes to mind when language-culture relationship is mentioned is Humboldt, a German thinker who lived in the late 1700s and early 1800s. His 17-volume book "Gesamelte Schriften" is a fundamental work on the relationship between language and culture. Wittgenstein, one of the contemporary philosophers who put language on the basis of philosophy, claims that the boundaries of language determine the horizon of thought of the person and society.

Humboldt considers cultural development and linguistic development to be parallel to each other. According to him, a developed culture can only be gained with a developed language. The soul of a nation is revealed in its language. The clear and understandable language of a nation facilitates the creation of ideas. When language makes people intellectual enough to raise them to the level of consciousness, people's feelings develop and they feel their own existence better.

The 13th century is a turning point in the history of Turkish culture. Turks experienced all the elements of culture from one end to the other in this century; In their relations with language, thought and religion, they experienced their most intense period compared to any other period. Turkish culture and Turkish language are in the most intense stage of structuring. Yunus reflected this structuring concretely on the language-culture relation in his poems in a rare way, not only that, he matured this structuring by establishing the word-meaning relationality. Turkish language will develop as long as it maintains its relationship with Turkish culture and Turkish people will feel better through this linguistic and cultural awareness. Feeling Yunus Emre and his poems as they were when they were first written for centuries; It is for this reason that we feel ourselves in the language-culture dialectic in those poems.

Yunus describes death in the most tragic lines:

*"They neither say nor give any news,
Those with all kinds of herbs on it,
They neither say nor give any news"
He describes the tomb as follows:*

"What door is there to enter,

What to eat,

What light is there,

It was yesterday's day" [4, p. 355],

"Syllable stones at the bedside,

They neither say nor give any news" [4, p. 355].

Yunus does not separate Turkish language from Turkish life and culture. In social life, culture is constantly produced, changed and developed. This cultural dynamism is reflected in Yunus's Turkish. In Yunus, language and culture always feed each other. In this sense, Wilhelm von Humboldt emphasizes creativity by making language feel an activity. It does not treat language as a mechanism or an organism, but as a highly specific human activity. On the other hand, he argues that language is also affected by the product it creates, and that the true nature of language in formation can only be grasped as a result of the interaction between *energia* and *ergon* (product). In other words, since we are born into language, the mental activity

that constitutes thinking by inheriting the historical material focuses on what has been given before; it is a reshaping activity rather than a creation [8, p. 59-71].

According to Humboldt, language is the organ that shapes thought rather than transmits it. According to Humboldt, who sees a relationship of determination between thought and language, "the interdependence of thought and language reveals that languages are not actually known truths, but rather a means of discovering previously unknown truth" [9]. That is why the difference between languages is not the "difference between sounds and signs", but "the difference between worldviews" [8, p. 59-71].

We have realized that there is an undeniable relationality between language-thought and culture. However, as we have argued from the very beginning, the word meaning in Yunus Emre's philosophy of language; indicator pointer; Verit determines reality and truth determines the fact. In short, language determines language of thought and culture, not thought.

The following statement by Evans supports this claim: "Everyone agrees that meaning is not the same as thought. If it were, language would determine thought, and we would not be able to think without language. Yet much evidence clearly demonstrates that language alone does not make thought possible. Delicate thought processes are also observed in infants who lack language, often forming quite complex concepts. This is also true for many other living species. Moreover, human infants, squirrel monkeys, bush crows, and many other species that have not yet acquired language can think without language" [Electronic resource].

Language emerged through interaction as energy with previous cultural and intellectual products, which Humboldt called *ergon*; born and developed with experience; but not innately determined.

"...in the context of the brain's microcircuitry, all of this suggests that the most important factor is experience rather than innate determination. The weight of findings from the field of neurobiology

precludes the possibility of a genetic information providing details such as grammatical information." [Electronic resource].

"A word that whitens the face of the person who knows the word,

A word that makes the job of the one who cooks the word.

Even the person said the word, the bone of the word to say,

This is a word that makes this world's hell, eight heavens"

Before the word, it is necessary to know what that word means. Cooking the word means trying whether it meets the meaning it represents adequately. An indicator that represents it at a level that the other person can understand correctly means that it is matured to be spoken, cooked. The speaker should know well whether the word adequately reflects the cultural background it refers to or not. The brewing of the word is the competent conveyance of the meaning, the culture, in short, the truth by that word. Therefore, knowing only the word as the word is similar to the situation of the person in the Chinese Room who knows the Chinese symbols but does not know their exact meanings. The same person speaks English. But knowing English is not the same as knowing some words in Chinese. This example also reveals that the meaning and the culture surrounding it determine the symbols, that is, the signifiers. According to Yunus, the fact that the word is cooked, taken and known shows that there is an epistemological and ontological basis in the philosophy of language.

Love is one of the main concepts in Yunus's philosophy; is another name for data. In this context, love includes all realities within the meaning set of data, that is, truth.

From the time of ost "İşkulaş", the world and the hereafter became one, if you call Ezel-ebeds, yesterday and today are for me."

Truth has made the world and the hereafter indifferent; Time measures such as ezel-ebed have become indistinguishable from each other until yesterday and today.

It shows that the rhetoric of the world-

the Hereafter, yesterday-today, eternal-eternal Yunus is dialectical. This and all similar contrasts reach a synthesis with love (verite-truth, meaning, culture) as fact (reality, language). In Yunus's philosophy of language, rhetoric is together with dialectic. Yunus wants to persuade his interlocutors. It uses the dialectical method for this.

Aristotle shows rhetoric as the synonym of dialectic.

According to Aristotle, three things are necessary to make believe in rhetoric. First, the power to reveal a personal character that will make the speaker's speech believable, second, the power to arouse the enthusiasm of the listeners, and third, the power to prove a truth or pseudo-truth through convincing evidence. Thus, rhetoric can be viewed as a branch of dialectics as well as ethical (or political) studies [11, p. 19].

In Yunus rhetoric, these three conditions of Aristotle are fulfilled. According to the first condition, Yunus displays his personal character throughout almost all of his poems that will convince his listeners:

*"They say that a stranger has died
hear after three days cold water waters
Be weirdly selfish like this"* [4, p. 269].

Another example:

"How is it, to Yunus, because Kocaldun is the light kogil,

Ruzigar does not stop by Iskaishkun, what month and u year does it have" [4, p. 36]. According to the second condition, he arouses great enthusiasm in his listeners:

*"I saw your face again
My heart is burned again
Friend became your love
It rested on my heart"* [4, p. 382].

Another example:

*"At the top of the snowy mountains
cloud with clusters
Untie your hair for me
Your age, do you cry?"* [4, p. 355].

Considered according to the third condition, Yunus Emre does not hesitate to try to prove the truth, namely the data, by means of convincing evidence:

*"Science is knowledge
Science is knowing yourself
you don't know yourself
This is a nice read"*

Another example:

"Those whose possessions are many

See it's nice

Finally wearing a shirt

He also has no yen"

Another example:

"The sentences are true, if you are true,

Truth is not found, if you are crooked"

[4, p. 355].

According to the Interactivity Measure Language Thesis that I have proposed, word and meaning, reality and data show a conventional similarity. But this consensus develops based on linguistic and intellectual principles. The decisive party is the latter; meaning; word, data; determines reality. The dialectical process between them is based on an epistemological and ontological basis. This thesis that I put forward for Yunus Emre's philosophy of language is similar to a philosophy of language that Plato put forward in Cratylus, beyond conventionalism and naturalism.

Hasan Aslan examines Plato's philosophy of language in the context of "activism" in Cratylus: "A picture is not the same as what it is a picture of, and language is not the same as what it expresses. The similarity between a painting and what it depicts is a matter of convention. However, this convention is not so arbitrary that we can liken a picture of the kind Hermogenes talks about to what we want. What is portrayed limits what the painting should look like" [2, p. 40-48].

"Plato, in the dialogue of Cratylus, addresses the problem of the "correctness of names". Both the conventionalist language approach, which argues that the "truth" relationship between a "name" and what that name "names" is a matter of convention, and a "natural" "truth" between a "name" and what that name "names". He criticizes the naturalist language approach, which claims that there is a relationship between them. Plato wants to show that both conventionalist and naturalistic conceptions of language preclude the Dialectical method, the means of investigating reality" [2, p. 40-48].

Plato does not accept that there is a reciprocity between the name and the thing named. Natural conformity is not a reciprocity relationship. According to Plato, this is an agency relationship. Plato's effort

is to make language a heuristic tool that can explore reality outside language. Plato's criticism of the naturalist understanding of language is not to defend conventionalism, but to give language a function that will enable it to make epistemology. This effort is clearly seen in Plato's criticism of Cratylus' naturalist approach, which equates knowing the name of a thing with knowing that thing [2, p. 40-48].

The similarity between the name and the thing named in Yunus's philosophy of language cannot be explained by a naturalist or conventional approach. Because the concept in his poems, the word; meaning determines the symbol. Language does not create thought, but the language of thought. Turkish folk culture is the primary source of this thought. Culture, thought and language enable us to follow the ontological and epistemological process of creating symbols respectively.

There is no right or wrong in Yunus' activism; We are always faced with change and metamorphosis. This happens most in the inner world of people. To symbolize any statement of an ever-changing, state-of-the-art "heart" with any word and fix it on "right or wrong" means trying to keep the heart, not the word, from interaction.

Conclusion

Yunus's philosophy of language can be understood according to the language thesis to the extent of interaction, due to this activism. Interactionism means that he interacts intensely with the cultural environment he lives in; explains that this interaction is a reciprocal process. The Language Thesis in Interaction Measures transcends precise valuations such as right and wrong in language; reaches the concept of culture, which is nourished by my mother and therefore that meaning.

In this sense, language is used in a way that allows it to be learned as a cultural dialectical process. Meaning in Yunus Emre's philosophy of language; Thought determines language. Word economy does not hide the weight of meaning; on the contrary, the emphasis is in style. Yunus's epistemological approach frees epistemology from the

dominance of positivism and stretches the true-false category.

According to Evans "Language in Use Thesis, human language and the human mind are inevitably linked. In both, language is shaped by experience and use. According to Evans, the factor that makes people special is our cultural intelligence, which gives rise to sociable and cooperative behavior. Cultural intelligence reached a mental competence at some point in our ancestors" evolutionary journey. Similar observations can be made for Yunus's philosophy of language, but the Language Thesis on the Interaction Measures sees language not only as a phenomenon that occurs at the social scale, but also as a reality that emerges and still continues through the interaction of human beings with the entire universe. Yunus's language can be better understood with this interaction phenomenon. Therefore, Jonah's word is not good or bad, right or wrong. On the contrary, the word finds value with the meaning or set of meanings it represents and symbolizes. Value is not in words, but in meaning. In Yunus, logos is the meaning of love, which symbolizes the truth. That is, it is data, it is a concept. It speaks the reality but means the data.

Folk culture is the most essential source of the sets of meanings that Yunus reflected in his poems with linguistic representation. Yunus does not sacrifice

meaning for words. Language philosophy is determined by the interaction with Turkish folk culture. The Language Thesis in the Measure of Interaction arises from the analysis of Yunus's poems in the context of language-culture.

References

- 1 Inan I. Inostensible reference and conceptual curiosity // *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*. - 2010. - №10(28). - P. 21-41.
- 2 Aslan H. Cratylus: Language as a Tool for Searching Reality // *Anxiety: Journal of Philosophy of the University of Uludag*. - 2005. - №5. - Pp. 40-48.
- 3 Gokalp Z. Small Magazine I-III (Trans. Şahin Filiz). – Ankara, Pankus Publications, 2022.
- 4 Tatci M. Yunus Emre Külliyyatı Yunus Emre Divanı II. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. - 2005. - P. 355.
- 5 Hospers J. Introduction to Analytical Philosophy. - Ankara, Address publications, 2021.
- 6 Montaigne. Trials. - İstanbul, İşbankası Cultural Publications, 2018.
- 7 Bilgin A. The Word of Yunus // *Turkish Language*. - 2020. - Issue 819. - Pp. 30-34.
- 8 Topkaya Y. Sosyal Bilgiler Ev Ödevi Tutum Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması // *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. - 2016. - №28. - Pp. 119-128.
- 9 Electronic resource. URL: https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Wilhelm_von_Humboldt (Date of application 20.02.2022)
- 10 Electronic resource. URL: <https://www.vyvevans.net/> (Date of application 17.02.2022)
- 11 Aristotle. Rhetoric. - İstanbul, YKY, 2019.

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

<i>Şahin Filiz</i>	Professor, Doctor of Philosophy, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya, Türkiye, sfiliz@akdeniz.edu.tr, ORCID ID:0000-0002-4249-22-21
<i>Laziza Nurpeis</i>	PhD Student, University of Sakarya, Türkiye, aruana84@gmail.com. ORCID ID:0000-0002-2564-8888
<i>Шахин Филіз</i>	Профессор, PhD, Ақтеңіз университеті, Анталия, Түркия, sfiliz@akdeniz.edu.tr, ORCID ID:0000-0002-4249-22-21
<i>Лазиза Нұрпейіс</i>	PhD докторант, Сакарія университеті, Сердиван, Түркия, aruana84@gmail.com. ORCID ID:0000-0002-2564-8888
<i>Шахин Филіз</i>	Профессор, PhD, университет Акдениз, Анталия, Турция, sfiliz@akdeniz.edu.tr, ORCID ID:0000-0002-4249-22-21
<i>Лазиза Нурпеис</i>	PhD докторант, университет Сакарія, Сердиван, Турция, aruana84@gmail.com. ORCID ID:0000-0002-2564-8888