



CHINESE AND EUROPEAN LINGUISTIC TRADITIONS AS WORLDVIEW VARIATIONS

Djurayev Dilshod Mamadiyorovich

Candidate Of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Uzbekistan

Sayfiddinova Marjona Turg'un Qizi

Master Of Linguistics Chinese Language 1st Year, Uzbekistan State University Of World Languages, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Hieroglyph, synopsis, linguistic thinking, Europeanization, linguistic phenomena, morphological and phonetic.

Received: 11.05.2024

Accepted: 16.05.2024

Published: 21.05.2024

Abstract: This article explores the differences between European and Chinese cognitive strategies as the basis for the "non-adaptability" of European grammatical categories to the Chinese language and the absence of "grammar" in the Chinese linguistic heritage. The analysis of linguistic elements involved in the formation and nomination of fundamental concepts of ancient and ancient Chinese philosophy identifies two distinct initial models of the world: a matter-oriented model and an energy-oriented model. This is based on the universality of the concept of "model-dependent realism" in relation to cognition. The energy-oriented picture of the world coincides with the unmanifest Principle's incomprehensibility, whereas the matter-oriented model correlates with the human mind's knowledge of the world's laws. The matter-oriented model has given rise to a methodologically reductionist approach to cognition, including language cognition. European grammar was looking for answers to the following questions: "What units exist?", "In what relations are they with each other?" and "What laws describe these relations?". When the studied languages were formed during the implementation of the same initial matter-oriented model of the world, this approach

corresponded to the nature of these languages, because such languages sought to distinguish some units from others and fix the signs of differentiation in a certain formal way.

INTRODUCTION

It's often accepted that the publication of Ma Jianzhong's book "Mr. Ma's Grammatical Compendium" at the close of the 1800s marked the beginning of grammar study in China as a scientific field. According to V.M. Alpatov, in the Chinese tradition, grammar was unknown until the end of the 19th century when it was introduced to Europe. Dictionary descriptions were the primary means of description in that tradition [1. p. 21]. We believe that "Europeanization" is the most important term in this brief synopsis. It alludes to two things: first, Ma Jianzhong's book is built around the core ideas of Latin grammar; second, the word "grammar" is closely associated with the European legacy of language. "Europeanization" has defined the main vector of development of the "grammar of the Chinese language" as a scientific discipline up to the present day: linguists have mainly followed the path of adapting European grammatical categories to real linguistic phenomena, but they have not been able to overcome the contradictions between them. In the first lines of the "Grammar of the modern Chinese language", published in 1930, a remark was made about the fundamental differences in the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the elementary units of Chinese language thinking from the European one [2. p. 3]. Further, the great linguists of their time write: "... we must consciously agree that the division of speech into elements (lexical, morphological and phonetic) has a specific character in the Chinese language and often does not find equal correspondences in the units of European linguistic thinking" [Ibid., p. 13]. It can be stated that in terms of theoretical understanding of the grammar of the Chinese language, the entire XX century. It was devoted to the development of specific criteria and methodological procedures for the allocation of units of the Chinese language, but in the end the essence of the issue remained the same: if you apply basic European grammatical concepts to the description of the Chinese language, you will have to change the essence of these concepts accordingly. In her review article, E.I. Shutova, after analyzing different approaches to the problem of parts of speech in the Chinese language, objectively pointed out the unresolved problem:

"The functional mobility of the Chinese language, the asymmetry of linguistic meanings of lexico-semantic and functional-syntactic plans accompanying the use of the word - this is the incessant empirical fact that was revealed in the process research of the problem and which is still waiting for its explanation" [3. p. 62]. Thus, the preservation of the universality of its meaning in parts of speech of different languages is called into question. It should be noted that the "non-adaptability" of European grammatical categories is observed not only in relation to the Chinese language. Analyzing the historical connection between the terminology of the theory of parts of speech and ancient philosophy, O.V. Lukin writes that "the terminology of Greek and Roman scientists describing the phenomena of their native language is subsequently uncritically transferred to the soil of languages with other typological characteristics, which only complicates their adequate research and description. However, the familiarity of this terminology, the widespread use of ancient labels, forces us not to abandon them, but to give them a real typological explanation" [4. p. 161].

However, the problem is far from the difficulty of adapting terminology, but what actually gives us a grammar based on the European vision of the language. The paradox lies in the fact that all the

theoretical difficulties and grammar disputes between linguists in no way affect either a person's natural ability to speak a language in early childhood, or the practice of further functioning of this language. It is believed that grammar should help to build "literate", correct speech. Nevertheless, if we talk about the native language, then "grammar" as a set of conscious rules only makes some adjustments towards the standardization of its use. If we talk about mastering a foreign language, then learning grammatical rules does not guarantee the generation of correct speech at all, and sometimes the help from "grammar" can be very doubtful: the discrepancy between the "Europeanized grammar" of the Chinese language with the real rules according to which this language functions is most clearly revealed in the course of learning Chinese as a foreign language. "The correct perception and reproduction of Chinese speech requires the correction of existing theories and concepts" [5. P. 20] – an objective assessment of a theoretical linguist with many years of experience teaching Chinese as a foreign language. This paradox is recognized by a number of researchers who point to the crisis of linguistics as a science (see: [6, 7]). Linguistics as a science in general and grammar in particular are still far from explaining language as a unique human feature. The need to explain this ability has appeared largely in connection with the development of artificial intelligence, in particular speech technologies. Today's speech technologies are still encountering "insurmountable difficulties as soon as artistic translation is required or the dialogue is conducted in a free communication mode"

Therefore, "grammar" in the sense of "the rules by which language functions" is not at all analogous to "grammar" as a scientific field with its accomplishments, which mostly arose out of the European heritage of language cognition. The fact that European grammatical terminology is widely used only serves as evidence for the dominance of Europocentrism throughout the entire history of modern linguistics. However, the popularity of a particular approach or vision does not imply that it is universal or that there are an infinite number of ways to find patterns. Furthermore, the Chinese linguistic tradition's distance from the discipline of "grammar" does not exclude its efficacy in this regard. We will attempt to respond to the question of why the

Approach

Although it may appear to be a linguistics issue at first, the Chinese language tradition has not established a "grammar" in the same way that it has in European linguistics. This is actually a cognitive issue. Therefore, the primary foundation of our research is not linguistic data per se, but rather the opinions of scientists from various fields, particularly neurophysiology and physiology, regarding the characteristics of our brains, which have allowed human cognition to advance to a completely new level. Neuroscientist Chris Frith contends that perception is a fiction that corresponds with consciousness based on the findings of numerous experiments meant to explore how the brain and consciousness function. "Our brain builds models of the world around us and constantly modifies these models based on signals reaching our senses. Therefore, in fact, we do not accept the world itself, but rather its models created by our brain" [9. p. 208]. In modern physics, after the discovery of "quantum uncertainty", the concept of "model-dependent realism" appeared. With the help of this concept, physicists explain the paradox of the discrepancy between the knowledge about the world obtained through direct observations and the knowledge about the world that modern physics has. Model-dependent realism "is based on the fact that our brain interprets signals coming from the senses and creates a model of the world. When such a model successfully explains events, we tend to attribute to it, as well as to its constituent elements and concepts, the property of reality, or absolute truth. But the same physical phenomenon can be modeled in different ways, using different fundamental ideas and concepts" [10. pp. 11-12]. Such a feature of the human brain is unlikely to manifest itself only in the perception and

cognition of physical phenomena, but rather, it is characteristic of a person in the course of cognition of everything, including in the course of comprehending the results of his own cognition.

Thus, cognition can well be represented as a modeling process, and the process of cognition itself and its result are always dependent on some kind of initial model. If we consider that the emergence of language was accompanied by a cognitive revolution, i.e. language simultaneously served as a tool for cognition of the world and was the result of this process, then language certainly contains a certain initial model. The origin of this initial model may have been formed even before the emergence of language, it is also possible that the model and language are in principle not separate and influenced each other. The only important thing is that this initial model should be quite successful in terms of the fact that with its help a person can adapt the world to himself, and not just adapt to the world.

In other words, any language, if it functions, contains a certain model that is successful for this language group. From this point of view, different languages do not represent the same world in different ways, but create their own world, their own reality, depending on their own initial model. The reality created by a certain language has an absolute reality for native speakers of a given language, but this objective reality is provided only by its intersubjectivity for a certain language collective. As for the cognition of the language itself, neither the European nor the Chinese linguistic traditions can also be independent of a certain initial model. In other words, the significant difference between these traditions should rather indicate the presence of different initial models of the world. Thus, the method of our research as a whole is deductive, but also reflects the principle of historicism and interdisciplinary, comprehensive consideration of the question posed. Starting from

We identify two different initial models of the world based on the analysis of the elements of language that were involved in the process of forming and nominating the basic concepts of ancient and ancient Chinese philosophy. Next, the influence of a certain initial model of the world on approaches to cognition, including language cognition, is revealed. In conclusion, a possible perspective is outlined for the study of "grammar" as a linguistic ability in the light of awareness of the model dependence of reality.

Study

Two variations of the worldview. Reflection on the structure of the world, of course, is explicitly contained, first of all, in the legacies from the great minds of antiquity, which we today call "philosophy". If we look at those elements of language that were used in the process of forming and nominating the basic concepts of ancient and ancient Chinese philosophy, we find two variations of the worldview, each using its own initial model.

"The Greek word ἀρχή 'beginning' ... denotes the primary element underlying all things, in most cases the material property - water, air, fire, earth, atoms, etc." "... The Greek word ὕλη, which originally meant 'timber' and which Aristotle, by analogy with everything made of this material, began to denote any material basis... Subsequently, as is known, Cicero translated the Greek ὕλη into Latin with the tracing paper materia (initially also "timber"), and in the later European tradition, in the sense of philosophical abstraction from matter and materiality, it was the Latin version of "matter" that took root. <...> Parmenides uses to denote the concept of "being" the substantive participle of the neuter gender of the verb εἶναι 'to be, to exist' in the form accepted in his dialect - τὸ εἶν (letters. 'what is')" [11. pp. 1034-1035, 1039-1040]. The variation "beginning - matter - being" presents us with a tangible and divisible world, and such a worldview not only implies the indivisibility of the world, but also offers a specific path to its cognition: the metaphorical image of a "drill forest" implies the presence of a "structure", the

cognition of which is possible by dividing the object the components and the identification of links between these components. A completely different world is represented by the daocentric Chinese philosophy. In this variation, "the world basically contains some kind of non-manifested principle" [12. p. 157]. The analogue of the concept of Being in the "Tao Te Ching" is denoted by a(yu) - the sign comes from the image of a bull's head symbolizing property. The main meaning is to have, to eat, which is close to the Greek verb εἶναι 'to be, to exist'. But in La-oji, it is not permanent and eternal, it is born from (y):- all the colors of the world are given by Being, and Non-Being gave birth to Him [13. P. 35]. Non-Being in the original is understood as 无 (y) - 'no, no'. Another designation for the unmanifested Beginning is 太虚 (taixiu) - it is commonly translated as "The Great Void". In fact, there are two signs in the Chinese language that differentiate the idea of "emptiness": 虚 (xu) and 空 (kun). There is a fundamental difference between them: 空 correlates to the perception of physical space with the "limit" resulting from this perception, such an understanding of "emptiness" is largely based on visual perception and indicates the absence of visually "fixable" in the limiting space; emptiness is boundless and contains the potential for metamorphosis, i.e. such emptiness It is caused by the lack of human ability to perceive and cognize it.

The concept is strikingly consonant with the "concept of emptiness" in modern physics: in the light of the quantum uncertainty principle, vacuum fluctuations occur, "this tremor of fields exists even in space that you would normally perceive as empty, in a space that seems to contain neither matter nor fields" [14. p. 336]. If we understand the Beginning as "unmanifested", then everything that is perceived and cognizable is a "manifestation" of the Beginning, in other words, the world is seen as an "embodiment" of the non-perceived and non-cognizable Beginning into the perceived and cognizable. The mechanism of the embodiment and reincarnation of one manifestation of the Principle in another is represented as movement and interaction (qi). Translating the concept of "qi" into another language is not an easy task, because it combines such moments that in Western metaphysics will necessarily require clear terminological articulation and differentiation. Qi is interpreted as one of the fundamental and most specific categories of Chinese philosophy, expressing the idea of a conceptual, dynamic, spatial-temporal, spiritual-material and vital-energy substance. The semantics of this concept is revealed with the help of words such as "pneuma", "ether", "atmosphere", "gas", "air", "breath", "spirit", "temperament", "energy", "life force", "matter" [15. p. 549]. In a certain sense, the idea of qi serves as a starting point for understanding the world in the Chinese variation of the worldview, and unlike ancient atomism, which focuses on "matter", the idea of qi focuses on "energy", and, accordingly, qi is not divided into constituent elements. To understand the interaction of qi, a certain differentiation is necessary, and the most famous differentiation is the difference between the two principles of yang and yin. But such differentiation has a fundamentally different character than the method of differentiation adopted by modern science in the spirit of Aristotle's categories. Yang and yin are not mutually exclusive, on the contrary: "In yang there is yin, in yin there is yang", "yang can return to yin when its movement reaches its maximum limit, and vice versa, yin turns into yang after reaching the maximum limit peace", "A thing remains itself only when yang and yin are harmoniously combined with each other in it" [16. p. 665]. The variation "unmanifested Principle - movement and interaction of qi phenomena" is largely focused on indivisible and non-fixed energy as the basis of the universe, which is what distinguishes it from the matter-oriented variation. Phenomena explained as a result of the movement and interaction of qi are not presented as something with an analyzed structure like a "drill forest".

A number of scientists consider alphabetic and hieroglyphic writing as a reflection of a global cultural alternative [17. pp. 104-111]. "Our world is binary, like man himself... The principle of duality has

always been followed by the Chinese worldview, whose most famous symbol in the world is yin and yang, and it corresponds to the global opposite of civilizations – Western and eastern.

Two different types of writing correspond to the same opposition: alphabetic and hieroglyphic. Thus, we are dealing with two different types of cultures, the specifics of which are rooted in the nature of man, language, writing, and mentality" [18. pp. 36-37].

Harmony between language and linguistic tradition, provided by a matter-oriented model of the world. To begin with, not only modern linguistics originated in Europe, but all modern science came out of Europe. According to Yuval Noah Harari, "the scientific revolution was not a revolution of knowledge, it was primarily a revolution of ignorance. The great discovery that led to the scientific revolution is the idea that people do not know the answers to the most important questions" [19. p. 298]. However, the appearance of such a thought in itself does not push a person to search for answers to questions, it also requires faith that the laws of the universe are comprehensible to the human mind. The matter-oriented model of the world correlates well with such faith. As we have already noted, such a model not only implies its comprehensibility, but also offers a specific path to its cognition. The knowledge of the world in the European scientific traditions went exactly along the path of "dividing and analyzing", laid down in the matter-oriented model of the world. Prominent biochemist and Anglican priest Arthur Peacock writes that: "a person looks at the world as an alien and opposite object to himself. This view of the world led to a process of abstraction, in which world phenomena and processes disintegrated into components. These components, in turn, were considered as independent whole, interconnected by relations like legal laws... A methodologically reductionist approach was required to answer the questions of the 'new philosophy': 'What things exist', then 'In what relations they are with each other', and finally 'What laws describe these relations'" [20. pp. 3-4].

So, the scientific revolution, as it occurred in Europe, largely occurred due to the matter-oriented model of the world functioning within European languages. But we should not ignore the fact that there were many great discoveries before the advent of modern science, and not only in Europe. However, it was in Europe that science entered into an alliance with politics and capital, which determined its focus on expanding human capabilities and creating new technologies. As a result, Europe, thanks to the growth of military and economic power, began to dominate the world, and military and economic dominance contributed to the dominance of the European worldview, including the methodologically reductionist approach to cognition that grew out of this variation of the worldview: the word "scientific" now automatically refers us to this approach. But as science develops, people begin to realize the limitations of this approach. About this, Arthur Peacock writes the following: "One can agree with the need for methodological reduction, in other words, with the fact that, in order to understand the work of a complex system and the interaction of its elements, it is necessary to decompose it into its component parts and examine them separately. No one is arguing about this. The dispute begins with the question of the relation of our knowledge of complex systems to their ontology, that is, the relationship between how we see them and what they really are" [20. pp. 79-80]. Harmony between language and linguistic tradition, provided by an energy-oriented model of the world. When the energy-oriented model is functioning, the world is explained as a result of the movement and interaction of qi, and qi is not represented as something with an analyzed structure like a "drill forest". In principle, such a variation of the worldview could not give rise to a methodologically reductionist approach to cognition. For example, one of the oldest areas of human cognitive activity is medicine. Chinese medicine considers the state of human health as balancing qi within the body and the interaction of human internal energy

with the energy of nature. The millennial development of such medicine has not led, and could never have led, to the emergence of such fields of science as biochemistry or genetics.

With the energy-oriented variation of the worldview, language, like other objects of knowledge, was not presented as a kind of system with a fixed structure, and Chinese scientists before Europeanization were occupied with purely pragmatic issues related mainly to the interpretation of ancient texts and generalization of experiments on the creation of the best literary works. If we call these areas of research in modern terms, then these are semantics, pragmatics and, of course, the linguistics of the text. At the same time, the natural unit for the interpretation and study of texts is 字 (tzu), but since there was no idea of language as a structured set of units and relations between them, the question of the allocation of language units, which turned out to be such a difficult theoretical question after Europeanization, was not raised at all.

In the Russian-Chinese dictionary, 字 is translated as "hieroglyph", but these two concepts are not equivalent, and the reason is again the difference between the two variations of worldview. The planes of sound, visual image and meaning are connected together. The word "hieroglyph" automatically refers to the idea of writing, i.e. a visual image separated from the sound and semantic plane.

Russian Sinologists today use the terms "monosyllabic", "significant monosyllable", "syllable morpheme", "word-syllable" to denote the basic units of the Chinese language, which, in our opinion, are compromise options when the holistic concept in the Chinese variation of the worldview does not find an analogue in the European variation, striving for a more detailed differentiation of phenomena and corresponding clear terminological articulation. The classification of 字 (denoting) was closely related to the classification of the denoted: 死字 (sytzi, lit. dead + 字 – tzu, representative objects or phenomena formed by nature) were contrasted with 活字 (hotzi, lit. living + 字 – tzu, representing the processes leading to the formation of objects and phenomena); 实字 (shizi, literally: full + 字 – tzu, representing tangible objects or phenomena; all Shizi have semantic definiteness) were opposed to 虚字 (xuzi, literally: empty + 字 – tzu, representing something that has no forms; part of Xuzi has semantic certainty, part does not, i.e. semantics will be determined only when interacting with others). In such a classification, anthropocentrism is largely present, because it is based, in fact, on a person's perception of reality: part of reality is recognized by him as fixed and unchangeable, part is changing, and the person himself often acts as the initiator of change; part of reality is really tangible by sense organs, and part exists only in human imagination; The imagined differs in the degree of its abstraction, on which semantic certainty/uncertainty depends. The boundary between the unchangeable and the changeable, between the imaginary and the tangible, is very blurred for our consciousness, in the Chinese linguistic tradition there were no attempts to develop any strict criteria for their systematic differentiation, but only the fact was stated (in the middle of the XVII century) about the flexibility of the use of 字 (or about polyfunctionality, if to express it in a word more familiar to modern linguistics): in speech products, 死字 can become 活字, 实字 can become 虚字 [26. p. 53]. After semantics began to receive much more attention in modern linguistics, as well as with the assertion of anthropocentrism, the opinion appeared that in ancient times Chinese scientists realized the need to develop linguistic science not in the traditional, but in the "modernist" direction [27. P. 12]. Of course, semantics has always occupied a central place in the Chinese linguistic tradition, and in the matter of classification, scientists initially took into account human perception, but it is hardly possible to say that we are dealing with a conscious "modernist" trend, because in this tradition there has never been a desire to reveal the laws of language

functioning. Chinese scientists did not call language a "gift from God" or an "involuntary emanation of the spirit," but for them the intuitive nature of the rules by which language functions was rather self-evident. This is also evidenced by the traditional method of teaching literacy by "learning standard texts", based on the ability to intuitively comprehend the essence of things.

On the one hand, the absence in the Chinese linguistic tradition of the desire to search for patterns in the functioning of language is quite natural with an energy-oriented model of worldview, correlating rather with the incomprehensibility of the unmanifested Principle for a person rather than with its comprehension; on the other hand, the same idea is projected in the knowledge of language, in particular in the qualification dualism like yin – yang: "dead" (static and unchangeable) is opposed to "alive" (dynamic and changeable), "filled" is opposed to "empty". Just like between yin and yang, such an opposition does not imply mutual exclusion, i.e. "reincarnation" is allowed, which, in turn, corresponds to the nature of the language itself. As already noted, for an energy-oriented model of worldview, the "interaction" of indivisible entities and their "reincarnation" is much more important than a fixed "relationship" between mutually exclusive and opposable elements. Therefore, for the Chinese language, it is not important at all to mark the correlation between form and meaning or between form and function. 字, if we talk about it generically, it is an image captured by a person - the subject of cognition when perceiving a certain situation. The process of capturing a situation is accompanied by both its interpretation and its abstraction. In a certain sense, the process of capturing a situation with power is the process of the emergence of the intersubjective essence of a given situation. Such an intersubjective entity has a fairly wide potential for "reincarnation".

In other words, "polyfunctionality" is nothing more than the possibility of "reincarnation" of a certain entity when interacting with other entities. We observe again the harmony between language and the initial model of worldview, the harmony between the cognitive strategy functioning inside the language and the approach to cognition of the language itself.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the linguistic tradition, European or Chinese, reflects a certain approach to language cognition, and this approach is largely predetermined by the corresponding language, because the original model of the world functions in the language, which determines the specifics of the language, encourages a person to cognition and at the same time limits his cognition. The answer to the question of why the Chinese linguistic tradition was not interested in "grammar" turns out to be simple: grammar is intuitively accessible to a person within a language collective, it does not need to be described. The intuitive nature of grammar is actually recognized by modern linguistics, at least in its cognitive-oriented direction, but the methodologically reductionist approach, which grew up on the basis of the European worldview, closes our path to cognition of our own linguistic intuition. Identifying "grammar" as a human ability requires us to first know "intuition" as a really functioning form of cognition, and then build a hypothesis about how our linguistic intuition could work. If we treat intuition as a really functioning form of cognition, then it must also have a "model-dependent realism", i.e. intuition works under the same general conditions: our brain, accepting certain signals, tends to build a certain model and apply this model to explain new signals and create new realities, thereby bringing diversity to uniformity until new signals are no longer explained by the existing model and require the use of a new model. Intuition differs from other forms of cognition, rather, only in that we do not need to be aware of the models used and the conditions for their application, and the brain, as it were, independently "selects" the desired model.

The most important obstacle to understanding the mechanism of linguistic intuition is the involvement of a person, including researchers of culture and language, in their own language and the intersubjective reality created by this language. However, it seems possible for us to overcome this obstacle, since to realize the "independence of reality" means to realize the limitations of our usual strategy of cognition, and awareness of limitations is the first step to expand the limit of our knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Polivanov E.D., Ivanov A.I. Grammar of the modern Chinese language. Moscow : Institute of Oriental Studies. Narimanova, 1930. 304 p.
2. Lukin O.V. Terminology of the theory of parts of speech: ancient origins // Yaroslavy Pedagogical Bulletin. 2012. No. 1, vol. I (Humanities). pp. 161-166.
3. Tan Aoshuang. Hidden Grammar Problems: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics of the language of the isolating system (on the example of the Chinese language). Moscow : Languages of Slavic culture, 2002. 896 p.
4. Koshelev A.D. Modern theoretical linguistics as the Tower of Babel (about the "peaceful" coexistence of many incompatible theories of language) // Izvestiya RAS. A series of literature and language. 2013. Vol. 72, No. 6. pp. 3-22.
5. Kravchenko A.V. Is traditional linguistic analysis an analysis of language?
6. // Vestnik TvGU. The series "Philology". 2015. No. 2. pp. 54-62.
7. Velikhov E.P., Kotov A.A., Lectorsky V.A., Velichkovsky B.M. Interdisciplinary studies of consciousness: 30 years later // Questions of philosophy. 2018. No. 12. URL: http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2071&Itemid=52
8. Frith K. Brain and soul: how nervous activity shapes our inner world /
9. translated from the English by P. Petrov. M.: Astrel : CORPUS, 2011. 335 p.
10. Hawking S., Mlodinov L. The Supreme plan / translated from the English by M. Kononov. M. : AST, 2018. 208 p.
11. Yanzina E.V., Korneev O.V. On the question of the role of grammar in the creation of the language of ancient Greek philosophy // Indo-European linguistics and classical philosophy. 2015. No. 19. pp. 1034-1050.
12. Eremeev V.E. Trigrams of the "Book of Changes" as symbols of interactions // Meta-physics. 2012. No. 1 (3). pp. 156-166.
13. Laozi. Tao Te Ching, or A Treatise on the Path and Morality / translated from ancient Chinese by L.I. Kondrashova. M. : RIPOL classic, 2005. 224 p.
14. Green B. The fabric of space: Space, time and the texture of reality / translated from English by V.O. Malysenko, A.D. Panova. 2nd ed., ispr. M. : Book house "LIBROCOM", 2011. 608 p.
15. The spiritual culture of China: an encyclopedia: in 5 volumes / ch. ed. M.L. Titarenko. M. : East lit., 2006. Vol. 1: Philosophy.
16. Chan Van Ko. The unity of "yang" and "yin" as truth (Problem statement) // Logical analysis of language. Favourites. 1998-1995. Moscow : Indrik, 2003. 696 p.
17. Karapetyants A.M. At the origins of Chinese literature : sobr. tr. M. : East lit., 2010. 479 p.
18. Kobzev A.I. Global cultural alternative: China – the West // Philosophical Sciences. 2015. No. 1. pp. 36-57.
19. Kharali Yu.N. A brief history of mankind / trans. from English L. Sum. M. : Sinbad, 2019. 512 p.
20. Peacock A. Evolution is the secret friend of faith / translated from English (Series "Science and theology"). Moscow : BBI, 2013. 375 p.

21. A large encyclopedic dictionary. Linguistics. 2nd ed. Moscow : The Great Russian Encyclopedia, 1998. 685 p.
22. Gasparov B.M. Theoretical linguistics as a worldview // Questions of linguistic knowledge. 2017. No. 3. pp. 7-23.