Truth and its theoretical and philosophical models Bunyatova Shams

2 authors, including:

Imcra Journals Library Imcra
Kuban State University
509 PUBLICATIONS   **49** CITATIONS

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   Journal of Language and Literature (2078-0303) View project

Project   Rahil Najafov View project

Truth and its theoretical and philosophical models

Author (s):   Bunyatova Shams
Baku State University, Department of Philosophy, PhD student
E-mail: quliyeva.shems@gmail.com

Abstract: One of the main and essential places in the theory of cognition occupies truth. It is not an accidental status, but it is due to truth's role in the cognitive process, its theoretical and empirical significance. It should be noted that the truth problem is not a new phenomenon in the philosophical thinking. There are a lot and different shades of thought and concepts have taken place in the history of philosophy on this problem. In this research we analyze various theoretical models of truth, including classical, coherent and pragmatic models. The interrelations between these models, as well as the philosophical and logical problems they face in trying to define the truth, have been studied and interpreted.

INTRODUCTION

It should be noted that the knowledge itself is the result of the cognitive process which is realized through the interaction of object and subject, so in its content the properties and qualities of both the object and the subject are reflected. From this point of view, it is possible to distinguish two different parts in the content of the concept of knowledge:

1) The first part emphasizes that knowledge depends on the subject's level of perception of the external world, senses, worldview, and emotional world. In this sense, the first layer is purely subjective and does not have an objective meaning.

 2) In the second part, called objective truth, the content of knowledge is revealed independently of the subject and humanity in general. Here the individual elements of the object, the existing interrelationships between them and the necessary connections are taken as the main fact. (7, pp. 436-437)

Generally, if we analyze the historical development of philosophical cognition, we can see that the problem of truth, the methods and means of obtaining it, and the forms of existence of truth have

played a leading role here. There are various definitions of the concept of truth in the philosophical literature: - Truth is empirical knowledge

> *Truth is the adequacy of knowledge to reality*
> *Truth is agreed knowledge*
> *The criterion of truth is benefit, pragma.*

According to the definitions which indicated above, there are various theories and concepts about truth in the philosophy of cognition. Among them, it is expedient to name the correspondent, coherent and pragmatic concepts of truth from those accepted by the majority. (7, pp. 438-439)

Discussion

The leading point of the classical theory of truth, also known as the corresponding concept in philosophical literature, is the 'adequacy' of the reality of thought. It is accepted as a classical theory based on the fact that it has the oldest in the history among other theories of truth and that it is from this concept that the theoretical study of the concept of truth began. The classical concept of truth, which has both idealistic and materialist interpretations, is philosophically heterogeneous. So, these interpretations differ from each other in terms of understanding the essence of the cognitive process, as well as its nature. However, the fact that the reality underlying the classical concept can be copied and described in the system of knowledge has been a common principle that unites both idealists and materialists. Meanwhile, it should be noted that this theory is closer to materialist thinking than idealism, and its true path of development is related to materialist views.

It is useful to mention that the historical roots of the classical theory of truth go back to ancient philosophy, and Plato and Aristotle made the first attempts to interpret it theoretically. Plato described the concept of truth as follows: Those who express things as they are in reality tell the truth, otherwise they lie. A similar definition can be found in Aristotle's Metaphysics: it is wrong to say that existence does not exist and that there is no creature, but it is true to say that existence does exist and that there is no non-existence. According to Aristotle, who described the image of an object in the external world in our minds "phantasm", the object or object of phantasm is reflected in our brain through its form. In this sense, the common feature of the object and the image reflected in our minds is the form of the object (1, pp. 87-88). In scholastic philosophy, the classical concept of truth is formulated as "veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus." That is, truth is the correspondence of intellect (thought, thought) and objects. Aquinas Thomas, one of the most important thinkers of scholastic philosophy, considered this theory acceptable and made a great contribution to its spread. Generally, it is like other theories of truth, the concept of classical truth experienced a renaissance in the twentieth century (5, p. 60). Particularly, the classical conception of truth, which occupies a leading position in the philosophical views of logical positivists, despite criticism and scientific debate was able to maintain its importance. As we mentioned before, during this period, there were two interpretations of classical theory. The first is the interpretation of truth developed by B. Russell, which accepts the idea as a correspondence between the image and the real image. According to Russell, there is a structural isomorphism relationship between the carriers of truth and reality. In this sense, in his view, there must be several preconditions for any idea to be true: the idea must include both truth and falsehood; to accept that the relationship of right and wrong does not belong only to the material world; Although the existence of expression is based on consciousness, its quality of authenticity is beyond consciousness (6, pp. 119-120). Analyzing the above points, we can say that the first condition includes the principles of verification, validation and falsification, error. This form of expression is judgment. In this case, truth is a qualitative property of judgments. According to the second condition, the bearers of truth are not the external world, but expressions or sentences. In this sense, it serves as a philosophical reinforcement of the first condition. According to the latter condition, although the carriers of truth are expressions, the truth itself is a relation of correspondence, which is beyond the expression, or rather; the expression is formed by the expression independent of it.

English philosopher J.L. Austin made second interpretation and we have to mention that his interpretation of the truth starts from the point of view of correlation. According to this interpretation, every truth depends on the interaction between knowledge and a particular event, the conditions of their existence, as well as space and time. In this sense, truth is not understood as a direct copy of an object (6, p. 123).

As we have noted before, the central idea of the classical concept is the conformity of ideas to reality. From this point of view, the concept of reality or reality is one of the basic concepts in classical theory. When perception is focused on the external world, this concept is equated with the concept of objective reality. But this is a very narrow interpretation of reality. So, if we can confirm this idea, we will limit the classical theory of truth only to the perception of the external world. However, the classical theory claims universality and states that it can be applied not only to objective reality, but also to mental objects. Now, for example, we can consider two types of sentences:

According to classical theory, both statements are considered true because they correspond to reality. In this sense, reality in classical theory means not only the objective reality that exists independently of our consciousness, but also the subjective reality (idea, theory, perception, principle, etc.) based on spiritual reality or logical rules.

If we express it shortly, according to the proponents of the classical theory of truth, it is possible to explain the truth in accordance with certain provisions:

● ● ●

The Earth is a planet in the solar system.

The Schrödinger equation is a linear equation.

● ● ●

• Reality, which is the subject of knowledge, does not depend on man and his activity;

• It is possible for ideas to be unequivocally consistent with reality;

• There are intuitively clear criteria that allow us to determine the relevance of an idea to reality;

• The theory that defines truth as the adequacy of thought to reality is logically consistent (2, p. 17).

Although classical theory of truth is a widely accepted concept in the philosophical field, it has faced certain challenges. Here are some of these problems:

1. The problem of the nature of perceived reality. Every person acts not only in relation to the direct objective world, but also in relation to the world he perceives and conceptually perceives. From this point of view, the facts that act as an indicator of true knowledge in classical theory are not objective in nature, they are concepts based on sensory perception and conceptual perception, human thinking.

2. The problem of the nature of the conformity of thought to reality. The main problem here is the claim that thought and reality is completely different in terms of their ontological features, and that they cannot interact in this sense. It is from this point of view that the relationship between language and the objective world put forward by classical theory has been criticized.

3. The problem of the criterion of truth. The problem of the criterion of truth, which is partly related to the first problem, has exceptional importance in the development of the classical concept. How can a subject check the adequacy of his judgment and claim to the objective world when he is in direct contact with his senses and with the conceptualized world? The problem of the criterion of truth is not limited to the aspect mentioned here, but various points must be taken into account. Even the ancient Greek skeptics pointed out that the question of the criterion of truth led to an endless regression paradox. For example, according to Sextus Empiricus, they prove each other through proof to prove that a statement is true and certain criteria must be adopted. However, this process of proof itself can go on indefinitely.

Thus, the "Nelson paradox" was formed on the basis of Empiricus' argument, which re-emerged in the twentieth century. The main issue here was the fundamental difficulties in checking the universal considerations accepted as the criterion of truth (2, pp. 18-20).

4. The problem of the position of the subject, described as a passive observer and spectator of truth. Coherent theory has emerged as a result of re-analysis and critique of the classical concept of truth, which evaluates truth as "agreed knowledge". The source of this concept, which is considered more acceptable by metaphysical, rationalist and idealist philosophers, has been the difficulties faced by classical theory in defining the relationship and criterion between reality and knowledge. Thus, according to E. M. Chudinov, there are two types of coherent theory.

Due to the first interpretation, which contradicts the classical concept and acts as an alternative to it, truth is the coherence of knowledge, the property of self-agreement. The famous German philosopher I. Kant is considered one of the founders of the first version of the coherent theory. However, it should be noted that Kant's views on the problem of truth are not unambiguous and consistent. On the one hand, Kant declared his commitment to the classical theory of truth, on the other hand, he noted that there was no one-sided correspondence between experience and knowledge, and that experience depended on the rational activity of a person. Thus, according to Kant, there is a mutual agreement that expresses the unity of feeling and logical perception that defines the essence and meaning of truth (2, p. 21).

Although the second interpretation retains the classical interpretation of truth, it states that the conformity of knowledge to reality is possible only through the coherence criterion, the property of truth. The source of this version is Zenon and Parmenides. They supported the idea that the knowledge gained as a result of the adequacy of thought was the truth, as well as that this knowledge coincided with the existing system of knowledge. In this sense, controversial opinions are unacceptable, and in the real world they have no source, no point of reference. In this sense, according to Parmeni, the concept of non-existence is false because it is not represented in the real world. Coherent theory has emerged in the twentieth century in two opposing philosophical currents. On the one hand, B. Blanchard, one of the main representatives of the idealist thought in the United States, and on the other hand, Otto Neurath, a representative of the Vienna Society, known for his harsh criticism of idealism and metaphysics, were supporters of the coherent concept. O. Neurath used this concept more to criticize R. Carnap's "protocol statements". According to Carnap, protocol statements are the starting point on which science must be trusted. However, according to Neurath, there is no "tabula rasa" and absolute knowledge in science. Each new knowledge must be compared with existing knowledge, and if it is adapted, it must be accepted as true, otherwise as false.

> **Despite all its efforts, the coherent theory of truth cannot be considered a worthy opponent of the classical concept. Thus, it not only does not eliminate the difficulties faced by the classical concept, but also deepens it. In this sense, we can mention two types of problems:**

1) This theory tries to solve the problem of coherence in a logical sense. However, it is important to keep in mind that the problem of coherence is as complex as a logical problem and can only be solved in simple situations. It is unsolvable in a number of logical calculations, especially in the context of sciences such as physics.

2) Coherence is considered as an internal feature of the system of expressions. N. Rischer writes in this regard: "The coherence considered in the concept in question refers to the attitude of certain expressions to others, and has nothing to do with the contradiction of reality or reality, with the logical agreement." The non-contradictory attitude of the knowledge understood in this context does not guarantee their coherence with reality. From this point of view, we can say that coherence is not a sufficiently accurate and reliable condition of truth. Thus, not every system of contradictory, logically consistent statements about the real, objective world is real (2, pp. 23-24).

Due to the difficulties faced by both theories, proponents of pragmatic theory have proposed a more concrete theory of truth. Meanwhile, it should be noted that in terms of epistemological origin, the concept of pragmatic truth is close to coherent theory. Thus, both concepts are cognitive but they differ from each other in terms of the positions they emphasize, which are the result of excessive exaggeration and hypertrophy of the active role of the subject in the process. Although coherent theory emphasizes the rational nature of the subject's activity, proponents of pragmatic theory, which excludes the possibility of achieving truth in the classical sense and empirically proposes it as an alternative to this rationalist tendency, consider the subject's practical activity more important.

Due to the pragmatist thought, both theories provided a formal and non-informative definition of truth, treating it as an abstract and metaphysical concept. The pragmatic conception of truth differs from the classical conception in that it emphasizes the active role of the subject. Unlike U. James, who emphasized the psychological aspect of the truth, Ch. Pierce approaches truth as a rational-logical problem. According to Pierce, truth is not the product of individuals, but the ultimate knowledge gained as a result of the activities of the research community.

According to William James, it is incorrect to talk about the concepts of truth and reality that exist outside of human activity. Thus, a human being is a passive spectator of reality, not just a subject who discovers the truth, but an active, active subject who shapes and interprets reality and creates truth (9, p.178). Approaching the truth from the point of view of radical empiricism, James evaluates it as a quality inherent in the results obtained at the end of a certain verification process through experience and in this context (3, p.36). From the epistemological point of view, the philosopher, who does not accept the objective-subjective classification of experience, treats it as the experience of mankind as a whole. Because, according to James, knowledge is inseparable from the perceiving subject and the perceived object, they are part of the unity and integrity that are inextricably linked with each other (3, p.37). In this sense, the truth must be sought not in the object or the subject, but directly in the experience itself. There is no need for an experimental reference point or criterion to verify the empirical result. Because experience or practice is the only method and platform for confirming the validity of any idea. In this sense, James called such views a rational postulate, as opposed to an approach based on the idea of permanent and perfect truth, which considers mental perception to be absolute.

As we mentioned, William James claims that knowledge gained through experience is considered true if it is inversely proportional to the pre-systematized beliefs in the individual's mind, and directly proportional to the maximum. Because an individual tends to maintain his usual beliefs, in other words, a person is conservative in matters of his beliefs. Human psychology is not capable of accepting revolutionary changes that will overthrow all his beliefs at once. From this point of view, changes in beliefs are small but persistent. Based on this opinion of James, we can say that the correctness and authenticity of any idea depends on the degree to which it acts as a mediator between knowledge gained in the past and future knowledge. In this sense, true knowledge must both align with the results of existing experiences and regulate the harmony between the past and the future. According to James, this process makes it possible for experiments to control each other and, consequently, for the objectivity of truth (4, p. 33).

> *The philosopher evaluates truth as knowledge obtained through pragmatic examination, which is useful for human life. Since the human mind operates in the teleological direction, the truth itself must be utilitarian in nature. In this sense, the authentic value of any idea is measured by the degree of usefulness and importance it holds in a person's life. In this case, authenticity is not a static and inherited quality of knowledge, but a feature of practice and relevance to the situation (4, p.103).*

James interprets truth as a form of "good idea",   good and useful concepts are equivalent. According to the philosopher, it is dogmatic to draw a line between truth and benefit. Because it is pointless to try to get an idea that is not useful by claiming that it is true. In this sense, the value of truth and the importance of efforts to achieve it depend on the pragmatic goodness of truth. Otherwise, the truth

will lose its value and become an unfounded dogma. At the same time, it is important to note that according to James, accepting everything that is useful in life as truth or truth can lead people to superstition. It is at this point that James, in order to confirm the validity of any idea, confronts it with other empirical facts in a minimum and in maximum harmony. He puts forward the principle that life is a field of endless experiments, and in this field each new idea must be compared with the previous vital experiences and a final decision must be made accordingly. In the words of William James, the worst enemy of any truth is other truths.

As a result, it is important to emphasize that William James opposes the notion of truth in itself, denying "ante rem" truths that do not depend on human activity and experience. According to him, truth is the product of human intellect; it is not the discoverer of truth, but the inventor of truth (4, p.110). It is unacceptable to consider knowledge that is not of personal or public benefit to be true.

Generally, we can express that the concept of truth should be understood as a process which can be understood in dual senses. At first, as a process of change in the direction of more detailed representation of an object or subject, and secondly, as a process of eliminating errors within the theory and concepts. In this sense, the process of truth combines static and dynamic moments that are in harmony with each other in order to achieve a more complete, complete truth. Violation of such unity weakens or completely disappears the elements that make up the truth. Excess of static or absolute property in the content of truth leads to dogma, dogmatism, authoritarianism, and cult.

Meanwhile, it is inadmissible to absolutize the relativity of knowledge in the sense that it replaces one theory with another. Such absoluteness eventually leads to meaningless skepticism, skepticism, agnosticism and other wrong phenomenas.

Conclusion

The research process of the concept of truth allows for the analysis of different concepts of truth and the relationship between them, as well as the study of whether there are different forms of truth in the background of these theories. In this sense, when new forms of truth are discovered in the process of cognition, it is important to approach them not from a straightforward-critical position, but from a strategic position based on a synthesis of new and old forms. According to L.A. Mikeshina's theory, the concepts of truth are complementary; do not deny each other, and each of them separately expresses the epistemological, epistemological, semantic, socio-cultural aspects of true knowledge, so these theories should be considered in relation to each other. From this point of view, since none of the concepts analyzed above claim to be universal, the only truth, each of them is a valuable tool for both methodological and epistemological analysis of the authenticity of the acquired knowledge. At the same time, although the different criteria put forward by these concepts about truth are not the same, they must be taken into account in interaction and unity (7, p. 457). In this sense, the modern concept of truth includes the dialogue of various philosophical concepts and the synthesis of the most productive ideas in the context of scientific and cultural innovations.

References

1. Ankin, Д. В. (2019). Theory of cognition-: Yekaterinburg: Ural Publishing House, -192 c.

2. Chudinov M.E. (1977). Nature of scientific truth- Moscow: Politizdat, - 312 p.

3. Dzhokhadze DI (2015). Pragmatism of James: basic ideas and their development.//Philosophical magazine. T. 8. № 2. - Moscow.- 31-43 p.

4. James W. (2003). Pragmatism: A New Name For Some Old Ways Of Thinking. - New York: Barnes & amp; Noble Publishing. — 142 p.

5. Kadir CH. (2005). Philosophy of Knowledge- Bursa: Asa, -279 p.

6. Kirkham R. (2001). Theories of truth: A critical introduction, USA: Fifth printing, - 415 p.

7. Mammadov A, (2010) Rationality and irrationality, Baku: Elm .-879 p

8. Tepe H. (2016) From Plato to Habermas; Truth or Truthfulness in Philosophy, Ankara: BilgeSu, -224 p

9. Türer C. (2009). Truthfulness of Pragmatism' House // Reference. Number: 17. - Kayseri - 165-185 p.