From a Semantic Perspective: the Relationship Between Linguistics and Philosophy

Rahmatullah Hakimi[1*]; Akbar Khan Andar[1]

[1]Department of Pashto Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Paktika University, Afghanistan
[2]Department of Pashto Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Herat University, Afghanistan
[*]Corresponding Email: rahmatullah.hakime@gmail.com, Phone Number: +93787360549

Abstract

Meaning serves as the common ground between linguistics and philosophy, forming the basis for their interconnection. Linguistic meaning often faces ambiguities when intertwined with philosophical meaning, and from a cultural viewpoint, linguistic components, along with their meanings, also encompass various philosophical interpretations. This study investigates the link between linguistics and philosophy by focusing on the expansion of these meanings. Given that linguistic components convey philosophical implications in addition to their linguistic meanings, the aim of this research is to examine the relationship between linguistics and philosophy through a semantic lens. In examining the connection between linguistics and philosophy, a descriptive-analytical approach was utilized. The research demonstrated that factors such as reference, reasoning, intentionality, structural, quantitative, and qualitative meanings, linguistic logic, and concepts of linguistic determinism and free will play a role in both expanding and constraining meaning in language. The findings indicate that, from a semantic standpoint, there is a shared boundary between linguistics and philosophy, and to achieve linguistic meaning in communication, it is essential to consider the interrelationship between both linguistic and philosophical disciplines.
Keywords: Linguistics, Philosophy of Linguistics, Philosophy, Semantics, Semantics Studies.

Introduction

Linguistics examines topics related to linguistics. It is the scientific discipline that analyzes the structure of languages, their historical development, and various linguistic phenomena (Arghand, 2017: 11). Semantics is a crucial and significant branch of linguistics that imparts meaning to words, phrases, and sentences. "There exists a strong and stable connection between words and their meanings. The condition of a word influences its meaning, and meaning becomes evident within the context of words and expressions." (Allama Hilli, 1990: 36).Meaning's semantic scope broadens within the linguistic environment as it progresses toward interpretation, concept, synonymy, and polysemy, and eventually it ties in with philosophy. The study of meaning has expanded in contemporary linguistics; it is

no longer limited to verbal structure based only on convention, but is now investigated from a variety of angles. Meaning has been moved from a potential state to an actual state while taking perception, action, and spatial-temporal contexts into account. This protracted search for meaning has ultimately demonstrated that linguistics and philosophy are closely related from a semantic standpoint. Since the study of meaning has broadened in contemporary linguistics and been approached from various angles, meaning is no longer limited to merely convention-based verbal structures. When perception, action, and spatiotemporal contexts are considered, meaning changes from a potential state to an actualized state. From a semantic standpoint, linguistics and philosophy continue to have a close relationship, as this lengthy search for meaning has ultimately confirmed. In reference to this point, Ghulam Mohsin Ibrahimi Dinani said: "Meaning is a topic connected with linguistics; even if it is only about identifying a person's name, it has no significance without perception, imagination, and general rational faculties.". Ibrahimi Dinani (2010), pp. 111–113. Philosophy is another product of language's ability to expand meaning. Questions like: How is the relationship between philosophical reasoning and linguistic production established? Does philosophy arise from the mental concepts of language or from external referents? What are the factors that bring linguistics and philosophy into a shared interaction? These philosophical concepts and meanings exist in the interaction between the speaker, the listener, and the environment. To answer these questions, this study was carried out using a descriptive-analytical method. Initially, several works were reviewed to enhance the topic's theoretical aspects. Following that, various cases and examples were used to analyze the semantic point that linguistics and philosophy maintain a close relationship, which finally resulted in a satisfactory conclusion.

Material and Method

The study is based on a qualitative approach, using a descriptive analysis method to collect the data. Data was collected from various documents such as journal articles, books, and websites. Data was reviewed, and the thematic analysis technique was used to interpret the data.

Meaning

The essence of any linguistic event or interaction is meaning. According to Saussure, the signified (concept), which lies between the sign and the message, is what gives something its meaning. Philosophical conversations about the connection between word and meaning were made possible by this realization. Linguist in this sense. The study of language philosophy looks at the connections between words and meaning as well as between words and meaning. Nasri (2006), p. 46. Each and every word has a purpose, according to Nasri. It is believed that meaning and word are two sides of the same coin. In terms of defining meaning, Pajtunzoy believes that despite numerous intricate discussions, no all-encompassing definition of meaning that is always applicable has yet been developed. It is challenging to arrive at a definition that is universally accepted for everyone and everywhere because meaning varies not only among cultures but also between people's perceptions (meanings). Similarly, meaning shifts with the changing circumstances of each era in the ongoing evolutionary process of life. Scholars have provided the following definitions of meaning, despite the fact that there is

no universally accepted definition: Meaning is the mental image of a human being. The connection between language and the outside world is known as meaning. The connection between language and experience is what gives it meaning (Daulat Mohammad, 1976: 46). Professor Jaj claims that the search, absence, and semantic ambiguity in semantics are exactly what bring us to philosophy. The understanding of realities and word meanings emerges from the interaction between philosophy and language. According to Pakin Richard and Arum Estrol, philosophers of the twentieth century believed that analysis was the primary function of philosophy and that language was the means by which analysis was accomplished. Therefore, language can offer answers to philosophical problems through the elucidation and investigation of expressions (Pakin, Richard, and Arum Estrol, 2010: 533).

Philosophy literally translates as "love of wisdom," but in technical terms, it is centered on logical reasoning, seeking truths, and exploring their depths. Philosophers use rational reasoning to approach the connections of figurative images, for instance, which are created in literature through imagination and convey meaning. Through the semanticist, meaning then emerges and becomes intelligible, demonstrating the connection between philosophical reasoning and the creation of intelligible meaning. The semantic relationship between philosophy and linguistics is demonstrated by this connection. Mohammad Akwan believes the following about these connections. "Among the key and essential topics in Wittgenstein's thinking are language and its relationship to philosophy. According to him, language serves as a means of communicating meaning and needs to be taken into consideration in daily life. He claims to be a philosopher. They all point in the same direction, which is the path of truth. Since truth is necessary for both knowledge and information, information is that which has the potential to produce knowledge (Dretske, 1981: 45). Dretske's perspective highlights the connection between philosophy and linguistics from a semantic standpoint by illuminating the relationship between information and knowledge, which applies to both nature and the mind. This set of relationships was called the "relationship between the signifier and the signified" by Ferdinand de Saussure. The following examples illustrate the semantic connection between philosophy and linguistics.

Signification (Dalālat)

It is a topic in logic that is also discussed in philosophical issues. It refers to a state in which knowledge of one thing leads us to knowledge of another. In Arabic, it is a transitive verbal noun and also refers to finding ways or providing guidance. In semantics, signification is a highly significant subject. The relationship between concept and referent is based on this signification. The semantic connection between word and meaning is established through this signification. As Esmat Aryat, quoting Saliba Jamil, writes: "Meaning is a mental image that exists opposite a word and signifies the intended object" (Aryan, 2014: 48).

The referent is broadly derived from the concept because it is based on signification, which strengthens the semantic relationship between philosophy and linguistics. Words, phrases, and other linguistic units are connected to linguistic components on the one hand, and non-linguistic assessments of the outside world on the other. Ziyar (2017) claims that these non-linguistic evaluations of the external environment show how semantics and signification are related philosophically. In general, there

are two categories of meaning: explicit and implicit. There is a secondary meaning in the second, but the first is explicit. Rational (logical) signification—which we also encounter in semantics—is frequently the focus of philosophy. "It is the signification in which there exists a necessary relationship between the signifier and the signified, that is, a cause-and-effect relationship," according to Mohammad Ali Ajayi. We can tell that the sun has risen in the morning, for instance, by looking at the sunlight. According to Ajayi (2014), "the sun (signified) is signified by the light (signifier)".Consider the following sentence:

Darkness and light are born from one another.

In terms of rational signification, the aforementioned sentence is correct on the one hand because night gives birth to day and day gives birth to night, according to a semantic analysis. In terms of implicational signification, it also forms a pair from the standpoint of mutual contradiction. However, if we use the word "darkness" as a symbol for a variety of other ideas (such as oppression, horror, nonexistence, ignorance, etc.), it becomes linked to "oppression, horror, or nonexistence.". and turned the term "light" into a symbol for a variety of other ideas (like illumination, knowledge, freedom, and happiness, among others). In terms of rational signification, the aforementioned sentence is no longer true. To put it simply, things are identified by their opposites. Darkness would seem like light to us if we were unaware of its existence. Many phenomena are conceptually understood through their opposites, according to semantic theory. Philosophical analysis is also used to examine the aforementioned sentence. There are many such questions, and philosophy aims to answer them by looking at the rational basis of each one. For example, why is darkness called "darkness"? Why is light born from darkness and darkness from light? Why do we feel aversion toward darkness and joy toward light? Why do we sleep better in darkness than in light? Why do we seek the light of the grave in prayer? Who did this

We are able to perceive light because of the blessing of darkness, so don't be upset if I say that. Because light particles are better absorbed in darkness, a lamp's light is barely perceptible when lit in broad daylight. However, as evening and night draw near, the light becomes more noticeable. In some ways, rational thinking persuades us that the world is made up of opposites. For this reason, philosophers frequently believe that the elements of fire, water, and air make up the world. The following pair of lines by Hamza Baba illustrates human philosophy:

When humans first entered the world of clay and water, love, conflict, and storm arrived.

It is clear from the aforementioned explanations that meaning connects linguistics and philosophy through signification, especially rational signification.

Deductive Reasoning

Many phenomena can be understood from a logical standpoint by using deductive reasoning, which also creates a semantic link between philosophy and linguistics. Alfred. "Deductive reasoning is an argument where the conclusions are already present in the premises," writes Chalmers. Reasoning like this produces logical knowledge. Take a look at these sentences, for instance.

1– All philosophy books are boring.
2– This book relates to philosophy.
3– Therefore, this book is also boring.

Follows that statement (3) is unquestionably true if statements (1) and (2) are. From a deductive reasoning standpoint, statement (3) cannot be incorrect (Chalmers, A. 1939: 9). Syllogism is a philosophical and logical discussion, but it also contributes significantly to meaning comprehension. Think about the sentences that follow.While Syllogism is, on one hand, a logical and philosophical discussion, on the other hand, it greatly helps in understanding meaning. Consider the following sentences:

1– People work during the day.
2– I work every day.
3– Night is for rest.

We can infer syllogistically from the preceding sentences that night is a place of rest as well.

Essentially, meaning can also be syllogistically derived through experience, reflection, and prior knowledge. It is possible to make additional claims based on that semantic lead. Take a look at these sentences:

1– Most philosophy books are boring.
2– This book is also about philosophy.
3– Therefore, this book is also boring.

The word "most" in the first sentence refers to the majority of books rather than all of them. Now, if the first two statements are accurate, the third sentence's syllogistic conclusion is flawed because this book may be one of the few books that isn't boring rather than the majority.

Intended Meaning and Literal Meaning

The literal meaning is what the language's structure itself conveys, whereas the intended meaning is what is connected to the writers or speaker's inner goals and intentions.

People work during the day.

Let's look at this sentence from both angles. The aforementioned sentence has two possible interpretations. It means, literally, that people work during the day and don't work at night. However, it is also implied that the speaker intends to convey that people work during the day and are unable to do so at night. Even if the definition of "day" is broadened and interpreted in terms of knowledge through implicational signification, the statement that the ignorant are incapable of employing or producing remains true. The "day" (knowledge and illumination) is exactly what drives people to work.

As per Nasri, every word has a deeper meaning. Meaning and word are viewed as two sides of the same coin. Pajtunzoy believes that despite numerous intricate discussions, a single, all-encompassing definition of meaning has not yet been developed that can be used consistently.

Since meaning varies not only between cultures but also between people's perceptions (meanings), it is challenging to come up with a definition that is universally accepted everywhere and for everyone. Similarly, in the ever-evolving process of life, meaning varies according to the changing circumstances of every period. Despite the lack of a universally accepted definition, scholars have proposed the following definitions: Meaning is the human mental image. Meaning is how language interacts with the outside world. According to Daulat Mohammad (1976: 46), meaning is the connection between language and experience.

Professor Jaj claims that the search, absence, and semantic ambiguity in semantics are exactly what bring us to philosophy. The understanding of realities and word meanings emerges from the interaction between philosophy and language. According to Pakin Richard and Arum Estrol, philosophers of the twentieth century believed that analysis was the primary function of philosophy and that language was the means by which analysis was accomplished. Thus, based on the clarification and exploration of expressions, language can provide solutions to philosophical issues" (Pakin, Richard & Arum Estrol, 2010: 533)."

Although the word philosophy literally translates as "love of wisdom," its technical definition is based on logical reasoning, the search for truths, and exploring their depths. For instance, the relationships between figurative images that are created in literature through creativity and convey meaning are also approached in philosophy through logical reasoning. The semanticist then makes meaning exist and understandable, demonstrating the connection between philosophical reasoning and the creation of understandable meaning through introspection and thought. The semantic relationship between linguistics and philosophy is demonstrated by this connection. In light of these connections, Mohammad Akwan believes the following.

One of the most significant and essential topics in Wittgenstein's thinking is language and its relationship to philosophy. According to him, language is the means by which meaning is communicated, and as such, it needs to be valued in daily life. He claims that the philosopher is the one who treats the ailments of human comprehension (Akwan, 2001: 293).

Information is frequently expressed in declarative form when we look to words, according to Dretske. The terms intelligence, notification, instruction, and knowledge also have declarative aspects, and it is worthwhile to consider them. They have a similar core. They all point in the same direction, which is the path of truth. Since knowledge depends on truth and information depends on truth, information is that which has the potential to produce knowledge (Dretske, 1981: 45).

By demonstrating the connection between knowledge and information that applies to both nature and the mind, Dretske's viewpoint emphasizes the semantic interdependence of linguistics and philosophy. This set of connections was known by Ferdinand de Saussure as the signifier-to-signified relationship. The following examples show how linguistics and philosophy are semantically related.

Signification (Dalālat)

This is a logical topic that is also covered in philosophical problems. It describes a situation where learning about one thing leads to learning about another. It is a verbal noun that is transitive in Arabic and also means to guide or find ways. One of the most important topics in semantics is signification. It is this signification that underpins the relationship between concept and referent. Through this signification, the semantic relationship between word and meaning is established. According to Saliba Jamil, who is quoted by Esmat Aryat, "Meaning is a mental image that exists opposite a word and signifies the intended object" (Aryan, 2014: 48).

The semantic relationship between philosophy and linguistics is strengthened by the referent's broad derivation from the concept due to its signification-based foundation. It has a connection to both non-linguistic assessments of the outside world

and linguistic components like words, phrases, and other units. The philosophical link between signification and semantics is established by these non-linguistic assessments of the outside world (Ziyar, 2017).

There are two categories of meaning in general: explicit and implicit. While the second has a secondary meaning, the first is explicit. Semantics also deals with rational (logical) signification, which is frequently the focus of philosophy. According to Mohammad Ali Ajayi, "it is the signification in which there exists a necessary relationship, that is, a cause-and-effect relationship, between the signifier and the signified.". For instance, we can tell that the sun has risen in the morning by looking at the sunlight. Stated differently, the sun (signified) is signified by the light (signifier) (Ajayi, 2014: 24). Consider the following sentence:

Darkness and light are born from one another."

If we analyze the above sentence semantically in terms of logical meaning, it is accurate in one sense because night gives rise to day, and day gives rise to night. From the viewpoint of mutual contradiction, it also forms a pair in terms of implicational meaning. However, when the term'darkness' is linked toconcepts like oppression, horror, or nonexistence...The exploration of the above sentence also involves philosophy. Why do we call darkness 'darkness'? Why is darkness born from light and light from darkness? Why do we feel aversion toward darkness and delight in light? Why do we sleep better in darkness compared to light?

Why is darkness born from light and light from darkness? Why do we feel aversion to darkness and joy toward light? Why do we sleep better in darkness compared to light? Why do we seek the light of the grave in prayer? Who named light as light? … There are many such questions, and philosophy strives to answer them, examining the foundation of each question through rational reasoning. If we interpret 'darkness' as a symbol for various other ideas (such as oppression, horror, nonexistence, ignorance, etc.) and 'light' as a symbol for different concepts (such as knowledge, freedom, happiness, enlightenment, etc.), then the original sentence no longer holds true in terms of logical meaning. Essentially, we understand things through their opposites. Without recognizing darkness, we would perceive it as light. From a semantic standpoint, many phenomena are conceptually comprehended through their opposites.

Please don't be upset when I say this: it is exactly the gift of darkness that enables us to see the light. If you light a lamp during the bright daylight, its glow is hardly noticeable; but as evening falls and night approaches, the light becomes more apparent because light particles are more effectively absorbed in the darkness. From a rational perspective, we understand that the world consists of opposites. This is why philosophers often describe the world as made up of elements like fire, water, and air. Hamza Baba expresses human philosophy in the following couplet.When humans came into the world of water and clay, Love came, strife came, and the storm came."

The above explanations clearly show that meaning, especially through rational signification, creates a link between linguistics and philosophy.

Deductive Reasoning

From a logical standpoint, numerous phenomena are comprehended via deductive reasoning, which also creates a semantic link between linguistics and philosophy. Alf Chalmers states: "An argument where the conclusions are already included within the

premises is known as deductive reasoning." This form of reasoning produces logical knowledge. For instance, examine the following sentences

1– All philosophy books are boring.

2– This book relates to philosophy.

3– Therefore, this book is also boring.

This demonstrates a typical example of deductive reasoning, where conclusions logically derive from the given premises.

If statements (1) and (2) hold true, then statement (3) must also be true without any doubt. According to deductive logic, statement (3) cannot be false (Chalmers, A., 1939: 9)."While Syllogism is, on one hand, a logical and philosophical discussion, on the other hand, it greatly aids in understanding meaning. Consider the following sentences:

1– People work during the day.

2– I work every day.

3– Night is for rest."

From the previous statements, we can logically conclude that there is also a designated time for rest, which is at night.

The key idea is that meaning can be obtained syllogistically by using prior knowledge, experience, and reflection. Building on this semantic foundation, additional statements can be formulated. Take the following sentences as an example.

1– Most philosophy books are boring.

2– This book is also about philosophy.

3– Therefore, this book is also boring.

In the first sentence, the term 'most' indicates the majority of books, not all of them. Therefore, if the first two sentences are true, the conclusion drawn in the third sentence is invalid, since this book might not be part of the majority of boring books; it could be among the minority that are not boring.

Intended Meaning and Literal Meaning

The intended meaning relates to the internal intentions and goals of the author or speaker, whereas the literal meaning is derived from the language's structure itself. Let's analyze the following sentence from both viewpoints.

People work during the day.

The sentence above can be understood in two ways. Literally, it means that people work during the day and not at night. However, it also implies the speaker's intention: that people work during the day because they are unable to work at night. When the concept of 'day' is broadened and interpreted metaphorically as knowledge through implicational meaning, it remains valid, suggesting that those who lack knowledge cannot work or create. It is precisely the 'day' (symbolizing knowledge and enlightenment) that drives people to work.

Mohammad Zahrabi states that the meaning of a word can be discussed from two perspectives:

1– The speaker's or writer's intended meaning (subjective)

2– The meaning of a word or sentence itself (objective)

The Speaker's Meaning

The meaning intended by a speaker reflects the purpose or aim conveyed through language, while the meaning of a word or sentence reflects its direct expression. For

example, at an airport, two strangers may greet each other. One says: *"Good day."* The other responds: *"Yes, milder than yesterday."* Here, the words hold meaning on one level, yet they do not provide factual information.

At times, utterances are not designed to communicate data but serve instead as expressions of politeness, respect, or social interaction. Nevertheless, such linguistic exchanges are not always genuine. The speaker's meaning may convey goodwill, hostility, praise, insult, or other intentions (Mohammad Zahrabi, 2021: 381).

Importantly, meaning is not solely tied to the speaker's purpose. It also depends on the listener's mental associations shaped by context, which adds a philosophical dimension. A humorous illustration highlights this: when a hungry person was asked, *"What is one plus one?"* he replied, *"Two loaves of bread."* This example reveals how meaning is shaped by the listener's interpretation. Sally McConnell-Ginet, drawing on Paul Grice, explains: *"Meaning is not only tied to the speaker, but also depends on the interaction between the speaker and the listener"* (McConnell-Ginet, 1998). Similarly, Jennifer Hornsby argues that semantics should include the notion of *"who says what to whom"* (Hornsb, 2000). She criticizes philosophical approaches to language that analyze meaning without reference to the social context or the interaction between speaker and listener (Hesni, 2025).

Meaning in Terms of Quantity and Quality

From a philosophical standpoint, quantity and quality are interdependent factors that shape and transform one another. Sayyid Bahawaldin Majruh, in *The Dialectical Effect of* Determinism and Free Will, writes under the law of quantity and quality: "In natural and social events, quantity always transforms into quality, and quality into quantity. A change in quality only occurs when quantity reaches a particular degree… It is impossible to alter the quality of something without also altering its quantity" (Majruh, 2016: 73).

Language, too, reflects this dynamic interaction between quantity and quality. For instance, if someone instructs, *"Do the work carefully,"* the immediate question becomes: how many people are involved — few or many? Consider these examples:

- Some good people exist, some have died.

This sentence has two clauses. The first, "some," highlights quality, as the adjective "good" defines their character. The second "some" points to quantity, referring to the number of good people mentioned earlier. The first clause naturally prompts the listener to question, in terms of quantity, what happened to the others.

Moreover, the number of words affects semantic quality. Compare the following:

1. Ahmad is diligent.
2. Ahmad is diligent, talented, intelligent, and clever.

The increased quantity of descriptive words alters the overall semantic quality.

Achieving a balance of quantity and quality in speech or writing is vital. As Mohammad Zahrabi notes, "Various factors play a role in understanding a text and grasping a message. Grice (1969) believes that, when speaking or writing a message, a person considers four aspects: (1) Quantity, (2) Quality, (3) Relation, (4) Clarity."

Logic from a Linguistic Perspective

From the standpoint of linguistics, logic varies with people's approaches to thought. For some, it represents rational decision-making; for others, rational conduct or a systematic method. For example, the instruction *"Plan logically"* essentially calls for reasonable thinking. Linguistically, this implies semantic consistency and rational soundness.

According to Mohammad Zahrabi: "*In* a linguistic system, logic is primarily concerned with meaning, with minimal connection to behavior. Logic is not used in the surface form of language. In the following example, logic applies to actual behavior: 'It is not logical for someone to kill themselves.'"

However, in the next examples, logic applies to meaning:

- *Humans are mortal; Socrates is human; therefore, Socrates is mortal.*
- *The statement 'Masood is not coming' is logically the negation of the statement 'Masood is coming.'*

Thus, although there is a strong link between rational action and logic, equating them directly is inaccurate. Logic merely supports rational action (Mohammad Zahrabi, 2021: 385).

From a semantic angle, the connection between linguistics and philosophy clarifies how humans conceptualize ideas and phenomena.

Linguistic Determinism and Free Will

Every language contains inherent norms within its structure, which speakers follow, often unconsciously. For example, Pashto has its own rules and cultural frameworks that speakers automatically apply in communication. This constitutes *linguistic determinism*.

At the same time, speakers exercise free will when they assign multiple meanings, expand, omit, or substitute words and expressions. Hence, the structure and meaning of language are both mental and guided by particular standards (Murphy, 2025). Paul Grice echoes this view, arguing that *"behind expressions there are usually specific intentions, and the meaning of language does not arise without a rational process"* (Grice, 1989).

In the 21st century, cognitive sciences have reinforced the link between philosophy and linguistics, particularly in semantics. Concepts such as determinism, free will, semantic logic, quality, quantity, and intended meaning all highlight how semantics introduces readers to philosophical issues. Without philosophy, examining these aspects would remain incomplete.

Philosophy has long addressed questions of knowledge and reasoning, but historically, its connections to linguistics were not fully explored. The rise of linguistic inquiry into meaning established a stronger bridge between the two fields. In Afghanistan, while some discussions have emerged, the overlap between philosophy and linguistics has rarely been treated as a distinct field. Filling this gap was one of the motivations behind writing this article. It also enables us to answer questions about the connections between these disciplines and the foundations of their relationship.

The Relationship between Linguistics and Philosophy

Language is a central tool for human thought, understanding, and conceptualization. Linguistics examines the structures and uses of language, while philosophy addresses deeper questions of truth, knowledge, reason, and existence. Semantics connects the two, using language to examine truth and meaning.

From a semantic perspective, language is not simply a symbolic system but an active element in human thought. This view allows philosophy to see language not just as a reflection of thought but as an integral part of it. Since language is shaped by experience and context, it is not entirely neutral.

Philosophers have explored this complexity. For instance, Ludwig Wittgenstein argued that language has meaning only within specific *language games*, meaning words derive their significance from use. This perspective enables semantics to define meaning not merely by dictionary definitions but also through usage, discourse, and context. Subfields such as operational semantics, relational semantics, and conceptual semantics further support precise answers to philosophical inquiries.

In sum, philosophy provides theoretical frameworks for analyzing meaning, linguistics supplies scientific methods, and semantics serves as the connecting bridge. A full analysis of meaning requires both linguistic tools and philosophical inquiry.

Conclusion

Language is the medium through which humans interpret their inner and outer worlds. Human life and interaction are inseparable from language. Meaning is the core factor in interpreting words, and semantics cannot be separated from philosophy, as it deals with issues such as signification, Syllogism, quality, quantity, determinism, free will, and logic. Philosophy allows us to explore these complexities and reach deeper semantic understanding. This article has shown how semantic concepts connect with philosophical ideas. From this perspective, we can confidently state that philosophy and linguistics share a common boundary, particularly in the study of meaning.

Acknowledgment

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

Allameh Hilli. (1990/1410 AH). *Al-Jawhar al-Nadid*. Qom: Bidar Publications.

Arban, E. (2014).Zaban Va Mana Dalili Bar Naqd Marifat Falsafeh Va Aqli Az Didgah e Maktab Tafkik [Language and meaning: A critique of philosophical and rational knowledge from the perspective of the Tafkik school. *Zehn*, (60).

Arghand, Zabihullah Sahib. (2017). *Manapohana, [Semantics]*. Paktos Publishing House. [In Pashto]

Azhayi, Mohammad Ali. (2014). Mabani e Mantiq *[Foundations of Logic]* (13th ed.). Organization for the Study and Compilation of University Humanities Textbooks (SAMT). [In Persian]

Dretske, F. I. (1981). Knowledge and the flow of information. MIT Press.

Ebrahimi, Dinani. (2010). *Falsafeh va sāhat-e sokhan [Philosophy and the realm of speech]*. Tehran: Hermes Publications. [In Persian]

Ellis, D. (1984). Theory and explanation in information retrieval research. Journal of Information Science, 8(2), 25–38

Grice, P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hesni, Samia.(2025). Philosophical Intuitions about Socially Significant Language. Cambridge University Press. Hypatia, vol40, no. 1, , pp. 28–10.,6

Jalmers, OF. (1939). Chesti Elam Dara Amad Bar Makateb Elam Shenasi Falsefeh, [*What is science? An introduction to schools of the philosophy of science]* (Z. Kalām, Trans., 17th ed., 2017). Tehran: SAMT [In Persian]

Kouan, Mohammad. (2001). *Wittgenstein: Zaban Va Falsafeh [Language and philosophy]*. Tehran: Journal of the Faculty of Literature and Humanities. [In Persian]

Lodin, Daulat Mohammad. (1976). Loghat Pohana [*Lexicology]* (A. Waheed, Ed.). Kabul: General Directorate of Social Sciences of Afghanistan. [In Persian]

Majrooh, Sayed Bahauddin. (2016). Da Jaba Aw Ekhtiar Dialectics [*The dialectics of determinism and free will]*. Asad Danish Press [In Persain]

McConnell-Ginet, S. (1998). The sexual (re)production of meaning: A discourse-based approach in the feminist critique of language. 2nd edition. Routledge Press.

Murphy, Elliot. (2025). The Nature of Language and the Structure of Reality. Biolinguistics at the Cutting Edge, 20–36

Nasri, Abdullah. (2006). Falsafeh Tahlili Va Nazaria e Shenakht [*Analytical philosophy and epistemological theory*] (M. Haeri Yazdi, Rev.). Tehran: Nashr-e Elm.

Ormur, Khaleelullah. (2013). Moqadima Bar Zaban e Awestaee [*Introduction to the Avestan language]*. Nebraska Educational Press. [In Persian]

Paken, Rechard., & Arom, AStroll. (2010). Kulyat Falsafeh [*General Philosophy]* (Jalaludin. Mojtabavi.; New ed.). Tehran: Hikmat.

Zohraabi, Mohammad. (2021). Mutali Ah Va Bararsi Manashenasi Az Manzar Zabanshenasi Ba Roykard Falsafeh [A study and analysis of semantics from the perspective of linguistics with a philosophical approach]. *Journal of Philosophical Research, University of Tabriz.* [In Persian]

Zyar, Mujaver Ahmad. (2017). Pashto Manapohana [*Pashto semantics]*. Kabul: Danish Publishing Society. [In Persian]