IRSTI 16.21.21

LANGUAGE-THOUGHT RELATİON HYPOTHESES: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

F. Karabulut [0000-0001-5039-9580]
Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey
e-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com

Abstract. It's clear that there is a close relationship between language and thought, but how this relationship is established and how much it affects human life is a matter of debate. Language causes people to display certain types of information, showing that people don't always need to think by focusing on certain details of the world and those who speak other languages on aspects of the experience. Since such speech habits develop from early centuries, they can influence people's experiences, perceptions, feelings, and memories. In this study, this relationship between language and thought has been emphasized and the hypotheses put forward on this issue have been put forward. Daily experience shows that most of our thinking is facilitated by language. In this case, the following questions should be asked: Is it possible to think without language? Or does our language determine the way we think? These seemingly simple questions' complexity has preoccupied philosophers, psychologists, and linguists for generations. A simple answer to these questions is by no means possible; but at least we can be clear about the factors causing complications. In the article the author examines the main assumptions and makes an analysis concerning the relationship between language and thought.

Key words: language, thought, cultural difference, lexicology

In mental approaches, language is a tool for communicating thoughts. In the philosophy of language, approaches that assume that meaning precedes use stand on the side of the mind. The first assumptions of the intellectual tradition can be based on Plato. But the historical background of the modern mental perspective on language can be depicted as a line that begins with Aristotle, who said that «voices are symbols of thoughts in the soul» and then continues markedly with the thoughts of Descartes, the Port-Royal School [1, 65-90]. Humboldt can also be added to these names.

In Platon's thought is an inner speech, and language is an inadequate tool in telling the knowledge of truth. In Aristotle, speech is again an indicator of thoughts. In Descartes ' philosophy, which sees the soul and body as two separate toz in the Janissary, language is an expression of the thought of the «intelligent soul» as a yeti unique only to man. According to Descartes, language is a symbolic expression of thought" [2]. Condillac (Essai 1746), the most important step in his views, and indeed what distinguishes him from Lock, is the claim that man cannot optionally inspect neither the ability to think nor the other abilities of the mind without the use of language. «Condillac has proposed that the mind of a pre-linguistic person depends on physiological determination and environmental stimuli. A certain sensation produced by a random event can cause this person to recall another sensation in the past and even conclude that these two sensations are similar. But without language, a person cannot remember a past sensation of his own free will, compare two sensations, or direct his thoughts in the mind. A person is given various mental abilities with innate desires, but

only when he has mastered a language can his mental abilities be used purposefully to fulfill one of his desires. Thus, language acquisition is a crucial point in Condillac's account of the progress of human understanding, since language allows a person to make an optional use of his inherent mental ability» [3, 126].

Can a person analyze their own thoughts without language? Can a person even pass these thoughts on to other people without language? In this case, the following question also comes to mind. Is mute communication possible? Can't people agree with body language? It's actually a fact that people communicate with hand-to-hand movement or facial expressions, but can Speech be as effective as language in explaining abstract concepts? Scientists who answer this last question are divided into two parts: it is impossible to think without language, it is possible to think without language and to transfer it across. According to the first group of scientists who pondered this issue, it is impossible for thought to be functional without language. «This means that a person cannot divide his complex thoughts into their components (i.e. ideas) and therefore cannot recreate them in order to understand their structures and use them as he wants. The more detailed and analogous a language has, the more precise and effective it is as a method of analyzing thought. But natural language (i.e. the language of physiologically determined hand-to-hand movements and excited screams) does not separate thought into its component parts. A natural hand-to-hand movement transmits a complex thought more as a whole; it does not divide a complex perception into its component parts, but transmits it all at the same time. Condillac suggests that this is more natural, because thought is like a picture. Thought consisted of the simultaneous perception of a complex deck of individual sensations, rather than the wrapping of individual ideas in the form of a wad in succession. In the case of Artificial languages, due to the linear structure of their sentences, we have to analyze our thoughts in order to present their component parts repeatedly» [3, 127]. Thus, language acquisition not only gives a person the ability to control what the mind contains and processes on demand, but also the ability to parse thoughts into component ideas and use them to create new thoughts when he wants to. «So thinking becomes a creative act, not an act determined by external circumstances. In this case, it is understandable why Condillac sees language acquisition and development as a key to the development of the human mind. But still one question remains. If the first man needed language to gain creative control over the operations and analytical power of the mind, how could he have managed to create an artificial language that was a complex mental work? The first person may have been granted the natural language of hand-to-hand movements and excitable screams, but this natural language was not under his optional control» [3,127-128].

Condillac was well aware of the problem that this dilemma created from the point of view of his own theory; he also openly faced it in Essai. According to him, «at the beginning of the language,

an important stage has been reached when children first use their natural indicators as an option. Condillac would like to imagine that: ‘for example, seeing a lot of fear that one of the other indicators in order to stimulate him to be exposed to the same danger of fear shouts and gestures, which are imitated (Essai: II, I, I, 3) » [3,129].

According to Crystal, many types of behavior are called thinking, but not all of them require us to establish a relationship with language. Clearly, there is no suggestion that language is involved in our emotional response to an object or event, as when we react to a beautiful painting or a cruel event: we can use language to explain our reaction to others, but the emotion itself is beyond words. Again, according to him, people engaged in the Creative Arts also do not consider it necessary to think using language: composers, for example, often report that they 'hear' the music they want to write. Also, our daily fantasies, everyday dreams and free dreams can progress without language. «Thinking involving language is of a different kind: this is when we solve problems, tell stories, plan strategies, etc. it is reasoned thinking that takes place. This, in turn, has been called rational, directed, logical or propositional thinking. This thinking includes elements that are both deductive (when we solve problems using a certain set of rules, such as in an arithmetic task) and deductive (when we solve problems based on data given before us, such as when working on a travel route). Language seems crucial to this kind of thinking. Formal features of language, such as word order and sentence sequence, create an environment in which our connected thoughts can be presented and organized» [4, 14].

In this case, crystal questions the distance of the relationship that should actually be established between language and thought, and believes that it is necessary to find a middle ground where the other is unlikely without one. «But how close is this relationship between language and thought? It is common to see this question at two extremes. First, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are completely separate entities, one connected to the other. At the opposite end, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are identical. According to them, it is impossible to engage in any rational thought without using language. The truth seems to lie somewhere between these two positions» [4, 14].

According to Crystal, in the first place, there are clearly two possibilities: language can depend on thought, or thought can depend on language. The traditional view, widely held at a popular level, adopts the first of these: people have thoughts, and then they put those thoughts into words. it is summarized in metaphorical views of language, such as 'dress' or 'tool of thought'. This view is well represented in the field of children's language acquisition, where children are seen to develop a range of cognitive abilities that precede language learning [4,14]. This latter view contradicts Condillac's view, as seen above. Condillac brought emotion to the fore more than thought in the emergence of

language. Here, the need for language was heard because it was thought, and language emerged as a product of thought.

The second possibility is also very much held: the way people use language determines the lines they can think about. Shelly gave an impressive summary of this:' he gave me speech, and speech created thought, which is the measure of the universe (Prometheus Unbound). It is not clear who gives the language here, but a superhuman power must be being cast. This view is also represented in the field of language acquisition in the argument that the child's earliest encounter with language is the main influence on the way concepts are learned. However, the most effective expression of the position is found in the Sapir Whorf hypothesis.

A third possibility, which is widely held, is that language and thought are interconnected, which Crystal calls the middle way. This does not necessarily mean that the two are a single being, but rather that they are parallel to each other. For this, we just need to think about the various mental processes that we can perform without language. Without language, we can go to school, work, or somewhere else every day in a certain way. It shows that we think and define the path. A language is not needed for this. In this case, it becomes clear that thought existed before language. It is also widely accepted that pictorial images and physical models help in problem solving and can sometimes be more effective than purely verbal representations of a problem. «To see language and thought as interconnected, then, is to recognize that language is a regular part of the thinking process, and also that we need to think in order to understand language. If we are going to explain behavior, it is not a question of one concept taking precedence over another, it is a question of both concepts being fundamental. People with this idea used metaphors to express their views. Accordingly, the tongue was likened to an arch that held the tunnel afloat, while the thought was thought of as if it were the tunnel itself. But the complex structure and function of language challenges such simple analogies» [4, 14].

Johann Herder (1744-1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt’s (1762-1835) views 18 encountered, romantic idealism at the end of the century placed great emphasis on the diversity of the world's languages and cultures. The tradition was adopted by American linguist and anthropologist Edward Sapir (1884-1939) and his student Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941), culminating in a view on the relationship between language and thought that was largely influential in the middle of this century. This view, which argues that language and thought are separated by a precise line, and that language is more important and more decisive than thought, has been debated for many years.

As we have seen above, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is also built on binary-contrast. There are strong and weak versions of the hypothesis that advocate more or less the influence of language on thought. The strong version, linguistic determinism (linguistic determinism), argues that thought

exists and cannot be without language, while the weak version, linguistic relativity (linguistic relativity), supports the idea that language has some influence on thought. «The Sapir Whorf Hypothesis, as its name suggests, combines two principles. The first is known as linguistic determinism: it states that language determines the way we think. The latter originates from this and is known as linguistic relativity: it states that distinctions encoded in one language do not exist in another language» [4, 15]. Linguistic determinism is the idea that language and its structures limit and determine human knowledge or thought, as well as thought processes such as classification, memory, and perception. This term refers to the fact that people who speak different languages as their mother tongue have different thought processes [5, 410]. Linguistic determinism is a powerful form of linguistic relativity, arguing that individuals experience the world based on the structure of the language they habitually use. One of the most important names among those who advocate the principle of linguistic relativity, which argues that language affects the worldview, is Guy Deutscher, as can be seen below [6].

The principle of linguistic relativity, known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, with its strong deterministic form first found its explicit expression in the writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Sapir proposed the idea that language is necessary to understand one's worldview, and that language difference means a difference in social reality. Although it has not been directly discovered how language affects thought, important traces of the principle of linguistic relativity lie at the heart of language perception [7,207].

Whorf went further and reformulated Sapir's thinking in his paper Science and Linguistics. Here his treatment of linguistic relativity was more radical. In Whorf's view, the relationship between language and culture was deterministic, and language played a crucial role in the perception of reality. Language is what gives thought its expression and thus shapes it; in other words, thinking is determined by language. He also makes a claim: «it has been discovered that every language, background language system (i.e. grammar), is the shaper of ideas, plans and understandings. We study nature along the lines set by our native languages. This fact is very important to modern science, because it means that no individual is free to describe nature with absolute neutrality» [8, 212-214].

According to Whorf, for example, the Hopi language is a «timeless» language, devoid of time mode. The Hopi Tribe's perception of time differs from the linear view of time in European languages, which refers to the past, present, and future. «The timeless Hopi verb does not distinguish the past, present, and future of the event, but every «time «, as it is known, must indicate the validity to which the speech is intended» [8, 217]. In fact, this may not be a reality as Whorf claims. It is unlikely that the Hopi Tribe does not know the past, present and future, or that it perceives time as a whole. Perhaps Whorf did not makedeep enough analyses or observations on this issue, since the Hopi tribe must be

compartmentalizing time with other words or concepts. Otherwise, complete communication between members of the tribe will not be possible.

In the Hopi language, except for birds, the word Masa'ytaka is used for everything that flies, which includes insects, planes, and pilots. This may seem unfamiliar to someone accustomed to thinking English, such as Sapir and Whorf, but Whorf can't name many varieties of snow, either, like Eskimos. Unlike Eskimo, which has many words for «snow», such as ice snow, watery snow, sepken snow, hail snow, falling snow, slow falling snow, non-melting snow, melting snow, rainy snow, a single word can be used for many «snow» in English or other languages. In this case, for example, according to the Eskimo language, English also becomes a language that does not have any details. In this case, the British also become a nation that does not think/think in detail. Having addressed all of Whorf's findings and claims, Crystal makes the following assessment. In the Aztec language, a single word (with different endings) covers a much broader English concept: snow, cold, and ice. When more abstract concepts are considered (such as time, duration, velocity), the differences become even more complex: Hopi, for example, lacks a concept of time seen as Dimension; There are no forms corresponding to English time modes, but there are a number of forms that make it possible to talk about various periods from the speaker's point of view. Worf argues that it would be very difficult for a Hopi and a British physicist to understand each other's thoughts, given the great differences between languages [9, 15]. While this claim is relatively true, it cannot be entirely true. In this case, «full transfer» between languages should not be possible in any way. For example, it means that a novel written in one language cannot be fully translated into another language, or that two statesmen who speak different languages can never agree, which is not scientific. According to crytsal, this hypothesis is unlikely to have any proponents at the moment in its strongest form. The fact that a successful translation can be made across languages, such as the fact that the conceptual uniqueness of a language such as Hopi can still be explained using English, is an important argument against this. There are some conceptual differences between cultures due to language. These differences are, of course, undeniable, but this does not mean that the differences are so great that mutual understanding is impossible. One language uses many roundabout words to say what another language says in a single word, but in the end it can make sense [9, 15].

Similarly, since a language does not have a word, it is not considered correct to say that its speakers therefore cannot understand the concept. Several languages have several words for numbers: Australian Aboriginal languages, for example, are often limited to a few generic words (such as «all», «many», «several»), «one» and «two». In such cases, it is sometimes said that humans lack the concept of number, meaning that the natives 'do not have the intelligence to count' as they were once said. However, these speakers are not as shown when they learn English as a second language: their

counting and calculation skills are quite similar to those of native English speakers. «However, a weaker version of the Sapir - Whorf hypothesis is generally accepted. Language may not determine the way we think, but it affects the way we perceive and remember, and provides convenience in performing mental tasks. Some experiments have shown that people remember events more easily if objects correspond to easily found words or phrases. And people certainly find it easier to make a conceptual distinction if it properly corresponds to the words present in their language» [9, 15].

Other studies supporting the principle of linguistic determinism have shown that people find it easier to recognize and remember the shades of color for which they have a given name [10]. In Russian English, for example, there are two words for different shades of blue, and Russian speakers are faster at distinguishing shades than English speakers [11,7780-85]. Linguistic determinism can also occur in situations where the means to draw attention to a particular aspect of an experience are language. French, Spanish, or Russian, for example, have two ways of addressing a person because in these languages there are two second - person pronouns-singular and plural. The choice of pronoun depends on the relationship between two people (formal or informal) and the degree of familiarity between them. In this context, the speaker of any of these languages always thinks about the relationship when addressing another person, and therefore cannot separate these two processes [12].

Psycho-linguists Eric Lenneberg and Roger Brown are among the first to refute Whorf's ideas of linguistic determinism. These scientists investigate two types of evidence that Whorf uses to defend the existence of cognitive differences between linguistic communities: lexical differences and structural differences [13, 454-462]. Lenneberg and Brown analyze words related to “snow” in the Eskimo language, as we mentioned above. English English speakers claim that three different terms, which the Eskimos refer to simply as «Snow» Show that English speakers cannot perceive these differences, but simply do not label them. They sometimes state that English speakers classify different types of snow (i.e., «well-packed snow» and «poorly-packed snow»), but do so with phrases rather than a single word element. Given that both groups can distinguish between different types of snow, Lenneberg and Brown concluded that the worldviews of English speakers and Eskimo speakers cannot be different in this way [13, 454-462].

To refute Whorf's idea that structural categories correspond to symbolic categories, Lenneberg and Brown point out that structural categories rarely have consistent meanings. As can be seen from the example of grammatical gender in French, these meanings are not necessarily obvious to speakers. All French words with feminine gender do not reflect feminine qualities and do not share common traits. Lenneberg and Brown concluded that the existence of structural classes alone cannot be interpreted as a reflection of differences in cognition [13, 454-462]. Ultimately, Lenneberg and Brown conclude that the causal relationship between linguistic differences and cognitive differences

cannot be concluded based on the evidence provided by Whorf, which is purely linguistic in nature. However, they seem to have found the proposition to be worth investigating, and investigate color terms to support linguistic evidence with psychological data [13, 454-462].

Another outspoken critic of linguistic determinism is linguist Steven Pinker, known for his alignment with Chomsky's universalist ideas. In his book The Language Instinct, Pinker dismisses linguistic determinism as «a traditional farce» and instead tries a universal language of thought – Mentalese [14, 55-82]. Pinker also echoes criticism from Lenneberg and Brown that Whorf relied too much on linguistic data alone to draw conclusions about the relationship between language and thought.

Pinker, color terminology with regard to the discussion of different languages, different colors of labeling, in spite of this difference in language and color perception argues that the process of biological change could: Also, the color of universal tendencies in language tags, it will indicate that you have (i.e. if you have two of a language term, these will be black and white; three term with a red, yellow or add Yesil with up to four). Pinker's recent criticism of linguistic determinism relates to the concept of time of the Hopi language: he suggests that Whorf, who characterizes the Hopi language as having no concept of time, is completely wrong, and that the Hopi people actually have a perception of time with metaphors and a complex system of time slicing. Pinker concludes that linguistic determinism stems from the tendency to equate thought with language, but evidence from cognitive science suggests that thought now predates language. In Pinker's eyes, people think not in individual languages, but in a shared language of thought. In contrast, knowledge of a particular language creates the ability to translate this Mentalese into a set of words for the sake of communication [14, 55-82].

Linguistic determinism has been widely criticized for its absolutism and rejected by other linguists. For example, Michael Frank and his colleagues [15, 819-24] concentrated on the research of Daniel Everett, who adopted a close view of Sapir and Whorf. These researchers, on Piraha «Number as a cognitive technology: Evidence from Pirah to language and cognition called» detect and Everett did wrong with published observations they made, the language of the Piraha «one» or «two» for the numbers not the words, but instead «small», «arge», «a little bigger» and «many» meaning from the words they use detected.

For example, they can distinguish between «green» and «blue» colors, although there is a single word input to describe both colors in the language of Yesil natives. Different colors can be detected even if a specific word is missing for each color in this language [16, 289-91]. The absence of any specific words in a language to describe color in these communities does not mean that this Color/Concept is invalid. Instead, the community can have a description or a unique sentence

structure to determine the concept. Everett describes his research on the Piraha tribe, which uses the language to describe the concepts of color differently from those of English speakers: «... every word of color in the Pirahã language was actually a sentence. For example, biísai did not simply mean «red». It was a phrase that also meant like blood» [17].

The fictional language of George Orwell's famous dystopian novel, New York (Newspeak) in 1984, provides a powerful example of linguistic determinism. Its limited vocabulary and grammar make it impossible to speak out against the totalitarian government and even consider rebellion, instead making its speakers in line with Ingsoc's ideology [18, 315-316]. The new language emphasizes the deterministic proposition that if a language does not have a means to express certain ideas, its speakers cannot conceptualize them.

«The purpose of Yenil was not to provide a means to express the worldview and mind habits characteristic of Yenil addicts; the goal was to make all other forms of thought impossible. It was desired that once the newlyweds were finally adopted and the newlyweds were forgotten, the contrary thought, that is, the thought that separated them from the hopes of the newlyweds, could never come to mind. At least as long as the thought is based on words. Yenil's vocabulary was so established that he could specify every meaning that the party could wish to specify exactly and many times very effectively; on the one hand, he eliminated all other meanings, as well as the ability to access them through entangled roads» [18, 315-316].

It is worth noting that the main character Winston Smith and others were both able to understand and talk about the rebellion, despite the effects of the New Testament. But 1984 takes place before the full imposition of the New Testament; the characters spoke of both the New Testament and the Old Testament, which may have allowed perverse thought and action.

Linguistic determinism is a partial assumption behind developments in rhetoric and literary theory [34, 114]. For example, the French philosopher Jacques Derrida had studied the terms of «paradigmatic» hierarchies. In language structures, some words exist only in relation to antonyms, such as light / dark, and others only in relation to other terms, such as father / son and mother/ daughter. Derrida targeted the second. He believed that if we separated hidden hierarchies by language terms, it could open a «gap», a «aporia» in understanding, and free the mind of the reader / critic [19,114]. Similarly, Michel Foucault's new theory of historicism assumes that there is a pseudo-linguistic structure in every age, a metaphor around which everything that can be understood is organized. This» epistem « determines the questions people can ask and the answers they can get. The epistem is historically varied: as material circumstances change, so do mental metaphors, and vice versa. As the ages enter new epistems, the science, religion, and art of the past age appear absurd [20, 209-234]. Some Neo-Marxist historians have similarly looked at culture as permanently codified

in a language that varies with material circumstances. As the environment changes, so do language structures.

We have said that linguist Guy Deutscher was a supporter of linguistic relativity, the weaker counterpart of linguistic determinism. The thesis of relativity argues that language influences thought, but avoids the view of «language as a prison». In deutscher's book Through the Language Glass, he discusses the Guugu Yimithirr language spoken by Australian Aborigines and how it strengthened linguistic relativity. Deutscher introduces the Guugu Yimithirr language, which describes everything as geocentric according to its main direction (the chair is East), rather than describing it as egocentric (the chair is to your right). For example, speakers of Guugu Yimithirr, who look at a photo with a tree on the left side and a girl on the right side, explain the tree to the west of the girl and the girl to the East. If the photo is then rotated 90 degrees clockwise, the tree will now be identified as located north of the girl [6].

Deutcher, who made important statements on the Sapir Whorf hypothesis, put forward the weak and strong sides of the hypothesis in an article for the New York Times and suggested that its strong sides are more understood today. «Whorf, we now know, made many mistakes. The most serious was to assume that our mother tongue restrained our minds and prevented us from thinking certain thoughts. The general structure of their argument was to argue that if a language does not have a word for a particular concept, those who speak that language cannot understand that concept. For example, if a language does not have a future tense, its speakers cannot understand our concept of Future Tense. No matter where you look, it seems difficult to understand that this argument has achieved such success, if so many opposing proofs appear in front of you. In perfectly normal English, and in the present, «are you coming tomorrow? » do you feel that the idea of the future is slipping away from you when you ask? German English speakers who have never heard the word Schadenfreude[1] find it difficult to understand the concept of enjoying someone else's misfortune? Or think about it this way: if the inventory of ready-made words in your own language determined what concepts you could understand, how would you learn something new? » [6].

Linguistic relativity, the weaker counterpart of linguistic determinism, by linguist Guy Deutscher.

According to him, it was necessary to look at the event from another direction to get rid of the criticism and see the accuracy of the hypothesis. Since there is no evidence that any language forbids speakers to think of anything, we must look in a completely different direction to discover how our mother tongue really shapes our world experience. About 50 years ago, the famous linguist Roman Jakobson pointed to a very important fact about the differences between languages with a concise proverb: languages differ not in what they convey, but in what they must convey. «This proverb gives

us the key to unleashing the true power of mother tongue: if different languages affect our minds in different ways, it's not because our language allows us to think, but because it habitually forces us to think» [6].

When our language routinely forces us to specify certain types of information, it forces us to pay attention to certain details in the world and certain aspects of experiences that those who speak other languages may not always have to think about. And since such speech habits were developed from the earliest ages, it is natural that they can settle into mind habits that go beyond the language itself, affecting our experiences, perceptions, connotations, feelings, memories and orientation in the world.

For many years, it has been argued that our mother tongue is a «prison» that restricts our capacity to reason. When it turned out that there was no evidence for such claims, this was taken as proof that people from every culture basically thought the same way. But it is certainly a mistake to overstate the importance of abstract reasoning in our lives. After all, how many decisions do we make daily on the basis of deductive logic, compared to those driven by instinctive emotion, intuition, emotions, impulse, or practical skills? Habits of mind instilled in us from infancy to our culture, our orientation to the world and shapes our emotional reactions and their results so far against the object we met probably goes beyond experimentally shown. Languages can also have a pronounced impact on our beliefs, values and ideologies. This effect is relative rather than absolute. In this case, we can talk about the relative effect of language on the human system of thought, but this effect is under the control of thought. We may not yet know how to measure these results directly or assess their contribution to cultural or political misunderstandings. But as a first step towards understanding each other, we can do better than pretend that we all think the same.

References

1. Altynors, A. (2012). On Chomsky's objection to behavioral approaches to language. Black Sea Journal.

2. Altynors, A. (2015). Descartes, Rene Don't talk about the method. Istanbul: Paradigm Publications.

3. Harris, R., Talbot J. (2018). Taylor Turning Points In Linguistic Thought I (Western Tradition From Socrates To Saussure). Ankara: TDK publications.

4. Crystal, D. (1987). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. vii + 472.

5. Hickmann, M. (2000). Linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism: some new directions. Linguistics. 38 (2): 410. DOI: 10.1515/ling.38.2.409.

6. Deutscher, G. (2016). Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages. New York: Cornerstone Digital. https ://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/magazine /29 anguage-t.html

7. Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. Language, 5 (4): 207. DOI:10.2307/409588, JSTOR 409588.

8. Whorf, B.L., Carroll, J.B. (1956). Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

9. Crystal, D. (1987). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. vii + 472

10. D'Andrade R. (1995). The development of cognitive anthropology. New York: Cambridge University Press.

11.Winawer, J. (2007). Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination. PNAS, 104 (19); DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701644104.

12. Comrie, B. (2012). Linguistic Society of America Linguistic Society of America. DOI: https://www.linguisticsociety.doi.org/resource/language-and-thought.

13. Brown, R.W., Lenneberg, E.H. (1954). A study in language and cognition. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 49 (3): 454–462. DOI:10.1037/h0057814.

14. Pinker, S. (1994). The Language Instinct. New York: William Morrow and Company.

15. Frank, M.C., Fedorenko, E., Edward G. (2008). Language as a cognitive technology: English-speakers match like Piraha when you don’t let them count, Cognition. 108(3):819-24.

16. Masharov, M. (2006). Linguistic relativity: does language help or hinder perception? Current Biology, ISSN 0960-9822, Vol: 16, Page: 289-91.

17. Everett, D. (2013). Language, Culture and Thinking. London: Profile Books.

18. Orwell, G., Haldun D.(çev.) (1960). Bindokuzyüz Seksen Dört. Ankara: Maarif Basımevi.

19. Mcgraw, B.R. (1983). Dissemination. SubStance, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 114., DOI: 10.2307/3684496.

20. Dzelzainis, M. (2012). Milton, Foucault, and the New Historicism. Rethinking Historicism from Shakespeare to Milton, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/cbo9781139226431.014

ТІЛ МЕН ОЙДЫҢ БАЙЛАНЫСЫ ТУРАЛЫ ГИПОТЕЗАЛАР: СЫНИ ТАЛДАУ

Ф.Карабулут
Джелал Баяр Университеті, Маниса, Түркия
e-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com

Аңдатпа.Тіл мен ойлаудың арасында тығыз байланыс бары анық, бірақ бұл қарым-қатынастың қалай байланысатынын және қаншалықты тиімді екендігін анықтау - пікірталас туғызары анық. Тіл әдетте адамдарды белгілі бір ақпарат түрлерін көрсетуге мәжбүр етеді, бұл адамдарды әрдайым ойлаудың қажетінсіз әлемдегі белгілі бір бөлшектерге және басқа тілдерде сөйлейтіндерді тәжірибенің белгілі бір аспектілеріне назар аудартады. Мұндай сөйлеу әдеттері ерте ғасырлардан бері дамып келе жатқандықтан, олар адамдардың тәжірибесіне, қабылдауына, сезімдеріне, естеліктеріне әсер етеді. Бұл зерттеуде тіл мен ойлаудың осы байланысы ерекше атап көрсетіліп, осы мәселеге қатысты болжамдар алға тартылды. Күнделікті тәжірибе көрсеткендей, біздің ойлауымыздың көп бөлігін тіл жеңілдетеді. Бұл жағдайда келесі сұрақтарды қою керек: тілсіз ойлауға бола ма? Немесе тіліміз біздің ойлауымызды анықтай ма? Қарапайым болып көрінетін осы сұрақтардың күрделілігі философтар, психологтар мен лингвистерді сан ғасырлар бойы алаңдатты. Бұл сұрақтарға біржақты жауап беру мүмкін емес; дегенмен де мәселені туындататын негізгі факторлар туралы нақты біле аламыз. Мақалада автор тіл мен ойдың байланысына қатысты негізгі болжамдар мен талдауларды қарастырады.

Түйін сөздер:тіл, ой, мәдени айырмашылық, лексикология

ГИПОТЕЗЫ О ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ ЯЗЫКА И МЫСЛИ: КРИТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Ф. Карабулут
Университет Джелал Баяр, Маниса, Турция
e-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com

Аннотация.Ясно, что существует тесная связь между языком и мышлением, но как эта связь устанавливается и насколько она влияет на человеческую жизнь, остается предметом споров. Язык обычно заставляет людей отображать определенные типы информации, показывая, что людям не всегда нужно думать, сосредоточившись на определенных деталях мира и тех, кто говорит на других языках, на определенных аспектах опыта. Поскольку такие речевые привычки развиваются с ранних веков, они могут влиять на опыт, восприятие, чувства, воспоминания людей. В этом исследовании эта связь между языком и мышлением была подчеркнута, и были выдвинуты гипотезы, выдвинутые по этому поводу. Ежедневный опыт показывает, что большая часть нашего мышления осуществляется с помощью языка. В этом случае следует задать следующие вопросы: Можно ли мыслить без языка? Или наш язык определяет то, как мы думаем? Сложность этих, казалось бы, простых вопросов волновала философов, психологов и лингвистов на протяжении многих поколений. Однозначно ответить на эти вопросы невозможно; но, по крайней мере, мы можем четко определить основные факторы, вызывающие осложнения. В статье автор рассматривает основные предположения и делает анализ, касающиеся связи между языка и мысли.

Ключевые слова: язык, мышление, культурные различия, лексикология.