

30

Fecha de presentación: marzo, 2023

Fecha de aceptación: mayo, 2023

Fecha de publicación: julio, 2023

LANGUAGE AND THINKING:

LOGICAL AND HISTORICAL APPROACH

LENGUAJE Y PENSAMIENTO: ENFOQUE LÓGICO E HISTÓRICO

Nazim Huseynli Ziyad oglu¹

E-mail: nazimhuseynli56@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0141-823X>

¹Baku Eurasian University. Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh ed.)

Huseynli, N. (2023). Language and thinking: Logical and historical approach. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 15(4), 294-302.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this work is to analyze the relationship between language and thought from a logical and historical perspective. For this, current references on philosophy, linguistics and logic related to the issue of language and thinking have been analyzed and concluded that the factor relates language and thinking to each other is actually neither the units of thinking nor of language, but a category of names with synthetic content. On one hand, a name is an opinion about the subjects of reality while on the other hand it is one of the factors that determines communication with regards to the units of language, on basis of which the relation between “the expressed object” and “the expressing subject” is elucidated and the content of an opinion is reasonably differentiated from the content of language. The importance and relevance of the analyzed topic lies in the fact that language allows us to express and communicate our thoughts, while thought shapes and structures our use of language to understand and make sense of the world, which shows the close relationship between both concepts.

Keywords: Philosophy, linguistics, logical-grammatical approach, Alexander Potebnya, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay

RESUMEN

El objetivo de este trabajo es analizar la relación entre lenguaje y pensamiento desde una perspectiva lógica e histórica. Para ello, se han analizado los referentes actuales de la filosofía, la lingüística y la lógica relacionados con el tema del lenguaje y el pensamiento y se ha concluido que el factor que relaciona lenguaje y pensamiento entre sí no son en realidad ni las unidades del pensamiento ni del lenguaje, sino una categoría de nombres con contenido sintético. Por un lado, un nombre es una opinión sobre los sujetos de la realidad, mientras que por otro lado es uno de los factores que determina la comunicación con respecto a las unidades del lenguaje, a partir de las cuales la relación entre “el objeto expresado” y “el sujeto que expresa” es elucidado y el contenido de una opinión es razonablemente diferenciado del contenido del lenguaje. La importancia y relevancia del tema analizado radica en que el lenguaje nos permite expresar y comunicar nuestros pensamientos, mientras que el pensamiento moldea y estructura nuestro uso del lenguaje para comprender y dar sentido al mundo, lo que demuestra la estrecha relación entre ambos conceptos.

Palabras clave: Filosofía, lingüística, enfoque lógico-gramatical, Alexander Potebnya, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay.

INTRODUCTION

From ancient times, language has been considered as one of the means of logic, that is, as a means of forming and expressing thoughts. Plato dedicated his work titled "Cratylus" almost entirely to linguistics. He has given a system of imaginations about logical thoughts and illustrated that essence of various aspects of objects ("thoughts") is reflected by names in individual consciousness. Plato stated that the stages of consciousness differ, the two lower stages are directly related to language and there exist five stages for realization of each of the objects. The first stage is name, the second is a definition as a sentence containing subject and predicate, the third is imagination (for example, a drawing), the fourth is knowledge, which is comprehension and correct thought about what is in soul, and the fifth is self-realization, which can also be considered as a real being (Plato, 1994, pp. 493–494). This way Plato connected language, thinking and speech to one another and equated thought and speech. In his words: "Thought and speech are of the same kind" (Plato, 1993, p. 338).

Aristotle considered the thoughts about language as an auxiliary part of logic. A speech presents our thoughts, whereas writing presents speech. Ancient thinkers, in their logical-grammatical approach to the nature of language, simplified the connection of consciousness with language by taking statistical ideas about language as their basis, and identified language and thought, logical and grammatical categories; the word was perceived as the equivalent of either a subject or a concept. Aristotle wrote: «... there is no difference between the proof of a word and of a thought" (Plato, 1993, p. 159). With regards to Aristotle's statement, Francis Bacon said: "Aristotle has subjugated the idea to you" (Bacon, 1977, p. 220). The ideas by the ancient philosophers show that, logic, grammar and rhetoric have been identical concept and the fields of knowledge study the same methods. To sum up, thought, language and rhetoric are identical concepts and there is no need to differentiate them.

The Stoics were the first to discover that there are two objects in speech: first, the objects of real reality (terms in twentieth-century's logic and linguistics: "subject value", "subject of sign", "denote" and "designate"); and second, the essence of any particular idea ("terminology", "signification", "intentional" according to modern terminology). Unlike Plato and Aristotle, they viewed the content of utterances not as a succession of abstract notions and gender and types, but as a unified whole of feelings and emotions. This was called "lecton", which is a thought organized particularly and expressed in speech. Only the beings with intellect can possess an "imagination based

upon intellect"; utterances have to comply with the "imagination based upon intellect"; the imaginations uttered in speech are based on intellect. "Imagination based upon intellect" and "utterance" are close terms, but not identical. An utterance is a content of an orally expressed opinion and differs from the imagination of objects in our consciousness. An utterance is somewhere in between thought and sound and is an abstract content of a speech which is inextricably linked with sound; herein the expressed object should not be equated with concept.

The Modists claimed that the unity and integrity of the world determine the unity and integrity of thought, conditioning the generality and universality of the grammatical values of words and sentences. Grammar is similar in all respects because it originates from the nature, mode of existence and meaning of things, and therefore the mode of sign is similar. The grammar of a language is similar to that of another language. This is why a person who is aware of grammar of any language can potentially know another one. This is a significant peculiarity of grammar (Perelmutter, 1991; Potebnya, 1958). So, the universality of grammar is derived from unity, integrity and completeness of the world.

When linguistic current prevailed in linguistics, the study and description of language was mainly applied and the language was viewed from the point of functioning of the system of means of communication and expression. This system existed within time. One of the figures of the logical-historical current was Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835). To his thinking, language is a creative process and its result. In essence, it is something that remains constant and unchanged. Language is a goal-oriented activity. Thus, language should be viewed not as a dead product, but as a creative process (Humboldt, 1984, p. 64). He deemed language as a self-organized and entire system which develops on the basis of internal contradictions and is connected with language-process and language-result.

Considering language as a constantly changing, evolving, active process, W. von Humboldt wrote: "Language is both a product of activity and an activity itself ... "deep spirit of the people" (Humboldt, 1984, p. 80). He asserted variability and mobility, viewed language as activity, and linked its dynamics with historical development.

One can agree with W. von Humboldt that, a direction of language is an activity: on one hand, this is an activity directing ideas at thoughts, on the other hand an activity that helps people communicate with each other by expressing their thoughts. Communication among people is based upon mutual understanding, thus, a language is tool of mutual understanding. Nevertheless, there are

some points in which we do not agree to W von Humboldt's views. In any activity, including the language activity, continuity and interruptedness, discreteness and indiscreteness, and stability and instability are the points that complete each other. It is equally wrong to deny one of them and make the other one asserted (Humboldt, 1984).

When it comes to the structure and system of language, W. von Humboldt assessed it as both a means of cognition and a means of expressing thoughts in mind. In creating the general theory of language, W. von Humboldt laid the foundation of a logical and grammatical approach to language, focusing on the nature and functions of language, the distinctive nature and essence of languages. Thus, he laid the foundation of a new concept of language, consisting of a synthesis of rationalist and sensationalist approaches. This concept is based on classical German philosophy. The most general connection and development of dialectics, unity and struggle of opposites, principles of comprehensiveness, activity, dependence on human character, influence of language on the geographical environment of the nation, etc. philosophical provisions underlie the new concept.

He considered language as an object of linguistics and a tool to connect the outer world and inner world of people. He had a functional approach to language considering it as 1) mutual understanding and management 2) communication between people control the thoughts); 4) learn and realize the truth and thought that language is also "a reflection and sign" and 6) an act that reflects existing things, their properties and relations (Humboldt, 1984).

So, language is a tool to help people communicate, to exchange opinions and realize objective things, their properties, features, and relations. Thus, language acts as a general tool and the most common way of connecting humans, society and thought. W. von Humboldt's theory of language laid the basis of a systematic approach. According to the general systems theory, a system is a set of interconnected and interacting elements. The existence of each language is the unity of its forms). Anything from clear sounds to expression of thoughts, the root of the word, the word, the word-builders are included in the form of language. The factors that ensure the integrity of a language system are: the unity of form and content in a language; structural hierarchy of language levels); interaction and influence of language elements with and to each other respectively and as a whole (Humboldt, 1984)

This theory of the interconnection between language and thought has survived to our days and has received considerable research attention. For example, the relationship between language and thinking is starting to receive

considerable attention in the field of SLA research under the name of Bilingual Cognition. Researchers need to clearly spell out what they mean by language, whether as the general property of human beings, in an abstract sense, as an external reality, as mental knowledge, as social community or as action, each of which has different implications for the relationship of language and cognition (Cook, 2021). Also, it has been proposed that mental processes such as remembering, thinking, and understanding language are based on the physical interactions that people have with their environment. Cognitive structures develop from perception and action. Mental processes are supported by the same processes that are used for physical interactions, that is, for perception and action (Pecher & Zwaan, 2005). In addition, it has been seen that natural language develops in close connection with intelligence, configuring broadly the features of thought. A child's mind has a limited number of reference systems from which it can, through experience, constitute the qualities that underlie the processing of knowledge and the skills formed at the representation level. In maturity, at the same time as the development of thinking, the mind constructs signification and communication procedures that go beyond natural language (Ceau u & Ceau u, 2017).

Considering the above, the objective of this work is to analyze the relationship between language and thought. For this, the historical and logical method were used as research methods, which allowed to effectively approach the subject.

DEVELOPMENT

Every natural language is structurally versatile and multi-level. Each level has its specific language groups. Based on the synthesis of languages, common language groups are formed. If gender, age, occupation, geographical environment, etc. are taken into account, then the number of language layers would be much higher. Humboldt united the internal and external forms of language. As an internal form, it is accepted as a means of forming thoughts and imaginations in thinking (Humboldt, 1984, p. 216). The attitude of language to thought is its form, and the attitude to sound is its content. Internal forms of language include morphemes and words. In the internal-intellectual spheres of language at the stages of evolution of forms, the following points should be present in the external forms:

1. designation of individual objects.
2. designation of general relations among individual objects.
3. laws of speech construction

The external forms of a language are sounds, their grammatical and lexical structures. Clear sound is the most necessary and first element of a language. Language signs are absolutely necessary for the sounds of a language. According to W. von Humboldt, a language is of great importance as one of the necessary factors to realize the development of human morality and the truth. To realize this function successfully, a language must develop on the basis of its internal contradictions. Differences and similarities in the character of the people underlie the basis of these contradictions and stimulate their development. W. von Humboldt shows three factors in the individual and group character of language: first, the way of life of peoples, their occupation, productivity of labor, satisfaction of their needs; second, their individual, physical structure and behavior, the color of their faces and hair, their physiognomy; third, fantasy, thought, feeling and so on. There are similarities and differences between the character of the people and the character of the language. They are based on a dialectical contradiction, for example, difference in identity, and the principle of identity in difference (Humboldt, 1984, p. 326).

W. von Humboldt divides languages into perfect and imperfect types and differentiates them in some ways. His point arouses some arguments. First of all, W. von Humboldt himself affirms that, the character of every nation determines the character of its language and every nation develops with both internal and external relations. Their languages form, develop and go up from specific to general (that is from inductive to deductive), which means a language cannot develop in an isolated environment. Therefore, the search for a "pure" perfect or "pure" imperfect language is in vain. Secondly, as there is not any absoluteness in life, mind and cognition, there is no absoluteness in language either. It is meaningless to speak in a language that is absolutely perfect and imperfect. And thirdly, according to the famous Azerbaijani scholar Lotfi Zadeh's theory of "spreading multiplicities", no language can be grammatically or lexically accurate and is essentially scattered; therefore, perfection itself is conditional and spreadable. The path from uncertainty to certainty, from disorder to order, from natural languages to artificial languages is complex and difficult (Zadeh & Desoer, 2008).

The important point here is the internal (inheritance) and external acquisitions of the language. The most important factor that gives impetus to that process is the character of people's development, the geographical environment in which they live, interaction and influence of languages and the development of science and industry. If we take Turkish language as example, we can see that, the

Turkic-speaking peoples living in the republics of the former USSR communicated with each other in the Russian language. Surely, the Russian language has had a significant influence on enrichment of these peoples' languages. The same goes for Russian language too. It has been influenced by the Turkish, German, English and other languages. The Azerbaijani language, which belongs to the Turkish language group, has many words of Arabic, Persian and English origin. In the language of the Turks living in Turkey itself, there are many words borrowed from Greek, French, German, and even Latin. The situation is almost the same in other languages of the Turkish language group.

W. von Humboldt wrote in this respect: "One has to seek the real advantages of languages in their unique and harmonic power. They are needed as a weapon in the path of spiritual activity (Humboldt, 1984, p. 230). In this regard, E. Sapir's opinion is also interesting. He stated: "He should be grateful to be Armenian, but the Armenian language itself is included in the pure Indo-European language group" (Sapir, 1993, p. 266). E. Sapir said that the Caucasian people's languages have had an irreplaceable role in development of the Armenian language. We will not be mistaken if we mention that Turkish words are widely used in the lexicon of the Armenian language.

German Paul (1846-1921), a prominent member of the minor grammar school, considered it important to use logical categories to interpret the materials of natural language. Such an approach to the issue formed the content of the views of minor grammarians. They believed that language is a natural organism existing apart from humans and that linguistics is a natural historical science. G. Paul thought that language is a subject of historical view as every product of human culture (Paul, 1960).

V. A. Zvegintsev showed that according to minor grammarians, language is a product of culture as a society, and culture is a product of society (Zvegintsev, 1964, p. 225). W. Wundt seriously criticized this point and righteously pointed out that for G. Paul, society is a sum of individuals (Zvegintsev, 1964, p. 173). G. Paul brought some terms into science, such as "narrowing of values of lexical units", "generalization of values" etc. The classification of his lexical modifications was based on logical ratio of previous values.

Summarizing the abovementioned, we can conclude that the ideas of grammarians are important for the relationship between logic and language, and the methodology of language theory. In their works: 1) language is studied as a property of human thinking and perception; 2) general methods have been developed for such studies;

3) an attempt was made to create a universal and general grammar. However, Humboldt's teaching included in science as a synthesizing approach, was addressed by Alexander Afanasyevich Potebnya (1835-1891) and Ivan Alexandrovich Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929), prominent Ukrainian scientists of later development.

In the first half of the XIX century, there were revealed a generality of its origin and and regularity of ratio in the works of F. Bopp, P. Paska, Y. Grimm, and others. Thus, historical and linguistic current turned to be an independent field of knowledge. Within the comparative historical linguistics, a psychological current appeared. This current denied the connection between logic and psychology. The generality of languages was explained by specifications in nations' psychology. Language develops in close connection with thought in accordance with appropriate semantic regularities. The most important semantic regularities are: 1) the law of substitution of signs that appear in semantic-syntactic transformation both in a word (internal form of a word) and in a sentence (substitution of the parts of speech), 2) the law of unity of the two mental essences in the sign - the subjective content of the information perceived in speech and its "internal form".

Therefore, mathematical language, algorithmic languages and other symbolic languages are formed as a result of certain language activities. Language activity cannot be imagined outside speech activity, communication outside the speech process. The entire richness of a language is realized in speech, and the possibilities of expression expand. It, in its turn, enriches by language and thought. It should also be mentioned that, it is not a good idea to analyze the language-speech-thought relations separately, because language and speech units have an irreplaceable role in formation and application of each idea in thinking. In fact, language and thinking are various sides and tools of the same thing.

Uniting the world, human and language, A. A. Potebnya believed that it is necessary to show the cognitive importance of the word in the formation of successive series of systems that cover the attitude of the individual to nature (Potebnya, 1976, p. 171). These views of A. A. Potebnya were based on the sensualist and gnoseological school of J. Locke: "Ultimately, the sense is derived from a word that expresses feelings (Locke, 1985, p. 460), and the sense of the word is necessary for communication as a sign" (Locke, 1985, p. 461). The author has considered the words as signs in order to indicate thoughts and ideas from genetic point of view. So, he deemed the word, in general, as a system of language and signs (Locke, 1988). Hereby he showed that the signs carried a meaning and, on this basis, words help communication. The first source

for linguistic teaching of A. A. Potebnya has been W. von Humboldt's philosophical and linguistic concept, on the basis of which the scientist considered language as an activity forming an idea and substantiated the idea of unity of objective and subjective and individual and social items in language.

He viewed language historically as a form of transition from unconsciousness to consciousness and self-consciousness and functionally as a means of cognition, thinking and communication. The activity of connecting the sense of self to the perceived self serves the existence of language. A. A. Potebnya indicated that a language sign has a material character and a synthesis of the presenter and the presented object. In other words, language consists of the synthesis of internal and external forms (Potebnya, 1958, p. 47). On this basis, he presented a school on 1) the phonetics which studies external forms of language and 2) the values that study the internal forms of language and approached both of them both historically and descriptively (Potebnya, 1958, pp. 47-48).

Considering the phenomenon of language on the principle of history, A. A. Potebnya believes that "for all of us cognition is important with regards to the future" (Potebnya, 1976, p. 306), "linguistics must be historical" (Potebnya, 1976, p. 306), "historical method is the correct method" (Potebnya, 1976). A. A. Potebnya's comprehensive approach to any happening and process, as well as a language does not let us come to proper conclusion. As it is known, each development has to be based on struggle against internal conflicts that are inherent in them. To learn the development of language and linguistics adequately, it is necessary to apply the historical and logical methods in unison. Noting the place and role of linguistics in the system of sciences, A. A. Potebnya showed that we do not know man as much as we do language. Language is more ancient than all other human activities (Potebnya, 1989, p. 202). By this idea, the author laid the foundation of a genetic approach to language.

The science of linguistics develops in conjunction with other sciences, including mathematics, psychology and logic. Based on the historical approach, the author distinguishes between language and non-linguistic contents and refutes logical and grammatical approach to language. Grammatical sentence can neither be parallel nor identical with logical statement (Potebnya, 1958, p. 69). One can partially agree to this opinion of A. A. Potebnya. First, it is not correct to equate logical category with grammatical one and they cannot, surely, be compared. However, it should be noted that, any opinion, as well as logical idea and logical category are expressed on the basis of words and sentences formed on the basis of

grammatical rules. As the expressed object and the expressing subject demand from each other, logical categories also require grammatical categories. As opposite sides, they reject each other as much as they demand from each other. Historically word and name, word and concept and sentence and statement have always evolved in interaction and influence. From Plato to the present day, the phenomena of language and thought have developed on the basis of identity and difference in identity. The ideas of Tafalluk have been established on the basis of the means of language and been expressed with the help of the means of language. In other words, the grammatical forms and grammatical forms, the signing subject and the signed object, and the expressing subject and the expressed object are organically related with each other.

A. A. Potebnya came to such result that "Grammatical forms have certain content through grammatical forms" (Potebnya, 1976, p. 215) and hereby he concluded that linguistics and grammar are much closed to logic (Potebnya, 1958, p. 70). In this connection, A. A. Potebnya has given preference to historic character. By differentiating language and thought, A. A. Potebnya also distinguishes between the content of language (internal) and that of thought (non-language content). Non-language content means an invariant content separated from oral expressions. We should note that, language units are signs, and those signs have an object value and a meaning. A sign functions to show something both by its object value and its meaning. In other words, a sign performs a denotative function in relation to its subject value, and a sign in its own sense performs as a signifier function by expressing an opinion about the value of an object. In this regard, the content expressed in the units of language is identical with the content expressed outside the language units, and there is no need to differentiate them.

As it is seen, the scientist cannot notice the difference between name and word and thinks they are identical. The idea in a name is expressed by different words. The word "insan" in the Azerbaijani language is translated as "chelovek" in Russian and "man" in English. Thus, such a relationship is created between the name and the word that the name is invariant with respect to the word, and the word is a variant with respect to the name. In the given example, the idea (invariant) about a human being is expressed in his name, and such words as "insan", "chelovek", "man" and others are included in this group.

A. A. Potebnya showed that the word consists of three parts: 1) clear sounds; 2) a value objectified by sounds; and 3) the internal form applied to the imagination. This is a very good idea. Just as language is a system of signs, so are its elements. Signs have subject value and meaning.

The value of sign means the subjects designated by a sign. Hereby the concept of subject is comprehended in a broad sense: it means the things that exist objectively, their properties and characteristics, the relations among them, the ideas about the real objects, the relations among thoughts and imaginary thoughts.

The word is covered with clear sounds, i.e., its materiality finds its expression through sounds in the process of acoustic-articulation. In this sense, sounds, being the material cover of words, have a subject value, which A. A. Potebnya calls an objectified value. The word expresses the thoughts in the mind, that is, the thought in the imagination acts as the meaning of the word. Internal form or imagination is a value that shows and defines a word. A sound is an external form, cover and a sign of a sign (Potebnya, 1958, pp. 17–19). An imagination is a sign of value of a given word and a sign of value of this word (Potebnya, 1989, p. 212). This is a link between an old and new value. Furthermore, A. A. Potebnya has stated the grammar forms to have consisted of three forms that are sound, imagination and value (Potebnya, 1958, p. 37).

A. A. Potebnya showed that the value of a word is not identical with the value that signifies a sign (Potebnya, 1977, p. 113). If the subject value of a word consists of the sum of signs, then the subject value of word does not coincide with the sign value. If a word signifies a sign of a subject, then the subject value is equal with the subject value. A. A. Potebnya related sound and value or internal and external signs in a dialectical connection and wrote: "A clear sound and the form of a word are included in a thought (Potebnya, 1976, p. 179). Value (sense figure) – Internal form (imagination) – Sounded figure – Sound – Sound figure – Internal form (imagination) – Value (sense figure). These processes require each other as much as they contradict each other. They realize the acoustics and articulation process.

Jan Baudouin de Courtenay had an enormous contribution to the development of theoretical linguistics. Based on the ideas of H. Leibniz, W. von Humboldt and A. A. Potebnya, he approached language from a system-structural point of view, and used new methods in the application of language (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 108). J. Baudouin de Courtenay approached the language in both a broad and a narrow sense. In the broadest sense, if language is a social, psychological, or psycho-social phenomenon that emerges in human-society relations (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, pp. 62, 200–201), in the narrow sense, language is a means and activity that develops by its own internal laws.

Unlike A. A. Potebnya (1835-1891), he considered language as a means of cognition from the genetic and functional point of view (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, p. 38). From genetic point of view, language develops and evolves internally as one of the functions of human body. Functionally, language performs both communication and cognitive functions. In this sense it manifests itself as a set of socio-psychological ideas.

According to J. Baudouin de Courtenay, man belongs to three worlds at the same time: the universe, the organic world and the psychological world (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 189,191). Language is a means of connecting all three worlds. Supporting the opinions of W. von Humboldt, J. Baudouin de Courtenay believed that, physical-geographical environment of the territories where the nations, people and ethnic groups live had an influence on their character. On this basis, he accepted Humboldt's thesis that the nature of language depends on the nature of the people. So he believed that physical-geographical environment impacts the nation, people and the individuals included in an ethnic group, their physiognomy and the structure of organs of speech. A physiological and geographical environment is a must for development of a language. He considered atmosphere as an environment: it is one of the factors influencing both hearing and speech" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 196). In short, the organic world is a proper, unified psychosocial environment (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 191). Baudouin de Courtenay based his conception of language on the following: "when we speak of individuals, we must first distinguish the anthropological aspect of living organisms, as well as the social aspect of human individuals. We have to look at an individual as a speaker in general, and as a representative of a certain linguistic community in particular" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, pp. 195-196).

To his thinking, a psychosocial event depends on the physiological substrate. "There is no psychological event without the brain" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 56), "Anything related to human language belongs to language centered in the brain" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, p. 212). Thus, it confirms that thinking and language are inseparable: 1) thinking and language depend on the brain; and 2) mental development improves the substance of the brain (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 57). Based on the interaction and influence of thought and language, the scientist categorizes thinking into 3 groups: language-based thinking, thinking related to linguistics and linguistics, and thinking in general (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 288).

As it is known, all actions of a human are controlled by brain. Human brain is one of the main conditions for language, thinking and speech. This thesis cannot be denied by anyone and as we mentioned, thinking, language and speech are different sides and means of the same process, which is called the cognition process. In other words, they complete and necessitate each other. In this regard, it is not correct to categorize thinking into groups, to put borders among them from logical andgnoseological point of view. This is because thinking makes no sense outside speech and language. Language is a thing in itself, without reference to thought in its activity. If linguistics does not approach language through the prism of thinking, then it cannot be formed as a science.

The author's thesis "Thinking is possible without language" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 71) should be understood as self-conversation of thinking. The thesis that thinking and society is a necessary condition for a real language (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 212) is that the fact that every society is made up of certain individuals and that each individual has a different level of thinking is a necessary factor for language development in a given environment. Although the author contradicts himself in his opinion that "language has been and is an invariable condition of thought" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, p. 227), he correctly showed the inseparable link between language and thought. The genetic development of people, or rather ethnic groups, peoples, and nations, shows that the differences in their natures, the differences in the minds of the individuals involved, are governed by the same laws. In this regard, J. Baudouin de Courtenay wrote: "Language thinking does not accord with the thinking outside logic" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, p. 227). Despite this opinion we want to mention that because ordinary thinking is not the same as logical thinking, "thinking for itself" does not coincide with "thinking for others". In this regard, his idea that "language is closely connected with thinking and has an impact on it: either it speeds it up or slows it down" (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 79) is interesting.

J. Baudouin de Courtenay, who affirmed the relative independence of thought in language, speaks of society as one of the factors that determines their interaction as free substances. Without society, there can be no talk of the existence and development of thought or language. Language is a factor in the formation of thinking and a means of realizing the thought in thinking. Baudouin de Courtenay also brought the concept of "linguistics" into linguistics: "In language, or in human speech, different worldviews and moods of both individuals and groups of people are manifested. Therefore, first of all, we consider

language a special knowledge, which means we accept two knowledge – observing, intuitive, direct and scientific-theoretical knowledge, as well as the third knowledge – language knowledge (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 79). When one says “a knowledge of language”, it means understanding and perception of the world (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 95). Such knowledge “covers all areas of existence and non-existence, matter and the individual, the manifestations of the mental and social world” (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963a, p. 312). Along with all this, J. Baudouin de Courtenay stated: 1) human speech is general; 2) as the language of individual tribes and peoples; 3) distinguished the language of individual people and at the same time showed that the “individual is universal” (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963b, pp. 76–77). He revealed the dialectics of singular and general in man and language.

In the early twentieth century, with the publication of F. de Cessur’s (1857-1913) “General Linguistics Course”, the foundation of the current of linguistic structuralism in linguistics was laid. The main principles of structuralism are:

1. Language is a system of signs, and the elements of the system are relations among certain rules.
2. The structure of the system is created by relations outside time, which plays a decisive role in the organization of elements.
3. Relationships in the language system can be studied by applying mathematical and quantitative methods to linguistics.
4. Language is such a special type of sign system that, on one hand, arises from communication between people and exists objectively regardless of their consciousness, while on the other hand, this system is formed in people’s minds. In other words, that system is an object-subject character.
5. This system is integrated with other systems operating in the life of society.

Representatives of the current of linguistic structuralism deemed the full concept not as a mechanical set of interconnected elements, but as a network of relations between the elements. L. Yelmslev wrote that it is necessary to confirm the fact that it is not a complete thing, but a relationship. It consists of full internal and external relations.

In the 60s of the XX century, constructive requirements were put on theoretical objects in linguistics, mathematics and mathematical logic. If a theory is established, the object must act as the object of the theory; if it is theoretically possible to build an object, then we can talk about the existence of the object. These new linguistic ideas were founded by U. Quay and H. Goodman. Constructivism in

linguistics is another branch of the current theory of derivative grammar. In this theory, a specific language is considered to consist of an ideal form and a sentence with a semantic interpretation. The rules that are subject to “sound-meaning” ratio make up the grammar of this language. Language theory is understood as grammar theory, and the task of which is to study the universal properties of a language and speech. Chen (2015). Finally, Noam Chomsky introduces grammar into the language system as a whole. Language, on the other hand, describes a set of formed sentences that takes the sounds and values of language signs. He wrote: “Grammar is a device that gives an infinite number of well-constructed sentences and combines one or more structural characteristics in each of them. It is possible to call such a device grammar. Chomsky practically identified the concepts of language and grammar. He distinguished between “formal universals” and “content universals” in grammar. “Formal universals” are translations for rules and their description in languages; while “content universals” are a grouping of lexical categories such as “name”, “verb”, “adjective”, and “universal phonetics”. Chomsky et al. (2019).

CONCLUSIONS

The study of the relationship between language and thought is essential because it is through language that we can organize and structure our ideas, give them meaning and share knowledge. Furthermore, language influences how we think, since words and linguistic structures can influence our perception and understanding of the world. By better understanding the connection between language and thought, we can become more aware of how our words and expressions can shape our ideas, facilitating effective communication and the development of cognitive skills.

Although the problem of the relation of language with thought has been particularly discussed in the literature on philosophy, logic, and linguistics, all the relations with this regard remains unanswered. To fill this gap, we include the name category in science for both thinking and language categories. The idea is both manifested and expressed in a name. On one hand, the name, being a category of thought about the things of reality, their properties and relations, has meaning, content and volume. On the other hand, because a name has an object value and is conveyed in words, the idea that reflects the name is transmitted to others through language. From this point of view, words cannot freely connect thinking with language. Secondly, the word has never been a form of thought, it first distinguishes between thought and the field of language and on this basis distinguishes between the content of language and the content of thought.

REFERENCES

- Bacon, F. (1977). *Works in two volumes* (Vol. 1). Mysl Publishing House.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1963a). *Selected works on general linguistics* (Vol. 2). Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1963b). *Selected works on general linguistics* (Vol. 1). Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Ceau u, F., & Ceau u, G. (2017). Thinking and Language in the Body / Psyche Issue: A Cognitive Ethology Focused on Human Being. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 5(4), 294–300. <https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2017.050407>
- Chen, B. (2015). Social constructivism of language and meaning. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, 15(43), 87–113
- Chomsky, N., Gallego, Á. J., & Ott, D. (2019). Generative grammar and the faculty of language: Insights, questions, and challenges. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 229–261.
- Cook, V. (2021). The language in language and thinking. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18, Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.35869/vial.v0i18.3364>
- Humboldt, W. von. (1984). *Selected works on linguistics*. Progress Publishing House.
- Humboldt, W. von. (1985). *Language and philosophy of culture*. Progress Publishing House.
- Locke, J. (1985). *Works in three volumes: Vol. Volume 1*. Mysl Publishing House.
- Locke, J. (1988). *Works in three volumes: Vol. Volume 3*. Mysl Publishing House.
- Paul, G. (1960). *Principles of the history of language*. Nauka.
- Pecher, D., & Zwaan, R. A. (2005). Introduction to Grounding Cognition: The Role of Perception and Action in Memory, Language, and Thinking. In D. Pecher & R. A. Zwaan (Eds.), *Grounding Cognition: The Role of Perception and Action in Memory, Language, and Thinking* (pp. 1–7). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511499968.001>
- Perelmutter, I. A. (1991). Grammatical doctrine of modists. In *History of linguistic doctrines. Late Middle Ages* (pp. 7–67). Nauka.
- Plato. (1993). *Collected works in four volumes* (Vol. 2). Mysl Publishing House.
- Plato. (1994). *Collected works in four volumes* (Vol. 4). Mysl Publishing House.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1958). *Notes on Russian grammar*. Uchpedgiz Publishing House.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1976). *Aesthetics and poetics*. Iskusstvo.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1977). *Notes on Russian grammar*. Prosveshenie Publishing House.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1989). *Word and myth*. Pravda.
- Sapir, E. (1993). *Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies*. Progress Publishing House.
- Zadeh, L., & Desoer, C. (2008). *Linear system theory: the state space approach*. Courier Dover Publications
- Zvegintsev, V. A. (1964). *History of linguistics of the 19th-20th centuries in essays and extracts*. Nauka.