



Available online at <http://jgu.garmian.edu.krd>

Journal of University of Garmian

<https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.21080219>



A comparative Study of Linguistic thought between English and Kurdish in perspective of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis

Aween Tahir Sabir

Department of English, Faculty of Education, Koya University

Burhan Saleh Sulaiman

Department of English, Faculty of Education, Koya University

### Article Info

Received: April, 2021

Accepted :June ,2021

Published :July ,2021

### Keywords

language, thought, Sapir and Whorf Hypothesis, linguistic determinism, linguistic relativity.

### Corresponding Author

[aween.tahir@koyauniversity.org](mailto:aween.tahir@koyauniversity.org)

### Abstract

There is an on-going argument about the impact of language on thought, i.e. either language shapes thought or thought shapes language. There are numerous thinkers, philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, and linguists have tried to find out the truth about which one has superiority over the other, to be supportive or against the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This study is about the linguistic thought among Kurds and English from the perspective of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which is also called 'Linguistic relativity'. It is named that because the linguists Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf are the first one whom they did make specific assumptions based on their research they conducted, that is why the theory named after them although they actually never formulated any concrete hypothesis. To get to know what it means that man thinks in language or that human thought is dependent on language, it can be assumed that the hypothesis is relatively true. This paper aims at exploring the relationship between language and thought by giving a critical review on this hypothesis from two aspects of thought orientation and language orientation, by critical review it doesn't mean to criticize the idea in a way to reject the theory but to enrich the subject and find out the problematic aspects of it. Since it is a hypothesis, it has advantages and disadvantages, because no one can prove that language shapes thought for sure, as the evidences are limited and it can't be applied all the time. And aims to show how different cultures and religions affect English and Kurdish linguistic Thought by giving some examples of everyday life

This research was conducted on the English and Kurdish examples to prove that in both languages, the formation of meanings is produced by the combination of language and thought to make sense of the concepts and how People think differently through having different **mother languages, cultures and religions** and clarifying it by giving examples in everyday life. Although these two languages are different at all the levels of language, in terms of structure and semantics but they are from the same family, what is interesting is that English is a western language and Kurdish is an eastern language. This article aims at investigating the application of the theory, i.e. to what extent in can be applied on them to come to an acceptable conclusion. At the end, we conclude that Kurdish language lays great stress on 'surface structure' of the words or denotations rather than connotations. Beside different mother languages, culture and religion have an influence on both Kurdish and English linguistic thought.

## 1. Introduction

Language and thought interact in many significant ways and the relationship between thought and language is an important topic especially for those who wish to understand the nature of human cognition. This study shows how Kurds and English Speakers think differently through language. Language may influence the way that we think, an idea known as linguistic determinism. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which is also called 'Linguistic relativity' is a principle suggesting that the structure of language affects its speakers' world view or cognition. It is named that because the linguists Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf are the first one whom they did make specific assumptions based on their research they conducted, that is why the theory named after them although they actually never formulated any concrete hypothesis. The view implies a relatively tight connection between language and thought (Hill and Mannheim ,1992: 381-404). Moreover, Formigari (2004: 53) states that the relationship between language and thought has always been an interesting topic in philosophy and has been studied frequently. To get to know what it means that man thinks in language or that human thought is dependent on language, first it needs to know what consequences such an assumption would have.

According to Deutscher (2010: 20), the linguistic relativism is one of the many theories which have caused the most heated debate in linguistics over the past few decades. This hypothesis, as clarified by Lucy (1999:48), is mainly concerned with the

effects of language on non-linguistic cognition "should assess the cognitive performance of individual speakers aside from explicitly verbal context". Von Humboldt (1999: 60) explains that a natural language, such as English or Kurdish, has an impact on the way a person thinks, i.e. because of their distinct mother tongues, a native speaker of English thinks differently from a native speaker of Kurdish. Although language and thought are two main topics of philosophy going back to classical civilizations, this theory was first proposed in modern times by Wilhelm von Humboldt. He stated that the way of viewing the world, is reflected in the grammar of its language, plus learning a new language means acquiring a new perspective of the world. In the same regard, Wittgenstein (1984: 67) clarifies that: "The limits of my language mean the limits of my world."

In this article an attempt has been made to find out the relationship between thought and language by giving examples in both languages English and Kurdish.

This paper aims at tracing the modern history of linguistic relativism, its strong form is called "linguistic determinism" and to what extent it applies on English and Kurdish languages.

## 2. The claim of 'Language is used for communication'

It is obvious that language is the main means of communication, language is something unique, because other species have communication but are using means other than language for example birds and animal are

using some musical sounds which are limited. In this case if it is said that language is merely a device or a tool, it means that it has no influence or impact on thought, i.e. thought controls language and there is no such thing to say 'those who can speak different languages think differently.'

Williams (1993: 91) states that "much modern linguistic theory is based on the assumption that the primary and fundamental function of language is communication."

Moreover, Jackendoff (2002: 123) takes as a basic assumption that "language arose primarily in the interests of enhancing communication, and only secondarily in the interests of enhancing thought." Millikan (2005: 25) argues that "a primary function of the human language faculty is to support linguistic conventions, and that these have an essentially communicative function." Deacon (1997: 11–12, 50) refers to language as "our unique and complex mode of communication." Carruthers (2002: 657–658) notes that "most members of the cognitive science community" support the idea that language is the (purely) communicative concept.

Some linguists consider language as an instrument of thought. This is the view of the rationalist tradition, most notably as it is demonstrated in philosophy of language and in linguistics. In philosophy, Moravcsik clarifies that there is Frege, who "insists that thought-content is prior to matters of use". Frege saw the communication is near the edge of the function of language and argued that the

"expression of thought must figure centrally in explanations of syntactic and semantic facts" (Moravcsik, 1981: 106). Fodor argues that language has no semantics in the first place as distinct from the content of the thoughts it expresses. "Learning English," he says, "*isn't learning a theory about what its sentences mean it's learning how to associate its sentences with the corresponding thoughts*" (Fodor 1998: 9). That is, to "know English is to know, for example, that the form of words 'there are cats' is standardly used to express the thought that there are cats".

There are two different claims; one is the implicit assumption that the structure of language is designed for the communication of thoughts. The other claim is that language is an instrument of thought. Pinker & Bloom (1990) remark that "the facts of grammar make it difficult to argue that language shows design for 'the expression of thought' in any sense that is substantially distinct from 'communication'". They paraphrase Chomsky's claim as emphasizing that "people's use of language does not tightly serve utilitarian goals of communication but is an autonomous competence to express thought" (Pinker & Bloom 1990: 714–719). However, the counter to language's function being communication is that it is an instrument of thought, not merely that it is a tool for the expression of thought.

According to the above mentioned topics, it can be said that there are two ways to interpret the claim that language is an instrument of thought: a weak and a strong claim. The

weaker claim is that language is used primarily for the expression of thought, whereas the stronger claim is that language to some extent structures thought.

### 3. Sapir-Whorf hypothesis

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of language has an impact on thinking, ignited thinkers, philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, and linguists to make researches about the truthfulness of the idea, because Whorf propounded the theory with some evidences which he had, to support and back up what he came up with.

Pinker (1994: 57) states that the famous Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic determinism, is something radical because it states that the first language determines the way a person perceives and thinks about the world. In terms of linguistic relativity which is its weaker version the speakers of different languages perceive and think about the world differently. Brown (1976: 128) made a distinction between 'strong' and 'weak' versions of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis:

(1) **The strong version:** "The structure of anyone's native language strongly influences or fully determines the world-view he will acquire as he learns the language."

(2) **The weak version:** "Structural differences between language systems will, in general, be paralleled by nonlinguistic cognitive differences, of an unspecified sort, in the native speakers of the two languages."

As far as linguistic determinism is concerned it leaves no room for thought to

play any role in human life, for it no one has any choice to think about something new because his/her native language determines his/her mental activities and how to perceive and view the world.

For linguistic relativity the idea is the same but there are some flexibilities by using the concept of relativity that language to some extent not fully determines thought, i.e. the language affects or influences the way a person think and see the world. Whereas for Kay and Kempton (1984), linguistic relativity refers to the following two ideas:

1. "Structural differences between language systems will, in general, be paralleled by non-linguistic cognitive differences, of an unspecified sort, in the native speakers of the two languages.

2. The structure of anyone's native language strongly influences or fully determines the world-view he will acquire as he learns the language"

Every theory or idea is based on the works of the others. It can be said it has a background; the following sections are about figures who have contributed in the formulation of the idea (Kay and Kempton, 1984: 66).

#### 3.1 The Contribution of Franz Boas

The beginnings of relativist thought in North America attributes to Franz Boas, he was a German educated immigrant who came to the United States in 1886 and spent most of his academic career at Columbia University. He has been called the founder of modern

anthropology (Encyclopedia Britannica Macropedia, 15th ed., 1982, 2, 1155).

(Lucy 1992:11-12) states that Franz Boas (1858-1942) was an anthropologist who contributed to linguistic anthropology he claimed that language played a role in culture and different languages will have a different classification of the same experience; i.e. it can lead to different experiences of the same event. Further, Martin (1986) clarifies that an example that was given by Boas about the people of Eskimo; they have various words for snow. He mentions four lexical words which are unrelated for “snow” in Eskimo; *aput* which refers to the snow that is on the ground, *qana* which is falling snow, *piqsirpoq* which means a drifting snow and *qimuqsuq* refers to a snow drift (Martin, 1986:418-423).

Another claimant of ‘Franz Boas’ was that these varying experiences of the same events due to language remained unnoticed by the speakers of a language because of the automatic nature of language. The essential claim by Boas was that the linguistic classifications reflect the thought of a language’s speakers, Boas didn’t stick to one opinion on the nature of the relationship between language and thought; he was never explicit in his opinion ((Lucy, 1992: 13-14). Finally, Koerner adds that “he was hedging, allowing for a possible reciprocal influence between language and thought” (Koerner, 2002:273).

### **3.2 The Contributions of Edward Sapir**

Edward Sapir (1884-1936), as clarified by Lucy (1992:20), was a student of Boas’ at

Columbia University. He learned anthropology and social science methodology from Boas, and seems to have been ideally educated to examine linguistic relativity, but he devoted little of his career to it (Friedrich, 1986: 11- 12).

Sapir (1929: 209) states that “The fact of the matter is that the ‘real world’ is to a large extent unconsciously built up of the language habits of the group . . .”. He later turned his attention to individual psychology, but meanwhile he had directed Whorf, his part-time graduate student, to the comparison of European and Indian languages, an activity which led finally to the hypothesis that language structures culture and directs experience (Rollins, 1980:69). Further, Lucy (1992:21) identifies that Sapir was a prominent figure who believes that culture influences language, believing that this influence was more on a vocabulary level than on a morphological one. Then, Penn (1972: 24-28) adds that Sapir ruled out the idea of being able to think without language. He also believed that “language is not the creation of human thought”. He supported the strong version of linguistic relativity i.e. linguistic determinism at some stage in his work.

### **3.3 The Contributions of Whorf to Linguistic Determinism**

The contribution of Whorf, according to (Carroll, 1956: 134), is that Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941) was a chemical engineer who worked as a fire prevention engineer for the Hartford Insurance Company. Then, (Lucy, 1992:25) adds that he developed an

interest in anthropology and linguistics for some reasons. The first possible reason is his own desire for linguistics through self-instruction, but after 1931 he came to know Edward Sapir and worked with him. It is said that this is how his interest in the area of linguistic relativity developed. Whereas the second possible reason, according to (Carroll, 1956:134), was he noticed that language subjected workers to danger, like the often-cited example of “empty”. While working in fire prevention Whorf noticed that people would smoke near containers which were labelled as ‘empty’ oil barrels. These barrels still contained volatile gases which workers described and treated as though the dangerous barrels were entirely empty. It was his belief that by using the word ‘empty’ it determined people’s reactions to the object. He said that: “Physically the situation is hazardous, but the linguistic analysis according to regular analogy must employ the word ‘empty’, which inevitably suggests lack of hazard”(Whorf, 1956:135).

The result, according to Thomson (1975: 80), is an explosion, he explains the causes as: The immediate cause of the explosion, of course, was the gasoline fumes that remained in the barrels. But it could be argued that a second cause of the explosion was the English language. The barrels were empty of their original contents and so belonged under the empty sign. Yet they were not empty of everything – the fumes were still present. English has no word – no single term – that can convey such a situation. Containers in

English are empty; there is no word describing the ambiguous state of being empty and yet not empty. There is no term in the language for “empty but not quite” or “empty of original contents but with something left over”. There is no word for such an in-between state, it did not occur to the watchman to think of the explosive fumes. Whorf as support for his theory ‘the linguistic relativity’, he made researches on American Indian languages; Hopi language was one of them which were based on the structure of these languages. He compared the differences between Hopi and Standard American English in terms of time and space.

“Our own “time” differs markedly from Hopi “duration”. It is conceived as like a space of strictly limited dimensions, or sometimes as like a motion upon such a space, and employed as an intellectual tool accordingly. Hopi “duration” seems to be inconceivable in terms of space or motion being the mode in which life differs from form, and consciousness in to from the spatial elements of consciousness. Certain ideas born of our own time-concept, such as that of absolute simultaneity, would be either very difficult to express or impossible and devoid of meaning under the Hopi conception, and would be replaced by operational concepts.” (Whorf, 1956:158)

Furthermore, Lucy (1992:46) identifies that Whorf believes that language influences thought mainly in grammatical structures

“speakers take (i.e., appropriate) language patterns as guides to the nature of reality”. In the quotation below, he indicates his focus on the differences in grammatical structures in languages.

“From this fact proceeds what I have called the “linguistic relativity principle,” which means, in informal terms, that users of markedly different grammars are pointed by their grammars toward different types of observations and different evaluations of externally similar acts of observation, and hence are not equivalent as observers but must arrive at somewhat different view of the world” (Whorf, 1956:221)

Moreover, Thomson (1975: 80) adds that Whorf was an unusual man who combined two careers, for he was both a successful insurance executive and a brilliant (and largely self-taught) linguistic scholar. Language, he claimed, may be shaped by the world, but it in turn shapes the world. He reasoned that people can think about only those things that their language can describe or express. Without the words or structures with which to articulate a concept, that concept will not occur.

#### **4. Argumentations about the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis**

There are two notions for the hypothesis, language may determine man’s thinking patterns, or language may influence relatively but not determine man’s thinking patterns, thus it arises many argumentations. The following sections are the opinion of linguists who agree and those who disagree with the idea, to demonstrate the weak and strong points of it.

#### **4.1 The advantages of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis**

Language does exert a great impact on our thinking and our culture, Orwell (1984: 246) points out that the notion that people think differently because they have different mother languages has become very popular and has even made its way into fictional literature. In George Orwell’s dystopian novel “1984” the government redesigns the commonly spoken language with the intention of making any kind of treason literally “unthinkable”. Their idea is that, through the elimination of certain words, citizens would not be able to think about them anymore.

Moreover, Deutscher (2010: 29) adds that Whorf concluded from his research on a Native American language called Hopi that “Native American languages impose on their speaker a picture of reality that is totally different from ours”, “ours” meaning Anglophone Americans.

#### **4.2 The disadvantages of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis**

Sapir and Whorf hypothesis is self-conflicting. In the second division which is linguistic relativism ,it claims that ‘language determines thought’ but there is no limits for the structural diversity of languages as the distinctions encoded in one language are not found in any other language(Reccardi, 2002:134). Then, Yule (1996) states that the concept of linguistic determinism, as it is called, claims that “you can think only in the categories which your language allows you to think.” He explains that one simple argument

against it is that languages change: “If thinking and perception were totally determined by language, then the concept of language change would be impossible” (Yule, 1996: 247-248).

Wolff and Holmes (2011: 253-265) state that “If people’s thoughts “were represented entirely in natural language,” they would never “have thoughts that are difficult to express”. They also say “If people thought entirely in words, words expressing new concepts could never be coined because there would be no way of imagining their meanings”.

Moreover, Wang (2017) adds that if language determines the world view there would be no class conscious because every member of the society would view the world same and think by the same thinking patterns (Wang, 2017:21). Another week point is clarified by Tsoi (2019); in his article he explains his idea against the example of Whorf as he states that: “Whorf failed to notice that such discrepancy between the used word (empty) and the reality (filled with gasoline vapor) is not due to linguistic reasons, but simply ignorance. Consider a chemist performing an experiment, such as electrolysis of water, and assume that he covers the experimental setup with a container. As the water is electrolyzed, it gradually disappears. Yet the chemist would not claim that the container is empty, because he understands that hydrogen and oxygen have been produced inside. On the other hand, it was the ignorance of the workers which made them fail to realize the existence of

gasoline vapor inside the drums, not the superficial meaning of the word “empty”. P.4

Further, Frawley (1992: 47) has explained that in the Dani language, there are only two basic color terms, one for “**dark**” and one for “**light**”, whereas in English and many other languages, there are many more. But he has pointed clearly, that this kind of differences can just be linguistic differences. Despite of having different vocabularies in different languages, people can understand each other and every human being obviously has the same biological system to sense and perceive different colors.

There is evidence in English language which is provided by Steinberg (1982: 109), He states that the variety of vocabularies clearly does not reflect our perception of the world, as even though we do not have a word for “**male dog**” (cf. bitch for female dog) or “back of hand” (cf. palm for the front or underside) in English, but we are certainly aware of these ideas. On the contrary, according to (Pinker, 1994:58) “... there is no scientific evidence that languages dramatically shape their speakers’ ways of thinking”.

### 5. Analyzing how linguistic thought among Kurdish is different from English with examples in everyday life:

Whorf claimed that speakers of Hopi and speakers of English see the world differently because of differences in their language. This reflects that different languages influence or shape the way one thinks, due to different culture, tradition and religion. The language and Kurdish language, as (Khalid, 2020) identified, are of the same family which is the biggest family 'Indo- European language Family' but there is a big difference in terms of word structure and sentence structure, morphologically speaking. Kurdistan is still a traditional society and religion is a part of Kurdish culture as a whole.

Kurdish language is not as rich as English language in terms of vocabulary, this phenomenon is a big problem for translators, Kurdish translators are stuck in translating some of the English expressions into Kurdish, it is supposed that because of the lack of enough words in Kurdish, leads to have a kind of shortage in thinking, to back up this idea Thomson (1975: 80) states that "If a language is rich in ways to express certain sorts of ideas, then the speakers of that language will habitually think along with those linguistic paths. In brief, the language that humans speak governs their views of reality; it determines their perception of the world. The picture of the universe shifts from tongue to tongue".

In the following examples as it is taken from English and Kurdish Language, show how People think differently because they have

different **mother languages, culture and religion**. English language, as clarified by Shay (2008:18) is an isolating language, which means that the form of the words usually stands next to each other and have spaces also called 'analytic language or a root language'. Whereas Khalid and Hamamorad (2015:2) point out that Kurdish language is an synthetic language, the form of the words is linked together and in most of the cases one word can stand for a sentence, i.e. one sentence can be written in one word and indicates to the tense and the aspect together as the word 'başm' in Kurdish language stands for the sentence 'I'm well' in English. English spelling and pronunciation are unpredictable, i.e. anyone wants to write a word he/she has to see it before, even if he/she was born from an English parent, which means a learner should memorize the form of the words. In terms of the pronunciation is the same in which it takes a hard work, the learner has to work hard to utter and produce the sound of a word correctly.

The above mentioned features indicate the simplicity from Kurdish part and complexity from of English part. This is the reflection of the lifestyle, Kurds are simple, they view the world superficially, but English people are more serious and they look in deep at the level of a word let's give two examples; usually Kurds give names to things according to what they see, not how they think, but English give names to things without being deceived by the appearance 'what they see' but how they think 'deeper thinking'. For example: in the

language, the word 'Bee-eater', is a colorful bird but the greatest enemy for bees that is why it is named as 'bee-eater' but for Kurdish, in Sorani dialect that bird is called 'Rengala' which means 'colorful' its name come from the appearance of that bird or 'how it looks like' this shows how Kurdish thought is different from English thought that is clearly reflected through their languages. Moreover, it indicates that Kurds have a simple language and they saw everything beautiful. The differences between linguistic thought among Kurds and English may come from different cultures and religions between them.

The word '**spoiled**' is another example, if a child is spoiled in English language, it means that the child is useless and his/her character messed and harmed by over solicitous attention. In Kurdish, it is called '**coddled**' that is used for naming girls and has meaning as 'charming', Pleasant', delightful 'or 'best behaved' so in Kurdish language, if the girl spoiled, she would be 'pleasant' or 'best behaved'. It may have come from the musicality of the word itself as they hear it. These examples clearly show that Kurdish language focuses on the surface structure or, denotation of the words, as (Chandler, 2002:140) clarified, 'what the word literary say' rather than the deep or inner meaning of the words. Kurdish language only shows the beauty and simplicity of life that is reflected in its words, which is completely different from English Language. English language laid great

stress on a deeper dive or connotation of words.

In terms of Culture, culture affects both Kurdish and English linguistic thought. Human culture, according to (Zlatev and Blomberg, 2015:2), shaped the evaluation of human cognition and memory. In other words, the influence of language, as clarified by (Mykhailyuk and Pohlod, 2015: 37-39), is not so much on what we can think about, or even what we do think about, but rather on how we break up reality into categories and label them. And in this, our language and our thoughts are probably both greatly influenced by our culture. For example, in English language, the brother of mother and the brother of father both are called 'uncle'; this indicates that they think there is no difference between them in terms of ranking, social relationships and the extent of loving them. Since English people do not have that word they oblige to use the same. This may stem from the lack of social relations, while the social relations in the Kurdish society are strong so Kurdish people are in need to have two different terms or labels for two persons. In Kurdish language, they have different names, the brother of father is called 'mam' and the brother of mother is called 'xal'; this difference automatically affects a Kurdish born child to make a difference between them in terms of love for example. Cultural factors play an important role in this field, because many of these differences are the result of cultural differences.

There is another example that indicates to differences in viewing the world between the two languages of the study, it can be said that it has a cultural background. The example is in situations or contexts like when two persons are doing something or did something the speaker usually mentions the name of his/her partner first then mentions his/her own name to precede the role of his/her partner before him/hers, the purpose is to avoid of being selfish. In Kurdish language and culture the case is exactly the opposite, the speaker is usually mentions his/her own name to make his/her role prominent and gives his /her partner a secondary role, which of course it is a kind of selfishness on the part of the speaker.

Moreover, in terms of Religion, our experiences, environment, beliefs and attitudes influence our behaviour, and determine our actions. Those beliefs that are widely accepted become part of our culture and, in many ways, shape the society we live in. There are various religions and sects in Kurdistan that each one has created a foundation for a distinct social identity (Mofidi and Rahmani, 2018:6). In Kurdish language, the expression "*asalaamu alaikum*" (peace be with you), to which you should respond "*wa alaikum salaam*" (and peace be with you too) are used for greetings, it has religious influence since the majority of Kurdish people are Muslims by religion. But in English language, 'how do you do' or 'Hello' is used for formal greetings. Moreover, The phrases such as '*Jesus*

*Christ*' or '*Jesus*' are widely used among religious and non-religious English people in speech, print-based writing, and digital communication as a casual way to express a great range of motions; These expletive interjections refer to the Christian religious figure of '*Jesus Christ*'. They are typically uttered in anger, surprise, or frustration, though sometimes also with humorous intent. The expressions "Christ", "Jesus", and "Jesus Christ" are also used as exclamations or expletives in English-speaking, Christian-influenced societies

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus\\_H.\\_Chris](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus_H._Chris))

Moreover, A clear evidence of the different view between English and Kurdish society in terms of religion is naming the months of the year or can be said the meaning of the names of months. As far as English language is concerned that the name of the months are named after the roman gods and the rest are named for roman numbers, it can be said in English the names of the months has a religious and historical background. This matter is explained in a website namely (The British museum) as the following:

**January** is named after the Roman god Janus. The god had two faces so he could see the future and the past! He was also the god of doors.

**February** is named after an ancient Roman festival of purification called Februa.

**March** is named after Mars, the Roman god of war.

**April** takes its name from the Latin word *aperire*, meaning 'to open' (just like

flowers do in spring!). The Romans called the month Aprilis.

**May** is named after the Greek goddess Maia.

**June** is named after the Roman goddess Juno – the god of marriage and childbirth, and the wife of Jupiter, king of the gods.

**July** and **August** were named after two major figures of the ancient Roman world – the statesman Julius Caesar and Rome's first emperor, Augustus.

But what about the rest? **September, October, November** and **December** are named after Roman numbers 7, 8, 9 and 10 – they were originally the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth months of the Roman year!

In Kurdish language the name of the months has something to do with nature and weather, it can be said it has an agricultural background, as it is explained in a website namely (Roj Bash Kurdistan, 2005) as the following:

**Rebandan** it means the earth is frozen.

**Rashameh** it means people's complexion became darker.

**Khakalew / Nawroz** it means a new day of spring.

**Gulan / Banamar** it means the flowers are blossoming.

**Jozardan** it means barley becomes yellow.

**Pushpar** it means all types of grass become yellow.

**Kharmanan** it means people are collecting their crops.

**Galawezh** it means summer time.

**Razbar** it means people are collecting their fruits from the trees.

**Khazalwar / Galarezan** it means the leaves of the trees are falling, it indicates autumn.

**Sarmawarz** it means the cold weather starts.

**Bafranbar** it means the snow falls.

The only month that English and Kurdish societies have the same view about is **April** because in both languages it indicates to a spring month that flowers are blossoming and the ground becomes alive again.

## 6. Conclusion

There is no adequate evidence to ensure that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is correct in one hundred percent. However, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has strong and weak points as well. It is quite plausible that language influences the way of thinking, but the hypothesis exaggerates the decisive role of language and ignores the social and culture factors on language. In this study it can be concluded that many different factors have to be taken into account like different speakers from different places, cultures, traditions and religions. Linguistic thought will be different according to different mother languages, cultures and religions.

The relationship between language and thought is not generally posed in the hope that someone will come up with a definite answer, because the language system does not necessarily provide specifics of one's world views. For instance, people speaking the same language may have different world views; On the other hand, people speaking different

languages may have similar political, religious and philosophical views.

One of the things that can be concluded from this paper is that the strong version of the hypothesis that language determines thought has no support in the modern world of linguistics, but it is used as a support for its weak version “Linguistic Relativity” because there is quite a lot of evidence for the effect that language has on thought.

It can also be concluded that the Kurdish language focuses on the surface structure or, denotation of the words, Kurdish language only shows the beauty and simplicity of life that is reflected in its words, which is completely different from English Language. English language laid great stress on a deeper dive or connotation of words. Kurdish language is a synthetic language whereas English language to a high extent is an isolating language which is inevitably also called analytic language. Culture and religion plays an important role in influencing the way of thinking.

### References

Brown, R. (1976). Reference in memorial tribute to Eric Lenneberg. In: Cognition. Edited by Steven Sloman et al. (Vol. 4, No. 2). Melbourne et al.: Elsevier.

Carruthers, P. 2002. The cognitive functions of language. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 25. 657–726.

Carroll, J. (Ed.). (1956). Language, thought and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.

Chandler, D.(2002). Semiotics: The Basics (1<sup>st</sup> edn). London: Routledge.

Deutscher, G. (2010). Through the Language Glass. Why the world looks different in other languages. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Deacon, Terrence W. (1997). The symbolic species: The co-evolution of language and the brain. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Encyclopedia britannica macropedia. (1982) 15th Ed, 10, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fodor, J. A. 1998. Concepts: Where cognitive science went wrong. Oxford: Clarendon Press. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0198236360.001.0001>

Formigari, L. (2004). A History of Language Philosophies. Philadelphia et al.: John Benjamins.

Friedrich, P. (1986). The language parallax. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Frawley ,W.(1992). Linguistic semantics. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hill, J. & Mannheim, B. (1992). Language and Worldview. In: Annual Review of Anthropology. Edited by Richard Gallagher et al. (Vol. 21) Palo Alto et al.: Annual Reviews.

Jackendoff, R. (2002). Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kay, P., & Kempton, W. (1984). What is the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis? *American Anthropologist*, 86, 65-79. Retrieved from: <https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1525/aa.1984.86.1.02a00050>

Khalid, H.S. (2020). Kurdish Language, its Family and Dialects. International Journal of Kuriname, 2 , 134-146. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341030310\\_KURDISH\\_LANGUAGE\\_ITS\\_FAMILY\\_AND\\_DIALECTS](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341030310_KURDISH_LANGUAGE_ITS_FAMILY_AND_DIALECTS)

Khalid, H.S. & Hamamorad, A.M. (2015). New Forms and Functions of Subordinate

Clause in Kurdish. *International Journal of Kurdish Studies*, 1 (2), pp. 1 – 14. Retrieved from:

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281068221\\_New\\_Forms\\_and\\_Functions\\_of\\_Subordinate-Clause\\_in\\_Kurdish](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281068221_New_Forms_and_Functions_of_Subordinate-Clause_in_Kurdish)

Koerner, E. F. K. (2002). On the Sources of the 'Sapir Whorf Hypothesis'. In Edward Sapir : critical assessments of leading linguists (2007). Ed. E.F.K. Koerner. London: Routledge.

Lucy, John. (1992). *Language diversity and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Martin, L. (1986). "Eskimo Words for Snow": A case study in the Genesis and decay of an anthropological example. *American Anthropologist*, New Series, 88.

Millikan, R. G. (2005). *Language: A biological model*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0199284768.001.0001>

Mofidi, S. & Rahmani, S. (2019). The effect of Religion on the political identity of Kurdish youth. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2(1). Retrieved from : [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337040780\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Religion\\_on\\_the\\_Political\\_Identity\\_of\\_Kurdish\\_Youth\\_With\\_a\\_Focus\\_on\\_the\\_University\\_Students/link/5dce82d7a6fdcc7e138229bf/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337040780_The_Effect_of_Religion_on_the_Political_Identity_of_Kurdish_Youth_With_a_Focus_on_the_University_Students/link/5dce82d7a6fdcc7e138229bf/download)

Moravcsik, J. M. (1981). Frege and Chomsky on thought and language. *Midwest Studies In Philosophy* , 6(1), pp. 105–124. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.1981.tb00431.x>

Mykhailyuk, O.Yu. & Pohlod, H. Ya. (2015). The languages we speak affect our perceptions of the world. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 2(2-3), pp. 36-41. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283783768\\_The\\_Languages\\_We\\_Speak\\_Affect\\_Our\\_Perceptions\\_of\\_the\\_World](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283783768_The_Languages_We_Speak_Affect_Our_Perceptions_of_the_World)

Orwell, G.(1984). 35th Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company 1961.

Penn, J. M. (1972). Linguistic Relativity versus Innate Ideas: The Origins of the Sapir

Whorf Hypothesis in German Thought. Paris: Mouton.

Pinker, S. & Bloom, P. (1990) . Natural language and natural selection. *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 13, pp.707–784. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00081061>

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. New York: Harper.

Riccardi, A.( Ed.). (2002). *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Rollins, P. (1980). Benjamin Lee Whorf: Lost generation theories of mind, language and religion. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Sapir, E. (1929). The Status of Linguistics as a Science. In E. Sapir (1958): *Culture, Language and Personality*. Ed. D. G. Mandelbaum. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Shay, S. (2008). *The History of English : A linguistic introduction*. Washington:wardja press.

Steinberg, D. D. (1982). *Psycholinguistics: Language, mind and world*. New York: Longman.

Thomson, D.S. (1975). *From Human Behaviour: Language*. Time-Life Books, Inc.

Tsoi, T.(2019) The Relationship between Language and Thought. pp. 4. Retrived from internet (May 6, 2019). <http://www.thomastsoi.com/2010/03/the-relationship-between-language-and-thought/>

Von Humboldt, W. (1999). Edited by Losonsky, Michael: *On Language. On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, X.(2017). Acritical review on the Sapir -Whorf hypothesis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 4(8), pp.21-22. Retrieved from :

<http://www.allsubjectjournal.com/archives/2017/vol4/issue8/4-7-182>

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. (1956). Language, thought and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Ed. John B. Carroll. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Williams, Joanna Radwanska. 1993. Expression and communication as basic linguistic functions. Intercultural Communication Studies 3. 91–100.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. (1984). Tractatus Logico-philosophicus. In: Werkausgabe Band 1. Edited by Joachim Schulte Frankfurt a.M.: suhrkamp.

Wolff, Ph.; Holmes, K. J. (2011). Linguistic Relativity. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science 2.

Yule, George. (1996). The Study of Language. 2nd Edition. New York et al.: Cambridge University Press.

Zlatev, J.& Blomberg, J.(2015). Language may indeed influence thought. Frontiers in Psychology. Retrieved on

The British museum (2017), what's in a name? Months of the year, viewed 19 April 2021,  
<https://blog.britishmuseum.org/whats-in-a-name-months-of-the-year/>

Roj Bash Kurdistan (2005), Kurdish Months, viewed 19 April 2021,  
<http://rojbash.org/forums/viewtopic.php?f=8&t=348>  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus\\_H.\\_Christ](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesus_H._Christ)