

МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81-112.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/42-1-15>

Vladyslava BEZBORODA,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8585-3413

*Postgraduate student at the Department of German and Slavic Philology
Donbas State Pedagogical University
(Sloviansk, Donetsk region, Ukraine) vysochina.vladislava@gmail.com*

O. POTEBNIA: LANGUAGE – THOUGHT – FOLK SPIRIT – NATIONALITY

In the article the author studies the concepts of “language”, “thought”, “folk spirit”, and “nationality” in the works of the prominent Ukrainian linguist O. Potebnia. The purpose of the article is to systematize the scientist's views on the relationship between language and thinking, the phenomenon of language, nationality and national spirit. It has been revealed that the Ukrainian linguist studied the language in connection with the history of the people and the development of human consciousness, and a comparative analysis to explain the facts of the development of language consciousness helped him justify how it manifested itself differently in every nations. The linguist's psychological concept of the thought, language and spirit of the people is cultural-historical, because the spirit of the people is manifested not only in morals, customs and traditions, but also in language.

We researched the problem of the genesis of language, as a result of which we learned that O. Potebnia developed his own concept of the origin of language, using the term “apperception”. We considered the internal form of the word as one of the central problems in the work of the Ukrainian scientist. It was revealed that the methodological positions of the linguist are closely connected with the research of W. Humboldt, because O. Potebnia considered cultural-historical, linguistic-philosophical, socio-psychological phenomena as a whole. The article provides a classification of the meaning of words and presents their characteristics, resulting in the cause of a large number of meanings for one word. It is proved that the word as a result of the development of thinking at a certain level acts as a means of combining articulate sound with the sensory image. It has been discovered that in the concept of the Ukrainian scientist, language is a necessary element for the objectification of human ideas, the existence of scientific discourse, as well as for individual thinking, because most human thinking depends on concepts related to language.

The author came to the conclusion that within the psychological direction the scientist managed to combine the achievements of many sciences, thanks to which psychology became the subject of a scientific approach to solving philosophical and linguistic problems. The proposed study is promising for understanding the hypothesis of linguistic relativity, because the ideological and ethnic side of the linguistic-philosophical concept of O. Potebnia is the initial ideas of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.

Key words: *language, thought, folk spirit, nationality.*

Владислава БЕЗБОРОДА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8585-3413

аспірант кафедри германської та слов'янської філології

*Державного вищого навчального закладу «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет
(Слов'янськ, Донецька область, Україна) vysochina.vladislava@gmail.com*

O. POTEBNIA: MOVA – MISLENNIA – NARODNIY DUH – NARODNIST'Y

Статтю присвячено дослідженню концептів «мови», «мислення», «народного духу» та «народності» у працях видатного українського мовознавця О. Потебні. Метою статті є систематизування поглядів вченого на взаємозв'язок мови та мислення, феномен мови, народність та народний дух. Виявлено, що український лінгвіст вивчав мову у зв'язку з історією народу та розвитком людської свідомості, а порівняльний аналіз у поясненні фактів розвитку мовної свідомості допоміг йому довести, як вона неоднаково виявляється в різних народів. Психологічна концепція мовознавця про думку, мову та дух народу є культурно-історичною, адже дух народу проявляється не лише в моралі, звичаях та традиціях, але й у мові.

Ми дослідили проблему генезису мови, внаслідок чого дізналися, що О. Потебня розробив власну концепцію походження мови, використовуючи термін «аперцепція». Ми розглянули внутрішню форму слова як одну із центральних проблем у творчості українського вченого. Виявлено, що методологічні позиції лінгвіста тісно пов'язані з дослідженнями В. Гумбольдта, адже О. Потебня розглявав культурно-історичні, лінгво-філософські, соціально-психологічні явища як одне ціле. У статті надано класифікацію значення слів та представлено їх характеристику, в результаті чого виявлено причину великої кількості значень для одного слова. Доведено, що

слово як результат розвитку мислення на певному рівні виступає як засіб поєднання членороздільного звуку з чуттєвим образом. Зазначимо, що в концепції українського вченого мова є необхідним елементом для об'єктивації людських ідей, існування наукового дискурсу, а також для мислення індивіда, адже більша частина мислення людини залежить від концептів, що пов'язані з мовою.

Автор дійшла висновку, що в межах психологічного напрямку вченому вдалося поєднати досягнення багатьох наук, завдяки чому психологія стала предметом наукового підходу до вирішення філософсько-лінгвістичних проблем. Пропоноване дослідження є перспективним для розуміння гіпотези лінгвістичної відносності, адже ідеологічна сторона лінгвофілософської концепції О. О. Потебні – початкові ідеї гіпотези Сепіра-Уорфа.

Ключові слова: мова, мислення, народний дух, народність.

Formulation of the problem. In modern linguistics, the question of the relation between language and culture, language and people, language and thought is not new. It has been studied for many years. Prominent German linguist W. Humboldt proposed a theoretical development to provide solutions to these issues, and gave a leading role to language in relation to various phenomena. The Ukrainian linguist O. Potebnia interpreted Humboldt's ideas and laid the foundations of a new trend in the development of linguistics, which determined the effectiveness of philosophical and linguistic research. Various aspects of O. Potebnia's work have been in the circle of linguists' interests of different countries for many years, and there is a lot of research on the works of the scientist's theoretical heritage.

An analysis of studies. Within the research topic, the works of I. Khairullin, L. Bulahovskii, L. Zubkova, A. Lipov, N. Bezlepkin, O. Fedorenko, and G. Spitsyna are of scientific interest to us. In this linguistic works, the philosophical and linguistic views of the scientist are studied.

The purpose of the article is to systematize the views of the scientist on the phenomenon of language, folk spirit, nationality, the relationship between language and thought.

Presentation of the main research material. The Ukrainian scholar was the founder of the modern approach to ethnolinguistics, historical dialectology, phonetics, cultural anthropology (Lipov, 2012: 36). According to I. Khairullin, the main merit of the linguist is the attempt to apply the linguistic concept of W. Humboldt to the actual material of the Russian language (Khairullin, 2008: 18).

O. Potebnia's scientific method was unique, because he considered cultural-historical, linguo-philosophical, socio-psychological phenomena as a whole unit. Therefore, it is possible to explain why the methodological positions of the Ukrainian scientist are so closely connected with the researches of W. Humboldt, who studied carefully the relationship between thinking and language (Lipov, 2012: 36).

The Ukrainian scholar was one of the first to study the history of thinking in connection with the development of language, as well as to determine the

main semantic principles of human awareness of the main categorical relations of reality (Potebnia, 1976). According to S. Borodai, O. Potebnia accepted the main provisions of W. Humboldt's teachings through the prism of Steinthal (Borodai, 2020: 31). For the scientist the central problem was "language and thought". Developing the idea of W. Humboldt, Potebnia studied how people explore the world, and how concepts are formed. Studying language as a form of creative activity, the scientist explained the peculiarity of poetic language and artistic expression, as well as laid the foundation for the study of the poetics of verbal art (Potebnia, 1990: 5). O. Potebnia's approach to language was based on two fundamental ideas that were introduced by W. Humboldt. The first idea included the understanding of languages as the embodiment of creative energy, the second idea used the concept of "internal form" of the word regarded as the main means through which the creative spirit of language is manifested in the matter of language (Gasparov, 1994: 94).

Humboldt's antinomies became the beginning of Potebnia's teachings, which is why it is necessary to study the epistemology and ontology of the Ukrainian scientist through the prism of a German linguist. Y. Sytko concludes that the ontological views of the Ukrainian scientist fit into the framework of anthropocentric relationalist ontology, which is a component of the functional pragmatic methodology (Sytko, 17: 38).

In their works G. Shpitsyna, I. Khairullin, L. Bulakhovsky and N. Bezlepkin write about Potebnia's division of the word meanings into "the nearest" and "the furthest" (Shpitsyna, 2005; Khairullin, 2008; Bulahovskii, 1952; Bezlepkin, 2002). Each word has two meanings, the first is objective (contains only one feature), and the second is subjective (contains several features) (Potebnia, 1990: 9). For the Ukrainian scientist, "the nearest" meaning is more common, the same for native speakers of one language, and "the furthest" is "the area of individual subjective thought, without which the general meaning of the word, ..., can not be complete" (Shpitsyna, 2005: 250).

Using the concepts of "the nearest" and "the furthest", the scientist proved that a man is responsible

for preserving the history of the past and enriching words with new meanings (Khairullin, 2008: 10). That is why in the language of each nation you can find a large number of different meanings for one word. During communication, a person identifies one of the most important features for him, which forms the nearest etymological meaning. The meaning of this concept is the internal form of the word, which makes possible mutual understanding between people (Bezlepkin, 2002: 143–144).

Studying the historical genesis of language and thought, the Ukrainian scientist develops the doctrine of the internal form of the word. O. Potebnia divided language into three main elements: external form (articulated sound), internal form (method of conveying the meaning of a word), and content (idea) (Fizer, 1982: 6–7). The external and internal forms cannot be separated from the content, the three components are organically connected and are determined by the property of thought and idea (Potebnia, 1976: 18).

According to B. Gasparov, O. Potebnia continued Humboldt's original idea, emphasizing that the internal form of a word always has the character of a tangible and vivid image. This characteristic of the internal form allows it to become a formative force in the formation of the word and its meaning. Due to the presence of a formative image, the meaning of the word can be perceived in its entirety and immediacy. Thus, for a native speaker, the word can be understood as a whole, because its meaning is fixed in a holistic image, which was created by the representation of the native speaker (Gasparov, 1994: 95). M. Krongauz claims that Potebnia rethought an important but not entirely clear concept of the internal form of language, which Humboldt contrasted with the external. Ukrainian scientist managed to transfer this idea to the word and specify in more detail (Krongauz, 2005: 86).

In the scientific work, Z. Karamanova writes about three types of development of the internal form:

1) simple matrices (consisting of a limited set of reflexive vectors) – the product of “processed” thought, have a nominative function and an everyday understanding;

2) complex matrices (have an extensive network of thought vectors): the formation of such matrices is associated with the complexity of thought and the need to express it. Replacing a simple form with a complex one is the creation of a new form of thought, this function Potebnia named “thickening of thought”. Complex structures can include proverbs, sayings, aphorisms, as well as individual words that have become stable poetic images, words-symbols and words-ideas (Karamanova, 2009: 39–40).

The scientific perception of the world in the work “Thought and Language” is characterized by forgetting the inner form; to change the sensory image is an abstract concept, which creates the possibility of movement of large mental masses, ie there is a “thickening of thought” (Bezlepkin, 2002: 158);

3) complicated internal form of the word: the internal relationship between word and thought can be a function of semantic formation, in this case the internal form of the word acts as a potential entity (Karamanova, 2009: 40).

In the late period of language, there are words whose content and external form are logically related, but still, there are words that lack imagery. The external form of the word has two sides: physical and mental. As long as there is a representation of the image, the external form acts as a sign in relation to it, a sign of the sign in relation to “the nearest” and “the furthest”. In case of forgetting the representation of the image, the external sign is a sign to the nearest, and also a sign to “the furthest” (Zubkova, 2002: 11).

In his research, O. Potebnia tried to identify the relationship between language and thinking, in his opinion, these two concepts are closely linked, but it is impossible to put them on the same level. “Language is a necessary condition for the thought of an individual, even in complete solitude, because the concept is formed only by words, and without a concept the true thinking is impossible” (Potebnia, 1989: 40). Thinking is impossible without language, because language is a means of expression, transmission and receipt of thought, the transition from the unconscious to the conscious. Language generates thinking, which changes over time, creating creative and intellectual forms (Salimgareeva, 2014: 231). O. Palkin points out that the motto of the scientist can be considered the following statement, “Language is an organ that forms thought” (Palkin, 2014: 55).

In the question of the interaction between language and thought, the scientist adhered to the opinion of W. Humboldt, and recognized their unity. O. Potebnia did not limit himself only to psychology to study this issue, but sought to determine the specifics of language as a single and special system. Studying the strong connection between language and thinking, Potebnia argues that the creation of thinking and its implementation arise through language, although it points to their differences (Sharafutdinova, 2006: 179). Language is a necessary condition for the thought of an individual, even in complete solitude, because the concept is formed only by words, and without the concept of true thinking is impossible.

The Ukrainian linguist concludes that thought is not always inextricably linked to the word, and as an

example, he speaks of musicians and painters who do not need words, although it assumes a certain degree of development, which is provided by language. Thus, language does not always coincide with the word, it cannot be related to the word at the initial stage of human development, and at the highest stage of abstraction thought leaves the word, because the word does not meet the needs of thinking. The scientist is of the opinion that the word is necessary for the spiritual development and activity of man, so that the person gained consciousness (Beloded, 1977: 8). Thus, the question of the genesis of language becomes psychological.

O. Potebnia develops Humboldt's idea of the absence of thought in the finished form of the word, but the word must be understood as the unity of "transformation and creation", and as the result of this, the disadvantage of the given theory can be found: thinking is considered too simplistic (Salimgareeva, 2014: 56). In his work O. Potebnia makes assumptions about the existence of wordless thinking. "There is no doubt that those actions of our thought which, at the moment of their realization, do not require a direct language manual, take place very quickly. In circumstances that require immediate reflection and action, such as an unexpected question, when a lot depends on what our answer will be, a person can think a lot without saying a word in an instant. But language does not deprive a person of this ability, but on the contrary, if it does not give, then at least strengthens it" (Potebnia, 1976: 167). Only in words does thought take its place in the system of human knowledge. "Wordless" thinking is based on thinking associated with the word.

In addition to "language" and "thought", O. Potebnia pays great attention to such categories as "people" and "nationality". The linguist holds the view that the people are the creators of language, and language is the product of the "folk spirit". In the term "nationality" it is the language that determines the national specificity of the people (Potebnia, 1989: 5). In his work "Language и nationality" O. Potebnia gives the following explanation, "Nationality is what distinguishes one nation from another. But why, exactly, do we consider a known population to be one people? Not by the unity of origin, and not by the similarity of the external type, we call the people – the people. The peoples have long gone beyond tribal unity and divided many tribes" (Potebnia, 1913: 221).

The study of the historical and philosophical aspect of the importance of language in the development of the people proves that this problem is considered quite actively during the turning point in the life of the people. During this period, language is not only a

means of forming national consciousness, but also an effective means of identifying the people (Fedorenko, 2005: 3). The Ukrainian linguist studied the language in connection with the history of the people and the development of human consciousness, and "comparative analysis in explaining the facts of the development of linguistic consciousness helped him to show how it manifests itself differently in different nations" (Mex p. 34) The world is known by man not only through language but also aesthetic, intellectual and moral worldview. Of course, the main component is the language, which preserves the history of the people and is a means of national self-identification (Fedorenko, 2005: 16).

In order to develop his own philosophical and linguistic doctrine, O. Potebnia began to study in depth the question of the genesis of language. In his opinion, the study of the origin of language should be the beginning of solving the problem of the relationship between language and thinking. In the scientific world, the most common concepts of the origin of language were the following: the doctrine of purposeful creation of language; theory of the divine origin of language; theory of the natural origin of language. The scientist emphasizes the importance of a scientific approach to solving the problem of language (Bezlepkin, 2002: 138).

As for the purposeful creation of language, Potebnia believes that at first people existed as animals, but later they felt the urge to create a society and communication. Most likely, people began to use facial expressions, but this was not enough, they noticed that mental movements made them reproduce sounds known to them, which they understood well. As a result, mankind began to use this discovery and make sounds as signs of thoughts (Potebnia, 1989: 20).

The hypothesis of the divine origin of language contains two theses:

- 1) God spoke, and people understood him;
- 2) language is directly embedded in a person.

The scholar criticizes both theses. In his opinion, in the first case, people could understand this language if they knew it, or would create their own; in the second case – "if a man is given only the embryos of forces necessary for the creation of the word, and if the development of these forces occurred according to the laws of nature, the beginning of language is human, and God can be called the creator of language only in the sense in which he is a Creator of the world. Thus there is only one assumption that highly perfect language is immediately inspired by man in incomprehensible ways" (Potebnia, 1989: 22).

The most consistent representatives of the hypothesis of the unconscious origin of language were

K. Becker and A. Schleicher. The main idea of this concept was the study of language as an organism. Becker believed that a person needs to speak, because a person thinks, just as a person needs to breathe. Potebnia is critical of this view, because if we compare the creation of language with the physiological process of respiration, the existence of thinking about language is assumed, as the existence of air to the process of respiration (Bezlepkin, 2002: 140).

O. Potebnia notes, “For the theory of intentional creation, the progress of language is impossible, because it matters when it is no longer needed; for the theory of divine origin – progress must be regress; for the theory of the unconscious origin of language, progress can exist only in the movement of sounds” (Potebnia, 1989: 39). The analysis of views on the origin of language convinced the Ukrainian scientist that their existing methodology destroys any possibility of scientific research of the problem. That is why the scientist believes that approaches to elucidating the nature of language should be sought not only through linguistic or logical means (Bezlepkin, 2002: 140).

The Ukrainian linguist proposed his own concept of the origin of language, using the term “apperception”. During the formation of language and its development, an important role is played by the sensory image, which arises due to the diversity of the same perceptions. Accumulated perceptions contribute to the “awakening of the soul”, which classifies them by apperception, and they encourage people to express their feelings through sounds (Salimgareeva, 2014: 231). N. Bezlepkin believes that Potebnia's theory opposes the concepts of the origin of

language mentioned above. The basis of the ideas of the Ukrainian linguist is linguistic and psychological science, and he demonstrates the application of the philosophical method in solving the scientific problem (Bezlepkin, 2002: 145).

Conclusions. From the above we can draw the following conclusions: for the first time in Ukrainian linguistics O. Potebnia applied a psychological approach to language, carefully studying such problems of linguistics as the genesis and development of language, the relationship of language and thinking, words and concepts, three-membered language structure, etc. Language is a psychological phenomenon, because it is an accessible reflection for the observation of human psychological experiences (Khairullin, 2008: 8).

O. Potebnia's philosophical and linguistic concept is of interest not only to linguists and historians, but also to culturologists, semioticians, and specialists in the field of poetics and aesthetics. The concept of a three-member word structure has always been a topical issue. The developed ideas were continued in the works of G. Shpet, F. de Saussure, D. Ovsyanyko-Kulikovsky, N. Van-Weik, G. Hirt, and L. Bulakhovsky. O. Potebnia's contribution to the development of the philosophy of language is quite large, he laid the foundations of a new trend in the development of linguistics, which determined the effectiveness of philosophical and linguistic research. Within the psychological field, the scientist managed to combine the achievements of many sciences, thanks to which psychology has become the subject of a scientific approach to solving philosophical and linguistic problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Fizer J. Potebnia's views of the structure of the work of poetic art: a critical retrospection. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1982. Vol. 6, No. 1. P. 5–24.
2. Gasparov B. From the romantic past to the modern world: historical-cultural underpinnings of Potebnia's thought on language. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1994. Vol. 18, No. 1. P. 94–103.
3. Безлепкин Н. И. Философия языка в России: К истории русской лингвофилософии. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПб, 2002. 272 с.
4. Белодед А. И. Грамматическая концепция А. А. Потебни в истории отечественного языкознания : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.01. Москва, 1977. 50 с.
5. Бородай С. Ю. Язык и познание. Введение в пострелятивизм. Москва : ООО «Садра» : Издательский Дом ЯСК, 2020. 800 с.
6. Булаховский Л. А. Александр Афанасьевич Потебня (К шестидесятилетию со дня смерти) / отв. ред. А. И. Белицкий. Киев : Издательство Киевского государственного университета им. Т. Г. Шевченко, 1952. 46 с.
7. Зубкова Л. Г. Язык в зеркале системных знаковых теорий: Платона – В. фон Гумбольдт – А. А. Потебня. *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов*. Москва. 2002. № 3. С. 4–22.
8. Караманова З. Я. О смысловом потенциале слова (в развитие идей А. А. Потебни). *Вестник Челябинского государственного университета*. Челябинск. 2009. Вып. 30. С. 36–43.
9. Кронгауз М. А. Семантика. Москва : Академия, 2005. 352 с.
10. Липов А. Слово в философско-лингвистической концепции Александра Потебни. *Acta Neophilologica*. 2012. № 14 (1). С. 31–49.
11. Палкин А. Д. Трактовка взаимосвязи языка и мышления: исторический экскурс. *Вестник Московского института лингвистики*. 2014. № 1. С. 54.

12. Потебня А. А. Мысль и язык. Изд. 3-е, доп. Харьков : Мирный Труд, 1913. 225 с.
13. Потебня А. А. Слово и миф / отв. ред. А. К. Байбурун. Москва : Правда, 1989. 624 с.
14. Потебня А. А. Теоретическая поэтика / сост., вступ. ст., коммент. А. Б. Муратова. Москва : Высшая школа, 1990. 344 с.
15. Потебня А. А. Эстетика и поэтика. Москва : Искусство, 1976. 614 с.
16. Салимгареева Г. Р. Онтологические основания языка в учении А. А. Потебни. *Молодой ученый*. 2014. № 5 (64). С. 229–231.
17. Ситько Ю. Л. Бытование функционально-прагматической методологии в отечественном языкознании 60-х годов XIX века 1-ой половины XX века (на примере понятия части речи) : монография. Севастополь : Рибэст, 2007. 140 с.
18. Федоренко А. А. Проблема взаимосвязи языка и народа в творчестве А. А. Потебни и Н. С. Трубецкого (историко-философский анализ) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук : 09.00.03. Москва, 2005. 22 с.
19. Хайруллин И. И. Философские идеи в наследии А. А. Потебни : автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук : 09.00.03. Мурманск, 2008. 18 с.
20. Шарафутдинова Н. С. Теория и история лингвистической науки: учебное пособие. Ульяновск : УлГТУ, 2006. 284 с.
21. Шпицына Г. М. Учение А. А. Потебни и современные семантические теории. *Лингвистические и методические основы филологической подготовки учителя-словесника*: материалы междунар. науч.-метод. конф. Т. 1. Старый Оскол, 2005. С. 247–253.

REFERENCES

1. Fizer J. Potebnja's views of the structure of the work of poetic art: a critical retrospection. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1982. Vol. 6, No. 1. Pp. 5–24 [in English].
2. Gasparov B. From the romantic past to the modern world: historical-cultural underpinnings of Potebnja's thought on language. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1994. Vol. 18, No. 1. Pp. 94–103 [in English].
3. Bezlepkin N. I. *Filosofiya yazyka v Rossii*. [Philosophy of Language in Russia]. St. Petersburg: Iskustvo–SPB, 2002. 272 p. [in Russian]
4. Beloded A. I. Grammaticheskaya kontseptsiya A. A. Potebni v istorii otechestvennogo yazykoznanija [The grammatical concept of A.A. Potebnya in the history of Russian linguistics]: author. dis. ... Doctor of Philological Science: 10.02.01. Moscow, 1977. 50 p. [in Russian]
5. Borodai S. YU. *Yazyk i poznanie. Vvedenie v postrelativizm*. [Language and cognition. An introduction to the postrelativism]. Moscow: OOO «SadrA»: Izdatel'skii Dom YASK, 2020. 800 p. [in Russian]
6. Bulakhovskii L. A. Aleksandr Afanas'evich Potebnya (K shestidesyatiletiju so dnya smerti) [Alexander Afanasyevich Potebnia (On the sixtieth anniversary of his death)] / Publishing editor A. I. Belitskii. Kiev: T. G. Shevchenko National University of Kyiv University Press, 1952. 46 p. [in Russian]
7. Zubkova L. G. *Yazyk v zerkale sistemnykh znakovykh teorii: Platona – V. fon Gumboldt – A. A. Potebnya*. [Language in the mirror of systemic sign theories: Plato – W. von Humboldt – A. Potebnia]. *Bulletin of RUDN University*. 2002. No. 3. Pp. 4–22 [in Russian].
8. Karamanova Z. YA. O smyslovom potentsiale slova (v razvitie idei A. A. Potebni). [On the semantic potential of the word (in the development of the ideas of A.A. Potebnia)]. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University*. 2009, 30. Pp. 36–43 [in Russian].
9. Krongauz M. A. *Semantika*. [Semantics]. Moscow : Akademiya, 2005. 352 p. [in Russian]
10. Lipov A. Slovo v filosofsko-lingvisticheskoi kontseptsii Aleksandra Potebni. [The word in the philosophical and linguistic concept of Alexander Potebnia]. *Acta Neophilologica*. 2012. No. 14 (1). Pp. 31–49 [in Russian].
11. Palkin A. D. *Traktovka vzaimosvyazi yazyka i myshleniya: istoricheskii ehkurs*. [Interpretation of the relationship between language and thinking: a historical excursion]. *Bulletin of Moscow Linguistics Institute*. 2014. No. 1. P. 54 [in Russian].
12. Potebnya A. A. *Mysl' i yazyk*. [Thought and language]. 3-rd ed., add. Khar'kov : Mirnyi Trud, 1913. 225 p. [in Russian]
13. Potebnya A. A. *Slovo i mif* [Word and Myths] / Publishing editor A. K. Baiburin. Moscow : Pravda, 1989. 624 p. [in Russian]
14. Potebnya A. A. *Teoreticheskaya poehtika* [Theoretical poetics]/ sost., vstup. st., komment. A. B. Muratova. Moscow : Vysshaya shkola, 1990. 344 p. [in Russian]
15. Potebnya A. A. *Ehstetika i poehtika*. [Aesthetics and poetics]. Moscow: Iskustvo, 1976. 614 p. [in Russian]
16. Salimgareeva G. R. *Ontologicheskie osnovaniya yazyka v uchenii A. A. Potebni*. [Ontological foundations of language in the teachings of A. A. Potebnia] *Molodoi uchenyi*. 2014. No. 5 (64). Pp. 229–231 [in Russian].
17. Sit'ko Yu. L. *Bytovanie funktsional'no-pragmaticheskoi metodologii v otechestvennom yazykoznanii 60-kh godov KHIX veka 1-oi poloviny XX veka (na primere ponyatiya chasti rechi)*: monografiya. [The existence of functional-pragmatic methodology in Russian linguistics in the 60s of the 19th century in the first half of the 20th century (using the example of the concept of a part of speech): monograph]. Sevastopol': Ribehst, 2007. 140 p. [in Russian]
18. Fedorenko A. A. *Problema vzaimosvyazi yazyka i naroda v tvorchestve A. A. Potebni i N. S. Trubetskogo (istoriko-filosofskii analiz)*. [The problem of the relationship between language and people in the works of A. A. Potebnia and N. S. Trubetskoy (historical and philosophical analysis)]: author. dis. ... Cand. Philos. Sciences : 09.00.03. Moscow, 2005. 22 p. [in Russian]

19. Khairullin I. I. Filosofskie idei v nasledii A. A. Potebni. [Philosophical ideas in the legacy of A. A. Potebnia]: author. dis. ... Cand. Philos. Sciences : 09.00.03. Murmansk, 2008. 18 p. [in Russian]
20. Sharafutdinova N. S. Teoriya i istoriya lingvisticheskoi nauki. [Theory and history of linguistic science: uchebnoe posobie]. Ul'yanovsk : ULGTU, 2006. 284 p. [in Russian]
21. Shpitsyna G. M. Uchenie A. A. Potebni i sovremennye semanticheskie teorii. [The teachings of A. A. Potebnya and modern semantic theories]. Linguistic and methodological foundations of the philological training of a teacher of language and literature: materials of Intern. scientif. And pract. konf. T. 1. Staryi Oskol, 2005. Pp. 247–253 [in Russian].