CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND INCULTURATION

Chapter III

Man is known as the only being that has a language. Language is the most fundamental aspect of human life that includes nearly everything. Language is a set of symbols governed by a set of rules, which allows people to communicate with each other (both verbal and nonverbal). It is said to be the vehicle of thought that carries the most subtle tool. Man is able to express his thoughts and feelings by the organized use of numerals from ‘zero’ to ‘nine’ and the alphabets from ‘A’ to ‘Z’. Language, is again, constituted with a system of conventional spoken or written symbols by means of which human beings, as members of a social group and participants in its culture, communicate.

Henry Sweet, an English phonetician and language scholar, stated: "Language is the expression of ideas by means of speech-sounds combined into words. Words are combined into sentences, this combination answering to that of ideas into thoughts." The U.S. linguists Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager advanced the following definition: "A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates." Western Philosophy and philosophers associate language with reason, which is also a uniquely human way of using symbols. In Ancient Greek philosophical terminology, the same word, logos, was used as a term for both language or speech and reason. Rules of grammar are one of the characteristics that distinguish language from other forms of communication. Another property of language is that its symbols are arbitrary. In other words, most languages make use of sound, but the combinations of sounds used do not have any necessary and inherent meaning; in other words, they are merely an agreed-upon convention to represent a certain object/purpose by users of that language. This combination is meaningful for one and meaningless for the other. Meaning comes from the convention. Language can be a source of discrimination. It is a common source of confusion, even among members of the same culture. Language is a vital means of transmitting culture. Language is a vital means of transmitting culture. It amounts to saying that the magic
and function of language constitute the basic concerns of man and his civilization.

The three major components of language are sign; act of understanding the signs; and concepts. A set of commonly accepted signs or symbols is only one feature of language; all languages must define (i) the structural relationships between these signs in a system of grammar (syntax) (ii) the context wherein the signs are used (pragmatics). The term pragmatics implies the usage or 'how to make these signs useful to human beings'; and (iii) dependent on their context the content specifies, i.e. its meaning (semantics). The term semantics implies the mechanism by means of which these signs apply to things and acquire a meaning. Thus the three important branches of language are syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

An important feature and an exclusive human trait is that human beings can use signs as organization. In the extreme conditions of pain, he can keep alive the feeling of hope by imagining the rays of happiness expected in near future. Therefore the behavior of man is not just physiologically controlled behavior. He has ability to transform himself against the hard-core necessity of the nature.

**Functions of Language**

The three important usages of language are expressive, imperative and indicative or informative. There is perhaps nothing more subtle than language is, and nothing has as many different uses. Informative language function deals particularly with the communication of information. It affirms or denies propositions e.g., in science. It is used to describe the statement of fact of the world or reason about it, e.g., whether a state of affairs is true or false. These propositions have a truth value. Expressive language function is concerned with expression of feelings or attitudes, it equally evokes feelings. Ordinary language discourses are the expression of emotions, feelings or attitudes. Two main aspects of it are to evoke certain feelings and to express feelings. Directive language function is concerned with the purpose of causing (or
preventing) overt actions. It is most commonly found in commands and requests. Normally it is not considered true or false e.g., open the door.

The common kinds of discourse are mixed type. Though primary function of language is generally said to be communication, the very general functions of language are thought, communication and expression. There are other uses of language also: The formal or ceremonial is something quite different from simply mixing the expressive and directive language functions. Performative utterances of language are those which are used to denote the completion of the action. For example, "I do" in the marriage ceremony and the use of performative verbs such as "accept," "apologize," "congratulate," and "promise." These words denote an action which is performed by using the verb in the first person. Phatic language function "elevator talk" and street-corner conversations are covered under such function.

Linguistics

Linguistics is the study of human language; it is the scientific study of language comprising of a number of sub-fields. At the core of linguistics are the study of language structure (grammar) and the study of meaning (semantics). The first of these encompasses morphology (the formation and composition of words), syntax (the rules that determine how words combine into phrases and sentences) and phonology (the study of sound systems and abstract sound units). Phonetics is a related branch of linguistics concerned with the actual properties of speech sounds (phones), non-speech sounds, and how they are produced and perceived. The latter comprises with semantics and pragmatics. The philologist is concerned primarily with the historical development of languages as it is manifest in written texts and in the context of the associated literature and culture.

Linguists have identified five basic branches of language: semantics, pragmatics, syntax, morphology and phonology.

Semantics

Semantics is the philosophical and scientific study of meaning; the study of the relation between the signs and the objects to which they apply.
It is also called as semiotics, semology, and/or semasiology. The term is one of a group of English words formed from the various derivatives of the Greek verb σημαίνω ("to mean" or "to signify"). The noun semantics and the adjective semantic are derived from σηματικός ("significant meaning" derived from σήμα, sign); semiotics (adjective and noun) comes from σημειοτικός ("pertaining to signs"); semology from σήμα ("sign") + λόγος ("account"); and semasiology from σημασία ("signification") + λόγος ("account"). In general, semantics is the study of meaning; it refers to the ways in which a language conveys meaning. Semantics transcends the literal meaning of words and is culture-dependent. Hence it is among the most difficult aspects of foreign language of which one is not native speaker; and even for those who speak the same language but come from different cultures and convey meaning using words in unique ways. Semantics study how word meanings are combined to form the meanings of sentences. It is defined as the study of meaning of words, phrases, sentences, and texts. Pragmatics is often considered a part of semantics.

**Pragmatics**

It is the study of how utterances are used literally, figuratively etc. in communicative acts; study of the relationship between the sign system and the user. It refers to the ways the members of the speech community achieve their goals using language. Knowing the difference and when to use which style is the essence of pragmatics. It is generally the study of natural language understanding, and specifically the study of how context influences the interpretation of meanings. Pragmatics is interested predominantly in utterances, made up of sentences, and usually in the context of conversations. A distinction is made in pragmatics between sentence meaning and speaker meaning. Sentence meaning is the literal meaning of the sentence, while the speaker meaning is the concept that the speaker is trying to convey. The ability to understand another speaker's intended meaning is called pragmatic competence.
Syntax

The term syntax has its origin from the Greek words 'sun' meaning together' and 'taxis' meaning 'sequence/order'. It is the study of the interrelation of the signs. The arrangement of words in sentences, clauses, and phrases; and the study of the formation of sentences and the relationship of their component parts is called syntax. Sentences are constructed from phrases or groups of words that have a closer relationship to each other than to the words outside the phrase. It may be described as the study of the rules, which govern the way the words in a sentence come together, i.e., the rules of grammar. Thus syntax implies the grammatical use of signs. Very generally, grammar is concerned with the relations between words in sentences. Traditionally, grammar has been divided into syntax and morphology. Syntax deals with the relations between words in sentence structure; and morphology with the internal grammatical structure of words. The distinction between the two is not as clear-cut. Some deny the relevance of distinguishing morphology from syntax at all, referring to grammatical structure as a whole under the term syntax.

Morphology:

Morphology is the study of the internal structure of words. At the basic level, words are made of "morphemes" which are the smallest units of grammar: roots, prefixes, and suffixes such as "hat," "dog," or "love," as well as affixes, such as "un-," "re-," the plural "s" or "es," and the past tense "ed." Knowledge of the morphology of our language is critical to vocabulary development and reflects the smallest building blocks for comprehension. Morphology includes the grammatical processes of inflection (q.v.) and derivation. Inflection marks categories such as person, tense, and case; e.g., "sings" contains a final -s, marker of the 3rd person singular, and the German Mannes consists of the stem Mann and the genitive singular inflection -es. Derivation is the formation of new words from existing words; e.g., "singer" from "sing" and "acceptable" from "accept." Derived words can also be inflected: "singers" from "singer."
People generally tend to think of words as the building blocks of sentences and of sentences as strings of words. But words are not all alike: some words (book) cannot be broken down into smaller elements; others (bookworm) can. The puzzle deepens when we try to translate words from one language into another. Sometimes expressions that require only one word in one language (préciser in French) require more than one word in another (to make precise in English). Other times, we must deal with languages whose utterances cannot easily be broken down into words at all. Looked at from this perspective, it may be said that morphology is the study of the structure of words in a language.

Phonology

The study of the basic sounds of language is called phonology. Speech sounds or sound patterns are studied in phonology. All considerations relating to the use of speech sounds in particular languages fall under the general heading of phonology; phonology is often regarded as one component of language structure. It encompasses the study of speech structure within a language which includes both the patterns of basic speech units and the accepted rules of pronunciation. The smallest units of sound that make up a language are called phonemes. For example, the word “that” contains three phonemes the “th” represents one phoneme /θ/, the “a” maps to the short a sound /ə/, and the “t” to its basic sound /t/; these actual sounds coming out of our mouths are called phones, and they vary continuously in acoustic properties. Part of the phonologist’s job is to map possible arrangements of speech organs that human beings may use to create the sounds of language. Another part is to examine individual languages to discover the particular sound combinations they contain and the patterns into which those sound combinations are organized. No language makes use of all the many sounds the human speech organs can produce, and no two languages use exactly the same set. Some linguists include phonetics, the study of the production and description of speech sounds, within the study of phonology. Whereas phonetics is
about the nature of sounds (or phones) per se, phonology describes the way sounds function within a given language.

Phonetics

The study of speech sounds and of the physiology of speaking is called phonetics; Phonetics covers much of the ground loosely referred to in language study as pronunciation. It is the study of the different sounds that are employed across all human languages.

Origin of Language

The use of language is one of the most conspicuous traits that distinguishes Homo sapiens from other species. The study about origin of language is known as glottogony. It is a topic that has attracted considerable attention throughout human history. The origin of language is of great interest to men because language is very essential characteristic of human culture. In classical Greek philosophy such inquiry was approached by considering the nature of things. Aristotle treated humans as creatures with reason and language by their intrinsic nature, related to their natural propensities to be "political," and dwell in city-state communities (Greek: poleis)\(^1\) Some philosophers like Hobbes, John Locke etc., propounded that language is an extension of the "speech" which humans have within themselves, which in a sense takes the classical Greek view that reason is the most primary characteristic feature of human nature. Others like Rousseau consider the opposite. They suppose that reason developed out of the need for more complex communication. Rousseau claimed\(^2\) that there had once been humans (primitive man) who had no language or reason. This primitive man developed first language and then reason. Rousseau explicitly described this development as a mixed blessing, with many negative characteristics. Merlin Donald writes "A shared communicative culture, with sharing of mental representations to some degree, must have come first, before language, creating a social environment in which language would have been useful and adaptive."\(^3\)
Philosophers and linguists agree that today there exists no primitive language and that all modern languages are quite complex. While existing languages differ in terms of the size of and subjects covered by their lexicons, all possess the grammar and syntax necessary for communication and can invent, translate, or borrow the vocabulary necessary to express the full range of their speakers’ concepts. All children possess the capacity to learn language and no child is born with a biological predisposition favoring any one language or type of language over another.

It is interesting that Greek historian Herodotus tells a story that King Psammetichus of Egypt made two children to be brought up in complete silence, from the point of view of human language, i.e., without ever hearing a word spoken in their presence. When they were two years old one day they greeted the caretaker who happened to be a shepherd calling out “bekos, bekos”; meaning bread in Phrygian language. This was enough for them to conclude that Phrygian was the original language of humanity. In Judeo-Christian Europe the position of Hebrew as the language of the Old Testament gave valid grounds through many centuries for regarding Hebrew as the original language of mankind. It seems that God created Adam and speech simultaneously; since God spoke to Adam and he replied, the language of communication was Hebrew. Such a view continued to be expressed even well into the 19th century. It is interesting to note that in the seventeenth century, Andreas Kemke, a Swedish philologist, claimed that in the Garden of Eden God spoke Swedish, Adam spoke Danish, and the serpent spoke French. In sixteenth century there was one Goropius Becanus who found the language of Eden garden to be Dutch.

Today there is no language which was language of primitive man nor any set theory satisfactory enough to explain the origin of language. Some of the common theories are:

**Mythical Origins of Language**

According to Genesis, the observed variety of human languages originated at the Tower of Babel with the confusion of tongues. In the Book
of Genesis 2:19-20 God gives Adam the task of assigning names to all the animals and plants he had in Eden. The key Biblical narrative is a later Bible story that God punished human presumption in building the Tower of Babel by confusing the tongues of the builders; the observed variety of human languages is a consequence of that divine judgment:

"The entire earth had one language with uniform words. When they migrated from the east, they found a valley in the land of Shinar, and they settled there. They said to one another, 'Come, let us mold bricks and fire them.' They then had bricks to use as stone, and asphalt for mortar. They said, 'Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top shall reach the sky. Let us make ourselves a name, so that we will not be scattered all over the face of the earth.' God descended to see the city and the tower that the sons of man had built. God said, 'They are a single people, all having one language, and this is the first thing they do! Now nothing they plan to do will be unattainable for them! Come, let us descend and confuse their speech, so that one person will not understand another's speech'. From that place, God scattered them all over the face of the earth, and they stopped building the city. He named it Babel, because this was the place where God confused the world's language. It was from there that God dispersed humanity over all the face of the earth." 

This Biblical account in Genesis has two fold meaning. First there was a vocal communication between God and Adam, most probably in Hebrew language. This was probably the only language at that time. Secondly the diversification of languages is attributed to God and not humans.

**Gestural Theory**

The gestural theory states that words and language developed from meaningful gestures, in other words initially humans used gestures and not language for communication and the gestures developed into language. We have the following evidences in support of this theory:
a) Gestural language and vocal language depend on similar neural systems. The regions on the cortex that are responsible for mouth and hand movements border each other.

b) Nonhuman primates can use gestures or symbols for at least primitive communication, and some of their gestures resemble those of humans, such as the "begging posture", with the hands stretched out, which humans share with chimpanzees.

c) All human beings use hand and facial gestures when they speak, especially when people meet who have no language in common. Deaf people also use languages composed entirely of signs.

Darwin objected to this theory saying that when the hands were engaged in some important work they could not be used to communicate. Also they gestures were useless in the dark hence vocal communication was inevitable.

**The "Ding-Dong" Hypothesis**

This theory was propagated by Max Muller. Every object in the nature gives a sound when struck by a solid body; similarly man's mind responded particularly to various impacts of nature. Hence _boom_ becomes a word for thunder, and _bhow_ for a dog. The "ding-dong" hypothesis is not considered as a total explanation for the origin of language. It is interesting to note that Muller himself rejected it at the latter stage.

**The "Bow-Wow" Hypothesis**

This name was coined by Max Muller. It is also called as onomatopoetic or echoic theory of origin of language. According to this hypothesis human language has its origin in imitating of animal sounds. Man is a creature who is expert in copying others. This ability to mimic resulted in the origin of human language. There are many shortcomings in this hypothesis. Different languages use different words differently, and this hypothesis would leave silent objects like rocks nameless; Words marked by onomatopoeia are conspicuous and somewhat unusual in most languages. And it seems difficult
to accept that humans learned to speak to one another by talking to the animals.

**The "Pooh-Pooh" Hypothesis**

Darwin in 'Descent of Man (1871)' postulated this hypothesis which maintains that human language like man himself originated from a primitive form, most probably from the expression of human emotions. Initially words developed from sighs of pleasure, moans of pain, and other semi-involuntary cries or exclamations. These vocalisms then became the names of the phenomena that made people say them. Max Muller making a joke of this hypothesis called it as POOH-POOH theory. Most of the objections to the "ding-dong" hypothesis apply here also. Such words are found in most languages; they are conspicuous by their preverbal nature and incomplete assimilation into the lexicon. Moreover, they are culturally determined, and they show a great deal of arbitrariness.

**The "Ta-Ta" Hypothesis**

According to this hypothesis human language represents the use of oral gestures that began in imitation of hand gestures that were already in use for communication. The difficulty with this hypothesis is that it requires that a fairly sophisticated repertoire of gestures be in place already for humans to imitate with their mouth gestures. It assumes the existence of a language of gestures but don't know how it arose.

**The "Uh-Oh" Hypothesis**

According to this hypothesis, human language begins with the use of arbitrary symbols that represent warnings to other members of the human society. Animal kingdom accepts one sort of vocal cry to mean that lion is present in the area, and another one indicates a snake or cat. This hypothesis seems to have the potential to explain the perceived diversity of human speech; obviously the warning cries uttered here are to some measure
arbitrary. It is less certain that this hypothesis could explain how more abstract features of human language developed.

The "Watch the Birdie" Hypothesis

This one is associated with ethologist and linguist E. H. Sturtevant. According to this hypothesis, human language became elaborated because humans found selective advantage in being able to deceive other humans. Since exclamations and vocalisms can involuntarily reveal your true mental state, humans learned to feign them in order to deceive others for selfish advantage.

It is important to note that no hypothesis is sufficient to explain the origin of language.

Culture and Language

Language is woven into the very fabric of all human cultures to such an extent that it is impossible to imagine culture without it. All myths about the origin of humanity suggest that human subjects were preloaded with language from the very beginning. The culture of a particular society and their life world are reflected in their language. In other words, they show how the languages in which we speak, sing, pray and otherwise conduct our daily lives carry information about our individual and collective identities, ideologies and histories. Language and culture are thus mutually influential. Grammatical, pragmatic and meta-pragmatic categories project themselves into the world, and our understanding of the world projects itself into what we deem significant in our discourse. Language and ideology overlap, defining not only how we understand the way we speak, but the way we understand the significance of what we speak about. Language is learned and transmitted culturally and not genetically. It is taught, when parents deliberately encourage their children to talk and to respond to talk, correct their mistakes, and enlarge their vocabulary. Language is transmitted as part of culture and the culture is transmitted very largely through language itself. It is interesting
to note that the greatest part of learned behavior or culture is transmitted by vocal instruction and not by imitation.

LANGUAGE has a setting. The people that speak it belong to a race (or a number of races), that is, to a group which is set off by physical characteristics from other groups. Again, language does not exist apart from culture, that is, from the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives................. Culture may be defined as what a society does and thinks. Language is a particular how of thought. Language is interwoven with culture; it affects how we think and behave, and is affected by how we think and behave. Actually languages grow up in the correlation with culture, they are part of culture. They are learnt and not transmitted genetically. Language is not merely one of the several aspects of culture. It is prima inter pares as it makes possible the development, the elaboration, the transmission of the culture.

Speech and a well ordered language are characteristic of every known community of human beings. No society has ever been found which is without language. Language is an essentially perfect means of expression and communication among people. "Of all aspects of culture it is fair guess that language was the first to receive a highly developed form and that its essential perfection is a prerequisite to the development of culture as a whole." The symbolic element of language, especially speech, has vast qualitative expansion over animal communication systems. Speech is infinitely more productive and allows people to communicate about things that are remote in time and space. Speech is one achievement of this process that uniquely identifies the human subject as humans. This ability of man's speech to transcend and transform his self sets man off fundamentally from the other animals. It suggests that "by means of speech the human self articulates a highly differentiated consciousness. Man does not merely respond globally to a total situation. Rather, by speech he refers to distinct aspect of his situation and unifies different objects by naming under different concepts...Thus he speaks his world and speaking in this sense is a creative process, for, he transforms his self from the speakables to the unspeakable where he lives in
a world created and re-created continually by his own lived experiences in speech. Thus through (the power of) speech, man can create and multiply the possible spaces and temporal orders that make up his self to the world of a non-temporal and non-spatial sphere. Even for that matter, artistic expressions are sign practices, which are dependent on and probably generative of the achievement of symbolic representations and reveal human subject as a living, communicative symbol. In the case of a symbolic sign, the process of interpretation comes to the foreground from cultural perspectives; that is to say that to be human is to be an interpreter whose achievement of symbolic significance stems from the vast capacities of man as man. Language is more than just a means of communication. It influences our culture and even our thought processes. Language and culture always have an interactive influence on each other; the two cannot exist without each other. Language is a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists. Significant social intercourse is not possible without language and the common language is a potent source of social solidarity among its speakers. Thus Edward Sapir emphasized greatly the unique culture-language relationship as is evident from the following quotations from his works:

1) "In the first place, language is felt to be a perfect symbolic system, in a perfectly homogeneous medium, for the handling of all references and meanings that a given culture is capable of, whether these be in the form of actual communications or in that of such ideal substitutes of communication as thinking. The content of every culture is expressible in its language and there are no linguistic materials whether as to content or form which are not felt to symbolize actual meanings, whatever may be the attitude of those who belong to other cultures. New cultural experiences frequently make it necessary to enlarge the resources of language, but such enlargement is never an arbitrary addition to the materials and forms already present; it is merely a further application of principles already in use."

2) "The use of language in cultural accumulation and historical transmission is obvious and important. This applies not only to sophisticated levels but
to primitive ones as well. A great deal of cultural stock in trade of a primitive society is presented in a more or less well developed linguistic form. Proverbs, medicine formulae, standardized prayers, folk tales, standardized speeches, song texts, genealogies, are some of the more overt forms which language takes as a culture preserving instrument.”

3) “Of the linguistic changes due to the more obvious types of contact the one which seems to have played the most important part in the history of language is the ‘borrowing of words across linguistic frontiers. This borrowing naturally goes hand in hand with cultural diffusion. An analysis of the provenience of the words of a given language is frequently an important index of the direction of cultural influence. Our English vocabulary, for instance, is very richly stratified in a cultural sense. The various layers of early Latin, medieval French, humanistic Latin and Greek and modern French borrowings constitute a fairly accurate gauge of the time, extent and nature of the various foreign cultural influences which have helped to mold English civilization. The notable lack of German loan words in English until a recent period, as contrasted with a large number of Italian words which were adopted at the time of Renaissance and later, is again a historical significant fact. By the diffusion of culturally important words, such as those referring to art, literature, the church, military affairs, sport and business, there have grown up important transnational vocabularies which do something to combat the isolating effect of the large number of languages which are still spoken in the modern world.”

4) “The importance of language as a whole for the definition, expression and transmission of culture is undoubted. The relevance of linguistic details, in both content and form, for the profounder understanding of culture is also clear. This does not follow, however, that there is a simple correspondence between the form of a language and the form of the culture of those who speak it. It is only very rarely, as a matter of fact, that it can be pointed out how a cultural trait has had some influence on the fundamental structure of a language. To a certain extent this lack of correspondence may be due to the fact that linguistic
changes do not proceed at the same rate as most cultural changes, which are on the whole far more rapid."  

5) “Language is a guide to ‘social reality.’ Though language is not ordinarily thought of as of essential interest to the students of social science, it powerfully conditions all our thinking about the social problems and processes. Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an accidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the ‘real world’ is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered to be representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.

The understanding of a simple poem, for instance, involves not merely an understanding of a single word in their average significance, but a full comprehension of the whole life of the community as it is mirrored in the words, or as it is suggested by the overtones. Even comparatively simple acts of perception are very much more at the mercy of the social patterns called words than we might suppose. If one draws some dozen lines, for instance, of different shapes, one perceives them as divisible into such categories as ‘straight’, ‘crooked’, ‘curved’, ‘zigzag’, because of the classificatory suggestiveness of the linguistic terms themselves. We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.”  

Language is mostly used in a social setting. It is probably the most important instrument of socialization that exists in all human societies and cultures. It is largely by means of language that one generation passes on to
the next its myths, laws, customs, beliefs and thoughts. It is largely by means of language that the child comes to apprehend the structure of the society into which he is born and its culture. As a social force language serves both to strengthen the links that bind the members of the same group and to differentiate the members of one group from those of another. We use it to communicate with others. We depend on others when learning language, and we constantly borrow one another's uses of expression. Language helps us perform various social functions, and many of its uses have become institutionalized. Hence Edward Sapir comments: "The 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group." It is a kind of symbolism which makes you aware of the presence of the divine. Whatever makes you aware of the presence of the divine becomes sign for this. Signs are scientific and symbols are religious. Symbolism is already involved in language; and language is a set of symbols governed by set of rules. No natural language can be separated from cultural backdrop.

Every culture has its own language. Even if it is not a complete language there is a dialect. Both language and culture cannot be separated; actually they are very intimately related. When we talk of a natural language then it is very deeply rooted with the culture. The artificial or technical or formal languages are not related with the culture but with some practical purpose or function only. Usually any language develops only in relation to a culture.

There are two elements always present in culture: moral and aesthetic, these are constitutive elements. Origin of culture is not natural but manmade. When one deviates from nature the result may be either of the two, deformity (non- natural to un-natural tendency) or refinement (refinement is culture). But what is refinement or deformity! can be decided only after the origin of culture, since the criteria of taste – moral or aesthetic standard will develop only with the development of culture. This is a post-hoc question.

Every culture is a linguistic community. Every culture has its linguistic community. The development of language, in the history of a particular cultural community, evolves the culture and it itself is guided by the culture.
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Language is the historical development of the community, it evolves the culture and the culture thus developed evolves the language too. Every community of a culture has its own language; and that language is so deeply related to its culture that both cannot be separated from each other. Thus both are growing by supporting each other. For example in European culture or Anglo-Saxon race we see the growth of science. Their language is quite enriched with terminology from technology. It is said about German language that there is deep level of thinking in it but superficial level of analysis. Similarly in English language there is great analysis but superficial thinking. In Indian languages whether it is Sanskrit or Hindi, there is very deep spiritual or internal thinking due to which language has developed in a particular manner. Language and culture of a community are so interlinked with each other that they cannot be separated. Hence, more often than not, we face extreme difficulty when we translate certain passages from one language to other language, since in it lacks development of similar thought culturally. It is not that it is impossible, it is difficult. As for example, the Sanskrit word dharma cannot be translated exhaustively in English and similar is the case of Jewish word, Mitzwah.

Europe has a common culture and on the basis of its development grew a family of languages called by Whorf SAE (Standard Average European), which has its own thought pattern. Thought is the part of culture; communication and articulation is possible due to language. Language develops peculiarly due to a particular type of thought pattern. In different cultures there has been different pattern of thought hence different kind of language. Say in India there was a greater emphasis on Self, God, deeper problems of life but scientific, in western sense of the term, language could not develop. When we take vocabulary or something to other culture where it is not present originally then clearly it is very difficult. This shows that there is a concomitant relation between language and culture. This relation is on two levels. First level is that one has to contemplate on language. There are two factors in language, langue and parole. Langue is the mark or evocable or the sound of the language; and parole is the meaning related to it. This parole is
very culture specific. Language and culture grow on each other and with each other. At one time one influences the other and at other time the other influences the first; this is applicable to all times. Second level of relation is that thought gives expansion to language, gives growth to it. Language will grow according to the thought pattern. As is the thought so will be the language, and if the kind of thought is absent in a culture such vocabulary will also be absent in the language. Evidently, influence of language on culture is immense and so is the vice-versa. This leads to a kind of cultural relativism, meaning thereby that if you don't belong to a culture hence don't possess its values then you cannot understand it. You cannot understand some things completely because you are not born in that culture. This does not mean that man cannot understand it and it is something else. Actually it is a part of human experience. This is a human culture and that also is a human culture. Neither it is that one will totally understand that culture nor one will totally misunderstand it. There are elements of a culture which cannot be understood completely by persons from other culture. Function of language is actually cultural only. From eating- drinking to customs & rituals, from moral to scientific thoughts, all kinds of thoughts are heritage of culture. All thought processes take place in a language; in the common language of its culture. Therefore there is a very intimate relation between language and its culture. To understand a language is to understand a culture, language can be understood through understanding the culture. Hence we cannot separate literature, language and culture.

The view that ‘language functions not simply as a device for reporting experience, but also more significantly as a way of defining experience for its speakers’ came to be known as ‘the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis’. The pūṇa pāksha or backdrop of Sapir/Whorf hypothesis is the common conception that ‘language reflects a pre-existing reality of which men are pre-linguistically aware. Languages are then devised to describe that reality. Since this reality is pretty much the same for all peoples, since environment is fairly similar, one expects that all languages will be basically similar in their modes of describing that reality. Equally it is commonly assumed that while, no doubt,
what we say often affects how we behave, the position is usually that what we say is determined by how we behave. Men first behave, and then describe how they behave."

Some people like Donald believe in a "culture-first" theory, which poses the prior emergence of a mimetic leading to subsequent evolution of language. They feel that cognitive skills evolved in early hominids allowing rudimental knowledge sharing across individuals in a nonverbal manner. The needs for improved communication lead to the emergence of language as an efficient system for sharing knowledge. Language came to exist only because humans could learn, produce, and process it. It has been shaped by cultural transmission over many generations. Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf said that language predetermines what we see in the world around us. In other words, language acts like a polarizing lens on a camera in filtering reality—we see the real world only in the categories of our language. Kant would say it is like the two forms of sensibility of time and space, which is pre given and through which we know the phenomena.

Sapir and Whorf strongly oppose this common conception. "For them, language is not mere passive recording instrument, which reflects a pre-existing reality of which we are aware. Rather it is the essential factor in forging what our conception of reality is, and how we perceive it. Not only our conceptions and perceptions, but also our attitude towards our fellow men, and so our behavior towards them, are largely dictated to us by the language we happen to possess. Nor is it the case that languages share any grate similarities; they differ radically, and as a result, the ways in which men conceive, perceive, evaluate, and behave will differ radically. Put in an extreme form, the hypothesis is that it makes no sense to speak of reality. What reality is for a person will be a function of the language he employs, and there will be as many ‘realities’ as there are radically distinct languages. Since there is no super-language, from the stand point of which it is possible to choose between differing conceptions of reality, different forms of evaluation, and different ways of perceiving. We are committed to complete
Leonard Bloomfield, a prominent linguist said that thinking was talking to oneself. This means that thinking is an internal communication that takes place in the same language in which external communication takes place. Hence the denotative properties of the external language influences the internal thought pattern. Meaning there by 'if you can’t say something you can’t think about it.' Edward Sapir took a stronger position that if you cannot say something you cannot perceive it. His student Benjamin Lee Whorf took a lenient position that language exerts a controlling influence on thought. This is nearer to Bloomfield’s position that thinking is an external communication/conversation. Benjamin Lee Whorf notes that where a culture and a language have developed together. And there is significant relationship between the general aspects of the grammar and the characteristic of the culture taken as a whole. He notices that Eskimo language have a variety of words for different kinds of snow where we use only one; Aztec are even poorer for they use the same word stem for cold, ice and snow. Sapir claims that the vocabulary of a language clearly reflects the physico-social environment of a people; and the entire vocabulary of a language would be “a complex inventory of all ideas, interests, and occupations that take up the attention of the community.”  According to Sapir "Language is not merely a more or less systematic inventory of the various items of experience which seem relevant to the individual, as is so often naively assumed, but is also a self-contained, creative symbolic organization, which not only refers to experience largely acquired without its help but actually defines experience for us by reason of its formal completeness and because of our unconscious projection of its implicit expectations into the field of experience. In this respect language is very much like a mathematical system which, also, records experience in the truest sense of the word, only in its crudest beginnings, but, as time goes on, becomes elaborated into self-contained conceptual system which previsages all possible experience in accordance with certain accepted formal limitations. [Meanings are ] not so much discovered in
experience as imposed upon it, because of the tyrannical hold that linguistic form has upon our orientation in the world."18 Whorf develops the same thesis when he says "........that the linguistic system (in other words, the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individuals' mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Formulation of ideas is not an independent process, strictly rational in the old sense, but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from slightly to greatly, between different grammars. We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds — and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds."19 According to Whorf, language shapes our ideas rather than merely expressing them. These conceptualizations are derived primarily from analyses of certain exotic linguistic systems, notably those of the Hopi, Shawnee, and Nootka Indian Cultures, which are compared with the family of languages called by Whorf SAE (Standard Average European). Franklin Fearing20 summarizes Whorf's analysis into four headings:

I. **The linguistic relativity principle.**

No individual is free to describe nature with absolute impartiality, but is "constrained to certain modes of interpretation even while he thinks himself most free.".............We are thus introduced to a new principle of relativity, which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated."21 The linguistic relativity principle means "that users of markedly different grammars are pointed by their grammars towards different types of observations and different evaluations of external similar acts of observation, and hence are not equivalent as observers but must arrive at somewhat different views of the world."22 Franklin Fearing comments
"Cultural-relativistic thinking emphasizes culture as a determiner of the individual's values, motives, needs, and in general, his world view. Such theory stresses the diversity and role of cultures and minimizes the biological universals controlling factors in human behavior."  

II. Background and obligatory character of linguistic systems.

The complex systems of linguistic patterns which are assumed to determine thinking are conceived to be outside the critical consciousness and control the individual. The notion that when we talk we are completely free to express any idea we wish to express is an illusion. "This illusory appearance results from the fact that the obligatory phenomena within the apparently free flow of talk are so completely autocratic that speaker and listener are bound unconsciously as though in a grip of a law of nature. The phenomena of language are background phenomena, of which the talkers are unaware, or at most very dimly aware....."  

The phenomena of language are to its own speakers largely of a background character and so are outside the critical consciousness and control of the speaker who is expounding natural logic. Hence, when anyone, as a natural logician, is talking about reason, logic, and the laws of correct thinking, he is apt to be simply marching in step with purely grammatical facts that have somewhat background character in his own language or family of language but are by no means universal in all languages and in no sense common substratum of reason.  

III. Processes which are prior to linguistic patterning.

Whorf recognizes a form of experience which occurs irrespective of language. This primordial experience may be common to all men:

"The tremendous importance of language cannot, in my opinion, be taken to mean necessarily that nothing is back of it, of the nature of what has traditionally been called "mind." My own studies suggest to me that language, for all its kingly role, is in some sense a superficial embroidery upon deeper processes of consciousness which are necessary before any communication, signaling, or symbolism whatsoever can occur and which also can at a pinch effect communication (though not true agreement)
without language's and without symbolism's aid. I mean "superficial" in the sense that all processes of chemistry, for example, can be said to be superficial upon the deeper layer of physical existence, which we can know variously as intra-atomic, electronic, or subelectronic.26

IV. Historical relations between linguistic patterns and culture.

Whorf assumes an interaction between cultural norms and linguistic patterns. There are "connections but not correlations or diagnostic correspondence between and linguistic patterns."27

Tackling the hen-egg query about which was first! Whorf says, "Which was first the language patterns or cultural norms? In the main they have grown up together, constantly influencing each other. But in this partnership the nature of language is the factor that limits plasticity and rigidifies channels of development in the more autocratic way.28" Language "represents the mass mind," and while it is affected by innovations it is affected "little and slowly." When Sapir and Whorf talk of the connection between language and thought, they are interested not in the connection of a particular sentence with a particular thought, but in connection between whole areas of language, and whole areas of human intellectual phenomena. For example, the connection between how men think about the nature of time, and the grammar of the language they use to talk about time. So it is being claimed that people in different societies perceive, behave in, conceive of, and take attitude towards the world in radically different ways- and these differences are largely to be explained in terms of their possessing radically different languages. David Cooper comments, "They are saying that not only do different people classify what they perceive differently, but that they actually perceive differently as a result of having different languages. They sat that not only do some people lack very sophisticated concepts, like that of electron, but that some people lack such basic concepts as those of time, space, matter, and cause. They are saying that not only do certain attitudes vary with language, but that whole systems of norms and morals differ as a result of linguistic differences."29
Spengler holds the view that numbers (mathematics), morals and language are culture relative phenomena. He says 'there are several number worlds as there are several Cultures. We find an Indian, an Arabian, a Classical, a Western type of mathematical thought and, corresponding with each, a type of number-each type fundamentally peculiar and unique, an expression of a specific world feeling, a symbol having a specific validity which is even capable of scientific definition, a principle of ordering the Becomes which reflects the central essence of one and only one soul, viz., the soul of that particular Culture. Consequently there are more mathematics than one. .................. The style of any mathematics which comes into being depends wholly on the culture in which it is rooted." 30 For morals he says 'there are as many morals as there are cultures, no more and no fewer. .................. Each culture possesses its own standards, the validity of which begins and ends with it. There being no general morale of (entire) humanity.'31 Similarly he says "One condition of ...... Higher world-consciousness is the possession of language, meaning thereby not mere human utterance but a cultural – language, and such is non-existent for primitive man and existent but not accessible in the case of the child. They have an inkling but no real knowledge of history and nature, being too intimately incorporated with the ensemble of these. They have no culture."32 And "Culture-languages are languages of historical men........ Culture languages are historical languages, which means primarily, that there is no historical event and no political institution that will not have been determined in part by the spirit of the language employed in it, and conversely, that will not have its influence upon the spiritual form of that language33.

The notion of language as a "guide to social reality" is not entirely original with Sapir. The seed of this doctrine are to be found in his teacher Boas as is evident from the passage from his 'Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages': "It seems, however, that a theoretical study of Indian languages is not less important than a practical knowledge of them; that the purely linguistic inquiry is part and parcel of a thorough investigation of the psychology of the people of the world"34 and "............... language
seems to be one of the most instructive fields of inquiry in an investigation of the formation of the fundamental ethnic ideas. The great advantage that linguistics offer in this respect is the fact that, on the whole the categories which are formed always remain unconscious, and that for this reason the processes which lead to their formation can be followed without the misleading and disturbing factors of secondary explanation, which are so common in ethnology, so much so that they generally obscure the real history of the development of ideas entirely.\(^{35}\)

Wittgenstein also shares this belief about the language-culture relation. In *Philosophical Investigations* he writes, "To imagine a language means to imagine a form of life." It is noteworthy that in *Blue and Brown Books* (134) also imagining a language is equated with imagining a culture. Wittgenstein’s later philosophy of language emphasizes that language is a living activity which consists of language games. To know a language game means to know a certain kind of language use. Therefore, language games are not only devices for describing language, but also exist in the actual practices of language. In this sense, language games cannot be fixed; they always change. Accordingly, language games are embedded in the totality of communal activities. A form of life is a given unjustified and unjustifiable pattern of human activity in other words, part of human natural history\(^{36}\). It consists of shared natural and linguistic responses. Speaking certain language or speaking and understanding a language is engaging in certain modes of behavior that exhibit a variety of abilities or skills. It is to engage in what Wittgenstein calls ‘forms of life\(^{37}\).’ “If a Lion could talk, we could not understand him,”\(^{38}\) reason being that he does not share the relevant form of life with us. Wittgenstein opines that “sharing a language is not agreement in opinions but in form of life.”\(^{39}\) He holds that human beings agree in the language they use, and this is not the agreement in opinions, but in the form of life. It is the characteristic of our language that the foundation on which it grows consists in the steady forms of life, regular activity. Its function is determined, above all by the action which it accompanies. He takes the common behavior of mankind as the system of reference by means of which
we interpret an unknown language. Hence he says that even if a lion could talk, we won't understand him; since he does not share the relevant form of life with us. Thus speaking is engaging in what Wittgenstein calls 'forms of life'. He declares boldly that "The limits of my language are the limits of my world." This establishes the Sapir-Whorfian contention that language predetermines what we see in the world around us; and language and culture are very intimately related to each other.

**Language and Inculturation**

Culture has become a privileged issue in this millennium due to its fundamental ground for the interaction and conflicts around the world. Hence the question: Can cultural groups act as agents of profound transformation in different cultural societies? This question leads to the possibility of enquiring into the concept of inculturation as inculturation puts us at the frontier between two opposite cultural groups. It focuses upon the action which introduces the values, theoretical principles or simple practical customs of one group to another through their respective cultures.

Inculturation is not a spontaneous or natural process because it is intended by someone from outside the group. I may try to inculturate into a neighboring group an idea! of literary conception, an idea or method. Looked at from this point of view, inculturation becomes a special kind of communication. Inculturation intends to communicate some cherished value for the benefit of each group in a major political unity and for the union itself. We may also note here that inculturation is not propaganda. Propaganda presents its physical objects or ideas, its models or customs exclusively from the point of view of its author. It is not dialogical and is not committed to the true interests of the receiving person.

Inculturation acts to achieve true communication with neighbors beyond one's own culture. It is made possible through dialogue (implicitly language) and personal interchange. The point is that inculturation is possible only through dialogue, so to say, language. Stated differently, we communicate not by translating a concept, but by co-producing a meaning.
We have to bring shared meanings to build real unity amidst the real diversities. This is said to be the real task of inculturation. Inculturation is intended to generate meanings which are shared by different cultural groups in order to build a peaceful bridge between their understandings and behavior. In the case of Indian societies where different cultural communities are sharing a common culture which we call Indian culture, application of this concept of inculturation has a special position. The above reflections obviate the necessity to underline the outlook that as long as language bestows images and symbols and man makes use of these symbols to communicate, there is a concomitant relation among language, culture and inculturation.
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