



مجلة التراث

ELT -R

Special Edition

مؤتمر اسطنبول الدولي الثاني للعلوم الإنسانية والطبيعية

Available online at: <http://www.asip.cerist.dz>
<https://www.asip.cerist.dz/en/PresentationReview/323>

*New Perspective of the Interrelationship
between
Language and Culture: A Linguistic Study*

Israa Rashed Mahdi ELTAIF AL-KUBAISY
Gifted Students' School / Al-Anbar – IRAQ

*EL TOURATH REVIEW, special edition of the works for the second Istanbul
International Conference on Humanities and Natural Sciences.*

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Israa Rashed Mahdi ELTAIF AL-KUBAISY; New Perspective of the Interrelationship between Language and Culture: A Linguistic Study, **EL TOURATH REVIEW**, special edition, of the works for the second Istanbul International Conference on Humanities and Natural Sciences held in Turkey – Istanbul 25-27 / 09 / 2019. **P188, P206.**



Abstract:

This paper looks at the interrelationship among language and culture. Language and culture are relentlessly entwined. Language is a result or a consequence of the way of life overall and furthermore a vehicle by which alternate features of the way of life are formed and imparted. The language we learn as a kid gives us a framework for connection, at the same time; more significantly, it manages the sort and the type of the interchanges we make. The universe is arranged as per the manner in which we name it. An Eskimo would think us incredibly unclear in the event that we revealed to him it.

The central matter of this paper is to inspect the connections between language, from one perspective, and culture, then again. The point is first to survey the hypothetical parts of the investigation and afterward to demonstrate the interrelationship between language and culture concerning linguistic perspectives. Investigating this interface between language and culture will require interdisciplinary crosstalk and combination of procedures over the spaces of language and culture study.

Key Words:

culture, linguistics, interrelationship, language. , cultural perspectives, culture studies.

الملخص:

يفصل هذا البحث العلاقة المتبادلة بين اللغة والثقافة؛ من هي الاشمل, اللغة أكثر من الثقافة ام الثقافة أكثر من اللغة ام كلاهما صحيح و هو الاقتراح الافضل. اللغة والثقافة متشابكتان لا محالة. اللغة هي حاليا نتيجة مفردة أو نتيجة للثقافة ككل ، وكذلك وسيلة يتم من خلالها تشكيل أوجه الثقافة الأخرى و ايصالها. إن اللغة التي نتعلمها ونحن اطفال لا تعطينا فقط نظامًا للاتصال ، ولكن الأهم من ذلك ، هو أنها تحدد نوع وشكل الاتصالات التي نقوم بها. فنحن نسمي الاشياء في البيئة التي نعيش فيها من منطلق ثقافة مجتمعنا. قد يعتقد شخص من الإسكيمو أننا غامضون للغاية إذا أخبرناه بذلك.

النقطة الرئيسية في هذا البحث هي دراسة العلاقات بين اللغة ، من ناحية ، والثقافة ، من ناحية أخرى، فالهدف الأول هو تقييم الجوانب النظرية للدراسة ومن ثم إظهار العلاقة المتبادلة بين اللغة والثقافة فيما يتعلق بالجوانب اللغوية. يتطلب استكشاف هذه العلاقة بين اللغة والثقافة تفاعلاً متعدد التخصصات وتكاملاً للمنهجيات عبر مجالات بحوث اللغة والثقافة.

الكلمات الدالة:

الثقافة, اللغويات, العلاقة, لغة, منظور ثقافي, دراسات ثقافية.

1. Introduction

The paper inspects how language may impact and be affected by culture, and what can be gotten of some answers concerning a specific culture by explore its language by giving an outline of the connection between the investigation of language and the investigation of culture. The shared bottom, of this examination is specified, as language and society (Biljana Mišić Ilić, 2004:6).

Language is firmly identified with man's nature, including his social condition and the abstract, religious and different customs of his general public. Language specialists, savants and anthropologists share an enthusiasm for the interrelationship of these fields. It is imperative to figure out what is interesting in a specific culture just as to find highlights which have all the earmarks of being all inclusive in all cultures (Hartmann et al, 1972: 56).

This paper is as yet a paper really taking shape. The interrelationship between language and culture still confounding. A few creators guarantee that language is culture. In spite of the fact that cultures somewhat exist through language, culture is more than language. Language is likewise more than culture (Birgit Brock-Utne, 2005: 2).

The most important points here are whether and how language may impact culture, and what we can know about specific culture by examining its language. On a progressively broad scale, we may likewise be keen on how the investigation of language structure and capacities can be utilized as a model for other semiotic frameworks. On the other hand, we may inquire, to what degree the information from a specific culture is an essential for translation of words, linguistic articulations, and entire talks. This paper is an endeavor to give an outline of the connection between the investigation of language and the investigation of culture and some common ground of research terms, for example, language and society (Biljana Mišić Ilić, 2004: 8).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

1. What is the interrelationship between language and culture?
2. Do individuals who talk distinctive language make cultural viewpoints process in an unexpected way?
3. Is a sure dimension of social improvement required for linguistics fields?
4. Is there close association between linguistics and culture?
5. For what reason are there various perspectives on the connection between language and culture?

1.2 Aim of the Study

The investigation goes for indicating how the cultural perspectives impact on linguistics. It

likewise goes for exploring the usefulness of social and cultural in language handling.

1.3 Hypothesis of the Study

The schooling postulates that:

1. There is association between language and culture.
2. Language is a mean of connection and culture alludes to all thoughts and presumptions about the idea of things and individuals that we realize when we progress toward becoming individuals from social gatherings

1.4 techniques (Methodology) of the Study

The investigation fosters the accompanying methods:

1. Looking over and researching the meaning of the essential idea concerning this investigation.
2. Introducing material that demonstrates the connection among language and culture.
3. Gathering information from the fields of language and culture.

1.5 Limit of the Study

The examination is constrained to show the interrelationship between language and culture.

1.6 Value of the Study

It is trusted that this investigation will be helpful for the individuals who intrigued by language and culture.

2. Language and culture studies

Characterizing culture or simply giving references to probably a portion of the real writing managing it goes a long ways past the points of this paper. For our motivation, it will do the trick to cite a couple of lexicon definitions and point to the principle components of the important faculties of the word. Along these lines, culture is "the coordinated example of human information, conviction and conduct that relies on man's ability for learning and transmitting learning to succeeding ages". Another use in a similar word reference focuses on the social part of culture and characterizes it as "the familiar convictions, social structures, and material characteristics of a racial, religious or social gathering". Culture is a specific structure, stage, or sort of scholarly advancement or progress in a general public; a general public or gathering described by its particular traditions, accomplishments, items, viewpoint, and so forth. It can be said twice that there can scarcely be any learning or transmitting information or scholarly improvement without language. Nor can a general public or a

gathering capacity without language (Yule, 2006: 150).

Then again, the investigation of language, or, all the more decisively, the scientific investigation of language, is the area of linguistics. As indicated by the language specialist's concentration and scope of diverse branches might be recognized. The customary parts of chronicled, hypothetical and illustrative semantics, with their subfields of phonology, morphology and sentence structure is what is generally considered the 'gist' linguistics. In the previous fifty years or somewhere in the vicinity, the covering interests of semantics and different controls brought about the setting up of new branches, now and again famously called 'hyphenated', to push their interdisciplinary nature. Among them, probably the most conspicuous ones are psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, anthropological semantics, sociolinguistics, content phonetics, psychological etymology, and connected phonetics, and it is fundamentally in a portion of these fields that we should search for the examination concentrated on the connection among language and additional etymological components which might be subsumed under the term culture Kramsch (1998: 13).

Language and Society From the above meanings of culture it tends to be noticed that one of the focal components in them is that culture is acknowledged inside society or a social gathering. Likely the most imperative instrument of socialization that exists in every human culture and societies is language. It is to a great extent by methods for language that one offspring passes on to the following its traditions and convictions, and by which individuals from a general public come to know about their place in it. A portion of the real specializations examining society and human's situation in it are human science, human studies and ethnology. The zone where they contact upon language is the genuine zone of semantic teaches, for example, anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, and ethno-linguistics (Aitchison, 1999:12).

2.1. Anthropological linguistics

Anthropological linguistics is typically what one first considers when discussing the connection among language and culture. It thinks about language variety and use in connection to the social examples and convictions and depends vigorously on hypotheses, strategies and discoveries of human studies. The beginnings are related with crafted by the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski and his exploration among the locals of the Trobriand Islands. So as to research the social parts of these folks Malinowski thought that it was urgent to think about their language conduct. He advanced linguistics with the possibility that language is a method of activity instead of a catchword of thought, just as with the terms, for example, phatic communication' and 'context of situation'(Nostrand, 1989: 49-52) .

The absolute most regular themes of anthropological linguistics manage the manner in which some linguistics highlights may recognize an individual from a (normally rudimentary)community inside a specific social, religious or family relationship gathering. Surely, the structure of family relationship is one of the prime points where anthropologists intensely draw upon linguistics, for example vocabulary. Is there any cultural importance in

the way that Arabic, for example, has a far more opulent family ties vocabulary than English? Near methodology can here demonstrate clever as well. The much-referred to instances of the broad vocabulary for 'snow' in Eskimo and 'camel' in Arabic were frequently used to demonstrate (or, all the more as of late, discredit) the relationship between vocabulary contrasts and cultural contrasts, however the correspondence is a long way from being straightforward and obvious. Indeed, even less is the relationship between one's idea and impression of the world as controlled by one's language, as uphold by the defenders of American anthropological etymology Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, in their hypothesis of language relativity (Fasold and Connor, 2006: 343).

Contemporary anthropological linguistics still has a lot of an unfamiliar area to investigate. The most huge and itemized research is being done on the indigenous languages of Latin, Central and North America (Silver and Miller, 1997, Gnerre 2000, Sammons and Scherzer 2000) and to a littler degree, Africa (Webb and Kembo-Sure 2000). The term linguistic human sciences is occasionally utilized reciprocally with anthropological linguistics, yet more explicitly it alludes to an a lot more extensive zone, including mother orders of human sciences and linguistics, yet in addition sociolinguistics, talk investigation, paralinguistics, intellectual human studies, and artistic examinations (Salzmann, 1993: 244 Duranti, 1997: 56).

The connection between linguistics and anthropology studies goes back to the structuralism of Ferdinand de Saussure, which laid the foundation for another methodology in in sociology and anthropology, having made the investigation of language the model for the investigation of different frameworks. De Saussure's dismissal of the old philologists' concept of 'predominant', 'increasingly flawless' or 'rudimentary' languages was paralleled in the anthropologists' thought that culture isn't something that is dispersed from the ace races, and in this way the way of life and establishments of a "rudimentary" society ought to be taken a gander at from the point of view of their usefulness to those social orders (Fasold and Connor, 2006: 343) .

Likewise powerful was de Saussure's concept of language as an arrangement of commonly characterizing substances and, particularly, his hypothesis of meaning with the thoughts of signifier, signified, and sign, where meaning isn't concurred by a straightforward correspondence of a sign to an outer thing, yet by the connection of the sign to the entire code of connotation. Anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss recommended that language, yet culture itself could be viewed as a code of significance in de Saussure's sense, its diverse viewpoints communicating and supporting one another, and in that way he could build up a more full understanding (Crystal, 2003: 464) .

2.2. Ethno-linguistics

Covering somewhat with anthropological linguistics and sociolinguistics is ethno-linguistics, which thinks about language in connection to the investigation of ethnic gatherings and conduct. Covering somewhat with anthropological linguistics and

sociolinguistics is ethno-linguistics, which thinks about language in connection to the investigation of ethnic gatherings and conduct. The central idea is language as the method of ethnic personality, as in, for example, the indication of ethnicity through specificities being used of a specific language assortment, or in the decision of language assortment for speaking with another ethnic gathering. Language is an imperative sign of ethnic and nationalistic developments since it is an exceptionally evident normal for the life of a folk and an amazingly expansive one. The issues of ethnic character are frequently identified with the requests and needs of ethnic minorities inside a bigger folk, (for example, in ethnic innate conflict, immigrants and so forth.), and to some fundamentally sociolinguistic issues, for example, bilingualism and societal multilingualism. By the by, regardless of the solid and evident connection among language and ethnicity in numerous folks, there is no straightforward condition (Duranti, 1997, 24) & (Bamgbose 1991, 11).

The term ethnography of talking (connection) somehow refers to ethno-linguistics, but more explicitly, it ordinarily alludes to an anthropological way to deal with the investigation of language use, created by D. Hymes, which depends on the genuine perception of discourse in the performance of connection, the discourse occasion. Hymes' model of connection turned out to be of real an incentive to sociolinguistics and talk examination(Labov 1966: 42).

2.3. Sociolinguistics

While anthropological linguistics and ethnolinguistics center on the connection between language and some specific parts of public activity and social jobs, sociolinguistics should research all parts of this relationship in the general public overall. With the beginning presumptions that all language occasions comprise of a bit of language in a social setting and that each unique social setting decides a specific type of language (Stockwell 2002:5), the potential extent of sociolinguistics is gigantic. It examines how language is utilized in a living and complex discourse society, from small scale sociolinguistic issues managing relationships between language variety and use and social gatherings and circumstances, to full scale sociolinguistic issues, for example, social demeanors to language, the examples and requirements of national language use, and so on (Tannen, 1996: 8).

The last outline, which concentrates more on the function of language in the public and reveals a more prominent worry with sociological as opposed to linguistic clarifications, is otherwise called the sociology of language. One of the key issues here concerns multilingualism and bilingualism, in a social gathering just as in an individual speaker, as the clearest instances of language variety. To the previously talked about, the connection between language and ethnic personality, language privileges of minorities, and political elements going with these issues, we should include the thoughts of pidgins and creoles, standard and vernacular languages, language steadfastness, diglossia, code exchanging and code blending, and language convenience. They essentially allude to different social circumstances and language practices where the speakers are presented to or constrained or willing to utilize more than one language or an assortment of language or discourse (Duranti, 1997, 24).

Some further indications of language variety are at times ambiguous to recognize particularly. They incorporate local lingos and social tongues, mirroring that in numerous folk it is conceivable to tell from an individual's speech where (s)he originates from yet additionally what class (s)he has belongs to, in spite of the fact that there is a general orientation that the talk of the higher classes exhibits less provincial variety (Trudgill 1995: 25). Additionally vital is the gender related language variety, the field of study which has particularly thrived in the recent decades. There are different manners by which the linguistic conduct of men and women from a similar discourse society contrasts pronunciation, vocabulary, conversational practices, and so on. For instance, a few examinations have observed that ladies will in general be progressively courteous, and utilize a greater amount of the standard types of language, which is much of the time clarified by their social class mindfulness, their job in the public, or their status by and large as a subordinate gathering (Coates, 1986: 31 and (Holmes 1995, 19) .

While these parts of the socially important language varieties center for the most part around language users, their ethnicity, gender, social foundation, and so on., there are a few perspectives which basically center around language use, reflecting specific settings. The manner in which individuals talk in court, in school, at conferences, for example, is more formal than the casual language they use at home or with individuals they know well. Comparative contrasts are discernible when we address individuals of a different ages or social gathering. Such language varieties, are commonly known as style, or complex contrasts, in spite of the fact that the term register is additionally utilized (Vidanović, Mišić Ilić et al, 2000: 3).

Be that as it may, it is smarter to limit the last term to particular styles formed by useful requests of explicit circumstances or occupations – sports announcer talk, for example, or a gathering of experts, for example cardiologists, PC software engineers, craftsmen, and so forth., discussing their claim to fame. Expressive contrasts have been primarily considered with reference to the recipient, their age or social gathering For sociolinguists especially the important ones, the matter of civility is the thought created by pragmatists (Brown and Levinson 1987: 124), which alludes to appearing of other individuals' open mental self-portrait (face) and can be showed as positive (appearing) or negative (tolerating another's privilege not to be forced on).

In connection speakers settle on suitable etymological selection in the light of their relationship to the recipient, in order not to make them awkward. In all social orders there are sociolinguistic principles for, for example, considerate acknowledgment or refusal, welcome, discussion points, types of location, and these vary diversely. What is adequate, even attractive linguistic conduct in one society might be unacceptable, even forbidden in another (Yule, 2010: 56) .

These distinctions may appear to be absolutely irregular; however they are quite associated with various social qualities and frames of mind of various social orders. A

standout amongst the clearest types of civility are the types of location, reflecting social connections along the social elements of separation or solidarity and relative power or status. From Brown and Gilman (1960) on, various examinations have explored types of location, giving huge bits of knowledge into social structure, social qualities and social changes (Ervin-Tripp, 1972: 78) .

The decision go between utilizing the principal name and the T-pronoun (2nd person singular) to the title + last name formula and the V-pronoun (honorific structure, in numerous languages second person plural) changes crosswise over various languages and folks, yet crosswise over social gatherings of a similar society, and through time. For instance, the way that in a specific culture V/title+(last) name is utilized for more established relatives as well as for guardians too, clarified by Brown and Gilman's model (1960) will disclose to us that it doesn't show esteem, yet in addition making an extent and intensity of the recipient. Or on the other hand, the emphasis on T/first name address in most British-based global organizations is a sign not of attachment or absence of obligingness but rather of the making progress toward organization solidarity, emphasis on shared frames of mind and qualities paying little mind to the distinctions in expert status(Hudson, 1996: 42).

It is vital to ask what connections between a language variable and a specific social viewpoint educate us concerning a specific folk and culture all in all. How is acquired information to be deciphered all together not to be simply similar records with esteem decisions and impressionistic clarifications? For this reason, advanced research procedure, just as a hypothetical model is required, the one which can put the information in a more extensive social and social point of view (ibid).

3. The Factors Influence the Way People Learn Languages

3.1 Large Culture

The general investigation of culture does not mean taking a gander at traditions, foundations, and ancient rarities, yet in addition examining individuals' qualities, convictions and demeanors and how they impact or are affected by communications among individuals. In this way, culture alludes to that which has been developed to incorporate social, chronicled, innovative and different perspectives (Kaplan, 2002: 246).

3.2 Small Culture

It incorporates given spot or gathering of individuals. It likewise incorporates casual style and language concerning this little gathering as in road, self-access centers and so on (same source above).

4. The Role of Culture in Learning Language

Culture assumes a crucial function in the development of the person's identity and learning procedures, for example, the independence and cooperation and social viewpoints

influence language realizing which intervened by identity type. Additionally, the elucidation of language in context relies upon how much the members share traditions and methodology, convictions and qualities are components of social learning and the general population who share them can be however as having a place with a similar culture (Cook, 2003: 52).

5. Investigating the Interrelation among Language and Culture

Culture is characterized by Yule (1996: 239) as "Social gained information". However it is fundamental to ignore the social part of language as "discourse in a shape of social character and is utilized, intentionally or unwittingly, to demonstrate membership". He guesses that a significant number of the variables which offer ascent to linguistic variety are at times talked about from the view of cultural varieties, so this view has been affected by anthropologists (ibid, 246). Brown (1987: 122) characterizes culture as "a lifestyle". Culture is the setting inside which we exist, think, feel, and identify with others.

Culture is our landmass and the aggregate character of all of us. The presence of various cultures prompts linguistic variety. Individuals allude to a similar culture when they share similar traditions and methods, including those identified with paralinguistics, pragmatics, and sort together with the qualities and convictions which lie behind them (Cook, 2003: 52). This gathering of individuals in a given timeframe is portrayed by specific traditions, abilities, expressions, and apparatuses; in other words that this gathering has its very own way of life or culture. Traditions, strategies, convictions, and qualities are considered as components of social information.

No community exists without a culture. This mirrors the requirement for culture to satisfy certain biological and mental needs in people. The psychological develops that empower us therefore to endure are a lifestyle which we call culture (Brown, 1987: 123). Languages can be gained because of the procedure of social transmission and this procedure stresses the reality of the presence of various societies. Brown (ibid) adds that it is clear that culture, as an instilled set of conduct and methods of observation, turns out to be exceedingly essential in learning of a second language then he (on the same page) illuminates that a language is a piece of a culture and a culture is a piece of a language; the two are unpredictably entwined to such an extent that one can't separate the two without losing the importance of their language or culture.

Individuals who live in specific gatherings have diverse languages as well as have distinctive world perspectives which are reflected in their languages, therefore language reflects culture (Yule, 1996: 246). Our first language has a critical job in molding ongoing idea, that is, the manner in which we consider things we approach our everyday lives, without examining how we are thinking (Yule, 2010: 269). One of the successful spaces of second language obtaining is that the obtaining of a second language is likewise the obtaining of a second culture (Brown, 1987: 124).

While there is no complete end to precisely how language and culture are connected, it is

obvious through the linguistic decisions that individuals utilize that a relationship exists. There is a requirement for language students to comprehend why individuals think and talk the manner in which they do, and to comprehend conceivable pacts that might be set up between a culture and its language. Coordinated investigations of language and culture are required if language students are to end up capable language users. In the event that language arrangement mirrors the requirement for students to become socially skillful language users, students will probably better comprehend their very own language and culture just as some other may choose to study.

For language students and educators alike, an affirmation that there is something else entirely to any language than the total of its parts is basic if any dimension of genuine competency is to be accomplished. Making language arrangement that mirrors the significance of the relationship(s) among language and culture will drive educators to instruct students on the legitimacy of language (for example the how and why behind its utilization, all things considered). Such strategy would not just offer language students understanding into their very own language and social competency, yet in addition furnish them with an informed base for how to see different languages and societies also. With the shocking substances of time and budgetary requirements imposed at language instruction, decisions unavoidably must be made concerning the job of social training in the second language classroom. Furthermore, as solid proof ties together culture and language, making an intelligent program of this relationship ought to be fulfilled (Sapir, 1921: 2 and Yule, 1996: 248).

6. Types of Links between Language and Culture

Since the commencement of language, we can recognize three kinds of connections between language guidance and culture: global, national, and domestic links.

6.1. Global Links among Language and Culture

The connection between language and culture is an unpredictable one due generally to some extent to the extraordinary trouble in understanding individuals' psychological procedures when they impart. Beneath, Wardhaugh and Thanasoulas each characterize language in a to some degree distinctive way, with the previous clarifying it for what it does, and the last survey it as it identifies with culture. Wardhaugh (2002: 2) characterizes language to be: learning of guidelines and standards and of the methods for saying and getting things done with sounds, words, and sentences as opposed to only information of explicit sounds, words, and sentences. While Wardhaugh does not specify culture as such, the discourse demonstrations we perform are definitely associated with the surroundings they are performed in, and subsequently he seems to characterize language with thought for context, something Thanasoulas (2001) all the more specifically incorporated in the accompanying language does not exist separated from culture, that is, from the socially acquired array of practices and convictions that decides the style of our lives (Sapir, 1970: 207). It might be said, it is 'a key to the social past of a general public' (Salzmann, 1998, p. 41), a manual for

'social reality' (Sapir, 1929: 209, referred to in Salzmann, 1993: 41). What's more, on the off chance that we are to talk about a connection between language and culture, we should likewise make them comprehend of what culture alludes to.

Goodenough (1996, 167, taken from Wardhaugh, 2002, 219) clarifies culture as far as the participatory obligations of its individuals. He expresses that a general public's way of life is comprised of whatever it is one needs to know or have confidence so as to work in a way satisfactory to its individuals, and to do as such in any job that they acknowledge for any of themselves. Malinowski (Stern, 2009: 97) sees culture through a to some degree increasingly intuitive plan, expressing that it is a reaction to require, and trusts that what establishes a culture is its reaction to three arrangements of necessities: the fundamental needs of the individual, the instrumental needs of the general public, and the emblematic and integrative needs of both the individual and the general public. For both Goodenough and Malinowski, culture is characterized by generosity and anticipation. While every individual holds their very own individual jobs and ensuing needs as a feature of a culture, the different needs of the way of life should likewise be kept in equalization.

Thus, in making a definition for culture, we can see that the idea is regularly better comprehended with regards to how the individuals of a culture work, both separately and as a gathering. It is in this way clear how critical it is for individuals from any general public to comprehend the genuine intensity of their words and activities when they collaborate. Above, Salzmann is cited by Thanasoulas as saying that language is a key to the social past, however it is likewise a key to the social present in its capacity to express what is (and has been) thought, accepted, and comprehended by its individuals.

Edward Sapir, in his examinations with Benjamin Lee Whorf, perceived the cozy connection between language and culture, reasoning that it was impractical to comprehend or assess one without information of the other" Wardhaugh, 2002: 220). In any case, Wardhaugh (2002, 219-220) revealed that there have three cases to the connection between language and culture: The structure of a language decides the manner by which speakers of that language see the world or, as a flimsier view, the structure does not decide the world-view but rather is still amazingly compelling in inclining speakers of a language toward receiving their world-view.

The culture of a people have a special place in the language they utilize in light of the fact that they esteem certain things and fulfill them in a specific way; they come to utilize their language in manners that reflect what they esteem and what they complete a neutral case which guarantees that there is next to zero connection between the two. The first of these cases, however in its conclusive expressing is questioned by numerous sociolinguists, is generally connected with Sapir and Whorf. This case is the reason for much research on the connection between language and culture and in this way will be canvassed in the most detail following an affirmation of the other two, start with a short thought of the 'neutral case'.

The neutral pretension that a link does not exist between language and culture, while

considering language for its outright forces and its job in the way of life that utilizes it, would have all the earmarks of being one for a philosophical discussion. While it tends to be contended that it is conceivable to investigate a language as well as culture without respect for the other, the explanations behind such an examination appear to be profoundly suspect. The way that language is utilized to pass on and to comprehend data would infer a relationship in which both the speaker and the addressee expect at least one jobs. In considering such connection its most insignificant of structures – for example the quick setting – it is hard to reason that culture would not the slightest bit affect the communication even on the littlest of scale.

The second proposed relationship recommends that individuals in a culture use language that mirrors their specific culture's qualities. This is the contradicting perspective of Sapir and Whorf in that here it is the 'musings' of a culture which are reflected in the language and not the language which decides the idea. This case infers that cultures utilize languages that are as various as the way of life that talk them and consequently linguistic capacities vary as far as, for instance, a culture's dimension of innovative improvement (ibid).

In any case, Wardhaugh (2002, 225-226) contends that we should accept that all languages have the assets to enable any speaker to state anything as long as speaker is want to utilize some level of circumlocution. At the point when requirements for lexical words emerge, he (in the same place) likewise clarifies, we can accept that cultures have the capacity and are allowed to make or to obtain them as required, and that cultures that have not done as such have not yet encountered the need. Wardhaugh likewise takes note of that individuals who talk languages with various structures (for example Germans and Hungarians) can have comparable social qualities, and individuals who have diverse cultures can likewise have comparable structures in language (for example Hungarians and Finns). Models like these show that the second connection between language and culture is very suitable.

The first of the three proposed connections from above is the foundation for the Whorfian hypothesis; the conviction that the structure of the language decides how individuals see the world. The possibility that language, to some degree, decides the manner in which we consider our general surroundings is known as linguistic determinism, with 'solid' determinism expressing that language really decides thought, and 'feeble' determinism inferring that our thinking is simply impacted by our language (Campbell, 1997: 65). Solid linguistic determinism and the possibility that distinction in language results in contrast in thought, or linguistic relativity, were the essential suggestions for the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis.

While one culture may recognize between father and uncle, another may not. The utilization of the term 'father' in a discussion between a local English speaker and a Seminole Indian would intelligently deliver an alternate picture for the two individuals, as culturally each may arrange the functions and picture of this individual in an unexpected way. While

solid determinism expresses that language decides thought, frail determinism permits the 'required' space for extra impacts to go into the connection among language and culture. Despite individual subjective procedures or general learning, it is reasonable for expect that perspectives might be impacted by culture and not simply language (Coates, 1986: 56) and (Holmes, 1995: 201) and (Tannen, 1996: 183).

Despite the fact that language structure furnishes us with phrasings for our comprehension and can control our musings in this admiration, if previous learning does not supply an establishment for general comprehension, the manners by which we characterize and assess every individual experience would be left exclusively to linguistic information. When we experience something commonplace we can classify it effectively and with some level of certainty because of pre-familiar learning or schemata (Nishida, 1999: 754). Nishida clarifies that when an individual enters a well-known circumstance, they recover a load of learning of suitable conduct as well as proper jobs he/she should play in that circumstance.

Hudson (1996, 77-8, taken from Wardhaugh 2002, 236) comparably proposes that when we hear something new, we connect with it who regularly may utilize it and in what sort of event it is seems, by all accounts, to be normally utilized. Our understandings of our perceptions in life are guided by how we (can) group those encounters both linguistically and culturally. Nostrand, 1989, 15-22 taken from Nishida, 1999: 760) states that individuals use schemata to help perceive circumstances, make methodologies for tending to them, apply the systems, and after that bargain with the subsequent activities in a similar way.

If we somehow want to make this genuine procedure, it would clearly be our language that would confine how we would convey what needs be, yet the way that we are not able to express every idea and feeling associated with each circumstance does not suggest that we come up short on those musings and emotions. Since this kind of procedure is experienced more than once in everyday life, it may be over shortsighted to accept that it is just language that limits us from speculation a specific way. We should accept that importance and comprehensibility are in any event mostly dictated by the circumstance, and the related knowledge of speakers (Gumperz, 1996: 39). As teachers, an acknowledgment that a connection between language and culture exists brings us to think about how this comprehension can apply to language instruction and language strategy.

In the days when the main scholastically good languages educated were Latin, traditional Greek or Hebrew, there was no doubt however that a specific general culture was procured together with and through the learning of indisputably the ablative and the conjugation of the aorist. Roman and Greek history was not generally instructed inside the language educational modules and the interpretation of De Bello Gallico seldom gave understudies a comprehension of the ways Roman really talked and thought; yet, nine years of Latin were the best passageway ticket to the all-inclusive culture of the European taught first class. The connection between language concentrate and culture was a quick and uncontested one. For every epochal language the best approach to internationality was through their literature. We

until a recent time, the sole method of reasoning for the instructing of current languages was access to the incredible works, the all-inclusive standard of world literary works, which implies that different speakers of different languages could share crosswise over social and national confines (Kramersch, 1993: 5).

Language is more than culture enabling kids to utilize their primary language to know how to write and reading; does not just have to do with holding cultural character. It likewise has to do with encouraging the way toward figuring out how to peruse and compose (Trudgill, 1990: 213 and Labov, 1966: 55).

Improvement in this regards comprises of the advancement of national solidarity; cultural improvement: and frugal and social improvement. Cultural advancement is fundamental to the other two. Language is a living instrument of culture, so that, starting here of view, language advancement is foremost. In any case, language is additionally an instrument of communication, in certainty the main complete and the most critical instrument in that capacity. Language utilization consequently is of central significance likewise for social and frugal development (Diamond, 1959: 12). Language is more than culture. At the point when the most imperative instructive inquiry is disregarded there is little uncertainty that the deliberate however regularly overlooked contrasts between the language and culture of the school and the language and culture of the student's locale have frequently brought about instructive programs with just negligible accomplishment at showing anything aside from self-devaluation (Okonkwo, 1983: 377).

Language is more than culture. In any case, moreover culture isn't just language. Contender shows what the standards profoundly kept in the organization of western tutoring do to woodland life when a school is presented among a huntsman and gatherer like the Huaorani amidst the tropical backwoods. The foundation of tutoring itself isolates kids from their folks, diminishes the time they need to gain from the more seasoned folk individuals, realize what is important and profitable in the sort of society they live. It separates the day in a heretofore obscure manner and powers a folk into a more stationary life than what they have ordinarily driven (Wood, 1969: 10).

7. Conclusion, Findings and Suggestions

It is concluded that language is a section or a subsystem of culture since language can't be created in separation. Likewise culture isn't reflected just by utilizing certain languages since culture is socially obtained information which shapes our musings. It isn't essential for individuals who have a similar culture, have a similar language. It presumes that language isn't the main path for individuals to impart their contemplations inside a culture. Furthermore, on the grounds that language is a subsystem of culture, so culture is more unrivaled than language. Accordingly, our way of life decides our musings and our considerations decide our language and the inverse of this straight procedure isn't valid.

To close this outline of the connection between the investigation of language and the

investigation of culture, it ought to be noticed that, however enlightening in its plan, it has, in any case, been definitely rather specific and a long way from comprehensive. Our goal was to refer to the domains where the investigation of language and the investigation of culture most notably interfere, for example, language and society, language use, and language and thought, and different etymological orders examining them, just as to attract consideration regarding some ways language reflects and decides different systems of social and intellectual connections in our general surroundings. From the point of view of standard language users, in their ordinary traveling, a few proposals and brought issues to light of how language functions on the planet may encourage the adventure. Then again, and all the more essentially, the paper tends to understudies of language and culture, and linguists and social researchers specifically, presumably the most curious and expertly best-prepared among the explorers in the Wonderland. The showed pathways of conceivable examination outlined by the guide of this article, similarly fascinating and animating, contingent upon the scientists' close to home scholarly interests and inclinations, are holding on to be filled in by new street signs and lampposts of creative discoveries, more profound understanding and more extensive learning.

The researcher reaches the following findings concerning this study What is the interrelationship between language and culture? Language is a part or a subsystem of culture because language cannot be developed in isolation. Also culture is not reflected only by using certain languages because culture is socially acquired knowledge which shapes our thoughts. It is not necessary for people who have the same culture, have the same language. It concludes that language is not the only way for people to communicate their thoughts within a culture. And because language is a subsystem of culture, so culture is more superior to language. As a result, our culture determines our thoughts and our thoughts determine our language and the opposite of this linear process is not true.

Do people who speak different language make cultural aspects process differently? No community exists without a culture. This mirrors the requirement for culture to satisfy certain biological and mental needs in people. The psychological develops that empower us therefore to endure are a lifestyle which we call culture (Brown, 1987: 123). Languages can be gained because of the procedure of social transmission and this procedure stresses the reality of the presence of various societies. Brown (ibid) adds that it is clear that culture, as an instilled set of conduct and methods of observation, turns out to be exceedingly essential in learning of a second language then he (on the same page) illuminates that a language is a piece of a culture and a culture is a piece of a language; the two are unpredictably entwined to such an extent that one can't separate the two without losing the importance of their language or culture.

Individuals who live in specific gatherings have diverse languages as well as have distinctive world perspectives which are reflected in their languages, therefor language reflects culture (Yule, 1996: 246). Our first language has a critical function in molding ongoing idea, that is, the manner in which we consider things we approach our everyday lives, without examining how we are thinking (Yule, 2010: 269). One of the successful

spaces of second language obtaining is that the obtaining of a second language is likewise the obtaining of a second culture (Brown, 1987: 124).

Is a certain level of cultural development required for linguistics fields? For sure there is a cultural development required for linguistics fields, as the most the cultural development increased, the most the linguistics field evolve and thrive because of the deep and clear link between both of them. Why are there different views on the relationship between language and culture? Language is more than culture. When the most important educational question is overlooked there is little doubt that the systematic but frequently ignored differences between the language and culture of the school and the language and culture of the learner's community have often resulted in educational programs with only marginal success at teaching anything except self-depreciation (Okonkwo, 1983: 377).

Language is more than culture. But likewise culture is not only language. Rival shows what the norms deeply enshrined in the institution of western schooling do to forest life when a school is introduced among a hunter and gatherer group like the Huaorani in the middle of the tropical forest. The institution of schooling itself separates children from their parents, reduces the time they have to learn from the older community members, learn what is necessary and valuable in the kind of society they live. It breaks up the day in a hitherto unknown way and forces a community into a more sedentary life than what they have normally led (Wood, 1969: 10). The researcher suggests the following points for further studies there is a clear link between language and culture. Language is a collective receptacle to absorb the content of this culture and knowledge acquired socially through a system of symbols of self-expression and communication of ideas, emotions and desires. Which is the most comprehensive, the language more than the culture or the culture more than the language or both true? The latter proposal is optimal from a research point of view. Hence, we propose to increase theoretical and applied field studies and to obtain up-to-date information that will play an important role in bringing together different viewpoints.

8. References:

- 1- Aitchison, Jean. (1999). Linguistics. UK: Bookpoint Ltd.
- 2- Bamgbose, A. (1991). Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Saharan Africa. Edinburgh.
- 3- Birgit Brock-Utne . (2005) . The interrelationship between language and Culture. Norway: Oslo .
- 4- Biljana Mišić Ilić. (2004). Linguistics and Literature. Vol. 3, No 1, Language and Culture Studies – Wonderland through the Linguistic Looking Glasses UDC 81:008 English Department, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš.
- 5- Brown, P. and Levinson S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals of Language Usage. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- 6- Campbell, L. (1997). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Retrieved October 4, 2005.
- 7- Coates, J. (1986). Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language. London, Longman.
- 8- Cook, Guy. (2003). Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 9- Crystal, David. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 10- Diamond, A.S.(1959). The History and Origin of Language. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- 11- Duranti, A. (1997). Linguistic Anthropology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 12- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). Sociolinguistic Rules of Address' in Pride and Holmes. USA.
- 13- Fasold, Ralph W & Connor Linton Jeff. (2006). An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 14- Goodenough, W.H. (1996). Culture. In Levinson & Ember (Eds.) Encyclopedia of cultural anthropology. vol. 1. New York: Henry Holt and co.
- 15- Gumperz, J.J. (1996). On Teaching Language in its Sociocultural Context. In D.I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), Social interaction, social context, and language (pp. 469-480). Mahay, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 16- Hartmann, et al. (1972). Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London: Applied Science Publishers Ltd.
- 17- Holmes, J. (1995). Women, Men and Politeness. London, Longman.
- 18- Hudson, R. A. (1996). Sociolinguistics. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 19- Kaplan, Robert. (2002). The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 20- Kramsch, C. (1993). Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 21- Kramsch, Claire. (1998). Language and Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 22- Labov, W. (1966). The Social Stratification of English in New York City, Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics. USA.
- 23- Lyons, John. (1981). Language and Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 24- 24 - Nishida, H. (1999). A cognitive approach to intercultural communication based on schema theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(5), 753-777.
- 25- Nostrand, Howard. (1989). Authentic texts and cultural authenticity: An Editorial. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 49-52.
- 26- Okonkwo, C. (1983). *Bilingualism in Education: The Nigerian experience re-examined Prospects*. USA.
- 27- Salzman, Z. (1993). *Language, Culture and Society: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*. 3rd ed. USA: Tuscon, Westview.
- 28- Sapir, E. (1970). *The Status of Linguistics as a Science of Language*. Reprinted in *The Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*, ed. by D.G. Mandelbaum, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 160-6
- 29- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- 30- Sapir, Edward.(1929). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1921, p. 7.
- 31- Stern, H. H.(2009). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 32- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- 33- Tannen, D. (1996). *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- 34- Trudgill , Peter . (1995) . *Sociolinguistics : An Introduction to Language and Society*. England : Penguin Books Ltd .
- 35- Vidanović, Dj., Mišić Ilić, B. et al. (2000). *Forms of Address in Contemporary Serbian*. USA: Congress.
- 36- Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. (4th ed). USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- 37- Wood, F.T.(1969). *An Outline History of the English Language*. Macmillan India Ltd, Chennai.
- 38- Yule, George. (2006). *The Study of Language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 39- 39 - Yule, George. (2010). *The Study of Language*. 4th ed . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 40- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

©opyright