

Lexicography among Indian languages: A case study of the linguistic relativity hypothesis

Nazir Ahmad Dhar

Professor, Head, Department of Linguistics

University of Kashmir, India 190006

Email Id: proflingdhar@gmail.com

Abstract

Underlying principle of Linguistic Relativity Theory is to discern an influential relationship between language, culture and thought. Culture in an ingrained set of behaviors and modes of perception that assert the way to people to organize and shape their worlds. One of the salient features of culture is that people adhere to cultural relativism. The characteristics of culture being relative instead of universal in nature, is plausible on the basis of various types of cross cultural studies. Fischer (1966) has analyzed the cultural comparison between Truks and Ponape while correlating syntactic diversity with social structures- one of the cultural forms. Similarly Hymes (1966) worked out the culture oriented linguistic description of Amerindians language forms an indispensable part of culture. This enunciates the fact that language and culture are intricately interwoven with each other. Harry Hoiyer (1964) opines that the interrelation of language and other aspects of the culture is so close that no part of the culture of a particular group can be purposely studied without reference to the linguistic symbols in

use. Simultaneously separating the study of linguistic forms from the cultural matrix of its people will lose the paramount understanding in language.

The cardinal objective underlying lexicography is to explore the horizons of form, content and function of a minimum unit of linguistic structure- the lexicon. Most of the linguistic processes that language undergoes are often lexicon centered. Communication transactions are largely accomplished by lexicon as the speaker or the writer carves his thoughts or feelings out of these lexicons. Thus lexicon forms the nucleus of the language corpora. Language Corpora is of central importance for the dictionaries. Dictionaries, although dates back to the Greek

Key words: Lexicon, lexical unit, word, world view, cultural values, language corpora, linguistic relativity.

civilization, have primary significance in linguistics, language studies and epistemology. The field of lexicography, in which dictionaries comprise a part, has flourished tremendously for the last few decades for the satisfaction of perceived needs. The purpose and goal for making dictionary differ from type to type. The serious lacuna that transpires in most of the dictionaries is the methodology which misses holistic approach.

Eugene. A Nida postulates that relationship between study of language and ethnology must be taken into account for translation of one language in to another and he goes to the extent of saying that words are fundamental symbols for features of culture. The postulation proposed by Eugene Nida seems to be of vital importance in lexicography and dictionary making.

Thus the lexicon "brother-in-law" in English culture enmeshes various types of kinship categories like sister giving, sister taking etc which are being denoted by different types of kinship terms and among various language groups like Balto-Slavic, Indo-Aryan etc. Twelve entries for camel in Arabic language will not have equivalents in other languages.

Similarly it is a subject matter of serious inquiry for lexicography to find out that the identical lexical units differ in holding cultural values in the perspective of dialect variation. This hypothesis is quite evident in the context of various Indian languages.

Introduction

Orhun Pamuk in his Nobel lecture, 2006, entitled "My Father's Suit Case" prophesies. "As I sit at my table, for days, months, years slowly editing words to empty pages, I feel as if I were bringing into being the other person inside me, in the same way that one might build a bridge, or a dome, stone by stone. As we hold words in our hands, like stones, sensing the way in which each is connected to other, looking at them sometimes from a far, sometimes from a very close, caressing them with our fingers and the tips of our pens, weighing them, moving them around, year in year out, patiently and hopefully, we create new world. ... But once we have shut ourselves away we soon discover that we are not as alone as we thought. We are in the company of words of those who came before us, of other people's stories, other people's book — things we call tradition [culture]". This quotation of Orhan Pamuk divulge that "word" is probably the most vital and powerful endowment by means of it we built up and stabilize our intellectual engagements with the world and regulate our social and interpersonal behaviour in the

society. It also encapsulates that "word" is the tool for cultural repository of the people.

Language is the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other by means of linguistic symbols or words. The linguistic symbols or words carry the process of linguistic transaction which consists of speaking and listening or writing and reading. In more general terms, the transaction consists of the production and reception of linguistic message. Words comprise the basic unit to formulate communicative transaction. Set of rules for combining the basic units into larger, more complex like phrases and sentences constitute the grammar of language and a list of basic units constitutes the lexicon of the language. Lexicon can be seen as the nucleus of the dictionary. The study of lexicon in the context of dictionary formation has been conceived into a specified area of study popularly known as lexicography which has the objective to write the words in some concrete form i.e. the premise of lexicography where in writing people insert their thoughts or feelings in the word; words accomplish the transfer by containing the thoughts or feelings and conveying them to others, and reading people extract the thoughts and feelings once again from the words. John Donne wrote, "No man is an island entire of itself, every man is the piece of the continent, a part of the main" (Brown 1993: 1225). Continent infers here the cultural domain and likewise cultural domains imply diversity instead of universality. A language is a part of a culture and culture is a part of language; the two are two without losing, the significance of either language or culture. Diversity is inherent principle among human languages. The linguistic diversity predominantly established fact that cultural norms differ from

place to place and from people to people. The cultural difference is in congruent with the variations in subtle, intricate and complex properties between languages. Since lexicography occupies centrality in the language structure, therefore it is safe to argue that lexicography if expounded within the cultural matrix of the people will have utility to reach out to the gross root level of the society.

Language-Culture Relationship: A Perspective

The nature of language-culture relationship has dominated the academic discourse of linguists, anthropologists, sociologist, philosophers and psychologists during the period of 20th century. The notion of culture has become perplexing issue that has led to greater diversity of opinions for the approaches differ in describing culture and they also differ in their ultimate goals. But most of the theories of culture share the common understanding belief that whatever has been created, 'achieved and learned by humans in the course of their evolution fall under the ambit of culture. Edward Tylor proposed the following definition of culture:

"Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". (Haviland 1989:278).

Franz Boas tried to search out the definition of culture within the behavioural model and wrote, "culture may be defined as the totality of mental and physical reactions and activities that characterizes the behaviour of the individuals comprising a social group collectively and individually in relation to their natural environment, to other groups, to members of the groups itself and

each individual to himself. It also includes the products of these activities and their role in the life of the group". (1911:149)

In this respect, culture is the behaviour, characteristic of the members of the group as a whole i.e. shared by all its members. This perspective reveals that the development of behaviour in an individual is the consequence of the combined influence of nature and nurture i.e. genetic inheritance and the environment respectively. These two interact in a complex manner to produce, what makes a human being, vary from every other person or a group or community. Culture accordingly to this doctrine is one of the fundamental tools that shapes the thought patterns and world view of the people. Goodenough, the staunch proponent of this doctrine, wrote, "... culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the form of things that people have in mind, their models of perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting, them." (1964:36). Sociologists like Maclver and Page believe culture to be the entire of social heritage which include the realm of styles, of values, of emotional attachments and of intellectual achievements. Although varied opinions have been figured out for the approach and treatment of the subject matter "culture" by the scientists of different streams of orientation but most of these opinions, share the fundamental ideas like culture is learned (Oswalt 1986, Haviland 1989); culture is knowledge (Goodenough 1964, Lava 1988); culture is shared (Rossi-Landi 1970) and culture is integrated (Malinowski 1923).

It is essentially a relevant fact that common property of all groups of men, which distinctively set off mankind from all

other species, is culture and civilization. But an equally important consideration is the language- nearly autonomous, self-consistent and self-contained system which is discernable within the totality of culture. Culture and language share certain properties, processes and allegiances which are considered to be of paramount importance for socialization and cognition- two unique human endeavours. There is however, one kind of context, one body of phenomena, which language and culture indubitably share and that is meaning. Lado (1957) argues that the acquisition of language is also the acquisition of culture. Harry Hoijer wrote, "The interrelations of language and other aspects of culture is so close that no part of the culture of a particular group can be properly studied without reference to the linguistic symbols in use". (1964: 456). Language-culture enunciates that languages are the symbolic representation of culture. Culture underlines all behaviour of human beings acquired as a member of a society. This behaviour, whether in the form of values, attitudes beliefs or in material acts etc is expressed through language. So language as a means of maintaining this functional necessity also exists because of culture. The use of language outside particular cultural contexts impedes communication. Communication can be meaningful only as long, as there exists a range of reference and a world of reality. This range of reference and world of reality are different for speakers of different languages and dialects and are largely provided by culture. Therefore describing language structure (including lexicography) with reference to cultural facets of the people make one to know "how linguistics forms are influenced by physiological, mental, social and other aspects of cultural elements; what is the real nature of meaning and form, and how they correspond; a theory which in fine, would give us a set of well-founded plastic definition

of grammatical [lexical] concepts". (Hymes 1964:4). Boroditsky explains approximately the similar idea with following examples: "Humans communicate with one another using an astonishing array of languages, and each language differ from the next in innumerable ways (from obvious differences in pronunciation and vocabulary to more subtle differences in grammar). For example to say that 'the elephant ate the peanuts' in English, we must include tense- the fact that the event happened in the past. In Mandarin and Indonesia, indicates when the event occurred would be optional and could not include tense and also whether the peanut-eater was male or female (though only in the past tense) ... In Turkish, on the other hand, one would specify (as a suffix on the verb) whether the eating of peanuts was witnessed or if it was hearsay" .(Gaily Article: 00567 <http://www-psych.stanford.edu/~lera/papers/ECS-proofs.pdf>). The past tense in most of the Indo-Aryan languages is indicated by two forms viz immediate past and remote past. Kashmiri language, on the other hand, has evolved three types of past tenses like immediate past, remote past and far remote past. The observations of this kind makes one to postulate that speakers end up attending to, partitioning and remembering their experience differently simply they speak different languages and hail from different cultures. The doctrine of language-culture relationship manifest tangible scheme in the modern perspective in the field of lexicography and dictionary research.

Linguistic-Relativity: A Theoretical Outline

Linguistic relativity has been squeezed out from the philosophical notions of German thinkers in the late eighteenth century and nineteenth century. The philosophical postulations enunciated by Johann Hamann, Gottfried Herder and Wilhem

Von Humboldt have become the primary source of instigations in formulating the linguistic relativity hypothesis and the dominating themes of their respective works had been either to explore the speculations about the origin of human natural language or to sum up the logical models for explaining the principles of intricate and complex structures of human natural languages. In the backdrop of linguistic theories of this kind, their deliberations have also tried to ponder over the issues with the common central idea how far languages serve as a tool to dissect nature. The theory pursued by Franz Boas had been later revitalized by Edward Sapir and Benjamann Lee Whorf. In the modern times the theory popularly known as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or the Whorfian Hypothesis is based on the following two preliminary claims:

- i. The structure of form and content across languages differ in important ways. The linguistic diversity is one of the essential means to discover human capabilities.
- ii. The structure or form or content including lexicon of different languages influence its speakers in language the world around differently in a systematic way. Hence linguistics influence over the thought of the people to shape the world view and it is of paramount importance. The following example is probably suitable to support this preliminary.

"The Chinese language is monosyllabic and uninflectional [or isolative] ... with a language so incapable of variation, a literature cannot be produced which possess the qualities we look for and admire in literary works. Elegance, variety, beauty of imaginary- this must all be lacking. A monotonous and wearisome language

must give rise to a forced and formal literature lacking in originality and interesting in its subject matter only" , (Brown 1993:127)

Sapir draws the close relationship between language and culture, maintaining that they are so closely related that both supplement each other to understand the either. Sapir wrote, "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 the language is merely an incidental 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 upon on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same worlds with different label attached". (1928: 207)

Whorf reverberates Sapir's concept of linguistic relativity. However, Whorf holds the view that understanding the ways in which the world existed, its real properties largely depend upon the linguistic of the people. Therefore Whorfian idea emphasized upon the fact that the linguistic diversity is the principle factor to apprehend the differences in the world views. Whorf states, "... all observes are not led by the same physical evidences to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar ... We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and the type 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 kaleidoscope flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds- and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds". (Wardough 1998:217). Whorfian hypothesis influenced by linguistic diversity, claims that variation between languages enshrine a way of perceiving, analyzing and acting in the world. In so far as languages differ, their speakers should differ in how they perceive and act in objectively similar situation. This concept has been known as linguistic determinism; explaining that thought and action are entirely determined by language the people speak. Demonstrative pronouns in Kashmiri and most of the Indo-Aryan languages (e.g. Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, -Marathi etc) show a remarkable difference in perception and codification. While Indo-Aryan languages have two categories to mark demonstrative pronoun [yih] 'this' and [voh] 'that' but Kashmiri language has five categories to mark demonstrative pronouns viz [yi] 'this'; [hu] 'that/masculine' (within sight); [hɔ̃] 'that/feminine' (within sight); [su] 'that/masculine' (out of sight) and [sɔ̃] 'that/feminine' (out of sight). Such evidences have ample scope for lexicography research as dictionaries and translations across these languages encounter crucial problems while handling such issues.

Different dimensions of linguistic relativity proposed have been explored during last two decades or so for achieving powerful generalizations conceiving the interrelations between language-culture and thought. Lucy (1997)-examines the historical conceptual development of empirical research on the relation of linguistic diversity and thought within the framework of linguistic anthropology and comparative psycholinguistics. Hill and Mannheim (1992) deliberated on the

issues focused on relating language-culture and world view in the anthropological perspective. Hunt and Agnoli (1991) examined linguistic relativity within the theoretical model of cognitive psychology. Lucy (1996) demonstratives that three interrelated levels are to be accounted among potential factors to determine the influence of language on thought.

Linguistic Relativity and Lexicography: Preliminaries

The foregoing description enables one to formulate the view that linguistic diversity indubitably signals cultural differences of the people. Many grammatical and lexical differences across languages fore see their explanation in the cultural differences. Therefore, the treatment of language diversity within domain of culture categories of the people may subscribe to the comprehensive understanding of language covering grammar and lexis. Wardough opines, "The strongest claim of all [i.e. theories of culture-based linguistic studies] is that the grammatical categories [including lexicography] available in a particular language not only help the users of the language to perceive the world in a certain way but also at the same time such perceptions. They [grammatical categories and lexical items] act as blinkers; you perceive only what your language allows you, or predispose you to perceive. Your language controls your 'world view'. Speakers of different languages will, therefore, have different world views ... language provides a screen or filter to reality: it determines how speakers perceive and organizes world around them, both natural world and social world". (1998: 218-19). Wide holds the view that words are cultural symbols of the people. Linguistic relativity theory is based on the principle that language and culture are inseparable from each other. Words are considered to be the fundamental

units for the architecture of language. In this backdrop lexicography is of paramount importance in the application of linguistic relativity theory. It is an acceptable fact that most of the linguistic processes that languages undergo are often word centered. Lexicographers believe that words being the nucleus of language Corpora nourish the development of language in the following ways: language following

- i. Semantic aspects of language are often based. Words carry different shades of meaning in different contents. This semantic vitality of language depends on the availability of word resources of the language.
- ii. The diglossic situation in the languages is grounded to a great extent in the power of words the language possesses.
- iii. The functional domains of language which includes literary styles of the language, language in media, language for socialization and enculturation, language for political discourse, language for social power etc is largely controlled by the resources of words available in the language.
- iv. Expendability and adoptability, considered among the potential traits of human natural language predominantly occur at the vocabulary level of language.

The above mentioned peculiar features of the word encapsulate that words are of central importance in patternin^g the structure of language. Hence enriching various linguistic horizons of language, expanding its functional domains, facilitating cross linguistic translation on scientific and creative lines, primarily depend upon the word resource of the

language. Hence lexicography and dictionary research is a quite productive discipline in academia. This field of study has gained currency even in Greek and Roman tradition. According to Robins, "the spread of literary and invention of printing gave rise to the large scale production of dictionaries and grammars of European languages. From their original function as limited glossaries of 'difficult word' dictionaries grew in size and shape to present day comprehension of books registering every word in use in language". (1979: 476).

On the basis of foregoing discussion, it is safe to say that language and culture are complimentary parts to each other. Linguistic relativity hypothesis explores the relationship between these two aspects on the basis of empirical evidences. It is an established fact that words are building stones for the architecture of language and culture. Orhun Pamuk, in his noble lecture supports this view. In this perspective it implies that to place lexicography within the cultural matrix of the language to match modern world due to globalization, technological is indispensable.

Linguistic Relativity and Lexicography: Postulations

Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis affirms that the language a person speaks, affects the person's relationship to the external world in many ways (Wardough 1998:219). If one language has a word to refer to a specific concept, it becomes easier for the speaker of that language to internalize that concepts as compared to the other language that lacks that word to indicate the similar concept. This kind of situation may also have an effect to deal with the world differently by the speakers of different languages. In the context of this theory one of the themes of

discourse in lexicography or dictionary research should be focused on to explore the followin^g postulations:

- i. Is there disharmony in the world view and conceptualization among people originating from different languages/dialects? If so, does it imply relevance in dictionaries?
- ii. Is the lexicography comprehensive while ignoring the relevance of dialect variation and the social Is the lexicography value that different lexical items encode within a single speech community?
- iii. Is accountin^g of cultural traits associated with lexicon dispensable in lexicography?

Lexicography in Indian Perspective: A Brief Account

Indian languages have a long and glorious history of lexicographic tradition. In Indian tradition of language studies, we find a good treasure of dictionaries and glossaries which include monolingual, bilingual and trilingual, general as well as technical are being prepared and used extensively from ancient times. Nirukta by yaaskacharya is considered to be the oldest document in India. Discovery of Sanskrit by the western scholars is usually credited with foundin^g comparative linguistic and discovering genetic founding genetic relationship among, Indo-European languages. Sanskrit studies by the western scholars have become the basis to initiate the movement of modern Indian lexicography. The first Sanskrit —English dictionary edited by Wilson appeared in 1819. St. Peter Berg's publication of great Sanskrit dictionary in seven volumes between 1855-1875, setting up of scholarship which is still model for similar work in different linguistic setting areas. Besides Sanskrit, other Indian languages

covered by the western scholars include Tamil, Kannad, Telgu, Marathi etc. These dictionaries were either monolingual dictionaries or bilingual where English constitute second language. The era of philological studies and planning regional languages for education, media or for other purposes added new impetus to the field of lexicography with reference to Indian context. Likewise, dictionaries for most of the Indian languages were documented. The note worthy lexicographer who figured durin⁸ this period are V S Apte (for Sanskrit language), W J Elmslie (for Kashmiri Dictionary), Stack (for Sandhi and English). According to Kelkar, "when looking at India's linguistic landscape, one is struck by India's linguistics diversity; hundreds of spoken idioms, well over a dozen of them writing and written tradition and about half a dozen language families in which to classify them. The boundary between language families (as with Oriya and Telgu) is so much sharper then within a single family (as with Oriya and Bangla). Correspondingly, mutual intelligibility is not possible across families but is atleast minimally possible within a family. Linguistic differences are linked not only with geographical difference but also coexisting groups within a single area" (2001:1). Sir George Abraham Grierson in his monumental work of *Linguistic Survey of India* (30 Volume) has attested not only grammatical feature of the language and dialects spoken on the Indian soil but also worked out comprehensive vocabularies of these languages. The science of lexicography is processing in tune with other human and social sciences in India. Kelkar notes, "Modern perspective of lexicography has opened up that the thinking of lexicography as the application of linguistic theory to the writing of reference guide to

the vocabulary of a language" (1968:142). The dictionary entries in the framework of Indian lexicography are spelled out as under:

- a. Entry word in local script.
- b. Transliteration in Roman Devnagri.
- c. Origin tag- Sanskrit, Persian, Pali, English etc.
- d. Part-of-speech tag.
- e. Sub-class tag- e.g., gender of a noun, transitivity of verb.
- f. String, of gloss in the same language in a unilateral dictionary or in another language in a bilingual dictionary- with some rudimentary-punctual structuring.
- g. Idioms and gloss of these idioms.
- h. Citations from literary texts.
- i. Etymology.
- j. Derivatives.

The lexicographic study of Kashmiri language was launched by Grierson, who compiled the few volumes of *A Dictionary of Kashmiri language* based on the material left by Pandit Ishwar Koul. In 1980, the Academy of Art, Culture and Languages brought out seven volumes of *Kashmir-Kashmir Dictionary* edited by S K Toshkhani. The same institute published 12 volumes of *Urdu-Kashmiri Farhang* in 1979. "Farhang Persian – Kashmiri" edited by M M Masoodi as published by Hanna Publishers, Srinagar, in 1998.

Lexicography of Indian Languages in Linguistic Relativity Matrix: Prospective

Linguistic relativity hypothesis generated the debate to know a particular language we speak influence the way we think about the reality. The inquiries based on empirical evidences have demonstrated that language-culture relationship provides substantial views for understanding psychological and cultural life of people. The taxonomies of taciturn and verbose speech communities (Hymes 1972) are backed on the psychological makeup of the people, the conceptualization of their world view and peculiar linguistic trait embedded in the languages they speak. The studies have also reached out the opinion that language-culture relationship paradigm also tends to the categorization and classification of linguistic forms in the language. Like, one language may group all components of a given set under one label (e.g, English: language C, "you"), another language may make several, subtle distinctions with the same set Urdu, Kashmiri, Punjabi etc). Duranti opines, "properties of objects or persons that are irrelevant to one system of classification may be crucial for another". (1997:26). Unlike English and Urdu and many other languages a crucial distinction in terms of patrilineal kin vs. matrilineal kin occurs. Thus most of the languages spoken on the Indian soil show clear distinctions between patrilineal and matrilineal cousins by using distinctive linguistic terms. Kashmiri draws further distinction of second cousin lineages which is apparent in particular lexicon. The kinship relations that fall under the category of "in-law" domain show sharp distinction

between 'daughter-given' and 'daughter-taken' among most of the languages which is ambiguous in English and many other languages. The variety of lexicon found in Indian languages denote clearly the type of kinship referred to in the "in-law" domain. Similarly wide range of kinship affiliations are demarcated by immense body of lexicon in Indian languages which indubitably document the cultural make up of the society on the basis of kinship organization. Notably the language also show further split in this gamut. For example grandparent, whether maternal or paternal have no distinction in Kashmiri but has distinctions in Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi lexicon.

Metaphors constitute an integral part of language. It is believed that culture is a store house of all the metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson wrote, "a culture may be thought of as providing, among other things, a part of available metaphors for making sense of reality" (Fraunza 2005:3). Linguistic diversity of Indian soil is linked to the cultural affinity of the people. The differences in languages and cultures figure out the large scale differences in metaphors embedded in these languages. Metaphors predominantly used in the literary works dominantly used in the literary works of Dravidian languages are grounded in the peculiar cultural history of the people. The critics and the readers elsewhere find it hard to break down the reality encapsulated in these metaphors. Similarly Kashmiri has distinct cultural legacy. The doctrines like Sufism, Rishism and Shivaism are found to be of key importance in shaping the culture as well as linguistic and literary trends of the people here in the valley. Hence the mystic and spiritual traditions has

dominated the theme of discourse in literary works for last few centuries. The use of words which shape and structure these literary works usually deviate from conventional and literal meaning and connote metaphorical notions. Thus the literature written in Kashmiri language impede to breakdown the reality for critics and readers elsewhere. Similarly customs and beliefs, festivals and celebrations adjunct to culture show diversity to some degree on Indian soil, contrive linguistic diversity as well.

Environmental distinctions have designed the distinctions in cultural and linguistic form across Indian soil. For example the environmental uniqueness in the valley of Kashmir has resulted into concerning distinct form of cultural categories for various aspects of social life which include flora fauna, art and architecture, folk and literary genre, food habits and dress codes etc. The lexicon found in Kashmir language to denote these objects unique to Kashmir has notably become the one of the sources of Kashmiri identity. The identities based on similar fashion are predominantly relevant for various other regions of India. Thus Marathi speaker defines himself to different from Hindi or Urdu speaker. The nation of identities are reflected in colloquial speech and literary genre as well as in other domains of social life.

The forgoing observations that different languages carve the world up in different ways, and that as a result their speakers think and look the world differently that has a certain appeal. This idea leads for the generalization that speakers originating from different languages and cultures show some kind of difference in

perceiving the world view. The linguistic form particularly lexicon is the key to represent such difference. meet present day need and demands. Trudgill holds the view that "dialectology is concerned to learn more Trudgill "dialectolog language, and to investigate topics such as the nature of linguistic variability and the structure of linguistic systems. All works in this category is aimed at improving linguistic theory and develop our understanding of the nature of language". (198³): 23). Lexicon seems to be one among the core areas to be studied within dialectological techniques to come to the grips of both in formulating the adequate linguistic theory and in understanding the nature of language. Therefore lexicography has ample scope of refinement while bringing in close proximity to dialectology. Empirical studies innumerate that dialect variations also manifest cultural variations to a proportionate size within language(s) or speech communities. The following illustrations from Kashmiri language and dialects try to substantiate this assumption. Kashmiri dialectology imply the fact that a sizable amount of identical lexicon differ in use and function governed by the dialectal principle of the language. The lexicon classified as euphemistic entities elsewhere in Kashmiri language constitute the part of casual expression in Kashtiwari. Kashtiwari dialect (an established dialect of Kashmiri language). This type of dialectal variations impede communication transaction among the interlocutors of cross-dialect origins. The examples like [pitrath], [ren0j], [rond], [bkut], [notLvdn] etc express the meaning paternal uncle, widow, widower, son or son-in-law, enervate in Kashtiwari while as the identical lexical entities carry the meaning malice,

bad woman, bad woman, kid, handicap respectively elsewhere. This type of barrier even leads to the circumstance of social offence among the speakers of these dialect varieties. Kashmiri language contains large count of lexicon denoting synonymy and homonymy which is determined by the dialect traits. This feature often result in communication gaps among interlocutors of cross dialect speakers. Such difference surface in folk literature hailing from these dialect communities which reveal the dialect identities within the language communities. These dialect identities are also linked with certain cultural traits peculiar to these dialects. The analogous evidences may be deciphered from other languages of Indian sub-continent.

To sum up, it emerges from foregoing description that combination of linguistic, cultural and a dialect content of the lexicon is inevitable for lexicography and dictionary research. The product of this exercise which has application to reach to the gross root level of the society may be richer in content, wider

and variegated in range. The schematic representation of this view is as under:

- a. Linguistic Content
- b. Cultural Content
- c. Dialectal Content

Conclusion

Sender-receiver-context are three fundamental and indispensable elements to fulfill all kinds of communication transactions. Each of these elements is enmeshed with linguistic, cultural and dialectal contents. Linguistic relativity

hypothesis among its varied aims, thrust upon to uncover the principles that interrelate linguistic and cultural contents. Dialect content has obvious implications in this perspective. Orhan Pamuk elucidates that the "word" has centrality in the architecture of language, literature and culture. It envisages that the lexicon has the potential to symbolize various cultural facets including world view. The realities of the world on synchrony and diachrony state are broken down by the language structure in which lexicon holds more credibility. Most of differences in cultural norms along with subtle and intricate linguistic differences. Among varied domains of applied linguistics, cross linguistic transactions and language teaching face innumerable problems in resolving the issues like blind spots, lexical gaps etc. It appears that the lexicographic and dictionary research form the holistic and theoretical and applicational approaches within the framework of hypothesis. Linguistic region like India is the best suited laboratory to substantiate empirically to this orientation.

References

- Apte, V. S. 1889. Practical Sanskrit English Dictionary. Bombay Arya Vijay Press: Pune.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. Introduction. Franz Boas (Ed). Handbook of American Indian Languages. Smithsonian Institution: Washington D C. Vol BAE-1340, part I. 1-83.
- Boroditsky Lera. 1964. Linguistic Relativity Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Cambridge Massachusetts USA. Galley Article: oo567. <http://www-psycho.stanford.edu/Lera/papers/ECS-proofs.pdf> Brown, H. Donles. 1993. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.

Printice Hall.

Corrolla, J. B (Ed). 1956. Language, Thought and Reality. Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Worf. MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass.

Dash, N Sekhar. 2003. Corpus Linguistics in India: Present Scenario and Future Direction. Vol 69. 1-4, 13, 85. *Indian Linguistics*. Deccan College: Pune.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. Linguistic Anthropology. CUP: Cambridge.

Elmslie, W. J. 1872. A Vocabulary of Kashmiri Language. Church Missionary Society: London.

Fischer, John L. 1966. Syntax and Social Structure. Truk Panape (Ed). Sociolinguistics

iolinguistics Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference. Mouton and Co, The Hague: Paris.

Frunza, Caelia. 2005. Translating Cultural- Specific Metaphoric Expressions. <http://proz.com>H Goodenough, Ward H. 1964. Cultural Anthropology and Linguistic. Dell Hymes (Ed). Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. Harper and Row Publishers: New York. Hajini, Mohidin. 1975. Outline of Cultural Heritage of Kashmir. *Founders of Kashmiri Culture*. Cultural Organization: Srinagar.

Haviland , William A. 1975. Cultural Anthropology. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York. Haviland, William A. 1989. Anthropology. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York.

Hill, J. H and Bruce, Mannheim. 1992. Language and World View Annual Review of Anthropolgy, 21. 381-406.

Hoijer, Harry. 1964. Linguistic and Cultural Change. Dell Hymes (Ed). Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in

Linguistics and Anthropology. Harper and Row Publishers: New York. 455-465. Hunt, E and Agnoli F. 1992. The Worphian Hypothesis: A Cognitive Psychology Perspective. *Psychological Review*. 98(3). 377-389.

Hymes, Dell. 1964. Introduction. Dell Hymes (Ed). *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in c'*

Linguistics and Anthropology. Harper and Row Publishers: New York.

Hymes, Dell. Two Types of Linguistic Relativity (With examples from Amerindian Ethnography). Dell Hymes (Ed). *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. Harper and Row Publishers: New York. 114-167.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. John J Gumperz and Dell Hymes. *Direction of Sociolinguistics The Ethnography of Communication*. Basil Blackwell. Sociolinguistics Ethnograph

Ashok R. 1968. The Anatomy of a Dictionary Entry with Samples Proposed for a Marathi- English Dictionary. *Indian Linguistics*. Vol 29. 142-149.

Kelkar Ashok R. 2001. Linguistic Diversity and Linguistic Identity in India. www.ciil.ebook.or(... Robert. 1957. *Linguistics across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lucy, John A. 1996. The Scope of Linguistic relativity: An Analysis and Review of Empirical Research. [http://staff.science.iiva.iil/-ililchiell/docs/I.IigRel.aiiiiui-ev.anthro.?-6.1.2⁹1.1\)df](http://staff.science.iiva.iil/-ililchiell/docs/I.IigRel.aiiiiui-ev.anthro.?-6.1.2⁹1.1)df)

Gumperz, J J and Levison, S C (Eds). *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: CUP. Lucy, John. 1997. A Linguistic Relativity. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 1997.26. 291-312.

Mallinowski, Bronislaw. 1923. The problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. C. K. Ogden and I. A Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning*. Kegan pawl: London.

Masoodi M Munaw. 1998. Farsi-Kashmiri Farhang. Hana Publishers: Srinagar.

Oswalt, Wendell H. 1986. Life Cycle and Life Ways: An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. Palo Alto C A: Mayfield.

Pamuk, Orhun. 2006. My Father's Suit Case Nobel Lecture. (Unpublished).

Robins, R. H. 1979. A Short History of Linguistics. Lingman: London.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1970. Linguistic Alienation Problems. Milan Edizioni Di Community Sapir, E. 1921. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. Harcourt, Brace: New York

Sapir, E. 1929. The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language. Vol 5*. Linguistic Society of America. Stack George A. 1855. Sindhi English Dictionary. American Mission Press. London.

Stack George A. 1949. English Sindhi Dictionary. American Mission Press: London.

Toshkhani S. K. 1979. Kashmiri-Kashmiri Dictionary(8 Volumes). Academy of Art, Culture and Language: Srinagar.

Toshkhani, S. K. 1980. Urdu- Kashmiri Dictionary. Academy of Art, Culture and Language: Srinagar. Trudgill, P. 1983. On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives. New York University Press: New York.

Wordough, Ronald. 1998. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Blackwell: London.

Colophon: I am thankful to Professor A R Bhat, SHIIS, University of Kashmir, Srinagar and Dr Sheeba Hassan, Dept of Linguistics, University of Kashmir, Srinagar for their help rendered to me during .the preparation of this paper.