



*Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*

*Academic Journal of History and Idea*

ISSN: 2148-2292

11 (3) 2024

*Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article*

*Geliş tarihi |Received:15.04.2024*

*Kabul tarihi |Accepted:25.05.2024*

*Yayın tarihi |Published:25.06.2024*

**Zarifa Sadigzadeh**

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1179-1214>

Lecturer, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan, zerifesadiqzade@ndu.edu.az

**Atf Künyesi / Citation Info**

Sadigzadeh, Z. (2024). Interplay of Linguistic Relativism and Universalism. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, 11 (3), 1750-1758.

## **Interplay of Linguistic Relativism and Universalism**

### **Abstract**

*Linguistic Relativism, often encapsulated in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, posits that the language we speak influences our cognition, shaping our perception and interpretation of the world. This theory challenges the notion of a universal human experience, suggesting that linguistic structures and vocabularies mold our thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors. Contrasting this, linguistic universalism, championed by Noam Chomsky, argues for innate cognitive structures shared across all humans, transcending linguistic diversity. This article explores the origins, key proponents, and evidence supporting both perspectives, examining the interplay between language, thought, and culture. By analyzing studies on color perception, spatial orientation, and time conceptualization, alongside neurobiological and psycholinguistic research, the article highlights the ongoing debate and interdisciplinary scholarship in understanding the complex relationship between language, cognition, and culture.*

**Keywords:** *Linguistic Relativism, Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, Linguistic Universalism, Noam Chomsky, Universal Grammar, Language and Cognition*

## **Dilsel Görecelik ve Evrenselciliğin Etkileşimi**

### **Öz**

*Genellikle Sapir-Whorf hipotezinde özetlenen Dilsel Görecelik, konuştuğumuz dilin bilişimizi etkilediğini, dünyayı algılayışımızı ve yorumlayışımızı şekillendirdiğini öne sürer. Bu teori, dilsel yapıların*



<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/atdd>

*ve kelime dağarcığının düşüncelerimizi, inançlarımızı ve davranışlarımızı şekillendirdiğini öne sürerek evrensel bir insan deneyimi kavramına meydan okur. Bunun aksine, Noam Chomsky tarafından savunulan dilbilimsel evrenselcilik, dilsel çeşitliliği aşarak tüm insanlar arasında paylaşılan doğuştan gelen bilişsel yapıları savunur. Bu makale, dil, düşünce ve kültür arasındaki etkileşimi inceleyerek her iki bakış açısını destekleyen kökenleri, temel savunucuları ve kanıtları araştırmaktadır. Nörobiyolojik ve psikodilbilimsel araştırmaların yanı sıra renk algısı, uzamsal yönelim ve zaman kavramsallaştırması üzerine yapılan çalışmaları analiz eden makale, dil, biliş ve kültür arasındaki karmaşık ilişkiyi anlamada süregelen tartışmaları ve disiplinler arası çalışmaları vurgulamaktadır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Dilsel Görecelik, Sapir-Whorf Hipotezi, Dilsel Evrenselcilik, Noam Chomsky, Evrensel Dilbilgisi, Dil ve Biliş*

### **Introduction**

Linguistic Relativism, often referred to as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, proposes a fascinating perspective on language and cognition. At its core, this theory suggests that the language we speak influences not just how we communicate, but also how we perceive and interpret the world around us. This notion challenges the traditional assumption of a universal human experience, suggesting instead that the structure and vocabulary of our language shape our thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors. In this article, we discuss the concepts of linguistic relativism, exploring its origins, key proponents, supporting evidence, critiques. Universalism offers a contrasting perspective to linguistic relativism, suggesting that there are underlying cognitive structures shared by all humans regardless of the language they speak. While linguistic relativism emphasizes the influence of language on thought and perception, universalism posits the existence of innate cognitive capacities that transcend linguistic differences. The term "Sapir-Whorf hypothesis" emerged to describe the theories put forth by Sapir and Whorf. Sapir's contributions to linguistic anthropology and his exploration of the linguistic diversity among Indigenous peoples of North America laid the groundwork for Whorf's elaboration of linguistic relativism. Universalism, particularly in the realm of language and cognition, gained prominence through the work of Noam Chomsky, an American linguist, philosopher, and cognitive scientist. Chomsky's theory of universal grammar proposed that humans possess an innate linguistic capacity that enables them to acquire language effortlessly. Chomsky's ideas challenged behaviorist theories of language acquisition prevalent at the time, which emphasized environmental input and reinforcement. Overall, the historical context of linguistic relativism and universalism reflects a rich tapestry of interdisciplinary scholarship, spanning linguistics, anthropology, psychology, and philosophy. These concepts continue to

evolve and stimulate debate among researchers seeking to understand the complex relationship between language, cognition, and culture.

### **1. Linguistic relativism: how language shapes perception**

The idea that language influences thought and perception, often referred to as linguistic relativity or the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, proposes that the language we speak shapes not only how we communicate but also how we perceive and conceptualize the world around us. At its core, this concept suggests that different languages offer unique frameworks for understanding reality, influencing the way speakers categorize experiences, form concepts, and reason about the world. This influence occurs through the vocabulary, grammar, and linguistic structures inherent to each language (Whorf, 1956). Linguistic relativism posits that different languages offer unique conceptual frameworks through which speakers interpret reality. This idea traces back to the work of linguists Benjamin Lee Whorf and Edward Sapir in the early 20th century. Whorf and Sapir observed patterns in language that seemed to correlate with differences in cultural practices and thought processes among speakers of different languages. For example, the famous linguistic anthropologist Franz Boas, a mentor to both Sapir and Whorf, studied the Inuit languages and noted the numerous terms for snow. This linguistic richness, he argued, reflected the Inuit people's deep understanding and nuanced perception of snow, essential for their way of life. Similarly, Whorf's analysis of the Hopi language suggested a worldview in which time was conceptualized differently from Western languages, challenging the notion of a linear, absolute concept of time. Supporters of linguistic relativism argue that language not only reflects but also shapes our reality. The vocabulary and grammatical structures of a language influence how speakers categorize, conceptualize, and reason about the world (Boas, 1966). Critics of linguistic relativism, however, contend that while language may influence thought to some extent, it does not entirely determine it. They argue that there are universal cognitive processes and concepts shared by all humans, regardless of language. Furthermore, they point out the methodological challenges in proving linguistic determinism, as it is difficult to disentangle the effects of language from other cultural and environmental factors.

The grammatical structure of a language can shape thought and perception. Languages vary in their syntax, word order, and grammatical features, which can influence how speakers organize and express their thoughts. For instance, languages with grammatical gender may subtly influence perceptions of objects based on their assigned gender categories.

The relationship between language, thought, and culture is complex and intertwined. Cultural norms, values, and beliefs are embedded in language through idiomatic expressions, metaphors, and cultural references. As a result, language serves as a vehicle for transmitting and perpetuating cultural perspectives and worldviews (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Benjamin Lee Whorf and Edward Sapir are two key proponents of linguistic relativism, whose theories have significantly shaped our understanding of the relationship between language, thought, and culture.

Edward Sapir was an American linguist and anthropologist who played a pivotal role in the development of linguistic anthropology and the study of linguistic diversity in North America. Sapir's work focused on the interplay between language, culture, and cognition. He emphasized the idea that language is not merely a tool for communication but also a reflection of the cultural and cognitive systems of its speakers. One of Sapir's most influential contributions is the concept of linguistic relativity, which suggests that the structure and vocabulary of a language shape the way its speakers perceive and conceptualize the world. He argued that different languages offer unique perspectives on reality, leading to variations in thought and behavior among speakers of different languages. Sapir conducted extensive fieldwork among Indigenous peoples of North America, documenting their languages and cultural practices. His studies of languages such as Navajo and Hopi provided empirical evidence for the influence of language on cognition and cultural worldview.

Benjamin Lee Whorf was an American linguist and chemical engineer who worked closely with Sapir and further developed his ideas on linguistic relativism. Whorf expanded on Sapir's theories, particularly through his analysis of the Hopi language and his concept of linguistic determinism—the idea that language determines thought. Whorf's analysis of the Hopi language challenged conventional Western notions of time, suggesting that the Hopi conceptualized time in a fundamentally different way from speakers of Indo-European languages. He argued that the grammatical structure of Hopi reflected a cyclical, event-oriented view of time, as opposed to the linear, clock-based conception of time in Western languages (Whorf, 1956). Together, Sapir and Whorf laid the theoretical foundation for linguistic relativism, emphasizing the dynamic relationship between language, thought, and culture. Their pioneering work continues to influence scholars across disciplines, sparking ongoing debate and inquiry into the nature of human language and cognition.

## 2. Case studies and empirical insights

Some examples and evidence to support the concept of linguistic relativism: Color Perception. One classic example of linguistic relativism comes from studies of color perception. Different languages categorize and label colors in various ways, which can influence how speakers perceive and remember colors.

Researchers such as Paul Kay and Brent Berlin conducted cross-cultural studies on color perception, examining how languages categorize and label colors. Their studies found that languages vary in the number and specificity of color terms they possess, and speakers of languages with more specific color terms are better at discriminating between colors within those categories. Some languages have separate words for colors that English speakers might categorize under a single term (e.g., distinguishing between "light blue" and "dark blue"). Studies have shown that speakers of languages with more specific color terms are better at discriminating between colors within those categories compared to speakers of languages with fewer color terms (Berlin & Kay, 1991). Spatial Orientation. Linguistic relativism also extends to spatial orientation and directionality. Different languages use different frames of reference to describe spatial relationships, which can affect how speakers navigate and conceptualize space.

Linguist Stephen Levinson conducted experiments on spatial orientation, comparing speakers of languages with different frames of reference for describing spatial relationships. His research found that speakers of languages with egocentric frames of reference (e.g., "left," "right") navigate space differently from speakers of languages with allocentric frames of reference (e.g., "north," "south"). Other languages use an allocentric frame of reference, where spatial relations are described in relation to external landmarks (e.g., "north," "south") (Levinson, 2003). Linguistic relativism also applies to the conceptualization of time. Different languages have different ways of expressing temporal concepts, which can influence how speakers perceive and reason about time. Cognitive scientists Lera Boroditsky and Alice Gaby conducted experiments on time conceptualization across different cultures and languages. For example, some languages use a futureless language structure, where the future is not grammatically distinguished from the present (e.g., the Aymara language spoken in South America). Speakers of such languages may have a different conceptualization of the future compared to speakers of languages that grammatically distinguish the future (Whorf, 1956).

## **2.1. Linguistic universalism: shared human experience beyond linguistic boundaries**

Linguistic universalism is a concept that stands in contrast to linguistic relativism. While linguistic relativism suggests that language influences thought and perception, linguistic universalism posits that there are underlying cognitive structures shared by all humans regardless of the language they speak. Linguistic universalism is closely associated with the theory of universal grammar, proposed by linguist Noam Chomsky. According to Chomsky, humans are born with an innate linguistic capacity that enables them to acquire language rapidly and effortlessly. Chomsky argued that children acquire language through a process of hypothesis testing and rule formation, guided by their innate language faculty. Linguistic universalism is supported by cross-linguistic similarities in language structure and processing. Despite the diversity of languages around the world, there are common patterns and principles that recur across different linguistic systems. For example, languages typically exhibit similar word order patterns (e.g., subject-verb-object), hierarchical sentence structures, and distinctions between nouns and verbs, suggesting underlying cognitive universals (Chomsky, 1957). Overall, linguistic universalism emphasizes the existence of shared cognitive structures underlying language use and comprehension, regardless of linguistic diversity. By highlighting the universal aspects of language and cognition, linguistic universalism offers insights into the innate capacities and mechanisms that enable humans to acquire and use language across cultures and contexts.

## **2.2. Case studies and empirical insights**

Some evidence and arguments in favor of linguistic universalism, along with research findings or theories that support the idea of universal cognitive structures underlying language: Cross-Linguistic Similarities. One of the key pieces of evidence supporting linguistic universalism is the presence of cross-linguistic similarities in language structure and processing. Despite the diversity of languages spoken around the world, there are common patterns and principles that recur across different linguistic systems. For example, most languages exhibit similar word order patterns (e.g., subject-verb-object), hierarchical sentence structures, and distinctions between nouns and verbs. These shared features suggest the existence of universal cognitive structures underlying language.

Neurobiological Evidence. Neurobiological research has provided evidence for the existence of universal neural substrates underlying language processing. While there may be variations in how languages are represented in the brain, there are also consistent patterns of

activation in regions associated with language comprehension and production (Hagoort & Indefrey 2014). Studies using neuroimaging techniques such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) have identified common neural circuits involved in language processing across different languages and language modalities. This suggests that there are universal cognitive mechanisms underlying language comprehension and production. Language Acquisition. Studies of language acquisition in infants provide further support for linguistic universalism. Research has shown that children from diverse linguistic backgrounds follow similar developmental trajectories in acquiring language, suggesting that there are innate cognitive capacities that facilitate language learning. Noam Chomsky's theory of universal grammar proposes that humans are born with an innate linguistic capacity that enables them to acquire language rapidly and effortlessly. This innate language faculty provides the foundation for the diversity of languages observed across different cultures.

Language Processing Universals. Psycholinguistic research has identified universal principles governing language processing, such as the preference for subject-verb-object word order and the use of recursion to generate hierarchical structures in language (Harley, 2013). Cognitive scientists have proposed models of language processing that incorporate these universal principles, such as the Connectionist Model and the Information Processing Model. These models suggest that there are common cognitive mechanisms underlying language comprehension and production across different languages.

Overall, the evidence and arguments in favor of linguistic universalism highlight the existence of shared cognitive structures underlying language use and comprehension. By emphasizing the universal aspects of language and cognition, linguistic universalism offers insights into the innate capacities and mechanisms that enable humans to acquire and use language across cultures and contexts.

### **Conclusion**

Linguistic relativism, also known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, suggests that the language we speak influences how we perceive and interpret the world around us. Proponents like Benjamin Lee Whorf and Edward Sapir argued that different languages offer unique frameworks for understanding reality, shaping cognition and cultural practices among speakers. Evidence supporting linguistic relativism includes studies on color perception, spatial orientation, time

conceptualization, and gender and language, demonstrating how language influences thought and perception.

Linguistic universalism posits that there are underlying cognitive structures shared by all humans regardless of the language they speak. Key aspects of linguistic universalism include the theory of universal grammar proposed by Noam Chomsky, cross-linguistic similarities in language structure and processing, neurobiological evidence for universal neural substrates underlying language processing, and common principles governing language acquisition and processing. Universalism emphasizes the innate capacities and mechanisms that enable humans to acquire and use language across cultures and contexts (Hagoort & Indefrey, 2014).

- The debate between linguistic relativism and universalism offers valuable insights into the relationship between language, thought, and culture.

- Linguistic relativism highlights the diversity and richness of linguistic and cultural diversity, emphasizing how language shapes cognition and perception.

- Linguistic universalism emphasizes the commonalities and universals underlying language and cognition, suggesting that there are innate cognitive capacities that facilitate language learning and processing.

- By integrating both perspectives, we gain a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between language, cognition, and culture in shaping the human experience.

- Ultimately, the significance of linguistic relativism and universalism lies in their contributions to our understanding of human cognition, cultural diversity, and communication, offering valuable insights into the ways in which language influences thought, perception, and behavior.

## References

Berlin, B. and Kay, P. (1991). *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. University of California Press.

Boas, F. (1966). *Introduction to Handbook of American Indian Languages*. University of Nebraska Press.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton.

Hagoort, P. and Indefrey, P. (2014). *The Neurobiology of Language: Beyond single words*. Annual Review of Neuroscience.

Harley, T. (2013). *The Psychology of language. From Data to Theory*. Psychology Press.



Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.

Levinson, S. C. (2003). *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge University Press.

Sapir, E. (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. *Language*, 207-214.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. MIT Press.