ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS AS A BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

Gulchekhra Sharipovna Khazratova
Senior Teacher, The branch center for retraining and in- service training of academic staff under Tashkent Medical Academy, PhD student in UzSWLU

Annotation
The article considers anthropolinguistics, anthropological linguistics as a branch of linguistics that studies the evolution of human thinking based on its reflection in the corresponding evolution of the language (primarily its vocabulary). The main reason for this section is the fact that the majority of cultural transformations, the history of human knowledge, and a lot of socially innovative

Keywords: anthropological linguistics, social and cultural context, linguistic classifications, ethnographic branches, visual perception, indexality.

Anthropological linguistics is a subdivision of linguistics and anthropology that studies the place of language in its broader social and cultural context and its role in creating and maintaining cultural practices and social structures. While many linguists believe that the true field of anthropological linguistics does not exist, preferring the term "linguistic anthropology" to encompass this subfield, many others consider the two fields interchangeable. Although researchers studied the two areas together at different times in the nineteenth century, the intersection of anthropology and linguistics grew significantly in the early twentieth century. As American scholars became increasingly interested in the diversity of Native American societies in the New World, anthropologists and linguists worked together to analyze Native American languages and study how the language relates to the origins, distribution, and characteristics of these indigenous peoples. This interdisciplinary approach distinguished American anthropology from European anthropology; while European anthropology mainly focused on ethnography, American anthropology began to integrate linguistics and other disciplines.

Anthropological linguistics initially focused on the unwritten language, but now explores languages with and without written traditions. Early anthropological linguists primarily focused on three main areas: linguistic description, classification, and methodology. Scholars such as Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Leonard Bloomfield, and Mary Haas have compiled descriptions of the linguistic structure and linguistic characteristics of various languages. They conducted the research as a field study, using recordings of texts from native speakers and performing analyzes to classify texts into linguistic forms and genres.

Classification included the definition of genetic relationships between languages. Linguistic classifications have allowed linguistic anthropologists to systematize large amounts of information about specific population groups.

By classifying language, scholars were able to systematize and organize data from their ethnographic works.

By analyzing language, anthropological linguistics can use the constituent parts to obtain social and cultural information. It also made pattern identification possible: Boas and Sapir used these procedures to show that language patterns were not implemented among native speakers of a given language. Anthropological linguistics is one of many disciplines that study the role of languages in the social life of people and within communities. To do this, experts had to understand not only the logic of linguistic systems, such as their grammars, but also to record the actions in which these systems are used. In the 1960s and 1970s, sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics were often viewed as a single field of study, but they have since become more separate as there is more academic distance between them. While there are many similarities and certain common themes such as gender and language, they are two related but different entities.

Anthropological linguistics emerged in the United States as a subset of anthropology when anthropologists began to study indigenous cultures, and indigenous languages could no longer be ignored, and it quickly evolved into a subset of linguistics known as today. Anthropological linguistics has greatly influenced research in areas such as visual perception (especially color) and bioregional democracy, which deal with the differences made in languages with respect to the perception of the environment. Traditional linguistic anthropology is also important for the sociology and self-organization of peoples.

For example, a study of the Penans shows that their language uses six different and distinct words, the best English translation of which is "we."

Anthropological linguistics studies these differences and connects them with types of societies and with the actual adaptation of the body to the senses, just as it studies the differences made in languages in relation to the colors of the rainbow: seeing the trend towards an increase in the variety of terms as evidence that there are differences that bodies in this environment must conduct, leading to situational knowledge and possibly to situational ethics, the ultimate evidence of which is the differentiated set of terms used to denote "we".

Two branches of anthropological linguistics - nomenclature / classification and ethnographic / sociolinguistics. Indexing refers to linguistic forms that are associated with meaning through the association of specific and general, as opposed to direct naming. For example, an anthropological linguist may use indexality to analyze what an individual's use of language says about his or her social class. Indexing is inherent in form-function relationships. Although the terms anthropological linguistics and linguistic anthropology are often considered synonymous, experts often distinguish between the two. While anthropological linguistics is considered a subsection of linguistics, linguistic anthropology is generally considered a subsection of anthropology.

Anthropological linguistics also uses clearer linguistic methodology and studies languages as "linguistic phenomena." Ultimately, anthropological linguistics focuses on the cultural and social meaning of language, with more emphasis on linguistic structure. Conversely, linguistic anthropology uses more anthropological methods (such as participatory observation and field research) to analyze language across cultural frameworks and define rules for its social use. While anthropological linguistics uses language to define cultural representations, sociolinguistics views language as a social institution. Anthropological linguistics is largely interpretive, seeking to define the meaning of the use of language through its forms, registers and styles.

Sociolinguistics instead explores how language relates to different social groups and identities such as race, gender, class, and age. In the theoretical and methodological study of attitudes in the social sciences, two main directions can be distinguished - mentalistic and behavioristic.

The mentalistic tendency views attitude as a mediating concept, while the behaviorist tendency operatively defines it as a concept of probability, although in research practice both derive their measures of attitude from variation in response. While there are many different views on the structure and components of a relationship, the vast majority agree that relationships are internalized, enduring, and positively associated with behavior. Relationship research methodology includes direct and indirect measurements of all kinds, but questionnaires are more commonly used in the study of linguistic relationships than other methods. Fitting the guise method - a sociolinguistic experimental method used to determine the true feelings of an individual or community towards a language of a particular dialect or accent - is widely used for research relating to the social significance of languages and varieties of language.

A special adaptation of this technique, called mirroring, seems promising for measuring consistent assessments of language switching at a situational level. Situational self-reporting tools, such as those used by Greenfield and Fishman, also promise to be very effective research tools regarding normative views of the situational use of languages and linguistic varieties. The adherence measure has been found to be particularly suitable for collecting data on behavioral trends. Data obtained from interviews can be difficult to process and evaluate - and can cause bias on the part of those surveyed - but exploratory interviews can be especially effective in assessing attitudes, especially when used in addition to observation.

Observational data can be formally treated like more formalized tools if attempts are made to record the data in more generally accessible forms, rather than just using the approach most characteristic of the kind of data used before so far. Many linguists believe that comparisons of linguistic and social behavior are blocked by the fact that linguistic and anthropological research is rarely based on comparable datasets. While the anthropologist's description refers to specific communities, linguistic analysis refers to a single language or dialect, as well as behavior shaped through verbal signs and structural similarities. The process of linguistic analysis is focused on the detection of uniform, structurally similar wholes. The result of these procedures is the selection of one single variety from the many varieties that characterize everyday speech and behavior.

And so this conformity provides opportunities for reliable research, the object of which is the reasons for this, so there is a good knowledge of development. In addition, it will allow to create the reconstruction of individual cultural trends. For this reason, antropolinguistics is inextricably linked to various anthropological, psycho-logical, linguistic and scientific disciplines.

Reference

1. Antropological linguistics - https://ru.qaz.wiki/wiki/Anthropological _linguistics
2. https://www.textologia.ru/slovari/lingvisticheskie-terminy/antropologi cheskaya -lingvistika/?q=486&n=2334