Anthropological Linguistics

Jassim Nasser Al-Azzawi
(Ph.D.English language & Linguistics)
(The Open Educational College)

1. Introduction

This research starts from the assumption that anthropological linguistics is a distinct discipline that deserves to be studied for its past accomplishments as much as for the vision of the future presented in the work of a relatively small but active group of interdisciplinary researchers. Their contributions on the nature of language as a social tool and speaking as a cultural practice have established a domain of inquiry that makes new sense of past and current traditions in the humanities and the social sciences and invites everyone to rethink about the relationship between language and culture.

Anthropological linguistics studies the relationship between language and culture in a community. It has studied the ways in which relationships within the family are expressed in different cultures(kinship terminology),and it has studied how people communicate with one another at certain social events,e.g.ceremonies,rituals,and meetings, and then related this to overall structure of the particular community.

2. Historical background

Language is not a simple, single code used in the same manner by all people in all situations, and linguistics has now arrived at a stage where it is both possible and beneficial to begin to tackle this complexity. Linguists have realized that language does not develop in a vacuum. A language is a part of the culture of a people and the chief means by which the members of a society communicate. A language therefore is both a component of culture and a central network through which the other components are expressed.

Sapir (1949:81) reminded linguists that if their works were to be scientifically productive and aesthetically rich, they should not be dealt with apart from the study of man. This is because language is a social or a cultural product and must be understood as such.

The collaboration of the linguist and the anthropologist can be particularly close when the people whose language or culture under investigation is remote from the well-trodden paths of European civilization and European influence. The reasons are obvious, in the case of such communities, knowledge on the part of the rest of the world is scanty, and in relation to the work to be done investigators are few. Work among unknown and hitherto unstudied languages, where there is a total absence of written records, and an almost total absence of

prior scholarship, is known, appropriately, as anthropological linguistics, (Robins, 1971:360-6).

The scope of study of language in an anthropological context depends upon two things, the requirements of field work and the nature of theoretical orientations. Intellectual fashions shape a good deal of the work done in anthropology and linguistics and hence affect the scope of their intersection, often to the determinant of community and cumulativeness. The recent lines of development in this field are: English, American and French.

From British point of view, the relation between language and other aspects of culture is seen as interdependence between different aspects of the same event or social action. Language itself is seen as primarily an activity and its engagement in social context as a necessary part of its description. Its use in communication tends to be seen primarily in terms of the function of controlling or influencing action. The most prominent British anthropologists are Sir Edward Tylor, Radcliffe Brown, Malinowski, Hacort, Haddon, A.H. Gardiner, and J.R. Firth.

In United States, we can trace an involvement of linguistics in anthropological study to the early interest in American Indian languages as indicative of the origins and character of the natives of the New World. The scope of American anthropological linguistics continued to be defined in terms of the American Indian throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. The most prominent figures are: Jefferson, Thoreau, Pickering, Barton, Hale, Gibbs, Whitney, Dorsey, Sapir, Lowie and Bloomfield. In the first half of the twentieth century, American linguists focused on the autonomy of language, while the second half witnessed the integration of language in sociocultural context and the analysis of function.

In France the modern linking of anthropology and linguistics must be traced to four great scholars, the linguists,de Saussure and Mellet, the sociologist Durkhiem,and the anthropologist Mauss.De Saussure distinguished between la langue and la parole, the former pertaining to the society and the collective norm, the latter to the individual person and event.Mellet is not only a great figure of historical and comparative linguistics, but also his forthright enrolling of linguistics in the ranks of social science. Linguistics is viewed in terms of Durkheim's conception of sociology as an autonomous study with social facts as its object.

According to French school, the relationship between language and other aspects of culture tends to be seen as one of congruence between parallel systems or products of collective psychology. Language itself is seen as primarily a shared, socially inherited system, the use of which in communication tends to be seen primarily in terms of the cognitive function of distinguishing or expressing meanings, (Hymes, 1964:3-14).

3. The scope of anthropological linguistics

Language is a truly fascinating and enigmatic phenomenon. What is language? How does language work? What do all languages have in common? What range of variation is found among languages? How does human language differ from animal communication? How does a child learn to speak? How does one write down and analyze an unwritten language? Why do languages change? To what extent are social class differences reflected in language? The scientific discipline that aims to answer such questions is known as **linguistics**. The particular approach that aims to focus on the relation between language and culture is known as **anthropological linguistics**. Anthropological linguistics is a branch of both anthropology and linguistics. It is a branch of linguistics which studies the role of language in relation to human cultural patterns and beliefs. Anthropological linguistics studies, for example, the way in which linguistic features vary in order to identify a member of a speech community with a social, religious, occupational or kinship group,(Crystal,2003:26).

Some of the most common topics of anthropological linguistics deal with the way some linguistic features may identify a member of a (usually primitive) community within a particular social, religious or kinship group. Indeed, the structure of kinship is one of the prime topics where anthropologists heavily draw upon linguistics, i.e. vocabulary. The much-cited examples of the extensive vocabulary for 'snow' in Eskimo and 'camel' in Arabic were often used to prove the correlation between vocabulary differences and cultural differences, but the correspondence is far from being simple and clear-cut.

4. What is language?

The origin of the English word *language* goes back to the Latin word *lingua,* meaning "tongue." Language is the use of the tongue to create forms of thought known as *words,* or more accurately *signs.* A sign is anything that stands for something other than itself. When we use or hear the word *man,* we do not think of the individual sounds *m-a-n* that comprise it, but we perceive the sound sequence *m-a-n* as a word.

Wherever there are humans, there is language. It does not matter if the language has a billion speakers (like Mandarin Chinese) or a small handful (like some indigenous languages of America). It does not matter whether it is the main language of one or more nation states, or whether it is spoken by a small community of people. There is no better or worse language. All languages serve humans in similar ways throughout the world. They enable people to name (and thus classify) the things that are relevant and meaningful to them wherever it is they live. All languages have five basic things in common. They all have: (1) a finite set of distinctive sounds used to make words and to convey various types of meaning, (2) units that bear meanings of one kind or another known as words, (3) grammatical structure, that is, specific principles for making words, and for

putting them together to form larger units of meaning (known as sentences and texts), (4) strategies for using language in various personal and social ways (known as speech), and (5) resources for making new words and for using language in new ways. Most languages use from 20 to 60 vocal sounds to make their words. These are the building blocks of language. Words are units made with these blocks that possess meaning, that is, they stand for the things of the world. Grammar refers to how languages make words and distribute them in the chain of speech. The strategies for using a language, such as for communication and encoding knowledge, are the result of traditions established within a speech community. Finally, language itself can be used to adapt to new situations and to reflect new experiences. Every time we come up with a new word, we are acknowledging with that word that a part of the world has changed, (Danesi, 2008).

5. Culture

The term "culture" has several related senses. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines culture as 'the integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief and behaviour that depends upon man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations". Another usage in the same dictionary stresses the social aspect of culture and defines it as 'the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious or social group". A similar definition is introduced by OED, states that culture is " a particular form, stage, or type of intellectual development or civilization in a society; a society or group characterized by its distinctive customs, achievements, products, outlook, etc."

Lyons (1981:301) mentions that the term "culture" has two significant senses. The first sense is that "culture" is more or less synonymous with "civilization" opposed to "barbarism", and the adjective word is "cultured". In this sense, culture means excellence in art, literature, and social institutions. This view was emphasized by thinkers of eighteenth-century Enlightenment and associated by them with their view of human history as progress and self-development. This view was highly criticized by many scholars. The German philosopher L.G. Herder said that the German equivalent of "culture": "nothing is more indeterminate than this word, and nothing is more deceptive than its application to all nations and periods",(Williams,1976:79).He did not accept the assumption that eighteenth-century European culture which was dominated by French ideas and the French language, represented the high point of human progress. According to this assumption, French-speaking people were considered as more advanced than those whose languages were culturally less advanced. Most linguists nowadays take the view that there are no primitive languages. Every language is a complex and highly developed system of communication regardless of the society in which it is used.

The second sense is that culture may be defined as socially acquired knowledge: i.e. as the knowledge that some one has by virtue of his being a member of a particular society,(Hudson,1980:74). This is the kind of knowledge, like our first language, we initially acquire without conscious awareness. We develop awareness of our culture only after having developed language. The particular language we learn through the process of cultural transmission provides us, at least initially, with a ready-made system of categorizing the world around us and our experience of it.

We can conclude that culture is the total beliefs, attitudes, customs, behaviours and social habits of the members of a particular society. It is commonly accepted that language is a part of culture, and that it plays a very important role in it. Some social scientists consider that without language, culture would not be possible. Language simultaneously reflects culture, and is influenced and shaped by it.

6. Kinship terms

One interesting way in which people use language in daily living is to refer to various kinds of kin. Kinship includes relationships through blood and marriage. In every society, the formation of groups and the regulation of behaviour depend to some extent on socially recognized ties of kinship. Because there is a relationship between the formation of kinship groups, the development of kinship ideology, the behaviour of different kind toward one another, and the kinship terminology of a society, anthropologists refer to kinship as a system. Kinship systems are a universal feature of languages because kinship is so important in social organization. Although some systems are much richer than others, all use the factors of gender, age, generation, blood.and marriage in their organization, (Wardhaugh, 2006:229).

Kinship terms are the lexical items that are used in a language to express personal relationships within the family. All languages have kinship terms (e.g. *brother, mother, grandfather*), but they do not all put family members into categories in the same way. In some languages, the equivalent of the word *father* is used not only for "male parent", but also for "male parent's brother." In Arabic, the distinction between "paternal uncle" (عم) and "maternal uncle" (خال) is lexicalized, but in English the word *uncle* is generally used for both. In Arabic, the English word "uncle" would be translated as either عم (father's brother) or خال (mother's brother).This distinction is important in Arab culture. For example, in Iraq a daughter cannot marry without the acceptance of her father's brother and his sons, whereas her mother's brother and his sons do not have such right. .Other distinctions among relatives are lexicalized differently in the world's languages. For example, in Norwegian, the distinction between "male parent's mother" (farmor) and "female parent's mother" (mormor) is

lexicalized, but in English the word "grandmother" is used for both, (Yule, 2010:268).

If social conditions change, kinship systems will change to reflect the new conditions. The changes that happened in Russian society in the last century affected Russian kinship designation. The Russians used separate words for wife's brother "*shurin*", and for brother's wife "*nevestka*", whereas in modern Russian these unitary terms are no longer used. In stead, the phrases *brat zheny* "wife's brother" and *zhena brata* "brother's wife" are used. The word *yatrov* "husband's brother's wife" has totally disappeared, and the term *svoyak* is now used to refer to any male relative by marriage while in the past it could be used only for wife's sister's hausband.Changing family structures have removed such relative distinctions from daily contact,(Wardhaugh,2006:231).

Although a kinship system always rests on some kind of biological relationship, kinship systems are cultural phenomena. The ways in which a society classifies kin are cultural.

7. Time concepts

When we learn a word such as *day* or *week*, we are inherited a conceptual system that operates with amounts of time as common categories. Having words for units of time such as "three hours" or "five days" shows that we can think of time (i.e. something abstract") in amounts, using noun phrases, in the same way as "three students" or "five books" (i.e. something physical).People in another part of the world may not treat time in this way. In the Hopi language, spoken in Arizona, there were traditionally no terms equivalent to most of our time words and phrases (*two hours, thirty minutes*) because our terms express concepts from a culture operating on "clock time",(Yule,2010:268).

8. Address terms

Address terms are words that are used to address somebody in speech or writing. When a man on the street asks another, *Brother, can you tell me the way to the railway station?*, the word *brother* is being used as an **address term**. In English, for example, a person can potentially be addressed by name, title, kinship term, nickname, or some combination of these, for example: Johnson, Your Honour, Father, Uncle Johnson, Judge Alex, Smith or Martin. The way in which people address one another usually depends on their age, sex, social group, and personal relationships. In the simplest of societies, persons are generally addressed by either kinship term or name, though in some nonliterate societies the person's real name is never used, some substitute name being used in its place. An interaction based on unequal relationship, the address terms that are used are a title (*Doctor*) or title plus last name (*Professor Johnson*) for the one with higher status, and first name only for the one with lower status, as in: *Professor Johnson, can I ask a question?~Yes,Larry,What is it?* More equal relationships have address terms that indicate similar status of the participants,

such as first names or nicknames: *Bucky, ready for some more coffee? ~ Thanks, Jenny*. In English, people without special titles are addressed as *Mr., Mrs., Miss,* or *Ms*.Only the women's address terms include information about their social status. In fact, one of the most frequently used address terms for a woman indicates that she is the wife of a particular man (called "Frank Smith," for example),as in *Mrs.Smith,*and sometimes even *Mrs. Frank Smith*. Women are socially identified through their relationship to a man, either as wife or daughter, (Yule, 2010:273-4)

In many languages, there is a choice between pronouns used for addressees who are socially close versus distant. This is known as **T/V distinction**, as in French pronouns *tu* (close) and *vous* (distant).A similar social distinction is found in German (*du/Sie*) and Spanish (*tu/Usted*).In older English usage *thou/you* was used for unequal relationships.Traditionally, the higher status or more powerful speaker could use *tu* or *thou* to a lower-status addressee, but not vice versa. Lower- status speakers had to use *vous* or *you* when addressing those of higher status. This usage is described as non-reciprocal, but when both speakers use the same forms, this usage is described as reciprocal. The asymmetric use of names and address terms is often a clear indicator of a power differential. For a long time in the southern states of the United States, whites addressed blacks by their names in situations which required them to use titles, or titles and last names, if they were addressing whites. There was a clear racial distinction in the practice. Johnson (1943:140) introduced one consequence of this practice:

> Middle and upper-class Negro women never permit their first names to be known….. The wife of a well-to-do Negro business man went into a department store in Atlanta to enquire about an account. The clerk asked her first name and she said "Mrs. William Jones." The clerk insisted on her first name, and when she refused to give it declared that the business could not be completed without it. It was a large account; and the manager, to whom appeal was made, decided that "Mrs." was simply good business and not "social equality."

In this case the clerk used the expression "good business" in order to conceal his desire to reinforce the social inequality with the Negro woman, and to avoid the use of the first name alone in addressing her.

There are some of the possible dangers in cross-cultural communication when different relationships are expressed through what appears, superficially at least to be the same address systems. The danger is greater when a speaker learns the terms of a new address system but s/he fails to understand how they are related to one another. In English, when a speaker is doubt as to how to address another s/he can avoid this difficulty by not using any address term at all. S/he can say *Good morning* as well as *Good morning, Sir/Mr Henry/Tony*. Such avoidance may be considered as impolite or deficient in other languages. For example, in France you cannot say Bonjour, Au revoir, Merci, or Pardon without attaching

an address term. So the French say *Bonjour, Monsieur* or *Merci, Pierre*, whereas the English can say simply *Good morning* or *thank you*. The culture of a society affects the use of address terms,(Wardhaugh:2006:269-70).

9. Colour terms

The terms people use to describe colour give us another means of exploring the relationships between different languages and cultures. The colour spectrum is a physical continuum showing no breaks at all. All languages furnish their users with words that enable them to refer to certain areas of this visual continuum: in English, such colour terms as black, white, green, blue, and so on. It is a well known fact that all languages make use of basic colour terms, but the number differs from one language to another. It is also well known fact that we sometimes cannot directly translate colour words from one language to another without introducing subtle changes in meaning. For example, there is no word in French that covers exactly what "brown" does in English; there is

no single word in Russian,Spanish,or Italian that corresponds to "blue"; no single word in Hungarian that corresponds to "red"; and so on,(Wardhaugh,2006:235).

In 1969 Berlin and Kay published an important book, *Basic Color Terms*. They showed that all languages make use of basic colour terms. A basic colour term must be a single word, e.g.blue or yellow, not some combination of words, e.g. light blue or pale yellow, and must have quite general use, e.g. *blond* is applied in English only to the colour of hair and wood. The basic colour terms are eleven:*white,black,red,green,yellow,blue,brown,purple,pink,orange*,and *grey*.Berlin and Kay (1969:2-3) stated that if a language encodes fewer than eleven basic colour categories, then there are strict limitations on which categories it may encode. The distributional restrictions of colour term across languages are:

1- If a language contains only two terms, then it contains terms for *black* and *white* (or *light*).
2- If a language contains three terms, then it contains a term for *red*.
3- If a language contains four terms, then it contains a term for *green* or *yellow* (but not both).
4- If a language contains five terms, then it contains terms for both *green* and *yellow*.
5- If a language contains six terms, then it contains a term for *blue*.
6- If a language contains seven terms, then it contains a term for *brown*.
7- If a language contains eight or more terms, then it contains a term for *purple, pink, orange, grey*, or some combinations of these.

If course, if one language has only two or three colour terms, the range of each term is wider than that of a language with the total of eleven. *Black* will probably include the dark reds, browns, greens, blues and purples, which the

other languages will distinguish, (Palmer, 1981:73).An attempt has been made to relate the number of the colour items which are used in a language to the level of cultural and technical complexity of the society in which such a language is spoken. Communities that show little technological development employ the fewest colour terms;e.g.,the Jale of New Guinea have words corresponding to *dark* and *light* alone. On the other hand, technologically advanced communities have terms corresponding to all eleven basic colours. Communities in intermediate stages have intermediate numbers: for example, the Tiv of Nigeria have three terms; the Hanunoo of the Philippines have four, and the Burmese have seven. If cultural and technological changes occur, it becomes more and more necessary for people to differentiate within the colour spectrum, (Wardhaugh, 2006:235).

10. The standard language

The way this national identity is expressed is through an artificially created standard language, fashioned from a multiplicity of dialects. The standard language is the variety which is used in newspapers, mass media, books and which is taught in schools. It is the variety which is taught to those who want to learn, for example, English as a second language. A typical standard language will have passed through the following processes, (Hudson, 1980:32-4).

(1) *Selection* – a particular variety must have been selected as the one to be developed into a standard language. The choice is a matter of great importance, as the chosen variety necessarily gains prestige and so the people who already speak it share in this prestige.

(2) *Codification* – some agency such as an academic must have written dictionaries and grammar books to "fix" the variety, so that everyone agrees on what is correct. Once codification has taken place, it becomes necessary for any ambitious citizen to learn the correct forms and not to use in writing any "incorrect" forms he may have in his native variety.

(3) *Elaboration of function* – it must be possible to use the selected variety in all functions associated with central government and with writing, for example in parliament and law courts, in bureaucratic, educational and scientific documents of all kinds, and of course in various forms of literature.

(4) *Acceptance* – the variety has to be accepted by the relevant population as the national language. The standard language serves as a strong unifying force for the state, as a symbol of its independence of other states.

Language acquires a symbolic value beyond its pragmatic use and becomes a totem of a cultural group. Members of a group who feel that their cultural and political identity is threatened are likely to attach particular importance to the

maintenance or resurrection of their language, e.g., Quebec, Belgium, Wales among many others.

11. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can be broken down into two basic principles: **linguistic determinism** and **linguistic relativity**. Linguistic determinism refers to the idea that language determines the way people perceive and organize their worlds. In the Whorfian view, language provides a screen or filter to reality; it determines how speakers perceive and organize the world around them, both the natural and social worlds. As a result, the language we speak helps to form our world-view. Linguistic relativity is a belief that the way people view the world is determined wholly or partly by their native language. The idea that the way we see the world is (to some degree) dependent on the language we use is an old one, but it was most clearly and influentially voiced by Wilhelm von Humboldt in his contention that each language contains a peculiar *Weltanschauung* (world view), which causes its speakers to see and think in a characteristic way, different from the speakers of other languages.

In the first half of the 20th century these ideas were particularly embraced in America, by the anthropologist F. Boas and linguist Edward Sapir, and expanded by Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf in what became known as the "Sapir-Whorf hypothesis" of language relativity. Whorf's much-quoted statement that language is "the shaper of ideas" and that "we dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages" has become the credo of linguistic determinism,(Yule,2010:269).Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf produced arguments, in the 1930s, claimed that the Hopi Indians of Arizona perceived the world differently from other tribes (e.g. the English-speaking tribe) because their language led them to do so. In the grammar of Hopi, there is a distinction between "animate" and "inanimate", and among the set of entities categorized as "animate" were *clouds* and *stones*. Whorf concluded that the Hopi believe that *clouds* and *stones* are animate (living) entities and that it is their language which leads them to believe this. Now, English does not mark in its grammar that *clouds* and *stones* are animate, so English speakers do not see the world in the same way as the Hopi.

A number of arguments have been presented against this view. Sampson (1980:86) states that there is a French tribe which has a language in which differences in sex are marked grammatically, so that the terms used for females have special markings in the language. They use the terms *la femme* (woman), *la pierre* (stone) and *la porte* (door).Do you think that the French believe that *stones* and *doors* are "female" in the same way as woman? When the Hopi consider stone as animate, it does not mean that a Hopi truck driver thinks he has killed a living creature when he runs over a stone with his truck.

Trudgill (1995:15-20) introduces examples against Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to show the opposite direction-the effect of society on language, and the way in which environment is reflected in language. First, there are many examples of the physical environment in which a society lives being reflected in its language, normally the structure of its lexicon. For example, Arabic has a large vocabulary of *camel* and *sword*, whereas English has only one word for each. The reasons are obvious; *camel* and *sword* have significant influences on the life of old Arab people. Secondly, the social environment can also be reflected in language, and can often have an effect on the structure of the vocabulary. For example, kinship systems in English-speaking societies are those that are signaled by single vocabulary items: *son, daughter, grandson, granddaughter, uncle, aunt, cousin*. It is possible to talk of other relationships such as *eldest son, maternal aunt, great uncle*, and *second cousin*, but the distinction between "maternal" and paternal" aunt or uncle is not important in western societies, and is not reflected in the English lexicon. Whereas such a distinction is important in eastern societies, and is reflected in the lexicon of their languages.Thirdly, the values of a society can also have an effect on its language. The significant example in which this happens is through the phenomenon known as taboo and euphemism which is discussed earlier in this study.

Pinker (1994:59-67) introduces the strongest criticism to Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. He says that Whorf's claims were "outlandish", his arguments were circular, any evidence he gave for them was either anecdotal or suspect in some other way, and all the experiments conducted to test the ideas have proved nothing. The notion that language determines thought may be partially correct, in some extremely limited way, but it fails to take into account the fact that users of a language do not inherit a fixed set of patterns to use. They inherit the ability to manipulate and create with a language, in order to express their perceptions. If thinking and perception were totally determined by language, then the concept of language change would be impossible. If a young Hopi boy had no word in his language for the object known to us as a computer, would he fail to perceive the object? Would he be unable to think about it? What the Hopi does when he encounters a new entity is to change his language to accommodate the need to refer to the new entity. The human manipulates the language, not the other way around.

Furthermore, we can add the following points which prove the invalidity of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis:

1- Whorf claimed that the Hopi language has no concept of time; while the anthropologist Malotki (1983) has found that the Hopi do have a concept of time very similar to ours-and in fact they have units of time, and a sophisticated calendar.

2- If a language affects thought, then some concepts would only be understandable in the language in which they were first thought. All linguists agree that translation is possible, and it occurs in all languages.

3- Words are borrowed from one language into another. If language determines thought, borrowing will be impossible.

4- If language determines thought, then children will be incapable of learning language at all.

5- Do the bilinguals have different views of the world?

It is true that each of us accepts many inherited presuppositions, and such presuppositions may well be reflected in our language, but we modify or replace them by new and better ideas. The next generation will do the same thing. Language is the means by which we interpret our environment, by which we classify or conceptualize our experiences, by which, by which we are able to impose structure on reality. The culture of a people finds reflection in the language they employ because they use language in ways that reflect how they value things, and do them in certain ways. In this view, cultural requirements do not determine the structure of a language, but they certainly influence how a language is used and perhaps determine why specific bits and pieces are the way they are.

12. Folk Taxonomies

In addition to the Sapir-Whorph hypothesis, folk taxonomies have received a lot of attention in studying the relation between language and culture. Taxonomy means the popularly accepted classification of various cultural domains; plants, animals, colours, diseases, kinship terms, speech acts, or whatever, (Penalosa: 1981:55).A folk taxonomy is a way of classifying a certain part of reality so that it makes some kind of sense to those who have to deal with it. An anthropological linguist studies the principles behind the classification which have been set up by people without regard to the modern Western scientific systems. For example Eskimos were able to identify twenty one distinctly different words for ice and snow in the local Eskimo language, some words requiring long sentences to translate into English. Folk taxonomies differ from the semantic analysis done by linguists in that linguists deal with single words, whereas anthropologists include phrases and compound items too, (Lehrer, 1974:20).

Frake (1961) introduced one of the best-known studies of folk taxonomies on the terms of disease that are used by the Subanun of Mindanao in the southern Philippines. The Subanun have a considerable amount of disease, particularly diseases of skin. The treatment a disease depends on proper diagnosis which itself depends on recognizing symptoms of that disease. The Subanun have a variety of categories when they discuss a particular set of symptoms. For

example, *nuka* can refer to skin disease in general but it also means "eruption", *meŋabag* to "inflammation", *telemaw* to "distal ulcer", or even a *telemaw glai* to "shallow distal ulcer". The Subanun have a hierarchy of terms with a term like *nuka* at the top and *telemaw glai* at the bottom, (Wardhaugh, 2006:233).

Analysis into folk taxonomies is useful in that they help us to organize data in ways that appear to indicate how speakers use their languages to organize the world around them. All speech communities have folk taxonomies as part of the lexical items of their languages. These taxonomies are not necessarily reflections of either nature or the language but rather of locally accepted socio-cultural conventions.

13. Taboo and euphemism

Words have referential meaning; they stand for things, objects, persons or ideas. They also evoke in themselves positive or negative attitudes. People cannot utter certain words because they are especially sacred, vulgar, obscene, or to refer to unpleasant matters, all as culturally defined. This phenomenon is known as taboo. Taboo is concerned with behaviour which is considered as supernaturally forbidden, immoral, or improper; it deals with bahaviour which is prohibited or inhibited in an apparently irrational manner. In language, taboo is associated with words or expressions which are not used. Such words are never used by many people, or they are used in a restricted set of situations. In the English-speaking world the strongest taboos are associated with words connected with sex and Christian religion, in Roman Catholic cultures the strongest taboos may be associated with religion, and in Norway, for example some of the strongly tabooed expressions are concerned with the devil,(Trudgill,1995:18).In Arab countries the strongest taboos are associated with female relations and Islamic religion.

In English some taboo words received legal as well as social reinforcement. For example the words *fuck* and *cunt* are not used in print, and the use of them could lead to prosecution and even imprisonment. In certain circumstances, words which phonetically similar to taboo words can be lost from a language. For example, the word *rabbit* replaced the older word *coney* (pronounced [kʌni]).For the same reason, in American English the word *rooster* replaced *cock*,(Ibid:19-20).

Frazer (1922:264:305) mentions that in nonliterate cultures, there is a reluctance or taboo against pronouncing a person's own name, the name of certain designated relatives, of the dead, or of royal and divine personages. The taboo extends even to ordinary words which resemble the tabooed name. Frazer believed that taboo was a strong factor in lexical change as many words dropped out of the local lexicon.Generally,the type of word that is tabooed in a particular language will be a good reflection of at least part of the system of values and beliefs of the society in question. As cultures change, so do the linguistic

taboos.Thus, note the following observations made six decades ago and certainly obsolete in many, if not most, segments of United States society, at least: "If you use the so called 'four-letter' or taboo words in mixed company except in the lowest classes of society, you will immediately be subjected to extreme disapproval, condemnation and ostracism", (Hall, 1960:20).

Euphemism means the use of words and expressions to talk about unpleasant things and disguise or neutralize the unpleasantness, e.g., the subjects of sickness, death and dying, unemployment, and criminality. It also means the use of labels to unpleasant tasks and jobs in an attempt to make them sound almost attractive. Euphemisms fall into two categories. In one, there is a substitution of a word phonetically similar to the disapproved one. For example, in English "Jesus" substituted *gee whiz*, and "God damned" substituted *goldarn*.In the other category of euphemism, an unpleasant idea is avoided by very oblique reference. For example, the word "toilet" originally referred to personal grooming.Likewise, a person may go to the "bathroom" who doesn't need a bath,(Wardhaugh,2006:240).

In American English, there are three areas in which euphemisms seem to have flourished most abundantly are the excretory functions, sexual organs and activities, and death. The area of business can be considered a fourth area, where corporations do not report "profits" but rather "earings".There are different ways to say a person has died without using the verb "die".Thus, a person has "passed on", "passed away", "gone to his reward", "gone to the big roundup in the sky", "been gathered to the bosom of the Lord", etc., (Penalosa, 1981:57).

Haas (1964a:489:491) mentioned that Creek Indians in Oklahoma avoided the use of certain words of their own language when white people were around. These words are the words which are phonetically similar to the "four-letter" words of English.

14. Language and sex

The English language is continually changing in order to meet the needs of the people using it. The ever- changing culture we live in affects the way language develops and the way it is used by different people in society. The ideology of society is reflected in its use of language, and because children learn their values, assumptions, expectations, and the words that they have to learn from their parents ,this ideology is passed down from generation to generation. For centuries we have lived in a male-dominated society where language has been biased towards men. Men are viewed as being the superior sex and this reinforced by the use of biased generic terms such as "mankind", which in fact refers to the whole human rice.

Possible sex differences in language usage have recently attracted a lot of attention. The most consistent differences found between men and women within the western society are:

1- Women tend to use more prestigious forms than men within the same general social background. That is, forms such as *I done it, it growed* and *he ain't* can be found more often in the speech of men, and *I did it, it grew* and *he isn't* in the speech of men.

2- In same gender pairs having conversations, women generally discuss their personal things more than men. Men appear to prefer non-personal topics such as sport and news.

3- Men tend to respond to an expression of feelings or problems by giving advice or solutions, while women are more likely to mention personal experiences that match or connect with the other woman's.

4- In mixed-gender conversation men talk twice as much as women. Women tend to take a much more co-operative approach during conversation, for example they make an effort to include others, use the first person plural pronoun more often and are much more willing to discuss issues raised by others. Whereas men are likely to interrupt more, ignore others and reluctant to talk about topics introduced by other people.

5- Women have been claimed to use more hedges, tentative phrases such as *kind of, sort of,* in place of straight statements: "*Bill is kind of short,* instead of "*Bill is short*".

6- Women have been accused of using question intonation in response to queries: "About eight o'clock?" as a reply to: "What time's dinner?"

7- Men typically speak in a lower pitch range (80-200 Herz) than women (120-400 Herz), (Wardhaugh, 2006:315-23).

15. Socio-cultural and linguistic factors in the development of writing systems

The variables that affect the choice of orthographic symbols or sets of symbols to be employed fall into two broad categories: the socio-cultural and linguistic. The linguistic factors are fundamental to the shaping of any orthography. To create an accurate orthography one must have a clear grasp of the language's phonology, grammar, and vocabulary. Fundamental to linguistics is the concept of the "phoneme". The phonemic analysis constitutes the linguist's efforts to devise practical orthographies for languages that may ever have been written. The aim of modern orthographers is to represent each phoneme by a distinctive sign consistently employed. Though such a goal is not often achieved, it remains an overriding consideration. During the 1930s and 1940s, many linguists who have developed orthographies for unwritten languages sought to write "unusual" phonemes with special symbols that had earlier been created for linguistic purposes. The most prominent of these symbol systems is the International Phonetic Alphabet. Its letters are based mainly upon

Roman alphabet, but they can be used to represent the sounds of any language,(Bright,1966:264).

One of the languages which has been affected by the movement to represent sounds by traditional linguistic symbols (as well as to represent each phoneme by a single sign) is Tarascan in Mexico. In parts of Africa south of the Sahara, special linguistic symbols still appear in several of the orthographies, particularly those created by British. The leaders of new nations particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa generally desire that their languages follow the orthographic patterns of the languages of advanced countries. They do not want their languages to be written with "strange" sets of signs. Moreover, there is a pressure to employ symbols that conform to the needs of modern life, which of course has largely influenced by Western Europe and the United States.

We can now explain certain kinds of socio-cultural factors in the development of writing systems. Nationalism or (national needs) is a major factor that frequently overrides linguistic considerations in the creation of orthographies. Most specific effects of nationalism can be observed from patterns in Mexico and other parts of Latin America. American linguists working with certain Mexican Indian languages have written the phoneme /ŋ/ as *ng* to avoid the need for special symbols and difficulty of typewriting. They have discovered that some governmental officials have interpreted their actions as an attempt to make the language look like English. Of course, the cluster *ng* is infrequent in Spanish and is absent word-finally,(Ibid:265).

In addition to the national considerations, orthographers must also accommodate to certain local and regional cultural traditions.First, there are some local or regional cultures that have a history of resistance to absorption into the national society, e.g., the Tarascans and the Isthmus Zapotecs in Mexico. In the case of The Tarascans, this group has an alphabet containing certain special symbols not used elsewhere in Latin America. As for the Isthmus Zapotecs, this group has not only sought to maintain a degree of autonomy, but a number of highly educated Zapotecs have published poetry, essays, and the like to reinforce their orthographies. In 1956 these cultural leaders met with two groups of linguists to work out compromise orthography for Isthmus Zapotec.They introduced a system which is somewhat unique but not at all unscientific mode of representing certain phonemes.

Second, there are certain broad regional languages that help to integrate different linguistic and cultural groups within a political unit or even across national boundaries. For example, Tok Pisin (also known as Melanesian Pidgin English and Neo-Melanesian) which is spoken in Papua New Guinea has permitted a degree of communication and cohesion among different local groups. When linguists develop a writing system for a given language group, must take into consideration the orthography of Tok Pisin.But since the sounds

of Tok Pisin are those of the languages of other groups, there are few problems in introducing a writing system.

Third, the survival of earlier writing systems among peoples affects the development of orthographies. The writing systems of the latter still carry a high degree of prestige and may be used by a few persons. Linguists who are working among the Cham people of South Vietnam are faced with the problem of the considerable prestige that still attaches to earlier writing system. This is the ancient Cham script, which is based on earlier scripts of India.Therefore, orthographers have had to prepare initial Cham reading materials in the traditional medium as well as in the scientific orthography (based upon the Roman alphabet) that they have devised.

Fourth, orthographers must take into account the values and beliefs of the local group in question including certain aesthetic considerations. For example, orthographers who have worked among the Pame and the Cuicateco in Mexico have asked individuals for their preferences to certain symbols. Native speakers may be asked whether they prefer writing sounds phonemically or morphophonemically.The symbolization of particular sounds is mostly a product of the interaction between the linguist's own cultural heritage and the socio-cultural traditions of the particular national society and local preliterate groups with which he is working.

Fifth, orthographies may be affected by the linguist's decision as to which dialect of the language is to be the basis of the writing system.Ideally, the dialect which is used by a large number of speakers is chosen. But linguists may choose the one that is most accessible to their analysis. In spite of the dialectal differences in a language, linguists often seek to devise an orthography that will be usable for all or most of the local variants,(Ibid:267-71).

16. Cultural transmission

We acquire a language in a culture with other speakers and not from parental genes. An infant born to Arab parents, which is adopted and brought up from birth by French speakers in France, may have physical characteristics inherited from its natural parents, but it will inevitably speak French. This process whereby language is passed on from one generation to the next is described as **cultural transmission**.

17. Conclusion

It is commonly accepted that language is a part of culture, and that it plays a very important role in it. Some social scientists consider that without language, culture would not be possible. Language simultaneously reflects culture, and is influenced and shaped by it. In the broadest sense, it is also the symbolic representation of a people, since it comprises their historical and cultural backgrounds, as well as their approach to life and their ways of living and thinking. Brown (1994: 165) describes the two as follows: 'A language is a part

of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture.' In a word, culture and language are inseparable.

Some people say that language is the mirror of culture, in the sense that people can see a culture through its language. Another metaphor used to symbolize language and culture is the iceberg. The visible part is the language, with a small part of culture; the greater part, lying hidden beneath the surface, is the invisible aspect of culture. This author's understanding of language and culture is conveyed through the following three new metaphors.

From a philosophical view:

language + culture -> a living organism
flesh   blood

Language and culture makes a living organism; language is flesh, and culture is blood. Without culture, language would be dead; without language, culture would have no shape.

From a communicative view:

language   + culture -> swimming (communication)
swimming skill   water

Communication is swimming, language is the swimming skill, and
culture is water. Without language, communication would remain to a
very limited degree (in very shallow water); without culture, there would
be no communication at all.

From a pragmatic view:

language   + culture -> transportation (communication)
vehicle   traffic light

Communication is like transportation: language is the vehicle and culture is traffic light. Language makes communication easier and faster; culture regulates, sometimes promotes and sometimes hinders communication. In a word, language and culture, as different as they are, form a whole.

References

Berlin. and P. Kay (1969) Basic Color Terms.Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bright, William (1966) Sociolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton & Co., Publishers.

Crystal, David (2003) A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Danesi, Marcel (2008) Linguistic Anthropology. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Frake, C.O. (1961) The Diagnosis of Disease among the Subanun of Mindanao. American Anthropologist, 63:113-32.

Frazer, Sir James (1922) The Golden Bough. Abridged ed.New York: Macmillan.

Haas, Mary R. (1964a) Interlingual Word Taboos, in Hymes, ed.Language in Culture and Society. New York: Harper & Row.

Hall, Robert A. (1960) Linguistics and Your Language. Second ed.N.Y: Anchor Books.

Hymes, Dell (1964) Language in Culture and Society. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Hudson, R.A. (1980) Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, C.S. (1943) Patterns of Negro Segregation. New York: Harper.

Lehrer, A. (1974) Semantic Field and Lexical Structure.Amsterdam: North Holland, Publishing Company.

Lyons, John (1981) Language and Linguistics: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malotki, E. (1983) Hopi Time: A Linguistic Analysis of the Temporal Concepts in the Hopi Language.Berlin: Mouton.

----------- Merriam- Webster Collegiate Dictionary, 10th edition. New York: Portland.

---------- OED-The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary.Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Palmer, F.R. (1981) Semantics (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Penalosa, Fernando (1981) Introduction to the Sociology of Language.Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Pinker, S. (1994) The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language. New York: William Morrow.

Robins, R.H. (1971) General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey.London: Longman.

Sampson. (1980) Schools of Linguistics.Standford: Standford University Press.

Sapir, Edward (1949) Culture, Language and Personality: Selected Essays. California: California University Press.

Trudgill, Peter (1995) Sociolinguistics: An Introduction To Language And Society.London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Yule, George (2010) (4th.ed.) The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald (2006) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Williams. (1976) Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society.London: Fontana/Croom Helm.

علم اللغة الأنثروبولوجي

بدأت هذه الدراسة من فرضية أن علم اللغة الأنثروبولوجي أحد فروع المعرفة التي تستحق الدراسة وذلك لأنجازاته في رؤية المستقبل على ضوء ماقدمته مجموعة صـــغيرة من الباحثين الأ أنها كانت كبيرة في أنجازاتها. أسست اسهامات الباحثين في معرفة طبيعة اللغة كوسيلة أجتماعية وثقافية مجالات جديدة للبحث في العلوم الأنسانية والأجتماعية،كمـــا أنها تدعو كل شخص منا الى أعادة التفكير في طبيعة العلاقة بين اللغة والثقافة.

يدرس علم اللغة الأنثروبولوجي العلاقة بين اللغة وثقافة المجتمع،حيث قام بدراسـة الوسائل التي من خلالها يعبر عن العلاقات العائلية فـــي مختلـف الثقافــات (المفـردات القاموسية للعائلة والقرابة)ً. قام علم اللغة الأنثروبولـــوجي أيـــضا بدراســـة أسـاليب التواصل بين الناس في مختلف المناسبات الأجتماعية مثل الأحتفالات والطقوس والـشعائر واللقاءات الأجتماعية وعلاقة كل ذلك ببنية المجتمع.