RESEARCH ON METHODS OF KINSHIP TERMS ANALYSIS

Assistant teacher of the Samarkand state institute of foreign languages,
Ochilova Gulnora Ulashevna

Abstract.
The study of kinship systems, without exaggeration, has long been one of the main topics of ethnology. The system of kinship terms of different peoples has always been a source of interest for various tourists visiting a given country, and has been an object of research by ethnologists long before the fields of ethnography and ethnology took their place among the humanities.
Keywords: ethnology, kinship system, linguistic approach, kinship relationship.

Introduction. According to the scientists who conducted the first scientific analysis of the system of kinship relations, such cases as dividing the forms of describing the phenomenon of kinship relations into two levels or contrasting ethnographic and linguistic approaches to the analysis of this phenomenon were not present in the initial research on this phenomenon. L.G. Morgan, one of the founders of the study of the phenomenon of kinship relations from an ethnographic perspective, in the introduction to his main work "Systems of Kinship Relations and the Characteristics of the Human Family", although he chose the ethnographic aspect of the phenomenon of kinship relations for research, he admits that the problem he is studying is purely philological in nature. The problems of the social history of mankind are raised to the primary level by the scientist only during the re-analysis of the collected material.

Main part. The issues related to the concepts of kinship terms, the system of kinship relations and the system of kinship terms, which are considered in this part of the study, are important as an object of interdisciplinary research. Research conducted in this area over many years shows that the topic to a certain extent also covers the fields of linguistics and ethnography. The functional division of this object shows that kinship terms are a structurally distinct group of language signs, reflecting the synchronous and diachronic features of the social system and demonstrating the ability to adapt stably to historical changes.

In the field of ethnography, a point of view has been formed regarding kinship terms as a source of information about social institutions and the historical dynamics of their development. For L.G. Morgan, this was a form of manifestation of various family and marriage relations that existed at the initial stages of social development. However, it should also be noted that for later researchers, the forms of marriage during the period when the system of kinship was in effect were more significant.

In general, the ethnographic direction of studying the phenomenon of kinship has developed from the search for special forms of social organization that give rise to the system of kinship terms, to the identification of "sociological universals" that can serve as a standard form and to the preservation of a general universal thesis that reflects the "real manifestations of kinship relations."

Ethnographers have also created typologies of the structural features of the kinship system or have been engaged in typological studies aimed at determining the place of certain types in the historical typologies of kinship systems, and at the same time have identified the mechanisms of transformation of a given kinship system into another kinship system.

Ethnographers have studied a very wide range of issues related to the phenomenon of kinship: marriage and family forms directly or indirectly related to the phenomenon of kinship; determining the degree of kinship in determining the heir; the hierarchy of social institutions; the rules for determining the heir; place of residence; stratification by sex and age and age systems; artificial (false) kinship - nepotism, and similar types. Historical and ethnological studies have also been conducted on the reconstruction of ethnogenesis; here, using materials from North American Indians and Polynesians, specific results have been achieved. Such studies are usually called the sociology of kinship (ethnosociology) or the anthropology of kinship. In addition to identifying the factors underlying some structural models of kinship systems and creating a dynamic typology of these models, ethnographers have also studied other problems related to kinship issues. In their research, there are a number of studies on the role of kinship in the system of social relations, carried out without taking into account the linguistic aspect of the phenomenon of kinship systems. Much attention is also paid to the evolution of kinship, which prioritizes the determination of kinship in kinship relations, and research has been conducted on the scientific essence of the issues of kinship relations based on maternal kinship (matrilateral, matrilineal) and kinship relations based on paternal kinship (patrilateral, patrilineal). In addition to studying the phenomenon of kinship systems in ethnosociology, the range of issues related to it includes: forms of marriage and family, rules of inheritance, hierarchy of forms of social structure based on kinship, rules of behavior between kinship, place of residence, age restrictions and rules in kinship relations, transition from clan ties to neighborhood ties, etc. From the perspective of studying archaic and primitive class societies, it is clear that it would be appropriate to call ethnosociology the sociology of kinship.

At the same time, the system of kinship relations can be considered within the ethnographic paradigm as an independent object of research, clearly separated from other social and interpersonal ties, only by studying the structures of kinship terms. The linguistic approach to the study of the system of kinship terms was formed under the influence of the dichotomy "content plan - expression plan" proposed by F. de Saussure, which serves to scientifically substantiate the separation of the system of kinship relations as a system of social kinship relations and the system of kinship terms as an egocentric expression of these relations. Indeed, it should be noted that the difference between the essence (the principle of structural structure) and the manifestation of the essence in one form or another, although this difference is not always perceived, is present in most studies devoted to the problems of the system of kinship terms. However, the need to emphasize this difference is reflected in the significant differences in the specific mechanisms of change, the principles of operation, that is, the essence and the characteristics of the forms of its manifestation.

Based on the above considerations, ethnographers are interested in the essence of the system of kinship relations, that is, the content plan of the object of research, while linguists focus on the terms of kinship terms, the nomenclature of kinship concepts, that is, the expression plan, in which the lexical-semantic layer of a particular language and the rules of correspondence of the terms of kinship terms of the same language with other language units are studied. Since the content plan mentioned in the previous sections of the study can be known only through the expression plan, the system of kinship terms is an object of study not only by linguists, but also by ethnographers who set goals other than linguistic research. Ethnographers, first of all, determine the rules of correspondence between the system of kinship terms and the system of kinship relations, which play the roles of the plan of expression and the plan of content in the

topic of kinship, or, in other words, the principles of grouping relatives, which transform the nomenclature of kinship into a system - a system of kinship terms. Linguists, in turn, pay attention to the issues of word formation, etymology and lexical semantics of kinship terms in a particular language or language group and aim to restore protosystems, having achieved some success in the study of Indo-European, Altaic and American languages.

An analysis of the research conducted in the field to date shows that there has been no consistent, sequential, systematic action in anthropology in studying the system of kinship relations and the terms of kinship terms, in other words, it is obvious that the perception of the essence of linguistic and anthropological phenomena related to kinship terms and their study is not a specific field of science, but rather the sole activity of a separate researcher, which creates problematic situations in the systematic understanding of the essence of the issue. In fact, the views on the presence of consistency and systematicity in the scientific description of the above-mentioned units have already been noted in the works of L.G. Morgan. This situation is due to the lack of a clear understanding of the essence of kinship among anthropologists and a lack of deep understanding of kinship as a social value. This is due to the stability of the anthropologist as a professional expert in understanding the true existence of man. The lack of consistent disclosure of the essence of kinship leads to the fact that kinship is considered a separate object of study, unrelated to other socio-cultural realities. Hermeneutic anthropology provides various examples of kinship in the structures of race, ethnicity, religion, and social class. However, researchers in this field also approach the phenomenon of kinship from the perspective of the ready-made stock of scientific knowledge about what a scientific concept of society and language sign is, but the fact that the phenomenon of kinship can convey information about linguistic, semantic, social, biological, and other characteristics for researchers is often overlooked. In fact, the most important thing in this case is not whether the concept of kinship terms or the kinship system in general is the object of scientific research conducted only by researchers, or whether it is an object of research in biological or social-humanitarian sciences, but rather whether the study of this concept leads to the study of the kinship system, kinship terms, family, social grouping, and the linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics of these phenomena as part of today's scientific problems.

In the fifties of the 19th century, the logical-semantic direction in the study of kinship terms was completed as a field that included a number of new independent ethnolinguistic directions, known as "ethnographic semantics", "new ethnography", "metatheory of cognitive culture", "ethnoscience". This is significant because it directly reflects the idea of E. Sapir and B.L. Whorf that each language corresponds to certain norms of thinking and behavior. During this period, special methods were developed to study the cognitive mechanisms based on the schemes that organize the performance of functional tasks of language. Among the structural linguistic methods used in the functional-semantic study of kinship terms, the following is an attempt to consider the methods of componental, transformational and generative analysis that correspond to the goals of this study.

Componential analysis (combinator) can be defined as a method of studying the meaningful units of a language, developed within the framework of structural semantics and aimed at dividing the meaning into minimal semantic components. It is based on at least two assumptions: 1) the meaning of each unit of a language at a certain structural level consists of a set of semantic features; 2) the entire vocabulary of a language can be described using a limited and relatively small number of these units. The basic principles of the method of dividing the meaning into its constituent elements in relation to the terms of kinship nouns were

developed by the mathematician A. Macfarlane. Kroeber, who conducted research on the same topic, published his article in 1909, without the knowledge of Macfarlane, who had previously studied this issue. The scientist, reflecting on the classification of kinship systems, notes eight aspects that, in his opinion, are universal for kinship systems of all peoples. These are: the limitation of kinship relations in terms of generations; the differentiation of kinship relations in the horizontal and vertical directions; Differences in age between relatives of the same generation; Differences in gender of the relative; Differences in gender of the subject selected for analysis; Differences in gender of the relative who is the kin; Differences in blood relative from relative by marriage; Vital status of the relative who is the kin (alive or dead).

As a result of the development and refinement of the principles of component analysis, founded by American scientists W.H. Goodenough and F.L. Lounsbury, interest in the importance of a structural approach to the study of kinship systems has increased again. In their articles, they developed the principles and tasks of formal description of terms related to kinship relations.

Unlike American researchers who studied the principles of component analysis separately from sociology, history and psychology, former Soviet researchers believed that this method of analysis could create the necessary conditions for creating a typology of kinship systems.

At the same time, some researchers critically assessed the method of component analysis and considered its widespread use in the analysis of kinship terms to be an over-idealization of the capabilities of this method. In particular, J. Lif noted that this method focuses too much attention on genealogical universals and that the importance of analyzing the real properties of the terms of kinship names is neglected in this method of analysis. O.N. Trubachev also expressed a similar opinion: "... Dividing the meaning into separate components or semantic signs - segmentation ... cannot fully cover its semantic scope, since in this case there is always a possibility of overlooking some suprasegment element that constitutes the true essence of the meaning." Based on the logic of the scientist, it is understood that the method of component analysis does not allow to determine the absolute semantic content of the term of kinship name "mother", but rather allows to characterize the meaning of this lexeme in the form of a set of semantic meaning units within the framework of "a blood relative of the female sex in the genealogy of primary ancestors at the primary level".

The list of used literature:

1. Бурыкин А.А. Семантическая структура эвенских терминов родства и свойства // Алгебра Родства. - СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 1998. - Вып. 2. - С. 155-167.
2. Буслаев Ф.И. О влиянии христианства на славянский язык. - М.: Унив. тип., 1848.-211 с.
3. Гиренко Н.М. Система терминов родства и система социальных категорий // Советская Этнография. - М.: Наука, 1974. - №6. - С.41-50.
4. Джавахадзе Н.В., Мгеладзе Н.В. Компонентный метод изучения системы родства в советской этнографии // Этнографические исследования. - Тбилиси: Мицниереба, 1988. - С. 15-29.
5. Дзибель Г.В. О системном подходе к феномену родства // Алгебра Родства. - СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 1995. - Вып. 7. - С.128-136.
6. Кузнецов А.М. От компонентного анализа к компонентному синтезу. - М.: Наука, 1986.- 128 с.
7. Попов В.А. Номенклатура родства и система терминов родства // Алгебра родства. - СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 1998. - Вып. 2. - С. 135-142.

8. Попов В.А. Предисловие // Алгебра родства. - СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 1998. - Вып. 2.- С.3-6.

9. Трубачев О.Н. Реконструкция слов и их значений // Вопросы языкознания. -М.: Наука, 1980.-№ 3. - С.140-143.

10. Durbin M. The goals of ethnoscience // Anthropological Linguistics. - Chicago: Chicago Press, 1966. - Vol. 8. -№ 8. -Pp.67-83.

11. Goodenough, W. Componental Analysis and the Study of Meaning // Language - Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1956. - Vol. 32. - № 1. - Pp.65-76.

12. Hammel E.A. A transformational analysis of Comanche kinship terminology // American Anthropologist. - Washington: University of Washington Press, 1965. - Vol. 67. - №5. - Pp.89-96.

13. Kroeber   A.L. Classificatory systems of relationship // Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 11909.-Vol. 32. -№1. -Pp.131-142.

14. Leaf M.J. The Punjabi kinship terminology as a semantic system // American Anthropologist. - Washington: University of Washington Press, 1977. - Vol. 73. - № 3. - Pp.76-81.

15. Ochilova G.U. A Brief History of Study of Kinship Terms. AMERICAN Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education Volume 02, Issue 04, 2024 ISSN (E): 2993-2769. Pp. – 90-93.

16. Ochilova G.U. The concept of "kinship" and its use in languages of different systems. - Eurasian Research Bulletin, Volume 19, April, 2023. – Pp. 301-304.

17. Rahimov A.A. Essence and interpretation of secondary nomination means// Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. January 2022. – P. 358-363

18. Saltarelli M., Durbin M. A semantic interpretation of kinship systems // Linguistics. - Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967. - Vol 33. - Pp.112-117.