The concept of "kinship" and its use in languages of different systems

Ochilova Gulnora Ulashevna   Teacher of Samarkand state institute of foreign languages
ochilovaraxmanovagulka@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study of the concept "kinship" is the focus of this article. This article explores numerous methods for studying kinship words in the Uzbek and English languages, as well as their classification and selection criteria. Kinship determines social relationships, establishes a person's status in society, and modifies his conduct. The terminology kinship attributes also reflection of the uniqueness of the language, the particulars of the national course, and, as a result, define the national mindset.

| Keywords: | Kinship, classification, relatives, terminology, terms, relations. |

Introduction

There is a set of terms that are used to describe the connections between people's relatives in every language. These are considered to be kinship words. They reflect the features of the linguistic array as a part of the language's lexical structure, and their qualities are classified as internal laws. There is a set of terms that are used to describe the connections between people's relatives in every language. These are considered to be kinship words.

Main part

The systematic approach, one of the contemporary methodologies of linguistic study, is currently being actively applied. However, it should be emphasized that it is not equally successful while studying all layers of the language. The system approach is particularly challenging and not usually practical for learning a language's vocabulary contents. This procedure is cumbersome and inconvenient because of the following: "Any language has really strange vocabulary. It is more challenging to examine methodically than the morphology, phonetics, or syntax-related topics. Due to the lexicon's "openness" and

ongoing mobility, selecting a "oppositional pair of terms" is somewhat conditional" [Fortes, 4]. The systematic investigation of lexical content is hindered by a variety of additional reasons. As a result, certain of the vocabulary's lexico-semantic layers have a systemic structure and may be easily studied in a systematic manner. Others make it challenging to use this research strategy due to their complicated systemic structures. The following is what A.G. Grigoryan says about this: "Individual lexico-semantic groups are relatively well studied - primarily the terms of kinship, color formation, and some groups of specific vocabulary; much worse, despite a significant number of works, the situation is with designations relating to social relations and the inner life of a person. These variations in study levels are mostly caused by the variability of the study subject itself: certain vocabulary groups are grouped more "systematically" than others, while others have more complicated compositions [Grigoryan , 39-57].

A comparative-typological approach is utilized in the analysis of facts that are equivalent in related and unrelated languages, and is of a conventional character. With its assistance,

researches can study speech facts rather than language in a strictly terminological sense. According to Rustamova Sh. Sh. the difficulty of dealing with a large number of students with different attitudes and interests in studying comparative linguistics depends on several aspects. Add to this is the difficulty of organizing effective activities. In addition, large classes make it difficult for teachers to give students equal opportunity to participate. More importantly, in large classes, teachers struggle to provide immediate feedback and assessment to students how to comprehend the kinship terms [Rustamova, 92].

The most practical and, hence, most justifiable use of the component analysis approach in the study of lexical-semantic groupings. Indeed, some semantic component serves as a basis for differentiating the semantic field (lexico-semantic group). As an illustration, the word "kinship" is used to group together concepts related to kinship into a single semantic field.

In order to examine the system of kinship words in languages with various structures, it is highly practical and profitable to combine the system approach with the synchronous-comparative technique. There are several publications in foreign linguistics that compare and contrast the historical development of kinship terminology based on the Germanic languages. This topic was investigated by the German scholar Jacob Grimm in the middle of the 19th century, and then by Delbrück, Shuf, M.M. Gukhman, and others [M.M. Gukhman, 93-115]. Jacob Grimm noted in some Germanic languages the presence of two categories of terms denoting "father", "mother", and tried to give this phenomenon his own explanation. He writes that "... apparently, those kindred peoples ... who once had the form vater, mutter, bruder, schwester, found other terms during their invasion of Europe, some of them they borrowed, others, on the contrary, penetrated from them to their neighbors. "As an illustration, J. Grimm cites the Gothic atta, "father" and aipei "mother" and rare, according to him, cases of use among the High German tribes azo and eidi [J. Grimm, 97].

In the article by M.M. Guckman "Pre-Indo-European terms of kinship in the Germanic languages" notes that "... in subsequent works, as Germanists, in a broader sense, they were forced to more and more reckon with the presence in the Indo-European languages, in addition to the well-known group of kinship terms, some other terms, more primitive in form and at the same time common to more than one Indo-European languages.

At one time, F. Engels noted that "... the system of terms of kinship, being conservative, often does not correspond to the family relations existing in a given people, but reflects the previous stage of social development." As an example, F. Engels cites the terms of kinship among the Iroquois of North America. They were dominated by a "paired family". Hence, one would expect that the terms "father", "mother", "son", "daughter", "brother", "sister" in their meaning correspond to this form of family. In reality, it turned out not to be so. "The Iroquois calls his sons and daughters not only his own children, but also the children of his brothers, and they call him father ..., the Iroquois calls the children of his sisters, as well as his own children, his sons and daughters, and they call her mother, the children of brothers, like the children of sisters, call each other brothers and sisters" [Engels, 239]. Further V.I. Abaev testifies that "... in the Ossetian language, the terms "father" (fud), "mother" (mad), "son" (furt) are familial, i.e. they are applied to intra-family relations of kinship in our modern sense" [Akbaev , 240]. The above facts indicate that some kinship terms in almost all languages of the world have a multifunctional, polysemantic character. Thus, in Uzbek and English, bobo//grandfather "paternal grandfather", aka/elder brother - "elder brother", amaki//uncle "paternal uncle", in addition to their own meanings, are also used in the meanings of "elder brother father", "father's younger brother"; Uzbek - aka "elder brother", tog'a "maternal uncle" - are used in the meanings of "mother's elder brother", "mother's younger brother". Another term ota "father" in the Uzbek language can be used in the meanings of "grandfather", "father's elder brother", "maternal uncle", "father's elder brother", "father's uncle", "mother's elder brother", in general "a relative older than the father", etc.,

which is typical for their English equivalents. In such uses (in improper meanings) in the semantic structure of the term ota//father "father" one of its main features is neutralized, seme is the feature (seme) "parent". This is also observed in the meanings of the term opa - "older sister". Opa, in addition to its own use, has several meanings, for example, "mother", "aunt on the side of the father", "aunt on the side of the mother", "wife of the elder brother", "stepmother", "older relative (older than me)", " any woman older than the speaker" in which the sign "blood relative along the horizontal line" is neutralized.

When kinship terms are used in improper meanings, "non-standard" synonymous rows arise between two or more kinship terms. For example, the kinship term aka-brother, meaning elder brother, is synonymous with small father ("father"); with the meaning "grandfather", synonymous with the term bobo/grandfather ("grandfather on the side of the father and on the side of the mother"); the kinship term opa/elder sister with the meaning "mother" is synonymous with the term ona//mother ("mother"); with the meaning "aunt on the side of the father" is synonymous with the term amma//aunt with the meaning "aunt on the mother's side" is synonymous with the term xola - aunt, etc. In such cases, the semantic structure of terms acquires new seme-features that are not characteristic of their own meanings. For example, in the semantic structures of the terms aka/elder brother with the meaning "father", opa/elder sister with the meaning "mother", the attribute "blood parent" appears, etc.

The main goal of our study is a synchronous-comparative study of the terms of kinship between the Uzbek and English languages. As we know, kinship terms form a kind of microsystem of the vocabulary of each language. In the study of terms of kinship in the Turkic languages, the monograph by I. Ismoilov "Terms of kinship in the Turkic languages" plays an important role. The study consists of three sections: 1) kinship terms (ota, o'g'il, qiz, aka//og'a, ini, opa, singil, qarindosh, buva, amaki, jiyan, nevara); 2) kinship terms of postmarital relations (er, xotin, kuyov, kelin,

yanga, pochcha, ovsin, kelin oyi, qayin, o'gay); 3) the names of the properties of related relations (kindred children, siblings). In the course of the analysis, in order to confirm the proposed provisions, I. Ismoilov cites relevant material from many Turkic languages, in particular, from the Uzbek, Uighur, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Karakalpak and Turkmen languages. The monograph noted that "... the study of kinship terms in the Uzbek and Uighur languages was of a non-linguistic nature." This point of view is supported by M.Sh. Saidova, who writes that "... the study of kinship terms is predominantly ethnographic in nature." This thesis was formulated by her in her dissertation "Lexico-semantic analysis of kinship terms in Namangan dialects", dedicated to the study of etymology and identifying ways of formation and further development of kinship terms in Namangan dialects of the Uzbek language.

The paper reveals the historical formation of kinship terms, from ancient times to the present day, traced their phonetic, morphological, semantic changes.

Conclusion. Kinship is a mechanism for adaptation. It is described variously across cultures as a sociocultural creation to meet the unique requirements of a civilization. Contrary to what most of us believe, kinship is a culturally defined connection rather than a biological one.

The List Of Used Literature
1. Fortes, M. 1969. Kinship and the social order: the legacy of Henry Lewis Morgan. Chicago: Aldine.
2. J. Grimm, Robin. *Kinship and Marriage*. UK: Pelican Books. P. 30. 1967. Print.
3. Rustamova Sh. Sh. Class size and the learning-teaching process in upper classes. American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development ISSN Online: 2771-8948, Volume 09, Oct., 2022
4. Акбаев Ш.Х. Сравнительно-исторический метод в тюркологии и генезис балкарского цоканья // СТ, Баку, 1971. № 2. - С. 98-101.
5. Григорян, А.Г. Некоторые проблемы системного и исторического

изучения лексики и семантики [Текст] /А. Г. Григорян // Вопр. языкознания. –1983. – № 4. – С. 57–63.

6. Григорян, А.Г. Некоторые проблемы системного и исторического изучения лексики и семантики [Текст] /А. Г. Григорян // Вопр. языкознания. –1983. – № 4. – С. 57–63.

7. Гухман, М.М. Доиндоевропейские термины родства в германских языках// Памяти академика И.Я. Марра. – М. – Л., 1978. – С. 93-115.

8. Исмоилов И. Туркий тилларда кавм-қариндошлик терминлари. - Тошкент: Фан, 1966. - С. 62-150.

9. Исмоилов И. Туркий тилларда тўнғич, кенжа, эгизак сўзлари // ж. «Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти». - Тошкент, 1975. № 2.

10. Исмоилов И. Ўзбек тилида қавм-қариндошлик терминларига доир баъзи мулоҳазалар // ж. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. — Тошкент, 1964. № 4. — С. 40 -43.

11. Мусаев К.М. Лексика тюркских языков в сравнительном освещении. - М., 1975.

12. Мусаев К.М. Основные проблемы изучения лексики языков // СТ, 1978. № 3.- С. 33-41.

13. Покровская А.А. Термины родства в тюркских языках // В кн. Историческое развитие лексики тюркских языков. - М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. - С. 11-81.

14. Саидова М.Ш. Қариндошлик атамалари тарихига доир // ж. «Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти». 1993. № 3.

15. Саидова М.Ш. Наманган шеваларидаги қариндошлик терминларининг лексик-семантик таҳлили. Автореферат кандидатской диссертации. – Тошкент, 1995. 21 с.