

Herald pedagogiki. Nauka i Praktyka

wydanie specjalne



Warszawa

Editorial Team

Editor-in-chief: *Gontarenko N.*

EDITORIAL COLLEGE:

W. Okulicz-Kozaryn, *dr. hab, MBA, Institute of Law, Administration and Economics of Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland;*

L. Nechaeva, *PhD, PNPUI Institute K.D. Ushinskogo, Ukraine.*

K. Fedorova, *PhD in Political Science, International political scientist, Ukraine.*

Aryslanbaeva Zoya, *Ph.D. in Uzbek State Institute of Arts and Culture Associate Professor of "Social Sciences and Humanities."*

Karimov Ismoil, *Kokand State Pedagogical Institute*

Nishanova Ozoda, *National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek*

Isamova Pakiza Shamsiyevna, *candidate of pedagogical sciences, associate professor of Uzbek State World Languages University, Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent city.*

(wydanie specjalne) Volume-2, № 3 May 2022

ARCHIVING

Sciendo archives the contents of this journal in ejournals.id - digital long-term preservation service of scholarly books, journals and collections.

PLAGIARISM POLICY

*The editorial board is participating in a growing community of **Similarity Check System's** users in order to ensure that the content published is original and trustworthy. Similarity Check is a medium that allows for comprehensive manuscripts screening, aimed to eliminate plagiarism and provide a high standard and quality peer-review process.*

About the Journal

Herald pedagogiki. Nauka i Praktyka (HP) publishes outstanding educational research from a wide range of conceptual, theoretical, and empirical traditions. Diverse perspectives, critiques, and theories related to pedagogy – broadly conceptualized as intentional and political teaching and learning across many spaces, disciplines, and discourses – are welcome, from authors seeking a critical, international audience for their work. All manuscripts of sufficient complexity and rigor will be given full review. In particular, HP seeks to publish scholarship that is critical of oppressive systems and the ways in which traditional and/or “commonsensical” pedagogical practices function to reproduce oppressive conditions and outcomes. Scholarship focused on macro, micro and meso level educational phenomena are welcome. JoP encourages authors to analyse and create alternative spaces within which such phenomena impact on and influence pedagogical practice in many different ways, from classrooms to forms of public pedagogy, and the myriad spaces in between. Manuscripts should be written for a broad, diverse, international audience of either researchers and/or practitioners. Accepted manuscripts will be available free to the public through HPs open-access policies, as well as we planed to index our journal in Elsevier's Scopus indexing service, ERIC, and others.

HP publishes two issues per year, including Themed Issues. To propose a Special Themed Issue, please contact the Lead Editor Dr. Gontarenko N (info@ejournals.id). All submissions deemed of sufficient quality by the Executive Editors are reviewed using a double-blind peer-review process. Scholars interested in serving as reviewers are encouraged to contact the Executive Editors with a list of areas in which they are qualified to review manuscripts.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TERMS OF KINSHIP IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH**Ulikova Mavluda**Teacher of the faculty of foreign languages
at Andijan state university

Abstract. This paper discusses various approaches to the study of these terms, their classification and criteria for their selection. Kinship determines social relations, determines the place of a person in society and corrects his behavior.

Keywords. Kinship, social relations, place of a person, society, marriage, kinship, gender-based terms are uncle, aunt, grandfather, grandmother.

To strength of family ties appears to vary across countries and over time. In a recent paper, Alesina and Giuliano find that the strength of family ties has significant effects on various economic outcomes, such as labor market participation, the extent of home production and geographic mobility.

Society is a dynamic system, its structure, system, system, etc. change, which, consequently, is reflected in the language. In particular, related vocabulary also changes. This leads to the fact that it becomes more difficult to determine a specific type of relationship. Terms of kinship and properties will change, some will fall into disuse. Therefore, for the classification of kinship terms and properties, criteria are required according to which it will be possible to determine the type of kinship, as well as to conduct a comparative analysis of kinship terms and properties of different languages.

Based on the research of various scientists, mainly on the basis of the work of A. Kroeber and R. Lowy, a step-by-step classification was compiled for the analysis of related vocabulary.

Analyze this as a strategic interaction between individuals who care about each other's material welfare, either voluntarily or under the coercion of social norms. An individual's total utility is taken to be a weighted sum of both individuals' material utility, which in turn is determined by each individual's work effort and consumption. The weight put on the other individual's material utility is assumed to be non-negative and not greater than the weight put on one's own material utility. This weight can be interpreted in terms of altruism, or, alternatively, in terms of the esteem derived from others who observe and evaluate one's behavior, such as members of one's extended family, village or society at large. By contrast to Alger and Weibull, where we assume that altruism alone determines transfers within the family, here we consider situations in which an individual's degree of altruism differs from that enforced by society. More precisely, we suppose that the interacting individuals live in a society with a social norm that dictates a larger transfer than the individuals' own altruism suggests. If the degree of such coerced altruism is strong, individuals feel forced to help each other out.

Relevant criteria were selected for the classification of terms of kinship and property

- this is generation (generativity), gender, consanguinity / property, linearity / collaterality (bifurcation), polarity / reciprocity, relative age, lifetime.

Based on this classification, a comparative analysis was carried out, which makes it possible to detect similarities and differences between the system of kinship terms and properties of different languages (in this case, between the terminological system in English and Uzbek).

All kinship terms and properties are considered from the point of view of relevance/irrelevance of these criteria in Uzbek and English. Kinship terms and properties are analyzed separately. For clarity, all terms are classified based on criteria.

Terms of consanguinity

Generation (generativity)

In both Uzbek and English, the generation criterion is embedded in the term itself, since there are different terms for referring to relatives of any generation, both parents and children.

The Uzbek and English languages have a very developed system of kinship terms based on the criterion of generation (generativity): there are terms denoting both direct kinship and collateral (lateral) based on this principle; hence this criterion is relevant for both languages.

In English, as well as in Uzbek, this criterion is relevant, but with the exception of one term: cousin; and also here you can include the term twins, but usually I add brother / sister to the term twin, for the gender indicator, and the term twin separately is usually used in the plural: twins.

Both in Uzbek and in English there are terms for designating both consanguinity (kinship by blood) and for designating property (kinship by marriage). Different terms used to denote kinship by blood and by marriage.

For example, in Uzbek: она - ўғай она, ота - ўғай ота, ўғил - ўғай ўғил, etc.

In English: mother - mother-in-law, father - father-in-law, son - stepson, etc.

2. Linearity/collaterality (bifurcativity)

Both English and Uzbek are characterized by linearity (the distinction between direct and lateral lines of kinship). This means that for relatives along these two lines there are separate different terms, a bifurcation (bifurcation) of terms. For example, in Uzbek it is a ўғил - набира - чевара; она - буви - катта буви- and so on.

3. Polarity/Reciprocity

For English and Uzbek, the criterion of polarity is relevant. Polarity is based on the principle that two people are needed for a relationship, and two different terms are used to name these people. For example, in the Uzbek system of kinship terms, there are polar relations between the terms husband - wife, father-in-law - mother-in-law and others.

4. Relative's age

This criterion is not relevant for either the English or Uzbek systems of kinship terms, since the relative's age relative to Ego does not affect the use of the property term in relation to this relative.

In Uzbek and English, Ego refers to a relative by marriage using the same term, both to a person older and younger than himself. After all, the main criterion is their position in relation to each other, the type of their connection.

From the point of view of which science kinship is considered, several types of kinship can be distinguished:

- blood relationship is a relationship between people, which is not based on the principle of the common origin of people. This kinship is a natural, "reference" kinship.
- marriage kinship (property) is a relationship between people resulting from a marriage relationship.
- legal kinship is a relationship between unrelated people that arises as a result of the legal consolidation of this relationship.
- spiritual kinship is a relationship equated to blood kinship that arose as a result of the church rite of baptism.
- ritual kinship is a connection between people that arises as a result of a ritual (twinning and others).
- psychological kinship is the rapprochement or separation of kindred / unrelated people based on their personal relationships (for example, comic kinship).

In conclusion, comparing modern terms with their predecessors, as well as identifying current trends based on a sociological survey, an increasing desire for linearity, rejection of bifurcation (delimitation) and polarity (the presence of a pair of terms opposed to each other) was noticed.

This means that the system of kinship and properties is gradually being simplified, and terms are merging.

References:

1. Girenko N. M. Sociology of the tribe. The formation of sociological theory and the main components of social dynamics. St. Petersburg: Carillon. 2004
2. Girenko N.M. Laterality and linearity as differentiating features of the social organism of kinship // Algebra of kinship: Kinship systems. Systems of terms of kinship / Responsible. ed., author. foreword V.A. Popov; RAN. MAE them. Peter the Great (Kunstkamera). St. Petersburg: MAE RAN, 1999. Issue. 3. S. 82-96
3. Danilenko V.P. Russian terminology. Experience of linguistic description. Moscow: Nauka, 1977
4. Dzibel G.V. On asystematic approach to the phenomenon of kinship // Algebra of Kinship. St. Petersburg: MAE RAN. Issue. 7th 1995
5. Dobronravii H.A. Terms of kinship, names of kinship and comparative studies / Algebra of Kinship. St. Petersburg: MAE RAN. Issue. 2. 1998
6. Zolotarev A.M. Tribal system and primitive mythology. M., 1964