Kinship Terms as Proof of Genetic Relationship

Ramilya Sagdieva[1], Damir Husnutdinov[2], Ramil Mirzagitov[3] and Radik Galiullin[4]

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to conduct a comparative study of peculiarities of kinship terms in the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish, Uzbek and Uyghur languages. The study of kinship nomenclature of the Turkic peoples makes it possible to draw a number of conclusions on the genetic kinship of languages, reveals the history of development and interrelations of these peoples, contributes to the creation of a comprehensive description of the lexical-semantic system of these Turkic languages. This article is the first experience of the comparative study of kinship terms in the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish, Uzbek and Uygur languages. A statistical comparison of the phonetic, nominal and semantic similarities of genetic features of kinship terms has been made. In the course of the study, it has been stated that each language has distinctive features and peculiarities, although they are included in the Turkic group. For the development of a typology of kinship systems, the authors chose to conduct the synchronous-comparative study of languages, which will apparently remain among the leading ones in the near future. Following it, the article fixes the kinship systems that currently exist in the Turkic languages (in particular, on the material of the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish and Uighur languages) and are available for direct observation. This method allowed the authors to analyze the actual material.

Key words: *Turkic-speaking people, common words, common Turkic dictionary, terms, semantics, statistical data.*

Introduction

Every nation living in the world has its own history, language and culture, customs and traditions, but they are closely connected with this world, communicate with many peoples, nationalities. The ethnic affinity of people, i.e. the similarity of linguistic elements, traditions, folk art, is an important element. One of these affinities is found among the Turkic peoples. This nation is close both in culture and in history (Ermachkov et al., 2018; Degtyarev et al., 2018; Kuznetsova et al., 2019; Magsumov, 2018a, b; Lysytsia et al., 2019; Tarman, 2018; Alajmi, 2019; Shevchenko et al., 2016; Bozhkova et al., 2019; Nechaev et al., 2018; Zhuravlev et al., 2018; Volchik and

---

[1] *Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation,,ramsag777@rambler.ru*

[2] *Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation, Domer1982@mail.ru*

[3] *Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation, mirza_ramil@mail.ru*

[4] *Naberezhnye Chelny Pedagogical University, Russian Federation, r.galiullin@mail.ru*

Maslyukova, 2019). Religious similarities are also an important factor for the interrelation and mutual understanding of these peoples. Therefore, a comparative analysis of kinship terms of Turkic-speaking peoples makes it possible to draw interesting conclusions. This determines the relevance of the topic. This article analyzes kinship terms of Turkic-speaking peoples from two sides: in terms of morphology and semantics. The scientific novelty of this article is determined by the comparative analysis of the terms of the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish, Uzbek, and Uighur languages.

A word as a linguistic unit corresponds with a subject or a phenomenon of the real world. In different cultures, not only objects or phenomena but also cultural ideas of them can be different. After all, they live and function in different worlds and cultures (Sadokhin, 2004). In other words, a language does not simply reflect the world; it builds an ideal world in people's mind.

Modern linguistics pays more and more attention to the comparative analysis of languages; this is a natural phenomenon: a rapid process of awareness of one's singularity, cultural identity, which swept many peoples, affected the development of the humanities in its own way. First of all, the attention of public consciousness was drawn to those areas and sectors that allow supplementing or developing the understanding of each people of the specifics of the national path within the general course of civilization, determining the value of its culture, the peculiarity of the language, i.e. to the directions characterizing the national mentality (Bliznyuk, 2006).

When studying the history of language, scientists found that kindred peoples have many common words (Mykytenko, 2004; Mukhamadieva, 2012). The language of the Turkic people, which has a common spiritual treasure, still exists; common concepts can serve as the basis for creating intercultural dialogue nowadays. In this regard, many scientists have recently considered the characteristic linguistic properties of kindred nations as their research subjects (Fattahova et al., 2016; Konuratbayeva et al., 2018; Abduali et al., 2017; Husnutdinov et al., 2016, 2017; Kadasheva et al., 2016; Omarova and Galymzhanova, 2017). Modern Turkic linguistics has significant achievements in understanding the nature and essence of the various phenomena of the phonological, grammatical and lexical structure of Turkic languages.

In Turkic languages, there are words that remained from the old lexicon and are common these days. They are called common Turkic words. The common Turkic dictionary is proof of the same origin of these languages.

Depending on the similarities and differences of semantics, researchers divide common Turkic words into the following groups:

- names related to human life;

- kinship conditions;

- names of animals and plants;

- natural phenomenon;

- names representing quality and quantity;

- pet names.

A vocabulary layer that conveys kinship relationships takes one of the first places among thematic vocabulary layers in terms of the time of origin and high stability of the concepts denoted by them. Such words are often used to reinforce one or another of the conclusions of the authors of various papers (Butinov, 1979; Zelenetsky and Monkhov, 1983), devoted to the issues of a comparative study of kindred languages and the basic word stock. However, the history of their forms and values, stylistic functions, prevalence, derivational potentiality remain insufficiently studied.

In the language of any nation, a group of words that denote kinship relations between people is of particular interest – these are the so-called kinship terms (Kryukov, 1972).

Every nation has a traditional vocabulary, which reflects a unique tradition of its people. Kinship terms are cognitive values that are important for intercultural communication.

The essential characteristic of this relationship, which is commonly understood as kinship, is the absolute interdependence and interdetermination of the participants in this relationship. It is not difficult to make sure that a father and a mother exist to the extent that there is a son or a daughter, and vice versa; talking about a brother or a sister only makes sense if there are other brothers or sisters, etc. In the context of kinship, there is no division into a subject and an object; each of the elements of kinship relationship is a subject, regardless of whom the relationship starts. Kinship terms are not a disorderly set of words; they form a certain system, and these systems are different among different nations. Studying them, ethnographers can learn a lot about family forms, their historical development and social organization of various peoples and tribes.

Among the Turkic peoples, including the Kazakhs, the tradition of the seven ancestors – "*zheti ata*" (seven ancestors) is very important. In a Turkic family, young people should not marry each other until the seventh generation from the side of one man. Akseleu Seydimbek said: "Certainly, the tradition of a girl who marries a man who is not among the seven ancestors, *zheti atu*, was the

only reason for the expansion of kinship in Kazakh society" (Akseleu Seydimbek, 2008, p. 180). The principle of comparing the kinship system of the Kazakh people from the point of view of the three groups of ego relatives – relatives of his father, relatives of his mother, relatives of his wife – is also common among the Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, Turks, and Uighurs.

As an important part of the vocabulary in a language, kinship terms are a linguistic phenomenon, which is determined by the laws of the internal development of the language. The laws of language development are directly related to the culture of a particular country. As for cultural linguistic knowledge, kinship terms are included in appellatives. They belong to specific lexical and semantic categories, which give a clear picture of national traditions and customs.

Method

Research Design

This research paper contains the analysis and synthesis of empirical materials, their generalization, and classification. For the development of a typology of kinship systems, the authors chose to conduct the synchronous-comparative study of languages, which will apparently remain among the leading ones in the near future. Following it, the article fixes the kinship systems that currently exist in the Turkic languages (in particular, on the material of the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish, and Uighur languages) and are available for direct observation. This method allowed the authors to analyze the actual material. The method of monitoring of the language material was also used. This method implies the study of the actual material, as well as the synthesis, interpretation, and classification.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, an American cultural anthropologist Alfred Louis Kroeber summarized the experience of previous generations and conducted more in-depth studies and identification of kinship, the social structure of humanity (Kröber, 2004). The authors are guided by the kinship system created by A.R. Kroeber, on the basis of statistical and comparative methods, the purpose of which is to study the kinship systems of Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkish, and Uighur languages.

The actual linguistic material (nouns, denoting the terms of kinship and properties) has been extracted by the method of continuous sampling from the Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary by K.K. Yudakhin (Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary, 1985), the Uighur-Chinese dictionary (Uygur-Chinese

dictionary, 2006), the Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language (Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language, 2008), the Turkish-Russian dictionary by R.R. Yusipov (Turkish-Russian dictionary, 2005), from the textbook on the Uzbek language (Uzbek for the CIS countries, 2012).

Data Collection

Kinship terms are selected with due account for their usage. The practical material was classified on the basis of a structural-semantic analysis. Special linguistic methods such as methods of semantic analysis, linguistic description, thematic classification, and statistical analysis were also used.

Findings

1. Every nation has a traditional vocabulary that reflects a unique tradition and is a unique feature of a nation. Among them are a number of words that are characterized by deep history, systematic structure, and cognitive values, which are especially important for intercultural communication. These are kinship terms. The kinship system correlates with the terms, by which various types of family relationships are expressed, as well as with a certain system of social attitudes.

2. Having conducted a statistical comparison of the nominal and semantic similarities of genetic features of kinship terms, a clear understanding of the corresponding basic kinship terms of these Turkic languages has been developed. There are many similarities in basic terms. Summarizing the comparative study of genetic traits of kinship terms, it can be noted that a number of words expressing kinship in the Kazakh language are common. Certainly, there is a difference between the Kazakh and four other languages (Turkish, Kyrgyz, Uyghur, Uzbek).

3. Since the phonetic contradictions of words of the same meaning are insignificant in many Turkic languages, they are often not displayed in borrowed words. It is necessary to pay attention to changes in the phonological level of a word during borrowing. The sound substance of lexemes in the Turkic language is subject to specific laws and characteristic of a particular language.

4. Many of kinship terms in the above-mentioned languages have the same semantics, but differ in pronunciation. In some terms, this difference may be insignificant, and in some cases cognate

words are used. This means that the languages of the Turkic group differ not only in phonology, but even in the lexical structure.

5. Compared languages have their own characteristics in a sound system for hundreds of years: audio functions that occur at the beginning and at the end of a word; a combination of two vowels at the beginning or at the end of a term; sound exchange, reduction and features of the use of sounds in the middle of a word. It can be concluded that common kinship terms of Turkic languages can be called universal terms of these aforementioned kindred languages.

Discussion

All three components of a speech event – a speaker (addresser), a listener (addressee), and a subject of speech are most fully expressed in dialogue. For that reason, each speech attribute is polyfunctional. The functioning of kinship terms in speech is based on a "kinship event", or the simultaneous presence of three participants in communication: ego, alter and connector (connecting relative). A connector is not only a father for the relationship "ego – father's brother" or a mother for the relationship "ego – maternal grandfather" (i.e. a genealogical connector), but also, for example, a mother for the relationship "ego – father" or parents (a pair connector) for the relationship "ego-sibling". Strictly speaking, an ego, an alter and a connector are subjects that embody those roles of a subject, which are considered to be the speaker's functions in cognitive linguistics (Demyankov, 1994). An ego in the act of using a kinship term acts only as a subject of speech; its "partners" – an alter and a connector – are respectively the subjects of consciousness and reference. The trialogue nature of the act of using kinship terms is obvious: a third person is necessary for the speech process, as well as an addressee and an addresser are necessary for him/her. Kinship terms can take into account or, on the contrary, ignore the gender, age, the genealogical status of a connector, but the verbal structure of a message will always reflect the unity of three, not two "persons".

According to researchers, kinship terms can be divided into two types, mainly based on peculiarities of the language and its use. The first is potential kinship terms that are rarely used or easily generated on demand. The second is the basic kinship terms, i.e. a group of active relative names that are constantly used. Here, 17 kinship terms, common to five nations, and 4 kinship terms, which differ from the Kazakh language, are a research object. The table below (Table 1 –

Similarity of Kinship Terms Based on Genetic Characteristics) summarizes the nominative similarities and differences of kinship terms based on genetic characteristics, divided into 8 categories, which are comparative and statistical data.

A symbol "+" in the table indicates that this kinship term has a difference in this category, and a symbol "-" means that this one does not have a difference in this category.

Thus, the authors have divided 17 kinship terms, listed in the table, into 8 categories based on genetic characteristics. The following differences can be observed:

1. Different or one generation.

Generation is an integral structural principle in terms of kinship, as well as an element of coordination of marital relations. It also defines the nominal use of kinship terms. Of the 17 basic terms to be compared in the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkish, and Uighur languages, only 35.29% demonstrate a generation principle. A total of six kinship terms "grandfather, grandmother, father, mother, grandson, nephew" show the generation principle, and the remaining 11 terms are not very clear. For example, the term "*aga*" is an elder brother of the youngest child, and it is not only the term of the kinship of one generation, but it is also used in previous or next generations. Besides, the generation principle is not taken into account in the kinship term "*kelin*". In the Kazakh language dictionary, the word "*kelin*" means "a married woman, a daughter-in-law of the husband's elder relatives and cousins" (Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language. 2008).

2. Kinship relationship.

In terms of comparing kindred languages, only 47.06% of the basic kinship terms are subject to this category.

3. Linear or incidental relationships.

The similarity of 17 basic kinship terms in the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkish, and Uighur languages is 100% in this category. Consequently, the kinship terms, which are linear or related, are connected with each other, correspond to each other, in other words, they have nominative and semantic match.

4. Sex of a relative.

Common properties of these languages in this category reach up to 82.35%. With the exception of 3 related terms (child, grandson, and nephew), the sex of kinship terms is known.

5. Sex of a person who is a link with one relative.

Comparison of compared languages in this category is 35.29%; this similarity is evident from the conditions of kinship between a father, a mother, a daughter-in-law, a son-in-law, and a sister-in-law. These terms are used for marital relationships. Relations are endless and always clear.

6. Sex of a speaker.

The genetic similarity of the index of kinship terms in this category is 0%. This means that there are no kinship terms in the languages of this category. Thus, kinship conditions do not depend on the speaker's sex.

7. Relative age within one generation.

Nominal and semantic correspondence of the kinship terms in this category showed 47.10%, this similarity includes 8 terms that define one generation.

8. A relative who links a person with the previous generation.

In this category, the presence of "C", which is a link between "A" and "B", does not affect the relationship between "A" and "B", in other words, the difference is 0%.

Kinship terms are translated as follows: ata (grandfather), ezhe (grandmother), eke (father), sheshe/ana (mother), bala (child), ul (son), kyz (daughter), azha (elder brother), ini/bauir (younger brother), kepke/apa (elder sister), sinly (younger sister), kelin (daughter-in-law), klyai bala (son-in-law), zhezde (son-in-law), zhenge (daughter-in-law), nemere (grandson), zhien (nephew).

Table 1
Affinity of kinship terms based on genetic characteristics

	Category (генетикалық белгі бойынша) Family Name						Different or same generation	Consanguine or affinal relationship	Lineal or collateral relation	Sex of relative	Sex of person who is a link between one relative and another	Sex of a speaker	Relative age within the same generation	Whether a linking relative is dead or alive
	Kazakh	Kyrgyz	Uzbek	Turkish		Uighur								
1	Ata	Chon ata	Bobo, buva	Dede	بوۋا	Boya	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-
2	Ezhe	Chon ene	Momo, buvi	Ebe	موما	Moma	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-
3	Eke	Ata	ota, dada	Baba	دادا / ناتا	Dada/ata	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-

No														
4	sheshe/ana	Ene/apa	ona, opa	Anne	نانا / ناپا	Ana/apa	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
5	Bala	Bala	Bola	Çöcuk	بالا	Bala	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
6	Ul	Uul	O'g'il	Oğul	ئوغۇل	Ugul	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
7	Kyz	Kyz	Qiz	Kız	قىز	Kiz	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
8	Aga	Aga	Aka	Ağabey	ئاكا	Aka	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
9	ini/bauir	Ini	Ini, uka	Erkek kardeş	ئۇكا	Uka	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
10	epke/apa	Ezhe	Opa	Abla	ئاچا / ھەدە	Acha/khede	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
11	Sinli	Sindi	Singil	Kız kardeş	سىڭىل	sinil	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
12	Kelin	Kelin	Kelin	Gelin	كېلىن	Kilin	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
13	kuyeu bala	Kuyee bala	Kuyov bola	Damat	ئۇغۇلكۈيۇز	Kui ugul	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
14	zhezde	Zhede	Ezna	Enişte	يەزنە	Iezne	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
15	zhenge	Zhene	Yanga, kennoyi	Yenge	يەڭگە	Ienge	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
16	Nemere	Nebere	Nevara, nabira	Torun	نەۋرە	Neure	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
17	Zhien	Zhen	Jiyan	Yeğen	جىەن	Zhien	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
							6	8	17	14	6	0	8	0
							35.29%	47.06%	100%	82.35%	35.29%	0%	47.06%	0%

In conclusion, after having conducted a statistical comparison of nominal and semantic similarities of genetic features of kinship terms, the authors developed a clear understanding of the corresponding basic kinship terms of these kindred languages. There are many similarities in basic terms. Certainly, there is a difference. This difference is shown in the following table (Table 2 – The lexemic difference of the basic kinship terms).

Table 2
The lexemic difference of the basic kinship terms

Kindred languages	Turkish	Uzbek	Kyrgyz	Uighur
Father's elder or younger brother	Amca	amaki	aba	Taga
father's elder or younger sister	hala	amma	aba ezhe	khamma
mother's elder or younger brother	dayi	tog'a	taga	
mother's elder or younger sister	teyze	xola	tai ezhe	khamma

Summarizing the comparative study of genetic features of kinship terms, it can be noted that a number of words expressing kinship in the Kazakh language are common. There is a difference between Kazakh and four other languages (Turkish, Kyrgyz, Uighur, and Uzbek). For example, the Kazakhs call a father's elder brother "father" or "brother" and use the word "nagashi" in relation to a mother's elder brother. Other kindred languages have a separate term for addressing this relative.

Since phonetic contradictions of words of the same meaning are insignificant in many Turkic languages; they are often not displayed in borrowed words. It is necessary to pay attention to changes in the phonological level of a word during borrowing. The sound substance of lexemes in the Turkic language is subject to specific laws and characteristic of a particular language.

Kinship terms in the study have the same semantics but differ in pronunciation. This can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Kinship terms with phonetic differences

	Kazakh	Kyrgyz	Uzbek	Turkish	Uighur	
1	zhien	zheen	jiyan	yeğen	جىمەن	Zhien
2	ul	uul	o'g'il	oğul	نوغۇل	Ugul
3	kyz	kyz	Qiz	kız	قىز	Kiz
4	kelin	kelin	kelin	gelin	كىلىن	Kilin
5	aga	aga	Aka	ağabey	ئاكا	Aka
6	zhenge	zhene	yanga,kennoyi	yenge	يەڭگە	Ienge

The words in this table are similar in pronunciation, and there are differences in alternation: the consonant [қ] in the Kazakh language is replaced by [k] in Kyrgyz, and the Kyrgyz and Uighur languages should not be exchanged within the consonant [қ] and [k]. For example: a girl in Kazakh – "kyz" ("қыз"), in Kyrgyz – "kyz" ("кыз"), in Uzbek – "kiz" ("киз"), in Turkish – "kiz" ("киз"), in Uigur – "kiz" ("қіз"). Besides, the sound [қ] in the Kazakh language is replaced by [k] in the Turkish, Uighur and Uzbek languages. In the Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, and Turkish languages, after the letter [к] there is [e] in the word "kelin" ("келін"); in the Uighur language, it is replaced with [и].

It can be seen that in the Kyrgyz language two vowels in words "zheen" and "uul" coexist. The word "ul" ("Ұл") in the Uzbek, Turkish and Uighur languages is pronounced as [г – ғ]. In the word "aga" ("аға"), the consonant "ғ" is replaced with the deaf consonant [қ] in the Uzbek and Uighur languages. Besides, the sound [e] in the first syllable of the word "zhenge" ("жеңге") in the Uzbek language will be replaced with the sound [a]. In the Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkish, and Uighur languages, the sound [ң] sounds in the first syllable of the word "zhenge" ("жеңге"), but in Kyrgyz [ң] does not sound.

The following table (Table 4 – Words with a different sound composition in kindred languages) compares the pronunciation and spelling of kinship terms. As can be seen from the examples, there are several similarities of words in the sound composition (child – in 3 languages, brother and younger sister – in 2 languages) and differences.

Table 4

The words with a different sound composition in kindred languages

	Kazakh	Kyrgyz	Uzbek	Turkish	Uighur	
1	ata	chon ata	bobo, buva	dede	بوژ	bowa
2	ezhe	chon ene	momo, buvi	ebe	موما	moma
3	eke	Ata	ota, dada	baba	دادا / ناتا	dada/ata
4	sheshe/ana	ene/apa	ona, opa	anne	نانا / نايا	ana/apa
5	bala	Bala	bola	çöcuk	بالا	bala
6	ini/bauir	Ini	ini, uka	erkek kardeş	ئۇكا	uka
7	epke/apa	Ezhe	opa	abla	هەده /ناچا	acha/khede
8	sinil	Sindi	singil	kız kardeş	سڭگل	sinil
9	kuyeu bala	kuyee bala	kuyov bola	damat	ئوغۇلكۇيۇ	kui ugul
10	zhezde	Zhezde	ezna	enişte	يەزنه	iezne
11	nemere	Nebere	nevara, nabira	torun	نەۋره	neure

For example, the Kazakh words *ana, nemere* and the Uzbek words *ona, nevara* have differences with the letters a-o, m-v, e-a. For example: *ana* in Kazakh; in Uzbek; *nevara* in Uzbek, etc.

Besides, there are words that have a great difference in pronunciation. For example: elder sister in Kazakh – "epke", in Kyrgyz – "ezhe", in Uzbek – "opa", "abla" – in Turkish and "acha" in Uighur. The word "groom" is called "kuyeu bala" – in Kazakh, "keyeu bala" – in Kyrgyz, "kuyov bola" – in Uzbek, "damat" – in Turkish and "kui ugul" – in Uighur. In Turkish, this word is fundamentally different from other above Turkic languages.

Conclusion

Kinship terms found in ethnic Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkish and Uighur languages reflect their way of life and features in the traditional social space. The Turkic-speaking people correspond to the traditions of family life, namely, upbringing the young generation, respect for the elderly, protection and care for the youth. All five nations that have been analyzed have had the same history and roots for a long time, as well as one religion, common language and culture.

Acknowledgments

References

Abduali B., Konuratbayeva Z. M., Abikenova G. T., Karipzhanova G. T., Sagdieva R. K., Akseleu Seydimbek. (2008). Kazakh oral history: Study. Astana: Foliant, 728 p.

Alajmi, M. A. (2019). The impact of E-portfolio use on the development of professional standards and life skills of students in the Faculty of Education at Princess NouraBint Abdul Rahman University, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 6(4) 1714-1735. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.6.4(12)

Bliznyuk O.V. (2006) Comparative semantic analysis of kinship terms in various linguistic cultures: Dis. ... Cand. filol. Sciences: 10.02.20. Tver, 163 p.

Bozhkova G.N., Shastina E.M., Kalimullina O.V., Shatunova O.V. (2019). Study of literary images of gifted characters in optional activities as a means to develop capable and talented youth. Space and Culture, India,Vol. 7:1, pp. 264- 273. https://doi.org/10.20896/saci.v7i1.463

Butinov H.A. (1979). Typology of kinship. Problems of typology in ethnography. M.: Science. – P. 66-75.

Demyankov V.Z. (1994). Cognitive linguistics as a kind of interpretive approach. *Questions of linguistics,* N 4, p. 17-33.

Degtyarev, S.I., Zavhorodnia, V.M., & Polyakova, L.G. (2018). On the establishment of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) University in Austria-Hungary and its coverage in "Kievskaya starina" journal. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 7*(4), 911-917.

Ermachkov, I.A., Ekimov, A.I., & Vazerova, A.G. (2018). Students' humanitarian science club activity in 2006-2012. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 7*(2), 286-290.

Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language (2008). Soc. ed. T. Zhanuzakov. Almaty: Dyke Press, 968 p. ISBN 9965-798-99-0

Fattahova, R. F., Sagdieva, R. K., Aydarova, S. H., & Giniyatullina, L. M. (2016). On the origin, phonetic variants, semantic and stylistic peculiarities of the use of the affix-lar in the turkic languages. *Man in India, 96*(10), 3529-3539.

Husnutdinov D. H., Mirzagitov R. H., Giniyatullina L. M. (2017). Historical and linguistic system of Turkic names and some specific features of creating vocabulary. *Man in India*, 97 (18), 443 – 456.

Husnutdinov D.H, Akalin S.H, Giniyatullina L.M. (2017). Linguistic means of expression in proverbs of tatar, Russian, Turkish. Astra Salvensis. Vol. 2017, 639-646.

Husnutdinov D.H, Sagdieva R.K, Mirzagitov R.H. (2016). Comparative constructions in G. Ibragimov's works. *Journal of Language and Literature*, (7).4, 42-45.

Kadasheva K., Omarova S.K., Asanova U.O. (2016). The study of closely related languages: the features of compiling an educational complex. Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. A series of theory of language. Semiotics. Semantics. Moscow. № 3,194-202.

Konuratbayeva, Zh.M., Karipzhanova, G.T., Sagdieva, R.K., Husnutdinov, D.H., Mirzagitov R.H., Kurbangalieva, G.M., Galiullin, R.R. (2018). Influence of urbanonyms on city image development. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology, 9*(11), 405-415.

Kröber A.L. (2004). K 79 Favorites: Nature of Culture. Trans. From English. M .: Russian Political Encyclopedia (ROSSPEN), 1008 p.

Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary. (1985). In two books. Under total. ed. K.K. Yudahin. Frunze: Main edition of the Kirghiz Soviet Encyclopedia, 503 p.

Kryukov M.V. (1972). The system of Chinese kinship (evolution and laws). – M.: Publishing house: Science. 333 p.

Kuznetsova, I. G., Bulyga, R. P., Rakhmatullina, L. V., Titova, S. V., Shichiyakh, R. A., & Zakirov, R. A. (2019). Problems and prospects of human capital development in modern russia. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration, 7*(2), 164-175.

Lysytsia, N.; Martynenko, M.; Prytychenko, T.; Gron O.; Us M. (2019). Prospects for innovations in marketing of economic educational services in Ukraine, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 6(4): 1771- 1783. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.6.4(16)

Magsumov, T.A. (2018a). Apprenticeship in Secondary Vocational Schools During the Economic Modernization in Late Imperial Russia. Part 1. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 7*(4): 918-926. doi: 10.13187/ejced.2018.4.918

Magsumov, T.A. (2018b). Vocational school and studying youth in the Russian revolution of 1905. Terra Sebus, 10, 289-313.Mykytenko N.Yu. (2004) Comparative analysis of Russian and Czech kinship terms (In diachrony and synchrony): Dis. ... Cand. filol. Sciences: 10.02.20 – Elista. – 137 p.

Mukhamadieva Z.A. (2012). Comparative analysis of the terms of marital relationship in the English and Tajik languages: Dis. ... Cand. filol. Sciences: 10.02.20. Dushanbe, 142 p.

Nechaev, V., Mikhailushkin, P., & Presnyakov, D. (2018). Priorities of social and economic safety. Paper presented at the MATEC Web of Conferences, , 212 doi:10.1051/matecconf/201821204015

Omarova S.K., Galymzhanova Z.T. (2017). History of research of Kazakh anthroponyms and appelative lexicon. Bulletin of Kokshetau State University named after Sh. Ualikhanov. Series of Philology. Kokshetau. №2,P. 69-74.

Tarman, B. (2018). Editorial. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, *1*(2), i-iii. Retrieved from http://cultureandvalues.org/index.php/JCV/article/view/17

Sadokhin A.P. (2004) Intercultural communication. M .: Alpha-M; INFRA-M, 288 p.

Shevchenko, N.A., Vidishcheva, E.V., & Emelyanova, O.V. (2016). The establishment of the system of public education in the Caucasus (1802-1917 years): The characteristic features. Bylye Gody, 40(2), 363-372.

Uygur-Chinese dictionary. (2006). ئۇيغۇرغۇتەرجىم – Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region: National Publishing House, 645 p. ISBN: 9787105078035

Uzbek for the CIS countries: textbook (2012). G.Kh. Bakiyev, B.Kh. Karaeva, E.N. Korshunova, I.A. Kraeva, D.M. Teshabaeva, G.M. Frolov. M.: Rema, 330 p.

Yusipova R.R. (2005). Turkish-Russian dictionary.M .: "Russian language. Media". 2005. 693 p. ISBN 5-9576-0131-4

Volchik, V.; Maslyukova, E. (2019). Trust and development of education and science, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 6(3): 1244-1255. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.6.3(27)

Zelenetsky A.L., Monkhov P.F. (1983). Comparative typology of German and Russian languages. M .: Enlightenment, 240 p.

Zhuravlev, P. V., Poltarykhin, A. L., Alkhimenko, O. N., & Kuksova, O. D. (2018). Human capital and its efficiency in the knowledge economy: The role of continuing education. *Espacios, 39*(46).