



Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal.
Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 1(89)

Вісник Житомирського державного
університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 1(89)

ISSN: 2663-7650

UDC 130.2:165.9(111.1)

DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1(89).2021.57-66

TURKIC SOCIALITY: FROM THE KAGANATS TO THE PARADIGM OF STATE CONSOLIDATION

N. I. Bilokopytova,* K. El Guessab**

The article is devoted to the study of the phenomenon of sociality in the Turkic world. The main difficulty in the holistic understanding of the material on this issue is that a large set of philosophical ideas is not used to analyze the Turkic sociality in the Ukrainian philosophical discourse, which in our opinion is important. We propose to consider all the literature we have selected in terms of two approaches to the analysis of social life, based on the methodology of J.-L. Nancy, who noted that social existence should be seen as the interaction of various associations and as knowledge of the ontology of such communities.

A peculiarity of the study of the genesis of philosophical and socio-humanitarian understanding of the phenomenon of Turkic sociality is the identification and development of ideas about the evolution of the Turkic world as «being-together», co-existence of difference and plurality. Such an ontology is not so "ontology of society" in the sense of a "regional ontology", but "sociality".

Based on this, the subject of our study "Turkic sociality" is a kind of specific unifying philosophy and ideology of different Turkic peoples, who have created independent state and political structures and to some extent remain independent world actors.

Using the methodology of social constructivism an analysis of the existing traditions of the Turkic socio-cultural space, which became an existential prerequisite for sociality in the formation of new patterns of activity, which will later acquire the status of traditional, is made. The idea of the structure of Turkic social life, the factors of which are the formation of statehood, the development of urbanization processes, the formation of the corresponding spiritual religious ideology of Tengriism and Islam, has been improved. The elucidation of worldviews (the desire for harmony, coexistence, spiritual introspection, traditional, religious culture, paternalism), which are an important factor in the unifying philosophy and ideology of Turkic society in the face of global challenges, has been further developed.

Keywords: *The Turkic world, Turkic sociality, Transformation of Modern Society, concept of Consolidation of the Turkic society, Turkic society and the pandemic.*

* Zaporizhzhia National University, Social Philosophy and Administration Department, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0002-7260-0705
nina_turk@ukr.net

** Assoc. Prof. PhD, Social Philosophy and Administration Department, Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0003-3555-1235
karimk@ukr.net

Key words: *The Turkic world, Turkic sociality, Transformation of Modern Society, Symbolic Production and Exchange, Consolidation of the Turkic society, Turkic society and the Pandemic.*

ТЮРКСЬКА СОЦІАЛЬНІСТЬ: ВІД КАГАНАТІВ ДО ПАРАДИГМИ КОНСОЛІДАЦІЇ ДЕРЖАВ

Н. І. Білокопитова, К. Ель Гуессаб

Стаття присвячена дослідженню феномена соціальності в тюркському світі. Основна складність в цілісному осмисленні матеріалу з даної проблематики полягає в тому, що в українському філософському дискурсі великий комплекс ідей не використовується для аналізу тюркської соціальності, що на наш погляд є важливим. Ми пропонуємо розглядати обрані нами для аналізу джерела з точки зору двох підходів аналітики соціального буття, взявши за основу методологію Ж.-Л. Нансі, який зазначає, що соціальне буття слід розглядати як взаємодію різних асоціацій і як пізнання онтології таких спільнот.

Особливістю дослідження тенези філософського та соціально-гуманітарного осмислення феномена тюркської соціальності є виявлення та розвиток уявлень про еволюцію тюркського світу як "буття-разом", спів-буття відмінності та множинності. Така онтологія є не стільки "онтологією суспільства" в сенсі "регіональної онтології", скільки онтологією "соціальності".

Виходячи з цього, предмет нашого дослідження «тюркська соціальність» виступає своєрідною специфічною об'єднуючою філософією та ідеологією різних тюркських народів, які створили самостійні державно-політичні структури і певною мірою залишаються самостійними незалежними світовими акторами.

За допомогою методології соціального конструктивізму здійснено аналіз сформованих традицій тюркського соціокультурного простору, які стали екзистенційальною передумовою соціальності у формуванні нових зразків діяльності, котрі набудуть згодом статус традиційних. Удосконалено уявлення про структуру тюркського соціального буття, факторами якого є формування державності, розвиток урбанізаційних процесів, формування відповідної духовної релігійної ідеології тенгріанства та ісламу. Набуло подальшого розвитку з'ясування світоглядних засад (прагнення до гармонії, спів-буття разом, духовне самозаглиблення, традиційна, релігійна культура, патерналізм), які виступають важливим чинником об'єднувальної філософії та ідеології тюркської соціальності в сучасних умовах глобальних викликів.

Ключові слова: *тюркський світ, тюркська соціальність, трансформація сучасного суспільства, символічне виробництво та обмін, концепт консолідації тюркських держав, тюркське суспільство і пандемія.*

Introduction of the issue. The Turks went down in history as a phenomenon of a "tribe-state" or "state based on the principles of kinship", whose rulers exercised control over the population. But kinship continues to be the basic principle of social organization. Factors adding to the complexity of the Turkic society were the formation of statehoods (Turkic kaganates) with the transition to the level of nomadic empires, the formation of social and political institutions, the processes of urbanization, a comprehensive

characteristic of power and social systems on the scale of the unification of the ancient Turks... These are just quick sketches to the matrix of the social structure of the ancient Turks. These aspects cannot be ignored, since they are *the mental and spiritual constants* of the modern social structure of the Turkic states, and the prerequisites for its *development and consolidation*, as we will analyze below.

The aim of the article is analysis of the phenomenon of sociality in the

Turkic world through the category of being.

The outline of unresolved issues brought up in the article. On the other hand, the functionalist views the material that he studies in a timeless context; he analyzes the structure and "how it works", not paying attention to how it arose and what it will transform into next. For example, he could analyze clans, their structure and functions in order to subsequently summarize the results and explain what a clan is. This approach to the study of culture is rooted in the works of A. Comte, E. Durkheim, B. Malinovsky, A. Radcliffe-Brown, and was formed as an alternative trend in relation to classical evolutionism. A certain conclusion can be drawn about functionalism: B. Malinovsky and A. Radcliffe-Brown, in their works, developed an understanding of society (and culture) as a self-regulating system, consisting of closely interconnected and interdependent parts that perform the functions of maintaining and preserving the integrity and vitality of the system. They actually developed the conceptual apparatus necessary for functional analysis: the concepts of "social structure", "function", "social organization", "integration", etc.

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, E. Husserl's teachings substantiated a new methodology of both philosophical and sociocultural knowledge. Husserl's phenomenology was in fairly strong opposition to the positivist tradition. In the latter, culture was ignored as a constitutive factor of human existence. And Husserl made culture not only the central meaning-forming element of his concept, but also later pointed out that culture is a dynamic, meaningful beginning of human existence open to the future.

In addition to the phenomenology of culture in the philosophical approach to the analysis of cultural realities, the importance of philosophical

hermeneutics should also be emphasized. One of the main means of cognizing culture is literature, both scientific and artistic. The origins of the problem of understanding go back to the times when people did not yet know the written language, but the communication among multilingual tribes and nationalities made it necessary to translate from one language to another, to correctly understand the foreign language. Like in the past, today, in the creative activity of translators, understanding and interpretation of texts is literally an everyday problem of prime importance. Since the advent of writing, hermeneutics has had a new task that differed from simple translation of colloquial speech, which is the problem of interpreting written sources. It will suffice here to recall the age-long controversy surrounding the interpretation of the Bible and other "holy books".

F. Schleiermacher identified the basic principles and methods of hermeneutic analysis: the principle of dialogicity of humanitarian thinking; the principle of the unity of grammatical and psychological interpretation; the principle of dialectical interaction of the part and the whole in the understanding of texts; the principle of dependence of understanding on knowledge of the inner and outer life of the author of the work; the principle of co-creation (congeniality) of the author and the interpreter; the method of translating the unconscious layer from the author's life into the plane of consciousness by the interpreter; a method for constructing interpretive hypotheses based on prior understanding.

The study of cultural phenomena gives adequate results when using structuralist methodology. The structuralist approach in the study of cultural phenomena was used by C. Levi-Strauss, M. Foucault, R. Barth, U. Eco and others, and it was proposed by the famous Swiss scientist, the

founder of structural linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure. Structuralism, developed by C. Levi-Strauss, was used by him for the purposes of anthropology, ethnography, the most important in his method, he recognizes the presence of formal structures in relationships between people, as well as the interpretation of myth as the fundamental content of collective consciousness, the basis of many stable social structures. The result that C. Levi-Strauss strove for in his works is the modeling of the structure. He studied traditional societies as languages of culture, sought to identify in them recurring elements, stable schemes, "mediators", "binary oppositions" that could reform or replace some positions with others.

In relation to the Turkic social culture, there is the following dilemma, which boils down to the following types of methodological approaches in the study of the Turkic society: the application of the available knowledge about the Turks as a whole to a specific material or, conversely, its use for the development of the methodology when studying the nomadic Turks. Some scientists strive, having at their disposal a huge theoretical and methodological groundwork, to find a place for the Turks in the context of a number of sociological universal schemes, while many others focus solely on specific problems.

The social philosophical specifics of the study of the evolution of Turkic society obviously require *new non-classical approaches* that will allow us to move from the paradigm of social constructivism to social realism. Therefore, referring to the study of scientific literature, we make one methodological remark that will allow us to systematize the multifaceted interdisciplinary scientific and theoretical literature on the research problem: we propose to consider all the literature we have chosen in terms of two approaches to the analysis of social life,

based on the methodology of J.-L. Nancy [15]. He rightly points out that social existence should be seen as the interaction of various associations and as knowledge of the ontology of such communities. Thus, the phenomenon of Turkic sociality will be analyzed by us as "being-together", as co-being of the singular and plural. In such an ontology, which is not an "ontology of society" in the sense of a "regional ontology", but an ontology as a "sociality", or as a "society", from the beginning more primary and original than any society and any other individuality and "any essence of being". In this ontology of being, everything is together; it is once from the very being (co-being of this being).

Results and Discussion. We will define the world of Turkic sociality as the evolution of culture, with its achievements, and as the organization of the political space in historical dynamics. The structures of social systems, their functioning and evolution, the social institutions and social values, society as a whole and its development are extremely complex. All are shaped by many factors. At the same time, they have the characteristic of historicity. Because of these features, many social sciences try to explain social events and phenomena from different angles. For this reason, in our study, the Turkic social culture is considered taking into account a holistic, interdisciplinary approach based on the ideas of structuralism. And the phenomenon of Turkic sociality will be analyzed by us through the category of being. Such "being-together" as the co-existence of the singular and plural.

Archaeological and historical research of the Turkic society constitutes a long historical baggage that dates back to the 3rd millennium BC. During this period, the Turks founded world empires, such as the Seljuk and Ottoman empires, which spread across three continents in a geographical latitude including Central Asia, the Balkans, the Middle East, parts

of Europe and Anatolia. The chronology of the study makes it possible to distinguish the following historical periods in the social structure of the Turkic societies: the period of the steppe nomadic Turks, the Turks of the Ottoman period, the Turks of the republican period, and, finally, the Turks in the era of globalization and in the time of a pandemic.

Western European historiography actively developed the line outlined by V. Radlov or Vambery. They outlined the basic principles of the social organization of nomads, establishing its tribal and supra-ethnic character. But Barthold turned to the problem of the interaction of nomads with a sedentary agricultural population. Later, these points were developed by W. Eberhard and O. Lattimore.

Soviet scientists approached the same problems, gradually, albeit in different ways (concepts of Pletneva [16], Markov [13]; Khazanov [12]; and others). Also was studied the question of the nature, the appearance of a complex military-political system among the nomads. Then also the creation of large nomadic political associations, the mechanisms of internal interaction of society and social structure in its connection with the peculiarities of social organization.

Sociality of steppe nomadic Türks.

Divided into tribes, the Turks could survive only through wars. United in federations which academician R. Grusset aptly called "steppe empires", they could exist only by imposing the will of the strong on the weak. In this case, they possessed such an impact force that they required indispensable use. They used it against the rich kingdoms of the settled peoples. Having seized the lands of three continents - in Beijing, Delhi, Isfahan, Damascus, Baghdad, Cairo, Constantinople, Algeria - they had to persist so as not to lose them. It should be noted that in the conquered lands, unprecedented prosperity was most often observed. For example, China under the

rule of Tabgach, Iran under the Seljuks, Egypt under the Mamluks, India under the rule of the Great Mughals. As for the Ottoman Empire, it was one of the largest Turkic powers in the world, which at first was a sword for Islam, then a shield.

The complex forms of social life and social institutions of the Turks are striking: el, the ladder system, the hierarchy of ranks, military discipline, diplomacy, as well as the presence of a well-developed worldview opposed to the ideological systems of neighboring countries. Here, obviously, one should recall the theory of L. Gumilyov about the passionarity of ethnogenesis, where passionarity is the ability and desire to change the environment, and ethnogenesis is a natural process that has been going on for over a thousand years, leaving traces no less than a flood or lava ejection from volcano.

As S. Klyashtorny [8] showed, all religious cults of the Turks had an exclusively social nature. This is the cult of the wolf, the legendary ancestor of the Ashina clan, and the cult of the Kagan and Khatun couple as the earthly hypostasis of the heavenly pair Tengri and Umai, etc. A mythological landscape of national memory is being created which has become, for the Turkic culture, a traditional social institution, a social matrix of spirituality. Religion for the Turks, both ancient and modern, is the idea of the historical continuity of being. Reproduction and preservation of society through the transfer of religious values and the development on this basis of social relations and spiritual achievements becomes an important task. The duration of the life of society, its development or the cessation of its existence depends on the solution of this problem.

Sociality of the Ottoman Türks. The Ottoman Empire had no nobility or any kind of noble class. However, in the mass consciousness there were ideas about the hierarchy of the social structure,

about nobility and aristocracy. Usually this was associated with the antiquity of the family, with the social origins or occupations of individuals, with their cultural level, their behavior, or their lifestyle. The descendants of the prophet (sayyids and sheriffs), as well as the persons who were descended from various kinds of Muslim "saints", from the Seljuk or Mamluk sultans, from the bey-gazi, etc., enjoyed a special prestige. However, all these differences, which existed at the level of everyday consciousness, were not fixed by the current norms of law. According to Ottoman concepts, all people were the same from birth. There were not and could not have existed any advantages associated with bloodlines, and its dignity could not be inherited. Theoretically, in doctrinal terms, Ottoman writers - mostly authors of socially didactic treatises - divided Ottoman society into four "classes" or "categories" (asnaf): clergy (ulama), military (askeri), philistinism (an-nas) and peasantry (reaya). Outwardly, according to their social and professional characteristics, the above four "categories" resembled estates. In reality, they were not such, they did not have a legally fixed status and were of a purely abstract, speculative nature. It was a sociological abstraction [10: 84].

Ottoman society was highly socially mobile. A servant could turn into a great vizier in a few hours. So, the ruling class was given a lot, but much was required of it - namely, unquestioning obedience. In addition, various groups of the elite did not have any ties with each other, which made it easier for the authorities to control the elite. It was an empire, internally divided, but expansionist. It was united by a powerful political apparatus based on the conditional holding of the land. The social structure corresponded to the needs of the despotic power. This system was stable, but not capable of self-development.

There were almost no rudiments of capitalism in the empire.

Turkic sociality of the republican period. Turkic society developed under the influence of cultures of previous eras. From ancient times, large and small nations lived in large areas of Central Asia, and there were states that contributed to the development of world civilization. Among them were the nomadic states of the nation of Central Asia, known collectively as the Turks. The Russian Empire included in its composition most of the lands of the former Golden Horde, on which the Turks lived and the Turkic states existed from time immemorial. And, since then, a policy of disintegration and assimilation has been pursued, with the exception of the Ottoman Empire, which became the Turkish Republic in the 20th century. Nomadic and semi-nomadic cattle breeding as the optimal forms of their economic activity, economic and cultural type, spiritual culture, social structure based on kinship relations, nomadic folk ethics, fine arts and folklore - everything was subject to overthrow. And where this was impossible, the apologists of imperialism tried to restructure, modify or completely replace cultural codes.

The concept of "culture" is correlated with the concept of "ideology", but they do not coincide in meaning. Ideology is created by man, so this category has a chronological framework. For example, the founders of the ideology of Pan-Turkism were Ismail Gasprinsky, Zia Gokalp, Yusuf Akchura, and it was founded in the late nineteenth century. The main goal was the consolidation of Turkic-speaking peoples, the creation of a single state of the Great Turan. It was Ismail Gasprinsky who put forward the original slogan, which the followers of Pan-Turkism continued to use: "Unity in language, thought and work". For example, ideology of Kemalism, founded by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, aimed to transform Ottoman Turkey into the

Republic of Turkey, the vector of which was returned to Western civilization. Its essence was the concept of nationalism, the transition of writing from Arabic to Latin, the course of Westernization and secularism, the abolition of polygamy, women's suffrage and the right to education, the replacement of Sharia law, the prohibition of religious education - all neoliberal reforms. As a result, the category of Turkish "economic miracle" was introduced into scientific circulation. The ideology of Turkish nationalism put forward by Kemal is still considered the official ideology of the Turkish Republic. The symbol of Kemalism is the six arrows, according to the six principles of ideology.

Transformations of the Turkic world in the era of globalization.

There are 24 Turkic nations in the world (and if we include all ethnic groups and sub-ethnic groups, 86). The Turks currently have 6 independent states (Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan) and 12 territorial autonomies (9 of them in Russia) [7]. The first diplomatic attempts to unite the Turkic-speaking states into a single whole with a center in Anatolia were undertaken at the end of the 19th century, but were never crowned with success. The same can be said about the subsequent ones undertaken during the First World War. The "golden time" for the revival of former power and even unification into a "Turkic-speaking community from the Adriatic Sea to the Great Wall of China" began after the collapse of the USSR [11]. As a prime example the creation of the International Organization of Turkic Culture TURKSOY, which was established on the basis of an agreement signed in 1993 by the ministers of culture of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Turkey. Later, the following entered TURKSOY as observers: the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the regions of the Russian Federation - the

Republics of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Altai, Sakha (Yakutia), Tuva, Khakassia, as well as Gagauzia as part of Moldova. TURKSOY sees its task as promoting spiritual rapprochement and strengthening the fraternal unity of the Turkic nations, presenting the Turkic culture to the world and broadcasting its traditions to subsequent generations.

The theory of consolidation can be confirmed by international summits, congresses, and conferences of the Turkic world. Creation of the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking states (Turkish - Türk Dili Konuşan Ülkeler İşbirliği Konseyi) is an international organization uniting modern Turkic states, the main goal of which is to develop all-round cooperation between the member states (Turkey, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan). The association was established on the 3 of October, 2009 in Nakhchivan. At first, it was called the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States. This association was preceded by other Turkic organizations, the essence of which was for the most part outside politics and geopolitics, but, rather, in culture and in philology.

The core of Turkic integration is traditionally the humanitarian component, where the central issue is the common language. As a rule, the need for its introduction is justified by references to the once unified cultural and historical community.

Thus, the ontology of co-being (within the framework of this goal, to exist together) can be defined as a variety of attempts to respond to the call of being. Each of these answers is characterized by integrity and completeness, and, at the same time, none of them can claim to be exclusive - precisely because of the impossibility of complete objectification of the event.

Therefore, the ontology of co-being inevitably presupposes a plurality of ways of realizing the comprehension of being, excluding any possibility of

creating the only true and, accordingly, universal "doctrine of being".

Turkic society and pandemic.

Humanity is already going through a painful melting down. The world into which we enter, as soon as those in power allow us to end this many days of lockdown, will be different. First of all, we will see the rehabilitation of traditional institutions - a kind of rollback will take place in different directions. The state will strengthen, which will have to raise the market destroyed by the epidemic, and at the same time, its supervisory potential will also increase, which will introduce into our life a reality hitherto known only from dystopias. The structure of society will also change - the burial stake will send the middle class on its last journey - as well as the nature of social interaction. Perhaps we are rendering in a world where individual individualism will be supplanted by a new solidarity - the ersatz of introverted globalism [2]. In effective self-presentation, only 35% are words, while 65% are charisma, which consists in gaze, eye contact, gestures, posture, including the correct greeting, which includes a handshake. In a pandemic era, the latter is taboo. The Turkic-speaking peoples have long had special rules for greeting people of the upper class, clergy, respected people, pilgrims, and distinguished guests. After shaking hands with a person enjoying universal respect (a pilgrim, a famous "effendi", an honored guest, a "murza", "bey"...), as a sign of deep respect, they kissed his hand and applied it to their forehead three times [4]. None of this will be possible in the future, it seems. By allowing the substitution of the cultural code, we create the conditions for changing our behavioral responses. The cultural code of a people (nation) and statehood, the characteristics of which are variable values, are a value that has an objectively subjective nature. At the same time, the cultural code that underlies social values and value

orientations is an inert phenomenon, more static in relation to changes than statehood.

Conclusions and research perspectives. We note that to construct the phenomenon of Turkic sociality, we turned to the category of social existence, which is designed primarily to fix in the minds of the social, its relationship with the natural. Therefore, we defined the existence of Turkic society as the evolution of its inherent culture, its various achievements, the organization of political space, the objective philosophy and ideology created by it in the historical dynamics of the area of Turkic states. The concept of "Turkic sociality" refers to a large group of peoples who, in conditions of weak social differentiation and the absence of a system of centralized power, exercise coercion to the law, to the formation of institutional relations carried out by the tribal community. The team was a normative culture that determined the values, norms, target orientation of members of society and the organization of roles in a particular system of interaction.

The formation and integration into the global world of the Turkic idea "altı devlet - bir millet", that is six states - one nations, takes place against the background of the general weakening of traditional ties between generations, which leads to the loss of succession of generations. That is why Turkic culture and socialism actualize values and attitudes that were previously either under an ideological ban or were exclusively declared. However, it is obvious that the worldview transformation process is slow, but the change of political and economic structures is very active process.

Therefore, for most Turkic societies, social problems remain to some extent declared and have the character of a residual solution, rather than the problems of economic development or

the problems of selfish policies maintained by the ruling groups.

LITERATURE

1. Білокопитова Н. Феномен соціальності в тюркському світі: соціально-філософський аналіз. Автореф...к.філос.н. 09.00.03, Житомир, 2021. 18 с. URL: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/32534/1/avt-Bilokopytova.pdf> (дата звернення: 15.05.21)

2. Добров Е. Сысоев Т. 15 образов мира после коронавируса. *Expert. №15 (1159)*, URL: <http://www.sib-science.info/ru/news/15-obrazov-mira-posle-koronav-06042020> (дата звернення 15.05.2021).

3. Ergan, Nevin Güngör. *Türkiye'nin toplumsal yapisi*, (Social structure of Turkey) Kızılay-Ankara, Siyasal Kitabevi, 2018. 372 s.

4. Гимбатова М. Б. Традиции гостепреимства и куначества у тюркоязычных народов Дагестана, 2012, URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/traditsii-gostepriimstva-i-kunachestva-u-turkoyazychnyh-narodov-dagestana-xix-nach-xx-v> (дата звернення: 15.05.2021).

5. Гумилев Л. *Древние тюрки*. Академия наук, институт народов Азии, Москва: Наука, 1967, 504 с. URL: <http://gumilevica.kulichki.net/OT/index.html> (дата звернення: 15.05.2021).

6. Гумилев Л. *Этногенез и биосфера земли*. Под ред. Л. Гончаровой. Ленинград: Airi Press, 2016. 560 с.

7. Инанч Г. Тему тюркского единства поднимают в основном лоялисты Кемаля, 2015, URL: <https://www.turkishnews.com/ru/content/2015/09/29> (дата звернення: 15.05.2021).

8. Klyashtorny S. G. *Runic Inscriptions of Uyghur Khaganate and History of Eurasian Steppes*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo "Petersburgskoye vostokovedeniye", 2010.

9. Kradin N. N. *Nomadic Empires: Origins, Rise, Decline*. In *Grinin, L. E., Bondarenko, D. M., and Barfield, T. (eds.), Nomadic Pathways in Social Evolution*. Moscow: Center of Civilizational Studies, 2003. P. 73–87.

10. Ковтунович Г. О. *История Востока*, том. 3. Восток на рубеже средневековья и нового времени XVI—XVIII вв, Москва: Восточная литература 2000. 696 с. URL: <https://book.ivran.ru/f/istoriya-vostoka-tom-3-vostok-na-rubezhe-srednevekovya-i-novogo-vremeni-xvi-xviii-vv>

novogo-vremeni-2000.pdf (дата звернення: 15.05.2021).

11. Колосков Ф. Каким целям служит TURKSOY, 2019. URL: <https://www.ritmeurasia.org/news--2019-10-22--kakim-celjam-sluzhit-tjurksoj-45536> (дата звернення: 15.05.2021).

12. Khazanov A. M. *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

13. Марков Г. Е. *Кочевники Азии. Структура хазайства и общественной организации*. Москва: Изд. Московского университета, 1976.

14. Морган Л. Г. *Древнее общество или исследование линий человеческого прогресса от дикости через варварство к цивилизации*. Москва: Изд. URSS, 2019.

15. Nancy Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*, Stanford University Press. 2000. 207 p.

16. Плетнева С. А. *Кочевники русских степеней IV-XIII века*. Москва: Ломоносов, 2018. 240 с.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Bilokopytova N. The phenomenon of sociality in the Turkic world: socio-philosophical analysis. Author's abstract... Ph.D. 09.00.03, Zhytomyr, 2021. 18 p. URL: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/32534/1/avt-Bilokopytova.pdf> (Accessed: 15.05.21) (in Ukrainian)

2. Dobrov, E. and Sysoyev, T. (2020). 15 obrazov mira posle koronavirus. *Expert, №15 (1159)*, Retrieved from <http://www.sib-science.info/ru/news/15-obrazov-mira-posle-koronav-06042020> (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

3. Ergan, Nevin Güngör (2018). *Türkiye'nin toplumsal yapisi*, (Social structure of Turkey) Kızılay-Ankara, Siyasal Kitabevi (in Turkish)

4. Gimbatova, M.B (2012). Traditsiy gostepriimstva I kunatcestva u turkoyazychnyh narodov Dagestana Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/traditsii-gostepriimstva-i-kunachestva-u-turkoyazychnyh-narodov-dagestana-xix-nach-xx-v> (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

5. Gumilev, L. N. (1967). *Drevniye turki*. Akademiya nauk USSR, Institut narodov Aziyi. Moscow: Nauka, 504 p. Retrieved from

<http://gumilevica.kulichki.net/OT/index.html> (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

6. Gumilev, L. N. (2016). *Etnoenez I biosfera zemli* / Pod red. Goncharovoy, Leningrad.: Izd. Airi Press (in Russian)

7. Inanch, Gulnara (2015). Temu turkskogo edinstva podnimayut v osnovnom loyalist Kemalya Retrieved from <https://www.turkishnews.com/ru/content/2015/09/29> (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

8. Klyashtorny, S. G. (2010). *Runic Inscriptions of Uyghur Khaganate and History of Eurasian Steppes*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo "Petersburgskoye vostokovedeniye".

9. Kradin, N. N. (2003). *Nomadic Empires: Origins, Rise, Decline*. In: Grinin, L. E., Bondarenko, D. M., and Barfield, T. (eds.), *Nomadic Pathways in Social Evolution*. Moscow: Center of Civilizational Studies.

10. Kovtunovich, G. O. (2000). *Istoriya Vostoka*, tom.3. Vostok na rubezhe srednevekova I novogo vremeni XVI—XVIII vv, Moskva: Izdatelskaya firma "Vostochnaya literature" 696: 84 Retrieved from [https://book.ivran.ru/f/istoriya-vostoka-](https://book.ivran.ru/f/istoriya-vostoka-tom-3-vostok-na-rubezhe-srednevekova-i-novogo-vremeni-2000.pdf)

[tom-3-vostok-na-rubezhe-srednevekova-i-novogo-vremeni-2000.pdf](https://book.ivran.ru/f/istoriya-vostoka-tom-3-vostok-na-rubezhe-srednevekova-i-novogo-vremeni-2000.pdf) (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

11. Koloskov, F. (2019). Kakim tselyam sluzhit TURKSOY. Retrieved from <https://www.ritm Eurasia.org/news--2019-10-22--kakim-celjam-sluzhit-tjurksoj-45536> (Accessed: 15.05.2021) (in Russian)

12. Khazanov, A. M. (1984). *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

13. Markov, G. E. (1976). *Kochevniki Aziji. Struktura khozyaistva I obschestvennoi organizatsiyi*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo universiteta (in Russian)

14. Morgan, L. G. (2019). *Drevneye obschestvo ili issledovaniye liniy chelovecheskogo progressa ot dikosti cherez varvarstvo k tsivilizatsiyi*, Izdatelstvo URSS (in Russian)

15. Nancy, J.-L. (2000). *"Being Singular Plural"*, Stanford University Press. 207.

16. Pletneva, S. A. (2018). *Kochevniki russkih stepey IV-XIII veka*. Moscow: Lomonosov (in Russian)

Receive: May 17, 2021

Accepted: June 17, 2021