

## HomerOS

---

Cilt / Volume 2, Sayı / Issue 2, 2019, pp. 31-38

E - ISSN: 2667-4688

URL: <http://www.ratingacademy.com.tr/ojs/index.php/homerOS>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33390/homerOS.2.005>

## YURT AS A MICRO MODEL OF THE UNIVERSE IN THE CONTEXT OF “LANGUAGE: CULTURE”

### (LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL ANALYSIS ON THE MATERIAL OF THE KAZAKH AND MONGOLIAN LANGUAGES)

*Gulsara Amangeldiyevna KOZHAKHMETOVA \* & Gulgaisha SAGIDOLDA\*\**

\* L.N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University, Faculty of Philology, Kazakhstan

E-mail: [gulsarateacher@mail.ru](mailto:gulsarateacher@mail.ru)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4775-3902>

\*\* L.N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University, Faculty of Philology, Kazakhstan

E-mail: [sagildolda@mail.ru](mailto:sagildolda@mail.ru)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1797-8457>

*Received: 2 January 2019; Accepted: 21 April 2019*

---

### ABSTRACT

*One of the main tasks of Altaistics in the XXI century is to study the interconnection and relationship between the large language groups, such as Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchu and Japanese-Korean, connecting ethnogenesis, history, traditions and customs, spiritual and cultural heritage and world outlook of the people speaking these languages, and an interdisciplinary approach to Altaistics on this basis. It is important to take the phraseological fund of Altaic languages as the goal of comparative studies, based on interdisciplinary complexity.*

*In this regard, studying mythological-symbolic code of Turkic-Mongolian language picture of the world by comparing the Kazakh and Mongolian equivalent phraseologisms, based on *kiiz úi* [ki:iz ui] ‘felted mat house’, ‘yurt’, in the context of “language and culture”, we identify the similarities and distinctive features of ancient cognition of the Turkic (Kazakh) and Mongolian culture in Central Asia, historically, culturally and linguistically connected since ancient times. *Kiiz úi* is not just a house, comfortable for moving from one place to another, but also can symbolise of binary oppositions of the universe.*

*In nomadic worldview *kiiz úi* – the micro image of the world, *shańyraq* [ʃaŋyraq] ‘wooden circle forming the smoke opening of a yurt’ in this image is the micromodel of the Sky, *kúldireyish* [kuldireuiʃ] ‘cross racks on the top side of yurt’ which is connected to *shańyraq* like arks symbolises “the unity of the Space and the Man”, *ýyq* [uwwq] ‘flexed racks connected to *shańyraq* is the symbol of the Sun rays that lights the world.*

**Keywords:** Turkic, Kazakh, Mongolian, language picture of the world, traditional culture of nomads, mythical-symbolic code, nomads’ worldview, phraseological system of language, language image, ethnographic phraseologism, internal structure of phraseologisms.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many lingual data of mythical-symbolic context concerning ancient Kazakh and Mongolian ethnoses' worldview and understanding of are associated with *kiiz úi* ‘felted mat house’.

Comparative study of Kazakh and Mongolian figurative phraseologisms with *kiiz úi* (yurt) in the context of “language and culture” is substantial. Phraseological system of any language is considered to be a small language system that encodes the centuries-old fund of knowledge about ethnic culture in its background image and connects with the next generation as “a typical scheme of life events”, that is a fragment of language picture of the world.

It comes from the basic function of phraseology as a unit of language, “the main function of phraseological units is not to make nominations but to evaluate and describe the phenomena and objects” (Smagulova, 1998). That’s why the function of phraseological units as linguacultural source is to identify the common areas, regarding the evaluation and description of some phenomena, objects and situations in the life of Kazakh and Mongolian people. We can also identify the peculiarities of each nation regarding the understanding of realities.

## 2. MAIN PART

From the last quarter of the XX century ethnographers had been paying great attention to the semantic description of *kiiz úi*, the home of the Turkic and Mongolian people in the Southern Siberia and Central Asia (Zhukovskaya). There are many scientific works considering *kiiz úi* as a micromodel of the world for nomads (Wasilewski). We can find semantic analyses that divide the inner part of *kiiz úi* into sectors (as a *fire place, seat of honor, treshold*), and their traditions and customs with these sectors and symbolic meaning (Shakhanova, 1998).

*Kiiz úi* is not just a house which is equipped according to the geographic location and comfortable for moving from one place to another, but also the symbol of binary oppositions of the universe like day and night, man and woman, hostility and friendship, poverty and richness, etc. (Timoshinov, 1997).

The nomadic circle formed *kiiz úi* is the navel of world at large. The initial spot of vertical lines raising to the top, horizontal lines expanding to sideways and the central spot of the space, is “the centre of outworld space” – family, village and hearth. For nomads, moving for the distance of about hundreds of kilometers from spring-place to summer-place, from summer-place to fall-place, from fall-place to winter-place and from winter-place again to spring-place, the world is ball-shaped and the sky is round shaped, like their yurts.

In the nomads' worldview *kiiz úi* – the micro image of the world, *shańyraq* [ʃaɲyraq] ‘wooden circle forming the smoke opening of a yurt’ (in figurative meaning: ‘house, family’) in this image is the micromodel of the Sky, *kúldireyish* [kuldireuiʃ] ‘cross racks on the top side of yurt’ which is connected to *shańyraq* like arks symbolises “the unity of the Space and the Man”, *ýyq* [uwwq] ‘flexed racks connected to *shańyraq* is the symbol of the Sun rays that lights the world. *Shańyraq* and *ýyq* are the symbols of “the space” and *kerege* [kerege] ‘cross racks like the house wall’ is “the steppe space”, *ýyq* and *kerege* is the junction of “space” and “steppe”.

Circle is the symbol of Obscurity, infinite Space, unmeasureable Time for nomads, so circle-shaped *shańyraq* is the symbol of “generation procreation”, “viability or termination of the tribe”. The joining of six straight lines to the *shańyraq* circle means *the unity of seven generation under one hearth*, i.e. *the unity of one tribe*.

*Shańyraq*, which is made of wood, is one of the main elements of *kiiz úi*, one of “the bones of house” like *ýyq*, *kerege* and *esik* (door). *Shańyraq*, becoming black from being

fumigated with the smoke of birch hearth and transferred from ancestors is symbolically very important for Kazakh people’s perception. For Kazakh people *shańyraq*, first of all, is a symbol of generation continuation, welfare and unity among the relatives, responsibility and respect between father and son. *Shańyraq* serves to provide entering of sun beams into the house and to fill the house with the rays of daytime life and plays great role in the spiritual and cultural life of Kazakh people. Its objective and symbolic meaning, its importance developed such set expressions as *qara shańyraq* (parental home), *shańyraq kóterý* (to create a family), *shańyraǵyna at (qobyz) oinatý* (to crush to the ground), *shańyraǵy shaiqalý* (to destroy family), *shańyraǵy ortasyna túsý* (to lose paterfamilias).

The fact that *shańyraq* is connected with generation procreation can be explained with its symbolic and semantic significance in the Kazakh worldview. Kazakh set expressions as *shańyraq kóterý* (lit. to raise a hearth - “to marry and live separately from parents”), *qara shańyraq* (“parental home, passed from father to son”), *shańyraǵyn biik bolsyn!* (Let your hearth be high! – wedding wish) mean prosperity of generation, their continuation, and the expressions as *shańyraǵy shaiqalý* (lit. fall of the hearth - “to destroy family”), *shańyraǵy ortasyna túsý* (to lose family members), *shańyraǵyna at (qobyz) oinatý* (to crush to the ground) mean family destruction. The ceremony of putting *shańyraq* near the tomb of the last successor of the generation is also one of the inseparable attributes of the Kazakh culture.

*Kuiz úi* is comfortable dwelling not only in Kazakh people’s everyday life, but all Turkic-Mongolian tribes, engaged in cattle-breeding and held nomadic lifestyle. The word *shańyraq* is not odd as a realey in Mongolian worldview, perception and understanding and in the Mongolian language it is called as *тооно*. There are phraseological units connected with *shańyraq* in the Mongolian language though very rare. Here it does not mean “family, tribe”, but connected with “getting adult” and used as a measure of age. For example, the Mongolian set expression *тооно өргөх* (lit. ‘to raise the hearth’) which sounds similar to Kazakh expression “to create a family” means “to be the head of the village, to be a citizen of the country”, and the expression *тоонотой гэрт толгой холбох хүн* (lit. ‘the person with whom you meet under the hearth’) means “your wife at home”. The notion “to get adult” is similar to Kazakh *shańyraq kóterý* (“to create a family”).

However the set expressions in Mongolian with the basic word *тооно* “family hearth” in lexical composition are not so active and viable as in the Kazakh language both numerically and contextually. But the word *голомт* “fire place” like the word “family hearth” in the Kazakh language is specific with its symbolic peculiarities and the basis for developing various set expressions, i.e. creates “image gallery”. For example, phraseological unit *гал голомт* (lit. ‘fire ash’) “main family house; the house which is heired from grandfather to father and from father to the youngest son, i.e. main hearth”, *голомт залгамжлагч* (lit. ‘fire successor’) means “the youngest son successor”, *голомт тасрах* (lit. ‘fire stopping’) means that due to the only son’s death because of unexpected situations or lack of a boy in the family “to lose family head”, and *голомты нь баллах* (lit. ‘to stop the fire’) reminds ancient war periods with the meaning “to destroy the family, to terminate the tribe”. We can see the lifestyle of Mongolian people in these phraseological units when they lived in caves, and blowed the ash not to extinguish the fire and guarded the fireplace.

It is obvious that many expressions which describe Kazakh and Mongolian peoples’ beliefs to worship fire can be found in both Kazakh and Mongolian languages. They are originally connected with the lifestyle of ancient people who considered fire as the basis of their life. The understanding of “keeping the fire in the hearth” in the life, belief and traditions of Mongolian people resulted in becoming the word “hot ash” the word-symbol. The word *голомт* “fire place” in the Mongolian language in its figurative meaning is the same as the word *shańyraq* “family hearth” in the Kazakh language and contributes to developing the notions,

describing the national cultural and spiritual values, transferred from generation to generation, therefore function as the dominant meaning in many figurative expressions.

From these linguistic data we notice that nomadic Mongolian people, who connect their *kiiz úi* with mythical worldview, where fireplace or fire hearth is “the central spot of the whole world”. Mongolian people marked the spot where the vertical and horizontal lines of the world join with fire made by them and they believe this joint spot links the spirits of their ancestors and them as the symbol of unity. The horizontal lines which come from the joint spot along the circle (space, time) mean people’s actions, and the vertical lines, raising to heaven from the joint spot, are the link between the predecessors and their generation. We can say that such mythical symbols have their place in figurative phraseological units of two languages concerning the *kiiz úi* as semantic units.

*Shańyraq* (family hearth), symbolizing the generation continuation in Kazakh people’s life and fireplace in the Mongolian language present the difference in the perception and understanding of two nations. We can say that these mythical symbols contain the information about the moments of social mentality emergence.

The fact that ancient people “associated the life with fire” and guarded the fireplace makes the mythical symbolic basis of the notions *fire, fireplace, fire hearth* (Gaadamba, 1990), and the mythical symbolic basis *shańyraq* is connected with the idea of “the sun is the source of life” (Zhubanov, 1999). G.Smagulova explains the occurrence of the Kazakh set expressions like “not to spit to the fire in the hearth”, “not to step on the ash”, “let the fire of your hearth not extinguish!”, “head of the fire” and other expressions of wishes, and the curses is “not with the beliefs of nomads to pray the fire”, but with “dependance of nomadic lifestyle from environment” (Smagulova, 1998). Kazakh people wish the safety of the fireplace and head of the fire, strongness of the *shańyraq (family)*, being *shańyraq* high and smoke from the fireplace straight is for well-being, and extinguishing of fire, breakage of *shańyraq* for painful and sad event as in Mongolian “the lack of fireplace successor” (*голомт залгамжлагч үргүүдэх*), “fire stopping” (*голомт тасрах*).

Nomads mark their living surrounding with circle *kerege* (cross racks of *kiiz úi*) like its wall, the “central circle” means the internal space, i.e. “inner world – own family and relatives”, protected from the outer world by *esik* (the felted mat door). *Esik* [esik], *bosaǵa* [bosaga] or *tabaldyryq* [tabaldyryk] (treshold) are the borders, separating the “inner world” from “outer world”. *Esikten syǵalay* (to look through the closed door) is an intention to “know about the somebody’s inner world”, i.e. “somebody’s family”, and *bosaǵa (tabaldyryq) attay* (lit. to step the treshold) means to “enter the inner world” or “to become a member of the family”.

In the Kazakh language the word *esik* develops such expressions as *esigi ashyq* (open door), *esigi tar* (narrow door), *esiginen qaramay* (not to look through the door), *esik kózinde* (near the door), *kisi esiginde* (near somebody's door), *esik kórgen* (lit. seeing someone else’s door – “a woman who has been married”) etc., the word *bosaǵa* (treshold) develops *bosaǵa attay* (to step the treshold), *bosaǵada júry* (lit. ‘to be on the treshold’ – “to be a servant”), *bosaǵasy úñirey* (‘empty treshold’), the word *tabaldyryq* (treshold) develops *tabaldyryǵyn attamay* (‘not to step through treshold’), *tabaldyryǵyn tozdyry* (‘to come everyday’) etc. The meaning of the Mongolian word “*босго*”: 1) treshold (old); 2) bounderies. There are expressions like *босгыг алхахгүй* (lit. ‘not to step the bounderies’) “to stop coming home, to break the relationship”, *босго элээх* (lit. ‘to deteriorate the treshold’) “to come everyday, to pester”, *босго ширүүнтэй* (lit. ‘restrained treshold’) “unfriendly family” etc. Mongolian people believe that to step the treshold or to stumble over the treshold is a bad sign, which means “the happiness leaves the family”, and for Kazakh people to put the feet on the treshold or to stretch the hand along the treshold is also bad luck (Akhmetov, 1995).

There are plenty of phraseological expressions with the word *esik* in the Kazakh language, but there just a few with word in the Mongolian language like *хаалга* “door” (*хаалга мөргөх* – 1. ‘to pray to the door (ceremony)’; 2. *lit.* ‘to butt the door’ -“to trouble by coming again and again”) (Akim, 1985).

The nomads circle the place of their cattle barn, milk pail etc., i.e. “the microworld of life” as *irge* [irge] (footing). To be inside this circle means to be closer “to his family”, and to go out of this circle means to be far from the ‘inner world’ (from the family), “to become outsider”. So the word *irge* is very active in both languages and develops many phraseological units as *irgesi berik* (*lit.* ‘to have strong wall’ - “united and friendly village, clan”, *irgesi sógily* (*lit.* ‘to destroy the footing’- “to lose the friendship”), *irge teby* (*lit.* ‘to put footing’ - “to settle, to live”), *irgesin kóterý* (*lit.* ‘to move the footing’ - “to move, to migrate”), *irgesin ashyp aly* (*lit.* ‘to divide the footing’ - “to go apart, to live separately”), *irgesin ayılaq salý* (*lit.* ‘to take footing away’ - “not to approach, to live in at a distance”) etc. in the Kazakh language, and *хаяа түшүх* – *lit.* ‘to support the footing’ - “to live supporting each other”, *хаяагаа манах* – *lit.* ‘to guard the footing’- “to wait for the outcome of something), *хаяаанд буух* – *lit.* ‘to step the footing’ - “to become neighbours”), *хаяа дэрлүүлэх* – *lit.* ‘to be close by footing’ - “to build the house close to neighbour’s”) etc. in the Mongolian language.

So we can say that the phraseological units with *kiiz úi* contribute to create the linguistic image of the world, the fragments of its manifestation. Not all the parts of *kiiz úi* are similar, but the parts, important symbolically in the the nation’s worldview and play great role as an object, can enter the linguistic image system of two languages. B.Akberdieva, the researcher of mythical and perceptive structures of the Kazakh lexical and phraseological system, provides A.F.Losev’s opinion that “myths are the truth of life in primitive society, the symbolic image of the surrounding of people” and that “myths do not live just in the thoughts and fantasy of people, but in their actions. The environment and lifestyle also can be the myths, i.e. the awareness of ancient people make the myths” (Akberdieva, 2000). The mythologems which are considered as the units (structures) which demonstrate the mythical perception are the “values” which survived in the depth of words and mind.

The internal structure of the names and phraseological units pertinent to “*kiiz úi* - microcosmos of nomads” containing the ethnical and cultural information are closely connected with mythologems. “Even though the mythologems in the internal structure cannot control totally the meaning of phraseological units, they can correct the present time functioning of their meanings and direct them” (Maslova, 2001). For example, the facts that denote the values of nomads’ “inner world”, namely, the nomad family, family hearth inheritor, wife, the fire he makes, the smoke of this fire, relatives, children in the house, that unite the figurative expressions and show their common ethnical and cultural environment are the mythologems like “*ot – tútin*” (fire-smoke), *ot–urpaq–jan* (fire-generation-person) in their internal structure. They are mythical and perceptual structures common for Turkic-Mongolian languages and put in one line the Kazakh phraseological units as *otbasy* (‘family’), *oshaq qasy* (‘fireplace’), *tútin tútetý* (‘to let the smoke out’), *tútini túzý ushý* (‘straight smoke’) and Mongolian phraseological units as *гал голомт сахигч* (*lit.* ‘fireplace guardian’) “the youngest son, family hearth inheritor”, *зэрийн умааг үзэх* (*lit.* ‘to see smoke at home’) “to be a separate family”, having the common ethnical and cultural background and creating the similar image.

If we combine the nomadic *kiiz úi* with the ancient perception of mythical model of the world, we can notice that the number of *kiiz úi* parts (three, four and seven) is similar to the number of mythical layers of the world. For example, the main parts of *kiiz úi*, containing *three* parts: *shañyraq* (hearth), *ýyq* (the arcs on the top of *kiiz úi*) and *kerege* (the cross lines like the wall of the *kiiz úi*), the outer cover of *kiiz úi* which contains *four* parts: *túndik*, *úzik*, *týrlyq*, *irgelik* make seven elements in total. The internal part of *kiiz úi* is divided according to the

nomad relationship and also in accordance with the social, sex and age status into three parts like *threshold, fireplace and place of honour*, and in accordance with the location of objects they are divided into seven: from the left to the place of honour: *dish place, bed place of the family head*; from the right to the place of honour: *place for the new-born cattle, place for the household objects* like saddle, stapes, lasso and etc., further if the family has a daughter-in-law, *then place of newly-married*, if not, then *the place of the daughter*; from the place of honour to the left: *chest place, fire place* (in the center).

Basis for recurring of the mythical layers of the world like 3, 4 and 7 parts of *kuiz úi*, also the fact that “these sacred numbers were the basis to make certain chains and combinations is the understanding, perception and worldview of the ancient people” (Kenesbaev, 1977). In other words, ancient people’s mythological understanding of their living environment, i.e. “the nature of the world and people” are shown in the symbolic meaning of those numbers, in the ethnographic meaning of the phraseological units with the numbers.

The numbers three, seven, nine and forty which are used as the symbols of an object or phenomenon are very important in the mythical system of nomads’ worldview. Saying about the mythical image of linguistic units in the Kazakh language B.Akberdieva points that the mythical layers in one of the variants of world horizontal model are marked with number *tórt* (four), and the expressions like *tórt buryshy* ‘four angles’, *tórt qubylasy túgel* ‘all the four angles together’, *tórt kózi túgel* ‘all four eyes together’ etc. indicate that the world vertical model is divided into three: *the sky, the Earth and the Underground world*, all these layers are linked vertically with “world column” or “space tree” (Akberdieva, 2000). N.Ualiuly draws our attention to the ancient people’s beliefs in the world mythological layers by the Kazakh phraseological units *jeti galam* (seven planets), *jeti dúnie* (seven worlds), *jeti qat kók* (seven-layered skyworld) etc.(Ualiuly, 1998).

In Mongolian mythical perception number *three* (гурав(н)) has combinations as *ертөнцийн гурав* (lit. ‘world’s three’) “three planets”: the Sky, the Earth, the Underground world; *гурван сайн заяа* - lit. ‘three good lives’: the God, the Sky, the Man; *гурван муу заяа* - lit. ‘three bad lives’: Hell, Devil, Wild animal; *ертөнцийн гурван үүд* -lit. ‘the three doors of the world’: Height, Tongue, Mood; *ертөнцийн гурван цагаан* -lit. ‘the three whites of the world’: the child’s teeth, the old man’s beard, the dead person’s actions; number *four* (дөрөв (н)) develops *дөрвөн зовхис* (‘four vicinities’) “the four angles of the world”; *дөрвөн зүг* (‘four directions’): the South, North, East, West. Number *seven* (долоо(н)) in the Mongolian language make such set expressions as *долоон голтой* (‘with seven endings’) “very patient”, *долоон ходоодтой* (‘has seven stomachs’) “insatiable”, *долоон уулын цаагуур* (‘beyond seven mountains’). They are similar to Kazakh phraseological units *jemeneidiń jer túbi, kóz kórmes, qulaq estimes jer* “very far, remote place”, *доройтхын долоон хамсаа* (‘crisis has seven companions’), similar to Kazakh phraseological units as *jut jeti aǵaıyndy, kedeidiń qyryq qursaıy* “the misfortune will not come alone”.

### 3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Kazakh people’s symbolically thinking about *shańyraq* (family hearth: “microimage of sky”, “symbol of generation procreation and unmeasureable time”), *esik* (“the boundary which does not allow entering the outerworld negative powers inside”), and Mongolian people about *fireplace*, *fire-pit* (“the joining spot of vertical and horizontal lines of the world”, “the central spot of the world which is located along the circle”) and the development of figurative phraseological units on the basis of these thinking demonstrates these nation’s perception and understanding of life etc. The similarity of mythical and symbolic meaning of Kazakh *irge* and Mongolian *xаяа* (footing), Kazakh *bosaǵa* and Mongolian *босоо* (treshold) (the boundary dividing “the inner space” from “the outer space”, “the inner world” from “the outer world”, “the inner circle” from “the outer circle”) shows us that the phraseological units with these words refer to one ethnical and cultural background and proves the common worldview of these two ethnoses.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- AKBERDIEVA B.K. Leksiko-frazeologiyalik juyedegi miftik-tanymdyq qurylymdar. KDA.- Almaty, 2000. B.15.
- AKBERDIEVA B.K. Leksiko-frazeologiyalik juyedegi miftik-tanymdyq qurylymdar. KDA.- Almaty, 2000. B.23.
- AKHMETOV A. Turki tilderindegi tabu men evfemismder. - Almaty, 1995. B.64.
- AKIM G. Mongol-oros, oros-mongol ovormots heltsiin tol. –UB., 1985. H.62.
- GAADAMBA Sh. Nuuts tovchoony nuutsaas.-UB., 1990. H. 110.
- KENESBAEV I. Qazaq tilining frazeologiyalik sozdigi.- Almaty, 1977.B. 612.
- MASLOVA V.A. Lingvokulturologiya. M., 2001. S.87.
- SHAKHANOVA N. Mir traditsionnoi kultury kazakhov.- Almaty, 1998. C. 19-47.
- SMAGULOVA G. Magynalas frazeologismderding ulttyq-madeni aspektileri.- Almaty, 1998. B. 12.
- SMAGULOVA G. Magynalas frazeologismderding ulttyq-madeni aspektileri –Almaty, 1998. B.168.
- TIMOSHINOV V. Kulturologiya: Kazakhstan-Evrasya-Vostok-Zapad. -Almaty, 1997. S.49.
- UALIULY N. Frazeologiya jane tildik norma. -Almaty, 1998. B.13.
- WASILEWSKI I. Space in Nomadic Cultures: A Spatial Analysis of the Mongol Yurts// Altaica Collecta.- Wiesbaden, 1976; Ibraev B. Kosmogonicheskie predstavleniya nashih predkov // DI SSSR. 1980. N8. S.40-45.
- ZHUBANOV K. Qazaq tili boiynsha zertteuler. - Almaty, 1999. B.398.
- ZHUKOVSKAYA N.L. Kategorii I simvolika traditsionnoi kultury mongolov.- M., 1988; Sagalayev A.M., Oktyabrskaya I.V., Lvova E.L., Usmanova M.S. Traditsionnoe mirovozzrenie turkov Yuzhnoi Sibiri: prostranstvo I vremya. Veschny mir. - Novosibirsk, 1988; Toleubaev A.T. Relikty doislamskih verovaniy v semeinoi obryadnosti kazakhov (XIX-XXcc.). - Almaty, 1991; Galiev A.A. Traditsionnoe mirovozzrenie kazakhov. - Almaty, 1977; Karakuzova Zh.K., Khasanov M.Sh. Kosmos kazakhskoi kultury.- Almaty, 1993.