An Ethnolinguistic Analysis of Jewellery Names Common in Turkic Languages

Gulsara Kozhakhmetova[a]* iD, Saule Tazhibayeva[b] iD, Gulgaysha Sagidolda[c] iD,
Lyazzat Beisenbayeva[d] iD, Nurgul Abeshova[e] iD

*[a] Senior lecturer, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasion National University. Astana, Kazakhstan.
Email: kozhakhmetovaga@enu.kz*

*[b] Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasion National University. Astana, Kazakhstan.
Email: tazhibaevaszh@enu.kz*

*[c] Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasion National University. Astana, Kazakhstan.
Email: asem963@mail.ru*

*[d] Senior lecturer, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasion National University. Astana, Kazakhstan.
Email: tancopan@gmail.com*

*[e] Lecturer, Semey Medical University. Semey, Kazakhstan.
Email: nurgulabeshova69@mail.ru*

Abstract
The jewellery names and the ethnic identity of the Kazakh culture are lexically correlated as clearly evident from various ethnolinguistic analyses of jewellery vocabulary. This study aimed to analyze some common jewellery names as jüzük (ring), biläzük (bracelet), şirγa (earring), mončak (necklace, beads), tügma (button), belbaγ, qur, qaδis (belt) and jewellery for braids common in Turkic languages. This linguistic journey attempted to uncover the meaning of these jewellery names in different Turkic languages and identify their functions and distinctive features through a comparative method. A qualitative research design with an ethnocultural approach was used to understand the ethnogenetic and cultural aspects of these jewellery names from 26 Turkic languages. The content analysis method was used to categorize them according to their origin and cultural significance. The findings revealed that the Turkic jewellery was of different types, and known by several names in different ancient Turkic languages. It also had sacred power, brought wealth and fertility, possessed healing properties and protected people from evil spirits. This study would help to expand knowledge about the traditional culture of the Turkic peoples.

Introduction

Jewellery has existed for thousands of years as a universal form of ornamentation, having social and cultural significance (Khazbulatov, 2021). Historically, shells, bones, and other natural materials were used to design jewellery, which had spiritual or ceremonial significance. Turkey has a historically and culturally

rich legacy of jewellery, with symbols embedded in Turkish traditions and society. The Kazakhs who, like many other Turkic people, had lost their national peculiarities under the influence of the Soviet ideology. However, the jewellery names and the ethnic identity of the Kazakh culture associated lexically with those names still inspire the craftsmen (Baigabatova et al., 2018; Nygmanova et al., 2022). The Kazakh linguist Shoibekov (2022) has made an ethnolinguistic analysis of jewellery and pointed out how the jewellery vocabulary gave birth to several phraseological units.

Several studies have examined jewellery as a manifestation of the ethnogenetic and cultural ties of the Turkic peoples. The material (form, production technology) and spiritual (role and place in the ethnocultural space, symbolic sign) aspects of jewellery are of great importance in the emergence, development and functional use of jewellery types. Interestingly, language has been an indispensable instrument for transmitting spiritual values and traditions, particularly through the jewellery names, which can be found in the Turkic written monuments and ancient explanatory and bilingual dictionaries in Turkic, dialectological and professional vocabularies, and ethnographic works of Turkic languages (Johanson, Csató, & Karakoç, 2020). It is clearly evident from these linguistic resources that the Turkic peoples used several versions of ancient Turkic jewellery names (Kozhakhmetova & Tazhibayeva, 2021; Salikzhanova, Turgut, & Mursalim, 2023).

Ancient Turkic Dictionaries are based on the language of Turkic-speaking monuments of 7th to 12th centuries. These dictionaries explain how the original meaning of some common jewellery names have been changed in the course of historical development for various reasons, and acquired other meanings (Chertykova & Kaksin, 2020; Kaksin & Chertykova, 2020). Still, it is crucial to be aware of the specific features of jewellery names common to Turkic languages in translating them into other non-Turkic languages. There is a dearth of studies on jewellery names and their ethnographical significance (Kozhakhmetova & Tazhibayeva, 2021; Salikzhanova et al., 2023). A few studies have only dealt with their cultural, spiritual and symbolic significance (Baigabatova et al., 2018; Khazbulatov, 2021; Nygmanova et al., 2022; Zzbaeva & Pumpkin, 2022). Hence, there was a need to examine jewellery names common to Turkic languages and study their peculiarities, with respect to the dictionaries of Turkic languages and ethnographic works.

This study has analyzed Turkic jewellery names based on Baskakov's (1963) widespread classification, which represent the geographical and linguistic characteristics of the Turkic languages. This classification divides the Turkic languages into Western and Eastern branches. The Western branch includes the groups: (i) Kipchak group comprising Kypchak-Nogai branch - *Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai;* Kipchak-Bulgar branch - *Tatar, Bashkir, Siberian Tatar;* Kipchak-Balkar branch - *Karachay-Balkar, Kumyk, Karaite, Crimean Tatar*; Karluk branch-*Uzbek, Uyghur;* Oguz-Seljuk branch - *Turkic, Azerbaijan, South Crimean Tatar*, Oguz-Bulgar branch - *Gagauz, Balkan-Turkic;* Oguz-Turkmen branch - *Turkmen, Trukhmen;* and (ii) Bulgar group comprising *Chuvash* branch. The Eastern branch includes Kyrgyz-Kypchak group- *Kyrgyz, Altai, Teleut;* and Uighur-Oguz Siberian group - *Tuvinian, Yakut, Khakassian, Shor, Tofalar, Dolgan, Chulym.*

The focus of the article was to analyze some common jewellery names as *jüzük* (ring), *biläzük* (bracelet), *şïrγa* (earring), *mončak* (necklace, beads), *tügma* (button), *belbaγ, qur, qaδis* (belt) and jewellery for braid common in the Turkic languages. This linguistic journey attempted to uncover the meaning of these jewellery names in different Turkic languages by making use of a comparative method. Besides their meaning, the study also identified the functions and distinctive features of these jewellery names, as evident from the translation, etymological dictionaries of Turkic languages, ethnographic works and reference books. The local characteristics of these jewellery names have also been explained to highlight the melodic harmonies, unique phonetics, and cultural nuances to captivate their multilingual significance. A detailed scientific literature review on these lexical items establishes them as thematic groups, occupying an important position in the vocabulary of Turkic languages, and revealing the culture, ethnography and language of Turkic peoples.

Literature Review

Origin of Turkic jewellery names

The Kazakh scholar Shoibekov (2006) studied the origin of the jewellery names, compared and analyzed them with respect to their originating Turkic languages. The study found out that jewellery names in the Turkic languages have both similarities and differences, when considered from a lexical-semantic point of view. These similarities and differences lie in the names of materials, methods and tools used in producing jewellery, common to the Turkic languages. For example, *altyn* (gold), *kumis* (silver), *bakyr* (copper), *temir* (iron), *tas* (stone), *suyek* (bone), and *inzhu* (pearl) were found in Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions from ancient times. In some Turkic languages the word "altyn" means "metal", and in other languages it is also used for "money". In jewellery art there are methods common to Turkic languages, such as *altyndau* (gilding), *kumisteu* (silvering), *kesu* (cutting), *sogu* (forging), *kuyu* (casting), etc (Abdullina et al., 2020; Shoibekov, 2006).

The jewellery names common in almost all Turkic languages include *jüzük* (ring), *biläzük* (bracelet), *şïrγa* (earrings), *mončak* (necklace, beads), *tügma* (button), *belbaγ, qur, qaδis* (belt), and *şaşbaw* (braid

jewellery). The Kazakh jewellery names have been created on the basis of ancient common Turkic names (Abdullina et al., 2020; Shoibekov, 2006). Specifically, Mankeyeva (2014) researched the semantic feature and origin of *bilezik* (bracelet) in Turkic languages. These names can be seen as important historical sources of information about the Turkic languages and their contacts with other ethnic groups (Abdullina et al., 2020). In some cases, these names do not only provide the meaning and lexical-sematic functions of these words, but also provide information about foreign borrowings (Abdullina et al., 2020). Hence, these vocabulary items found in early Turkic dictionaries show the relationship existing between Turkic people and the rest the world. These words show how from ancient times, the lexical structure of the Turkic languages have existed as thematic groups and also has been a subject of a research (Nygmanova et al., 2022; Rakhmatullina & Khusainova, 2022).

Classification of Jewellery Names

In order to determine the use of jewellery names in modern Turkic languages, there exist different classifications of Turkic language groups (Anonby et al., 2020; Johanson, 2021a, 2021b; Savelyev, 2020; Tekin, 1991; Zhunissova, 2014). Most classifications of Turkic languages are based according to their different features and thematic groups. For instance, Turkologists like V. Radlov, N.I. Ilminsky, N.A. Baskakov, A.N. Samoilovich, V.A. Bogoroditsky, S.E. Malov, N.A. Aristov, I.N. Berezin, G.I. Ramstedt, and M. Ryasyanen have classified the Turkic languages according to their own thematic grouping styles (Memmedova, 2023).

Other classification methods are based on geographical, cultural and symbolical underpinnings. Geographically, it is evident that most common words of the Turkic peoples were separated by thousands of years and at a distance of thousands of kilometers from each other, and still had kinship. Despite several differences in time and geographical regions, the Turkic languages have many geographical features as evidence of their close contacts. These common words not only united Turkic peoples in geographical terms, but also show some identical cultural values. Culturally, for the Kazakh people, jewellery is not only artistic artefacts, but represents traditions, beliefs, aesthetic values, and cultural heritage. Jewellery names are the source of information about the owner's clan, age, social status and other personal information. They can be used to analyze Kazakh traditions and rituals, spiritual culture, ethnography, folklore, history, literature and language of Turkic peoples.

Symbolically, the Turkish jewellery names are rich in symbolic underpinnings as each name tells a story that has survived several centuries. For instance, one of the most recognizable symbols in Turkish jewelry is the Evil Eye, or Nazar Boncuğu, which is believed to combat negative energy. The crescent moon and star, or Ay Yıldız, is another symbol which represents unity and progress and is even featured on the Turkish flag. In jewelry, this symbol often signifies a sense of belonging and national pride. Likewise, the Tughra monogram symbolizes power and authority; while the Whirling Dervish, or Mevlevi Sema, represents spiritual enlightenment.

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative research design with an ethnocultural approach (Mertens, 2012; Nagata, Suzuki, & Kohn-Wood, 2012) was used to understand the ethnogenetic and cultural aspects from the names of jewellery types. The descriptive and historical methods were adopted to examine the Turkic written monuments, ancient bilingual dictionaries in Turkic, dialectological and professional vocabularies, and ethnographic works of Turkic languages (Johanson et al., 2020). While the descriptive method helped to collect the data and classify it to determine the correlation of the individual names of jewelry, the historical approach assisted in connecting vocabulary of jewelry with the history and *culture* of the Turkic people to a specific period in social life. The findings contribute to the development of historical lexicology, ethnography and cultural linguistics of the Turkic people. In addition, this study also adopted the semantic approach as it necessitated highlighting the meaning of the jewellery names.

Data Collection

The primary data was mainly collected from ancient Turkic dictionaries and ethnographical documents comprising translations, etymological dictionaries of Turkic languages, ethnographic works and reference books such as Clauson (1972) and Egorov (1964) and bilingual thematic dictionary of Kaksin & Chertykova (2020). These resources contained both common and archaic jewellery names from 26 Turkic languages. Some Turkic languages have several variations in the name of one type of jewellery. After collecting the names, they were tabulated and organized into categories. A comparative method was used to identify their functions, common and distinctive features.

Data Analysis

The ethnocultural analysis patterns were used *to* examine the jewellery names common in Turkic

languages. The peculiarities of different versions in some Turkic languages were analysed and local characteristics of some jewellery names were explained. The content analysis method was adopted to analyze these jewellery names, which required categorizing them according to their origin and cultural significance. The study also conducted a comparative analysis to reveal the correlation between languages, and reveal the cultural differences (Suecin, 2022).

Results and Discussion

Jüzük (ring)

One of the most common jewellery names in modern Turkic languages is ***Jüzük*** (ring). Regarding its origin, Khabichev (1971) believes that this name *juzik*is is derived from Turkic word *zhez* (copper), a derivative from the ancient Turkic word *chus,* which means "joint" and "finger joint," in Tuvan and Khakass languages. In some other Turkic languages, there are other names that have phonetic-structural differences. Salmin (2017) talks about common feature of the word *çĕpĕ* (ring) in the Chuvash language with the languages of the Finno-Ugric group, linking the name with Chuvash *çĕrĕ* and Mansi *suri*. Sir Clauson's (1972) etymological dictionary defines the word *küpe* as "a small metal ring", hence, "an earring," while the word *köbe* in the Kazakh language has retained its original meaning "chain mail".

The word *бинилэк* (a ring) in the Yakut and Dolgan languages corresponds to the form *бэһэлиг* in the Buryat language, which belongs to the Mongolian language family. However, considering the etymology and semantics of the word *biltsg* (ring) in the Kalmyk language, Kukanova (2018) came to the conclusion that the morphemic structure of the words *bilesüg* and *bilüčeg* is different. The Mongolian language has two variants of lexemes, opposite to each other in origin, namely, *Bilesüg* and *bilüčeg,* both having different morphemic structures. The first form is a compound word related to the Turkic language, and not stabilized in Mongolian language systems, due to the lack of a stable affix *bilek* "wrist" + *üsüg* "ring". The second form is the affix *bile-* and *-čAg*, formed in the Mongolian languages. This lexeme comes from a relict stem from Proto-Turkic *bilek and Proto-Tungus-Manchu *bilen, and has not been preserved in modern languages. Historical morphemic structure of the Kalmyk word *бил + иг < *bülü + čEg*, where the first part is a name or verb, the second part is an affix, means the result of an action or an object (Kukanova, 2018).

Another name that appears in several Turkic languages is *baldak,* "a finger ring". It is a ring made of gold or silver without stones, worn not only by women, but also by men (Qasimanov, 1969).This name is found in the Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai*(балдақ),* Tatar, Bashkir *(балдақ),*and Uzbek*(boldoq)* languages. Table 1 summrizes these names in different Turkic languages.

Table 1*: The Ring in the Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Ring *(jüzük)*	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	*жүзік, балдақ*	*žüzịk,baldaḳ*
Karakalpak	*жүзик, халқа*	*žüzik,halka*
Nogai	*йузик*	*yụžik*
Tatar	*йөзек, балдак*	*jözek, baldak*
Bashkir	*йөҙөк, балдақ*	*jözek, baldak*
Siberian Tatar	*йөсөк*	*jösök*
Karachay-Balkar	*жүзүк*	*žüzük*
Kumyk	*юзюк*	*jụzụk*
Karaim	*изик, йÿзÿк*	*izik, yụžụk*
Crimean Tatar	*юзюк*	*jụzụk*
Uzbek	*узук*	*ụzụk*
Uyghur	*үзүк*	*üzük*
Turkish	*yüzük*	*jụzụk*
Azerbaijan	*üzük*	*ụzụk*
Gagauz	*yüzük*	*jụzük*
Turkmen	*йузук/ýüzük*	*jụzụk*
Чуваш	*çĕpĕ*	*čĕrĕ*
Kyrgyz	*жузук*	*jụzụk*
Altai	*jÿстÿк*	*jụstụk*
Teleut	*jÿстÿк*	*jụstụk*
Tuvan	*билзек*	*bilzek*
Khakas	*чустук*	*čụstụk*
Sor	*йустук, чустук*	*jụstụk, čụstụk*
Tofalar	*чүстүк*	*čüstük*
Yakut	*бинилэк*	*bihilek*
Dolgan	*бинилэк*	*bihilek*

Bilezik (Bracelet)

Bilezik (bracelet) is also a common jewellery name in almost all Turkic languages as seen in Table 2. The ancient Turkic word ***biläzük,*** in various phonetic forms and with several meanings, is a combination of the words *bilek* (wrist) and *juzuk* (ring). In the Uzbek and Uyghur languages, it is *bilakuzuk* (wrist ring). The Teleut word *пилерик* also also means "wrist" (Kukanova, 2018). Interpreting a historical and linguistic interpretation of Turkic written monuments, N.N. Konkabaeva *Qonqabaeva , 2020)* explains that the pronunciation of *пілектöс, пілектес* in the Khakass language corresponds to the sounds *b* and *p*. At the same time, the words *билектÿÿш or билектээш,* in the Altai and Tuvan languages, indicate that *тÿÿш or тээш* represent a modified form of the word *узук(ring)* Fedorova & Akimova (2021) considers that the Yakut word *бöҕöх* has two different meanings, "bracelet" and "neck jewellery" (Fedorova & Akimova, 2021).

Table 2*: Bracelet in the Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Bracelet *(biläzük)*	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	*бiлезiк*	*bịlezịk*
Karakalpak	*билезик*	*bilezik*
Nogai	*бiлезiк*	*bịlezịk*
Tatar	*беләзек*	*beläzek*
Bashkir	*беләҙек, бïläδïk*	*beläzek*
Siberian Tatar	*пеләлек*	*pelälek*
Karachay-Balkar	*билезик*	*bilezik*
Kumyk	*билезик*	*bilezik*
Karaim	*белезик*	*belezik*
Crimean Tatar	*билезлик*	*bilezlik*
Uzbek	*билагузук*	*bilaguzuk*
Uyghur	*bilözük*	*bilözük*
Turkish	*bilezik*	*bilezik*
Azerbaijan	*biläzik*	*bịläzik*
Gagauz	*bilezik*	*bilezik*
Turkmen	*bilezik*	*bilezik*
Chuvash	*сÿлă*	*sülă*
Kyrgyz	*билерик*	*bilerik*
Altai	*билектÿÿш*	*bilektụụş*
Teleut	*пилерик*	*pilerik*
Tuvan	*bịlzek, билектээш*	*bilzek, bilekte:ş*
Khakas	*пілектöс, пілектес*	*pilektos, pilektes*
Shor	*билектээж*	*bilekteež*
Tofalar	*буғаа*	*bụγa*
Yakut	*бöҕöх*	*böγöh*

According to Turkic people's understanding, wearing bracelets helps to prevent arthritis, keep hands clean, and ward off evil spirits. For example, the snake head or spiral shaped bracelets represent protective ideas. Bracelet was considered to keep life force. In the Kazakh worldview, a woman's energy power gradually leaves through her palm, so women, especially older women, wore bracelets on both wrists so as not to lose their last strength. The Tatar women also wore double bracelets on both hands, and girls wore one or more bracelets on one hand.

Syrga (Earring)

The word *syrga* (earrings) is found in many modern Turkic languages as shown in Table 3. S. It is believed that the word *sirga* has been used in written literature since the 13th century. Scientists claim that the exact origin of the word *syrga* has not yet been fully established. A variant of this jewellery name with a vowel at the beginning in the ancient Turkic languages; for example, in Turkmen (*ысырға*), Khakass and Shor *(ызырға)*, Yakut and Dolgan (*ытырҕа, ытырга*) (Shoibekov, 2006). In the monument "At-Tuhfa" it has the form *sizya* and *isirqa*. The variants beginning with a consonant in other Turkic languages have undergone reduction (Qonqabaeva, 2020). In some Turkic languages the word *alqa* from Arabic word *khalkhe* (round) also means "earrings;" in Uyghur *(халқа)*, Turkmen *(gulakhalka)*, Tatar *(alka)*, Bashkir *(алқа)*, Chuvash *(хăлхă)*, and in some dialects of the Kazakh language. In Turkmen *гулакысырға, гулакхалка, гулагалка* mean the same, and *burun halkasy* means an earring for the nose (Shoibekov, 2006).

The Turkic girls and women always wore earrings. According to ethnographic data of many Turkic peoples, when a girl reaches the age of seven, they pierce their ears and put on the light earrings. In the ancient times, when a Turkic woman died, all her jewellery was removed, but only earrings were left, believing that if she was without earrings, a snake could pass through her ear.

Table 3*: Earring in Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Earring *(ašïra/ sïrγa)*	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	*сырға*	*sïrγa*
Karakalpak	*сырға*	*sïrγa*
Nogai	*сырға*	*sïrγa*
Tatar	*сырга, алка*	*sïrga, alka*
Bashkir	*һырға, алка*	*hïrga, alḳa*
Siberian Tatar	*сырға*	*sïrγa*
Karachay-Balkar	*сыргъала*	*sïrγala*
Kumyk	*сыргъа, гъалкъа*	*sïrγa, γalḳa*
Karaim	*сыргъа*	*sïrγa*
Crimean Tatar	*küpe, сыргъа*	*küpe, sïrγa*
Uzbek	*исурға, sirg'a*	*isirγa, sirγa*
Uyghur	*халқа, зирә*	*halḳa, zirä*
Turkish	*küpe*	*küpe*
Azerbaijan	*syrga*	*sirγa*
Gagauz	*küнä*	*küpä*
Turkmen	*gulakhalka, ысырға*	*gulakhalka, ïsïrγa*
Chuvash	*хăлхă çакки, алкă*	*hälhä čakki, alkă*
Kyrgyz	*сырга*	*sirga, söykö*
Altai	*сырға*	*sïrγa*
Teleut	*ызырга, сырга*	*ïzïrga, sirga*
Tuvan	*сырга*	*sirga*
Khakas	*ызырға*	*ïzïrγa*
Shor	*ызырга*	*ïzïrγa*
Tofalar	*сырга*	*sïrγa*
Yakut	*ытарҕа/ытырҕа/ытарђа*	*ïtarγa/ïtïrγa/ ïtarja*
Dolgan	*ытырга*	*ïtïrγa*

Mončak/mončyk (Necklace, beads)

The ancient Turkic **mončak/mončyk** means "beads, necklace" or "amulet" (Qasimanov, 1969). Shoibekov (2006) considers **mončak** may be a combination of the words *moiyn* (neck in Kazakh) and *shak*. Since this jewellery is worn around the neck, the second form *shak* could be an old version of the verb *tak* ('to wear' in Kazakh). In Chuvash *(мăй çыххи)* and Yakut *(мăй çыххи)* the word necklace is formed of two separate words: Yakut *моой* (neck) and *оҕуруота* (glass beads), *оҕуруо симэх* - necklace, Chuvash *мăй* (neck) and çыххи (bead and coin necklace) (Egorov, 1964).

In the modern Turkic languages, **mončak** means "beads", "gemstone" or "gold or silver necklace". In Azerbaijan *(muncuq)* and Turkish *(boncuk)* it is a blue stone with a hole in the middle, often made of glass or stone (pearl, agate, etc.). In the Turkmen and Tatar national clothing, it is a neck jewellery made of gold or silver with various gemstones, or coins. In the Tofalar *маньчақ* is "a band on the shaman's clothing", in Teleut *мончок* is pearl. The Tuvan *чинчи* and Altai *јинҗи*, which means "small beads" comes from ancient Turkic **jenčü** (pearl). It is obvious that Turkic **mončak** has mostly retained its meaning in modern languages. In most Turkic languages the Arabic word *халхэ* is also used along with the word *mončak*. Tabnle 4 presents various forms of necklace in Turkic languages.

In Turkic languages, *közmonšak* – amulet with a small white stone, is attached to the head-dress or wrists of a baby, a girl or a young bride, to protect her from evil eyes. It is said that *közmonšaḳ* was one of the amulets of the pre-Islamic Turkic people: *köz monšaḳ* in Kazakh and Karakalpak, *koz monchok* in Kyrgyz, *göz muncuğu* in Azerbaijani, *nazar boncuğu* in Turkish, *kuzmunchok* in Uzbek, and *koktaš* in Tatar languages. In the Tatar culture this jewellery, made of dark blue or blue stone (carnelian, turquoise), is associated with the blue sky and the Heavenly God or Kumyk *гёз минчакъ* is black beads with white spots (Valeev, 1976).

Tügma (Button)

In earlier times, the buttons of various shapes (ball, round) were used not only as fasteners, but as jewellery or amulets to protect from evil tongues and evil eye. At the beginning of the 20th century, this type of jewellery fell into disuse and was kept mostly in museums. The Kazakh saying *"Alṭïnnantüymetüyip, kümïsten köze soḳḳan"* (makes a button from gold and a jug from silver) describes its craftsmanship. The ancient Turkic word **tügma** common to many modern Turkic languages, as seen in Table 5, comes from **tüg** "to tie", "to gather in a knot" and a noun forming suffix **-ma** in Turkic languages. In the modern Turkic languages, this word is used as "fastener, clasp, brooch".

Table 4*: Necklace in the Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Necklace *(mončak/ mončyk*	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	моншақ	*monšaḳ*
Karakalpak	моншақ	*monšaḳ*
Nogai	мойшак	*moyšak*
Tatar	муенса	*mwensa*
Bashkir	мунсақ, муйынса	*mwnsaḳ*
Siberian Tatar	мунцак	*mwnčaḳ*
Karachay-Balkar	мынчакъла	*mïnčaḳla*
Kumyk	минчакъ	*minčaḳ*
Karaim	мундзэк, мунцэк	*mwnjek / mwnček*
Crimean Tatar	боюнджакъ	*boyunjaḳ*
Uzbek	мунчок	*mwnčok*
Uyghur	мончақ	*mončaḳ*
Turkish	boncuk	*bončwk*
Azerbaijan	munciq	*mwnčaḳ*
Gagauz	бонҗук	*bonjwk*
Turkmen	monjuk	*monjwk*
Chuvash	мăй çыххи	*mäy čïhhi*
Kyrgyz	мончок	*mončok*
Altai	јинји	*jinjw*
Teleut	мончок	*mončok*
Tuvan	Чинчи боошкун	*Činči booškwn*
Khakas	мончых	*monjïh*
Shor	мунчуқ	*mwnčwḳ*
Tofalar	маньчақ	*mančwḳ, ninči*
Yakut	моой оҕуруота оҕуруо симэх	*mooi oɣïrïta, oɣïrwo simeh*
Dolgan	мунчуука	*mančwwka*

Another word *топчы* (fastener) is used in the Altai, Teleut, and Shor languages. In the Kazakh craft vocabulary, the word *топшы* (a local name of button) is the Mongolian word *товч-* a button, fastener. The name *топшы* is derived from the Mongolian word *tovkh* - "piece", "grain". Shoibekov (2006) notes that this word is common to the Turkic-Mongolian languages. The word *өөк* in Tuvan and Tofalar has Mongolian origin. Tuvan *допчу өөк* is "a round button of the national robe" (Badarch & Maadyr-Oolovna, 2022). in many Altai languages, in the Khakass language the button is called differently depending on its type (Kaksin & Chertykova, 2020). For example, *tana* – is a large mother-of-pearl button, *топчы-* is a button with an eye or a large coral bead. The word *мархаis* of Khakass origin, is unknown in other languages (Abdina, 2010). The word *седеп/садеп/ сәтән/садеф* (Arabic word *sadaf - pearl*) is also used for "button" in some languages of Kipchak and Ozuz group.

Table 5: *Button in Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Button (*tügma*)	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	түйме	*tüyme*
Karakalpak	түйме, седеп	*tüyme,sedep*
Nogai	туьйме, садеп	*tüyme, sadep*
Tatar	төймә	*töymä*
Bashkir	төймә	*töymä*
Siberian Tatar	төймә, сәтән	*töymä,sätäp*
Karachay-Balkar	тюйме	*tjume*
Kumyk	тюйме	*tjume*
Karaim	дөгмә	*dögme*
Crimean Tatar	дёгме, садеф	*dögme, sadef*
Uzbek	тугма	*twgma*
Uyghur	түгмә	*tügmä*
Turkic	düğme	*düğme*
Azerbaijan	düymə	*düymä*
Gagauz	дÿÿмä	*düymä*
Turkmen	дувме	*dwvme*
Chuvash	тÿ́ме, мăха	*tüme*
Kyrgyz	түймө	*tüymö*
Altai	топчы	*topčï*
Teleut	тана, топчы	*topčï, tana,*
Tuvan	допчу өөк	*dopčw öök*
Khakas	топчы, тана, марха	*topčï, tana, marha*
Shor	топчы	*topčï*
Tofalar	өөк	*öök*
Yakut	тимех	*timeh*
Dolgan	тимэк	*timek*

Belbaγ (Belt)

Belt in modern Turkic languages has some common names as seen in Table 6. The ancient Turkic word **belbaγ** (belt) is a combination of the word **bel** (waist, lower back) and the word **baγ** (tie, thread) in the Turkic languages. The words like **белбағ, бил бағы** are found in ancient Turkic monuments (Shoibekov, 2006). The Persian word *kemer/kəmər* (belt) is used in the Turkish *(kemer)*, Azerbaijani *(kəmər)*, Gagauz *(kemer)*, Turkmen *(kemer)* languages of the Oguz group, in Karachay-Balkar *(кямар)* of the Kipchak group, and in Uyghur *(kəmər)* of the Karluk group. In the Kazakh language, the word *kemer* has the meaning of "belt" or "silver belt" *(kemer belbeu -*"silver belt") (Shoibekov, 2006).

Another ancient Turkic word **qur** also means "belt" in many Turkic languages: in Altai and Teleut *(құр)* of the Kyrgyz-Kipchak group, in Tuvan, Yakut, Dolgan *(кур)*, Khakass *(хур)*, Shor *(құр)*, and Tofalar *(ҡур)* of the Uighur-Oguz Siberian group. In Kazakh құр is a thread made of wool, and *"құр белбеу"* is a belt woven from sheep and camel wool threads. The ancient Turkic word **qaδis**(belt) is found in the languages of ancient monuments. In Kazakh *қайыс белбеу* is a belt made of rawhide. It is used in Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai *(қайыс)*, Tatar *(каеш)*, Siberian Tatar *(кайыш)*, Bashkir *(кайыш)*, Kumyk *(къайыш)*, Karaite *(кайыс)*, Turkish *(кайыш)*, Azerbaijan *(гајыш)*, Turkmen *(гайыш)*, Uzbek *(kayish)*, Uyghur *(қейиш)*, Kyrgyz *(кайыш)*, Altai *(кайыш)*, Khakass *(хайыс)*. In Bashkir *билгә кайыш быуыу* means "to wear a belt".The Turkic word *quşak*also means belt in Bashkir *(кушак)*, Crimean Tatar *(къушакъ)*, Gagauz*(кушак)*, Turkish *(kusak)* etc. The Chuvash word *пиçиххи* (belt) differs from other Turkic languages, but it also consists of two words *пилек* (waist)and *çиххи* (tie, bandage, cord) (Egorov, 1964).

Table 6*: Belt in Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	Belt (qur, belbaγ, qaδis)	Turkic Transcription
Kazakh	*белбеу*	*belbew*
Karakalpak	*белбеў*	*belbew*
Nogai	*белбав*	*belbav*
Tatar	*билбау*	*bilbaw*
Bashkir	*билбау,*	*bilbaw, ķwşaķ*
Siberian Tatar	*пилбау*	*pilbaw*
Karachay-Balkar	*белибау, кямар*	*belibaw,kyamar*
Kumyk	*белбав*	*belbav*
Karaim	*белбав, белибав*	*belbav/belibav*
Crimean Tatar	*къушакъ*	*ķwşaķ, ķayïş*
Uzbek	*белбоғ,камар*	*belboy, kamar*
Uyghur	*бәлвағ, кәмәр*	*bälväy, kämär*
Turkic	*kemer*	*kemer*
Azerbaijan	*kəmər*	*kämär*
Gagauz	*кемер, кушак*	*kemer, kwşaķ*
Turkmen	*kemer,билбағ, билгушак*	*kemer, bilbag, bilguşak*
Chuvash	*пиçиххи*	*piçihhi*
Kyrgyz	*белбоо*	*belboo*
Altai	*құр*	*kwr*
Teleut	*құр*	*ķwr*
Tuvan	*кур,бағ кур*	*kwr, bag kwr*
Khakas	*хур*	*hwr*
Shor	*құр*	*ķwr*
Tofalar	*ҡур*	*ķwr*
Yakut	*кур,билэ*	*kwr, bile*
Dolgan	*кур*	*kwr*

Jewellery for Braids

The names of jewellery for braids are characteristic to some Turkic languages, as exhibited in Table 7, namely the Kipchak *(Kazakh, Nogai, Karakalpak, Tatar, Bashkir, Siberian Tatar),* Karluk *(Uzbek, Uyghur),* Oguz-Turkmen branch *(Turkmen),* Bulgar *(Chuvash),* and the Kyrgyz-Kypchak *(Kyrgyz, Altai, Teleut),*Uighur-Oguz Siberian *(Tuvan, Yakut, Khakas).* There are a number of works on the classification and typology of traditional women's jewellery of the Turkic *(Altaians, Tuvans, Siberian Tatars, Khakass, Yakuts)* and Mongolian groups of the Altai language family of Siberia.

The braid jewellery was available in many different types (Yakovleva, 2011), and was characteristic of the Polovtsian-Scythian culture, found on Polovtsian women's statues (Moskvina, 2014). The Turkic peoples used different types of braid jewellery made of various materials; hence, this type of jewellery may not have common names. In this context, three types of braid jewellery deserves mention their name and description.

The first type comes from the ancient Turkic sač "hair" and baγ "tie". The jewellery usually is made of silver and sometimes gilded metal, and is an element of the Nogai women's costume, and "unmarried Nogai women's *shashbau*, made of silk and silver threads mixed with a tassel and a silk ribbon at the end, sometimes reaches to their ankles" (Kalmykov, Kereitov, & Sikaliev, 1988). The Kyrgyz women have the

same jewellery- *чачбақ*. Bashkir *сәсбау/сәсмәу* is made by stringing coins onto a long cloth. The ancient Bukhara jewellery- *шашпо* was made of long threads with silver and gilded coral and pearl beads and worn over the headdress. It had silk tassels with metal caps. This type of jewellery for braids was common not only with the Turkic, but also with the Altaians. Potapov (1951) writes about hair jewellery of the Altai peoples. The girls of the southern Altai had gold thread with buttons and shells, woven into their braids. The Teleut girls wore a braid jewellery called *чач бууш*, woven from three tassels with cowrie shells or coins and buttons. They used colored silk threads. The Kumandian girls wore a rectangular pendant *чаачыш* or *чинче* made of red cloth, trimmed with a black border, and with the beads sewn to the lower edge. Cowrie shells were attached to the end of each thread (Potapov, 1951). The Shor "heavy pendants made of cowrie shells and beads" is close to northern Altaians' jewellery. Tuvan *боошкун* were long bundles woven from black or multi-colored threads. There was also Tuvan women's hair jewellery *чавага* that was more than five strands of beads, and tassels. The Khakass *пос чачак* was made of beads, often with pieces pearl, metal plaques or coins at the ends; tassels made of hair cords with beads and cowrie shells at the ends (Rahmatdildaevna Kurmanbekova et al., 2023).

The second type of braid jewellery consisted of ringing pendants, woven into braids with a ribbon attached to them. This type of silver jewellery of Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Nogai, Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash people, had the function of pulling the braids down. *Шолпы* (in Kazakh) was an element of Kazakh girls' clothing. This jewellery for braid had ringing sound that made young girls walk gracefully without loud noises (Tokhtabaeva, 2011).The ringing sound of Kazan Tatars' *чулпа* pendant, attached to the end of the braid, was also important. There were different types of Tatar *чулпа* depending on the size of the coins. At the ends of the woven ribbons there were silver chains with many coin pendants. There may be medallions inlaid with stones (carnelian) and interconnected by silver chains. Kyrgyz braid jewellery *чолпу* is in the form of a triangular plate made of silver or copper. The Bashkir *сулпы/тәңкә*is silver or a copper pendant hung below the braids and has the type *көйәнтәле сулпы* "double pendants" (Shamigulova et al., 2015). Tuvan hair jewellery *салбақ* can be added to this type, as it was worn by young girls (Ayizhy & Biche-Oolovna, 2020). The main difference between the first and second hair jewellery was *şaşbaw* (first type) is attached to the beginning and braided with the hair, and *şolpï* (second type) is attached to the tip of the braid.

The third type of ancient Turkic braid jewellery was in the form of a small bag, which is apparently out of use today (Gadzhiyeva, 1976). This jewellery name was derived from Turkic **sač** (hair)and **kap** (bag) and is found in the Kazakh, Nogai *(шашқап),* Bashkir *(сәскап),* Siberian-Tatar *(чәч-кап),* and Chuvash *(чĕçкап)* languages. At the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, Nogai women of the Terek-Sulak lowland wore similar bags *(шутку)* for braids. It was like a headdress worn under a scarf, in the form of a bag for braids made of black fabric 80-90 cm long and 60-70 cm wide with ribbon tied in the upper part. The ribbons, crossing the head, were tied at the back. According to S.Sh. Gadzhieva *чуткъу* (a headband in the form of a bag where women hid the hair) was used by the Kumyk woman (Gadzhiyeva, 1976). Table 7 lists all three types of jewellery for braids in ancient Turkic languages.

Table 7*: Jewellery for Braids in The Turkic Languages.*

Ancient Turkic Languages	The First Type	The Second Type	The Third Type
Kazakh	*шашбау (şaşbaw)*	*шолпы(şolpï)*	*шашқап(şaşķap)*
Karakalpak	*шашбау (şaşbaw)*	*шолпы (şolpï)*	*шашқап (şaşķap)*
Nogai	*шашбау (şaşbaw)*	*шолпы (şolpï)*	*шашқап (şaşķap)*
Tatar	*чәчбау (čäčbaw)*	*чулпа (čwlpa)*	
Bashkir	*сәсбау (säsbaw)*	*сулпы (swlpï) сәстәңкә(sästäŋkä)*	*сәскап (säskap)*
Siberian Tatar		*чулпы (čwlpï)*	*чәчкап (čäčkap)*
Kumyk			*чуткъу (čwtķw)*
Uzbek	*чочпопук (čočpopuk)*		
Uyghur	*гөйәк (göyak)*		
Turkmen	*сачлык (sačļïk) сачмонджук (sačmonjuk)*		
Chuvash		*чулпă(čwlpa) çeçтенкĕ (sesteŋkö)*	*чĕçкап (čöčkap)*
Kyrgyz	*чачбак (čäčbak)*	*чолпу (čolpw)*	
Altai	*чач пууш (čäč pwwş)*		
Teleut	*чач бууш(čäč bwwş)*		
Tuvan	*чавага(čavaga) боошкун (booşkwn)*	*салбак (salbak)*	
Khakas	*пос чачак (pos čäčak)*		
Yakut	*cyhyox симәҕә(swhwoh simeγe)*		

Turkic peoples devoted particular attention to hair, and believed that a woman's soul was in her hair. Long hair was the pride of women, while short hair was considered a sign of trouble or illness. According to ancient worldview, there was a certain connection between a woman's hair (length, thickness) and female

fertility. Tassels and fringes at the ends of pendants and ribbons woven into braids served as a protection from negative energy and had a semantic characteristic of religious and cult ideas (Kuzeeva, 2014). A similar function was performed by ringing braid pendants and coins attached to head-dresses, temple pendants and earrings that drove away "evil spirits"

Conclusion

The jewellery names common to almost all Turkic languages identify ethnogenetic and linguistic parallels in the jewellery culture of the Turkic peoples. Some features of the common names of jewellery from the dictionaries have been identified in this study. It is evident that jewellery had several names in the ancient Turkic language, which is the source of all common jewellery names in modern Turkic languages. In addition to common jewellery *names*, Turkic people had a lot of specific jewellery types. Studying the common names of Turkic jewellery show that many of them are characteristic of Turkic peoples and also have local characteristics. For example, jewellery for hair were characteristic to the Kipchak, Karluk, Oguz-Turkmen branch, Bulgar, and the Kyrgyz-Kypchak, Uighur-Oguz Siberian groups of Turkic people.

Turkic jewellery with common names were made from different materials that had sacred power. It was believed that coral brought wealth and fertility, pearl, silver, cowrie shells had healing properties and protected people from evil spirits. The claws and teeth of animals, beads were used as amulets. The shine and sound of metal pendants repelled evil spirits. Jewellery was an integral part of the Turkic culture and had deep semantic *content*, the study of which helps to expand knowledge about the traditional culture of the Turkic peoples.

Acknowledgements

References

Abdina, R. P. (2010). Terms denoting traditional dress and its elements in the dialects of the Khakass language in comparison with the Altai language. *Filologiya i chelovek,* (2), 136-144. Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=15586064

Abdullina, G. R., Abdullina, L. B., Sultanbaeva, K. V., Isyangulova, G. A., & Akilova, M. F. (2020). Comparative Research of Traditional Clothes and Jewelry Lexical Items in Bashkir and Turkish Languages. *Astra Salvensis, 8*(S1), 379-389. Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44718271

Anonby, E., Taheri-Ardali, M., Schreiber, L., Bulut, C., Haig, G., Pishyar Dehkordi, P., et al. (2020). Turkic languages in the Atlas of the Languages of Iran (ALI). *Turkic Languages, 24*(2), 290-308. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-01GK9PJYRM4GXDYSM2B7NYM1ST

Ayizhy, E. V., & Biche-Oolovna, K. R. (2020). Women's hairstyles and braid jewellery of Tuvans: historical and ethnographic essay. *Oriental Studies, 13*(1), 64-74. doi: https://doi.org/10.22162/2619-0990-2020-47-1-64-74

Badarch, B., & Maadyr-Oolovna, S. O. (2022). Factors of vitality and spheres of functioning of the native language of the Tsengel Tuvans of Mongolia (according to a sociolinguistic study in 2018). *New Studies of Tuva,* (4), 78-88.

Baigabatova, N., Tolamissov, A., Rakhipova, S., Ashimova, D., Khuangan, O., & Smagulov, K. (2018). Ethnocultural Identity of Kazakhs of Mongolia in Everyday Life. *Codrul Cosminului, 24*(1), 79-96. Retrieved from http://atlas.usv.ro/www/codru_net/CC24/1/kazakhs.pdf

Baskakov, N. A. (1963). A Contribution to the Critique of the New Classifications of the Turkic Languages. *Soviet Anthropology and Archeology, 2*(2), 48-55. doi: https://doi.org/10.2753/AAE1061-1959020248

Chertykova, M. D., & Kaksin, A. D. (2020). The conceptualization of auditory perceptions in the folklore-linguistic picture of the world: on the material of the heroic legend Albynchy. *Bulletin of North-eastern Federal University Named After Mk Ammosov, 1*, 101.

Clauson, G. (1972). An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish. Retrieved from http://www.analecta.hu/index.php/stualtaica/article/download/13512/13368/13942

Egorov, V. G. (1964). *Etymological dictionary of the Chuvash language.* Cheboksary.

Fedorova, E. P., & Akimova, A. S. (2021). About some Yakut terms denoting jewellery (semantics, etymology, comparative typology and symbolism). *Modern Teacher Education,* (5), 249-252. Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=46206831

Gadzhiyeva, S. S. (1976). *Material culture of the Nogais in the 19th - early 20th centuries.* M.

Johanson, L. (2021a). The history of Turkic. In L. Johanson & É. Á. Csató (Eds.), *The Turkic Languages* (pp.

83-120). Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003243809-6

Johanson, L. (2021b). The structure of Turkic. In L. Johanson & É. Á. Csató (Eds.), *The Turkic languages* (pp. 26-59). Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003243809-3

Johanson, L., Csató, É. Á., & Karakoç, B. (2020). Turkic Language Contacts. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact* (pp. 551-570). John Wiley & Sons Ltd. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119485094.ch28

Kaksin, A. D., & Chertykova, M. D. (2020). *Khakass-Russian and Russian-Khakass thematic dictionary (sections" Man"," Flora and Fauna")*. Khakass State University named after. N.F. Katanova. Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44847666

Kalmykov, I. H., Kereitov, R. H., & Sikaliev, A. I. (1988). *Nogais. Historical and Ethnographic Essay*. Cherkessk.

Khabichev, M. A. (1971). *Karachay-Balkar nominal word formation (experience of comparative historical study*. Cherkessk: Stavropol Book Publishing House.

Khazbulatov, A. (2021). Ornament as a Language of Culture: Tradition and Modernity. *Pedagogy and Psychology, 48*(3), 265-276. doi: https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-3.2077-6861.29

Kozhakhmetova, G. A., & Tazhibayeva, S. Z. (2021). Kazakh jewelry: problems of translation and creation of a multilingual thesaurus. *Bulletin of LN Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series, 135*(2), 55-63. doi: https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2021-135-2-55-63

Kukanova, V. V. (2018). Lexeme biltsg: on the question of origin and semantics (based on the material of the epic "Dzhangar"). *Oriental Studies,* (4 (38)), 100-121. doi: https://doi.org/10.22162/2619-0990-2018-38-4-100-121

Kuzeeva, Z. Z. (2014). Head decorations of Nogai women of the 19th and early 20th centuries. *History, archeology and ethnography of the Caucasus,* (1 (37)), 166-187.

Mankeyeva, Z. (2014). *Issues of Kazakh linguistics*. Almaty.

Memmedova, A. (2023). Historical Turkic Literary Languages and Khwarezm Turkic. *Journal of Old Turkic Studies, 7*(1), 158-178. doi: https://doi.org/10.35236/jots.1235726

Mertens, D. M. (2012). Ethics and social justice in ethnocultural qualitative research. In D. K. Nagata, L. Kohn-Wood, & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Qualitative strategies for ethnocultural research* (pp. 61–84). American Psychological Association. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/13742-004

Moskvina, M. V. (2014). Classification and typology of women's jewellery of the Turkic peoples of Sayan-Altai at the end of the XIX and beginning of the XX centuries. *News of Altai State University, 1*(4 (84)), 148-152. doi: https://doi.org/10.14258/izvasu(2014)4.1-24

Nagata, D. K., Suzuki, L., & Kohn-Wood, L. (2012). Qualitative research with ethnocultural populations: Addressing the unique challenges of relationship, role, and context. In D. K. Nagata, L. Kohn-Wood, & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Qualitative strategies with ethnocultural populations* (pp. 9-18). American Psychological Association. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/13742-001

Nygmanova, D. K., Abidenkyzy, A., Masimkhanuly, D., Dalelkyzy, K., & Akim, K. S. (2022). Semantic elements in ancient Kazakh ethnographic clothing (lingvocultural research). *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18*(1), 309-322. Retrieved from https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/3489

Potapov, L. P. (1951). Altaian Clothes. *Sat. MAE, 13*, 5-59.

Qasimanov, K. (1969). *Handicraft of the Kazakh People*. Almaty.

Rahmatildaevna Kurmanbekova, Z., Sarekenova, K. K., Oner, M., Turarbekovich Malikov, K., & Sagatovna Shokabayeva, S. (2023). A Linguistic Analysis of Social Network Communication. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 11*(1), 119-132. doi: https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2023.1972010.2824

Rakhmatullina, Z. Y., & Khusainova, G. R. (2022). The National Jewelry of Bashkir Women: Tradition and Modernity. *Conservation Science in Cultural Heritage, 22*, 115-128. doi: https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1973-9494/17306

Salikzhanova, S. B., Turgut, T., & Mursalim, G. O. (2023). Linguistic and National Cultural Character of Ethnographies. *Yasawi University Bulletin, 2*(128), 190-200. doi: https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-2/2664-0686.15

Salmin, A. K. (2017). *History of the Chuvash people: analysis of the main versions*. SPb.: Nestor-Istoriya.

Savelyev, A. (2020). A Bayesian approach to the classification of the Turkic languages. In *The Oxford Guide to the Transeurasian Languages* (pp. 115-126). Oxford University Press Oxford and New York. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198804628.003.0010

Shamigulova, A. T., Karabaev, M. I., Abdullina, G. R., & Ishkildina, Z. K. (2015). Vocabulary of Clothes and Jewelry in Studies of Turkic Languages (From the History of the Study of the Issue). *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(5), 194-200. doi: https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s3p194

Shoibekov, R. N. (2006). *Handicraft vocabulary of the Kazakh language* (Doctoral dissertation, Almaty).

Shoibekov, R. N. (2022). Modernized Names in the Kazakh Lexicon. *Tiltanym, 87*(3), 81-90. doi: https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2022-3-81-90

Suecin, S. (2022). The concept" Family" in various linguistic worldviews (the English and Chinese languages

case study). Retrieved from https://dspace.spbu.ru/bitstream/11701/41129/2/Thesis_Xia_Xueqing_Sa_Suecin_20.M95.pdf

Tekin, T. (1991). A New classification of the Turkic languages. *Türk dilleri araştırmaları, 1*, 5-18. Retrieved from https://altaica.ru/LIBRARY/Tekin%20Talat/Tekin_A%20New%20Classification%20of%20the%20Turkic%20Languages%201990.pdf

Tokhtabaeva, S. Z. (2011). *Kazakh jewellery art*. Almaty kitap.

Valeev, F. T. (1976). Amulets as a relic of pre-Islamic beliefs among the Siberian Tatars (according to field ethnographic observations in the Omsk and Tyumen regions). *From the history of Siberia, 19*, 244-249. Retrieved from http://annales.info/sibir/small/valeev.htm

Yakovleva, K. M. (2011). *Classification of jewellery of the Altai cultural community peoples (based on the material of the peoples of Siberia at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries)* (Doctoral dissertation, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Yakutsk). Retrieved from https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=28390767

Zhunissova, M. A. (2014). Historical Periodization of Turkic Languages. *Life Science Journal, 11*(6), 438-444. Retrieved from https://www.lifesciencesite.com/lsj/life1106/062_24341life110614_438_444.pdf

Zzbaeva, A. B., & Pumpkin, A. I. (2022). Contemporary Kazakh Crafts in the Focus of Ethno-Symbolism: Methodological Aspects. *Central Asian Journal of Art Studies, 7*(2), 28-40. doi: https://doi.org/10.47940/cajas.v7i2.575