

**Sh.Ualikhanov and theories of mythological school in Russian literal study**

Zhandos Kozhakhmetovich Smagulov<sup>1</sup>, Kalamkas Sagindykovna Kalybekova<sup>2</sup>, Sarzhan Uakhitovich Takirov<sup>1</sup>, Azat Maksutbekovich Babashov<sup>3</sup>, Nurlybek Mamanovich Aubakirov<sup>2</sup>, Sayan Akylzhanovich Kenzhegaliyev<sup>2</sup>, Karlygash Kanagatovna Nurzhanova<sup>2</sup>, Zhanaidar Shaimerdenovich Zhumageldin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Karaganda State University n.a. Ye.A. Buketov, Universitetskaya str., 28, Karaganda, 100028, Karaganda region, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Karaganda State Technical University, Bulvar Mira, 56, 100027, Karaganda, Karaganda region, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>“Bolashak” Karaganda University, Yerubayev str., 16, 100008, Karaganda, Karaganda region, Republic of Kazakhstan

**Abstract.** In the early nineteenth century in Germany were mythological theory, the theory of borrowing and anthropological theory, the foundations of which were laid by the Grimm brothers. Then these theories spread to Russia and laid the foundation for the historical - comparative method in science Russian literary criticism. These three theories were also mentioned in the research looks great scientist Sh.Ualihanov. This article describes the plot similarities found in various folklore of different countries, and also notes the need to consider national literary heritage inherent to every nation, in accordance with its place in human society and the need to disclose to him the special characteristic and individuality through comparative analysis.

[Smagulov Z.K., Kalybekova K.S., Takirov S.U., Babashov A.M., Aubakirov N.M., Kenzhegaliyev S.A., Nurzhanova K.K., Zhumageldin Z.S. **Sh.Ualikhanov and theories of mythological school in Russian literal study** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(9s):202-206] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 39

**Keywords:** school, mythology, method, poetry, opinion, anthropology, literary heritage, search, ethnography

**Introduction**

Sh.Ualikhanov was bright, but quickly faded star in the Oriental studies. His scientific legacy was thoroughly studied, many of his scientific works and monographs were published. Personality of Shokan in the science of national literal study as specialist in folklore, oriental studies, literal studies and as critic was searched from the point of monographical view. He was highly appreciated as scientist and took proper place in the history of literature. However, searching problem, which we took at searching the study about Shokan, we found out that only few men gave attention to his research methods and theories, which he used during scientific study of literal legacy. His scientific-research opinion was studied only superficially.

There were theories of mythology, adoption and anthropology, which were found in the beginning of XIX century in Germany by Brothers Grimm, then that theories spread in Russia and found historical-comparative method in science of Russian literal study. That three theories were mentioned in scientific-research view of great scientist Shokan Ualikhanov as well. Because his idea about approaching to Russian revolutionary democracy was predominate, his opinions about principles of mythological school were recognized wrong, according to Marks-Lenin methodology in the period of Soviet Union. There was wrong conclusion that «Shokan in some of his articles switched from democracy opinion in folk poetry to

mythological theory and like such scientists as Buslaev, Afanasiev supported the idea that folk poetry is ownerless» [1, 19 p.]. However, mythological school, as other schools in the Russian literal study, was one of original searches on the way of mastering literary heritage of world literal study. He initiated to continue works which were limited only with biographical research on school of biographic, with methods of collecting-publishing and explanation of philological school and it was especially appreciated in his methods of research. The problem was that in the period of studying literal legacy, displaying of theories of mythology, adoption and anthropology, which were the newest searches of literary heritage, through Shokan's manner was worth to be specially interpreted. Because, it indicates that national scientific-research opinion didn't stand apart from newest searches of literary heritage in world literal study in XIX century.

Thus, nowadays we can't look differently on such fact that Marks-Lenin methodology, having conservative feature, disclaimed key role of revolutionary-democracy opinion, that praised party and class nature of literature. That opinion in it's own part played a key role in mythological school on the way of scientific researches. Theories, that rised the problem of collecting and publishing folklore, researching the history of its foundation, were the newest ways of scientific researches. Even in the period when Marks-Lenin methodology rose above,

scientist, researching the history of Russian literary study, named that school as: "Exactly in the heart of mythological school there originated the newest ways of literal opinion in XIX century" [2, 123 p.]. Thus, we must consider the fact that theories, peculiar to mythological school, took part in Shokan's works not because «he was retreating from scientific-research view to folk poetry», but because it was unavoidable event on the way of historical development of national scientific-research opinion [1, 19 p.].

Like Russian scientists Shokan also didn't deny the role of mythological cognition in the appearance of folklore. Speaking about folk traditions, beliefs, legends and true stories, he considered them in connection with mythological terms and expressed scientific opinion about such types as ethnographic, ethnogenetic, zoogenetic, toponymic, cosmogonic and demonologic. "Any mythology appears from the imagination of the human being. People, which don't understand natural phenomenon, try to understand it through different myths. Later, when people subdued the nature and understood its phenomenon, that myths were disappeared" considered Shokan [3, 165 p.].

Shokan believed that displaying the reason of appearance of human being in mythological legends about individual man or animals is the phenomenon of mythological interpretation. As example he mentioned mythological concept about ancestors, i.e. "ancestors cult", which was the base for many ethnogenetic legends and true stories. For example, he draw attention that Kazakh people in "Legends of Kazakh people from Uly zhuz", "Kazakh chronicles" bound their appearance with myths about "Alash", "Alasha", and Kyrgyz people in "Works about Kyrgyz's" bound their appearance with "Khanshayim (Princess)", "Forty girls" (Kyryk kyz), "Kyrgyzbay". The concept that people appeared due to some divine power was peculiar to many nationalities in Middle Asia. One course of Shokan's opinion about mythological theory concerned the mythological and totem terms that based the appearance of the world on any leading powers. Also in that period there developed such zoo-genetic legends in mythological cognition, according to which people thought they appeared from animals in the result of any holy powers. For example, Old Turk people according to their zoo-genetic legends thought they appeared from wolves, and so they worshiped wolves. North-Siberian people thought that they appeared from Mother-Walrus. Shokan in his work "Notes about Kyrgyz" underlined that one tribe of Kyrgyz thought that they appeared from Deer. He wrote down that myth in his work. Also he wrote some legends about origination of Kyrgyz people from "Red dog". He didn't insisted on the fact that those myths influenced on appearance of folklore, but he underlined its role on development of national opinion

as mythological legend. In comparison with concepts of such Russian mythologists as F.I. Buslaev, O. Miller, Shokan had its own peculiarity in his opinion about mythological theory. He considered any mythological legends from the point of comparing them with historical facts. It can be seen from his attempts to compare myths about appearance of Kyrgyz people with historical notes of China chronicles or his attempts to compare legend about appearance of Istykkol with historical facts in Abilgazy chronicles [4, 100 p.].

Shokan examined the cosmogonic and demonologic types of mythological theories from the ethnographic viewpoint. It is well seen in such his works as "Divinity", "Remains of shamanism at Kazakh people", "About Islam in Sakhara". Scientist, talking about relation between Shamanism and Islam, also outlined influence of shamanism on formation of myth. "Religion of Buddha, due to its traditions and magnificent mythological legacy, had to shove back simple spirit and traditions of shamanism. And, Kazakh people, comparing with Mongol, had richer legacy, containing shaman traditions and sorcery (shaman demonology)", wrote Shokan in his works [5, 170 p.]. Mythological concepts, originated from shamanism, and Muslim beliefs closely mixed with each other. Shokan separately stopped on the fact of their place in folklore compositions. He underlined that people not only didn't lose mythological concepts, based on shamanism, but also brought them into correspondence with mythological concepts of Islam: "There changed only religious names, terms, and the basic concept about shamanism left the same. Ongon was named as holy spirit, divinity of sky – Allah or God, spirit of Earth – shaitan, peri, genie, but it was still shamanism concept in minds of people" [5, 171 p.].

According to scientist coming from ancients, was a reflection of concepts of primitive people about world, universe, environment, their life practice and reflection of natural phenomenon. That opinion was very interesting and logically resulted from scientific-research standpoint. "If person whole his life lives under the influence of beautiful nature, he would have manifestations of shaman beliefs and worships to nature in general. From that standpoint shamanism can be considered as materialism. From the other side, if we examine shaman belief about soul of the person after death, about soul, living for ever, thus here shamanism was considered as spiritualism. It was good, well-engineered idea, that human was free from from mythological standpoint and social laws as much as it was possible... Concepts about nature and human, life and death seemed obscure, fantastic events for conscious understanding. Human and nature! What can be more fantastic and magic than this? Wish to

understand all fantastic things in the world, to clue secrets of life and death, secrets of nature was the reason to originate shamanism. Shamanism is love to environment, infinite love to nature, and respect to souls of dead people. Ingenuous minds of ancient people worshiped sun, moon, whole world and generalized all this as nature or environment”, thus we can clearly see that author deeply understood the mythological theory [6, 7, 8, 9].

Shokan interpreted such demonologic concepts as divinity, holy spirit, genie, peri, angel, devil, sorel (evil spirit), spirit of forest, shaitan, such cosmogonic mythological concepts as the Pole Star (Temirkazyk), the Great bear (Zhetikarakshy), Pleiades (Yrker), Venus, Day star, the Milky way, Moon, Sun, Sky, Thunder, Rainbow – stars and natural events – from the scientific view. He considered that concepts in relation to such types of traditions and beliefs as funeral, inclination to deceased, handout, offering of sacrifice, fortunetelling, sorcery treatment, pouring oil in the fire, go round oneself, cause damage, pray, fumigation, conjuration with water, flap, pray to star, witchcraft, bewitch, beguile, pray, sorcery, put the evil eye (tongue), to make an oath, amulet. Shokan’s opinion fits the viewpoint of Russian mythologist F.I. Buslayev about mythological cognition. Saying about magic power of fingers he referred to works of Snegirev and Buslayev and said that “ring finger (third finger) does not let to lie, according to Buslayev”, however it had sorcery power of beguiling and concealing in epic legends of Indi-German people. Considering mythological concepts of people from ethnographic standpoint Shokan also didn’t overpass its influence on folklore. In his work “Divinity” author gave as example legend about girl, which turned into cuckoo, in order to prove that different demonstrations of sanctity and peculiarities in myths about animals cause beliefs and convictions. Later G. Potanin also draw attention to the role of mythological concepts in folklore and said the following: “The basic concept about marmot – conceited batyr, mergen who was incurred sentence for his boastfulness. Thus, hedgehog in Kazakh folklore is – wise man, mole – youth, which was betrayed by his sister, wild cat – girl, who sined with the relative”. [10, 767 p.]. It corresponds to the idea that before people transferred their everyday life on nature in order to understand secrets of surrounding world, gave human features to animals. Such was the appearance of the mythological concept.

The same conclusion is shown in his work named “Remains of shamanism at Kazakh people”, where Shokan made remark about spoiled bone of ram, and it became a legend thereafter. Standpoint of Sh. Ualikhanov about mythological theory was

considered from the opinion of ethnography. They were not clearly seen when analyzing folklore works.

In the purpose of familiarizing his opinion he didn’t go beyond writing such origins as “Legend about friendship between alive and dead”, which was full of mythological concepts. It will be right to say that theory took a great part in scientific research works of Shokan, and it was historical regularity. Because, the fact that “The theory of Brothers Grimm for that time was an outstanding stage in development of philological science and its influence went beyond the Germany, having affected works of the largest scientists-philologists of other European countries” took place in world scientific-research opinion with the help of such person as Shokan, made clear many things [11, 24 p.]. Because Shokan published many of his works on Russian and many of his works weren’t widely used in scientific world, Kazakh readers didn’t react on his opinions about mythological theory at first. They couldn’t immediately deviate from philological school, which basically oriented on collecting and publishing and printing books of literal legacy. However, it would be wrong to think that only Shokan had scientific-research opinions about mythological theory. In spite Abai didn’t write scientific work about folklore study, he had ideas about mythological theory in his work “Some words about origination of Kazakh people”. Opinions of ethnogenetic myths about origination of Kazakh, Kyrgyz people and connection with mythological theory were continued in articles of some other enlighteners of Kazakh people. In such works as “Good legacy from the past” of A. Bokeikhanov, “Our Kazakh people...” of M. Zh. Kopeev, “About worship of Kazakh people to everything”, “Legends about some Kazakh tribes” of unknown authors, it can be clearly seen that mythological concepts took their own place in peoples art. Indeed, in spite that works were not as deep as works of Shokan, however they must be considered as first steps in scientific-research cognition of literal legacy and affected problems of mythological school.

Comparing with above-mentioned theory of mythological school, the adoption theory can be clearly seen in scientific works of Shokan during literal analysis. In the middle of XIX century other scientists criticized scantiness of searches on the way of mastering literary heritage of mythological school. On that base A. N. Pynin, A. N. Afanasiev, N. A. Lvov and others originated the theory of adoption as newest means of learning folklore from the scientific point of view. A. N. Balandin wrote the following: “Mythologists raised the question about origination of folklore, supporters of adoption theory raised its historical destiny. In essence, one course was supplemented with other...” [11, 42 p.].

Shokan during his short lifetime made first steps in the way of scientific research of literary heritage of that theory. His well knowing of world literal history and fundamental understanding of many secrets of native and neighbor nations' literary heritage let him to analyze demands of adoption theory, underline it's peculiarities and similarities.

The adoption theory of that school begun to develop in full extent only after 1874, when the founder of mythological theory in Russian literal study F.I.Buslayev published his work "Wandering tales and stories" in 5<sup>th</sup> edition of "Russian bulletin". Due to short life of the scientist, he had not so many works about adopting folklore themes from one nation by another nation, however, they all worse to be considered separately. Even in his short life he managed to give the principles for using that theory in studying Kazakh folklore.

Shokan was against negative missionary attitude to literary art of Kazakh people. In order to adopt the theme, subject from another nation, the adopting nation must be on the same level with adopted one. Thus he proved that development of literary heritage of Kazakh people was not lower than at other nations. «The most important is that forms of development of our society are not on the false level and equal with highly developed cultures», - wrote he. Thus he concluded that "There is growing up literature, it does not yield from artistic point to our people. That literature is closer to Indi-German poetry than to poetry of East nations" [5, 50 p.]. The most amazing thing is that Shokan's opinion was said before opinion of T.Beinfer, supporter of adoption theory in European literal study. Beinfer showed the following view in his work "Panchatantra": "Mutual similarity of models and subjects in art of many nations was caused not by their sameness, but by adoption of compositions due to historical-cultural bound between that nations. Native land of all adopted tales, stories and poetry is India". Probably, Shokan was familiar with work of T.Beinfer. "Panchatantra" was published in 1859 and work of author "Notes about court reforms", from which we got a quote, was published in 1864. So it is clear that above-mentioned conclusion was found on early ideas about "theory of adoption". F.I.Buslayev, in his work "Comparative research of national everyday life and poetry", published in 1873, saying about equal participation of European and Asian nations in the process of developing world literature tried to prove from the scientific point the following: "It equalized all nationalities in its advantages not paying attention to the race they depend or the level of civilization they stood: the highest level as Jews, Egypt people, or the lowest level as Finns, Lithuanian, Tatars or wild tribes of Old and New World" [12, 651 p.].

Adoption theory of mythological school, historical-comparative method caused by that theory was also proved by opinions widely made during survey of Kazakh and Kyrgyz folklore. Those opinions were later used in "Zhungar studies". "Collecting many Kazakh-Kyrgyz stories, myths, epic poems and tales, I was very surprised by their similarity with compositions of European nations, especially with Slavyan nation. In collection of mister A.Afanasyev I found only 6 stories, which differed from Kazakh stories. At first, as Abel Remyuza, I thought it was a result of influence and adoption, which took place when Indi-German descendants lived together with Tatar descendants on the territory of Middle Asia. Now I believe that the key of this secret is in relations between Uly zhuz and Kyrgyz people. Thus I hoped to collect rich material for my collection, but it isn't fated to come true", - wrote Shokan [5, 83 p.]. Hence we can see that Shokan was very interested by similarities, nature, reasons and historical principles of adoption theory in literature of every nation.

He proved that similarities in literary heritage was reached by means of literal interchange with neighboring nations: "Listening stories and poetry, especially of Buryat people, I understood that Indi-German motives in Kazakh and Nogai folk were interchanged during relation with Slavyan nations and Russia". Shokan, like scientist A.N.Afanasyev, didn't stay long on that point of view. However, he also was against conclusion that literal art of one nation establishes and develops only due to adoption from other nation. «Further, - wrote Sh.Ualikhanov, - we must underline that poetic legends were simply adopted by one nation from another due to their neighbourhood and sameness of the languages. So, we must thoroughly distinguish them... There are a lot of legends and stories, songs and poems, that widely spread in Asia" [5, 84 p.]. Scientist said that sameness can be met not only at neighboring nations, which live near each other. But there also can be found sameness in traditions, culture and literature of nations, which situated far from each other and having no cultural-literal bound. As example he gave legends and stories, heroic myths of Greek people, which were also widely met in Kazakh folklore. He said that its reason was in sameness of life conditions, world view and aesthetic cognition of nations. Here Shokan's point of view is close to opinion of F.I.Buslayev in above-mentioned work: "The general to all mankind logic and psychology laws, the general phenomena in family and practical life, at last, the general ways in cultural development, naturally, had to be reflected in a life and had identical ways to understand the phenomena of life and equally to express them in the myth, the fairy tale, the legend, a parable or a proverb" [13, 36 p.].

Later next representatives of mythological school became supporters of F. Buslayev opinion and such revolutionary-democrats as Chernischevskiy, Dobrolyubov strongly criticized general position of school. In the result there appeared separate folklore that proved origination of mythological, story and other subjects from living conditions, traditions, habits and manners, general in development of human society, i.e. appeared anthropologic theory, which also entered scientific-research standpoint. Fundamental support of Shokan's opinion about adoption theory was based on that anthropologic theory. Of, course, it is clear, that scientist's enlightening-democratic view also played a great role on it. Saying about similarity of subjects, meeting in folklore of different nations, it is very important to underline the necessity of recognition the individual literary heritage as national, due to the place of every nation, the necessity of opening the original similarities and peculiarities through comparison. For example, he especially underlined the fact that events in the history of nations, level of development of societies were on the same level, that nations lived nomad way of life and it was the reason why their literal legacy had the same themes, objects, characters and even such art as improvisation of poets. «Poetry of two such nations was similar, because their poetry praised steppe life, both nations took objects from surrounding nature. Both nations praised nomad way of life, described beautiful nature, relations and disputes between tribes», - saying that, author researched Arabian and Kazakh poetry by means of comparing two cultures. He reminded incorrectness of having similar opinion about literature of nomad and settled nations, asked to keep in mind the ability of nomad people to be quick and talented in poetry, thus to be able to improvization and extemporize songs at once.

That remark of Shokan was later mentioned in the critical note and article of A. Bokeikhanov "Women in zhyr 'Kobylandy batyr'", where he searched history of Kazakh folklore and its theoretical problems [14, 105 p.]. Also such opinions, peculiar to mythological theory, can be clearly seen in works of Sh. Kudaiberdiyev, which wrote the fundamental work about chronicles of Kazakh [15, 80 p.].

Generally, in spite he didn't write separate research work about that three theories of mythological school, he found the idea that bases of traditions and culture of every nation layed in historical life truth of that nation. That conclusion corresponded to his first steps on searching literal legacy by means of historical-comparative principle of theory of

anthropology. "Thus, saying that Shokan supported 'theory of adoption', we don't mean that he was fully under the influence of that concept in his research works" [16, 55 p.].

It shows that national scientist-researches in XIX century were able to cognize literature from the scientific point of view and to use newest and original ways of world and Russian science of literal study in their first attempts to search. And it is also clear that historical method in historical-cultural school of Shokan and his opinion about peoples character is worth to be specially searched.

#### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Smagulov Zhandos Kozhakhmetovich  
Karaganda State University n.a. Ye. A. Buketov  
Universitetskaya str., 28, Karaganda, 100028,  
Karaganda region, Republic of Kazakhstan

#### References

1. History of Kazakh literature. Almaty: Gylym publishing house, 1960
2. History of Russian literal study. Moscow: «Nauka» publishing house, 1980
3. Marks, K. and F. Engels, 1983. About art. Moscow: «Nauka» publishing house, pp: 1-307
4. Abilgazy. Chronicles of Turks. – Almaty: «Anatyly» publishing house, 1999
5. Ualokhanov, S., 1985. Selected. Almaty: «Gylym» publishing house, , pp: 1-12
6. Karwot, E., 1955. Katalog magii Rudolfa: Zrodlo etnograficzne XIII w. Wroclaw, , pp: 47-52
7. Lehr, U., 1984. Wierzenia w istoty nadzmyslowe. Etnografm Polska. Warszawa, 28 (1): 223-250
8. Moszynski, K., 1987. Kultura Ludowa Slowian. T. 2. Kultura duchowa. Warszawa, pp: 1-234
9. Pelka, L., 1987. Polska demonologia ludowa. Warszawa, pp: 54-59
10. Potanin, G. 1883. Essays of North-West Mongolia. St-Petersburg, pp: 1-291
11. Academic schools in Russian literal study. Moscow: «Sovremennik» publishing house, 1976
12. Russian bulletin, 1873. Moscow, №10
13. Buslayev, F.I., 1874. Wandering legends and stories. Russian bulletin, (5): 18-27
14. Kudaiberdiyev, Sh., 1991. Chronicles of Turkish, Kyrgyz-Kazakh khnas. Almaty: «Kazakhstan» publishing house, pp: 1-194
15. Bokeikhanov, A., 1995. Selected. Almaty: Kazakh encyclopedia, pp: 1-247
16. Smagulov, Zh., 1999. History of science of Kazakh literal study. Almaty: «Kazakh University» publishing house, pp: 1- 217.

5/29/2014