
ОТАНДЫҚ ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУДЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОГО

ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЯ

ACTUAL ISSUES OF DOMESTIC LITERARY CRITICISM

UDC 398.3=111

S. Yskakuly, Zh.K. Smagulov, K.S. Kalybekova

*Karaganda Technical State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: kalam09@mail.ru)*

Sh. Ualikhanov and theories of mythological school in russian literal study

The scientific heritage of Shokan Shyngysuly Ualikhanov was carefully studied and published in many scientific works and monographs. A monograph was written that assessed the personality of Shokan in national literary science as a folklorist, orientalist and literary critic. And he took his rightful place in the history of literature as a great scientist. However, if we consider these studies in the context of the problem, which is the object of our research, the words about the methods and theories of research used in scientific studies of the literary heritage of the great scientist are ignored and often generalized. For this reason, we proved that the great literary and cultural heritage of Shokan is not only in one aspect and that his contribution to the field of literary criticism is enormous.

Keywords: folklore, national heritage, comparative literature, people.

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 a specialist in folklore, oriental studies, literal studies and as critic was searched from the monography viewpoint. He was highly appreciated as a scientist and took a proper place in the history of literature. However, when studying the problem about Shokan, we found out that only few men gave an 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 the XIXth century in Germany by Brothers Grimm, then those theories spread in Russia and found historical and comparative method in science of Russian literal study. Those three theories were mentioned in scientific-research view of a 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 a wrong conclusion that «Shokan in some of his articles switched from democracy opinion in folk poetry to mythological theory and like such scientists as Buslayev, Afanasyev supported the idea that folk poetry is ownerless» [1; 19]. However, mythological school, as other schools in the Russian literal study, was one of the original searches on the way of mastering literary heritage of the 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 being specially interpreted. Because, it indicates that na-

tional scientific-research opinion didn't stand apart from the newest searches of literary heritage in the world literal study of the XIXth century.

Thus, nowadays we can't look differently at such fact that Marks-Lenin methodology, having a conservative feature, disclaimed a key role of revolutionary-democracy opinion that praised party and class nature of literature. That opinion in its own part played a key role in mythological school of scientific researches. Theories, that arose 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 arose, the 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 the XIXth century» [2; 123]. 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 to historical development of national scientific-research opinion [1; 19].

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

Shokan believed that displaying the reason of appearance of human being in mythological legends about an individual man or animals was the phenomenon of mythological interpretation. As an 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 to the fact that Kazakh people in «Legends of Kazakh people from Ulyzhuz», «Kazakh chronicles» bound their appearance with myths about «Alash», «Alasha», and Kyrgyz people in «Works about Kyrgyz» bound their appearance with «Khanshayim (Princess)», «Forty girls» (Kyrykkyz), «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 based on the appearance of the world on any leading powers. Also in that period, there were such zoo-genetic legends in mythological cognition, according to which people thought they appeared from animals as a result of any holy powers. For example, Old Turk people according to their zoo-genetic legends thought they appeared from wolves, and, that is why, they worshiped wolves. North-Siberian people thought they appeared from Mother-Walrus. Shokan in his work «Notes about Kyrgyz» underlined that one tribe of Kyrgyz thought that they appeared from a deer. He wrote down about that myth in his work. Also he wrote some legends about origination of Kyrgyz people from «Red dog». He didn't insist on the fact that those myths influenced on appearance of folklore, but he underlined its role on the development of a national opinion as a mythological legend. In comparison with the concepts of such Russian mythologists as F.I. Buslaev, O. Miller, Shokan had its own peculiarity in his opinion about mythological theory. He studied any mythological legend 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].

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». The scientist, talking about relation between Shamanism and Islam, also outlined the influence of shamanism on myth formation. «Religion of Budda, due to its traditions and magnificent mythological legacy, had to push back simple spirit and traditions of shamanism. And, Kazakh people in comparison with Mongol, had a richer legacy, containing shaman traditions and sorcery (shaman demonology)», wrote Shokan in his works [5; 170]. Mythological concepts, originated from shamanism, and Muslim beliefs were 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: «Only religious names, terms changed there and the basic concept about shamanism was the same. Ongon was named as a 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].

According to scientist coming from ancientry, was a reflection of concepts of primitive people about world, universe, environment, there life practice and reflection of natural phenomenon. That opinion was very interesting and logically resulted from scientific-research standpoint. «If a person lives all his life 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 another side, if we examine shaman belief about soul of the person after death, about soul, living forever, thus here shamanism was considered as spiritualism. It was good, well-engineered idea, that human was free 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 worshipped sun, moon, whole world and generalized all this as nature or environment», thus we can clearly see that author deeply understood the mythological theory.

Shokan interpreted such demonologic concepts as divinity, holy spirit, genie, peri, angel, devil, sorrel (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 learned those concepts in connection to such types of traditions and beliefs as funeral, inclination to deceased, handout, offering of sacrifice, fortune telling, 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 applied 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 conceiting 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 legend about girl as an example, 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 a wise man, mole – youth, which was betrayed by his sister, wild cat – girl, who sined with the relative». [6; 767]. 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 «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 the 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 the development of philological science and its influence went beyond Germany, having affected works of the largest scientists-philologists of other European countries» took place in the world scientific-research opinion with the help of such person as Shokan, made many things clear [7; 24]. Because Shokan published many of his works in 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. Kopeyev, «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 the

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 study 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 the XIXth 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. Afanasyev, N.A. Lvov and others originated the theory of adoption as the 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...» [7; 42].

Shokan during his short lifetime made first steps in the scientific research of literary heritage of that theory. His well known 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 its 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 the 5th 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, 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 toward 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 the development of literary heritage of Kazakh people was not poorer than the same of other nations. «The most important is that the development forms of our society are not on the false level and equal with highly developed cultures», — he wrote. 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]. The most amazing thing is that Shokan's opinion was said before opinion of T. Beinfeir, supporter of adoption theory in European literal study. Beinfeir showed the following view in his work «Panchatantra»: «Mutual similarity of models and subjects in art of many nations was caused not by their similarity, but by adoption of compositions due to historical-cultural bound between those nations. Native land of all adopted tales, stories and poetry is India». Probably, Shokan was familiar with work of T. Benfeir. «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» [8; 651].

Adoption theory of mythological school, historical and comparative method caused by that theory and proved by opinions was also 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 Mr. 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 Middle Asia territory. Now I believe that the key of this secret is in relations between Ulyzhuz 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]. Hence we can see that Shokan was very interested in 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 the 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 established and developed only due to adoption from another nation. «Further, — wrote Sh. Ualikhanov, — we must underline that poetic legends were simply adopted by one nation from another due to their neighbourhood and language similarity. So, we must thoroughly distin-

guish them... There are a lot of legends and stories, songs and poems, which widely spread in Asia» [5; 84]. Scientist said that similarity can be met not only at neighboring nations, which live near each other, but there also can be found similarity in traditions, culture and literature of nations, which situated far from each other and having no cultural-literal bound. As an example, he gave legends and stories, heroic myths of Greek people, which were also widely met in Kazakh folklore. He said that his reason was in similarity of life conditions, world view and aesthetic knowledge 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» [9; 36].

Later, next representatives of mythological school became the supporters of F. Buslayev's opinion and such revolutionary-democrats as Chernischevskiy, Dobrolyubov strongly criticized general position of school. As a result, there was separate folklore that proved origination of mythological, story and other subjects from living conditions, traditions, habits and manners, general in the 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 in it. Saying about similarity of subjects met in folklore of different nations, it is very important to underline the necessity of recognition of the individual literary heritage as national, due to the place of every nation, the necessity of discovering the original similarities and peculiarities by comparing. 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 a 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 a steppe life, and 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 comparing two cultures. He reminded incorrectness of having similar opinion on literature of nomad and settled nations, asked to keep in mind the ability of nomad people to be quick and talented in poetry, and thus, to be able to improvise 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 [10; 80]. 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 [11; 80].

Generally, in spite he didn't write separate research work on those 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» [12; 55].

It shows that national scientific studies in the XIXth century were able to learn literature from the scientific point of view and to use the newest and original ways of the world and Russian science of literal study in their first attempts to search. And it is also clear that historical method in Shokan's historical and cultural school and his opinion concerning peoples' character is worth being specially searched.

References

- 1 Баишев С.Б. История казахской литературы / С.Б. Баишев. — Алма-Ата: Гылым, 1960. — 360 с.
- 2 Николаев П.А. История русского литературоведения / П.А. Николаев. — М.: Наука, 1980. — 349 с.
- 3 Лифшиц М.А. К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс об искусстве / М.А. Лифшиц. — М.: Наука, 1983. — 631 с.
- 4 Әбілғазы. Түрік шежіресі / Әбілғазы. — Алматы: Ана тілі, 1999. — 210 б.
- 5 Валиханов Ч.Ч. Избранное / Ч.Ч. Валиханов. — Алма-Ата: Гылым, 1985. — 528 с.
- 6 Потанин Г.Н. Очерки Северо-Западной Монголии / Г.Н. Потанин. — СПб.: Типография В. Киршбаума, 1883. — 1025 с.
- 7 Академические школы русского литературоведения. — М.: Современник, 1976. — 516 с.
- 8 Русский вестн. — 1873. — № 10.

9 Буслаев Ф.И. Перехожие повести и рассказы / Ф.И. Буслаев [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://feb-web.ru/feb/skazki/critics/91-1886.html?cmd=1&dscr=1>

10 Құдайбердіұлы Ш. Түрік, қырғыз-қазақ һәм хандар шежіресі / Ш. Құдайбердіұлы. — Алматы: Қазақстан, 1991. — 80 б.

11 Бокейханов А.Н. Избранное / А.Н. Бокейханов. — Алма-Ата: Казахстан, 1995. — 478 с.

12 Смагулов Ж.К. Қазақ әдебиеттану тарихы / Ж.К. Смагулов. — Алматы, 1999.

С. Ысқақұлы, Ж.Қ. Смағұлов, К.С. Калыбекова

Шоқан Уәлиханов және орыс әдебиеттануындағы мифологиялық мектептің теориялары

Шығыстану ғылымында «құйрықты жұлдыздай жарқ етіп ағып өткен» Шоқан Шыңғысұлы Уәлихановтың ғылыми мұрасы жан-жақты зерттеліп, көптеген ғылыми еңбектер мен монографиялар жарияланды. Ұлттық әдебиеттану ғылымында Шоканның фольклорист, ориенталист, әдебиетші, сыншы ретіндегі тұлғасы монографиялық тұрғыда қарастырылып, ғалымдық тұлғасына баға берілді, әдебиет тарихындағы алатын орны айқындалды. Бірақ шоқантану іліміндегі осы еңбектерге біз зерттеу нысаны етіп алып отырған проблема тұрғысынан қарасақ, ұлы ғалымның ғылыми-зерттеушілік ой-пікіріндегі әдеби мұраны ғылыми тексеруде қолданған зерттеу әдістері мен теориялары туралы нақты сөз ету назардан тыс қалып, көбіне жалпылама ғана айтылғаны байқалады. Сол себепті біз Шоканның бай әдеби-мәдени мұрасын тек бір тұрғыдан ғана емес, бірнеше бағыттан қарастырып, оның нақты әдебиеттану саласына қосқан үлесі орасан екендігін ғылыми тұрғыда дәлелдеп шықтық.

Кілт сөздер: фольклор, ұлттық мұра, салыстырмалы әдебиет, адамдар.

С. Ысқақұлы, Ж.К. Смагулов, К.С. Калыбекова

Шоқан Уәлиханов и теории мифологической школы в русском литературоведении

Научное наследие Шокана Чингисовича Уәлиханова было тщательно изучено и опубликовано во многих научных работах и монографиях. Была написана монография, давшая оценку личности Шокана в национальной литературной науке как фольклориста, востоковеда, литературоведа и критика. Он занял свое достойное место в истории литературы как великий ученый. Однако если рассмотреть эти исследования в контексте проблемы, которая является объектом нашего исследования, конкретное слово о методах и теориях исследования, используемых в научных исследованиях литературного наследия великого ученого, игнорируется и часто обобщается. По этой причине с научной точки зрения, нами доказано, что великое литературное и культурное наследие Шокана находится не только в одном аспекте и что его вклад в область литературоведения был огромен.

Ключевые слова: фольклор, национальное наследие, сравнительная литература, люди.

References

- 1 Baishev, S.B. (1960). *Istoriia kazahskoi literatury [History of Kazakh literature]*. Almaty: Nauka [in Russian].
- 2 Nikolaev, P.A. (1980). *Istoriia russkoho literaturovedeniia [History of Russian literary study]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 3 Lifshic, M.A. (1983). *K. Marks i F. Enhels ob iskusstve [K. Marks and F. Engels about art]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 4 Abilhazy (1999). *Turik shezhiresi [Chronicles of Turks]*. Almaty: Hylm [in Kazakh].
- 5 Valikhanov, Ch.Ch. (1985). *Izbrannoe [Selected]*. Almaty [in Russian].
- 6 Potanin, G.N. (1883). *Ocherki Severo-Zapadnoi Monholii [Essays of North-West Mongolia]*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Kirshbauma [in Russian].
- 7 *Akademicheskie shkoly russkoho literaturovedeniia [Academic schools in Russian literal study]* (1976). Moscow: Sovremennik [in Russian].
- 8 *Russkii vestnik [Russian bulletin]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 9 Buslaev, F.I. (1874). *Perekhozhie povesti i rasskazy [Wandering legends and stories]*. web.ru. Retrived from: <http://feb-web.ru/feb/skazki/critics/91-1886.html?cmd=1&dscr=1> [in Russian].

- 10 Kydaiberdiyly, Sh. (1991). *Turik, kyrhыз – kazak kham khandar shezhiresi* [*Chronicles of Turkish, Kyrgyz-Kazakh khans*]. Almaty: Kazakhstan [in Kazakh].
- 11 Bokeikhanov, A.N. (1995). *Izbrannoe* [*Selected*]. Almaty: Kazakhstanskoe knizhnoe izdatelstvo [in Kazakh].
- 12 Smahulov, Zh.K. (1999). *Kazakh adebiettany tarikhy* [*History of science of Kazakh literal study*]. Almaty [in Kazakh].