

Typology of musical cultures of Central Asia (Aspects of commonality of language and economic-cultural types)

Gulzada Omarova

Doctor of Art, Professor, Scientific Advisor of the Grant Project (Kazakhstan)

Abstract

The article raises the problem of comparative-typological study of Central Asian musical cultures. There is a huge diversity of ethnic and musical traditions in this region, which are still poorly investigated comparatively. The purpose of the study is to consider the issues related to geographical-territorial, linguistic, economic-cultural parameters of Central Asian region, which played a major role in formation of different superethnic communities and cultural systems. The methods of modern ethnology and ethnomusicology with data and methods of related sciences and comparative-historical, comparative-typological and other methods were used. The author believes that the main Central Asian superethnoses – Turkic-Mongolian and Turkic-Iranian – belong to different Eastern (nomadic and settledagricultural) cultural civilizations. Creators of nomadic civilization (Eastern Turkic and Mongolian peoples) are labeled by scientists as *Tengrian superethnos*, in contrast to *Muslim superethnos*, which was joined by most of Western Turks. The successors of Central Asian nomadic civilization are all modern Turkic and Mongolian peoples. In this question, the scientist borrows G. Vico's idea about cyclicity of civilizations and presence of the era of gods (ancient period – mythology), the era of heroes (middle ages – heroic epic) and the era of people (new time – lyrics) in each of them. Representatives of Turkic-Mongolian (Tengrian) superethnos preserved the most archaic layers of music and its core elements that form the basis of the Turkic musical thinking (bourdon, guttural singing). We can talk about the actual cultural assimilation of Western Turks, who settled and fell under the influence of local musical cultures of the Middle East (makamat).

Key words: nomads, superethnos, Tengrism, bourdon, polyphony

Introduction

The ethnic history of the Central Asian peoples attests to the fact that as modern nations they were formed as a result of direct mixes, long historical and cultural contacts, mutual influences and interactions of different ethnic communities, as well as different cultural-economic types and state formations (associations). They played a significant role in historical destinies of the peoples, living now in the territories adjacent to Central Asia. So, Central Asia was a kind of an epicenter from which for thousands of years people moved in all directions of the Eurasian continent: to Near and Middle East (including Transcaucasia), North and North-Western Russia, Eastern and Western Europe, South (India, etc.) and Far East (China). As a result, we have most interesting pages of the world history and culture, represented, for example, by the history and culture of the ancient States of Mesopotamia (Sumer) and Asia Minor, Aryans and Indo-Aryans, the phenomena of the Great Wall of China and Migration Period, the relationship between Turan and Iran, Ancient Rus and The Great Steppe, unique cultures of the Kushan Empire and the Great Moguls of India, Tang Empire of China. In general, according to historians, ethno-cultural processes in Central Asia played “a crucial role in continent-wide processes of ethnogenesis, formation of the languages of many ancient, medieval and modern peoples of Eurasia” (History of Kazakhstan and Central Asia, 2001) [1, p.6].

In our report we would like to focus on the problem of comparative typological study of musical cultures of Central Asian superethnoses. The purpose of this study is to briefly express own point of view on the issues related to the geographical-territorial, linguistic, and economic-cultural parameters of Central Asian region. These parameters contributed to the formation of different super-ethnic communities, which are the subjects of different Eastern cultural models and civilizations. Accordingly, in the investigated region we observe enormous diversity and richness of ethnic, cultural and musical traditions, which are comparatively still poorly investigated.

In the study of traditional musical cultures of the region, we used the well-known **methods** of modern ethnology and ethnomusicology¹, as well as the data and methodology of historical, cultural, religious studies, ethnography, folklore, art studies, etc. Historicalgenetic, comparative-historical, comparative-typological, synchronic-diachronic and structural methods of research common for the humanities were used alongside the methods mentioned above. We should emphasize *systematic approach* widely used in ethnomusicology in the study of oral musical traditions (folklore and oral-professional art). This method contributes to successful solution of a large range of issues of musical and, more broadly, spiritual culture of both European and Eastern peoples. We can name a large number of modern ethnomusicological studies that have contributed to the disclosure of the cultural identity of the peoples and the creation of *picture of the world of ethnic musical cultures* that astounds with richness of colors.

¹ Ethnomusicology (comparative musicology) is a scientific discipline that studies the musical systems of the peoples of the world, cross-cultural comparison and study of the relationship between musical systems and other social and cultural factors [2].

Results

In short encyclopedia, Central Asia is “a natural country that covers the Inland Asia within China and Mongolia” (Great Russian encyclopedic dictionary, 2005) [3, p.1487]. Let us pay attention to the definition of "the Inland Asia" added up to other definition, which says that it is "a big region in the heart of Asia without exit to an Ocean" [4], and it is, in our point of view, very significant. Further, in this source (heading - Structure of Central Asia), we can find the following: “Central Asia in any criteria of boundary identification includes Central Asian Republics of the Former USSR and *Kazakhstan*. Besides, it can partially or fully include surrounding countries” (Same). Thus, there are partially Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, India, China, Mongolia and Russia in the circle of Middle Asia. It is interesting that Kazakhstan here (in the table) is noted as “geographically partially” constituting part of Central Asia - apparently, given the fact that the border between Asia and Europe passes through Ural. This is well demonstrated by another map of Central Asia, clearly matching strict geographical criteria: in the west there is the whole Iran, part of Turkmenistan, Usturt Plateau and Western Kazakhstan and in the east, part of Mongolia and Buryatia are out of the Central Asian "spot" [5].



This geographic frame is clearly narrow from the perspective of modern territorial, economical, political and moreover cultural and historical realms. As a huge ethnical region and cultural-historical basis, Central Asia certainly covers quite a big number of countries and their neighboring border zones. Thus, in the North it partially includes Russia and Kazakhstan, which in the west extends till Caspian Sea and Ural, and south and eastern borders are, according to L.Gumilyov, the areas “adjacent to the mountain ranges of Pamir, Kopetdag, Altay, Karakorum and Hindu Kush” (Gumilev L. N.,1986) [6, p.14]. Thereby, summarizing the above, we can state: as one ethno-cultural area, Central Asia covers Middle Asia and Kazakhstan, areas surrounding Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Northern India, Mongolia, eastern part of China and part of Russia, particularly the whole Southern, partly Western and Eastern Siberia. Speaking of the latter, we mean Bashkirs, Tatars, Kalmyks (Ural and Volga region) in the west, and Yakuts in the East, who are culturally very close to other Turkic-Mongol peoples, but by historical circumstance found to be on the periphery and a bit far from the Central Asian region.

In this connection, I would like to briefly dwell on the concepts like “Turkic world”, “Turkic superethnos”, “Turkic culture” recently so popular in politics and culture, which are certainly connected with people of Central Asia. There are no doubts in correctness and validity of these given concepts, their ‘basicness’ considering the common Turkic cultural legacy, ethno-historical roots and large connections in many different spheres of the life of Turkic people. At the same time, the linguistic factor of unification of ethnic groups here falters a bit, since, in comparison with other Eurasian superethnoses (on the basis of ethnolinguistic community), for example, with Slavic, German, Chinese, Indian and others, the Turkic superethnos is not that monolithic. It is obvious. Why? Suffice it to say that due to historical conflicts, the Turkic superethnos was very scattered geographically and, most importantly, it “united” representatives of two different branches or models of human culture – sedentary-agricultural (Asian type) and nomadic (stock-raising, Central Asian type). As is well-known, the *landscape factor*, that is, the unity of the natural habitat of people and ethnic groups, and hence the unity of the corresponding type of economy, lifestyle and culture itself, which in complex form the so-called ECT – economic and cultural types (ethnographic term) acquires a fundamental importance in *formation*, as well as in the subsequent *proximity* of cultures (Zhdanko T.A., 1980) [7, p.305]. This is on one hand.

On the other hand, the author of the term “superethnoses” L.N.Gumilyov, explaining its meaning, specifies such an important thing as *mentality*, which is the consolidating factor and the essential part of *ethnic tradition*² of peoples (Gumilyov L.N., 1993) [8]. Accordingly, the superethnos is formed according to Gumilev as, first of all, *ideological, religious and cultural integrity* [Same]. Giving the examples of superethnoses, L.Gumilyov justly names Christian (Western European), Byzantine (Orthodox), and Muslim (Islamic, Arabic) as the most vivid and outstanding superethnoses in the history of mankind.

² “**Ethnic tradition** is the hierarchy of stereotypes and rule of behavior, cultural canons, political and economic forms and worldviews, peculiar for the ethnos and transmittable from one generation to another. Singularity of each ethnos, its place among other peoples is defined by accumulating ethnical traditions. Ethnic traditions are formed in the youth of an ethnos, when it actively develops the skills of adaptation to the environment (ethnic and natural)” (Gumilyov L.N., 1993) [8].

Defining the superethnoses of Central Asia from the perspective of the abovementioned linguistic factor of unification of ethnic groups into superethnoses, we can say that in addition to the largest, Turkic, superethnos, Mongolian and Iranian (but then again, taking into account the cultural and historical realities) superethnoses should be named here. Relationships of Turks and Iranians are historically well known, centuries-old and bright moments of political confrontation (but sometimes a unity) of Turan and Iran, and the real entwining of their cultures is unmatched. This also holds true for the relationship, fundamental ties and history of Turks and Mongols, whose languages are from one Altay family, and nomadic lifestyle, associated, for the most part, with the steppe landscape and pastoral type of economy, gave rise to the deepest cultural kinship and close mentality of these peoples. Therefore, it looks somewhat absurd when at international Turkic *cultural* forums, one (Western) side of Turkic world is represented, for example, by Uzbeks and Azerbaijan, excluding Iranian-speaking people (eg, Tajiks and Iranians), and the other (Eastern) side is represented by Kazakhs and Tuvans, but there are no Mongol-speaking people (Mongol, Buryat or Kalmyks). Once again, this example shows the narrowness of the language factor.

Thus, the “Turkic framework” in Central Asian region should be expanded, as no one can deny a certain monolithic character of Turkic-Mongolian world in the East and the Turkic-Iranian world in the West. Besides, speaking of the Western Turks (Uzbeks, Azerbaijanis, Turks, Karakalpaks, Turkmens etc.) and Eastern Turks (Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Khakas, Tuvans, Yakuts etc.), we should admit that their cultures, as it was noted before, belong to the different types of economies: the former (Western Turks) belongs to sedentary agricultural type, the second (Eastern Turks) – to the nomadic type. Important classificatory-typological characteristics of these cultures testify to it. At the same time, this division is by no means absolutized by us: we are talking about the general typology (as we know, there are no “pure” nomads and “pure” agriculturalists in nature) and conditional boundaries of cultures, taking into account ethnogenesis, history, contact and other ethno-cultural ties of the above-mentioned peoples.

At the same time, different landscape zones in the west (south-west) and east (northeast) of Central Asia leave no doubt in the abovementioned *localization* of sedentary agricultural and nomadic systems in the region. That is why it is natural that western (let us note again - conditionally western) Turks bordering with Iran accepted Islam organically and entered the Muslim superethnos. Eastern Turks do not fall into this superethnos, and despite the fact that in Middle Ages Islam (Sufi Islam) penetrated from south to south-west and west of Kazakhstan through the Arabic missionaries, most of the Kazakhs remained in traditional nomadic faith - Tengriism till the 20th century.

In this regard, we recall that in the early 2000s, Kazakh ethnomusicologist A.I. Mukhambetova, exploring the 12-year animal calendar of Central Asian nomads, *mushel*, expressed a brand new idea at that time. The idea is that nomadic Turkic-Mongol peoples of Central Asia who are the inventors of so called “Eastern calendar”, i.e. 12-year animal calendar (and the existence of own calendar reveals the civilizational essence of culture), in fact constitute *the Tengrian superethnos* – by analogy with Christian and Muslim superethnos (Mukhambetova A., 2003) [9]. The correctness of the scientist today is confirmed by a huge amount of literature, materials of conferences and forums on the topic of Tengriism as the main religion or even the worldview of the nomads of Eurasia.

As follows from the research of Tengriism, its openness, tolerance, as well as the amazing religious tolerance of the followers of Tengriism – rulers of nomadic empires, played an important role in the fact that in Central Asia, in addition to the main religions (Tengrianism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, Lamaism), in different eras there appeared temporal focal points of many other religions, like Christianity, Buddhism, Manichaeism, Judaism. All this happened against the background of extant ancient beliefs, not formalized into religious systems (totemism, magic, shamanism, nagualism, Bon, etc.). It is in the east of the region, the traditional beliefs and mythology, as well as the religion of the ancient Turks - Tengriism, which has not lost its value so far, constitute the foundation of the system of Turk-Mongol peoples³, which is brightly expressed in traditional musical cultures.

The cultures of Central Asian Nations in the West, who joined the Muslim superethnos, clearly reflect the traces of both ancient Turkic (shamanic and Tengrian) and ancient Iranian (Zoroastrian) cults. However, Sufi Islam had a great influence on the development of art and music, particularly in the sphere of urban culture, and led to formation of the *makomat* system (in Iran – *dastgah*, in Northern India – *raga*), which later formed the classical musical traditions of the Western regions of Central Asia. It is very symptomatic that Turkmens and Karakalpaks, due to the peculiarities of their ethnogenesis and history (like mountain Tajiks of Pamir or Surkhandarya Uzbeks) do not have these traditions. However, it is interesting that the term “*makam*” (*mugham*) is present in other genres of Turkmen and Karakalpak music. Also, in the West Kazakhstan musical traditions⁴, the term *makam* (whereas in the Eastern Kazakhstan – *saryn*) is used to denote a melody.

Discussion

So, in Central Asian region we distinguish two super-ethnic communities and, accordingly, two cultural systems – ***Turkic-Mongolian (Turkic-Tengrian) and Turkic-Iranian (Turkic-Muslim)***. Accordingly, modern Turkic-speaking peoples belong to different superethnic communities and they formed their distinctive ***national*** (including musical) traditions within the framework of different Eastern civilizations and sub-civilizations, the essence of which is determined by such spatial and temporal categories as climate, economic and cultural type, lifestyle, religious affiliation, historical era, etc. Therefore, integration of Western Turks into the system of Muslim culture, and some Eastern Turks into the system of Buddhist culture (at later stages of history) is natural because of their dominance in the respective regions (Arab or ***Iranian-Islamic*** influence on the culture of Western Turks and/or ***Mongol-Buddhist*** influence on the culture of some Eastern Turks). That is why we find the term “Turkic civilization” occurring in popular science and even scientific literature (in particular, philosophical literature) (Ayazbekova S.Sh.) [11] quite incorrect based at least on the typology of Central Asian musical cultures.

³ We think this is obvious, despite the fact that a number of peoples (Mongols, Buryats, and Tuvans) organically accepted Tibetan Buddhism – Lamaism.

⁴ According to our preliminary observations, the West Kazakhstan traditions are more correlated with the music of the Western Turks in their intonation structure than that of the Eastern Turks, including the Eastern Kazakhs (Omarova G.N., 2012) [10].

At the same time, we fully agree with historians who, on the basis of a deep knowledge of the subject, use the term “ancient Turkic civilization”. S. Klyashtorny in his article “Eurasia: the first empire of the Turks and their civilization”, dedicated to the civilizational foundations of the Turkic khaganates in the VI-VIII centuries, writes: “The factor of imperial tradition in the history of formation of ancient Turkic civilization is still waiting for researchers’ attention. Meanwhile, everything that we can define as signs inherent in civilization (first of all, quite advanced writing system and historical memory captured in this writing) was a direct consequence of the creation of the Turkic ‘el’ (state)” (Klyashtorny S.)[12]. Analyzing further the content of runic monuments and other written sources, the author concludes: “With the birth of the Turkic ‘el’, the inherited traditional culture was transformed into a new civilization, which gave rise to qualitatively new forms of existence and new communication means — the construction of cities in the places of the steppe princely rates, religious searches and the pinnacle is a writing system, which worked its way from stone steles to manuscripts on paper, the writing system, which gave rise to a rich and diverse literary tradition in the VIII-XIII centuries. All this lets us characterize the ancient Turkic civilization of Central Asia as a system, which, along with archaic and conservative structures, included progressive and mobile structures that determined a relatively high, albeit short-term dynamism of its development. This civilization was inseparable or, on any view, genetically related to the Turkic ‘el’ — the first Eurasian Empire created by the Central Asian nomadic tribes” [Same].

So, we can assume that the most important factor – the factor of ethnic identity on the basis of the Turkic language and writing originated in the early middle ages and the successors of Turkic, or rather, Central Asian nomadic civilization and culture, to some degree, are all modern Turkic and Mongolian peoples. The study of the commonality of modern peoples’ cultures in ethnography revealed three main levels (or signs): 1) historical and genetic, 2) typological, 3) contact (Zhdanko T.A., 1980) [7]. On these grounds, we can make preliminary notes that in culture Kazakhs may have common features with the North Caucasian Turks (Kумыks, Karachays, Balkars, Nogai) – on the first sign; with Uzbeks, Azerbaijanis, Turks – on the first and partly the third sign; with Tatars, Bashkirs, Khakas, Tuvans, Yakuts, Mongols and Buryats – on the first and partly the second and third signs; with the Altai, Kyrgyz, Karakalpaks and Turkmens – on the first, second, third signs. This arrangement is conditional to a certain extent, because during the history of ethnic groups, economic and cultural types, as well as boundaries of the territories changed due to intensive formations and disintegration of states (especially in the Middle Ages), within which diverse contacts of nations developed. However, there is no doubt that all three signs of commonality are most stable among the peoples who have preserved to the greatest extent the ancient Turkic basis of musical culture.

This historical-ethnographic trend of research of the commonality of cultures, in particular, musical cultures, can square with the trend of further identification of forms of musical and linguistic contacts, like the contacts that exist in linguistics. That is, to understand the interaction of cultures, their common (for example, common Turkic elements) and special (national elements) features, comparative studies of sub-, super- and adstrat correlations in the compared cultures (languages, music) should be carried out. For example, we can observe the phenomenon of linguistic substrate (the dissolution of local languages in Turkic language - the language of foreign nomadic ethnic groups) in the cultures of Turkic-speaking peoples of the Western region of Central Asia and its borders, and in most cases, superstrat correlations

(assimilation of “indigenous” musical traditions of the Turks in a more powerful musical-linguistic environment of local settled ethnic groups) in the *music* of these nations.

Within the frames of civilizational-graphical trend in the study of Central Asian musical cultures, we find the theory of cyclic nature of civilizations put forward by Giambattista Vico in the XVIII century quite efficient. This theory was further developed in new historical conditions in O. Spengler and A. Toynbee’s works. For most general coverage of the civilizational foundations of Turkic and Mongolian peoples’ culture and art, we find the theory of cyclic nature of civilizations very attractive in its “natural” and “pristine” form, as it was presented by G. Vico. Thus, in the historical cycle of civilizations, he emphasized the following eras in each of them: a) the era of Gods (ancient period), b) the era of heroes (Middle Ages), c) the era of people (new era) (Giambattista Vico, 1994) [13]. These eras in the folklore, literature and music of the Turkic peoples are accordingly reflected in such areas as *mythology*, *heroic epos* and *lyrics*.

Interestingly, ancient period of civilization, that is, *mythology* and the former unity within the Tengrian community are well preserved in traditional cultures of the Eastern Turks (Yakuts, Altai and South Siberian Turks, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, etc.), and medieval period of civilization, that is, *the heroic epic* (a common set of epic monuments of Oguz and Kipchak time among the Western Kazakhs, Turkmens, Karakalpaks, Uzbeks, Turks, Azerbaijan, Nogais, Bashkirs, Tatars) is preserved in the cultures of the Western Turks. The era of *lyricism* in each culture is already nation-specific, and in it we observe a certain influence of local (root) regional cultures or local civilizations, such as Muslim culture in the West of the Turkic world.

Together with the demonstration of the differences between the two cultural systems, their dissimilarity and deep identity, at the same time it is possible to find those points of coincidence, which will let advance arguments on the complex unity of the TurkicMongolian-Iranian culture in the territory of Central Asia.

From the same point of view, I would like to pay special attention to a phenomenon of bourdon two-voice or polyphony widespread in many musical cultures of Eurasia. Its manifestations, properties and features in all cultures and regions – Western and Eastern Europe, the Baltic States, the Balkans, the Caucasus, various regions of Asia – were studied in different degrees. In Kazakhstan, bourdon polyphony became the object of a special (dissertation) study by L.Khaltaeva in close connection with the cosmogonic ideas of the Turkic-Mongolian peoples (Khaltaeva L.A., 2015) [14]. According to the researcher, “the process of the emergence and development of bourdon polyphony in diverse performance forms is not an achievement of individual musical cultures of the region and the subsequent adoption of these cultures by other cultures, but constitutes the essence, core, stylistic basis of Turkic-Mongolian peoples’ musical space” (Same) [14, p.7].

The Bashkir ethnomusicologist H. Ikhtisanov, studying the unique phenomenon of Siberian peoples as *throat singing* (Ikhtisamov Kh., 1984) [15] was the first to pay attention to this stylistic phenomenon (bourdon polyphony) in different genres of music of Turks and Mongols. There is a huge variety of the types of bourdon two voice texture and polyphony, starting with the throat singing of the Altaians, Tuvinians, Khakas, Mongols and ending with the developed samples of instrumental music (wind, idiophonic and all stringed instruments) of other Turkic peoples! Although the issues of actual origin of bourdon is associated with the issues of origin of polyphony, and music in general, we agree with the Tuvan scholar V.

Suzukei's view that in Eastern regions of Central Asia, it demonstrates "the fundamental principles of sound organization", where we can observe "a kind of "oral theory", selfactualized in the form of bourdon-overtone sound signal (code)...» (Suzukei V.Y., 2007) [16, p. 366]. We can say that this "signal" is the "sound code" of Turkic-Mongolian peoples' culture.

It is the oldest, acoustic type of bourdon polyphony, which is according to L.Khaltaeva is a **genetic type** (the others generated from it). In this type of bourdon polyphony, under special acoustic conditions, allowing for simultaneous performance of the root and overtones extracted from it, natural harmonic series is "natural sound model" (Kh.Ikhtisamov). The lower, key note here is an "acoustic foundation", and the overtone melody is an "acoustic superstructure", forming **a seamless whole** in this form of bourdon polyphony, where one cannot exist without the other (Khaltaeva L.A., 2015) [14, p. 104]. This natural-acoustic type further generates non-acoustic types of bourdon polyphony (for example, with stringed plucked and bow instruments). Bourdon polyphony, in our opinion, is between them and is performed with a long flute like kurai, sybyzgy and shor.

Leaving aside the issue of classification of the types of bourdon polyphony, which may be the subject of detailed synchronous and diachronic research in the field of comparative musicology,⁵ we want to touch upon the issue of monophony and polyphony in bourdon polyphony. As we know, the Eastern musical culture belongs to monodic (or monophonic) culture. However, the bourdon polyphony, which is between the monodic (horizontal-linear) and polyphonic (vertical-spatial) types of musical thinking, represents a bridge or some "common place", which, in our opinion, connects not only these two types of thinking in traditional musical cultures, but also these ("ethnic") cultures with European classical culture. In other words, bourdon polyphony is the source, which, evolving further in various monogenic and polyphonic cultures, ultimately resulted in a huge variety of types and forms of its elements and the presence of ostinato both in Eastern (Asian, in particular, oral-professional) and Western (European, including written-professional) music of the Eurasian continent.

Declaring this thesis, let us first of all address the conclusions of the Georgian ethnomusicologist I.Zhordania, who has been successfully researching the origin of polyphony for many years (Jordania J., 1991) [17] , (Jordania J. (2006) [18]. In one of his recent articles, referring to Siegfried Nadel and Marius Schneider, who completely changed the point of view on the origin of European polyphony in Western musicology, he writes: "it was not medieval European professional polyphony that caused the emergence of polyphony in traditional cultures, but, on the contrary, the traditional polyphony caused the emergence of medieval European professional polyphonic art" (Jordania J.) [19]. According to the scientist, Christianity, which came to Europe from the Middle East, cultivated monophonic singing style in the Church for several centuries, which "tried to suppress the "pagan" tradition of folk polyphonic (and apparently dissonant) chants. However, the Church music could not maintain everlasting resistance to the pressure from the part of traditional music..." (Same) [19]. As a result, in the X-XII centuries, and then in the Renaissance in the XV-XVI centuries, there emerged European polyphonic professional art, which, according to the researcher, is the result of a mixture of middle Eastern monophony and European ("national" or traditional – G.O.) polyphony. However, "in contrast to the ancient European polyphonic style with the bourdon,

⁵ Taking into account the diversity of the types of bourdon in traditional instrumental, as well as choral culture of many peoples of Eurasia.

with a fairly sharp vertical dissonances and with melodies of a very narrow range, the new European professional style formed another aesthetics, where “melody was the soul of the music” [Same], the scientist writes, bearing in mind the results of the interaction of two different layers of the musical art (in homophony).

However, it should be noted that in many Eastern oral and professional cultures, despite their monodic nature, researchers have found peculiar forms of the different types of polyphony. It is clear that polyphony (vertical) here bears mainly phonic (not modefunctional) load, which does not violate one-linearity of melodic relief and horizontal-modal conjugation of tones in it, but there is, nevertheless, the interaction, a certain *diffusion* of monophony and polyphony in many genres of music of Eastern peoples. Here, in connection with the topic of our report, we can say that in the study of the origin of bourdon and bourdon polyphony, which is one of the sources of polyphonic forms in European and Eastern musical cultures, there will be a tendency to “making it ancient” and “moving it further” to the East.

This is strikingly similar to the situation with the study of the genesis of bowed musical instruments in Europe: until the mid-60s of the last century it was believed in musicology that that bowed instruments came to Europe through Arabs from India [20]. This version was significantly shattered by Werner Bachmann [21] and Slavi Donchev [22]. Now it is impossible to refute the version about the Central Asian roots of bow instruments. Similarly, if in West, S.Nadel and M. Schneider expressed their quite revolutionary views at the origin of European polyphony in the 40-s and meant Caucasus as the source of the folk polyphony, in the beginning of 60-s Paul Collier suggested that “European professional polyphony developed under the direct influence of traditional music of the *local* (we highlighted – *G.O.*) European peoples of mainly the Mediterranean area...” (Jordania J.) [19]. According to Jordania J., his researches also confirm Paul Collier’s idea [Same].

Who were those “local” European nations? The history of the “barbarian” tribes of Europe, as shown by modern studies of ethnologists [23] also originates in the East, and since the era of the Great migration of peoples, they have been re-creating their history and culture here...

Conclusion

Thus, on the basis of the above, we can draw the following conclusions:

- 1) Through the example of ethnic (traditional) music, we can demonstrate what happened to the peoples of Central Asia in time, that is, to some extent, we can trace the history of the Turkic peoples on the example of folklore and oral-professional genres of their traditional music. Due to a certain conservatism of its language, music testifies to the preservation of the indigenous ties of the Eastern Turks and Mongols, their deepest cultural kinship and close mentality. Since the nomadic way of life existed until the twentieth century in the Eastern (steppe) zone of Central Asia, it was the representatives of the Turkic-Mongolian (Tengrian) superethnos who preserved the most archaic layers of music and its core elements, which constitutes the basis of the Turkic musical thinking (bourdon, throat singing) in their traditional cultures. And again, based on traditional music, we can talk about actual cultural assimilation of the Western Turks, who, after getting into the settled agricultural oases also settled and fell under the influence of local cultures (in particular, the cultures of the Near and Middle East).

- 2) In this regard, the ethnomusicology of Kazakhstan, as well as the whole Central Asia requires comparative historical research, since we can understand many things in the musical cultures of the peoples of this region only through fragmentation of typological, historical and genetic origins of traditions, as well as through understanding of the role of contacts and mutual influences in the history of peoples.
Comparative studies, even within the framework of one culture, can be very effective, as in many countries the regional features of musical traditions are based on genetic relation or contacts with the ethnic groups of neighboring territories. In our opinion, the study of musical basis of folklore with different styles and oral professional genres of Western and Eastern (conditionally) Kazakhstan, can complement the history of musical relations of the Central Asian peoples, as well as be important for ethnological disciplines related to the history of music. Relict phenomena in music can become a valuable source in the study of ethnogenesis, ethnic, historical and cultural parallels of both the Turkic-Mongolian (East) and the Turkic-Iranian (West) community.
- 3) All the above mentioned lets us draw conclusion on the necessity of comparative historical and comparative typological studies of the culture and traditional music of the Eurasian peoples, as well as the importance of musical comparative studies as a very promising branch of musicology. Comparative studies in the musical culture of even one nation can shed light on some historical processes in the development of traditional music of the peoples of Central Asia (Omarova G.N., 2012) [10]. If we can show the identity (features) of different systems of musical thinking on the national material of the Turkic, Mongolian and Iranian peoples, cross-cultural studies will help find those essential points of contact, which will let advance arguments on complex unity of the Turkic-Mongolian-Iranian culture of the Central Asian region.
- 4)

Acknowledgment

This article is the result of the author's research work in the frames of the grant project of the Committee of science of the Ministry of education and science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (URN of the project: AP05130613 «A comprehensive study and transmission of historical and cultural heritage (traditional music) into the sphere of social knowledge, mass culture and information»).

References

- [1] History of Kazakhstan and Central Asia/Abuseitova M.Kh. et al. (2001). Almaty: Dyke Press.
- [2] Encyclopedia of culture science. Ethnomusicology https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_culture/801
- [3] Great Russian encyclopedic dictionary, 2005. Moscow: Great Russian Encyclopedia.
- [4] Central Asian countries http://actravel.ru/central_asia.html
- [5] All maps of the world. Central Asia <https://karta.uef.ru/centralnaja-azija/>
- [6] Gumilyov L. N. (1986). Artistic heritage of the peoples of the ancient East. Art of the East. Moscow: Education. pp. 5-19.

- [7] Zhdanko T.A. (1980). The issues of intraregional ethno-cultural relations of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the late feudal period. Problems of modern Turkology. Materials of the 2nd All-Union Turkic Conference. Alma-Ata: "Science" of the Kazakh SSR. pp.303-309.
- [8] Gumilyov L.N. (1993). Ethnosphere: history of people and history of nature. Dictionary of concepts and terms of L.N.Gumilev's theory of ethnogenesis / Compiled by Michurin V.A., edited by Gumilev L.N. Moscow: Ecopros. <http://gumilevica.kulichki.net/MVA/mva09.htm>
- [9] Mukhambetova A. (2003). Tengrian calendar as the basis of nomadic civilization (on the Kazakh material). Kazakh traditional music and the XX century. – Almaty: Dyke Press. pp.1152.
- [10] Omarova G.N. (2012). Kazakh kui: Cultural-historical context and regional styles: Author's abstract of the Doctor of art. Tashkent.
- [11] Ayazbekova S.Sh. Turkic civilization in the system of civilizational classifiers <http://www.viaevrasia.com/ru/>
- [12] Klyashtorny S. Eurasia: the first Empire of the Turks and their civilization <http://turkmenhistory.narod.ru/kaganat.html>
- [13] Giambattista Vico. (1994). The foundation of the new science about the common nature of nations: Translated from Italian. Moscow-Kiev: «REFL-book».
- [14] Khaltaeva L.A. (2015). Genesis and evolution of bourdon polyphony in the context of cosmogonic representations of the Turkic-Mongolian peoples. – Ulan-Ude: "Republican printing house" JSC.
- [15] Ikhtisamov Kh. (1984). Notes on the two-voiced guttural singing of the Turkic and Mongolian peoples. Music of Asia and Africa. Issue 4. Moscow: Soviet composer. pp.179-193.
- [16] Suzukei V.Y. (2007). Musical culture of Tuva in the twentieth century. Moscow: "Composer" publishing house.
- [17] Jordania J. (1991). Georgian traditional polyphony in the international context of polyphonic cultures (On the Genesis of polyphony): Author's abstract of the Doctor of art history. Kiev.
- [18] Jordania J. (2006). Who Asked the First Question? Origins of Human Choral Singing, Intelligence, Language and Speech. Tbilisi State University: Logos.
- [19] Jordania J. The disappearance of traditional polyphony as a problem of cultural anthropology (translated from English by A. Sokolova) <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/ischeznovenie-traditsionnogo-mnogogolosnogopesnopeniya-kak-problema-kulturnoy-antropologii>
- [20] Modr A. (1959). Musical instruments (translated from Czech). Moscow: Muzgiz.
- [21] Bachmann W. (1966). Die Anfangedes Striechinsrumentenspiels. Leipzig.
- [22] Donchev Slavy. (1984). Към въпроса за произхода и на-ранната поява на струните лъкови инструмента в Европа . Музыкални хоризонти. - N 3.- pp.102-158.
- [23] Baizhumin Zh. (2012). Turan. A look at the history of human society. Notebooks I-IV. – Almaty: "Arys" publishing house.