

Amanzholova D.

Institute of Russian History RAS, Doctor of Historical Sciences,
Professor, leading researcher, Russian, Moscow,
e-mail: amanzholova19@mail.ru

**LANGUAGE POLICY AND MANAGEMENT CLASS FORMATION
IN THE KAZAKH AUTONOMOUS SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC.
1920-1936 YEARS**

The issue of language was determined not only by the choice of optimal communication tool and modernization of multi-ethnic population, but had a deep symbolic and political significance. Language was an important tool for shaping peoples ethnoidentity of the USSR, served in the republics as marker for the admission to the privileges of the titular ethnic group and consolidate its administrative-territorial status. In the organization and provision of the all government system of governance in the KASSR in 1920-1936 years special role played in the dynamics of discursive practices in bilingual space. The functioning of Russian and Kazakh languages has an ambivalent impact on the formation and activities of the management class in the indigenization and the transformation of Kazakh alphabet from Arabic script to Latin and Cyrillic.

Key words: Soviet language policy, ethnicity, bureaucracy, Kazakh ASSR.

Аманжолова Д.

тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор,
РФА Ресей тарихы институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері, Ресей, Мәскеу қ.,
e-mail: amanzholova19@mail.ru

**Қазақ Автономиялық Кеңестік Социалистік Республикасындағы
тілдік саясат және басқару тобының қалыптасуы. 1920-1936 жылдар**

Тіл туралы мәселе қарым-қатынас құралдарының және көпэтносты халықты жаңғыртудың тиімді жолдарын таңдаумен ғана анықталған жоқ, сонымен қатар терең символдық және саяси мағынасы болды. Тіл КСРО халқының этнобірегейлігін қалыптастырудың маңызды құралы болды, республикаларда этностың артықшылық белгілерін көрсетудің белгісі және оның әкімшілік-аумақтық мәртебесін бекіту қызметін атқарды. 1920-1936 жж. ҚАКСР жалпы мемлекеттік басқарма жүйесін ұйымдастыру мен қамтамасыз етуде екітілді кеңестіктегі дикурстық тәжірибенің деңгейі ерекше рөл атқарды. Қазақ жазуының араб графикасынан латын тілі мен кириллицаға ауысуы және толық түрде енуі барысында орыс және қазақ тілдерінің қолдануы басқару тобының қалыптасуы мен қызметіне екі жақты әсер етті.

Түйін сөздер: кеңестік тілдік саясат, этникалық, бюрократия, Қазақ АКСР.

Аманжолова Д.

доктор исторических наук, профессор, ведущий научный сотрудник
Института российской истории РАН, Россия, г. Москва,
e-mail: amanzholova19@mail.ru

**Языковая политика и формирование управленческого класса
в Казахской Автономной Советской Социалистической Республике. 1920-1936 годы**

Вопрос о языке не только определялся выбором оптимального средства коммуникации и модернизации полиэтничного населения, но и имел глубокое символическое и политическое значение. Язык был важнейшим инструментом формирования этноидентичности народов СССР,

служил в республиках маркером для допуска к привилегиям титульного этноса и закрепления его административно-территориального статуса. В организации и обеспечении общегосударственной системы управления в КАССР в 1920-1936 гг. особую роль играла динамика дискурсивных практик в двуязычном пространстве. Функционирование русского и казахского языков оказывало амбивалентное воздействие на формирование и деятельность управленческого класса в ходе коренизации и трансформации казахской письменности от арабской графики к латинице и кириллице.

Ключевые слова: советская языковая политика, этничность, бюрократия, Казахская АССР.

Introduction

The Bolsheviks language policy was one of the measures to assert the national equality and national self-determination. The Kazakhs literacy rate based on Arabic script at the beginning of the XX century was not precisely determined. About 100 Kazakhs had higher and incomplete higher education degrees, about 700 graduated from high school, pre-schools, schools and teachers' *seminaries/courses* (Ismagambetov, 1997). They certainly knew Russian. According to the 1926 census, Kazakhs literacy was rated 6.9% (Asylbek, 2015). Thus, the transition to the Latin alphabet for the majority of the population was also a literacy education, besides Latin was politically neutral. It was of fundamental importance for managers, since clerical and written communications were an essential part of their job.

There are 3 stages of Kazakh Literature transformations:

- 1) 1920-1929 – The introduction of the Kazakh language into the paperwork, using the Arabic alphabet,
- 2) the transition to the Latin alphabet 1927-1940,
- 3) The introduction of the Cyrillic alphabet in 1940.

The language policy aligned the illiteracy elimination, expanding the scope of national languages communications and by equality of nations.

In 1927 the secretary of the USSR Central Executive Committee (the USSR CEC) Avel Yenukidze said: «... is it possible to raise Kazakhs level up to the level of the Russian nationality without the Kazakh national language? If so, we would call it chauvinism then» (GARF, 2:16-36).

It was connected with the policy of *korenizatsiya*. In 1924 it was decided to transfer the proceedings in autonomous republics into local languages, but the implementation was delayed and extended until the end of 1928. The local documentation in national languages often remained untranslated. But local institutions were required to provide a translation of documents sent to the central authorities of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic

(RSFSR). In 1927 the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee recommended the republics to identify the terms for the study of national languages and to provide their employees with opportunities to do so (GA RF, 161:167, 172, 98, 41-43, 47, 37).

In 1927 the Kazakh ASSR officially declared the transition to the Latin alphabet. By order of the Kazakh CEC there were introduced new alphabet committees (NAC) in the local executives. In 1928 there were about 80 communities-supporters (5,000 members) of the new alphabet company in the Kazakh ASSR. In December 1928 the first All-Kazakh conference to support a new alphabet was held in Kyzyl-Orda. On March 7, 1929 the USSR CEC and the USSR Council of People's Commissars (the USSR CPC) banned the Arabic script. But it was literally preserved.

On July 25, 1929 the CEC and the Government of the Republic approved the new Kazakh alphabet based on the Latin alphabet (Togzhanov, 1934:64-65). By that time, the literacy rate based on Arabic alphabet in the country was about 8-10% – 10 newspapers, 2 magazines and about 100 of books with a circulation of 3 000 copies each were constantly published in Arabic at that time there (Togzhanov, 1934:65). However, the narrowness of the base of the Arabic alphabet, like all others, was primarily due to the antediluvian material and technical base of the region and the total mass illiteracy. Moreover when the new alphabet was formally introduced we could observe a significant growth in funding both from the budget of the All-Russian central committee for New Alphabet and from the budget of the Republic. 15 publications in Arabic and Latin base were edited in 1929. In 1932 the remained number of the above publications was 2, nothing was published in Arabic, and 60 publications were in Latin (Togzhanov, 1934: 67, 66.).

The eradication of illiteracy of the majority facilitated the language transformation, although they used Arabic script before the reform. The Bolsheviks saw the eradication of illiteracy in the introduction of a new alphabet. There was no conflict

between the government and ethnic community during the reform. The pre-Soviet writings were not taken as more «spiritual» or «national», because the majority of the population became literate and cultural educated through the efforts of the authorities. Speaking and communication skills in Russian appeared long before the written communication skill was possessed. At the meeting on Minority Affairs in November 1927, the head of the All-Russian CEC nationalities department, Kazakh at birth, A.Asfendiarov said: «Any Kazakh may say that he'd rather learn Russian than his own language, any Kyrgyz would be happy if his child learnt Russian language» (GARF, 2: 16-36.). At the same time the Kazakh language remained an integral part of everyday life. It was also the way to establish linguistic and semantic barrier or general field of communications, when an ordinary man and the officials needed to trust each other. Meanwhile the availability of information in conflict situations with the «Europeans» was limited because of that.

Replacing a culture of writing with the other one was more difficult and directly influenced both managers and quality of their work. For a person or group of persons some specific features of spelling, writing, font and alphabet can be associated with a certain fact or belonging to a certain thing or group. For example, the Arabic stylized font can symbolize Islam or Islamic culture and traditions. The representatives of the old intellectuals had a good command of the Russian language and Arabic script. The *vydvizheny* («Recruits» from the people) had other initial conditions and motivation to master both the Russian language and its use, and their mother tongue on the basis of a new alphabet. For the old intellectuals the Arabic script associated with the past and Islam. The Cyrillic alphabet could be seen as an element of *Russification* by them.

As is known, in 1912 A. Baitursynov created and perfected the Arabic script and orthography of the Kazakh language (synharmonic alphabet and spelling). As a result of the study and selection of the Kazakh language sounds and Arabic script in 1924 there was created the original «baitursynovskaya spelling.» In 1927, Professor E.D. Polivanov stated that A. Baitursynov carried out a «ingenious reform of the Arabic script» (Stenograficheskiy otchet, 1927:81). He was supported by H.Dosmuhamedov, M.Dulatov and others.

As a part of ethno-bureaucracy there appeared the so-called Arabists and Latinists headed by N.Tyuryakulov. Arabists had leading posts both in the Commissariat of Education headed by Baitursynov and in press. Supporters of the Latin

alphabet often argued for a smooth transition to a new script, suggesting to use Baitursynov's ideas in spelling and reasoning against the total unification of the alphabet (Togzhanov, 1934:70). June 12-17, 1924, a Congress for the representatives of the Kazakh Education Committees took place in Orenburg. Eldes Omarov presented his report on spelling, his co-speaker was Mukhtar Murzin. 9 people voted for Nazir Tyuryakulov, 8 participants voted for Ahmet Baitursynov (Mukanova, 2014).

Turiakulov vindicated the Latin alphabet as follows: «We don't bring issues without careful examination, we are not going to forcibly enter the Latin alphabet, we are not interested in fashion. ... It is impossible to hold cultural progress on the ground that people are not accustomed to it. At first people didn't support locomotives and steamboats either, but nobody moves between Tashkent and Orenburg riding a camel now. It is necessary to switch to the Latin script. It is more convenient and cheaper in terms of typography.» Dulatov emphasized that instead of illiteracy elimination it could cause a greater number of illiterate people, besides that there was a lack of sufficient fundings. He suggested maintaining and improving the Turkic writing. H. Dosmukhamedov noted that the Kazakh language wasn't fully studied in terms of its internal reserves and demanded that the new terms to be introduced gradually and discussed publically. Baitursynov aggressively defended his position: «The Nazir's only keynote is the benefits of the Latin typographic font. We can't see a dark side of the moon now. People are very pervious and imitative. It is much more difficult to invent something of your own and new than to take over something ready from the others. ... The Kazakh youngsters must demonstrate resourcefulness, creativity and inventive mind. In that case you will create a variety of options out the Turkish writing. ... The Latin font is not easy. ... I don't recommend you to be fond of Latin: Latin is old, dead, it is just a delusion to try to revive it» (Ozganbai, 2003:146-154). In 1926 at the first Turkological Union Congress in Baku, Baitursynov again struggled for his ideas (Sbornik dokumentov i materialov, 1965:54). He also made an important report on scientific terminology. He called for the unity of the literary and national languages that could help in the course of their latinization.

Spelling of any language as a complex symbolic structure has a meaningful and figurative power and at the same time reflects the political course. The choice of spelling has some implicit and explicit social meanings. This is reflected both by users and creators. The social construct of a «standard

language» has a certain ideology. It is primarily identified by standard language users who support it's high status. At the same time, the use of non-standard writing is perceived as a certain marker. For example – political opposition, religious beliefs, class stratification, as it is not supported by the majority.

In 1943 a writer M. Gabdullin recalled: «My father Yelemesov Gabdulla was an educated his own way person. It means that he could read and write, while other Kazakhs couldn't. That was his advantage. He taught children the old Arabic alphabet. Earlier he was a teacher, now just an ordinary farmer.

After the Soviet power came into existence in 1924, there appeared primary schools in all villages. ... I began to study in native language. The school was located in a nearby village, situated 2 km. away from our village. We were taught Kazakh language and arithmetic. There were no textbooks. Nugmanov graduated from a course for teachers and came up with the knowledge that he got there. In the middle of the school year we received our first textbooks in the Arabic script. Now we have Russian fonts» (Nauchnyi arkhiv IRI RAN: 1, 2).

Baitursynov perfecting his project in 1924 proposed to write numbers from right to left so that the usual Arabic writing skills would lessen students' psychological discomfort. He continued to prove the benefits and possibilities of advanced Arabic graphics in typography, typewriting and teaching practice comparing to Russian and other European graphics (Baitursynuly, 2006:275-283; Baitursynuly, 2006:288). The usage of an old writing and Baitursynov's support showed a desire to emphasize the isolated cultures and were the means to represent and to become a symbol of identity preservation. A certain part of the old intellectuals considered a new alphabet as an attempt upon the identity, gave it a special value in the consciousness of the ethnic groups. Its suspension could not provide spelling and stylistic perfection reform of the Kazakh language, primarily due to the lack of staff.

Baitursynov in his report on merits of the Arabic alphabet, published in the book «Əlippe Aitys» (A discussion about the alphabet) in 1927, went on to prove the viability of the Arabic alphabet. He wrote that the acceptability or unacceptability of the Arabic or Latin script for the construction of the alphabet, spelling, designing principles for publishing were least dependent on graphics. It depended on the educational level of an expert. He noted that the Latin script could not be applied to Turkic languages; it must have been reformed by at least 25-30%.

Baitursynov admitted a possibility of it's gradual replacement by the Arabic script, under parallel existence of two graphics until it was completely transferred into the Latin. As a condition for it to be done he considered a methodology acceptance for teaching to read and write, as well as an easier visual perception. He referred to German experts and claimed that the Arabic script is perceived more quickly and more easily than the Latin alphabet, because reading is carried out not only by syllables, but also by the nature of the word mark as a whole, i.e. the graphic image character (Polemika, 1927:24).

A new Turkic alphabet was approved in 1927. T. Zhurgenev, S. Asfendiyarov, O. Jandosov, I. Kaboulov, T. Shonanov, stood for Latinization. In fact, the development of spelling, terminology, literary language development continued until the Latin alphabet was abdicated and the Cyrillic alphabet was accepted. According to G. Togzhanov, «Class enemies of the new alphabet shifted from schools and press into the Party and Soviet apparatus». Now both managers and activists were urged to use Latin alphabet not only at work but also at home (Togzhanov, 1934:71). According to the republic's leadership of the party, the Arabists' resistance was broken by the end of 1928. In July 1929, the CEC and the government of Kazakhstan approved the state alphabet (Sbornik dokumentov i materialov, 1965:69).

In 1930 by the USSR CPC decision the entire state apparatus had to use Latin alphabet in all proceedings, but in reality they did not succeed even by 1934. The Arabic alphabet along with the Russian alphabet remained an important communicative part among the locals in villages, areas, homes and works. Managers barely mastered new alphabet and preferred to write in Arabic even in provincial and regional institutions. They shifted Latin translation to typists. A very difficult task was the production of Latin alphabet typewriters. Thus schools and eradication of illiteracy centers graduates were semi-literate or even illiterate. A lot of them referred to the lack of Latin-literate authorities and transferred into Russian language at meetings and when drafting documents (Nurmakov, 1934:7; Togzhanov, 1934:67, 69).

In general, the integrity of the communicative field was reached by a set of measures, including a new script. Spreading Latin among the officials was an important issue for the authorities. The level they mastered written language influenced the language, the office culture, the status and scope of the language, the formation and the nature of the functional styles and speech. The difficulties with

administrative shifting to Latin influenced the bureaucrats' competence. Their attitude towards writings directly and indirectly influenced the public opinion about the importance of writing and speaking culture.

The Korenizatsiya policy increased the prestige of the language literacy and reasoned to master a writing culture. In connection with a new language ideology and policy, the linguistic and cultural socialization of the officials took place in a different system of symbols and values. Moreover, in social practice, there appeared a lot of new concepts and neologisms. A member of The All-Union Central Committee For New Alphabet E.D. Polivanov tried to appeal to class arguments: «You can even put a point of view which will determine the language of the average man in 1913 and, on the other hand, the language of a modern Komsomol member – is not seeing as two different dialects, it is seeing as two different languages» (Polivanov, 1928:167).

The ideological aspect was changing together with the context of use, genre, verbal reasoning in relation to the dynamics of representations and semiotic relationships. Prof. A.M. Selishchev pointed out: «The unity of a social life process and impact of the center is inextricably linked with language experiences, penetration of the center language elements into the regional workers language, even though they dealt with the issues of language purity, and tried to banish the old Russianisms» (Selishev:1927:220).

At the Communist University of the Toilers of the East (CUTE) in 1920-th the study of native languages along with the Russian language occupied an equal place in training the national personnel managers. Polivanov worked at the University and noticed that the students did not show any interest in the study of their native language, in contrast to the Russian language. Moreover, «their native language was not involved in the process of thinking while studying.» The literacy level in Russian was higher than in their mother tongue. Students could not use their native language to express non-conversational ideas. An ordinary CUTE student «... was educated as a Russian language speaker and remained a stranger to his native language» (Polivanov, 1927:113, 114). At the General Meeting for Kazakh Students in Moscow on April 24, 1927 a report on a new Kazakh alphabet by Turiakulov was supported. The students agreed that it's implementation required a systematic and hard work for a long time; they noted that any forcing and compulsion could only put the process back (Sbornik dokumentov i materialov, 1960:55).

However, the further development of the society showed some inconveniences and disadvantages of the Latin alphabet. M.Dulatov wrote how hard it was to keep proceedings in Kazakh language, as it became confusing when translating, clerical Kazakh language lost its meaning after a low-quality translation from Russian. For example a translation of a person's name Lev Tolstoy into Kazakh – the Kazakh variation was Juan Arystan. That literally meant Fat Lion (Amirkhazin, 2015).

In 1934, Mikhail Gavrilov, Terminology Committee Secretary at the People's Commissariat of the Republic, highlighted the difficulties and specificity of a language development in Kazakhstan in his report on «Kazakh language development» as follows: 1) features inherent to the Kazakh language: the sound effects associated with the law of vowel harmony; 2) the lack of a sufficient number of consonants in the Kazakh alphabet needed to transfer appropriate sounds of newly borrowed words; 3) the lack of lexicology. It meant not only the absence of new scientific categories and concepts, but also the simplest concepts associated with general cultural, urban and sedentary life. He stood for an efficient and gradual language addition with foreign borrowings and language development itself; he also noted to avoid double spelling and additional signs (CGA RK, 680:4).

They saw both native languages teaching process completion in secondary schools, colleges, pedagogical, medical schools and creating such a condition only by the end of the second 5-years plan (Maimin, 1932:38).

In addition, the simultaneous use of the Latin and the Russian alphabets – was difficult, because Kazakh students were taught in Russian. The republic government set up a committee to develop a new alphabet. A wide discussion on language policy spread in press. Zhurgenev paid attention to a semantic contradiction by using new alphabet under the conditions of socialist modernization. «The word 'belsendy», which is now is used as an adjective (active) and as a noun (asset) is actually a verb in the third person singular. Instead of unnecessary and harmful word creation it would be better to include the word «asset» with its unchanged meaning into the Kazakh language dictionary as it is already included in the Dictionary of International Terminology» (Zhurgenev, 1935:44-51).

He cited some translation examples: «water carriage trust» – as a trust, that lets water through the throat,» («Sotsialdy Kazakstan»); «warship» – as «a ship that is necessary to keep in front of bullets». There was often a lack of colloquial and dialectal

tal words to express the content on the Soviet and European lexicon and semantics, each added the dialects of their village into the contents of the selected terms. It also referred to the representatives of the People's Commissariat of Education. Various forms of new phrases and sentences unusual and alien to the structure of the Kazakh language together created a special jargon, that didn't differ from the old one. The textual translation of the Kazakh figurative expressions and zoo-technical terms led to a semantic incident. «For example, instead of saying, that the majority of women gained joined socialism-building process, they had «Oatndar Sabpangangatnast» («Sotsialdy Kazakstan», № 55), which in Kazakh is offensive and rude. Those examples were numerous. They, unfortunately, could be found in almost every issue of a newspaper such as «Sotsialdy Kazakstan». A translation of «Glavtabak» as «Bastemeki» (head of tobacco), or «OGIZ» (State union of books and magazines publishers) as «Ogiz», that means «bull» in Kazakh, not only facilitates the understanding of words translated, but also distorts and confuses its understanding» (Amirkhazin, 2015).

Later Zhurgenev extensively wrote about the typical terminology problems caused by semantic features of the language and the emergence of neologisms.

On August 8, 1939 a «popular» discussion of a new alphabet project began. On November 10, 1940 the fifth session of the Supreme Council of the Kazakh SSR adopted the law «On the Kazakh alphabet transference to a new Latinized alphabet based on Russian scripts». On November 13, 1940 they adopted the law «On the Kazakh alphabet transference to a new Latinized alphabet based on Russian scripts» (Sbornik dokumentov, 1997:180, 181).

When switching to the Cyrillic alphabet, differences between writing and pronunciation increased because writing was carried out close to the Russian language. Preferring to speak and communicate in their native language, the officials, in fact, retarded the development of a writing culture. As a result, Zhurgenev suggestion not to change international terminology and to provide common concepts in Russian and Kazakh languages was accepted. It was easier to implement after the Cyrillic introduction. But even in the 2-nd half of the XX century the Cabinet of Ministers or the Supreme Council used 20-25% of Russian words in Kazakh office language, that made understanding more difficult. A lot of terms remained untranslated into the Kazakh language.

Some translations were not accustomed.

Some terms were restored, for example «class» – «synyp». It is very difficult to find an equivalent for some certain terms when translating from Russian into Kazakh. For example, «part – bəlim», «department – bəlim» «section – bəlim» or «department – bəlimshe», «division – bəlimshe» or «rule – erezhe» and «position – erezhe», «consolidation – bekitu» and «statement – bekitu», «contract – Shart», «condition – Shart». How do we translate a phrase «contract condition» then? How do we translate into Kazakh a phrase «to state consolidation»?

Different types of writing reflected different history stages and different characters in ethnic consciousness. A language and cultural socialization of new generations of managers took place in the absence of the personal memory of the previous writings. In 1960 M. Auezov identified some changes in the Kazakh language as a result of illiteracy elimination, writings reforms and growth in cross-cultural communication: «The types of complex sentences that were hardly used in the recent past become quite natural nowadays. An author's speech in direct speech also becomes widespread now. The word order in the Kazakh language becomes more mobile. Literary styles are developing and differentiating». He said that the vocabulary development was due to the internationalization of linguistic practices: «Such successfully words traced from the Russian language as *beszhyldyk, eñbekkyn, kolzhazba, halykaralyk* and many others organically entered the Kazakh language. Some new phrases like *zheñilendiris* (light industry), *zhylzhymalykitaphana* (bookmobile), *kyrdelikarzhly* (investments), *zhasandyserik* (artificial satellite) came into the Kazakh language» (Auezov, 2015).

The issue of language was determined not only by the choice of optimal communication tool and modernization of multi-ethnic population, but had a deep symbolic and political significance. Language was an important tool for shaping peoples ethnoidentity of the USSR, served in the republics as marker for the admission to the privileges of the titular ethnic group and consolidate its administrative-territorial status.

In the organization and provision of the all government system of governance in the KASSR in 1920-1936 years special role played in the dynamics of discursive practices in bilingual space. The functionate of Russian and Kazakh languages has an ambivalent impact on the formation and activities of the management class in the indigenization and the transformation of.

Kazakh alphabet from Arabic script to Latin and Cyrillic

The alphabet reform was a part of a social actions system that implied the expression of its position and belongings, symbolic value, and other socially-mediated goals. The opposition «friend or foe», «prestige-non-prestige», «profitable-unprofitable», etc. in a bureaucratic society lined up both through the character, attitude of the transition to a new alphabet and the speed of its mastering in everyday life.

The need for identity, understanding and office unification were the main factors that influenced the role and spread of Kazakh and Russian languages. In reality a weaker language was displaced into less important and prestigious spheres of communication. The need for mutual understanding under the threat of war led to a greater role of the Russian language, especially in managerial environment. At the same time, Kazakh managers had poor command of the Russian language and adapted the content of their official speeches and documents to the level of their communicative competence. Career interests stimulated the study of the Russian language. Communication in closed meetings was mostly in Russian. Kazakh and Russian officials were in a privileged position in their own ethnic environment.

This could strengthen the inter-ethnic division, but a mass spread of the Russian language, especially in communication, prevented it. A more functionally-powerful language occupies new positions to meet the needs of people in mutual understanding. A mandatory use of the Kazakh language was a symbol of national equality in the governing bodies work. But a real decrease in the scope of writing operation led to a gap between written and oral language culture.

As a result, the national language literacy and its social status declined. Neglecting of written culture

became a routing and the command of the written Kazakh language among the officials was quite unsatisfactory. It influenced the general bureaucracy culture and language authority itself.

Interaction of institutions of governance and power from the center to the subjects of the federation (the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation, the KASSR), as well as places in the context of the simultaneous operation of native and national languages was largely depended on the business and political culture of the party and the Soviet nomenclature and its ethno-social parameters affected the evolution the national lexical stylistics and semantics as an indication of the quality and results of management.

Notes

Zhurgenev gave an example regarding a fall period when herbs dry up and so-called khazan-period (khazan-cauldron) by kazaks. During this period if you graze horses in a meadow of clover they will get diarrhea. There is a version that such story happened to the horse of Yana-Kurgan district police office in the old days.

The district chief convened a consultation of Kazakh cattle breeders, and they made the following conclusions in one voice from the examination of the sick horse, confirmed by centuries of pastoralism; «Cepti qazan soqqanda соңьақан көрpesin саялған мал сығьldag boladъ». The present staff translator of the district chief translated these words as follows: «kirghizs say, if cauldron hits the herbs and people allow the horse to feed on the carpet of clover, then shyrkyldak will be». Certainly, the district chief did not understand what are they talking about in this case as and translator. However, one should pay tribute to the translator, who did not translate the untranslatable (the term «shyrkyldak» is missing in the Russian language).

References

- Amirkhazin A. (2015). Nekotorye voprosu terminologii kazakhskogo yazuka [some questions of the Kazakh language terminology]. http://www.neotech.kz/terminology_ru.html. 30.11.2017.
- Asylbek M.Kh., Asylbekova Zh.M. (2015). Naselenie Kazakhstana mezhdru Vsesoyuznymi perepisyami 1926 g. и 1939 g. [Population of Kazakhstan 1926 and 1938] // <http://www.iie.kz/?p=4615>. 16.09.2017.
- Auezov M. (2015). O tradicionnom i novatorskom v kazakhskoi sovetskoj literature. [About traditional and innovative in the kazakh soviet literature]. <http://el.kz/m/articles/view/content-4822>. 30.11.2017.
- Baitursynuly A. (2006) Bes tomdyq shygarmalar zhinagy. [Collection of works in 5 volumes] T. 4. A'lippeler men maqalalar. Almaty: Alash. 275-283 ss.
- Baitursynuly A. (2006). Tuzetilgen a'rip. Baitursynuly A. Bes tomdyq shygarmalar zhinagy. [Collection of works in 5 volumes] T. 5. Almaty: «Alash» baspasy.

- CGA RK. F. 81. Op. 3. D. 680. L. 4.
GA RF. F. 1235. In. 121. D. 2. L. 16-36.
GA RF. F. 1235. In. 121. D. 161. L. 167, 172, 98, 41-43, 47, 37.
GA RF. F. 1235. In. 121. D. 2. L. 16-36.
- Ismagambetov T. (1997). Razvitie kazakhskogo isteblishmenta v konce XIX – seredine XX vekov [the development of Kazakh establishment in the late 19th and mid 20th] // *Centralnaya Aziya*. № 11. <http://turkolog.narod.ru>.
- Kazakhstanskaya pravda. (1997). Yazukovaya politika v Kazakhstane (1921 – 1990 gg.). [language policy in Kazakhstan] Sb. dokumentov. Almaty: Kazakh University.
- Kulturnoe stroitelstvo v Kazakhstane v 1918 – 1932 gg. (1965). [Cultural construction in Kazakhstan]. / Sbornik dokumentov i materialov. T. 1. Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan.
- Maimin I.B. (1932). O 2-i pyatiletke Kazakhstana. [about the second five-year plan]. Alma-Ata: Izdanie Gosplana KazASSR.
- Mukanova G.K.(2014) Vekhi identichnosti: diaspora I pervui nauchnyi kazakhskii s`ezd, 1924 g. [Milestones of identity] (Arkhivnye nakhodki) // Scientific E-journal «edu.e-history.kz» № 1 // <http://edu.e-history.kz/en/publications/view/107>
- Nauchnyi arkhiv IRI RAN. F. 2. Razdel IV. Op. 1. Delo na Geroya [SU hero's case] Sovetskogo Soyuz Malika Gabdullina.
- Nurmakov N. (1934). Latinizatsiya alfavita – orudie proletarskoi revoliutsii [Romanization of the alphabet]. Alfavit Oktyabrya. Itogi vvedeniya novogo alfavita sredi narodov RSGSR. Sb.st. pod obschei redaktsiei N.Nurmakova. Moscow-Leningrad.
- Ozganbai Ø. (2003). Zharygy oshpeitin zhuldyz. [The star that never sets]. Almaty: Uzh Qiyen.
- Polemika o vubore alfavita. (1927). [Debates of alphabet choice]. Kzyl-Orda: Kazgiz.
- Polivanov E.D. (1928). Osnovnye formy graficheskoi revoliutsii v tureckikh pismennostyakh SSSR [The main forms of graphic revolution]. *Novyi Vostok*. Kn.23-24. Moscow.
- Polivanov E.D. (1927). Rodnoi yazuk v nacionalnoi partshkole [Mother tongue in the national party school]. *Voprosy nacionalnogo partprosvescheniya*. Moscow.
- Selischev A.M. (1927). **Yazuk revoliucionnoi epokhi. Iz nabludehii nad russkim yazukom (1917-1926)**, [language of the revolutionary era]. Moscow.
- Stenograficheskyi otchet pervogo plenuma Vsesoyuznogo Centralnogo komiteta novogo tyurkskogo alfavita. (1927).[V erbatim record]. Moscow: Izdanie VCK NTA.
- Togzhanov G. (1934). Istoriya dvizheniya i pobedy novogo alfavita sredi kazakov [history of movement and victory of the new alphabet among the kazakhs]. Alfavit Oktyabrya. Itogi vvedeniya novogo alfavita sredi narodov RSGSR. Sb.st. pod obschei redaktsiei N. Nurmakova. Moscow-Leningrad.
- Zhurgenev T.K. (1935). Voprosu terminologii kazakhskogo yazuka [Terminology issues]. *Bolshevik Kazakhstana*. № 6.