

B.B. Kozhahmetov* , **D.S. Baygunakov** 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

THE ROLE OF THE DOG IN THE TRADITIONAL KAZAKH SOCIETY IN THE WORKS OF FOREIGN RESEARCHERS (second half of the XIX and early XX centuries)

The article analyzes the works of researchers providing information about superstitions and prohibitions related to the dog, deep roots of hunting with eagle and greyhound which have not lost their importance in the life, farming and cultural life of the Kazakh people from the ethnographic history of the Kazakh steppe in the second half of the XIX and the beginning of the XX centuries that continue to this day. The purpose and task of the research – is to study in the course of a historiographic analysis of the works of researchers that the dog, which as the first domesticated animal played an important role in the life of different nations – also in Kazakh society, as a protector of livestock, guard, in the hunting system – as a source of income and food, from a religious and mythological point of view – as a protector from evil. In the research work, the concept of “dog” is common to Turkic peoples, but there were a number of differences according to the peculiarities of the cultural and economic life of the nomadic Kazakh society, in particular, two types of dogs are common among Kazakhs, that is, “tobet” (dog) which protects livestock in nomadic life, and “tazy” (greyhound) which used in hunting were considered based on the works of A. Bram, A. Scherbak, A. Dobrosmyslov, Ya. Polferov, I. Ibrahimov, M. Masson. As well as, superstitions and rituals related to dogs in the worldview of Kazakhs were studied in the works of A. Divaev, A. Budagov, R. Karutz, S. Abramzon. Conclusion. Analyzing the works of researchers who provided information about the Kazakh dog, it was determined that dog played a significant role in the cultural, historical and economic life of the traditional Kazakh society and there were two types that were widespread in the Kazakh steppe.

Key words: Kazakhs, superstitions, dog, “zoological code”, data, historiography, totemism.

Б.Б. Кожаметов*, Д.С. Байгунаков

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық Университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан

*e-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

Қазақтардың дәстүрлі қоғамындағы иттің рөлі шетел зерттеушілерінің еңбектерінде (XIX ғ. екінші жартысы мен XX ғ. басы)

Мақалада қазақ халқының тұрмыс-тіршілігінде, шаруашылығы мен мәдени өмірінде маңызын жоғалтпай, бүгінгі күнге дейін жалғасын тауып келе жатқан итпен қатысты ырымдар мен тыйымдар, аңшылық пен саятшылықтың тамыры тереңде жатқаны, XIX ғасырдың екінші жартысы мен XX ғасырдың басындағы қазақ даласының этнографиялық тарихынан мәлімет беретін зерттеушілердің еңбектері талданады. Зерттеудің мақсаты мен міндеті – қолға үйретілген алғашқы үй жануар ретінде түрлі халықтардың өмірінде маңызды рөлге ие иттің – қазақ қоғамында да, мал-жайды қорғаушы, күзетші, аңшылық жүйеде – қорек, табыс әкелуші, діни-мифологиялық тұрғыдан – жамандықтан сақтаушы мәнге ие болғанын зерттеушілер еңбектеріне тарихнамалық талдау барсында зерделенеді. Зерттеу жұмысында “ит” ұғымы түркі халықтарына ортақ болғанымен, көшпелі қазақ қоғамының мәдени-шаруашылық өмірінің ерекшелігіне сәйкес, бірқатар айырмашылықтар болғаны туралы, атап айтқанда, қазақтарда кең тараған екі иттің түрі, яғни көшпелі өмірде мал-жанды қорғайтын – “төбет” жөнінде және аңшылықта қолданатын – “тазы” болғаны туралы А. Брем, А. Щербак, А. Добросмыслов, Я. Полферов, И. Ибрагимов, М. Массонның еңбектері негізінде дәйектеледі. Ал А. Диваев, А. Будагов, Р. Карутц, С. Абрамзонның еңбектері негізінде қазақтардың дүниетанымындағы итпен байланысты ырымдар мен салт-жоралғылар зерделенді. Қорытынды. Қазақ иті туралы мәлімет берген зерттеушілердің еңбектерін талдай келе, қазақтың дәстүрлі қоғамында иттің мәдени, тарихи, шаруашылық тұрмысында маңызды рөл атқарғанын және қазақ даласында кең таралған екі түрі болғанын айқындалды.

Түйін сөздер: қазақтар, ырымдар, ит, “зоологиялық код”, деректер, тарихнама, тотемизм.

Б.Б. Кожаметов*, Д.С. Байгунаков

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан

*e-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

**Роль собаки в традиционном обществе казахов
в трудах зарубежных исследователей
(вторая половина XIX – начало XX вв.)**

В статье на основе трудов исследователей, дающих сведения из этнографической истории казахской степи второй половины XIX-начала XX веков, анализируются суеверия и запреты, связанные с собакой, которые продолжают существовать и по сей день, не утрачивая значения в быту, хозяйстве и культурной жизни казахского народа. Цель и задача исследования – путем историографического анализа трудов исследователей изучается, что собака как первое одомашненное животное играет важную роль в жизни разных народов и в казахском обществе, как в качестве защитника скота, охранника, как охотника – кормильца, приносящего доход, в религиозной – мифологий – хранитель зла. В исследовательской работе было установлено, что, хотя понятие “собака” было общим для тюркских народов, в соответствии со спецификой культурно-хозяйственной жизни кочевого казахского общества существовал ряд различий. В частности, о том, что два вида собак, широко распространенные у казахов, то есть те, которые в кочевой жизни защищают скот – “тобет” и те, которые используют на охоте – “борзые”, свидетельствуют труды А. Брема, А. Щербака, А. Добросмыслова, Я. Полферова, И. Ибрагимова, М. Массона. А на основе трудов А. Диваева, А. Будагова, Р. Каруца, С. Абрамзона были изучены суеверия и обряды, связанные с собакой в мировоззрении казахов. Вывод. Анализируя труды исследователей, давших сведения о казахской собаке, было установлено, что в традиционном казахском обществе собака играла важную роль в культурной, исторической, хозяйственной жизни и имела два распространенных вида в казахской степи.

Ключевые слова: казахи, суеверия, собака, “зоологический код”, источники, историография, тотемизм.

Introduction

In the world view of all the peoples of the world, connecting with the “magic power of nature”, there is found the role of animals everywhere. For example: there can be totemism, natural-economic and socio-religious cults, traditions based on beliefs and superstitions, hunting and others. As an integral part of the sphere of mythological and traditional culture, the abundance of zoomorphic images is observed in the manifestation of physical, emotional, intellectual and other features of each people. Including communication with animals, together with the mythological understanding from ancient times, allows us to identify ethno-cultural connections. A comprehensive research of ideas about the animal world that has never been studied before in domestic and foreign science, allows for significant progress in research in this field, understanding of the “zoological code” of the culture of various nations.

When considering the ethnic history of any nation, its traditional worldview is an important aspect that determines its lifestyle, culture, and mentality.

The role of the dog as one of the first domesticated animals, the encounter of dog bones and images found as a result of archaeological excavations carried out in different regions, becomes clear that the dog had a certain importance in the history of

each country. We were sure of this while studying the works of foreign researchers who raised the issue of the role of the “dog” in society. The purpose of the article is – to determine the role of the dog in Kazakh society relying on published research on the basis of ethnographic data collected as a result of scientific expeditions of various directions in the Kazakh steppes in the second half of the XIX and early XX centuries.

Materials and methods

The study of the problem was based on the works of foreign researchers who investigated issues related to dogs with the history of different nations internationally, and the research works of Russian and German scientists who conducted scientific expeditions in various directions in the Kazakh steppe in the second half of the XIX and early XX centuries. In the course of the differentiation of these works, it determines that problem of the role of dog in society as a “cult” is common not only by the Kazakh people, but also by the Turkic peoples who are connected with world history.

In the course of the research, there were applied general historicity, objectivity, historiographic analysis, and historical-comparative methods of scientific research aimed at effectively solving the set tasks.

The data base of our research work is provided by scientific articles and works of Russian and German researchers and travelers who conducted study in various scientific expeditions to Central Asia and the Kazakh steppe: as A. Divaev, A. Bram, M. Masson, R. Karutz, N. Grodekov and others.

In the process of analyzing the works of Russian and foreign researchers, we obtain information about the place of the dog in the social and traditional society of each nation, the role of the dog in the farming, and the continuity associated with the dog in its historical and cultural life. This is because, if we consider any nation, there is a mythology related to animals in its original history.

Results and analysis

The methodological basis of the research work is based on the theories and concepts that are guided by the works of foreign scientists considered in the course of historiographic analysis. In particular, taking into account the main concepts in the theoretical work of K. Levi-Stros "Totemism today" (Levi Stros, 2008), we can determine the role of the dog in the Kazakh tradition based on the works of Russian orientalist.

One of the domesticated animals of humans the dog – there is no clear conclusion about when the dog became a pet and from which territory it spread. According to archaeologists and genetic scientists, the area of origin of the long process, which covered the time from 15,000 to 30,000 years before our era, is Europe, Siberia or East Asia. However, they concluded that hunter-collectors in Europe began to domesticate dogs before the first agriculture appeared and before dogs became pets. Skeletons of dogs dating back to the early Stone Age were found in the territories of Belgium, Germany, Moravia and Russia (O. Thalmann et al., 2013).

In 1975, palentologist N.D. Ovodov conducted research on a skull of the dog with a completely preserved lower jaw and teeth at the Accelerator Mass Spectrometry Laboratory of the University of Arizona in 2008 which found in the Razboinichya cave in Altai and identified as the oldest dog, in 2009 the result was confirmed that age of the dog found in the Razboinichya cave is about 33,000 years old and it was carried out by Oxford University scientist Thomas Hayem (UK) and Groningen University (Netherlands) scientist Johannes van der Plicht (Kuzmin, 2011). In the conclusion of this scientific result, according to the researchers, the area of distribution of the first domesticated dog was East Asia, however, taking into account that the ances-

tors of dogs come from wolves, it noted that it is necessary not to forget that wild wolves coexisted with dogs in every territory of the globe. However, some researchers pointed out that the dog's genetics coincides with wolves, shibori (jackals) and coyotes (Emelyanov et al., 2007: 31-32).

Researcher P. Pallas quoted information about the influence of various wild animals on the breed of the dog as – wolf, fox, tiger, jackal based on the writings of Aristotle: "Aristotle says that there were many mixed breeds of dogs before it, but that the best dogs are considered to be those that have the most similarity with wild animals, that is, with a wolf, fox and tiger. It is known that dog breeds from a wolf and a fox; but there is no doubt that dog will also breed with jackal, which easily makes friends with dog and gets used to a person", three types of dog were depicted, it was mentioned separately according to the areas of distribution: "We accept the breed of Asian nomads as one of the original breeds. This breed is not as thin as the European shepherd dog and resembles jackal. It seems that Aristotle's *Canis moloticus* belongs here. It is most probable to suppose that this breed originated from the mix of a domesticated jackal with a wolf. Further to the north, in cold countries where the jackal could no live, in the formation of the dog breed, the wolf was predominantly involved, thus the stronger and more vicious shepherd dog appeared. This was undoubtedly Aristotle's *Canis pecuarius*. This dog differs little from the wolf in fur and color. In the Asian steppes, the purity of the breed is still maintained from time to time by means of a jackal. The greyhound from the Levantine mountains, mixed with the northern dog, became the Danish dog. The so-called dog (Medelyan) comes from India and South Asia and according to the ancient stories, there is the product of hyena with one of the strong breeds of dog" (Marakuev, 1877: 38-39).

According to D. Walsh, he notes that "we recognize the domesticated dog and horse – as the most reliable, intelligent and loving companion of man", the fact that the dog has been with man since immemorial time and as a pet has contributed to the popularity of its abilities (capabilities) compared to other animals in natural world and their presence in different shades, shapes, temperaments depends on climatic features and food in each region (Walsh, 1898).

We can determine the role of the dog in society by distinguishing rituals, proverbs, legends and artifacts found in archeological excavations which are detected in the lifestyles of different peoples. Because, the dog is – one of the domestic animals

that played an important role in both nomadic and sedentary society.

The first records of the dog as a domestic animal in Central Asia dates back to the poem of Avesta, religious monument of ancient times, depicting many local phenomena and folk ideas of the first half of the 1st millennium BC. It is considered as an ancient pet created by Akhura Mazda to help settlers who work the land and livestock. Coming across the dog bones with horse, slaves and wife and various items buried with the owner in the belief that they will be needed in the afterlife, discovered in the north Kyrgyzstan and south Kazakhstan in mounds dating back to the 1st-2nd centuries, emphasize its role (Masson, 1956:149).

The fact that in the history of early Turkic tribes, information about dogs is less common than about wolves, Polish scientist E. Trijarski reported that nearly 150 names of dogs can be found in the language of modern Turkic peoples, “at each stage of the development of Turkic society, there were two positions regarding dogs, the first as found in written and archaeological sources – as a religious cult, and the second reached through folklore and language words – in the form of discord and hatred, that is, serious insults such as equating man to a dog and woman to a bitch” [...dependent on time, area, beliefs and individual: in some periods, the dog used to be the object of religious cult, in others cases, or even simultaneously, an object of enmity and contempt. The first case is clearly evidenced by written and archaeological sources, the second can be observed in folklore and language tradition – calling a man a dog and woman a bitch has always been among the Turks, like among all other peoples, a grave insult] focused on what happened and considered examples of Turkic legends related to dogs (Tryjarski, 1979: 297-298).

Considering the legend of the wolf and the crow in the worldview of the Wu-sun and Mongolian tribes belonging to the Altai language based on Chinese data, Yu. Namu noted the existence of such a legend in the history of ancient Rome, identified their differences from each other and explained the reason for the similarity of the legends and pointed out that these tribes as Wu-sun and Xunnu lived along the Great Silk Road, which connected Eastern and Western cultures, and clarified it with the history of cultural exchange of certain ethnic groups in the ancient Eurasian contingent. (Namu, 2006).

Peter Golden, who has examined the role of the wolf and the dog in the Kypchaks' religious position, notes that these two animals played a significant role in the Eurasian steppe before the con-

version to Islam “I would like to turn now to two particular elements in the religious system of the Qipchaqs before they adopted one or another of the monotheistic, universal religions. Both of these elements focus on two important animals in the steppe world: the wolf and the dog. As we will see, these animals have a long history in the belief systems of the Eurasian steppes” (Golden, 1997: 87-88).

However, noting that there is no common opinion among scientists on the principle of the pre-Islamic Turkic tribes regarding dogs, on the basis of data, they analyze the presence of human names associated with the name “dog” in the Oguz, Kipchak, Kangli tribes as follows: “Nonetheless, synonyms figure in the anthroponymy and ethnonymy of some Turkic (and Mongol) peoples. The Oguz tribal legends tell of a struggle with the Qil Baraq, appropriately led by It Barak (“Turk. It/dog”), whose menfolk, as their name suggests (Turk gil “hair” often used in animal compounds, e.g. gil guš: “swallow”, baraq “long-haired dog”) resemble dogs. The Qil Baraq are probably to be identified with the Pecenegs. Relatively early examples of canine-based anthroponymy can be seen in the name of the Khazar Itax =Itaq, who was among the early gulams brought into Abbasid service during the Caliphate of Ma-mun (813-833). Among the pre-Cinggisid era Qipchaqs and Qangli we find personal names such as: Itlar (Итларь), It-ogli (Итоглый), Itük (Итык) as well as the clan/tribal-name Itoba. The notes of the Synaxarion of Sudaq, the Crimean port city dominated by the Cumans in which a sizable Christianized Cuman population lived, mentions It/it-Mengu. We also encounter canine names such as: Qutuz Xan (in Chinese transcription Huo-t’u-szu-han, < Türk, qutuz “mad dog”), Aqa Köpäk (< Türk, köpek “dog”) Aq Qasar (two mamluks of Toqsoba Qipchaq origin, qasar is the name of a kind of dog). In this connection we might note that Bonjak had the sobriquet in Rus’ of “seludivyj” “mangy” (= Turk qotur). Other Mamlük canine names include Enük (Türk, enük “chiot, lionceau, petit de lion, du chien, des fauves en général”) and Küçük (Turk. Küçük “chiot”). In Uyğur juridical documents from Turfan (probably dating to the twelfth Century, but not later than the fourteenth Century), we find an individual named It Saman. Ibn Battüta mentions a daughter of Uzbek khan (1312-1341) of the Ulus of Joči named It-Küçük. Rasid ad-Din mentions a number of individuals with synonyms in the Cinggisid era, e.g. It Qara, an important amir of Batu and It Buqa who took part in an expedition against the Qirgiz led by Toq Temur”. Talking about the Kypchak tribe and their dog sacrifice, it concludes that the role of the

dog in the world view of the Kypchaks is different from that of other Turkic tribes (Golden, 1997: 94-95).

Researcher A. Divaev pointed out that names of pets and wild animals, birds, metals, that is, surrounding objects, especially men's names, are more common in the names of Volga Tatars and Central Asian Uzbek-Kyrgyz (Kazakhs) than Osman Turks. For example: *Tuie(bai)* Camel(rich), *Zhylky(bai)* Horse(rich), *Buralky* pye-dog, *Kushik(bai)* Puppy(rich), *Karsak(bai)* Corsac (rich), *Tulki(bai)* Fox(rich), *Kaban(bai)* Boar(rich), *Bori(bai)* Wolf(rich), *Sunkar(bai)* Falcon(rich), *Shortan(bai)* Pike(rich), *Temir(bai)* Iron (rich),..." (Divaev, 1916: 1). According to the researchers, in the Turkic peoples, when their little children often died and "did not survive", in order to save the newly born baby, names like "Zhamanit" (Bad dog), *Itayak*, *Bokmuryr*" were given to children (Urmanche, 2015: 110). The research works of R. Karutz N.I. Grodekov were considered as "If children are dying in the family and the parents are afraid that the newly born child will not die, they will call him *toktamys* = he stays alive (expressing this desire to live for ten years), or he will be called by some ugly, repulsive name, for example: *it-ketyu* = dog-back, *it-basi* = dog-head and others (Karutz, 1911: 82). In order for the newborn baby to have a long life, they give unpleasant names such as "Kushikbai, Kotibar, Bokkut (Bokkut), Maykut, Itayak, Katpa (camel disease). For example, it was said that the reason for the name Kushikbai is "bir kuchukdei Tiri bulub yurermeken", which they put in the belief that he would live a long life (Grodekov, 1889: 99). As well as, information about the name of the dog was found in rituals related to the family formation, for example, it was reported that a man who came to see his proposed bride for the first time (coming secretly) gives gifts to women who prepare "Itiryldar" ritual (Grodekov, 1889: 71; Brem, 1894: 339). Such information has in A. Divaev's work: "It-yryldar – for chasing away dog that is growling at the groom. They say that the dog is represented by a woman sitting at the threshold of the yurt" (Divaev, 1900: 21), in I. Ibragimov's work "Before he enters the yurt, the doors of which he opens himself, an old woman grabs his shirt with her teeth, which is called *it-yryldar* (the dog growls); the old woman also releases the groom not before receiving a gift from him" (Ibragimov, 1872: 137) and it is also found in the work of A. Budagov: "the dog is growling – this is what an old woman is called, grumbling at the entrance to the newlyweds' yurt to receive a gift. That's what the best gift is called" (Budagov, 1869:

32). As well as, ritual that is associated with marriage, information related to a dog can be found as: "kargu-bau (dog-collar), gifts given by the groom or his parents before the actual wedding, as a kind of betrothal ceremony" (Budagov, 1871: 11).

Patrik Hellzon, Laszlo Karoy and Ingvar Svanberg focusing on the types of dogs distributed in the territory of East Turkestan, analyze the beliefs associated with dogs, reporting on the revival of the most common treatment methods in folk medicine associated with a dog in Central Asia during the Covid-19 pandemic. A comprehensive analysis of the important role of the dog in the daily life of the people in the territory of East Turkestan was carried out. Among them, it is noted that in the nomadic Kazakh steppes there were two types of service (assistant) dogs, namely "tobet" for guarding livestock, and "tazy" for hunting: "the Kazakh nomads in Dzungaria kept two kinds of working dogs. While one breed was kept as a livestock guardian dog to protect the herds from predatory animals, another was a lazy dog, a saluki-like sighthound used for hunting. Nowadays, there are many international or nationally recognized Central Asian breeds such as the Central Asian Ovcharka (Alabai, Tobet), Tuvan Ovcharka, and Kazakh Tazy" (Hällzon P. et al., 2022: 251-252). Explaining the names of domestic and wild animals common in the languages of the Turkic peoples, A. Shcherbak emphasized that the word "dog" is known to everyone (except Khakass) in the Turkic language, explained the essence of the words "dog, bitch, puppy, arlan", according to the dictionary of V.V. Radlov "tobet is a breed of big dogs", "it is not noted anywhere in modern languages, therefore it is difficult to talk about any moments of semantic transformation of the word in question," – he said that this word caused difficulty in revealing the meaning of the word (Shcherbak, 1961: 128). Most of the scientists and travelers who left information about the dog, when writing about the "tobet", describe it only as a "dog" that protects livestock and houses.

German scientist A. Brem, who traveled through the Kazakh steppes to the city of Shaueshek, described the high role of four types of livestock in Kazakh society, starting with horses, and reported that the Kazakhs liked hunting, and said that there were two types of dogs: "If hunting with eagle requires great skill of a rider, it is even more necessary when hunting antelope with greyhounds. Kyrgyz thick-legged dogs fly like an arrow when they see a fast-footed animal, and rider rushes after it over rocks and bushes until he catches up with the pursued goat..." (Brem, 1894: 329) – he said about the

hunting dog – greyhound that they are fast, and the Kazakh dog that protects livestock is explained as: “Then comes the dog, which enjoys the least respect among the domestic animals of the Kyrgyz. It is for the most part a large dog, in any case, significantly different, in its favor, from the ugly mongrels found in other parts of Siberia and in Turkestan. The body structure is more like a greyhound than a shepherd dog, its head is oblong but awkward, fur is long and soft, tail is fluffy, and the color is different. The extremely vigilant and brave Kyrgyz dog is a dangerous opponent of the wolf, a reasonable and cautious protector for weaker cattle, a tireless watchman, a faithful slave to its master and a companion in the games of his children; it thus combines in itself many of the virtues of its breed, and therefore it is kept in every yurt, or at least in every village” (Brem: 1896: 145).

A. Dobrosmyslov gave information about the Kazakhs living in Torgai region having two types of dogs and their characteristics, care, and role in society and he points out as: “The importance of the dog in the Kyrgyz farming is very significant; it guards the Kyrgyz dwellings and their herds... Most Kyrgyz keep one dog, large sheep breeders keep up to 10; on average, there are 2 dogs per yurt, or from 150,000 to 160,000 heads in the region. The Kyrgyz of the Torgai region have two breeds of dogs: the common Kyrgyz dog and the greyhound, of which the former constitutes the main contingent of all steppe dogs, the greyhound (tazy) is rare. In all Torgai district there are not more than 100 examples, and in all regions there are hardly 500-600” and he describes their features (Dobrosmyslov, 1898: 1). The first mentioned Kazakh dog – emphasizes that the dog is mainly a reliable companion of pastoralists, has a very important role for shepherds, and the greyhound is highly valued by professional hunters, their value is even equal to a good horse or camel.

Researcher Ya. Polferov analyzed the information in Bram’s work as “a good falcon, a fast dog, a noble horse is more valuable than twenty women” and considered the greyhound as the most reliable companion and friend of the Kazakh hunters, stated that it does not help the owner in his life, but also “gives him good feelings” (Polferov, 1896: 19-20). As well as, in his work, the Kazakh greyhounds were divided into two groups: field and mountain, described their characteristics and reported the methods of hunting wolves, foxes, corsac, and rabbits with greyhounds (Polferov, 1896: 17-50).

I. Ibragimov, who gave information about the good development of hunting in Kazakhs and said as follows: “Hunting with greyhounds, ‘tazy’, can also be entertaining. The Kyrgyz people also go

hunting fox in fresh snow. Here owner does not look for the trace, but the dogs do it themselves. A dog experienced in hunting very quickly attacks the trace; having caught up with the fox, it grabs it by the face, not allowing it to defend itself, throws it to the ground, and then the owner finishes it off” (Ibragimov, 1876: 53).

The scientist M. Masson, who studied the position of the peoples of the Central Asian territory in relation to the dog and the well-developed hunting, said that the Kazakh greyhound is very fast and hunts along with the eagle: “The Kazakh and Turkmen tazy (greyhound) has a great fame, a breed of steppe greyhounds is common from Mongolia to Arabia and further across North Africa to Morocco. Among the local tazy, the Kazakh greyhound was less purebred and somewhat rough in shape. Most often, these were dogs of a light fawn color, although there were also red, white, black and piebald ones. Not distinguished by their speed, they were quite hardy in running long distances (up to 15 km). Tazy was used most often for hares and foxes; wolves were taken rarely and only in a pack. In addition, Kazakh tazy was used in mixed hunting with eagle, which, having flown to the animal (saiga, gazelle etc.), rushed at the prey, dug its claws in, and held the animal for a while until the tazy had arrived in time, finally took possession of it” (Masson, 1956:154-155).

A. Divaev, who wrote a legend about the hunting dog of the Kazakh people “Kumai Tazy” (greyhound), heard from the Kazakhs in Kazaly, Perovsk, Shymkent districts, said as follows: “... it-ala kaz (dog – motley goose) lays eggs in old abandoned cemeteries (graves), on deserted and elevated hills, where there are uninhabited burrows of various animals. From the eggs hatch hounds, nicknamed as “kumai”. They appear tiny, have a black or white chest, are distinguished by extraordinary speed, courage and dexterity, so that not a single victim of the hunt, subjected to the pursuit of the kumai, remains uncaught” – giving information about the connection of the history of the origin of the “Kumay” dog with the bird, he said that this legend is confirmed by both the old and the young people (Divaev, 149).

In the Explanatory Dictionary of the scientist A. Budagov, there are also proverbs on the age of the dog, on different names depending on the species, and on the existence of dogs trained for hunting (Budagov, 1869: 177; 239; 364; Budagov, 1871: 100, 144) such as: “when the enemy grabs you by the collar, the dog grabs you by the hem”, “not every barking dog bites”, “a complete fool praises his wife, a completely smart one – his dog” (Budagov, 1869:

430; 512; 575). “If a dog gets fat, bites its owner, a slave goes crazy – throws a fishing rod into a well (i.e. causes at least some harm)”, “just as a fox does not like a dog’s somersaults (friskiness), so a sick person does not like gaiety (strangers)”, “if a bad dog gets fat, then it will not let anyone near it”, “a dog instructs a dog, and the dog instructs its tail (only wags its tail, it instructs another to carry out given task to him) (Budagov, 1871: 71; 161; 345; 385), also analyzed the occurrence of resentment (insulting) or admiring words (for example: “son of dog”, “dog begets dog”), and explained the meaning of the word “four-eyed dog” as follows: “Four-eyed dog (that’s what Kyrgyz call dogs having two black spots above their eyes)” (Budagov, 1871: 412). Proverbs related to dogs can be found in the works of other researchers. For example: “If a dog falls once, it must fall three more times” – similar in meaning to ours: “Trouble has come, open the gates” (Karutz, 1911: 93)»’

During his visit to Mangyshlak, the German scientist R. Karutz noted that Kazakhs use dogs to hunt foxes and rabbits and keep a pack of dogs to protect the village and livestock. It also tells about the fact that despite the fact that Kazakhs adhere to the Islamic religion, they turn to shamanism in the treatment of diseases. The information that the shaman used the skulls of one horse and two dogs is described as follows: “After the scene of the spell in the yurt, at which the sorceress, unfortunately, did not allow me to be present, and which consists mainly in shaking and rolling the patient, whistling and shouting, they take a horse’s skull, studded with dolls, i.e. sticks wrapped in rags and painted with red dots, and two more dog skulls, painted in the same way, they take them out into the steppe and put one behind the other on the road (mostly there are trampled paths leading to a well); then they burn the old rags and whistle and blow at the evil spirits which are embodied in the dolls and are carried away by a horse driven by dogs. The skulls are left in the very place where they were placed until they are trampled by animals, and rain and wind do not turn them into dust. If Kyrgyz encounters them on his way, he will go around them, but it is not customary to hide them or cover them in the ground” (Karutz, 1911: 127-128).

Based on the work of researchers, S. Abramzon reported that the Kazakhs paid great attention to the skull of dog and used it by Kazakh healers in the treatment of “bedlamite” and stated as: “Kazakh shamans (baksy) in the Irgiz and Torgai regions placed painted horse skulls near the main roads when driving out evil spirits from the sick people. Baksy would take a woman possessed by an

evil spirit to the main road, recite a series of spells, circle a painted horse skull over her head, and then place it to the side. Sometimes the skull of one or two dogs would be placed behind. It was assumed that the horse would carry away the spirits, and the dogs behind would urge the horse on”- and explains the reason why shamans-healers use the skulls of two dogs along with the skull of a horse (Abramzon, 1978: 62-62).

Conclusion

After analyzing the information provided, we conclude that the works of researchers, travelers of the second half of the XIX-early XX centuries are scientific heritage, which is an important source in the study of the role of dogs in the life, traditions and customs of the Kazakh people. Analyzing the works of researchers, we find out that, like other peoples, Kazakhs have superstitions and prohibitions, proverbs and sayings associated with the dog in their life, traditions, and that the dog played an important role in nomadic Kazakh society as a pet. This is evidenced by the fact that Kazakhs, as a protective “force” from evil, call their young children by the name of the dog, the presence of rituals, proverbs and sayings associated with the dog in rituals.

From mythological point of view – some nations connect their origins with dogs, and from economic and cultural point of view in the history of many nations, the role of the dog – is closely associated with the farming – it is known as hunter” that brings food to the house during the hunting, a “shepherd” that takes care for livestock, a house guard, a reliable companion of the owner, protector from evil and others.

Information about the important role of the dog in the life of Kazakhs can be noticed in the works of researchers and scientists, described from various points of view, who made a significant contribution to the study of Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the second half of the XIX and the beginning of the XX centuries. In particular, studying the works of scientists about herding dogs – “tobet” and hunting dogs “tazy” which are widespread in the Kazakh steppe, today we can consider it as an important fact in determining the characteristics of the “Kazakh greyhound”.

Acknowledgements

The article was written based on the project: «API4869303 – Ethnozooarchaeology study of the role of wolf and dog in ancient and modern cultures of Kazakhstan».

Әдебиеттер

- Абрамзон С.М. (1978). Предметы культа казахов, киргизов и каракалпаков. Сборник музея антропологии и этнографии XXXIV. Материальная культура и хозяйство народов Кавказа, Средней Азии и Казахстана. Ленинград: «Наука» Ленинградское отделение. С. 44-67.
- Брем А. (1894). Бытовая и семейная жизнь киргизов. Ежемесячное литературное приложение при журнале “НИВА”, №2. Санкт-Петербург: Издание А.Ф. Маркса. С. 325-346.
- Брем А. (1896). Степные кочевники-скотоводы. Ежемесячное литературное приложение к журналу “НИВА”, за январь, февраль, март и апрель. Санкт-Петербург: Издание А.Ф. Маркса. С. 131-158.
- Будагов Л. (1869). Сравнительный словарь Турецко-татарских наречий, с включением употребительных слов арабских и персидских и с переводом на русский язык. В 2-х томах. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук. Том 1. 813 с.
- Будагов Л. (1871). Сравнительный словарь Турецко-татарских наречий, с включением употребительных слов арабских и персидских и с переводом на русский язык. В 2-х томах. Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук. Том 2. 416 с.
- Диваев А. (1908). Ит-ала-каз (Поверье). Этнографическое обозрение. Издание Этнографического отдела Императорского общества любителей естествознания, антропологии и этнографии. №1-2, с. 149-150.
- Диваев А. (1916). К вопросу о наречении имен у киргизов. Туркестанские ведомости, №206, с. 1.
- Диваев А. (1900). О свадебном ритуале Киргизов Сыр-Дарьинской области. Казань: Типо-литография Императорского университета. С. 1-27.
- Добросмыслов А. (1898). Разведение и содержание киргизами собак. Тургайская газета, 30 августа, № 35, с. 1-4.
- Емельянов А.В., Гусев А.А., Громаков Н.А. (2007). Животные Зооботанического сада ТГУ. Волк обыкновенный. Биология. Экология. Культ. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина. 41 с.
- Голден П.Б. (1997). Волки, собаки и религия кипчаков. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, т. 50, №1/3, с. 87-97. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23658208>. Доступ получен 1 июля 2024.
- Гродеков Н.И. (1889). Киргизы и Каракиргизы Сыр-Дарьинской области. Том первый. Юридический быт. Ташкент: Типо-литография С.И. Лахтина. 528 с.
- Хельзон П., Кароли Л., Сванберг И. (2022). Собака для лечения и немного теста для зуба. Историческая роль домашней собаки и других псовых в различных лечебных практиках в Восточном Туркестане / В книге: Община все еще важна: Юбилейный сборник Ильдико Беллер-Хана, ред. Айсима Мирсултан, Эрик Шлуссель и Эсет Сулейман. Издательство: NIAS Press, Копенгаген. С. 248-264.
- Ибрагимов И. (1876). Очерки быта киргизов. Древняя и новая Россия. Исторический иллюстрированный ежемесячный сборник. Санкт-Петербург: Хромолитография и типография В.И. Гращенского. Том 3. №9. С. 51-63.
- Ибрагимов И. (1872). Этнографические очерки Киргизского народа. Русский Туркестан. Сборник. Выпуск второй. Москва: Университетская типография Катков и ко. 289 с.
- Каруц Р. (1911). Среди киргизов и туркмен на Мангышлаке. Перевод Е. Петри. Санкт-Петербург: Издание А.Ф. Деврина. 188 с.
- Кузьмин Я.В. (2011). Древнейшая в Азии собака. Наука в Сибири, №30-31 (2815-2816). <http://www.nsc.ru/NBC/article.phtml?nid=600&id=17>.
- Леви-Строс К. (2008). Тотемизм сегодня. Неприрученная мысль. Перевод с фр. А.Б. Островского. Москва: Академический Проспект. 520 с.
- Массон М. (1956). К истории охотничьих собак Средней Азии. Труды Среднеазиатского Государственного университета им. В.И. Ленина. Археология Средней Азии. Ташкент: Издательство САГУ. С. 148-155.
- Маракуев В. (1877). Петр Симон Паллас, его жизнь, ученые труды и путешествия. Москва: Типография А.А. Торлецкого и ко. 214 с.
- Наму Дж. (2006). Мифы и традиционные верования о волке и вороне в Центральной Азии: Примеры тюркских усуней и монголов. Asian Folklore Studies, т. 65, №2, с. 161-77. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030397>. Доступ получен 1 июля 2024.
- Польферов Я.Я. (1896). Охота в Тургайской области (с рисунками). Оренбург: Типо-литография П.Н. Жаринова. 141 с.
- Щербак А.М. (1961). Название домашних и диких животных в тюркских языках. Историческое развитие лексики тюркских языков. Москва: Издательство Академии Наук СССР. С. 82-172.
- Тальманн О. и др. (2013). Полные митохондриальные геномы древних псовых предполагают европейское происхождение домашних собак. Science. Т. 342, №6160, с. 871-874. DOI:10.1126/science.1243650 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1243650#tab-citations>.
- Третьяковский Э. (1979). Собака в тюркском ареале: Этнолингвистическое исследование. Central Asiatic Journal, т. 23, №3/4, с. 297-319. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41927272>. Доступ получен 1 июля 2024.
- Урманче Ф.И. (2015). Тюркский героический эпос. Казань: ИЯЛИ. 448 с.
- Уолш Г.Е. (1898). Культ собаки. The North American Review. Т. 167, №500, с. 120-123. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25119039>. Доступ получен 2 июля 2024.

References

- Abramzon S.M. (1978). Predmety kul'ta kazahov, Kirgizov i karakalpakov [Objects of worship of Kazakhs, Kyrgyzs and Karakalpaks]. Sbornik muzeja antropologii i jetnografii XXXIV. Material'naja i kul'tura i hozjajstvo narodov Kavkaza, Srednej Azii i Kazahstana. Leningrad: «Nauka» Leningradskoe otdelenie. – S. 44-67. [in Russian].
- Brem A. (1894). Bytovaja i semejnaja zhizn' kirgizov [Household and family life of the Kyrgyz]. Ezhemesjachnyj Literaturnaja Prilozhenija pri zhurnale "NIVA", №2. Sank-Peterburg: Izdanie A.F. Marksa. S. 325-346. [in Russian].
- Brem A. (1896). Stepnye kochevniki-skotovody [Steppe nomads-pastoralists]. Ezhemesjachnyj Literaturnaja Prilozhenija k zhurnalu "NIVA", za janvar', fevral', mart i april'. Sank-Peterburg: Izdanie A.F. Marksa. S. 131- 158. [in Russian].
- Budagov L. (1869) Sravnitel'nyj slovar' Turecko-tatarskih narechij, so vkljucheniem upotrebitel'nejshih slov arabskih i persidskih i s perevodom na russkij jazyk [Comparative dictionary of Turkish-Tatar dialects, including the most common words of Arabic and Persian and with translation into Russian]. V 2-h tomah. Sank-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. Tom 1. 813 s. [in Russian].
- Budagov L. (1871). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' Turecko-tatarskih narechij, so vkljucheniem upotrebitel'nejshih slov arabskih i persidskih i s perevodom na russkij jazyk [Comparative dictionary of Turkish-Tatar dialects, including the most common words of Arabic and Persian and with translation into Russian]. V 2-h tomah. Sank-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. Tom 2. 416 s. [in Russian].
- Divaev A. (1908). It-ala-kaz (Pover'e). Jetnograficheskogo obozrenija. Izdanie Jetnograficheskogo otdela. Imperatorskogo obshhestva ljubitelej estestvoznaniya, antropologii i jetnografii. №1-2, s. 149-150. [in Russian].
- Divaev A. (1916). K voprosu o narechenii imen u kirgizov [On the issue of naming names among the Kyrgyz]. Turkestanskije vedomosti, №206, s. 1. [in Russian].
- Divaev A. (1900). O svadebnom rituale Kirgizov Syr-Dar'inskoj oblasti [About the wedding ritual of the Kyrgyz of the Syr-Darya region]. Kazan': Tipo-litografija Imperatorskogo universiteta. S. 1-27. [in Russian].
- Dobromyslov A. (1898). Razvedenie i sodarzhanie kirgizami sobak [Breeding and maintenance of Kyrgyz dogs]. Turgajskaja gazeta, 30 avgusta, № 35, s. 1-4. [in Russian].
- Emel'janov A.V., Gusev A.A., Gromakov N.A. (2007). Zhivotnye Zoobotanicheskogo sada TGU. Volk obyknovennyj. Biologija. Jekologija. Kul't [Animals of TSU Zoo Botanical Garden. An ordinary wolf. Biology. Ecology. The cult]. Tambov: Izd-vo TGU im. G.R. Derzhavina. 41 s. [in Russian].
- Golden P.B. (1997). Wolves, Dogs and Qipčaq religion. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, vol. 50, no. 1/3, pp. 87-97. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23658208>. Accessed 1 July 2024.
- Grodekov N.I. (1889). Kirgizy i Karakirgizy Syr-Dar'inskoj oblasti [Kyrgyz and Karakirgiz of the Syr-Darya region]. Tom pervyj. Juridicheskij byt'. Tashkent: Tipo-Litografija S.I. Lahtina. 528 s. [in Russian].
- Hällzon P, Karoly L., Svanberg I. (2022). Dog for a Cure and Some Dough for a Tooth The Historical Role of the Domestic Dog and Other Canids in Various Healing Practices in Eastern Turkestan / In book: Community Still Matters: Ildiko Beller-Hahn Festschrift, eds. Aysima Mirsultan, Eric Schluessel & Eset Sulayman. Publisher: NIAS Press, Copenhagen. Pp.248-264.
- Ibragimov I. (1876). Ocherki byta kirgizov [Sketches of the Kyrgyz way of life]. Drevnjaja i Novaja Rossija. Istoricheskij illjustrirovannyj ezhemesjachnyj sbornik. Sank-Peterburg: Hromolitografija i Tipografija V.I. Grashanskogo. Tom 3. № 9. S. 51-63. [in Russian].
- Ibragimov I. (1872). Jetnografieskie ocherki Kirgizskogo naroda [Ethnographic sketches of the Kyrgyz people]. Russkij Turkestan. Sbornik. Vypusk vtoroj. Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija Katkov i ko. 289 s. [in Russian].
- Karutic R. (1911). Sredi kirgizov i turkmenov na Mangyshlake [Among Kyrgyz and Turkmen in Mangyshlak]. Perevod E. Petri. Sank-Peterburg: Izdanie A.F. Devrina. 188 s. [in Russian].
- Kuz'min Ja.V. (2011). Drevnejshaja v Azii sobaka [The oldest dog in Asia]. Nauka v Sibiri, № 30-31 (2815-2816). <http://www.nsc.ru/HBC/article.phtml?nid=600&id=17> [in Russian].
- Levi-Stros K. (2008) Totemizm segodnja. Nepriruchennaja mysl' [Totemism today. An untamed thought]. /Per. S fr. A.B. Ostrovskogo. Moskva: Akademicheskij Prospekt. 520 s. [in Russian].
- Masson M. (1956). K istorii ohotnich'ih sobak Srednej Azii [On the history of hunting dogs of Central Asia]. Trudy Sredneaziatskogo Gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. V.I. Lenina. Arheologija Srednej Azii. Tashkent: Izdatel'stvo SAGU. S. 148-155. [in Russian].
- Marakuev V. (1877). Petr Simon Pallas, ego zhizn', uchenye trudy i puteshestvija [Peter Simon Pallas, his life, scientific works and travels]. Moskva: Tipografija A.A. Torleckago i Ko. 214 s. [in Russian].
- Namu J. (2006). Myths and Traditional Beliefs about the Wolf and the Crow in Central Asia: Examples from the Turkic Wu-Sun and the Mongols. Asian Folklore Studies, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 161-77. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030397> Accessed 1 July 2024.
- Polferov Ja.Ja. (1896). Ohota v Turgajskoj oblasti (s risunkami) [Hunting in the Turgai region (with drawings)]. Orenburg: Tipo-litografija P.N. Zharinova. 141 s. [in Russian].
- Shherbak A.M. (1961). Nazvanie domashnih i dikih zhivotnyh v tjurkskih jazykah [The names of domestic and wild animals in the Turkic languages]. Istoricheskie razvitie leksiki tjurkskih jazykov. Moskva: izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. S. 82-172. [in Russian].
- Thalmann O. et al. (2013). Complete Mitochondrial Genomes of Ancient Canids Suggest a European Origin of Domestic Dogs. Science. Vol. 342, N6160, pp. 871-874. DOI:10.1126/science.1243650 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1243650#tab-citations>

Tryjarski E. (1979). The dog in the Turkic area: An Ethnolinguistic study. *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 23, no. 3/4, pp. 297-319. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41927272>. Accessed 1 July 2024.

Urmanche F.I. (2015). *Tjurkskij geroicheskiy jepos [The Turkic Heroic Epic]*. Kazan?: IJaLI. 448 s. [in Russian].

Walsh G.E. (1898). The Cult of the Dog. *The North American Review*. Vol. 167, no. 500, pp. 120-123. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25119039>. Accessed 2 July 2024.

About the authors:

Kozhahmetov Bagashar – doctoral student of the Department of Archaeology, Ethnology and Museology, Kazakh National University named after Al-Farabi. Kazakhstan, Almaty. E-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

Baigunakov Dosbol Suleimenovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Dean of the Faculty of History, Kazakh National University named after Al-Farabi. Kazakhstan, Almaty. E-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Қожахметов Бағашар – докторант, археология, этнология және музеология кафедрасы, әл-Фараби ат. Қазақ ұлттық университеті. Қазақстан, Алматы қ. E-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

Байғунаков Досбол Сулейменович – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, тарих факультетінің деканы, әл-Фараби ат. Қазақ ұлттық университеті. Қазақстан, Алматы қ. E-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах:

Кожахметов Бағашар – докторант кафедры археологии, этнологии и музеологии, Казахский Национальный университет им. Аль-Фараби. Казахстан, г. Алматы. E-mail: bagashar0909@gmail.com

Байғунаков Досбол Сулейменович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, декан факультета истории, Казахский Национальный университет им. Аль-Фараби. Казахстан, г. Алматы. E-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Поступило: 15.07.2024

Принято: 30.08.2024