
TRADITIONS OF ART AND CRAFT DECORATION AND ARCHITECTURE OF KAZAKH YURT AS A SOURCE OF MODERN ART

Yelena Yurievna Lichman* and Tamara Mikhailovna Doroshenko

Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, Mir Street 60, Pavlodar, 140000, Kazakhstan

(Received 6 October 2015, revised 8 February 2016)

Abstract

Kazakhstan is a country with a rich cultural heritage. Carpeting patterns and ornaments of silver and golden jewellery, portable dwelling – yurt are the greatest inventions of nomads. Architecture and inner decoration of yurt comprise an imaginary-conceptual model of the world while the interior comprises the best folk traditions of craft and pattern creativity. Activity of scientists of Russian Geographical society on study of cultural and artistic traditions of Kazakh folk allowed presenting yurt and items of national art and craft as museum exhibit for the first time. Formation of the system of art education in Kazakhstan by Russian painters contributed into translation of traditions of folk art into easel painting. Ethnic traditions comprise valuable artistic achievements of the folk, determine the individuality of creative method and the style of the Kazakhstan artists, and remain the source of modern Kazakh art.

Keywords: national, artistic heritage, Russian artists, easel painting

1. Introduction

The problem of preservation of national cultural heritage and traditional cultural values is especially actual in the period of globalization. Due to the above mentioned factor the role of folk art arises as a formation source of the national artistic culture. Orientation on ethno-cultural tradition is an important feature of modern socio-cultural process as a whole [1]. Cultural heritage is the priceless and irretrievable property of every folk in the world. In 2014 the list of immaterial cultural heritage of UNESCO was supplemented with the art of performing Kazakh kuis (for Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Turkmens - an instrumental piece for folk instruments; for Tatars and Bashkirs – a song and an instrumental piece; for Altais, Khakas - ‘kai’ - an epic tale) on dombyra (a two-stringed musical instrument, the main source of ethno-cultural information of the Kazakhs) and creation of Kazakh yurt [<http://rus.azattyq.mobi/a/kui-dombra-jurta-junesko/26713279.html>]. An attempt to find the connections and succession of traditional folk and modern art and definition of regularity of

*E-mail: lichmane@mail..ru

professional performing art and craft formation based on folk art is undertaken in this article. The research allowed identifying the peculiarities of application of Kazakh nomadic lifestyle images in the art works of easel painting of Russian and Kazakhstan artists. In contradiction to the regions with developed urban culture, which attracted Russian artists, who became new art direction pioneers, the area of new type cultural activity was noticeably narrowed in Kazakhstan [2]. According to the conception of Eurasianism centuries - old spirituality was bound as a pivot for creation of new kinds and genres of art. Art possesses a unique feature to accumulate, imaginary implement, and transmit from generation to generation the socio-cultural experience of a folk, transforming it into lively spiritual experience of every human [3]. The problem of traditions and their interconnections with the everyday life culture comprises interest for art critic. Artistic tradition acts as an objective premise of formation of art national specifics. Elicitation, succession and use of traditions of architecture, art and craft decoration in performing art and exhibition activity are especially accented.

2. Research method

The problem was analysed on the basis of interdisciplinary principle, which stipulates the use of scientific methods. Attraction of comparative-historical method contributed to the determination of modifications of Kazakh yurt in different historical periods. Culturological approach contributed into determination of the mythological model of Kazakh yurt space. Iconological approach allowed characterizing the specifics of the use of painting means for the creation of artistic image of Kazakh nomadic lifestyle. Critical art analyses facilitated to determine the functioning of traditions of art and craft of Kazakh folk in the space of modern art of Kazakhstan.

3. Results

3.1. History of development

Yurt is the greatest invention of the nomads of Eurasia. The word 'yurt' takes its origin from the Turkic word 'yurt' (zhurt - Kazakh). In Kazakh language the given word means not the dwelling, but the place of camp. Turkic word formations 'Ata Yurt' – The Land of Fathers (Paternal house) takes their origin from it. Also the word 'yurt' means generation, family, pasture, ancestral lands, and Motherland. Kazakh yurt – kiyiz ui appertains to Turkic (Qypchaq) type of collapsible lattice - felted buildings, construction, which never outdid by any nomadic nation, comprising the most perfect portable buildings. Comparing with Mongol, Kazakh yurt possesses higher domes share of the roof, which withstands against winds, rain, snow drifts. Nowadays the origin of Kazakh yurt and formation of its constructive peculiarities are broadly discussed in special literature. Several scientific versions of the emergence of a yurt appeared.

Scientists believe that it could be developed from Bedouin marquee, Siberian tent, or a hovel. First primitive types of yurts appeared in the III millennium BC, which are identified by rock images in Bayar (Siberia), Crimea and in Gobian Altai. Archaeological excavations of S.P. Tolstoy confirmed that buildings, shaped as yurts, existed already in the IV–II centuries BC. Some titles of yurt types ('Altyn-orda', 'Ak-orda', 'Kok-orda', 'Sary-odra') were connected with the names of States Golden Horde, White Horde, Blue Horde and Yellow Horde [4]. According to the opinion of S.I. Vainshtein old-Turkic type yurt became the prototype of modern Kazakh yurt; invention which belongs to the middle of the first millennium AD and is linked by its constructive peculiarities with the earlier form of portable dwelling – semispherical Gunn hovel [5].

The first portable non-collapsible dwellings were on wheels; they appeared in the Bronze Age in XII-IX centuries BC. They were prototypes of the oncoming model of yurt – tents and huts rigidly reinforced at two- or four-wheeled carts. Different types of houses at wheels were created in the past by Kazakhs, which rapidly emerged out of the use due to the fact of their uncomfortable movement during migration [6]. In XVIII-XIX centuries the main forms of portable dwelling of nomadic Kazakhs were felt yurts. Kiyiz ui is composed from beautifully curved transforming lattice walls – kerege, arched poles – uyks and upper ring – shanyrak. All these are bonded with ropes and carpets, covered on the sides with four tuyrlyks (name of felt covers of a yurt), on the upper part – with uzuks and tunduks, forming a wall and roofing of a dwelling, reliably preserving from weather [7]. Research of ethnographer M.S. Mukanov approved that interior of the Kazakh yurt was based on the best folk traditions, preserved cycles of production of ancient masters and basics of national ornamental decoration [8].

3.2. Mythological model of the world in the space of the Kazakh yurt

Kazakh yurt is not only an element of material culture of the folk, but also contents symbolism, in which different information about religious and mythological image of the world is focused. In Kazakhs folk image of the world available to usual conscious, such external features of the surrounding world as the sky, the Sun, the stars and the steppe served as a model for the outer and inner space of yurt. Tight connection and parallel between the image of conceptual model of the world and yurt are available for observation in construction of Kazakh yurt. Sphere of a yurt is a small copy of the sphere of the sky above the steppe [9]. Primary visible elements: circle of the Sun, semicircle of the sky and semicircle of a yurt, formed a representation about three parts of space. A point represents the Sun, a surface stands for the land, and volume – for a dwelling, were repeated in a yurt. A point – shanyrak, surface, transforming into a semicircle – kerege, and volume – uyks. Division into three is also preserved in outer decoration of yurt. Yurt from outer parts is covered by tuyrlyk, from upper part – by tynduk, which are connected by uzik. All three

parts of a cover are made of large felt mat, and by their etymology represent worldview perception of the space [10].

The vast space of the steppe without ending caused a desire to focus, concentrating inside the dwelling. The yurt inside was divided into three parts: a door point, middle and upper points. A circle inside the yurt reiterated the outer structure of the sphere. Space of a yurt was covered by large felt mat, which is named 'kiyiz': 'iz' – 'trail', 'ki' – 'substance', i.e. 'substantial trail' (mortal material), by its semantics indicating the embodiment of the lower world. In the upper part kiyiz – large felt mat was covered by striped lint-free carpet – alasha. Its stripes are identical to uyks, trunk of a tree, middle part of a mountain, sunshine, human body; and alasha symbolizes the human world, middle world, and world of life. The upper point in horizontal developing of the space of a yurt is 'tor'. In a yurt tor indicates the upper world, the world of ancestors-gods. According to the three divisions above, certain locations of people and ethical norms of behaviour were fixed in a yurt. In the lower part – world of death, on black large felt mat kiyiz three categories of people were placed: very ill people, close to death; paupers, i.e. close to death according to their social status; people without children, who have no continuation. Three categories of people were placed on alasha: on men side (left) there were relatives of husband and all visiting men; on women side (right) there were relatives of wife and all visiting women and children. On tor were placed also three categories of people: those who were close to the God, according to their status – bais, biis, beks, khans and shakhs; and the ones who were close to the God according to their talent [11]. Thus, the yurt presents a construction with original architectural context, and reflects the ideology of nomads

3.3. Ornament as ethnographical source of yurt decoration

Decoration of yurt is the main vector of Kazakh national ornament. At the same time the ornament itself is a peculiar chronicle of Kazakh ethnoculture. Different worldview codes of ancient traditional society are being transported by figurative plastics of ornament. Universal model of the world is directly linked with religious symbolism of Kazakh folk, which has been reflected in the subject of ornamental patterns. One of the leading attributes of Kazakh ornament is its polisemism. Ornament is able to mean multiple ideas with the assistance of the simplest visual row. Despite the loss of semantic meaning of many ornamental motives, astral, zoomorphic, floral patterns - ram's horn, pair of horns, neck of mountain ram, camel's step, birds' wings, tree, leaves, etc. – they prevail in the art and craft of Kazakhs. Ornament is the reflection of mentality of ancient cattle breeders and cultivators, stipulated by cultivation of nature as a source of material and emotional-spiritual needs. Decoding of semantics of separate elements of Kazakh ornament proves its realistic basis. Beauty of surrounding nature, the Sun, the Moon, steppe, trees, and flowers were portrayed by masters in symbolical manner, by the way of art and craft processing [12]. Like a form, the colour of an ornament is the representation of separate definitions and

presentations. For example, blue is the symbol of the sky, cult of the sky; red – flame, the Sun; white – the truth, happiness and joy; yellow – knowledge, wisdom, conscious; black – ground; green – youth and spring [13]. Magic meaning of ornament is what is invoked to guard all enters and exits, edges and joints. That is the reason why ornament fringes clothes, dishes, headwear, jewellery, carpets and tekemets (felt carpet with embedded waved ornament from lamb wool coloured in blue, golden-yellow, red, white and brown), ornamental stripes, which join parts of yurt. Howsoever different ornamental images are special features that connect them into an united ornamental system: clarity of constructive solution of motive and compositions, pithiness of an image, large module, infrequent repetition of rapport, positive-negative principle in picturing of decorative surface, and heroic monumentality [14]. All listed signs of Kazakh ornament interdependent and adequately reflect the holistic worldview of the folk. In the process of development the ornamental language was gradually loosing concrete ornamental certainty, and was compiled to decorative-artistic tasks. Loosing narrate veness, the ornament acquired the ability to reflect in larger scale the emotional side of human perception of the world. Being the most important element of traditional Kazakh culture, ornament along with unique esthetical peculiarities preserves the specific perception of the world by folk, continuing its existence in the modern art and craft of Kazakhstan.

3.4. Kazakh yurt as an object of ethnographical research for the scientists of Russia

Since the XVIIIth century yurt became an object of attention for ethnographers, geographers and travellers. B.A. Kuftin, a Russian archaeologist and ethnographer wrote, that yurt “...is the highest type of portable dwelling ever” [15]. Scientists of West-Siberian department of Imperial Russian Geographical society dealt with research of geography, co-arrangement of population on given territory, and culture of Western Siberia, Altai and Kazakhstan. Among the members of the Department, the major expert of ethnography of Kazakhs was G.E. Katanayev. The Department had success at several exhibitions (especially at Nizhni Novgorod All-Russian exhibition, where ethnography of ‘Steppe Department’ was presented with an exclusive range) due to his knowledge and energetic position. Materials on ethnography of Kazakhs are present in ‘The Notes’ from the first years of existence of the Department. In 1878 I.Y. Slovtsov went to Kokchetav region for geobotanical research. ‘Travel Notes on the trip to Kokchetav region in 1878’ contains a decent amount of valuable ethnographical materials; information about Kazakh craft being especially valuable [16].

Special rise of interest to Kazakhstan can be observed from the middle of the 80s and continued till the 90s. This fact was linked with the activity of the Direction of Migration, which conducted research in Kazakhstan with the aim of making large land expropriation for migrants. During that time many

economists, agronomists and other specialists, connected with the Direction of Migration started their activity in Omsk. Part of them entered into the list of members of Western-Siberian Department, and noticeably activated its work. In 1885 in the Department Shestakov presented the plan of research of nomadic culture. It noticed that nomadic culture was necessary to be broadly researched, including questions on the economical mode of life, material culture, worldview, philosophy, etc. Among the material culture of Kazakhs special attention was paid to the dwelling. Shne and Makovetsky conducted a large research on Kazakh dwelling, settled and portable. Their materials were published as articles. The authors were able to give ethnographical materials on dwelling with tight connection with the peculiarities of household and history of Kazakhs. By the end of the XIXth century yurt was performed as a museum object. In 1892 yurt was showed due to the visit of Tsesarevich Nikolay Alekandrovich to Omsk. There were presented samples of weaponry, musical instruments (synay, kerney, kobyz), clothes, dishes and items of art and craft [16, p. 11].

3.5. Images of Kazakh nomadic lifestyle in easel painting works of artists from Russian and Kazakhstan

In different time along with researches Kazakhstan was visited by Russian artists. Contribution into development of artistic and cultural heritage of Kazakhstan was made by Russian artists not only by author artworks (watercolour and graphic paintings of V.N. Plotnikov, V.I. Shteinberg and O.I. Chernyshov), but also by the communion of Kazakh authors to European kinds and genres of fine art. The first at the level of perception is the Russian artist V.V. Vereschagin, which created the cycle 'Turkestan', portraying nature and everyday life of Kazakh folk in the artworks 'Kazakh with golden eagle', 'Mountains of Lepsi valley', 'Carting away' and 'Internal decoration of a yurt of a rich Kyrgyz'. As a part of scientific expedition A. Karazin travelled through Amudariya, Semirechie and Irtysh rivers. Portraying life of local folk plays an important role in the artworks of the artist: 'Kazakh on a camel', 'Kazakh and Russian', 'Colt' and 'Bayga'. The artist Znamensky published in 1873 in the magazine 'Painter' the following artworks: 'Internal look of a Kazakh house', 'Yurts are being installed' and 'Turkestani yurt'. In the creative activity of the poet and artist T.G. Shevchenko, deported from Ukraine to Kazakhstan, a special place is designated to the image of lifestyle of Kazakh folk in the artworks 'In yurt' (1849), 'Unfortunates' (1853) and 'Kazakh girl Katya' (1853) [17].

Khludov Nikolay Gavrilovitch came to Kazakhstan in 1877. He worked as draftsman, and then as an abutment-man in Semirechie regional administration, participated as topography and artist in expeditions of the geologist I.V. Ignatyev and the botanist A.N. Krasnov on the research of mountain group Khan-Tengri (1886) and with Professor I.V. Mushketov on the research of the earthquake in Verny city (1887). He was a member of Turkestani section of archaeology amateurs and founder of Semirechie department of Russian Geographical Society. Participation in expeditions, governmental work, travelling for land-

abutment gave to the artist the opportunity to notice aptly and portray in everyday scenes the spirit and peculiarity of Kazakh folk. Khludov painted landscapes and portrays, made sketches of everyday scenes, which served as basics for creation of numerous painting works, dedicated to the life of Kazakh folk. The artist managed to gather and portray on his paintings a colossal material, concerning customs and lifestyle of Kazakh people, what was possible only for a person, possessing huge hardworking traits, sense of purpose and thirst for knowledge [18]. Observing paintings of Nikolay Gavrilovitch Khludov, who had lived in Kazakhstan for 57 years, it is possible to compile an encyclopaedia of nomadic life from the end of the XIXth century till the beginning of the XXth century: 'Rich nomadic ground', 'Bathing Kazakh girls', 'Fording', 'Mourning nomadic trip', 'Haymaking in the mountains', 'Night barymta', 'For firewood' (1886), 'Driving cattle' (1887), 'Caught by a storm' (1896), 'Boy on a bull' (1907), 'Boy on an ox' (1907), 'Milking mares' (1908), 'Messenger' (1916), and 'Esaul' (1916). Paintings of the artist often exceeded ethnographic boundaries; they were authentic and valuable by reflection of Kazakh lifestyle, having not only ethnographical, but also historical-esthetical value. In 1920, the 70 years old artist opened the first Almaty artistic studio, where later recognized artists, such as Tchuikov, Bortnikov, Soloviev and Kasteev, spent their artistic studies [19]. The creative personality of N.G. Khludov became a linking element between the Russian art school and Kazakh national art [20].

N.G. Khludov's student, Abyl Khan Kasteev, is the first professional Kazakh artist. The space of his pieces of art is filled with concrete items and everyday actions of nomadic lifestyle: pouring kumys, bustling about cauldron women, shepherds focused on their thoughts, yurts, flocks. Artworks of the artist, like 'Portable yurt of shepherd', 'On zhaylau' or 'In the mountains' resurrect the ideal model of the world in Turkic conscious 'summer noon, calm weather, yurt in a valley, protected by mountains'. Practice of traditional art, affecting on methods of Kasteev, provided the opportunity to look at human world and nature world without rush, thoughtfully, as it happened with the ancient masters-craftsmen. National worldview was subject of artworks and way of painting expression of the artist: panoramic view, ability to feel diversity and unity of all elements of the space in an artistic way, as approval of wholeness of existence of human, his organic connection with nature [21].

The first Kazakh artist-woman Aysha Galimbayeva discovered the aesthetic value of folk art and craft, focused inside the yurt. Special feature of her art was 'ethnographism'. The artist often appealed to ethnic motives, including into composition of still-life a special set of items of Kazakh yurt: piala with kumys, decorated with national ornaments dishes, large felt mat, and ancient ceramics. Interpretation, colour harmony, ornamental saturation created national colouring in the artworks of the artist. First still-life 'Dostarkhan' is created by the artist in 1959. Using bright colours, the theme of national Kazakh ornament in still-life artworks is fulfilled in decorative and exquisite manner in the following pieces of art: 'Still-life on black background' (1960), 'Kobyz'

(1962), 'Ancient ceramics' (1965), 'Kazakh headwear' (1965), 'Three centuries' (1966), and 'Tea dishes' (1966). Artist's outstanding knowledge of folk art, the careful approach to items of national history and culture are fully expressed in the above artworks [21, p. 64]. Art of Kazakh artists, through national worldview, becomes heritage of world culture.

3.6. Development of traditions of art and craft of Kazakh yurt in modern artistic practices

Starting from the 90s of the XX century, modern masters of Kazakhstan actively addressed to the origins of national culture to preserve yurt as national symbol in life of Kazakhs [22]. Several kinds of yurt are presented in Eastern-Kazakhstani regional architecture-ethnographical and nature-landscape museum-reservation (Ust-Kamenogorsk city). Six-roped yurt of average size (alty kanatty kiyiz ui) can be seen in the building of museum-reservation, as well as in open sky exposition in the ethnopark Zhastar. Big yurt (horde) is installed on the main square of Left-banked ethnographic complex. This construction is made of metal; the basis diameter has 16 meters and the height 6.5 meters. External cover contents white waterproof material with specific decoration. Lower edge of domical part (dodege) is decorated by embroidered golden ornament of zoomorphic motive. According to the tradition, this type of yurt is aimed at conduct of official ceremonies, press-conferences, meetings of important guests of the city; it also serves to conduct seminars, festivals, and portable exhibitions. Shanyrak of the yurt unites not only family, but also the whole nation [23]. That's why the image of shanyrak on State Emblem of the Republic is an image of common home, common Motherland for all people, living in Kazakhstan.

Kazakh yurt induces broad interest among the visitors of museum-reservation. Unrepeatable play of colours, ornaments and design in decoration of yurt form items of art and craft. Specific order of items, settling round along on domical poles defines peculiarity, comfort and cosiness of portable dwelling. Traditional construction of yurt is preserved and embodied by folk masters of Almaty region. It is made of wood (tal) willow and birch. Carcass of yurt (uidin suyegi) is made of steppe willow – tal wood, to be light and firm. Dome – shanyrak – is made of birch. Felt cover is made of fleece of high quality from autumn grooming – kuzem zhun, which can be easily processed; mat, processed from this kind of wool is usually thick [24].

Yurt interior is still based on the nest traditions of folk art and craft. Kiyiz ui is covered from outside with white felt mats, fitted in its cylindrical part with mats, and in upper part, in the place of attachment of uyks, it is covered with wide carpet stripe – baskur. Yurt doors – sykyrlauyk are decorated with thin curving, bone incrustation or painting, and covered with felt mat. Constant items of Kazakh yurt are different stripes and suspended decorations – tangysh, shanyrak-bau, arkan, uykbau, zhelbau and ayakbau. In names of ornamental stripes: baskur, ayakbau, uykbau, beldeu – definitions of head, leg, body and arms conjoin in each case with the definition of bau – ornamental stripe. All

these prove the peace making law in conception of space, when usual human consciousness analogizes human body, dwelling and model of the world [25]. There are metal lamps in the dwelling; the most original of them is the suspended lamp – shyrak, which hangs under yurt's dome. Processed skins of different animals in yurt serve as interior decoration. Despite the nomadic lifestyle among Kazakhs, they used wooden furniture, curved by masters from a whole piece of wood, easy in form and not numerous dishes, usually without curving. Furniture, comfortable in conditions of nomadic life, is rarely met in modern interior: asadal, kebezhe and zhuk ayak – stand for chest [26]. Art and craft of Kazakhstan, brightly presented in decoration of yurt, preserving inherent national peculiarity, continues to develop, enriching by the activity of folk and professional masters of the republic in the XXI century.

4. Discussion

Ethnocultural heritage is an organic part of historical-cultural heritage of Kazakhstan. All folks are obliged to preserve traits of their history throughout centuries in order to exist. Ethnocultural heritage is an instrument to achieve this goal, connecting past, present time and future. Ethnographical objects of heritage, especially Kazakh yurt, are the ones to act as peculiar timestamps; they create precise and solid channel of connection not only with the present and the distant past, but also with the distant future [24]. The semantic foundation of this heritage is to preserve the memory of ethnic groups' culture, which stays in previously created items; and the older the item, the higher the value it acquires for descendants. The etymology of the definition of heritage is linked with the definition of inheritance – “the thing that we acquired from the ancestors and, multiplying, we are obliged to transmit to the following generations” [27]. In this sense ethnocultural heritage is responsible for storage and transmission of information about ethnic cultures. Kazakh portable dwelling – yurt – is presented as a material value of Kazakh folk and is an important factor in preserving and development of artistic national Kazakh style, whose originality is an unique component of the treasury of world cultural heritage. Yurt in Kazakh culture, as in the culture of other folks, is considered not only as a material element, but also as the most important manifestation of the peculiarities of the spiritual culture of Kazakh ethnos.

5. Conclusions

Portable dwelling of nomads – yurt – is an unique product of durable development and gradual improvement of more primitive types of dwelling. Round shape and mobility of yurt reflected not only the household way of nomadic life, but also revealed connection of Kazakh yurt architecture with the model of creation of the world, defining it as a symbol of space and trinity of the Universe, mastered space and copy of the World Tree. Peculiarities of Kazakh yurt are the stability of existence, brightness and colourfulness of interior decor,

abundant use of traditional felt items decorated by ornament. Interior of yurt was based on the best folk traditions. Different items made of felt, woven products, ornamented mats, wall carpets, embroideries, utensils, decorated with carving, bone in play, painting, etc. preserved the production cycles of the ancient masters and the basics of national ornamental decoration.

Due to the broad research activity of the Russian scientists of the XVIIIth century, works about the peculiarities of nomadic life and lifestyle of Kazakh folk were published for the first time; yurt as well as a material sample of folk culture of Kazakhs was presented on exhibition for the first time. Paying artistic interest, Russian painters reflected peculiarities of nomadic lifestyle of Kazakh folk in their artworks. Teaching the basics of fine art to the first Kazakh artists, they promoted preservation and translation of the traditions of art and craft into easel painting in Kazakhstan. Kazakh easel painting opened the aesthetic value of art and craft; professional artists broadly used folk motives and ornament in their artworks. Painters appealed to the myth, folklore and images of folk art not only thematically, but also as to an instrument of artistic organization of material, and mean of expression of 'eternal' values, raising them to the generalized level of a symbol.

Restraining on the basis of succession of the most important origins and sides of historical experience, in new sociocultural conditions set in the end of XX century, Kazakh artistic tradition achieved its broad development. This is linked with the fact that artistic traditions preserve the source of vitality on deep levels of ethnic attitude and conscious on the level of genotype and national mentality, regenerating in previous or other shapes within new comfortable conditions. Traditional artistic culture in the panorama of artistic life of modern Kazakhstan is largely presented by such directions as producing large felt mats, carpeting, embroidery, and creative wood processing. Art and craft of Kazakhstan, brightly presented in decoration of Kazakh yurt, preserving inherent national uniqueness, continue to develop, enriching by the activity of folk and professional masters of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the XXIst century. Values of folk art need to be translated into modern culture of Kazakhstan, preserving its uniqueness for future generation. The problem of preserving, development and use of traditions of folk art and craft demands continuation of research in the aspect of transformation of architectural model and ornamental symbolism of Kazakh yurt in the interior and exterior landscape and graphic design of modern buildings architecture.

Acknowledgment

The authors express their gratitude to professor of Altai State University, PhD in art critics Stepanskaya Tamara Ivanovna for scientific consultation on questions regarding the interaction and interplay of cultures of Kazakhstan and Russia. Thanks to the pedagogues of the Faculty of Theory and Methods of musical education of Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institution for their assistance in conducting the research. The authors also express special gratitude to the

rector of Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, Arshabekov Nurgali Rakhimgalievich, for the financial assistance requested by the research.

References

- [1] T.M. Stepankaya and K.A. Melehova, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* **15(1)** (2013) 87-93.
- [2] A.K. Niyazov, *Basic tendencies of Kazakhstan painting in the context of sociocultural transformations: XXth century – beginning of XXIst century*, Ph.D. thesis, South Kazakhstani State University named after Auezov, Tashkent, 2011, 41.
- [3] A. Tassimova, *Journal of International Scientific Publications: Language Individual & Society*, **5(1)** (2011) 4-13, online at www.scientific-publications.net/download/language-individual-and-society-2011-1.pdf.
- [4] B. Glaudinov, *History of architecture of Kazakhstan*, Kazakh State Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Almaty, 1999, 237.
- [5] S.I. Vainshtein, *Problem of dwelling history of steppe nomads of Eurasia*, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1976, 42-62.
- [6] M.M. Mendikulov, *On the characteristic of architecture of Kazakhstan in the XIXth and beginning of XXth century*, Kazgosizdat, Alma-Ata, 1959, 116-147.
- [7] A.H. Margulan, *Kazakh folk art and craft*, Oner, Alma-ata, 1986, 88-107.
- [8] M.S. Mukanov, *Kazakh yurt*, Kainar, Alma-Ata, 1981, 224.
- [9] Z.K. Karakuzova, *Eurasia*, **2** (2001) 27–37.
- [10] M.K. Kozybayev, H.A. Argynbayev and M.S. Mukanov, *Kazakhs*, Kazakhstan, Almaty, 1995, 234.
- [11] M. Sabit, B.D. Kokumbayeva and G. Temirton, *Spiritual culture of Great steppe and modern times*, Zhibek Zholy, Almaty, 2013, 176.
- [12] E. Zaltsman (ed.), *Art-pedagogue-student. Art of Kazakhstan*, Science Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, Almaty, 1983, 116-120.
- [13] S.S. Turganbayeva, T.M. Stepankaya, S.Z. Asanova, A.E. Asanova and B.E. Asanova, *Life Science Journal*, **11(10s)** (2014) 544-547.
- [14] A.S. Galimzhanova, M.B. Glaudinova, T.A. Kishkanbayev, S.A. Shklyayeva, K.K. Muratayev, G.S. Eleukenova and B.K. Barmankulova, *Art history of Kazakhstan*, Market Publishing, Almaty, 2006, 248.
- [15] B.A. Kuftin, *Kirgiz-kazakhi. Culture and life*, Central museum of Ethnography, Moscow, 1926, 11.
- [16] E. Zhanaikhan, *Artistic life of Pavlodar Priirtyshie of the second part of XIX – first third of XX century*, Ph.D. thesis, Altai State University, Barnaul, 2011, 21.
- [17] E.Y. Lichman, E. Zhanaikhan and N.I. Denisova, *National heritage and dialogue of the cultures Kazakhstan – Russia*, Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institution, Pavlodar-Barnaul, 2013, 362.
- [18] E.Y. Lichman, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* **12(10)** (2012) 1320-1323.
- [19] E.Y. Lichman, *Life Science Journal*, **11(4s)** (2014) 165-169.
- [20] L.I. Nekhyvadovich, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, **21(2)** (2014) 406-409.
- [21] R.A. Ergaliyeva, *Masters of fine art of Kazakhstan*, Oner, Almaty, 2004, 183.
- [22] A.A. Kodar, *Kazakh philosophy as a dialogue with tradition*, Ph.D. thesis, Institution of philosophy and political science of Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty, 1999, 32.

- [23] T.M. Stepanskaya, D.M. Mergaliyev, Z.T. Sarbalayev, M.P. Popandopulo and E. Zhanaykhan, *Life Science Journal*, **11(10s)** (2014) 195-197.
- [24] E. Zhanaikhan, T.M. Doroshenko and D.M. Mergaliyev, *Life Science Journal*, **11(10s)** (2014) 552-555.
- [25] S. Akatayeva, M. Auezov, E. Shakenova, E. Tursunov, M. Karatayev A. Mukhambetova, B. Karakulov and A. Medoyev, *Nomads. Esthetics: Cognition of the world by traditional Kazakh art*, Gylym, Almaty, 1993, 264.
- [26] G.K. Ibraishina, *Art and craft as reflection of national originality of Kazakh culture*, Ph.D. thesis, Kazakh State University named after al-Farabi, Almaty, 2005, 24.
- [27] E.L. Nikulshina, *Proportion of traditions and innovations in national culture in the epoch of globalisation*, Proc. of the conference 'Cultural memory: actual problems and connections of time periods', Siberian Ministry of Internal Affairs Legal Institute of Russia, Krasnoyarsk, 2006, 36-41.