

Kazakh Folklore: Ourselves and Others¹

Alma Kunanbaeva

The subject of this article is the way folklore has been presented in various historical contexts. I will limit myself to a brief overview of three key phases in the history of Kazakh folklore as it has been presented, in one way or another, *for show*—first during the Soviet era, then in Kazakhstan following independence, and finally, in recent times, abroad. In terms of chronology, this overview covers approximately the last century.

The history of the presentation of Kazakh folklore is reflected in a series of publications,² though to this day it has not been comprehensively covered. We will attempt, without fear of schematization, to imagine a relatively generalized framework within which folklore was presented over this entire period, as well as to indicate the main phases of the *stage evolution*, as it were, of folklore. This evolution was conditioned by a number of factors, not the least of which were the demands made on folklore by a constantly changing society.

In the 1920s and 30s, the period in which the stratum of traditional culture known at the time as folk art was initially adapted, these demands were conditioned, in the first instance, by the necessity of creating new staged genres in Kazakhstan—such as the “musical play”³ and opera. The creators of the first Kazakh operas were composers of the Russian-European school, among them Evgeny Brusilovsky (1905-1981), who wrote the operas *Qyz-Zhibek*, *Zhalbyr*, *Er-Targhyn*, *Ayman-Sholpan*, *Altyn-Astyq*, and others.⁴ I am referring to the so-called “song operas”—musical dramas in which folk songs were used as musical fragments. The contents of these operas were based on traditional epic plots; nevertheless, from the entire range of genres in Kazakh folklore, it was lyric melodies that were chosen over epic ones for the scores of these operas. Song texts were rewritten according to the demands of the libretto, and thus traditional music acquired new stylistic

and ideological content. Popular folk melodies were reconceptualized to suit a stage dramatism extrinsic to folkloric poetics, and fairly quickly, they found new life, returned to the tradition, and practically became (at least in the large cities) table songs.

The next socio-musical project was the reconstruction of Kazakh folk instruments and their inclusion in ensembles like Vasily Andreev's Russian Folk Instrument Orchestra.⁵ Orchestral arrangements of traditional solo *küys* undoubtedly represented a new acoustic and aesthetic phenomenon, as a result of which Kazakh music began to fit into the context of Soviet All-Union musical reality.

In the 1940s and 50s, the system of musical instruction, oriented as it was toward the establishment of discrete “masterpieces of folk art,” suppressed the phenomenon of oral variation that exists in tradition and brought to the foreground a conception of “musical composition”—a composer's “opus”—that was new to folklore. As a result, the productivity of tradition was cut off at its roots, and the production of reference or standard versions of folk music became the goal. It was in this context that the tragic figure of Zhambyl Zhabaev (1846-1945), a prominent epic *zhylrau* and *aqyn*-improviser unbeatable in *aytys* (a traditional poetic competition), was used by the government as a political mouthpiece. His later works illustrate the transformation of oral poetry into written poetry, a transition from epic consciousness to literary-political declarativity; ultimately, they represent the deformation of folklore under the conditions of totalitarianism.

The period from the 1960s to the 1980s was marked by an active search for “authenticity” in the presentation of Kazakh folklore. There was now propaganda about authentic or “real” folklore, which was primarily associated, as in Russian folkloristics, with the opening up of remote areas in the USSR, where ostensibly unadulterated sources of folk wisdom had been safely preserved. However, alongside the multitude of heretofore unknown local traditions and examples

of high art that really were discovered in places, the so-called folk ensembles also flourished in the same remote areas. Thus, the dominant influence of “secondary” collectives and “folk” orchestras became apparent. The presentation of Kazakh folklore took place in a Soviet system in which each titular republic of the USSR was required to present itself on the capital’s stage, which was constructed to showcase the friendship of the peoples. Festivals of folk music somewhat resembled geological collections of precious stones in museums—stones which, despite the fact that they are uncut and unset, are nonetheless made beautiful by the hidden potential of their possible shaping.

After the breakup of the Soviet Union, the task of presenting folklore in independent Kazakhstan originated in a programmatic aim: to recover the ethnic memory of the people, to save and bring back to life the slave-*manqurt*, who had lost his memory.⁶ To the Kazakh way of thinking, the spirit behind this theme of discovering memories is one, above all, of invoking genealogies. It was precisely this spirit that also determined the place of folklore in the formation of Kazakh identity. A notable example is the international festivals of Turkic-language cultures that have been taking place in Almaty since the late 1980s, along with the CD series that have come out afterwards. These CDs have been prepared on the basis of concerts called “Traditional Music of the East,” where Kazakh folklore has been consciously and purposefully represented alongside related cultures—Tuvan, Khakas, Turkmen, Qaraqalpaq, Kyrgyz, Azeri, and others.⁷ This kinship is derived from several organizing principles: linguistic (their languages are Turkic), culturological (their lifestyles are nomadic), religious (they are shamanists or Muslims with a firm shamanistic base), musical (they are related by instruments, types of sound-making, musical development of shared epic plots), and so forth.⁸

In the 1990s, Kazakh folklore entered onto the world stage, signaling not so much a geographical as a cultural shift (amid the breakup of the Soviet Union and Kazakhstan's attainment of sovereignty). Such fundamental binaries for Kazakhs as European vs. non-European, oral vs. written, and nomadic vs. agricultural now operated within a broad Eurasian context. In the system of world musics, Kazakh folklore was now surrounded by cultural phenomena completely different from those phenomena previously to be found in the Soviet space. And if in these new historical conditions Azeri *muğam* could naturally be connected to the Iranian civilization, and Uzbek *maqom* and Uyghur *muqam* to the Indian and Arabian civilizations, then Kazakh folklore was integrated with that of the Mongols, Turkmens, Kyrgyz, and Tuvans—that is, with the world of original nomadic civilization. This newly apparent fact also determined the format of the presentation of Kazakh folklore at the Smithsonian Folklife Festival in Washington, D.C. during the summer of 2002.⁹

The Smithsonian Folklife Festival is oriented not only toward folklore in the narrow sense of the word (as oral artistic creation), but also toward the entire context of traditional culture, traditional forms of life, husbandry, crafts, games, etc.—that which in English is called *folklife*. As a result, our ideal format for presenting Kazakh folklore was in complete agreement with the intent of the American festival. It became an urgent necessity to reconstruct what amounted to the entire context of nomadic culture in the conditions in Washington. To achieve this goal, yurts were brought in, camels were found, masters of applied arts were invited to work for the duration of the festival, and the customary setting for the guest ritual was organized and provided.

Attending the festival were Kazakh musicians from just two adjacent clan groups of the Kishi, or Lesser zhuz (representatives of the Qyzylorda and Mangghyshlaq regions). For the duration of the festival, they competed ceaselessly in yurt-building contests; in the “taming” of

American camels; in oral debates and various forms of storytelling (legends, genealogical histories, *memorats*, and so on); and, of course, in musical contests, vocal and instrumental. It was no coincidence that the stage upon which the nomads performed was called an *aytys*. The setup of this competition—the *aytys*—included Mongol, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, and Kazakh musicians following a single competitive “script,” similar to a traditional contest.

A development unanticipated by the organizers of the festival was the self-isolation of the nomadic groups, which clearly occurred along cultural lines. Lacking a common language, and with substantial religious differences (between Buddhists and Muslims) as well as access to their own individual living spaces (there were two separate Kazakh yurts and one Mongolian ger), Mongols and Turks were deaf to the festival organizers’ attempts to represent the cultures of the nomadic domain as unified, monumental, and historically indivisible. Moreover, the representatives of these traditionally nomadic cultures showed a minimum of interest in the events of neighboring spaces and even less interest in the “exchange” of cultural values planned by the organizers. For the same reasons, the task of dialogue between cultures gave way to monologues with a shade of competitiveness and a jealous struggle for listeners and spectators. The Kazakhs, largest in number among representatives of the nomads, spent most of their time during the festival inside the yurt, comfortably alternating between tea drinking and more serious eating; over the well-laid *dastarqan* table, they participated in endless monologues and dialogues on genealogies and historical and legendary tales, as well as anecdotes, one after another, according to the flow of the conversation and the whims of the Kazakhs’ abstruse associations, all to the accompaniment of *dombra küys* and epic *termes* (selections of improvised edifications). Each “musical work” was part of a folkloric narrative, and its sense and meaning lay outside of the musical-poetic text itself. All of the non-Kazakh “intruders” from outside were received as welcome guests whom the

Kazakhs, through translators, attempted to draw into conversation— which as a rule was difficult, owing to the absence, in the generic repertoire of most of the guests, of oral narrative prose forms analogous to that of the Kazakhs. In addition, the unspoken but fairly strict taboo in contemporary American life on open dialogue devoted to the meaning of life and especially death, along with a whole host of other subjects that are of existential importance but taboo for one reason or another, prevented the guests from participating in the traditional ritual of hospitality and put them in the position instead of consumers. One of the Kazakh festival participants noted that the guests were obsessed with sampling the cultures to the point of being overfull and were clearly suffering from a figurative indigestion, as a result of which they could only be served small delicacies: climactic short *termes* and *küys* with vivid legends and an abundance of visual performance effects.

This orientation toward brilliant, sparkling miniatures was also a determining factor in the program of Edil Khuseinov (born 1955), a *shangqobyz* (121.2,¹⁰ or jaw harp) player, composer, alumnus of Almaty State Conservatory, and pupil of Bolat Sarybaev (1927-1984), a prominent collector and restorer of Kazakh instruments. In the past, Edil was also a participant in several Kazakh musical-ethnographic ensembles. Over the last decade, he has performed in concerts with musicians from Altai and Tuva, from whom he has learned the technique of throat singing. The combination, in masterful original compositions, of Kazakh folk melodies, arranged virtuosically on the *shangqobyz*, with simultaneously interwoven samples of throat singing brought Edil resounding success among his listeners, and also served as a bridge between traditional musicians and the rock group Roksonaki (led by Ruslan Karin), which was extremely popular at the festival.

Roksonaki's performance at the Washington festival was unanimously recognized as a sensation, and it gave rise to a loyal and literally obsessed group of fans who are, to this day, patiently awaiting the next tour of this talented Almaty group. The group's repertoire consists of

works by Ruslan Karin, the winner of the first international “Aziya Dauysy” (“Voice of Asia”) competition, whose unique voice is not drowned out by the increasingly noisy and aggressive torrent of ethno- (or folk) rock. Shamanistic, epic, and ritual texts from Kazakh folklore form the basis of Karin’s compositions; they are read by the young musician and incorporated into the contemporary cultural context.

In this way, there were three different levels of Kazakh folklore presented in Washington. *Aytys* is the first, closest to the reality of nomadic cultures, keeping to itself under the dome of a yurt. It is traditional folklore, surrounded by interpreters, translators, helpers, and guides, and it appears before the public in the form of a stage competition. The second level is represented by Edil Khuseinov, who has absorbed nomadic mythology and incorporated key “exotic” features—unrelated to the ethnic marking of his own tradition, which has already led him to the highest technical perfection—into his original compositions. These musical compositions are typologically equivalent to contemporary paintings by Kazakh artists, upon whose canvases petroglyphs, elements of Scythian “Golden Man” décor, and contemporary symbols of the postmodern all coexist.

The third level is an attempt somehow to transmit into the future ethnically and culturally formative elements of Kazakh folklore using a style of mass youth culture more in keeping with a globalized generation. *Roksonaki* is an experiment in generating an ethnic voice in a context radically new for it. What is noteworthy about this experiment is not just the phenomenon of the voice but also the level of the poetry. It is as if Ruslan Karin’s compositions, because of the philosophical depth he has achieved in them by “reading” traditional poetics afresh, have the power to electrify the poetic thinking of his modern listeners. In essence, Karin is returning tradition to the youth, reintoning it in a style of rock ahead of its time. In Washington, his rock-*termes*,

resounding powerfully like a caravan of musicians, seemed almost to hang over the festival square, a space so enormous it could not be taken in at a single glance.

In my view, these three levels of Kazakh folklore presentation are correlated with what in Russian folkloristics is called, following Evgeny Gippius and Zinaida Mozheiko,¹¹ the “age-determined cyclization of song.” Within the framework of his or her own tradition, each ethnophore lives through several stylistic-repertorial cycles of music-making that correspond to the gradual modification of his or her age, gender, and social identity. In moving from one cycle to another, an ethnophore orients him- or herself not just to the stylistics but also to all the values of the new cycle. In the context of Kazakh music, moreover, this kind of cyclization also symbolizes the three-dimensional structure of the nomadic cosmos, wherein there is a constant correspondence between the past, the present, and the future. If, for example, traditional musicians are chiefly oriented toward the past, while Edil Khuseinov, in his solo compositions, is oriented toward the present, then Ruslan Karin, steering clear of both the past and the present in his songs, is oriented toward the future.

For me, what is obvious here is not simply the definite similarity between the Kazakh case of age-determined song cyclization and its counterpart in the relatively closed agricultural tradition of the East Slavs (where this cyclization was initially discovered), but also the fundamental distinctiveness of the Kazakh case. The three levels I have described are characterized by varying preoccupations and dissimilar musical scopes—they are located not within a single self-sufficient tradition, but sometimes reach decisively beyond that framework. I would venture to say that it has always been this way in Kazakh folklore: there have always been creative forces that do not, so to speak, sit still, but that orient themselves to different and various things, depending on the specific historical situation and the specific aesthetic contexts available to a given society at a

given time. Things that were once deeply innovative (e.g., the art of wandering *sal-seri* singers) have become, over time, Kazakh classics. The essence must be found in an understanding of the present, for which we have no recourse to sources. The present, to put it bluntly, is not interested in the sources of its “origins”; that is a question that occupies the minds of art critics, who come later. The present takes from its surroundings that which it needs *today*—that which responds to the yearnings and preferences of those living in the present. The present is always the “disturber of the peace” in folkloric tradition.¹² Therefore, despite the radical differences between the aforementioned three groups of musicians representing Kazakh folklore in Washington, the vertical, three-dimensional *Past – Present – Future* structure they reflect is not, for Kazakhs, a creation of New Time. It would seem that the consciousness (and the unconscious) of ethnophores has always been animated by the conviction that what folklore knows is not one single truth; truth is always *multifaceted* and many-sided, backward-facing and forward-facing, open to innumerable interpretations and reformulations of the present, in each subsequent epoch of *its* present. It is not inconceivable that this is the reason why all the Kazakh musicians, regardless of their age and the performance genres they preferred, were so at ease together, in private, while they were in Washington (of course, this must also have been due to the language they shared across all levels of the folkloric tradition). As a result, I have become firmly convinced that bearers of Kazakh folklore themselves view the musical pursuits of these three groups of musicians as equally *authentic forms of ethnic self-expression*—in spite of the obvious stylistic and even technological innovations and borrowings.

I believe that what I have said here corrects, to a significant extent, our ideas about the nature of any folklore’s “authenticity.” In any case, what is understood as “authentic” differs between folklore bearers and researchers. This was made plain during the Smithsonian Festival.

The driving idea behind the Smithsonian Institution is an orientation toward the preservation and propagation of traditional art in the world; this orientation coincides with the creative impulse we have come to know through our experience (and especially through the pronouncements) of our native folkloristics. Given the inherent breadth of its approach, the Smithsonian operates on the basis of three premises: 1) that there exist protected communities living according to traditions of the past; 2) that there are products which require master-level skill to manufacture; and 3) that there is a fundamental understanding of (or way of using) such products based on certain criteria of human civilization that the Smithsonian takes to be universal. We might say that these three premises are the mythical *whales* on which the Smithsonian *world turtle* rests. Specifically, we are speaking of education, enlightenment, inclusivity, and outreach—that is, knowledge, as it transforms all that is private and particular into the general and the commonly accepted, of interest to one and all.

Within such a framework, the presentation of nomadic art runs up against certain difficulties. I will make note of two of them. First, true “classical” nomads no longer exist, either as a socioeconomic phenomenon or even as sanctuary-type “authentic” communities, at least in Central Asia. The 20th century revealed the political and economic untenability of nomadism in an era of scientific and technological revolution.¹³ Second, there are particular difficulties for nomads related to the so-called folkloric product that festivals put on display. Although the technical and aesthetic parameters of nomadic art allow for the production of undeniable masterpieces fully meeting the requirements of products for export, a closer look reveals that the nomads themselves have different priorities; most notable is their prioritization of process over end result. As I have had occasion to remark elsewhere, the contrast between European-oriented and traditional nomadic art might be compared to the experience of a diner at a restaurant with

both nomadic and European waitstaff. The nomadic waiter, in contrast to the European, will never offer a made-to-order meat dish—or even a menu.¹⁴ Instead, the nomadic host will lead the guest to a pasture, select a sheep especially for him, slaughter it in the correct way (according to Kazakh tradition), boil it in water with salt... and serve it with the head and the intestines. In the run-up to this long-awaited moment, the host will also inquire about the genealogy of the guest; tell of his own heroic ancestors; discuss life and death, the connections between the generations, love and friendship; and only long after midnight will he sit down to the feast, the actual recipe for which is so simple. For the nomad, just as there exists no such thing as an abstract, nameless “meat,” there are also no two dishes that are exactly the same. In each there is a hidden abyss of information: the age of the sheep, the time of the year, the condition of the pasture, the technique of the hostess in butchering and preparing the feast, and the parts of the carcass offered to the guest in—without exaggeration—a traditional semiotic designation of his social status, his age, his place in an orally preserved genealogical table, his ability to accept this gift and hold up his end of the traditional conversation, and so on and so forth. It is an endless history, with many layers and many vectors, embodied in the procedure of the guest ritual, where the PROCESS, as we can see, is almost more important than the product.

Just how significant this process is became clear in Washington as well, when, on a day free of performances, the Kazakh participants received a gracious invitation from one of the festival-goers to visit his farm not far from the city, choose a sheep to kill, and prepare the traditional meat dish *bashbarmaq*. In addition, the Americans asked for permission to record on video literally everything that would take place that day, from the capture of the sheep to the presentation of the prepared dish.

The preparation for this procedure itself took on a mythological coloring. It was necessary to make a sacrifice in honor of the spirits of the ancestors for the protection of the musicians, who were on the road and in a foreign country. At the same time, this feast was also a sacrifice in memory of those who had tragically perished on September 11 the previous year in New York. As the musicians knew, time and space that have not been given form by ritual are chaotic and dangerous. Performing the ritual was meant to reestablish the harmony of life and the perception of life. After the ritual, the participants, feeling that they had fulfilled their duty, gathered once more at the hotel, since a hard day of work awaited them in the morning. To the question of why they did not eat their fill of meat, the Kazakhs responded, with surprise, that they had been overfed at the festival, and that having a *dastarqan*-style conversation with the Americans through an interpreter would be too tiring. They said that the sheep's meat was "thin," not at all like Kazakh meat, apparently because the grass around Washington contained too much moisture and not enough salt. Apart from that, everything was in order. The ritual was executed and even captured in its entirety on film. The festival could go on.

The extent to which the reception of Kazakh folklore can depend on external circumstances is illustrated by another sensationally successful concert, one at which I had occasion to be present on 3 February 2005. The concert took place in New York, in the Isaac Stern Auditorium of Carnegie Hall, and was organized by the Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the United States of America and the Ministry of Culture and Information of Kazakhstan.¹⁵ The auditorium was overflowing; the reserved seats were occupied by representatives of foreign embassies in the United States and also by Kazakh students studying in New York. The first part of the concert was devoted to European classical music (including an operatic aria by Leonard Bernstein), performed by brilliant violinists, pianists, opera singers, and a string chamber ensemble. This part of the

concert was a tuning fork for the next one, as well as a frame of reference for it. The second part was devoted to folk music. It was represented by soloists as well as the already legendary Kazakh State Kurmangazy Orchestra of Folk Instruments, which had observed its 60th anniversary the previous year. Everything was stunning: the show-stopping pace of the performance, the virtuosic vocal and instrumental mastery of the singers, the richness and diversity of the folk costumes. I must confess that the whole concert gave rise to such a feeling of nostalgia, among those of us who had been present for them, for the “happy” times of the *dekada* festival of national cultures, that our almost painful delight was transmitted to the entirely non-Soviet (or non-post-Soviet) American members of the audience as well. It was interesting to observe the artists backstage, where they awaited their entrances with professional patience, and also to observe them afterward, when they took off their makeup, changed their clothes, and calmly returned to their everyday lives. The behavior of the musicians from both the first and second parts of the concert did not fundamentally differ: most of them, after all, were graduates of Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory in Almaty.

Edil Khuseinov, already familiar to us from the Smithsonian Folklife Festival, also participated in this concert. His performance sparkled like a jewel in the crown of Kazakh art, and remarkably, it sounded—from the stage of Carnegie Hall—absolutely “authentic.”

Finally, the last concert I will describe is a performance of Kazakh musicians in London that I had organized for the opening of Asia House on 20 October 2005, in connection with the release of the first CD of Kazakh traditional music in England.¹⁶ This concert proved to be no less revealing than the others for an analysis of the typology of concert presentations of Kazakh folklore.

The folkloric-ethnographic ensemble that performed at this concert was created under the auspices of the Presidential Orchestra of the Republic of Kazakhstan in connection with the transfer of the capital to Astana in 1997. Because of its status (it accompanies the president on trips abroad and welcomes guests of the government), the ensemble functions as the nation's business card. It is made up of the best graduates from departments of folk instruments and singing at Almaty's Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory and Astana's Kazakh National Academy of Music. The musicians were distinguished by their youth and their strong professional preparation.

Unlike the musicians in the New York concert, the basis of whose experience consisted of government concerts as well as participation in *dekada* festivals and culture days in Kazakhstan, the musicians of the Presidential ensemble have a more chamber look and sound. For the most part, their repertoire is comprised of lyric songs. Their delicate arrangements gently encapsulate the untouched folkloric *melos*. At the same time, stylistically and emotionally, these arrangements are modernized to the highest degree, which is especially noticeable in their articulation: the musicians' experience of hearing bardic songs and *estradas* has paid off. On the whole (with the sole exception, perhaps, of selections from *epos*), all songs as performed by the ensemble sound very modern in a sophisticated or genteel way, if I may call it that.

We encounter the art of Edil Khuseinov once again in the repertoire of the Presidential ensemble, tastefully recorded on CD by Michael Church. In this new context, Khuseinov's music-making is reminiscent of that very popular "postmodern" style, New Age music. In the stylistic halo of this music-making, Khuseinov's compositions bear elements of an almost mystical knowledge of the future.

In these brief remarks, I have tried to capture the fluidity of the ethnic self-presentation of Kazakh folklore. Among numerous factors that have had a decisive impact on the character of folklore representation and require special research, we can now point to the following: 1) the ways presentation can be conceptualized, 2) the ideological and political orientation of the performance organizers, 3) the expectations of the public, 4) the age of the musicians and their level of training. What I find particularly interesting is the semantic reconceptualization of a single performer's art (e.g., that of Edil Khuseinov) across various concert contexts.

In this way, the proverbial authenticity—or, more broadly, the cultural stratification—of Kazakh folklore at the present stage cannot be discussed at all seriously without taking into consideration research on the laws regarding the way folklore is perceived by OTHERS, which makes it clearer and clearer that we are to be understood as diverse and constantly evolving OURSELVES.

– Translated by Scott Bartling and D. Brian Kim

¹ Alma Kunanbaeva. “Kazakhskii fol’klor: My i drugie.” In *Folk’lor i my: Traditsionnaia kul’tura v zerkale ee vospriiatii. Sbornik nauchnykh statei, posviashchennyi 70-letiiu I. I. Zemtsovskogo* [Folklore and Us: Traditional Culture in the Mirror of Its Reception. Collection of Scholarly Articles Dedicated to the 70th Birthday of I. I. Zemtsovsky]. Part 2. Comp. Nail’ia Al’meeva. Ed. Anna Nekrylova. St. Petersburg, 2011: 115-126.

² See, e.g., Boris Erzakovich, *Kazakhskaiia SSR [Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic]*, Moscow, 1954, and *Pesennaia kul’tura kazakhskogo naroda [Song Culture of the Kazakh People]*, Alma-Ata, 1966; Viktor Vinogradov, *Muzyka Sovetskogo Vostoka [Music of the Soviet East]*, Moscow, 1968; Bisengali Gizatov, *Ot kiüia do simfonii [From Kiiy to Symphony]*, Alma-Ata, 1976; Esengel’dy Zhakupov, *Epos na tsene [Epos on the Stage]*, Alma-Ata, 1977; Tamara Dzhumalievna and Alma Temirbekova, eds., *Istoriia kazakhskoi muzyki v dvukh tomakh [History of Kazakh Music in Two Volumes]*, Vol. 1, Almaty, 2000; Asiia Mukhambetova, “Traditsionnaia muzykal’naia kul’tura kazakhov v sotsial’nom kontekste XX veka [Traditional Musical Culture of the Kazakhs in the Social Context of the 20th Century],” in Bagdaulet Amanov and Asiia Mukhambetova, eds.,

Kazakhskaiia traditsionnaia muzyka i XX vek [Kazakh Traditional Music and the 20th Century], Almaty, 2002: 359-389; Gulnar Kendirbaeva, “Folklore and Folklorism in Kazakhstan,” *Asian Folklore Studies*, vol. 53 (1994): 97-123.

³ See, e.g.: Gabit Musperov, *Qyz-Zhibek: Musical play in 4 acts, 5 scenes; Kazakhskaiia narodnaia muzyka v obrabotke Narodnogo artista Respubliki, ordenonostsa, E. G. Brusilovskogo [Kazakh Folk Music Adapted by People’s Artist of the Republic, Order-Bearer E. G. Brusilovsky]*, Kazakh State Operatic Theater, Alma-Ata and Leningrad: 1937.

⁴ See Nurgiiian Ketegenova, ed. and comp., *Korifei kazakhskoi muzyki kompozitor Evgenii Brusilovskii [Composer Evgeny Brusilovsky, Leading Figure of Kazakh Music]*, Almaty, 1999. *Qyz-Zhibek*, which was originally a musical drama, was later reworked into an opera by Brusilovsky.

⁵ See Iurii Boiko, “Russkie narodnye instrumenty i orkestry russkikh narodnykh instrumentov [Russian folk instruments and orchestras of Russian folk instruments],” in Izalii Zemtsovskii, ed. and comp., *Traditsionnyi fol’klor v sovremennoi khudozhestvennoi zhizni [Traditional Folklore in Modern Artistic Life]*, Leningrad, 1984: 87-96.

⁶ Here I have in mind a parable that has become symbolic of the threat of cultural barbarization. It has achieved great popularity as a result of Chingiz Aitmatov’s 1980 novel *The Day Lasts More Than a Hundred Years*. See Chingiz Aitmatov, *The Day Lasts More Than a Hundred Years*, trans. John French, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.

⁷ See Saida Elemanova, “Mezhdunarodnye festivali traditsionnoi muzyki v Kazakhstane [International Festivals of Traditional Music in Kazakhstan],” in *Kul’tura i SMI: Problemy vzaimodeistviia [Culture and the Media: Problems of Interaction]*, Almaty, 2000: 86-94.

⁸ It is interesting that the system of Uzbek-Uyghur-Tajik maqom did not play a significant role in the Almaty festivals; this was likely in response to their over-representation, during the Samarkand symposia of the 1980s, as a central phenomenon of Central Asian oral professionalism.

⁹ See Alma Kunanbaeva, “Nomads,” in *The Silk Road: Connecting Cultures, Creating Trust. The 36th Annual Smithsonian Folklife Festival on the National Mall*, Washington, D.C., 2002: 81-87.

¹⁰ Hornbostel-Sachs number.

¹¹ Zinaida Mozheiko. “O vozrastnoi tsiklizatsii pesen [On the Age-Determined Cyclization of Songs].” *Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet Music]* 1969, 10:92-95.

¹² I am using Izaly Zemtsovsky’s expression. See his article “Intonatsionnoe novatorstvo soldatskogo fol’klora [The Intonational Innovation of Soldiers’ Folklore]” (*Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet Music]* 1985, 11:69.) His hypothesis on “disturbers of the peace in the evolution of the music of oral tradition” can now be refined and reconceptualized within the framework of the hypothesis I have presented here regarding the coexistence of three generational levels of folkloric tradition, among which it is specifically the middle level that is open to “disturbers of the peace.”

¹³ For more on contemporary nomadism, see Nurbulat Masanov, *Kochevaia tsivilizatsiia kazakhov* [*Nomadic Civilization of the Kazakhs*], Moscow, Almaty: 1995; Anatoly M. Khazanov, *Nomads and the Outside World*, trans. Julia Crookenden, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994; Anatoly M. Khazanov and André Wink, eds., *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2001.

¹⁴ See Alma Kunanbaeva, “Kochevaia tsivilizatsiia kak iskusstvo interpretatsii [Nomadic Civilization as the Art of Interpretation],” in *Muzykal’naia akademiia* [*Musical Academy*], 2006, 1:13; “Nomadic Civilization as the Art of Interpretation,” in *Music Along the Silk Road* (The Silk Road Project at UC Berkeley, Cal Performances, 2003): 60-62 (an abridged English version of a 2006 article published in Russian; the full version can be found at <http://www.silkroadhouse.org/papers/>).

¹⁵ *Songs and Melodies of Kazakhstan: A concert of Kazakh traditional and classical music performed by the Kazakh State Kurmangazy Orchestra of Folk Instruments* (art director and conductor Aitkali Zhaimov) and the Kazakh State Chamber Orchestra “Academy of Soloists” (art director Aiman Mussakhodjayeva, rector of the Kazakh National Academy of Music in Astana; conductor Bakhytzhhan Mussakhodjayeva).

¹⁶ *Songs from the Steppes: Kazakh Music Today*, recordings by Michael Church; notes, translations of song texts from Kazakh into English, source study and glossary by Alma Kunanbaeva; produced for Radio by Felix Radek Boschetty; production for Topic Records by Tony Engle. TSCD 929. Topic Records Ltd. (Topic World Series). London, 2005. (See review in *Ethnomusicology*, Vol. 50 [2006], No. 3: 524-26, by Izaly Zemtsovsky). This concert has its own story. Michael Church was in Almaty with the BBC as a judge for a Central Asian piano competition. By chance, he happened to hear about a different competition that was taking place concurrently: a competition of professional Kazakh traditional singing. Church was so impressed with the artistry of the young singers that he was struck by an idea: he would record them to be broadcast on the BBC, and he would produce a special CD. With this goal in mind, he went to Kazakhstan a second time. On that trip, he was invited to Astana, where he would record the repertoire of the Presidential Ensemble of folk music. For more details, see Michael Church, “Bowling to Kazakhstan,” *BBC Music Magazine*, October 2005: 44-46.