

## **Role and scientific contribution of L. Gumilyov in study of history and tradition of ancient Turkic people**

The main object of research of Lev Nikolayevich Gumilev was history of the nomadic people of the Great steppe. Deeply studying history and culture of the nomadic people, L. Gumilyov had huge respect and sympathy for the people of Eurasia. For this reason his scientific work "Ancient Turkic Peoples" begins with words: "I devote this book to our brothers - the Turkic people of the Soviet Union". Marking huge value ancient Turk in the history of mankind, the scientist with a big regret states that "... the history of these people is still not written. It was explained in passing and in abbreviated form ..."

In this regard, L. Gumilyov's role and scientific contribution in study of socio-political and ethnic history, tradition of statehood and the power, culture of the Turkic people is huge. It is important for us that one of receivers of Turkic heritage is also the Kazakh people.

L. Gumilyov as the scientist-humanist always marked that the culture of each people is unique that there are no defective ethnos. Ethnos cannot be determined as "worse" or "best", "cultural" or "cultureless" as any ethnos in its development follows the same universal regularities of ethno-genesis.

The scientist explained why it so: "... all ethnos have the different containing landscape and different past creating the present both in time and in space. The culture of each ethnos is peculiar, and this diversity of mankind as look gives it plasticity thanks to which the type of Homo sapiens survived on the planet Earth". In introduction of the book "Ancient Turkic Peoples" L. Gumilyov emphasized that "... Turkic peoples not only played a role of intermediaries, but also at the same time developed own culture which they found it possible to oppose to culture of China, Iran, Byzantium and India. This special steppe culture had ancient traditions and deep roots, but the culture of the settled countries is known little to us.

The reason, certainly, not that Turkic peoples and other nomad tribes were less gifted, than their neighbors, and that residuals of their material culture — felt, skin, a tree and furs — remain worse, than a stone, but because among the West European scientists there was an erratic judgment that nomads were "idler of mankind" (Viola de-Duke)".

Further the scientist, reflecting on deep roots of a Turkics civilization, claims that "the archaeological works which are carried out in Southern Siberia, Mongolia and Central Asia annually refute this judgment, and soon there will come time when we are able to tell about art ancient Turks. But even more, than the material culture, difficult forms of social being and social institutes Turks strike the researcher: ale, specific and ladder system, hierarchy of ranks, military discipline,

diplomacy and also existence of accurately waste outlook opposed to ideological systems of neighboring countries".

L. Gumilyov was sure that in-depth scientific studies on stories and cultures of the Turk-Mongolian people will make clear this issue.

Thus, it is important to note that the role of the scientist in study of history of the Turkic people, firstly, consists in a denial of the Europe-centrist concept about stories of the steppe nomadic people.

L. Gumilyov in his work was against Europe-centrist statement that nomads had neither history nor statehood and even more own civilization. N.Trubetsky, particularly, denying Eurocentrism wrote that it is "the Roman-German chauvinism".

L. Gumilev in the book "The Millennium around the Caspian Sea" emphasized that long time the scientific thought of historians of Europe was occupied with an iron ring of mono-centrism. Since F. Hegel's era it seemed obvious that development of a civilization went through ancient Judea, Hellas, and Rome and found the completion in the Western Roman-German Europe surrounded by the "unhistorical" or "backward" people.

Relying on the book against Eurocentrism, he made the concept of polycentrism, in particular the Euroasian polycentrism. "The Euroasian polycentrism assumes that there are a lot of such centers. Europe – center of the world, also Palestine – center of the world. Iberia and China – center of the world, etc. There is a lot of centers" – stated the scientist.

In his work "Ancient Turkic peoples", "Huns", "Discovery of Khazaria", "The millennium around the Caspian Sea", etc. the scientist gives the scientific analysis to features of formation of statehood of nomads. He draws a conclusion about existence and statehood and a developed civilization at nomad. In his book "History of the People to a Huns" wrote: "We want to understand how the sparse nomadic people created such form of the organization and culture which allowed it to save independence and originality throughout many centuries, did not undergo final defeat yet and did not undergo full destruction. What was the power of these people and why they lost it? Who were Huns? And what they left to descendants? Having found responses to the questions posed, we thereby will correctly define value of Huns in the history of mankind".

L. Gumilyov marks an important role of historic figures in formation and development of statehood in Turkic peoples. So, in the example of military-political activities of Bilge Kagan, Tonykuka and Kultegin, L. Gumilev explicitly describes political history, features of statehood and culture of Turkic peoples. So, in the book "The Millennium around the Caspian Sea" L. Gumilev wrote: "If

Kapagan-Khan claimed that he is at war only against the Chinese government, but loves the people and accepts the Chinese culture, Tonuyukuk countered Turkic culture to Laozi and Buddha's doctrines, as independent and equivalent. ... Even on the escaped literature monuments making hardly a hundredth part of that that was written on birch bark or it was stored in memory of steppe storytellers, it is visible that Turkic peoples had original outlook, mythology, history and big data on geography.

Turkic people to develop culture required peace and independence from aggressive China. Bilge Khan managed to achieve them. In 731 died Kultegin, faithful fellow campaigner of his brother. His monument shows that the culture of Turkic people in 8th century was not undeveloped compare to other cultures of the people of that time”.

L. Gumilyov's scientific works on history and statehood of the Turkic people were always followed by rich factual material. He used wide range of literature in different languages in his works.

L. Gumilyov proved efficiency of synthesis of methods of researchers of humanitarian and natural sciences by his original scientific approaches. Interdisciplinary approach was always in his research works.

L. Gumilev entered into ethnology such concepts as ethno-genesis phases, "passionarity", "passional waves", etc. He claimed that in ethnic history of any people it is necessary to consider natural and geographical factors.

He introduced into ethnology such concepts as ethno-genesis, “passionarity”, “passion waves”, etc. He claimed that in ethnic history of any people it is necessary to consider natural and geographical factors.

Problems of interethnic and cross-cultural contacts existed always throughout all history of mankind. These problems are also central in L. Gumilev's concept. Thus, it is necessary to mark that L. Gumileva is belonged by idea of ethnic and cultural "complementarity" of the people of Eurasia.

L. Gumilev, opening regularities of formation of ethnic traditions, defined what complementarity is. According to him, a complementarity – the basis on which not simply pass, but destinies of interacting ethnos and super ethnos are carried out. He concluded that manifestation of a complementarity does not depend on the state feasibility, an economic benefit or character of ideological system ... the phenomenon of a complementarity exists and plays in ethnic history if not deciding, very the significant role.

According to the scientist, the complementarity is a not only mutual sympathy, but also antipathy. In this regard it subdivided a complementarity into the positive and the negative.

Positive complementarity was considered as expression of boundless tolerance in relation to the partner. Highlighting tolerance of the Turkic people L. Gumilyov wrote: Turkic people showed unique ability to perceive achievements of other cultures and adjust them to their conditions.

It was not closed culture. Afterwards Muslims, facing Turkic people marked their ability to find a common language with the environmental people. Turkic peoples showed these qualities regardless of whether they came to the new country as winner or as guests, as mercenaries or as prisoners of war slaves (L. Gumilev, Ancient Turkic peoples, p. 149).

The negative complementarity was characterized mainly by intolerance of unaccountable antipathy. In this case aspirations to rebuild or destroy the partner dominated. But along with basic provisions of a complementarity, Gumilev marked also a neutral complementarity. And it is characterized as "the tolerance caused by indifference".

Relationship of Turkic-Slavic people, he considered in close connection with environment with the feeding landscape. He was convinced that functioning of ethnos is a method of adaption to the geographical and ethnic environment. Thus, the complementarity is also natural phenomenon.

According to L. Gumilev, ethno-cultural relations of the Great steppe and Russia had complementary character. He as the scientist-humanist proved that the true friendship of the people is possible only in case of deep respect for dignity, honor, culture, language and history of each people and broad communication between them.

In the book "Black legend. Friends and foes of the Great steppe" he refuted the most different negative stereotypes and fought for restoration of honor and advantage and Russian, both Turkic, and the Mongolian people, standing up for a natural and necessary brotherhood of all people.

Thus, L.N. Gumilev formulated the concept of a dialog, mutual understanding between the Turkic-Mongolian and Slavic people. In our opinion, these ideas and concepts of the scientist can be demanded in the solution of interethnic and cross-cultural problems of the modern society.

L. Gumilev's one more important methodological approach is in the fact that history of the nomadic people including history of Turkic peoples, he considered in a context from world history. His profound knowledge on world history promoted most fully to light these or those sides of history of Turkic peoples. He wrote that "Ancient Turkic peoples, despite their huge value in the history of mankind, were small, and the tight neighborhood with China and Iran could not but be reflected in

their internal affairs. Thus, the social and political history of these countries is tightly bound and for restoration of the course of events we shall keep an eye both that and another. Not the smaller role was played by the changes of an economic environment, in particular, connected to the high or low level of export of the Chinese goods and obstructive actions Iranian the governments. As boundaries of a Turkic khanate at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century were closed in the West with Byzantium, in the south with Persia and even India, and in the east with China, it is natural that peripheries of history of these countries during the period are connected to destinies of the Turkic power".

Contemporary researches of scientific heritage mark that L. Gumilyov, studying at first political and then ethnic history of the steppe people of Eurasia, was beyond of traditional philological or social and economic orientalism. He rose to the level of regional (Eurasian) history, and then on the conceptual level of the world history, it is very rare who manage that. Feature of scientific approach of L. Gumilyov in study of the people of Eurasia was that it differentiated and as the same time connected three research books: "from birds flight", "from a barrow" and "from a mouse hole".

At the same time research of history of Turkic peoples and the Great steppe allowed him "rise" on history boundary with geography, to catch visible correlation of changes of economic and political system of this ethnos with changes in its native, feeding landscape.

His scientific heritage as historian of the Eurasian people, causes huge interest not only in Russia and but also in Kazakhstan. For this reason, in 1996 by the Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev in Astana was opened the Eurasian National University which was named after him.

Today the Eurasian National University named after L. Gumilyov is one of research center which is study and advocate scientific heritage of L. Gumilyov and Eurasianism. For this purpose the specialized chair of the Euroasian researches and "Eurasia" scientific center were created.

In 2012, a range of events devoted to the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of L. Gumilyov were carried out. According to the plan L. Gumilyov's the museum-office, where all memorial things, letters from friends and colleagues and other exhibits had been kept, was restored.

In summary there is a wish to tell that the name and a creative heritage of L.N. Gumilev is a bright and unique phenomenon of historical destiny of the scientist-researcher.

In conclusion, the name and heritage of L.Gumilyov is a bright and unique phenomenon of historical destiny of the scientist-researcher.

## **Literature:**

1. L. Gumilyov, Ancient Turkic people, 1967, p.3;
2. Zh. Ermekbayev, Theory of ethno-genesis and Eurasian Ideas of L. Gumilyov in teaching historical disciplines, Textbook for students of humanities specialties, Astana, ENU named after L.Gumilyov, 2003, p.69;
3. L. Gumilyov, Histocial-philosophical works of the prince N. Trubetsky (notice of the last Eurasian);
4. N.Trubetsky, History, Culture, Language, 1995, p.36, p.114;
5. L. Gumilyov, Rhythms of Eurasia: eras and civilizations. M, 1993, p. 10, 27
6. L. Gumilyov, History of Huns, Two books, book No 1, 2002, p.7-8;
7. L. Gumilyov, “The Millennium around the Caspian Sea”, 1998, p. 205-210, p.362-365;
8. Marlene Laryuel. When the intellectual property, or about L.N. Gumilyov and P. Savitsky's contrast//the Bulletin of Eurasia is appropriated, 2001, No. 4, p. 14.
9. N. Doroshenko, Methodological approaches of L. Gumilyov and Eurasians;
10. S. Seliverstov, World of Eurasia: history, present and perspectives: Works of the Fifth international Eurasian scientific forum. Astana: Publishing house of ENU, 2007, p. 36-43.

***T. Sadykov***

*Doctor of History,*

*Dean of faculty of social sciences of ENU named after L.Gumilyov*