



Influence of symbolism in world literature on Kazakh poets' creativity

Laila Zh. Mussaly^{a1} , Laura N. Daurenbekova^b , Saule D. Seidenova^c ,
Aizhan M. Kartayeva^d , Bakytzhan B. Kelgembayeva^e 

^{a,c}Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

^bEurasian Humanitarian Institute, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

^{d,e}Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Republic of Kazakhstan

APA Citation:

Mussaly, L. Zh., Daurenbekova, L. N., Seidenova, S. D., Kartayeva, A. M., & Kelgembayeva, B. B. (2022). Influence of symbolism in world literature on Kazakh poets' creativity. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 447-457. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.193

Submission Date:04/07/2021

Acceptance Date:10/10/2021

Abstract

There is reason to believe that among the poetic methods, the artistic activity of the symbol is great, if we talk about the importance of activity and significance of the art of the artistic word. Due to the syncretic nature of the word in fiction, its means of representation, the word-symbols are also syncretic to a certain extent. This paper explores the trends in the study of symbolism in foreign and domestic literary studies, the direction of its development, and it considers the artistic and aesthetic function of the symbol in the works of representatives of the first symbolist movement in Kazakh poetry M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev as well. Moreover, the concepts used in Kazakh poetry that provide information about the symbols of the national worldview, the way of thinking, singing and life of nomads are analyzed in the paper in general. Through the analysis of the symbol, the poet's worldview, attitude to the inner feelings have been revealed, and attention is drawn to the fact that literary symbols are an artistic category. In general, when recognizing a symbol, the opinions of world thinkers are taken into consideration.

Keywords: symbolism; poetry; lyrics; suggestibility; poetics; concept

1. Introduction

It can be seen that artistic symbols are an artistic phenomenon inherent in the nature of Kazakh literature, the national system of thinking as a whole, in the history of national literature, the course of development of artistic thought, and poetic memory through poetic memory. The method of linking an author's concept with a specific symbol has never been alien. In Kazakh literature at the beginning of the XX century, the transformation of the symbol into an artistic and creative character and a special poetic approach serves as a confirmation of the expansion of the horizons and increasing the level of general artistic thought.

The term symbolism as the name of a poetic direction was first used by the French symbolist poet J. Moreas (1886) explained in his work "Symbolis Manifesto". Symbolists recognized poetry as a special type of artistic thinking, the content of it is conveyed by the means of prose, without recognizing the external features of the poetic form, they introduced *verlibre*. The word "*verlibre*" was

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: l-mussaly7265@ust-hk.com.cn

introduced by the classic of world literature A. Rembo (Andreeva & Tolmacheva, 1988; Atabekova, 2020). Symbolists enhanced the multi-meaning and ambivalence of the image, thereby giving an intonation tone to small lyrical forms. It was a game of associations, a combination of meanings that destroyed the formed real meanings of the word, gave it an understatement. He enriched poetry with the compositional principles of music, thereby expanding the boundaries of artistic creativity, striving for the synthesis of theater, art, music, and poetry following Wagner's example.

We did not accidentally choose Kazakh poetry of the early XX century as a poetic material for our work on the symbol. In the poetry of this period, examples of pure symbols of a national character were shown, and there is a tendency to symbolism. At the same time, the main object is the work of famous poets Magzhan Zhumabayev and Berniyaz Kuley. The above-mentioned “obsession with symbolism” is evident in the works of these poets, and it is known that these poets were first accused of being “cynical” and “symbolist”. As the most advanced representative of poetry at that time, these poets could not have passed without a touch of symbolism. There was an objective, subjective overflow of reasons for this.

We all know that at the beginning of XX century, the dominant trend in Russian poetry, and even in all European art, was symbolism. And the identification of the character and national identity of the symbol, the individualization of national patterns and its continuity in poetic thought based on the works of representatives of the symbolist movement in Kazakh literature M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev and this is undoubtedly a great place in the formation of a comprehensive teaching about artistic phenomena. It is because in the poetic practice of these poets, who became “symbolists”, symbolization was specifically used as a real creative method.

1.1 Literature Review

Foreign and domestic social sciences have developed their own tradition of research work on the interpretation of the artistic and aesthetic meaning and function of the poetic symbol in poetry. Although the symbol is an ancient concept closely related to human consciousness, its philosophical and aesthetic interpretation has started later. If we look at the data mentioned in the work “Brief Literature Encyclopedia” (Surkov, 1989), we can see that although symbols have a significant place in the history of the development of the human mind, there is no consistency in its perception and research. Chronologically, the first manifestations of the symbol can be found in ancient times. In the literary monuments of the Ancient East, runic inscriptions of the ancient Turks, Orkhon-Yenisei script, one can find of hint and puzzle methods.

And in the general ancient mythological worldview, the symbolic meaning and its real meaning were not separated, but they are understood as a balance, that is, the symbol did not undergo any reflection. And in ancient culture, after Plato's experience of reviving the second symbolic meaning of ancient mythology, a new approach began to form. For Plato, it was necessary, first of all, to separate the symbol from pre-philosophical myth, because in the Hellenistic system of thought, the symbol was often confused with allegory (Svasian, 1980). In the context of such views, the search was aimed at identifying the dependence of the symbol on the idea of dual, bilateral or antithetical construction, as well as its material and ideal, real and universal characteristics, and made efforts to identify the correspondence that forms the structure of the symbol (Atabekova & Shoustikova, 2018).

Russian literary critic B. A. Zhetpisbayeva (1999) notes that symbols go through various stages of development, entering into a close relationship with time, history and being. Indeed, by weighing works related to the history of the symbol, it can be seen that this concept has experienced periods of ups and downs, and even symbolization. In the Renaissance, when human consciousness was revived the multiplicity of the symbol was taken into account and the tendency to perceive it intuitively

increased, but a new theory of the symbol was not developed. In Baroque and classicism, the symbol again went unnoticed due to the renewed taste for book allegory. Only the aesthetic theory of German Romanticism consciously opposed the classicist allegory of symbol and myth as the equality of idea and image.

In “Brief Literature Encyclopedia”, it is noted that F. Kreitzer's work “symbolism and mythology of ancient peoples” played a special role in the formation of the romantic theory of symbols. “He developed a classification of symbol types on the material of ancient Greek mythology. Mystical symbols that indicate that a form cannot be a direct manifestation of infinity; plastic symbols that try to fit the semantic infinity of a symbol into simplicity, a closed form, etc” (Lavrenev, 1987). It is not superfluous to pay attention to this classification in order to recognize some of the individual properties of the symbol. In contrast to the allegory of the symbol, Kreutzer, who agreed with Schelling, notes the “instantaneous integrity” of the symbol, the ability to influence directly, and the naturalness of its structure.

In the study of the symbol, the views of German thinkers also attract attention. For example, for the German poet F. Schlegel, the general meaning of poetic creativity is “eternal symbolization”. German romantics rely heavily on Goethe in symbol judgment, because he valued all forms of nature and human creativity as symbols that have meaning and speak. The main difference of Goethe's reasoning from the Romantics is that he connects the invisible abstractness and unclassifiable integrity of the symbol with the naturalness of life itself, which is manifested through the symbol, and not in a mystical context that connects it with the other world, it should be noted that this view had some influence on the development of literature and culture. The German philosopher Hegel opposed the romantics and emphasized the rationalistic, symbolic character in the structure of the symbol, noting that “the symbol is, first of all, a symbolic unit” (Andreev et al., 1987), Hegel emphasizes its conditionality and does not give spiritual freedom.

A. Bely (1994), a Russian symbolist poet and theorist of symbolism, also draws attention to the opinion of the symbol. For A. Bely, the symbol is a universal category with a philosophical and creative context. “The symbol represents all imaginative, creative and ethical norms. The conclusion that the symbol in this sense is bound of bounds. The constantly repeated opinion of the scientist “symbol-value” shows that the symbol is a very important concept for the scientist. In general, in the recognition and evaluation of the symbol, it is necessary to pay deep attention to the definitions of the theorist of symbolism A. Bely defined especially the approach that connects the symbol with cognition and creativity. He concludes that symbol is “creative cognition and unity of content”.

In general, if we look at the etymology of the term symbol, we can see that at first the social and communicative function of this term was strong. “Cumbola” was called by the ancient Greeks by overlapping fragments of a dissected plate. Through these fragments, friendly, allied people recognized each other, that is, they knew and understood “their people” by the symbol. Unlike an allegory that other aliens can also recognize and understand, the symbol has a warm secret that can unite people. In this regard, A. Bely's suggests that the word “symbol”, which is a noun, comes from the verb gumballw (throw together, combine); the symbol is the result of fusion; the noun “synthesis” comes from the verb guvrio (think together), the word “think together” is not yet a merger, the word “synthesis” is only a mechanical sum of ideas obtained together; and “symbol is the result of organic fusion” (Bely, 1994). This view of the scientist is of great importance for the recognition of the characteristic that makes the symbol a symbol. We see that the etymological meaning of the symbol does not disappear at all, but only in the course of development it is updated from different angles.

In order to come to a clear conclusion about the symbol, we would like to give the most unambiguous, reasoned definitions among the reviews we have already encountered. In the “Short

dictionary of literary criticism terms” a symbol is a word or object that conditionally expresses the essence of a particular phenomenon. Along with the generally understood symbolism, there are also individual symbols created by poets in literature. To reveal their essence, it is necessary to look into the poetic world of the author (Akhmetov & Shanbayev, 1998). In the book “Literary encyclopedic dictionary” (Kozhevnikov & Nikolaev, 1987; Polyakova & Balanyuk, 2018; Ermachkov et al., 2021) the concept of a symbol is considered deeper and broader, “symbol” is a Greek symbol, a sign of recognition:

1. in science – a symbol;
2. in art – a universal aesthetic category, defined by a giant comparison with the subsidiary categories of an artistic image: on the one hand – a symbol, on the other - an allegory.

In a broad sense, a symbol is an image, an image obtained in its symbolic aspect, and the symbol itself is distinguished by the inexhaustible multiplicity and naturalness of the image.

2. Materials and Methods

The object image and the deep meaning appear in the structure of the symbol as two poles that cannot be imagined without each other, and they are separated by two, giving rise to the symbol. According to A. F. Losev (1976), “if there is no accumulation of this substance in a symbol that exceeds its limits, it is not a symbol”, that is, the accumulation that occurs in a symbol can be divided into infinite semantic sides, open from different angles and create new associations.

Therefore, it is necessary to think about the statement “symbol – accumulation”. It is also the opinion of the outstanding Kazakh literary critic Akhmet Baitursynov (1991) that “this is a collection of meanings and conspiracies”. A symbol never remains within the same meaning, its semantic field is infinitely wide. In any case, the symbol is the same thing as the object itself, exceeding its limits. When one is revealed through the essence of the next phenomenon, a new knowledge of truth is born from the mutual influence of the two phenomena, from the connection of each side. This truth is a new truth that is accumulated and born, a truth that is clear, understandable, and filtered from both previous phenomena. For example, the symbol “double Swan” is a symbol of love and loyalty in the same position. The meaning and power of the symbol is here, in darkness and clarity. It is obvious that the special juiciness and richness of the Kazakh language, especially the consonant harmony in symbolistic poetry, enhance the musical and suggestive character of national literary symbols.

When we talk about the problem of symbols in Kazakh literary studies, first of all, we turn again to A. Baitursynov's “the bearer of literature”. In the chapter “The science of word art” of this work, he emphasized the “conditions of speech”. Among these conditions, the most important thing for the poet's language is to know that “language is visual”, and “it is necessary to express the word correctly, clearly, clearly, accurately. A person is more aware of a documentary object than an abstract object, and the state of a living object is more familiar to him than the state of an inanimate object. Therefore, in order for the word to be fully understood in speech, a person describes abstract objects as documentary objects, inanimate objects as living things” (Baitursynov, 1989). According to the main types of methods, they are divided into three classes:

1. Decoration.
2. Pointing.
3. Influence, thus he classified the poetic method-means.

3. Results and Discussion

According to A. Baitursynov's definition it is “to express the character, will, and behavior of one thing, most often a person, on the example of another thing”. Literary critic Z. Kabdолоv (1992) in his work “Art of words” said that “a kind of trope – an understatement, or a symbol (Greek, a conventional sign) – does not literally describe something, but hides something like it in a secret, conciseness, interpretation of thoughts with an attractive hint, without revealing the idea”, “the most important thing is that the symbol gives a beautiful, serious philosophical primer to the reality embroidered in the art of words”.

The definition symbol in literature is an alternative image with a specific character, which is created by highlighting thoughts and describing something else” was given by academician Z. Akhmetov (1998). The scholar concretizes the poetic symbol, saying that the symbols found in the folk language are closer to the hint (allegory), and “in literature and poetry, the symbol is often made in harmony, the meaning of the primer is deep, it is expressed in the form of a single image-image”. It is also one of the works that specifically addressed the problem of symbols in modern Kazakh literary criticism – in the monograph of the literary researcher B. A. Zhetpisbayeva (1999) “symbol in movement of literature”, based on the leading concepts of “symbol”, in the first chapter, which describes the current state of symbol science, the scientist analyzes various controversial views on it, arising from the ambiguous nature of the symbol.

The fact that the symbol is recognized in Kazakh literary science only as one of the artistic tropes and defined only from the point of view of some features requires a deep study and consistent analysis of it.

At the beginning of the XX century, a symbolistic channel appeared in Kazakh poetry, and in the poems of talented Kazakh poets such as M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev, you can find various manifestations of symbol-burneling.

Сылдыр-сылдыр сылдырлап,

Бірінің сырын бірі ұрлап...

(Zhumabayev, 1992)

Сылқ-сылқ етіп езу тартып күлді су,

Сәуле ме екен, елестеген неткен бұ

Қанаты ма жарқыраған немене

Ұялассыз, мезгілсіз жүрген неткен қу...

(Kuleyev, 1969)

The Kazakh language, which is inherent in its own nature, is characterized by a ringing syngarmonism, which increases the plasticity of the language of poetry. Magzhan and Berniyaz skillfully used such musical and harmonic capabilities of their native language, captivated the Kazakh reader and increased the suggestive (seductive) of artistic character.

Suggestibility is one of the most important qualities of the symbol, it simply does not succumb to the power of the mind. Suggestibility should not be perceived only as “polynomial”. Suggestibility is a powerful feature of the influence that an artist can intuitively convey and entice the reader's mood to a secret that he has discovered. The symbol and its layered structure require mental labor, awakening the intuition of the recipient-researcher (recipient-interpreter).

It is obvious that suggestive symbols come from suggestive ideas. The writer also leads and seduces his reader to the high ideals that they strive for. It seems that the smell of symbolists Magzhan

and Berniyaz is always dear and close to the Kazakh reader, and the reason can be found in the artistic meaning of the symbols created by them. Suggestive is a Latin word that means “influence, impact”, and also means “inviting and tempting to think”. Literary critic N. Zhuanyshbekov stated that “suggestiveness – in poetry an active expression of the reader's imagination, emotions, subconscious mind”, “Plenipotentiary ignorance” is logically incomprehensible, disturbing, hinting thematic, image, rhythmic, sound associations” (Zhuanyshbekov, 2000). It can be said that the suggestiveness of poems of Magzhan and Berniyaz is associated with the power, ecstatic character, and meditative influence of image, rhythm, and sound associations in the fiery poems of bernias.

The famous literary critic B.K. Maitanov (2001), in his research on the artistic skills of M. Zhumabayev, analyzes and scales symbolic expressions in the poetry of Magzhan about their poetic function. For example, in the context of the image of “Fire” alone, “the concept of fire, which is a sacred totem of the ancient Turkic people, is characterized in the form of various ethnographic and physical characteristics and has a symbolic meaning at the ideological level. It is a consolidated image of the Asian country of the East”. Another characteristic feature of Magzhan and Berniyaz’s symbols is the formation of certain supporting symbols.

One of the most important conditions of artistic knowledge is considered to be symbols–words that come from associations with each other in different chains, depending on the specifics of the poet's perception of the world. For example, the poetics of Magzhan and Berniyaz are distinguished by the stability of a specific theme and the fact that the poet impresses them with different shades. In his artistic practice, the artist, who has perfected poetic techniques, is able to develop the types of tropes in different directions, elevating individual words to the degree of symbol. Words that have acquired such a stable character in our perception (sun, wind, steppe, river, life, fire, wave, etc.) has become a symbol of their creativity.

Symbols in the poetry of B. Kuleyev and M. Zhumabayev have a strong artistic function in poetry. These are the components of the ideological concept of poets, the most obvious motive of their aesthetics, which are formed as a constant expression in all their poems, and other figurative uses arise from these supporting symbols and reveal them in many ways. The most characteristic of Magzhan's aesthetics are the life-giving pathos, human-loving pathos, unbridled willpower, the cult of the heart, the freedom-loving liberator, the patriotic motives of his native land and nation, which are reflected in certain symbols and change in different shades (Table 1). For example:

Table 1. Symbols in the poetry of B. Kuleyev and M. Zhumabayev

| Words-symbols | Meaning |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Sun, fire, life | optimistic motif that calls for life; |
| wind, wave | freedom and action; |
| river, steppe, mountain, sea | symbols that appeal to the properties of nature-breadth, height, generosity, etc.; |
| lion, tiger, falcon | strong will; |
| birch, young tree, poplar, leaf | fresh and naive youth, purity; |
| sun, star, and moon | light and heat, energy, and life. |

The richness of the semantics of Magzhan Zhumabayev's symbols is so great that you can't connect them to just one meaning, one symbol changes from the inside and even covers the opposite meaning (silk wind – crazy wind). The compositional, ideological, and semantic–semiotic roles of such symbols are diverse. This is one of the features of the symbolic content and form in the works of M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleev. It can be seen that such symbols are the basis of poetic thought, and other

artistic means and images are spreading. The main feature of the lyrics is subjectivism, which is very characteristic of the lyrics of Magzhan Zhumabayev and Berniyaz Kuleyev.

Berniyaz Kuleyev (1969) is an irrationalist poet who does not make any objective, concrete, materialized thought a subject in his poems. In his poems, the truth lies in the fact that he wants to convey the facts of life, but also in his own emotions about this phenomenon. In the last his work, we see that the melody of longing for the past, longing for sadness intensified. In the poems “Now my heart, I am ready to die”, “Take me my God”, the character of Berniyaz Kuleyev is strengthened, the accent is only a different pessimistic tone. In the poem “Take me my God” there is a symbolic image:

*Өлді жүрек, идеал жоқ,
Идеал табар, қиял жоқ.
Өрттен қалған көмірмін.*

Here the semantics of heart are complicated, and the symbolic undertone is deepened. The author has integrated all his creative, poetic essence, soul into this symbol. Berniyaz Kuleyev is a poet of the heart, always speaks on the heart, worships the heart. The heart is a symbol of the whole being, the spiritual world. And the death of the heart in this poem is the destruction of the poet's own creation, the end of his own life. Indeed, these poems were written before the tragic death of B. Kuleyev in October. It is clear from this poem that one of the reasons for the death of Berniyaz Kuleyev, who was able to predict his death with poetic intuition, was a creative crisis. The reason for the death of the heart is the lack of an ideal, the cutting off of the wings of the imagination. The poet describes his state in such a difficult creative moment as “the coal left over from the fire”. It is a symbol of the heart of the poet, of the exhausted inspiration, of the creative world, which has cooled down without fire. Through the character of the chalet, coal left over from the fire, the poet summed up all his horror, creative cry. There are also the following symbols that give this motive:

*Үзілген бұл, жас өмір
Үнсіз бұлбұл - қызыл тіл
Зардан басқа сыр білмес
Жан жаңылды тілегін
Шөлден көпкен жүрегім
өлді қайта тірілмес.*

“Silent nightingale – red tongue” is a symbol of creative “silence”, the images “interrupted young life”, “my heart dried up from the desert” also convey the motive of frustration from different angles, to varying degrees. The image of “my heart dried from the desert” is rich in symbolic images. The symbol “desert” refers to many aspects: spiritual thirst, crisis, thirst for creativity, inability to find an ideal, loss of heart, etc. clearly and impressively conveyed the poet's state at that moment.

The nature of the birth and realization of a symbol in a poetic context depends primarily on the author's position, which, by replacing poetic meanings, creates random associations, seeks to show the power of mood and emotion of the lyrical hero. In the poetry of talented poets Magzhan and Berniyaz, who managed to rise to the level of thinking with symbols, along with other types of tropes, a whole chain of symbols is formed, on the basis of which a whole poetic world is formed.

In general, Magzhan and Berniyaz are more restrained in the use of traditional variations, more elegant in the selection of poetic material, because they are well aware of the complex semantic possibilities of the word. “...half of the vocabulary in the language of poetry consists of words used in a literal sense”. Creating a new word by “branching” the meaning of a word is the only feature of poetry. This is a poetic vocabulary, that is, the use of words in a figurative, expressive style. Poetry is

separated from prose by such active words as these, which it brings to the fore in its vocabulary. It is active against the background of other normal “passive” words, in the sense that they are in the background. Coloring a particular component is a way to promote it. In order for the patterned, colored component to manifest itself in this pattern, color, it needs a normality, a background in the form, which will stand after it, which will allow it to show its originality.

The relationship of equality, harmony between this normal group of words and active (avant-garde) words, which go forward, into the picture, creates an artistic image in the poetic language. Such active words acquire a stable character, pass to the symbolic character. In general, it should be borne in mind that “when it comes to the history of the language of poetry, the vocabulary of poetry should be considered in parallel in two directions: in the direction of origin – meaning and semantic use” (Vinogradov, 1963). From this point of view, in the poetry of Magzhan and Berniyaz, some words are used in a generic-semantic sense, that is, certain reference words are formed. Another word-images revolves around these basic words. For example, such basic words in the poetry of Magzhan and Berniyaz include the words of the heart and life.

These words-symbols appear in all poems of poets in different content, in different forms. These words, which reflect the life and creative concepts of the two poets, are revealed in each poem from different angles. So, in this article, we analyzed the process of birth, consolidation, and replenishment of symbolic content and form in the poetry of M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev until we reached our state. When studying this phenomenon, you can recognize the most prominent and perfect, significant and expressive symbolic expressions.

One can add that “At the beginning of the formation of symbolism in Kazakh literature, European and Russian symbolism managed to completely overcome the stages of saturation and even stagnation. Therefore, Magzhan and Berniyaz had the opportunity to use in their works the imperfections, the viability and transience of the famous literary trend. It is possible to join the opinion that they were guided by the ideal of writing poems, which they received from the ideological and aesthetic school” (Eleukenov, 1995).

The origins and prerequisites of the symbolist process, the practice of symbolization in the works of Magzhan Zhumabayev and Berniyaz Kuleyev come from completely different directions. Kazakh symbolism is based on the symbols of the National worldview, the style and content of thinking, singing of nomads in general. Reviving this traditional spiritual consciousness, the two most talented Kazakh poets were able to express their poetic experiences in a new way and give them a different symbol. In this poetry, a more complex artistic and suggestive new symbolic content was formed, which was combined with an organic combination of mystical features, occult concepts, religious knowledge, philosophical principles, scientific principles, and life impressions. And this content was decorated with symbolistic patterns, expertly embroidered in various forms.

All the details of the artistic language (sound, syllable, word, rotation, sleep, rhythm, etc.) have acquired a symbolic character, and symbolistic lyrics have appeared in the history of Kazakh poetry. Thus, in our article, we analyzed the course of birth, consolidation, and replenishment of symbolic content and form in the poetry of M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev.

4. Conclusions

Artistic symbols, i.e. symbols, are not only a meaningful and valuable result of artistic knowledge, but also to some extent an indicator of its development and change. It is because it goes beyond the framework of artistic processes and becomes a framework of knowledge, a way of symbolic knowledge of the world. Symbolist aesthetics, which raised the artistic word to a new quality, raised the level of artistic thought, finds a new content and original form in the works of Magzhan and

Berniyaz. In the poetry of talented poets, who have made the most of all the creative power and symbolic capabilities of national traditional symbols, the artistic thought in which the symbol is decorated has reached a poetic level as an ideological suggestion.

Poets who have grown up in the cradle of tradition have now begun to master the skills of thinking in a new way in accordance with the requirements of the time. As the leading poet of their time, Magzhan and Berniyaz first realized poetic changes. Having completed the traditional process of stylization of black poetry, they continued their artistic search in the direction of creating a single poetic context. The symbolist aesthetic satisfied the artistic tastes of Magzhan and Berniyaz, and we know that in this channel they have achieved many poetic successes. However, we know that the artistic world of these artists, whose poetic talent is great, cannot be limited to symbolism either. The symbolist channel in the creative path of these poets is one of the most productive, artistic channel, but it does not seem to cover their creative world as a whole. It seems that this channel was for them only a temporary School of learning, a transition period, a poetic experience.

In the artistic world of M. Zhumabayev and B. Kuleyev, a symbolic idea has reached a poetic level as an ideological suggestion. In the history of national artistic expression, a new type of symbolic content and form has been formed. The ability to create symbolic content and form and artistic experience were embodied in the work of these poets. These writers, who have a great poetic power and deep artistic knowledge, were able to give a symbolic character to all forms of artistic techniques, to all parts of the language:

1. developed the process of writing with a sound, expanding the possibilities of syngarmonism, they created a system of supporting sounds (symbol-sound) with a certain symbolic meaning. (symbol-*assonance*, etc.);
2. gave symbolic primes to the methods of repetition and reflection, created symbolic figures;
3. among the methods of variation, enriched the content and strengthened the function of the method of burning, along with the traditional phenomenon, phenomenon-symbols, gave rise to and improved the pattern of burning-symbol (the very symbol).

A new type of symbols of a national and artistic nature has appeared, and for the first time in Kazakh poetry, a system of poetic symbols has been formed. A symbolistic style of thinking has been formed, artistic knowledge has deepened, and Kazakh poetry has entered the world circle.

5. Recommendations

Magzhan Zhumabayev and Berniyaz Kuleyev learned from Russian and French symbolists only the ability to transform forms and reproduce words, and we will not underestimate any of them. The content and idea of these poets were completely different, oriental and national in nature. It is necessary to look for reasons that allow us to call Magzhan and Berniyaz symbolists in the depths of national traditions. We believe that only in this case will the meaning of the symbolic channel in their poetry be revealed. When we look at how symbolic content and form were reflected in the poetry of Kazakh poets of the beginning of the XX century, we find in the poetic experience of these poets' numerous examples of the revival and renewal of the traditions of national poetry, the new content and expression of black poetry, the transformation of size and rhythm. Therefore, considering the tradition of symbols in world literature, we propose to consider the artistic and aesthetic nature of the symbol in Kazakh poetry.

References

- Akhmetov, Z., & Shanbayev, T. (1998). *Literature studies. Dictionary of terms*. Almaty: Ana Tili.
- Andreev, L. G., Kozlova, N. P., & Kosikov, G. K. (1987). *History of French literature*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Atabekova, A. (2020). Language representation of youth health concept in international institutional discourse. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(12), 1417-1427.
- Atabekova, A., & Shoustikova, T. (2018). Language issues within forced migration at borders and temporary settlements: An integrated content analysis. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21, 690-700.
- Baitursynov, A. (1989). *Works*. Almaty: Pisatel.
- Bely, A. (1994). *Symbolism as a Worldview*. Moscow: Respublika.
- Eleukenov, Sh. (1995). *Magzhan. Life and Creativity*. Almaty: Kategoriya.
- Ermachkov, I.A., Vidishcheva, E.V., Mineeva, E.K., & Balanyuk, L.L. (2021). The “Temporary regulation on military censorship” as a historical source. *Bylye Gody*, 16(2), 1008-1015.
- Kabdolov, Z. (1989). *Art of words*. Almaty: Nauka.
- Kozhevnikov, V. M., Nikolaev, P. A. (1987). *Literary encyclopedic dictionary*. Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya.
- Kuleev, B. (1969). *Say, White Birch*. Almaty: Pisatel.
- Lavrenev, B. A. (1978). *Brief literary encyclopedia*. Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya.
- Losev, A. F. (1976). *The problem of symbolism and realistic art*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- Maitanov, B. M. (2001). *Poetics of Zhumabayev*. Almaty: Kazakh University.
- Moréas, J. (1886). *Symbolist Manifesto*. <https://ru.scribd.com/document/189573492/Jean-Moreas-Symbolist-Manifesto>.
- Polyakova, L.G., & Balanyuk, L.L. (2018). The black sea province in the first world war: A historiographical review. *Bylye Gody*, 48(2), 838-849.
- Rembo, A. E. (1988). *Poetical works in verse and prose*. Moscow: Raduga.
- Svasyan, K. A. (1980). *The problem of symbol in modern philosophy*. Yerevan: AN ArmSSR.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1963). *Stylistics. Theory of poetic speech. Poetics*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zhetpisbayeva, B. A. (1999). *Symbol in the movement of literature*. Almaty: Gylym.
- Zhuanysbekov, N. (2000). *Problems of modern comparative literature*. Almaty: Kazakh University.
- Zhumabayev, M. (2002). *A complete two-volume collection of works*. Almaty: Pisatel.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Laila Zh. Mussaly is a PhD in Philology, Acting Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Laura N. Daurenbekova is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Kazakh and Russian Philology, Eurasian Humanitarian Institute, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Saule D. Seidenova is a PhD in Philology, Acting Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Aizhan M. Kartayeva is a Full Doctor in Philology, Professor Department of Kazakh, Russian Philology and Journalism, Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Bakytzhan B. Kelgembayeva is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Kazakh, Russian Philology and Journalism, Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Republic of Kazakhstan.