

регулярного печатного органа. Рукопись Бакунина имеет заглавие, структуру, логическую завершенность. Возможно, она нуждалась в незначительной стилистической правке. Все это может свидетельствовать о ее подготовке к печати. Другому предположению автора противоречит то, что для «разъяснения самому себе» интересующих его идей Бакунин всегда прибегал к общению с друзьями и родными — непосредственному или письмам. По своей природной организации, выражавшейся в потребностях его души, образе жизни, привычках, Бакунин нуждался в постоянном интеллектуальном общении, в передаче своих мыслей, взаимодействии с окружающими людьми, поэтому он никогда не вел дневников и «для себя» писал только конспекты сложных произведений, но не собственные рассуждения, которыми наполнена рукопись. Можно допустить, что, при завершении работы он увидел, что статья не может быть опубликована вследствие полной несовместимости выраженных в ней идей с официальной точкой зрения. Содержание рукописи показывает, что уже в 1837 г. перед Бакуниным встает проблема невозможности самореализации его личности (индивидуальности) в России. Оно помогает понять, почему сразу после приезда в Германию великий бунтарь поражал немецких профессоров радикальностью своих взглядов, и противоречит представлению о «переходе» Бакунина от консерватизма к радикализму в условиях западноевропейского общественного развития 1840-х годов.

В рукописи представлена анархическая трактовка Гамлета как прекрасной, светлой души последовательного борца за человечность, право, истину, справедливость, находящегося в конкретных жизненных обстоятельствах и действующего в соответствии с ними. Гамлет Бакунина — это тип *деятеля*, целостной личности, действующей в соответствии со своими чувствами и убеждениями и сообразно существующим условиям, обладаю-

щей, следовательно, не только развитым нравственным чувством, но и волей к борьбе. Представление Бакунина о Гамлете как олицетворении единства внутреннего и внешнего мира личности, последовательном борце за человечность соответствовала зарождающейся потребности русского общества в переходе к практике социальных преобразований.

В сознании русского общества утвердилась концепция образа Гамлета, созданная В.Г. Белинским, другом и оппонентом Бакунина. Гамлет в представлении Белинского — это тип рефлектирующего интеллигента, человека с развитым чувством и сознанием, стремлением к добру, прекрасному, но не способный к борьбе за их осуществление в жизни, к деятельности [5, I, с. 32, 296; V, с. 55]. Бакунинская трактовка Гамлета не была известна в обществе. При этом Гамлет В. Высоцкого воссоздал представленный в ней образ борца за принципы человечности, что доказывает типологическое родство, единство русского бунтарства двух столетий.

#### СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ:

1. Бакунин М.А. Собрание сочинений и писем, 1828 — 1876. В 4 т. М.: Изд-во Всесоюз. о-ва политкат. и ссыльно-пос., 1934 — 1935.
2. Бакунин М.А. Избранные сочинения: В 5 т. Пб.: Голос труда, 1919—1921.
3. Ударцев С.Ф. Рукопись М.А. Бакунина «Гамлет». // Памятники культуры. Новые открытия: Письменность. Искусство. Археология. Ежегодник (1984). Л.: Наука, Ленингр. отд-ние. 1986. С. 55 — 63.
4. Бакунин М.А.: pro et contra, антология. 2-е изд., испр. СПб.: Изд-во РХГА, 2015. С. 859 — 868.
5. Белинский В.Г. Полное собрание сочинений. В 13 т. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1953 — 1959. Т. I. М., 1953; Т. 2. М., 1953; Т. V. М., 1954.

#### ETHNOCULTURAL INTERACTION IN BASIN OF THE MOLOCHNA RIVER (NORTHERN PRIAZOVIA, UKRAINE) IN XIX c.

**Krylova A.**

*Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bogdan Khmelnytsky,  
Ph.D. in History, Associate Professor*

**Pachev S.**

*Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bogdan Khmelnytsky,  
Ph.D. in History, Associate Professor*

**Zamuruysev A.**

*Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bogdan Khmelnytsky,  
Ph.D. in History, Associate Professor*

**Zhiryakov A.**

*Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bogdan Khmelnytsky,  
Ph.D. in History, Associate Professor*

#### Abstract

In article cross-ethnic and religious contacts which happened in the course of the neighbourhood in one region of Mennonites, the state peasants (Russians and Ukrainians), Nogais, Dukhobors and Molokans are investigated. Between ethnic and religious groups which developed our region, occurred not only the conflicts. Interference took place. Different forms of housekeeping and land use united that created a possibility of further development and progress of agriculture and the industry

**Keywords:** Mennonite, peasants, Nogai, Molokans, Dukhobors, Molochna river, ethnic diversity, Johan Cornis.

Joining to Russian Empire in the second half of the 18th century the lands on the south and east has caused the necessity for their economic development according to needs of the Empire. However, some joined territories for various reasons did not have a permanent population, that compelled before government the task of their settlement. One of such regions was the basin of river Molochna, which was a part of Melitopol uyezd (an administrative subdivision of Russian Empire which was in use from the 13th century. Uyezds for most of the history in Russia were a secondary-level of administrative division) of a Tauride guberniya (administrative subdivision of the Russian Empire usually translated as government, governorate, or province). Attempts to settle this territory in the late 18th century by the nationals of the Empire revealed the need for the invitation of foreign colonists in the region for its rapid development. Thus, in the basin of the river Molochna in 1804 there were colonies of Germans and Mennonites (representatives of ethnic-religious group which formed the basis of Flemings and Friesians). In subsequent years, the re-settlement to Molochna was implemented as from the territory of the Empire so from abroad.

Immigration policy of the imperial government determined the formation of colorful ethnic composition of population in the basin of the river Molochna. It was introduced by the Russians, Ukrainian, Friesians, Flemings, Germans, Nogays, Bulgarians and others.

Ethnic diversity also caused confessional variety of the local population. The region has been extended by Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Islam, Duhoborstvo, Molokanstvo, Lutheranism, Judaism and others. Settling on a limited territory, of course, determined the presence of contacts between the representatives of a different ethnic groups and confessions, that was the main forms of conflicts, mutual influence and reciprocity. Conflicts in the most cases occurred during the initial settlement of area. They are related to land and religious misunderstandings.

Ethnic groups that migrated to the basin of the river Molochna distinguished by varying degrees of isolation that more often determined by their religion, and had different customs and methods of land use. Most confined socially have been the Mennonites, but they were very advanced methods of land use. Almost immediately after moving to river Molochna, Mennonites felt «kindness and hospitality» of Nogays. The last caused to Mennonites of much damage. Mennonites have expressed about Nogays, as about semi-civilized tribes, whose homes reminded a bee hive, covered with blankets and placed on two-wheeled cart. It is on these carts Nogays roamed. Their main occupation was animal husbandry. They ate meat and drank mare's milk only. According to Mennonites, religion of Nogays was a mixture of fatalism and useless loyalty. Mennonites believed that Nogays are gifted and modest, but robbers and murderers. But Nogays considered undesirable aliens Mennonites

who came to take away their land [14]. This is due to land conflict in 1805.

To General Rosenberg came complaint from Nogays that from the promised them 50,000 desyatin (an archaic land measurement used in tsarist Russia. A dessiatin is equal to 2400 square sazhen and is approximately equivalent to 2.702 English acres or 10,900 square metres) of land, 10069 desyatin and 1279 fathom of suitable and 1350 desyatin unsuitable land was given to Count Denisov. Instead, they were assigned land plots number 60 and 61. But this land soon gave the Mennonites, who immediately began to build up it. Nogays were very dissatisfied with what they had to endure a lack of land and rent it to neighboring landowners [7].

They used every opportunity to cause damage, especially by robbery and murder. In 1811 four men from the Mennonite village Rozenort were killed by Nogays. It was designed reward of 100 rubles. For information about the murder, and one Nogai woman pointed the killers and told about watch, which was shot from one killed. Murderers were sent to Siberia, and all Nogays deprived the weapon. But robbery is not stopped so soon.

Between German colonists and state peasants of village Mykhailivka land conflict arose in 1825. Providing ground Imperial Germans were approved April 14, 1806 but the land has not been delimited and therefore the section number 14 there was a shortage. 9547 desyatin of lands that were granted colonists were busy farmers Mykhailivka and 3694 desyatin Mykhailivka village were connected to colonists district. Thus, colonists had to add 5853 desyatin of land to colonize Michael peasants.

With the consent of Michael farmers and settlers association, the overmeasure was marked by surveyors on the plan. This plan Yecaterinoslav office of foreign immigrants sent February 10, 1825 at Tavria expedition, asking about joining Molochansk colonists district 5853 desyatin, according to proposals made.

The official government expedition awaiting a decision on that matter in Megeve Office. Last found in the village Mykhailivka only 15,607 desyatin and 542 fath. excess land, and the decision of 24 January 1833 the land was given in order breach Expeditions, which in turn has made an order for replacement land. Since September 29, 1835 from the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Department of Economic Department) to the Minister of Finance received a request to replace the 5853 desyatin to colonists. It was argued that the request of the colonists, Minister of Internal Affairs considers completely fair [9].

May 20, 1819 in the Committee of Ministers heard the case on a complaint with the state peasants of Tokmak to Mennonites. In 1818 farmers have filed a request to provide them protection from their oppressed neighbors Mennonites. Explained that the Mennonites are not allowed their cattle to pasture, captured from field corn and hay, and that tokmakski

farmers at different times received damage more than a thousand rubles. This complaint was a request for allocation of land between farmers and Mennonites, for possession of two Mennonite colonies near Tokmak, and return to farmers their losses.

Chief Trustee colonists southern tip of Russia, Lieutenant General Inzov, took over the consideration of this case on the spot. He found that misunderstandings between tokmachanamy and Mennonites arose because tokmachany on the river Behym Chokrak settle-farms, which in 1814 were taken as the limit, and had provisions inside the Mennonite settlement. Farmers living on the very border Mennonite settlement Ryukkenau, through its negligence left unattended in his beast, which was down on the field and Mennonites led losses. The detention of such cattle Mennonites led to complaints and hostility between the two parties.

To cease hostilities, Lieutenant-General again offered to farmers on farms moved in himself Tokmak, leaving in a 3000 desyatin of land on the left side of Behym-Chokrak, so that the same amount of land they were given in 1815 the rest of the land he proposed to give the Mennonites. Interior Minister agreed with this decision [10]. Later there were disputes about leaving for tokmakskyh peasants on the left bank of the river Behym-Chokrak only 3000 desyatin of land. Thus they would have lost more than 6000 desyatin of land assigned to them from the former Kherson Military Governor of the Duke de Richelieu.

The Committee of Ministers instructed the Minister of the Interior to explain how tokmakski farmers have land on each revizku soul, and that the circumstances were for this purpose for which Duke de Richelieu 9340 desyatin. In connection with these, from Count Langeron, during the Kherson Military Governor, requested information regarding the number of souls and the amount of land in Tokmak. Count Langeron reported that:

- has already been made available for withdrawal on the farms on the river Behym-Chokrak;
- during the initial settlement to tokmaksky peasants were given land in the area № 1 - 30000 desyatin suitable and 1545 desyatin of unsuitable, the section number 62 - suitable 3500 desyatin of land;
- after the start of hostilities between the Mennonites and tokmaksky peasants in 1813 arrived on the scene county surveyor, who found suitable land 35 thousand desyatin instead of 30 thousand and 10 500 desyatin of unsuitable instead of 1545 desyatin. Moreover, for he found in tokmachan land that belonged to the Mennonites, in areas of number 58, 59 and 62 - on the left bank of Tokmak – suitable 8600 desyatin and useless 829 desyatin. Total land of tokmaks peasants were 43,600 desyatin of suitable land;
- calculating this amount of land suitable for 2537 revizkyh souls, each soul had to 17 desyatin and 445.5 fath. and Kherson Military Governor believed that this amount of land should be left to the peasants, so that over time the number of revizkyh souls increase.

Count Langeron reported that 10,500 unsuitable desyatin of land with found surveyor in the village Tokmak, is a stony, gristly and clay soil, where agriculture is impossible.

The note, which was presented to the Committee of Ministers on 7 May 1819, explained that even in times of Richelieu to end disputes between Mennonites and tokmaksky peasants, the latter were on the left side was Tokmak plot size of 9340 desyatin. Initially under Imperial Order granted in the name of Richelieu, 25 July 1805 on the left bank for tokmaksky farmers with land allocated number 62 of 3000 desyatin, that is exactly the amount of land that the Chief Trustee colonists Inzov, about to leave for them.

Managing the Ministry of Count Kochubey was noted that farmers have approximately of 6,000 desyatin of land. And it is more established proportions of the soul. He acknowledged that there is no occasion to leave tokmachan additional 2 desyatin to fathom per capita, more established 15 desyatin aspect ratio. In them, he thought, there was still 10 000 desyatin of land which they consider unsuitable. In connection with this, Kochubey final decision, according to information Inzov and Langeron, leaving about 3000 desyatin for tokmaks farmers and transfer 9340 desyatin to ownership of Mennonites [11].

As was noted between the ethnic groups that mastered our land, took place not only conflicts. There occurred the interference. Different forms of management and land use combined, creating the possibility of further development and advancement of agriculture and industry.

Under the guidance of prominent Mennonite leader I. Cornis Mennonites implemented measures to reduce disputes with nogais. I. Cornis managed to get among nogais unusual respect and trust.

The first step of I. Cornis arrangement was of permanent housing for nogais. Under his leadership, was built aul Akkermen Street and placement of buildings in which it was planned like a Mennonite.

The second step was the introduction of merino sheeps to nogais. After a poor harvest in 1833 Kornis used poverty that emerged among nogais. Some sayings from the Koran, it seemed was the obstacle to the introduction of improved sheep. Spiritual representatives argued that the Spanish sheep may not be necessary sacrifice. But Cornis find a German version of the Quran, and was able to overcome this obstacle. He proved that the Spanish sheep is the most noble and true that Muslims can offer as a sacrifice.

To help to nogais buy and breed merino sheeps I. Cornis gave them half of the annual offspring of some of own herds, so that they are 4 years of keeping the herds on their lands, and watched them.

Very influential authority of Cornis was on Molokans and Dukhobors. They always took advice from him, so that their economy is much improved [4]. Dukhobors willing followers of the Mennonite colonists and innovation in agriculture. Many duhobors homes were built by kolonists standard. The men were dressed as colonists. The women left the Russian clothes. Changed only headgear [3].

In 1844 under the I.Cornis Project began educational placement Forestry (modern Staroberdyanske). From 1846 in this forest began ranger boys training. Initially the study lasted 5 years [1], later – 6 [12]. During this period they received the

knowledge and skills not only for afforestation, but also on agriculture, sericulture, tobacco growing, gardening. In winter, they learn to read, write and count. Set to the school and the number of graduates in 1846 - 1863 shown in Table 1.

Table 1

**Training of foresters at the Berdyansk steppe forestry in 1846-1863 [12]**

Year	Entered	Graduated	Year	Entered	Graduated
1846	8	-	1856	4	4
1847	7	-	1857	2	2
1848	15	-	1858	7	3
1849	5	-	1859	4	4
1850	4	-	1860	10	7
1851	6	5	1861	12	2
1852	4	6	1862	3	-
1853	5	-	1863	1	4
1854	10	7	All	112	48
1855	5	4			

An example of the success of the Mennonites of Forestry and Horticulture caused the race - the peasants of neighboring villages began to show the Russians wish to gardening. Even nogais sometimes has a great, properly planted gardens, which they carefully looked after [5].

In agriculture the Mennonites were first in the basin of Molochna who entered a steam system which was characterized by deep plowing, which provided the soil moisture. After 1833 the system became mandatory for all farmers of the river Molochna [15].

For the best plowing in 50 years of the nineteenth century by Mennonite B. Vakentin three blades plow was constructed, which for years has been improved and widely distributed in southern Ukraine [14].

In the early twentieth century, during the Stolypin agrarian reforms, including 16 farms of Mordynivskyh one specifically was granted German colonists to provide an example to other farmers. Over time, despite the best yields in the colonists, other owners took over in his black couples and fertilizing fields [6].

An example of cultural influence of mennonites to neighbors can be projected by plan of Berdyansk Uyezd for 1853, which marked the place «Where would like to settled kaykulakskye peasants and make new village such as sample Mennonite colonies» [2].

Despite of the Mennonite religious seclusion, which manifested itself in marriage only within societies, sometimes they have an inter-religious marriages. On the last spread shows data that suggests J. Shtah, in Melitopol was the 60 Mennonite families, including 28 - with mix marriages. In 23 of these 28 cases, one party professed Orthodox faith [13].

The third aspect of relations between different ethnic groups in the basin of the river Molochna was mutual. In 1861 from Vidino in Taurian Guberniya came up to 6,000 Bulgarians. Due to poor weather conditions on the lands assigned to them they could not settle, and were quartered in 2 districts of Molochansk: kolonists and mennonites. This quartering of tremendous difficulties, because the Bulgarians did not want to part with their fellow villagers for the

whole winter, and besides they were not accustomed to local food. These problems were eliminated colonists and Mennonites. They provided few settlers' houses, with payment of their owners cash prizes. In addition, they donated 2,000 rubles for treatment and 9,000 rubles on food for Bulgarians. Some Mennonite owners even took responsibility for the management of agricultural settlers in the classroom. For this assistance Mennonites and Germans was proclaimed Imperial favor of Alexander II [8].

It should be noted about the relocation to river Molochna of representatives of a religious society guttersy. Their religion was very similar to Mennonite. When guttersy applied to Cornis, he took them under his protection. They founded a colony Huttertal (1843), and later Yohanesru (1852). The design of houses and structures repeated Mennonite settlement model. Cornis not allowed to guttersy practice subsistence agriculture. Due to their capacity and leadership of Cornis, guttersyes economy began to flourish [14].

Interethnic and interfaith contacts that occurred in the process of living together, and imperial government policy aimed the eliminating of ethnic identity led to the gradual integration of foreigners in Russian society. But the government of the Russian Empire had not completely eliminate the identity, and the people who managed to avoid deportation and complete destruction of the Soviet time, still retained ethnic traditions.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Виббе Г. Краткое описание казенной образцовой плантации Таврической губернии, в Бердянском уезде, в 1852 г. // Журнал сельского хозяйства. – 1853. - № 3. - С. 308-310.
2. Державний архів Запорізької області, ф. 263, оп. 1., спр. 22.
3. Записка о духоборцах, обитающих в Мелитопольском уезде, Таврической губернии // Тр. Киевской Духовной Академии. - 1876. - Т. 3, № 8. - С. 390-420.

4. Корнис И. И. Биографии сельских хозяев // Журнал Министерства Государственных Имуществ. - 1848. - Ч. 29, №10-11. - с. 220 - 231.
5. О состоянии хозяйства в Молочанских Меннонитских колониях в 1843 году // Журнал Министерства Государственных Имуществ. - 1844. - Ч.1, № 4-6. - с. 138.
6. Постников В.Е. Крестьянские хутора в Таврической губернии // Записки Общества Сельского Хозяйства Южной России. - 1885. - № 6/7. - С. 283.
7. Полное собрание законов Российской империи (далее – ПСЗ) 21752. 13 мая 1805 г. - Именной, данный Сенату. - О приведении в исполнение положения о обращении ногайцев в земледельческое состояние. С приложением доклада Министров Военных сухопутных сил и Внутренних дел, Положения и Штата для управления сего народа.
8. ПСЗ 37859. 15 января 1862 г. - Именной, объявленный Сенату Управляющим Министерством Государственных Имуществ. - Об изъявлении Высочайшего благоволения колонистам и менонистам двух Молочанских округов, Таврической губернии, Бердянского уезда, за добровольный приём в свои дома и продовольствие Болгар, переселившихся из Турции, и, за позднюю осень, окончательно неводворённых на предназначенных им местах.
9. Российский государственный исторический архив, ф. 383, оп. 30, д. 445.
10. Российский государственный исторический архив, ф. 1263, оп. 1, д. 183.
11. Российский государственный исторический архив, ф. 1263, оп. 1, д. 215.
12. Рудзкой А. Письма о русских лесах:... О Бердянском лесничестве... // Журнал Министерства Государственных Имуществ. - 1864. - Т. 85, № 1-4. - С. 273-280.
13. Штаб Я. Очерки из истории и современной жизни южно-русских колонистов. - М.: 1916. - 266 с.
14. Goerz H. The Molotchna settlement. - Winnipeg: 1996. - 252 p.
15. Urry J. None but saints. The transformation of Mennonite Life in Russia 1789-1889. - Hyperion press limited: 1989. - 322 p.

## THE IMAGE OF THE WOMAN WARRIOR IN THE HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL SUBJECTS OF THE TURKIC PEOPLES

**Khabizhanova G.**

*Doctor of historical sciences, professor*

**Mensitova G.**

*Master of History, Archaeology and Ethnology*

### Abstract

The article represents experience of reconstructing the image of woman warrior in medieval history of Turkic history and culture based on the sources, relating to both traditional history and a system of oral and folk arts significant site. The image of a woman warrior as a lover of liberty, possessing incredible strength, strong character, ascending to ancient sources of matriarchy era is common for these epic legends. The image of a woman warrior well prevailed in medieval literature traditions, but Turkic peculiarity of this type was the influence of generic relations that determined its specificity. Alongside with that, realistic features, reflecting real position of Turkic woman can be seen in legends heroines. The summary of this problematic investigation is provided in this article. The Author analyses images of mothers, sisters, beloved women of heroes based on a wide range of Turkic folk material. Special attention is paid to the image of a woman warrior in folk legends and eposes. This problematic is poorly investigated nowadays and requires for further researches.

**Keywords:** woman warrior, Turkic, nomads, Central Asia, antiques, sociocultural type.

Perception of a woman within the framework culture of nomadic medieval ages was specified by the peculiarities of the World picture. A sociocultural model, where images of mother, sister and wife, belonging to a symbolic space of the ideal, are interrelated and balanced within the image of a woman warrior, represents inclusion of a woman into social order of Turkic medieval society. The principal thing is that the combination of these images allowed for including a woman into sociocultural relations.

Alongside with that, it is critical for creating a full image of a woman in Turkic world history to investigate the image of a woman warrior, explained in the best folk literature works.

Problems of heroic epos of Turkic people are considered in works by V.Zhirmunskiy. Images of mothers, sister, and beloved women of heroes were

investigated based on a wide range of folk material. "Epos of Central Asian people, occurred under the conditions of nomadic life- the Scientist said,- often represents a hero's wife as the equal to him, clever and fearless adviser and helpmate. Such features are specific, for example, for Kanykei in "Manas", Kortka- a wife of kypchak hero Koblandy, Burla-khatun- a wife of oguz hero Salor-Kazanand many others heroes-wives of Central Asian epos"[1, p.250 ].

A woman warrior in heroic fairy tale is represented a "famous woman-hero", sounded by her strength. In hero fairy-tale, a woman warrior fights against many fiancés while waiting for "intended man". Fights of a woman warrior with heroes are represented with the help of mythic features. "In mythological pictures of fights, woman warrior fights against heroes. Woman warrior and hero defeat each