

**Tashagil A.<sup>1</sup>, Maydanali Z.<sup>2</sup>, Bizhanova M.<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>doctor, professor, University of Yeditepe, Turkey, Istanbul

<sup>2</sup>Ph.D., Associate Professor, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

<sup>3</sup>Ph.D. Student, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: b.meiramgul7@gmail.com

**THE GOLDEN HORDE: HISTORICAL PREDECESSORS AND SUCCESSORS  
(historiography aspect)**

The problems of the history of the Golden Horde are relevant not only to Kazakhstan researchers but also to scholars from the post-Soviet countries, who demonstrate great interest in the problem. Various aspects are in the process of scientific comprehension by specialists in the study of nomadic associations and their historical predecessors and successors. The historiographical review is devoted to the analysis of research of scientists on this issue. Researchers from different countries perceive the problem from different and, at times, directly opposite points of view. The study of various scientific positions, the analysis of all major modern trends makes it possible to compile the most complete picture of the scientific research of the history of the Golden Horde.

**Key words:** Golden Horde, historical predecessors, historical successors, nomadic empire, Mongolian empire.

Ташағыл А.<sup>1</sup>, Майданали З.<sup>2</sup>, Бижанова М.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>доктор, профессор, Едитепе университеті, Түркия, Стамбул қ.

<sup>2</sup>т.ғ.к., доцент, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,

<sup>3</sup>Phd докторант, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: b.meiramgul7@gmail.com

**Алтын Орда: тарихи алғышарттары мен сабақтастығы  
(тарихнамалық аспектісі)**

Алтын Орда тарихының мәселелері қазақстандық зерттеушілерге ғана өзекті емес, посткеңестік елдердің ғалымдары да бұл мәселеге қызығушылық танытуда. Оның әртүрлі аспектілері көшпелі бірлестіктер, олардың тарихи алғышарттары мен сабақтастығын зерттеуші мамандардың ғылыми тұжырымдарында көрініс табууда. Тарихнамалық шолулар осы мәселе бойынша ғалымдардың зерттеулеріне талдау жасауға арналған. Әртүрлі елдердің зерттеушілері бұл мәселеге әр қырынан келе отырып, бір-біріне қайшы түрлі көзқарастар туындауда. Ғылыми тұрғының әр қырынан зерттеу, басты жаңа қағидаларға талдау жасау Алтын Орда тарихының ғылыми зерттелуі бойынша толығырақ ұғымды қалыптастырады.

**Түйін сөздер:** Алтын Орда, тарихи алғышарттар, тарихи сабақтастық, көшпелі империя, Моңғол империясы.

Ташағыл А.<sup>1</sup>, Майданали З.<sup>2</sup>, Бижанова М.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>доктор, профессор, Университет Едитепе, Турция, г. Стамбул

<sup>2</sup>к.и.н., доцент, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

<sup>3</sup>докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: b.meiramgul7@gmail.com

**Золотая Орда: исторические предшественники и преемники  
(историографический аспект)**

Проблема истории Золотой Орды актуальна не только для казахстанских исследователей. Ученые постсоветских стран также демонстрируют большой интерес к данному вопросу. Различные его аспекты находятся в процессе научного осмысления специалистами в изучении

кочевых объединений, их исторических предшественников и преемников. Историографический обзор посвящен анализу исследований ученых по данному вопросу. Исследователи из разных стран воспринимают проблему с разных и, порой, прямо противоположных точек зрения. Изучение различных научных позиций, анализ всех главных современных направлений позволяет составить наиболее полное представление о научных исследованиях истории Золотой Орды.

**Ключевые слова:** Золотая Орда, исторические предшественники, исторические преемники, кочевая империя, Монгольская империя.

## Introduction

For a long time, historical science has been solving one of the main problems: how and why “transcontinental nomadic super-empires” or mega-empires like the Mongolian empire, the Golden Horde has been formed. The investigation of the problem of new political structures in the “nomadic empires” of Eurasia is caused by the need to identify new, alternative, promising theoretical and methodological constructions with regard to the problems of dialectical development of nomadic political formations. The history of the nomadic formations of Eurasia and their political structures is still one of the most important objects of study. New approaches and systematic analysis take into account that processes of different orientation are observed in research and discourse on the history of the Golden Horde and its successors. The methodological approaches have one or another sense, which depends on the researcher, on the specific conditions of his work, and also on many other factors.

## Historical Predecessors

The period of formation of the “nomadic empires” was marked by significant changes in the socio-political structure, which are in the state of an ongoing process, accompanied by the destruction of traditional social institutions. Considering the dynamism of political processes in nomadic formations, the ratio of subsystems was unstable and mobile. Outstanding scientist K. Inostransev in his work called “Hunnu and Huns” noted: “... three great nomadic empires: Hunnu, Tu-gyu and Mongols were a motley mixture of different tribes and clans, under the rule of one clan. ... When we want to know the origin of some nomadic people, it means that we need to determine to which group of tribes or even the race belonged to the dynasty and with it the core of the people. Therefore, we need to determine as far as possible what the origin of that tribe or clan that has long been known in China and has grown in the course of time so that it has formed a powerful nomadic empire” (Inostransev, 1926:

92). The researcher clearly points out the need for an identification approach and the reconstruction of the ethnic, social and political strata of the internal structure of the nomadic society. G.V. Vernadsky, analyzing the examples of world empires, observes: “Russian civilization and culture was gradually infused with the beginnings, on the one hand, of Byzantine civilization and culture, and the civilization and culture of the steppe nomads, taking from them clothes and weapons, song and fairy tale, way of thinking on the other hand” (Vernadsky, 2005: 236). Following the path of comparative analysis, and drawing analogies, the author turns to the history of the existing empires, so according to his conclusions, he defines: “The role of Rome and Byzantium is to unify of cultures of the West and the East, the culture of the agricultural sea and the nomadic steppe culture, this role in the beginning of the XIII century, after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, was passed to the empire of the Mongols. The Roman and, later, Byzantine empire were built on the system of the Mediterranean center of civilization (agricultural-marine) and steppe culture of nomads. The Mongolian empire has already occupied two centers of civilization (agricultural-maritime): China on the one hand, and lands that were part of the Byzantine Empire (Asia Minor, Caucasus, Crimea, the Balkans) on the one hand” (Vernadsky, 2005: 237). Thus, he points to the geopolitical space occupied by the transcontinental empires, and models their political and socio-cultural influence on the conquered territories. Summarizing the reflections on the “nomadic empires” G.V. Vernadsky, on the example of the Mongol Empire, concludes: “The central position of the Mongolian core of the empire and its control over internal lines of communication, the stability of the empire depended to a large extent on its own integration of this zone. In fact, the Central Asian region became the proving ground of the Mongolian feudal policy, which had a devastating effect on the imperial unity” (Vernadsky, 1997: 137).

The well-known historian and researcher S.A. Pletneva defined three main directions in the study of nomadic associations: 1. analysis of political history; 2. consideration of the economy, life

and culture of nomads; 3. Household and cultural features on the basis of linguistic and archaeological material (Pletneva 1982:3-16). The author, through his scientific research, contributed to a deeper understanding of the general trends and methodology of research practices. For a long time and several generations of historians, these directions were the basis of methodological approaches.

VL. Egorov is one of the first scientist who identified the fourth direction – historical and geographical in the system analysis of nomadic structures (Egorov, 1985:3-23). Using this research approach, the author presents the clear state territory of the Golden Horde, its internal content, proves that the movements of nomads have a strict pattern, connected not only with the natural, but also with the social features of society.

The modern methodology of political and social anthropology has highlighted the research of American and European scholars. According to American researchers, the monotonous cycles of elevation and decline of empires do not show signs of evolutionary changes. In this regard, the whole anthropological schools of Europe and America consider nomadic societies as entirely stagnant, devoid of proper historical development.

One of the brightest researchers of the American anthropological school, T. Barfield, put forward a proposal to study the mechanisms of the existence of a nomadic society, as well as transformations and changes that occurred during the period of interactions with sedentary peoples. The author suggests considering the history of nomadic societies (the most complex as the “nomadic empire”) as a result of not internal development, but direct contact with agricultural and sedentary people. In the late stages of the existence of Chinese centralized empires, their rulers asked nomadic leaders for help which prolonged the existence of a dynasty for some period of time, but ultimately depleted the state’s economic resources. T. Barfield regards nomadic culture as a special system, the changes in which are determined by the need for adaptation to specific natural and social conditions. The logical consequence of this concept was the conclusion about the interconnection of socio-political processes in China with various forms of social development of nomads. Typology of processes that took place on the territory of Central Asia, so-called cycles of power became the basis of the theory of T. Barfield (Barfield, 2009:44-55).

Modern historians concentrate their attention on another problem of “nomad empires” as a power structure. T. Barfield believes that the nomadic

empires are tribal “imperial confederations”. Analyzing the components of these nomadic formations, he defines them as autocratic and state-like in foreign and military policy, but they adhere to the principles of deliberativeness and federalism in internal affairs. Using methods of extrapolation and retrospection, he defined an administrative hierarchy of three levels: 1) the imperial leader and his court; 2) the imperial governors appointed to control the tribes included in the empire; 3) the local tribal leaders. For such political associations, the stability of existence was supported by the extraction of financial resources outside the steppe. T. Barfield puts forward a theory of power cycles, i.e. synchronism in the dynamics of changes in the state-bureaucratic organism in China and the military-political structure of nomads in the steppe (Barfield, 2009:44).

The result of a set of critical analysis techniques was an understanding of the transformation processes of the Mongol Empire into a mega-empire, which included various political, economic, ethnic, religious and other subsystems (uluses, “wings”, segments of the decimal system, tribal structures, oases, cities and agricultural territories, confessional communities etc.). This historical precedent, modern researchers, is shown as “a peculiar symbiosis of the tributary and conquering types of nomadic imperial organizations”

Investigating the cause-effect relations in the political culture, the Mongol Empire was revealed that the idea of citizenship was rooted in, and the influence of the great khan was built not so much on personal authority as on the power of the military-state machine that he personified. The sacral role of the khan, inherited from Genghis Khan, had significance so far only among nomads. Despite the contradictory nature of the inheritance system, a tradition of power transfer has developed, the legitimization of which was carried out by the council of the nobility – the Kuriltai.

Historical knowledge on the basis of comparative and retrospective analysis shows numerous historical examples of the Middle Ages, where the nomadic relatives of different ranks were real elements of internal socio-economic, political and mental ties. Therefore, based on the current state of historical science and its evidence base, their presence cannot be considered an unequivocal argument in favor of the pre-state character of the nomadic social system. The sequence of historical thinking and exact historical analysis, modern methodological approaches shows that related structures and genealogies caused “dispersity” and

centrifugal nomadic societies. However, in the nomadic empires, the military hierarchical bodies of political management were closely intertwined with the tribal segments, at the same time they towered over them, controlled them, and organized their effective use in accordance with the goals of the imperial leadership.

The presented historiographic review shows the complex and ambiguous nature of the administrative institutions of the “nomadic empires” and makes promising in historical science the application of system principles of analysis, an integrated approach to the consideration of the power structures of political formations of nomads. In the system analysis, the potestary and political institutions of nomads is a complex of elements (subsystems) that are in constant interaction and movement. Research practice shows that it is necessary to take into account the problems of continuity, analogies and special features of state traditions in nomadic empires. The variability and controversy of the conceptual situation “nomadic empire” showed the insufficiently developed problems of the typology of socio-political structures and the formation of state institutions in nomadic societies. This puts the researchers in need of a diversified approach to the problems of studying nomadic political entities of their systematization and reconstruction as a complicate complex of different types and models of power united in a single imperial structure. The study of concrete historical events and processes associated with nomadic power structures creates the ground for the formulation and analysis of conceptual conclusions and methodological approaches.

### **Historical Successors**

Russian researcher E.S. Kulpin focuses attention on the peculiarities of the construction of cities in the Golden Horde: “The Golden Horde cities were different from the European ones. If the European cities were created at the expense of society and to a small extent at the expense of the state, then the state, economic and financial resource in the creation of the Golden Horde cities was a significant “ (Kulpin, 2008: 101-102). Under the Uzbek Khan (1312/13-1341/42), whose name is associated with the palmy days of the Golden Horde. The Golden Horde becomes the center of urban development and international trade, the center of education and spiritual life. At the modern stage of development of historical science, the problems of interaction between nomadic and sedentary civilizations and

various cultural traditions are among the priority areas. The modern researcher L.I. Semennikova believes that “Russia is a conglomerate of different civilizations. She recognizes the existence of Russian civilization, the foundation of which was formed during the period of the Moscow state (XV-XVI centuries) on the basis of the synthesis of a whole bouquet of traditions: Old Russian, Byzantine, Islamic, and classic Oriental ...» [8]. Historiographic sources inform us: “In the system of internal management of the Golden Horde, an important role was played by the administrative and bureaucratic apparatus represented by servicemen and military nomadic nobility, among whom the most prominent was the role of people from Turkic peoples: Kipshaks, medieval Uighurs, and Volga Bulgars”. The history of the Turkic, Slavic, Finno-Ugric tribes and associations continued in the states formed during the Mongol conquest. In this respect, both the bureaucracy and the army of the Golden Horde were composed of representatives of the local population. “The main nationals of the Golden Horde were the Turkic people, the Kypshaks, conquered by the Mongols – the Polovets of Kazakhstan, the Volga region and the Black Sea region, the inhabitants of Khorezm and Volga Bulgaria and the inhabitants of Russian principalities ... The Mongols, of whom the elite troops were composed, quickly fell under the influence of their more cultured nationals, having already perceived by the end of the thirteenth century their Turkic language, and then the religion of Islam.”

Thus, the complex and ambiguous nature of the development and synthesis of the two systems of sedentary and nomadic in the Mongol Empire and the Golden Horde makes promising the application of system principles for the analysis of institutions of power and domination, the social system and the peculiarities of the process of transformation and convergence of the nomadic society and the settled population.

The traditional scheme for the formation of the autocracy can also be found in the works of N.M. Karamzin. He also notes the fact that conditions for the formation of autocracy arose in ancient Kiev Rus. N.M. Karamzin was the first historian to express an opinion on the influence of T.N. Tatar-Mongol invasion of the formation of the Moscow autocracy. As follows from his definitions: the invasion of Batu, the conflagrations and mountains of corpses, the preservation of yoke and slavery for a long time, a period of great decline, but at the same time there were “good consequences”. N.M. Karamzin sees these consequences during

the formation of the Moscow state, the revival of Moscow, the strengthening of the role of the church, the diminution of the influence of the urban rich people became possible “thanks to the khans,” the historian emphasizes. In his opinion, the per capita collection and other taxes under the guise of the Tatars yoke cunning replenished the treasury of the great princes. Objective assessment of the influence of the Golden Horde on the transformation of Moscow into the center of the Russian state and the formation of Russian statehood, we read in the theses of N.M. Karamzin (Karamzin, 1819: 235, 233). At the heart of this point of view, perhaps, lies the origin of the historian. In the biographical article of the “History of the Russian State” which was written and published in 1819 in St. Petersburg you can find the following: “Karamzins originate from the Tatar prince Karamurza, who was in the service of the Tsar.” In the works of the next generation of Russian historians, the influence of the Golden Horde on the formation of Russian statehood is no longer mentioned or even denied. The historian of the XIX century S.M. Soloviev contrasts his conceptual conclusions with the historical views of N.M. Karamzin. In his historical works the “Tatar-Mongol invasion” was withdrawn from the periods of Russian history. Soloviyov summarizes his point of view as follows: “When the Baskaks left, counters and tax collectors of the princes were completely freed from the influence of the Tatars and began to act on their own. Even during the period of Baskaks, their influence on internal management was not noticeable, and there are no signs of this influence.” In his opinion, internal, independent trends in the development of Russian society, contributed to the transformation of clan relations into state relations and the formation of the Moscow state. Historical paradigm of S.M. Soloviyov proceeds from the fact that geographic relations played a decisive role in this process. As follows from the historical reconstruction of the researcher in the XII-XIII century on the shores of Moscow river Russian statehood was formed. The growth of the number of Moscow princes, the increase in the number of inhabitants, the growth of funds raised from the population, which were used to strengthen the security of this region and the resettlement of people – all together led to the unification of the whole northeast Russia (Soloviyov, 1960: 489, 650-651).

The next stage in the development of Russian historical thought is connected with the names of D.I. Ilovaysky, N.J. Danilevsky, K.N. Bestuzhev-Ryumin, N.I. Vasilevsky and V.O. Klyuchevsky. Thus, D.I. Ilovaisky believes that “collectors of Russia” Moscow princes are symbols of a

monarchical state. The conceptual conclusion of the historian is that “the political resourcefulness of the Moscow princes in the Golden Horde relations put them at the forefront. The influence of the Golden Horde on the political structure of the Russian state, the national identity of the Russian people is significant” (Ilovaisky, 1876: 6). Here you can see the coincidence of the conceptual provisions of D.I. Ilovaysky and N.M. Karamzin.

N.J. Danilevsky defends the thesis of the unique historical path of each people. As the historian believes, the “Tatar-Mongol invasion” saved Rus from the final disintegration and actions of the Moscow princes prevented the intentions of the conquerors (Danilevsky, 1888: 281).

K.N. Bestuzhev-Ryumin has similar views with the above-mentioned authors. He also emphasizes the influence of the Golden Horde on Russian history. Thus the historian notes that it is impossible to deny the role of the Tatars, because in international relations with other eastern states we resorted to their help for a long time, in the management system and especially the financial system relied on the eastern system, and in the military sphere traces of Tatar military practice are visible. At the same time he denies the direct origin of the royal power from the state traditions of the Golden Horde and refers to the history and experience of the Roman emperors (Bestuzhev-Ryumin, 1872: 531). Famous Orientalist N.I. Veselovsky in his work “The Tatar influence on the Russian ambassadorial ceremonial” (Veselovsky, 1911: 1-2), he notes the following: in the Moscow period of Russian history the ambassadorial ceremonial was fully Tatar or rather Asian in character. This was facilitated by the fact that the Russian princes were in diplomatic relations only with the Golden Horde and therefore were forced to obey the requirements of these khans or so perceived them as if they were invented by them. All this ceremonial was described in the Nikonovsky chronicle. According to the records of the annals, each person at the meeting as a sign of respect must get off the horse, only equal to each other people could remain in the saddle. This ceremonial of the nomadic people was adopted by the Russian princes.

The scientific heritage of V.O. Klyuchevsky left a big mark and played a huge role in the formation of Russian historical thought. He sees the role of Moscow as a collector of Russian lands primarily in its geographical position. As the historian believes, Moscow was surrounded on all sides by Russian lands, so in comparison with other lands, it suffered less from the burdens of riots. Located at the intersection of trade routes, Moscow began to rapidly enrich itself, which led to the concentration of large

funds in the hands of the Moscow princes and the strengthening of their power. Klyuchevsky did not attach any decisive importance to the influence on the political system of the tradition and heritage of the Golden Horde. In his opinion, the Khans of the Golden Horde did not impose their own rules and were satisfied with the collection of taxes, tribute and duties and did not attach importance to their internal situation. The economic and geographical advantage of the Moscow princes influenced the formation of their genealogical certainty in their origin and the emergence of a new formation – the “great Russian civilization”. **In his conclusions, V.O. Klyuchevsky emphasizes that the Moscow state originated under the influence of the external factor of the “Tatar yoke”, which prevented internal strife, external attacks and contributed to the strengthening and expansion of the territories (Klyuchevsky, 2010: 41).**

As we can see from the analytical exploration of nineteenth-century Russian historical thought, the problem of the formation of Russian statehood and its concentration in Moscow was the main issue of historical works for a long time. The role of the Golden Horde and its influence on the formation of Russian statehood is diminished or hushed up. In most of the inferences of Russian historians, the relationship between the Moscow princes and the Golden Horde, the similarity of management traditions and state institutions, is not paid enough attention or weak attempts are being made to study them. The limitations of methodological methods, the denial of the decisive role of the Golden Horde in the choice of Moscow as the center of Russian statehood, and other problems constitute a common Eurocentrist characteristic of Russian historical thought of this period.

A well-known Kazakh historian, Professor T.O. Omarbekov notes that the divided Russian minorities that did not recognize each other were united by the efforts of Batu Khan. The author quotes the words of the Tatar researcher R. Fahredin: “In fact, Batu’s activities brought the Russians much benefit, because of them they ceased to feud between themselves. They realized that the reason for the feuds was not in the redundancy of the princes, but in their stupidity. Realizing this, they began to get together. From the Mongols, they adopted the methods of command and control, the art of warfare, and also learned how to govern the state .... In fact, it was the lessons of Chinggis Khan and Batu Khan, as well as the enormous influence of the Golden Horde, that turned Russia into the current Russia. Therefore, the Russians should not curse the Mongols, but thank them for their science” (Fakhretdin, 1996: 116).

Modern authors from Tatarstan, M.A. Usmanov, D.M. Iskhakov, I. Izmailov, and others, from new methodological positions, consider the place and significance of the Golden Horde as the first Eurasian empire of the late medieval period, which has risen on the same level as the great European states. M.A. Usmanov, draws attention to the commonality of the social structure, political organization, mentality and historical memory of the subjects of the Golden Horde (Usmanov, 2001: 3-14).

Famous Russian historian V.V. Trepavlov does not quite agree with the authors who claim about the historical continuity of Russia in relation to the Golden Horde. He does not deny the existence of indisputable examples of such borrowings – for example, in the Russian titlature and social terminology (kagan, tarkhan, etc.), in the financial system of medieval Russia, in the organization of military affairs, Yamskoy service and others. These facts he argues as follows: “Taking over from the Horde of certain phenomena and institutions can testify, on the one hand, about the attractiveness and expediency of Russian oriental models at the time. But in themselves they still are not an argument in favor of the Golden Horde “heritage” or some historical continuity of Russia in relation to the Golden Horde. After all, the import of ideas and institutions is a general cultural phenomenon.” (Trepavlov, 2016: 183).

### Conclusion

Considering the historiographical aspect of the theme of the predecessors and successors of the Golden Horde, well-known historians and researchers have identified several basic directions in the study of nomadic associations. Everyone knows that historians of Soviet times supported the thesis that the heirs of the Golden Horde were the Crimean, Kazan and Astrakhan khanates. Thus, the Kazakh Khanate was officially excluded from the “heirs of the Golden Horde”. The repressions of 1937 forced historians to live in fear. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, not only Kazakhstani researchers but also researchers from other post-Soviet countries support the point of view that there is continuity between the Kazakh Khanate and the Golden Horde. Under the Golden Horde heritage we can mean ethnic continuity, dynastic continuity, territorial continuity, folklore continuity, continuity of spiritual and material culture. This means that, like the Crimean, Polish-Lithuanian, Astrakhan, Siberian and Kazan Tatars, Bashkirs, Nogais and Karakalpaks, Kazakhs are also the successors of the Golden Horde.

## References

- Barfield T.Dzh. (2009) *Opasnaya granica: kochevye imperii i Kitaj (221 g. Do n.eh. – 1757 g. n.eh.)*. [Dangerous frontier: nomadic empires and China (221 BC – 1757 AD)]. Ed. Ruhlyadeva D.V., Kuznecova V.B. SPb.
- Bestuzhev – Ryumin K. (1872) *Russkaya istoriya*. [Russian History] SPb.
- Veselovskij N.I. (1911) *Tatarskoe vliyanie na russkij posol'skij ceremonial*. V Moskovskij period russkoj istorii. [Tatar influence on the Russian ambassadorial ceremonial. In the Moscow period of Russian history]. SPb.
- Vernadskij G.V. (2005) *Mongol'skoe igo v russkoj istorii*. Opyt istorii Evrazii. Zven'ya russkoj kul'tury [The Mongolian yoke in Russian history. The history of Eurasia. Links of Russian culture]. M.
- Vernadskij G.V. (1997) *Mongoly i Rus'*. [The Mongols and Russia]. Tver': LEAN, Moskva.
- Danilevskij N.YA. (1988) *Rossiya i Evropa*. [Russia and Europe]. SPb.
- Egorov V.L. (1985) *Istoricheskaya geografiya Zolotoj Ordy v XIII-XIV vv.* [Historical Geography of the Golden Horde in the XIII-XIV centuries]. Moskva, Nauka.
- Ilovajskij D.I. (1876) *Istoriya Rossii*. [History of Russia]. Moskva., CH.1.
- Inostrancev K. (1926) *Hunnu i gunny*. [Hunnu and the Hun]. Leningrad
- Karamzin N.M. (1819) *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossijskogo*. [History of the Russian]. SPb.
- Klyuchevskij V.O. (2010) *Sochineniya*. t. 2. [Compositions]. Moskva.
- Kul'pin E.H.S. (2008) *Zolotaya Orda: sud'by poklenij*. [The Golden Horde: the fate of the wiles.]. Moskva.
- Pletneva S.A. *Kochevniki srednevekov'ya*. [Nomads of the Middle Ages] Moskva. Nauka. 1982
- Semennikova L.I. (2000) *Rossiya v mirvom soobshchestve civilizacij*. [Russia in a peaceful community of civilizations]. Moskva.
- Solov'ev S.M. (1960) *Istoriya Gossii s drevnejshih vremen*. Kn 2, [The history of Gossia from ancient times]. Moskva.
- Trepavlov V.V. (2015) *Stepnye imperii Evrazii: Mongoly i tatory*. [Steppe empires of Eurasia: Mongols and Tatars.]. Moskva: Kvadriga
- Usmanov M.A. (2001) *Sostoyanie i perspektivy istochnikovedeniya istorii Ulusa Dzhuchi*. Istochnikovedenie Ulusa Dzhuchi (Zolotoj Ordy. Ot Kalki do Astrahani 1223- 1556). [The state and perspectives of the source study of Ulus Juchi's history. Source of Ulus Juchi (Golden Horde, from Kalki to Astrakhan 1223-1556).]. Kazan'.
- Fahretdin R. (1996) *Hany Zolotoj Ordy*. [Khans of the Golden Horde]. Kazan'.

## Литература

- Барфилд Т.Дж. (2009) *Опасная граница: кочевые империи и Китай (221 г. до н.э. – 1757 г. н.э.)* / пер. Рухлядева Д.В., Кузнецова В.Б. Санкт-Петербург.
- Бестужев – Рюмин К. (1872) *Русская история*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Веселовский Н.И. (1911) *Татарское влияние на русский посольский церемониал*. В Московский период русской истории. Санкт-Петербург.
- Вернадский Г.В. (2005) *Монгольское иго в русской истории // Опыт истории Евразии. Звенья русской культуры* Москва.
- Вернадский Г.В. (1997) *Монголы и Русь*. Тверь: LEAN, Москва
- Данилевский Н.Я. (1988) *Россия и Европа*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Егоров В.Л. (1985) *Историческая география Золотой Орды в XIII-XIV вв.* Москва: Наука.
- Иловайский Д.И. (1876) *История России*. Москва, Ч.1.
- Иностранцев К. (1926) *Хунну и гунны*. Ленинград.
- Карамзин Н.М. (1819) *История государства Российского* Санкт-Петербург.
- Ключевский В.О. (2010) *Сочинения*. т. 2. Москва.
- Кульпин Э.С. (2008) *Золотая Орда: судьбы поколений*. Москва
- Плетнева С.А. *Кочевники средневековья*. Москва: Наука. 1982
- Семенникова Л.И. (2000) *Россия в мировом сообществе цивилизаций*. Москва.
- Соловьев С.М. (1960) *История России с древнейших времен*. Kn 2. Москва.
- Тrepавлов В.В. (2015) *Степные империи Евразии: Монголы и татары*. Москва: Квадрига
- Усманов М.А. (2001) *Состояние и перспективы источниковедения истории Улуса Джучи// Источниковедение Улуса Джучи (Золотой Орды. От Калки до Астрахани 1223-1556)*. Казань.
- Фахретдин Р. (1996) *Ханы Золотой Орды*. Казань.