

Ahmadi Laeg¹, Dautbekova M.²

¹Bamyan University, Department of Archeology, Afghanistan, Bamyan, e-mail: alaeiq@mail.ru

²Kazakh National University Al-Farabi, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: mar_-zhan@mail.ru

INSTITUTE OF BATYRS IN KAZAKH SOCIETY

In this article batyrs' institution in Kazakh culture is considered as "phenomenon of Kazakh culture". In 18th century and in the beginning of 19th centuries batyrs played in society significant political economic role. It has been analyzed the place of batyrs in society, their specific ideology as special social group, their stile of life based on their social obligations, tradition of military, social rules and ethics to regulate their relation with other social groups and other "estate" features. Their phenomenology includes in their contribution to unity of people, ability to organize people against enemies, oratory skills used for the future of state, unifying people in groups by mindik (thousands) and tumenbasy (ten thousands), in ability to encourage military and to give them self-confidence.

Key words: Kazakh, Hero, Social Institution, Traditional Society, War.

Аһмади Лаек¹, Дауытбекова М.²

¹Бамьян университеті, Ауғанстан, Бамьян қ., е-mail: alaeiq@mail.ru

²Т.ғ.к., доцент, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., е-mail: mar_-zhan@mail.ru

Қазақ қоғамындағы батырлар институты

Мақалада қазақ қоғамындағы батырлар институты өкілдері қазақ мәдениетіндегі ерекше феномен ретінде қарастырылады. XVIII ғ. аяғы – XIX ғасырдың басында қазақ батырларының қоғамдағы саяси-әлеуметтік рөлі ерекше маңызды болғаны белгілі. Мақалада батырлар институтының қоғамдағы орны ғылыми сарапталып, әлеуметтік институт ретіндегі орны талданады. Ел бірлігі мен тұтастығы мәселесіндегі батырлардың әскери өнері, шешендік өнері, ұйымдастырушылық қабілеті мен халық үшін жанқиярлық қасиеттерінің қазақ мемлекеттілігі жолындағы алатын орны қарастырылады.

Түйін сөздер: қазақ, батыр, әлеуметтік институт, дәстүрлі қоғам, соғыс.

Ахмади Лаек¹, Дауытбекова М.²

¹Университет Бамьян, Департамент Археологии, Афганистан, г. Бамьян, e-mail: alaeiq@mail.ru

²к.и.н., доцент, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: mar_-zhan@mail.ru

Институт батырства в казахском обществе

В статье рассматривается институт батыров в казахском обществе. В XVIII веке и в начале XIX века батыры играли в обществе значимую политическую и экономическую роль. Авторами было проанализировано место батыров в обществе, их специфическая идеология как особая социальная группа, их стиль жизни, основанный на их социальных обязательствах, военные традиции, социальные нормы и этика, регулирующие их отношения с другими социальными группами, функции батыров в обществе. Их феноменология включает в себя их вклад в единство людей, способность организовывать людей против врагов, ораторские навыки, используемые для будущего государства, объединяющие людей в группы с помощью умников (тысяч) и туменбаси (десять тысяч), способностью поощрять военные успехи и дать им уверенность в себе.

Ключевые слова: казахский, герой, социальный институт, традиционное общество, война.

Introduction

In 18th and in the beginning of 19th centuries heroes were one of the social groups who had social and economic significance in Kazakh society. The word batyr (hero) in Kazakh means brave, courageous, skilful in military art and famous for his deeds. However this dignity was adhered to much broader concepts along with above-mentioned description. It is known that from the ancient times in all societies existed military people who served to defend their society. However due to different level of development of diverse societies each society had its own features of military service. The style of life of nomadic people and its features of historical cultural development required existence of people who were professionally trained to military art. Their function was to provide state's safety, sovereignty, and public order. As result it was established special social group who had specific obligations in society. These types of groups were known in other societies as "samurai", "knight", "Kshatriya". In Kazakh culture they were known as "batyrlar".

Social and political role of institute of batirs

In spite the fact their main skills were related with military art the main aim this profession was in protection of motherland, to free state from occupation, to enlarge state's territories, to free people who are in captivity of enemies, to take revenge for the ancestors who were killed by enemies. However because of Europe centrism concepts the place of batyr was perceived as people who destroyed sedentary civilizations. It is well-known fact that there are two contradicting opinions on development of social, political and public institutions of nomadic societies. These concepts about bi, batyr institutions left behind cultural, social, and historical features of nomadic society. For example the word "batyr" used in Kazakh society was referred only to authority title.

In traditional Kazakh society batyrs were established as individual social group and had own ideology, life of style according to their public service, military tradition, rules and ethics to follow in interrelation with other social groups and their own "estate" features. One of the main features was that they were specialized only in military art profession. These facts were mentioned in Kazakh folk literature such as epic tales, historical poems, zhirau's poetry and etc. Along with idea of protection motherland from enemies in epic poems there are described heroes world perception, self-assessment, moral-

ethical concepts, ideals of heroism, consciousness, understanding of life meaning, and other ethnical features. Hence batyr institution in Kazakh society should be regarded as part of national spiritual values systems.

Survey of service of Kazakh heroes institution shows that they were inseparable part of traditional society's political elite. This institution contributed to military art, state government and cultural development of Kazakh society. Next we will consider place heroes and measures of heroism in Kazakh society. Followers of heroism tradition in Kazakh society had own special image as definite social group. It is clear that the real image of heroes cannot be fully reflected in peaceful time. Their heroism deeds are usually vividly expressed in war times. In any times heroes are accepted as followers of military traditions. Heroes' institution, which contributed to peaceful condition in state, organized people to fight against enemies, made speeches for the future of country, grouped people into mindik (thousands) and tumenbasy (ten thousands) and encouraged military with braveness, is considered as "phenomenon of Kazakh society (Erofeeva, 1992: 4).

Heroes were those who led their tribes. Usually they were titled as zholbatar (guide), kolbasy (leader), rubasy (leader of ru), zhon silter (adviser). They expressed tribe and rus interests in significant meetings and defended them. Each of Kazakh heroes highly evaluated the power and meaning of words and had high intelligence. From history we know that the same condition was with Japanese samurais who used to master Hanko (education of aristocrats) along with military art. They had high intelligence, braveness and courage and had courteous nature.

Abai described batyr: "Kazakh people title those batyr who have big heart" (Kunanbayev, 2009: 68). Professor Garifolla Esim analyses features of sacredness of Raymbek batyr from philosophical approach. He analyzed the concepts of "heroism" and "courage" and give following definitions for them: "Courage is one of the special features of human's feature. Created gave the power of courage to the nature of some special people. However the way how he uses it depends on him. Brave person is not afraid of death, because his honor gives him power. Braveness is not only a momentous condition of a hero, but it is his usual condition." When courage changes into ideological concept there is always threat of changing kindness to violence. Kalmyk heroes are heroes too. But can be their actions considered as good deeds? Then what

is the measure of courage? The measure of courage is in being kind (Esym, 2005: 16).

Further he explains that the aim of heroes is to defend motherland. He identifies Raymbek batyr's sanctity in being protector of people, leader and adviser in difficult situations of life. He concludes that: "Saint is an honored man; honored man is very proud person. Hence heroism of our ancestor and his service to be protector of people shows his sanctity (Magauyin, 1991: 17).

For example the main profession of knights is war. Hence their way of life organized according to requirements and rules of war. In Kazakh society the sign of heroism was identified with his heats in the fights against the enemy. For instance in epic poems one hero is shown as the owner of super power, who can beat everyone. He does not know what defeat is. In epic poem "Alpamys no one can resist to strength of Alpamys, in "Kobylandy" he is the most powerful hero amongst Nogais, in "Er Sain" Sain is described even stronger than Kobilandy. The main plot of epic poems is fight against enemies. This is the reason why the poem is titled epic" (Akhmetzhanov, 1996: 186.; 192).

In Kazakh tradition heroism is not passed as heritage, but each person must deserve the title being hero. Heroes who sacrificed their lives in the sake of his people were remembered in the memory of people and became their motto in the battles against enemies. Those who were known as heroes from several generations and were known for their high courage were titled as "kara Batyr" or "Kara beren Batyr" (real hero). Those who fought alone with enemies were titled as "zheke Batyr" (special hero). Those who could destroy enemies' fortress were titled as "kamal buzgan kaz batyr" (the real hero who destroyed enemies' fortress) (Kliashtorniy, 1992: 3).

S.G. Kliashtorny and T.I. Sultanov wrote in the work "Kazakhstan's chronicle of three millennia: "For individual braveness in war and for skilled management of military actions there were titled authoritative title "batyr". According to the sources from 15th century the most famous heroes and those who showed heroism several times in the battlefield were titled with title tolubatyr which means full hero who is full of courage, persistence and strength. The title batyr was added to the name of a hero" (Kliashtorniy, 1992: 345]. Tradition of giving title to heroes with the names of zheke batyr, khas batyr and etc. comes from the ancient times.

For example Herodotus mentioned that Scythians highly evaluated warriors who showed feats in the war (Latyshev, 1893: 66). Rulers used to

give special jars with drink for warriors who killed enemies. Those who were not awarded to try this drink felt ashamed. It is known that there was similar tradition amongst Hunns (Materialy, 1968: 41). In the other words we may claim that that heroism was highly evaluated and perceived as one of the main ideologies of traditional society of nomads. This concept is still preserved in our days.

Hence the rise of hero roles in society was conditioned by the tradition of system of assigning titles. System of assigning titles to courage heroes organized assignment of military rank of leading onbasy (tens), zhuzbasy (hundreds). Along with it they had rights to receive part of triumph from battle, to receive rank (tarkhan and etc.), lands, cities, tribes, to get respect and honor financially and in goods, to have the right to take parts in khan's meetings and etc. (Akhmetzhanov, 1996: 230).

Tradition of ceremony titling heroes is described by academician Alkey Margulan's work about Olzhabay batyr folk tales. There it is described that Olzhabay batyr could oust Dzhungars who were ruling in Turkestan to Chinese territories. To show gratitude to batyr's feat khans Abylkhayir, Sameke, Abilmambet gave him as present golden crutch and saber which were preserved from the ancient times in Yasawiy mosque. Initial owner of saber was Tamerlan. People say that Tamerlan gave them as present to mosque. This fact shows the feeling of gratitude to heroism by people (Margulan, 1984: 170-175). Historian B. Berlybayev describes heroes as adopters of heroic military traditions. He concludes that: "Kazakh military art has developed in the result of fights and defenses from enemies (Berlybayev, 2005: 46-53). Scholar M. Kozybayev wrote about batyrs evolvment process: "All of them are individuals who faced difficulties, overcome hardships, and became people with high experience in life. In the times of difficulties, when the present and future of state was under threat there appeared heroes who could sacrifice their lives for motherland. History gave birth to heroes and made their names to be kept in the memory of people" (Kozybayev, 1994: 60).

All scholars underline that they highly evaluate military art of nomads' amongst all other nomadic value system. Place of battles made great influence on ideology and psychology of nomads' life. Even foreign explorers mentioned about heroism and braveness features of traditional Kazakh society. For instance explorer N. Zeland who travelled and explored Kazakh traditions wrote: "One can find all features in Kazakh nature to be a hero. Life in steppe teaches to be cautious to threats." (Zeland, 1998: 67).

Makhambet Otemysuly described Kazakh heroes in his poem: “Can be one titled batyr if he does not nock bow strings, if he does not oust enemies, if he does not put balls into matchlock, if he does not stretch arms into quiver, if his arrow is not lost, if his steel sword with a gold hilt does not covered with blood, if he does not make his enemy to taste the blood, if he has not been called roughneck?!” (18-19 gasyrlardagy, 1962: 10).

K. Akmetzhanov listed and defined the main features of heroes and underlined that: “the main feature of heroes was that they were professionally skilled in art military. As Japan’s samurais, French knights, Indian Kshatriyas Kazakh military service served as Kazakh batyrs’ social monopoly. Doing other professions was considered as shameful for them. Kabanbay, Bogenbay, Zhanibek batyr’s lives were related with only military art” (Akhmetzhanov, 1996: 15).

Reviewing the concept and meaning of word “batyr” we can be convinced that the place of batyrs in Kazakh society’s political social sytem was significant. As you can see heroism was inseparable part of Kazakh nature and became the specific feature of Kazakh people. If we can consider value as social phenomenon which can arise from historical cultural features of nation, then we should investigate institution of heroes as inseparable part this issue. Currently it is often stated that considering historical nature as cultural values shows trustworthiness of scientific opinion (Alymbayev, 1995: 47). Identification of specific historical, cultural and socail features of nomadic and semi-nomadic societies is possible only if we know the historical features of this society. This will help understand better the features of interrelation of separate components in that society (Shemiakin, 1991: 94). Social phenomenon appears only when there is necessity in it in society. The reason of heroes to be raised into institution is closely related with society’s spiritual cultural development peculiarities.

Society’s peculiarities are based on both its economic construction, and its cultural spiritual style of life. In nomadic societies these two concepts are tightly interrelated. Many scholars underline that Kazakh’s consciousness, traditions, world perception and the entire life is based on traditions of nomadic style of life. S. Tolybekov states: “It is impossible to imagine establishment of nomadic style of life without batyrs” (Tolybekov, 1959: 257).

In order to perceive batyrs as social institution in Kazakh society’s social political construction, we should understand what the social construction is

and its general regualtions features to become social institution. The term construction means combination of interrelation of components within the object and interdependence of functions dependent form each other. Construction of object is identified with the number of components, their placement and features of their interrelationship. Perception of construction in this identification is approved in investigation of social construction. According to B. Russell only identification of object’s construction is not enough to investigate the object. While investigating the construction we can know about its components and their interrelationship, but it does not give any information about its components’ interactions with other objects.

Majority of scholars pay attention to repetition and stability of construction elements. They underline the fact that there is necessity to identify the interdependence of elements, functions of each element, and the way how they are changed. Due to dynamic feature of whole systems it is important to know how repetition and stability processes occur within the construction. System is interrelation and change of constructive elements which lead to exchange of dynamic changes. Integrity is a process. Hence construction is organization of integrity in time space. What are the specificity of social constructions from general constructions? There is an entire history of investigation of social life from constructive approach. In the natural sciences the term structure was introduced from the end of 16th century in order to explain the interrelationship of components of integrity. The term “social structure” was introduced after 1945. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown were the first scholars who concerned issues of social structure. Social structure requires unity of members of commune. Function of social integrity is performed by social institutions. According to Radcliffe-Brown society is a social structure with stability and durability. In biology the process of stabilization by exchanging with environment is entitled with word life. Life of society is cooperation of its components in harmony. In other words Radcliffe-Brown offered hypothesis of social systems elements’ integrity. Proper function of any element of structure is directed on proper operation of whole system.

Leading scholars of the social anthropology school paid high attention to functions of social institutions in investigation of whole organism (tribe, commune, specific historical society). This school was accepted in 1920. Since it was believed that social structure serves to keep stability there was not taken into account reason of mechanisms.

In fact there were not investigated questions such as if a society is one organism, where border of one society with the other is, how the difference between pathological and properly functioning societies can be identified. Social norms are tools to regulate the rules of relation between groups and individuals. Using social norms society and social organizations can make requirements from its members. These requirements must satisfy social norms. Social norms are reflected in concepts which are accepted or non-accepted, approved or non-approved, useful or useless for people. All types of man's social behavior including his formation as an individual depend on the level how he absorbed and practiced social norms. On the basis of social norms required by society it is established model or etalon of social behavior of this group. Social norms provide society's stability, protection from inner and outer destructing factors. Hence social norms regulate and support society's ability to live. The decisive moment of public relations' social nature is in socialization of each generation and their skilling of social norms. Institution of batyrs established as peculiar social institution in Kazakh society. This institution had own regulations and concepts. Transference of regulation from one generation to next depends on continuity. Stability of regulations is defined with sanctions for breaking social and established legislation. After considering social structure we will analyze one of its components social institutions. Institution is a concept used to define formal and informal rules, principles and positions which regulate man's functioning in diverse spheres. It identifies organizing social theories of man's role and status. When we consider concept "social institution", we understand that we are going to analyze large groups of formal roles. An idea offered by G. Spenser states that investigation of institution is investigation of society's evolvement and structure, occurrence of changes and investigation of its growth. Institutionalism (including T. Veblen) aims to investigate institutions as main factor in all social sciences. Establishing the term institution this school explained this term as a group of people with one interests to operate definite functions. As many other basic concepts in science the term institute is also explained in broad way and vague. However we will perceive institutionalism as defining part of interactions. Main elements of institutionalism are social norms and rules. Institutionalism can be understood as exchange of elements of society such as individuals, groups, organizations and etc. True interests and attempts of people mainly based on their structural positions and importance

of their positions. Resources they own are changed according to their institutional positions and institutional regions. These resources can be tools to perform aims of individuals and can serve as objects of individuals. Labor division and social economic difference in Kazakh society is the continuation of social institutions. Social stratification appeared in the result of social labor division and construction of ideal model of different individuals. In spite of that Kazakhs social economic structure and social stratification did not accord to each other and sometimes even contradicted with each other. Peoples' social status is not identified by their economic condition and it does not depend on their place in society. Identification of batyrs as ruling class by the Soviet scholars is related with military potestarian structure of society at that moment. At that moment the military potestarian system of government played significant role and batyrs also could use benefits of this system as part of it.

Social stratification in 18-19th centuries shows that external economic relations were not so important in Kazakh society. Different categories of social structure such as judiciary, social, military political services were not developed professionally. As result there were established social institutions and definite groups. The level of quality of social political organizations in Kazakh society were identified by use of territories, issues of migration, regulation of relations between different tribes, interrelations with foreign countries and etc. They performed different social services of social institutions including military and political functions. Each type of social relations acted separately, as result it led to change of whole system of society. There were two main types of social political institutions in Kazakh society: social structures which regulate non-economic issues of public relations and services which are responsible for military political services, regulation of territories, ways of migration and etc. In fact khans, sultans and tribe leaders were responsible for migration processes. The other function of association was related with regulation of non-economic issues such as controlling, revealing offenders, to solve problems between different tribes, provision of protection, abaction and etc. In summer and other seasons of the year there were other structural organizations which were responsible for regulation of different public relations such as regulation of military political relations within the tribe and between different tribes. Since it was possible to perform internal and external economy they were solved by one individual such as khan, sultan or batyr. In peaceful time they usually

were seceded. It is vivid that the reason why batyrs could be distinguished as separate political military power was due to social organization features in political system of Kazakh society. Change of political structure was the result of interrelations between tribes. The main reason for that was that people were governed by tribal systems. Regulation of social political life of Kazakh society according to genealogical principles is peculiar feature of Kazakhs from the ancient times. Interrelations of tribes based on definite rules led to establishment of potestarian government. Existence of military and potestarian governing system in 18th century was the main factor for batyrs' to become separate social political institution in political structure. P. Rychkov underlined that government in those systems can be identified as democratic, since each tribe shows respect to elderly people and wealth people. However, in fact the art of governing the population was skilled neither by tribe rulers, nor by leaders of larger groups. People could be gathered by bi or khans only when they were going to hunting or attacking enemies" (Rychkov, 1896: 72). P. Pallas mentioned that each tribe or region had its own ruler and people who are related by kinship with him served the rulers on their own will (Pallas, 1773: 578). I. Georgi stated that in such social groups the place of bi is lower than sultan's authority, but higher than Kozha's (Kozha is a tribe which are descendants of Muslim missionaries. They are originated from Arabs. They are not considered as the part of tribes of Kazakh ethnos. However, they have high authority due to high authority of Islam in Kazakh society) authority. The reason for that was due to fact that batyrs were dependent from bis. Rulers of regions were chosen from well-known and wealthy group. Even if they are assigned as rulers people will obey them only in case if it is beneficial for people. If rulers do not have any authority amongst people, no one will obey them" (Georgy, 1799: 124). In these statements we should consider thoroughly the fact that the batyrs were dependent from bis. In fact their authority was not lower than bis' authority. In most cases in Kazakh society difference of positions of bi, batyr, zhirau or other were not distinguished clearly. We may conclude that the reason why batyrs' become institutionalized was due to their simultaneous performance of positions of orator, zhirau and ruler of tribe. Scholars, who did researches in 18th century in Kazakhstan, concluded that regions were ruled by sultans, tribes were ruled by bi, small tribes were ruled by plain folk (Proshloe Kazakhstana, 1935: 186). However

these conclusions do not show absoluteness of bi and batyrs power in Kazakh society. In spite the fact that they had authority in some regions and tribes, they could not act without assignment of khans. In majority of Russian sources it is mentioned that rulers of tribes were chosen by people. Even bi-judges were chosen by people. However if they did not have support by khan, they could not perform any actions. Also, it should be mentioned that khan's authority also depended from batyr and bis' support. For example Abylai's power and authority shows the power and authority of argyn tribe. Other khans also increased authority of their tribes. For example Kaip khan was from shekti and tortkara ru, Barak khan was from Naiman ru, Kenesary Kasymuli from kipchaks and etc. The number of people in military political organization was in average of 10 thousand people. In the army of Kenesary Kasymuli the number of people were about 20-25 thousand soldiers. In cases when there was threat from foreign countries the number of men used to increase on account of men from other neighbouring countries. Their role was high in regulation of territory issues with sedentary neighbor countries. For example there was created military political centers of residence of Kazakh khanates in Turkestan consisting from nomadic and sedentary people. Regulation of nomadic economy was realized by social institutions. Difference in social political government in different spheres led to instability of state structure and made barriers to make the centralized government of whole Kazakh society. N. Rychkov wrote that any representative of ruling including khan could not punish offender on his own will. Authority of each person depends on his adherence to definite tribe. If there is necessity in it any person could rely on support of his tribe. In Kazakh societies in order to do an act one need support of tribe's leader. For members of tribe even khan's power can be less influential than tribe's leader's power. Khans and sultans were dependent from tribe's leaders' support. The same was with batyrs, who were strictly criticized by plain folk and traditional judges. Tribe leaders could not make any decisions without agreement of people. In the documents of Orenburg border guard there were written following sentences: "famous judges, sons of khans, people from ruling group had high influence and authority only in case if their actions were in accordance to peoples' necessities. Otherwise no one obeys them" (Materialy, 1940: 120). Georgi I. wrote that decisions made by different officials in official meetings were realized by people only if they were convenient for people.

Impact of batyrs was related on their personal qualities, impact of his tribe, and the quantity of people in tribe. If number of people in tribe was large, then it enlarges the power of batyr. L. Gaverdlovsky wrote: “poor Kazakh families join to one of well-known tribes. In order to provide their protection they had to obey their rulers and sometimes to tolerate their oppression. If the oppression is too strong, then they can leave their tribe and to join to other tribes. Later they could organize abaction of their previous tribes” (Viatkin, 1947: 143). Governor of Orenburg Volkonsky mentioned that strong leaders of tribes or group of youth from plain folk can organize cattle rustling, theft and etc. They do not obey tribe leaders. On the contrary, they can be dangerous for them (Materialy, 1940: 135). Materials of Russian scholars prove that speech made by bi and batyrs had high authority. Describing social political condition of Kazakhs in 18th century I. Georgy concluded that: “in recent times the power of plain folk is strengthening. They started to take titles of bi, batyrs and try to make kinship relations with ruling group of nation and to become equal with ruling group” (Georgy, 1799: 135). Zh. Artykbayev mentioned that in spite the fact that data from Russian sources about two main groups of Kazakh people is described vividly, they were not analyzed properly. He underlines that gaining strength and power of plain folk is not the situation occurred only in 18th century, but this tradition came from the ancient times due to Kazakhs tribal structure. Leaders of tribes have high authority, because of tight kinship relationships. System of self-ruling of plain folk can cause contradictions to power of the state, since it can be against of policy of khan (Artykbayev, 1997: 263-264). As we can see there were numerous reasons for increase of role and place of batyrs in political social structure of Kazakh society. Situation in 18th century brought difficulties to political ruling institutions. We can assume that traditional nomadic society’s style of life was tightly related with military economy. Data given in 18th century about Kazakhs describe them as brave and courage people. Russian scholars wrote: “in the ancient times Kazakhs were accepted as the strongest nation. After Zhungars have been destroyed there was no other brave nation except Kazakhs. They have never paid taxes to other countries” (Kazakhsko, 1961: 577). However political Potestarian ruling system of that times were accepted as traditional Kazakh peculiar method of ruling. In nomadic society potestarian ruling was based on batyrs and old-aged people soviet.

In traditional Kazakh society the place of batyrs

were regulated and identified according to state law. For example one of the founders of Kazakh khanate Kasym khan (1511-1523) assigned law “zhargy” based on political situation and people’s needs, and on the ancient traditional customs. The third part of this law which is known as “Kasym khannin kaska zholy” (Peculiar way of Kasym khan) was related to military issues. The fifth part of “Zheti zhargy” (“Seven laws”) also covered military issues such as keeping unity of the state, defense of state, army construction and etc. One of the punishments mentioned in this law was withdrawal of gun of a soldier. This was accepted as one of the most strict punishments and was equal to death (Elamanov, 2004: 244). The reason why heroes in Kazakh society could achieve equal level with ruling groups and gain high authority was due to tribal structure of society, because in the time of war and battles people were organized by tribe leaders or batyrs. In these battles batyrs used to lead tribe raising their flag. There is great meaning of slogan words of Kazakhs with names of batyrs such as “Kanzhigaly Bogenbai”, “Shakshak Zhanibek”, “Karakerei Kabanbai”, “Shapyrashti Nauryzbai”. People used to attack recalling their names in battles. The name of batyrs showed their adherence to definite tribe. Each tribe showed their adherence to this or that tribe by recalling the names of their ancestor batyrs. Each tribe tried to show strength and power of their own tribe by recalling their names. Khan was the main commander-in-chief of Kazakh military. He served as organizer, leader and coordinator. Military organization mechanism during war was directly related with khan’s braveness, leadership talents and authority. Increase or decrease of their authority was also related with high social groups of Kazakh societies. Hence Kazakh khans attached to their names titles such as “bahadur” or “batyr”. Main warlord was assigned by khan. He had to have skills of organization, be able to lead, to be known with his feats in battles, skilled in attack and defense strategies, and to be winner in several duels. Only a hero who could satisfy these requirements could be assigned as main warlord (Elamanov, 2004: 186).

Soviet scholars who based their researches on class group domination did not explain properly significant role and place of batyrs in society. For example M. Viatkin considered term batyr as concept without social class meaning and suggested that it is difficult define social feature of batyrs who had important role in 18th century. This difficulty was caused due to methodology which is based in explanation of social relations only from class group domination approach. We should not forget

that heroes were originated either from aristocrats and from plain folk. Identification of batyrs as dominating class in traditional Kazakh society is related with high importance of military governing structure. In the age of military oppositions batyrs had equal power with other leaders.

Conclusion

Concluding above mentioned we can suggest following conclusions:

- The word “batyr” means brave, courage man who has skilled military art and famous for his feats. The title batyr can be titled to any man regardless his social adherence to any group. The main considered issue to be titled as batyr is a man’s personal quality.

- Batyrs make combination of social units which are related with Kazakh society’s national values. They have specific peculiarities as individual group of adopters of military tradition.

- As main impacts on gaining importance of batyrs in Kazakh societies’ political social construction can be considered features of general

nomadic society, tribal construction and political potestarian organization. Main consistent part of foundation of batyrs institution, peculiar to traditional Kazakh society, are related with features of establishment of Kazakh society. Issues on development of Kazakh society are directly related with social construction and statehood of general nomadic societies. Peculiarity of traditional Kazakh society’s tribal construction is in its close interrelation with ancient states constructions and khanate unions before establishment of Kazakh khanate. It was related with their political, social and military life, traditional style of life and human essence development. Only in case if we take into account the role of those tightly interrelated factors, we would be able to understand ways of foundation and main functions of batyrs’ institutions.

Current generation is happy generation, because they live in independent state. Gaining independence was aim of heroes. Our aim is to praise and to pass to new generation our ancestors’ feats and their place in society.

References

Akhmetzhanov K.S. (1996). Zharagan temyr kigender: Batyrlardin karu-zharagi, askeri oneri, salt-dasturleri. [Heroes of Armed Forces: Heroes’ weapons, military art, traditions]. Almaty: Daur.

Alymbayev N. (1995). Voprosy tipologii traditsionnoi kochevoi kultury Kazakhov. Kultura kochevnikov na rubezhe vekov (19-20 vekov). Problemy genesis i transformatsii: tezisi dokladov mezhd. konf. [Questions of typology of traditional nomadic culture Kazakhs]. Almaty.

Artykbayev Zh. 18-gastydagy Kazakh kogaminin etnoaleumettik kurilimi: tarikh gylm dokt. ... diss. (1997). [Ethno-social structure of the Kazakh society of the 18th century]. Almaty.

Berlybayev B. (2005). Rayimbek batyr znahe tarikh tanymdagi zhaungerlik dastur. Mina zhinakta: Rayimbek Kazakh khalkinin dankti uly. [Rayimbek batyr and traditions of historical traditions. In this collection: Rayimbek is the glorious son of the Kazakh people.] Almaty.

Viatkin M.P. (1947). Batyr Syrym [Batyr Syrym]. Moscow – Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Georgy I. (1799). Opisanie vsekh obitaiushikh v Rossiskom gosudarstve narodov. Volume 2. [The oppression of all peoples living in the Russian state]. St. Petersburg.

Zeland N. (1998). Kirgizdar. Batys Sibir boliminin zhazbalary. Kazakhtar. Kazakhstan ham Kazakhtan hakinda. [Kyrgyzs. Records of the West Siberian Department Kazakhs. Kazakhstan is the only one in Kazakhstan]. Almaty.

Elamanov K. (2004). Kazaktyn burungi el baskaru kurilimi zhane biler kizmeti. [The structure of the Kazakh state and the dance function of the former Kazakh law. Documents, data and research] Kazakhtin ata zandary. Kuzhattar, derekter zhane zerteuler. Volume 2. In 10 volumes /Edited by S.Z. Zimanov. Almaty.

Erofeeva I. (1992). Batory kak fenomen istorii kazakhskogo naroda [Batyrs as a phenomenon of the history of the Kazakh people]. Kazakhstanskaia Pravda. 25th September.

Esym G. (2005). Aulie Rayimbek zholy eldikke bastaidi: Rayimbek batyrdin tunganina 300 zhil. [Said Raiymbek Zholy has begun the country: 300 years since Raiymbek batyr’s birth]. Zhetisu. 30th June, 18

Kliashorniy S.G., Sultanov T. (1992). Kazakhstan: Letopis triekh tisechaletii. [Annals of the Three Millennium]. Alma-Ata, T. I. 384

Kazakhsko-russkie otnoshenie v 16-18 vekakh (1961). Sbornik dokumentov i materualov. [Kazakh-Russian relations in the 16-18 centuries. Collection of documents and materials.] Alma-Ata: AN Kaz SSR.

Kunanbayev A. (2009). Karasoz [Black word]. Almaty: Mezhdunarodniy klub Abaia.

Kozybayev M. (1994). Zhaudi shaptym tu bailap. [I tied an ass and tied it]. Almaty: Kazakhstan.

Latyshev V.V. (1893). Izvestia drevnikh pisatelei grecheskikh i latinskikh o Skifi i Kavkaza. Grecheskie pisateli. [News of ancient Greek and Latin writers about Scythia and the Caucasus. Greek Writers]. 1st edition. Saint Petersburg.

Magauyin M. (1991). Gasyrlar bederi [Century relief]. Almaty: Zhazushy.

- Margulan A. (1984). Olzhabay. [Olzhabai]. Zhuldyz. No. 2. P.170-175
- Materialy po istorii Sunnu (1968). Predisl., per. i primich. V.S. Taskina. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shemiakin I.G. (1991). Problema tsivilizatsii v sovetskoj nauchnoj literature 60-80 godov (1991). [The problem of tsivilizatsii in the Soviet scientific literature of the 60-80s]. Istorija SSSR. No. 5. 86-103
- Tolybekov S.E. (1959). Obshchestvenno-ekonomicheskii stroi kazakhov v 16-19 vekakh (1959). [The socio-economic system of Kazakhs in the 16th-19th centuries]. Alma-Ata.
- Rychkov P.I. (1886). Istorija Orenburgskaia (1730-1750). [History Orenburg (1730-1750)]. Orenburg: Tipo-litographia Iv. Efim-skogo-Mirovitskoga.
- Pallas P.S. (1773). Puteshestvie po raznym provintsiam Rossiskoi imperii. Volume 1. [Travel to different provinces of the Russian Empire] Saint Petersburg: Pri Imperat. Acad. Nauk.
- Proshloe Kazakhstana v istochnikakh i materialakh. Sbornik. (5 v.n.e., – 18 v.n.e.) (1935). Volume 1. [The past of Kazakhstan in sources and materials]. Collection. Moscow- Almaty.
- Materialy po istorii Kazakhskoi SSR. (1940). (1785-1828 gg.). Volume 4. Moscow. Leningrad.: Izd. AN SSSR.
- 8-19 gasyrlardagy Kazakh akindarinin shigarmalary (1962). / Edited by Duisenbayev I.T. [Works of Kazakh poets of 18-19 centuries]. Almaty: Science Academy of Kazakh Social Soviet Republic press.

Әдебиеттер

- Ахметжанов К.С. (1996). Жараған темір кигендер: Батырлардың қару-жарағы, әскери өнері, салт-дәстүрлері. Алматы.
- Алимбаев Н. (1995). Вопросы типологии традиционной кочевой культуры Казахо́в. Культура кочевников на рубеже 19-20 веков. Проблемы генезиса и трансформации // Тезисы докладов междунар. конф. Алматы.
- Артыкбаев Ж. (1997). 18-ғасырдағы Қазақ қоғамының этно-әлеуметтік құрылымы: тарих ғылым. докт.... дисс. Алматы.
- Берлыбаев Б. (2005). Райымбек батыр және тарихи танымдағы дәстүр. Жинақта: Райымбек Қазақ халқының даңқты ұлы. Алматы.
- Вяткин М.П. (1947). Батыр Сырым. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство АН СССР.
- Георги И. (1799). Описание всех обитающих в Российском государстве народов. Т.2. Санкт-Петербург.
- Зеланд Н. (1998). Қырғыздар. Батыс Сібір бөлімінің жазбалары. /Қазақтар. Қазақстан хәм Қазақстан хақында. Алматы.
- Еламанов К. (2004). Қазақтың бұрынғы ел басқару құрылымы және билер қызметі Қазақтың ата-зандары. Құжаттар, деректер және зерттеулер. Редакторы С.З. Зиманов. Алматы.
- Ерафеева И. (1992). Батыры как феномен истории казахского народа // Казахстанская Правда. 25 сентября.
- Есім Ғ. (2005). Әулие Райымбек жолы елдікке бастайды: Райымбек батырдың туғанына 300 жыл. Жетісу, 30 маусым.
- Кунанбаев А. (2009). Карасөз. Алматы: Международный клуб Абая.
- Кляшторный С.Г., Султанов Т. (1992). Казахстан: Летопись трех тысячелетий. Алма-Ата.
- Казакско-русские отношения в 16-18 веках (Сборник документов и материалов) (1961). Алма-Ата: АН СССР.
- Қозыбаев М. Жауды шаптым ту байлап (1994). Алматы: Қазақстан.
- Латышев В.В. (1893). Известия древних греческих и латинских писателей о Скифии и Кавказе // Греческие писатели. Санкт-Петербург.
- Мағауин М. Ғасырлар бедері (1991). Алматы: Жазушы.
- Маргулан А. Олжабай (1984) // Жұлдыз. № 2. 170-175 бб.
- Материалы по истории Сунны (1968). Предисл., пер. и примеч. В.С. Таскина. Москва: Наука.
- Материалы по истории Казахской ССР. (1940). (1785-1828 гг.). Т.4. Москва-Ленинград.: Изд. АН СССР.
- Паллас Р.С. (1773). Путешествие по разным провинциям Российской империи. Санкт-Петербург: При Императ. Акад. Наук.
- Прошлое Казахстана в источниках и материалах. (1935). Сборник. (5-18 вв). Том. 1. (1935). Москва-Алматы.
- Рычков П.И. (1886). История Оренбургская (1730-1750). Оренбург: Типо-литография Ив.Ефимского-Мировитского, 95
- Толыбеков С.Е. (1959). Общественно-экономический строй казахов в 16-19 веках. Алма-Ата, 448
- Шемякин И.Г. (1991). Проблема цивилизации в советской научной литературе 60-80 годов. История СССР. №5. С.86-103.
- 18-19 ғасырлардағы Қазақ ақындарының шығармалары (1962). Құрастырған: И.Т. Дүйсенбаев. Алматы. Ғылым.