

Sultanov T.I.¹, Karibaev B.B.², Maidanali Z.³, Rakhimbekova B.K.⁴

¹doctor, professor, St. Petersburg University, e-mail: berber2008@mail.ru

²doctor, professor, e-mail: bereketbk64@gmail.com

³Ph.D., Associate Professor, e-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru

⁴Ph.D

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

THE POWER AND AUTHORITY IN THE «NOMADIC EMPIRES» OF EURASIA (historiography of problem)

Main conceptual positions and methodological paradigms to problem power and authority in the «nomadic empires» are considered in the article. The presented historiographical analysis shows that the power in nomadic formations and the Mongolian empire itself was a complex and internally structured political phenomenon. The effectiveness of theoretical and methodological constructions raises the task for researchers to study administrative institutions of nomadic formations, a new quality of scientific knowledge requires their reconstruction as a complex of different types and models of power, united in a single imperial structure. At the present stage of the development of historical science, specialists are interested in developing criteria, models and typologization of the structures of the nomadic society, which would allow us to express definitively on the problems of the addition of the political and administrative system of the nomadic empires. The complex and ambiguous nature of the development of political institutions of nomads makes promising the application of system principles for the analysis of power structures, the social system and the peculiarities of the process of transformation in nomadic empires. The article deals with different conceptual positions and approaches to the problem power and authority institutes of the nomadic society and presents historiographical review of the modern historical science.

Key words: nomadic empires, methodological paradigms, structure, power, authority.

Сұлтанов Т.И.¹, Кәрібаев Б.Б.², Майданали З.³, Рахимбекова Б.⁴

¹доктор, профессор, Санкт-Петербург университеті, Ресей Федерациясы, berber2008@mail.ru

²доктор, профессор, e-mail: bereketbk64@gmail.com

³т.ғ.к., доцент, e-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru

⁴т.ғ.к.

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Еуразия «көшпелі империяларындағы» билік және билеуші (мәселенің тарихнамасы)

Мақалада көшпелі империяларындағы билік пен билеуші саяси құбылысының концептуалды қорытындылары мен методологиялық парадигмалары қарастырылады. Ұсынылып отырған тарихнамалық сараптау көрсеткендей Моңғол империясында және көшпелі қоғамдарда билік күрделі және іштей құрылымданған саяси құбылыс болған еді. Теориялық-методологиялық құрудың тиімділігінің талабы зерттеушілердің алдына көшпелі құрылымдардың басқару институттарын зерделеуді, ғылыми білімнің жаңа сапасы біртұтас империялық құрылымға біріктірілген биліктің әртүрлі типтері мен модельдерін қайта қарастыруды қажетсінеді. Тарих ғылымы дамуының заманауи кезеңінде мамандар көшпелі қоғам құрылымының критерийлерін, модельдері мен типтерін талдап жасауға мүдделі болып отыр. Мұның өзі көшпелі империялардың саяси басқару жүйесі туралы анық пікір қалыптастыруға жетелейді. Көшпелілердің саяси институттары дамуының күрделілігі және әрқилы сипаты билеуші құрылымдарды, әлеуметтік және көшпелі империядағы трансформация үдерісінің ерекшеліктерін сараптауда жүйелілік

қағидаларын қолдануды талап етеді. Тарихнамалық сараптау қазіргі тарих ғылымының көшпелі қоғамның билік және билеуші институттарының қалыптасу мәселелерін көрсетеді, ізденіс парадигмалары мен концептуалдық тұжырымдар мен көзқарастарын айқындайды.

Түйін сөздер: көшпелі империялар, методологиялық парадигмалар, құрылым, билік, билеуші.

Султанов Т.И.¹, Карибаев Б.Б.², Майданали З.³, Рахимбекова Б.⁴

¹доктор, профессор, Санкт-Петербургский Университет, Россия, г. Санкт-Петербург

e-mail: berber2008@mail.ru

²доктор, профессор, e-mail: bereketbk64@gmail.com

³к.и.н., доцент, e-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru

⁴к.и.н.

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

Власть и властвование в «кочевых империях» Евразии (историография проблемы)

В статье рассматриваются концептуальные заключения и методологические парадигмы о таких политических явлениях, как власть и властвование в «кочевых империях». Представленный историографический анализ показывает, что власть в кочевых образованиях и собственно Монгольской империи, представляла собой сложные и внутренне структурированные политические явления. Эффективность теоретико-методологических построений ставит перед исследователями задачи по изучению управленческих институтов кочевых образований, новое качество научных знаний требует их реконструкции как сложного комплекса разных типов и моделей власти, соединенных в единую имперскую структуру. На современном этапе развития исторической науки специалисты заинтересованы в разработке критериев, моделей и типологизации структур кочевого общества, которые позволили бы определенно высказаться по проблемам сложения политико-управленческой системы кочевых империй. Сложный и неоднозначный характер развития политических институтов кочевников делает перспективными применение системных принципов анализа властных структур, социальной системы и особенностей процесса трансформации в кочевых империях. В статье освещаются различные концептуальные положения и подходы к проблеме формирования институтов власти и властвования, представлен историографический обзор исследовательских парадигм современной исторической науки.

Ключевые слова: кочевые империи, методологические парадигмы, структура, власть, властвование.

Introduction

The interest to the issue of new political structures in the «nomadic empires» of Eurasia, caused by necessity to identify a new, alternative and prospective theoretical and methodological approaches in framework of the problems of the dialectical development of nomadic political entities. For a long time historical science has been solved one of the main matter – how and why «the super-transcontinental nomadic empires» emerged. The history of nomadic structures in Central Asia and their political structures is still one of the most important objects of study. New approaches and systems analysis consider process of different directions of study and discourse. The content and meaning of methodological approaches depend on particular researcher, the specific conditions of his work, as well as many other factors.

The period of «nomadic empires» formation was distinguished by sharp and permanent changes in the socio-political structure, accompanied by the

destruction of traditional social institutions. The subsystems ratio has been unstable and mobile, given the dynamics nature of political processes in nomadic societies

Modern methodology of political and social anthropology has brought into focus the studies of American and European scholars. According to American researchers, repetitive cycles of the rise and fall of empires can't show signs of evolutionary change. In this regard, the whole anthropological schools of Europe and America have considered the nomadic society as a fully stagnated, deprived of historical development.

Methods of research

At the present stage of development of historical science and its theories as historical knowledge there is an urgent need for the formulation and analysis of the various conceptual problems. Conceptual conclusion of such political entity to problem power and authority in the «nomadic

empires» is one of the difficult to understand and has different level of generalization and coverage of historical reality. Changing of paradigms identified different methodological approaches and principles in studying of the problem of the existence and functioning of the «nomadic empire». The modern history identifies the elements in early-state imperial structures of nomads. Research paradigms in their comparative analysis determine the similarities in the description of the specific forms of power among the nomads, but emphasize it differently. Some of them are based on the assessment of governance structures by nomads directly; others emphasize the essence of the entire military-hierarchical organization empires in cowing dependent peoples and the removal of their surplus product. The sequence of historical thinking and concrete historical analysis, modern methodological approaches indicates that family structure and genealogy conditioned a «dispersion» and centrifugal nomadic societies. However, in the nomadic empires military hierarchical bodies of political management closely intertwined with tribal segments, while being high above them, control them, and organized their effective use in accordance with the aims of the imperial leadership.

The main part

The representatives of evolutionary theory suggest that Mongol Empire is the highest point of the previous nomadic empires of the steppe and the classic example of nomadic statehood. Theorists of evolutionary nomadism have drawn attention to nomadic state as the result of gradual internal development and have denied that the nomads created the some semblance of Chinese political system. J. Fletcher determines that all theories can be reduced to the seven characteristics: 1. greedy and predatory nature of the steppe; 2. climate change; 3. overpopulation steppe; 4. reluctance of farmers to trade with the nomads; 5. necessity for additional sources of income; 6. a need to establish over tribes association of nomads; 7. psychology of nomads – the duality of nature – be equal to the farmers and the belief in Tengri, who has given a divine mission to conquer the world. Proceeding from these provisions, the author comes to the conclusion that if the bulk of the Mongolian population was left «supporters of nomadization» and followed its traditional steppe models to exploit the agricultural world, their empire would have lasted longer (Fletcher, 2004: 221-222).

Analyzing the conceptual conclusions of American anthropologist O. Lattimore (Lattimore. 1940) it appears that the specificity of nomadic society

cannot be properly understood only on the basis of internal development logic. Nomad needs agricultural food, handicrafts, weapons, etc. all that could be obtained in peaceful trade with farmers or war. That is another way involves pooling and creating over tribal society. But not always and not everywhere nomads need to establish contacts with the sedentary and urban societies in order to create of «nomadic empires». A.M. Khazanov, who represents contemporary American anthropological school, determines the system of interaction of settled agricultural areas and nomadic environments as a process of addition of large communities due to the asymmetry of nomad's relations between them and their external settled surroundings (Khazanov, 2000: p.270).

T. Barfield via rejection «diffusionistic» interpretation, that nomads borrowed state from farmers, has showed the degree of centralization of the steppe society which was directly linked to the level of political integration of the settled agricultural society. At the same time the specificity of the political organization of the nomadic societies is largely mediated by the peculiarities of the regional environment and the size of the neighboring agricultural civilizations (Barfield, 2006:425-426.).

Modern anthropologist, T. Hall understands on the world-system approach, so if we consider nomadism in terms of this methodology, the pre-industrial era nomads ranked as «semi – peripheral» (Hall, 2004:136-167). **The various regional economies united in a single space (local civilization, the «world- emperies»).** He has shared the view of T. Barfield that there are synchronous cycles of rises and declines of agricultural civilization and the nomadic empires.

The individual opinions and hypotheses of modern historical science, is not fully reflect the characteristics of the phenomenon under study. In the course of historical debate even more contradictory theories are not mutually exclusive, and reflect important structural parameters of the research object. J. Fletcher (Fletcher, 2004:221-222) emphasizes that the state is not an institution that is vital for the nomadic society, and, in turn, P. Golden (Golden, 2004: 109) is skeptical about the idea that the nomads can create their own state, but does not deny that under the influence of Chinese civilization steppe empires took shape of early-societies. A somewhat different view is held by L. Kwanten (Kwanten, 1979) in his work «Nomads founders of empires,» he points out to the similarity of traditions of creating nomadic empires, and also requires a strategic plan for the Mongols in

formation Empire in order to avoid the mistakes of previous nomadic states.

The nomads could use two different models in relation to the conquered sedentary urban society : 1. the destruction of cities, the agricultural population, the transformation of the fields into pastures for cattle; 2. the complexity of their own government – sedentarization of the ruling elite in the cities, the establishment of the bureaucracy, the introduction of writing and record keeping. As long as the conquered territories could not be controlled by traditional nomadic society institutions, it requires a fundamental modernization of the administration. Russian researcher S.A. Vasjutin points out: «The peculiarity of nomadic empires, including the Mongolian, that ratio of chiefdom and early-state components of power is not constant and mobility» (Vasyutin, 2005: 109).

The modern historical science believes that more appropriate to consider these relationships in terms of the «elite theory», when «on the one hand, within the new political association there is a higher elite from among the conquerors, and on the other, is formed or supported by the elite of the autochthonous masses of people, representatives which reached great heights in the social hierarchy. « Contemporary researcher A.A. Tishkin (Tishkin, 2003:8) notes that as a result of the interaction of nomadic elite often becomes a «double elite» in relation to the ruling class has openly appropriating the surplus product and is widely participating in various spheres of activity. V.V. Trepavlov (Trepavlov, 1993:14) has been reflecting on existing models of nomadic society, has pointed out two major trends: 1. the establishment of a centralized autocratic monarchy; 2. the association is gradually decaying tribal tribes adaptation of institutions to the functions of over tribal power structure. The researcher analyses the socio-political organization of nomadic empires and suggests that they are a kind of single steps of the development process of the social system of nomads.

The progressive development of historical thought has led to the definition of the main stages of the dialectical development of the political system in nomadic society's (Kljashornyj, 2005:30):

1. Community nomadic tribes in VIII-V centuries B.C. in Central Asia accordance of sufficient certain characteristic in the written sources had no political organization that goes beyond tribal, military and democratic institutions.

2. The fundamental changes in their environment occurred in IV-III centuries BC, when there was recorded in the sources existence of over

tribal new political organization as early state governed by hierarchically structured military-tribal aristocracy.

3. Imperial structure of supreme power determined the profound social changes not only within the dominant tribal groups, but also in the communities dependent on them, which sharply intensified the politogenesis processes. These processes are reflected in the unified for the entire Central Asian political terminology sources.

4. its new incarnation of the classic socio-political structure reached in the VI-VIII centuries, when the runic texts of Orkhon and Yenisei Kyrgyz Turks were their own terms, is referred to as a state political organization (el), continuing over tribal community (budun).

At the present stage of development of historical science and its theories as historical cognition there is an urgent need for the formulation and analysis of different conceptual problems. One of the most difficult to comprehend, and distinguished by the levels of generalization and the coverage of historical reality, are conceptual findings of such political entity as a «nomadic empire». Change of methodological paradigms has been identified different approaches and principles of the study of the problem of the existence and functioning of the «nomadic empire». Modern historical science has been determined the presence of early-state elements in the imperial structures of nomads. Progress in the study of nomadic statehood problems is impossible without taking into account philosophical knowledge of past social reality and integrated approach to the socio-historical knowledge.

The discussions of the last decade have identified two approaches for the assessment of the nomadic empires. Predominant in modern historical scholarship is a provision stating that the nomadic empires were complicated chiefdoms (Kradin, Trepavlov, Skrynnikova, Bondarenko, Korotaev). The researchers Skrynnikova T., N. Kradin describe these formations as «tribal confederation». However, a number of researchers as T. Barfield, C. Vasjutin, A. Khazanov prefer to talk about the relationship with the most formidable political entities of nomads (state Sünnu, Turk Empire, Mongol Empire) as an early form of state (Vasyutin, 2005:56). Research paradigms in comparative analysis determine similarities in the description of the specific forms of power among the nomads, but different emphases. Some are based on an assessment of governance structures directly nomads, while others emphasize the essence of the entire military-hierarchical organization of empires aimed at the subordination of

dependent peoples and seizure of their portion of the surplus product.

One of the urgent sides of the conceptual provisions of «nomadic empire» is the need to develop criteria that would clearly define its nature and content. N.N. Kradin’s research paradigm considering the nature of the object identifies two main signs of «nomadic empire»: 1. large areas, 2. the presence of dependent or colonial possessions. Describing the nomadic empire as a nomadic society organized on military-hierarchical principle, occupy a relatively large space and the exploitation of the neighboring territories by external forms of exploitation (looting, war and indemnities, extortion of «gifts» are not equivalent trade and tribute, etc.), researcher identifies the following features of the nomadic empire: multi-hierarchical nature of social organization, trial or dual principle of the administrative division of the empire, the military-hierarchical social organization, coachman service as a specific way of organizing administrative infrastructure, specific system of inheritance of power, etc. N.N. Kradin’s models of the power structure in the nomadic formations divided into three levels: 1. Ruler of nomadic empire; 2. imperial governors, appointed to manage the tribes, formed part of the empire; 3. Local tribal leaders (Kradin, 2001:22).

The definition of the Mongolian and other nomad empires as «super complex chiefdoms» reveals a number of contradictions in the logical constructions of the supporters of this concept. The genesis of hierarchical structures in nomads is associated only with war, robbery, conquests of neighbors and primarily farmers. A key role in nomadic empires is given to exopolitician forms of exploitation. The classification of these empires is built on the basis of various forms of relationships with sedentary agricultural peoples (typical, tributary, aggressive). At the same time, when we characterize the type of the administrative system of the «nomadic empire» all the above-mentioned factors recede into the background, and the essence of power within the nomadic community becomes the main criterion (Vasyutin, 2004:273).

According to N.N. Kradin’s research experience, the mechanism that connected the rulers with their nomadic subjects was «a prestigious economy.» Thus, the emphasis is on the redistributive functions of the nomadic leader with respect to the nomadic population groups that played a decisive role in the creation of the empire. All its organizational principles aimed at the outside world are recognized only as «state-like». This approach, on the whole, will allow us to speak about the dual nature

of power in nomadic empires (the state and the early state) (Kradin, 2006:491).

Historical cognition 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 linkages. 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 concrete 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.

A renowned researcher of nomadism, A.M. Khazanov, realizing specific research tasks, mentioned that the existence in the Mongol Empire of the concept of a ruler whose authority was sanctioned by Heaven evidently underwent some development. In the preceding states of nomads, Heaven first sanctioned the power of the Khagans over their own people, in the Mongol Empire it gave them power over the whole world. According to the author, the Turkic Khagans and possibly their predecessors – the Huns, propagandized the idea of the divine origin of their power, their sanctioned right to govern the people and the kingdom, but their claims never included the belief in the Heavenly Mandate to rule the whole world (Khazanov, 2005:399). The author has investigated the nature of power in Mongolian society and he notes that the sole purpose was proclaimed how to subordinate the world of power to the Golden Genghis Khan. «In the Mongol Empire, and then in all the Chingizid states, the nomads always occupied a dominant position, many of them migrated to the conquered countries, but there they continued to lead a nomadic way of life.» The Mongolian ruling elite also didn’t want to settle ... all of the Chingizid states, and even in many states of their successors, for example the Timurids, the military elite consisted of nomads and in ethnic and tribal respect was always closely connected with the rulers «- sums up A.M. Khazanov (Khazanov 2005:397).

E.I. Kychanov, drawing historical parallels and modeling the management systems of nomadic societies, has determined that all the known great nomadic states of Central Asia possessed such an at-

tribute of statehood as sovereignty expressed in the supremacy of the ruler (shanyu, kagan, khan) in the country and its independence outside. According to the view of the researcher, this sign is expressed in the manifestation of sovereignty of the supreme authority and its bodies to resolve criminal and civil cases in the established order. Law as a collection of norms sanctioned or established by the supreme authority had as its source both the norms of customary law recognized by the sovereign supreme authority, the state, and new norms established by the supreme authority, the state (Kychanov, 1997:301).

S.A.Vasyutin, continuing the research traditions of previous generations and using methods of critical analysis, points out: «The peculiarity of all the nomad empires, including the Mongolian one, is that the ratio of the leading and early state components of power is unstable and mobile, and there have been occasional» rollbacks «to such archaic institutions that could have ended with the disintegration of the organizational structures of the early state» (Vasyutin, 2005:57).

The researcher emphasizes the role of the supreme ruler in the Mongolian empire, which united in his person the functions of the traditional clan leader, the head of the tribal confederation of nomads (complex or super sophisticate chiefdom) and the head of a poly-cultural (with nomadic and sedentary population) political formation. One thing was common for all types of nomadic empires – certain entropy of the behavior of the supreme rulers (the transition from charismatic to traditional dominance). Defining the nature and nature of power in nomadic empires, as well as those who personified it (nomadic leaders), S.A. Vasyutin comes to the conclusion that they were complex and internally structured political phenomena (Vasyutin, 2005:68).

E.D. Skrynnikova poses the problem in two ways: 1. Firstly, about the presence or absence of statehood of Mongolians proper, and, secondly, about the statehood of the Mongolian empire. The second presupposes the presence of features of the state (a certain territory, the tax system, the administrative apparatus for executing the functions of leadership and management) that have exopolitan forms, since they must be directed at exploiting the population of more developed societies. The supreme ruler objectively contributed to overcoming the resistance of related clans in the process of social evolution. The author notes the existence of two tendencies: 1) the destruction of leaders, who resisted the centralization under the rule of a new leader; 2) the use by the new leader in the leadership of the confederation of the established clan system and mechanisms.

Combination a) military journey, when the seizure of power was carried out by military leaders with the participation of military democracy / military hierarchy and squads, b) aristocratic, in which power was concentrated among tribal leaders. Both types of power relations – traditional and charismatic – were reflected in the division of the Mongol rulers into two groups. The first group consisted of representatives of the hereditary aristocracy – behi, ebugen, echige; the second included leaders who came to power thanks to personal merit – khan, bagatury, mergen, seetsen, etc. but there is no a sharp border between these two groups, primarily because all of their representatives were leaders due to the possession of charisma. Thus, both types of “domination and submission” were used in substantiating the right to power.

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 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 structures provides the ground for the formulation and analysis of conceptual, methodological problems (Skrynnikova, 2013).

Reconstruction of the political-administrative and system-structural model of the Mongolian empire promotes a deepening of understanding of general trends and directions in studying the modern movement of historical knowledge in the issues of interconnection and interaction of the political and social system of nomadic societies. Modern historical science aims to conduct a systematic analysis of the Mongolian society proper, its social structure and social organization, the identification of the basic and significant prerequisites for the formation of the empire, the nature of its socio-political and administrative-managerial position. Mobility, the dynamism of political processes in nomadic societies led to instability and mobility of the whole structure, and cardinal changes led to the transformation of the whole system as a whole.

Russian historical science on the basis of historical and comparative analysis and systems approach determined the predominance of leadership or early state components of power in nomadic empires, which was determined by the type of imperial organization. In typical and tributary empires,

where the exopolitan forms of exploitation assumed a leading role, the tasks of power were reduced to the creation of a military and political organization that could most effectively exert pressure on farmers in order to obtain nomadic resources from part of their resources. In the conquering nomad empires, the tasks of power were substantially transformed. The main ones were the organization of a system of military and political control over the subordinate sedentary population and the creation of a bureaucratic apparatus to ensure regular (tax) seizures of a part of the surplus product of farmers. Characterizing one of the first nomad empires, the Hun empire, the modern researcher N.N. Kradin notes: «In fact, the Hun Empire was, in effect, a tribal empire, «in which the new military hierarchical relations not only changed the complex system of clan and tribal genealogy of nomads, but co-existed and interwoven with it» (Kradin, 2002:192). The current stage of discussions on the problems of statehood and the limits of the political development of nomadic societies shows the need to develop common criteria for evaluating nomadic management systems and their classification. In nomadic formations it is difficult to define a clear line between supercomplex chiefdom and the early state. Modern historical thought emphasizes that even with nomad empires, it is necessary to talk about the dual nature of power – pre-state (like complex and supercomplex chiefdoms, tribal confederations, archaic empires, quasi-empires) and early xenocratic statehood (Vasyutin, 2005:56)

The historical findings of the last decade revealed that in the Mongol Empire, the number of officials and the complexity of the administrative apparatus directly depended on the territorial scope of the gains (especially the inclusion of territories with sedentary and semi-nomadic populations in the empire) and the traditions of political power in conquered lands. Later, this factor undoubtedly had significance for the political organization of other nomad empires. (Vasyutin, 2005:57). In the research paradigms, the solution of these questions presents great difficulties, because in all nomadic empires the ratio of pre-state and early-state components of power was unstable and agile.

In the context of diverse historical research on the problems of power relations and manifestations of various forms of supreme power in the nomads V.V. Trepavlov, in turn, singles out some general paradigms of organizing the management system: 1. Khan's dignity was regarded as acquired as a result of the favor of the divine forces, as well as personal valor. 2. These circumstances served as the basis for distinguishing the khan from among his fellow tribesmen, as well as concentrating in his hands

the functions of the owner of cattle, the leader, the defender and the judge of the people. 3. The power was concentrated in the collective of the khan's direct and cousin relatives. 4. The Khan status and prerogatives of the supreme administration were usually inherited by the eldest sons. 5. Ulus shared between the khan and his brother (or twin) and his son according to the two-winged principle. Perhaps, there was a subsequent fragmentation of these wings, which resulted from the multistage hierarchy of the ulus chiefs. 6. Management of the ulus took several stages. Initially, the power was concentrated in the hands of one leader, who later transferred part of his prerogatives (in particular, military, economic, and priestly) to special ulus magistrates, forming the ulus administration (Trepavlov, 2005:72-85). The evolution of the political system of nomads is shown on the basis of a modification of administrative mechanisms and a combination of ideological, social, and military methods. The methodological value of these studies in the use of a coherent and consistent model of the development of Mongolian society.

As the development of historical thought shows, the symbiosis of the administrative institutions of nomads and settled-agricultural state traditions makes the application of system principles for the analysis of power structures promising. Researchers consistently raise the problems of folding the institutions of early statehood in fairly complex forms, both at the level of the empire, and in combination with the strengthening of power centers in the uluses. In the Mongol Empire and its individual uluses, there was a combination of the roles of the supreme rulers and at the same time the leaders of the nomadic formations, the supreme officials and functions – the supreme commander, the judge and administrator, the resource manager, the bearer of sacred rights. All this speaks of the complex and ambiguous nature of power and domination in the Mongol Empire. Historical thought in the course of its development also determined the negative factors in the political system of the empire, which, in particular, pointed out the outstanding scientist G.V. Vernadsky: «The internal contradictions that threatened the entire structure of the Mongol Empire were numerous and varied, first of all, there was a basic incompatibility of a number of principles on which the empire was built, primarily a discrepancy between the imperial system and the feudal nature of Mongolian society. Further, there was no absolute coherence of actions, which led to numerous conflicts between the empire and the local khanates ... Third, under the primitive technological conditions of this time and the vastness of the empire represented an eternal problem

for its rulers» (Vernadskiy, 1997:136). Across the territory of the empire in the political and administrative system, there were two opposite tendencies – centrifugal nomadic and centralist. In the works of V.V. Bartold, A.Yu. Yakubovsky, S.P. Tolstova, I.P. Petrushevsky, N.C. Munkueva et al. Carried out a comparative-historical and analytical work with respect to these two trends. The basis for this confrontation, as defined by I.P. Petrushevsky was the question of the methods of exploitation of the indigenous population «and at the same time the question of merging the conquered countries with the feudal elite, accepting their feudal statehood, ideology and cultural traditions» (Petrush-evskiy, 1970:32).

Modern methodology defines new approaches in the study of the functions of rulers, which became wider, and the hierarchy of subordination and dependence in Mongolian society is much more complex and diverse. According to the scientific concept of T.I. Sultanova the supreme power of the medieval Mongols, based on the right of reign of any representative of the «altan of the Urugu» Genghis Khan and was affirmed on the croquet of princes and the higher aristocracy. At the same time, in ulus-states, the succession of power correlated with the consideration of political traditions and specific circumstances (Sultanov, 2008:228). The Russian author S.A. Vasyutin rightly notes: «The concept of the» dual nature «of nomad empires developed by nomadic scholars in recent decades is undoubtedly positive, but even it can not give exhaustive answers. Apparently, one must take into account that the management systems of nomadic empires, as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, cannot be with the help of unambiguous definitions ... A certain internal differentiation of administrative institutions and political events in nomadic empires allows us to talk about different strata in the pre-state and early state political cultures of nomads» (Vasyutin, 2004: p. 270).

The paradigms of research in their comparative analysis determine similar features in describing specific forms of power for nomads, but the accents differ in different ways. Some proceed from the assessment of managerial structures directly by the nomads, others attach special importance to the essence of the whole military hierarchical organization of empires, aimed at subjugation of dependent peoples and the elimination of part of the excess product from them. As the American author A.M. Khazanov notes: «To some extent, social stratification in nomadic societies can intensify when the nomadic aristocracy managed to subordinate other groups of nomads socially and politically, the

problem was the lack of a sufficiently strong law enforcement apparatus» (Khazanov 2006:479).

The conceptual provisions and methodological approaches of the last decades show that the dynamics of the evolution of social relations in nomadic empires was not one-liner and one-vector. Russian historical science in the person of a well-known researcher D.G. Savinov suggested the system of ethno political stratification of nomadic societies. Based on the author's conceptual framework, the structure of the nomadic society did not change within the framework of the newly created state associations and was a kind of «core» of social organization from the Hun and the period of the Mongol Empire. Developing the theoretical and methodological foundations of the problem, D.G. Savinov notes: «The main forces of the ethnos-elite have always been aimed at creating a multi-ethnic state formation with the aim of using the economic potential of various areas in the cultural and economic respect ... Dependent tribes, especially those belonging to the same (or similar) economic-cultural type as the ethnos – elit, always strove to leave the existing system of protectorate, to change political hegemony and create their own statehood ...» (Savinov, 2005).

Conclusion

This historiographical review shows the complex and ambiguous nature of the administrative institutions of the «nomadic empires» and makes perspective of application of principles of comprehensive analysis in historical science, an integrated approach to the consideration of the power structures of political formations of nomads. According the comprehensive analysis, the political and political institutions of nomads are 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 underlining «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 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.

References

- Barfield T.J. (2006) *Mir kochevnikov-skotovodov Raneeg gosudarstvo. ego analogi I alternative. Sbornik statey.* [The world of nomadic pastoralists// The early state, its alternatives and analogues]. Collection of articles. Volgograd.
- Vasyutin S.A. (2008). *Liki vlasti (k voprosu o prirode vlasti v kochevii imperii) Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [The faces of power (to the question about the nature of power in nomadic empires) the Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude. T.2.
- Vasyutin S.A. (2004) *Mongolskay imperia kak osobaya forma ranney gosudarstvennosti? Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [The Mongol Empire as a special form of early statehood? the Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude.
- Vernadskiy G.V. *Mongoly i Rus.* [The Mongols and Russia]. Tver': LEAN, Moskva.
- Golden P. (2004). *Kipchaki srednevekovoi Evrasii: primer negosudarstvennoy adaptatsii Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [The qipchaqs of medieval Eurasia: an example of non-state adaptation in the steppe. The Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude. 546 s.
- Kwanten L. (1979). *Imperial Nomads: A History of Central Asia, 500–1500.* [Imperial Nomads: A History of Central Asia, 500–1500]. Philadelphia.
- Klyashtorny S.G. (2005). *Osnovnie etapi politogeneza u drevnih kochevnikov Centralnoy Azii// Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [The main stages of the politogenesis ancient nomads Central Asia// the Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude.
- Kradin N.N. (2001). *Kochevii imperii: genezis, rascvet, upadok* [Nomadic Empire: the Genesis, the flourishing, the decline]. Vostok, №5.
- Kradin N.N. (2006). *Kochevii imperii I zemledelcheskiy mir / Raneeg gosudarstvo. ego analogi I alternativy. Sbornik statey.* [Nomads, world-empires, and social evolution// the Early state, its alternatives and analogues]. Volgograd.
- Kradin N.N. (2002). *Imperia Hunnu.* [The Empire Of The Huns]. Moskva.
- Kichanov E.I. (1997). *Kochevii gosudarstva ot gunnov do mangurov.* [Nomadic States from the Huns to the Manchus]. Moskva.
- Lattimore O. (1940) *Inner Asian Frontiers of China.* American Geographical Society. [Inner Asian Frontiers of China. New York: American Geographical Society]. New York.
- Petrushevskiy I.P. (1970). *Zemledelie I agrarnie otnosheniya v Irane. XIII-XIV vv.* [Agriculture and agrarian relations in Iran in the XIII-XIV centuries]. M; L.
- Savinov S.G. (2005) *Drevnie turkskie plemena v zerkale arheologii // Klyashtorny S.G., Savinov D.G. Stepnie imperii drevney Evrasii.* [Ancient Turkic tribes in the mirror of archaeology // S. Klyashtorny, Savinov D. G.: the Steppe empires of ancient Eurasia]. SPb. 346 s.
- Skrinnikova T.D. (2013). *Harizma I vlast v epohu Chingizhana.* [Charisma and power in the era of Genghis Khan]. St Peterburg.
- Sultanov. T.I. (2008). *Chingizhan I chingizidi.. sudbi I vlast.* [Genghis Khan and Genghis Khan. The fate and power]. Almaty.
- Tishkin. A.A., Dashkovskiy P.K. (2003). *Socialnaya struktura I sisteme mirovozzreniy naseleniya Altaya skifskoy epohi A.A.* Tishkin. [Social structure in a system of philosophy population of the Altai in the Scythian epoch]. Barnaul. 430 s.
- Trepavlov V.V. (1993) *Gosudarstvenniy story Mongolskaya Imperia XIII v. : problem istoricheskoy preemstvennosti* [The state system of the Mongol Empire, XIII century: the Problem of historical continuity] Moskva., 168 s.
- Trepavlov V.V. (2005). *ulusniy substrat I imperskiy superstrat: poisk «ydra» kochevoy gosudarstvennosti Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [Ulus substrate and Imperial.: search for «kernel» nomadic state of the Mongolian Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude. T. 2.
- Fletcher J. (2004). *Srednevekovii mongoli: ekologicheskie I socialnie perspektivi Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [The medieval Mongols: ecological and social prospects of the Mongolian Empire and the nomadic world. ulan ude]. Ulan-Ude., 546 c.
- Hazanov A.M. (2000). *Kochevniki I vneshniy mir.* [Nomads and the outside world]. Almaty.
- Hazanov A.M. (2005). *Muhamed b Chingizhan v sravnenii: rol religioznogo faktora v sozdaniy mirovii imperii Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir.* [Muhammad and Jenghiz Khan compared: the religious factor in the creation of global empires the Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Ulan-Ude. T.2.
- Hazanov A.M. (2006). *Kochevniki evraziiskih stepey v istoricheskoy retrospektive Raneeg gosudarstvo. ego analogi I alternativa. Sbornik statey.* [Nomads of the Eurasian steppes in historical retrospective the Early state, its alternatives and analogues: Sat. article]. Volgograd.
- Holl T. (2006) *Mongoli v mir-sistemnoy istorii// Raneeg gosudarstvo. ego analogi I alternativa. Sbornik statey.* [The Mongols in world-system history/ Mongol Empire and the nomadic world]. Volgograd.

Литература

- Барфилд Т. Дж. (2006). *Мир кочевников-скотоводов// Раннее государство, его альтернативы и аналоги: Сборник статей.* Раннее государство, его альтернативы и аналоги. Волгоград., 559 с.
- Васютин С.А. (2005). *Лики власти (к вопросу о природе власти в кочевых империях). Монгольская империя и кочевой мир.* Улан-Удэ, Т.2.
- Васютин С.А. (2004). *Монгольская империя как особая форма ранней государственности? (к дискуссии о политических системах кочевых империй)// Монгольская империя и кочевой мир.* Улан-Удэ, Т.1.
- Вернадский Г.В. (1997). *Монголы и Русь.* Тверь, Москва.
- Кляшторный С.Г. (2005). *Основные этапы политогенеза у древних кочевников Центральной Азии // Монгольская империя и кочевой мир.* Улан-Удэ, Т. 2.

- Голден П. (2004). Кипчаки средневековой Евразии: пример негосударственной адаптации в степи // Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. Улан-Удэ, 546 с.
- Kwanten L. (1979). *Imperial Nomads: A History of Central Asia, 500–1500*. Philadelphia.
- Крадин Н.Н. (2001). Кочевые империи: генезис, расцвет, упадок // *Восток*, №5.
- Крадин Н.Н. (2006). Кочевники, мир-империи и социальная эволюция // *Раннее государство, его альтернативы и аналоги*. Волгоград.
- Крадин Н.Н. (2002). *Империя Хунну*. Москва.
- Кычанов Е.И. (1997). *Кочевые государства от гуннов до маньчжуров*. Москва.
- Lattimore O. (1940). *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*. New York: American Geographical Society.
- Петрушевский И.П. (1970). *Земледелие и аграрные отношения в Иране XIII-XIV вв.* Москва; Ленинград.
- Савинов Д.Г. (2005). Древнетюркские племена в зеркале археологии Кляшторный С.Г., Савинов Д.Г.: *Степные империи древней Евразии*. Санкт-Петербург. 346 с.
- Скрынникова Т.Д. (2013). *Харизма и власть в эпоху Чингисхана*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Султанов Т.И. (2008). *Чингиз-хан и чингизиды. Судьбы и власть*. Алматы.
- Тишкин А.А., Дашковский П.К. (2003). *Социальная структура и система мировоззрений населения Алтая скифской эпохи*. Барнаул.
- Трепавлов В.В. (1993). *Государственный строй Монгольской империи XIII в.: Проблема исторической преемственности*. Москва. 168 с.
- Трепавлов В.В. (2005). Улусный субстрат и имперский суперстрат: поиск «ядра» кочевой государственности // *Монгольская империя и кочевой мир*. Кн. 2. Улан-Удэ.
- Флетчер Дж. (2004). *Средневековые монголы: экологические и социальные перспективы* // *Монгольская империя и кочевой мир*. Улан-Удэ, 546 с.
- Хазанов А.М. (2000). *Кочевники и внешний мир*. Алматы.
- Хазанов А.М. (2005). Мухаммед и Чингисхан в сравнении: роль религиозного фактора в создании мировых империй // *Монгольская империя и кочевой мир*. Улан-Удэ, Т.2.
- Хазанов А.М. (2006). *Кочевники евразийских степей в исторической ретроспективе* // *Раннее государство, его альтернативы и аналоги*: Сб. ст. Волгоград.
- Холл Т. (2004). *Монголы в мир-системной истории* // *Монгольская империя и кочевой мир*. Улан-Удэ.