IRSTI 03.20.00 https://doi.org/10.26577/JH-2019-4-h16

M.T. Bizhanova

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

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF THE CONTINUITY OF NOMADIC STATEHOOD

Abstract. The article discusses the theoretical and methodological issues of the historical continuity of statehood of the states of Deshti-i-Kipchak. Political unions formed in the steppes were characterized by a different form of statehood, with features of development, primarily elements of historical continuity. In other words, the methods of organization and government that have taken place here are often inherited from their near and distant predecessors. In this regard, it is necessary to talk about the important role of continuity in nomadic statehood.The modern movement of historical knowledge requires further understanding of the process of continuity of state institutions of the Kazakh Khanate, which was a direct continuation of the Turkic state traditions, the political and ideological successor of the Golden Horde, Ak Horde, Mogulistan, Nogai Horde, Abulkhair Khanate and an understanding of the essence of the changes that were directly related to transformation of the internal mechanisms of a nomadic society.

Key words: Statehood, historical succession, Deshti-i-Kipchak, civilization, Kazakh Khanate.

М.Т. Бижанова

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

Көшпелі мемлекеттіліктің сабақтастығының теориялық және методологиялық мәселелері

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Дешті Қыпшақ аумағындағы мемлекеттердің мемлекеттілігінің тарихи сабақтастығының теориялық-методологиялық мәселелері қарастырылған. Көшпелі далада құрылған саяси бірлестіктерге даму тұрғысынан әртүрлі деңгейдегі мемлекеттіліктің формасы тән болды және олар өз бойында ең алдымен тарихи сабақтастық элементтерін алып жүрді. Басқаша айтқанда, бұл жерде орын алған мемлекеттік ұйымдастыру және басқару әдістері көбінесе олардың жақын немесе алыс ізашарларынан мұра болып қалғаны белгілі. Осыны ескере отырып көшпелі мемлекеттілікте сабақтастықтың маңызды рөлі туралы айтқан жөн. Тарихи білімнің қазіргі заманғы қозғалысы Алтын Орда, Ақ Орда, Моғолстан, Ноғай Ордасы, Әбілқайыр хандығының саяси және идеологиялық мұрагері, түркі мемлекеттік дәстүрлерінің тікелей жалғастырушысы болған Қазақ хандығының мемлекеттілік институттарының сабақтастық процесін одан әрі тереңдей түсінуді қажет етеді.

Түйін сөздер: Мемлекеттілік, Қазақ хандығы, тарихи сабақтастық, Дешті Қыпшақ, өркениет.

М.Т. Бижанова

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

Теоретико-методологические проблемы преемственности кочевой государственности

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются теоретические и методологические вопросы исторической преемственности государственности государств Дешти-и-Кипчака. Политические союзы, сформированные в степях, характеризовались другой формой государственности, с особенностями развития, прежде всего элементов исторической преемственности. Другими словами, методы организации и управления государством, которые здесь имели место, часто наследуются от их ближних и дальних предшественников. В связи с этим необходимо говорить о важной роли преемственности в кочевой государственности. Современное движение исторического знания требует дальнейшего осмысления процесса преемственности институтов государственности Казахского ханства, которое являлось непосредственным продолжателем

тюркских государственных традиций, политического и идеологического наследника Золотой Орды, Ак Орды, Могулистана, Ногайской Орды, ханства Абулхаира.

Ключевые слова: Государственность, историческая преемственность, Дешт-и-Кипчак, цивилизация, Казахское ханство.

Introduction

Statehood is an indicator of the development and heritage of society, but at the same time it is also its ideology, political, social and cultural orientation, aimed at protecting and developing the state. Sociological theories define the state as a special form of organization of a society, possessing certain means and methods of applying power within a society, establishing a certain order of relations between members of a society in a certain territory, which involves the entire population in the established territory. The modern movement of historical knowledge requires further understanding of the process of continuity of state institutions of the Kazakh Khanate, which was a direct continuation of the Turkic state traditions, the political and ideological successor of the Golden Horde, Ak Horde, Mogulistan, Nogai Horde, Abulkhair Khanate and an understanding of the essence of the changes that were directly related to transformation of the internal mechanisms of a nomadic society. The main emphasis of the research is put on the identification of various forms and features of the political, legal and spiritual and ideological continuity of the Kazakh statehood from large political entities that existed on the territory of East Desht-i-Kypchak and Zhetysu in the XIV-XVI centuries.

Methodology

In recent years, Kazakhstani scientists have become leaders in the field of research of the nomadic society. At the same time, the contribution of Kazakh researchers to the development of world nomadic studies is not limited to historical, sociological, ethnographic and cultural studies, the theoretical, methodological and epistemological aspects have received significant development. The application of the methodology of both formational and civilizational approaches in the study of the history of nomadic peoples from the mid-19th century did not provide conclusive answers to the key questions of nomadism. Moreover, the traditional opposition of these directions in historiography in practice turned out to be an identical evolution of views among proponents of formation theory and followers of the concept of civilization, and ultimately led to similar conclusions. This is explained by the fact that both approaches based on the model of its development laid the features of the evolution of agricultural peoples. The concepts of “formation” and “civilization” were given from the standpoint of the ideas of Western European man. And it is no coincidence that the term “state” has become key for them as one of the signs of the level of development of society. But, as it turned out, the features characteristic of certain stages of development of the evolution of settled peoples are not necessarily present in nomadic societies, and the signs of various stages can exist among nomads at a time. The evolution of views within the framework of the formational and civilizational approaches is very similar and went from the opinion of the static nature of the nomadic society to the creation of theories about its special development and the exceptional influence of neighboring settled peoples on the emergence of the state among nomads. Historiographic analysis allows us to conclude that the views on the military-political organization of nomads evolve – from the complete denial of nomadic statehood to the historical, genetic and cultural continuity of nomadic empires – Turkic and Mongolian. At the present stage of the development of historical thought, the main problems are the interaction of various state traditions and political and legal systems. At present, attempts are being made to expand and deepen the historical perspectives of the development and interaction of various civilizations, including the nomadic system. Each researcher proceeds from his own evaluative nuances, the level of research training, which allows us to consider the evolution of historical ideas on the development of statehood in Central Asia. Discussions and conflicting conclusions of modern historical science reflect the level of theoretical and methodological approaches and show the lack of logical tools for understanding the essence and nature of changes in the political and legal system of a nomadic society. Today, there is a great need for further research and development of conceptual problems of the socio-political and ideological transformation of nomadic societies, determining the nature and essence of the formation of political institutions.

Kazakhstani scientists, too, did not stand aside from the discussions that unfolded in modern science on the relationship of different methodological approaches, including civilization. Modern scholars pay attention to the fact that at present Kazakhstan historical science, having survived an ideological vacuum, is striving to form new approaches and study such scientific categories as "statehood", "power", "social organization", "social mobility" and others inherent to nomadic societies that were created on the territory of Kazakhstan and beyond in the past, it became an urgent task for it in the search for a model of nation-building and sustainable development of statehood (Torlanbaeva, 2016).

The main part

On the basis of medieval Arab sources, B.E. Kumekov urges to understand the uniqueness of the civilizational signs of nomadic culture. Defending the presence in the steppe civilization of the basic definitions of civilization, such as state, cities, and writing, he claims: "Due to intergenerational adaptation to the geographical environment and the dominant cattle-breeding economy, nomadic tribes developed the traditions of the steppe culture, the most stable block associated with a particular phenomenon, with steppe lifestyle. Its deepest sources originate in the Bronze Age, the standards are established in the Saka historical and cultural community. A high degree of continuity is characteristic of the steppe lifestyle in time and space "(Kumekov, 2004: 102). The term "nomadic civilization" has become a self-designation thanks to the work of such famous scientists as A.Kh. Margulan, K.A. Akishev and N. Masanov. A significant contribution to the study of the problems of nomadic societies and the problems of "cultural ecology" was made by the famous Kazakh ethnologist N.E. Masanov. So the researcher typologized the habitat of nomads in accordance with the principles of generally accepted ecological systematics on the range (ecosystem) of nomadism and the marginal zone (ecotone) (Masanov, 1995). The modern Kazakhstani scientist Z. Qinayatuly in the article "N.M. Mogilyansky, L.N. Gumilevtin ethnos theoriyasy qazaqtanydyn keibir maseleri "draws attention to the term" ethnos "as part of the civilizational paradigm, which entered into scientific circulation with the filing of French sociologists and N.M. Mogilyansky. In the ethnic dynamics of the nomadic societies of Eurasia and the Kazakh people proper, he distinguishes the following stages: 1. Sako-Usunsky era; 2. Kanly-Kypchak; 3. Ak Horde and the Alash era; 4. The Kazakh Khanate (Kinayatuly, 2012: 7). In the study and refinement of terms and definitions, the opinion of K.M. is interesting Baipakova: "The terms" nomadic culture "," nomadic civilization "are not entirely successful. It's more correct to talk about "steppe culture and civilization", which implies not only nomadism, but also sedentary life, not only cattle breeding, but also agriculture and urban life .... Nomadism is only a part of the steppe economy, life and everyday life, part of the peculiar civilization of Kazakhstan " (Orazbaeva, 2005: 72). In his monograph "Civilization of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes", the modern Kazakhstan author A.I. Orazbaeva, considers it appropriate to include in the categorical apparatus the term "civilization of nomads of the Eurasian steppes" (CCEC), since it meets all the most significant socio-cultural characteristics of traditional Kazakh society and is more optimal in further revealing its essence and content (Orazbaeva, 2005: 76).

Ambiguous theoretical and conceptual constructions about the civilizational affiliation of nomadic societies of the steppe zone of Eurasia are presented in the works of Russian scientists A.I. Martynova, N.N. Kradina, V.V. Trepalova and others B. Entukhshvin emphasizes that the concept of "civilization" does not necessarily have to be reduced to the term "urbanization." ... For this reason, there is no reason to consider nomads who had statehood and their own highly developed doctrine of statehood as uncivilized, uncultured, or barbaric peoples (Entukhshvin, 2009).

Civilization theory in Russian and Russian historical thought has quite a few regional and typological changes. So in the article of a scientist from Tatarstan E.S. Kulpin attempted to determine the influence of the Golden Horde in the formation of Russian civilization: "... the creation of a system of cities in the southern Russian steppes of the XIV century. It allows us to talk about the history of the Golden Horde as an attempt at a civilizational breakthrough in the history of mankind, and also about an incompletely realized original path of evolution of Russian (Eurasian civilization) (Kulpin, 2008). Further, E. S. Kulpin determines that civilization is, first of all, the ability to learn, change, develop and be creative, to meet basic human needs, tolerance in human relationships and the level of self-organization of society, where the degree of autonomy from the natural environment is the most important criterion . And all these features, according to the researcher, were inherent in the civilization of the Golden Horde (Kulpin, 2008:118).

Indicates the huge role of the Golden Horde in the life of the Turkic peoples and the entire Eurasian space R.S. Khakimov: "The Golden Horde culture absorbed the medieval achievements of many Turkic and other peoples. A perfect economy, built on a wonderful financial system, communications and management, fantastic at the time, that made it possible to control a vast territory and ensure security, excellent military art, science, literature, architecture, etc. – all this speaks of an independent culture of the Golden Horde, which stood at the highest level in the Middle Ages "(Khakimov, 2008: 14).

In historical science, there are several theories of the emergence of state formations among nomads. The most common are two points of view. The first concept consists in the formation of a state as a result of the elimination by the khan of a clan aristocracy that could claim power, and the conquest of neighboring territories. The second concept consists in uniting tribes experiencing a crisis of tribal relations and adapting their institutions of power to the emerging functions of a tribal power system. At the same time, researchers consider the development of these tendencies on the example of nomadic societies of Hunnu, Syanbi, Juanjans, Türk-tutszüe, Uyghurs, Kyrgyz, Kimaks, and finally the Mongols, often contrasting them with each other (Bartold, 1968: 94, 95, 87). Researchers note the inheritance of ancient Turkic state traditions with varying degrees of their completeness by later Turkic state formations (Zhumaganbetov, 2003: 228-261). Foreign historiography on the problems of statehood is represented by the works of J. Nettle, C. Tilly, S. Bartolini, H. Linz, A. Stepan, S. Roccan, J. Colomere, F. Raeder, R. Jackson and P. Colsto, F. Fukuyamo , F. Schmitter, L. and O. Yohhansen, O. Norad, J. Yadav, A. Hirschman et al (Orazbaeva, 2017: 25).

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 societies (Klyashtorny, 2005:30):

1. The community of nomadic tribes of Central Asia of the VIII-V centuries. BC. according to a sufficiently definite description of contemporary written sources, they did not have a political organization that went beyond tribal and military-democratic institutions.

2. radical changes in their environment occurred in the IV-III centuries. BC, when a new tertiary political organization was recorded in the sources – an early state governed by a hierarchically structured military-tribal aristocracy.

3. The imperial structure of the supreme power predetermined profound social changes not only within the dominant tribal group, but also in the communities dependent on them, in which the processes of political genesis were sharply intensified. These processes are also reflected in the political terminology of sources unified for the entire Central Asian world.

4. The new sociopolitical structure reached its classical embodiment in the 6th-8th centuries, when the own terms appeared in the runic texts of the Orkhon Turks and Yenisei Kyrgyz designated as a state political organization (ale), a continuing ethnic tribal community (bodun).

Characteristic features for nomadic societies were: the preservation of tribal relations (personal freedom and economic independence of ordinary nomads, communal ownership of land), the presence of a small number of foreign slaves and the existence of property differentiation. All these specific features of nomadic societies led to discussion of three key issues in this problem: the causes of nomadism, the existence of statehood among nomads and the possibility of considering the "steppe culture" as an alternative to agricultural civilization. In this regard, considering the history of the formation of the early state among Turkic-speaking Naimans, we come across, first of all, the idea of the similarity of the socio-political institutions, the tax system that existed among the nomads. This similarity, in turn, was due to the similar functioning of the livestock economy. A number of researchers, including V. Trepavlov, put forward the idea of an organic connection of nomadic states with each other. This connection determined the continuity in their socio-economic and political development, which allowed the aforementioned author to present each subsequent nomadic state formation that arose in history as a stage or "steps of a single process of development of the social system of nomads" (Trepavlov, 1993: 14-15). The formation of statehood among nomadic tribes proceeded through mutual influence and consolidation of elements of state formation not only from the predecessors, nomads, but also from neighboring settled agricultural peoples. In this regard, the history of the Khitan state and the nomadic Turkic tribes inhabiting this empire is indicative. Under these conditions, ethnic processes continued to develop among the Turkic tribes, which were characterized by different levels of unification: ethnic and interethnic consolidation, integration and assimilation, as well as ethnic division in the form of dispersion, separation or ethnic partition.

Thus, one can agree with the opinion of one of the best methodologists of modern historical science N.N. Ionova, that in the conditions of the modern

cognitive tradition (scientific pluralism) there cannot be a single, consistent concept of civilization.

In Russian historical science, today there are three main approaches to the study of the nomadic world: stadial, dichotomous and the concept of local civilizations. O. N. Proskuryakova in the article "Concepts of civilization and modernization in domestic historiography" defines: "An analysis of the current methodological situation allows us to identify several major trends in domestic historiography: 1. updating the formation approach; 2. development of a civilizational approach; 3. The combination and formation of civilizational approaches; 4. active development of the modernization paradigm "(Proskuryakova, 2007: 154). The main results of this period were the formulation of such important problems as the beginning of nomadic statehood, the definition of an ethno-political history, the development of some theoretical issues of social stratification and differentiation of a nomadic society. Part of the civilizational paradigm of modern historical science is scientific research on the history of nomadic state structures and new theoretical and methodological constructions as applied to the study of the concept of "nomadic statehood". The content of historiography gradually expanded, and the system of historical science includes both the development of specific concepts, and the impact of theory on the cognition process – a methodology that defines the principles of cognition and is the basis for using the method. The American scientist T. Barfield proposed to the scientific community an interesting theory of the development of nomadic societies, which shows the possibility of establishing the synchronism of the growth and decline of nomadic empires and similar processes in China. The cyclic connection between the political systems of China, Central Asia and the Far East was repeated three times over two thousand years (Barfield, 2009). Russian scientist L.S. Vasiliev distinguishes 3 types of nomadic civilization: Khitan – when a nomadic tribe is formed on the outskirts of a powerful empire, it borrows a lot from it, but strives to maintain its identity; Turkic – when nomads constantly change their habitats, invading the zone of farmers and subjugating them to themselves; Mongolian – when a state is created under external influence that invades the zone of farmers, subjugating their states one after another, but trying to maintain their identity (Vasiliev, 1998).

N.N. Kradin in his monograph "Nomads of Eurasia" (Kradin, 2007) proposed to divide nomadic societies according to their complexity into three groups:

– acefal, segmental, clan and tribal formations;
– "Secondary" tribes and chiefdoms;
– nomadic empires and smaller quasi-imperial polities.

Famous Russian researcher S.A. Vasyutin outlined six types of nomadic societies (in order of complexity): 1) decentralized tribal societies; 2) decentralized large tribal unions; 3) chiefdoms; 4) nomadic xenocratic empires; 5) nomadic super empires; 6) polities with a high proportion of subordinate agricultural population; 7) states created by nomads on the territory of agricultural civilizations (Vasyutin, 2004: 272-273).

Thus, the historiography of the theory of civilizations as noted by I. Ionov "Has not only scientific, but also great applied value, since it can become the basis of a new worldview on the main trends of global development. In the context of global changes in the world, an ever-increasing sound is acquiring a number of universal human problems that form an objective basis for understanding the role of the civilizational paradigm. At the present stage of development of the world community, the interaction of representatives of different cultures, nationalities, faiths is becoming an undeniable imperative "(Ionov, 2007). A comparative historical analysis of research practices allows us to show the evolution of historical ideas caused by internal polemics and the development of science itself. Each researcher proceeds from his evaluative nuances, the level of research training, and for all the difference in methodological approaches, none of the above authors deny the process of progressive, dialectical development of statehood institutions in the vast expanses of Central Asia. The history of the political associations of nomads has always been the history of their contacts with settled societies. An analysis of the ethnocultural and ethnopolitical interaction of nomadic associations and settled agricultural peoples in the social dimension is a new non-traditional approach adopted in modern science. As modern Kazakhstani authors point out, "in foreign historiography one can indicate the presence of various definitions, such as failed states and quasi-states, weak states, collapsed states, non-state, strong states or functional / capable states, unrecognized states, as well as good governance, states – building, etc. put forward during political science discourses regarding the conceptualization of the characteristics of states, which are reduced mainly to the concepts of state status and state consistency, behind which "... there are two different concepts, reflecting different the state's status as an unconditional property of the state – a state of

its own nature. ” It seems that the essence of the discrepancies here is rather that in the first meaning it is supposed to study the formal aspects of the state related to material wealth, and in the latter it is more likely to study the spiritual component related to the general history, culture, traditions ”(Orazbaeva, 2005: 23-24). The study of specific historical events and processes associated with nomadic structures creates the basis for the formulation and analysis of conceptual, methodological problems. The current historiographic situation has developed around two main lines: the first, the evolution of nomadic society occurred with regular contacts of nomads with more highly organized agrarian-urban societies, and the second, about an alternative evolutionary path that ensured a high degree of hierarchical and cultural complexity, but was not associated with the emergence of a bureaucratic society.

In modern historiography, the Kazakh people and Kazakh statehood began to be seen as a subject of the international historical process and opportunities were open for posing problems about the state tradition and the continuity of political institutions. M.K. Kozybaev, T.I. Sultanov, K.A. Pishchulina (Pishchulina, 1977), M.K. Abuseitova, B.E. Kumekov, J.O. Artykbaev in their studies examined questions about the formation of the main stages of historical thought regarding the formation and development of the Kazakh Khanate. A huge proportion of studies that have studied this issue from a different angle are accounted for by V.Z. Galiev, J.K. Kasymbaev, A.Sh. Kadyrbaev (Kadyrbaev, 1995), M.Zh. Abdirov, N.E. Masanov, I. Erofeeva. A great contribution to the study of the issue was made by the monograph of B. B. Karibaeva (Karibaev, 2015) presents a separate and rigorous study of the history of the formation of the Kazakh Khanate, especially the relationship and state of Genghis ideology, on the political and ethnic prerequisites for the founding of the Kazakh people, where a new thesis is put forward regarding the dating of the formation of the Kazakh Khanate. The spiritual and ideological development of Kazakh society and the state is structured in the writings of N.D. Nurtazina (Nurtazina, 2000: 45). Questions of the political and dynastic history of Ak Orda are substantively and capaciously investigated in the work of K.Z. Uskenbaya. (Uskenbay, 2013). Various options for dating the formation of the Kazakh Khanate, as well as international political contacts of the Kazakh rulers in the work of N.A., have been extensively and comprehensively studied. Atygaev (Atygaev, 2015). Interesting study T.I. Sultanov (Sultanov, 2001), which affects not only the dynastic history of Genghisides, but also the administrative and social system of the Kazakh khanate. The issue of incorporation of Islamic law in the legal systems of the states of the Jochi ulus in the XIV-XVI centuries is well covered in the work of R.Yu. Pochekaev (Pochekaev, 2016). Features of the establishment of democratic law of the Kazakhs are described in the studies of S.Z. Zimanov (Zimanov, 2003). Important information about Kazakh statehood is covered by the scientist Z. Kinayatuly (Kinayatuly, 2007), who examined in detail the problems of continuity in the history of nomadic states. T.O. Omarbekova (Omarbekov, 2015). who posed theoretical and methodological questions about the ethnic history of the Kazakh people, the influence of the tribal structure on the political, state and ideological development of the nomadic society.

The collective work of a number of foreign scientists together with Tatar researchers M.G. Usmanov, D.M. Iskhakov, A.A. Arslanova is one of the key in the study of the source study of the history of the Jochi ulus (Usmanov, 2001: 2007). Proceedings I.M. Mirgaleeva devoted to the political history of the Golden Horde, coins of the Jochids play an equally important role in studying the history of Kazakh statehood. A contribution to the study of the issue was made by the research interpretations of the American scientist Yu. Shamiloglu (Shamiloglu, 2019) on the problems of the clan structure in the Golden Horde society.

Conclusion

The variability and debatability of the conceptual position of “nomadic statehood”, “state institutions”, “continuity of state traditions” has shown that the typology of socio-political structures and the formation of state institutions in nomadic societies are not well developed. This poses the need for a diversified approach to the problems of studying political entities in Central Asia, their systematization and reconstruction as a complex set of different types and models of power, combined into a single state structure of the Kazakh Khanate. Many issues need to be revised, new approaches from the perspective of knowledge accumulated by historical science, theories of the historical process, which will contribute to the restoration of the historical past and the spiritual and cultural consolidation of the Kazakh people. At every moment, history is an idea of the past, corresponding to the knowledge achieved. Since society is constantly in motion,

in development, it accordingly changes; they cannot stand still and the ways of knowing it. The development of modern scientific knowledge has shown that development is impossible without a combination of the role of worldview and socio-historical knowledge.

References

Atygaev N. (2015) Kazahskoe hanstvo v potoke istorii [Kazakh Khanate in the stream of history]. «Izdatel'stvo Eltanym» Almaty.

Bartol'd V.V. (1968) Dvenadcat' lekcij po istorii tureckih narodov Srednej Azii [Twelve lectures on the history of the Turkish peoples of Central Asia] // V.V. Bartol'd Sochineniya v 9-ti tomah. Red. kollegiya B.G. Gafurov (pred.) i dr. Moskwa. Nauka,. T.5. 757 s.

Barfild T.D. (2009) Opasnaya granica: kochevye imperii i Kitaj (221 g. do n.e. – 1757 n.e.) [Dangerous border: nomadic empires and China (221 BC – 1757 BC]. Sankt-Peterburg: Fakul'tet filologii i iskusstv SpbGU. 488 s.

Entuhshvin B. (2009) Tradicii gosudarstvennosti i istoriya kochevnikov [Traditions of statehood and the history of nomads] // Mongol'skaya imperiya i kochevoj mir. Ulan-Ude.

Hakimov R.S. (2008) Zolotaya Orda kak vershina tyurko-tatarskoj civilizacii [The Golden Horde as the peak of the Turkic-Tatar civilization] //Zolotoordynskaya civilizaciya. Vypusk 1. Kazan'. 176 s.

Ionov I.N. (2007) Civilizacionnoe soznanie i istoricheskoe znanie: problemy vzaimodejstviya [Civilization consciousness and historical knowledge: problems of interaction]. Moskva.

Kadyrbaev A.Sh. (1995) Kochevoj mir Kazahstana v drevnetyurkskuyu epohu (VI- IX) [The nomadic world of Kazakhstan in the ancient Turkic era (VI-IX)] //Kul'tura kochevnikov na rubezhe vekov: problemy genezisa i transformacii. Almaty.

Karibaev B.B. (2015) Kazak handygynyn қurylu tarihy [History of the formation of the Kazakh Khanate]. Almaty: «Sardar» baspa үji, 520 b.

Kinayatuly Z. (2012) N.M. Mogilyanski, L. Gumilevtin etnos teoriyasy zhane kazaktanudyn keibir maseleleri [The theory of ethnoses of L.Gumilev and N.M. Mogilyanski and some questions of kazakh studies] //Central'naya Aziya v drevnosti i srednevekov'e: sovremennoe osmyslenie istoricheskogo naslediya. Almaty.

Kinayatuly Z. (2007) Preemstvennost' v istorii gosudarstv kochevnikov [Continuity in the history of nomad states] // V kn.: Istoriya kazahskoj gosudarstvennosti: drevnost' i srednevekov'e. – Almaty: Adamar.

Kumekov B.E. (2004) Stepnaya i gorodskaya kul'tura kimekov [Steppe and urban Kimek culture].//Urbanizaciya i nomadizm v Central'noj Azii: istoriya i problemy. Almaty. p.102.

Kul'pin E.S. (2008) Zolotaya Orda: sud'by pokoleni [Golden Horde: the fate of generations]. Moskwa. 192 s.

Klyashtornyj S.G. (2005) Osnovnye etapy politogeneza u drevnih kochevnikov Central'noj Azii [The main stages of political genesis in the ancient nomads of Central Asia] // Mongol'skaya imperiya i kochevoj mir. Ulan-Ude, T.2 .

Kradin V.V. (2007) Kochevniki Evrazii [Nomads of Eurasia]. Almaty, 209 s.

Kradin N.N. (1999) Transformaciya politicheskoj sistemy ot vozhdestva k gosudarstvu: mongol'skij primer, 1180(?)-1206 [Transformation of the political system from chiefdom to state: the Mongolian example] // Al'ternativnye puti k rannej gosudarstvennosti Otv. red. N. N. Kradin i V. A. Lyisha. Vladivostok.

Masanov N.E. (1995) Kochevaya civilizaciya kazahov: osnovy zhiznedeyatel'nosti nomadnogo obshchestva [The nomadic civilization of the Kazakhs: the foundations of a nomadic society]. Almaty, 320 s.

Nurtazina N.D. (2000) Islam v istorii srednevekovogo Kazahstana (Islam in the history of medieval Kazakhstan). – Almaty: Farab,– 310

Omarbekov T.O. (2015) Kazak tyrkilerinin memlekettiligi: kaganattar, ulystar, men handyktar bayany [Statehood of the Kazakh Turks: the history of the Khaganates, uluses and khanates]. Almaty; Habizhanova G.B. Vzaimodejstviya prirody i obshchestva v kochevoi civilizacii narodov Central'noj Azii. Almaty; Nurtazina N.D. Tyurkskaya civilizaciya. Almaty; Ortalyқ Aziya kөshpelileriniң dөstүrli mөdenieti: negizderi zhөne tarihi sabaқtary. 1-2 tom. Almaty.

Orazbaeva A.I. (2005) Civilizaciya kochevnikov evrazijskih stepei [Civilization of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes].Almaty, 310 s.

Orazbaeva A.I. (2017) Formula gosudarstvennosti kazahov [Formula of Kazakh statehood]. Moskva.

Pochekaev R.Y. (2006) Yarlyki hanov Zolotoj Ordy: istoriko-pravovoe issledovanie: Dissertaciya [Labels of Khans of the Golden Horde: historical and legal research: Dissertation]. Sankt-Peterburg; Pochekaev R.YU. «Chingizovo pravo». Pravovoe nasledie Mongol'skoj imperii v tyurko-tatarskih hanstvah i gosudarstvah Central'noj Azii [Srednie veka i Novoe vremya] ["Chingiz law." The legal heritage of the Mongol Empire in the Turkic-Tatar khanates and the states of Central Asia] Tatarskoe kn. izdatel'stvo. s.490.

Pishchulina K.A. (1977) Yugo-Vostochnyj Kazahstan v seredine XIV– nachale XVI vekov [Southeast Kazakhstan in the middle of the XIV– early XVI centuries]. Alma-Ata, «Nauka» KazSSR. – 289 s.

Proskuryakova N.A. (2007) Koncepcii civilizacii i modernizacii v otechestvennoj istoriografii [Concepts of civilization and modernization in domestic historiography]. Voprosy istorii. №7.

Sultanov T.I. (2001) Podnyatye na beloj koshme. Potomki Chingiskhana [Descendants of Genghis Khan]. Iz-vo; Daik-Press, Almaty. 276 s.

Torlanbaeva K.U. (2016) Nekotorye voprosy razvitiya politicheskoj vlasti v obshchestvah kochevnikov Central'noj Azii [Some issues of the development of political power in the societies of nomads of Central Asia]//«edu.e-history.kz»,№1. https://e-history.kz/kz/books/library/view/1201. Date 11.09.2019.

Trepavlov V. (1993) Gosudarstvennyj stroj Mongol'skoj imperii XIII v. [The political system of the 13th century Mongol Empire]. Moskva, Nauka. 170 s.

Uskenbai K.Z. (2013) Vostochnyj Dasht-i Kypchak v XIII-nachale XIV veka. Problemy etnopoliticheskoj istorii Ulusa Dzhuchi [Eastern Dasht-i Kipchak in the XIII-beginning of the XIV century. Problems of the ethno-political history of Ulus Jochi]. Kazan': Izd-vo «Fen».

Vasil'ev L.S. (1998) Istoriya Vostoka [History of East]. Moskva.

Vasyutin S.A. (2004) Mongol'skaya imperiya kak osobaya forma rannei gosudarstvennosti? [The Mongol empire as a special form of early statehood] (K diskussii o politicheskih sistemah kochevyh imperij). Mongol'skaya imperiya i kochevoj mir. Ulan-Ude.

Zimanov S.Z. (2003) Drevni mir prava kazahov: Materialy, dokumenty i issledovaniya [The ancient world of Kazakh law: Materials, documents and research]: V X T. T.I Astana.

Zhumaganbetov T.S. (2003) Problemy formirovaniya i razvitiya drevnetyurkskoj sistemy gosudarstvennosti i prava [Problems of formation and development of the ancient Turkic sistem of ststehood and low. VI-XII centuries]. VI-XII vv. Almaty: Zheti zhargy. 432 s.