

Z. Maidanali Ph.D., Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru

IMPERIAL TRADITIONS AND SYMBOLS OF THE NOMADIC SOCIETY: THE MODERN PARADIGM AND TRENDS

Main conceptual positions and methodological paradigms to problem imperial traditions and symbols of the nomadic society are considered in the article. The study of concrete historical events and processes associated with nomadic structures provides the ground for the formulation and analysis of conceptual, methodological problems. 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.

Key words: Empire, symbols, traditions, nomadic society, the scientific paradigm, ideology.

З. Майданали

т.ғ.к., доцент, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru.

Көшпелі қоғамдағы империялық дәстүрлер және символдар: заманауи парадигмалар мен тұжырымдары

Мақалада көшпелі қоғамдағы империялық символдар және дәстүрлер секілді саяси құбылыстар туралы концептуалды тұжырымдар мен парадигмалар қарастырылады. Көшпелі құрылымдармен байланысты нақты-тарихи оқиғалар мен үдерістерді зерделеу методологиялық мәселелерді алға қойып, сараптаудың негіздерін қалайды. Моңғол империясының саяси-басқару және жүйелілік-құрылымдық моделін қайта құрастыру жалпы үрдістер мен бағыттарды тереңдеп түсінуге және көшпелі қоғамдардың саяси және әлеуметтік жүйелерінің өзара байланысы мен өзара іс-әрекеттері мәселелері бойынша тарихи білімнің заманауи қозғалысын зерделеуге жәрдемдеседі. Қазіргі тарих ғылымының мақсаты көшпелі қоғамның әлеуметтік құрылымы мен қоғамдық ұйымдастырылуын, империя құрылуының айшықты алғышарттарын, әлеуметтік-саяси және әкімшілік-басқару жағдайын жүйелі сараптау болып табылады. Көшпелі қоғамдардағы саяси үдерістердің ұтқырлығы мен айнымалылығын туындатқан және мұндай түбегейлі жүйені толықтай трансформацияға алып келген болатын.

Түйін сөздер: империя, символдар, дәстүрлер, көшпелі қоғам, ғылыми парадигмалар, идеология.

З. Майданали

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

Имперские традиции и символы кочевого общества: современные парадигмы и тенденции

В статье рассматриваются концептуальные заключения и методологические парадигмы о таких политических явлениях, как имперские символы и традиции в кочевом обществе. Изучение конкретно-исторических событий и процессов, связанных с кочевыми структурами, создает почву для постановки и анализа концептуальных, методологических проблем. Реконструкция политико-управленческой и системно-структурной модели Монгольской империи способствует углублению понимания общих тенденций и направлений в изучении современного движения

исторического знания в вопросах взаимосвязи и взаимодействия политической и социальной систем кочевых обществ. Современная историческая наука ставит целью проведение системного анализа кочевого общества, его социальной структуры и общественной организации, выявление основных и значимых предпосылок образования империи, характера ее социально-политического и административно-управленческого положения. Мобильность динамичность политических процессов в кочевых обществах приводили к неустойчивости и подвижности всей структуры, и кардинальные изменения вели к трансформации всей имперской системы в целом.

Ключевые слова: империя, символы, традиции, кочевое общество, научные парадигмы, идеология.

Introduction

Considering different approaches and trends in the study of the nature of nomadic statehood, the researcher comes to the conclusion that the most historical researches are based on the original nature of nomadism and the position that nomadic societies have less specialized and structurally differentiated socio-economic organization. Eurocentric theories of the emergence and development of the state imply a centralized political power that monopolizes (or delegates) management and regularly collects taxes on more or less defined territory, and in turn, on the territory of Eurasia, the processes are more complex and ambiguous. Special attention of modern science is focused to the problem of development of nomadic state traditions and institutions. The evolution and transformation of historical views within the framework of the formational and civilizational approaches is very similar. It has gone from thinking about the static nature of nomadic society to creating theories about the special way of development and the exclusive influence of neighboring sedentary tribes. In Russian historiography in the late XX-early XXI centuries there was question about «steppe culture» as an alternative to the development of civilization, which, of course, was an appeal to the civilizational approach. There are a number of theories that explain in different ways the basic laws of the origin, further change, and sometimes vanishing of complex human systems.

Methods of research

Modern methodology defines new approaches to the study of the functions of the ruler, 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. Sultanov, the supreme power of the medieval Mongols was based on the right to reign of any representative of the “altanurug” of Genghis Khan and was established on the kurultai of the princes and the highest aristocracy. At the same

time, in the ulus-states, the succession of power was correlated taking into account political traditions and specific circumstances (Suitanov, 2008, p. 228]. Russian author S.A. Vasyutin rightly notes: “... the concept of the” dual nature “of nomadic empires developed by nomadist in recent decades is undoubtedly positive, but even it cannot give exhaustive answers. Apparently, we must take into account that the administrative systems of nomadic empires, as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, cannot be described with the help of unambiguous definitions. ... A certain internal differentiation of administrative institutions and political activities in nomadic empires allows us to talk about different layers in the pre-state and early state political cultures of nomads” (Vasyutin, 2004, p. 270). The modern methodology of political and social anthropology has brought to the fore the historiographical research of American and European scientists. According to American researchers, the monotonous cycles of the rise and fall of empires show no signs of evolutionary change. In this regard, entire anthropological schools in Europe and America consider nomadic societies as completely stagnant, devoid of proper historical development. One of the most prominent researchers of the American school of anthropology T. Barfield put forward a proposal to study the mechanisms of the regularity of the existence of nomadic society, as well as the transformations and changes that occurred during the period of interaction with sedentary tribes. The author proposes to consider the history of nomadic societies (the most complex as “nomadic Empire”) as the result of not internal development, but direct contact with agricultural and sedentary tribes. In the later stages of the Chinese centralized empires, their rulers turned to nomadic leaders for help, which for some period extended the existence of a dynasty, but finally depleted the economic resources of the state. T. Barfield considers nomadic culture as a special system, changes in which are determined by the need to adapt to specific natural and social conditions. The logical consequence of this concept was the conclusion about the relationship

of socio-political processes in China with various forms of social development among the nomads. Typologization of processes that took place in Central Asia, the so-called cycles of power-became the basis of T. Barfield's theory (Barfield, 2009, p. 44-55). Representatives of the evolutionist theory believe that the highest point of development of the former nomadic empires and the classic example of steppe statehood is the Mongol Empire.

Research paradigms in their comparative analysis identify similar features in the description of specific forms of power among nomads, but different accents are placed. Some proceed from the assessment of the management structures directly nomads, others attach special importance to the essence of the entire military-hierarchical organization of empires, aimed at subordinating dependent tribes and taking away from them part of the surplus product. As the American author A.M. Khazanov notes: "to some extent, social stratification in nomadic societies could be enhanced when the nomadic aristocracy managed to subdue other groups of nomads. ... in socio-political terms, the problem was in the absence of a sufficiently strong enforcement apparatus" (Khazanov, 2006, p. 479). Conceptual positions and methodological approaches of the last decades show that the dynamics of the evolution of social relations in nomadic empires was not one-line and one-vector. Russian historical science in the person of the famous researcher D.G. Savinov suggested a system of ethno political stratification of nomadic societies. Based on the author's conceptual attitudes, the structure of nomadic society did not change within the newly created state associations and represented a kind of "core" of social organization from the hunnu era to the period of the Mongol Empire. Developing the theoretical and methodological foundations of the problem, D.G. Savinova notes: "the main forces of the ethnos-elite have always been aimed at creating a multi-ethnic state education in order to use the economic potential of different cultural and economic areas...Dependent tribes, especially those belonging to the same (or close) economic and cultural type as the ethnos-elite, have always sought to get out of the existing protectorate system, to change the political hegemony and create their own statehood..." (Savinov, 2005, p.5).

Imperial traditions and symbols

Thus, the complex nature of administrative institutions of nomads makes it promising to apply the system principles of analysis of power structures in nomadic empires. Considering the dynamism

of political processes in nomadic formations, the ratio of subsystems was unstable and flexible, and tremendous changes in the ratio of subsystems led to the transformation of the entire system as a whole. Following the modern movement of historical thought and research paradigms, multifactorial as a military-political pressure (mostly the interests of China and competing nomadic elites were united), the presence of internal contradictions in the ruling clan or among different tribal groups, the deterioration of environmental conditions and military defeats led to the fall or collapse of nomadic formations. Considering the cyclical nature of political processes in Eurasia, the end of one nomadic Empire was usually the beginning of the history of another. Such processes could lead to the complete elimination of the organizational structures of the Empire and the formation of a segmented ethno-political space. Thus, the integrative nature of the information contained in all these sources allows the historian to present a characteristic of nomadic political structures. In the course of our review, there were raised some issues of "mythologizing" of history and to realize theoretical breakthrough in historical science it is necessary to develop new approaches in research work, needed on many factors, primarily the development of interdisciplinary dialogue as a medium for the development of progressive methods of research work. The development of modern scientific knowledge has shown that progress is impossible without taking into account the scientific methodology and the goal of historical science in debunking of all kinds of myths and creating a critical, organic history.

The sequence of historical thinking, concrete historical and retrospective analysis, modeling and reconstruction methods, as well as other modern theoretical and methodological approaches shows that related structures and genealogies caused the "dispersion" and centrifugal nature of nomadic societies. However, in nomadic confederations, the military-hierarchical bodies of political management were closely intertwined with the tribal segments, while at the same time they towered over them, controlled them, and organized their effective use in accordance with the goals of the imperial leadership. The actualization in modern historical science of such layers as "Imperial Confederation of nomads", "nomadic political system", "political and legal relations" in nomadic associations and their construction on the basis of new historical methods allows us to present a complete model of the complex process of development of nomadic statehood. The appeal to the problem of "nomadic empires"

is caused by the need to identify new, alternative theoretical and methodological constructions in relation to the problems of dialectical development of nomadic political formations. For a long time, historical science has been solving one of the main issues – how and why there were “transcontinental nomadic super states”. The history of the nomadic formations of Central Asia and their political structures is still one of the most important objects of study. New approaches and system analysis take into account that in different research studies and discourse occurs processes of various directions.

The appeal to the problem of imperial traditions and symbols is caused by the need to identify new, alternative, promising theoretical and methodological constructions in relation to the problems of dialectical development of nomadic political formations. New approaches and system analysis take into account that in research studies and discourse of Imperial structures are observed processes of different directions. The content of methodological approaches in one way or another depends on the researcher, on the specific conditions of his work, as well as many other factors. At every moment, the history is a representation of the past, corresponding to the knowledge attained. Since society is constantly in motion, in development, the ways of its knowledge change accordingly, and cannot stand still. The development of modern scientific knowledge has shown that development is impossible without a combination of the role of worldview and socio-historical knowledge.

The modern methodology of political and social anthropology has brought to the fore the research of American and European scientists. According to American researchers, the monotonous cycles of the rise and fall of empires show no signs of evolutionary change. In this regard, entire anthropological schools in Europe and America consider nomadic societies as completely stagnant, devoid of proper historical development.

One of the most prominent researchers of the American anthropological school T. Barfield proposed to study the mechanisms of the regularity of the existence of nomadic society, as well as the transformations and changes that occurred during the period of interaction with sedentary tribes. The author proposes to consider the history of nomadic societies (the most complex as “nomadic Empire”) as the result of not internal development, but direct contact with agricultural and sedentary tribes. In the later stages of the Chinese centralized empires, their rulers turned to nomadic leaders for help, which for some period extended the existence of a dynasty, but

finally depleted the economic resources of the state. T. Barfield considers nomadic culture as a special system, changes in which are determined by the need to adapt to specific natural and social conditions. The logical consequence of this concept was the conclusion about the relationship of socio-political processes in China with various forms of social development among the nomads. Typologization of processes that took place in Central Asia, the so-called cycles of power-became the basis of T. Barfield’s theory (Barfield, 2009, p. 44-55). Western author J. Bentley points to the contribution of nomads to the transcontinental circulation and transmission of cultural and technological artifacts and innovations (Bentley, 1993). Modern theories draw common points between the history of continental empires, Alfred Rieber notes that “the Imperial system consists of a set of symbols, institutions and spatial relationships that determine the power of the ruler and the ruling elite” (Rieber, 2004, p. 34]. As it follows from the development of historical thought, the imperial idea was personified by the image of the ruler and the author focuses on three circumstances: the concept of power became part of the moral and religious ideas, they were associated with traditions and myths, the language of politics turned them into visible symbols and written texts. The concept of power became a part of moral or religious ideas, they were associated with traditions and myths (Rieber, 2004, p. 39). Modern historical science believes that it is productive to consider these relationships from the point of view of the “theory of elites”, when “on the one hand, within a new political association there is a higher elite from among the conquerors, and on the other, an elite is formed or maintained from the autochthonous mass of people, whose representatives reach great heights in the social hierarchy”. Modern author A. A. Tishkin (Tishkin, 2004, p. 8) notes that as a result of interaction, the nomadic elite often became a “double elite” in relation to the already dominant class, openly appropriating the surplus product and widely participating in various spheres of activity. V.V. Trepavlov (Trepavlov, 1993, p. 14) reflecting on the existing models of development of nomadic society, noted two main trends: 1. the establishment of a despotic centralized monarchical government; 2. the consolidation of gradually disintegrating tribes with the adaptation of tribal institutions to the functions of the super-tribal power structure. Analyzing the socio-political organization of nomadic empires, the researcher suggests that they were like stages of a single process of development of the social system of nomads.

At the present stage of development of historical science and its theory as historical knowledge, there is an urgent need for the formulation and analysis of various conceptual problems. One of the most difficult to comprehend and distinguishing in the level of generalization and coverage of historical reality are the conceptual conclusions about such a political entity as the "nomadic Empire". The change of methodological paradigms revealed different approaches and principles of research of the problem of existence and functioning of the "nomadic Empire". Modern historical science determines the presence of early state elements in the Imperial structures of the nomads.

Examining the cause-and-effect relationships in the political culture of the Mongol Empire, it was revealed that the idea of citizenship was taking root, and the influence of the great Khan was based not so much on personal authority, but on the power of the military-state machine, which he represented. The sacred role of the Khan, inherited from Genghis Khan, was important only among the nomads. Despite all the inconsistency of the inheritance system, there was a tradition of transferring power, which was legitimized by the Council of nobles-the *kuriltai*. The definition of the Mongol and other nomadic empires as "super-complex chiefdoms" reveals a number of contradictions in the logical constructions of the proponents of this concept. The Genesis of hierarchical structures in nomads is associated only with war, plunder, conquests of neighbors and primarily farmers, a key role in nomadic empires is assigned to exopolitic forms of exploitation, the classification of these empires is based on different forms of relationships with sedentary agricultural tribes (typical, tributary, conquering). At the same time, characterizing the type of administrative system of the "nomadic Empire" all the above-mentioned factors recede into the background, and the main criteria is the essence of power within the nomadic community itself (Vasyutin, 2004, p. 273). V. Dode in the article «Imperial culture. Symbols of legitimation of belonging to the Empire in the suit of nomads of the Golden Horde " determines that the external ideological justification of the power of the Genghisids was expressed in the accepted symbols of the Khan's investiture. At the same time, the social leaders of the conquered tribes sought to show personal loyalty to the state, which was expressed in external signs that identified the individual with the submitted Empire. The expression of their involvement in the Mongol state required the execution of certain symbols that had to be understood in a multi-ethnic environment...

Thus, the Mongols ' choice of Royal insignia was based on ideas about the world order. The ensign, umbrella, and chair of the ruler marked the center of the universe associated with the figure of the ruler, who personified this center, and indicated its sacred function" (Dode, 2005, p. 27).

The historical knowledge based on comparative and retrospective analysis shows numerous historical examples of the middle ages, where nomads related groups of different ranks were real elements of internal socio-economic, political and mental relationships. Therefore, based on the current state of historical science and its evidence base, it is impossible to consider their presence as an unambiguous argument in favor of the pre-state character of the social system of nomads. The sequence of historical thinking and concrete historical analysis, modern methodological approaches show that related structures and genealogies caused the "dispersion" and centrifugal nature of nomadic societies. However, in nomadic empires, the military-hierarchical bodies of political management were closely intertwined with the tribal segments, at the same time towered over them, controlled them, and organized their effective use in accordance with the goals of the Imperial leadership.

The well-known nomad scholar A.M. Khazanov, implementing specific research tasks, established that the existence in the Mongol Empire of the concept of a ruler whose power was sanctioned by Heaven, obviously, has undergone some development. In the preceding nomadic States, heaven first sanctioned the power of the kagans over their own people; in the Mongol Empire, it gave them power over the whole world. According to the author, the Turkic kagans, and perhaps their predecessors – the *syunnu*, promoted the idea of the divine origin of their power, their Heaven-sanctioned right to rule the people and the Kingdom, but their claims never featured faith in the heavenly Mandate to rule the whole world (Khazanov, 2008, p. 399).

Exploring the nature of power in Mongolian society, the author notes that the only goal that they proclaimed was to subordinate the world to the power of the Golden Genghis Khan family. "In the Mongol Empire, and then in all the States of the Genghisids, the nomads always occupied a dominant position. Many of them migrated to the conquered countries, but even there they continued to lead a nomadic lifestyle. The Mongol ruling elite also did not want their sedentarization....in all States of the Genghisids, and even in many States of their successors, such as the Timurids, the military elite consisted of nomads and in ethnic and tribal terms

has always been closely associated with the rulers” – sums up A. M. Khazanov (Khazanov, 2008, p. 397). The simulation of Implementation turned Genghis Khan not so much into a political, but also to some extent a religious leader. The ways of how determines cyclical changes in the structure of power. V.V. Trepavlov argumentatively notes: “the Doctrine of Supreme power in the Mongol Empire was formed mainly on the basis of the ancient Turkic concept: the title of Kagan was restored, the full formula of titles was revived, reflecting the connection of the Kagan with the Sky” (Trepavlov, 1993, p.74). The Western Explorer J. Fletcher reveals the basic principles and methods of management of Mongol society, notes that “the ideological means of strengthening the control of the Khan was the belief in Tengri universal, giving victory to God, who as a horsemanship, worship of fire, ...as well as the monotheism itself, which came from the ancient Aryans, some of whom migrated to Iran and India, and others remained in the steppes. The idea of a universal Supreme God ... contains the possibility of a single universal sphere on earth, the probability that the Supreme God can appoint a single ruler to establish his rule over the entire universal sphere” (Fletcher, 2004, p. 231).

Ye.I. Kychanov drawing historical parallels and modeling the management systems of nomadic societies determined that all the known large nomadic states of Central Asia had such an attribute of statehood as sovereignty, expressed in the supremacy of the ruler’s power (shanyu, Kagan, Khan) inside the country and its independence outside. According to the researcher, this feature is expressed in the manifestation of the sovereignty of the Supreme power and its bodies to resolve criminal and civil cases in the prescribed manner. Law as a set of sanctioned or established by the Supreme power of the rules had its source as the rules of customary law, recognized by the sovereign Supreme power, the state, and new, established by the Supreme power, the state rules (Kychanov, 1997, p. 301). According to T. May (May, 2012, p.165): «The terminology for the civil administrators of the Mongol Empire adds to the difficulty of understanding how the Mongols ran their empire. Throughout the sources three titles are mentioned in several places. Most often the chronicler referred to the terms without further explanation and modern scholars have struggled to define them. One problem is that each term originates in different language, darughachi from Mongolian, basqaq from Turkic and shanna from Persian». Y. Shamiloglu (Shamiloglu, 2019, 19) defines the fundamental aspects of state organization as:

1. In the Chingizid states of Eurasia, any socio-

political group that could act in accordance with three other socio-political groups to establish a “land”, according to an agreement with a “sovereign, was a” ruling tribe “by definition to form a” state “.

2. Each ruling tribe was a socio-political group, united around a center of power on the basis of a common ideology. The “ruling tribe” could be abandoned or joined to it, and thus, ordinary membership in it was changeable and dynamic, and was not limited, static and unchanging.

3. The center of power in each ruling tribe was a special hierarchy, headed by a leader or Bey, independent of the ruling Genghisid dynasty. this leader or bay came from earlier leaders of the ruling tribe.

4. The basis of unity within the ruling tribe was a common ideology. This ideology can be defined as certain shared by all faith in the kinship between members of the ruling tribe.

5. Each of these four “ruling tribes” participated in the formation of one state and another, different from it.

6. There could be several “ruling tribes” with the same name due to the great geographical extent of the Mongolian world empire.

7. One of these “ruling tribes” and especially the leader of this “ruling tribe” within the “state” had special responsibilities in managing this “state” as the first among equals (*primus inter pares*), blunting as an expression of the interests of his “land”.

Continuing the research traditions of previous generations and using a set of techniques of critical analysis, S.A. Vasyutin points out: “the Peculiarity of all nomadic empires, including the Mongol, is that the ratio of chieftain and early state components of power is unstable and flexible. In such formations, periodically there were “rollbacks” to archaic institutions of management, which could result in the collapse of the organizational structures of the early state” (Васютин, 2005, p. 57). The researcher emphasizes the role of the Supreme ruler in the Mongol Empire, who combined the functions of a traditional clan leader, the head of the supertribal confederation of nomads (complex or supercomplex chiefdom) and the head of a multicultural (with a nomadic and sedentary population) political education. Common to all types of nomadic empires was a certain entropy of the behavior of the Supreme rulers (the transition from charismatic to traditional domination). Defining the essence 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, p. 68).

Conclusion

The presented historiographical review shows the complex and ambiguous nature of the imperial traditions and symbols of government, which makes it promising to apply the system principles of analysis, an integrated approach to the consideration of power structures of political nomadic systems. 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. This makes it necessary for researchers to take a diversified approach to the problems of studying imperial traditions and their systematization and reconstruction as a difficult complex of different types and models of power, united in a single imperial structure. The study of specific historical events and processes associated with nomadic power structures creates the ground for the formulation and analysis of conceptual conclusions and methodological approaches.

The effectiveness of theoretical and methodological constructions sets the researchers the task of studying the administrative institutions of nomadic formations, the new quality of scientific knowledge requires their reconstruction as a difficult complex of different types and models of power, united in a single imperial structure. At the present stage of development of historical science, experts are interested in developing criteria, models and typologization of structures of nomadic society, which would allow you to definitely speak out on the problems of the political and administrative system of the Mongol Empire. Thus, the complex and ambiguous nature of the development of political institutions of nomads makes it promising to apply the system principles of analysis of power structures, social system and features of the process of transformation in nomadic empires. Thus, in the system analysis of political institutions of nomads, it is necessary to consider the complex of elements that make up the interpenetrating and interacting subsystems.

References

- Barfield T.J. *Opasnayagranica: kochevyemperiii Kitaj (221 g. Do n.eh. – 1757 g. n.eh.)* [Dangerous frontier: nomadic empires and China (221 BC – 1757 AD)]. Ed. Ruhlyadeva D.V., Kuznecova V.B. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Bentley J. (1993) *Old world Encounters: Cross-Cultural Contacts and Exchanges in Pre-modern Times*. New York.
- Vasyutin S.A. (2004) *Mongolskay imperia kak osobaya forma ranney gosudarstvennosti? Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoimir* [The Mongol Empire as a special form of early statehood? The Mongol Empire and the nomadic world] Ulan-Ude.
- Vasyutin S.A. (2008). *Likivlasti (k voprosu o prirodevlasni v kochevih imperiahk)*// *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.
- Dode V. (2005) *Imperskaya cuitura. Simvolil egatimacii prinadlegnosti k imperii v costume kochevnicov Zolotoy Ordy*. // *Vostok. Orients*. №4.
- Riber A. (2004) *Sravnivaya continentalnyi imperii/Rossiyskaya imperia v sravnitelnoy perspechnive*[Comparing continental empires//Russian Empire in comparative perspective]. *Sbornikstatey*. Moskva.
- Savinov S.G. (2005) *Drevne turkskie plemene v zerkale arheologii*. SPb, FilologicheskifacultetSPbGU.
- Sultanov. T.I. (2008). *Chingizhan I chingizidi..sudbi I vlast*. [Genghis Khan and Genghis Khan. The fate and power].Almaty.
- Tishkin. A.A., Dashkovski P.K. (2003). *Socialnaya struktura I sisteme mirovozzreniy naselenia Altaya skifskoy epohi* A.A. Tishkin. [Social structure m a system of philosophy population of the Altai in the Scythian epoch]. Barnaul.
- Trepavlov V.V. (1993) *Gosudarstveniy story MongolskayaEmperia XIII v. : problem istoricheskoypreemstvennosti*[The state system of the Mongol Empire, XIII century: the Problem of historical continuity] Moskva.
- Fletcher J. (2004). *Srednevekovimongoli: ekologicheskie I socialnieperspektivi*// *Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir*. [The medieval Mongols: ecological and social prospects of the Mongolian Empire and the nomadic world. ulanude]. Ulan-Ude.
- Hazanov A.M. (2006). *Kochevniki evraziiskih stepey v istoricheskoy retrospective*//*Ranee 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.
- Hazanov A.M. (2005). *Muhamed b Chingizhan v sravnenii: rolreligioznogofaktora v sozdaniimirovihimperii*// *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.
- Kichanov E.I. (1997). *Kocheviegosudarstvaotgunnov do mangurov*. [Nomadic States from the Huns to the Manchus]. Moskva.

Литература

- Барфилд Т.Дж. (2009) *Опасная граница: кочевые империи и Китай (221 г. до н.э.-1757 г. н.э.)* Санкт-Петербург.
- Bentley J. (1993) *Old world Encounters: Cross-Cultural Contacts and Exchanges in Pre-modern Times*. NewYork.

- 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.
- Васютин С.А. Лики власти (к вопросу о природе власти в кочевых империях)// Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. Улан-Удэ, 2005.Т.2.
- Доде В. (2005) Имперская культура. Символы легитимации принадлежности к империи в костюме кочевников Золотой Орды//Восток.Orients. №4.
- May T. (2012) The Mongol conquests in world history,London, Reaktion Books.
- Шамильоглу Ю. (2019) Племенная политика и социальное устройство в Золотой Орде. Казань.
- Рибер А. (2004) Сравнимая континентальные империи// Российская империя в сравнительной перспективе. Москва.
- Савинов Д.Г. (2005)Древнетюркские племена в зеркале археологии.СПб:Филологический факультет СПбГУ.
- Султанов Т.И. (2008) Чингиз-хан и чингизиды. Судьбы и власть. Алматы.
- Тишкин А.А.(2004) Введение: кочевники, монголосфера и цивилизационный процесс// Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. Улан-Удэ.
- Трепавлов В.В. (1993) Государственный строй Монгольской империи XIII в.: Проблема исторической преемственности. Москва.
- Флетчер Дж. (2004). Средневековые монголы: экологические и социальные перспективы// Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. Улан-Удэ.
- Хазанов А.М. (2006) Кочевники евразийских степей в исторической ретроспективе// Раннее государство, его альтернативы и аналоги: Сб. ст. Волгоград.
- Хазанов А.М. (2005) Мухаммед и Чингис хан в сравнении: роль религиозного фактора в создании мировых империй// Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. Улан-Удэ.
- Кычанов Е.И. (1997) Кочевые государства от гуннов до маньчжуров. Москва.