

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
ҒЫЛЫМ КОМИТЕТІ
Ш.Ш.УӘЛИХАНОВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ТАРИХ
ЖӘНЕ ЭТНОЛОГИЯ ИНСТИТУТЫ



«EDU.E-HISTORY.KZ» ЭЛЕКТРОНДЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ



№1 (29) қаңтар-наурыз 2022

ISSN 2710-3994



Бас редактор:

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы

Редакциялық алқа:

Абашиин Сергей Николаевич – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Санкт-Петербургтегі Европа университеті (Ресей)

Абдырахманов Толобек Абылович – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, И. Арабаев атындағы Қызғыз мемлекеттік университетінің ректоры. (Қырғызстан)

Аяған Бүркітбай Фелманұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институты директорының орынбасары. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбаев Нұрсан – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Қазақстан Республикасы Орталық мемлекеттік музейінің директоры. (Қазақстан)

Әбусейтова Меруерт Қуатқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі. ҚР БжҒМ ҒК Р. Сүлейменов атындағы Шығыстану институтының «Тарихи материалдарды зерттеу» орталығының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Голден Кэти Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden) – PhD, Миссисипи өңірлік мемлекеттік университеті (Mississippi Valley State University) (АҚШ)

Кәрібаев Берекет Бақытжанұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, «Қазақстан тарихы» кафедрасының меңгерушісі. (Қазақстан)

Қожамжарова Дария Пернешқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна – саясаттану ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Фудан Университетінің Қытай және Орталық Азияны зерттеу орталығының мен «Астана» ХҒК бірлескен директоры (Қазақстан)

Козодой Виктор Иванович – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. (Ресей)

Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Какенқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты (Қазақстан)

Көмеков Болат Ешимұхамедұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Халықаралық қыпшақтану институтының директоры, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

Матыжанов Кенжехан Исламжанұлы – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА корр.-мүшесі, М.О. Әуезов атындағы әдебиет және өнер институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) – PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета (Великобритания)

Муртазаева Рахборхон Хамидқызы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Мирзо Ұлықбек атындағы Өзбекстан ұлттық университеті «Өзбекстан тарихы» кафедрасының профессоры. (Өзбекстан)

Панто Дмитрий (Panto Dmitri) – PhD доктор, Гданьск қаласындағы Екінші дүниежүзілік соғыс мұражайының ғылыми қызметкері. (Польша)

Римантас Желвис (Želvyus Rimantas) – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті (Литва)

Самашев Зайнолла Самашұлы – археолог, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Герман археология институтының корр.-мүшесі. ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ә. Марғұлан атындағы Археология институты. (Қазақстан)

Сайлан Болат Санабайұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті. (Қазақстан)

Смағұлов Оразақ Смағұлұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Балон ғылым академиясының корр.-мүшесі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы сыйлықтың лауреаты, ғылым мен техниканың еңбек сіңірген қайраткері, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан)

Сыдықов Ерлан Бәтташұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ректоры. (Қазақстан)

Таймағамбетов Жәкен Қожахметұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР Ұлттық музейі. (Қазақстан)

Жауапты редактор:

Қаипбаева Айнагүл Толғанбайқызы

Ғылыми редактор:

Қозыбаева Махаббат Мәлікқызы

Редактор:

Кубеев Рустем Жаулыбайұлы

Жауапты хатшы:

Қоңқабаева Арайлым

Техникалық хатшы:

Хумарзах Алтынбек

Главный редактор:
Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович

Редакционная коллегия:

Абашиин Сергей Николаевич – доктор исторических наук, профессор, Европейский университет в Санкт-Петербурге (Россия)

Абдырахманов Толобек Абылович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, ректор Кыргызского государственного университета им. И. Арабаева (Кыргызстан)

Алимбай Нурсан – кандидат исторических наук, профессор, директор Центрального государственного музея Республики Казахстан (Казахстан)

Абусеитова Меруерт Хуатовна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, директор Республиканского центра по изучению исторических материалов Института востоковедения имени Р.Б. Сулейменова (Казахстан)

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, директор Института истории государства КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Аяган Буркитбай Гелманович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института истории государства КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Голден Кэтти Стромайл (Kathie Stromile Golden) – PhD, Государственный университет долины Миссисипи (Mississippi Valley State University) (США)

Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, член-корр. Болонской академии наук, лауреат премии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова, заслуженный деятель науки и техники, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева (г. Нур-Султан, Казахстан)

Карибаев Берекет Бахытжанович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, заведующий кафедрой истории Казахстана, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби (Казахстан)

Кожамжарова Дария Пернешовна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Южно-Казахстанского университета им. М. Ауэзова (Казахстан)

Кожирова Светлана Басиевна – доктор политических наук, профессор, содиректор Центра исследования Китая и Центральной Азии Фуданьского Университета и МНК «Астана», руководитель Центра китайских и азиатских исследований (Казахстан)

Козодой Виктор Иванович – доктор исторических наук, профессор (Россия)

Кокебаева Гульжаухар Какеновна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч.Валиханова КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Кумеков Болат Ешмухамбетович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, директор Международного института кипчаковедения Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева (Казахстан)

Матыжанов Кенжехан Слямжанович – доктор филологических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. НАН РК, директор Института литературы и искусства им. М. Ауэзова (Казахстан)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) – PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета (Великобритания)

Муртазаева Рахборхон Хамидовна – доктор исторических наук, профессор кафедры «Истории Узбекистана» Национального университета Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека. (Узбекистан)

Панто Дмитрий (Panto Dmitri) – доктор PhD, профессор, главный специалист научного отдела Музея Второй мировой войны г. Гданьска (Польша)

Римантас Желвис (Želvyis Rimantas) – доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Вильнюсский педагогический университет (Литва)

Самашев Зайнолла Самашевич – археолог, доктор исторических наук, профессор, чл.-корр. Германского археологического института. Институт археологии им. А.Маргулана КН МОН РК (Казахстан)

Сайлан Болат Санабаевич – доктор исторических наук, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби (Казахстан)

Сыдыков Ерлан Батташевич – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, ректор Евразийского национального университета им. Л.Н. Гумилева (Казахстан)

Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожжахметович – доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК (Казахстан)

Ответственный редактор:

Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна

Научный редактор:

Козыбаева Махаббат Маликовна

Редактор:

Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы

Ответственный секретарь:

Конкабаева Арайлым Нурболатовна

Технический секретарь:

Хумарзах Алтынбек

Editor-In-Chief:

Kabuldinov Ziabek Ermukhanovich

Members of editorial board:

Abashin Sergei Nikolaevich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, European University at St. Petersburg (Russia)

Abdyrakhmanov Tolobek Abylovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Rector of I. Arabaev Kyrgyz State University (Kyrgyzstan)

Alimbay Nursan – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Central State Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan)

Abusseitova Meruert Khuatovna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of the Republican Center for the Study of Historical Materials at R.B. Suleimenov Institute of Oriental Studies (Kazakhstan)

Abil Yerkin Amanzholovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

Ayagan Burkitbai Gelmanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

Golden Kathie Stromile – PhD, Mississippi Valley State University (USA)

Ismagulov Orazak Ismagulovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Corresponding Member of Bologna Academy of Sciences, winner of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Award, Honored Worker of Science and Technology, Professor of L.N. Gumilyov University (Kazakhstan)

Karibayev Bereket Bakhytzhonovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Head of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Kazakhstan)

Kozhamzharova Daria Perneshevna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the NAS of the Republic of Kazakhstan, rector of the M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University (Kazakhstan)

Kozhirova Svetlana Bassieвна – Doctor of Political Science, Professor, Co-Director of the Center for the Study of China and Central Asia of Fudan University and the International Scientific Complex of the National Company "Astana", Head of the Center for Chinese and Asian Studies (Kazakhstan)

Kozodoi Viktor Ivanovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, chief researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

Kumekov Bolat Eshmukhambetovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Director of the International Institute of Kipchak Studies of the Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Kazakhstan)

Matyghanov Kenzhekhan Slyamzhanovich – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Corresponding Member of the NAS RK, Director of M. Auezov Institute of Literature and Art (Kazakhstan)

Morrison Alexander – PhD, Professor, University of Oxford (UK)

Murtazayeva Rakhborkhon Khamidovna – doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Department of «History of Uzbekistan» of Mirzo Ulugbek National University of Uzbekistan. (Uzbekistan)

Panto Dmitri – PhD, researcher at the Museum of the Second World War in Gdansk (Poland)

Rimantas Želvyys – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Vilnius Pedagogical University (Lithuania)

Samashev Zainolla Samashevich – archaeologist, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of German Archaeological Institute. A. Marghulan Institute of Archeology CS MES RK (Kazakhstan)

Sailan Bolat Sanabayevich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Kazakhstan)

Sydykov Erlan Battashevich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Rector of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Kazakhstan)

Taimagambetov Zhaken Kozhakhmetovich – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan)

Executive Editor:

Kaipbayeva Ainagul Tolganbayevna

Scientific Editor:

Kozybayeva Makhabbat Malikovna

Editor:

Kubeyev Rustem Dzhaulybayevich

Executive Secretary

Konkabayeva Arailym Nurbolatovna

Technical secretary:

Khumarzak Altynbek

FEATURES OF FUNCTIONING OF THE INSTITUTION OF KAZAKH BATYRS (XVIII – XIX C.)

O. Kuanbay* 

Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

*Corresponding author

E-mail: olkube89@gmail.com (Kuanbay)

Abstract. This article describes the features of the functioning of the institution of the *batyrs* (knight, heroes) of the Kazakh people from the XVIII to the first half of the XIX centuries. The full event of that century is considered, which is disclosed in detail by archival data. The Institution of *batyrs* (heroism, chivalry) is a very important scientific topic for research on the unknown pages of the life and activities of Kazakh khans, sultans, and batyrs. The article also examines the role and importance of batyrs in political and public life, which occupy a special place in the social structure of the Kazakh people. In order to thoroughly and deeply understand the institute of batyrs, letters and manuscripts of those times are also considered, which allows you to plunge into the world of the heroes of that century. Archival documents also clearly demonstrate the diplomatic abilities of the Kazakh knights, who are perfectly able to conduct state affairs. The transformation of the heroic worldview of the Kazakh people into a national value has formed the institution of heroes unique to the Kazakh people. The study of the role of batyrs (knight, heroes) in Kazakh history is very important for the future preservation and strengthening of the Kazakh borders and statehood. The importance of the institution of heroes in the state structure of the Kazakh people is characterized by the fact that for centuries the Kazakh people have been able to preserve the territorial hegemony of the heart of Eurasia.

Key words: Institute of batyrs (knight), Kazakh khans, Kazakh sultans, bakhadur, batyr, heroism.

Introduction. Features of the functioning of the institution of batyrs (knight, heroes) since the XVIII century and through the first half of the XIX century are due to historical, cultural, geographical and socio-political factors. This influenced the military nomadic lifestyle of the Kazakh people. From time immemorial, professional nomadic brave warriors and wise commanders have received social significance, protecting their native boundless steppe and the cradle of the ancient Turks. In the history of the Kazakh people, the XVIII century is characterized by the dawn of the institution of *batyrism* (heroism, chivalry – auth.). Of all the Turkic peoples who lived in the expanses of Eurasia, the functioning of the institute of batyrism among the Kazakhs reached the highest socio-political development in the structure of statehood. From time immemorial until the 19th century, in the worldview of the Kazakh people at the genetic level, from the birth of a child, there was no choice but to become a batyr. At the first knowledge in the guise of the brave batyrs of the father and children, the subconscious of the child develops the appearance of a hero who tirelessly defended his homeland. The term «Baty» or «Erlık» was idealized so highly in every Kazakh family that to die as a batyr defending native lands is a blessed farewell to the native people and remain in the centuries of their memory: «It is well known that the term “batyr” is very widespread in Kazakh folklore and everyday life. ... The entire Kazakh heroic epos is mainly legends about legendary or real historical batyrs. The widespread use of the title "batyr" in the Kazakh nomadic society in the late Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times is a specific feature of its history and culture» (Collection of materials, 2010: 325).

The boomerang of the historical chain did not pass by the once strong and powerful steppe states, which forced the same Muscovite Russia to pay tribute. In 1700, after a complete exemption from tribute, on October 22, 1721, the Russian Empire itself seized the initiative to seize all the lands and peoples through colonization in the 18th century. According to prominent scientists of the USSR in the

XVII century the nomad camps of the Kazakh people reached Tyumen, and with the gradual strengthening of the tsarist empires, the Kazakh people lost these native lands. After the fall of the kingdom of Genghisides Kuchum Khan, the grandson of Ibak Khan, the ruler of Tyumen and the Great Horde, the Russian state began to strengthen in Siberia: «Under Tsevan-Rabdan, the unity and power of the Oirat Union was strengthened. This was facilitated by the fact that until 1714 he managed to maintain peaceful relations with China. Major changes have taken place in the north of Siberia. After the fall of the kingdom of Kuchum in Siberia, the Russian state begins to grow. In the first half of the XVII century, Russian settlements approached Kamchatka. True, the possessions of the Muscovite state and the Kazakh Hordes at the beginning of the XVII century did not yet directly touch, but during the XVII century they gradually drew closer, and already in the 90s of the XVII century the nomad camp of the Kazakhs was about 15 miles from Tyumen. This international situation determined the political history of the Kazakh Union in the XVII and early XVIII centuries» (Vyatkin, 1941:103).

After only 10 years, from the day of the proclamations of the Russian empires, in 1731, the Junior Zhuz (Kazakh tribal association-auth.) were the first to accept Russian citizenship. In the future, the scientific world should once again deeply consider from a scientific point of view the fact that the Kazakh people supposedly “of their own free will” accepted royal citizenship, and besides, this was a geopolitical game in favor of the Kazakh people to preserve the existence between the two empires. The geopolitical vision of the institution of the batyrs of the Kazakh people worked well in deterring the forces of the two powers of Tsarist Russia and the Qin empires from attacking each other, and in the meantime, to maintain the hegemony of the Kazakh people through the "voluntary" "acceptance" of the citizenship of the two empires: «In August 1738, 150 elders swore allegiance to Russia. In August 1740, during the period of a new onslaught of the Dzungars, the oath was taken by the Khan of the Middle Juz Abulmambet (who replaced the deceased Semeke) and the influential sultan of the Middle Juz Ablai. Together with them, 128 foremen swore allegiance. In July 1742 in Orenburg, when Tarkhan Dzhanybek was taking the oath, more than 730 Kazakh elders swore allegiance to Russia» (KRR, 1961: 9).

However, according to our conviction, do the archives of the tsarist empires say about the adoption of citizenship by the highest echelon of power, and the institution of the batyrs of the Kazakh people? Here we are witnessing the opposite historical event. The imperial ambition and colonial intentions of the Russian empires always show their steps, referring to the "desires" of the "natives" to be loyal subjects to them. This is evidenced by a historical document, in which 6 years ago, on March 17, 1726, “desires” to accept Russian citizenship were stated: «The Kirgis-Kaisaks, for their part, promise to serve Her Majesty in all fidelity and according to the decrees of Her Majesty, when the outfit has to be against any enemies to serve the Kalmyks and Bashkirs, and they and those peoples from Her Majesty's side to serve and, if necessary, help with cattle and the rest are ready with all willingness» (Archive AFPR, 1:63). The military class and endless wars have always influenced state structures in making fateful decisions for the people. The sharp confrontation between noble persons and the military structure who were against the “acceptance” of royal citizenship is evidence that the institution of batyris, although to a lesser extent, opposed the adoption of fatal decisions for the Kazakh people: «To bring Abulkhair to the oath, the tsarist government sent a special embassy to the Steppe, headed by the translator of the College of Foreign Affairs A.I. Tevkelev. And he arrived at the headquarters of Khan Abulkhair, located in the tract of Manityube on the right bank of the Irgiz River. On October 5, 1731, at the kurultai (national congress-auth.), the Kazakh nobility and foremen of the younger zhuz, in an atmosphere of sharp confrontation between the parties, Abulkhair signed the oath of allegiance to the Russian throne» (HKRS, 2007: 291-292). As stated above, there was no complete desire to accept citizenship. Another interesting fact is that the date of acceptance of citizenship on different historical sources is indicated in different ways. Touching upon the topic of "voluntary" acceptance of citizenship is very important for a thorough study of the life and work of the Kazakh khans, sultans and batyrs. On some scientific works, October 5, 1731 is indicated as the date of taking the oath of allegiance to Tsarist Russia, while others are indicated as: «On October 10, 1731 Khan Abulkhair, batyrs Bukenbai and Iset, Murza Khuday-Nazar and 27 noble foremen took the oath of allegiance to Russia» (KRR, 1961: 8).

Materials and research methods. In this article, general scientific historical methods were used as analysis, synthesis, as well as historical-retrospective, historical-genetic, historical-typological, historical-systemic methods. These and other important research methods allow us to formulate the picture of that century in the most complete form. Since the article is scientifically based on archival documents (Omsk Region Russian Federation (HAOR) and the History of Kazakhstan in Russian Sources of the XVI-XX centuries (HKRS), Archive of the Foreign Policy of Russia (AFPR) it dates back to the XIX century major historical events and the political and social life of the Kazakh people at that time became the object of study. Each historical theoretical conclusion in the article is presented with specific archival documentary accuracy. Archival documents, letters, statements and reports, are the basis of the study.

Discussion. This scientific article is mainly based on archival materials such as the State Archive of the Orenburg Region. (SAOR) F. 5. In. 1. C. 30. Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (CSARK) F. 2300. In10. C327., Archive of the Foreign Policy of Russia (AFPR) F.109/1.C.1., and also were used founds of Historical Archive of the Omsk Region (HAOR) F. 1. In. 1. C. 66., F. 1. In. 1. C. 16., F. 1. In. 1. C. 76., F. 1. In. 1. C.76., F. 1. In. 1. C. 69., F. 1. In. 1. C. 195., F. 1. In. 1. C. 170., F. 1. In. 1. C. 190., F. 1. In. 1. C.212., The military-political position of the Kazakh people in the eighteenth century is also well studied in the book of the "History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries", (HKRS) Russian chronicles and official materials of the XVI-first quarter of the XVIII century. about the peoples of Kazakhstan / Comp., transcription, commentary introductory article by I.V. Erofeeva. Also on the third volume (V. 3) of the same collection of documents "History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the 16th-20th centuries", (HKRS) Journals and memos of the diplomat A.I. I.V. Erofeeva. [AFPR. F. 122/1. 1748 C. 4. L. 16-20v. Published: A. B. From the history of Kazakhstan in the XVIII century. // Red archive. 1938. No. 2 (87). pp. 153-156; KRO-1. Doc. No. 155, pp. 406-407; No. 156. S. 407-440.] the life and activities of the Kazakh khans, sultans and batyrs, are superbly described. Also were used ol volumes V4.,V5., V6., V7., V8.,V9 of this collecting materials "History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries" (HKRS), P26, The first historical and ethnographic descriptions of the Kazakh lands. XVIII century./Compiled by I.V. Erofeeva. B.T. Zhanaev, Sh.K. Alimgazinov.S.F. Mazhitov. When the topic concerns the relations of the Kazakh Khanate with the Russian empire, it is impossible not to mention the collection of historical documents «Kazakh-Russian relations in XVI-XVIII (Collection of documents), Central Archive of the Kazakh USSR, Alma-Ata: - Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh USSR, 1961. As mentioned above, this article also used the article in the Collection of materials, "The role of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes in the development of world military art", Scientific readings in memory of N.E. Masanov: Sat. materials of international scientific conf, Erofeeva I.V., Zhanaev B.T., Masanova L.E., *Article:* [I.V. Erofeeva (Kazakhstan) Institute of batyrs in the structure of the military organization of Kazakh nomads]. Also in this scientific article, a collection of materials by Colonel A.G. Serebrennikov was used. This valuable collection was published in Tashkent in 1912 "Collection of materials for the Turkestan region in 1841.", Volume III., Comp. Tashkent: - Type. headquarters of the Turkest-o military. okr., 1912. In the scientific research of the relations of the Kazakh Khanate with the Qing Empire, a collection of documents edited by Khafizova K.Sh., Moiseev V.A. was used: Collection of documents, "Qing Empire and Kazakh Khanates. The second half of the XVIII - the first third of the XIX centuries. / Compiled by K.Sh. Khafizova, V.A. Moiseev/Second edition (corrected and expanded). Ch.Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. For a thorough and comprehensive study of this topic, books of the 1941 edition were also used: Vyatkin M.P., "Essays on the history of the Kazakh SSR from ancient times to 1870" Volume One, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow:-OGIZ GosPolitIzdat, 1941. As it is written in the discussions, all the scientific and historical documents used, archives and collections, in their originality and authenticity of information, reveal the essence of the research topic in every possible way.

Results. The XVIII century in itself gave rise to a galaxy of military commanders, from an early age trained batyr heroes from all clans and tribes of the Kazakh people who bravely fought against external enemies in the face of the Dzungar military nomadic state, the Qin and Russian empires. In this

most difficult military-geopolitical situation, the institute of batyryism (the institute of heroism) of the Kazakh people played a decisive role in protecting the Fatherland from various foreign invasions. Batyrs came out of almost every family during the long war with the Dzungars, and until the 18th century, during the period of great power of the steppe nomadic peoples: «The great social demand for batyrs in Kazakh society in the late medieval period was also caused by the difficult geopolitical position of the three zhuzes ... In the 16th - first half of the 18th centuries, the Kazakh tribes occupied mainly the inner part of the territory of modern Kazakhstan...» (Collection of materials, 2010: 326).

One of the main features of the functioning of the institute of batyryism is the rapid and huge mobilization of the military forces of nomads in the Great Steppe of Central Eurasia. This was facilitated by the geographical position of the Kazakh people in connection with the nomadic lifestyle in the current territories of modern Kazakhstan and beyond the Great Steppe, which correctly formed the institution of batyryism in protecting vast territories and repelled almost all invasions of external enemy forces. One of these events shows the cohesion before the adoption of royal citizenship of the ruling sultans and biys (judicial and political figures-auth.) and noble personalities of the three zhuzes with the military institute of the batyrs of the Kazakh people: «From the very first months of the tragic Oirat-Kazakh war of 1723-1730, Abulkhair actually led the popular resistance against the conquerors. As a result, at the unifying congress of commanders of militant detachments held in Ordabasy in 1726, the Kazakh khans, sultans and batyrs elected him commander-in-chief of the united people's armies of the three zhuzes. In subsequent years, the Kazakhs under the supreme command of Abulkhair won major victories over the troops of the Dzungars in the battles at the Bulanty River (1727) and the Anrakay battle on the southeastern coast of Lake Balkhash...» (HKRS, 2007: 290).

To protect the state border and independence, the Great Steppe witnessed many legendary national heroes-batyrs who fought to the last blood with foreign invaders. The institution of the batyrs of the Kazakh people was strengthened during the long war with the Oirat tribes, which the Turkic peoples called the Kalmyks: «In the first half of the seventeenth century, these tribes formed a strong union - the Dzungar or Oirat state, which pushed the eastern Mongols into the background. The Oirat state reached its highest power at the end of the 17th century, and in the first half of the 18th century, – during the reign of the khans Batur, Tsevan-Rabtan and Galdan Tseren»(HKRS, 2007:431-432). The military-tactical art of the institute of batyryism was superbly demonstrated during the Battle of Orbulak. Kazakh batyrs knew the geo-locations of the area well, and skillfully used biological and all weapons of warfare. In world history, this is a very impressive and incredible victory of Salkam-Zhangir as three hundred Spartans in the ancient world: «In 1635, Zhagangir (Salqam Zhangir-khan 1610–1652-auth.), the son of Ishim, was defeated by the Oirots and taken prisoner, from where he soon managed to free himself. Zhagangir's raids on the Oirat pastures caused the campaign of Batur (Erdani-Batur, the Oirat ruler-auth.) against the Kazakhs. He took possession of the nomad camps of two tribes. Zhagangir could put up a detachment of 600 people against the fifty-thousandth (50,000 soldiers-auth.) army. True, he was promised help from the Bukhara ruler Yalantush (Zhalantos bahadur Seyitkululy-auth). But without waiting for the arrival of the Bukhara troops, Zhagangir successfully took advantage of the terrain, locked Batur's army in the gorge and managed to inflict very significant damage on him. The arrival of the Yalantush detachments forced Batur to retreat»(Vyatkin, 1941:104).

In connection with the unification of the Oirat tribes under one banner as the military nomadic state of Dzungaria, the Kazakh ruler Ablai took precise steps to strengthen the institution of batyrs in the technical sphere by building military strongholds, and hiring professional masons builders from near and far abroad. And in turn, the Oirat ruler Tsevan-Rabdan did not lag behind and was even one step ahead in arming and equipping his tireless troops: «The Noyans (rulers of Dzungars-auth.) tried to invite Bukharins from eastern Turkestan to the lands of their generations and built stone buildings, Ablai built two stone chambers on the Beske (Debiske) River with the help of masons ordered by him from China, Tsevan-Rabdan built a city, that is, a proper agricultural village in the Kobokzaur tract (at the southern foot of the Saura Ridge), ordered pigs and turkeys from Siberia» (HKRS, 2006:86). Despite the difficult military situation, the military industry of the Oirats developed rapidly from year to year. Gunsmith engineers were hired from distant countries to cast a heavy cannon: «Galdan-Tseren brought ore

prospectors and craftsmen from China and Russia who looked for gold, silver and copper ores and smelted them; the Swede Arezat, captured near Poltava, poured him guns. But the turmoil that followed after the death of Galdan-Tseren put an end to these rudiments of a peaceful culture» (HKRS, 2006:86-87).

From the reports of General Bandi on April 10, 1755, we see the same imperial plans for the colonization of divisions into small principalities by appointing khans to the tribal institutions of the Oirat people and destroying the military structure of the Dzungaria. And also the plans of the Qing government about the future structure of Dzungaria are openly disclosed: « In addition, the servant explained to Banchzhur and others the plans for dividing Dzungaria into [l. 12v.] // four parts by /four/ tribes and appointment of a separate khan over each of them. And so that they do not raise this issue during contacts with Amursana, so that he does not know / about the plans for the future structure of Dzungaria /. And that Amursana, a man who understands everything, who is already our guide, will repent when he hears /news/. PChF(Ch). Z. 8. P. 11v.-14» (Collection of documents, 2020:57). After the disappearance of the Dzungarian military nomadic state from the political scene, relations between the powers and the Kazakh Khanate acquired a geopolitical aspect. One of the archival documents reveals to us the military campaign of the Kazakh people. Tsarist Russia, 1758 March 19, Secretary Sprivkov Mishirey Voruchin May 14, 1758 reported on the passage up the Irtysh Kirghiz-Kaisak (Kazakhs-auth.) to ruin the Zengorians (Dzhungar-auth.) who remained in the steppe to the Highly Governmental Senate of the Privy Councilor and the Siberian Governor Semyonov: «Most humble report. On the 6th (J "16" f) of June of this March, Brigadier Arakhin Dorf reported to him by the Irtysh newly designed line of reporters who sent me reporters that the Kyrgyz (Kazakh-aut.) Ablai Saltan and the Chinese army, again no news was available. Only in the Irtysh line past both the fortresses and outposts, the Kirghis-Kaisaks (Kazakhs-auth.) incessantly ride up the Irtysh steppes of the Western side to catch the poppyat and the posts of those who allegedly showed up, they go on the orders of their ablai saltan to ruin the Zyungarts (Dzhungar- auth.). And in more detail, for the help of the biys (brothers) of the later lines, everything is going well, and the evil enemy in Russian borders» (Archive CSARK, 327: 884). As we can see from the above historical archive, what is meant by the word “enemy in Russian borders” is that the tsarist empire has not yet penetrated deep into the Kazakh steppe through colonial policy, despite the “voluntary” acceptance of citizenship of the Middle Zhuz in August 1740. And this historical archive once again proves the skillful policy of containing the forces of the two powers by “accepting” “citizenship”. And this border of the northern part of the Kazakh Khanate was still held by the Middle Zhuz thanks to the institution of batyrs.

Another historical document testifies to the military-political game of Ablai Khan: «Report No. 43. It is secret document. It is served on April 9, 1758 to the Excellent Deacon Brigadier Karl Lvovich Von Frauendorf. Your Highness a warrant, issued last March on the 23rd, about a certificate about the Kirghiz-Kaisak Ablai-Saltan. Ablai-saltan from the former wintering nomad camp on that March 28 from the Tobolu River migrated in twenty-five (25-auth.) yurts (Kazakh hous-auth.), including the foreman of the Karaul clan Kashegai-Murza. Ablai-saltan from the former wintering nomad camp on that March 28 from the Tobolu River migrated in twenty-five (25-auth.) wagons, including the foreman of the Karaul clan Kashegai-Murza. Now Ablai, with the elder Koshegay, in the prescribed number with yurts, wanders to the lake, called Dry Chubarkul. The distance from the Tobol River to the steppe side is nine versts (9 versts-bus), and from the local fortress to fivety versts (50 versts-bus), maybe. The rest of the Kirghiz of the Atagai tribe still have a nomad camp in the vicinity of the Tobol River... Ablai-saltan, allegedly and with some foremen, migrated from the Ishim River for written cases, he was not here according to the original certificate...In addition, they intend to continue their roaming in the vicinity of the local Uiskaya and Lower Distance fortresses near the Ishim River even in the coming summer» (Archive HAOR, 66: 74-74v.). Ablai Sultan, together with his batyrs and twenty-five yurts, boldly roamed in his native land and was politically ready for military operations at any moment and showing the northern neighbors the borders of the Kazakh Khanate. This is the foresight of Ablai Sultan. Further in the same archive, the following is narrated: «...Moreover, here from the Kirghiz-Kaisaks running out of them, captured by interrogations, it turns out that those Kirghiz from the Chinese army have fear and

intend to continue all their time as a nomad near Russian fortresses. But even then it is impossible to know whether it is in the very firmness of the positive. Well, there is nothing more to be conveyed from the local needs your nobility needs. And I humbly inform about everything that has been written to your highness on April 1, 1758. Second Major Dmitry Sukhotin» (Archive HAOR, 66:75). As stated above, “to have fears from the Chinese army” and wander around Russian fortresses means to always be on the alert for the institute of batyrs. This is a military-strategically deliberate move on the part of the Kazakh batyrs-military leaders.

As mentioned above from the historical archive of the Omsk region, we observe the same case of strengthening the eastern borders of the Kazakh Khanate by batyrs headed by Ablai Khan from the Chinese military force. As we noted from the above historical data, the Kazakh batyrs led by Ablai Saltan showed an excellent example of protecting the homeland, having migrated, they drove in from the border. Exactly ten years ago, in 1748, on June 17, reports were made to the commander of the troops on the Siberian border lines, Major General Kinderman, on behalf of the chief commandant of the Irtysh line from the Yamyshevsk fortress, Colonel Pavlutsky. The archival document mentions the threat from Alembet-batyr and, in order to pacify the batyrs, the royal power, as indicated in the archive, “gave away” a lot of material rewards to the batyrs: «And at the same time, I report that from this journal it concerns the person, according to the intention of Alembet-batyr to return instead of their captives by the Russian people, as if in a difficult time he intended to go with the war, about a strong and unsleeping precaution from me to all the fortresses...» (Archive HAOR, 16: 80).

In 1740, four (4-auth.) years later, in 1748, on June 17, from the day of taking citizenship, the Russian Empire “generously rewards” Ablai Saltan in order to bribe in the future in its imperial favor. But the wise and far-sighted ruler of the Kazakh people always went three steps ahead in the political chess game with his neighbors. As we have repeatedly noted from a geopolitical point of view, Ablai Khan diplomatically keeps the forces of Tsarist Russia and China in order to preserve the hegemony and independence of his people by “accepting a protectorate” of these powers: «In 1767, Qing China was forced to allow the Kazakhs to use pastures in the Tarbagatai Or. In exchange for this, the Chinese authorities demanded the payment of rent and the acceptance of Chinese citizenship by the steppes. By the end of the 18th century, indeed, part of the representatives of the Middle and Senior zhuzes accepted Chinese citizenship and again occupied their traditional pastures in the territory of Xinjiang [Prof. Z.E. Kabuldinov]» (Collection of documents, 2020: 7).

Another archival confirmation of the cautious behavior of tsarist Russia from the Qing empires clearly shows the fruit of the elegant foreign diplomatic policy of the Kazakh khans and sultans and the excellent cohesion of the institution of batyrs. From the prime minister to the commander of the Siberian Corps, Brigadier K.L. Frauendorf on March 23, 1759, we learn the military power of the batyrtstva institute while preventing the Chinese from entering the former Dzungarian lands. For the same reason, Abulmamet Khan and Ablai Sultan negotiated with Chinese envoys. In turn, the Kazakh rulers kept tsarist Russia in combat readiness to protect against Chinese attacks on Kazakh land, and besides, they did not allow the Qing army to enter the former Dzungar lands: «This year, to Major General Tevkelev and collegiate adviser Rychkov sent this, so that the Chinese could not establish themselves in the Zengor land, it was honored for an important deed, and in this they were ordered to hinder the Kirghis-Kaisaks. For this reason, in the power of Her Imperial Majesty, the decree of the Orenbur provincial office from the secret expedition has to take all possible measures» (Archive HAOR, 76: 231).

The Qin Empire from historical memory highly valued the military nomadic institution of batyrs, and almost always recognized the border of the Kazakh people. To the great regret from time immemorial from the ancient history of the Huns, the Chinese side has always skillfully bribed the Turkic rulers. And this time they wanted to achieve the aim the same way. But the noble Kazakh ambassadors and the wise military intelligentsia negotiated at the highest level with the emperor of the Qin dynasty, not allowing them to be humiliated as the rulers of the people of the Great Steppe: «Now about the Kazakh nomads. Before, they were in the northwest of Ili River. Then gradually many of them reached the northeast. And now, on the northern banks of the Irtysh, there are also their camps, bordering on the camps of Amursana. If the Kazakhs arrive and express a desire to obey, then order to

send their elders to the capital for an audience. Let's grant them bureaucratic positions, titles. Let their subjects still remain in their nomad camps, they do not need to move from there. If the Kazakhs do not want to accept our citizenship, then they should not be subjugated by military means. We must take precautions against them, or solve the case with them taking advantage of the favorable moment, that is, the destruction of the Dzungar Khanate.- [l. 14] K.Kh.), - / this / we order Amursana to think about ... PChF (Ch). Z. 8. P.14» (Collection of documents, 2020:57).

Also in the collection of archival documents of diplomatic and political relations «Qing Empire and Kazakh Khanates. The second half of the XVIII - the first third of the XIX centuries» of Kazakh rulers with Qing Empire Doctor of History, Professor Z.E. Kabuldinov superbly emphasizes with archival material the far-sighted and diplomatic actions of Ablai Khan and Sultanmamet Sultan, despite the adoption of citizenship: «Ablai, despite his acceptance of Russian citizenship in 1740, in 1759 and 1764, together with Sultanmamet, sent Sultan Urus (son of Sultanmamet-auth.) to Beijing on a diplomatic mission. The fact that Abylai and Sultanmamet sent their envoys to the Chinese is reported in the report of the commander in the Koryakovo outpost, captain of the Lutsk regiment I. Kleytin, to the commander of the Siberian Corps, Lieutenant General I.I. Springer on February 27, 1765: «This February 23, Saltamamet-saltan came to me. And besides, between conversations, he, Saltamamet-Saltan, announced that they would soon receive news from the envoys sent from them to the Chinese, and even if that news was to be received a long time ago, only it was not possible for them to leave for the great snows. Yes, and now we have received news from the Kaisaks (Kazakh warriors-auth.) sent to the Kirghiz people for the war, who announce that several people were beaten and many people were taken in a full of people and livestock. And he, Saltamamet-Saltan, together with Oblai-Saltan, has to go to those Kirghists with the whole army, when all the snow has melted» (Collection of Documents, 2020: 5-6). As we see from all the above archival data, the appearance of vertical military organizations: «A characteristic feature of nomadic societies is the presence of a vertical military organization, which played an important role in the socio-historical development of all the nomadic peoples of the continent. The most important structural element of the military organization of nomadic societies from ancient times to the beginning of modern times was the institution of military leaders or batyrs...»(Collection of materials, 2010: 322-323)

From a letter dated March 12, 1759, from collegiate registrar Pyotr Chyuchalov to the commander of the Siberian Corps, Brigadier K.L. Frauendorf, you can see an accented letter about the requirements of polite appeals to the ruling elite of the Kazakh people: «...Ablai-Saltan in his letter mentions this, as if the serf commanders who are on the Siberian lines do not know their honor. For this, for the sake of your nobility, through this, it is obligatory required: do not deign, your nobility to confirm all the local lines to the serf commanders, so that in cases to him Ablai-Saltan, as well as to other Kirghis, they were kind, and without the parables given from them, no offense they did not show any rudeness to them. ...Ablai-saltan in his letter mentions this, as if the serf commanders who are supposedly on the Siberian lines do not know their honor. And, of course, they don't respect him that way. For that, for the sake of your nobility, will your nobility deign to confirm all the serf commanders on all the lines there, so that in cases they are kinder to Ablai-Saltan, as well as to other Kirghiz people, and so that no insults and rudeness are applied to them without parables. Or, according to the current circumstances, Her Imperial Majesty's interest requires the highest. What was reported to all the State Collegium of Foreign Affairs. Chancellor Andrey Portnyagin. March 28th day, 1759 Orenburg.» (Archive HAOR, 76: 188).

From the list of the Horde of the Eastern part, awarded the presentation for the award, one can observe how the institution of batyryism, due to the gradual colonial policy of the tsarist empires, began to collapse and divided into two camps, the first defended the interests of the Kazakh people (Kenesary Khan, Sultan Sarzhan, etc.) and were supporters of conservation independence and the restoration of the khan's power, and the second camp tried as much as possible and, regardless of kinship and contrary to all moral values, they wanted to be in the "forefront" of the colonization of their people and were presented with a reward for devotion to the royal empires. Thus, from year to year, the colonial system broke the back of the institute of batyrs from the inside, creating a "pleiad" of traitors to the motherland in the person of sultans and foremen and local "batyrs" of medal heroes: "Head of the XIX distance,

foreman Turmambet Kunbasov, 59 years old ... to the Russian government, constant zeal for the benefits of service and excellent behavior ... In 1839 he was on an expedition under the command of the military foreman Lebedev, and in 1843 and 1844 under the command of Sultan Ahmed Dzhanurin to act against the rebellious Sultan Kinesary Kasymov. Presented for a gold medal for constant loyalty to the government, exemplary diligence in service and excellent behavior» (HKRS, 2006: 21).

In 1771, Ablai Sultan was elected khan of three zhuzes. This historical event is confirmed by both tsarist Russia and Qing China. During this period of the reign of Ablai Khan, the military institute of batyrism reached its peak of development. The exploits of the batyrs were intertwined with epics and legends among the Kazakh people. From the translation of a letter written on October 30, 1771 by Ablai Khan to the commander of the Siberian Corps, Major General S.K. Stanislavsky about the battle with the Volga Kalmyks, we see the military achievements of Ablai Khan. This once again proves the cohesive functioning of the institute of batyrism: «I went on a campaign after the Volga Kalmyks and in the battle with other Kalmyks, killed five thousand (5,000 people-auth.), and took more than ten thousand (10,000 people-auth.) in full to myself. auth.). Yes, of these Kalmyks, about twenty thousand (20,000 people-authors) died of starvation in the steppe. And only ten thousand were accepted into Chinese citizenship (10,000 people – auth.). For assurance, Ablai-Sultan attached his black seal. Translated by the senior interpreter Mametiyar Kucheyarov» (Archive HAOR, 170:291v).

Ablai Sultan and foremen Abulfeist on January 9, 1774, having gathered sixty thousand (60,000-authors) people, went to the Kyrgyz (ancestors of the current Kyrgyz-auth.), and this is one proof and a vivid example of the cohesion and mobilization of the institution of batyrism, despite the vast territory of the Kazakh khanates: “Today, on the 5th day of the Kirghis-Kaisak Middle Horde of the Kirey volost, foreman Umir-batyr, on his arrival, announced to him, Captain Ushakov, the Kirghis (Kazakh-aut.) horde Ablai Sultan and foremen Abulfeist and Karabarak, having gathered the troops of the Kirgis (Kazakhs-aut.) up to sixty thousand (60,000 people -aut.) Went to war against the Kirghists living in stone (current Kyrgyz-aut.), the distance from the Chinese by horse riding ten (10-aut.) days, and from our borders by horse riding for thirty (30-aut.) days. But did they really, in such a plural, go to the stony Kyrgyz (the current Kyrgyz-auth.) ... Colonel Ilya Titov» (Archive HAOR, 190:69).

From a report in the old Kazakh language by Aptigirim Apsolimov on June 1, 1774 addressed to Major General Anton Danilovich Skalon about the famous historical figure, 70-year-old Barak Batyr (Kokzhal Barak-author) who died in the war with the Kirghiz, with his army, and about the capture by the Kirghiz (current Kyrgyz-auth.) But many batyrs of Ablai Khan say the heroism of Barak batyr, who fought with the Kyrgyz to the end, despite his age. The death of Kokzhal-Barak batyr during the battle clearly demonstrates the functioning of the incredible and steel heroism of the institution of batyrs of the Kazakh people: «At the same time, I inform your excellency, I was informed of the foreman Barak-batyr of the Kuk-Yaralinsky volost from the Kirghiz that this foreman of his conduct from all uluses, having gathered six thousand troops (6,000 batyrs-auth.), went for war to the so-called wild Kyrgyz (current Kirghiz-auth.), who nailed all the people, including the Evo himself, Barak Batyr...» (Archive HAOR, 190: 618).

Foreign archival data does not always accurately reveal the historical events of that century. For example, from the descriptions of the tribal composition of the three zhuzes, clerk Vasily Sedov wrote that “their khans are not hereditary” and allegedly “no one knows the former khans” and also added that “there is no written history” is a gross historical mistake, or a deliberate distortion of stories of the Kazakh khanate: “And in the Great Horde of khans, they choose from the Kirghiz-Kaisak saltans; and their khan has a residence in Tashkent; now they don’t have a khan, and their khans are not hereditary, but elected, therefore no one knows the former khans, because they don’t have a written history» (HKRS, 2005:304). If the Kazakh khanate (for example, in the Great Horde) has “not hereditary” khans, then why is the term “Chingizids” used in the historiography of the Kazakh people? Why then the Kazakh word "aksuyek" is used as a designation of the aristocracy? This is the legacy of the Khan's power. How does the clerk Vasily Sedov “confidently” “claim” that the Kazakhs do not remember their khans, while the Kazakh khans introduced power between their people if the same people did not know their rulers up to seven tribes? Epics, oral folk tales are proof that at the genetic level, historical memory

is very well developed among the Kazakh people. The same, for example, the Khan of the Great Horde Zholbarys (1690-1740) Khan was a significant figure in the period of formation and development of the Kazakh statehood. If there is no written history, then why was the Chagatai language used in reproduction among the Kazakh people? If there were no written history, how would the descendants of the nomads learn about the genealogy and about “Zheti zhargy”? Judging by the aforementioned data of “well-read” clerks, then history is completely absent among the nomadic people. Unfortunately, this is a clear example of the fact that the history of the defeated countries is written by the colonialists. From time immemorial, the institute of batyrisms among the Kazakh people played a key role in the settlement of the country's military-political situations. And after death, the grave of batyrs is especially revered. We learn about this from the journal of the retinue of His Imperial Majesty, kept by Lieutenant Gaverdovsky in 1803: war is numb from weapons, however, before all the advantage, on the death of which several languid songs about his courage remain in the offspring» (HKRS, 2007: 43).

After the statehood of the militant steppe people was paralyzed by the systematic course of colonial policy, the military institution of batyrs gradually ceased to function. This centuries-old hierarchical military system, after the elimination of the khan's power in 1822 by the “Charter on the Siberian Kirghiz”, acquired a new look in the form of various vassal volosts and foremen, having lost the power of the ancestors of the once glorious sultans and batyrs of the Desht-Kipchak and Golden Horde empires and various powerful empires of the Eurasian space. After many centuries of weakening and fragmentation of the military institution of batyrisms, the colonialists, admiringly, write about their “exploits” and about bloody military campaigns in Central Asia. Thus, he emphasizes the weak defense and how they, with “insignificant means”, occupied and abolished the already non-functioning institute of batyrs in the 19th century: “Military actions to conquer the Turkestan region occupy quite a few glorious pages in the annals of our military past and we can rightly be proud of them our army, especially the Turkestan troops. Being a brilliant example of how enormous results can be achieved with insignificant means ...» (Collection of materials, 1912: 3).

Yes, both in the literal and figurative sense, “insignificant means” destroyed statehood in the guise of khan power, thereby taking away the whole centuries-old era of the institution of the batyrs of the Kazakh people, which dominated the Eurasian space for centuries. From time immemorial, the institute of batyrisms has always had a socio-political significance in the life of the nomadic state of the Great Steppe.

Conclusion. According to historical archival data of the Russian State Military Historical Archive (RGVIA), the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA), the Historical Archive of the Omsk Region (IAOO), the State Archive of the Orenburg Region (GAORO), the Foreign Policy Archive of Russia (AVPR) and the Center. State. archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan (TsGA RK), the features of the functioning of the institute of batyrisms (the institute of heroism) of the Kazakh people from the XVIII to the first half of the XIX century were comprehensively considered in this article. All the above scientific materials contributed, as far as possible, to a deep study of the military nomadic institute of the batyrs of the Kazakh people. Particular attention is paid to the Kazakh-Russian historical relationship. And according to the same historical structure of bilateral official relations, many archival documents concerning the Kazakh-Dzungarian and Kazakh-Chinese military-diplomatic relations have survived to this day.

The institution of batyrs and the highest echelon of power before the tsarist colonization did not know bad habits like smoking, alcoholism, drug addiction, corruption, servility, pedophilia, leaving parents to their fate, and so on. Accordingly, a mentally, genetically and physically healthy nation lived in an ecologically healthy environment, which, without breaking the genetic code for centuries and centuries, preserved and strengthened the institution of batyrs in every Kazakh family. Tsarist colonization caused irreparable damage to the moral, psychophysical, genetic health of the Kazakh people, depriving a significant part of the vast territory and depriving the free and brave steppe people of their identity and self-confidence. Nowhere in the world was the military-political, socio-cultural elite so purposefully destroyed, nowhere in the world was there such a violent de-linguification of the

indigenous population on their own land, as a result of which the national code of the descendants of the Scythians and Huns was gradually and systematically destroyed from year to year.

And also in the article the topic of "arbitrary" acceptance of citizenship of tsarist Russia to the Kazakh rulers was considered. Archival data paid quite special attention to the functionality of the institution of batyrs together with the ruling elite of the Kazakh people. In these vague difficult historical years, it was the institution of batyrs that supported the rulers in the policy of containing counterbalances and the sphere of influence of two huge empires, "voluntarily" "accepting" the citizenship of tsarist Russia and the Qing empires. This military-diplomatic act preserved the independence of the Kazakh people for many decades. On the basis of historical documents, the article also touches upon the personal qualities of khans, sultans and batyrs for the full disclosure of the mental and moral functioning of the institute of batyrism. At all times and in all peoples there is a rise and fall of institutional structures in the history of the state system. The institute of heroism has also passed all the stages of historical testing on the way of preserving the hegemony and integrity of the border of the Kazakh people from century to century. As noted above, according to archival material, some of the de-functioning of the institution of batyrs in the structure of public administration is revealed.

Undoubtedly, the study of the features of the institution of batyrs (the institution of heroism) of the Kazakh people (XVIII-XIX centuries) requires even deeper scientific work. However, on the basis of archival documents, the structure of the institution of batyrs, and their great contribution to the preservation of statehood and the borders of the Kazakh people, were studied in detail with scientific evidence and presented to the reader with full scientific baggage. Over the centuries of its formation, the institute of batyrs was able to absorb the foresight, wisdom, strategic courage and courage of the Kazakh people. This was the main feature of the spiritual core of the centuries-old functionality of the institution of batyrs.

References

- Arkhiv Vneshney Politiki Rossii. AVPR.F.109/1.D.1.L.51 ob. [Archive of the Foreign Policy of Russia. AFPR.F.109/1.C.1.P.51 v] [In Russian]
 AVPR.F.122/1.D.1.L.63
 Istoricheskiy Arkhiv Omskoy Oblasti. IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 66. L.74. [Historical Archive of the Omsk Region. HAOR. F. 1. In. 1. C. 66. P. 74] [In Russian]
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 66. L.74 ob.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 66. L.75.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 16. L.80-80 ob
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 76. L. 188.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 69. L. 78.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 69. L. 78 ob.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 195. L. 636 ob.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 76. L.231.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 170. L. 291 ob.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 170. L. 324.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 170. L. 344.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 190. L. 69.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 212. L.532.
 IAOO. F. 1. Op. 1. D. 190. L. 618.
 Gosudarstvennyy Arkhiv Orenburgskoy Oblasti. GAOrO. F. 5. Op. 1. D. 30. L. 130. [State Archive of the Orenburg Region. SAOR. F. 5. In. 1. C. 30. P. 130] [In Russian]
 Tsentral'nyy Gosudarstvennyy Arkhiv Respubliki Kazakhstan. TSGA RK.F. 2300. Op10. D327.L.884. [Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. CSA RK. F. 2300. In10. C327.P.884] [In Russian]
 Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], Russkiye letopisi i ofitsial'nyye materialy XVI-pervoy chetverti

XVIII v. o narodakh Kazakhstana/Sost., transkriptsiya, kommentariy vstupil'naya stat'ya I.V. Yerofeyevoy.V.2. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2005. – 448 p. [In Russian]

AVPRI. F. 122/1. 1748 g. D. 4. L. 16-20 ob. Opubl.: A. B. Iz istorii Kazakhstana XVIII v. // Krasnyy arkhiv. 1938. № 2 (87). S. 153-156; KRO-1. Dok. № 155. S. 406-407; № 156. S. 407-440

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], Zhurnaly i sluzhebnyye zapiski diplomata A.I.Tevkeleva po istoriy i etnografiy Kazakhstana (1731-1759 gg.) /Sost., transkriptsiya, skoropisi XVIII v., istoriograficheskiy ocherk i kommentarii I.V. Yerofeyevoy. T. 3. – Almaty: Dayk-Press, 2005. – 484 s. [In Russian]

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], P 26, Pervyye istoriko-etnograficheskiye opisaniya kazakhskikh zemel'. XVIII vek./Sost.I.V. Yerofeyeva. V.4. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2007. – 368 p.

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], P 26, Pervyye istoriko-etnograficheskiye opisaniya kazakhskikh zemel'. Pervaya polovina XVIII veka/Sost., I.V. Yerofeyeva, B.T. Zhanayev, V.5. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2007. – 620 p. [In Russian]

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the 16th-20th centuries], P 90 Putevyye dnevniki i sluzhebnyye zapiski o poyezdkakh po yuzhnym kazakhskim stepyam. Pervaya polovina XVIII- XIX veka. / Sost. I.V. Yerofeyeva, B.T. Zhanayev V. 6. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2007. – 516 p.

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], P 64 Potanin G.N. Issledovaniya i materialy / Sostavleniya toma i ukazateley, transkriptsiya tekstov, istoriograficheskiy ocherk Sh.K. Alimgazinova. V.7. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2006. – 600 p. [In Russian]

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the 16th-20th centuries], O-11, O pochotneyshikh i vliyatel'neyshikh ordyntsakh: alfavitnyye, imennyye formulyarnyye i posluzhnyye spiski. 12 noyabrya 1827 g. 9 avgusta 1917 g. T. 8. Chast' 2 / Sost., predisloviye i kommentarii i ukazateli B.T. Zhanayeva. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2006. – 962 p. [In Russian]

Istoriya Kazakhstana v russkikh istochnikakh XVI-XX vekov [History of Kazakhstan in Russian sources of the XVI-XX centuries], N-30, Narodnyye predaniya ob istoricheskikh sobyitiyakh i vydayushchikhsya lyudey Kazakhskoy stepi (XIX-XX vv.) T. 9. Chast' 2 / Sost., S.F. Mazhitov. – Almaty: Dike-Press, 2007. – 500 p. [In Russian]

Kazakhsko-russkiye otnosheniye v XVI-XVIII (Sbornik dokumentov) [Kazakh-russian relations in XVI-XVIII» (Collection of documents)], Tsentral'nyy Arkhiv Kazakhskoy SSR, – Alma-Ata: Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh USSR, 1961. – 739 p. [In Russian]

Rol' nomadov Yevraziyskikh stepey v razvitii mirovogo voyennogo iskusstva [The role of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes in the development of world military art] / Nauchnyye chteniya pamyati N.E.Masanova: Sb. mat-lov mezhd.nauch. konf, Yerofeyeva I.V., Zhanayev B.T., Masanova L.Ye., Almaty: – Izdatel'stvo LEM, 2010. – 400 s.

I.V. Yerofeyeva (Kazakhstan) Institut batyrov v strukture voyennoy organizatsii kazakhov-kochevnikov [Institute of batyrs in the structure of the military organization of Kazakh nomads] – 322 p. [In Russian]

Sbornik materialov dlya Turkestanskogo kraya 1841 god. [Collection of materials for the Turkestan region in 1841]. Tom III., Sost. polkovnik Serebrennikov A.G. – Tashkent: Tip. shtaba Turkest-o voyen. okr., 1912 g. [In Russian]

Tsinskaya imperiya i kazakhskiye khanstva. Vtoraya polovina XVIII – pervaya tret' XIX vv. [Qing Empire and Kazakh Khanates. The second half of the XVIII - the first third of the XIX centuries] / Sostaviteli Khafizova K.SH., Moiseyev V.A. / Vtoroye izdaniye (ispravleno i dopolneno). Institut istorii i etnologii im. Ch.Ch. Valikhanova, Otvet. redaktor Khafizova K.Sh. / Compiled by Khafizova K.Sh., Moiseev V.A. / Second edition (corrected and expanded). – Nur-Sultan, 2020. – 344 p. [In Russian]

Vyatkin M.P. Ocherki po istorii Kazakhskoy SSR s drevneyshikh vremen po 1870g. [Essays on the history of the Kazakh SSR from ancient times to 1870] Tom Pervyy, Akademiya nauk SSSR, Institut istorii i Kazakhstanskiy filial. – Moscow: OGIz Gospolitizdat, 1941. – 368 p. [In Russian]

ҒТАМР 03.20.00

БАТЫРЛАР ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ ФУНКЦИОНАЛДЫҚ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ (XVIII – XIX Ғ.)

О.Б. Қуанбай*

Анкара Университеті, Анкара, Түркия.

*Автор-корреспондент

E-mail: olkub89@gmail.com (Қуанбай)

Аңдатпа. Мақалада XVIII ғасырдан XIX ғасырдың бірінші жартысына дейінгі қазақ халқының батырлар институты ерекшеліктері сипатталған. Сол кезеңнің толық тарихи оқиғалары қарастырыла отырып, мұрағаттық деректері негізінде егжей-тегжейлі зерттеу тақырыбының қыр-сыры ашылады. Батырлар институты – қазақ хандары, сұлтандары мен батырларының өмірі мен қызметінің белгісіз қырларын зерттеуде өте маңызды ғылыми сала болып табылады. Сонымен қатар мақалада қазақ халқының қоғамдық құрылымындағы ерекше орын алатын батырлардың саяси әлеуметтік өмірге қалай араласқандығы мен мән-маңызы зерттеледі. Батырлар институтының ерекшеліктерін тану үшін, сол дәуірлердегі хаттар мен қолжазбалар да ғылыми зерттеу назарынан тыс қалмайды. Мұрағаттық құжаттарда батырлардың мемлекеттік істерді өте шебер жүргізе алатын дипломаттық қабілеттері де анық көрсетіледі. Қазақ халқының батырлық дүниетанымының ұлттық құндылыққа айналуы – тек қазақ халқына тән батырлар институтын қалыптастырды. Батырлардың қазақ тарихындағы орнын зерттеу – қазақ шекарасы мен мемлекеттілігін сақтау мен мығайтуда орасан зор құндылыққы ие екендігі даусыз. Қазақ халқының мемлекеттік құрылымында батырлар институтының маңыздылығы – ғасырлар бойы қазақ халқының Еуразия кеңістігінен ойып тұрып орын алып, территориялық гегемониясын сақтай алғандығымен сипатталады.

Түйін сөздер: Батырлар институты, қазақ хандары, қазақ сұлтандары, баһадүр, батыр, ерлік.

МРНТИ 03.20.00

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ФУНКЦИОНИРОВАНИЯ ИНСТИТУТА БАТЫРСТВА (XVIII – XIX ВВ.)

О.Б. Қуанбай*

Анкарский Университет, Анкара, Турция.

*Корреспондирующий автор

E-mail: olkub89@gmail.com (Қуанбай)

Аннотация. В данной статье описывается особенности функционирования института батырства (институт героизма) казахского народа с XVIII по первой половине XIX вв. Рассматривается полное события того столетия которое детально раскрывается архивными данными. Институт батырства является очень важной научной тематикой для исследования о

неизвестных страницах жизни и деятельности казахских ханов, султанов, батыров. В статье также исследуются роль и значение батыров в политической и общественной жизни, занимающих особое место в социальной структуре казахского народа. В целях тщательного и глубокого познания института батырства так же рассматриваются письма и рукописи тех времен которые позволяет окунуться в мир героев того столетия. Архивные документы также наглядно демонстрируют дипломатические способности батыров, прекрасно умеющих вести государственные дела. Превращение героического мировоззрения казахского народа в национальную ценность сформировало институт батыров, уникально свойственного для казахского народа. Изучение батыров в истории Казахстана очень важно в будущем для сохранения и укрепления границ и государственности. Значение института батыров в государственном устройстве казахского народа характеризуется тем, что на протяжении веков казахский народ сумел сохранять территориальную гегемонию в Евразийском пространстве.

Ключевые слова: Институт батырства, казахские ханы, казахские султаны, бахадур, батыр, героизм.

Information about the author:

^{1*}PhD doctoral student

МАЗМҰНЫ / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENTS

І.Ғ. Ғалымова Арабтілді деректердегі Орталық Азияның этникалық тарихы.....	5
Т.Н. Мухажанова, Г.Е. Сабденова, Д.С. Байгунаков Мажар этномәдениетіндегі түркілік контекст.....	19
А.Р. Хазбулатов, А.И. Ибрагимов Практика сохранения традиционных ремесел в странах Азиатско-Тихоокеанского региона.....	33
Д.Б. Касымова, М.Ч. Калыбекова Казахи в Туркменистане в начале 1930-х гг.: эпизоды противостояния советской власти.....	45
Е.Ш. Ақымбек, М.С. Шагирбаев Талас өңіріндегі ортағасырлық төрткүлдердің зерттелу тарихы.....	58
О.Х. Мұхатова Қазақстанда ХІХ-ХХ ғасырдың бас кезіндегі білім берудің революцияға дейінгі тарихнамасы.....	77
А.Қ. Ахмет, Ғ.А. Шотанова Неплюев училищесінің қазақ түлектері.....	92
Л.С. Динашева, Г.Ж. Примкулова, М.О. Аксой ХІХ ғ. 60-70 жж. патша үкіметінің Оңтүстік Қазақстанда жүргізген қоныс аудару саясаты және көпэтносты құрылымның қалыптасуы.....	105
О.Б. Қуанбай, Н.Н. Құрманалина Қазақ-жоңғар күресі кезеңіндегі тұлғалардың зерттелу мәселелерінен (қазіргі қазақстандық еңбектерде).....	119
С.А. Асанова, А.Т. Капаева Некоторые аспекты истории казахской культуры второй половины ХХ века.....	129
Р.Х. Муртазаева Подготовка женщин-лидеров – неотъемлемый элемент достижения целей развития Узбекистана.....	143
А.Ш. Махаева, О. Чаргынова Түркі халықтарының өзара байланыстарын зерттеудің кейбір мәселелері (ХІХ ғ. екінші жартысы мен ХХ ғ. басы).....	151
З.К. Сураганова, К.К. Сарсембина Ұлы даланың есте қалдыру мәдениеті шеңберіндегі қымызға қатысты мерекелер, рәсімдер мен ғұрыптардың символдық қоры.....	163
Қ.Қ. Жылқышыбаева, А.Т. Жағыпар Қазақ қоғамындағы әйелдердің әлеуметтік және саяси ролі.....	177

О. Кuanбай Features of functioning of the institution of kazakh batyrs (XVIII – XIX c.).....	192
Д.М. Иноятова Меннониты в Туркестане: процессы диаспоризации.....	205
Soner Saglam, Yashar Sozen Consideration of the concept of criticism as a social theme in Jambyl Jabayev's poems.....	218
Ә.Ә. Тәжекеев, Ы.С. Құрманязов, Е. Каналхан ЖЕТІАСАР ЕСКЕРТКІШТЕРІ ӨЛКЕТАНУШЫ ҒАЛЫМДАРДЫҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІ МЕН РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ КАРТОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНДА (XIX ғ. аяғы – XX ғ. басы).....	230

Редакцияның мекен-жайы:

050010, Қазақстан Республикасы

Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28,

ҚР БҒМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты

«edu.e-history.kz» журналының редакциясы

Телефон: +7 (727) 261-67-19

E-mail: edu.history@bk.ru

Электрондық мекен-жайы: www.edu.e-history.kz

Журнал 2013 жылдан бастап шығады.

Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2014 ж. 29 қазанында тіркеліп, № 14602-ИА куәлігіне ие болды.