

Maidanali Z.¹Malinovskaya R. V.²

*¹Ph.D., Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University; Almaty, Kazakhstan,
E-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru*

*² undergraduate, 7M01602 - history-geography, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University; Almaty city,
Kazakhstan E-mail: gina.malinovskaya@gmail.com*

TEACHING AND STUDYING THE HISTORY OF THE GOLDEN HORDE (based on historical literature of the 19th century)

Abstract

The article presents a historiographical analysis of the development of nomadic state and imperial traditions and institutions of the Golden Horde. The evolution and transformation of the historical views of European and Russian researchers within the framework of formational and civilizational approaches is very similar, because it has gone from an opinion about the static nature of nomadic society to the creation of theories about a special development path and the exclusive influence of neighboring settled agricultural peoples. Considering various approaches and trends in studying the nature of the Golden Horde state and imperial institutions, the researcher comes to the conclusion that most of the historical research comes from a complex and structurally differentiated political organization and the continuity of its management traditions in the system of power and rule of the nomad Khanates and the Muscovite state. The development of modern scientific knowledge has shown that progress is impossible without taking into account scientific methodology and the goal of historical science is to debunk all kinds of myths in the scientific community in order to create a critical, organic history. Such complex changes strengthen interdisciplinary links and analytical study of the development of the general process of the nomadic statehood of Eurasia based on new methodology and systemic methods

Keywords: teaching, statehood, evolution, power, empire, scientific paradigms, continuity

Майданали З.¹, Малиновская Р.В.²

*¹т.ғ.к., доцент, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті; Алматы қ., Қазақстан,
E-mail: zeremmm@mail.ru*

*²магистрант, 7M01602 – тарих-география, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық
университеті; Алматы қ., Қазақстан,
E-mail: gina.malinovskaya@gmail.com*

АЛТЫН ОРДА ТАРИХЫН ОҚЫТУ ЖӘНЕ ЗЕРТТЕУ (ғылыми тарихи еңбектерінің негізінде)

Аңдатпа

Мақалада Алтын Ордада көшпелі мемлекеттік және империялық дәстүрлер мен институттарының даму мәселелеріне тарихнамалық сараптама жасалған. Еуропалық және ресей зерттеушілердің тарихи көзқарастардың формациялық және өркениеттік әдістер шеңберіндегі эволюциясы мен трансформациясы өте ұқсас, себебі бұл үрдістер көшпелілер қоғамының статикалық сипаты туралы пікірден бастап ерекше даму жолдары бар және шекаралас отырықшы-егінші халықтардың күшті әсері туралы теорияларыдың қалыптасуында болса керек. Алтын Орданың мемлекеттік және империялық жаратылысы туралы әртүрлі әдістерді қарастыра отырып зерттеуші тарихи ізденістердің көпшілігі саяси ұйымдастырудың күрделілігі және құрылымдық өзгешіліктері туралы көшпелі хандықтар және Мәскеу мемлекетіндегі басқарудың үзілмеген жалғастығы болғаны туралы қорытындыға келеді. Бұл мәселеде, ең алдымен зерттеудің прогресивті ортасы ретінде пәнаралық диалогты дамыту өзектілігі анықталды. Ғылыми білім дамуының заманауи үрдістері көрсеткендей ғылыми әдіснама талаптарына сәйкес зерттеулер ғана өз жемісін бермек, сондықтан тарих ғылымыны мақсаты қайдағы бір мифтерді әшкерелеп, сыни және сәйкестелген тарихи орта қалыптастыруда болса керек. Бұндай кешенді өзгерістер пәнаралық

байланыстарлы нығайтуды және Еуразия кеңістігіндегі көшпелі мемлекеттілік-тің жалпы тарихи үдерісін жүйелі әдіс – тәсілдер мен жаңа методология негізінде зерделеуді дамыта түседі.

Кілт сөздер: оқыту, мемлекеттілік, эволюция, билік, империя, ғылыми парадигмалар, сабақтастық .

Майданали З.¹ Малиновская Р.В.²

¹к.и.н., доцент, *Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан*

E-mail: zereemmm@mail.ru, к.и.н.

²магистрант, 7М01602 –история-география, *Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан*

E-mail: gina.malinovskaya@gmail.com

ПРЕПОДАВАНИЕ И ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ИСТОРИИ ЗОЛОТОЙ ОРДЫ КАК ИСТОЧНИКА ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫХ И ИМПЕРСКИХ ТРАДИЦИЙ (на основе исторической литературы XIX в.)

Аннотация

В статье представлен историографический анализ проблем развития кочевых государственных и имперских традиций и институтов Золотой Орды. Эволюция и трансформация исторических взглядов европейских и российских исследователей в рамках формационного и цивилизационного подходов очень схожа, ведь она прошла путь от мнения о статичном характере общества кочевников до создания теорий об особом пути развития и исключительном влиянии соседних оседлоземледельческих народов. Рассматривая различные подходы и тенденции в изучении природы золотоордынских государственных и имперских институтов, исследователь приходит к выводу, что большинство исторических изысканий исходят из сложной и структурно дифференцированной политической организации и преемственности ее традиций управления в системе власти и властвования как кочевых ханств, так и Московского государства. Развитие современного научного знания показало, что прогресс невозможен без учета научной методологии и цель исторической науки в развенчании всякого рода мифов в научной среде для создания критичной, органичной истории. Такие комплексные изменения укрепляют междисциплинарные связи и аналитическое исследование развития общего процесса кочевой государственности Евразии на основе новой методологии и системных методов.

Ключевые слова: преподавание, государственность, эволюция, власть, империя, научные парадигмы, преемственность.

Introduction.

The scientific approach to the problems of the history of the Golden Horde is based on a system analysis that develops toward a synergistic paradigm and historical research. This methodology presents many current issues from new theoretical and methodological positions and, in some cases, speculative reconstructions of little-studied historical and ethnocultural events and phenomena. Based on the documentary dimension, conceptual and contextual methods are developed. The analysis of these sources by contemporary scholars reveals a synthesis of two opposing perspectives—classical historical tradition and innovative view. The social dimension of historical development analysis is a novel, unconventional method of comprehending events and processes. It involves layering, gradation, and a three-dimensional presentation of a historical perspective, which serves to increase interest in diverse societal issues, reevaluate long-held beliefs, and identify different forces that have influenced society's history. From this perspective, the Golden Horde's history is fascinating since it represents the first fusion of the settled agricultural and nomadic societies of the Eurasian empire. Such state formations as the AkOrda, the Kazan Khanate, the Crimean Khanate, the Nogai Horde, the Kazakh Khanate, and the Muscovite State, which emerged in the very center of the realm of the Golden Horde, are its immediate descendants in terms of ethno politics, ideology, and culture.

Methods of research.

The analysis of the teaching and studying Golden Horde's history and its interactions with settled agricultural peoples, as well as the identification of the dynamics and continuity of these processes, is a directed process that is organized and managed in accordance with historically accepted methodological

requirements and guidelines. The idea of alternative historical development has become deeply ingrained in the practice of historical science, and contemporary research methodologies demonstrate its scientific productivity. Sociological theories define the state as a unique kind of social organization that has specific ways of exercising power within society, establishing a certain hierarchy of social relationships inside a given territory, and including the entire population within that region in its operations. According to contemporary researchers, the issue of the creation of the ulus system or the design of the administrative-territorial division of the Mongol Empire is a decisive factor in both socio-economic and ethnic processes throughout Eurasia, of which Muscovy eventually became a part.

Features in teaching the history of the Golden Horde.

Speaking about the issues of teaching the history of the Golden Horde, it is important for the teacher to choose the methods of selection and presentation of material. In Soviet times, for example, the study of the history of Kazakhstan was one-sided, ideological. Basically, it was considered in the context of the History of the USSR, therefore, special attention was paid to the events that took place after the October Revolution. The situation of Soviet historical science worsened the Decree of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks "On the state and measures to improve mass-political and ideological work in the Tatar Party organization", issued on August 9, 1944, where the main attention was paid to the role of Ulug Ulus - the Golden Horde in the history of the peoples of the USSR. In fact, the decree implied an official ban on studying the history of the Golden Horde: in the textbooks of that time, the Golden Horde state was presented as "predatory and parasitic", and the folk epic "Idegey" was recognized as reactionary and banned.

After gaining independence, there was a need to rethink the issues of national history, to prepare new scientific studies and textbooks departing from the previous ideology. At present, the special significance of the Golden Horde period in the formation of Kazakh statehood has been noted, therefore, its study and teaching should be approached carefully and comprehensively. When selecting educational material, the teacher needs to take into account the existing pluralism of opinions about this historical period, be aware of current trends and approaches both in research and in teaching methods, and also be able to show the importance of the Golden Horde period not only within the framework of national history, but also in the context of world historical development.

Conclusion.

You should consult the writings of eminent figures in Russian historical science, scientific paradigms, and conclusions of the luminaries of Russian historical science if you have questions about the origins of Russian statehood and autocracy and the impact of the first synthesis empire in the Eurasian reaches of the Golden Horde on this complex process. In his analysis of the historical empires, G.V. Vernadsky states that "Russian civilization and culture was gradually saturated with the beginnings, on the one hand, of the Byzantine civilization and culture, on the other hand, of the civilization and culture of the steppe nomads, adopting from their clothing and, a song and a fairy tale, a military system and way of thinking" [1, . 236]. Following the path of comparative analysis and drawing analogies, the author refers to the history of the existing empires, thus following his conclusions, he determines: "The duty of Rome and Byzantium, which was to unite the cultures of the West and the East, the agricultural culture of the sea and the culture of the nomadic steppe, was transferred to the Mongol Empire at the start of the XIII century following the fall of the Byzantine Empire. The agricultural-marine system of the Mediterranean region's center of civilization and the nomadic steppe culture served as the foundation for the Roman Empire and, subsequently, the Byzantine Empire. China, on the one hand, and the regions that made up the Byzantine Empire (Asia Minor, the Caucasus, the Crimea, and the Balkans), on the other hand, had already been conquered by the Mongol Empire." [1, p. 237]. In order to model the transcontinental empires' political and societal influence on the conquered countries, he draws attention to the geopolitical space that they occupied. G.V. Vernadsky uses the Mongol Empire as an example to summarize his thoughts on "nomadic empires" and draws the following conclusion: "Due to the central position of the Mongol core of the empire and its control over internal lines of communication, the stability of the empire depended to a great extent on its own integration of this zone. Actually, the Central Asian region served as the Mongol feudal policy's proving ground, which was detrimental to imperial unity » [1, p. 236].

According to Alfred Rieber, "Empires are state institutions in which one ethnic group establishes and maintains power over other ethnic groups within the bounds of a specific territory" [2, c. 39]. Modern theories draw comparisons between the history of continental empires. The imperial system, according to the author, is composed of a number of symbols, institutions, and physical linkages that determine the authority of the king and the ruling class. The author focuses on three situations: the concepts of power became part of moral and religious ideas; they were associated with traditions and myths, and the language

of politics transformed them into tangible symbols and written texts. As a result of the development of historical thought, the imperial idea was personified by the image of the ruler. Power was interwoven with myths and stories and assimilated into moral or religious ideas. Contemporary literature shows that managing borders within empires was not a simple process. The stages of the empire's development under the influence of the Byzantine-Orthodox, Norman-Pagan, Roman-Latin, steppe, and Islamic civilizations are shown by Andreas Kappeler in the article "Formation of the Russian Empire in the XV-XVIII centuries: the legacy of Russia, Byzantium, and the Horde" [3, p.95].

The evolution of historical philosophy has had an impact on how events are depicted and, to some extent, how public opinion and worldview are formed. The issue of the formation of the Russian state is a topic covered in historical literature from the 18th and 19th century. They provide information on historical events' influences on the general audience as well as their chronological progression in their historical works. The governor of Astrakhan, V.N. Tatishchev, gives a fairly thorough account of Russian history. According to him, the Russian autocracy lasted from "Ryurik to Monomakh," after which the aristocracy took control and the Tatars seized control of everything, and the Lithuanians captured several lands. Furthermore, the Tatar ideals have influenced the state for more than 200 years. According to him, the Varangians are where the history of the autocracy's unrestricted power began. The time when the aristocracy rose to power undermined the centripetal forces, which led to the state's weakness and the formation of a foreign power, including "Tatar power" [4, p. 366-367].

In N.M. Karamzin, we can also find the conventional model for the rise of authoritarianism. He also points out that in ancient Kievan Rus, the elements for the formation of autocracy were present. The first historian to comment on the impact of the so called Tatar-Mongol invasion on the development of the Moscow autocracy was N.M. Karamzin. According to his definitions, there were "positive outcomes" along with the invasion of Batu, the inferno and mountains of dead bodies, the long-term continuation of the yoke and slavery, and the period of enormous deterioration. When the Muscovite state was forming, N.M. Karamzin [5, p. 235, 233] observed these results. The historian underlines that it was "due to the khans" that the revival of Moscow, the strengthening of the church's position, and the reduction in the dominance of the city's wealthy were made possible. According to him, the great dukes' coffers were cleverly restocked by the per capita and other taxes that were collected while the Tatar yoke was in place. In the theses of N.M. Karamzin, we read an unbiased evaluation of the impact of the Golden Horde on the development of the Russian state and the transformation of Moscow into its capital. This stance could also be supported by the historian's origin. The following can be found in the biographical profile of the "History of the Russian State," which was written and published in St. Petersburg in 1819: "The Karamzin's descend from the Tatar prince Karamurza, who was in the service of the tsar" [5, p.3]. The Golden Horde's contribution to the establishment of Russian statehood is no longer acknowledged and is even ignored in the writings of the following generation of Russian historians. S.M. Soloviev, a historian of the 19th century, contrasts his conceptual findings with those of N.M. Karamzin. The "Tatar-Mongol invasion" is left out of the periods of Russian history in his historical writings. "When the Baskaks withdrew, the counts and tax collectors, the princes, entirely liberated themselves from the influence of the Tatars and began to act at their own discretion," summarizes S.M. Solovyov in support of his position. There are no indications of this impact, and even under the Baskaks, their influence on internal administration was negligible [6, p. 489]. He believed that the internal, autonomous dynamics in Russian society's growth were responsible for the transition from tribal to state relations and the establishment of the Muscovite state. Geographical relationships played a crucial role in this process, which is where S.M. Solovyova's historical paradigm derives from. According to the researcher's historical reconstruction, Russian sovereignty started to take shape on the banks of the Moscow River in the XII and XIII centuries. The expansion in the population, the number of Moscow princes, and the growth of monies raised from the populace for the sake of resettling people and enhancing regional security all contributed to the unification of all of northeastern Russia [6, p. 650-651].

The names of D.I. Ilovaisky, N.Ya. Danilevsky, K.N. Bestuzheva-Ryumin, N.I. Vasilevsky, and V.O. Klyuchevsky are linked to the next phase of Russian historical philosophy. Therefore, Moscow princes are emblems of the monarchical state for D.I. Ilovaisky's "collectors of Russia." The theoretical conclusions of the historian, according to which "the political ingenuity of the Moscow princes in connection to the Golden Horde propelled them to the fore. The Golden Horde had a profound impact on the political system of the Russian state and the national identity of the Russian people [7, p. 6]. Here, you can see how well D.I. Ilovaisky and N.M. Karamzin's conceptual provisions align.

N.Y. Danilevsky defends the idea that every people have had an own historical trajectory. According to the historian, the "Tatar-Mongol invasion" stopped Russia's ultimate disintegration, and the Moscow princes' deeds thwarted the conquerors' plans [8, p.281]. K.N. Bestuzheva-Ryumin shares the same opinions as the aforementioned authors. He also underlines how the Golden Horde had an impact on Russian history. The historian concludes that the Tatars' importance cannot be disputed because we long relied on their assistance in our diplomatic efforts with other Eastern nations; they also borrowed heavily from the Eastern system in terms of management, particularly in the financial sector; and there are still signs of Tatar military tradition in the realm of armed conflict. He also makes reference to Roman emperors' history and experience while disputing the idea that royal authority derives directly from the state customs of the Golden Horde [9, p. 531]. In his book "Tatar effect on the Russian embassy ceremonial," the renowned orientalist N.I. Veselovsky makes the following observation: throughout the Moscow period of Russian history, the embassy ceremony was entirely Tatar, or rather Asian in origin. This was made easier by the fact that the Russian princes had diplomatic contacts solely with the Golden Horde and were thus compelled to comply with their demands, or else regarded them so highly as though they had been made up by the khans. The Nikon record described all of these ceremonies. According to the chronicle, each person at a meeting as a sign of respect should get off his horse, only people equal to each other could remain in the saddle. This ceremonial of the nomadic people was adopted by the Russian princes [10, p. 1-2].

The scientific legacy of V.O. Klyuchevsky made a lasting impression and was instrumental in the advancement of Russian historical philosophy [11, p.41]. He attributes Moscow's function as a gatherer of Russian territories chiefly to its physical location. According to the historian, because Moscow was encircled by Russian territory on all sides, it had less riot-related troubles than other nations. Due to its strategic location at the intersection of trade routes, Moscow experienced fast economic growth, which resulted in the consolidation of significant wealth in the hands of the Moscow princes and the growth of their power. The influence of Golden Horde tradition and heritage on the political system was not given much weight by Klyuchevsky. He believed that the Golden Horde's khans did not impose their own laws and were content with collecting taxes, tributes, and duties rather than placing much value on internal commands. The Moscow lords' economic and geographic advantages contributed to the rise of the "great Russian civilization" and the development of their genealogical belief in their ancestry [11, p.42.47]. In his conclusions, V.O. Klyuchevsky underlines that the "Tatar yoke," an external element that prevented internal turmoil and foreign attacks and helped to develop and expand territory, was a factor that was there when the Muscovite state was founded [11, p. 396]. The study of historical phenomena begins with a study of the significance of events and processes based on the cause-and-effect foundations of these processes due to the objective appeal of scientific ideas to historical facts. History is "both a science and an art at the same time" D.I. Ilovaisky underlined [7, p.5]. The historical paradigms that developed in the Russian Empire of the 19th century not only changed the course of history, but they also had some influence on how people formed their worldviews and opinions. According to D.I. Ilovaisky [7, p.6] historical thought not only lengthens historical memory but also serves as a unifying element for difficult situations throughout time eras. History also looks to understand the principles and underpinnings of life as well as the evolution of civilization.

The conflict between "Normanists" and "Anti-Normanists" is one of the fundamental issues in Russian history. The origin of the word "Rus," the Kievan dynasty, and the state's fundamental nature as a democratic institution are the primary issues that divide these two currents. M.A. Alpatov makes the following hypothesis in light of these historical viewpoints: "The battle of the Normanists and anti-Normanists of the 19th century became the struggle of two monarchical ideologies..." [12, p.12]. If D.I. Ilovaisky was a Normanist, then notable Russian historians like N.M. Karamzin, S.M. Solovyov, V.O. Klyuchevsky, and others would have supported the Normanists. Therefore, D. I. Ilovaisky emphasized that monarchy is the origin of Russian history and that the birth of ancient Russia does not accord with the Norman idea. Russian monarchy developed in a distinctive manner that is unique to Russian history. The assertions of D.I. Ilovaisky that the Moscow princes were the unifying force of Russia have come to symbolize the monarchical idea of Russian history, as defined by Academician A.M. Sakharov [13, p.165].

The scientist focused on the historical significance of Russian collectors like Ivan Kalita in his publications. The way he expresses his ideas is as follows: "Kalita completely recognized Uzbek Khan, using the Tatars to bolster Moscow while receiving gifts. He claimed the authority to manage the princes' payment of taxes and tributes, as well as to organize their delivery to the Horde. Through the power of money, he peacefully increased the size of his principality. He bought cities, towns, and sometimes entire villages from impoverished princes [14, p.183]. Thus, the political adaptability of the Moscow princes in their dealings with the Horde combines the historical evaluations of N.M. Karamzin and D.I. Ilovaisky. The

author acknowledges that the so-called Tatar-Mongol (Golden Horde) played a vital influence in political development and the creation of national identity. He believed that Russia's inferior status in regard to the Golden Horde's rulers was chiefly evident by its high fees and taxes. The right to collect taxes from the Russian lands was then passed to the Moscow princes, and the Baskak tax collectors from the Golden Horde withdrew as a result of their rising resistance to the Golden Horde administration [14, p.4]. D.I. Ilovaisky states the following about the conflict and struggle between Moscow and Novgorod: "Because Novgorod could not establish a strong power, internal riots increased, and subsequent historical development led to the destruction of Veliky Novgorod and the destruction of Veche - the general assembly".

Exploring the stages of strengthening the role of Moscow, the historian points to the following stages [14, p.4] :

1. Convenient geographical location
2. Great Russian people
3. Spiritual power and cohesion of the boyars
4. The presence of a number of talented individuals
5. Support and assistance to the Golden Horde
6. Limited number of people in the princely rank
7. Approval of the new order of succession to the throne
8. Weakness of neighboring princes due to their fragmentation

As can be seen from these points, the scientist underlines the impact of the Golden Horde on the historical process of establishing Moscow while also noting the ideal geographic location of Moscow, paying attention to ethnic traits, and giving historical figures a significant role. It should also be mentioned that his theory is an expanded version of S.M. Solovyov's [6, p.650-651]. "On the Geographic Position of Moscow" and N.M. Karamzin's "On State Force". The researcher highlights the following pattern when looking at the time of the Golden Horde's demise: "Famous rulers and murzas transferred large farms and entire cities to the ownership of Russian princes, which obliged them to always come to protect property and at the same time protect the borders of principalities from any encroachment within these territories. By pointing out the widespread use of Golden Horde management techniques on the territory of the Russian princes, D.I. Ilovaisky describes the union of the foundations of the Russian aristocracy and the ruling circles of the Golden Horde. Religion-related issues and the function of the Orthodox Church hold a significant place in his studies. The move of the Russian Orthodox Church's administrative center from Vladimir to Moscow, which became a major factor in the further political development of the Moscow Principality, was started by Ivan Kalita. This procedure contributed to the consolidation of Russian regions by acting as a unifying force. In turn, the Russian Orthodox Church's capital city aided in boosting the principality of Moscow's political stature and importance. According to D.I. Ilovaisky [14, p.4]. "Moscow princes started using strong spiritual weapons against other princes as a "church ban. He recounts the following fact: Prince Dmitry obtains Sergius of Radonezh's benediction upon his arrival at the Trinity Lavra on the eve of the Battle of Kulikovo. The author claims that the Battle of Kulikovo gave the Moscow dynasty of grand dukes more prestige and glory. The historian makes use of Russian chronicles to describe and characterize this conflict (Novgorod, Sofia, Voskresenskaya, Nikonovskaya). On the one hand, this made it possible for D.I. Ilovaisky to securely bind his historical notion of the characteristics and the founding of Russian statehood while simultaneously excluding the opposing viewpoints.

The author also wrote about the Russian areas' possession of the Lithuanian principality and made comparisons between the Golden Horde and Lithuania's sovereignty. The inhabitants of Russian regions eagerly supported the power of the Principality of Lithuania as a means of releasing Russia from the rule of the Golden Horde after D.I. Ilovaisky's [14, p.4] analytical hypothesis. Prince Gedemin didn't meddle with the internal workings and didn't stop Orthodox religious leaders from observing customary church holidays. Gedemin chose the Lithuanian city of Vilna as the capital of his realms because he had the title of Grand Duke of Lithuania and Russia. Orthodoxy was prevalent in these possessions because the majority of them were Russian lands, according to D.I. Ilovaisky. The fact that "the descendants of the Lithuanian boyars clung to the Eastern tradition of the Christian faith" can be attributed to Gedemin's dynastic ties to the house of the Great Vladimir and the expansion of the Christian Church's influence in Lithuania. The union of the Lithuanian prince Jagiello and the daughter of the Hungarian monarch Jadwiga, who started to promote the Catholic faith, stopped the later gradual rapprochement and unification of the populations of Lithuania and Russia. Thus, we are able to study the historical processes of Russian science and, in the second half of the XIX centuries, its distinctive qualities and features thanks to the theoretical and conceptual conclusions of D.I. Ilovaisky.

As this brief overview has shown, statehood is a measure of the progress and prosperity of society, but it is also the ideology, political, social, and cultural orientation of that society that guides the preservation and growth of the state. The revealing of the origins of sociopolitical changes and the transformation of the political descendants of the Golden Horde has been made possible by a variety of contemporary perspectives and viewpoints. We determine the need for specialized scientific research with regard to the issues of power and domination in the region of Eurasia, the synthesis and transformation of the political, ideological, and cultural heritage of the Golden Horde, represented not only by the Turkic state formations (Ak Orda, the Kazan Khanate, the Crimean Khanate, the Nogai Horde, the Kazakh Khanate), but also the Muscovite State – the Russian Empire.

The nature of evolutionary changes in the nomadic setting, yet in the presence of frequent connections with urban cultures, is highlighted by various accents and nuances of study activity. And because most nomadic civilizations had the rudiments of a state, the push toward statehood, having gained the requisite encouragement, was easily effective. Despite the disparities in the results obtained, this group of researchers shares the belief that nomadic societies had internal forces capable of forming states, even those as synthetic and syncretic as the Golden Horde and its successors, the Ak Orda, the Kazakh Khanate, and the Muscovite state. However, it is undeniable that the emphasis in scientific approaches is on the primary role of external influence, which serves as the starting point and catalyst. It should be mentioned that the research effort has such a property where even conflicting ideas may not exclude one another but rather function as a complement and display the growth of conceptual frameworks and refined methodological approaches. At the present stage of development of our society, the requirements for the study of history have especially increased, the degree of scientific character of the historical picture, the adequacy of our ideas about the past, as well as the effectiveness and extent of their impact on the formation of the historical consciousness of society depends on the language of the historian.

References:

1. Vernadsky G.V. *Mongolskoye igov russkoy istorii // Oput istorii Evrazii. Zvenia russkoy kul'tury*. Moskva, 2005.
2. Riber A. *Rossiyskaya imperia v sravnitel'noy perspektive // Sravnivaya kontinental'nyye imperii*. Moskva, 2004.
3. Kappeler A. *Formirovaniye Rossiyskoy imperii v XV-XVIII veka: nasledstvo Rusi, Vizantii, Ordy // Sravnivaya kontinental'nyye imperii*. Moskva, 2004.
4. Tatischev V.N. *Istoriya Rossiyskaya*. Moskva, T. 1. 1796.
5. Karamzin N.M. *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiyskogo*. SPb., 1819.
6. Soloviev S.M. *Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshih vremen. Kn. II*, Moskva, 1960.
7. Il'ovayskiy D.I. *Istoriya Rossii*. Moskva, 1876.
8. Danilevskiy N.Y. *Rossia i Evropa*. SPb., 1888.
9. Bestuzhev-Rumin K. *Russkaya istoria*. SPb., T. I. 1872.
10. Veselovskiy N.I. *Tamarskoe vliyaniye narusskiy posolskiy ceremonial. V Moskovskiy period istorii*. SPb., 1911.
11. Kluchevskiy V.O. *Sochineniya v 9-ti .T.2.. tomah*. Moskva, 1987-1990.
12. Alpatov M.A. *Russkaya istoricheskaya misl' I Zapadnaya Evropa XII – XIV vv*. Moskva, 1973.
13. Saharov A.M. *Istoriografiya SSSR. Dosovetskiy period*. Moskva, 1978.
14. Il'ovayskiy D.I. *Ocherki tekhstvennoy istorii*. Moskva, 1995.

Список использованной литературы:

1. Вернадский Г.В. *Монгольское иго в русской истории // Опыт истории Евразии. Звенья русской культуры* Москва, 2005.
2. Рибер А. *Российская империя, в сравнительной перспективе // Сравнивая континентальные империи* Москва, 2004.
3. Каппелер А. *Сравнивая континентальные империи // Формирование Российской империи в XV-XVIII века: наследство Руси, Византии и Орды*. Москва, 2004.
4. Татищев В.Н. *История Российская*. Т. 1. Москва, 1796.
5. Карамзин Н.М. *История государства Российского*. СПб., 1819.
6. Соловьев С.М. *История России с древнейших времен. Кн. II*, Москва, 1960.
7. Иловайский Д.И. *История России*. Москва. 1876.
8. Данилевский Н.Я. *Россия и Европа*. СПб. 1888.

9. Бестужев-Рюмин К. Русская история. СПб., Т.1. 1872.
10. Веселовский Н.И. Татарское влияние на русский посольский церемониал. В Московский период русской истории. СПб., 1911.
11. Ключевский В.О. Сочинения в 9-ти томах. Т.2. Москва, 1987-1990.
12. Алпатов М.А. Русская историческая мысль и Западная Европа XII – XIV вв. Москва, 1973.
13. Сахаров А. М. Историография СССР. Досоветский период. Москва, 1978.
14. Иловайский Д.И. Очерки отечественной истории. Москва, 1995.