

Иманбекова А.А.¹

*¹Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, кафедра археологии, этнологии и музеологии, PhD, старший преподаватель
e-mail Imanbekova.alfiya@gmail.com*

ТРАДИЦИОННОЕ ХОЗЯЙСТВО НОМАДОВ И ПРОБЛЕМА ПОНЯТИЙНО-КАТЕГОРИАЛЬНОГО ИНСТРУМЕНТАРИЯ

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается понятийно-категориальный аппарат скотоводства и кочевничества. Терминология является ключевым вопросом в любой науке в том числе и в этнологической. Автор поднимает актуальные проблемы уточнения некоторых понятий традиционного хозяйства номадов, которые используют термины - синонимы, а иногда разные по значению дефиниции.

Дискуссия была поставлена в советской этнографической науке в конце 70 – х начале 80 – х гг. XX в., предметом дискуссии стали такие термины как: «скотоводство», «кочевничество», «кочевое скотоводство», «оседлое скотоводство», типы, виды и формы и др. Однако развернувшаяся дискуссия так и не получила окончательного однозначного решения и вопрос остается открытым по сей день.

Ключевые слова: традиционное хозяйство, скотоводство, номадизм, кочевое скотоводство, кочевники, номады, оседлость, бродяжничество, полуседлость, полубродячий, хозяйственная деятельность.

А.А. Иманбекова¹

*¹ал-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті Археология, этнология және музеология кафедрасы, PhD, аға оқытушы
e-mail Imanbekova.alfiya@gmail.com*

КӨШПЕНДІЛЕРДІҢ ДӘСТҮРЛІ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҒЫ ЖӘНЕ ҰҒЫМДЫҚ-КАТЕГОРИЯЛЫҚ СИПАТТАУ МӘСЕЛЕСІ

Аңдатпа

Мақалада мал шаруашылығы мен көшпеліліктің ұғымдық-тұжырымдамаларындағы анықтамалар мәселесі қарастырылады. Терминология кез-келген ғылымда, соның ішінде этнологияда да маңызды мәселенің бірі. Автор мақаласында түрлі терминдер мен синонимдердің және мағынасы жағынан түрлі дефинициялық терминдерді қолдана отырып, дәстүрлі көшпенділер шаруашылығының кейбір ұғымдарын нақтылаудың өзекті мәселелерін көтеріп отыр. Әсіресе, XX ғасырдың 70-ші жылдардың аяғы мен 80-ші жылдардың басындағы кеңестік этнографиялық ғылымдағы «мал шаруашылығы», «көшпенділік», «көшпелі мал шаруашылығы», «отырықшы мал шаруашылығы», типтері, түрлері мен формалары және т. б. мәселелер қарастырылады. Дегенменде, термин мәселелері әлі күнге дейін өзінің жауабын таппай тұрған проблемалардың бірі болып отырғаны анық.

Түйін сөздер: дәстүрлі шаруашылық, мал шаруашылығы, номадизм, көшпелі мал шаруашылығы, көшпенділер, номадтар, отырықшылық, кезбелік, жартылай отырықшы, жартылай көшпелі, шаруашылық қызмет.

Imanbekova A.A.¹

*¹Kazakh National University al-Farabi Department of Archeology, Ethnology and Museology,
PhD, Senior Lecturer
e-mail Imanbekova.alfiya@gmail.com*

TRADITIONAL NOMADIC ECONOMY AND ISSUE OF CONCEPTUAL AND CATEGORICAL APPARATUS

Annotation

The article tells about the conceptual and categorical apparatus of cattle breeding and nomadism. The terminology is a key issue in any science, including ethnology. The author pays attention to the actual

issues of clarifying some concepts of the traditional nomad economy, which use synonymous terms and sometimes-different definitions.

The debate was raised in the Soviet ethnographic science in the late 70s and early 80s of 20th c., the discussion scope were terms such as: "cattle breeding", "nomadism", "pastoral nomadism", "sedentary pastoralism", types, kinds, and forms and etc. However, the enlarged discussion has not received a final unambiguous solution and the issue remains open to this day.

Key words: traditional economy, cattle breeding, nomadism, nomadic pastoralism, nomads, sedentism, vagrancy, semi-sedentism, semi-wandering, economic activity.

Introduction. The conceptual and categorical apparatus is a debatable general theoretical problem in nomadism, and today the historiographic study of this issue shows the unresolvedness and relevance in historical science. Conceptual maturity of science is determined by the quality of terminology elaboration. Animal husbandry and definitions related to nomadism are not uniform. This is one of the most significant theoretical and methodological problems in nomadic studies.

As it is known, a theory is a system of generalized, reliable knowledge that interprets and explains the field of research, giving it conceptual support and developing terminology.

The structural elements of the theory are concepts, principles, laws, and axioms. Since concepts reflect the subject in its essential features, they act as one of the initial foundations of any theory, since the theoretical understanding of historical phenomena and events is carried out primarily thanks to concepts. The famous Soviet ethnographer Yu.V. Bromley noted that being a generalized result of cognition of reality, essential properties, connections and relationships of objects and phenomena, concepts fixed in terms are the most important tool of scientific research [1, p.69].

A theory adequately reflects the historical reality, it must be based on an ideal conceptual apparatus. The linguistic expression of a concept is a term that must be the exact designation of a certain concept and have an unambiguous content and scope. A theoretical system must be internally consistent, this is the most important criterion for its scientific character. Therefore, a term cannot have synonyms, it must not be ambiguous, one cannot call different phenomena with one term, one and the same phenomenon with different terms. Since a concept fixed in a term is an important tool for any scientific research, the development of a conceptual and terminological apparatus is a necessary indicator of the methodological maturity of any science.

Yu.V. Bromley noted that the interpretation of the content of many ethnographic terms still causes discrepancies between specialists. Proceeding from the fact that in any theoretical system the most important role belongs to its concepts, which constitute, as it were, the supporting nodes of this system, it seems necessary ... to pay special attention to the conceptual and terminological apparatus, he considered it necessary to clarify and unify ethnographic concepts, and sometimes introduce new terms [2, p.7].

Research methodology. The work was based on the principle of historicism, and used the method of scientific knowledge, objectivity, mainly problem-chronological, perspective, comparative-historical and comparative methods are used. The work uses such modern research methods as a systematic approach that allows you to restore the general features of a nomadic cattle breeding economy in its integrity, and comparative, comparative historical and comparative methods make it possible to find out the specifics of cattle breeding and its conceptual and categorical apparatus.

Discussion. Scientists are unanimous in the understanding that scientific theory presupposes the presence of a clearly developed categorical apparatus expressed in terms that have a single meaning. According to G.E. Markov, the situation is especially unfavorable in the terminology of cattle breeding and nomadism. Suffice it to say that there is no generally accepted classification of types of cattle breeding and the corresponding definitions. The same types and forms of economic and social life of pastoralists are understood and denoted differently. Most of the terms are interpreted by the authors differently, and one term denotes different phenomena [3, p.83]. Therefore, his article "Cattle breeding. Definitions and terminology" G.Ye. Markov in 1981 initiated a discussion on the pages of the journal "Soviet Ethnography", in which the Soviet researchers G.E. Markov, I. Yu. Semenov, B.V. Andrianov, G.N. Simakov, V.M. Shamiladze. The subject of discussion was such terms as cattle breeding, "nomadism", "nomadic economy", "semi-nomadic cattle breeding", "semi-sedentary cattle breeding", "sedentary cattle breeding", types and forms of cattle breeding, etc.

Research results. The traditional economy of the Kazakhs as a subject of research also has its own set of ideas, views, generalized provisions, concepts, laws and principles, which creates a holistic view of its essence, patterns, structure, and development.

Initially, it is necessary to dwell on the definition of "traditional economy", which consists of two elements: the key word "economy" and its definition of "traditional".

The term "economy" is ambiguous, but in this case, we are talking about the system of social production that has historically developed within certain territorial boundaries to provide people and society with the necessary means for existence and development.

As for the term "tradition", it is also ambiguous, in our case it means "elements of social and cultural heritage, passed from generation to generation and preserved in certain societies and social groups for a long time" [4, p. 239].

Consequently, a semantically traditional economy is an economy with traditional foundations, which has preserved and preserves a set of economic traditions, knowledge, methods, and techniques of economic management, a historically established habitual way of life. Today the concept of "traditional economy" acts as an element of the system of traditional society, which is itself regulated by tradition, which is undoubtedly its most qualitative characteristic. In the system of a traditional society, the economy (household) is the economic component of his life.

The very concept of "traditional society" is associated with the history of tribes, ethnic groups, peoples, and civilizations that, as a result of great geographical discoveries, encountered Europeans and who are classified as agrarian, pre-industrial societies, thereby opposing them to modern, industrial societies. From here comes that shade of archaism, backwardness, immutability, opposition to innovations, progress, with which traditional society is perceived. But after all, both tradition and tradition occupy a certain place in the spiritual and material life of modern society, ensuring its progressive evolutionary development.

The specificity of the traditional economy is objectively determined by the natural conditions within which it exists; there is clearly a close relationship between the production factor and natural conditions. Of course, in any society, a person relates to nature, since it provides the resources he needs, but a person in a traditional society is completely dependent on nature. So, the traditional economic activity of the Kazakhs was nomadic cattle breeding (nomadism), they led a nomadic, traditional way of life for them, because they were forced to adapt to the environment, live in unison with nature, since the nomads were directly dependent on it (loss of livestock, lack of food etc.)

According to A.M. Kuryshov dependence consists in the adaptation of economic activity to natural and climatic conditions, because of which acceptable "... resources to support life" are created [5, p.47]. "Economic activity is conditioned by natural expediency and has an objective character, i.e., does not depend on society as a whole or its individual members. ... The interruption of ties with nature, the acquisition of "autonomy from it marks the beginning of the collapse of the traditional economy" [5, p. 48].

This position can be shared by most researchers who have a whole list of features of the traditional economy, among which they consider significant. For example, the stagnation of its economic life and the scarcity of its forms. But A.M. Kuryshov proposes to discard these phenomena when defining the traditional economy, although he does not deny their connection. He does not accept the presentation of the traditional economy as a set of economic traditions, which appear as a combination of traditional methods, techniques, and customs. He considers the traditional economy as a system that presupposes the presence of an "integrative principle and a system-forming factor" [5, p.43].

He is interested in the essential features of a traditional society, i.e., those signs without which it cannot exist, and not those that take place, but are not systemic. Therefore, the conditionality of economic activity in a traditional society by natural expediency, which is widely known and emphasized by all researchers, A.M. Kuryshov considers the first and main feature of a traditional society.

The concept of a traditional economy, containing its definition and features, was so thoroughly, and most importantly, convincingly developed by A.M. Kuryshov.

The ethnographer considers the natural character of the economy to be the second feature of the traditional economy, which is noted by all researchers of the traditional economy [5, p.48].

The third sign of a traditional economy in A.M. Kuryshov stems from his careful attitude to nature, from the understanding of the need for the rational use of natural resources, since they must ensure the future of this society [5, p.49].

The purpose of the traditional economy is not the consumption of goods, but the satisfaction of basic needs. But when "there is a need for the consumption of goods that is not directly related to life support," a departure from the traditional economy begins, which manifests itself in the priority of personal interests over public interests and the loss of control over the economic activity of a person by the clan or community [5, p.49-50].

Thus, the essential features of a traditional economy, features without which it ceases to be, are: a) dependence of the economy on natural and climatic conditions; b) the natural nature of economic activity; c) the presence of a set of environmental standards; d) create a minimum of benefits necessary for the reproduction of the population as the goal of economic activity; e) control of society over economic activities while recognizing the priority of public interests over individual [5, p.50].

It has already been noted that A.M. Kuryshov views the traditional economy as a system. According to the author, the system of traditional economy consists of elements that are represented by economic traditions, i.e., ways, techniques, and rules for obtaining material benefits [5, p.51]. The author emphasizes that these features characterize the traditional economy of any people (group, ethnic group).

For A.M. Kuryshov, the idea of the stagnation of the traditional economy, its inability to develop is unacceptable. As a result, according to A.M. Kuryshov, a traditional economy: "it is a set of economic phenomena that represent an integral self-organizing system, the formation factor of which is the way of using natural resources" [5, p.55].

N.E. Masanov, characterizing the traditional economy of the Kazakhs, also defined it as "an integral system of interaction and complementarity of various types of production activities, but the vital activity, which was determined by the leading branch of the economy - nomadic cattle breeding" [6, p. 295].

Of course, the definition of the traditional economy of N.E. Masanov, in comparison with A.M. Kuryshov, is narrower. This is quite understandable because for N.E. Masanov's theoretical aspects of this problem were not dominant in his research.

Pre-revolutionary and Soviet researchers have done a great deal of work to study the history and politics of nomadic peoples. However, it should be noted that scientists paid little attention to theoretical problems of typology, classification of nomadic pastoralism and comparative analysis with other types of economy. As a result of a systematic study of theoretical, methodological, and general problems of the socio-economic history of pastoralists, scientists realized the importance of a more detailed classification of pastoralism, the absence of which led to inaccuracies in terminology and to confusion in the typology of pastoralism.

First of all, about the term "nomads". Often this term is applied to the entire non-sedentary, mobile population. Not only in everyday consciousness, but also in ethnographic literature, the way of life of nomads was perceived as vagrancy. For example, the famous dictionary of F.A. Brockhaus and I.A. Efron, at the end of the XIX century, defined nomads as "nomadic, wandering tribes", opposing them to sedentary, farmers. Back in 1934, D. Ford wrote that nomadism should be associated only with a shepherd's life, while simultaneously introducing the term "gatherers" [7, p. 43].

But even in the XX century, such an idea of nomads continued to exist. So, R. Capo-Rey writes in 1953 that "Nomads are people who move all year round in search of food for themselves or their herd. ... The life of a nomad is a constant movement" [8, p.192]. The first form of nomadic life, he calls hunting and gathering wild fruits, then he lists the nomadic fishermen, nomadic pastoralists, the participation of nomads in the caravan trade [8, p.192-197]. Yu.V. Maretin calls gatherers and hunters of eastern Sumatra nomads [1, p.41]. Yu.P. Averkieva - equestrian buffalo hunters, de Planol - Australian aborigines, and Lee and Di Wo - all hunters and gatherers [9, p.83]. Thus, the nomad appeared as a "wandering", and his way of life was opposed to the settled way of life.

Therefore, Yu.I. Semenov stated that "it is necessary to dwell on terminology. The fact is that the concepts of "settledness" and "vagrancy" do not have a clearly defined content. Different authors put in them far from the same meaning ... between complete settledness and a completely wandering way of life, there are a lot of transitional forms, which are evaluated differently by different researchers. The use of the terms "semi-sedentary", "semi-vagrant" also does not help much, because each of them, again, does not have a clearly defined content "[10, p.56].

As for the concept - "nomadism", derived from the word "nomads", it was interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the main term. In the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia", published in 1953, nomadism is presented as "a way of life (emphasis added by the author) of various peoples of the world, arising during the first social division of labor and associated with their production activities. Some forms of economic life of earlier stages of social development, with the dominance of gathering, fishing, and hunting, are also close to nomadism. The Prairie Indians, for example, roamed most of the year after herds of bison, the hunt for which was their main source of livelihood. ... The most typical forms of nomadism in cattle breeding" [11, p. 170 - 171]. Thus, the main feature of nomadism here was the nomadic way of life, however, it was recognized that this way of life was determined by their production activities.

As it is known, in the Soviet Union encyclopedic articles were considered canonical, their authors were the most famous scientists. In the 60s-70s. the author of the article on nomadism was G.E. Markov. First, in 1965 in the Soviet Historical Encyclopedia, and then in 1973 in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, he proposed a fundamentally new approach, according to which the nomadic way of life was a consequence of the economic activity of the nomad. Here is his definition of nomadism: nomadism is “a special form of economic activity (emphasis added by the author) and the way of life associated with it. The term “nomadism” is mainly applied to the lifestyle of pastoralists in the arid (arid) zone, but sometimes it is also used in relation to the more archaic economic and cultural type of wandering hunters and gatherers ... Cattle breeding, which is the main occupation of nomads and semi-nomads, was combined with other types of activities: agriculture, trade, hunting. Quite often a part of this or that tribe roamed, and a part was sedentary” [12; 13, p.298]

So, G.E. Markov does not perceive nomadism as vagrancy, on the contrary, he defines it as a special form of economic activity, and their nomadic way of life is a consequence of this activity. An important sign of nomadism, in his opinion, is that, in addition to cattle breeding, people are engaged in other types of economic activities, thereby he allowed agricultural occupations among the nomads.

This approach to nomadism can be seen in A.M. Khazanov, who stated that nomadism is "a special kind of productive economy, in which the predominant occupation is extensive mobile livestock raising, and most of the population is involved in periodic migrations" [14, p.6]. This assignment of nomads to a producing economy absolutely excluded for hunters and gatherers engaged in appropriating economy the possibility of their inclusion in the community of nomads. For A.M. Khazanov's position on nomadism as a special kind of a producing economy was fundamentally important.

Unlike G.E. Markov, who simply stated the use of the term “nomadism” in the literature and in relation to more archaic wandering hunters and gatherers, A.M. Khazanov in his monograph "Nomads and the Outside World" again stated the fundamental impossibility of uniting hunters and gatherers, on the one hand, and mobile pastoralists, on the other, under the general name of "nomads" because the former lead an appropriating economy, the latter a producing one. A.M. Khazanov believed that the terms "nomads" - "nomads" are inapplicable to those who lead a mobile, but appropriating way of life, such as hunters and gatherers. He suggested calling them "stray". The term "nomadic", in his opinion, should be assigned to mobile extensive pastoralists, whose economy is of a productive nature.

At the same time, he did not accept too broad and vague use of the term "nomads", if we understand by them any mobile herders. In his opinion, nomadic pastoralism “from the economic point of view can be defined as a special type of producing economy, in which the predominant occupation is extensive mobile livestock breeding, and most of the population is involved in periodic migrations” [9, p.85]. Since, from the point of view of the author, cattle breeding has various forms, therefore A.M. Khazanov formulates specific features of nomadic cattle breeding.

They are as follows: “1) cattle breeding as the predominant type of economic activity; 2) its extensive nature with year-round grazing of livestock outside of the stall; 3) periodic mobility within grazing areas or between them (as opposed to migrations); 4) participation in the migrations of all or most of the population (as opposed to shepherd or distant pasture cattle breeding); 5) natural, i.e. the nature of the economy, aimed primarily at meeting the immediate needs ... ”. The last feature, according to the author, is no longer applicable, or partially applicable to some groups of modern nomadic pastoralists, although at an earlier time it was characteristic of nomadic pastoralists [9, p.84-85].

G.E. Markov also emphasized that the basis of nomadic pastoralism is extensive animal breeding, which is the main source of employment for the nomadic population and a means of livelihood [3, p.84], as well as the productive nature of the economy of nomadism, but over time it became fundamentally important for him that the concept “Nomadism” “presupposes not only economic, but also social characteristics (emphasis added)” [3, p.84]. For G.E. Markov “nomadism is a significant historical phenomenon, the essence of which is not just the way of doing the economy, but above all in the presence of a specific complex of socio-economic relations, tribal social organization, political structure” [3, p.86]. Nomadism has a characteristic socio-economic system and a specific communal - tribal structure.

G.E. Markov considered the definition of nomadism given by V.M. Shamiladze, according to which "the main characteristic features of nomadism are recognized as the nomadic way of life of the population and the conduct of an appropriate form of economy, which excluded the conduct of other sectors of the economy in conditions of settled life" [15, p.47]. As you can see, V.M. Shamiladze, considered the nomadic way of life to be the main characteristic of nomadism, completely denying, in contrast to G.E. Markov, the nomads' management of "other branches of the economy in the conditions of settled life." According to G.E. Markov, this definition by V.M. Shamiladze can be attributed to mountain

cattle breeding, which he takes for "nomadic". G.E. Markov, several claims to the definition of the nomadism of V.M. Shamiladze, but the main thing is the lack of "characteristics of social relations and social structure of population groups defined as "nomads" [3, p.93].

A.M. Khazanov also notes that cattle breeding, of course, is a way of life, but for him, cattle breeding is, first of all, a way of life, and "it was unreasonable to deny that special specialization entails a special way of life, world views, cultural values, preferences and ideals "[14, p.10].

S.A. Pletneva represents nomadism "... in which the main productive economy is extensive cattle breeding with year-round grazing and participation in the nomadic movement together with the herds of a larger (or even overwhelming) part of the population" [16, p.5]. But for a complete description of nomadism, according to the author, it is necessary to consider all the features of the nomadic way of life - not only in the economy and social relations, but also in politics, everyday life, material culture, religion [16, p.5].

As it can be seen, different interpretations of the term "nomadism" were outlined in Soviet historiography. The definition of nomadism through its inherent type of economic activity has already become a commonplace. At the same time, the novelty of the conceptual approaches of G.E. Markova, A.M. Khazanov, S.A. Pletneva.

N.E. Masanov believed that nomadism is ecologically determined: "Nomadism is not only a person's adaptation to a given ecosystem through seasonal nomadism along certain routes in search of convenient pasture lands, but also such an organization of the material production system, which was aimed at the rational use of natural resources of the habitat by improving various elements and types of economic activities that can ensure not only the reproduction of the herd, but also the normal functioning of the ecosystem in question "[17, pp. 32-33].

N. Alimbay proposes a completely different approach to nomadism that differs from the above. He opposed the scientific tradition of considering the nomadic community of Kazakhs as an oriented "economic determinism", i.e., against the idea "of the economic and economic structure of a nomadic society as an absolutely autonomous and the only possible basis for the life of nomads" [18, p.19]. The author presents nomadism as a type of sociality [18, p.28]. For him, the community is not only the only way of life of nomads, but a generalizing type of social relations, therefore, he believes, nomadism as a special type of sociality ceases to exist when the community disintegrates [18, p.26]. Hence, N. Alimbay makes an interesting conclusion: the stadial typology in relation to the Eurasian nomads is fundamentally inapplicable [18, p.26].

Against this background, the Russian textbook *Ethnology* (published in 2005) looks somehow strange, the definition of which of nomadism is identical to the concept of nomads in the Brockhaus and Efron dictionary (late 19th century). According to this textbook, the distinctive features of nomadism are "the absence of permanent places of settlement for pastoralists and their year-round migrations from one pasture to another, sometimes over long distances. This way of life contributed to the predatory moods in the society of nomads, who made predatory raids on agricultural settlements" [19, p.132-133]. Here one does not see only the further conceptual development of the notion of nomadism, but even a simple acquaintance with the views of their predecessors.

G.E. Markov also tried to deal with such definitions as cattle breeding and animal husbandry. If in the reference literature animal husbandry is a branch of agriculture, and cattle breeding is a branch of cattle breeding, then in the historical literature cattle breeding was understood as an independent form of economic activity underlying certain economic and cultural types. G.E. Markov considered it necessary to establish the relationship between livestock and livestock raising with the economic and cultural classification. He proposed that the term "animal husbandry" encompass "all forms of animal husbandry, including the breeding of cattle and small ruminants, and transport animals, reindeer husbandry and animal husbandry. As a result, based on livestock farming, different economic and cultural types could arise" [3, p.83-84].

According to G.E. Markov, dealing with the definition of "cattle breeding" is difficult, since, firstly, there are various forms of cattle breeding, and secondly, different types of cattle breeding. Therefore, the author cautiously, relying on the word "apparently", believes that cattle breeding is "a type of economic activity based mainly on extensive breeding of animals and either completely defining the nature of the economic and cultural type, or constituting one of its most important signs ". Thus, according to G.E. Markov, the terms "cattle breeding" and "nomadic cattle breeding" differ from each other meaningfully. If "cattle breeding can be considered as a form of economy", then nomadic pastoralism is a specific socio-economic phenomenon based "not only on the nature of economic activity,

but to an even greater extent on the features of the social structure and tribal social organization” [3, p.87].

As already noted, A.M. Khazanov did not accept too broad use of the term "nomads" when it meant any mobile herders. G.E. Markov also believed that the concept of "mobile livestock breeding" is a complex and comprehensive definition, which can characterize not one type, but several types of cattle breeding [3, p.91]. The varieties of “mobile livestock breeding are quite large, and there are significant differences between them in economic and social relations” [3, p. 90].

Conclusion. Thus, the traditional economy (nomadic pastoralism) and the concepts associated with it are not unified, and therefore, remaining the most important theoretical and methodological problem of nomadism, is subject to further development. Nomadic specialists need to introduce a unified terminology into scientific circulation, therefore, to develop the conceptual and categorical apparatus of nomadism and organize in scientific circles a single platform for discussing this debatable problem at joint symposia, conferences, round tables, etc.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE (in Russian)

1. Bromley YU.V. *Vazhnaya zadacha sovremennoy etnografii // Sovetskaya etnografiya. - 1983. - №5 - S. 69-72.*
2. Bromley YU.V. *Ocherki teorii etnosa. - M., 1983.- 418 s.*
3. Markov G.Ye. *Skotovodcheskoye khozyaystvo i kochevnichestvo. Definitсии i terminologiya // Sovetskaya etnografiya. - 1981. - №4. - S. 83-94.*
4. «Kazakhstan» *Natsional'naya entsiklopediya. / Gl. red. B. Ayagan. – Almaty: Glavnaya redaktsiya «Kazak, entsiklopediyasy», 2006 – T.5. - 560 s.*
5. Kuryshov A.M. *Transformatsiya sistemy traditsionnogo khozyaystva korennykh narodov Pribaykal'ya na rubezhe XIX-XX stoletii. – Irkutsk: Izd-vo BGUEP, 2011. – 212 s.*
6. Masanov N.E. *Kochevaya tsivilizatsiya kazakhov: osnovy zhiznedeyatel'nosti nomadnogo obshchestva. – Izd. 2-ye, dop. – Almaty: Print-S, 2011. – 740 s.*
7. Andrianov B.V. *Neosedloye naseleniye mira: istoriko-etnograficheskoye issledovaniye. – M.: Nauka, 1985. – 285 s.*
8. Kapo-Rey R. *Frantsuzskaya Sakhara. Perevod s frants. – M.: Geografiz, 1958. – 496 s.*
9. Khazanov A.M. *Kochevniki i vneshniy mir. - Izd. 3-ye, dop. – Almaty: Dayk - Press, 2002. -604 s.*
10. Semenov YU.I. *O materinskom rode i osedlosti v pozdnem paleolite // Sovetskaya Etnografiya. – 1973. - №4. - S. 52-65.*
11. *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. - M., 1953. - T.13. - S. 170-171.*
12. Markov G.Ye. *Kochevnichestvo // Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya. T. 7. – M., 1965. - S.1017-1019.*
13. Markov G.Ye. *Kochevnichestvo // Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. - Izd. 3. - M., 1973. - T.13. - S. 298-299.*
14. Khazanov A.M. *Sotsial'naya istoriya skifov: osnovnyye problemy razvitiya drevnykh kochevnikov Yevraziyskikh stepey. – M., 1975.- 343 s.*
15. Shamiladze V.M. *Khozyaystvenno-kul'turnyye i sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy skotovodstva Gruzii. Istoriko-etnograficheskoye issledovaniye. – Tbili: Metsniyereba, 1979. – 348 s.*
16. Pletneva S. A. *Kochevniki srednevekov'ya. Poiski istoricheskikh zakonomernostey. - M.: Nauka, 1982. -188 s.*
17. Masanov N.E. *Problemy sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoy istorii Kazakhstana na rubezhe XVIII-XIX vv. - Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1984. -176 s.*
18. Alimbayev N., Mukanov M.S., Argynbayev KH. *Traditsionnaya kul'tura zhizneobespecheniya kazakhov. Ocherki teorii i istorii. – Almaty: Gylym, 1998. –234 s.*
19. *Etnologiya / pod red. Mis'kovoy Ye.V., Mekhedova N.L., Pimenova V.V.– M.: Akademicheskii proyekt; Izdatel'stvo «Kul'tura», 2005. – 624 s.*

Список литературы:

1. Бромлей Ю. В. *Важная задача современной этнографии // Советская этнография. – 1983. - №5. – С. 69-72.*
2. Бромлей Ю. В. *Очерки теории этноса. – М., 1983.– 418 с.*

3. Марков Г. Е. Скотоводческое хозяйство и кочевничество. Определения и терминология // Советская этнография. - 1981. - №4. - С. 83-94.
4. "Казахстан" Национальная энциклопедия. / Гл. ред. Б. Аяган. - Алматы: Главная редакция "қазақ энциклопедиясы", 2006 - Т. 5. - 560 с.
5. Курьшов А. М. Трансформация системы традиционного хозяйства коренных народов Прибайкалья или рубежа XIX-XX веков. - Иркутск: Изд-во БГУЭП, 2011. - 212 с.
6. Масанов Н. Е. Кочевая цивилизация казахов: основы жизнедеятельности кочевого общества. - Изд. 2-да, доп. - Алматы: Принт-С, 2011. - 740 с.
7. Андрианов Б. В. Неоседлое население: историко-этнографическое исследование. - М.: Наука, 1985. - 285 с.
8. Групповое изнасилование-Рей Р. Французская Сахара. Перевод с франц. - М.: Географгиз, 1958. - 496 с.
9. Хазанов А. М. Кочевники и внешний мир. - Изд. 3-да, доп. - Алматы: Дайк - Пресс, 2002. - 604 с.
10. Семенов Ю. И. О материнском роде, осадлости в позднем палеолите // Советская этнография. - 1973. - №4. - С. 52-65.
11. Большая Советская энциклопедия. - М., 1953. - Т. 13. - С. 170-171.
12. Марков Г. Е. Кочевничество // Советская историческая энциклопедия. Т. 7. - М., 1965. - С. 1017-1019.
13. Марков Г. Е. Кочевничество // Большая Советская энциклопедия. - Изд. 3. - М., 1973. - Т. 13. - С. 298-299.
14. Хазанов А. М. Социальная история скифов: основные проблемы развития древних кочевников Евразийских степей. - М., 1975. - 343 с.
15. Шамиладзе В. М. Хозяйственно-культурные и социально-экономические проблемы скотоводства грузин. Историко-этнографическое исследование. - Тбилиси: Мецниереба, 1979. - 348 с.
16. Плетнева С. А. Кочевники средних веков. Поиски исторических закономерностей. - М.: Наука, 1982. - 188 с.
17. Масанов Н.Е. Проблемы социально-экономической истории Казахстана или рубеж XVIII-XIX вв. - Алма-Ата: Наука, 1984. - 176 с.
18. Алимбаев Н., Муканов М. С., Аргынбаев Х. Традиционная культура жизнеобеспечения казахов. Очерки теории и истории. - Алматы: Гылым, 1998. - 234 с.
19. Этнология / под ред. Миськовой Е. В., Мехедова Н.Л., Пименова А. В. - М.: Академический проект; Издательство "Культура", 2005. - 624 с.