

2025. 12 (6)

Asian Journal "STEPPE PANORAMA"



ISSN 2710-3994

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Құрылтайшысы және баспагері: Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Ғылыми журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2025 ж. 5 сәуірде тіркелген. Тіркеу нөмірі № KZ91VPY00116246. Жылына 6 рет жарияланады (электронды нұсқада).

Журналда тарих ғылымының *келесі бағыттары* бойынша ғылыми жұмыстар жарияланады: тарих, этнология.

Жарияланым тілдері: қазақ, орыс, ағылшын.

Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй

ҚР ЕЖБМ ғк Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Журнал сайты: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты 2025
© Авторлар ұжымы, 2025

БАС РЕДАКТОР

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒКШ.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас директоры. (Қазақстан)

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА

Аутрам Алан (Outram Alan) — археология ғылымдарының докторы, Эксетер университеті, тарих және археология кафедрасының профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

Аширов Адхамжон Азимбаевич — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Өзбекстан Республикасы Ғылым академиясының Тарих институтының Этнология және антропология орталығының мәнгерушісі. (Өзбекстан)

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР Парламенті Мәжілісінің депутаты. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбай Нұрсан — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас ғылыми қызметкери. (Қазақстан)

Вернер Күнтһия (Werner Cynthia) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Техас университеті. (АҚШ).

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. Канзас университеті. (АҚШ)

Жаркен Айгүл Мәліккызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия Ұлттық университеттің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

Қокебаева Гүлжаянтар Қакенкызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті. (Қазақстан)

Кригер Виктор (Krieger Viktor) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Нюрнбергтегі Бавариялық немістер мәдени орталығының (BKDR) ғылыми қызметкери. (Германия)

Оайон Изабель (Ohayon Isabelle) — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, CERCEC директорының орынбасары, Францияның Ұлттық ғылыми зерттеу орталығының (CNRS) қызметкери. (Франция)

Сабурова Татьяна — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Индиана университеті. (АҚШ)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, Оксфорд университеттін профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

Муминов Ашірбек Құрбанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ислам тарихы, өнер және мәдениеттүрмиси-зерттеу орталығының аға ғылыми қызметкери IRCICA – İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Түркия)

Римантас Желвис (Želvys Rimantas) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті. (Литва)

Смагұлов Оразак Смагұлұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Балон ғылым академиясының корр.-мүшесі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы сыйлықтың лауреаты, ғылым мен техниканың еңбек сінірген қайраткері, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеттің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

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

Томохико Үяма — PhD, Хоккайдо университеттінің Славян және Еуразиялық зерттеулер орталығының профессоры (Жапония)

Ян У. Кэмбелл (Ian W. Campbell) — PhD, Калифорния университеттінің профессоры (АҚШ)

ЖАУАПТЫ РЕДАКТОР

Қаипбаева Айнагүл Толғанбайқызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкери. (Қазақстан)

ҒЫЛЫМИ РЕДАКТОРЛАР

Қанаева Айжан Тоқанқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкери. (Қазақстан)

Кубеев Рустем Жаулыбайұлы — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының ғылыми қызметкери. (Қазақстан)

ТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ ХАТШЫ

Копеева Сания Жуматайқызы — магистр, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының қызметкери. (Қазақстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Учредитель и издатель: РГП на ПХВ «Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова»
Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан

Научный журнал зарегистрирован в Комитете связи, информатизации и информации
Министерства по инвестициям и развитию Республики Казахстан, свидетельство
о регистрации:
№ KZ91VPY00116246 от 03.04.2025 г. Публикуется 6 раза в год (в электронном формате).

В журнале публикуются научные работы *по следующим направлениям* исторической науки:
история, этнология.

Языки публикации: казахский, русский, английский.

Адрес редакции и издательства:

050010 Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, д. 28

РГП на ПХВ Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Сайт журнала: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Институт истории и этнологии

имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2025

© Коллектив авторов, 2025

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Депутат Мажилиса Парламента РК. (Казахстан)

Алимбай Нурсан — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

Аутрам Алан (Outram Alan) — доктор археологических наук, профессор департамента археологии и истории Университета Эксетера. (Великобритания)

Аширов Адхамжон Азимбаевич — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заведующий Центром этнологии и антропологии Института истории Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. (Узбекистан)

Вернер Синтия (Werner, Cynthia) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Техасский университет. (США)

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Канзасский университет (США)

Жаркен Айгуль Маликова — доктор исторических наук, профессор Евразийского национального университета им. Л.Н. Гумилёва. (Казахстан)

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. Гумилёва. (Казахстан)

Кокебаева Гульжаяхар Кakenовна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахского Национального университета им. аль-Фараби. (Казахстан)

Кригер Виктор (Krieger Viktor) — доктор исторических наук, научный сотрудник Баварского культурного центра немцев (BKDR) в Нюрнберге. (Германия)

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

Муминов Аширбек Курбанович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, старший научный сотрудник Исследовательского центра исламской истории, искусства и культуры. IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırmaları Merkezi. (Турция)

Оайон Изабель (Ohayon Isabelle) — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора CERCEC, сотрудник Национального центра научных исследований Франции (CNRS). (Франция)

Римантас Жельвис (Želvys Rimantas) — доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Вильнюсский педагогический университет. (Литва)

Сабурова Татьяна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Университет Индианы. (США)

Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожахметович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК. (Казахстан)

Томохико Уяма — PhD, профессор Центра славяно-евразийских исследований Хоккайдского университета (Япония)

Ян Кэмпбелл (Ian W. Campbell) — PhD, профессор Калифорнийского университета (США)

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна — кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

НАУЧНЫЕ РЕДАКТОРЫ

Капаева Айжан Токановна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

Кубеев Рустем Джаялыйбайулы — научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ

Копеева Сания Жуматаевна — магистр, сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Founder and publisher: RSE on REM "Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology" of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan

The scientific journal is registered at the Committee for Communications, Informatization and Information of the Ministry for Investments and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, registration certificate: No. KZ91VPY00116246 dated 03.04.2025. The journal is published 6 times a year (in electronic format).

The journal publishes scientific works in the *following areas* of historical science: history, ethnology.

Publication languages: Kazakh, Russian, English.

Editorial and publisher address:

28 Shevchenko Str., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

RSE on REM Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MSHE of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Tel.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Journal website: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology, 2025

© Group of authors, 2025

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Kabuldinov Ziyabek Ermukhanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, General Director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Abil Yerkin Amanzholovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Member of the Mazhilis of the Parliament of the RK. (Kazakhstan)

Alimbay Nursan — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Azimqulov Javohir — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Center for Ethnology and Anthropology at the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (Uzbekistan)

Diener Alexander — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, University of Kansas. (USA)

Ian W. Campbell — PhD, Professor at the University of California (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)

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. (Kazakhstan)

Kriegs Viktor — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Researcher at the Bavarian Cultural Center of Germans (BKDR) in Nuremberg. (Germany)

Morrison Alexander — PhD, Professor, University of Oxford. (UK)

Muminov Ashirbek Kurbanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher at the Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture. IRCICA (İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi). (Turkey)

Ohayon Isabelle — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of CERCEC, Researcher at the French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS). (France)

Outram Alan — Doctor of Archaeological Sciences, Professor in the Department of Archaeology and History at University of Exeter. (Britain)

Rimantas Želvys — Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Vilnius Pedagogical University. (Lithuania)

Saburova Tatiana — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Indiana University. (USA)

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)

Werner, Cynthia — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Texas university. (USA)

Tomohiko Uyama — PhD, Professor at the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center, Hokkaido University. (Sapporo, Japan)

Zharken Aigul — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. (Kazakhstan)

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Kaipbayeva Ainagul Tolganbayevna — Candidate of Historical Sciences, leading researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan).

ACADEMIC EDITOR

Kapaeva Aizhan Tokanovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Kubayev Rustem Dzhalybayuly — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Kopeyeva Saniya Zhumataevna — Master's, researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

ТАРИХ / ИСТОРИЯ / HISTORY

Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan

Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”

Has been issued as a journal since 2014

ISSN 2710-3994.

Vol. 12. Is. 6, pp. 1588-1604, 2025

Journal homepage: <https://ajspiie.com>

FTAXP / МРНТИ / IRSTI 03.20

https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_6_1588-1604

KAZAKH–DZUNGAR CONFRONTATION IN THE 1630S–1680S

Ziyabek E. Kabuldinov¹, Akmaral R. Beisembayeva², Gulnara T. Mussabalina³

¹Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology

(28, Shevchenko Str., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, general manager

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9625-0535>. E-mail: kabulzia@rambler.ru

²Branch of the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology in Astana
(11/5, Kabanbay Batyr Ave., 010017 Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan)

Researcher

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru

³L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University

(2 Satpayev St., 010000, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan)

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7576-9311>. E-mail: g.mussabalina@yandex.kz

© Valichanov IHE, 2025

© Kabuldinov Z.E., Beisembayeva A.R., Mussabalina G.T., 2025

Abstract. *Introduction.* The article examines the formation of the Dzungar Khanate and the evolution of the Kazakh–Dzungar confrontation in the seventeenth century as a systemic phenomenon that determined the redistribution of power in Central Asia. *Aims and objectives.* The aim of the study is to identify the relationship between the internal transformations of the Dzungar Khanate and the logic of its expansionist policy toward Kazakh domains. The objectives include reconstructing the stages of the strengthening of the Dzungar Khanate in the context of its confrontation with the Kazakh Khanate, analyzing the mechanisms of mobilization and centralization of Oirat society and their impact on the military-political balance in the Kazakh steppe, clarifying the nature of military campaigns and diplomatic practices in Kazakh–Dzungar relations, and identifying the ideological dimension of this confrontation, including attempts at religious and political influence on Kazakh territories and the ruling elite. *Methodologically,* the study is based on the principles of historicism and objectivity and applies comparative-historical and problem-chronological approaches. The source base includes materials from RGADA, AVPRI, and the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM RAS), Russian diplomatic documents and chronicle evidence, as well as comparative data from Kazakh, Oirat, and Chinese traditions. *Results.* The results substantiate that the centralization and resource base of the Dzungar Khanate provided it with a strategic advantage over the more loosely organized political structure of the Kazakh Khanate; the confrontation assumed a long-term character and in the 1680s developed into attempts to establish sustained control over cities and territories of Southern Kazakhstan and Semirechye. *Conclusion.* It is concluded that the Kazakh–Dzungar confrontation of the seventeenth century was not only a

military struggle but also an institutional and ideological process that predetermined the parameters of regional politics at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Keywords: Kazakh Khanate, Dzungar Khanate, military conflicts, international relations, Central Asia

Acknowledgements. The article was prepared within the framework of the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan under Program-Targeted Funding (PTF) "Writing an illustrated biographical encyclopedia on the history of Kazakhstan" (IRN No. BR24993173).

For citation: Kabuldinov Z.E., Beisembayeva A.R., Mussabalina G.T. Kazakh-Dzungar confrontation in the 1630s–1680s // Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama". 2025. Vol. 12. No. 6. Pp. 1588–1604. (In Eng.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_6_1588-1604

1630–1680 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОНҒАР ҚАҚТЫҒЫСЫ

Зиябек Ермұханұлы Қабылдинов¹, Ақмарал Рашидқызы Бейсембаева², Мұсабалина Гүлнара Төлеугазынқызы³

¹Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
(28-үй, Шевченко көш., 050010, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)

Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, бас директор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9625-0535>. E-mail: kabulzia@rambler.ru

²Астана қаласындағы Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институтының филиалы
(11/5-үй, Қабанбай батыр даңғ., 050010 Астана, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Ғылыми қызметкер
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru

³Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті
(Сәтбаев көш., 2-үй, 010000, Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы)
Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7576-9311>. E-mail: g.mussabalina@yandex.kz

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2025
© Қабылдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Мусабалина Г.Т., 2025

Андратпа. *Kiриспе.* Мақалада XVII ғасырдағы Орталық Азиядағы күштер арақатынасының қайта белінүйін айқындаған жүйелі құбылыс ретінде Жонғар хандығының қалыптасуы мен қазақ-жонғар қарсылығының эволюциясы қарастырылады. *Мақсаты мен міндеттері.* Зерттеудің мақсаты – Жонғар хандығының ішкі трансформациялары мен оның қазақ иеліктеріне бағытталған экспансиялық саясатының логикасы арасындағы өзара байланысты айқындау. Міндеттерге: Жонғар хандығының Қазақ хандығымен қарсылық контексіндегі күшею кезеңдерін қайта құрастыру; ойрат қоғамын жұмылдыру мен орталықтандыру тетіктерін және олардың қазақ даласындағы әскери-саяси тере-теңдікке ықпалын талдау; қазақ-жонғар қатынастарындағы әскери жорықтар мен дипломатиялық практикалардың сипатын нақтылау; сондай-ақ қазақ иеліктері мен билеуші элитаға діни-саяси ықпал ету әрекеттерін қоса алғанда, осы қарсылығының идеологиялық құрамдасын айқындау кіреді. Әдіснамалық түрғыдан жұмыс тарихиленген пен объективтілік қағидаттарына сүйеніп, салыстырмалы-тарихи және проблемалық-хронологиялық тәсілдерді қолданады. Деректік база Ежелгі актілердің Ресей мемлекеттік архиві (EAPMA), Ресей империясының сыртқы саясат архиві (РИССА) және Ресей Ғылым академиясының шығыс қолжазбалары институты (PFA ШҚИ (Санкт-Петербург)) материалдарын, орыс дипломатиялық құжаттары мен жылнамалық мәліметтерді, сондай-ақ қазақ, ойрат және қытай дәстүрлерінен алғынған

салыстырмалы деректерді қамтиды. *Нәтижелер*. Зерттеу нәтижесінде Жонғар хандығының орталықтануы мен ресурстық базасы Қазақ хандығының салыстырмалы түрде әлсіз саяси құрылымына қарағанда оған стратегиялық артықшылық бергені дәлелденді; қарсыластылық ұзақ мерзімді сипат алғып, 1680-жылдары Оңтүстік Қазақстан мен Жетісу қалалары мен аумақтарын тұрақты бақылауға алу әрекеттеріне ұласқаны көрсетілді. *Қорытынды*. XVII ғасырдағы қазақ-жонғар қарсыластылығы тек әскери қақтығыс қана емес, сонымен бірге XVII–XVIII ғасырлар тоғысындағы өнірлік саясаттың параметрлерін айқындаған институционалдық-идеологиялық үдеріс болғаны туралы қорытынды жасалды.

Түйін сөздер: Қазақ хандығы, Жонғар хандығы, әскери қақтығыстар, халықаралық қатынастар, Орта Азия

Алғыс. Мақала Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің «Қазақстан тарихы бойынша иллюстрацияланған өмірбаяндық энциклопедия жазу» атты бағдарламалық-нысаналы қаржыландыру (тіркеу нөмірі: BR24993173) аясында дайындалды.

Дәйексөз үшін: Кабульдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Мусабалина Г.Т. 1630–1680 жылдардағы қазақ-жонғар қақтығысы // Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama". 2025. Т. 12. № 6. 1588–1604 66. (Ағылш.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_6_1588-1604

КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКОЕ ПРОТИВОСТОЯНИЕ В 1630–1680-Е ГОДЫ

Зиябек Ермұханович Кабульдинов¹, Ақмарал Рашидқызы Бейсембаева², Гульнара Толеугазиновна Мусабалина³

¹Институт истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова
(д. 28, ул. Шевченко, 050010, Алматы, Республика Казахстан)
Доктор исторических наук, профессор, генеральный директор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9625-0535>. E-mail: kabulzia@rambler.ru

²Филиал Института истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова в г. Астана
(д. 11/5, пр. Кабанбай батыра, 010017 Астана, Республика Казахстан)
Научный сотрудник
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru

³Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева
(д. 2, ул. Сатпаева, 010000 Астана, Республика Казахстан)
Доктор исторических наук, профессор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7576-9311>. E-mail: g.mussabalina@yandex.kz

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2025
© Кабульдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Мусабалина Г.Т., 2025

Аннотация. *Введение.* В статье рассматривается формирование Джунгарского ханства и эволюция казахско-джунгарского противостояния в XVII веке как системного явления, определившего перераспределение сил в Центральной Азии. *Цели и задачи.* Цель исследования состоит в выявлении связи между внутренними трансформациями Джунгарского ханства и логикой его экспансионистской политики в отношении казахских владений. Задачи включают: реконструкцию этапов усиления Джунгарского ханства в контексте его противостояния с Казахским ханством, анализ механизмов мобилизации и централизации ойратского общества и их влияния на военно-политический баланс в казахской степи, уточнение характера военных кампаний и дипломатических практик в казахско-джунгарских отношениях, а также выявление идеологической составляющей данного противостояния, включая попытки религиозно-политического воздействия на казахские владения и правящую элиту. Методологическая работа опирается на принципы историзма и объективности, применяет сравнительно-исторический и проблемно-хронологический

подходы. Источниковая база включает материалы РГАДА, АВПРИ и ИВР РАН, русские дипломатические документы и летописные сведения, а также сопоставляемые данные из казахской, ойратской и китайской традиций. *Результаты*. В результате обосновано, что централизация и ресурсная база Джунгарского ханства обеспечили ему стратегическое преимущество над более рыхлой политической структурой Казахского ханства; конфронтация приобрела долгосрочный характер, а в 1680-е годы перешла к попыткам устойчивого контроля над городами и территориями Южного Казахстана и Семиречья. *Заключение*. Сделан вывод о том, что казахско-джунгарское противостояние XVII века было не только военным, но и институционально-идеологическим процессом, предопределившим параметры региональной политики на рубеже XVII–XVIII вв.

Ключевые слова: Казахское ханство, Джунгарское ханство, военные конфликты, международные отношения, Центральная Азия

Благодарность. Статья подготовлена в рамках реализации проекта ИРН BR24993173 «Написание иллюстрированной биографической энциклопедии по истории Казахстана» ПЦФ Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан.

Для цитирования: Кабульдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Мусабалина Г.Т. Казахско-джунгарское противостояние в 1630–1680-е годы // Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama". 2025. Т. 12. № 6. С. 1588-1604. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_6_1588-1604

Introduction

By the mid-17th century, a new and formidable political entity had emerged in Inner Asia – the Dzungar (or Dzungar-Oirat) Khanate, which V. V. Bartold aptly characterized as «the last great nomadic empire in Central Asia» (Bartold, 1961). The consolidation of the Oirat tribes under the authority of the Choros lineage decisively reshaped the geopolitical balance of the steppe world, precipitating a profound escalation in confrontation with neighboring nomadic polities, above all the Kazakh Khanate.

A careful analysis of the historical evidence demonstrates that, beginning with the rule of Batur Khuntaiji and continuing under his successors, the primary vector of Dzungar foreign policy was systematic expansion combined with the strategic objective of politically subordinating the Kazakh Zhuz. Notwithstanding this clear pattern of assertive external activism, historiographical engagement with 17th century Kazakh–Dzungar relations remains incomplete. Scholarly attention has traditionally centered either on discrete military episodes – most famously the Battle of Orbulak in 1643 – or on the internal dynamics of the Kazakh polity, while the foreign policy agenda pursued by the Dzungar rulers toward the Kazakhs has often been treated only superficially.

Earlier researchers such as I.Ia. Zlatkin and A.M. Pozdneev even portrayed Batur Khuntaiji and his heirs as relatively passive actors on the international stage, a characterization that is increasingly difficult to sustain in light of newly examined archival materials and comparative sources, which reveal a far more ambitious and interventionist strategy pursued by the Oirat leadership (Zlatkin, 1964; Pozdneev, 1887). Recent studies – including the works of N.A. Atygaev and others – underscore the necessity of applying a comprehensive, multi-perspectival methodology that draws simultaneously upon sources originating from Kazakh, Dzungar, Russian, and Chinese traditions, allowing for a more balanced reconstruction of inter-nomadic interactions and the diplomatic logic underpinning them.

Methods and Methodology

The study is based on the principles of historicism and objectivity and employs a comparative-historical approach and a problem-chronological method. The source base of the research comprises archival materials from the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA), the Archive of Foreign Policy of Russia (AVPRI), and the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM RAS), as well as published written sources – including Russian chronicles and diplomatic reports, Kazakh and Oirat documentary records – and a wide range of works by domestic and international historians. A comprehensive analysis of heterogeneous categories of sources enables

the reconstruction of the internal development of the Dzungar Khanate and its correlation with the broader foreign-policy dynamics of Central Asia during the period under examination.

Results

In the mid-1630s, the Oirat tribes remaining in Dzungaria consolidated into a unified political structure known as the Dzungar Khanate. This transformation coincided with the accession of Khoji (Hoto-Hochin), the son of Khara-Khula, who received the title Erdeni Batur Khongtaiji from the Dalai Lama. According to a Russian chronicle, this moment marked the beginning of a centralised Oirat state: «In these years the Dzungar domain began to take shape under the Kalmyk taishas, for Batyrtaisha, son of Khara-Khula, by his prudence and bravery united the scattered Kalmyk principalities and their rulers, conquered part of Bukhara, and from 1635 onwards assumed the title of Khuntaiji» (Zlatkin, 1983: 98)

The rise of the Dzungar Khanate was facilitated not only by Batur Khongtaiji's personal leadership but also by the broader socio-political processes of feudalisation gradually transforming Mongol tribal society in the 17th century.

Economically, the Dzungar Khanate relied primarily on nomadic pastoralism. Yet, its geographical remoteness from sedentary agricultural centres and periodic diplomatic and military complications encouraged the development of internal agriculture and crafts on a considerable scale, thereby diversifying the economy and enhancing its autonomy from neighbouring states (Sbornik, 1958: 7, 62).

The political consolidation of the Oirat tribes was also facilitated by the strategic foresight and state-building initiatives of Khara-Khula and his son Hoto-Hochin. As the 19th-century scholar Bichurin observed, «Batur Khongtaiji was for the Eleuts what Peter the Great was for Russia» (Bichurin, 1991: 128). Yet, charismatic leadership alone would not have sufficed to subjugate the rival Oirat nobles, had the Choros lineage not possessed a significantly superior economic and military base.

According to the Xinjiang Shilue, cited by Bichurin, the Dzungar Khanate had an estimated population of 600,000 people, of whom nearly 10,000 households belonged personally to the khan (Bichurin, 1991: 134–135). This concentration of power contrasted sharply with earlier arrangements in which each noyonn held his domain independently. As Norbo-Danjin testified during an interrogation in Ust-Kamenogorsk in April 1757, «formerly each noyonn held his own possession, not under the authority of the Khongtaiji; only due to his great power did the Khongtaiji annex all the domains under his control» (AVPRI. F. Zyungsrskiye dela. Op. 113/1. 1757 g., d. 2. l. 178 ob.).

As emphasised by Zlatkin, the khan's ability to impose his will on the Oirat nobility derived from the considerable resources of his personal domain, which included numerous uluses and extensive nutug territories, and enabled him to maintain a formidable army and enforce obedience among subordinate princes (Zlatkin, 1983: 267).

The need to preserve social dominance over the arats (common herders) and the enslaved labour populations of conquered regions, alongside long-standing ideological aspirations for Mongol unity and the fierce confrontation with the Qing Empire, contributed to the creation of a highly centralised state structure. Compared to neighbouring nomadic and agrarian polities of Central Asia, the Dzungar Khanate achieved a notably stronger, more cohesive form of governance, which had a direct impact on its expanding ambitions and assertive foreign policy.

The basic feudal unit among the Oirats was the ulus, comprising several socio-territorial groupings such as otok, angi, and aymak. The otok represented a collective of related and unrelated clans residing in a shared pastoral zone and subordinate to a single lord; it functioned simultaneously as a military unit (khoshun), required to provide a defined contingent of warriors. In contrast, the aymak was a kin-based association typically tracing descent from a common ancestor. Vladimirtsov regarded both otok and aymak as forms of nomadic feudal domains (Vladimirtsov, 1934: 139).

The publication of I. Zlatkin's monograph *Istoriya Dzhungarskogo khanstva* stimulated an active scholarly debate on the nature and characteristics of various socio-economic institutions not

only within the Oirat polity but in medieval Mongolian society more broadly (Zlatkin, 1983). In contemporary historiography, interpretations of the otok structure remain divided.

A. Chernyshov argues that the otok represented merely a territorial division of lands occupied by nomadic groups and therefore was not inherently linked to specific population units. Conversely, the angi (or anki) is understood by him as a kin-based social group subordinate to a particular feudal lord (Chernyshov, 1982: 164–171). However, working from essentially the same primary materials, E. Kychanov presented a more convincing interpretation: the Dzungar otok should be regarded as an administrative-economic unit that constituted the personal patrimony of the Dzungar khan. Some otoks, as Russian archival evidence confirms, lacked territorial continuity altogether, while the angi were the patrimonial holdings of the Oirat hereditary nobility – the taiji (Kychanov, 1989: 157–160).

Several uluses formed a tribe. By the early 17th century, the four principal Oirat tribal formations – the Choros, the Derbet, the Khoshut, and the Khoit – had crystallised into hereditary principalities. As Leontovich observed, «the leader of the senior or largest ulus was regarded simultaneously as head of the entire tribe, bearing the title taishi (or taiji), while the noyons of the remaining uluses were subordinate to him» (Leontovich, 1880: 229).

The decimal administrative-military system, introduced in Mongolia under Chinggis Khan, continued to function in Dzungaria. Adult male subjects – with the exception of clergy and slaves – were organised into units of tens, hundreds, and thousands, obligated to perform border defence and military service at their commanders' orders (Golstunskii, 1880).

At the foundation of the Oirat socio-economic structure stood the ail, referred to in Dzungaria as khoton and occasionally kuriya (rendered in Russian sources as kuren'), which comprised a cluster of closely related households. This communal-familial grouping served as the fundamental productive and social cell of nomadic life.

The economic foundations of the Oirats of Dzungaria relied primarily on nomadic pastoralism, complemented by agriculture, hunting, crafts, and auxiliary seasonal industries. Earlier pre-revolutionary and Soviet historiography tended to interpret nomadic herding in a simplified manner as an entirely extensive and technologically limited system common to Mongols, Kazakhs, and other pastoral peoples. Modern scholarship, however, has sought to refine such characterisations.

The ability to sustain large herds within relatively limited territorial boundaries resulted in a higher population density per unit of land than in the Kazakh steppe. This factor significantly influenced Dzungar relations with neighbouring states: Oirat elites could mobilise military forces more rapidly and maintain more effective political control within their domain than their Kazakh counterparts.

Seasonal migrations followed a defined hierarchy. The ruling lord would first relocate to secure the most favourable, well-watered pastures for his urga (court) and herds; only then did subordinate groups follow. P. Pallas described Kalmyk (Volga Oirat) migrations as follows: «When the Kalmyk horde or ulus changes its location in search of pasture, which occurs every four, six or eight days, scouts are sent ahead to select the best places for the khan or princes, for the lamas and for the sacred carts where their worship is conducted. Once these are designated and announced by heralds, they move first, followed by the entire population choosing suitable places for themselves» (Pallas, 1778: 223).

Territorial distribution among the principal Oirat tribes followed a customary geographic pattern. The Torguts and Derbets roamed the northern regions of Dzungaria – along the Irtysh River, in the Mongolian Altai, and the Tarbagatai range. The Choros held the upper and middle basins of the Ili River and its tributaries. Further eastward were the pastures of the Khoshuts, as well as those Torgut groups that had returned to Dzungaria from the Volga in 1701. The Khoits occupied areas along the Black Irtysh and the tributaries flowing into the Khovd basin (Potanin, 1868: 2).

During the 17th century, a distinctive Oirat literary culture began to flourish in Dzungaria. Original works were composed in the Oirat language, and numerous translations – especially of religious and philosophical writings from Sanskrit, Tibetan, and other languages – appeared. Remarkably, the prominent reformer of Oirat writing and influential lamaist scholar Zaya Pandita is credited with the translation of 177 works. Archaeological findings by Soviet scholars in Eastern and

South-Eastern Kazakhstan – territories frequented by Oirat nomads in the late 17th and early 18th centuries – demonstrate the high material culture of the Dzungars (Pozdneev, 1880: 139–140; Mikhailov, 1969).

Within the Kazakh Khanate, nomadic pastoralism likewise constituted the dominant sector of the economy. However, the natural and climatic conditions of the Kazakh steppe – vast expanses of arid grasslands, deserts, and semi-deserts – compelled Kazakh herders to undertake significantly longer seasonal migrations, sometimes extending up to 1,500 kilometres or more, typically in a meridional direction, from south to north and back again (Bekmakhnov, 1957: 27). Environmental constraints also determined the structure of the herd: sheep, horses, and camels prevailed, being best adapted to long-distance movements and pasture scarcity, whereas cattle occupied a marginal position due to their low resistance to year-round grazing pressure. A well-known proverb encapsulates this hierarchy: «*maldyn zhamany syir*» – «the worst livestock is cattle».

Livestock served as the principal means of subsistence, fulfilled transport functions, was used as a medium of exchange for craft goods, and stood as the primary indicator of wealth and social prestige among Kazakh nomads. While animals were privately owned, pasturelands were theoretically held in common by free members of the community; in practice, rights of disposal came to be appropriated by elite figures – khans, sultans, and lineage chiefs (Shakhmatov, 1962).

In the southern regions of Kazakhstan, particularly within wintering areas, localised pockets of agriculture existed, though they played a relatively minor role in the overall nomadic economy. Crafts and domestic industries were largely auxiliary, focused on the processing of livestock products and the production of dwellings, tools, weaponry, and household items (Istoriya Kazakhstana, 1997: 299–341).

Politically, the Kazakh Khanate was organised into uluses, which by the second half of the 16th century gave way to the emergence of the zhuzes – three major supra-tribal territorial-political entities (Sultanov, 1982: 84–85). Scholarly interpretations of the origins of the zhuz system vary considerably (Istoriya Kazakhstana, 1997: 248–251). The most persuasive, in our view, is the argument advanced by Yudin: the spatial distribution of the zhuzes reflected the historical sequence in which Kazakh khans extended their authority across the territory of Kazakhstan (Yudin, 1965: 82).

The approximate tribal composition of the zhuzes may be summarised as follows: the Great Zhuz included such major tribes as the Dulat, Alban, Jalair, Suan, Chaprashty, Ysty, Chanyshkyly and others. The Middle Zhuz comprised the Argyn, Naiman, Kipchak, Kongyrat, Kerei, Uak and related tribes. The Little Zhuz consisted of three tribal unions – Baiuly, Alimuly, and Zhetiru (Sultanov, 1982: 25). According to Sultanov's calculations, the three zhuzes together in the 17th and early 18th centuries encompassed approximately 112 distinct tribal and clan groupings. Estimates of the total population differ among scholars, but most likely ranged between 2 and 3 million individuals (Levshin, 1832).

The Kazakh Khanate represented a relatively loose political structure in which central authority remained fragile and often ineffective. Tribal rivalries, the lack of close economic integration both between and within zhuzes, the persistent drive of the nobility toward autonomy, as well as the nomadic mode of life, resulted in a limited ability of khans and sultans to maintain a stable administrative system. Free herders were formally obliged to provide a share of their income to their rulers; in practice, however, contributions were mostly voluntary. The principal revenues of the khan's treasury consisted of trade duties, court fees, and taxes imposed on the urban population. Political influence was therefore highly dependent on the personal abilities of the rulers, as well as on the size and prestige of the particular tribe or clan under their immediate control (Vyatkin, 1947: 93–98).

A comparison of statehood in the Kazakh and Dzungar Khanates reveals a significant imbalance. The western Mongol polity possessed a more advanced and operationally effective system of governance, supported by a broader administrative apparatus and more substantial material and human resources. This advantage played a decisive role in Kazakh–Dzungar relations: Oirat elites were able to organise military campaigns more rapidly, sustain prolonged warfare, and react swiftly to changing geopolitical circumstances.

The structural asymmetry between a more centralised, militarily cohesive Dzungar Khanate and a politically fragmented Kazakh Khanate predestined the emergence of a prolonged confrontation. From the 1630s onward, the Oirat rulers increasingly viewed the Kazakh steppe as a zone of strategic expansion, while Kazakh leaders were forced into a reactive defensive posture.

The unification of the Oirat tribes under the Choro ruling house marked a turning point in the foreign policy of the western Mongols. Following the Pan-Mongol congress of 1640, the main strategic vector of Dzungar expansion shifted decisively toward the Kazakh steppe. The rise to power of Erdeni Batur Khongtaiji in Dzungaria nearly coincided with the accession of Zhangir Khan (1629–1680), the capable and ambitious son of Yesim, in the Kazakh Khanate. Before emerging as a central figure of Kazakh resistance to the Oirat advance, Zhangir himself had suffered the setbacks of defeat and captivity.

A Russian record describes these events: in 1635, the Tatar prince Abak arrived in Tobolsk and reported, based on Oirat accounts, that «the black Kalmyk taishas – Talai-taisha, Kontaisha, Kuzhu-taisha and Turgucha-taisha, with all the black Kalmyks – clashed with the Kazakh Horde, and the battle was great. The black Kalmyks defeated the Kazakh forces and captured Prince Yangyr, son of Ishim, who was the Kazakh ruler; and the prince remains among the black Kalmyks.» Encouraged by this victory, the Oirat commanders reportedly prepared a new campaign against the Kazakh Horde (Russian–Mongolian Relations, vol. 1, 1974: 278).

Russian envoys, led by the Cossack ataman Gavrila Ilyin, became unwitting witnesses to the renewed Oirat invasion. Dispatched by Governor M. Temkin-Rostovskii to demand the release of prisoners seized near Tyumen and Tara, they encountered Talai-taisha marching against «Yanibek-tsar» of the Kazakhs (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1974: 174). Once again the Oirats secured victory, followed by another successful campaign the next year against the Qatagay forces (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1974: 175–179).

These consecutive military successes – in Kazakhstan, Mongolia, and Eastern Turkestan – significantly elevated the international stature of Erdeni Batur. His court emerged as a key diplomatic centre in Central Asia. When the Russian nobleman Menshoi Remezov visited the Khongtaiji's headquarters in September 1640, he observed the presence of notable foreign delegations, including emissaries from Bukhara and representatives of Zhangir's court, as well as monks of the Dalai Lama (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1974: 175–179).

The early victories of the Dzungar armies in the Kazakh steppe consolidated Erdeni Batur's authority and transformed Dzungaria into a central geopolitical actor in Inner Asia. The confrontation with the Kazakh Khanate thus became not episodic but a defining axis of Dzungar foreign policy from the 1630s onward.

However, this rise in influence did not come without subsequent setbacks for the Dzungar leadership. In the winter of 1643, Oirat ruling princes, joined by Ombo-Erdeni – the son of the Altan Khan – launched a major campaign into Kazakh territory, plundering Kyrgyz pastures along their route. Upon receiving news of the invasion, Zhangir Khan advanced to intercept the enemy with a comparatively small force, estimated by Ilyin at only 600 warriors. Testimonies of direct observers provide a vivid picture of the battle: «Zhangir dug trenches among the rocks and placed 300 men with firearms in them, while positioning another 300 behind the rocks for cover. Kon-taisha advanced and attacked the trenches, losing many men to the firing. Then Zhangir himself attacked Kon-taisha from the other side and in those two clashes slew as many as ten thousand of his men». Soon, substantial reinforcements arrived – the renowned Uzbek leader Yalantush marched to assist the Kazakhs with a force of 20,000. Facing such a coalition, Erdeni Batur, despite possessing an army of approximately 50,000 troops, was forced to retreat (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 234, 239).

According to Zlatkin, the defeat had profound consequences for Oirat internal politics. Batur Khongtaiji targeted those Oirat nobles who had refused to join the expedition against Zhangir, provoking a wave of feudal internecine conflict within Dzungaria (Zlatkin, 1983: 131–132).

Driven by a determination to avenge the setback against Zhangir and Yalantush, Batur Khongtaiji sought to secure a two-front assault by forging an alliance with the Volga Kalmyk ruler Kho-Urluk: «So that Urluk-taisha would provide him, the Khongtaiji, with his people as support, and

would send them to wage war against Kundelen-taisha, while he, the Khongtaiji, would attack Zhangir and Yalantush from another side; for Kundelen-taisha did not march to war against Zhangir and Yalantush and did not send his men, but supports Zhangir and calls him his adopted son» (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 277).

However, the Khongtaiji's envoys were intercepted en route by supporters of Kundelen-taisha – one of the most powerful Oirat magnates and the brother of Baibagas (Baibagish) – taisha, head of the Khoshuts. Meanwhile, Kho-Urluk was killed in 1644 during clashes with North Caucasian mountaineers. As a result, the plan to strike the Kazakh Khanate simultaneously from two directions ultimately failed.

Despite the unfavorable domestic political context within the Dzungar ruling elite – most notably the opposition posed by a powerful coalition of nobles led by Kundelen-taiji, who consistently advocated a pro-Kazakh orientation in regional affairs – Batur Khuntaiji nevertheless demonstrated an unwavering determination to continue his expansionist strategic agenda toward the Kazakh steppe. Archival evidence suggests that the Dzungar leadership actively prepared for renewed confrontation, not only through mobilization of manpower but also through substantial procurement of armaments and warhorses from the Turkic communities living in the Upper Ob–Irtysh region, thereby compensating for earlier combat losses and enhancing their military capabilities (Zlatkin, 1983: 131–132). This dynamic attests to both the scale of previous engagements and the resilience of the Dzungar war machine.

Contrary to I. Ia. Zlatkin's interpretation that the ongoing conflict between Dzungaria and the Kazakh Khanate entered a period of relative stagnation after 1645 and resumed only in 1652 (Zlatkin, 1983: 131–132), primary Russian diplomatic accounts clearly indicate that hostilities were neither suspended nor diminished. In particular, the travel report (stateinyi spisok) of the Tobolsk envoy Danila Arshinskii, who visited Batur Khuntaiji's court in 1646, provides detailed testimony that the Oirat ruler launched a military campaign against Yanggir Khan's domain during that very year: «The khuntaiji went to war upon the Kazakh Horde and Yanggir tsarevich, killed many, and took captive Yanggir's brother with his wife, children, and numerous people» (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 277).

The same source records that the return of the Dzungar army triggered a violent confrontation between Batur and his powerful internal opponent Kundelen-taiji, who, accompanied by a large armed contingent, intercepted the khuntaiji's forces two days before they reached their home territories; although the clash was fierce, the sides eventually negotiated a truce that temporarily eliminated the increasingly destabilizing intra-elite conflict (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 277).

The 1646 expedition thus stands as one of the final large-scale offensive operations against the Kazakhs during Batur Khuntaiji's lifetime. Although precise details of diplomatic initiatives remain uncertain, available testimonies suggest that the mid-1640s marked a transitional moment: military rivalry gave way, for a time, to pragmatic negotiations between the two dominant nomadic political actors of Inner Asia. In 1647, the Oirat envoy Khorokhai Daldin reported to Tomsk authorities that: «The khuntaiji fought against the black Kalmyks with Kundelen-Ubasha, and also fought the Kazakh Horde, but afterwards peace was concluded, provided that no new provocations would arise» (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 306). It is plausible that this strategic de-escalation was facilitated by Kundelen-taiji himself, whose long-standing personal ties with Yanggir Khan made continued conflict undesirable for a faction of the Oirat aristocracy.

Even this temporary stabilization, however, did not alter the strategic balance in the region: during the same period, the Oirats succeeded in occupying and subsequently consolidating control over a segment of eastern Semirechye, previously considered an integral zone of Kazakh nomadic dominion (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 219). This territorial acquisition not only served as the first concretely documented shift of the frontier in favor of the Dzungar Khanate, but also marked the beginning of a systemic geopolitical transformation that would profoundly reshape Kazakh–Oirat relations throughout the late 17th century.

A pivotal role in the military confrontation with the Dzungars was played by Zhangir Khan, whose personal bravery and strategic resolve earned him among the Kazakh population the honorific epithet «Salkam»—conventionally translated as «the Imposing» or «the Formidable.» The Kazakh Khanate did not stand alone in its efforts to contain Oirat expansion: various Uzbek regional rulers, motivated by shared geopolitical concerns, and the Kyrgyz communities of the Tien Shan consistently joined the Kazakhs as active military collaborators. Since the Kyrgyz nomadic groups were geographically closest to Dzungar frontier strongholds, they inevitably became the first victims of sudden Oirat incursions, which, according to Russian diplomatic records, repeatedly struck their mountain pastures without warning (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 237). Oirat historical tradition likewise preserves memory of this struggle: the biographical narrative of Zaya Pandita reports that in 1652 Tsötsen Khan, the head of the Khoshuud aristocracy, led a campaign into Kyrgyz territories of the Tien Shan, accompanied by his seventeen-year-old son Galdan—later celebrated in Oirat heroic epics as a symbol of martial valor.

Cooperation between the Kazakh Khanate and the Tien Shan Kyrgyz, forged under the pressure of shared existential threats, found symbolic expression even in monumental architecture. As Chokan Valikhanov observed, a tower in Tashkent – known locally as the «Blue Dome of Kukem» – preserved the memory of the historical alliance between the Tien Shan Kyrgyz and Kazakh rulers; «Kukem» was the name of an influential Kyrgyz progenitor who supported Khan Esim, thereby reinforcing the political cohesion necessary for resisting the Oirat offense (Valikhanov, 1985: 77).

The death of Batur Khuntaiji – occurring sometime between 1653 and 1655 – initiated a temporary reduction of direct military pressure on the Kazakh Khanate. The Dzungar political elite became absorbed in internal matters: the late ruler was survived by eleven (in some accounts, twelve) sons (Russian–Mongolian Relations, 1636–1654: 302, 305), whose competing claims to inheritance generated a prolonged succession crisis. The prevailing scholarly viewpoint holds that the throne initially passed to Batur's eldest son, Sengge; correspondingly, the author of the «Legend of the Derben-Oirats» remarked that the deceased ruler divided his realm into two major portions, granting one half to Sengge while the remaining domains were shared among eight of his brothers, with Galdan – the future leader of Dzungaria – ranking 10th among them (Kalmyk Historical-Literary Monuments: 37). The numerous younger princes, perceiving this settlement as inequitable, soon challenged Sengge's authority, resorting to armed force in an attempt to redistribute the patrimonial legacy (Zlatkin, 1983: 136). As a result, Dzungaria fragmented into antagonistic aristocratic factions, which sharply limited the capacity of its central government to exert outward pressure.

In an attempt to consolidate his political legitimacy and restore the cohesion of the khanate, Sengge redirected attention toward foreign policy initiatives. In early 1658, Dzungar forces achieved a significant military success against troops of the Bukhara Khanate in a major engagement near the Talas River. Based on the materials assembled by A. M. Pozdneev, an army of 38,000 under Bukhara commander Abad-Shukur marched into the region, unaware that the Khoshuud prince Galdan, encamped in the southwestern territories of Dzungaria, had mobilized a strike force of 3,000 warriors. Launching a sudden and decisive attack in the Hulun-Jilin valley, the Oirats routed the Bukharan contingent and captured one of its prominent commanders, Shak-Khozo, who was positioned with a specialized guard corps of 300 elite fighters (Pozdneev, 1880: 147). The scarcity of corroborating primary documentation, however, prevents scholars from reconstructing the full tactical picture of the battle.

This campaign marked the resumption of Dzungar incursions into Kazakhstan. The peace that had been concluded previously between Zhangir and Batur Khuntaiji proved fragile and short-lived, giving way once again to border warfare and retaliatory raids. Some accounts suggest that during these renewed hostilities, the Kazakhs succeeded in capturing one of Batur's sons – Onchon – who, due to his lineage, was regarded within Dzungaria as a potential claimant to the throne. According to a later European travel description, the Kazakhs nursed him back to health from smallpox and only after three years returned him to the Oirat rulers (Gerbillon, 1785: 277–301). This episode, while anecdotal, illustrates the degree to which dynastic rivalry and frontier conflict became deeply entangled in the broader geopolitical struggle.

The authority of Sengge proved fundamentally fragile, and, as numerous researchers have noted, his real power appears not to have extended even over the entire Choros tribal federation. A.M. Pozdneev emphasized that Sengge «never held, in contrast to his father, the position of the undisputed sovereign of the Oirat confederation; only after six or seven years following the death of Batur Khuntaiji did he manage to secure control over the Dzungar clans, and even this status did not elevate his significance beyond the limits of those particular lineages» (Pozdneev, 1887: 8). The succession struggle that erupted between Sengge and his elder brothers from another maternal line – Tsötsen and Zotba – ultimately ended to the latter's advantage. In 1670, Sengge fell victim to their conspiracy and was assassinated. Yet the conspirators' expectations were rapidly overturned: the supreme authority of the khanate passed not to them, but to Sengge's full brother, the highly capable and politically assertive Galdan. Renouncing, with the consent of the Dalai Lama, his former ecclesiastical vocation within the Gelugpa clergy, Galdan mounted a swift punitive strike against the fratricidal usurpers and proclaimed himself ruler of the Dzungar Khanate (Kychanov, 1980: 37–38).

The first phase of Galdan's reign was defined by the dual imperative of consolidating personal authority and restoring the coherence of the Dzungar state structure. Simultaneously, he undertook the reestablishment of diplomatic contacts with the Tsardom of Russia and the Qing Empire – relationships that were strategically indispensable given the changing balance of power in Inner Asia (Zlatkin, 1983: 159–183). As A. M. Pozdneev convincingly argued, any assessment of Galdan's early political agenda must account for the dramatic intensification of Qing expansion into Khalka Mongolia. Galdan recognized that the only viable means to prevent the Mongol world from descending into Chinese subjugation lay in the reunification of its fragmented territories under a single sovereign. Accordingly, he resorted to military action against the princes who had voluntarily become tributaries of Beijing: he first dispossessed the Khoshuud khan – brother of the renowned Guushi Khan – and in 1678 launched a campaign against Ochirtu-Tsetsen Khan, ruler of the western segment of Southern Mongolia from Ordos to Kökönör, whom he defeated and had executed thereafter (IVR RAN, Pozdneev Collection, f. 1, d. 169, l. 3–3 ob).

In the late 1670s, continuing the geopolitical priorities initially pursued by Sengge, Galdan intervened forcefully in the internecine struggle between the Ak-Taghlik («white mountain») and Kara-Taghlik («black mountain») khojas in Eastern Turkestan, ultimately extending Dzungar supremacy over the greater part of the region (Kuznetsov, 1970). This realignment of political authority dramatically strengthened the economic foundation of the Dzungar Khanate. It is noteworthy that Russian administrative sources of the period openly acknowledged the rapid rise of its power, remarking that the «khuntaiji seized several cities from the rebellious Bukharan rulers and took control of a wealthy land, becoming at present the strongest among the peoples scattered between India, China, Siberia, Russia, and Persia; he possesses ample firearms, powder, and even organizes grain production – a thing never before found among them» (RGADA, Senat, f. 113/1, 1731, d. 743, l. 250).

Through these campaigns and reforms, Galdan not only restored the political legacy of Batur Khuntaiji, but also transformed the Dzungar Khanate into the most formidable nomadic power in Inner Asia – a development that would have profound consequences for its relations with the Kazakh Khanate in the final decades of the 17th century.

Building upon the substantial material resources extracted from Eastern Turkestan and other subjugated regions of Siberia, Galdan in the early 1680s initiated a new phase of expansive warfare directed simultaneously against the Kazakh Khanate and the political entities of Central Asia. Soviet historian P. P. Ivanov rightly observed that, beginning from the second half of the 17th century, «a new wave of Kalmyk advances toward the northeastern periphery of Central Asia emerged, triggering a broader displacement of nomadic populations toward the core zones of the region» (Materialy, 1935: 40). The agricultural-urban polities of Central Asia and the tribal confederations of the Kazakh steppe theoretically possessed the capacity to mobilize a larger total number of combatants than the Dzungar state; however, this demographic advantage was offset by profound internal disunity and organizational deficiencies.

Russian diplomatic documentation provides detailed insight into the comparative military potential of the opposing sides. It noted that the Bukhara Khanate was capable of assembling «more than 150,000 warriors,» drawing contingents from the Turki-speaking populations of Turkistan as well as from the Karakalpaks and Kazakhs, whereas the ruler of Balkh commanded merely half that number. Yet despite this numerical strength, Bukharan and Balkh cavalry was regarded as militarily unreliable; only the Turkistan Kazakhs and the Karakalpak princes loyal to Bukhara were considered formidable fighters in battle. The same records estimated that the auxiliary forces of Kazakhs and Karakalpaks numbered around 50,000, who divided their contingents between defending Bukhara and protecting their own pastoral domains from «the black Kalmyks dwelling beneath the Chinese city» – an unmistakable reference to Oirat incursions along the Ili basin (Materialy, 1935: 40; Russian Historical Library, vol. 15, 1894: 61; RGADA, f. 113/1. 1744, d. 1, l. 43 ob.). By contrast, modern scholarship usually estimates the full mobilization capacity of the Dzungar military machine at approximately 100,000 well-armed nomadic warriors – a professionalized force superior in cohesion and discipline to its adversaries.

In the early 1680s, the Dzungar army under Galdan's direct command launched a major invasion into Semirechye and southern Kazakhstan. During one of these engagements, the Kazakh ruler Zhangir Khan was killed – Oirat epic narratives claim that he perished in personal combat with the Khoshuud prince Galdama, whose heroic status in oral tradition reflects the traumatic resonance of this clash (Pozdneev, 1880: 147). The disarray and mutual distrust among the Kazakh, Bukharan, and Kyrgyz authorities, combined with the velocity and force of the Dzungar offensive, produced devastating outcomes: entire Kazakh uluses were destroyed, and several fortified settlements in the Syr Darya basin fell to the invaders.

The chronicler Molla Musa ibn Molla Aisa Khoja Sayrami, author of *Tārīkh-i Amniya* (The History of Tranquility and Security), wrote that Dzungar authority at that time extended as far as Tashkent (Materials on the history of the Kazakh khanates, 1969: 486–487). Resistance emerged, however, when the population of Sayram rose in rebellion, killing the Oirat garrison and the appointed governor. Galdan responded with a second punitive expedition into southern Kazakhstan in 1684: Sayram was captured, subjected to widespread devastation, and, according to the same accounts, part of the surviving population was forcibly resettled into Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan (Materials on the history of the Kazakh khanates, 1969: 486–487).

P.P. Ivanov and several other scholars argue that the destruction of Sayram marked a turning point in the political geography of the region: deprived of its administrative and commercial functions, the ancient city began its irreversible decline and gradually lost significance as one of the foremost cultural and economic centers of both the Kazakh steppe and Central Asia as a whole (Ivanov, 1927: 153).

This particular invasion differed fundamentally in nature and purpose from all preceding Oirat offensives into Kazakh and Central Asian territories. The Dzungar ruling elite no longer sought merely to plunder or destabilize border regions: rather, they attempted to establish durable dominance, impose tribute upon the populations of conquered cities, and institutionalize a mechanism of fiscal extraction across the newly subjugated lands. The strategic horizon of Dzungar expansion had visibly shifted – from episodic raiding to a deliberate reconfiguration of political authority across the Syr Darya basin and Semirechye.

Moreover, as newly discovered Russian archival documentation reveals, the motivations guiding Galdan's campaign were not confined to economic or geopolitical factors alone. In March 1691, two of his envoys – Ayuka-Kashka and Ochin-Kashka – presented a statement before the Irkutsk voivode L. I. Kislyanskii, describing the ideological roots of the conflict. According to their testimony: «Boshugtu Khan sent envoys to the Kazakh horde so that they would unite with him and profess the same faith in the Dalai Lama as the Kalmyk Boshugtu Khan and all his people; but because they refused to accept belief in the Dalai Lama in the Kalmyk manner, discord arose and from this great battles ensued» (RGADA, Siberian Prikaz, f. 1, d. 544, l. 210).

This remarkable statement demonstrates that Galdan considered the growing consolidation of Kazakh political institutions under Tauke Khan an existential threat, which he sought to prevent by

force before a strengthened Kazakh polity could alter the balance of power in Inner Asia. Additionally, it strongly suggests that Galdan aimed to induce a confessional transformation in the Kazakh steppe, compelling its ruling elite and population to adopt Tibetan Buddhism (Lamaist doctrine), which he personally revered after many years spent in Lhasa as a religious disciple. His deep personal connections with the Fifth Dalai Lama Ngawang Lobsang Gyatso and the regent Desi Sangye Gyatso are well attested in Mongolian and Tibetan sources (Kychanov, 1980).

The same envoys provided a detailed list of the urban centers conquered by Galdan's forces, stating that nine cities previously recognizing Tauke's sovereignty had fallen into Oirat hands, among them: Sayram, Menkent, Karasman, Chimkent, Tekek, Baban-Yelgan, Kharamurl, Tashkent, Chinak, and an 11th city whose name they had forgotten, located «on the Tsyrcekt River» (RGADA, f. 1, d. 544, l. 212). Only Yasi (Turkestan) and Tashkent avoided military devastation – the former due to Tauke Khan's presence there with his main army, and the latter because its inhabitants submitted peacefully and provided allegiance and tax tribute (yasak) to the Dzungar ruler (RGADA, f. 1, d. 544, l. 213).

Furthermore, the envoys reported that the Oirats had captured one of Tauke's sons – a figure recorded as Solton (likely not a personal name but the dynastic title Sultan) – whom they transported to Lhasa as a political hostage and a symbolic convert. According to their words: «And this Solton lives with the Dalai Lama to this day; he resides there of his own accord, and the Dalai Lama grants him honor befitting his rank» (RGADA, Siberian Prikaz, f. 1, d. 544, l. 210).

This episode not only confirms the ideological component of the Dzungar expansion but also provides direct evidence of Galdan's long-term objective: to anchor a Lamaist religio-political hegemony across the Kazakh steppe as a means of permanently reorienting regional order.

After conquering large swaths of southern Kazakhstan and portions of Central Asia, Galdan did not continue the advance deeper into the core regions of Transoxiana. This tactical decision later allowed the author of the Muqim-khān's History to boast triumphantly that «the Kalmyk people – more numerous than ants and locusts and more savage and fearless than lions and tigers – had marched against us but ultimately suffered divine punishment» (Mukhammed-Yusuf, 1956: 144). The withdrawal of the Oirat troops, however, had little to do with any legendary defeat inflicted by the Bukharan ruler Subhankuli Khan. Instead, it resulted from a profound shift in Dzungar strategic priorities.

During the first half of the 1680s a major political crisis erupted in Khalkha Mongolia, where a violent feud unfolded between Dzasaqtu Khan Tsengdon and Tusheetu Khan Chikhundorji. Recognizing that internal Mongol fragmentation would create a favorable opening for the Qing Empire to establish suzerainty over Mongolia, Galdan resolved to intervene militarily to impose reunification under his authority (Mukhammed-Yusuf, 1956: 144). In 1688, leading an army of roughly 30,000 elite horsemen, he entered Khalkha territory, inflicted decisive defeats upon Chikhundorji and allied northern Mongol princes, and inevitably precipitated a direct confrontation with the Qing state – a conflict that would soon become existential for both sides (Zlatkin, 1983; Gurevich, 1983).

No sooner had Galdan departed for Khalkha than a series of destabilizing events unfolded in Dzungaria itself, which ultimately played a crucial role in determining the final outcome of his struggle against the Qing Empire. First, Kazakh forces launched a sharp counteroffensive against the western frontiers of Dzungar territory, ravaging the border encampments and reclaiming lost pastures. Second, a palace coup dramatically altered the political order: Tsewang Rabtan – Galdan's nephew, who had previously fled to Uch-Turfan to escape his uncle's persecution – seized the opportunity created by Galdan's absence to lay claim to the throne.

Oirat envoys Manzhi-Ishtemin and Shara-Yenzan, dispatched in 1691 to Tomsk, reported that: «When Boshugtu-Khan marched into the Mongol lands and left his urga on the Khovd River, Chagan-Araptan came after him and took Boshugtu-Khan's urga for himself...» (RGADA, Jungar Affairs, f. 1, 1595–1736, d. 1, l. 7). This episode signaled not merely a dynastic betrayal but a strategic fracture at the heart of Dzungar authority: the khanate's central political and military command was effectively compromised at the moment when Dzungaria faced its most formidable external

adversary. Following several devastating defeats inflicted by Qing imperial armies, Galdan's military capabilities collapsed, culminating in his suicide in 1697. His death brought an end to the most aggressive and expansionist phase of Dzungar foreign policy in the 17th century and marked the beginning of a qualitatively new stage in Dzungar–Kazakh relations.

Historical evidence leaves little doubt that the creation of the Dzungar Khanate fundamentally transformed the geopolitical dynamics of Inner Asia. The consolidation of Oirat political institutions provided the khanate with the administrative coherence and military capacity required to intensify pressure on Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and—albeit to a lesser extent—the Bukhara Khanate. What had previously consisted mainly of episodic medieval predatory raids evolved into systematic territorial expansion aimed at the annexation of Kazakh domains and their incorporation into the Dzungar state. V. V. Bartold noted that after Galdan's campaigns in Kazakhstan and the northern regions of Central Asia in the early 1680s, «Kalmyk authority in Semirechye, as far as is known, was not challenged by anyone, and their numerous wars with the Kazakhs, Mongols, and Chinese did not concern that area» (Bartold, 1963: 98). During this same period, the political and military center of the Dzungar Khanate shifted from the upper Irtysh to the Ili River basin near the confluence with the Tekes – a strategic relocation reflecting not only territorial gains but also the desire to consolidate rule over Semirechye as a permanent possession.

At the same time, oppositional polities in the region sought—though with limited success—to develop a coordinated anti-Dzungar coalition. The alliance forged between the Kazakhs and the Kyrgyz increasingly attracted the attention and participation of Bukhara's rulers. Their combined military effort had previously succeeded in repelling Batur Khuntaiji's invasion in 1643. Yet such coalitions were ephemeral, fragile, and highly dependent upon short-term political circumstances. Their instability allowed Dzungar rulers to exploit divisions among their adversaries and engage them sequentially, thereby securing military victories and cumulative territorial advantage.

As a result, by the late 17th century the Dzungar Khanate had emerged as the dominant nomadic power in Inner Asia, capable of reshaping borders, controlling key trade routes, and projecting its influence deep into the Kazakh steppe and beyond. The asymmetry in the level of political centralization and military organization between Dzungaria and the Kazakh polities played a decisive role in determining the course of their relationship during this formative period.

Conclusion

The conducted research demonstrates that the formation of the Dzungar Khanate and the strengthening of its statehood in the 17th century fundamentally transformed the balance of power in Central Asia. As a result of the consolidation of the Oirat tribes under the authority of the Khuntaiji, a powerful military-political system emerged, surpassing the Kazakh Khanate in terms of the degree of centralization and the availability of mobilizable resources. This advantage enabled the Dzungars to shift from limited raiding operations to strategically oriented territorial expansion, subjugating significant portions of the traditionally Kazakh domains.

An examination of the key stages of Kazakh–Dzungar confrontation reveals that by the end of the 17th century, Dzungaria had firmly established itself as the dominant nomadic power capable of imposing its will on the region. Moreover, it has been confirmed that Dzungar expansion had not only military-political but also ideological dimensions: the attempt to impose a politically advantageous religious orientation upon subjugated peoples became an integral component of their foreign policy strategy.

Thus, the objective of the study – to analyze the correlation between the internal transformations of the Dzungar Khanate and the nature and success of its external policy toward the Kazakh khanates – has been successfully achieved. The findings also provide a reflective perspective on the condition of the Kazakh khanates during the period under consideration: while the temporary political fragmentation of the Kazakhs is evident, the results simultaneously highlight the capacity for collective mobilization and the emergence of a consolidated defensive response in the struggle against Dzungar aggression.

The results of the study deepen the scholarly understanding of the causes and mechanisms of the Kazakh–Oirat confrontation in the 17th century, bridging existing gaps in historiography and emphasizing the importance of a comprehensive approach to the study of interstate relations among nomadic societies.

Источники

АВПРИ – Архив внешней политики Российской империи
ИВР РАН – Институт восточных рукописей Российской академии наук
РГАДА – Российский государственный архив древних актов

Литература

Бартольд, 1963 – *Бартольд В.В. Сочинения*. Т. II, ч. 1. М.: Изд-во восточной литературы, 1963. 1020 с.

Бекмаханов, 1957 – *Бекмаханов Е.Б. Присоединение Казахстана к России*. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1957. 342 с.

Бичурин, 1991 – *Бичурин Н.Я. Историческое обозрение ойратов или калмыков с XV столетия до настоящего времени*. Элиста: Калмыцкое книжное издательство, 1991. 127 с.

Валиханов, 1985 – *Валиханов Ч.Ч. Собрание сочинений: в 5 т. Т. 2. Алма-Ата: Главная редакция Казахской советской энциклопедии*, 1985. 416 с.

Владимирцов, 1934 – *Владимирцов Б.Я. Общественный строй монголов. Монгольский кочевой феодализм*. Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1934. 223 с.

Вяткин, 1947 – *Вяткин М.П. Батыр Срым: Освободительное движение в Казахстане в конце XVIII века*. М.; Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1947. 392 с.

Гербilon, 1785 – *Гербilon И.Ф. О Великой Татарии // Собрание сочинений, выбранных из месяцесловов на разные годы*. СПб., 1785. Ч. 1. С. 277–301.

Голстунский, 1880 – *Голстунский К.Ф. Монголо-ойратские законы 1640 года, дополнительные указы Галдан-Хун-Тайджия и законы, составленные для волжских калмыков при калмыцком хане Дондук-Даши / пер. К.Ф.Голстунского*. СПб.: Тип. Имп. АН, 1880. 144 с.

Гуревич, 1983 – *Гуревич Б.П. Международные отношения в Центральной Азии в XVII – первой половине XIX в.* М.: Наука, 1983. 309 с.

Златкин, 1983 – *Златкин И.Я. История Джунгарского ханства, 1635–1758*. М.: Наука, 1983. 332 с.

История Казахстана, 1997 – *История Казахстана (с древнейших времен до наших дней): в 5 т.* Т. 2. Алматы: Атамұра, 1997. 624 с.

Калмыцкие историко-литературные памятники, 1969 – *Калмыцкие историко-литературные памятники в русском переводе*. Элиста, 1969. 203 с.

Кузнецов, 1970 – *Кузнецов В.С. К вопросу о владычестве Джунгарского ханства над Восточным Туркестаном (XVII–XVIII вв.)*. Улан-Удэ, 1970. С. 21–28.

Кычанов, 1980 – *Кычанов Е.И. Повествование об ойратском Галдане Башкыту-хане*. Новосибирск: Наука, Сиб. отд-ние, 1980. 190 с.

Кычанов, 1989 – *Кычанов Е.И. О джунгарских отоках и анги // НКОГК*. М., 1982. Ч. 2. С. 157–160.

Левшин, 1832 – *Левшин А.И. Описание киргиз-казачьих, или киргиз-кайсацких орд и степей*. СПб.: Карла Крайя, 1832. 264 с.

Леонтович, 1880 – *Леонтович Ф.И. Калмыцкое право // Сочинения Ф.И. Леонтовича*. Ч. 1. Одесса: Тип. Г. Ульриха, 1880. 440 с.

Материалы по истории казахских ханств, 1969 – *Материалы по истории казахских ханств XV–XVIII веков*. Алма-Ата: Наука Казахской ССР, 1969. 648 с.

Материалы, 1935 – *Материалы по истории каракалпаков: сб.* М.; Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1935. 299 с.

Михайлов, 1969 – *Михайлов Г.И. Монгольская литература: краткий очерк*. М.: Наука, 1969. 222 с.

Мухаммед Юсуф, 1956 – *Мухаммед Юсуф мунши. Муким-ханская история / пер. с тадж., предисл., примеч. и указатели А.А.Семенова; Ин-т востоковедения АН УзССР*. Ташкент: Изд-во АН УзССР, 1956. 303 с.

Паллас, 1778 – *Паллас П.С. Собрание исторических известий о монгольских народах // Санкт-Петербургский вестник*. СПб., 1778. Ч. 1.

Позднеев, 1880 – *Позднеев А.М. Образцы народной литературы монгольских племен / собр. и изд. А.Позднеевым*. Вып. 1. СПб.: Тип. АН, 1880. 347 с.

Потанин, 1868 – *Потанин Г.Н. О караванной торговле с Джунгарской Бухарией в XVIII столетии // Сочинения Г.Н.Потанина*. М.: Университетская типография Катков и Ко, 1868. 93 с.

Русско-монгольские отношения, 1974 – *Русско-монгольские отношения. 1636–1654: сборник документов*. М.: Наука, 1974. 469 с.

Сборник, 1958 – *Сборник научных трудов*. Вып. 126: Хозяйственные связи кочевых народов с Россией, Средней Азией и Китаем (с XV до половины XVIII века). Ташкент: САГУ, 1958. 104 с.

Султанов, 1982 – *Султанов Т.И. Кочевые племена Приаралья в XV–XVII вв. (вопросы этнической и социальной истории)*. М.: Наука, 1982. 133 с.

Чернышев, 1982 – Чернышев А.И. «Цинь-дин хуан-юй си-юй ту-чжи» (Высочайше утвержденное географическое описание Западного края с картами) об отоках и аилах Джунгарского ханства // НКОГК. М., 1982. Ч. 2. С. 164–171.

Шахматов, 1964 – Шахматов В.Ф. Казахская пастбищно-кочевая община: вопросы образования, эволюции и разложения. Алма-Ата: Изд-во АН КазССР, 1964. 207 с.

Юдин, 1965 – Юдин В.П. О родоплеменном составе моголов Могулистана и Могулии и их этнических связях с казахами и другими соседними народами // Известия АН КазССР. 1965. № 3. С. 52–65.

Sources

AVPRI – Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire

IVR RAN – Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences

RGADA – Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts

References

Bartold, 1963 – Bartold V.V. Sochineniya. Vol. II, pt. 1. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1963. 1020 p. (In Russ.).

Bekmakhonov, 1957 — Bekmakhonov E.B. Prisoedinenie Kazakhstana k Rossii [The Accession of Kazakhstan to Russia]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1957. 342 p. (In Russ.).

Bichurin, 1991 – Bichurin N.Ya. Istoricheskoe obozrenie oiratov ili kalmykov s XV stoletiya do nastoyashchego vremeni. Elista: Kalmytskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1991. 127 p. (In Russ.).

Chernyshev, 1982 – Chernyshev A.I. “Tsin'-din khuan'-yui si-yui tu-chzhi” (Vysochaishe utverzhdennoe geograficheskoe opisanie Zapadnogo kraya s kartami) ob otokakh i ailakh Dzhungarskogo khanstva [“Qinding huanyu xiyu tuzhi” (Imperially Approved Geographical Description of the Western Regions with Maps) on Otoks and Ails of the Dzungar Khanate] // NKOGK. Moscow, 1982. Part 2. Pp. 164–171. (In Russ.).

Gerbillon, 1785 – Gerbillon I.F. O Velikoi Tatarii [On Great Tartary] // Sobranie sochinenii, vybrannyykh iz mesyatseslovov na raznye gody. St. Petersburg, 1785. Part 1. Pp. 277–301. (In Russ.).

Golstunskii, 1880 – Golstunskii K.F. Mongolo-oiratskie zakony 1640 goda, dopolnitel'nye ukazy Galdan-Khun-Taijiya i zakony, sostavленные для volzhskikh kalmykov pri kalmytskom khane Donduk-Dashi. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1880. 144 p. (In Russ.).

Gurevich, 1983 – Gurevich B.P. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya v Tsentral'noi Azii v XVII – pervoi polovine XIX v. Moscow: Nauka, 1983. 309 p. (In Russ.).

Istoriya Kazakhstana, 1997 – Istoriya Kazakhstana (s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei): in 5 vols. Vol. 2. Almaty: Atamura, 1997. 624 p. (In Russ.).

Kalmytskie istoriko-literaturnye pamyatniki, 1969 – Kalmytskie istoriko-literaturnye pamyatniki v russkom perevode. Elista, 1969. 203 p. (In Russ.).

Kuznetsov, 1970 – Kuznetsov V.S. K voprosu o vladychestve Dzhungarskogo khanstva nad Vostochnym Turkestanom (XVII–XVIII vv.) [On the Domination of the Dzungar Khanate over Eastern Turkestan (17th–18th Centuries)]. Ulan-Ude, 1970. Pp. 21–28. (In Russ.).

Kychanov, 1980 – Kychanov E.I. Povestvovanie ob oiratskom Galdane Boshoktu-khane. Novosibirsk: Nauka, Sibirske otdelenie, 1980. 190 p. (In Russ.).

Kychanov, 1989 – Kychanov E.I. O dzhungarskikh otokakh i angi [On Dzungar Otoks and Angi] // NKOGK. Moscow, 1982. Part 2. Pp. 157–160. (In Russ.).

Leontovich, 1880 – Leontovich F.I. Kalmytskoe pravo. In: Sochineniya F.I. Leontovicha. Part 1. Odessa: Tipografiya G. Ul'rikha, 1880. 440 p. (In Russ.).

Levshin, 1832 – Levshin A.I. Opisanie kirgiz-kazach'ikh, ili kirgiz-kaissatskikh ord i stepei. St. Petersburg: Karla Kraiya, 1832. 264 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy po istorii kazakhskikh khanstv, 1969 – Materialy po istorii kazakhskikh khanstv XV–XVIII vekov. Alma-Ata: Nauka Kazakhskoi SSR, 1969. 648 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy, 1935 – Materialy po istorii karakalpakov: Collection. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1935. 299 p. (In Russ.).

Mikhailov, 1969 – Mikhailov G.I. Mongol'skaya literatura: kratkii ocherk. Moscow: Nauka, 1969. 222 p. (In Russ.).

Mukhammed-Yusuf, 1956 – Mukhammed-Yusuf munshi. Mukim-khanskaya istoriya. Trans., introd., notes and indexes by A.A. Semenov; Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR. Tashkent: Izdatel'stvo AN UzSSR, 1956. 303 p. (In Russ.).

Pallas, 1778 – Pallas P.S. Sobranie istoricheskikh izvestii o mongol'skikh narodakh. St. Petersburgskii vestnik. St. Petersburg, 1778. Part 1. (In Russ.).

Potanin, 1868 – Potanin G.N. Sochineniya. Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya Katkov i Ko, 1868. 93 p. (In Russ.).

Pozdneev, 1880 – Pozdneev A.M. Obraztsy narodnoi literatury mongol'skikh plemen. Issue 1. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya Akademii nauk, 1880. 347 p. (In Russ.).

Russko-mongol'skie otnosheniya, 1974 – Russko-mongol'skie otnosheniya. 1636–1654: Collection of documents. Moscow: Nauka, 1974. 469 p. (In Russ.).

Sbornik, 1958 – Sbornik nauchnykh trudov. Issue 126: Khozyaystvennye svyazi kочevykh narodov s Rossiei, Srednei Aziei i Kitaem (s XV do poloviny XVIII veka). Tashkent: SAGU, 1958. 104 p. (In Russ.).

Shakhmatov, 1964 – *Shakhmatov V.F. Kazakhskaya pastbischchno-kochevaya obshchina: voprosy obrazovaniya, evolyutsii i razlozheniya*. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo AN KazSSR, 1964. 207 p. (In Russ.).

Sultanov, 1982 – *Sultanov T.I. Kочevye plemena Priaral'ya v XV–XVII vv. (voprosy etnicheskoi i sotsial'noi istorii)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982. 133 p. (In Russ.).

Valikhanov, 1985 – *Valikhanov Ch.Ch. Sobranie sochinenii: in 5 vols. Vol. 2*. Alma-Ata: Glavnaya redaktsiya Kazakhskoi sovetskoi entsiklopedii, 1985. 416 p. (In Russ.).

Vladimirtsov, 1934 – *Vladimirtsov B.Ya. Obshchestvennyi stroi mongolov. Mongol'skii kочevoi feodalizm*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1934. 223 p. (In Russ.).

Vyatkin, 1947 – *Vyatkin M.P. Batyr Srym: Osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie v Kazakhstane v kontse XVIII veka*. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1947. 392 p. (In Russ.).

Yudin, 1965 – *Yudin V.P. O rodoplemennom sostave mogulov Mogulistana i Mogulii i ikh etnicheskikh svyazyakh s kazakhami i drugimi sosednimi narodami* [On the Tribal Composition of the Moguls of Moghulistan and Moghulia and Their Ethnic Ties with the Kazakhs and Other Neighboring Peoples] // *Izvestiya AN KazSSR*. 1965. No. 3. Pp. 52–65. (In Russ.).

Zlatkin, 1983 – *Zlatkin I.Ya. Iстория Dzhungarskogo khanstva, 1635–1758*. Moscow: Nauka, 1983. 332 p. (In Russ.).

CONTENTS

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE STUDIES

Kupenova G.Y., Smanova A.M.	
THE «SCHOOL QUESTION» IN THE HISTORY OF THE TURKIC-MUSLIM PEOPLES OF RUSSIA (BASED ON THE MATERIALS OF THE PRE-REVOLUTIONARY TATAR PRESS).....	1563
Kasymkhan K., Saurykan Y.	
RELIGIOUS AND SOURCE-STUDY ASPECTS OF MASHKHUR ZHUSIP KOPEULY'S MANUSCRIPT "DIN TAGYLYMY".....	1575

HISTORY

Kabuldinov Z.E., Beisembayeva A.R., Mussabalina G.T.	
FOREIGN POLICY OF THE DZUNGAR KHANATE TOWARD THE KAZAKH KHANATE IN THE 1630S–1680S.....	1588
Abdikhanova A.E., Akhmetova Zh.K., Abdimanov S.A.	
PRINCIPLES OF THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL STATEHOOD (USING THE EXAMPLE OF THE «USH ZHUZ» PARTY).....	1605
Abdullaeva A., Dinasheva L., Myrzaliyeva E.	
THE EVOLUTION OF TRADITIONAL URBAN CULTURE OF TURKESTAN IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY.....	1619
Adilbaeva A.S., Bakitzhanova A.B., Gabdullina A.Zh.	
THE SIZE AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION OF SEMEY DURING THE PERIOD OF INDEPENDENCE.....	1636
Dadabayeva G., Gerald Pech.	
GERMANS IN KAZAKHSTAN: HISTORY OF RESETTLEMENT AND ADAPTATION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.....	1649
Jursunbayev B.A., Zhubanyshov B.T., Danabekova D.I.	
THE CULT OF MOUNTAINS IS THE ORIGINAL SOURCE OF THE TENGRIAN WORLDVIEW.....	1662
Koja M.B., Sandybayeva A.D., Primkulova G.J.	
SOME RESEARCH RESULTS OF THE AL-KHOJA-ATA COMPLEX IN THE CITY OF TURKESTAN.....	1680
Legkiy D.M., Ibrayev Y.Y., Tabuldenov A.N.	
LEADERS OF THE KAZAKH NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN DOCUMENTS OF POLITICAL INVESTIGATION (ORENBURG, AUGUST 1916).....	1693
Oralova A.A.	
THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF KOZHABERGEN BATYR IN THE EASTERN FRONTIER POLICY OF THE KAZAKH KHANATE	1707
Saktaganova Z.G., Yelibayev T.A.	
THE TURGAY REGION BASED ON THE MATERIALS OF THE FIRST GENERAL CENSUS OF THE POPULATION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE OF 1897.....	1720
Sydykov E.B., Sailybay E.E., Düysen S.Zh.	
THE PRODUCTIVE WORK OF BALZHAN BOLTIRIKOVA DURING HER DIPLOMATIC SERVICE AT THE UNITED NATIONS.....	1735
Tassilova A.A., Zhappasov Z.E.	
WOMEN IN WARTIME SOVIET SOCIETY.....	1750
Turlybai B.S. Kenzhebaev G.K.	
THE ROLE OF THE NEWSPAPER "BIRLIK TUY" IN RAISING EDUCATIONAL ISSUES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY.....	1762
Tokishkadirov B., Dautova A., Issin A.	
HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATION OF KAZAKH-DZHUNGAR RELATIONS IN FOLK LITERATURE (BASED ON THE SONG "AIKUNIM" COMPOSED BY SHAKARIM).....	1776
Shukeeva A.T., Bukanova R.G., Utegenov M.Z.	
EVERYDAY LIFE OF THE RURAL POPULATION OF THE NORTHERN REGIONS OF KAZAKHSTAN IN THE 1950s–1960s THROUGH THE PRISM OF HISTORICAL MEMORY.....	1792

ETHNOLOGY/ANTHROPOLOGY

Sakhi Zh., Aidymbayeva A.	
GENDER POLICY IN EARLY 20TH-CENTURY KAZAKH SOCIETY ON THE PAGES OF THE "AIQAP" JOURNAL: A MEDIA-ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS.....	1808
Syzydkova G.M.	
ENDO- AND EXO-ETHNONYMS OF THE KAZAKH PEOPLE IN RUSSIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE SECOND HALF XVIII – EARLY XX CENTURIES.....	1824
Kaliyeva B.T., Tleubekova G.B.	
THE WAY OF LIFE OF KAZAKH PEOPLE IN THE MATERIALS OF RUSSIAN IMPERIAL EXPEDITIONS AND THE WORKS OF RUSSIAN TRAVELERS OF THE 18TH–19TH CENTURIES.....	1834

МАЗМУНЫ

ТАРИХНАМА ЖӘНЕ ДЕРЕКТАНУ

Купенова Г.Ы., Сманова А.М.	
РЕСЕЙДЕГІ ТҮРКІ-МҰСЫЛМАН ХАЛЫҚТАРЫ ТАРИХЫНДАҒЫ «МЕКТЕП МӘСЕЛЕСІ» (РЕВОЛЮЦИЯҒА ДЕЙІНГІ ТАТАР БАСПАСӨЗІНІҢ ДЕРЕКТЕРІ НЕГІЗІНДЕ).....	1563
Қасымқан Қ., Сауырқан Е.	
МӘШІҮР ЖУСІП КӨПЕЙҰЛЫНЫҢ «ДІН ТАҒЫЛЫМЫ» ҚОЛЖАЗБАСЫНЫҢ ДІНТАНУЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ ДЕРЕКТАНУЛЫҚ АСПЕКТИЛЕР.....	1575

ТАРИХ

Қабылдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Құсайдиқова Г.Т.	
1630–1680-ЖЫЛДАРЫ ЖОНҒАР ХАНДЫҒЫНЫҢ ҚАЗАҚ ХАНДЫҒЫНА ҚАТЫСТЫ СЫРТҚЫ САЯСАТЫ.....	1588
Абдиханова А.Е., Ахметова Ж.Қ., Абдиманов С.Ә.	
ҮЛТТЫҚ МЕМЛЕКЕТТІЛІК ЖОЛЫНДАҒЫ КҮРЕСКЕРЛІК ҮСТАНЫМДАР («ҰШ ЖҰЗ» ПАРТИЯСЫ МЫСАЛЫНДА).....	1605
Абдуллаева А.Т., Динашева Л.С., Мырзалиева Э.К.	
XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ЕКІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫНДАҒЫ ТҮРКІСТАН ҚАЛАСЫНЫҢ ДӘСТҮРЛІ ҚАЛА МӘДЕНИЕТІНІҢ ЭВОЛЮЦИЯСЫ.....	1619
Адильбаева А.С., Бақытжанова А.Б., Габдуллина А.Ж.	
ТӘУЕЛСІЗДІК КЕЗЕҢІНДЕГІ СЕМЕЙ ҚАЛАСЫНЫҢ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ САНЫ МЕН ЭТНИКАЛЫҚ ҚҰРАМЫ.....	1636
Дадабаева Г., Пек Д.	
ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ НЕМІСТЕР: XX ҒАСЫРДАҒЫ ҚОНЫС АУДАРУ МЕН БЕЙІМДЕЛУ ТАРИХЫ.....	1649
Жүрсінбаев Б.А., Жұбанышов Б.Т., Данабекова Д.И.	
ТАУ КУЛТІ – ТӘҢІРЛІК ДУНИЕТАНЫМНЫҢ АЛҒАШҚЫ БАСТАУЫ.....	1662
Кожа М., Сандыбаева А., Примкулова Г.	
ТҮРКІСТАН ҚАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ӘЛ-ҚОЖА-АТА КЕШЕНІ ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРІНІҢ КЕЙБІР НӘТИЖЕЛЕРІ.....	1680
Легкий Д.М., Ибраев Е.Е., Табулденов Ә.Н.	
ҚАЗАҚ ҮЛТТЫҚ ҚОЗҒАЛЫСЫНЫҢ ЖЕТЕКШІЛЕРІ САЯСИ ТЕРГЕУ ҚҰЖАТТАРЫНДА (ОРЫНБОР, 1916 Ж. ТАМЫЗ).....	1693
Оралова А.А.	
ҚАЗАҚ ХАНДЫҒЫНЫҢ ШЫГЫС ШЕКАРАЛАРЫНДАҒЫ САЯСАТЫНДА ҚОЖАБЕРГЕН БАТЫРДЫҢ ТАРИХИ РӨЛІ.....	1707
Сақтаганова З.Ғ., Елібаев Т.А.	
ТОРҒАЙ ОБЛЫСЫ РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫНЫҢ 1897 ЖЫЛҒЫ БІРІНШІ ЖАЛПЫХАЛЫҚТАҚ ХАЛЫҚ САНАҒЫ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫ БОЙЫНША.....	1720
Сыздықов Е., Сайлаубай Е., Дүйсен С.	
БАЛЖАН БӨЛТІРІКОВАНЫҢ БІРІККЕН ҮЛТТАР ҰЙЫМЫНА ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ ИССАПАРЛАРЫ КЕЗІНДЕГІ ТИМДІ ЖУМЫСТАРЫ.....	1735
Тасилова А.А., Жаппасов Ж.Е.	
СОҒЫС ЖАҒДАЙЫНДА ӘЙЕЛДЕРДІҢ КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІРГЕ БЕЙІМДЕЛУІ.....	1750
Тұрлыбай Б.С. Қенжебаев Ғ.К.	
XX ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДАҒЫ «БІРЛІК ТУЫ» ГАЗЕТИНІҢ БІЛІМ БЕРУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІН КӨТЕРУДЕГІ РӨЛІ.....	1762
Токишиқадиров Б., Даутова А., Исин А.	
ФОЛЬКЛОР МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ-ЖОНҒАР ҚАТЫНАСТАРЫНЫҢ ТАРИХИ-МӘДЕНИ КӨРІНІСІ (ШӘКЕРІМНЕҢ ЖЕТКЕН «АЙКУНІМ» ӘНІ МЫСАЛЫНДА).....	1776
Шукеева А.Т., Буканова Р.Г., Утегенов М.З.	
XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 50–60-ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ СОЛТУСТИК ӨНІРЛЕРІНДЕГІ АУЫЛ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІРІ ТАРИХИ ЖАДЫ АЯСЫНДА.....	1792

ЭТНОЛОГИЯ/АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Сахи Ж., Айдымбаева А.	
XX ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ ҚОҒАМЫНДАҒЫ ГЕНДЕРЛІК САЯСАТ «АЙҚАЛЬ» ЖУРНАЛЫ БЕТТЕРІНДЕ: МЕДИА-ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....	1808
Сыздықова Г.М.	
XVIII ҒАСЫРДЫҢ ЕКІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫ – XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАС КЕЗЕҢІНДЕГІ РЕСЕЙ ТАРИХНАМАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ ЭНДО ЖӘНЕ ЭКЗОЭТНИМДЕРІ.....	1824
Калиева Б.Т., Тлеубекова Г.Б.	
XVIII-XIX ғғ. РЕСЕЙ ИМПЕРИЯСЫ ҰЙЫМДАСТАҮРҒАН ЗЕРТТЕУ ЭКСПЕДИЦИЯ МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫ МЕН ОРЫС САЯХАТШЫЛАРЫНЫҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ ТҮРМЫС-ТИРШІЛІГІ.....	1834

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ И ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ

Купенова Г.Ы., Сманова А.М.	
«ШКОЛЬНЫЙ ВОПРОС» В ИСТОРИИ ТЮРКО-МУСУЛЬМАНСКИХ НАРОДОВ РОССИИ (ПО МАТЕРИАЛАМ ДОРЕВОЛЮЦИОННОЙ ТАТАРСКОЙ ПЕЧАТИ).....	1563
Касымхан Қ., Сауыркан Е.	
РЕЛИГИОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ И ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ РУКОПИСИ «ДІН ТАҒЫЛЫМЫ» МАШХУРА ЖУСУПА КОПЕЙУЛЫ.....	1575

ИСТОРИЯ

Қабылдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р., Мұсаубалина Г.Т.	
ВНЕШНЯЯ ПОЛИТИКА ДЖУНГАРСКОГО ХАНСТВА В ОТНОШЕНИИ КАЗАХСКОГО ХАНСТВА В 1630–1680-Е ГОДЫ.....	1588
Абдиханова А.Е., Ахметова Ж.К., Абдиманов С.А.	
ПРИНЦИПЫ БОРЬБЫ ЗА НАЦИОНАЛЬНУЮ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОСТЬ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ПАРТИИ «УШ ЖУЗ»).....	1605
Абдуллаева А.Т., Динашева Л.С., Мырзалиева Э.К.	
ЭВОЛЮЦИЯ ТРАДИЦИОННОЙ ГОРОДСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ ГОРОДА ТУРКЕСТАНА ВО ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX ВЕКА.....	1619
Адильбаева А.С., Бакытжанова А.Б., Габдуллина А.Ж.	
ЧИСЛЕННОСТЬ И ЭТНИЧЕСКИЙ СОСТАВ НАСЕЛЕНИЯ ГОРОДА СЕМЕЙ В ПЕРИОД НЕЗАВИСИМОСТИ.....	1636
Дадабаева Г., Пек Д.	
НЕМЦЫ КАЗАХСТАНА: ИСТОРИЯ ПЕРЕСЕЛЕНИЙ И АДАПТАЦИИ В XX ВЕКЕ.....	1649
Журсинбаев Б.А., Жубанышев Б.Т., Данабекова Д.И.	
КУЛЬ ГОР – ПЕРВОНАЧАЛЬНЫЙ ИСТОК ТЕНГРИАНСКОГО МИРОВОЗЗРЕНИЯ.....	1662
Кожа М., Сандыбаева А., Примкулова Г.	
НЕКОТОРЫЕ РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ КОМПЛЕКСА АЛЬ-ХОДЖА-АТА В ГОРОДЕ ТУРКЕСТАНЕ.....	1680
Легкий Д.М., Ибраев Е.Е., Табулденов А.Н.	
ЛИДЕРЫ КАЗАХСКОГО НАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ДВИЖЕНИЯ В ДОКУМЕНТАХ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО СЫСКА (ОРЕНБУРГ, АВГУСТ 1916 г.).....	1693
Оралова А.А.	
ИСТОРИЧЕСКАЯ РОЛЬ КОЖАБЕРГЕНА БАТЫРА В ПОЛИТИКЕ КАЗАХСКОГО ХАНСТВА НА ВОСТОЧНЫХ РУБЕЖАХ.....	1707
Сактаганова З.Г., Елибаев Т.А.	
ТУРГАЙСКАЯ ОБЛАСТЬ ПО МАТЕРИАЛАМ ПЕРВОЙ ВСЕОБЩЕЙ ПЕРЕПИСИ НАСЕЛЕНИЯ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ 1897 ГОДА.....	1720
Сыздыков Е., Сайлаубай Е., Дүйсен С.	
ПЛОДОТВОРНАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ БАЛЖАН БОЛТИРИКОВОЙ ВО ВРЕМЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОЙ СЛУЖБЫ В ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ.....	1735
Тасилова А.А., Жаппасов Ж.Е.	
ЖЕНЩИНЫ В СОВЕТСКОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ В ГОДЫ ВОЙНЫ.....	1750
Турлыбай Б.С., Кенжебаев Г.К.	
РОЛЬ ГАЗЕТЫ «БІРЛІК ТУЫ» В ПОДНЯТИИ ПРОБЛЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКА.....	1762
Токишкадиров Б., Даутова А., Исин А.	
ИСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНОЕ ОТРАЖЕНИЕ КАЗАХСКО-ДЖУНГАРСКИХ ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЙ В ФОЛЬКЛОРНЫХ МАТЕРИАЛАХ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ПЕСНИ «АЙКУНІМ», ДОШЕДШЕЙ ОТ ШАКАРИМА).....	1776
Шукеева А.Т., Буканова Р.Г., Утегенов М.З.	
ПОВСЕДНЕВНАЯ ЖИЗНЬ СЕЛЬСКОГО НАСЕЛЕНИЯ СЕВЕРНЫХ РАЙОНОВ КАЗАХСТАНА В 50-60-Х ГОДАХ XX В. ЧЕРЕЗ ПРИЗМУ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПАМЯТИ.....	1792

ЭТНОЛОГИЯ/АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Сахи Ж., Айдымбаева А.	
ГЕНДЕРНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА В КАЗАХСКОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ НАЧАЛА XX ВЕКА НА СТРАНИЦАХ ЖУРНАЛА «АЙКАП»: МЕДИА-ЭТНОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ.....	1808
Сыздыкова Г.М.	
ЭНДО- И ЭКЗОЭТНОНИМЫ КАЗАХСКОГО НАРОДА В РОССИЙСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XVIII – НАЧАЛА XX В.....	1824
Калиева Б.Т., Тлеубекова Г.Б.	
ОБРАЗ ЖИЗНИ КАЗАХСКОГО НАРОДА В МАТЕРИАЛАХ ЭКСПЕДИЦИЙ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ И ТРУДАХ РУССКИХ ПУТЕШЕСТВЕННИКОВ XVIII–XIX ВЕКОВ.....	1834

ASIAN JOURNAL “STEPPE PANORAMA”

2025. 12 (6)

Бас редактор:

Қабылдинов З.Е.

Компьютерде беттеген:

Копеева С.Ж.

Кұрылтайшысы және баспағері:

Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті
Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Редакция мен баспаңың мекен-жайы:

050010, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй
ҚР ғұжырулыш мекемесі Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Журнал сайты: <https://ajspiie.com>

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. ТжЭИ басылған:

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй