



УДК 93/94  
МРНТИ 03.20  
DOI 10.37238/2960-1371.2960-138X.2024.96(4).101

**Ishkalova Gulbanu Ismagulovna**

**Zhetysay University after named I.Zhansugurov  
Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan**

E-mail: ishkalova0703@mail.ru

## **THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF TRADITIONAL HUNTING OF KAZAKHS**

**Annotation.** The article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of traditional hunting of the Kazakh people and outlines foreign and domestic theories and concepts related to this problem. The main goal is to identify the main theories and concepts for the study of traditional Kazakh hunting. Tasks: to determine the significance of the proposed theories and concepts in the study of the problem; to substantiate them in solving the problems of traditional Kazakh hunting. The considered basic theories and concepts for the study of traditional Kazakh hunting allowed us to reveal the development of Kazakh traditional hunting along with the main nomadic cattle breeding, its place in the Kazakh life support system and preservation in the modern period. Kazakhs did not try to change the local natural landscape, on the contrary, without science, supporting the principle of "one with nature", they built relationships between nature and man through knowledge about it. Kazakhs, adapting to the environment and engaging in nomadic cattle breeding, also developed hunting at a high level, preserving the relationship and balance between man and nature.

**Key words:** traditional hunting; methodology; theory; concept; landscape; ecosystem; economy; ethnic ecology; subconscious psychology; life support.

### *Introduction*

In addition to nomadic animal husbandry, the Kazakhs were engaged in hunting, forming a kind of traditionalism as a subsistence economy. The aviary that forms its basis is falcon hunting with other countries in 2021, that is, the hut was included in the UNESCO list of intangible cultural heritage of humanity [1]. 2024 was declared the national brand of Kazakhstan as "Tazy-ezhelgy kazakhy it tukumy" [2]. The measures taken by the leadership of the Republic of Kazakhstan to preserve and protect the hunting types that form the basis of traditional hunting today demonstrate the importance of this tradition. In addition, due to the inclusion of hunting in the Kazakh national sports, hunting competitions called "Sonar", "Kansonar" and "Kyran" are organized annually in the regions of Kazakhstan [3]. Of course, in the past, hunting was a source of livelihood and an integral part of the economy, but today, due to economic development, hunting has lost its traditional character and is developing in a sports-



amateur direction. The decision of the Republic of Kazakhstan to ratify the Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage increases the effectiveness of its work to protect, promote, develop and revitalize the intangible cultural heritage of our country. It confirms the relevance of the study of birdwatching, which is included in this direction [4]. Currently, ethnological science is interested in the formation of traditional hunting along with nomadic animal husbandry of the Kazakh people. The influence of the local landscape on traditional hunting, its transformation as a result of the colonial policy of the kingdom, its loss of traditionalism and modern revival. On September 8-13, 2024, on the last day of the V World Nomad Games in Astana, there was a competition of nomads.

Because most studies on traditional hunting under the tsarist government were descriptive. It was studied in Soviet times not enough. Although the extraction of wild birds, moose and various equipment is mainly provided. But its economic development and place in the life support system are not fully determined. Nevertheless, since this type of economy is common to all mankind, theories and concepts of foreign and domestic scientists methodologically related to this issue have formed in science. Some are seen as subservient to the ecosystem (rational choice theory: A. Hindmoor, H. Ward; the concept of ethnic ecology: Levin M.G., Cheboksarov N.N., Alekseev V.P., Kozlov V.I. and Masanov N.E.); the second group is associated with the development of civilization (A. Toynbee); the following representatives of the group are based on the theory of historical geography (L.N. Gumilev); fundamental conclusions related to a nomadic lifestyle through the genesis of nomadism (S.I. Vainshtein, A.K. Kushkumbaev); life theory laid down by Russian researchers (S.A. Arutyunov, E.S. Markaryan, E.L. Melkonyan and Yu.I. Mkrtyumyan) and domestic scientists N. Alimbai, M.S. Mukanov and H. Argyubaev in interpretation, and its preservation in folk traditions, despite the initial natural approach and habitat change, formulated on the basis of device theory and unprecedented psychological priority (S.V. Lurie). Through these concepts and theories, we strive to propose ways of using the Kazakh traditional hunting economy in the study.

#### *Methods and materials.*

During the writing of the article, theoretically and methodologically, the theories and concepts prevailing in science, scientific works and scientific approaches were taken as a basis. In particular, historical and logical methods were effective in studying the importance of hunting in time and space, contributed to the implementation of the principle of theoretical analysis and historicity. Based on the theories prevailing in science, a historical and comparative method was used in the study of the Kazakh hunting economy, which was formulated to substantiate theories. While the typological method forms the theoretical and methodological basis in the study of the Kazakh hunting economy, the genetic method was important in the study of the development of the Kazakh hunting economy in the form of a subsidiary farm in conditions of nomadic life. Analysis and synthesis methods made it possible to identify and substantiate the theories underlying the study of the Kazakh hunting economy.

#### *Discussion*

Kazakh hunting has aroused great interest among many researchers. Traditional hunting is, of course, the development of the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries.



Therefore, this issue became widespread in the tsarist era, in Soviet times and in independent historiography. Travelers, merchants, diplomats, scientists and officials who visited our steppe during tsarist Russia tried to describe in as much detail as possible what they saw and knew about the life of the nomadic Kazakh people. We will divide the works of these authors into two groups: one is descriptive, that is, limited to the submission of superficial information, the second is an attempt to make our own analysis by publishing small studies of hunting as an article. A.I. Levshin, who devoted the fundamental work of geography, history and ethnography of the Kazakh people, described the ways of hunting Kazakhs and their trade [5]. I. Kolachev: "The hunt for Europeans was a game among the Kazakhs" [6, p. 292]. F. Zhukov [7], G.S. Zagryazhskii [8], A.M Nikol'skii [9], V.P. Nalivkin [10] and A.E. Brem [11] mainly hunt Kazakhs briefly records species. Researchers of the tsarist period wrote about Kazakh hunting from different points of view, but did not analyze it on the basis of a specific theory. Nevertheless, the authors mentioned above praised the hunting traditions of the nomadic people, and imperial ethnocentric and racist views did not appear. While I. G. Georgi [12], I. P. Fal'k [13] and a number of other authors considered as a "wild people" or "rude people".

Kazakh historians Margulan A.Kh. [14], Mukanov M.S. [15] and others, as representatives of Russian history, analyzed universal human values. Kushkumbaev A.K. [16], Oshanov N.Z. and Nugman B.G. [17] and Beknazarov R.A. [18] considered Kazakh hunting as an element of nomadism - an indicator of the high culture of a nomadic people.

### *Results*

In world history, hunting is known as the first farm of mankind engaged in survival. However, with the formation of agriculture and animal husbandry in the Bronze Age, hunting was supplanted. But for many peoples it has been preserved in the form of the main economy. The Kazakh people, engaged in nomadic animal husbandry, hunted as a subsidiary farm. That is, the Kazakhs, who carefully and effectively used the ecosystem, together with nomadic animal husbandry, developed traditional hunting. In the study, it is important to explain this question using the theory of rational choice of foreign scientists A. Hindmoor [19] and H. Ward [20]. The theory of rational choice substantiated by these authors allows us to determine the development of hunting in the form of a subsidiary farm. This theory, applied in the branches of economics and political science. It is now effectively used in other branches of science. As a result, the rational choice theory of A. Hindmoor and H. Ward represented the rational activity of subjects in the social sciences and, becoming the basis of economics, "was adopted as the basis for determining one's own personal capabilities". It was important in revealing the reasons why Kazakhs hunted in a nomadic society as necessary. This theory in determining ways to use the available opportunities of the Kazakh people, hunting for walks, the entertainment of the steppe. It helps to understand "the actions of people in the implementation of rational life and the choice of opportunities available to them in the environment and society". People close to nature were able to turn nomadic life into life, analyze rational actions and choices in realizing their capabilities in the environment and society. That is, the Kazakh people, which is the main type of nomadic animal husbandry, used the local landscape in accordance with their capabilities,



combining hunting with subsidiary farming, while simultaneously hardening combat practice. As a result, the Kazakhs, having satisfied their wishes, brought this economy to a high level and brought up future generations in a military spirit, instilled understanding and concern for the environment. Because Kazakh life was connected with natural conditions. It studied to adapt field life and as a result tried to run a farm adapted to this natural environment. The most effective form of adaptation of cattle breeders to the prevailing natural and climatic conditions was mobile animal husbandry. Nomads adapted to the environment, created the most effective and convenient ways of migration, created a resettlement system to protect livestock from predatory animals, enemies, cold and heat, jute. Therefore, along with nomadic animal husbandry, the Kazakh people determine the reasons for the development of hunting in the form of a subsidiary farm.

A special place in science is occupied by the study and adaptation of humans to the environment, the rational use of the local natural landscape for their own capabilities and human farms. This is based on the concept of "ethnic ecology" and outweighs the theory of rational choice. This theory helps to reveal the issues existing in the world of the emergence, preservation and development of hunting. The doctrine of ethnic ecology arose in the middle of the XIX - early XX centuries and was explained by the fact that "society and nature develop in close relationship as part of a single system". This direction was developed by such researchers as M.G. Levin [21], N.N. Cheboksarov [22], V.P. Alekseev [23]. A prominent representative of this direction, the Soviet historian V.I.Kozlov proposed "to study the features of the traditional system in environmental conditions" [24]. Based on the above opinion, the Kazakhs, engaged in traditional animal husbandry as the main type of farming, were able to adapt to environmental conditions and develop hunting at a high level. In the concept of "ethnic ecology" presented by Russian scientists, three basic concepts have formed: cultural adaptation (the method and result of non-biological adaptation to environmental conditions); life support and ethno-ecosystem. These three concepts serve as the basis for determining the essence of the Kazakh hunting economy. In other words, the Kazakhs adapted to the environment, used its products in everyday life and developed as a type of subsidiary farm, living in harmony with nature. The ethno-ecosystem provides for the presence of an economic collective, an developed zone and economic property. Accordingly, there is every reason to believe that in the Kazakh traditional society there were hunters, and developed hunting grounds, and equipment.

Thus, ethnic ecology is a scientific discipline that is formed at the intersection of ethnography with human ecology (social ecology) and has areas that coincide with ethnogeography, ethnic demography, and ethnic anthropology. Taking into account studies of the interaction of organisms and the environment, such as ecology in general, they take into account the characteristics of man, as well as the entire ecology of man, as a carrier of socio-biological life, first of all, the leading role of social factors in the formation of ethno-population groups and the importance of cultural features. As the main means of non-biological adaptation to the environment, economic activity is of great importance in ensuring the life of human groups and their ever-growing transformative impact on nature.



Today, "ethnic ecology" includes the study of the features of traditional life support systems for ethnic communities in natural and sociocultural habitat conditions, as well as the impact of existing environmental relations on human health; studying the natural environment of ethnic groups and their influence on this environment, the laws of the formation and functioning of ecosystems, ethnography is an important theory in the study of the economy of peoples.

It was L.N. Gumilev who based his research on the influence of the landscape on humans and considered human adaptation to the landscape as a kind of ethnic system. "Through their economic activities, ethnic organizations closely related to nature become accustomed to a specific landscape. And if they move, then according to their customs they are looking for a similar territory" [25, p. 193]. This conclusion of the scientist allows us to explain the preservation of traditional hunting for the Kazakhs of China and Mongolia, which are located far from their historical homeland. That is, Kazakhs who moved to another territory, despite the transition to the border zone, according to their customs, retained their economy on the territory as atakasib. Given the author's opinion that "many tribes and peoples of antiquity and the Middle Ages entered the landscape, did not try to change it," on this basis, one of the reasons why the Kazakh people are hunting in conditions of nomadic life can be explained. That is, in a nomadic lifestyle, Kazakhs, dependent on ecosystems, obeyed the landscape, did not change it, but combined hunting with customs.

The opinion of L.N. Gumilev that "the fact of impact on nature determines the character of the nation, and not the level of culture" [25, p. 194]. explains that the Kazakh people are patient, attentive, courageous.

Based on the study of ethnos and landscape, L.N. Gumilev determines the influence of ethnos on the landscape on the basis of three principles: 1) nations that create a new landscape; 2) nationalities that preserve the existing landscape, the historical state of the ethnic group; 3) ethnic groups that do not protect the "cultural landscape" (Gumilev, 1968:195). Taking into account these principles, Kazakhs belong to the second principle. Because they were able to adapt their needs to the habitat and bring it to the level of tradition. Nothing has changed. For example, the presence of salbura, the hunting season, the formation of hunting etiquette, traditions and rituals associated with hunting, folk knowledge, ethnomedicine, the continuity of generations - all this happened as a result of the development of hunting.

Scientists who raised the issue of the genesis of nomadic animal husbandry believe that the nomadic economy was formed on the basis of the hunting of ancient inhabitants. For example, S.I. Vainshtein, "a group of researchers, from the ancient era until the end of the 19th century, had three stages in the development of universal human culture. Among the first hunters, first tribes who mastered nomadic animal husbandry were distinguished, and then somewhat later farmers. Researchers from another point of view suggest that after the Neolithic revolution, the tribes of arable farmers living in special conditions of the arid zone gradually developed in the direction of nomadic animal husbandry" [26, p. 284]. Continuing the game, he says that "the possibility of a transition to nomadic hunting testifies to some materials," which, despite the nomadic lifestyle of the Kazakhs, is the basis for scientific confirmation of the formation of traditional hunting.



Ethnoecological research is subject to the work of the outstanding Kazakh scientist N.E. Masanov "Nomadic civilization of Kazakhs: Fundamentals of the life of a nomadic society," which made a significant contribution to world historical science, scientifically substantiating the nomadic civilization of the Kazakh people. The scientist noted the growth and decline of livestock in a favorable and unfavorable nature based on natural and climatic conditions; seasonal movement of the nomadic community. Kazakhs adapted to the local landscape and, using the features of a specific geographical environment, formed nomadic animal husbandry as a kind of production economy in the history of mankind. He says: "The ecosystem with seasonal performance can be attributed to the outbound range" [27, p. 22].

The author refers to this arid territory steppe, desert, mountain and mountain zones. Various natural and climatic conditions of the territory of Kazakhstan pushed Kazakhs to adapt to the environment. As a result, economic activity has developed in the form of nomadic animal husbandry in accordance with the peculiarities of the geographical environment. Therefore, the nomadic life of the Kazakh people aroused interest among many researchers, which was considered on the basis of natural and climatic conditions. This theory of the scientist is combined with the concept of ethnic ecology in ethnological science and allows you to reveal the essence of traditional hunting. As noted above, the study of such types of farms as hunting is important not only for Russian researchers, but also for Kazakh science based on this concept.

"In other words, the activity of the" external factor "is aimed at turning the" internal creative impulse "into a sustainable stimulus that allows for potential creative variations," said A. Toinbi [28, p. 108]. Or, according to the well-known law of the scientist "on challenge-response," the Kazakh people adapted to the environment, skillfully used four seasons of the year and through migration were engaged in nomadic animal husbandry. Therefore, the products of the main economy provided the necessary food, clothing, etc. And hunting products are an integral part of the life support system.

The vital activity and life support of the ethnos through the theory of the vital system were considered in the studies of foreign, Russian and domestic scientists. This concept of "concern for life" (subsistence) refers to the 30s of the XIX century. American ethnographer Robert Lowey introduced it into scientific circulation. In the first application, this meant "forage search and production technology." In origin, literally translated as "life, food, life." R. Lowey said: "In a complex society, people get their feed from simple types of farms such as hunting, fishing and gathering... So hunting, the first stage of the search for food " [29, p. 238].

The author of the article in his work talks about the fodder farms of the ancient peoples of Africa, Asia, Australia and America, such as hunting, fishing and gathering. Nevertheless, they do not give exact definitions, but write about subsidiary plots. Thus, in foreign ethnography, such types of consumer farms as hunting, gathering, agriculture and the first types of animal husbandry are studied, some of which are still aimed at finding feed under the concept of vital activity.

The term "concern for life" was widely used by Soviet scientists and conducted his research. They tried to create a concept and maximize the original meaning of the term subsistence "something that contributes to survival, nutrition, life" [30, p. 127]. In the course of a deep study of life, Soviet ethnographers introduced the concept of "life



culture" into scientific circulation as a special component of ethnic culture, expanding its versatility. As a result, in foreign ethnography, the term subsistence refers to a consumer economy focused on the search for feed, such as hunting, fishing and gathering, and now Soviet scientists have studied food, housing, clothing and dishwashing aspects.

In Soviet historiography in the 80s of the twentieth century S.A. Arutyunov, E.S. Markaryan, E.L. Melkonyan and Yu.I. Mkrtumyan first created the foundations of the theory of life support [31]. Having set the task to determine the "place and role of modern environmental analysis of culture," in other words, "to create primary environmental principles in considering the life support system as an adaptation mechanism," including "housing, clothing and food" [32, p.21-24]. S.A. Arutyunov conducted fruitful studies in the field of "ethnic ecology," which showed that the "process of adaptation of society to the ecological environment" occurs precisely in the culture of life [33, p.204]. A.N. Yamskov: "For a comprehensive study of the culture of the ethnic group, we must, first of all, study the system of life of this people" - taking into account the conclusions of Armenian historians who disagree with the opinion of the scientists mentioned above, referring to the conclusions of V.I. Kozlov: "Life cannot be limited to clothing, food and housing. It is necessary to take into account the ecological adaptation of society," says [34, p.77]. Based on the findings of clerical scientists, human economic activity is an adaptation to the conditions of the natural environment and requires human knowledge of the environment. Thus, these researchers, when using the term "life culture," considered and developed it as "phenomena included in material culture".

Kazakhstani scientists also showed interest in the theory of life. Among them are N. Alimbay, M. S. Mukanov and H. Argynbaev. They were among the first to conduct research on the life support system of the Kazakhs. N. Alimbay considered the community as a mechanism of life support in the nomadic ecosystem and, within the framework of the culture of life support, proposed the concepts of "purpose of need," "ways of meeting the need," "subject and form of meeting the needs." Mukanov M.S. took steps to reveal nomadic housing in the traditional system of life of the Kazakhs, and Argynbaev Kh. - the life of the national education of the Kazakhs [35]. However, N. Alimbai, M.S. Mukanov and H. Argynbaev believe that V.I. Kozlov could not give a satisfactory definition of the concept of human needs. "The main structural factor of the life support system is the need," said one of them N. Alimbay. That is, only through the structure and nature of a person's needs is the direction of the culture of the life of the ethnic group determined and the basis of the lifestyle described.

One cannot but touch upon the theory of adaptation (adaptation) to the consideration of the culture of life based on foreign and Soviet periods. In the modern field of science, the adaptation of ethnic groups to the environment is recognized as directions of material and social adaptation, which determine the special manifestations of the development of culture in the field of cultural ecology. The founder of this concept in the 19th century, L. White, noted that "cultural development will be carried out through increased efficiency in the use of natural resources, which will ultimately lead to an increase in population, increased labour productivity and economic



specialization. This development can be divided into stages. All other aspects of culture depend on the material situation, "said Lurie [30, p. 14].

Fatalism the driving policy pursued by Russia in the 19th century led to the capture of hunting not only for meat, but also for furs and horns of animals such as deer, which led to a violation of traditional hunting. That is, the tradition disappeared, hunting began to transform and took on a wild form of hunting. In this current situation, the theory of "device" S.V. Lur'e. "The most important goal in the ecology of an ethnic group is to study the state and communication of ethnic groups with the environment, but also psychological adaptation," the researcher believes [30, p. 126].

Scientist: "From the point of view of the ecology of the ethnic group, the most interesting and fruitful approach that contributes to the disclosure of the main connections of both humans and a group of people with the environment is the study of a different geographical and cultural center, namely the problems of migration and psychological health. Here you can immediately see the importance of the connection of a person or ethnic group with its natural and cultural foundations, that if such connections disappear, what are the mechanisms for establishing new, paid connections, "he said, adding that" each person imperceptibly gives psychological priority to the environment of his origin, that is, the edge of the origin of his ancestors " [30, p. 126]. Our compatriots far from their historical homeland - the Kazakhs of China and Mongolia - preserve traditional hunting in a different ethnic, geographical and cultural environment in its original form - on the other hand, it can be determined by the theory of the author's "unprecedented psychological priority".

Considering the theoretical and methodological basis for studying the traditional hunting of the Kazakh people, the Kazakhs, depending on the natural and climatic conditions, had the opportunity to engage not only in nomadic animal husbandry, but also in hunting. The circumstances that served as the basis for these opportunities can be stated as follows:

- based on the predominance of opportunities for mobile hunters to transition to nomadic animal husbandry, the Kazakhs, being nomads, have become a genetically preserved practice;
- being in the winter in nomadic wintering, only at this time once a year they had the opportunity to relax and refresh, developing it as a tourism;
- group hunting was one of the ways of military art of the nomadic people, that is, they were necessary for mutual understanding, the use of effective tactics and training, hardening during hunting, persecution, etc.;
- in case of livestock death due to drought that occurred against the background of unfavorable natural conditions, since the animal is the main product, the feed was supplemented with animal husbandry products;
- hunting products gave Kazakhs not only food, but also clothes, etc.;
- hunting products: leather, horns, meat, etc.

#### *Conclusion*

Thus, the Kazakhs did not try to change the local natural landscape, but, on the contrary, without a scientific understanding of the principle of "surrounded by nature," they built the relationship between nature and man through knowledge about it. They are determined by the above theories of ethnic ecology and survival. Knowledge of the





nature of the native land, its care, recognition - hard work, endurance and intolerance led to the fact that the Kazakh people, adapting to the environment, along with the main nomadic animal husbandry, formed a hunting farm of a high degree.

While Kazakh hunting was considered as one of the types of economy in the tsarist and Soviet period, after gaining independence it was identified as an important form of management in the organization of the military-political life of nomads, the similarity and identity with the military-organizational structure were studied. The theory of "device" determines the need to maintain equilibrium and relations between man and nature, and the theory of "ethnic ecology" determines the issues of the formation of an economy with adaptation to the environment. The above theories constitute an important theoretical and methodological basis in revealing the essence of the Kazakh hunting economy.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Browse the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of good safeguarding practices. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists> [in English].
- [2] Sait informburo. <https://informburo.kz/kaz/newskaz/tazy-ezelgi-qazaqy-it-tuqymy-qazaqstan-resmi-turde-tazy-tuqymynyn-iesi-dep-tanyldy> [in Kazakh].
- [3] Ulttiq sport turlerinin tizbesin bekitu turaly [On approval of the list of national sports. <https://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/V2100022265>] [in Kazakh].
- [4] Materialdyk emes madeni muranyi korgau turalyi konventsiyaniy ratifikatsiyalau turalyi [Ratification of the Convention for the Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage] <https://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/Z1100000514> [in Kazakh].
- [5] Levshin, A.I. (1832). Opisanie kirgiz-kazach'ikh ili kirgiz-kaisatskikh ord i stepei [Description of the Kirghiz-Cossack or Kirghiz-Kaysak hordes and steppes]. Ch. III. Etnograficheskie izvestiya. SPb.: Tip. Karla Kraiya, 1832. 264. [In Russian].
- [6] Kolachev, I. (1860). Okhota u kirgiz-kaisakov [Hunting among the Kyrgyz-Kaysaks] // Syn Otechestva. 1860. № 11. 292-294. [In Russian].
- [7] Zhukov, F. (1872). Okhota v Turkestankom krae [Hunting in the Turkestan region] // Turkestanskije vedomosti. 1872. № 17. 67-68. [In Russian].
- [8] Zagryazhskii G.S. (1874). Byt kochevogo naseleniya dolin Chu i Syrdar'i [The life of the nomadic population of the Chu and Syr Darya valleys] // Turkestanskije vedomosti. 1874. № 25. 27-32. [In Russian].
- [9] Nikol'skii, N. (1885). Puteshestvie na ozero Balkhash i v Semirechenskuyu oblast' [A trip to Lake Balkhash and the Semirechensk region] // Zapiski ZSIRGO. Kn. VII. / I. Omsk, 1885. 93. [In Russian].
- [10] Nalivkin, V.P. (1891). Osobennosti okhoty u tuzemtsev Turkestanskogo kraja [Peculiarities of hunting among the natives of the Turkestan region] // Priroda i okhota. 1891. June, № 6. 60-81. [In Russian].
- [11] Brem, A. (1894). Bytovaya i semeinaya zhizn' kirgizov [Household and family life of the Kyrgyz] // Niva. 1894. № 2. 325-345. [In Russian].
- [12] Georgi, 1799 – Georgi I.G. Opisanie vsekh obitayushchikh v Rossiiskom gosudarstve narodov: ikh zhiteiskikh obryadov, obyknovenii, odezhd, zhilishch, uprazhnenii, zabav, veroispovedanii i drugikh dostopamyatnostei [Description of all the peoples living in the Russian state: their everyday rituals, customs, clothes, dwellings, exercises, amusements, religions and other memorabilia] / Per. s nem. Ch.2. O narodakh



tatarskogo plemeni i drugikh ne reshennogo eshche proiskhozhdeniya Severnykh Sibirskikh. SPb., 1799. 178. 30 l. tsv. il. [In Russian].

[13] Fal'k, I.P. (2007). Okhota [Hunting] // Rossiiskie akademicheskie ekspeditsii KhVIII veka ob etnografii kazakhov. 2-e izdanie, dopolnennoe. Astana: Altyn kitap, 2007. 240. [In Russian].

[14] Margulan, A.Kh. (2007). Sayat kystary [Hunting birds] // Tandamaly. 2-tom. Almaty: Alatau, 2007. 432. [in Kazakh].

[15] Mukanov, M.S. (1983). Okhota s lovchimi ptitsami u kazakhov [Hunting with hunting birds among the Kazakhs] // Izvestiya AN KazSSR. Seriya obshchestvennykh nauk. 1983. № 5. 48-55. [In Russian].

[16] Kushkumbaev, 2009 – *Kushkumbaev A.K.* Institut oblavnykh okhot i voennoe delo kochevnikov Tsentral'noi Azii. Sravnitel'no-istoricheskoe issledovanie [The Institute of Round-up hunting and military affairs of the nomads of Central Asia. Comparative historical research]. Kokshetau: Keleshek-2030, 2009. 170. [In Russian].

[17] Oshanov, N.Z., Nugman B.G. (2015). Rol' okhoty v voenno-politicheskoi zhizni kochevnikov evraziiskikh stepei [Роль охоты в военно-политической жизни кочевников евразийских степей] // International journal of experimental education. 2015. № 7. 86-89. [In Russian].

[18] Beknazarov R.A. (2022). Kazakhi Severnogo Priaral'ya v KhIKh-nachale. (istoriko-etnograficheskoe issledovanie) [Kazakhs of the Northern Aral Sea region in the nineteenth century. (historical and ethnographic research)]. Almaty: Arys, 2022. 472 p. + 16 p. Tsvetnoi vkladys. [In Russian].

[19] Hindmoor, A. 2010. Rational Choice Theory // Theory and Methods in Political Science. Ed. by Marsh D., Stoker G. Houndmills et al. Palgrave, 2010. 385. [in English].

[20] Ward, H. (2002). Rational Choice Theory // Theory and Methods in Political Science. Ed. by Marsh D., Stoker G. Houndmills et al. Palgrave, 2002. 368. [in English].

[21] Levin, 1947 – *Levin M.G.* K probleme istoricheskogo sootnosheniya khozyaistvenno-kul'turnykh tipov Severnoi Azii [On the problem of the historical correlation of economic and cultural types of North Asia] // Kratkie soobshcheniya Instituta etnografii AN SSSR. M., 1947. T.2. Pp. 84-86. (In Russ.).

[22] Cheboksarov, N.N. (1955). Khozyaistvenno-kul'turnye tipy i istoriko-etnograficheskii oblasti (k postanovke problemy) [Economic and cultural types and historical and ethnographic areas (to pose the problem)] // Sovetskaya etnografiya. 1955. № 4. 3-7. [In Russian].

[23] Alekseev, V.P. (1984). Stanovlenie chelovechestva [The formation of humanity]. M.: Politizdat, 1984. 374-444. (462 p.). [In Russian].

[24] Kozlov V.I. (1983). Osnovnye problemy etnicheskoi ekologii [The main problems of ethnic ecology] // Sovetskaya etnografiya. 1983. № 1. S. 3-16. [In Russian].

[25] Gumilev, L.N. (1968). Etnos i landshaft [Ethnicity and landscape] // Doklady Geograficheskogo obshchestva SSSR. M.: Redaktsiya zhurnala Izvestiya VGO. 1968. № 3. 193-202. [In Russian].

[26] Vainshtein S.I. Mir kochevnikov tsentra Azii [The world of the nomads of Central Asia]. M.: Nauka, 1991. 296. [In Russian].



[27] Masanov N.E. (1995). Kochevaya tsivilizatsiya kazakhov: osnovy zhiznedeyatel'nosti nomadnogo obshchestva [The nomadic civilization of the Kazakhs: the foundations of the nomadic society]. Almaty «Sotsinvest» – Moskva «Gorizont», 1995. 320. [In Russian].

[28] Toinbi A. (1991). Postizhenie istorii [Comprehension of history]. – M.: Progress, 1991. – 730. [In Russian].

[29] Lowie R.N. (1938). Subsistence//Boas F. And others (ed.). General Anthropology. – Boston: «D.S. Heath and company», 1938. 282-326. [in English].

[30] Lur'e, S.V. (2020). Tarikhi etnologiya [Historical ethnology]. Almaty: «Ulttyk audarma byurosy» kogamdyk kory, 2020. 500. [in Kazakh].

[31] Kul'tura zhizneobespecheniya i etnos. (1983). [Life support culture and ethnicity]. Opyt etnokul'turologicheskogo issledovaniya (na materialakh armyanskoj sel'skoj kul'tury). Otv. red. S.A.Arutyunov, E.S.Markaryan E.S. Erevan: Izd-vo AN ArmSSR, 1983. 319. [In Russian].

[32] Arutyunov S.A., Mkrtumyan Yu.I. (1984). Problemy tipologicheskogo issledovaniya mekhanizmov zhizneobespecheniya v etnicheskoi kul'ture [Problems of typological research of life support mechanisms in ethnic culture] // Tipologiya osnovnykh elementov traditsionnoj kul'tury. Otv. red.: M.V. Kryukov, A.I.Kuznetsov. M.: Nauka, 1984. 21-24. [In Russian].

[33] Arutyunov, S.A. (1989). Narody i kul'tury. Razvitie i vzaimodeistvie [Peoples and cultures. Development and interaction.] M.: Nauka, 1989. 247. [In Russian].

[34] Yamskov, F.N. (2003). Istoriya razvitiya kontseptsii etnoekosistemy v otechestvennoj etnoekologii i kharakteristiki ee strukturnykh blokov [The history of the development of the concept of an ethnoecosystem in Russian ethnoecology and the characteristics of its structural blocks] // Ekologii drevnykh i sovremennykh obshchestv. Tyumen', 2003. № 2. 271-273. [In Russian].

[35] Alimbai i dr., 1998 – *Alimbai N., Mukanov M.S., Argynbaev Kh.* Traditsionnaya kul'tura zhizneobespecheniya kazakhov [Traditional Kazakh life support culture]. Almaty: Gylym, 1998. 234. [In Russian].

## ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР

[1] Browse the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of good safeguarding practices. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists>

[2] Тазы-ежелгі қазақы ит тұқымы [Электронды ресурс]. <https://informburo.kz/kaz/newskaz/tazy-ezelgi-qazaqy-it-tuqymy-qazaqstan-resmi-turde-tazy-tuqymynyn-iesi-dep-tanyldy>

[3] Ұлттық спорт түрлерінің тізбесін бекіту туралы [Электронды ресурс]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/V2100022265>

[4] Материалдық емес мәдени мұраны қорғау туралы конвенцияны ратификациялау туралы. [Электронды ресурс]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/Z1100000514>

[5] Левшин А.И. Описание киргиз-казачьих или киргиз-кайсацких орд и степей. Ч. III. Этнографические известия. – СПб.: Тип. Карла Крайя, 1832. – 264 с.



- [6] Колачев И. Охота у киргиз-кайсаков // Сын Отечества. – 1860. – № 11. – С. 292-294.
- [7] Жуков Ф. Охота в Туркестанском крае // Туркестанские ведомости. – 1872. – № 17. – С. 67-68.
- [8] Загряжский Г.С. Быт кочевого населения долин Чу и Сырдарьи // Туркестанские ведомости. – 1874. – № 25. – С.27-32.
- [9] Никольский Н. Путешествие на озеро Балхаш и в Семиреченскую область // Записки ЗСИРГО. – Кн. VII. – Вып. I. Омск, 1885. – 93 с.
- [10] Наливкин В.П. Особенности охоты у туземцев Туркестанского края // Природа и охота. 1891. – Июнь, № 6. – С. 60-81.
- [11] Брем А. Бытовая и семейная жизнь киргизов // Нива. – 1894. – № 2. – С. 325-345.
- [12] Георги И.Г. Описание всех обитающих в Российском государстве народов: их житейских обрядов, обыкновений, одежд, жилищ, упражнений, забав, вероисповеданий и других достопамятностей / Пер. с нем. Ч.2. О народах татарского племени и других не решенного еще происхождения Северных Сибирских. – СПб., 1799. – 178 с., 30 л. цв. ил.
- [13] Фальк И.П. Охота // Российские академические экспедиции XVIII века об этнографии казахов. 2-е издание, дополненное. – Астана: Алтын кітап, 2007. – 240 с.
- [14] Марғұлан Ә.Х. Саят құстары // Таңдамалы. – 2-том. – Алматы: Алатау, 2007. – 432 б.
- [15] Муканов М.С. Охота с ловчими птицами у казахов // Известия АН КазССР. Серия общественных наук. – 1983. – № 5. – С. 48-55.
- [16] Кушкумбаев А.К. Институт облавных охот и военное дело кочевников Центральной Азии. Сравнительно-историческое исследование. – Кокшетау: Келешек-2030, 2009. – 170 с.
- [17] Ошанов Н.З., Нугман Б.Г. Роль охоты в военно-политической жизни кочевников евразийских степей // International journal of experimental education. – 2015. – № 7. – С. 86-89.
- [18] Бекназаров, 2022 – *Бекназаров Р.А.* Казахи Северного Приаралья в XIX-начале. (историко-этнографическое исследование). – Алматы: Арыс, 2022. – 472 с. + 16 с. Цветной вкладыш.
- [19] Hindmoor Ф. Rational Choice Theory // Theory and Methods in Political Science. Ed. by Marsh D., Stoker G. Houndmills et al. – Palgrave, 2010. – 385 p.
- [20] Ward Н. Rational Choice Theory // Theory and Methods in Political Science. Ed. by Marsh D., Stoker G. Houndmills et al. Palgrave, 2002. 368 p.
- [21] Левин М.Г. К проблеме исторического соотношения хозяйственно-культурных типов Северной Азии // Краткие сообщения Института этнографии АН СССР. – М., 1947. – Т.2. – С. 84-86.
- [22] Чебоксаров, Н.Н. Хозяйственно-культурные типы и историко-этнографические области (к постановке проблемы) // Советская этнография. – 1955. – № 4. – С. 3-7.
- [23] Алексеев В.П. Становление человечества. – М.: Политиздат, 1984. – 462 с.



- [24] Козлов В.И. Основные проблемы этнической экологии // Советская этнография. – 1983. – № 1. – С. 3-16.
- [25] Гумилев Л.Н. Этнос и ландшафт // Доклады Географического общества СССР. М.: Редакция журнала Известия ВГО. – 1968. – Вып. 3. – С. 193-202.
- [26] Вайнштейн С.И. Мир кочевников центра Азии. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 296 с.
- [27] Масанов Н.Э. Кочевая цивилизация казахов: основы жизнедеятельности номадного общества. – Алматы «Социнвест» – Москва «Горизонт», 1995. – 320 с.
- [28] Тойнби А. Постижение истории. – М.: Прогресс, 1991. – 730 с.
- [29] Lowie R.N Subsistence//Boas F. And others (ed.). General Anthropology. – Boston: «D.S. Heath and company», 1938. – P. 282-326.
- [30] Лурье С.В. Тарихи этнология. – Алматы: «Ұлттық аударма бюросы» қоғамдық қоры, 2020. – 500 б.
- [31] Культура жизнеобеспечения и этнос. Опыт этнокультурологического исследования (на материалах армянской сельской культуры). Отв. ред. С.А.Арутюнов, Э.С.Маркарян Э.С. – Ереван: Изд-во АН АрмССР, 1983. – 319 с.
- [32] Арутюнов С.А., Мкртумян С.А. Проблемы типологического исследования механизмов жизнеобеспечения в этнической культуре // Типология основных элементов традиционной культуры. Отв. ред.: М.В. Крюков, А.И.Кузнецов. – М.: Наука, 1984. – С. 21-24.
- [33] Арутюнов С.А. Народы и культуры. Развитие и взаимодействие. – М.: Наука, 1989. – 247 с.
- [34] Ямсков А.Н. История развития концепции этноэкосистемы в отечественной этноэкологии и характеристики ее структурных блоков // Экологии древних и современных обществ. – Тюмень, 2003. Вып. 2. – С. 271-273.
- [35] Алимбай Н., Муканов М.С., Аргынбаев Х. Традиционная культура жизнеобеспечения казахов. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1998. – 234 с.

### **Ишкалова Гульбану Исмагуловна**

#### **ҚАЗАҚ ХАЛҚЫНЫҢ ДӘСТҮРЛІ АҢШЫЛЫҒЫН ЗЕРТТЕУДІҢ ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ-МЕТОДОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ**

**Андатпа.** Мақалада қазақ халқының дәстүрлі аңшылығын зерттеудің теориялық-методологиялық негіздері қарастырылып, осы мәселеге қатысты шетелдік және отандық теориялар мен концепциялар баяндалған. Дәстүрлі аңшылықты зерттеуге негіз болатын теориялар мен концепцияларды анықтау басты мақсат болып табылады. Міндеттері: ұсынылған теориялар мен концепцияларды мәселені зерттеудегі маңызын айқындау; дәстүрлі аңшылыққа байланысты мәселелерді шешуде негіздеу. Зерттеуде тарихи және логикалық әдістер, тарихи-салыстырмалы әдіс, анализ және синтез әдістері пайдаланылды. Осы орайда аталған әдістер аңшылықты тарихи уақыт пен кеңістіктегі маңызын зерттеуде тиімді болып, теориялық талдау және тарихилық принципін жүзеге асыруға көмектесті. Мәселені зерттеуге негіз болатын теориялар мен концепциялар қазақ дәстүрлі аңшылығының негізгі көшпелі мал шаруашылығымен қатар дамуын, оның тіршілік қамы жүйесіндегі орнын және бүгінгі күні сақталуын ашуға мүмкіндік берді. Қазақтар жергілікті табиғи



ландшафтты өзгертуге тырыспады, керісінше «табиғатпен етене» ұстанымын еш ғылымсыз ұғынып, табиғат пен адам арасындағы өзара қатынасты ол туралы білімі арқылы құрды. Қоршаған ортаға бейімделе отырып, негізгі көшпелі мал шаруашылығымен қатар жоғары дәрежедегі аңшылық шаруашылықты қалыптастырып, адам мен табиғат арасындағы қарым-қатынас пен тепе-теңдікті сақтады.

**Кілт сөздер:** дәстүрлі аңшылық; методология; теория; концепция; ландшафт; экожүйе; шаруашылық; этникалық экология; бейсана психология; тіршілік қамы.

**Ишкалова Гульбану Исмагуловна**  
**ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ**  
**ТРАДИЦИОННОЙ ОХОТЫ КАЗАХОВ**

**Аннотация.** В статье рассмотрены теоретико-методологические основы изучения традиционной охоты казахского народа и изложены зарубежные и отечественные теории и концепции, касающиеся этой проблемы. Основной целью является определение основных теорий и концепций по изучению традиционной охоты казахов. Задачи: определение значения предложенных теорий и концепций в изучении проблемы; обосновать их в решении проблем традиционной охоты казахов. Рассмотренные основные теории и концепции по изучению традиционной охоты казахов позволили раскрыть развитие казахской традиционной охоты наряду с основным кочевым скотоводством, ее место в системе жизнеобеспечения казахов и сохранение в современном периоде. Казахи не пытались изменить местный природный ландшафт, наоборот без науки поддерживая принцип «с природой едины» строили взаимоотношения между природой и человеком через знания о ней. Казахи адаптируясь к окружающей среде и занимаясь кочевым скотоводством, также развивали охоту на высоком уровне, сохранив отношения и баланс между человеком и природой.

**Ключевые слова:** традиционная охота; методология; теория; концепция; ландшафт; экосистема; хозяйство; этническая экология; подсознательная психология; жизнеобеспечение.