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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to consider the authority of Kyrgyz tribal chieftains, called “manap” in the early 20th century under the rule of the Russian empire, through investigating the funeral ceremonies of Shabdan Jantai (1840-1912).

Shabdan Jantai was one of the prominent manap from Sarybagysh tribe, who succeeded the position of his father, Jantai Karabek (1794-1867), who, utilizing the mutual relationship between the Russian empire, Kokand khanate, Kazakh and Kyrgyz, had attained the dominant power within and without own tribe in the middle of the 19th century. At the time of the establishment of the Governor Generalship of Turkestan in 1867, Shabdan preserved the dominant position as a tribal chieftain not only by serving Russia faithfully, but also excusing himself purposely from the post of the native colonial official (“volostnoi upravitel’”). At the same time he played a role as a mediator between Kyrgyz and the Russian colonial authorities, and achieved the military exploits in the expedition of Fergana, through which he was elected as a member of the native delegation to the coronation of Alexander III in 1883, and was awarded with the military rank of the Lieutenant Colonel (“Voiskovoi Starshina”).

On 6th April 1912, Shabdan died at the age of 73. This paper is to focus on this. The academic backgrounds of this approach are as indicated bellow: (1) to reconsider the mutual relationship between Russia and Kyrgyz in the early 20th century, which has been recognized as an excessively confrontational process, converting with the 1916 revolt. Of course such a dichotomy has been reexamined mainly by the scholars of the area study of Central Asia, who are bringing out the structure of various discourses and activities of the local intelligentsia under
the Russian colonial governance. Also thanks to the activation of the empire study in recent years, not a few study results on the structure of the Russian governance in Central Asia have been accumulated; (2) as a whole, from the tsarist period to the present day funeral ceremonies have been investigated from the standpoint of the ethnography of “traditional” customs.\(^1\) Therefore political dynamics behind them have not really been noticed. As social anthropologists have acutely pointed out\(^2\), “death” requires the community not only to represent the social order and power relationship surrounding the deceased, but also to reorganize and fill the power vacuum. Of course in the Slavic Eurasian studies, the political nature behind funeral ceremonies was pointed out. For example a prominent Soviet ethnologist S.M.Abramzon pointed out that the funeral ceremony of Shabdan Jantai was a major pageant of the tie between the manaps and the tsarist autocracy\(^3\). Although Abramzon’s indication is suggestive to this paper, his approach did not exceed the limits of the perception by the class conflict.

Taking into consideration the above mentioned research directions, this paper, based on the historical-anthropological perspective, is to reconstruct the funeral ceremonies: (1) the funeral ceremony held a few days after his death, (2) the mass, called yīl āshi, held half a year later, (3) the circumstances after these ceremonies, by investigating various primary documents: (a) the commentaries of the contemporaries (Tatar, Kyrgyz and Russians) who participated in these ceremonies, (b) archive documents from Kzakhstan (TsGA RK), Kyrgyzstan (TsGA KR) and Uzbekistan (TsGA RUz), which would reveal, how his death was perceived, was there what kind of interactions between Kyrgyz society and the Russian colonial authorities by means of his death. This investigation offers the key to reconsider the mutual relationship between Russia and Kyrgyz in the early 20\(^{th}\) century.

### I. Collaboration between Kyrgyz and Russia in the Funeral

#### 1. Muslim Funeral and Cossack Funeral

The funeral of Shabdan was held in April 9\(^{th}\) in Chong Kemin. The point to observe in this chapter is how the Russian colonial authority was involved in the funeral, which was called “janaza” by muslim. The news of Shabdan’s death was broken to the Russian colonial authority a few days after his death. Receiving the telegram from Shabdan’s son, Kamal\(^4\), the military governor of Semirech’e oblast M.Fol’baum instructed to publish the news in the colonial

\(^1\) For example, see: [Valikhanov 1985], [Zagriazhskii 1873], [Grodekov 1889], [Kovalev 1894; 1895], [Chimkent 1896], [Fiel’strup 2002] ect.

\(^2\) For example, see: [Geertz 1980]

\(^3\) [Abramzon 1932; 94]

\(^4\) [Shābdān... 1912]
official newspaper “Semirechenkie Oblastnye vedomosti” and to attend the funeral (“pokhorno” in Russian) to the administrator of Pishpek uezd. Circumstances of the funeral were expressed by Kutukov, the chief of the local police of Tokmak district (“Uchastkovyi Pristav”), when he reported to Fol’baum: “…A platoon of the Semirech’e Cossack from the settlement of Samsonovka, attended at the funeral under the command of the ataman Ivanov. They saluted to the body. And the Cossack guards were deployed at the gate of the kibitka (=tent), where the body was laid. When the body was taken off to the cemetery, Cossacks were in a line on both sides of the body. In time of burial military medals were detached from the body by Cossacks. …And they shoot blanks three times”⁵. What is apparent in this extract is that the Russian colonial authority organized Cossack burial rites in the funeral, considering that Shabdan had possessed the military status of Lieutenant Colonel. The attendance of the Russian colonial authority at the muslim funeral had not a few impact on muslim, as can be seen from the following description by ‘Abd al-Mann: “…Other than various muslims, gathering for janaza, there were Cossacks, the administrator of Pishpek uezd and the chief of the local police”⁶. ‘Abd al-Mann goes on to say: “…at the beginning of the janaza the chief of the local police made Cossacks to put a few medals in the pillow… After gathering earths according to customs, mullahs said grace…In time of burial all the attendees, holding earths, read a line from Koran…”⁷ What these two passages make clear is that at first the Russian colonial authority performed the Cossack funeral and then the mullahs did muslim one. Here we notice that the Russian colonial authority did not take control all over the funeral, rather the Russia and Kyrgyz collaborated each other as a whole, which is expressed by the chief of the local police, when he says: “…the crowd of 4000 Kyrgyz gathering from all over the Semirech’e was impressed with the much respect shown for Shabdan by Cossacks. Shabdan’s sons and the other delegates of Kyrgyz asked me to convey their gratitude to His Excellency [=Fol’baum]…”⁸

2. The Two Faces of Kutukov

When we consider the Russians in the funeral, the chief of the local police Kutukov is worthy of attention. As mentioned above, Kutukov played a central role in the funeral. Chief of the local police was a security-administrative authority, set up under the Uezd administrator. Its authority was built upon the strong tie with Shabdan’s clan, as can be seen in the following quotation from the evidence of a colonial agent, who worked in the Tokmak district:

⁵ [TsGA RK.f. 44. op. 1. d. 4125. l. 9-9ob.]
⁶ ['Abd al-Mann 1913: no.2/63]
⁷ ['Abd al-Mann 1913: no.2/63]
⁸ [TsGA RK.f. 44. op. 1. d. 4125. l. 10]
“…sustaining ties with Shabdan’s clan was a policy line of Kutukov and his predecessors, for Shabdan’s clan was able to reduce significantly the administrative burden…Kutukov could never settle various issues within the district without their support”.\(^9\)

On the other hand Kutukov had another face as a practitioner of the authority of Shabdan’s clan. For example, in 1911, when the chief of Sarybagysh volost, Shabdan’s son Samdin was fired because of the arrest of his brother, Mokush in the slaying, Kutukov asked Fol’baum to select a successor from close relative of Shabdan. After Shabdan’s death, as the police chief of the Pishpek city, N.A.Gribanovskii explained, “…Kutukov managed to inspire Kyrgyz to respect and follow Shabdan’s clan”, which can be seen in the memorial article by a teacher of the Russian-native school in Tokmak, V.Rovniagin:

…in the funeral Kutukov, describing the role of Shabdan as a mediator, reminded the influential local figures of the Kyrgyz volosts not to upset the bones of the deceased by quarreling with one another. In response to this they pledged to follow the advice of their immediate supervisor [=Kutukov], and not to sully the memory of Shabdan by their conspiracies.\(^10\)

Judging from the above, it is apparent that for Kutukov the funeral was an opportunity not only to organize a Cossack funeral on the order from Fol’baum, but also to appeal the ongoing governance through Shabdan’s clan. Thus it is no exaggeration when an akyn (=troubadour) recited: “…In your funeral, not only Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, but also Russians including Kutukov cried with all their hearts. Oh! When Russian did mourning cries for Kyrgyz!”\(^11\) In the volost election, held soon after the funeral, in May, Kamal was elected as a volost chief, and his brother Aman as its assistant\(^12\), which reflected, it seems reasonable to suppose, the idea of Kutukov.

### II. Organizing the “yīl āshi”

1. **The Organizer of the “yīl āshi”**

The main commemoration after the funeral was the “yīl āshi”, which was held on October 1912. It was organized by the “special committee”\(^13\), consisted of Shabdan’s clan and other persons of influence. According to Abramzon, the chairperson of the committee was Shabdan’s son, Samdin, who was supported by other manaps of the northern Kyrgyz tribes: Sarybagysh

---

\(^9\) [TsGA RK.f. 44.op. 1.d. 20951.l. 17]

\(^10\) [Rovniagin 1912]

\(^11\) [Malaia ...1912 : no. 227]

\(^12\) [ShB 1999 : 157-158]

\(^13\) [Dmitriev 1913: 2]
Miktibek (from Solto tribe), Murzabek Dikanbai (from Sayak tribe) and Batyrkhan Nogai (from Bugu tribe). In addition, it also included Kazakhs (Sat Niyazbek, Kobogon Shigai), a Dungan (Bural Mogui), Uzbek (so-called “sart”) merchant (Gali Uzbek) and the chiefs of the volosts in Pishpek uezd: Choko Kaidu (manap, Sarybagysh tribe), Kukumbai Chiny (manap, Sayak tribe), Tezekbai Churkin, Sulaiman Korchi (manap, Solto tribe), Dür Sooronbai (manap, Sarybagysh tribe), Mambetaly Muratalyn (manap, Sarybagysh tribe), and Sultan Dalbai (manap, Sarybagysh tribe).\[14\]

The committee originated at the “kenesh” (=gathering) for the yīl āshī, held after the “qirqī” on 13th June 1912 at Chong Kemin. It is only ‘Abd al-Mann who described the “kenesh”, in which, judging from his writing, he actually participated. It was the manaps of Sarybagysh tribe who had the initiative in it, as can be seen from the following quotation: “…the head tables are occupied by the influential manaps: Choko, Dür and Sultan”.\[15\] Choko was a leading manap from Esengul lineage of Sarybagysh tribe, Dür was from Tynai lineage and Sultan was from Tynai lineage. Thus on the one side the yīl āshī was a tribal festival, organized mainly by Tynai lineage of Sarybagysh tribe. Indeed it was the Kyrgyz from Tynai lineage who were called up to arrange the yīl āshī, including serving the guests.\[16\] ‘Abd al-Mann goes on to say: “…October has come. As soon as the manaps gave an order, the stillness among Kyrgyz was broken, they begun to ride horses”.\[17\]

2. Mobilizing the Visitors

On the other side the yīl āshī appealed to the colonial society beyond the bounds of tribe. Although the number of the participants varies depending on the various sources, at least it reached into the tens of thousands. Belek Soltonoev describes: “A total of 50 thousand people from Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Dungan, Russian, Nogai [=Tatar], Uygur, Cossacks and Russian colonial officials participated”.\[18\] And B.Kenesarin from Solto tribe, regarding it as “the biggest āshī” he had ever seen, flashed back as bellow: “…Then I was 16 years old. I saw it from the first to the last. From the Eastern Sukuluk volost, 81 people with 3 race horses got off under the direction of my older brother Jantai. Camping for two nights along the way, we arrived at the site of the yīl āshī, the hill named Boroldoi. We put up at 4 tents. 21 of us did at the tent of Shabdan’s adopted son, Maichi Adzhi, who slaughtered for us a mare and 2 bullocks. From top of the hill

---

\[14\] [Abramzon 1930]
\[15\] ['Abd al-Mann 1913: no. 4/127]
\[16\] [Dmitriev 1913: 2]
\[17\] ['Abd al-Mann 1913: no.5/ 158]
\[18\] [Soltonoev 2003: 284]
to the Small Kemin River, there were standing a row of tents. Aksakals said that there were standing about 1000 tents. The number of visitors was thought to be around 20 thousand on average"\[19\].

To mobilize the visitors, the “new” means, brought under the Russian governance, were utilized. Three months before the yil āshī, its “program” had been made out, which was sent to Kazakh, Kyrgyz and Russians of Semirech’e, Syr-Dar’ia and Fergana oblasts. Although the original of the program does not exist, according to Dmitriev, who indeed received it, it was an “ordinary typewritten europian invitation card”\[20\]. Secondly, each day from October 1\textsuperscript{st} to 12\textsuperscript{th} the announcement of the yil āshī, written both in Russian and Arabic Turkish, was published on the colonial official newspaper “Semirechenkie Oblastnye vedomosti” (See Fig.2). Forty years ago from this, the first administrator of Tokmak uezd G.Zagriazhskii noticed that it was only the tribes people whose chieftains were invited, who were allowed to attend the āshī.\[21\] Now, it was opened to general public through mass media. Although the details of making the announcement is unspecified, it seems reasonable to suppose that it was written by Shabdan’s sons, who, as noted Dmitriev, were familiar with Russian education and lifestyle and indeed were good at writing and talking in Russian.\[22\]

Let us pay attention to the messages of the announcement by comparing the Turkish version to the Russian one. The former reads: “Ūshbū jīlī 10-nchī āktəbdən 15-nchī āktəbrigachə rahmatlik vāyiskāvāy istārshīna Shābdān Jāntāyifning jilliq āshin būrāchakdir ham bāyga āt chābis būlādūr (From October 10\textsuperscript{th} to 15\textsuperscript{th} of this year the yil āshī of the Lieutinant Colonel, Shabdan Jantaev is to be held and the horse race “baige” is also”. Here we notice that the horse race was regarded as a part of the yil āshī. On the other hand the Russian version accents the horse race “baige”, when it reads: “Traditsionnaia baiga, na pominki Voiskovogo starshiny militsii Shabdana Dzhantaeva nachnetsia s 10-go po 15-e oktiabria s[ego]. g[oda] (The traditional baige in the yil āshī of Shabdan Jantaev is to be held from October 10\textsuperscript{th} to 15\textsuperscript{th} this

\[19\] Kenesarin 1993: 566-567
\[20\] Dmitriev 1913: 2
\[21\] Zagriazhskii 1873
\[22\] Dmitriev 1913: 2-3
year).” Besides, the adjective “traditional” is also worthy of attention, because it appealed to the
notion of Russians of “vanishing traditions” of nomads under the increasing Russian peasant
colonization. Additionally taking into consideration that the letters of the “traditional baige”
were indicated by boldface, it is clear that the organizer of the yīl āshī or Shabdan’s family
intended to mobilize the Russians by being aware of Russian’s eyes. One reason behind this is
that the presence of the Russian authority could not only fulfill a role in the maintenance of
security, but also help to acquire the authority. In fact on the first day of the yīl āshī (10th
October 1912), Shabdan’s sons sent a telegram to Fol’baum to attend.

3. Representing and Remembering the Authority of Shabdan

(1) The “Traditional” Means

The yīl āshī was a place to represent Shabdan’s authority and to make the visitors to
remember it. As Zagriazhskii noted, “the fame of the deceased depended on the amount,
expended at the āsh and the enormous āsh would be passed down to posterity, through which
the deceased himself and his descendants would be honored.”

It was a very focus of the
discussion in the keneshe,
where the 200-year history of āsh was reviewed and proposed to
organize the greatest one with few equals in history. It was also estimated that its
“vigorousness” depended on the amount of the reward for the horse race, as can be seen in the
following description of ‘Abd al-Mann: “…One said “Why don’t we organize the āsh, adequate
for the greatness of Battyr Haj [=Shabdan]. I can provide 500 heads of white camel”. One said
“on the opening baige for [the āsh of] our ancestor Paran Battyr, 500 heads of sheep, 100 heads
of camel, 100 heads of horse and 100 pieces of yanbu [were provided]”. One said “for the
opening baige of Satay Battyr, 100 sheets of cotton cloths, 100 sheets of chapan (=jacket) and
100 pieces of yanbu [were provided]”.

Following this discussion it was agreed
that each manap would collect money
from the subject people. It was borne
principally by Tynai linage of
Sarybagysh tribe, including Shabdan’s
clan: from Shabdan’s clan – 20 thousand
ruble, Atake volost – 15 thousand, Tynai

23 [TsGA RK.f. 44. op. 1. d. 4125. l. 15]
24 [Zagriazhskii 1873].
25 [‘Abd al-Mann 1913: no. 4/127-128]
volost – 10 thousand, Shamsi volost – 10 thousand, Kazakhs – 3 thousand. The collecting was begun from August 1912. Thus we see that the Kyrgyz, belonging to Tynai lineage including Shabdan’s clan recognized his authority in the traditional context of the amount of the reward for the horse race, which they managed to achieve by mobilizing the tribespeople.

At the site of the yil āshī, the social space, centered on Shabdan was represented traditionally. To its center Shabdan’s tent with his banner was delivered (See. Fig.3). Although the origin of the banner is unclear, it must be a custom in this area, as Zagriazhskii noted: “…a flag of the deceased was placed on his tent”. Having set up own tents around Shabdan’s tent, visitors made for it, crying out (“ökürüp”): “My khan! My father!” Entering the tent, they recited a line from Koran performed short “bata” (=grace) and presented gifts.

(2) The “New” Means

We shall look more closely inside the tent (See. Fig.4). There is a group of women, performing “Koshok” or ritual crying. On the surface of the tent can be seen the saddle and several jackets. At the front of them was placed a dummy, dressed in the prestigious caftan with a shoulder loop and the gold, silver medals awarded from Tsarist government to Shabdan during his life. Next to this was displayed a reproduction painting of the photograph, taken at the coronation of Alexander III in 1883 (See. Fig.5).

Figure 4 can be described as a miniature of the Kyrgyz society surrounding Shabdan. The Kyrgyz women must find out the “aura” of Shabdan, which, at the same time, meant a confirming action of the Russian authority, internalized in the iconography and the costume of Shabdan. In the memorial article, issued on the “Semirechenkie Oblastnye vedomosti” in April 11th 1912, Shabdan was described as a “father for Kyrgyz and Kazakh”.

26 [ʿAbd al-Mann 1913: no. 4/128]
27 [Zagriazhskii 1873]
28 [Dmitriev 1913: 3-4]; [Malaia... 1912: no. 225]
29 [Malaia... 1912: no. 227]; [Kenesarin 1993: 566-567]
30 [Shābdān ... 1912]
paternalism was based not only on the patriarchal authority within the Kyrgyz society as a manap, but also on the Russian authority.

4. The Russian Authority in the yīl āshī

How the Russian authority got involved in the yīl āshī? It was held under the official approval of the military governor of Semirech’ ē oblast, Fol’baum. Soon after the kenesh, on July 26th, he gave permission Kamal to hold the horse race.  

Although the Russian authority did not preserve the comprehensive records of their participation, it seemed to be on a scale, similar to the funeral, when B. Kenesarin said that there participated 100 of Cossacks, the administrator of Pishpek uezd and the chief of the local police. The Russian authority did not intervene strongly in the yīl āshī, only to send the Cossacks for the maintenance of security. Of course a little bit of evidence of their intervention can be found in the game of “Saish”, held on the 4th day of the yīl āshī, October 13th. Saish was a game, where two armed men with a long pike were goring each other until the other fell from a horse. According to the contemporary evidences, “it left a ghoulish impression on the Russian audience”, and “it was prohibited by the Russian authority, which considered its unsubtle backwardness”. However, taking into consideration that the saish was held and died two men, the Russian authority did not take compulsive measures, only to raise caution. The same can be seen in the way that the petition, complaining about the illegal tax gathering for the yīl āshī was handled. Fol’baum refused the offer from Kamal to attend the yīl āshī. Instead he sent the special official to dig up the illegal tax. Kenesarin had a close-up view of all the details:

…soon after arriving at the site of the yīl āshī, the vice military governor, the uezd administrator and other Russian officials called all the manaps. The uezd administrator, with a paper in his hand, told that a Kyrgyz, named Alike Alimbek had written a petition to the military governor, complaining that Shabdan’s āshī was leading common people to destruction. To this, my brother Jantai, citing Shabdan’s attainment of persuading the Kyrgyz to subject to Russia, answered: “On this occasion I came with 80 people. We are helping to organize the āshī by bringing our own foods”. And he said that the petition was a lie. Having heard this, the uezd administrator and other officials concluded that it was a

31 [ShB 1999 : 158]  
32 [Malai ... 1912: no. 227]  
33 [Malai ... 1912: no. 228]  
34 [Dmitriev 1913: 16]  
35 [TsGA RK.f. 44. op. 1. d. 4125. l. 15] ; [Kenesarin 1993: 567]
lie.\textsuperscript{36}

On the other hand, the chief of the local police, Kutukov actively cooperated in organizing the yīl āshī, especially in collecting money, as can be seen from the following petition of Alike Alimbek, submitted to the Governor General of Turkestan in 1913: “…after the official, sent by the military governor, left the āshī, Shabdan’s clan collected a lot of money from us, …which had been done by the volost administrator in witness of the patrol officer, Smirnov”.\textsuperscript{37}

III. Reorganization of the regional order

1. The Succession of Power within the Tribe

In this chapter I shall discuss the question of the transfer of power after the death of Shabdan. For this purpose it is useful to quote from ‘Abd al-Mann:

…the manaps were reluctant to submit own share of expenses [of the ash they promised each other in the kenessh]. They haggled each other, swearing: “First you must submit!” They managed to pocket the more amount of money they collected. That made 90 thousand som 30 thousand som. As a result, the program of the ash was simplified and the prize money was reduced. Shabdan’s sons, who wanted to become prominent manap as their own father, lamented the inadequateness of the ash.\textsuperscript{38}

Indeed the article of the colonial newspaper also described: “In the 3\textsuperscript{rd} day of the ash (=October 12\textsuperscript{th}), it has flatly languished. There remained only a small number of visitors. According to the organizer, it is less than 800 people”\textsuperscript{39}. The “greatness”, which Shabdan’s family intended, failed to be accomplished. One akyn sang ironically this situation: “… Now you are lost. Such an outstanding figure as you. …Your four sons are not able to accomplish any kind of enormous contribution that you have done, and to get so much attention from the Russian authority ("nachal’stvo"). …Several years before your death… one of your sons (=Mokush) was adjudicated guilty and was cast in jail for murder, which withered your vitality and hastened your death. Look at this! Your family has been living peacefully under your protection\textsuperscript{40}.

At the last day of the ash, on October 15\textsuperscript{th}, an assembly of the influential manaps was held, where the question of the transfer of Shabdan’s power was discussed. After that, the closing ceremony was held, where Shabdan’s banner (See Fig.3) was broken into some pieces, which

\textsuperscript{36} [Kenesarin 1993: 567]
\textsuperscript{37} [TsGA RUz. f. I-1.op.17.d.935.l.20ob.], [Soltonoev 2003: 284]
\textsuperscript{38} [‘Abd al-Mann 1913: no.5/159]
\textsuperscript{39} [Malaia... 1912: no.228]
\textsuperscript{40} [Malaia... 1912: no.227]
were handed over to the successor elected in the assembly\textsuperscript{41}. However it is uncertain whether this ceremony took on a practical meaning or formal one, because the Kyrgyz’s experiencing it did not make a mark on this ceremony. It was the Russian authority that was more interested in it. In the next year, in 1913, the Russian authority of Semirech’e oblast sent a special officer to collect relevant information, according to which, in one view Shabdan’s power was transferred to Dür Sooronbai, a manap of the Tynai linage of Sarybagysh tribe, in another view, on majority opinion, although the banner was handed over to the Aman, the youngest son of Shabdan, the ceremony never held a substantial meaning. Viewed in this light, it is certain that at any late there no longer existed such an outstanding chieftain as Shabdan, as said a manap of the Tynai linage, M. Muratalyn, the volost commander of Shamusi volost : “…after the death of Shabdan, nobody won the first place”\textsuperscript{42}.

This situation can be accounted for by future perspective of Shabdan, in other words, the acceptance of the “death” of manaps as a social category. It was Shabdan who definitely understood that in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century the social system of the Kyrgyz nomads lead by manaps become outdated. Kamal describes as following: “…When my father (=Shabdan) saw his relatives and family, he used to say that the manap system would cease to exist with me (manaptïk meni menen jok bolot), so you must seed wheat. He advised own sons to get job: Mokush was engaged in cattle breeding; Samudin was engaged in farming and fruit growing; for me, Kamal, my father bought the field for bee keeping…; for Aman he built tannery workplace…”\textsuperscript{43} As this sentence indicates, Shabdan managed to perform the personal transformation of the manap stratum by taking advantage of various resources acquired under the Russian rule. In this sense there is good reason to regard Dür Sooronbai as his “successor”. Dür was a symbol of the manaps of new generation born after the Russian conquest, who not only got Russian education, but also was engaged in various cultural, social, religious practices, as ‘Uthmān ‘Alī described : “…after Shabdan, Dür serves to our religion and our nation…”\textsuperscript{44}

\section*{2. The Attitude of the Russian Authority}

\subsection*{(1) The expropriations of privileges and suppression of the power}

After Shabdan’s death, the Russian authority did not permit the inheritance of the rank of Lieutenat Colonel (“Voiskovoi Starshina”) and expropriated the privileges\textsuperscript{45} including the

\textsuperscript{41}[Malaia... 1912: no.229] ; [Dmitriev 1913: 15]
\textsuperscript{42}[TsGA RK.f.44.op.1.d.20951.1.35-50ob.]
\textsuperscript{43}[RFNAN KR : Kamal 1947: 21-22]
\textsuperscript{44}[‘Uthmān ‘Alī 1914: 51-52]
\textsuperscript{45}In May 1913 the honorable caftan and military medals were given away to the Museum of the
special allotment land. Before own death Shabdan asked for the inheritance of this land. To this petition, in March 1912, the military governor of Semirech’e oblast, M. Fol’baum with the director of the land and resettlement agency in Semirech’e, S. Veretskii, announced the policy of permitting the inheritance under condition of departing of Shabdan’s family from Sarybagysh volost and settling within the special allotment land. However Shabdan’s family denied this suggestion. In January 1913 Fol’baum offered the rejection of their petition to the Governor General of Turkestan, Samsonov, who reported to the Department of the Army General Staff: “…Now, after Shabdan’s death, his sons and family have no attainment deserving of special allotment…”46 Department of the Army General Staff agreed to this view, and finally the inheritance of the land was rejected. Although in the condolence telegram Samsonov affirmed the allegiance of Shabdan’s sons and family to the Tsar and the Russian government47, but he never accepted the inheritance of the privileges. In parallel with this the Russian colonial authority of Semirech’e oblast intended to fractionalize Sarybagysh volost. As a Kazakh intelligentsia, M. Tynyshpaev (later, he became the first leader of the Turkestan self-government), reported to the Governor General of Turkestan, A.N. Kuropatkin in 1916, “…after Shabdan’s death, in the colonial office of Semirech’e oblast, it was decided to suppress Shabdan’s family”48. Indeed the colonial office of Semirech’e oblast ardently supported one of the brothers of Shabdan, Alagusy, who tried to divide Sarybagysh volost.49

(2) “Shabdan” Continues to Survive

While the Russian colonial authority did not recognize the attainments of Shabdan as a basis for the inheritance of the special allotment land, it did not deny his attainments itself. Indeed they were often recalled and reflected in the process of the policy making by the Russian colonial authority. For example in 1913, in the secret letter to Fol’baum, Samsonov pointed out “the close relationship between the chief of the Tokmak district, Kutukov and the late Shabdan Jantaev and persons, who were involved in the pan Islamic movement”50. In response to this, Fol’baum countered the suspicion, saying:

…as a result of the local investigation by the special official, the relationship between Kutukov and persons, who were involved in the pan Islamic movement, was not affirmed.

It is not only because, among Kirgiz, there is no pan Islamic movement, but also because

Cossack army [ShB 1999: 160].
46 [TsGA RUz.f.I-1.op.13.d.430.1.26-26ob.]
47 [ShB 1999: 155]
48 [VSAK 1960: 370-371]
49 [TsGA RK.f.44.op.1.d.25583.1.4-4ob.]
50 [TsGA RK.f.44.op.1.d.20951.1.27-27ob.]
Shabdan Jantaev, who showed his whole commitment, would not organize that kind of movement...\(^{51}\)

Thus the colonial office of Semirech’e oblast managed to prevent the case from being complicated and to cover-up the suspicion by taking advantage of the “commitment of Shabdan”. In other words, it is possible to say that Shabdan, even after his physical death, continued to “survive” as a convenient resource to settle local problems peacefully. It was also reflected in the petition, submitted to the Governor General of Turkestan, Samsonov, by a Kyrgyz from Atake volost, Alike Alimbek on July 1913: “...manaps led by the sons of the late Shabdan Jantaev, who are against the sedentarization, rule us with the attainment of Shabadan to the Russian authority and its affection to them...”\(^{52}\) The Governor General of Turkestan, Samsonov advised Fol’baum to meet this petition. But, the latter never agreed\(^{53}\).

**Conclusion**

In this paper I considered the authority of Kyrgyz tribal chieftains, manaps in the early 20\(^{th}\) century under the rule of the Russian empire, through investigating the funeral ceremonies of Shabdan Jantai. The death of Shabdan required the colonial society not only to represent the social order and power relationship surrounding the deceased, but also to re-organize the regional order. The Kyrgyz, especially Shabdan’s family, managed to represent his authority. Although on the formal level, the funeral ceremonies were performed along the “traditional” cycle, they were performed by mobilizing not only the “traditional” resources, but also the “new” ones, brought under the Russian rule. However, upon closer investigation of the political dynamics behind the ceremonies, they revealed that the authority of Shabdan lost substance. Even among the Kyrgyz, there were those who managed to demonstrate disobedience to the authority of Shabdan, by rejecting the gathering. Besides, after his death the Russian colonial authority of Semirech’e oblast expropriated the privileges and managed to dismantle his power. However, in the local level, the Russian authority, including the chief of the local police, managed to maintain the authority of his family. In other words, it was the inability of the Russian governance to penetrate into the Kyrgyz society that helped to maintain the authority of manaps, including Shabdan to some extent. Thus it is concluded that, even after his physical death, Shabdan continued to exist as a sort of “symbol”, by which the Russian colonial authority and Kyrgyz could communicate with each other.

\(^{51}\) [TsGA RK.f.44.op.1.d.20951.1.13ob.]
\(^{52}\) [TsGA RUz.f.I-1.op.17.d.9351.191ob.]
\(^{53}\) [TsGA RUz.f.I-1.op.17.d.9351.111ob.,193-193ob.]
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