

**REDACTIONS AND DATES OF THE COMPILATION
OF THE ČINGIZ-NĀMĀ OF ÖTĀMIŠ ḤĀJJĪ**

Csaba Göncöl

MTA–SZTE Ottoman Era Research Group

Szeged, Hungary

csaba986@gmail.com

Abstract: This article aims to scrutinise the relationship between the texts of the 16-th century chronicle, the so called *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötāmiš Ḥājjī, preserved in two manuscripts, as well as to determine the date(s) of the compilation of the work.

Materials: The Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts of the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötāmiš Ḥājjī, Central Asian chronicles in Turkic and Persian, relevant scholarly literature.

Results and novelty of the research: Analysing the relationship of the two texts, the author has come to the conclusion that the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts of the above-mentioned chronicle contain different redactions of the *Čingiz-nāmā* written by the same chronicler. Furthermore, the author argues that the text preserved in the Tashkent manuscript is the initial redaction compiled before the year 1539, while the text of the Istanbul manuscript contains the second redaction – an extended one – written around middle of the 1540s.

Keywords: Ötāmiš Ḥājjī, *Čingiz-nāmā*, Golden Horde, Tashkent manuscript, Istanbul manuscript

For citation: Göncöl Cs. Redactions and dates of the compilation of the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötāmiš Ḥājjī. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2023, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 582–591. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-3.582-591

The past three decades witnessed a considerable increase of interest in the study of “native sources” of the Golden Horde, and in particular the so-called *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötāmiš Ḥājjī. This unique piece of historical literature was written in the 16th century in the territory of Ḥ^wārazm, then under Šaybanīd rule, and in an eastern Turkic Islamic literary language. The work has been preserved in two copies, one in Tashkent (hence: Tashkent manuscript), and one in Istanbul (hence: Istanbul manuscript)¹, the text of which – as we shall see – was supplemented with events of the 17th century.

¹ For an in-depth analysis of the author, his chronicle, and its extant copies consult [3, pp. 5–10; 4, pp. 164–169; 11, pp. 144–145; 16, pp. 72–74; 19, pp. 20–29; 20; 21; 22, 24].



Although the Tashkent manuscript of this unique chronicle was introduced to scholarship as early as 1902 by Bartol'd [4, p. 164–166], and the Istanbul manuscript was acquired by Togan not much later in the 1910s [19, p. 27, 22, pp. 14–19; 23, pp. 60–62; 32, pp. 8–10]. The historical circumstances of the 20th century largely prevented simultaneous access to both manuscripts for a long time. This resulted in scholars being able to work only with either one or the other copy of the chronicle, and as a consequence its many editions and translations have been based on either the Tashkent or the Istanbul manuscript. For the time being, this remains a serious shortcoming of scholarship regarding the *Čingiz-nāme*. However, excellent editions containing transliterations and facsimiles of both the Tashkent [25; 31] and Istanbul [19; 32] manuscripts offer us the possibility to compare the texts and reveal details hidden up to the present.

It is important to note that both the extant manuscripts are later copies of the *Čingiz-nāmā*. My aim here is not to determine the date at which these copies were finished², but to point out that Ötämiš Hājjī made two separate redactions of the chronicle and to assert the times at which the author finished them.

A remark in the Istanbul manuscript of the *Čingiz-nāmā* reads as follows: *Further, I wish to compose this copy³ of this [poo]r wretched [soul] – as the author refers to himself – for a second time. I start for the second time.*” [19, p. 136, 32, pp. 59–60, 133, 216/fol. 48b]⁴. Mirgaleev pointed out this fact [32, p. 6], which lead me to raise a few questions. The remark leaves no doubt that Ötämiš Hājjī made two separate redactions of his chronicle and that the Istanbul manuscript contains the second one. Could the Tashkent manuscript contain the first/initial redaction of the *Čingiz-nāmā*? If so, how can we prove it and when did the author finish the first and then the second? These are the questions that are going to be answered in this article. Although I have recently addressed both these topics and formed a hypothesis [13, pp. 127–129], at that time I failed to recognise further clues that support it.

Keeping in mind that the Istanbul manuscript contains the second, i.e., the later redaction, it seems reasonable to compare the texts and the structure of the narrative in both manuscripts. A comparison of these shows substantial differences, but only at the beginning of the chronicle. The text preserved in the Tashkent manuscript begins – as was typical for works composed in an Islamic environment – with the praise of God and the Prophet Muhammad (*invocation*) and proceeds with information on the author, his patron, the sources of the chronicle, and the circumstances of its compilation (*introduction*). After these it continues with the partition of the Mongol Empire and the history of the Jočids (*narration*). It is important to point out that there is no abrupt break in the manuscript between the *introduction* and the *narration*. In stark contrast, the text of the Istanbul manuscript lacks the *invocation* and *introduction*! It starts with the history of Genghis Khan followed by that of the establishment of the Mongol Empire. Only after these does the manu-

² To my knowledge there has been no attempt to determine the date of copy of the Tashkent manuscript. Kafalı and Mirgaleev made their claims regarding the Istanbul manuscript's dating [19, p. 28; 24, p. 67; 32, p. 6], a topic to which we shall return shortly.

³ The text uses the word *nuşha* ‘exemplar, prototype, archetype, a copy or model [...] a manuscript; [...]’ [28, p. 1400].

⁴ *basa tilār-mān ki bu nuşha-i [faqī]r-i haqīrnī iki def'ā (!) inşā qīlsam def'a-i sānīsīnā şurū' qīlgum turur*

script proceed with the partition of the empire and the history of the Jočids (*narration*), from which point the text corresponds to that of the Tashkent manuscript almost verbatim⁵.

Tashkent manuscript	Istanbul manuscript
<i>invocation</i>	missing
<i>introduction</i>	missing
missing	<i>history of Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire</i>
<i>narration</i> – the end of the text is missing	<i>narration</i> – text uninterrupted
missing	<i>continuation from the 17th century</i> ⁶

Structural differences between the texts of the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts

The structural difference between the texts leads us to the hypothesis that the Tashkent manuscript preserved the text of the first redaction. This redaction had been compiled for Iš (Muḥammad) Sulṭān, the patron of Ötāmiš Hājjī, a fact that is stated *expressis verbis* in the *introduction* [25, pp. 7–8, 66–67; 31, pp. 90–91, 119–120]. At a later date, Ötāmiš Hājjī made a second redaction of the chronicle, in which he left out the *invocation* and the *introduction*, opting instead to extend the text with the history of Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire.

There is a further clue that supports this hypothesis, one that at first seems negligible but is quite important, so long as we place it in the right context. At one point the Tashkent manuscript makes mention of Sultan Gāzī Sulṭān b. Ilbars Khan without anything added after his name [25, pp. 40, 95; 31, pp. 114, 140]. In the Istanbul manuscript, however, he is referred to as “*his great and auspicious majesty, whom [God] has taken into [his] mercy, whose sins are forgiven – may God make his grave pleasant and make Paradise his abode!*” [19, p. 132; 32, pp. 53, 127, p. 229/fo. 42a]⁷. This seemingly unimportant addition to the text makes it clear that the author penned the text of the Tashkent manuscript before the death of the above-mentioned Ghenghisid prince, whereas he wrote the one preserved in the Istanbul manuscript after the event. When we take the disparity in the structure of the chronicle into consideration too, it becomes evident that Ötāmiš Hājjī made two redactions of the *Čingiz-nāmā*. The Tashkent manuscript contains the initial one, while the Istanbul manuscript certainly preserves the second.

The existence of two separately compiled redactions leads us to the next question, namely, when did the author finish the first and the second redactions respectively? Scholarly literature on the topic presents wildly different opinions. This disparity can be explained by researchers long having had access to only one of the manuscripts. Due to the scarcity of information in the text, scholars utilising only the Tashkent manuscript could only suggest a wide time range. Bartol’d worked

⁵ Beginning from the partition of the empire, there are only minor differences between the two drafts. For an insight into these see [14, pp. 60–61].

⁶ For an in-depth analysis of the continuation, see [5; 21; 23; 24, pp. 59; 67].

⁷ *ḥazrat-i sulṭān-i kabīr-i sa’id-i marḥūm-i maḡfūr ṭayyab llāhu ṣarāhu wa ja’ala l-janna miṭwāhu sulṭān Gāzī Sulṭān* The text of the Istanbul manuscript uses the erroneous verbal form *tāba* instead of *ṭayyab*. I corrected this.

with the whole span of the 16th century [4, p. 166], while Akhmedov – in his preface to the edition of Yudin et al. – pointed to the first half of that century [3, p. 5]. Kawaguchi and Nagamine place the compilation of first redaction between the death of Ilbas Khan and Dōst Muḥammad Khan – that is, within the years 1518 and 1558 [20, p. 48]. Scholars who had access to the Istanbul manuscript, which offers more data for dating the compilation, operated within a narrower time range, and they suggest the 1550s [11, p. 144]. Only Kafalı went further and argued that the year 1552 was the *terminus ante quem* [19, p. 27]. Access to both manuscripts and a comparison of them, however, offers substantially more information to date the compilation of both redactions.

The text of the Tashkent manuscript provides us with three hints regarding the date of its compilation. The first points to the time span (*bu aṣnāda* ‘in this time’) when Iṣ Sultān was the “refuge of sultans” along the Syr Darya River (*Sir dāryāsīja*) [25, pp. 7, 66–67; 31, pp. 90, 119–120]. I failed to identify any source that would ascribe any kind of appanage to Iṣ (Muḥammad) Sultān along the said river⁸, and any of my attempts to date the redaction on this ground turned out to be futile. This leaves us with two clues and only a rudimentary chronology whith which to work.

Ötämiš Hājjī left a second clue when he referred to his former lord, Ilbars Khan in the following way in the Tashkent redaction: “*his majesty the khan, whose sins are forgiven, whom [God] has taken into [his] mercy – may God make his grave pleasant and the Paradise his abode!*” [31, pp. 110, 137; 25, pp. 34, 90; 19, p. 129; 32, pp. 49, 123, 238/fol. 37b]⁹. Kawaguchi and Nagamine were correct in pointing to Ilbars Khan’s death in 1518 as the *terminus post quem* of the compilation of the Tashkent redaction [20, p. 48].

The final clue that we are able to work with – as we saw earlier – is the date of death of the succeeding Sultan Ġāzī Sultān. Although Abu l-Ġāzī Bahadur khan (r. 1643–1663) in his *Šajara-i Tūrk* vividly portrays the event that led to the murder of the said prince [10, pp. ۲۱۲–۲۲۲], his chronicle fails to provide a date. There are, however, sources that enable us to narrow down the chronology of the event to a span of few years.

The death of Sultan Ġāzī Sultān was a result of power struggles within the ‘Arabšāhid dynasty. In the 1530s, two major groups were competing for primacy in Ḥ^wārazm. The first one consisted of the offspring of Büräkä b. Yādgār Khan, headed by Sultan Ġāzī Sultān who wielded actual authority within the khanate. The second constituted the progeny of Āminäk b. Yādgār Khan with Āwānāš at its head as nominal khan [29, pp. 312–314; 34, pp. 105–107]. The *Firdaws al-iqbāl* of Mūnis and Āgāhī recalls a revolt in Astarābād against the governor of Tahmāsb Shah (r. 1542–1576). Āwānāš Khan – on the advice (*kāngās*) of Sultan Ġāzī Sultān – sent troops under the command of the later’s son, ‘Umar Ġāzī, to aid in the insurrection [18, pp. ۱۱۱–۱۱۲; 27, p. 31]. Šafawī chronicles fully support the testimony of the *Firdaws*

⁸ Abu l-Ġāzī’s *Šajara-i Tūrk* relates that of the brothers Dōst Muḥammad and Iṣ Muḥammad, the latter who commissioned Ötämiš Hājjī to compile the *Čingiz-nāmā*, received the town of Kāt (modern-day Beruniy, Uzbekistan) as an appanage [10, p. ۲۱۲], which is considerable distance away from the Syr Darya River.

⁹ *ḥazrat-i ḥān-i maḡfūr u marḥūm ṭayyaba allāhu ṣarāhu wa ja‘ala l-ḡanna miṭwāhu* The text of the Istanbul manuscript – again – uses the verbal form *ṭāba*. The citation is given according to the correct form of the Tashkent manuscript.

al-iqbāl. The *‘Ālam-ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī* of Iskandar Beg Türkmān dates the revolt to AH 944/AD 10 July 1537–29 May 1538 [17, I. p. ,’ · ʿ], whereas the *Aḥsanu t-tawārīḥ* of Ḥasan Rūmlū records it under the events of the year AH 945/AD 30 May 1538–18 May 1539 [1, pp. ʿʸʿ-ʿʸʸ; 2, pp. 129–130; 15, pp. ʿʸʿ-ʿʸʸ]. The armed conflict among of the ‘Arabšāhids broke out after the Ḥ^wārazmian troops returned from Astarābād. At the end of those events, the faction under Āwānāš Khan killed Sultan Ġāzī Sultān and several other members of his family. However, ‘Umar Ġāzī was left alive and banished to Buḥarā where he managed to gather the support of ‘Ubayd Khan b. Maḥmūd of Buḥarā (r. 1533–1540) and Barāq Khan, the future ruler of Samarqand (1551–1556). The joint forces marched into Ḥ^wārazm and – for a short period – ousted the enemy faction killing many of its members, including the khan. The conquest of Ḥ^wārazm proved to be a successful, but short-lived enterprise. The troops of Buḥarā suffered a defeat shortly afterwards and pulled back. The faction supporting Āwānāš khan came to power once more and raised Qahīl – in other sources Qal – khan to the throne [10, pp. ʿʿʿ-ʿʿʿ; 18, pp. ʿʿʿ-ʿʿʿ; 27, p. 32]. The *Firdaws al-iqbāl* sets these events into AH 946/AD 19 May 1539–6 May 1540, but also mentions that “*Ḥasan ḥān Rūmlū* (in the chronicle *Aḥsanu t-tawārīḥ* - Cs. G.) and the *‘Ālam-ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī say* [the events happened – addition by Cs. G.] in [AH] 945” [18, p. ʿʿʿ; 27, p. 32]¹⁰. While the *‘Ālam-ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī* only alludes to the above-mentioned events in Astarābād, Ḥasan Rūmlū in fact inserted them under the events of this year [1, pp. ʿʿʿ-ʿʿʿ; 2, pp. 132–133; 15, pp. ʿʿʿ-ʿʿʿ]. Taking this evidence into consideration we can safely argue that Sultan Ġāzī Sultān must have perished in the years 1538/39, giving a *terminus ante quem* for the compilation of the first redaction preserved in the Tashkent manuscript. This means that Ötāmiš Hājjī must have penned his first version of the *Čingiz-nāmā* between the years 1518 and 1538/39.

The redaction of the Istanbul manuscript offers considerably more information with the help of which we can date it even more precisely. Most importantly, at the very end of the continuation, two dates are given. It runs as follows: *qad waqa ‘a l-farāğ min ḥāzīhī l-awraq fī yawmi ‘aḥāršanba fī šaḥri Muḥarram sanati [...]* *bāraka llāhu tamma tāriḥ-i sanati-i [...]* [19, p. 156; 32, pp. 160/fol. 76b]. It translates to “This manuscript was finished on the day of Wednesday, in the month of Muḥarram of the year [...]. May God praise it! [In] the year of [...].” I had good reason to leave out both of the years. In the first case, the date is blurred to the extent that I find it impossible to read any text or recognise any numerals. Kafalı and Mirgaleev read 959 [19, p. 156; 24, p. 67; 32, pp. 85, 159]. Wednesdays of Muḥarram 959 correspond to the 30th of December 1551, the 6th, 13th, 20th or 27th of January 1552, and if their reading is right, it would be a credible chronology for the compilation of the second draft of the *Čingiz-nāmā*. As for the second, both scholars read it as 1040 [19, p. 156; 24, p. 67; 32, pp. 85, 159], that is 10th August 1630 – 29th July 1631. I find this reading uncertain too, especially because there are five numerals visible on the facsimile. And even if the afore-mentioned readings are right, the question still remains, what do they actually mark? All in all, there are two dates at the end of the chronicle’s continuation, the reading of which are dubious. One has to agree with Belyakov according to whom the dating of the manuscript does not hold water [5, pp. 380–381]. Given all these doubts, in the follow-

¹⁰ For more detail and further literature consult [8, p.375. note 80].

ing I shall scrutinise the content of the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Istanbul manuscript¹¹, and look for indications that may give us a hint regarding the time of its compilation.

When enumerating the genealogy of different branches of the Šaybanids, Ötāmiš Hājjī lists the rulers of H^wārazm in the following fashion: *hān-i marhūm Buğūja hān wā Šofyā[n] hān wā Āvānāš hān wā Qal*¹² *hān hallada mulkahū* [19, p. 138; 32, pp. 62, 136, 210/fol. 51b]. The Arabic felicitation *hallada mulkahū* ‘may his reign last forever’ is usually added to the names of currently reigning monarchs, meaning that the author was drafting the second redaction of the *Čingiz-nāmā* during the reign of Qal Khan. This has been already noticed by Kafalı who – for reasons unknown to me – set the demise of the afore-mentioned monarch to 1552 [19, p. 27]¹³. To my knowledge, the only source giving hints regarding the time of the event is the *Firdaws al-iqbāl*, which tells us that Qal Khan reigned for nine years [18 p. ۱۱۵; 27, p. 34]. Knowing that Qal Khan was raised to the throne after the forces of ‘Ubayd Khan pulled out from H^wārazm around the year 1539/40, it is safe to assume that we ought reckon with the dates 1539/40–1548/1549 for Qal Khan’s reign. Thus, the date 1549 could be considered the *terminus ante quem* of the compilation of the second redaction of the *Čingiz-nāmā*. It is, however, possible to narrow down the date even further!

When narrating the reign of Uluğ Muḥammad (ruled the Golden Horde cc. 1419–1423, and with short interruptions 1428–1432; ruled the Khanate of Kazan’ 1438–1435), Ötāmiš Hājjī alludes to “*Aq Kōbāk khan who is khan in Hājjī Tarḥan* (i.e. Astrakhan – Cs. G.) [...]” [19, p. 152; 32, pp. 80, 155, 169/fol. 72a]¹⁴. The tense employed by the author in this passage is called aorist (*hān turur*). “Since the aorist does not have a point of time or time frame specifically assigned to it” [7, p. 204], it is hard to determine its exact function in the given sentence. It may refer to a narrated past action, a wide range of present actions – habitual or recurring, progressive or continuous –, general truths, established facts, or future actions [7, pp. 204–207]¹⁵. Although the use of the aorist in the given sentence can be ambiguous, it seems plausible, nay, likely that in this case, it refers to the author’s own time. If that is so, it means that Ötāmiš Hājjī worked on the second redaction of the *Čingiz-nāmā* during the reign of the above-mentioned monarch, Aq Kōbāk Khan.

The politics of the Khanate of Astrakhan in the first half of the 16th century were exceptionally complex, but it is possible to provide an acceptable chronology of the rulers’ reign in this period. Aq Kōbāk Khan b. Murtažā, came to power in

¹¹ The content of the continuation has been exhaustively analysed by Belyakov who argues that the *terminus post quem* of the compilation is 1654 [5, pp. 380–387].

¹² The manuscript does not offer a clear reading of the name. Both Kafalı and Mirgaleev read *Qahil hān*, Kafalı even mentioning the discrepancy [19, p. 27]. Be that as it may, the letters *qāf* and *lām* are legible, and we can be sure that the monarch in question is the same person whom the *Šājārā-i türk* [10, p. ۷۷۹] and the *Firaws al-iqbāl* [18, pp. ۱۱۶, ۱۱۵; 27, pp. 33–34], mention as Qal Khan.

¹³ Kafalı was certainly right in setting the date of the work’s compilation prior to 1552. This was the year Russian troops wrested the city of Kazan’ from Genghisid hands. The event proved to be so significant that it reverberated in most of the chronicles in successor-states of the Golden Horde. The fact that Ötāmiš Hājjī, a contemporary of the events, failed to mention it, suggests that he, indeed, finished the second redaction of his texts prior to the conquest.

¹⁴ *Aq Kōbāk hān kim Hājjī Tarḥanda hān turur atyur kim [...]*

¹⁵ For an in depth view of the tense consult the following grammar books: [6, pp. 340–341; 7, pp. 203–208; 9, pp. 230–237; 12, pp. 163–167; 26, pp. 126–127].

the khanate with the help of his Cherkes allies in 1532, but he lost his position after only a year on the throne. He managed to reclaim it for a second time from 1545 until he was ousted by his enemies in 1546/1547 [30, pp. 219–221, 35, pp. 138–139, 144]. The first reign of Aq Köbäk Khan (1532–1533) can not correspond to that of Qal Khan (1539/40–1548/9) in *Ḥwārazm*, which means we can dismiss it. However, the chronology of his second reign, between 1545 and 1547 does! This indicates that the aorist in sentence “*Aq Köbäk ḥān kim Hājjī Tarḥanda ḥān turur*” expresses a present tense, thus signalling that Ötämiš Hājjī must have worked on the second redaction of the *Čingiz-nāmā* in the given period. The questions regarding the dates at the end of the Istanbul manuscript, their exact reading and meaning, however, still remains open.

In the course of the article, we compared the structure of the *Čingiz-nāmā* in the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts and were able to conclude that Ötämiš Hājjī drafted two separate redactions of his chronicle. He finished the first one for his patron, İṣ Muḥammad Sulṭān between the years of 1518 and 1539, the Tashkent manuscript preserved this version of the text. Latter, most probably around 1545–1547, the author made a second redaction which he extended with the history of Genghis Khan and the early history of the Mongol Empire, this is the version preserved in the Istanbul manuscript. These findings raise further questions: why did the author draft a second redaction of the text? Why did he leave the *invocation* and *introduction* out of it? Unfortunately, for the time being, it is not possible to answer these questions. Additionally, the study calls to attention the need for, and benefits that arise from modern critical text editions of “native sources” of the later Golden Horde period – a need that has been pointed out three decades ago [33, p. 252].

REFERENCES

1. *A Chronicle of the Early Şafawīs Being the Aḥsanu't-tawārīkh of Ḥasan-i-Rūmlū Vol. I (Persian Text)* Ed. by: Seddon, C.N. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931. 520 p. (In Persian)
2. *A Chronicle of the Early Şafawīs Being the Aḥsanu't-tawārīkh of Ḥasan-i-Rūmlū Vol II (English Translation)* Trans. by: Seddon, C.N. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1934. 303 p.
3. Akhmedov B.A. Ot otvetsvennogo redaktora. In: Utemish-khadzhi: *Chingiz-name*. Faksimile, perevod, transkriptsiya, tekstologicheskie primecheniya, issledovanie V.P. Yudina. Podgotovka k izdaniyu Yu.G. Baranova. Kommentarii i ukazateli M.Kh. Abuseitovoi. Alma-ata: Gylym, 1992. 296, pp. 5–10. (In Russian and Türkī)
4. Bartol'd V.V. Otchet o kommandirovke v Turkestan. In: *Sochineniya VIII. Raboty po istochnikovedeniyu*. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1973, pp. 119–210. (In Russian)
5. Belyakov A.V. O vremeni i meste napisaniya prodolzheniya sochineniya Utemish-khadzhi «Kara tavarikh» (kommentarii k tekstu) [On the Time and Place of Writing the Continuation of Ötemish-Hajji's “Qara Tavarikh” (Comments on the Text)]. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie = Golden Horde Review*. 2018, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 370–392. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-2.370-392 (In Russian)
6. Blagova G.F. “*Babur-name*”: *Yazyk, pragmatika teksta, stil*. *K istorii chagatayskogo literaturnogo yazyka*. Moscow: Oriental Literature Publisher, 1994. 404 p. (In Russian)
7. Bodrogligeti A.J.E. *A Grammar of Chagatay*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa, 2001. 437 p.

8. Bregel Y. Tribal Tradition and Dynastic History: The Early Rulers of the Qongrats According to Munis. *Asian and African Studies* 16 (1982), pp. 357–398.

9. Brockelmann, C.: *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Literatursprachen Mittelasiens*. Leiden: Brill, 1954. 431 p. (In German)

10. Desmaisons, Peter *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghāzi Bēhādour Khan Souverain de Kharezm et Historien Djağhatai 1604–1664 A.D.* Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970². 781 p. (In Türkī and French)

11. DeWeese D. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde. Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994. 638 p.

12. Eckman J. *Chagatay Manual*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1966. 340 p.

13. Göncöl Cs. Remarks on the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötämiš Hājjī. In: Zimonyi, I. (ed.): *Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged: Innovariant Ltd, 2020, pp. 123–131.

14. Göncöl Cs. The Chapter of Bārdi Bāk khan in the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötämiš Hājjī: Tolu Bay, āmīr of the Golden Horde. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 74/1 (2021), pp. 53–63.

15. Ḥasan Rūmlū: *Kitāb-i aḥsanu t-tawārīḥ*. Ed. by Seddon, C. N. Tehrān: Kitābhāna-ye šadr, AH 1342 (AD 1963/64). (In Persian)

16. Hofman H.F.: *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey, Section III (Chagatai) Part I: Authors*. Utrecht: The Library of the University of Utrecht, 1969. 348 p.

17. Iskandar Beg Türkman: *Tārīḥ-i ‘ālam-ārā-yi ‘Abbāsī I-II*. Ed. by Īrāj Afšār. Tehrān: Čāpḥāna-ye Golšan, AH 1350 (AD 1971). 1235 p. (In Persian)

18. *Firdaws al-iqbāl. History of Khorezm by Shir Muhammad Mirab Munis and Muhammad Riza Mirab Agahi*. Translated From Chaghatay and Annotated by Yuri Bregel. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1999. 718 p.

19. Kafalı M. *Ötemiş Hacı’ya Göre Cuci Ulusu’nun Tarihi*. Ankara: Öncü Basımevi, 2009. 160 p. (In Turkish)

20. Kavaguchi T., Nagamine H. Nekotorye novye dannye o «Chingiz-name» Utemisha-khadzhi: v sisteme istoriografii v Dasht-i Kipchake. In: *Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya. Sbornik stat’ey*. Iss. 3. Kazan: Fen Publ., 2010, pp. 44–52. (In Russian)

21. Maslyuzhenko D.N. Soobshchenie prodolzhatelya «Chingiz-name» Utemisha-Khadzhi kak istochnik po istorii Sibirskikh Shibanidov. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie*. 2015, no. 4, pp. 117–134. (In Russian)

22. Mirgaleev I.M. «Chingiz-name» Utemisha-khadzsi: perspektivy izucheniya. In: *Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya. Sbornik stat’ey*. Iss. 4. Kazan: OOO «Foliant»; Marjani Institute of History of the Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2011, pp. 14–19. (In Russian)

23. Mirgaleev I.M. Soobshchenie prodolzhatelya «Chingiz-name» Utemisha-Khadzhi o pozdnykh Shibanidakh. In: Maslyuzhenko D.N. – Tataurov S.F. (ot. red.): *Istoriya, ekonomika i kul’tura srednevekovykh tyurko-tatarskikh gosudarstv Zapadnoj Sibiri: materialy II Vseposijskoj nauchnoj konferencii (Kurgan, 17-18. aprelya 2014 g.)*. Kurgan: Kurgan State University Publ., 2014, pp. 64–66. (In Russian)

24. Mirgaleev I.M. «Kara tavarikh» Utemisha-Khadzhi. Spisok Rizaëtdina Fakhret-dina. *Tyurkologicheskie issledovaniya / Turcological Studies*, 1/2 (2018), pp. 58–72. (In Russian)

25. Ötämiš Hājjī. *Čingiz-nāma*. Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text by Kawaguchi, T. – Nagamine, H. Tokyo: Fujiwara Printing co., Ltd, 2008. (In Japanese, English and Türkī)

26. Schönig C. *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997. 395 p. (In German)

27. Shīr Muḥammad Mīrāb Mūnis and Muḥammad Rizā Mīrāb Āgahī: *Firdaws al-iqbāl: History of Khorezm*. Ed. by Bregel, Yu. Leiden: Brill, 1988, 1282 p. (In Türkī)

28. Steingass F.J. *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary, Including the Arabic Words and Phrases to Be Met with in Persian Literature*. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1892.
29. Sultanov T.I. *Chingiz-khan i Chingizidy. Sud'ba i vlast'*. Moscow: ACT, 2006. 445 p. (In Russian)
30. Trepavlov V.V. *Istoriya Nogayskoi ordy*. Moscow: Oriental Literature Publisher, 2002. 752 p. (In Russian)
31. Utemish-khadzhi: *Chingiz-name*. Faksimile, perevod, transkriptsiya, tekstologicheskie primecheniya, issledovanie V.P. Yudina. Podgotovka k izdaniyu Yu.G. Baranova. Kommentarii i ukazateli M.Kh. Abuseitovoi. Alma-ata: Gylym, 1992. 296 p. (In Russian and Türkī)
32. Utemish-khadzsi. *Kara tavarikh*. Transkriptsiya I.M. Mirgaleeva, È.G. Sayfetdinovoy, Z.T. Khafizova; perevod na russkiy yazyk I. M. Mirgaleeva, È.G. Sayfetdinovoy, nauchnaya redaktsiya I.M. Mirgaleeva. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of the Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2017. 312 p. (In Russian, Tatar and Türkī)
33. Vásáry I. «History and Legend» in Berke Khan's Conversion to Islam. In *Aspects of Altaic Civilization III: Proceedings of the Thirtieth Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, June 19–25, 1987*. ed.: Sinor, D. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990, pp. 230–252. Reprint: Vásáry I.: *Turks, Tatars and Russians in the 13th–16th centuries*. Aldershot – Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007. XVII.
34. Veselovskiy N.I. *Ocherki istriko-geograficheskikh svedenij o Khivinskom khanstve ot drevneyshikh vremen do nastoyashchevo*. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya brat. Panteleevykh, 1877, 366 p. (In Russian)
35. Zaitsev I.V. *Astrakhanskoe khanstvo*. Moscow: Oriental Literature Publisher, 2006. 303 p. (In Russian)

About the author: Csaba Göncöl – MA (History, Turcology), Assistant Research Fellow, MTA-SZTE Ottoman Era Research Group (2, University Str., Szeged 6722, Hungary). E-mail: csaba986@gmail.com

Received March 8, 2023 Accepted for publication June 27, 2023
Published September 29, 2023

РЕДАКЦИИ И ДАТЫ СОСТАВЛЕНИЯ ТЕКСТОВ ХРОНИКИ «ЧИНГИЗ-НАМЕ» УТЕМИША-ХАДЖИ

Чаба Гёнцёль

*Исследовательская Группа османской эпохи
Венгерской Академии Наук при Сегедском Университете
Сегед, Венгрия
csaba986@gmail.com*

Настоящая статья направлена на исследование взаимосвязи текстов хроники XVI века, так называемой «Чингиз-наме» Утемиша-хаджи, сохранившейся в двух списках, а также на определение даты создания этого произведения.

Материалы исследования: Рукописи «Чингиз-наме» Утемиша-хаджи из Ташкента и Стамбула, среднеазиатские хроники на тюркском и персидском языках, актуальная научная литература.

Результаты и новизна исследования: Анализируя отношения между двумя текстами, автор приходит к выводу, что рукописи вышеупомянутой хроники из Ташкента и Стамбула содержат разные редакции «Чингиз-наме», написанные одним и тем же летописцем. Кроме того, автор считает, что текст, сохранившийся в Ташкентском списке, является первоначальной редакцией, составленной до 1539 года, в то время как текст, сохранившийся в Стамбульской рукописи, представляет собой вторую редакцию – расширенную – написанную примерно в середине 1540-х годов.

Ключевые слова: Утемиш-хаджи, Чингиз-наме, Золотая Орда, Ташкентский список, Стамбульский список

Для цитирования: Göncöl Cs. Redactions and dates of the compilation of the *Čingiz-nāmā* of Ötämiš Hājjī // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2023. Т. 11, № 3. С. 582–591. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-3.582-591 EDN: LVNEZH

Сведения об авторе: Чаба Гёнцель – аспирант по историческим наукам (Сегедский университет), младший научный сотрудник, Исследовательская Группа османской эпохи Венгерской Академии Наук при Сегедском университете (6722, ул. Университетская, 2, Сегед, Венгрия). E-mail: csaba986@gmail.com

*Поступила 08.03.2023 Принята к публикации 27.06.2023
Опубликована 29.09.2023*