

Оригинальная статья / Original paper

<https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2026-14-1.117-129>
EDN: LPITRM

УДК 94(5)

THE JOCHID ULUS IN SAFAVID SOURCES:
ON THE ISSUE OF THE JOCHID GENEALOGY

Hiroyuki Nagamine

*National Institute of Technology, Oyama College
Oyama, Japan
gamaja.yokaton.13@gmail.com*

Abstract. This paper examines the issue of the Jochid genealogy in the Safavid sources with particular attention to the genealogy of Urus Khan, the “Left Hand” ruler of the Jochid Ulus, and reconsiders the nature of their portrayals of the Jochid Ulus. In addition, through the analysis in this paper, I hope to provide some insight into the question of how the Safavid sources perceived the Jochid Ulus and its successor states.

Research materials. *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, B. 411, Safavid sources, Ghaffārī’s *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā*, Ḥaydar Rāzī’s *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī*.

Results and novelty of the research. 1) The Safavid historiography was strongly in the tradition of the Timurid historiography. However, among the Timurid sources, it is the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī* that provides specific descriptions of the Jochid Ulus in the late fourteenth century – a period for which little information is otherwise available. It may therefore be assumed that the *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā*, in its account of the Jochid Ulus, drew upon the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī*, albeit with certain interpretative modifications. 2) The Safavid sources recognized not only the rulers of the “Aq Orda / Left Hand” but also those of the “Kök Orda / Right Hand” (Batuids) as the descendants of Orda. 3) The Safavid sources after *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā* have been said to refer to the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī*, but more accurately they referred to *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā* that may have attempted to reasonably interpret the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī* statement. 4) The Safavid sources were exclusively interested in the eastern successor states to the Jochid Ulus. Among them, the Kazakh Khanate, which ruled the eastern Kipchak steppe, was recognized as having continuity from the Jochid Ulus.

Keywords: Urus Khan, *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī*, Safavid sources, Ghaffārī’s *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā*, Ḥaydar Rāzī’s *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī*

For citation: Nagamine H. The Jochid Ulus in Safavid Sources: On the Issue of the Jochid Genealogy. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2026, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2026-14-1.117-129>

Financial Support: This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant (JP24K04296).

© Nagamine H., 2026



Контент доступен под лицензией Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.
The content is available under the license Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Some Safavid sources contain descriptions of the Jochid Ulus¹. However, these descriptions are generally regarded as having been based on the Timurid general/universal history *Muntakhab al-Tawārikh-i Muʿīnī* (or its earlier version, *Iskandar Anonymous* [1413/4]), attributed to Muʿīn al-Dīn Naṭanzī² (1414; hereafter – *MTM*) [20, c. 210, 213]; and although they have been partially utilized, they have not been examined in a direct and systematic manner. In this context, A. A. Absalikov recently paid attention to the Safavid sources and claimed that Urus Khan (ancestor of the Kazakh Khanate, r. 1368–77), the “Left Hand” ruler of the Jochid Ulus, was a descendant of Orda (Ūrda; the eldest son of Jochi) [1]. This paper examines Absalikov’s theory and reconsiders the nature of the portrayals of the Jochid Ulus in the Safavid sources³.

Ts. Akasaka also makes an interesting point that the Safavid sources recognized the Kazakh Khanate as the “legitimate” successor to the Jochid Ulus in the eastern Kipchak steppe [24, p. 243–245]. Through the analysis in this paper, I hope to provide some insight into the question of how the Safavid sources perceived the Jochid Ulus and its successor states (Later Jochid states).

1. The Genealogy of Urus Khan and the *MTM*

The questions of whether the “Left Hand” ruler Urus Khan, ancestor of the Kazakh Khanate, belonged to the Ordaid or the Toqa/Toqay Temürid line, and whether the “Left Hand” that gave rise to the Kazakh Khanate was designated as “Aq Orda (*āq ūrda*, i.e. White Horde)” or “Kök Orda (*kük ūrda*, i.e. Blue Horde)”, are of central importance for the history of the Jochid Ulus and the Kazakh Khanate, and have been the subject of substantial scholarly research⁴. In my previous works, I have argued that Urus Khan belonged to the Toqa Temürid line (see note 5) and that the “Left Hand” was designated as the “Kök Orda” at least by the late fourteenth century [32, p. 174–177; 37]. With regard to these issues, the Timurid general history *MTM*, one of the few historical sources that provides specific descriptions of the Jochid Ulus in the late fourteenth century, has long been at the center of scholarly debate.

Many of the theories of Urus Khan as an Orda descendant identify the “Left Hand” ruler Sāsī Būqā, Urus Khan’s great-grandfather in the *MTM*, as the same person as Sātī/Sāsī Būqā b. Bāyān, a descendant of Orda, who appears in Rashīd al-Dīn’s *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārikh* (1307, enlarged 1310/1; see Genealogy (a), (b)). However, elsewhere in the *MTM*, Sāsī Būqā’s father Nūqāy (Noqai, Noghai) is described as “son of Tātār, son of TWWK [*<Būl; the eighth son of Jochi*]

¹ Of those, Qāḍī Aḥmad Ghaffārī Qazvīnī’s *Nusakh/Tārikh-i Jahān-ārā* (1564/5) and Ḥaydar b. ‘Alī Ḥusaynī Rāzī’s *Tārikh-i Ḥaydarī (Majmaʿ al-Tawārikh)* (1618/9) are included in V. G. Tizengauzen’s *Collection of materials relating to the history of the Golden Horde*. T. II [20, c. 210–215, 269–274].

² On a discussion of his authorship, see [12, c. 528, прим. 1].

³ At the same time, a re-examination of the descriptions of the Chinggisids in Ottoman sources has begun [33], thereby opening up new avenues for research.

⁴ For recent research on these questions, see [4, c. 117–119; 5, c. 10–15; 7, c. 195–204; 8; 9, c. 46–48; 10; 15; 22, c. 172–184; 24, p. 63–90; 49]. Zh. M. Sabitov’s latest article [18], while sharing some of the same concerns as this paper, also examines these issues from a broader perspective. Where the *MTM* got its information about Jochid Ulus is also an important consideration [3, c. 102–103; 16; 22, c. 84–92; 27, p. 116–117; 36; 38, p. 418–419; 50].

theory that Sāsī Būqā in the *MTM* was a descendant of Qūlī, the second son of Orda, in contrast to the traditional view that the Sāsī Būqā was Sāsī/Sātī Būqā b. Bāyān, a descendant of Orda. In other words, he argued that Urus Khan belonged to the Ordaids and descended from Qūlī.

As for this Absalikov theory, Zh. M. Sabitov has already criticized it [18, c. 93–94]. This paper will examine this theory below in terms of the correlation between the *MTM* and the Safavid sources' descriptions of the Jochid Ulus.

<p>(a) Genealogy of the <i>Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh</i> and the <i>Mu'izz al-Ansāb</i> [6, c. 39–40, 18b–19b; 13, c. 66–67, 69; 45, p. 710–713] Orda — Sartāqtāy — Qūnīchī — Bāyān — <u>Sātī/Sāsī Būqā</u> — <u>Qūlī</u>¹¹ — Tumakān — <u>Jārūq</u> — <u>Nūqāy</u></p>
<p>(b) Genealogy of the <i>Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu'tmī</i> [21, c. 65–66; 28, p. 88–92] <u>Nūqāy</u> (listed as Sārī Būghā in the <i>jadwal</i> and B. 411) — <u>Sāsī Būqā</u> — Īrazan — Jīm̄bāy (Chimbay)¹² — <u>Ūrus Khān</u></p>
<p>(c) Genealogy of the <i>Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā</i> [2, c. 65–66; 20, c. 211–212, 270–271; 41, p. 205–207] Orda — <u>Qūlī</u> — <u>Nūqāy/Būqāy</u> — <u>Sāsī Būqā</u>¹³ — Īrazan/Īdzan — Jīmtāy/Jīhāy (Chimbay) — <u>Ūrus Khān</u> — Qūyzi (Quyurchuq) Khān¹⁴ — Barāq Khān — Jānī Bīk — Saydak Khān¹⁵ — Qāsim Khān — Ḥaqq Nazar Khān</p>
<p>(d) Genealogy of the <i>Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh</i> [30, p. 1135] Orda — <u>Qūyī (Qūlī)</u> — <u>Sāsī Būqā</u> — Īrazan — Chitmāy (Chimbay) Khān — <u>Ūrus Khān</u> — Qūzī (Quyurchuq) Khān — Qarāja — Barāq — Jānī Bīk Khān — Saydak Khān — Qāsim Khān</p>
<p>(e) Genealogy of the <i>Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī</i> [20, c. 213–215, 272–274; 31, f. 49b–51b] Orda — <u>Tūlī (Qūlī)</u> — <u>Būqāy (Nūqāy)</u> — <u>Sāsī Būqā</u>¹⁶ — Īdaran/Īdarūn (Īrazan) — Jījāy/Šījāy (Chimbay) — <u>Ūrus Khān</u> — Qūyri Jān Ughlān / Qūbrī/Qūrī Khān (Quyurchuq) — Barāq Khān — Jānī/Jān Bīk — Saydak Khān — Qāsim Khān — Qamāsh (Mamash) Khān (— Ṭāhir Khān¹⁷)</p>

¹¹ In the Russian translation of the *Mu'izz al-Ansāb*, he is mistakenly described as the son of Qūnīchī.

¹² There is no information on this figure other than the *MTM* and other sources discussed in this paper that may have been influenced by it. R. Yu. Reva and V. A. Belyaev's study is an interesting attempt to identify the recently discovered “*čimty-a*” on the *paiza* with this figure, but as the authors note, this is an issue for further study [14].

¹³ This figure is described as Īdzan in [41].

¹⁴ The father-son relationship between Qūyzi Khān (Quyurchuq) and Barāq Khān is indicated in Tizengauzen's edition [20], but not in [41].

¹⁵ Qāsim Khān is the son of Jānī Bīk Khān. “Saydak Khān” could be another name of Jānī Bīk Khān (also called “Abū Sa'īd Khān”).

¹⁶ The father-son relationship between Būqāy (Nūqāy) and Sāsī Būqā is indicated in Tizengauzen's edition [20], but not in [31]. See below and note 23.

¹⁷ Ṭāhir Khān is Qāsim Khān's nephew. In the *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī*, Ṭāhir Khān's father is described as Ūz Bek (Özbek) Khān.

3. Qāḍī Aḥmad Ghaffārī Qazvīnī's *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā*

The earliest Safavid source that contains descriptions of the Jochid Ulus is Qāḍī Aḥmad Ghaffārī Qazvīnī's general history *Nusakh/Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā* (1564/5; hereafter – *NJA*; see Genealogy (c))¹⁸.

It is confirmed that the genealogy of the *Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh* referred to that of the *NJA*; the genealogy from Nūqāy to Urus Khān (and the descriptions of the “Aq Orda” and “Kök Orda”) also confirm once again that the *NJA* referred to the *MTM* (or the *Iskandar Anonymous*). However, some descriptions that differ from the *MTM* can be found. Absalikov also notes these differences and states that the *NJA* did not use the *MTM*, or if it did, the *MTM* was not its primary source [2, c. 66–68]. However, given the similarities of descriptions between the *MTM* and *NJA*, these differences appear to be the result of the *NJA*'s interpretation of the *MTM* description while referring to it, as explained below.

The *NJA* states as follows after Jochi, Batu, Sartaq, and Berke: “After him [=Berke], the throne passed to the descendants of Orda, and they were divided into two branches” (see note 22). After that, the rulers of the “Kök Orda / Right Hand (*dast-i rāst*; from Tūqtā Khān to Berdī Bīk)” and the “Aq Orda / Left Hand (*dast-i chap*; from Tūdā Munkā to Ḥaqq Nazar Khān)” are described, but the description of the “Kök Orda / Right Hand” begins as follows: “The provinces of the Right Hand, such as Urus, Līqā, Ūkek, Mājar, Bulghār, and Qazān, belonged to them. Tūqtā/Tūqnā Khān b. Qūbūqūy b. Orda b. Jochi (Jūjī/Chūchī) sat on the throne”¹⁹. Then, all of the following rulers up to Berdibek are considered to be the descendants of Orda [2, c. 64–65; 20, c. 210–211, 269–270; 41, p. 203–205].

The description of the “Aq Orda / Left Hand” begins as follows: “The provinces of the Left Hand from the boundary of Uluq Tāq to Qarāṭāl and the border of Lūs belonged to them. Tūdā Munkā b. Nūqāy b. Qūlī b. Orda was anointed to the throne and held the position for a long time. Sāsī Būqā b. Nūqā(y) (see note 13) seized power after [his] brother and died in 720” [2, c. 65; 20, c. 211, 270; 41, p. 205]. While the *NJA* does identify Sāsī Būqā b. Nūqāy as the son of Qūlī, the second son of Orda, at the same time, the *NJA* also recognizes the rulers, who are actually the Batuids, as the descendants of Orda.

Previous studies have focused on the genealogy of the “Aq Orda / Left Hand” (including Urus Khan); however, it is noteworthy that the *NJA* states that “the throne passed to the descendants of Orda” and that the “Kök Orda / Right Hand” (Batuids) was also recognized as the descendants of Orda. This is probably the result of interpreting the *MTM* statement asserting that “(after Batu) his brother Orda became the successor” (see above). In doing so, actually the *MTM* does not name Sāsī Būqā b. Nūqāy as a descendant of Orda, but the *NJA* may have attempted to reasonably interpret the *MTM* statement by linking the *MTM*

¹⁸ For the Safavid sources treated in this paper, see [26; 42, p. 16–18; 43; 44; 48]. Ghaffārī and ‘Abdī Beg Shīrāzī were contemporaries and likely knew one another. Although their writings exhibit similarities, the latter probably referred to the works of the former [29, p. 28; 42, p. 18].

¹⁹ As Absalikov notes [2, c. 67], it is an important difference that the *MTM* states that the Jochid Ulus was divided into two branches after Tūqtā, whereas the *NJA* places it after Berke. However, the *NJA* is common to the *MTM* in that the first ruler of the “Kök Orda / Right Hand” is Tūqtā.

genealogy to that of the *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh* and so on²⁰ (by making Sāsī Būqā b. Nūqāy a descendant of Qūlī b. Orda; see Genealogy (a), (b), (c))²¹.

Why did the *NJA* draw upon the *MTM*? It is clear from the works of Sh. A. Quinn and T. Trausch that the Safavid historiography was strongly in the tradition of the Timurid historiography (partly of the Aq Qoyunlu) [29, p. 28–29; 42; 43; 44; 48]. However, among the Timurid sources, it is the *MTM* that provides specific descriptions of the Jochid Ulus in the late fourteenth century – a period for which little information is otherwise available. It may therefore be assumed that the *NJA*, in its account of the Jochid Ulus, drew upon the *MTM*, albeit with certain interpretative modifications.

4. Safavid Sources after the *NJA*

Safavid sources after the *NJA*, including the aforementioned *Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh*, contain information basically similar to that of the *NJA*. Of those, the description of ‘Abdī Beg Shīrāzī’s *Taklimat al-Akhhbār* (1570) almost follows the *NJA* [23, p. 155–159; see note 18].

Ḥaydar b. ‘Alī Ḥusaynī Rāzī’s *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī (Majma‘ al-Tawārīkh)* (1618/9; the author’s background is, in fact, unknown [26]; see Genealogy (e)) states as follows: after the death of Berke “his descendants became two stratums (*tabaqa*)²²”; “Account of sultāns of Kōk [Orda] who were the descendants of Jochi (Jūjī). First was Qūbūy b. Orda b. Jochi” (below, from Tūqtāy Khān to Berdī Bīk); “Account of sultāns of Aq [Orda] who are also the descendants of Jochi... [Tūdā] Munkāy b. Būqāy (Nūqāy) b. Tūlī (Qūlī) b. Orda b. Jochi... after him, Sāsī Būqā, who was his brother²³...” (below, from Īdarān/Īdarūn [Īrazaan] to Ṭāhir Khān) [20, c. 213–215, 272–274; 31, f. 49b–51b].

With minor variations, these are basically similar information to the *NJA*. These have been said to refer to the *MTM* so far, but more accurately they referred to the *NJA* that may have attempted to reasonably interpret the *MTM* statement.

It is also noteworthy that the influence of the *MTM* and the *NJA* was far-reaching, including Ṭāhir Muḥammad Sabzwārī’s *Rawḍat al-Ṭāhirīn* (1606/7), who emigrated from Iran to India, Ottoman historiography (Ahmet Müneccimbaşı’s *Sahāif ül-ahbar [Cami‘u’d-düvel]*, ca. 1672), and Crimean Khanate historiography (Seyyid Muhmed Rizā’s *Es-seb‘ü’s-seyyār*, 1737 or

²⁰ It is unclear if the *NJA* ever saw the *Mu‘izz al-Ansāb* itself as Absalikov pointed out. However, similar genealogical information is available in the *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, to which Qādī Aḥmad Ghaffārī referred in another work *Nigāristān* (1552) [39, p. 85], therefore, he would have had such genealogical information at hand. There is also a similar genealogy in the *Tavārīkh-i Guzīda(-yi) Nusrat-nāma* (from Orda to Jārūq) [47, p. 116–117]. Interestingly, the confusion between Nūqāy b. Tātār and Nūqāy b. Jārūq is also found in some manuscripts of the *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh* [7, c. 200; 13, c. 82]. Sabitov specifies that such confusion may have affected the genealogy of the *NJA* [18, c. 95].

²¹ The appearance of Qūlī b. Orda on another place in the *MTM* text [21, c. 61; 28, p. 72] may have contributed to the *NJA* interpretation.

²² *farzandān-i ū du tabaqa shudand*. This part in the *NJA* is as follows: *salṭanat bi-fanzandān-i ūrda rasīda mutafarriq bi-du farqa shudand*; it is possible that Ḥaydar Rāzī rewrote (or miswrote) the underlined part.

²³ *sāsī būqā ki barādarash būd*. This part follows Tizengauzen’s edition [20]. In [31]: “his son Sāsī Būqā, his brother Būqā(?) (*pisarash sāsī būqā ki barādarash būqā*)”.

1744)²⁴. The genealogy of information originating in the *MTM* and the *NJA* is also an important issue (see also [17; 18, c. 92–94]).

5. How the Safavid Sources Perceived the Jochid Ulus and their descendant states?

As mentioned at the beginning, Akasaka makes an interesting point that the Safavid sources recognized the Kazakh Khanate as the “legitimate” successor to the Jochid Ulus in the eastern Kipchak steppe [24, p. 243–245]. The rationale is as follows (see Genealogy (c), (e)):

1) In the *NJA* description of the Jochid rulers, the account of “Muḥammad Sulṭān (Küchük Muḥammad) b. Tīmūr Khān b. Qutluḡ Tīmūr” is followed by “Qāsim Khān b. Saydak Khān b. Jānī Bīk b. Barāq Khān” (Kazakh Khanate ruler), then comes the account of “Ḥaqq Naẓar Khān b. Qāsim Khān” (Kazakh Khanate ruler, r. 1537/8–80) [20, c. 211–212, 270–271; 41, p. 205–207].

2) According to the *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī*, “Muḥammad [b.] Tīmūr Khān b. Qutluḡ Tīmūr” (Küchük Muḥammad) is followed by “Qāsim Khān b. Saydak Khān b. Jānī/Jān Bīk b. Barāq Khān” (Kazakh Khanate ruler), followed by “Qamāsh (Mamash) Khān b. Qāsim Khān” (Kazakh Khanate ruler, r. 1521–22), followed by “Ṭāhir Khān” (Kazakh Khanate ruler, r. 1522–1531/2). It is also stated that Qāsim Khān brought “the Ulus of Jochi Khān (*ulūs-i jūjī khān*)” under his control [20, c. 213–215, 272–274; 31, f. 49b–51b].

Indeed, the Kazakh rulers are continuously described in the account of the “Aq Orda / Left Hand” rulers. In addition, Qāsim Khān is also called “the ruler of the steppe and the Ulus of Jochi Khān (*ḥākim-i dasht wa ulūs-i jūjī khān*)”, “the emperor/ruler of the steppe (*pādshāh/ḥākim-i dasht*)”, and Ḥaqq Naẓar Khān – “the ruler of the steppe (*farmān-farmā-yi dasht*)” [31, f. 52b, 53b; 41, p. 207]. Akasaka’s points are thought-provoking. Furthermore, let us turn to the structure of the Safavid sources’ narrative on the Jochids.

Structure of the *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā* [41, p. 203–210]

Chapter (*saṭr*) 3. On Descendants (*dhurrīyat*) of Jochi: from Jochi to Berke Khān.

Paragraph (*ḥarf*) 1. On sulṭāns of Kōk Orda: from Tūqnā (Tūqtā) Khān to Berdī Bīk.

Paragraph 2. On khāqāns of Aq Orda: from Tūdā Munkā to Ḥaqq Naẓar Khān.

After mentioning that the Ordavid dynasty (*dawlat-i dūdmān-i ūrda*) was weakened by the conflict with the Tuqtamish (Toqtamish) family and the rise of the descendants of Shībān b. Jochi:

Paragraph 1. On sulṭāns of Mā warā’ al-nahr: the Shaybanid Dynasty, from Abū al-Khayr Khān (r. 1428/9–68/9) to Iskandar Khān (r. 1561–83).

Paragraph 2. On sulṭāns of Kh’arāzm: the Khiva Khanate, from Īl Pārs (Īlbārs) to Jājim Khān (Ḥājim/Ḥājī Muḥammad, r. 1558–1603).

Structure of the *Tārīkh-i Ḥaydarī* [31, f. 49a–57a]

Account of Jochi Khān: from Jochi Khān to Berke Khān.

Account of sulṭāns of Kōk [Orda]: from Qūbūy to Berdī Bīk.

Account of sulṭāns of Aq [Orda]: from [Tūdā] Munkāy to Ṭāhir Khān.

²⁴ *Sahaif ūl-ahbar* mentions the *NJA* (*ghaffārīn jahān-ārā*) as its source [24, p. 84; 35, p. 689]. In *Es-seb’ū s-seyyār*, the “white tent (*aq obali*)” is associated with Orda and the “blue tent (*kōk obali*)” with Batu [19, c. 117–118; 40, p. 90–91].

Account of another group of the Jochids (*faujī dīgarān-i āl-i jūjī*): the Shaybanid Dynasty, from Abū al-Khayr Khān to ‘Abd Allāh (the second, r. 1583–98).

Account of the Jochids’ rule in Kh^wārazm (*ḥukūmat-i āl-i jūjī dar kh^wārazm*): the Khiva Khanate, from [Īl] Pārs to Ḥājim Khān.

What is characteristic here is that only the eastern states – the Kazakh Khanate and the Shīdanids (Shaybanid Dynasty and Khiva Khanate) – are described among the successor states to the Jochid Ulus. In other words, the Safavid sources, of course, were exclusively interested in the eastern successor states to the Jochid Ulus (these are especially detailed about the Shaybanid Dynasty and the Khiva Khanate). Among them, the Kazakh Khanate, which ruled the eastern Kipchak steppe, was recognized as having continuity (“legitimacy” according to Akasaka) from the Jochid Ulus²⁵. In addition, this may also be the result of the tradition of (Islamic) general history, in which sources follow the contents of previous generations and add contemporaneous history to them [34, p. 13].

On the other hand, there is an interesting argument that the Great Horde (*Bol’shaya Orda*) existed in the west and that the Crimean Khanate claimed to have inherited the Great Horde. It should be noted, however, that these discussions do not actually include the eastern part [11, c. 361–362; 24, p. 240–243]. The debate over “legitimacy” within the successor states to the Jochid Ulus will be deepened by considering both of the eastern and western successor states, as well as the perceptions from the surrounding powers.

Concluding remarks

The following has been discussed in this paper:

1) The Safavid historiography was strongly in the tradition of the Timurid historiography. However, among the Timurid sources, it is the *MTM* (or the *Iskandar Anonymous*) that provides specific descriptions of the Jochid Ulus in the late fourteenth century – a period for which little information is otherwise available. It may therefore be assumed that the *NJA*, in its account of the Jochid Ulus, drew upon the *MTM*, albeit with certain interpretative modifications.

2) The Safavid sources recognized not only the rulers of the “Aq Orda / Left Hand” but also those of the “Kök Orda / Right Hand” (Batuids) as the descendants of Orda. In doing so, the *NJA* may have attempted to reasonably interpret the *MTM* statement by linking the *MTM* genealogy to that of the *Jāmi’ al-Tawārīkh* and so on (by making Sāsī Būqā b. Nūqāy a descendant of Qūlī b. Orda).

3) The Safavid sources after the *NJA* have been said to refer to the *MTM* so far, but more accurately they referred to the *NJA* that may have attempted to reasonably interpret the *MTM* statement.

4) The Safavid sources were exclusively interested in the eastern successor states to the Jochid Ulus. Among them, the Kazakh Khanate, which ruled the eastern Kipchak steppe, was recognized as having continuity (“legitimacy” according to Akasaka) from the Jochid Ulus.

²⁵ However, it is noteworthy that they are not called “kazakh (*qazāq*)” in the quoted parts in this paper except the *Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh* [30, p. 1135].

This paper has examined Absalikov's theory; however, in light of the considerations discussed above, attributing Urus Khan to the Ordaid line on the basis of the Safavid sources is unconvincing. In other words, his theory does not constitute a refutation of the view that Urus Khan belonged to the Toqa Temürid line. Nevertheless, his study represents an important contribution, as it has opened the way for a re-examination of the Safavid sources. In addition, he raised another significant question concerning how to position the father of Sāsī Būqā/Būghā (Nūqāy or Sārī Būghā / Hārūq Būghā(y)) in the *MTM* and B. 411.

The aim of this paper is to present a new perspective on the *MTM* and the Safavid sources, one that has not yet been sufficiently considered. In order to address the issues outlined at the beginning through the genealogical information contained in the *MTM* and the Safavid sources, it is necessary to examine how these works portray not only the “Aq Orda / Left Hand,” but also the Jochid Ulus and its successor states as a whole – that is, how they perceived the Jochid Ulus and its political legacy.

However, the arguments advanced in this paper remain provisional and require further verification. It is hoped that these tentative attempts will contribute to future research on the history of the Jochid Ulus.

REFERENCES

1. Absalikov A.A. The Manuscript of Hasanbek Rumlu's *Ahsan at-Tawarikh* and the Issue of the Genealogy of the Kazakh Khans. *Uly Dala Murasy*. 2022, no. 16, pp. 35–42. (In Russian)
2. Absalikov A.A. The White Horde and the Blue Horde in «Muntahab at Tavarikh» Natanzi and «Tarikh Jahan Ara» Ghaffari. Personality of Nukai in Historical Sources. *Arkhiv khabarshisi*. 2023, no. 1, pp. 58–70. (In Russian)
3. Bartol'd V.V. Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion. *Works*. vol. I. Moscow: Nauka, 1965. 759 p. (In Russian)
4. Varvarovskii Yu.E. *Jochi Ulus in the 60–70s of the fourteenth century*. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2008. 128 p. (In Russian)
5. Gaev A.G. Genealogy and chronology of the Jochids. For clarifying the pedigree of numismatically recorded rulers of the ulus of Jochi. *Antiquities of the Volga Region and Other Regions, Iss. 4: Numismatic Collection. Vol. 3*. M.: Informelektro, 2002, pp. 9–55. (In Russian)
6. *History of Kazakhstan in Persian sources. Vol. III. Mu'izz al-ansāb (Glorifying genealogy)*. Translated from Persian, notes by Sh. H. Vohidov; resp. ed. A. K. Muminov. Almaty: “Dyke-Press”, 2006. 354 p. + 164 f. (In Persian, Russian)
7. Kostyukov V.P. The ulus of Jochi and the syndrome of federalism. *Issues of History and Archaeology of Western Kazakhstan*. 2007, no. 1, pp. 169–207. (In Russian)
8. Margulan A.S. On the question of the origin of Urus Khan, the progenitor of the founders of the Kazakh Khanate Zhanibek and Kerey. *Otan tarikhī*. 2022, no. 4(100), pp. 80–90. (In Russian)
9. Mirgaleev I.M. *Political history of the Golden Horde during the reign of Toktamyskh Khan*. Kazan: Alma-Lit, 2003. 164 p. (In Russian)
10. Mirgaleev I.M. Dynasty crisis in the Golden Horde during the troubles of the 60–70 years of the fourteenth century and Urus Khan. *Collection of materials of the*

international scientific-practical conference «History of the cities of Aktobe-Laeti and Atyrau: A new look». Almaty: izd-vo «Print plyus», 2024, pp. 55–61. (In Russian)

11. Nagamine H. Tuqay-Timurids, Shibanids, and the Crimean Khanate in Qādir ‘Alī Beg’s historiography: How did the Later Jochid Sources Understand the Reorganization of the Jochid Ulus? *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2023, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 349–370. (In Russian)

12. Nagamine H. Jochi in the *jadwal* of *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu‘īnī* and Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi. B. 411. *Qazaq Historical Review*. 2023, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 527–535. (In Russian)

13. Rashid ad-Din. *Compendium of Chronicles*. Vol. 2. Translated from Persian by Yu. P. Verkhovskii; notes by Yu.P. Verkhovskii, B.I. Pankratov; ed. by Prof. I.P. Petrushevskii. Moscow-Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publ., 1960. 253 p. (In Russian)

14. Reva R.Yu., Belyaev V.A. Two Silve Paizas of the Golden Horde with Uighur-Mongolian Inscriptions. *Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya=The Golden Horde Civilization*. 2017, iss. 10, pp. 25–37. (In Russian)

15. Sabitov Zh.M. Anonymous Iskender as a genealogical source. *Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya = Golden Horde Civilization*. 2008, iss. 1, pp. 117–121. (In Russian)

16. Sabitov Zh.M. Natanzy as a source on the history of the Golden Horde. *Zolotoordynskaya tsivilizatsiya=The Golden Horde Civilization*. 2010, iss. 3, pp. 150–154. (In Russian)

17. Sabitov Zh.M. Sources of genealogy of Juchids dependent on «Muntahab al-Tavarihi Muini». *From the history and culture of the peoples of the Middle Volga region*. 2016, no. 6, pp. 136–144. (In Russian)

18. Sabitov Zh.M. Classification and “origin criticism” of medieval sources of the 14th–16th centuries on the genealogy of the Jochids. *Golden Horde Legacy*. Iss. 6. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2025, pp. 87–99. (In Russian)

19. Seyid Mukhammed Riza. *Seven Planets in the Reports of the Tatar Kings*. Book 2: Translation. Translated from Ottoman by I. R. Gibadullin; scientific editing by I. M. Mirgaleev. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2023. 528 p. (In Russian)

20. Tizengauzen V.G. *Collection of materials relating to the history of the Golden Horde*. Vol. II. Moscow-Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publ., 1941. 308 p. (In Russian)

21. Tulibaeva Zh.M. The Estate of the Descendants of Jūjī Khān: Translation of Extracts from *Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh-i Mu‘īnī*. *Bulletin of history*. 2022, no. 2(105), pp. 58–70. (In Russian)

22. Uskenbai K. *The eastern Dasht-i Qipchaq in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Problems of the ethnopolitical history of the Ulus of Jochi*. Kazan: Fen, 2013. 288 p. (In Russian)

23. ‘Abdī Beg Shīrāzī. *Historical Supplement*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Ḥoseyn Navā‘ī. Tehran: Nashr-i Nay, 1369. 275 p. (In Persian)

24. Akasaka Tsuneaki. *Study on Juchid Dynasties*. Tokyo: Kazama-shobō, 2005. ii + 548 + 191 p. (In Japanese)

25. Allsen Thomas T. The Princes of the Left Hand: An Introduction to the History of the Ulus of Orda in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 1985 [1987], vol. V, pp. 5–40.

26. Barthold W. [Spuler B.] Ḥaydar b. ‘Alī. *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition*. Vol. III. Ed by B. Lewis et al. Leiden-London: E. J. Brill-Luzac & Co, pp. 316.

27. DeWeese Devin. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition*. University Park

PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994. xvii + 638 p.

28. *Extraits du Muntakhab al-Tavarikh-i Mu'ini (Anonyme d'Iskandar)*. Ed. by Jean Aubin. Tehran: Librairie Khayyam, 1957. (In Persian)

29. Goto Yukako. A Poetic Bureaucrat, 'Abdī Beg, and his Works: The Intention for Compiling the *Ṣarīḥ al-Milk. The Shrine of Safī al-Din Ardabili and its Real Estate Inventory: Collected Papers on the Shrine's History and Property Management*. Ed. by Ryoko Watabe. Tokyo: Research Institute for Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2022, pp. 21–37. (In Japanese)

30. Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū. *The Most Beautiful of Histories*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Ḥoseyn Navā'ī. Vol. 2. Tehran: Asāfīr, 1384, pp. 601–1204. (In Persian)

31. Haydar b. 'Alī Husaynī Rāzī. *The History of Haydar (Compendium of History)*. Ms. Bibliothèque nationale de France Département des Manuscrits. Supplément persan 1330. 262 f. (In Persian)

32. Kawaguchi Takushi, Nagamine Hiroyuki. Rethinking the Political System of the Jöchid. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* 2016, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 165–181.

33. Kemalöglü I. Review of the International Symposium “The Genghisids in Ottoman Sources”. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2025, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 224–230. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2025-13-1.224-230>

34. Morikawa Tomoko. The Birth of “Iranian History”. *Journal of Historical Studies*. 2010, no. 863, pp. 12–21. (In Japanese)

35. Müneccimbaşı Ahmed. *The Pages of the Chronicle (History of Müneccimbaşı)*. Vol. 2. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1868. 722 p. (In Ottoman)

36. Nagamine Hiroyuki. On the *Jadwal* of Kök Orda and Aq Orda in the Paris Manuscript of *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu'īnī. Saryarka and the Golden Horde: Time and Space*. Almaty: Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University Eurasian Research Institute, 2019, pp. 40–48.

37. Nagamine Hiroyuki. *Jadwal* in the Paris Manuscript of the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu'īnī* and Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, B. 411. *MUSEUM.KZ*. 2023, no. 1(2), pp. 31–42.

38. Nagamine Hiroyuki. Four Manuscripts of the *Daftar-i Čingiz-nāma*: London, Paris, Berlin, and Edinburgh. *Qazaq Historical Review*. 2024, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 411–425.

39. Otsuka Osamu. The Transmission and Reception of the *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*: From a History of the Mongols to a History of the World. *The Journal of Oriental Researches*. 2016, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 68–103. (In Japanese)

40. Seyyid Muhmed Rizā. *Es-seb'ū's-seyyār fī-ahbār-ı mülūki't-Tatar: inceleme, tenkitli metin*. Ed. by Yavuz Söylemez. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2020. LI + 470 p. (In Turkish, Ottoman)

41. Qādī Aḥmad Ghaffārī Qazvīnī. *The History of the World-Adorning*. Ed. by Abū al-Qāsem Mar'ashī. Tehran: Asāfīr, 1396. 390 p. (In Persian)

42. Quinn Sholeh A. *Historical Writing during the Reign of Shah 'Abbas: Ideology, Imitation, and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles*. Salt Lake City: The University Utah Press, 2000. 197 p.

43. Quinn Sholeh A. Safavid historiography: The place of the Safavids in Iranian history. *The Safavid World*. Ed. by Rudi Matthee. London-New York: Routledge, 2022, pp. 164–181.

44. Quinn Shole & Melville Charles. Safavid Historiography. *A History of Persian Literature. Vol. X. Persian Historiography*. Ed. by Charles Melville. London-New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012, pp. 209–257.

45. Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh Hamadānī. *Compendium of Chronicles*. Vol. 1. Ed. by Moḥammad Rowshan & Moṣṭafā Mūsavī. Tehran: Nashr-e Alborz, 1373. 776 p. (In Persian)

46. Rásonyi László, Baski Imre. *Onomasticon Turcicum: Turcic Personal Names*. 2 vols. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2007. 836 p.
47. *Tevârih-i Güzîde-Nusret-nâme: metin-aktarım-dizin*. Ed. by Harun Kaya. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2022. XXVIII + 469 p. (In Turkic, Turkish)
48. Trausch Tilmann. Continuing a legacy in times of change: Courtly historiography in the sixteenth-century Safavid world. *The Safavid World*, 2022, pp. 182–199.
49. Vásáry István. The beginnings of coinage in the Blue Horde. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* 2009, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 371–385.
50. Vásáry István. Turcica and Mongolica in Mu‘īn al-Dīn Naṭanzī’s *Muntakhab al-Tavārikh. Historical Linguistics and Philology of Central Asia: Essays on Turkic and Mongolic Studies*. Ed. by Bayarma Khabtagaeva. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2022, pp. 463–472.

УЛУС ДЖУЧИ В СЕФЕВИДСКИХ ИСТОЧНИКАХ: К ВОПРОСУ О ДЖУЧИДСКОЙ ГЕНЕАЛОГИИ

Х. Нагаминэ

Национальный институт технологии, Ояма колледж
Ояма, Япония
gamaja.yokaton.13@gmail.com

Резюме. Цель исследования: рассмотреть проблему Джучидской генеалогии в сефевидских источниках, прежде всего генеалогию Урус-хана, правителя «Левого крыла» Улуса Джучи, а также переосмыслить характер сефевидских описаний Улуса Джучи. Кроме того, в результате проведённого анализа предпринимается попытка прояснить, каким образом сефевидские источники воспринимали Золотую Орду и государства-преемники.

Материалы исследования: «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини»; рукопись Библиотеки Музея дворца Топкапы, В. 411; сефевидские источники: «Нусах-и Джахан-ара» Гаффари, «Тарих-и Хайдари» Хайдар Рази.

Результаты и научная новизна. 1) Сефевидская историография в значительной степени опиралась на традиции тимуридской историографии. Среди тимуридских источников именно «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини» содержит подробные сведения об Улусе Джучи второй половины XIV в., поэтому, по-видимому, при описании Джучиев Улуса автор «Нусах-и Джахан-ара» опирался на «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини». 2) Сефевидские источники считали потомками Орды не только правителей «Ак Орды / Левого крыла», но и правителей «Кук Орды / Правого крыла» (Батуидов). 3) Считается, что сефевидские источники после «Нусах-и Джахан-ара» обращались к «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини», однако точнее говорить о том, что они использовали «Нусах-и Джахан-ара», представлявшее собой попытку рациональной интерпретации сведений «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини». 4) Сефевидские источники проявляли интерес исключительно к восточным государствам-преемникам Улуса Джучи. Среди них Казахское ханство, правившее в восточной части Кипчакской степи, рассматривалось как государство, сохранявшее преемственность от Улуса Джучи.

Ключевые слова: Урус-хан, «Мунтахаб ат-Таварих-и Му‘ини», сефевидские источники, «Нусах-и Джахан-ара» Гаффари, «Тарих-и Хайдари» Хайдар Рази

Для цитирования: Nagamine H. The Jochid Ulus in Safavid Sources: On the Issue of the Jochid Genealogy // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2026. Т. 14, № 1. С. 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2026-14-1.117-129> EDN: LPITRM

Финансирование: Данная работа выполнена при поддержке гранта JSPS KAKENHI (JP24K04296).

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Хироюки Нагаминэ – магистр литературы, доцент отдела общего образования, Национальный институт технологии, Ояма колледж (771, Накакуки, Ояма, Точиги 3230806, Япония); ORCID: 0000-0003-4869-5780. E-mail: h_nagamine@oyama-ct.ac.jp; gamaja.yokaton.13@gmail.com

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Hiroyuki Nagamine – Master of Arts, Associate Professor, Department of General Education, National Institute of Technology, Oyama College (771, Nakakuki, Oyama, Tochigi 3230806, Japan); ORCID: 0000-0003-4869-5780. E-mail: h_nagamine@oyama-ct.ac.jp; gamaja.yokaton.13@gmail.com

Поступила в редакцию / Received 06.10.2025

Поступила после рецензирования / Revised 18.02.2026

Принята к публикации / Accepted 09.03.2026