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ABSTRACT

In the past few years researchers of the history of the Golden Horde devoted considerable attention to formerly neglected chronicles written in Turkic in the successor states of the Ulus of Ḫuṭ, particularly to the so called Čingiz-nāmā of Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī. Though this collection of genuine oral tradition is an indispensable source, a critical approach is oftentimes overlooked by the scholars using it. This paper aims to demonstrate how the historical consciousness of the populace of the Golden Horde altered the stories behind certain events. For this purpose, the story of Bärdi Bäk khan in the Čingiz-nāmā will be subjected to criticism.
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INTRODUCTION

Oral historical tradition of the populace of the Golden Horde, preserved in Turkic chronicles, connected the dissolution of the Batuid line with the actions of Bārdi Bāk khan (1357–1359). These sources usually explain the fratricide of the ruler with his lust for power and unwillingness to share it. One only needs to recall the words of Abu l-Ġāzī Bahadur khan (1644–1663), ruler and chronicler of the Khanate of Ḫīwa: ‘He (Bārdi Bāk khan – Cs. G.) speared no one from is older or younger brothers, from his siblings and kin (qarïndaš uruģïnda), because he wanted the country (yurt) forever for himself. He did not know that the word is temporal. In the end his rule did not last two years. In the year 762 (11 November 1360 – 01 November 1361 – Cs. G.) he died. The lineage (äwlād) of Şayïn khan ceased at Bārdi Bāk’ (Abu l-Ġāzī/Desmaisons1970²: 176–177).

However, there is a chronicle from the Khanate of Ḫīwa which tells us a different motive for Bārdi Bāk khan’s fratricide. Its writer, Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī b. Māvlānā Muhammad Dōstī, served in the courts of Şaybānid Ilbars khan (c. 1511–1518), and later Iš Muḥammad Sulţān, brother of Dōst Muḥammad khan (c. 1556–1558). Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī was a gatherer of oral traditions circulating on the steppe (qarï söz), with which he became renowned. In the 1550s Iš Muḥammad Sulţān summoned him to his court and commissioned him to compile a book on the history of the Jučids. Based on the traditions he collected, Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī drafted his chronicle, in scholarly literature known as the Čingiz-nāmā ‘Book of Genghis’ (Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī/Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2008: 6–8).¹

Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī was aware that historical consciousness influenced oral traditions and that they change time to time: ‘It is [well] known – he writes – that most of the words one hears with ears are lies.’ (Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī/Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2008: 8). Changes in the tradition of certain events, however, can be an excellent asset to modern historians, given we are able to map these. The aim of this paper is to scrutinize the plot of Bārdi Bāk khan’s story in Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī’s Čingiz-nāmā and compare its details to the testimony of Russian and Persian sources on the same event. Through a comparison we are able to establish two versions of the same story: a ‘how it must have happened’ – basically how modern historians evaluate the events – and ‘how the people thought it happened’ – the version Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī transmitted.² The difference between the two may shed light on some basic characteristics of oral traditions of the Later Golden Horde. Additionally, this paper will provide information on Tolu Bay, an important, but little known figure in Bārdi Bāk khan’s court.

² There is an unfolding scholarly debate about the character of Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī’s work. While some scholars view the Čingiz-nāmā as a collection of authentic steppe tradition (Bartol’d 1973: 166; Togan 1981²: 148; Yudin et al. 1992: 25; DeWeese 1994: 142; Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2010: 48–50) others regard it as a compilation of earlier written sources (Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī/Mirgaleev 2017: 12). I myself regard the stories of Ötāmiš Hāǰǰī’s chronicle as oral traditions influenced by the author’s pro-Şaybānid sympathies.
ÖTÄMIŞ ḤĀǰǰĪ’S STORY OF BÄRDĪ BĀЌ KHAN

The story of Bārdī Bāk khan in the Čingiz-nāmā unfolds as follows:3

The beginning of Bārdī Bāk khan’s story: [Jānī Bāk khan’s] son, Bārdī Bāk became khan on his father’s throne. Bārdī Bāk was a severely mindless and ill-judged person. Claiming that ‘The power (ḥānlīq) belongs to me!’ he killed his own brothers and his own sons. They say there was a man by the name of Qanglī Tolu Bay, whose brothers and tribe were extremely powerful. [He] was the tutor (atalīği) of the khan. Whatever he said, [the khan never] neglected his word. He (i. e. Tolu Bay – Cs. G.) had a son, Sumay by name, a brave archer. In the time of Jānī Bāk khan, he committed roguery, and because of this the khan – May mercy be upon him! – had him killed. Tolu Bay, because of his grief for his son, gave the [following] advice [to Bārdī Bāk khan]: – Now you are a young man. Your son who was born today grows up tomorrow. Day by day you grow old. He becomes a young man and tomorrow, after you become old, he claims your power (ḫānlīġīng) [and] takes it. Kill them now! When you start to grow old, then leave one [of them] alive!’ he said. This ill-fated took his advice and killed [them all]. Because of this, they call him ʻKötän khan who wiped out his root. ‘ In his reign the discord (täfrīqa-līq) increased greatly. Qïyat Mamay took the right wing, and with the clans (el kün) went to the Crimea. Tengiz Buġa, the son of Qïyat ğīr Qutlī brought the left wing to the Syr Darya river. The khan with his entourage (ički) stayed in Saray. He ruled in Saray for three years, [and] died after.5

As it can be seen, the historical consciousness of the Golden Horde preserved the memory of the dissolution of the line of Batu and its connection with the reign of Bārdī Bāk khan. Further, it also recorded that a certain Tolu Bay was the mastermind behind the event, and it explains his actions as an act of revenge. This is basically the variant of ‘how the people thought it had happened’. But what do other sources, Persian and Russian have to say about him and his role in Bārdī Bāk khan’s actions?

HISTORICAL DATA ON TOLU BAY

First of all, we have to accept that Tolu Bay was a historical figure, his name appears in Turkic chronicles as Tolū Bay (Ötämiş Ḥāǰǰī) and Tolī Bay (ʿAbdu l-Gaffār Qïrīmī), in the Persian sources of Muʿın ad-Dīn Naṭanzī and Ahmad Ǧaffārī as Ţ(o)glū/Ţ(u)glū Bay ( porno bā (СМОИЗО II: 128–129; 211; 233–234; 267), in Russian annals as Təvlǔби (ПСРЛ І: 228; ПСРЛ ІV.: 55, 63; ПСРЛ VIII.: 10; ПСРЛ XV.: 420) Taʋlǔби (ПСРЛ Х.: 211), Təvlǔби (ПСРЛ XVIII.: 93), Təvlǔби в dative case (ПСРЛ XXIII.: 105), Təvlǔби in a charter preserved in the Venetian dialect as Təlőbei and Təlõbe (Grigor’ev and Grigor’ev 2002: 147, 160). All these

3 Though there are a number of editions of the Čingiz-nāmā, there is no critical edition of it. By utilising the facsimiles of the Tashkent (Ötämiş Ḥāǰǰī/Yudin et al. 1992) and Istanbul (Ötämiş Ḥāǰǰī/Mirgaleev 2017) editions, I prepared a critical text with philological remarks on Bārdī Bāk khan’s reign, given in the appendix. The translation in this section follows the Tashkent manuscript, for alterations, consult the critical text.

4 The meaning of the word kötän ‘bottom, ass’ (Rásonyi and Baski 2007: 384), in this context it must have been a derogatory name given to the khan.

5 The same story is told by the 18th century Crimean historian ʿAbdu l-Gaffār Qïrīmī in his ‘Umduṭū l-aḥbār ‘Esence of histories’ (Esad ef. 2331, fol. 264v–265r, ‘Abdu l-Gaffār/Derin Pašaoglu 2014: 77–78). Since ‘Abdu l-Gaffār had access to the Čingiz-nāmā itself, or they have a common source (Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2010: 50), here I restrict my research only on Ötämiş Ḥāǰǰī’s work.
variants go back to the same name and mirror regular sound changes in Kipchak Turkic languages. According to the Onomasticon Turcicum of Rásonyi and Baski, the name Tolu/Tulu was frequently used with the honorary title bay ‘wealthy’ (2007 II: 775–776), thus we have to treat Tolu Bay as the original form of the name. The bey/biy/bi forms of the Russian sources can be considered as misunderstanding of the far more frequent Turkic dignity of a beg/bey/biy. But who was Tolu Bay and why does oral tradition connect him to Bärdi Bäk khan’s fratricide?

TOLU BAY’S ROLE IN BÄRDI BÄK KHAN’S ACCESSION TO THE THRONE

In the fall of 1356 Īnī Bäk khan invaded and seized Azerbaijan, installed his son Bärdi Bäk as governor (ḥākim) and left for Sarāy. The khan fell ill already during the campaign or shortly after arriving in Sarāy (Safargaliev 1960: 107–108; Gračyov 2011: 50–58). What happened next is summed up in great detail in the chronicle of Muʿīn ad-Dīn Naṭanzī. Toḡlū Bāy, ‘a pillar of the state’ of Īnī Bäk khan – as Naṭanzī refers to him – sent a message to Bärdi Bäk about his father’s illness, and called him to Sarāy. However, the khan’s health improved. He learnt of the arrival of his son, and this made him suspicious. He consulted the matter with his wife Ṭoḡāy Ṭoḡlū ḥāṭān,7 the mother of Bärdi Bäk and with Toḡlū Bāy, ‘unaware that he was the wind of this malice’ as Naṭanzī eloquently writes. Both Ṭoḡāy Ṭoḡlū ḥāṭān and Toḡlū Bāy denied Bärdi Bäk’s arrival. Not much later Toḡlū Bāy, together with some of his men killed Īnī Bäk khan and everyone who did not submit to their will. The conspirators then installed Bärdi Bäk as khan. He, in turn, supposed to have said the following to Toḡlū Bāy: ‘I will kill the whole of the kin (urūġ), just as you killed Muqsān qaraǰū.’ Toḡlū Bāy – we are told – approved these words. He gathered all the princes, and [Bärdi] Bāk suddenly killed all of them.’ He is even supposed to have murdered his 6 months old brother himself (Tizengausen 1941.II.: 128–129; 233–234).

Among the specialists of the Golden Horde Natanzi is regarded as an untrustworthy source (Schamiloglu 1986: 165–170; Sabitov 2010: 151, 154), but in this case his data is unanimously corroborated by a number of Russian annals. The Patriaršaya/Nikonovskaya letopis’ also describe the events in details. According to them Tovlubij, a wise and evil temnik (тёмник), i. e. leader of a military contingent of ten thousand men, wanting to rule all the land, persuaded Bärdi Bäk to kill his father and take his throne. He gathered supporters from the tribal aristocracy (князь) to his cause. Bärdi Bäk, together with tribal leaders suffocated the khan and killed twelve of his brothers

6 The word derives from the East Old Turkic tuğlïğ ‘having … standard(s)’ (ED: 469) and it is formed from the base tuğ ‘a royal emblem’ (ED: 464, Doerfer 1965 II: 618–622) and the suffix +lUG forming adjectives (Eckmann 1966: 56–57; Bodrogligeti 2001: 102–104). Different forms of the name mirror stages of sound changes in Kipchak languages, namely the labialisation of word-end ğ: ġ > w > ø (Johanson 1998: 100). The oldest forms of the name appear interestingly in the 15–16th century Persian chronicles: t(u)glü or t(o)glü, with the final ğ preserved in tuğ (but interestingly not on the suffix!). This would mean that Mu’in ad-Din Natanzi and Gaffari utilised sources/traditions in which these sound shifts did not came to pass. In the 14th century monument of the Kipchak language, the Codex Cumanicus the word appears as t(ow)glü or t(o)glü, (Gronbech 1942: 250), this corresponds to the forms of the Russian annals Tovlyubii, Tavlyubii, etc. where we encounter the already labialised form. The variant of Otamis Hağı (Tolu Bay) and ‘Abdu l-Gaffar (Toli Bay) represent therefor the newest forms, as can be seen in a number of modern Kipchak languages: Kirgiz: t(u) ‘знамя, стяг’ and t(u)glü ‘со знаменем, со стягом’ (Yudahin 1965: 771–772), Kazakh tu ‘standard, banner’ (Shitnikov 1966: 205).

7 Toğay Toğlu ḥāṭān is certainly the wife of Özbāk khan, mother of Īnī Bäk khan and grandmother of Bärdi Bäk khan, Tajdula in Russian annals. On her name and variants see Pelliot 1949: 101–105.
(ПСРЛ X.: 229). Even if the description differs in some minor details, they clearly state that Bārdi Bāk seized the throne by a conspiracy and Tolu Bay was on the forefront of the events. This variant of the story – as the sources are earlier, unconnected and unanimous – can be regarded as the ‘how it must have happened’.

**FURTHER REFERENCES ON TOLU BAY**

Russian chronicles contain a range of additional data on Tolu Bay and his carrier. By scrutinizing these we may verify some of Ötämiš Hâjji’s details on Tolu Bay on the one hand, and gain insight into the carrier of Tolu Bay on the other.

In 1339 Özbāk khan summoned the prince of Tver, Aleksandr Mihajlovič (1301–1339). He was charged with organising a plot against Tartar rule in the Rus’ principalities and was eventually killed by the men of the khan. Among them the author of the Terskoj sbornik mentions Tovlubij who headed the execution (ПСРЛ XV.: 420). Later that year a number of Russian annals report on a joint Tatar-Rus’ punitive expedition against the town of Smolensk, whose prince refused to pay their taxes. On the head of the troops the sources mention a ‘mighty envoy’ (посол), Tovlubij (ПСРЛ X.: 211; ПСРЛ XV.: 424;). It is safe to assume that the Tovlubij of Alexandr Mihajlovič’s execution and the ‘envoy’ leading the forces against Smolensk are one and the same. In any case it is clear that this Tovlubij was not just an executioner and an ‘envoy’, but also a high ranking member of the military organisation of the Golden Horde, having a considerable number of Tatar and tributary troops at his disposal.

For the next two decades there is no information on Tolu Bay neither in Russian, nor in Persian sources. He reappears only in connection to the plot against Jānī Bāk khan. The charters of the Golden Horde khans usually mention the highest dignitaries of the state organisation. Since neither the charters of Özbāk, nor Jānī Bāk khan list his name, Safargaliev came to the conclusion that Tolu Bay must have been an ‘āmīr of second grade’ (Safargaliev 1960: 109) which seems reasonable, with the remark that he was influential enough to initiate a successful coup d’état. At the time of the plot, he must have been a higher dignitary of the military organisation, since Gaffārī calls him as an amīr-i laškar ‘commander of the army’ (Tizengausen 1941.II.: 211, 267). Russian sources corroborate the Persian data, where he appears – as mentioned above – temnik (ПСРЛ X.: 229), i. e. Turkic timen begi ‘leader of ten thousand men’. This piece of information – in my view – affirms the assumption, that Tolu Bay, the ‘envoy’ sent to Smolensk in 1339 and Tolu Bay of the coup d’état are one and the same person.

According to Ötämiš Hâjji, Tolu Bay could exercise power over Bārdi Bāk khan due to the khan’s ‘mindlessness’ and ‘ill-judgement’ (bī-‘aqāl wā bī-mulâhaţa kiši erdi), and to the fact that he was the tutor (atalîq) of the khan (Ötämiš Hâjji/Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2008: 31, 87–88).

---

8 See further ПСРЛ IV.: 63.
9 References on Tolu Bay in Russian and Persian sources are given in the work of Seleznyov 2009: 177–178.
10 For an overview of the event and further literature on them see Hautala 2017: 471–474.
11 Although the Nikonovskaya or Patriaršaya letopis’ also mention a certain Mengukaš’ together with Tolu Bay, the command of the troops seems to have been assigned to the later (Seleznyov 2009: 128–129).
12 Safargaliev (1960: 109) claims that Tolu Bay remained in the capital and started the organisation of the plot already during Jānī Bāk khan’s campaign against Azerbaijan. Though his claim seems reasonable, there are no sources supporting it.
Russian annals also suggest a certain form of tutorship to Tolu Bay. He is either called an učitel’ (учитель) ‘tutor’ on the one hand (ПСРЛ X.: 229), and predstatel’ (предстатель), an archaic Russian word for ‘protector, patron’ on the other (ПСРЛ V.: 228; ПСРЛ VIII.: 10; ПСРЛ XXIII.: 112). It seems that in this instance the oral tradition preserved trustworthy details of Tolu Bay.

If we take a closer look at some sources describing the execution of Alexandr Mihajlovič, we can raise serious questions about the tribal affiliation of Tolu Bay. As cited above, Ötämiš Hāǰǰī thought him to come from the tribe Qanglï, a statement which was accepted by scholars as Isxakov (2009: 51) and Sabitov (2014: 130). For an unknown reason, the Grigor’evs without any ground thought him to be a leader of the Baġrîn tribe (Grigor’ev and Grigor’ev 2002: 125; Grigor’ev 2004: 87). The author of the 16th century Tverskoj Sbornik, however, mentions Tolu Bay as a Cherkes: ‘Prince Aleksandr raised his eyes, ordered the fifth prayer (пети часы), his final prayer [to be sung]; he raised his eyes and saw the Čerkes heading to his tent, Tatars with him who ran him over. They mercilessly grappled him, wrestled him, tore down his clothes, placed him before Tovlubij naked and tied up. And he [Tovlubij – Cs. G.], the infidel sitting on a horse, surrounded by numerous Tatars, made his damned voice be heard: Kill him! And they grabbed prince Aleksandr and his son, prince Feodor, they stabbed them mercilessly, laid them on the ground, cut their heads of; and thus they met their end, excepted such fait for the Christian nation’ (ПСРЛ XV.: 420). The Patriaršaya/Nikonovskaya letopis’ mention two persons at the execution of the prince, a certain ‘Berkâń’ and ‘Čerkas’ (ПСРЛ X.: 210). Keeping the entry of the Tverskoj sbornik in mind, it is safe to assume that the later refers to Tolu Bay. We already saw that Ötämiš Hāǰǰī and some Russian annals call Tolu Bay as the tutor (ataliq, учитель, предстатель) of Bärdi Bâk khan. We know little of the ataliqs of the Golden Horde, but in the period of the Later Golden Horde the princes of the Crimean and Kazan’ Khanats, even the sons of the Nogay biys were raised among the Cherkes of the Caucasus (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2007: 413). This practice might as well go back to the Golden Horde period. The 17th century compilation of oral traditions of the Volga area, another Čingiz-nāmā also connects the youth of Bärdi Bâk khan to the Cherkes (Ivanics and Usmanov 2011: 83; Ivanics 2017: 252). In my view all this points out that we should link Tolu Bay to the Cherkes, and not to the Qanglï. Be it as it may, this peace of data about the origin of Tolu Bay in the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötämiš Hāǰǰī should be treated with caution.

It was already mentioned that before the plot against Jānī Bâk khan the name of Tolu Bay did not appear on Golden Horde charters, which means that he was not among the highest members of the state organisation, the so called four ulus begs. According to the charter of Bärdi Bâk khan given to the Venetians in 1358, the number of the ulus begs rose to six, and Tolu Bay was listed fifth among them (Grigor’ev and Grigor’ev 2002: 160). This means that the dignity and power of Tolu Bay rose, undeniably his support to the khan had a major role in this. It is safe to assume that contrary to his fifth place in the charter, he became a leading figure after the khan (Safargaliev 1960: 110), maybe a sort of eminence grise. The same charter also testifies that Tolu Bay was rewarded with a share of the customs in Azov (Grigor’ev and Grigor’ev 2002: 148, 152).

---

13 Князь же Александрь взведе очи свои, повеле пети часы; се же им кончавшим часы, и взведе очи свои, и виде Чѐркас, идущь прямь к веже своей, и с ним Татарове, и высоки противу его. Они же немилостивый похватиша его, вложи(ша) назад, и оборваша порты его, и поставиша и перед Товлубием нага связана. Оному же безаконному стоащу на коне, и с ним множество Татар, испусти окаанный глас свой: «убийте.» Они же емше князя Александра и сына его князя Феодора, без милости прободоша, и поврьгоша на земли, отсекоша главы им; и тако скончашася, и приемше таковую кончину за род христианьский.
In the short reign of Bārdi Bāk khan his power – according to all sources – deteriorated. Ötemiş Ḥāǰǰī states that the clans of the Golden Horde migrated to the Crimea and to the vicinity of the Syr Darya under the rule of clan leaders, Mamay and Tengiz Buğa. The khan on the other hand remained in the capital Sarāy, only with his entourage (ički), where he died of sickness. To the contrary of Ötemiş Ḥāǰǰī’s narrative Russian sources tell a different story. They mention a certain Kulpa, who challenged the rule of the khan. Ironically, Kulpa – according to the study of Grigor’ev (1983: 22–26) – managed to take Azov, zone of interest of Tolu Bay, and minted his coins already in 1358. Though sources – both written and numismatic – for these events are scarce, it is clear that Kulpa took the capital next year, overthrew and killed Bārdi Bāk. The Patriaršaya/ Nikonovskaya letopis’ portrays these events vividly under the year 1359: ‘In the summer of the same year, car’ Berdibek, son of Čyanibek, grandson of Azbyak, was killed in the Horde; and with [his] his well-wisher, the wretched Tolubiy, an evil and powerful knyaz’, and other counsellors of his [he] drank out the same cup that he filled for his father and brother[s]’ (ПСРЛ Х.: 230–231).

The mere fact that the annals mention only Tolu Bay by name points out his might and influence in the affairs of the Golden Horde. Since numismatic finds corroborate the details of our Russian sources, we have every reason to give credit to them.

CONCLUSIONS

When we compare the evidence of Persian and Russian sources to Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī’s plot of Bārdi Bāk khan, it becomes clear that the historical consciousness erased the memory of the plot against Īānī Bāk khan, it kept only the dissolution of the Batuid line and its connection to Tolu Bay. In an interesting manner, it also recorded the fact that he was the tutor of the khan. So the plot had a deed, a villain, it required only a motive for Tolu Bay. Thus, the historical consciousness constructed one, namely that Tolu Bay was acting because of personal motives, trying to avenge his son. We might even consider this phenomenon as a feature of steppe historiography. It operates with historical events and persons, it even preserves trustworthy details of some individuals, but at the same time it deploys fictional elements, motives to explain a plot. From this analysis we can conclude that the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī is a valuable asset for the study of the Golden Horde, but the traditions it preserved could change considerably. Every detail of the chronicle must be approached with criticism and at the same time it is of paramount importance to corroborate it with other sources or group of sources.

APPENDIX

In the following I give a critical text of Bārdi Bāk khan’s reign from the Čingis-nāmā. The facsimile of the Tashkent manuscript (ÖḤt) – published in Yudin et al. 1992 – serves as the principal text which is supplemented by the one in Istanbul (ÖḤi) – published by Mirgaleev 2017. Words, suffixes etc. absent in the ÖḤt but present in the ÖḤi are given in (round brackets), unreadable

14 Того же лета во Орде убиен бысть царь Бердебек, сын Чянибеков, внук Азбяков, и з доброхотом своим окаанным Толубибем, князем темным и силным, и со иными советники его; и испи тую же чашу, еюже напоил отца своего и братью свою.
words with (---), interpolations in [square brackets]. Different wordings of the ÖḤi are given in footnotes. Since the remarks on the margin of the ÖḤi seems to originate from a version of the ÖḤt, I leave them from the critical text.


āġāz-i dastān-i Bärđi Bāk ħān15 oglī Bärđi Bāk (ḥān) atasī taḥtīnda16 ħān boldī Bärđi Bāk17 bāṣī18 bi-‘aql wā bi-mulāḥaža19 kīṣī erdi özining qarīndaʃlarī20 taqī öz oğlanlarīni manaʃ ḥānliq talaʃur deb21 ʿoltūrūr erdi ʿayturlar Qangli Tolu Bay tegān qawmī qarīndaʃ[i] kōb kūļūk kīṣī erdi bu ḡānīndug atalīgi erdi hār nā ʿaytṣā22 aning sözīndīn čiqmaz23 erdi aning bir ogli bar erdi ʿSu- may24 atliq alp25 atgüci erdi ol ʿSumay26 (ḥāzrāt-i) Jānī Bāk ḡān zamānīnda qaraqčiļīq27 ʿoltūr erdi aning jihātīdīn28 ḡān ‘alāyihi r-raḥmāt anī ʿoltūrūb erdi Tolu Bay ol29 ʿoltīnīg a règledīn bu kūngāsni ol berūr ʿaytūr30 erdi sen hālā31 yigit turur-sen32 bu mahall-da/qi33 ʿotgān ʿogling tang ʿosār34 sen kūndīn kūngā qarīr-sen ol ʿyigit bolur(lar) tangla sen qarīgandīn song ḡānīndig-nī talaʃīb35 algay ḡālā bular-nī ʿoltūrā (---) tur-ʿîl qačan qaɾī baʃlasang andīn song36 (birāwnī) qoyɣay-sen ter edī (sic!) ol bi-ḍawłat hām munun37 søzīgā kirīb ʿoltūrūr erdi bu sābābdīn anga kōgīn38 (qirgān) kötān hān terlār aning zamānīnda tāʃfīqa-liq bīyār boldī ʿing qolnī Qïyat39 Mamay alıp el kūn

15 ÖḤi: missing.
16 ÖḤi: yerīndā
17 ÖḤi: bu
18 ÖḤi: bās
19 ÖḤi: bi-‘aqīl wā bi-mulāḥaža
20 ÖḤi: qarīndaʃlarīni
21 ÖḤi: teb
22 ÖḤi: ol hār nā aysa
23 ÖḤi: aʃlan tāʃawūz qīlmās
24 ÖḤi: Ṣumārī
25 ÖḤi: alip
26 ÖḤi: missing.
27 ÖḤi: qaraqču/liq
28 ÖḤi: ol jihātdīn
29 ÖḤi: māgzūr
30 ÖḤi: ol berā (?!) aydī
31 ÖḤi: missing.
32 ÖḤi: yigit-durur-sen
33 ÖḤi: mahall-da/qi
34 ÖḤi: oğlanlarīnīng birīlī tang ʿosārsīn
35 ÖḤi: tilāʃīb (?)
36 ÖḤi: missing.
37 ÖḤi: muning
38 The Tashkent manuscript has the form ڪڪرڪ, thus its editors read kerākīn (Ötāmiʃ Ḥāǰǰī/Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2008: 89) and kārkin (Ötāmiʃ Ḥāǰǰī/Yudin et al. 1992: 135). Although the manuscript supports this reading – the word kārkin is documented in Teleut’ ein großer Dolch’ (Radloff 1960² II.: 1100) – I would suggest that the scribe copying the manuscript made a lapsus calami. The wording in Istanbul manuscript, which has kōgīn qirgān ‘the one who wiped out his roots’, fits the fratricidal actions of Bārdi Bāk khan better. A similar phrase (kōgīn uyu-γan kötān hān) on Bārdi Bāk khan can be found in a manuscript of the 17th century Čingiz-nāmā of the Volga region, see Mustakimov 2009: 123.
39 ÖḤi: Written erroneously as ڪڪي. The correct should be Qïyat.
birlä⁴⁰ Qïrïm-ğa kitdi sol qolnï (50b) Qïyat Ŧïr Qutlï oglï⁴¹ Tengiz Buğa Sïr däryäşi boynïga⁴² alïp kitdi hän öz(i) ički(si) birlä(n) Saräyda boldï⁴³ üç yïl Saräy šähindä pâdişah boldï⁴⁴ andïn song wäfät boldï⁴⁵

ABBREVIATIONS

ED = Clauson 1972.
PÇRL = Полное собрание русских летописей.
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⁴⁰ ÖḤi: missing.
⁴¹ ÖḤi: missing.
⁴² ÖḤi: b.w.y.k.ä (?)
⁴³ ÖḤi: bolur edî
⁴⁴ ÖḤi: pâdişah-liq qïldï
⁴⁵ ÖḤi: tapdï
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