

УДК 94

**MEMORIES OF STATEHOOD
IN THE DEFTER-I GENGHIS-NAME*****Maria Ivanics***

*University of Szeged
Szeged 6722, Hungary
E-mail: res13986@helka.iif.hu*

The Turkic peoples of the Volga Region lost their statehood for centuries due to the Russian occupation of the Khanate of Kazan and Astrakhan in the mid-16th century. The memory of statehood among these peoples has been maintained and preserved for posterity through the oral historiography of the steppe. It comes as no surprise then that there has been an effort to create and strengthen the national identities in the post-Soviet Turkic republics with the successive publication of the latest editions of national epics and collections of historical stories.

Research objectives and materials: This investigation focuses on one such source that forms part of the oral historiography of the steppe, a Genghis-name compiled and recorded by an unknown author in the late 17th century. The chapter on Genghis Khan contains two stories that depict the various forms of organisational practices in nomadic states. The first was characteristic of the Golden Horde and the Nogai Horde at its zenith; it concerns the joint rule of the khan and the beglerbeg. The second depicts relations in the late Golden Horde and its successor states, in which the khan and the four chieftains constituted and led the country together. In the Genghis-name we could set the type of a super complex chiefdom headed by Temir Kutlu Khan with his four *karači biy*'s of the clans Kiyat, Kongrat, Cathay, Saldzhut.

Research results and novelty: It was possible to give an answer to the question why are so different the *karači biy*'s of the Great Horde of those in the other late Golden Horde states.

A historian can glean information from this story both on the age in which the source was created and on practices of nomadic rule: What stands out above all is that the clans had the right to resist and that they were able to shift away from their tyrannical rulers without any consequences and seek a new ruler for themselves. The steppe lacked the power of law that would have enabled the ruler to use force in such cases. The khan was only able to maintain his power over the chieftains through his generous gifts or by ensuring regular opportunities for booty. The khan came to be the leader of the society through the support of the chieftains but had no absolute power over them.

Keywords: Volga Region, Defter-i Genghis-name, oral historiographical tradition, Golden Horde, Great Horde, Temir Kutlu Khan, *karači biy*'s.

For citation: Ivanics M. Memories of Statehood in the Defter-i Genghis-name. *Golden Horde Review*. 2016, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 570–579.

The Turkic peoples of the Volga Region lost their statehood for centuries due to the Russian occupation of the Khanate of Kazan in the mid-16th century. The memory of statehood among these peoples has been maintained and preserved for posterity through the oral historiography of the steppe. It comes as no surprise then that there has been an effort to create and strengthen the national identities in the

post-Soviet Turkic republics with the successive publication of the latest editions of national epics and collections of historical stories, the so-called Genghis-name, part of the oral historiographies of the steppe – which had previously been forbidden and considered to be ‘feudal in content’¹.

The oral historiography of the steppe, according to Judin’s definition, is the individual’s memory of his own past, a collection of stories of events he has experienced which have been strung together and written down. This is considered unique because it does not refer to a chronicle either recorded by *one* author or (perhaps) commissioned, but to a series of loosely linked stories that have preserved the collective historical consciousness of the nomadic peoples [10, p. 64–65]. The genre of the individual pieces within the collections is *qarī sōz* ‘the old word’. Historical research has only recently acknowledged this group of sources after Judin with his colleagues published the Genghis-name of Ötemiš Haǰǰī [10]. My investigation focuses on one such source that forms part of the oral historiography of the steppe, a Genghis-name compiled and recorded by an unknown author in the late 17th century [12]. The chapter on Genghis Khan contains two stories that depict the various forms of organisational practices in nomadic states. I will discuss these in the following. Although a number of motifs in the stories refer to the Secret History of the Mongols^[19], it must be emphasised that the Genghis Khan depicted in them is not identical to the historical figure who established the Mongol Empire. Instead, this figure represents the ideal ruler and his relationship to the chieftains. For those who are unfamiliar with the story, I will briefly summarise it:

The father of the most beautiful maiden in all the land intended her for the gods, so he had her locked up in a dark tower so the eyes of no man could behold her. At the urging of the maiden, her nanny opened the window and she fell pregnant from the ray of light that entered the room. In order to avoid shame, her parents locked her up in a boat and left her to her fate. A sharp-eyed archer, however, shot at the boat and tore off the sideboard, thus freeing the girl, whom he later married. During their wedding night, the girl proved to be a virgin despite her pregnancy. The child conceived supernaturally was born and was called Duyin-bayan, and when he grew up they bought him a wife. Three boys were born to his wife, Alango, but on his death bed Duyin-bayan considered none of them fit for leadership and thus promised his people that after his death a child would be born who would be worthy to be their ruler. There would be a sign: he would come down in the shape of a ray of light to the tent of his widowed wife and would exit the tent in the shape of a wolf. The child was indeed born, as it was foretold, and was called Genghis in the end because the wolf had shouted this name twice on leaving the tent.

Now the question arises, whether the story in the Genghis-name preserved an old Mongolian legend of origin or did rather the oral historiography of the steppe adapt the story included in the Secret History of the Mongols? If the version of Genghis Khan’s birth surviving in our sources would be known only from the steppe one might think about its adaptation. But exactly in the very same form as to be read in the Genghis-name, the story also appears on an ink wash drawing in a genealogy composed in the years 1426/1427 for the Timurid sovereign, Shahruh

¹ It was the fate of the Edige epic too [8, p. 247–254].

(1409–1447), from which a copy from the 16th-century survived². It is well known that in order to ensure his legitimacy Tamerlan went back in several forms to the Mongol traditions³. The genealogy compiled for his son, Shahruh, begins with the miraculous conception of Alan-koa. It was displayed on the drawing as follows: the tent in which Alan-koa was staying symbolized the circle. The square in the circle was referring to her bed, on which Alan-koa is represented kneeling. On her left shoulder lies the Moon. She follows the Wolf leaving the tent with her eyes, while spreading her hands as a sign of astonishment. Above of the drawing is the explanation in Persian and Turkī (in Uyghur script): Alan-quwa-ning oġlan-lar-ı-ning ū'bā-si buu yosun birl-ä. “The origin of the sons of Alan-koa [ocured] in this way.” (see the picture below).



The path of the posthumous child, Genghis, to the throne of the khanate, however, was not a straight one. His tyrannical elder brothers threatened his life, and he was forced to escape. This is where the chieftains enter the story. They turned their backs on the tyrannical brothers, and ten *biys* set out to find Genghis and invite him to be their ruler. Four chieftains, however, refused to go with them because they continued to support Genghis' brothers. After a long search, when the ten *biys* finally found Genghis, they were so happy that they let their horses go free. They therefore did not know how to bring Genghis home. So they made a wagon for Genghis to sit on, and they tied themselves to the front of the wagon for lack of horses. Since one of the *beys* was lame, he sat next to Genghis on the wagon and drove the “horses”, that is, the *beys* [12, fol. 19r].

A historian can glean information from this story both on the age in which the source was created and on practices of nomadic rule: What stands out above all is

² The ink wash drawing is from the manuscript *Šu'bi pānjgānā* (*Baysunġur Album*, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi № 2152, fol. 42a*). It was first published by Z.V. Togan and Emel Esin [23; 11].

³ This can be observed in Timur's mausoleum in Samarkand. The genealogy on his sarcophagus – from them only a part is quoted – enough to Bodonchar, the ancestor of Genghis, and reflects the story broadly known from the Secret History of Mongols. “The father of this nobleman [i.e. of Bodonchar] is unknown, his mother is Alan Qo'a. One says Alan Qo'a was inherently loyal and pure, and she was not a whore. It was of a light beam in a human form that occurred on the door, and made her pregnant. They said he was a descendant of Ali bin Abu Talib were, the Emir of the Faithful. The declaration of Alan Qo'a is underpinned by the fact that her grandchild defeated everybody” [22; 18, p. 332–333; 17].

that the clans had the right to resist and that they were able to shift away from their tyrannical rulers without any consequences and seek a new ruler for themselves. The steppe lacked the power of law that would have enabled the ruler to use force in such cases [15, p. 372]. The khan was only able to maintain his power over the chieftains through his generous gifts or by ensuring regular opportunities for booty. The khan came to be the leader of the society through the support of the chieftains but had no absolute power over them. The image of the chieftains pulling the wagon, with one of them driving the others, symbolizes this concept. The wagon represents the country here, which is ruled in tandem by the khan and *beglerbeg*⁴. Although the word *beglerbeg* does not appear in the story, there are unmistakable references to the lame *bey* filling this position, for example, the signet ring of Alango, which he requested so that he could prove that he and the other chieftains had come from Genghis' mother [12, fol. 18r]. The seal is actually the symbol of the *beglerbeg*'s power.









For the contemporary nomadic audience, the motif of the wagon mentioned above clearly symbolized the shared rule of the khan and the *beglerbeg* over the clans, which was the practice on the eastern wing of the Golden Horde as of the fifteenth century. On the eastern wing, the descendants of Edige of the Mangit clan, the head of the Nogai Horde, supplied the *beglerbegs*, who ruled together with the Jochid khans, and it was often they themselves who were the true lords of the steppe [6]. This system of exercising power in the East wing was preserved for centuries, while in the West wing it disappeared with the dissolution of the Golden Horde and was replaced with a new practice of power in the newly established khanates. If we continue reading the Genghis-name, we can also find traces of this as well.



As the story continues, Genghis and the chieftain consult. Genghis ensures the *biys* that just as the eyebrow and the eye belong together they too would form a unity⁵. Genghis redistributed the people among them and designated a territory for each chieftain, providing them with clan markers, such as trees and birds, and war cries (*uran*), such as sign of property (*tamga*). I wish to point out here that, as far as I know, the Genghis-name is the only source that preserves all the four clan markers⁶. The markers of the clans helped to distinguish themselves from the others and in addition had an everyday function too: it served as the clans' prosperity protection (*tamga*), and assisted in the survival of the clans' members, as in combat they recognized each other with their war cry (*uran*). The role of the trees and birds of the clans are beyond everyday life's usage. They are associated with the vitality and the charisma of their society.

⁴ The most cited example is the explaining of the Shirin bey about the hierarchy in the Crimean Khanate: "Are there not two shafts to a cart? The right shaft is my lord the khan, and the left shaft am I, with my brothers and children" [16]. According to a Karakalpak legend to rescue the collapsed country they wanted to call Genghis among them. They went to look for Genghis, and brought him on a car in to the country [5, c. 88].

⁵ "köz üstünde qaşı teg..." [12, fol. 26v].

⁶ For the trees of the clans see [13]. The other markers of the clans are discussed in my forthcoming book.

Name	Tree	Bird	Uran	Tamga	
Genghis Khan	<i>činar</i> <i>Platanus</i>	<i>iki baš</i> <i>qaraquš</i> double-headed eagle	<i>jān qaba</i>	<i>quš baš</i> bird's head	
Uyšin Mayqı-biy	<i>qarağaç Ulmus</i> <i>pumila</i>	<i>qaraquš</i> <i>Aquila</i> <i>chrysaetos</i>	<i>salawat</i>	<i>sergä (?)</i>	
Ming Ordač-biy	<i>qayın</i> <i>Betulaceae</i>	<i>qarčığa</i> <i>Astur</i> <i>palumbariusu</i>	Alaj	<i>quš</i> <i>qabırğa</i> bird's rib	
Qaldar-biy	<i>şandal</i> <i>Santalum</i>	<i>kögärçin</i> <i>Culumba</i>	<i>arnaw</i>	<i>jümüj</i> ladle	
Tamyan-biy	<i>tiräk</i> <i>Populus</i>	<i>qirğiy</i> <i>Accipiter</i> <i>nissus</i>	<i>tuŋya</i>	<i>irğaq</i> hook	
Qıpçaq-biy	<i>qarama Ulmus</i>	<i>börküt</i> <i>Aquila fulva</i>	Toqsaba	<i>taraq</i> comb	
Mutyān-biy	<i>miläš</i> <i>Sorbus</i> <i>aucuparia</i>	<i>turna</i> <i>Grus grus</i>	Bayqongrat	<i>quyušğan</i> crupper	
Burdjan-biy	<i>imän</i> <i>Quercus</i>	<i>küçükän</i> <i>Milvus migrans</i> <i>Bodd.</i>	<i>aq toğan</i>	<i>jağalbay</i> hammer	
Jormatı-biy	<i>üyängi</i> <i>Salix</i>	<i>itelgü</i> <i>Buteo buteo</i>	<i>aq taylaq</i>	<i>sinli sinäk</i> hayfork	
Kereit-biy	<i>čökä</i> <i>Tilia</i>	<i>qaz</i> <i>Anger anser</i>	<i>ar börü</i>	<i>köz</i> eye	
Borqit-biy	<i>čağan</i> <i>Acer</i>	<i>hödhöd</i> <i>Upupa epops</i>	Buruĵ	<i>hamza</i> <i>hamza</i> character	
QİYAT, son of Bodončar	<i>Qarağay</i> <i>Pinus larix</i>	<i>şonqar</i> <i>Gyr-falcon</i>	<i>aru jān</i>	<i>ačamay</i> <i>/äwirnä</i> reel	
QATAY, son of Qağınčar-biy	<i>artiš</i> <i>Juniperus</i>	<i>qawdu</i> <i>Ciconia</i> <i>ciconia</i>	<i>taylaq</i>	<i>särü(?)</i>	
Sengle, son of QONGRAT	<i>älmağaç</i> <i>Zelkova</i> <i>ulmoides</i>	<i>läčün</i> <i>Accipiter</i> <i>gentilis</i>	Qongrat	<i>ay</i> Moon	

SALJUT- biy	<i>köbrüj</i> <i>Fraxinus</i>	<i>köyüldü</i> <i>Scolopax</i> <i>rusticola</i>	Barlas	öy house	
Temir Qutlu-biy	<i>ĵirük</i> <i>Alnus</i>	<i>şayışqan</i> <i>Pica pica</i>	<i>taban</i>	<i>yarım</i> <i>taraq</i> half a comb	

Let's see now what we can read out from the table with regard to the organisation of the contemporary society. Can the clans mentioned in the Genghis story be connected to some nomadic social organisation that can be defined in terms of time? You must have noticed by now that I have attempted to avoid the terms *tribe* and *tribal alliance*. The most recent literature by Russian and American scholars does not use these, instead dividing nomadic societies into simple, complex and super complex chiefdoms (*voždestvo*) and conceding the super complex chiefdom as the forerunner of the early state [3]. This new theory can be nicely illustrated through our source. But let's first look at the list of chieftains' names [12, fols. 23r–25v]⁷. Following the name of Genghis Khan, we see the names of the ten *biys* who elected him as khan. Most of these can be accepted as ethnoanthroponyms, that is, a personal name that evolved out of a clan name, but it is more likely that in this case we are dealing with ethnonyms. In addition to each name, the title *biy* is noted next to each name. This is the Kipchak Turkic form of the well-known Turkic word *beg/bey*. One of the elements of the compound names is also the name of a clan (*Uyşin* Mayqı-biy, *Ming* Ordač-biy). There are only three exceptions: Genghis Khan, Qaldar-biy and Temir Qutlu-biy. In the story, Genghis Khan is the leader of the complex chiefdom, the clan to which Qaldar-biy belongs is debated – therefore, I will not discuss it now – and Temir Qutlu is an actual historical figure, the khan of the Golden Horde, who ruled during the last years of the fourteenth century in Astrakhan. Naturally, in this story, he cannot be called a khan since this position is held by Genghis, and this is why he is referred to as a chieftain. But the fact that his name appears supports the supposition that these are perhaps the clans of the Volga region in the late Golden Horde period during the reign of Temir Qutlu. I have marked the various clan names with different colours and used bold to mark four of them. These latter clans are those whose leaders did not accompany the others to ask Genghis to be their khan, but continued to support Genghis' tyrannical brothers. And they paid for it. Genghis had them killed. However, one son of each survived because they were each hidden in time. Why would the children of Genghis's obvious enemies have been permitted to join the newly established khanate and have been granted people and signs of clan hood, just like Genghis' supporters?

There is only one explanation for this: this part of the Genghis story preserved the so-called four-bey system⁸. The khan and the leaders of the four major clans, the *qarači-beys*, established a new khanate together on the right (West) wing of the late Golden Horde, in the successor khanates formed west of the Yaik (Ural) River, in the Great Horde [7, p. 29] and in the Crimean [20], Kazan and Kasimov Kha-

⁷ The order of the chieftains' name does not follow the source. They are grouped now by me.

⁸ First described by V.V. Vel'jaminov-Zernov [1].

nates⁹. The international literature uses the term *ruling tribes* to describe them, noting that their leaders participated in governance as well. In my view, the term *state-forming clans* would be more appropriate because their role in establishing and maintaining the state was highly significant. It was they who elected the khans, it was they who inaugurated them by raising them on a white felt rug [21; 14], or, in contrast, it was they who removed them from their position by withdrawing support. The khan and the four chieftains pre-supposed one another, they formed the state together, they exercised power together, and none of them was able to rule without the other. In the late fourteenth century, there were probably four major clans in league with Temir Qutlu Khan: the Qiyat, Qongrat, Qatay and Saljut clans. Thus, in the story, it would not have been possible for Genghis to establish a new khanate without them; this explains why these four also received clan markers.

If we now examine the ten loyal clans, we recognize among them the complex chiefdom of the Bashkir Seven Clans, the *Yete iriu* [5, p. 434 ff.], which, at the time, consisted of the Tamyān, Mutyan (Muyten), Burdžan and Qipčaq clans. The last in the list, however, formed a simple chiefdom with the Qari-Qipsaq (Qipsaq=Qipčaq), Sari-Qipsaq and Sankem-Qipsaq clans. These were independent clans; otherwise, we would not have arrived at the number seven!

Thus, we are not far from the truth if we suppose that the Genghis-name preserved the image of a nomadic society in the Volga region in the late fourteenth century, in a supercomplex chiefdom. It was led by the khan, Temir Qutlu, who, besides being the leader of his own clan, ruled in tandem with four state-forming clans, the Qiyat, Qongrat, Qatay (Qitay/Hitay) and Saldžut clans. The clans that submitted to him directly (the Uyšın, Ming, Kereit, Borqit/Burqut and Džormatı clans) fell under his rule, including the Bashkir complex chiefdom mentioned above, the *Yete iriu*.

Finally, the Genghis story also provides an answer to the question posed in 1986 in the Ph.D. dissertation by Schamiloglu, the American Turkologist of Tatar descent. In his discussion of the four-bey system, Schamiloglu pointed out that in the successor khanates of the Golden Horde the *qarači-beys* were initially everywhere that the leaders of the Širin, Barin, Argin and Qipčaq clans were, except in the Great Horde, where this office was filled by the leaders of the Qiyat, Mangit, Salciut and Qongrat clans. He supposed that the state-forming clans of the Great Horde were so different from those of the other khanates developed along the right wing because their khans had inherited the clans of Temir Qutlu. The Genghis-name confirms his supposition. If we compare the four state-forming clans in the Genghis-name (Qiyat, Qongrat, Qatay and Saldžut) with the leading clans of the Great Horde (Qiyat, Mangit, Salciut and Qongrat), we find only one difference: the Mangits took the place of the Qatays in the Great Horde. The Qatay clan did not disappear, however; it maintained its leading role in Astrakhan as late as the mid-sixteenth century [2, p. 66–67]. The appearance of the Mangits can be explained by the fact that they exercised a significant influence in the eastern and western wings of the Golden Horde as of the fifteenth century, first in the Great Horde and then in the Crimean khanate, but only as one of the four *qarači-beys*.

⁹ The last work on this theme: [4].

REFERENCES

1. Velyaminov-Zernov V.V. *Issledovanie o kasimovskikh tsaryakh i tsarevichakh* [Study on Kasimov Tsars and Tsareviches]. St. Petersburg, Vol. II. 1864, pp. 411–437. (In Russian)
2. Zaitsev I.V. *Astrakhanskoe khanstvo* [The Astrakhan Khanate]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 2004. 303 p. (In Russian)
3. Kradin N.N. Kochevniki, mir-imperii i sotsial'naya evolyutsiya [Nomads, World-Empires and Social Evolution]. *Al'ternativnye puti k tsivilizatsii* [Alternative Ways to Civilization]. N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotaev, D.M. Bondarenko, V.A. Lyn-shi (eds.). Moscow, Logos Publ., 2000, pp. 314–335. (In Russian)
4. Sabytov Zh.M. Klanovaya sistema Ulusa Dzhuchi: osnovnye etapy razvitiya [Clan System of the Jochid Ulus: Main Stages of Development]. *Srednevekovye tyurko-tatarskie gosudarstva. Sbornik stat'ey* [Medieval Turkic-Tatar States. Collected papers]. Kazan, Sh.Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2012, Iss. 4, pp. 118–121. (In Russian)
5. Trepavlov V.V. *Istoriya Nogayskoy Ordy* [History of the Nogai Horde]. Moscow, Vostochnaya Literatura Publ., 2001. 752 p. (In Russian)
6. Trepavlov V.V. Beklerbek v strukture mongol'skoy i tyurkskoy gosudarstvennosti [Beglerbegi in the Structure of the Mongol and Turkic State System]. *Golden Horde Review*. 2014. No. 2(4), pp. 21–34. (In Russian)
7. Trepavlov V.V. *Bol'shaya Orda – Takht eli. Ocherk Istorii* [The Great Horde – Takht eli. An Essay on the History]. Tula, Grif i K. Publ., 2010. 112 p. (In Russian)
8. Usmanov M.A. O tragedii eposa i tragediyakh lyudskikh [On the Epic's Tragedy and Human Tragedies]. *Idegey. Tatarskiy narodnyy epos* [Edigu. The Tatar National Epos]. Per. S. Lipkina. Kazan, Tatarskoe knizhnoe Publ., 1990. (In Russian)
9. Utemish Hajji. *Chingiz-name* [Chingiz-name]. Faksimile, perevod, transkriptsiya, tekstologicheskie primechaniya, issledovanie V.P. Yudina. Pod red. Yu.G. Baranova. Kommentarii i ukazateli M.Kh. Abuseitovoy. Alma-Ata, Gilim Publ., 1992. 296 p. (In Russian)
10. Yudin V.P. Perekhod vlasti k plemennym biyam i neizvestnoy dinastii Tukatimuridov v kazakhskikh stepyakh v XIV v. (K probleme vostochnykh pis'mennykh istochnikov, stepnoy ustnoy istoriografii i predystorii kazakhskogo Khanstva) [Power Transition to the Tribal Beys and Unknown Dynasty of the Tuqa-Timurids in the Kazakh Steppes in the 14th century (On the Problem of Oriental Written Sources, Steppe Oral Historiography and Prehistory of the Kazakh Khanate)]. Utemish Hajji. *Chingiz-name* [Chingiz-name]. Faksimile, perevod, transkriptsiya, tekstologicheskie primechaniya, issledovanie V.P. Yudina. Pod red. Yu.G. Baranova. Kommentarii i ukazateli M.Kh. Abuseitovoy. Alma-Ata, Gilim Publ., 1992, pp. 57–66. (In Russian)
11. Esin E. Hanlar Ulaki (The succession of kings). On the illustrated genealogy, with Uyğur inscriptions, of the Mongol and Temürid dynasties, at the Topkapı library. Heissig W., Sagaster K. (hrsg.). *Gedanke und Wirkung. Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag von Nikolaus Poppe*. Asiatische Forschungen 108. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz. 1989, pp. 113–127.
12. Ivanics M., Usmanov M.A. *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende. Däftär-i Čingiz-nämä*. I. Studia Uralo-altaica 44. Szeged, Univ., Dep. of Altaic Studies, 2002. 324 p. (In German)
13. Ivanics M. Der Sippenbaum im Buch der Dschingis-Legende. *Man and Nature in the Altaic World: Proceedings of the 49th Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Berlin, July 30 – August 4, 2006*. B. Kellner-Heinkele, E.V. Boykova, B. Heuer (hrsgs.). Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag. 2012, pp. 179–191. (In German)

14. Ivanics M. Türk–Moğol geleneğinde han kötermek merasimi. Paper read on the conference *Ölümünün 100. Yılında Ármin Vámbéry'yi Anma Toplantısı*. Ankara, 2013. Forthcoming. (In Turkish)

15. Kradin N.N. Nomadism, evolution, and world-systems: Pastoral societies in theories of historical development. *Journal of World-Systems Research*. Santa Cruz, Calif., 2002, no. 8/3, pp. 368–388.

16. Manz Forbes B. The Clans of the Crimean Khanate 1466–1532. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1978, no. 2 (3), pp. 282–309.

17. Manz Forbes B. *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. xi + 227 p.

18. Nagel T. *Timur der Eroberer und die islamische Welt des späten Mittelalters*. München, C.H. Beck, 1993. 531 p. (In German).

19. Rachewiltz I. de. *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. 2 Vols. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2004.

20. Schamiloğlu U. The Qaraçi Beys of the Later Golden Horde: Notes on the Organization of the Mongol World Empire. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1984, Is. 4, pp. 283–297.

21. Sela R. *Ritual and Authority in Central Asia: The Khan's Inauguration Ceremony*. Papers on Inner Asia, no. 37. Bloomington, 2003. 79 p.

22. Semenov A.A. „Gur-i Emir” Türbesinde Timur'un ve Ahfadının Mezar Kitabeleri. (Cev. Abdülkadir İnan) *Belleten* 24. Sayı 93, (1960), pp. 139–169. 7 resim ile. (In Turkish).

23. Togan Z.V. The Composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashīd al-Dīn. *Central Asiatic Journal*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1962, no. 7, pp. 60–72.

About the author: Maria Ivanics – Ph.D. (History), Professor, Department of Altaic Studies, University of Szeged Hungary (Egyetem u. 2, Szeged 6722, Hungary). E-mail: res13986@helka.iif.hu

Received May 25, 2016

Accepted for publication August 17, 2016

ВОСПОМИНАНИЯ О ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОСТИ В ДАФТАР-И ЧИНГИЗ-НАМЕ

Мария Иванич

Сегедский университет

6722, Сегед, Венгрия

E-mail: res13986@helka.iif.hu

Тюркские народы Поволжья потеряли свою государственность на протяжении веков из-за завоевания Россией Казанского и Астраханского ханств в середине XVI века. Память о государственности у этих народов была сохранена в устной историографии степи. Неудивительно поэтому, что в пост-советских тюркских республиках была предпринята попытка создания и укрепления национальной идентичности с последующей публикацией новейших редакций национальных эпосов и сборников исторических преданий.

Цели и материалы исследования: Статья анализирует одно из произведений устной историографии – Дафтар-и Чингиз-наме, – составленное и записанное неизвестным автором в конце XVII века. В главе о Чингиз хане находятся две истории, которые отражают различные формы организационной практики в кочевых государствах. Первая была характерна для Золотой и Ногайской Орды в их зените (совместное управление хана и бега), а вторая изображает отношения постордынских государств, в которых хан и четыре карачи составляли руководящую верхушку. В Чингиз-наме можно установить тип суперсложного общества, во главе которого стоял Темир Кутлу хан со своими четырьмя карачи-биями из родов Кият, Конграт, Катай, Салджут.

Результаты и научная новизна: Анализ источника позволяет дать ответ на вопрос, почему карачи-бии Большой Орды так отчетливо отличаются от карачей других постордынских государств?

Историк может почерпнуть информацию из этой истории как в отношении времени создания этого источника, так и о механизмах кочевнической администрации. То, что становится ясно из этой истории, это то, что кланы имели право сопротивляться и могли выйти из-под власти тиранического правителя в поисках нового. В степи не существовало такого закона, который мог бы позволить хану использовать силу в подобных случаях. Хан мог удерживать свою власть только путем подарков предводителям кланов и предоставления возможности регулярного получения военной добычи. Таким образом, хан был предводителем кочевнического общества только при поддержке глав кланов и не имел абсолютной власти над ними.

Ключевые слова: Поволжье, Дафтар-и Чингиз-наме, устная историографическая традиция, Золотая Орда, Большая Орда, Темир Кутлу хан, карачи-бии.

Для цитирования: Ivanics M. Memories of Statehood in the Defter-i Genghis-name // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2016. Т. 4, № 3. С. 570–579.

Сведения об авторе: Мария Иванич – доктор исторических наук, кафедра алтаистики Сегедского университета (6722, Egyetem u. 2, Сегед, Венгрия). E-mail: res13986@helka.iif.hu

Поступила 25.05.2016 г.

Принята к публикации 17.08.2016 г.