УДК 398.223 DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-2.274-284
EDN: CWXUQY

ON KADYR ALI-BEK'S NARRATIVE OF OGHUZ KHAN

Aslıhan Dinçer

İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University
İzmir, Turkey
aslihandincer@gmail.com

Abstract: *Research objectives:* The purpose of this study is to analyze the story of Oghuz Khan, which is located in the beginning of Kadyr Ali-bek's *Genghisnāma*; to compare this narrative with Rašīd al-Dīn's *Oghuznāma*, which is the main source of the work, and other variants of *Oghuznāma* and to reveal their similarities and original features.

Research materials: The sources used in this study mainly consist of Kadyr Ali-bek's work based on the Qazan manuscript and various Oghuznāma variants carrying Islamic motifs. The main sources include Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍlallāh's Oghuz narrative in *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, Yazïǰïoġlu ʻAli's *Tavārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*. The poetic Oghuznāmas, the pre-Islamic version, texts from the periods after Kadyr Ali-bek, and especially texts that do not share the same narrative structure and instead present different genealogical stories, were not influential in the comparative process.

Results and novelty of the research: Kadyr Ali-bek's work is known as *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* in the academic area, as it is considered a translation of Rašīd al-Dīn's work. However, when it comes to the Oghuz narrative, it can be seen that the author actually used other sources, but avoided mentioning their names. Comparisons with other Oghuznāma variants show that Kadyr Ali-bek either used the same source as Yazïǰïoġlu ʻAli, a 15th-century Ottoman historian who wrote *Tavārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*, or directly adapted his work. Because the composition of the two texts is almost the same when the omitted or removed parts from the text are set aside.

***Keywords*:** Oghuz Khan, *Oghuznāma*, Kadyr Ali-bek, *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, Yazïǰïoġlu ʻAli, *Tavārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*

For citation: Dinçer A. On Kadyr Ali-bek's narrative of Oghuz khan. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2023, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 274–284. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-2.274-284

To put it briefly Oghuz Khan narratives, comprise a collection of narratives that recount his life starting from his birth, wives, children, grandchildren, the peoples are together with him, conquests of him, the division of his country among his children. The term Oghuznāma is used as a more general and common title for these narrative in the literature.

The Oghuznāmas actually narrate the legendary history and genealogy of the Turks through Oghuz Khan. Since their emergence, the act of writing the Oghuznāma has gradually become a tradition among Turkish communities, and this collection of narratives has formed a private genre.

Although the Oghuznāmas are records of genealogies, they also serve as documents that provide information about *tamga*s (brands of animal), *onqun*s (totemic, sacred and symbolic animals), *ülüš*es (which part of which animal belongs to whom), *orun*s (hierarchical seating arrangement), and the rights and responsibilities in governance. In this sense, they have also functioned to regulate social life and governance. Therefore, the existence of such works, whether verbal or written, has become almost a necessity for the continuity of the state and the nation.

There are many surviving copies of Oghuznāma in various sizes that have been discovered to date. The only existing example that constitutes the pre-Islamic version of Oghuznāmas among them is the Oghuznāma written in Uighur script. This Oghuznāma has been excluded from comparison because it lacks some fundamental motifs found in Islamic versions, such as following Oghuz's genesis back to Noah, Oghuz being born as a Muslim, refusing his non-Muslim mother's milk, not loving his wifes who refuse to convert to Islam and fighting against his unbeliever father [see for a good study that analyzing this narrative 5].

The first Islamic version of Oghuznāmas is constituted by the Persian Oghuznāma, which is included in Rašīd al-Dīn's *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh.* In this place the Oghuz story appears twice. The first one is at the beginning of the book and serves as a brief summary. The other one is included in the second volume of the book, and is based on a more detailed and longer narrative [12].

Oghuznāma in *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* has served as a major source for later versions of Oghuznāma. Sümer [11, p. 360] evaluates this Oghuznāma by dividing it into five narrative layers: the story of Oghuz, the story of the Oghuz yabqus, the story of Qara Khan and Bugra Khan, the story of Šāh Mälik and the Säljuqs, and the story of various Turkish and Islamic dynasties.

Another early version is the Oghuznāma from Uzunköprü, which is the oldest known narrative written in poetry form. It is thought that this work in among the Eastern Turkish texts dated to the 13th or 14th century (6, p. 171–72). However, despite the unchanged basic motifs, this work, being in poetry form, has not been included in the scope of comparison.

Apart from the mentioned earliest dated works, various Oghuz narratives intertwined both with their independent status and the history of Genghis can be found in numerous linguistic geographies. However, the boundaries of this study consist of narratives preceding the year 1602, which is considered as the year Kadyr Ali-bek wrote his work.

According to this, the works named Qitāb-ï Diyārbäkriyyä and Tawārīkh-i Cedīd-i Mir'āt- ï Cihān, which are Aqqoyunlu Oghuznāmas; the Cām-ï Cäm-Āyīn and the Enverī's Oghuznāma, each of which are Ottoman Oghuznāmas; Nešrī's Oghuznāma, which kept Oghuz alive during the time of the prophet Abraham, is not included in the scope of this study (primarily because they offer different genealogies).

However, Tavārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk (2, 2009) by written Yazïǰïoġlu ʿAli in the 15th century, in the Murad II era; the Oghuznāma of Salar Baba (7, 2022), which is a translation of Rašīd al-Dīn's Oghuznāma into Chaghatay Turkish in 1556, the anonymous Tawārikh-i Güzidä-Nuṣrät-nāma written for Muhammad Šibāni Khan in the 16th century (9, 2022), and the anonymous Šibāni-nāma written in Chaghatay Turkish in the 16th century (3, 1849) have been specifically examined for the similarities they display in the narrative of Oghuz Khan. However, due to the significant resemblances observed particularly between Yazıcıoğlu's work and Kadyr Al''s work, the main focus of this study is delineated by these two works, which are notably distinct from the others.

By this time, there has not been any record of his original name in his issues, however, amongst researchers, Kadyr Ali-bek's work is being known as *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, which had been introduced to the science world in 1851 by the Russian orientalist I.N. Berezin. This work was of great interest for researchers due to the tribute to the tsar at the beginning of the Petersburg manuscript together with historical information on the Golden Horde inheritors. The related work had been drawn up and and completed in 1602 in the Kasim Khanate dedicated to the Tsar Boris Fedoroviç Godunov who ascented the throne in 1598. The content is starting with a brief story on Oghuz Khan, after mentioning diverse Mongolian tribes, the history of Genghis Khan, their ancestries, their sons and granchildren who became emperor as well as the successor states and ends with the section on Oraz Muhammed Khan taking the lead of Kasim Khanate [see for more detailed information 1].

Among all the manuscripts, the most comprehensive one is the Qazan manuscript, and therefore Alimov expanded his doctoral thesis based on this work and published its critical text [sc. 1] in Russian in 2022. This article also provides a basis on Alimov's findings and facsimiles of his copies, which he added to the end of the issue.

The work of Hisemiyeva [10], which is one of the latest publications on the subject, only covers Boris Khan's panegyric and the 10 original epic poems at the end. Therefore, the story of Oghuz Khan is not included in her work. Hence, Alimov's study remains the only reference source for Kadyr Ali-bek.

The narrative of Oghuz Khan that is creating the work of Kadyr Ali-bek is based on the introduction part of his first volume of *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* with its main storyline. As it is known, within the Oghuznāma rumors consisting Islamic motives, the oldest belongs to Rašīd al-Dīn that had been referred to as primary or secondary source for further Oghuznāmas being created afterwards. Although, despite the fact that is is an Iranian writing it has been of significant importance considering the Oghuznāma tradition as well as the related writings *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. The Oghuz narrative presented in Kadyr Ali-bek's manuscript is also referrering to *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh* in general terms, however, considering additions, removals, repeats and especially by looking at the complex information given on the Mongolian tribes, it can be understood that the writing is not the exact translation of *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*.

The general framework of the relevant section in the manuscript is about Oghuz Khan being descended from the lineage of Prophet Noah, inviting his mother to Islam as soon as he was born and drinking his mother's milk as soon as she became Muslim, the fact that he was given a name once he turned one year of age, his marriages, the war with his father, giving his tribes acting with him together the name (this section has been shortened, only Uighur's narrative has been explicated), the names of his sons and grandsons, dividing his six sons as Üčoq and Bozoq and sharing out the administration amongst them.

Furthermore, there has been a chapter included in the text in order to describe the *onqun*s (totemic animals), *ülüš*es (which part of which animal belongs to whom) and *tamga*s (brands of their animals). However, the *tamga*s are not illustrated here and also the meaning of *ülüš*es and *onqun*s are not given.

In the text, the military expedition and conquests, the war against *Qïl Baraq*, rumors on the Oghuz rulers are not given. But, in the manuscripts of Petersburg and London I, there is a brief section stated on the Oghuz's military expeditions. This section has been written in the Petersburg manuscript as marginal note in the book face 10a and in the London I manuscript 26/a which has been moved to the original text from the third line on. The fact that this section is based on *Šajara-i Türk* has been mentioned in the copies as below:

L_1: *"Šäcärä-i Türkī Ḫʷārazmī Abu'l-ġāzī Ḫān taṣnīfidä ušandaq aytmišdur"* (27a/2-3) >> "Abūʾl-Ghāzī Khan from Khwarezm said in the Šaǰara-i Turk arrengement"

However, considering that *Šaǰara-i Türk* has been completed after the death of Abūʾl-Ghāzī Bahādur Khan in 1663 [8, p. 22] and that the writing of Kadyr Ali was finished in 1602, it is obvious that these two are later additions.

The Oghuz narrative in the Qazan manuscript is firstly seen in the section "*äsāmī-i aqvām-i atrāk"* >> "names of Turkish tribes", following the title fihrist with the red ink between the lines 4a/4 and 4b/11.

This section is characterised as the abstract of the main narrative starting after a few passages. Whereby the main section taking place in 5b / 16th line under the title of "f*aṣl-i ävväl där-tārīḫ <u> ḥikāyät <-i Oġuz>*" >> chapter one: the history and stories (of Oghuz).

In fact, the London I manuscript directly contains the following title: "hazā där bäyān-i Oġuznāma ävväl äz-kitāb-i Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh" >> "the pronouncement of Oghuznama in the introductory section of the book Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh". In the Petersburg and Qazan manuscripts, these sections can be found with the title "faṣl-ı dibāce" >> "entrance section". However, the Oghuz narrative is not yet starting in this section. Here, the emergence of the nations on earth, in private as well of Turks and Mongol tribes is being explained.

As above-mentioned, the manuscript of Kadyr Ali-bek is not a whole translation of *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. In fact, even going too far we can argue that this section of Kadyr Ali was not written by considering *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. Because, by considering the detected lineage of the main Oghuz narratives within the Oghuznāma and Genghisnāma, Timurnāma, *Šibāninäma* carefully, it can be seen that the Oghuz section of Kadyr Ali overlapping with the section Oghuznāma added to the top of T*avārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*, by Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali to a great extent. The difference between both texts is that only one is written in Eastern Turkish and the other one in Western Turkish. Thus, there are two hypotheses: Either there is another common text both referred to or Kadyr Ali-bek has adjusted the Oghuznāma from Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali to Eastern Turkish. Hence, in order to state in particular with the Oghuz narratives, Kadyr Ali-bek did not directly issue the writing by considering *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*, but he referred to a work that is also based on the main sources among *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*.

Yazïǰïoġlu, is one of the historians during the Murad II. era. He has translated his work named T*avārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*, from the Iranian work *al-Awāmir al-ʿAlāʾiyya fi 'l-umūr al-ʿAlāʾiyya* written by Ibn Bībī at the request of the sovereign. However, his work cannot be considered as a mere translation, as he made additions and removals. It was remarkable with its many unique sections. There is no explicit information on the date of writing for the available diverse manuscripts, however, the common view is that it had been written in 1423 [2, p. XXXIII].

The text being referred to as Oghuznāma of Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali in the literature is taking place at the top part of T*avārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk*. The main source of the mentioned Oghuznāma again is *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*. But Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali himself is stating by giving the following references that he did not write the text Oghuznāma only by considering *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, but that there are also other Oghuznāmas among his sources:

"…Uiġur ḫaṭṭïy*ä*la Oġuznāmad*ä* yaz*ï*l*mïšdur*" (2b/6) >> "It is recorded in the *Oghuznäma* written in Uighur script."[1]

"…cüml*äsi*nüŋ *šä*rh*i* Oġuznām*adä* g*ė*lür" (2b/12) >> "The interpretation of all of them is convey in the Oghuznām*ä*."

[1] Transcription and translations are mine.

"Oġuz *šu'bäsi*: *šöylä* k*i*m anuŋ *šär*ḥi Oġuznām*ä*d*ä* v*ä* Jāmī'ü'l-Tavārīḫd*ä* g*e*lür" (2b/17) >> "Oghuz community: That is, its interpretation is convey in the Oghuznāma and *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*."

As these expressions are pointing out more than one source, the Oghuznāma of Yazïǰïoġlu is definitely not a direct translation of *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. In the circumstances, the fact that we thought Kadyr Ali-bek referred to the text of Yazïǰïoġlu or to a common source with him together, he did not directly make reference to *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. As yet, since there is no common footnote available (means Oghuznāma), the relevant section of text has been adjusted from Yazïǰïoġlu.

Nevertheless, the text of Kadyr Ali is partly or mostly being shortened. Due to the fact that the main focus is not on the Oghuz Khan narrative, it represents an example that seems like it has been assembled into the long work. Inherently, sometimes this situation is leading to the fact that complex, uninterested and meaningless compositions are created.

Especially in the last section of the Oghuznāma, it can be seen that those types of fiction problems are increasing. As an example, after Oghuz in accordance with his devise, Kün Khan from the Bozoqs needs to take his place. But, Kadyr Ali-bek enthroned Kün Khan while Oghuz was alive.

Another example is that, with the encouragement and advice of Ïrqïl K̲ ᵛāja, who was Oghuz's trusted person and also the vizier of Kün Khan, it was anticipate to give names, nicknames, oruns (hierarchical seating arrangement), *tamga*s (animal brands), *ülüš*es (which part of which animal belongs to whom), and *onqun*s (totemic animals) of the tribes. However, Kadyr Ali Bek does not provide any explanation of why Ïrqïl K̲ ᵛāja deemed these necessary for Kün Khan. As a result, it is not clearly stated to the reader what Kün Khan found reasonable and accepted. This subject is explained in the text as follows:

"Kün ḫān ol sözni qabūl ėtip v*ä* Yėnik*ä*nt *Ïrqï*l *K̲ᵛāja*ġa bu<yu>rup *oynu*q[2] bil*ä*n tamġan*ï* h*ä*r birisin*ä* ol b*e*lgi q*ï*ldï" (8b/12-13) >> "Kün Khan approved these words and told Ïrqïl K̲ᵛāja from Yėnikänt (to do this job). He determined *tamġa* (brand of their animals) for each of them with auspiciousness".

Those imprecise attitudes of the author that he actually wrote without understanding shows that he is not an expert of this subject and even that he did not graduated from a higher education.

The chronological summary of the overlapping and differing contents between Yazıcıoğlu's Oghuznāma (=YO) and Kadyr Ali-bek's Oghuznāma (=KAO) is as follows:

– In both texts, all Turkish tribes that are living as nomads derive from the descendants of Dib Yaquy (Baquy / Yawqu / Yaqub), son of Abulja Khan then again the son of Noah.

– In both works, the Prophet Noah has sent one of his sons Abulja Khan to the Northeast as well as Northwest parts of the world.

---

[2] اینق I think this word is *oynuq*, not *ïnaq*. Because the word *ïnaq*, which means "intimate friend, confident, (royal) favourite" [4, p. 182], does not suitable in this context. Yazïǰïoğlu's text also gives an idea about what meaning we can attribute to the word *oynuq*:

Vä här boya bir cānavarı maḫsūs ėtdilär ki anlaruŋ oyqunu ola vä bu lafzuŋ ištiqaqï oynuqdandur ki ol zamānuŋ Türkčäsincä kutluluqdur šöylä ki oynuq bolsun dėrlärmiš yani kutlu olsun dėmäkdür (10a/17-10b/2) >> They designated a living being as the *oyqun* (totemic animal) for each tribe and the cognate of this word is *oynuq*, which means "blessed" in the Turkish of that time. Namely, they say "oynuq bolsun", it means "blessed".

– In both texts, the four sons of Dib Yaquy are Qara Khan, Or Khan, Kür Khan and Küz Khan.

– In KAO, Oghuz and some of his brothers were together, but later the group split into two. However, in YO, this point was not simply mentioned in a single sentence. In YO, those who allied with Oghuz believed in God, and those who did not follow Oghuz continued to exist as infidels, and they were known as Mongols and Tatars.

– In both texts, Oghuz has 6 sons and 24 grandsons. Right wing was being managed by Kün/Gün, Ay, Yulduz and their sons, left wing by Kök/Gök, Taq/Daq and Tėŋiz/Dėŋiz as well as their sons.

– Those siblings and first cousins who allied with Oghuz are Uyġur, Qangli, Qïpčaq, Qarluq, Qalač and Aġačäri. Those who unaligned with Oghuz are his uncles Or Khan, Kür Khan, Küz Khan and their children. These two enemy tribes can be separated in two groups. One's origin and branches are unclear, whereby the other one is known in details. Here, the first group is actually not consisting of original Mongols, they took the Mongolian name later. There are many tribes originated from each of these branches and took diverse names. Whereby, the second group lived in rural areas nearby the previous ones. These are original Mongolians and they can be devided into two groups Alan Qoa and the Mongolians that have descended from Ergene Qon (Ergene Qol based on KAO). Alan Qoa Mongolians are also two groups. There are 16 Mongolian tribes attendant to the Nirun branch, whereby the other group is being mentioned as Hirun tribe (4b/7) based on YO. These are also called Qiyat. The name of the second tribe at KAO is also named as Nirun (5b/8) by mistake. In both works, Genghis Khan is mentioned to be from the Qïyat Mongols, however, considering KAO the tribe is called Borčïqïn and based on YO, it is called Yesar.

The short narrative by this point can be seen as the first part of both Oghuznāma's. This section is charactarised as a condensed abstract or a preparation section for the main narrative that will be given in details as below. Thus, KAO is also highlighting the introduction to the second part with a title in red ink:

"*faṣl-i ävväl där-tārīḫ <u> ḥikāyät <-i Oġuz>*" >> chapter one: the history and stories (of Oghuz) (5b/16).

– The second section is reminding that the Oghuz nation is consisting of 24 tribes including his sons, grandsons as well as some of Oghuz allies from his brothers and uncle's children, means Uighur, Qïpčaq, Qanglï, Qarluq and Qalač.

Here, the detail that shows the similarity of both texts is the fact that both counts the Aġačäri tribe amongst them. Whereas, in the abstract section of both texts that seems to be the first part are referring to the name Aġačäri.

– This section continues by referring to the Islamic histories and the Torah as well as the fact that the Prophet Noah has divided the earth from the north to the south among his three sons. Hereunder, the first part is about Ham, the mid part about Shem and the third section about Japheth. Here, it is indicated that Japheth was called Abulja Khan by Turks, however, it is unknown whether Abulja Khan is the son of the grandson of Noah in reality. It is only known that they certainly believe they come from his lineage. Here lastly, there are summer pasture as well as winter quarters presented.

– The next lines are stating Dib Yaquy the son of Abulja and his four sons. Oghuz was born as a muslim among the unbeliever Qara Khan and after inviting his mother to convert to Islam and after her acceptance of the invitation, he then started breastfeeding accordingly. When he turned one year of age and while he was about to be given a name, he began to talk and gave himself a name. When he matured, he got married with the daughter of his uncle Kür Khan by his father. Since she refused his invitation to convert to Islam, Oghuz absent himself from her and got married with the daughter

of Küz Khan by his father Qara Khan without knowing the situation. However, Oghuz stood away from the second girl since he could not find an answer to his invitation to convert to Islam.

In this respect, the following emphasis about the breach of morals through Oghuz is only highlighted at KAO and not in any other Oghuznāma:

"Andïn burun hīč kim ėrsä ėki ḫātūnnï yibärmäs ėrdi ušbu yoldan çïqtï" (7a/5-6) >> "No one had ever given up on two women before. He went too far (broke the rule)."

This aforesaid fiction ends with the fact that the third cousin accepts the Islam and gains the closeness to Oghuz.

– The next main topic is about how Oghuz's father finds out about his Islam through the previous two daughters in law and declared war against his son. While Qara Khan died by a stroke of the sword, the victor of the 75-lasting war has been Oghuz. At the final point, Oghuz took possession of those provinces up to Talas, Sayram and Buḫārā and the whole nation owed him obedience. Some brother and cousins, who were not allied with him settled in the eastern parts. All Mongols are descendants of these and all of them are unbelievers.

– Once Oghuz started reigning the states he conquered, he arranged a huge toy and presented diverse gifts to the leading principalities with his brothers together.

– The next section of the narrative is about Oghuz giving names to allied tribes. However, KAO has only put the narrative of giving Uighur the name here. He explains this by shortening and sluring over. Right after, even it is said "vä taqï <bir> qavmġa Qanġlï at bėrdilär" (8b/6-7) >> "And he gave another tribe the name Qanglï" there is no explanation about it. Whereas YO is explaining in detail on what grounds the names Uighur, Qanglï, Qïpčaq, Qarluq, Qalač, Aġačäri were given. Even the history given here of Aġačäri are not stated in other Oghuznāma sources.

– Actually, the similarity expression between KAO and YO are thus far. From here, the author has skipped several sentences, lines, words or passages at the expense of spoiling the fiction and did not want to extent the history of Oghuz. Although, Oghuz wished that after him Kün Khan and then Ay Khan to get selected as mentioned at YO, referring to KAO, it is mentioned that Kün Khan got enthroned while Oghuz was alive.

– In the next section, Oghuz has conquered Iran, Turan, Šam, Mïsïr, Rum, Äfränč (is not given at YO) and other countries and returned to his actual hometown and organised a big toy. After his three big sons returned after hunting with a bow in their hand, he shared the bow with his big sons and shared the arrow with his small sons. Those, who bring bow are called *Bozoq* and those who bring arrow are named *Üčoq*. He also shares the administration among these two arms and recommends to select one of the Bozoq arm for the management.

– In addition, during the reign of Kün Khan in the YO, the vizier Ïrqïl K̲ᵛāja advised Kün Khan that, in accordance with Oghuz Khan's will, *orun* (hierarchical seating arrangement), *tamga* (animal brand), *ülüš* (which part of which animal belongs to whom), and *onqun*s (totemic animal) of the Oghuz tribes should be determined to prevent any disputes over property, wealth, and superiority among the brothers. Kün Khan supported this idea and entrusted Ïrqïl K̲ᵛāja with the task of determining the *tamga, ongun, ülüš* of the tribes. However, in KAO, the details of this dialogue are not available, making the plot unclear:

"Kün ḫān ol sözni qabūl ėtip vä Yėnikänt Ïrqïl K̲ᵛājaġa bu<yu>rup *oynu*q bilän tamġanï här birisinä ol bėlgi qïldï" (8b/12-13) >> "Kün Khan approved these words and told Ïrqïl K̲ᵛāja from Yėnikänt (to do this job). He determined *tamġa* (brand of their animals) for each of them with auspiciousness".

Since there is only the above-mentioned sentence assembled to the text, there is no answer for which statement Kün Khan accepts and who Ïrqïl Ḵᵛāja is. It is also not clar, whether Kün Khan made the identifikation or Ïrqïl Ḵᵛāja.

– The last section of the narrative is about the of tribes *tamga*s (animal brands), *ülüš*es (which part of which animal belongs to whom), and *onqun*s (their totemic animals) in the order of YO. The drawings of *tamga*s are so clear that they cannot be seen in any Oghuznāma. *Onqun*s and *ülüš*es are also given in detail. There is no such information in KAO; only the meanings of the tribe names are given, and there are some noticeable regularities in this regard.

I think the most basic and important difference that catches the attention between the two texts is that the references cited by YO are not mentioned by KAO. Moreover, most of these references are recorded as Oghuznāma. This situation can be explained by two reasons.

First, we might think that Kadyr Ali-bek wanted to hide the sources for any reason. Second, the names of the sources might have been included by Yazïǰïoġlu ʿAli in order to give confidence to his manuscript. But, when we consider the second possibility, the source text is not Yazïǰïoġlu, but there must be another common source he has made use of.

Yazïǰïoġlu

-*…cüml*ä Dürlikin Moġollar*ï ve Nirun* Moġollar*ï ki ḫāṣ M*oġollar d*ururlar š*öylä ki anlaruŋ z̲ikri ve *ḫiq*āyätläri Ġazan ***Ḫ***ān raḥimähull***āh tārīḫind***ä ***g***älür (2a/17–2b/1) >> "Such that, the mentions and stories of all the Dürlikin Mongols and Nirun Mongols - who are the real Mongols- is convey in the history of Gazan Khan -God have mercy on him-."

-vä baʿ*żï* qavmlar*ï* ki anuŋ*ï*la müttäfiq old*ï*lar iki q*ï*sm old*ï*lar vä cümlesinüŋ *š*ärḥi Oġuznāmädä gälür (2b/12) >> "And some tribes who were with him became two groups, and the interpretation of all of them is convey in the Oghuznāma."

-Oġuz *š*uʿbäsi *š*öylä kim anuŋ *š*ärḥi Oġuznāmädä vä Cāmiü't Tevārīḫdä gälür (2b/17) >> "Oghuz community: That is, its interpretation are convey in the Oġhuznām*a* and *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*."

-vä ol ḫālüŋ *š*ärḥi böylädür ki Oġuzuŋ alt*ï* oġl*ï* var*ï*d*ï* anlaruŋ ad*ï* i*š*bu tafẓīl vä tärtībcä Gün, Ay, Y*ï*lduz, Gök, Daq, Dėŋiz *š*öylä ki anlaruŋ tevārīḫindä Oġuznāmädä gälmi*š*dür (9a/11–12) >> "And the interpretation of that situation is as follows: Oghuz had six sons. Their names, in order and sequence of Gün, Ay, Yïlduz, Gök, Daq, and Dėŋiz, are convey in their own histories, in Oġhuznāma."

Kadyr Ali-bek

-*Anlardïn öniŋni v*ä ġayr häm cümläsin Moġol Dürlikin tėp ayturlar *v*ä taq*ï* qavm-i Nirun kim *ḫāṣ M*oġol turur andaġ kim öniŋ qavmlarn*ï* ***mašrūḥ v***ä mufaṣṣalda tiläsä kälür >> "They call someone else and all others Mongol Dürlikin and the Nirun tribe – which is the real Mongol – if the interpretation and details of other tribes are requested, is convey."

– Baʿż qarïndašlarï bilän bir ėdilär ėki böläk boldïlar vä šärḥ-i cümlä tiläsä kälür tā maʿlūm qïlġïl (4a/9-10) >> "They were together with some of their brothers and became two groups, and if requested, the interpretation of all of them are convey for you to learn."

– Šuʿbä-i Oġuz uruġïn andaġ tiläsä kälür (4a/11–12) >> "If requested in that manner, the branches of the Oghuz tribe is convey."

– Vä šärḥ-i ḥāl andaġ ėrdi kim Oġuznïŋ altï oġlï bar ėrdi. Anlarnïŋ atlar<ï> munuŋ-dėk tafṣīldä kälip turur: Kün, Ay, Yulduz, Kök, Ṭaq, Dėŋiz (8b/9-11) >> "And

the interpretation of the situation is that Oghuz had six sons. Their names is convey as follows: Kün, Ay, Yulduz, Kök, Ṭaq, Dėŋiz."

Conclusion

The existing copies of Kadyr Ali-bek's work begin with a shortened version of the story of Oghuz Khan, except for the section on praising the czar added to the beginning of the Petersburg manuscript. Namely this section begin as (faṣl-i dībāčä) the introduction section of the work. The composition and plot of this narrative are largely based on the Oghuznāma section of the *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. However, it is understood from some additions and omissions that Kadyr Ali-bek did not write this section by directly referring to *Jāmīʿ al-tawārīkh*. In fact upon careful comparison, it becomes apparent that this text bears similarity to the Oghuznāma found at the beginning of Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali's T*avārikh-i Āl-i Selǰuk* rather than Rašid al-Din's version. The presence of parallel passages, shared fictional elements, similar sentence structures, and sometimes identical word choices between these two different versions indicates a clear connection between the texts. In this case, there are two possibilities. Either both authors used a common source work, or specifically in the story of Oghuz Khan, Kadyr Ali-bek saw Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali's work and translated it into Eastern Turkish. The main and original claim of this article is to draw attention to the similarity in composition and plot between the two texts. Did Yazïǰïoġlu 'Ali have any other written sources that he did not mention in his work? It only provides the name of the Oghuznāma written in Uighur script; so what were the other Oghuznāma or Oghuznāmas that he named Oghuznāma? And when Kadyr Ali-bek wrote his work, which written sources did he use? Could he have deliberately erased the names of the sources he used? Was there some other subtext that both authors used? We currently do not have the answers to these questions, and therefore, we cannot fully explain the real reason for the closeness between the two texts.

REFERENCES

1. Alimov R. *Kadyr Ali-bek: Jami al-tawarikh. Facsimile of the manuscript* / critical edition, research, translation from Turkic and glossary by R. Alimov; under scientific supervision by I.M. Mirgaleev. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of the Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2022. 544 p. (In Russian)

2. Bakır A. *Yazıcızâde Ali: Tevârîh-i Âl-i Selçuk [Selçuklu Tarihi]*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2009. 998 p. (In Turkish)

3. Berezin I. *Sheybaniada: Istoriya mongola-tyurkov na dzhagatayskom dialekte.* Biblioteka vostochnykh, vol. 1. Kazan, 1849 (In Russian)

4. Clauson Sir G. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish.* Oxford: Oxford University Publ., 1972. 989 p.

5. Danka, B. *The 'Pagan' Oγuz-namä, A Philological and Linguistic Analysis*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019. 377 p.

6. Eraslan K. "Manzum Oğuzname". *Türkiyat Mecmuası XVIII.* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Türkiyat Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1976, pp. 169–244. (In Turkish)

7. Güler M. *Salar Baba Oğuznâmesi (İnceleme, Metin, Tercüme, Sözlük).* İstanbul: DBY Yayınları, 2022. 428 p. (In Turkish)

8. Kargı Ölmez Z. *Ebulgazi Bahadır Han: Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soy Kütüğü)*. Ankara: Simurg Yayıncılık, 1996. 560 p. (In Turkish)

9. Kaya H. *Tevârîh-i Güzîde-Nusret-Nâme.* (In Turkish). Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 2022. 469 p. (In Turkish)

10. Khisamieva Z.A. *The language of the dastans of Kadyr Ali-bek*. Kazan: Marjani Institute of History of the Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2022. 244 p. (In Russian)

11. Sümer F. "Oğuzlara Ait Destani Mahiyette Eserler. "*Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 17, 1954, pp. 359–456. (In Turkish)

12. Thackston W.M. *Rashiduddin Fazlullah: Jami'u't-tawarikh. A Compendium of Chronicles: A History of the Mongol, vol.* 1–2–3, Harvard: Harvard University Publ., 1998. 819 p.

About the author: Aslıhan Dinçer – Associate Professor of Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University (Balatçık Mah, Havaalanı Şosesi Cd., no: 33/2, İzmir 35620, Turkey); ORCID: 0000-0002-2055-1809. E-mail: aslihandincer@gmail.com

Received March 16, 2023 Accepted for publication May 26, 2023
Published June 29, 2023

О ПОВЕСТВОВАНИИ КАДЫР АЛИ-БЕКА ОБ ОГУЗ-ХАНЕ

Аслыхан Динчер

Измирский университет имени Катипа Челеби
Измир, Турция
aslihandincer@gmail.com

Цель исследования: целью данного исследования является анализ рассказа об Огуз-хане, который находится в начале дастана о Чингиз-хане Кадыр Али-бека; сравнение этого рассказа с «Огуз-наме» из «Сборник летописей» Рашид ад-Дина, который является одним из источников произведения, и другими вариантами «Огуз-наме» и выявление их сходства и оригинальных черт, если таковые имеются.

Материалы исследования: Источники, использованные в данном исследовании, в основном состоят из работы Кадыра Али-бека (казанский список) и различных вариантов «Огуз-наме», несущих исламские мотивы. Основные источники включают перевод «Огуз-наме» Рашид ад-Дина Фазлуллаха на турецкий язык, выполненный Заки Валиди Тоганом, «Таварих-и Ал-и Сельджук» Язичи-заде Али, «Джами Джемайн» Хасана бин Махмуда ал-Баяти, «Шеджере-и Теракиме» и «Шеджере-и Тюрк» Абульгази Бахадир-хана, а также «Огуз-наме» Нешри из его произведения «Джиханнаме». Поэтические формы «Огуз-наме» в этом исследовании не играют главной роли.

Результаты и новизна исследования: Труд Кадыр Али-бека в научной среде известен как «Джами ат-таварих», так как он считается переводом труда Рашид ад-Дина. Однако, когда речь идет об огузском повествовании, видно, что автор действительно использовал другие источники, но избегал упоминания их названий. Сравнение с другими огузскими вариантами показывает, что Кадыр Али-бек либо использовал тот же источник, что и Язичи-заде Али, османский историк XV века, написавший «Таварих-и Ал-и Сельджук», либо непосредственно адаптировал его работу. Если отбросить опущенные или изъятые из текста части, композиция двух текстов практически одинакова.

Ключевые слова: Огуз-хан, Огуз-наме, Кадыр Али-бек, «Джами ат-таварих», Язичи-заде Али, «Таварих-и Ал-и Сельджук»

Для цитирования: Dinçer A. On Kadyr Ali-bek's narrative of Oghuz khan // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2023. Т. 11, № 2. С. 274–284. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-2.274-284 EDN: CWXUQY

Сведения об авторе: Аслыхан Динчер – доцент кафедры турецкого языка и литературы факультета социальных и гуманитарных наук, Измирский университет имени Катипа Челеби (35620, провинция Балатчик, шоссе Аэропорт, 33/2, Измир, Турция); ORCID: 0000-0002-2055-1809. E-mail: aslihandincer@gmail.com

Поступила 16.03.2023 Принята к публикации 26.05.2023
Опубликована 29.06.2023