

Suleimenova D. K. 

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

E-mail: Suleimenova911@gmail.com

IMAGES OF EDIGE AND TOKHTAMYSH IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORIOGRAPHY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF APPROACHES

Abstract. Purpose and significance of the research. The aim of this article is to analyze and compare modern historiographical approaches to the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh, prominent figures of the Golden Horde during the late 14th to early 15th centuries. The research highlights how these figures are interpreted in current academic discourse and why those interpretations differ across scholarly traditions. The significance lies in understanding the role of historical narratives in shaping collective memory and national identity. Novelty, directions, and research ideas. This study focuses not on primary source analysis but on evaluating interpretations in contemporary historiography. It highlights how Eastern (mostly Turkic and Central Asian) and Western (primarily Russian and European) scholars construct divergent narratives about Edige and Tokhtamysh. The novelty is in revealing the influence of national historiographical traditions on academic interpretation. Scientific objectives and practical value. The objectives are to: identify dominant historiographical approaches to both figures; compare interpretive tendencies across regions; assess how these interpretations reflect broader ideological and cultural contexts. The findings are relevant for historians studying Eurasian identity, political symbolism, and historical memory. Methodological characteristics. The article employs historiographical and comparative methods. It is based on qualitative analysis of academic literature, focusing on interpretation strategies, argumentation patterns, and the national context of scholarly production. Main findings and conclusion. Eastern historiography often portrays Edige and Tokhtamysh as stabilizing forces and legitimate heirs to the Jochid tradition. In contrast, Western scholarship emphasizes their roles in political conflict and military aggression. These contrasting narratives are rooted in differing historical experiences and academic traditions. The study concludes that further research should expand the comparative scope and include memory studies, cultural representations, and interdisciplinary analysis.

Acknowledgement: The research was carried out with the support of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan within the framework of grant funding (project IRN BR24992878 – Study of the ethnopolitical and socio-economic history of the Ulus of Jochi in the 13th–15th centuries).

Key words: Tokhtamysh, Edige, Golden Horde, Edige epic, comparative analysis, Eurasia.

Introduction

The figures of Edige and Tokhtamysh occupy a key place in the political history of the Golden Horde in the late 14th – early 15th centuries. Their confrontation reflected the dramatic processes of the disintegration of centralized authority and the transformation of the imperial governance model, as well as the struggle for legitimacy and control over the steppe lands of Eurasia. The significance of these personalities extends beyond local history: Tokhtamysh, who sought to restore the unity of the Horde, and Edige, who embodied a new form of biy power under a weak khan, became symbols of two models of political legitimation – the sacred Khanship and the military charisma of the emiral nobility.

The history of the Golden Horde is the subject of active scholarly debate in modern historiography. Various and sometimes opposite evaluations of these figures are presented in the academic literature. In this regard, studying modern approaches and interpretations in domestic and foreign historiography is particularly relevant. The aim of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of contemporary historiographical approaches to studying the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh and to identify the causes of differences and similarities in the assessments of these figures by modern researchers. To achieve the stated goal, the following tasks were set:

1. Examine the main directions of modern historiography related to the study of the figures of Edige and Tokhtamysh.

2. Conduct a comparative analysis of Eastern and Western historiographical traditions and identify characteristic features of their interpretations.

3. Identify the reasons for differences and similarities in the approaches of modern scholars to assessing the activities and historical role of Edige and Tokhtamysh.

The article employs historiographical and comparative approaches, allowing for critical analysis and comparison of the scholarly works and approaches of various researchers, revealing the specific positions and arguments of each.

Materials and Methods

The research materials consist of scholarly works by modern domestic and foreign authors devoted to the study of the history of the Golden Horde, in particular, the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh.

The source base of the study covers a wide range of Eastern and Western materials, including: Eastern chronicles – Persian (primarily Sheref ad-Din Yazdi's *Zafar-nama*), Timurid, Ottoman, and Muslim annals mentioning the Golden Horde, Tokhtamysh, and Edige (including Muizz al-Ansab, Ottoman chronicles, later Uzbek and Kazakh compilations); Turkic-language epic traditions and folk versions of the dastan “Idegey,” represented in Tatar, Nogai, Bashkir, Kazakh, Crimean Tatar, and Uzbek traditions (based on the works of Iskhakov 2024, Mukhametzyanova, Eshchanova, Zakirova, Fazlutdinov 2024, etc.); Western written sources – Russian chronicles of the 14th–15th centuries (including accounts of Tokhtamysh's campaigns against Moscow and Edige's raid in 1408), Lithuanian chronicles (chiefly in the context of Tokhtamysh's alliance with Vytautas), Byzantine testimonies, as well as echoes of these figures in Western European narratives.

Additionally, later interpretations of the era, such as the work of Kadir-Ali Bek (*Jami at-Tawarikh*, early 17th century), which is not a primary source but is significant as an element of historical memory and dynastic legitimation of post-Horde states (e.g., the Qasim Khanate), were taken into account. Its use in this study aims to analyze the transformation of the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh in later Turkic-Mongol political traditions.

Methodologically, the study is grounded in historiographical and comparative approaches, enabling critical analysis of diverse scholarly concepts. Comparing these two traditions helps to identify not only regional differences in the perception of Tokhtamysh and Edige but also the deeper cultural and political foundations of these interpretations, thereby contributing to a broader understanding of the historical memory of the Golden Horde and its legacy in post-Horde societies.

Discussion

In modern Eastern historiography, the epic tradition about Edige presents him primarily as a representative of Jochi's ulus sovereignty, albeit in new forms (Iskhakov, 2024: 835). In the Uzbek version of the dastan (based on G. A. Eshchanova's materials), Edige is depicted as one who knew how to build a vertical power structure and act in the interests of stability. In the Tatar and Nogai traditions, Edige is the central heroic figure, and the epic “Idegey” has “spread” across all regions of the Kipchak world (Zakirova, 2024). In the Bashkir and Kazakh variants, represented in the studies

of Ualiev and Kushkumbaev (2024), Edige's figure acquires features of political giftedness and even genius after the Horde's disintegration (Salmanov, 2023).

In the Western historiographical tradition—encompassing Russian, Lithuanian, Byzantine, and Western European sources—Tokhtamysh appears primarily in the context of military and conflict narratives. Russian chronicles of the 14th–15th centuries portray him as a major adversary, associating his campaigns with upheavals in neighboring principalities (Kemaloglu, Favereau, 2021). The Lithuanian chronicles, in contrast, often emphasize his legitimacy and strategic importance in alliance with Vytautas (Parunin, 2019). Byzantine accounts introduce Tokhtamysh and Timur more as external figures affecting the balance of power in the Christian East than as internal Horde actors (Kemaloglu 2024).

Results

The conducted historiographical analysis revealed substantial divergences in scholarly approaches to depicting Edige and Tokhtamysh, rooted in the differing cultural and ideological assumptions of researchers. Eastern chronicles and Turkic epic traditions construct the images of these figures by emphasizing their sacred legitimacy and roles as unifiers and stabilizers of the ulus. In contrast, Western sources—particularly Russian and European narratives—tend to foreground the military campaigns of Tokhtamysh and the conflictual nature of Edige's ascendancy, associating both leaders primarily with episodes of destruction or political upheaval in neighboring states.

The differences in the interpretation of the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh are conditioned not only by the nature of the sources themselves but also by the deep-seated processes of historical memory formation in different societies. In the Eastern tradition, where the idea of the sacred authority of the Chinggisids and the central role of the Horde persisted, the images of these leaders were transformed within the framework of the concept of legitimacy. In the Western tradition—primarily Russian and Lithuanian—the emphasis shifted to questions of military threat and geopolitical struggle. These differences in perception demonstrate how historical figures were adapted within the collective memory of various peoples.

The late 14th century was marked by a crisis of dynastic legitimacy in the Golden Horde and a growing role of beks (beglerbeks) and regional elites. Tokhtamysh, relying on the support of Emir Timur, managed in the 1380s to unite the Golden and White Hordes and restore central authority, temporarily stabilizing the political system of the Ulus of Jochi. One of the most significant events of this period was the burning of Moscow in 1382, which became a symbol of the return of Golden Horde hegemony in Eastern Europe. However, Tokhtamysh's ambitions soon clashed with the interests of his former patron (Mirgaleev, 2003).

The rupture between Tokhtamysh and Timur led to a series of military campaigns, culminating in the destruction of the Horde's capital, Sarai, in 1395. This catastrophe marked the beginning of a new phase of fragmentation, in which actual power concentrated in the hands of emirs. Against this backdrop emerged the figure of Edige—a beglerbek of Manghit origin—who, without claiming the khan's title, became the de facto ruler of vast territories of the Ulus of Jochi (Pochekaev, 2017: 35).

As A. V. Parunin notes, it was precisely after Tokhtamysh's defeat that “the period of institutionalization of the beks' authority began,” and Edige came to represent a new model of power based not on Chinggisid legitimacy, but on control over the military and administrative infrastructure of the Horde (Parunin, 2019: 452).

Tokhtamysh, a descendant of Tuy-Khoja, came to power in the White Horde with the active support of Timur, who sought to establish a dependent ruler in Tokhtamysh to control the Kipchak steppe. However, after consolidating his power, Tokhtamysh pursued an independent foreign policy, including expansion into the Transcaucasian region, which led to open conflict with Timur (Sabitov, 2016).

The 1395 campaign ended in a complete defeat for Tokhtamysh. Persian chronicles, including Sharaf ad-Din Yazdi's *Zafar-nama*, provide a vivid account of the Horde's devastation and the

khan's flight. According to Yazdi, Timur regarded Tokhtamysh as a treacherous vassal who had broken his oath, which justified the military intervention in terms of sacred law (Sharaf ad-Din Ali Yazdi, 1972).

After Tokhtamysh's flight, Edige took up a strategic position—he did not claim the khan's title but instead installed puppet khans from the Chinggisid line who were dependent on him, thus securing political legitimacy. In 1399, he defeated Tokhtamysh at the Vorskla River alongside a Horde–Lithuanian coalition, which marked the final end of the former khan's ambitions to restore sole rule over the Horde (Pochekaev, 2017: 126–127).

Throughout the first two decades of the 15th century, Edige governed the Golden Horde through a system of controlled puppet khans. His policy reveals the features of a farsighted centralizing strategy: suppression of internal revolts, diplomatic contact with Rus and Lithuania, and the struggle for control over the treasury in Sarai. In Eastern narratives, he is portrayed as the “gatherer of the Horde,” restoring lost unity after the chaos of Tokhtamysh's rule.

Despite his defeats, Tokhtamysh continued the struggle, relying on the support of the Lithuanian prince Vytautas. His final political base became the Tyumen Khanate, where he established a yurt uniting his supporters and relatives. According to a number of sources, he was killed by Edige's men in 1406 in the Trans-Ural region, on the territory of what would later become the Siberian Khanate. His death marked the transition to a new political configuration, in which power shifted from a vertical khanate model to a clan-based system of military aristocracy (Zlygostev, 2012: 413).

The image of Tokhtamysh in Eastern sources is dual and contradictory. In the Persian and Timurid chronicle tradition, he is usually portrayed through the lens of his conflict with Tamerlane, which inevitably colors his characterization. While in the early years of his rule he was recognized as a legitimate khan who had united the Ulus of Jochi, after his break with Timur his portrayal takes on features of a traitor and a strategically short-sighted ruler.

The most significant source is *Zafar-nama* by Sharaf ad-Din Yazdi, who, as Timur's court historian, depicts Tokhtamysh as a “breaker of oaths” who rebelled against the will of his benefactor. Yazdi emphasizes Tokhtamysh's betrayal and treachery, contrasting him with the image of a just and magnanimous Timur. In this narrative scheme, Tokhtamysh plays the role of a political anti-hero—outwardly legitimate but internally unstable, a ruler whom history punished for his ingratitude.

Other sources from the same tradition, particularly *Mu'izz al-ansāb* and Ottoman chronicles of the 15th century, offer similar interpretations, though with a lesser degree of bias. Ottoman authors, interested in establishing dynastic parallels, sometimes depict Tokhtamysh as a tragic figure, emphasizing his noble lineage but fateful inability to retain power.

In the Tatar tradition, by contrast, the image of Tokhtamysh is far less negative. The chronicles of Kazan and Crimea preserve the memory of him as a legitimate khan who fought for the Horde until the end of his life. In particular, in the Tatar version of the epic *Idegey* (compiled by Naki Isanbet and its historiographic adaptation), Tokhtamysh is not portrayed as a traitor but as a political rival who failed to overcome the challenges of his time, yet retained his dignity.

Recent studies also highlight the existence of texts in which Tokhtamysh is depicted as a victim of circumstance, overwhelmed by an external force—Timur—and betrayed by part of the nobility, especially the Manghits. In the oral tradition of Uzbek Khwarezm, the name of Tokhtamysh is remembered in the context of a tragic ruler who was exiled from his land but maintained his honor until the end.

The image of Edige in the Eastern Muslim and Turkic tradition is shaped at the intersection of epic, political, and sacral narratives. Unlike Tokhtamysh—whose portrayal in sources ranges from legitimate khan to traitor—Edige consistently appears as a defender and continuator of the Horde tradition. In various sources, he is interpreted either as a statesman-hero or as an emir-collector of lands acting in the interests of the ulus.

Chronicles of the Timurid circle, such as *Zafar-nama*, and later works of the Uzbek tradition confirm Edige's political significance as one of the last effective organizers of Horde power. He is presented as a "ruler without a throne," a man who controlled the appointment of khans, diplomatic missions, tax collection, and foreign policy. Persian sources, in contrast to Russian ones, describe him with respect—as a political actor resisting anarchy, rather than an impostor (Sharaf ad-Din Ali Yazdi, 1972: 385).

The most developed image of Edige is found in the Turkic epic heritage. The *dastan Idegey* (also rendered as *Edige* or *Yedige* in different traditions) represents a unique genre synthesis: on the one hand, it retains the folkloric poetics of the heroic epic; on the other, it contains numerous insertions that refer to the historical realities of the late Golden Horde, especially its clan and military structure.

Research shows that in the epic, Edige appears as a representative of the "white bone" (*ak süyek*), a bearer of the sacred military function, associated with the symbolism of the golden throne, the khan's bird, and legitimate right. He is both Tokhtamysh's opponent and his successor, for Edige's goal becomes the preservation of the Ulus of Jochi's integrity, albeit in new forms (Iskhakov, 2024: 835).

In the Uzbek version of the *dastan* (based on materials by G. A. Eshchanova), Edige is portrayed as a mediator between the destructive legacy of Tokhtamysh and a new political reality. His diplomatic and strategic qualities dominate over his image as a warrior. In particular, emphasis is placed on his ability to resolve intertribal conflicts, build a vertical power structure, and act in the interest of stability.

In the Tatar and Nogai traditions, Edige is a central heroic figure, a symbol of the continuity of statehood from the Golden Horde to the later Turkic khanates (Mukhametzhanova, 2024: 742). In Naki Isanbet's compiled version, he is endowed with the traits of the ideal ruler: wisdom, loyalty to the Horde, and strategic thinking. In the Nogai version of the epic, as analyzed by I. G. Zakirova, Edige personifies legitimacy itself—he is not merely an emir, but a "father of the people," a figure who "carried the epic" to all regions of the Kipchak world (Zakirova, 2024).

In the Bashkir and Kazakh versions, studied by A. S. Salmanov, T. A. Ualiev, and A. K. Kushkumbaev, the image of Edige retains features of sacred charisma, but is supplemented by motifs of exile, return, and sacrifice. He often becomes a keeper of the memory of the Golden Horde and a symbol of resistance to chaos following its collapse (Ualiev & Kushkumbaev, Salmanov, 2023).

In the Western historiographical tradition—encompassing Russian, Lithuanian, Byzantine, and to some extent Western European sources—the image of Tokhtamysh is constructed primarily through the lens of foreign policy conflicts and diplomatic alliances. Here, he is not viewed as a figure of internal political development but as a player on the Eurasian geopolitical stage—an enemy of Moscow, an ally of Lithuania, and a subject of Byzantine allusions to the rivalry among Muslim powers (Kemaloglu, Favereau 2021).

In the Russian chronicle tradition, Tokhtamysh appears as one of the main adversaries of the Russian principalities. The burning of Moscow in 1382 became deeply ingrained in historical memory and formed the basis of his negative image. According to *The Tale of the Great Devastation of Moscow*, he is portrayed as a cruel, vengeful conqueror who deceitfully entered the city by taking advantage of the Russians mistaking him for Mamai's ally.

Gradually, as Muscovite chronicle writing developed, Tokhtamysh's image lost the details of his Chinggisid legitimacy and took on a near-mythical character—as the embodiment of an external threat that Rus' had to confront on the eve of its rise (Gromenko, 2015: 50).

A completely different image of Tokhtamysh appears in the Lithuanian chronicles. There, he is depicted as an ally of Grand Duke Vytautas. This alliance, directed first against Timur and later against Edige, was seen as part of a broader anti-Asian coalition. Vytautas's diplomatic

correspondence with various European courts suggests that the alliance with Tokhtamysh was regarded as legitimate and strategically significant (Parunin, 2019: 439).

A. V. Parunin and other contemporary researchers emphasize that it was precisely Lithuania's support that enabled Tokhtamysh not only to continue the struggle for the throne but also to establish a unique form of "emigration khanate" on Lithuania's eastern frontier—a base for the restoration of the Horde.

In the Byzantine chronicles, where the figures of Tokhtamysh and Timur appear in the context of Ottoman pressure, the khan's image emerges as a figure of external chaos—alongside Tamerlane. His involvement in the conflict is perceived more as influencing the relationship between Byzantium and the Ottomans, rather than as an internal issue of the Horde (Kemaloglu, 2024: 891).

In Western European sources, references to Tokhtamysh are extremely fragmentary. They are typically related either to the dispatch of embassies (via Vytautas) or to descriptions of Timur's wars and his "Eastern adversaries." Tokhtamysh appears in the European perception more as an "exotic barbarian ruler" than as a historical figure with a deep political agenda (Favereau, 2021:107).

Whereas Tokhtamysh's image in the Western tradition fluctuates between that of a tragic figure and an enemy, the image of Edige is much more uniform: he is generally portrayed as a "treacherous conqueror" who conducted devastating raids on Rus' and posed a threat to Christian lands.

The Russian chronicle tradition developed a consistently negative image of Edige as a lawless emir who violated international obligations. His raid of 1408, during which Kolomna, Ryazan, Pereslavl, and Yuriev were destroyed and Moscow was besieged, became the second most traumatic event after Tokhtamysh's campaign. In *The Tale of Edige's Invasion*, he is depicted as an avenger acting out of personal resentment rather than political rationale.

At the same time, in the late medieval tradition, the figure of Edige begins to lose specificity, and his image merges with other nomadic threats. Nevertheless, in a number of texts from the 14th–15th centuries, his ability to control khans and govern the Horde from behind the scenes is emphasized, adding to his portrayal as politically gifted, even brilliant.

In Lithuanian sources, Edige is interpreted as Tokhtamysh's antagonist and, therefore, an adversary of Lithuania. Some chronicles, such as the *Bykhovets Chronicle*, depict him as a military leader seeking to weaken Lithuania by striking its allies. In these texts, his actions are often framed within the conflict of 1399 and the Battle of the Vorskla River, where the Lithuanian army suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Horde coalition led by Edige.

Byzantine and Western European references to Edige are rare and generally limited to brief mentions of "khanal advisors" or "great emiral houses" controlling the Horde. Unlike Tokhtamysh, Edige does not appear in Western diplomatic correspondence, but his raids are indirectly understood as a continuation of the "Eastern threat" (Kemaloglu, 2024).

The images of Tokhtamysh and Edige were shaped amid deep political and cultural polarization between the Islamic East and the Christian West. This is evident primarily in the differing narrative strategies through which both figures are described in the sources.

In the Eastern tradition—especially in Turkic-Persian chronicles and epic tales—both rulers are evaluated in the context of restoring or preserving political order. Tokhtamysh appears as a bearer of Chinggisid legitimacy, a khan who sought to reunite the Horde but was ultimately defeated by an external enemy and internal destabilizers. Edige, on the other hand, is portrayed as a pragmatic emir embodying the principle of "real power," a defender and reformer of the Horde acting on behalf of weak but legitimate khans.

In the Western tradition, by contrast, the emphasis on sacred legitimacy is not of primary importance. Here, Tokhtamysh is seen as the destroyer of Moscow, and Edige as a symbol of the renewed nomadic threat. Both figures are presented through the prism of their interaction with the

Christian world: Tokhtamysh as a barbarian traitor or an “inconvenient ally” of Lithuania, Edige as a “ruthless emir” bringing raids, fires, and sieges.

Comparative analysis shows that Eastern narratives are dominated by a vertical axis of evaluation—based on sacredness, wisdom, and connection to tradition—while Western sources adopt a horizontal lens, emphasizing effectiveness, threat, destruction, or interaction with neighboring powers.

Table 1. Comparative analysis

Figure	Eastern Sources	Western Sources
Tokhtamysh	Legitimate khan, victim of conflict with Timur	Barbarian conqueror, burned Moscow
Edige	Wise ruler, defender of the Horde, epic hero	Treacherous commander, devastator of Rus’

The historical reputations of Tokhtamysh and Edige have significantly shifted over time, shaped by ideological needs and national historical narratives.

During the early Muslim tradition (15th–16th centuries), both figures retained elements of heroization: Tokhtamysh was portrayed as a figure of sorrow and loyalty to the Horde, while Edige became a national hero in the Nogai and Tatar epic traditions. It was in this period that the *dastan Idegey* took shape, in which Edige is presented as a brave, wise, and just warrior and statesman, and Tokhtamysh as a complex but legitimate opponent.

In the Russian chronicle tradition, their images underwent a substantial transformation: Edige was ultimately severed from the Eastern heroic tradition and became a symbol of hostile force. Tokhtamysh, meanwhile, was fixed as an antagonist within the emerging Grand Principality narrative—the burning of Moscow became part of a national trauma, reproduced in historiography and literature (from *The Tale of the Battle of the Don* to 19th-century textbooks). In the 19th–20th centuries, Russian imperial historiography interpreted Edige as an “enemy of Russian statehood,” opposing him to the rising centralized Moscow (Anikeeva, 2024). At the same time, Turkic scholars gradually reclaimed Edige’s role as a defender of the Horde and a symbol of Turkic national resilience.

Contemporary studies aim to deconstruct the binary “enemy/hero” framework, offering a more nuanced view of these figures as political actors in an era of imperial crisis. In this context, Edige becomes a bearer of the “conservative modernization” of the Horde, while Tokhtamysh symbolizes an attempt to restore the sacral vertical of power amid geopolitical disintegration.

The images of Edige and Tokhtamysh in historical sources reflect a complex transformation of ideas about power, legitimacy, and heroism in the post-Chinggisid world. The conducted comparative analysis demonstrated that Eastern and Western narratives not only offer diametrically opposed interpretations of these figures but also operate within different categories of historical memory: sacred and pragmatic, centralizing and epic, national and trans-imperial.

Tokhtamysh appears in Eastern chronicles as a figure of khalid legitimacy—a tragic ruler who sought to restore the unity of the Horde but ultimately fell victim to conflict with Timur and betrayal by the internal elite. In the Western tradition—particularly in Russian chronicles—he is seen as a destroyer, whose memory was shaped by the trauma of the Moscow fire of 1382.

Edige, on the other hand, is portrayed in Turkic epic texts and Persian chronicles as a guardian and restorer of Horde statehood. He is a commander, a diplomat, a wise *bek*, a symbol of resilience and political pragmatism. In Western narratives, however, he becomes an antagonist, a menacing shadow over Russian lands, an embodiment of instability and the nomadic threat.

The historical reputations of both figures have shifted significantly depending on the era and ideological context. Russian imperial and Soviet historiography often inherited a Russocentric perspective, marginalizing the Eastern heroic tradition. Meanwhile, contemporary studies have

contributed to the revision of such interpretations, restoring to Edige and Tokhtamysh their multidimensionality and historical ambivalence (Mukhametzhanova, Eshchanova, 2024).

Conclusion

The conducted comparative historiographical analysis has shown that the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh are interpreted in contemporary scholarship in diverse ways, depending on methodological approaches, scholarly traditions, and cultural-ideological contexts.

The Eastern historiographical tradition—primarily Turkic-speaking—tends to emphasize the sacred, legitimate, and stabilizing roles of these historical figures within the framework of Jochid political heritage. Western, and especially Russian, historiography more often interprets Edige and Tokhtamysh through the prism of military conflicts and perceived threats to neighboring states, particularly Rus’.

These divergent assessments are explained not only by the nature of the source base but also by historically constructed narratives reflecting national interests, political ideologies, and cultural identities.

Historiographical research enables us to trace how scholarly thought has transformed the perception of these figures—from “enemies of the state” to bearers of imperial continuity and symbols of political stability.

Particularly noteworthy is the growing trend toward reevaluating the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh in current scholarship. This reflects not only increased academic interest in the history of the Golden Horde but also the relevance of these topics within national historical projects of post-Soviet states.

Analyzing the representations of these figures across various historiographical schools also provides deeper insight into the mechanisms of historical memory formation within the Eurasian space.

In the future, further study of historiographical interpretations is advisable, incorporating interdisciplinary approaches and expanding the range of sources under analysis. Of special importance is the study of how the images of Edige and Tokhtamysh are positioned within post-Horde historiography in Kazakhstan and Tatarstan, as well as in the public and academic memory of Central Asia.

References:

Anikeeva, 2024 – *Anikeeva T.A.* P.A. Falev i ego "Nogayskoe skazanie ob Edigee" (k istorii izucheniya eposa) [P.A. Falev and his "Nogai Tale about Edigei" (On the history of studying the epic)] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. Pp. 915–925. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.915-925> (accessed 01.02.2024) (in Rus.).

Eshchanova, 2024 – *Eshchanova G.A.* Uzbekskaya versiya eposa "Idegey" [Uzbek version of the epic "Idegey"] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.934-942> (accessed 10.02.2024) (in Rus.).

Favereau, 2021 – *Favereau M.* *The Golden Horde and the Mamluks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. https://www.academia.edu/32581532/The_Golden_Horde_and_the_Mamluks_English_Version_The_Golden_Horde_in_World_History_Chap_6 (accessed 28.01.2025) (in Eng.).

Fazlutdinov, 2024 – *Fazlutdinov I.I.* Varianty tatarskogo eposa "Idegey" (Sibirskiy areal) [Versions of the Tatar epic "Idegey" (Siberian area)] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.766-781> (accessed 16.10.2024) (in Rus.).

Gromenko, 2015 – *Gromenko S.* Timur, Tokhtamysh i Idegey: k voprosu o khronike sobytiiy 1395–1417 gg. [Timur, Tokhtamysh and Idegey: on the chronology of events 1395–1417] // *Istoriik*. 2015. No. 3. (accessed 09.09.2024) (in Rus.).

Iskhakov, 2024 – *Iskhakov D.M.* Istoricheskie realii v dastane "Idegeï" [Historical realities in the dastan "Idegeï"] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.897-914> (in Rus.).

Kadyr Ali-bek, 2022 – *Kadyr Ali-bek.* *Dzhami at-tavarikh* [Collection of chronicles]. Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Marzhani AN RT, 2022. 544 p. (accessed 17.02.2025) (in Rus.).

Kemaloglu, 2024 – *Kemaloglu I.* Issledovaniya eposa ob Idegee v Turtsii [Studies of the epic about Idegee in Turkey] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.888-896> (accessed 06.10.2024) (in Rus.).

Mirgaleev, 2023 – *Mirgaleev I.M.* Svedeniya kasimovskogo avtora Kadyr Ali-beka o Zolotoy Orde [Information of the Kasimov author Kadyr Ali-bek about the Golden Horde] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2023. Vol. 11, No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-2.303-316> (accessed 29.09.2024) (in Rus.).

Mirgaleev, 2003 – *Mirgaleev I.M.* *Politicheskaya istoriya Zolotoy Ordy perioda pravleniya Tokhtamysh-khana* [Political history of the Golden Horde during the reign of Tokhtamysh Khan]. Kazan: Alma-Lit, 2003. 164 p. (in Rus.).

Mukhametzyanova, 2024 – *Mukhametzyanova L.Kh.* Tatarskaya istoriografiya "Idegeï" [Tatar historiography of "Idegeï"] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.740-757> (accessed 08.04.2024) (in Rus.).

Nagamine, 2019 – *Nagamine H.* Eshche raz o sochinenii Kadyr-Ali-beka [Once again about the work of Kadyr-Ali-bek] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2019. Vol. 7, No. 1. (In Rus.).

Parunin, 2019 – *Parunin A.V.* Politicheskaya istoriya Zolotoy Ordy v 1419–1427 gg. [Political history of the Golden Horde in 1419–1427] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2019. Vol. 7, No. 3. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2019-7-3.434-460> (accessed 11.09.2024) (in Rus.).

Pochekaev, 2017 – *Pochekaev R.Yu.* *Zolotaya Orda. Istoriya v imperskom kontekste* [The Golden Horde. History in the imperial context]. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2017. 206 p. (in Rus.).

Sabitov, 2016 – *Sabitov Zh.M.* *Dzhami at-tavarikh Kadyrgali Zhalairi kak istochnik o zhizni Urus-khana* [Dzhami at-tavarikh by Kadyrgali Zhalairi as a source on the life of Urus Khan] // *Respublika Kazakhstan i Evraziyskoye prostranstvo*. Astana, 2016. (accessed 28.09.2024) (in Rus.).

Salmanov, 2023 – *Salmanov A.S.* Bashkirskie tabyntsyy v epokhu Tokhtamysha [Bashkir Tabyn people in the era of Tokhtamysh] // *Istoricheskaya etnologiya*. 2023. No. 2. (in Rus.).

Sharaf ad-Din Ali Yazdi, 1972 – *Sharaf ad-Din Ali Yazdi.* *Zafar-name*. Tashkent, 1972. (in Rus.).

Ualiev, Kushkumbayev, 2024 – *Ualiev T.A., Kushkumbayev A.K.* Kazakhskie versii predaniy ob Idegee [Kazakh versions of the legends about Idegee] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.782-813> (accessed 15.10.2024) (in Rus.).

Utemish-khadzhi, 2017 – *Utemish-khadzhi.* *Kara tavarikh* [Black chronicles]. Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Marzhani AN RT, 2017. (in Rus.).

Zakirova, 2024 – *Zakirova I.G.* Nogayskaya versiya eposa "Idegeï" [Nogai version of the epic "Idegeï"] // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* (Golden Horde Review). 2024. Vol. 12, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2024-12-4.897-914> (accessed 07.10.2024) (in Rus.).

Zlygostev, 2012 – *Zlygostev V.A.* *Tokhtamysh*. Ufa: Dizayn Press, 2012. 472 p. (in Rus.).

Сулейменова Д. К.

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан
E-mail: Suleimenova911@gmail.com

ҚАЗІРГІ ТАРИХНАМАДАҒЫ ЕДІГЕ МЕН ТОҚТАМЫСТЫҢ БЕЙНЕЛЕРІ ТӘСІЛДЕРДІ САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕ

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада XIV ғасырдың соңы мен XV ғасырдың басындағы Алтын Орданың көрнекті тарихи тұлғалары — Едіге мен Тоқтамыстың бейнелерін заманауи тарихнамадағы интерпретациялар тұрғысынан салыстырмалы талдау жүргізіледі. Зерттеудің мақсаты — аталған тұлғаларға қатысты бағалаулардың айырмашылықтарын анықтап, олардың себебін түсіндіру. Зерттеу тарихи жад пен ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастырудағы нарративтердің рөлін ашуға бағытталған. Мақала дереккөздерді емес, осы тарихи тұлғалардың қазіргі тарихнамада қалай сипатталатынын зерттеуге бағытталған. Автор шығыс (негізінен түркі және Орталық Азия) және батыс (негізінен ресейлік және еуропалық) тарихнамалық дәстүрлер арасындағы айырмашылықтарға назар аударады. Жаңашылдығы – ұлттық тарихнама мектептерінің ғылыми интерпретацияларға әсерін көрсетуінде. Ғылыми міндеттері мен практикалық маңызы. Мақалада мынадай міндеттер қойылады: Едіге мен Тоқтамысты зерттеудегі негізгі бағыттарды анықтау; әртүрлі аймақтардағы интерпретациялық ұстанымдарды салыстыру; тарихнамалық бағалар мен идеологиялық контекст арасындағы байланысты талдау. Зерттеу нәтижелері тарихи сана мен еуразиялық кеңістіктегі бірегейлікті зерттеу үшін маңызды. Әдістемесі. Зерттеуде тарихнамалық және салыстырмалы әдістер қолданылады. Ғылыми әдебиеттер сапалық тұрғыда сарапталып, авторлардың ұстанымдары мен дәйектеріне назар аударылады. Негізгі қорытындылар. Шығыс тарихнамасы Едіге мен Тоқтамысты легитимді саяси қайраткерлер ретінде бағалап, оларды тұрақтылықтың кепілі ретінде сипаттаса, батыс тарихнамасы оларды саяси қақтығыстар мен күйзелістермен байланыстырады. Бұл айырмашылықтар тарихи тәжірибе мен академиялық дәстүрлерге негізделген. Автор зерттеуді кеңейтіп, мәдени репрезентациялар мен пәнаралық тәсілдер арқылы жалғастыруды ұсынады.

Алғыс: Зерттеу Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің гранттық қаржыландыруы аясында жүзеге асырылды (жоба ИРН BR24992878 – XIII–XV ғасырлардағы Жошы Ұлысының этносаяси және әлеуметтік-экономикалық тарихын зерттеу).

Кілт сөздер: Тоқтамыш, Едіге, Алтын Орда, Едіге дастаны, шығыс шежірелері, Еуразия.

Сулейменова Д. К.

Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан
E-mail: Suleimenova911@gmail.com

ОБРАЗЫ ЭДИГЕ И ТОХТАМЫША В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОГО АНАЛИЗА ПОДХОДОВ

Аннотация. Цель статьи – анализ и сопоставление современных историографических подходов к образам Эдиге и Тохтамыш, ключевых фигур Золотой Орды конца XIV – начала XV веков. В исследовании рассматривается, как эти личности интерпретируются в современной научной литературе и чем обусловлены различия в оценках. Актуальность работы заключается в выявлении роли исторических нарративов в формировании коллективной памяти и идентичности.

Работа сосредоточена не на анализе первоисточников, а на критическом осмыслении интерпретаций в современной историографии. Особое внимание уделяется различиям между восточной (преимущественно тюркской и центральноазиатской) и западной (прежде всего российской и европейской) научными традициями. Новизна заключается в акценте на национальные историографические контексты, влияющие на формирование образов Эдиге и Тохтамыш. Цели исследования включают: выявление ведущих направлений в историографии; сравнение интерпретационных подходов в разных регионах; анализ взаимосвязи между научными оценками и идеологическим контекстом. Результаты представляют интерес для историков, изучающих проблемы евразийской идентичности и исторической памяти. Методология. Применены историографический и сравнительный методы. Исследование основано на качественном анализе научных работ, с акцентом на интерпретационные стратегии и аргументацию исследователей. Основные выводы. Восточная историография часто рассматривает Эдиге и Тохтамыш как легитимных политических акторов и стабилизирующую силу, тогда как западная — как фигуры, вовлечённые в конфликты и деструктивные процессы. Различия обусловлены историческим опытом и традициями научного мышления. Предлагается расширить исследования за счёт междисциплинарных подходов и изучения культурной репрезентации этих образов.

Благодарность: Исследование выполнено при поддержке Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан в рамках грантового финансирования (проект ИРН BR24992878 - Изучение этнополитической и социально-экономической истории Улуса Джучи в XIII-XV веках).

Ключевые слова: Тохтамыш, Эдиге, Золотая Орда, эпос Идегей, сравнительный анализ, Евразия.

Information about authors:

Dinara K. Suleimenova – Ph.D., doctoral student at L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Сулейменова Динара Қайсарқызы - Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің Ph.D докторанты, Астана, Қазақстан.

Сведения об авторе:

Сулейменова Динара Кайсаровна - Ph.D., докторант Евразийского национального университета им.Л.Н.Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан.