

*Ninomiya Takashi 

¹ University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan

E-mail: ¹s0430062.ninomiya@gmail.com

PRELIMINARY RESEARCH FOR CHAGHATAY LANGUAGE STUDIES BASED ON TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CHINGIZ-NAMA: TOWARD UNDERSTANDING THE HISTORY OF ALTYN ORDA

Abstract. The “Chingiz-nama” has come to play a crucial role in researching the history of the Altyn Orda, or the Jochi Ulus. It was written in the Khiva Khanate, one of the successor states of the Jochi Ulus. The Chingiz-nama is a historical text written not in standard Chaghatay, but in a form of Chaghatay influenced by the western Turkic languages. The authors aim to describe the language of this historical text. Two extant manuscripts of the Chingiz-nama exist: the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript. This study reviewed the research history of these two manuscripts and proposed several linguistic avenues for studying the Chaghatay language of the Chingiz-nama. When examining the corresponding pages between the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts, it was found that the Tashkent manuscript, consisting of 36a-59a (47 pages), corresponds to 1a-IIb and 16a-48a (69 pages) of the Istanbul manuscript. This result differed from Validov’s (1915: 320) assertion that the Tashkent manuscript corresponded to the 15b-46b of the Istanbul manuscript. Additionally, we focused on two narratives within the Chingiz-nama: the story of Chingiz Khan, and the story of Ichen Khan (Orda Khan) and Sayin Khan (Batu Khan) (Tashkent: 37b (56) - 40a (157)) as preliminary research, comparing the script, vocabulary, and grammar of both manuscripts. The Tashkent manuscript showed more frequent insertion of the *-n-* sound than the Istanbul manuscript, greater retention of *-r-* in the verb *er-* and the postposition *birlä*, and more frequent use of the relative pronoun *ki*. Based on the linguistic features above, it was found that the Tashkent manuscript exhibits characteristics of a western dialect more than the Istanbul manuscript, retains older features of Turkic languages, and shows Persian influence.

Key words: Altyn Orda, Chingiz-nama, Chaghatay, Tashkent manuscript, Istanbul manuscript

Funding: 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).

Introduction

One historical source for the Aq Orda, Kok Orda, and Altyn Orda is the “Chingiz-nama,” written in a Turkic language by Ötemish Hajji in 16th-century Khwarazm (Yudin, 1992: 25). These three Ordas refer to the regimes within the Jochi Ulus of the Mongol Empire. The Altyn Orda generally refers to the Jochi Ulus itself, while the administrative affiliation of Aq Orda and Kok Orda remains a matter of debate (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2013: 37-41). Kawaguchi and Nagamine, who research medieval Mongol and Turkic history in Japan, particularly the history of Altyn Orda, positioned the Chingiz-nama as a valuable source for understanding the history of the Mongol Empire, especially the Jochi Ulus (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008, 2013). These Japanese scholars provided a more precise explanation of Yudin’s (1992) point: The Chingiz-nama was written by the mid-16th century at the latest, and the place where it was written was the Khiva Khanate, one of the successor states to Altyn Orda, and the Turkic language used was Chaghatay (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: v).

Chingiz Khan established the Mongol Empire spanning east and west across the Eurasian continent in the 13th century. After his death, his descendants expanded the empire, which

fragmented into the Great Yuan in China, the Hūlegü Ulus in Persia, the Chaghatay Ulus in Central Asia, and the Jochi Ulus in northwestern Eurasia. The Jochi Ulus was initially ruled by the clans of Batu, Jochi's second son, and Orda, his eldest son. However, the influence of both clans waned, and from the 15th century onward, the country fragmented into the following smaller states (Nagamine, 2014: 2, 5).

- Kazan Khanate (early 15th century – mid-16th century): Ruled by the clan of Ulugh Muhammad, a descendant of Jochi's 13th son, Tuqa Timur.

- Crimean Khanate (early 15th century – late 18th century): Ruled by the clan of Hajji Giray, a descendant of Tuqa Timur.

- Astrakhan Khanate (mid-15th century – mid-16th century): Ruled by the clan of Timur Qutluq, a descendant of Tuqa Timur.

- Kazakh Khanate (late 15th century – mid-19th century): Ruled by the clan of Urus, a descendant of Tuqa Timur.

- Sibir Khanate (late 15th century – late 16th century): Ruled by the clan of Hajji Muhammad, a descendant of Shayban, the fifth son of Jochi.

- Shaybanid dynasty (early 16th century – late 16th century): Ruled by the clan of Abul Khayr, a descendant of Shayban

- Khiva Khanate (early 16th century – early 20th century): Ruled by the clan of Yadigar, a descendant of Shayban

Ötemish Hajji was active in the Khiva Khanate, which boasted a long history as a successor state to Altyn Orda. From the preface of the Chingiz-nama, it is clear that he served Ilbars, the first ruler of the Khiva Khanate, was well-versed in the history of Chingiz Khan's clan that laid the foundation for the Mongol Empire, and wrote the Chingiz-nama by order of Ish Sultan (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: xviii-xx).

We focus on the Chaghatay language in which the Chingiz-nama was written. Chaghatay, in the narrow sense, refers to the language of works by 'Ali Sher Nava'i of the Timurid dynasty and Zahir ud-Din Babur's *Babur-nama*. In the broad sense, however, it denotes various Eastern Turkic languages written in the Arabo-Persian writing from the 1400s to the 1950s, which were far more widely used as a common language in Central Asia (Schluessel, 2018: vi). Medieval Turkic literary languages broadly divided into eastern and western groups, with Chaghatay belonging to the eastern group alongside Khorezminan Turkic (Johanson, 1998: 85-86). The western group comprised Kipchak Turkic and Oghuz Turkic (Johanson, 1998: 86). Modern Turkic languages are divided as follows: 1. The Southwestern group (Oghuz Turkic); 2. The Northwestern group (Kipchak Turkic); 3. The Southeastern group (Uyghur-Karaluk Turkic); 4. The Northeastern group (Siberian Turkic); 5. Chuvash; 6. Khalaj. Chaghatay is considered close to Uzbek and Uyghur within the Southeastern group (Eckmann, 1966).

Chaghatay, like the spoken language, varied significantly by the region, but remained broadly intelligible across time and space to different readers and listeners (Schluessel, 2018: vi). The extensive use of Chaghatay as a literary language over a long period likely led to its many variants. Chaghatay sources include literary works like the *Babur-nama*, early 20th-century East Turkestan newspapers, and historical texts such as *Shajara-i Turk* by Abu 'l-Ghazi Bahadur in the Khiva Khanate (Schluessel, 2018). The language of this historical work differs from that of works like the *Babur-nama*, being a mixture of Eastern Turkic Chaghatay and Western Turkic languages such as Tatar (Kipchak Turkic) and Ottoman (Oghuz Turkic) (Schluessel, 2018: 106). Since the Chingiz-nama was also written in the Khiva Khanate, it likely shares similar characteristics with *Shajara-i Turk*. Kawaguchi and Nagamine stated: "The Chingiz-nama by Ötemish Hajji is noteworthy not only for its content but also for its language, as it is one of the Chaghatay prose texts written in a region somewhat removed from the Chaghatay language center where Timurid court literati were active, during the dynasty and subsequent eras." (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: vii). The language of this text exhibits features older than Classical Chaghatay, and furthermore, it displays

characteristics influenced by Oghuz Turkic and Kipchak Turkic (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: viii-ix). Regarding orthography, the spelling in the Chingiz-nama differs from the standard spelling of Classical Chaghatay, reflecting the earlier literary tradition of the Jochi Ulus (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: ix).

Ötemish Hajji wrote the Chingiz-nama in the Khiva Khanate, a region distant from the Chaghatay language center, which was the successor state to the Jochi Ulus. Consequently, although the work was written in Chaghatay, it likely reflects the influence of Ötemish Hajji's native language and the spoken language of the people of Khiva Khanate. Suleimenov (2006) described the phonology and grammar of Chaghatay based on the Tashkent manuscript of the Chingiz-nama and compiled a lexical index. While this research is valuable, several research questions remain. For example, as discussed later, two manuscripts of the Chingiz-nama currently exist: the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript. A major research task could be to describe the language of the latter manuscript. Additionally, paleographic studies of these two manuscripts and linguistic contrasts between them could be set as future research topics. This paper serves as a preliminary investigation to clarify the scope of corresponding passages between the two manuscripts. It then focuses on two stories found in both the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts and contrasts their linguistic features.

Materials and methods

Regarding the materials, as mentioned above, two manuscripts of the Chingiz-nama currently exist: the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript. While Göncöl (2023) referred to the latter as the Istanbul manuscript, Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008, 2013) called it the Rizaeddin manuscript. Their designation stems from the fact that it was once owned by the Ulama Rizaeddin. Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008, 2013) provided detailed accounts of the research history of these two manuscripts. The Tashkent manuscript was written in the 1550s, while the Istanbul manuscript was written in Hijri year 959 (1551-1552) and copied in Hijri year 1040 (1630/31) (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: 43).

Regarding the Tashkent manuscript, Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008: xxvi) described its characteristics as follows. All characters in the manuscript are written in solid black; no vermilion characters are visible. It is an incomplete manuscript that breaks off midway through the story of Tokhtamysh, with significant damage at the top of pages 55a and 55b. The copying conditions were also poor, showing obvious errors, unnecessary repetitions, and traces of sloppy corrections. When making corrections in the manuscript, incorrect characters or phrases were crossed out with a line, and the correct spelling was then written afterward or above/below them. The script appears identical to that of the person who wrote the main text. Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2013) noted that a facsimile publication of the Istanbul manuscript was awaited; however, as discussed later, Mirgaleev published precisely that facsimile in 2017.

According to Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2013: 43), the Istanbul manuscript passed from Rizaeddin bin Fakhreddin, an Ulama from the Volga-Ural Region, to Zeki Velidi Togan. They stated that Togan noted that this manuscript was incomparably more complete than the Tashkent manuscript, yet Togan never published it. However, Kafalı, a disciple of Togan, produced a transcription of the Istanbul manuscript. Significant textual variations exist between the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts, suggesting they may belong to different manuscript lineages (Kafalı, 2009). Later, Mirgaleev provided a transcription, Russian translation, and facsimile in 2017. In 2019, he provided a facsimile with higher image quality. According to Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2013: 43), the manuscript bears the title "*qara tawārīx*," written by someone in a later period. Therefore, Mirgaleev (2017, 2019) referred to this manuscript as «Капа Таварих». For some reason, the copy provided by a Turkish colleague did not include page 15 of the manuscript (Mirgaleev, 2017: 7). Consequently, Mirgaleev created the transcription and Russian translation for pages 15a and 15b based on Kafalı's transcription (Mirgaleev, 2017).

Yudin (1992) provided a facsimile and transcription of the Tashkent manuscript, along with a Russian translation. Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008) provided a facsimile based on the Tashkent manuscript, a typed version in Arabo-Persian writing, a transcription, and a Japanese translation. Regarding the Istanbul manuscript, Kafalı (2009) first presented a transcription. Mirgaleev (2017) presented a facsimile, transcription, and Russian translation, while Mirgaleev (2019) published a higher-quality facsimile.

The Tashkent manuscript consists of 47 pages. The page numbers within the text ran from 36a to 59a. Meanwhile, the Istanbul manuscript consists of 156 pages, with page numbers within the text designated as Ia, Ib, IIa, IIb, and 1a-76b. The discovery of the Istanbul manuscript is not only highly significant for advancing the history of Jochi Ulus, as noted by Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2013: 44), but also crucial for understanding the actual state of the Chaghatay language in the Khiva Khanate.

We present the correspondences of Arabo-Persian script based on various studies that provided transcriptions for the manuscripts. As shown in Table 1 below, Kawaguchi and Nagamine and Kafalı used a Latin-based alphabet, while Mirgaleev used a Cyrillic-based alphabet.

Table 1: Transliteration correspondences for the Arabo-Persian script in Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008) (KN), Kafalı (2009) (Ka), and Mirgaleev (2017) (Mi)

	ب	پ	ت	ث	ن	ج	چ	ح	خ
KN	b	p	t	s	n	j	č	h	h
Ka	b	p	t	s	n	c/ç	ç	h	h
Mi	б	п	т	с	н	ж/ч	ч	x	x
	خی	ل	د	ذ	ر	ز	و	د	س
KN	h ^w	l	d	z	r	z	v/w	d	s
Ka	ho, hā	l	d	z	r	z	v	d	s
Mi	xy, xa	л	д	з	p	з	в/у	д	с
	ش	ص	ض	ط	ظ	ع	غ	ف	ق
KN	š	ṣ	ẓ	ṭ	ẓ	‘	ġ	f	q
Ka	ş	ş	ẓ	ṭ	ẓ	‘	ġ	f	k
Mi	ш	c/c	з/з	т/т	з/з	ғ	г/ғ	ф	қ
	ک	کن	م	ه	ی / ی				
KN	k/g/ng	ng	m	h	y	’			
Ka	k/g/ŋ	ŋ	m	h	y	’			
Mi	к/г/ҕ/ң	ң	м	һ	й	Ø			

Validov’ discussed the corresponding pages between the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript. He noted that pages 36a-59a of the Tashkent manuscript correspond to pages 15b-46b of the Istanbul manuscript (Validov’, 1915: 320). Kafalı (2009) noted that the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript contain numerous variations, but it is important to investigate the extent to which the two manuscripts differ in terms of writing, phonology, vocabulary, and grammar.

Suleimenov (2006) conducted a linguistic description of Chaghatay based on the Tashkent manuscript and presented an indexed lexicon. The description items are as follows:

•Phonology (pp. 20-33): The author identified consonant and vowel phonemes, analyzing vowel harmony, gemination, and consonant clusters. The question remains how vowel values were determined using the Arabo-Persian script, which cannot fully represent vowel values. While information from other Turkic languages was likely referenced, its true validity is unclear.

●Vocabulary (p.34-55): The author presented vocabulary organized by category (human anatomy, kinship relations, religion, daily life, etc.), including archaic terms, words of Arabic and Persian origin, synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, and idioms. Correspondences between basic vocabulary and Kazakh and Uyghur were also indicated. On p.39, percentages of Turkic-derived, Arabic-derived, and Persian-derived vocabulary from medieval Turkic-language texts «Мухаббат-наме», «Гулистан бит-түрки», and «Хосроу-шырын» were shown, but no such information was presented for the Chingiz-nama. Presenting this information will be an important task for future research.

●Morphology (pp. 56-86): Affixes attached to nouns and adjectives, numerals, pronouns, and verbs (aspect, mood, tense, auxiliary verbs, etc.) were analyzed. A significant number of pages were devoted to verb analysis. Since the Istanbul manuscript has more pages than the Tashkent manuscript, it will likely provide more information for describing the grammar of the Chingiz-nama's language. It will be necessary to investigate the grammatical differences of the Istanbul and Tashkent manuscripts.

Results and Discussion

First, we investigated the scope of correspondence between the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts. The Tashkent manuscript has page numbers and line numbers written on every page. Line numbers were not assigned per page but were given consecutively throughout the entire manuscript, from line 1 to line 869. Kafalı (2009) lacks facsimiles for pages Ia, Ib, IIa, and IIb, preventing verification of line information in this study. However, since the next page after IIb contains a facsimile, it is possible to verify the page correspondence thereafter. Note that in Kafalı's text, pages 21a and 21b are duplicated twice (Kafalı, 2009: 118-119): "Bu varak mükerrer (tekrar 21 olarak) numaralanmış." Consequently, page numbers in Kafalı (2009) and Mirgaleev (2017) are misaligned thereafter. Below, we show the page correspondence between the two manuscripts, focusing primarily on the beginning and end of the narrative.

Table 2: Partial page correspondence between the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts
(Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008) = KN, Kafalı (2009) = Ka, Mirgaleev (2017) = Mi)

Tashkent	Istanbul	The opening words of each page in the Tashkent manuscript and their corresponding words in the Istanbul manuscript
36a(2-3)	Ka: Ia	KN: Bismi Allāhi al-raḥmāni al-raḥīmi. Ḥamd-i... Ka: Bismi 'llāhi 'r-raḥmāni 'r-raḥīm Ḥamd-i...
36b(18-35)	Ka: Ia+Ib+IIa	KN: ma'lūm bolğay kim bu faqīr-i... Ka: Ma'lūm bolğay kim bu ḥakīr-i faqīr...
37a(36-52)	Ka: IIa+IIb	KN: mamlakat-panāh zillu Allāhi, sarwar-i salāṭīn-i Ka: memleket-penāh-ı zılullāh sürür-ı selāṭīn-i
37b(53-56)	Ka: IIb	KN: maṣḥūr turur kim qulaq eşitkän... Ka: Meṣḥūr turur kim kulaq işitgenur...
37b(56-69)	Ka+Mi: 16a (11)-16b (9)	KN: Čün Čingiz Ḥān wilāyatlarnı fath... Ka: Čün Čengiz Ḥān vilāyetlerni feth... Mi: Чүн Чинкиз хан вилайәтләрни фәтх...
38a(70-86)	Ka + Mi: 16b (9)-17a (10)	KN: ḥānliqnı bir-birising mura'at qıldılar. Şayın... Ka: hānlıkı birbirige mürāca'at kıldılar. Şayın

		Mi: ханлықны берберегә мөрағат қылдылар, Сайын...
38b(87-103)	Ka + Mi: 17a (10)-17b (12)	KN: kök ordanī Ejängä saldī, bolat... Ka: İcen Hānga orke şaldı. (Temir) bosağalı Mi: Ижан ханга (өркә) салды, бусагалы...
39a(104-121)	Ka+Mi: 17b (12)-18b (1)	KN: -larin song ol hān tahtında... Ka: dın soñ ol... Mi: -дин сун, ул...
39b(122-139)	Ka+Mi: 18b (1)-19b (2)	KN: ‘İdil Daryāsındağī wlāyatlarinī hān yosuqına... Ka: ‘İdil deryāsı... Mi: Ғыйдил дәрийасы...
40a(140-157)	Ka+Mi: 19b(2)-20a(12)	KN: şafqatlar qılıp, soyurgallar etdi. Tüşkän... Ka: şefqatlar suyrugaal itdiler. Taqı түшген... Mi: шәфқатләр сийүргал итделәр тәҗы түшкән...
40b(158-176)	Ka: 20a (12)-21a (11) (p.117-118); Mi: 20a (12)-21a (11)	KN: Hān Şiban Hānning ‘ajāyib wa... Ka: Ol yorişda ‘acāyib ve... Mi: [] йүрешдә гажаиб вә...
41a(177-194)	Ka: 21a (11)-22a (5) (p.118-119); Mi: 21a(11)-22a (5)	KN: çiqğaç qal‘agä özin saldılar. Taqı... Ka: çıkkaç qal‘age özlerin saldılar. Taqı... Mi: чыҗач қалғакә үзләрен салдылар, тәҗы...
41b(195-212)	Ka: 21a(5)-21b(16) (p.119-120); Mi: 22a(5) - 22b(16)	KN: taqı özgä kâfir za‘İfalarınġ sütüni emmädi. Bu jihatdın kâhinlar birlä... Ka: immedi. Bu cihet kâhinler birle... Mi: имәди бу жәһәт каһинләр берлә...
42a(213-230)	Ka: 21b(16)-22b(4) (p.119-120); Mi: 22b(16) - 23b(4)	KN: wilāyatınga mutawajjih boldılar. Hājī Tarhān... Ka: vilāyetiğa muteveccih boldı. Hācı Tarhan... Mi: вилайәтега мөтәвәжжіһ булды, Хажі Тархан
42b(231-249)	Ka: 22b(4)-23a(17); Mi: 23b(4)-24a(17)	KN: ta‘ālā manga berür. Agar omqa... Ka: Te‘ālā maña berür. Eger omқа... Mi: Тәғалә меңа бирүр, әкәр умқа...
43a-57b
58a(824-840)	Ka: 45b(2) - 46a(7); Mi: 46b(2) - 47a(7)	KN: Tang kalīda orun berdi. Bir... Ka: tengelide orun berdi. Bir... Mi: тенгелидә урунберди, бер...
58b(841-855)	Ka: 46a(8) - 46b(8); Mi: 47a(8) - 47b(8)	KN: Tengri ta‘ālā işingni ongdur qılğay... Ka: Teñri Ta‘ālā işiñi oñadur bolğay... Mi: Тәңре Тәғалә әшени унадур булғай...
59a(856-869)	Ka: 46b(8) - 47a(4); Mi: 47b(8) - 48a(4)	KN: sarkaş bolup baş kōtārip yürgān... Ka: serkeş bolup baş bektürip yürigen... Mi: серкеш булуб баш бекүтиб...
The final line of page 59a, the last page of the Tashkent manuscript, line 869, corresponds to line 4 of page 48a in Mi and line 4 of page 47a in Ka.		KN: qul wa yasağdın qaçğan el bolsa” Ka: қаңған уауı senıñ ilıñe kelse Mi: қачған йайы сениң илинә килсә

The section preceding the story of Chingiz Khan, which marks the beginning of the narrative, was recorded in the Tashkent manuscript from 36a(2) to 37b(56). In contrast, Kafalı (2009) established that the corresponding section in the Istanbul manuscript was written in Ia, Ib, IIa, and IIb. Validov' (1915: 320) stated that the correspondence begins at 15b, but Kafalı's (2009) text showed that it actually starts at Ia, not 15b. Regarding the story's conclusion, the Tashkent manuscript ended at 59a (869). Validov' (1915: 320) noted that the corresponding Istanbul manuscript ended at 46b, but examining Mirgaleev's (2017, 2019) manuscript numbering reveals the story continued through 48a(4). Even in Kafalı's (2009) study, the narrative extended to 47a (4). To summarize the results of this survey, the Tashkent manuscript comprised 36a-59a (47 pages), while the Istanbul manuscript corresponded to Ia-IIb, 16a-48a (69 pages).

Next, we contrasted the linguistic features of both manuscripts. As a preliminary investigation, the present authors narrowed the scope to the stories of Chingiz Khan, Ichen Khan (Orda Khan) and Sayin Khan (Batu Khan) (Tashkent: 37b (56) - 40a (157)). The investigation revealed instances where the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts used identical wording, while in other cases they employed different words or phrases. This paper presented some of these examples below. When citing data from previous studies, we used the following abbreviations: Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008) = KN, Kafalı (2009) = Ka.

(A) Correspondence between initial *y-* and *b-*. Observing Kawaguchi and Nagamine (2008) for the Tashkent manuscript and Kafalı (2009) and Mirgalayev (2017) for the Istanbul manuscript, the following four instances of correspondence were found: Initial *y-* in the Tashkent manuscript and initial *b-* in the Istanbul manuscript. For instance, (i) Tashkent 38a(72) KN *yaşğa* – Istanbul 16b(12) Ka *başğa*; (ii) Tashkent 38b(100) KN *yüküngändä* – Istanbul 17b(7) Ka *büküngende*; (iii) Tashkent 39b(122) KN *yosuqına* – Istanbul 18b(2) Ka *bosuqın*; (iv) Tashkent 40a(157) KN *Yuraldaynı* – Istanbul 20a(10) Ka *Buraldaynı*.

Because <Y> and are similar in the Arabo-Persian script, Kawaguchi and Nagamine and Kafalı likely applied different interpretations to a single character. Alternatively, it may refer to different words in the two manuscripts, or it may indicate variants of a single word. In any case, it is necessary to consult Turkic dictionaries, examine the context to determine the word's form and meaning, and if variants are possible, explain what sound changes produced them.

(B) Presence or absence of the inserted sound *-n-* within words. Observing locative case, dative case, and ablative case nouns accompanied by the third-person possessive suffix, we found instances where *-n-* was inserted before the case ending. Both the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript had instances where *-n-* was not inserted (18 cases). However, there were 8 cases where [Tashkent had *-n-* insertion, Istanbul had *-n-* insertion], and 15 cases where [Tashkent had *-n-* insertion, Istanbul did not have *-n-* insertion]. Examples where insertion occurred in both manuscripts include the following: (i) Tashkent 38b(103) KN *wilāyatında* – Istanbul 17b(11) Ka *wilāyetinde*; (ii) Tashkent 37b(69) KN *za'ifalarındin* – Istanbul 16b(8) Ka *za'ifelerindin*. Additionally, the following are cases where *-n-* was inserted in the Tashkent manuscript but not in the Istanbul manuscript: (i) Tashkent 37b(59) KN *wilāyatında* – Istanbul 16a(14) Ka *wilāyetide*; (ii) Tashkent 37b(64) KN *wilāyatınğa* – Istanbul 16b(2) Ka *wilāyetigä*.

In Western Turkic languages such as Ottoman Turkish, *-n-* may be inserted (Schluessel, 2018: 111). The *-n-* insertion occurred between the third-person possessive suffix and case endings beginning with *d*: E.g., *aldida* / *aldında* and *yäridin* / *yärindin*. If the *-n-* insertion is a characteristic of Western Turkic languages, the Tashkent manuscript may exhibit more features of these western languages than the Istanbul manuscript. Comparing other passages and observing other characteristics of western languages could further substantiate the connection between the Tashkent manuscript and western languages.

(C) Variants of the verb *er-*. Regarding *er-* “to be,” one of the basic verbs, Chaghatay possessed two series: one with *-r-* and one without (Bodrogligeti, 2001: 248). Comparing correspondences of this verb's past tense across manuscripts yielded the following results: (i)

[Tashkent *erdi* – Rizaeddin *erdi*] (Tashkent 37b(60) – Istanbul 16a(15) and, 6 other examples); (ii) [Tashkent *erdi* – Istanbul *edi*] (Tashkent 37b (58) – Istanbul 16a(12), and 8 other examples); (iii) [Tashkent *edi* – Istanbul *erdi*] (Tashkent 39b(133) – Istanbul 19a(7) 1 example).

Older forms such as *erdi* “was” (Baburnama: *edi*), *ermäs* “is not” (Baburnama: *emäs*), and *birlä* “with” (Baburnama: *bilä*) were found in the Tashkent manuscript [Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: viii]. Comparative studies by Clauson (1972: 193) and Old Turkic materials by Tekin (1967: 326) also indicated that *er-* is the older form compared to *e-*. Therefore, the above results suggest the Tashkent manuscript may preserve older features than the Istanbul manuscript. Future work should confirm other forms of this verb besides the finite past tense and examine passages beyond the scope of this study to substantiate this feature.

(D) Variants of the postposition *birlä*. The postposition *birlä(n)*, indicating accompaniment, similarly possesses not only variants with *-r-*, but also variants without *-r-*, such as *bilä(n)* (Bodrogligeti 2001: 73). This study demonstrated the following correspondences: (i) [Tashkent *birlä(n)* – Istanbul *birlä(n)*] (Tashkent 37b(69) – Istanbul 16b(9), and 3 other examples); (ii) [Tashkent *bilä* – Istanbul *bilä*] (Tashkent 38b(89) – Istanbul 17a(12) 1 example); (iii) [Tashkent *birlä(n)* – Istanbul *bilä(n)*] (Tashkent 39a(121) – Istanbul 18b(1), and 4 other examples); (iv) [Tashkent *bilä(n)* – Istanbul *birlä(n)*] (Tashkent 37b(67) – Istanbul 16b(7), and 1 other example).

In *birlä* and *bilä*, the former with *-r-* is the older form (Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008: viii). Therefore, it can be said that the Tashkent manuscript retains older features than the Istanbul manuscript. However, unlike the case with *er-*, the number of examples was limited. It is necessary to examine passages outside the scope of this study to substantiate this feature.

(E) Variants of the verb *ay-*. In Chaghatay, the verb *ay-* “to say” also has the variant *ayt-*. This study found the following correspondences: (i) [Tashkent *ay-* – Istanbul *ay-*] (Tashkent 38a(72) – Istanbul 16b(10), and 7 other examples); (ii) [Tashkent *ay-* – Istanbul *ayt-*] (Tashkent 39a(109) – Istanbul 17b(19), and 3 other examples); (iii) [Tashkent *ayt-* – Istanbul *ayt-*] (Tashkent 39a(105) – Istanbul 17b(14), and 5 other examples).

The form *ayt-* is the causative form of *ay-*. For some unknown reason, it lost its causative meaning as early as the 11th century in Oghuz and became synonymous with *ay-*, which then became obsolete (Clauson, 1972: 268). It is clear that *ayt-* derived from *ay-*, but if it can be said that *ay-* was once more frequently used than *ayt-*, this would support the possibility that the Tashkent manuscript retains older features than the Istanbul manuscript.

(F) Third person plural in the past tense of definite verbs. In the past tense of Chaghatay, the third-person plural form may or may not include *-lär* after *-di-* (Schluessel, 2018: 36). This study identified the following correspondences: (i) [Tashkent *-dilär* – Istanbul *-dilär*] (e.g., Tashkent 37b(70) – Istanbul 16b(9), and 17 other examples); (ii) [Tashkent *-dilär* – Istanbul *-di*] (e.g., Tashkent 37b(57) – Istanbul 16a(11), and 1 other example); (iii) [Tashkent *-di* – Istanbul *-dilär*] (e.g., Tashkent 38b(93) – Istanbul 17a(16), and 6 other examples).

Such differences between the two manuscripts may stem from variations in subject, the inclusion or omission of adjuncts, or the reflection of honorific plural forms. Tekin noted that in Old Turkic, the third person plural and third person singular were identical (Tekin, 1967: 190): E.g., *käl-ti* “they came” *te-di* “they said.” If the *-lär* suffix was not originally added to the third person plural, the Tashkent manuscript would retain an older feature than the Istanbul manuscript. It is necessary to investigate whether this feature is also present in other parts of the two manuscripts.

(G) Variants of relative pronouns. Chaghatay possesses not only the Persian-derived relative pronoun *ki*, but also the form *kim* (Schluessel, 2018: 48-49). Examination of both manuscripts yielded the following results: (i) [Tashkent *kim* – Istanbul *kim*] (Tashkent 37b (69) – Istanbul 16b(8), and 1 other example); (ii) [Tashkent *ki* – Istanbul *kim*] (Tashkent 37b(64) – Istanbul 16b(2), and 7 other examples); (iii) [Tashkent *ki* – Istanbul *ki*] (Tashkent 40a (145) – Istanbul 19b(11), 1 example); (iv) [Tashkent \emptyset – Istanbul *kim*] (Tashkent 38a (71) – Istanbul 16b(10), and 5 other examples).

The word *ki* is of Persian origin, whereas *kim* derives from the interrogative words of the Turkic languages. Since the former *ki* was predominant in the Tashkent manuscript, the author or scribe of the Tashkent manuscript may have used Persian loanwords more frequently than Turkic vocabulary. It is necessary to investigate whether Persian loanwords other than *ki* are also more frequently found in the Tashkent manuscript than in the Istanbul manuscript.

We have observed and examined seven examples of correspondence from (A) to (G). Beyond these, a small number of additional correspondences were also noted between manuscripts, such as *biz* and *bizlär* “we” [Tashkent 38b(90) – Istanbul 17a(13)] and *sän* and *siz* “you” [Tashkent 39a(109) – Istanbul 18a(1)]. Furthermore, different vocabulary was used depending on the manuscript (these examples are also few): (i) [Tashkent *oğlu Yöçi Xān yādığa tüşüp* – Istanbul *oğlu Juji Xān yādığa kelüp*] “come down – come” (Tashkent 39a(120) – Istanbul 18a(14)); (ii) [Tashkent *altun busağalı* – Istanbul *kümüş bosağalı*] “gold – silver” (Tashkent 38b(87) – Istanbul 17a(10)); (iii) [Tashkent *munda* – Istanbul *bu yerde*] “here – in this place” (Tashkent 39a(105) – Istanbul 17b(13)); (iv) [Tashkent *wa lēkin* – Istanbul *ammā*] “but” (Tashkent 39a(113) – Istanbul 18a(6)).

Conclusion

The Chingiz-nama has gained attention as a key text for understanding the history of Altyn Orda. Two manuscripts of the Chingiz-nama are known: the Tashkent manuscript and the Istanbul manuscript. Upon examining corresponding pages between the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts, it was found that Tashkent manuscript pages 36a-59a correspond to Istanbul manuscript pages Ia-IIb, 16a-48a. This result differs from Validov’s (1915: 320) assertion that the Istanbul manuscript corresponds to pages 15b-46b. Furthermore, we narrowed our focus to specific corresponding pages and compared the linguistic features of both manuscripts. The insertion of the sound *-n-* indicates that the Tashkent manuscript exhibits more western Turkic features than the Istanbul manuscript. The retention of the *-r-* in the verb *er-* and the postposition *birlä* indicates that the Tashkent manuscript preserves older Turkic features compared to the Istanbul manuscript. The use of the relative pronoun *ki* reveals that the Tashkent manuscript shows strong Persian influence. As this is a partial investigation, other sections of the Chingiz-nama require examination. This paper proposed several research themes for Chaghatay using the Tashkent and Istanbul manuscripts. Following these proposals, we aim to provide data contributing to the historical study of Altyn Orda by describing the language of the Chingiz-nama’s manuscripts.

References:

- Bodrogligeti, 2001 – *Bodrogligeti A.J.E.* A grammar of Chagatay. München: Lincom Europa, 2001. 437 p.
- Clauson, 1972 – *Clauson G.* An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish. Oxford: University Press, 1972. 1034 p.
- Eckmann, 1966 – *Eckmann J.* Chagatay manual. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1966. 340 p.
- Göncöl, 2023 – *Göncöl C.* Redactions and Dates of the Compilation of the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötämiš Hājjī. *Zolotoordynskoye obozreniye*. 2023. No.11(3). P. 582-591.
- Johanson, 1998 – *Johanson L.* The history of Turkic. In: Johanson and Csató, É.Á. The Turkic languages. London: Routledge, 1998. P. 81-125.
- Kafalı, 2009 – *Kafalı M.* Ötemiş Hacı’ya göre Cuci Ulusu’nun tarihi. Ankara: Öncü Basımev, 2009. 160 p. (in Tur.)
- Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2008 – *Kawaguchi T., H. Nagamine.* Ötämiš haajii. Čingiz-nāma: Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2008. 191 p. (in Jap.)
- Kawaguchi and Nagamine, 2013 – *Kawaguchi T., H. Nagamine.* Rethinking the History of Ulūs Juučii/Jöči// *Inner Asian Studies* 2013. No.28: P. 27-51. (in Jap.)

Mirgaleev, 2017 – *Mirgaleev I.M.* Utemiš Hadži Kara tavarikh. Kazan': Institut istorii im. Š. Mardžani AN RT, 2017. 312 p. (in Rus.)

Mirgaleev, 2019 – *Mirgaleev I.M.* Utemiš-hadži. Kara tavarikh: Faksimile. Kazan': Institut istorii im. Š. Mardžani AN RT, 2019. 160 p. (in Rus.)

Nagamine, 2014 – *Nagamine H.* On Qādir 'Alī Beg's Historiography: The values as Sources and Historical Perceptions of the Historiographies of Successor States to Ulūs-i Jūchī/Jochi// The world of Islam. 2014. No.81. P.1-31. (in Jap.)

Schluessel, 2018 – *Schluessel E.* An introduction to Chaghatay: A graded textbook for reading Central Asian sources. Michigan: Michigan Publishing, 2018. 250 p.

Suleimenov, 2006 – *Suleimenov atyndaghy Shyghystanu instituty.* Qazaqstan tarixy turaly turki derektemeleri, III tom, Otemis qajynyng "Shynggys-namesi" tilining korsetkish-sozdigi. Almaty, Daik-press, 2006. 302 p. (in Kaz.)

Tekin, 1967 – *Tekin T.* A grammar of Orkhon Turkic. Indiana University Publications, 1967. 419 p.

Validov', 1915 – *Validov A.Z.* Vostochnyya rukopisi v' Ferganskoy oblasti// Zapiski Vostochnago otdbleniya. Petrograd': Tipografiya imperatorskoy akademi nauk'. 1915. P. 303-320. (in Rus.)

Yudin, 1992 – *Yudin V.P.* Utemish-khadzhi, Chingiz-name, Faksimile, perevod, transkriptsiya, tekstologicheskiye prtmehaniya, issledvaniye. Alma-ata: Ghylym, 1992. 296 p. (in Rus.)

^{1*}**Ниномия Такаши**

¹*Цукуба университеті, Цукуба, Жапония*

E-mail: ¹s0430062.ninomiya@gmail.com

АЛТЫН ОРДА ТАРИХЫН ТҮСІНУГЕ БАҒЫТТАЛҒАН ЕКІ «ШЫҢҒЫС-НАМА» ҚОЛЖАЗБАСЫ НЕГІЗІНДЕГІ ШАҒАТАЙ ТІЛІ ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРІНЕ АЛҒАШҚЫ ЗЕРТТЕУ

Аңдатпа. «Шыңғыс-нама» Жошы Ұлысының (Алтын Орданың) тарихын зерттеуде маңызды дерек көзі болып табылады. Ол Жошы Ұлысының мұрагер мемлекеттерінің бірі – Хиуа хандығында жазылған. «Шыңғыс-нама» стандартты шағатай тілінде емес, батыс түркі тілдерінің ықпалы бар шағатай тілі нұсқасында жазылған тарихи шығарма болып табылады. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – осы тарихи мәтіннің тілдік ерекшеліктерін сипаттау. «Шыңғыс-нама» шығармасының екі қолжазбасы сақталған: Ташкент және Ыстамбұл нұсқалары. Бұл зерттеуде екі қолжазбаның зерттелу тарихы қарастырылып, олардың тілін шағатай тілі тұрғысынан талдау бағыттары ұсынылды. Ташкент пен Ыстамбұл қолжазбаларының сәйкес беттерін салыстыру нәтижесінде Ташкент нұсқасы 36a–59a (47 бет) аралығын, ал Ыстамбұл нұсқасы Ia–IIb және 16a–48a (69 бет) аралығын қамтитыны анықталды. Бұл нәтиже Валидовтың (1915: 320) Ташкент нұсқасы Ыстамбұл нұсқасының 15b–46b беттеріне сәйкес келеді деген пікірімен сәйкес келмейді. Сонымен қатар, алдын ала зерттеу ретінде екі әңгімеге – Шыңғыс хан туралы және Ішен хан (Орда хан) мен Сайын хан (Бату хан) туралы оқиғаларға (Ташкент: 37b (56) – 40a (157)) – назар аударылып, екі нұсқаның жазуы, сөздік қоры және грамматикасы салыстырылды. Ташкент нұсқасында Ыстамбұл нұсқасына қарағанда *-n-* дыбысының жиі енгізілуі, *er-* етістігі мен *birlä* шылауындағы *-r-* дыбысының жиі сақталуы, сондай-ақ *ki* қатысты есімдігінің жиірек қолданылуы байқалды. Осы тілдік ерекшеліктерге сүйене отырып, Ташкент нұсқасы Ыстамбұл нұсқасына қарағанда батыс диалектісінің белгілерін көбірек сақтағаны, көне түркі тілінің элементтерін көбірек көрсететіні және парсы тілінің әсерін байқататыны анықталды.

Кілт сөздер: Алтын Орда, Шыңғыс-нама, шағатай тілі, Ташкент қолжазбасы, Ыстамбұл қолжазбасы

Қаржыландыру: 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).

¹*Ниномия Такаши

¹Университета Цукуба, Цукуба, Япония

E-mail: ¹s0430062.ninomiya@gmail.com

ПРЕДВАРИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ДЛЯ ИЗУЧЕНИЙ ЧАГАТАЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА НА ОСНОВЕ ДВУХ РУКОПИСЕЙ «ЧИНГИЗ-НАМЕ»: К ПОНИМАНИЮ ИСТОРИИ ЗОЛОТОЙ ОРДЫ

Аннотация. «Чингиз-наме» играет важную роль в изучении истории Алтын Орды (Улуса Джучи). Произведение было написано в Хивинском ханстве, одном из государств-наследников Улуса Джучи. «Чингиз-наме» представляет собой исторический текст, написанный не на стандартном чагатайском языке, а на его варианте, подвергнувшись влиянию западнотюркских языков. Авторы ставят целью описать языковые особенности этого произведения. Сохранились две рукописи «Чингиз-наме»: ташкентская и стамбульская. В исследовании рассмотрена история их изучения и предложены лингвистические направления анализа чагатайского языка данного текста. При сравнении соответствующих страниц ташкентской и стамбульской рукописей было установлено, что ташкентская рукопись (36а–59а, 47 страниц) соответствует Ia–IIb и 16а–48а (69 страниц) стамбульской. Этот результат отличается от утверждения Валидова (1915: 320), согласно которому ташкентская рукопись соответствовала 15b–46b стамбульской. В качестве предварительного анализа были рассмотрены два повествования — о Чингис-хане и об Ичен-хане (Орда-хане) и Сайын-хане (Бату-хане) (Ташкент: 37b (56) – 40а (157)) – с сопоставлением письма, лексики и грамматики обеих рукописей. Ташкентская рукопись демонстрирует более частое вставление звука *-n-*, лучшее сохранение *-r-* в глаголе *er-* и послелоге *birlä*, а также более частое употребление относительного местоимения *ki*. На основании выявленных языковых особенностей установлено, что ташкентская рукопись отражает более западные диалектные черты, сохраняет более архаичные элементы тюркских языков и обнаруживает влияние персидского языка.

Ключевые слова: Алтын Орда, Чингиз-наме, чагатайский язык, ташкентская рукопись, стамбульская рукопись

Источник финансирования: 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).

Information about the authors:

Ninomiya Takashi, PhD., Coordinator, Almaty Office, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan;
Invited professor, Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Ниномия Такаши, PhD., Цукуба университетінің Алматыдағы кеңсесінің координатор,
Цукуба, Жапония; Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің шақырылған
профессоры, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Сведения об авторах:

Ниномия Такаши, PhD., Координатор алматинского офиса Университета Цукуба, Цукуба,
Япония; приглашённый профессор, факультета востоковедения, Казахского национального
университета имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан.