Abstract: The legends surrounding the eponymous founder of the Oğuz people, Oğuz Kağan, have a long and diverse history of reappropriation and use in legitimising power in the Central Asian world. Key to this is the Tawariq-e *Oğuz* of Rashīd al-Dīn and the influence it has had on assembling both inclusive and exclusive national origin myths. However, aside from this *Oğuz* tradition we also possess the tantalising *Oğuz-Nāme* manuscript from Turfan, the dating and language of which are often disputed. This variant presents the reader with several provoking puzzles in attempting to reassemble the transmission of the figure of Oğuz. Do some of the work's constituents extend back as far as the legends surrounding Modun Chanyu? Is the work a unique and repository of pre-Islamic Türkic myth and ritual? In this paper I will address these questions as I attempt to revive study of this curious variant and revaluate its relevance.[1]

Keywords: Oğuz Kağan, Turfan, Rashīd al-Dīn, Pelliot.

Reappraising the Strata and Value of the Turfan *Oğuz Nāme* and Preliminary Translation.

Jonathan Ratcliffe, Monash University.

Oğuz Kağan is one of the great figures of Central Asian lore. Like the Roman Romulus he is an endonym: a people's name and nature distilled retrojectively into a primordial founder. His deeds and those of his noble begs (lords) form the basis of the exclusive Oğuz worldview. They explain why the world is the way it is, especially the origins and natures of Turkic ethnic groups, and legitimise Oğuz's descendants as inheritors of his legacy of world rule under one sovereign *kağan*. For this reason it is not surprising that Oğuz Kağan is a fantastically "mobile" figure in Central Asian myth- readily reappropriated and mixed with ancient, contemporary and local legends as the Turkic peoples migrated and rose to power as the Seljuks and Ottomans and filled the armies of the Chingisids and Timurids. Much attention to this diverse tradition has centred on the heavily Islamicised branch of the fourteenth century

[1] During the process of writing my Masters thesis I came across Shcherbak's (1959) edition of the Turfan *Oğuz-nāme* and decided to translate it into English for my own benefit. At present aside from Ölmez's (2009) very flawed English translation uploaded on Commentary Project of the Centre for Central Eurasian Civilisation Archive there are none others available. At present my translation and this paper represent a work in process, which I hope at a later date may eventually become a professional edition. See section d. for this translation. It does not contain a transliteration at this stage owing to not having been able to consult the original manuscript, merely the various professional editions mentioned below. Alternate readings of various scholars and matters of curiosity and importance are detailed throughout.

Tawariq-e *Oğuz* of Rashīd al-Dīn, which was used by Abu'l-Ḡāzi in the seventeenth century as well as many other Ottoman, Timurid and post-Timurid scholars to legitimise their secular and religious heads through descent from the figure of Oğuz.[2] However, in this paper I would like to contrast this better known tradition to another which is rarely discussed in the English speaking world. This is that of the Turfan *Oğuz-Nāme* text, which appears to have preserved a far greater deal of pre-Islamic elements (Marquart 1914: 37; Sinor 1950: 1-2; Shcherbak 1959: 87-92; Bınbaş 2010: EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"), and which is a vital source in attempting to reassemble the retention and evolution of mediaeval Turkic-Mongolian myth.

a. Scholarly Background.

The forty-two page (twenty-one folio) untitled Uyghur script Turfan Schafer manuscript in question was discovered during the nineteenth century and first appeared as an eight page abridged sample in Radlov's Uyghur script Qutagu Billig in 1890, before it was later translated fully into Russian and German by the same scholar between the former date and 1893 (Pelliot 1930: 247; Shcherbak 1959: 10-13; Ölmez 2009: 2-3). The text, written in what appears to be a unique Eastern Turkic dialect, contains several large lacunas, alternate spellings of the same words and many multiple readings, which still remain highly debatable (cf. Pelliot 1930: 247-350; Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 10-52; Shcherbak 1959: 66-89; Ölmez 2009: 1-16). Activity

[2] Rashīd al-Dīn's work had a powerful influence on Timurid, Ottoman and Mogal conceptions of descent and cultural legitimacy. Relying on this, Yazıjıoğlu ʿAli's fifteenth century *Tāriq-e āl*-e Saljuq cointains a section in which the rules of inheritance and descent are legimtised by putting them in the mouth of Oğuz Kağan (fols. 1b-18b ap. Mustafaev 1996: 11-12). Rashīd al-Dīn's geneologies of the Türks from Noah's son Japhet made in the preevmptive Oğuz legend at the start of his World History (JAT. I. p. 25, 28, 30), which goes back to Mas'udi's tenth century world geography (Tolan 2012: 13), connected this biblical figure with Oğuz and his sons, particualry Gök and Gün, and had a profound influence on Ottoman concepts of descent, though there were also connections between the biblical Esau and Oğuz (EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"). Timurid historians mixed Oğuz with other figures such as Chingis Khan and the Mongol ancestress Alan Qo'a and the Ergenekün myth in order to legitimise themselves from many backgrounds (EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"). Abu'l Ghazi (pp. 5-61), the seventeenth century Mogal ruler of Khiva and historian, made use of Rashīd-al-Dīn's Oğuz legends and Türk geneologoies in his *Šajara-ye Tarākema* (Türkmen History). In turn, eighteenth century poet Nur-Moḥammad Andalip combined elements of Abu'l-Ḡāzi's work with local oral legends in his own *Oğuz Nāma* (Bekmyradov 1987: 105-23). There is also a strong tradition of connecting figures of Central Asian Sufism with descent from Oğuz Kağan. Moḥyi Golšani (p. 13) in the late fifteenth cewntury connected the Ottoman mystic Ebrāhim Golšani with the figure of Oğuz. Another nineteenth century *Šajara-ye Tarākema* contains an appendix in which the sufi Dāna Atā is said to have desmeninated the *Oğuz* Nama in the Golden Horde (Samojlovich 2005: 896-98). The now-lost *Tawārik̲-e mašāye*-e Tork by Sayyed Aḥmad Nāṣer-al-Din Marḡināni connects Oğuz with Kvaja Solaymān b. Barman, the son-in-law of twelfth century sufi Aḥmad Yasavi (Togan 1953: 525).

on this manuscript, long held in the National Library of France under the title "Suppl. turc 1001" (Pelliot 1930: 247; Ölmez 2009: 1-2; Bınbaş 2010: EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"), peaked during the end of the nineteenth century and the start of the twentieth with some of the great figures of Central Asian studies presenting translations and commentaries including Marquart (1914) and Pelliot (1930). Opinions on the dialect and dating of the composition also differ greatly. Pelliot (1930: 350-352), whose 120 page commentary and review of Riza Nur's 1928 French edition is the only other oft cited source on this topic (Bang and Rahmeti 1936; passim; Shcherbak 1959 passim; Ölmez 2009: 1-2; Bınbaş 2010: EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"), took much of its narrative to be a product of the thirteenth century CE Mongol conquests, but the text to have been composed in the fifteenth under the Timurids, due to the palatalisation of certain consonants and the inclusion of certain Persian terms not attested before this point. Shcherbak (1959: 101-107), whose edition with parallel Russian and transliterated Uyghur text is the only commonly available translation for this work and the last edition printed (Ölmez 2009: 1-2), in comparison, took it to be a creation of the Mongol Chaghatai Ulus, no later than the start of the fourteenth century CE, due to the vast transition Turfanian Uyghur vowels had undergone by this stage, as attested in a Ming era Chinese-Kitai-Uyghur dictionary of 1407.[3] Others have even suggested the Persian Il-Kağanate during the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century as a place of composition due to similarities with Rashīd al-Dīn's branch of the tradition (Sümer 1954: 389), for which there would seem to be little linguistic or cultural evidence due to the uniqueness and greater completeness of many elements in the Turfanian text, and the fact that Rashīd al-Dīn's sources were most likely of Azerbaijani origin (Togan 1982: 120). However, it should be noted that prior to this we find in the Xingjian region the thirteenth/fourteenth century East Turkic Uzunköprü manuscript (Orkun 1936: 267; Eraslan 1973-1975: 176-190), which is a versified text very similar to that of Rashīd al-Dīn's. There is also a fragment of this Turfanian narrative in the eighteenth century Chaghatai-Persian Sanglaq dictionary of Astarābādī (fol. 180a ap. Bınbaş 2010: EIO. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives"). This suggests that not only oral versions, but also

[3] Cf. ON. and Shcherbak (1959: 106): *чубук* (tree)= *чїбїк*; *нӱкäр* (companion)- *нӱкӱр*, *кік* (game, beast)= *к*ijik, *адуƀ* (bear)- *адїƀ*; *туңлуқ* (window)= *тӱңлӱк*; *чоң* (left)= *сол*. For the full list of all seventeen words held in common see Shcherbak (1959: 106). The tendencies here are largely a drifting from rounded vowels to unrounded ones by 1407.

manuscripts were in circulation in the region both prior to and following the creation of the text in question.

As one may see there would appear to be a long quiet between Shcherbak's time and now in relation to serious work on this text in western academia. Turkish scholars, however, regularly publish interesting articles on the topic (Balkaya 2008: 151-163; Gariper 2011: 781-796), though some of these, it must be said, remain somewhat poor: particularly in reference to their habit, stemming largely from nationalistic concerns, of treating Oğuz Kağan and his sons as literal historical figures (Gömeç 2009: 133-145/57-66), when in reality the history and layers of this work is far more subtle and complex than this. In bringing analysis up to line with modern analytic methodology, there are several key "hints" that I have followed in preparing this paper. The first of these is Deweese's (1994) Islamisation and Native Religion in the Golden Horde, which though it makes mention of the Turfan text only in passing (ibid. 331, 501), outlines a series of highly useful theories on the political use of Turkic-Mongolian mythology to substantiate tribal legitimacy through culture heroes during the Mongol Period (ibid. 273-278). Another is the recent Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan, which on the subject of the *Oğuz-Nāme* proposes that the overall tradition most likely took form during the eleventh century and was actively reappropriated as a courtly cycle to legitimise different rulers before being written down later (Abazov 2005: 122). It is with this sort of historical and political methodology that I believe we should reapproach the layers of the text, which I shall now outline as we proceed.

b. The Turfanian Epos.

The Turfanian *Oğuz-Nāme* describes the life of Oğuz Kağan from his birth and swift maturity (§1-2), to his early battle against a mysterious monster called the qat/*qïat* (§3-6), his two divine wives (§6-10), his adult conquests on which he is led by a talking blue wolf (§11-35), and finally the bequeathing of his authority and property to the two major branches of his offspring: the Buzuks and the Üchoks (§35-42). Some of these aspects are shared in part with the Tawariq-e *Oğuz* tradition of Rashīd al-Dīn, but most of them are not. In some cases, as will be shown as we progress, it is almost impossible to make sense of either branch without the other regarding some of the myths. The reason for this, most likely, is that with the outgrowth of myth and the

passage of time, certain foci or major narrative themes of the Oğuz legend came to be retained only in part, or were obvious to the audience, and thus went unexplained- though to the scribe of the Turfanian manuscript, Rashīd al-Dīn and even the early western scholars of this text, some of the meaning may have been opaque compared to the oral tradition out of which the diverse constituents of the Oğuz legends emerged. Thus, we should be mindful of each of these parties and their involvements as active participants in the act of creating and transmitting the cycle.

Beginning with Oğuz's birth we run into the first of several textual problems. This is that some of the initial words of the text appear to have been lost. Not only is the title of the work missing (Pelliot 1930: 249; Shcherbak 1959: 22), but the first legible words are: "*…bolsunγïl deb dediler*" (§1.I), which Pelliot (1930: 249) takes as *"...qu'il soit*" (let him/it be), Shcherbak (1959: 22) as "*ɔa буɔem он*" (indeed he will be [?]) and which I believe to be simply an invocation for the story to begin in accordance with previous traditions of the oral cycle, because as the text says: "*mundan song sevinč čäptilär* ("after it they have been filled with joy [because of it]) (§1.II). This appears to be an integral traditional oral component, emphasising notions that it was a courtly cycle, and before this official acceptance to legitimise rulers had its basis in folktales of Oğuz as primordial founding culture hero. Thus I take this initial line as: "…let it be[gin], [as] they have said". Next there is the matter of Oğuz's ana*γu*-su (his image/portrait), which is accompanied in the text by a "miniature" of a bull (Pelliot 1930: 249). Only Bang and Rahmeti's (1936: 10) edition has printed this "miniature" along with that of the falcon and qiat (§3-6), which appear later in the text. As Pelliot (1930: 249) deftly notes, the purpose of the bull is to highlight Oğuz's sharing in the powerful qualities of the creature, as is made also during his later general description, which includes many other bestial aspects (§2.III-VI). This in itself may connect with notions of zoomorphic progenitors and cosmogonic battles, as are widely spread amongst the Turkic-Mongolian peoples, and were re-enacted as coming of age rituals as combats against animals- particularly bulls (Roux 1993: 326).

The next matter is more difficult- it is not clear at all in the text as to whether it is Oğuz's mother or father is the one who gives birth to him (§I.III-IV)! The reason for this is that the figure in question is called Ay Kağan (§1.III), and Kağan is a title which belongs solely to male rulers, in spite of Pelliot's (1930: 250) suggestion of Crimean Turkic *ḫānīm* for princesses. For this reason one might assume that the

mother is missing due to textual error on the part of the scribe. This might also suggest that this text is a copy of an older document, which we shall discuss more fully at the end of my investigation. Following this passage we have a description of Oğuz's rapid growth, in which he drinks his mother's milk only once before he demands meat and wine (§I.VIII- 2.I), and becomes adult sized within the span of but forty days (§1.VIII- 2.IX). He is also described as possessing a blue complexion (§1.V) and the limbs of various mighty animals (§2.III-VII). Both these dietary and physical descriptive tropes are common elements for emphasising a culture hero's destiny and power in living Turkic-Mongolian epic such as Er Töshtük, Ka*ğan Märgän* and Manas (Chadwick 1969: 156-157), which suggests that not only have these been retained a long time, but also that the dating of their inception is almost impossible to determine. Compared with this nativity in the Turfanian version, the tradition of Rashīd al-Dīn, is as Findley (1995: 64) calls it: "preoccupied" with conversion to and the proselytising of Islam. It portrays Oğuz as born naturally a Muslim (Hist. *Oğuz*. §18 script 590v, Findley 2005: 64), refusing his parents and wife until they convert (Hist. *Oğuz*. §20 script 591r), and damning his uncles, who become the Mongols, for not taking up the faith (Hist. *Oğuz*. §20 script 591r). As one might see, this other branch has a very specific undercurrent to it not found in the Turfanian version, where there is not a single reference to Islam or any other introduced religion (Pelliot 1930: 252). This is the erasing of older pagan elements from what is very much a pagan story tradition reliant on ancient tropes used to foreshadow the later glories of a divine figure. Thus, we must note at this point the fact that the kök (blue) complexion of Oğuz (1.V), like that of the wolf who leads his army later in the text (§11, 16, 18, 33), is deeply connected with notions of the *kağan* as chief religious officiator and earthly conduit of the Turkic-Mongolian sky-deity *Tänri*, through whom blessings, law and order (kut/törü) are dispensed on earth (Skrynnikova 2004: 530). For this reason it is not surprising that inherent Islam has replaced this aspect of the inherent pagan sacral role of the ruler to legitimise the beliefs of those who claimed descent from Oğuz Kağan in both cases.

The next episode of the Turfanian epic is that of the hero's conflict with the monster known as the *qïat* (§3-6), as to the identity of which there have been many suggestions of Chinese, Uyghur and Sogdian terms for a rhinoceros, a unicorn or even a kind of magical dog (Pelliot 1930: 264-267; Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 10; Shcherbak 1959: 64). Notably, Pelliot (1930: 264) reads the term as *qa'at*, a Mongolised version

of Sanskrit ka*ḍ*ga (rhinoceros) and refutes all connections between its name and that of the Mongol *qïat* tribe, which would seem irrelevant anyway. Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 12) include the second "miniature" at this point, of a creature which in many ways would seem to have the appearance of the western unicorn, though of course we must be mindful of cultural differences. For this reason, in my translation I have left the creature as *qïat* in order to emphasise its other qualities to the reader and remove the "unicorn" imagery. This episode does not occur at all in the tradition of Rashīd al-Dīn, and its purpose appears to be one, clearly, of a ritualistic coming of age by slaying a local monster that has beset the populace and is devouring them, which, as Roux (1993: 326) mirrors rituals found amongst the mediaeval Turks, which were necessary for a man to claim a wife. This is emphasised by Oğuz's killing of the falcon that feeds on the slain monster's innards with his arrows (§6), after which he exclaims his power with both spear and bow (§6). As Pelliot (1930: 275) has remarked on the foreshadowing quality of this demonstration of power: "Et tout ceci vise les combats futurs que le heros livrera pour créer son empire" ("And all this shows the future wars the hero will wage in order to create his empire"). How old the inclusion of the *qïat* is, or whether the floating foci of hero myths could replace it and predate it with other monstrosities is uncertain. However, its absence in the more westerly Islamic Oğuz Kağan tradition might also suggest that it is a creature indeed of Chinese or Uyghur origin and has been attached to Oğuz Kağan due to local legends not found amongst the Anatolian and Azerbaijani Oğuz tribes of the thirteenth century, from whose work Rashīd al-Dīn's text is most likely drawn (Togan 1982: 120).

On several accounts there are also examples from within the Islamicised tradition that are partly shared with the Turfanian text, and which without knowledge of both branches, are hard to comprehend. The first of these is the nature of the two divine wives of Oğuz Kağan in the Turfanian version. One is a heavenly spirit who descends to the hero on a beam of light, with a mysterious glowing birth-mark compared to the north-star Polaris (§7). It is imperative here to note that in Turkic-Mongolian tradition, the north star or altun qazuq/*altan γadasu* ("golden stake") is deeply connected with notions of the world's soul, the axis mundi (axis of the world) (Serruys 1974: 74; Chiodo 1992: 147-149), and the Mongol ruler's törü-yin qadaqasun ("pillar of state") attached to the throne of the *kağan*, who as described, was regarded as the earthly instrument for bestowing law and good fortune on earth

(Roux 1984: 53; Skrynnikova 2004: 254). This woman gives birth to three heavenly progeny via Oğuz whose names mean Sun, Moon and Star (§8), and who become the Buzuk tribe and are connected with ultimate authority as wielders of a celestial bow later in the text (§39-42). It should also be noted that mating with goddesses to produce the first men is a common world origin myth analysed by DeWeese (1994: 272-278, 353) in his complex of Turkic-Mongolian creation and hero foci, which were actively reappropriated during the Mongol period as tribal origin myths to emphasise the rights to world rulership through exclusive prioritisation as the "first people". All of this suggests a profound religio-political symbolism in connection with Oğuz and his descendants as destined rulers of the world- a myth which many rulers would want to partake in for the sake of legitimacy. As one might expect, this goddess figure does not appear in Rashīd al-Dīn at all- probably because she is so obviously pagan.

The second wife of Oğuz in the Turfanian text is an earth spirit who becomes the mother of three sons whose names appear to represent the three layers of the world: Sky, Hill and Sea (§9-10), and whose authority stems from three celestial arrows later in the text (§39-42). What is most important is that in this myth the dual ancestry from sky and earth of the two branches of sons deftly echoes the Sky (*Tänri*/Tngri) and Earth (Umai) dualistic deities of mediaeval Turkic-Mongolian native religion, which compared with the many deities of the Buriat and West Mongol pantheon is a very simple one (Skrynnikova 2002: 70). Thus Oğuz's two wives and two branches of sons represent completeness of cosmic order and rulership, which will be discussed more fully in the relevant section below. Although the language is difficult, the woman in question in the Turfanian text appears to emerge from the hollow of a tree when Oğuz meets her (§9). This mirrors a number of similar Persian, Chinese and European records of Uyghur tribal origin and world creation myths in which a tree or mound bulges and the first men emerge from it (Juv. HWC. I. 40-41; JAT I. §98; Marco Polo [Latham ed.]: 88-89; Roux 1993: 326; DeWeese 1994: 285, 500).[4] Moreover, this earth spirit, who is also fundamentally a pagan figure, does appear in Rashīd al-Dīn's text, though only in a minor manner as an aetiological myth in connection with the Kipchaqs, who are also born by a noblewoman from "The Land of Filthy Dogs" (Qïl Barak) to Oğuz in a hollow tree (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script

[4] Roux (1993: 306) also lists stories regarding the figures Tepegöz and Bey Börek from the Kitab-i Dede Korkut, which are not found in this text, in which the former's father is a tree and the latter marries the daughter of the white poplar.

591r; cf. JAT. I. §34). This myth has its basis in Turkic folk etymology, linking the proximity of the sound of the word Kipchaq with the term for a hollow tree or log (qabuch)- and is even explained by Rashīd al-Dīn twice in both his epitomised Oğuz legend, as well as his fuller narrative (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script 591r; cf. JAT. I. §34; Ömerəliev 1988: 37). Whether or not the Kipchaqs ever possessed a tree emergence myth like the Uyghurs, we cannot know, but this does suggest at least the possibility in the mindset of other Turks, both the Azerbaijani Oğuz and the Uyghur, who themselves definitely appear to have known such myths. What is of greatest consequence is that such an etymological and aetiological myth as this does occur in relation to the Kipchaqs and trees in the Turfanian text, where it is interrupted by a small lacuna but remains legible, in relation to the deeds of a certain Kipchaq beg, who gains his name after he makes use of what appear to be felled trees to convey Oğuz's army across the Itil river (§24). This is an episode which seems to repeat one of a similar crossing dreamt up by Jamuqa using saqal bayan (beard-grass) to make rafts in The Secret History of the Mongols (§105,109). This suggests that the composers of the Turfanian tradition understood the Kipchaq and tree trunk links, but because they had the tree emergence myth themselves, did not simply want to give it away to a different ethnic group and replaced it with another myth in connection with river crossing. Thus we require both texts in order to make sense of the overall mythic traditions at work here.

Following these early episodes that establish Oğuz's foreboding power and that of his descendants, we begin the second major sequence of the text detailing the conquest of Oğuz Kağan and the exploits of his begs (§10-35). Key to this is the myth of Oğuz Kağan and his people being led to the lands they will conquer by a talking blue wolf that descends from heaven (§16, cf. 18, 29, 32) - a very important symbol in Turkic-Mongolian tradition linking the blue aspect of the sky-god *Tänri* and the wolf's ferociousness to the qualities and legitimacy of the tribal founder (Sinor 1982: 223-257; de Rachewiltz 1997: 155; Ratcliffe 2013: 47-48). This aspect is utterly absent from Rashīd al-Dīn's *Oğuz Nāme*. However, this mythic symbol of the wolf as leader of migration was indeed brought westwards by the Oğuz tribes as is attested by its recording in the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (III. 152-153) in Anatolia during the twelfth century, in which it leads the Oğuz people out of a mountain of iron. Perhaps like the wolf which the hero Kazan meets when lost in the wilderness and which deliberately cannot talk in the Islamicised sixteenth century Azerbaijani Oğuz

Kitab-i Dede Korkut (2 p. 47), this very pagan symbol was being discouraged by this time, and thus, in spite of its cultural importance, disappeared from western Oğuz Kağan tradition. Moreover, contrary to Ölmez (2009: 6), the Turfanian wolf-myth could not have been borrowed from the Ergenekün myth of ethnic emergence from a mountain, as this Mongolised creation mentions the blue-wolf in name only: Būrtah Cīnah (*Börte Činō*), who is simply a man in this rendition with a lupine name (JAT I. p.23-43; DeWeese 1994: 274; Ratcliffe 2013: 57-58), which may have been opaque both to Rashīd al-Dīn and Il-Kağanid Mongols who had appropriated it during the fourteenth century. The Anatolian Oğuz connection predates both of these other myths, and most likely was the origin of the mythic foci that later became both the Mongolised Ergenekün myth and the Turfanian Oğuz myth. Together, the Turfanian and Anatolian myths would seem to represent a shared migratory legend that came into being prior to the Oğuz migrations westward, and was retained in greatest detail in the Turfanian text, albeit without emergence from a mountain because of the emphasis on Oğuz Kağan and his origins instead. As Sinor (1982: 223-257, 1997: 336) has pointed out, the iron mountain of Michael and Ergenekün may have its origins in a mythologising of Göktürk emergence from slavery as a tribe of metal workers to the Rouran during the sixth century, but as we may see from the Turfanian text, the wolf aspect continued to actively evolve in its role as a symbol of predestined emergence into Turkic identity and migration.

Another example requiring both branches of the tradition in order to make sense of myth is the land of Baraka in the Turfanian text (§33-35)- one of the locations conquered by Oğuz Kağan, which some have attempted to square with Kashgar and the Kara-Khitai (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 49-50; Shcherbak 1959: 98)- and most reasonably: Egypt and Syria (Pelliot 1930: 340-341), due to the name of the ruler of this land being called Masar and these places being known widely as al-Misr during the Mongol conquests and Yüan Dynasty. To shed some light on this perplexing subject, a land called Barak indeed also appears in Rashīd al-Dīn's version of the Oğuz tradition as a mythical "land of dogs" (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script 592r p. 60-61; Pelliot 1930: 340). Within the text of Rashīd al-Dīn we also find the story of two dogs: the evil Kara Barak, and It Barak - a miraculous dog hatched from an egg that gives its name to a land of canine people (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script 592r p. 58-59). It Barak is also found in reference to the Khitan rulership in ninth century Chinese

records (White 1991: 134-135).[5] So too does Carpini (Hist. Mong. p. 61, 69) include two "lands of dogs" (Nochoykazar and Nochoyterim) mentioned by the Mongols, one of which is north of the Samoyeds and another in a land of darkness – a facet shared with Qil Barak in Rashīd al-Dīn (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script 592r p. 60).[6] Similar lands of dog-men are found north of the Khitan in a tenth century Chinese chronicle and as a tale told by the Mongols once more in a fragment falsely attributed to the Armenian historian Hayton of Corycus (White 1991: 133-134). Thus it appears that this mythical country was a widely-spread creation of the Central Asian imagination during the Mongol era. Its emphasis often on the canine nature of such peoples' men and the relative normality of their women (White 1991: 133-134), might suggest a geographical trope to dehumanise enemies and distant peoples and legitimise stealing their women. It may in fact stretch back to Antiquity and be the source of Indian, Greek and Chinese geographers locating dog-men in Central Asia, where these legends arose amongst the nomads (Hdt. IV. 105, 119; Strabo II.1.9; SHJ. VIII. p. 121; B*ṛ*hat Sa*ṃhitā* XIV. 21-27). The Turfanian Baraqa, however, possesses no canine connotations, but we should note that like the other "dog lands" its people are uniquely described as swarthy- in fact jet-black in appearance (§34). This suggests that this land, whether shorn of canine elements or not, as appears to have happened in the case of the Turfanian legend, was a standard trope for people who to the Turkic-Mongolian peoples were decidedly "other" because of their different appearance. It may indeed indicate Egypt or Syria, but we must be mindful of the Turkic-Mongolian lens used to represent such peoples.

Other locations that the Turfanian Oğuz conquers and the folk etymology of the naming of the begs (lords) who aid him in his conquests appear to show a great deal of similarity with Sübedei and Batu's conquests under Chingis and Ögödei during the early thirteenth century CE (Marquart 1914: 10-16; Pelliot 1930: 352-358). For instance the Itil river in the text (§18-19) is most likely the Volga- and appears in the later parts of The Secret History of the Mongols in reference to Chingis' western

[5] Baraq in the Turkic languages appears literally to mean "shaggy" and is found in connection not only dogs but also "shaggy" horses both pejoratively and positively in Rashīd al-Dīn (cf. JAT. §304, 322). It should not be confused at all with the mystical Islamic steed buraq (Dankoff 1971: 102-107).

[6] The land of darkness appears also in Marco Polo ([Latham ed.] p. 331) and in the Mongolian Alexander Romance (10r-11r, Cleaves 1959: 21-24). Whilst this has some loose parallels in relation to Firdausi and some other Alexander Romances (ibid. 22-24), we appear to be dealing with something that remains largely a Mongolian narrative and geographical trope for the edges of the earth – particularly the far north of the world with its long winters.

conquests as "Adil" (SHM §270, 274; Minorsky 1952: 225, 228; de Rachewiltz 2004: 960). This location is largely agreed on by commentators on the text, and is one of the few that are (Pelliot 1930: 310; Shcherbak 1959: 98; Ölmez 2009: 24). The *Teräng* river (§20) is slightly more difficult, the Dnepr being a popular conception (Marquart 1914: 145-146; Pelliot 1930: 318; Shcherbak 1959: 99), though we should be mindful that whatever the original name, *Teräng* remains descriptive- it is Uyghur for "deep" (Pelliot 1930: 318). Locations such as Shagam, Tangut, Jurjit and Sind seem to represent the Mongol conquests of Syria (Ar. *Shām*), the Tangut and Jürchen kingdoms of northern China, and India with little problem (Pelliot 1930: 338-339; Shcherbak 1959: 97-98; Ölmez 2009: 30).[7]

Further, as to the names of the figures with whom Oğuz interacts during the middle section of the text- both his begs and other rulers, these are also laden with folk etymologies and aetiologies. These are largely used as part of the cycle to explain the origins and collective natures of peoples through their positive or negative interactions with Oğuz as primordial shaper of the world. The most obvious of these is the story of the beg who goes out into the snow to find Oğuz's horse and gains the name *qaɣ*arlïq "snowy" (§27-28), which appears to be aetiological of the Karluks, a Turkic people of Central Asia attested from the eighth century when they migrated under Oğuz influence to the time of the Mongol conquests, where they were regarded as possessing a prioritised position due to their early submission to Chingis (Pelliot 1930: 332; Shcherbak 1959: 96; Golden 2000: 22, 28). This same etymology is attested in Rashīd al-Dīn's (Hist. *Oğuz*. §42 script 596u; cf. JAT. I. §34; Ömerəliev 1988: 32-33) Oğuz tradition in which Oğuz gives the name to a group of soldiers who refuse to come with him because of the difficulty of traversing snow. Other figures include a Kalach beg who is set by Oğuz to watch over a locked and impenetrable house (kal, ach = stay [and] open [it]) (§29-30) and appears to be an obvious reference to the Kalach Türks from the ninth century (Pelliot 1930: 335; Shcherbak 1959: 96). In Rashīd al-Dīn we find a similar etymological structure in relation to the Kalach people (kal, ach= stay [here and be] hungry), though only in the general body of the World History itself (JAT. I. §34-35; Ömerəliev 1988: 34-35). Another is the Kangli Turks, or western Kipchaqs, from a similar period to the other peoples and

[7] Comparatively, the Oğuz Kağan of Rashīd al-Dīn appears to echo the Oğuz and Seljuk conquests of the eleventh century from China to the Volga, Azerbaijan and Jerusalem (Pinner and Franses 1980: 70).

mentioned as a conquered people in The Secret History (§262, 270), who in the Turfanian text are given their name by Oğuz due to the noise their wagons make: kanga, kanga (§31-32), when they are used as slaves (living goods) to pull wagons filled with (dead) goods pillaged from Urum Kağan's ordu. This may well be connected with the Mongol extermination in 1221 of perhaps thirty-thousand Kanglis under Temür Malik at Fanakat and the disbanding of their tribes by the Mongols (JAT. II. §356; Golden 2000: 31). In Rashīd al-Dīn this name and aetiology is repeated, when it is given to the inventor of the two wheel wagon, which makes a "kank" sound as it goes (Hist. *Oğuz*. §20 script 591r; cf. JAT. I. §34; Ömerəliev 1988: 34-35), though the Kangli themselves are not depicted as a slave race. This suggests that the Turfanian version, with its Mongol influence may have readapted this myth to fit the later emphasis. There is also of course the Kipchaq Turks of modern Russia, against whom the Mongol generals Sübedei and Jebe fought at the instruction of Chingis between 1221-1223, along with ten other "nations" including the Russians and Alans (SHM §262; cf. RaD. Succ. Ch. Ka*ğan*. II 55,69-70; Saunders 1971: 59; Gabriel 2004: 89-95; de Rachewiltz 2005: 958-959) and again in the reign of Ögödei along with Batu from 1237 to 1242 (SHM §270, 274,275; Juv. HWC. I. 222, 224-226; RaD. Succ. Ch. *Kağan*. II. 43-54; Minorsky 1952: 221-238; Turnbull 2003: 44-55),[8] and whose tree based etymology has already explained. In relation to this period, other figures in the text such as Urus Beg (§20), whose etymology is uncertain, may represent the Russian conquests of the Mongols (Pelliot 1930: 350; Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 44) and the son of Urus, who gains the name Saklab (one who obeyed) after giving over his citadel to Oğuz (§21-23), has been said to represent the Slavs (Riza Nur 1928: 6 ap. Pelliot 1930: 350), though this latter designation is less than precise.[9] We should also note that Rashīd al-Dīn's (Hist. *Oğuz*. §20 script 591r) Oğuz tradition possesses an etymology of the Uyghurs as obedient "followers," which as might be imagined, is absent from the Turfanian text, where Oğuz's nature is *kağan* of the Uyghurs (§12), and not the Oğuz (cf. JAT. I. §34; Ömerəliev 1988: 36-37). This different perspective

[8] De Rachewiltz (2004: 960) has deftly noted that the list of the "ten nations" mentioned as subdued by the Mongols at SHM §262 from the campaign of 1221-1223 appears to have had added to it some of Ögödei's conquests of 1237-1242, which are reiterated at §270. The collapsing of the western conquests together would also seem to have relevance for the overall stream which the Turfanian Oğuz tradition is borrowing.

[9] See n. 81 for discussion on the difficulties of Saklab= Arabic *saqāliba*, which was used to describe a myriad of fair skinned eastern European peoples taken as slaves from the eight century onwards (Duczko 2004: 22).

is vital in showing the importance of "owning" Oğuz as tribal progenitor rather than being the passive recipient of Oğuz's deeds and consigned to "otherness".[10]

In light of this, it is important to discuss the fact that many scholars, upon finding reference to the Mongol conquests in the Turfan text have tried their hardest to square all the figures available, in geographical and chronological order, with the Oğuz tradition as though it were a historical record (Marquart 1914: passim; Pelliot 1930: passim; Shcherbak 1959: 62-102; Ölmez 2009: 17-33). In many ways this is a little too literal and typical of the nineteenth century thinking that generated these theories and have had such a large influence on this rarely discussed text. Rather, perhaps whilst we should acknowledge these ideas, and in some ways the conquests of Sübedei and Batu as floating place names and labels that had an impact on the story, we should also consider the possibility that Oğuz's conquests cannot be located perfectly in geographical space. In no way may these tales of western conquest that were added to the Turfanian Oğuz have been even as clear as the Mongol records with which Juwaynī, Rashīd al-Dīn and the author of The Secret History worked in writing their histories of the Chingisid conquests- all of which are severely confused with regard to Turkic and Mongolian approximations of local names and which remain the topics of ongoing discussion for Mongolists because of this (Pelliot 1950: 114, 128-130, 219, 226, Minorsky 1952: 221-238; Cleaves 1982: 203, 210, 215; de Rachewiltz 2004: 958-960, 989-991).

In reference to these geographical difficulties, some remarks are called for in relation to the symbolic nature of geography in the Turfanian text, which is of far greater consequence than merely a literal reading of the work. For instance, one curious issue regarding geography is the two mountains called Muz Tag (Ice Mountain) that appear in the text (§15, 21), which Marquart (1914: 143) took as two different locations and Pelliot (1930: 208) simply as a redundancy not to be concerned with. Rather, I would like to suggest that this repeating mountain may represent a reduced image of the cosmic "World Mountain" of Indo-Iranian and Turkic-Mongolian mythology, which is taken as the centre of the world, human origination and action (Eliade [1970] 1995: 266-267). Perhaps like the omnipresent Burqan Qaldun in The Secret History (§1-145), which Roux (1993: 327-228) regards as

[10] In Rashīd al-Dīn's epitomised Oğuz Kağan narrative (§35) there is also an Agacheri ("forest people") mentioned as a recent creation when the Oğuz invaded their undisclosed realm. They are not mentioned in the Turfanian tradition.

fulfilling this cosmic purpose along with the Göktürk sacred mountain of rulership and origination Ötüken, the repetition of Muz Tag in the cycle's action suggests older ideas in which the World Mountain represented the entire world.

Such symbolic concerns are also very important in reference to two key instances: the first being the location of the submissive good ruler Altun Kağan and the arrogant ruler Urum Kağan (§13-18), and the other being the location of the bow and arrows in Ulug Türks dream, which are used through their finding by the children of Oğuz to illustrate a symbollic principle of dual world rulership (§36-42). Urum Kağan is juxtaposed with the obedient Altun Kağan during Oğuz's early command for all his neighbours to obey him as ruler of all four corners of the world and *kağan* of the Uyghurs (§13-15). Altun is most likely, as many suggest (Marquart 1914: 143; Pelliot 1930: 297; Bang and Rahemti 1936: 40; Shcherbak 1959: 95), the Altan Qa'an of the Chinese/Jurjit Jin nation who is described in The Secret History of the Mongols (§248-251) as submitting to Chingis Kağan through a message sent by his minister Ongging Chingsang, after which, like the Altun Kağan of the Oğuz narrative (§13-14), much gold, silver and other wares were tributed to the Mongols around 1211.[11] However, more than anything Altun Kağan is a symbolic plot device: an epitome of the rewards and favour that come to one who acknowledges Oğuz Kağan as sovereign (§13-14), and thus a necessary inclusion so as to precipitate Oğuz going to war with Urum Kağan, who is strictly disobedient (§15-18). Urum himself may indicate anything from the Alans, who worked as mercenaries for the Byzantines (Urum= Rome) (Marquart 1914: 142-143; Shcherbak 1959: 95), to the Byzantines themselves (Ölmez 2009: 23) or even the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum (Pelliot 1930: 29). The name may have stemmed from any of these and is unimportant compared with, as emphasised, Altun and Urum representing a case study of those obedient and disobedient to Oğuz, whose key importance is a narrative one rather than an arguably historical one.

Furthermore, regarding the issue of symbolic direction and location in the text, the most important thing to note, as Pelliot (1930: 297) points out, is that the positioning of Altun and Urum Kağan in relation to Oğuz appears to be from a northerly orientated perspective- very rare in the Turkic-Mongolian cultures, which

[11] Ögödei is also listed as subduing him and taking a great deal of tribute around 1231 (§SHM 273). He appears to finally have come to an end around February 1234 (§274; de Rachewiltz 2004: 1009-1010).

are usually east-orientated and sometimes south-orientated because of Chinese influence. This is significant as what might appear to mean "east" or "west" at first glance in the text- especially the rare word *čöng* ("left hand side" §14, 41), which may have stemmed from Mongolian *ze'ün* ("left/east") (Pelliot 1930: 298), actually indicate on the "left hand side" and on the "right hand side" of the figure or point in question in the Turkic-Mongolian languages (ibid. 297). Thus, for Altun Kağan, assumed to be the Jürchen/Jin in northern China, to be in the "west" of the Uyghurs and Chaghatai Ulus, and for Urum Kağan, assumed to be the Byzantines or their Alan mercenaries to be in the "east" would seem absurd to anyone who follows these lines of argument. This is why Pelliot (1930: 297) assumes that the speaker is facing north and thus the perspectives are inverted. However, it may also be possible to suggest here that as Urum and Altun appear to be in deliberate juxtaposition as to their characters and attitudes to Oğuz, their positions might indeed be figurative of West-Mongolian and Siberian shamanic dualism in which the east is the direction of wicked spirits and the west the direction of positive ones, inherited from early Indo-Iranian dualistic concepts of cosmic structure (Skrynnikova 2002: 70). Although the mediaeval Turks and Mongols do not seem to have inherited this east-west dualism in their native religions, which emphasised the heaven and earth instead and the role of the Kağan as intermediary (ibid.), there is also no evidence of Islam, Christianity, Manichaeism or any other contemporary religion in the text (Pelliot 1930: 252), wherein we might find evidence of the pejoration of the left hand side. However, against this it should be noted that at the end of the Turfanian text when Oğuz sets up two totems for the two branches of his children and seats them on the right (the controlling tribe- Buzuk) and the left (the lower Üchoks) (§39-41), [12] we may see that there is indeed a left and right hierarchy, which some scholars have compared with dualistic Siberian Yakut beliefs (Shcherbak 1959: 89). This suggests that several different qualitative geographical systems are inherent in the text, which is not surprising when we have already seen the complexity of cultural and historical layers in the work.

In relation to this hierarchy of sons, the elder and celestial Buzuk (broken [bow]) and the younger and earthly Üchok (three arrows) are related explicitly to a series of mutually reinforcing aetiological myths of dualistic hierarchy, beginning

[12] They are called in the JAT epitome of the Oğuz legend (I. §36): "those who hold the bow" and "the army of the left hand" respectively.

with the respective heavenly and earthly mothers, in which both parties are required for the wielding of power over the entire world. The most important of these myths is instituted through the symbolism of a dream on the part of Oğuz Kağan's chamberlain, Ulug Türük, in the Turfanian text in which he sees a golden bow stretching from sunrise to sunset and three silver arrows in "the direction of darkness/night" (§35-37). Oğuz subsequently sends his sons out hunting for game without telling them about the objects (§38). Destiny plays its part and they return with the sacred objects (§38-39). What the bow most likely symbolises is the vault of heaven or a rainbow and is located in the east when the older Buzuk sons find it (§38). The arrows, in "the direction of darkness/night" (§36, 38), which Shcherbak (1959: 57, 59) takes to be north in both the dream and when the objects are found, supply the missiles for the world sized bow: they are the servants to the Buzuks- their soldiers without whom there is no military power. As Oğuz Kağan says to his sons: "A bow looses arrows towards the heavens…. A bow looses arrows. Be you like [its] arrows" (§39, 40). However, Ölmez (2009: 31) takes the direction in which the arrows are found in the first case to be the north and in the latter case the west, without explanation. Perhaps this is a mistake on his part, or perhaps it is to mirror the left/west- right/east of their later seating under the totems at Oğuz's banquet (§40-41). Despite this, at the banquet, as described, right is prioritised in relation to the Buzuks (§41). If Ölmez is correct, this means we now have a southerly facing orientation, which would seem an absurd addition to our already convoluted directional problems! Rather it would seem to make far more sense symbolically for east-west in this episode to be for the Buzuks and the bow and north to be for the Üchoks and the arrows, forming the crossed image of an arrow perched on the horizontal bow string as a symbol of world rulership through bow and arrow.

In my Master's thesis I spent much time on this myth given at the end of both this Turfanian text and that of Rashīd al-Dīn's version in which the two groups of sons receive their inheritance through associations with either the bow or arrows (Ratcliffe 2013: 95-101). In the end I came to the conclusion that it was a polythetic outgrowth of similar mythic foci to ones found in "bundle" of arrows fables of the Scythians (Plut. Mor. 174f, 511c), Tu-yü-hun (Molé 1970: 5-6), Alan Qo'ai in The Secret History of the Mongols (SHM §18-22), and the Seljuk ruler Tughril Beg in the *Sāljuq-nāma* tradition (*Rāḥ*at al-*ṣudūr* 102, *Risāla-i Juwaynī* 5-6 ap. Luther trans. 2001: 167 n. 21), in which collective force and tribal solidarity is evoked through the

nomadic power symbol of the bow and its missiles (Ratcliffe 2013: 100ff). Rashīd al-Dīn's (Hist. *Oğuz*. §43 script 596v) version of the Oğuz bow and arrows episode is not prefigured by any of the symbolism involving descent from an earth and sky goddess or a dream, though the names of the six sons in the Oğuz Kağan epitome at the start of The World History are the same as in the Turfanian tradition, though their inclusion remains primarily a genealogical one for plotting the descent of the Turkic peoples (JAT. I. §39-43). Unlike the Turfanian version, however, both of Rashīd al-Dīn's (Hist. O*ğuz* §43 script 596v 78; cf. JAT. I. §36-37) versions of the Oğuz bow/arrows myth are a little clearer on the folk etymology of the sons' names: Buzuk stemming from the act of Oğuz breaking a bow and sharing it with his three oldest sons, and Üchok in relation to the three arrows for the younger sons. However, the Turfanian version appears to have retained a lot more of older mythic and symbolic, traditions, for which we must assume that either the two branches of the sons' names were either obvious to the audience or had been retained without being understood. The former seems far more likely.

c. Language and Dating.

Lastly, I would like to discuss to some degree the question of linguistics in relation to the dating and substrata of this text. Pelliot (1930), Bang and Rahmeti (1936) and Shcherbak (1959) have approached this task in great detail, and recent comments such as Ölmez's (2009: 1-5) merely seem to be to the effect of agreeing with these. Upon inspection there are indeed some very telling peculiarities regarding the dialect of this text. One is the large number of Mongolian lone words,[13] or Turkic words which appear to have been Mongolised that are present,[14] which is not surprising considering the generally agreed placement of this text in the Chaghatai Ulus within the period of the Mongol conquests and the Timurid renewed usage of the Uyghur script (Pelliot 1930: 252-258; Ölmez 2009: 2-3). There are also several Arabic,[15] Chinese,[16] and

[13] mö*rän* (§3, 12 18, 20)= river; *ǰï*da (§3,5,12,42) = spear; *ǰalbarγu*-da (§6)= at prayer; talai/talui (§12,37)= sea; uran (§12)= war-cry; amïraq (§13)= friend/ally; soyurqab (§14)= honoured; atla- (§15, 16, 25, 33, 34)= ride; minority: Pelliot 1930: 335- *temür γ*ool (§28)= Iron River; *nükär[lär*] (§31)= companion[s]; *tüšimäl* (§35)= functionary; minority: Pelliot 1930: 298- *ǰöng/čöng* (§14, 41)= Mong. *ze'ün* (east); minority: Shcherbak 1959: 86- törlüg (§37) = power; quriltai (§40)= meeting of Mongolian rulers.

[14] *čïraγï* (§1)= face; minority: Pelliot 1930: 264-267- *qa'at* (§4-5)= rhinoceros; *šungqar* (§5)= falcon; *suγï* (§19)= water; *čïbar* (§28, 31)= noble.

[15] *bädän* (§2) = body; minority: Ölmez 2009: 3- yaqut = ruby.

Persian terms,[17] inherent in the text (Pelliot 1930: 355; Ölmez 2009: 2-3), which may have entered at any point during this time, especially given the medial position and role of the Chaghatai Ulus as a trade root between the Il-Kağanate in Persia, China and the Islamic world between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries (Cooper and Burbank 2011: 105).

Further, the influence of the Turkic Kyrgyz language has also been suggested as playing a major part in reference to the affrication of y- into *ǰ*-[18] and *č*- [19] within the text, which is also a characteristic of Mongolian (Pelliot 1930: 352-356; Erdal 2004: 70).[20] Thus Pelliot's (1930: 255) suggestion is that the text we possess is a Turfanian Uyghur redaction of a western Kitai-Uyghur oral tradition or pre-existing text from the fourteenth century in which these linguistic quirks were present and were not removed by the editors. As emphasised by Seçkin (2013: section 4), the veritable plethora of extraneous verbs of speaking such as de- as final particles, suggests a clearly oral tradition which has only just begun to move towards the conventions of written language. Such arguments would seem to remain strong regarding finding a date and place for this manuscript, on that basis that such linguistic transitions are not attested prior to this point in Ming recordings of the Turfanian Uyghur language (Pelliot 1930: 256-258), which as Shcherbak (1959: 105-106) noted, varied greatly from the vocabulary of the Oğuz name with regard to the use of rounded/unrounded vowels. However, we must remember that this "younger language" as Ölmez (2009: 5) calls it is a very young one indeed- and an artificial one to boot due to redactions. It is not in any means "Chaghatai" in the sense of the features usually regarded as being necessary for this later stage of development: it does not possess an excess of Arabic or Persian terms, nor Indo-European word order nor any of the florid language of the

---

[16] *bandäng* (§11) = bench.

[17] *atäš* = fire, in *atäš qïzïl* (fire-red); tost (§13, 14)= friend; *düšmäl* (§13)= enemy.

[18] yarlig- *ǰarluγ* (§12-14)= command; yal- *ǰ*al (§16, 17, 18, 24, 32) = hair; yosun- *ǰ*osun (§31)= custom; minority: Pelliot (1930: 347) yas- -*ǰasγu* (§36) = health.

[19] *buyurmuš- bučurmuš* (§22) = fulfil a promise, bring about; minority: Ölmez (2009: 31) yas--*čašγu* (§36) = health.

[20] Erdal (2004: 70) says of the dynamic between fricative y- and affricate *ǰ*- and *č*- :"Proto-Turkic onset /y/ does, however, appear as the voiced affricate [ǰ] in a number of Turkic languages including Volga Bolgarian, and also in cognates in Mongolic (which itself does have onset /y/ beside onset / ǰ / in original Mongolic words with no Turkic counterparts)". He also adds regarding such minority influences as far back as Orkhon Turkish (ibid.): "*čalïnlïg* appears as variant of yalïn+lïg 'brilliant' in completely fragmented context, followed by a lacuna, in BT XIII 5,188 and also, in the binome *čalïnlïg čoglug*, in ShōAv XIIa9. This spelling may be the result of reborrowing from Mongolian, where yalïn appears as jali(n), and/or *čoglug* (which may possibly have stood in the lacuna also in BT XIII) may have had some alliterative influence." Thus, the movement of y- towards *č*- and *ǰ*- would strongly suggest influence from outside of the Orkhon-Oğuz-Uyghur chain of linguistic descent.

Sufi universities and use as a trade language between the successor states of the Mongols which begins in the late fourteenth century (EIO. Bodroligeti 2009: "Turkic-Iranian Contacts II: Chaghatay"; Cakan 2011: 158-160). Rather, what I believe we are looking at is the successive recording of an oral tradition or redaction of an older manuscript with the addition of certain fifteenth century suffixes and late neologistic vocabulary on the part of the redactor (Pelliot 1930: 275-276 Ölmez 2009: 4),[21] which otherwise remains Middle Turkic (Ölmez 2009: 5). This would also help us in explaining two key issues: one is the distinct lack of Timurid military superstrata, as it appears that as a figure of conquest the Turfanian Oğuz remains "fixed" in the thirteenth century Mongol conquests, and thus was most likely written down in its first form before, at very latest, the start of the fifteenth century. The other is the textual difficulty arising from the issue as to whether it is Oğuz's mother or father giving birth to him, which if our manuscript were merely a copy of a possibly damaged earlier one, it may explain why an error such as this appears to have been made.

Finally in attempting to explain the layers of the text historically, we should begin by refuting Gömeç's (2009: 133-145/57-66) belief that the Turfanian Oğuz has his basis in the second century BCE Xiong-nu ruler Modun Chan-yu, as he fails to note the fact that this connection was made by Bichurin (1950: 36-47) in reference to Rashīd al-Dīn's Oğuz Kağan and elements specific to his narrative and not the Turfanian version, such as warring between father and son and the order of conquests undertaken by the two figures appearing similar. Either way, such observations on Bichurin's (ibid.) part would appear somewhat generic regarding supposed links between Oğuz and Modun on the basis of infighting between the hero and relatives, which in Modun's case are manifest in the killing of his father using trained bowmen during a hunting trip (Sima Qian Shi Ji 110. 2888-2890). Oğuz's pejoration of his relatives who do not take up Islam and their becoming the Mongols (Hist. *Oğuz*. §20 script 591r), for that matter, would seem to be a clear aetiological myth of the religio-political differences inherent in the rulership of the Mongol empire during Rashīd al-Dīn's day. The Turfanian Oğuz Kağan does not share any of these elements at all.

[21] *čïrayï* (§1), *suγï* (§19)= face, water- late usage of *-γï*; körüklügrek (§1); *quγulγuluγraq* (§14), = more beautiful, brighter- late usage of *–luγraq* comparative suffix. Pelliot (1930: 345) also believes that ta ("jusqu'à"- "right up to") is a late Persian influence.

Rather, from a historical perspective, it is more important to note the fact that the Oğuz name is first mentioned by the Göktürks during the 730's as a wayward group of nine disobedient tribes in the Orkhon valley inscriptions (Dennison Ross and Thomsen 1930: I.S2, I.E14, I. N4 II. E1, 30, 34, 35 pp. 861-875; Ölmez 2009: 1).[22] The presence in the text of archaic Old Turkic terms, stemming back to Orkhon Turkish is also curious,[23] and would also seem to suggest the retention of older language in oral poetry, though whether this signifies the existence of an eponymous Oğuz Kağan as an extant figure at this early date would seem very hard to determine.[24] However, it should also be mentioned that of these Oğuz tribes the Ten Uyghurs appear to have been members (Hamilton 1962: 29; Kim 2013: 217), which does suggest that the Oğuz link could descend back at least to the eighth century. Further, although the Turfan and Azerbaijani branches' fixation with peoples such as the Kalach, Karluk and Kangli who are first attested in the eighth and ninth centuries and lasted until the Mongol empire would seem to place a large span on these aetiological myths, it should also be noted, as was discussed above, that the Kangli myth appears to have been altered in the Turfanian tale due to influence from the Mongol conquests. Thus, we might suggest that where myths of origin such as those of the Kipchak, Kalach and Karluk and Kangli occur in both branches, these may be assigned to a period prior to Oğuz migration westwards in the eleventh century, even if they have undergone later changes.

Most importantly, the greater proportion of pagan elements in the Turfanian text and the many facets shared with the twelfth century Anatolian wolf migration legend of the Oğuz and the Azerbaijani Oğuz legends of the thirteenth/fourteenth century used by Rashīd al-Dīn suggest that the Oğuz cycle did begin before the Oğuz migration westwards in the mid-eleventh century CE under the Seljuks, who had only converted to Islam seventy years prior to this (Nafziger and Walton 2003: 91-92). The contrary idea, which could be defended by the existence of the thirteenth/fourteenth century East Turkic Uzunköprü manuscript in this region, which appears to be a

[22] Before this time there is only a slim possibility of their identification with the Wu-chieh, a people defeated by Modun, whose name Pulleyblank (1983: 456) suggests may have been pronounced something akin to **Hagaŕ*.

[23] *bädük* (§2, 3, 10, 23, 28) = big; Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 51- türlüg (§37) = various, different; Ölmez (2009: 3).

[24] One thing which would seem to count against this is that al-Kāšγarī (40N) in his eleventh century CE *Dīwān* in his in-depth analysis of the term "*oγus*" (tribe) and Oğuz tribal dynamics, does not mention such a figure, though we should also be mindful that the Kitabi-i Dedem Korkut in detailing the diverse Oğuz oral traditions of Azerbaijan does not either.

versified variant of Rashīd al-Dīn's branch (Orkun 1936: 267; Eraslan 1973-1975: 176-190), that the contents of the Turfanian epic are later than those of the Islamicised one and that the Turfanian tradition is merely the affixing of the figure of Oğuz and some of the tradition's elements to pagan Uyghur myth, would seem weak. The mythic contents of the Turfanian manuscript are far too archaic. As we have seen, in many cases the Turfanian tradition preserves many details that are cut down in the Azerbaijani branch such as the dual division of sons and wives and the symbolism of the celestial bows and arrows. For this reason, due to what we can learn from viewing the tradition holistically, I am inclined to believe that the eighth century was a period of importance in the formation of this cycle and, tentatively, Oğuz as a figure, the eleventh century migrations another, the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century, and finally, as discussed in detail, the fourteenth century for the origination of the Kyrgyz influenced oral tradition and possible earlier manuscript, and the fifteenth century as terminus for our manuscript in question.

d. Translation of the Uyghur Text of the *Oğuz* Name.[25]

[25] The actual title has been torn off the manuscript and thus is not known (Ölmez 2009: 2). Pelliot (1930: 247) refers to it for this reason as "incomplet" and "Oughouz-*namé"* as a conventional yet arbitrary title adopted by Riza Nur and Radlov. The following is a translation of pp. 22-63 of

Nativity and Youth.

(1) Let it begin, they have said.[26] This is his image:  .[27] And because of it (people)[28] have been filled with joy. One day Ay Kağan's eyes grew bright[29] and (his wife) gave birth to a mighty son.[30] The boy's complexion was sky blue; his mouth was crimson like flame; his eyes vermillion;[31] his hair and brows (jet) black. He was

---

Shcherbak's (1959) text, comprising the 42 pages of nine lines each of a most likely fourteenth century CE Turfanian manuscript written in a curious form of the Uyghur language. Ölmez (2009: 2-3) contends that the mix of Old Turkic, Middle Mongolian and post-Oğuz Turkish of this dialect, in conjunction with the use of the Uyghur script, which became common again in the time of the Timurids gives it a definite fifteenth century dating. Pelliot (1930: 350-352) also agrees on the fifteenth century as the terminus for the written text owing to its late Kyrgyz dialect palatisation of certain consonants, but sets its creation as the thirteenth century CE due to what he believes is a very strong Mongol period influence on the story's content. In spite of such largely unsolvable arguments, the pre-Islamic nature of much of the text would seem to more importantly suggest older material renewed and orally reworked over a long time through many cultural periods before this individual example was recorded.

[26] I have not retained Shcherbak's structure, wherein he transcribes the text in Cyrillic in Uyghur line by line, and beneath it the equivalent in Russian. Often this seems to force the translator to attempt to convey the meaning of the text word for word in an approximation of Turkic syntax, causing it to appear somewhat awkward. I have attempted to translate the text as closely as possible, but also to present it in a manner easily readable and hope to have struck a mid-point between these two somewhat opposing extremes.

[27] Аңаҕусу/*angugu* (cf. 6.III) or *anɣu*-su, as read by Pelliot (1930: 249) does literally mean (fr.,)"son image", but as Pelliot (ibid) points out it is a verbal noun- perhaps "his description". Pelliot (ibid.) notes here that there is an image of a bull inserted into the text after the word in question. The only edition I have found this integral aspect of the manuscript printed in is Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 10). Images are also included for the qiat and falcon in Bang and Rahmeti's text (ibid 12)This seems to echo the emphasis placed on Oğuz's bull like qualities later in his description (found at 2.III).

[28] Round brackets are my insertion where a word is required to render the sense more accurately in English. Square brackets are in accordance with Shcherbak (1959) and his suggested readings of corrupt and missing passages. These will be commented on where necessary.

[29] The argument here is whether the verb describing the eyes is Pelliot's (1930: 249-250) yara- (variant of *köz aɣï*- for the eyes to grow dim) or yaru- ("become bright" also attested 8. III, 10. IV), supported by Radlov (1890 ap. Pelliot 1930: 249), Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 10, 32-34), Shcherbak (1959: 22) and Ölmez (2009: 18). I have settled with the majority, as the word does seem more likely and has precedents in Turkic Buddhist literature (cf. Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 32-34).

[30] Shcherbak's (1959: 22, 94) Russian has "*она родила сына"* (she gave birth to a son), taking Ay Kağan as the name of the mother. Ölmez (2009: 17-18) also has "she gave birth to a baby boy" without context or explanation. The root of the problem, as Pelliot (1930: 250) points out, is that if the mother is the only person mentioned here (and not the father of Oğuz at all), katun is the feminine title for a Türkic ruler (and not Kağan) and that the proximal *ḫānīm* is attested only amongst the Crimean Türks of the Ottoman period. This suggests to me that the mother is either elided or that there has been an error in the manuscript. Bernshtam (1935: 35; 1951: 66) linked her divine glow with the Turkic earth goddess Umai, and compares her to the goddess Ishtar as a moon deity due to the lunar connections with her name *"ay"* (Turk. moon- *ay Kağan* = lit. "moon queen/king?). This may have some value in relation to Turkic creation myths, but lack of context within the text causes difficulties for such interpretations.

[31] Ölmez (2009: 18) says "hazel" which would seem more natural, though this colouration (*ал*) would seem intrinsically connected with blushing and redness. In modern Turkish it can mean chestnut in connection with horses (Alderson and İz 1959: 9 "al" [1]).

more handsome than (even) angels are.[32] The boy drank the first milk from his mother's breast[33] and then he (2) did not drink what was left of it. He desired bloody meat, and rice to go with it and wine,[34] and going to (each of his) desire(s), he fulfilled them. At forty days old he was colossal and (could) run and play. His legs were like those of a bullock; his loins like those of a wolf; his shoulders like those of a sable; his breast like that of a bear. His whole body was covered with hair.[35] He stood watch over the flocks and he rode horses and he went hunting for game.[36] In (but) a number of days and nights he reached maturity.

The Qiat.

(3) At this time[37] in this place there was a great forest. There were many rivers and streams there.[38] There was a great deal of game and migratory birds there. In the middle of the forest there was (also) a mighty qiat.[39] It fed upon horses and men. It

[32] The words here are *ǰäkshï näpsïkïlär-dän* (than the good *näpsïkïlär*). Pelliot (1930: 254-255) details that navsiki is a Uyghur term for spirits or djinn, which stems from Indic literature where it means a local genius. Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 11) have perilerden (than the peris). körüklügrek (§1)= brighter, like *quγulγuluγraq* (§14) appears to indicate a late usage (fifteenth century CE) of the *–luγra*q comparative suffix (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 34-35; cf. Ölmez 2009: 4).

[33] Pelliot (1930: 256-257) links the word for (fr.) "premiere lait" (*uγuz*) with the name of Oğuz Kağan himself and the word "*oγus"* (tribe). This is a curious notion- one ritually linking Türkic identity with initiation and birth, and should be looked into in greater detail.

[34] Pelliot (1930: 257-260) goes into much discussion on these foodstuffs, after which he finally concludes that yig = raw/bloody and describes the *et/ät* (meat); *aš*= a term for cereal based food that accompanies meats; and that *sürmä*= wine, though its derivation from sub (water) appears to have caused it to mean many different edible liquids, interpreted differently by various Türkic peoples. Shcherbak (1959: 23) "*мяса сырого, пищи*, *вина*" (of raw meat, cooked food and wine). Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 10) have "*çiğ et, çorba ve şarap*" (raw meat, soup and wine).

[35] The word for body here: *bedän/bädän* = Arabic badan (body). Uyghur: *mÿg mÿlÿglÿg* (lit. as hairy as hairy can get). Ölmez (2009: 18) has "his whole body was fairy", which appears a mistake for "furry".

[36] *Kiк* seems to suggest mammals, as it is sharply distinguished from birds in poetic formulas. The Russian retains it as *кик*. Note in (3) the qiat is referred to as a *кік*, which in this case I have translated as "beast".

[37] Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 10) seem to believe that bu (this) does not agree with *čaqta* (at … time), and that there is a lacuna here. Shcherbak (1959: 23-24) does not suggest anything like this, not Pelliot (1930), and the language seems to agree without problem.

[38] Pelliot (1930: 264) claims that *mörän*= Ch. kiang and *öγüz* = Ch. ho- official terms for large rivers.

[39] The qiat seems a difficult creature to deduce, though the image contained in the manuscript does suggest an animal that at least visually mirrors that of the western unicorn (cf. ON 6 and n. 50 of my work below). The Russian has *единорог* (rhinoceros), which could also indicate a unicorn, though each time it is mentioned a question mark follows it in Shcherbak's (1959: 24-27) text, showing indecision on coming to any strong conclusion. Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 12) have gergedan- the modern Turkish term for a rhinoceros. Shcherbak (1959: 68) suggests multiple possibilities meaning a legendary animal like a rhinoceros or a dog in Uyghur and Sogdian respectively. Pelliot (1930: 264-267) discusses this beast in great detail, after which he refutes its connection with Arabic qiat and the Mongol *qïat tribe,* and suggests instead that it should be read *qa'at* (qat)- a Mongolised version of Skt. ka*ḍ*ga (rhinoceros). For this reason I have left it as kiat and for the reader's imagination to fill in by the

was a powerful and terrifying beast. It had become a harsh burden and preyed upon men. Oğuz Kağan was a manly, mighty fellow.[40] He wanted to hunt the qiat. One day he went out hunting with his spear (4) and with his bow and arrow and with his sword and with his shield. He caught a deer. He bound the deer to a tree with a willow bough and then he left. After that the morning of the next day arrived, and when it was morning he came back. He saw that the qiat had taken the deer. Then he caught a bear and bound it to the tree with his golden belt and left. After that the morning of the next day arrived and when it was morning he came back. He saw that the kiat had taken the bear. (5) Thus he put himself in front of the tree. The qiat came and pierced Oğuz's shield with its head. Oğuz pierced the q*iat's* head with his spear and he killed it. With his sword he cut off its head, took it, and went home. When he returned he saw that a falcon[41] was feasting on the q*iat's* innards. With his bow and arrow he slew the falcon, and cut off its head. This is an image of the falcon: .[42] "It ate the deer and it ate the bear. By my spear it perished, (6) - it was made of iron (the spear). The falcon ate the kiat. By my bow it perished, - it was made from the winds (the bow and arrow),"[43] and having said this he went home. This is an image of the kiat: .[44]

Oğuz's Wives and Children.

---

context of the rest of the work. Ölmez (2009: 18-19) bizarrely and slightly disconcertingly refers to it as "the horny".

[40] Pelliot (1930: 268-269) translates eriz/iris as "royale" instead of my "manly" because of the semiotic value inherent in Mong. er-/ Türk. *är* in the titles of warriors. His manliness makes him a member of the aristorcracy and vice-versa.

[41] Ölmez (2009: 19) has rather specifically "red-footed falcon" throughout. I am not sure if this is a species distinction without mention of redness or feet in the text, though the word *шуңкар* (Mod. Mong. *шонхор*) is obviously Mongolian, as Ölmez (2009: 3) agrees.

[42] Once again we have another miniature (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 12).

[43] Pelliot (1930: 273-275) discusses the syntactical difficulties in this passage in detail, deciding that the spear = made of iron and the arrows = made of the winds, and that this is merely a showing of Oğuz's might with both traditional melée and distanced wepaons. He (ibid 275) explains its function in the overall text by adding finally: *"Et tout ceci vise les combats futurs que le heros livrera pour créer son empire"* ("And all this shows the future battles which the hero will endure in order to create his empire").

[44] Note the image of the qiat included appears quite like that of a unicorn (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 12). This whole section is rather curious. I would suggest that it indicates that the soul of the monster has passed into the falcon and therefore it has to be ritually and apotropaically beheaded as the kiat was.

One day in a certain place Oğuz Kağan was at prayer to Heaven.[45] It became dark. A blue light came out of the blue sky. It was brighter than (even) the sun or moon.[46] Oğuz Kağan ran up to it and saw that (7) in the middle of this light there was a young woman. She was sitting there alone. She was a most beautiful young woman. On her head there was a fiery, gleaming, birthmark like the North Star.[47] This young woman was so beautiful that if she laughed the Blue Sky would have laughed and if she wept the Blue Sky would have wept. As soon as Oğuz Kağan saw her he was beside himself, went up to her, was pleased with her, took her, lay (8) with her and did with her as he desired. She became heavy with child. After (but) a number of days and nights she was lightened and gave birth to three manly sons. They called the first Sun, they called the second Moon and they called the third Star. One day Oğuz Kağan went out hunting. In front of him he saw a tree in the middle of a lake. Inside the hollow[48] of the (9) tree there was a young woman. She was sitting alone. She was a most beautiful young woman. Her eyes were bluer than the blue sky. Her hair was like the flows of a stream. Her teeth were like pearls. She was so beautiful that when the people saw her they said: "Oh, oh, oh, we have died!"[49] And milk turned itself into kumis.[50] As soon as Oğuz Kağan saw her he was beside himself, his heart (10) skipped a beat, he found her pleasing and took her, lay with her and did with her as he

[45] Shcherbak (1959: 24, 70) translates *Jалбарђуда* here as *"плоконялся небесонму владыке*" (he venerated the lord of heaven), where it would more naturally mean "at prayer" as in mid. Mong. Zalbaril (prayer) (Lessing 1995: 1030). Ölmez (2009: 3) claims this is a Türkic word that had been Mongolised by this stage. Pelliot (1930: 276) adds little, except saying that *ǰ*albarga-da is an incorrect reading compared with *ǰ*albargu-da.

[46] Bright(er) = *quγulγuluγraq.* This word is taken by Ölmez (2009: 4) as proving the lateness of the text (fifteenth century) due to its long form and odd suffixes. Pelliot (1930: 275-276) says nothing of its newness, but links it with qut (heavenly power, good fortune) and its use in Manichaean Uyghur terminology for divine light.

[47] *Алтун казук/Mong.* altan qadaqasun ("golden stake") is a term used for the star Polaris. In Turkic-Mongolian tradition this star is regarded as the world's soul and suggests a profound divine symbolism whereby Oğuz Kağan's receiving of such a woman destines him for world rule. cf. törü-yin qadaqasun (the pillar of state) in Chapter Two of my Masters thesis (Ratcliffe 2013).

[48] Shcherbak (1959: 71-72) suggests that this curious term is a combination of k*абу* (tree) + *чак* (cover) which he defends with Radlov's (1893-1911: 456 ap. Shcherbak 1959: 71) dictionary entry on the same term: "*Неболшая попрышка или оболочка"* (a not small cover or coat). Ölmez (2009: 18) has "in the cavity of this tree" which would seem to have much in common with Uyghur origination myths (cf. DeWeese 1994: 285, 500) and that of the Kipchaks who are born from Oğuz Kağan and one of his wives in a hollow tree in Rashīd al-Dīn's *Oğuz-Nāme* (*Hist. Oğuz.* §43 script 591r 56), but is not defended or explained. Pelliot (1930: 278-291) takes *qabučak* to signify the hollow of a tree, and refutes suggestions that it means a way out or little door, as well as mentioning the connections with RaD's Kipchak aetiology.

[49] Pelliot (1930: 283) denies Radlov's (1893 ap. Pelliot 1930: 283) claims that the onomatopoeic "ay, ay, ay," of this section is in any way connected with the moon (Turk. ay = moon).

[50] Alcohol manufactured from horse or cow's milk. Cf. Hdt. IV.2 for a description of its manufacture as far back as the fifth century BCE.

desired. She became heavy with child. After (but) a number of days and nights she was lightened and gave birth to three manly sons. They called the first Sky, they called the second Hill and they called the third Sea.[51]

The Command.

After this Oğuz Kağan organised a great feast,[52] and (11) giving to his people a command, they complied and came. He had forty tables and forty benches set up. [53] They ate dishes of meat and joints of meat and drank wine and kumis. At the assembly Oğuz Kağan gave a command[54] to his begs (lords) and people and said: "I have become your Kağan. Fetch up your bows and shields. Let 'Good Fortune' be our motto.[55] Let 'Blue Wolf' be our battle cry. Let there be a (veritable) (12) forest of spears.[56] Let the wild ass[57] and the sea and the river run in the hunting grounds.[58] Let

[51] Note how the first three sons are celestial, in accordance with their celestial mother and the second three are layers of the world, in accordance with their more earthly parent. This dualism of heaven and earth and the two tribes later to spring from these sons underpins much of this tale.

[52] *Toi* is the term used and remains untranslated in the Russian (Shcherbak 1959: 37). Ölmez (2009: 22) has "feast" and Pelliot (1930: 283) "festin" (feast).

[53] *bindäng* = 40,000 (mïng) + cauldrons (*-däng*) as Radlov suggests (1893 ap. Pelliot 1930: 285) is quite absurd compared with ban(d)*däng*= Ch. pan-teng (bench) (Pelliot 1930: 286).

[54] The term for command is *ǰarluγ*, borrowed from the language of the Mongolian court for an official command. In Uyghur the term was yarlig, which suggests Mongol influence in pronunciation as well (Pelliot 1930: 306).

[55] *Тамҷа* is the term used here. *Tamγa* in Mid. Mong. signifies a "seal, brand" (Lessing 1995: 774). Because of the traditional difficulty of this section I give several versions: Radlov (1893 ap. Pelliot 1930: 287): *"Ich bin nun euer Kağan*, lasst uns Bogen und Schild nehmen, sie mögen uns als Tamga d*ienen, unser Bujan möge der blaue Wolf sein, unser Uran möge 'der eiserne Speer' sein, im Walde möge das Wild leben, die Kulane und die Talui, und die Flüsse und die Bäche mögen die Fahne sein. Dies is der blaue Kurigan"* ("I am now your Kağan. Let us take up our bows and shields, may they serve as our tamga (sign), may our bujan (good fortune) be of the Blue Wolf, may our Uran (battle-cry) be "the Iron Spear"; in the forest may the game dwell, the kulan (wild ass) and the talui (?), and the rivers and the streams may they be our standard. This is the blue Kurigan (tent)"). Riza Nur (1928 ap. Pelliot 1930: 287): *"Je suis devenu votre souverain. Prenez l'arc et le bouclier! Que le "hoyan" soit notre tamgha (empreinte)! Que "loup gris" soit notre mot d'ordre !* Lances de fer, soyez *une forêt! Que le gibier et le zèbre courent á 1'endroit où on chasse, dans la mer et dans la rivière! Que la tente bleue soit comme le soleil!"* ("I have become your ruler. Fetch up the bow and shield! May "hoyan" (good fortune) be our tamga (seal, mark)! May "Grey Wolf" be our battle-cry! May [our] iron spears be a forest! May the game and wild horse run in the hunting grounds, into the sea and into the river! May the blue tent be as the sun!").

[56] Ölmez (2009: 22) has "let iron spears and forests be abundant". This would seem a rather banal gloss at best and misses the point of the metaphor, as well as ignoring the grammar.

[57] *Кулан* = "wild ass" remains untranslated in the Russian here (Shcherbak 1959: 33)

[58] With regard to syntax and thus meaning this is quite an odd sentence. Presumably all these things are to run or move. The verb is *jÿрÿсÿн* which is intransitive and thus cannot mean pursue. Ölmez (2009: 22) has "let wild horses fill the hunting places, more sea, more sea, more rivers and sun," which would seem semantically and syntactically meaningless. Ergin (1988: §17) similalry has "daha deniz, daha müren" (more sea, more river). Pelliot (1930: 291) takes it as "Encore des mers! Encore des fleuves !" ("More seas! More rivers!"), which is seemingly odd as takï would seem to simply be linking the sea and rivers and not mean "more of".

the sun be our banner and the sky be our pavilion."[59] After that Oğuz Kağan sent a command to the four corners (of the land). He wrote down an announcement and giving it to his messengers he sent it. In this announcement it was written: "I have become the Kağan of the Uyghur people. It is a matter of importance that I have become the Kağan of this land's four corners. (13) I desire for you to bow your heads.[60] If you obey my instruction and send me tribute I will consider you a friend," he said, "(But) if you do not obey my instruction, becoming wrathful and marshalling my troops, I will consider you an enemy. Instantaneously attacking and striking, (all I need) say (is): 'let there be nothing there,' and I will have it done," he said.

Altun Kağan and Urum Kağan.

At this time to his (Oğuz's) west there was a Kağan called Altun Kağan.[61] (14) This Altun Kağan sent a messenger to Oğuz Kağan. He tributed him a great deal of gold and silver and he had brought to him a great deal of red precious stones,[62] and sending to him a great deal of treasures, honouring[63] Oğuz Kağan, he gave him (these things). He (Oğuz) made him one of his begs and his companion and became an ally with him. To his (Oğuz') east there was a Kağan by the name of Urum Kağan.[64] This Kağan's

[59] Ölmez (2009: 22) "let the blue pavilion be the token" would seem a very poor translation and does not admit the obvious equational nature of sun= flag/sky= pavilion, which Pelliot (1930: 291) appears to have been the first to highlight as the most likely answer.

[60] Riza Nur's (1928 ap. Pelliot 1930: 292) conception that *baš čaluγaluγ* means *beš* (five) + *čaling* (Mong. pay made out to soldiers in silver from Ch. *ts'ien*-leang) would seem a minority reading compared with Radlov (1989 ap. Pelliot 1930: 292), Pelliot (1930: 292-293) and Shcherbak (1959: 34-35) who all take it to be connected with Ch. *k'o-t'eou* or kowtowing. Ölmez (2009: 23) has the absurd "I want you to knuckle under to me."

[61] This name may refer to the Jürchen/Chin or Kitai peoples and Mongol experiences of them in the thirteenth century (Marquart 1914: 143; Pelliot 1930: 297; Bang and Rahemti 1936: 40; Shcherbak 1959: 95), but this needs more work than I am able to undertake at present. Pelliot (1930: 297) notes that Altun Kağan being on the "right" and Urum on the "left" suggests a northerly orientation, which compared with the usual easterly orientation of the Altaic peoples and southerly orientation adopted from the Chinese is certainly an anomaly.

[62] Although qïz would seem to mean "daughter" and not be a valid readiing (Pelliot 1930: 298), it would actually seem to be qïzïl (red) (Shcherbak 1959: 50; Ölmez 2009: 22). Ölmez (2009: 22), following Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 16-17) takes *qïz yaqut taš* here specifically as "red ruby". Pelliot (1930: 298-299) reads qïz as *qaš* to indicate a "mongolisme"- as the Mid. Mong. term for stone is qas and that it might be responsible for the origins of the word "jade" via the Mongol term for rain-stones: *ǰ*ad (cf. SHM §143; RaD. JAT. II. §458). All this means that he takes *qas yaqut taš* as two entities: much in the way of jade and precious stones.

[63] The verb is soyurqab, which Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 40) point out, appears to have been borrowed from Mong. sojurqa- (to honour).

[64] Marquart (1914: 142-143) suggests that Urum Kağan represents the Alans. Shcherbak (1959: 95) himself simply seems to agree with this arbitrary designation, when Urum could indicate many places such as the Anatolian Seljuk Sulanate of Rūm, or even any portion of the Byzantine Empire in general. Ölmez (2009: 23) has "Roma" without explanation. Pelliot (1930: 298) automatically assumes it to mean the sultanate of Rūm and notes that the word for east: *čöng/ǰ*öng appears to be from the

army was very large and his cities were very many. (15) This Urum Kağan did not heed Oğuz Kağan's command and he did not act in conformity (with it). "I will not obey these words of his," he said and did not attend to the command. Oğuz Kağan, becoming wrathful, desired to attack him. He rode out,[65] striking with his army bearing their banners.[66] After forty days he (Oğuz) came to the base of the mountain called Ice Mountain.[67] He (Oğuz) lay down in his tent, fell fast asleep (16) and slumbered. When the following morning came, a beam of light like the sun came into Oğuz Kağan's tent. From out of this light a blue-furred,[68] blue-maned massive, male wolf shone. This wolf gave words to Oğuz Kağan. It said: "O, o, o, Oğuz-you are soon to fight against Urum. (17) O, o, o, Oğuz- I will go in front of you (all),"[69] it said. After that Oğuz Kağan packed up his tent, departed, and saw that in front of his army a blue-furred, blue-maned, massive, male wolf was walking. Falling into order behind the wolf, they marched.[70]

War on Urum Kağan.

(18) A number of days later the blue-furred, blue-maned, massive, male wolf came to a halt. Oğuz along with his men (also) came to a halt. At this place there was a large body of water called the Itil River.[71] On the banks of the Itil River, in front of a black hill they made battle. They fought with arrows and with spears and with swords. Between[72] the armies there was a great deal of fighting (19) and there was a great deal of grief in the peoples' hearts. The combats and fighting were so ferocious that the

---

Mongolian word "*ze'ün*" (east), and that ong and sol are the usual terms for east and west. *Čong* for east is also found in 41.III and 41.VIII.

[65] Pelliot (1930: 208) takes the verb for riding here: atla- to be a "mongolisme", as Mong. moril- = ride a horse (morin) and at= a gelding in Mid. Mong. The verb appears also at: 15.VII, 16. IX, 20.IX, 25. III and IV, 33.III, 34.VI) suggesting very common usage.

[66] Ölmez (2009: 23) has the rather absurd "raised his plume".

[67] Marquart (1914: 143) takes this Muz-*Taγ* (Ice Mountain) and the one in section 21 to be two different ones. Pelliot (1930: 208) disagrees, suspecting redundancy and natural inexactness within the tradition.

[68] Pelliot (1930: 309) rightly takes *ǰ*al to be a palatised form of Türk. yal (hair, coat), as is found in Mong. del and delun. Ölmez (2009: 24) has "blue feathered". This seems a misunderstanding of the fact that in English, unlike Turkish, there are different words for the coverings of mammals' and birds' bodies.

[69] The term for "in front" here is tapuqung-*γa* which is repeated with slightly different grammar in reference to the blue wolf as tapuqlarï-*γa* (17. V), the hill where Oğuz fights Urum: tapïq-ï-da (18.VI) and again with the wolf as tapuq-larï-da (25.VIII), as Pelliot (1930: 309) deftly points out.

[70] Cf. Chapter Two of my Masters thesis (Ratcliffe 2013) for a detailed account of this pattern of myths.

[71] Shcherbak (1959: 98) considers that this river may represent the Volga, Don or Kama, though he settles upon the first, strangely. Ölmez (2009: 24) has Volga as does Pelliot (1930: 310).

[72] Pelliot (1930: 311) considers ara-larï-da coming from Mong. *är*/er (ie. amongst the men) as more likely than from a plural of ara ("milleu").

water[73] of the Itil River turned bright red, as if it were cinnabar.[74] Oğuz Kağan attacked and Urum Kağan[75] fled. Oğuz Kağan captured Urum Kağan's kağanate (kingdom) and took his people. In his (Urum's) ordu[76] there was a great deal of dead goods and a great deal of live goods.[77] (20) One of Urum Kağan's brothers was there, Urus Bek by name.[78] This Urus Bek had sent his son to a mighty citadel on the top of a hill in the middle of the Teräng River.[79] He had said: "The safety of the citadel is of paramount importance. Hence, after the battle protect the citadel for as long as possible," he said. Oğuz Kağan attacked the citadel. Urus (21) Bek's son gave to him a great deal of gold and silver. He said: "O you are my Kağan. My father gave this citadel to me. He said: 'The safety of the citadel is of paramount importance. Hence, after the battle protect the citadel for as long as possible,' he said. If my father becomes wrathful, will you protect me?"[80] I acknowledge your command, wealth and wisdom. (22) Our power has become your power.[81] Our dynasty has become your line's dynasty.[82] Heaven has conceded[83] to give you this land. I give you my head and my authority. Giving you tribute, I will not break with your friendship," he said. Oğuz Kağan considered the young man's words to be good, liked this, and was pleased and (23) said: "You have given me a great deal of gold and you have handed over your

[73] The form for water here: *suγï* is suggested by Pelliot (1930: 312) to stem from the thirteenth century CE dialect of the Chaghatai Ulus, which under Mongol influence dropped the final –v/b of Türk. sub (water) like Mong. usu(n). Another example discussed by Pelliot (ibid 252-253 ad. ON 1.V) is *čïrayï* which appears to be Mong. cara(y)i (face) rather than *čïraγ* (lamp).

[74] *cïn cïŋçïp* lit. as close to cinnabar as possible, which appears to have first been proposed by Pelliot (1930: 314-315) rather than connections with arteries (Osman. Türk. sigir), as made by Riza Nur (1928 ap. Pelliot 1930: 314). Cf. Shcherbak (1959: 98) for discussion on this term, which appears largely to agree with Pelliot.

[75] Ölmez (2009: 24-25) has "The Roman Emperor" throughout.

[76] Pelliot (1930: 317) remarks that ordu should be taken as place of ancestral residence and hence rulership- neither a camp nor a palace.

[77] This designation appears to imply goods plundered from the dead and live captives and is an important coordinate compound reiterated throughout the work. Cf. (31) and (32) for the importance of this in the wagon episode.

[78] Pelliot (1930: 350) takes him to represent the Russians, to which Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 44) agree.

[79] Marquart (1914: 145-146) suggests that this means the Dnepr river. Literally it would seem to mean the deep river (Pelliot 1930: 318).

[80] Lit. "will you stand in front of me?"

[81] *Kym* = authority that is divinely given and maintains world order.

[82] Lit. your tree's offspring. Ölmez has "our seeds has [sic] become the fruit of your tree", which, though colourful, does not even make sense as a metaphor. Pelliot (1930: 321) refers to p. 469 of Erdman's Tchengis volume of RaD's *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* as a parallel use of these terms.

[83] Pelliot (1930: 321) says of *bučurmuš* that it most likely comes from buyurm- (fulfil promise), which has become palatised possibly due to Mongol or Kyrgyz influence.

citadel well," he said. Because of this he called him by the name Saklab[84] and made him his companion.

The Deeds of Oğuz's Companions.

Then with his army Oğuz Kağan [crossed over] the river called Itil. The one called Itil was a mammoth river. Oğuz Kağan looked at it[85] and then he said: "How are we to cross[86] the waters of the Itil?" he said. Amongst his army there was an excellent beg. His name was Ulug Ordu the beg. (24) He was a clever and canny fellow. He noticed that [on the bank there were a great many] rose-willows[87] and a great many trees. [This beg] cut down….. (these) trees and lay upon the trees and crossed.[88] Oğuz Kağan was pleased with this and liked it. Thus he said: "You are to be a beg for this and you are to the have the name Kipchak beg,"[89] he said, and then he went onwards…[90] After this Oğuz Kağan saw the blue-furred (25), blue-maned, massive, male wolf. This blue wolf said to Oğuz Kağan: "Now, with your army ride on from here, Oğuz. Riding, have your people and begs follow.[91] I, leading, will show you the way," it said. Then when morning came Oğuz Kağan saw that the male wolf was walking in front of his army. He was pleased with this and went on. Oğuz (26) Kağan had a dappled stallion[92] as his mount. He loved this stallion very much. On the road

[84] "One who hands over", echoing previous line where the verb is *саклабсäн* (you have handed over). Pelliot (1930: 350) takes him to represent the Slavs due to the homophony of the two words. The term *saqāliba* refers generically in mediaeval Arabic literature to fair skinned slaves taken from Eastern Europe in general (Duczko 2004: 22). The ninth century Arabic Kitab al Masalik was L-Mamalik (Book of Roads and Kingdoms) refers to the ar-Rus as a tribe "…from amongst the as-Saqliba" and mentions the river Itil (Boba 1967: 27; Duczko 2004: 22). Ibn Fadlān's tenth century geography refers to the Volga Bulgars explicitly as *saqāliba* (Czeglédy 1951: 243; Duczko 2004: 22), which is mentioned by Shcherbak (1959: 96) in his Oğuz Kağan commentary.

[85] Pelliot (1930: 323) reads sürdi (commanded) instead of kördi (saw), but the "r" is not legible, so he claims. Either way, there would seem much difficulty with either approach due to lack of context from the lacuna-ridden lines that follow.

[86] Shcherbak (1959: 44) reads *нэчүк* (cross) here, but Pelliot admits that he cannot even make out the word at this section and considers it more like (m)inüp (go into?).

[87] The term here is *мал* and *мальник* in Russian- most likely coming from a Türkic language. A very specific Central Asian shrub.

[88] Curiously the two verbs here are singular. Perhaps the lacuna explained how the rest of the army crossed, but this could be too retrojective a suggestion.

[89] Aetiological of the Kipchaks, a Türkic people from the eighth and ninth c. CE to the Mongol Empire (Shcherbak 1959: 95). Most likely it is connected with an idea found in Rashīd al-Dīn's *Oğuz-Nāme* (*Hist. Oğuz.* §43 script 591r) in which Kipchak is taken to be derived from qabuq ("a tree trunk").

[90] Ölmez (2009: 27) has "He went towards East" which seems a vested interest in his own unexplained geographical interpretation.

[91] Pelliot (1930: 324) thinks that *bäag-lä*r-ni could be the reading for beg-*lär*-ni here, though why the extra vowel is present is mysterious.

[92] *aiçïp* would seem to literally mean "heavy, significant" as it does in modern Turkish, where with a horse it indicates a stallion or warhorse (Alderson and İz 1959: 5 *"ağır"*). Ölmez (2009:27) has

this stallion escaped from his sight and ran away. At this place there was a great big mountain. On top of this mountain there was ice. Its peak, due to the cold, was white as white can get. It was for this reason that it had the name Ice Mountain[93] Oğuz Kağan's horse, having escaped, went into[94] Ice Mountain. Oğuz Kağan (27) spent a great deal of time there (looking for it). Amongst his army there was a massive courageous fellow who was a beg. He was not frightened of any kind of danger.[95] He was a hardy[96] fellow when it came to travelling and the cold. This beg went into the hills. Nine days later he brought back Oğuz Kağan's distinguished horse. Because it was so very cold in the Ice Mountains,[97] this beg was covered with snow and was white as white can get. Oğuz (28) Kağan was pleased at this, and said: "O, (because of this) you are to be chief of the begs (who are) here.[98] May the name Kağarlig[99] be for you," he said. He honoured him with much treasure and went onwards.

More Deeds.

Later on the road he (Oğuz) saw a large house. This house's roof was made of gold, its windows were of silver and its doors were of iron. There were locks on it, but no key. Amongst his (Oğuz's) army there was a very resourceful[100] man. (29) His name

---

"colourful studhorse". Pelliot (1930: 325) agrees on stallion (fr. étalon) and reflecting on Radlov (1893) and Riza Nur (1928) who read the word *čuqur*-dan (from the valley/plane) without a verb of motion for this ablative suffix to agree with, considers Mong. *čoqor* and Chaghatai *čubar* meaning "pied, speckled", though remains unconvinced by it as well as the unknown *tan/taï* which might follow. Shcherbak (1959: 47) seems to ignore translating *маң*, though he does take *чокур* to mean speckled (ru. *чубарого*). Ölmez (2009: 13) reads *čoqurdïn* without explanation.

[93] Curiously we appear to have returned to Ice Mountain as was mentioned above in n. 58. There seems to be a continuity problem here or perhaps it represents a cosmic mountain like Burqan Qaldun in SHM (cf. §1-90) around which all the major narrative takes place.

[94] "into" is *ičigä*, which would seem to indicate inside the mountain.

[95] The operative term is the coordinate compound *чалаң булаң*. Pelliot (1930) translates it as: "Il n'avait pas peur des coups et de la mêlée" ("he was not scared of injury or of fighting"). Shcherbak (1959: 82) discusses the term in much detail and agrees with Pelliot in its overall meaning of dangerous things.

[96] Pelliot (1930: 329) gives a myriad of terms from "droit" (skilful) and "juste" (just) and "fidèle" (loyal) to "ferme" (stoic, firm, durable) in relation to the word *onga/öngä* at this point.

[97] The Ice Mountain has now become pluralised (27.VIII), as are the hills several lines above (27.V.).

[98] The words at the start of line 28.III appear to be "*ma marlab"*, as is read by Pelliot (1930: 333). Ma = "also". Marlab is a curious term yet to be explained properly. Pelliot (ibid) suggests a verb deriving from the nouns mar ("monseigneur"- a Manichaean religious term) and *mïr* (Osman. Türk. "chief"). Both Shcherbak (1959: 49) and Ölmez (2009: 13) read *mängläp*, the meaning of which is not explained.

[99] Lit. "snowy". Most likely an aetiological punning on the Karluk Türks, a prominent people from the seventh century CE to the period of the Mongol Empire (Pelliot 1930: 332; Shcherbak 1959: 96).

[100] Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 48) suggest that the base of this word is Mong. *čeber* (clean, pure [?]). It occurs at 31.V as *čïbar*, as Pelliot (1930: 335) points out. This remains a difficult term to

was Tömürdü Kağul.[101] He (Oğuz) gave him a command: "you stay here and open (it). Stay here and when you get it open come to the camp," he said. Because of this he gave him the name Kalach[102] and went on. One day the blue-furred, blue-maned, male wolf halted in its passage. Oğuz Kağan then halted (too), and lying down in his tent, took his rest.[103] This land was a plateau that had never before been planted. They call(ed) it Jurjit.[104] (30) There was a massive estate and populace there. There were many horses, many calves, much in the way of gold and silver and much in the way of treasure. It was here that the Kağan and the people of Jurjit went out against Oğuz Kağan. They engaged in battle and combat and fought with arrows and with swords. Oğuz Kağan attacked and captured the Kağan of Jurjit, killed him, and cut off his head. The people of Jurjit conceded to his (Oğuz's) command. After the battle (31) there was such a massive amount of inanimate plunder for Oğuz Kağan's army, his companions,[105] and his people, that their horses, mules and bullocks were insufficient to carry it and take it away. (However), amongst Oğuz Kağan's army there was a most[106] good and resourceful fellow. His name was Barmaklug Josun Billik.[107] This excellent fellow found a wagon. He put the inanimate plunder in the wagon and he put the living plunder in front of the wagon[108] and they drew it and went on. (32) (When) all of (Oğuz's) companions and people beheld this they were amazed. It was in this

---

analyse or translate into the context, aside from the resourcefulness Tömürdü and later Barmaklug (cf. 31.Vff) display in their respective situations.

[101] It has been suggested that this is a Mongol name (Pelliot 1930: 335; Shcherbak 1959: 97), as indicated by the rounded initial vowel in Mod. Mong. tömör, rather than Mid. Uyghur *tämür* (eg. ON 28. VII). The other half of his name is perhaps Mong. qa'ul= *γool* (river) (Pelliot 1930: 335). Another suggestion is that ka*γul= kağıl,* a term used by al-Kāšγarī (TTIVS.448 n. 7) for using fresh willow bows to bind something onto a trellis (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 48). Therefore his name would mean "iron trellis".

[102] Most likely an aetiology of the Kalach Türks, another eighth to ninth c. CE people (Pelliot 1930: 335; Shcherbak 1959: 96).

[103] Ölmez (2009: 28) bizarrely has: "…and so did Oghuz Qaghan, and so did the tent pitcher". There is clearly no second subject present in the sentence.

[104] Cf. n. 52 in relation to Altun Kağan and the Jurchen Jin dynasty of the period of the Mongol Conquests. The name is diversely recorded as Jürčät/Jürčäk (Pelliot 1930: 333).

[105] The term is *nükärlär*, which may have come from Mid. Mong. nükür (companion, comrade) (Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 48).

[106] This is reading the mysterious word *ïшai* as *jakшï* (rather/much), as suggested by Pelliot (1930: 335) and agreed upon by Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 48) and Shcherbak (1959: 84).

[107] Pelliot (1930: 337) notes that the word *ǰ*osun is a Kyrgyz pronunciation of Mong. yosun (custom, law). *Baramqlaγ* remains more obscure and possibly connected with barmaq (fr. "doigt"= finger). Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 49) query the origin of *ǰ*osun/çosun , but don't give an answer. They suggest that barmak-*lığ* might stem from *bağırsaklığ* (Turk. "marhametili"= merciful). Billig would obviously seem to be the widespread Turkic noun for "wisdom" , akin to Mong. bilig = "wisdom".

[108] Shcherbak (1959: 31.VIII, p. 52) decides to clarify this in Russian: "*а в нее впрягли живую добычу"*("and to it they harnessed the living loot"). Pelliot (1930: 337-338) makes similar designations.

way that the Kanga people came into being. (This was because) when they were towing the wagon they kept saying the words: "kanga, kanga."[109] Because of this they gave them the name Kanga. Oğuz Kağan looked at the Kangas and was pleased. Hence he said: "Kanga, Kanga¸ as you carry along the plunder both dead and living, may you have the name Kanga and be known as (the) Kanga(s)," he said, and went on.

Baraka.

After that (33) along with the blue-furred, blue-maned, male wolf, he (Oğuz) went attacking the lands of Sindu, Tangut and Shağam.[110] After many battles and many wars, he took these, made them part of his own property and attacked and defeated them.[111] May it not be left out of the story, may it become knowledge[112] that there was a land in the south[113] called Baraka[114]. There was a massive estate there, (and) it was a very hot country. (34) There were many game animals and fowl there and great amounts of gold, great amounts of silver and great amounts of treasure, and its people's complexions were jet black. This land's Kağan was a Kağan by the name of Masar. Oğuz Kağan struck against him. There was a most brutal battle. Oğuz Kağan won and Masar Kağan fled. Oğuz defeated him, took his estate and went. His (Oğuz's) friends were greatly joyous and his enemies [were afflicted with] (35) many miseries. Oğuz (Kağan) prevailed and took his innumerable wealth and horses, sent it (back) to his home and estates and went (on).

The Dream of Ulug Türük.

---

[109] Lit. "wagon, wagon". The Kangli, another Türkic people from the eight to ninth c. CE onwards appear to be being aetiologically explained here (Pelliot 1930: 337-338; Shcherbak 1959: 96).

[110] Pelliot (1930: 338-339) and Shcherbak (1959: 97-98) suggest these to be India, the Türkic Tangut people in northern China (Si-Hia) and Syria (Sha'am= Ar. Shām: Syria). Ölmez (2009: 30) has Hindu, Tangut and Damascus.

[111] The actions are out of sequence.

[112] Ölmez (2009: 30) has "let it be remembered, let it be known". This is correct but in glossing the actual words he has reduced the beauty of the language.

[113] Lit. the sun's region.

[114] There are many suggestions for this place including Kashgar and the Kara-Kitai, due to the use of the term barhan in al-Kāšγarī (LvOQ, 714) and barkan to describe them in Abu'l Ghazi (I. S. XXXII; Bang and Rahmeti 1936: 49-50; Shcherbak 1959: 98). Pelliot (1930: 340-341) takes this land to be Egypt or Syria due to the ruler's name being Masar and the many references extant from the Mongol epoch (thirteenth century CE) to Egypt (al-Misr) and the Mamluk dominance of Syria under this same name. Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 50) find this very improbable for no given reason. However, the richness of Baraqa and its swarthy inhabitants might indeed fit Eqypt more reasonably than the other possibilities. Ölmez (2009: 30) leaves it as "Baraq". The name "Barak" may have some elements in common with the Kara Barak (black dog) and Qïl Barak (white dog)- canine ancestors used by the Türks to demean the ancestry of other peoples from far off lands in the other *Oğuz Kağan* tradition, which also possess associations of swarthiness (RaD. Hist. *Oğuz* §43 script 591r 56; Pelliot 1930: 340).

May it not be left out of the story, may it become knowledge that amongst Oğuz Kağan's retinue there was a white-bearded snowy-haired, grey bearded old fellow.[115] He was an intelligent and upright man and was his (Oğuz's) chamberlain.[116] His name was Ulug Türük. (36) One day in a dream he (Ulug) saw a golden bow and he saw three silver arrows. This golden bow stretched from sunrise to sunset, and the three silver arrows were in the direction of darkness.[117] After this dream he informed Oğuz Kağan of what he had seen in the vision. He said: "O my Kağan, may your life be long.[118] [O] my [Kağan] (37) may just rulership be yours.[119] [Eternal Blue] Heaven has given to me a vision- may it come true! May it grant land and sea to your descendants!" he said.[120] Oğuz Kağan considered the words of Ulug Türk to be good and liked his council. Considering his council, he acted.

Bows and Arrows.

After this, when it was morning, he (Oğuz) summoned his older and younger sons and had them come (to him), and then he said: "O my heart yearns to go hunting. (But)

[115] Ölmez (2009: 31) has "who could see the future". Perhaps *узун узлук…карт* means lit. "Possessing a long vision". I am willing to consider this. Pelliot (1930: 342) has "à l'expérience longue" (with a greaty deal of experience), which would seem better and qart as a late Kyrgyz form of qarï. Shcherbak (1959: 56) and Ölmez (2009: 31) seem to take the grey beard not literally at all- merely as a euphemism for wisdom. Pelliot (1930: 343) deduces the "greyness" from moz/muz= boz.

[116] *Түшімәл* appears to be the Mid. Mong. tysimel "dignitary, official" (Pelliot 1930: 344; Lessing 1995: 857). Shcherbak's (1959: 56) *кудесник* "soothsayer" appears a bit of a strong assumption. Perhaps advisor would be the most neutral term. Ölmez (2009: 31) has "paymaster", which seems slightly anachronistic and banal. Pelliot's (1930: 344) "functionnaire" (functionary) is not unreasonable.

[117] Shcherbak (1959: 57) says that this is the north in this particular passage, and he also takes the word *мӱң* (dark) as the same direction later in the text (idem.: 59). Ölmez (2009: 31) also takes this as north, though he later chooses west for *мӱң* in (ON 38) during the sons' journey. Pelliot (1930: 297-298) believes both to be west and that ta ("jusqu'à"- "right up to") is a late Persian influence (idem. 345).

[118] The word *ǰ(a)s(a)γu* read here by Pelliot (1930: 347) is associated with yas-= to have good health. Ölmez (2009: 31) reads *čašγu* = (may your life be blessed), which I assume he also takes as a palatised variant of yas-.

[119] Pelliot (1930: 346) calls this line "endomagée" (damaged) and claims that he cannot translate it. Ölmez (2009: 31) has the inexplicable "may peace and goodness be on you". *Törӱ* (power/rule) is taken to be the basic concept behind the word *мӧрлӱк* in this line by Shcherbak (1959: 86): *"пусть принадлежит власть* (may power be in [your] possession) and it is hard to find any alternative. Bang and Rahmeti (1936: 51) note than tüzün in this instance is implicitly associated with notions of stability and sameness and take türüglüg as an older form of Mod. Turk. türlü (sort, various). What such a justapositon between same and other could mean, I have no idea, and am yet to find any explanation. Their "*senin hayatın hoş olsun*" (may your life be blessed/pleasant) seems a strange gloss in spite of these comments.

[120] Ölmez (2009: 31) has "May almighty give you all this land". This completely ignores *уруӷуӊӷа* (to your descendants).

because I have become old, (38) my kingliness[121] is no more. Sun, Moon, Star- go you towards the direction of dawn.[122] Sky, Hill, Sea- go you towards the direction of darkness,"[123] he said. After this the (first) three of them went in the direction of dawn and (the other) three of them went in the direction of darkness. Sun, Moon and Star, after they had caught much game and many fowl, came upon the golden bow on their journey, and they took it and [gave it to] their father. (39) [Oğuz Kağan was pleased and liked this] and breaking the bow into three[124] he said: "O my older sons, let this bow be yours and like the bow loose arrows towards the Heavens,"[125] he said. After this, Sky, Hill and Sea, after they had caught much game and many fowl, came upon the three silver arrows on their journey and they took them and gave them to their father. (40) Oğuz Kağan was pleased and liked (this), divided up the arrows to the three of them and said: "O younger sons, let (these) arrows be yours. A bow looses arrows. Be you like (its) arrows." He said.

The Quriltai and Death of Oğuz Kağan.

After this Oğuz Kağan assembled a great quriltai,[126] and summoning his comrades and people he convened (it). Having arrived and complied (with him) they sat down. Oğuz Kağan in his great camp…..[127] [on the right hand side]. (41) [He had set up a post[128] forty ságèn high].[129] At the top he [put] a golden [cock]. [At the bottom] he attached a white ram. To the [left] of this he had set up a post forty ságèn high. At the top he put a silver cock. At the bottom he attached a black ram. On the right the

[121] Lit. my khanishness. Pelliot (1930: 347) also comments on the loss of "khanishness" due to Oğuz's age and infirmity preventing him from hunting.

[122] Lit. in the direction of dawn.

[123] Lit. in the direction of night/darkness. Ölmez (2009: 31) has west. Shcherbak (1959: 59) has north. No further explanation is given.

[124] The terms for the phrase "breaking the bow into three" is: *üch buzyuluγ kïldï* (lit. he made it three broken parts). This is later echoed in this group of sons' tribal name of Buzuk (cf. ON 41 n. 121 below).

[125] Cf. Chapter Four of my Masters thesis (Ratcliffe 2013) for detailed discussion on this section.

[126] A very obviously Mongolian term used by the Mongol court for a meeting, most importantly to elect a successor to the ruler. Pelliot (1930: 348-349) takes it as evidence of strong Mongol influence on the work.

[127] The rest of 40.VIII and 40.IX are missing.

[128] Lit. a tree. See Chapter Four of my Masters thesis (Ratcliffe 2013) for some remarks on this symbolism of the two trees.

[129] Because this section mirrors itself, Shcherbak's (1959: 63) conjectures regarding the lacunas at this point would all seem reasonably sound. Fr. Ságèn = 2.134 m.

Buzuks sat. On the left the Üchoks sat.[130] They feasted and drank for forty days and forty nights (42) and were joyful. After this Oğuz Kağan divided up and gave his estate to his sons. He said: "O my sons, I have endured much and I have seen many battles. I have loosed many spears and arrows. I have travelled much with my distinguished (horse). I have piled up my enemies and I have made my companions happy. I have sung to the Blue Sky.[131] I give to you my estate," he said….

[130] The Buzuks seem to take their name from the broken bow and thus are the older sons. Ölmez (2009: 33) takes their name to mean "grey arrows", without regard for the aetiology of the story. The younger sons, the Üchoks (lit. three arrows) form the second branch of Oğuz's descendants, who one might assume through the arrow and bow allegory are being invoked to work together. For discussion on this section and comparison with Rashīd al-Dīn's version of these events, see Chapter Four of my Masters thesis (Ratcliffe 2013).

[131] Shcherbak (1959: 63, ON 42.VII-VIII) takes this as performing one's religious duty before heaven. One must recall, as with the section on Oğuz praying earlier in the text (ON 6), that in Turkic-Mongolian tradition the khan maintains world order through his religious ceremonies and laws- not a priest caste. See Chapters Two and Four of my Masters thesis for discussion on this (Ratcliffe 2013).

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES.

Primary Sources.

Abu'l-Ḡāzi Bahādor Kağan. [1871-1874] 1970. (Desmaisons, P.I. trans. ed.) *Šajara*-ye Tork: Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghâzi Béhâdour Khân, Souverain de Kharezm et Historien Djaghataï. [St. Petersberg] Amsterdam:

al-Dīn, R. (Tekin, Ş. And Tekin, G.A. eds, Thackston, W. M. trans.) 1999. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 45: Rashidud*din Fazlullah's Jami' u't Tawarikh: A Compendium of* Chronicles: History of the Mongols Part One. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

_____ (Boyle, J. A. trans.) 1971. The Successors of Genghis *Kağan*. New York: Columbia University
Press.
_____(Austerlitz, E. trans.) 2010. History of the Ogus. Glastonbury: AM Notebook Publishing.

_____(Luther, K.A. trans. and Bosworth, C. E. ed.) 2001. History of the Seljuk Turks: From the *Jami 'al*-Tawarikh. Surrey: Curzon Press.

al-Kāšγarī, M. (Dankoff, R. And Kelly, J. trans.) 1982-1985. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 7: *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at*-Turk). Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Birrell, A. (trans.) 1999. The Classic of Mountains and Seas. Richmond: Penguin Classics, Penguin Books.

Carpini, G. da P. 1996. (Hildinger, E. trans.) The Story of the Mongols Who We Call the Tatars. Wellesley: Branden Books.

Dennison Ross, E. and Thomsen, V. 1930. "The Orkhon Inscriptions: Being a Translation of Professor Vilhelm Thomsen's Final Danish Rendering*," Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 5.4: 861-876.

de Rachewiltz, I. (trans.) 2004. The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century. Leiden and Boston: E.J. Brill Academic Publishers.

Herodotus (Godley A.D. trans.) 2012. The Persian Wars Vol. I-IV. Harvard: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.

Juvaini, A. M. (Boyle, J. A. trans.) 1958. Genghis *Kağan*: History of the World Conqueror. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lewis, G. (trans.) 1974. The Book of Dede Korkut. Ringwood: Penguin Classics, Penguin Books.

Michael the Syrian (Ibrahim, G. I. trans.) 2009. Text and Translations of the Chronicle of Michael the Great: Vol. I. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.

Moḥyi-ye Gülşeni. (Yazıcı, T. ed.) 1982. Menâkib-*i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Plutarch (Babbitt, F.C. trans.). 2006. Moralia: Vol. III, V. Harvard: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.

Polo, M. (Latham, R. E. trans.) The Travels. Richmond: Penguin Classics, Penguin Books.

Shcherbak, A. M. (trans.) 1959. *Oγуз-Hāме и Myẋaббат-Hāме*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Science, Institute of Linguistics.

Strabo (Lloyd- Jones, H. trans.) 1930. Geography: Vol. I. Harvard: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.

Ssu-am Ch'ien (Sima Qian) (Farmer, J., M., Giele, E. et al. trans. Nienhauser, W. H. ed.) 2011. Grand *Scribe's Records. Vol. VIII*-IX. Bloomingston: Indiana University Press.

Varāhamihira (Bhat, M.R. trans.) 1997. *Varāhamihira's Bṛ*hat Sa*ṃhitā Vol. I*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Secondary, Tertiary Sources.

Abazov, R. 2005. Historical Dictionary of Turkmenistan. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, Rowman and Littlefield Press.

Alderson, A.D. and İz, F. (eds) 1959. The Concise Oxford Turkish Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Balkaya, A. 2008. "Oğuz Kağan Destani'nda Mekân," Turkish Studies 3.2:151-163.

Bang, W. and Rahmeti, G.R. 1936. *Oğuz Kağan Destani*. Istanbul: Burhaneddin Basmevi.

Bekmyradov, A. 1987. Andalyp Khem *Oğuz*namachylyk Débi. Ashgabat: YLYM Publishers.

Bernshtam, A.N. 1935. "Историческая правда в легенде об Огуз-Каагане," *Советская этнография*. 6, 35-36.

_____ 1951. *Очерк Истории Гуннов.* Leningrad: Leningrad University.

Bichurin N. Ya. 1950. *Собрание Сведений о Народах Обитавших в Средней Азии в Древние Времена*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Science.

Bınbaş, I. E. 2010. "Oğuz Kağan Narratives," in Encyclopedia Iranica Online. Updated October, 2010. Available online from: http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/*Oğuz-kağan*-narratives. Last accessed: 23/04/13.

Boba, I. 1967. Nomads, Northmen and Slavs: Europe in the Ninth Century. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz Publishers.

Bodroligeti, A.J. E. 2009. "Turkic-Iranian Contacts ii. Chaghatay Language and Literature," in Encyclopedia Iranica Online. Updated 20 Feburary 2009. Available online from: http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/turkic-iranian-contacts-ii-chaghatay. Last accessed: 08/09/13.

Cakan, V. 2011. "Chagatai Turkish and Its Effects on Central Asian Culture," Osaka Institute for World Languages 6: 143-158. Osaka University Knowledge Archive. Available from: ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/11094/.../1/riwl_006_143.pdf Last accessed 08/09/13.

Chadwick, N. K. 1969. "Historical and Unhistrorical Elements in Heroic Poetry and Saga," in Chadwick, N. K. and Zhirmunsky, V. (eds) Oral Epics of Central Asia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 142-159.

Chiodo, E. 1992. "The Horse White-as-Egg (öndegen cаγan): a Study of the Custom of Consecrating Animals to Deities," Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, New Series 11: 125-151.

Cleaves, F.W. 1959. "An Early Mongolian Version of the Alexander Romance," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. 22: 1-99.

_____1982. Introduction in Cleaves, F.W. (trans.) 1982. The Secret History of the Mongols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cooper, J. and Burbank, F. 2011. Empires in History: The Power and Politics of Difference. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Czeglédy, K. 1951. “Zur Meschheder Handschrift von Ibn Faḍlān’s Reisebericht,” Acta Orientalia I.2-3: 218-260.

Dankoff, R. 1971. “Baraq and Buraq,” Central Asiatic Journal 15: 102-107.

de Rachewiltz, I. 1997. “A Note on the Word Börte in the Secret History of the Mongols,” East Asian History. 13/14: 153-155.

_____ (trans.) 2004. Commentary in The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century. Leiden and Boston: E.J. Brill Academic Publishers.

DeWeese, D. 1994. Islamisation and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition. Pennsylvania Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Duczko, W. 2004. Viking Rus: Studies on the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe. Leiden: E.J. Brill Academic Publishers.

Eliade, M. (Trask, W. R. trans.) [1951] 1989. Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy. Ringwood: Arkana, Penguin Books.

Eraslan, K. (trans.ed.) 1973-1975. “Manzum Oğuznâme,” *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 18: 169-244.

Erdal, M. 2004. A Grammar of Old Turkic. Leiden and Boston: E.J. Brill Academic Publishers.

Findley, C.V. 1995. The Turks in World History. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabriel, R. A. 2006. Genghis *Kağan*'s Greatest General: Subotai the Valiant. Oklahoma: Oklahoma University Press.

Gariper, C. 2011. “Destandan Modern Şiiri Kolektif Bilincin Sürekliliği ve Yeniden Inşasi: Oğuz Kağan Destani ile yahya Kemal’in O Rüzgâr Şiiri,” Turkish Studies 6.3: 781- 796.

Gömeç, S. 2009. The Identity of Oğuz Kağan, the Oğuz in the History and Epics of Oğuz Kağan. Turkish Studies 4.8: 133-145. Simultaneously printed under the same title in Oriento Moderno 89: 57-66.

Hamilton, J. R. 1962. Toquz-*Oğuz* et On-uygur. Société Asiatique, Paul Geuthner Publishers.

Kim, H. J. 2013. The Huns, Rome and the Birth of Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lessing, F. ed. 1995. A Modern Mongolian-English Dictionary. Berkely: The Mongolia Society, University of California Press.

Lewis, G. 1974. Introduction in The Book of Dede Korkut. Ringwood: Penguin Classics, Penguin Books.

Marquart, J. 1914. Über das Volkstum der Komanen. Berlin: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse Series.

Minorsky, V. 1952. “Caucasica III: The Alān Capital *Magas and the Mongol Campaigns,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 14.2: 221-238.

Molé, G. 1970. The T’u-yü-hun: from the Northern Wei to the Time of the Five Dynasties. Serie Orientale Vol. XLI. Rome: ISMEO.

Mustafaev, Sh. M. 1996. “Концепция верховной власти и права в «Огуз Наме» Языджи-оглу Али,” in Oreshkova, S.F. (ed.) *Османская Империя: Проблемы Внешней Политики и Отношений с Россией*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Science, 10-23.

Nafziger, G. F. and Walton, M. W. 2003. Islam at War: A History. Westport: Greenwood Publishing.

Ölmez. M. 2009. "Commentary of Oghuz Nama," Commentary Project of the Centre for Central Eurasian *"Civilisation Archive"*. Seoul: Seoul National University. Available from: http://cces.snu.ac.kr/eng/sub2/sub2.html. Last accessed: 9/6/13.

Ömerəliev, K. 1988. *Оғуз Қаған*: *Эпосының Тілі*. Almaty: Kazakh SSR State Publishing.

Orkun, H. N. 1936. "Bir Oğuz Efsanesi," Ülkü, 6.34: 267.

Pelliot, P. 1930. "Sur la legend d'Utuz-Kağan en éncriture Ouigoure," *T'oung pao* 27: 247-358.

_____ 1950. Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or (Oeuvres Posthumes de P. Pelliot). Paris: Adrien- Maisonneuve.

Pinner. R. and Frances, M. 1980. Turcoman Studies Vol. I. London: Oğuz Publishers.

Pulleyblank, E. G. 1983. "The Chinese and Their Neighbours in Prehistoric and Early Historic Time," in Keightley, D. N. (ed.) The Origins of Chinese Civilisation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 411-466.

Ratcliffe, J. 2013. Insignia Summi Imperii and Törü-yin Qadaqasun: The Wolf and Bundled Rods and their Role in Legitimising the Authority of the Roman and Mongol Empires. Melbourne: Monash University. Submitted for the degree of Master of Arts (Classics).

Roux, J-P. 1984. La Religion des Turcs et des Mongols. Paris: Payot.

_____1993. "The Tree of Life and the Cosmic Axis amongst the Turks and Mongols," in Bonnefoy, Y. (ed.) and Doniger, W. (trans.) 1993. Asian Mythologies, 326-328.

Samojlovich, A. N. 2005. "Один из списков «Родословного Древа Туркменского» Абулгази-Хана," in A. N. Samoilovich (ed.) T*юркское Языконание, Филология, Руника*. Moscow: "Vostochnaya Lit-ra" Publishers, 896-900.

Seçkin, K.P. 2013. "Mental Fiiller Bağlamında Uygur Harafli Oğuz Kağan Destani," VI. Dünya Dili Türkçe Sempozyumu, Bursa. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/5538767/Mental_Fiiller_Baglaminda_Uygur_Harfli_Oguz_Kagan_Destani Last accessed 27/04/14.

Serruys, H. 1974. Kumiss Ceremonies and Horse Races: Three Mongolian Texts. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz Publishers.

Shcherbak, A. M. 1959. Introduction in Shcherbak, A. M. (trans.) *Огуз-Нāме и Муҳаббат-Нāме*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Science, Institute of Linguistics.

Sinor, D. 1950. (Ates, A. trans.) "Oğuz Kağan Destani Üzerinde Bazı Mülâhazalar," Türk Dili ve Edebiyati Dergisi. 4: 1-14.

_____1982. "The Legendary Origins of the Turks," in Zygas, E.V. and Voorheis, P. (eds) Folklorica: Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 223-257.

_____ 1997. Studies in Mediaeval Inner Asia. New York: Ashgate Publishers.

Skrynnikova, T. D. 2002. "Shamanism in Inner Asia: Two Archetypes," Sibirica 2.1: 69-87.

_____2004. "Mongolian Nomadic Society of the Empire Period," in Grinin, L. E. et al. (eds) The Early State, Its Alternatives and Analogues. Volgograd, Russia: Uchitel Publishing, 525-535.

Sümer, F. 1954. “Oğuzlara Ait Destani Mahiyette Eserler,” Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-*Coğrafya* Fakültesi Dergisi 17: 359-456.

Togan, Z.V. 1953. “Yesevîliğe Dair Bazı Yeni Malûmat,” *Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*. Ankara: Osman Yalçın Matbaası Publishers, 523-29.

_____ 1982. *Oğuz Destanı*. Istanbul: Modern Ofset Basimevi.

Tolan, J. 2012. “The Geographers’ World: From Arabia Felix to Balad al- Ifranj (The Land of the Franks),” in Tolan, J. Weinstein, G. and Laurens, H. (eds) Europe and the Islamic World: A History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 11-26.

Turnbull, S. 2003. Genghis *Kağan* and the Mongols Conquests: 1190- 1400. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

White, D. G. 1991. Myths of the Dog- Man. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.