

## TUŠI: THE TURKIC NAME OF JOČI

PETER B. GOLDEN\*  
(Newark)

Tuši, Duši, the Turkic name of Činggis Qan's oldest son, is a finely nuanced translation of his Mongol name that also hints at the circumstances of his birth: "unexpected guest".

*Key words:* Joči, Činggisids.

As is well-known, Joči was the oldest son of Činggis Qan.<sup>1</sup> It was the name also borne by Činggis Qan's brother, Joči Qasar. In the *Secret History*, it is given in the form Joči.<sup>2</sup> The name was already established in the family, one of Qutula Qan's sons had also been named Joči.<sup>3</sup> In Islamic and some Western sources, this anthroponym is given in two forms: جوچى: *jwŷj* and توشى: *tûši*<sup>4</sup> and variants of that (see below). This is the only Činggisid ruler for whom we have a double name, one Mongol, the other Turkic. Rašid al-Dîn informs us that Ögedei (Ögetäi and Ögedäi in that author) had previously had another name, which is left blank in the manuscripts, but had changed it because he did not like it.<sup>5</sup>

\* Peter B. Golden, Rutgers University, Department of History, Conklin Hall 175 University Avenue, Newark, New Jersey, 07102 USA, e-mail: pgolden@andromeda.rutgers.edu

<sup>1</sup> A sketch of his career may be found in Boyle (1960–2000, II, pp. 571–572).

<sup>2</sup> De Rachewiltz (1972), lines 9436 (Joči), 1231, 7113 (Joči Qasar), see also Cleaves (1982, pp. 60, 195, 242).

<sup>3</sup> De Rachewiltz (1972), line 10033, Cleaves (1982, p. 51). Qutula Qan was a son of Qabul Qaġan, who was reckoned the founder of the first Mongol polity which Činggis Qan later revived and made an empire. Qabul Qaġan's boorish behaviour, which produced an attempt on his life, was cited as the main cause for Mongol–Jin/Jurchen hostility towards the latter part of the first half of the 12th century. Qabul's cousin and successor, Ambaġai, was captured by the Tatars and killed by the Jin, setting off yet more discord. Qutula succeeded Ambaġai and attempted to punish the Tatars and Jin. With this the Mongol "state" declined and returned to its loose confederal status, see Ratchnevsky (1991, pp. 9–12); Allsen (1994, pp. 331–332); Golden (1960–2000, X, p. 371).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. al-‘Umarî in Lech (1968), Arabic text, pp. 13, 15.

<sup>5</sup> Rašid al-Dîn (1994, I, p. 618). Ögedei is probably to be derived from Turk. öge "A high Turkish title, roughly equivalent to 'Counselor,'" see Clauson (1972, p. 101), as was suggested by Pelliot and Hambis (1951, I, pp. 9–10). Mong. öge "fault, roughness, unevenness" (see Lessing et al., 1995, p. 627) seems unlikely.

The Mongol form is explained as *joči(n)* “guest, visitor” (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 1066) “hôte non souhaité, hôte non attendu” or simply “hôte” (Pelliot 1949, p. 10) or “der unverhoffte Gast”, “der unerwartete Gast” (Spuler 1985, p. 161). He was given this name because his mother, Börte, who had earlier been kidnapped by the Merkid (which raised questions about his parentage), gave birth to him (unexpectedly) on the return trip from the court of the Kereyid ruler, the Wang/Ong Qan to whom the Merkid ultimately sent her.<sup>6</sup> Naming a child after unusual occurrences surrounding his birth was part of the complex system of name-giving known to the pagan Turkic and Mongolic peoples.<sup>7</sup> Thus, according to Abû'l-Ğâzî, Temüjin/Činggis Qan is reported to have cried out, when Joči was born that “a guest has come to us” (*Činggis Xân bu oğlunu körüp xoşhâl bulup bizge juji keldi tidi Moğul tilinde juji tip yengi kelgen mihmânnı aytular*).<sup>8</sup> The Chaghatai dictionary of Šeyx Süleymân Efendi Buxârî defines *joči* as “bağeteten vehleteten gelen misâfir” (i.e. a guest who arrives unexpectedly) and secondarily as “sevimli çocuk, dilber, cüce”, etc. (Šeyx Süleymân Efendi 1881, p. 141). The name *joči* has been discussed in detail by Pelliot who notes the various etymologies, popular and otherwise, that have been given regarding this anthroponym (Pelliot 1949, pp. 10–28).

Medieval Mongol patterns of name giving fell into the following categories: commemoration of an event (this would seem to be the case for *Joči*), animal names (e.g. *Qasar*<sup>9</sup> “name of a kind of dog”), names of foreign people with whom they were in contact (e.g. *Tanggudai* < *Tangut*), personal characteristics (e.g. *Batu* “confident”), names denoting great value, strength or durability (e.g. *Altun* “gold”, *Temür* “iron”, *Čila'un* “stone”), names of weapons or metal tools (e.g. *Jebe* “arrow point”, *Togon* “pot”), colour or beautiful object (e.g. *Kökö* “blue” = “everlasting”, *Čagan* “white”), numbers (*Jirgo' adai* “sixth”), something bad or despised (to ward off evil spirits, e.g. *Muu noqoi* “bad dog”, *Büjir* “filthy”).<sup>10</sup>

Pelliot, in particular, sought to understand what Rašîd ad-Dîn meant in his account of Joči’s birth. Rašîd ad-Dîn says that Börte “unexpectedly” (*nâgâh* “suddenly, unexpectedly, unseasonably” Steingass 1970, p. 1377) gave birth to the child en route

<sup>6</sup> The most favourable spin on events is given by Rašîd al-Dîn (1994, I, pp. 708–709), see also the English translation by Boyle (1971, pp. 97–98), who says that Börte was pregnant before she was kidnapped.

<sup>7</sup> On this system, see Rásónyi (1971, pp. 22–26); İnan (1954, pp. 173–175).

<sup>8</sup> Desmaisons (1970), I, text, p. 169, Fr. trans., II, p. 178: “Lorsque Tchinguiz-Khan vit ce jeune fils, il s’écra plein de joie: ‘Voilà un Djoudji quis nous arrive.’ Le mot Djoudji signifie en mogol un hôte récemment arrivé.”

<sup>9</sup> This name is first noted among the North Caucasian Huns (cf. Č'at' *Kasar* recorded in Movsê Dasxuranc'ı (see Dowsett, 1961, p. 167) and is later found as a term used for a “pack of dogs” in Medieval Qipčaq (see the *at-Tuhfat az-Zakiyya fi Luğat at-Turkiyya*, facs. ed. in Halasi-Kun (1942), f. 85r where *urğuq* and *qasarlar* are defined as *jam 'al-kilâb* (“pack of dogs”). It is also found in Modern Kalmyk, *xasr (noxä)* “jagd-hund” (see Ramstedt, 1935, pp. 35, 36, 171). On dog-names used as personal names in the Altaic world, see Golden (1991, pp. 45–55) and Golden (1997, pp. 94–95).

<sup>10</sup> Jagchid – Hyer (1979, p. 76). Most of these names can be found in the *Secret History*.

(*dar râh*) and “because of this he was called Joči”.<sup>11</sup> Pelliot concluded, however, that “rien ne montre clairement que Rašid ait eu en vue le mot *jocin* ‘hôte’, et en principe, *jocin* pourrait être une de ces étymologies tantôt populaires, et tantôt purement personnelles et fantaisistes...” Moreover, Pelliot said that he could find no trace of *joči* in literary Mongol except as a personal name and suggested that Vladimirov had deduced the meaning “hôte, nouvel arrivant” from what other Muslim authors had to say on the subject. Even the form of the word, *joči* or *jöči*, was, in his view, unclear.<sup>12</sup> We need not review all the forms and possibilities suggested by Pelliot who was, in any event, not willing to come out firmly in favour of one or the other.

Of particular interest to us, however, is another name associated with Joči in our sources given in the forms: توشى twšy = *Tušî*, طوشى ṭwšy = *Tûšî*, دوشى dwšy = *Dûšî*. This name, as we shall see, fits the circumstances of Joči’s birth and can, in fact, best be rendered as “unexpected guest, visitor”. It is found in the Muslim, Syriac, Georgian and Latin sources and it is here that the solution to the Joči question may lie. Boyle, in his comments on these forms, saw in them “a depalatalised, perhaps Turkish form” of Joči (Boyle 1960–2000, vol. II, pp. 571–572). There is no reason to accept this formulation as other examples of such a shift or correspondence are not evident. Moreover, if this were a direct “Turkicisation” of a Mongol word, one would expect \*Yoši (cf. Mong. *y-* > Turk. *y-*, e.g. Mong. *jasa-* “to put in order” > Turk. *yasa-* “to construct, arrange”) (Clauson 1972, p. 974; Lessing 1995, p. 1039). Pelliot correctly concluded that *Tûšî* / *Dûšî* was not a corruption of Joči, but a genuine Turkic form of the name (“une forme turque correspondant au Joči, Juči, Čoči des Mongols”) (Pelliot 1949, p. 19). Nonetheless, he still had doubts about it and subsequently noted that “...je fais remarquer dès à présent que, si Tušî (ou Tûšî) semble avoir été la forme adoptée pour Joči dans le monde turc, on ne la rencontre qu’en fonction du fils aîné de Gengis-Khan” (Pelliot – Hambis 1951, I, p. 95). Indeed, the word is not otherwise encountered in Turkic. It would be useful here to give some idea of the variants of the Turkic form of this name:

Nasawî (the private secretary of the fugitive Khwârazmshâh Jalâl ad-Dîn, writing some ten years after the demise of the latter, i.e. in the 1240s): دوشى dwšy (*Dûšî*, *Dôšî*, *Düšî*, *Döšî*).<sup>13</sup>

Plano Carpini (Franciscan monk sent on embassy to Mongolia in 1245–1247): *Tossu* nominee quem etiam Can appellabant = *Tossucan*<sup>14</sup> (= Tošu Qan).

Juvainî (d. 1283, Iranian official of the Činggisid regime in Iran, his “History of the World-Conqueror” was completed in 1260): توشى twšy (*Tûšî*, *Tôšî*, *Tüšî*, *Töšî*).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Rašid ad-Dîn (1994, I, p. 709). Boyle (1971, p. 98), renders the passage thus: “Upon the way a son was suddenly born to her, and for that reason he was called Joči”.

<sup>12</sup> Pelliot (1949, pp. 11–13, 20). Poppe (1958, p. 200), for example derives the term from Mong. *jon*, cf. Buryat *zon* “people”, Oirat *dyon* “people” > Xalxa *čon* “people” = “fellow countryman”.

<sup>13</sup> Nasawî (1996), Arabic text, pp. 6, 11/Russ., pp. 43, 47.

<sup>14</sup> Piano Carpini (1995), Latin text, pp. 96, 98.

<sup>15</sup> Juvainî (1912, 1916, 1937, I, p. 29); Eng. trans. in Boyle (1958, I, p. 40).

Juzjânî (from a family of bureaucrats in Ghûrid Afghanistan. He composed his history in the Delhi Sultanate of the Ölberli Qipčaq Sultan, İl-Tutmiš, having fled thither from the Mongols. His work was completed in 1260): توشی twšy (Tûšî, Tôšî, Tüšî, Töšî) (Juzjânî 1984, p. 310).

Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286, a native of Malatîa in Eastern Anatolia and later Jacobite bishop and Maphrian of the East. His “Chronography” written in Syriac goes up to the year of his death): twšy (Tûšî, Tôšî, Tüšî, Töšî) (Bar Hebraeus 1932, I, pp. 368, 391). The Arabic abridgement of his “Chronography”, which adds that Tûšî was in charge of the “hunt and the chase”, has the form: توشی twšy (Tûšî, Tôšî, Tüšî, Töšî) (Bar Hebraeus 1958, pp. 227, 244, 248).

The anonymous author, the Žamt'aagmcereli (“recorder of the times”) of the Mongol era, writing in the 14th century and preserved in the Georgian national chronicle, the *K'art'lis C'xovreba* has: ო'յბი (t'ubi), a corruption of \*օ'յթո t'uši.<sup>16</sup> Although Georgian *t'* in the transcription of Turkic and Mongol terms often indicates palatal vocalisation, this is not always the case. Thus, the name Batu is rendered in Georgian as *Bat'o* (*K'art'lis C'xovreba* 1959, II, p. 197). Our form, thus, may reflect, like those in Arabic script: Tûšî or Tüšî.

Ibn Xaldûn (d. 1406, the famous historian whose comments on these matters are largely based on earlier sources): دوشی dwšy (Dûšî, Dôšî, Düšî, Döšî) (Ibn Xaldûn 1983, X, pp. 295, 805, 805 et passim) and طوشی ṭwšy (Tûšî, Tôšî) (Ibn Xaldûn 1983, X, p. 1121).

The form found in Ibn Xaldûn, طوشی ṭwšy, would appear to indicate a velar vocalisation.

This was the name given to Joči in Turkic world, most probably stemming from the Qipčaq and Oğuz dialects of the recently subjugated Turkic peoples under his rule in the Western Eurasian steppelands. The form with initial *d-* (\*Dušî, etc.) most probably reflects an Oğuz dialect from the Khwârazmian region. This was a special designation for their new overlord. It is a term not otherwise attested in Turkic, but for which a Turkic explanation, completely in keeping with the Mongol sense of the name can be found. Before examining that, we must say a few words about Joči's activities in the Qipčaq zone and in the Turkic world in general.

Juzjânî describes Joči/Tušî as “exceedingly energetic, intrepid, manly and warlike; and his greatness was to that degree that his father used to stand in awe of him” (Juzjânî 1984, II, p. 149; Raverty 1970, II, p. 1096). According to this same author, after subjugating the land of the Qipčaqs, together with his brother Čağadai, Tušî became much attached to the “Dašt-i Qipčaq”, considering it the best land. It was then that “repugnance towards his father began to enter his mind”. He began to plot against Činggis to whom these activities were reported by Čağadai. Činggis then sent his agents to Joči/Tušî and they, Juzjânî claims, poisoned him (Juzjânî 1984, II, p. 150; Raverty 1970, II, p. 1101). This version of Joči's death is not reported elsewhere. There is, however, evidence of some bad feeling between Činggis and his old-

<sup>16</sup> *Kart'lis C'xovreba* (1959, II, p. 163) which notes “t'ubi whom the Georgian call Joči...” (*t'ubis, romelsa k'art'velni joč'id ucoddes*), 196. The mss give variant readings: t'ubisi, t'ubiši, t'ušiši).

est son (regarding whose parentage, Činggis may still have harboured lingering doubts). Joči had been operating in Central Asia in 1219 against the Khwârazmshâh state.<sup>17</sup> Here, he attacked the Qanglı, a tribal confederation that was part of the larger Qipčaq union.<sup>18</sup> In accounts of his activities in this region, Joči is often referred to as *Uluš İdi*, a posthumous title given especially to him.<sup>19</sup> The term *ulus* “country” was borrowed into Mongol, becoming *ulus* where it denoted an appanage, political territory (e.g. the *ulus* of *Joči*, etc.). In this form it was later borrowed back into Turkic where it came to mean “people, country, tribe” (Sevortjan 1984–2000, I, pp. 592–593). *İdi* is also Turkic < *idi* “master, owner, lord” (Clauson 1972, pp. 41, 152–153). Thus, *Uluš İdi* = “Master of the Country”.

Clearly, Joči had some special standing in the Turkic world. Of his actual military activities we know that his campaign against the Qanglı broke off in the Spring of 1221, when he was forced to turn to a rebellion that had broken out in the upper Syr Darya region in Barjligkent. Having suppressed the rebels, he was ordered by his father to join Čağadai in the attack on Khwârazm. Here the brothers quarrelled and Ögedei was dispatched to settle affairs between his older brothers and get the operation back on track. Rašid ad-Dîn reports that Joči was ordered by a *yarlığ* from his father to conquer “all the northern countries, such as Îbir-Sibir, Bûlár, the Qipčaq steppe, and the lands of the Başgurd, Rûs and Čerkes as far as Darband on the Caspian”. Joči, however, having taken parts of the Qipčaq steppe, tarried there<sup>20</sup> and did not undertake active measures to complete the conquest of the more westerly Qipčaqs, the Alans, the Volga Bulgars, and the Rus’ principalities. Attacking the Qanglı en route, he advanced on Saqsin, the Bulgars and the Rus’ lands, but did not pursue his military objectives with any vigour. His retreat to his *ordo* in Western Siberia greatly angered his father. The latter was prepared to have him killed, but he died in 1227 (several months before his father’s death) of an undetermined illness, aged somewhere around 40.<sup>21</sup>

It is hard to find in the accounts of Joči’s activities anything that would merit the exceptionally high stature that Juzjânî ascribes to him or the reasons for the special title *Uluš İdi*. True, he was largely successful in his Central Asian campaigns, although his quarrels with Čağadai at Khwârazm could hardly have gained him special merit. Perhaps, his successes, certainly not inconsiderable, his initiation of the

<sup>17</sup> Mongol military operations in Western Eurasia are thoroughly discussed in Allsen (1983, pp. 5–24).

<sup>18</sup> On the tribes of the Qipčaq union, see Golden (1995–1997, pp. 99–122).

<sup>19</sup> See discussion in Boyle (1956, pp. 148–152).

<sup>20</sup> Rašid ad-Dîn (1994, I, p. 720), Boyle (1971, p. 107). My renderings of the place names are in keeping with the new edition and differ slightly from Boyle’s translation. I agree, however, with Boyle’s Bûlár as opposed to the Pûlár of the new edition. Bûlár is Bûlár, a place name and tribal name in Volga Bulgaria. In the 12th century, it became the political centre of the Volga Bulgar state, see Muxametšin – Xakimzjanov (1987, pp. 114–115); Fëdorov-Davydov (1987, pp. 18–19). In Russian this was called “Biljar” and “Velikij gorod” (“the Great City”). It appears to be the same as *Bulgar*, see F. Š. Xuzin (1997, pp. 47–60).

<sup>21</sup> Rašid ad-Dîn (1994, I, pp. 731–733), Boyle (1970, p. 119); Allsen (1983, pp. 11–13); Boyle (1960–2000, II, pp. 571–572) dates him ca. 580–624/1184–1227, i.e. about 43 years of age at the time of his death.

conquest of the Qipčaqs, and his founding of a powerful Činggisid dynasty were enough to earn him these signal, posthumous honours. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the Qipčaqs were not fully conquered until 1236–1237, almost a decade after his death, and their resistance delayed the Mongol subjugation of Western Eurasia (Allsen 1983, pp. 18–22).

According to Juzjānī, there was another area of Joči's activities which might have subsequently earned him special consideration among the Muslim historians. Joči, we are told, had his son Berke raised by Muslims and instructed in that faith (Juzjānī 1984, II, p. 2130; Raverty 1970, II, pp. 1283–1284). Serious conversion to Islam among the Qipčaqs did not occur, however, until the reign of Özbek (1312–1341).<sup>22</sup> But, Joči, quite early on, appears to have been granted special wisdom in this regard by the Muslim sources.

What, then, is one to make of this name and its historical context?

Tuši/Duši, the name of the Great Qan's oldest son is a carefully nuanced translation into Turkic of the Mongol *joči* “guest”: Turk. \**tuši* is a deverbal nominal form from *tuš-* “to meet” found in Uyğur and Qarakhanid texts and surviving today in some Modern Turkic languages. From the Qarakhanid era, Maḥmūd al-Kâşgarî records: *ol manga tušdi* “he confronted me”, *mäning bargım bolsa manga tušgil* “when the time comes for me to go, meet me”, *män oğulnu atásingga tuşgurdum* “I arranged a meeting between the son and the father”, *ol mäni sanga tušurdi* “he arranged a meeting between me and you” (Maḥmūd al-Kâşgarî 1982–1985, I, pp. 81, 394, II, pp. 4, 51). In 14th-century Khwârazmian Turkic, *tuš-* meant “to meet, to go to”.<sup>23</sup> This is perhaps influenced by Qipčaq where, in some dialects, *tuš-* had come to mean “to visit”.<sup>24</sup> *Tuši* is formed in the same way that Turk *tögi* “cleansed and/or crushed cereal” <*tög-* “to pound, crush”, *yapı* “horse blanket” <*yap-* “to cover”, cf. also the adjectives *köni* “straight” <*kön-* “to get or be straight”, *buši* “bad-tempered, irritable” <*buš-* “to be irritated, annoyed” (Erdal 1991, I, pp. 340–344) are formed. In Middle and Modern Turkic, *tuš* (Räsänen 1969, p. 501; Sevortjan 1984–2000, III, pp. 303–306) means “opposite, face to face, someone/something standing opposite to one” with a great many semantic evolutions from that. As a verb, it denotes the idea of coming face to face with someone, i.e. to meet or encounter, cf. Modern Turkic: Qazaq *tus*, Qırğız *tuš* “opposite place” (Shnitnikov 1966, p. 205; Judaxin 1965, p. 774), Osm. *duš* “face to face, side by side”, *duš olmak* “to be face to face or side by side with another”, *duš gelmek* “to meet face to face, to chance to meet” (Redhouse 1974, p. 992), Turkmen *dûš bolmaq* “popadat’ (v bedu)”, *dûš gelmek* “vstretil’sja s kem-čem-l.”, *dûš* “okolo, primerno, priblizitel’no”, *dûšuna* as in *öynüng dûšuna barmaq* “priblizit’sja k domu”, *dûšišiq* “vstreča, priem”, *dûšurmaq* “dat’ vozmožnost’ vstrečat’sja” (Baskakov et al. 1968, pp. 287–288).

<sup>22</sup> See discussion of the conversion narrative in De Weese (1994).

<sup>23</sup> Zajączkowski (1961, p. 187): *tuš-* “skierować się, wyjść naprzeciw, spotkać się”, *tušur-* “spotykać, witać”.

<sup>24</sup> Clauson (1972, p. 560); Abu Ḥayyân (1931), Arabic text, p. 63: *tušdi* “zâra”.

The basic idea is “to come (unexpectedly) face to face with someone”. *Tuši/Duši*, then, is a rather good Turkic translation of the Mongol *Joči* with an allusion to the circumstances of the latter’s birth: “an unexpected visitor”. Had the Mongol anthroponym in this instance merely meant “visitor”, it would have been rendered by Turk. *qonaq/gonuq*, the most common Turkic term for a “guest” (Poppe 1958, pp. 198–199). Although the name has an earlier history in Činggis Qan’s family (and we do not know the circumstances of Joči Qasar’s birth), it clearly fits the eldest Činggisid’s personal history.

There are a number of Turkic or Turkic-derived terms which were used as personal names by the Mongols even in the pre-imperial period (cf. To’oril, the Ong Qan < Turk. *toğrul* “bird of prey” Clauson 1972, p. 472). Among the early Činggisids alone one may point to Temüjin/Temüčin, Činggis Qan’s name, taken from that of a Tatar slain by his father, literally denoting “blacksmith” < Turk. *temür* “iron” (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 800; Clauson 1972, pp. 508–509), Qasar (see above), Berke “difficult, hard, burdensome” < Turk. *berk* “firm, stable, solid” (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 99; Clauson 1972, pp. 361–362), Möngke “eternal” < *bengü/mengü* “eternal” (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 547; Clauson 1972, pp. 350–351), Orda (cf. Mong. *ordu[n]*) “residence of a ruler, palace, camp” < Turk. *ordu* “royal residence, palace, royal camp”, later “military camp”. In Middle Turkic (including Qipčaq) we find *orda* “royal court” (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 617; Clauson 1972, p. 203). Such names were known among the royal women as well, e.g. Töregene (mother of Goyük, reigned: 1246–1248) and regent of the Empire (1241–1246) < Mong. *törü*- “to give birth” < Turk. *törü*- “to give birth” (cf. Qipčaq *töre-*) (Lessing et al. 1995, p. 836; Clauson 1972, p. 533) and Doquz Xatun (the Christian wife of Hülegü) < Turk. *doquz/toquz* “nine” (Clauson 1972, p. 474). Many of these are old borrowings and represent many centuries of close cultural contact. Mongolic groupings (e.g. the Qitaň and the Tatabi) were among the subject peoples of the Turkic Qağanate (Golden 1992, pp. 143, 145, 183ff. 202) and the Činggisid state, in many respects, represented the culmination of the Steppe Imperial Tradition in which Turkic and Mongolic peoples shared. There has been little attention paid, however, to the calquing of Turkic names into Mongol and Mongol names into Turkic.

## References

- Abu Ḥayyān (1931): *Kitâb al-Idrâk li-Lisân al-Atrâk*, ed. Turk. trans. A. Caferoğlu. Istanbul, Evkaf Matbaası.
- Allsen, T. (1983): Prelude to the Western Campaigns: Mongol Military Operations in the Volga-Ural Region, 1217–1237. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* Vol. 3, pp. 5–24.
- Allsen, T. (1994): The Rise of the Mongolian Empire in north China. In: Twitchett – Fairbank (1994), pp. 321–413.
- Bar Hebraeus (1932): *The Chronography of Gregory Abû'l-Farâj... commonly known as Bar Hebraeus*, trans. E. A. W. Budge. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2 vols.
- Bar Hebraeus (1958): Ġrigūriyûs al-Malaṭî, Ibn al-'Ibrî, *Ta'rîx Muxtaşar ad-Duwal*. Beirut, Al-Maṭba'at al-Kâṭulîkiyya.

- Baskakov, N. A. et al. (1968): *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva, Sovetskaja Énciklopedija.
- Boyle, J. A. (1956): On the Title Given in Juvainî to Certain Mongolian Princes. *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* Vol. 19, pp. 148–152.
- Boyle, J. A. (1958): *The History of the World Conqueror*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press., 2 vols.
- Boyle, J. A. (1960–2000): “Djuči” in Gibb et al. (1960–2000), II, pp. 571–572.
- Boyle, J. A. (1971): *The Successors of Genghis Khan*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Clauson, G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1982): *The Secret History of the Mongols*, trans. F. W. Cleaves. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Dasxuranc’ı, Movsēs in Dowsett
- Desmaisons, P. I. (1970): *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatars par Aboul-Ghazi Béhadour Khan*. Saint Petersbourg, 1871–1874, reprint Amsterdam, Philo. 2 vols.
- De Rachewiltz, I. (1972): *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*. Bloomington, Indiana (Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 121).
- De Weese, D. (1994): *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde*. University Park, Pa., Penn State University Press.
- Dowsett, C. (1961): *The History of the Caucasian Albanians*, trans. C. Dowsett. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Erdal, M. (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz (Turcologica, 7).
- Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. (1987): *Gorod Bolgar. Očerki istorii i kultury*, ed. G. A. Fedorov-Davydov. Moskva, Nauka.
- Gibb, H. A. R. et al. (eds) (1960–2000): *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Leiden, Brill.
- Golden, P. B. (1960–2000) in Gibb et al. (eds) (1960–2000), X, p. 371.
- Golden, P. B. (1991): The Dogs of the Medieval Qipchaqs. In: *Varia Eurasiatica. Festschrift für Professor András Róna-Tas*. Szeged, Szeged University, pp. 45–55.
- Golden, P. B. (1992), *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.
- Golden, P. B. (1995–1997): Cumanica IV: The Tribes of the Cuman-Qipchaqs. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* Vol. IX, pp. 99–122.
- Golden, P. B. (1997): Wolves, Dogs and Qipchaq Religion. *AOH* Vol. L (1–3), pp. 87–97.
- Halasi-Kun, T. (1942): *La langue des Kiptchaks d’après un manuscript arabe d’Istanbul*, facs. ed. T. Halasi-Kun, partie II. Budapest, Société Körösi Csoma (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, IV) = *at-Tuhfat az-Zakiyya fi Luğat at-Turkiyya*.
- Ibn Xaldûn (1983): *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*. Beirut.
- İnan, A. (1954): *Tarihte ve Bugün ‘amanizm*. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Jagchid, S.–Hyer, P. (1979): *Mongolia’s Culture and Society*. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.
- Judaxin, K. K. (1965): *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva, Sovetskaja Énciklopedija.
- Juvainî, Atâ Malik (1912, 1916, 1937): *Ta’rîx-i Jahân-Gušâ*, ed. M. Qazwînî. Leiden–London, Brill, 3 vols. For Eng. trans. see Boyle (1958).
- Juzjânî, Minhâj ad-Dîn (1984): *Tabaqâti Nâṣîrî*, ed. ‘Abd al-Hayy Ḥabîbî. Tehran, Dunyâ-yi Kitâb. Engl. trans. see Raverty (1970).
- K’art’lis Cxovreba (1955, 1959): ed. S. Qauxč’išvili. T’bilisi, Saxelgami.
- Lech, K. (1968): *Das Mongolische Weltreich. al-‘Umari’s Darstellung der mongolischen Reiche in seinem Werk al-absâr fi mamâlik al-amşâr*, ed. trans. commentary by K. Lech. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz (Asiatische Forschungen, 22).

- Lessing, F. et al. (1995): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Bloomington, Indiana, The Mongolia Society.
- Mahmûd al-Kâşyarî (1982–1985): *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects* (*Dîwân Luyât al-Turk*, ed. trans. Dankoff, R. and Kelly, J. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press (Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, 7).
- Muxametšin, D. G.–Xakimzjanov, F. S. (1987): *Épigrافические памятники города Булгары*. Kazan', Tatarskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Nasawî (1996) an-Nasawî, Şihâb ad-Dîn: *Sîrat as-Sultân Jalâl ad-Dîn Mankburnî*, ed., Russ. trans. Z. M. Bunijatov. Moscow, Vostočnaja Literatura.
- Pelliot, P.–Hambis, L. (1951): *Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan*. Leiden, Brill.
- Pelliot, P. (1949): *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'or* in *Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot*. II. Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Piano Carpine (1995): Giessauf, J. (ed. Germ. trans.): *Die Mongolengeschichte des Johannes von Piano Carpine*. Graz, Institut für Geschichte der Karl-Franzens Universität-Graz (Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Geschichte, Bd. 6).
- Poppe, N. (1958): On Some Words for 'Guest' in the Altaic Languages. In: Eckman, J. et al. (eds): *Jean Deny Armağanı*. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, pp.197–201.
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1935): *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. (Lexica Societatis Fennou-Ugricæ III.) Helsinki.
- Rásónyi, L. (1971), *Tarihte Türklik*. Ankara, Türk Kültürünyü Araşturma Enstitüsü.
- Rašîd al-Dîn (1994): Rašîd al-Dîn Faḍlallâh, *Jâmiʻl-lâl-Tavârîx*, ed. Rowšan, M. and Müsavî, M. Theran, Naşr-i Albruz. Eng. trans. see Boyle (1971).
- Ratchnevsky (1991): *Genghis Khan. His Life and Legacy*, trans. T. N. Haining. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Räsänen, M. (1969): *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricæ, XVII.) Helsinki.
- Raverty, H. G. (1970): *The Ṭabaqât-i Nâṣirî*, trans. H. G. Raverty. London, 1881, reprint: New Delhi. 2 vols.
- Redhouse, J. (1974): *A Turkish–English Lexicon*. Constantinople, 1890, reprint: Beirut, Librairie du Liban.
- Sevortjan, É. (1984–2000): *Etimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva, Nauka.
- Şeyx Süleymân Efendi Buxârî (1881): *Luğat-i Čağatay ve Türkî ‘Osmâni*. İstanbul, Mîhrân Maṭba-‘ası.
- Shnitnikov, B. (1966): *Kazakh–English Dictionary*. London–The Hague–Paris, Mouton.
- Spuler, B. (1985): *Monglen in Iran*, 4th ed. Leiden, Brill.
- Steingass, F. (1970): *Persian–English Dictionary*. 1892, reprint: Beirut, Hayat.
- Twitchett, D.–Fairbank, J. K. (eds) (1994): *The Cambridge History of China*, vol. 6, *Alien Regimes and Border States, 907–1368*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- al-‘Umarî in Lech (1968).
- Xuzin, F. Š. (1997): *Volžskaja Bulgarija v domongol'skoe vremja*. Kazan', Fest.
- Zajęczkowski, A. (1961): *Najstarsza wersja turecka Husrâv u Šîrîn Qutba*, część ii, Słownik. Warszawa, Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.