

The Genealogy of ‘Abdulġaffār Kırımī and its Relevance to the Study of *atalıks* and *emildeşes* in the Crimean Khanate

Csaba GÖNCÖL*

HUN-REN-SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age, Szeged, Hungary

Received: 10 December 2024 • Accepted: 15 March 2026

© 2026 The Authors



ABSTRACT

Recent historical scholarship has seen an increased interest in Turkic narrative sources coming from the successor-states of the Golden Horde, which also includes the chronicle *‘Umdetü l-aḥbār* ‘Essence of Histories’ by the Crimean author ‘Abdulġaffār Kırımī. Particular significance lies in the chapters about the history of the Golden Horde and of the Crimean Khanate, the text of which has been published by ‘Āşım (‘Abdulġaffār/‘Āşım 1343 [1924/25]), and recently Derin Paşaoġlu (Abdulġaffar/Derin Pashaoglu 2014), followed by a translation into Russian (Abdulġaffar/Karimova and Mirgaleev 2018), which has been expanded on by numerous other studies. In addition, there has been scholarly attention to the biography of the author. The most notable recent studies are those of Kellner-Heinkele (1998; 2001) and Seytyag’yaev (2013). The present article focuses on the genealogy of ‘Abdulġaffār and will show how this text contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the institutions of tutors (*atalık*) and foster-brotherhood (*emildeş*) in the Crimean Khanate.

KEYWORDS

‘Abdulġaffār Kırımī, *‘Umdet ü l-aḥbār*, *emildeş*, *atalık*, *besleme*

* Corresponding author. Email: csaba986@gmail.com

The few details known about the life, or rather the career, of ‘Abdulgaffār Kırımı (died after 1748), are scattered in the text of the *‘Umdetü l-aḥbār*. There is, however, a longer account on the margins of fol. 281v–283r of the manuscript (Esad ef. 2331.; Abdulgaffar/Derin Pashaoglu 2014: 123–128, 322–325), in which the chronicler relates his genealogy, stretching from the 1380s to his own time. This text constitutes the primary source of the current article, the English translation of which reads as follows:¹

‘This Emīn Girey sultan, son of Şāḥib Girey khan, was the foster-child (*besleme*) of Ḥudāy Berdi *bey*’s son, Şafā *bey*. Şafā *bey* was old and had bad eyesight. After his visit to the House of God, his eyesight worsened, so his [Şafā *bey*’s] father came to the Crimea and hoped to settle down. The allotted lands granted by the above-mentioned khan [are] called the Estate of Şafā Koñratı,² it is well-known that [they are] on the bank of the river Bulğanağ³ within the [possessions] of the Şīrīn [clan]. Şafā *bey* founded a village (*qarye*) at that place and settled down a number of people from his *örpideş*⁴ Koñrat folk in the vicinity. He settled down [people] in the village called Esenengi⁵ and granted lands with the condition that they serve him well. The villages of Şafā Koñratı and Esenengi on the bank of the river Bulğanağ still exist and are well-known. It has already been mentioned in the chapter of Toktamış khan that Şīrīn Rüktemür *bey*, [who] came with Toktamış khan, killed the illustrious ancestor of this above-mentioned Şafā *bey*, Mamay *bey*, son of Kıyat Alaç, at the place called Yılkı şuyu.⁶ After this [event], Beg Sulṭān, Mamay’s son, roamed among his people on the steppes and did not take revenge. Similarly, his son, Ḥudāy Berdi *bey*, did not take [revenge], and wandered on. His son after him, the above-mentioned *hajji* Şafā *bey*, since he was impoverished, became the tutor (*atalıḳ*) of the said prince [Emīn Girey], only to protect himself, and settled down in his village. However, he had a brave and zealous son by the name of Gence. He roamed among his people and retainers (*nöger*) in an unsophisticated Tatar fashion (*gayret-i cāhiliye-i Tatar üzere*) and did not enter the Crimea. He somehow killed three *mirzās* from the line of Rüktemür, after which he set out, forded the Yılkı şuyu, passed through the river Tın [Don], and settled down at the place called [...] on

¹ The transcription of the text follows the system of the *İslām Ansiklopedisi*. Persons and place names mentioned here are either explained in the footnotes or in the main body of the article. Place names that I could not identify were left unaddressed. For the Russian translation of the genealogy – which at some points differs from mine – see Abdulgaffar/Karimova and Mirgaleev 2018: 94–99.

² I failed to find any references of this place name. The author describes this estate vaguely, at times calling it a ‘farm’ (*çıftlık*) (Esad ef. 2331. fol. 1v–2r; ‘Abdulgaffār/‘Āşım 1343 [1924/25]: 5–6), at other as ‘village’ (*qarye*), just as it can be seen in the current text.

³ River in the southern part of the Crimean Peninsula.

⁴ The reading *örpideş* (اورپیدش) and etymology of this term is obscure. It clearly includes the Turkic suffix +*DAş* expressing the idea of sharing something. The noun it is attached to, however, is not clear. The dictionary of Budagov (I 1869: 121) and, following his data, Radloff (I 1960²: 1241) list a Kirghiz word *örpü* indicating ‘pasture’ (выгон; Viehweide). I could not confirm this in a more recent Kirghiz lexicon (Yudakhin 1965). If this etymology holds ground, *örpideş halkı* in the text could indicate a people, in this specific case the Koñrat clan, which ‘shared the same pastures’. The translators of the *‘Umdetü l-aḥbār* did not translate or explain this term (Abdulgaffar/Karimova and Mirgaleev 2018: 94).

⁵ This settlement is listed in the administrative registers of the Crimea (*каммеральное описание*) in the year 1784 as Эсенъки by Lashkov (1888: 57) and mapped as Эсеньки on the military maps of the peninsula drawn by Mukhin (1817). For further data, see Jankowski 2006: 464.

⁶ The river Kins’ka (Rus. Konka, Konnye vody) in Zaporiz’ska oblast, Ukraine. The river constituted the border of the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire.

the shore of the Azak sea.⁷ He took the tribute of that area, set out [again], and settled down at the place [called] ̲ara K    ⁸ by the river [...].⁹ [There] he made a pact (*‘ahd u yem  n*) with the Cherkes [people] of ̲abartay,¹⁰ and he became [their] tribesman and guest (*  l ve   onak*). During this time *hajji   af   bey* died in the Crimea. [Gence], in order to gather his [father’s] belongings and to mourn the death of his [father’s] foster-sultan (*besleme sult  n  *), rode out and set foot on Crimean soil. When the *bey* of the      n, *Baba bey*, received news [of Gence’s arrival], he made two of his sons, ̲ara     and   utlus   at commanders and prepared a few soldiers. During the night when Gence *bey* was in   af   Ko  rat  , in the house of his father, [they] came and made a night-attack. While fighting them, Gence fled, and ̲ara     *mirza*, it is unknown who shot [at him], was wounded by an arrow and died. As for Gence, he was wounded several times. In the end, he barricaded himself in the mosque of *Mirz   Baz  r  * and died of his wounds. His grave is still there. The news of this spread, and when it reached ̲abartay, the despicable Cherkes broke their oath, attacked the clans of Gence and looted his possessions. The well-known village called Gence in ̲abartay [used to be] his.¹¹ At the time his clan scattered, Gence had a small son called *Murta  z  *. His tutor took *Murta  z  *, disguised him and brought him to the Crimea as a labourer. At that time, the *bey* of the      n was   utlu Girey *bey*, son of H  cc   *bey*. In the end, the above-mentioned tutor brought *Murta  z  *, his *besleme*, placed him in front of   utlu Girey *bey*, and said: “My sultan! I am a commoner. Although he (i.e. *Murta  z  *) belongs to your enemy’s clan, he is a father’s only surviving boy (*  ra  *). I did my duty. You are a generous man! If you please so, kill him, if you wish [otherwise], pardon him and educate him!” As soon as [the tutor] said this, good conscience and mercy overcame the *bey*. He took [him] in. Together with his son, called *Arslan*, he sent [Murta  z  ] to be educated (*beslemeye ver  r*), and made [them] drink one woman’s milk. He said to all [members] of the      n [the following]: “Our enemy was Gence *bey*. He has been slain. Now, let us be just! This young boy is my *besleme*. From now on, he shall not claim the rank of a *mirz  *!” – he made [them] content. After a time, *Arslan mirz  * became a renowned *mirz  *, but *Murta  z  * studied and became a member of the *  lem  *. He made the pilgrimage to the House of God and returned [from there]. Allegedly, he was quite a rich man. Although he had his nest at   af   Ko  rat  , he settled in the village of *Yayla Saray*,¹² next to *Arslan mirz  *. After him, his son, *hajji ‘Abdulvahn  b* lived this way. The same way, his eldest son, *hajji Ma  m  d efendi* lived this way. ‘Abdulvahn  b had nine sons; most of them died at   af   Ko  rat  . The son of *hajji Ma  m  d*, *hajji H  san efendi* lived the same way. After that, his sons, ‘Abdurrezz  k efendi and ‘Abdullah efendi lived the same way. I, *hajji ‘Abdul  aff  r*, the author of the [present] book, I am the son of the late *H  san efendi*. My nest and my possession (*m  lim*) is, as previously, in   af   Ko  rat[  ]. Without ever wishing for it (*bil   taleb*), at times I was bound to the issues of the

⁷ Turkish name of the Sea of Azov.

⁸ The reading is unsure. Karimova and Mirgaleev (2018: 95) read *Kapak      m*.

⁹ I am unsure of the correct reading, Karimova and Mirgaleev (2018: 95) read *    map-    map*.

¹⁰ ̲abarda(y) is a historical territory in the northern parts of the Caucasus Mountains. It was inhabited mainly, but not exclusively, by different tribes of the Cherkes. The region had strong contacts, sometimes peaceful, sometimes characterized by raids, with the Crimean Khanate.

¹¹ I failed to localize the given place-name. It may or may not be identical with today’s city of Ganja, Azerbaijan.

¹² *Yayla Saray  * (Crimean Tatar *Ca  la Saray*, Ukrainian *Zolote Pole*, Russian *Zolotoe Pole*) is a settlement on the eastern part of the Crimea, it used to be the seat of the      n clan before the annexation of the peninsula into the Russian Empire in 1783.

juridical district (*kāzılık*) of the Şirîn, at times I spent my days in the service of khans and sultans of great renown. By the grace of the everlasting God, both khans, sultans, and *beys* took benefit and profit from my service and council. In 1156 (1743/44), when it came to the time of Selim Girey khan, son of Kaplan Girey khan, apparently some mischief-makers and hypocrites muddled around. I was his judge and confidant (*maḳreb*) during his days as *kaḷğa*. He cast [me] down without any grounds, and in the end banished [me] to the merciless place called the fortress of Soğucak.¹³ This collection, the *ʿUmdetü l-aḥbār*, has been written there, [a place] of disappointment and full of lamentation, in 1160 (1747/48). Due to the relation [to the main text's topic], my ancestry has been added to the margins. It is a well-known proverb of the historian *hajji* Cāntemür *bey*, *hajji* Murtezā *mirzā*, and the world-renowned chronicler, Mirzā Bey Mirzā, son of Arslanbey *mirzā* from Ẕanbolat Oğlan, they say “Gence, son of Şafā, his world was [either] left to you, [or] you are left with this much.” [This remark on the margin] was added in light of this [proverb].¹⁴

CHRONOLOGICAL LAYERS IN THE GENEALOGY

In short, the Crimean chronicler's genealogy gives the following lineage from the well-known Golden Horde *beylerbey*, Kıyat Mamay (died 1380) up to himself AH 1160 (A.D. 1747/1748) as follows: Mamay > Beg Sultān > Hūdāy Berdī > Şafā *bey* > Gence > Murtaẓā > ‘Abdulvahhāb > two sons of his, Maḥmūd efendi and Ḥasan efendi > three sons of the former, ‘Abdulḡaffār and his brothers, ‘Abdurrezāk and ‘Abdullāh. From 1380 to 1747/48, in a span of approximately four centuries, ‘Abdulḡaffār lists eight generations. At least a few names are missing from this list, a fact that becomes evident when we set up a tentative chronology based on the persons mentioned in the genealogy.

The genealogy alludes to a part of the *ʿUmdetü l-aḥbār* that narrates events of the late 14th century. In short, the Crimean chronicler claims that after Toḡtamiş khan took the Volga region under his command, he led an inconclusive war with Mamay *bey*, *de facto* ruler of the west-wing of the Golden Horde, at the end of which they made peace. After a while, under this guise of visiting his Genghisid relative, Bişulu *ḡaniş*, the wife of Mamay, Toḡtamiş went to Mamay's camp situated on the bank of Kin'ka river (*Yılkı şuyı*). One night, a feast was held, after which Rüktemür, leader of the Şirîn clan and a staunch supporter of Toḡtamiş khan, lured the *bey* into the steppes and murdered him. When news of this spread the next day, the son of Mamay, Beg Sultān, moved with his people to the far-side of the Dnieper – i.e. outside of the khan's jurisdiction, indicating a ‘political vagabondage’ (*kaẓaklık*).¹⁴ For his service Rüktemür received Bişulu *ḡaniş*'s hand in marriage, from the two of whom the Şirîns of the Crimea take their origin (Esad ef. 2331. fol. 268v–269v; ‘Abdulḡaffār/‘Āşım 1343: 52–55; Abdulḡaffar/Derin Pashaoglu 2014: 87–88, 351–352). The narrative contradicts every historical source that relates these events.¹⁵ Regardless of this fact, it gives us the first chronological layer of ‘Abdulḡaffār's genealogy: the date of Mamay's death, i.e., ca. 1380.

¹³ Ottoman fortress on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, the construction of which ended in 1722, currently a district (Sudzhuk-kale) of the city Novorossiysk, Krasnodarskiy kray, Russia.

¹⁴ For an excellent article on *kaẓaklık* ‘political vagabondage’, see Yo-Yup Lee 2017.

¹⁵ On different versions of Mamay bey's death with further literature, see Pochekaev 2010: 232–233.

The next chronological layer covers events that occurred before and in 1551. A forefather of ‘Abdulğaffār, a certain Şafā *bey*, became a tutor (*atalık*) of Emin Girey *sultān*, son and *kalğa*, i.e., second in command of Şāhib Girey khan. It is reported that the khan and his son died in a coup in 1551. I could not find any reference to Şafā *bey* from the Kıyat clan from sources on the given period. The diviner, doctor, and later chronicler of Şāhib Girey khan, Remmāl Hoca makes mention of Emīn Girey *sultān*’s tutor, a certain İbrāhīm *paşa bey* (Tārīḥ-i Şāhib Giray/Gökbilgin 1973: 49). In any case, Şafā *bey* must have also died in 1551, since his son, Gence, went to the Crimea ‘in order to gather his [father’s] belongings and to mourn the death of his [father’s] foster-sultan (*besleme sultānı*)’. Furthermore, the genealogy mentions a number of persons who were active in Crimean Tatar politics in the 1540’s. For example, Remmāl Hoca makes several mentions of Baba(y) *bey* of the Şirīn, as well as his sons, Karağız and Kutlu Sa’āt, who all participated in Şāhib Girey khan’s campaigns in the given period against Muscovy and the Circassians (Tārīḥ-i Şāhib Giray/Gökbilgin 1973: 37, 61; İnalçık 1979–1980).¹⁶ What is important here is that the second chronological layer of ‘Abdulğaffār’s genealogy comes from the middle of the 16th century.

Regarding the third layer of chronology, there seems to be some confusion. The genealogy relates that not long after Şafā *bey*’s death, his underaged (*tifl-i şağır*) and orphaned grandson, Murtażā, became Sirin Kultu Girey *bey*’s *besleme*, a term I shall address later in this article. He, like other persons in the genealogy, excluding the ancestors of ‘Abdulğaffār, were genuine historical figures mentioned by numerous other sources. According to these, however, Kutlu Girey *bey* became an active figure in Crimean politics only at the end of the 16th century (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 417). Reports by Muscovite envoys relate that he was killed in 1601 by Khan Ġāzī II Girey’s (1588–1608) men for taking part in a plot. These same reports also tell that three of Kutlu Girey’s sons escaped to the Ottoman Empire (Belokurov 1889: 352). It seems that, in ‘Abdulğaffār’s family’s historical memory, events and persons belonging to two different periods faded into one.

The fourth and final layer of chronology, as evident from the text, is the year of 1747/48, the same year ‘Abdulğaffār finished his work.

CRITICAL REMARKS TO THE GENEALOGY

Having the available data of the genealogy scrutinised and a tentative chronology set, we can proceed with a few critical remarks. We must bear in mind, however, that genealogies were, for a long time, oral traditions. Zaytsev argues that Crimean Tatar clans started writing down their family trees from the 17th century (2009: 2011), but many of them were put to paper at an even later period. Due to this fact, many of these narratives come with shortcomings. For example, the list of ‘Abdulğaffār’s forefathers evidently skipped a few generations. This is particularly true for earlier periods of Kıyat history. As stated earlier, ‘Abdulğaffār listed, in total, eight generations for the period of 1380 to 1747/48. Of these, three are given for the period of 1380 to 1551: Beg Sultān

¹⁶ The ‘*Umdetü l-aḥbār*’s chapter on Şāhib Girey khan’s reign (Esad ef. 2331. fol. 279v–283r; ‘Abdulğaffār/Āşım 1343: 100–110; Abdulğaffār/Derin Pashaoglu 2014: 117–128, 322–329) clearly shows that ‘Abdulğaffār was familiar with and worked from Remmāl Hoca’s chronicle; some details of the genealogy, however, are genuine and are absent from the *Tārīḥ-i Şāhib Girey ḥān*.

> Hüdāy Berdi > Şafā bey. For three generations to span a century and a half is unrealistic, and thus the list seems to be too short. The lack of additional generations is even more evident if the Crimean chronicler's genealogy is compared to that of another family of Tatar origin: the Glinskiys. This family is far better documented, and also happens to trace their lineage to Mamay bey.

The Glinskiy family has three different genealogies compiled independently from one another (Bychkova 2012: 299–304). Of these, the most extended version is the ПОДЛЫННЫЙ РОДОСЛОВ ГЛЫНСКИХ КНЯЗЕЙ 'The Authentic Genealogy of Glinskyi Princes' (Vremmenik 1851: 195–197), which is of particular interest to our study. This version, which could be a translation of a Turkic original, narrates 'ancestral legends' from the time of Genghis khan to the death of Mamay. Three excellent historical analyses of the text were conducted by Shennikov (URL 1), Trepavlov (2010), and Mustakimov (2010). After the 'ancestral legends' the text continues with a list of *Mamay-car's* progeny. This part of text relates that, after the battle on the Don (i.e., 1380) *Mamay-car's* son, Munsur Kiyat, left the Golden Horde and migrated to the region of modern-day Poltava. He had two sons. The first one, Aleksa, was baptized and took the name Aleksandr. Later, his lineage became an influential political factor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Vremmenik 1851: 196). This early period of the family, however, is shrouded in mystery. A document from 1437 bears witness that Boris L'vovich, grandson of Aleksa/Aleksandr, took an oath of fealty to king Wladislaw III of Poland and grand duke of Lithuania (1434–1444). From this date onwards the history of the Glinskiy family becomes better documented (URL 1). A turning point for the Glinskiys' came in 1508, when Mikhael L'vovich Glinskiy, the grandson of Boris L'vovich, fled the Duchy of Lithuania with some of his relatives after an unsuccessful military revolt against king Sigismund I of Poland (1506–1548), and entered the service of Vasiliy III grand duke of Muscovy (1505–1533). In their new home, they quickly became one of the leading families of the aristocracy,¹⁷ so much so that the granddaughter of Michael L'vovich, Elena Glinskaya, became the second wife of Vasiliy III (1505–1533) in 1526, and their son, later known as Ivan the Terrible (died 1584), was the first monarch to assume the title 'Tsar of all Russia' in 1547.

These two genealogies both go back to the same historical person, Mamay bey. Due to the fact that the Glinskiy genealogy is much older and closer to the actual events it described, and that their history is better documented, one must give it more credibility. Altogether, the Glinskiy genealogy lists nine consecutive generations from Mamay bey up to Ivan the Terrible, whereas 'Abdulgaḡfār mentions only three. The *Podlynnyy rodoslov* thus implies that 'Abdulgaḡfār's genealogy must contain several generational gaps for the same period.

Interestingly, the *Podlynnyy rodoslov* also contains data that seems to support important claims of 'Abdulgaḡfār's family-tree. It makes mention of Munsur Kiyat's second son, Skidyr' (Скидырь) who 'having received a herd of horses and camels went to Perekop' i.e. to the Crimea (Vremmenik 1851: 195). This short remark shows that at the beginning of the 16th century, when the *Podlynnyy rodoslov* was compiled, the members of the Glinskiy family still had a memory of a distant relative who migrated back to Crimea. Could this Skidyr', who moved back to the clan's ancestral homeland, be an ancestor of Şafā bey, or was he somehow related to 'Abdulgaḡfār's lineages? Be it as it may, the current state of research does not allow to give an answer to these questions.

¹⁷ The *Podlynnyy rodoslov* was compiled in the 1520s (Trepavlov 2010: 137).

THE GENEALOGY AS A SOURCE ON SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Regardless of how many generations may be missing from ‘Abdulġaffār’s genealogy, it clearly covers the period of approximately 380 years. In view of this, it stands out that the bulk of the text revolves around the blood-feud and then eventual reconciliation of the Şīrīn and Qıyat clans in the middle of the 16th century. Based on this, one can even argue that this was the single most impactful event of ‘Abdulġaffār’s family, after which the feuding families formed a long lasting cooperation. This bond was established on the basis of two social institutions of fictive kinship: the tutorship (*atalık*) and foster-brotherhood (*émildeşlik*). In other words, ‘Abdulġaffār’s genealogy provides an example that showcases how these social institutions functioned in a *long durée*. Therefore, the following chapters of this article will summarise what is known about tutors and foster-brothers in the Golden Horde, the Crimean Khanate, as well as peoples of the Caucasus. I will then compare this with the testimony of the Crimean chronicler’s genealogy. The reason for including the Caucasus into the scope of the present study is twofold. This territory was the region of choice of Crimean khans and other Tatar elites west of the Volga when choosing tutors for their offspring, and much of the relevant customs must have overlapped or shaped one another or both. Furthermore, these social institutions survived well into the 19th century, providing valuable ethnographic data.

THE CLAN OF THE ŞİRİN

Since the Şīrīn play such a crucial role in the topic, it is worth to give an outline of their history and influence within the Crimean Khanate. In the middle of the 14th century the clan belonged to the left-wing of the Golden Horde, and their grazing grounds and camps were situated along the Syr Darya. On the right-wing they appeared shortly after 1380 as supporters of Toktamış khan and took part in the campaigns against Mamay *bey* (Ivanics 2012: 29–36; Schamiloglu 2019). In the ensuing decades the clan gained particular influence on the Crimean peninsula, where the offspring of Rüktemür *bey* became the leaders of the khanate’s tribal aristocracy: the *qaraçı beys*. As head of the *qaraçı beys*, they had the prerogative to assemble the Crimean clans (*kurultay*), and at times held influence over the election and removal of the khans. The Şīrīns constituted the bulk of the khanate’s tribal armed forces, and they led their own kinsmen on campaigns. A further prerogative of the clan was intermarriage with the Girey dynasty. Their *beys* disposed over agricultural lands, salterns, and other assets on the eastern parts of the peninsula; they set up a court-administration imitating that of the khans (Manz 1978: 284–297; İnalçık 1979/80: 447–454; Schamiloglu 1984: 283–285; Ivanics 2012: 28–30; Kołodziejczyk 2012: 6–11).

TUTORS AND FOSTER-BROTHERS IN THE GOLDEN HORDE, CRIMEAN KHANATE AND THE CAUCASUS

Different social institutions, at the bases of which lies some kind of personal connection, be it by marriage, friendship, service in the military, etc., were often named after real kinship terms: father-in-law, mother-in-law, brothers-in-arms, and many more. Such is the case for tutors in many Turkic speaking communities, including those on the territory of the Golden Horde, where they

were called *atalık*, a derivative of *ata* ‘father’ (Doerfer 1965: II.69–71). We can say with reasonable confidence that *atalıks*, or at least some tutors of Batuid and other Genghisid princes, were present from the initial time of the Golden Horde (Izmaylov 2023). At the same time, it is hard to determine what their social role and function actually was. In fact, the scarce evidence that we do have often comes from much later sources, which are quite vague. For example, the unique collection of 16th century Central Asian oral historical tradition, the *Çingiz-nâme* of Ötemiş Hâccî,¹⁸ makes mention of three *atalıks*. One of these, Kıyat Buralday, was supposedly the tutor of Şiban b. Coçi. He is alleged to have accompanied him in the campaign against the Crimean Peninsula, and led troops during the storm on the fortress of *Qırq yer*¹⁹ (Utemish-khadzhi/Mirgaleev 2017: 31–33, 105–107, 271–273). The campaign took place in the years of 1238/39.²⁰ The historical memory of the steppes attributed the demise of the Batuid-line to a vengeful *atalık* of Berdi Beg khan (1357–1359), called Tolubay. The chronicle relates that this *atalık* convinced the khan to kill all his male relatives as an act of revenge, because Cänibek khan (1342–1357) put the tutor’s son to death (Utemish-khadzhi/Yudakhin *et al.* 1992: 108–109; Utemish-khadzhi/Mirgaleev 2017: 47–48, 121–122, 240–241). These events took place around 1358/59. The third one, Yağşı Hoca, son of the above-mentioned Rüktemür, aided Kebek bin Toktamış in his fight against his brothers (Utemish-khadzhi/Mirgaleev 2017: 67–68, 141–142, 194–196) in the events of the 1410’s. These examples offer only superficial insight into the ins and outs of the social institution of *atalık*. At the same time, it is important to mention that Kıyat Buralday, Tolubay, and Yağşı Hoca were all genuine historical figures,²¹ with such influence that their names were preserved in the memory of nomadic groups for as long as three hundred years. Sources from the same period, however, are silent about foster-brothers.

Evidence, particularly diplomatic texts (orders to and reports from envoys, peace agreements, etc.), about *atalıks* in the Crimean Khanate becomes more numerous from the 16th century onward. From these we learn that *atalıks* retained their influential status and acted as confidants and counsellors of the khans, which included supporting the khans with funds, equipment, and their own kinsmen during times of a khan’s exile (*kazaklık*) (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 414). They also often led secret diplomatic missions. Tutors of khans and sultans regularly swore an oath on peace agreements of the Crimean Khanate (Kołodziejczyk 2011: 303–304, Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 413–414) and received a share from the tribute paid by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Duchy of Muscovy (Vel’yaminov-Zernov 1864: ۱۶۴, ۱۷۱, ۱۷۴, ۱۷۸, ۱۸۴, ۱۸۵, etc.).²² This indicates that the social institution of *atalık* became a position within the courts of the centres of power (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 414). Furthermore, these sources indicate that Crimean khans chose their offspring’s tutors from the local tribal aristocracy and Circassian tribes, and, in many cases, the tutors were the maternal

¹⁸ On the chronicle, see Utemish-khadzhi/Yudakhin *et al.* 1992: 25–26; Mirgaleev 2011; Utemish-khadzhi/Mirgaleev 2017: 5–13; Göncöl 2020; 2023.

¹⁹ The fortress is also called Çufut-kale the ruins of which are situated 3 km’s from the former capital of the Crimean Khanate, Bağçesaray.

²⁰ Although the Crimean campaign of the Mongols and the participation of Şiban in it is documented, the description of it in the work of Ötemiş Hâccî is a historical trope (see Zaytsev 2013: 496–498).

²¹ On Kıyat Buralday (in some sources Burunday), see Seleznev 2021 with further literature; on Tolubay, see Göncöl 2021.

²² A few Crimean Tatar registers survived, so called *tiyiş-defters*, that list the type, quantity and recipients (the khan, his family-members, court-officials, confidants and the like) of the yearly tribute sent from Muscovy. For further reading on the topic, see Ivanics 1994.

uncles of princes (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 415). However useful these diplomatic sources are, they allow only a restricted insight into the ins and outs of the institution of *atalık*; they shed light specifically on tutors of the Girey-dynasty and their function within the court, but they say little to nothing about tutelage between commoners (*kara kişi*), nor about customs and other social aspects connected to tutelage. The same restrictions are encountered in case of reports on foster-brotherhood. The genealogy of ‘Abdulgaffār and ethnographic material from the Caucasus, however, cover exactly those gaps that are left by the above-mentioned diplomatic type sources. To have a better insight of the whole institution, the question must first be addressed: how does someone become a tutor?

As mentioned earlier, customs of tutelage in the Caucasus survived well into the 19th century, and ethnographers describe in detail the process of becoming a tutor, the responsibilities, the enjoyed benefits, and what customs were associated with it. It is important to highlight that tutelage usually connects two families that are positioned on different levels of the social hierarchy. Since this process results in a special kind of patron-client relationship between the participants, this study shall call the family on the higher level patron-family, whereas the one on the lower client-family. It must be kept in mind that, although the tutelage of a high-born offspring was entrusted to the client-family, it was rather a matter of its whole clan. Once word spread that the prospective patron-family expected a child, a clan interested in building relationships with them searched for a suitable foster-family among their ranks. When a wife within the clan who was also pregnant was found, they applied, bearing gifts, for the position of tutor. The child, either male or female, was usually given to the foster-family (from now on: client-family), for care soon after its birth. The Crimean Tatar word indicating the foster-child was *besleme*, the original meaning of the word being 1) ‘the act of feeding, fattening, or supporting; but it also indicates 2) fed, supported, ...’ (Redhouse 1921: 265), a term we regularly encountered in ‘Abdulgaffār’s family history, whereas the custom of tutelage was called *besleme verme* ‘to hand someone over as a *besleme*’ (Cevdet cited by Tavkul 2016: 228). The *besleme* remained with his or her tutor’s family and kin until their 15th–16th year, and then he or she was returned to their biological parents.

During the period of the tutelage, every aspect of child care was the responsibility of the client-family, material, social and emotional. It was customary for the wife of the tutor to breastfeed the child together with her own, and the *besleme* enjoyed priority over her own children. The tutor was expected to provide sustenance, clothing, education, military training and more. One can argue that, in all likelihood, the *besleme*, growing up at his tutor’s home and within the tutor’s family and kin, must have formed a deep bond with and trust towards them. At the end of the tutelage the tutor was expected to provide lavish gifts for his *besleme*, such as clothing, dowry if they were females, a mount and other military equipment if they were males. This means that the client-family must have had a stable material status in order to provide for the *besleme*. In any case, after the foster-child’s return to the patron-family, the client-family could expect to be handsomely rewarded. They received valuable gifts, cloth, clothing, horses, bows, muskets, and, in many cases, even a plot of land on the patron-family’s estates. Additionally, they gained an influential lordship and their protection. It is important to note that tutors often moved into their *besleme*’s court after they came of age or settled down near them, and served them with counsel and other kinds of similar services (Lavrov 1978: 211–212; Tavkul 2016: 227). This must have made tutorship a sought after, even a lucrative position. How lucrative, can be learned from an entry from Evliyā Çelebi’s *Seyāhat-nāme*. In 1666, the Ottoman administration deposed the reigning khan, Mehmed IV Girey (1641–1644, 1654–1665) and ordered him to report to Istanbul.

The khan refused to comply, and set out with his sons and retinue to gather support from his allies in the Caucasus. On one occasion, the Circassian tribe hosting the khan, appeared ‘armed to the teeth’ in front of him, and, ‘pretending to ask’ (*güyā alā ʔarīḳi r-ricā*), took his son, Cānibek Girey sultan. ‘We will feed him, let him remain some time with us, he is our lord! As time passes, he may become khan and his blessings will profit us.’ – relates the Ottoman traveller (Evliyā Çelebi/Dağlı *et al.* 2003: 284). This report shows that the tribe took advantage of the khan’s vulnerable situation, and, for possible future gains, they forced the khan to engage with them in the institution of *atalıḳ*.

It is important to note that tutorship in the Caucasus was also employed as a means of reconciliation between families involved in a blood-feud. In this case, the party that committed a murder took in a child of the victim’s family and brought him or her up (Lavrov 1978: 211–212; Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 413).

Whatever the reason for the families involved in this social institution of tutorship was, one must bear in mind that its customs could be, and often were, quite flexible. A *besleme*, particularly coming from a family of exceptionally high status, could have more than one tutor, but an *atalıḳ* was only allowed to have one *besleme*. Furthermore, there are reported cases when adult persons (between 15 to 30 years of age) chose for themselves an *atalıḳ*, or vice versa. Although these reports come from diplomatic sources, and are related to princes (*sultān*, *ḥānzāde*) of the Girey dynasty (Belyakov, Vinogradov and Moiseev 2017: 413) – meaning they were politically motivated – the cases clearly show that this social institution must have had considerable importance to the Crimean society and aristocracy, symbolic or otherwise.

It was noted earlier that it was customary for the tutor’s wife to breast-feed the *besleme* in his or her infancy which, in turn, created yet another notion of a fictive kinship with the children of the client-family. The East Old Turkic term indicating these foster-brothers and foster-sisters reflects this relationship quite literally. As the 11th century lexicographer, Kaşgarī notes, they were called *emigdeş*, a term formed from the word *emig* ‘female breast’ and the suffix +*DAş* expressing the idea of sharing something, thus ‘comrades of the breast’. Tuvan and Uzbek testify the survival of the word; in other contemporary Turkic languages it was replaced by the term *emçekteş*, formed from the verb *em-* ‘to suck’ (Vásáry 1982: 549–551). In the Mongol era, however, two other lexemes appeared in parallel. In Ilkhanid Iran and Timurid Central-Asia the term *kökelteş* came to be used, from West Middle Mongolian *köke(n)* ‘female breast’ (Doerfer I 1963: 481–482; Vásáry 1982: 554–557). In the Golden Horde and its successor-states, the word *emildeş* caught hold (Vásáry 1982: 551–554).

We know a number of *emildeş* from several successor-states of the Golden Horde, but we are yet again limited by sources; they are all ‘related’ to Genghisids. Not much is known about its social aspects among the lower levels of society. In any case, the khans’ and sultans’ foster-brothers and foster-sisters enjoyed a high social standing. They held positions at court, were personal servants, and perhaps also bodyguards of their royal ‘kin’ (Vásáry 1982: 551–552). Scarce data shows that at times the *emildeş* of Crimean khans also received a share of Polish-Lithuanian and Muscovian tribute (Vel’jaminov-Zernov 1864: ۱۷۳), although they are not so often mentioned in *tiyiş-defters* as the *atalıḳs*. There is somewhat more data on foster-brothers from Ilkhanid Iran and Timurid Central-Asia, which are of particular relevance. In these territories, the *kökelteş* were confidants of the rulers. They belonged to a ruler’s inner circle, or their offsprings, and are quite often mentioned as high ranking military leaders. They could even rise to the position of regional governors or state ministers (Vásáry 1982: 557–560; Ando 1992: 248–250).

This short review on *atalıks* and *emildeşes* helps to better understand the motivation of ‘Abdulgaffār’s forefathers. Descendants of Mamay *bey* spent a number of years in exile, arguably losing much of their influence on politics within the western wing of the Golden Horde. Then, one of their members, Şafā *bey*, decided to return to the Crimea. Empoverished, blind, having no power base, and entangled in a blood-feud with the peninsula’s most powerful clan, the Şirîn, the possibilities of social progress were slim. It is not too hard to see what the incentives of Şafā *bey* were for becoming the tutor of the khan’s first-born son, the *kalğa*. First and foremost, he and his kin enjoyed the protection of their royal patrons. Additionally, Şafā *bey* received a land-donation – as we saw, this was a usual reward of an *atalık*. On this land, he settled down ‘his *örpideş* Koñrat people’, who can possibly be identified as his allies or clients. There were further incentives for taking the role of tutor. His *besleme*, the *kalğa*, was the prospective ruler of the Crimean Khanate. In case he succeeded to the throne, Şafā *bey* would have become a member of the khan’s inner-most circle, a confidant, and a member of court with a high potential of influence. Becoming an *atalık* was therefore a way for Şafā *bey*, *de facto* an outsider in Crimean politics, to achieve rapid rise within the society, and also an opportunity to further his clan’s and allies’ prospects in their new home. However, after Şāhib Girey khan and Emīn Girey *kalğa* were killed in 1551, this all came to naught. Şafā *bey* and his offspring lost their powerful patron, and violence again spilled out between the Kıyats and the Şirīns.

There are several interesting developments regarding the further history of these two clans. As mentioned earlier, tutorship was a customary way to settle ongoing blood-feuds, and this is reflected in ‘Abdulgaffār’s genealogy. A member of the perpetrator’s clan, Şirīn Kütlu Girey *bey*, declared the son of the victim, Kıyat Murtażā, to be his *besleme*. This meant the end of hostilities by initiative of Murtażā’s *atalık*. Moreover, we learn that Kütlu Girey ‘sent [Murtażā] to be educated (*beslemeye verür*), and made [him and his son, Arslan] drink one woman’s milk.’ This remark indicates several interesting and important developments. It becomes clear that the Şirīn *bey* delegated the responsibilities of tutorship to a third person, meaning his tutorship must have been nominal, and he himself was not actually involved in the upbringing of Murtażā. It also shows that Murtażā, an impoverished orphan, had at least three tutors during his youth. It is also intriguing that Kütlu Girey determined the future career of his *besleme*: ‘He shall not claim the rank of *mirzā*’ he stated, therefore Murtażā ‘became a member of the ‘*ulemā*’ (sing. ‘*ālim*’). Manz Forbes (1978: 295) argues that in the Crimean Khanate in middle of the 16th century *mirzās* were junior members of aristocratic clans who were active in military affairs, such as leading raids and forays, and clearly had a high social status. Instead, Murtażā underwent a training in Islamic theology and law, which opened the way for the young man to acquire a similarly elevated status in the social hierarchy of the khanate. Such cases must have been rare, as it is hard to imagine that patron families allowed the tutors to make such impactful decisions.

‘Abdulgaffār remarks that Kütlu Girey *bey* made his son Arslan and Murtażā ‘drink one woman’s milk.’ This makes it apparent that Arslan and Murtażā became *emildeş* to one another, a decision that turned out to be most impactful for the chronicler’s family. After his training and the *hacc*, Murtażā moved into Yayla Sarāy, and it is safe to assume he was tasked with administering justice on Şirīn estates. What is more, all of his offspring ‘lived the same way’; evidence shows that even ‘Abdulgaffār held this office for a number of years (Esad Efendi 2331. fol. 320r; ‘Abdulgaffār/‘Āşım 1343 [1924/25]: 198–199; Abdulgaffar/Derın Pashaoglu 2014: 228, 248). Here we have two families of non-Genghisid origin which were connected by *emildeşlik*, the client-family serving as judges for the patron-family, on a hereditary basis for nearly two centuries! Such long-last-

ing patron-client cooperation between foster-brother families are currently only known in the Timurid successor-states (Vásáry 1982: 559). Ando's research on the tribes, clans and individuals even lead him 'to suppose the existence of a social institution under the Timurids, in which a family under the term *kūkaltāš* (see *kökelteš* above) was bound to a prince, and which created a relationship – possibly lasting for several generations – between the family and a given line of the Timurids. This institution seems to have played an important role in forming a personal circle of confidants' (Ando 1992: 248). 'Abdulğaffār's genealogy, even though it was produced in the Crimean Khanate not the Timurid Empire, confirms Ando's assumption.

As the study shows, the institutions of *atalıķ* and *émildeš* were based on the notion of fictive kinship-forms which benefited the parties involved in them. Patron-families were able to out-source the burdens of child-care, and, at the same time, recruit new clients. This includes not just the *atalıķ* or *émildeš*, but possibly their entire extended families. Owing to the imbalance of the participants' social status, the patron-family was able to keep the client-family firmly under their power. For families on lower levels of society, these institutions provided a way to rapidly rise in the social hierarchy, to acquire protection, and to accumulate wealth and influence. In short, these fictitious kinship-forms offered a kind of social mobility. 'Abdulğaffār's genealogy also shows that these social institutions – under the right circumstances – could bind families to one another for many generations, meaning they were a way of social organization within the successor-states of the Golden Horde.

TRANSCRIPTION OF 'ABDULĞAFFĀR'S GENEALOGY

[281v] işbu Emîn Girey sultân bin Şâhib Girey hân Şafâ Beg bin Hudây Berdi begiñ beslemesi olub Şafâ Beg pîr ü a'mâ olub ziyâret-i beytû l-lâh êtdikden şoñra 'amâlık 'arız olmağla babası gelüb Kırmıda iskân murâd êdüb hân-i müşârün ileyhden 'inâyet olunan arâzî-yi mañdûde ki Şafâ Koñratı erzî dëfmekle Şîrîn içinde nehr-i Bulğanağda meşhûrdur Şafâ Beg ol mañallde qarye ihdâş êdüb ve civârında kendü örpideş halkı olan Koñrat halkından bir miğdâr halk iskân eylemiş ve kezâlik kendüsine hizmet êtdirmek üzere Esenengi nâm qaryeyi iskân ve bir miğdâr erz i'tâ eylemiş ve hâliyen Bulğanağ nehri üzere qarye-i Şafâ Koñratı ve qarye-i Esenengi mevcûd ve ma'rûfdur mârû z-zikr el-hâcc Şafâ begiñ cedd-i a'llâsı olan Kıyat Alaç oğlu Mamay begi Yılķı suyu dëdikleri yerde Toķtamış hân ile gelüb Şîrîn Rüktemür beg katl êtdigi Toķtamış hân faşında beyân olunmuşdur ba'dehû Mamay oğlu Beg Sultân kendü halkı içinde kırdâ gezmiş intikâm almamış ba'dehû anıñ oğlu Hudây Berdi beg kezâlik aħz êtmeyüb gezmiş gitmiş gitmiş (!) ba'dehû anıñ oğlu mezkûr el-hâcc Şafâ beg 'alil olmağla ancak kendüsini hıfz için müşârün ileyh sultâna atalıķ olmuş ve qaryesinde sâkin olmuş ammâ Gence nâmında bir bahadır ve gayûr [282r] oğlu olub gayret-i câhiliye-i Tatar üzere kırdâ kendü halkı ve nögeri içinde gezüb K[ırım] girmemiş bir takrîr ile nesl-i Rüktemürden üç 'aded mirzâyı katl eylemiş ve ba'dehû Yılķı suyundan göçüb Tın suynın geçüb Azak deñizi sâhilinde [Aftar Baħtyar?] nâm mevķi'inde sâkin olub ol mañallin bacını almış andan şoñra göçüb nehr-i Kümide Qara [Kökçe] mañallde sâkin olmuş ve Qabarṭay çerkesi ile 'ahd u yemîn ve el ve qonaķ olmuş işbu eşnâda Kırmıda el-hâcc Şafâ Beg fevt olmağla anıñ metrûkâtını cem' için ve besleme sultânı fevt olmağla ta'ziye için at atlayub Kırmıya geçer ve Şîrîn begi Baba beg haber alub Qarakız ve Kutlusâ'at nâm iki oğlını baş êdüb bir miğdâr 'asker hâzır êder Gence beg babasınıñ hânesi olan Şafâ Koñratına konduğı gece gelüb şeb-i hûn êderler muhârebe êdererek Gence firâr êder ve Qarakız mirzâ dağı her kimden olursada gece ok [t]okunur

fevt olur ve Gence dağı kaç yerinden mecrûh olub ‘âkıbet Karye Mirzâ Bâzârî câmi‘ine kapanur ve anda cerâhetden fevt olur ve hâlâ mezârı andadır işbu haber olına ve Kabartaya vardıkda çerkes-i nâkes nakz-i ‘ahd édüb Genceniñ élini çaparlar mâlini yağma éderler hattâ meşhûr olan Kabartaydaki Gence dedikleri köy anıdır dërler ve Genceniñ éli perâkende olıcak Murtzâ nâm tıfl-i şağır oğlınıñ atalığ²³ Murtezâyı alub tebdîl-i şekil édüb ırğad t̃arıkasınca Kırıma gelür bir kaç vakit

[282v]

ve ol vakitte Şiriniñ baş begi Kutlu Girey beg bin Hâccî beg imiş ‘âkıbet merķûm atalık beslemesi olan Murtezâyı getirür Kutlu Girey begiñ öñine birağur ve dër ki sultânım ben bir k̃ara kişiyim her neķadar düşmeniñiz nesli isede bir atanın faķat kalan bir çırağıdır ben bana düşenini icrâ siz mürüvvet-kânîsiz isterseñiz katl édiñ isterseñiz ‘avf u çırağ édiñ d̃eyücek bege dağı insâf u merķamet gelür ve alur Arslan nâm oğlıyla ma‘en beslemeye ṽerür bir hatunıñ südin içerür ve ‘umümen Şirînlere dër ki bizim haşmımız Gence beg idi ol ise katl olundu artık inşâf édelim işbu yaş benim beslememdir min ba‘d mirzâlık da‘vâsın étmesün d̃eyü irzâ’ éder ba‘de zamanin Arslan mirzâ nâmdâr mirzâ olur ve Murtezâ dağı okuyub zümre-i ‘ulemâdan olur ve hacc-i beytu l-lâh édüb gelür ve haylî mâldâr kimse imiş Şafâ Koñrat[ın]da evkârı olub kendüsi Arslan mirzâ yanında k̃arye-i Yayla Sarayında sâkin olur ba‘dehü bunuñ oğlu el-hâcc ‘Abdulahâbb dağı bu minvâl üzere geçer ve kezâlık bunuñ oğullarınıñ ekberi el-hâcc Maḥmûd efendi dağı böyle geçer ve ‘Abdulahâbbiñ t̃okuz ‘aded oğlu olub ekseri Şafâ Koñratda

[283r]

ölmüşler ve el-hâcc Maḥmûduñ oğlu el-hâcc Ḥasan efendi dağı ol minvâl üzere geçmiş ba‘dehü oğulları ‘Abdurrezâķ ve ‘Abdullâh efendiler dağı bu minvâl üzere geçmişler muḥarreru l-kitâb el-hâcc ‘Abdulğaffâr dağı merḥûm Ḥasan efendi oğluyum evkârım ve mâlim kemâ kân Şafâ Koñratdadır kendüm bilâ taleb gâh umûr-i k̃azâ’-i Şirine mübtelâ ve gâh ḥânân ve selâtin-i ‘âlî-şânân hizmetlerinde evķât-güzâr olub fażl-i ḥudây-i lâ-yezâl ile gerek ḥân ve gerek sultân ve gerek beg hizmet ü şoḥbetimden memnûn u maḥzûz idiler biñ yüz elli altı târîhinde ḥânlık nevbeti Selim Girey ḥân bin Kaplan Girey ḥâna geldikde ba‘zı müfsid ü münâfıklar ġalibâ ifsâd étmişdür kaḡalıġında k̃azısı ve maḡrebi idim ol vakitte envâ’ [u] dürlü k̃ahr-i bilâ-sebeb édüb ‘âkıbet Şoğucuk kal‘esi dedikleri cây-i bî-emâne nefy eyledi ol maḡalalde maġbûn-i zâr-giryân biñ yüz altmış târîhinde işbu cem‘iyât-i ‘Umdetü l-aḡbâr taḡrîr olunub bi-hasebü l-münâsebe kendü âbâ vu ecdâdım derkenâr olundu râvî-yi aḡbâr el-hâcc Cântemür beg ve el-hâcc Murtezâ mirzâ ve K̃anbolat oğlandan meşhûr-i cihân olan müverriḡ Mirzâ Beg mirzâ bin Arslanbek mirzâdır Şafâ oğlu Gence sana k̃aldı bu dünyâ ve yâḡûd saña k̃aldı bu munca d̃erler meşel-i meşhûrdur aña binâen iṣaret olundu

²³ Corrected from *atalıġımı* by Cs. G. – the presence of the direct object-marker is unnecessary and can only be attributed to a scribal mistake.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- ‘Abdulgaffār Kırımı: *‘Umdetü l-aḥbār* [‘Essence of Histories’]. Süleymaniye Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Esad ef. 2331. İstānbul.
- ‘Abdulgaffār Kırımı 1343 [1924/25]: *‘Umdetü t-tevārīḥ* [‘Essence of Histories’]. Ed. Necib ‘AŞİM. İstānbul: Maṭba‘a-i āmire.
- [Abdulgaffar Kurgumy] Абдулгаффар Кырыми 2014. *Умдет ал-ахбар. Книга 1. Транскрипция, факсимиле*. Транскрипция ДЕРЯ ДЕРИН ПАШАОГЛУ. Казань: Инститит истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ.
- [Abdulgaffar Kurgumy] Абдулгаффар Кырыми 2018. *Умдет ал-ахбар. Книга 2. Перевод*. Пер. с османского Ю. Н. КАРИМОВОЙ и И. М. МИРГАЛЕЕВА, общая и научная редакция, предисловие и комментарии И. М. МИРГАЛЕЕВА. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ.
- [BELOKUROV, Sergey Alekseevich] БЕЛОКУРОВ, Сергей Алексеевич 1889. *Сношения России с Кавказом. Материалы, извлеченные из Московского главного архива министерства иностранных дел. Выпуск 1-й. 1578–1613 гг.* Москва: Университетская типография.
- Evliyâ Çelebi 2003. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi VII. Kitap*. (Ed. Yücel DAĞLI, Seyit Ali KAHRAMAN and Robert DANKOFF) İstanbul: Şefik Matbaası.
- Tārīḥ-i Şāhib Giray Ḥān (Histoire de Sahib Giray, Khan de Crimée de 1532 à 1551)*. Edition Critique, Traduction, Notes et Glossaire: Dr. Özalp GÖ GÖKBİLGİN. 1973. Ankara: Baylan Matbaası.
- [УТЕМИШ-КНАДЗНІ] УТЕМИШ-ХАДЖИ 2017. *Кара таварих*. Ильнур Мидхатович МИРГАЛЕЕВ *et al.* (ред.) Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ.
- [VEL’AMINOV-ZERNOV, Vladimir Vladimirovich] ВЕЛЬЯМИНОВ-ЗЕРНОВ, Владимир Владимирович 1864. *Материалы для истории Крымского ханства*. Санктпетербург: Тип. Императорской Академии наук. [Reprint: Melek A. ÖZYETGİN & İlyas KAMALOV 2009.] Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- [Vremennik] *Временник московского общества истории и древностей российских*. (Книга 10.) 1851. Москва.

Secondary Sources

- ANDO Shiro 1992. *Timuridische Emire nach dem Mu’izz al-ansāb. Untersuchung zur Stammesaristokratie Zentralasiens im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*. (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 153.) Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- [BELYAKOV, Andrey Vasil’evich, Aleksandr Vadimovich VINOGRADOV & Maksim Vladimirovich MOISEEV] БЕЛЯКОВ, Андрей Васильевич, Александр Вадимович ВИНОГРАДОВ и Максим Владимирович МОИСЕЕВ 2017. ‘Институт аталычества в постзолотоордынском мире.’ *Золотоордынское обозрение* 5/2: 412–436.
- [BUDAGOV, Lazar’] БУДАГОВ, Лазарь 1869–1871. *Сравнительный словарь турско-татарских наречий I–II*. Санктпетербург: Типография императорской академии наук.
- [ВУСНКОВА, Margarita Evgen’eva] БЫЧКОВА, Маргарита Евгеньевна 2012. *Русско-литовская знать XV–XVII вв. Источниковедение, генеалогия, геральдика*. Москва: Квадирга.
- DOERFER, Gerhard 1963–1975. *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen I–IV*. (Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission Band XVI.) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- GÖNCÖL, Csaba 2020. ‘Remarks on the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötämiš Hājjī.’ In: István ZIMONYI (ed.) *Ottomans–Crimea–Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged: Innovariant Ltd, 123–132.

- GÖNCÖL, Csaba 2021. 'The Chapter of Bārdi Bāk khan in the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötāmiš Hājjī: Tolu Bay, *āmīr* of the Golden Horde.' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 74/1: 53–63.
- GÖNCÖL, Csaba 2023. 'Redactions and Dates of the Compilation of the Čingiz-nāmā of Ötāmiš Hājjī.' *Золотоордынское обозрение* 11/3: 582–591.
- İNALCIK, Halil 1979–1980. 'The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I.' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4: 445–466.
- IVANICS, Mária 1994. 'Entstehung und Quellenwert der krimtatarischen *tiyiş* Defters.' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 47/1-2: 105–112.
- IVANICS, Mária 2012. 'Die Şirin. Abstammung und Aufstieg einer Sippe in der Steppe.' In: Denise KLEIN (ed.) *The Crimean Khanate between East and West (15th–18th Century)*. (Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte 78.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 27–44.
- [IZMAYLOV, Iskander Lerunovich] ИЗМАЙЛОВ, Искандер Лерунович 2023. 'Социальная структура Улуса Джучи и татарских ханств по материалам «Джами ат-таварих» Кадыр Али-бека.' *Золотоордынское обозрение* 12/2: 317–334.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk 2006. *A Historical-Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Russian Habitation Names of the Crimea*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- KELLNER-HEINKELE, Barbara 1998. 'Who was 'Abdulghaffar el-Qirimi? Some Notes on an 18th century Crimean Tatar Historian.' *Journal of Asian History* 32/2: 145–156.
- [KELLNER-HEINKELE, Barbara] КЕЛНЕР-ХАЙНКЕЛЕ, Барбара 2001. 'Кто был Абдулгаффар ал-Кирими. Заметки о крымско-татарском историке XVIII. века.' In: Миркасим Абдулахатович УСМАНОВ *et al.* (ред.) *Источниковедение истории Улуса Джучи (Золотой орды). От Калки до Астрахани, 1223–1256*. Казань: Институт истории АН РТ, 378–390.
- KOŁODZIEJCZYK, Dariusz 2011. *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania. International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th–18th century). A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- KOŁODZIEJCZYK, Dariusz 2012. 'Divided Sovereignty in the Genghisid States as Exemplified by the Crimean Khanate: "Oriental Despotism" à rebours?' *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 32: 1–21.
- [LASHKOV, Fedor Fedorovich] ЛАШКОВ, Фёдор Фёдорович 1888. 'Камеральное описание Крыма 1784. года.' *Известия таврической учённой архивной комиссии* 6: 36–63.
- [LAVROV, Leonid Ivanovich] ЛАВРОВ, Леонид Иванович 1978. *Карачаевцы. Историко-этнографический очерк*. Черкеск: Карачаево-черкесское отделение ставропольского книжного издательства.
- LEE, Yo-Yup 2017. 'The Political Vagabondage of the Chinggisid and Timurid Contenders of the Throne and Others in Post-Mongol Central Asian and the Qipchaq Steppe: A Comprehensive Study of Qazaqliq, or the Qazaq Way of Life.' *Central Asiatic Journal* 60: 59–95.
- MANZ, Beatrice Forbes 1978. 'The Clans of the Crimean Khanate, 1466–1532.' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2/3: 282–309.
- [MIRGALEEV, Il'nur Midkhatovich] МИРГАЛЕЕВ, Ильнур Мидхатович 2011. '«Чингиз-наме» Утемиша-хаджи: перспективы изучения.' *Золотоордынская цивилизация* 4: 14–19.
- [MUSTAKIMOV, Ilyas Al'fredovich] МУСТАКИМОВ, Иляс Альфредович 2010. 'Еще раз о редках «Мамая-царя».' In: Вадим Винцерович ТРЕПАВЛОВ и Ильнур Мидхатович МИРГАЛЕЕВ (ред.) *Мамай. Опыт историографического антологии*. Казань: Издательство «ФЕН» АН РТ, 171–183.
- [ROSNEKAEV, Roman Yulianovich] ПОЧЕКАЕВ, Роман Юлианович 2010. 'Мамай летописный и Мамай исторический (попытка развенчания стереотипов).' In: Вадим Винцерович ТРЕПАВЛОВ и Ильнур Мидхатович МИРГАЛЕЕВ (ред.) *Мамай. Опыт историографического антологии*. Казань: Издательство «ФЕН» АН РТ, 206–238.
- RADLOFF, Wilhelm 1960². *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte I–IV*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.

- REDHOUSE, James W. 1921. *A Turkish and English Lexicon*. Constantinople: M. Matteosian.
- SCHAMILOGLU, Uli 1984. 'The Qaraçı Beys of the Later Golden Horde: Notes on the Organization of the Mongol World Empire.' *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 4: 283–297.
- SCHAMILOGLU, Uli 2019. 'The Migration of Tribes from East to West in the Golden Horde in the Time of Toqtamış.' In: *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference to the 750th Anniversary of the Foundation of the Golden Horde: Saryaka and the Golden Horde: Time and Space*. Karagandy, October 23–25, 2019. Almaty, 25–29.
- [SELEZNEV, Yuriy Vasilevich] СЕЛЕЗНЁВ, Юрий Василевич 2021. 'К вопросу о происхождении полководца Бурундая.' *Золотоотдынское обозрение* 9/2: 236–246.
- [SEYTYAG'YAEV, Nariman] СЕЙТЯГ'ЯЕВ, Нариман 2013. 'Ученый из Карасу Абдульгаффар Кырыми и его историческое сочинение (история, проблемы и перспективы изучения).' In: ЭМИРОВ Айдер РЕШАТОВИЧ (ред.) *Мир Бекира Чобан-заде. Сборник материалов I. крымской международной тюркологической конференции, Белгородск (Карасубазар) 23–25 мая 2012 г. Симферополь: НАТА*, 222–242.
- TAVKUL, Ufuk 2016. 'Kırım-Kafkasya İlişkilerinde "Atalık" Kurumunun Kökeni Üzerinde Değerlendirmeler [Considerations regarding the Origin of the Institution of 'Atalık' within the Frame of Crimean–Caucasian Contacts].' *Karadeniz Araştırmaları* 51: 223–232.
- [TREPAVLOV, Vadim Vinceroovich] ТРЕПАВЛОВ, Вадим Винцерович 2010. 'Предки «Мамая-царя». Киятские беки в «Подлинном родослове Глинских князей».' In: Вадим Винцерович ТРЕПАВЛОВ и Ильнур Мидхатович МИРГАЛЕЕВ (ред.) *Мамай. Опыт историографического антологии*. Казань: Издательство «ФЕН» АН РТ, 136–170.
- VÁSÁRY, István 1982. 'The Institution of Foster-Brothers (*emildäš* and *kökäldäš*) in the Chingisid States.' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 36/1-3: 549–562.
- [VINOGRADOV, Aleksandr Vadimovich] ВИНОГРАДОВ, Александр Вадимович 2019. 'Русско-крымские отношения в период второго правления хана Гази-Гирея II 1597–1607 гг.' *Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства* 11: 16–42.
- [YUDANIN, Konstantin Kuzmich] ЮДАХИН, Константин Кузьмич 1965. *Киргизско-русский словарь*. Москва: Издательство «Советская Энциклопедия».
- [ZAYTSEV, Il'ya Vladimirovich] ЗАЙЦЕВ, Илья Владимирович 2009. *Крымская историческая традиция XV–XIX. веков. Пути развития. Рукописи, тексты и источники*. Москва: Восточная литература.
- [ZAYTSEV, Il'ya Vladimirovich] ЗАЙЦЕВ, Илья Владимирович 2013. 'Кырк-йер/Киркор (Чуфут-Кале) и ранняя история Крымского ханства.' In: Валерий Павлович СТЕПАНЕНКО и Александр Григорьевич ЮРЧЕНКО (ред.) *От Онона к Темзе. Чингисиды и их западные соседи. К 70-летию Марка Григорьевича Крамаровского*. Москва: Изд. дом Марджани, 494–505.

Online sources:

URL 1

[SHENNIKOV, Aleksandr Aleksandrevich] ШЕННИКОВ, Александр Александрович 1981. *Княжество потомков Мамая*. (last view: 08. 12. 2024.)
<https://web.archive.org/web/20121114022259/http://zarusskiy.org/history/2008/06/29/mamay>

Open Access. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, a link to the CC License is provided, and changes – if any – are indicated. (SID_1)