

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Al-Xwārazmī on the Peoples of Central Asia

Author(s): C. E. Bosworth and Gerard Clauson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 1/2 (Apr., 1965), pp. 2-12

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25202803>

Accessed: 24/08/2012 14:35

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

AL-XWĀRAZMĪ ON THE PEOPLES OF CENTRAL ASIA

By C. E. BOSWORTH and SIR GERARD CLAUSON

I. INTRODUCTION

THE PASSAGE TREATED HERE OCCURS in the seventh *faṣl*, "Concerning words which are frequently used in reference to conquests, expeditions and historical accounts of the Arabs during Islam," of the sixth *bāb* of the first *maqāla* of al-Xwārazmī's *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm* (pp. 119–20 of the edition of Van Vloten, Leiden 1895 = p. 73 of the edition of Cairo 1342/1923–4). The whole *faṣl* was published in the original and translated by J. M. Unvala in his article, "The translation of an extract from *Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm* of al-Khwārazmī" in the *Journal of the K.R. Cama Institute*, XI, Bombay 1928, 76–110. However, Unvala was primarily an Iranian scholar and his commentary on the *faṣl* is oriented primarily in that direction. He was on weaker ground when dealing with Central Asiatic and especially Turkish topics: and this fact, together with the lapse of nearly 40 years since Unvala prepared his article, warrants a reconsideration of the brief section on Central Asia in the light of more recent researches.

II. AL-XWĀRAZMĪ'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE PEOPLES OF CENTRAL ASIA

Almost nothing is known about the life and career of Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad al-Xwārazmī, but his only known work, the *Mafātīḥ al-'ulūm*, is dedicated to Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Ubaidallāh al-'Utḡī, Vizier to the Sāmānids, and this dedication and certain internal evidence enables us to date its composition to shortly after 977 (see on this work, Bosworth, "A pioneer Arabic encyclopedia of the sciences: al-Khwārizmī's Keys of the sciences," *Isis*, LIV, 1963, 97–111). From his intimate knowledge of administrative procedures and the various official registers in use, he must have been connected with the Sāmānid bureaucracy. It is therefore probable that al-Xwārazmī was familiar with the topography and ethnography of the Sāmānid empire and its tributaries, and would be cognizant of the administrative problems involved in exercising authority over the borderlands adjoining the Central Asiatic steppes and mountain massif. More exactly, he might be expected to know something of the tribal affiliations and social organization of the Turkish-speaking peoples on the northern and eastern frontiers of the empire, roughly corresponding to the Syr Darya valley and the Pamir-Tien Shan ranges.

Of which Turkish-speaking or other peoples might al-Xwārazmī have had some knowledge? We are unhappily very ignorant of the earliest history of the Turkish-speaking peoples. The evidence is scanty and widely scattered, and there is, as yet, no general agreement regarding its interpretation. The latest attempt to summarize this history very briefly is in Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian studies*, London 1962, Ch. 1.

The name "Turk" did not appear in history till the middle of the 6th century A.D., when a tribe which called itself *Türkü* destroyed the "empire" of the Juan-juan (the possible identity of this people with the Avars is still hotly debated) and established an "empire" of its own. This "empire" at its greatest extent reached temporarily from the Great Wall of China to the Oxus and existed intermittently from the middle of the 6th century till the middle of the 8th. There were of course Turkish-speaking peoples many centuries before

this; the difficulty lies in determining which of the various peoples mentioned before this date in the Chinese records, the most important and almost the only ones relevant for this remote period, answer to this description. The Chinese historians of the T'ang dynasty believed that the Türkü were "descended" from the Hsiung-nu and so they presumably believed that the latter were Turkish-speaking; but there is no general agreement that the Hsiung-nu were Turkish-speaking and evidence to the contrary has recently been put forward by E. R. Pulleyblank in "The consonantal system of Old Chinese", *Asia Major*, N.S. IX, 1963, 239 ff.

Be that as it may, the Hsiung-nu, whose serious history goes back to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. (and their mythological history a great deal further), were unquestionably in close contact with Turkish-speaking peoples from the earliest period, and there can be little doubt that when they made their great raid into Europe in the 4th century A.D., the horde of the Huns (leaving ethnology aside, there is now no doubt that the *names* Hsiung-nu and Hun are identical) included a number of Turkish-speaking elements. Moreover, in the immediately following centuries other waves of Turkish-speaking peoples found their way from the eastern Asiatic steppes to the west. What is impossible is to determine to which wave individual Turkish-speaking peoples belonged. These included in the earliest period the Bulgār, the tribe which the Byzantine historians called Saviroi and the Muslim historians Suwār, and several Oğuz tribes, whose name, with the sound change $z > r$ characteristic of the language of the Bulgār and their modern descendants the Chuvash, forms part of the names of the Onogoroi, Saragouroi, Outourgouroi and Koutourgouroi mentioned by 5th century Byzantine historians. Basically, all the Turkish-speaking tribes which found their way to the west were nomadic herdsmen, but some seem to have settled on the land as agriculturists, or at any rate to have dominated agriculturists of other ethnic stocks so effectively as to force them to assume their name and language. The position is greatly complicated by the fact that the Türkü had played such an important political rôle during the 6th and 7th centuries that several peoples who were neither ethnically Turkish nor Turkish speakers called themselves, or were called by their neighbours, "Turks." For example, in some Byzantine sources "Tourkoi" means "Magyars" and it is probable that in some Muslim authorities the term "Turk" is equally inaccurate.

There were certainly people who were Turks, or who were called Turks, settled peacefully within the borders of Sāmānid Transoxania and Afrigid Xwārazm, probably before the Islamic conquest of these regions in the 8th century, and R. N. Frye and A. M. Sayılı have suggested that the penetration was profound and continuous from the late 6th century onwards (the date of the greatest Türkü expansion to the west), see "Turks in the Middle East before the Saljuqs", *JAOS*, LXIII, 1943, 194-207. In the 9th and 10th centuries there was also considerable pressure from genuine Turks outside the borders of Islam who were still nomadic. Prominent among these peoples were the Oğuz and later the Qıpčaq. These were a later wave of Oğuz than the "Ogur" of the 5th century; and owing to long contact with Iranian-speaking peoples and detachment from their Turkish-speaking relatives further east, had developed dialects sufficiently different from the standard Turkish of the Uyğur of Sinkiang and the subjects of the Qaraxanid dynasty to the north and west of the Uyğur, for Maḥmūd al-Kāšğari, writing in the middle of the 11th century, to make a clear distinction between "the language of the Turks" and "the language of the Oğuz and

Qıpçaq". These two peoples were often described as Türkmen. The origin of this designation has been much debated, but having regard to the fact that the people to whom it was applied were in close contact with Iranians, the simple explanation that it is "Türk" with the Persian suffix *-mān* "like", is probably correct. It seems at first sight a little ironical that people who really were ethnically Turks should be described as "like Turks", but the name no doubt goes back to a period when the Muslim term "Turk" still meant the historical Türkü and had not yet become a vague generic term.

By the 8th century at the latest, an Oğuz confederation had established itself in the region of the Aral Sea and Syr Darya, and this migration brings them into the purview of Islamic writers. The first mention of the Oğuz in Islamic literature seems to be in the historian al-Balāḍurī (d. 892) who says that Ṭāhir b. 'Abdallāh raided the land of the Guzz during the Caliph al-Mu'taṣim's reign (sc. 833-42) (*Futūḥ al-buldān*, Cairo 1959, 420); and Ṭabarī mentions an attack of the Toğuz-Oğuz on Uṣrūsana in 820-1 (*Annales*, III, 1044). Marvazī, writing c. 1120 but drawing on information which probably went back to the early 10th century, says that the pasture grounds of the Oğuz march with Xwārazm and Transoxania (Minorsky, *Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*, London 1942, 29).

A century and a half later, in al-Xwārazmī's own time, the northern borders of Transoxania were dotted with *ribāṭs* or fortresses against the "Turks". These were especially thick in the province of Uṣrūsana, the region to the south of the Syr Darya whose chief town was Xuḡanda (the most recent and thorough survey of this region is N. Negmatov's *Istoriko-geograficheskoy ocherk Ustrushany s drevneyshikh vremen do X v.n.e.*, in *Tadzhikskaya Arkheologicheskaya Ekspeditsiya*, M.I.A. XXXVII, Moscow-Leningrad 1953), and in the province of Isfīḡāb to the north of the river. The geographer Maqdisī (wrote c. 985) speaks of the towns Barūkat and Balāḡ as "two frontier posts against the Türkmen" (*taḡrān 'alā 'l-Turkmāniyyin*); these Türkmen had been converted to Islam "out of fear", but still kept up their old predatory habits (*Aḥsan at-taqāsīm*, 274). This seems to be the earliest mention of the Türkmen under this name, though within a few decades it was generally applied to the Oğuz and Qıpçaq groups, for example, in the Gaznavid historians Gardīzi and Baihaqī. (On the possible application of the term "Türkmen" to other Turkish groups, see İ. Kafesoğlu, "Türkmen adı, manası ve mahiyeti," in *Jean Deny armağanı*, Ankara 1958, 121-31, French résumé in *Oriens*, XI, 1958, 146-50.)

Saurān, on the middle Syr Darya to the north-west of Isfīḡāb, is described by Maqdisī as a frontier post against the Oğuz and Kimek. The whole course of the river from there down to the Aral Sea was in Oğuz hands and remained pagan till the 12th or even 13th century; it was from here that the Xwārazm-Šāhs of Atsız and his line recruited many of the pagan Qıpçaq troops whose excesses in Persia made the Šāhs so unpopular. The Oğuz and later the Qıpçaq ranged westwards from Xwārazm as far as the Volga. Ibn Faḍlān met Oğuz tribesmen on his journey towards the Emba river and Birūnī records that in the 10th century the Afrīḡid Xwārazm-Šāhs led an expedition, called *Faḡbūrī*, "the King's expedition," into the steppes each autumn (*The chronology of ancient nations*, tr. Sachau, London 1879, 224). The mention of the Kimek is interesting and their being linked with the Oğuz confirms what Marvazī, tr. Minorsky, 32, says of the close proximity and relationship of the two peoples. According to Gardīzi, the Qıpçaq were originally one of the seven tribes of the Kimek. The name Kimek does not occur in Kāšḡarī, but may be

identical with Yemek, the tribe mentioned next to the Oğuz in his chapter on the geography of the Turkish tribes. In the *Dīwān luġāt al-turk*, tr. Atalay [all subsequent references are to this edition], III, 29, the word Yemek is listed among the words beginning with *y-*, so cannot be a scribal error for Kimek, as Yasmil is for Basmil (this word is so spelt in the MS. even when listed among the words beginning with *b-*), but it might be a later form. According to Kašġari, loc. cit., the Yemek were "a tribe (*ġil*) of Turks and according to us (*indānā*) Qıpčaq, but the Qıpčaq Turks reckon themselves a different confederation (*hizb*)". This suggests a change in the relationship between the two tribes, but tribal relationships among the Turks were so fluid that the point is not important (see further, Barthold, *Encycl. of Islam*,¹ arts. "Kimäk", "Qıpčaq"). What is certain is that in the 11th century the Kimek drop out of mention, but the Qıpčaq are in turn described as harrying the borders of Xwārazm in Baihaqī, *Ta'rix-i Mas'ūdi*, ed. Ganī and Fayyāq, Tehran 1945, 86, tr. A. K. Arends, Tashkent 1962, 104 (events of 1030).

With regard to the tribal groups of the eastern Turks, who in al-Xwārazmī's time occupied such regions to the east of Transoxania as Fargāna and the Semirechye, explicit information is lacking for the third quarter of the 10th century. A consideration of these groups is, of course, bound up with the question of the origins of the Qaraxanids, who appeared on the northern borders of the Sāmānid empire in 992. The Sāmānids had long had dealings with the Qaraxanid family and with the Qarluq tribes, not only by way of military expeditions (in 943 the son of the Turkish Xāqān was a prisoner in Sāmānid hands, Ibn al-Aṭīr, VIII, 310), but also by way of commercial relations and Muslim missionary activity, this last leading to the conversion of a large number of Turks in 960, doubtless including the Qaraxanids (Ibn al-Aṭīr, VIII, 396). That the Qaraxanids were themselves Qarluq has recently been strongly maintained by O. Pritsak, whose efforts have thrown so much light on this shadowy but important Turkish dynasty (especially in his "Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden", *ZDMG*, CI, 1951, 270–300); but this identification can still not be regarded as wholly proven.

Finally, can any pattern be discerned in al-Xwārazmī's choice of terms to discuss? It is difficult to see one. The terms in question are variously Turkish and Iranian ones. The Iranian ones Ixšīd, Afšin and Baġpūr relate to the past rather than to his own time, for the Arab conquests and then the centralizing policies of the Sāmānids had ended the day of local rulers in Sogdiana and the outlying parts of Transoxania. Mention of the Hayāṭila or Hephthalites takes us back to the pre-Islamic past of Central Asia, but it is true that the Hephthalites (or more correctly, the Chionites, for Ghirshman's researches have shown that the Hephthalites were one component of the Chionite people, perhaps the ruling house) made an ethnic and political impression on what is now Soviet Tadzhikistan and northern and eastern Afghanistan which lasted well into Islamic times. As an Islamic geographical term, Haiṭal (*rectius* *Habṭal) was for long synonymous with the regions of Ṭuxāristān and Badaxšān to the south of the upper Oxus and those of Čagāniyān, Qubāḍiyān, Xuttal and Waxš to the north of it; and Birūnī speaks of "Walwāliġ, the capital of Ṭuxāristān, which in the days of old was the country of the Haiṭal" (quoted in Minorsky, *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 340; see also Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, Cairo 1958, 58–60, to be considered now in the light of V. A. Livshits, *Sogdiyskie dokumenty s gory Mug*, II, *Yuridicheskie dokumenty i pis'ma*, Moscow 1962, 53 ff., Document V4). Al-Xwārazmī's

Turkish terms Ğabbūya, Ināl-tigin and ʿarxān are especially associated with the Oğuz; but he also mentions the Qarluq, and his Şuwār-tigin is probably to be connected with the old Turkish people of the Suvār, who appear however in the Islamic geographical sources very far from Farġāna, in association with the Bulgār on the middle Volga.

III. TRANSLATION OF AL-XWĀRAZMĪ'S TEXT

"Al-Farāġina are the people of Farġāna. Al-Ixšīd is the ruler of Farġāna, and al-Şuwārtigin is under him. Al-Afšin is the ruler of Uşrūsana. Al-Hayātila are a tribal group (*ġil min al-nās*) who were formerly powerful and ruled over ʿuxāristān; the Xalaġ and Kanġina Turks are remnants of them. Xāqān is the supreme ruler of the Turks; Xān means chief, and Xāqān means Xān of Xāns, i.e. chief of chiefs, just as the Persians say Šāhānšāh. Ğabbūya is the ruler of the Oğuz, and the ruler of the Xarluxiyya is similarly called Ğabbūya. Ināl-tigin is the heir (*walī 'ahd*) of the Ğabbūya; every chief of the Turks, whether he be a king or a local landowner (*dihqān*) has an Ināl, i.e. heir. Subāši means commander of the army (*ṣāhib al-ġais*). Al-ʿarxān means noble one (*al-šarīf*); its plural is al-ʿarāxina. Baġbūr is the ruler of China; *baġ* means king and *būr* means son in Sogdian, Chinese and pure Persian, i.e. Pahlavi."

IV. COMMENTARY

Ixšīd

Unvala derives this, not from OP *xšāyaŋiya* (> MP and NP *šāh* "king"), but from *xšaēta*- "shining, brilliant", via Sogdian, and Spuler, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit*, 30, 356, favours this too; but an etymology from the former is much the more probable. The former word is certainly the origin of the Turkish title *Şaġ*, used in Orkhon Turkish for a rank bestowed on senior members of the royal family under the Qaġan, and doubtless going back to late 6th century Türkü usage. We meet with the title *Ixšīd* in the accounts of the Arab conquest of Transoxania, for the local rulers of Sogdiana were known by it; Maqdisi, 279, says that the *Ixšīd*, king of Samarqand, had his castle and residence at Māymurg in the Samarqand oasis. The title does not occur as such in the Sogdian documents (first quarter of the 8th century) found at Mount Mug, but V. A. Livshits has suggested, op. cit., 50, that the Aramaic ideogram *MLK* "king" common in these documents represented Sogdian *ʾγšēd*. O. I. Smirnova gives a list of the *Ixšīds* of Sogdiana during the period 650–783 in her "Sogdiyskie monety kak novy istochnik dlya istorii Sredney Azii", *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, VI, 1949, 356–67. The *Ixšīd* of Sogdiana was still disaffected towards the Arabs during the Caliphate of al-Mahdi (775–85) (Ya'qūbi, in Barthold, *Turkestan*, 202). The local rulers of Farġāna likewise bore the title *Ixšīd*, although it seems that they were little more than *primi inter pares* amongst the other *dihqāns* (*Ḥudūd al-'ālam*, 116, 355); according to Ibn al-Aʿīr, V, 344, it was the *Ixšīd* of Farġāna who called in the Chinese army which invaded Transoxania and was defeated in 751 by the Arab general Ziyād b. Šāliḥ. In the 10th century, Muḥammad b. Tuġġ, whose family had been in the service of the Abbasid Caliphs and their Viziers, became governor of Egypt, and founded there a dynasty which lasted till the coming of the Fāṭimids. In 938 he sought from the Caliph al-Rāḍi the title of *Ixšīd*, claiming to be a descendant of the ancient princes of Farġāna, and his line is generally known as the *Ixšīdids* (cf. C. H. Becker, *Encycl. of Islam*,¹

art. "Ikhshidids"). So far as is known, Muḥammad b. Ṭuġġ was a Turk and not an Iranian, but he may well have come from Farġāna, for that region furnished large numbers of men for the Abbasids' guards; it is to designate these troops that the Arabic broken plural *al-Farāġina* is first found in the sources. An interesting parallel to this late appearance of the title *Ixšīd* is the title of the Turkish Viceroy in Egypt in modern times, Khedive (*Xudaiwi*), which started life as the Sogdian title *γwt'w*, one of the titles which also occurs in the Mount Mug documents.

Šuwār-tiġin

Unvala could only suggest an etymology from MP and NP *suwār* "rider, cavalryman", but the spelling with *šād* makes this unlikely. The element *tēgin* is quite straightforward. In Orkhon Turkish *tēgin* meant "prince", the legitimate son of a Qaġan, that is it was acquired by birth and not by grant of the sovereign. But as adult *tēgins* often held administrative, viceregal, posts, the term became by degrees attached to an office and *tēgins* were no longer necessarily the sons of Qaġans. The frequency with which the element *-tiġin* is found in the onomastic of Turks in the service of the Caliphate, the Sāmānids, the Būyids, etc., points to the fact that this stage had been reached by the end of the 9th century. It is the element *Šuwār* which makes this title an intriguing one. The whole title may mean "Prince Šuwār" or "the Prince [administering] Šuwār". If the latter is the case, it could well be evidence that a section of the Suwār Turks had been dropped off in Farġāna on the road to the middle Volga, where there were undoubtedly Suwār in the 10th century. These Suwār are associated with the Bulġār by the Arab geographer Iṣṭaxrī in his *Kitāb masālik al-mamālik*, 225 (written c. 951) and by the anonymous author of the *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 103, cf. 461, written 30 years later. Suwār and Bulġār were populous and flourishing towns lying to the south of the later Kazan, and coins with Islamic legends were minted at Suwār as early as 948–9 (I. Hrbek, *Encycl. of Islam*,² art. "Bulghār"). It has been put forward by Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian studies*, 20, that this Turkish people of the Suwār (mentioned by Kāšġarī, I, 30 and elsewhere), the Sabiroi (pronounced Saviroi) of the Byzantine chronicles and the tribe which the Chinese called the Hsien-pei, are all the same, and this hypothesis would be strengthened if we could posit a migration across Central Asia which reached the Caucasus in the 5th–6th centuries (the date of the earliest Byzantine references) after depositing some of the Suwār in Farġāna. Finally, we may note the appearance of the personal name Waṣīf b. Šuwārtiġin in Hilāl al-Šābi's *Kitāb al-wuzarā'*, Cairo 1958, 101, 256; this man was a secretary in the Caliphal administration and a partisan of Ibn al-Mu'tazz, who in 908 made an abortive attempt to seize the Caliphate for himself. The name "Waṣīf" points to the man's servile origin, and it may well be that he came from Farġāna, for that region, as has been noted, provided large numbers of Turks and others for the service of the Caliphs.

Afšin

Unvala correctly gives the etymology of this from MP *Pišin*, found in Persian epic lore as the name of a Kayāni prince (cf. Justi's long entry, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 252–3, s.v. *Pisina*). The title was no doubt used in other parts of the north-eastern Iranian world, but the Afšin of Ušrūsana, Ḥaidar b. Kā'ūs, achieved fame in the early 9th century as one of

al-Mu'tašim's generals and the vanquisher of the Xurramī rebel Bābak. The story of his trial and execution is described in detail by Ṭabarī, III, 1303–18, tr. E. Marin, *The reign of al-Mu'tašim* (833–42), New Haven 1951, 111–23, and Browne, *Literary history of Persia*, I, 330–6. Ḥaidar claimed to be a descendant of the old kings of Persia; accusations at his trial included the one that he had flogged two Muslims for turning an idol-temple in Ušrūsana into a mosque, thus violating Ḥaidar's pact with the kings of Sogdiana to leave the people to their own religion, and the further one that he himself had in his palace pagan idols and books. However, Afšins seemed to have survived in Ušrūsana for another 50 years. In 893 the Sāmānid Amšr Ismā'il b. Aḥmad dethroned the local dynasty of Afšins and incorporated the province into his empire; a coin of this last Afšin, dated 892, is extant (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 211, 224). The Afšin mentioned among the Turkish commanders in Alp Arslan's army during the Mantzikert campaign of 1071 must have been a Turk who had taken this ancient title as a personal name (Ibn al-Aṭīr, X, 285).

Hayāṭila, Xalağ, Kaṅgina

The Haiṭal/Haṭṭal loom quite largely in the Islamic historical sources for the eastern Iranian world. As the Arabs pushed eastwards, they met the Hephthalites. Ṭabarī, I, 2885, under the year 31/651–2, records that al-Aḥnaf b. Qais defeated near Nishapur an army of "the Hayāṭila of Herat", and on reaching Tūxāristān, they came up against the Hephthalite king Tārḫān Nizak. The Hephthalite kingdom disintegrated in the latter part of the 7th century, but left important ethnic elements in northern Afghanistan, and the more southerly branch of the Chionites, called by Ghirshman the Zabulites, remained powerful in south-eastern Afghanistan until the time of the Šaffārids and early Ġaznavids (cf. Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, 96–134). Ghirshman's conclusion is that the ruling stratum of the Chionites were Indo-Europeans, originally speaking a "Tokharian" language, but becoming more and more Persianized under the effect of Sāsānid contacts; this does not, of course, exclude the presence of other nationalities in the body of the confederation.

We are thus led on to al-Xwārazmī's statement that the Xalağ and Kaṅgina Turks are remnants of the Hephthalites. The Arabic خلاج can as easily be read *Xallux* as *Xalağ*; Minorsky, in a detailed study of the origins and history of the Xalağ, thought that Van Vloten was probably correct in adopting the reading *Xalağ* ("The Turkish dialect of the Khalaj", *BSOS*, X, 1939–42, 426 ff.). However, we do know of *Xallux*/Qarluq in Tūxāristān (*Ḥudūd al-'ālam*, 108, 338), so an interpretation as *Xallux* cannot be wholly disregarded. The 10th century Arab geographers say that the Xalağ were Turks, that they had early crossed to the south of the Oxus and that they nomadized along the plateaux of eastern Afghanistan between Bust and Kabul. Kāšgarī mentions the Xalač in his long article on the Türkmen (III, 412–16), but regards them as separate from the main body of Türkmen, and can only offer fanciful legends for the origin of the name. The Xalağ thus have a somewhat equivocal position as Turks, and although al-Xwārazmī calls them "Turks", his statement that they were remnants of the Hephthalite confederation strengthens the suspicion that he was here using "Turks" in the vague and inaccurate sense referred to above, and that the Xalağ were not ethnically Turks at all. This suspicion is much stronger in regard to al-Xwārazmī's "Kaṅgina Turks". In Islamic sources, the Kaṅgina are usually linked with the Kumiḡī or Kumiği, and both peoples are located in the Buttaman

Mountains at the heads of the valleys running down to the Oxus through Čagāniyān and Xuttal. In the Gāznavid period, they frequently harried the Sultans' possessions along the upper Oxus (cf. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids: their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran* 994–1040, Edinburgh 1963, 239). The Kumīgi were almost certainly not Turks, but the remnants of an old-established Central Asian Iranian people, probably the Sakae, for Ptolemy mentions a Saka tribe of *Kōmēdoi*. The *Ḥudūd al-'ālum*, 120, cf. 361–3, distinguishes between the Kumīgi and the Kanġina, and says that the latter are now reduced to a small tribe; nevertheless, the probability is that the Kanġina too were Saka remnants which had been absorbed into the Hepthalite confederation and had persisted during Islamic times in the mountainous and inaccessible lands of the upper Oxus.

Xāqān, Xān

There is no evidence to support al-Xwārazmī's distinction between *Xāqān* and *Xān* and his implicit parallel of the Persian terms *Šāhānšāh* and *Šāh*. In Orkhon Turkish a Qaġan (this is the normal Türkü spelling, but the characters in the "runic" script could equally represent the form Xaġan, and this may have been intended; the word is certainly pre-Türkü and possibly a pre-Turkish loan-word, although evidence here is lacking except that initial *x-* is non-Turkish) was essentially an independent ruler not owing allegiance to anyone, but occasionally in the early period a Qaġan with wide dominions might appoint one or even more of his close relations to be a "small Qaġan" under him. In these circumstances it would be true to say that the great Qaġan was in effect a Šāhānšāh and the small Qaġans in effect Šāhs. But the supposed antithesis between *qaġan* and *qan* as between *šāhānšāh* and *šāh* is unreal. The title Qan is found in the Tonyuquq inscription, the oldest Türkü inscription (c. A.D. 716), in contexts where Qaġan might have been expected. It was perhaps a less dignified title than Qaġan, but etymologically, there is no possibility of *qaġan* being an elative form of *qan*. On the contrary, *qan* was almost certainly merely a crasis of *qaġan*, perhaps a dialect form.

Ġabbūya

A later form of *Yabġu*. Etymologically, the word is an old, pre-Türkü title going back to the Yüeh-chih, and if, as seems likely, the Yüeh-chih, Wu-sun and related peoples were "Tokharian" speakers, the title *Yabġu* may be "Tokharian", although there is as yet no conclusive evidence for this. It is therefore almost certainly Indo-European rather than Turkish in origin, but whether it is "Tokharian" or Iranian is still uncertain (this latter view has recently been affirmed by R. N. Frye, "Some early Iranian titles," *Oriens*, XV, 1962, 356–8). In Kāšġari, III, 32, it is spelt *yavġū*, and this is also the spelling of the *Qutadġū bilig*. This may in fact always have been the Turkish spelling, since in the "runic" (Türkü) alphabet the same letter was used for *b* and *v*. Either sound would have been represented by *b* in Arabic, in which language *v* does not occur, and in any event the sound change *v* > *b* is a common enough one in other languages. Amongst the Türkü, the title was one of rank and not of birth; the *Yavġu* ranked immediately after the Qaġan and before the *Šaġ*. The initial sound change in an Oġuz context of *y-* > *ġ-*, which we have here in al-Xwārazmī's form *Ġabbūya*, well fits the statement of Kāšġari, I, 31, that the Oġuz made this sound change; this must be one of the earliest confirmations of it. The

title was borne by Turkish princes in post-Hephthalite Tūxāristān, appearing on their coins (Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, 50–1), and the Islamic sources attest to al-Xwārazmī's correctness in connecting it with both the Qarluq and the Oğuz. In the early Abbasid period, al-Mahdī received the submission of *inter alia* the *Yabğu* of the Qarluq, and in 811 al-Ma'mūn was obliged to conciliate this *Yabğu* in Transoxania and seek his support (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 202; Spuler, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit*, 55). Further historical references to the early *Yabğus* are given in Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 107, Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang*, 143, n. 3, and Frye, *History of Bukhara*, 107–8. We also meet the title amongst Ibn Faḍlān's Oğuz, who were under a *Yabğu*, this man having the prestige and moral authority of a tribal chief (tr. Togan, *Ibn Faḍlān's Reisebericht*, 28, 140–1, tr. A. P. Kovalevskiy, *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlan o ego puteshestvii na Volgu b 921–922 gg.*, Kharkov 1956, 128, 188). At the beginning of the 11th century, when the Oğuz were becoming Islamized and the Salḡuqs were about to burst into the Islamic world, we meet the Oğuz *Yabğu* again as ruler from Yangikent near the Syr Darya delta, and the title was shortly afterwards assumed by members of the rival Salḡuq family (cf. Pritsak, "Der Untergang des Reiches des Oğuzischen Yabğu," *Fuad Köprülü armağanı*, Istanbul 1953, 397–410).

Ināl

Al-Xwārazmī's explanation here is very odd. Etymologically, *ināl* is a deverbal noun from **mā-*, the unrecorded basic form of *man-*, "to trust, rely on," and should mean "reliable, trustworthy", but is never recorded as being used as a noun/adjective in this sense. The word is attested as a title in the 10th century. In 921, Ibn Faḍlān met the "Lesser Yināl" (*Yindl al-Ṣaḡīr*) amongst the Oğuz, one of the commanders beneath the Sübaşı. In the Uyḡur texts from Turfan, the title appears as a high one. The younger brother of someone (probably of the Qaḡan, but the text is damaged here) is called in the third *Pfahl*, line 4, of F. W. K. Müller's "Zwei Pfahlinschriften aus den Turfanfunden", *AKPAW*, Berlin 1915, 23, *Tengride bolmuş ināl*: "the *Ināl* who came into existence in Heaven"; and several people called *ināls* are mentioned in the following lines, coming after the *téḡins* (princes), *tengrims* (princesses) and *sanguns* or *sengüns* (generals). According to J. R. Hamilton, *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties*, Paris 1955, 142, this inscription should be dated 947, less probably 1007. As a personal name, we find in Miskawaih, the historian of the Persian Būyid dynasty, one Muḥammad b. Yināl al-Tarḡumān "the Interpreter", apparently a Turk in the service of the Būyids and perhaps used as a liaison officer between the Turkish and native Dailamī elements of the Būyid army (*Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, I, 376, 407, 408, tr. IV, 423, 451, 452, years 937 and 939). In the period of the Salḡuq irruptions into the Islamic world (the first half of the 11th century), we find much mention in Baihaqī of the Yināliyyān, a group associated with the Salḡūqiyyān and headed by Ibrāhīm Ināl, described as Toḡril Beg's uterine half-brother. This group cannot be a tribal one, and Minorsky has concluded that amongst the Salḡuqs, the family of the Oğuz Yināl had a special place and special rights; these would explain the later pretensions to power of Ibrāhīm Ināl ("Ājnallu/Inallu", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, XVII, 1951–2, 1–11; cf. also Cl. Cahen, "Le Malik-Nameh et les origines Seljukides," *Oriens*, II, 1949, 57–8). Kāšḡarī, I, 122, defines *ināl* as "a word for any youth who is the son of a princess (*xātūn*)

and a commoner (*sūga*)", and in I, 361, he mentions one Tapar as "a son of Ināl Ūz of the kings of Qıpčaq". To add to the confusion, Rašid al-Dīn and Abū'l-Gāzi say that among the Qırğız the title *Inal* corresponds to *pādīšāh* amongst the Mongolians and Tağiks (cf. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuch*, I, 1441). It looks as if al-Xwārazmī's Ināl-tigin were a proper name, and the statement that *inal* means "heir" must be due to some misunderstanding.

Sübaşı

In his account of his travels to Bulgār, Ibn Faḍlān mentions the *Şāhib al-Ğaiş* of the Oğuz whom he met, and this is obviously an attempt to render into Arabic the Turkish title *sü-başı* "army commander"; this man was, amongst the Oğuz, military leader of the tribe and it was to him, and not to the Yabğu or titular head, that Ibn Faḍlān presented his credentials from the Caliph and handed over rich presents (tr. Togan, *Reisebericht*, 28–30, 141–2; tr. Kovalevskiy, *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlan*, 129). The eponymous ancestor of the Salğuq Turks, Salğuq b. Duqaq, is given by Kāşğari, I, 478, the title *Sübaşı* (rendered in the Arabic and Persian sources as *Qā'id al-ğaiş* or *Muqaddam al-ğaiş*, cf. Şadr al-Dīn Ḥusaini, *Axbār al-daula al-Salğūqiyya*, Lahore 1933, 2). Amongst the early Gaznavids we find a Turkish general with *Sübaşı* as a personal name (Baihaqī, *Ta'rix-i Mas'ūdi*, passim, cf. Arents's translation, 659, n. 24; Ibn al-Aṭīr, IX, 327; Ḥusaini, 5–9). The title must soon afterwards have begun to decline in status. In a legal document from Khotan dated 1107, three of the witnesses have the title *Sübaşı*, and Minorsky says that it occurs in nearly all the ancient documents from nearby Yarkand; its significance here seems to be that of "captain, commander of a detachment" ("Some early documents in Persian. I", *JRAS*, 1942, 186–8).

Tarxān

A considerable amount has been written about this title. It is certainly a very old, pre-Türkü one, which changed its connotation frequently over the years. Amongst the Oğuz whom Ibn Faḍlān met, the *Tarxān* was a subordinate military commander under the *Sübaşı*, alongside the Y.ğ.l.z (? Yuğruş, cf. Köprülü, "Zur Kenntnis der alttürkischen Titulatur," *Körösi-Csoma Archivum*, Ergänzungsband, 1938, 337–41) and the "Lesser Yināl" (tr. Togan, 30–1, who notes that *Tarxān* was also a Xazar title; tr. Kovalevskiy, 129, 189). Amongst the Mongols of the 13th century it was still an honoured rank; according to Ğuwainī, tr. Boyle, I, 37–8, "*Tarkhan* are those who are exempt from compulsory contributions, and to whom the booty taken on every campaign is surrendered: whenever they so wish they may enter the royal presence without leave or permission." The latest discussion of the title's origin is by E. R. Pulleyblank, "The consonantal system of Old Chinese," *Asia Major*, N.S. IX, 1963, 256, where it is suggested that the Old Chinese pronunciation of *šan-yü*, the title of the supreme ruler of the Hsiung-nu from the 3rd century B.C. onwards, was *dān-hwāh*, representing *darxan*. In the early Turkish languages, the word was consistently spelt with initial *t-*, but there is good evidence that in these languages initial *d-*, both in native and foreign words, was devoiced. The Mongols habitually spelt the word *darxan*, having received it from some unidentified Turkish language which did not devoice initial *d-*. The medial *-x-* is an un-Turkish sound in this context, and the most plausible explanation is that the word was originally *darxan* and meant in

Hsiung-nu "supreme ruler", and then gradually sank in the social scale (much like Turkish *çavuş*, which in the Tonyuquq inscription means "commander-in-chief" but now means "sergeant"). Objection has been taken to Pulleyblank's theory that Mongolian *daruga* "governor, commander" is another form of the same word separated off at an earlier period and given a different connotation, on the ground that this word is a normal Mongolian deverbal noun form from *daru*- "to oppress" and the like, parallel to the Turkish word *basqaq* "tax-gatherer", derived from *bas*- "to oppress", which first occurs in the Mongol period and may indeed have been a literal translation of *daruga*.

Bagbūr

It is generally agreed that *bagbūr*, *fağfūr*, etc., go back to a specifically Sogdian translation of the Chinese title *t'ien-tzū* (Giles, Chinese-English Dictionary, nos. 11, 208; 12, 317) "Son of Heaven". It must be Sogdian because the Sogdians, through their mercantile activities, were the earliest Iranians to be in prolonged contact with China, and this seems phonetically quite reasonable. In Sogdian, "God, Heaven" was βγ (*vag*); "son" is habitually represented in the texts by the Aramaic ideogram *BRY*, but the native word was probably *pwr* and the whole would have been pronounced *vagpūr*.