

Peter B. Golden

Professor Emeritus of History,
Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies, Rutgers University

OQ AND OĞUR ~ OĞUZ*

On Oq

1. The name *On Oq*, usually translated as “the Ten Arrows,” denoted in Old Turkic the collective name of the core of ten tribal or military groupings that comprised the Western Türk state. There are several accounts regarding its origins. One, a fleeting reference stemming from the Türks themselves, to organizational activities in the western zone of the Türk Empire in the early years following its foundation in 552, has been viewed as alluding to its beginnings. It is found in virtually identical passages in the Kül¹ Tegin (KT, E3) and Bilgä Qağan (BQ, E4) inscriptions, written in 732 and 735 respectively.² Neither actually mentions the *On Oq per se*. The Türk Qağanate founded by Bumin³ and his younger brother İstāmi (or İštāmi),⁴ r. 552-575) had overthrown the Asian Avars (*Abar/Apar/ Awar*, usually termed *Rouran* 柔然 in Chinese⁵) in 552 (KT, E1, BQ, E2-3,⁶ Chavannes, 1941, 3, 47, 219-229), the

* I would like to thank Sylvia Wu Golden, as always, for assistance with the Chinese texts.

¹ The name/title *kül* has also been read as *köl*. Clauson, 1972:715, noting the uncertainty of the vowel and citing the Chinese “k’üe” (關 Pinyin *que*) opted for *ü*, hence *Kül* (see also User, 2010: 138-139). Kempf, 2004: 45 and Berta, 2005: 89ff., prefer *Köl*. The Chinese data is not conclusive. For the Türk era (eastern empire: 552-630, 682-742/3, western empire: 552-657-59, 690s-766), reconstructions of Middle Chinese (MC), for which there are several systems, are most appropriate. Chronologically, MC may be defined as covering the period from the late Han (202 BCE-220 CE, the Later Han are dated to 25-220 CE) to the late Tang (618-907) eras (Wilkinson, 2000:26). Reconstructions of Old Chinese (OC), dating from the Shang oracle bone inscriptions (ca. 1250-1050 BCE) to the Han era (ca. 200 BCE-200 CE, see Schuessler, 2007: xi-xii) are noted when relevant. Of the two commonly used reconstructions, Schuessler, 2009 (a reworking of Karlgren, 1957/1996) defines MC as reflecting the language ca. 600. Pulleyblank, 1984, 1991, divides MC into Early Middle Chinese (EMC, before 601 CE, i.e. the language that had taken shape by the Sui, 581-618) and Late Middle Chinese (LMC, seventh-eighth centuries, i.e. the language that had taken shape by the early Tang eras). Modern *que* = MC *k^hiwet* (Schuessler, 2009: 277 [26-10k]), EMC *k^huat*, LMC: *k^hyat*, (Pulleyblank, 1991: 263).

² On the dating, see Kempf, 2004: 44-45.

³ A name that is probably of Iranian origin from: **būmī* “zemplja,” Aryan **bhūmī* “zemplja,” Old Indic *bhūmī* “zemplja, strana,” Middle Pers. *būm* “zemplja, strana” (Rastorgueva, Edel’man, 2000-ongoing, 2:134-135; Harmatta, 1999:396) and hence “Lord of the Earth” (Dobrovits 2004b: 111). This is not unlike the ethnonym *Tabğaç* MC *t^hāk bāt* (Schuessler 2009, 69 [2-17m], 237 [21-31h]) = **takbat/takbač* reflecting either the native (ProtoMongolian/Para-Mongolic) form of this ethnonym, **taγbač* or one that came to Turkic via Rouran intermediation, see Beckwith 2005: 9-12, who also suggests that it meant “ruler (bač < Indic pati) of the Earth.” In Chinese his name is given as *Tumen* 土門 (Liu 1958, II:490,n.18) “earth-door,” which does not transcribe but appears to hint at the meaning of his name. For objections to this interpretation, see Beckwith, 2009: 390,n.17. Bumin’s Türk title was “*İl(l)ig* (or *El(l)ig Qağan*,” i.e. “The Qağan (Emperor) possessed of the *el/il*” (“realm” see Clauson, 1972 121-122), which gives some sense of the Turkic rendering of *Bumin*, but see discussion in Rybatzki, 2000:206-218, regarding some of the complications.

⁴ Read, most recently, as İstāmi (cf. User, 2010:134). The Middle Chinese and East Roman/ Byzantine Greek renderings of the name are not conclusive: Chin. 室點蜜 / 密/ Shidianmi, MC: *šjet tiem mjiet/mjet* (Schuessler 2009: 299 [29-15j], 350 [3612n],

304 [29-41p and r]), EMC: *šit tēm mjit*, LMC: *šit tiam’ mjit* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 285, 77, 213). His name appears in Byzantine sources (Theophylaktos Simokattes, 1972: 257, see also Moravcsik, 1958, II: 291) as Στεμβισχάγαν. With its initial *İst-/İšt-* in the Turkic forms (an initial *İ-* is absent from the Chinese and Greek renderings of the name, pointing to *St-* or *Št-*), it is clearly not Turkic. It is perhaps of Iranian origin, cf. Khotanese Saka *sthaimä* = *sθāmi* < Old Iran. *stāna* “place, country,” i.e. “King of the Land” (as suggested by Harmatta, 1999: 396, Dobrovits, 2004b: 112 and Dobrovits, 2008: 67-78). His rank, as *Yabğū Qağan*, was slightly lower than that of his brother Bumin, as this etymology of his name (or title) might indicate, i.e. “king of a specific place or country” rather than a universal monarch. This is reminiscent of the Turkic title posthumously accorded to Joči, Činggis Khan’s oldest son and ruler of the Qıpčaq steppe and lands later conquered further to the west: *Uluš İdi* “Master of the Country,” see Boyle, 1956:148-152.

⁵ On the Rouran, the “Asian Avars,” later derisively termed Ruanruan 蠕蠕, 蠕蠕 “creeping/ crawling creepers/crawlers” i.e. “insects”, see Taskin, 1984: 267-295; Kljaštornyj and Savinov, 2005: 48-59, 62; Kyčanov, 2010: 91-95. On their proposed connection with the European Avars, see Kollautz and Miyakawa, 1970; Pohl, 1988 and below.

⁶ KT = inscription of Kül Tegin, E= East, line 1, BQ = inscription of Bilge Qağan, E(ast) lines 2-3: (Tekin, 2000: 24/25,50/51, Berta, 2004: 139-140: *üzä kök täjri asra yağız yer qılındwqda ekin ara kiši oğlı qılınıš kiši oğlında üzä äcüm apam bwmin qağan ištāmi qağan olormwš olorwpan türk bodwnwñ elin törüsin tuta bermiš etü bermiš...* “When the blue heavens above and the brown earth below were created, humankind was created between the two, my ancestors Bumin Qağan and İštāmi Qağan sat

previous nomadic imperial power in Mongolia, and created a state (*el/il*) and an attendant legal system (*törü*).⁷ The Türk inscriptions go on to note (KT, E3, BQ, E4) that surrounded by foes, these leaders of the Ašina, the royal clan of the Türks,⁸ forced the peoples on their “four sides” (*tört bulwñdaqi bodwnwğ*), who were all enemies (*qop yaği ärmiš*) into submission. In the east, Muqan (r. 553-572, Chin. Muhan 木 扞/ 汧 EMC *məwk yan^h/yan*,⁹ Pulleyblank, 1991: 220, 119, 118), Bumın’s son and eventual successor, consolidated power (Liu, 1958, I, 8-13, 19-22, II: 495,n.36). Meanwhile, the Türk conquests extended eastwards to the Qađırqan Yıš¹⁰ (= the Great Xingan) and westward, under his uncle, İstāmi/İštāmi, to the Iron Gates,¹¹ between which they settled their peoples (*ilgärü qadırqan yıšqa tägi kerü tämir qapığqa tägi qondwrmwš ekin ara*) and ruled over the “Kök Türk people, who had been living, thus, without a ruler/master and without an *oq* (a tribal/clan/military organization)”: *idi oqswz [oqsız] kök türk anja olorwr ärmiš*, Berta, 2004: 139-140; Tekin, 2006: 24/25, 50/51). These events had transpired between 552-555 and in the western zone amounted to a mass migration thither of Türk or Türk-led tribes, which then brought other Turkic and non-Turkic peoples of the Volga-Ural and North Caucasian-Caspian-Pontic steppes under Türk rule (or forced them to flee along with the Avars to Pannonia), a process that was completed not long before or just after İstāmi/İštāmi’s death (Kljaštornyj, Savinov, 2005:92-95, Kljaštornyj, Sultanov, 2009:111, 114-115). The western part of the Türk Empire now extended from Jungaria (northern Xinjiang) to the Pontic steppes. This important passage does not mention the On Oq by name, but only the word *oqsız*. All references to the On Oq in the Türk (and Uyğur) inscriptions mention them only within the context of contemporary (to the inscriptions) political and military issues of the first six decades of the eighth century, i.e. up to 759: T (Tonyuquq Inscription, ca. 726), 19, 30, 33, 42-43, KT, S 19, N 13, BQ, N15) as do also the Uyğur Tariat (dated 752/757, S3) and Šine Usu (dated 759, N11) inscriptions.¹² The Sogdian text of the poorly preserved Qara Balğasun trilingual (Turkic, Chinese and Sogdian) inscription (810? 821?) notes: [*twrky*]š *χωβ χ’γ-’n ky pr δs’ p’δ’ δry twrkyš* translated as “the king of [Türge]š people, the Qaghan, who was the ruler of the Ten Arrows Three Türgeš people” (Moriyasu, Ochir, 1999: 215-216). If this is correct, then Sogdian *δs’ p’δ* (*dasa pād* “ten feet”) should probably be *δs’ p’δ’y* (*dasa pādē*) “ten arrows” (see Gharib, 2004: 25, 257) and indicates that *On Oq* was understood in the sense of “Ten Arrows” in Uyğur imperial inscriptions of that time. The text refers to the period following the death of Kül Bilgä Qağan (r. 744-747), the founder of the Uyğur Qağanate.

upon (the throne), when they sat (upon the throne), they organized the realm of the Türk people and established the law and put (it) into order.”

⁷ *Törü* “traditional, customary, unwritten law” (Clouston, 1972: 531-532); “tören, merasim;” “toplumsal yasalar bütünü, tore” (User, 2010: 300, 301-302). For a discussion of the contradictions in the Chinese, Türk and Byzantine sources in situating İstāmi/İštāmi as an imperial founder, see Dobrovits, 2008: 68-70.

⁸ The name *Ašina* is not recorded in the Turkic-language inscriptions of the Türks, but is frequently mentioned in the Chinese sources, Ashina 阿史那 (EMC **ʎaʃna*’, Pulleyblank, 1991: 23, 283, 221), MC *ʎa ʃna^c* (Schuessler, 2009: 211 [18-1m], 103 [4-52a], 215 [18-12a]) and is probably from Khotanese Saka *āššēna/āššēna* “blue,” implied by Bailey, 1985: 104 and affirmed by Kljaštornyj, 1994: 445-447. Recent readings of the Sogdian-language Bugut inscription of 582 (*tr-’wkt’ (’)šy-n’s*), one of the earliest official monuments of the Türk state, appear to note it as well, Moriyasu, Ochir, 1999: 123, although this reading of the poorly preserved monument has not gone unchallenged (Beckwith, 2005: 13-15). Moreover, Beckwith, (1987: 206-208 and Beckwith, 2009: 138, 410-412, nn.71, 72), maintains that this name is Aršila, ultimately of Tokharian origin (cf. the Tokharian A (Qoço) title *āršilānci*), noted in Menander, 1985: 172/173 as Ἀρσίλας “the senior ruler of the Turks” at the time of the Byzantine embassy to the Türks in 576 (see below).

⁹ Written in Sogdian as *mwx’n* with an “unclear” etymology, but Turkic seems most unlikely (Lurje, 2010:252-253). Rybatzki, 2000:218-219, suggests Old Pers. *magu-*, Middle Pers. *magū* [*mgw*], *mōg*, Sogdian *mwğ* “magus,” which, while in keeping with the apparently Iranian names/titles/throne names of the early Türk Qağans, does not seem likely here as the Türk Qağans did not perform any Mazdaic priestly functions.

¹⁰ *Yiš* (Clouston, 1972:976) denotes a “mountain forest, the upper parts of a mountain covered with forest, but also containing treeless, grassy valleys;” User, 2010: 150, 226 “orman, ormanla kaplı dağ.”

¹¹ A similar campaign is noted several lines later (KT, E21, Berta, 2004:152) that extends from the Qađırqan Heights to *Kāñü Tarman/Tarban* (the region of Tarband, i.e. Otrar, see discussion in Kljaštornyj, 1964:155-179). The Iron Gate(s), *Tāmir Qapığ*, is a term used for a number of regions, from the North Caucasus to Transoxiana and Balkh. Here it is used to denote a specific area, the Pass of Buzgala in modern Uzbekistan, on the route from Samarqand to Balkh, some 90 km. south of Šahrīsabz and as Kljaštornyj (1964: 76-77, 143, Kljaštornyj and Savinov, 2005: 92, following Thomsen, 1896: 137-138/Thomsen, 1993: 168-169), suggests it is probably a calque into Turkic of a local term, see also Giraud, 1960: 29, 45, 182 and User, 2010:153 (a pass west of the Syr Darya, on the Balkh-Samarqand route). It was associated with Alexander the Great and his (legendary) building of great iron gates to keep out the barbarous hordes of Gog and Magog, see Van Donzel and Schmidt, 2010: 9 et passim.

¹² See texts in Berta, 2004: 55, 61, 62, 67, 133, 137, 185, 250, 284; citations in User, 2010: 163.

The word *oq* (“arrow”) in the Türk and Uyğur sources is, aside from the politonym *On Oq*, used only in its primary meaning to denote the weapon/implement.¹³ Similarly, in the Old Qırğız runiform monuments it appears only in the meaning of “arrow” (Kormušin, 2008: 132, Qızıl-Çiraa I, Tuva, inscription).

The decimal principle of organization, in particular military organization, clearly articulated in the term *On Oq* is known across Eurasia (Göckenjan, 1980:51-86). The formation of the *On Oq*, whatever the date of its inception, was not an innovation. The Xiongnu, in many respects the paradigm for later Inner Asian nomad-based states, led by their *chanyu* 單于,¹⁴ were divided into right and left wings, each headed by a “Wise King” with subordinate generals, commanders and “household administrators” of whom “the more important ones command 10000 horsemen.” These commanders totaled twenty-four and all were known, regardless of the actual numbers under their command as “Ten Thousand Horsemen” (Sima Qian, 1993: 136; Hanshu, 2004: 8).

1. a. *On Oq* in 550s (?). There are some uncertainties regarding the existence this early of an *On Oq* organization *per se*. On the one hand, there is a notice in the *Jiu Tangshu*, written well after the events, but based on contemporary documents (on the *Jiu Tangshu*, “Old Standard History of the Tang,” compiled in 940-945 by Liu Xu et al., see Wilkinson, 2000: 504) which in speaking of events of the mid-seventh century, interjects that İstāmi/İštāmi “in the past,” as the commander of “ten great chiefs” and 100,000 troops conquered the various *hu*胡¹⁵ lands of the west and became Qağan of the “Ten Surnames/Clans/Descendants” Chin. *Shi Xing* 十姓¹⁶ (Chavannes, 1941: 38; Kljaštornyj, Sultanov, 2009:115), clearly a reference to a foundational event and to the *tümens* (units of 10,000 warriors¹⁷) of the *On Oq* structure. However, it has been argued, based on the reports of two Byzantine embassies to the Türks, that a ten-fold division did not yet exist among the Türks in the 570s. John of Ephesus (ca. 507-ca.586/588) in his brief notice on the embassy of Zemarchus (*Zimarkā*) in 569-570, the Byzantine response to the Türk embassy of 568, remarks that Zemarchus reached one of the rulers of the *ḫūrqīs/ḫūrqīūs* and that there were eight other rulers further inland (Kmoskó, 2004: 133-134, see Dobrovits, 2011:385-386, on the dating and itinerary, 388). Menander’s report (he was writing in the late sixth century and made use of archival and oral sources, see Menander, 1985: 18, text: 172/173) would appear to confirm this eight-fold division. In his account of the strained audience that the Byzantine ambassador, Valentinus, had with “one of the leaders” of the Western Türks, Τοῦρξανθος,¹⁸ in 576, not

¹³ It is not to be confused with the enclitic particle *oq/ök*, see Clauson, 1972:76; User, 2010: 201, 312.

¹⁴ OC: *dan/tān wa*, Late Han: *džan/ tān wa*, Schuessler, 2007: 255 [24-21az, a], 50 [1-23, 97a]; Karlgren, 1957/1996: 59 [147a, a’], 44[97a] **tān/tān*, **ḏān/ḏiān ḡiwo*; Pulleyblank, 1991: 48, 381 EMC *džian wuā*. *Chan* has alternate pronunciations: *dan*, *shan*. Dybo, 2007: 105-106, suggests Western Han *tān-wa*. Usually rendered *Shanyu* previously, *Chanyu* is now the accepted modern reading of this title. There have been a number of attempts to decipher the Inner Asian title masked by the Chinese characters. The most recent is Beckwith, 2009: 386,n.7 who sees **dar-ya* or **dan-ya* here and suggests a connection with the Mongol title *darūga(či)* “a high-ranking official with various functions.” See Golden, 1992: 65 for the literature on earlier readings, e.g. *ḏabǵu* (> *yabǵu*), *darḫan/tarḫan* etc.

¹⁵ OC: *gā*, Late Han: *gǝ < ga*, MC *yo* (Schuessler, 2009: 46 [1-1a’], Schuessler, 2007: 281, with the meaning of “dewlap of an animal [which hangs down from the chin]” > “beard” and “steppe nomads” with an unknown etymology) a term that denoted the northern nomadic neighbors of the Chinese, then came to be associated with the Xiongnu and eventually the Iranian peoples of Central Eurasia, see Pulleyblank, 1983:449, 450, 460, Liu, 1958, II: 490-491,n.22, 584,n.786.; Abramson, 2008: viii, 19-20, 87. The Eastern Hu (*Dong Hu* 東胡) probably had Altaic affiliations, embracing a number of Mongolic or Para-Mongolic peoples (Taskin, 1984: 39ff.; Janhunen, 1996: 183-184).

¹⁶ *Xing* “surname, clan name, offspring,” Schuessler, 2007: 541. Ecsedy, 1972:249, n.6, 251-252 remarks that *xing* is “traditionally etymologized as a ‘matrilineal clan’ which “was not characteristic for China” in “historical times.” She renders *xing* as “clan”, but “with restrictions and attributives where possible.” She further notes that it was frequently used to denote “the natural units of the kinship structure of nomads, irrespective of the degree and nature of the actual political organization” and could also mean “sub-tribe.” As Ashina power grew, *xing* referring to the original “charismatic clan” (the Ashina) also came to mean tribe, Dobrovits, 2004:258.

¹⁷ Clauson, 1972: 507-508. Cf. BQ, E 25 (Berta, 2004: 163-164, Tekin, 2006: 58/59), which makes reference to the “five *tümän* (= 50,000) man army of the Chinese commander, Ong Totoq (*taβǵač wj twtwq beš tümän sü*). Pritsak, 1985: 208 rendered Chin. *xing* as denoting “Old Turkic *oq* ‘organized polity able to supply 10,000 soldiers’.”

¹⁸ Németh, 1991: 63 and Haussig, 1975: 98-99, among others, suggested **Türk-Šad*. In the Turkic world, titles used as names are not unknown (*šad* is a high rank just below that of Qağan and usually given to Ašina kinsmen, Clauson, 1972: 866); the ruler here may have been a younger son of İstāmi/İštāmi (Chavannes, 1941: 227, 239-242) and brother of Tardu (r. 575-603) who succeeded İstāmi/İštāmi as supreme Qağan of the Western Türks. Accordingly, *Šad* of the Türks may have been his title/status,

long after İstāmi/Īštāmi died, he remarks that the ruler of the Türks had “divided up all the land there into eight parts,” i.e. into eight tribal or military units.¹⁹ Presumably, these were eight subordinate “chiefs,” each controlling a certain number of warriors and a specific geographical region. Τοῦρξανθος, if he was, indeed, a *šad*, and hence an Ashina, may have held a rank higher than the others. This system continued up to ca. 635-650, when a division into ten units appears to have been consolidated (Dobrovits, 2004:101-109).

Our knowledge of the demographics of the Volga-Ural region and eastward is somewhat limited for this period. Were these names that were given to what we have deduced were *tümen* units? Were these previously existing tribal names? This is unclear. One may well wonder if the author of the *Jiu Tangshu*, in his aside on İstāmi/Īštāmi, had projected into the past a structure which his sources actually attest as coming into being some sixty years after İstāmi/Īštāmi’s death? It should be added that the KT and BQ inscriptions also date to well after the events surrounding the foundation of the first Türk Empire and only briefly allude to them.

1.b. Oq and Oqsız: How are we to understand the word *oqsız* as it appears in the KT and BQ inscriptions? *Oq* as “arrow” is found across the spectrum of Turkic languages, ancient and modern. In Tatar and Baškir it has become *uq* and in some Siberian Turkic languages we find *uq/ux*. It has also expanded its meaning to “bow” and has been modernized to denote “bullet” (e.g. Khakas *ux* “pulja, strela,” Baskakov, Inkižekova-Grekul, 1953: 252; Sevortjan, 1974: 437-438; Radlov, 1893-1911, I/2: 988-991, for the *o > u* shift in Tatar, Baškir and Siberian Turkic, not a “global” phenomenon, see Tenišev, ed. 1984: 157-160; Tenišev, ed. 2002: 477, 478, 480; Radlov, 1893-1911, I/2: 988-991, 1606, a number of Siberian Turkic languages have both *oq* and *uq*). In Čuvaš, where it first meant “arrow” and later “bow,” it is *uxă/oxă* (Fedotov, 1996, II: 296; Ašmarin, 1994, III: 344) which Mudrak reconstructs as coming from an earlier **ō’qə*, **oğb* (Dybo, Mudrak, 2006: 54).²⁰ Clauson (1972: 76) noting its original meaning as “arrow” deduced that “at an early date” it took on “the sense of ‘sub-tribe.’” This is, perhaps, to be best understood as a semantic shift that first occurred within the context of the creation of the On Oq institution. This, however, must remain a surmise. Moreover, it cannot be demonstrated that this secondary semantic development was universal in Turkic.

Kljaštornyj and Stark understand *oq* (“arrow”) in the KT and BQ passages pertaining to *oqsız* as designating a *tümen* (Kljaštornyj, Savinov, 2005: 93, Stark, 2008: 61), a not unreasonable assumption, even if relating to a period prior to the organization of the On Oq. Stark rendered the passage as “the master- and *oq*-less [i.e. ‘unorganized’] Kök Türk” and suggested that İstāmi/Īštāmi Qağan, as KT, E1 and BQ, E2-3 state, “organized the clans and tribes” into the On Oq. He sees these divisions as originally military in nature, producing military units that “gradually turned into tribal groups,” thereby transforming *On Oq* into an ethnonym (Stark, 2006/2007: 170).

1.c. There is general, but not universal agreement that *oqsız*, noted only in KT, E3, BQ, E4, is to be understood as defining a socio-political group that lacks organization (or a particular kind of organization, i.e. organization into clans): cf. Nadeljaev et al., (1969: 370): “lišennyj [vnutri] rodovoj organizacii,” (User, 2010: 183, 307): “boy örgütü olmayan, örgütsüz.” Clauson (1972:95) has a slightly different reading: “the Türkü whose lineage (? – his rendering of *kök*²¹ here, pbg) is completely without division into sub-tribes”). *Oqsız* should probably best be understood as “clans/tribes that lacked a proper military organization” stemming from a central authority. It can hardly have meant that the tribes of the Türk union lacked clans or other forms of politico-kinship groupings – unless this was political hyperbole on the part of the authors of the inscriptions. Needless to say, *oqsız* can hardly have meant “arrow-less.”

not necessarily his name. Gumilëv, 1967: 111, identifies him with Tanhan Qağan, an active figure in Türk internecine strife (cf. Liu, 1958, I: 49, II: 522,n.235, Taşağıl, 1995: 33, 38, 41, 43-44, 46, 130, 155, who do not make such a connection).

¹⁹ The superior of Τοῦρξανθος, the “senior” Türk ruler was Ἀρσίλας, see above, n.8. Gumilëv, 1967: 48-50, 58, 106, places Τοῦρξανθος’s territory on the lower Volga-North Caucasus-Ural zone and correctly points to the chill in Byzantine-Türk relations because of Constantinople’s recent treaty with the Avars and truce with Iran. This truce, he implies freed up Sāsānid forces to deal with the Türks. The truce, however, was uneasy and negotiations were still ongoing at the time of the death of Khursaw I (r. 531-579, see Frye, 1984: 328-329).

²⁰ For its Altaic connections, see Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, II: 1046: **ōk’ä* “sharp point, notch,” Proto-Tung. **ok-* “arrow with wooden head,” Proto-Mong. **oki* “top, tip, edge,” Proto-Turk. **ok* “arrow” etc.

²¹ Lit. “root, origin,” Clauson, 1972, 708-709, notes the “great difficulty in determining how many early Turkish words of this general form there were and what were the qualities of their vowels and final consonants.” Cf. in addition *kök* “thong,” “seam”, *kōk* “the sky, sky-coloured, blue, blue-grey” etc.

İstāmi/Īstāmi Qağan, undoubtedly, carried out organizational activities consolidating the Western Türk tribes that had come with him and other Turkic (or nomadic) tribes that had come under Türk sway, into some kind of structured military union. His immediate successors, all Ashinas, undoubtedly carried out similar organizational activities – when they could. As a member of the founder family of the Empire, İstāmi/Īstāmi would have had the right to organize such large-scale military-political entities. The *Jiu Tangshu* notice (see above), if not an anachronism, would point to the creation or reorganization of *tümen*-sized units. Were they termed *oqs* at that time? Was *oq* (“arrow”) conflated with the kinship – social grouping term *uq* ~ *oq*? (see 5.a below). We have no other Old Turkic sources that indicate that the word *oq* (“arrow”) was used with this specific military, socio-political meaning, except for the politonym *On Oq*.

The inscriptions, it should be reiterated, were written some 175 years after the events, reflecting a very different era. *Stricto sensu*, they merely note, in broad strokes, that Bumın and İstāmi/Īstāmi created a state out of what they imply was an unorganized, leaderless mass, lacking a central ruler until they came under Ašina rule (the inscriptions were in part *res gestae* with a strong political propaganda component). KT, E2-3, BQ, E3-4 do not say that İstāmi/Īstāmi Qağan created the On Oq as such, although we cannot rule out such a possibility (or other organizational activities among the Türk and newly subjugated peoples), but the Byzantine reference to an eight-fold rather than ten-fold division raises some important questions as to the actual political organization of the Western Türks during the era of İstāmi/Īstāmi and his immediate successors. The people who were *idi oqsız* are identified as the *Kök Türks*, i.e. the whole of the eventual union of thirty tribes that formed the Türk people (Dobrovits, 2004a: 257-262). The implication is that this ordering of the Türk tribes, in essence state formation, extended to the entire union, east and west. The Chinese accounts, as we shall see, overall, point to a later time at which the On Oq system was created (see 2 below).

In sum, although Clauson (1972:76) defines *oq* as coming to be used to denote “sub-tribe,” the Türk and Uyğur inscriptions use *oq* in this sense *only* with reference to the *On Oq*.

1.d. *Oq* in pre-thirteenth century Turkic had homonyms with meanings other than “arrow.” Kâşğarî’s *Compendium of Turkic Dialects* (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 89) mentions: a) a “lot used in dividing up lands or shares of property,” b) a particle “which accompanies circumstantial expressions,” c) a term of affirmation = “yes” (Üşenmez, 2010: 211). In addition, Kâşğarî (1982-1985, I: 89, Kâşğarî, 1941, 31) records: اُق which Dankoff read as *oq* and rendered as the “beam of a house” (cf. Osm. *oq* “any stick, beam, or pole, when used as an adjunct to, and at right angles with some larger thing,” Redhouse, 1974: 259²²). Clauson (1972: 76) and the *DTS* (Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 607), vocalize it as *uğ* “a tent rib, wooden strut forming part of the framework of a tent...sometimes confused with *oq*,” “dugobrazno sognutyje palki derevjannogo ostova kubitki.” Sevortjan (1974: 583-584) cites the form قوا which can be read as *oq* and *uq*. He sharply distinguishes *oq* (“arrow;” “pole [šest], beam [balka],” “tribal subdivision”) and *uq/uğ*, which refers solely to tent/house construction (“poles for the dome of a tent”). Middle Qıpčaq has *uğ* “çadırın üst kısmına koyulan ağaç veya ok” (Toparlı, Vural, Karaatlı 2003: 291).²³ It is rather interesting that in many of these additional meanings recorded by Kâşğarî, *oq* closely mirrors Pers. *tîr* (Steingass, 1970: 340) “arrow, either for shooting or casting lots; portion, lot; a straight piece of wood or beam, as the mast of a ship, the main beam of a house” etc., borrowed into Ottoman with these same meanings (Redhouse, 1974: 618). Variants of *oq/uq* “žerdi kupola jurty” etc. are found in other later and modern Turkic languages (Sevortjan, 1974: 583-584). The possibility of calquing from Persian into Qarakhanid Turkic should not be excluded.

Kâşğarî also mentions *oq yılan* “a viper” (*yılan*) “which hurls itself at a man” (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 89), *oqluq kirpi*, lit. “a hedgehog with arrows,” i.e. a “porcupine” (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 316), clearly stemming from the sense of “arrow.” None of these sheds further light on *oq* in terms of socio-political vocabulary. The one exception might be *oq* in the sense of a “lot used in dividing up lands or shares of property.” If such is the usage here and it is not a calque from Persian, then *On Oq* might also mean the “Ten Appanages,” a reference, seemingly, to lands, but very possibly including people, in

²² It is not related to Osm. *huğ* “a hut made of reeds or rushes,” as Clauson, 1972: 76, tentatively suggests, as *huğ* appears to be a loanword in Turkish from Arabic *kūḫ* or Armenian *χug*, the former perhaps coming from the latter? (Tietze et al. 2009: 332 under *hu*).

²³ Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 166 records *oğulmuq* “a straight piece of wood supporting a beam,” the etymology of which is not clear. Clauson, 1972: 87, was uncertain, deriving it “apparently” from *oğul* [“son”] “but with no obvious semantic connection.” A connection with *oğ/uğ* “beam” seems more logical.

particular military forces. In this regard, it would bear some resemblance to the Činggisid Mongol *qubi* “share” which, although in a Chinese (Yuan) setting, could denote “fief” was not limited to land, but could include people (including slaves) and livestock. There are numerous examples of Činggisid qağans assigning military forces to members of the royal house.²⁴ *Oq*, then, in this secondary meaning noted by Kâšğarî, may also have denoted an allotment of military forces. Initially, these were given to members of the Türk royal house, the Ashina, bearing the title *šad* (see 2 below). The Činggisids, as noted, made similar allotments of people to members of the ruling house. Later, the leadership of these *oqs* came to be held by chiefs bearing much lower titles than *šad* – and hence probably of non-Ashina origin. The Chinese accounts clearly tell us that the allotments/divisions were of “people.” Interestingly, the Old Qırğız inscriptions in Tuva use the word *bağ* to denote a “lot, allotment/appanage,” within the Qırğız polity, cf. *altı bağ bodun* (“the people of the six lots/appanages” (Kormušin, 2008: 91 [E-1, Uyuk-Tarlak, Tuva, line 2], 140-141 [E-49, Bay-Bulun II, Tuva, line 4]). Clauson (1972:310-311) notes the primary meaning of this word, “bond, tie, belt” and thence “something tied or fastened together.” He further comments that “[i]n early political terminology, *bāğ* also seems to mean ‘a confederation’, that is a number of clans united by contractual arrangements as opposed to *bōd* ‘clan’, a number of families united by ties of blood.” He renders the *altı bağ* of the Old Qırğız inscriptions as the “six confederations.” *Bağ* appears to have had this socio-political connotation only in Old Qırğız.

In sum, we cannot say that the use of the word *oqsız* in the passage in KT and BQ noted above provides definite evidence for the existence of an *On Oq* organization in the latter half of the 6th century. As understood in the 8th – 9th century sources, however, *On Oq* meant “Ten Arrows” and referred to tribes or most probably tribalized military units.

1.e. In an account from the latter half of the eighth century (probably more towards the end of the century) written either in Tibetan or translated from Uyğur into Tibetan giving a description of the “northern peoples,” mention is made of a grouping of “about ten alluded tribes” (Venturi, 2008:5-8, 29). No mention is made of the *On Oq* and the “ten tribes” to in an otherwise relatively detailed account, may not necessarily have meant the former. If the account dates to before 766 the date at which time the Qarluqs took Sûyâb and subsumed the now enfeebled Western Türk (Chavannes, 1941: 85; Golden, 1992: 141, 196), it might be a reference to them. Nothing is said about their origins.

1.f. İstâmi/İštâmi and the Western Türk realm. İstâmi/İštâmi, who had the title *Yabğu Qağan*, a rank slightly below that of his brother *Bumın*, the *El[li]g Qağan*, was also called *Sir Yabğu* (< *Śri Yabğu*) rendered into Pahlavî as *sr/nčypw/yk* (*Sinjêbîk*)²⁵ and as Σιζάβουλος, Σιλζίβουλος Διζάβουλος in Byzantine accounts (Moravcsik, 1958, II: 118,

275-6) and as سنجبوا *Sinjibû* in aṭ-Ṭabarî’s *History* (al-Ṭabarî, 1967-1969, II: 100²⁶). It was probably the title used by İstâmi/İštâmi Qağan’s Iranian subjects (Dobrovits, 2008: 70-78, who also suggests that *Bumın* and *İstâmi/İštâmi* were posthumously bestowed names/titles).

The Western Türk ruling house stemmed from İstâmi/İštâmi’s branch of the Ašinas. During his lifetime, the Qağante, east and west, remained a united polity. In the quarter century or so after his death, the two branches, functionally divided from the outset into Ašina-led eastern and western wings, as was typical of Eurasian nomadic polities, were coalescing into connected but distinct and often independent entities. The eastern wing consisted of Mongolia and the western wing comprised the urban city-states of Transoxiana and East Turkistan/Xinjiang as well as the steppes to the west of Mongolia. The east wing was considered higher in status. Given their different theaters of operation, the eastern Ašinas largely focusing on China, while their western kinsmen were dealing with Iran (and its Arabo-Islamic successor

²⁴ On *qubi*, see Farquhar, 1990: 17, 58,n.3; Allsen, 2001: 45. My thanks to Thomas Allsen for noting the resemblances of *oq*, if it is indeed being used in this sense, to the Činggisid *qubi*.

²⁵ The *Šahrestānīhā ī Erānšahr*, composed in “late antiquity” and last redacted early in the ‘Abbāsīd era (see Daryae, 2002: 1) records (Daryae, 2002:13/17) the *Yabbu xāgān*, *Sinjêbîk xāgān* and *Čól xāgān*. *Yabbu xāgān* and *Sinjêbîk xāgān* are probably a conflation of *Yabğu Qağan* and *Sir Yabğu (Jabğu) Qağan*. Daryae, 2002: 36, identifies *Čól Qağan* with Chuluo (Daman Chuluo 達漫處羅 MC: *dāt mwā tš^hjwo^B lā*, Schuessler, 2009: 233 [21-14b], 263 [24-56n], 49 [1-18,85a], 215 [18-10a] Qağan (r. 603-611, Chavannes, 1941:3, 14-22, 51). His reign was filled with strife. It might also be a reference to the steppe ruler beyond Darband (Pers. “barred gate”), the Arabic Bâb al-Abwâb “Door/Gate of Doors/Gates”) and Armenian Č’or/Č’oĥ/Č’oĥa, the city that guarded the entry way into Caucasia into the steppes, on Darband, see Kettenhofen, 2011; Ananias of Širak, 1992: 57, 122-123, nn.105-106. It is unlikely that it represents Turkic *čöl* “desert” (according to Clauson, 1972: 417, 420, a loanword from Mongol, but see Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, I: 450-451).

²⁶ Al-Ṭabarî describes him, clearly İstâmi/İštâmi, as the “most mighty” (*a’zz*) of the Turks, the victor and slayer of the Hephthalite king (see also Marquart, 1938: 147).

state, the Umayyad and early ‘Abbâsid Caliphates) and Byzantium, it is hardly remarkable that the two grew somewhat apart. The dating of the formation of two de facto Türk states has been placed between 581 and 603 (see Wang, 1982: 139-141, Pan, 1997: 101, Ôsawa, 2006: 477-478, Stark, 2008: 17 who favor the earlier period and Kljaštornyj, Savinov, 2005: 97, who opt for 603). Western Ašinas (such as Tardu, r.575-603, a son and successor of İstâmi/İštâmi, Golden, 1992:131-133) made attempts to gain control over the whole of the realm and conflicts in East Turkistan /Xinjiang were not unknown. The Sui early on (Bielenstein, 2005: 397-398; Xiong, 2006: 209-214) and the Tang (Pan, 1997, Skaff, 2012) were always ready to promote feuds among the often factionalized Ašinas. This is an important aspect of the pre-history and history of the On Oq.

2. The Chinese Accounts. There are several Chinese accounts of the formation of what they termed the *Shi Xing* 十姓 (“Ten Surnames/Clan Names”) and sometimes the *Shi Jian* 十箭 (“Ten Arrows”, Maljavkin, 1989: 168,n.248, 175, n.262). Chinese *xing* “surname, clan name” derives from terms denoting “what is inborn,” “nature” > “surname, clan name” < “birth, offspring” see Schuessler, 2007: 541 – this is another indication that we are dealing with groupings of people, at least putatively related by kinship). It is one of the few instances in which the Chinese accounts translate rather than transcribe a Turkic ethnonym or politonym (see *Toquz Oğuz* in 5 below). Interestingly, both of the possible meanings of *On Oq* are translated.

The “oldest” account is found in the *Tongdian* (“Encyclopaedic History of Institutions”²⁷) written by Du You (735-812) that appeared in 801 (Wilkinson, 2000: 525). Contemporary with the *Tongdian* and in a sense a conservative response to it, is the *Tang huiyao* (“Important Documents of the Tang,” or “Gathering of the Essentials of the Tang”) first compiled by the brothers Su Mian (?-805) and Su Bian (ca. 760-805) in 804 and later edited in 961 by Wang Pu (922-982), who updated it to the late Tang era (Wilkinson, 2000: 52; Ng and Wang, 2005: 131-132; Kamalov, 2001: 32-35). These two works are followed by the Tang dynastic histories, the *Jiu Tangshu* (“Old Standard History of the Tang,” compiled 940-945 by Liu Xu et al.) and the *Xin Tangshu* (“New Standard History of the Tang,” by Ouyang Xiu et al. appearing in 1060, both covering the period 618-906, see Wilkinson, 2000: 504, 525-526, 819-821; Ng and Wang, 2005: 114, 136-138,146-147). The accounts although written well after the events they describe stem from a common source or sources²⁸ and have some variant material, their information is essentially similar.

The information can be summed up as follows: during the reign of Išbara Dielishi²⁹ 唃利失 (r. 634-639,³⁰), the Western Türk realm, following periods of intermittent discord, self-inflicted but encouraged by China,³¹ was “suddenly” divided into ten subdivisions/ tribes (Chin. *bu* 部³²), each led by one leader. The *Jiu Tangshu* places this event after 635; the *Tang huiyao* dates it to 638 (Chavannes,

²⁷ Also rendered as “Comprehensive Compendium,” see Ng and Wang, 2005: 128-133, a private, rather than court-sponsored work of historical scholarship.

²⁸ On Tang historiography see Twitchett, 1992 and Ng and Wang, 2005: 114, 108-134. The Tang, based on a number of earlier precedents, created a “History Bureau,” a distinct institution within the central government/palace aimed at organizing along more formal lines the various documents (and persons or agencies that produced them) that would make up an official dynastic history. It also gave them more control over the contents.

²⁹ *Išbara* is a Türk title of ultimately Indic origin (Sanskrit *īśvara* “lord, prince”) that probably was borrowed into Turkic via Tokharian (Kljaštornyj, 1964: 113, n.174; Clauson, 1972:257). The character (唃) *die* has two distinct meanings (“to bite” and “to laugh, giggle”) and two pronunciations, *die* and *xi* respectively. Karlgren, 1957/1996: 116 [413-m] had **d'iet/d'iet/tie* “laugh” and “bite,” noting “an alternate reading” *?/xi-/hi*. Taşağıl, 1999: 93 (see *Tongdian*: 199-1078a in facsimile at the back of his book) in transcribing this name used “*hsi*” (*xi*), while Chavannes (in his translations of the passages in the *Jiu Tangshu* and *Xin Tangshu*) preferred *die*, which is a better fit from the onomastic perspective.

³⁰ MC *diet li šjet* (Schuessler, 2009: 299 [29-15m], 280 [26-24ab], 300 [29-17a]) = **Tāriš* (“gather,” Clauson, 1972: 554, cf. the later *Eltāriš* Qağan, “Gatherer of the realm,” r. 682-694, i.e. reviver of the Eastern Türk state).

³¹ The relatively successful reign of Toñ Yabğū (r. 618/619?-630), who was assassinated by a kinsman, was preceded and followed by ongoing dynastic strife. In 634 there were two competing Western Türk qağans, each vying for Tang commercial and marital ties. Dielishi had failed in his bid for a Tang bride, certainly a blow to his prestige.

³² Ošanin, 1983-1984, II: 776 [3487] *bu* “čast’, razdel, department, podrazdelenie...oblast’, rajon, okrug...”, *buluo* 部落 “plemja, rod...stanovišče, poselenie.” Ecsedy, 1972: 249, 254-255: “a term used for foreigners who were mostly characterized as a patriarchal group led by a chief, and generally translated as ‘tribes’” and “the biggest unit of the Turk society...showing no kinship-concern...tribe.” Wittfogel and Fêng, 1949: 47, 84, n.1, note that *bu* can serve as “an equivalent” for *buluo*; Taskin, 1984: 16-17. *Buluo*, often used interchangeably with *xing*, usually entailed substantial numbers (at least several hundred family units), see also Dobrovits, 2004: 257-258.

1941: 27; Kjuner, 1961: 191-192). They were called the Ten Šads, each of whom was presented with an arrow,³³ hence their name the “Ten Arrows.” They divided the “Ten Arrows” into left and right “sides” (Chin. *xiang* 廂, i.e. subgroupings). Each “wing/side” (*xiang* 箱³⁴) was arranged as five arrows. The left “side” (i.e. wing) was named the Five Dulu 都陸 (MC *tuə ljuək*, EMC *tɔ luwk*, LMC *tuə liwək* (*Tölük,^{35?} Schuessler, 2009: 53 [1-38e’], 188 [14-16f], Pulleyblank, 1991: 81, 201) “tribes” (部落 *bu luo*), each (Dulu) “arrow” was headed by a *čor*.³⁶ The Dulu³⁷ were located east of Sûyâb. The right “side” (i.e. right wing) was named the Five Nushibi 弩失畢 (MC *nuo ši pjiet*, EMC *nɔ çit pjit*, LMC *nuɔ šit pjit*, Schuessler, 2009: 58 [1-56z], 279 [26-19a], 304 [29-42a], Pulleyblank, 1991: 228, 282, 34),³⁸ located west of Sûyâb.³⁹ The five “arrows” of the Nushibi, in turn, were each led by an *erkin* (or *irkin*, Clauson, 1972: 225, a title of tribal chiefs) or *kül erkin*. One “arrow” was called one “tribe” (*bu luo*). The “Great Arrow Head” (*da jian tou* 大箭頭) became the Great Leader/Commander. They were all named the “Ten Surname Tribes” (*shi xing bu luo*, Taşağıl, 1999, II: 93 for the *Tongdian* cap. 199, see also <http://zh.wikisource.org/wiki/通典/卷199>; Chavannes, 1941: 27-28 [*Jiu Tangshu*], 56 [*Xin Tangshu*]).

³³ On the technology and rich terminology regarding the arrow and bow in Central Eurasia, see Kóhalmi, 1956: 109-162.

³⁴ Ošanin, 1983-1984, II: 619 [2735] “jaščik, čemodan, sunduk...ambar, sklad” etc. and used also for 廂 *xiang* “fligel’ (“wing of a house” see above), clearly the sense in which it is used here, see also Kjuner, 1961: 192.

³⁵ Clauson, 1972: 498, notes *töliük*, a word, “of obscure etymology,” attested in Uyğur denoting “vigour, violence,” cf. DTS: 579-580 (“sila, mošč”). This would fit into the semantic grouping of Turkic tribal names and ethnonyms that denote “military valor, force, attacking,” see Németh, 1991: 87-92.

³⁶ *Čor* is an old Turkic title, probably of Iranian origin (Aalto, 1971: 35, Bailey, 1985:99), “perhaps head of a small confederation” (Clauson, 1972: 427-428) in particular coming from the comitatus or personal retinue of the ruler (Sims-Williams and Hamilton, 1990: 82).

³⁷ Given the MC forms of Dulu, it is highly unlikely that it has any association with the ruling clan of the Bulğars, the *Dulo* (Доуло) of Qubrat, the founder of “Magna Bulgaria,” noted in the Bulgarian Prince List. This was suggested by Artamonov, 2002: 180-181 (notions largely prompted by L.N. Gumilëv as noted in Artamonov’s footnotes and implied in Gumilëv, 1967: 202-203). Pritsak, 1955: 64, in his study of the Bulgarian Prince List, attempted to connect the Bulğar *Dulo* with a late ruling clan of the Xiongnu, the Tuge 屠各 (OC *dā krāk*, Late Han *da kak*, Schuessler, 2009: 54 [1-38i’], 65 [2-1a]), which he, following the earlier, 1940 ed. of Karlgren, 1957/1996: 30-31 [45i’], 202 [766a], 202, reconstructed as *d’o klāk, “Altchin. *d’uo-klo.” Simeonov, 2008: 108-113, after a thorough overview of other speculations, put forth his own hypothesis regarding a Dulu~Bulğar Dulo connection. He identifies the Tiele/Toquz Oğuz tribe Pugu 僕骨 (Kjuner, 1961: 36, 38, 40; Hamilton, 1955:2; Liu, 1958, I:108, II: 558.555; Maljavkin, 1989: 139) with *Bulğar*. The Pugu were in the northern sector of the eastern Tiele tribes. Pugu in MC is *buk/buok kwət* (Schuessler, 2009:160 [11-23b], 311 [31—1a]). Final -t in MC is often used to render final -r, **Buqir?* **Buqur* = *Bulğar?* However, according to Hamilton, 1955: 2, n.7 and Hamilton, 1962:45, Pugu rendered **Buqut*, plural of *Buqu?* Within the *Toquz Oğuz* union, the **Buqu[t]* were the second highest-ranking tribe after the Uyğurs. Simeonov further suggests that the Pugu and Dulu had merged into a tribal union (cf. also the partial, but succinct summary in Ziemann, 2007: 42). Simeonov derives *Dulo* from Turk. *dul/tul* “big, powerful, giant” (goljam, silen, velikan) and “war horse” (the latter recorded in Räsänen, 1969: 497 “ein zum Kampf ausgerüstetes Pferd,” but only attested in Čağatay, not Old Turkic). *Dulo* he views as a later, partly Slavicized form. **Dullu*, he derives from “Old Hunnic” *dul* + *-lu*, i.e. “mounted, horseman.” All of this is highly speculative. No such “Hunnic” world is attested. *Tul* in Old Turkic denotes “widow” (or perhaps “widower” as well, Clauson, 1972: 490). Qubrat formed his state (630s) in a critical period of fragmentation of the Western Türk realm (leading also to the foundation of the Khazar state), but a Dulo-Dulu connection, however appealing as a legitimating source for Bulğar kingship, cannot be established on the basis of our current data.

³⁸ Harmatta, 1992: 257-258, reconstructs this as **nu ši pi.l*, **nu šipir* and views it as Iranian **nu* < Old Iran. *naiba*, Middle Pers. *nēvak* “outstanding, hero” + *ašsaβâra* (*ašva-bâra* or **ašsaβârya*, cf. Saka *ašša* “horse,” Old Indic *bhârya*, “servant, soldier” > **šāβir* ~ **šāβir* in the language of the Western Türks and ultimately Russ. *Sibir*’ (Siberia). This became, with Turkicization, *Sabir* (*Sabur*). Harmatta (1992:266) concluded that the Nushibi were largely derived from the Sabirs. Beckwith, 1987: 209-210, identifies the Dulu with the Tarduš. The former is a tribal grouping under the Türk; the Nushibi, he suggests, is composed of Nu (?) + a title Šadpıt (*šadapit*, seemingly a compound title consisting of *šad*, a title of Iranian origin, designating a rank just below that of the Qağan (see above) + *apit* “entourage of the *šad*”? Clauson, 1972:866, 867; User, 2010: 267-268). On the tribal composition of the Dulu and Nushibi, see, in addition to Beckwith, 1987: 209-210; Maljavkin, 1989: 39, 164-165 (nn.239, 241, 243), 168,n.248. Ligeti found the majority of the On Oq names obscure, deriving, perhaps, from some unknown language (Ligeti, 1986: 329-330).

³⁹ An important link in the Silk Road, today the ruins at Ak-Bešim on the Ču River in Kyrgyzstan, near Tokmak. This was an area of Sogdian colonization (de la Vaissière, 2005: 114-116). Dosymbaeva, 2006: 253-157, locates the Dulu between the Ili and Ču Rivers and the Nushibi between the Ču and Talas Rivers. The Western Türk urban centers were in the Ču River region, as was also an important sacred site at Merke.

Soon after this division, Dielishi was attacked by his own officials and fled to Yanqi焉耆 (Tokh. Agni, Old Turk. Solmi, today Qarašahr), returned, reassumed some of his authority but was then forced to flee to Fargāna where he ended his days. The dates for these events differ slightly in the sources. What is important is despite his attempts at reorganization, Dielishi was unable to retain power.

The names and titles ([*kül(i)*]čor and [*kül*] erkin, respectively), of the Dulu and Nushibi tribes are recorded in the *Jiu Tangshu* and *Xin Tangshu* (Chavannes, 1941:34, 60, 270-273; Beckwith, 1987: 209-210; Taşağıl, 1999: 71, Taşağıl, 2004a: 119, see discussions in Dobrovits, 2004: 101-109; see Dobrovits, 2012, for the most recent explanations) in a notice dated to 651. The *On Oq* took on the profile described to us in the Chinese accounts in the period 635-650 (Dobrovits, 2004: 1008). Given the fact that the leaders of these ten *tümen* originally held the title *šad*, virtually reserved for the kinsmen of the *qağan*, it may be that initially these commands were given to members of the Ašina ruling clan. The titles *čor* and *erkin/irkin* are well below that of *šad* and may indicate that after the initial organization under Ašinas, the leadership of the Dulu and Nushibi subdivisions came from the local tribal aristocracies.

The pre-*On Oq* history of these tribes remains little known. The *Jiu Tangshu* and *Xin Tangshu* list the Dulu and Nushibi among the mix of tribes in the western regions that submitted to the Türks. It would appear that these tribes (or many of them) were already in the region by the mid-sixth century. Did these names that we encounter antedate the Türk conquest? Or, were they created with the organization of the *On Oq*? We cannot say. We do know that the tribes had the same or similar customs as the Türks and spoke languages that only slightly differed from that of the Türks (Chavannes, 1941:21, 47).

Gumilëv (1967: 154-157) dates the “complete collapse” of the Western Türk Qağanate to 604, but notes the “restoration” of the preexisting authority under Toņ Yabġu (r. 618/619-630). There were compelling reasons for such a re-organization. In 630, the Eastern Türk realm had fallen to the Tang and in 634-635 the latter had launched a series of campaigns against a regionally powerful people of Xianbei origin in the Kokonor region of Qinghai, called in Chinese the Tuyuhun 吐谷 渾,⁴⁰ as the Emperor Taizong sought to strengthen China’s access to the “Western Regions” (East Turkistan/ Xinjiang) and beyond.

Although the western Türks under Toņ Yabġu had been effective allies of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius (r. 610-641) in his wars against the Sāsānids in the late 620s, fissiparous tendencies within the polity were already evident. After the assassination of Toņ Yabġu, who had greatly expanded Western Türk power, the uncertain unity of the Western Türk realm crumbled further. Internecine strife continued after the death of Dielishi as well (Chavannes, 1941: 24-27, 265-266; Golden, 1992: 135-136).

By 651, yet another Ashina bearing the title *Išbara Qağan*⁴¹ who had been in and out of submission to the Tang since 648, briefly achieved preeminence among the Western Türks (the start of his reign as *Qağan* is often placed in 653). By 657-659, he, too, had been defeated and died in Tang captivity (Chavannes, 1941: 28-40, 59-67, 267-268; Pan, 1997:139-141, 176-179, 193-196; Bielenstein, 2005: 402).

A further sign of the deterioration of Western Türk authority following the demise of Toņ Yabġu was the breakaway of the more westerly tribes, which formed (ca. 630-ca. 650) a new state, the Khazar Qağanate, under Ashina leadership (Novosel’cev, 1990: 88 places the rise of Khazaria slightly earlier, to the 620s, but see Golden, 2000a: 291-294; Zuckerman, 2007: 401ff.). Thus, an attempt in the 630s and perhaps ongoing until mid-century to tighten internal control and organization had been very much in order. The Dulu – Nushibi strife, however, was never resolved and remained an ongoing problem. If the purpose of the creation of the *On Oq* structure was to preserve unity in the Western Türk realm, it must be viewed as largely a failure.

3. Arrow and tribe

As was noted above, Clauson surmised that Turk. *oq* “arrow,” came to denote “sub-tribe” because of the “use of arrows for various ritual and ceremonial purposes” (Clauson, 1972: 76), a not implausible deduction based on the origin tale of the *On Oq*. Osman Turan (1945: 307-310) surveyed the symbolic use of the arrow for a variety of activities: summons (often to military campaigns), messages (sometimes of a threatening nature) and indications of dependence among the various Inner Asian peoples. These

⁴⁰ MC: t^huo kuk ɣwəŋ (Schuessler, 2000: 53 [1-36d], 158 [11-14a], 335 [34-13b]) = *Togon and ‘Aža in Tibetan, see Beckwith, 1987: 17, Beckwith, 2009: 128-129; Pan, 1997:4, 235-236.

⁴¹ Ashina Helu 賀 魯 MC: ɣā ljwo^B, Schuessler, 2009: 212 [18-4j], 57 [1-52a].

practices, he avers, go back to ancient times and continued well into the Islamic era (including the Seljukids, see 3.a). Similar customs were known among the Mongols (see 3.b. below). Although arrows may have been used by the Türks as a symbol of or accompanying an invitation or summons, the Old Turkic inscriptions make no mention of their employment in this sense. Moreover, *oq* does not appear to be related to the verb *oqi-* “to call out loud,...to summon,...to read out loud” (Clauson, 1972:79), as Turan implies.⁴²

3. a. Seljuks, Oğuz Tradition and Arrows

The bow and arrow were important symbols in the Seljuk state with roots in the Oğuz tribal past. The *tuğra* of Toğrul Beg (d.1063), a grandson of Seljūk and one of the founders of Seljukid might in the Middle East, was in the form of a bow and arrow (Spuler, 1951: 353; Turan, 1965: 78, 85; Cuisenier, 1972: 930-931; Çaycı, 2008: 198-205, who also notes [p.204] that the arrow, sometimes combined with the bow, was a symbol used in the Činggisid Golden Horde, see also Turan, 1945:311). Turan (1945:313, 316) highlights its role in military organization, stratification and tribal organization flowing therefrom. From this also sprang the Ottoman *tuğra* (“an ornamental arrangement, or monogram, of the name and title of the Sultan, constituting the great seal of the Ottoman Empire; the imperial cypher” (Redhouse, 1974: 1241). In older Oğuz, *tuğrağ* is first noted by Kâşğarî as meaning “the king’s seal and signature.” This, he writes, was a specifically Oğuz term and comments that “[t]he Turks (meaning here the Qarakhanids, pbg) do not know this word and I do not know its origin” (Kâşğarî (1982-1985, I: 346).⁴³ Elsewhere, under the verb *tuğrağlan-* he cites *tuğrağ* as “a horse that the king gives his troops to ride on the day of a parade and that is returned to him after they dismount”⁴⁴ and as a “document, when the signature is affixed,” again noted as Oğuz (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, II: 98). This particular symbolic usage of the “arrow” (and bow) may have been unique to the Oğuz, as Kâşğarî states and ultimately became the Seljuk Sultan’s monogram or signature, a visible sign of his power. In Kâşğarî’s time, it would appear that the arrow, outside of the Oğuz politico-cultural sphere, did not have wider socio-political implications nor did it denote a military or socio-political group. If it did, these instances are unrecorded. *Oq* was also the homonym of words that were clearly devoid of the socio-political content with which *oq* was invested in the specific instance of *On Oq*. In post-Kâşğarî Middle Qıpçaq, it continued to have the same range of meanings as noted by Kâşğarî (see Toparlı, Vural and Karaatlı, 2003: 204), again without socio-military organizational connotations.

An ongoing association of arrows as symbols of authority in Oğuz traditions can be seen in the Oğuz Xan tales. The latter, preserved in variants of the *Oğuznâma*, a cycle of tales about the deeds of Oğuz Xan, the eponymous ancestor of the Oğuz Turks and about the origins of the various Turkic peoples. How far back these tales go is uncertain. The thirteenth century seems to have been an important moment in their crystallization (Tezcan, 2007: 621-622). During the Činggisid Mongol era, the tales of Činggis Xan were conflated with those about Oğuz Xan (Bartol’d, 1963-1977, V: 435). The Mamlûk historian Abu Bakr al-Dawâdârî (d. 1332) mentions a work entitled *Ulu Xan Ata Bitikçi* (which he translates as “Book About the Great Ruler-Father,” i.e. *Ulu Xan Ata Bitik*), written in Uyğur to which “Turks” (non-Oğuz here), Mongols and Qıpçaqs were much devoted and the *Oğuznâma* to which the Oğuz were devoted and which had been passed down from generation to generation (Rašid ad-Dîn, 1987: 9⁴⁵). The power and charisma of the Činggisid traditions may have spurred the growth of a competing cycle of tales about the ancestor of the Oğuz.

⁴² Turan bases himself on BQ, E28 and the much-debated form of *oqwğalı kâldi* (see Berta, 2004: 165n.1735 for the numerous variant readings), which he reads as *oqiğlı kelti* and renders as “okunmuş, ok gönderilmiş olanlar yâni çağrılan imdat kuvvetleri geldi.” Berta, 2004:99, has: “the person[s] came from the city to talk.” Tekin, 2006: 60/61 and 110, n. 210, has *ok(i)g(a)lı k(e)lti* = “...davet etmek için geldiler,” (see also User, 2010: 392, who places *oqiğalı* under *oqi-* “çağırmaq; davet etmek”). Clauson himself was troubled by the passage and did not accept the reading *oqiğlı kelti*. He suggested with some hesitation (“probably something like”) **[uts]uqiğlı kelti* which he left un-translated.

⁴³ Räsänen, 1969: 496, derives it from Persian (cf. *tuğrâ*, *tuğrâ*, Steingass, 1970: 311, 815 “an emperor’s sign manual,” “the imperial signature”), but in light of the Oğuz form *tuğrağ* this seems unlikely. Nonetheless, there is no Turkic root to which one can point.

⁴⁴ Connected to this perhaps is his entry (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, II: 182) in which *tuğrağ* is mentioned in a poem in the meaning of “mounted messenger,” without any indication of dialect – perhaps the bearer of an arrow-message? See also see Clauson, 1972: 471.

⁴⁵ Šukjurova, 1987: 99,n.22 is citing here the manuscript (Istanbul, Süleymaniye, No.523: 202a-b) of Dawâdârî’s *Durar at-Tijan wa Ğurar Tawârîx az-Zamân*.

The oldest surviving elements of the *Oğuznâme* are found in the *Jâmi' at-Tawârîḫ* of Rašîd ad-Dîn Faḍlallâh (d. 1318), the great historian of Činggisid Iran. A crucial foundational tale gives a special significance to arrows. Having returned to his home territory, his core camping grounds (*yurt*, Clauson, 1972: 958), Oğuz Xan sent off his six sons to hunt. They came back bringing with them a golden bow and three golden arrows that they had found. They presented them to their father who broke the bow into three parts and gave each of the three eldest sons a piece of the bow and each of the three younger sons one of the golden arrows. The tribes that would descend from the three older sons, he ordained, would be the *Boz Oq*, a term Rašîd ad-Dîn etymologized as deriving from Oğuz Turkic *boz*-⁴⁶ (“the opposite of to make, to demolish” [yapmanın aksi, yıkmak], Tietze, 2002, I: 377) explaining that the bow had to be broken in order to be distributed to the three older sons. The three sons to whom the three golden arrows had been given would be the progenitors of the *Üç Oq* (lit. “Three Arrows,” *sih tîr* as Rašîd ad-Dîn, 1994, I: 56, notes). While there is little doubt that *Üç Oq* does, indeed, mean “Three Arrows” and is not a folk etymology, the *boz* in *Boz Oq* probably denotes “gray” (Clauson, 1972: 388-389, Tenišev et al. 2001:605-606), although its symbolic significance here is not clear. The word *boz* (“gray”) is used in connection with a later Oğuz nomadic subdivision, e.g. the sixteenth-seventeenth-century *Boz Ulus* of eastern Anatolia, deriving from nomadic groups that had been part of the Aq Qoyunlu and other eastern Turkish confederations, which the Ottoman government ultimately sedentarized (see Gündüz, 2007: 39ff., Gündüz, 2009: 73-86). The existence of a *Boz Orda* (if *boz* بوز is not a corruption of بوز yüz “one hundred”) noted only in Ötämiš Hâjji’s *Čingiz-nâme*, a Čingissid *ulus* associated with the Jočid house of Šiban, alongside the kindred Jočid *ulusud* of the *Aq Orda* and *Kök Orda* (the White and Blue *yurts* of Šiban’s brothers Batu and Orda Ejen, respectively, the former denoting the west and the latter the east) remains under discussion (Judin, 1992: 24-38, ms, 38b, 92,121). *Boz/buz* is also found in the names of a number of Turkic subgroupings (Lezina, Superanskaja, 1994, I: 124, 130). It is highly unlikely that the *boz* in this socio-political name denoted “broken.”

Rašîd ad-Dîn elaborates further in his account that the *Boz Oq*, the older sons, would command the forces on the right. They were given the bow (or rather pieces of it) because it is a symbol of rule (*bi-mašâbat-i pâdišâh*) and the imperial seat and the right of succession (*taḫt-i pâdišâhi wa râh-i qâ'im-maqâmî*) would belong to them. The arrows given to the younger sons, who would command the forces of the left, denoted the rank of ambassador (*bi-manzilât-i ilçi*, Rašîd ad-Dîn, 1994, I: 54-56, for the Turkic version, see Bang, Rachmati, 1932: 702/703-704/705). The parallels with the tale of the formation of the *On Oq* were noted long ago (cf. Marquart, 1914: 38). Sümer (1981:24-25) suggests that the Syr Darya Oğuz were part of the *On Oq* and dates their division into the *Boz Oq* and *Üç Oq* to the time of their Syr Darya habitat. He also suggests that their distinct form of Turkic (Oğuz) differed significantly from “Eastern Turkic” and may be adduced as evidence that they had left the eastern zone of Turkic well before the 8th - 9th centuries. To bring the Oğuz westward this early, however, he has to revise and reinterpret our early notices on the Oğuz, e.g. the notice of Ibn al-Athîr (1965-1966, XI: 178), which clearly describes them as migrating from the “borderlands of the most distant parts of the Turks to Mâ warâ'-nahr (Transoxiana) in the days of al-Mahdi” (r.775-785), i.e. after the collapse of the *On Oq* and in the aftermath of the overthrow of the Ašina Basmil successors of the Ašina Eastern Türk Qağans in 744. The evidence points, rather, to their arrival in the Syr Darya zone, from which they soon expelled the Pečenegs, in the 770s (see Golden, 1972: 48-58). Nonetheless, Oğuz Turkic was distinct from that of their Türkî and Qıpçaq neighbors. Indeed, Kâšgarî leaves no doubt that “between the Khâqâni Turks” (i.e. the Qarakhanids) and the “Turkmân-Oğuz ...there is an absolute and consistent dialectal cleavage” (Kâšgarî 1982-1985, I: 75-76).

The Oğuz Xan tales reported by Rašîd ad-Dîn and others after him that note the *Boz Oq* – *Üç Oq* division of the Oğuz (attested among Oğuz groupings in the 13th and later centuries in Syria, Anatolia and elsewhere, see Sümer, 1981:165-166, 173, 177, 202) present it as one of great antiquity. It is still recorded by Abu'l-Gâzî Bahadur Xan (1603-1663) in his *Šâjârâ-yi Târâkimâ* (Ebulgazi Bahadur Han, 1996: 147-149 [Old Turkmen text]/243-244) who basically repeats Rašîd ad-Dîn’s account. It also appears in the *Dede Qorqud* tales, but now the division is more often presented as *İç Oğuz* (“Inner Oğuz”) and *Taş Oğuz*

⁴⁶ < Standard Turkic *buz*- “to destroy, damage,” but also *boz*- (e.g. in Oğuz Turkic), see Clauson, 1972: 389-390, Sevortjan et al. 2003: 113-115 < **poz*-, but in Kâšgarî, 1982-1985, I: 391: *boz*-“to tear down,” see also Old Anatolian Turkish: Kanar, 2011: 140-141: *boz olmak, bozdurmak, bozilmek, bozmak* etc.

(“Outer Oğuz,” Dankoff, 1982:21-25).⁴⁷ Kâşğarî, however, who gives us the first listing of the Oğuz tribes knows nothing of the Boz Oq – Üç Oq division – unlikely, it would seem, if such a division had existed in his time.

Are we to conclude that the *oq* in *On Oq*, used in the sense of a socio-political and subsequently tribal entity, came out of the Oğuz tradition? This seems highly unlikely if for no other reason (*pace* Marquart and Sümer) that the Oğuz had not yet come to the lands of the Western Türk realm and would only do so after that polity had collapsed.

3.b. Oğur~Oğuz “Tribe”

Németh (1991: 77-78), in his discussion of the Chinese accounts suggested that the word for “arrow” was used to designate a “tribe” (*törzs*) and other, specifically military, subdivisions, citing Mongol and Manchu practices as evidence, cf. Mong. *sumun* “arrow” and “a troop consisting of some 100-200 people” (cf. Lessing, 1995: 737: “missile, arrow, bullet,” “District (administrative unit) a subdivision of an aimay consisting of 150 soldiers with familiars,” “military unit, squadron, company”) and Manchu *niru* “arrow” and “troop” (Norman, 1978: 216: “A large arrow for shooting game and people,” “a banner company of a hundred men,” Cincius, 1975, I: 600 “rota, sotnja,” 648 “strela”). The inference is that this is a longstanding, widespread steppe political tradition. However, this dual meaning of “arrow” denoting both the implement and a military unit is only found in Manchu and not in the other Manchu-Tungusic languages, which only have “arrow,” cf. Evenk. *n’ur* “strela,” Solon *niru~nir~nuru* “strela,” Neg. *n’oj* “strela” etc. (Cincius, 1975, I: 648⁴⁸). Indeed, the Mongol and Manchu data, as used by Németh, is anachronistic. These terms, in this military-political sense, appeared later. Mongol *sumun*, is attested only in the sense of “arrow” in the *Secret History*, which has much to say about clan, tribal and military matters. *Sumun*, most probably, developed the meaning of a “military subdivision,” when Mongols were incorporated into the Manchu banner system.⁴⁹ Arrows could be used for a variety of symbolic and credentialing functions in Mongol society. They were given to envoys and messengers as a sign of *bona fides*. They were broken (or thrust into the ground) on the occasion of making promises, solemn oaths etc. (Serruys, 1958: 279-294), but they were not used to denote clans or tribes. The Manchu *niru* as a military formation grew out of Jurchen hunting units deployed in the *aba* (“battue,” < Mong. *aba* “chase, hunt, battue,” cf. Turk *av* “hunt”⁵⁰) that served as both a system of hunting and military training. The evolution of the *niru* into a distinct military unit, the underpinning of the Manchu banner system, appears to date to around the last decade of the 16th century (Elliot, 2001:56-61).

Németh (1991:77) also noted one example in which “arrow” does, indeed, appear to denote a social or kinship group: Persian *tîra* can mean both “arrow” and “sub-tribe.” This term is known to the nomadic peoples, Iranian and Turkic, of Modern Iran (Tapper, 1997: 13, 14, 17, Barth, 1986:50 – among the Iranian Başerî it means “descent group”), presumably deriving from Pers. *tîr* “arrow” (Steingass, 1970: 340-341, only notes *tîra* as meaning “obscure, dark; turbid, muddy; sad,” cf. also Osm. *tîre* with these same meanings, Redhouse, 1974: 618, but Rubinčik et al. 1983: note Pers. *tîra* as “rod, plemja; semejstvo” etc.). From Persian it entered Čağatay Turkic *tirä* (تیرا) “šu’be, âl, qabile, ‘aşabe, il, řavâ’if, uruğ, tîre” (Buřârî, 1298/1981: 131) and Turkmen: *tire* “clan, tribe” (Frank and Touch-Werner, 1999: 537, Baskakov, 1968: 634 “rod, rodovoj, plemja, plemennoj” etc.) and Qaşqâ’î (Oberling, 1974: 22-23, meaning “clan,” below a *řâ’ifa* “tribe” [< Arabic], but above a *bölik* “section” [< Turkic, Clauson, 1972:339]⁵¹). It is not used in this precise meaning in standard Azeri Turkic (Musayev, 1996: 522 *tirä* “division, bloc”). It also entered Qazaq dialects within the Türkmen orbit, cf. Qazaq *tire* “branch of a family, clan, tribe” (*rudıñ bir tarmağı*, Žamiqäeva, Mařranov, 2007: 637). The similar sounding Qaraçay *tiyre* “patronimičeskij kvartal v karačäevskom sele...okrugä,” (Tenišev and Sujunčev, eds., 1989: 633)

⁴⁷ The *Dede Qorqud* tales were written down in the fourteenth century, but are based on epics, which are believed to date back to the early eleventh century, Anikeeva, 2005:6-8.

⁴⁸ Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, II: 1020, derive it from Altaic **nóro* “arrow, harpoon,” which also produced Mongolic *řoruqa* “arrow with bone head.”

⁴⁹ The Khalkha Mongols, hard pressed by their local foe, the Jungar Oirat Mongol ruler, Galdan (r. 1644-1697), drew close to the Qing and were incorporated into the banner system in the late 1680s (Perdue, 2005:150-151).

⁵⁰ Lessing, 1995: 2; Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, I: 512-513; Severtjan, 1974:62-64. Although Manchu has *wa*, *vä* deriving from a Proto-Manchu-Tungusic **ebä* < Altaic **špo* “to hunt, kill,” Starostin, Dybo and Mudrak do not note Manchu *aba* under the Tungusic terms, but following earlier studies mark it as a loanword from Mongol.

⁵¹ The whole confederation was termed an *il*, a Turkic (*el*) term originally denoting “realm” (Clauson, 1972:121-122), but had taken on this meaning in post-Činggisid Iran. Among the Başerî, *il* means “tribe” (Barth, 1986:50), indicating the wide range of usages of one and the same word among and within the various nomadic peoples of Iran.

and Tatar and Baškır *tirä* “okresnost’, okruga” (Osmanov et al. 1966: 541; Axmerov et al. 1958: 528) are from Turkic *tegre* “all around... surroundings,” which appears in Cuman as *teyre* (Clauson, 1972:485; Toparlı, Vural, Karaatlı, 2003: 273, 275, Qıpçaq: *tigre*) and is not connected.

It is unclear if *tıra* is a calque of Turkic *oq* or vice-versa as it is regularly found among Iranian nomadic groups such as the Xamsa and Baḫtiyârî confederations (among the latter it denotes “migrations unit” composed of “kindred encampments,” Digard, Windfuhr, Ittig. 1988). As was suggested above (1.c) Turkic *oq* may have taken on additional meanings calqued from Persian. However, it should also be borne in mind that Iran experienced centuries of interaction with Turko-Mongolian peoples, in particular Oğuz Turkic peoples, dating back to the arrival of the Seljuks in the mid-eleventh century. These linguistic influences continued with the influx of more Turkic (in particular Oğuz) tribes during the Ćinggisid Mongol era and thereafter.⁵² Ample evidence of this may be seen in the history of the post-Ćinggisid ruling houses of Iran, in particular dynasties such as the Şafavids (1501-1722, 1729-1736), Afşars (1836-1796) and Qajars (1796-1925), the latter two deriving from Oğuz tribes that had settled in Iran. The Şafavids stemmed from a probably Persian or Kurdish family of Şûfî *pîrs* that had become Turkic-speaking, having been closely associated and intermarried with Oğuz Turkic tribal groupings (what became the Qızılbaş, see Sümer, 1992; Tapper, 1997: 39-47).

The fluidity in nomadic social formations, composition and nomenclature noted by Reid and Tapper (Reid, 1983:1-3, 8-11; Tapper, 1997: 10-18, 46-47) from the time of the arrival of the Seljuks into the Şafavid era was the aftermath of the large-scale movements of tribes, which fragmented as they entered the sedentary world. The Seljuks, like the Mongols later, broke up and scattered their nomadic tribal followers (themselves a far from homogeneous group), especially in Anatolia, to prevent tribal resistance to the central government towards which the tribesmen were largely hostile. Some settled, or rather nomadized (and eventually sedentarized) in one region while other groups advanced further westward. The various tribes left toponymic vestiges of their movements and settlements (see Köprülü, 1972: 84-95, Sümer, 1981). While maintaining the idiom of kinship, putative or clearly fictive at the macro level, for politico-social organization, the realities of what were “tribe” and tribe-like social organizations were often in flux. Adding to the complication was the use of many of the earlier ethnonyms, which now functioned as the names of clans or other sub-groups, themselves subject to change (Lindner, 1982: 689-711; Golden, 1992:304-306; Golden, 2000:21-41).

In Şafavid Iran, we find a pairing of *tîras* with *oqs* (understood here as “family group,” Reid, 1983: 88). *Tîras* are described as “migrational communities,” beneath which were *obas* (Reid, 1983:8). The *oba*, in that era, was a “camp group...a cluster of families and smaller camp units” centered “around an already existing entity” with a name and a “legendary genealogy.” They were not, strictly speaking, kinship groups as they did not have consanguineous ties to the “entity” with which they were associated. (Reid, 1983: 8, following Cuisenier, 1972: 931). Originally, Turkic *oba* denoted “a small social unit, possibly ‘clan’ but prob[ably] even smaller, ‘extended family’” etc. The term evolved then to mean “the dwelling place of such a unit; small encampment or large tent” (Clauson, 1972: 5-6, Kanar, 2011: 525: “oymağın yerleşik olduğu yer, göçebe çadırı, kır,⁵³ çardak.” See also Cuisenier, 1972: 930-931; Teniřev et al. 2001: 323: “rod, plemja” which the latter connect with Mong. *obuq/omaq/oboğ/owoq* “plemja, klan,” as do Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, II: 1059). Kâşğarî (1982-1985, I: 122), writing in the 1070s, defines *oba* in Arabic as *qabîla* “tribe” and notes it as an Oğuz dialect word. “Tribe” is currently a much-contested term in modern anthropological literature.⁵⁴ The post-Ćinggisid *obas* (and *tîras*) in Iran were constantly growing and splitting, often forming alliances with groups with whom there was no claim of blood kinship. Hence this mix of Iranian, Arabic and Turkic words to designate various subdivisions is not surprising. Overall, the employment of the Persian word *tîra* to denote some kind of kinship grouping, clan, tribe or tribal subdivision, among the Turkic peoples of Iran would appear to be of relatively recent vintage in Turkic and limited to the Iranian or Persianate sphere. The one Qazaq example stems from a dialect in propinquity to and influenced by Türkmen and in turn Persian. The presence of the term in Ćağatay is easily explained by the strong impact of Persian on that language. Persian/Tajik remained the

⁵² See, in particular, the studies on lexical, areal, convergence and copying phenomena, in the Irano-Turkic area in Johanson and Bulut (eds.), 2006.

⁵³ Cf. Mod. Turkish *ova* “plain, grassy plain” and Turkish dial. *ova* “nomads’ pasturage” (Sevortjan, 1974: 400-401, 403-404).

⁵⁴ Among the more workable descriptions is: an entity that is “flexible, adaptive and highly variable.” “Tribalism” was and is a “dynamic” not a “static social form,” one, which “undergoes and generates a range of social transformations over varying time scales” (Szuchman 2009: 4-5).

dominant language of the urban centers (e.g. Bukhara, Samarqand) of the Uzbek khanates in which Čağatay functioned, alongside of Persian, as a court and literary language.

In sum, one is hard-pressed to find in the pre-Činggisid period the word “arrow” being used to denote a socio-political grouping or form of organization among the Inner Asian Turkic peoples. *On Oq* and the fleeting reference to the Türks as *oqsız* seem to be the exceptions. In the Činggisid-era and beyond, *oq* appears to bear some socio-political-organizational content only in the Oğuz world and groups near it that were influenced by Persianate civilization.

4. The Oğuric Tribes

Priscus (an “unofficial” participant in the East Roman embassy to Attila in 449, of which he left an account, he died sometime after 472, Blockley, 1981, I: 48-70; Kazhdan et al. 1991, III: 1721) reports the arrival, ca. 460, in the Pontic steppe zone and as a consequence into the Byzantine orbit of the Σαράγουροι: *Šara/Šari Oğurs (“Yellow” or “White” Oğurs), Οὔρωροι: *Oğurs⁵⁵ and Ὀνόγουροι: *On Oğurs* (more conventionally written *Onoğurs*, “Ten Oğurs” see Priscus in Blockley, 1983, II: 344/345,⁵⁶ on these forms and variants in other accounts, see Moravcsik, 1958, II: 219-220, 227-228, 230, 267-268⁵⁷). These Oğuric tribes had been driven into the Pontic steppes, according to Priscus, from the east (most probably Kazakhstan, see Genning, Xalikov, 1964: 142-147; Czeglédy, 1983: 97-103) by the Sabirs in a chain of migrations initiated by the Asian Avars, who themselves were being pressed by “tribes who lived by the shore of the Ocean.” They, in turn, were fleeing ocean mists and – with a nod to Herodotus – a flock of man-eating griffins. They defeated the Ἀκατίροι/Ἀκάρτιροι (see Moravcsik, 1958, II: 58-59 for variant readings), a people that had been under Hunnic rule and made their presence known by sending an embassy to Constantinople.

Their location in the Caspian-Pontic steppes is confirmed by a notice in the Syriac compilation (ca. 568/9) known under the name of “Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor” (Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor, 2011:65 on the dating of the work as a whole), which gives a listing of “Hunnish” peoples beyond the “Caspian Gates.” These included the Bulğars (*Bûrgârê*), the Alans, the Hephthalites (cited in two forms, *Abdel* and *Eftalîr*⁵⁸), the Onoğurs (*Ūngûr*), Oğurs (*Ūğâr*), Sabirs (*Sâber*) Quturğurs (*Kûrtargar*), Avars (*Ābâr*), *Kâser* [KSR] (Qasars? Ἀκατίροι/Ἀκάρτιροι?), Dîrmar, Šara/Šari Oğurs (*Sarûrgûr*) and others (Dickens, 2008: 19-30; Marquart, 1961:355-356, Pigulëvskaja, 2000: 283, 286, Kmoskó, 2004: 48, 99, Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor, 2011: 447-450). It is widely accepted that this list dates to ca. 555. The Onoğurs, among others, are also recorded in the mid-sixth century *Getica* (551) compiled from earlier accounts by the part-Gothic, Latin-writing Jordanes (d. 552?), who notes among the “Hunnish” nomads of the Pontic steppes the *Hunuguri* who trade in rodent hides (Jordanes, 1960: 136).

The Syriac compilation includes the *Kûrtargar*, a people relatively well known to contemporary East Roman historians (Procopius, writing also in the mid-sixth century, Agathias, ca. 532 - ca.580 and Menander, writing in the late sixth century) as the Κουτρίγουροι (var. Κουτούργουροι, Κουτράγουροι, Κοτρίγουροι, Procopius, 1978: 88/89 et passim; Agathias, 1967: 177-179, 185, 195, Menander, 1985: 42/43-44/45, 50-51, 136/137-140/141, see also Moravcsik, 1958, II:171-172) and their kinsmen, the Οὔτιγουροι (var. Οὔττιγουροι, Οὔττιγοροι, Οὔτούργουροι, Procopius, 1978: 84/85-88/89 et passim, Agathias, 1967: 178, 194-195, see Moravcsik, 1958, II: 238-239) not mentioned by the Syriac compiler. The Οὔτιγουροι/ Οὔτούργουροι are the *Otur Oğur* “Thirty Oğurs” and the Κουτρίγουροι/ Κουτούργουροι are the *Qutur Oğur*, a metathesized form of *Toqur Oğur* “Nine Oğurs” (Németh, 1991: 132). The Κότραγοι mentioned in the late eighth-early ninth century accounts of the Patriarch (806-815)/historian Nicephorus (Nicephorus, 1990: 86/87) and Theophanes, (1883/1980, I: 356-357) whose *History* was completed by 815, drew on the same sources used by Nicephorus, but is independent of the latter’s

⁵⁵ The Greek form is generally viewed as a corruption of Ὠγουροι, ie. Oğurs. Róna-Tas, 1999: 210, reads this as *Uğur* (cf. Moravcsik, 1958, II: 227: Οὔωροι) and associates it with the family name of the founder of the Asian Avars/Rouran: 郁久闐 Yujūlū reconstructed in MC, as *ʃuk kjəu ljwo* (see Schuessler, 2009: 96 [4-17a], 95 [4-13a], 57 [1-54g]) or EMC as *ʃwkw kww’ lʃə* and as *ʃwkw kiw’ liəʃlyə* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 384, 161, 204). Róna-Tas, 1999: 210-211, reads this as rendering **ugur(i)* and thence *Uğur*. He considers the latter a “secondary” form coming from an original *Oğur*.

⁵⁶ This passage and the Oğuric peoples are discussed in Németh, 1991:138-143, 146-149 (on the Onoğurs); Ligeti, 1986: 341-343; Golden, 1992:92-104; Róna-Tas, 1999: 209-212.

⁵⁷ Menander, 1985: 50/51, 174/175 has Οὐνίγουροι.

⁵⁸ Theophylactus Simocattes, 1972: 257, also citing the two forms, correctly equates the two, indicating that two forms of this ethnonym were known in East Roman/Byzantine circles.

work⁵⁹) and the Κοτζαηνοί, noted by Theophylactus Simocattes (writing, probably, in the late 620s, Whitby, 1988: 39-50), may be the same people as the *Qutur Oğur* (Moravcsik, 1958, II: 164, 155, see general discussion of these peoples in Ziemann, 2007: 95-103).

4.a The Tiele and Oğur ~ Oğuz

The Tiele tribal union included both the *Oğurs* and other Oğuric-Turkic peoples, i.e. peoples speaking variants of West Old Turkic (also termed Oğuric or Bulgaric) and the Common-Turkic-speaking Toquz Oğuz tribes in the east from which the Uyğurs ultimately emerged as the leaders (Pulleyblank, 1956: 34-2;⁶⁰ Czeglédy, 1983:109-112).

The *Suishu* (composed by Wei Zheng in 636 and covering the period 581-617, Wilkinson, 2000, 504, 819) has a notice, dating to ca. 600 (Ligeti, 1986: 333) on the Tiele 鐵勒 tribes (Liu, 1958, I: 127-128; Ligeti, 1986: 333-336; Dobrovits, 2011: 375-378, and discussion of the Tiele in Golden, 1992:93-95). The Tiele (EMC **t^het-lək*, perhaps a rendering of **tegreg*⁶¹), who are, in any event, not to be identified with the Töles, a Turkic people within the Eastern Türk confederation, as Czeglédy (1951:266-267) demonstrated long ago, constituted a large, important but ill-defined union of tribes that extended across Eurasia from Mongolia and Southern Siberia to the Caspian-Pontic steppe zone. They formed, geographically eastern and western units. Included in the listing of the peoples of the western unit are the Enqu 恩屈 (Late Han *ʔen k^hut*, MC *ʔən k^hjuət*, Schuessler, 2009, 319 [32-9j], 314 [31-16k]), EMC *ʔən k^hut*, LMC *ʔən k^hyt*, Pulleyblank, 1991, 87, 266; = **Ongur* = *Onoğur* (Liu, 1958, II:569-570, n.663) who are near the Alans and to the East of *Fulin* 拂菻, the Eastern Roman/ Byzantine Empire, i.e. most probably in the Pontic steppes. If this identification is correct, it would be the only instance, known to me, in which the term/ethnonym *oğur* ~ *oğuz*, before it attained ethnonymic status, denoted “tribe” or “sub-tribe,” is recorded in transcription in the Chinese accounts. Pulleyblank suggested, tentatively, that the Hujie 呼揭 (EMC: *xɔ g^hat*) or Wujie 烏揭 (EMC *ʔɔ g^hat*⁶²), tribes noted in the Han histories among the peoples and states conquered ca. 174 BCE by Maodun, the Xiongnu ruler and subsequently appearing in mid-first century BCE events (Sima Qian, 1993: 140 *Hanshu* 2004:14 53, 58), might render “something like **Hagaŋ*, perhaps an early form of Turkish *Oğur* ~ *Oğuz*” (Pulleyblank, 1983: 456). This is far from certain.⁶³

Oğur is the West Old Turkic equivalent of *Oğuz*.⁶⁴ As we have seen, West Old Turkic *Qutur Oğur*, **Toqur Oğur* mirrors Common Turkic *Toquz Oğuz* (“Nine Oğur/Oğuz,” “the Nine Tribes/Sub-tribes”).

⁵⁹ Nicephorus died in 828, His *Short History* covers the period 602-769 and was probably written in the 780s, cf. Mango’s comments in Nicephorus, 1990:8-12.

⁶⁰ Pulleyblank, 1956: 38-40 provides the passages on this eastern grouping of the Tiele from the *Tang huiyao* and the *Jiu Tangshu*, the latter based on the former. See also Kjuner, 1961: 36-39, who cites the accounts on the Tiele found in the *Tang huiyao* and the *Wenxian tongkao* by Ma Duanlin (1254-1323) another encyclopaedic institutional history, see Wilkinson, 2000: 524-525.

⁶¹ Pulleyblank, 1956:35-36, Pulleyblank, 1983: 448,455, **tägräg* in a suggestion going back to a 1951 article of Boodberg, 1979: 354, 356, conjectured an association with Mongol *telegen*, *terge*, *tergen* “cart,” which is semantically connected with another name of this confederation the 高車 *Gaoche* “High Carts,” see Pulleyblank, 1990a: 21-26. See also Schuessler, 2009: 227 [20-09b], 110[5-21f]: OC *lhêt rək*, Late Han *t^het lək*, MC *t^hiet lək*. The *tegreg* reconstruction fits well semantically, but is not without problems. Mong. *terge(n)* has been derived from an Altaic **t^hārko*, producing Proto-Tung. **turki* “sleigh” and Proto-Mong. **terge* “vehicle,” but not attested in Turkic (Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, II:1433-1434). The Old Turkic might be *tegrek* (Clauson, 1972:485) “the rim of anything, ring, circle,” cf. also Üşenmez, 2010: 279). Middle Qıpçaq (Toparlı, Vural, Karaatlı: 2003: 275, 282) has *tigrek* “toka” (“buckle”) and *tögerik* “değirmi, teker” (“round, circular,” “wheel”), cf. also Turkish *teker* “wheel,” *tekerlek* “wheel of a vehicle” (Redhouse, 1974: 581, Redhouse, 1997: 1128).” See the lengthy discussion of Hung. *teker* “to wind something round, to twist” from Western Old Turkic **täkir-*, Eastern Old Turkic **tägir-* (Róna-Tas, Berta, 2011, II: 877-882). Earlier renderings in Chinese of this people are: *Dingling* 丁靈 (OC *têŋ rēŋ* > Late Han *teŋ-leŋ* Schuessler, 2009: 137 [9-11a], EMC *teŋ-leŋ*, Pulleyblank, 1983:448), *Tele* 特勒 (OC: *dək rək*, Late Han, MC *dək lək*, Schuessler, 2009: 98 [4-26h’], 110 [5-21f]. Pulleyblank, 1983: 448) et al.

⁶² Schuessler, 2009: 49 [1-17h.], 231 [21-1n], 51[1-28a], 231 [21-1n], reconstructs these as OC: *hâ/hâh gat/kat* Late Han: *ha^c* *g^hat/ k^hat* MC^c) *xuo giät/kjät*, Late Han: *ʔa g^hat/k^hat*, MC *ʔuo g^hat/ k^hat*.

⁶³ Németh, 1991: 143, already made this suggestion in the first edition of his *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása* (Németh, 1930: 114-115), see also Kafesoğlu, 2011:60. Senga, 1980: 103, pointed to the “insuperable difficulties” with this identification

⁶⁴ *Oğur* is not the source of the Mongol tribal name *Oyirad* (**oğir* > **oyir*) which stems from Turk. **öy* “dun” (horse color, see Clauson, 1972: 266) + *g/ğir* (> *yir*) + collective suffix *-(A)n* = *Oyiran*, pl. *Oyirad*, see Kempf, 2010/2011: 191-192, 195.

We cannot rule out the possibility that at an earlier time these two groupings formed a single unit. With the exception of *Šara/Šarı Oğur*, *Oğur* ~ *Oğuz*, when mentioned without adjectival modifiers,⁶⁵ is invariably preceded in our sources by a number: *Üç Oğuz* (“Three Oğuz,” BQ, E32), *Altı Oğuz* (“Six Oğuz”⁶⁶), *Sekiz Oğuz* (“Eight Oğuz, Šine Usu, E1, 3, W 8, Aydın, 2007: 37, 39, 55), clearly pointing to the number of constituent tribes/sub-tribes that formed the union. The Oğuric tribes spoke a form of Old West Turkic which had begun to distinguish itself from Old East or “Common Turkic” sometime around the first-century BCE–first-century CE and today survives only in Čuvaš (Róna-Tas, 1999:101-104 and Róna-Tas, 2011: 226-227).⁶⁷

An oft-discussed, but still not fully untangled letter of the Türk Qağan to the Byzantine Emperor Maurice (582-602), preserved by Theophylactus Simocattes (1972: 257-259, 1986:188-190), which may have come to Simocattes in an already garbled form and was probably dispatched very early in the reign of Maurice (as suggested by Whitby and Whitby in Theophylactus Simocattes, 1986: 188n.32, 198-199n.43; Whitby, 1988:316), tells of events that included the defeat and expulsion of the Asian Avars by the Türks, (552-555) and the conquests of the latter extending to the Pontic steppes. The *Tongdian* reports that the Türk Qağan Muqan (see above) had his forces advance westward, defeating the fugitive Rouran/Avar fragments and the Hephthalites (Chin. Yida 𐰽𐰺 or 𐰽𐰺, Yada 嚙達).⁶⁸ “In the east, he marched on the Qitan. He went to the north and subjugated the 契骨 Qigu (EMC k^h et kwət = Qırğız, Pulleyblank, 1990:99, more probably a rendering of *Qırqır⁶⁹). All the countries beyond the borders of China submitted to him out of fear.” His lands extended from the Liaohai in the east to the Northern Sea (Beihai = Lake Baykal) in the north and the Western Sea (Xihai) in the west.⁷⁰ Theophylactus Simocattes believed these fleeing Avar/Rouran elements, which he identifies as the War-Huns (Οὐάρ and Χουví), to be imposters, the “Pseudo-Avars.” The War-Huns passed themselves off, he avers, as the Avars, a misunderstanding that has produced a lengthy, disputatious literature than need not detain us here.⁷¹ It is clear from Menander that the War-Huns are or contained Asian Avar/Rouran elements.⁷² European Avar antecedents remain problematic.⁷³ Theophylactus Simocattes reports that the Qağan tells of his victory over the Ὀγῶρ, one of the most powerful people in the east, whose “home” was on the River Τίλ (i.e. Atıl/Ätil, the Volga⁷⁴, Theophylactus Simocattes, 1972: 258, Theophylactus Simocattes, 1986: 189). The Türks conquered both the Uyğurs in the east and the Oğuric tribes in the Volga-North Caucasian and

⁶⁵ The Oğuz, *per se*, were originally located between the Tola and Selenge Rivers in Mongolia, see Giraud, 1960: 168-173; Sümer, 1980: 6, User, 2010: 161

⁶⁶ So Sümer, 1980:3, citing earlier editions of the Yenisej Barıq inscription, but see Kormušin, 2008: 95-96 (E-5, Barıq I, Tuva) who has the reading *altı oğuş bodunda* (“u naroda Šesti pleměn”).

⁶⁷ Czeglédy (1983: 112) placed the separation of the *Oğur* and *Oğuz* groupings from one another as early as the 3rd century BCE. Physical separation would have most probably preceded their linguistic differentiation.

⁶⁸ See Schuessler, 2009: 355 [37-5gf], 233 [21-14b] MC 𐰽𐰺 *dāt*; Maljavkin, 1989: 112, 379, 425.

This is a reference to the Türk pursuit of what became the European Avars.

⁶⁹ Menander (Blockley, 1985: 120/121) in his account of the Byzantine embassy of Zemarchus in 568 to the Türks, mentions “a female slave, a war-captive from the people called Χερχίρ.” The use of this Oğuric/West Old Turkic form at a Türk court is enigmatic. Dobrovits, 2011: 396-399 (citing Pulleyblank, 1990: 98-108, whose discussion of the Chinese renderings of this name clearly point to *Qırqır), notes a range of Chinese transcriptions of this ethnonym and suggests a plural form that entered Chinese via Proto-Mongolic Xianbei: *Qırqud* > *Qırqır* with the *-d > -r/-z shift in Turkic. This is certainly a possibility, but it still does not explain why Zemarchus’ report has this Oğuric form. In the Old Turkic of the Türk, Uyğur and Qırğız inscriptions, the name is given as *Qırqız* (User, 2010, 160, Kormushin, 2008, 76-77) probably from Old Turk. *qır* “gray” (horse color) + suffix – *q(X)r/ğ(X)r* ~ *qk(X)z/ğ(X)z*, see Kempf 2010/2011, 192, 200-201.

⁷⁰ Taşağıl, 1995:97. Xihai is perhaps the Etsin Gol (in Gansu and Inner Mongolia), Liaohai is the northern part of the Yellow Sea (Taşağıl, 1995: 95, n.553, 97, n. 562; Maljavkin, 1989: 9, 124 who notes the wide range of geographical entities ranging from the Caspian Sea and Persian Gulf eastward for which the Chinese sources employed the term *xihai*.

⁷¹ See discussions in see Boodberg, [1938, 1939] 1979: 265-285; Haussig, 1953; Czeglédy, 1983:107ff.

⁷² Menander, Blockley, 1985: 174/175, quotes a Türk ruler who berated the Byzantines “for making a treaty with the Οὐαρχωνίται (Uarkhonitai), our slaves (he meant the Avars) who have fled their masters” and then compared the Avars to ants who would be trampled under the hooves of Türk horses, see also Moravcsik, 1958, II: 223.

⁷³ See Czeglédy, 1983: 99-120, who argues for War-Hun components among both the Asian Avars/Rouran and Hephthalites. Tremblay, 2001: 185-187 argues for the Eastern Iranian origins of the Hephthalites. Pohl, 1988: 27-37, 215-225, points to the complex origins of the European Avars – a migration westward would have inevitably brought the addition and subtraction of new elements.

⁷⁴ Golden, 1980, I: 224-229. Theophylactus Simocattes confused *Oğur* with *Uyğur* (an identification made also by Chavannes, 1941: 247 and others) and jumbled peoples, chronology and geography in this passage, see Czeglédy, 1983:107-121, Whitby, 1988:315-317.

Pontic steppes – those that had not fled with the Avars to Pannonia. In 576, the Uturgurs under their leader, Anağay (Ἀναγαῖος) were among the Türk-led forces that attacked the Byzantine city of Bosphorus (Panticapaeum in antiquity, now Kerč') in the Crimea (Menander, 1985: 172/173, 178/179; Pohl, 1988: 40, 67) as the Türks vented their anger at Constantinople for its dealings with the Avars.

There can be little doubt that the Oğuric peoples came to the Pontic steppes from the east. Their language is the probable source for a number of early Turkic borrowings in Mongolic (see Schönig, 2003: 403-419), pointing to their eastern “Urheimat.” Whether these terms are to be explained as stemming from a common “Altaic” language family or the result of centuries of interaction, melding or areal convergence among distinct and linguistically unrelated groups remains a much-discussed question – not to be resolved here.⁷⁵ In any event, this “genetic” or “areal/convergence” relationship could only have taken place in the South Siberian-Mongolian-Manchurian borderlands.

Is there a connection between *oq*, used in the sense of a politico-social (kinship) and military unit, and *Oğur* ~ *Oğuz*, which before it became fixed (or fossilized) as an ethnonym or component of an ethnonym also denoted a socio-political grouping or tribe/sub-tribe?

5. Oq and Oğur~Oğuz.

Gyula Németh in his *magnum opus* on Hungarian origins (first published in 1930), following Ligeti (1925: 382), suggested that *Oğuz* derived from *oq* + *uz* (Németh, 1991: 77-79, *-uz*), a position earlier put forward, in passing, by Marquart (1914:37, who incorrectly viewed *-uz* as denoting “Mann,” hence *Oğuz* = “Pfeilmänner”). Németh’s view has a number of adherents today (e.g. Sümer, 1981: 124-25; Taşağıl, 2004a: 92; Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3590, 3593 and Kafesoğlu, 2011: 144). Kafesoğlu, who defines *oq* and *oğuz* as “Turkic tribes,” notes that there are “objections” to this etymology, but, nonetheless, finds it “logically consistent” from a social and historico-political as well as linguistic perspective. Pritsak (1952/2007: 59-60/71-72 [13-14]), cited *oq* < **oqu* as an example of *oq* “arrow” also serving as the term for a military unit. Indeed, overall he conflates military and socio-political organization (and hence terminology) among the “Altaic” peoples. He offers a slight variation on Németh’s theory, positing: *oq* > *oğus* > *oğuz* in which the latter refers “to a wing of the core tribes among the T’u-chüe [Türks, pbg] and Uighur.” He also renders *oq* as “tribe” (Pritsak, 1952/2007: 59, 60/72, 74 [14, 16]). Kononov (1958: 83-84) in his commentary to Abu’l-Ġâzi’s *Šâjârâ-yi Târâkimâ*, provides a useful summary of these hypotheses.

However appealing an etymology from *oq* might be, the etymology of *Oğuz* (and hence *Oğur*) from *oq* + *-uz* has problems. *Oğur*-*Oğuz* cannot be derived from it (Róna-Tas, 1999: 284 and his broader remarks in Róna-Tas, 2011:226-227 on the rhotacism question, which is connected to this⁷⁶). The shift of intervocalic *-q-* > *-ğ-* found frequently in Turkic is not typical of *oq* in Old Turkic (e.g. KT, E33 *yüz arDwq oqwn urDı* “([the enemy] hit him with more than one hundred arrows,” Berta, 2004: 159-160, n.1562, User, 2010: 449⁷⁷). Turkish and Turkmen, as with most modern Turkic languages retain *-q* (Mod. Turk. *-k*) in *oq*, cf. *oka tutmak/oqa tutmaq* “to shower with arrows,” “to fire upon” (Çağbayır, 2007, IV:3595-3596, Frank, Touch-Werner, 1999: 411). Siberian Turkic is an exception (e.g. Khakas *ot uğı* “serdcevena ognja, buk. “strela ognja,” Butanaev, 1999: 164) as is also Qaraçay-Balqar *oq* [> *oğu*] “bullet; sting (of a bee),” Tenišev and Sujunčev, 1989: 493). If *Oğur* ~ *Oğuz* cannot stem from Old Turkic *oq* (“arrow”) what is their origin?

Kononov (1958:84) suggested a connection between *oğuz* and kinship terms, such as *oğul* “descendants, son” (Clauson, 1972: 83-84 “offspring, child,” see Sevortjan, 1974: 414-416 for further extended meanings)⁷⁸ and *oğuş* “sorodič,” but, along with others, pointed to the impossibility of *oq* >

⁷⁵ On the dispute between the “Altaicists” and “anti-Altaicists,” cf. Janhunen, 1996: 237ff., Greenburg, 2000-2002, I: 11ff., Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, I: 11-236 (critical review in Kempf, 2008: 403-408), Beckwith, 2004: 184-194; Robeets, 2005 (see Miller, 2007: 274-279 for a very critical review, yet in Miller, 1971, he accepted such a relationship), Vovin, 2005: 71-132. Antonov and Jacques, 2011:151-170, present evidence that may be interpreted as strengthening the “Altaicist” position. Subsequently, Oğuric/Old West Turkic had an important impact on Hungarian (see Róna-Tas and Berta, 2011).

⁷⁶ The dating of the *-z* > *-r* shift in West Old Turkic may be placed ca. 1st century BCE/1st century CE (Róna-Tas, 1999: 101-104, Róna-Tas, 2011: 226-227), noted above.

⁷⁷ Bazin, 1953: 315 pointed to the problems with the sonorization of *q-* > *-ğ-*, but limited it to Oğuz Turkic. His attempt (pp. 315-318) to identify *oğuz* as signifying “jeune taureau” and thence “valeurux” must be judged incorrect in light of the Chinese rendering of *oğuz* as *xing*.

⁷⁸ See discussion of *oğul* in Erol, 2008: 119-123, 407-411, 732-734, who connects it with *oq* “tribe” (*boy*). Çağbayır (2007, IV: 3588) also notes *oğ* “çocuk” (but without any indication of sources). Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 152 records the clearly related *oğla*

oğuz, as noted above. Chinese accounts regularly render the *Toquz Oğuz* as *Jiu Xing* 九姓 (the “Nine Surnames/Clan [Names],” Liu, 1958. I: 158, 170; II: 591-593, n.831; Hamilton, 1962: 24-25). The *Toquz Oğuz* constituted the most significant grouping of the eastern Tiele union and this term is most commonly used by the Islamic sources to denote the Uyğurs (Golden, 1992:145-146, 155-156). The Chinese translation of *oq* in *On Oq* and *oğuz* in *Toquz Oğuz* as *xing* “surname/clan name/tribe” was not accidental.

Hamilton (1962: 23-25), followed similar lines, connecting *oğuz* with *oğuş* and *oğul*, and proffered a derivation from a root **oğ-* or **oğu-* “procréer”?⁷⁹ Furthermore, he suggested that *oğuz* was a variant of *oğuş*, coming from **Toquz Oğuş* and resulting from “une assimilation harmonique” producing *Toquz Oğuş* > *Toquz Oğuz*. There is no evidence for a *-š* > *-z* shift. Moreover, given what we know of the Tiele and the role of various groupings using the name *oğur* ~ *oğuz* one does not have to stray that far afield.

Similarly, Sevortjan (1974: 416) placed his comments on *oğuş*, another kinship term within his entry on *oğul*, deriving them from the “common root **oğ-* or **oq-* (or perhaps **uq-* or **uğ-*) “roždat” (with Tenišev, 2001: 314, following him) and distinguished it from *oq* “arrow, beam, pole” and *uq* “rod, poroda, potomstvo, imja” and “žerdi kupola jurty,” a term with a very similar range of meanings (Sevortjan, 1974: 583-584).

In Turkic texts through the 11th century, *oğuş* denoted “rod, plemja” (Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 365, User, 2010: 292-293 “boy, kabile”), “clan” (Kâşğarî, 1982-1985, I: 104 = Arab. *‘ašîra*,⁸⁰ also I: 123, II: 7, 16, and I:165, *oğuşluğ* “a man with a clan,” 241 *är oğuşlandı* “the man acquired a party and kinsmen”), “pokolenie, rod, rodnja, rodstvennik, plemja” (Sevortjan, 1974: 416), cf. also Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3593: *ogus* “kabile; soy, sop; aile, klan, nesil” (Old Uyğur); *oguş* “erkek evlat” (Old Turkic), “kabile; nesil; boy; oymak; aile, hisim, akraba, soy” (Türk and Old Uyğur). Clauson (1972: 96, with Berta, 2004: 164, 167 [BQ, E25, 31], etc. and Tekin, 2006: 44, 60 [BQ, N1, BQ, E31] etc.) preferred to vocalize it as *uğuş*, which he defines: “in the early period a population unit smaller than a tribe or clan...but larger than a single unitary family, ‘extended family’ or less precisely ‘family’.” Further meanings flowing from that are “a generation or degree of relationship.”

It can be reasonably inferred that *oğul*, *oğuş*, *oğulčuq* “womb” (Clauson, 1972: 86) and *oğlaq* “kid, young goat” (Clauson, 1972: 84-85, Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3590-3591), stem from a common root denoting progeny, family and kinship.⁸¹ Kononov attempted to connect *oğul* et al. with *ög* “mother” (Clauson, 1972: 99) which is impossible, but deduced an unattested form *oğ* (*oq*) “clan, tribe” (Kononov, 1958: 84 and Kononov, 1980: 145, followed with some mistakes by Gumilëv, 1967: 61-62, see also the remarks of Sevortjan, 1974: 415-416).

5.a. In this context, the term *uq/oq* (*uğ/oğ* ?) should be borne in mind. Among some Siberian Turkic peoples, one finds the phonologically and semantically close term *uq* (with the *-q-* > *-ğ-* intervocalic shift): Čelkan⁸²: *uq* “rod, imja, proisxoždenie” (Radlov, 1893-1911, I/2: 1605); Khakas: *uχ* “proisxoždenie; rodoslovnaja,” *uği çoχ kizi polbas* “there is no person without a genealogy” (bez rodoslovnaj net čeloveka, see Butanaev, 1999: 164); Altay Turkic: *uği yoq kiži* “a person who has no clan” (čelovek bez roda, Radlov, 1893-1911, I/2: 1605), Tuvinian *uq* “rod, poroda, potomstvo, imja” and in Qazaq dialects⁸³ (Sevortjan (1974: 582-583). Related to this is Kryaşen Tatar *žoq* “rodnja, rod, rodoslovnaja” and Čuvaš *yăχ* “rod, plemja, sperma” and the verb *yăχ-* “oplodotvorit” (Ašmarin, 1928-1934/1994, V: 103-104, 105; Fedotov, 1996, I: 188, Sevortjan, 1974: 582-583), and Turkish dial. *oğur*

“young man” in the Arğu dialect and *oğulčuq* (I: 166) “womb of a woman,” Osm. *oğulduruq* “womb” (Redhouse, 1974: 257), cf. also Clauson, 1972: 85 *oğulluq* “adoption, an adopted son.” Clauson also derives *oğlağu* “gently nurtured, delicate, pampered, brought up in luxury” from **oğla-* < *oğul*. Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3588-3589, gives a range of words derived from *oğul*.

⁷⁹ Of possible interest here is *uğan/oğan* “God, the one who creates” from *u-* (or *o-* see Clauson, 1972: 2 (*u-* “to be capable”), 87, Toparlı, Vural, Karaatlı, 2003: 203 (*oğan* “Tanrı”), 291 (*uğan* “Yaratici, Allah”), or *o-* **oğ-* > **oğğan* > *oğan* ?

⁸⁰ Lane 1968, I/5: 2053 “a man’s kinsfolk or his nearer or nearest relations, next of kin...small sub-tribe...smallest subdivision of a tribe.” The Arabic points to blood-relations.

⁸¹ See extensive citations in Róna-Tas, Berta, 2011: II: 638-641, under Hung. *olló* which derives from Oğuric/West Old Turkic **oğlağ*, but they note that “the base of *oğul* is obscure” and point to unspecified problems with *oğ-loq-* “roždat” and other etymologies.

⁸² Self-designation *Šalğannu*, consisting of two *sööks* (< Old Turk. *sünük* “bone”, Clauson, 1972:838-839), now in many Turkic languages, under the influence of Mongol *yasun* (“bone, race family, clan, descent,” Lessing, 1995:430) denoting a socio-political subgrouping, often rendered as “clan”: the *Šalğannu* and *Šaqşlu*, earlier called *Quu Kiži* or *Lebedincy* in Russian, a subdivision of the northern subgrouping of the Altay Turkic people (*Altay Kiži*, see Ageeva, 2000: 40-41; Funk, Tomilov, eds., 2006: 463, 466-469).

⁸³ Cf. the frozen form *üqum-tüqum* “ürim-butağı” (“descendants”) Žamiqeva, Maıranov, 2007: 663.

“ineklerin çiftleşme isteme durumu; kızma; döl” (Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3593), “plod, začatok” (Sevortjan, 1974: 1974: 416, who derives it from *oğ-). The Tatar and Čuvaš forms go back to *yoq* < *yuq* < *uq* ~ *oq*. Qaraçay-Balqar *oq* “sperma, semja” (Tenišev, Sujunčev, 1989: 493) confirms an earlier form with *o*-.

Radlov (1893-1911, I/2: 1605) and Räsänen (1969: 511) associated *uq* with Mong. *uğ* (Luvsandédév, Cédéndamba, 2001, II: 300) “osnovanie, koren’...načalo, isxod, vozvyšenie, proisxoždenie, rodoslovie, rod.” *Uq*, however, need not be viewed as a loanword from Mongol. Here, with some caution, we may take into account the Altaic root suggested by the *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages* (Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak, 2003, II: 1491): **úk*’u “kin, clan,” Proto-Tung. **uK*- “unity, accord, kin, successors;” Proto-Mong. *(*h*)*ug* “origin, kin;” Proto-Turk **uk* “kin, tribe,” Old Turk. *uq*~ *oq*, Čuv. *jъ*’χ (not to be confused with *oq* “arrow”), Jpn. **úkárà* “clan, family”). Tenišev et al. (2001:323) also note an Old Uyğur *uq* (of uncertain vocalization) and Qazaq dialect *uq*, which is viewed as first denoting “rod, poroda, plemja, potomstvo, pokolenie” (referencing Sevortjan, 1974: 582: *uq*). Tenišev et al. 2001: 323, associate *uq* with “tribal names formed from it” in the plural: *uğur*, *oğuz*, *oğur*. The possibility of *uq* ~ *oq* (“kin, tribe”) > *oğur* et al. has to be considered.

5.b. In the Türk era, there was still more than one form of the plural in Turkic (beyond the standard *-IAr*, see Erdal, 1991< I: 90), some of which were becoming fossilized by that time. Thus, *oğlan* (< *oğul-An*) could mean “son” and its plural (Clouston, 1972:83-84; User, 2010: 252, Erdal, 1991, I: 90-91). Similarly, *oğul* could form a plural in *oğlit*, as did *tarqan* (a title) < *tarqut* and *tegin* (a princely title) > *tegit* (Erdal, 2005: 128; Çağbayır, 2007, IV: 3589; User, 2010: 252. Kononov, 1980: 147 considered the plural in *-Vt* as a borrowing from Sogdian, but see discussion in Choi, 2010: 263-264 for its Altaic background). Kononov (1980: 145) viewed the *-uz* in *oğuz* as a plural marker.

Clues for a solution to our problem may, perhaps, be found in two other forms of the ethnonym *Onoğur*: *Onoğundur* (Οὐνγούρδοῦροι) recorded by Nicephorus (1990: 70/71) and Theophanes (1883/1980, I: 356), used in tandem with the ethnonym *Bulğar* and by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his *De Thematibus* (Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 1952: 85) who says that the Bulğars had earlier called themselves by this name. This name became *razahK eht ni rutnunoV** וננתר – Hebrew correspondence and **ونندُر* **Vunundur* in the *Hudūd al-‘Ālam* (see sources and discussion in Golden, 2005:216-217, on the Hungarian vestige of this ethnonym *nándor*, which survives as a toponym, Nándorfejérvár [Belgrad] < West Old Turkic **wnandur* < **wānandur* < **uanandur* < **onundur* < *onugundur*, < *onogundur*, see Róna-Tas and Berta, 2011, II: 1233), the term for the Danubian Bulğars. This form of the name is also reminiscent of the *الغندر* (**’wI[’w]g’nd’r* = **Uluğundur* < **Uluğ Oğundur* (if not a corruption of **انغندر* **n’g’nd’r* *Onoğundur*) recorded by Hišām al-Kalbî (d. 204/219-220, Marquart, 1924:275).⁸⁴ Of paramount concern to us is the form *On-oğundur*. The latter part of this form has never been satisfactorily explained. *Oğundur*, I would suggest, stems from **oğ* + the collective/plural in *-Vn* + *dVr* (another collective suffix), cf. the plural form in *-Vn* (e.g. *bođ* “tribe” > *bođun* “people, nation, tribes;” *er* “man, warrior” *eren* “men” and later “fighting men;” and *oğlan*, noted above (Clouston, 1962/ 2002: 148, Clouston, 1972: 83-84,192, 232; Kononov, 1980:146; Erdal, 1991, I: 91-92; Németh, 1991: 83, 97, 99, 102-103; Pritsak, 1952 /2007: 77/[39]97: *-dVr/-tVr*).⁸⁵ Examples may be seen in: *Zaβevδép*⁸⁶ (**Ĵabındır?* *Čavındır* < *čav* “fame, good reputation” Clouston, 1972: 392), the Oğuz tribe in the Boz Ulus: *Čavuldur*, *Čavdır* ~ *Čavundur* (Sümer, 1980: 140, 142, 177, 208; Németh, 1991: 97) the Oğuz subgroupings *İğdir/Yigdir*, and *Bayındır/Bayındur* (the name is found among the Kimek and Oğuz, among the latter it became the ruling house of the Aq Qoyunlu confederation) and the *Monğoldor* (< *Monğoldur*) and *Qara Monğoldor* of the *Qırğız* noted by Németh and Pritsak (see also Lezina, Superanskaja, 1994, I:186, 216 , II:301, 427, who do not cite the Qundur mentioned by Németh).

It might also be noted that the Old Qırğız runiform inscriptions record the word *oğdamdam* which seems to have denoted an ethnonym or some extended kinship grouping (see texts in Kormušin, 2008: 155 [Elegest or Ir Xol’, Tuva, line 3], 161 [Uyuk-Oorzak, II, Tuva, line 3], 162 [Uyuk-Oorzak III, Tuva, line 1]) all of which are preceded or followed by *toquz*.

⁸⁴ A form *Ulu[o]ğundur* is probably reflected in the *Οη[un]uunnp* *Ε[lu]wip* *Olğontor Blkar*, of the *Armenian Georgraphy* of Ananias Širakex’i (ca. 610-685, composed before 636, but with later entries by other hands, Marquart, 1903/1961:57, Ananias of Širak, 1992: 15, 33-34

⁸⁵ Pritsak, 1952/2007:77/97 [39] suggested *Unno* + *gun* + *dur* (the latter two collective suffixes, see *~k^on~g^on*, *q^on~ğ^on* Pritsak, 1952/2007: 75/94 [36]) but does not explain *Unno*.

⁸⁶ They stemmed from the tribes brought westward with or attached by the Avars/War-Huns into their union (Theophylactus Simocattes, 1972: 260, Moravcsik, 1958, II: 128; Pohl, 1988: 80-81).

Aside from the example of the *On Oq*, the word *oq* as “arrow” is not used in the sense or “tribe”/“military sub-division” in any of the early Turkic materials available to us. Hence, the question may well be asked: is there another word, homophonous with *oq* that could have been the actual source of this particular usage or confounded with its homonym *oq*? The possibility of its conflation with *uq/uğ ~ oq/oğ* should also not be excluded. The Chinese rendering of both *oq* and *oğuz* (in *Toquz Oğuz*) as 姓 *xing* (see above), with its strong inference of kinship, would seem to point in this direction. *Oğur ~ Oğuz, Oğundur*, I would argue, derive from the root **oğ* or *oq ~ uq* (which does have the shift of intervocalic -*q*- > -*ğ*-) an early term for a kinship grouping, no longer productive and ethnonymized by the eighth century, combined with collective/plural suffixes.⁸⁷

Abbreviations

BQ	Inscription of Bilgä Qağan
DLT	<i>Dîwân Luğât at-Turk</i> , see Kâşğarî, 1941 and Kâşğarî, 1982-1985
DTS	<i>Drevnetjurkskij slovar</i> ’, see Nadeljaev et al. 1969
E, W, N, S	East, West, North, South (in reference to inscriptions)
EMC	Early Middle Chinese
KT	Inscription of Kül Tegin
LMC	Late Middle Chinese
MC	Middle Chinese
PSRL	<i>Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej</i>
T	Inscription of Tonyuquq

Bibliography

Collections of Sources

- Blockley, R.C. 1981. *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus* Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 6 (Liverpool: Francis Cairns) I.
- Blockley, R.C. 1983. *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*. Text, Translation and Historiographical Notes. Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 10 (Liverpool: Francis Cairns) II.
- Chavannes, E. (ed., trans.). 1941. *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux, suivis de Notes Additionnelles* (Paris: Librairie d’Amérique de d’Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve)
- Chavannes, E. 2007. *Çin Kaynaklarına Göre Batı Türkleri*, Turk. Trans. M. Koç, ed. D. A. Batur (Istanbul: Selenge) which sometimes offers a slightly different translation.
- Kjuner, N.V. 1961. *Kitajskie izvestija o narodax Južnoj Sibiri, Central’noj Azii i Dal’nego Vostoka* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Vostočnoj Literatury).
- Kmoskó, M. 2004. *Szír irók a steppe népeiről*, ed. Sz. Felföldi in *Magyar Östörténeti Könyvtár*, 20, ed. I. Zimonyi (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó)
- Kormušin, I.V. 2008. *Tjurkskie enisejskie épitafii. Grammatika. Tekstologija* (Moskva: Nauka)
- Liu, Mau-tsai, 1958. *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T’u-Küe)*, Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen, 10 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz), 2 vols.
- Maljavkin, A.G. 1989. *Tanskie xroniki o gosudarstvax Central’noj Azii* (Novosibirsk: Nauka).
- Moriyasu, T. and Ochir, A. (eds.) 1999. *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998* (Osaka: The Society of Central Eurasian Studies).
- Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*. 1841-2004 (Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg/Petrograd/ Leningrad: Istoriko-arxeografičeskaja komissija Akademii Nauk)
- Sims-Williams, N. and Hamilton, J. 1990. *Documents turco-sogdiens du IXe-Xe siècles de Touen houang*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicum (London: School of Oriental and African Studies)

⁸⁷ A fifth-century “Hunnic” (perhaps Chionite or Kidarite) seal from Samarqand written in Bactrian records: βαγοογλαργο/βαγοογλαργο or ογλαργο υονανο βαο (“king of the Oğlarǵo Huns”). The question as to whether this personal name contains the term **oğ/oğlar* (see discussion in De la Vaissière, 2008: 129-130, n.11, Sims-Williams, 2010:105), requires further data and analysis.

- Taşağıl, A. 1995. *Gök-Türkler I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu)
Taşağıl, A. 1999. *Gök-Türkler II* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu)
Taşağıl, A. 2004. *Gök-Türkler III* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu)
Taşağıl, A. 2004a. *Çin Kaynaklarına Göre Eski Türk Boyları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu)
Taskin, V.S. 1984. *Materialy po istorii drevnix kočevyx narodov gruppy dunxu* (Moskva: Nauka)
Tekin, T. 2006. *Orhon Yazıtları* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu)
Thomsen, V. 1896. *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, V (Helsingfors: Société de la Littérature Finnoise) and the Turkish version: *Orhon ve Yenisey Yazıtlarının Çözümü İlk Bildiri. Çözülmüş Orhon Yazıtları*, trans. V. Köken (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993).

Sources

- Agathias, 1967. *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinqe*, ed. R. Keydell, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, v. II (Berlin: De Gruyter)
Ananias of Širak, 1992. *The Geography of Ananias of Širak (Ašxarhac'oyc')*, trans. commentary R.H. Hewsen in Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B (Geisteswissenschaften) Nr. 77 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert)
Aydın, E. 2007. *Şine Usu Yazıtı* (Çorum: KaraM).
Bang, W. Rachmati, G.R. 1932. "Die Legende von Oğuz Qayan" *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, XXV: 683-724
Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 1952. *De Thematribus*, ed. A. Pertusi (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana).
T. Daryae (ed.), 2002. *Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr. A Middle Persian Text on Late Antique Geography, Epic, and History* (Costa Mesa, Calif.: Mazda Publishers).
Ebulgazi Bahadur Han. 1996. *Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soykütüğü)*, ed. Turk. trans. Z.K. Ölmez (Ankara: Simurg). See also Kononov, 1958)
Hanshu. 2004. A. Onat, S. Orsoy, K. Ercilasun (eds. trans.), *Çin Kaynaklarında Türkler. Han Hanedanlığı Tarihi Bölüm 94A/B. Hsiung-nu Hun Monografisi* (Ankara: Türk Tarihi Kurumu).
Ibn al-Athîr, 1965-1967. *Al-Kâmil fi'l-Ta'rih*, ed. Carl J. Tornberg (Beirut: reprint Dâr Şâdir, with different pagination than the Leiden edition of 1851-1876), 13 vols.
Jordanes, 1960. *Jordan o proisxoždenii I dejanijax getov. Getica*, ed. trans. E.Č. Skržinskaja (Moskva: Izdatel'stov Vostočnoj Literatury).
Kâşğarî, 1941. *Divanü Lügat-it-Türk Tıpkıbasımı* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, Alâeddin Kırıl Basımevi)
Kâşğarî, 1982-85: Maḥmūd al-Kaşğarî, *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dîwân Luyât at-Turk)*, ed. trans. Robert Dankoff in collaboration with James Kelley in *Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures*, 7, (Duxbury, MA.: distributed by Harvard University Press), 3 vols.
Kononov, A.N. (ed. trans.) 1958. *Rodoslovnaja turkmen. Sočinenie Abu-l-Gazi xana xivinskogo* (Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR)
Menander. 1985. R.C. Blockley (ed. trans.), *The History of Menander the Guardsman*. Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 17 (Liverpool: Francis Cairns)
Nicephorus, 1990. *Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople. Short History*, ed. trans. C. Mango, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XIII (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks)
Oğuznâme, see Bang, Rachmati, 1932.
Priscus, see Blockley, 1981, 1983
Procopius. 1978. *History of the Wars*, vol. 5, ed. trans. H.B. Dewing, Loeb Classical Library, No. 217 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press-London: William Heinemann).
Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. 2011. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. Church and War in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Greatrex, trans. R.R. Phenix and C.B. Horn with contributions by S.P. Brock and W. Witakowski. Translated Texts for Historians, 55 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)
Rašîd ad-Dîn, Faḍlallâh. 1994: Rašîd ad-Dîn Faḍlallâh, *Jâmi' at-Tawârih*, ed. Muḥammad Rowšan and Muştafâ Mûsawî (Tehran: Naşr-i Alburz, 1373/1994), 4 vols.
Rašîd ad-Dîn, Fazlallax, 1987. *Oguz-Name*, ed., Russ. trans. R.M. Šukjurova (Baku: Élm).
Sima Qian. 1993. *Records of the Grand Historian: Han Dynasty*, II, trans. B. Watson (Hong Kong-New York: Columbia University Press).
Şine Usu inscription, see Aydın, 2007.

Al-Ṭabarī, 1967-1969: *Ta'riḫ al-Ṭabarī. Ta'riḫ al-Rusūl wa'l-Mulūk*, ed. M. Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif 1967-1969) 10 vols.

Theophanes, 1883/1980. *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. De Boor (Leipzig: Teubner, reprint: Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms Verlag), 2 vols.

Theophylactus Simocattes. 1972. *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, ed. C. De Boor, re-edited, reprint P. Wirth (Stuttgart: Teubner)

Theophylactus Simocattes. 1986. *The History of Theophylact Simocatta*, trans. with notes by M. Whitby and M. Whitby (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

<http://zh.wikisource.org/wiki/通典/卷>

Venturi, F. 2008. "An Old Tibetan Document on the Uighurs: A new Translation and Interpretation" *Journal of Asian History* 42/1: 1-35.

Literature

Aalto, P. 1971. "Iranian Contacts of the Turks in pre-Islamic Times" in L. Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Turcica* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó).

Abramson, M. 2008. *Ethnic Identity in Tang China* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Ageeva, R.A. 2000. *Kakogo my rodu-plemeni? Narody Rossii: Imena i sud'by* (Moskva: Academia)

Allsen, T.T. 2001. *Culture and Conquest in Mongol Eurasia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Anikeeva, T.A. 2005. "Élementy drevnetjurkskoj kartiny mira" *Tjurkogičeskij Sbornik 2003-2004* (Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura):6-29.

Antonov, A., Jacques, G. 2011. "Turkic *kümüš* 'silver' and the lambdaism vs stigmatism debate" *Turkic Languages* 15/2:151-170.

Artamonov, M.I. 1962/2002. *Istorija xazar*, 2nd ed. (St. Peterburg: Gosudarstvennyj Érmitaž, Filologičeskij fakul'tet Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta)

Ašmarin, N.I. 1928-1934/1994. *Slovar' Čuvaškogo jazyka* (Kazan'-Čeboksary, reprint: Čeboksary: Russika), 6 vols.

Axmerov K.Z. et al. 1958. *Baškirsko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx jazykov)

Bailey, H. 1985. *Indo-Scythian Studies, being Khotanese Texts*, VII (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Barth, F. 1986. *Nomads of South Persia. The Basseri tribe of the Khanseh Confederacy* (1961, reprint: Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press)

Bartol'd, V.V. 1963-1977. *Sočinenija* (Moskva: Izdatel'svo Vostočnoj Literatury, Nauka), 9 vols.

Bartol'd, 1963-1977a. "Obzor istorii tjurkskix narodov" in Bartol'd, 1963-1977, V:425- 437.

Baskakov, N.A. et al. 1968. *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Sovetskaja Énciklopedija).

Bazin, L. 1953. "Notes sur les mots 'Oguz' et 'Türk'" *Oriens* 6/2: 315-322.

Beckwith, C.I. 1987. *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Beckwith, C.I. 2004. *Koguryo. The Language of Japan's Continental Relatives* (Leiden-Boston: Brill)

Beckwith, C.I. 2005. "The Chinese Names of the Tibetans, Tabghatch, and Turks" *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 14: 5-20.

Beckwith, C.I. 2009. *Empires of the Silk Road* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Benzing, J. 1952/2007. Review of Pritsak, 1952 in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* CII:409-411, Eng. trans. in Bosworth, 2007: 55-58.

Bielenstein, H. 2005. *Diplomacy and Trade in the Chinese World 589-1276* (Leiden: Brill).

Boodberg, P.A. 1979. "Three Notes on the T'u-chüeh Turks" *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology* XI (1951): 1-11, reprinted in his *Selected Works of Peter A. Boodberg*, comp. A.P. Cohen (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press): 350-362.

- Boodberg, P.A. 1979a. "Marginalia to the Histories of the Northern Dynasties" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 3 (1938): 223-253, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 4 (1939): 230-283, , reprinted in his *Selected Works of Peter A. Boodberg*, comp. A.P. Cohen (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press): 265-349.
- Bosworth, C. E. (ed.), 2007. *The Turks in the Early Islamic World in The Formation of the Classical Islamic World*, vol. 9 (Aldershot, Hants, UK: Ashgate).
- Boyle, J.A. 1956. "On the Title Given in Juvainî to Certain Mongolian Princes" *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* 19:148-152.
- Buḡârî, Şeyḡ Süleyman Efendi, 1298/1880-1881. *Luğat-i Ćağatay ve Türkî Osmânî* (Istanbul: Mihrân Matba'ası)
- Çaycı, A. 2008. *Selçuklularda Egemenlik Sembolleri* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık)
- Butanaev, V. Ja. 1999. *Xakasskko-russkij istoriko-étnografičeskij slovar'* (Abakan UPP "Xakasija").
- Çağbayır, Y. 2007. *Orhun Yazıtlarından Günümüze Türkiye Türkçesinin Söz Varlığı*. Ötüken *Türkçe Sözlük* (İstanbul: Ötüken), 5 vols.
- Han-Woo Choi. 2010. *Türkçe, Korece, Moğolca ve Mançu-Tunguzcanın Karşılaştırmalı Ses ve Biçim Bilgisi* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu).
- V.I. Cincius et al. 1975. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-mančžurskix jazykov* (Leningrad: Nauka). 2 vols.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1962/2002. *Studies in Turkic and Mongolic Linguistics* (Royal Asiatic Society, 1962, reprint: London-New York: RoutledgeCurzon).
- Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Cuisenier, J. 1972. "Parenté et organization social dans le domaine turc" *Annales, Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 27/4-5: 928-948.
- Czeglédy, K. 1951. "Új adatok az onogur történetéhez" *Magyar Nyelv* XLVIII:266-267.
- Czeglédy, K. 1983. "From East to West: The Age of Nomadic Migrations in Eurasia" *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, III: 25-125.
- Dankoff, R. 1982. "'Inner and 'Outer' Oğuz in Dede Korkut." *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 6: 21-25.
- De la Vaissière, É. 2005. *Sogdian Traders. A History*, trans, J. Ward (Leiden-Boston: Brill).
- De la Vaissière, É. 2008. "Is there any 'Nationality of the Hephthalites'" *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 17: 119-132.
- Dickens, Mark. 2008. *Turkāyē: Turkic Peoples in Syriac Literature Prior to the Seljuks*. PhD dissertation, Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge.
- Digard, J.-P., G. L. Windfuhr, A. Ittig. 1988 "Baḡtîārî" *Encyclopaedia Iranica*: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/baktiari-tribe>
- Dobrovits, M. 2004. "A nyugati türkök tíz törzsének kialakulása" *Antik Tanulmányok* XLVIII: 101-109.
- Dobrovits, M. 2004a. "The Thirty Tribes of the Turks" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 57/3:257-262.
- Dobrovits, M. 2004b. "A nyugati türkök első uralkodójáról" *Antik Tanulmányok* XLVIII: 111-114.
- Dobrovits, M. 2008. "Silziboulos" *Archivum Ottomanicum* 25: 67-78 (an English expansion of Dobrovits, 2004).
- Dobrovits, M. 2011. "The Altaic World Through Byzantine Eyes: Some Remarks on the Historical Circumstances of Zemarchus' Journey to the Turks (AD 569-570):" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 65/4:373-409.
- Dobrovits, M. 2012. "The Titulature of the Western Turkic Chieftains" paper read at the Proceedings of the 55th Session of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, July 22-27, 2012, Cluj-Napoca, Romania.
- van Donzel, E., Schmidt, A. 2010. *Gog and Magog in Early Eastern Christian and Islamic Sources* (Leiden-Boston: Brill).
- Dosymbaeva, A. 2006. *Zapadnyj Tjurkskij kaganat. Kul'turnoe nasledie kazaxskoj stepi* (Almaty: Tjurkskoe nasledie).

- Dybo, A.V. 2007. *Lingvističeskie kontakty rannix tjurkov. Leksičeskij fond* (Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura RAN).
- Dybo, A.V., Mudrak, O.A. 2006. "Očerok prattjurskogo jazyka-osnovy. Fonetika. in Tenišev (ed.) 2006: 9-152.
- Ecsedy, H. 1972. "Tribe and Tribal Society in the 6th Century Türk Empire" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 25: 245-262.
- Elliot, M.C. 2001. *The Manchu Way. The Ethnic Banners and Ethnic Identity in Late Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Erdal, M.1991. *Old Turkic World Foration. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. Turcologica 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 2 vols.
- Erdal, M.2004. *A Grammar of Old Turkic* (Leiden-Boston: Brill)
- Erol, H.A. 2008. *Eski Türkçeden Easki Anadolu Türkçesine Anlam Değişmeleri* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu).
- Farquhar, D.M. 1990. *The Government of China under Mongolian Rule*. Münchener ostasiatische Studien, Bd. 53 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag)
- Fedotov, M.R. 1996. *Étimologičeskij slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka* (Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institute gumanitarnyx nauk), 2 vols.
- Frank, A.J., Touch-Werner (Tachmouradova) J. 1999. *Turkmen-English Dictionary* (Kensington, MD.: Dunwoody Press)
- Frye, R.N. 1984. *The History of Ancient Iran* (München: Verlag C.H. Beck).
- Funk, D.A., N.A. Tomilov (eds.) 2006. *Tjurkskie narody Sibiri* (Moskva: Nauka)
- Gening, V.F. Xalikov, A.X. 1964. *Rannie bolgary na Volge* (Moskva: Nauka)
- Gharib, B. 2004. *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian-Persian-English* (Tehran: Farhang Publications)
- Göckenjan, H. 1980. "Zur Stammesstruktur und Heeresorganisation Altaischer Völker" in K.-D. Grothusen, K. Zernack (eds.), *Europa Slavica—Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot): 51-86.
- Golden, P.B. 1972. "The Migrations of the Oğuz" *Archivum Ottomanicum* IV: 45-84.
- Golden, P.B. 1980. *Khazar Studies. An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, XXV/1-2 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó), 2 vols.
- Golden, P.B. 1992. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Turcologica, Bd. 9 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- Golden, P.B. 2000. "I Will Give the People Unto Three: The Činggisid Conquests and Their Aftermath in the Turkic World" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 10/1: 21-41.
- Golden, P.B. 2000a. "Nomads of the Western Eurasian Steppes: Oğuzs, Onoğuzs and Khazars" in H.R. Roemer and W.-E. Scharlipp (eds.), *History of the Turkic Peoples in the Pre-Islamic Period/Histoire des Peuples Turcs à l'Époque Pré-Islamique in Philologiae et Historiae Turcicae Fundamenta, I (Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, III)* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag): 282-302.
- Golden, P.B. 2005. "Khazarica: Notes on Khazar terms" *Turkic Languages* 9/2:205-222.
- Greenberg, 2000-2002. *Indo-European and its Closest Relatives. The Eurasiatic Language Family* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 2 vols.
- Gumilëv, L.N. *Drevnie tjurki* (Moskva: Nauka).
- Gündüz, T. 2007. *Anadolu Türkmen Aşiretleri. "Bozulus Türkmenleri 1540-1640"* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları)
- Gündüz, T. 2009. *Türkmen Üzerine Makaleler. Bozkırın Efendileri* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları)
- Halman, T. 2007. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı) 4 vols.
- Hamilton, J. 1955. *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des cinq dynastis d'après les documents chinois*. Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, X (Paris: Presses universitaires de France)
- Hamilton, J. 1962. "Toquz-Oğuz et On-Uyğur" *Journal Asiatique* CCL/1:23-63.
- Harmatta, J. 1992. "Az onogur vándorlás" *Magyar Nyelv* LXXXVIII/3: 257-272,
- Harmatta, J. 1999. "A türkök eredetmondaja" *Magyar Nyelv* 95: 385-397
- Haussig, H.W. 1953. "Theophylakts Exkurs über die skythischen Völker" *Byzantion* 23:275-436
- Haussig, H.W. 1975. "Über die Bedeutung der Namen Hunnen und Awaren" *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 47:95-103.

- Janhunen, J. 1996. *Manchuria. An Ethnic History*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 222 (Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society).
- Janhunen, J. 2003. (ed.), *The Mongolic Languages* (London-New York: Routledge).
- Johanson, L. and Bulut, (eds.). 2006. *Turkic-Iranian Contact Areas. Historical and Linguistic Aspects*, Turcologica 62 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Judin, V.P. 1992. "Ordy: belaja, sinjaja, seraja, zolotaja" in Judin, V.P. ed. trans. et al. *Utemiš-Xadži, Čingiz-Name* (Alma-Ata: Gylym): 14-56.
- Kafesoğlu, İ. 2011. *Türk Millî Kültürü*, 3rd ed. (Istanbul: Ötüken)
- Kanar, M. 2011. *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Say Yayınları)
- Karlgren, B. 1957/1996. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm, *Bulletin* No. 29:1-332 (Stockholm, reprinted: Taipei: SMC Publishing)
- Kazhdan, A.P. et al. (eds.). 1991. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press), 3 vols.
- Kempf, B. 2004. "Old Turkic runiform inscriptions in Mongolia: An overview" *Turkic Languages* 8/1:41-52.
- Kempf, B. 2008. Review of Starostin, Dybo and Mudrak, 2003 in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 61/3: 403-408.
- Kempf, B. 2010/2011. "Ethnonyms and etymology –The case of Oyrat and beyond" *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher*, N.F. 24: 189-20
- Kettenhofen, E. 2011. "Darband" *Encyclopaedia Iranica*: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/darband-i-ancient-city>
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. 1964. *Drevnetjurkskie runičeskie pamjatniki kak istočnik po istorii Srednej Azii* (Moskva: Nauka).
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. 1994. "The Royal Clan of the Turks and the Problem of Early Turkic-Iranian Contacts" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XLVII: 445-447.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G., Savinov, D.G. 2005. *Stepnye imperii drevnej Evrazii* (Sankt-Peterburg: Filologičeskij fakul'tet Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta).
- Kljaštornyj, S.G., Sultanov, T.I. 2009. *Gosudarstva i narody evrazijskix stepej ot drevnosti k Novomu vremeni*, 3rd, rev. ed. (Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie, Orientalia).
- Köhalmi, K.U. 1956. "Der Pfeil bi den innerasiatischen Reiternomaden und ihren Nachbarn" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 6:109-162.
- Kollautz, A., H. Miyakawa. 1970. *Geschichte und Kultur eines völkerwanderungszeitlichen Nomaden Volkes. Die Jou-jan der Mongolei und die Awaren in Mitteleuropa*, Aus Forschung und Kunst, Gesichtsverein für Kärnten, 10 (Klagenfurt-Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag), 2 vols.
- Kononov, A.N. 1980. *Grammatika jazyka tjurkskix runičeskix pamjatnikov (VII-IX vv.)* (Leningrad: Nauka)
- Köprülü, M.F. 1972. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Kuruluşu*, 2nd ed. (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası).
- Kučanov, E.I. 2010. *Istorija prigraničnyx s Kitaem drevnix i srednevekovyx gosudarstv (ot gunnov do man'čžurov)* (Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoe lingvističeskoe obščestvo).
- Lane, E.W. 1968. *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban reprint of Edinburgh 1863-1893), 8 parts (vols.).
- Lessing, F. et al. 1995. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Bloomington, Ind.: The Mongolia Society).
- Lewis, C.T., Short, C. 1998. *A Latin Dictionary* rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Lezina, I.N., Superanskaja, A.V. 1994. *Onomastika. Slovar'-spravočnik tjurkskix-rodoplemennyx nazvanij* (Moskva: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Étnologii i Antropologii im. N.N. Mikluxo-Maklaja)
- Ligeti, L. 1925. "Die Herkunft des Volksnamens Kirgis" *Kőrösi-Csoma Archivum* I: 369-383.
- Ligeti, L. 1986. *A Magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó).
- Lindner, R. 1982. "What was a Nomadic Tribe?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24/4: 689-711.
- Lurje, P.B. 2010. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch. Bd. II. Mitteliranische Personennamen*, Fasz. 8. *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts in Iranische Onomastik*, Nr. 8, ed. B.G. Fragner, V. Sadovski,

- Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 808 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Luvsandэндэв, А. Сэдэндэмба, С. 2001. *Bol'soj akademičeskij mongol'sko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Academia), 4 vols.
- Marquart, J. 1903/1961. *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig, 1903, reprint: Hildesheim: Geog Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung)
- Marquart, J. 1914/1970. *Über das Volkstum der Komanen* in W. Bang and J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien in Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, N.F. XIII/1: 25-238 (Berlin, 1914, reprint: Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Ruprecht)
- Markwart (Marquart), J. 1924. "Ein arabischer Bericht über die arktischen (uralischen) Länder aus dem 10. Jahrhundert" *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 4: 261-334.
- Markwart, J. 1938. *Wehrot und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran* (Leiden: Brill).
- Miller, R.A. 1971. *Japanese and the Other Altaic Languages* (Chicago: University of Chicago press),
- Miller, R.A. 2007. Review of Robeets, 2005 in *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* N.F. 21: 274- 279.
- Moravcsik, Julius (Gyula). 1958. *Byzantinoturcica. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag)
- Musayev, O.I. 1996. *Azərbaycanja-İngilijä Lüğät* (Bakı: Azərbaycan Dövlət Nəşriyyatı)
- Nadeljaev et al., 1969. *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'* (Leningrad: Nauka).
- Németh, Gy. 1930. *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia* (Budapest: Hornyánsky)
- Németh, Gy. 1991. *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, 2nd rev. ed. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó).
- Ng, On-cho, Wang. Q.E. 2005. *Mirroring the Past. The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).
- Norman, J 1978. *A Concise Manchu-English Lexicon* (Seattle-London: University of Washington Press).
- Novosel'cev, A.P. 1990. *Xazarskoe gosudarstvo I ego rol' v istorii Vostočnoj Evropy I Kavkaza* (Moskva, Nauka).
- Oberling, P. 1974. *Qashqā'i Nomads of Fārs* (The Hague: Mouton).
- Ōsawa, T. 2006. "Aspects of the Relationship between the Ancient Turks and Sogdians- based on a stone statue with Sogdian inscription in Xinjiang" in M, Compareti, P. Raffetta, G. Scarcia (eds.), *Ērān ud Anērān. Webfestschrift Marshak 2003*: <http://www.transoxiana.org/Eran/> and (Venice: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina): 471-504.
- Ošanin, I.M. 1983-1984. *Bol'soj kitajsko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Nauka), 4 vols.
- Osmanov, M.M. et al. 1966. *Tatarsko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija).
- Pan, Yihong. 1997. *Son of Heaven and Heavenly Qaghan: Suit-Tang China and its Neighbors*. Western Washington University, Studies on East Asia, 20 (Bellingham, Wash.: Center for East Asian Studies)
- Perdue, P.C. 2005. *China Marches West. The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press)
- Pigulëvskaja, N.V. 2000. *Sirijskaja srednevekovaja istoriografija* (Santk-Peterburg: Dmitrij Bulanin).
- Pohl, W. 1988. *Die Awaren. Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567-822 n. Chr.* (München: C.H. Beck)
- Poppe, N. 1955. *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* in *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 110 (Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura).
- Pritsak, O. 1952/2007. "Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der Altaischen Völker" *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* XXIV/1-2 (1952): 49-104, Eng. trans. "Tribal Names and Titles Amongst the Altaic Peoples" in Bosworth, 2007: 59-116 (which includes J. Benzing's review of it, see Benzing, 1952.)
- Pritsak, O. 1955. *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren*, Ural- Altäische Bibliothek (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz)

- Pritsak, O. 1985. "Old Turkic Regnal Names in the Chinese Sources" in *Niguča Bičig. Pi Wien Shu. An Anniversary Volume in Honor of Francis Woodman Cleaves. Journal of Turkish Studies* 9: 205-211.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1956. "Some Remarks on the Toquzoghuz Problem" *Ural- Altaischer Jahrbücher* 28/1-2:35-32
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1983. "The Chinese and Their Neighbors in Prehistoric and Early Historic Times" in D.N. Keightley (ed.). 1984. *The Origins of Chinese Civilization* (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press):411-466.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1984. *Middle Chinese: A Study in Historical Phonology* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia).
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1990. "The Name of the Kirghiz" *Central Asiatic Journal* 34/1-2: 98- 108.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1990a. "The 'High Carts': A Turkish Speaking People Before the Türks" *Asia Major* 3/1: 21-26.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver: UBC Press)
- Radlov (Radloff), Vasilij V., 1893-1911. *Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narečij. Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* (Sankt Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk), 4 vols in 8 parts.
- Rastorgueva, Vera S., Edel'man, Džoj I., 2000-ongoing. *Étimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov* (Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura RAN)
- Räsänen, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*, XVII,1 (Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura).
- Redhouse, J. W. 1974. *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople [Istanbul]: The American Mission, 1890, reprint: Beirut: Librairie du Liban)
- Redhouse, J.W. 1997. *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca Sözlük*, ed. U.B. Alkim et al. (Istanbul: SEV Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık)
- Reid, J.J. 1983. *Tribalism and Society in Islamic Iran 1500-1629*. *Studies in Near Eastern Cultures and Society*, 4, G.E. von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies, University of California, Los Angeles (Malibu, CA: Undena Publications)
- Robbeets, M.I. 2005. *Is Japanese Related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* *Turcologica* Bd. 64 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- Róna-Tas, A. 1999. *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages. An Introduction to Early Hungarian History*, trans. N. Bodoczky (Budapest: Central European University Press).
- Róna-Tas, A. 2011. "Recent Trends in Mongolic Studies" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 64/2: 221-238.
- Róna-Tas, A., Berta, Á. 2011, with the assistance of L. Károly. *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*, *Turcologica*, 84 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag), 2 vols.
- Rubinčik, Ju. A. (ed.), 1983. *Persidsko-russkij slovar'* 2nd ed. (Moskva: Russkij Jazyk).
- Rybatzki, V.2000. "Titles of Türk and Uigur Rulers" *Central Asiatic Journal* 44: 205-292.
- Schönig, C. 2003. "Turko-Mongolic Relations" in Janhunen, 2003: 403-419.
- Schuessler, A. 2007. *ABC Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese* (Honolulu: University of Hawa'i Press)
- Schuessler, A. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese* (Honolulu: University of Hawa'i Press)
- Senga, T. 1980. "Az onogurok a Kinai forrásokban" *Uralica. Journal of the Uralic Society of Japan* 5:105-113.
- Serruys, H. 1958. "A Note on Arrows and Oaths Among the Mongols" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78/4: 279-294.
- Sevortjan, É.V. et al. 1974-2003-ongoing. *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov* (Moskva: Nauka, Indrik, Vostočnaja Literatura RAN) 7 vols. thus far. Cited according to year of appearance.
- Simeonov, B. 2008. *Prabŭlgarska onomastika* (Plovdiv: Fondacija. Bŭlgarsko istoričesko nasledstvo).
- Sims-Williams, N. 2010. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, Bd. II *Mitteliranische Personennamen*, Fasz. 7, *Bactrian Personal Names* in R. Schmitt, H. Eichner, B.G. Fragner, V. Sadovski (eds.),

Iranische Onomastik, Nr. 7, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Bd. 806 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Skaff, J.K. 2012. *Sui-Tang China and Its Turko-Mongol Neighbors. Culture, Power and Connections, 580-800.* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press).

Spuler, B. 1952. *Iran in früh-Islamischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Stark, S. 2006/2007. "On Oq Bodun. The Western Türk Qağanate and the Ashina Clan" *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 15:159-172.

Stark, S. 2008. *Die Alttürkenzeit in Mittel- und Zentralsien. Archäologische und historische Studien* (Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag).

Starostin, S., Dybo, A., Mudrak, O. 2003. *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages* (Leiden-Boston: Brill), 3 vols.

Steingass, F. 1970. *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary* (London: Routledge and Paul, 1892, reprint: Beirut: Librairie du Liban)

Sümer, F. 1980. *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler) Tarihleri-Biy Teşkilâtı-Destanları*, 3rd ed. (Istanbul: Ana Yayınları)

Sümer, F. 1992. *Safevî Devletinin Kuruluşu ve Gelişmesinde Anadolu Türklerinin Rolü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu).

Szuchman, J. 2009. "Integrating Approaches to Nomads, Tribes, and the State in the Ancient Near East" in J. Szuchman (ed.), *Nomads, Tribes, and the State in the Ancient Near East. Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*, Oriental Institute Seminar, No. 5 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 1-13.

Tapper, R. 1997. *Frontier Nomads of Iran. A Political and Social History of the Shahsevan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tenišev, É.R. et al. 1984. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Fonetika* (Moskva: Nauka).

Tenišev, É.R. et al. 2001. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Leksika* (Moskva: Nauka).

Tenišev, É.R. et al. 2004. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Regional'nye rekonstrukcii* (Moskva: Nauka).

Tenišev, É.R. et al. 2006. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Pra-tjurkskij jazyk-osnova. Kartina mira prattjurkskogo étnosa po dannym jazyka* (Moskva: Nauka).

Tenišev, É.R., Sujunčev, X.I. (eds.), 1989. *Karačaevo-balkarsko-russkij slovar'* (Moskva: Russkij jazyk).

Tezcan, S. 2007. "Oğuznameler" in Halman, 2007, I: 621-634.

Tietze, A. 2002. *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatu. Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Turkey-Türkischen.* (Istanbul-Wien: Simurg, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften), I

Tietze, A. et al. 2009. *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatu. Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Turkey-Türkischen.* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), II

Toparlı, R. Vural, H. Karaatlı, R. 2003. *Kıpçak Türkçesi Sözlüğü* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu).

Turan, O. 1945. "Eski Türkde okun hukukî bir sembol olarak kullanılması" *Belleten* IX/35: 305-318.

Turan, O. 1965. *Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk-İslâm Medeniyeti* (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü).

Twitchett, D. 1992. *The Writing of Official History under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

User, Hatice Şirin. 2010. *Köktürk ve Ötüken Uygur Kağanlığı Yazıtları Söz Varlığı İncelemesi.* Konya: Kömen Yayınları

Üşenmez, E. 2010. *Karahanlı Türkçesinin Sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Doğu Kitabevi).

Vovin, A. 2005. "The End of the Altaic Controversy" *Central Asiatic Journal*, 49/1:71- 132.

- Vovin, A. 2011. "Once Again on the Ruan-ruan Language" *Ötüken'den İstanbul'a Türkçenin 1200 yılı (720-2010) Sempozyumu 3-5 Aralık 2010, İstanbul. Bildiriler*, ed. M. Ölmez, E. Aydın, P. Zieme, M. S. Kaçalın (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür ve Sosyal İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Kültür Müdürlüğü, 2011): 27- 36
- Wang Huan. 1982. "Apa Qaghan, Founder of the Western Turkish Khanate, the Splitting up of the Turkish Khanate and the Formation of the Western Turkish Khanate" *Social Sciences in China: A Quarterly Journal* 3/4:124-154.
- Whitby, M. 1988. *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian. Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Wilkinson, E. 2000. *Chinese History. A Manual*. 2nd, rev. ed. Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series, 52 (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center for the Harvard-Yenching Institute)
- Wittfogel, K.A., Féng, Chia-shêng, 1949. *History of Chinese Society. Liao (9-7-1125)* in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society N.S.*, 36, 1946 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society)
- Xiong, V.C. 2006. *Emperor Yang of the Sui Dynasty. His Life, Times, and Legacy* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Žamiqaeva, Š., Maıranov, D. (eds.). 2007. *Dialektologiyalıq Sözdik* (Almatı: Arıs).
- Ziemann, D. 2007. *Vom Wandervolk zur Großmacht. Die Entstehung Bulgariens im frühen Mittelalter (7.-9. Jh.)* (Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau Verlag)
- Zuckerman, C. 2007. "The Khazars and Byzantium – The First Encounter" in P. B. Golden, H. Ben-Shammai, A. Róna-Tas (eds.), *The World of the Khazars. New Perspectives*. (Leiden-Boston: Brill).