

THE ALTAIC WORLD THROUGH BYZANTINE EYES: SOME REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF ZEMARCHUS' JOURNEY TO THE TURKS (AD 569–570)*

MIHÁLY DOBROVITS

Research Group for Central Asia, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H-1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 4/D, Hungary
e-mail: dobrovits@yahoo.com

*Dedicated to the memory of
Professor Károly Czeglédy*

The famous embassy of Zemarchus to the western ruler of the Turks is quite a well-known story. In this paper an attempt is made to clarify some details of the journey, with special focus on methods and manners of communication. Did Byzantine diplomacy make use of some of its old skills in dealing with the Altaic peoples, or, as many scholars have already supposed, was there a new process based mainly on experiences with Sasanian Iran and other Iranian peoples?

Key words: Zemarchus, *Tiele*, John of Ephesus, Menander, Altai Ranges, Kirghiz.

The Sources of the History of Zemarchus' Journey

The earliest account about this embassy is preserved in the Third Part (VI, XXIII) of the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus (ca. 507–588) (*HE* III, pp. 244–246),¹ who as the Monophysite Bishop of Ephesus was obviously interested in the affairs of the Sasanian Empire. During the reign of Justinian I he also had a key role in converting to Christianity those who had remained pagans in Asia Minor.² The Syrian Monophysite Church also had close connections with their co-religionists in the Sassanian

* I would like to express my sincere acknowledgements to Á. Apatóczy, F. Csirkés, B. Csongor, Gy. Geréby, S. G. Klyashtorny, and I. Vásáry for their invaluable help they yielded to me during different phases of writing this paper.

¹ We have also consulted the older translation of Schönfelder (1862, pp. 251–253).

² On his life and work, see Honigmann (1951, pp. 207–215); Whitby (1988, pp. 245–248); van Ginkel (1995).

Empire (Czeglédy 1971, pp. 139–140). Not having been taken into consideration until nowadays, John's work, being the only contemporary account on this embassy, is a source of primary importance.

The most famous and detailed description of the journey can be found in the work of Menander (Müller: *FHG* IV, pp. 200–269; de Boor: *Excerpta* I, pp. 170–221, II, pp. 442–477; Menander/Blockley 1984).³ A short parallel mention of these embassies can also be found in the fragments of Theophanes Byzantinus (Theophanes Byzantinus/Henry pp. 77–78; Whitby 1988, pp. 243–244). The story of the embassy is also preserved in the Fragment of John of Epiphania (Müller: *FHG* IV, pp. 272–276). There is also a short account, based on the work of John of Epiphania, in the *History* of Theophylactus Simokatta (III, 9, 7) (Theophylactus/Schreiner p. 100; Theophylactus/Whitby pp. 85–86).

The Ethnolinguistic Situation in the Ponto-Caspian Steppe Zone in the 5th–6th Centuries

When the power of the European Huns was crushed at Nedao in 455, the balance of power on the Pontic-Caspian steppes changed dramatically. Their remnants moved eastwards, where they formed some separated tribal units, but never again a centralised empire (Thompson 2000, p. 168). For a short time the *Akatziri* became the masters of the Pontic steppes. Priscus tells us (*fr.* 30), that in 462–463 the tribes of the *Saraguri*, *Ogori* and *Onoguri* first established contacts with the Romans. Pushed forward by the *Sabirs*,⁴ they invaded the Pontus-Caspian steppe zones and, crushing the *Akatziri* became the masters of this region. The *Sabirs* themselves were expelled from their own territories by the *Avars*, originally living along the Ocean coasts, who were forced to leave their original territories by the mist from the inroads and the gripphins of the Ocean (Moravcsik 1930, pp. 54–56).⁵ Contemporary scholarship identifies the westward moving Avars of Priscus with the Hephthalites (a part of the Joujan or the so-called Asian Avars), who established themselves as the overlords of the White Huns (Sinor 1946–1947).⁶ They were later followed by the *Kutrigurs*, *Utigurs*, *Bulgars* and at 503 the Sabirs themselves. Saragurs, Kutrigurs, Utigurs, Bulgars, and Savirs equally were parts of a vast confederacy called by the Chinese *Dingling* (丁零) and later *Tiele* (鐵勒) (Moravcsik 1930, pp. 59–61; Hamilton 1962, pp. 25–26; Pulleyblank 1990; Golden 1992, pp. 100–106). The *Suishu* (隋書) contains a detailed description of these tribes living in the vast area between the Tola river and the Pontic

³ On the work and its author, see Baldwin (1978); Szádeczky-Kardoss (1979).

⁴ Harmatta supposed that the name of the later Western Turkic subconfederation *Nushibi* (弩失畢, reconstructed by himself as Old Chinese *nuo-si-pjět*, Tang Chinese *nu-si-pi*) corresponds to an original *Nu Šipir* the second element (*šipir*) of which is to be identified with the name *Sabir* (Harmatta 1992, p. 257).

⁵ This work includes the Greek text of Priscus and that of the Suidas; Gordon (1961, pp. 133–134), an English translation of Priscus' text.

⁶ For another point of view, see Mohay (1976); Golden (1992, pp. 92–93).

steppes (*Suishu* 84, *liechuan* 49, Shanghai, Commercial Press ed., 18a–18b; LMT pp. 127–128; Hamilton 1962, pp. 26–27).⁷

“From the north to the Tola River they were: *Pugu* (僕骨 EMC *bawk/bawk-kwət*;⁸ Ligeti: *buok-kuət* or *buok-kuo*),⁹ *Tongluo* (同羅, EMC *dəwŋ-la*; Hamilton: *Tonra*; Ligeti: *dung-lâ* or *Tongra*), *Weige/he* (韋紇, EMC *wuj-γət*; Hamilton: *jw ɛi-γuət*;¹⁰ Ligeti: *Wei-hu* without reconstruction), *Bayegu* (拔也古, EMC *bəit/bəit-jia²-kə²*; Hamilton: *Bayarqu* without reconstruction; Ligeti: *bwat-ia-kuo* or *Bayarqu*),¹¹ and *Fuluo* (覆羅, EMC *buw^h-la*; Hamilton: *p'juk-lâ*) the chieftains are equally *erkin* (*si/qijin* 俟斤 [EMC *zi³/zi²-kin*; Hamilton: *g'jiē-kiēn*]¹²), a little bit farther to the west there were the *Mengchen* (蒙陳, EMC *məwŋ-drin*; Hamilton: *mung-d'iēn* (-?)) Ligeti: not authentic), the *Turu* (吐如, EMC *tə²-jiə*; Ligeti: not authentic), the *Hesijie* (紇斯結, EMC *γət-siə/si-kət*; Ligeti: not authentic),¹³ the *Hun* (渾, EMC *γwən*; Ligeti: *γuən*),¹⁴ the *Huxie* (斛薛, EMC *γəwk-siat*, Hamilton: *γuk-siät*; Ligeti: *γuk-siät*), and other tribes who altogether had 20 000 elite warriors. To the west from *Yiwu* (伊吾, Hami) and to the north from *Yanqi* (焉耆, Qarašar), at the vicinity of the *Bai/Boshan*¹⁵ (白山) there lived the *Qibi* (契弊, EMC

⁷ His reconstructions are shown as Hamilton; the list of the *Tiele* tribes in this work and one of its later variants consisting of 15 tribal names preserved in the 14th century work *Wenxian dongkao* (文獻通考 ‘Comprehensive Examination of Literature’) is analysed also by Ligeti (1986, pp. 333–336; his readings and reconstructions are shown as Ligeti), and later analysed by Golden (1992, pp. 155–156); for a partial analysis in English, see Mori (1985); in Turkish, see Ögel (1945, pp. 80–83); later (based on the *Tangshu*) Taşağıl (2004, pp. 45–46); in Mongolian (the Eastern tribes only), Batsüren (2009, pp. 32–33).

⁸ If otherwise not shown, all data in Early Middle Chinese are given according to Pulleyblank (1991).

⁹ Maybe this is a Chinese rendering of an original *Buqu* and its plural *Buqut*, Ligeti (1986, p. 335). Bailey mentions two titles in the second Khotanese document of the Staël-Holstein miscellany (27.4 and 27.5), one written in the form of *bākū* which he holds for a Khotanese form of an original Old Turkic title *Buqu Khan* or *Buyuq Khan* and compares it with the Chinese form *Pugu* 僕固 (EMC *bəwk/bəwk-kə^h*) a (*Tiele*) tribal name, the other is being *bāsākättä* which he compares with the *Pugu* 僕骨 in question; cf. Bailey (1951, p. 18). Hamilton (1962, p. 26) reconstructed it as **Boqut*.

¹⁰ Maybe a more archaic form for 回紇 *Huihe* (EMC *γwəj-γət*), the name of the Uighurs; Hirth (1899, p. 372), Hamilton (1962, p. 26), Golden (1992, p. 155). This identification was rejected without any further explanation by Ligeti (1986, p. 233).

¹¹ Golden (1992, p. 155) reads it as *Bayırqu*.

¹² So the original form of this title known already by the *Jujuan* could be **jerkin*.

¹³ Hamilton reads these names as *Turuhe* (吐如紇) and *Sijie* (斯結) reconstructing them as Hamilton: *t'uo-nziwo-γuət*; Hamilton: *si-kiet* (**Siqir*); Golden (1992, p. 156) follows Hamilton's reading and reconstruction.

¹⁴ Ligeti (1986, p. 335) holds them for the southernmost part of the confederation and compares their name with the Khotanese Saka *hūna*; Hamilton (1962, p. 26) simply explains this name as *Xun*, 26; Golden (1992, p. 156).

¹⁵ Hamilton (1962, p. 26) holds it for the *Tianshan*.

k^hej^h-bjiaj^h; Ligeti: *k'iei-piēt*),¹⁶ the *Boluozi* (薄落職, EMC *bak-lak-tcik*), the *Yidie* (乙啞, EMC *?it-det*), the *Supo* (蘇婆, EMC *sɔ-ba*), the *Nahe* (那曷, EMC *na²-yat*),¹⁷ *Wuhuan* (烏謹, EMC *?ɔ-xwan*; Hamilton: *ʷo-xuân*), the *Hegu* (紇骨, EMC *ɣət-kwət*; Ligeti: *ɣuət-kuət*),¹⁸ the *Yedie* (也啞, EMC *jia²-det*)¹⁹, the *Yunihuan* (於尼謹, EMC *?iǎ-nri-xwan*; Hamilton: *ʔwo-ni-xuân*), and other tribes, having approximately 20 000 elite warriors. To the south-west from the *Jinshan* (金山, Altai), there are the *Xueyantuo* (薛延陀, EMC *siat-jian-da*; Hamilton: *ʃiät-iän-d'ä*),²⁰ the *Diele'er* (啞勒兒, EMC *det-lək-jiǎ/pi*)²¹, the *Shipan* (十槃, EMC *dzip-ban*), the *Daqi* (達契, EMC *dat-k^hej^h*),²² and others, the warriors of whose exceeded over 10 000 ones. To the north of the *Kang* country (康國, Samarqand or Sogdiana), near to the *Syr-darya* (阿得 Ade [EMC *?a-tək*],²³ or maybe the Volga river) there are the *Hedie* (訶啞, EMC *xa-det*), *Hejie* (曷戩 EMC *ɣət-dzət*)²⁴, *Bohu* (撥忽, EMC *pä^h-xwət*), *Biqian* (LMT, p. 128) (比千 *pji^h/bjit-ts^hen* or 比干 *Bigan*,²⁵ EMC *pji^h/bjit-kan*) *Juhai* (具海, EMC *guǎ^h-xəj^h*), *Hebixi* (曷比悉, EMC *ɣət-pji^h/bjit-sit*), *Heyang* (何*養, EMC *ɣa-jiaŋ^h*),²⁶ *Suba* (蘇拔, EMC *sɔ-bəit/bəit*),²⁷ *Yewei* (也未, EMC *jia²-muj^h*),²⁸ *Keda* (渴達, EMC *k^hat-dat*) and other tribes, who altogether had some 30 000 warriors. To the east and west of the *Deyi* (得疑 [EMC *tək-ji/pi*]²⁹ 海, Caspian Sea)³⁰, lived

¹⁶ Later mentioned amongst the Turkic (*Tujue* 突厥) tribes, cf. Dobrovits (2004a, p. 259).

¹⁷ Hamilton (1962, p. 26) gives totally different readings and reconstructions such as *Boluo* (薄落, Hamilton: *b'āk-lāk*), *Zhiyi* (職乙, Hamilton: *tʃiək-iēt* [Çigil?]), *Diesu* (啞蘇, Hamilton: *d'iet-suo*), *Ponahē* (婆那曷, Hamilton: *b'uā-nā-yāt*).

¹⁸ Ligeti (1986, p. 233) supposes that only *Hegu* can be an authentic tribal name in this group, ending maybe in *-ɣur* (**utɣur* or **uɣur* ?).

¹⁹ According to Hamilton (1962, p. 26) **Yädiz = Ädiz* (?).

²⁰ According to Ligeti (1986, pp. 333–334) *Xueyantuo* is the only authentic tribal name within this group, the identification of which with a supposed **Sir-tarduš* is phonetically problematic.

²¹ *darlakīn* ?

²² These three units are held for one and reconstructed as *Diele'er shi pan daqi* (啞勒兒十槃達契, Hamilton: *d'iet-lək nziē ɟiəp b'uân d'ät-k'iei*) by Hamilton (1962, p. 26).

²³ Harmatta (1992, p. 259) reconstructs it as a derivation of an Old Iranian *ā-taka* 'tributary (of a river)' and identifies it with the Išim.

²⁴ Hamilton read and based his reconstruction on *jie* 戩 (EMC *dzət*), while the CP edition gives *jie* 戩. The later two names were held for one and reconstructed as *Hedie Hejie* (訶啞曷戩 *xä-d'iet yät dz'iet*, **Adil Xazir*) by Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

²⁵ So in CP edition f. 18^b.

²⁶ Our reconstruction is based on the character *yang* 養 (EMC *jiaŋ^h*). These five units are held for one and reconstructed as *Bohu bi gan ju hai he bi xi he yang* (撥忽比干具海曷比悉何*養, Hamilton: *puät-xuat b'ji kân g'ju xai yät b'ji ʃiēt yä iaŋ*) by Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

²⁷ *Suɣar* (?), Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

²⁸ So according to LMT; Hamilton reads it as *Ye-mo* (也末, EMC *jia²-mat*), and reconstructs it as *ja-muāt* (*Yamar*?, cf. *Käšyarī*) (Hamilton 1962, p. 27). It is difficult to distinguish between the two readings on the basis of the CP edition f. 18^b, but Hamilton's reading seems a bit closer to reality.

²⁹ OT *tānjiz* 'sea' (?), cf. Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

³⁰ Ligeti, following Hirth, reads *Yi-hai* (Ligeti 1986, p. 334).

the *Sulujie* (蘇路羯, EMC *sɔ-lɔ^h-kiat*; Hamilton: *suo-luo-kiät*), the *Sansuo* (三索, EMC *sam/sam^h-sak* or merely the ‘Three Sak[as]’)³¹, *Yanmie* (咽蔑, EMC *?en-met*),³² *Culonghu* (促隆忽, EMC *ts^huawk-luwŋ-xwət*; Hamilton: *ts^hiwok-liung-xuət*) and other tribes, having more than 8000 (warriors).³³ To the east of *Fulin* (拂菻, Rome, EMC *p^hut-lim*)³⁴ lived the *Enqu* (恩屈, EMC *?ən-k^hut*; Hamilton: *ʔən-kiuət*),³⁵ the *Alan* (阿蘭, EMC *?a-lan*),³⁶ the *Beiru* (北褥, EMC *pək-juawk*; Hamilton: *pək-nǐziwok*), the *Jiuli* (九離, EMC *kuw²-liǎ^h/li^h* or the ‘Nine Li’), the *Wufu* (LMT, 128) (????伏 or *Fu-wa* (CP, f. 8^b) 伏唄, EMC *buw²-?wət*),

³¹ On the identification *Suo* 索 and *Saka*, see Harmatta (1999, p. 391); the Sakas were otherwise called *Sai* 塞, Pulleyblank (1970, p. 154).

³² These two units are held for one and reconstructed as *Sansuo Yanmie* (三索咽蔑, Hamilton: *sām-sāk ʔen-miet*), Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

³³ Ligeti reconstructed these names as *Sulu*, *Hesan*, *Suoyin*, *Miecu*, *Longhu* (Ligeti 1986, p. 334).

³⁴ The second syllable was reconstructed by Pulleyblank (1999, p. 77). Hirth (1885a, pp. 206–217; 1885b; 1909; 1913) argued that both the names *Daqin* (大秦) and *Fulin* (拂菻) must stand only for Syria and the Nestorians while the expression of *Da Fulin* (大拂菻 ‘Greater Fulin’) designated the Roman Empire. Hirth’s ideas were disputed by Chavannes (1904, p. 37), and later, based on Song sources, Enoki (1954). However, Bielenstein (2005, p. 366) still argues, following Hirth’s ideas, that the Fulin of the Chinese must stand not for the Byzantine Empire but only for Syria and its king, who sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor in 643, must be the Nestorian (!) Patriarch of Antioch. This view is hardly defensible since there were no Nestorian Patriarchs in Antioch at that time. The followers of this lore emigrated from Edessa to Persia in 497 and became officially recognised as the Christian denomination of the empire. From the territory of Persia they launched three missions into Central Asia, China, and India (on this topic, see Vine 1937, pp. 37–52). Had there been any Nestorian Patriarchs in Antioch, they definitely could not have managed such a diplomatic affair during the turbulent years of the Arabic conquest of the Middle East. Such would be the case with the Monophysite Patriarchate that really existed, cf. Honigmann (1951, pp. 19–31), but had no connections with China and Inner Asia and also with the Orthodox/Melchite one. One can rather suppose that the Chinese source referred to by Bielenstein (*Tanghuiyao* 99, 12a–12b) erroneously narrates not only the date (661–663) but also the extent of the Arabic conquest, claiming that the whole country of Fulin was taken by the Arabs. Describing the *Tiele*, the *Suishu* (see above) mentions some tribes of them living to the north of *Fulin* (but to the east of the Caspian Sea), which also would be impossible if this term stood for Syria. The description of *Fulin* in the *Xin Tangshu*, according to which *Fulin* is to the south of the *Gesa* tribe of the *Tujue* and to the north-west of Persia (*Bosi* 波斯) makes also impossible the identification of *Fulin* (and also *Daqin* as its forerunner) with Syria, cf. Ögel (1945, p. 72). On the other hand, it seems to be impossible that any Nestorian (or other) Patriarch could be mentioned in the Orkhon Inscriptions (I. E1), where the (*a*)*purum* were one of the peoples who sent envoys to the funeral of the first (?) ruler of the Turks. The title ‘king’ in the Chinese source may well correspond to Greek βασιλεύς, the official title of the Byzantine emperors since 629, cf. Chrysos (1978). For the Chinese data on the title *wang* (王), cf. Hucker (1988, p. 562); on the traditional Chinese vision on the Emperor as a universal ruler and harmony-maker of the inhabited world, cf. Alimov – Ermakov – Martynov (1988, pp. 53–59), Eisenberg (2008, pp. 16–18).

³⁵ Some scholars identify them with the Onogur; see Golden (1992, p. 95), Ögel (1945, p. 80).

³⁶ The only tribal name that can certainly be identified with that of the Alans, Ligeti (1986, p. 334); cf. also Alemany (2000, pp. 1, 401–403).

Hun (昏, EMC *xwən*),³⁷ and other tribes. Altogether they have 20 000 men. To the south of the *Beihai* (北海, Baikal, EMC *pək-xajʔ*), live the *Dubo* (都波, EMC *tə-pa*, Hamilton: *tuo-puá* [*Tupa*] Ligeti: *Tuba*) and other tribes.”

Our text later states that these tribes have no common overlords of their own but are divided between the Eastern and Western Turks (CP f. 18^b; LMT 128; Hamilton 1962, p. 27).

Ligeti dates this list to 600 CE and states that many of the names in it cannot be identified (Ligeti 1986, p. 333; cf. also Hirth 1901). We may also add that a great number of the names are definitely not of Turkic origin, or, we can also find them as names of other peoples of the steppe zone, especially that of the Kirgiz and Alans.

It was Czeglédy who finally demonstrated that the western parts of this vast confederacy (or a chain of tribal confederacies) formed what we call the *ogur* tribes while the eastern ones became parts of the (*Toquz-*)*Oγuz* confederacy (Czeglédy 1983).³⁸ Although the geographical environment is clear, we cannot find any direct link (except of the name *Alan*) between the names of this list and the ethnonyms of the Byzantine authors. One can argue that the two groups of sources are too far from each other in both chronological and geographical sense, but this will not solve the problem. We can suppose that the authors of the chapter in question of the *Suishu* (compiled ca. 636) put all the tribal names known to them as vassals of the Turks into this list, regardless of their real ethnic origin and original political allegiances. One can add that given the permanent alterations in the political circumstances of the steppe regions, such confusions seem to be natural.

Byzantine authors usually refer to these Oguric tribes as “Huns” based on the fact that they not only followed the same pattern of pastoral nomadic tradition, but they also mingled with the remnants of the once powerful empire of Attila (Golden 1980, I, pp. 90–93; 1992, pp. 106–108; Harmatta 1992, p. 257; Tóth 2008). A special kind of Runic inscriptions usually called Eastern European Runic script (EER), the various examples of what is to be found between the Altai ranges and the Carpathian Basin may also be connected with their presence (Ščerbak 1962; Vásáry 1972; Klyash-torny 1987, pp. 59–609; Kljaštornyj–Vásáry 1987; Şçerbak 1990; Tryjarski 2002, 2003, 2004; Vasiliev 2005; 2009).³⁹

With the advent of the Avars in 558 and the Turks in 568 the political landscape of this region changed dramatically, but the ethnical situation remained more or less untouched. The various *Ogur* groupings were seeking alliances not only with the Avars and Turks but also with the Byzantines and Sasanians, the major protagonists of the contemporary historical scene.

³⁷ These two units are held for one and reconstructed as *Jiulifu* (九離伏, Hamilton: *kjeu-ljie-b'juuk*) and *Wuhun* (暍昏, Hamilton: *uət-xuən*) by Hamilton (1962, p. 27).

³⁸ For earlier discussions of this topic, see Pulleyblank (1956, 1990a); Golden (1972).

³⁹ It is still a question if the enigmatic “Turkic” alphabet preserved in the work of Aethicus Ister does belong to this cycle or is merely an invention of the author, cf. Löwe (1976).

Byzantine Alliance and Missionary Politics in the Pontic-Caspian Steppe Zone during the First Half of the 6th Century

Through the Cimmerian Bosphorus Byzantium formed close contacts with the peoples of steppes (Vasiliev 1936, pp. 70–76; Barker 1966, p. 129; Golden 1990, pp. 257–260; Blockley 1992, pp. 73, 242). This was a safe and comfortable way to reach that region. Orthodox and Monophysite missionaries from Byzantine territories, also carried on an extended missionary activity in both the Crimean and Caucasian steppes.⁴⁰ It is natural that through this channel they had gradually accumulated accurate information concerning their pastoral neighbours (Czeglédy 1971). As one of the most important actions we should mention the mission of the Monophysite bishop Qarduṣaṭ in Caucasian Albania, where he, together with his six other clerics, served not only the Byzantine and Syrian prisoners but they were also engaged in missionary activities amongst the local “Huns”. They even prepared some writings in their language (Pseudo-Zacharias/Brooks II, pp. 145–146). Their stay must have lasted until 537 when they were replaced by an Armenian bishop Maqar. While amongst the Huns, Qarduṣaṭ met Probus, a Monophysite nephew of the Emperor Anastasius (491–518), who was sent out in ca. 525–527 by the Emperor Justin I (518–527) to recruit Hunnic mercenaries in the Cimmerian Bosphorus. As his efforts turned unsuccessful he left for the Hunnic tribes living north of the Caucasus.⁴¹ Byzantine efforts in the Crimea turned successful only in 528, when *Boa(r)ex*, the widowed princess of the Sabirs (or Sabir-Huns) made an alliance with the Byzantines (Theophanes/de Boor p. 175; Theophanes/Mango–Scott p. 266; Czeglédy 1971, p. 147). Byzantine positions were soon weakened again as a result of the ill-omened baptism of Gordas, the king of another Hunnic tribe who was later deposed and killed by his brother Muageris (Malalas/Thurn, pp. 360–362; Malalas/Jeffreys–Scott, pp. 250–251; Theophanes/de Boor, pp. 175–176; Zheophanes/Mango–Scott, p. 267).⁴² Czeglédy supposed that these Huns mentioned by Pseudo-Zacharias and Procopius were in fact identical with the Sabirs, the lords of the vast territories north of the Caucasus between 503 and 558 who had a number of other nomadic peoples under their sovereignty, including the Bulgars and the Onogurs.⁴³

⁴⁰ On the circumstances of the final split between the Monophysites and the Orthodox in the Middle East, see Foss (1975).

⁴¹ “Probus, however, returned from there [i.e. the Cimmerian Bosphorus] without accomplishing his mission ...” (*ἐπεὶ Πρόβος ἐνθένδε ἀπρακτος ἀνεχώρησε*) De Bello Persico I, 12, 6 in: Procopius/Dewing (I, pp. 96, 98: original, pp. 97, 99: translation); Procopius/Haury–Wirth (pp. 56–57); “accidisse vero ut ille tempore probus illuc a rege [i.e. the Emperor Justinian] *προσβείας* modo missus esset ut ex eis conduceret qui populis proelio occurrerent”, Pseudo-Zacharias/Brooks (II, p. 146); Stein (1949, pp. 269–271); Czeglédy (1971, pp. 146–147).

⁴² For a detailed analysis of the story, see Moravcsik (1946, p. 38); reprinted in his *Studia Byzantina* (Budapest 1967, p. 253); based on the version of Malalas, the story was also quoted by Stein (1949, II, p. 304) and Bury (1958, II, pp. 311–312).

⁴³ “Unāghur populus qui in tabernaculis habitant, Oghor, Sabhir, Abhar, KSR, DYRMR, Sarurgur, B'GRSYQ, KWLIS, Abhdel, Ephtalita, hi populi tredecim in tabernaculis habitantes, Pseudo-

The Earliest Contacts between the Eastern Romans and the Turks⁴⁴

Theophanes Confessor [AM 6055] says that the first embassy representing any Old Turkic power visited Byzantium in July 563. This was sent by a certain *Askêl rex*, the ruler of the *Hermikhiones* (*Ἀσκήλ τοῦ ῥηγῶς Ἡρμηχιόνων*), a certain Barbarian people who were living near the Ocean (Theophanes/de Boor, p. 239; Theophanes/Mango–Scott, p. 351). It is Theophanes Byzantinus who, telling the story of the contacts five years later, informs us that the Persians called the Turks in their own language as *Kermikhiones* (*Τούρκοι [...]οὗς Πέρσαι οἴκεια γλώσση Κερμιχιόνάς φασι*) (Theophanes/Henry, p. 77). Bailey and later Harmatta reconstructed this name as *karmir xiyōn*, or Red Huns (Bailey 1932, pp. 945–946; Harmatta 1962, pp. 137–140; Sinor 1990, pp. 301–302).⁴⁵ *Askêl rex*,⁴⁶ whose name was probably preserved as Scaldor or Scultor in Corippus,⁴⁷ was already thought to be the chieftain of a tribe called later in the

Zacharias/Brooks (II, pp. 144–145); for a similar list see Marquart (1901, p. 253), Czeglédy (1971, pp. 147–148).

⁴⁴ As it seems to be next to impossible to draw a definite line between the Eastern Roman Empire and Byzantium, cf. Cameron (1993, pp. 7–8), we shall use the two terms interchangeably; the designation “Turks” refers to the Old Turks.

⁴⁵ Sinor calls them ‘red Hephthalites’; Macartney (1944, pp. 271–272) still holds them Chionites, a people other than the Turks.

⁴⁶ On the usage of the title *ῥηγῆς* in Byzantium as ‘tribal chieftain’, see Harmatta (1962, pp. 142–143).

⁴⁷ Laud. Iustini III, pp. 390–398, in a long quotation of the speech of the Emperor to the Avars, beginning from line 310: “*en Scaldor nostra servire paratus in aula / legatos nobis et plurima munera mittit / quos contra ingratos offendimus, arma paramus. / obstamus dominis, profugis damus ostia servis ? / legibus hoc nostra non convenit. arguo factum / [395] indignis praebemus opem. Caganque timeri / se putat et bello meo signa lacesere temptat ? / ite, licet. campos, acies et castra parate. / signorumque duces certo sperate meorum*”, in translation: “See, Scaldor is ready to serve in our palace (390) and sends us legates and countless gifts. Against those we find ungrateful, we go to war. Are we to stand in the way of kings, yet open our doors to exiled slaves? This does not fit our laws. I tell you the truth. (?) We are offering aid to the unworthy. Does the Cagan think that he is feared (395) and dare to assail my standards in war? Very well, go. Prepare your battles, dispositions and encampments, and wait with certainty for the generals of my army.” Corippus/Cameron (p. 72) (original), pp. 109–110; There are some other readings and translations of the passage: “(...) *en Scultor, nostra servire paratus in aula / legatus nobis et plurima munera mittit. / Quos contra ingratos defendimus, arma paramus. / Obstamus dominis, profugis damus ostia servis. / Legibus hoc nostris non convenit. Argo factum. / [395] Indignis praebemus opem. Caganque timeri / se putat et bello mea signa lacesere temptat. / Ite, licet, campos, et castra parate / signorumque duces certo sperate meorum.*”, in French translation: “(...) voilà Scultor qui est prêt à servir à notre Cour et qui nous envoie des ambassadeurs et de très nombreux présents. Nous fourbissons nos armes contre ceux que nous avons défendus quand ils sont ingrats. Nous barrons le passage aux dominateurs, nous ouvrons notre porte aux esclaves fugitifs. Cette scène est en désaccord avec nos lois. Je dénonce ce qui passe. [395] Nous offrons notre aide à des hommes qui en sont indignes. Le Cagan croit faire peur et tente de défier par le combat mes enseignes. Allez, si vous le voulez, préparez vos champs de batailles, vos lignes et votre camp et comptez de façon certaine sur les généraux qui commandent à mes enseignes.” Corippus/Antès (pp. 70–71); Corippus/Partsch (p. 147) read the name as en Sultan which is of course a historically impossible, Partsch’ mistaken reading was also reproduced by Aalto–Pekkanen (1975, p. 85); according to Szádeczky-Kardoss (1998, p. 30) the reading is Ensultor. Marquart (1897, p. 197); cf. also Macartney (1944, pp. 267, 271);

Chinese sources *Axijie* (阿悉結 EMC ?*a-sit-ket*, or in another transcription *Axiji* 阿悉吉 [EMC ?*a-sit-kjit*]) (Harmatta 1962, pp. 140–142; 2000; Sinor 1990 p. 302).⁴⁸ According to the Chinese sources this must be the westernmost tribe of what later will be called Western Turks (Chavannes 1903, pp. 27–28, 60; Dobrovits 2004b), and later was partly engaged in the ethnogenesis of the (Volga) Bulgarians (Zimonyi 1990, pp. 48–49; Golden 1992, p. 254). In the Orkhon Inscriptions they occur in two instances as *Izgil bodun* (I. N. 3, 4). They were also mentioned as one of the three Kabar tribes that seceded from the Khazars and joined to the landtaking Hungarians (Gorelik 2002, p. 55). So we can assume that *Askêl rex* must be the chieftain of the westernmost part of the Turks at that time when his envoys paid honour to Justinian's court. The date of this embassy must also coincide with the final crush of the Hephthalites (Grignaschi 1984; Felföldi 2001).

Harmatta also supposed that the first contacts between the Turks and Byzantium must have been conducted in Middle Persian (Harmatta 1962, pp. 146–148; Ecsedy 2000, p. 212).⁴⁹ If it was really so, this must be an extraordinary situation. As to the language used in Byzantine–Persian diplomatic relations, we can rely on Menander Protector, who informs us (18,1) that an Armenian envoy by the name of Jakob was specially chosen to go to Constantinople, because he was able to deliver the message of the Persian king in Greek (Menander/Blockley, p. 157). Hormizd IV (579–590), the ill-fated son of Chosroes I (531–579) was called *Turkzād* for his mother was Istāmi's daughter (Harmatta 1962, p. 147).⁵⁰ So we can assume that he knew his mother's native language. Writing in the first half of the 7th century, Theophylactus Simocatta states that “These are Huns who dwell in the east as neighbours of the Persians and whom it is more familiar for the many to call Turks” (I. 8. 5);⁵¹ or (III. 6. 9) “the Huns, who dwell towards the north-east and whom it is customary for the Persians to call Turks”,⁵² or (IV. 6. 10) “(...) approached the Hun tribes whom his-

Kollautz–Miyakawa (1970, I, p. 165); Pohl (1988, 41); Beckwith (2006/2007). Corippus, at another place [319–324] have already called the Avars fugitives: ‘*quid profugos laudas, famaue adtollis inani / extorrem populum ? quae fortia regna subegit, / effera gens Avarum proprias defendere terras / non potuit, sedesque suas fugitiva reliquit.*’, in translation: “why do you praise fugitives and extol an exiled people with empty glory? The bold Avar race, which you say subdued strong kingdoms [320] could not defend its own lands and left its home as a fugitive.” Corippus/Cameron (p. 70: original, p. 108: translation).

⁴⁸ Mori (1965, p. 43) identifies them with the *Sijie* 思結 tribe of the *Tiele* confederation; Pohl (1988, p. 41) still echoes some older identifications with *Sejin* (俟斤), the original name or more correctly the title of Muhan *qayan*, the second eastern Turkic ruler (553–572), which is however the Chinese rendering of the Old Turkic title *erkin*.

⁴⁹ On the Byzantine knowledge of Middle Persian, cf. Suolahti (1947).

⁵⁰ Daryae (2008, p. 41) misinterprets his genealogy supposing that his mother might be the daughter of the king of the Khazars.

⁵¹ Theophylactus/Whitby (p. 30); Theophylactus/Schreiner (p. 52); original: *Οἰννοι δ' οὔτοι, προσοικούντες τῇ ἔα, Περσῶν πλησιόχωροι, οὐς καὶ Τούρκους ἀποκαλεῖν τοῖς πολλοῖς γνωριμώτερον*, Theophylactus/de Boor–Wirth (p. 54).

⁵² Theophylactus/Whitby (p. 80); *τῶν Οἰννων τοιγαροῦν τῶν πρὸς τῷ βορρᾶ τῆς ἔω, οὐς Τούρκους ἔθος Πέρσαις ἀποκαλεῖν*, Theophylactus/de Boor–Wirth (p. 121).

tory has almost universally recognised as Turks.”⁵³ This completely corresponds to the usage of later Pahlavi sources.⁵⁴ Of course we have some later, historically more correct mentions of the name Turk.

Many other speculations have appeared about these early contacts. It was supposed that in 563 the Turks were seeking in the Byzantines an ally against the Avars.⁵⁵ This supposition, however, is based on a complete misunderstanding of the sources. Theophanes Confessor gives an account of an embassy of the Turks in 563, without any mention of its purposes. On the other hand, regarding the embassy of Maniakh in 568, Theophanes Byzantinus remarks that the Turks were seeking an alliance against the Avars in Constantinople. We can therefore conclude that there was no offer of any Turko-Byzantine alliance in 563, and there is no reason to look for the alleged causes of its rejection.

The Political Circumstances of the Steppe Zone about 568–569

A Sogdian merchant, Maniakh was the first to represent any real Turkic ruler, in this case Istāmi,⁵⁶ the brother of Bumīn. Istāmi’s “Scythian” letter (*τὸ γράμμα τὸ Σκυθικόν*) (Menander/Blockley, p. 114: original, p. 115: English) to the Byzantine emperor Justin II (565–578) is usually considered to be a Sogdian text. Sogdian played an important role in the life of the Turkic Empire. It was the language of the Bugut inscription (ca. 571–582), the first historical inscription of the Turks and as well of the Altaic peoples of Inner Asia (Kljaštornyj–Livšic 1972). Maniakh might have offered an alliance against the Persians, with whom the Empire had been entangled in a long and unsuccessful war after the accession of Justin II, and also against the Avars who, entering the Carpathian Basin in the same year, threatened Singidunum and

⁵³ Theophylactus/Whitby (p. 112); *τῶν Οὐννων [...], οὓς Τούρκους πολλαχοῦ πον ἡ ἱστορία ἐγνώρισεν*, Theophylactus/de Boor–Wirth (p. 161).

⁵⁴ The *Kārnamag ī Ardaxšīr ī Pābagān* (XVIII, 22) speaks about Turks when the historical situation clearly corresponds to White Huns, or, more generally speaking, to the pastoral nomads of Inner Asia, perhaps the Yuezhi: *ud az Hrōm ud Hindūgān sāk ud bāj xwāst ud Ērānšahr ō payrā-yišnīgtar ud čābuktar ud nāmīgtar kard ud kēsar ī hrōmāyān (ud) šahryār ī t/h y/b ud Kābul ud Hindūgān šāh ud Turk <ī> xākān ud abārīg gil-xwadāyān ī kustag kustag pad drōd (ī) šīrēnag ō dar āmad hēnd* “Он потребовал дань и подать от Рума и Индии и сделал Эран-шахр еще краше, сильнее и славнее. И кесарь румийский, правитель ... , кабульский и индийский царь, тюркский хакан и другие правители разных стран пришли к его двору с любезными приветствиями.” (Karnamag/Chunakova, pp. 62–63, 83); the *Žāmāsp-nāmag*, speaking about the disturbances at the end of the Sasanian era, states: *avēšān Tāčīkān apāk Hrōmikān ut Tūrakān andar gumēčēnd ut kišvar bē višōpēnd* “Those Arabs will be confounded with Romans and Turks and they will desolate the world.” (Zamasnamak/Bailey, p. 582).

⁵⁵ Macartney (1944, p. 273) speaks about pseudo-Avars; Harmatta (1962, p. 144).

⁵⁶ The first attempt to identify this ruler with Istāmi was made by Marquart (1901, p. 216). For the criticisms of this identification, see Sinor (1992). On Maniakh's background see de la Vaisière (2005, pp. 235–237).

some territories of Pannonia still in Byzantine hands.⁵⁷ Enumerating the causes of the new Roman–Persian war, John of Ephesus first mentioned the surrender the Persarmenians to the Romans, and secondly the Roman embassy to the Turks.⁵⁸ The Turks officially asked for and were granted “peace and (defensive) alliance” (*εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμαιχμίαν*), quite an unusual offer from a Barbarian party to the Empire at the time (Miller 1971, p. 60). The third point that an agreement could be reached about was undoubtedly the silk-trade, the cause of the original conflict between the Turks and the Sasanian Empire. Silk and silk-trade was a matter of utmost importance for the Byzantines.⁵⁹ A note on silk and silk-trade precedes and also follows the mention of the embassy of the Turks at 568 in Theophanes Byzantius (Theophanes Byzantius/Henry, p. 77). Haussig also quotes this author stating that in 568 Iran also occupied Yemen expelling the Ethiopians and their local Himyarite allies, closing this route for Byzantine trade (Haussig 1979, p. 47). Theophanes recounts all these events just the opposite way. According to him the manoeuvre of Chosroes in Southern Arabia was provoked by Zemarchus’ journey to Inner Asia.⁶⁰ So we can accept the opinion of Christensen and Irfan Shahīd, who dated this action to 570.⁶¹ Another event in this war was the move of Abraha against Mecca with elephants in his army, which was widely reflected in both the Islamic religious tradition and historiography as an event marking the year of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad (Ṭabarī/Bosworth, p. 216).

⁵⁷ For a detailed description of the age, see Stein (1919); Barker (1966, pp. 211–218); Whitby (2007).

⁵⁸ “Causa vero prima ruptae pacis deditio fuit Armeniorum Persarum quae ad Romanos facta est. Secundo autem preterea causa animicitiae durae id fuit quod rex Romanorum ad populos barbaros ultra regiones Persarum quos Turcios vocant legatos misit, cum ceteris aliis causis multis ob quas Persae ad indignationem et inimicitiam pervenerunt.” (HE III, p. 244; Greatrex–Lieu 2002, p. 141).

⁵⁹ On silk trade and silk production in Byzantium during our period see: Uspenskij (1912, pp. 547–560); Richter (1929); Henning (1933); Stein (1949, pp. 772–773); Pigulewskaja (1969, pp. 150–171); Lopez (1945); Hannestad (1955–1957); Garsoïan (1983, p. 571); Oikonomidès (1986); Muthesius (1997, pp. 27–33).

⁶⁰ (...) ὁς καὶ λαμπρῶς ἐστίασας τε τοὺς Τούρκους καὶ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φιλοφροντεῖς ἐς τὸ Βυζάντιον ἐπᾶνξε. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Χοσρόης ἐπ’ Αἰθιοπίας φίλους ὄντας Ῥωμαίοις, τοὺς πάλαι μὲν Μακροβίους νῦν δὲ Ὀμηρίτας καλουμένους, ἐστράτευσεν (...) “Zémarque traita les Turcs avec magnificence et fut reçu avec les plus grandes marques d’amitié, puis rentra à Byzance. C’est ce qui déterminait Chosroès à conduire une expédition contre les Éthiopiens, alliés des Romains, appelés autrefois Macrobités et maintenant Homérites.” (Theophanes Byzantinus/Henry, p. 78). Haussig must have confused the text of Theophanes with that of Theophylactus whose text really makes mention of the Persian manoeuvres before the account on the Byzantine embassy to the Turks (III, 9, 6), stating that the (failed) Persian attempt to have the returning Byzantine envoys slaughtered by the Alans (see *infra*) was just “another cause” of the war, together with the Persian action in Yemen (Theophylactus/Schreiner, p. 100; Theophylactus/Whitby, p. 85).

⁶¹ Christensen (1944, p. 373); Shahīd (1979; 1995, I/1, pp. 365–367) also pointed out that the “Ethiopians” in question were the local, Ethiopian rulers of South Arabia, while the “Persians” were their local, Himyarite allies. He (Shahīd 1979, p. 25) dates the Persian attack to 572; Pigulewskaja supposes that all these events happened between 570 and 575 (1969, pp. 268–271); cf. also Frye (1983, p. 156); Bosworth (1983, pp. 605–606).

It is, however, more important to understand that silk-trade and any other interaction with the barbarian neighbours both in Inner Asia and the Middle East were part of a broader imperial strategy mostly determined by the Empire's interests and plans against her permanent enemies, the Sasanians.

Zemarchus' Personality

It was Zemarchus, the *magister militum per Orientem*,⁶² who, accompanying Maniakh on his way back, paid honour to Istāmi, the ruler of the western part of the Turkic Empire.⁶³ This choice clearly shows the extreme importance of these new allies for Constantinople. We have only fragmentary and controversial data about Zemarchus' life and personality. He was a Senator, and might also be identical with the Zemarchus who held the title Prefect of Rome (*i.e.* Roma Nova or Constantinople) before 560 and as *comes Orientis* suppressed a revolt in Antioch in 560. In 561 the *comes Orientis* was a certain Gerontius.⁶⁴ By the year 562 he might have been the curator of the Imperial palaces (Stein 1949, p. 799; Cameron–Cameron 1966, p. 9). He was removed from prefecture of the capital in 565 (Greatrex 1997, p. 71). It is not clear, however, exactly when was he sent back to the East. As commander-in-chief he commanded the Byzantine armies against Iran (Pohl 1988, p. 43).⁶⁵ This was one of the most important defence lines of the Empire at that time (Honigman 1935, pp. 3–37; Nyberg 1959; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1976; Liebeschuetz 1977).⁶⁶

As a member of the Senatorian aristocracy and a high-ranking commander of the Roman armies, he must have been (as prescribed by the *Codex Justinianus* I. 5. 12) a strict follower of the Chalcedonian Creed (Leontsini 2004, p. 75). But in this case he would have followed a path originally paved by the Monophysites. We may also assume that he must have some command of Syriac, the most important language of the age along the Byzantine–Persian border. We may also assume that during his prefecture in Constantinople he must have had personal contacts with John of Ephesus, who lived in the capital and had strong connections with the imperial court.

⁶² ὁς τῶν πρὸς ἑὸν πόλεων τήνικα ὕτα ὑπῆρχε στρατηγός, “who was at the time the general in command of the eastern cities” (Menander/Blockley, p. 116; original: p. 117; translation: p. 263).

⁶³ On him as the forefather of the ruling clan of the Western Turks, see Chavannes (1903, p. 47), and Wang (1983).

⁶⁴ The first attempt to identify his personality within the framework of Roman history was made by Grégoire (1907, p. 325); the data were later re-examined by Russu (1970, pp. 415–416), who supposed that our Zemarchus was of Thracian origin and held the title *comes Orientis* between 556 and 561; we accepted the views of Feissel (1986, p. 126).

⁶⁵ In 531, when Belisarius held this position, the Eastern armies consisted of 20 000 warriors (cf. Treadgold 1995, p. 47), so one can assume that Zemarchus must have at least the same or even larger force under his command.

⁶⁶ On the administration of the Prefecture see Kelly (2005).

Description of the Journey

Although the name of the Romans was well known and had a good reputation in Eurasia as far as China,⁶⁷ Zemarchus was the first Roman to penetrate the deserts of Inner Asia so deeply.⁶⁸ According to Menander, they set out on their journey in August 569, and returned a year later.⁶⁹ John of Ephesus maybe mistakenly dates it with the seventh year of the reign of Justin II (571).⁷⁰ Our sources give us quite a detailed description of this journey. According to Menander they had a “journey of many” days (*πολλῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδόν*) (Menander/Blockley, p. 116: original, p. 117: translation) to Sogdiana. John of Ephesus, however, gives a more realistic view, stating that the journey to the Turks took a whole year.⁷¹

According to the description of their itinerary Zemarchus and his companions have not chosen the route via Crimea and the Pontic-Caspian steppes. The influence of the Avars was certainly still strong enough here to make this way unsafe for the Byzantians. Therefore, Byzantine envoys had not made use of it until 576.⁷² It is also a matter of fact that in 571 the Sabirs were still (or again) allies of the Persians against Byzantium. At least between 576 and 579 the Pontic steppes were firmly in the hands of the Turks. The accusations of Turxanthos, the son of Istämi, who alleged that the Romans were deliberately cheating the Turks not showing them the more comfortable ways to their country through the Crimea in order to hide their alliance with the Avars, make this point clear (Menander/Blockley, p. 174: original, p. 175: translation).⁷³ According to some archaeological evidences, this route through the northern slopes of the Caucasus had also direct connections with China (Kovalev 2005, p. 62). As to the allegations of Turxanthos, one may assume that it must have been the Turks who showed the way to their far remote country to the Romans who had never set out to such a journey. The route they followed must have been the same where Maniakh

⁶⁷ On the earlier contacts between the Roman Orient and China see Yule (1882); Chavannes (1904, p. 37); Teggart (1969); Loewe (1971); Thierry – Morisson (1994); Kordosis (1999).

⁶⁸ “(...) cum ad populos hos magnos et potentes legatio Romanorum numquam omnino missa esset.”, *HE* III, p. 244.

⁶⁹ Pigulewskaja (1969, p. 166) speaks about August 568.

⁷⁰ “Iustinus enim rex anno 7^o regni sui ad eosdem qui vocantur Turcii legatos miserat, principum quendam cui nomen Zemarchus (...)” (*HE* III, p. 244).

⁷¹ “Quamobrem, cum post annum unum totum legatus ad regiones ut narrabat pervenisset, (...)” (*HE* III, p. 244; Schönfelder (1862, p. 251).

⁷² In 576 the embassy of Valentinus took the way via Sinope and Cherson, cf. Menander/Blockley (pp. 171, 173), on the philological problems of this passage see *ibid.*, pp. 275–276.

⁷³ Pigulewskaja (1969, p. 152) put forth the possibility that this route, which went north of the Caspian Sea and led through waterless deserts before the 9th century, was not frequently used, but this opinion was eliminated by Haussig, who showed evidences about the usage of this route in Antiquity, cf. Haussig (1979, p. 48); Hannestad (1955–1957, pp. 431–455) argues that there must have been some direct relations between Byzantium, the Hephthalites (and White Huns) and Sogdiana even before the crucial date 568. De la Vaissière (2005, p. 244) argues that Zemarchus and his retinue travelled through the Crimea.

and his companions reached the Roman territory.⁷⁴ This was a path also well-known for the Roman Monophysite missionaries.

On the Name Ektag

The Byzantine envoy met the Western ruler of the Turks at his (perhaps summer) residence “on a mountain called Ektag, or ‘Golden Mountain’ in Greek (ἔω ὄρει τινὶ λεγόμενῳ Ἐκτάγ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι χριστοῦν ὄρος Ἑλλην ἀνήρ)” (Menander/Blockley, p. 118: original, p. 119: translation).

As to the ‘Golden Mountain’ the expressions *Altun yış* (‘Golden Mountain slopes’) in Old Turkic and *Chin-shan* (金山 ‘Golden Mountain’) in Chinese are well-known appellations of the Altai ranges. Klaproth supposed that the Byzantine envoys met Istāmi somewhere in the Altai ranges (Klaproth 1826, p. 117). Later scholarship, however, did not support this idea. Reconstructing the events, Chavannes accepts the emendation originally made by the geographer Vivien de Saint Martin, who supposed that the Greek *Ektag* is a corruption of the original Turkic *Aq tay* (‘White mountain’).⁷⁵ He found evidence in the *Xiyu shuidao ji* (西域水道記 ‘The Waterways of the Western Region’), compiled by the eminent scholar, Xu Song (徐松, 1781–1848),⁷⁶ which refers to a place near the mountain *Eshik bashi* (額什克巴什, *Eshike-bashi*) which the *Suishu* calls *Ajie* (阿羯 EMC ?*a-kiat*) and the Tang-shu *Ajietian* (阿羯田 EMC ?*a-kiat-den*), while the Chinese call it *Boshan* (白山), i.e. the White Mountain(s).⁷⁷ He also quotes the *Suishu* and the *Tangshu* where these names were attested.⁷⁸ Later scholarship usually shared this point of view (Herrmann 1914, p. 55; Cannata 1981, 70).⁷⁹ As to the Sui and Tang data, we can assume that the original form must be *Ajie* (EMC ?*a-kiat*), for the third element in the Tang variant of this toponyme (田 *tian* EMC *den*) means merely ‘(arable) land’ and thus can be a Chinese determinative element here. *Ajie* (EMC ?*a-kiat*) can hardly correspond to an Old

⁷⁴ On Zemarchus’ itinerary, see Klaproth (1826, pp. 117–118); Herrmann (1914, pp. 54–57).

⁷⁵ Chavannes (1903, p. 236), with further bibliographical notes.

⁷⁶ On the author and his work see Hummel (1943, I, pp. 321–322).

⁷⁷ As we have already seen, according to the *Suishu* a certain *Boshan* was also inhabited by the *Tiele* (see *supra*); cf. also “Le volcan de *Pe-chan* (Mont-Blanc) appelé aussi par les Chinois *Hochan* et *Aghil* (Montagne de feu) presque dans les méridiens de Gouldja, qui est situé sur les bordes de l’Ili et la ville de Koutché (Kou-tché) dans le Petite Boukharie, probablement par 42°25’ ou 42°35’ latitude [according to Paris, *the author*]” (Humboldt 1843, pp. 30–31).

⁷⁸ For all these data, see Chavannes (1903, p. 237); and cf. also Blockley’s comment: “A-kie-tien (‘White Mountain’ in Chinese) which is far to the south, by the river Tekes in the Celestine Mountains in Dzungaria” (Menander/Blockley, p. 264, No. 129).

⁷⁹ Sinor cuts short this issue stating that “Unfortunately there is no way to locate with precision the place where he [*i.e.* Zemarchus] had met the Türk ruler, though it is clear that it was somewhere to the east, in the Talas valley” (Sinor 1990, p. 303). As we shall see a part the Byzantine embassy later really visited the Talas valley, but it was not their original meeting point with the Turks.

Turkic *Aq tay* form, but may be a Chinese rendering for an Old Turkic *aq* ‘white’. On the basis of the Tang form one can suppose that it refers to an Old Turkic **Aq yer* ‘White Land’, which would literally correspond to the hybrid variant of the Tang epoch, or to **Aq yiš* ‘White Mountain slopes’.

What later scholarship seems to permanently forget about is that *aq tay* in old and modern Turkic geographical terminology is not a name for a peculiar mountain, but a common geographical denotation for any mountain having permanent snow.⁸⁰ Molchanova also mentions an *Aktuu* (< *Aq tay*) in the Koxsin ranges, and in four other places in the territory of the Gorno-Altai Autonomous District, translating this name as ‘snowy mountain’.⁸¹ It is (in some phonetical variants) also to be found in many places in the toponymy of Eurasia. In contemporary Khakasia we can also find this name as *Ax tay*.⁸² In the territory of what is now Kazakhstan one can find at least three toponyms *Aktau*.⁸³ Humboldt also mentions an *Aktagh* in the Tianshan.⁸⁴ So the *Ektag* or **Aq tay* in the Byzantine text can be identical with any snowy mountain in the region. So we have no need to identify it with any peculiar geographical point. The Greek expression “on a mountain called *Ektag*, or ‘Golden Mountain’ in Greek” simply denotes a snowy peak in a mountain range the name of which was translated into Greek as ‘Golden Mountain’. Hence we do not need to accept the emendation of Chavannes. On the contrary, we can assume that *Istāmi* met *Zemarchus* somewhere in the Altai ranges,⁸⁵ where they were close enough to transfer their headquarters later to Talas.⁸⁶

⁸⁰ “По отношению к орообъектам **ак** имеет значение белый; снежный; высокогорский белок, голый, лишенный растительности, леса (в противоположность **кара**).” Molchanova (1979, p. 19). The local Russian terminology translates it as *белуха*, cf. Sapozhnikov (1949, pp. 98–99) and also Molchanova (1979, pp. 154–156). In the second half of the 19th century there were two ranges called in Russian *Belki Galinskie* (Бѣлки Галинские) and *Belki Korgonskie* (Бѣлки Коргонские) (cf. Podrobnij 1876).

⁸¹ “*Актуу* – белоснежная высокая гора” (Molchanova 1979, p. 127, with detailed topological descriptions).

⁸² “*Ах таг* (...) – название связано с цветом слагарующих пород” (Sunchugashev 2001, p. 15, with detailed topological descriptions).

⁸³ There was originally a fort *Aktavskoe* on the river Manaka in the former Akmolinskaja oblast’, cf. Glinka (1914, p. 34 [12-E], p. 41 [10-Ж]); and there are two cities called *Aktau* in contemporary Kazakhstan.

⁸⁴ “Cette extrémité occidentale [of the Tianshan] porte le nom de *chaîne d’Asferah* ou d’*Aktagh*; c’est le groupe métallifère et anciennement volcanique de *Botom*, *Botm*, ou *Botam* (Mont Blanc) d’Edrisi, le groupe montagneux que les Mémoires du Sultan Baber, les itinéraires de Nazarroff et de Mir Isset Ullah nous ont fait connaître dans un grand détail” (Humboldt 1843, p. 16).

⁸⁵ If there was no other ‘Golden Mountain’ in question, for Sunchugashev (2001, p. 13), mentioning an *Altın tay* (Алтын таг) states: “(...) название, возможно, связано с наличием золота. В настоящее время в этих районах работают золотодобывающие рудники.”

⁸⁶ This was already pointed out by Blockley: “(...) if *Sizabul* were advancing from *Dzungaria* to *Talas* [...] there would be no reason, when he left *Ektag*, to send away those attendants of *Zemarchus* who were not to travel with him against the Persians [...] since they would all be travelling due west. On the other hand, if they were leaving the *Altai*, there would be good reason to send them away” (Menander/Blockley, p. 264, No. 129).

The Country of the Turks in the Report of Zemarchus

According to the report of John of Ephesus, the country of the Turks had eight rulers besides Istāmi.⁸⁷ This coincides with the data preserved in the text of Menander (19.1), according to whom at the death of Istāmi (576) “the ruler of the Turkish people had divided up all the land there into eight parts”.⁸⁸

Before being admitted to the ruler of the Turks, Zemarchus and his retinue must have gone through the famous Shamanistic ritual of purification by fire. “Certain others of their tribe appeared, who, they said, were exorcisers of their ill-omened things, and they came up to Zemarchus and his companions. They took all of the baggage that they were carrying and placed it onto the ground. Then they set fire branches from incensed tree, chanted some barbarous words, in their Schythian tongue, making noise with bells and drums, waved above the frames, and falling into a frenzy and acting like madmen, supposed that they were driving away evil spirits. For in this way some men were thought to be averters of and guardians against evil. When they had chased away the evil beings as they supposed, and had led Zemarchus himself through the fire, they thought that by this means they had purified themselves also” (Menander/Blockley, pp. 118, 119).

At the Court of Silziboulos

Being admitted to his presence, Zemarchus used all his diplomatic skills addressing Istāmi simply “Ruler of so many peoples” (*ᾠτισσοῦτων ἐθνῶν ἡγεμῶν*), while he introduced his own ruler as Emperor (*βασιλεὺς*) (Menander/Blockley, p. 118: original, p. 119: translation). Istāmi accepted the Byzantine envoys on the way of a traditional nomadic ruler. According to our Greek source “He was in a tent, sitting upon a golden throne with two wheels (*ἐπι διτρόχου καθέδρας χρυσοῦς*), which could be drawn when necessary by one horse” (Menander/Blockley, p. 118: original, p. 119: translation; cf. also Goubert 1951, pp. 121–122).

John of Ephesus tells us a very interesting anecdote on the meeting of the Turkic ruler with Zemarchus. When the ruler realised that an embassy of the Emperor of Rome has arrived in his place, he broke out in a deep mourning cry for he and his people had a tradition that such an embassy would be a sign of the coming of the apocalypse.⁸⁹ This story may sound naïve but on the other hand it reflects a

⁸⁷ “ultra quem octo alii magni reges esse dicuntur” (*HE* III, p. 244); “es gab nämlich noch acht andere mächtige Könige weiter drinnen von ihm” (Schönfelder 1862, p. 251).

⁸⁸ ἐν ὀκτῶ γὰρ μοίραις διεδάσαντο τὰ ἐκείνη ἅπαντα, οἷς γε τοῦ φύλου τῶν Τούρκων ἔλαχε προεστάναι (Menander/Blockley, pp. 172, 173).

⁸⁹ “Quamobrem, cum post annum unum totum legatos ad regiones ut narrabat pervenisset, rex quidam horum ipsorum populorum (ultra quem octo alii magni reges esse dicuntur) legationem Romanorum ad eos missam esse didicisset, stupuit statim et et commotus est, et ad maerorum gravem et fletum acerbam se subito convertit ; et *id* magis cum legatos recepisset eosque diu ante se

very deep political and apocalyptic tradition of the Middle East and the Buddhist world, *i.e.* the tradition of the Four Empires of the world. According to the Middle Iranian version of this tradition, as it was preserved in the *Fārsnāma*, these four rulers were the Emperors of Rome, Iran, the Turks (or later the King of the Khazars), and China.⁹⁰

Istāmi granted two other audiences to the Byzantines. All of them took place in different dwellings, equally well-furnished with silk, gold, and silver (Menander/Blockley, pp. 120, 121). The Greek expressions denoting these three dwellings (Menander/Blockley, pp. 118, 120), *i.e.*: ἔνδον σκηνῆς ('inside of a tent'), καλύβη ('in a tent or hut'), διαίτη ('in a dwelling') gives us an impression of a typical nomadic ruler, still living in tents and some mobile dwellings. What is also worth mentioning that amongst the assets of the Turkic ruler there were different statues (Menander/Blockley, pp. 120, 121). Such statues are usually unknown in Shamanism but are very typical in Buddhism. Buddhism, later rejected by the second Turkic Empire was at the highest point of its influence at that time amongst the Eastern Turks (Chavannes 1905; Gabain 1954; Klimkeit 1990).

It also aroused the Byzantine envoy's attention (Menander/Blockley, pp. 120, 121) that during the luxurious receptions the Turks "drank their fill another barbarous kind of sweet wine (βαρβαρικοῦ [...] γλεύκους)". Blockley (Menander/Blockley, p. 264) seems to be right that it could hardly be the famous kumiss, which is sour, but rather some Chinese or Chinese-type sweet rice-wine. It is also a clear sign of a Chinese influence on Istāmi's court manners. We have some evidence that in Central Asia grape wine existed long before that time (Lewis 1966, p. 478).

stantes vidisset, hominibus cum eo loqui non audentibus. «Quamobrem, cum eum ita ita fletu adflicti alii narrent, nec quisquam e primoribus eius cum eo loqui auderet, prona ante cum procubimus, et interpretibus mandavimus ut ei dicerent: 'Te rogamus, rex, quia nos vidisti qui a fratre tuo rege Romanorum ad te missi sumus, ita fles?' Qui cum audivisset rursus fletu magis diu adflictatus est, nec usque ad duas horas verbum omnino nobiscum locutus est. Et deinde ipse singultibus paulum remissis ad nos dixit: 'Ut maeroris et fletus mei pesentis causam sciatis, iam dico vobis, nos a generationibus et a generibus hanc traditionem accepisse, «Quando legatos de terra Romanorum in his regionibus videbitis, scitote et vobis certum est fore ut mundus totus transeat et dissolvatur, et regna omnia desinant, et statim his ipsis temporibus omnes homines se invicem caede perdant». 'Et ergo nunc, cum vos vidissem et haec in memoriam revocassem, propter hoc maerui et flevi'» (HE III, pp. 244–245; Schönfelder 1862, pp. 251–252).

در جمله آیین بارگاه انوشیروان بود کی از دست راست تخت او کرسی زر نهاده بود و از دست چپ و پس همچنین کرسیهای زر نهاده بود و ازین سه کرسی یکی جای ملک صین بودی و دیگری جای ملک روم بودی و سه دیگر جای ملک خزر بودی کی چون ببارگاه او آمدندی برین کرسی نشستندی و همه سال این «It was one of the rites of the court of Anūšīrvān that he let set up a golden chair on the right side of this throne, and on the left side and on the back of it he let to set up similar golden chairs. And one of these places was for the ruler of China (*malik-i Šīn*), and the other place was for the ruler of Rome (*malik-i Rūm*), the third place was for the ruler of the Khazars (*malik-i Ĥazar*). Should they happen to come to his court, they would sit onto these chairs. He set up these three chairs in every year and never removed them. And no one dared to seat onto them except of these three persons" (our translation). Cf. Balhī/Le Strange–Nicholson (p. 97); Golden (2007, p. 162); for an older Buddhist variant, see Pelliot (1923); de la Vaissière (2006).

The four golden peacocks (*ταῶνες χρυσοὶ τέτταρες*) supporting the golden couch of Istämi also show a clear foreign, mostly Indo-Iranian influence, widely spread along the Silk Route even before the coming of the Turks (Nair 1974; Litvinskij–Solov’ev 1985, pp. 14–15, fig. 14; Marshak 2001).

In order to join the Turkic campaign against the Persians, Zemarchus followed the ruler to Talas, which might have been his winter residence. However, things took a different turn.

While in Talas Istämi received another embassy, that of the Persian King. During the negotiations and the reception Istämi expressed his disfavour towards them. They were seated to a place lower than the place of the Byzantine envoys and they must have endured all the reproaches of the Turkic ruler. Finally they could not stand it and “they vehemently argued back and refuted Sizabul’s accusations” (Menander/Blockley, pp. 122, 123). With it all the negotiations came to an end, and Istämi finally turned back to his former allies.

John of Ephesus gives us some details of the Persian envoys’ arguments. According to his account, the Persian party based his arguments on the apanage-policy of East Roman court. Refuting the allegations of the Persian envoys that the Romans were their slaves paying tribute to their rulers, the Romans evoked the memory of Traianus, who not only conquered Mesopotamia (where Ktesiphon, the capital city of Persia was situated at that time), but ordered his statue to be erected and worshipped there (*HE III*, p. 233, pp. 246–247; Schönfelder 1862, pp. 252–253).

On the Way Back

We have no information about the return of this embassy in the narrative of John of Ephesus. He simply states that Zemarchus and his companions returned after two years.⁹¹ We have, however, a more detailed account of it in the text of Menander the Guardsman.

Without engaging in military activities, Zemarchus left the camp for the “first city of *Kholiatai*”. Here, asking permission from their suzerain Istämi, the representatives of the local leaders tried to join the Roman embassy, but eventually this favour was granted only to the representative of the ruler of the *Kholiatai*.

Since Maniakh died in the meantime, Zemarchus was accompanied home by a new Turkic ambassador who held the title *Tayma tarxan*. The son of Maniach, who was very young at that time, was also a member of the new Turkic embassy and he ranked immediately after the leader (Menander/Blockley, pp. 122, 123; Sinor 1990, pp. 303–304).

⁹¹ “Legati vero Romanorum post annos duo reversi de multitudine horum populorum, et de mirabilitate harum regionum, et de institutis eorum et morum eorum probitate magna ac mirabilia narrabant” (*HE III*, p. 246; Schönfelder 1862, p. 25).

The *Kholiatai*

We have no valid explanation of the name of this city of the *Kholiatai*. Our source has three spellings of this name (all in *pl. gen.*): *Χολιατῶν* (10,3) (Menander/Blockley, p. 120), *Χοαλιτῶν* (10,3) (Menander/Blockley, p. 122), and *Χλιατῶν* (10,4) (Menander/Blockley, p. 124). In terms of form, *Kholiatai* must be a Hellenised ethnonym. What we do know about them is that they had a city, some fortresses,⁹² and lived in the vicinity of an enormous lake. They were also a kind of “well distinguished vassals” of the Turks (Minorsky 1940–1942, p. 427). Their envoys joined the Roman embassy passing through the river *Oekh* (Ὠχ),⁹³ which was not a long distance from that large lake. This corresponds to the further itinerary of our travellers, who followed the way across the Emba, Ural, and Volga rivers (*Ikh*, *Daikh*, and *Attilas*, respectively).⁹⁴

It was P. Lerch who first attempted in 1873 to identify country of the *Kholiatai* with Khorazm (Lerch 1873, pp. 24–25; Veselovski 1877, p. 19). Later scholarship, although not without doubts, usually shared this opinion (Bartol’d 1965, pp. 37–38).⁹⁵ Khorezm was a sedentary civilisation with a city and fortresses. Based on the Amu Darya river (*Oxus* in Classical Greek, *Oxius* according to Ammian), it had access to two enormous lakes (Lake Aral and the Caspian Sea) in its vicinity,⁹⁶ and was

⁹² “Leaving the first city of the Kholiatai they travelled through fortresses” (καὶ δὴ καταλειπότες τὴν πρωτεύουσαν πόλιν τῶν Χοαλιτῶν διὰ φροθρίων ἐπορεύοντο) (Menander/Blockley, p. 122: original, p. 123: translation).

⁹³ Some authors, hold it for the Amu Darya, just like Lerch (1873); others say it is maybe a corrupted form for Iaxartes, the Greek name of the Syr Darya, cf. Alemany (2000, p. 183).

⁹⁴ For these identifications see Klaproth (1826, p. 117); Chavannes (1903, p. 238); Bartol’d (1965, p. 37); Hermann (1914, p. 56); Alemany (2000, p. 183).

⁹⁵ For a German version see Barthold (1910, pp. 19–20); see also Hermann (1914, p. 56); Pigulewskaja (1969, p. 167).

⁹⁶ Maybe the Lake Aral, as it was thought already by Humboldt (1843, II. p.147); cf. also Bartol’d (1965, pp. 37–38); Herrmann (1914, p. 56): “Es ist bereits [...] als von dem See des Ammianus Marcellinus, der *Oxia palus longe lateque diffusa*, die Rede war, darauf hingewiesen, daß ebenso wie dies Bezeichnung auch die *λίμνη ἢ ἄπλετον ἐκείνη καὶ εὐρεῖα* des Zemarchos anscheinend auf die altiranische Form *Vuru-kascha*, d.h. „weitufig“, zurückgeht; im *Awesta* soll damit der Aralsee bezeichnet sein.”; Alemany (2000, p. 183); Blockley otherwise states that: “All attempts are vitiated by two factors: the physical geography of Central Asia, including the direction of flow of the Jaxartes (Syr Darya) and the Oxus (Amu Darya) and the extent of both Lake Aral and Caspian Sea, has changed drastically and repeatedly since antiquity; second, neither Menander’s river Oekh nor his *τὴν λίμνην τὴν ἄπλετον ἐκείνην καὶ εὐρεῖαν* can be identified with certainty. [...] In fact Oekh could be any river west of Talas, whether now existing or not (many ancient rivers of the region have disappeared) and it need not to be major one since it is not noted as a landmark of the journey but merely as the river across which the leader of the Kholiatai joined up with (or caught up with) the Romans. As for the ‘enormous, wide lake’, the majority, perhaps influenced by Ammianus, who mentions the Aral in terms similar to those used by Menander (23, 6, 59: *Oxiam nomine ... late longeque diffusam* [*λίμνη* of course, can be either lake or marsh]), have identified it as Lake Aral. Whether or not what Zemarchus saw was the Aral, the use of *τὴν* before *λίμνην* and the omission of the name suggests strongly to me that what he thought he saw (or what he actually saw) was the Caspian, which to a Greek reader, who would know little or nothing about the Aral, was *the* ‘enormous, wide lake’ of the area. If what Zemarchus saw was the Aral, then it would have

surrounded by deserts mentioned in our account. Fortified complexes and citadels (*kala/gala* < Ar. *qaḥ* ‘fortress, citadel’) were and even now are in their ruins dominant parts of the landscape.⁹⁷ Hence, we have every reason to suppose that the city of the *Kholiat* was that of Khorezm. This region had close commercial ties to the Volga region, where the Byzantine envoys must have proceeded on their way back to the empire (Kovalev 2005, pp. 63–73).

There are some other identifications of this ethnonym. Some tried to identify the name of the *Kholiat* with the *Khallukh*,⁹⁸ which is a well-known Arabic spelling of the Turkic ethnonym *Qarluq* and might be a contaminated form of the ethnonym *Khalaj*,⁹⁹ a still extant ethnic group the members of which are allegedly Turkicised descendants of the Hephthalites.¹⁰⁰ In the *Appendix* of Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor they are mentioned as *k.w.l.s*, a form reconstructed by Moravcsik and later Czeglédý as *xwalis* (KWLIS in Pseudo-Zacharias/Brooks II, p. 145; Czeglédý 1971, p. 137). A later Byzantine source, the *Notitia Episcopatum* (733–746) shows a form *Khoualês* (Χουάλης), as the name of one of the suffragan dioceses of the Gothic Eparchy of Doros (de Boor 1891, p. 531). Analysing this name, Vasiliev, citing the views of older Russian and Hungarian scholars, supposes that this name must be connected with *Khvalisskoe more* and *Khvalinskoe more*, the Old Russian names of the Caspian Sea. He also connects this name with the name of the Khorezmian vassals of the Kings of Hungary, preserved in the work of Cinnamus, as *Khalis* (Χαλισίων, Χαλισίονς) (Vasiliev 1936, pp. 97, 99–100; Moravcsik 1984, pp. 202, 234).¹⁰¹ The stem **Kholi-* may very well be identical with the early Medieval *Káliz*, the Hungarian name of the Khorezmians in Hungary.¹⁰² Hungarian diplomatic sources are frequently mentioning Khorezmians “who in Hungarian are called *káliz*”.¹⁰³ They were also mentioned as *Koaliz*, and also the toponyma like *Kálóz*, *Kálóc*, and *Kalász* must be connected

seemed to be a gulf of the Caspian (which travellers have often thought it to be, and indeed which at times has virtually been when it has overflowed to the north of the plateau of Ust-urt into the Caspians), otherwise a second enormous lake must have been noticed and recorded. At any rate, whatever the body of water mentioned, the recording of only one suggests that Zemarchus travelled north of the Aral” (Menander/Blockley, pp. 265–266, No. 140).

⁹⁷ On Khorazm at that age in general *vd.*: Altman (1947); Tolstov (1948a, 1948b); Gulyamov (1957, pp. 114–124); Rapoport–Nerazik (1984); Nerazik–Bulgakov (1996).

⁹⁸ As was supposed by Blockley (Menander/Blockley, pp. 263, 264–265), who derived his data from the outdated-when-appeared monography of Cahun (1896, pp. 112–113).

⁹⁹ On the connection between the Hephthalites and the Khalaj see Ḥwārizmī: *Mafāṭīḥ al-culūm*: الهَيَاظِلَةُ جَيْلٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ كَانَتْ لَهُمْ شَوْكَةٌ وَكَانَتْ لَهُمْ بِلَادٌ طَخَارِسْتَانَ وَأَتْرَاكَ خَلْجٍ وَكَنْجِينَةَ مِنْ بَقَايَاهُمْ “The Hayāṭila [Hephthalites] a nation which once had strength and had the country Toḥāristān. The Turks of Halaj and Kanjīna are their remnants” (al-Ḥwārizmī/van Vloten 1895, p. 119 [= ١١٩]).

¹⁰⁰ As was supposed originally by Marquart (1901, p. 253) later accepted by Hermann (1914, p. 55); and also by Harmatta (2001, pp. 92–93, 97); but also held for dubious by Minorsky (1940–1942, p. 428); cf. also Dani–Litvinsky–Zamir Safi (1996, p. 181).

¹⁰¹ Moravcsik’s text and translation was based on the edition Cinnamus/Meineke.

¹⁰² Györffy (1977, pp. 274, 334, 335, 355); Gyóni (1938, pp. 86–92, 159–171) who argued that they originally must be Jews; Göckenjan (1972, pp. 44–48); Berend (2001, pp. 66, 113, 161); Szűcs (2008, pp. 1401–1405).

¹⁰³ “*quos hungarice caliz vocant*” (from Nitra county, now in Slovakia, from the year 1111), Szűcs (2008, p. 1401), originally: Fejérpataky (1892, pp. 42–43).

with this population (Szűcs 2008, p. 1401). According to Harmatta (1997, p. 79) the original form of this name could be (an Alanian) *khvāli(n)s*, which is an obvious parallel to the form preserved in the Arabic sources. Along with other Chinese data like *Huanqian* 驩潛 (6th century, Pelliot: *χuan-dz'jäm* < **χwārzäm*), Pelliot (1937, pp. 148–149) cites a transcription of the name of this region in Xuanzang as *Huoliximi-qie* 貨利習彌伽 (Pelliot: *χua-lji-zjap-mjie-g'ia* < **χwārizmiga*) and *Huoliximi* in the *Xin Tangshu*.

From the Caspian to the Caucasian Lands

In the land of the *Kholiatai* Zemarchus rested for three days. He also sent off a certain George with a letter informing the Emperor that the embassy was returning from the Turks. Menander also informs us (Menander/Blockley, pp. 124, 125) that “George set off for Byzantium with twelve Turks by a route that was waterless and wholly desert, but shorter (τῆς [...] ὁδοῦ ἀνύδρου τε μάλα οὐσας καὶ πάντη ἐρήμιον, ὅμως δ' οὖν ἐπιτομωτέρας).” Though grammatically easily understandable, the geographic interpretation of this sentence yields special difficulties. Since in the next passage we read: “Zemarchus travelled along the sandy shore for twelve days and when he had skirted some difficult terrain came to the river Ikh, then to the Daikh and, passing some other lakes, to the Attila.”¹⁰⁴ Comparing these passages we are faced with a series of geographical difficulties. Two of these three hydronyms are to be easily identified. Daikh (Δαῖχ) is certainly *Yayïq*, the old Turkic name of the river Ural, while *Attila(s)* (Ἀτίλαν) must be identical with *Ätil*, i.e. the Volga. Henceforth we can suppose, that the translation of Blockley “passing some other lakes (there)” (διὰ λιμνῶν ἑτερων αὐθις) should be emended as “passing some marshlands”, regarding the Volga-delta. The Greek text allows us to make such a correction without any further grammatical explanation. We can also accept that Ikh (Ἰχ) could be identical with the Emba, as it has been already supposed by other authors. Notwithstanding, all these facts are in clear contradiction of what our source tells us about the route of Georgios. Wherever the country of the *Kholiatai* should be, definitely there was no route to Byzantium through any deserts. Georgios and his retinue must have passed the same rivers that were mentioned by our author regarding the itinerary of Zemarchus from the land of the *Kholiatai* to Byzantium. They could not leave Zemarchus' way before passing these rivers, especially the Volga Delta. So we can well assume that their mission was not only to get to Byzantium faster than Zemarchus could reach the city, but also to carry out a kind of military intelligence on the lands that could be deserts in Byzantine eyes, i.e. the Ponto-Caspian steppes and therefore seek a conjunction route between the Lower Volga Region and the Crimea.

¹⁰⁴ ὁ δὲ Ζήμαρχος κατὰ δὴ τὸ ψαμαθῶδες τῆς λίμνης παροδεύων ἐπὶ ἡμέρας δέκα καὶ δύο δυσβάτους τέ τινας χώρους παραμεινόμενος ἐγένετο κατὰ τὰ ῥεῖθρα τοῦ Ἰχ, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸν Δαῖχ, καὶ διὰ λιμνῶν ἑτερων αὐθις ἐς τὸν Ἀτίλαν (Menander/Blockley, pp. 124, 125).

As to Zemarchus' further itinerary, we can begin our investigations with another emendation: Our source states, that he "travelled along the sandy shore (*ψαμαθῶδες τῆς λίμνης παροδεύων*)" before he reached the three great rivers we have mentioned above. For geographical reasons we can suppose that this journey must have been carried out before that, for there are no sandy shores between the Lake Aral and the Caspian Sea.¹⁰⁵

The story of the further journey of the embassy is so confused geographically that it needs a special reconstruction. So first we shall cite the text then make our explanation.

"Then they came to the Ugurs, who told them that in a wooded area by the river Kophen four thousand Persians were waiting in ambush to take them prisoner as they passed. Therefore the leader of the Ugurs, who maintained Sizalbul's authority there, filled skins with water and gave them to Zemarchus and his companions so that they might have something to drink while they crossed the desert (*διὰ τῆς ἀνύδρου ἰόντες*). They came upon a lake and when they passed this great body of water, they reached those lakes into which the river Kophen empties (*εὗρον δὲ καὶ λίμνην, καὶ παραμειψάμενοι τὸ μέγα τοῦτο ὑδροστάσιον ἀφίκοντο ἐς ἐκείνας τὰς λίμνας, ἐν αἷς ἐπιμυγνύμενος ἀπολλονται ὁ Κωφὴν ποταμός*). From this place they sent forward scouts to see if the Persians were really lying in wait for them. They searched out the area thoroughly and reported that they could see no one. Nevertheless, they proceeded with great trepidation to the land of the Alans, because they greatly feared the tribe of the Oromuski." (Menander/Blockley, pp. 124, 125)¹⁰⁶

"Lake" (*λίμνη*) and "desert" (*ἀνύδρος*) are the two key words of this part of the text. As to the desert we can assume that it merely stands for what is nowadays called "steppe", for there are no real desert lands in this area. The frequent use of the term "lake" is much more deceiving. Lakes are often mentioned in the text, but the region has none. The Caspian Sea, which in geographical terms is really a lake, has always been held for a sea and the classical Greek geographical writers assumed that it should have a connection with the Ocean.¹⁰⁷ Kophen is usually held for the Kābul river

¹⁰⁵ As it was stated by Barthold earlier: "Однако при последнем объяснении [Kholiatai = Khorazm] остается непонятным целый ряд подробностей рассказа, именно слова о продолжительности странствования от берегов реки до озера; о двенадцати днях пути вдоль берегов последнего; о песчаном характере этих берегов, (как известно, такой характер имеет только восточный берег Арала)" (Bartol'd 1965, p. 38).

¹⁰⁶ On the region cf. also: Alemany (2000, pp. 183–184); Arzhantseva (2007, pp. 59–61).

¹⁰⁷ So in the *Geography* of Strabo e.g. we read: "[...] and then on the north by the Ocean as far as the mouth of the Caspian sea [...] (*ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἄρκτων τῷ Ὠκεανῷ μέχρι τοῦ στόματος τῆς Κασπίας θαλάττης*)" (11.1.5) or: "[...] both the Caspian and Colchian [Black] Sea (*ἐκάτερα θαλάττης τῆς τε Κασπίας καὶ τῆς Κολχικῆς*)" (11. 1. 6), Strabo/Jones (V, pp. 186, 187).

in Afganistan,¹⁰⁸ in this context most commentaries identify it with the Kuma river in Southern Russia (Menander/Blockley, p. 266). So we may assume that the “lake” mentioned here is merely the small bay of the Caspian Sea into which the Kuma really empties.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless it becomes clear from this text that the Byzantine embassy travelled along the Caspian shores. What still remains unclear is why does not the Byzantine author name this body of water known for a long time to them.

Then the text continues with their experiences in the land of the Alans:

“When they came to the land of the Alans and wished, together with the Turks who were with them, to be granted an audience with their ruler Sarosius, he gladly received Zemarchus and his companions but refused to admit the Turkish envoys until they had disarmed.¹¹⁰ They argued about this for three days until Zemarchus acted as referee in the dispute. Finally, the Turks laid down their weapons, as Sarosius wished, when they came before him. Sarosius advised Zemarchus and his companions not to take the road through the land of the Miusimians because the Persians were lying in wait for them in Suania; it would be better for them to make a detour home by the road called Dareine. When learned this, Zemarchus sent ten porters carrying silk through Miusimia to deceive the Persians into thinking that the silk had been sent ahead and was travelling first along the road, so they would assume that he would appear on the next day, when the porters had left, Zemarchus travelled through Dareine to the land of the Apsilii, leaving Miusimia, where the Persians were thought to be lying in ambush, behind on the left.¹¹¹ Zemarchus reached Rogatorium, then

¹⁰⁸ Strabo [*Kophes*] 15.1.26, 15.1.27; Strabo/Jones (VII, pp. 44, 45, 45, 47); Arrianus: *Historia Indica* [*Κωφήν*], I. 1: *Τὰ ἔξω Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ πρὸς ἑσπέρην ἔστε ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Κωφήνα Ἀστακηνοὶ καὶ Ἀσσηνοὶ, ἔθνη Ἰνδικά, ἐποικέουσιν.* Arrianus/Roos–Wirth (II, p. 1); “All the territory that lies beyond the boundary of the river Indus westwards to the river Cophen [Kabul] is inhabited by Astaceni and Assaceni, Indian tribes;” Arrianus/Brunt (II, pp. 306, 307); I. 8: *Τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀκίστα πρὸς ἑσπέρην ἔστε ἐπὶ τὸν Κωφήνα* Arrianus/Roos–Wirth (II, p. 2); These then are inhabited places beyond the Indus west to the river Cophen”, Arrianus/Brunt (II, pp. 308, 309); IV. 11: *Κωφήν δὲ ἐν Πευκελαίτιδι, ἅμα οἱ ἄγων Μαλάμαντόν τε καὶ Σοάστον, καὶ Γαροίαν, ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς τὸν Ἰνδόν,* Arrianus/Roos–Wirth, 7; “The Cophen [Kabul] is in Peucelaitis, carrying along with it the Malamantus, Soastus [Swat], and the Garoeas [Panjkora], empties into the Indus”, Arrianus/Brunt (II, pp. 314, 315, 316, 317); Tam (1966, p. 471).

¹⁰⁹ Maybe this is a contamination of a name of the *port of Kōphas (Ras Koppah)* on the Indian sea route mentioned by Arrianus: *Historia Indica*, XXVII, 4: *ἐνθὲνδε ἀμφὶ μέσας νύκτας ἄραντες ἐς Κώφανα λιμένα ἀπίκοντο, τετρακοσίους μάλιστα σταδίου διεκπλώσαντες* (Arrianus/Roos–Wirth II, p. 48); “Thence starting out about midnight they reached a harbour, Cophas, after a voyage of about 400 stades;” (Arrianus/Brunt, pp. 384, 385, 386, 387).

¹¹⁰ According to John of Epiphania (fr. 2; Müller: *FHG*, IV, p. 274), the Persians wanted to bribe the Alans to kill Zemarchus, cf. Menander/Blockley (p. 266).

¹¹¹ “Agathias (3,15,8) puts the Miusimians (whom he calls Misimians) to the north-east of the Apsilii, who were themselves just to the north of the river Phasis (Procopius: *Wars*, 8, 2, 32–33). Dareine was the Pass of the Alan (Dar-i-Alan) through the Caucasus into Apsilia (Tomaschek: *RE* IV, 2, col. 2182f.), and Rogatorium would have been a town or fort to the south Kissling: *RE* IA, 1, col. 1000f.). Where Zemarchus picked up the first ship is not clear; the port of Dioscurias was to the north of Apsilia. It is quite remarkable, that Zemarchus should have been considered returning via Suania, given its uncertain status at the time of his departure (*Fr.* 9).” Menander/Blockley (pp.

came to the Black Sea, where he took ship to the river Phasis,¹¹² and took another ship to Trapezus.” Later we can learn that “He took the public post (*δημοσίῳ ἵππῳ*) to Byzantium, came before the Emperor and told him everything” (Menander/Blockley, pp. 126, 127).

The Evidence of the Name of the *Khirkhiz*

The language(s) of communication used by Zemarchus and his followers is another important issue. Some scholars are probably correct to insist that they must have used some Iranian tongue. Iranian languages played an important role in the Altaic world. As mentioned above, the language of the first inscription made for the Turks was Sogdian. Harmatta supposed that even the throne names of the founders of the Turkic Empire were Iranian (Harmatta 1999, p. 396). On the other hand, we have evidences that Old Turkic dialects must also have played an important role in this business.

How can we evaluate Zemarchus’ report that, when in Talas Istāmi presented him “a female slave, a war-captive from the people called *Kherkhir*” (Menander/Blockley, pp. 120, 121) (*τὸν δὲ Ζήναρχον καὶ θεραπαινὴν ἐτίμησε δοριαλώτῳ· ἢ δὲ ἦν ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων Χερχίρ*)? Most scholars identify this ethnonym as *Khirkhiz*.¹¹³ This was the self-identification of the so-called *Yenisey Khirghiz* living far north of the Old Turks. Many scholars, including Moravcsik, tried to emend this form and read *Kherkhis* but this contradicts the evidence of the manuscripts.

It is Pulleyblank (1990b, pp. 99, 101–107) who tried to explain this form as a proof of a very late change from *-r* to *-z*, a well-known feature of the Turkic languages and maybe of the whole Altaic area. Without consulting the original text, he intended to demonstrate that this change from *-r* to *-z* could not have taken place before 700 CE. Of course, this was not the case. Pulleyblank was right in quoting all the late Chinese names of this people. The names *Gekun* (隔 [鬲] 昆 EMC *kɛʹjk-kwən*), *Jiankun* (鑿 昆 EMC *ken-kwən*), *Qigu* (契 骨 EMC *kʰet-kwət*), *Hegu* (紇 骨 EMC *ɣət-kwət*),¹¹⁴ as well as later forms such as *Jiegu* (結 骨 EMC *ket-kwət*),¹¹⁵ which had been in use until the 8th century, represent a Middle Chinese ending in *-n*, or *-t* which can hardly represent any *-z* in *coda*.

266–267); Apsilia and the Mi(u)simians from the end of the 4th century belonged to the rulers of Lazike, cf. Lomouri (1988, pp. 113–140); Fänrich (2010, pp. 120, 150).

¹¹² Phasis is mentioned in the *Periēgēsis/Periplus Ponti Euxini* of Arrianus, 8.1: *ἐνθένδε ἐκ τὸν Φάσιν εἰσπλεύσαμεν ἐνενήκοντα εἰς τὸν Μώγρον διέχοντα, ποταμῶν ὧν ἐγὼ ἔργων κορυφώτατον ὕδωρ παρεχόμενον καὶ τὴν χροιάν μάλιστα ἐξῆλλαγμένον.*; Arrianus/Roos – Wirth II, p. 109; “Ensuite nous pénétrâmes dans la Phase, distant du Mōgros de 9 stades et offrant, des fleuves que je connais, l’eau la plus légère et pol la couleur, la plus singulière” (Arrianus/Silbermann, p. 6).

¹¹³ As was already done by Klapproth (1826, p. 117) who read it as *Kherkhis* or *Khirkiz*.

¹¹⁴ Also mentioned by the *Suishu* as one of the *Tiele* tribes (see above); cf. also Potapov (1966).

¹¹⁵ Originally reconstructed as *Kirkis* by Hirth (1886, p. 221).

On Rhotacism and Zetacism

This issue is also closely connected with rhotacism and zetacism, the key issues of the Altaic theory. There are too many contradictions about the explanation of this well-known feature. Controversion lies mostly in theoretical approaches, not in the facts themselves.¹¹⁶ Supporters of genetic Altaic theory hold *-r/-l* for primary to a secondary *-z/š* of the so-called “common” Turkic languages and dialects. Those scholars, who do not support genetic Altaic theory, usually do not share this opinion. They stand for a primary *-z/š* as opposite of a secondary *-r/-l* (Tekin (1979; 1984)).¹¹⁷ Even those like Ramstedt (1922, pp. 26–30), who fully supported the Altaic theory, did not date this split to a time later than between AD 400 and 600. Poppe supposed that Chuvash (and the *lir*-Turkic languages at all) must have a special position within a hypothetical Altaic family of languages (Poppe 1965, pp. 146–148). Ligeti (1960), criticising Poppe’s evaluation of the Altaic loan words in Hungarian (Poppe 1960, pp. 139–147), originally supposed that the changes *-r > -z* (and *-l > -š*) could not take place after the establishment of the Empire of the Turks. Later, he supported (1975, pp. 100–102) the theory of the primacy of *-z* to *-r*. These Chinese data are highly informative with regard to the history of the Turkic peoples and languages of Eurasia. The people surrounding Zemarchus (and also Khorezm) were, according to the Chinese chronicle *Suishu*, a part of the large Tiele confederation. We also know that the Byzantine embassy could cross the Kuma (*Kophen*) river with the help of “the leader of the *Ugurs*, who maintained Sizabul’s authority there” (Menander/Blockley, p. 125). Of course, these people were also of *Tiele* descent, speaking, like the peoples of the Pontic steppes, a kind of *lir*-Turkic.

Explanation of Our Data

Pulleyblank missed two points. (1) The Old Khirghiz were not a Turkic-speaking people until they were subjugated by the Old Turks, and (2) they had no immediate contacts with the Chinese until their conquest of Inner Asia at 840 (Drompp 2002, pp. 480–481). All these data refer to their brokers to the Chinese, i.e. people of *Xianbi* (that means Proto-Mongolian) origin. So all these data must refer to the language of peoples who acted as go-betweens for them with the Chinese. Since they were Proto-Mongolian, these data can be considered the Proto-Mongolian rendering of the name of a (still) non-Altaic speaking people (Boodberg 1936a; 1936b; 1939, pp. 230–232;

¹¹⁶ “Somit ist diese an sich linguistisch-philologische Frage zu einer »theologischen« Frage geworden.” Pritsak (1964, p. 338); on the other hand, he saw a grammatical case in this question.

¹¹⁷ Şçerbak (1987) also accepted his criticism, supposing that both Zetacism and Rhotacism came to exist from a weakening of an original *-s* after the original long vowels; and in Turkey, Hasan Eren also stood for Rhotacism and Lambdacism, i.e. the primacy of *-z/-š* as opposed to a Chuvashian *-r/-l*, cf. Eren (1999). The latest companion to Altaic philology tries to provide its readers with a simple and superficial mention of this question, see Rachewiltz–Rybatzki (2010, p. 5).

Ligeti 1970; Golden 1992, pp. 73–74). They were conquered by the Turks in 560 (Drompp 2002, p. 481).

Pelliot, criticising an older reconstruction of Marquart, supposes that all the Chinese data represent an original **qirqun* and **qirqud* form (Marquart 1914, pp. 67–68; Pelliot 1920, p. 137), with an Altaic or rather Proto-Mongolian singular ending *-n* and its plural form in *-d* (reflected in Old Turkic as *-t*) (Sinor 1952, pp. 208–209; Erdal 2004, p. 158).

Pelliot also argues that during the Han period, at the beginning of the Common Era, the Chinese, losing their original final *-r*, began to substitute this sound with *-n* in *coda* (Pelliot 1934, pp. 31–32; 1937, p. 147; Wang 1944, p. 86; Doerfer: *TMEN* II, p. 283). Later, in the Tang period, when a weakening *-d* or rather *-δ* stood for for the original final dentals, the Chinese made use of this sound to render a foreign *-r coda* (Pelliot 1934, p. 33; see also Csongor 1952, p. 92; 1960, pp. 119, 135–136; Doerfer: *TMEN* II, p. 283), whereas this Chinese final sound was substituted with *-r* by the Tibetans and the Old Turkic speaking peoples.¹¹⁸ This means that our Byzantine form with its final *-r* can hardly be connected directly with these Chinese glosses, which represent an original Proto-Mongolian (or Proto-Altaic) singular and plural form of the ethnonym **Qirqun/*Qirqud*.

Explaining these data we should also mention another feature. The word for foot in Chuvash is *ura* (spelt *ypa* in Cyrillic script), which, of course, must correspond to an Old-Turkic *adaq* (> Middle Turkic *ađaq/azaq*, which have been preserved also in Bashkirian and in some Siberian dialects) (Egorov 1964, p. 275; Fedotov 1996, II, p. 283; *ĖSTJA* I, pp. 103–104). One could also mention the Old Turkic *bugday* ‘wheat’ and Chuvash *pări* (spelt in Cyrillic *năpu*) ‘German wheat, spelt’ (*ĖSTJA* II, p. 234).¹¹⁹ This shows the well-known feature of the changes of Turkic *-d-* into *-z-* (> *-y-*) and *-r-*.¹²⁰ One could also mention Hu. *karó* ‘stake’ (< **qariy* < *qadiy*, cf. Kom. Soj. Tob. *qadiq* ‘Nagel’ (Radloff: *Wb*, II, p. 322) ~ Mongol *qadiyasun/xadayasun* ‘nail, peg, spike’ (Lessing 1960, p. 902) ~ Common Turkic *qaziq* (K. Palló 1959, pp. 245, 250).

We can see similar development in some word finals. E.g. one could mention Old Turkic *tod-* (< *to-*) ‘to be full, satiated’ (Clauson: *ED*, p. 451), Middle and Modern Turkic *toy-/doy-* ‘*id.*’, Altai, Teleut *toy-* ‘satt werden’ (Radloff: *Wb*, III, p. 114); Sagai, Koibal *tos-* ‘*id.*’ (Radloff: *Wb*, III, p. 120); which K. Palló has already compared with Chuvashian *tăran-* ‘to eat (or drink) full, get satisfied’,¹²¹ and Hungarian

¹¹⁸ As it happened in the first syllable of *Burxan*, the Inner Asian form of the name of Buddha which is in Modern Chinese *fo* (佛, ‘Buddha’), cf. Laufer (1916, p. 391); and Bailey (1931, p. 280); Doerfer: *TMEN* (II, pp. 261–262 [*but*], 283 [*burxan*]); according to Pulleyblank (1991, p. 96) the Early Middle Chinese form of this first syllable was in Early Middle Chinese was still *but*.

¹¹⁹ On Hungarian *búza* (< OT *buydai*) ‘wheat’ and its parallel Hu. *túzok* ‘bustard’ < OT *toydaq; toqdari, toydui, tōdai* ‘*id.*’, cf. Ligeti (1986, pp. 68–69).

¹²⁰ On the chronology and circumstances of all these cf. Clauson (1959); Şçerbak (1987, pp. 283–284); Erdal argues (2007, pp. 97–98) that the change of intervocalic *-d-* > *-r-* might have never taken place in the Khazarian language and could have been not taken place before the 9th century amongst the Danubian Bulgars and 1230 amongst the Volga Bulgarians.

¹²¹ *Tăran* ‘насыщаться, наедаться, напиваться’ (Skrovtsov 1982, p. 458).

tor ‘wake, burial feast’, what she holds for a Chuvash-type loan word in Hungarian (K. Palló 1959, p. 256).¹²² Therefore we can also suppose that the change between (Proto- and) Old-Turkic (and maybe Altaic) *-r/-z* must go back to an original **-d*, which fully coincides with our Chinese data.

Final Remarks

As a final remark we can state that Zemarchus’ embassy was not only an answer to an occasional embassy coming from the Western Turks. It also was a part of a well-established grand strategy of the Empire towards the peoples of the steppe zone. This strategy, based on the Monophysite missionary activities in the Caucasus was launched during the reign of Justinian.

As the *Scrinium Barbarorum* (“the Office of Barbarian Affairs”) took notice of all the movements on the borders of the Empire and they knew the relevant languages, we can suppose that this expression sheds light on a stage of Altaic languages well-known to Byzantine authorities,¹²³ who could make use of their experience with Ogur peoples in their interactions with the Turks.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- Aalto, P. – Pekkanen, T. (1975): *Latin Sources on North-Eastern Eurasia*. Part I. Wiesbaden (Asiatische Forschungen 44).
- Alemaný, A. (2000): *Sources on the Alans: A Critical Compilation*. Leiden–Boston–Köln (Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik, VIII, 5).
- Alimov, I. A. – Ermakov, M. E. – Martynov, A. S. (1988): *Срединное государство. Введение в традиционную культуру Китая*. Москва.
- Altman, V. (1947): Ancient Khorezmian Civilization in the Light of the Latest Archaeological Discoveries (1937–1945). *JAOS* 47, pp. 81–85.
- Arrianus/Brunt = *Arrian* with an English translation by P. A. Brunt, vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.–London 1983 (The Loeb Classical Library 269).
- Arrianus/Roos–Wirth = *Flavii Ariiani quae exstant omnia*, ed. A. G. Roos, vol. II.: *Scripta minora et fragmenta*, ed. stereotypa, correctior addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. Wirth. Lipsiae 1968.
- Arrianus/Silbermann = *Arrien: Pérople du Pont-Euxin*. Texte établi et traduit par Alain Silbermann. Paris 1995.

¹²² The real etymon would be Tü. *toy* ‘feast’, cf. also *ĒSTJA* (III, pp. 251–252 [dōü-], 252–253 [dōk]); Doerfer (*TMEN* III, pp. 352–355, No. 1352 طوى) does not mention this etymology.

¹²³ On *Scrinium Barbarorum*: Bréhier (1949, p. 287); Shahid (1989, pp. 105–106, 417); Shahid (1995, II/1, p. 355); according to Bury (1911, p. 93) this office seems to have been still in existence during the 9th century as a part of the office of the office of the *Logothetes tou droumou*. On the Late Roman government and the *scrinia* in general see Bury (1910); Kelly (2004).

- Arzhantseva, I. (2007): The Alans: Neighbours of the Khazars in the Caucasus. In: Golden, P. B. – Ben-Shammai, H. – Róna-Tas, A. (eds): *The World of the Khazars*. Leiden–Boston, pp. 59–73.
- Bailey, H. W. (1931): The Word “*But*” in Iranian. *BOAS* 6, pp. 279–283.
- Bailey, H. W. (1932): Iranian Studies 1. *BOAS* 6, pp. 945–955.
- Bailey, H. W. (1951): The Staël-Holstein miscellany. *Asia Major, New Series* 2, pp. 1–45.
- Baldwin, B. (1978): Menander Protector. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32, pp. 99–125.
- Balhī/Le Strange–Nicholson = Ibn Al-Balhī: *Fārsnāma* (eds Le Strange, G. – Nicholson, R. A.). London 1921.
- Barker, J. W. (1966): *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*. Madison–Milwaukee–London.
- Barthold, W. (1910): *Nachrichten über den Aral-See und der Unterlauf des des Amu-darja*. Leipzig (Quellen und Forschungen zur Erd- und Kulturkunde, Bd. II).
- Bartol'd [Barthold], V. V. (1965): Сведения об Аральском море и низовьях Аму-дарьи с древнейших времен до XVII века. In: Бартольд, В. В.: *Сочинения* III. Москва, pp. 15–94.
- Batsüren (2009): *Өндөр тэрэгтнүүд ба эртний түрэгүүд (VI–IX зуун)*. Улаанбаатар.
- Beckwith, Chr. (2006–2007): The Frankish Name of the King of the Turks. *АЕМАе* 15, pp. 5–12.
- Berend, N. (2001): At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims, and ‘Pagans’ in Medieval Hungary, ca. 1000–ca. 1300. Cambridge.
- Bielenstein, H. (2005): *Diplomacy and Trade in the Chinese World, 589–1276*. Leiden–Boston (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies IV/18).
- Blockley, R. C. (1992): *East Roman Foreign Policy. Formation and and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*. Leeds.
- Boodberg, P. A. (1936a): The Language of the T’o-pa Wei. *HJAS* 1, pp. 167–185.
- Boodberg, P. A. (1936b): Two Notes on the History of the Chinese Frontier. *HJAS* 1, pp. 283–307.
- Boodberg, P. A. (1939): Marginalia to the Histories of the Northern Dynasties 3: The Altaic Word for “Horn” in the Political Nomenclature of the Steppe. *HJAS* 4, pp. 230–283.
- Bosworth, C. E. (1983): Iran and the Arabs. In: Yarshater, E. (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Iran* (henceforth *CHIr*) 3(1), pp. 593–612.
- Bréhier, L. (1949): *Le monde byzantin II. Les institutions de l’Empire byzantin*. Paris.
- Bury, J. B. (1910): *Magistri scriniorum, ἀντιγραφῆς and ῥεφερενδάριοι*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 21, pp. 23–29.
- Bury, J. B. (1911): *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century: With a Revised Text of the Klerotologikon of Philotheos*. London (The British Academy Supplemental Papers I).
- Bury, J. B. (1958): *History of the Later Roman Empire: From the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian*. Vols I–II. New York.
- Cahun, L. (1896): *Introduction à l’histoire d’Asie*. Paris.
- Cameron, April (1993): *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, A. D. 395–600*. London–New York.
- Cameron, April–Cameron, Alan (1966): The Cycle of Agathias. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86, pp. 6–25.
- Cannatta, P. (1981): *Profilo storico del I° Imperio Turco (metà VI–metà VII secolo)*. Roma.
- Chavannes, Ed. (1903): *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux. Recueillis et commentés par ...* St.-Pétersbourg.
- Chavannes, Ed. (1904): Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux. *T’oung Pao* (NS) 5, pp. 1–110.
- Chavannes, Ed. (1905): Jinagupta (528–605 après J.-C.). *T’oung Pao* 6, pp. 332–356. *CHIr* = Yarshater, E. (ed.): *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 3(1). Cambridge 1983.
- Christensen, A. (1944): *L’Iran sous les Sassanides*. Copenhagen.

- Chrysos, E. K. (1978): The Official Title βασιλεύς in Early Byzantine International Relations. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 33, pp. 29–75.
- Cinnamus/Meineke (1836): *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, rec. A. Meineke, Bonnae.
- Clauson, G. (1957): Turkish -Y- and Related Sounds. In: *Studia Altaica. Festschrift für Nicholas Poppe zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden (Ural-altaische Bibliothek 5), pp. 33–45.
- Clauson: ED = Clauson, Gerard, Sir (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Corippus/Antès = Corippe (Flavius Cresconius Corippus): *Éloge de l'Empereur Justin II*, texte établi et traduit par Serge Antès. Paris 1981.
- Corippus/Cameron = Flavius Cresconius Corippus: *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*. Ed. with transl. and commentary by Averil Cameron. London 1976.
- Corippus/Partsch = Partsch, J.: *Corippi Africani Grammatici Libri qui supersunt*. Nachdruck, München 1981 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi, 3,2, Berolini MDCCCLXXVIII).
- Csongor, B. (1952): Chinese in the Uighur Script of the T'ang period. *AOH* 2, pp. 73–121.
- Csongor, B. (1960): Some Chinese Texts in Tibetan Script from Tun-huang. *AOH* 10, pp. 97–140.
- Czeglédy, K. (1971): Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor on the Nomads. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Studia Turcica*. Budapest, pp. 133–148.
- Czeglédy, K. (1983): From East to West. The Age of the Nomadic Migrations in Eurasia (trans. by P. B. Golden). *AEMae* 3, pp. 25–125.
- Dani, A. H. – Litvinsky, B. A. – Zamir Safi, M. A. (1996): Eastern Kushans, Kidarites in Gandhara and Kashmir, and Later Hephthalites. In: Litvinsky, B. A. – Zhang G. D. – Samghabadi, R. S. (eds): *History of Civilizations of Central Asia III. The Crossroads of Civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*. Paris (Multiple History Series), pp. 166–187.
- Daryaeae, T. (2008): The Political History of Ērānšahr. *e-Sasanika* 2 (2008), <http://www.humanities.uci.edu/sasanika/pdf/Political%20history%20of%20Eranshahr.pdf>
- de Boor, C. (1891): Nachtrage zu den Notitia Episcopatum II. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 12, pp. 519–534.
- de Boor: *Excerpta = Excerpta de legationibus*, edidit Carolus de Boor. Berolini, MCMIII (1903).
- de la Vaissière, E. (2005): *Sogdian Traders: A History*. Leiden–Boston–Köln (Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik, VIII, 10).
- de la Vaissière, E. (2006): Les Turcs, rois du monde à Samarcande. In: Compareti, M. – de la Vaissière, E. (eds): *Royal Naurüz in Samarkand: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Venice on the Pre-Islamic Paintings at Afrasiab*. Pisa–Roma, pp. 147–162.
- Dobrovits, M. (2004a): The Thirty Tribes of the Türks. *AOH* 57, pp. 257–262.
- Dobrovits, M. (2004b): A nyugati türkök tíz törzsének kialakulása [The formation of the ten tribes of the Western Türks]. *Antik Tanulmányok* 48, pp. 101–109.
- Doerfer: TMEN: Doerfer, G. (1963–1975): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. I–IV. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer, G. (1984): The Problems of Rhotacism/Zetacism. *CAJ* 28, pp. 36–42.
- Drompp, M. (2002): The Yenisey Kyrgyz from Early Times to the Mongol Conquest. In: Güzel, H. C. – Oğuz, C. C. – Karatay, O. (eds): *The Turks: Early Ages*. Ankara, pp. 480–488.
- Ecsedy, I. (2000): Contacts between Byzantium and Iran (As seen by Chinese historians). In: Bálint Cs. (Hrsg.): *Kontakte zwischen Iran, Byzanz und der Steppe im 6.–7. Jahrhundert*. Budapest–Roma–Napoli (Varia Archeologica Hungarica X.), pp. 209–213.
- Egorov, V. G. (1964): *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка*. Чебоксары.

- Einsenberg, A. (2008): *Kingship in Early Medieval China*. Leiden–Boston (Sinica Leidensia, vol. 83).
- EMC = Early Middle Chinese
- Enoki, K. (1954): Some Remarks on the Country of Ta-ch'in as Known to the Chinese Under the Sung. *Asia Major*, NS, 4, pp. 1–19.
- Erdal, M. (2004): *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden–Boston (Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik, VIII, 3).
- Erdal, M. (2007): The Khazar Language. In: Golden, P. B. – Ben Shammai, H. – Róna-Tas, A. (eds): *The World of the Khazars. New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute*. Leiden–Boston (Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik, VIII, 17), pp. 75–108.
- Eren, H. (1999): Rotasizm ve lambdasizm mi yoksa zetasizm ve sigmatizm mi. *TDAYB* 1999, pp. 79–88.
- ÉSTJA = Sevortyan, Э. В. (& alii) (1974 onwards): *Этимологический словарь тюркских языков*. I–VII (VIII). Москва.
- Fänrich, H. (2010): *Geschichte Georgiens*. Leiden–Boston (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, VIII, 21).
- Fedotov, M. R. (1996): *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка*. I–II. Чебоксары.
- Feissel, D. (1986): Le préfet de Constantionople, les poids-étalons et l'estempillage de l'argenterie au VI^e et VII^e siècle. *Revue numismatique* 6^e série 28, pp. 119–142.
- Fejérpataky, L. (1892): *Kálmán király oklevelei* [The diploms of King Koloman]. Budapest.
- Felföldi, Sz. (2001): A Prominent Hephthalite: *Katulph* and the Fall of the Hephthalite Empire. *AOH* 54, pp. 191–202.
- Foss, Cl. (1975): The Persians in Asia Minor and the End of Antiquity. *The English Historical Review* 90, pp. 721–747.
- Frye, R. N. (1983): The Political History of Iran under the Sasanians. *CHIr* 3(1), pp. 116–180.
- Gabain, A. von (1954): Buddhistische Türkenmission. In: Schubert, J. – Schneider, U. (Hrsg.): *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*. Leipzig, pp. 161–173.
- Garsoïan, N. (1983): Byzantium and the Sasanians. *CHIr* 3(1), pp. 568–592.
- van Ginkel, J. J. (1995): *John of Ephesus. A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium*. Groningen.
- Glinka, G. B. (1914): *Атлас Азиатской России*. Санктпетербург.
- Göckenjan, H. (1972): *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter in mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Wiesbaden.
- Golden, P. B. (1972): The Migrations of the Oğuz. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4, pp. 45–84.
- Golden, P. B. (1980): *Khazar Studies. An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. I–II. Budapest.
- Golden, P. B. (1990): The Peoples of the South Russian Steppes. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge, pp. 256–284.
- Golden, P. B. (1992): *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. Wiesbaden.
- Golden, P. B. (2007): Irano-Turcica: The Khazar Sacral Kingship Revisited. *AOH* 60, pp. 161–194.
- Gordon, C. D. (1961): *The Age of Attila. Fifth Century Byzantium and the Barbarians*. Ann Arbor.
- Gorelik, V. M. (2002): Три племени кабар. In: Васильев, В. В. (ed.): *Hungaro-Rossica. Бюллетень Общества востоковедов*, вып. 9. Москва, pp. 47–51.
- Goubert, P. (1951): *Byzance avant l'Islam, I. Byzance et l'Orient sous les successeurs de Justinien, l'Empereur Maurice*. Paris.
- Greatrex, G. (1997): The Nika Riot: A Reappraisal. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117, pp. 60–86.

- Greatrex, G. – Lieu, S. N. C. (2002): *The Roman Eastern Frontiers and the Persian Wars, part II: AD 363–630. A Narrative Sourcebook*. London–New York.
- Grégoire, H. (1907): L'ἐπάρχος Ῥώμης, à propos d'un poids-étalon grecque. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique* 31, pp. 321–327.
- Grignaschi, M. (1984): La chute de l'Empire Hephtalite dans les sources byzantines et perses et le problème des Avar. In: Harmatta, J. (ed.): *From Hecataeus to al-Huwārazmī. Bactrian, Pahlavi, Sogdian, Sanskrit, Syriac, Arabic, Chinese, Greek and Latin Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, pp. 219–248.
- Guljamov, Ja. G. (1957): *История орошения Хорезма с древнейших времен до наших дней*. Ташкент.
- Gyóni, M. (1938): Kálizok, kazárok, kabarok, magyarok [Kaliz', Khazars, Kabars, Hungarians]. *Magyar Nyelv* 34, pp. 86–92, 159–171.
- Györffy Gy. (1977): *István király és műve* [King St. Stephen and his work]. Budapest.
- Hamilton, J. R. (1962): Toquz-Uyuz et On-Uyur. *JA* 102, pp. 23–63.
- Hannestad, K. (1955–1957): Les relations de Byzance avec la Transcaucasie et l'Asie Centrale aux 5^e et 6^e siècles. *Byzantion* 15–17, pp. 421–456.
- al-Ḥ^wārizmī/van Vloten (1895): *Liber Mafātīh al-oloum explicans Vocabula technica scientiarum tam arabum tam peregrinorum auctore Abū Abdallah Mohammad ibn Ahmed ibn Jūsuf al-kātib al Khowarezmi*. Edidit, indice adjecit G. van Vloten. Lugdunu Batavorum.
- Harmatta, J. (1962): Byzantinoturcica. *AAH* 10, pp. 131–150.
- Harmatta, J. (1992): Az onogur vándorlás [The migration of the Onogurs]. *Magyar Nyelv* 87, pp. 257–272.
- Harmatta, J. (1997): Az iráni nyelvek hatása az ősmagyar nyelvre [The influence of the Iranian languages on the Proto-Hungarian language]. In: Kovács, L. – Veszprémi, L. (eds): *Honfoglalás és nyelvészet*. Budapest, pp. 71–83.
- Harmatta, J. (1999): A türkök eredetmondája [On the legendary origin of the Turks]. *Magyar Nyelv* 95, pp. 385–397.
- Harmatta, J. (2000): Struggle for the Silk Road between Iran, Byzantium, and the Türk Empire from 560 to 630 AD. In: Bálint, Cs. (Hrsg.): *Kontakte zwischen Iran, Byzanz und der Steppe im 6.–7. Jahrhundert*. Budapest–Roma–Napoli (Varia Archeologica Hungarica X), pp. 249–252.
- Harmatta, J. (2001): A bizánci–türk diplomáciai kapcsolatok történetéből [From the history of the Byzantino–Turkic diplomatic relations]. In: Neuman, T. (ed.): *Analecta Mediaevalia I. Tanulmányok a középkorról*. Piliscsaba, pp. 89–98.
- Haussig, H. W. (1979): Byzantinische Quellen über Mittelasien in ihrer historischen Aussage. In: Harmatta, J.: *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, pp. 41–60.
- Henning, R. (1933): Der Einführung der Seidenraupenzucht ins Byzantinerreich. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 32, pp. 295–312.
- HE III = *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae pars tertia* (interpretatus est E. W. Brooks). Louvain 1964 (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vol. 106, Scriptorum Syri, tomus 55).
- Herrmann, A. (1914): *Alte Geographie des untern Oxusgebietes*. Göttingen (Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. N.F. Bd. XV. No. 4).
- Hirth, F. (1885a): *China and the Roman Orient. Researches into Their Ancient and Mediaeval Relations as Represented in Old Chinese Records*. Leipzig–München–Shanghai–Hongkong.
- Hirth, F. (1885b): The Ta-ts'in Question. *The Chinese Recorder* (November 1885), pp. 1–8.

- Hirth, F. (1886): Chinese Equivalents of the Letter "R" in Foreign Languages. *Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 21, pp. 214–223.
- Hirth, F. (1899): Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert nach chinesischen Quellen. In: Radloff, W.: *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei. Zweite Folge*. Sanktpeterburg, pp. 1–140.
- Hirth, F. (1901): Hunnenforschungen. *Keleti Szemle* 2, pp. 81–91.
- Hirth, F. (1909, 1913): The Mystery of Fu-lin. *JAOS* 30, pp. 1–31; 33, pp. 193–208.
- Honigmann, E. (1935): Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071 nach griechischen, arabischen, syrischen und armenischen Quellen. In: Vasiliev, A. A.: *Byzance et les Arabes*. T. III. Bruxelles (Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae 3), pp. 3–37.
- Honigmann, E. (1951): *Evêques et évêches monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*. Louvain (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Subsidia, t. 2).
- Hucker, Ch. O (1988): *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. (Taiwan Edition) Taipei.
- Humboldt, A. de (1843): *Asie Centrale. Recherches sur les chaines de montagnes et le climatologie comparée II*. Paris.
- Hummel, A. W. (1943): *Eminent Chinese of the Ching Period*. I–II. Washington.
- K. Palló, M. (1959): Hungaro-Tschuwaschica. *UJb* 31, pp. 243–259.
- Kaegi, W. E. (1994): Review on Shahid (1989), W. Kaegi. *JNES* 53, pp. 47–50.
- Karnamag/Chunakova = *Книга деяний Ардашира сына Папака*, транскрипция текста, перевод со среднеперсидского, введение, комментариев и глоссарий О. М. Чунаковой. Москва 1987 (Памятники письменности Востока 88).
- Kelly, Ch. (2004): *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.–London.
- Kelly, Ch. (2005): John Lydus and the Eastern Praetorian Prefecture in the Sixth century AD. *BZ* 98, pp. 431–458.
- Klaproth, H. J. (1826): *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*. Paris–Londres–Stuttgart.
- Klimkeit, H.-J. (1990): Buddhism in Turkish Central Asia. *Numen* 37, pp. 53–69.
- Kljaštornyj, S. G. (1987): Древнетюркская цивилизация: диахронические связи, синхронные аспекты. *Советская тюркология* 1987/3, pp. 58–62.
- Kljaštornyj, S. G. – Livšic, V. A. (1972): The Sogdian Inscription of Bugut Revised. *AOH* 26, pp. 69–102.
- Kljaštornyj, S. G. – Vásáry, I. (1987): A Runic Inscription on a Bull-Skull From the Volga Region. In: Kara, G. (ed.): *Between the Danube and the Caucasus. A Collection of Papers Concerning Oriental Sources on the History of the Peoples of Central and South-Eastern Europe*. Budapest, pp. 171–178.
- Kollautz, A. – Miyakawa, H. (1970): *Geschichte und Kultur eines völkerwanderungszeitlichen Nomadenvolkes. Die Jou-jan der Mongolei und die Awaren in Mitteleuropa*. I–II. Klagenfurt.
- Kordosis, M. (1999): The Sea Route from China to Ta-ch'in (Roman–Early Byzantine State) According to the Chinese Sources. In: Kaegi, W. (ed.): 7th Symposium Byzantinon: "Byzance et l'Asie", Decembre 1997. *Byzantinische Forschungen* 25, pp. 47–54.
- Kovalev, R. K. (2005): Commerce and Caravan Routes Along the Northern Silk Road (Sixth–Ninth Centuries) Part I: The Western Sector. *AEMae* 14, pp. 55–105.
- Laufer, B. (1916): Burkhan. *JAOS* 36, pp. 390–395.
- Leontsini, M. (2004): Adherence to the Chalcedonian Creed and Organisation of Byzantine Army in the Seventh Century. *Byzantinoslavica* 63, pp. 71–78.
- Lerch, P. I. (1873): *Khiva oder Kharezm. Seine historische und geographische Verhältnisse*. St. Petersburg.
- Lessing, F. G. (1960): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Berkeley–Los Angeles.

- Lewis, R. A. (1966): Early Irrigation in West Turkestan. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 56, pp. 467–491.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. G. W. (1977): The Defences of Syria in the Sixth Century. In: *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms II: Vorträge des 10. internationalen Limeskongresses in der Germania Inferior*. Köln, pp. 487–499.
- Ligeti L. (1960): Néhány megjegyzés úgynevezett altaji jövevényszavainkról [Some remarks on our so-called Altaic loan words]. *Magyar Nyelv* 56, pp. 292–295; reprinted in: Ligeti L. (1977): *A magyar nyelv török jövevényszavai és ami körülöttük van* [The Turkic loan words in Hungarian and their cultural environment]. I. Budapest (Budapest Oriental Reprints A1), pp. 287–290.
- Ligeti, L. (1970): Le Tabgatch, un dialecte de la langue Sien-pi. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Mongolian Studies*. Budapest (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 14), pp. 265–308.
- Ligeti, L. (1975): La théorie altaïque et la lexico-statistique. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Researches in Altaic Languages. Papers read at the 14th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Held in Szeged, August 22–28, 1971*. Budapest (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 20), pp. 99–115.
- Ligeti, L. (1986): *A magyar nyelv török jövevényszavai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban* [The Turkic loan words in Hungarian before the landtaking and during the Árpáds]. Budapest.
- Litvinskij, B. A.–Solov'ev, V. S. (1985): L'Art du Toxaristan à l'époque du Haut Moyen Âge (monuments non-bouddhiques). *Arts asiatiques* 40, pp. 5–17.
- LMT = Liu Mau-tsai (1958): *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-kü)*. I–II. Wiesbaden (Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen 10).
- Loewe, M. (1971): Spices and Silk: Aspects of World Trade in the First Seven Centuries of the Christian Era. *JRAS* 1971, pp. 166–179.
- Lomouri, N. Yu. (1988): Западная Грузия (Лазика) в IV–V вв. In: Лордкипанидзе, М. Д. – Мухелашвили, Д. Л. (eds): *Очерки по истории Грузии в восьми томах II: Грузия в IV–X веках*. Тбилиси, pp. 113–140.
- Lopez, R. S. (1945): Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire. *Speculum* 20, pp. 1–42.
- Löwe, H. (1976): Aethicus Ister und das alttürkische Runenalphabet. *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 32, pp. 1–22.
- Macartney, C. A. (1944): On the Greek Sources for the History of the Turks in the Sixth Century. *BSAS* 11, pp. 266–275.
- Malalas/Jeffreys–Scott = *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. A Translation by Elisabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys and Roger Scott, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. Melbourne 1986 (Byzantina Australiensia 4).
- Malalas/Thurn = *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, recensuit Ioannis Thurn. Berolini et Novi Eboraci 2000 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, vol. XXXV; series Beroliensis).
- Marquart, J. (1897): Historische Glossen zu den alttürkischen Inachriften. *WZKM* 12, pp. 157–290.
- Marquart, J. (1901): *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i. Mit historisch-kritischen Kommentar und historischen und topographischen Excursen*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge Bd. III, № 2).
- Marquart, J. (1914): Über das Volkstum der Komanen. In: Bang, W.–Marquart, J.: *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*. Berlin (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge Bd. XIII, Nr. 1), pp. 25–238.
- Marshak, B. I. (2001): La thématique sogdienne dans l'art de la Chine de la seconde moitié du VI^e siècle. *Comptes-rendus et séances de l'année. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 145^e année, №1, pp. 227–246.

- Menander/Blockley = *The History of Menander the Guardsman*, ed. by R. C. Blockley. London 1984.
- Miller, D. A. (1971): Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-making: 500–1025 A.D. *Byzantinoslavica* 32, pp. 56–76.
- Minorsky, V. (1940–1942): The Turkish Dialect of Khalaj. *BSAS* 10, pp. 417–437.
- Mohay, A. (1976): Priskos' Fragment über die Wanderungen der Steppenvölker (Übersicht über die neueren Forschungen). *AAH* 24, pp. 125–140; reprinted in: Harmatta, J. (ed.) (1979): *Studies in the Sources of the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, pp. 129–144.
- Molchanova, O. T. (1979): *Топонимический словарь Горного Алтая*. Горно-Алтайск.
- Moravcsik, J. (1930): Zur Geschichte der Onoguren. *UJ* 10, pp. 53–90, this article was also reprinted in: Moravcsik, Gy. [J.] (1967): *Studia Byzantina*. Budapest, pp. 85–118.
- Moravcsik, Gy. (1946): Byzantine Christianity and the Magyars in the Period of Their Migration. *American Slavic and East European Review* 5, pp. 29–45; reprinted in his *Studia Byzantina*. Budapest 1967, pp. 245–259.
- Moravcsik, Gy. (1984): *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai* [The Byzantine sources of Hungarian history during the Árpáds' age]. Budapest.
- Mori, M. (1965): On Chi-li-fa 俟利發 (Elteber/Eltebir) and Ch'i-chin 俟斤 (Erkin) of the T'ieh-lé 鐵勒 Tribes. *Acta Asiatica* 9, pp. 31–55.
- Muthesius, A. (1997): *Byzantine Silk Weaving AD 400 to AD 1200*. Vienna.
- Müller: *FHG = Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, I–IV, collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit Carolus Mullerus. Parisii 1841–1851.
- Nair, P. T. (1974): The Peacock Cult in Asia. *Asian Folklore Studies* 33, pp. 164–170.
- Nerazik, E. E. – Bulgakov, P. G. (1996): Khwarizm. In: Litvinsky, B. A. – Zhang G. – Shabani Samghabadi, R. (eds): *History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Volume III: The Crossroads of Civilizations: A. D. 250 to 750*. Paris, pp. 207–231.
- Nyberg, H. S (1959): Die sassanidische Westgrenze und ihre Verteidigung. In: *Septentrionalia et Orientalia. Studia Bernharo Karlgren A. D. III. Non. Oct. Anno MCLIX dedicata*. Stockholm, pp. 316–326.
- Oikonomidès, N. (1986): Silk Trade and Production in Byzantium from the Sixth to the Ninth Century: The Seals of Kommerkiarioi. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 40, pp. 35–53.
- Ögel, B. (1945): Göktürk yazıtlarının «Apurım» ları ve «Fu-lin» problemi. *TTK Belleten* 9, pp. 63–87.
- Pelliot, P. (1920): A propos des Comans. *JA*, sér. 11, tome 15, pp. 125–185.
- Pelliot, P. (1923): La théorie des quatre Fils du Ciel. *T'oung Pao*, 2nd series, 22, pp. 97–125.
- Pelliot, P. (1934): Tokharien et koutchéen. *JA* 224, pp. 23–106.
- Pelliot, P. (1937): Le nom du χwārizm dans les textes chinois. *T'oung Pao* 37, pp. 146–152.
- Pigulewskaja, N. (1969): *Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien*. Berlin.
- Podrobnij (1876): *Подробный Атлас Российской Империи съ планами главных городов*. Санкт-петербург.
- Pohl, W. (1988): *Die Awaren. Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa, 567–822 n. Chr.* München.
- Poppe, N. (1960): On some Altaic Loanwords in Hungarian. *American Studies in Uralic Linguistics*. Bloomington (Indiana University, Uralic and Altaic Series I), pp. 139–147.
- Poppe, N. (1965): *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*. Wiesbaden (Ural-Altäische Bibliothek 14).
- Ротаров, Л. П. (1966): Этноним теле и алтайцы. In: *Тюркологический сборник. К шестидесятилетию Андрея Николаевича Кононова*. Москва, pp. 234–240.
- Pritsak, O. (1964): Der „Rhotazismus“ und „Lambdazismus“. *UJb* 35, pp. 337–349.
- Procopius/Dewing = *Procopius with an English Translation* by H. B. Dewing. Cambridge, Mass. – London 1954 (The Loeb Classical Library).

- Procopius/Haury–Wirth = *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, recognovit J. Haury, vol I. *De Bellis Libri I–IV* (Editio stereotypa correctior addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. Wirth). Lipsiae 1962.
- Pseudo-Zacharias/Brooks = *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta I–II*, interpretatus est E. W. Brooks. Louvain 1953 (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vol. 88).
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1956): Some Remarks on the Toquzoghuz Problem. *UJb* 28, pp. 25–42.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1970): The Wu-sun and Sakas and the Yüeh-chih Migration. *BSOAS* 33, pp. 154–160.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1990a): The “High Carts”: A Turkish-Speaking People Before the Türks. *Asia Major. Third Series* 3, pp. 21–26.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1990b): The Name of the Kirghiz. *CAJ* 34, pp. 98–108.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1991): *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1999): The Roman Empire as known to Han China. *JAOS* 119, pp. 71–79.
- Rachewiltz, I. de–Rybatzki, V. (2010): *Introduction to Altaic Philology*. Leiden–Boston (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies VIII, 20).
- Radloff: Wb = Radloff, W./Radlov, V. V.: *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий I–IV – Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte*. Sankpetersburg 1893–1911.
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1922): Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen. *JSFOu XXXVIII*:1.
- Rapoport, Yu. A.–Nerazik, E. E. (1984): *Тонрак-кала. Дворец*. Москва (Труды Хорезмской археолого-этнографической экспедиции XIV).
- RE* = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Alterthumwissenschaft*. Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler, 1894 onwards.
- Richter, G. M. A. (1929): The Silk in Greece. *American Journal of Archaeology* 33, pp. 27–33.
- Russu, I. I. (1970): Zemarkhus. Ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Prosopographie (6 Jhdt). *Dacia* 14, pp. 411–418.
- Sapozhnikov, V. V. (1949): *По русскому и монгольскому Алтаю*. Москва.
- Ščerbak, A. M. (1962): Les inscriptions inconnues sur les pierres de Khoumra (au Caucase du Nord) et le problème de l’alphabet runique des Turcs occidentaux. *AOH* 15, pp. 283–290.
- Şçerbak, A. M. (1987): Zetasizm-rotasizm meselesi ve Türkçe ile Moğolca arasındaki ilişkilere dair bazı düşünceler. *TDAYB* pp. 281–288.
- Şçerbak, A. M. (1990): Türk “Runik” Alfabetesinin Yayılmasına Dair. *TDAYB* pp. 183–187.
- Schönfelder, J. M. (1862): *Die Kirchen Geschichte des Johannes von Ephesus. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt*. München.
- Shahîd, I. (1979): Byzantium in South Arabia. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 33, pp. 23–92.
- Shahîd, I. (1989): *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century*. Washington, D.C.
- Shahîd, I. (1995): *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*. Washington, D.C.
- Sinor, D. (1946–1947): Autour d’une migration des peuples au V^e siècle. *JA* 235, pp. 1–77.
- Sinor, D. (1952): On Some Ural-Altaic Plural Suffixes. *Asia Major, NS* II (1952), pp. 203–230.
- Sinor, D. (1990): The Establishment and Dissolution of the Türk Empire. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge, pp. 285–316.
- Sinor, D. (1992): Notes on the History of the First Türk Empire. In: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress for Asian and North African Studies, Hamburg 1986*. Stuttgart, pp. 575–577.
- Skrovtsov, M. I. (1982): *Чувашко–русский словарь*. Москва.
- Stein, E. (1919): *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches, vornämlich unter den Kaisern Justinus II und Tiberius Constantinus*. Stuttgart.

- Stein, E. (1949): *Histoire du Bas-Empire II. De la disparition de l'Empire d'Occident à la mort de Justinien (476–565)*. Publié par J. R. Palanque. Paris–Bruxelles–Amsterdam.
- Strabo/Jones = *The Geography of Strabo*. With an English Translation by H. L. Jones. Vol. V. London–Cambridge, Mass. 1961 (Loeb's Classical Library).
- Suishu 84, *liechuan* 49. Shanghai, Commercial Press ed. s.a.
- Sunchugashev, R. D. (2001): *Словарь оронимов Хакасии (географические названия)*. Абакан.
- Suolahti, J. (1947): On the Persian Sources Used by the Byzantine Historian Agathias. *Studia Orientalia* 13, pp. 3–13.
- Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. (1976): Bemerkungen zur Geschichte (Chronologie und Topographie) der sassanidisch-byzantinischen Kriege (in den siebziger Jahren des sechsten Jahrhunderts). *AAH* 24, pp. 109–114; reprinted in: Harmatta, J. (ed.) (1979): *Studies in the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, pp. 113–118.
- Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. (1979): Über das Werk der Menandros Protektor als eine Quelle der Geschichte Mittelasiens. In: Harmatta, J. (ed.): *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, pp. 61–70.
- Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. (1998): *Az avar történelem forrásai, 557-től 806-ig* [Sources on the history of the Avars from 557 to 806]. Budapest (Magyar Őstörténeti Könyvtár 12).
- Szűcs, J. (2008): Két történelmi példa az etnikai csoportok életképességéről [Two historical examples on the vitality of ethnic groups]. *Holmi* 20, pp. 1399–1411. (Originally published in: *A Magyarorsággutató Csoport Évkönyve*. Budapest 1987.)
- Ṭabarī/Bosworth (1999): *The History of Al-Ṭabarī, vol. V: The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakhmids, and Yemen*, translated by C. E. Bosworth. Albany, NY.
- Tarn, W. W., Sir (1966): *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Cambridge.
- Taşağıl, A. (2004): *Çin kaynaklarına göre eski Türk boyları. MÖ. III–MS X. asır*. Ankara.
- Teggart, F. J. (1969): *Rome and China. A Study of Correlations in Historical Events*. Berkeley.
- Tekin, T. (1969): Zetacism and Sigmatism in Proto-Turkic. *AOH* 22, pp. 51–80.
- Tekin, T. (1979): Once More Zetacism and Sigmatism. *CAJ* 22, pp. 118–137.
- Tekin, T. (1986): Zetacism and Sigmatism. Main Pillars of Altaic Theory. *CAJ* 30, pp. 141–16.
- Theophanes Byzantius/Henry = Theophanes Byzantius. In: *Photius Bibliothèque*, T. I. (« Codices » 1–84). Texte établi et traduit par R. Henry. Paris 1959.
- Theophanes/de Boor = Theophanis *Chronographia*, rec. Carolus de Boor, vol. I., Textum Graecum continens. Lipsiae 1883.
- Theophanes/Mango–Scott = *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, Translated with Introduction and Commentary by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott. Oxford 1997.
- Theophylactus/de Boor–Wirth = Theophylacti Simocattae *Historiae* (ed. C. de Boor, con. cur. P. Wirth. Stuttgart 1982.
- Theophylactus/Schreiner = Theophylaktos Simokattes: *Geschichte*, übersetzt und erläutert von Peter Schreiner. Stuttgart 1985.
- Theophylactus/Whitby = *The History of Theophylact Simocatta. An English Translation with Introduction and Notes* (ed. by) Michael and Mary Whitby. Oxford 1986.
- Thierry, F.–Morrisson, C. (1994): Sur les monnaies byzantines trouvées en Chine. *Revue numismatique* 6^e série, 36, pp. 109–145.
- Thompson, E. A. (2000): *The Huns* (revised and with a foreword by Peter Heater. Oxford–Malden.
- Tolstov, S. P. (1948a): *Древний Хорезм. Опыт историко-археологического исследования*. Москва.
- Tolstov, S. P. (1948b): *По следам древнехорезмской цивилизации*. Москва–Ленинград.

- Tóth, A. J. (2008): Hun-türkök és asszír-perzsák. Archaizáló nevek Malalasnál [Hunnic–Turks and Assyrian–Persians. Archaicising ethnonyms in Malalas]. In: Dobrovits, M. (ed.): *A becsvágy ígézetében. Az V. Nemzetközi Vámbéry Konferencia*. Dunaszerdahely/Dunajská Streda, pp. 263–285.
- Treadgold, W. (1995): *Byzantium and Its Army*. Stanford.
- Tryjarski, E. (2002–2004): Runes and Runelike Scripts of the Eurasian Area. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 20, pp. 5–80; 21, pp. 5–90; 22, pp. 173–202.
- Uspenskij, F. I. (1912): *История Византийской Империи*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Vásáry, I. (1972): Runiform Signs on Objects of the Avar Period. *AOH* 25, pp. 335–347.
- Vasiliev, A. A. (1936): *The Goths in the Crimea*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Vasiliev, D. D. (2005): The Eurasian Areal Aspect of the Old Turkic Written Culture. *AOH* 58, pp. 323–330.
- Vasiliev, D. D. (2009): К истории открытия и изучения памятников древнетюркской письменности Горного Алтая. *Вестник РГГУ. Серия «Востоковедения. Африканистика»* № 8, pp. 48–55.
- Veselovskij, N. (1877): *Очерки историко-географических сведений о Хивинском ханстве от древнейших времен до настоящего*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Vine, A. (1937): *The Nestorian Churches. A Concise History of Nestorian Christianity in Asia from the Persian Schism to the Modern Assyrians*. London.
- Wang Ching-ju (1944): Arsi and Yen-ch'i 焉耆, Tokhri and Yüeh-shih 月氏. *Monumenta Serica* 9, pp. 81–91.
- Wang Huan (1983): 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* 2, pp. 124–154.
- Whitby, M. (1988): *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian: Theophylact Simokatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare*. Oxford.
- Whitby, M. (2007): The Successors of Justinian. In: Cameron, A. – Ward-Perkins, B. – Whitby, M. (eds): *The Cambridge Ancient History XIV. The Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425–600*, Cambridge, pp. 86–111.
- Yule, H. (1882): Notes on the Oldest Records of the Sea-Route from China to Western Asia. *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography*. New Monthly Series IV: 11, pp. 649–660.
- Zamaspnamak/Bailey = Bailey, H. W. (1931): To the Zamasp Namak II. *BSOS* 6, pp. 581–600.
- Zimonyi, I. (1990): *The Origins of the Volga Bulgarians*. Szeged.