

**O.K. Karataev** Universiti of Kastamonu, Turkey, Kastamonu  
e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com**ABOUT ANCIENT POLITICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE TITLES:  
SHANYUY, TARKHAN, BUYURUK**

The nomadic peoples and tribes of Central Asia created a political organization, the imperial confederation, which centralized their military power and kept the tribes united. At the grassroots level, the principles of tribal organization were used by the authority of local tribal leaders. The imperial over-tribal structure was supported by an exceptional monopoly on the management of foreign and military affairs. This structure had three main levels of organization. The imperial leadership belonged to the ruling tribe that founded the state. At the second level were governors (governors), appointed to control the local tribal leadership and command the regional armies. Associated with a kinship with the ruler, these imperial appointees served as key links between the central administration and the local tribal leaders. Local tribal leaders constituted the third level of organization.

At the same time, the state of the nomads arose only there and only when they were forced to interact with more highly organized sedentary societies. However, herders did not “borrow” the state from their more civilized neighbors, but created their own original political system, designed to effectively adapt to larger and more socio-economically more developed neighbors. With the emergence of the Turkic Kaganate, the state of the Kyrgyz, the Uigurs in the historical arena, ancient Turkic titles and other terms began to be mentioned in significant numbers primarily in Chinese chronicles, sources in Greek, Armenian, Sogdian and Bactrian languages (last Chet. VI – 40s. VII century), And then the ancient Turkic steles and inscriptions, texts on Pahlavi, Tibetan documents and other sources (beginning of the VIII-IX centuries.). Types of social terminology (titles, ranks, positions) of the Turkic society of antiquity and the Middle Ages were strictly differentiated and performed various functions, denoting the place of a member of society in the political structure, administrative structure, his military rank, spiritual or civil dignity.

**Key words:** Shanyuy, Tarkhan, Buyuruk, China, titles, Hunn (Huns), Syanbi, Turks.

O.K. Каратаев

Кастамону Университеті, Түркия, Кастамону қ.  
e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com**Ежелгі мемлекеттік-саяси, әкімшілік атақтар: шаньюй, тархан, буюрук**

Көшпелі халықтар мен Орталық Азия тайпалары өздерінің әскери күштерін орталықтандырып, тайпаларды біріктіре отырып, саяси ұйыммен империялық конфедерация құрды. Төменгі деңгейдегілер жергілікті тайпалық көшбасшылардың беделді ұстанымдарын қолданды. Империялық тайпалық құрылым шетелдік және әскери істерді басқаруға ерекше монополия арқылы қолдау тапты. Бұл құрылым ұйымның үш негізгі деңгейіне ие болды. Империялық көшбасшылық мемлекетті құрған тайпаның билеуші тобына тиесілі еді. Екінші деңгейде, жергілікті тайпалық көшбасшылықты басқаруға және аймақтық әскерлерді басқаруға тағайындалған басқарушылар (governors) болды. Басқарушымен арадағы туыстық байланыс, орталық әкімшілік пен жергілікті тайпа көсемдері арасындағы негізгі кілт болды. Жергілікті тайпа көсемдері ұйымның үшінші деңгейін құрады. Сонымен қатар, көшпелі мемлекет жоғары деңгейде ұйымдасқан отырықшы қоғаммен өзара әрекеттесу кезінде ғана пайда болғанымен, көшпелі мал шаруашылығымен айналысушылар ірі және әлеуметтік-экономикалық жағынан жоғары дамыған өркениетті көршілерімен байланыс орнату емес, өздерінің саяси жүйесін құрды. Түрік қағанатының пайда болуымен, қырғыз мемлекеті, ұйғырлардың тарихи аренада ежелгі түркі титулдары және басқа да терминдер айтарлықтай сандармен ең алғаш қытай шежірелерінде, грек, армян, соғды және бактрия тілдерінде (VI ғасырдың соңғы ширегі – VII ғасырдың 40 ж.), содан кейін түркі жазбаларынан, пехлеви мәтіндерінде, тибеттіктердің құжаттары мен басқа да деректерде (VIII ғ. басы – IV ғ.) кездесе бастады. Ежелгі және орта ғасырлық түркі қоғамының әлеуметтік терминологиясының түрлері (атаулары, атақтары, лауазымдары) саяси құрылымдағы қоғам мүшелері, әкімшілік құрылым, оның әскери атағы, рухани немесе азаматтық қатаң сараланған және түрлі функцияны орындады.

**Түйін сөздер:** шануй, буйрук, Қытай, титул, хунну (сюнну), сәнби, түркілер.

О.К. Каратаев

Университет Кастамону, Турция, г. Кастамону,  
e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com

**О древних государственно-политических, административных титулах:  
шаньюй, тархан, буюрук**

Кочевые народы и племена Центральной Азии создали политическую организацию, имперскую конфедерацию, которая централизовала их военную мощь и держала племена объединенными. На низовом уровне использовались принципы племенной организации авторитетом местных племенных лидеров. Имперская надплеменная структура поддерживалась исключительной монополией на управление иностранными и военными делами. Эта структура имела три основных уровня организации. Имперское лидерство принадлежало правящему роду племени, которое основало государство. На втором уровне были наместники (governors), назначенные контролировать местное племенное лидерство и командовать региональными армиями. Связанные родственными отношениями с правителем, эти имперские назначенцы служили ключевыми связующими между центральной администрацией и местными племенными лидерами. Местные племенные лидеры составляли третий уровень организации.

При этом государство у кочевников возникало только там и только тогда, когда они были вынуждены вступать во взаимодействие с более высоко организованными оседлыми обществами. Однако скотоводы не “заимствовали” государство у своих более цивилизованных соседей, а создавали свою оригинальную политическую систему, предназначенную для эффективной адаптации к более крупным и социально-экономически более высокоразвитым соседям. С возникновением Тюркского каганата, государство кыргызов, уйгуров на исторической арене древнетюркские титулы и другие термины в значительном количестве начали упоминаться прежде всего в китайских хрониках, источниках на греческом, армянском, согдийском и бактрийском языках (посл. четв. VI – 40-е гг. VII в.), а затем древнетюркских стелах и надписях, текстах на пехлеви, тибетских документах и других источниках (нач. VIII-IX в.). Типы социальной терминологии (титулы, ранги, должности) тюркского общества древности и средневековья были строго дифференцированы и выполняли различные функции, обозначая место члена общества в политической структуре, административном устройстве, его воинское звание, духовный или гражданский сан.

**Ключевые слова:** шаньюй, тархан, буюрук, Китай, титулы, хунну (сюнну), сянби, тюрки.

The time of the appearance of ancient Turkic titles and terms in the historical arena, as well as their fixation in written sources, are among the urgent problems not only of the history of the Turkic Kaganate (552-744), but also of all Turkic peoples. As it is known, in the Chinese chronicles «Shi Ji» and «Han Shu», in connection with the state association of the Sünnu (the Huns, Hsiung-nu), titles and terms relating to the 2nd century BC were recorded, many of which were interpreted by researchers on the ancient Turkic basis. However, the circle of supporters of this opinion is not so wide. This is largely due to the insufficient argumentation given by some researchers on this issue, as well as a discussion about the linguistic affiliation of the Huns, which is still ongoing in scientific circles (Babayarov, Kubatin, 2012: 52).

The potestarno-political system of the society of all Turkic state formations of antiquity and the Middle Ages was based on two main ways that political genesis proceeded: military-political and aristocratic. In this way of political genesis, on the one hand, in the hands of traditional aristocracy, the ideologi-

cal leadership of society, and on the other hand, there were forms of military democracy in society that included popular assemblies, councils of elders, etc., as basic elements (Makhpirov, 1997: 127).

This form of potestarno-political organization of society predetermined such a social nomenclature, which implied the unification of two main categories of members of society, i.e. the political status of a member of society reflected at the same time his military rank (kagan – supreme commander and supreme ruler, yabgu – co-ruler of the western part and at the same time commander of the western wing of the army, etc.). The potestarno-political and military organization of the Turkic society in many ways continued the traditions of the previous state formations of the Huns. In the linguistic sense, most of them are borrowings – mostly from Sogdian, Chinese, and Tibetan (Kononov, 1980: 104; Makhpirov, 1997: 127).

*Shanyuy* – the title of the head of state of the Hun (Hun). He was elected a Hun tribal aristocracy, rules for life. He ruled together with the council of tribal elders, consisting of 24 *Hunnish* tribes. The

Chinese chroniclers estimated this title as approximately equal to the royal (Wang), but in some years, the *Hunnish Shanyu* was recognized equal to the emperors of the Celestial dynasties (China). In the Chinese chronicles, most of the titles of the Huns (Huns) are given either in the form of translations or their correspondences are given in the nomenclature of the Chinese hierarchy, their insignificant part is still given in the form of transcriptions (Liu, Mautsai, 1958; Babayarov., Kubatin, 2012: 56-57). As it is known, the first state association, the creation of which most researchers associate with the Turkic ethnic groups, was the state of the Huns (Huns). At first, this political association had its own clear hierarchy and system of titles (Materials on the Sünnu history, 1968: 39–40). The state structure of the Huns, their vocabulary, including titles recorded in the form of transcriptions, are reflected in the Chinese chronicles «*Shi Ji*» («Historical Notes») and «*Han Shu*», which are the only written sources on this issue.

*Shanyu*, the title of supreme ruler of the *Huns* (*Huns*), appears in Chinese sources no later than the Zhangguo period (403-221 BC). Sima Qian, for example, mentions that in the middle of the third century. BC e. Li Mu, the military commander of Zhao's estate, defeated the *Shanyu* troops who invaded Yanmen County (Taskin, 1986: 213). According to Ban Gu (32-92 CE), «*Shanyu* means» extensive «and shows that the bearer of this title is vast, like Heaven» (Han shu, ch. 94a, l 7a). «*Shanyu* comes from the surname Liu-an-di. In their state it is called “Chen-li gu-do shanyu”. I call the Huns the sky – chen-li, and the son is called – gu-do. [The word] shan-yu means “extensive” and shows that the bearer of this title is vast like the sky (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1968: 39-40; Babayarov., Kubatin, 2012: 53-54).

Calling their ruler a *shanyu*, the Huns (*Huns*) meant that under his authority, as if under Heaven, is the whole earth. Based on this value, we can talk about the enormous power that belonged to the supreme rulers of the Huns. The importance of their position was emphasized by the form of official documents adopted in correspondence with the Han court. The letters of the *shanyu* usually began with arrogant words: “Heaven and earth born, set by the sun and moon, the great *shanyu* hunnu respectfully asks about the health of the han emperor” (Shi chi, ch. 110, l 166). For its part, the Han court appealed to the *shanyu* accordingly: “The emperor respectfully asks about the health of the great *shanyu* hunnu” (Shi chi, ch. ON, l 186). The title is of Turkic origin (Taskin, 1986: 213). The highest level of the

Hun hierarchy was occupied by the title of *shanyu*, whose interpretation is still controversial. E. K. Pulblank, based on the ancient reading of the Shan-yu title as \**dān-γwāy*, restores it in the form of *darxan* / *tarxan*. G. Babayarov and A. Kubatin offer reading “yabgu”. There are other points of view (A. Dybo and others). But, none of the above points of view is universally recognized.

The power of the *shanyu* was hereditary. At the same time, the applicant for this position had to go through the election process in Kurultai. The main requirement for the applicant: to have wisdom and military talent (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1968: 42). Initially, the position of *shanyu* passed from father to eldest son. If by the time of the death of his father he was a minor, then the younger brother of the deceased became a *shanyu*. Since the end of the 3rd century BC. *Shanyu* came from the clan Suyanti. A totem of this kind was a bull (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1968: 127). The system of transferring power from father to eldest son was changed during the *shanyu* named Huhanye (58-31 years BC). Since that time, the post of ruler began to pass not to the eldest son, but to the brothers of the deceased in the order of their seniority (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1968: 8). *Shanyu*'s wife bore the title “*yan-chi*». He could not marry a girl from a kind of Xiulyanti, but was obliged to marry a representative of one of the three clans – *Kuyan*, *Lan* and *Xuybu*. The Huns *shanyu* performed the following functions: performed the duties of the head of state and represented the Huns in relations with other states; negotiated, concluded contracts, exchanged letters with the Chinese emperor, etc.; *shanyu* served as commander in chief; he was personally responsible for protecting the Hunnic possessions. Land was declared the foundation of the Hunnic state; *shanyu* served as supreme judge. He was subordinate to the state judge and ordinary judges.

The position of state judge was performed by a representative of the Suibu clan. Simple judges were from the families of *Kuyang*, *Lan*. A judge from the *Kuyan* clan judged in the eastern part of the state, and from a doe clan in the western part. Judges determined the type and measure of punishment. The state judge informed the *shanyu* orally about his decisions in the most important cases. No written documents were drawn up. If the *shanyu* as the supreme judge agreed with the decision, then it was considered final and could not be appealed. Chinese historians emphasized that «their laws are easy and conveniently enforceable» (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1973: 77; Karatayev, 2013:45).

The death penalty was provided for the deliberate murder of a fellow tribesman and even for removing the sword from the scabbard by one foot with the intention of killing a person, the same punishment was provided for evading military service and violating military discipline. The family was taken from the guilty person in the theft and given into slavery to the robbed. For lighter crimes and misconduct, they were punished with blows with a stick or exiled to the northern regions of the Hunnic state. The longest term in prison is not more than ten days. In the entire state of Hunnu, the number of prisoners did not exceed ten at the same *time* (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1973: 40). Shanuy served as the high priest-shaman. Every morning, he was the first of the Huns to leave his yurt to bow to the sun on behalf of the entire Hunnic people. It is no coincidence that some historians read the hieroglyph with the help of which the title of ruler of the Huns is recorded as «tan-hu», i.e. the man of the dawn. In the evening, the shanyu worshiped the moon (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1968: 86).

Centuries later than the shanyu title, the kagan title appears in Chinese sources, and, as the Japanese researcher K. Shiratori showed, he was first registered with the *Syanbi* tribe tsifu. Around the same time, the title *kagan* was also registered among the tuyuyhuns, attributed by Chinese historians to the xianbi ethnic group (III century AD). However, despite the *Khagan* title that existed among the *Syanbi*, their leaders did not officially bear this title, but called themselves, like the rulers of the Huns, *shanyuy* (Taskin, 1986: 214-215). In 307, the *Syanbi* leader Muzhun Gui declared himself the great *shanyu* of the *Syanbi* (*Jin shu*, ch. 108, l 2a), and in 317 the title of *Great Shanyu* was officially granted to him by the Pzin Emperor Yuan-di (*Jin Shu*, Ch. 108, l 26). The official use of the Turkic title of *Shanyu* with the simultaneous existence of the *Syanbi* title of *kagan* is clearly seen in the example of the Tuyuykhun leader Shulogan (Taskin, 1986: 215).

Why did the leader of Zhuanzhuan Shalun first officially proclaim himself a *kagan*, abandoning the former shanyu title? According to Shiratori, this was due to the fact that over time the title shanyu lost its real meaning. Only one person could be the holder of the *shanyu* title. And indeed, when in 105 BC. e. the emperor of Han in connection with the death of *Shanyu* Uwei sent two ambassadors to the Huns to express his condolences: one to the new *Shanyu*, the other to the right Sian-Wang, enraged by the encroachments of the Han dynasty on his rights, the new *Shanyu* detained the ambassadors

at home (Shi Ji, Ch. ON, l 296). According to K. Shiratori, the value of shanyu begins to fall with the division of the Huns in 48 AD e. in the north and south, in connection with which two shanyu appeared. As a result of further weakening of the Huns, approximately in the middle of the Late Han dynasty, they were suppressed by the *Syanbians*, from among whom the talented leader Tansihui came forward, uniting under his authority the whole territory subject to the Huns during their greatest prosperity (Shiratori, 1922. V. 11. No. 315).

The appearance of the new title was the logical result of the centuries-old struggle between the Turkic-speaking and Mongol-speaking peoples, which ended in victory for the latter. For many centuries, dominance over the endless steppes of Central Asia belonged to the Turkic-speaking Huns, whose rulers not only kept the nomadic tribes living here subordinate, but also posed a serious threat to agricultural China. Appearing on the territory of modern Mongolia about the last century BC, the Mongol-speaking tribes represented by the Wuhan and *Syanbi* were at the beginning too weak and could not wage a successful struggle against the powerful Huns. They obeyed the Huns, and, of course, their rulers, imitating the Huns, called themselves *Shanyuy*, although the *Syanbi* had their own Kagan title (Taskin, 1986: 17).

However, I. N. Shevashidze does not agree with the conclusions of V.S. Taskin: "... it is hardly possible to agree with V.S. Taskin (*Taskin*, 1986: 216), who considers (without sufficient etymological reasons) the "qagan" form of Mongolian origin and explaining the replacement of the title of *shanyu* with the kagan among the Turks "a logical result of the centuries-old struggle between the Turkic-speaking and Mongol-speaking peoples, which ended in the victory of the latter." Rather, one must agree with the traditional point of view of K. Shiratori (Shiratori K. Kakan to katon shogo ko (On the etymology of the titles kagan and katun) // *Tsub Gakuho*. 1922. V. 11. No. 315) about the gradual decrease in the value of shanyu in the Huns starting from mid 1st century n e., when the Huns were divided into northern and southern and two shanyu appeared (Shervashidze, 1990: 86).

The term shanyu for a long time outlived the people among whom it was born. After the collapse of the Hunnic state, this title was worn by leaders of various Turkic-Mongolian tribal unions and state formations (Uhuans, *Syanbians*, *Disci*, etc.) for 4-5 centuries. The historical charm of this name was so great that it did not disappear completely and for a long time was used in Central Asia, but

not as a designation of an official title, but simply as an honorary title of the supreme leader until the 12th century. This is evidenced by the poem of the Chinese ambassador who visited the *Khitan* in 1055, which stated that on the day of the New Year's celebration he was invited to the palace of the *Chanyu* (Khitan emperor) (Materials on the history of the Huns, 1973: 7; Dugarov, 2005: 88-89). Written sources are silent about the fate of the term *shanyu*, nevertheless he finds an indirect continuation in the title name of the founder of the Mongol Empire Chinggis. As D. Banzarov writes about this, Temujin, accepting this name, restored the Hunnic title to *shanyu*, which corresponded to the Mongolian concept of *tengri* – cube, i.e. son of heaven (Banzarov, 1955: 176). In other words, we are talking about the sacralization of the *Hagan* power among the Mongols, who brought it to their distant historical predecessors in the person of the Hunnic Shanuy (Dugarov, 2005: 90).

**Tarhan (Tarqan)** – one of the ancient titles of the Turkic-Mongolian peoples. Ethnonyms and toponyms are known under this name. *Tarqan* – “tarhan, dignitary” (Karataev, 2013:53). This honorary ancient Türkic title plays a very important role in the general pattern of the origin of the Turkic title (Shervashidze, 1990: 85). E.J. Pulleyblank (Pulleyblank, 1962: 256-257) identified the Turk, *tarqan* with the supreme title of the Huns *shanyii* (i.e., *Shanyu*), cf. gen-hii, late dr.-whale. (according to S. A. Starostin) \*djan- ^ wa. G. Dörfer disputes this theory (like all others), but it has received support from J. Clauson (Clauson, 1972: 539-540). The alleged form of the Huns was to sound like \*d (j) ar [wa. This version is undoubtedly supported by the meaning of the title “*shanyu*” among the ancient Huns (*Huns*), where he meant the supreme ruler. In contrast to the *qagan* and *tagin (tegin)* titles, which “functionally increased” in the Turkic environment, the “*tarqan*” title, as we see, somewhat “decreased” (the value passed from the supreme ruler to a dignitary, and then to a privileged person in general (Shervashidze, 1990: 85). From the point of view of G. Dörfer himself, it is again reduced to stating the borrowed character of the Turkic word and the likelihood of its “*Juan-Juan*” origin.

In ancient times, this title-term was widespread in the vastness of Eurasia. In ancient Turkic society, one of the highest ranks and positions was *tarqan* – a granted title among the *Huns*, *Khazars*, *Bulgars*, *Kyrgyz* and other Turkic and Mongolian peoples (Baskakov, 1985: 41), who were simultaneously the leaders of the army. The origin of the term is associated with Chinese ta't = Turk. *tarxan* “title

exempting the carrier from taxes” < kit. t'ât – “noble, expert” (Ramstedt, 1951: 63; Baskakov, 1987: 3). In modern Turkic languages, the term “*tarhan*” (*darkhan*) means: 1. A blacksmith making military equipment; trans.: “respected”, “honorary”, “holy”, in Mongolian: *Darkhan*. 1. Blacksmith, blacksmith; 2. Holy, having an immunity; 3. Source: Freed from various state duties (Mongol Oros Tol, 1957: 143). *Darqan* mong. “A noble person; the blacksmith” (Shervashidze, 1990: 85).

Rashid ad-Din in “*Jami at-Tavarih*” gives the term “*tarhan*” (Mong. *Darkhan*) the following definition: “... *Darkhan* (the period of the reign of Genghis Khan and his descendants – OK) means a person who is ninefold forgiven crime, which is exempted from duties and enjoys the right of free entry to the khan” (Rashid ad-Din, 1952.T.I.C.I: 171).

The title “*Tarkhan*” has been known since the *Hunnic* era. The highest level of the Hun hierarchy was occupied by the title of *shanyu*, whose interpretation is still controversial. E.K. Pulliblack, based on the ancient reading of the Shan-yu title as \*dān-γwāy, restores it in the form of *darxan / tarxan* (Doerfer, Bd. II: 471). “... in written sources there is no evidence that the holder of the title of *tarqan* ever occupied the highest level of the hierarchy, that is, he was the head of state, and, as you know, individuals with this title did not belong to the ruling family, according to some Researchers, the title *tarqan* began to be used only from the era of the Toba bang (Tabyač) (386-557). According to A.N. Bernshtam's term *Dagyan*, used by the Usuns in the meaning of “official”, like the later Chinese *Dagan*, is nothing more than a transcription of the Turkic term *tarxan (tarqan)*” (Bernshtam, 1951: 107; Babayarov., Kubatin, 2013; Karataev, 2013:54).

The ancient etymology of the title term is *da-guan*. Yu.A. Zuev saw a combination of *da-guan* transcription of the Turkic title *tarqan* (Zuev, 1998: 155–156; Zuev, 2002: 282). In the “Dictionary of borrowed and mixed words in Chinese” for the word “*tarqan*” transcription *dágān* is recorded. In the texts of the Tang era, the term “*tarqan*” was transcribed precisely by the combination “*da-gan*”. E. Chavannes drew attention to the appearance in the Late Tan sources of the spelling “*da guan*” in fragments taken from earlier sources (Chavannes, p. 19: 3). However, it should also be pointed out that, according to the reconstruction of E.J. Pulleyblank, an early Chinese reading of *tá guān* can only transmit *dāj kwan* (Pulleyblank, 1904: 299,113). The first hieroglyph “yes” has one of the meanings “wise, insightful, erudite” (Tishin, p. 4),

the second, “guan”, just means “official”; “official person; employee mandarin, chin”, “position, chin; rank”, and others (Tishin, p. 4). Another fragment of the Chinese source, which lists the highest ranks of the Turks, they are all called *da-guan*, i.e. letters. “Higher ranks.”

Another fragment of the Chinese source, which lists the highest ranks of the Turks, they are all called *da-guan*, i.e. letters. “Higher ranks” (Tong dian, tz. 197) (Kychanov, 1997: 102–103). It turns out that the elders (*lao*), called *ge-li*, that Yu.A. Zuev (Zuev, 1998: 155; Zuev, 2002: 281–282) correctly associated with the Turkic *qari* “old” (DTS, 1969: 426; Clauson, 1972: 644, considered *da-guan*, letters. “Wise officials.” Subsequently, it was precisely one of such wise elders, the notorious Tonyukuk, who was a *Kagan* adviser, and who for some time wore the rank of “*apa tarkan*”, commander in chief *apatarqan* > whale. *a-bo da-gan*, played one of the most important roles in restoring the sovereignty of the Turkic Kaganate in the late VII – early VIII centuries (Tishin, p.6).

The Institute of *Tarkhanism*, first mentioned in the monuments of the ancient Turkic and Khazar period, underwent a significant evolution over many centuries. Initially denoting representatives of the Turkic nobility, in the empire of Genghis Khan and the states of his successors, the title (or title) of the *Tarkhan* began to be assigned, on the contrary, to immigrants from the lower layers of society, who, for their merits, acquired some rights and privileges that the aristocracy already possessed by virtue of its origin (Pochekaev, 2015: 353). Pure honorary titles and official names, such as “*tarqan*”, “privileged person,” should be distinguished from rank titles; won privilege on the basis of special merit” (Shervashidze, 1990: 81). In the VI century. the Buddhist monk Xuan Jian, who visited the headquarters of the West Turkic Hagan Yabgu, wrote that the Hagan was wearing a green silk robe. He was accompanied by more than 200 *Tarhans*, dressed in brocade robes, with braided hair. In the eastern part of the kaganate, the higher officials were called the *Tarkhans*, and the lower, divided into 24 classes, were *Buyuruk*, that is, “ordered” (Markov, 1976: 48). The ancient Türks until the VII century. there was a privileged layer of military leaders who wore titles, including the *Tarkhans* (Asfandiyarov, 2006: 5).

In the inscription of Tonyukuk (Yuanzhen), the title “*tarhan*” is mentioned. “The fate of the Kutlug uprising could only be decided by going to the side of the rebels of the bulk of the Turkic tribes in Yunzhong. Joining Ashide Yuanzhen to the rebels

was a major success for Kutlug, but a success that required immediate development. At the initiative of Tonyukuk, Kutlug proclaimed himself Ilterish Kagan (Ton. 5–8). Tonyukuk received the title of “Boyla of the Tarkan bug,” the younger brothers Kutlug, Mojo and Dusifu, the titles of Shad and Yabgu (Klyashtorny, 1964: 31). Ashide Tonyukuk (Yuanzhen), who passed over to Kutlug Kagan, was awarded a high state title – *Apatarkan* (i.e. Commander-in-Chief). “*Tarkhan*” as a social term is found in the inscription on the monument erected in honor of the Turkic Kagan Bilge Kagan and his brother Prince Kul-Tegin. Among the monuments of ancient Türkic writing there were also the names of the *Tarkhans*: *Boturmis targan*, *Ogul targan* (Asfandiyarov, 2006: 5). The above *Tarkhans* and those mentioned in the “Uyghur Document” (a certain *Taynchak-Tarkhan* gives a receipt in receipt of three bags of millet for Yasak Khan), A. N. Bernshtam quite rightly considers “tax collectors” in the days of the ancient Türks, who could be the founders authorized to collecting all kinds of requisitions in favor of the conquerors-Turks and freed by them from all taxes (Bernshtam, 1946: 113).

In the Khazar state, the *Tarkhans* were also representatives of the tsarist authorities in the localities, who controlled the local government, ensuring the regular receipt of taxes and other duties in favor of the Kagan, the most important of which was military service (Artamonov, 1962: 410). According to the research of S. G. Agadzhanov, the *Tarkhans* occupied a higher position in the Turkic and Khazar Kaganates, since they represented the “privileged layer of the ruling nobility”: military leaders, leaders and large beks (Agadzhanov, 1969: 143). Having analyzed the data of several sources about the *Tarkhans*, A. P. Novoseltsev came to the conclusion that in *Khazaria* so were called noble people, free of taxes; the privileged part of the Khazar army, in some cases – local rulers, appointed by the Khakan (Novoseltsev, 1990: 118, 119).

Uigur Kaganate VIII–IX centuries. the *Tarkhans* “belonged to the upper class of the ruling class long before submission to the Mongols.” In 779, the noble dignitary *Tunmoho-tarkhan* killed the Kagan of the Uighurs Idigan and took his place, after the death, the son of the killer became kagan. For them, the word “*tarhan*” also meant a title: the envoy of the Uigur kagan to the Chinese emperor was called *Kuguluk-moko-tarhan* (Tikhonov, 1966: 27,150). In the supreme bodies of central and territorial power, a special position was occupied by persons in whose title the word “*Tarkan*” was present. It is not

possible to accurately determine the meaning of this term in relation to the Uyghur period. We can only assume that the concept of “*Tarkan*” emphasized the special privileged status of its carriers, since among its famous carriers were the head of internal *Buyuruk Yananchu-baga-tarkan* (researchers identify him with *Ton-baga-tarkan*, who also held the posts of Ulug Tutuk, then the external minister who made the coup in 779, the great *Tarkan Bukug*, the *Tardush Bilige Tarkan*, the famous *El Ugashi Baga Tarkan*, the head of the great Buyuruk Kutlug, and then Tengrid Ulug Ulug Bolmysh Alp Kutlug Ulug Bilge Kagan. the holder of the Karabalgasun inscription *Alp Inanchu Tarkany* was also represented in the regional authorities (Vasyutin, 2016: 218-219). In 783, a military leader with the title “*Tarkan*” brought to China a three-thousand-strong army, consisting of Uyghurs and “other foreigners,” to suppress Hebei uprising. The chronicler does not name this military leader, whom he would undoubtedly know if he belonged to a Kagan family and possessed the title of *yabgu*, shada or minister. Probably, some promoted Alp Kutlug Bilge-kagan was a *Tarkan*. The killing during the coup of 779 of more than 2,000 representatives of the Uyghur and Sogdian nobility and the subsequent death during the feuds of natives of the ruling elite made it necessary to attract servicemen to the management (Vasyutin, 2016: 22).

At the beginning of the X century. among the Guz, tarhan is a name that gradually stands out from the general mass and is included in the privileged estate (layer). In 912, Ibn-Fadlan, secretary of the embassy of the Arab Baghdad caliphate, who was on his way to the Volga Bulgaria, was an eyewitness when “Atrak son al-Qatan (commander of the Guz) invited close people: tarhan and Yanal, son of Jambakh and Baghliz. Tarkhan is the most noble of them, the most respected” (Ibn Fadlan, 1939: 65). In the XII century. in the state of Desht-i-Kipchak (Kipchak steppe), large officials – aristocrats were called Tarhans, Yugurs, Basques and Beks (Asfandiyarov, 2016: 6). In the Turkic-speaking Volga Bulgaria, according to the aforementioned Arab Ibn-Fadlan, “there was Tarkhan the most noble of them (representatives) and the most prominent of them.” From this information it is clearly seen that the word “*tarkhan*” meant a representative of the highest circle (Kovalevsky, 1956: 129).

According to the *Tarkhan* letters (labels) that have reached us and the Golden Horde epoch and post-Horde states and studies based on them, the rights granted to the *Tarkhans* can be reduced to the following: exemption from taxes and duties

(in whole or in part), partial judicial immunity (non-jurisdiction for a number of not too serious offenses and crimes), the right to choose their share of prey on the hunt and in the military campaign (unprivileged soldiers received what the chiefs allocated to them in the general division of the prey). Accordingly, *Tarkhanism* could be individual or inherited: traditionally – for nine generations, but, as a rule, depending on the situation, the number of generations of descendants of the first *Tarkhan* was either less or (in rare cases) more. As you can see, the listed rights did not make sense to specially grant representatives of the clan aristocracy: they possessed them initially by virtue of their origin. Accordingly, *Tarkhanism* complained to representatives of the taxable estate, who, thus, acquired part of the benefits inherent in the nobility and, thus, somewhat approached it in status. Naturally, since the status of the *Tarkhans* depended entirely on the khans who granted this title, they remained faithful to it. The largest number of awards, which is quite logical, occurred during periods of fierce struggle for power: with the help of *Tarhan* labels, various candidates for the throne tried to increase the number of their supporters (Pochekeyev, 2006: 354-355). In the empire of Genghis Khan and the states of its descendants, Tarkhanism was a reward for services rendered earlier to the khan or state. That is, the person who received the title of Tarkhan was exempted from taxes and duties, acquired a number of additional benefits and at the same time did not bear any obligations to the state: if wealth allowed, the *Tarkhans* could live in their possessions, at their own expense, etc. ., and only those who needed funds entered the khan’s or other service (Pochekaev, 2006: 355; Karatayev, 2003: 147). Late period, the social term “tarhan” was used by the Dzungarian (Oirat) and Kazakh khanates.

***Buyuruk (Buyuruk)*** – public administration and military position, title in the state management system of the Turkic Kaganates (551-744), Uygur Kaganate (744-840). Buyuruk. letters. “Ordered”, “the one to whom orders are given” (< *bujur* – “to command”, “to give orders”). *Buj (u) ruq* “legislator, head of the royal legislative service”, derived from *bujur* – “to order, command, dispose” (apparently, to the later *\*blrukci* “herald” – “herald, manager” (Shervashidze, 1990: 83; Karatayev, 2013: 46).

*Buyuruk* – as a hereditary title was used in the XII-XIII centuries. in state formations of Kereyites and Naimans. The title came to be known as the “*great Buyuruk*”, and performed military, administrative and diplomatic functions. In the Uigur Kaganate, the role and influence of the *Buyuruk* is increasing.

In the kaganate, the titles of shada and yabgu remained, but their functions were transformed and became less significant, since both the Uyghur and Chinese sources put not the shad and *yabgu*, but the “*great buyuruk*” (“ministers”) and *tutuk* (Vasyutin 2016: 212).

Administrative and administrative functions were also entrusted to the buirukas (three “internal” and six “external” great buirukas), referred to in Chinese sources as ministers and *tutuk*, who exercised administrative leadership over subordinate tribes and were vested with local authority. The *Buyruk*’s position was especially strong in the Uyghur Kaganate, where they concentrated all power in their hands, as a result of which at the last stage of the Uyghur Kaganate’s history it was the Buyruks who replaced the Yaglakars on the throne and replaced them with the Ediz dynasty in 795 (Makhpirov, 1997: 131). The origin of the first term (*buyuruk*) is transparently and lightly restored on Turkic soil: *Buyruq* <*bujur-* (order) (Doerfer, 2, N 816). V.V. Barthold writes about *Buyuruk*: “meanwhile, inscriptions from *Buyuruk*, as well as from *Khagans*, require not only wisdom and courage, from which we can conclude that these “overlords” (the literal meaning of the word *Buyuruk*) also belonged to military commanders; probably the word buiruk is a collective name for the Shads and other subordinates of the *kagan* to the head of individual clans of governors on behalf of the supreme ruler (Barthold, 1968: 243-244).

The monuments of the runic writing of the Turkic Kaganate do not contain any direct information about the mentioned institute, unless you count those who are called by the term “*bujruq*” letters. “Ordered”, “the one to whom orders are given” (< *bujur-* “to command”, “to give orders”). P.M. Melioransky considered them adjutants under the *kagan* itself (Melioransky, 1899: 99; Seregin, Tishin, 2019: 48). V.V. Barthold believed that perhaps this is a collective name for all officials subordinate to the *kagan* and heads of dependent clans who ruled on behalf of the supreme ruler (Barthold, 1968: 244). E. I. Kychanov attributed buiruk to xiao-guan to “junior officials”, opposed to da-guan to “senior officials” (Kychanov, 2010: 123).

V. Thomsen’s view on this position, who believed that this is a generalizing term for the entire set of officials directly subordinate to the *Kagan*, civil and military (Seregin., Tishin, 2018: 49). Other scholars viewed *bujruq* as judges (Bernshtam, 1946: 112–113), the common name of civil servants with administrative functions (Giraud, 1960: 82–83; Clauson, 1972: 387), a specific official like the

chancellor (Doerfer, 1965: 363–364 397; Donuk, 1988: 11–13). E. I. Kychanov attributed buirukov to xiao-guan to “junior officials”, opposed to da-guan to “senior officials” (Kychanov, 2010: 123; Seregin, Tishin, 2018: 50-51). György Györffy believed that they could have the same functions as *nökör* among the Mongols, which, following B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, he interpreted as a “military escort”. In other words, “*bujruq*” is presented as “an instrument of political and at the same time military organization,” an escort of the *kagan* “at this economic and social level,” but subsequently high dignitaries were appointed from them (Györffy, 1960: 175; Seregin., Tishin, 2018: 50).

Much later, Alfred Marton noted that many interpretations took place before such a monument of the Uyghur Kaganate as the Terkhin (Tariat) stela was found, where, as the researcher considered, evidence of their administrative functions was found (Márton, 1998). Mihai Dobrovich, who also attracted materials from the Uigur Kaganate era, as well as data from Chinese sources, suggested that *bujruq* is not a specific rank, but the general name of authorized persons who were on the retinue of officials at various levels (Dobrovits, 2002; Seregin., Tishin 2018: 50).

Rashid ad-Din in the 14th century the title “*bujruq*” is given by the following definition: “In ancient times, their (Naiman’s) name was *Kushluk Khan* or *Buyuruk Khan*. The meaning of the name *Buyuruk* is “giving an order.” Nevertheless, each of their sovereigns (had) a different, real (personal) name, which (their) was called the mother and father” (Rashid ad-Din, T.I. Kn.I: 137).

P. Melioransky regarding the term “*Buyuruk*” remarks that etymologically it means “the one to whom the khan will order as if a “clerk”. This was the name of the subordinates of the khan to the chiefs of individual detachments, who were sometimes given independent assignments, governors of the khan, and the like. The use of this title with the term “running” suggests an explanation of P. Melioransky. It is also possible that the *Buyuriks* were that part of the flight that served as a kind of casia (judges), most of them also from the ruling class. The text in the monument to Kultegin convinces them that they were a type of “these people’s judges.” The text of the monument says: “all his *buyuruk* were wise, courageous, all his runs and people were straight (i.e., true to the *kagan*).

In the description of the Bilge Kagan intronization, “*Buyuruk-run*” is mentioned, headed by the “leader of the Internal *Buyuruk Kul-Erkin*”, followed by the name “*Buyuruk*” (Malov, 1959:



23). Following the example of the organization of power by the Uyghurs, it can be assumed that the “*internal Buyuruk*” with “*Buyuruk-races*” and simple “*Buyuriks*” were connected with the center of the empire, performed military-administrative functions, and were “ordered” *kagans*. When the institution of internal *Buyuruk* was born among the Türks, it’s hard to say. Perhaps his appearance was due to the long stay of the Turks in China and the borrowing of the managerial experience of Tang (Vasyutin, 2016: 207).

In the Terkhins inscription, the first of the “sixty internal dignitaries” of Eletmish Bilge-kagan called nine “*great Buyuruk*” (centurions, five hundredths, thousandths, the head of five thousand soldiers). They were led by *Yananchu-baga-tarkan* – the head of the internal *Buyuruk* (Klyashtorny, 2010: 42). Earlier, the “great buyuruks” (“nine ministers”, Chinese *jiaysyan* were mistakenly defined by us as heads of the Tokuz-Oguz tribes (Vasyutin, 2016: 126). For the first time, ministers (“six external and three internal”) mentioned during the reign of the Uyghur “*kagan*” *elegiber Tumidu* (Bichurin, 1950: 305), but their role can only be fully judged during the heyday of the Uygur kaganate. S. G. Klyashtorny designated as a stratum “the highest commanders of the Uyghur army and higher officials of the state” (Liu, Ma-tsai, 1960; Klyashtorny, 2010: 47). The influence of the great *Buyuruk* is evidenced by the fact that they, along with the *Senguns* (military commanders, “commanders”, “generals”) (Kamalov, 2001: 136) and the common people called the applicant to the Kagan throne, participated in the intronization ceremony of Eletmish Bilge Kagan (Klyashtorny, 2010: 44; Vasyutin, 2016: 213). One way or another, the works of the mentioned researchers have done

enough to confidently consider “*buyruq*” the trusted representatives of *kagans* or other dignitaries who performed the most various functions (Earrings., The silence in 2018: 51).

The title “*Buyuruk*” was used by medieval *Kereyites and Naimans*. Sources say that the *Naimans* at that time were led by the *tayans* and *khans*, but the ratio of these titles and the powers of the people who wore them are unknown. The defeat in the war with the *Khitan* in 1092 led to the death of the *Dalai Khan Marguz* and the subjugation of the nomads of the *Liao Empire*. After the restoration of independence, the structure of government has changed somewhat. Among the *Kereits*, the rulers bore the title of *Buyuruk Khan* and transferred power by inheritance. The *Mongols* subordinate to the *Kereits* were headed by a *gurkhan*, who was in vassal dependence on the *Buyuruk Khan*. In 1183, the *Terekul* ruler of the *Kereits* was officially recognized by the Chinese Empire as the *Van – king*, which was a recognition of the sovereignty of the *Kereit* state. From this moment *Torgul* also accepts the title of *Van Khan*. In 1203, the *Kereites* were defeated by the *Mongols* and lost their independence. At the end of the 12th – beginning of the 13th centuries, the *Naiman* state was ruled by two rulers – “*Buyuruk Khan*” and “*Tayan Khan*”.

One way or another, the works of the mentioned researchers have done enough to confidently consider *bujruq* the trusted representatives of *kagans* or other high-ranking officials who performed a variety of functions. At the same time, they are more interested in the sphere where they could act as participants in certain military associations that are not related to the tribal structure, but there is no direct evidence of this (Seregin., Tishin, 2018: 50).

## References

- Agadzhanov S.G. (1969). *Ocherki istorii oguzov i turkmen Srednej Azii (IX – XIII vv.)*. [Essays on the history of the Oghuz and Turkmens of Central Asia (IX – XIII centuries)]. Ashgabat.
- Asfandiyarov A.Z. (2006). *Bashkirskie tarhany*. [Bashkir Tarkhans]. Ufa: Kitap. – 160 p.
- Artamonov M.I. (1962). *Istorija hazar*. [History of the Khazars]. Leningrad.
- Babayarov G., Kubatin A. (2012). *Drevnetjurkskie tituly v jepohu do Tjurkskogo Kaganata* [Ancient Turkic titles in the era before the Turkic Kaganate] // *Age of Science and Education*, No.7, Astana. P.52-64.
- Banzarov D. (1955). *Sobranie sochinenij* [Collected Works]. Moskova.
- Barthold V.V. (1968). *Raboty po istorii filologii tjurkskih i mongol'skih narodov*. [Works on the history of philology of Turkic and Mongolian peoples]. Tom. 5. Moskova. 759 p.
- Baskakov N.A. (1987). *K probleme kitajskih zaimstvovaniij v tjurkskih jazykah* [To the problem of Chinese borrowings in the Turkic languages] // *Turcica et Orientalia*. Studies in honor of Gunnar Jarring on his eightieth birthday. Istanbul.
- Baskakov N.A. (1987). *K probleme kitajskih zaimstvovaniij v tjurkskih jazykah* [To the problem of Chinese borrowings in Turkic languages] // *Soviet Turkology*, No. 1. Baku. – P.69–75.
- Bernshtam A.L. (1946). *Social'no-jekonomicheskij stroj orhono-enisejskih tjurkov VI – VIII vv. Vostochno-tjurkskij kaganat i kyrgyzy* [The socio-economic system of the Orkhon-Yenisei Turks of the 6th-8th centuries. East Turkic Kaganate and Kyrgyz]. Moskova-Leningrad.

- Bernshtam A.N. (1951). *Ocherk istorii gunnov* [Essay on the history of the Huns]. Leningrad. Publishing house of Leningrad State University. – S. 107.
- Bichurin (Iakinf) N.Ya. (1950). *Sobranie svedenij o narodah, obitavshih v Srednej Azii v drevnie vremena* [A collection of information about the peoples who lived in Central Asia in ancient times]. Moskova-Leningrad.
- Vasyutin S.A. (2016). *Vlast' i socium v kochevyh imperijah Central'noj Azii VI – nachala XII v.* [Power and society in the nomadic empires of Central Asia of the 6th – early 12th centuries] // Manuscript of a doctoral dissertation. Kemerovo. -752 p.
- Zuev Yu. A. (1998). *Ancient Turkic social terminology in the Chinese text of the 8th century* // *Issues of archeology of Kazakhstan*. Vol. 2. Almaty-Moskova.
- Zuev Yu. A. (2002). *Drevnetjurkaskaja social'naja terminologija v kitajskom tekste VIII v.* [Early Turks: Essays on History and Ideology]. Almaty.
- Dybo A.V. (2007). *Linguistic contacts of the early Türks. Lexical fund. Pratiurk period.* – Moscow. Publishing company Vostochnaya Literatura.
- Dugarov B.S. (2005). *O semantike odnogo jepicheskogo prozvisshhe* [On the semantics of one epic nickname] // *Russia and Asia-Pacific*. No. 3. P. 88-91.
- Karatayev O.K. (2003). *Kyrgyz jetnografijasy bojuncha sozdyk* [Dictionary of Kyrgyz ethnography]. Bishkek. – 367 p.
- Karatayev O.K. (2013). *Kyrgyzdardyn tegi, kelip chygyshy, jetnostuk-madaniy alakalary* [Kyrgyz origin, ethnic and cultural relations]. Bishkek. 500 p.
- Klyashtorny S.G. (2010). *Runicheskie pamjatniki Ujgurskogo kaganata i istorija evrazijskih stepej.* [Runic monuments of the Uyghur Kaganate and the history of the Eurasian steppes] / S.G. Monastic. Sankt-Peterburg. Publishing house "Petersburg Oriental Studies. 328 p.
- Kovalevsky A. (1956). *Kniga Ahmeda ibn-Fadlana o ego puteshestvijah na Volgu v 921-922 gg.* [The book of Ahmed Ibn-Fadlan about his travels to the Volga in 921 – 922]. Kharkov.
- Kononov A.N. (1980). *Grammatika jazyka tjurkskih runicheskikh pamjatnikov VII-IX vv.* [Grammar of the language of the Turkic runic monuments of the 7th-9th centuries]. Leningrad.
- Koshgar Makhmud. (1960). *Devonu lugotit turk (Slovar' tjurkskih narechij)* [Turk devotonu (Dictionary of Turkic dialects)]. Tashkent.
- Kychanov E.I. (1997). *Kochevye gosudarstva ot gunnov do man'chzhurov.* [Nomadic states from the Huns to the Manchu]. Moskova.
- Kychanov E.I. (2010). *Istorija prigranichnyh s Kitaem drevnih i srednevekovykh gosudarstv (ot gunnov do man'chzhurov).* [The history of ancient and medieval states bordering on China (from the Huns to the Manchus)]. 2nd ed., Rev. and add. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Malov S.E. (1959). *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii.* [Monuments of the ancient Turkic writing of Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan] / S.E. Malov. Moskova-Leningrad, Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. – 109 p.
- Markov G.E. (1976). *Kochevniky Azii. Struktura hozjajstva i obshhestvennye organizacii.* [Nomads of Asia. The structure of the economy and public organizations]. Moskova. Moscow Publishing House. University.
- Márton A. (1998). *A katonai kíséret és az ótörök bujruk tisztségnév viszonya a kora-középkori steppe.* *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis: Acta Historica*. T. 106. 38–44. o.
- Materialy po istorii sjunnu (po kitajskim istochnikam).* [Materials on the history of the Huns (according to Chinese sources)]. (1968). Issue 1 / Transl. and note. V.S. Taskina. Moskova.
- Materialy po istorii sjunnu (po kitajskim istochnikam).* [Materials on the history of the Huns (according to Chinese sources)]. (1973). Issue 2. / Per. and note. V.S. Taskina. Moskova.
- Makhipirov V.U. (1997) *Imena dalekih predkov (Istochniki formirovanija i osobennosti funkcionirovanija drevnetjurkskoj onomastiki)* [Names of distant ancestors (Sources of formation and features of the functioning of the ancient Turkic onomastics)]. Almaty, 1997. 302 p.
- Mongol Oros tol' [Mongol Oros Tol]* (1957). Moskova.
- Novoseltsev A.P. (1990). *Hazarskoe gosudarstvo i ego rol' v istorii Vostochnoj Evropy i Kavkaza.* [The Khazar state and its role in the history of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus]. Moskova.
- Pochekaev R.Yu. (2015). *Transformacija tarhanstva v Povolzh'e i Priural'e XVIII–XIX vv.: drevnij tjurkskij institut na sluzhbe Rossijskoj imperii* [Transformation of Tarkhanism in the Volga and Ural regions of the 18th – 19th centuries: Ancient Turkic Institute in the service of the Russian Empire] // *Historical Fates of the Volga and Ural Urals*. Sat articles. Vol. 5. Materials of the international scientific conference. Kazan. S. 345-352.
- Puteshestvie Ibn-Fadlana na Volgu* [Journey of Ibn Fadlan to the Volga]. (1939). Moskova-Leningrad. Per. and comment. under the editorship of Acad. I. Yu. Krachkovsky.
- Rashid ad-Din. (1952). *Sbornik letopisej.* [Collection of annals]. T.I. Prince I. Moskova. -145 p.
- Taskin V.S. (1986). *O titulah shan'juj i kagan* [On the titles of shanyu and kagan] // *Mongolika*. A collection of materials in memory of academician B.Ya. Vladimir Vladimirov (1884-1931). Moskova. S. 213-218.
- Tikhonov D.I. (1966). *Hozjajstvo i obshhestvennyj stroj Ujgurskogo gosudarstva X – XIV vv.* [The economy and social system of the Uyghur state of the X – XIV centuries]. Moskova-Leningrad. S. 27, 150.
- Seregin N.N., Tishin V.V. (2018). *Druzina u tjurkov u Central'noj Azii (Osnovnye aspekty interpretacii pis'mennyh i arheologicheskikh istochnikov)* [The Türkic team in Central Asia (The main aspects of the interpretation of written and archaeological sources)] // *East (Oriens)*. No. 6. s. 47-65
- Shervashidze, I. N. (1990). *Fragment drevnetjurkskoj leksiki.* [Fragment of ancient Turkic vocabulary]. Title // *Questions of linguistics*. No. 3. s. 81-92.

- Dobrovits M. (2002). Buyruq: egy ótörök tisztségnév anatómiája. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Acta Universitatis Szegediensis: Acta Historica*. T. CXII. 49–62.
- Doerfer G. *Türkische und mongolische*. Bd. II. S. 471.
- Doerfer G. (1965-1975). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd 1-4. Wiesbaden.
- Donuk A. (1988). *Eski Türk Devletlerinde İdarî-askerî Ünvan ve Terimler*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Golden P.B. (1982). *Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the Pre-Ginggisid Nomads of Western Eurasia*. *AEMAE* 2. P. 37–76.
- Liu Mau-tsai. (1958). *Die Chinesischen Nachrichten Zur Geschichte Der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 2 cilt, Wiesbaden.
- Liu Mau-tsai. (1960). *Die Chinesischen Nachrichten Zur Geschichte Der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 2 cilt, Wiesbaden, 1958. *Contribution a l'histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*.
- Mori Masao, *Kuzey Asya'daki Eski Bozkır Devletlerinin Teşkilâtı, Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, İstanbul, 1978, s.209-226.
- Pulleyblank E.G. (1962). *The consonantal system of Old Chinese* // *AM*. V. 9. Pt 2.
- Pulleyblank E.G. (1991). *A Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
- Chavannes E. (1904). *Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux* // *T'oung Pao*. Vol. five.
- Clauson G. (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ramstedt D.J. (1951). *Alte türkische und mongolische Titel*. *Journal de la Société Finno Ougrienne*. Helsinki, Vol. 55.
- Shiratori K. (1922). *Kakan to katon shogo ko (To the etymology of the titles kagan and katun)* // *Tbub Gakuho*. V. 11. No. 3.
- Tishin V.V. *On the meaning of the term da-guan in Chinese sources about the ancient Turks (to criticize the hypothesis of I. Kafesoglu)*. [www.synologia.ru/.../About\\_value\\_of\\_the\\_date-guan\\_in\\_Chinese\\_sources](http://www.synologia.ru/.../About_value_of_the_date-guan_in_Chinese_sources). (Date: 01.10.2020).

### Литература

- Агаджанов С.Г. (1969). *Очерки истории огузов и туркмен Средней Азии (IX-XIII вв.)*. Ашхабад. – 267 с.
- Асфандияров А.З. (2006). *Башкирские тарханы*. Уфа.: Китап. – 160 с.
- Артамонов М.И. (1962). *История хазар*. Ленинград, 1962.
- Бабаяров, Г., Кубатин, А. (2012). *Древнетюркские титулы в эпоху до Тюркского Каганата // Век науки и образования, №7*. Астана, С. 52-64.
- Банзаров Д. (1955). *Собрание сочинений*. Москва.
- Бартольд В.В. (1968). *Работы по истории филологии тюркских и монгольских народов*. Том. 5. Москва. 759 с.
- Баскаков Н.А. (1987). *К проблеме китайских заимствований в тюркских языках* // *Turcica et Orientalia. Studies in honour of Gunnar Jarring on his eightieth birthday*. Istanbul.
- Баскаков Н.А. (1987). *К проблеме китайских заимствований в тюркских языках // Советская тюркология, № 1*. Баку. С.69-75.
- Бернштам А.Н. (1946). *Социально-экономический строй орхон-енисейских тюрков VI-VIII вв. Восточно-тюркский каганат и кыргызы*. Москва-Ленинград.
- Бернштам А.Н. (1951). *Очерк истории гуннов*. Ленинград: Изд-во ЛГУ. С.107.
- Бичурин (Иакинф) Н.Я. (1950). *Собрание сведений о народах, обитавших в Средней Азии в древние времена*. Москва-Ленинград.
- Васютин С.А. (2016). *Власть и социум в кочевых империях Центральной Азии VI – начала XII в. // Рукопись докторской диссертации*. Кемерово. 752 с.
- Дыбо А.В. (2007). *Лингвистические контакты ранних тюрков. Лексический фонд. Пратюркский период*. Москва: Издательская фирма Восточная литература.
- Зуев Ю.А. (1998). *Древнетюркская социальная терминология в китайском тексте VIII в. // Вопросы археологии Казахстана. Вып. 2*. Алматы-Москва.
- Зуев Ю.А. (2002). *Ранние тюрки: очерки истории и идеологии*. Алматы.
- Дугаров Б.С. *О семантике одного эпического прозвище // Россия и АТР*. 2005. № 3. С. 88-91.
- Каратаев О.К. (2003). *Кыргыз этнографиясы боюнча сөздүк*. Бишкек. 367 б.
- Каратаев О.К. (2013). *Кыргыздардын теги, келип чыгышы, этностук-маданий алакалары*. Бишкек. 500 с.
- Кляшторный С.Г. (2010). *Рунические памятники Уйгурского каганата и история евразийских степей*. Санкт-Петербург. 328 с.
- Ковалевский А. (1956). *Книга Ахмеда ибн-Фадлана о его путешествиях на Волгу в 921-922 гг.* Харьков.
- Кононов А.Н. (1980). *Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников VII-IX вв.* Ленинград.
- Кошгарий Махмуд. (1960). *Девону луготит турк (Словарь тюркских наречий)*. Ташкент.
- Кычанов Е.И. (1997). *Кочевые государства от гуннов до маньчжуров*. Москва.
- Кычанов Е.И. (2010). *История приграничных с Китаем древних и средневековых государств (от гуннов до маньчжуров)*. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Санкт-Петербург.
- Малов С.Е. (1959). *Памятники древнетюркской письменности Монголии и Киргизии*. Москва-Ленинград: Изд-во АН СССР. 109 с.
- Марков Г.Е. (1976). *Кочевники Азии. Структура хозяйства и общественные организации*. Москва: Изд-во Моск. ун-та.
- Материалы по истории сюнну (по китайским источникам)*. (1968). Вып.1 / Пер. и примеч. В.С. Таскина. Москва.
- Материалы по истории сюнну (по китайским источникам)*. (1973). Вып.2. / Пер. и примеч. В.С. Таскина. Москва.

- Махпиров В.У. (1997). Имена далеких предков (Источники формирования и особенности функционирования древнетюркской ономастики). Алматы. 302 с.
- Монгол Орос толь (1957). Москва.
- Новосельцев А.П. (1990). Хазарское государство и его роль в истории Восточной Европы и Кавказа. Москва.
- Почекаев Р.Ю. (2015). Трансформация тарханства в Поволжье и Приуралье XVIII – XIX вв.: древний тюркский институт на службе Российской империи//Исторические судьбы народов Поволжья и Приуралья. Сб. статей. Вып. 5. Материалы международной научной конференции. Казань. С. 345-352.
- Путешествие Ибн-Фадлана на Волгу (1939). Москва-Ленинград / Пер. и коммент. под ред. акад. И Ю. Крачковского.
- Рашид ад-Дин. (1952). Сборник летописей. Т. I. Кн. I. Москва. 145 с.
- Таскин В.С. (1986). О титулах шаньюй и каган // *Mongolika*. Сборник материалов памяти академика Б.Я. Владимирцова (1884-1931). Москва. С.213-218.
- Тихонов Д.И. (1966). Хозяйство и общественный строй Уйгурского государства X – XIV вв. Москва. С. 27, 150.
- Серегин Н.Н., Тишин В.В. (2018). Дружина у тюрков у Центральной Азии (Основные аспекты интерпретации письменных и археологических источников) // *Восток (Oriens)*. № 6. С. 47-65.
- Шервашидзе И.Н. (1990). Фрагмент древнетюркской лексики. Титулатура // *Вопросы языкознания*. № 3. С. 81-92.
- Dobrovits M. (2002). *Buyruq: egy őtörök tisztségnév anatómiája*. Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Acta Universitatis Szegediensis: Acta Historica. T. CXII. 49-62.
- Doerfer G. (1965). *Türkische und mongolische*. Bd. II. S. 471.
- Doerfer G. (1965). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd 1-4. Wiesbaden,
- Márton A.A. (1998, 1975). *katonai kíséret és az őtörök bujuk tisztségnév viszonya a kora-középkori steppe*. Acta Universitatis Szegediensis: Acta Historica. T. 106. 38-44.
- Donuk A. (1988). *Eski Türk Devletlerinde İdarî-askerî Ünvan ve Terimler*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Golden P.B. (1982). *Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the Pre-Ginggisid Nomads of Western Eurasia*. AEMAE 2. P. 37-76.
- Liu Mau-tsai. (1958). *Die Chinesischen Nachrichten Zur Geschichte Der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 2 cilt, Wiesbaden, 1958.
- Liu Mau-tsai. (1960). *Die Chinesischen Nachrichten Zur Geschichte Der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 2 cilt, Wiesbaden, 1958. Contribution a l'histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale.
- Mori Masao, *Kuzey Asya'daki Eski Bozkır Devletlerinin Teşkilâtı, Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, İstanbul, 1978, s.209-226.
- Pulleyblank E. G. (1962). *The consonantal system of Old Chinese* // AM. V. 9. Pt 2.
- Pulleyblank E.G. (1991). *A Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
- Chavannes E. (1904). *Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux* // T'oung Pao. Vol. 5.
- Clauson G. (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ramstedt D.J. (1951). *Alte türkische und mongolische Titel*. Journal de la Société Finno Ougrienne. Helsinki. Vol. 55.
- Shiratori K. (1922). *Kakan to katon shogo ko (К этимологии титулов каган и катун)* // Тбуб Gakuho. V. 11. № 3.
- Тишин В.В. О значении термина да-гуань в китайских источниках о древних тюрках (к критике гипотезы И. Кафесоглу). [www.synologia.ru/.../О\\_значении\\_термина\\_да-гуань\\_в\\_китайских\\_источниках](http://www.synologia.ru/.../О_значении_термина_да-гуань_в_китайских_источниках). (Дата: 01.10.2020).