

O. Karataev Kastamonu University, Turkey, Kastamonu,
e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com**TITLE OF THE ANCIENT TURKS:
“KAGAN” (QAGAN) AND “ZHABGU” (YABGU)**

The Turks managed to create a huge empire. Territory – from the Altai mountains in the east to the Black Sea in the west, from the upper Yenisei in the north to the upper Amu Darya in the south. At the beginning of the VI century, the territory of Kazakhstan came under the authority of the Turkic Kaganate. Turkic Kaganate is the first state in Kazakhstan. Its basis was the union of Turkic-speaking tribes, which was headed by the kagan. The state, based on tribal traditions, was based on military-administrative management. It was part of a system of relations with such major states of the time as Iran and Byzantium. China was a tributary of the kaganate. The title in many cultures played the role of an important indicator of the international prestige of the state. As is known, only members of the Ashina clan had the sacred right to supreme power in the Turkic Kaganate. Possession of one or another title, occupation of one or another place in the political and state structure of society, depended on many circumstances, the main of which was belonging to a particular tribe in a tribal union, clan in a tribe, etc. Social determinants (titles, ranks, positions), as the most significant components of ancient Turkic anthroponomy, contained complete information about the social status of the bearer of a given name, its origin and membership in a particular layer of society, data on its place in the political structure of society and the administrative structure. The political and military organization of Turkic society in many respects continued the traditions of previous state formations of the Huns. In linguistic terms, most of them are borrowings – mainly from Sogdian, Chinese and Tibetan languages.

Key words: Turks, Ashina, sacredness, titles, kagan, yabgu.

О. Қаратаев

профессор, т.ғ.д., Кастамону Университеті,
Түркия, Кастамону қ., e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com**Ежелгі түркілердің титулдары:
«қаған» (каган) және «жабғу» (ябгу)**

Түріктер үлкен империяны құрды. Аумағы – шығыстағы Алтай тауларынан батыста Қара теңізге дейін, солтүстігінде Енисейдің жоғарғы жағынан, оңтүстігінде Әмударияның жоғарғы жағына дейін. VI ғасырдың басында Қазақстан территориясы Түрік қағанатының қарамағына өтті. Түрік қағанаты – Қазақстандағы алғашқы мемлекет. Оның негізін қаған басқарған түркітәулес тайпалардың одағы құрды. Тайпалық дәстүрлерге негізделген мемлекет әскери-әкімшілік басқаруға негізделді. Ол сол кездегі Иран мен Византия сияқты ірі мемлекеттермен қатынастар жүйесінің бөлігі болған. Қытай қағанаттың салмағы болды. Көптеген мәдениеттердегі атау мемлекеттің халықаралық беделінің маңызды индикаторы рөлін атқарды. Түрік қағанатында жоғарғы билікке деген қасиетті құқығы ашина руының мүшелеріне ғана белгілі болды. Қоғамның саяси және мемлекеттік құрылымында бір немесе басқа орынға ие болу үшін көптеген атақтарға ие болу көптеген жағдайларға байланысты болды, олардың негізгілері тайпалық одақта белгілі бір руға, тайпадағы кланға және т.б. Әлеуметтік детерминанттар (атақтар, лауазымдар) ежелгі түркі антропонимиясының маңызды құрамдас бөліктері ретінде, аталған аттың иесінің әлеуметтік мәртебесі, шығу тегі және қоғамның белгілі бір қабатына жататындығы, оның қоғамның саяси құрылымындағы және әкімшілік құрылымдағы орны туралы мәліметтер болған. Түркі қоғамының саяси және әскери ұйымы көп жағдайда ғұндардың бұрынғы мемлекеттік құрылыстарының дәстүрлерін жалғастырды. Тілдік тұрғыдан алғанда, олардың байланысы көпшілігінен – негізінен соғды, қытай және тибет тілдерінен алынған.

Түйін сөздер: түріктер, Ашина, сакралды, титулдар, қаған, ябғу.

О. Каратаев

профессор, д.и.н., Университет Кастамону,
Турция, г. Кастамону, e-mail: okaratayev@gmail.com

Титулатура древних тюрков: «каган» (каган) и «жабгу» (ябгу)

Тюркам удалось создать огромную империю на территории от Алтайских гор на востоке до Черного моря на западе, от верховьев Енисея на севере до верховьев Амударьи на юге. В начале VI века территория Казахстана попала под власть Тюркского каганата. Тюркский каганат – это первое государство на территории Казахстана. Его основу составлял союз тюрко-язычных племен, который возглавлял каган. Государство, опиравшееся на родовые традиции, основывалось на военно-административном управлении. Оно входило в систему отношений с такими крупнейшими государствами того времени, как Иран и Византия. Китай был данником каганата. Титулатура во многих культурах играла роль важного показателя международного престижа государства. Сакральным правом на верховную власть в тюркском каганате, как известно, имели лишь члены рода Ашина. Обладание тем или иным титулом, занятие того или иного места в политической и государственной структуре общества зависело от многих обстоятельств, главным из которых было принадлежность к тому или иному племени в союзе племен, роду в племени и т.п. Социальные детерминативы (титулы, ранги, должности), как наиболее значимые компоненты древнетюркской антропологии, заключали в себе полную информацию о социальном статусе носителя данного имени, о его происхождении и принадлежности к определенному слою общества, данные о его месте в политической структуре общества и административном устройстве. Политическая и военная организация тюркского общества во многом продолжала традиции предшествующих государственных образований хуннов. В лингвистическом отношении большинство из них представляют собой заимствования – преимущественно из согдийского, китайского и тибетского языков.

Ключевые слова: тюрки, Ашина, сакральность, титулы, каган, ябгу.

Introduction and methodology of the problem

In recent decades, historical science is undergoing a major transformation. The basic problems of historical knowledge are subject to revision: the objectivity of historical research, the relationship between the historian and the source, the interpretation of historical concepts, and many others. All of them touch upon the question of how historical science complies with the basic criteria of scientific knowledge. When writing this work, the methods of instrumentalism and constructivism were used.

It is known that instrumentalism (also known as situationalism, mobilization, or the hedonistic concept of ethnicity) is an approach that has been widely adopted in the interpretation of ethnicity in the mid-70s in Western ethnology. Instrumentalism combines primordialist and constructivist principles. The essence of the concept lies in the fact that the main thing in the existence of an ethnos is to serve certain specific goals and interests. Instrumentalism is often based on socio-psychological theories, where ethnicity is interpreted as an effective means to overcome alienation, achieve a more comfortable state and acts as a social therapy. Constructivism in historical knowledge is a direction in historical epistemology that opposes realism and objectivism. Two trends can be distinguished in it: constructive realism and radical constructivism. Constructive

realism, or phenomenological constructivism, overcoming the opposition of realism and constructivism, proceeds from the fact that the cognizing subject does not so much reflect as constructs historical reality within the framework of a certain cultural and epistemological context. Representatives of constructive realism consider historical knowledge as such cognitive activity, which involves the interaction of historians, on the one hand, with transcendental historical reality, and on the other, with each other. In the framework of these interactions, “life worlds” are constructed as pictures of the historical past, which to a certain extent correspond to historical reality itself, but inevitably bear the “handwriting” of the cognizer (*Terminological Dictionary, 2014: 226-229*).

The term “title” means not only the names of the highest state, possessive, hereditary and clan honorary titles of the elite of society, that is, the title in a narrow, proper sense, but also the name or the name of someone by occupation, social status, or distinctive features, that is, a title in the broad sense of the term; honorary possessive or clan title requiring appropriate title (Kagan title, princely title); the name of someone, something (usually high, honorable) by occupation, social status, some distinguishing features; the name of any position, rank (*Sheriyev, 1991: 3*). Ancient Turkic social terminology has repeatedly been the subject of scientific analysis. The

material in this case was both texts of the ancient Turkic runic inscriptions, and documents in other languages. Its main circle, relating mainly to the time of the Second Turkic Kaganate (682-745), is now known. But a significant part of it, contained in the early Chinese materials, despite the serious developments available, has not been examined enough, and sometimes it has not been identified. Now there is already a tradition of reconstructing the ancient Turkic vocabulary proper in Chinese transcription, but the accumulation of experience in this direction is hampered by the fact that, as a general rule, its Chinese translation is absent. From the first steps of state history, Turkic society was strictly ranked (Zuev, 1998: 153-154).

When writing this work, Chinese chronicles, arabographic sources, works of famous orientalists, historians and turkologists, for example, N. Ya. Bichurin, V. V. Barthold, S. E. Malov, N. A. Baskakov, L. P. Potapov, V. S. Taskin, E. Shavannes, G. Clauson, G. Doerfer, F. Donuk, Liu Mau-tsai, K. Shiratori, R. Pelliot, G. Ramstedt, S. G. Klyash-torny, etc.

Kagan

Kagan (Qagan), the highest state title of the ancient and medieval Central Asian states, the highest sovereign title in the early medieval and medieval hierarchies. The highest state term in the early Middle Ages was used among the Sabir, Bulgars, Avars (Zhuanzhuan-Zhuzhan), Khazars, Kök Turks, Kyrgyz, Uighurs and Pechenegs. In Mongolian time it merged with the related form “kaan” (“Qaan”, “qhan”, ie “great khan”). The term “kagan” was first witnessed in Chinese sources in relation to the Central Asian tribe of the xianbi (III century). A number of scholars, referring to the studies of E. Pulliblack, believe that the title “kagan” was worn by the Huns (Huns) as early as the 1st century AD. BC. in the form of “hu-yu” (wah-wa) (Clauson, 1959: 611a; Donuk, 1988: 42). Kipchak clan-tribal associations, kimaki (kimeks), and Karakhanids used the parallel title-term “kan” (khan).

There are different points of view regarding the origin of the “kagan” title: the altaiist G. Ramstedt (Ramstedt, 1951: 62) believed that this term has Chinese roots, F. Laszlo [F. Laszlo, 1944: 37] – the Syanbi origin, V. Bang (Bang, 1929: 118) – ancient Sogdian, K. Shiratori (Shiratori, 1922: 1-26), P. Pelliot (Pelliot, 1921: 328), V. V. Barthold (Barthold, 1927: 8) – Zhuanzhuan.

ON THE. N. A. Baskakov, relying on the work of a number of researchers, gives such a definition

to the title term: Turkic. qayan “kagan, sovereign” < kit. “Ke-xan” – “the great khan” (Chen Chang-Hao, 1953); < whale. ke-kuan “great sovereign” > qayan (Ramstedt, 1951: 62; Baskakov, 1987: 5).

In 402, the title “kagan” was adopted by the Mongol-speaking Zhuzhans (“Zhuzhuan” or “Zhuanzhuan”) instead of the Hun (sünnu) title of “shanyu”. The first to accept the title of “kagan” was the Juan ruler Shelun (Kradin, 1992: 136; Donuk, 1988: 41-42). Then, from the Juan Juan he was borrowed by the Avars and Turks (from 551 years), who created in the middle of the VI century. the largest nomadic empire at that historical moment was the Turkic Kaganate (551-630). The founder of the Turkic state, Bumyn (Tumyn, died in 552) took the title “kagan,” worn by their overlords – the Juan rulers. Since the VI century. Kyrgyz, Uyghurs, Karluks, Khazars and Kimaks took this title.

The genesis of the imperial structures among the Turks was closely connected with the fate of the Zhuanzhuan (Zhozhuan) Kaganate. The Khanate of Zhuanzhuan during its exaltation was for the Turks a model of an empire that partially integrated the nomads of Mongolia into a single political system. In addition, for the Türks, the Zhuanzhuangs were the bearers of more ancient imperial traditions (title, hierarchy, management methods, sacred nature of power, etc.). In the clashes between the Türks and the Zhuanzhuan, the mechanism of replacing the Chinese nomadic elite with another, more consolidated ethno-political group was reflected (see: Vasyutin, 2016: 189).

The ruler of Zhuanzhuan, Shelun, officially accepts the title “qayan” as the title of supreme ruler and from this period ceases to be used as such the title of shanyu (Taskin, 1986: 216-217; Donuk, 1988: 41-42). There is the following information about the appropriation of the qayan title by Shalun in the Chinese chronicle “Wei shu”: “All the minor possessions that suffered from the raids and robberies of Shalun were (as it were) on his leash and obeyed him. In this regard, Shelun appropriated the title of Zudouf Kekhan. Tzudouf in the language of the Wei dynasty means “ruling and led to expansion”, and Kekhan means “emperor” (FMPRC, p. 269).

But, some researchers, referring to Chinese written sources, conclude that the title “kagan” was used by Central Asian nomads before zhuanzhuan. The title “ke-han” (qayan) was used by the syanbi in 269-333. (see: Taskin, 1986: 214-215). However, as can be judged from the information of the Chinese chronicles, the rulers of the Tuyuyhuns (one of the branches of the Mongolian-speaking Syanbi) in practice officially used two titles – shanyuy and

qayan, of which, according to V. S. Taskin, the first is Turkic and the second is Syanbian (*Taskin, 1986: 215; Babayarov, Kubatin, 2012: 60*).

According to the Wei-shu chronicle, the first ruler of the tuyuyhuni was nicknamed “qa-han” (qayan) by the ruler of Kualuy. It also notes that “he sat (ie, Kualui) on a golden couch decorated with lions, and called his wife ke-zun (katun) ...” (*Taskin, 1984: 227*). In the name of the wife of the ruler of tuyuyhuni, already noted in “Zhou shu”, a number of scholars see the ancient Turkic title “qatun” (Döerfer, 1965: 471).

N.I. Shervashidze notes, “however, one can hardly agree with V. S. Taskin (*Taskin, 1986: 217*), who considers (without sufficient etymological reasons) the “qagan” form of Mongolian origin and explains the replacement of the title “shanyu” by “kagan” among the Türks as the “logical outcome of the centuries-long struggle between the Türkic-speaking and Mongol-speaking peoples, ending with the victory of the latter “ Rather, one must agree with the traditional point of view of K. Shiratori (*Shiratori, 1922, No. 3*) on the gradual decrease in the value of shanyu among the Huns, starting from the middle of the 1st century n e., when the Huns (i.e., the Huns – O. K) divided into northern and southern and two shanyuy appeared (*Shervashidze, 1990: 86*).

After the collapse of the state of the Huns, in Chinese chronicles, a number of ancient Turkic titles begin to be mentioned that have not been seen before and whose interpretation is not in doubt. During this period, the title “qayan” was first mentioned in Chinese chronicles, which later supplanted the title “shanyu” (*Taskin, 1986: 213-218*) and was used as a title of supreme ruler for centuries in a number of Turkic and non-Turkic states. According to K. Shiratori, the title “qayan” was first mentioned in Chinese chronicles in connection with the Syanbi tribe tsifu (ie, Xianbi) (*Babayarov, Kubatin, 2012: 59*).

Kagan – has become synonymous with the terms of emperors and shahinshahs. V. V. Barthold and A. N. Bernshtam deduces “kan / qan (khan)” from “kangan / qagan” and notices that the kagan began to mean “khan khans” (*Barthold, 1968: 602*). In recent years, there has been widespread support for the Chinese origin of the term: kagan – kağan < ke-kuan “great ruler” (*Ramstedt, 1951: 62; Döerfer, 111: 828; Gabain, 1974; Kononov, 1980: 104; Baskakov, 1985: 154, etc*). The “eternal ale” (beggü el) of the Türks, the empire created by them, appears in the inscriptions as the social ideal of the Turkic aristocracy. Fidelity of running and “the whole nation” is postulated as the basic condition for the well-

being of the “Eternal Ale”, and the kagan acts as a guarantor of this well-being (*Tishin, 2015: 123*).

The kagan and the aristocracy had, first of all, military-organizational functions, while “it is known that they were in charge of the distribution of pastures, especially in the conquered territories,” and the kagans “also served sacred functions”. The Khagans were most afraid of the migrations of certain groups to other territories, which meant a way out of their power, and it is from this that the Khagan warns the Türks, urging them to stay in Ötüken (*Khazanov, 2002: 398; Tishin, 2015: 154-155*).

This title, a social determinative, is found as a component of the anthroponym in many monuments: Aj qağan, Baz-qağan, Bilge-qağan, Bögü-qağan, Bumin-qağan, Barsbek-qagan and many others. Dr. Khan < whale. kwan, “ruler” (*Ramstedt, 1955: 61*). In Arabographic sources, the Khazar sovereign (according to Ibn Rust) is called “Khazar-Khakan”, Ibn Fadlan is “the great Khakan”, and his deputy is “Khakan-bek”. In Mahmud Kashgari, the “rulers” mention the rulers of states – “Khakans” (ie, Khagans). Ibn Khordadbeh, noting that the kings of the Turks, Tibet and the Khazars are called the Khakan, cites further in the section describing the honorable nickname of the kings of Khorasan and the East, six more people who wore the same title.

G. Döerfer writes: “The expressions qagan and qan, therefore, can refer to the same person, since the first is a specific title (and at the same time the designation of position), and the second is more likely a general designation of rank” (*Döerfer, 1967: 141*). The fact that the titles qan // qagan are hierarchically truly “aligned” and eliminated can easily be seen even with the examples of the dictionary entry qan in the OTD (*OTD, 1969: 417; Shervashidze, 1989:57*).

“Khudud al-alam”, in addition to the rulers of Tibet, the Kyrgyz, the Khazars, also includes the Rus, among the people who wore the title of kagan. At the beginning of the IX century dependent Kiev princes (Kievan Rus) adopted from the Khazars the title “kagan”. Having adopted this title, the Kiev princes wanted to emphasize the independence of Kiev from the Khazar Khaganate. The term “kagan” remains the official title of the grand duke until the last quarter of the 11th century, when a mural depicting the patron saint of Kiev prince Svyatoslav Yaroslavovich (1073-1076) is covered with a graffiti with a prayer for the salvation of his soul: “Grace our Lord’s kagan”. In this inscription Svyatoslav is called a kagan.

The party-political and military organization of Turkic society in many respects continued the tradi-

tions of the previous state formations of the Huns (Huns). In linguistic terms, most of them are borrowings – mainly from Sogdian, Chinese and Tibetan languages (Kononov, 1980: 104). In the state, the kagan occupied the highest step in the hierarchy of social organization. It was the center of the triad system of social organization, personifying el – the unity of the Turkic people. Kagan was the commander in chief, standing at the head of the military hierarchical public organization. He was the overlord of the entire territory of the state. The title and public office of the kagan personified both the supreme shaman and the main blacksmith of society (country). The Zhou-shu annals of the ancient Türks say: “Every year, the kagan led noble people (gui-jen) to the cave of their ancestors to make sacrifices, and in the middle decade of the 5th month they gathered on the river. Tamir to sacrifice to the god of heaven.” The record clearly indicates that it was the kagan who led the Turkic nobility for prayer, and this can serve as indirect evidence that the kagan himself committed it, i.e. it is possible that the kagan was also a shaman. A number of researchers quite reasonably assume that shamanistic traits are traced in the ceremony of placing the khagans on the throne (Potapov, 1991: 123). Emphasizing the genetic and ritual relationship of shamans and blacksmiths is quite justified, given the prominent place of blacksmithing in the economic life of the ancient Türks, as evidenced by the sources and archaeological materials of the burial of the ancient Türks, because the profession of a blacksmith is considered sacred in many peoples, including Turkic, with constant casing of fire – a symbol of the deity.

Tengri (god) granted the right to power to selected people, what were the kagans through which he controlled people. They were endowed with supernatural abilities expressed through the following interconnected concepts: a) qut ‘grace, charisma / political power’; b) uluř, ülüg “fate, inheritance, share”; c) küč “strength” (Babayarov, 2012: 47). But if the kagan was not able to rule, then it was believed that qut left him, then he shifted and moved away from power. The ruler had enormous powers. “Each of his orders was considered and revered as a law. “Officials at all levels of government and the whole people had to obey the orders and decrees of the ruler.” In addition to the administrative, he performed judicial functions ..., ... the kagan commanded the army (Babayarov, 2012: 47; Tishin, 2015: 203-204).

The concept of the divine origin of the kagan and its power. The power of the kagan is bestowed by Heaven (Tengri). The ruler appears as

a sacred heroic leader: “Unborn” / “born of Heaven” (Malov, 1951: 33; Klyashtorny, 1980: 92, 93; 2010: 41, 42, 44, 89; Vasyutin, 2016: 248], “Set by Heaven”/“Given by Heaven” (Malov, 1951: 65; 1959: 20, 23, 38), “Heavenly Khan”/“Heavenly Hagan” (Klyashtorny, 1980, p. 93; 2010: 42, 43; Vasyutin 2016: 248), “Unbelievable” (Malov, 1951: 33; 1959: 23; Vasyutin, 2016: 248), “God-like” (Malov, 1959: 20; Vasyutin, 2016: 248), “Divine” (Malov 1951: 10; Vasyutin, 2016: 248). His power is a manifestation of divine will (Klyashtorny, 2003: 62). This connection was made using special public rituals. During the procedure for the proclamation of a new kagan, the nearest dignitaries planted the applicant for a nightmare and surrounded him nine times in a circle (in the sun). After each round they bowed. At the end of the ceremony, the ruler was mounted on a horse, how many years he will rule over the people and the state. From the spoken words of the kagan dignitaries “made a conclusion ... about the term of his powers” (Bichurin, 1950: 229; Liu Mau-tsai, 1958: 8; Klyashtorny, 1983: 88).

According to P. K. Dashkovsky, in the early medieval societies of Central Asia, the Hunnic tradition was of great importance. According to her, sacralization covered the entire ruling clan (the cult of Ashin, the myth of the origin of this dynasty). The mental attitude of the nomads was dominated by the idea of the heavenly origin of the Khagans and their intermediary role between the “sons of men” and Heaven (Tengri), which expanded the religious and meditative powers of the ruler. Kagan, from the point of view of P. K. Dashkovsky, acted as a symbol of religious and political unity, and his name became an eponym and synonym for the whole empire. In general, the author connects the emergence of political mythology and symbolism with the processes of state formation (Dashkovsky, 2005: 64-65; Vasyutin, 2016: 177). In another article, P. K. Dashkovsky emphasized the divine origin of the Hagan. In his opinion, the mythology of the heavenly birth of the Hagan (the cult of the Hagan, the cult of the Ashin clan) was formed in the worldview of the Turkic population. The ruler personified the divine origin of the state and the existence of the beast (wolf) – the first ancestor (Dashkovsky, 2007: 48; Vasyutin, 2016: 177).

In the monuments of the ancient Türkic runic writing there is an exalted description of the mystical connection of the Turkic Hagan clan with the spirits of Heaven (Tengri) and the sacred Earth-Water (Yduk Yer-Sub = Iduk Jir-sub). So, in the monument in honor of Kul-Tegin there are such expressions: “Turkic wise kagan born of heaven”; “By the

predestination of Heaven and a happy fate, he became a kagan”; “The Sky revered by the Turks, the sacred Earth-Water, all together determined: Let the Turkic people not disappear ...”; “The sky, leading my father Ilerish-kagan and mother Ilbilgya-katun, exalted them”; “Since Heaven granted power, the army of my father-kagan was like a wolf, and the enemy was like a sheep” (*Malov, 1961: 27-31.33.35, 37.39-40*).

S.G. Klyashtorny traces the following managerial powers of the kagan: 1) to settle and resettle hostile tribes, i.e. redefine their territory; 2) resettle the Türks on the occupied lands, i.e. distribute land; 3) to collect, resettle and arrange Türks “in the country of Otügen”, i.e. on the root earth; 4) transfer land under certain conditions to immigrants (Sogdians, Chinese). Leaving was considered as a crime of the people against the kagan and ale, because the main function of the kagan was precisely the “gathering” and “dispensation” of the people on the land subject to the kagan, i.e. the creation of a political organization, a system of submission (*Klyashtorny, 1984: 101; Tishin, 2015: 123-124*). Kagan could be considered the supreme owner of the land, but possessions were determined by him with the support of the nobility.

Yabgu (Yabǧu), Jabgu (Jabǧu)

Yabgu (Yabǧu), Jabgu (Jabǧu) – military-political and administrative title in the system of state management of the ancient Huns (Huns) and Turkic Khaganates. According to some reports, the title “yabgu” was originally used in the government of the Huns (Huns) and symbolized a high power title (*Pelliot, 1915: 688, n. 5; Hirth, 1989: 4; Donuk, 1988: 56*). According to the definition of scientists, this title was known in the Usun Union, in the state of Kangyui (Sogd), in Yuezhi (*Laszlo, 1944: 48*).

The title Yabgu / Jabǧu was worn by members of the Hagan family of Ashin and were second persons or vice-kagans in the Türkic-Turkic state (Türkic kük – Türkic Kaganate, 552-581). It should also be noted that the ancient Turks during the period of their submission to the Juan-Juan had the title yabǧu. So, the leader of the Tu-u Turks (535) – the father of Bumyn and Istemi – the founders of the Turkic Kaganate, had the titles “Ta Sheih-hu” and “Ta Ye-hu” (“Ta-ye” -hu”), i.e. “The great yabgu” (*Chavannes, 1903: 47*).

Some scholars consider this title to be Kushan, others – Tocharian, and still others – ancient Iranian. According to some scholars, the origin of this title is associated with the Kushan political tradition

preserved by the Ephtalites: jabǧu < jawuga “ruler” from jam – “order”, “command” (*Aalto, 1971; Golden, 1974: 108*). Turkic. jabǧu ~ žabǧu “ruler, leader”, alleged borrowing from Iran. Kushansk. Sanskrit jawǧu (*Golden, 1980*) < kit. djan-giwo > modern. šan-ju “title of supreme ruler” (*Menges, 1968: 88; Gabain, 1974: 381; Baskakov, 1987: 5*). The word “yabgu”, despite a number of scientific hypotheses, remains unclear.

Jabgu is “Viceroy” (“member of the reigning house”), but a reliable etymology of the word does not exist. The proposed identification of the titles “jabǧu” and “shanyii” by K. Menges (*Menges, 1968: 88*) does not hold water for phonetic reasons. G. Dörfer convincingly enough shows that this term fell to the Türks from Tochars, however, his Tocharian etymology is also unclear. For the first time, the title jabju is attested in the Chinese chronicle of 23 BC. e. (iap-yo (according to S. A. Starostin). It is tempting to compare the word with Tib. skjabs-mgon – “assistant, deputy.” It can be assumed that a form like s-kjab ~ sm ~ go-n (kjabgo) is “vice “king”, that is, “assistant, deputy (ruler)” went through the filter of a particular language and developed according to its phonetic samples. Note that the Tibetan skjabs-mgon “assistant, protector, patron” was used in the titles of Tibetan Dalai Lamas and Panchen Lam (*Shervashidze, 1990: 89*).

The second person in the Turkic Kaganate was yabgu (dzhabgu, ye-hu, yabgu), but he could not become the heir to the kagan. Only the brother of Bumyn Istemi (died in 576), who bore the title of yabgu, after expanding to the west, rose and became almost an independent ruler. Both in sources and in scientific studies of Istemi (Greek: Dizabul – Sizabulos, Silzabulos) are often referred to as kagan (khan), yabgu-kagan. Especially indicative is the naming of Istemi Kagan in inscriptions in honor of Kul-tegin and Bilge-kagan (*Malov, 1951: 36; Klyashtorny, 2003: 61; Vasyutin, 2016: 192*). The population of the Western Türkic Kaganate was called “yabgu-türkleri” (*Chavannes, 1903: 21.95, n. 3.219*). In addition to the Türks, the title “yabgu” was carried by the Khazars, European Avars, and possibly Magyars (*Donuk, 1988: 57*).

Yabgu is always mentioned in the inscriptions in front of the shad, as well as the fact that in the Chinese source (*Liu Mau-Tsai, 1958: 8*), the yabgu is higher than the shad, clearly shows that his official position was higher than that of the shad. R. Giraud thinks that yabgu and shad were present at the same time only among the Western Türks, and the Eastern Türks had only two Shads; however, the construction of eki sad “two shads” should undoubtedly

be understood as “yabgu and shad” (*Giraud, 1960: 73-75*). In addition, Chinese sources argue that the Eastern Türks had yabgu (*Liu Mau-Tsai, 1958: 81*). “In the highest ranks, tutsjue had ye-hu (z / abgu), and then she (şad)” (*Shervashidze, 1990: 81*).

“Yabgu” was originally appointed as a kagan from members of the royal family. It was, as a rule, the younger brother or one of the sons of the kagan. If the first rulers of the ancient Turks bore the title of Shad (governor), then the ruler of the Tuu Turks who ruled the ancient Turks in the beginning of the 6th century (according to another version of Tumen, the father of Bumyn-kagan) was already called the “great yabgu” (“dzhabgu”), which indicated an increased level of political claims. His son Bumyn, who became the ruler of the ancient Türks in 534, continued the line of his father aimed at building his own statehood and in 551 became the kagan of the Turkic kaganate. An important role in all the events was also played by the younger brother of the Kagan Bumyn – Istemi-yabgu, which is emphasized in the texts of the runic written monuments. Formally accepting the title “yabgu” of Istemi-yabgu (second person in the state) from the Ashin dynasty – the yabgu of the Turkic Kaganate from 552 to 576, for 20 years led the western politics of the kaganate and was an almost independent ruler of the western territories and bore the title “yabgu-kagan” “The Byzantine Ambassador Zemarch of Cilicia, who visited the Istemi Kagan (Yabgu Kagan) calls him Dizabul (i.e., Yabgu). The last Yabgu-Kagan of the Western Turkic Kaganate was Tong-Yabgu (Chinese “Tong-Yabgu”), which ruled the state in 618-630. According to E. Shavann, the title “yabgu-kagan” denoted the joint ruler of the state (*Chavannes, 1903: 24*).

The founder of the II East Turkic Kaganate, Iltes-Kagan (Kutlug Kagan, 681-692), appointed his younger brother To-si-fu “yabgu” (*Donuk, 1988: 57*). In the same period in the east (Toles) and in the western part of the empire – Tardush, special representatives of the kagan – yabgu were appointed (*Gabain, 1950: 350*). The first Uigur kagan Kutluk Bilge Kyl Kagan (744-747), before becoming a kagan, was called Yeh-hu (i.e., yabgu). The second Uigur Kagan, Moyun-Chur (747-759), appointed one of his sons, the Yabgu (Ögel, 1951: 363). Sent by Moyun-Chur, the Tay Bilge Tutuk ambassador to the Tang Court was named “yabgu”. The title “yabgu” was held by high officials in the Turgesh Kaganate (*Donuk, 1988: 57*). The Karluk ruler, an ally of the Uigur Kagan, who bore the title “right yabgu”, i.e. “Sağ yabgu” (742-744), with the establishment of statehood of the Uigur Kaganate (744), like the ruler of the Karluks received the title “left yabgu”

(ie, “sol yabgu”): (*Chavannes, 1903: 85 n. 4.12*). It is known that in the XI century. in Central Asia, the Oguz state of Yabgu was formed. Later, the Seljukid Sultanate arose on the foundation of this state.

They (yabgu, şad) are often mentioned in inscriptions in honor of Mogilyan, Tonyukuk and others, with yabgu primarily as the head of the Tölis Federation, and şad as the head of the Tarduş Federation. The same titles are found in Chinese sources (*Liu Mau-Tsai, 1958: 8, 132, 179, 429*). Once again, we note the fact that the yabgu is always mentioned in the inscriptions in front of the shad, while in the Chinese source (*Liu Mau-Tsai, 1958: 8*), the yabgu stands above the shad clearly shows that his position was higher than that of the shad. R. Giraud thinks that yabgu and şad were at the same time only among the Western Türks, and the Eastern Türks had only two Shads; however, the construction of eki sad “two shads” should undoubtedly be understood as “yabgu and shad” (*Giraud, 1960: 73-75*). In addition, Chinese sources argue that the Eastern Türks had yabgu (*Liu Mau-Tsai, p. 81*), for example, “tujue had ye-hu (z / abgu) in the highest ranks, and she (şad) after him” (*Shervashidze, 1990: 82*).

In the control system, “yabgu” were also called “younger kagans”. The terms of the reign of the co-rulers, as noted by S. G. Klyashtorny, did not coincide with the reign of the main khagans. So, Istemi, as a yabgu-kagan, outlived his brother Bumyn and Kagan Kara-Yeske and served as co-ruler and ruler of the Western territories at the same time until the 60th century. Even during the life of the kagan at this post he was replaced by the younger brother of Mugan – Makhan tegin. The state title of Mahan tegin indicates that he was in fact a kagan of the Eastern Türks, and the descendants of Istemi continued to perform the functions of managing the Western wing. Officially, the younger kagans of the First Kaganate ruled the western wing and were called the combination of the class and state title “yabgu-kagan”, which did not exclude the preservation of the independent title “yabgu” in this part of the Türks. This is confirmed by the titles that have reached us of the West Turkic rulers. The system of two khagans was preserved after 603, i.e., after the division into Western and Eastern Kaganates, i.e. in every part of it. The institute of co-rulers and the replacement of senior posts is explained by many reasons. The external and internal political situation in the kaganate dictated the need for multi-reserve power, but the main reason is the vast territories and weak communications. The winter rate of the Great Yabgu / Jabgu-Kagan of the Western Türks, which was considered the main one, according to scientists,

was in the city of Navakent (Suyab). At present, this is a localized area near the city of Tokmok (Kyrgyzstan). The summer rate was in the Min-Bulak area, north of Chach (the area of the modern Zhambyl region, Kazakhstan). The official title of the ruler of the Western Turkic kaganate from the Ashin dynasty was “the kagan of the people of ten arrows”, or the Turkic yabgu-kagan. The title “yabgu” (variants of Jafgu, Yafgu) was later also held by the rulers of the Western Turkic Kaganate (yabgu-kagan), Karluks, Karakhanids, Oguzes, Khazars and Bulgars. The head of the Oguz state (Yabgu state) X-XI centuries. in the middle course of the river. Syr-Darya was the supreme ruler, who held the honorary title of jabuya, or yabgu. Ibn Fadlan reports that the king of the Oghuz Turks bears the title of yabgu.

The title term “yabgu” was used by the Khazars when they were still part of the Turkic Kaganate (VI – early VII centuries). Very interesting facts tell the Khazars about this title in Albanian, Armenian and Georgian sources. Yabgu (Zabgu / Zebgu) was a high rank among the Turks, usually he was worn by the khagan brothers or his very close blood relatives. An Albanian historian reports that the leader of the southern Khazars, who lived in the zone bordering the Transcaucasian countries, was a certain Jabgu (from the author Jebu)? and his son Buri Shad. They considered all of Northern Albania their possessions (*Ghukasyan, 1977: 38-39*). It is also noteworthy that the Albanian historian also cites the semantics of the word “jabgu”. He writes that in 626 the Byzantine emperor Heraclius I made an alliance with the Khazars against Iran and promised a big reward to the Khazar dzhabgu: “When the governor of the northern king (that is, the Khazar kagan) with the name Jebukhagan, the second person in the kingdom heard and saw promises of great rewards... gave an answer...” (*Ghukasyan, 1977: 38*). From this small passage it is clear that the jabgu / jabgu was the governor of the Khazar Khagan in southern Khazaria, and he was the second person after the Khazar Khagan. Perhaps the same is described by the Byzantine historian of the 7th century Theophanes. The latter writes that in 627 the Khazars “under the leadership of their leader Siebel (that is, Jebu), who was considered the largest person after the hakan, inundated the province of Atrpatkan” (*Ghukasyan, 1977: 38-39*). In the Byzantine sources it is mentioned that the Khazar ruler is called “yabgu-kagan”. It is known that the title “yabgu-kagan” until the fall of the Turkic kaganate was worn by the brother of Bumyn Istemi kagan.

In the “History of Alvan” the spelling “jabgu”, or rather “jabgu” instead of “yabgu” is not acciden-

tal and is not a distortion. This word is recorded almost in the same sound in Armenian and Georgian sources. An Armenian historian of the 7th century Sebeos, a contemporary of the Khazar dzhabgu, writes that when the Iran war with the Kushans began, “the Kushan kings asked for help from the great Khakan, the king of the north. And the army came to their aid in the amount of 30 buros; it crossed a river called Vekhrot, which originates in Turkestan ... Then came the order of the hakan Dzhembuh ...”. The Georgian source of the 7th – 9th centuries “Moktsevay Kartlisay” provides a more accurate form of this title. It notes that in 627 the Byzantine emperor Heraclius left Eristav Jibgo for the siege of Tiflis. “But this jibgo, after a few days, took Kalu ...”. In “Brief History of Georgia” by Juansher a form of this title was recorded, which was almost similar to the Khazar one: “... Jibgu took the Tiflis fortress, captured the head of the fortress ...” (*Ghukasyan, 1977: 38-39*).

In “Kitab ahbar al-buldan”, Ibn al-Fakih sets forth (or rather retells) the legend of the founders of the Oguz state, often mentioning dzhabgu. Hamadani Balkik, who lived in the UPP century, was named by the Arab author Najip “Balkik ibn Jabgu” (*Agadzhanov, 1969: 122-128*). The indicated title in the ancient Turkic languages existed in two dialect versions: Zhabgu and Jabgu. The Transcaucasian sources borrowed the form Jabey / Jebgu through J – the dialect of the languages of the Saviro-Khazar Union. The title of the Khazar vice-kagan jabgu was preserved in the Turkic languages in the following centuries: the supreme rulers of the Oguzes of the XI-XI centuries were called “jafga”, which goes back to the Saviro-Khazar form of jabga / jabgu. Mahmud Kashgari (11th century) notes that among the Kypchaks and Oguzes of the 10th-11th centuries the Jafga meant “leader” and “guide”, and Ibn Muhanna interprets it as “the elder of the tribe”. Therefore, the form of jabga / jafga cannot be attributed only to jacking Kypchak languages. In general, attributing jacking only to Kipchak languages is unlawful (*Ghukasyan, 1977: 40*).

Conclusion

Thus, the materials examined by us above on the ancient Turkic title give us the right to conclude that the place and political weight of a member of society was largely determined by his title, often hereditary, securing the position of its bearer in the system of social ties and subordinations. According to Chinese information, the proclamation of the khan was framed by a complicated ceremonial: dignitaries put

him on felt and carried nine times around, across the sun, to the cheers of those present. Then they put him on a horse, pulled his throat with silk cloth and, quickly loosening the noose, asked how many years he wanted to be a khan. In the history of Turkic peoples it is imperceptible that the answers to these questions play at least some role in determining the term of government; most likely this custom was preserved as a rudiment from the time when the khan was an elected tribal leader. The first person in the state after the khan was yabgu. As a matter of fact, the yabgu was the vice-king, and members of the royal family were most often appointed to this position. For example, under Il-Khan Bumyn, the rank of yabgu was his brother Istemi. But at the same time, the yabgu was not the heir to the throne; the heir was called “tegin” regardless of the position held. The title “shad” belonged to the princes of blood, who had in their control inheritance, for example, Symo, later a khan, could not become a shad because of the suspicion that he was illegitimate. Lesser ranks were received by persons who did not belong to the Ashin clan, but all posts were hereditary. Based on this, it

can be assumed that Turkic society was aristocratic. The establishment of the rule of the Ashin clan with its totemic cult of the wolf was the foundation of state power in the Great Turkic Kaganate, as was the sacred cult of Tengri. Sacred status played a crucial role in legitimizing the power of the ruler among the Turks. The title “kagan” itself, even though it was borrowed from the Jujans, became fundamental in the system of state power and administration in the Turkic kaganates.

The rites of initiation and legitimation of power of the Ashin clan remained unchanged, right up to the division of the Kaganate in 603. From this moment, the weakening of the sacred status of the Eastern Turkic Hagan begins. Two reasons at once contributed to this: the fall of the Ashin dynasty, with the establishment of the power of the Ashide clan, and also the increased influence of China on the Turkic power. The beginning of such transformations was laid back during the Hagan Taspar (567-581) when the influence of Buddhism was introduced into the kaganate, but it did not have a strong influence on Turkic society.

Литература

- Aalto P. (1971). Iranian contacts of the turks in pre-islamic Times/Studia turcica? Budapest. P. 29-37.
- Агаджанов С.Г. (1969). Очерки истории огузов и туркмен Средней Азии IX-XIII вв. Ашхабад.
- Бабаяров Г., Кубатин А. (2012). Древнетюркские титулы в эпоху до Тюркского Каганата. Век науки и образования, №7. Астана. С. 52-64.
- Бабаяров, Г. Б. (2012). Государственный строй Западно-Тюркского каганата: автореф. дис. ... д-ра ист. наук : 07.00.03. Ташкент.
- Бартольд В. В. (1968). Соч.: В 9 т. Москва: «Восточная литература». Т. 5.
- Баскаков Н. А. (1985). К этимологии собственных тюркских имён в русских летописях. Теория и практика этимологических исследований. Москва. С. 30-34.
- Баскаков Н. А. (1985). Тюркская лексика в «Слове о полку Игореве». Москва.
- 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.
- Бичурин Н. Я. (1950). Собрание сведений о народах, обитавших в Средней Азии в древние времена. Том 1. М.-Л., АН СССР.
- Васюгин С. А. (2016). Власть и социум в кочевых империях Центральной Азии VI – начала XII вв. Рукопись докторской диссертации. Кемерово.
- Гукасян В. Л. (1977). Тюркизмы в албанских источниках. Советская тюркология. №2. Баку. С.30-41.
- Дашковский П. К. (2005). О сакрализации правителей государственных образований кочевников Центральной Азии. Древние кочевники Центральной Азии (история, культура, наследие): Мат. междунар. науч. конф. Улан-Удэ. С. 63-67.
- Зуев Ю. А. (1998). Древнетюркская социальная терминология в китайском тексте VIII в. // Вопросы археологии Казахстана. Вып. 2. Алматы – Москва. С.151-161.
- Кляшторный С. Г. (1964). Древнетюркские рунические памятники как источник по истории Средней Азии. Москва.
- Кляшторный С. Г. (1984). Каган, беги и народ в памятниках тюркской рунической письменности. Востоковедение. 9. Филологические исследования. Ученые записки ЛГУ. № 412. Серия востоковедческих наук. Вып. 25. С. 143-153.
- Кляшторный С. Г., Саввинов Д. Г. (1988). Древнетюркские этнополитические объединения и их значения в этногенезе народов Средней Азии и Казахстана. Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории народов Центральной Азии и Казахстана. Москва. С. 66-70.
- Кононов А. Н. (1992). Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников VII-IX вв. Ленинград.
- Крадин Н. Н. (1992). Кочевые общества (проблемы формационной характеристики). Владивосток.
- Коновалова И. Г. (2009). Древнейший титул русских князей «каган». ДТ. Москва. С. 226-237.
- Малов С.Е. (1951). Памятники древнетюркской письменности: Тексты и исследования. Москва-Ленинград.

- Потапов Л.П. (1991). Алтайский шаманизм. Москва.
- Рамstedт Г. (1957). Введение в алтайское языкознание. Москва.
- Таскин В.С. (1984). Материалы по истории древних кочевых народов группы дунху Введение, перевод и комментарии В.С. Таскина. Москва. МИДКНГД.
- Таскин В.С. (1986). О титулах шаньюй и каган. *Mongolica*. Памяти академика Б.Я.Владимирцова (1884-1931). Москва. С. 213-218. МИДКНГД.
- Терминологический словарь. (2014). Отв. ред. А.О. Чубарьян. Москва.
- Тишин В.В. (2015). Историография социальной истории Тюркского каганата VI-VIII вв. Рукопись докт. дисс. Москва.
- Хазанов А.М. (2002). Кочевники и внешний мир. Изд. 3-е, доп. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс.
- Чэнь Чан-Хао, Дубровский А.Г., Котов А.В. (1953). Русско-китайский словарь. Москва.
- Шервашидзе И. Н. (1989). Фрагмент общетюркской лексики. Заимствованный фонд. Вопросы языкознания. № 2. С.54-80.
- Шервашидзе И. Н. (1990). Фрагмент древнетюркской лексики. Титулатура. Вопросы языкознания. № 3. С. 81-92.
- Шериев А.Ж. (1991). Титулатура в языке киргизского эпоса «Манас»: Автореф. канд. дисс., Москва.
- Aalto P. (1971). Iranian contacts of the turks in pre-islamic Times/Studia turcica? Budapest. P. 29-37.
- Bang W. (1929). *Türkische Turlan-Texte*, I, SPAW, Berlin.
- Barthold W. (1927). *Orta Asya Türk Tarihi Hakkında Dersler*, Istanbul.
- Chavannes Ed.(1903). “Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux”, Petersburgs.
- Clauson G. (1959). The Earliest Turkish LoanWords in Mongolian, CAJ-, IV, 3.
- Gabain A. V. (1950). *Altürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- Giraud R. (1960). *L’empire des Turcs Celestes. Les regnes d’Elterich, Qaghan et Bilga (680-734)*. Contribution a l’histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale.
- Doerfer G. (1965). *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd II. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer G. (1965-1975). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd 1-4. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer G. (1967). *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung alterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen und Timuridenzeit. Bd III: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen. Wiesbaden.
- Donuk A. (1988). *Eski Türk Devletlerinde idari-askeri ünvan ve terimler*. İstanbul.
- Hirth F. (1899). Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk, ATİM, II, Folge.
- Laszlo F. (1944). /*Türk.terc.*./, Kagan ve ililesi, *Türk Hukuk Tarihi Dergisi*, I, Ankara.
- Liu Mau-Tsai (1958). Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Turken (T’u-Kiie). Buch 1-2. Wiesbaden.
- Menges K. H. (1968). *The Turkic languages and peoples*. Wiesbaden.
- Ögel B. (1951). Şine-usu yazıtının tarihi önemi, *Belleten*, sayı. 59.
- Pelliot P. (1915). *L’Origine des Tou-kiue nom chinois des Turcs*, TP, XVI.
- Pelliot P. (1926). Note sur les Pou-yu-houen et les Sou-p’i, TP, XX, 1921. TP, XXIV.
- Ramstedt G. J. (1951). *Altürkische und Mongolische Titel*, MSFou, 55, Helsinki.
- Shiratori K. (1922). *Kakan to katon shogo ko* (К этимологии титулов каган и катун). Тб. Gakuho.V. 11. № 3.

References

- Aalto P. (1971). Iranian contacts of the turks in pre-islamic Times/Studia turcica? Budapest. P. 29-37.
- Agadzhanov S. G. (1969). *Oчерки истории oguzov i turkmen Srednej Azii IX-XIII vv.* [Essays on the history of the Oghuz and Turkmens of Central Asia of the 9th-19th centuries.] Ashgabat.
- Babayarov G., Kubatin, A. (2012). *Drevnetjurkskie tituly v jepohu do Tjurkskogo Kaganata. Vek nauki i obrazovanija* [Ancient Turkic titles in the era before the Turkic Kaganate]. Century of science and education, No. 7. Astana. S. 52-64.
- Babayarov G.B. (2012). *Gosudarstvennyj stroj Zapadno-Tjurkskogo kaganata: avtoref. dis.* [The political system of the Western Turkic Kaganate] author. dis. ... Dr. ist. Sciences: 07.00.03. Tashkent.
- Bang W. (1929). *Türkische Turlan-Texte*, I, SPAW, Berlin.
- Barthold W. (1927). *Orta Asya Türk Tarihi Hakkında Dersler*, Istanbul.
- Barthold V. V. (1968). *Op. .: In 9 vol. Moskov, “Oriental literature.” V. 5.*
- Baskakov N. A. (1985). *K jetimologii sobstvennyh turkskih imjon v russkih letopisjah. Teorija i praktika jetimologicheskij issledovanij* [To the etymology of their own Turkic names in Russian chronicles. Theory and practice of etymological research]. Moscow. S. 30-34.
- Baskakov N. A. (1985). *Tjurkskaja leksika v «Slove o polku Igoreve».* [Türkic vocabulary in the “Word on Igor’s Regiment”]. Moscow.
- Baskakov N. A. (1987). *To the problem of Chinese borrowings in Turkic languages. Turcica et. Orientalia. Studies in honor of Gunnar Jarring on his eightieth birthday.* Istanbul
- Bichurin 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]. Volume 1. Moskov-Leningrad., Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Vasyutin S. A. (2016). *Vlast’ i socium v kochevyh imperijah Central’noj Azii VI – nachala XII vv. Rukopis’ doktorskoj dissertacii* [Power and society in the nomadic empires of Central Asia of the 6th – early 12th centuries Manuscript of a doctoral dissertation]. Kemerovo.
- Gabain A. V. (1950). *Altürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig.

- Ghukasyan V. L. (1977). Tjurkizmy v albanskih istochnikah. Sovetskaja tjurkologija [Turkisms in Albanian sources. Soviet Turkology]. No. 2. Baku. S.30-41.
- Giraud R. (1960). L'empire des Turcs Celestes. Les regnes d'Elterich, Qapghan et Bilga (680-734). Contribution a l'histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale.
- Dashkovskiy P. K. (2005). O sakralizacii pravitelej gosudarstvennyh obrazovanij nomadov Central'noj Azii. Drevnie kochevniki Central'noj Azii (istorija, kul'tura, nasledie) [On the sacralization of the rulers of state formations of nomads of Central Asia. Ancient nomads of Central Asia (history, culture, heritage)]. Mat. Int. scientific conf. Ulan-Ude. S. 63-67.
- Doerfer G. (1965). Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Bd II. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer G. (1965-1975). Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Bd 1-4. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer G. (1967). Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung alterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen und Timuridenzeit. Bd III: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen. Wiesbaden.
- Donuk A. (1988). Eski Türk Devletlerinde idari-askeri ünvan ve terimler. İstanbul.
- Zuev Yu.A. (1998). Drevnetjurkskaja social'naja terminologija v kitajskom tekste VIII v. // Voprosy arheologii Kazahstana. [Ancient Turkic social terminology in the Chinese text of the VIII century]. // Issues of archeology of Kazakhstan. Vol. 2. Almaty – Moscow. S.151-161.
- Klyashtorny S. G. (1964). Drevnetjurkskie runicheskie pamjatniki kak istochnik po istorii Srednej Azii. [Ancient Turkic runic monuments as a source on the history of Central Asia]. Moscow.
- Klyashtorny S.G. (1984). Kagan, begi i narod v pamjatnikah tjurkskoj runicheskoj pis'mennosti. Vostokovedenie. 9. Filologicheskie issledovanija. [Kagan, run and people in the monuments of the Turkic runic writing. Oriental studies. 9. Philological research]. Scientific notes of Leningrad State University. No. 412. A series of oriental sciences. Vol. 25.S. 143-153.
- Klyashtorny S. G., Savvinov D. G. (1988). Drevnetjurkskie jetnopoliticheskie ob#edinenija i ih znachenija v jetnogeneze narodov Srednej Azii i Kazahstana. Problemy jetnogeneza i jetnicheskoj istorii narodov Central'noj Azii i Kazahstana [Ancient Turkic ethnopolitical associations and their significance in the ethnogenesis of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Problems of ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan]. Moscow. S. 66-70.
- Clauson G. (1959). The Earliest Turkish LoanWords in Mongolian, CAJ-, IV, 3.
- Kononov A. N. (1992). Grammatika jazyka tjurkskih runicheskikh pamjatnikov VII-IX vv. [Grammar of the language of the Turkic runic monuments of the 7th-9th centuries] Leningrad.
- Kradin N. N. (1992). Kochevye obshhestva (problemy formacionnoj karakteristiki). [Nomadic societies (problems of formation characteristics)]. Vladivostok.
- Konovalova I. G. (2009). Drevnejshij titul russkikh knjazej «kagan» [The oldest title of Russian princes is “kagan”]. DT Moscow. S. 226-237.
- Laszlo F. (1944). /Turk.terc./,Kagan ve ililesi, Turk Hukuk Tarihi Dergisi, I, Ankara.
- Liu Mau-Tsai (1958). Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Turken (T'u-Kiie). Buch 1-2. Wiesbaden.
- Menges K. H. (1968). The Turkic languages and peoples. Wiesbaden.
- Malov S. E. (1951). Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti: Teksty i issledovanija. [Monuments of ancient Turkic writing: Texts and studies]. Moscow-Leningrad.
- Ögel B. (1951). Şine-usu yazıtının tarihi onemi, Belleten, sayı. 59.
- Pelliot P. (1915). L'Origine des Tou-kiue nom chinois des Turcs, TP, XVI.
- Pelliot P. (1926). Note sur les Pou-yu-houen et les Sou-p'ı, TP, XX, 1921. TP, XXIV.
- Potapov L. P. (1991). Altajskij shamanizm. [Altai shamanism]. Moscow.
- Ramstedt G. J. (1951). Alttürkische und Mongolische Titel, MSFou, 55, Helsinki.
- Ramstedt G. (1957). Vvedenie v altajskoe jazykoznanie [Introduction to Altai linguistics]. Moscow.
- Hirth F. (1899). Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk, ATİM, II, Folge.
- Taskin V.S. (1984). Materialy po istorii drevnih kochevyh narodov gruppy dunhu Vvedenie, perevod i komentarii V.S. Taskina. [Materials on the history of the ancient nomadic peoples of the Donghu group Introduction, translation and comments by V.S. Taskina]. Moscow. MIDKNGD.
- Taskin V.S. (1986). O titulakh shan'juj i kagan. Mongolica. Pamjati akademika B.Ja.Vladimircova (1884-1931). [On the titles of shanyu and kagan. Mongolica. In memory of Academician B.Ya. Vladimirircov (1884-1931)]. Moscow. S. 213-218. MIDKNGD.
- Terminologicheskij slovar'. [Terminological dictionary]. (2014). Repl. ed. A.O. Chubaryan. Moscow.
- Tishin V. V. (2015). Istoriografija social'noj istorii Tjurkskogo kaganata VI-VIII vv. Rukopis' dokt. diss. [Historiography of the social history of the Turkic Kaganate of the 6th-8th centuries Manuscript Doct. Diss]. Moscow.
- Khazanov A. M. (2002). Kochevniki i vneshnij mir. [Nomads and the outside world]. Ed. 3rd, add. Almaty: Dyke-Press.
- Chen Chang-Hao, Dubrovsky A.G., Kotov A.V. (1953). Russko-kitajskij slovar' [Russian-Chinese dictionary]. Moscow.
- Chavannes Ed. (1903). Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux, Sankt-Petersburgs.
- Shervashidze I. N. (1989). Fragment obshhetjurkskoj leksiki. Zaimstvovannyj fond. Voprosy jazykoznanija. [A fragment of common Turkic vocabulary. Borrowed fund. Questions of linguistics]. No. 2. S. 54-80.
- Shervashidze I. N. (1990). Fragment drevnetjurkskoj leksiki. Titulatura. [A fragment of ancient Turkic vocabulary]. Title Questions of linguistics. No. 3. S. 81-92.
- Sheriyev A. Zh. (1991). Titulatura v jazyke kirgizskogo jeposa «Manas»//Avto-ref. kand. diss. [Title in the language of the Kyrgyz epos “Manas” // Author. Cand. Diss]. Moscow.
- Shiratori K. (1922). Kakan to katon shogo ko Tb. Gakuho.V. 11. № 3.