

THE DECLINE OF THE EMPIRE OF THE OGHUZ YABGHU*

OMELIAN PRITSAK

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the Turks in world history, both medieval and modern, lies in its founding of two States: the Empire of the Seljuks and that of the Ottomans. The founders of both Empires were the Turkic tribes known in the sources under the collective names of *Türkmen* or *Oghuz*. Their great migrations in the first half, and in part of the second half of the eleventh century brought them on the one hand into southeastern Europe and then into the Balkan possessions of the Byzantine Empire; on the other hand they pressed into Transoxiana, West Iran, Iraq, and finally also into the Asia Minor possessions of the Byzantine Empire. Like the migrations of many other peoples, these were brought about by the downfall of a steppe empire. In this case it was the downfall of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu.

In the sources, the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu appears under two names: *Türkmen* and *Oghuz* (*Ghuzz*, *Uz*). In Islamic sources there are at least two scholarly etymologies for the word *türkmen*: 1) Persian *türk manand* "similar to the Turks" (to be found as early as Kāšgharī, III, 304), 2) Persian *türk iman* allegedly "the believing Turks", (Nešrī, died 1520). However, from the turcological viewpoint the word *türkmen* is only a collective formed with *-man* or *-men* from *türk*.¹ This explains the fact, among others, that the same people called Türkmen in Central Asia, was known only as Torki in sources of Kievan Rus,² that is without the suffix *-man* or *-men*.

The name *Oghuz* is immediately associated with that of *Toquz*

* The author wishes to dedicate this article to Professor M. Fuad Köprülü.

¹ Compare my *Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der altaischen Völker*, Part I (To be referred to as *Stammesnamen I*) in *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, Vol. 24, No. 1-2, Wiesbaden, 1952, 79 (§31, 21).

² In the so-called *Nestor Chronicle* (*Povest' vremennykh let*) we next find, under the year 985, a report on a common campaign by the Torki and the Grand-Duke of Kiev, Vladimir the Great, against the Volga Bulgarians. Sergey P. Tolstov correctly interprets this as an indication of an alliance between the Oghuz Yabghu and the Kiev Grand-

Oghuz, one of the two names for the leading federation of the Turks in Mongolia of the sixth to eighth centuries (*Türk* and *Toquz Oghuz*). At this time the name *Oghuz* was primarily a political concept,³ and should not be considered ethnographical or as a designation for a language group. One indication of this is the fact that the *Oghuz* spoke a different dialect from that of the *Toquz Oghuz*. However, this political term derives from a self-designation which may have originally meant "man, men, the men, or compatriots."⁴ The equally important and fascinating problem of the etymon of *Oghuz*, which appears in names like *Oghur*,⁵ *Oirat*,⁶ etc., lies outside my subject. I shall come later to the title of the *Yabghu*.

As yet there has not only been no monograph on the *Oghuz*

Dukes (*Po sledam drevnekhorezmiyskoy tsivilizatsii*, Moscow—Leningrad, 1948, pp. 255-56 and map on p. 254; to be referred to as *Po sledam*). This is the only mention of the *Torki* until 1054; after that date the *Torki* appear more often, together with the *Polovtsy* (*Qomans*) as the new rulers of the Ukrainian steppe. In the chronicles the following ways of writing the name of this people appear: *tor'ki* (984), *torky* (1054), *torci* (1060, 1093, 1096, 1116), *t'rkyy* (1080). Here we have the Old Rus (Old Ukrainian) rendering of the name *türk* with the Slavic collective suffix *-i, -y*. The vowel *ü*, which does not exist in the Slavic languages, is sometimes given as *o*, sometimes as a reduced vowel. Under the year 1096 we also find the form *Torkmeni*, that is *türkmen* + *i*. The people of the *Torki* are called *torč'in* (e.g. 1097). The city of the *Torki* on the *Ros' River* in the Ukraine was called *Torc' skyj grad* (as, e.g. 1093). I am quoting from the *Nestor Chronicle* according to the last edition: *Povest' vremennykh let*, ed. by V. P. Adrianova Peretts, Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Volumes I-II, Moscow—Leningrad, 1950.

³ And perhaps also the designation for a military unit, cf. my *Stammesnamen* I, p. 59 and notes 48, 50, and 51 on page 92. A new theory on the relations of the *Türk* (*köz türk*) to the *Toquz Oghuz* has recently been proposed by Franz v. László, but it still to be tested. ("Die *Tokuz-Oghuz* und die *Köktürken*" in *Analecta orientalia memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Körös dicata, Bibl. Orient. Hungaria*, Vol. 5, Budapest, 1947, pp. 103-109; Turkish translation by Hasan Eren in: *Belleten*, Vol. XIV, No. 53, Ankara, 1950, pp. 37-43.)

⁴ More about this will be found in the (still unpublished) second part of my *Stammesnamen*.

⁵ Cf. Németh Gyula, *A honfoglaló Magyarság kialakulása*, Budapest, 1930, pp. 90-92; Moravcsik Gyula, *Byzantinoturcica*, Vol. II, Budapest, 1943, pp. 196, 152, 189, and 222. Cf. also my *Stammesnamen*, I, 76.

⁶ Cf. Gustaf John Ramstedt, "Etimologiya imeni Oyrat, "Sbornik v chest' semidesyatiletia Gr. N. Potanina, Zapiski Imp. russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva po otd. etnografii, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 547-558.

Yabghu, but up to the most recent times⁷ this ruler has generally been overlooked. Of the numerous still unanswered questions about this almost unknown Empire, I should like to discuss, before I come to my proper subject—two major ones: where the Empire was and when it arose.

GEOGRAPHICAL CONDITIONS.

From the data of classic Islamic geographers (e.g. al-Istakhri, Ibn Hauqal, Ibn Fadhlān, Mas'ūdī, "Hudūd al-'Ālam", etc.), it appears that in the tenth century the empire of the Oghuz was composed of the territory around the north coast of the Aral Sea with a circumference of 600 to 800 kilometers. Thus the Empire was about as large as Germany in 1914. The western boundary was the River Emba (*Djim*, according to Ibn Fadhlān, *Djam*), on the further bank of which was the territory of the Khazars. The northern neighbors of the Oghuz were the Turkic Kimāks; in the south the Empire of the Yabghus bounded on the two Khorezmian Empires (Urgenč and Khwārezm-Kāth) and then on the Iranian-Islamic Empire of the Sāmānids in Transoxania. In the east the Qarluqs were their neighbors. The Syr-Darya River flowed through the region of the Ghuzz to Otrār (Fārāb), that is to the mouth of the Aris in the Syr-Darya. They felt so closely linked to this river that they called it only the *Öküüz*, i.e. "The River *par excellence*", as Kāšgharī (I, 364) says. About 100 kilometers upstream from the mouth of the Syr-Darya it turns toward the Aral Sea. There, between the Syr-Darya and the Aral Sea lay the capital, or rather the winter residence (*refugium*) of the Oghuz Yabghu, the city *Yangikent* "new city," which also appears in the sources in Persian and Arabian translation (*Dih-i-nou*, *Madīna al-djadīda*). This city corresponds to the ruins of Djankent, which have recently been examined by S. P. Tolstov in connection with the Khorezmian expedition.⁸ Yangikent was not the only city of the Oghuz. Next was the city of *Djand* (near Perovsk), which played

⁷ The only scholar who has devoted his attention to the empire of the Oghuz Yabghu is S. P. Tolstov in his works *Goroda Guzov*, in *Sovetskaya etnografiya*, 1947, Nr. 3, pp. 52-102, and *Po sledam*, pp. 244-265; 270-273.

⁸ *Goroda Guzov*, pp. 57-71.

an important role in the rise of the Seljuks, then *Sauran*, *Sighnaq*, *Süikend*, *Qarnaq*, and others.⁹ Idrīsī speaks of the numerous cities of the Oghuz, which lay in a row north and south.¹⁰ Idrīsī himself names more than ten of these cities and describes them briefly. This information of Idrīsī's (who wrote in 1153) must have been taken from an older written source (perhaps from al-Djaihānī), for in his time the Oghuz were no longer living north of the Aral Sea. The most recent archeological excavations (of S. P. Tolstov¹¹) show that these assertions are credible, even though it has not yet been possible to identify the individual names. S. P. Tolstov was able to show that the later depopulation of the territory must have resulted from the destruction of the irrigation system. Now the statements of Mas 'ūdī¹² that there were settled as well as nomadic Oghuz become comprehensible. All these facts serve to refute the thesis of Barthold who, in 1929, expressed the opinion that the cities on the territory of the Oghuz were first built as Islamic settlements.¹³ According to him the Islamic merchants were able to achieve what was impossible for Islamic arms. But even Kāšgharī (I, 392) speaks of the city of Sughnaq (today: Sunaq-Qurghan near Otrār) as an Oghuz city. The inhabitants of the Empire of the Yabghu were under the cultural influence of the Khazar Empire¹⁴ and under that of Iranian civilization, particularly that of

⁹ On this point see W. Barthold, *Očerķ istorii turķmenskogo naroda* (to be referred to as *Očerķ*), in *Sbornik Turķmeniya*, Vol. I, Leningrad, 1929, pp. 15-16.

¹⁰ *Kitāb nuzhat al-mustāq*, Manuscript in the Leningrad Public Library, (Ar.n.s. 176, c.), 108b-109b. I am quoting from the translation by S. Volin in *Materialy po istorii Turķmen i Turķmenii* (to be referred to as *Materialy*), Vol. I, Moscow—Leningrad, 1939, pp. 220-222.

¹¹ *Goroda Guzov*, pp. 53-75.

¹² *Les prairies d'or*, edited by C. Barbier de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, Vol. I, Paris, 1851, p. 212.

¹³ E.g. *Očerķ*, pp. 15ff. The testimony of Ibn Fadhlāns can not be accepted as evidence against the existence of cities among the Oghuz, since his path lay chiefly through the region of the nomadic Oghuz.

¹⁴ For political relations between the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu and the Khazars see Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos (died 959)—*De administrando imperio* (Chapters 1-13, 37, 79-80, 164, 166); above all, for the alliance between the Khazars and the Oghuz against the Pechenegs in 900 (Chapt. 37.). The "Jewish" names of the Seljuks, such as *Mikā-il*, *Yūnus*, *Mūsā*, *Isrā'il*, etc., as undoubtedly to be traced to Khazarian cultural influence. Recently Douglas M. Dunlop, relying on later compilations, has sought to show

Khorezm.¹⁵ The encounter of the Oghuz with the Islamic world also left profound traces. The representation of this syncretic cultural picture still remains as a task for research.¹⁶ Although as yet the number of inhabitants can not be estimated even approximately, all sources unite in indicating that the Oghuz were one of the most numerous of the Turkic peoples. All sources also emphasize their wealth, particularly in herds.¹⁷

THE RISE OF THE EMPIRE OF THE OGHUZ YABGHU

When did the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu appear? This question¹⁸ is a difficult one to answer. Unfortunately the accounts dating from the time of the Tāhirids and the first Sāmānids in Transoxiana about their Turkish neighbors have been lost. (As an example I mention only the Meshed manuscript of Ibn al-Faūqih about such a reporter, Habib b. 'Isā.¹⁹) The Arabian universal historian of the 13th century, Ibn al-Athīr²⁰, has handed down an

the sovereign of the ancestors of the Seljuks was the Qaghan of the Khazars (of Jewish religion). "Aspects of the Khazar Problem," *Transactions of the Glasgow Oriental Society*, Vol. XIII, 1951, pp. 34-44.) This thesis is to be rejected since here—according to contemporary evidence (Cf. *infra*)—there can only be a question of the Oghuz Yabghu.

15 Thus, for instance, the Oghuz nomads made use of the Khorezmian word *pekend* when they asked for bread from the Islamic caravans, Ibn Fadhlān, edited by A. Zeki Validi Togan (*Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht*, Leipzig, 1939, ar. Text 14, Translation 26, commentary 137), edited by A. P. Kovalivsky (*Puteshestvie Ibn Fadlana na Volgu*, Moscow—Leningrad, 1939, ar. Text 201 b translation 63.)

16 In this connection there is also the question of the spread of Christianity among the Oghuz; cf. W. Barthold, *12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, Berlin, 1935, p. 104. A. Z. Validi Togan, at least, decides this problem in the negative (*Oghuzların hıristiyanlığı meselesine ait in Türkiyat Mecmuası*, Vol. II, Istanbul, 1928, pp. 61-67. In this connection we must not forget the pre-Oghuzian "autochthonous" population of the Syr-Darja basin, especially the altaic Huns and Hephthalites and the Iranian Alans and Soghdians, who undoubtedly also had an influence. The problem of the ethnogenesis of the present Türkmens has been treated by Tolstov (*Goroda Guzov*) and also by A. Yu. Yakubovskii (*Voprosy etnogeneza turkmen v VIII-X vv. in Sovetskaya etnografiya*, 1947, No. 3, pp. 48-54) and by A. A. Roslyakov (*Proiskhozhdenie turkmenskogo naroda, in Programma VIII nauchnoy konferentsii ashkhabad'skogo gosud. pedagog. instituta im. M. Gorkogo*, Ashkhabad, 1950).

17 *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, photostatted edition by Barthold, Leningrad, 1930, 18b; Idrīsī, Leningrad Manuscript 108b. At this point compare also Barthold, *Ocherk*, 18.

18 If I am not mistaken, this is the first time that this has been suggested.

19 Meshhed Manuscript, 172a. I quote from a photocopy in Bonn.

20 edited by C. J. Tornberg, Vol. XI, p. 117. Cf. also M. Th. Houtsma, "Die Ghuzenstämme," in *WZKM*, Vol. II, Vienna, 1888, p. 219.

important note, which may contribute to the clarification of our problems: "A historian of Khorasan [Abū'l-Hasan Baihaqī, according to Barthold] says the following about the Oghuz. . . . In the time of Caliph al-Mahdī [775-785] the Oghuz migrated from the land of the Toquz Oghuz to Transoxiana; they had been converted to Islam, and assisted the magician al-Muqanna' until his cause was lost. . ." It is clear that this may not be accepted literally; for instance the complete conversion to Islam of the Oghuz, particularly of the ruling house, only took place two hundred years later.²² However the statement that the (Syr-Darya)-Oghuz came thither in the time of al-Mahdī from the Empire of the Toquz Oghuz in Mongolia is important. This information may well be fairly correct, for the following reasons.²³ Turkish tradition mentions the Oghuz and the Qarluq as being politically associated. If we overlook the assertions of Ibn-al-Faqīh²⁴ and Gardīzī²⁵ (here I refer to the legend of the rainstone) the reader is immediately struck by the way in which a scholar of the Turkish world such as Kāšgharī always gives the Qarluq and the Oghuz the political names of *Türkmen*.²⁶ Here we must also mention that Kāšgharī links the language of the Oghuz with that of the Qipčaq rather than with that of the Qarluq.²⁷

21 *Sultan Sinddjar i Guzu*, in *Zapiski VO*, Vol. XX, St. Petersburg, 048.

22 See below.

23 In *T'ung-tien* (Ch. 193, p. 6v⁰) by Tu Yu (812), the earlier land of the Alans (*Su-i*, or *Su-t'è*), which lay 5000 li north of Persia (*Ansi*, originally the empire of the Arsacids), was also called *T'è-kü-meng* (according to B. Karlgren, *AD* No. 980, 484, 612, the old pronunciation was d'ek-kiu-mung). As early as 1900 Friedrich Hirth proposed the identification of this name with the name *Türkmen* ("Über Wolga-Hunnen und Hiung-nu," in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akad. der Wiss.*, 1900, p. 264, n. 2). Barthold (*Ocherk*, p. 7) accepts his thesis. If it can indeed be shown that the name *T'è-kü-meng* first appears in Chinese sources in the 8th and 9th centuries, this Chinese evidence will be of value in confirming the statements of Islamic sources about the taking of the Syr-Darya region by the Oghuz in the 8th century.

24 Meshhed Manuscript, 171b-173a.

25 Edited by Barthold, in *Otchet o poyezdke v srednyuyu Aziyu s nauchnoy tsel'yu 1893-94 gg.*, St. Petersburg, 1897, pp. 80-81.

26 E.g. *at-turkmān al qarluqiya* (Kāšgharī, *Kitāb diwān lughat at-turk*, Vol. I, Istanbul, 1914-1915, 80, 13-14) and *at-turkmān al-ghuzziya* (ibid. I, 14, 10), and *turkmāniya oghuzziya* (ibid. I, 3, p-10).

27 Thus in Kāšgharī (I, 31-35), we find the following phonetic phenomena, which are typical of the Oghuz and the Qifčaq: the Turkish *y*-, *n*-, *z*-, *t*-, etc. become, in the languages of the Oghuz and the Qifčaq *dj*-, *b*-, *d*-, *-d*-, etc. Moreover, the dropping of the inter-vowel *-gh-* is supposed to be typical for the Oghuz and the Qifčaq.

The rise of the Qarluq is connected with the decline of the two T'u-chüe, i.e. the Turkish Empire.²⁸ The second eastern Turkish empire was destroyed by a coalition of the Basmil, Uighur and Qarluq in 742. The old central Asiatic stronghold, the refuge in Ötüken in Mongolia, seat of the mother deity and of the protective genius of the nomad empire (*il ötükkän quti*), fell into the hands of the Basmil leaders. The two chief positions of honor in the State, that of the "Left" and the "Right" Yabghu were awarded to the Uighurian and the Qarluqian rulers in gratitude for their collaboration. The Qarluq ruler obtained the office of Right Yabghu, which corresponded to the position of the *Tarduš-šad* in the empire of the Bilgä-Qaghan. Two years later, in 744, the Ötükkän once again fell into other hands. The Left Yabghu, the Uighur *Yabghu ili tubar* (*yeh-hu-hie-li-t'u-fa*), joined by the Right Yabghu, the Qarluq ruler, killed the Basmil-Great-Qaghan; the Uighur now took the holy mountain of *Iduq baš* "whence the empire must be governed," into his possession, and adopted the Great Qaghan title of *Qutluğ Bilgä Kül Qaghan*. According to the law of step-wise progress typical of the Altaic empires, we must assume that the Qarluq ruler was now given the title of Left Yabghu for his services. But who could have obtained the post of Right Yabghu? Here an indication in the encyclopedia of the Sāmānidian scholar al-Khwārizmī (10th century) takes us further. There it states that only the rulers of the Oghuz and the Qarluq had the titles of Djabbüya (Yabghu).²⁹ On the basis of this I should like to consider the Oghuz Yabghu as the second Yabghu of the expanding Uighur Empire.

In the battle of the Central Asiatic people of the 8th century against the Arabs, whose strength had increased particularly after

²⁸ The thesis defended here is based on my article, "Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden," *ZDMG*, Vol. 101, Wiesbaden, 1951, pp. 270-300.

²⁹ *Libër Mafatih al-olüm* . . . auctore abü Abdallah Mohammed ibn Ahmad . . . al-Kätib al-Khwarezmī, edited by G. van Vloten, Leiden, 1895, p. 120. The data of Khwarezmī refer to some more ancient Sāmānidian sources which have not been preserved. In the meantime the Yabghu of the Qarluq had already become Qaghan (*Qara-Qaghan*) (cf. my "Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden," pp. 279-287).

the victory over the Chinese at Talas (751), the successors of the West Turks, the Türgiř, tried to maintain their leadership against these Arabian conquerors. In the meantime another claimant to domination over Central Asia appeared, the Tibetans. At a moment when all the opponents were occupied, the Qarluq attacked the region of Türgiř in Semireč'e, and in 766 the two chief West Turkish cities, *Quz Ordu* (*Süyāb, Balasaghun*) and *Tārāz* fell into the hands of the Qarluq. We may well assume that at this time the Oghuz were not sitting idly by, but that it was at the same time that they took possession of regions around the Syr-Darya River.³⁰ This assumption of mine is supported by the previously cited statement of Ibn al-Athīr on the migration of the Oghuz from the regions of the Toquz Oghuz to the Syr-Darya in the time of Caliph al-Mahdī (775-785). Other Islamic sources indicate the presence of the Oghuz around the Syr-Darya at least as early as 820.

For instance Islamic sources mention that in 820-821 the "Toquz Oghuz" invaded the Islamic land of Osruřana.³¹ If, as Balādūrī (died 892) reports, at this time the viceroy of the Khorasan 'Abdalāh b. Tāhir (died 844) sent his son "Abdallāh to the regions of the "Ghuzz,"³² this was certainly a countermeasure against this invasion of the Oghuz.

This statement by Balādūrī is, moreover, the very first mention in Islamic literature of the name of Oghuz (Ghuzz) that we know of.³³

In Islamic literature the name of *Türkmen* first appears in the works of the geographer of the second half of the 10th century, al-Muqaddasī.³⁴

³⁰ Cf. note 23. We have evidence that at the beginning of the 10th century the friendly relations of the Oghuz extended even to the Volga Bulgarians. The Oghuz *Tarxan* was the son-in-law (or brother-in-law) of the Bulgarian ruler *Almiř* (Ibn Fadhlān, edited by Togan, ar. text 16 = translation 31; edited by Kovalivsky, 202b = translation 65).

³¹ Tabarī, Leiden edition, Vol. III, 1044.

³² *Liber expugnationis regionum*, edited by M. J. de Goeje, Leiden, 1862-1868, 431.

³³ Cf. *Materialy*, I, 78.

³⁴ *Descriptio Imperii Moslemici*, edited by M. J. Goeje, Leiden, 1872, 274, 275.

In this connection we should mention a statement in the Meshhed manuscript of the work of Ibn al-Faqīh, according to which Dā'ūd b. Mansūr b. Abū 'Alī al-Bādsghešī, a contemporary of the Sāmānid Ismā'il b. Ahmad (892-907), who had formerly been viceroy of Khorasan, once received an audience from the son of the Oghuz Yabghu, named *Bālqīq* (?) b. *Djabbūya* (=Yabghu).³⁵

THE DOWNFALL OF THE EMPIRE OF THE OGHUZ YABGHU

The fall of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu was contemporary with two major events: the rise of the Seljuks in Central Asia and the appearance of the Qoman (Polovtsy) in Western Asia and Eastern Europe. I believe that it may be demonstrated that this contemporaneity was no accident, but rather that these two movements were the cause of the downfall of the Empire of the Yabghu.

Our knowledge of the origins of the Seljuks comes only from tales based on the Seljuk tradition in the works of Ibn al-Athīr³⁶ and Mīrkhwānd.³⁷ A work dating from 1067, *Malik-nāme*, which first took up this tradition and drew from these authors, has not been preserved for us. Although the assertions of this Seljuk tradition have already been investigated several times,³⁸ an essential point remains unclear—the relations of the Seljuks to the Empire of the Yabghu, after they left it.

According to the Seljuk tradition, the ancestor of the Seljuks, a certain Tutaq³⁹, and later his son Seldjūk⁴⁰, disagreed with the Yabghu, supposedly in reference to the treatment of the neighboring Islamic lands. Finally Seldjū, who in the meantime had risen to be *Sūba'sī* (supreme commander),⁴¹ decided to depart with his tribe into the neighborhood of the Islamic regions.

³⁵ Meshhed Manuscript, 171b ff. I hope to dedicate a special article to the question of the constitution of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu.

³⁶ Vol. 9, 321-325.

³⁷ *Historia Seldschukidorum*, edited by J. A. Vullers, Giessen, 1837, pp. 1-20.

³⁸ Finally through Claude Cohen, "Le Malik-nameh et l'histoire des origines Seljukides," in *Oriens*, Vol. II, Leiden, 1949, pp. 31-65.

³⁹ South-turkic form: *Dudaq*.

⁴⁰ The name is presented in a palatal form (*Seldjūk*) as well as in a velar one (*Saldjuq*).

⁴¹ Cf. also Kāšgharī, I, 397, 9.

He drove the viceroy of the Yabghu from the city of Djand, freed the preponderantly Islamic population from their tribute and settled there with his tribe. Then he adopted Islam and maintained friendly relations with the Sāmānids. Under his orders his son *Arslan* fought the West-Qarakhanid Qaghan Hārūn-Hasan b. Sulaimān (entitled Boghra Xan), who in 992 occupied Bukhara for a time.⁴² This evidence leads us to an important conclusion: the Islamization of a part of the Oghuz, i.e. of the Seljuks, must have taken place before 992. Somewhat later a conflict arose between the Seljuks and the Emir of Bukhara, a Sāmānid⁴³, and the Seljuks fled to the Qarakhanids.⁴⁴ The importance of the Seljuks increased greatly when, in 999, the Qarakhanid Nasr b. 'Alī (*Arslan Ilig*, the so-called *Ilig Xan*) conquered Buchara and, together with the Ghaznevid Mahmūd, prepared an end to the Sāmānid Empire. They settled in the region of Bukhara. From this time to that of the death of the West Qarakhanid Great Qaghan 'Alī b. al-Hasan (the so-called *Alī Tigin*) (1034), the Seljuks remained in the province of the Qarakhanids.⁴⁵

Gardīzī makes a laconic note on the year 1003⁴⁶: the Yabghu of the Oghuz adopted Islam and became the blood brother of the (last) Sāmānid Abū Ibrāhīm Ismāīl b. Nūh (died 1005). Up to now this reference has been misinterpreted. Barthold⁴⁷ equated the Oghuzian Yabghu of Gardīzī with the son of the Seljuk Mūsā,

⁴² Ibn al-Athīr, Vol. IX, p. 322;—Ütbī, edited by Manīnī, Cairo, 1286—1869-70, Vol. I, 176.

⁴³ As yet the corresponding place of Ibn al-Athīr has not been adequately commented upon, and therefore no opinion has been expressed as to who is to be understood by the "Emir of Bukhara" mentioned here. Here it is a question of the Sāmānid Nūh II b. Mansūr (976-997).

⁴⁴ They then lived in the realm of the Qarakhanid Co-qaghan, i.e. the master of the western part of the Empire, with the title of *Boghra Xan*. He was the follower of Hārūn al-Hasan b. Sulaimān, who died in 992. The connection between the Seljuks and the Qarakhanids was so close that it could not be destroyed even by the Seljuks' disillusionment by the "Boghra Xan" and their resulting return to the region of Djand. Thus they later also sought the shelter of another Westqarakhanid, the *Arslan Ilig* Nasr b. 'Alī.

⁴⁵ Cf. my *Karachanidische Streitfragen 2*," in *Oriens*, Vol. III, Leiden, 1950, p. 220.

⁴⁶ Edited by Barthold, in *Turkestan v epokhu mongolskogo nashestviya*, Vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1898, p. 13.

⁴⁷ As, for instance, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, London, 1928, p. 289.

who had the title of *Payghu*, for which he wanted to read *Yabghu*, and therefore applied this statement of Gardīzī to the wrong person. In a note to my *Karachanidische Studien*⁴⁸ I was able to demonstrate that among the Turks there was not only the high Central Asiatic Title of *Yabghu*, but also a title of *Payghu* which, like *Toghrul*, *Čaghri* meant "Falcon" or "sparrow hawk," and as such was one of the *bird of prey-Onghuntitles* for the tribal leaders. Like his father, the son of Seldjūk had already been a Muslim for a long time (*terminus ante quem* 992) and therefore could not have first been converted to Islam in 1003. Moreover, as we saw, at that time the Seljuks were the allies of the new masters of Transoxiana, the Qarakhanids. Thus here we have to do with an interesting and important dual political constellation: on one side the Oghuz under the Yabghu and Sāmānids, on the other side the Seljuks and the Qarakhanids. A few years later we hear of a hereditary archenemy of the Seljuks, Šāh-Malik, the ruler of Djand. This hostility became acute when the Seljuks were forced to leave the Qarakhanid region and to move to the Khoresmian and Ghasnevidian regions. Who is this Šāh-Malik? In *Ta'riḫ-i Baihaq* we have his full name: Abū'l-Fawāris Šāh-Malik b. 'Alī al-Berānī, with the honorary title (*al-qāb* Husām addaula wa Nizām al-milla.⁴⁹ The key to this riddle is to be found in the work, published photostatically in Istanbul in 1937, by the 17th century Abū'l Ghāzī (*Šedjere-i Tarāḫima*), historian a ruler of Khiwa. In this work we learn that Šāh-Malik, the ruler of Djand, was none other than the son and co-regent of the Oghuz Yabghu of Yangikent, named 'Alī.⁵⁰ Since, as we have seen, this Yabghu had closed a compact of blood brotherhood with the Sāmānids, this explains the title of his son in the form of the Kunya *Abū'l-Fawāris*, which was typical of the Sāmānids (e.g. 'Abd al-

⁴⁸ Still unpublished.

⁴⁹ Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Zaid, *Ta'riḫ-i Baihaq*, edited by Ahmad Bahmanyār, Teheran, 1317=1938, 51.

⁵⁰ *Secerei Terāḫime*, edited by the Turk Dil Kurumu, Istanbul, 1937, pp. 31 ff. On this point compare Tolstov, *Goroda Guzov*, pp. 91-92.

Malik b.Nūh, died 999⁵¹). Moreover, the reason why the Seljuks were in a feud with Šāh-Malik, the ruler of Djand is now comprehensible.

In the sources, Šāh-Malik only appears as the prince of Djand, even in the thirties and forties, when, as an ally of the Ghaznavid Mas 'ūd b.Mahmūd, he was also the ruler of Khorezm (1041)⁵². At that time his father, the Yabghu 'Alī mentioned in 1003, was no longer alive. Why was Šāh-Malik unable to succeed his father on the throne in Yangikent? A similar question arises when we follow his downfall. After the Seljuks took Khorezm in 1044, Šāh-Malik did not flee to his homeland, Djand or Yangikent, but to Iran (via Dahistān to Kermān and then to Makrān)⁵³, where he died. The only possible explanation for this is that Šāh-Malik was unable to return to his homeland because it was already ruled by other masters. Under the year 1054 the chronicle of old Rus notes the first appearance of the *Torki* in the Ukraine of today. The old Rus designation of Torki corresponds to the Byzantine *Uzoi*, and this name can only mean the Oghuz of the Empire of the Yabghu, who, in his time in 985 had conducted a common campaign with the Kievan Grand-Duke Vladimir the Great against the Volga Bulgarians. But now, in 1054, the Torki appear in the company of another people, the *Polovtsy-Qoman-Qipčaq*, who were to be of importance in the next two hundred years of East European history. These partners were the new leaders of the Torki-Oghuz. They had entered into hegemony over the western steppe. As an outward sign of this the name of Oghuzian Steppe was replaced by that of Qipčaqian Steppe (*Dešt-i Qipčaq*). It is curious that this event of so much importance in the history of the steppe should have found so little echo in the Islamic sources which we have. Only the recently discovered work of Marwazī (c. 1127),

⁵¹ On this point compare the data of Bīrūnīs on the role of the Kunya of this sort in the titles of the Sāmānids, *Chronologie orientalischer Völker*, edited by Eduard Sachau, Leipzig, 1878, p. 134. L

⁵² Abū'l-Fadhl Baihaqī, *Ta'rih-i Baihaqī*, edited by W. H. Morley, Calcutta, 1862, pp. 857, 868;—Ibn al-Athīr, Vol. IX, pp. 325, 346-347.

⁵³ Ibn al-Athīr, Vol. IX, p. 347. According to the *Ta'riḫ-i Baihaq* (see note 49), in 433 of the Hegira (1041-42) Šāh-Malik b. 'Alī also reigned in the city of Baihaq.

masterfully edited and commented upon by Vladimir Minorsky, and some of the sources dependent on him, give us information about this migration of peoples.⁵⁴ It was caused by the new circumstances in Eastern Asia. The rise of the Qitai, which led to a chain reaction so to speak, of migrations of peoples.⁵⁵ The *Qayī* people⁵⁶ set the *Qūn* in motion; the *Qūn* then the *Šari*, this latter attacked the *Türkmen-Oghuz* and together with them pressed into the region of the Pecheneg. As for the name *Šari*, (literally yellow, pale), I agree with Minorsky⁵⁷ in regarding it as a name for the *Qoman*⁵⁸, namely a Turkish equivalent of the Old Rus name *Polovtsy*⁵⁹ or the medieval Latin *Valvi*⁶⁰.

⁵⁴ Vladimir Minorsky, *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks, and India*, London, 1942, ar. Text 18 = translation 29-30.

⁵⁵ Such a "chain reaction" of the migration of peoples must be regarded as typical for the Altaic migrations of peoples. Apart from the reference of Marvazī, we find in at least three independent sources similar reports. 1) The report of Aristes (in Herodotus IV, 12-13) on the migrations of peoples in relation to the migration of the Scythians (8th and 7th centuries B.C.): the Arimaspians set the Issedonians in motion, the Issedonians the Scythians, and the Scythians the Cymmerians. More on this subject is to be found in the work of Wilhelm Tomaschek, "Über das Arimaspiische Gedicht des Aristes," in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad. d. Wiss.*, Vol. CXVVI, Vienna, 1888, pp. 715-780. 2) the migration of the "Tokharians" (about 129-128 B.C.) which is noted in both Chinese (Report of General Chang-ch'ien in *Shi-chi*, Ch. 123) and Greek sources (Apollodoros of Artemita, to be found in Strabo, Ch. 11 and in Popeius Trogus, *Prologue*, 41. Any dependence of one of these sources on the other is completely out of the question. Most recently this migration has been treated by Franz Altheim in *Weltgeschichte Asiens im griechischen Zeitalter*, Halle (Saale), 1948, pp. 88-105. 3) the migrations in the year 463 B.C.: the *Avars* were attacked by the "griffins" (newcomers) and set the Sabirians into motion; these latter pushed the Saraghur, Oghur, and Onoghur, who then pressed upon the Akatzir. Information on this is to be found in the treatment by Moravcsik "Zur Geschichte der Onoguren," in *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, Vol. X, 1930, pp. 53-90. V cf. also Denis Sinor "Autour d'une migration de peuples au V^e siècle" in *Journal Asiatique*, t. 235, Paris, 1948, 1-77.

⁵⁶ On the *Qayī* see A. Z. V. Togan, "Die Vorfahren der Osmanen in Mittelasien," in *ZDMG*, Vol. LXXXV [95] 1941, pp. 367-373; M. Fuad Köprülü, "Kay kabilesi hakkında yeni notlar," in *Bellesten*, Vol. VIII, No. 31, Ankara, 1944, pp. 421-452; Wolfram Eberhard, "Kay'lar kabilesi hakkında sinolojik mülahazalar," in *Bellesten*, Vol. XIII, No. 32, 1944, pp. 567-588; Eberhard, "Sinologische Bemerkungen über den Stamm der Kay," in *Monumenta Serica*, Vol. XII, Peking, 1947, pp. 204-223.

⁵⁷ Minorsky, *Marvazī*, p. 100.

⁵⁸ On the names *Qoman*, *Qūn*, and *Valvi* see Németh, "Die Volksnamen *quman* und *qun*," *KCsA*, Vol. III, No. 1, Budapest, 1940, pp. 94-109.

⁵⁹ On the *Polovtsy* see the most recent article by Ananiasz Zajaczkowski, *Zwiazki językowe potowiecko-stowian'skie*, Breslau, 1949 (my report on this is to be found in *Der Islam*, Vol. XXX, No. 1, Berlin, 1952).

⁶⁰ Cf. note 58.

The downfall of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu was, therefore, caused by both internal and external factors, namely the rise of the Seljuks and the migration of the Qomans. These two factors were sufficiently dynamic to set into motion a movement which for centuries was also dynamic enough to determine the course of European history.