

THE ETHNOGENESIS OF THE MODERN TURKIC PEOPLES : A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Having outlined the major historical developments in the history of the Turkic peoples and put into place, spatially and diachronically, their ethnic building blocks, we may now turn to a brief examination of the various factors that have gone into the ethnogenesis of each of these peoples. As the foregoing chapters have shown, this has seldom been a tidy process. Many of the Central Asian Turkic peoples, for example, have multiple points of origin, with ethnic layer placed on top of ethnic layer. Although there are many ancestral elements shared in common by a number of Turkic peoples (e.g. the Qıpçaq elements found among among the Özbeks, Qazaqs, Qırğız, Qara Qalpaqs, Noğays, Baškirs etc.), the proportions of the common elements entering each varied.¹ Moreover, some of the shared elements (e.g. the Qıpçaqs) were themselves hardly homogeneous. In addition, many had or developed unique combinations of elements which helped to distinguish one from the other.

Lurking behind the ethnic elements that are more or less clearly delineated in our sources are the substratal elements. The Turkic peoples, on the whole, have shown extraordinary absorptive powers. This has not proved true of other steppe conquerors. The Mongols conquered Eurasia, but today only Mongolia (the Mongolization of which began with the Qitañ) is Mongolian in speech and even here, Inner Mongolia is in danger of losing its Mongol character. There are only a few places where Turkic conquest groups held sway in which the subject population was not Turkicized. Leaving aside diasporan military colonies (e.g. the Ghaznavids and other Mamlûk-type states) and the Ottoman colonies in the Balkans (where Christian local cultures, except for Manichaeism-Bogomil Bosnia and much of Albania, proved too resilient) and North Africa (the Ottoman presence was numerically too insignificant), Balkan Bulgaria under the Oğuric Bulgars is the only region in which a substantial Turkic presence failed to bring about Turkicization. Here, however, there were extraordinary circumstances. The propinquity of great empires (Byzantine and Carolingian) and their struggle for ecclesiastical control over the Western and Slavic world, made Balkan Bulgaria the focal point of intense pressures. The triumph of Orthodoxy brought in its political wake Slavization. Domestic political factors (opposition by the Bulgar aristocracy to Christianity) also played an important role in devaluing Bulgaric Turkic, now tainted with pagan resistance.

1 Sultanov, *Kočevye plemena*, pp. 7-8.

Elsewhere, however, in Anatolia, Northwestern Iran (where the tribes were more heavily concentrated) extending into Eastern Transcaucasia, the lowlands of the North Caucasus and especially Iranian Central Asia, the Turks, often a minority, eventually Turkicized much of the local population. This was not deliberate. It was not state policy. Pre-modern states did not require linguistic homogeneity. Linguistic identification with the ruling elite was, undoubtedly, an important consideration for officials and perhaps merchants. In Iranian Central Asia, however, even this was not crucial, since the Turkic elite traditionally used Iranians to staff their bureaucracies, the chancellery language of which was usually Iranian. The spread of Arabic provides some interesting parallels, but there are also fundamental differences. Arabic speech largely took hold among Semitic-speakers, in lands in which there was an ancient tradition of a supra-national Semitic *lingua franca*. In fact, it replaced just such a *lingua franca*: Aramaic. In North Africa, Arabic spread out from the cities to a Berber nomadic population very much akin to its conquerors and speaking languages that were at the least structurally similar and perhaps genetically related.² It is a process that is still incomplete, although the pressures of nationalism and mass media do not offer optimistic prospects for partisans of the Berber tongues.

In Iranian Central Asia a similar process may have taken place with respect to Iranian-speaking nomads. Although, it is not very likely that the cities, still very Iranian in character, played a major role in this. The religious factor, so important in Anatolia, was of a different character. The Turks were not the bearers of Islam but its recipients from the Iranian cities. Certainly, their conversion was a necessary pre-condition for the subsequent Turkicization of the sedentary Iranian population. The socio-linguistic aspects of this question require much more research.

The question of substratal influences also requires further elucidation. Does the odd loan-word (e.g. Samodian, Ugric or Kettic elements in Türk³) bespeak random cultural borrowing or profound ethno-political contacts? To what degree were substantial elements of the early Türks themselves Turkicized peoples? The Turkicization of Southern Siberia, a process whose chronological starting point cannot be determined, has reached its concluding stage in our own day. The Uralic and Palaeo-Siberian peoples, undoubtedly, represent one substratal element. Of equal and very likely even greater importance, as was indicated above, are the Iranian nomads. Before the Turkic peoples appeared on the stage of history, the Eurasian steppes were dominated, for almost a thousand years, by nomads of Iranian speech.

2 Moscati et al., *Introduction*, pp. 15-17. Diakonoff, *Semito-Hamitic* has a useful survey of the problem.

3 Cf. Sinor, 1979-80, pp. 768-773.

At this stage, we can only guess at the role they may have played in the transformation of the Turks into equestrian, pastoral nomads of the steppes. Archaeology provides some hints, but remains mute on the crucial linguistic question. Presumably, the Turkic peoples absorbed large numbers of Iranian nomads. If not, what, then, became of them? Our sources do not note a great dash of Iranian nomads to the safety of sedentary society once the Turkic-speaking nomads had fully emerged as masters of the steppes.

Al-Birûnî, in a brief comment, on the Trans-Volgan, Iranian Alano-As tribes, remarks that in his day their language had become a mixture of Xwârazmian and Pečeneg.⁴ A close symbiosis of Alano-As and Pečenegs was observed by the Old Rus' translator of Josephus Flavius who, in a similar vein, noted that "the Yas people («Языкъ [lit. "tongue"] же яескыи»), as is known, descended from the Pečeneg clan/tribe («отъ печениженьска рода»)." ⁵ A close symbiosis of Alano-As and Qırçaq tribes is also noted. Indeed, some of these tribes, perhaps as a subject tribal union, joined the Qırçaqs seeking refuge in Hungary from the Mongol invasions.⁶ Thus, any discussion of the formation of the Turkic peoples, must take the Iranian element into consideration.

Given the fluidity of the Turkic steppe, the present day configurations of the Turkic peoples could easily have been somewhat different. Ethnic forces do not operate in a vacuum. Although certain linguistic, tribal or ethnic elements have been brought into place, it is ultimately the political process that creates a people. Thus, national languages, so crucial an element in modern nation-building, as Hobsbawm notes, are "almost always semi-artificial constructs."⁷ The same may be said of many modern nations and nationalities. The state, whether expressed in the vast imperial confederations of the Hsiung-nu, Türks and Činggisids or most recently in the powerful modern state, often plays the decisive role.⁸ Disparate groups may be brought together and forged into a "nation" whether such was their will or not. Again, following Hobsbawm, "nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way around."⁹ He argues further that an analysis of nation-building cannot be divorced from the specific economic and technological context of its time and place. The creation of a literary language becomes significant when there exist mass media to expand its area

4 al-Birûnî, *Kitâb Tahdîd al-Amâkin*, passage cited in Hudûd /Minorsky, p. 481.

5 Meščerskij, *Istorija iudejskoj vojny*, p. 454. Pritsak, 1975, pp. 228-229, who views them as initially Toxarian speakers, interprets these notices to indicate that they had adopted an Eastern Iranian tongue.

6 Szabó, *A jász etnikai csoport*, I, pp. 26-32; Pálóczi Horváth, *Pečenegs, Cumans, Iasians*, pp. 64-65.

7 Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, p. 54.

8 Gladney, 1990, p. 5.

9 Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, p. 10.

of usage to the larger target population. Moreover, the impact of the new national spirit is not evenly spread regionally or even among various social groupings. There are also competing forces of identification (regionalism, religion). Hobsbawm posits three stages in the creation of a modern national identity. In the first stage, a small group of largely apolitical scholars and amateurs engages in extensive literary and folkloric research. In the second, a highly politicized grouping, making use of the accumulated research, often in a highly idiosyncratic manner, constructs a political-national program, a nationalist ideology or myth. This becomes the focus of intense political agitation. In the final stage, this nationalist program is propagated on a mass scale.¹⁰ By the late 19th-early 20th century, a number of Turkic peoples had reached this last stage (e.g. Ottomans, Azeris, Volga Tatars, Özbeks), others had not even begun the process (e.g. Yaquqs, Xakas etc.). The Russian revolutions and their aftermath played an important role in determining the delineation of the individual Turkic peoples within the Soviet Union.¹¹ It also had some influence on the shaping of identities in the Near and Middle East and China. Needless to say, this is a huge topic, one that really focuses on modern ethnic and national politics and as such would require another book-length study.

The organization of our discussion can be approached from several directions : a) by language subgrouping (bearing in mind that official designations often belie considerable ethno-linguistic engineering) b) geographically. The two more often than not overlap. I believe, however, that the geographical approach is most productive.

TURKIC PEOPLES OF THE BALKANS, TRANSCAUCASIA, THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

The Oğuz ethno-linguistic subgrouping of the Turkic peoples dominates here. As we noted earlier (Chap. 7), the Oğuz tribal union appeared on the borders of Irano-Muslim Central Asia in the late 8th century. Their relationship to the various groupings termed Oğuz in the Türk empire (e.g. the Toquz Oğuz), often accepted at face value, remains, in fact, unclear. By the time of Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, they had already come to constitute a subgrouping of Turks linguistically distinguished from other speakers of Common Turkic. The reasons for this growing sense of distinction are obscure. Undoubtedly, intense interaction with Irano-Muslim Central Asia, already apparent in Ibn Faḍlān's account (early 10th century), played a role.

¹⁰ Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, pp. 10-12.

¹¹ For a Soviet perspective on ethnic processes in the USSR, see Kozlov, *Peoples*, pp. 152-158 which discusses evolutionary and transformational (assimilation, consolidation) processes. See also Bromlej, *Očerki*, pp. 338ff.

The Oğuz, as they penetrated deeper into the sedentary world of the Near and Middle East, were compelled, eventually, to abandon nomadism and ultimately assimilate substantial elements of the local population. It is this intimate contact with the Iranian world, common to all the Oğuz-descended peoples, and the specifics of their individual interactions with North Caucasian, Anatolian Greek, South Slavic, Armenian, K'art'velian, Semitic and other populations that has given an individual stamp to each of these groups.

THE TURKS OF TURKEY AND THE FORMER EUROPEAN-NEAR EASTERN POSSESSIONS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The overwhelming majority of these are the **Turks** (**Türk**) of Turkey. They subdivide into a number of dialect groupings the contours and interrelations of which are still being explored.¹² Broadly speaking these are : İstanbullu, Southwestern (Bandırma -Antalya), Central or Middle Anatolian (Afyon Karahisar - Erzerum-Elâzığ), Eastern (eastwards from Erzerum-Elâzığ), Northeastern-Pontic (Samsun - Rize), Southeastern (Gaziantep, Adana, Antalya), Northwestern-Kastamonu (incl. "Karamanlı").¹³ They are descended, in part, from the Oğuz-Türkmen tribes that engulfed substantial portions of Anatolia in the aftermath of the battle of Manzikert in 1071. Further movements of Oğuz-speaking Turks to the region resulted from the Çinggisid invasions of Central Asia and Iran. Smaller groupings of Qıpçaq, Uyğur and even some Mongol-speakers entered the region in the Mongol era.

While we can obtain a fairly clear picture of the Turkic components in this ethnogenetic process, the involvement of indigenous Anatolian populations is much more complex. Nationalist politics have, needless to say, not helped to shed much light on this important subject. There is no doubt that numbers of Anatolian Greek-speakers (themselves the descendants, in part of Hellenized populations), Kurds, Armenians, speakers of K'art'velian (Georgian, Chan/Lâz) and Semitic tongues (Aramaic and Arabic) were Turkicized and, in the case of non-Muslims, Islamicized. Among the Lâz (who spoke a K'art'velian language closely related to Georgian), a distinct dialect of Turkish is still spoken reflecting this origin. Such substratal elements have been little studied.¹⁴ Moreover, the Ottoman realm, being a world empire with active involvement in Europe, Caucasia and the Near Eastern lands attracted untold numbers of individuals from these regions.

¹² The most recent survey of the literature is that of Kakuk, 1990, pp. 388-413.

¹³ See Caferoğlu, 1959, p. 239; Dilâçar, *Türk Diline*, p. 31; Kakuk, *Mai török*, p. 24.

¹⁴ See the studies of Tietze, 1955, 1957, 1958 and the remarks of Eren, 1960. These, however, deal with the loanwords from Greek, Slavic and Arabic in Turkish, but not the larger socio-linguistic issues.

The Slavic and Albanian components of the Janissary forces, brought in through the *devşirme*, were particularly strong and are reflected linguistically in slang. The strife that preceded and followed the First World War brought large migrations and population transfers of Turkish and Turkicized populations from the Balkans. Sizable numbers of North Caucasians, usually all lumped together under the heading *Çerkes* ("Circassian") also came as captives in earlier eras and later sought refuge in the Ottoman Empire during the Russian imperial wars of the 19th century. Speakers of these languages are still to be found in Anatolia (as well as in parts of the Arab world where they were settled).

The proportion of Turk to non-Turk in this process, cannot, at present be determined with precision. İnalcık has suggested that non-Turkish, Islamicized elements made up perhaps 30%. Ereemeev, a Soviet student of this problem, suspects that the Turkic percentage was considerably lower.¹⁵ The Ottoman financial and other records, especially from the 16th century, are extremely rich in this regard. They are slowly being studied and published and will undoubtedly shed much new light on some of the ethnogenetic processes in Anatolia (not to mention other parts of the Ottoman realm). But, they will provide a portrait of a process that had already been underway for centuries.¹⁶ A recent study of the ethnogenesis of the Turks concludes that the crucial period was that which witnessed the unification of Anatolia under the Ottomans and the transformation of Constantinople/Istanbul into the capital of this empire. This brought together the various groups of Turks, divided in part by tribal origins, political demarcations (the former *beyliks*) and the extent to which this or that grouping had incorporated this or that non-Turkish element as well as the nomadic tribes which were under ever-increasing pressure to sedentarize. It was this melding that produced the Turkish nationality by the late 15th-to mid-16th century.¹⁷

The Balkan Turkish-speaking populations¹⁸ in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece derive from Ottoman-era settlers from Anatolia and Islamicized and Turkicized elements of the local population.¹⁹ There are also Balkan groupings that Islamicized but did not Turkicize (e.g. the Pomaks of Bulgaria). Of particular interest are the Gagauz, Turkish-speaking (with

15 Ereemeev, *Ètnogenez*, pp. 142-149.

16 On Turkicization during the Seljuk era, see Cahen's remarks, *Pre-Ottoman*, pp. 143-155. The Turks were not a majority but they were the ruling elite and they were distributed throughout the region.

17 Ereemeev, *Ètnogenez*, p. 135. Vryonis, in his exhaustive study (see *Decline*, esp. pp. 361ff., 444ff.), concluded that large-scale conversions of Anatolian Christians had occurred by the 15th century.

18 For the literature on the Balkan/Rumelian dialects, see Tryjarski, 1990, pp. 414-453; Dilaçar, *Türk Diline*, pp. 124-127.

19 Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 261-262.

some special dialect features), Orthodox Christians, who are found in Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Turkey and the Soviet Union (esp. the Moldavian SSR). Their origins remain obscure. Although Pečeneg, Western Oğuz and Qıpčaq ancestors have been proposed for them (with little in the way of linguistic evidence to support this), it seems more likely to seek their origins in a Turkicized population of the Ottoman era with, perhaps, some contributing elements stemming from earlier Turkic groupings. Wittek suggested a "Seljuk tribe" bearing the name *Kaykâûs* > *Gagauz* (?).²⁰

There are also smaller populations of Turkish-speakers in Iraq, Syria and elsewhere in the Arab world (deriving from Oğuz/Türkmen groupings settled there in Seljuk and Ottoman times and Ottoman officialdom) and in Transcaucasia. In the latter, they stem from Ottoman-era settlers and converts among the Armenians (e.g. the Xemšins or Xemšils [*Hemšili*]) and Georgians (cf. the "Mesxet'ian Turks" who were deported to Central Asia). The Adžars, a Georgian grouping of Sunnî Muslims, speak a somewhat Turkishized Georgian.²¹

Small groupings of Crimean Tatars are also to be found in Rumania (the "Dobrudja Tatars") and Bulgaria (see section on Crimean Tatars)

THE TURKS OF IRAN

The Azerîs

This extraordinary pattern of absorption of the subject populace is equally a feature of the closest relatives of the Anatolian Turks, the Azerî or Azarbâyjânî Turks. Azarbâyjân (< Arab. Ādarbâjân < Pers. Ādarbâdagan < Āturpâtākân, deriving, allegedly, from the name of a Persian governor sent there by Alexander the Great, Ἀτροπάτης) was originally the homeland of non-Indo-European peoples. In the northern area, medieval Albania of the Greek and Latin sources, the land of the *Aluank*' of the Armenians, *Arrân* and *Šarvân*/*Širvân* of the Islamic geographers, there lived a number of Palaeo-Caucasian peoples, remnants of whom are still found today (e.g. the Udi, the Šah Dağ peoples) and perhaps others.²² Iranization, particularly in the south, began with its incorporation into a succession of Iranian states starting with that of the Medes. Iranian languages, such as Tat (a South-western Iranian tongue) and Talyš (a Northwestern Iranian language),²³

20 Wittek, 1951-52, pp. 12-24; Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 47-48; Pokrovskaja, *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka*, pp. 3-6; Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 257-261.

21 Wixman, *Peoples*, pp. 6, 103-104; Shiriner, *Islamic Peoples*, pp. 243-245, 255-256, 261; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 207-208, 216-218.

22 Barthold, *Historical Geography*, p. 214; Frye, *Ancient Iran*, pp. 31-32; Ašurbejli, *Gosudarstvo širvanšaxov*, pp. 18-21; *Narody Kavkaza*, II, pp. 195-204; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 139, 206-207.

23 Oranskij, *Vvedenie*, pp. 319-322, 335; *Narody Kavkaza*, II, pp. 181-194.

survive but have been steadily giving way to Turkic.

Turkic penetration probably began in the Hunnic era and its aftermath. Steady pressure from Turkic nomads was typical of the Khazar era, although there are no unambiguous references to permanent settlements.²⁴ These most certainly occurred with the arrival of the Oğuz in the 11th century. The Turkicization of much of Azarbâyjân, according to Soviet scholars, was completed largely during the Īlġanid period if not by late Seljuk times.²⁵ Sümer, placing a slightly different emphasis on the data (more correct in my view), posits three periods in which Turkicization took place: Seljuk, Mongol and Post-Mongol (Qara Qoyunlu, Aq Qoyunlu and Şafavid). In the first two, Oğuz Turkic tribes advanced or were driven to the western frontiers (Anatolia) and Northern Azarbâyjân (Arrân, the Muğan steppe). In the last period, the Turkic elements in Iran (derived from Oğuz, with lesser admixtures of Uyğur, Qıpçaq, Qarluq and other Turks brought to Iran during the Çinggisid era, as well as Turkicized Mongols) were joined now by Anatolian Turks migrating back to Iran. This marked the final stage of Turkicization.²⁶

Although there is some evidence for the presence of Qıpçaqs among the Turkic tribes coming to this region, there is little doubt that the critical mass, which brought about this linguistic shift was provided by the same Oğuz-Türkmen tribes that had come to Anatolia.

The Azeris of today, are an overwhelmingly sedentary, detribalized people. Anthropologically, they are little distinguished from their Iranian neighbors.²⁷ In Soviet Azarbâyjân some four nomadic groups remain, the Airums,²⁸ Padars, Şah-sevens (who are in considerably greater numbers in Iranian Azarbâyjân) and Qara Papaxs. The latter, considered Türkmen by some, are also found in Georgia, Iran and Turkey.²⁹

Other Turkic Groupings of Iran

In Iran, the Qaşqâʿî nomadic confederation (some 570,000 strong) of disparate origins, Turkic, Iranian (Luri, Kurdish) and Arab, speak what is

24 Some Azeri scholars, however, assert that by the time of the Arab conquests, there were permanent Turkic elements in Azarbâyjân, see Aşurbejlî, *Gosudarstvo Şirvanşaxov*, pp. 21-24.

25 *Narody Kavkaza*, II, pp. 42-43; Gusejnov, 1980, pp. 349-351, dates the completion of the Turkicization of the region to the 12th century.

26 Sümer, 1957, pp. 429-447.

27 Oshanin, *Anthropological*, 2, p. 42.

28 Not to be confused with Urums, an Orthodox Christian grouping of Greek origin, as their name implies, living in the Doneck region in the USSR, who speak a Turkic language of mixed Qıpçaqo-Oğuz type probably acquired in the Crimea, see Podolsky, *Greek-Tatar*.

29 Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 136-137; Caferoğlu, *Türk Kavimleri*, pp. 68-70.

usually classified as a dialect of Azerî Turkic.³⁰ Although now camping primarily in Fars and Xuzistan, their clan names indicate origins in Northwestern Iran. They also appear to have absorbed fairly substantial Xalaj elements (see below). Despite the conflicting traditions regarding their origins, there is little doubt that their ancestry is to be traced to the same Oğuz Turkic tribal elements that formed the basis for the Azerbâyjânîs. The significance of their ethnonym and the date of their origin as tribal union are unclear. They appear to have taken on their present day contours in the aftermath of the collapse of the Şafavid regime in the 18th century. Indeed, it has been argued that the confederation, under the Şâhîlu family, took shape under governmental auspices.³¹

The Xalaj/Xalaç of Central Iran present something of a problem. The medieval Muslim geographers frequently confused them (xlj in Arabic script) with the Qarluq (often rendered **xlx** : **xallux** in Arabic script). Attempts have been made to connect them with Pre-Islamic nomadic peoples (the Hephthalites) or early Islamic Turkic settlements in Afghanistan.³² Kâşgarî places them among the Türkmen groupings and explains their name through the folk etymology of *qal aç* "remain hungry."³³ Linguistically (see Chap. 1), they also present difficulties. Doerfer³⁴ and his adherents consider Xalaj to be separate branch of Turkic, while his opponents continue to view them as Oğuzic.

There are a number of other Turkic groupings in Iran that are more clearly Oğuzic (e.g. Xurâşân Turkic³⁵) and those obviously derived from well-known Oğuz tribes (e.g. Afşars, Qajars).³⁶ In Northeastern Iran and Afghanistan there are sizable numbers of Türkmens (perhaps 500,000 in Iran and 400,000 in Afghanistan). There are also substantial groupings that still bear this name in Turkey, Iraq and elsewhere in the Near East. With the Türkmens, however, we cross over into Central Asia. Before turning to the Turkic peoples of that region, we should examine the Turkic populations of the Crimea and North Caucasus.

30 Doerfer, 1990, p. 19 classifies them as a separate grouping (Qaşqâ'i-Aynallu) within Oğuzic.

31 See discussion in Oberling, *The Qashqâ'i*, pp. 27-40; Beck, *Qashqâ'i*, pp. 41-59; Orhonlu, 1967, pp. 421-422, 424-425 (listing of tribes/clans); Sümer, *Oğuzlar*, p. 237, 358 (for İğdir and Bayat clans).

32 See *Hudûd*/Minorsky, pp. 347-348 and Minorsky, 1940-42, pp. 430-342; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, pp. 35-36; Togan, *UTTG*, pp. 150-151; Frye, *Ancient Iran*, p. 350.

33 Kâşgarî/Dankoff, II, p. 363.

34 Doerfer, 1978, pp. 15-31.

35 See literature in Doerfer, 1990, pp. 13-14.

36 Caferoğlu, *Türk Kavimleri*, pp. 66-71.

TURKIC PEOPLES OF THE CRIMEA AND NORTH CAUCASUS

These groups are, from the linguistic standpoint, overwhelmingly Qıpčaq in character. Their origins, however, are quite diverse.

THE CRIMEA

The dominant Turkic grouping of the Crimea, for the most part no longer resident there (having been deported by Stalin in 1944 to Central Asia), were the Crimean Tatars. As we have seen, the Turkic population of the Crimean Xanate derived from disparate sources : Turkicized Mongols (e.g. the Mangıt/Noğays) and Qıpçaqs under Jočid leadership. It is presumed that Khazar and other pre-Qıpčaq Turkic groupings were absorbed by the Qıpçaqs or local confessional communities (Orthodox Christians, Jews etc.) In any event, Quman-Qıpčaq became the *lingua franca* of the peninsula in the pre-Mongol era. The *Codex Cumanicus* stands eloquent testimony to its status as such. It was adopted by local populations of Armenians ("Armeno-Cuman") and Jews (the Qaraim and Krymčaks³⁷). It is highly unlikely that either of the latter may be descended from Khazar Jewish groupings, although such claims are occasionally put forth.

The origins of the Qaraim, Jewish sectarians, are probably to be sought in the settlements of Byzantine Qaraim in the period immediately preceding the Mongol invasions.³⁸ Their language, except for cultic terminology, is very close to Armeno-Cuman. The Krymčaks are rabbinical Jews, also deriving from Byzantine Jewish settlements to which Sephardic (the dominant group) and Ashkenazic elements were subsequently added. The community thus formed (12th-18th century) adopted the Crimean Tatar language.³⁹

The Muslim Turkic population of the Crimea subdivided into 4 distinct linguistic units, reflecting the differing origins of its constituent elements : speakers of Ottoman Turkish (the xanate was a vassal of the Porte, 1475-1774), Northern or Steppe Crimean Tatar, Southern or Mountain Crimean Tatar (comprised of several sub-dialects with varying mixtures of Oğuz (Ottoman) and Qıpčaq elements, the southern coastal population is

37 Statistical information for both groups is sketchy at best. The Krymčaks, in particular, fell victim to the Holocaust. In 1959 the Qaraim of the USSR numbered some 5,727. In 1979, this number had shrunk to 3,341 (see Akiner, *Islamic Peoples*, p. 425). The Krymčak population of the USSR in 1979 was put at about 1,800 (Polinsky, 1991, p. 124).

38 Ankori, *Karaites*, pp. 58ff. East European Karaite scholars tend to stress the Turkic elements of their traditional culture and conclude that they derive from or are the "heirs" of Khazaria and the Cumans, see Zajaczkowski, *Ze studiów*, pp. 61ff. and his *Karaims*, pp. 12-13.

39 See Polinsky, 1991, pp. 123-129 and Khazanov, 1989.

sometimes termed Tat) and Crimean Noğay.⁴⁰ The Dobrudja Tatars have adopted a written language close, in form, to that of Steppe Crimean Tatar.⁴¹ Crimean Tatar *per se* is much closer to Qumano-Qıpçaq and the Quman-derived North Caucasian Turkic languages than the Volga Tatar languages.

One may presume, given the prominent role that the Crimea played in the slave trade, drawing, during the era of the xanate, on Eastern Slavic and North Caucasian populations, among others, that these ethnic elements, as well as older populations of the Crimea (including the Goths) have contributed to the ethnic composition of the Crimean Tatars. This is especially true of the Tat grouping. Tat is an old Turkic term for "alien, stranger, non-Turk"⁴² which was largely applied to Iranian-speakers in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Given the ethnic diversity of the Turkicized population of the Crimea, it is hardly surprising that it was employed here for the heterogeneous coastal peoples and their Turkicized and Islamicized descendants (some of whom are also found among the Dobrudja Tatar communities today). Modern scholars point to linguistic, anthropological and cultural differences between the Tatars and Tats as well as some degree of inter-ethnic friction.⁴³

THE NORTH CAUCASUS

The Qumuq (Russ. Kumyk) people are found in Dağıstan. The origin of this ethnonym is obscure. Kâşğari notes it as both an anthroponym and a term for "dung, especially of horses."⁴⁴ Although names of this type (used to ward off evil spirits) are well-known to the Turkic system of name-giving, we have no further data on such an individual, clan or tribe that might have served as the source of this ethnonym. Perhaps more productive in this regard is the older designation of the Lak, speakers of a Northeastern or Dağıstani Caucasian language of the Lako-Dargwa family: Qazi Qumux (< Ar. qâḍī "religious judge" or ḡâzī "fighter for the faith" + qumux < medieval Ġūmīq, a toponym). The people of Ġūmīq, then Christians, are mentioned in the medieval Arab accounts of the struggle to bring Dağıstan under Muslim rule.⁴⁵ The Qumuqs were later under the šamxal of Qazi

40 Sevortjan, 1966, p. 234 divides them into Noğay Tatarları or Noğays of the Northern steppe zone, Qım Tatarları who were in the region from the steppe to the coast and the Tats, the southern coastal population. Çagatay, *Türk Lehçeleri*, II, p. 86 divides them into the following dialects: 1) Urban-mountain (a mixed grouping with a strong Ottoman component) 2) Crimean Tatar 3) Crimean Noğay. The literary language is based on the central dialects, i.e. that of the Qım Tatars proper.

41 Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 58-59.

42 Clauson, ED, p. 449.

43 See Schütz, 1977, pp. 77-106.

44 Kâşğari/Dankoff, I, p. 294.

45 Minorsky, *Sharvân*, pp. 96-97, 103, 155, 167; Bartol'd, "Dagestan," pp. 410-412; Erel, *Dağıstan*, p. 48.

Qumux. The šamxalate, which had appeared by the 14th century, encompassed much of the Northeastern Caucasus, including the Caucasian Avars, Dargins, Laks, Aguls, Lezgins as well as the Turkic Noğays and Qumuqs (the latter from the 16th century, if not earlier).⁴⁶

There has been considerable debate regarding their origins; some scholars stressing their autochthonicity, others their largely alien derivation. Some of their mountaineer neighbors term them "steppe people" (cf. Avar *İparaglal*), pointing to a steppe origin, while the Noğays call them *tawlı* "mountaineer."⁴⁷ The prevailing current opinion, supported by anthropological and some linguistic data, sees in them, a Turkicized people of largely local origin. Their territory has been subject to repeated contact with the steppe beginning in the Hunnic era. In the period of the Khazar Qağanate, these contacts were intensified, undoubtedly including Bulğaric elements and continuing on into the Qıpçaq era. It was in the Činggisid epoch that this ethnogenetic process was completed. Their present-day internal designations show no trace of earlier tribal nomenclature, but are geographically-derived. The southern Qumuq dialects display strong Dargwa influences (although these could also be explained by centuries of contact). The toponyms of the region, however, are also largely of Dargwa origin. We have evidence for Qıpçaq and even earlier Turkic settlements and these should be viewed as the crucial element in their Turkicization.⁴⁸

The Qumuq language is of the Cumano-Qıpçaq type, with some Oğuz (Azeri) influence. But other factors, especially economic, may also be taken into consideration. As Wixman has noted, in the North Caucasus a "vertical zone principal of language" is operative. Languages of the lower regions and plains/steppes became *linguae francae* in the lowland pasturages whither the polyglot mountaineers brought their herds for winter, came to trade or find employment. Until the Russian absorption of the region, these lowland areas were dominated by Turkic peoples, the Azeris in Southeastern Dağıstan, the Noğays in the northwest and central zone and the Qumuqs in the northeast. The more advanced political organization of some of the Turkic groups also contributed significantly to this. Thus, for these political and economic reasons, Turkicization was extended into the North Caucasus. This trend was clearly in evidence before the Revolution and for more than a decade after it, until the process was reversed by government policy.⁴⁹ Although Azeri was the principle vehicle for this process, it points to means by which Qıpçaq Qumuq may also have spread.

46 *Ist. narodov Severnogo Kavkaza*, p. 242; Erel, *Dağıstan*, p. 49.

47 Gadžieva, *Kumyki*, p. 45, Volkova, *Ėtnonimiy*, p. 181.

48 See in general Fëdorov, Fëdorov, *Rannie tjurki*, esp. pp. 257ff.; Gadžieva, *Kumyki*, pp. 25-45; Fëdorov, *Ist. ėtn. Sev. Kavkaza*, pp. 114-116.

49 Wixman, *Language Aspects*, pp. 108-111; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 137-138, 174-175.

The origins of the Qaračay (Qaračaylı)-Balqars (Tawlı, Malqarlı) geographically divided but speaking dialects of a common tongue, follow the same pattern. The contributing Turkic elements were Hunnic-era tribes, Oğuro-Bulğaric, Khazar (complex) and Qıpçaq. By the 13th-14th century, this ethnîe had been formed. In addition to the Turkic and Palaeo-Caucasian components, there appears to have been an Iranian Alanic element as well, perhaps one that was earlier Caucasianized. This is reflected in the fact the Osetins call the Balqars *asiag*, *œsiag*, *œsson* and the Qaračays *x'œrœseag*, *Ustur-Asi*, i.e. *As*, the Svans call them *Mukrčai ovsî* and *Musav*, pl. *Saviar* and the Megrelians *Alani*,⁵⁰ all pointing to the Alano-As world. Abu'l-Fidâ (d.1331) notes in the North Caucasus "the tribe of the al-^cAllân, they are Christianized Turks...(they) are a numerous people in that region. Beyond Bâb al-Abwâb, they are neighbored by a tribe of the Turks called al-Âs who have the same manners and faith as they."⁵¹ Other self-designations used by this people, aside from **Tawlı** "mountaineer," are also unclear. Their connections with the steppe world are reflected in their rich traditions of animal husbandry, their principal occupation prior to World War II. The products of this economy were famous throughout the Caucasus.⁵²

Attempts to connect Balqar/Malqar with Bulğar, resting on a superficial sound resemblance, require more than conjecture. There were, apparently, also close ties with the K'art'velian Svans, reflected in family names (cf. Qaračay Ebzeler and Balqar *Švanlari*, both denoting "Svan").⁵³ Islam, although strong in the North Caucasus from the early years of the Muslim conquests, was firmly implanted among the Qaračay-Balqars only in the late 17th-early 18th century under Noğay and Crimean Tatar influence.⁵⁴

We have already encountered the Noğay confederation (Chap. 10) that figured so prominently in the events surrounding and following the break-up of the Golden Horde. The mass of the Noğays, derived from Qıpçaq and Qıpçaqicized Mongol groupings (the Mangit, Qongrat, Keneges, Qanglı, Argın, Sırın/Širin, Qıpçaq [Qıpšaq], Üysin/Uysun, Nayman, Qitay, Qiyat, Türkpen [Türkmen], Uyğur [Uyğur] and others - the ethnonyms Qazaq and Qumuq also appear as clan names⁵⁵), were absorbed into the Central Asian

50 Volkova, *Ètnonimiy*, pp. 87,94-95, 178, 180; Alekseeva, *Drevnjaja i srednevekovaja istorija*, pp. 161-174.

51 Abu'l-Fidâ, *Taqwîm al-Buldân*, p. 203; Volkova, *Ètnonimiy*, p. 95; *Ist. narodov Severnogo Kavkaza*, pp. 237-238.

52 See Karça, Koşay, *Karaçay-Malkar*, pp. 2-3 and the detailed discussions there of these traditions.

53 Volkova, *Ètnonimiy*, p. 91; Alekseev, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 200-203.

54 Akiner, *Islamic Peoples*, pp. 202-203; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, p. 203; *Ist. narodov Severnogo Kavkaza*, p. 495.

55 Alekseeva, *Drevnjaja i srednevekovaja istorija*, pp. 200-201. Later Ottoman and European sources point to a great variety of tribal and clan names, see Volkova, *Ètnonimiy*, pp. 80-84. Baskakov, *Noğaj-russk. slov.*, pp. 490-492 gives a full listing of tribal and clan names.

and Crimean descendants of the "Tatars." The Noğay, as such, had formed as a distinct union, but perhaps not yet an *ethnie*, by the mid-15th century. They nomadized over the steppes extending from Western Siberia to the Volga and Aralo-Caspian zone. By the mid 16th century, this union began to break up into the Great and Little Noğay Hordes. Further splintering produced the three remaining Noğay groupings of today : the Noğay of the Stavropol' region, largely the Ačıqulaq district (of Lesser Noğay Horde origins), the Qara Noğay in Northern Dagestan ASSR (of Greater Noğay Horde origins) and Aq Noğay groupings in the Qaraçay-Çerkes AO and Čečen-İnguş ASSR. The Qara Noğay are under strong Qumuq influence, while the Aq Noğay are subject to Çerkes influence. Noğay groupings elsewhere (among the Astraxan and Crimean Tatars) have been absorbed by the dominant Turkic ethnic unit. Among the Noğay today, tribal consciousness seems to be more developed than a sense of Noğay nationhood.⁵⁶

Near the Noğay of the Stavropol' kraj are the Türkpen (Türkmen, Russ. Truxmen or Stavropol' Turkmens). They are descended from the Čoudur or Čawur, İğdir and Soyınajı tribes of the Mangyşlak region who were brought to the North Caucasus during the reign of Peter the Great (d. 1725).⁵⁷ Judging from the Noğay clan name Türkpen, elements of them are being absorbed by the Noğays.

THE VOLGA-URAL-WEST SIBERIAN PEOPLES

This grouping of Turkic peoples presents some of the most interesting ethnogenetic problems. As elsewhere, ethnogenesis here involves several layers of Turkic peoples, including an older stratum speaking Oğuric (still preserved in Čuvaş) and considerable mixture with earlier Iranian tribes and Finno-Ugric peoples (who still remain as separate entities in the region). The Finno-Ugric layer can be dated to the 3rd-2nd millennia B.C. Iranian tribes came into contact with the region in the 2nd millennium B.C. Turkic elements become active in the region when tribes, of unknown affiliation within the Turkic group and probably associated with the movement of Eurasian nomads that climaxed with the crossing of the Volga by the Huns, ca. 350 A.D., surface here. This, it has been claimed, may have been as early as the 2nd century A.D. Thereafter, the Turkic element predominated politically and economically.

56 Alekseeva, *Drevnjaja i srednevekovaja istorija*, pp. 200-204; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 170-171; Wixman, *Peoples*, p. 146; Akiner, *Islamic*, pp. 159-160; Volkova, *Etnonimy*, pp. 84-85; *Ist. narodov Severnogo Kavkaza*, pp. 367-368.

57 Bartol'd, *Očerık ist. trkm.*, pp. 613-614.

The Činggisid era witnessed the emplacement of the different ethnic building blocks. But, the final form these elements took has, to some degree, been determined by the nationality policies of the Tsarist and Soviet governments. Xalikov, for example, argues that the different groupings of what today constitute the Tatars were drifting apart and if not for the Russian conquest would have become separate peoples.⁵⁸

Let us examine the ethnogenetic process more closely. Some of these issues, in particular the question of who are the "real heirs" of the Volga Bulğar legacy, have generated considerable heat.

The Volga-Ural-West Siberian Tatars

The designation Tatar is old and yet new. Well into the 19th century, the Tatars usually termed themselves *Müsülman/Mösälman* "Muslim." Terms such as *Qazanlı*, *Bulğar(lı)*, *Tatar* (a general term used by the Russians to designate many Turkic peoples), *Türk/Törk*, *Mişer* and more infrequently *Noğay* are noted. Their Mari neighbors termed them *Suas* (< *Suwar/Suwaz* ? perhaps < *Čuvaš* ?⁵⁹), while the Udmurts called them *Biger* (< *Bulğar*).⁶⁰

Tatar scholars, and others, were not sure how to handle the multiple elements in Tatar ethnogenesis. The question became highly politicized.⁶¹ Some stressed the Bulğar component, others the Qıpčaq-Golden Horde elements. Some even highlighted the role of Turkized Finno-Ugrians. These arguments largely swirled around the Tatars of the Middle Volga and adjacent regions. The Astraxan and Siberian Tatars, with their more Mongoloid physical type had a different evolution,⁶² one in which *Noğay* and other Golden Horde elements figured more prominently. Language was a key question. The Volga Bulğars spoke several dialects of Oğuric (Common Turkic may also have been spoken by some of their subject tribes). But, the Volga Tatars today speak a particular form of Qıpčaq, forming a complex with *Başkir*.⁶³ Oğuric, however, is still represented in the region by the *Čuvaš*.

58 Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 147,151-152.

59 Ašmarin, *Bolgary i čuvashi*, p. 45.

60 Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 15-16; Kuzeev (ed.), *Narody Povolž'ja*, p. 206; Rorlich, *Volga Tatars*, pp. 3-4. On the rise of modern Tatar national consciousness, see Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism*, pp. 24ff.; Rorlich, *Op. cit.*, pp. 48ff.

61 Cf. the shaping of modern Tatar thinking on this question by Marjānī, see Schamiloglu, 1990, pp. 39-49. See also discussion in Kappeler, 1976, pp.319-325..

62 Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 5-7,12,29-33; Rorlich, *Volga Tatars*, pp. 5-9.

63 See Garipov, *Kypčakskie*.

As we have already noted, Oğuric tribes, later associated with the Volga Bulğar state, probably began to advance into the region during the Khazar era. One recent study would not place them there before the 8th century.⁶⁴ The Volga Bulğar state took shape in the 9th-10th century and was expanding outwards, through its elaborate trade network with the surrounding Finno-Ugric forest peoples and Islamo-Iranian Central Asia, until the Mongol conquest. By that time, it had also come into contact with the Qıpçaqs. It is impossible to determine, at present, what Finno-Ugric ethnic elements the Bulğars may have absorbed by this time. We have evidence, however, for Bulğar-Proto-Permian Finnic linguistic contacts by the 9th-10th century.⁶⁵ It is equally difficult to determine what the Qıpçaq impact on the Bulğars may have been. The fact that Kâşğari did not single out Bulğar and Suwâr for special treatment either points to the widespread use of Common Turkic in Volga Bulğaria by that time or his ignorance of the true situation there.

The Bulğar realm was absorbed into the Jočid ulus, the Golden Horde, ultimately forming the basis for the Qazan xanate. It was during this period, under the influence of the Qıpçaq and Qıpçaqicized elements of the Golden Horde, the "real Tatars" (although this, too, is a misnomer, now hallowed by age and usage), that the language shift from Oğuric to Qıpçaq among sizable elements of the Volga Bulğar population must have occurred. The vagaries of Činggisid politics, both Jočid and subsequently Qazanian, brought about shifts of population as well. The name Bulğar, long interchangeable with "Muslim" (Büsürman, Russ. Бесермяне, etc.), became less used. Thus was laid the foundation of the different subgroups of Tatars.⁶⁶

The Tatars today, it is generally held, consist of three major dialect subgroupings: the Central or Qazan Tatar, the Western or Mişer and the Eastern or Siberian Tatar. There are also transitional or mixed dialects: Astraxan Tatar (consisting of Noğay and Kundur elements which have been assimilated by Volga Tatar), Kasimov Tatar (mid-way between Volga and Mişer), the Teptâr/Tiptâr (Russ. Teptjar, < *defter*, i.e. those registered in books⁶⁷), mid-way between Tatar and Başkir, the Ural Tatar subdialects (incl. the Nagaybak, who are "Krjašen [< Russ. крещенный "converted," i.e. converts to Russian Orthodoxy], the Krjašen are found among both the Qazan Tatars and Mişers).

Geographically, the Qazan Tatars, taken in the largest sense, subdivide into regional groupings: Northwestern with a number of subgroupings

64 Zimonyi, *Origins*, p. 182.

65 Zimonyi, *Origins*, pp. 84-88.

66 Kuzeev (ed.), *Narody Povolž'ja*, pp. 203-206; Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 34-55, 81, 92-99, Xalikov, 1980, pp. 373-376.

67 Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, p. 148.

(some of which have Čuvašic influences), the Yelabuga, Southeastern, Uralian (= Teptärs and others in Baškiria, they are frequently distinguished from the Baškirs only with great difficulty, if at all), the Permian grouping (with strong Bulğaric and Finno-Ugric substratal elements), Čepec (with Nukrat, Karino and Glazov subgroupings) and Kasimov (with a strong Noğay component). The Qazan Tatars took on their present-day contours in the 15th-16th century with the creation of the Qazan Xanate.⁶⁸

The Mišers, whose ethnonym is probably to be connected with either the Finno-Ugric people called *Meščera* in Rus' or with *Magyar/Megyer*,⁶⁹ are divided into : Oka, Right Bank group, Left Bank or Trans-Volgan. Their ethnogenesis involves the Finno-Ugric *Meščers*, *Burtas*, *Mordvins*, *Bulğars*, *Qıpçaqs* and Turkic elements brought in with Tatar rule in the region. They took shape in the course of the 14th-15th century. The Qazan Tatars and Mišers were brought together, under the auspices of the Russian state, to form one people in the 17th-18th century.⁷⁰

The Uralian group largely derives from Mišers brought to Baškiria.⁷¹

The least studied are the Siberian Tatars : the Tümenli, Tatars of the Tara, Tobol, Išim, Irtyš rivers, the Baraba steppe, Tomsk and other regions that largely developed out of the peoples of Küčüm's xanate. The Baraba were islamized only in the 19th century. The Tobol (Russ. Tobol'skie Tatars) and Irtyš Tatars are an amalgam of Tatar tribes from the southern xanates, Central Asian elements (Sarts and "Buxarans") and Volga Tatars. Their tribal consciousness has largely faded (except among the Tara grouping) and Islam had become, by Radloff's time, a key marker of their identity.⁷² Undoubtedly, some of their constituent elements go back to the Kimek union of Western Siberia from which the Qıpçaqs themselves emerged. In the Činggisid era, Noğay and similar elements were added. The extent to which indigenous Uralic elements may have figured in their ethnogenesis is not clear. Thus, although linguistically closely related, their origins differ in some crucial respects from those of the Volga Tatars.

Aside from emigré communities, there are smaller groups of Tatars in Byelorussia, Lithuania Poland, deriving from elements of the Noğays who

68 Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 285-287; Vorob'ev, Xisamutdinov, *Tatary*, pp. 39-45, 51-53; Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 29, 34, 106, 122.

69 Németh (1972, pp. 293-299), among others, viewed *Mišer* as deriving from *Mejer* (Hung. *Megyer*), a palatal variant of *Magyar*.

70 Vášáry, 1975, pp. 237-275. See also Vorob'ev, Xisamutdinov, *Tatary*, pp. 45-50; Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 105-106, 145-146, 151-152; Muxamedova, *Tatary-Mišari*, pp. 11-17.

71 Vorob'ev, Xisamutdinov, *Tatary*, pp. 50-51.

72 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 115-121; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 423-424; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 231-232. On the Baraba Tatars, see, Dmitrieva, *Jazyk barabinskix tatar*, pp. 7-25.

took service with the Lithuanian Grand Prince Vytautas/Vitovt, which have slavized linguistically. There are Byelorussian texts, in Arabic script, that stem from these groupings.

The Čuvaš

We are much less well-informed about the circumstances of Čuvaš (Čuv. čăvaš) ethnogenesis. At present they divide into two dialect groupings: Upper (viryal), i.e. Northern, Northwestern and Lower (anatri), i.e. Southern, Southeastern. In anthropological type, they are closest to the Finnic Highland Mari. There can be little doubt that the arrival of the Oğuric Turks to the region had an impact on the Finnic population, breaking up the unity of the Permian grouping (producing the Komi and Udmurts) and displacing others.⁷³ One theory suggests that the Upper Čuvaš derive from the assimilation by Volga Bulğars of Finnic Mari, Burtas and Mordvin peoples and the Lower Čuvaš stem from the Suwâr.⁷⁴ Ašmarin connected the Mari Suas "Tatar" with the ethnonym Čuvaš (čŷvaš, čŷvaš, čuaš).⁷⁵ Some scholars would see in the swâr/swân (conjecturally read *swâz) of Ibn Xurdâdbih, Ibn Faḍlân and other Islamic authors a rendering of čuvaš. Swâr etc., however, is a reflection of the ethnonym Sabir.⁷⁶ Németh associated the ethnonym čuvaš with Tat. jwaš "peaceful"⁷⁷ but this is, by no means, conclusively demonstrated. Whatever the outcome of the etymological disputes, there can be no doubt regarding the linguistic relationship between Volga Bulgarian and Čuvaš.⁷⁸ One is troubled, however, by the absence of an Islamic tradition among the Čuvaš,⁷⁹ for it figures very prominently in the Volga Bulgarian

73 Xalikov, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 44-45, 51-52. The Mordvins were, perhaps, least affected, while the Mari, their Volga Finnic kin, show a greater Oğuric linguistic influence. The Qaratay subgrouping of the Tatars are believed to be Tatarized Mordvins, reflecting ethnic changes during the Qazan xanate period. Among the Permian groupings, the ancestors of the Udmurts, the Southern Permians, were most affected by Bulğaric, see Golden, "Russian forest belt," *CHEIA*, pp. 250-253; Xajdu (Hajdu), *Ural'skie*, pp. 64, 70, 201-202.

74 Cf. Xakovskij, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 220-231, 380-383 and discussion in Kappeler, 1976, p. 323.

75 Kuzeev, *Narody Povolž'ja*, pp. 175-177, Mokša čuvaš, Erzya čuvaš, Bašk. suaš; Ašmarin, *Bolgari i čuvaši*, p. 45.

76 Golden, *Khazar Studies*, I, pp. 34-36, 256-257; Zimonyi, *Origins*, pp. 42-45.

77 Németh, *HMK*, pp. 35-36; cf. Räsänen, *Versuch*, p. 176: Uyğ. yabaš, yawaš "sanft, mild" etc.

78 See most recently Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, pp. 9-44. For an overview of Čuvaš-Common Turkic, see Róna-Tas, *Bevezetés*, pp. 82-98. Róna-Tas (pp. 34-35) divides Čuvaš linguistic history into the following eras: 1) Old Čuvaš extending until the end of the 1st millennium A.D. and including the formation of Volga Bulğaria 2) Middle Čuvaš, from the 9th century until the collapse of the Golden Horde and the formation of the Qazan xanate (1430's) 3) New Čuvaš, to the end of the 19th century 4) Modern Čuvaš. For an attempted comparison of Čuvaš and Danubian Bulgarian culture, see Denisov, *Ėtno-kul'turnye paralleli*.

79 Islamic loan-words are present, but the overwhelming majority (80%) were borrowed from

identity. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Čuvaš ever called themselves "Bulğars."

It seems most likely, then, that the Čuvaš formed in the period after the Mongol conquest. Oğuric-speaking elements within the Bulğar state, perhaps unislamicized, fled, some initially and others later when the Golden Horde began to break up, to Finnic regions that had been part of the state. There, they mixed with the local population, producing the Čuvaš. It is also possible that Oğuric elements, not yet deeply affected by the Islamic culture at the Volga Bulğar center and already established at the periphery of the Finnic world, now moved deeper into this zone to escape the Mongols. Some Soviet scholars suggest that Bulğars fleeing the Mongols to the pagan lands of the forest, abjured Islam and reverted to paganism.⁸⁰ It is impossible to determine when the process of Oğuricization achieved a critical mass. Certainly, the spread of Bulğaric to Finno-Ugric elements, especially the Mari/Čeremis, in the Bulğar state was a continuing process that antedated the advent of the Mongols. In any event, the formation of the Čuvaš, as such, is, in all likelihood, a product of the disruptions and dislocations of the Činggisid era.⁸¹ Qıpčaq-Tatar influences reached them as subjects of the Xanate of Qazan.

The Baškirs

We have already discussed some of the principal questions pertaining to Baškir ethnogenesis in Chap. 8. We may briefly recapitulate some of the problems here. The formation of the Baškirs (Bašqort) partook of many of the same ethnic elements (Oğuric, Qıpčaq, Finno-Ugric) found among their neighbors, the Volga Tatars, but in different measure. The Baškir language, today, is divided into two major dialect groupings, the southern and eastern. In these we find those phonemes that are peculiar to Baškir and distinguish it from Tatar : cf. Bašk. *hüð* Tat. *süz* Com. Turk. *söz* "word," Bašk. *siğw* Tat. *čğu* Com. Turk. *çiq-* "to go out." The northwestern dialects are much closer to Tatar. Whether this is the result of Tatarizing influences or a natural transition between the two is in dispute.⁸²

The ethnonym Bašqort (presumably < Bašqurt/Başqurd, given the u > o shift typical of Tatar and Baškir, cf. Bašk. *qoro* Com. Turk. *quru* "dry") appears as *Basjirt* (Basgirt), *Bášjird*, *Bášgird*, *Bášqird*, *Bajgird* etc. in the Islamic geographical literature. *Kášgarî* has *Başgirt* which is very close to the Ilxanid Persian sources : *Başgird*, *Bášgird*. Mongol-era Latin sources have :

Qazan Tatar, see Scherner, *Arabische und neupersische*, p. 183.

80 *Ist. Čuvaš. ASSR*, I, p. 49.

81 *Ist. Čuvaš. ASSR*, I, pp. 49-52.

82 Kuzev, *Narody Povolž'ja*, p. 239; Išberdin, *Istoričeskoe razvitie*, pp. 93-94. Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 76-77 delineates the two subdialects as *Quwaqan/Mountain* (NE and SE) and

Bascart, Bastarcos, Pascatur. The Mongol writers recorded the form : **Bajigit[d]** (sing. ***Bajigir**).⁸³ It was frequently used to designate the Hungarians as well as a Turkic people. Indeed, these forms are suspiciously like **Majgar/Majgir**, the rendering of **Magyar** [mjǵryyh] in Ibn Rusta.⁸⁴ Ligeti suggested that **Bajgir** etc. is the Turkic form of **Magyar** (with m - b alternation) and that the Turkic form of this ethnonym was transferred to a Qıpčaq-speaking people who occupied the old Hungarian lands ("Magna Hungaria") after the bulk of the Magyar-led union migrated to the Pontic steppes.⁸⁵ Indeed, Hungarian travellers to "Magna Hungaria"/Baškiria in the 13th century claimed that they found persons with whom they could readily converse in their native tongue. This and toponymic data attest to the historic and continued presence of Magyar elements in that region on the eve of the Mongol invasions.⁸⁶ As was noted earlier **İstek/İstek**, a term associated with the Uralic peoples (cf. **Ostyak**), is the name used by the Qazaqs and Qırğız to designate the Baškirs. Attempts, thus far, however, to find Hungarian linguistic traces in Baškir have not proved successful.⁸⁷

Kuzeev, while not denying the Finno-Ugric element, takes a somewhat different tack. He posits the influx into Baškiria, in the 7th-10th century, of nomadic, Common Turkic-speaking elements from Southern Siberia and Northern Central Asia. They were in contact with Oğuric, becoming in the late 9th-early 10th century, subjects of the Volga Bulğar state. They assimilated some of the Finno-Ugrians of the region and expelled the others (the ancestors of the Hungarians). Qıpčaqs began to penetrate the region by the late 10th-early 11th century. These contacts were strengthened during the Činggisid era. According to Kuzeev's schema, the ethnogenetic process was completed by the 16th century, after the incorporation of the Baškirs into the Russian state. Thereafter, smaller groups of Kalmyks, Central Asian Sarts, Tipter Tatars and Mišers were added.⁸⁸

The two theses, despite differences over the ultimate origins of the ethnonym itself, can be meshed. The Hungarian union contained sizable Turkic elements, not all of which may have been Oğuric. Some of these may have stemmed from groupings that contributed to the shaping of the Baškir

83 See Chap. 8 and the discussion and citations in Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, pp. 377-378, 397-399; Káßgari/Dankoff, pp. 82, 83.

84 ed. Goeje, p. 142.

85 Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, p. 400.

86 Anninskij, 1940, (Latin text) p. 95 Györffy et al., *Julianus barát*, pp. 61-62; Czegledy, 1943, pp. 158ff.; Vásáry, 1975, pp. 237-275. See Sinor, 1952, pp. 591-602 for discussion of Julianus' text. See also Rubruck (in Wyngaert, *Sinica*, I, pp. 218-219 : "ideoma Pascatur et Ungarorum idem est...")

87 Vásáry, 1985, pp. 201-232.

88 Kuzeev, *Narody Povolžja*, pp. 241-242 and his more detailed *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 393ff. 427ff. Ivanov, Kriger, Kurgany, p. 57 date the completion of the ethnogenetic process to the 14th-15th century.

union. Clearly, the Hungarian union was the dominant element in Baškiria until their departure (for reasons that remain unclear) for the Pontic steppes in the early 9th century. How Ugric the region remained, linguistically, until the coming of the Qıpçaqs is equally unclear. Some Hungarian-speaking elements remained into the early 13th century. Thus, it is the Mongol era that is pivotal in Baškir ethnogenesis. Presumably, Qıpçaqization here paralleled the same process in the Volga Bulğar lands. The striking similarities of the two languages would seem to confirm that. The Baškir name, in any event, which cannot be etymologized in Turkic (except through folk etymologies), itself would seem to point to the Ugric world.

Despite fierce and dogged resistance to the Russians, the Baškirs, according to Bennigsen and Wimbush, possessed no real "historical identity." Their history, since the Činggisid conquest, was largely subordinate to that of the Qazan or Sibir Xanates and the Noğay union. The differences between them and the highly sedentarized, urbanized Volga Tatars were largely economic. The Baškir nation, in their view, is largely a Soviet creation.⁸⁹ From this perspective, the Volga Tatars and Baškirs may be considered one people or at the very least constituted a grouping that had the potential to form a common nation. Such was the intent of the "Idel-Ural" ideology, largely the work of the socially more advanced Tatars, which attempted to create a Tatar-Baškir political entity.⁹⁰ A joining of the Baškirs with the Qazaqs and Qırğız, to whom they bore a greater economic resemblance, was not impossible either.⁹¹

THE CENTRAL ASIAN TURKIC PEOPLES

Linguistically, these subdivide into three groupings : Central Asian Oğuz (Türkmen), Aralo-Caspian Qıpçaq (Qazaq, Qara Qalpaq, Qırğız), Turkí (Özbeks/Uzbeks, Uyğurs) and their subgroupings (Salars, Dolans, Šera/Šira Yoğurs).

CENTRAL ASIAN OĞUZ

Türkmen

The Türkmen derive from the Oğuz confederation, which, as we have already noted, early on began to absorb non-Turkic (largely Iranian) elements in Central Asia. Soviet anthropological studies make this point, in particular, with regard to the Türkmen. Through constant raiding and the

⁸⁹ 14th-15th century.

⁸⁹ Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 247-248.

⁹⁰ See Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism*, pp. 165-178.

carrying off of captives, the Türkmen have steadily added to the Iranian element in their composition.⁹² Needless to say, the Türkmen make distinctions between *ig* "pure-blooded" Türkmen and those born of captive Iranians. The Yomud and Göklen consider themselves *ig*, but look down on the Tekke as being of servile origin.⁹³ At present, the Türkmen are absorbing other Muslim elements, Turkic (Qazaqs, Qara Qalpaqs) and non-Turkic (Baluchis, Hazaras, Arabs) on their territory.⁹⁴ Having lived for centuries adjacent to Qıpçaq and Turkî groupings (the Medieval Qıpçaqs, the Qarluqs), inevitably elements from these peoples may be presumed to be present among the Türkmen. It is interesting to note in this regard that the Mamlûk Qıpçaq glossaries contain Türkmen material as well.⁹⁵

Their present day tribal divisions are mirrored in their dialects: Yomud, Tekke, Göklen (the largest grouping), Salur/Salor/Salır, Sarıq, Ersarı, Çoudur/Çavdur (<Çavuldur). Smaller tribes are the İmreli/Emreli, 'Alı-ili, Bayat, Qaradaşlı and others.⁹⁶ At the time of the Russian conquest (1880's), most of these tribes were semi-nomadic, i.e. clearly in a transitional stage to sedentarization.⁹⁷

Soviet scholars date the formation of the Türkmen, in their modern form, to the 14th-15th century, i.e. the aftermath of an extensive reshuffling of tribes caused by the Mongol invasions. In the 16th century, the Türkmen were divided into three territorial units: 1) the Salurs of Xurâsân in the Balxan region, 2) the principal grouping consisting of the Salurs, Tekke, Yomud and Sarıq around Lake Sarıqamış/Sarykamyş, the Southern Üstyurt, on the shores of Qara Boğaz and the Caspian up to Mangyşlak, 3) the Çoudur, İğdir, and Abdal, who bordered with the Özbeks in Northwestern Xwârazm. There were also Tekke in Northern Xurâsân consisting of the Oqlu/Oxlu, Göklen, Eymür and Salur. In the 17th-early 19th century, there were further shifts/migrations to the Köpet Dağ region and elsewhere. These movements, which continued up to the Russian conquest, were brought about by the impact of more powerful neighbors (Noğays, Özbeks, Kalmyks, Qazaqs etc.) as well as internal fights for territory. Some of the Çavuldur/Çavundur and İğdir were pushed into the North Caucasus under pressure from the Kalmyks. These were the ancestors of the Stavropol' Türkmen, also called *Turxmen* (Türkpen in their own tongue). The Central Asian Türkmen were famous for their fighting prowess. This bellicosity was

92 Oshanin, *Anthropological*, 3, pp. 41-42, 47-51, 53-57, 65.

93 Aristov, 1896, pp. 415-416.

94 Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 93-94.

95 Caferoğlu, *Türk Dili Tarihi*, II, pp. 189-191.

96 Kakuk, *Mai török*, p. 43; Aristov, 1896, pp. 414-415; Wixman, *Peoples*, p. 199; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 98-99. See also Sümer, *Oğuzlar*, pp. 140, 141, 242, 324-326, 336-340, 343-344, 364ff.

97 Tixomirov, *Prisoedinenie*, pp. 29-30.

undoubtedly a factor in their never forming a state. Each tribe was independent, having its own elected xan. There was no central authority, except in times of crisis when a single xan could be selected.⁹⁸ Khazanov suggests that the Türkmen emphasis on camel-breeding, which required less in the way of managerial skills and organization than horse-breeding, as practiced in the steppe, produced a Türkmen society, on the margins of the steppe world, that was smaller in scale, less politically developed and hence less stable.⁹⁹

This structure was remade into something approaching a modern nation in the Soviet era (creation of the Turkmen SSR in 1924). Although tribal and clan consciousness (and partisanship) remain strong, the Türkmen have a developed, albeit pre-modern sense of self and of the superiority of Türkmen over others.¹⁰⁰

Substantial Türkmen groupings are also found in Iran, Iraq and Turkey.

THE CENTRAL ASIAN OR ARALO-CASPIAN QIPČAQ

The Qipčaq confederation, as we have seen, played the primary role in the shaping of a number of Turkic peoples: Noğays, Tatars, Baškirs, Qazaqs, Özbeks, Qırğız and somewhat lesser roles in the genesis of the Türkmen and Siberian Turks. The Qipčaq that were incorporated into the Aq Orda, where they were joined by Mongol tribes that they Qipčaqicized, formed the ethnic mass that underlay the polity of Abu'l-Xair (Özbeks), the Noğay Horde, the Qazaqs and the Qırğız. Where these groups were differentiated was in the varying proportions of these elements. Thus, in addition to the Qipčaq and Qanqlı proper, we find the Qipčaqicized Mongol groupings of the Nayman, Qunğrat, Manğıt, Jalayır, Kerey, Duğlat and others shared by several if not all of these peoples. Lesser known tribes/clans, such as the Ming, Yüz, Qırq, Alçın, Arğun and Tabın, are also found among two or more present-day Central Asian Turkic peoples.¹⁰¹ Soviet scholars concluded that from an anthropological standpoint the Qırğız and Qazaqs were very similar, although ultimately stemming, in part, from different ethnic sources.¹⁰² In the 19th century, Russian sources termed the Qazaqs "Kirgiz-Kaisak/Kaisak-Kirgiz" or "Kazax-Kirgiz." The Qırğız were called "Kara Kirgiz" or "Dikokamennye Kirgizy" as well as "Burut."¹⁰³

98 Sümer, *Oğuzlar*, pp. 139-142; Logaševa, *Türkmeny Irana*, pp. 14-17; Bregel, *Korezmские*, pp. 21-42; Tixomirov, *Prisodinenie*, p. 30,32.

99 Khazanov, 1990, p. 7.

100 Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 95,98-99,105-106.

101 Kūhistāni, *Tārīx-i Abu'l-Xair Xāni* in *MIKX*, pp. 143-144; Ivanov, *Očerki*, pp. 39-40; Piščulina, *Jugo-vostočnuij*, pp. 232-233,238,245; Sultanov, *Kočevye plemena*, pp. 34-37.

102 Oshanin, *Anthropological*, p. 25.

103 Valixanov, "O kirgiz-kajsackoj" *Sobranie sočinenij*, I, pp. 180-181 and his "Zapiski," *Sobranie sočinenij*, II, p. 7; Aristov, 1896, pp. 350,394; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 106,110; Akiner, *Islamic Peoples*, pp. 286-287,327.

The Qazaqs

Kazakhstan has served as the home of the Iranian Saka and Sarmatians, the Wu-sun (of uncertain ethnic affiliation), tribes associated with the Huns, Oğuric Turks and then the Türks. The introduction of Mongoloid elements is associated with the Turkic peoples. The Qıpçaq-Qanglıs and other Turkic peoples subsequently brought in with the Qara Qıtay and then Mongol invasions increased this South Siberian type. Thus, by the 13th century, the basic ethnic elements, Iranian, Turkic and Mongol were in place to produce the Qazaqs.¹⁰⁴ Smaller elements, of an almost transient nature, were added, e.g. the Šerkes/Čerkeš[s] clan¹⁰⁵ which, if this etymology is correct, may have resulted from Čerkes in Činggisid service.¹⁰⁶ These components were brought together in Abu'l-Xair's polity and its breakaway grouping which took the name **Qazaq**.

The Qazaqs, in the course of the 15th-16th century, subdivided into three tribal confederations: the Ulu/Ulı Jüz/Žüz in eastern and southeastern Kazakhstan (Semireč'e) consisting of the Dulat (Duğlat), Alban, Suwan, Sarı Üysün, Sirgeli, Istı, Oşaqtı, Čapraštı, Čanışqlı (Qatağan), Qanglı and Jalayır tribes,¹⁰⁷ the Orta Jüz, primarily in Central Kazakhstan, comprising the Qıpçaq, Arğın, Nayman, Kerei, Uwaq and Qonğrat (who later splintered off and came under the influence of the Özbek xanates),¹⁰⁸ the Kiči/Kiši Jüz in western Kazakhstan which included, according to Levšin, the Alčın which divided into the tribes of Alimulı (consisting of 6 subgroupings) and Bayulı (with 12 or 13 subgroupings). The Jeti-urug' (with 7 subgroupings) were also part of this union. The Bukey Horde, which formed in the early 19th century, developed out of groupings from the Kiči Jüz.¹⁰⁹

Bennigsen and Wimbush ascribe to the Qazaqs of the USSR, in addition to a continuing sense of jüz identification, both a high level of national and supra-national, Turkistanian consciousness. Islam which came in several stages (Činggisid era, Šūfis of the 15th-16th century and especially through the activities of Tatar and later Özbek merchants during the Russian Imperial period), has become more firmly rooted during the Soviet era.¹¹⁰ As elsewhere, it must be reckoned a factor in the national identity.

104 Oshanin, *Anthropological*, pp. 15-17, 22, 24-25; Abdushelishvili et al., *Contributions*, pp. 129, 131.

105 Vostrov, Mukanov, *Rodoplemennoj*, pp. 81, 82, 106, 147, 149.

106 Qazaq scholars, cf. Nurmagambetov, 1984, pp. 94-96, do not accept this.

107 Vostrov, Mukanov, *Rodoplemennoj sostav*, pp. 29ff.; Aristov, 1986, pp. 350-353; Levchine, *Description*, pp. 303-304; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 111.

108 Levchine, *Description*, p. 303; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 111-112; Vostrov, Mukanov, *Rodoplemennoj sostav*, pp. 56ff.; Aristov, 1986, pp. 353-378.

109 Levchine, *Description*, p. 302; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 112; Aristov, 1896, pp. 378-385; Vostrov, Mukanov, *Rodoplemennoj sostav*, pp. 81ff. and in general Sultanov, *Kočevye plemena*, pp. 24-25. Other sources, from different periods, have variant arrangements.

110 Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 70-73; Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism*, pp. 58-60..

There are almost 1 million Qazaqs in China (primarily Sinkiang).¹¹¹

The Qara Qalpaqs

The Qara Qalpaqs, as such, are not mentioned in written sources prior to the late 16th century. They appear in a document of the Šaybānīd ʿAbdullāh Xan (1588-98) in a listing of peoples in the Lower Syr Darya region. Abu'l-Gāzī notes them there (*sīr boyında oltuğan qara qalpaq*) in the early 17th century.¹¹² Attempts have been made to connect them with the Черные Клобоуцы "Black Cows" (*qara qalpaq* "black hat") = the *qaum-i kulāh-i siyāhān* of Rašīd ad-Dīn,¹¹³ the nomadic servitors of the Kievan princes, largely drawn from Oğuz and Pečeneg elements who had earlier connections with the Syr Darya region. Again, on the basis of semantic similarity, they have been connected with the Qara Börklü (*börk* "hat") of the Qıpçaq union.¹¹⁴ Such names, however, are very ancient in the nomadic world. Herodotus (IV.102.2) mentions a tribe called "Black Cloaks" (*Μελαγχλαίων*) on the borders of Scythia.¹¹⁵ They are known to the Oğuz world as well, cf. the Qara Papax. This type of ethnonym could refer to a favored clothing color or type of headgear. It may also have social and political connotations (cf. the Qızılbaş). Given the usages *qara budun* (the common people, as opposed to the begs in the Türk inscriptions), *qarabaş* ("slave"¹¹⁶) and the subordinate position of the Černye Klobuki/*qaum-i kulāh-i siyāhān* to the Rus' princes, one may wonder whether this is a social rather than an ethnic designation.

Ždanko, the Soviet specialist on the Qara Qalpaq posits an Oğuz-Pečeneg "Black Cows" element in their ethnogenesis. In her view, the ancestors of the Qara Qalpaqs were Qıpçaqized and then, in the 14th-15th century, became part of the Eastern Noğay Horde. They are presently divided into two main groupings: the On Tört uru (Qtay/Qitay, Qıpçaq, Keneges, Mañıt) and Qoñrat (Šuuluk, Žaunğır), all ethnonyms that one would expect from a people deriving from an Eastern Qıpçaq milieu. Anthropologically, they display the expected Central Asian Iranian substratum with an admixture of South Siberian and Inner Asian Mongoloid types.¹¹⁷ In the 16th-17th century, they were under the sway of the Buxārān xans and were, apparently, in the process of sedentarization or, at least, had become semi-nomadic. After

111 Ramsey, *Languages*, p. 183; Ma (ed.), *China's Minority Nationalities*, pp. 152ff.

112 Abu'l-Gāzī, *Sajara-yi Türk*, ed. Desmaisons, pp. 290/311.

113 Rašīd ad-Dīn, ed. Karīmī, I, p. 482.

114 Nurmuxamedov et al., *Karakalpaki*, pp. 5-6.

115 in Dovatur et al., *Narody*, pp. 140/141. 350.

116 Kāšgarī/Dankoff, II, p. 265.

117 Oshanin, *Anthropological*, pp. 29-35; Šanijazov, *K ètničeskoj ist.*, pp. 81-82; Nurmuxamedov et al., *Karakalpaki*, pp. 8-17, 22; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, p. 111.

becoming the subjects of the Qazaqs, ca. 1700, they paid their annual tribute in grain, a clear indication of their movement away from nomadism. The buffetings of the Jungarian invasions and subsequent Qazaq pressure, drove them from their old habitats by mid-century. Elements of them became part of the Xivan xanate, to be joined by still others in the early 19th century.¹¹⁸ Qara Qalpaqs living outside of Qara Qalpaqia (constituting local groupings in the Buxâra, Farğâna and Samarqand regions and Afghanistan) have been or are being absorbed by the surrounding Turkic populations.¹¹⁹

The Qara Qalpaq language is very close to Qazaq. Some would consider it a dialect of the latter.¹²⁰

The Qırğız

Qırğız ethnogenesis presents a number of problems dividing scholarly opinion. The fundamental issue centers around the question of the relationship, if any, of the present-day Qırğız (in the T'ien-shan region) to the earlier Qırğız of the Yenisei. Such a connection would appear to require a migration, language shift (Modern Qırğız is Eastern Qıpčaq, very close to Qazaq, they are virtually dialects of one another), ethnic and somatic changes. The Yenisei Qırğız, according to one line of thought, unlike their modern namesakes, appear to have had a strong, perhaps predominant, Europoid component (see Chap. 6). We should bear in mind, however, that the possibility that they may have undergone substantial changes, over the centuries, is not, in itself, remarkable. Soviet anthropologists date the beginnings of Mongoloid admixtures to the Hsiung-nu era. The Mongolian somatic type become predominant, they argue, in the Činggisid period.¹²¹ Thus, the alleged physical-somatic differences between the Yenisei Qırğız and the modern Qırğız, if indeed, true, only bespeak interaction with other peoples and not, necessarily, a discontinuity. Recent theories, however, tend to stress the latter, or at best to marginalize the ethnic relationship of the T'ien-shan Qırğız to the Yenisei people.

L.R. Kyzlasov completely disassociates the modern Qırğız from the similarly named Yenisei people. The descendants of the latter, a people formed from the Turkic Qırğız and a Turkicized Palaeo-Siberian people, he claims, are the Xakas. The origins of the T'ien-shan Qırğız are to be sought among the Qıpčaqs and other tribes which, in ancient times, lived between the Altay Mountains in the west and the Xingan in the east. They are, thus, descendants of what he terms the Inner Asian Qırğız, a Turkic grouping that

118 Nurmuxamedov et al., *Karakalpaki*, pp. 18-27; Akiner, *Islamic Peoples*, p. 338.

119 Nasyrov, Tolstova, 1980, pp. 106-124.

120 Menges, *TLP*, p. 40; Kakuk, *Mai Török*, pp. 85-86.

121 Abdušelišvili et al., *Contributions*, pp. 5,34.

had acquired the ethnonym *Qırğız* as a political name. In the early Činggisid period they were in Northern Mongolia, not the Yenisei, and from there migrated to their present-day habitat.¹²²

S.M. Abramzon also views the ethnonym *Qırğız* as having a largely political rather than ethnic function among the T'ien-shan bearers of this name. In his reconstruction of *Qırğız* origins, it is the Eastern T'ien-shan and adjoining regions, rather than the Yenisei, that served as the crucible of the present-day *Qırğız* people. They took shape in the 14th-17th century, combining local Turkic tribes, earlier associated with the Türk, Uyğur, Yenisei *Qırğız* and Qaraxanid states, with groupings that came in from Southern Siberia and Inner Asia and with Mongol and Eastern Qıpçaq (Qazaq-Noğay) tribes. The various migrations were set in motion by the Mongol invasions, or perhaps even earlier. A mass migration of *Qırğız* from the Yenisei did not take place.¹²³

K.I. Petrov takes a similar position, placing a greater accent, however, on the Yenisei region. He suggests that the modern *Qırğız* language was formed in the Upper Yenisei and Southern Altay, in a Qıpçaq milieu. The modern *Qırğız* derive, then, from three elements : 1) local Turkic and Turkicized populations of their present-day territory (Qarluq, Uyğur and Qanglı-Qıpçaq), 2) Mongol tribes from the appanages of Ögedei and Čagatai 3) Turkic tribes, called *Qırğız*, from the Yenisei-Irtyš mesopotamia, themselves an amalgam of Western Mongol, Kimek-Qıpçaq and tribes derived from the Yenisei *Qırğız* state and Eastern Qıpçaqs.¹²⁴ Once again, we see the "layering" of different ethnic and linguistic elements.

S. Soucek, in several papers/unpublished studies, following Kyzlasov's thesis, views the Yenisei *Qırğız* as a Turkicized Samoyedic and Ostyak population ruled by the Turkic *Qırğız*, who may have been Qıpçaq speakers. The T'ien-shan *Qırğız* were formed, in the 13th-16th century, out of nomadic elements that entered the region in the Činggisid era, absorbing the earlier Irano-Sogdian sedentary population and Islamicized Turkic population. It was Oirat, rather than Činggisid, pressure, in Soucek's view, that brought about the more permanent movement of the *Qırğız* from their Irtyš-Yenisei homeland. It is unclear how great the role of the actual Yenisei *Qırğız* was in this process. Was it their ethnonym, now a political name adopted by other groups, that spread or they themselves ? The Yenisei *Qırğız*, in any event, disappeared, as such, by the early 18th century. The Modern *Qırğız* were, Soucek suggests, to some considerable extent, created by the Soviets.¹²⁵

122 Kyzlasov, *Ist. južn. Sibiri*, pp. 65-67 and his *Ist. Turvy*, pp. 136-137.

123 Abramzon, *Kırğızy*, pp. 21-70.

124 Petrov, *Očerki*, pp. 23-24, 31-32 and his *K istorii*, pp. 4-5.

125 Soucek, *Kırğız*, 112pp. I must record here my gratitude to Svat Soucek for generously sharing his work with me.

The problems remain unresolved. There is no evidence for a mass migration of Yenisei Qırğız to the T'ien-shan. Nonetheless, the name Qırğız had to come to its current bearers from the Yenisei grouping. Whether it came as a genuine ethnonym or a political name (and if so when?) cannot be determined with certainty. We should be cautious, however, about severing completely the ethnic links between the two.

The linguistic connections with Altay Turkic may point to an old Qıpçaq base in Siberia, indicating an area where Qıpçaq speakers could have been in contact with the Yenisei Qırğız. Other explanations for the Qıpçaq element in Altay Turkic are also possible. The connection with the Eastern Qıpçaqs of the Činggisid era, however, reflected in tribal and clan names and language, is beyond dispute. In Menges' view, the Qıpçaq character of Qırğız stems from their close contacts with Qazaq after their settlement in the T'ien-shan region.¹²⁶

The modern Qırğız divide into two confederations, the Otuz Uul ("Thirty Sons") and the İčkilik ("Inner"). The Otuz Uul subdivide into the Onq Qanat and Sol Qanat (Right and Left Wings). Among the numerous tribal and clan names we find many that are shared by their neighbors (e.g. Qtay/Qitay, Qušču, Qıpçaq, Nayman, Qungrat).¹²⁷ Islam came relatively late to the Qırğız who were still viewed as "Infidels" in the 16th-17th century. It was in the late 17th-18th century that Islam made more substantial headway. But, numerous relics of pre-Islamic practices remain.¹²⁸

THE CENTRAL ASIAN TURKİ

This grouping consists of the Özbeks, East Turkis/Modern Uyğurs, Salars, Dolans and Šera/Šira Yoğurs. Linguistically, their literary languages appear to descend directly from the dialects of the politically prominent elements of the Türk, Uyğur and Qaraxanid states.¹²⁹ In Western Turkistan, i.e. modern-day Uzbekistan and the westerly parts of Eastern Turkistan, the language or dialects of the Qarluq confederation probably served as the base-language.

The Özbeks

As we have seen, the Özbek confederation, consisting of Eastern Qıpçaq and Qıpçaqicized Mongol tribes under Muḥammad Šaybânî Xan, overran Timurid Transoxiana in the beginning of the 16th century. Maḥmūd b. Walî,

¹²⁶ Menges, *TLP*, pp. 43-44.

¹²⁷ Abramzon, *Kirgizy*, pp. 26-27; Aristov, 1896, pp. 396-398; Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 78-79. Petrov, *Očerki*, p. 26 dates these divisions to the Yenisei-Irtyš homeland.

¹²⁸ Abramzon, *Kirgizy*, pp. 267ff.; Bajalieva, *Doislamskie*.

¹²⁹ Menges, *TLP*, p. 60.

in his discussion of "Turkistân" comments that "the people of this land had a special name and sobriquet in every epoch. Thus, from the time of Tura b. Yâfaṭ until the appearance of Moḡul Xan, the inhabitants of this land were called **Turks**. After the power of Moḡul Xan was established, the name **Moḡul** was applied to all who dwelled in this land. After the raising of the banner of state of Uzbak Xan, and unto the present day, the inhabitants are called **Uzbaks**...However, in distant lands, as before, they call all the inhabitants of Tūrân **Turks**" (*italics mine*).¹³⁰ As elsewhere in Central Asia, this was a multi-layered process, one that has been furthered by modern governments.

Uzbekistan and adjoining Afghanistan, where Özbek populations are also to be found, have been the meeting ground of ancient Iranian populations, both nomadic and sedentary, and Turkic nomads since the Hsiung-nu/Hun era.¹³¹ With the establishment of the Türk Qaḡanate in the mid-6th century, the Turkic element significantly increased. The process of Turkicization, however, is not complete.

The Özbeks basically consist of three elements : 1) the Turkicized Old Iranian population,¹³² termed **Sarts**, in some regions (see below). This was itself a composite population including Iranian (Saka, Sogdian, Xwârazmian, Kušano-Bactrian) and some Arab elements. 2) the pre-Özbek Turkic nomads. These were also an amalgam of different elements, some dating back to the Hephthalite period, if not earlier, but certainly including : Qarluqs, Yaḡma and other tribes that had been part of the Türk Qaḡanates, both eastern and western, and later of the Qaraxanid state, Oḡuz, the Qangli-Qıpçaqs¹³³ (particularly in the western region) and a variety of Turkicized Mongol tribes (Barlas, Jalayir etc.), that came in with the Činggisid conquests and the Timurid era. They were all often termed **Türk/Türkî** or **Čaḡatay**. 3) the Eastern Qıpçaq Özbek union.¹³⁴ The latter were sometimes called **Taza Özbek** "Pure Özbeks." The Turkicization of the local Iranian population, speaking Sogdian and/or other Iranian languages (including Persian/Dari/Tâjik), on a large scale, probably began in the Qaraxanid and Seljukid era.

¹³⁰ Maḡmūd b. Walī/Axmedov, p. 32.

¹³¹ Some studies by contemporary Özbek scholars tend to minimize the Iranian element and place Turkic elements in the region well before the first millennium A.D., cf. Ėrmatov, *Ėtnoġenez*.

¹³² Oshanin, *Anthropological*, pp. 36-37, views the Tâjik and Özbek populations as essentially the same, except that the Özbeks were "Mongolized in type, to some degree, and almost completely Turkicized in language." This is certainly an over-simplification, but it does underscore the strong Iranian component.

¹³³ On the distribution and history of the Qangli, Qıpçaq, Uz (Oḡuz) and others in Uzbekistan, see the studies of Šanijazov, 1972, pp. 4-12 and his monographs *Uzbeki-karluki* and *K etničeskoi istorii*; Kubakov, 1972, pp. 13-19.

¹³⁴ As early as the 16th century, lists of the tribes and clans composing this union, usually given as 92 in number, were composed, cf. that of Sayf ad-Dīn Axsikentī writing in Fargāna, see Sultanov, *Kočevye plemena*, pp. 26-51.

It is already apparent in the *Diwān* of Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī. Turkic influences were being felt in Xwārazm in the century immediately preceding the Mongol conquest and even more strongly after the Činggisids took control. Prolonged periods of bilingualism followed, continuing in a number of regions, especially the cities, even today.¹³⁵ Bilingualism may also be observed among smaller, composite ethno-confessional groupings, e.g. the Šī'ite Irānīs, based on a Persian Šī'ite core to which other elements (Tajiks, Qıpçaqs, Baluči) were added. They are now linguistically divided between Tajik and Özbek speakers.¹³⁶

The much-discussed term *Sart* (now considered ethnically biased), previously used by the Turkic nomads to designate the sedentary, Iranian population, was applied by the nomadic Özbeks to the sedentary population, including Turkic speakers, as a whole. In time, it came to be used as an intra-Turkic term to designate the sedentary Turkic-speaking population, thereby distinguishing it from the Tājiks who continued to speak only Iranian. It was mostly used in the Xwārazm, Fargāna and Taškent regions and only infrequently in the Buxara region.¹³⁷ In Xwārazm/Xanate of Xiva, the term denoted the population of the southern regions of the xanate which was overwhelmingly descended from the ancient Iranian population. This population Turkicized by the 16th century, although it appears that bilingualism may have continued until the mid-19th century. It was only after the Özbek population of the north began to sedentarize that Turkicization was completed. These Sarts speak a form of Turkic with strong Türkmen elements and hence different from the Qıpçaq-Özbek of the north.¹³⁸

Some Özbek groups have maintained a tribal identity (e.g. the Qurama, Qıpçaq, Qangli) into the 20th century.¹³⁹

The dialects of Özbek proper divide into two groupings: 1) Southern or Central, also termed *Qarluq-Čigil* (typical of cites, Taškent, Samarqand, Buxara, Qatta-Qurğān etc.), which are iranized, to varying degrees, having lost Turkic vowel harmony 2) Northern, in which the Iranian influence is not felt (subdivides into Northwestern and Southern). In addition, there are the Qıpçaq and Oğuz/Türkmen dialects. These three major groupings (Turki, Qıpçaq and Oğuz) are also represented among the Özbek-speakers in Afghanistan.¹⁴⁰

135 Bennigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, pp. 57-58; Oranskij, *Vvedenie* (2nd ed.), pp. 236-239; see also Jakubovskij, *K voprosu*, pp. 3-18 for a general overview.

136 Ljuškevič, 1980, pp. 202-203.

137 Bregel, 1978, pp. 120-122.

138 Bregel, 1978, pp. 123, 138, 146-149.

139 Data on some of these groups can be found in the summaries of Aristov, 1896, pp. 422-425; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 102-105 (for the late 19th century) and Wixman, *Peoples*, p. 212. According to Oshanin, *Anthropological*, 2, pp. 49-50 the "tribal" or "clan" Özbeks have preserved more of the Mongolian type than those who have lost these affiliations.

140 Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 97-98, (bibl. on dialects), 100-102.

Modern Uyğurs

The present-day Uyğurs derive from the Turkic tribes of the Orxon and diasporan Uyğur states, to which other Turkic tribes (Qarluqo-Qaraxanid¹⁴¹ Yağma, Tuxsi, perhaps Čigil) and tribal elements shuffled around in the turmoil of the Činggisid and Timurid periods, undoubtedly contributed. The Turkicized Iranian and Toxarian population of Eastern Turkistan, Turkicizing in Kāšgarī's day, must also be reckoned a significant factor in their ethnogenesis. The name Uyğur appears to have fallen into disuse by the 16th century. The Ta'rix-i Rašidī, as was noted previously, remarks that what Juvainī had called Uyğur "is quite unknown at the present time; it is not understood which country is meant."¹⁴² This may well have been due to Islamicizing pressures emanating from the Čağatayids. The ethnonym Uyğur with its rich, un-islamic historical, cultural and religious past, so long associated with the "Infidel" was deemed inappropriate. "Muslim" became, as elsewhere in the Turkic world, a general designation along with regional or local names (e.g. Turpanliq "Turfanian," Qašqarliq "Kāšgarian") or simply yerlik ("local people"). Özbeks from Taškent, Andijan and other areas that formed an urban merchant class were collectively termed Andijanliq. East Turkī-speakers that were settled in the Ili valley were given the designation Taranči ("farmer").¹⁴³ Travellers also mention groupings of East Turkīs such as the Abdal "who speak East Turkish, but also use some words of unknown origin," or the still little-studied Dolons/Dolans (of obscure origins) whose women went unveiled and mixed freely.¹⁴⁴

The only grouping to have preserved the Uyğur ethnonym was that of the Buddhist "Yellow Uyğurs"/Sariğ Yuğur/Šera-Šira Yoğurs, descendants of the Uyğur diaspora in Kansu who have been subject to strong Mongolian and Tibetan influences as well as Chinese which is now widely spoken by them.¹⁴⁵ The ethnonym Uyğur was revived in 1921 by Turkistanian intellectuals and political figures at a congress in Taškent. It gained wider acceptance by the

141 Kāšgar, a major Uyğur city of today, it should be remembered, was an Eastern Qaraxanid capital and a major center for the development of Turko-Islamic culture. Maljavkin, *Ujgurskie gosudarstva*, p. 194, is of the opinion that the actual Uyğurs played virtually no role in the genesis of the people who today bear their name.

142 *Tarikh-i Rashidi*/Ross, p. 360.

143 Tixonov, *Kozjajstvo*, pp. 25-26; von Le Coq, *Buried*, p. 40; Ruziev, *Vozroždennyj narod*, p. 42; Valixanov, "O sostojanii" *Sobranie sočinenij*, III, pp. 157-158; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 100-102; Čvyr', *Vost. Turkestan*, pp. 36, 38, 42, 50, 73.

144 von Le Coq, *Buried*, p. 39; Valixanov, "O sostojanii" *Sobranie sočinenij*, III, p. 158; Skrine, *Chinese Central Asia*, pp. 123-124; Tenišev, 1965, pp. 94-96; Čvyr', *Vost. Turkestan*, pp. 57, 63-64. Nadžip, *Sovremennij*, p. 9 views Dolan as a separate language of the Uyğur grouping.

145 According to Tenišev, see his introductory comments to Malov, *Jazyk želyx ujgurov*, p. 3, only those calling themselves Sariğ Yuğur continue to speak Turkic.

1940's.¹⁴⁶

Modern Uyğur dialectology is a relatively young field. Kakuk presents the following division : a) two major groupings : Southern (western and southern Tarim Basin, including Kaşgar, Yarkend, Yangi Hisar, Xotan, Aqsu) Northern (northern and eastern Tarim Basin, including Kuča, Qaraşar, Turfan, Qomul, the İli Uyğurs) and b) two distinct, isolates: the dialects of Lobnor and that of the Xoton (< Mong. Xoton Class. Mong. Xotong "inhabitant of Turkistan, Moslem"). The latter term themselves *Busurman* ("Muslim") and derive from prisoners of war/slaves taken in Mongol raids in Turkistan. In the late 19th century, some 400 Xotons nomadized among the Western Mongol Dörbet. They appear to have largely Mongolized at present.¹⁴⁷ Tenişev divides the Neo-Uyğur dialects into Central (Turfan, Qaraxoja, Kuçar, Aqsu, Maralveşi Kaşgar, Yarkend), Southern (Guma, Xotan, Lob, Čeriya, Keriya) and Eastern (Lobnor).¹⁴⁸

Salar (Salır) is spoken by a Muslim Turkic people living, for the most part, in eastern Chinghai province and numbering perhaps 70,000. Some view it as an isolated Neo-Uyğur dialect; others as more closely tied to Sarığ Yuğur. Chinese sources, of the Ming era, place their migration to China in the 14th century. The *Ta'rix-i Raşidi* notes the toponym Huču Salar, located on the borders of Tibet.¹⁴⁹ Their own traditions derive their origins from the Samarqand region and associate them with the Türkmen Salur/Salor etc. While it is not impossible that the Salars were originally an Oğuz-Türkmen grouping that underwent uyğurization, the available linguistic data (largely pertaining to the treatment of long vowels) is ambiguous and requires further study.¹⁵⁰ They have undergone substantial Mongol, Chinese and Tibetan influences.¹⁵¹

THE TURKIC PEOPLES OF SIBERIA

Southern Siberia, along with Mongolia, as we have seen, is the region in which the Turkic peoples are first attested in the written sources. It was also, over the course of centuries, a refuge for Turkic groups pushed out of the

146 Binnigsen, Wimbush, *Muslims*, p. 115; Ramsey, *Languages*, p. 186; Gladney, 1990, pp. 11-12.

147 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 100; Pritsak, "Das Neuuygurische" *PhTF*, I, p. 528; Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 103-104; Bromlej (ed.), *Narody mira*, p. 309.

148 Tenişev, *Uygurskie teksty*, p. 4. See also Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 311-312. Kajdarov, *Razvitie*, pp. 56ff. provides a detailed survey of the study of the dialects. Classification schemata are discussed, pp. 124ff.

149 *Tarikh-i Rashidi*/Ross, pp. 404-405n.2.

150 Kakuk, 1962a, p. 162.

151 Kakuk, *Mai török*, pp. 108-109 and Kakuk, 1960, pp. 173-196; Ma, *China's Minority*, pp. 119-123; Thomsen, "Die Sprache" *PhTF*, I, p. 566; Çağatay, *Türk Lehçeleri*, II, p. 215.

steppe and unable to move westward. The present-day Turkic population is, numerically speaking, rather small. It has, however, complicated antecedents, reflecting ethnic processes that have, undoubtedly, been taking place, sporadically, for millennia : the Turkicization of the Uralo-Samodian and Palaeo-Siberian (especially Kettic) peoples. The consolidation of many small, pre-tribal groupings into more clear-cut entities is largely the work of modern governments.

It is unclear, at present, whether Southern Siberia was simply an early recipient of Turkic populations, coming either from the west-southwest (steppe zone) or the east, or itself an ancient homeland of Turkic-speakers. Subsequently, in historical times, Turkic influences came not only from the steppes directly to the south, but later from Kazakhstan and Western Siberia as well.¹⁵² Thus, it is possible, positing the region as a Turkic *Urheimat*, that Turkic populations, adopting the equestrian pastoral nomadic economy of the steppe, left it only to return in later eras. In historical times, the southwestern zone appears most Turkic or Turkicized, as it was most open to the steppe. As elsewhere, the Turkicization of Palaeo-Siberian (Kettic, Yukagir-related tongues) and Samodian peoples was a layered process, taking place over centuries. In the 18th-19th century, the process was accelerated. These various layers, which included earlier Iranian elements, are reflected in toponyms and in the material culture of the Siberian Turkic peoples.¹⁵³

Similarly, there were overlapping periods of outside rule and jurisdictions. Tributes were paid, simultaneously, to more than one overlord (cf. the *Dvoedancy*). In the early 17th century, many of these tribes were under the rule of various Qırğız princes. Russian penetration and contact with these tribes began at about this time. The ruling Qırğız elements were removed in 1703 by the Jungars.¹⁵⁴ The period of Jungarian/West Mongol rule, which ended in 1755, together with the growing Russian administration over these peoples was, perhaps, most crucial to establishing their present-day configurations. Groups were consolidated and "tribes" created for administrative reasons. A process that was furthered by Tsarist administrative reforms in the 19th century.

We may divide these peoples into the following groupings:

- I. South Siberian : 1. Altay Turks 2. Abakan-Xakas Grouping 3. Tuba
- II. Yakut

152 Menges, 1955, pp. 110,112, who posits a "relatively late penetration of Central-Southern and Northeastern Siberia" by Turkic groupings moving up from the southwest. He dates its beginning to the Cinggisid era.

153 *Ist. Sibiri*, I, pp. 360-361; Menges, 1956, p. 161; Menges, *TLP*, pp. 48,50.

154 Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 111-114, 348-349,384.

I. SOUTH SIBERIAN TURKS

1. The Altay Turks

Called "Altajcy" in Russian, and earlier "Oyrot" (< Mong. Oyirad), a designation deriving from their having been part of the Hungarian empire, they live in the Altay and Kuzneckij Alatau mountain area in the Gorno-Altaj Autonomous Oblast' of the Altaj Kraj in Siberia. Elements of this grouping were brought under Činggisid rule with Joči's campaign of 1207 against the "People of the Forest." Among those submitting to Joči were the Mongol Oyirad, Buriyad and the Bargun, Ursud, Qabganas, Qangqas, Tubas, Kirgisud, Šibir, Kesdiyim, Bayid, Tuqas, Tenleg (Teleng ?), Tö'eles, Tas and Bajigid (Baškir).¹⁵⁵

They subdivide into the Northern Altays, consisting of the Tuba [Tuva-Tuma/Yış Kiži, the former "Černevyje Tatory"], the Kumandins [Qumandi-/Qubandi-/Quvanti-Kiži, "Bijskie Kalmyki"], Lebed [Qû-Kiži, "Lebedincy" or "Lebedinskie Tatory," Čalqandu-/Čalqan-/Šalqan(du)-Kiži etc.]¹⁵⁶ and the Southern Altays, embracing the Altay-Kiži, Telengit ["Urjanxajcy," "Čujcy," Dvoedancy"] and Teleut [Telenggut/Telenget, "Belye Kalmyki"].¹⁵⁷ Some of the clan-names noted among this people (e.g. Qıpčaq, Mundus, Nayman, Mürküt (Merkit), Sart, Soyon, Mongol etc.)¹⁵⁸ clearly connect them with other Turkic and Mongol-Turkic populations.

The Southern Altay groupings, pastoral nomads, are closest linguistically and anthropologically to the Central Asian Turkic population. Among the Northern Altays, forest hunters with elements of sedentary pastoralism, the Uralic type (much like Ob Ugrian) predominates. This, once again, points to their complex ethnogenesis, attested in the clan-names noted above. In addition to Turkic and Turkicized Mongol elements (among whom Qıpčaqš figured prominently), Samodian and Kettic ethnic strains are considered to be important as well. This is reflected in language and culture.¹⁵⁹

155 *Secret Hist./Cleaves*, p. 173. In another context, pp. 147-148, the "Činos, Tö'ölös and Telenggüd" are noted. See also Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire*, pp. 141-142.

156 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 210-222.

157 Menges, 1955, p. 107; Pritsak, "Das Altaitürkische," *PhTF*, pp. 569-571; Kakuk *Mai török*, pp. 114-115; Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 123ff., 187-198, who calls them "Altajskie Gornye Kalmyki" has a detailed description of them.

158 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 96.

159 Potapov, *Očerki*, pp. 134-135, 137, 143, 150, 153-162; Menges, *TLP*, p. 50; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 7, 101-102 305-309. For a more detailed discussion, see the study by Potapov, *Etničeskij sostav*.

2. The Abakan (Abaqan)-Xakas Grouping

Located in the southern region of the Krasnojarsk Kraj in the Minusa Basin, they were formerly termed the Abakan or Minusa Tatars ("Abakanskije, Minusinskije Tatary"). They now have the name Xakas, an ethnonym consciously adopted by the local intelligentsia after the 1917 Revolution. Prior to that, clan-names served as their self-designations. The Tsarist government, in an attempt to create a smoother administrative system, aided the process of people-formation by pushing them into "tribes." Kyzlasov has attempted to argue that this is an old name, reflected in the Chinese Hsia-chia-ssü (transcribed into Russian as Xakas, Xagjas etc., actually a designation for the Qırğız), which he derives from Samodian *kas/xas* "man, person, people" (cf. Motor *kazn* etc.) which figures in other Samodian tribal names (e.g. the Nenec *Xasava* and the Enec *Kasa*, or *Karagas* "Crane People"). It may also be seen among the Baškir.¹⁶⁰ Barthold, however, as was noted in Chap. 6, long ago pointed out that this was an artificial creation. He commented that after the Revolution, the Turkic inhabitants of the Upper Yenisei-Minusa area, having received national autonomy, felt the need for a national name. Up to this time they had managed without one. "The Minusinsk intelligentsia then took from the Chinese sources the word *xakas*, knowing that the Chinese called thus the people who formerly lived in the Minusa kraj and who had some political significance, but not knowing that the name incorrectly designaed the Qırğız who were no longer in the Minusa kraj."¹⁶¹

According to Radlov, they embraced 5 large groupings : the Qača (Kas, Kač, Kaš, "Kačincy"), who had been absorbing Kettic Arins since the 17th century (cf. the clan Ara), other Kettic peoples, Samodian, Qırğız and other elements, the Sağay (including the clans Sağay, Turan, Sarığ, Irgit, Qıy, Qırğıs etc.), Beltir, Qoybal (of Southern Samodian origin¹⁶²) and Qızıl which had "gradually formed out of many smaller tribes."¹⁶³

Here again, we find the familiar pattern of Kettic, Samodian (Karagas, Koibal, Kamasin, Motor) and other components coming into interaction or being organized by the Tsarist government into units together with Turkic populations, including the Qırğız and their subjects (qıştums). They were

160 Kyzlasov, *Ist. južn. Sibiri*, p. 61. Kuzev, *Proisxoždenie*, pp. 250,271 (Kaxas). Cf. the critical comments of Serdobov, *Ist. form. tuv. naci*, pp. 101-105, regarding Kyzlasov's idealization of the ancient "Xakas" and misinterpretations.

161 Bartol'd, *Dvenadcat' lekciij, Sočinenija*, V, pp. 40-41; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, p. 351; Menges, 1956, pp. 166-168. See also S.I. Vajnshtejn's commentary in Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 586-587n.11.

162 Hajdú, *Finn-Ugrian*, p. 216. According to Menges, 1956, p. 168, they call themselves *Tuba*.

163 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 88-91. See also his description of their economy and culture, pp. 222-246.

Turkicized in the early 18th century, although some were bilingual into the 19th century.¹⁶⁴

At present, the Xakas peoples are divided into 2 linguistic groupings : 1) Sağay-Beltir, 2) Qača-Qoybal-Qızıl-Šor (see below).¹⁶⁵ Also in the Xakas grouping are the :

Čulm Tatars

The small grouping of Čulm Tatars, barely 500 souls in Radlov's day, are located on the Čulym river. They are subdivided into the Kecik, Küerik and Čulm Tatars. It would appear that they derive from Qıpçaq-speaking Tatars, from the Siberian Xanate, that migrated eastward in the aftermath of the fall of Küčüm. Here, they mixed with older Turkic elements and Kettic elements.¹⁶⁶

The Šor

Formerly termed in Russian the "Kuzneckie, Kondomskie, Mrasskie Tatars" and now "Šorcy" (= Šor-Kiži), they live in the Kemerovo Oblast' of the RSFSR. There is a grouping bearing this name among the Northern Altay Turks (the relationship is not entirely clear) as well as among the Xakas proper.¹⁶⁷ This ethnonym means "sleigh," Šor-kiži "sleigh-man." Its derivation is obscure.¹⁶⁸ Previously, they themselves did not use a common ethnic designation. They appear to stem from Turkicized Samodians, Kets and perhaps Ugrians, showing similarities with the Northern Altay Turks, combined with older Turkic populations of the region.¹⁶⁹

3. The Tuba Grouping

The Tuvians (self-designation *Tuva*, *Tiva*) of Western Mongolia-Tannu Tuva, were termed previously Soyot, pl. Soyot (< Mong.), Uryanqai,

164 Potapov, *Očerki*, p. 143; Menges, 1955, p. 113; Hajdú, *Finno-Ugrian*, p. 216; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 342,350-351,358,360,362-5; Pritsak, "Das Abakan-" *PhTF*, I, pp. 599,629.

165 Pritsak, "Das Abakan-" *PhTF*, I, p. 599; Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, p. 326-334; Kakuk, *Mai Török*, pp. 118-119; Menges, 1955, p. 108. Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, p. 440 suggest that the Sağay are of Šor origins.

166 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, p. 92; Pritsak, "Das Abakan-", *PhTF*, I, p. 623; Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 336-337.

167 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 93-95,198-210,595n.58.

168 See discussion in Menges, 1956, pp. 164-166.

169 Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 440-444; Wixman, *Peoples*, p. 178; Akiner, *Islamic*, p. 417; Baskakov, *Vvedenie*, pp. 334-335; Kakuk *Mai Török*, pp. 121-123.

Urxanxajcy etc.¹⁷⁰ Related groupings are the Tofalar/Tubalar¹⁷¹ and the Tuba of the Altay Turks. The name is possibly to be connected with the Tupo of Chinese sources, a T'ieh-lê tribe, living south of Lake Baikal. Their ethnogenesis, like others in the region, involves Samodian, Kettic and Mongol elements as well as Turkic. The latter, it has been suggested, included the Uyğurs, Çik, Az and Telengüt, among others. Soviet scholars place them, successively, under Türk, Uyğur, Qırğız, Çinggisid, Oirad Jungarian and Manchu rule.¹⁷²

II. THE YAQUTS

This designation is from the Tungus Yaka via Russian. The Yakuts call themselves *Saxa* (< *Yaqqa*). Presently in Eastern Siberia, their language, folklore, elements of their economy (cattle and horse-breeding) and material culture indicate that their original habitats must have been well to the south of the land they now occupy. They also absorbed a number of local peoples, Samodians (the Dolgans are Yaquticized Samodians/Tavgy), Yukagirs and perhaps other Palaeo-Siberians as well as Mongols and Tungusic peoples. It is hypothesized that the Turkic ancestors of the Yaquts came from the Lake Baikal region and are to be connected with the Üč Qurıqan known from the Orxon Türk inscriptions, Chinese (Ku-li-kan) and Islamic (qwry) sources. The chronology of their migration is unclear. Okladnikov suggests it antedates the rise of Çinggis Xan. He further suggests that it was the ancestors of the Buryat that caused the displacement of the Turkic ancestors of the Yaquts northwards.¹⁷³ Other scholars, however, place their migration in the Çinggisid era, i.e. the 13th-14th century. Yet others posit a prolonged period, extending from the 10th-16th century.¹⁷⁴ The Yaquts present a remarkable adaptation of a steppe society to the conditions of the far North.

The process of nation-building is open-ended. Given the fact that a number of the modern Turkic peoples have only recently taken form, usually in structures influenced by "outside" political forces, it is possible that new

170 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 86-88, 97-100, 481ff., 585n.7; Kakuk, *Mai török*, p. 125; Menges, 1955, pp. 108-109. He remarks (Menges, 1956, p. 171) that this ethnonym "is used to designate tribes by almost all South-Siberian Turks."

171 Radlov, *Iz Sibiri*, pp. 87-88, 583-584n.2; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, p. 474.

172 Liu, CN, I, p. 128 (Sui-shu); Serdobov, *Ist. form.tuv. naciı*, pp. 94, 110; Menges, TLP, p. 47; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, pp. 281-384; Akiner, *Islamic*, p. 400; Wixman, *Peoples*, p. 201.

173 Menges, 1955, pp. 112-113; Okladnikov, *Yakutia*, pp. 229-235, 245-251, 285, 298-303, 306, 314, 318, 320-336, 343, 351, 380.

174 Menges, TLP, pp. 51-52; Kakuk, *Mai török*, p. 128; Ergis (ed.), *Istor. predanija*, I, p. 20; Levin, Potapov, *Peoples*, p. 89, 98, 102, 244-246.

combinations, especially in a fluid political situation, may develop. Indeed, with the breakup of the Soviet Union, taking place as this work is being prepared for press, we witness just such a situation.