On the Term *dáguān* 達官 of Chinese Sources on the Early Turkic History (in View of the One Hypothesis of İbrahim Kafesoğlu)

Vladimir Tishin[*]

Abstract: The article deals with the consideration of the occurrences of the term *dáguān* 達官 in Chinese sources of Tang period. The author examines the hypothesis of the Turkish scholar İbrahim Kafesoğlu, linking the term with the Old Turkic word *toyğun* in the meaning 'members of the national assembly'.

Key words: toy, kurultay, toyğun, Old Turkic, runic, Chinese, transcription, etymology

Eski Türk Tarihî Hakkındaki Çince Kaynaklarda Geçen *dáguān* 達官 Terimi Üzerine

Özet: Bu çalışmada Tang dönemindeki kaynaklarda *dáguān* 達官 terimi incelenmiştir. Yazar, Türk âlimi İbrahim Kafesoğlu'nun bir hipotezi olan bu terimi Eski Türkçede 'millet meclisi üyesi' anlamındaki *toyğun* kelimesine bağlayan, fikri tartışmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: toy, kurultay, toyğun, Eski Türkçe, runik, Çince, transkripsiyon, etimoloji

The first edition of the fundamental work on Turkic history of Pre-Islamic period "Türk Millî Kültürü" of Prof. İbrahim Kafesoğlu was published in 1977, since then has been reprinted several times (1982; 1984; 1997, etc.), and hasn't lost its importance until now. It's hardly an exaggeration to say that the book has become the handbook for many Turkish scholars of the following generations. There were a lot of interesting ideas, was borrowed then into works of other authors, including, moreover, also original but often questionable hypotheses

[*] *P.G., Department of the History of the Orient, The Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, tihij-511@mail.ru........*

based on weak arguments.

Among the similar ideas took hold in works of Turkish scholars it should to be marked the assumption of the identity of the combination *dáguān* 達官 mentioned in Chinese historical sources and the Old Turkic term *toyğun* recorded in the Inscription of Kül Tegin, meant the members of the national assembly ("Devlet meclisi" or "Millet meclisi") (Kafesoğlu 1997: 260–263). This statement can be found in the works of many Turkish authors now (Donuk 1988: 40 (note 318), 52; Taşağıl 2003a: 51, 96 (note 559); Taşağıl 2003b: 22; Çayır, Şahin 2007: 1608–1609; Çakır 2007: 117; Seyitdanlıoğlu 2009: 5–6).

In his work İbrahim Kafesoğlu based on the following items.

Firstly, in different sources is mentioned such political institution as the meeting (or congress) of the nobility in the Early Turkic states, later known as *toy*, identical to kurultay (*xuriltai*) of Mongols.

Secondly, it is the etymologization of the Old Turkic term *toyğun* from the nominal stem *toy* with addition of plural suffix +*ğun*, as a result, with the meaning 'toy üyesi'.

Thirdly, it is the interpretation of the combination of Chinese characters *dáguān* 達官 as the transcription of the Turkic *toyğun*.

All these positions can be discussed if we turn to the source material directly.

Firstly, it's known according to Chinese sources that there were some assemblies of Early Turkic people, but, in general, it's impossible to say something certain about the participants of these assemblies.

So, according the data on Eastern Turks, *qaghan* and *guìrén* 貴人 'noblemen' every year gathered to the sacrifice in the cave of their ancestors, and "in the middle of the fifth decade of a month" *qaghan* "convoked other people" (*jí tārén* 集他人) to the sacrifice to the Heaven, near the river (Zhou shu: juan 50: 6a. Cf.: Bichurin 1950: 230–231; Julien 1864: 335; Parker 1899: 122–123; Parker 1900a: 166; Pelliot 1929: 212, 213–214; Liu Mau-tsai 1958: 10; Liu Maotsai 2002: 22; Taşağıl 2003a: 98, 113; Koca 2002: 52). Western Turks had similar custom to gather to the sacrifice, practicing it "in every fifth and every eighth month", and *qaghan* "every year sent an important dignitary (*zhòngchén* 重臣) to the cave was the dwelling their ancestors to sacrifice" (Sui shu: juan 84: 19b. Cf.: Bichurin 1950: 279; Chavannes 1903: 15; Taşağıl 2003a: 107).

According the Chinese calendar system, fifth month is the period of late May–June, the third and eighth ones are respectively periods of late March–April and late August–September. In this case it's not so principal. Second and

third dates are clear, because they might to correspond to the beginning and end of the summer nomadic-pastoral season, respectively, when it was the necessary for nomad chiefs to gather to consider their outstanding, first of all, economic activities and the distribution of pasture lands. Because Early Turks, traditionally calculating the time based on the effects of vegetation cycle (Bazin 1974: 55–56, 66–67, 87–88, 90–93, 143), about 586 A.D. adopted the Chinese calendar (Bazin 1974: 141–156), there is shouldn't be a significant difference between this two time scales (Bazin 1974: 144). The meeting of all the people to sacrifice to the Heaven may be related to some sort of a holiday. Similar meetings, were both in May and September, are also known related to the *Xiōngnú* 匈奴 (Kychanov 1997: 32–33; Kychanov 2010: 39–40; Kradin 2001: 212–214; Ögel 2002: 874–875). In this connection, it is interesting the fact of the opposition in different Turkic languages of meanings 'spring'/ 'summer' for the lexeme *yaz* (with the meaning 'summer' in languages of South areas of Turkic world, where such semantic shift has been determined by the transhumance practiced by local nomads) (Bazin 1974: 52), may be just found in "Divān-ı luġāt it-Türk" of Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī in the sense 'the first half of the year' (SIGTYa 1997: 73).

Relating to the election of the *qaghan* in Chinese sources are mentioned *guórén* 国人, literally 'people of the state' (Sui shu: juan 84: 4a. Cf.: Bichurin 1950: 234; Julien 1864: 354–355; Parker 1900b: 2; Chavannes 1903: 48; Tolstov 1938: 11; Tolstov 1948: 253 (dipnot 46); Liu Mau-tsai 1958: 44). In 594 to the Chinese court was sent an emissary with gifts from all the chiefs of Turks called in the source *dàrén* 大人, i.e. literally 'great men' (Sui shu: juan 84: 13b). Originally: *tūjué bùluò dàrén* 突厥部落大人 'great men of Turkic race' (Cf.: Bichurin 1950: 239–240; Julien 1864: 509; Parker 1900c: 70; Liu Mau-tsai 1958: 56, 103; Liu Maotsai 2002: 55; Taşağıl 2003a: 52, 118). According to I. Ecsedy these both *bùluò dàrén* 部落大人 and *guìrén* 貴人 should be considered as leaders of different social units less than a tribe (Ecsedy 1977: 10).

The materials of Turkic folklore are able to provide contradictory data. For example, in the *Oğuz Kağan Destanı* Oğuz Kağan had convoked to the *toy* his retainers (*nöker*) and all his subject people (*il kün*), in contrast to the *Kitab-i Dedem Korkut*, where only Oghuz nobles, *beg*'s, had been invited by khan to the *toy* (See: Duymaz 2005: 42). In this regard, it is noteworthy that the primary for the term *tōy*, as it may be seen basing on the Old Uygur and Xākānı materials, is the meaning 'camp', in the sense of a set of tents, then the whole congregation of the people in it (EDT: 566–567; TMN III: 354; VEWT: 484). Cf., however, other etymology: < *toy-* < *tod-* 'become satiated, full' (TKBS II: 921. See also: SIGTYa 1997: 309–310; SIGTYa 2006: 560).

But that hypothesis may be weakened in point of view of historical phonetics: for the Old Turkic is known a just phonetic form *tod-*; only in more

later sources is the reflection of phoneme /d/ found in Old Turkic are realized as /y/ (EDT: 451). In all Turkic languages the term *toy* is present in similar phonetic form, and therefore would be hard to treat the nominal form *toy* in the connection with the verb *toy-* are only its homonym. On the other hand, the form with the long vowel needs to be explained.

Some scholars are convinced of the similarity of functions of the *toy* of Turk and the *xuriltai* of Mongols, which were viewed by them as oldest public institutions of these nations (Ceylan 1997: 2 ff.; Seyitdanlıoğlu 2009: 2 ff.), in addition, it is often emphasized the difference between these institutions that such meetings of Mongols were alleged purely aristocratic, while ones of Turks were democratic (Ögel 2002: 884; Donuk 2011: 2–8).

But what was *xuriltai*? Originally "it was nor a diet (seym), nor a parliament; it was the family council of clansmen, where they had to discuss their accidental plans, and where had took a part only willing and interested ones" (Vladimirtsov 2002: 375); later, in the period of united Mongol empire, it had became the meeting of members of the royal family, their relatives and nobility (Vladimirtsov 2002: 411–412). It probably should be discussed the possibility of some social evolution in different cases in Turkic history, too.

Is it right, from a methodological point of view, in both cases to characterize these institutions without the chronological dynamics? All conclusions should be made not on the basis of mechanical extrapolations, but on the basis of concrete historical evidences.

Secondly, all cases of the mention in Old Turkic sources of the term *toyğun* are devoid of context, and, so, that fact makes it impossible to interpret it thoroughly. There are, in addition, three different, in view of orthography, forms. On the North-Eastern site of the Kül Tegin inscription it occurs in the form *toyğun* 〉ꓕD𐰰 (KT NE). In other fragment there, on the South-Eastern site, it is found being in its casal form *tayğun-iŋizda* 𐰖𐰏:𐰭𐰃𐰕𐰍𐱃 (KT SE). On the South-Western site of same inscription it also can be read *toyğut* 𐱃ꓕD𐰰 (KT SW), being the possible plural form (suffix +*t*).

V. Thomsen read the term as *tajγun*[1] and interpreted it as a title adopted from Chinese ('les grands'), not associating with the occurring above *tojγun* 〉ꓕD𐰰. According to him, that form originated from the Chin. *tai* [*tài* / *dà* 大] 'grand' with addition of the plural suffix -*γun*, -*gün* (Thomsen 1896: 120, 177 n. 84), cf.: "taygunlar", "büyükler" (Aydın 2004: 79). But this point was objected to by P. M. Melioranskiy, who had seen in both cases the reading *moïꞐγн*,

---

1   Here and later using the terms from cited work we keep the original writing of authors.

connecting them with the same name of a title (Melioranskiy 1899: 78, 136), which, however, is also unlikely. W. Radloff had also read in both cases *moiҕун* (Radloff 1897: 155, 156; Radlov, Melioranskiy 1897: 30, 31). In the Glossary in his work of 1897 he noted about *myiҕун*, *moiҕун* 'eine Würde' (Radloff 1897: 176), and in his fundamental "Wörterbuch", in 1905, he put *myiҕун*)Ϡ Dᛢ 'eine Würde', too (Radloff VWTD III 2: 1424). Then, H. Namık (Orkun) had also connected these two forms to each other, deriving them from the Chin. *tai-kuan* [*tài*(/ *dà*)*guān* 大官] (Orkun 1994: 859, 868).

H. Vámbéry was the first to note that *tujgun* might be a form of *tudun*, originated from the *tud* 'merken, fühlen, wissen' with suffix -*gun*, -*gin*. Because in Chagatai Turkic it has been the lexeme *tujgun* 'Falke', in the similar meaning this word was able to be used as a figurative expression with the meaning 'Held' (Vámbéry 1898: 85). But it is certainly wrong.

The writing form with the labial vowel, separately from the other form, had been considered there by W. Bang (Bang 1898: 41), S. E. Malov. (Malov 1951: 431), L. Yu. Tuguševa (DTS: 572), T. Tekin (Tekin 1968: 386; Tekin 1998: 112; Tekin 2003: 256) and as it seems following him V. Rybatzki (Rybatzki 2006: 82). A. von Gabain translated the both variants as 'Würdenträger (?)' (Gabain 1950: 339, 343). Sir G. Clauson had considered *tayǧun* / *toyǧun* as a title adopted from Chinese (EDT: 568) or *Toyǧun* – as a personal name (EDT: 134). V. Rybatzki (Rybatzki 2006: 348, 558–559) also follows the point of Chinese origin of that title.

In this connection it may be rather interesting that fact, that the lexeme *tuygun* being a part of names among the Sakha Turkic (Yakut) people has the meaning 'great', 'excellent', compared by E. G. Pekarskiy with the Radloff's *myiҕун* (Okladnikov 1947: 103–104). Cf. also: VEWT: 484, where Old Turkic *tojγun* 'Würdenträger' is compared also with Sakha Turkic *tujgun*, *tujugun* 'otlichnyi, prevoskhodnyi (byk, kon')', i.e. 'great, excellent (bull, horse)'.

T. Tekin interpreted the form *tayγun* as plural form of *tay* in 'colts, young horses; (fig.) sons', i.e. the figurative expression using by *qaghan* to describe his sons (Tekin 1968: 377, 121, 123). Cf. also: "tay (gibi olan oğul)larınız" < tay "tay, at yavrusu" (Tekin 1998: 111, 52; Tekin 2003: 102). Cf. in "Divān" of Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī: *tay* 'one- or two-years-old foal' (MK III: 158; DTS: 527; EDT: 568; MK/Dankoff III: 125; DLT: 858). Cf. also lexeme *taj* in personal names (SIGTYa 1997: 646–647; SIGTYa 2006: 721). T. Gülensoy also noted *tayǧun* 'oğullar' (TKBS I: 522).

C. Kaya proposed a new reading *ataygun* with the translation 'yavrular, evlatlar, çocuklar' (Kaya 1998; Aydın 2005: 48). M. Erdal has translated *tay-agun-uŋuz* as 'your colts' (Erdal 2004: 160). But he has also noticed that it is

more correct to speak about the form of plural suffix +*(A)gU+(n),* but not +*gUn* (Erdal 2004: 160 (note 276)). This remark matters much.

S. Tezcan interpreted the term in the meaning of 'hunting bird, falcon' (Tezcan 2010: 279–280). But the similar word is known only in forms with the labial vowel.

There is the form from the *Irk Bitig* in form *toγan* 𐰖𐰍𐰆𐱃 (IB, IV. Cf.: Orkun 1994: 266, 866; Malov 1951: 80, 85, 431; DTS: 571; EDT: 470; Tekin 1993: 1, 3, [facsim.] 8; also see: VEWT: 483; SIGTYa 1997: 651; SIGTYa 2006: 703, presented *toγan ~ tuγan* for the personal names), and other, the form *tojγan* in the later periods too, that is closer to the original < *toy+gan* (Erdal 1991: 90). These forms are related to the different deriving stems (ESTYa 1980: 247–248. Cf., however, an attempt of etymology from Proto-Altaic protoform: SIGTYa 1997: 169–170). It still should be discussed in future.

S. G. Klyashtorny had read in the Terkhin (Tariat) inscription the fragment: *...toqᵘz-yᵘz-ᵃr bᵃšï-toyqᵃn ulᵘγ-tᵃrqᵃn buquγ-bïŋa* '…Regiment of the head of nine hundred warriors, *toygan* (commander of the khan's residence) Uluγ Tarqan Buquγ' (Terkh W, 8; Cf.: Kljaštornyi 1980: 91, 93; Klyashtorny 1982: 342, 344; Kljaštornyi 2006: 134, 137). Apparently, the same term was noted by E. I. Kychanov as *toykan* with the similar meaning (Kychanov 1997: 291; Kychanov 2010: 330). T. Tekin gave in this case a reading **tuγqun* as the original form for *tuγγun* with the meaning 'a kind of white falcon; have used attributive for heroes and youths' (Tekin 1983: 46, 49, 67). S. Gömeç believes *Toygun-Taygun* of the Kül Tegin inscription is a title, might be compared with the personal name *Tokuzyüz Erbaşı Toykun Ulug Tarkan* of Terkhin (Tariat) inscription (Gömeç 2000: 941). Cf.: *Tokuz yüz er başı toykun ulug tarkan* (Gömeç 1997: 75). Cf. also the reading given by Akio Katayama: *////////////// # toquz jüz är bašï tuyqun uluš tarqan buquγ bïŋa* '/////// **** is Tuyqun Uluγ Tarqan Buquγ bïŋa, a leader of nine hundred soldiers' (Katayama 1999: 170, 172). V. Rybatzki citing this work, however, noticed the writing *toyqan* (Rybatzki 2006: 425). In the new edition of translation by S. G. Kljaštornyi is given the reading *tujqᵃn* in the context '…the head of nine hundred warriors Tujqan', i.e. now it is a personal name in his view (Kljaštornyi 2010: 38, 42).

This aspect needs to become the object of the special research. It is clear that, most likely, in these texts, it should be told about some kind of title or maybe personal name. But it is impossible to try to find there that etymology, preferred by İ. Kafesoğlu.

Thirdly, as regard to the Turkic *tayğun* and Chinese *dáguān* 達官 in the context of their correlation, there are also certain difficulties.

The fact, the Chinese combination, as far as we know, is found in so-called fragment "On ranks and titles [of Turks]" first mentioned in 197-th volume of the historical work *Tōng diǎn* 通典 composed to 801 A.D. there is the phrase: *yòu wèi lǎo wèi gēlì gù yǒu gēlì dáguān* 又謂老為哥利故有哥利達官 'Also it is saying about old men [called] *gēlì*, then there are *gēlì dáguān*' (Tong dian: juan 197: 7a. Cf.: Liu Mau-tsai 1958: 498; Liu Maotsai 2002: 16; Taşağıl 2003a: 96; Zuev 1998: 154; Zuev 2002: 280). In another variant this phrase had been put into *Cè fǔ yuán guī* 冊府元龜 (of 1013 A.D.): *wèi lǎo wèi gēlì gùyǒu dáguān* 謂老為哥利故有達官 'It is saying about old men [called] *gēlì*, then there are *dáguān*' (Ce fu yuan gui: juan 962: 12b. Cf. translation of A. Taşağıl: 'Yaşlı olanlara "agabey ke-li" derler. Bunun için Ta-kuan vardır ki' (Taşağıl 2003a: 114), and his commentary: "Aslı T'un Tien'deki gibi Ke-li olmalıdır" (Taşağıl 2003a: 114 (note 591)).

Already Liu Mau-tsai, commenting on the fragment of *Tōng diǎn* 通典, had noted that *dáguān* 達官 might to be either an attempt of phonetic transcription of the word *tarkhan*, like the *dágān* 達干, or only marked a high-ranking official (Liu Mau-tsai 1958: 498; Liu Maotsai 2002: 16). E. G. Pulleyblank had written that in the Tang period the Turkic title *tarqan* transcribed by Chinese as *dágān* 達干 (< *dat-kan) or *dáguān* 達官 (< *dat-kwan) (Pulleyblank 1962: 257). Later Yu. A. Zuev had determined the combination *dáguān* 達官 as the transcription of the Turkic title *tarqan* (Zuev 1998: 155–156; Zuev 2002: 282).

It should be noted that W. Eberhard had wrote that *dáguān* 達官 (> t'ât kwân) could not be a transcription of the form *tarkan*, but only *tarkhan* (Eberhard 1945: 322–323). But İ. Kafesoğlu had mentioned this work only in view of argumentation the point of the term *dáguān* 達官 had a wider meaning, including *dágān* 達干 (< *tarkan*)'s among other members of *toy*. In addition, it is thought important to state that according to the last variant of system of E. G. Pulleyblank the reading *dáguān* 達官 is reconstructed for Early Middle Chinese only as *dəj^h kwan (Pulleyblank 1991: 299, 113). According the system of S. A. Starostin[2] for the Middle Chinese it should be reading *dât/ thât kwân. The labialization shown by both these reconstructions of pronunciation of second character creates some difficulties for understanding it as the transcription of origin form /kan/.

In the "A Dictionary of Loan Words and Hybrid Words in Chinese" scheduled by group Chinese linguists, for the word *tarqan* is given only the transcription *dágān* 达干 (İnayet 2006: 83; İnayet 2008: 280). In Chinese texts of period of Tang dynasty for the reproduction of the term *tarqan* had been using the combination *dágān* 達干 (Hirth 1899: 6). It was of the main arguments

---

2   In this matter we relied on the database of the project "Tower of Babel", on the site www.starling.rinet.ru.

of İ. Kafesoğlu that fact (Kafesoğlu 1997: 262–263 (note 269)), although E. Chavannes had just noticed the emergence of the writing *dáguān* 達官 in the same fragments of late-Tang sources, came from earlier sources (Chavannes 1904: 19 (n. 3)). Due to the work of A. Taşağıl had proper consistently transcribed *dáguān* 達官 as 'toygun' and *dágān* 達干 as 'tarkan' it is the possibility for the one important observation: are known in other sources such names as *Dōută dágān* 都塔達干 (Tou-t'a Tarkan) and *Bùshī dágān* 步失達干 (Pu-shih Tarkan) (Taşağıl 1999: 73, 74) presented in the *Tōng diǎn* 通典 in forms *Dōută dáguān* 都塔達官 (Tou-t'a Ta-kuan (Toygun)) and *Bùshī dáguān* 步失達官 (Pu-shih Ta-kuan (Toygun)), respectively (Taşağıl 1999: 97. See: Tong dian: juan 199: 1079a, in: Taşağıl 1999: [Belgeler] 13). Apparently, such substitution of terms are reflected caused by subjective factors.

Most likely, there is no the necessary to look anything transcription for the combination *dáguān* 達官. The first symbol *dá* 達 is characterized by one of meanings as 'wise, sophisticate, erudite' (BKRS IV: 105); the second one, *guān* 官, just means 'officer; official (person); clerk; mandarin, the rank', 'position, title; rank', etc. (BKRS II: 543). Cf., for example, other passage of the Chinese source, listed the higher ranks of Turks, all determined as *dàguān* 大官, i.e. literally 'higher ranks' (Tong dian: juan 197: 1b). Cf. also opinion of E. I. Kychanov (Kychanov 1997: 102–103; Kychanov 2010: 123), according to which, however, *dàguān* 大官 was compared with *tarqans*. Then the author noticed the derivation of the Turkic word *tarqan*, mentioning it in the transcription as *dágān* 達干, from the Chinese *dàguān* 大官 'great official' (Kychanov 1997: 124; Kychanov 2010: 145). It seems to be misleading.

It may, therefore, be saying that old men (*lǎo* 老), called *gēlì* 哥利, which had been correctly linked by Yu.A. Zuev (Zuev 1998: 155; Zuev 2002: 281–282) with the Old Turkic term *qarï* 'old' (DTS: 426; EDT: 644; Aydarov 1971: 121, 362), cf.: *qarï* 𐰴𐰺𐰝 (T II E, 6 / 56), or casal *qarï-p* 𐰴𐰺𐰶𐰯 (KČ W, 3)), that were considered *dáguān* 達官, i.e. 'wise officials'. So, later one of such wise old men, famous Tonyukuk, being the advisor of *qaghan* (*ajγučï*) (Aydın 2008: 51), and having some time a rank of a commander-in-chief, *apa tarqan* (> Chin. *ābō dágān* 阿波達干) (Hirth 1899: 56), had played a critical role in the restoring of the sovereignty of Turkic Qaghanate in the late 7th – early 8th centuries.

Abbreviations

BKRS II	Oshanin 1982
BKRS IV	Oshanin 1984
Ce fu yuan gui	Wáng Qīnruō 王欽若 2005
DLT	Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī 2005
DTS	Nadelyaev etc. 1969

EDT	Clauson 1972
ESTYA 1980	Sevortyan 1980
IB	Ōrq Bitig (Book of Omens)
KT NE	Kül Tegin inscription, north-eastern site
KT SE	Kül Tegin inscription, south-eastern site
KT SW	Kül Tegin inscription, south-western site
KČ W	Küli Čor inscription, western site
MK III	Atalay 1985
MK/Dankoff III	Mahmūd al-Kāšɣarī 1985
Radloff VWTD III 2	Radlov 1905
SIGTYa 1997	Tenišev 1997
SIGTYa 2006	Tenišev, Dybo 2006
Sui shu	Wñi Zhēng 魏徵 2005
T II E	Tonyukuk inscription, eastern site of second monument
Terkh W	Terkhin (Tariat) inscription, western site
TKBS	Gülensoy 2007
TMN III	Doerfer 1967
Tong dian	Dū Yōu 杜佑 2005
Zhou shu	Lĭnghʿ Défēn 令狐德芬 2005
VEWT	Rāsānen 1969

References

ATALAY, Besim, çev. (1985), *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk ve Tercümesi*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Cilt III, Ankara.

AYDIN, Erhan (2004), Vilhelm Thomsen'in Sözlüğü, *İlmî Araştırmalar*, S. 17, Güz, s. 69–82.

AYDIN, Erhan (2005), 1995İ2005 Yılları Arasında Türk Runik Metinleri Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalara Bir Bakış, *İlmi Araştırmalar*, Sayı 20, Güz, s. 43–56.

AYDIN, Erhan (2008), Eski Türklerde Meslek Adları (Eski Türk Yazıtlarına Göre), *Journal of Turkish Linguistics*, Vol. 2, Nu 1, March, Skopje, s. 49–66.

BANG, Willy (1898), Zur Erklārung der köktürkischen Inschriften, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. XII, Wien, S. 34–54.

BAZIN, Louis (1974), *Les calendriers turcs anciens et medievaux*, Université de Lille III, Lille.

BICHURIN, Nikita Yakovlevich (Iakinf) (1950), *Sobraniye svedeniy o narodakh v Sredney Azii v drevniye vremena*, T. I, Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Moskva – Leningrad.

CEYLAN, Ayhan (1997), İslam Öncesi Türk Hukukunda Danışma Meclisi, *Erzincan Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt I, Sayı 1, s. 1–12.

CHAVANNES, Edouard (1903), *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve, Paris.

CHAVANNES, Edouard (1904), Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux, *T'oung Pao*, T. V, Leiden, p. 1–110.

CLAUSON, Sir Gerard (1972), *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

ÇAKIR, Ayşe (2007). *Bozkır Kültür Çevresinde Sosyal Yapı ve Teşkilatlanma*, Gazi

Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.

ÇAYIR, Yasemin, ŞAHİN, Mehmet (2007), Prof. Dr. İbrahim Kafesoğlu'nun Hayati ve Eserleri, *I. Burdur Sempozyumu Bildiriler, Burdur, 16—19 Kasım 2005*, II. Cilt, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Sempozyum Dizisi 1, Burdur, s. 1602İ 1614.

DOERFER, Gerhard (1967), *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, Bd. III, *Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Komission, Bd. XX, Wiesbaden.

DONUK, Abdülkadir (1988), *Eski Türk Devletlerinde İdarî-askerî Ünvan ve Terimler*, Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, İstanbul.

DONUK, Abdülkadir (2011), Türklerde ve Moğollarda Meclis Geleneği, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, Sayı 52 (2010/2), İstanbul, s. 1—12.

DŪ YÒU 杜佑 (2005), *Qīndìng sì kù quánshū huì yào: Tōng diǎn (quán 3 cè)* 钦定四库全书荟要: 通典(全3册), Zhǎngchūn chūbǎn shñ 长春出版社, Zhǎngchūn 长春.

DUYMAZ, Ali (2005), Oğuz Kağan Destanı'ndan Dede Korkut'a Toy Geleneğinin Simgesel Anlamı ve Türk Paylaşım Modeli, *Karadeniz Araştırmaları Balkan, Kafkas, Doğu Avrupa ve Anadolu İncelemeleri Dergisi*, Sayı 2(5), Bahar, Ankara, s. 37–60.

EBERHARD, Wolfram (1945), Birkaç eski Türk ünvanı hakkında, *Belleten*, Cilt IX, Sayı 35, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, Ankara, s. 319–340.

ECSEDY, Ildikó (1977), Tribe and Empire, Tribe and Society in the Turk Age, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, T. XXXI, Fasc. 1, Budapest, p. 3–15.

ERDAL, Marcel (1991), *Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*, Vol. I, Turcologica. Bd. 9, Wiesbaben.

ERDAL, Marcel (2004), *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8: Uralic & Central Asia, № 3, Leiden – Boston.

GABAIN, Annemarie von (1950), *Alttürkische Grammatik. Mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch Neutürkisch. Mit vier Schrifttafeln und sieben Schriftproben,* 2. verbesserte Auflage, Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Sammlung von Lehrbüchern für das Studium der orientalischen Sprachen, herausgegeben von Richard Hartmann, XXIII, Leipzig.

GÖMEÇ, Saadettin (1997), Terhin Yazıtı'nın Tarihi Açıdan Değerlendirilmesi, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Cilt 17, Sayı 28, Ankara, s. 71–84.

GÖMEÇ, Saadettin (2000), Kök Türkçe Yazılı Belgelerde Yer Alan Unvanlar, *Erdem*, Cilt 12, Sayı 36, Mayıs, Ankara, s. 929–945.

GÜLENSOY, Tuncer (2007), *Türkiye Türkçesindeki Türkçe Sözcüklerin Köken Bilgisi Sözlüğü*: tarihi – yaşayan Türk lehçeleri (şiveleri/dilleri). Anadolu ağızları ve Altay dilleri ile karşılaştırmalı: (etimolojik sözlük denemesi), Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 911, Cilt I–II, Ankara.

HIRTH, Friedrich (1899), *Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert nach chinesischen Quellen*, in RADLOFF, Wilhelm, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei, Zweite Folge, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, St. Petersburg, S. 1–140.

İNAYET, Alimcan (2006). Doğrudan ve Dolaylı Olarak Çinceye Geçen Türkçe Kelimeler Üzerine, *Türk Dünyası İncelemeleri Dergisi*, Cilt VI, Sayı 1, İzmir, S. 81–99.

İNAYET, Alimcan (2008). Hanyu Wailaici Cidian'a (Hwc) Göre Çinceye Geçen Türkçe

Kelimeler Üzerine, *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 3/1, Winter, Erzincan, p. 278–295.

JULIEN, Stanislas (1864), Documents historiques sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs). Extraits du Pien-i-tien et traduits du chinois, *Journal Asiatique*, Ser. 6, Vol. III, Mai-Juin, p. 325İ367, 491İ549; T. IV, juillet-décembre, p. 201–242, 391–430, 453–477.

KATAYAMA, Aimi (1999), Tariat lnscription (タリアト碑文), *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998* (モンゴル国現存遺蹟・ 碑文調査研究報告) (ed. Takao MORIYASU, Ayudai OCHIR), The Society of Central Eurasian Studies, Osaka University, Toyonaka, p. 168–176.

KAFESOĞLU, İbrahim (1997), *Türk Milli Kültürü*, 4. Baskı, Ötüken Neşriyat Yayın Nu: 376, Kültür serisi 128, Istanbul.

KAYA, Ceval (1998), Köl Tigin yazıtının güneydoğu yüzünde taygun mu yoksa ataygun mu okunmalı?, *İlmî araştırmalar*, Sayı 6, İstanbul, s. 171–179.

KLYASHTORNY, Sergey Grigoryevich (1980), Terkhinskaya nadpis', **Sovetskaya** tyurkologiya, N 3, Baku, p. 82–95.

KLYASHTORNY, Sergey Grigoryevich (2006), Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti i etnokul'turnaya istoriya Tsentral'noy Azii, Nauka, Sankt-Peterburg.

KLYASHTORNY, Sergey Grigoryevich (2010), Runicheskiye pamyatniki Uygurskogo kaganata i istoriya evraziyskikh stepey, Peterburgskoye vostokovedeniye, Sankt-Peterburg.

KLYASHTORNY, Sergey Grigoryevich (1982), The Terkhin Inscription, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 1982, T. XXXVI, Fasc. 1–3, Budapest, p. 335–366.

KOCA, Salim (2002), Eski Türklerde Bayram ve Festivaller, *Türkler* (editörler: Hasan Celal GÜZEL, Kemal ÇİÇEK, Salim KOCA), Cilt 3, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, s. 51–57.

KRADIN, Nikolay Nikolayevich (2001), *Imperiya Hunnu*, 2-nd ed., Logos, Moskva.

KYCHANOV, Evgeniy Ivanovich (1997), *Kochevyie gosudarstva ot gunnov do manchzhurov*, Vostochnaya literature RAN, Moskva.

KYCHANOV, Evgeniy Ivanovich (2010), *Istoriya prigranichnykh s Kitayem drevnikh I srednevekovykh gosudarstv (ot gunnov do manchzhurov)*, 2-nd ed., Peterburgskoye lingvisticheskoye obschestvo, Sankt-Peterburg.

LÌNGHÖ DÕFĒN 令狐德芬 (2005), *Qīndìng sì kù quánshū huì yào: Zhōu shū* 钦定四庫全書荟要: 周书, Zhǎngchūn chūbǎn shñ 长春出版社, Zhǎngchūn 長春.

LIU MAOTSAI (2002), Svedeniya o drevnikh tyurkakh v srednevekovykh kitayskikh istochnikah (Trans.: Viktor Nikolayevich DOBZHANSKIY, Lyudov' Nikolayevna YERMOLENKO), *Byulleten' (Newsletter) obschestva vostokovedov, Prilozheniye 1*, Institut vostokovedeniya RAN, Moskva.

LIU MAU-TSAI (1958), *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, I. Buch, Göttinger asiatische Forschungen: Monographienreihe zur Geschichte, Sprache u. Literatur d. Völker Süd-, Ost- u. Zentralasiens, Band 10, Wiesbaden.

MALOV, Sergey Yefimovich (1951), *Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovaniya*, Nauka, Moskva – Leningrad.

NADELYAEV, Vladimir Mikhaylovich, NASILOV, Dmitriy Mikhaylovich, TENIŠEV, Edxyam Raximovich, ŠČERBAK Alexandr Mikhaylovich (1969), *Drevnetyurkskiy slovar'*, Nauka, Leningrad.

MAḤMŪD AL-KĀŠΓARĪ (2005), *Dīvān Luǧāt at-Turk* (Trans.: AUEZOVA, Zifa-Alua

Muratovna), Daik-Press, Almaty, 2005.

MAḤMŪD AL-KĀŠ͞ARĪ (1985), *Compendium of The Turkic Dialects (Dīvānu Luγāt at-Turk)* (Ed. and trans. Robert DANKOFF, James KELLY), Part III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

MELIORANSKIY, Platon Mikhaylovich (1899), Pamyatnik v chest' Kyul-Tegina. S dvumya tablitsami nadpisey, *Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniya Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obschestva*, T. XII, Vol. II–III, Imperatorskaya Akademiya nauk, Sankt-Peterburg.

OKLADNIKOV, Alexey Pavlovich (1947), Sotsial'nyi stroy predkov yakutov, *Sovetskaya etnografiya*, N 2, Moskva, p. 95–122.

ORKUN. Hüseyin Namık (1994), *Eski Türk yazıtları*, 3. baskı, Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 529, Ankara.

OSHANIN, Ilya Mikhaylovich, ed. (1983), *Bol'shoy kitaysko-russkiy slovar' po russkoy graficheskoy sisteme*, T. 2, Nauka, Moskva.

OSHANIN, Ilya Mikhaylovich, ed. (1984), *Bol'shoy kitaysko-russkiy slovar' po russkoy graficheskoy sisteme*, T. 4, Nauka, Moskva.

ÖGEL, Bahaeddin (2002). Devlet Meclisi ve Kurultay , *Türkler* (editörler: Hasan Celal GÜZEL, Kemal ÇİÇEK, Salim KOCA), Cilt 2, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, s. 874İ887.

PARKER, Edward Harper (1899), The Early Turks (From the CHOU SHU), *The China Review*, Vol. 24, N 3, Hong Kong, p. 120–130.

PARKER, Edward Harper (1900a), The Early Turks (From the PEI SHI and the SUI SHU), *The China Review*, 1900a. Vol. 24, N 4, Hong Kong, p. 163–173.

PARKER, Edward Harper (1900b), The Early Turks – Part II (From the PEI SHI), *The China Review*, Vol. 25, N 1, Hong Kong, p. 1–12.

PARKER, Edward Harper (1900c), The Early Turks – Parts III (From the PEI SHI), *The China Review*, Vol. 25, N 2, Hong Kong, p. 69–79.

PELLIOT, Paul (1929), Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie central, *T'oung Pao*, T. XXVI, N 4–5, Leiden, p. 201–266.

PULLEYBLANK Edwin George (1962) The Consonantal System of Old Chinese, *Asia Major (New Series)*, Vol. IX, Pt. I, London, p. 58–144; Pt. II, p. 206–265.

PULLEYBLANK Edwin George (1991), *A Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, UBC Press, Vancouver.

RADLOFF, Wilhelm (1897), *Die Alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, Neue Folge, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, St. Petersburg, 1897.

RADLOV, Vasiliy Vasilyevich (1905), *Opyt slovarya tyurkskikh narechiy*, T. III, Pt. 2, Imperatorskaya Akademiya nauk, Sankt-Peterburg.

RADLOV, Vasiliy Vasilyevich, MELIORANSKIY, Platon Mikhaylovich (1897), Drevnetyurkskiye pamyatniki v Kosho-Tsaidame, *Sbornik trudov Orkhonskoy ekspeditsii*, T. IV, Imperatorskaya Akademiya nauk, Sankt-Peterburg.

RÄSÄNEN, Martti (1969), *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Lexica societatis Fenno-Ugricae XVII/1, Helsinki.

RYBATZKI, Volker (2006), *Die Personennamen und Titel der Mittelmongolischen Dokumente Eine lexikalische Untersuchung*, Publications of the Institute for Asian and African Studies 8, Helsinki.

SEVORTYAN, Ervand Vladimirovich (1980), *Etimologicheskiy slovar' tyurkskikh yazykov.*

DİL
araştırmaları

On the Term *dáguān* 達官 of Chinese Sources on the Early Turkic History (in View of the One Hypothesis of İbrahim Kafesoğlu)

Obschetyrkskiye i mezhtyurkskiye osnovy na bukvu "V", "G" i "D", Nauka, Moskva.

SEYITDANLIOĞLU, Mehmet (2009), Eski Türklerde Devlet Meclisi "Toy" Üzerine Düşünceler, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi. Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Cilt XXVIII, Sayı 45, Ankara, s. 1–12.

TAŞAĞIL, Ahmet (1999), *Gök-Türkler II (Fetret Devri 630—681)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VII. Dizi, Sayı 160ª, Ankara.

TAŞAĞIL, Ahmet (2003a), Gök-Türkler'de İdari ve Sosyal Yapı, *Bilim ve Ütopya Dergisi*, Sayı 104, Şubat, İstanbul, s. 20–25.

TAŞAĞIL, Ahmet (2003b), *Gök-Türkler I*, 2. baskı, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VII. Dizi, Sayı 160¹, Ankara.

TEKIN, Talât (1968), *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series. Vol. 69, Bloomington – The Hague.

TEKIN, Talât (1993), *Irk Bitig (the Book of Omens)*, Turcologica, Bd. 18, Wiesbaden.

TEKIN, Talât (1998)*, Orhon Yazıtları Kül Tigin, Bilge Kağan*, Tunyukuk, 2. baskı, Dil ve Ebebiyat Dergisi 1, İstanbul.

TEKIN, Talât (2003), *Orhon Türkçesi Grameri*, 2. baskı, Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 9, İstanbul.

TENIŠEV, Edxyam Raximovich, ed. (1997), *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurkskikh yazykov. Leksika*, Nauka, Moskva.

TENIŠEV, Edxyam Raximovich, DYBO, Anna Vladimirovna, ed. (2006), *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurkskikh yazykov. Pratyurkskiy yazyk-osnova. Kartina mira pratyurkskogo etnosa po dannym yazyka*, Nauka, Moskva.

TEZCAN, Semih (2010), Yazıtlarda Yeni Okuyuş ve Anlamlandırma Önerileri, *I. Uluslararası Uzak Asya'dan Ön Asya'ya Eski Türkçe Bilgi Söleni, 18–20 Kasım 2009*, Afyonkarahisar, s. 273–280.

THOMSEN, Vilhelm (1896), *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, Mémories de la Société Finno-ougrienne, T. V, Helsingfors.

TOLSTOV, Sergey Pavlovich (1938), Tiraniya Abruya (Iz istorii klassovoy bor'by v Sogdiane i tyurkskom kaganate vo vtoroy polovine VI v. n.e.), *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, Vol. III, Moskva, p. 3–53.

TOLSTOV, Sergey Pavlovich (1948), *Drevniy Horezm. Opyt istoriko-arkheologicheskogo issledovaniya*, Nauka, Moskva.

VÁMBÓRY, Hermann (1898), *Noten zu den alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei und Sibiriens*, Mémories de la Société Finno-ougrienne, Vol. XII, Helsingfors.

VLADIMIRTSOV, Boris Yakovlevich (2002), Obschestvennyi stroy mongolov. Mongol'skiy kochevoy feodalizm, *Raboty po istorii i ethografii mongol'skikh narodov*, Vostochnaya literatura RAN, Moskva, p. 295–488.

WĀNG QĪNRUÒ 王欽若 (2005), *Qīndìng sì kù quánshū huì yào: Cè fǔ yuán guī* 钦定四库全书荟要: 冊府元龜, Zhǎngchūn chūbǎn shñ 长春出版社, Zhǎngchūn 长春.

WÈI ZHĒNG 魏徵 (2005), *Qīndìng sì kù quánshū huì yào: Suí shū (gòng 2 cè)* 钦定四库全書荟要: 隋书(共2册), Zhǎngchūn chūbǎn shñ 长春出版社, Zhǎngchūn 长春.

ZUEV, Yuriy Alexeevich (1998), Drevnetyurkskaya sotsial'naya terminologiya v kitayskom tekste VIII v., *Voprosy arkheologii Kazakhstana*, Vol. II, Gylym, Almaty – Moskva, p. 153–161.

ZUEV, Yuriy Alexeevich (2002), *Ranniye tyurki: ocherki istorii i ideologii*, Daik-Press, Almaty.