

DOI: 10.17746/1563-0110.2018.46.3.107-113

V.V. Tishin

*Institute of Mongolian, Buddhist and Tibetan Studies, Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences,
Sakhyanovoy 6, Ulan-Ude, 670047, Russia
E-mail: tihij-511@mail.ru*

Kimäk and *Chù-mù-kūn* 處木昆: Notes on an Identification

*This study addresses the origin of the Turkic tribe Kimäk, known from Muslim sources. In 800–1100 AD, the Kimäk lived in Semirechye. In the article, they are associated with the Chù-mù-kūn 處木昆 tribe, which resided in the same area in 600–800 AD and was described by Chinese sources. The Kimäk genealogical legend related by the 11th century Persian author Gardīzī includes the story of the founder of the Kimäk tribe's being immersed in water (the alleged reason why the Kimäk worshipped water). This story suggests that the reconstructed Chinese variant of the tribal name Chù-mù-kūn 處木昆 meant *čumuqun ~ *čomuqun 'immersed in water', 'drowned (?)'. On the basis of toponymy in the Chinese sources and of the Old Turkic personal names relating to Altai and Semirechye, it is concluded that the words Chù-mù-kūn 處木昆 and Yemäk (Yán-mò 鹽莫) were used as early as the mid-7th century, but were parts of personal names, unrelated to the Irtysh valley, where, according to Gardīzī, the Kimäk tribal union originated. These facts not only document the ethnic diversity of the Kimäk tribal union, but suggest that the name, at least, of the dominant tribe derived from a personal name. Like Y.A. Zuev, I am skeptical of the identification of the names of Kimäk and Yemäk.*

Keywords: Ethnic history, Turks, nomads, tribes, ethnonymy, onomastics.

Introduction

Study of the ethnic processes associated with the history of nomadic societies in the Eurasian steppes always encounters a number of difficulties, especially when it comes to attempts to identify peoples living in different chronological periods in the same territory, and/or having common ethnic names (Németh, 1991; Akın, 1982).

L.N. Gumilev proposed the hypothesis of identifying the *Chù-mù-kūn* 處木昆 tribe¹, which inhabited Semirechye in the 7th–8th centuries, and which is well-known from Chinese sources, with the *Kimäk* tribal group, known in the later period from Muslim sources

(Gumilev, 1993: 380–381, nt. 38). Orientalists were skeptical of this hypothesis, and found this identification lacking any proof (Kumekov, 1972: 32). We do not intend to study the history of the *Kimäk*, since this is a separate and large issue (Kumekov, 1972; Golden, 1992: 202–205; 2002), but consider it necessary to turn to reviewing some data concerning the early history of the *Kimäk*. Such data may confirm the presence of a certain sound insight in the hypothesis by Gumilev, which can be rejected owing to the lack of philological arguments alone.

Chù-mù-kūn and *Yemäk*: from personal names to ethnic names

All direct information about the *Kimäk* that scholars currently have has survived solely in Muslim sources.

¹ Hereinafter, the hieroglyphic writing is omitted while using this ethnic name. When mentioning other names from the Chinese sources, hieroglyphic writing is provided only the first time the name occurs, or when otherwise necessary.

Thus, the Persian author of the 11th century Gardīzī cited the following legend on the origin of the people bearing this name: “<As for the Kīmek people (*kīmākiyān*)> their origin (*aṣl*) was this, that the leader (*mehtar*) of the Tatars (*Tatārān*) died leaving [82C] two sons. The elder son seized the kingship (*pādšāhī*) and the younger son became envious of his brother. The name of that younger brother was *Šad. He tried to kill the older brother but was not able, [after which] he be-came afraid for himself.

[Now], this Šad had a girl (lit. concubine, or maid, maiden, *kanīzak*), [who] was his lover (or mistress, ‘*aṣīqe*). He took away this girl and fled [257D] from before his brother. He went to a place where there was a great river (or lake *āb-e bozorg*), many trees, and abundant game. There he pitched his tent (*xarqāh*) [C1] and settled down (*forūd āmad*). Every day that man and girl, both of them, would go hunting and they would eat the flesh of the game [they killed] and they would make garments of [258A] skins of sable, grey squirrel, and ermine (*samūr*, *senjāb o qāqom*).

[And so it went] until seven persons from among the clients (**mawālīyān* or the adopted, inferior [tribesmen], *mowāledān* in the sense of *mowalladān*) of the Tatars [82D] came to them (*nazdik-e īšān šodand*). The first was Īmī; the second, Īmāk; the third, Tatār; the fourth *Bayāndur (*B'lānd'r*); the fifth, Qifčaq; the sixth, Lānīqāz; the seventh, Ajlād. And these were a party (*qōmī*) who had taken (lit. brought) <out> their masters' (*xodāvandān*) horses (*sotūrān*) to graze, but where the horses were there was no pasturage left and so they had gone (lit. went) in search of grass to that region in which Šad was. When the maid saw them she came out and said ‘*ertiš*’, which means ‘dismount yourselves’ for which reason this river has been named the Ertiš (Irtysh).

[Now] when this party recognized that girl, they all dismounted and put up [their] tents. [Then] when Šad returned (*ferāz rasīd*), he brought [258B] much game and [82E] entertained them, [so that] they stayed there until winter. When the snow came (*beyāmad*) they were unable to go back, [but] [83A] there was abundant grass in that place [and so] they were there all winter.

[At length] when the world became fair [again] and the snow went away, they sent a person to the abode (*bongāh*) of the Tatars, that he might bring them news of that party. But when he arrived, he *saw [that] the entire place had become desolate and devoid of people, for the enemy had come and plundered and killed the whole nation (*qom*), [except for] that remnant which had been left (and came forward) towards him from the foot of the mountain. [These] he told of Šad (**hāl-e Šad*, ut Barthold, *pro*, *xālī šod*) and his own comrades, and all that folk set out for the Ertiš. When they arrived there they greeted Šad at as their chief (<be> *riyāsat salām kardand*) and held him in awe (*u-rā bozorg dāštand*). Then other folk (*qōm*) who

heard this news [83B] began to come, [until at length] seven-hundred persons came together [258C] and stayed a long [C2] time in Šad's service. Afterwards, when they became [more] numerous they spread out over those mountains and became seven tribes, named after those seven persons we have mentioned. <...> Now, all these Kīmekīs are bad tempered, ungenerous and inhospitable (*ğārīb-došmān*). One day this Šad was standing on the edge of the Ertiš with his attendants (*qōm-e x'īs*) [when] a cry came [saying] ‘O Šad, *give me [your] hand (Ḥab.: **ma-rā dast de*; Bart.: **ma-rā didi, pro, morād šodī*) in the water’. [But] he saw nothing except some hair that was floating (lit. going) on top of the water. He tethered his horse, went into the water and took hold of that hair. It was his wife, the Xātūn. He asked her ‘How did you fall [in]?’ The woman said, [83C] ‘a water-dragon (*nehāng*) seized me from the river's edge’. [So now] the Kīmek people revere that river, worship it [258D] and prostrate themselves to it and they say thus that the river is the god of the Kīmek. To Šad they gave the name Tutuq which means that he heard the cry, entered the water and was not afraid.” (cited after (Martinez, 1982: 120–121 (English translation), 179–181 (Persian text), cf.: (Marquart, 1914: 89–91; Bartold, 1973: 27–28 (Persian text), 43–44 (Russian translation)).

The last sentence, certainly, speaks about the “folk etymology” (Bartold, 1973: 44, nt. 14; Czeglédy, 1973: 259; Zuev, 2004: No. 2: 18); nevertheless this is a source reflecting such events as migration of a group of tribes of various origins to the Irtysh from somewhere else (this fact, albeit in a somewhat different aspect, was specially noted by S.M. Akhinzhanov (1995: 102, 103, 107, 115, 120)) and the formation of the *Kimāk* tribal union in that exact place. Without going into the discussion about the time and historical context of this migration (see (Golden, 2002)), we want to draw attention only to one point: whenever and wherever the representatives of the various tribal groups came to the Irtysh valley, the local population also participated in the formation of a new association. Since, in view of the specificity of social organization in the nomadic societies, all ethnic processes associated with their history appear to be much more complex than those in the sedentary societies (Németh, 1991: 38–44; Akın, 1982: 2–3), and any attempts to equate the peoples inhabiting the same territory, but in different historical periods, are ungrounded.

It has been established that the valley of the Emel River, in the area of the Chuguchak River, was the place where the *Chù-mù-kūn* tribe had settled (Chavannes, 1903: 34, nt. 3; p. 73, nt. 2; p. 270, nt. 1; Malyavkin, 1989: 38, 163, comm. 232). In the year of 656, the “Xīn Táng shū” and “Cè fǔ yuán guī” mentioned the *Chù-mù-kūn* “town of Yàn-咽” (*Yàncéng* 咽城), which apparently was the center of the tribal possessions (Chavannes, 1903: 267, 270, nt. 2; p. 294, 307); cf.:

(Zuev, 1962: 119)². However, if we make a connection between this center and the territory of the district (*zhōu* 州) *Yànmiàn* 咽麴, created in 702, which apparently coincided with the territory of the *Fúyán* 富延 province (*dūdūfū* 都督府), formed in 657 (Chavannes, 1903: 281, nt. 2; Zuev, 1962: 120, nt. 83; Malyavkin, 1981: 188–189, comm. 286; 1989: 38, 163, comm. 232)³, we may assume: *yàn-miàn* < EMC **ʔen^h-mjian^h*, LMC **ʔjian^h-mjian^h* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 358, 214), MC **ʔiän-mjiän* (Schuessler, 2009: 319 (32–9h = K. 370), 250 (23–31a = K. 223)), < **emän*, which is comparable to the name of the Emel River ((Chavannes, 1903: 270, nt. 1; Malyavkin, 1989: 38, 163, comm. 232), cf.: (Zuev, 1962: 120–121)). This river now flows into Lake Alakol, which together with the adjacent lakes Uyaly and Sasykol, at least in the early second millennium AD, probably formed one large lake (Gagan غان in al-Idrīsī) in the central part of the Semirechye possessions of the *Kimäk* (Kumekov, 1972: 70–74, 75).

The scholars who analyzed the fragment quoted by Gardīzī repeatedly paid attention to the report on the special status of water among the *Kimäk* (Ögel, 1995: 326; Zuev, 2002: 128–129; 2004, No. 2: 9–10). Mention of water in this context is curious, since it may give us an opportunity to reconstruct the original sound of the tribal name *chù-mù-kūn* < EMC **te^hiä^h-mawk-kwən*, LMC **tʂ^hiä^h / tʂ^hyä^h-mawk-kun* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 60, 220, 282), MC **tʂ^hjwo-muk-kwən* (Schuessler, 2009: 49 (1–18a = K. 85), 161 (11–24ae = K. 1212), 333 (34–1a = K. 417)), < **čumuqun*. The following etymology is probable: **čumuqun* ~ **čomuqun* ‘‘immersed in water’’, **‘drowned* (?)’ < *čom-uq-* ‘to drown’ (middle voice) (see (Erdal, 1991: Vol. 2, p. 646)), < *čom-* ‘to sink in (water, etc. Loc.)’ (Clauson, 1972: 422) + *-(X)k-* + *-Xn*. It is theoretically possible to imagine this form as primary, if we assume that the wide vowel is labialized under the influence of the adjacent nasal consonant /m/: **čam-* > *čom-* (Erdal, 1991: Vol. 1, p. 391). The hypothesis as to the presence here of the word *čomuk* (dialect. *čumak*) > *comuk* (Zeki Velidi Togan, 1946: 51, 428, dipnot 182, 183) leaves the presence of the third syllable without explanation. We should also compare the variants of reconstruction suggested by Zuev: < **tʂi^wo-muk-kuen* < ? *čumul qun* (1962: 119), *čumuq qun* (1967: 18; 1981: 66). The attempts to link this ethnonym

with the group of words (personal names, toponyms, ethnonyms, and social terms) containing a wide vowel in the first syllable, for example, *جموك* (*ǧmwk*) *ǧamūk* in Arabic writing (see (Iskhakov, Kamoliddin, Babayarov, 2009: 8–10; Babayarov, Kubatin, 2010: 16; Otaxo‘jaev, 2010, 65–67)) raise some doubts. For example, al-Ṭabarī mentioned “the people from the house of *al-ǧ.mūk*” *اهل بيت الجموكيين* (*‘hl byt ‘l-ǧmwkyyn*) present at the funeral of the Türk Qaghan who was killed in 119 AH / 737 AD⁴. The change in the form of the ethnonym may be explained by its reinterpretation, since the proposed variant **čamoq* ~ **čamuq* may be interpreted as a derivative of the same verb **čam-* by means of the corresponding affix *-(O)k* (Erdal, 1991: Vol. 1, p. 224–261), which, in turn, makes it possible to further make the form of **čomuq*. In this case, this abstract verbal name in its essence is synonymous with the form **čumuqun* ~ **čomuqun*.

In 649, 651, 739, and 740, the leader of this tribe was called *Chùmükūn [Qū] Lǔ Chuò* 處木昆 (屈)律啜 (Chavannes, 1903: 34, 60, 65, nt. 4: 84, 270; Taşağıl, 1999: 71, 96; Malyavkin, 1989: 39, 168, comm. 248), that is **külüg čor* (see (Hamilton, 1955: 96, nt. 8)). Such a reconstruction of the reading of this title (instead of the written form *Chùmükūn Lǔ Chuò* 處木昆律啜) makes it possible to reject the E. Chavannes’s suggestion (Chavannes, 1903: 285–286, nt. 3; Beckwith, 1987: 118, nt. 60) to correlate the leader of the *Chù-mù-kūn* with the Türgiś (with the nisba *‘l-trqšy* الترقشي) commander named Kūrşul كورصول (*kwrʃwl*), who killed the Qaghan in a quarrel (119 AH / 737 AD), and who was mentioned by al-Ṭabarī. It seems more sensible to make a comparison with the Türgiś tribal leader Mòhè Dágān 莫賀達干 (< **baya tarqan*), well-known from the Chinese sources, who killed Sūlǔ 蘇錄 Qaghan (738) (Marquart, 1898a: 38–39, Anm. 1; 1898b: 181–182) (*sū-lǔ* < EMC **sɔ-ləwk*, LMC *suǎ-ləwk* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 294, 201), MC **suo-ljwok* (Schuessler, 2009: 52 (1–31c = K. 67), 159 (11–15klm = K. 1208)), < **sulūq* (cf.: (Hirth, 1899: 77, Klyashtorny, 1986: 166, 169); cf. with the vowels of the palatal type (Zuev, 1998: 66))). If we take into account the hereditary nature of the titles, which is suggested, for example, by the epitaph of some “lady from the *Āshīnà* 阿史那 clan” (*fūrén āshīnà shì* 夫人阿史那氏), daughter of the governor (*dūdū* 都督) of Shuānghé 双河, named Shèshěti Tūn Chuò 憍舍提墩啜 (**Ton čor* from the tribe *Shèshěti* 憍舍提⁵; cf. the form *Shèshěti*

² Contrary to the opinion of Zuev, the combination of *tūqí* 突騎, which precedes the name of *Chù-mù-kūn* in the second source, is probably an abbreviation of *Tūqishī* 突騎施 (< **tūrgiś*).

³ *Fú-yán* 富延 < EMC **buwk-jian*, LMC **fɸyiwk/fɸuwk-jian* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 98, 356), MC **bjuk/bək-jian* (Schuessler, 2009: 112 (5–33 = K. 933), 257 (24–30 = K. 203)), < **bōgān* < *bōg-* ‘to collect, gather together (people or things)’; cf.: *bāg sū:sin bōgdi* ‘the beg assembled (*cama* ‘a) his army’ ((Clauson, 1972: 324), cf.: (Drevnetyurkskiy slovar, 1969: 117), where erroneously *bōk-*, + *-Xn*).

⁴ O.I. Smirnova provided a rather inaccurate translation, but correctly pointed that this was not a social group, but some tribal community (1970: 33).

⁵ Interestingly, judging by the name *Kàn Tūtún Shèshěti* Yúqūzhāomù dūdū 瞰土屯掇舍提於屈昭穆都督, where instead of the character *kàn* 瞰 one should read the character *tūn* 墩 (in the “Táng huì yào”: *zhí* 職), the governor of Ferghana (Dàyuàn 大宛) from 658/659, that is, after the defeat of *Āshīnà*

摄舍提)⁶, who married one of the Tang high-ranking commanders⁷, and most likely this commander belonged to the tribe of Húlǔwū 胡禄屋, whose leader, mentioned in the year 651, was called Húlǔwū Què Chuò 胡禄屋闕啜 (< *uluy oq kül čor) (Marquart, 1898b: 182; Chavannes, 1903: 34; Malyavkin, 1989: 39, 166, comm. 245; Taşağıl, 1999: 96).

It is curious that in the year 649, the Chinese sources mention *Básāifǔ Chùmùkūn Mòhèduō Qījīn* 拔塞匭處木昆莫賀咄侯斤 (in “Xīn Táng Shū”, *Chùmùkūn Mòhèduō Qījīn* 處木昆莫賀咄侯斤) (Bichurin, 1950: Vol. 1, p. 263; Liu Mau-tsai, 1958: B. I, S. 155, 208; B. II, S. 585, Anm. 804, S. 646, Anm. 1139; Taşağıl, 1999: 40, 90) among the surrendered tribal chiefs (*qiúzhǎng* 酋长)—the companions of the Chēbī 車鼻 Qaghan (< *čaviš) (see

(Ecsedy, 1980: 27; Kasai Yukio, 2012: 89)), who formerly resided on the northern slopes of the Mongolian Altai (see (Zuev, 2004: No. 2, p. 11–12)), where *básāi* 拔塞 is undoubtedly the transcription of the word *bars* (see, e.g., (Harmatta, 1972: 270; Malyavkin, 1989: 39, 169, comm. 251)); *fū* 匭 is the transcription of the Turkic word *bäg* ((Hirth, 1899: 107, Hamilton, 1955: 148–149), see also: (Harmatta, 1972: 270; Malyavkin, 1989: 41, 169, comm. 251)) (cf. the personal name *bars bæg* (Drevnetyurkskiy slovar, 1969: 84)); *mòhèduō* 莫賀咄 is the transcription of the word *bayatur* (Chavannes, 1903: 83–84, 90, 346); and *qījīn* 侯斤 is the transcription of the title of *irkin* (Hirth, 1899: 103, 109, 111–112; Pelliot, 1929: 227–228; Hamilton, 1955: 98, nt. 1; Kasai Yukio, 2012: 90)⁸. This makes it possible to consider the word *Chùmùkūn* exclusively an element of a personal name. Thus there is every reason to believe that this name, being once the personal name of an individual leader, formed the basis for the name of the group under his leadership. This is a fairly well-known phenomenon among the nomads of the Eurasian steppes (Németh, 1991: 58–65).

One more point is remarkable in this respect in connection with the history of the Kimäk. While enumerating the peoples inhabiting the territory to the north of the Altai, “Tōng Diǎn” mentions the combination of *Yánmò Niàn Duōlù Què Qījīn* 鹽漠念咄陸闕侯斤 (Zuev, 1962: 105–106; cf.: Kyuner, 1961: 54)). In this combination, the last three hieroglyphs (*què qījīn*) certainly denote the title of **kül irkin* (see, e.g., (Zuev, 1962: 118)); the fourth and fifth, that is, *Duōlù*, like all other forms of this combination used in the name of one of the tribal confederations of Western Türks, taken together, make it possible to reconstruct here the sounding of **tölük* (see (Golden, 2012: 167)) or **türük* (cf.: (Klyashtorny, 1986: 169)); the third character *niàn* < EMC **nem*^h, LMC **niam*^h (Pulleyblank, 1991: 225), MC **niem* (Schuessler, 2009: 365 (38–24a = K. 670))), which, as Zuev pointed out (2004, No. 2: 3), is tempting to link with the Sogdian *nām* (*n'm*) ‘name’ (Gharib, 1995: 232); while the first and second characters, that is, *yán-mò* < EMC, LMC **jiam-mak* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 357, 218), MC **jiām-māk* (Schuessler, 2009: 347 (36–5n = K. 609), 74 (2–40ad = K. 802)), < **yemāk* (Zuev, 1962: 118). With a significant degree of certainty, it may be assumed that the reconstructed **yemāk nam tölük* (*türük kül erkin*, which originally had clearly designated a personal name, in the Chinese text marked some subordinate group, which was the subject of a certain leader. The word **yemāk* here may act as an element of the personal name of that leader, and denote the name of

Hèlǔ 阿史那賀魯, belonged to the group of *Shèshěti* 摄舍提 (cf. (Zuev, 1998: 91–92)). According to Yutaka Yoshida, Yú-qū-zhāo-mù 於屈昭穆 < EMC **ʔo-kʰut-teiaw-muwk* < Sogdian *Ukku't-camūk* (**wkkwrctm'wk*), was the name of the ruler of Samarkand in the 7th–8th centuries (see (Lurje, 2010: 115; Stark, 2008: 224–225, Anm. 1248, 2009: 4, 26, Komm. 40)). S. Stark considered this word to be Turkic. As P.B. Lurje noted, it cannot be etymologized on the Sogdian grounds. Apparently, the same person appears in the sources as Tūn Tūtūn 墩土屯—the ruler of the town of Binket (Tashkent, that is *Shí* 石, i.e. Čač), and probably as Tūn Chuò 墩啜 (< *Ton čor), mentioned in the Chinese sources under the years of 649, 651, and 658, and under the year of 658 as an associate of Āshīnà Hèlǔ (see (Chavannes, 1903: 34, 60, 141, nt. 3; Malyavkin, 1989: 38, 164–165, comm. 239; p. 39, 166–167, comm. 246; p. 83, 270, comm. 638; Bichurin, 1950: Vol. 1, p. 289, 292; vol. 2, p. 313; Taşağıl, 1999: 71, 96).

⁶The tribal group of *Shèshěti* 摄舍提 occupied the lands in the Boro-Tala River valley, to the west of Lake Ebi (Malyavkin, 1989: 38, 164, comm. 238). According to Stark, the *Shèshěti* tribe was not Turkic (2008: 191, Anm. 1081; p. 225); cf.: *shè(zhè)-shě-tí* 摄(摺)舍提 < EMC **ciap(tecip)-cia'-dej*, LMC **ɕiap(tɕiap)-ɕia'-tɕiaj* (Pulleyblank, 1991: 279, 400, 278, 304), MC *ɕjāp(tɕjāp)-ɕjā-diei* (Schuessler, 2009: 344 (35–13d = K. 638), 356 (37–12 = K. 690), 56 (1–48a = K. 48), 124 (7–14n = K. 866)), < **čapṣatā* < Sogdian *šāw/u* (*š'w*) “black” (Gharib, 1995: 370) + Sogdian *xšēd* (*xšyḏ*) ‘chief, commander’ (< Avestan **xšaēta* id.) ((Ibid.: 433); see (Cheung, 2007: 451–452) + ? Sogdian plural suffix *-ā* (see (Gershevitch, 1961: 179)), cf. with the “king of the Turks” Šāba شابه mentioned by al-Ṭabarī, or at *Sāwa* شاه ساوه, mentioned by Ferdowsī (Zuev, 2002: 195). Zuev reconstructed here **Jebšed* (see (1998: 91–92)).

⁷According to the source, this lady died in 746, at the age of 54; thus she must have been born around 693. It is therefore difficult to imagine that her father could be the eponymous person mentioned in the mid-7th century as an active politician (Guō Mǎoyù, Zhào Zhènhuá, 2006). However, the administration (*dūdūfū*) of Shuānghé 双河 was established in the lands of the *Shèshěti* tribe in 658 (Malyavkin, 1989: 38, 238, comm. 164). Apparently, it is necessary to agree with the opinion of Guō Mǎoyù and Zhào Zhènhuá that this is a case of representatives of the line of chiefs all being from the same clan.

⁸The title *irkin* was typically used by the confederation of *Nūshībī* 弩失毕, although the tribe of *Chùmùkūn* was a part of another confederation of Western Türk tribes *Duōlù* 咄陸 / *Dōulù* 都陸 / *Dōuliù* 都六 / *Duōliù* 咄六.

the tribal group from which he originated. The first option is preferable. If the interpretation of the second element in the reconstructed combination of the Sogdian lexeme is correct, then **yemāk nam* may literally be interpreted as ‘the one bearing the name of *yemāk*’ (Zuev, 2004: No. 2, p. 3). The former assumption seems more logical, if we take into account that, further into the source, the combination of *yān-mò* (< **yemāk*) occurs independently.

The word *yemāk*, which has been mentioned in the Chinese sources at least since the mid-7th century (Kyuner, 1961: 55), makes us turn again to the hypothesis (which has become commonly accepted by the scholars) of considering this word a secondary form of the word *kimāk*. The former word has reliably and independently appeared in sources written in Arabic since the second half of the 11th century AD in the form ايماك (**ymāk*) as the name of one of the main tribes of the union called كيماك (*kymāk*) (sometimes كيمياء (*kymyāk*)) in Gardīzī, and in the form يمāk (*ymāk*) as the name of this entire union in Maḥmūd al-Qaṣṣārī, who did not know any *Kimāk* (see (Zuev, 1962: 121–122; Kumekov, 1972: 39–41; Golden, 1992: 202; 2002)). Differences in writing can be explained by the rules of Turkic phonetics: **īmak* < **yemāk* ~ **yimāk*, which is adequately linked with the data of the 7th century.

According to K. Czeglédý, the narration of Gardīzī about the *Kimāk*, like his stories about other Turkic tribal groups, may refer to events that happened between 745 and 766 (1973: 263–267). Notably, Czeglédý dated the “Turkic episodes” only on the basis of information about the tribes of *Qarluq* and *Yayma*. Nevertheless, as Lurje has shown, the date proposed by Czeglédý is generally confirmed by the indirect evidence (2007: 189–190).

Abū Sa‘īd Gardīzī, who had no knowledge of the Turkic languages, as Czeglédý had shown, borrowed information about the Turks from the author of the “Kitāb Rub’ al-dunya” (“The Book of the Inhabited Quarter of the World”) by the name of Abū Muhammad ‘Abd Allāh Ibn al-Muqaffā’ (720 to ca 757) (Czeglédý, 1973: 259, 260–261, 263). More convincing is the suggestion of Lurje (2007: 189–190), according to which Gardīzī might have taken this information from another source that he mentioned, “Kitāb al-Masālik w’al-Mamālik” (“Book of Roads and Kingdoms”, which has not survived) by Abū ‘Abd Allāh Jayhānī (first half of the 10th century), who served as a *wazīr* at the court of the Sāmānids.

The name of *Kimāk* has been reliably recorded in the most common form of كيماك (*kymak*) since the 9th century, although it might already have been known in the second half of the 8th century (Kumekov, 1972: 11–13, 36, 56). The latter date appears in the list of the Turkic tribes, which was given in the book “Kitāb al-Masālik w’al-Mamālik” (“Book of Roads and Kingdoms”) by Ibn Khordādhbeh (the 880s), which was one of the sources of Gardīzī.

Conclusions

The above analysis makes it possible to conclude that the hypothesis of Gumilev as to identifying the Semirechye tribe of *Chūmūkūn* with the *Kimāk*, which was based solely on the data regarding the coincidence of the territories inhabited by them, may find additional, albeit indirect, confirmation in the reconstruction of the Chinese sound of the name of the Semirechye tribe of *Chūmūkūn* as **čumuqun* ~ **čomuqun* with the meaning ‘‘immersed in water’’, ‘‘drowned (?)’’, which echoes the story about why the *Kimāk* worshipped water, which was cited by the Persian author of the 11th century Gardīzī. The formation of the *Kimāk* tribal union, according to Gardīzī, occurred exactly in the Irtysh valley, where the representatives of various tribal groups arrived. The most important of these tribal groups was the group of *Yemāk*. Its name occurred in the Chinese sources in the form of *Yānmò* as early as the mid-7th century. Initially, this name was mentioned as the personal name of a certain leader.

Without addressing the issues of migration-processes associated with the formation of a new tribal community and of their dating, we should emphasize that the formation was complex and involved both local and migrant populations.

We should also pay attention to the doubts voiced by Zuev, contrary to the opinion of most scholars, about the impossibility of identifying the names of *Yemāk* and *Kimāk* as forms of the same word. The identification of these two forms as **yimāk* < **kimāk* has been accepted by the scholars on the basis of reduction of the initial **k-* > *0*, observed by the philologists in some Middle Kipchak dialects, which has not been found in the Old Turkic period. Together with the indirect data on the existence of both forms (for the 7th and 8th–9th centuries, respectively), this circumstance suggests another explanation for the consonance in the names used in relation to the same tribal group.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project No. 16-31-01029a2).

References

- Akhinzhanov S.M. 1995
Kypchaki v istorii srednevekovogo Kazakhstana. Rev. ed. Almaty: Gylym.
- Akın H. 1982
Nemeth’e Göre En Eski Türk–Macar Münasebetleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*. Cilt: XXX. Sayı: 1/2 (Ocak 1979 – Haziran 1982). Atatürk’ün 100. Doğum Yılına Armağan: 1–6.

Babayarov G., Kubatin A. 2010

K voprosu o dinasticheskikh svyazyakh Chacha i Bukhary v epokhu rannego srednevekoviya (na osnove numizmaticheskogo materiala). In *Drevniye tsivilizatsii na Srednem Vostoke. Arkheologiya, istoriya, kultura: Materialy Mezhdunar. nauch. konf., posvyashch. 80-letiyu G.V. Shishkinoi*, S.B. Bolelov (ed.). Moscow: Gos. muzei Vostoka, pp. 14–16.

Bartold V.V. 1973

<Iz vlechenie iz sochineniya Gardizi *Zayn al-akhbār*> Prilozheniye k “Otchetu o poezdke v Srednyuyu Aziyu s nauchnoy tselyu. 1893–1894 gg.” In *Sochineniya*: V 9 t. Vol. VIII: Raboty po istochnikovedeniyu. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 23–62.

Beckwith C.I. 1987

The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia. A History of the Struggle for Great Power among Tibetans, Turks, Arabs, and Chinese during the Early Middle Ages. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.

Bichurin N.Y. [Iakin]. 1950

Sobraniye svedeniy o narodakh, obitavshikh v Srednei Azii v drevniye vremena, A.N. Bernshtam, N.V. Kyuner (eds., intr., and comm.). Moscow, Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR.

Chavannes E. 1903

Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve.

Cheung J. 2007

Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb. Leiden, Boston: Brill (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Ser.; vol. 2).

Clauson G. 1972

An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Czeglédy K. 1973

Gardizi on the history of Central Asia (746–780 A.D.). *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XXVII (3): 257–267.

Drevnyeturkskiy slovar. 1969

V.M. Nadelyayev et al. (eds.). Leningrad: Nauka.

Ecsedy I. 1980

A contribution to the history of Karlucs in the T'ang period. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XXXIV (1–3): 23–37.

Erdal M. 1991

Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon, vol. I/II. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (Turcologica; Bd. 7).

Gershevitch I. 1961

A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gharib B. 1995

Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian–Persian–English. Tehran: Farhang Publications.

Golden P. 2002

Kabileleri Üzerine Notlar: Kimekler ve Yemekler. In *Türkler*, H.C. Güzel, K. Çiçek, S. Koca (eds.). Cilt 2, İlk Çağ. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, pp. 757–766.

Golden P.B. 1992

An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (Turcologica; Bd. 9).

Golden P.B. 2012

Oq and Oğuz ~ Oğuz. Turkic Languages, vol. 16 (2): 155–199.

Gumilev L.N. 1993

Drevnie tyurki. Moscow: Klyshnikov, Komarov i K°.

Guō Mào yù, Zhào Zhèn huá. 2006

“Táng zhāng xīzhī fūrén āshǐnà shì mùzhì” yǔ hú hàn liányīn. *Xīyù Yánjiū*, iss. 2: 90–94. (In Chinese).

Hamilton J.R. 1955

Les ouïghours à l'époque des cinq dynasties d'après les documents chinois. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises; vol. X).

Harmatta J. 1972

Irano-Turcica. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. XXV: 263–273.

Hirth F. 1899

Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert nach chinesischen Quellen. In *W. Radloff. Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*. F. 2. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akad. der Wissenschaften, pp. 1–140.

Iskhakov M., Kamoliddin S., Babayarov G. 2009

Titulatura doislamskikh pravitelei Chacha. Tashkent: TashGIV.

Kasai Yukio. 2012

Die alttürkischen Wörter aus Natur und Gesellschaft in chinesischen Quellen (6. und 9. Jh.). Der Ausgangsterminus der chinesischen Transkription *tū jué* 突厥. In “*Die Wunder der Schöpfung*”. *Mensch und Natur in der türkischsprachigen Welt*, B. Heuer, B. Kellner-Heinkele, C. Schöniß (eds.). Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, pp. 81–141. (Istanbuler Texte und Studien; Bd. 9).

Klyashtorny S.G. 1986

Genealogiya i khronologiya zapadno-tyurkskikh i tyurgeskikh kaganov VI–VIII vekov. In *Iz istorii dorevolutsionnogo Kirgizstana*. Frunze: Ilim, pp. 164–170.

Kumekov B.E. 1972

Gosudarstvo kimakov IX–XI vv. po arabskim istochnikam. Alma-Ata: Nauka.

Kyuner N.V. 1961

Kitaiskiye izvestiya o narodakh Yuzhnoi Sibiri, Tsentralnoi Azii i Dalnego Vostoka. Moscow: Vost. lit.

Liu Mau-tsai. 1958

Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe). B. I: Texte; B. 2: Anmerkungen, Anhänge, Index. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (Göttinger asiatische Forschungen: Monographienreihe zur Geschichte, Sprache u. Literatur d. Völker Süd-, Ost- u. Zentralasiens; Bd. 10).

Lurje P.B. 2007

Description of the Overland Route to China in Hudud al-'Alam: Dates of the Underlying Itinerary. *Eurasian Studies (Ouya xuekan, 欧亚学刊)*, vol. 6: 179–197.

Lurje P.B. 2010

Personal Names in Sogdian Texts. (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Iranisches Personennamenbuch; Bd. 2: Mitteliranische Personennamen. Fasz. 8; Philosophisch-Historische Klasse; Bd. 808; Iranische Onomastik; No. 8).

Malyavkin A.G. 1981

Istoricheskaya geografiya Tsentralnoi Azii (materialy i issledovaniya). Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Malyavkin A.G. 1989

Tanskiye khroniki o gosudarstvakh Tsentralnoi Azii: Teksty i issledovaniya. Novosibirsk: Nauka.

- Marquart J. 1898a**
Die Chronologie der Altürkischen Inschriften. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung.
- Marquart J. 1898b**
Historische Glossen zu den altürkischen Inschriften. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. XII: 157–200.
- Marquart J. 1914**
Über das Volkstum der Komanen. In *W. Bang, J. Marquart. Osttürkische Dialektstudien*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, pp. 25–238. (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge; Bd. XIII, No. 1).
- Martínez A.P. 1982**
Gardīzī's two chapters on the Turks. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, vol. II: 109–217.
- Németh Gy. 1991**
A honfoglaló Magyarság kialakulása. Közzéteszi B. Árpád. Második, bővített és átdolgozott kiadás. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Otaxo'jaev A. 2010**
Ilk o'rta asrlar Markaziy Osiyo sivilizatsiyasida turk-sug'd munosabatlari. Tashkent: ART-FLEX.
- Ögel B. 1995**
Türk mitolojisi (Kaynakları ve açıklamaları ile destanlar). 2. baskı. Cilt. II. Ankara: Türk tarih kurumu basımevi. (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları; VII. Dizi – Sa. 102^a).
- Pelliot P. 1929**
Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie central. *T'oung Pao*, vol. 26 (4/5): 201–266.
- Pulleyblank E.G. 1991**
A Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Schuessler A. 2009**
Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.
- Smirnova O.I. 1970**
Ocherki iz istorii Sogda. Moscow: Nauka.
- Stark S. 2008**
Die Alttürkenzeit in Mittel- und Zentralasien. Archäologische und historische Studien. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verl. (Nomaden und Sesshafte; Bd. 6).
- Stark S. 2009**
Transoxanien nach dem Tang Huiyao des Wang Pu: Übersetzung und Kommentar. Norderstedt: Books on Demand GmbH.
- Taşgöl A. 1999**
Gök-Türkler II (fetret devri 630–681). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları; VII. Dizi – Sa. 160^a).
- Zeki Velidi Togan A. 1946**
Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş. İstanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası. Cild 1. En Eski Devirlerden 16. Asra Kadar. (Tarih Araştırmaları. No. 2. Cild 1).
- Zuev Y.A. 1962**
Iz drevnetyurkskoy etnonimiki po kitayskim istochnikam (*boma, gui, yanmo*). In *Voprosy istorii Kazakhstana i Vostochnogo Turkestana*. Alma-Ata: AN KazSSR, pp. 103–122. (Trudy Instituta istorii, arkhologii i etnografii im. C.C. Valikhanova AN KazSSR; vol. XV).
- Zuev Y.A. 1967**
Drevnetyurkskiye genealogicheskiye predaniya kak istochnik po rannei istorii tyurkov. Cand. Sc. (History) Dissertation. Alma-Ata.
- Zuev Y.A. 1981**
Istoricheskaya proektsiya kazakhskikh genealogicheskikh predaniy (k voprosu o sushchnosti i perezhitkakh realnoi organizatsii u kochevykh narodov Tsentralnoi Azii). In *Kazakhstan v epokhu feodalizma (problemy etnopoliticheskoi istorii)*, A.K. Margulan (ed.). Alma-Ata: Nauka, pp. 63–78.
- Zuev Y.A. 1998**
O formakh etno-sotsialnoi organizatsii narodov Tsentralnoi Azii v drevnosti i srednevekoviye: Pestraya Orda, Sotnya. In *Voyennoye iskusstvo kochevnikov Tsentralnoi Azii i Kazakhstana (epokha drevnosti i srednevekoviya)*, N.Z. Shakhnova (ed.). Almaty: [s.l.], pp. 49–100.
- Zuev Y.A. 2002**
Ranniye tyurki: Ocherki istorii i ideologii. Almaty: Dayk-Press.
- Zuev Y.A. 2004**
Kaganat Xuëyántuó i kimeki (k tyurkskoi etnogeografii Tsentralnoi Azii v seredine VII v.). *Shygys*, No. 1: 11–21; No. 2: 3–26.

Received January 24, 2017.

Received in revised form February 3, 2017.