



International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)
A Peer-Reviewed Bi-monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal
ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)
Volume-III, Issue-I, July 2016, Page No. 235-242
Published by Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711
Website: <http://www.ijhsss.com>

About To the Question of the Main Origin of Sogdian Rulers

Bobir GAYIBOV

Ph.D., Chief Research Fellow of Samarkand State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article analyzes the origin (genealogy) Sogdian rulers who occupied a significant place in the history of Central Asia. Sogd confederation united the territory of Samarkand, Kashkadarya regions of Uzbekistan and modern land attached to Panjikent in Tajikistan. Administrative center of Sogd confederation was Samarkand. Boards located in the valley of Zarafshan Panch, Maymurgh, Ishtihan, Kabhudan, Kushaniyya and boards located in the valley of Kashkadarya and Kesh Nakhshab, ruled from Samarkand. Showing description information about the problems in the Chinese sources. Particular attention is paid to the interpretation of the ruling in the kind of Afrasiab murals. Analyze the written sources and numismatic materials, the author comes to the conclusion that the ethnic origin of the Sogd dynasty linked with Turkish and Sogdian ethnic groups.

Keywords: Kingdom of Kang, Sinlyan, Jamuk, Yuezhi, Zhaowu, Unashu, murals of Afrasiab, Chinese chronicles

Introduction: Sogd confederation along the river Zarafshan in Samarkand united the sovereignties of Kesh, Nakhshab, Panch, Maymurgh, Ishtikhan, Kabudhan, Kushaniyya, Fai and their unity even more intensified in the early middle ages. These domains with their confederative relationship held their own independent internal control. Each of them had their own control centre (capital), the ruling dynasty, government symbols, military circles and other ideological commitments of statehood. The basis for their integration into a single political union was maintaining relationship among between their dynasties and carrying out political, military, ideological actions in collaboration where necessary.

One of the main problems of contemporary Sogdology is the question of genealogical background of rulers, who reigned Sogdian confederation and the dynasty they originated from. In this case it is also necessary to note that nowadays the names of most Sogdian rulers are unknown, especially those who were on the throne till the epoch of the early Middle ages. The names of most rulers of the confederation, who held authority till the epoch of early middle Ages, are mostly known thanks to the Chinese chronicles and coin legends.

The findings from Chinese chronicles about the origin of Sogdian rulers in the epoch of the Kang (Kangyuy) kingdom: Some information, found in Chinese chronicles, can bring light to this problem. More often than not, in Chinese chronicles, like ‘Bei Shi’, ‘Sui shu’ and ‘Tang shu’ we can see that the origin of Kan (Samarkand) rulers come from the territory of Zhaowu. Moreover, it was mentioned blood relations of the rulers of the government of Kang, the capital city of which was Chach and there was a pool of the middle Sirdarya, with the ruling family of Kang in Samarkand. In the sources we can see the following things about this: “Initially the people of Yuezhi in the northern part of the Sinlyan mountains in the city of Zhaowu, after being invaded by *tyukue* (turks), they moved to the south and settled near the Sunlin mountains (Alliaceous mountains / Pamir). There they settled in the inner lands and separated into nine ruling houses: Kan (Samarkand), An (Bukhara), Tsao (Kabudhan), Shi (Chach), Mi (Maymurg), Khe (Kushaniya / Katta kurgan), Khosyun (Khoresm?), Maodi (Bitik?), Shishi (Kesh). The rulers of the seproperties, whose power passed down to the next member of dynasty, was called ‘nine houses / generations’ and all the properties held the surname of the family dynasty Zhaowu” (Khojayev, 2014. p. 30 Bichurin, 1950. p. 310). A. Khojayev started to relate this historical process to 177-176s bringing more clarity to the problem (Khojayev, 2004).

Kang government (or Kangyuy) existed from III century till our era, and during its most prosperous period Kang from the II century till our era, Sogd, situated in the valley of Zarafshan, was the part of the territory of the Kingdoms (Shaniyazov, 1990). It would be pertinent to mention the following in formation of the Chinese chronicles at this stage: during the fifth summer period of ruling of Chjen-guan, the ruler of which was Guyumuchja (Kyuumuchji), the ruler of Kang, asked to accep them to the Chinese nationality. The prince Tay-szun said: “unpleasant is forme to ruin a nation in order to obtain inane reputation; going in a slow pace and a fast pace are equally oppressive in being a part riality of Kang. Shall I indeed send my troops to a thousand of distance?” (Bichurin, 1950. p. 311). Seemingly, after this event Sogd rulers became more concerned about the defense of Turkish khaganate, and eventually these kings of Samarkand main tained family relationships with khagans.

According to K. Shaniyazov, the genesis of Kang kings (Samarkand), mentioned in Chinese chronicles, is connected with the ruling dynasty of Kang. Starting with the epoch of Khans (in 206 before our era to 220 of our era) the power was handed down from generation to generation, and in the following century, more or less, this tradition continued. The ruler Kan came from the ruling class Yuezhi (Shaniyazov, 1990).

However, this information needs to be commented upon. It is well known fact that the administration of this dynasty in China is divided into two stages: Western Khan (206 y. before our era. – 25 y. of our era.) and Eastern Khan (25-220 yy.). The rear I see question interm soft his change, starting from which of these two stages the power of Kan dynasty began going down to the next dynasty, and it causes difficulty to a certain degree. B. Gafurov relates the inclusion of Sogd government to the constitution of Kushan Empire with the epoch of ruling system of Kanishka (78-123) (Gafurov, 1989. p. 189). However,

most researches leave the question of the inclusion of Sogd in the empire of Kushan open to debate. The researchers haven't come to an agreement about this matter. The main reason of this case is the paucity of sources, and archeological materials do not always allow us to come to favourable conclusions.

Now we will dwell on the records of Chinese chronicles, connected with the origin of Sogdian rulers. In the chronicles, we can see the ruler of Kan (Samarkand) was one of the nine dynasties, and his central position was especially accentuated along with the names of other rulers. Moreover, the records of the chronicles 'Bei shi' and 'Sui shui' confirm the above mentioned facts about that the rulers 'Khe' (Kushaniya) and 'Mi' (Maymurg) who came from the dynasty of Zhaowu and they by origin had relations with the family of Kan (Samarkand) rulers (Bichurin, 1950). This record puts ground on the fact that the members of the ruling family, who came from the city of Zhaowu, laid foundation to their own dynasty arriving in Samarkand. This also talks from the fact that, the opinion by K. Shaniyazov, according to which the authority of the rulers passed to the next generations, starting from 206 till our era, is close to reality.

The information of tamg about the origin of Sogdian rulers: Some researchers, relying on the tamgh of Zhaowu origin, which came from the mountains of Sinlyan, were able to find incentive to clarify the problem. According to them, there is a family relation among the rulers of Sogdian confederation, Bukhara and Chach. More frequently in the coin with the title of *c'cynk xwβw* – 'the ruler of Chach', relating to the VI-VIII centuries, tamgh took its place in the form of , of which has similarity with the tamga in the shape of , which was found on the coins of Bukhara and with the tamgh in the shape of , which were carved on the coins of Samarkand, minted at that period of history (*look: Picture №1*). Presumably, the tamgh came from the tamgh of the Zhaowu dynasty of Samarkand ( ←  → ) (Boboyorov, 2010). Resemblance of tamgh can inform us about the kinship of the central dynasties of Samarkand, Bukhara and Chach, and their affiliation to the ruling house of Zhaowu. Even more lucidity of the records of Chinese chronicles about the common feature of the origin of the kings of Samarkand, Bukhara and Chach. The analysis of tamghs show the fact that the leading role in the genesis of the dynasty Zhaowu played turks, and the next came Sogdians, which is also clear from the above mentioned facts. The analysis of the records of Chinese chronicles, concerning the problem. Nowadays there are a number of varying opinions about what ethnic groups belongs the origin of Zhaowu dynasty, which came from the rulers of Sogd, and what was the real form of this word, mentioned in Chinese chronicles. First of all, it is necessary to note that, according to the researchers, the tribes of Yuezhi (Yuezhi meant 'conquering', 'nomadic'), moved to the South (related to earlier time, that is to 177-176 till our era) enduring defeat from – *ty-kyue* (turks) (Khojayev, 2004. p. 53-54). As a result of the pressure of the Yuezhi, who endured defeat by khuns moved in the South, leaving the city of Zhaowu, part of the local people moved to the South, belongs to earlier times that is to the middle of the II century till our era, to be more precise to 177-176 till our era. It talks from the fact that the migration of

representatives of the Zhaowu to the South-western regions of Central Asia and their settlement on Sogd lands occurred precisely in the II century before our era.

This information has found its confirmation on the basis of archeological facts. Most frequently, as a result of archeological investigations, French archeologist Clod Rapen deduced that the primary onrush of the Yuezhi relates to 145 before our era, and its second step belongs to 130 s B.C. (Rapin, Isamiddinov & Khasanov, 2001. p. 75-79; 81-82). According to Chinese chronicles the movement of Yuezhi to the West happened in 177-176s B.C., and the refore, we cannot refuse the fact that their arrival to Sogd belongs to about 145 before our era. Additionally, the finding sin the form of money circulation on the territory of Baktria of the coin of the King Yevkradit (II-I centuries before our era) (Zeymal, 1983) even after the collision of Greek Baktrian kingdom, it is revealed that above mentioned proposals are close to the real facts. On the basis of records of Chinese chronicles and numismatic materials we can say that the seproc esses, that they occurred in order to lay grounds for bringing Sogdian confederation to the stage of city government, and it will not be surprising that they created precondition for the acceleration of the process of incorporation of oasis belongings which had already been in the unification.

The ruling of the representatives of the dynasty Zhaowu lasted from 177-176s before our era till the second half of the VII century that is almost 1000 years (Smirnova, 1970). This way, the records relating to the history of sogdian confederation belong to this period. However, during this historical period Sogdian confederation was under the power of Kang (Kangyuy), Kushan, Khionits, Kidarits, Eftalits and Turkish Khaganate. This in turn puts under question whether the admistration of Zhaowu dynasty lasted for thousand years, maintaining their power in Sogdian confederation. Yet, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that the Sogdian dynasty Zhaowu always tried to retain their relative autonomy and power, reaching the compromises which domineered this or that time over the empire (Gayibov, 2013).

About the term ‘Djamuk’: Sogdologist and numismatist O.I. Smirnova dwelling on this question, noted that in due course time the dynasty of Zhaowu was exposed to strong iranization (persianization) and this dynasty appeared at the same time with Kushans. This information allows us to bring forward the idea that Iranian tribes played an important role in the origination of Zhaowu dynasty. Presumably, this started when Zhaowu settled in Sogd lands. On the grounds of the medieval spelling of this term *t’siä-miu* in Tan chronicles, discerned to consider Maverannahr, according to prominent muslim sources under the term of *جموك* – *djamuk* (in the meaning of ‘precious stone’) (Smirnova, 1970. p. 32-35). According to O. Smirnova this group is mentioned in some muslim sources in the form of aristokrat of Bukhara *جموك* – *djamuk* or *حموك* – *khamuk* and in other sources with the characters of *جموكيين* – *djamukiyin* implicating Turkish nobility (Boboyorov, 2010), as a form of confirmation he brings the following extract from ‘History of Bukhara’: - “People came (to the territory of Bukhara in the current time) from all around, and the place revived. People came from the country of Turkestan. ... People liked the region, and they settled down there. At first they lived in tents and chatris (tent). However, in the course of time

they came together and built their own houses. The population rose. They selected one person and appointed him as their ruler (Emir). His name was Abruy...” (Muxammad an-Narshaxi, 2011. p. 22-23). Tabari also mentioned in his work ‘history of tsars and prophets’ about *jamuks*, as *الترك عظماء منهمو* – ‘they are from Turkish countries’, that is from Turkish folks (Istoriya at-Tabari, 1987. p. 253). In the sources we can see that the possessions belong not only to ‘*djamuks*’, not only to Sogd government, but to its neighboring territories. The analysis of varying opinions upon Zhaowu, reveals that the term relates with the title of the head of the government in the epoch of Kushan kingdom – *yabyū* (*yabgu*) and probably the origin of this dynasty is connected with Yuezhi tribes (Smirnova, 1970).

The records from Afrasiab murals about the origin of Sogdian rulers: Some information about the origin of the main dynasty of Sogdian confederation took place from the records and murals of Afrasiab. More often than not, on the mural paintings of the rulers palace, discovered in 1965 in the northern part of the town Afrasiab, there depicted 16 lines of Sogdian writings which informs that the origin of the ruler of Varkhuman confederation (650-675) is mentioned as *'wnš'w* – Unashu (or ‘Unshu’) (Iskhakov 2009). The inscription was deciphered by V.A Livshits (Livshis 1965; Al’baum 1975), who initially read it as *'βrywm'n wnyw MLK* – ‘Avarkhuman the king from Khun’ (Livshis 1973). Later he considered it would be wise reading it as *'βrywm'n 'wnš MLK* – ‘king Avarkhuman (from the ancestry of) Unash’. He believes that, the spelling of the word *'wnš / γw* like ‘Unash’ has its own base. That is, this word is regarded to be the ethnic origin, and it is parallel can be found in Chinese sources in the form of ‘Win shu’, which is the ancestral name of Sogdian kings (Kan / Samarkand) (Livshis, 1979. p. 59; Livshis, 2008. p. 315). As a result of the investigation of the last few years, on the basis of paleographic peculiarities of the coin legends, minted with the order of Avarkhuman–Varkhuman, there appeared an assumption that there were two names of the ruling kings by the name of Varkhuman–Varkhuman I and Varkhuman II (Iskhakov, 2009).

According to G. Babayarov and A. Kubatin perusal of V.A. Livshis and his opinion about this case is open to question. Thus, they pointed out that one of the first translators of Chinese chronicles N.Y. Bichurin brought forward this information in the following way ‘the owner himself was nicknamed as Vin; descended from the House of Yuezhi’ (Bichurin, 1950. p. 285-290). In its French translation by E. Shavannah it is translated as ‘Le nom de famille du prince est Wen. C’étaient à l’origine des Yue-tche’. Even though in ‘Sin Tang shu’ this information is given with a little bit difference as *jün xing Wen ben Yuezhi* – that is ‘the surname of the ruler Ven (he) came from Yuezhi’. Thus, this information about the origin of Kan (Samarkand) rulers, who reigned in the first quarter of the VII century, which can be found in Chinese sources, was initially fixed in the chronicles of ‘Bei Shi’ (in 636) ‘Tang shu’ (in 945) (Babayarov & Kubatin 2007). As well as this, over the last few years V.A. Livshits put forward another version relating to this word, according to which it is necessary to interpret the word *'wnš* in association with the word *wen-na-sha*, mentioned in Chinese annals and which can be one of the Chinese version of calling Sogd (Livshis, 2008a).

The above mentioned scientists assume that because of the paleographic peculiarities of spelling rules of the words, which reflected family backgrounds of *Avarkhuman* in recordings, it is possible to read in the form of *'wnyw*, instead of the proposed version of reading by V.A. Livshis as *'wnšw* – *Unash* (Babayarov & Kubatin, 2007. p. 218-220). That is it is possible to read the gender of *Avarkhuman* as *On Oq*. We can consider that the spelling of Afrasiab inscriptions the word *'wnyw* is regarded to be the reflection of the ancient Turkish ethnonym *On Oq* (in ancient Turkish *On Oq* – ‘ten arrows’) in Sogdian letters. This Sogdian ethnonym designated western Turkish khaganate and was mentioned in ancient runic stelae in the form of *On^Oq* – ‘Ten arrows / tribes’, as for the information in Chinese chronicles it is given as ‘Ten aimaks / tribes’. All of these allow to come into conclusion that the origin of the ruler from Samarkand *Avarkhuman* (650s) is connected with western Turkish khaganates. Moreover, paleographic peculiarities of the legends on the coins ‘*Mastich*’ (or ‘*Mastan*’), does not allow to read the second word as *Unash*. These kinds of legends on the coins can be read as *m'stc / n 'wny MLK*’ – ‘the king *Mastich* / *Mastan* (whose ancestry is) *On Ok*’ (Babayarov & Kubatin, 2007. p. 218-220). It also allows us to interpret the word as ‘on ok’.

Historical realities of that epoch let us think the name of the origin of *Avarkhuman* in the legends is connected with Turks and the unification of ‘*On Ok*’. Supposedly, between 40-50s of the VII century, after the evasion of the western Turkish khaganate, during the period of khaghan *Yukuk-khan* (*Ibi Dulu*; 638-642) one of his fellow campaigners, probably, from the family of *dulu*, took the control over the country in Samarkand coming from seven rivers (the name of a place) via Sogd to Tokharistan and announced himself as the only ruler, but only *Varkhuman* was able to legalise this position and he appropriated the title of the ruler of Samarkand and the king of Sogd government (Al'baum, 1975. p. 29, 38). It is necessary to note at this stage, that tribal unions *Dulu* and *Nushibi* were the main power of the Western Turkish khaganate. As a result of the civil discords the country representatives of *Dulu*, enduring defeat, established their power in Sogd and the subsequent rulers, following *Varkhuman*, came up from this generation.

Conclusion: By way of conclusion we can say that, with its ethnical background of the main dynasty of Sogd confederation, which in sources connected with the ruling ancestry ‘*Zhaowu*’ and the local form of calling was presumably like ‘*Djamuk*’ or ‘*Chamuk*’, the best tributed to Turkish ethnos and Sogdians. It is confirmed with the information ‘*Bei shi*’ and ‘*Sui shu*’, that the kings of *Khe* (*Kushaniya*) and *My* (*Maymurgh*) came from the generation of *Zhaowu* and their genealogy is related to the ruling family of *Kang* (*Samarkand*). If we consider from the second half of the VI century the power in Samarkand was taken by the dynasty, which has relations with the western-Turkish tribal unions *On Ok*, and on the other hand the origin of the rulers of the confederation, who were in management for them, was related to the above mentioned families recorded in Chinese chronicles *Zhaowu*, or with Sogdians who were the representatives of the local dynasty *Kan*.

References:

Books:

1. Al'baum L.I. (1975). *Jivopis Afrasiaba* [Monograph]. Tashkent, Fan.
2. Babayarov G. & Kubatin A.V. (2007). K novoy interpretasii imeni pravayayeshyego roda Samarkanda iz nadpisey v rospisyax Afrasiaba // *Samarqand shahrining umumbashariy madaniy taraqqiyot tarixida tütgan o'rni. Samarqand shahrining 2750 yillik yubileyiga bag'ishlangan xalqaro ilmiy simpozium materiallari*. Tashkent-Samarkand, Fan.
3. Boboyorov G. (2010). *Choch tarixidan lavhalar (Ilk o'rta asrlar)* [Monograph]. Tashkent, Yangi nashr.
4. Bichurin N.Ya. (Iakinf). (1950). *Sobraniye svedeniy o narodax, obitavshix v Sredney Azii v drevniye vremena*. Moskva-Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. Vol. II.
5. Rapin Cl., Isamiddinov M., Khasanov M. (2001). La tombe d'une princesse nomade a Koktepe pres de Samarkand // *Akademie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Comptes rendus de seances*. Paris.
6. Gafurov B. (1989). *Tadjiki. Drevneyshaya, drevnyaya i srednevekovaya istoriya* [Monograph]. Dushanbe, Irfon. Book I.
7. *Istoriya at-Tabari* (1987). / *Perevod s arabского V.I. Belyayeva s dopolneniyami O.G. Bolshakova, A.B. Xalidova*. Tashkent, Fan.
8. Iskhakov M. (2009). *Sentralnaya Aziya v sisteme mirovoy pismennoy kul'turi* [Monograph]. Tashkent, Universitet mirovoy ekonomiki i diplomatii.
9. Muxammad an-Narshaxi. *Istoriya Buxari* (2011) / *Perevod, kommentarii i primechaniya Sh.S. Kamoliddina. Arxeologo-topograficheskiy kommentariy Ye. G. Nekrasovoy*. Tashkent, SMIA-SIA.
10. Khojayev A. (2014). *Xitoy manbalari. O'zbekiston tarixi. (Xrestomatiya). 2-jild. 1-qism*. Tashkent, Fan.
11. Livshis V.A. (1965). *Nadpisi na freskax iz Afrasiab // Tezisi dokladov sessii, posvyashyennoy istorii jivopisi stran Azii*. Leningrad.
12. Livshis V.A. (1973). *Praviteli Sogda i "sari xunnov" kitayskix dinasticheskix istoriy // Pismenniye pamyatniki i problemi istorii kul'turi narodov Vostoka*. Moskva: 1973.
13. Livshis V.A. (2008). *Sogdiyskaya epigrafika Sredney Azii i Semirechya* [Monograph]. Sankt-Peterburg, 2008.
14. Livshis V.A. (2008a). *Istoriya izucheniye Sogda / Raxmat-name. Sbornik statey k 70-letiyu Raxmata Raximovicha Raximova*. Sankt-Peterburg, Kunstkamera.
15. Smirnova O.I. (1970). *Ocherki iz istorii Sogda* [Monograph]. Moskva, Nauka.
16. Shaniyazov K. (1990). *Qang' davlati va qang'lilar* [Monograph]. Tashkent, Fan.
17. Zeymal' Ye.V. (1983). *Drevniye moneti Tadjikistana* [Monograph]. Dushanbe, Donish.

Journals/Periodicals:

1. Gayibov B. (2013). Soğd merkezi yönetimi ve onun Köktürk kağanlığına bağlılık şartları // *Gazi Türkiyat*. Ankara: №13.
2. Khojajev A. (2004). Xitoy manbalarida sug'dlarga oid ayrim ma'lumotlar // *O'zbekiston tarixi*. Tashkent, №1.
3. Livshis V.A. (1979). Praviteli Pancha (sogdiysi i tyurki) // *Narodi Azii Afriki*. Moskva, Nauka. № 4.



Coins of rulers Samarkand



Coins of rulers Chach



Coins of rulers Bukhara

Picture № I