



Reforms Of The Western Turkish Khanate In The Chach Administration

Yoqubjon Muhamedov

Teacher, Department Of "Archeology", National University Of Uzbekistan Named After Mirzo Ulugbek

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

ABSTRACT

The article discusses some of the issues related to the reforms of the Western Turkic Khanate in the early Middle Ages under Chach, based on written sources and archeological (mainly numismatic) materials, as well as research on the history of the oasis in recent years. In particular, the existence of administrative or political governance in the Chach oasis management system during this period, the location of the administrative centers, the reforms carried out by the khanate in the management of the oasis, and the methods and tools used in oasis management among researchers were analyzed. The article also provides a detailed analysis of the history of Chach's administrative reforms by the Western Turkic Khanate on the basis of scientific sources, especially numismatic materials.

KEYWORDS

Western Turkish Khanate, Chach oasis, administrative reform, Ashina dynasty.

INTRODUCTION

We need to refer to the sources that have preserved more information about the administration of the Chach dynasty, especially the sources in the Chinese chronicles, in order

to determine the methods and tools used by any state in governing the states within which it is known, especially the vassals of the Western Turkic Khanate.

As the Western Turkish Khanate established its rule in the Chach oasis, it resorted to a number of methods and means, as was the case with other vassal oasis administrations. Firstly, written sources in Chinese, Arabic-Persian and Sogdian languages, and secondly, numismatic materials confirm this idea. However, with the exception of some scholars [1], most historians, while covering the history of the early medieval Chach oasis, did not approach the issue in depth, noting that the Khaganate, like other kingdoms, established relative rule here, leaving local dynasties in place and limited to tribute. emphasized [2].

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the form of government established by the Western Turkic Khanate in the Chach oasis, it is necessary to look at the form of government of other governments in the vicinity of the oasis, whose socio-political and economic-cultural life is similar. The Khaganate, which simultaneously took control of Fergana, Otrar, Ustrushna, and the Sughd region in neighboring Chach, did not initially interfere in their internal affairs, allowing local dynasties to govern themselves and restricting them mainly to tribute, but this policy changed over time. - Although it is noticeable that different methods and means have been introduced in vassal relations, it is clear that not all of them have used the same method. The khanate seems to have ruled some of them directly, that is, to have abolished or reduced their position in the local dynasty, and to have appointed representatives of their own dynasty in their place, while others have ruled indirectly, that is, by sending their representatives to the places only as deputies.

Although this is the case, this idea, which most scholars consider to belong to only a part of

the Khanate period, seems to have been accepted for its entire period, with a few exceptions, and most researchers repeat the same idea. However, some scholars claim that the Khaganate distributed its vassals as a nation to the members of the Ashina dynasty - princes, and describe Chach as a nation first on the border of Tardun, then Sheguy shad, which dates back to the last quarter of the VI century - the first half of the VII century [3].

It should be noted that the assassination of the Chach ruler Inye (Inal) by this Sheguy in 605 and the transfer of power in the oasis to Tegin Tianchji also coincided with these years. According to Chinese chronicles, if the representatives sent by the khanate to Sughd and Tokharistan in the 590s met with the same title, [4] the question arises as to whether the national system was not introduced in these countries as well. If the Chinese chronicle Tan Shu states that "[Haqq's] sons and brothers were called shad, all those who ruled over the other tribes with their soldiers were called shad" [5], the problem is much more serious. it becomes clear. Thus, the fact that in almost the same years in Chach, Sughd and Tokharistan the representatives of the Tiginunvan worked for some time suggests that the Khaganate also tried to introduce a national system in the oasis administrations.

If, as mentioned above, there was evidence that the Khaganate sent a prince to each of the other oases, such as Chach, Bukhara, Sughd, and Tokharistan, in the last quarter of the seventh century, a number of issues with the administration of the Khaganate oasis could be solved. For now, however, it can be said that although the rule of the oasis was given to a prince by the khanate, or vice versa, most of them continued to be ruled by local

dynasties. Perhaps the method used by the khanate to nomads in the settlement of settlements was their own. he must have tried to use the method of dividing them into a prince - a tag or a shad - as a "nation" while leaving the existing chief in his place. So, G'. As Boboyorov points out, the "nation system" in the Turkish khanate was different from a number of subsequent Turkic and Turkic-Mongol states, that is, it was less developed and was still in a "budding state." [6] The fact that the ruling dynasties of the six separate oasis rulers in East Turkestan, such as Turfan, Aksu, Karashahr, Kashgar, Khutan, and Qumul, remained in place, the khanate sent representatives to control them, and married local rulers was an indication of indirect rule. In the administrations of Fergana and Tokharistan, the opposite is true. Evidence that the Western Turkic khagans appointed a prince of the Ashina dynasty to rule each of these kingdoms, and that no marital relations were established between the local dynasty and the khaganate, established direct rule in Chach, Fergana, and Turkestan.

The Western Turkic Khanate used different methods and means in the management of all three kingdoms, such as Sughd (Samarkand, Panj, Nakhshab, Kesh, etc.), Bukhara, Ustrushna, Otrar, Khorezm, and so on. appointed representatives of his household, and sent deputies to some, or established a marital relationship, which is confirmed by the following examples:

The Hakans established marriages with the rulers of Samarkand and Bukhara, probably Panch, that is, they gave their daughters to the local rulers;

The administration of Nakhshab and Ustrushona was changed, the power of the

local rulers was abolished, and they were replaced by representatives of the Khaganate;

In a number of administrations, in particular the local dynasties of several smaller administrations in Kesh, Khorezm and Sughd, were left under their rule.

Thus, the methods and means used by the khanate in the Chach administration differed slightly from most of the dozens of oasis rulers in East Turkestan and the Amudarya-Syrdarya oasis, and were similar only to some of the rulers in Fergana, Tokharistan, and Sughd. It should be noted that the khanate used this method not for all the rulers in the Chach oasis, but for the main dynasty in the oasis, some small or secondary rulers continued their rule and their control was exercised by representatives of the Ashina dynasty of Chach. This is confirmed not only by some written data, but also by numismatic materials, and the presence of different marks (,,) and titles ("tegin", "tudun", "eltabar", "xuvu") on Chach coins minted by different authorities [8] also confirms. At this point, the question of why the Khaganate introduced such an administration in the Chach administration requires an explanation. For this purpose it is necessary to dwell on the question of "exactly what factors introduced the various methods and means on the ground when the khanate ruled its vassals." According to researchers, the khanate introduced methods of governing its vassals mainly due to the following factors[9]:

Geographical location of oasis dominions;

The strategic importance of oasis rulers.

The first factor is that the oasis is rich in natural resources or vice versa in the geographical location of the dominions. The

dominions in the relatively narrow valleys of East Turkestan did not have large pastures and were not suitable for large populations. The khanate had little chance of relocating large populations to these lands or stationing troops. A similar situation is observed in some oasis administrations between the Amudarya and Syrdarya. An example of this is the Khorezm oasis. The local dynasty here, the Africans, maintained their rule during the Turkish Khanate, as they did during the Hephthalite period, and were limited to paying tribute based on the Khanate, with the exception of certain titles and epithets. In any case, this was due to the fact that the Khorezm oasis was far from the central territory of the khanate - Ettisuv [10], and on the other hand, there was no major political force that threatened Khorezm at that time. It is true that the Khorezm oasis was close to the Sassanid territory of Iran in the south-west, but the rulers of the oasis in this region, such as Merv, Dehistan, Gurgan, were also subject to the khanate.

If we look at the example of the Tokharistan Yabgulari [11], one of the dynasties that emerged in connection with the Western Turkic Khanate, such as the Chach Tegin, the area was one of the most remote in the southwestern part of the Khanate, close to Sassanid Iran. In the 620s, a branch of the Western Turkic khanate, the Yabgu dynasty, ruled here, controlling dozens of large and small kingdoms here on behalf of the khanate. The Khanate's troops marched from Tokharistan to the interior of Khorasan and Kabul, and claims to the area sometimes sparked disputes between the Khanate and the Sassanids. (12) Hence, Tokharistan was of great strategic importance for the khanate. Due to this, the khanate used the practice of

direct administration - the appointment of representatives of the Ashina dynasty instead of the local dynasty, which remained relative until the 750s.

Although strategically small in geography, administration in Fergana passed directly into the hands of members of the Ashina dynasty, who were assassinated in 630 by a local dynasty in Fergana. [13] Princes of the Ashina dynasty took over the administration, and this dynasty continued to operate until the 750s. Representatives of this dynasty issued coins in the name of the Khaganate, which reflected the title of "Khagan" in the ancient Turkic-Runic and Sogdian scripts. Researchers attribute the direct administration of the khanate in Fergana to the fact that the area had extensive pastures. Thus, the natural geographical location of the Fergana Valley, ie the location of the ruling class and the location of the Khanate's armies, and its suitability for new migration in general, led to the use of such a method.

In this respect, the Chach oasis and the Fergana Valley are similar. The Chach oasis itself and the surrounding areas are suitable for agriculture and cattle-breeding, as well as having large pastures, and during the khanate a significant number of people came here from the middle basins of the neighboring Ettisuv and Syrdarya rivers. In this regard, the share of the Turkish population, which has long been a significant part of the local population, is increasing. This is confirmed by the appearance of dozens of Turkic toponyms in the oasis [15]. In short, the establishment of direct rule in Chach, as in Turkestan and Fergana, can be considered to be related to the natural geographical location of the land.

According to a number of researchers, the information about Choch in the Chronicle "Tan Shu" shows that the four Chach rulers who ruled the oasis between 640 and 750 met in the title of Tudun [16], In the Sogdian document A-14 (720) the person named tdwn is mentioned as an official in charge of political issues related to Chach [17], and in Tabari's work the phrase "Tudun malik ash-Shosh" ("The ruler of Shosh Tudun") is mentioned. [18] and Beruni's use of the word "tudun" as the title of the ancient rulers of Shosh [19] confirms the existence of the Tudun dynasty in the oasis almost at the same time as the Tegin dynasty. The fact that the phrase tdwn c'cynk xwb ("the ruler of Chach Tudun") appears on coins of the 7th and 8th centuries, further confirms this idea. The mention of Shigo as Fu-wan ("Deputy Ruler of the Chach State") [21] suggests that the former was the main dynasty and the latter the secondary dynasty. However, the constant involvement of the Tuduns as a decisive factor in the political events surrounding Chach during the years 640-750 shows that they took the reins of Chach's power into their own hands. This must be due to the fact that the khagans were directly responsible for the control of the vassals.

At this point, the question arises as to whether there was a need to send smoke here if the Western Turkic Khanate had appointed a prince-tegin to the administration of the Chach oasis and taken direct control of the land. The fact that the princes responsible for the administration of this land sent their ambassadors to China as the ruling dynasty of this land and began to mint coins, signifying a certain degree of independence in their internal administration, G. According to Boboyorov, the Chach Tegin had become local

rulers who were not much different from other vassal rulers in the eyes of the khanate, who later gave the dynasty members eltabar titles and sent their representatives with tudun titles to control them. As a confirmation of his opinion, the researcher cites the occurrence of the sentences c'cynk gwbw tk 'ryttypyr ("The ruler of Chach Tegin? - Eltabar") on coins belonging to the Chach Tegin [23].

This means that the existence of separate dynasties such as the Tegins and the Tuduns in the Chach oasis at the same time raises the question of whether there was dual rule in the oasis, but a closer look at the written sources reveals the importance of the methods and tools used by the Turkish Khanate to govern its vassals. when approached, it turns out that this situation is related not to dualism, but to the peculiarities of the rule of the khanate. By the way, the title tudun was used to refer to the representatives who were not directly related to the ruling dynasty of the Turkish khanate, mainly to control the rulers of the conquered lands and to collect taxes there [24]. This allows Tegin to be considered the ruler of Chach, and Tudun the representative sent by the khanate to control him. The Western Turkic Khanate, while preserving their old local dynasties not only in Chach but also in the control of dozens of oasis rulers, appointed representatives of some of their dynasties, as well as supervisors, known as Tudunlikdeb, who held the reins of power. He controlled the main ruling dynasties of the oasis, called the "Chach Tengins," the "Chach Rulers," and other small dominions in the oasis. The main thing was that they acted on behalf of the Khagans, that is, they were the deputies of the Khaganate.

CONCLUSION.

Thus, the Western Turkic Khanate introduced a number of methods and tools in the management of the Chach oasis, as in other oasis administrations, in the suzerain-vassal relationship. In the Chach oasis, as in Fergana, Turkestan and Kabulistan, such relations were carried out directly, ie directly, as evidenced by the fact that the administration of the oasis was headed by the Chach Tegin (605-750), whose origins are related to the Ashina dynasty. The deputies of the khanate, the Tuduns, were also associated with the establishment of direct rule in Chach. In Samarkand, Panj, Kashgar, Turfan and a number of other oasis administrations, indirect management, ie the establishment of marital ties and thus the control of the khanate, is not found in the Chach administration.

REFERENCES

1. Буряков Ю. К истории раннесредневекового Чача//O'zbekiston tarixi. – Тошкент, 2002. – №3. – С. 10–20; Исхаков М., Камолитдин Ш., Бабаяров Г. Титулатура доисламских правителей Чача. – Т.: Изд-во ТашГИВ, 2009; Бобоёров Ф. Ғарбий Туркхоқонлигининг давлат тузуми. Тарих фанлари док. дисс. автореферати. – Т., 2012. – Б. 36–38; Хатамова М. Турк хоқонлиги шаҳарлари (VI–VIII асрлар): Тарих фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) диссертацияси автореферати. – Т., 2018. – Б. 22–23.
2. Аскарлов А. Некоторые вопросы истории становления узбекской государственности // Общественные науки Узбекистана. – Ташкент, 1997. – № 3–4. – С. 65–76; Мукминова Р. Г., Филанович М. И. Ташкент на перекрёстке истории (Очерки древний и средневековой истории города). – Т.: Фан, 2001; Muhammadjonov A. O'zbekiston tarixi (IV asrdan XVI asr boshlarigacha). 7-sinf uchun darslik. – Toshkent, 2009. – Б. 17–28; Сагдуллаев А. ва б. Ўзбекистон тарихи: давлат ва жамият тараққиёти. – Т.: Академия, 2000. – Б. 7, 60–82; Ртвеладзе Э. История и нумизматика Чача (вторая половина III – середина VIII в. н. э.). – Т., 2006, Ochiliev F.B. Social Relationship And Tax Types In The XIX - XX Century In Bukhara Emirate. International Journal Of Scientific & Technology Research Volume 9, Issue 01, January 2020 P.723-729.
3. Markwart J. Wehrot und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran. – Leiden, 1938. – S. 14; Гумилев Л. Н. Древние тюрки. – М.: Наука, 1967. – 502 с. – С. 115, 132.
4. Liu Mau-Tsai. Die Chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost Türken (T'u-küe), Buch 1–2 («Göttinger Asiatische Firschungen», Bd, 10). – Wiesbaden, 1958. – S. 56; Taşağıl A. Gök-Türkler. – Ankara, 1995. – S. 88.
5. Togan İ., Kara G., Baysal C. Çin kaynaklarında Türkler. Eski T'ang Tarihi. – Ankara: TTK, 200. – S. 80.
6. Бобоёров Ф. Ғарбий Турк хоқонлигининг давлат тузуми ... Б. 34.
7. Маликов А. Тюрки в среднеазиатском междуречье в VI–VIII вв. (по археологическим и письменным источникам): Автореф. дис. канд. ист. наук. – Самарканд:

- ИААН РУз, 2000; Исхаков М., Камолиддин Ш., Бабаяров Г. Титулатура доисламских правителей Чача. – Т.: Изд-во ТашГИВ, 2009; Камолиддин Ш. С. Сведения источников о Чаче как владении доисламских предков Саманидов // Общественные науки Узбекистана. – Ташкент, 2009. – № 2. – С. 22–31; Исхаков М., Камолиддин Ш., Бабаяров Г. Титулатура доисламских правителей Чача. – Т.: Изд-во ТашГИВ, 2009.
8. Бобоёров Ғ. Чоч тарихидан лавҳалар (Илк ўрта асрлар). – Т.: Yangi nashr, 2010. – Б. 35-40.
9. Skaff K. J. Western Turk Rule of Turkestan's Oases in the Sixth through Eighth Centuries // TURKS– Ankara, 2002. – Vol. 2. – P. 364–372; Бобоёров Ғ. Ғарбий Турк хоқонлигининг давлат тузуми... Б. 36-38.
10. Бобоёров Ғ. Турк хоқонлиги даврида Хоразм // Хоразм тарихи замонавий тадқиқотларда. – Тошкент-Урганч, 2019. – Б. 48-50.
11. Джуманиязова Ф. Илк ўрта асрларда Тохаристон ва Кобул водийсида туркий сулолалар. Тарих фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) диссертацияси автореферати. – Тошкент, 2018. – Б. 15-17.
12. Бобоёров Ғ. Турк хоқонлиги даврида Тохаристон // Мозийдан садо. – Тошкент, 2002. – №4. – Б. 10–11.
13. Бернштам А.Н. Древняя Фергана (Научно-популярный очерк). – Т., 1951. – С. 22-26; Смирнова О. И. Очерки из истории Согда. – М.: Наука, 1970; Асқаров А. Ўзбек халқининг этногенези ва этник тарихи. – Т.: Университет, 2007. – Б. 34-37; Матбобоев Б.Х. Қадимги Фарғонанинг илк ўрта асрлар даври маданияти (V–VIII асрлар археологик манбаларининг тарихий таҳлили асосида): Тарих фанлари док. дисс. автореферати. – Самарқанд, 2009; Анарбаев А. Ахсиқент – столица древней Ферганы. – Т., 2013; Ochildiev Fayzulla The Craftsmanship Of The Emirate Of Bukhara At The Second Half Of The XIX Century - The Beginning Of The XX Century The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research. S-33-38; Баратова Л.С. Некоторые аспекты товарно-денежных отношений Ферганы древности и раннем средневековье // Марғилон шаҳрининг жаҳон цивилизацияси тарихидаги тутган ўрни. Марғилон шаҳрининг 2000 йиллигига бағишланган халқаро илмий конференция материаллари. – Т., 2007. – С. 43-50.
14. Babayar G. Fergane bölgesinde bulunan Türk-Runik yazılı Köktürk sikkeleri üzerine // Dünden Bugüne İpek Yolu: Beklentiler ve Gerçekler. – İstanbul, 2008. – S. 135-146.
15. Хатамова М. Турк хоқонлиги шаҳарлари (VI–VIII асрлар): Тарих фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) диссертацияси автореферати. – Т., 2018. – Б. 22-23.
16. Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений о народах, обитавших в Средней Азии в древние времена. Т. I—II. М.; Л., 1950. I. – С. 313–314.
17. Согдийские документы с горы Муг. Чтение, Перевод. Комментарий. Вып. II. Юридические документы и

- письма / Чтение, перевод и комментарии В. А. Лившица. – Москва.: Изд-во восточной лит-ры, 1962. – С.82-83.
18. История ат-Табари. избранные отрывки (перевод арабского В.И. Беляева), Т., 1987. – С. 269.
19. Бируни, Абу Рейхан. Памятники минувших поколений / Перевод с арабского и примечания М.А.Салье // Бируни. Избранные произведения. Т. 1. – Т., 1957. – С.111.
20. Muxamedov Yo.Q. (2020). Features of the western turkish kaganate administration system // *Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. 10 (12), 1541-1550.
21. Chavannes E. Documents sur les... – P. 142; Chavannes E. Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kie (Turcs) occidentaux // *T'oung Pao.* – Vol. II. – Leide, 1904. – P. 67, 69–70, 74, 92.
22. Бабаяров Г. Древнетюркские монеты Чачского оазиса (VI–VIII вв.). – Т.: Изд-во Национальной библиотеки Узбекистана имени Алишера Навои, 2007. – С. 56-60
23. Бабаяров Г. Древнетюркские монеты Чачского оазиса ... – С. 48, 49.
24. Толстов С. П. Древний Хорезм: Опыт историко-археологического исследования. – М.: Издание МГУ, 1948. – С. 260.
25. Oblomurodov Naim Khalimovich, Ismatullayeva Nargiza Rasuljanovna, Goyibnazarov Isobek Shakarovich. THE PURPOSE AND OUTCOME OF DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS IN THE II-I CENTURIES BETWEEN CENTRAL ASIA AND CHINA. *JCR*. 2020; 7(9): 126-128. doi:10.31838/jcr.07.09.23