

A hypothesis on the etymology of the Old Turkic royal clan name Ašina/Ašinas and the transformation process in the early Abbasid period

TAKASHI ŌSAWA (Ōsaka, Japan)



Preface

As is well known, there are many hypotheses on the etymology of the name of the royal family of the Old Turks. On this issue, S.G. Klyashtornyi proposed an interesting hypothesis that the Chinese form *Ašina* could originate not from Altaistic words but from Indo-European words such as the Tocharian, Khotan-Saka or Sogdian languages. His theory was based on the following situation: Except the expression 阿史那 *A-ši-na* * *â-sî-nâ* (LMC)¹ from Old Chinese chronicles, such as *Zhoushu-50* and *Suishu-84*, there is no term *Ašina* in the Old Turkic and other sources on the Old Turkic peoples.²

Klyashtorny's hypothesis was proposed in 1994, however, as a result of the international joint investigation of 1997 in Mongolia, a new Sogdian form '(')šy-n's [*Ašinas*] was identified, firstly by Yoshida Yutaka and Moriyasu Takao from our *estampazhi* of the Sogdian text of the Bugut inscription (circa AD 586), in Arkhangai province of Mongolia.³ In their new deciphering of this text, the first lines can be read as follows:

¹ B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, Stockholm 1972: 1m, 975a, 350a.

² S. G. Klyashtorny, "The royal clan of the Turks and the problem of Early Turkic-Iranian contacts," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 47:3 (1998), 445-447.

³ Y. Yoshida and T. Moriyasu, Bugut inscription, ed. T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir, *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*, The Society of Central Eurasian Studies, Osaka University, Faculty of Letters, Toyonaka, 1999: 122-125. As is well known, the Sogdian text was read and published by S. G. Klyashtorny and V. A. Livshic in 1969, and was revised in 1972. (Cf. V. A. Livshic and S. G. Klyashtorny, "The Sogdian Inscription Revised," *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 26:1 [1972], 69-102). And as to the new identification of Y. Yoshida on the Ashina reading, it seems that Livshic admits it, as far as I am informed by a Japanese colleague who stayed in Saint Petersburg.

[Transcription]

Bugut stele-1(left side)

L-1.: rty (m)[wn']k nwm (sn)k' 'wast' ʒ'r-'nt tr-'wkt '(')šy-n's kwtr'tt 'x'šy-wn'k

L-2: 'Y-(K)' +m+++ m(wx)'n x'γ'n y'rwk' 'HY nw''r x'γ'n 'wr-kwp-'r cr-'cw my''

L-3: t'[t](p)[r] (x'γ'n) wsn wy'(r)[nt]

[Translation]

<B-1: 1-3> Kings of the Turkish Ashinas tribe have established [this] stone of law when ***Muqan Qaghan's Yaruka-brother (named?) Niwar Qaghan ***ed for the sake of Urkupar Cracu Magha Tatpar Qaghan.

Subsequently, on the basis of the *estampazhi* that had been conserved in the Faculty of Letters of Kyoto University, Yoshida and Moriyasu could also confirm the Sogdian form from the Sogdian text of the Karabalgasun stele (circa AD 821), also from Arkhangai province, as follows:

"šyn's kwtr wrk' xš'wnh (land of Ashinas tribe of Turks)

This Sogdian form "šyn's can be considered as the parallel expression with the Chinese characters 阿史那 *'ā-šī-nā (LMC) from the Chinese phrase [阿]史那革命 *Ashina geming* (revolution of A-ši-na) from the same stele.⁴

As far as I can know, Yoshida and Moriyasu's identification of this word is commonly recognized among Turkic philologists and historians such as Golden, Zieme, Erdal, Livshits, Klyashtorny and De la Vaissière. On the contrary, Beckwith doubted Yoshida's reading of *Ašinas* from the Bugut and Karabalgasun steles on the grounds such that some parts of the very Sogdian scripts are not clear in our *estampazhi*, therefore he insisted that this transliteration should be reconsidered. However, he did not propose his own decipherment of this word.⁵

On the basis of this discussion, I would like to analyze the identification of this word from some kinds of sources relating to Old Turkic peoples and propose my

⁴ T. Moriyasu and Y. Yoshida, A preliminary report on the recent survey of Archaeological sites and Inscriptions from the Turkic and Uighur period in Mongolia, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages XIII*, Osaka University, Toyonaka, 1998: 155. On the new researches on the Sogdian text and Chinese text of the Karabalgasun stele, cf. O. Hansen, "Zur sogdhischen Inschrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal von Karabalgasun," *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 44:3 (1930), 3-39; Y. Yoshida, "Karabarugasun no Sogudo ban ni tsuite (Sogdian text of the Karabalgasun inscription in Mongolia from Uighur period)," (in Japanese), *Journal of Southwestern History* [Kyoto University] 28 (1988), 24-52; T. Moriyasu, *World History Reconsidered through the Silk Road* (in Japanese), Osaka University, The 21st Century COE Program Interface Humanities Research Activities 2002-2003, Vol. 3, Toyonaka (Osaka) 2003, 61-62, Fig. 1&2.

⁵ C. I. Beckwith, "The Chinese names of Tibetans, Tabghatch, and Turks," *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 14 (2005), 5-20.

hypothesis on the issue of the etymology of *Ašinas* / *Ašina* on the basis of our recent survey in Mongolia during 2006–2008.⁶

1) *New track on Ašinas in Old Turkic epitaph*

I conducted fieldwork in 1996–1998 and 2006–2011 in Mongolia under the International Joint Expedition between Japan and Mongolia, and as mentioned above, during the first three-year expedition, we were able to take a new *estampazhi* of the Bugut stele. Yoshida found the new reading of *Ašinas*, and then Yoshida Yutaka and Moriyasu Takao surveyed the Karabalgasun inscription and also found the same reading of *Ašinas*. From the fact that this word can be found in the Sogdian texts of the Bugut and Karabalgasun steles, this may be recognized as the Sogdian form, however, it is unknown whether this form is original or not. However, given the *Ašinas* form, the Khotan-Saca *āššeine*, Tocharian *āsna* or Sogdian *xs'yn'k*, that Klyashtorny had proposed as the original form, cannot be recognized, and so we must reconsider another original form.

In this regard, we recently acquired a new source. That is, during the summer seasons of 2006–2008, I visited Old Turkic sites and steles under the second international expedition with the Mongolian archaeological institute. In particular, I researched the Old Turkic site and inscriptions of Khör-Asgat (Ike-Askhete), which consisted of two sarcophagi in the center of this mound and one stele between the eastern sarcophagus and six balbal stones.⁷ This site is well known as Ike-Askhete, however, this name is not true from the geographical and natural positional point of view, so the site should be renamed Khör-Asgat, as it is known by native Mongolians.⁸ This site was first discovered by a botanical researcher, Levin, a member of the Russian Orkhon Expedition under Radloff while visiting from July 28 to August 7, 1891, and then the Russian ethnographer Yadrintsev visited and investigated on August 29–30, 1891. Yadrintsev made sketches of a three-figure stone board and a general plan of the site and took three *estampazhi* of runic letters of the upper, left and right borders of three-figure board. Later he sent these materials to V. V. Radloff. These sketches and *estampazhi* of three parts of letters are recorded in Radloff's *Atlas* (1892),⁹ plates XV and XXVI. In the summer of 1893, Klements visited and took some *estampazhi* of the upper, left, and right borders and two sides of a big stone board that was lying down in the eastern tradition from the site. They are also recorded in Radloff's *Atlas* (1896)

⁶ On all the routes and contents of our survey, see: Т. Осава, К. Сүзүки, Р. Мөнхтулга, eds. *Бичээс II, 2006 оноос 2008 оны Монгол улс дахь Түргийн бичээс ба эртний дурсгалыг судлах экспедицийн илтгэл*, Улаанбаатар 2009. (henceforth, Bichees 2).

⁷ It is remarkable that six balbal stone were discovered in the east of the site in August 2008. As far as we know, nobody had discovered them at this site until now (Bichees 2: 109–110; Ōsawa 2010: 8). This discovery demonstrates evidently that this site may belong to the second Turkic Kaγanate period with runic texts.

⁸ *Монгол Нутаг Дахь Түүх Соёлын Дурсгал*. Улаанбаатар 1999, 125–126, 237–238.

⁹ V. V. Radloff, *Atlas Drevnostej Mongolii, Trudy Orkhonskoi Ekspedicii. Atlas der Alterthümer der Mongolei, Arbeiten der Orkhon-Expedition*. Saint Petersburg 1892–1899.

plate LXXXIV, 1-7. As far as we know, all researchers have interpreted these inscriptions based on these *estampazhi* and Radloff's deciphering.¹⁰ Primarily to confirm the runic scripts, we visited this site in August 2006 and took *estampazhi* of all the surfaces on both sides of a sarcophagus that holds the three-figures, bird and the ram-shaped *tamga*, and all surfaces of both sides of the big stone pillars that hold the deer figure on one side and a ram-shaped *tamga* in another side, that were lying down to the east of the mound.

After we returned to Japan, I tried to decipher all the runic parts including the newly found texts in the places between the human figures, so we could read the texts in almost all parts in different ways. Especially relevant to our topic, it is remarkable that the forms of three runic scripts should be <š N š>, and they are entirely different from <T k š> as transliterated by Radloff. I can say that, as to my new identification of these scripts, R. Munkhtulga, Ts. Battulga and C. Alyılmaz also agreed with me, however, at that time it seems that they cannot respond clearly how to read. After my investigation of all the *estampazhi*, I found three runic scripts in five places on these inscriptions.¹¹ At last I can say that these scripts should be read as *Ašinas* for the Old Turkic royal family name.¹² From this, we can say that the Sogdian form *Ašinas* from the Bugut and Karabalgasun stele is obviously confirmed, therefore Kliyashtorny's hypothesis can no longer be supported.

2) *Ašinās from medieval Islamic sources*

Chavannes observed that the personal name of the Turkic general *Ašinās al-Turkī* under the eighth Caliph *Mu'tasim* (reigned AD 833-842) of the Abbasid dynasty, who appears in Arabic sources such as Ṭabarī and Ya'qūbī, has a close relation with 阿史那**â-sî-nâ* (LMC) of Chinese chronicles¹³. This identification can now be confirmed by the existence of *Ašinas* in Sogdian and Old Turkic inscriptions of the Old Turkic Kaghanate.

¹⁰ V. V. Radloff, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*. Vol. 3. Saint Petersburg 1895; (Reprint in 2 vols.: Osnabrück 1987): 257-258. Then many philologists and historians such as H. N. Orkun, S. E. Malov, Kliyashtornuyi, Voitov, Ser-Odzhav, L. Bold, M. Dobrovits, N. Bazilkhan and others also basically followed Radloff's reading. Cf. T. Ōsawa, "Revisiting the Khör-Asgat Inscription in Mongolia from the Second Turkic Qaghanate," *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 25 (2010), 1-73.

¹¹ Khör-Asgat-Ia, East-L1; Asgat-Ib, West-L1; Asgat-IIa, West-L4; Asgat-IIb, East-L1 and East-L14. Ōsawa, "Revisiting the Khör-Asgat Inscription": 22-23, 24, 26, 28-29, 50.

¹² On this interpretation and historical significance, Cf. *ibid.*, 50-61.

¹³ É. Chavannes, "Notes Additionnelles sur les Tu-Kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux," in *Documents sur Les Tou-Kiue [turcs] Occidentaux*, Saint Petersburg 1903, 20-22, n.2; S. G. Kliyashtorny, *Древнетюркские Рунические Памятники*. Москва 1964, 112, n.169. Cf. Shumizu Kazuhiro, "Atrak and slave soldiers under the Abbasid Dynasty," (in Japanese), *Historical Journal* [Tokyo University] 99:6 (1990), 1-37.

According to Golden,¹⁴ from Islamic sources, we can identify several forms that might correspond with the Turkic royal clan *Ašinas* / *Ašina* as follows:

- (1) *Ašnās* (Ṭabarī).¹⁵
- (2) *Ašinās* (Ṭabarī).¹⁶
- (3) *Ānsa* (Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam).¹⁷
- (4) *Šaba* (Ibn Hurdādhbih).¹⁸
- (5) *Šāna*, *Šāya* (Al-Mas‘ūdī).¹⁹

From these forms corresponding to *Ašinas* / *Ašina*, the issue seems unresolved because copyists of these sources might have been mistaken and have changed the Arabic script on the point of a comma or other details. But one can rely on the description by Ṭabarī, and it is remarkable that there are two orthographies – *Ašnās* / *Ašinās* – and, according to the note of the editors, the latter *Ašinās* in Ṭabarī is analyzed as a Persian form. In my view, it seems that this analysis has a significance from the viewpoint of the historical root of this word. That is, this Arabic form has common features with the Sogdian form, therefore we can assume that the Arabic form can go back to the Sogdian form in the Middle Iranian, reflecting the intimate contacts between Sogdians and Arabians in the early Medieval period. In my view, the Arabic form of this word indicates that members of the Old Turkic royal family *Ašinas* went to the Khorāsān and western Asian territory from Sogdiana and Tocharistan of the Middle Asian regions, through social and cultural contacts or under the campaigns of the Abbasid dynasties. So, as in Ṭabarī, the resemblance of the Arabic form to the Sogdian form that has no vowel harmony was confirmed. But this form gradually became the omission form *Ašnās*.

However, at present, except Ṭabarī, other forms cannot be identified in Islamic sources whether they directly reflect *Ašinas*/*Ašina* or not.²⁰

¹⁴ P. B. Golden, "Irano-Turcica: The Khazar sacral kingship revisited," *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 60:2 (2007) 165, 172, n. 33.

¹⁵ C. E. Bosworth, *The History of al-Ṭabarī, Storm and Stress along the Northern Frontiers of the Ābbāsīde Caliphate*, vol. 33, New York 1991, xv, 12, 98–100, 102–104, 107–109, 111–112, 122, 124–128, 132–133, 178–179, 183, 201, 214.

¹⁶ J. L. Kraemer, *The History of al-Ṭabarī, Incipient Decline*. Vol. 34, New York 1989, xi, 5, 21.

¹⁷ V. Minorsky, *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam, The Regions of the World*, London 1937; Rev. ed. 1970, 161–162.

¹⁸ Ibn Hurdādhbih, *Kitāb al-Masālik wa'l- Mamālik*. ed. M. J. De Doeje, Leiden 1889, 40.

¹⁹ al-Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj ad-Dahab wa Ma‘ādin al-Jawhar*, ed. Ch. Pellat, 7 vols. Beirut 1996, 1: 155.

²⁰ Golden also follows Minorsky's view that the *Ānsa* of *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam, The Regions of the World* is transformed from the *išan* that means "sacred" in the Khazar Kaghan, and is not the form so it cannot be attested with a kind of *Ašina* (P. Golden, *Khazar Studies: An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. Budapest 1980, 219–221; T. Tamura, "9–10 seiki ni okeru hazaru no nijyuu ookeru," *Arabu isuramu kenkyuu* 5 (2006) 57, n.6). In other places, however, from indirect circumstances, Golden considers even now that the origin of the Khazar Kaghan could be the Old Turkic royal family *Ašina*.

3) *The historical background of the transformation of the Ašinas name from Inner Asia to Western Asia*

As mentioned above, the research into the root of this word requires us to consider the historical background in the early medieval period. First of all, we can say that after the death of the emperor of the Tang dynasty, Taizong, a Turkic leader, *Ašina Helo*, was appointed *totoq* of *Peiting* (Bišbalik) by the Tang dynasty. As the real ruler of the eastern wings, namely the *Tulu* tribes of the Western Turkic Kaghanate, he rose against the Tang dynasty in AD 651 and became *İshbara Baya Kayan*, and enlarged his political influence over the many tribes and oasis countries of the northern steppe of the Tianshan Mountains. In response to this rebellion, the Tang dynasty campaigned against *Ašina Helo* from three directions with the army of the *Ašina* family of the north Huanghu River and the Ordus regions and the Uyghur army of Mongolia under the control of the Tang dynasty. The rebellion was suppressed in 657, and the Tang dynasty appointed a nominal ruler titled *Ilteber* from members of the *Ašina*'s family and strategically governed the regional peoples of the steppe and oasis regions, and central Asia from Mongolia, north Tianshan and Sogdiana to Tocharistan. Thus the political system known as *Ce-fe* can be confirmed during the reign of the Türgish Kaghanate from at least AD 750 years.

At the same time, the Sogdiana and Fergana regions also began to be invaded by Muslim commanders and armies under the Abbasid dynasty. In this regard, we can see from the Sogdian and Chinese texts of the Karabalgasun stele that the Sogdiana people of Fergana were invaded by the Tajik peoples (Muslims) and asked for the sake of the Uyghur peoples of Mongolia, and the latter also went on campaign to help the Tajik peoples and battled with them.²¹ On the date of this struggle, unfortunately, because of severe damage to the inscription we have no concrete data. But, according to the description of this stele, it can be dated to the period AD 780–820. From Islamic sources, we can mention several struggles in the second half of the eighth or the first half of the ninth centuries, as indicated by Minorsky.²² These happened in AD 777, 806, 810 and 821, however, it is not possible to connect them with the events of the Karabalgasun stele. In my view, during these periods, the Old Turkic rulers or the elite people titled *Ašina Ilteber* were captured or bought by Muslim soldiers under the Abbasid dynasty, and were sold by the slave-merchants in the Sogdiana, Fergana or Khorāsān regions.

Thus, many Turkic leaders such as the *Ašina Ilteber* or other elite individuals must have been sold by the Abbasid dynasty through the slave markets of Sogdiana or Fergana, and then they could not help serving the Caliph in Bagdad, and then Samarra, as the military slaves (*Atrak*) known as *kul*, *gulām* and *mamlūk*. And at that time, we can assume that these Turkic leaders of the *Ašina* family took their original family name *Ašinas* as their personal name.

²¹ Y. Yoshida, "Karabarugasun hibun no sogudoban ni tsuite," *Journal of Southwestern Asian history* [Kyoto University] 28 (1988), 27–29.

²² V. Minorsky, "Tamīm ibn Baḥr's Journey to the Uyghurs," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12:2 (1948), 301–303.

As a result, the personal name *Ašinās* of a commander in chief under the Abbasid dynasty can be traced back to the name of the *Ašinas* family of the Old Turkic Kaghanate.

4) *Etymology of Ašinas / Ašinas from morphological and semantic perspectives*

As for my hypothesis on *Ašina / Ašinas*, we can analyze them from the morphological and semantic points of view.

4.1) *Ašinas / Ašinas from the viewpoint of morphology.*

In my view, the original name of the royal family of the Old Turks can be *ašinas*, as indicated by the Khör-Asgat stele.

But there is no rule on vowel harmony in Iranian languages such as the Sogdian language, so this name can be registered as *ašinas* as shown in the Sogdian language of the Bugut and Karabalgasun steles; and this Sogdian form of the name has been succeeded as *ašnas* or *ašinas* in the Arabic sources such as Ṭabarī. According to the commentary of the translator, as noted above, the latter form may originate from a Persian form.

As to forms such as *Ānsa*, *Šaba*, *Šāna* and *Šāya* in other Islamic sources, however, at present I cannot say whether they have a connection with *Ašina / Ašinas* or not.

On these grounds, a Chinese form *A-ši-na* can be traced back to the Old Turkic form *ašinas*, however, the Sogdian alphabet and language were commonly used amongst the aristocracy in the first Old Turkic Kaghanate, so this form must have been recorded in the same form as the Sogdian form *ašinas* by the editors of the Old Chinese chronicles.

However, in the Old Chinese chronicles, *A-ši-na* is common notation. This may be a shortened form, without the 's' letter from the Sogdian form *ašinas*.

In my view, Chinese editors might avoid using four Chinese characters 阿史那 **ʾā-sī-nā* (LMC) and one Chinese character that reflects a phonetic /s/, and prefer to express the family name as 阿史那**ʾā-sī-nā* with three Chinese characters. It is probable that surveyors registered the family name not as *Ašinas* in Sogdian form, but as 阿史那**ʾā-sī-nā* in Chinese form as a result of the omission of the basic form, that is, the Sogdian form *Ašinas* and the clan name 氏 **zie*.²³

Previously, some researchers have attempted to bind this etymology to a characteristic activity of selection of their leaders, such as the Turkic verbal stem *aš-/ašin-* "cross over, jump over"²⁴ for instance, the branch of a big tree, as shown

²³ Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, 867a. According to Pulleyblank, this letter is reconstructed as **tʃi* (LMC). E. G. Pulleyblank, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver 1994, 404.

²⁴ According to the old Tujue legend of Suishu-84, among the brothers of the mother named *Ašina*, one of the youngest was finally selected as the tribal leader because he could jump highest to a branch of a big tree (ZS-50: 908). From this, on the etymology of this word, Boodberg supposed a hypothesis of a verbal stem *aš- / ašin-* meaning "jumping over" (Boodberg 1936; Cf. Mori 1967, 279, n.4).

in the section on the *Tujue* peoples in *Zhoushu*-50. However, I would like to pay attention to another legend in which the family name of a tribal leader's wife is given as *A-ši-na*. Though it is uncertain that women were selected as tribal leaders among Turkic nomadic peoples in pre-Turkic periods, it is noteworthy that, according to this legend from the Old Chinese chronicles, *A-ši-na* was a term that belonged to female lineages among the *Tujue*, as indicated by Klyashtorny.²⁵

In relation to this, the tradition reminds us that in the Xiung-nu period, the ruler's wife was made 關氏 **ʼât-zie*²⁶ (LMC) in the surveyed period of *Zhoushu* and *Suishu* (AD 630–640), that is, in the early Tang dynasty. The editors of *Suishu* explain that the Turkic title *katun* contemporarily compared with the old title of the sovereign's wife of the Xiung-nu 關氏 **ʼât-zie* (LMC).

4.2) Semantic point of view

At present, I cannot tell the original meaning, however I can say that during the first Old Turkic Kaghanate, it was considered to be connected with 關氏 **ʼât-zie* (LMC) which means "wife of" 單于 **tân-jiu*:²⁷(LMC) < **tân-giwo* (EMC) in the Xiung-nu (Xwn), and in the surveyed period this word might be regarded as the family name of a *Tujue* tribal woman ancestor of the *Tujue* peoples as shown in *Suishu*-84.

Under such a situation, at the period when *Suishu* was edited, that is, in the early Tang period, the problematic word was connected with 關氏 **ʼât-zie* (LMC) which means "wife of the ruler" among the royal family of the Xiung-nu (Xwn) tribe, and this might be derived from **aš* / *eš*, **azhi* / **ezhi* < **ašin* / *ešin*, and **azhün* / **ezhin* that were borne by "wife of the ruler", so this can be originally considered as an Altaic kinship term. Shiratori Kurakichi considered this etymology as a Tsungus kinship word *aši*, and proposed the historical process *ači* < *ačun* < **hatun* < *khatun* < *katun* among Turkic and Mongolian words as well as **asun*/**asi* < **hasun* < **khasu* < **kasun* < **katsun* among the Tungus words.²⁸

The final element *-as* of *Ašinas* might be the plural suffix *-(a)s* in the case of *känjäräs* 'Kangar, Kangli' (KT, E39) which consists of the tribal name *känjär* + plural suffix *-(ä)s* as proposed by Marquart, Melioranskii and others.²⁹

This word can be also confirmed in the form *känkäräs* as a former variation in N3 of the Tes inscription (dated AD 750).³⁰ in Mongolia. And the same plural usage can be confirmed from the case of *-s* of the Old Turkic title *išbara-s* in Old

²⁵ Klyashtorny, *Древнетюркские Рунические Памятники*. 112.

²⁶ Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, 270a, 867a.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 147a, 97a.

²⁸ K. Shiratori, "Tookominzokukoo (On the nomad peoples of eastern Asia)," (in Japanese), *Shiratori Kurakichi Zensyuu* 4, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo n. d., 137–138.

²⁹ Klyashtorny, *Древнетюркские Рунические Памятники*. 164–165.

³⁰ T. Ōsawa, "Tes Inscription," in T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir, *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998*, Toganaka 1999, 158–167.

Turkic inscriptions as attested in the runic inscriptions of Terkh (Tariat), W6-7, and Šine-Ušu, S2.

Conclusion

Thus, from the philological and historical points of view, the name of the Old Turkic royal family in Chinese form, *A-ši-na*, may have been translated from the Sogdian form *Ašinas* through the close contact between Turks and Sogdians, and could be pronounced basically as *Ašinas* with vocal harmony in the old Turkic Kaghanate and Uyghur Kaghanate periods.

After the invasion of the Sogdiana and Fergana regions by Tajik peoples, the local rulers, titled *A-ši-na Ilteber*, were captured and taken from there and made to serve the Abbasid dynasty as slave-warriors named *Atrak* in Bagdad and Samarra, and they were registered as *Ašinas* after their original family name.

As to the etymology of *Ašinas*, in my view, according to the old legend, their mother originally had the *A-ši-na* name, so this family name may originate from **Aši* of Tungus words and **Ači* of Turk-Mongolian words among the Altaic peoples.