

## Expanding the territory of the Western Turkic Khanate (VII-VIII centuries)

Galiya Iskakova<sup>1</sup>, Talas Omarbekov<sup>1</sup>, Ahmet Tashagil<sup>2</sup>, Moldir Oskenbay<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University Faculty of History, Archaeology and Ethnology, Al-Farabi Avenue, 71, Almaty, 050040, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University Faculty of Science, Meclis-i Mebusan Str., 24, Turkey.

**Abstract.** The main purpose of the paper is to analyze main directions of khaganat's expansion. The problem statement is to understand the concept of the influence of space on the development of history is not enough just to study historical events. The close relationship of human being, land and space requires deep study of this issue. For the nomad and sedentary people the notion of belonging to a specific space, the definition of its territory and their boundaries were not identical. Often uncertainty of the territory, the boundaries of the territories in these matters gave rise to various conflicts and wars. Currently these relationships are defined and regulated by law. In this regard, the question arises: how the nomads of Eurasia defined territory and boundaries of individual tribes and the state as a whole 1300-1400 years ago,? In this article the author suggests to consider this issue on the sample of West Khaganat. This is one of the strongest states of Central Asian in VII-VIII centuries. The research allows all parties to consider and determine the features of the development of the surrounding space of nomadic Turks. Draw conclusions about their understanding of state, tribal territories and borders.

[Iskakova G., Omarbekov T., Tashagil A., Oskenbay M. **Expanding the territory of the Western Turkic Khanate (VII-VIII centuries)**. *Life Sci J* 2014;11(12):586-593] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 113

**Keywords:** nomads; identity; nature, tribes, Central Asian history, turks kings, turks, environmental history, historical geography.

### Introduction

The main purpose of the paper is to analyse the border identification of Turkic khaganats and the tribes within the nation in the sample of West Turkic khaganat. The purpose of this study is to consider features of tribal boundaries in nomadic society on the sample of Western Turkic Khanate. Additionally the article aims to analyze areas of boundaries expansion. Thus, the paper considers this issue on the sample of Western Turkic Khanate. The state was chosen as example for being the strongest one in Central Asia in VII-VIII centuries.

To consider the impact of space on the development of history is not enough just to study historical events. The close relationship of man, earth and space requires a deep study of this issue. For nomads and sedentary people, the notion of belonging to a particular space, the definition of its territory and their boundaries were not identical. Often particular area, the border areas in these matters gave rise to various conflicts and wars. Currently these relationships are defined and regulated by law. For example, in accordance with Article 23 of the Land Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan the subject land is a private property. On this basis, the boundaries of land are defined and protected by the state. In this regard the following question arises: how did 1300-1400 years ago, the nomads of Eurasia define territory and boundaries of individual tribes and the state as a whole?

Research in this area shows the importance of studying of this issue. It suggests that this will help to reveal common features inherent in tribes and nations of medieval Central Asia.

As concern to methodology, comprehensive approach was applied in this research. As the result, knowledge of multiple disciplines was employed. They are geography, economy and related research fields - Turkic philology, archeology and ethnography. In addition, historical-genetic, historical, comparative methods, resources of revealed from Turkic written monuments and archeological expedition were used in the research.

There was not previous research identifying boundaries of tribal territories part of the Western Turkic Khanate and international borders

There are many sources of the history of the nomads of Eurasia, including the Western Turkic khanate. Place names and names of nomads are found in medieval Turkic written monuments found by archaeologists in the territory of Central Asia and Mongolia [1]. The complexity of this type of source is that in the Middle Ages, ancient Turkic writing was not widely used. Secondly, the difficulty of dating and uninformative source.

The most important source of Western Turk Empire history are Chinese dynastic chronicles. Chinese sources which giving information about the history of Western Turk Empire Studied and translated by many scientists such as I.Y. Bichurin, V.V. Grigoriev, V.V. Barthold, G.E. Groom-

Grizhimaylo, etc. In the book "Collection of information about the peoples who lived in Central Asia in ancient times" Y. Bichurin systematized Chinese chronicles. In this book, first published in 1850 given the sketchy information about the tribes were part of the Western Turkic Khanate and its territories. However, there are many errors in place names [2]. Ministry of Education and Science of Kazakhstan, Institute of History and Ethnology of the name of Sh. Ualihanov (Kazakhstan) and the Institute of History of the Public Academy of Sciences of China (Shynzhan Autonomous Republic), a compilation of "Sources of the history of the Kazakh people in the Chinese annals" there are 40 documents are devoted to the subject [3].

As a study of the problems identified and the issue was not devoted special work by scientists. But some of the issues raised in the works of historians. Based on Chinese sources, L.N. Gumilev in his "Old Turks" concludes that a major expansion by the territorial boundaries of the Western Turkic Khanate were sent on mission, and wars of conquest [4]. The same view is held by Thomas J. Barfield, in his book "Dangerous border. Nomadic empires and China" (221 BC. E. - 1757 n. E.) [5]. The writings of scholars T. Omarbekov [6] "clan and tribal history of the Kazakh people. Dulaty" and K. Fayndlid [7] «The Turks in World History» all parties will consider the issue of tribal composition of the Western Turkic Khanate. There are works of D. Kshibekov [8] "Nomadic Society", N. Kradin "Nomadic Society" [9], Nomads of Eurasia [10], G.E.Markov "Nomads of Asia" [11] devoted to this issue. Which make it possible to compare the whole nomadic peoples, nations, tribes of the Western Turkic Khanate on the issue of land ownership, the emergence of ideas about the boundaries. This problem makes it possible to reveal the works of A. Dosymbaeva "Western Turkic Khanate. Cultural heritage of the Kazakh steppe" [12] and "Merce - the sacred land of the Turks Seven Rivers" based on archaeological sources [13].

History of Turks attracted the attention of many scientists. Examining various aspects. Politics, economics, ethnicity, historical geography, etc. Based on the works Bichurin, by V.V. Grigoriev was written work devoted to the historical geography of East Turkestan. The author tried to establish continuity of cultures and nations in the region [14].

During the study addressed the following questions: How is the area and the border tribes of the Western Turkic Khanate? As the tribes were located Western Turkic Khanate? What causes changes in areas Khanate? If we analyze the structure of the paper, it consists of the following parts: I. The problem of the location of the tribes of the Western

Turkic Khanate. In this article the author, based on archaeological and written sources will be analyzed peculiarity of the individual tribes medieval Khanate. II. Patterns of Turkic tribes, clans territory and borders formation (VI-VIII centuries). It will highlight the problem of the concept of tribal, state and territory borders on the example of the nomadic tribes of the Western Turkic Khanate.

### **The problem of Western Turkic Kakhanate tribes location**

After 100 years of the Roman Empire collapse nearly in 551/552 on the continent of Eurasia nomadic state Turkic Kakhanate was founded. The state occupied the territory of current Central Asia and Southern Siberia. According to Chinese sources, in a distance of 10 thousand li, the country was located from the Korean Bay in the east to the Caspian Sea in the west, in a distance of 5-6 thousand li, from the Sandy steppe (the Gobi or the Alashan) in the south to the North Sea (Baikal sea) in the north [15]. L. Gumilev wrote about that geographical knowledge of the Turks did not yield to their aggressive policy. For instance, they were well acquainted with a large state – Tabgach, as they called China and Tibet [16]. They were familiar with the tribes of Siberia bordering the steppe. In addition, the tribe bayirku in the eastern Baikal, Kirgiz in Sayan Altay, karluks in the lower reaches of the Irtysh were in this list. Moreover ancient Turkic inscriptions contain information about the states bordering the Turkic state. For example, they are the Byzantine Empire that the Turks called Purum Rum (Rome), the Arabs called them - tazik.

In VI century the Great Silk Road passed through the territories of the Turkic Kakhanate. The state contended with the countries of the Far East such as Persia, Byzantium for control of trade routes to the Mediterranean Sea. This gave a political and economic advantage to the Turkic Kakhanate. The state was interested in the taxes collected from the Chinese Empire and ensured the safety of trade caravan routes in its territory. In this regard, Carter Vaughn Findley [17] and Barfield T.J [18] give a characterization of Turkic Kakhanate as a "trade and taxation empire."

In Turkic Kakhanate the struggle for power lasted for more than 20 years. This instilled a split of Kakhanate into western and eastern states in 603. This meant that the state had western and eastern ruler [19]. According to Chinese sources, "in the period when Turkic Kakhanate was established, Bumin kaghan (the founder of the Turkic Kakhanate, reigned nearly in 552-553) passed his western territories to his brother kaghan Istemi (approximate reign period is 562-576) [20]. As the result the

boundary of the eastern and western possessions of the Turks was eastern side of the Altai Mountains". The Western Turkic Kakhanate occupied territory in Central Asia: Dzhungaria, East Turkistan. The Eastern Turkic Kakhanate was located in the territory of present Mongolia [21]. The administrative center of the Western Turkic Kakhanate was situated near the northern Tien Shan "on the former lands of Usins." Middle Tien Shan, Issykul, interfluvium of Shu and Talas were the central lands of the Western Turkic Kakhanate. Capital Suyab was located on the Chu River (present Kirghizia) [22]. All this above mentioned facts are reflected in the Chinese sources: "the history of the Western Turkic Kakhanate begins with Toremän (the estimated reign period is 579-587.), the son of Mukan hagkan (the estimated reign period is 553-572.). Due to disagreements with Yshbara Hagan (approximate reign period is 579-587), the state was split into two parts. Part of the state owned by Toremän increased and gradually turned into a strong state. Its eastern boundary reached Tuken, in the west Kusan, Telek, Ubyr " [23]. In addition, the Chinese sources provide data on the territorial boundaries of the Western Turkic Kakhanate: "Western Turkic Kakhanate was a rival of the Eastern Turks. In the east the boundary of the state reached the Eastern Turks, in the west it stretched till the sea Leyzhu (Aral Sea), seven thousand li (one li is a 6-ft) to the north of Chiang annya (Chang-an western capital of the Chinese Empire). It took up to seven days to get from a capital to Besbalyk "[24].

Moving to the West Turks conquered the North Caucasus, the Kuban River basin, the territory of Azerbaijan. Son of Istemi Hagan Istemi Turksanf (Tardu) (reigned in the period nearly 577-603.) continued the tradition of his father won the beech and Kerch [25].

The Western Turkic Kakhanate was called "on ok Budun" (literal translation of "Ten Arrows"- "people of ten tribes"). The left wing consisted of five tribes of doula, right wing included five tribes of nushubi. In December, 12, (in 638), the Western Turkic Kakhanate was divided into 10 ulus. Hagan gave an arrow to each part of Ulus, for this reason the state became well known. They were divided into two wings - left, right. The left wing was five doula, and above them were appointed five Thai chory. The basis of the right wing were five nushube over them were appointed five Thai Irkin. In general, they were called "on ok Budun". Five doula lived in the east of the city of Suyab and five nushube settled in the west of it" [26]. The boundary between these divisions was the river Chu. The east territories of the River Chu and Dzungarian Mountains were owned by five tribes of doula. This is a "former land of Usun", notably

called the valley of the Ily River [27]. The territory in the west of the river Chu, in the western Tien Shan, around Lake Issyk- Kul was settled by five tribes of nushubi [28]. This is approved by archaeological research of Sher A.Y. Based on the reconstruction analysis of Zuev, A, Dosymbaeva, A concludes that "in the VI-VII centuries the name of the tribes formed the basis of the Western Turkic Khanate did not occur in its eastern borders "[29].

Dulats comprised of five tribes: turkesh, koylau, chimoyyn (shimugin) ysty-tone and zhanys-shopan [30]. They were led by chors: first - Turgis Alash chor, the second -Koylau Kulik chor, the third Chimoyyn (shimugin) Kool-chor, the fourth Ysty-Ton-chor, the fifth-Zhanys Shopan-chor. In the geography chapter of the Tang Dynasty history it is stated that after the accession of the western lands of the Tang Dynasty common Turgeshes were divided into two parts and resigned to the empire. Some of them were in the Turgeshes ulus called Sugamuks in Lunshun, the second part in the Turgis Alash ulus was subordinated to Zhesan province. Tribe koylau occupied present-day Mountain Balyk and Lake Ebnor. They were subjugated to the province Yanbo. The tribe shimoyyn resided the area of Tarbagatai ridge and were reported to province of Boyan. The tribe Zhanys submitted to province Insa. Tribe easty (ysty) populated the territory east of the River Ily. Tribe shymyr (chumi) occupied the territory of present Kutubi, Manas area, located to the east of the tribe chuio [31].

The right wing of the Western Turkic Kakhanate comprised of five nushbi tribes: Azgyr (eskil) Raso, Baryskan (barsyfan) Azgyr (eskil) Kaso. They led five Jerkins, the first - Eskil Cool Jerkins (azgyr), the second - Caso Cool Jerkins, the third - Barysgan (baryskan) Tone Yshbara Jerkins, the fourth - Eskil (azgyr) Nizek Jerkins and the fifth Jerkins Caso Shopan [32].

The most powerful tribe of the nushbe union was azgyr (eskil). The Caso was originally one of the strongest tribes of the eastern territories in the Western Turkic Kakhanate. They wandered together with Karluks. The Caso was adjacent to shuio, shymyr, imps. Later they joined nushubi, the right wing of the Western Turkic Kakhanate.

Furthermore, there were other tribes in the doula and nushubi. According to Chinese sources such tribes as Karluks, Chonuts, Chumusl, Ybirs lived in corporation with doula and nushubi. For example, the ancient "history of the Tan kingdom" suggests that after establishment of the Turkic Kakhanate, numerous Tribe tele (telek) was mixed with Dulats, nushbes (nushube) Karluks, shuio, shymyrs. In IV-V centuries various tribes of the tele union appeared in the western part of Eurasia.

Dzungaria and Khangai highlands remained as their main area. According to Chinese sources Teleks were descendants of the Huns. In the considered period the number of soldiers fit to bear arms was about twenty thousand. In the western part of the Golden Mountains (Altai mountains) lived sir-ends, tarinaks, zyban, darkyts while in the north to river Edil (Volga) was populated by Canlis, ediz, gazhar, bargyt, bigan, koky, Kabysh, azhasu, Bayamo, kerders. They had the army of 10 000 warriors. Other tribes settled in the west reported to the western and eastern Turks. They were in the military service of the Turks [33].

It could be concluded that in the considered period the basis of the Western Turkic Kakhanate was consisted of ten tribes. The sources suggest that they occupied a strict set of territories, which belonged to certain tribes for centuries. Moreover, there were mentioned other different Turkic speaking tribes. They became an integral part of a single state.

#### **Patterns of Turkic tribes, clans territory and borders formation (VI-VIII centuries)**

In the jurisprudence the state border is defined as line and vertical surface passing through this line. It is a key of state territory boundary [34]. But the territory is not just a special kind of space. From both human and natural sciences perspective the concepts of "space" and "territory" are varied. The space involves both actual physical space (territory) and its geographical field (geographic relationship). If the physical space is discrete (dashed), the geographic field is continuous. The territories have not only spatially specific criteria, but many other features. They are:

- 1) size, the total area;
- 2) the distance from north to south and from east to west;
- 3) compactness, concentration in organic whole;
- 4) geographic location in the world map, including the presence of rivers and outlet to the sea.
- 5) population (population size and density, its distribution by section area);
- 6) climatic conditions, affected by proximity to the equator or to one of the poles of the earth, the seas or other large bodies of water, location in depth or on the edge of the continent
- 7) landscape features (mountains and lowlands, swamps or deserts);
- 8) the nature of the subsoil;
- 9) the nature of the boundaries (legal or actually existing, natural or arbitrary, securely fenced or unprotected);
- 10) the nature of the neighboring territories;
- 11) life time [35];

Notion of territory is reflected in the Turks' written monuments. Information about the four directions and the representation of the land area could be found in them. Key words used by Turks is the "East" and "west", "north" and "south" [36]. "For example, the following information is available provided by written monument in honor of Kultegin: " There were enemies in four directions in times of Bumin Kagan and Kagan Estimi. To Kadyrkan Yysha in front and to the Iron Gates behind. "

Moreover, the information on constitutives of territory could be found from before stated inscription. The words such as «land-water, pasture» and phrases as «may no land and water got orphaned» and «may no livestock left without pasture» are applied in it. For example, similar information is provided in the text of this classic written monument in honor of Bilge Kagan on line 16: "the people of onok Budun was in pain. We cared about the land and water not got orphaned. There is a great number of such samples in many Turkic characters.

Additionally to above stated criteria one of the most important parts of the territory is a bound. What does the concept of a state border mean? The word boundary refers to line between the territories abroad the violation of which leads to conflict. This issue is governed by the laws of individual countries, international agreements. For example, in the Republic of Kazakhstan as in other countries of the world the delimitation and demarcation of borders are carried out with neighboring states. The delimitation of the border (lat. delimitatio - setting boundaries) is - definition of general position and direction of the state border between the neighboring countries by means of negotiations.

Boundary delimitation or simply delimitation is the term used to describe the drawing of boundaries, but most often it is used to describe the drawing of electoral boundaries, specifically those of precincts, states, counties or other municipalities [37]. The demarcation of the border involves establishment of the state border in the area by the construction of border markers on the basis of documents concerning the delimitation of frontiers. Demarcation - is the act of creating a boundary around a place or thing.

Above mentioned situation takes place in the modern world, then arises the question on what basis the boundaries of individual tribes and nations were defined in Turkic tribes?

According to assumptions of many scholars territorial boundaries were marked with tamga by nomadic ethnics - toguzogyz, segizogyz, turgesh, on ok, kyrgyz, karlyk and many others mentioned in inscriptions. They had independent tamgas, such as

tribal ones and derivatives of them, including personal, family, patrimonial that defined their public or social status and the right to the property [38].

Verbal characteristic of «tamga» sign has double meaning at ancient Turki:

It was considered as a sign, tamga of genus or tribe and «a sign of gold seal of khagan». "Root" is the origin of this word in ancient Turkic inscriptions developed in this way: - tap - / / tab - (semantics: a trace of something, the remains, to leave a trace - to trample down, foot, to tread) / /> tam - (semantics: the manufacturer of seal, the keeper of seal)>tanba (tanba). In ancient mongolian language it was taba> (a trace), tamaga> (tamga) [39].

Ancient Turkic tamga-signs are drawn on surfaces of some worship-memorial objects: complexes consisting, except specially erected constructions, of stela with inscriptions, sarcophagi, statues of especially important persons, zoomorphic sculptures, balbal-mengirs. Their sacramental and the special semiotics status is emphasized by this fact. Additionally tamgas used to mark the territory of the movement and dispersal of the Turkic tribes. For example, archaeologists found tamgas of Western Turkic Kakhanat caln in the territory of a former Bulgar state. According to researchers tamgas provide information on migration of individual tribes and genus of Western Turkic Khanate in Eastern Europe. Found generic tamgas on the walls of ceramics Pliska are similar to those carved on rocks sanctuary Zhaisan (located in the district of Shu, Jambul region of the Republic of Kazakhstan) [40].

Medieval generic tamgas carved on rocks were found close to mountain sites of Turkic tribes in the area between the Shu and Ili. These tamgas 2 and 4 are similar to stella generic tamgas in Kogaly complex (complex of medieval monuments in the upper of the river Sarybulak was discovered in 2007). Rogozhinskiy A.E. claims that this fact enable us to establish the approximate territory of the "ten tribes" (Western Turkic Kakhanate in the sources called "people of the ten tribes"), the territory of the tribes forming the basis of the Western Turkic Kakhanate.

In abovementioned period the territorial issue was solved on legal basis. In Western Kakhanat the main source of rights were the laws based on tradition. Traditions were codified, and guaranteed by the state. The laws of ruling Ashina dynasty took a special place in the Western Turkic Kakhanate. This law was called the "Tore bitik." The purpose of this law was to preserve the integrity of the state and prevent tribal feuds. This law became the basis for receivers of the state. The law was used only in an oral form. However articles of the law are reflected in written Chinese sources.

The Turks were engaged in nomadic pastoralists and nomadised in a strictly defined boundaries. Chinese sources reveal the following information about the Turks: "They owned certain lands. They do not stay in one place for a long time. Permanent seat of Kagan was Otuken mountains. Moreover the tribe Telek, stationed in the Western Turkic Khanate, was mentioned in "the book of Northern Dynasty". They were forced to migrate in search of pasture and water sources in specially established territories.

In Western Kakhanat territorial boundaries were determined by natural objects. This is confirmed by Chinese sources. For example, according to the history of the North Dynasty Yshbara Hagan led the long negotiations over the establishment of territorial boundaries. As a result of negotiations, the boundary was set at Mangar desert [41].

Due to lack of written information and archaeological sources of the Middle Ages on this issue the author offers to consider the issue compared with other tribes and Turkic Khanate receivers with the Kazakh Khanate. For example, general population of Kazakh Khanate owned land and was engaged in nomadic pastoralism in the XVIII century. Therefore, each tribe had its own land with clearly defined boundaries. There were winter and summer pastures. This prevented the intergeneric disputes. These relations were governed by the laws of the vault, "Jetizhargy." Genus Chief, elder established a special mark on the ground of village stop. This is usually plunges a spear into the ground, mounted Kuruk (loop for catching a horse) [42]. For example, the mark of the territory by the spear and Kuruk could be make on a spring, the genus chief left a thing (for instance, shackles), and put the fabric on the tall grass [43]. Furthermore, to determine generic boundaries sometimes wells and dug canals were used. Intergeneric land disputes were resolved based on the historical identity of the region. According to authorto solve the issue of inter-state borders this kind of marking of the area was utilized by genus and tribes of Western Turkic Khanate.

Many scholars note the relationship between the continuity of Western Turkic Kakhanate and Kazakh Kakhanate. For instance, this concern saving Tengrianism, continuity of territory and language and nomadic herding. As it was mentioned above, generic labeling tamgas used in Western Kahanatwere popular in Kazakh Kakhanate as well. Based on this the author tries to suggest that marking the territories and borders in WesternTurkic Kakhanate emerged in approximately the same way as in Kazakh Khanate in the XV-XVIII centuries.

According to Kishibekov D. nomads of Central Asia in the period under consideration

roamed from one place to another at a distance of 10-15 km. Prosperous lands were chosen as nomadic locations. They had to be found on the upland areas [44]. Similar allegations put forward Kradin N.N. His research yielded that in a nomadic society 1.5 acres (1 tithing - 1.092 hectares), are required per capita, while settled nations need 0.78 acres of land on average. The average population density was 0.5-2 persons [45]. If the land was in the desert and semi-arid steppes they needed more land and the distance between the areas declined. According to geologists in the period of Western Turkic Kakhanate (about 603-704 years.), the temperature in the deserts was relatively close to the current temperature in the deserts of Central Asia. Chernyshevsky (Selected works of economic M, 1948, T 3, h 1.) concludes that the area was not measured by the human soul and the number of cattle. For example, for 24-25 horses nomad took 2-3 square meters of pasture. The land of nomads was communal property. On the basis of Maykov I.M. expedition materials to Mongolia in 1921, N.N. Kradin argues that extensive farming forced nomads to expand external lands but not internal. This was expressed by pasture land expansion. Taking in account the fact that animal husbandry required vast areas of land, favorable territory was separated rapidly. This led to a breach of population and livestock growth. As a result, in a certain area a dynamic balance was established in livestock number and population. There is a famous Mongolian proverb associated with this situation "there is no cattle without grass, no food without cattle".

According to Pletneva S.A. (Pletneva. Nomads of the Middle Ages, Moscow, 1982) continually land grabs have been taken place in Central Asia, including Western Turkic Kakhanate until the end of the XI century. Therefore, the problem was solved by established rules within the state, tribes and genus. For example, in famous medieval source on the history of the Mongols "Secret History of the Mongols" it is stated that "the pasture and specific area were determined within the state along with collective decision. Genus in a large nomadic tribal unions traveled on the same principle. Markov G.E. defines the concept of territory for nomads as "a collection of pasture land." The main area in a nomadic society was allocated for cattle breeding [46].

Territories were defended by arms. Weak tribes were displaced from their lands. Geologists assume that in the period of Western Turkic Kakhanate tribal movement was caused by climate change and political reasons [47]. However, interestingly, despite all above mentioned, there were cases when particular tribes were allowed to cross the

territory of others on the basis of the contract. Currently this is called *severtut*. *Severtut* - is a limited use of land, hike and go to transportation.

For Turks of Kakhanate and the nomads of Central Asia, the concept of the territory, border was nominal and movable. In other words, territorial boundaries were not shielded obstacles. Additionally there were constantly expanded.

Resuming all above stated, it could be concluded that Turkics in common s inhabiting the country retained traditions of their ancestors in demarcation of territorial boundaries, defining territories and left them to inheritors.

### Conclusion

In conclusion Western Turk Empire occupied a huge territory. In the heyday of the State it covers the area from the Pacific Ocean to the Black Sea. Definition of territories between the subjection of nations and neighboring empires played an important role in the regulation of political relations in the country.

Western Turk Empire was the State which had representatives from both types of public. The representative of the nomadic society engaged in nomadic farming uses on average almost three times more space than the representative of the sedentary society. So strictly adhered concrete territories and borders between different tribes and nations. Territory marked by generic and nephew *tamgas*, ie they were markers of specific areas (on the rocks, *balbals* etc..) Also, this issue was regulated by law.

Finally investigation of this issue makes it possible to have a general knowledge of what was to present the tribes formed the basis of Western Turk Empire of the environment and of its development.

### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Galiya Iskakova  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University Faculty of History, Archaeology and Ethnology, Al-Farabi Avenue, 71, Almaty, 050040, Republic of Kazakhstan

### References

1. Turkish sources of the history of Kazakhstan. Ancient Turkic gravestones stones and written records (Orhon, Yenisey, Talas) [Kazakhstan tarihi turali turki derektemeleri. Kone turik bitik tastari men eskertkishteri (Orhon, Enisey, Talas)], 2005. Almaty: Dyke Press, pp: 5-252.
2. Bichurin, N.Y., 1950. Collection of information about the people living in Central Asia in ancient times [Sobraniye svedeniy o narodah obitavshih v Sredney Asyi v drevnie vremena].

- Moscow-Leningrad: Publisher USSR Academy of Sciences, pp: 100.
3. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 344.
  4. Gumilev, L.N., 2010. Ancient turks [Drevnie turki]. Moscow: Astrel, pp: 575.
  5. Barfield, Th.J., 1992. The perilous frontier: Nomadic Empires and China 221 BC to AD 1757. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Cambridge, MA & Oxford, UK, pp: 7-20.
  6. Omarbekov T.O., 2008. History of the Kazakh clans and tribes. Dulats [Kazakh ru-taipalarinin tarihi. Dulattar.]. Almaty: Historical Research Center Alash, pp: 466.
  7. Findley C.V., 2005. The Turks in World History Oxford: Oxford University Press. (<http://www.fatih.edu/~ayasar/HIST388/The%20Turks%20in%20World%20History.pdf>) Date Views 11.10.2011.
  8. Kshibekov D., 1984. Nomadic society [Kochevoe obshestvo]. Alma-Ata: Science press of Kazakh SSR, pp: 238.
  9. Kradin N.N., 1992. Nomadic societies [Kochevie obshestva]. Vladivastok: Dalnauka, pp: 240.
  10. Kradin N.N., 2007. Eurasian nomads [Kochevniki Evrasyi]. Almaty: Dyke-Press, pp: 416.
  11. Markov G.E., 1976. Asian nomads [Kochevniki Asii]. Moscow: Moscow university press, pp: 316.
  12. Dosimbaeva A., 2006. The Western Turk Empire. The cultural heritage of the Kazakh steppe [Zapadnyy Turkskiy kaganat. Kulturnoe nasledie kazakhskoi stepi]. Almaty: Complex, pp: 4-168.
  13. Dosimbaeva A., 2002, Merke - Sacred land of Sevenriver Turks [Merke – Zhetisu turkilerinini kieli zheri]. Taraz: Senim, pp: 108.
  14. Grigoriev V.V., 1873. Eastern or Chinese Turkestan [Vostochniy ili Kitayskiy Turkestan]. St. Petersburg: Russian geographical society, pp: 5-10.
  15. Bichurin N. IA. (Iakin), 1950. Collection of information on peoples in Central Asia in ancient times [Sobranie svedenii o narodakh, obitavshikh v Srednei Azii v drevnie vremena]. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, pp: 229.
  16. Gumilev L.N., 2010. Ancient turks [Drevnie turki]. Moscow: Astrel, pp: 381.
  17. Findley C.V., 2005. The Turks in World History. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (<http://www.fatih.edu/~ayasar/HIST388/The%20Turks%20in%20World%20History.pdf>). Date Views 11.10.2011.
  18. Barfield T.J., 1992. The perilous frontier: Nomadic Empires and China 221 BC to AD 1757. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Cambridge, MA & Oxford, UK, pp: 18.
  19. Dosimbaeva A., 2006. The Western Turk Empire. The cultural heritage of the Kazakh steppe [Zapadnyy Turkskiy kaganat. Kulturnoe nasledie kazakhskoi stepi]. Almaty: Complex, pp: 153.
  20. Tasagil A., 2003. Blue turks [Gok-Turkler]. Ankara: Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, pp: 31, 85.
  21. Klashoniy S.G., Sultanov T.I., 1992. Kazakhstan chronicle three millennia [Kazakhstan letopis treh tisachiletiiy]. Alma-Ata: Rayan, pp: 94.
  22. History of Kirgiz SSR [Istoriya Kirgizskoi SSR], 1968. Phrunze: Kirgizstan, pp: 106.
  23. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 119.
  24. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 140.
  25. Tasagil A., 2003. Blue turks [Gok-Turkler]. Ankara: Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, pp: 32-33
  26. Tasagil A., 2003. Blue turks [Gok-Turkler]. Ankara: Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, pp: 142.
  27. Gumilev L.N., 2010. Ancient turks [Drevnie turki]. Moscow: Astrel, pp: 173.
  28. Minzhan N., 1994. Short Kazakh history [Kazakhtin kiskasha tarihi]. Almaty: Zhalin, pp: 119.
  29. Dosimbaeva A., 2006. The Western Turk Empire. The cultural heritage of the Kazakh steppe [Zapadnyy Turkskiy kaganat. Kulturnoe nasledie kazakhskoi stepi]. Almaty: Complex, pp: 153.
  30. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2 volume, 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 141, 143.
  31. Minzhan N., 1994. Short Kazakh history [Kazakhtin kiskasha tarihi]. Almaty: Zhalin, pp:121-122.
  32. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 141, 143.
  33. Chines sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 77.
  34. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Y. 2005. Russian dictionary. Moscow: ITI Tehnologiyi, pp: 143.
  35. Baburin S.N.,1997. State territory. Legal and geopolitical issues. Moscow. [www.pravo.vuzlib.org/book\\_z101\\_page\\_10.html](http://www.pravo.vuzlib.org/book_z101_page_10.html) Date Views 07.11.12.

36. Omarbekov T., Khabizanova G., Iskakova G., 2013. The nature and human being in the Turkic world-view. *AwerProcedia Advances in Applied sciences* Vol 1. pp: 358-363.
37. Boundary delimitation. Date Views 09.06. 12. [www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boundary\\_delimitation](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boundary_delimitation).
38. Symbol [Tanba], 2009. *Kazakh National encyclopedia [Kazakh Ultik encyclopedia]*. Almaty: Kazakh encyclopediyasi, pp: 217.
39. Samashev Z., Bazilhan N., Samashev S., 2010. Ancient Turkic tamga-signs. *Almaty: Archaeology*, pp: 120-121.
40. Dosimbaeva, A., 2011. Turkic heirs of Kazakhstan as a source for the history of the Turkic peoples of Eurasia [Turkskie nasledniki Kazakhstana kak istochnic po istoriyi turkskih narodov Evrazyi]. In *Archaeology of Kazakhstan in independence era: results and prospects. Proceedings of the international scientific conference dedicated to the 20th anniversary of Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the 20th anniversary of the Institute of Archaeology named after A.H. Margulan, Institute of Archaeology named after A.H. Margulan (issue 2)*, pp: 280-282.
41. Chinese sources of the history of Kazakhstan [Kitai zhilnamalarindagy Kazakh tarihinin derekteri], 2006. Almaty: Oner, pp: 111.
42. Artikbaev Z.O., 2006. *Jeti zhargy - State and legal monument [Zheti zhargy – memleket zhane kukik eskertkishi]*. Almaty: Zhan adabiyeti, pp: 97.
43. Teleuova E.T., 2007. Social and legal characteristics of the traditional Kazakh society [Dasturli Kazakh kogaminin aleumettik-kukiktik erekshelikteri]. Almaty: Kazakh University, pp: 36.
44. Kshibekov D., 1984. *Nomadic society [Kochevoe obshestvo]*. Alma-Ata: Science press of Kazakh SSR, pp: 63.
45. Kradin N.N., 1992. *Nomadic societies [Kochevie obshestva]*. Vladivostok: Dalnauka, pp: 56.
46. Markov G.E., 1976. *Asian nomads [Kochevniki Asii]*. Moscow: Moscow university press, pp: 59.
47. Aubekero, B.Z. and S.A. Nygmatova, 2007. Climate and landscape changes, the history and evolution of human society from the earliest hominids to nomads in Kazakhstan [Izmineniya klimata i landshavta, osnovnie etapi evoluciyi chelovecestva obshestva ot drevneishih gominid do kochevnikov na territoriyi Kazakhstana]. In: *Materials of International Research Conference "Contribution of the nomads in development of world civilization"*, Almaty: Dyke-Press, pp: 145.

8/22/2014