

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

INTERNATIONAL PERIODICAL
FOR THE LANGUAGES, LITERATURE,
HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF
CENTRAL ASIA

VOLUME IV

Nr. 3

1959

joint publication of

MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ
WIESBADEN

THE EARLIEST TURKISH LOAN WORDS
IN MONGOLIAN

by

Sir GERARD CLAUSON

London

In an article in the *Central Asiatic Journal*, II, 3, entitled "The Case against the Altaic Theory", I stated the reasons for which I do not believe that the Turkish and Mongolian languages are genetically related, and in an article in *Studia Altaica*, the Festschrift for Prof. Poppe published in the *Ural-Altaische Bibliothek* (1957), entitled "The Turkish Y and related sounds", I produced evidence which shows that the Mongols or their ancestors at three different periods borrowed words from three different Turkish dialects (or languages¹), one of which was older than any which now survive.

In the present article, a summary of which was read at the 24th International Congress of Orientalists in Munich in September, 1957, I propose to carry the subject a stage further and to discuss, first how it is possible to determine in which of the two languages a word common to both is native and in which it is a loan word, secondly what light is thrown on the problem by a study of the history and pre-history of the two peoples, and finally at what periods and from what dialects the earlier Turkish loan words in Mongolian were borrowed. The second part involves *inter alia* an examination of the archaeology of an area in which little systematic work has yet been done and of which no comprehensive account has yet been published. This part of the article is therefore no more than a preliminary and incomplete study of a very complicated subject on which we may confidently look to the future to throw more light.

It is common ground that a great many words, including even verbs, ¹ The question when two later forms of a single language cease to be "dialects" and become "languages" in their own right has been discussed at great length without reaching a satisfactory conclusion for dealing with doubtful cases. In the present article, for the sake of clarity I have used "language" only for "Mongolian" and "Turkish" and "dialect" for any form of those languages, although some of these "dialects" are generally, and quite rightly, recognised as languages in their own right.

occur both in one or more Turkish dialects and in one or more Mongolian dialects, either in exactly the same form or in forms so similar that their identity is certain. If it is accepted that Turkish and Mongolian are descended from a common "Altaic" ancestor, this is easily explained; but if this is not accepted, and personally I do not accept it, then it must be shown that the words concerned are native to one language and loan words in the other, and methods must be worked out of determining which language is the lender and which the borrower. It seems to me that there are at least six methods, one or more of which can be applied in any individual case.

One method, and very often the simplest, is to examine the word in both languages and ascertain whether it is the traditional, perhaps the only, word for a particular concept in one language and a more or less superfluous duplicate of some other word in the other. When one people dominates another, as for example the Mongols dominated the Tuvars right down to the early part of the present century, the language of the latter people becomes completely saturated with the vocabulary of the former, words being borrowed right and left even when perfectly good native words exist for the same concept. The same thing may happen when two peoples speaking different languages are in intimate contact with one another, even without any political relationship of superiority and subordination. Let me give a specific example. There are in 8th century Turkish at least two words meaning "to fear, be afraid", *kork-* and *ir-k-*, as well as other words with related meanings, like *eymen-* "to be nervous, shy". All these words are still in current use in many Turkish dialects. Nevertheless at the present time there is current in all parts of the Turkish-speaking world except Azerbaijan and Turkey a word *qoç-* "to be afraid", which is the normal word for this concept in Mongolian. It must have been borrowed at a comparatively recent date, since there is no authority for its existence in Turkish prior to the 19th century (this does not mean that it was borrowed quite as late as this, there are many gaps in the record).

Conversely even in the earliest surviving Mongolian dialect, that of the Secret History compiled in the middle of the 13th century, there are several pairs of words, one peculiar to Mongolian and seemingly the normal word for the concept concerned and the other found also in Turkish and there traceable back to the 8th century; for example for "year" *hon* and also *jil* (in Turkish *cil*),² for "half" *düli* and also ² For Mongolian I use the standard system of transliteration used, for example, by Prof. Poppe, for Turkish the official alphabet of the Turkish Republic with a few

jarim (*carim*) and for "camping ground" *nutuy* and also *ayil* (*ağil*).

Thus if one of the two languages uses a word, let us call it "word A", for a particular concept and the other language uses another word, "word B", for it and also word A, it is safe to assume that word A is a loan word in the second language.

Secondly, if a word common to both languages can be identified as a derived word, for example a deverbal noun derived from a verb, or a denominative verb formed from a noun, and the word from which it is derived is peculiar to one of the two languages, then it can safely be assumed that the derived word is a loan word in the other language. Let me give a specific example. There is a Turkish word verb *yar-* "to split, divide", in some dialects pronounced *car-*; from it are derived *yarim* (*carim*), a Noun of Single Action, meaning "a single action of dividing, i.e. half", and *yarğa* (*carğa*), a Noun of Action meaning "dividing" in a metaphorical sense, presumably between right and wrong, hence "a legal process or decision". Both the basic verb and its derivatives occur in Turkish from the earliest period. In Mongolian there is no trace of a verb *yar-* (*jar-*) "to divide", but *jarim* and *jarγu* both occur with the same meaning as in Turkish, and both must be loan words, *jarim* both for this reason and for the reasons already stated (under the first method).

The third method rests on a study of the way in which derived words are formed. Derived words are formed in the same way in both languages by attaching suffixes to the basic forms of verbs or nouns. Such suffixes may be simple, as for example the Turkish suffixes *-im* and *-ğu* (see the preceding paragraph), or compound, as for example a nominal suffix attached to a verbal suffix, used to form a verbal noun from a denominative verb. Generally speaking the suffixes used in the two languages are quite different; where they are identical the explanation seems to be either sheer coincidence, or the borrowing of the actual suffix itself. In the case of compound suffixes the fact that borrowing has taken place can sometimes be proved by the fact that the constituent parts of the suffix do not both occur in the borrowing language.³ A good example of a purely Mongolian suffix is *-lang/-leng*, used to form Nouns of Action or State from verbs,

additional letters as explained in the preamble to "The Turkish Y and related sounds". One correction to the transliterations used in that paper must be made. A study of the ḡPaḡa-pa alphabet has convinced me that the velar sound which occurs in the Secret History should be transliterated *γ* and not *χ* (x).

³ The borrowing of constituent parts of words as well as whole words is not unusual in other languages. For example, in English *philo-*, "fond of", borrowed from Greek, is used to make compound words like "philoprogenitive", of which the second element is not Greek.

e.g. *jobalang* "suffering" from *joba-* "to suffer". A good many words with this suffix occur in some modern Turkish dialects, which have been under strong Mongolian influence. They are all loan words. Conversely there is a Turkish desiderative verbal suffix *-sa/-se-* attached both to verbs and nouns to form verbs meaning "to wish to", e.g. *sev-* "to love", hence *sevs-e* "to wish to love"; *suv* "water", hence *suvsa-* "to wish for water, be thirsty". This verbal suffix is unknown in Mongolian. From it is formed the nominal suffix *-sağ/-seg* "fond of", e.g. in Turkish *erseg* "(a woman) fond of men, nymphomaniac". A number of such words were borrowed by Mongolian from Turkish; later the suffix was found to be so convenient to express a concept which could not otherwise be expressed as simply in Mongolian that it was attached to purely Mongolian basic words, e.g. *eme* "woman", hence *emeseg* "a ladies' man"; *miqa(n)* "meat", hence *miqasay* "fond of meat". Although these words cannot be described as Turkish loan words, since they do not occur in Turkish, they are certainly not pure Mongolian since they contain a foreign element.

The fourth method rests on a study of the phonetic structure of a word common to the two languages. Turkish basic words are usually monosyllables or dissyllables, and, if the latter, usually (not invariably) end in a consonant. A Turkish word of more than two syllables is almost invariably a derived word of which syllables after the second are suffixes of one kind or another. In Mongolian, dissyllables ending in vowels and words of more than two syllables are not uncommon, though no doubt many of the latter are derived words. Words like *cerge* "a row, line" and *itarim* "a partridge" look like loan words in Turkish and in fact are Mongolian loan words, borrowed in the 13th or 14th century; but structure by itself, unsupported by other considerations, is not conclusive.

Fifthly, chronology by itself may prove almost conclusively that a word common to both languages is native to one and a loan word in the other. There is a gap of about five centuries between the earliest substantial Turkish texts, the so-called "runic" or "Orkhon" inscriptions of the first half of the 8th century, and the earliest substantial Mongolian text, the Secret History, supposedly compiled in the middle of the 13th century, and there are many other Turkish texts, some of them very voluminous, representing the Turkish language as it existed between these two dates. From these texts a vocabulary containing thousands of words can be compiled, representing the Turkish language as it existed in the period before its speakers came into close contact with the Mongols as the result of the conquests of Chinggis Khan. In the whole of this large vocabulary there are no words which could be identified as Mongolian loan words by

employing the methods enumerated above. From this two conclusions follow. First if a word common to the two languages occurs in pre-13th century Turkish, it is certainly native Turkish, and in Mongolian a loan word. Secondly if such a word is not traceable in pre-13th century Turkish there is a strong presumption that it is native Mongolian and in Turkish a loan word, but this presumption, unless supported by the use of one of the preceding methods, does not amount to absolute certainty, since we cannot be sure that the pre-13th century Turkish texts which have survived contain every single Turkish word which then existed.

Sixthly and finally, a word common to the two languages may be provisionally classified as native to one language and a loan word in the other because of the economic or cultural background which it implies.

This takes me to my second topic, the light which is thrown on the subject by a study of the history and pre-history of the two peoples. In both cases their history can be traced back much further than the names by which they are now known.

The name "Turk", of which the earliest known form seems to have been *Türkü*, was the name of a tribe which did not become known to history until the second half of the 6th century A.D., but peoples with other names, who certainly or almost certainly spoke a form of Turkish, can be traced back to a much earlier period. All these peoples seem to have been specifically nomadic steppe-dwellers, ranging over the great plains or steppes which are bounded on the north by the southern edge of the forest belt running across Eurasia from the Baltic to the Pacific and on the south by the high mountains on the northern edge of Tibet, and extend with partial interruptions from the mountains of Shansi, which roughly formed the boundary of ancient China, and their northern extension, the Khingian range, in the east, to the complex net-work of mountains in the west formed by the Pamirs, the Tannu-ola mountains and the various ranges which lies between them.

Of these peoples mention must first be made of the Huns. I imagine that all Turcologists accept Professor Pritsak's contentions in his recent book *Die Bulgarischen Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren* (Wiesbaden, 1955), that the Hsiung-nu of the Chinese histories were, broadly speaking, the ancestors of the European Huns, and the European Huns the ancestors of the Protobulgars. This does not of course necessarily imply that the Hsiung-nu, the Huns and the Protobulgars were pure and homogeneous racial groups and that no additional Turkish or foreign elements were incorporated in these peoples in the course of their long wanderings, or even that they necessarily retained their original

language,⁴ subject of course to inevitable wear and tear; but there is a very strong presumption amounting almost to certainty that modern Chuvash is a direct descendant of ancient Bulgar; Bulgar, in its turn, a later form of the European Hunnish; and that, in its turn, a later form of the language of the Hsiung-nu. If so, that language must have been an early form of Turkish, and this seems to be confirmed by the scanty and obscure remnants of it (words, titles and phrases) preserved in the Chinese records. These are so distorted that it is hard to make anything of them, but they clearly contain some words which were later Turkish, like *teyri* "heaven" and the title of the supreme ruler, *shan-yü*, which is almost certainly *yavǵu* in an earlier form, probably *dangǵu*.

And so it is a reasonable hypothesis that the Hsiung-nu were the ancestors of the Turks and their language an earlier form of Turkish; and as a result we can use the information about the Hsiung-nu in the Chinese records as a guide to the economic and cultural background of the ancestors of the 6th century Turks as far back as those records will take us. The most important of these is Chapter 110 of the *Shih Chi*, which was compiled at about the end of the 2nd century B.C. no doubt partly from much earlier material. The earlier parts of the history, which purport to go back beyond the middle of the 2nd millennium, are obviously mythical and there is no solid history in the subsequent narrative until about the middle of the 3rd century B.C., when the Hsiung-nu became an organized tribe with a ruler called a *shan-yü*. But if the record is short on concrete historical facts, of which there may well have been none worth mentioning, it paints an admirably clear picture of the kind of people these ancestors of the Turks were at this date and probably a good deal earlier. They can be described, in ethnological terms, as nomadic steppe-dwellers, who had passed through the first, or "savage", stage of human existence, that of food-gathering and hunting wild animals, and reached the second, or "barbaric", stage of stock-owning and stock-breeding, perhaps with a little primitive agriculture as a side line and no doubt important survivals of food-gathering and hunting. Their habitat in this period was the great plains defined above and primarily the eastern part of them; archaeological research in this area has not advanced sufficiently to make it possible to correlate the facts of history and those of archaeology and thus to show where the cradle of this race was, but there is no evidence at all to show that they came from anywhere else.

⁴ It is of course well known that the Danubian Bulgars lost their own language and adopted a Slavonic one, but the Kama Bulgars did not.

very early period, but its character and extent cannot be known at all clearly until further work has been carried out. There is, however, one archaeological fact which takes us far back into the 2nd millennium B.C., perhaps even into the 3rd. The Chinese socketed bronze celt can be linked by a series of intermediate types with a prototype originating either at some point in southern Europe, if the movement was all eastwards, or more probably at some point rather further East, if the movement was in both directions; the distribution map shows that it reached China by a route along the steppes probably not very far south of the edge of the forest belt. Other cultural influences, for example the technique of making painted pottery, seem to have reached China by the same route. Obviously these influences must have moved gradually through a series of peoples, and it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the last link in the chain before China was a tribe of remote ancestors of the Turks, unless we are to assume the existence of a people who later completely disappeared.

For a period which may be very tentatively dated to about the turn of the 2nd and 1st millennia we have rather more concrete information. In his fascinating book *Drevnyaya Istoriya Yuzhnoy Sibiri* (i.e. "The Ancient History of Southern Siberia"), 2nd edition (Moscow, 1951), S. B. Kisilev traces in detail the successive archaeological periods in Southern Siberia, that is in this context an area in the forest belt not far north of the north-west corner of the great plains, and points out that down to the end of the Andronovo period the human skeletal remains indicate that the area was inhabited by "Europeoids", but that in the next, or Karasuk, period, dated roughly from the 12th to the 8th centuries B.C., there are traces of immigrations of "Mongoloids" into this area from the south-east, and the appearance of artefacts showing clearly the influence of Chinese art and culture. "Mongoloid" is, of course, an anthropological term of art and includes many races besides Mongols (in fact it very seldom means Mongols proper). It is very unlikely that representatives of the greatest Mongoloid race of all, the Chinese themselves, reached so far west as early as this; remote ancestors of the Turks may well have been the middle-men through whom these artefacts reached this area.

There is an interesting little piece of linguistic evidence which seems to point to the presence of ancestors of the Turks far to the west at a very early period. One, and only one, Indo-European people (it would probably be safer to say a people talking an Indo-European language) crossed the great mountain barrier at an early date and established themselves in the region of the great plains, the people commonly, but probably incorrectly, known as "Tokharians". In the second half of the first millennium

A.D. they were established in the Kucha-Turfan area and fragments of Buddhist scriptures in two dialects of their language, "Tokharian-A" or "Agnan" and "Tokharian-B" or "Kuchaean", have been found at Turfan and Kucha respectively. As I pointed out in "The Case against the Altaic Theory" it was probably from the Tokharian-B word *okso* that the Turks got their word for "ox", *öküz*, a word which they subsequently passed on to the Mongols in the aberrant form (*hükker*). If this is so, then it was probably from the Tokharians that they got not only the name, but also the animal itself, and very probably the first rudiments of stock-breeding and animal husbandry. Indeed further research might show that other Turkish words with a similar context had the same origin.

There are no Chinese records of comparable antiquity relating to the ancestors of the Mongols. The name "Mongol" appears fairly late in the history of Mongolian-speaking peoples, perhaps not much before the 12th century A.D., and, as in the case of the Turks, their ancestors must be sought under an alias. At one time or another, and for wholly inadequate reasons, various early peoples have been described as Mongolian-speakers; these include the Hsien-pei of the 3rd century A.D., who almost certainly spoke a form of Turkish, the Hephthalites of the 5th century A.D., who clearly spoke an Indo-European (Iranian) language,⁵ and the Avars of the 6th century, who were probably Turkish-speakers. But there do seem to be solid grounds for supposing that the Kitan (whose name became Kitay in the 8th or 9th century) spoke a form of Mongolian, and the Chinese records trace their history back to the beginning of the 5th century A.D. when they were in Manchuria, in or not far out of the forest belt.

The general impression conveyed by the very unclear references in the Chinese records is that the earliest ancestors of the Mongols were a forest people centred somewhere north of the edge of the forest belt between the longitude of Lake Baikal and the Pacific, and that neither the Kitan nor the Mongols became known to the rest of the world until they emerged from their forests and adopted a nomadic form of life.

Much the same is true of the people known collectively as Tungus. The researches of A. P. Okladnikov and other Soviet archaeologists seem to have proved the existence of a continuous series of ancient cultures on the western shores of Lake Baikal and thence northwards down the Angara valley, of which the earliest goes back perhaps to the 3rd millennium B.C.

⁵ See R. Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites (Mémoires de la délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan, Tome XIII)* (Cairo, 1948).

and the latest merges into the culture of the Tungus speakers who still live in that area.⁶

If this summary appreciation of the evidence of history and archaeology is more or less correct, then during that formative period in human history when, according to the generally accepted theory, languages as we understand the term today originated and were developed, the cradles of the Turkish-, Mongolian- and Tungus-speaking peoples lay far apart, the first in the great plains west of China, the second in the forest belt between Lake Baikal and the Pacific and the third in the forests west and north of that lake. And so we might expect that the primeval Turkish language would be well provided with terms used by steppe-dwellers, including the names of animals native to, or introduced from elsewhere into, the steppes, but poorly provided with names for forest animals and terms for the techniques for hunting them, while the Mongolian and Tungus languages should be poorly provided with the former, but rich in the latter, category of words.

Obviously this state of affairs will not be fully reflected in stages of the languages as late as 8th century Turkish and 13th century Mongolian. The edge of the forest belt is not an unclimbable fence, separating two different worlds as the shore separates land and sea; there are intermediate areas of wooded steppe, and even within the forest there are fairly large areas in the river valleys in which such typically steppe forms of economic life as animal husbandry are not only possible, but even enjoy exceptional amenities. By the 8th century the Turks were already fully aware of these amenities and of the advantages to the steppe-dweller of taking refuge from his enemies in the mountain forests. Indeed in the introductory paragraph to his brother's memorial tablet⁷ Bilge Kağan said that he reckoned that the Ötüken mountain forest was the safest place for his people to settle down. Conversely the Mongols, and the Kitān before them, had emerged from the forests into the steppes. But these movements must all have taken place long after the languages had taken shape, and their basic vocabularies, when stripped of loan words, should reflect the conditions of their primeval environment.

Names of animals are particularly significant in matters of this kind, and the twelve-year animal cycle, which was used by both peoples from a

very early period, gives a convenient list of such names. In the following list the animals have been arranged not in the order in which they occur in the cycle, but in a logical order which will facilitate their study; the forms of the names are the earliest available, that is for Turkish 8th or 9th century and for Mongolian 13th century forms.

	Turkish	Mongolian
Tiger	<i>bars</i>	<i>bars</i>
Monkey	<i>biçin</i>	<i>biçin</i>
Dragon	<i>lu</i>	<i>lu</i>
Mouse	<i>siğān</i>	<i>quluqana</i>
Snake	<i>yulan</i>	<i>moγay</i>
Pig	<i>lağzin</i>	<i>yagay</i>
Dog	<i>ii</i>	<i>moγay</i>
Ox	<i>siğur, uđ</i>	<i>(h)iker</i>
Sheep	<i>koñ</i>	<i>qoni</i>
Fowl	<i>takıñu</i>	<i>takiya</i>
Hare	<i>tavığan</i>	<i>taılay</i>
Horse	<i>ai</i>	<i>morin</i>

The first three animals are exotic both to the Siberian forests and to the steppes; for these animals both languages use the same foreign loan words; for "tiger" an Indo-European (?specifically Iranian) word, for "monkey" an Indo-European word, the precise origin of which is uncertain (but cf. Persian *būzin*), and for "dragon" the Chinese word *lung* in the abbreviated pronunciation which was current in north-west China in the 8th century. There can be no reasonable doubt that these words reached Mongolian through Turkish.

The next four animals, mouse, snake, pig and dog, are native both to the steppe and the forests; for these four the two languages use completely different words.

The next four animals, ox, sheep, fowl and hare are typically steppe animals, the first three being among the earliest animals domesticated by man in the "barbaric" stage. For these Mongolian uses Turkish loan words, three of them showing phonetic peculiarities which I shall discuss later. It is odd that for "ox" Mongolian uses a Turkish word which is not actually used in the Turkish version of the cycle.

The horse too is, *prima facie*, a typically steppe animal, and it is curious that here the two languages use completely different words, in contrast to the Indo-European languages which in their earlier stages all use the same word in various forms, which are often used to illustrate the Indo-European phonetic laws. The conclusion seems to be that the Turks and Mongols met the horse independently and before they met one another.

The main conclusion to be derived from this list is that the two lan-

⁶ See *Narady Sibiri* ("The Peoples of Siberia"), edited by Levin and Potapov (Moscow, 1956), p. 704.

⁷ Orkhon inscription I, South side, 1.8; see H. N. Orkun, *Eski Türk Yazıları*, I (İstanbul, 1936), p. 26, and various other editions, e.g. A. von Gabain, *Altürkische Grammatik*, p. 248.

guages evolved in isolation from one another (animals 4-7 & 12), but that the Mongols learnt their "steppe" terminology from the Turks and very likely also the rudiments of animal husbandry (animals 8-11). Another word pointing in the same direction is that for "calf", Turkish *buzğu*, Mongolian *burāu*.

I now turn to my third topic, the periods at which and the dialects from which the earlier Turkish loan words in Mongolian were borrowed. The latest period which I propose to discuss in this connection is the 13th century; the process of interchange between the two languages has been more or less continuous since then, but does not present any particular points of interest; it may well have been more or less continuous, at any rate so far as Mongolian borrowings from Turkish are concerned, for some long period before that date, but a careful study of the words which in standard Turkish begin with *y-*, to which I devoted my attention in "The Turkish *Y* and related sounds", shows that there were three distinct phases, one in the 13th century and two earlier.

The latest, or 13th century, phase began when the first attempts were made to convert the Mongols to Buddhism and Buddhist scriptures in Turkish were translated into Mongolian. This involved introducing into Mongolian a number of Turkish words for which Mongolian equivalents could not be found. The Turkish dialect concerned was Uyğur, which is in the main line of tradition of standard Turkish, and loan words like *yilvi* "magic" and *yiringçi* "universe" which began with *y-* in Uyğur were borrowed in that form. In this, as in earlier phases, certain phonetic changes were made in some loan words in order to bring them into conformity with Mongolian phonetics. In particular final *-s* (*-š*) in Turkish words was altered to *-s*, as in *ulus* "country", which became *ulus*; and since final unvoiced plosives and affricates did not exist in Mongolian a vowel was added at the end of words with these finals (see "Turkish *Y*" p. 37, footnote).

The intermediate stage ended when the third phase began, early in the 13th century, and presumably began when the Mongols proper first came into contact with Turkish-speaking tribes. Well before the 13th century, certainly as early as the middle of the 11th and perhaps earlier, the pronunciation in some Turkish dialects had begun to diverge from the standard. In particular initial *y-* had become *c-*, for example *yıl* "year" had become *cıl*. One such dialect, presumably the ancestor of the modern South Siberian dialects ("languages") Xakas, Mountain Altai, Tuva and the rest, seems to have been spoken by a north-eastern Turkish tribe in contact with the Mongols prior to the expansion which occurred under

Chingiz Khan, and extensive borrowings from it seem to have taken place. In the language of the Secret History, which is antecedent to the third phase and contains no Turkish loan words beginning with *y-*⁸ about 6% of the words beginning with *y-* appear to be Turkish loan words beginning with *y-* in standard Turkish, e.g. *jıl* (*cıl* < *yıl*), *jarın* (*carın* < *yarın*) and *jaru* (*caru* < *yaru*) mentioned above. One word *jangi-* "to strike, pierce" is a phonetic oddity, it is derived from Turkish *sang-* with the initial *s-* altered to *c-* under the influence of the following *-g-*, as occurs in some Turkish dialects.

The earliest phase is very much earlier, certainly prior to the 8th century A.D.. Borrowings during this period were made from a Turkish language which had marked peculiarities, two showing great archaism, and three a rather advanced stage of phonetic decay. The first archaic trait was the retention of the voiced dental spirant, *ḍ*, as an initial. This sound (see "Turkish *Y*" p. 40) survived as a medial and final until the 14th century, but as an initial had become *y-* (the sound into which medial and final *ḍ* most commonly evolved) by the 8th century in all known Turkish dialects, except one to be mentioned shortly. The second archaic trait was the retention of the palatal nasal *ñ* both as an initial and as a medial or final. This sound (see "Turkish *Y*" p. 42) had much the same history as *ḍ*, except that as a medial or final it did not survive later than the 9th century, turning thereafter into *n*, *y* or some combination of the two. The third trait is the sound change medial *ḡ* > *y*, the fourth the sound change *z* > *r* and the fifth *ḡ* > *l*. Words were taken from this dialect into Mongolian more or less unchanged, apart from the regular phonetic adjustments mentioned above, except that the voiced dental spirant *ḍ*, which did not exist in Mongolian, became plosive *d*.

The following table gives typical examples of Turkish loan-words in Mongolian, which show one or more of these peculiarities, and also parallel examples in the other group of Turkish dialects referred to above.

	Mongolian Proto-Turkish	8th century Turkish	Protobulgar etc.
1. <i>ḍ</i> retained	<i>day(ḡn)</i> < <i>ḡaḡi</i> "enemy"	> <i>yagḡi</i>	
	<i>ḡlan</i> "snake"	> <i>yılan</i>	< <i>ḡlōm</i> (Protob.)
2. <i>ñ</i> retained	<i>nodurḡa</i> < <i>ñodruk</i> "fast"	> <i>yodruk</i>	
	<i>ñaz</i> "summer"	> <i>yaz</i>	< <i>nyār</i> (Turkish loanword in Magyar)

⁸ Only one word beginning with *y-*, *yara* "wound", occurs also in Turkish, and as that word is not found in Turkish prior to the 13th century, it can reasonably, on the principle laid down in "method 5" above, be regarded as a Mongolian loan word.

	Mongolian	Proto-Turkish	Protobulgar etc.
3. $\tilde{g}->-y-$	<i>takiya</i> <i>ayil</i>	< <i>takiġu</i> "fowl" < <i>aġil</i> "camping ground"	
4. $z>r$	<i>dayi(n)</i> (<i>h</i>) <i>ük</i> <i>er</i>	<i>see above</i> < <i>öküz</i> "ox"	(< Tokharian B <i>okso</i>)
5. $s>l$	<i>burā'u</i> <i>ta'ulay</i>	< <i>buzāġu</i> "calf" < <i>tokuz/lokkuz</i> "nine" < <i>tavišan</i> "hare" <i>taš</i> "stone"	> <i>paru</i> (Chuvash) > <i>taxan/taxxar</i> (ditto) <i>nydr</i> (see above) > <i>t'ul/gul</i> (ditto)

It is surely more than a mere coincidence that none of these traits, except the third, which is of minor importance and not uncommon in Turkish dialectology, have any parallel in any other Turkish dialects except Protobulgar (including Protobulgar loan words in Magyar) and its descendants mediaeval Bulgar and modern Chuvash, and that in these dialects they are all found together.

It is at first sight disconcerting to find that the only close parallel to the hypothetical far-north-eastern language from which these borrowings of the earliest period were made is to be found in the most westerly of all the Turkish dialects, but we need not really be surprised at finding an early language surviving in isolated pockets far from one another. Exactly the same thing has happened in the case of Basque and the only other languages genetically related to it, Abkhaz and some other Caucasian language.

Moreover there is another curious link between the far west and the far east. In the Chuvash language *ġu-* (properly *t'u-* with a palatalized *t'*) regularly represents standard Turkish *ta-* (as in *taš* > *gul* in the table above); standard Turkish medial $\tilde{g}$ - is frequently omitted; and in the modern dialect standard *ç* becomes *ş* as regularly as in the earlier dialect standard *ş* became *l*. In short, although other explanations are theoretically possible, the most reasonable explanation of the modern name Chuvash (T'uvaš) is that it is a later form of Tavġaġ, the name of a very famous ancient Turkish tribe.

Admittedly there is no record in history of a part of the Tavġaġ having accompanied the Hsiung-nu in their movement to the west, but equally there is no record in history of the Bulgars having ever been in the east, from which we know they must have come. We know that the Bulgars, who came to the west in a subordinate position, ultimately imposed their name on the horde of which they were part, and there is nothing impossible in the theory that a section of Tavġaġ also formed part of the horde, and

ultimately imposed their name on it, after the Bulgars had lost their importance as one of the ultimate consequences of the Mongol invasion of southern Russia.

The Tavġaġ (in Chinese transcription *T'o-pa*) first appeared in history in the 4th century A.D. and very rapidly became important. They seized large parts of northern China and governed it for a century and a half, the ruling clan rapidly becoming completely Sinitized and assuming the dynastic title of "Northern Wei" (ruling from A.D. 386 to 535). It was precisely to the Northern Wei court that the Kitan began to send annual missions with gifts (that is tribute) in A.D. 440. It seems reasonable to suppose that this was the first substantial contact between a Mongolian-speaking and a Turkish-speaking people and that it was from the Tavġaġ that the Kitan started borrowing words for concepts for which they had no words of their own, as primitive peoples always have done when they have come into contact with more advanced peoples. Indeed it seems reasonable also to suppose that it was during this period that the Kitan, recently emerged from their Siberian forests but already familiar with the horse, for which they had a name of their own (*morin*), first learnt the rudiments of animal husbandry and acquired from the Tavġaġ not only oxen, calves, sheep and domestic fowls, but also names for them, just as centuries earlier the ancestors of the Turks had acquired oxen and a name for them from the Tokharians.

My suggestion therefore is that the earliest phase of Mongolian borrowings from Turkish started in about the fifth century A.D. and that these earliest loan words were borrowed by the Kitan from the Tavġaġ. It is not often that a date practically imposed by considerations of a purely phonetic nature agrees so neatly with the recorded facts of history. My only regret, and it is a very sincere one, is that I do not at present see any means of proving positively that this theory is correct.