

Audreyen Mongolian: Proceedings of the
First North American Conference on Alta-
golian Studies, Ed. by H. Schwert. Western
Washington University, 1979.

A PROBLEM IN BURYAT HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

Larry V. Clark
Indiana University

The Buryat Mongols are among those peoples of Siberia who may be said to lack historical profile prior to the early seventeenth-century conquest of Siberia by Tsarist Russia. Ethnonyms and toponyms with supposed connections to the Buryats rarely occur in earlier Asian sources, and those that do are attended by ambiguity. Behind this historical obscurity follows the dark course of the Buryat language, which began to be recorded only in the eighteenth century when it had already by and large assumed its modern form. Lacking earlier concrete data, we might presume that the investigation of the historical development of Buryat belongs to that kind of intellectual puzzle whose solution depends on arguments that cannot be supported by facts.

The present paper addresses only a fragment of this puzzle, namely, the Buryat developments of Mongol *s*, *č*, and *š*:

WM <i>s</i> :	<i>sara</i>	"moon"	B <i>h</i> :	<i>hara</i>
<i>si</i> :	<i>sira</i>	"yellow"	<i>š</i> :	<i>šara</i>
<i>-s</i> :	<i>bos-</i>	"to rise"	<i>-d</i> :	<i>bod-</i>
<i>č</i> :	<i>časun</i>	"snow"	<i>s</i> :	<i>sahan</i>
<i>či</i> :	<i>čino</i>	"wolf"	<i>š</i> :	<i>šono</i>
<i>š</i> :	<i>šaga</i>	"edge"	<i>z</i> :	<i>zaxa</i>
<i>ši</i> :	<i>šida</i>	"spear"	<i>ž</i> :	<i>žada</i>

These developments highlight that distinctive shape which all Buryat dialects share in contrast to other Mongol languages, and which is already characteristic of Buryat in the eighteenth century.

Thus we know the starting and the ending points of these developments, but on the face of it the lack of earlier data might seem to preclude knowing when these developments occurred. The present paper addresses the problem of the chronology of these developments, and attempts to outline a research strategy that takes into account various kinds of later linguistic sources for Buryat whose utilization may partially compensate for the absence of earlier materials.

Several assumptions may be made in regard to these developments. The first is that there were intermediate stages between the starting and the ending points, specifically:

<i>s</i>	>	*θ	>	<i>h</i>
<i>si</i>	>	*ši	>	<i>š</i>
<i>č[ts]</i>	>	*c[ts]	>	<i>s</i>
<i>š[ds]</i>	>	*š[ds]	>	<i>z</i>
<i>či</i>	>	*cV	>	<i>š</i>
<i>ši</i>	>	*šV	>	<i>ž</i>

Evidence will be cited below that supports the intermediate states for *č* and *š*.

while the others are postulated on the basis of probable phonetic developments.

A second assumption that is made is that the developments of the affricates occurred in tandem; in other words, the changes which affected $\tilde{c}/\tilde{c}i$ affected $\tilde{j}/\tilde{j}i$ in the same way and at the same time. This assumption is based on the fact that these affricates begin and end with the same primary phonetic shapes (differing only in the secondary feature of voicing) and thus ought to have followed parallel developments.

Furthermore, it may be argued that at least some of these developments occurred in a certain order relative to one another, that is, that they may be arranged in a relative chronology: (1) $si > \tilde{s}$ occurred before $s > h$; otherwise, si would have become h as well ($*hara < *hira < sira$, rather than $\tilde{s}ara$); (2) $s > h$ occurred before $\tilde{c}/\tilde{j} > s/z$; otherwise, \tilde{c} would have become h as well ($*hahan < *sasan < \tilde{c}asan$, rather than $sahan$). Only if we suppose that $\tilde{c}/\tilde{j} > s/z$ was a conditioned change before vowels other than i can we postulate: (3) $\tilde{c}/\tilde{j} > s/z$ occurred before $\tilde{c}i/\tilde{j}i > \tilde{s}/\tilde{z}$; otherwise, $\tilde{c}i/\tilde{j}i$ would have become s/z as well ($*sono < *cono < \tilde{c}ono < \tilde{c}ino$, rather than $\tilde{s}ono$). The development $-s > -d$ cannot be ordered in this way, but in view of the existence of this development already in Middle Mongol (just as "i-breaking" and the contraction of disyllabics to long vowels in Buryat), it potentially existed as a feature of the Mongol dialect base from which Buryat evolved. Thus, preliminary to its further discussion below, $-s > -d$ may be placed at the beginning of this ordered arrangement.

As a consequence of these considerations, the Buryat treatments of s , \tilde{c} , and \tilde{j} may be arranged in the following relative chronology where (4) is divided into two stages for reasons that will be evident below:

- (1) $-s > -d$
- (2) $si > *si > \tilde{s}$
- (3) $s > *θ > h$
- (4a) $\tilde{c}/\tilde{j} > *c/j$
- (4b) $*c/\tilde{j} > s/z$
- (5) $\tilde{c}i/\tilde{j}i > *cV/\tilde{j}V > \tilde{s}/\tilde{z}$

For the evidence that might enable us to assign some of these changes to specific periods in time, we turn now to an examination of each of the linguistic sources of Buryat.

Written Mongol Among the Buryats

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries Lamaism was propagated by Oirat and Southern Mongol clergymen among the leading tribes of the Trans-Baikal area: the Khori Buryat who migrated there from the Sis-Baikal in the seventeenth century; the Mongols of the Selenga River area, essentially the Congol and Sartuul who were emigrants from Mongolia; and the Barguzin Buryat, originally Ekhirit Buryat from the Sis-Baikal, who began to settle the Barguzin area in the seventeenth century. One of the significant consequences of the spread of Lamaism among these tribes was the introduction and adoption of the Written Mongol literary language.

The first mention of the existence of this literary language among the Buryats is located in the *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (1692) of Nicolaes Witsen who remarked

Y *bičik* "decoration" ← M, WM *bičig* "writing," B *bešeg*; Y *Joγus* ~ *jayis* "suitability" ← M, WM *jokis*, B *zoxid*; Y *jiläi* "resin" ← M **jilei*, B *zeli*.¹⁹ Kažuzynski supposed that the two reflexes indicated that the Mongol loanwords entered Yaqut from different Mongol dialects; that, since Mongol *č/j* become sibilants *s/z/š/ž* only in Buryat, layer (a) must be the Buryat layer in Yaqut; and that the Buryat layer is the most recent.²⁰ According to this view, then Yaqut is a potential source for the linguistic history of Buryat.

However, it can be shown with some clarity that a different interpretation of the two reflexes of Mongol *č/j* must be correct. In the first place, the fact of intensive contact between predecessors of speakers of Buryat and Yaqut is indisputable. This is nowhere more evident than from the example of the designation of the "rainbow" in the two languages: B *ünegen šektete* and Y *sasi tktäbit*, literally "the fox pissed."²¹ Here the parallel expressions which employ native words imply a connection that is deeper than ordinary borrowing, namely, the common conceptualization of an atmospheric phenomenon. Because this conceptualization is unknown elsewhere in Siberia, it is possible to infer some period of community among peoples who later formed components of the Buryats and the Yaquts.²²

Even among the Mongol borrowings in Yaqut, it is possible to detect specifically Buryat loanwords: Y *järsin* "thin; book" ← B **čärsan* > *sarhan*, cf. WM *čayasun*, Middle Mongol *ča'alsun*, Kalmyk *cāsu*, Ordos *čāsu*, Khalkha *čas(an)*; Y *Jon* "people" ← B **Jon* > *zon*, a word that is not found in other Mongol languages.²³ These borrowings alone prove that layer (b) *č/j* → *č/j* is a Buryat layer in Yaqut.

The status of layer (a) *č/j* → *s* must be evaluated in light of the sound changes which affected the Turkic portion of the Yaqut lexicon. By the time of the compilation of Witsen's *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (1692), but undoubtedly several decades earlier, a small Yaqut word had been recorded that already reflected the major Yaqut sound changes, including the change *č/j* > *s* in all position. *Us* "3" < *üč*; *Suis* "face" < **čūs* < **jūn*; *Sili* "marrow" < **čili* < **jilik*.²⁴ The Mongol borrowings of layer (a) show precisely the same reflexes in Yaqut as do the native Turkic words, from which it may be inferred that layer (a) existed in Yaqut prior to the Yaqut sound change *č/j* > *s* and, of course, prior to the entrance of layer (b).²⁵

As a result of these considerations, it can be seen that layer (a) borrowings which, it goes without saying, are probably also to be attributed to those Mongol dialects which formed modern Buryat,²⁶ cannot be utilized as a source for the present problem since internal Yaqut developments served to "mask" the original phonetic shapes of the borrowed words. Layer (b) borrowings, which are demonstrably Buryat, cannot be assigned even an approximate absolute chronology due to the still obscure historical relationship between the Buryat and Yaqut peoples. On the positive side, however, it has been established that layer (b) reflects a stage of Buryat that existed prior to the operation of the sound changes which concern us here.

Buryat Loanwords in Evenki

Several dialects of Evenki, a Northern Tungus language, are spoken on the territory of modern Buryatia.²⁷ Of these, only the dialect of the Barguzin

Evenki has been described in any detail, from which it is clear that it contains a substantial number of words borrowed from Buryat.²⁸

One of these borrowings has immediate significance for the present problem. The name for the Russian Tsar in Barguzin Evenki is *čagān kǎn*, which represents Mongol *čayan qayan* "White Khan."³⁰ Since this term should not have come into existence prior to the first penetration into Buryatia by the Russians in the 1620s, we may infer from its presence in Barguzin Evenki that a form **čagān* existed in Buryat between the 1620s and that point in the period between the 1680s and the 1720s when a form **cagān* would have regularly developed in Buryat (see above under *Dialects*).

Written Mongol Elements in Buryat

Although it is probably true that the use of Written Mongol accompanied the introduction of Lamaism among the Buryats at the end of the seventeenth century, it is at least possible that Written Mongol was known in this area as early as the 1660s since Witsen's information noted above could have dated from this time. Over several centuries, Written Mongol cannot have failed to leave its impress on Buryat, especially in the lexicon where borrowed elements may be identified on the basis of their phonetic and semantic characteristics. As an example, B *el'gese-* "to sympathize with" must be borrowed from WM *eligese-* "id.," both because we should expect B **el'gehe-* and because this word is typical of literary, religious contexts. Indeed, many of the aberrant forms of Mongol words in Buryat, that is, those which seem to have defied regular sound changes, probably reflect borrowings from Written Mongol.

Such is the case, it may be argued, with B *tūbhen* "level, smooth; peaceful, calm," which corresponds to WM *tübsin* "id." Had this word developed regularly as a part of the Buryat lexicon, it would have undergone the sound change (2) *si* > *š* and ended up as B **tūbsen*. Rather, B *tūbhen* may be explained as a borrowing from WM *tübsin* that occurred after (2) *si* > *š* and before (3) *s* > *h*, since it shows the effect of the latter change. Because this borrowing could not have taken place prior to the introduction of Written Mongol, whose earliest possible attested date is the 1660s, and because the change (3) *s* > *h* is known to have existed in the 1720s (Fischer-Messerschmidt), we can establish two further facts of Buryat linguistic history: (1) the change (2) *si* > *š* demonstrably occurred before the change (3) *s* > *h*, as argued above; (2) the change (3) *s* > *h* occurred at some point between the 1660s and 1720s.

Russian Loanwords in Buryat

Due to the fact that they cannot antedate the period of first contacts in the 1620s, the Russian borrowings in Buryat may eventually prove to be one of the most important sources of Buryat linguistic history. The Russian element is devilishly difficult to investigate and no systematic effort to do so has been expended for the present paper. Here only one aspect of this question will be commented upon.

The Buryat sound change (1) *-s* > *-d* had certainly occurred by the 1720s, as it is reflected in the Fischer-Messerschmidt materials. Moreover, as Doerfer pointed out, the change is reflected in the name *Fedot*, which represents a

Buryat form of the Russian name *Feodosij* and which is attested in a Russian document from 1701.³¹ Furthermore, certain Russian loanwords in Buryat also have this reflex: *Rus'* → *orod* "Russian," *rož'* → *orōd* "rye" (Bokhan dial.), *peskar'* → *pedger* "gudgeon-fish; *gobio gobio*" (Mukhorshibir dial.).³² Barring mediation through Siberian Turkic languages, these words could not have been borrowed before the 1620s, so that one might suppose that the change *-s* > *-d* occurred after that time. However, several factors should be considered before reaching such a conclusion.

It was already noted above that the change *-s* > *-d* is attested in the Middle Mongol period and so could have existed in the dialect base of later Buryat.³³ More significantly, it may be posited that the change *-s* > *-d* in Buryat is morphophonemically determined, that is, that the phonetic structure of the Buryat word conforms to a constraint against the occurrence of final *-s* such that it automatically becomes *-d*. Support of this hypothesis may be found in the false back formations that occur in several Buryat dialects; e.g., Alar *bulāt* "steel" ~ *bulāhtyē* (Acc.) < **bulāsiyē* (WM *bolod* ← Persian *pūlād*), *pālāt-pālāhār* (Instr.) < **pālāsār* (← Russ. *plat*).³⁴ Such cases in which **s* > *h* appears in declined forms could not occur, did not Alar speakers sense that they belonged with cases as *ulāt* "people" ~ *ulāhā* (Gen.) < **ulāsā* (WM *ulus* ← Turkic *uluš*)--in other words, did they not sense that *t(d)* paradigmatically replaces *s* in final position.

Thus on the diachronic plane, the change (1) *-s* > *-d* probably occurred before the seventeenth century, while on the synchronic plane, the change *-s* > *-d* is a structural rule of Buryat that already existed in the seventeenth century.

Conclusions

On the basis of the preceding discussion, we may now attempt to assign an approximate absolute chronology to each of the sound changes which were aligned in a relative chronology above:

- (1) *-s* > *-d* occurred before the seventeenth century
- (2) *si* > *š* occurred before (3) (WM *tübsin* → B *tübhen*)
thus before some point in the period 1660s-1720s
- (3) *s* > *h* occurred at some point in the period 1660s-1720s
(WM *tübsin* → B *tübhen*)
- (4a) *č/j* > *c/j* occurred after the 1620s (B **čagān* → Barguzin Evenki *čagān*) and before (4b) (B **cō* → Congol *cō*), thus
before some point in the period 1680s-1720s
- (4b) *c/j* > *s/z* occurred at some point in the period 1680s-1720s
(B **cō* → Congol *cō*)
- (5) *či/ji* > *š/zš* occurred after (4) but before the 1720s (Messerschmidt)
thus toward the end of the period 1680s-1720s

It is significant that (1) and (2) are already attested in Middle Mongol sources and thus need not be peculiarly Buryat at all. The uniquely Buryat features (3)-(5), on the other hand, all occurred over the course of a century, from the 1620s to the 1720s, and are concentrated in the period from the 1660s

to the 1720s. Prior to this cluster of sound changes, then, the special character of Buryat phonology had not yet taken shape, so that the dialects spoken in the Sis-Baikal area differed but little from other dialects of the central Mongol group.

Notes

1. Throughout this paper, *s*, *š*, *ḡ*, are used for these sounds before vowels other than *i*, while *si*, *ši*, *ḡi*, are used for the latter environment. Abbreviations used are: WM = Written Mongol (F. D. Lessing, *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960), B = Buryat (K. M. Čeremisov, *Burjatsko-russkij slovar'*, Moscow 1973).

2. Only the second edition of 1705 is available to me; cf. Volume II, p. 668. Although Witsen spent three years in the Muscovy state (1664-1667), where he consulted many of the Russian sources which he used for this compilation, he also continued to receive information in Holland from his Russian correspondents, as well as from traveling Dutchmen, for the next thirty-five years--thus, it is not possible to date this mention precisely; cf. E. P. Zinner, *Sibir' v izvestijakh Zapadnoevropejskikh putešestvennikov i učenykh XVIII veka*, 1968, pp. 10-35.

3. The basic monograph on this subject is now C. B. Cydendambaev, *Burjatskie istoričeskie khroniki i rodoslovnye. Istoriko-lingvističeskoe issledovanie*, Ulan-Ude 1972 (cf. the review by Lajos Bese, *Acta Orient. Hung.* 31 (1977), pp. 391-394). Here may be found a complete survey of Buryat historical chronicles and genealogical tables, as well as an exhaustive examination of the language of such texts. Other groups of texts from this area include: grammatical treatises and dictionaries (e.g., cf. the remarks of P. B. Baldanzapov, *Jirūken-ū tolta-yin tayilburi. Mongol'skoe grammatičeskoe sočinenie XVIII veka*, Ulan-Ude 1962, pp. 16-17; also R. Ye. Pubaev, "The Tibeto-Mongolian dictionary compiled by the Aga Buryat, Galsan Jimba Tuguldorov, of the Khuatsai clan," *Mongolic Society Bulletin* 10:2 (1971), pp. 64-71); legal codes (cf. B. D. Cibikov, *Obyčnoe pravo selenginskikh burjat*, Ulan-Ude 1970) and official documents (cf. Cydendambaev, *op. cit.*, pp. 555-569; Rintchen, "À propos d'une pièce de chancellerie bouriate du XIX siècle," in *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics*, Tokyo 1970, pp. 500-504); popular and religious texts (cf. N. Poppe, "An essay in Mongolian on medicinal waters," *Asia Major* 6 (1957), pp. 99-105; *id.*, "A Buriat literary source of the XIX century on shamanism," in *Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques*, Paris 1972, pp. 109-113; *id.*, "Opisanie mongol'skikh 'šamanskikh' rukopisej Instituta vostokovedenija," *Zapiski Instituta vostokovedenija* I (1932), pp. 151-200), story cycles of Indian origin (cf. C. Damdinsuren, "Burjatskij pereskaz Ramajany," in *Issledovanija po vostočnoj filologii*, Moscow 1974, pp. 64-88; N. O. Sharakhshinova, "Les contes du cadavre ensorcelé chez les Bouriates," *Acta Orient. Hung.* 16 (1965), pp. 45-54; E. V. Barannikova, "Simvolika belogo cveta v burjatskikh volšebnykh skazkakh," in *Filologičeskie zapiski*, Leningrad 1973, pp. 103-118), and the very important Buryat copies of the Geser epic (cf. Rintchen, "En marge du culte de Guesser Khan en Mongolie," *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 60:4 (1958), 51 pp.; A. Ulanov, "Burjatskaja unginskaja versija 'Gesera,'" in *Trudy XXV. Meždunarodnogo Kongressa Vostokovedov*, III, Moscow 1963, pp. 252-257; C. B. Cydendambaev, "On the language of the Mongol and Buriat versions of the Geser epic," in *Mongolian Studies*, Budapest 1970, pp. 565-579; L. Lőrincz, "Geser-Varianten in Ulan-Ude, Ulan-Bator und Leningrad," *Acta Orient. Hung.* 25 (1972),

pp. 175-190; *id.*, "'Khurin Altaĵ' i 'Erensej,'" in *Issledovaniĵa po vostočnoj filologii*, Moscow 1974, pp. 119-125).

4. See my "Two eighteenth century Buryat glossaries," *Mongolian Studies* 3, (1976), pp. 53-82.

5. In my study cited in the previous note, I erred in stating (p. 57) that Fischer represented *s* by both *ś* and *sf*; rather, in German orthography, *ś* always represents *z* and *sf* always stands for *s* (*ss*). It is a pleasure to acknowledge that my honored teacher, Denis Sinor, brought this error to my attention.

6. Messerschmidt's *dsch* presumably represents *ǰ* (*dscheġen* "glutton, wolferine," WM *ġegeġen*, as against B *zġegen*; *dschebbġn* "trout," WM *ġebeġe* "Siberian salmon, lenok"), but then one must wonder why he should record *ǰ* where Buryat has *z* and *z* where Buryat has *ǰ*. This is not clear to me.

7. G. Doerfer, in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 64 (1969), cc. 506-507, on the basis of the Pallas glossary, had supposed that the Buryat changes of *s*, *š*, *ǰ*, occurred during the eighteenth century. G. Kara, "Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen," *Acta Orient. Hung.* 25 (1972), p. 433, accepts Doerfer's view but points out that these changes are already present in the Fischer glossary.

8. Cf. N. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* (Helsinki, 1955) [*Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 110], pp. 22-23; G. Sanġeev, *Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skikh jazykov*, I, Moscow 1953, pp. 42, 46-55; G. Doerfer, "Klassifikation und Verbreitung der mongolischen Sprachen," in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, V/2. *Mongolistik*, Leiden/Kġln 1964, pp. 42-43, 46-47; N. Poppe, "Die burġätischen Mundarten," *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 67 (1933), pp. 331-335; D. A. Alekseev, "Dialekty burġat-mongol'skogo jazyka," *Uġenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 1949, no. 98, pp. 161-202.

9. Cf. B. V. Matkheev, "Oġerki ekhirit-bulagatskogo govora," in *Issledovanie burġatskikh govorov*, II, Ulan-Ude 1968, pp. 3-46; M. P. Khomonov, "Bokhanskij govor," in *Issledovanie burġatskikh govorov*, I, Ulan-Ude 1965, pp. 35-70; E. R. Radnaev, "Barguzinskij govor," in *Issledovanie*, I, pp. 70-107; A. G. Mitroškina "Govor kaġugskikh (verkholenskikh) burġat," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 47-73; N. Poppe, *Alarskij govor*, I-II, Leningrad 1930-1931; I. D. Buraev, "Nekotorye fonetiġeskie osobennosti govora alaro-unginskikh burġat," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 117-135; C. B. Cydendambaev, "Kratkaja kharakteristika govora kudarinskikh burġat," *Kratkie soobšġeniĵa Instituta narodov Azii* 1964, no. 83, pp. 57-68; M. A. Castrġn, *Versuch einer burġätischen Sprachlehre nebst kurzem Wġrterverzeichnis*, ed. A. Schiefner, St. Petersburg 1857; G. D. Sanġeev, *Fonetiġeskie osobennosti govora nišneudinskikh burġat*, Leningrad 1930; D. A. Abašeev, "Tunkinskij govor," in *Issledovanie*, I, pp. 3-34; C. B. Cydendambaev, "K itogam ekspedicionnogo izuġeniĵa govorov dobajkal'skikh burġat," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 164-175.

10. Cf. A. D. Rudnev, *Khori-burġatskij govor*, I-III, St. Petersburg 1913-1914; L. Bese, "Contributions to the Khori-Buriat subdialect of Ivolġa," *Acta Orient. Hung.* 15 (1962), pp. 15-21; *id.*, "Ob affrikatakh khorinskogo dialekta," *Kratkie soobšġeniĵa Instituta narodov Azii* 1964, no. 83, pp. 46-48; N. Poppe, *Zameġki o govore aginskikh burġat*, Leningrad 1932; L. D. Šagdarov, "O nekotorykh jazykovyġ osobennostjakh tunguskikh i aginskikh burġat i stepeni ikh oġraženija v literaturnom jazyke," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 154-163.

11. Cf. N. Poppe, "Über einige Besonderheiten des Tsongol-Dialektes," *Zentralasiatische Studien* 5 (1971), pp. 145-155; I. D. Buraev, "Sartul'skij govor," in *Issledovanie*, I, pp. 108-150; C. B. Budaev, "Congol'skij govor," in

Issledovanie, I, pp. 151-186; C. B. Budaev, "Izmenenija v leksike i frazeologii mongol'skogo govora," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 136-153; N. Poppe, "Skizze der Phonetik des Burgu-Burjätischen," *Asia Major* 7 (1932), pp. 307-378.

12. Cf. W. Heissig, "A Mongolian source to the Lamaist suppression of shamanism in the seventeenth century," *Anthropos* 48 (1953), pp. 506-507; Poppe, "Über einige Besonderheiten des Tsongol-Dialektes," p. 145.

13. Cf. Poppe, *ibid.*, pp. 146-147.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

15. Cf. N. Poppe, *Grammatika burjat-mongol'skogo jazyka*, Moscow and Leningrad 1938, p. 181. The enclitic *sō*, which does not observe vowel harmony, should not be confused with the terminative suffix *.čaya*, found in Buryat dialects as *.sā/.sē/.sō/.sō*; cf. *ibid.*, p. 130, and Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, p. 206.

16. The etymology of *sō* is still somewhat problematic. Rudnev, *Khori-burjatskij govor*, I, pp. lx-lxi, communicated Ramstedt's opinion that *sō* derives from **dosō* from **dočō*, which is etymologically related to *dotona* 'inner, within, dotur 'inner.' G. J. Ramstedt, *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*, II, Helsinki, 1952 [*Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 104:2], pp. 52-53, derives B *sō* from **dočā*, parallel to Kalmyk *dotā* 'inner,' by a special development. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, pp. 206-207, says that *sō* 'is an abbreviation of *dosō* ~ *zosō* < **dočaya* ~ **dotaya* 'within,' cf. Mo. *dotoyadu* 'inner,' Kh. *dotōda* id., cf. the analogous form Mo. *yadayadu* 'outer,' Kh. *gadā* 'outside,' Bur. *gazā* id." Although *sō* ought to be an abbreviation of some form whose root is common to that of *dotona*, *dotura* and **dotaya* (Kalmyk!), it cannot have developed from **dočaya*, which could only have become Buryat **dočā* > **čā* > **sā*. Rather, *sō* is a regular development of **cō* < **čaya* < **dočaya*, and the latter form contains an element **-čū-* that is not otherwise noted in the derivational morphology of adverbials of this nature.

17. Some aspects of the Mongol loanwords in South Siberian Turkic have been treated in N. Poppe's "Über einige Vokalentsprechungen in mongolischen Lehnwörtern im Tuvinischen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 118 (1968), pp. 113-123, and "On some vowel correspondences in Mongolian loan words in Turkic," *Central Asiatic Journal* 13 (1969), pp. 207-214, while Hasan Eren, "Sibirya Türk Dillerinde Moğol Unsurlar," *Türk Dili Belleten* 14-15 (1950), pp. 35-43, merely extracts, without consequence, the Siberian etymologies of B.Ja. Vladimircov, "Tureckie elementy v mongol'skom jazyke," *Zapiski vostočnago otdelenija Imperatorskago Russkago arkheologičeskago obščestva* 20 (1910), pp. 153-184. The Buryat borrowings in the language of the Tofalars, a small group who live intermixed with the Buryats in the Oka area and who speak a language most closely related to Tuva and Tojji, have been studied by V. I. Rassadin, but these loanwords already show the modern state of Buryat; cf. "Burjatskie leksičeskije zaimstvovanija v tofalarskom jazyke," in *Issledovanie burjatskikh govorov*, II, pp. 187-191; see the same scholar's "O tjurkizmakh v burjatskom jazyke," in *K izučeniju burjatskogo jazyka*, Ulan-Ude 1969, pp. 129-134, and L. D. Sagdarov and V. I. Rassadin, "Ob upotreblenii tofalarami burjatskogo jazyka," in *Issledovanie*, II, pp. 176-186. The following contact studies are devoid of methodological value: A. A. Bulakaeva-Barannikova, "Sopostavitel'nye materialy po leksike sovremennogo tatarskogo i burjat-mongol'skogo jazykov," in *Sbornik trudov po filologii*, Ulan-Ude 1958, pp. 157-175; P. P. Baraškov, "O mongolo-burjatskikh i jakutskikh jazykovykh zvjazjakh," in *ibid.*, pp. 176-206; A. A. Bulakaeva-Barannikova, "Obščie slova v leksike sovremennogo kirgizskogo i burjatskogo jazykov," *Učenyje zapiski Burjatskogo*

gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo Instituta imena D. Banzarova 16 (1958), pp. 113-143; *id.*, "Turecko-burjatskie jazykovye paralleli," *ibid.* 23 (1961), pp. 237-266.

18. *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*, Warsaw 1962 [Prace Orientalistyczne 10].

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-48.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 123-126.

21. I. A. Podgorbunskij, *Russko-mongolo-burjatskij slovar'*, Irkutsk 1909, p. 257; E. K. Pekarskij, *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka*, I, St. Petersburg 1907, p. 911.

22. This is hardly the place to broach the complex problem of the southern origin of the Yakuts which, since the fundamental researches of A. P. Okladnikov *Yakutia Before its Incorporation into the Russian State*, Montreal and London 1970 [Anthropology of the North: Translations from Russian Sources, 8], has been localized in the Sis-Baikal region where the Buryats evolved, and where the Mongol-Yaqut contacts presumably occurred prior to the northern migration of the Yakuts. Nonetheless, I should like to recall two facts that somewhat obscure this picture. First, on the basis of his study of the geographical and demographic distribution of Siberian peoples in the seventeenth century, B. O. Dolgikh, *Rodovoj i plemennoj sostav narodov Sibiri v XVII veke*, Moscow 1960, was able to complete a map (between pp. 614 and 615) which shows a group of "Korintsy" (= Khori) and "Daury" settled in the region northeast of Yakutsk. This important proof of probably Mongol elements co-existing with the Yakuts as late as the seventeenth century was first pointed out by G. Kara, "Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen," p. 432. Second, it may be recalled that one of the components of the Yaqut people were the Khoro who, according to Yaqut legends, spoke in the special *xoro tila* "Khori language"; cf. G. U. Ergis, *Istoričeskie predanija i rasskazy jakutov*, I, Moscow and Leningrad 1960, pp. 18, 100-103, 244-245, 298. This suggests the presence in the north of a Mongol-speaking people, specifically the Khori who also took part in the formation of the Buryats, over an indeterminable period prior to and perhaps during the seventeenth century.

23. These examples are cited by G. Doerfer in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 58 (1963), c. 506; cf. Kažužnyški, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125.

24. Cf. Kara, "Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen," and note 2 above.

25. That layer (a) is older than layer (b) was already the conclusion reached by N. Poppe, "Das Jakutische," *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I, Wiesbaden 1959, p. 683, and accepted by Kara, "Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen," p. 434.

26. On the essentially Buryat character of both layers of loanwords in Yaqut I agree with Doerfer, in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 58 (1963), cc. 506-507, although my conclusions concerning the chronology of Buryat sound changes differ from his.

27. Cf. the recent sketch of A. S. Šubin, *Kratkij očerk etničeskoj istorii evenkov Zabajkal'ja (XVII-XX vv.)*, Ulan-Ude 1973.

28. Cf. N. Poppe, *Materialy dlja issledovanija tungusskogo jazyka. Narečie barguzinskikh tungusov*, Leningrad 1927; W. Kotwicz, "Le dialecte tongous de Bargouzine (matériaux recueillis par D. Rinčino)," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 16 (1950), pp. 315-326; the work of V. A. Gorcevskaia, *Kharakteristika govora barguzinskikh evenkov*, Moscow and Leningrad 1936, is based solely on the materials of Poppe.

29. This example was brought to my attention by Professor Poppe during his

comments on my paper at the Bellingham conference, for which I wish to express my gratitude at this time. To my regret, I have not otherwise investigated the Buryat loanwords in Evenki.

30. Cf. Poppe, *Materialy dlja issledovanija tungusskogo jazyka*, p. 59.

31. Cf. Doerfer, *Oriens* 18-19 (1965-1966), p. 434; G. N. Rumjancev and S. B. Okun', *Sbornik dokumentov po istorii Burjatii. XVII vek*, I, Ulan-Ude 1960, p.

422. Both Sanžeev, *Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skikh jazykov*, I, p. 9, and Doerfer, in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 58 (1963), c. 506, interpret the Mongol data in such Russian documents as Buryat. In the light of my new conclusions concerning the chronology of Buryat sound changes, I am inclined to accept their view as the most probable, but have not yet examined this material in detail; cf. my "Two eighteenth century Buryat glossaries," p. 61 [on p. 82, n. 33, I have wrongly criticized a statement of Sanžeev, which I simply misconstrued!]; also cf. the view of Kara, "Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen," p. 433.

32. Cf. M. P. Khomonov, "Bokhanskij govor," in *Issledovanie*, I, p. 64; T. A. Bertagaev, *K issledovaniju leksiki mongol'skikh jazykov*, Ulan-Ude 1961, p. 77 [nūrai pedger "a fish of the carp species, a karas'-fish," but see G. U. Lindberg and A. S. Gerd, *Slovar' nazvanij presnovodnykh ryb SSSR*, Leningrad 1972, pp. 157-159, for this species].

33. Cf. my remarks in *Mongolian Studies* 3 (1976), pp. 123-125, and in "Turkic loanwords in Mongol, I. The treatment of non-initial s, z, š, č," *Central Asiatic Journal* 23 (1979), in press.

34. Cf. Poppe, *Alarskij govor*, p. 25.