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 $s$, $\tilde{s}$, and $\tilde{j}$:¹

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:

\[ s > *\tilde{g} > \tilde{h} \]
\[ si > *\tilde{gi} > \tilde{s} \]
\[ \tilde{s}[t\tilde{g}] > *o[ts] > s \]
\[ \tilde{j}[\tilde{dz}] > *j[dz] > z \]
\[ \tilde{ci} > *\tilde{c}v > \tilde{s} \]
\[ \tilde{ji} > *\tilde{j}v > \tilde{s} \]

Evidence will be cited below that supports the intermediate states for $\tilde{s}$ and $\tilde{j}$.
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 ԗ/ԡi affected ԕ/Ԥi 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) ʃi > ʃ occurred before ʃ > ʰ; otherwise, ʃi would have become ʰ as well (*hara < *hira < sira, rather than ʰara); (2) ʃ > ʰ occurred before ʃ/ʃi > ʃ/ʃ; otherwise, ʃ would have become ʰ as well (*hānan < sasan < ʃasan, rather than sāhan). Only if we suppose that ʃ/ʃi > ʃ/ʃ occurred before *s > ʰ, would ʃ have become ʰ as well (*sara). Otherwise, (2) *s > ʰ occurred before *ʃ > ʃ; otherwise, *ʃi would have become ʃ as well (*hahar < *sasar < *oasun, rather than sdhar). Only if we suppose that *s > ʃ was a conditioned change before vowels other than ʃ can we postulate: (3) ʃ/ʃi > ʃ/ʃ occurred before ʃ/ʃi > ʃ/ʃ; otherwise, ʃ/ʃi would have become ʃ as well (*sono < *sono < *sino < ʃino, rather than ʃono). 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 disyllables 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 ʃ, ʃi, and ʃ may be arranged in the following relative chronology where (h) is divided into two stages for reasons that will be evident below:

(1) -s > -d
(2) ʃi > *ʃi > ʃ
(3) ʃ > *ʃ > ʰ
(4a) ʃ/ʃi > *ʃ/ʃ
(4b) *ʃ/ʃi > ʃ/ʃ
(5) ʃi/ʃi > *ʃvʃv > ʃ/ʃ

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
that "the Bratsi have a special writing, although few of them know how to read." A number of texts in this "special writing" (i.e., Written Mongol) have been edited or studied, from which it is evident that many manuscripts reflect Buryat phonetic shapes, grammatical forms, and lexica, that appear at the indiscretion of their scribes, in the otherwise Classical literary language in which they were written. While the importance of this body of texts for aspects of later Buryat linguistic history is incontestable, it is the case that no manuscript datable to before the late eighteenth century has yet come to light, so that this source cannot be utilized for the present problem.

Early Western Recordings

It was noted above that Buryat had developed in most respects its characteristic modern shape by the eighteenth century. Our witness to this consists of some stray recordings made in 1723 by Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt and of several glossaries passed on in the compilations of Johann Eberhard Fischer (ca. 1730) and Peter Simon Pallas (1786-1789). Of these, the Fischer glossary is especially important as it reflects in a relatively systematic fashion a Western Buryat dialect that is unambiguous in regard to most of the developments which concern us: (1) \( s > d \), cf. F *totoko* "clay," B *todxo* "a fine dust," WM *toyosaq* "brick"; (2) \( s > f \), cf. F *shara* "yellow," B *sara,* WM *sira*; (3) \( s > h \), cf. F *chakal* "beard," B *haxal,* WM *saqal*; (4) \( s/f > s/s \), cf. F *sfagun* "snow," B *sahan,* WM *casun*; (5) \( s > h \), cf. F *chakal* "beard," B *haxal,* WM *saqal*; (6) \( ci/ji > z \), cf. F *ci/ji* and Messerschmidt reflects the change \( > s \) (schomo* "wolf," B *kono,* WM *hino; gusohn* "30," B *gusan,* WM *hino*), while for \( j \) it may be that Messerschmidt’s spelling *ds* represents \( s \) (dsheron "60," B *karon,* WM *firan; nadshir* "summer," B *nazar* < *najir*). Taken together, then, Fischer's and Messerschmidt's recordings establish that the major sound changes characteristic of all modern Buryat dialects were already in existence in the Western Buryat dialect area in the 1720s.

Dialects

Although numerous problems and issues in Buryat dialectology remain unresolved, we are in possession of basic monographs describing the major dialects. Without violating general views toward their classification, Buryat dialects may be divided into the following groups:

I. Western: Ekhirit and Bulagat, with Bokhan and Barguzin (where \( z > y \), cf. *jiruya* "ambler" > *yorö* > *yorö*), Alar, Kudara, Nizhne-Udinsk, Tunka, etc.;

II. Eastern: Khori, which is the basis of the literary language, with Aga, Ivolga, and other sub-dialects;

III. Southern: Selenga, consisting of Congol and Sartuul; Bargu.

One might suppose that those dialects which have participated in all the major Buryat changes, and which are spoken by ethnic groups who are core components of the present Buryat people, would be those dialects most pertinent to problems of the historical development of Buryat. However, it is the case that the Congol dialect, which linguistically stands closest to Khalkha, provides us with a key to the solution of the chronology of one of the Buryat changes.

An important aspect of Congol is that it is spoken by people whose movement out of Mongolia into the Selenga region may be dated with some precision. It
is known, both from Russian administrative documents and from historical chronicles composed by the Selenga Buryats that the Congol clans migrated into the Selenga area in the contact zone with the Buryat language in the 1680s, largely as the result of the war between the Oirat prince Galdan Bušugtu and the Khalkha prince Sayin Khan. Another important facet of Congol is that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it belonged to the Khalkha dialect group according to features which it still retains: (1) s remains s in Congol, Khalkha sara "moon," but B hara; (2) c/j become c/j in C, Kh cever "clean, pure," but B seber, and C, Kh jujän "thick," but B nusan; (3) õi/ji remain in C, Kh õono "wolf," but B õono, and C, Kh joru "ambler," but B jorö. The Buryat influence on Congol shows up in certain phonetic details (-s > -d), and more pronouncedly in the lexicon.

One element of the latter kind of influence is the postposition—perhaps better described as an enclitic--cdd, which has in Congol an inessive-illative function meaning "in, within", e.g., C gercd "within the house." This enclitic, in the form sdd and with the same function, is found in all Buryat dialects, but in no other Mongol language. Consequently, its appearance in Congol may unequivocally be interpreted as a borrowing from Buryat. Moreover, on the basis of the initials of cdd and sdd, the immediately preceding form *cdd may be postulated.

What makes the Congol reflex of this enclitic so significant is that its adoption from Buryat can be dated to the period after the 1680s when the Congols moved into contact with Buryat. Congol cdd cannot have been borrowed from Buryat sdd, that is, after the latter had undergone the change õ > s, because in that case Congol would have the form sdd, since Congol had and has the phoneme s. Nor should it have been borrowed from the reconstructed Buryat *cdd at a stage before Buryat had made the change õ > s, because in that case Congol would have the form cdd, as the phoneme õ has always existed in Congol.

Therefore, the only possible inference to be drawn from Congol cdd is that it was borrowed from Buryat *cdd. With this we are in a position to establish two facts of Buryat linguistic history: (1) the intermediate stage õ > c/j, which was postulated as (4a) above, was a reality in the Buryat dialect area at some point after the 1680s (Congol-Buryat contact) and before the 1720s (Fischer-Messerschmidt); (2) the sound change (4b) c/j > s/s occurred between the 1680s and the 1720s, since its starting point is entailed by the Congol reflex cdd and its ending point is attested in the Fischer-Messerschmidt recordings.

The Buryat Element in Yaqut

Among the problems connected with the Mongol elements in Siberian Turkic languages, none is more pertinent to the present theme than the Mongol borrowings in Yaqut, at least one layer of which was thought to be of Buryat origin by the chief investigator of this question, S. Kažuyński. The Mongol loanwords in Yaqut display two reflexes of Mongol c/j:

(a) õ > s; cf. Y sugulân "assembly" ← M, WM sugilân, B suglân; Y starja -sirja "sled" ← M, WM starja, B sarga; Y sîykî "cream" ← M, WM jogeke, B dîsîsî;
(b) c/j → c/j; cf. Y oycîlîan "lightning" ← M, WM ëakîlîan, B wqîlîgan;
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Y biţik "decoration" ← M, WM biţig "writing," B bešeg; Y jɔyus ~ jayus "suitability" ← M, WM ʃokis, B zovid; Y ʃilâi "resin" ← M *ʃilei, B nêll. 19

Kažużyński supposed that the two reflexes indicated that the Mongol loanwords entered Yaqut from different Mongol dialects; that, since Mongol ġ/ʃ become sibilants ʃ/z/ʃ/ʃ 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 ġ/ʃ 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 ʃekêtête and Y saeil ʃketibit, 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 ʃârsän "thin; book" ← B *ʃârsan > sarkin, cf. WM ʃâvasun, Middle Mongol ʃa'alsun, Kalmyk ʃãszj, Ordos ʃasu, Khalkha ʃâšlan; Y ʃon "people" ← B *ʃon > zon, a word that is not found in other Mongol languages. 23 These borrowings alone prove that layer (b) ʃ/ʃ —> ʒ is a Buryat layer in Yaqut.

The status of layer (a) ʃ/ʃ —> 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 ʃ/ʃ —> s in all positions: Us "ʃ" < ʃũ; Suis "face" < *ʃus < *ʃũ; Sili "marrow" < *ʃili < *ʃilik. 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 ʃ/ʃ —> 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.29 The name for the Russian Tsar in Barguzin Evenki is čagan khan, 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'gesė- "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 tubhēn "level, smooth; peaceful, calm," which corresponds to WM tubsin "id." Had this word developed regularly as a part of the Buryat lexicon, it would have undergone the sound change (2) sī > ū and ended up as B *tubšēn. Rather, B tubhēn may be explained as a borrowing from WM tubsin that occurred after (2) sī > ū and before (3) s > ē, 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 > ē is known to have existed in the 1720s (Fischer-Messerschmidt), we can establish two further facts of Buryat linguistic history: (1) the change (2) sī > ū demonstrably occurred before the change (3) s > ē, as argued above; (2) the change (3) s > ē 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. Furthermore, certain Russian loanwords in Buryat also have this reflex: Rus' —> orod "Russian," rozh —> orød "rye" (Bokhan dial.), peskar' —> pedger "gudgeon-fish; gobio gobio" (Mukhorsibir dial.). 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. 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 bulät "steel" ~ buláhiye (Acc.) < *bulsäyiye (WM bolod ← Persian pulād), pälät ~ pälähär (Instr.) < *päläsär ← Russ. plat). Such cases in which *s > h appears in declined forms could not occur, did not Alar speakers sense that they belonged with cases as utät "people" ~ ulzä (Gen.) < *uläsä (WM ulus ← Turkic uluū)—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 > ʰ occurred before (3) (WM tübsin → B tūbhen)
   thus before some point in the period 1660s-1720s
3. s > h occurred at some point in the period 1660s-1720s
   (WM tübsin → B tūbhen)
4a. ĺ/y > c/j occurred after the 1620s (B *dagān → Barguzin Evenki ḏagān) and before (4b) (B *oǭ → Congol oǭ), thus before some point in the period 1680s-1720s
4b. c/j > s/z occurred at some point in the period 1680s-1720s
   (B *oǭ → Congol oǭ)
5. ċ/i/ū > ġ/z 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, ə, ɔ, ɔ̆, ʃ, j, are used for these sounds before vowels other than i, while ei, øi, ʃi, 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, Siberi v isvestijakh Zapadnoevropejskix putešestvnikov i učenykh XVIII veka, 1968, pp. 10-35.

pp. 175-190; id., "'Khurin Altaj' i 'Erensej,'" in Issledovanija po vostochnoj filologii, Moscow 1974, pp. 119-125).


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

6. Messerschmidt's dsahe presumably represents j (dsahgen "glutton, wolverine," WM jegegen, as against B zegen; dsahebbön "trout," WM jebege "Siberian salmon, lenok"), but then one must wonder why he should record j where Buryat has s and z where Buryat has s. 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, z, j, 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.
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15. Cf. N. Poppe, Grammatika burjat-mongolskogo jazyka, Moscow and Leningrad 1938, p. 181. The enclitic so, which does not observe vowel harmony, should not be confused with the terminative suffix .saya, found in Buryat dialects as .slo/.slo/.slo/.slo; cf. ibid., p. 130, and Poppe, Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies, p. 206.

16. The etymology of so is still somewhat problematic. Rudnev, Khori-burjatskij govor, I, pp. lx-1x, communicated Ramstedt's opinion that so derives from *dosd from "*docd, 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 104:21, pp. 52-53, derives B so from *dosd, parallel to Kalmyk dotä "inner," by a special development. Poppe, Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies, pp. 206-207, says that so "is an abbreviation of dosd ~ rosd < *docaya ~ *dotaya 'within,' cf. Mo. dotoyadu 'inner,' Kh. dotëda id., cf. the analogous form Mo. yadayadu 'outside,' Bur. gasdä id." Although so ought to be an abbreviation of some form whose root is common to that of dotona, dotuva and *dotaya (Kalmyk!), it cannot have developed from *docaya, which could only have become Buryat *dosd > *sä > *sä. Rather, so is a regular development of *sö < *suya < *søva, and the latter form contains an element *-s- that is not otherwise noted in the derivational morphology of adverbials of this nature.


22. This is hardly the place to broach the complex problem of the southern origin of the Yaquts 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, 81], 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 Yaquts. 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 Yaquts as late as the seventeenth century was first pointed out by G. Kara, "Le glosaire 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 t'la "Khori language"; cf. G. U. Ergis, Istoriščeskie 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. Kažužynski, op. cit., pp. 124–125.
25. That layer (a) is older than layer (b) was already the conclusion reached by N. Poppe, "Das Jakutische," Philologiae Turciæe Fundamenta, I, Wiesbaden 1959, p. 683, and accepted by Kara, "Le glosaire 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.
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.


