

On the mixed character of the Old Turkic literary language of the 7th–8th centuries

I.V. Kormushin

(*Moscow*)

(The research is supported by RFBR grant, No 19-012-00161)

Igor Valentinovich Kormushin – PhD, Professor, Chief research fellow, Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences; e-mail: igorkormushin@yandex.ru.

Orkhon runiform monuments and the beginning of the literary work of Turkic peoples.

At the beginning of acquaintance with the Orkhon runiform monuments devoted to Kul Tigin and Bilgä Qaghan the scientists couldn't stop admiring the perfection, precision of means of expression used in these imperial epitaphs. That is, these monuments were the very first fixation of ancient Turkic speech used at the period of decryption of runiform script in the 1890's performed by V. Thomsen [Thomsen 1893] and V.V. Radloff in his early attempts in translation of runiform monuments [Radloff 1894]. It seemed that before the Orkhon inscriptions of the 730's there were no texts created in the Turkic language, but already in 732 and 735 AD the two masterpieces have appeared. Moreover, a few years later some other marvellous inscriptions were discovered, and then read. Some of them were of such years of creation, that let the scientists redate the beginning of Turkic written history to an earlier period, i.e., from the 730's to the first decade of the 8th century, besides all, the monument in honour of Tonyukuk (circa 716 AD). And then, even nowadays, the beginning of Turkic written history was dated as the end of the 7th century. A new, more careful analysis of the Choyren inscription made by S.G. Klyashtorny also lead to this change in the age dating [Klyashtorny 1969; Klyashtorny 1971].

Although the first publication of the mentioned inscription was made by S.Ye. Malov in 1936 [Malov 1936], a great specialist in the field of Turkic runology, it was not decrypted correctly. That's because of incorrectness of those images (photographs) and sketches made by S.Ye. Malov's Mongolian counterparts, for more information (cf. [Kormushin 2011]). A new reading of Choyren by S.G. Klyashtorny unpredictably has made its dating older (even compared to Tonyukuk) because of recognition of the name of Ilterish Qaghan (680–691 AD). Then, S.G. Klyashtorny linked the events described on the monument located near the Northern border of the Gobi Desert with the war in this part of the country in 688–691 AD. Conception of the other lines by S.G. Klyashtorny and other scholars who attempted to reread the monument in their own way are absolutely different from what is done by myself. All arguments on discrepancies in reading and interpretation of text of

the Choyren (Choiren) inscription between the authors (including me) – S.Ye. Malov (1936), S.G. Klyashtorny (1969; 1971), O.F. Sertkaya (1996), F.S. Barutchu Özönder (2006), K. Suzuki (2009), I.V. Kormushin (2011) – I set out in a comparative table (who and how is reading the lines and parts of them) and commentaries to it [Kormushin 2011: 205–212].

But the main historical aim even after this, quite acceptable redating of the beginning of Turkic written activity (732 AD, 735 AD → 716 AD → 688–691 AD) remains unchanged: during the period, that preceded the Second Western Turkic Khaganate (682–744 AD), i.e. beginning with the moment of victory of Turks over the Rourans in 552 AD and existence of the First Turkic Khaganate until its separation into Western and Eastern in 603 AD, and also at the time of dependence of the Turks on China (603 AD–677–688 AD) there were no literary works in any Turkic language or dialect.

The discovery of Rouran (Mongolic) inscriptions in Brāhmī script related to the Turks of the First Khaganate. The statement on absence of any inscriptions in any type of script in any Turkic language hasn't changed mainly even after the discovery made by a group of scientists, who presented ancient inscriptions, even older than the Orkhon ones, inscriptions of the First Turkic Khaganate of the end of the 6th–the very beginning of the 7th centuries in an unpredicted language style. We are talking about two stelas – containing inscriptions – the Bugut and Khüis-Tolghoi stelas.

The first of them – the Bugut stela was found in 1956 near the town of Bugut in the Arkhangai Aimag by Ts. Dorjsüren, a Mongolian archaeologist and was read and interpreted in many aspects for the first time by V.A. Livshits and S.G. Klyashtorny in 1971–1972 [Livšic, Kljaštorny 1971; Kljaštorny, Livšic 1972]. As things turned out, on the three sides of the Bugut stela, with height near 2 meters, width near 70 cm, and thickness near 20 cm we can found only traces (ends) of circa 30 lines of the text (19–20 lines on the wide face, signed as B II by the authors, and 5 or 6 lines on two other, narrow faces, respectively B I and B III), written in Sogdian cursive script in Sogdian, but related to the First Khaganate, i.e., it is Turkic by content criteria. On the fourth face (the second of the two wide faces), as it was written by scholars, “...one can distinguish the traces of more than 20 lines of inscription, written, as it seems, in ideographic characters. The text suffered notably because of weathering. In the museum the stela lies on the B IV face, and that made the condition of the inscription even worse.” – and, as if they were anticipating their conception about the “ideographicity” of this part of the text, the authors are writing later: “The accurate determination of stela’s script and language will become possible only after a thoroughly performed cleaning of the B IV face and taking of new photographs and procedure of stamping” [Livšic, Kljaštorny 1971: 121, 123].

The second stela, almost identical to the first one both in its size (154 x 41 x 12–15 cm), and, as we see, in its script and language on the B IV face of the Bugut

monument, and also in its content – related to the period of the First Turkic Khaganate. This stela was found by D. Navan, an archaeologist, on the left bank of the Tuul (also: Tula, Tola) river, near the town of Khüis Tolgoi, near Tsetserleg, the administrative centre of the Bulgan aimag, over a distance of circa 400 km west of Ulaanbaatar, i.e., on the same longitude, as the Orkhon monuments. After a series of fact-finding visits and publication of articles in 2005–2010, the group of scientists, including Dieter Maue, Alexander Vovin, Étienne de la Vaissière, and Mehmet Ölmez made a united expedition in 2014 to both these monuments. The group of linguists was supported by a technical staff from Mainz University of Applied Sciences, which had a task to take the best possible 3D photographs. It is possible that by the time of expedition the team had already known about the discovery of Alexander Vovin on Mongolic essence of Brāhmī inscriptions of the Khüis Tolgoi stela. Although the conclusion, that the inscription on one of the wide faces (B III) of the Bugut stela (as the already read by A. Vovin inscription of Khüis Tolgoi) is non-Sogdian and written in Brāhmī and in the same – Rouran (of Mongolic type) – language led scientist to think more seriously on this *coincidence*. And it is possible to accept the main inference from this coincidence: we may speak about “the Mongolian language...”, that “was and official language of the First Turkic Khaganate, and that justifies the fact of absence of Old Turkic inscriptions before the Second Khaganate” [Vovin 2019: 121]. So, one can add those fact that the main part of the Bugut stela was written in the Sogdian language, which was obviously one of the main languages of Buddhism in territories westward of India. Thus, the Turks of Bugut and Khüis Tolgoi period – the second part of the 6th century – most likely had two written languages – the Sogdian and the Rouran. It is possible to adapt the interpretation of the Chinese transcription of the name of Turks – **türküt*, which was recognized by P. Pelliot as a Mongolian plural form (-üt) [Pelliot 1915: 687–688] (practically identical to the modern Mongolian word *Turkuud* ‘the Turks’). Perhaps, it will be better to refuse the proposal of S.G. Klyashtorny on the Sogdian origin of -*t* plural marker [Klyashtorny 2003: 91].

But we can insist that the use of both these languages – Sogdian and Rouran – as mediums of official declarations – shows us the fact that the Turks didn’t find their own language a well-advanced tool for that mission. I.e., there was no available literary mother tongue, comparable with two mentioned non-Turkic idioms. But why and how such an advanced and brilliant in its expressive means – the language of the Orkhon runiform inscriptions – appears just in 80 years (or a little bit more) time, in the Second Western Turkic Khaganate, among the relatives and heirs of Turks of the First Khaganate?

From the point of view of the author of these lines, an acceptable explanation of this phenomenon could be connected with two independent but closely related problems: i) the origins of the Old Turkic literary koiné; ii) the origins of Old Turkic runiform script. In this article I will concentrate my attention on some new approaches to

handling the first problem. It is based on a more detailed research of a question on influence of different Turkic dialects on the creation of the written literary Turkic koiné of the 7th–8th centuries. And what is the thing of the same importance: in what proportion? To solve the problem one should refer to linguistic and – at least – historical and political situation in the region, where once appeared and still remain preserved inscriptions – Brāhmī and Rouran from the point of linguistics and script, but entirely Turkic in their sense and content, as well as some purely Turkic inscriptions, written in runiform characters.

Historical and geographical circumstances of coexistence and strife of Turkic and Mongolic tribes from the 4th century AD until the first part of the 9th century AD in Middle-Western Mongolia.

Before their victory over the Rourans the Turks were their tributaries, near after 460 AD, when they were brought under control of Rourans and then were resettled by them in Southern Altai subregion. Here, generation by generation, they practised smelting of metals, but yet not for the Rourans. In Altai region they had changed their previous tribal name *Ashna* to *Türk*, reserving the former for the dynastic name of the ruling clan [Kljaštorny 2005: 154–157].

The Rouran state was founded in 330 AD, but became stronger in organization and political aspect only under Shelun, who had introduced into the social classification of Mongolic and Turkic peoples a new term for their Supreme Sovereign – the Khagan, or Qaghan (in 402 AD).

It was considered in science, that the Rourans have not created any monuments in their Mongolic dialect. After the discovery of inscriptions – and what's notable – inscriptions **made by the Turks** in Rouran, dated between 574 to 601 AD or a little bit later in both cases – i.e., at any rate **after** the victory above the Rourans and cessation of their state in 555 AD – considering such a gap in chronology (552 ← 571, 601 AD), it is hard to imagine that the Turks could use – use without any reason – a language of the beaten enemy, extinct in a short time after being at the top of the historical hill. Furthermore, until the entire Rouran inscriptions will not be found, the question of existence of a literary language at the times of their state (second part of the 4th – first part of the 6th century AD) won't be solved completely. But, logically thinking, the written form of language should have been existed. It is just impossibility to write a serious text in a language, which doesn't have any written tradition or even practice – that's it. And this statement also relates to the Rouran versions of Bugut and Khüis Tolgoi. Thus, we should find some unknown Rouran monuments. It is likely that the factor of the chronological distance of Turkic inscriptions from a far earlier epoqe (after the disappearance of the Rouran Khaganate) gives us a possibility to propose that the Rouran language itself had accumulated cultural capability, which have been used by the Turks until the certain time.

A challenging alliance with Toquz Oghuz during the period of Restauration of the Eastern Turkic Khaganate at the end of the 7th century. Brāhmī-Rouran by its script and language and Turkic by its content inscription on the stelae, on which we are talking about, were found (i.e., were reared at the certain moment) on the territory of the Khangai Mountains (in Mongolian; in Turkic: Ötükän Jış ‘the Ötükän Rabble’). During the 4th and till the first half of the 6th century the dominating power here were the Rourans. Before them these territories were occupied by the Uighur-speaking Toquz Oghuzs (*Tele* in Chinese), who also settled there at the Rouran time, and also, more recently, during the Turkic Khaganate period. It should be a verisimilar proposal, that the Turks are described in preserved lines of the third line of the Northern face of the Selenga inscription in honour of Moyan-chor (also: Moyun-chur): (3)...nta q(a)lm(i)šī bod(u)n on uyxur t(o)q(u)z ox(u)z üzä yüz y(i)l ol(u)r(i)p ... ‘those, who rested [there], ruled upon the peoples of Ten Uighur and Nine Oghuz during a hundred of years’. I.e., from the time of foundation of the Turkic Khaganate in 552 AD till the downfall of the First Eastern Turkic Khaganate and capture of the Turks by Chinese in 630 AD.

If it was mentioned about “one of the ruling clans in the confederation of Tiele tribes” in this part of the Selenga inscription, as supported L.Yu. Tugusheva [2008: 102, note 159], it wouldn’t be acceptable to mention the “State of Turks”: (4) ...türük ilinā altı otuz yaşıma id(u)qu[t]... ‘at the age of mine – 26 years [I became] an Ydyqut (the Ruler of the Uighur tribes) in the State of Turks’. Since Moyan-chor, mentioned in the Selenga inscription, succeeded to the throne in 747 AD, after his father’s death and just three years after the victory of Uighurs upon the Turks, and he lived until 759 AD, so, his 26th birthday should have happened even earlier, than 744 AD. In that case everything will fit in our hypothesis: it goes without saying that he was promoted to his high title under the Turks.

If only the claim of Tonyukuk is right, it was him who lead the Turks of the Second Khaganate from their scarce inhabitation near the Southern border of the Gobi Desert, where the Black Sand (Qara Qum) meets with the Yinshan mountains (Čogaj Jış), on the territory of modern Inner Mongolia (contemporary autonomous region of China) – to the land of Ötüken. It became possible because of a pre-emptive war of the Turks against the Toquz Oghuzs near 688–689 AD under the command of Tonyukuk and with the approval of Ilterish Khagan (Ton 15). A 2, 000 army of the Turks routed the superior forces of the Oghuzs (Ton 16). The vanquishers remained on the land of Ötüken Rabble, near Orkhon. The Oghuzs, who lived a bit more eastwardly, on the river Tola (Toyla), “all came” (Ton 16), i.e., they had to submit. So, the Turks of the Second Eastern Khaganate, as earlier the Turks of the First (the great, common for both of parts) Khaganate, and even earlier the Rourans not only subdued, but also ejected the Toquz Oghuzs. The Uighur-speaking tribes are likely to be the indigenous inhabitants of those happy places. Under the command of the Sir tribe (Xueyantuo in Chinese) occupied the territories of Selenga, Tola and

Orkhon river basins during the epoqe after the downfall of the First Eastern Turkic Khaganate in 630 AD. [Tuguševa 2008: 102, note 161].

Thus, at the very end of the 7th century, after the renovation of the Eastern Turkic Khaganate the circumstances lead to the vicinity of the Turks and the Uighur-speaking Toquz Oghuzs and their coexistence (but not of the free will of the last ones) in the rehabilitated Eastern Turkic Khaganate. It was the key not only for their military interaction, which was taking place under the pressure of the Turks, but also for mutual enrichment in the field of culture and language. It seems to be very typical, that the first monuments of the Second Eastern-Turkic Khaganate were created already under Ilterish Khagan, at the same time with the settlement of the Turks in Ötüken. Could it be, that Uighurs have already cultivated their own literary language just before the migration of the Turks and, *mutatis mutandis*, the Turks adopted it for their native dialect, introducing a big amount of their “domestic” forms into this written language, and therefore being the pioneers in this mixed literary idiom?

The analysis of dialectal features of the language of Orkhon monuments on their heterogeneity according to the data of “Dīwān Lughāt it-Turk” by Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī. It has become to be very common among the linguists to speak about the mixed nature of the ancient Turkic literary language in 1910’s. That is because the old written language is heterogenic in its linguistic features and looks like an artificial, but – and very common – well performed thing, made from different dialects of the same language or even different languages. And it is not surprising for us – linguists call such a symbiosis *koiné* and this phenomenon is well-known in different written cultures from the ancient times. For the ancient Turkic *koiné* this question is interesting from the point of which dialects/*resp* languages were the material for the fusion. We should know, if they were closely or not closely related and using of which criterium we can claim this. In fact, we can solve the problem using the data of Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī’s “Dīwān Lughāt it-Turk” and his linguistical characteristics – even if somebody can find them uncompleted or narrowly focused nowadays – they still remain unique.

Scholars, who studied the written heritage of Turkic-speaking peoples, believe that at the very beginning, before the introduction of the al-Kāshgharī’s “Dīwān ...” in 1915–1917 only the language of the ancient Turkic monuments itself appeared to them as mixed. And that was bearing in mind that the separate large groups of monuments showed different dialectological features: the Orkhon runiform inscriptions – Türküt (Türkic) at their core, ancient Uighur runiform inscriptions of Khangai and, a fortiori, the manuscripts of the Eastern Turkestan – had mainly Uighur-Karluk linguistic features.

Then we can suppose (and we will talk about our supposition a bit later) that the acquaintance of A.N. Samoylovich with the text of Kāshgharī’s “Dīwān” could have happened in March of 1918, after the Russia’s exit from the World War I. In the

introductory parts of “Dīwān”, chapter “On clarification of the differences between the words/dialects” [Dankoff, Kelly 1982: 84; Rustamov, Kormušin 2010: 77; Ercilasun, Akkoyunlu 2014: 12], Samoylovich prophetically have noted the dialectally important consonantal mutations in the proper Turkic lexis, described for the first time by Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī as accurate differential features of ancient Turkic dialects [Samojlovič 1918; re-edited: 1922; cited as in: Samojlovič 2005].

But we also must mention, that in A.N. Samoylovich’s work of 1918/1922 “On some extensions to the classification of Turkic languages” there is no idea on the “mixed nature” of ancient written languages: as V.V. Radloff and F.Ye. Korsch, he classified them as separate “dialects”. In the view of A.N. Samoylovich, here he introduces a new classification criterium, which was absent in classifications by Radloff and Korsch. That allows him to “make the classification more accurate in the whole its volume”. In other words, Samoylovich understood, that the introduced by him as the classification criterium alteration of stem consonants can be observed in many indigenous common Turkic lexemes. This alteration – mutation of sounds $d(t)$, $z(s)$, y in the middle and at the end of words: *adaq*, *ataq*, *azaq*, *ayaq* ‘a leg’; *qod*, *qot*, *qos*, *qoy* ‘put it!’ [Samojlovič 2005: 81]. Judging by the ‘leg’ and ‘put’ examples, A.N. Samoylovich could (!) have been acquainted with the content of just printed in Istanbul in 1915–1917 three volumes of Arabographic “Dīwān” and was probably able to evaluate the bright future of research on the inlaut mutation $d//t//z//y$ for the entire Turkic family (all of the branches of the Turkic language tree). I (the author of this article, I.K.) can also add the fact, that there are at least 50–60 lexemes of the main Turkic vocabulary, affected by this mutation (according to my data). Although the direct allusion to the al-Kāshgharī’s Dictionary happened after “Some extensions ...”, in the text of Samoylovich’s report on the First All-Union Turcological Congress of 1926 in Baku as a powerful argument to the correctness of Radloff’s proposals of 1911–1912 (i.e., articulated long before the acquisition of the only known copie of the 13th century of al-Kāshgharī’s “Dīwān” after practically total absence of any facts about this momentous source during six centuries) in his “Ancient Turkic research” [Radloff 1911: 305; Radloff 1912: 427]. “The data of the 11th century of Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī – noted A.N. Samoylovich – to a large extent approves the proposal of V.V. Radloff that in the 6th and 7th centuries, during the period of creation of Yenissei-Orkhon monuments, the differences between the Turkic languages, their groups and subgroups, that we observe nowadays, should have already been marked...” [Samojlovič 1926/2005: 91].

Simply put, as V.V. Radloff has already proposed and A.N. Samoylovich, who believed in this theory, the main criterium – even if it was an untapped criterium – of division of Turkic languages into groups is the mutation of sounds $d(t)/\delta$, $z(s)$, y , it was Samoylovich, who discovered the separation of Turkic languages by this criterium, and that helped him to devise them *clearly*. (Unlike such criteria, as correspondence of initial y with sibilants \check{c} , \check{z} , \check{s} and nasal \acute{n} (η), loss of the medial \acute{g}

(y) in adverb of habitual simple action *qalan//qalyan*, existence of the *ol-* form instead of *bol-* in Oghuz branch (the verb 'to be'), which can't divide the Turkic branches clearly.) Thinking about this collision, we can claim, that the source is the time of appearance of these mutations in phonetics: so, those mutations of sounds and forms, that happened in pre-Turkic dialects were materialized and became an entire part of language in different periods. It looks like the order of description of the phonetical alteration, performed by Samoylovich, suggests that it was their natural sequence in history.

Correspondence/mutation #1 – *r₁//z*, as in Chuvash *tăxăr* // other Turkic branches *tokuz ~ dokuz* 'nine' and so on. The *r*-languages are named Bulgar by Samoylovich: the languages of ancient Bulgars and modern Chuvashs. There is no common name for the *z*-group: frankly speaking, it is a unity of all other languages without the Bulgar branch. In fact, it is the most ancient defragmentation of languages of this family into two major branches. The first is the Proto-Bulgar branch, the second one even can't be named as Turkic, but it is possible to mention the embryos of the next branches: Oghuz-Karluk/Oghuz-Turkmen-Turkic. The defragmentation of the second level Samoylovich described, using mutation #2 – that lead to correspondence *r//d-t*, *z/y*, as in Chuvash *ură* // Tuvan *adak*, Yakut (Sakha) *atax*, Khakass *azak*, and the rest of Turkic – *ayak*.

Here, the word "Oghuz" needs some explanation because of its because of its ambiguity. On the one hand, the Toquz Oghuzs were the core element of the ancient Uighur tribes of the Karluk branch. But on the other hand, the Oghuzs themselves (according to Samoylovich) consisted of two subdivisions: The Western and the Eastern one. The Eastern subdivision is composed of languages of Turkmen, Azerbaijanis, Turks of Anatolia and the Balkan peninsula, Gagauzs of Bessarabia, Southern (Coastal) Crimean Tatars. The Western subdivision, as Samoylovich proposed, consisted of ancient languages of the Turkmen tribes, settled in Eastern European steppes in the 11th century in so-called Poros'ye (on the right bank of Dnieper and south of Kiev) – namely *uzs//ghuzs* and *torks* of Russian chronicles. Then, A.N. Samoylovich mentions four more mutations, just cited earlier, but only the two first criteria, described here, form the base for this, the entirely modern and adequate for synchronic, as well as historical material of the Turkic languages, classification, fairly named after Samoylovich.

But besides all of these things, we must mention that the Samoylovich's decision on the language of Orkhon-Yenisei monuments was a bit head-on: he excluded it from the Oghuz (South-Western) group and moved it to the North-Eastern group, according to the *d*-criterium. However, even before the acceptance of the leading position of the *d//y* criterium in Turkic division into groups, the scholars were sure about the attribution of, at least, the language of Orkhon monuments as an Oghuz one, as modern Turkish or Turkmen. But what was the base for such a decision?

First of all, because of the leadership of Türks (in Russian: *тюрку, тюрку*) in the First (552–603 AD), as well as in the Second (682–744 AD) Khaganates, who had preserved their ethnic name *Türk* during the centuries and chain of migrations, interaction with other peoples and social transformations. Nowadays this ethnonym is still used as the self-name of the main ethnic group of the Republic of Turkey, grew up on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire since 1923 and was a name of an important part of *Turkmens* – a folk, related to Turks.

I have been talking on the narrow meaning of the *Türk* term. But one should accept the fact of assimilation during the widespread of the Turkic state: the aboriginal population became *Türks*, as their conquerors, during some time, but in social or political sense. The closest example: the Chigil Türks, the countrymen of Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī. E.g., they pronounce such words as *aḍaq* ‘a leg’ or *qoḍ* ‘put it!’ with a *ḍ* – and that shows the Karluk-Uighur basis of the idiom. But Maḥmūd doggedly don’t want to associate himself with the Uighurs. And the cause of this phenomenon is not a linguistical, but a social and political: Uighurs – for the generation of al-Kāshgharī – were first of all pagans, idolators, non-Muslims.

So, accepting both possibilities: being a proper ethnonym or only a political one the criterium of Kāshgharī and Samoylovich can still help us in classification of the discussed idiom. But only in the case of a real, so-called *natural* idiom, i.e., spoken dialect. The literary language differs drastically in this aspect. The main peculiar feature of a literary idiom is its *artificiality* because of adaptation and refinement of sources by rhapsodes, poets, writers and all other literary figures of any other (especially written) language. That is, e.g., due to the practice of the oral performance of *dāstāns* in a multidialectal auditory during a long period of time the interdialectal poetical *koiné* was adopted by a big number of tribes. Then, during the process of adoption of writing, the oral *koiné* also became to be an internal part of a written literary language. Only because of this the forms from different dialectal and even language sources could be incorporated into one language. It is hard to find such a development in so-called *natural* dialects of the Ancient epoqe, only if they were not surrounded geographically by some other idioms.

And now only one question is rest, but, maybe, it is the main one. Yes, some sporadic incorporation of foreign forms into Old Turkic literary language is a well-known and well-explainable thing. But which dialect was a basis for creation of this literary idiom, and which other dialects were only extensions or appendices to the main stem we can realize only looking to the early stages of creations of that multidialectal society, that produced the Old Turkic literary language.

The rise of Turks as a result of their victory over Mongol-speaking Rourans in 552 AD was not possible without an alliance with all other anti-Rouran powers. The first one, who proposed the idea of alliance to Bumin Qaghan, who had become the leader of Ashina tribe, was the ruler of a sinicized Xianbei Mongol-speaking principality

Western Wei (Xī Wèi), namely Taizu. In 545 AD he dispatched an embassy with abundant gifts, and that was a fact of international acknowledgement of the Türks. The second, and even more natural ally of Turks was the unity of Tiele, the basis of which was Karluk Uighur-speaking tribes. The members of Tiele confederation didn't want to be a part of the state of Türks, thinking that they were a self-sufficient policy actor. Notwithstanding that, Bumin, by strength and guile, forced them to incorporate into the Türkic state in 546 AD in the amount of 50.000 of yurts. It would be relevant to mention that the tribes of Tiele created their own statal unities even earlier than Turks, but, at first, just for a while. Thus, in 482 AD the Gaoju (i.e., the High Wains) principality was created, but soon was damaged by the Rourans in 516 AD. In 605 AD the Dzungar Tiele tribes created their own state, which fell to the Western Turks 10 years later.

In 628 AD some tribes of Tiele created the state of Toqus Oghuzs, where, shortly afterwards, the Uighurs occupied the leading positions. The coalition of Uighur-speaking tribes with the Türks, during the very beginning, wasn't solid. And that's because of the reluctance of Tiele/Toqoghuzs/Uighurs to obey the Türks and then the coalition was interrupted a number of times. According to the text of Tonyukuk on the events of the Second Khaganate epoque, only under Ilterish Khagan (682–691 AD) the Türks fought against the Oghuzs five times (Ton 49). And now, compare this evidence with some inscriptions in honour of Kul Tigin. There, according to assessments – on the events of 714 AD, is written that the Türks really had five wars with the Oghuzs (KT North 4). It is notable that in this line of the KT (as in similar line of the compatible with the KT part of the BK East 29) the Bilge Khagan of Türks called the Toquz Oghuzs as “his own people”. It is possible, that one day (seems that it was during the war against the Rourans, in the mid-6th century), once agreed to be ruled by the Türks, the Toquz Oghuzs then began to feel ashamed of themselves because of this fact. As we can understand, the Türks were quite bellicose and armed because of their power in the Altai region, the homeland of mining (especially, the mining of iron). On the same time, the Uighurs were a far more advanced in the field of culture because of their statal history, even if one can claim that their states were ephemeral, but still that can't change the fact that they were created before any Turkic Khaganate. With such an assumption, the way of creation of the literary (and then – a written) koiné will become more clear.

A.N. Kononov wrote in his “Grammar of the language of Turkic runiform monuments of the 7th–9th centuries” (Leningrad: Nauka, 1980), in which he synthesized all his experience of research and teaching, that the language of monuments incorporates “the most typical features of two, at that time – the most powerful – language groups, namely, the Uighur and the Oghuz, hence [this] language <...> was, as every written literary language, quite a mixed picture in the usage of grammatical forms of Uighur and Oghuz funds...” [Kononov 1980: 4]. It looks like E.R. Tenishev has slightly changed the Kononov's conclusion in the

multivolume **encyclopaedic** edition “Languages of World” published by Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences (volume: “Turkic Languages”, article: “Languages of monuments of Turkic origin”): “the first written [Turkic] literary language was created on the Oghuz base with some Uighur and Kipchak additions...” [Tenišev 1997: 35]. One can assume that the second conclusion is less plausible: nevertheless, the basis of the Old Turkic literary koiné was more Uighur in its origin than Oghuz. And the main criterium is yet the inlaut d//y correspondence – and all of the known Orkhon monuments were written using the so-called *d*-language.

References

- Dankoff, Robert; Kelly, James. 1982–1985. Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, *Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)*. Part I–III. Harvard: Harvard University Printing Office.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican; Akkoyunlu, Ziyat. 2014. *Kâşgarlı Mahmud Dîvânü Lugâti't-Türk Giriş-Metin-Çeviri-Notlar-Dizin*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. 2003. *Istorija Central'noj Azii i pamjatniki runičeskogo pis'ma*. Sankt-Peterburg: Filologičeskij fakul'tet SPbGU.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G. 1969. *Runičeskaja nadpis' na kamennom izvajanii iz Čojrena*. In: *Pis'mennyje pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. Kratkoje soderžanije dokladov V godičnoj naučnoj sessii LO IV AN. Maj 1969 goda*. Leningrad. 46–47.
- Kljaštornyj, S.G.; Livšic, V.A. 1971. *Sogdijskaja nadpis' iz Buguta*. In: *Strany i narody Vostoka. Vypusk X. Srednjaja i Central'naja Azija. Geografija, étnografija, istorija*. Moskva: Nauka, GRVL. 121–146.
- Kononov, A.N. 1980. *Grammatika jazyka tjurkskix runičeskix pamjatnikov VII–IX vv*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Kormušin, I.V.; Rustamov, A.R. 2010. Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk (Svod tjurkskix slov). V 3-x tomax. Tom 1*. In: *Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka, CXXVIII, 1*. Moskva: “Vostočnaja literatura” RAN.
- Kormušin, I.V. 2011. *Zametki o sootnositel'nyx terminax “narod türk” i “jazyk türk” v drevnetjurkskix tekstax*. In: *Rossijskaja tjurkologija, №2 (5)*. 8–11.
- Kormušin, I.V.; Battulga, C. 2011. *Arxananskaja nadpis'*. In: *Tjurkologičeskij sbornik*. 2011–2012. Moskva. 204–219.
- Korš, F.Je. 1909. *Drevnejšij narodnyj stix tureckix plemjon*. In: *Zapiski Vostočnogo otdela russkogo arxivnogo obščestva. T. XIX*. Sankt-Peterburg.

- Malov, S.Je. 1951. *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovanija*. Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Malov, S.Je. 1959. *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii*. Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1915. *L'origine de T'ou-kiue, nom chinois des Turcs*. In: *T'oung Pao*. Vol. XVI.
- Radloff, Friedrich Wilhelm/W.W. 1911. *Alttürkische Studien. IV. Einleitende Gedanken zur Untersuchung der alttürkischen Dialekte (mit einer Schrifttafel)*. Sankt-Peterburg: IAN, ser. VI, № 5. 305–326.
- Radloff, Friedrich Wilhelm/W.W. 1912. *Alttürkische Studien. V. Die alttürkischen Dialekte*. Sankt-Peterburg: IAN, ser. VI (V). №6. 427–452.
- Samojlovič, A.N. 1922/2005. *Nekotoryje dopolnenija k klassifikacii tureckix jazykov*. Petrograd, 1922 / In: *Tjurkskoje jazykoznanije. Filologija. Runika*. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura RAN, 2005. 77–87.
- Samojlovič, A.N. 1926/2005. *K voprosu o klassifikacii tureckix jazykov*. Baku, 1926. / In: *Tjurkskoje jazykoznanije. Filologija. Runika*. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura RAN, 2005. 77–87.
- Sertkaya, O.F. *Kızilkum (Ulaangom) Yazıtı 'nda geçen kişi adı üzerine*. In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten 1994*. Ankara: 1996. 137–144
- Suzuki, Kōsetsu. 2009. *Revision and Reinterpretation of the Choir Inscription*. In: *J. Bemann, H. Parzinger, E. Pohl, D. Tseveendorj (eds.), Current Archaeological Research in Mongolia: Papers from the First International Conference on 'Archaeological Research in Mongolia', held in Ulaanbaatar, August 19th–23th, 2007, (Bonn Contribution to Asian Archaeology, 4), Bohn, Vor- und Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Sep. 2009, 417–425.*
- Taskin, V.S. 1984. *Materialy po istorii drevnix kočevyx narodov gruppy dunxu*. In: *N.C. Munkujev*. Moskva: Nauka. 397.
- Tenišev, È.R. 1997. *Tjurkojazyčnyx pis'mennyx pamjatnikov jazyki*. In: *Jazyki mira. Tjurkskije jazyki*. Moskva: Indrik. 35–46.
- Tuguševa, L.Ju. 2008. *Tjurkskije runičeskije pis'mennyje pamjatniki iz Mongolii*. Moskva: INSAN.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2019. *Groping in the Dark: The First Attempt to Interpret the Bugut Brāhmī*. In: *Journal Asiatique*. Vol. 307. Num. 1.

TO A NEW COMPREHENSION OF MIXED NATURE OF THE OLD TURKIC WRITTEN LITERARY KOINÉ OF THE 7th–11th CENTURIES

I.V. Kormushin

(Moscow)

Summary: In this paper, we attempt to draw attention of experts in Turkic linguistics to the mixed nature of the Old Turkic Literary language. It is no surprise that an ancient literary language is not uniform linguistically, being an artificial – and cunning, in most cases – amalgam of words and forms taken from different dialects. This *koiné* phenomenon is known to different writing cultures. With regard to the Old Turkic *koiné*, the question of interest is which dialects were subject to amalgamation and which linguistic features allow to distinguish between these dialects. As we show, it is the features described in Mahmud al-Kashgari's *Dīwān* – a unique source on the Old Turkic dialect system, even if it is not fully comprehensive or complete – that help us to solve the problem.

Abstract: In this article an attempt is made to draw the attention of specialists to the concept of the mixing of the ancient Turkic literary language. There is nothing surprising in the fact that the ancient literary language is heterogeneous in its linguistic means and represents an artificial, and most often – skillful combination of words and forms – either from different dialects of the same language, or from closely related languages. This symbiosis is called *koiné* in linguistics and has been known to various written cultures since ancient times. For the ancient *Türkic Koiné*, this question is interesting first because of which dialects / *resp* languages serve as material for merging and by what linguistic characteristics it can be established. It turns out that the correct assessment in solving this problem helps to make the linguistic characteristics – albeit not complete and comprehensive enough for us, but unique – which it was given to the Turkic dialects in famous philological work of the 11th century, “*Dīwān lughāt at-Turk*” by Mahmud Kashgari.

Key words: ancient/old *Türkic* literary language, *koiné*, ancient dialects, inter-dialectal alternations, dialect correspondences, dictionary of the 11th century “*Dīwān lughāt at-Turk*”, Mahmud al-Kashgari.