

REFLECTION OF ANCIENT ALTAI-INDO-EUROPEAN TIES IN CULTURE AND LANGUAGE OF YAKUTS

ОТРАЖЕНИЕ ДРЕВНИХ АЛТАЕ-ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ СВЯЗЕЙ В КУЛЬТУРЕ И ЯЗЫКЕ ЯКУТОВ

YAKUTLARIN DILI VE KÜLTÜRÜNDE ESKİ ALTAY-HINT-AVRUPA BAĞLANTILARININ İNCELENMESİ

Prof. Dr. Anatoly GOGOLEV

ÖZET

Her bir ulusun etnik genetiği uzun ve çeşitli etnik süreçlerin sonucudur. Bu tespit özellikle altı dil ailesi için geçerlidir: Afrika-asyatik, Karvelyen, Hint-Avrupa, Ural, Altay ve Dravinsky dil aileleri. Eski zamanlarda, bu dil aileleri birbiriyle yakın bir ilişki içinde idiler. Bu yüzden, bu dil aileleri Nostratik dil ailesinde birleşirler. Bu dil ailesinin genetik yapısı çok çeşitli bağlantılı hece yapılarında mevcuttur. Etnik-gelişimin oldukça karmaşık süreçlerinin sentezinden ortaya çıkan günümüz Yakutları, etnik kökenlerinde eski ve ortaçağ Hint-Avrupa ve Altay kültürleri ve dil öğelerini barındırırlar.

Anahtar ifadeler: Nostratik dil ailesi, Altay-Hint-Avrupa bağlantıları, Yakutlar, Etnik-genetik

ABSTRACT

Ethnogenesis of each nation is a long and diverse ethnic process. This statement is mainly true for people of six language families – Afro-Asiatic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralian, Altaic and Dravivsky families- which were closely related to each other in ancient times. Therefore, they are united in one Nostratic language family. Genetic affinity of the Nostratic language family is found in vast variety of related morphemes. The modern Yakuts originated from the synthesis of highly complex processes of ethno-formation, in which ancient, medieval Indo-European and Altaic cultural and language elements take part.

Key words: Nostratic language family, Altai-Indo-European ties, Yakuts, Ethnogenesis.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Этногенез каждого народа является длительным и разнообразным по этническому составу процессом. Это положение особенно характерно для народов б языковых семей - афразийской картвельской, индоевропейской, уральской, алтайской и дравийской - между которыми в глубокой древности существовало близкое родство. Поэтому их объединяют в одну ностратическую общность. Генетическое родство ностратической общности обнаруживается в наличии в ней обширного корпуса родственных морфем. Современные якуты представляют собой итог синтеза

очень сложных процессов этнообразования, в которых участвовали древние, средневековые индоевропейские и алтайские культурно-языковые субстраты.

Ключевые слова: ностратическая языковая общность, алтае-индоевропейские связи, якуты, этногенез

Ethnogenesis of each nation is a long and diverse ethnic process. Metaphorically speaking, humankind may be compared to a conventional closed circuit consisting of multiple rings connected with one another by means of visible and invisible ties of anthropological, linguistic and cultural features. This statement is mainly true for people of six language families – Afro-Asiatic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Uralian, Altaic and Dravidsky families- which were closely related to each other in ancient times. Therefore, they are united in one Nostratic language family [Dolgopolsky, Dybo, Terentyev, Illich-Svitch]. Genetic affinity of the Nostratic language family is found in vast variety of related morphemes. This linguistic affinity includes the basis of the main vocabulary of the six language families and covers main basic elementary concepts and realia. V.A.Dybo and V.A.Terentev associate the beginning of divergence of the once existed Nostratic language family with the Mesolithic era of Southwest Asia within XII-XI centuries BC [Dybo, Terentyev].

There is some difficulty in assessing the cultural and historical territory of extension of the Nostratic family of parent languages. That territory could be the separate region of Southwest Asia, which was at the borders of Asia Minor, Transcaucasia, Mesopotamia and Levant.

According to the Nostratic dictionary, the “leakage” (translator’s remark – in Russian “lekazha”, is an adopted word, synonym to “divergence”) of Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic languages is most archaic. Kartvelsky and Dravidsky language families are distanced more significantly from "Nostratic parent language", and Ural and Altay languages are at intermediate position. The Altay languages are more closely related to the Nostratic vocabulary, than the Urals languages. (In this case, it is probably the result of the degree of intensity of late interaction among successors of Nostratic parent language.)

Most likely, the divergence of Nostratic parent language system came to the end by the beginning of the Neolithic, about VII-VI centuries BC. A stage-by-stage dividing process took place between XII-XI and VII-VI centuries BC: a digression from an initial basis of the Indo-European-Afrasian and "Ural" dialect zone; separation of the Indo-European and Dravidsky dialects, separation of the Indo-European from Afrasian and Kartvelsky, proto-Altaysky - from Dravidsky and proto-Uralsky [Pozdnyakov].

The history of formation and development of Altay language family consisting of Turkic, Mongolian and Tunguso-Manchurian groups, is complicated by the variety of interrelations among them, that are not revealed yet.

There are two main theories concerning the family of Altay languages - genetic and typological. But nevertheless what is clear - Altay language family resulted from permanent development of proto-Altaysky dialect of Nostratic linguistic affinity in the environment (existing conditions) of Euro-Asian Northern Lands, in the process of interconnection and disintegration of tribes and of their continuous differentiation.

The westernmost territory of the Altay languages' extension was occupied by Turks, further to the East – by Mongols, whose neighbors were Tungus and Manchurians. There is no common opinion about the time of Ancient-Turkic language formation. According to a prominent Turkic expert Tenisheva Z.R., the earliest period of the formation of the Turkic parent language is defined by the beginning of I century BC, the latest period of its existence - III century AD. Since III to V centuries the basis has been separating into languages, which later passed a long way of development and at the time of the first Turkic Khaganate developed in quite mature languages.

According to linguistic, toponymic and archaeological data, ancient-Turkic tribes settled down in Sayano-Altaysky uplands, Northern and Southern regions of Western Mongolia. At the turn of III-II centuries BC those places were settled by Caucasian tribes. Thus, the people of Afanasiev archaeological culture that occupied parts of Southern Siberia at the specified time, had probable connections with the tribes of Drevneyamnoy (Eastern Europe) and Keltemiranskoy (Central Asia) cultures. And these tribes belonged to the Indo-European language family. It lasted during XVII-XIII centuries BC. Andronovtsy were followed by Karasukets in XII-VII centuries BC, then – by tagarets in VII-II centuries BC. The researches do not doubt that these tribes belonged to the Indo-Iranian language family. All it means that since the end of III century BC on the territory of Mongolia there were two ethno-cultural regions with different cultures and anthropological type of the population: Mongolians in the East, South, and Caucasians in the West. Caucasians lived in Sayano-Altaysky uplands as well [Kuzmina, Kiselev].

During the scythian-siberian period a vast territory of Gorny Altay was occupied by the Pazyryk culture, which becomes one of the recognized centers of the Irano-Saksky nomadic culture in Central Asia.

Not only toponymic and archaeological facts prove that Caucasian population, (which was partly mixed) which inhabit the specified territory till the end of the 1 century BC, relate to the Indo-Iranian language family, but also paleoanthropology data: in particular, it proves the anthropological relation of Karasukets and the Pamiro-Fergana type of Caucasian [Alekseev, Gohman, Tumen].

Therefore, ancient habitants of the Southern Siberia and the Western regions of Mongolia, who were the ancestors of ancient-Turkic tribes, were related neighbors of the Indo-Iranian cattle breeders, who populate East Turkestan, Kazakhstan and Central Asia since the end of the 3d century till the beginning of the 1st century AD. An important conclusion can be made from the abovesaid - ancestors of ancient Turks as well as early Turks themselves lived surrounded by ancient Indo-European ethnoses during two eras since Eneolithic times. Specifying the matter it should be noted that they were Indo-Iranian tribes.

In the Scythian time Mongoloid population of Gorny Altai, the only one in the Southern Siberia, has already intermarried with Saka-Usun Caucasian tribes, who actually became Pazyryk. Probably, the researchers, who refer the people of Pazyryk culture of Gorny Altai (V-III centuries BC) to "Saks in arrow-shaped shapkas" ("shapka" is a traditional headwear, usually a furry one – translator's remark) of North-Eastern Kazakhstan, being, in all probabilities, a part of proto-Turkic tribes, are right [Gogolev].

Artifacts of Pazyryk type were prevailing on the territory of Central Asia and East Kazakhstan. It were Pazyryks and affined tribes, that occupied a large territory to Southwest Mongolia, who had for the first time ever the elements of future ancient-Turkic

culture: in a funeral ritual - accompanying bury of horses on the North side of a bone chamber and vertically imbed oblong stones on the side of sunrise [Savinov, Novgorodova]. Analysis of the ancient-Turkic language vocabulary showed that a large number of economic, social and religious terms were borrowed by Turks from Indo-European, mainly Iranian languages [Eremeev]. But the part of this vocabulary, probably, has an ancient Nostratic basis. Besides the plot of ancient-Turkic legend, in which a wolf is the founder, hero or leader, was mainly common for the mythology of the Indo-European peoples - Hittites, Iranians, Greeks, Romans, Germans [Eremeev]. It is considered that this fact also evidences Indo-European influence on the culture of ancient-Turk tribes. All this approve the conclusion that the ethnic history of proto-Turks resulted from synthesis of two populations of Central Asia and Southern Siberia - the Indo-European (mainly Iranian speaking, Caucasian) and Altai-Turkic (Mongoloid).

In I century BC Turkic tribes were prevailing in the Eurasian steppes (the word "steppes" is common for Russian language and culture, "steppe" is an ecoregion characterized by vast plain territory without any trees – translator's remark) and the Eastern-Iranian nomadic-cattle breeders were no more in ethnic majority. In Altai and South-Western Mongolia influence of Iranian-speaking population on ancient-Turkic tribes reflected in their genealogic legend: sons of the wolf, who was the ancestor of Turks, marry women from Iranian-speaking Turfan (East Turkestan).

How did formation of Yakut language and culture take place with such a complicated background of interrelation among ancient people of diverse ethnic groups of Central Asia and Southern Siberia?

In the year 1851 academician Otto Betlingk, the pioneer of the scientific study of Sakha language, suggested a theory, that language belonged to the most ancient Turkic dialects. Later this theory was supported by V.L.Kotvich, N.A.Baskakov, EI Ubryatova, A.M.Scherbak and by others [Kotvich, Baskakov, Werbak]. S.E.Malov held to an opinion, that Yakut language by its structure was preliterate and was formed before the VII century. He found in it "...more ancient linguistic facts than in other Turkic languages, - facts that are dating back 1500 years ago – that's why it should be considered as one of the ancient Turkic languages [Malov]. Therefore, the ancient platform of Yakut language with standard Ancient-Turkic basis (perhaps, d - a sign in the middle of the word) and with Indo-European (Indo-Iranian) substrate, separated from the rest of the Turkic languages VI century AD and was developing independently for a long period of time. [Kloson, Sidorov]. Therefore the Indo-Aryan basis prevails in Indo-Iranian vocabulary, which is found in the Yakut language. In this regard, I would like to remind you that in the first half of II century BC Aryan language family divided into proto-Iransky and proto-Indoariysky branches. And in the first half of I century BC further differentiation of this process has led to the isolation of the North-Iranian (Scythian-Sarmatian) group from the South-Iranian group [Abaev]. Before these events (before XIII century BC) Indo-Aryan tribes OTESHI (the word "oteshi" means "to move", "to migrate") from the steppes of Kazakhstan and South Siberia to the South (the people of Andronov archaeological culture). Therefore, it is safe to assume, that brachicranial Caucasians with a large and flat face and middle-sized prominent nose had part in the formation of ethnogroups of Indo-Iranian origin of Gorny Altai – ethno genesis of Sakha. According to the toponimic data, the language of the Saka people, who lived in the North-Eastern Altai, was considerably archaic [Maloletka]. Therefore, this North-Iranian language due to its archaism adopted archaisms of Aryan language family. Taking into consideration the linguistic affinity of languages of Saka and Avest Iranians, it

is also important to emphasize the affinity of Saka language and the language of Vedic Aryans. Perhaps, hence the Yakut language and culture keep some substrate elements that probably came from the era of Aryan language family [Gogolev]. In this regard, it is relevant to cite the opinion of Q.H Betlingka that "easing of the basis, like the Sanskrit ... is so prevailing in the Yakut language" [Betlingk].

E.S.Sidorov relates Yakut words of Indo-Aryan origin to the archaic vocabulary of the epic and ritual songs. It is noteworthy, that the Sanskrit (Indian) parallels mainly originate from the ancient Vedic source, dating back to the ancient Indo-European parent language. There are more than two hundred bases and roots of such parallels in the Yakut language [Sidorov, Gogolev]. Let us recall that the "Vedas" is a monument of ancient-Indian literature of the late II - early I centuries BC, that consists of a collection of hymns and sacrificial formulas.

Let us exemplify some linguistic parallels: sansk. *sik* - to spray = yak. *cuuk* - dew, dampness; *smil* - to blink, to shimmer = *cum*, *simirinnee* (симирииннээ)- to blink; *tosa*-satisfaction = *myha* benefit; *akaoi* not wise akaary (*акаары*)-stupid; *ayas* (*айас*) - tireless; *ajaas* - quick, unbroken; *is* - juice, drink, is (ис) - to drink, drink; *yd* - water, wave, *yy* - water; *ostha* - lip, *yoc* - lips; *kathin* - solid, firm, *khatan* - firm, hard-tempered, *kan* (*кан*)- to be happy, *khan* (*хан*) - to be content; *jana* - person, human kind, nation, *dyon* (*дьон*) - people, nation, vic-community, human kind, bees (*буус*) - a tribe; *dhenu* - cow, *тинэнэ* - trehtravaya cow, calf and etc. It should be emphasized once again, that religious terms prevail in these parallels. In support of this thesis, the terms *aar* (*аар*) and *kereh* (*кэрэх*) can be good examples. So, for instance, *Aar toyon* (*Аар тойон*) - the highest godship, the creator and the overking of the world, a creator of life on the earth, irrigating the earth, responsible for an abundance of food [Pekarsky]. Besides Turkic parallels there are also Indo-Iranian compliances to *aar* (*аар*). According to E. Benveniste, *ar*, *art* (*ар*, *арм*) in Indo-European languages "order", to which the world's structure, motion of the luminaries, the change of seasons and years, and relationships between gods and people are adhered. All that relates to a person or to the world is under the "order", ie religious and moral basis of society, of the universe, without this principle would be returned to the original chaos. Initial semantics of Yakut *aar* (*аар*), as well as in ancient Indo-European languages, comes from the concept of "original order", the order that originated from the collapse of the mythological Original chaos. Therefore *Aar toyon* (*Аар тойон*) is uppermost in the Yakut pateone. It is also evident by the fact that in I century BC the Eastern-Iranian nomads (Scythians = Sakas) had the term *ar* (*ар*) in the form of *ard* (*ард*), that even by that time meant "god". By this time the Vedic Aryans understood the term *art* (*арм*) as the name of the godship with the supreme regulating power.

Iranian *kerekh*, *hereh*, *karakht* (*кэрэх*, *хэрэх*, *карахт*)- *adjectives that mean to lost sensibility, to be stiff (ie to be dead)*. Hence is the other Turk word, *kergek bolty* (*кэрэк болты*), meaning that someone "has died." Yakut word *kerekh* (*кэрэх*) means - cattle sacrifice or stuffed sacrificed cattle or horse. According to V.E.Vasilyeva, original meaning of *yak.kerekh* (як.кэрэх) was - "dead", but later it has been extended [Benveniste].

These materials were confirmed in the research of an immunogenetics, V.V.Fefelova. She found in the blood of "native-born, pure blooded Yakuts" two types of the antigen, which were common for Caucasian populations. From among modern Caucasians these antigens are common only for Indians (in particular, for Hindi, the main ethnic group of Indian Republic). "...We can assume - writes V.Fefelova - that Yakuts and Hindi have

common ancestors. Considering the "Caucasoid" of haplotype HLA-AI, B 17, it must be the Caucasians. And they must have come to India from the North. We believe that they were Arias. Thus, the ancient Caucasian group had part in the ethnogenesis of the Yakuts, but now its influence is hidden by Mongoloid extraneous features [Fefelova]. In this regard, we should note that the modern features of Yakuts were forming mainly not earlier than in the middle of the II century BC because of intermarrying of alien and autochthonic groups. Moreover, the formation of native environment, which in the future influenced the Sakha ethnogenesis, may be dated by the final stage of Yakut Neolith, III-II centuries BC. It is represented by Diring-Yuryakhsky type of the human being.

Later it possibly formed that group of Yakuts, that became, according to V.A.Sheremetyeva, the "Paleo-Asiatics in Central Asian masks" [Sheremetyeva, Gorshkov, Mednikov].

We can erect two types in the Southern anthropological group of Yakuts - the strong Central-Asiatic type, represented by pribaykalsky Turkic community, which was influenced by Mongolian-speaking tribes, and the South-Siberian "kypchakizirovanny" type, that was intermixed with the ancient Caucasians [Gohman].

As the result of ethnogenesis these two types intermixed and formed the Southern basis of modern Yakuts. According to the studies of pre-revolutionary researchers [Maak, Middendorf, Seroshevsky] turansky (mixed) type of Yakut people mainly was represented by lengthy people, who had oblong oval shaped face, straight curved nose, "wide-open" (Caucasian eye shape – translator's remark) eyes, this type was common for princes (in Russian "knyaz" - is a Slavic title found in most Slavic languages, denoting a royal nobility rank – translator's remark) and rich people till the middle of XIX centuries. A.F.Middendorf, in particular, compared them to American Indians [Middendorf].

"The Turkic type, - as it was noted by a quite competent ethnographer V.L.Seroshevsky, - is mainly common for tribal toyony" [Seroshevsky]. N.K.Antonov, who has been working in the field of historical vocabulary for many years, notes that "in the society of ancient Yakuts ... the dominant group of the population consisted of Turkic-speaking tribes, and the poor, workfolk and inferior people was mainly Mongolian-speaking" [Antonov].

Thus, modern Yakuts originated from the synthesis of highly complex processes of ethno-formation, in which had part ancient, medieval Indo-European and Altaic cultural and language elements. In the simplest terms, the can be presented schematically as follows: the Nostratic language family (XII-VII centuries BC) = the Altaic parent language (V-II centuries BC) = the influence on it by the Aryan language family (III century – the first half of II century BC) = the ancient Turkic parent language = (I century BC - III century AD.) = its relation with the separate North-Iranian (Scythian-Saka-Sarmatian) group (I century BC) = the formation of the ancient-Turk basis of the Yakut language with preservation of the anlaut C and its ancient interaction with the Indo-Aryan parent language within II century BC (up to V-VI centuries AD) = Pribaikalsky Oguz language of proto-Yakuts, Kurykany (VI-X centuries.) = mixing of the medieval Turkic Kypchak and the Oguz basis of the Yakut parent language (X-XIV centuries.) = influence of the Mongolian languages (VI-X and XI-XV centuries) = formation of the Yakut language under little influence of the Tungusky language (XIV -XVI centuries).

References:

1. Abaev V.I. Skifo-evropeyskie izogolossy na styke Vostoka i Zapada [Scythian-European izoglosses at the borders of East and West]. – Moscow, 1965. – S.121
2. Alekseev V.P., Gohman I.I., Tumen D. Kratky ocherk paleoantropologii Centralnoy Azii / Arheologiya, etnografiya i antropologiya Mongolii [A brief essay of paleoanthropology of Central Asia / Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Mongolia]. – Novosibirsk, 1987. – S.232
3. Antonov N.K. Istoricheskaya leksika yakutskogo yazyka [Historical vocabulary of the Yakut language]. – Yakutsk, 1971. – S.121
4. Baskakov N.A. Tyurkskie yazyki [Turkic languages]. - Moscow, 1960. – C.53
5. Benveniste E. Dictionary of Indo-European social terms. – Moscow, 1995. – C.299
6. Betlingk O.N.O yazyke jakutov. Per. s nem. V.I.Rassadina [About Yakut language, translated from German by V.I. Rassadina]. – Novosibirsk, 1969. – C.35
7. Dolgopolsky A.B. Gipoteza drevneyshego rodstva yazykovykh semey Severnoy Evrazii s veroyatnoy tochki zreniya. Voprosy yazykoznanija. [The hypothesis of the ancient relation of language families of Northern Eurasia in the context of a probability. Problems of Linguistics] – Moscow, 1964
8. Dybo V.A., Terentyev V.A. Nostraticheskaya makrosemya i problema ee vremennoy lokalizacii. Lingvisticheskie rekonstrukcii i drevneyshaya istoriya Vostoka [Nostratic macrofamily and the problem of its time localization. Linguistic reconstruction and ancient history of the East]. 4.5. Problemy izucheniya nostraticheskoy makrosemyi yazykov: Tezisy i dokl. konf. [Problems of studying of Nostratic macrofamily languages: Thesis and reports. conf.]. – Moscow, 1984
9. Eremeev D.E. "Tyurk" - etnonim iranskogo proishozhdeniya? / Sovetskaya etnografiya ["Tyurk" is an ethnonym of the Iranian origin? / Soviet Ethnography] - 1990. - no. 3. - pp. 119-130.
10. Illich-Svitich V.M. Opyt sravneniya nostraticheskikh jazykov. Sravnitelny slovar [Experience of comparison of Nostratic languages. Comparative Dictionary]. - Moscow, 1971, 1984
11. Fefelova V.A., Vysockaya G.S. Izuchenie rasprostraneniya antigenov sistemy HLA u korennykh narodnostey Sibiri kak osnova dlya analiza etnogeneza populyaciy. Preprint VC SOAN SSSR [Study of the advance of HLA antigens of the indigenous peoples of Siberia as a basis for the analysis of the ethnogenesis populations]. – Krasnoyarsk - pp. 9-11.
12. Gogolev A.I. Yakuty: problemy etnogeneza i formirovaniya kultury [Yakuts: problems of ethnogenesis and culture formation]. - Yakutsk, 1993. –S.25
13. Gohman I.I., Tomtosova L.F. Antropologicheskie issledovaniya neoliticheskikh mogilnikov Diring-Yuryah i Rodinka. Arheologicheskie issledovaniya v Yakutii [Anthropological studies of Neolithic burials of Diring-Yuryakh and Rodinka. Archaeological research in Yakutia] - Novosibirsk, 1992. – S.112
14. Kiselev S.V. Drevnaya istoriya Yuzhnoy Sibiri [The ancient history of Southern

Siberia]. – M. – L., 1951. – S.114 -116

15. Kloson Dzh. Issledovanie tyurko-mongolskih yazykov [Study of Turkic-Mongolian languages]. - London, 1962

16. Kotvich V.L. Issledovanie po altayskim yazykam. Per. s polsk. [Altaic language research. Translation from Polish language]. – Moscow, 1962. – S.346

17. Kuzmina E.E. Proishozhdenie indoirancev v svete noveyshih arheologicheskikh dannyh. Etnicheskie problemy istorii Centralnoy Azii v drevnosti [The origin of Indo-Iranians, in the context of the latest archeological data. Ethnic problems of the history of Central Asia in ancient times]. - Moscow, 1984. – S.112-117

18. Malov S.E. Yakutskiy yazyk i ego otnoshenie k drugim tyurkskim yazykam. Vestnik AN SSSR [Yakut language and its relation to other Turkic languages. Bulletin of the USSR Academy of Science]. – Moscow, 1941. – C.63-64

19. Maloletka A.M. Toponimisticheskie svidetelstva prebyvaniya sakov na Altae. / Problemy arheologii stepnoy Evrazii: Tezisy dokl. Ch.P. [Toponymic signs of Saks on the territory of Altai. / Problems of the archeology of the steppe Eurasia: Thesis report Ch.P.]. - Kemerovo, 1987. – S.53

20. Middendorf A.F. Puteshestvie na sever i vostok Sibiri [Travel to the North and East of Siberia]. - St-Petersburg, 1878. – S.765

21. Novgorodova E.A. Ranny etap etnogeneza narodov Mongolii (konec III-I tys. do n.e.). Etnicheskie problemy istorii Centralnoy Azii v drevnosti [Early stage of the ethnogenesis of Mongolian people (the end of III-I centuries BC). Ethnic problems of the history of Central Asia in ancient times]. – Moscow, 1981. – S.209

22. Pozdnyakov K.I. K probleme geneticheskoy klassifikatsii nostraticheskikh yazykov. Lingvisticheskaya rekonstruktsiya i drevneyshaya istoriya Vostoka [The problem of genetic classification of Nostratic languages. Linguistic reconstruction and the ancient history of the East] 4.5. Problemy izucheniya nostraticheskoy makrosemyi yazykov [Problems of studying macrofamily of the Nostratic languages]. – Moscow, 1984. – S.28

23. Pekarsky E.K. Yakut language dictionary. – Leningrad, 1958. – Stb. 126

24. Savinov D.G. Narody Yzhnoy Sibiri v drevnyetyurkskuyu epohu [The peoples of Southern Siberia in ancient times]. – Leningrad, 1848

25. Seroshevsky V.L. Yakuts. - St-Petersburg., 1896. – S.244

26. Sidorov E.S. Sanskritsko-yakutskie leksicheskie paralleli [Sanskrit-Yakut lexical parallels], Yakutsk, 1992. – S.13

27. Sheremetyeva V.A. Gorshkov V.A., Mednikov B.I. Molekulyarnaya istoriya Kamchatki. Priroda [Molecular history of Kamchatka. Nature]. no. 11. – Moscow, 1983. – S.28-32

28. Werbak A.M. Grammaticheskyy ocherk yazyka tyurkskih tekstov X-XI vv. iz Vostochnogo Turkestana [Grammatical essay of the Turkic language texts X-XIII centuries from East Turkestan]. – Moscow, 1962. – S.11

1. Абаев В.И. Скифо-европейские изоголоссы на стыке Востока и Запада. - М., 1965. - С. 121.
2. Алексеев В.П., Гохман И.И., Тумэн Д. Краткий очерк палеоантропологии Центральной Азии // Археология, этнография и антропология Монголии. - Новосибирск, 1987. - С. 232.
3. Антонов Н.К. Историческая лексика якутского языка. - Якутск, 1971. - С.121.
4. Баскаков Н.А. Тюркские языки. - М., 1960. - С. 53
5. Бенвенист Э. Словарь индоевропейских социальных терминов. - М., 1995. -С. 299.
6. Бетлингк О.Н. О языке якутов. Пер. с нем. В.И.Рассадиной. - Новосибирск, 1969. - С. 35.
7. Долгопольский А.Б. Гипотеза древнейшего родства языковых семей Северной Евразии с вероятной точки зрения // Вопросы языкознания. – 1964. - N 2
8. Дыбо В.А., Терентьев В.А. Ностратическая макросемья и проблема ее временной локализации //Лингвистические реконструкции и древнейшая история Востока. Проблемы изучения ностратической макросемьи языков: Тезисы и докл. конф. - М., 1984
9. Еремеев Д.Е. "Тюрк" - этноним иранского происхождения? // Советская этнография. 1990. - N 3. - С. 119-130.
10. Иллич-Свитич В.М. Опыт сравнения ностратических языков. Сравнительный словарь. - М., 1971; М., 1984.
11. Фелелова В.А., Высоцкая Г.С. Изучение распространения антигенов системы HLA у коренных народностей Сибири как основа для анализа этногенеза популяций: Препринт ВЦ СОАН СССР. - Красноярск, 1987. - N 12. - С. 9-11.
12. Гоголев А.И. Якуты: проблемы этногенеза и формирования культуры. - Якутск, 1993. - С. 25.
13. Гохман И.И., Томтосова Л.Ф. Антропологические исследования неолитических могильников Дириг-Юрях и Родинка // Археологические исследования в Якутии. - Новосибирск, 1992. - С. 112.
14. Киселев СВ. Древняя история Южной Сибири. – М.–Л., 1951. - С. 114-116.
15. Клосон Дж. Исследование тюрко-монгольских языков. - Лондон, 1962. - С. 205
16. Котвич В.Л. Исследование по алтайским языкам. Пер. с польск. - М., 1962. - С. 346
17. Кузьмина Е.Е. Происхождение индоиранцев в свете новейших археологических данных // Этнические проблемы истории Центральной Азии в древности. - М., 1984. - С.112-117;
18. Малов С. Е. Якутский язык и его отношение к другим тюркским языкам // Вестник АН СССР. - 1941. - N 6. - С. 63-64.
19. Малолетка А.М. Топонимистические свидетельства пребывания саков на Алтае // Проблемы археологии степной Евразии: Тезисы докл. Ч.П. - Кемерово, 1987. -С.53.

20. Новгородова Э.А. Ранний этап этногенеза народов Монголии (конец III-1 тыс. до н.э.). // Этнические проблемы истории Центральной Азии в древности. - М., 1981. - С. 209
21. Поздняков К.И. К проблеме генетической классификации ностратических языков
22. // Лингвистическая реконструкция и древнейшая история Востока 4.5. Проблемы изучения ностратической макросемьи языков. - М., 1984. - С.28
23. Пекарский Э.К. Словарь якутского языка. – М, 1959. - Стб. 126
24. Савинов Д.Г. Народы Южной Сибири в древнетюркскую эпоху. - Л., 1984. - С. 13
25. Серошевский В.Л. Якуты. - СПб., 1896. - С. 244.
26. Сидоров Е.С. Санскритско-якутские лексические параллели. – Якутск 1992. - С. 13
27. Шереметьева В.А., Горшков В.А., Медников Б.И. Молекулярная история Камчатки // Природа. - 1983. - N 11. - С. 28-32.
28. Щербак А.М. Грамматический очерк языка тюркских текстов X-XIII вв. из Восточного Туркестана. - М., 1962. - С. 11