

VIII.—*On the Ethnography of High Asia.* By JAMES COWLES
PRICHARD, M.D., F.R.S.

SINCE the time of Videlou and De Guignes, the sanguine hope, once entertained, of illustrating the ancient history of Northern Asia, from resources hidden in the Chinese language and in the archives of the Celestial Empire, seems to have been gradually abandoned. Those writers traced in Chinese books obscure notices of an infinity of barbarous tribes, whose names—and it often happened that their names only were recorded—disguised by a Chinese orthography, could not be recognised as having belonged to any people known to the learned of Europe. Attempts made to identify the races, of whom more ample accounts were delivered in the historical works of the Chinese, with nations known to western geographers and historians, were particularly unsuccessful. They were founded chiefly on some slight resemblances of names, or on accidental synchronisms in the accounts of migratory movements, or on passages of history too imperfectly recorded to admit of a comparison leading to results. It was thus that De Guignes was led into the mistake of identifying the Hiong-nú of the Chinese traditions with the Huns, so well known in the history of the West. That this identification was erroneous, was less apparent to most readers than the circumstance, more easily perceived, that it rested on no shadow of proof, and it was generally inferred that no data were to be found, in the voluminous works which De Guignes examined, that might have rendered possible a more accurate research. But since Abel-Remusat and Julius von Klaproth applied themselves to the investigation, that unfavourable opinion has been gradually changed; new lights have been struck out which are likely to elucidate dark passages in the history of those great nations who performed so conspicuous a part on the theatre of human affairs during the middle ages, and some reason appears for looking to the same quarter with expectation of further success. Klaproth and Abel-Remusat had not access to the oldest and most authentic documents of Chinese history. They have principally consulted abstracts and compilations of a later era; and some important documents have come into the possession of Europeans since the death of those distinguished writers, from which we may expect further contributions to the ethnography of Northern Asia.*

* It seems that Abel-Remusat and Klaproth had never consulted the original annals of the elder Han, the celebrated dynasty who ruled over China from B. C. 163 to 196 after Christ, and in whose time the principal wars between the Hiong-nú and China were carried on. They were only acquainted with the contents of this important work through the great historical cyclopædia of Ma-tuanlin, or the Wen-hian-thoung-khao, compiled A. D. 1321, and in other comparatively later documents. The original annals of the Han have been translated from the Chinese

In the mean time some knowledge has been obtained which is fitted to promote this investigation. It is well known that the high region of Central Asia, reaching through the whole longitude of that continent from the Euxine to the Sea of Japan, is occupied by tribes chiefly nomadic, belonging to three great races of men. These are the Turkish, or the improperly called Tartar race, whose chief country is between the Caspian and the Blue Lake, or Koko-Nor, viz., Western and Eastern Turkestan; the Mongolian race, somewhat farther towards the E. and N.; and the Tungusian or Mandschurian race in Daouria, and what is called Mantschu-Tartary. Since the races of mankind have been distributed with reference to their physical organisation and especially to the form of the skull, it has been a prevalent opinion that the two latter of these races, who nearly resemble each other in the shapes of their heads, belong to one great stock, which is termed Mongolian, and is supposed to have had its origin and abode for many ages in the remote East, and probably beyond Lake Baikal. The Turkish race, on the other hand, is set down without hesitation as a Caucasian stock, or a people akin to the western nations, and originating in the same region of the world as the inhabitants of Europe. The Turks of the race of Osmanli, subjects of the Sultan, and the Tartars in European Russia and the Siberian towns, have the form of the head which is termed Caucasian, and this is generally supposed to be the primitive type of the Turkish race. The great nomadic nations of this race, the Nogays, Kirghises, Turkomans, as well as the remote offshoots of the same stock in the distant parts of Asia, as the Jakutes, are known to have a different organisation, approaching nearly to the Mongolian and Tungusian character. It is common to refer this deviation from the form assumed to be the original type of the race to mixture with the Mongolians, whose intermarriages are supposed to have modified the true Turkish form, and to have given rise to the comparative ugliness of the nomadic Turks, according to the European idea of beauty. The fact that many of the nomadic races speak pure Turkish dialects, and display few or no traces of intercourse with Mongolians, must be allowed to be an objection of some weight against this assumed intermixture in stock. But this difficulty has been overlooked. Now, it is an essential part of this hypothesis that the local position of the original Turks was in the same region with that of other Caucasian tribes, and far remote from the cradle of the Mongolian race. All the nations of the West have nearly one type; those of the north-eastern parts of Asia display another

by Father Hyacinth, and published at St. Petersburg in 1829. A part of this version has been translated from the Russian by Dr. Schott, and inserted by Ritter in his excellent *Erdkunde von Asien*. Th. 5.

form, peculiar from immemorial times to all the various races beyond the Altai. As there is not one instance of a nation that bore originally the Mongolian type originating from or having their abiding place, from the first ages of the world, in the western parts, or amidst the group of Caucasian nations, so it is not to be expected that one particular race from the Mongolian centre should be found to bear, as its genuine and original character, the Caucasian type. Here the historical information derived from Chinese sources comes to our aid.

That the Turkish nations are descended from the Hiong-nú, whose early history is preserved in Chinese records, has been clearly established by Abel-Remusat and Klaproth. The Chinese records are, in the opinion of the former of these writers, fully worthy of confidence, and sources of authentic history as far back as the accession of the dynasty of Han. Klaproth deduces from them a series of events much more remote in the history of the Hiong-nú. According to that learned writer, the Turkish race, soon after the great deluge, came down from the lofty and now perpetually snow-clad mountains of Tang-nú and the Great Altai, and soon spread themselves towards the S.W. and S.E. It seems that in very early times they took possession of the country on the southern declivity of the highest steppes of Mongolia, to the northwards of the Chinese provinces of Shan-si and Shen-si, and particularly of the region of In-shan, where the mountain of that name, near the northward bending of the Hoang-ho, forms the continuation of the second great hill-system of Central Asia, that of the Thian-shan, or the Mountains of Heaven. This people were, according to Klaproth, styled Hiun-yue, under the dynasty of Shang, which reigned over China from 1766 to 1134 B.C.; under the Tsin and Han, from 256 B.C. to A.D. 263 they obtained the name of Hiong-nú. The time of their greatest power, when they were formidable enemies of the Chinese, and waged frequent and bloody wars with the generals of the Celestial Empire, was before the middle of the second century of our era. Their power was then broken by various accidents, by severe famines, by internal dissensions; the consequence of which was a division of their race into the northern and southern Hiong-nú. The southern tribes allied themselves to the Chinese, and by these the northern hordes were expelled from the ancient domains of the Hiong-nú race, situated between the upper Amur, the Selinga, and the mountains of Altai. The dispersion of the northern Hiong-nú is supposed by Klaproth to have given occasion to the first great movement among the nomadic nations of Asia towards the west.

The enemies of the Hiong-nú increased in power in subsequent times; and, in the first quarter of the third century, the remains

of that celebrated people were overcome and finally expelled from the country which the southern tribes had continued to possess between the desert of Gobi and the northern boundary of China. This is the date of the dispersion and of the wandering march of a great part of the Hiong-nú or Turkish race towards the western parts of Tartary, and of the final occupation of the desert of Gobi and the northern provinces of the Chinese empire, by the tribes who have since possessed the country, and who over China itself have raised several imperial dynasties.

After the destruction of the empire of the Hiong-nú, the Turkish race, aboriginal in the region of Asia which lies between the Amur and the Hoang-ho, abandoned the vast steppes which border on the desert of Gobi and reach to In-shan and the north of China, and dispersed themselves over various parts of Northern Asia. The main body of them found a new country, which became their second home or permanent abode, in the high plains now included in Chinese Turkestan, viz., in the mountainous region of Tian-shan, around Turfan, and reaching eastward to Chamil or Hami, and westward to Karaschar, and northward to Uran-tschì or Bischbalig. The Chinese annals in subsequent ages contain accounts of several barbaric dynasties, founded by tribes of the same race, who held a temporary and limited dominion in the countries farther westward, whither the Hiong-nú had retired. One of them was the empire of the Thu-khiue: a third dynasty of much later origin was that of the Hoi-hou.

It was in this region that the Thu-khiue became known to the Byzantines and to Europe in general, under the name of Turks. An embassy was sent by the younger Justinian to the court of the sovereign of the Turks, in 596, who reigned in Ektag, or the Golden mountain, over the greater part of Central Asia. It was on this occasion that the people of Constantinople first heard the name of their future conquerors. It seems that the Turks had at this period conquered the greater part of the country between Mount Altai and the eastern shores of the Caspian.

In the middle of the eighth century, according to Klaproth, the empire of the Thu-khiue was destroyed by another Turkish people, likewise descended from the Hiong-nú, who came from the countries situated to the southward of lake Baikal. These people were called Hoi-hou, and by some writers Hakas: they ruled for 100 years over the Turks of Altai, but were partly extirpated and partly expelled by the Chinese. A remnant of the Hoi settled in Tangut, to the northward of the Koko-Nor or Blue Lake. At length, in 1257, the Hoi were conquered by the overwhelming armies commanded by Tschengis and his Mongoles. A part of them retired farther westward and settled in the towns which are to the southward of the chain called the Mountains of

Heaven, where they became amalgamated with the Ouigours, the earlier inhabitants of the same districts, whose language and origin were the same as their own.

I have mentioned the Hœi-hou first, in order to distinguish them the more clearly from the Ouigours, with whom they are frequently confounded. The Chinese term the latter people Wei-ou-eul (üy-ü-ül), which answers in Chinese orthography to Ou-ig-ür. The Ouigours are the ancient inhabitants of the plains of Chinese Turkestan, where they had dwelt for many centuries before they were conquered by the nomadic people of the same race, termed Hœi-hou. They came in ancient times from a high country to the N.E. of the wilderness of Gobi, near the sources of the Orghon and the Selinga, where they were followed by the Mongoles, who occupied their former abodes, to the plains of Turfan and Chamil or Hami, and between Lake Lop and the river Ili. Here at an unknown period they laid aside their nomadic habits and became agriculturists and the inhabitants of towns, among which were those of Turfan, Chamil, Aksou, Kashgar. To the northward of these places was the more celebrated state of Khotan, which was for centuries the principal town of High Turkestan, and the history of which Abel-Remusat has elucidated from Chinese sources. It was in the vicinity of Khotan or Iu-thian that the celebrated traveller Lao-tseu is said to have erected a temple in honour of Buddha in the sixth century before the Christian era. Khotan became afterwards the metropolis of Buddhism or the religion of Fo, in Tartary, and the inhabitants of Central Asia had adopted that religion, and with it a certain degree of civilization, many centuries before it reached the Mongoles or the Mandshures. According to the historians of the Wei, the religion of Fo was widely spread in these countries in the fourth century B.C., and they were over-spread with temples, towns, and monasteries of persons of both sexes, devoted to the monasticism of the Lamaite superstition. In times long anterior at least to the era of Islam, Khotan was the emporium of trade between China, Persia, and India, and it was the medium by which the religious doctrines brought into it from India, through Kashmir, were disseminated over China and the whole N.E. of Asia. It retained its independence till the extension of the Mongolian power, and subsequently, with the rest of Eastern Turkestan, came under the dominion of China. Khotan has been visited by two Europeans: by Marco Polo about 1280 A.D., and by Benedict Goetz, the discoverer of China, in 1604. The former found the people already Mohammedans, and their towns abounding to superfluity with all the supports of human life—with cotton, flax, corn, and wine: the inhabitants were devoted to agriculture and manufactures, but were bad soldiers.

We thus discover the patriarchal stem of the great Turkish race at that era when the light of history begins to dawn upon the East, still planted as one member in a group of nations, isolated in a remote region of Asia, on the borders of China, or between them and the lofty desert of Gobi which sends its streams on one side to water the Chinese empire, and on the other to the Frozen Ocean. These nations are far removed from the centre of the western or Caucasian race, whose physical type is so strongly contrasted with the Mongolian. Without assuming that there is a close relation between the physical organisation of human races and the regions of which they have been the immemorial inhabitants, it yet seems extremely improbable that a stock so situated was originally of the Caucasian type. The question is one of more interest in regard to the physical history of our species than it at first appears to be. It is fitted to excite us to further inquiry into the relation between the Turkish race and the other nations, who by their local positions belonged originally to the same group. Philological researches are alone calculated to throw satisfactory light upon this subject. A comparison of the language of the Turkish, Mongolian, and Tungusian races is not, as may be supposed, altogether new or unattempted. It has suggested itself to several writers since the time when Adelung and Vater first laid open and marked out the great field of philological research; but Abel-Remusat, until very lately, was the only writer who had entered far into this subject. The philology and literature of the Turkish nations was in particular his investigation. By exploring the history of the Ouigours or eastern Turks, and of their curious language, the first of the Scythian dialects that was reduced to writing, he discovered an important link in the chain of these languages which connects the western Turkish with the idioms of the Mongols and Mandshurians. Some later writers have followed up this investigation; among them the most distinguished is Dr. Schott, who has seen further into the structure and affinities of the Scythian languages than any former philologist. As this inquiry affords the only probable way of discovering what original relations existed between the three great races of High Asia, I shall endeavour to collect and lay before the reader, in as short a compass as possible, the results of all the inquiries yet instituted.*

Adelung considered the Turks, Mongolians, and Tungusians, to be three distinct races of men, each having a peculiar and original language; and he supposed these languages to be quite uncon-

* See Adelung, *Mithridates* (Th. 1.; Scherer in Fried. Adelung's *Nachträge zu dem ersten Theil des Mithridates*; Abel-Remusat, *Recherches sur les Langues Tartares*; Julius von Klaproth, *Asia Polyglotta*; Dr. Schott, *Versuch über den Tatarischen Sprachen*; F. Ritter von Xylander, *Das Sprachgeschlecht der Titanen; Gyamathi, Affinitas Linguae Hungaricæ, &c.*

nected with each other, and with all other human idioms. It is so much the more remarkable, in his opinion, that the Tungusian, though confined to the eastern extreme of the ancient continent, contains some words common to it with languages spoken in Europe, such are the following:—

TUNGUSIAN.	EUROPEAN.
Sengui	Sanguis (Latin).
Ura (hinder-part)	ὀψά (Greek).
Tschop (top of a hill)	Zopf, top, tuft (Germ. Eng.)
Non (virgin)	Nonne, nun (German).
Heren (master)	Herr, Herrn (German).
Kiesun (to talk)	Kösen (German).
Hife (oats)	Hafer (German).
Farsche	Part.
Fialhou	Foul.
Furu	Fury.
Fourdan (a way)	Fordh (Welsh).
Latu	Late.
Malu	Malleus.
Morin (a horse)	Mähre (German).

In the time of Adelung there were no accessible sources of information respecting these languages that were sufficient for enabling him to form a correct opinion as to their affinity or diversity. Of late years materials have been acquired which lessen this deficiency, and an opinion has gained ground which is opposed to that maintained by Adelung. The first writer who appears to have been strongly impressed by the analogy which really exists between the different idioms of Tartary was Scherer, a librarian at Munich. He observed that a comparison of corresponding sentences in these languages indicates a striking resemblance both in the structure of phrases and in particular words. Scherer's remarks are founded on certain passages in versions of the Lord's Prayer in Turkish or Tartar dialects, in the Mandschu dialect of the Tungusian language, and in the Kalmuk dialect of the Mongolian, and they likewise contain one or two references to an extract from a Kalmuk romance in Benj. Bergmann's *Nomadische Streifereyen*. The following are Scherer's specimens. Octorgai-du (Kalmuk), i. e. *Heaven in*. In Turkish the same construction, *Tangri-de*.

Tani neretani, Kalm. i. e. *vestri nomen vestrum*. Turkish, Senin adin, i. e. *tui nomen tuum*.

Abga-de thege meni ama—Mandschu. Compare Goek-de degen benin atam—Turk. i. e. *Heaven-in dwelling my Father*.

The expressions, "Bayassuk-sani dula," K., i. e. "*the rejoicing for,*" in German, "*Zu erfreuen um,*" and "oengoeroel-duktu adali," i. e. *the forgiving like*, or "*dem Vergeben gleich,*" also

Kalmuk phrases, and "eget-schi," *evil-from*, in Mandschu, are constructions completely analogous to those of the Tartar or Turkish language.

Scherer subjoins a collection of words which strikingly resemble each other. In this point of view we shall hereafter have occasion to compare the languages of the three nations. He also first pointed out the analogy which is to be recognised in the elements and composition of words. These elements, especially the guttural and nasal consonants, are strikingly alike in the Mongolian, Mandschu, and Turkish. This correspondence is displayed in the fact that the same alphabet has been found well adapted to all these idioms. The Ouigours, as it is well known, were the first Turkish nation who learnt the art of writing. They were taught the use of letters by Nestorian or other Syrian missionaries, and by them the art was communicated to the Mongoles and the Mandschures. These Ouigourian characters, says M. Abel-Remusat, are found to express the vocables of the Mongolian, Mandschurian, and Turkish languages, just as texts drawn from the Neski, Cufic, or Mauretanic, are spelled with nearly equal facility in the ordinary Arabic characters.

Scherer also noticed in the structure of Mandschu and Mongolian words, and in the arrangement of the elements of which they are composed, that remarkable peculiarity which Viguier pointed out in his Turkish grammar as a characteristic of some Turkish dialects, and which he termed the Quadruple Harmony of Vowels. It consists in the rule that a given vowel occurring in one syllable of a word, or in the root, requires an analogous vowel—that is, a vowel belonging to the same set, of which sets there are in the Turkish four—in the following syllables of the same word, or in the particles appended to it, which therefore alter their vowels accordingly.

This law in the formation of words constitutes a very remarkable feature of analogy in the languages of Tartary or of Central Asia. The rule which exacts the harmony of vowels, as above described, pervades the original component materials of these dialects, and it therefore seems necessarily to carry us back for the period of its origination to the age of their first developement. The languages in which this law prevails are not only the Turkish, Mongolian, and Mandschu, but likewise some others, all of which have been observed to display, in various particulars, marks of relationship more or less decided with the same class of human idioms. The Hungarian language, which belongs to the class of the Finnish or Uralian dialects, displays the influence of this same principle of formation in the most extensive degree. In that language, the vowels of the primitive word or root have a predominant influence over the vowels of the adjunct or servile syllables. In the other languages above mentioned, the vowels

of the suffixes, or of the additional syllables which are appended to words, and perform the office assigned in other languages to inflexions or the terminations of case and number, take different vowels, according to the vowels of the word to which they are appended. Thus, *sza* and *ta*, which are signs of the plural in Mandschu, become *sze* and *te*, when they are suffixed to words containing *e*, or a vowel analogous to it. An attention to this harmony of vowels is likewise perceptible in the entire structure of polysyllabic words; such in Mandschu are *surapa*, *angara*, *ele*, *eme*. Words similar to *αγκυρα*, *χαριζομαι*, *ελωρ*, would not be tolerated in this language.

Another peculiarity prevails through the formation of words in the Turkish and Mongolian languages, in which certain consonants can only be pronounced in juxtaposition with certain vowels: some consonants require to be joined with *a*, *o*, *u*; others admit into connection with them only *e*, or the analogous diphthongs *oe* and *ue*.

These analogies in the structure of sentences, and still more such as are found in the composition of words themselves, are very remarkable. It seems difficult to account for them satisfactorily, either by referring them to accidental coincidence, or on the supposition that peculiarities so deeply inlaid in the component materials of languages can have been acquired or adopted through the imitation of foreign idioms; and this leads us to inquire whether confirmatory proofs can be discovered of a common origin, either in the grammatical framework of these languages or in examining the primitive words of which they are composed.

On comparing the Mongolian, the Mandschu, and Turkish languages, in relation to their grammatical structure, a series of very remarkable analogies is discovered. The resemblance of the Mongolian and the Mandschu is much closer than between either of them and the western dialects of the Turkish language. These dialects, especially that of the Osmanli, have been subjected to a foreign influence and culture, the result of intercourse with Persians and Arabians, and the introduction of Mohammedan literature among the Turks. But in the most essential points in which the western Turks differ in the grammatical forms of their language from the more remote nations of Turan, the eastern Turks or the Ouigours, tribes of the same race who dwell within the Chinese empire, and have never emigrated, and have therefore much less associated with people foreign to their race, actually differ from the Osmanli and approach to the Mongolians and Mandschures. The Ouigours themselves have indeed cultivated a peculiar literature from a remote period, and it is therefore likely that their idiom should be found more improved, both by the development of its native resources, and by embellishments from foreign intercourse, than the Mongolian or Mandschu.

Yet it retains much of its apparently original simplicity, and certainly some very remarkable traits which are common to it and to those eastern languages. Some of these characteristics are also discovered in the idioms of the Finnish and Hungarian nations.

The principal features of this grammatical resemblance may be comprised under the following heads:—

1. Words have in these languages no inflexions which can be so termed in the strictest sense; they admit no formative prefixes, allow no modification in the constituent elements of roots, nor any change, generally speaking, in the endings; they express the relations of nouns only by suffixed particles, of which they have a sufficient variety; the modifications of meaning in verbs are denoted likewise by suffixes; all these are joined for the most part to the unaltered root; to it they rather become adherent than are really compounded with it. There is a juxtaposition or aggregation of such auxiliary words, and no real cohesion.

Thus the plural number of nouns is marked by additional particles which do not form a part of the words, and may sometimes be written separately. Separate words, indicative of plurality or multitude, are added in the Mongolian and Mandschu, as also in Chinese. Among the separate words indicative of plurality one is common, as Dr. Schott has observed, to the three principal languages of Turan; *chamuk*, in Mongolian, is *qamuk*, or *qamu*, in Turkish; in Mandschu, *gemu*. Compare ὄμων and γέμει.

It is a peculiarity of the Mandschu that the only nouns which have plurals are significant of things which have life; all other substantives are indefinite as to number. In the Ouigour dialect of the Turkish, the particle which in other dialects denotes the plural is never appended to nouns, which are therefore found in the same indefinite state; yet this particle exists in the Ouigour language, and is used for forming a plural in pronouns.

The derivation of these pluralising particles is unknown; but it is apparent, as Dr. Schott has observed, that those used in the different languages are of cognate origin. The Mandschu and Mongolian have only what may be termed a dialectic difference, and even the Turkish and Finnish are plainly allied. Thus the Mandschu plural particles *sza*, *sze*, *szi*, *ta*, *te*, *ri*, are analogous to the Mongolian *sz*, *d*, *od*, *nar*, and the Mongolian *nar* to the *lar*, or *ler*, which is the Turkish plural ending, since *n* and *l* are in these languages interchangeable consonants, as it has been abundantly proved by Dr. Schott. In the Finnish dialects, properly so termed, the plural is formed by adding *t*, which in the Laponic, as well as in the Magyar, is replaced by *ch* or *k*.

Cases are likewise formed exclusively in these languages by appended syllables, or suffix particles, if they may be so termed.

These particles display unequivocal marks of a common derivation in the several languages. Thus, the signs of the genitive case, or of possession, are as follows:—

Mandschu—ni, i. Turkish—ning, ün. Mongol—ün, ü, jin.

The sign of the ablative is in Mandschu the particle *zi*, that is, *tschi*, postfixed; in Mongolian, *etze*: these are, as Schott remarks, nearly related among themselves, and with the Finnish *st* or *sta*. The Turkish has *den*, a form nearly parallel to the Greek *θεν*, and used precisely in the same manner. The Turkish *den* is a modification of the locative and dative particle *de*—compare *θι*. It is remarkable that *da*, *de*, or *du*, is the particle answering to *in*, in the Mandschu, Mongolian, and Turkish.

Abel-Remusat has remarked that the termination *tschi*, after a verb, becomes the formative of the agent noun in each of the three great Tartar languages. Another characteristic feature in all the High Asiatic languages, including the Mandschu, the Mongolian, and Tartar dialects, and the Finnish and Hungarian, as well as the Chinese, is, that the nouns, both substantive and adjective, have no gender; they are in form neither masculine nor feminine. When, in speaking of living creatures, it is necessary to distinguish sexes, this object is attained by appending words meaning male or female. These words are, in Mandschu, *khakha* and *khekhe*; in Mongolian, *ere* and *eme*; the Mongolian *ere* has been compared with the old Scythian word for *man*, *αορ*, and with the Greek *ἀρσεν*. In the Turkish *er* and *erkhek*, meaning male, correspond to the Mongolian *ere*, and *kas* or *kys* to *eme* or *khekhe*.

2. A want of inflexion in the forms of words always renders it necessary to observe strict rules as to their collocation, in order that their mutual dependencies and relations may not be mistaken. But in the Turanian languages very peculiar laws prevail as to the precise order of words and their arrangement in sentences. Dr. Schott observes that every word which influences the meaning of another, and denotes any circumstance, or defines any mode in its relations, must always be prefixed to it. Thus, adjectives uniformly precede nouns, adverbs verbs, the possessive pronoun the thing possessed, and clauses dependent on a relative precede the relative; nouns affected by a preposition always precede the preposition or the word which has the force of a preposition. It is difficult to bring this last fact under the meaning of the rule above stated. The circumstance, however, that prepositions, or rather particles used instead of prepositions, always follow nouns, is one of the most striking characters of the Turanian languages. In all other instances, prepositions are appended or suffixed in a manner precisely analogous to that in which they appear as substitutes for the terminations of cases, and it is indeed somewhat

difficult to point out a distinction between these modes of using servile or subsidiary particles.

In the Turkish and Finnish dialects, although the same laws prevail in general, yet some occasional deviation takes place from the rigid law of collocation established in the Scythian languages. This appears chiefly in the Osmanli and the Magyar, and is attributed to the influence of Persian and Arabic on the one, and of the European languages on the other. In general, however, the Turkish dialects have in this particular the same habitude which is characteristic of the High Asiatic languages:—

“Un trait commun à tous les dialects Turcs,” says M. Abel-Remusat, “sans excepter le Turc oriental (i. e. the Ouïgour), c’est l’inversion perpetuelle si contraire à nos habitudes, il semble même qu’on peut dire, si contraire à la nature. Ici, comme en Mandschou et en Mongol, le mot qui régit se place toujours après celui qui est régi, et le verbe principal, auquel viennent ressortir directement ou indirectement tous les mots d’une phrase, doit toujours être mis à la fin. Les mots composés, les noms en rapport, les particules, les phrases incidentales, tout est soumis à la même règle; et si dans les textes Ouïgours on trouve des cas où elle semble négligée, on s’aperçoit aisément que ces exceptions sont l’effet immédiat et palpable d’une influence étrangère.”

3. The preceding observations relate chiefly, though not exclusively, to nouns, and the method of collocation which the peculiarity of their structure makes necessary. The following remarks refer principally to verbs:—

Circumstances or modes in action which other languages express by means of adverbs, by separate pronouns, or by auxiliary verbs dependant on the principal verb, are expressed in the Scythian languages by means of particles or particular syllables brought into immediate connexion with the verbal root, and serving to denote all such modifications in its meaning.

With one single exception, which is that of the Osmanli Turkish, a mixed dialect disguised by a peculiar culture under the influence of a foreign literature, all the languages of Eastern Asia display the greatest simplicity in the formation of verbs. The root of the verb is always the imperative. By the addition of particles to the imperative, all the modifications of which these verbs are susceptible are induced. It has even been proposed by some writers to characterise all these languages by a term derived from this circumstance. The Osmanli, as I have observed, forms an exception to the simplicity or poverty of the other languages comprehended in the same class. It employs a verb substantive as an auxiliary verb, a thing unknown in the cognate idioms. It forms a great variety of compound tenses and moods, and has complex derivative conjugations, such as those called transitive, co-operative, reciprocal, and inceptive verbs. Of all these no vestiges have been discovered in the Ouïgour or

Eastern Turkish, which, on the contrary, has all the simplicity of the other Turanian languages. It employs no auxiliary verb, has no compound tenses. By means of post-fixed particles it forms a present and a past tense, and it has been found to possess no other modification of the verb indicative of time.*

4. Most of these languages are scantily provided with conjunctions, but rich in gerunds, which actually contain conjunctions, and render separate and distinct particles unnecessary; even when the gerunds, or the participles which supply their place, are less numerous, they are still frequently used. Thus, as Dr. Schott observes, are formed long-winded and singularly involved periods, especially in the Turkish language, which it is quite impossible to translate, their construction being preserved. † From this want of conjunctions and tendency to form involved periods, the infinitives and participles assume the character of verbal nouns, and are brought more frequently and with greater boldness into connexion with pronominal suffixes, and with the terminations of cases belonging to nouns, than in any other language. Hence an apparent copiousness in verbal inflexion which is in fact a simplicity and poverty of structure. Some instances of this kind may be seen in the short citation above made from Scherer, in which the same construction appears in all the languages compared. Verbal nouns, which resemble in form the Greek *θελημα*, become in construction with pronouns real verbs. ‡ With that form indeed the infinitive mood ending in *me* or *ma* in Mandschu, and in Tartar or Turkish in *mek* or *mak*, may be compared. In this want of analysis in construction, which is so striking a characteristic of the High Asiatic languages, the Turkish fully participates. It is remarkable that the Osmanli, which possesses a greater variety of forms than the pure Turkish or Ouigour, scarcely derives any advantage from them, as if it had not been able to shake off the yoke originally impressed upon it, and to accustom itself to the liberty which it has acquired.

“L’usage des temps simples et impersonnels,” says M. Abel-Remusat, “viennent souvent y obscurcir les idées, que les temps composés exprimeraient avec netteté et précision.” “Les Ouigours ont évité les principaux inconvéniens de ce système, en suivant un marche simple et naturel, qui empêche d’être élégant, mais permet d’être clair. Les autres Turcs, qui, sans renoncer à l’emploi fréquent des participes, ont voulu porter dans leurs compositions un style plus orné, et construire leurs phrases d’après un plan plus compliqué, n’ont réussi qu’à rendre la construction embarrassée. Chez eux une longue période, imparfaitement soutenue par le retour fréquent du gérond ou du participe, conduit souvent le lecteur au bout d’une page, sans lui offrir le verbe d’où

* Abel-Remusat. Recherches sur les Langues Tartares.

† Versuch über die Tatarischen Sprachen.

‡ “Ritter F. Von Xylander.” Die Sprache der Titanen.

dépend le sens de la phrase entière. C'est de l'aveu des plus habiles dans ce genre de littérature, ce qui fait que la lecture des ouvrages Turcs est toujours difficile et fatigante."

These general remarks are sufficient to point out the nature of that analogy in genius and structure which exists between the languages of the Tartarian nations. I shall now add some particular grammatical forms, which exemplify their connexion.

There is no class of words in which the oldest forms of languages are so well preserved as in pronouns, as any one is aware who has any accurate knowledge of the classical languages.

The personal pronouns are as follows :

	I.	Thou.	He.
Mongolian	Bi	Tschi	Tere
Mandschu	Bi	Si	Tere, I
Turkish	Ben	Sen	Ol, O
Ouigour	Mau	San	Ol
Finnish	Ma	Sa	
Esthonian	Ma, Minna	Sa, Sinna	Ta, temma
Lapponic	Mon	Don	Son
Hungarian	En	'Te	Oe

N.B. The third person is in reality wanting in most of these (as in Greek), and the place is supplied by a demonstrative.

	Genitive.	Of me or mine.	Of thee or thine.	Of him, his.
Mongolian		mini	tschini	ta
Mandschu		mini	sini	tereï
Turkish		benüm	sening	aning
Ouigour		maning	sangge	aning
	Dative.	To me.	To thee.	To him.
Mongolian		mëndou	tschimdou	
Mandschu		minde	sinde	
Turkish		bange	sange	ange
Ouigour		mangge	saning	angge
	Plural.	We.	Ye.	They.
Mongolian		bida	ta	te-det
Mandschu		be	souwe	te-set
Turkish		biz	siz	an-lar
Ouigour		bis-lar	sis	o-lar
Finnish		me	te	
Esthonian		meie	teie	neet, nummad
Lapponic		mi, mige	ti, tiye	si
Hungarian		mi, miyuk	ti, tiyed	oe-k
	Genitive Plural.	Of us, our.	Of you, your.	Of them, their.
Mongolian		minu	tschinu	
Mandschu		mini	sini	ini
Turkish		bizim	sizing	anlarong
Ouigour				alar-din

Dative Plural.	To us.	To you.	To them.
Mongolian	mendou	tachendou	tedendou
Mandschu	mindeu	sinde	terede
Turkish	bize	size	anlare
Ouigourian	bis-ke	sis-ke	alar-ke.

It must here be observed that the pronoun of the third person is in many instances defective in several of these languages, and made up of demonstratives and of other substitutes. Hence there is great variety in the forms apparently belonging to this personal pronoun. But those of the first and second display the most striking resemblances in all the above languages; the differences may be considered as merely dialectical; and the pronouns of the third person correspond when they are extant. Even the irregularities of one language correspond with those of another.

We must not omit to observe that the Mandschu has another form answering to the plural of the 1st person, viz. *mouse*, regularly formed as a plural by addition of the pluralising particle from *mou*. Compare the Lithuanian *més*, genitive *mísi*, dat. *mís*. This word is used when the speaker includes the person whom he addresses together with himself in the same *we*; a variety in the number and conception of personal pronouns, which is well known in the languages of the Algonquin and other American nations, and has been considered as peculiar to them.

The Mandschu, Mongolian, and Turkish languages have, according to the peculiar genius of those idioms, syllables which, suffixed to the attributes of the subject, form a sort of possessive or attributive participle or adjective, and answer the purpose of relatives governing clauses. This requires explanation.

In Mandschu, *aracha-ngge* means *written-having*, or "quiscrpsit;" *minde-buche-ngge*, to me given-having, "qui mihi dedit." The particle *ngge* means possession, *belonging to*; as *nijalna-ingge*, i.e. "menschen-wo," "what belongs to man," and it thence becomes the sign of the possessive case. This *ningge*, or *ngge*, of the Mandschu is likewise found in Turkish, in the particle indicative of the possessive case, which is *ning*. The Mongolians have a particle, *ki*, *gi*, and *kei*, which they use just as the Mandschures use *ngge* for a sort of relative suffix. The Turkish alone has a separate relative pronoun, *kim* and *ki*, which is even found in the Ouigour, or pure Eastern Turkish dialect, and this may be prefixed and used as is the relative pronoun in the European languages. The use of this is, as M. Abel-Remusat observes, foreign to the grammatical structure of these languages, and the Ouigour has the means of substituting for it a suffix particle like the other idioms of Northern Asia.

From the Mandschu *ningge*, or *ngge*, compounded with the possessive pronoun, or rather with the possessive case of the personal pronoun, and from corresponding words in Mongol and Turkish, arises a sort of abstract relative which is very remarkable from its almost exact identity with the German *meinige*. Thus, *mini*, *sini*, &c., make in Mandschu, *miningge*, *siningge*, *iningge* (literally *mi-ni-ngge*, viz. "mine what is" or "mine being," in German, "das meinige," "das deinige," "das seinige.") In Mongolian the corresponding form is *minüge*, *tschinüge*, *ekonüge*; in Turkish, *minningki*, *seningki*, *aningki*.

The verb-substantive is another part of speech which retains very old forms in many languages. The Mandschu has two verbs used in the sense of *to be*; these are *hi*, meaning properly *to hold*, or abide, as in the infinitive *bime*, pres. indic. *bimbe*; this resembles and *may be* cognate with the Sanskrit, *bhu*; Welsh, *bû*; be, *bin*, *buwain*, *φύω*, *fu*, of European languages. Another verb, more strictly a verb substantive, in Mandschu, is *ome* (εμεν). The Mongolian has *bü-kü* (φύται), and present *bui* (ich bin) and *acho* (esse), *amui* (I am). The Turkish has only *ol-maq* (properly, *fieri*): with this we must compare the Finnish infinitive *olla*, Esthon, *ollema*, in the pres. tense, 1. *olek*, 2. *olet*, 3. *on*; pl. 1. *olemma*, 2. *olette*, 3. *owat*; and the Lapponic corresponding form, 1. *lem*, 2. *lek*, 3. *la*; pl. 1. *lep*, 2. *lepped*, 3. *lak*.

The preceding instances answer the double purpose of showing resemblances in vocabulary, and also in grammatical forms between the different Scythian languages. It is impossible to doubt of the original affinity of the pronouns in all these idioms, or of those of the verb-substantive. What is more surprising is the resemblance which displays itself, without being sought, between these Scythian forms and those of the Indo-European languages. The consideration of this last subject would be foreign to my present undertaking, and I shall merely remark, with respect to it, that the resemblances in particular grammatical elements, as in the pronouns especially, and also those which may be pointed out in radical words—of these a short specimen has already been given from Scherer, which has been greatly extended by Klaproth—between even the most western European languages and the Mongolian and Mandschu, spoken in the extreme east of Asia, are certainly too strong and decided to be attributed to mere accidental coincidence, while, on the other hand, it is impossible to account for these phenomena by referring them to occasional intercourse, a thing which cannot be imagined between nations so widely remote from each other. If we attempt to resort to the only explanation that remains, namely, the hypothesis of a common origin, we seem to be carried back beyond the period open to historical or even ethnographical research.

We come now to the inquiry whether, and to what extent, there is a connexion in regard to the vocabulary and the stock of primitive words between the Turanian languages. It may be observed that, if no such affinity is found, we shall consider them to be one class of languages, a class strongly marked, and the members of which are nearly related to each other by such analogies as constitute a class, but we shall not venture to declare that a family relation exists between them, unless it be allowed that resemblance in grammatical construction, where it amounts to a certain degree, constitutes by itself this relation. Many have thought so, and they have reckoned the polysynthetic idioms of America, and the monosyllabic idioms of the Chinese and Indo-Chinese as languages respectively of one kindred stock. On this ground, the languages of the Turanian nations would be considered as one family of languages, even if no roots should be found common to them.

Father Gerbillon, who travelled in Chinese Tartary, in the suite of an expedition commanded by the Emperor of China, and whose "*Elementa Linguae Tartaricæ*" was the first work that appeared in Europe on the Mandschu language, was of opinion that only seven or eight words in that idiom were similar to the Mongolian. It has been generally supposed that there is an almost equal diversity between the latter and the Turkish, notwithstanding the tradition collected by Abulghazi Khan of the common original of the two races of people speaking these idioms. M. Abel-Remusat says that Gerbillon was greatly mistaken; both he and Klapproth affirm that a large number of similar words exist in these languages, though they do not thence infer a common origin. M. Abel-Remusat makes a distinction in reference to this point, which supports a very strong argument, and cannot easily be set aside if the fact is exactly as he considered it to be. He divides words into different classes; one class he terms words of the first necessity and simplicity, and thinks common to all nations, springing from the same stock; another set are words of a merely secondary kind, such as simple nations adopt from their neighbours; a third class denote ideas which indicate refinement. The first class contains such expressions as those of kindred, father, mother, husband, wife, &c., and words denoting parts of the body, hand, head, &c., striking external objects, sun, moon, star, tree, river, and numbers up to ten. Secondary words are terms for domestic animals, metals, fruits, esculent plants, instruments of agriculture, of war, and other arts. The third class contains names for offices, dignities, &c. M. Abel-Remusat says, that of words belonging to the second class a great proportion are common to the Mongolian and Mandschu particularly, but that the terms included in the first class are distinct in each

of these idioms. He therefore considers the Turanian nations as separate and different races.

A late writer, who has investigated this subject with great accuracy, has called in question inferences drawn by Abel-Remusat, as well as the data from which they are deduced. His work, to which he has given the modest title of "Versuch über die Tatarischen Sprachen," indicates a deeper insight into the genius of the Scythian languages than any former writer has displayed. Dr. Schott begins by observing, that even in idioms between which a near affinity has been completely established and is universally allowed, a multitude of words radically distinct from each other may be found to express the most universal ideas and objects of the first necessity. What resemblance is there, for example, between our German word *sohn*, a son, and the Greek *υιος*, or between *sohn* and *tochter*, and *filius* and *filia*? Who would connect *bruder*, or brother, with *ἀδελφος*; sister with *ἀδελφη*; *frau* with woman, *femina*, or *γυνη*; man with *vir*; *gattin* or *gemahlin*, wife, with *uxor* and *ἄλοχος*? How is *himmel*, heaven, related to *cælum*, *οὐρανός*, and the Russian *niebo*? How earth, *terra*, *γη*, and the Persian *zemin*? How moon, *luna*, and the Sanskrit *tshandra*? our sun and the Persian *churshid*, *mihir*, and *afitâb*? *kopf*, head, and the Persian *szer*? hand, *manus*, *χειρ*, and *deszt*? *mund*, *os*, *dehân*, *στομα*, and the Russian *rott*? *baum*, tree, arbor, *δενδρον*? *vogel*, bird, *avis*, *ορνις*, and the Russian *ptitza*? *stone*, *saxum*, *πετρα*, and Russian *kamen*? All these, and very many other words, in languages known to belong to one family, express ideas of the most simple class, and are yet totally diverse. Similar instances are afforded by a comparison of the Semitic languages, whose relation to each other is in other respects scarcely more distant than that of dialects of one speech. The moon is in Hebrew *yârêach*, in Arabic *qamar*; a hill, Hebrew, *hôr*, Arabic, *jebel*; a tree, Hebrew, *êtz*, Arabic, *shedsher*; a stone, Hebrew, *ebhen*, Arabic, *hajar*. Even in the very same language, words are often found expressive of necessary objects, which, though exactly synonymous, are totally different in several provincial dialects.

These instances are quite sufficient to prove that a considerable number of different words, even though expressive of ideas of the first necessity, do not disprove a family relation between languages. In the Scythian languages as in the Indo-European the same roots are often discovered, with some deviation in their meaning. It must also be observed that words themselves undergo in the Scythian dialects modification from the interchanges of particular consonants and vowels. In this way many words derived certainly from the same origin are so disguised that, without attention to the laws which govern this interchange, and which

Dr. Schott has been the first to explore with respect to the Scythian languages, their real affinity could hardly be recognised.

The following is a short selection of examples in which words of the same origin are found in several of these languages, expressive of ideas nearly related to each other.

In Turkish *gol* or *goel* means a lake: in Mongolian *ghool*, a river: *golo* in Mandschu is the bed of a river. The sea is in Turkish *dengiz* or *deñiz*: in the Magyar or Hungarian, *tenger*: *r* and *z* are shown to be frequently interchanged. In Mongolian *tenggisz*, and in Mandschu *tenggir*, means a *great lake*. In Mandschu *alia* (Mong. *aghola*, *oola*), a mountain: in Hungarian *alom*, a hill. In Turkish *qaya*, a rock: Hung., *koe*, *köv*; and in the Finnish languages *kii*, *ku*, a stone. The Mongolian *tsilagh-on*, a stone, resembles the Hungarian *szikla*, in the word *kö-szikla*, rocks, which seems to be compounded of two synonyms.

For *ice* the Finns have the word *yeg*, *yegna*: the Hungarians, *yég*. To this word the root of the Mongolian word *yik-ekün*, cold, frost, corresponds, while the Mandschu *juche* again means *ice*. With *juche* the Turkish *szuq*, or *saghauq*, cold, is closely connected.

The Mongolian *aldar*, and the Mandschu *elder*, mean shine, splendour: in Turkish we have *ilder-im*, or *yilder-im*, lighting, and *yeldiz* (for *yeldir*), star. The sun is in Mongolian *nar-an*: summer, the sunny season, is in Hungarian *nyár*: in Turkish *yaz*, written for *yar*, by the interchange of consonants. In German and English the names for sun and summer seem to be in like manner related.

The Turkish for heaven, *gök*, *gökler*, pl., does not occur in that sense in the other Scythian languages; but in the meaning of *blue*, which it has not lost in Turkish, we recognise it in the Hungarian *kék*, the Mongolian *köke*, and the Mandschu *kuku*.

Boi in Turkish, form, stature, is related to *beye* in Mongolian and Mandschu, meaning *bodies*. The Mandschu *udju*, head, seems isolated; but in Turkish *üşz*, or *üz*, means the upper part of anything, as in *uz-re*, upon, above. The root of the Turkish *qul-aq*, ear, is found in the Finnish *caul-en*, I hear: Hungar. *halla-ni*, to hear. The Turkish *göz*, eye, is connected with the Mongolian *üze* (*üze-kü*), to see, from which the Mongolian forms the word *üzel*, sight, and the Turkish *güzel*, *beautiful*, *spectabilis*.

These instances have been adduced by Dr. Schott as indicative of the fact, that, when the same roots are not detected in different Scythian languages in corresponding terms for the same objects or ideas, they are often to be found in use in a somewhat modified sense, in several of these idioms. There is also a considerable number of words bearing precisely the same meaning, both radical and

derivative, which are either identical or very similar in the Turkish, Mongolian, and Mandschu languages. In some instances these words have been borrowed by one people from another. It is difficult to determine when this is the fact, and when they are a part of the original stock of vocables belonging to each language; but sometimes this may be done by noticing the form of such words, and whether their formative terminations belong to one idiom or to another; whether such words are in one dialect isolated and in another derivable from known roots, and associated with cognate words. When words nearly similar or identical exist in several languages, connected with ideas of the first necessity, we ought not, without proof, to conclude that they were derived by one people from another. Several examples illustrative of these remarks are cited in the work to which I refer. They afford additional evidence in support of the conclusion already suggested.

The preceding examples of analogy have been pointed out by Dr. Schott; they are few in number, but on comparing carefully the vocabularies of the Northern Asiatic languages given by Klaproth and others, I have found a correspondence equally decided, comprising a large proportion of words belonging to that class which Abel-Rémusat designates as terms of the first necessity. The collection is too long for insertion in these pages: I intend to avail myself of it on some future occasion. I must now give a few specimens of the interchanges of consonants and vowels, discovered by Dr. Schott in comparing the vocabularies of the High Asiatic languages, a subject which has been first elucidated by that writer. The following are some of the leading facts which he has observed:—

The final *n* in Mandschu nouns is frequently elided, and this is the only change produced in roots by grammatical construction: this consonant is in fact only a formal termination. *Morin*, horse, makes *mori-sa* in the plural. The Mongoles also omit *n*; as for *Khan-t*, plural of *Khan*, king, *Kcha-t*. Both these languages often drop the *n*, ad libitum, even without construction. Turkish nouns never drop *n*, grammatically or in construction, but often want *n* or *un*, in instances where the other languages have it as the usual ending. This syllable must therefore be cut off when we compare Turkish with Mongolian or Mantschu words. Examples:—

Mongolian, kütz-ün	Turkish, gütsch (strength).
„ mez-ün	„ muz, buz (ice).
„ toghoz-un	„ toz (dust).

The Turkish avoids *n* at the beginning of words by omitting it or changing it into *j* or *d*,* as—

* *d* and *n* are interchangeable in the Celtic, *d* and *j* in many languages.

Mongolian, neng	Turkish, eng, (very).
" nasz-un	" jaz or jaach (age, period).
Mandschu, nasz'ch-un (fortunate time).	
Mongolian, nögür	Turkish, ögür (amicus, consuetus).
Mandschu, nadan	" jadi, jedi (seven).

In the Hungarian or Magyar, *ny* takes the place of *d*.

*Mongolian, neile-kü	} to open.	Turkish, del-mek (to bore a hole). }
Hungarian, nyil-ni		
" nyelv	" dil, (tongue).	
" nyel-ni	" dile-mek (to swallow).	
" negy (four)	Mandschu, dechi (forty).	
" nyar	Turkish, jaz for jar, (summer).	
Compare Mongolian, nar-an (sun).		
nyol-ni	" jal-maq (to lick).	

The Turkish affects the medial or soft mutes and avoids aspirates and even tenués at the beginning of words. Thus it changes all labials, including *f* and *v*, into *b*; it drops *f* entirely in some instances.

The Mandschu, like the Chinese, avoids *r* by changing it for *l*. The Turkish often changes it into a soft and scarcely audible *z*. Examples of the above changes:—

Mandschu	falga	Turkish, barq (a race).
Mongolian	ghar	Mandschu, gala; Turkish, gol (hand).
Hungarian	tenger	Turkish, dengiz (sea).
"	nyar	" jaz (summer).
"	ökür	" öküz (ox).
"	terd	" tiz (knee).
Mongolian	mörü	" omuz (shoulder).
Mandschu, ara: Hungarian, ír		" jaz (to write).

Words are in like manner disguised by the interchanges of gutturals and sibilants, and by the occasional omission of the former, phenomena which are observable in the dialects of most other languages.

The Turks and Mongoles change the hard *k* for a guttural *gh*, and the softer *k* for *q* and *j*. The Turkish final *k* or *q* is often a mere formative ending and is liable to be dropped: *qamuq*, Turkish, all, is in Osmanli *qamu*, in Mongolian *chamu*. The *maq* or *mek* of the infinitive in Turkish corresponds with *me* in Mandschu. *Gh* is dropped from the middle of words between two vowels, as *szighür*, a bullock, in Osmanli Turkish, becomes *szir* in Eastern Turkish, *schir* in Mongolian. So also *taghosz-un* (dropping also *un* as above) *toz*, Turkish; *chaghorai*, Mongolian, i. e. *chōrai*, in Turkish *qoru*, dry; *chabar*, Mongolian, a

* Kü in Mongolian, *si* in Magyar, and *meq* in Turkish, are only the signs of the infinitive.

nose, dropping the initial guttural and changing the mute into its aspirate and adding a vowel, which the Mandschu requires uniformly at the end of words, becomes very near the Mandschu *oforo*, in Turkish *bur-un*. The common root is *var* or *vor*; *olcho-me* Mandschu, is *qorq-maq*, Turkish.

Omissions of the initial guttural and changes of *x* and *j* produce such differences as the following:—*göz*, eye, Turkish; *üze-kü* (i. e. *üze*), Mongolian, to see; *üz-el*, sight, Mongolian; *güzel*, Turkish, spectabilis; *jasz-a*, Mandschu, an eye.

Mongolian, <i>zai</i>	space, room	Turkish, <i>jai-maq</i> (to extend).
„ <i>zacha</i>	border	„ <i>jaqa</i> .
„ <i>zali</i>	flame, cunning	„ { <i>jaling</i> (flame) <i>jalan</i> (deceit).
„ <i>zekü-kü</i>	to draw	„ <i>jük</i> (a burden).
„ <i>dschimesz</i>	barley	„ <i>jemisch</i> .
„ <i>zol-gha-cho</i>	to meet	„ <i>jol</i> (a way).

Examples of the same interchange in other Turanian languages:—

Mandschu, <i>dsche-me</i>	to eat	Turkish, <i>je-mek</i> .
„ <i>dschulergi</i>	before	„ <i>jileru</i> or <i>ilerü</i> (<i>ilergu</i>).
„ <i>dschaman</i>	quarrel	„ <i>jaman</i> (bad).
„ <i>tschala-me</i>	to err	„ <i>jalan</i> (false).
„ <i>botscho</i>	colour	„ <i>boja</i> .
Hungarian, <i>szel</i>	wind	„ <i>jel</i> .
Mandschu, <i>dschuche</i>	ice	„ <i>szouq</i> (cold).
		Finnish, <i>jeg</i> (ice).

By a similar comparison the author has shown that although the numerals differ considerably in all these languages, a sufficient analogy is discoverable between them to indicate an ancient though now obscure relation.

On comparing the phenomena traced in the preceding pages, it appears unquestionably to result that an extensive analogy of structure prevails through the four principal groups of languages compared—I mean the dialects belonging to the Turkish, the Mongolian, the Tungusian, and the Finnish, or Finno-Uralian families of languages, but I refer more particularly to the three former. They are all formed according to the same general laws. In the simplicity of their structure, and the want of real inflections, of which the place is supplied by juxta-position of particles, they approach in some degree to the character of the monosyllabic idioms spoken by nations who inhabit a contiguous region of the earth. They form a distinct class of languages, both from the Semitic, which inflects its dissyllabic roots and abounds in prepositions and conjunctions, and from the Indo-European idioms, which make so extensive a use both of inflection and composition,

which affect changes at the beginnings of words, and have their endings for the most part without addition. The languages of all these classes of nations last mentioned display the influence of that active fancy which peopled the universe with sentient souls, and ascribed life to all the objects of nature. Groves and fountains, rivers and trees, even stocks and stones, are in all their idioms either male or female. But the rude inhabitant of cold and arid steppes, rendered dull and phlegmatic by the monotonous aspect of nature and the changeless manner of his existence, gave no play to his imagination; he affixed different terms to his bulls, cows, his horses, and mares, and to creatures of which he made different uses, but all other objects were to him of one sex; he never compared inanimate with living things. It is, however, impossible to explain the common construction of the Turanian nations by reference to physical or moral circumstances; they display one type and method of formation; all question on this point seems to be silenced by the discovery of so many particular grammatical forms as we have traced through all of them, by their having the same pronouns, verbs substantive, and resembling particles. If we go still further back and examine the very structure of words, we find the inference confirmed; the law of harmonic vowels, found as far as I know in no other languages, shows that the inventors of words themselves had their attention directed to one principle, or were governed by a similar habit. Even the idiom or style in the composition of sentences sometimes displays similar analogies, and this was the fact which struck the attention of Scherer, and perhaps first suggested a further examination. Lastly, in the vocabulary itself, or the material of the several languages, there is a considerable extent of analogy; perhaps this would be thought of itself scarcely sufficient to lead us further than it led Klaproth and Abel-Rémusat, viz. to the opinion that frequent and ancient intercourse between the Mongolian, Tungusian, and Tartar tribes occasioned the adoption by each of common terms from the vocabulary of others. But such intercourse could only have produced an effect similar to that which the mixture of Normans and Saxons has effected in our own dialect; the adopted words would be distinguishable as entirely foreign; they would not be found naturalized by such interchanges of the particular elements of articulation as we have traced.

On the whole, there seems to be sufficient evidence to constitute the languages of Northern Asia as not only a particular class of human dialects, but as belonging to one great family of languages, of which the different members, though more remote from each other than the idioms of the Indo-European class, yet bear

and they are curiously contrasted with the African languages, traits that cannot be mistaken of a very ancient affinity. That the different nations who speak these languages, though they have been separated and scattered over interminable wildernesses from immemorial times, were yet allied in origin, or sprang from one primitive stock, is a further inference which it is difficult to avoid.

If we join the evidence thus deducible from a comparison of languages to the conclusion which historical testimony establishes respecting the original position of the Turkish race, and their early connection with nations of the remote East, we must give up entirely the notion that they were a Caucasian tribe, or nearly related in the first ages to the races of men who peopled Europe and the western parts of Asia. It has been observed, that while some Turkish nations, as the Russian Tartars and the Osmanli, have nearly the features of Europeans, other Turkish races display the type termed Mongolian. The latter are all the great nomadic races of Turkish extraction, in the central parts of Asia. The fact that the dialects of most of these nomadic nations are pure Turkish, without any considerable mixture of Mongolian words, strongly opposes the often-maintained opinion that their resemblance in features to the Mongoles has arisen from the blending of races, a supposition which the small numbers of the Mongoles at all times, in comparison of the great Turkish races, renders extremely improbable. This is not the proper place for a discussion of the question, to what other causes may be assigned such diversity in tribes descended from one race. I shall only remark, that it is not without parallel instances in the history of the Asiatic and European nations. The Finns and Lapps, for example, are allowed to be nations of one stock; yet they differ physically. The skull of the Lapp has the broad-faced Turanian form, while that of the Finn is entirely European, or of the type termed Caucasian.
