

Selected remarks to the spread of the title *khan*, *khagan*, *khatun* and related forms in languages of Inner Asia

Michal SCHWARZ

Masaryk University, CZECH REPUBLIC

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper¹ is to comment forms of the title *khan*, *khagan* and *khatun*² in languages of Inner Asia and focus on selected promising subtopics. Instead of standard philological analysis and full extraction of dictionaries, only selected or less frequently considered data are collected. The subtopics of this paper³ are connected to the typology of syllable, pragmatic

¹ This paper is written thanks to financial support of the Czech Science Foundation in the project *Mongolian ritual manuscripts in a Czech collection: their edition, history and Central Asian roots*, project code: GA19-07619S. Another deep thanks belongs to the library and kind colleagues at Jeju National University.

² In this paper I will use all variants *q-/k-/x-/χ-/kh-* in the initial and *-g/-/γ-* in the second consonant of the title *khagan* mostly as they are cited by mentioned authors. For *x-/k-* written by the same letter in Turkic/Uyghur texts see Clauson (1972: 611).

³ Planned another paper will be dedicated to Chinese characters used for transcription and cultural reception of these most probably non-Chinese titles.

shift of the meaning in historical development, semantic network of older words related with original form, and finally migration patterns, with interdisciplinary interpretation.

2. Methodological remarks

2.1. Typological note

From synchronic point of view, the syllable of the type *qan/xan* (with occlusive/fricative + vowel + nasal) is not rare in the morphological inventory of Inner Asian non-Chinese languages. For only few examples in Altaic cf. Turk. *qān-* > Mong. *qan-/qanu-/qang-* “to be satiated, satisfied” (Kara 1992: 192). Orkhon Turkic *qan* “blood”, *qaŋ* “father” (Tekin 1968: 341). In Mongolian there is also a loanword *Xan* designating not only Han Chinese people (Bawden 1997: 426), but also Koreans.

In places names, the component *-kan* is originally a diminutive suffix appearing in toponyms like *Abakan*, *Zavkhan*, *Orkhon*, Evenki *birakan* “small river/печка” (Murzaev 1964: 6). There is also same probably Mongolian diminutive suffix in Yakut e.g. *bičikän/byčykän* “small” (Kałużyński 1995: 111-112).

Similar situation is also in Indo-European languages of Inner Asia: in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian there is not only *qʰn* / *q:ʰn* / *xʰn*, phonetically *qān* as a title or part of Uighur name/title, but there is also Parthian *qhn*, phonetically *qahan* as “Jewish priest” or *xʰn* phonetically *xān* “house” as lexical unit not so easy distinguishable from *xngʰn* phonetically *qaγan* and *xʰtwn* phonetically *qatun* (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 202, 205, 363). The ending syllable is also widespread in tens of Parthian proper names, usually patronyms for example *Kasi(a)kān*, *Mardēngān*, *Mihragān*,

Frātākān, *Rastagān* (Livshits 2010: 103, 109, 112, 132, 135, 139), or toponyms like *Argakān*, *Artarašnukān*, *Kaw(i)dātakān*, *Rašndātakān*, from Middle Persian *Wurgān* (Livshits 2010: 173, 175, 191, 195, 198). In New Persian there is also a Turkic loanword *yaratqan* “creator” borrowed from Chaghatai *yara-* “tauglich sein”, causative suffix *-t* and Partizipsuffix *-γan* “der Schöpfer (= Gott)” (Doerfer 1975: 150). The quantity of lexical units of this type is interesting and it might deserve closer investigation in development and use of the title *khan/khagan* in Central Asia. Diachronic application of this typology is slightly touched in the section 6.

2.2. Ethnolinguistic ambiguity

According to Janhunen (1996: 128) “Ethnonyms are quite often both linguistically and contextually so vague that their ethnohistorical interpretation is virtually impossible.” It means, that there might be no exact relation between scribes and ethnic groups living around the steles and inscriptions in early literary cultures. The users might be limited mainly to the nobility, which often came from another group. For example in case of Hephtalites “The prevailing view is that the ruling class was of Turkish origin and that their subjects were of Iranian descent, though, some believe they were from the “White Huns” (...) It was eventually overthrown in 567 by an allied force lead by the Sassanian Empire and Muqan Kaghan of the Gokturk Empire.” (Jeong Su-il 2016: 356).

Above mentioned multinational relations obscure chances for exactitude in ethnolinguistic investigation of ancient languages. In a strict sense the presence of the title on edict/stele does not mean, that such title was used by all groups of local population. And on the contrary the absence of attestation in written sources does not mean, that the title was unknown to local people. The research of modern languages can offer examples of the types of contact analogous to the past.

For example when Field (1997: 226-227) comments the vocabulary of Turkic origin in Santa, he mentions, that one part of the lexicon are core vocabulary items and highlights that borrowed lexical items tend not to be the core vocabulary. He explains that several lexical items are more likely retentions from an earlier period when some of the ancestors of the Santa spoke a Turkic language, and thus are not borrowings - “in other words, when the Santa population shifted to Mongolic in the late 13th or early 14th century, these items remained in the Santa vocabulary and were never lost.” From this point of view it must be distinguished between retention, vs. borrowing and reborrowing. Even though there is a lack of data for ancient period, all these processes must but taken into consideration of hypothetical development of cognates vs. loanwords and their semantical shifts.

At the latest stage of their development, the titles also became parts of personal names. And in the transitory period, some appearances in historical inscriptions do not allow to properly judge if they are personal names or titles and may be both.⁴

3. Basic chronology in older stage and main languages

3.1. Older stage, Turkic and Indo-European

The disyllabic term *qaghan* or *qayan* was known in Inner Asia since the 3rd century A.D. (Gabain 1983: 616), i.e. in the period following the dissolution of the Han empire. Following citations describe opinions about this “title of great antiquity taken over by the Turks in the specific sense of an independent ruler” (Clauson 1972: 611) and its early spread.

“It was probably with the Avars (Ruanruan) and the proto-Mongolian Tuyuhun that the title *qayan* was first introduced to designate the great chief

⁴ For one example of the title *tarkhan* see Lurje (2010: 390).

or supreme ruler, in place of the older title Šan-jü (= Jabγu).” (Menges 1995: 20). Similarly Doerfer (1985: 56, 136) thinks that both Turkic *xaγan* / *xān* “Herrscher” and *xātun* “Herrscherin” go back to Ruanruan.

“The word was first used in 402 by Yujiulu Shelun of Rouran, who reportedly went by the title of Qiudoufa Khan. Records of earlier use of the title by the Tuoba Xianbei, founders of Northern Wei, were found on inscriptions at the Gaxian Cave Site discovered in 1980 in northern Daxinganling Prefecture.” (Jeong Su-il 2016: 453) Vovin supports interesting remark, that while Xianbei firstly did not called themselves by the title *qaγan*, the title was in use on the popular level (Taskin 1986 cited by Vovin 2007: 178). This remark is important for conclusion.

Also according to Schönig (2003: 406) the term *qaghan* was firstly used by Xianbei and “although the etymology of **kagan* remains unclear, it belongs to a distinct type of nouns ending in *n*, many of which may have entered Turkic from Mongolic (or Para-Mongolic).

The ending *-n* is quite specific factor mentioned in another functions by other scholars. Beckwith (2007: 122, note 12) mentions it as possible Chinese influence giving addition of final nasal *-n* during the transmission from Puyo-Koguryoic to Mongolic and Turkic. On the contrary Shiratori (1926: 25) mentions the fact, that in Mongol and Manchu languages the *n*-ending is often dropped. When Vovin (2007: 178) mention *-tu-* of *katun* as a feminine gender marker, he thinks that *-n* is another suffix or a part of an interrupted word.

Chinese sources mention the ruler of Tabgach (Toba Wei) as *Ke-han* with frequently accepted direction of spread from Xianbei to Ruan Ruan and further to Turks. In older research the disyllabic form is mentioned by Shiratori (1902, 1926) and Boodberg (1936). Dybo (2007: 120) mentions Pulleblank’s hypothesis about its possible relation already to Xiongnu, see the section 5.

Shiratori (1926: 25) is more strict methodologically: although he mentions older opinions about the semantical distinction between short and long variants of the title, he refused any distinction between them. Confirmation of both variants in one inscription is attested in 692, when Radloff commented not only the usual semantical distinction, but also opinion, that “*kan* might be the proper Tujue term, while *kaγan* was perhaps a variation caused by the influence of the Chinese language” (cited by Shiratori 1926: 19). Clauson (1972: 611) offers slightly different opinion. According to him (and similarly Shiratori) the both words are “practically synonymous” and their relationship is obscure, because in Turkic they cannot be connected morphologically, but “may have been alternative forms in the languages from which they passed to Turkish”.

The Tabgach (Toba) term for *qaγan*, *qasun*, and in case of Tuyuhuns also *qačun* and *qatun* (*qatun* also in Kitan), is translated by Doerfer (1992: 43, 45, 48, 54) as “Kaiser” and “Kaiserin” or “Herrscher” and “Herrscherin” besides “Chan” in case of *qaγan*. Analytically more specific Shiratori (1926: 1) is of opinion that the early Toba Wei name of the prince Shamohan (sent to the Chinese court in 261 AD) does not contain a monosyllabic title, i.e. that *-han* is only a part of name, while introduction of the disyllabic title is dated into a period between 394 and 402 (Shiratori 1926: 7). However, refusal of the monosyllabic *-han* as a title cannot be easily verified.

In European sources the title was known since 4th century as Greek χαγάνος and later Latin *chaganus*. The Greek form was used as designation of the head of Avars, Khazars and Bulgars (Dybo 2007: 120). There is usual correspondence between Altaic (mainly Old Turkic) and Arabic *q-/k-* which often gave *x-/χ-/k-/*(exceptionally *ø-*) in Greek, Armenian and Byzantinian (Menges 1986: 62-63). Similar phonetical shift is observed in Iranian: in Bactrian there are main disyllabic loans from Turkic: χαγανο “*qaγan*” and ταρχανο “*tarxan*” (Sims-Williams 2001: 226, 231; 2007: 276). Similarly Khotan Saka adopted both short and long form, i.e. *hana* “*khan*” and *hahana*

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

“khagan” as well as *hattuna-*, *xatun*, *qatun* “khatun” and also morphologically related *ttarkana-*, *tarkhan* (also in Tocharian B *tarhkāne*, *tārhkane*) “tarkhan” (Bailey 1982: 14). In Manichaean Middle Persian the title is *q’n* (Boyce 1977: 51).

Far more important was Sogdian as a lingua franca in Central Asia since 4th to 10th centuries A.D. (according to Pelliot Dresden 1983: 1219, note 2). Even when the Kōk-Turks adopted the title *qaghan* in 552 and took over the Buddhism, they adopted Buddhist terminology mainly from Sogdians (Gabain 1983: 616-618). This contacts caused, that the Turkic title was reversely borrowed to Sogdian as *γ’γ’n xāγān* “title of the Turkish king” (Gharib 1995: 160).

Further spread of the word in Turkic areas in the 6th century is confirmed by the Turkic steles found in Xinjiang and Mongolia (Arkhangai). The little Khonakhai inscription in Tekes valley is dated between 600 and 604: it mentions the names of Muqan Qaghan, Niri Qaghan and in the title *khaγatun* (Lin Meicun 2005: 379, 392-393).

In the years 638 and 642 in relation to the subdivision of Western Turks divided by the Ili River, the Turks sent envoys to the areas north of Tianshan and then also to Turfan, then the titles are attested in texts (Pelliot 2002: 48, 50, 53) and on inscriptions in Xinjiang. During the 7th century the title reached its practical importance when it appears on Sogdian coins with Turkic rulers. On the coin from Chach there is probably a ruler of the Western Turks *Shaboluo Kehan* (651-656) as in reconstruction *šβr (?) twrk [x](‘)γ’n pny* according to Babayarov, supported by Lurje (2010: 111-112). Arabo-Turkic Islamic names in Sogdian: *Alīmxān Abbās* = *‘lymxn p’s* represents later development (Lurje 2010: 89).

The overview of Old Turkic forms (Gabain 1950: 60) for the title component *-xan/-qan/-kän* includes examples like: *burxan* “Buddha”, *tägrikän* “Göttlicher”, *tarxan* “ein hoher Adelsrank”, *pärikän* “Feenkönigin” from new Persian *päri* “Fee”; she also mentions the oronym *Qadırqan* and *Ötükan*, and

the astral name *Yitikän* “Sieben Herren” = “Großer Bär”. The usual place of this title is in the apposition in both long and short version *bilgä qaγan* “Bilgä, der König”, *ilig xan* “König” (Gabain 1950: 160). This variability raises a question whether there is (or is not) some formative correlation between some titles and related typologically close suffixes and normal words as in 2.1. See also end of the section 6. In the course of history, this title was probably repeatedly reborrowed via Mongolian back to Turkic as mentioned by Clauson (1972: 611) for Turkic > Mongolian *ka'an* > Chaghatai even though the Turkic form was probably not lost in older lexical strata.

According to Dybo (2007: 120) Orkhon inscriptions have already both long and short form, where she (as it is often thought) guess, that short form might be the reduction of long one. Short form “ruler, leader, tsar (in Russian context)” is in Turkic languages: Orchon Turkic and Old Uyghur *qan*, Karakhanid-Uyghur and Chaghatai *xan*, Old Kypchak both *qan* and *xan*, Turkish *han*, Azerbaijani *xan*, Karakalpak, Kazakh and Nogai *qan*, Krymean Tatar and Karachai-Balkar and Kumyk, Tatar, Bashkir, also Nogai and Karakalpak *xan*, Kirghiz *qan* and *xan*, Altai *xan*, Uzbek *xon*, Yakut/Sakha *xan* and Chuvash *xun*. The forms with *x-* might be influenced by Mongolian. This is also in long Tuvan *khaan* “хан; цар; король” (Palmbax 1955: 442). In Salar *xan* for “xan” and “xaqan” (Chao & Ma 2010: 315), similarly in Turkic Saryg Yughur *xan* (Xue Xuanchun 1992: 177) since they perhaps knew better the local khan than the highest qaghan.⁵ But there is also another explanation: Yakut forms for woman’s title / word *xotun*, *xatın* (Doerfer 1985: 136) might indicate, that this word was known to Yakuts more intimately due to royal marriages, which were practiced longer than direct influence of Mongolian expansion. This title, derived similarly like *xaan* from Xianbi/Tuoba/Ruanruan, is specific by feminine suffix *-tun*, but it is hard to ascribe it firmly to any language (cf. Doerfer 1985: 161).

⁵ Other short forms are also in Samoyedic languages: Kamasin and Selkup *qoŋ*, Koibal *kon*, Karagas *kok*; Forest Nenets *kān* and *Kāk* (Dybo 2007: 141).

3.2. Mongolic

In Mongolian *Khaan* (хаан) means both “emperor” as well as “king/khan” after the collapse of the Mongol empire including China.⁶ The second meaning is usually ascribed only to the short form *khan* (хан). *Khatan* (хатан) is “lady; queen” (Bawden 1997: 412, 426, 435). The word is considered as a Turkic loanword (Clauson 1972: 611), but it has older attestation in Khitan and according to some opinions, some of unknown early Mongolic varieties might also contribute to its early formation.

Khitan attests mono- and disyllabic forms *qa* “khan” and *qa.ha* “khagan” or in large script probably genitive of the longer form *qa.ha.an*. The title or word *qatun* Kane (2009: 103, 112) translates as “wife of a khan”.

In Sino-Mongolian dictionary *Zheyuan yiyu* there is a *qan* (*qān* in Phagspa script) for “emperor” and *qadun* for fr. “épouse, dame” (Ligeti & Kara 1990: 263; Kara 1990: 316). Dictionary *Mukaddimat al-Adab* also distinguishes both short and long vowel in *ḡan* vs. *ḡān* besides woman’s title *ḡatun* (Poppe 1938: 117, 138, 203, 225, 337, 398, 508-509). The older forms of the *Mukaddimat al-Adab* also have the form of the highest title *xāntu*, in quadratic script *qa’an*, in Istanbul also *qa’an* (Todaeva 1973: 373).

In contemporary Inner Mongolian there is identical long form *xaan* in all dialects, the only phonetical difference is in term for *qatun*: the Inner Mongolian dialects have *xatan* with exception of Xilingol and Chakhar *gatan* (Todaeva 1981: 223, 232). Dictionary of Sun Zhu (1990: 311, 335) distinguishes final *-n* vs. *-ŋ* in both terms for “khaan” and “khatun, i.e. Zhenglanqi, Chen Barga, Buriad, East Sunit *xa:ŋ* vs. Right Baarin, Darhan, Kharchin, Otoq, Alxa, Dulan, Hejing *xa:n*. Similarly *-ŋ* in Zhenglanqi and Otoq *gataŋ*, Chen Barga and Buriad *xataŋ*, and *-n* in: Right Baarin *xatən*, Darhan, Kharchin, Alxa, Dulan and Hejing *xatan*. In other Mongolic languages Dagur *katun*, but

⁶ Mongolian *qaγan* appears for example on the inscription of the prince d’Aruγ in Yunnan in 1340 (Kara 1964: 147-150).

man's title may be not only *xa:n* but also Tungusic *əḍḡin*, further Shira Yughur *χa:n* and *χatən*, Monguor *xa:n* (/ woman's title missing), and Chinese loan-word in Santa/Dongxiang *xuanʃaŋ* / *xuanxəu* or *taitai* and Baoan *χaŋʃaŋ* / *tətɛ*.

In other Mongolic languages and sources cf. Monguor *χān* “emperor” (De Smedt & Mostaert 1964: 180), Kalmyk *χān* “chan, herrscher”, *χatŋ* “gemahlin, edelfrau, königin” in forms *χānā χatŋ* / *χatŋ χān* “die königin, kaiserin (gesetzliche herrscherin)” (Ramstedt 1935: 172, 175).

Ramstedt (1906: 29) collected the Moghol title only with long vowel *xān*, in corresponding Persian / Farsi forms also *χān*, the woman's title has also shortened form *χot* “weib”, besides Taranchi dialect *χotun* corresponding to Persian / Farsi, Turkic Tatar and written Mongolian *qatun* (also according to Steingass Ligeti 1955: 133-134).

In Zirni Manuscript there is a plural form *xatut* “women”, corresponding to Moghol *χotun*, *xātun*, *xātu* “wife, woman”, in the *Secret History of the Mongols qa-tun/qa-dun*, Khalkha *xatan* “noble woman, woman, lady” and Kalmyk *χatŋ* “gemahlin, edelfrau, königin” (Shinobu Iwamura 1961: 106).

During their spread to the West, the attested forms have kept long vowel *qān*, disyllabic *qaqan* or slightly contracted *qa'an*. The mediator for Moguls in India was Persian *qā'ān* “title first given to the Mogul Emperor Oktai and transmitted to his successors, in contradiction from other Mogul princess” (according to Steingass 945 Ligeti 1962: 40). Especially interesting and complex was Persian-Turko-Mongolian interface, because of Iranian or Arab mediation. According to Ligeti (1962: 40) “Les formes à initiale χ- sont intéressantes, elles s'expliquent, du moins en partie, par un intermédiaire iranien (ou arabe): tchag. *χaqan* ‘roi des rois, titre donné par excellence aux souverains de la Chine’..., pers. *χāqān* ‘emperor of China or Chinese Tartary; an emperor, a king’..., tchag. *χan* ‘titre donné au souverain ou même à un puissant émir’..., pers. *χān* ‘the title of the kings of Khata and Tartary; a prince, nobleman, lord; a Persian satrap; at present a title given to almost

every officer and no longer of much value' (Steingass, 443). C'est cette dernière variante qui se recontre aussi dans les lexiques mongols en écriture arabe: *χan* / *χān* (Ligeti 1962: 40). Less semantically diverse is the term for khatun (Ligeti 1962: 43) with forms *qatun*, *χatun*, *qatu*, *qadun*, Moghol *χot*, *χotun*; *χātu*, *χātun* plural *χatut* in Zirni manuscript.

3.3. Tungusic

Kane (1989: 265) provided Jurchen **ha'an* "emperor" for edited versions of the Bureau of Interpreters *haganni* (Kirose) and *han-'an-ni* (Grube), both genitives, with corresponding written Manchu *han* and Sibe *haaN*. Despite Jurchen early attested disyllabic form *xaγan(ni)* (Doerfer 1985: 56), usual later forms are borrowings from Mongolian to Manchu: Mongolian *haγan* "khaan" > Manchu *han* "khan" or Mongolian *hatan* "queen; wife of the khan" > Manchu *hatan* idem. (Baasanbat 2008: 65-66). Rozycki (1991: 101) mentions both short and long forms in Written Mongolian and not only corresponding Manchu *han* "emperor, khan", but also highly interesting Nanai *kā* of the same meaning, which corresponds to Koguryoic forms (as in section 5) or it might be the result of dropping of the *n*-ending as it is mentioned by Shiratori (1926: 26) for some forms in Mongolian (*χan* > *χa-* / 合) and Manchu. But it might be also a result of borrowing, although "the direction of borrowing for that form is problematic." (Rozycki 1991: 101) According to Menges (1995: 204) generally "the great majority of the Tungus tribes north of the Amur line and the Sajon mountains were beyond the reach of the Mongol armies, (...) so that political, military or cultural influence exerted by Mongol supremacy, did not touched them." Also the Ewenki do not mention Mongolians and Čingis Xan. And Manchus used the word *ežen* "the lord, ruler" even for Mongolian Čingis Xan (Menges 1995: 205). Menges (1995: 208) nevertheless thinks that Tungusic people had to know his name, only the historical memory suppressed him out of collective thinking.

4. Historical and interethnic changes

The vast Turkic areas and contextual changes caused the use of both short and long term in both meaning *χaγan* / *qaγan* “Kaiser, König, Herrscher” and *χan* / *qan* “König, Kaiser”, but *χatun* / *qatun* is (Gabain 1950: 309) mentioned only as “Königin”, while Tekin (1968: 338-343) translated Orkhon Turkic *qayan* “kagan, emperor” vs. *qan* “khan, king”; *qatun* “katun, empress”.

On Uighur Buddhist stake inscriptions from Turfan there are combinations of royal titles like *tängrikän tegin* or *tärkän qunčuy tängrim*. Takao Moriyasu (2001: 166) explains something like evolutionary way of titles in words that “It is a normal progression that each title of high rank began to be used in a much less restricted sense as a title of honor of diminishing importance. Neither *tegin* nor *qunčuy* was an exception. So, I think, when these titles began to lose the original meaning, they needed to have some modifiers like *tängrikän* or *tärkän* in order to indicate obviously “royal” princes or princesses among the Uighurs. Meanwhile, in the western Turkic world from the period of the Karakhanids, the title *tegin* began to be adapted to mean the special slaves who could have a chance to get into the ruling class, [cf. CTD I, p. 276].” The other similar change is gradual use of titles in personal names, and gradual loss of the distinction between the name and title.⁷

The spread of Manichaeism contributed to interethnic mergers and spread of the Turkic title of *qatun* to Iranian *Yıpar-γazan-βām Xatun*, *Duytān-šāh Ratnak Yımar Xatun*, *Wartan-βām Xatun* (according to Müller 1912 in Tremblay 2005: 430). Multiple mergers of this type appear for example in the colophons, where Tocharian A manuscripts (fragments 302b8 and

⁷ The Chang'an inscription from the 8th century (reading by Ölmez 2015: 342) includes personal names with monosyllabic title: *yaglakar kan* “Yaghlaqar Khan” and *kan totok* “Khan Totoq”.

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

303a5-b2) contains Irano-Turkic personal name-title *Śeri Kāttum*. Tremblay (2005: 430, note 52) analyzed the first component as a Khotanese or Tumšūqese name **ćirī-kā*, Khotanese *śśira*- “Bona”. In Tocharian A *kāttum* “Qatun” is the name or part of the name of an Uyghur lady, attested in 302b8 and 303a6 also as *hkhātum* (Carling et al. 2009: 112). Both *kāttum* and *hkhātum* were identified/compared by Poucha as Turkic *qadyñ* in Latin “femina”, more explicitly: “Est simile Turcico *χatun*, *qatun* “regina”” (1955: 57, 398). In Tocharian B there is only by Uighur mediated loanword “tarkhan” in *tārkhāñem* (289b5, Adams 1999: 287, 2013: 304). It is interesting, that more widely used Tokharian B did not attest word for *khan/khagan*.

New semantic connection is mentioned in Orxon Turkic inscriptions, e.g. Kül Tegin Inscription from the 8th century with wide context of the heaven worship:

tājri tāg, tājridä bolmiš türiük bilgä qaγan bu ödkä olurtum...

“I, the Heaven-like and Heaven-born Turkish Bilgä Kagan, succeeded to the throne at this time.” (Tekin 1968: 231, 261)

or the two identical formulations at the Bilgä Kagan Inscription (E1 and S13):

tājri tāg, tājri yaratmiš türiük bilgä qaγan sabim...

“I, the Heaven-like and Heaven-created Turkish Bilgä Kagan, (here are) my words: ... (Tekin 1968: 243, 246, 275, 280).

Both titles *qaγan* and *qatun* (*xātūn*) are confirmed as the members of the ruling elite of the West Uighur khans ruling also in Kucha and Karashahr also in relation to Manicheism (Moriyasu Takao 2004: 165-166). This had larger influence on the form of Uyghur royal titles with words for heavenly

planets symbolizing the sphere of light: like the Uyghur khagan *Ay Täñridä Qut Bulmiš Alp Bilgä* “(He who) obtains glory from Heaven and Moon, hero wise (kaghan)”. He ruled in 808-821 and ordered erection of Karabalgasun stele (Lurje 2010: 76). Similarly constructed titles are also in cases of other Uyghur khagans: *Täñridä Bulmiš El Etmiš Bilgä* “(he who) obtained from Heaven (by God), Regulates the state, Wise” was the 2nd khagan (747-759); *Ay Täñridä Qut Bolmiš Külig Bilgä* “(he who) Obtained from Heaven and Moon, Famous, Wise” was the 5th khagan (789-790); *Qutluγ Bilgä* “Glorious + wise” was the 6th khagan (790-795, cf. Lurje 2010: 388, 449); *Tängridä Ülüg Bulmiš Alp Qutluγ Uluγ Bilgä* “(he who) obtained (his) share from Heaven, Hero, Glorious, Great, Wise” was the 7th khagan (795-808).

For the chronology of religious events of the West Uighur rulers between 934 and 1068 see also Moriyasu Takao (2004: 184-188), but this chronology is touched to Buddhism and tributary relations with Chinese emperor. It had an influence on the form of official titles and names, where the supreme position among the Manicheian Uighurs was *kehan tianwang* (Moriyasu Takao 2004: 191-192).

In Zabulistan Hyecho mentions the name of Turkic chief *Satakgan*, which nevertheless may not be the title-ending. Hyecho conducted his travel already in time of the expansion of Islam, when the king of Wakhān had to accept the rule of the Arabs (Whitfield 2012: 139, 157-159). With wider distance from the origin and after multiple borrowings, the titles are losing their original meaning even if they belong to the core of borrowed lexicon: Regarding Arabic and Turkish elements, Procházka (Doerfer 2005: 192-193) analyzed, that 75 per cent of all Turkish loans in Arabic were in three areas: 1) private life, 2) law, government, and society, 3) war and military. As it is “the consequence of centuries of Ottoman bureaucracy, coupled the dominating presence of the Ottoman army” in Arab regions, then “even after the independence of the Arab states, several Turkish titles, both civil and military, such as *paşa* and *bey*, were for a certain time in use, from Iraq in the

East to Tunisia in the West. But today the majority of such titles are obsolete, although in Jordan, for instance, *bāša* and *bēy* are often still used when addressing high-ranking civil officers.” Similarly in Syriac literary language the word for khan was known, but not widely used before the Mongol conquest – usually through Turkic armies. Even then the domestic words were dominant and mostly glossed in written sources or partly mixed, like the *khan* was glossed by Syriac *malkā* “king”, in the highest form *mlek malkē* / *malkā malkē* “king of the kings” or rare *mlek malkē kān* “the king of the kings Khan” (Borbone 2009: 283). Similarly *melik* is in Armenian lexicon from Kirakos de Gandzak (Ligeti 1965: 291). In Islamized Golden Horde there were similar structures of the type “beg of begs” or “vezir of the khan of khans” (Egorov 2009: 169).

Other change occurred under the influence of Buddhism, when the high nobles are not connected with real prestige and became just laymen as we can read for example in one inscription of donors in Gaochang from the 10th century (here only in translation to English according to Moriyasu 2004: 179): “[...] we, Tängrikän Tegin Silig Tärkän Qunčuγ Tängrim and Külüg İnanč Šaču Sangum, the laywoman and layman with the indomitable, unshakeable, pure and faithful heart for the Three Jewels, we two together have heard from the wise teachers well acquainted with the (Buddhist) law as follows: [...]”

By the origin double Turkic word (*il* / *el* “tribe; people; administration” + *qan*) has got new meaning of “subservient/subordinate” khan in Mongolian time (Allsen 1987: 48). For detailed comprehensive discussion about *il*, *ilig*, and *il-ilig*, variation and changes to Uighur *ïdiqut* see Moriyasu Takao (2004: 194, note 100).

After the Mongol conquest of Inner Asia, their newly created capital in the area of contemporary Beijing was called *xan balıq* “the city of the Khan” in Turkic languages and was further spread not only to New Persian *hān-bālīg* and middle Latin *Cambaluc* (Doerfer 1975: 282).

In Turco-Mongolian area of Qara-Chōdscha, the titles tend to be explained in Sinicized meaning: *χān* “der chinesische Kaiser; ein Fürst” and *χānīm* “Titel einer respektablen Frau, Anrede unbekannten Frauen und Mädchen gegenüber” (Le Coq 1911: 90).

Similarly for Turkic and Iranian tribes out of Chinese empire, there was obvious semantic shift, when the Turkic title *qaγan* had meaning not only the “head of the federation of tribes”, but also (in limited period) Emperor of China. It was later also detected in Persian, Chaghatai and Kirgiz (Dybo 2007: 119), where it must have relation to the setting of the Yuan Empire. In former periods, this title thus had be reflected from the point of view of the rule of Kitans and previously thanks to Turco-Chinese royal relations. From this context and Turco-Mongolian influences come words in Teleut, Lebedin, Turkic Altai *qan*, Tofalar *ha:n* might be influenced even by Russian (Dybo 2007: 119). Also Yakut/Sacha *xān* “groß, wichtig” might be of Mongolian origin (Doerfer 1985: 56). It would correspond to the fact, that Sakha knew the name *Čyŋys-χān* as the name of a hard and cruel deity (Kałużyński 1995: 40). In modern Turkish *kadın* is semantically reduced to “woman” and in Arabic-Iranian mixed varieties replaced by Arabic *mara* “woman” (Heine & Motoki Nomachi 2013: 81).⁸

The Turkic Islamized world was more influenced by Arabic than by Persian. For example in Kazakh, besides basic form *хан* “цар, правитель”, a new development happened due to the influence of Islam and creation of new compounds of personal names with Arabian elements. Besides examples with Kazakh/Turkic elements: *Адилъхан* < Kaz. *Адилъ* “fair, rightful”;

⁸ Other matter were attempts to analyze personal names already in ancient languages. For example Tremblay (2001: 184-185) tried to analyze Bactrian personal name *αλχανο* “Alkhan” as containing pre-Turkic word *xan* “ruler”, but Sims-Williams (2010: 33-34) is doubting about this interpretation, and prefers analysis *αλχ-ανο*, even though the comparison with personal name *αλχισο* “Alkhis” is also not strong. Regarding Hephtalite coins, some vocalization ascribe them the title *khan* in personal name *Vargat Khan*, but more probably it was improper reading and vocalization of the word for Wachān (Junker 1930: 652).

Батырхан < *батыр* “hero” + *хан*; *Кадырхан* < *кадыр* “prudence, thinking” + *хан*; the elements from Arab are more numerous: *Какимхан* < Arab. *hakim* “wise; title of a spiritual leader” + *хан*; *Калихан* < Arab. *kali* “high, great” + *хан*; *Касымхан* < Arab. *kasim* “handsome” + *хан*; *Кемельхан* < Arab. *kemel* “fulfilment” + *хан* (Raxmetova 2007). There are also combination of titles like *Ханбек* < *Хан* + *beg* or names containing unrelated Persian syllable *хан*-. *Ханжар* “острый, опасный, кинжал” or *Ханжарбек* < Persian *Ханжар* + *beg* (Raxmetova 2007: 350-352).

Personal names of contemporary Bayan Ölgii Kazakhs in Mongolia have following forms with “common Altaic word *xan* ‘khan’: female name *Kulim-xan* “(My) Flower khan”, male name *Muratkhan* consisting from Persian *murat* “goal, aim, desire, ideal” and common Altaic *xan* etc. (Yu Wonsoo 2017: 471, 478). Yu Wonsoo (2017: 486) summarizes that the syllable *xan* appeared in 730 names of 1747 people, when “the morpheme *xan* seemed to be approximately in 623 Kazakh names of 1563 people”, while the long *xaan* was in 29 names of 31 people. He mentions, that besides usual meaning of approximately “a (sovereign) ruler” there might be even the role of another syllable *-xan/-qan* as the past perfective verbal noun marker.” I fully agree with Yu Wonsoo – with suggesting one more option: a diminutive *-qan/-xan*. Even though it might seem that diminutive function does not fit to the noble name or to the title of the highest ruler, the diminutives are often used in emotional context of the positive value/affirmation. For example in Czech sport commentaries the first winner is often freely described by diminutive form *jednička* derived from the numeral for “1” and free meaning: “the best one”. This might be considered even for Altaic disyllabic forms of the title, i.e. not only in case of place names – see the sections 2.1. and 6.

5. Possible sources and early use

5.1. Possible sources or parallel words

One of explanations of the two-syllable form *qaghan* is “qan of qans” vs. monosyllabic *qan* as just Mongol prince ruling an *ulus* (e.g. Allsen 1987: 229-230). In early Altaic forms Shiratori and Clauson do not see any real distinction and the scale of rather possible connections than etymologies could be (in only partial overview) offered as follows:

Pulleyblank have formerly (1962: 256) suggested that the Xiongnu supreme title *ch'an-yü*, EMC *džian-wuă* < **dân-wà* corresponding phonetically to **darɣwa*, might even be the original as in the Turkish *tarqan* and Mongolian *daruɣa*, because the Chinese final *-n* regularly corresponds to foreign *-r* in transcription of the Han period. He thinks that even the title *qaɣan* (appearing first among the Tuyuhun in close connections with Mu-jung) may also go back to a Xiongnu original (Pulleyblank 2000: 64-65 as formerly 1966: 28).

But problem is with multilingual nature of the Xiongnu confederacy. More promising might be the set of words which appear in Koguryo and Sino-Korean, since they cover wider range of meanings connectible with high social status. It would correspond to the opinion of Clauson (1972: 611), that both *xan* and *xagan* are probably the loanwords from some unspecified language. Beckwith (2007: 122, note 12) further speculates about possible Chinese influence in addition of final nasal *-n* during the transmission from Puyo-Koguryoic to Mongolic and Turkic.⁹ Connections with the title *khan* /*khagan* are made by the authors cited below:

⁹ Beckwith (2007: 125, note 20) mentions the reconstruction of Starostin *kan* with *-n*, i.e. the appearance of final *-n* in the Central dialect of Old Chinese by the second century BC.

• Koguryo **kan* “**head**”, then **ka* “**tribal chief, official, minister**” and finally **key* < **kay* / **keyc* “**king**” (partly according to Beckwith in Itabashi 2003: 141 and again Beckwith 2007: 123) are most probably related. Beckwith (2007: 122) distinguishes **ka* from **key* “king” on the basis of dichotomy between the higher title of Koguryo **makrikey* and the title **makri(p)kan* of subordinated Silla rulers (Beckwith 2007: 47). The lower title **ka* “tribal chief, official, minister” was probably introduced into Silla **ka* / **kan* as the form of the Koguryo title “regent”. Beckwith (2007: 122) adds, that “In view of the fact that the Puyo and Koguryo states emerged in an area dominated by the Hsiung-nu and Hsien-pei as well as by Han China, (...) it might be thought that (...) **ka* (...) could be a loanword from Hsiung-nu, or from a Hsien-pei Mongolian language. (...) The reverse loan direction (from Japanese-Koguryoic) is however also possible, especially in view of the fact that there is no good etymology for these Old Turkic and Mongolian words. On the contrary the Koguryo word for “head” has its cognate in Old Japanese **kabu* / **kaube* “head” and **kapo* “face” (Beckwith 2007: 123). Koguryo **key* < **kay* / **keyc* “**king**” is connected with Silla *kan* “king”, Tungusic Jurchen *χaγan* “king”, Mongolian *qan* / *qaγan* and Old Turkic *qaγan* (partly according to Beckwith in Itabashi 2003: 142). Beckwith (2007: 124) analyzes a compound **makrikey* “regent”, literally “true king”. Other reconstructions of this word allow forms like Old Chinese **ke* or Middle Chinese **gai* / **gɛ*. On one side and especially in later development, all the three forms might be mutual transcriptions of the same word (Beckwith 2007: 125). On the other side “The Old Koguryo word for ‘king’ does not derive from the Archaic Koguryo and Puyo word **ka* ‘tribal chief, subordinate ruler’, which is attested from Late Antiquity on. Moreover, Silla Korean **kan* (not **χan*) first appears in the title of the Silla ruler when the Silla dynasty was restored or installed by Koguryo.” (Beckwith 2007: 169).

Selected remarks to the spread of the title *khan*, *khagan* and *khatun*

- Sino-Korean *ka* “**family, house**”, Tungusic *kalan* “clan, family” / “pot”, Manchu, Gold, Olcha, Negidal *χala* “the family, the clan, the tribe”, by Ramstedt also related to Mongolian *qadum* “relatives through the marriage of the children” – analysed as *qa* + *dum*, and compared to Uighur *qadyn*, Kazan Turkish and Kazakh *qajyn*, Turkic Uighur and Chagatai *qa-daš* “relatives of the same family or clan”, *qa-qadaš* “family relatives” (Ramstedt 1949: 81)
- Sino-Korean *kam* “**the inspector**, to supervise, to inspect”; *kam-gun* “an officer who is appointed to keep his eye on the conduct of soldiers and to report it to the commander-in-chief”, *kam-kwan/kamgwan* “an overseer of public work”, *kam-li/kamni* “a superintendent”. According to Ramstedt, this word went to Turkic *qam* “the shaman” as “the arranger or supervisor of the sacrifices to the gods” and finally very significant is the title pattern *tai-kam* “great Kam” (Ramstedt 1949: 90).
- Sino-Korean *kap-kwan*, in old Korean pronunciation *kapkan* “**the first (= kap) among the officials** (= *kwan*), the leading or chief Kan” can be seen in Avar *Koppan*, *Kappan*, reported as *capcanus* and Ramstedt (1949: 95) also connects this word to its use in personal name in Orkhon inscription *qapγan qaγan*. Same is Sino-Korean *kappan* “a noble of the first rank” giving (according to Ramstedt 1949: 95) Manchu *χafan* “a governor, a mandarin of highest rank”.
- Another possible etymology in Ramstedt (1949: 102) is from Sino-Korean *kē* “**large, great**” as in *kē-in* “a giant”, *kē-pho* “a big gun, a cannon” or *kē-sil* “a grand house, mansion”. From this reason Ramstedt reconstructed the compound **kē-kwan* “the great Kwan (Kan)”, i.e. the Grand-Khan, the Kagan” with possible Mongolian source/mediation of this word into Tungusic.

• Tremblay (2001: 185, note 305) relates the title *qan* with Ket *qa* “**great**” or *qaγan* with Samoyedic *kuŋ* and Ket *kɪy* “**prince**”. This is further supported by Vovin (2007: 180) defending his etymology of *qaγan* as “great khan” by proto-Yeniseian **qε?* “big”, similarly Ket *qε?*, Yug *xε?*, when there is no phonemic opposition between *qε* and *qa*. But in such case the name / title *qatun* would mean only “big/great (woman)”. It does not make good sense, when (as pointed out by Vovin himself) there is not only *qatun*, but also *qaγatun*. If the second form would mean “great khan woman”, i.e. “wife of the great khan”, then the meaning of *qatun* would be “wife of the great (one)”. It is more understandable to ascribe the meaning “ruler” to the first syllable, while the second syllable of *qaγan* resembles something like diminutive marker of deification.¹⁰

5.2. Early use

Historical data confirm real use of titles. The tribal leaders of the Puyo-Koguryo people living north of Korean peninsula were commonly designated *ka* / *ga* (加) with individual prefix created for example by the word for animal: *ma* (“horse”) *ka*, *u* (“cow”) *ka*, *che* (“pig”) *ka*, and *ku* (“dog”) *ka* (Han Woo-keun 1970: 24).¹¹ Similarly the syllable *ka* suffixed to a name designated the head of a tribe and more distinguished patriarchs “were entitled to call themselves *Kochu-ka*” or in case of clan patriarchs of the ordinary sort: *Sang-ka*.” (Han Woo-keun 1970: 27-28). Then *Jaegahoeui* (a meeting of many Ga) then served as the decision-making group and the voting right was granted according to the level of influence. *Daega* (大加) adorned unique hats called *chaek* (幘) and *Soga* (小加) and those with less influence wore scone-shaped

¹⁰ Main reason why it is important to discuss it is that when Vovin (2007: 183-185) connects the word *qaγan* to both Xiongnu and Yeniseian, he mentions only philological data and no population movements.

¹¹ It is interesting, that besides totemic meaning all these four animals can be found as on of the twelf zodiac animals of traditional Asian calendar.

hats so that the status and official position of each participant were easily recognizable (Ho-tae Jeon 2007: 11-13).

Differently it was more in the south, where later in the fourth century appeared the highest title *maripkan*, which had the full sense of English king. “King Naemul (356-401) was the first to receive this appellation,” but it was replaced by the Chinese word for king, *wang*.” (Han Woo-keun 1970: 44-45)

Above mentioned excerpts show that the lexicons of population in Korean Peninsula and adjacent areas had words which correspond to the syllabary components of both mono- and disyllabic titles *khan* and *khagan*. The semantics of Koguryo and Sino-Korean words with meanings “head”, “family”, “king”, “first”, “great” etc. indicates, that most probably the word of the type *ka* or *kan* had to be used longer time with the result of gradual diversification into various meanings connectible with the role of ancestors, family and tribal leadership. The development from local to global use would correspond to gradual unification of northern part of Korean Peninsula and subsequent transfer to the west in the context of relations among Koguryo and Northern Wei through royal marriages and forced migrations, cf. below. It is also important to mention that Koguryo was strong in diplomacy – its envoys are attested on paintings in Samarkand (Han Young Woo 2010: 119).

6. Interpretation and conclusion

At the first point it is important to consider former weather conditions in northern Sino-Altaic areas – it touched not only the “core” area of the Liao River and Manchuria, but also the wider space in North China with more pleasant conditions during the second millennium BC. According to Keightley (2002: 1-2) studies of the paleo-flora and fauna indicate, that the climate of North China was still rather wetter and warmer toward the end of the first millennium BC than it is today. The rainfall inscriptions of Late Shang confirm that, by comparison with the present, rain was more prolonged and was likely to fall in months that are now virtually free of rain. Also the Late Shang temperature was warmer than at present during the winter months, when, during the mid-Holocene, temperatures may have been some 4-5°C higher than they are today, compared to summer temperatures that may have been only some 1°C higher (Shi Yafeng et al. 1993:229). Thus late Shang winters may have been more benevolent than modern winters...” (Keightley 2002: 1-2). This created better conditions for larger population and the agricultural range of Shang reached even north of the Yellow river, see the map in Boyle (2015: 58 according to Daniels 1968).

This sheds light on possible wider extent of peopling patterns. Even though the Puyo-Koguryoic people are recorded in Manchuria in relation to the expansion of Han Wudi, according to Beckwith (2007: 33) they did not originated there, but probably represent older merger of Northeast Eurasian strata with admixture from south-central China coast as confirmed by early Yayoi culture. It might mean that some elements of Koguryo came not only from Siberia and Central Asia, but also from ethnically Chinese areas after the climate change, when northern Inner Asia became more arid. It seems that some harsh climate changes affected even Manchuria and East Mongolia, since there are data about massive immigration from the north to politically Sinicized areas: Holcombe (2001: 122) mentions that “Shortly after 265,

natural disasters on the steppe induced some 20,000 nomadic camps (perhaps 100,000 persons) to enter the empire and settle among the “Jin” (Chinese) people. In 284, another group of 29,300 Xiongnu were admitted. In 286, 100,000 Xiongnu subordinated themselves to a certain member of the Chinese imperial family near modern Xi’an, and a year later 11,500 additional Xiongnu surrendered, bringing with them a reported 22,000 head of cattle and 105,000 sheep. Between 265 and 287, it is estimated that over 250,000 non-Chinese persons were deliberately resettled deep within the interior of northern China to provide economic and military manpower. (...) By the year 300, it was complained, perhaps with considerable exaggeration, that Rong and Di tribespeople constituted half the total population in the area of the old Han capital at Chang’an (modern Xi’an).” Also other authors (Ch’en 1964: 77-78) analyzed the documents confirming that already around 299 the “non-Chinese groups living in the Ch’ang-an area numbered over half a million – more than one half the population of the region.”

And how it was with Koguryo people? Some of their population movements are attested in historical sources. And even though their exactitude may not be strong (it is part of ethno-linguistical ambiguity), they explain possible principles of the spread of words through population and nobility movements. In 342, the war of Murong Huang of Former Yan against Koguryo caused forced migration of the “king’s mother and the queen along with 50,000 other Koguryo people, who were taken hostage by former Yan.” (Hotaе Jeon 2007: 19-21). This process continued also later, when “in 398 the Tuoba headman reportedly (...) transported 360,000 people from the far northeast and Koguryō and 100,000 other skilled artisans to construct and populate his new metropolis (near modern Datong in Shanxi). (...) Conquered people were extensively resettled onto the war-ravaged and depopulated fields of northern China in order to secure an economic base for the regime. Between 398 and 469, by one estimate, the Tuoba transplanted no fewer than 1,205,500 people – Chinese, Koguryō, Xiongnu, Yemaek, and

other branches of the Xianbei – into their home area.” (Holcombe 2001: 133).

These forced resettlements are of key importance for the use of titles. Since it is known that the word *qaγan* was used by the population sooner than it was introduced as the highest title, it seems as the most convincing that the title word of *ka* related to respect and high social status had to be introduced to Tuoba Wei areas with resettlement of Koguryo people. Subsequent huge forced migrations of various tribes created conditions for political unification through titles which had to be already known to the population because of political identification uniting many distinct people. It is highly remarkable that first use of the Tuoba title *khagan* in around 402 correspond to the time of introduction of the title *makripkan* to Silla, where the rule was re-installed by Koguryo.

On the background of above mentioned processes it is highly probable that the most influential resettled Koguryo people with the title *ka/ga* became part of administration of Tuoba elites (similarly like Mongols served in the Jurchen army, or later Turkic people served in Mongolian armies) and their established social status might be the basis of introduction of the title to the official use, since the word *qaγan* was already known before its official adoption. If the title was adopted in the multi-ethnic area, the change of syntax (of the type *Yue-Nan/Viêt-Nam* vs. *Nan-Yue/Nam-Viêt*), i.e. use of the word for *ka /ga* as the first component and its new semantic development would not be unusual. Minimalist explanation of the second component - *kan/-γan* would be an appellative and deification marker (serving for symbolic elevation) developed from the diminutive suffix attested in Old Turkic theonyms, oronyms and hydronyms (Gabain 1950: 60, also section 3.1.). The fourth and fifth century AD is late enough for existence of this morpho-syntactic element.

This does not exclude Yenisean connection or other interpretations, only the Koguryo lexicon and population movements have better correspondence to the history, social hierarchy, religious patterns, and rock art.¹²

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.
- Allsen, Thomas T. 1987. *Mongolian Imperialism: The policies of the grand qan Möngke in China, Russia, and the Islamic lands, 1251-1259*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.
- Baasanbat 2008 = Баасанбат, Д. 2008. *Монгол-Манж бичгийн хэлний дундын үг*. Улаанбаатар: МУИС.
- Bailey, Harold W. 1982. *The Culture of Sakas in Ancient Iranian Khotan*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- Bawden, Charles. 1997. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. London – New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Beckwith, Christopher I. 2007. Koguryo. *The Language of Japan's Continental Relatives. An Introduction to The Historical-Comparative Study of the Japanese-Koguryoic Languages. With a preliminary Description of Archaic Northeastern Middle Chinese*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

¹² Connection to the word for “head” is interesting because preliterate and early literary societies had high esteem to socially recognized persons (tribal leaders and shamans) depicted by human figures and human heads on the rock art. This semantics is culturally universal, i.e. not language specific. It means that the explanation of the word for “head” in both Ket and Koguryo might be simple. It had to be in wide use in Eurasia, that the word for “head” became (even etymologically) one of the first cultural words for leaders. In Sino-Korean there is another significant connection with word for family, important for clans and lineages.

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

- Borbone, Pier Giorgio. 2009. Syroturcica 3. Hülegü's rock-climbers: a short-lived Turkic word in 13th-14th century Syriac historical writing. In: *Tujue yuwenxue yanjiu. Studies in Turkic Philology. Festschrift in honour of the 80th birthday of Professor Geng Shimin*. Edited by Zhang Dingjing and Abdurishid Yakup. Beijing: Zhongyang minzu daxue chubanshe, 283-292.
- Boyle, Mark. 2015. *Human Geography. A Concise Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Boyce, Mary. 1977. *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden: E.J. Brill – Téhéran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi.
- Carling, Gerd et al. 2009. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Volume 1: A-J*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Chao Jianya & Ma Chengxiu. 2010. *Saweihan cidian*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.
- Ch'en, Kenneth. 1964 (1973). *Buddhism in China. A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clauson, Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- De Smedt, A. & A. Mostaert. 1964. *Le dialecte monguor parlé par les Mongols du Kansu occidental. II^e partie: Grammaire. Reproduction photomécanique*. The Hague – London – Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Band IV: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen (Schluss) und Register zur Gesamtarbeit*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1985. *Mongolo-Tungusica*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dresden, Mark. 1983. Sogdian language and literature. In: *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 3(2). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*. Ed. Ehsan Yarshater. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1216-1229.

- Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond. 2004. *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts. Vol. III. Texts from Central Asia and China. Edited by Nicholas Sims-Williams. Part 1: Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian.* Turnhout: Brepols.
- Dybo 2007 = Дыбо, А. В. 2007. *Лингвистические контакты ранних тюрков.* Москва: Восточная литература.
- Egorov 2009 = Егоров, В. Л. 2009. *Историческая география Золотой Орды в XIII-XIV вв.* Москва: URSS.
- Field, Kenneth Lynn. 1997. *A Grammatical Overview of Santa Mongolian.* (Ph.D. Dissertation). Ann Arbor: UMI Company.
- Gabain, Annemarie von. 1950. *Alttürkische Grammatik.* Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gabain, Annemarie von. 1983. Irano-Turkish Relations in the late Sasanian period. In: *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 3(1). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods.* Ed. Ehsan Yarshater. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 613-624.
- Gharib, B. 1995. *Sogdian Dictionary.* Tehran: Farhangian Publications.
- Han Woo-keun. 1970. *The History of Korea.* Transl. Lee Kyung-shik, ed. Grafton K. Mintz. Seoul: The Eul-yoo Publishing Company.
- Han Young Woo. 2010. *A Review of Korean History. Vol 1. Ancient / Goryeo Era.* Pajubookcity: Kyongsaewon Publishing.
- Hansen, Valerie. 2012. *Silk Road: A New History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Motoki Nomachi. 2013. Contact-induced replication: Some diagnostic. In: *Shared Grammaticalization: with Special Focus on the Transeurasian Languages.* Ed. By Martine Robbeets and Hubert Cuykens. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 67-100.
- Holcombe, Charles. 2001. *The Genesis of East Asia 221 B.C. – A.D. 907.* Honolulu: Association for Asian Studies and University of Hawai'i Press.

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

- Ho-tae Jeon. 2007. Outline of Koguryo History. In: *Koguryo, The Origin of Korean Power and Pride*. Seoul: Northeast Asian History Foundation. 8-35.
- Itabashi, Yoshizo. 2003. A Study of the Historical Relationship of the Koguryo Language, the Old Japanese Language, and the Middle Korean Language on the Basis of Fragmentary Glosses Preserved as Place Names in the Samguk Sagi. In: *Perspectives on the origins of the Japanese language*. Eds. Osada, T., A. Vovin and K. Russel. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 131-185.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1996. *Manchuria. An Ethnic History*. Helsinki: The Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Jeong Su-il. 2016. *The Silk Road Encyclopedia*. Andong: Gyeongsangbuk-do & Seoul: Korea Institute for Civilizational Exchanges.
- Junker, Heinrich F. J. 1930. Die hephthalitischen Münzinschriften. *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Jahrgang 1930. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie des Wissenschaften, 641-661.
- Kałużyński, Stanisław. 1995. *Iacutica. Prace jakutoznawcze*. Warszawa: DIA-LOG.
- Kane, Daniel. 1989. *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*. Bloomington: Indiana University – Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.
- Kane, Daniel. 2009. *The Kitan Language and Script*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Kara, György. 1964. L'inscription mongole d'Aruγ, prince de Yun-nan (1340). *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 17, 145-168.
- Kara, György. 1990. Zhiyuan yiyu. Index alphabétique des mots mongols. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. Tomus XLIV (3), 279-344.

- Kara, György. 1992. On some “Altaic” long vowels. *Altaic Religious Beliefs and Practices. Proceedings of the 33rd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*, Budapest, June 24-29, 1990. Eds. G. Bethlenfalvy et al. Budapest: Research Group for Altaic Studies, 189-192.
- Kara, György. 2000/2001. Late Mediaeval Turkic Elements in Mongolian. In: *De Dunhuang à Istanbul: Hommage à James Russel Hamilton*. Eds. L. Bazin & P. Zieme. Turnhout: Brepols, 73-119.
- Keightley, David N. 2002. *The Ancestral Landscape. Time, Space, and Community in Late Shang China (ca. 1200-1045 B.C.)*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California.
- Le Coq, Albert von. 1911. *Baessler-Archiv – Beiträge zur Völkerkunde herausgegeben aus Mitteln des Baessler-Instituts. Beiheft I. Sprichwörter und Lieder aus der Gegend von Turfan. Mit einer dort aufgenommenen Wörterliste*. Leipzig – Berlin: B.G. Teubner.
- Ligeti, Louis. 1955. Le lexique moghol de R. Leech. *AOASH* IV, 119-157.
- Ligeti, Louis. 1962. Un vocabulaire Mongol d’Istanbul. *AOH* 14, 3-76.
- Ligeti, Louis. 1965. Le lexique mongol de Kirakos de Gandzak. *AOH* 18, 241-297.
- Ligeti, Louis & G. Kara. 1990. Un vocabulaire sino-mongol des Yuan le *Tcheyuan yi-yu*. *AOASH* XLIV(3), 259-277.
- Lin Meicun. 2005. A Survey of the Turkic Cemetery in Little Khonakhai. In: *Les Sogdians en Chine*. Ed. Étienne de la Vaissière & Éric Trombert. Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient, 377-396.
- Livshits, Vladimir A. 2010. *Парфянская ономастика* [Parthian Onomastics]. St. Petersburg: Linguistic Society of St. Petersburg.
- Lurje, Pavel B. 2010. *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts*. (Iranische Onomastik, Nr. 8: Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Band II: Mitteliranische Personennamen, Faszikel 8). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

- Menges, Karl H. 1986 (review). Peter B. Golden. "Khazar Studies. An historico-philological inquiry into the origin of the Khazars." Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1980. *Central Asiatic Journal* 30, 55-77.
- Menges, Karl H. 1995. *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Moriyasu, Takao. 2001. Uighur Buddhist Stake Inscriptions from Turfan. In: *Silk Road Studies V*. Ed. Louis Bazin et Peter Zieme. *De Dunhuang a Istanbul. Hommage à James Russel Hamilton*. Turnhout: Brepols, 149-223.
- Moriyasu, Takao. 2004. *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße. Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund*. Transl. Christian Steineck. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Müller, F. W. K. 1912. Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch (*Mahrnâmag*). *APAW*, 1912: 5.
- Murzaev 1964 = Мурзаев, Э. М. 1964. Централноазиатские топонимические миниатюры. In. *Топонимика Востока. Новые исследования*. Ed. Г. А. Давидова. Москва: Наука, 3-13.
- Ölmez, Mehmet. 2015. Discussions on Old Uighur Runic Inscription from Chang'an. *Proceedings of the 12th Seoul International Altaistic Conference. Multidimensional understandings of languages and cultures of Altaic people*. Seoul: The Altaic Society of Korea – Seoul National University, 339-348.
- Palmbach 1955 = Пальмбах, А. А. 1955. *Тувинско-русский словарь*. Москва: Государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей.
- Peiros, Ilia & Starostin, Sergei. 1996. *A Comparative Vocabulary of Five Sino-Tibetan Languages. Fascicle III. Laterals*. Parkville: The University of Melbourne.
- Pelliot, Paul. 2002. *Les routes de la region de Turfan sous le T'ang suivi de l'histoire et la géographie anciennes de l'Asie Centrale dans Innermost Asia*. Paris: Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises do Collège de France.

- Porre 1938 = Поппе, Н. Н. 1938. *Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб*. Часть I-II. Москва – Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук.
- Poucha, Pavel. 1955. *Institutiones linguae tocharicae. Pars I. Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2005. The Turkish Contribution to the Arabic Lexicon. In: *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion. Case studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Ed. É. Á. Csató et al. London – New York: Routledge, 191-202.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. 2000. Tribal Confederations of Uncertain Identity. In: Roemer, Robert Hans & Wolfgang-Ekkehard Scharlip (Eds). *History of the Turkic Peoples in the Pre-Islamic Period. / Historie des Peuples Turcs à l'Époque Pré-Islamique*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 52-75.
- Ramstedt, G. J. 1906. Mogholica. *JSFOu* 23, 1-60.
- Ramstedt, G. J. 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura.
- Ramstedt, G. J. 1949. *Studies in Korean Etymology*. Helsinki: Memoires de la société Finno-ougrienne.
- Rahmetova 2007 = Рахметова, М. К. 2007. *Казахские имена*. Алматы: Кочевники.
- Rozycki, William. 1991. *Mongol elements in Manchu*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Schönig, Claus. 2003. Turko-Mongolic Relations. In: *Mongolic Languages*. Ed. Juha Janhunen. London – New York: Routledge, 403-419.
- Shinobu Iwamura. 1961. *The Zirni Manuscript. A Persian-Mongolian Glossary and Grammar*. Kyoto: Kyoto University.
- Shiratori, Kurakichi. 1926. A Study on the Titles *kaghan* and *katun*. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* (The Oriental Library) No. 1. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.

15th Seoul International Altaistic Conference, July 16-17, 2021

- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 2001. *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*. London: The Nour Foundation – Azimuth Editions – Oxford University Press.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 2007. *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Letters and Buddhist Texts*. London: The Nour Foundation – Azimuth Editions.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 2010. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch. Band II. Miteliranische Personennamen. Faszikel 7. Bactrian Personal Names*. Wien. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Srba, Ondřej & Michal Schwarz. 2015. *Dějiny Mongolska* (History of Mongolia). Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Sun Zhu (ed.). 1990. *Menggu yugu yuzu cidian*. Xining: Qinghai renmin chubanshe.
- Tekin, Talat. 1968. *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Todaeva 1973 = Тодаева, Б. Х. 1973. *Монгорский язык*. Москва: Наука.
- Todaeva 1981 = Тодаева, Б. Х. 1981. *Язык Монголов Внутренней Монголии*. Москва: Наука.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2001. *Pour une histoire de la Sérinde. Le manichéisme parmi les peuples et religions d'Asie Centrale d'après les sources primaires*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2005. Irano-Tocharica and Tocharo-Iranica. *Bulletin of SOAS* 68(3), 421-449.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2007. Once again on the etymology of the title *qaγan*. *Studia Etymologia Cracoviensia* 12, 177-187.
- Whitfield, Roderick (ed.). 2012. *Hyecho's pilgrimage to India and Central Asia in 723-728 as Memoir of a Pilgrimage to the Five Indian Kingdoms*. Collected Works on Korean Buddhism 10. Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.

Selected remarks to the spread of the title *khan*, *khagan* and *khatun*

Yu Wonsoo. 2017. A study of the names of the Bayan-Ölgii Kazakhs. *Proceedings of The 13th Seoul International Altaistic Conference*. Contemporary outlooks on Altaic languages, 13-16 July, 2017, National University of Mongolia. Seoul: The Altaic Society of Korea – Seoul National University, 459-504.

ABSTRACT

Selected remarks to the spread of the title *khan*, *khagan*, *khatun* and related forms in languages of Inner Asia

Michal SCHWARZ

Masaryk University, CZECH REPUBLIC

This paper offers selected remarks about the title *khan*, *khagan* and *khatun* in languages of Inner Asia. Instead of standard philological analysis, the selective and less frequently considered data are collected.

After the introduction in the first part, the notes about the typology of the syllable and ethnolinguistic ambiguity are mentioned in the second part, followed by brief chronology of the spread and basic forms of titles in Inner Asian languages (mainly Altaic and Indo-European; Chinese transcriptions are planned for separate paper) in the third part. The fourth part comments examples of semantical changes which followed the process of borrowing to another cultural contexts. The fifth part focuses on possible sources of the word and early use of words in Koguryo and Sino-Korean. The sixth part offers interpretation on the basis of past climate change and extensive migration patterns. Preliminary conclusion is that relocation of Koguryo people contributed to the spread of possible source-words in north Inner Asia and created conditions for the use of this title by another (or in fact multiethnic) nobility. The second part of the disyllabic title might be a diminutive marker of deification/elevation.