

Ivan Dobrev
THE COUPLET FOR PUGU - THE EARLIEST TEXT IN
BOLGARIAN LANGUAGE

The earliest fully connected text in the Bulgarian language was found in the ancient Chinese chronicles. In the 4th century the south Xiongnu conquered North China, the khans of the various tribes started proclaiming themselves Emperors of China and began to fight each other. Around 328 AD khan Shi Le - the khan of one of Bulgars' tribes neighbouring Pugu - was getting ready to come to the rescue to one of the besieged towns nearby, when his dignitaries decide to oppose this. Then Shi Le requested advice from the courtier soothsayer, the Buddhist monk Fotu-chen. He needed to know what the outcome of the forthcoming event would be. The monk heard a prophecy in the ringing of the bells of his pagoda and he uttered it in the language of Xiongnu:

Престарелый деревенский чиновник из Бэйюаньши Сунь Цзи поднес Ши Лэ подарки и просил разрешения навестить Лю Яо, на что Ши Лэ дал согласие. Поднеся Лю Яо вино, Сунь Цзи сказал: “Правитель племени пугу объявил себя императором в землях к западу от заставы Ханьгугуань. Вы должны были придерживаться справедливости и охранять земли государства. Однако, легкомысленно командуя войсками, вы потерпели поражение у Лояна. Сливая для вас судьба закончилась, Небо погубило вас. Теперь, когда вы подошли к концу жизни, примите чашу вина”. Лю Яо ответил: “Это будет мне во вред, но я должен выпить за вас”. Услышав об этом, Ши Лэ с грустью, изменившись в лице, сказал: “Достаточно того, что человека, потерявшего государство, упрекнул старец” [Сюаньлин, 132].

Despite the fact that it was written within Chinese context and without such, despite the many different researches done on it, the Poem for Pugu has a fully defined form. It is being transcribed and translated on the bases of different languages and in many possible ways, many of which sound not only illogical, but also strange and comical. What's more the obligatory quality-competent, comparatively-etymological rationale and - proof are either missing or are too poor, even scarce. Exactly here it must be noted, that while the historians demonstrate again their utmost linguistic ignorance, for example Azgar Muhamadiev, one great expert in Sinology such as E. Pulleyblank wholeheartedly confesses, that he is not capable to offer his own reconstruction of the distich. Speaking about the truth the reason for this is that he is on the very wrong opinion that Xiongnu were Samodians:

1. **Siu tʃi t'i li kaŋ p'u küe k'ü t'u taŋ.** *If the army comes out, the Iranian (Hu) chief Liuyau will be seized* [Bailey 2011, 40].
2. The couplet as explained in Chinese consist of four words: (1) 秀支 **M. sju-cje < *sux-kēh** = 軍 “army“, (2) 替戾岡 **M. thei-let/lei-kaŋ < *θe(t)s-let/le(t)s-kaŋ** = 出 “go out“, (3) 僕谷 **M. bok-kuk/yok < *buk-kok/(g)δök** = 劉曜胡位 “Liu Yao's barbarian rank“, (4) 劬秃當 **M. gjou-thuk-taŋ < *gōh-thok/θok-taŋ** = 捉 “capture”. Beyond remarking that -ŋ is a common verbal ending in Yenisseian, especially Kottish, I shall not, at least for the present, attempt to add to the list of suggested reconstructions [Pulleyblank 2008, 264].
3. **Sü:kä tılıkaŋ Buguk'u tutun!** *Savaş çıkın, Buguk'u tutun!* [Tekin 2010, 35-55].
4. **Sükä talıqañ (or tılıqañ),** *”Go out to the army (on campaign)*
Böquqyü tuqıañ! *(and) capture the Bokuk!”* [Tekin 2014, 5].

Вряд ли есть необходимость приводить другие многочисленные примеры, подтверждающие, что Китайцы относили Цзесцев к Сюнну, но нельзя пройти мимо

одного чрезвычайно важного лингвистического свидетельства, которое помогает определить этническую принадлежность как самих Цзесцев, так и Сюнну к которым они относились. Речь идет о фразе, сказанной на языке Цзесцев уроженцем Индии, Буддийским монахом Фоту Дэном, служившим Ши Лэ и занимавшимся распространением Буддизма в Китае. К этой единственной дошедшей до нашего времени фразе из языка Сюнну даются значения входящих в нее слов и предлагается общий перевод.

В 328 г. вспыхнула война между Ши Лэ и Лю Яо, императором династии Ранняя Чжао. Разбив войска Ши Лэ при Гао-хоу, Лю Яо подошел к Лояну и осадил лежащий близ него уездный город Цзиньон. Ши Лэ хотел выступить на помощь Лояну, но сановники убеждали его не делать этого.

Тогда Ши Лэ обратился за советом к Фоту Дэну (*Buttocho 佛图澄*, pinyin: *Fu Tucheng*; *Wade-Giles: Fu T'u-ch'eng*, ca. 235-348), который, ссылаясь на звуки, издаваемые колокольчиками на пагоде, сказал на языке Цзесцев (*presumably correctly adjusted to the phonetics of the 4th c. AD*):

Кириллица

**Сючжи тилиган
Пугу цзюйтудан.**

Латиница

**Süçy tiligan
Pugu qüitudan.**

Согласно имеющимся объяснениям, сючжи означает “войска”, тилиган - “высылать”, “двинуть”, пугу - Хуское звание, которое носил Лю Яо, а цзюйтудан - “схватить”, “поймать”. Дается и перевод всей фразы: “Двините войска, поймаете Лю Яо” [20, гл. 95, л. 12-б-13-а].

Any linguist would observe the amazing continuity of the vocabulary and grammatical affixes:

Su = army -*çi* = noun-derivational affix to form profession or occupation

tilek = to wish (ref. *Old Türkic Dictionary*, 1969, Leningrad, Science, p. 560)

-gan = past participle, 3rd person singular, perfect tense verbal affix

Pugu = 1. *Türkic* title/rank, with few interpretations, one is historically attested Bull; 2. A homophonic *pug/buk* is also excrement, poop, *shit-yu /-'gyu* = future conditional verbal transitive affix

tutar = 1. capture in 3rd person future tense; 2. *quyut* = to scare, to spook, *quitudan* - scare out of. *Mahmud Kashgari* cites an example "*Ol atig quiutti*" = "He scared a horse" (*Mahmud Kashgari*, 1960. *Turky suzlar devoni* (Devon lugotit turk), Tashkent, vol. 2, p. 326).

-dan / -tan = locative directional verbal affix "from, out of" (Russ. "указывает на исходность действия") (ref. *Old Türkic Dictionary*, 1969, Leningrad, Science, p. 664)

The Modern Turkish replaced the verb *tiligan* (*tiligar*) with a different root, *çık*, the only substantial modification in the 2,000-year old phrase.

Pugu qüitudan has 2 homophonic forms:

1. Literally: *Pugu'yu tutar* = (He) would capture *Pugu*

2. Figuratively: *Pug quitudan* = scared his poop (akin to English idioms "scared his ass", or closer "scared shit out of him"). This form originates in a *Türkic* proverb "[Do not try to scare me], scare your own poop"

Analysis ©2010 A. Mukhamadiev

Как видим, каждый интерпретатор имеет достаточно веские основания связывать две фразы, сказанные Фоту Дэном, с древнетюркским языком.

Как уже говорилось, Цзесцы появляются на исторической арене Китая в период Шестнадцати государств пяти северных племен, продолжавшийся 135 лет - с 304 по 439 г. В это время вся северная часть Китая оказалась во власти пяти кочевых племен: Сюнну, Цзе, Сяньби, Ди и Цян, которые поочередно захватывали Китайские земли,

создавая на них собственные государственные образования, число которых, по традиционным подсчетам, составляло шестнадцать [Таскин 2012а, 9-12].

Not more successful in meaning are the reading and translation of the Poem for Pugu on the basis of the Turkic languages as a whole, at that with the extremely illiterate presumption that the Turkic protolanguage and the “Bulgarian” are one and the same thing, having in mind that both languages simultaneously represent a later and separate continuation of the Altaic protolanguage. Exactly this thoughtlessness is further guaranteed by the “genius insight”, that the Xiongnu were only some kind of “early Turks”. From here originates the pretentious and narcissistic desire and aim “in one fell swoop” to be received “an early Turkic poem as well as a proof for the Turkic nature of the Xiongnu”, which remains simply as one very noble but rather a voluntaristic intent because it is not based on the real and realistic chronology during the decay of the Turkic languages, and what's more it ignores on the one hand the extremely important and essential place and role in this decay of the Bulgarian dialects and languages and on the other the sufficient knowledge and use of the recently discovered and proved as such grammar and vocabulary of the Bulgarian. And all this happens despite the most drastic dissonance with the long adopted theory by many other researchers, as well as the numerous references and emphasis in the ancient Chinese chronicles, that Pugu is a tribe within the Xiongnu unity and nothing more! It is utterly unjustified and unacceptable to take for granted the translation in the 7-century chronicle, having in mind its vague historical ties and retrospections towards the year 310, when the Poem was created. Here is why it is more than unnecessary and quite abnormal to admit and accept that we are talking about some kind of “book”, rather than accept that it is about the Bulgarian tribe in question. And how come the Buddhist monk, the sage(!) Fotu-chen, suddenly and most unexpectedly in the very end turns into a shaman, whose name is formed by the basis of the common noun “quail”(Sic!)??? Very inappropriately counterproductive here are also the frivolously chaotic excursions in the “Altaistics” lacking even the essential feel, that there is absolutely nothing, what's more - there rules the Nothingness. The morphology represents a chaotically accumulated eclecticism, which doesn't clarify when and how the past tenses turn into imperative constructions; irrespective of the unnecessary detailed explications and allusions, still the combination of dativ and causative is not and by no means is equal to dativ and accusative. Here is why the final translation of the Poem is in absolutely no consilience and is even contrary to the logic and the course of the real events:

Одним из свидетельств ранних китайско-тюркских контактов являются, конечно, китайские транскрипции имен собственных, этнонимов и титулов, которые могут иметь отношение к ранним тюркам. Пожалуй, наиболее соблазнительно для толкования известное двустишие на языке варваров цзе [gēi?] - одного из племен сюнну, записанное в хронике Цзинь-шу (составленной в середине VII в. н.э.) и относимое к 310 г. н.э. Понятно, что исходя из того, что двустишие читается по-тюркски, и получив правдоподобное толкование, мы одним махом получаем и раннетюркское стихотворение, и доказательство тюркоязычности сюнну (или хотя бы некоторых племен в составе союза сюнну).

Рассматриваемое двустишие - это прорицание, произнесенное в Лояне мудрецом Фотучэном, относительно успешности воинского похода цзеского военачальника Ши Лэ против другого гуннского военачальника Лю Яо. Каждая строка затранскрибирована пятью иероглифами:

秀支替戾岡
僕谷劬秃當

Имеется общий перевод на китайский: «Войско выйдет, Яо будет схвачен» (грамматическое будущее время в русском переводе - по общему контексту: идет речь о предсказании, в китайском переводе указаний на время нет). Кроме того дан китайский перевод каждого слова:

秀支 означает «войско»

替戾岡 означает «выходить»

僕谷 означает варварское звание Лю Яо

劬秃當 означает «схватить».

Транскрипция в рамках среднего постклассического древнекитайского дает приблизительно следующее звучание:

śaw-kje thiēs/j-liēt-kāŋ

bwōk-kwōk g(h)wo-thwōk-tāŋ

Я предлагаю следующее тюркское прочтение и истолкование:

sü-ge taλi-t-kan

bökö-g göt-ök-ta-ŋ

войско-Dat. переправляться, выходит наружу-Caus.-Part.Pf.

бёке-Асс. поднимать, уносить, хватать-Subst.-Denom. Verb.-Imp. вежл. 2 Prs.

Войско заставив выйти наружу,

бёке захватите, пожалуйста.

Сам шаман, произнесший пророчество, носит в китайском тексте имя Фотучэн 佛圖澄, что для среднего постклассического древнекитайского читается как *bwit-dō-dhiŋ*. По-видимому, небольшой натяжкой будет предположить, что это - ПТ **bidurčün* 'перепелка' (А. Дыбо).

Thus, perfectly obvious, along with the strictly specific phonetics and morphological traits and characteristics of the Bolgar's language, when it comes to translation and transcription of the Poem for Pugu, the characteristics of the ancient Chinese phonetics and more specifically - the absence in the end of the word of the sound *r* (С. Яхонтов), are not being taken into consideration. This absence can also be observed in the ancient Chinese language transference and adaptation of not only of the several undoubtedly Bulgarian ethnonyms, but also in the following, for example “предположительно тюркские слова” in the Chinese language, only because “конечное *-r* в ханьских транскрипциях обычно передается как *-n*” (А. Дыбо): **tānjir* “sky; god” - 撐, contemporary *chēng* ‘подпирать’, Middle Chinese *ʃaŋ, ʃaŋ, ʃaŋ*; **darxan* “шаньюй (титул)” - 單于 1. 單, Contemporary Chinese *dān*, Old Chinese *tār*, Classical Chinese *tān*, Middle Chinese *tān* ‘нечетный, единичный’; 2. 于, Contemporary Chinese *yú[yū/xū]*, Old Chinese *w(h)a*, Classical Chinese *wo*, Middle Chinese *hü* ‘идти, отправляться’; **koŋur* “horse breed”: 蛩蛩, 蛩, Contemporary Chinese *qióng*, Old Chinese, Classical Chinese *g(h)oŋ*, Middle Chinese *gōuŋ* ‘саранча; сверчок’; **kirkir*/**kirkiř* кыркыз (этноним): 隔昆 - 隔, Contemporary Chinese *gé*, Old Chinese, Classical Chinese *krēk, kriēk, kięk*, Middle Chinese *kaik* ‘отделяться; разлучаться’; 2. 昆, Contemporary Chinese *kūn*, Old Chinese *kūn*, Classical Chinese *kwən*, Middle Chinese *kon* ‘старший брат’, *krēk-kwən* [Дыбо 2013, 82-105]:

Конечных согласных в древнекитайском языке было семь:

m n ŋg

p t k

r

Шесть из них в большинстве случаев сохранились без изменения в современных южнокитайских диалектах. Только звук *r* еще до начала новой эры перешел в *-i* или исчез [Яхонтов 2014, 26-27].

In Middle Chinese syllables could end in *-ŋ, -k, -n, -t, -m, -p*, or in a vowel (including *-i* and *-u* diphthongs).

These may perhaps reflect increasing penetration and admixture with Eastern Hun that is the Hsien-pi and Wu-yüan 乌桓 M. *ou-hwan* < **aĥu-hwan* = Avar.

Nevertheless shan-yü did not vanish and we can, I think see in it the ancestral form of another title that reappears the Turks and Mongols and was also known farther west, namely *tarkan, tarxan, etc.*

The use of Chinese -n for foreign -r is regular in the Han period [Pulleyblank 2008, 209-259].

*Some of the defeated ruling clans managed to flee to the distant Hsiung-nu successor state near Lake Balkash, an area known as Yüe-pan in the Chinese sources [27], reflecting *Öör-pän as the old pronunciation [28]. This same designation also occurs in the Old Turkic Bilgä Qagan inscription of 732 (II E 20).*

(27) See the monograph on Yüe-pan in Pei-shi, ch. 97, fol. 15-16.

*(28) According to Karlgren's Analytic Dictionary (henceforth AD, cf. fn. 9) the old pronunciation of the signs nos. 1138-690 was jwät-puân, i.e. *Öörpän.*

...and the Proto-Mongolian Säbirs (Hsien-pi = Σάβιροι) [Pritsak 2009, 9-10].

(12) Sabiroi - Сюбу[sio-pok], или просто транслитерация Сяньбу[sian-pie] [Тайшан 2012, 24].

Маодунь (имя шаньюя): 冒頓 (ИЗ II 512)

1. 冒, совр. кит. mào, др.-кит. mǔʔs (~ -ks), класс. кит., 3X, ВХ mǔh, ПДК mǔ, ср.-кит. mǎw (Karlgren 1062 a-b). 2. 頓, совр. кит. dùn, др.-кит. tǔrs, класс. кит., 3X, ВХ twənh, ПДК twəp, ср.-кит. tòn 'останавливать(ся)' (Karlgren 0427 j). Предположительное чтение: 3X mǔh-twənh. Основатель сюннуского государства, объединил сюнну в 209 г. до н.э. Обычно толкуется как отражение тюрк. *bagatur (Clauson, Studies, 19) [Дыбо 2013, 103, see and compare Menges 1951, 93-95].

*...проф. Б. Симеонов,... целенасочено-подробно проучи и достъпните му преводи на китайските летописи и систематизира и представи в явен вид и в контактолингвистичен аспект редица достатъчно странни и сериозно респектиращи дори обикновено владеещите, познаващи или най-малкото имащи представа за немалък брой генеалого-типологически най-разнообразни езици, езиковеди ориенталисти, структурно-типологически черти и особености на китайския език като предимно моносилабични думи, между III в. пр.н.е. и VIII в. в краесловие само гласна, възходящ дифтонг и два вида **n** - веларно и палатално, което към началото на Новата ера преминава в зв. **ŋ** [дж] или се изпуска, но преди III в. пр.н.е. финалът е представен само от фонемите **p, t, k, m, n** и други такива черти и особености.*

*Пак в древнокитайските летописи се срещат изключително важни данни и свидетелства и за произхода на българското народностно название, защото се оказва, че именно и единствено в тях, както по безспорен начин проличава и се доказва от много полезната и значима за цялата българска лингвистика и историография сводно-обобщителна студия от най-ново време на един китайски по произход канадски учен на име Sapring Chen, са съхранени такива негови варианти като **Buluoji, Buluojian, Bulugen, Boluohui, Buliuhan, Poliuhan, Poluohan**, в среднокитайско произношение **В'ио-lak-kiei** като наименование на "етническа група" (S. Chen), но според нас по-скоро голяма група племена от състава на българската в основата си и като цяло полиетнична военно-племенна конфедерация Хунну с по-късен фонетичен вариант Сюнну.*

*По-нататък проф. Chen възприема вече обоснованото и доказано преди това и от други изследователи основно положение, че "китайското звукосъчетание **ji** представя едно крайно **-r** в последната сричка", след което обръща много по-силно внимание върху проявата на зв. **-r**, "която всъщност изгражда пряко съответствие между имената **Buluoji** и **Bulgar/Bulyar**" в лицето на зв. **-n** от състава на вариантите **Poluohan/Poliuhan, Buliuhan, Buluojian** и **Bulugen**, засвидетелствувани предимно в лични имена, като при това не пропуска да изпише и съответните китайски йероглифи, които тук не се привеждат по добре разбираеми и обясними причини.*

Наред с това налице са достатъчно примери, които показват, че китайският зв. **h** не е нищо повече от закономерна субституция на българския зв. **γ** или **gh**, откъдето пък и китайският завършек **-han** е напълно редовното и закономерно съответствие на българската сричка **-gar** [Добрев 2012а, 13-18].

*We would like to point out more prominent evidence for the -r ending in the name Buluoji, which in fact creates a direct correspondence between the names Buluoji and Bulgar/Bular. This is the -n ending in the variants Poluohan/Poliuhan, Buliuhan, Buluojian and Bulugen, attested mostly in personal names. It is well-known that Chinese -n was frequently used to transcribe a foreign -r/l.[27] The most prominent example is perhaps the ethnonym Xianbei, widely believed to be a transliteration of *Srbi or *Serbi.[28] For example of terminal -r, see Pulleyblank's reconstruction *Taxwar of the name Dayuan.[28] Also in our particular case, we note numerous -han endings, whose medieval pronunciation directly indicates a consonant or gh in the final syllable [Chen 2014, 3].*

So the transcription of the Poem for Pugu, before being written through the means of the Chinese hieroglyphs, fully acquires a certain form, within which its lexico-phonetical and grammatical components are being further motivated and proven:

Süčig täligar

Puguy toyuduyar

The word form **süčig* “commander in chief” is a derivative noun subject in accusative. The basis *sü* “troops, army” is also met in the Bulgarian inscriptions in Greek language in the lands of the First Bulgarian Empire and more specifically in the complex compound title KANACYBICI of the Omurtag' inscription. Here KANA is a vocative from the contracted каган; CYBICI is a postpositive qualifier meaning “commander in chief”, comprising CY “troops” and BICI “head, chief, master”, while -I is a possessive suffix 3 p. sg. in its secondary-service or syntax-connective function. Particularly Bulgarian is also the word-forming suffix *-či*, which was being taken in an integrative way from the Bulgarian language to the Old Bulgarian language, where it was being added also to bases from other origins - кѣнигѣуни, крѣуни, самѣуни, шарѣуни, but also зѣдѣуни, корабѣуни etc. The righteous legitimacy and correctness of this extremely short comparatively-historic and ethymological analysis are also extralinguistically confirmed by the above-mentioned story by Фан Сюаньлин. Here the commander in chief of the Shi Le' troops declares a war to the tribe of Pugu, but he is defeated, for which he is imprisoned and there he is poisoned. In order only to be used as a distinctive mark and not as a target of the action, the accusative suffix *-g* is also added to the subject, the way it is done in the Inscription of khan Dengiz: **Kiŋkeg Dengiz jikü käse! Kijü, čox-čox saxyŋil, gür Täŋrig!** *The dish, from which khan Dengiz has to eat! Man, be very afraid of Him, mighty is Tangra!* [Добрев 2005, 314-316, 406-408; ~*~2011, 437-439, see and compare Бешевлиев 2014, 17, 83, 105-106; Ваклинов 2012, 121-122; Серебренников, Гаджиева 1986, 75-77, compare Menges 1951, 91-93].

The word form **täligar* consists of the verb root *täl-* “go out; go to war” and the two-component suffix *-igar*, with the help of which is formed a present-future tense. The root of this verb has to be related to the Chuvash word *тул* “поверхност; наружная сторона, внешняя сторона”; *туллат-* “покрывать”; *туллă* “крытый, с крышкой”; *тулти* “находящийся вне жилища, наружный”; *тулашри* “наружный, внешний”; *тулашĕ* “внешность, наружность; лицо”; Bulgarian-Hungarian *túl* “вне”. Parallels of this root of the Oguzian Turkic languages can be drawn, for example, with the Old Turkic *maš* “внешний вид, облик; наружная, внешняя сторона”; *maš* “наружный, внешний; верхний”; Turkish *diş*, dialectal *teş*, *diş*, Bashkirian *тыш*, Kirgizian *тыс*, Uigurish *таш*, Altaic dialect *mac*, Turfan-Turkic *tašil-* “падать наружу, вываливаться; выходить” etc. [ДТС, 539; ЭСТЯз-в, 164-167; ЭСЧЯз, 243-

244]. The two-component suffix for the present-future tense consists of the participle suffix *-ik* and 3 p. sg. of the auxiliary verb *ar-* with a possible-supposed meaning [see Добрев 2005, 401-409, see and compare Левитская 1976, 59-65; Серебренников, Гаджиева 1986, 155-172].

The word form **toyuduyar* consists of the verb root *toyu-* “hit, beat; defeat” and the two-component suffix *-tuyar*, with the help of which is formed a past imperfect tense, equivalent to a future in the past tense. The root of the verb has to be related to the North Danube Bulgarian (X c.) *двуче-*, the parallels and the correspondences of which are in some Turkic languages as for example the Old Turkic *toqi-* “бить, ударять, стучать; вбивать, вколачивать; биться, стучать; ковать, выковывать; класть; устанавливать, воздвигать” [ДТС, 571-577], again Old Turkic *токыт-* “велеть вырѣзать; поставить”, Old Uyghurish *тогы-* “стучать”, Old Uzbekish *тогун-* “бить себя” [Радлов-3, 1149,1161], Old Oguzian *toki-* “beat somebody; knock on something; hit, smith, make; weave” [DLT-3, 268]. The suffix for the past imperfect tense consists of the passive past participle of *-tuy-* and 3 p. sg. of the auxiliary *ar-* with a resultant-complementary meaning. Here the passive participle neutralizes the precedent semantics of the verb, similarly to the already lexicalized Turkish past participles *bildik*, *tanidik* “знакомый” [TRSz, 118,825]. As a whole the past imperfect tense is transmitted through the tense of the precedent verb to an additional orientation moment into the future and turns into a prefuture tense [see Добрев 2005, 392-399, see and compare Дыбо 2013, 74-80; ЭСТЯз-в-д, 247-249; Левитская 1976, 65-75,85-101; Серебренников, Гаджиева 1986, 159-199,224].

Therefore the Poem for Pugu must be translated in the following manner, which best matches and repeats the logic and the course of the real events:

*If the commander-in-chief goes to war,
The Pugu tribe will be defeated.*

The Poem for Pugu is the oldest and most precious fully-connected text in Bulgarian language, and by and large in Bulgarian and more generally in Turkic language. That is why it is one of the most powerful and extremely important testimonies and evidences for the Bulgarian origin and the ethnicity of the Central Asian Xiongnu.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Бешевлиев В.**, Прабългарски епиграфски паметници. Интернет, 2014.
- Ваклинов Ст.**, Формиране на старобългарската култура VI-IX век. Интернет, 2012.
- Добрев Ив.**, Златното съкровище на българските ханове от Атила до Симеон. София, 2005.
- ~*~Българите за руския народ, държава и култура. София, 2011.
- ~*~Етимон и апелатив на българското народно название. - Bulgarian Names of Eastern Languages Origin. Internet, 2012a.
- Дыбо А. В.**, Лингвистические контакты ранних тюрков. Лексический фонд. Пратюркский период. Интернет, 2013.
- Левитская Л. С.**, Историческая морфология чувашского языка. Москва, 1976.
- Серебренников Б. А., Н. З. Гаджиева**, Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Москва, 1986.
- Тайшань Ю.**, Дискуссия о утверждении родственности сюнну и гуннов. Интернет, 2012.
- Таскин В. С.**, Материалы по истории кочевых народов в Китае 3-5 вв., вып. 2. Цзе (Хунны цзе 羯匈奴). Интернет, 2012a.
- Яхонтов С. Е.**, Древнекитайский язык. Интернет, 2014.
- Bailey H. W.**, Indo-Scythian Studies. Internet, 2011.
- Chen S.**, Some Remarks on the Chinese “Bulgar”. Internet, 2014.
- Menges K.**, Altaic elements in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions. - Byzantion, t. 21.1, 1951.
- Pritsak O.**, The Slavs and the Avars. Internet, 2009.
- Pulleyblank E. G.**, The Consonantal System of Old Chinese. Internet, 2008.
- Tekin T.**, Hunların Dili. Internet, 2010.
- ~*~The Hunnic (Hsiung-Nu) Couplet in *Chin-Shu*. Internet, 2014.

SOURCES

ДТС - Древнетюркский словарь. Ленинград, 1962.

ЭСТЯз - Этимологический словарь тюркских языков, буквы а-с. Интернет, 2008.

ЭСЧЯз - Федотов М. Р., Этимологический словарь чувашского языка, т. I-II. Интернет, 2007.

Радлов - Радлов В. В., Опыт словаря тюркских нарѣчій, т. 1-4. С.-Петербургъ, 1905-1911.

Сюаньлин - Фан Сюаньлин, История династии Цзинь. Интернет, 2012.

DLT - Kaşgarlı M., Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk, с. 1-4. Ankara, 1998-1999.

TRSz - Türkçe-Rusça Sözlük. İstanbul, 1989.