

Discussion with Anatole Klyosov on an article I wrote about Proto-Turkish at the root of Western languages

Kaan Arslanoğlu 27.02.2022

ABSTRACT: Last month, I submitted two articles to Academia to be published as “letter”. The first was rejected despite the very positive opinion of two reviewers. Because one of the other two referees criticized the format rather than the content, and the last one managed to summarize his/her insults in three sentences. The second article, which you will see below, was also subjected to 7-sentence swearing by a referee. The second one was Anatole Klyosov, a world-renowned scientist and geneticist. Although Klyosov is not against the idea in the article, he found significant flaws in the scientific approach. He could have kept his name private by being a negative referee. But thankfully, he gave me the opportunity to discuss the matter in detail with him. I'm putting that article below without any changes. I've included Klyosov's specific answers to my article below. Then I'll briefly touch some additional things. Below that, I will quote from an article by Klyosov on this subject. You will see that Klyosov explains Turkism at the root of Western languages better than I do.

Are thousands of Turkish root words in western languages just a “similarity” or a coincidence?

Kaan Arslanoğlu

İlknur Arslanoğlu

ABSTRACT

So far, I have shown about 5 thousand Turkish words that have been transferred to Western languages, especially English, German, Latin. Almost all of them are of archaic roots. They are not loan words or new words of the last few centuries. The two most frequent objections that come as we reproduce and show the examples are as follows: 1- These are sound similarities, 2- These are coincidences. First, I will briefly discuss these two objections, and then I will try to show that these similarities are not accidental but inevitable results. The inevitable consequence of which facts? The inevitable result of: Pre-Christian history, the first assembly areas of humanity, agriculture and urbanization, and then the emergence of states... Relations of production, archaeological findings, prehistoric culture, ancient migration routes. All this is complemented by the genetic findings of the last 20 years.

RESULTS AND REVIEWS

A) It is beyond the scope of the discussion of linguistics to say for such a large number of overlaps in terms of meaning and phonetic: "can be seen for each language, only sound similarity". Therefore, we must concentrate on responding to the "coincidence" objections.

B) Could there be such a lot coincidences? Many statistical methods have been applied since Swadesh in order to understand whether two languages are common or not (1). Either we first make a word list from the basic words and compare it over it, or we compare old words in general and make calculations. There is no need to calculate this again here, since we have already shown a complete overlap between Turkish and Western languages (Indo-European languages) with at least 1000 words in terms of meaning and sound (2). Swadesh was only looking for over 100 words to prove partnership.

C) Turkish is an older language than Indo-European languages. Many of those who created this theory were talking about 4-5-6 thousand years of history for Indo-European languages and their divergence. However, the history of Turkish goes back 7-9 thousand years. Some of the old and very recent studies on this subject are in the references section (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10).

D) The fact that we show Turkic elements in the languages, names and cultures of the Native Americans and point to genetic commonality takes the Turkish root back to 20,000 years ago (11,12).

E) It is shown that Turkish is an agricultural society language and our examples in language and culture overlap with these findings (9,10, 13, 14, 15, 16).

F) The main areas and migration routes of Indo-European languages and races, shown by genetic studies, overlap exactly with the main areas and migration routes of Turkish-speaking tribes (17,18,19,20). If a common root is to be mentioned, it is quite natural to include Turkish in it.

G) Haplogroups, which are frequently mentioned in linguistics discussions and attributed to the Indo-European language group, are densely present in Turkish populations. R1a and R1b are also found at high rates in Turks. The most common haplogroups in Turks are J2, R1b, R1a, J1 and then G, I, E etc... C and Q increase significantly as one goes into East Asia. The Yakuts, the furthest Turkic clan, are of 90 percent belonging to N group. Turkishness is first and foremost a language union. Turkish-speaking tribes are considered Turkish and they can be in any haplogroup except a few haplogroups. Therefore, every haplogroup mentioned in the Indo-European discussions is also the proof of the Turkish root (21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30).

H) There are studies linking Sumerian, Akkadian, Etruscan and even Hittite languages with Turkish. Fritz Hommel and Noah Kramer initiated these studies (8,31,32,33).

I) Cultural motifs show that a culture settled in Siberia and Central Asia spread east and west all over the world. The similarity of the Central Asian monuments with those in Britain, the main themes of the Hyperborea Legend, the similarity of Santa Claus with the Turkic Ayaz Ata, the similarity of the stories of Krishna and Jesus Christ and their identity with the Turkish *kariş* > *caress* (blessing > Messiah), the Turkish Oz Stamp's conversion to Buddhism and its transformation into a fascist symbol of shame (Swastica). Mother wolf and Romus, Romulus Legend, Vatican > Ötüken name similarity etc. The spread of the Kipchaks to Europe after Christ and founding cities there, developing techniques based on iron production. The examples are too numerous to count here (31,34,35).

J) Much emphasis is placed on the really existing differences between Turkish grammar and Indo-European grammar. But the possibility of Turkish grammar being a root grammar is omitted. Grammatical differences between Indo-European languages are minimized, but the similarities between these languages and Turkish grammar are ignored. The stages of grammatical formation should be dealt with more scientific vision. The flexible structure of Turkish grammar and its aspects close to Indo-European grammar should be re-examined. I gave a short summary of these in my previous article (36).

Linguistic maps visually prove that the similarities and differences between languages in grammar are not that simple, but that they are versatile and complex (37).

K) Prefixes and suffixes are of grammatical importance in terms of structure in the language. Most of the Latin and English prefixes are compatible with

Turkish. Some of them fit exactly, some indirectly. An important part of the suffixes are compatible with Turkish. Examples of prefixes are: *Ab, ad (e-a) > e, a* (direction); *ab: öbürü; ante: önde; alter: alt, alt üst; ana:* with many and ambiguous meanings, PIE root: on > **önde, ön**, general, main: **ana**; *com: kamu, kamug* (community); *con: kon, kenet, kengeş, kopgi, kolbo, koş; coop: kop, kopça; col (collect): kolbo, göl; de: değil; dis: değil, düş; dual, du: secundo > ikili, ikinci, tüng, tüngai* (Radloff); *in, endo: engiz, endir* (Kyrghyz), **ingiz** (Radloff) (38); *intra: in-doğru; inter: in-yer; eu: iyi; ex: eksi, eksilmiş, çık, 'ks'* (öksürük, aksırık...); *extra: ek; ecto: ek; gen, gene: can* (not Persian because there is also Old Turkish version: 'yan'); *iso: eşit; juxta: yakın; cross: karşı; contra: karşı; circum: sar, sarmal; epi: hep; ob: oyuk, kovuk, obruk; multi: mol, bol; poly: bol, mol; no, none, not: ne; omni: yeme: all* (Radloff) (38); *uni: ön, en* (first, unic); *quadro: dört; tetra: dört; para, peri: beri; pro: bir, birinci; pre: bir, birincil; per: her; syn: sinme* (absorb); *ultra: öte, ulu; up, upper, upon: kop, aba, apa.*

L) At least 60 of the parts shown as Indo-European root words are in harmony with Turkish. The number of words derived from these roots solely in English is over 3,000. Experts in this subject have made strides in finding the sound rules of these transitions for the last 20 years. In other words, some rules of these transitions unknown in the West were established. Only 9 examples. Al: beyond (alien), Turkish 'el'; ater: fire, Turkish 'ateş, od, ot'; aug: increase, Turkish 'ağ, ak, ağmak'; bhel: shine, Turkish 'balkı'; bhend: bond, bind, Turkish 'bağ, ban'; deru: stable, strong, Turkish 'dur, tura, duru'; dheigw: stick, Turkish 'dik'; el: hand Turkish 'el'; kes: cut, Turkish 'kes'.

M) I did a study on Sanskrit, English, Turkish partnership in 2019. I compared these three languages over 1000 basic words. These three languages were

compatible around 20 percent on average. Turkish-Sanskrit concordance was higher than English-Sanskrit concordance (39).

N) There were serious scholarly criticisms and objections from within and outside of the Indo-European language theory. These criticisms and objections have been increasing recently (17,18,40, 41,42,43,44,45).

P) Finally, I am giving some examples from English and Latin words with Turkish roots. The samples in this article are enough to easily break the Swadesh's 100 limit in the sum. All of these words are pure Turkish words that are not found in neighboring languages, eg Persian, Arabic. These words are the first concepts related to agriculture, animal husbandry, urbanization, and some of them are oldest nouns and verbs. Acre: **arık**; aqua: **kova, akma**; aul: **ağıl**; architect: **ark-tekne** yapımı; baby: **bebek**; beret: **börk**; big: **büyük**; blade: **bile**; botanic: **bitki**; bright: **parla**; bruise: **bere**; bud: **budak**; bug: **böcü**; butch: **biç**; calorie: **kala**; cap: **kapak**; capsize: **kapsa**; cheese: **kesik, keş**; chew: **çiğne**; chop: **çap**; circum: **sar**; crease: **kırış**; crop: **kırp**; cup: **kap**; curve: **kıvr**; dawn: **tan**; dome: **dam**; donate: **donat**; dust: **doz, toz**; earth: **yer**; ergo: **erk**; father: **ata, baba**; get: **git**; goose: **kaz**; guard: **koru**; guide: **güd**; horde: **ordu**; horrible: **korkulu**; huge: **koca**; idea: **iduk**; mare: **müren**; me, my, mine: **men**; oath: **ant**; ox: **öküz**; pasture: **besle**; peace, pax: **baz, barış**; peek: **bak**; press: **bas**; sap: **sopa**; save: **savun**; say: **söyle**; scene: **seki**; sea: **su**; sear: **sarı**; second: **ikinci**; secret: **saklı**; sharp: **sarp**; sock: **sok**; suck: **sağ**; tact, touch: **değ, dokun**; tag: **tak**; through, true: **doğru**; time: **dem**; toe: **toynak**; turn: **dön...**

To look at about 5,000 words: (46).

ARGUMENT

The problem is not saving or glorifying Turkish. Our aim should be to bring scientific knowledge closer to reality and to raise science. For humanity and human brother- / sisterhood. The denial of the truth for bigotry, political, ideological, deep psychological reasons has a far more devastating effect than expected. Trying to block the debate with censorship or offensive attitudes does not benefit science, but fanaticism.

CONCLUSION

I tried to show Turkish, which is the root of Western languages, within the framework of a short article and to make a brief literature review on this subject. Revealing more truths is possible with mutual knowledge transfer and scientific discussion. If the mistakes can be seen and shown mutually, we can be united in the Aristotle's "golden middle".

OPINIONS OF KLYOSOV ON THIS ARTICLE AS A REFEREE

"It is worth reading by scholars, however, most of them would not understand the principal idea by the author and would make it a laughable matter. The contemporary science, particularly linguistic, does not aim at deep and original new concepts, it embraces copy-paste "approach" and "research" where scholars are walking by Indian file, step into step, sticking to established concepts.

The author, apparently partly intuitively, partly knowingly, albeit at the surface, has described Turkish roots of contemporary European languages. However, it was not "Turkish", particularly thousands of years ago, it was a different group

of languages, which does not have a name as yet in a modern classification of languages and their families. **It could probably be called proto-Turkic**, a Russian linguist Sergey Starostin had called some of them “Dene-Caucasian”, I call them **Arbins**, only because it was a language (or a group of languages) of bearers of haplogroup R1b which arose approximately 19,000 years ago. In fact, those languages could have appeared some 64,000 years back (according to DNA genealogy data), among bearers of haplogroup BT, and evolved since then following a chain of haplogroups (in short)

BT > CT > CF > F > GHIJK > HIJK > IJK > K > P > (R+Q) > R1 > R1b

It was an agglutinated language, which, of course, has evolved beyond recognition for 40,000+ years until it became a language of R1b bearers (19,000 years ago in the Altai region in South Siberia), hence, Arbin language. R1b bearers brought it from South Siberia to Europe by a long way, through a number of archaeological cultures, and currently about 60% of European males bear R1b haplogroup. Most of them are descendants of Bell Beakers (4,800-3,800 years ago), which have never been detected in Yamnaya culture. **Until about 3,000 years before present most of Europeans spoke that proto-Turkic language, aka Arbin, hence, so many words are stuck in European languages since then.** Only early Celts began to speak Indo-European languages, which they borrowed from R1a bearers heading to Europe from the East (Scythians, proto-Slavs, Illyrians, Veneds, etc.). However, many words from Arbin, which was a very archaic “Turkic” language, remained in European languages.

Obviously, the reviewed paper does not describe that story. It only touches it in some “roundabout” way. Furthermore, it mentions – mistakenly – some “genetic evidence” which are unrelated to that story, and which are plain wrong. For example, the paper mentions an article by Haak et al (2015), which

was incorrect in many ways. The Haak paper had nothing to do with “Indo-European” language, their DNA study did not show any “IndoEuropean” relevance, and, after all, IE language was not written in the DNA of Yamnaya ancient inhabitants. Haak et al just took it from thin air. Besides, Yamnaya has revealed R1b-Z2103 haplogroup, which is practically absent in Europe. Z2103 had gone to the Caucasus and further on to Anatolia, and now there are plenty of R1b-Z2103 bearers in Armenia, Turkey, among Kurds, Assyrians, Yazidis, and other peoples in the Middle East. R1b-Z2103, from Yamnaya, are observed mainly among Ashkenazi in Europe, with a common ancestor only 900 years ago. Hence, there were no any “massive migration” of Yamnaya folks to Europe. In fact, there were none, except some occasional “tourists”.

To sum it up, “thousands of Turkish root words in western languages” are neither “similarity”, nor “coincidence”. It is a reflection of deep history of a language (or languages) which we now call “Turkic”. From a viewpoint of many (most) linguists Turkic languages have a rather short history, only some 1500-2000 years ago. However, it is only a divergence time of a very ancient language (languages), call it agglutinative, proto-Turkic, Arbin, or whatever. In that regard the author got a general idea. However, he failed to present it in a continuous, historically adequate way, he presents a kind of a guesswork, and his “genetic” arguments were confusing. They lead to nowhere.

Therefore, the paper should be re-worked taking into account some notes presented above.

Additional: The system allows two options only - "recommend" or "reject". By "reject" I mean to modify the paper and remove, in particular, any "genetic" "reasoning". They are irrelevant, particularly refs. 18, 19, 26, 27, and certainly many others.”

Anatole A. Klyosov, Professor, President, the Academy of DNA Genealogy

The views expressed for the second, third time by Prof. Klyosov on my responses summarized below:

"IE languages (R1a) and "proto-Turkic" (R1b) migrated to Europe by totally different ways. About 5000 ybp R1b expelled R1a to the Russian Plain. From there IE/R1a have migrated to the East, particularly to India, Iran, Altay, Northern China, and R1b stayed in Europe with their proto-Turkic language until about 3000 ybp, when they switched over to IE languages, as I have explained earlier. However, many "Arbin" words remain. (...)

(...) As you see, I was fairly positive to your principal idea. What I was critical about, was how you present your principal idea, that you cited irrelevant papers, or papers which were plain erroneous ones. What was your response? Instead of to accept it, you argue: "None of the references in my article are irrelevant. Direct and closely related." I can assure you that I know many of those papers better than you. (...)

First, I gave you a chain of haplogroups from BT through R1b, and an intermediate fragment there was (R+Q). It means that haplogroup Q, which is a "brother" haplogroup of R, spoke the same language, and it was not Turkish, I repeat. You seem to be not got it. It was apparently some agglutinative language, a long ago a predecessor of contemporary Turkish. (...)

that "proto-Turkish", whatever we name it (but categorically not "Turkish"), split a long ago onto bearers of haplogroups R and Q (and all haplogroups prior it). Bearers of haplogroup Q have partly left for America, that is why many Indian tribes (most of them with haplogroup Q) speak languages resembling

those "proto-Turkic" languages (NOT Turkish). Many of haplogroup Q bearers left in Siberia and speak NOW some variants of Turkic languages. **When haplogroup R1a bearers came from Europe to South Siberia (after 4,000 ybp) and to Altay in particular, they apparently picked in Siberia those "proto-Turkic" languages, and now some Altay folks have haplogroup R1a and speak Turkic languages. Many Scythians (mainly R1a, but not only R1a) who migrated between Altay and Danube (mainly between 3000-2000 ybp) spoke variants of that "proto-Turkic" language.** Today a number of Caucasian peoples with haplogroups G2a, J2a, J1, L, T speak Turkic language. (...)

What I have described, is that R1b tribe(s) migrating from South Siberia to Europe, carried that "proto-Turkic" language, or Arbin, on their way, and brought it to Europe. Of course, they left their language on vast areas from Siberia to Europe, and many other haplogroups picked it, in some dialects and variants. **Bearers of haplogroups Q, R, C, N in Siberia spoke the same "proto-Turkic" language in variety of dialects and variants. I have suggested many years ago that Sumerians were R1b people and I gave factual support to that hypothesis. Assyrians have an unusually high content of R1b, for example. It might have been that many other peoples in Europe picked the same "proto-Turkic" language, that was Arbin, despite they belonged to different haplogroups. (...)**

The same thing. You go in circles. I say that Turkish speakers lived here at the same time (with IE speakers, 5000-4000 ybp - my note). No, you are making the same mistake. There was no any "Turkish" language those times. You mix up different epochs.

You can add my notes, but with a reference: Anatole A. Klyosov. "Haplogroup R1b as a carrier of Proto-Turkic languages, aka Dene-Caucasian languages, aka

Arbin, that is a non-Indo-European language in its dynamics during 16,000 to 3,000 years before present". Proceedings of the Academy of DNA Genealogy, vol. 4, No. 9, September 2011, pp. 1716-1773."

Anatole A. Klyosov, Professor

FINALLY MY VIEWS:

Before I started arguing with Klyosov, I had only read one of his articles. Through this discussion, I read more and learned more about him. Klyosov is perfectly right in his own way. He is trying to draw pictures of human tribes and languages thousands, tens of thousands of years ago. From the point of view he has, the pictures he draws look like criminal robot pictures that will bring us very close to the perpetrator. Of course it is probably missing, it has flaws, but it will help us a lot to find the person. Next to his, the picture I drew looks like a scribble of a novice cartoonist. It's natural he reacted to it. But I'm right too, because this cartoon, albeit rough, looks like a human and can bring us closer to that person to some extent. Especially when the vast majority of people in the area of linguistics believe in such nonsense fabrications and when they show us pictures of fairy tale heroes or ugly ghosts as humans, my crude caricature is seen much more realistic compared with them.

What about Turkish or Proto-Turkish? Klyosov counts Turkish as a language that is at most 2000 years old and limits the term "Turkish" to this. It might be true. I don't have any pretensions or obsessions to call 8,000-year-old, 20-thousand-year-old Turkic languages Turkish. It might be more accurate to say Proto-Turkish. Maybe not even Proto-Turkish... As Klyosov suggested, we can call it the "Arbin" language or give it another name. But "the Turkic" and Turkic

content of this language should definitely be emphasized. Klyosov does exactly that, in my opinion. Why should this be done this way? Is it because I'm a nationalist? I see that the vast majority in the scientific community is fanatically nationalist, but they blame others for being nationalist. In this respect, you can be a nationalist, but that's not my problem. The Turkic element should be especially emphasized in this ancient root language. Because that's the truth. Because science requires it. Because the Turkic element is deliberately tried to be hidden. That's exactly why I used the "Turkish" term. Wasn't "Academia" wanting provocative letters from us? Here's the provocation. Cleaning the Augeas Stables, which are covered with the prejudices of the Western World with a colonialist ideology of at least 300 years, is not such a clean job. Inevitably, we too will be polluted.

As for the irrelevance and inaccuracy of some of the references in the article... Klyosov is right, but right in his own way, in terms of perfection. I explained it in the first paragraph of this section. And I'm right, because every reference I gave was put there with a certain in-text logic in terms of a general review of the topic, a literature review. Some of them may contain very wrong things in their content, they may also deflect the subject. These are most likely the work of scholars which Klyosov calls "popgeneticists". But I do not know these contents as well as Klyosov. I cannot evaluate the content of the references as precisely as he does. What I see very well is the intense Turkish among the languages known today as English, German and French. I don't know much about some specialties. Despite this I know even these better than most of the linguists with exceptions.

SOME PARAGRAPHS RELATED TO THE TOPIC FROM AN ARTICLE OF KLYOSOV
(47) (mainly the ancient story of R1a and R1b and also Proto-Turkish – I made
some sentences and words in bold- K.A):

“(...) Strictly speaking, we do not exactly know where this haplogroup was formed, and, probably, we would never know. Any find of an ancient R1a would not ensure that no more ancient find does not exist somewhere in a not yet excavated place. Therefore, as a result of some optimization of the available data, the origin of R1a was placed on a map somewhere between Altai and Baikal. (...)

We know that in those days, between 5,000 and 6,000 YA, the Aryan languages, which were renamed “Indo-European” in the 19th century for reasons of political correctness (and also to prevent German scholars from continuing to call them “Indo-Germanic”), according to linguists, diverged into a number of linguistic branches, in particular, the future Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, Paleo-Balkan, Greek, Germanic and some (+8) others. (...) Before the divergence, all of them definitely spoke a language of the parent Aryan haplogroup Z645 , and continued to speak it many centuries later. Therefore, it is not surprising that according to the well-known linguist S.A. Starostin, modern Russian has 54% the same basic vocabulary as the Old Indian language. The same applies to other Slavic languages, the representative of which is the Russian language. Therefore, to say that the Slavic languages “evolved”, or “formed” in the middle (or even at the end) of the 1st millennium AD (!), as believe linguists, is completely faulty and primitive. (...)

It is known that the migration of the southern Aryans along the East European Plain and on to the southern Urals, and formation of the Sintashta and Andronovo archaeological cultures continued further eastward, after (or

*simultaneously) with separation of the migratory direction towards India, possibly after leaving a settlement with (modern) name Arkaim about 3,600 YA (...) **Altai** happened about 3,600-3,000 YA, on the way leaving the Karasuk (3,500-2,800 YA), Tagar (2,800-2,200 YA) and Tashtyk (2,200-1,500 YA). In all these cultures were found haplogroup **R1a fossil DNA**. (...)*

*The **Scythians** went to Altai and Mongolia, most of them became nomads, and made transitions from Altai to the Black Sea region (sometimes further to the west) and back, **spoke in the majority in Turkic languages** (although some, perhaps, in “Indo-Iranian” languages), had mostly haplogroup R1a-Z2123. So, in the Samara region, fossil remains of the Scythians were found with an archaeological date of 2,395-2,215 YA, **haplogroup R1a-Z2123**. The Scythians became the ancestors of most of the Kyrgyz and at least a third of the Karachai-Balkars. Those who became **Sarmatians mainly had the R1b** haplogroup with a series of subclades (...)*

*Then, in the first half of the 1st millennium BC, or 3,000-2,500 YA, formation of the early Celts of the haplogroup R1a with Indo-European (IE) languages(circle 30), and then a rapid borrowing of cultural characteristics of the early Celts, borrowing of their IE languages and their assimilating by the surrounding Europeans of haplogroup R1b. **There was a rapid “Erbinization” of the early Celts and very soon by historical standards, over several centuries, the Celts in Europe became mainly carriers of the haplogroup R1b.***

CONCLUSION

Those are the quotes from Klyosov. As far as I understand and in summary Klyosov says: R1a mainly represents "Indo-European" languages, R1b represents Turkic (Proto-Turkish) languages. Proto-Turkish (Arbin language) was the most dominant language in Europe until 3000 BC. R1a also went to the

Altai region and Siberia from East Europe and from there to China and India. This is how the IE languages spread to the east. But we can see from the examples given here that there were Turkish speakers in R1a as well. Therefore, it may be easier to separate R1a from R1b, but it is not always so easy to separate IE from Proto-Turkish. Thank you Klyosov.

References

- (1) Moris Swadesh,
[https://www.academia.edu/64996937/The Origin and Diversification of Language Morris Swadesh Joel Sherzer](https://www.academia.edu/64996937/The_Origin_and_Diversification_of_Language_Morris_Swadesh_Joel_Sherzer)
- (2) Samuel E. Martin, Lexical Evidence Relating Korean to Japanese Languages, 1966
- (3) Roy Andrew Miller, The Japanese Language, 1967
- (4) Nicholas Poppe, Altaic Linguistic An Overview Science and Language, No 6, 1975
- (5) Nicholas Poppe, A New Symposium on the Altaic Theory CAJ, c. XVI, n.1, 1972
- (6) Karl. H. Menges, The Turkic Language and People, 1968
- (7) Osman Nedim Tuna, Altay Dilleri Teorisi, Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1983
- (8) Osman Nedim Tuna, Sümer ve Türk Dillerinin Tarihi İlgisi ile Türk Dili'nin Yaşı Meselesi, Atatürk Kültür, Dil, Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Dil Kurumu Yay, 1990, (based on the work of Fritz Hommel and Noah Kramer)

(9) Martine Robbeets, Remco Bouckaert, Matthew Conte, Alexander Savelyev, Tao Li, Ken-ichi Shinoda, Yinqiu Cui, Takamune Kawashima, Geonyoung Kim, et al. ; Triangulation supports agricultural spread of the Transeurasian languages; Nature 2021

(10) Robbeets, Martine 2017. Japanese, Korean and the Transeurasian languages. In: Hickey, Raymond (ed.) The Cambridge handbook of areal linguistics (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

(11) Kaan Arslanoğlu, <https://www.insanbu.com/Felsefe-Haberleri/2625-15-20-bin-yil-once-kitadan-gocen-tingitler-dillerindeki-turkik-kokleri-hl-sasirtici-duzeyde-koruyorlar->

(12) Theodore G. Schurr, Matthew C. Dulik, Amanda C. Owings, Sergey I. Zhadanov, Jill B. Gaieski, Miguel G. Vilar, Judy Ramos, Mary Beth Moss, Francis Natkong, and The Genographic Consortium; Clan, Language, and Migration History Has Shaped Genetic Diversity in Haida and Tlingit Populations From Southeast Alaska; Am J Phys Anthropol; PMC 2015 Feb 20; Published in final edited form as: Am J Phys Anthropol. 2012 Jul; 148(3): 422–435

(13) Bernardini, Bonora, Traina; “Turkmenistan - Histories of a Country, Cities and a Desert”, Umberto Allemandi, Torino, 2016

(14) David R. Harris, “Origins of Agriculture in Western Central Asia”, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010

(15) Karatay, Osman, The Genesis of the Turks: An Ethno-Linguistic Inquiry into the Prehistory of Central Eurasia, trans. Mehmet Cığerli, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2022

(16) <http://www.irishcentral.com/roots/new-study-claims-that-irishmendescended-from-turkish-farmers-83217437-237788351>

(17) Anton Perdih, Continuity of European Languages from the Point of View of DNA Genealogy, International Journal of Social Science Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1; January 2018, Published by Redfame Publishing

(18) Xavier Rouard, Did Indo-european languages stem from a trans-eurasian original language? An interdisciplinary approach; Scientific Culture, vol. 8, no 1, (2022), pp. 15-49

(19) Haak, W.; Lazaridis, I.; Patterson, N.; Rohland, N.; Mallick, S.; Llamas, B.; Brandt, G.; Nordenfelt, S.; Harney, E.; Stewardson, K. et al. ; "Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe"; Nature, 2015, 11 June; 522(7555):207-11

(20) Rasmus Nielsen, Joshua M. Akey, Mattias Jakobsson, Jonathan K. Pritchard, Sarah Tishkoff and Eske Willerslev; "Tracing the peopling of the world through genomics"; Nature, 2017, 18 January; 541(7637): 302–310); <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5772775/>

(21) Cinnioglu, Cengiz; King, Roy; Kivisild, Toomas; Kalfoglu, Ersi; Atasoy, Sevil; Cavalleri, Gianpiero L.; Lillie, Anita S.; Roseman, Charles C.; Lin, Alice A.; Prince, Kristina; Oefner, Peter J.; Shen, Peidong; Semino, Ornella; Cavalli-Sforza, L. Luca; Underhill, Peter A. (2004). "Excavating Y-chromosome haplotype strata in Anatolia". Human Genetics. 114 (2). ss. 127-48. doi:10.1007/s00439-003-1031-4. PMID 14586639

(22) Shou WH, Qiao EF, Wei CY, Dong YL, Tan SJ, Shi H, Tang WR, Xiao CJ., Y-chromosome distributions among populations in Northwest China identify significant contribution from Central Asian pastoralists and lesser influence of

western Eurasians, *J Hum Genet.* 2010 May;55(5):314-22. Epub 2010 Apr 23

(23) J. Douglas McDonald, University of Illinois, Y Haplogroups of the World Online Edition 11.12. 2013, Wayback Machine

(24) Yong-Gang Yao, Different matrilineal contributions to genetic structure of ethnic groups in the Silk Road region in China, quoted: "(...)". Online Read 30.5. 2012, Wayback Machine

(25) Yali Xue, Tatiana Zerjal, Weidong Bao, Suling Zhu, Qunfang Shu, Jiujin Xu, Ruofu Du, Songbin Fu, Pu Li, Matthew E. Hurles, Huanming Yang, and Chris Tyler-Smith, Male demography in East Asia: a north-south contrast in human population expansion times, *Genetics*, 172:4 (April 2006): pages 2431-2439

(26) V N Khar'kov, V A Stepanov, O F Medvedev, M G Spiridonova, N R Maksimova, A N Nogovitsyna, V P Puzyrev; The origin of Yakuts: analysis of Y-chromosome haplotypes; *Mol Biol (Mosk)* Mar-Apr 2008;42(2):226-37

(27) S A Fedorova 1, M A Bermisheva, R Villems, N R Maksimova, E K Khusnutdinova; Analysis of mitochondrial DNA haplotypes in yakut population; *Mol Biol (Mosk)* Jul-Aug 2003;37(4):643-53

(28) Christine Keyser, Clémence Hollard, Angela Gonzalez, Jean-Luc Fausser, Eric Rivals, Anatoly Nikolayevich Alexeev, Alexandre Riberon, Eric Crubézy and Bertrand Ludes; The ancient Yakuts: a population genetic enigma; The Royal Society Publishing; 19 January 2015

(29) Di Cristofaro J, Pennarun E, Mazières S, Myres NM, Lin AA, et al. (2013), "Afghan Hindu Kush: Where Eurasian Sub-Continent Gene Flows Converge." *PLoS ONE* 8(10): e76748. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076748

- (30) Yao, Yong-Gang; Kong, Qing-Peng; Wang, Cheng-Ye; Zhu, Chun-Ling; Zhang, Ya-Ping (2004). "Different Matrilineal Contributions to Genetic Structure of Ethnic Groups in the Silk Road Region in China". Mol Biol Evol. 21 (12): 2265–2280. doi:10.1093/molbev/msh238. PMID 15317881
- (31) Adile Ayda, Etrüskler Türk Mü İdi?, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, Ankara, 1974
- (32) Muazzez İlmiye Çığ, Sümerliler Türklerin Bir Koludur, Kaynak Yayınları, 2016
- (33) Elşad Allili, Osman Çataloluk; Similarity Between Turkish & Akkadian Based on Rules of Inflective & Agglutinative Languages; Advances in Language and Literary Studies Vol. 5 No. 4; August 2014
- (34) Murat Adji, Kıpçaklar - Türklerin ve Büyük Bozkırın Kadim Tarihi, çev. Zeynep Bağlan Özer, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayınları, 1994
- (35) Irek Bikkinin, İngilizcede Türkçe Kökenli Sözcükler (internet sources)
- (36) Kaan Arslanoğlu,
https://www.academia.edu/71232884/Medical_terms_as_well_indicate_Turkish_at_the_root_of_Western_languages_Refusing_of_this_puts_history_and_linguistics_in_a_deadlock_why
- (37) <https://linguisticmaps.tumblr.com/>
- (38) Wilhelm Radloff, Versuch Eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte, 1872
- (39) Kaan Arslanoğlu; Türkçe Sanskritçe İngilizce uyumunun ölçülmesi :
<https://www.insanbu.com/Felsefe-Haberleri/735-1000-temel-sozcuk-ustunden-turkce-sanskritce-ingilizce-uyumunun-karsilastirmasi>
- (40) Edo Nyland, Linguistic Archaeology, FriesenPress, 2016

(41) Martin Bernal, Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization (The Fabrication of Ancient Greece), Rutland Local History & Record Society 1987

(42) Mustafa Celalettin Paşa (Konstanty Borzęcki), Les Turcs Anciens et Modernes, 1869

(43) Bedros Efendi Keresteciyan, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Turquie, 1912

(44) İsmail Hami Danişmend, Hind-Avrupalıların Menşe Birliği (1935), Devlet Basımevi, İstanbul, 1935

(45) Alev Şeyda Uzun, Ahmet Cevat Emre'nin Türkçenin dünya dilleri arasındaki yeri ile ilgili görüşleri, Çukurova Üniversitesi Türkoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi, Haziran 2019

(46) <https://www.insanbu.com/sozluk>

(47) Anatole Klyosov, 24 thousand years of R1a migrations / Map and ancient migration routes of haplogroup R1a, <http://pereformat.ru/2019/10/r1a-map/>, 23.10.2019