

“exempt from taxes.” GOLSTUNSKI, in his Mongol-Russian Dictionary (Vol. III, p. 63), defines it as “smith, master; exempt from taxes and obligations.” There is no association between these two meanings, as wrongly deduced by E. BLOCHET (Djami el-Tévarikh, Vol. II, p. 58). In Karakirgiz we have *darkan* in the sense of “smith, artist,” while the same word in Kirgiz means “favorite of the Khan” and “liberty.” Perhaps *darkan* was an independent Mongol-Turkish word, which was subsequently amalgamated with Old Turkish *tarkan*.

The Tibetan forms *dar-k'a-č'e* and *dar-rgan* lead to Uigur *darkači* (-či being a suffix) and *dargan* or *darkan*. Tibetan tradition itself assigns these words to the Uigur language; thus it is legitimate to conclude that Mongol, on its part, derived the words from the Uigur, and that the initial dental sonant is peculiar or due to the latter. The Tibetan transcriptions, further, are decisive in reconstructing the Uigur forms; for an Uigur (or Mongol) *tarkan* would have been transcribed by the Tibetans only *t'ar-k'an*. Among the Mongols, the title never had an extensive application; it does not occur in the chronicle of Sanan Setsen. Also the fact that the Manchu and other Tungusian languages did not adopt it from the Mongols is apt to show that it is of comparatively recent date among the Mongols. Neither was it the Mongols who conveyed the word to Persia, as is evidenced by the Persian form *tarxān*. The form *dargan* paves the way to *daruga*, which, although a different word, that has assumed a development of its own, in its foundation is doubtless related to *darkan*, *tarkan*. Both words start with the common significance “official, governor, commander, high authority,” and gradually depreciate in value, *daruga* simply becoming a chief, mayor, superintendent, manager, and *tarkan* a favorite of the Khan.

There is no evidence of the existence of the title on Asiatic soil prior to the seventh or eighth century A.D. The Chinese do not ascribe it to the Hiuñ-nu or any of the numerous early Turkish tribes with which they came in contact, while they have preserved many titles and offices in their languages. We have no right to assume an unlimited antiquity for any historical or linguistic phenomenon; nor can it be argued with Mr. Beveridge that “the antiquity of the name is evidenced by the fact that its etymology is unknown, and that Oriental writers are obliged to make absurd guesses on the subject.” There are a great many ancient words the etymology of which is perfectly known, and there are many words of recent origin the etymology of which is shrouded in mystery or dubious. I have no judgment on the point raised by Mr. Beveridge, that the names Tarchon, Tarquin, and Tarkhan may be identical; but for chronological and ethnographical reasons this theory does not seem very probable. At any rate, both detailed phonetic and