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PREFACE

To my best knowledge, Hungary is the only country in the world where one has to write and defend a diploma-work and three dissertations. This dissertation-centric procedure, which is combined with a hierarchy of titles, has been vividly criticised in recent years and with reason. The system is roughly as follows: On finishing five university years one has to present a diploma-work. The university diploma can be approximately equated with the MA level of Anglo-Saxon universities. Then follows the university doctorate which is awarded by the university. A subsequent dissertation has to be written to acquire the title of Candidate of Sciences. For the last dissertation one gets the title of Doctor of Sciences. The level of the Candidate of Sciences is now considered to be equivalent to the PhD level of the Anglo-Saxon university system.

I wrote my diploma-work in 1955, defended my university doctorate in 1958, my dissertation for the Candidate degree was accepted in 1965, and I defended my last dissertation in 1971. My work for the university doctorate was published in 1955 /Social Terms in the List of Grants of the Tibetan Tun-huang Chronicle: Acta Orient. Hung. V, 249-270/, and my dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Sciences appeared in 1966 / Tibeto-Mongolica. The Hague-Budapest, 232 p/. The third dissertation had a somewhat clumsy Hungarian title which can be translated as "The Fundations of the Research of the Altaic Linguistic Relationship. The Theory of the Linguistic Relationship and the Relation of Chuvash and Mongolian". It consisted of 1025 densely typewritten pages. It was divided into two parts. In the first part, I dealt with the theory of linguistic relationship. This part has been published in Hungarian /A nyelvrőkonság Budapest 1978, 488 p/. The second part dealt with the relationship of the Chuvash and Mongolian languages. At this point I was fed up with preparing bulky monographs for printing, and so it remained in manuscript. This manuscript is used by my students and colleagues. Instead of publishing the whole of it, I decided to select some of the topics dealt with and publish them in separate papers, bringing, of course, the relevant material up to date.

I have always tried to focus my interest on the history of the Altaic languages as a source of the history of these peoples. I consider myself rather a historian who predominantly uses language to
reconstruct the past than a linguist who is interested in linguistic changes for its own sake. This approach is reflected in the title of this volume. It contains a selection of those papers which are within the framework of the second part of my dissertation, and have been published in different, in some cases hardly accessible, places, with the exception of those which appeared in an earlier volume: Studies in Chuvash Etymology I. Studia Uralo-Altaica vol.17. Szeged 1982.

It is my kind duty to acknowledge the permission of the respective publishers to reprint these papers. My sincere thanks are due to Á. Molnár for the editing work.

A. Róna-Tas
I think, if linguists were called upon to state in one word the most important methodological device of the scientific investigation of language, the answer would be in the overwhelming majority of cases: comparison. It is not without interest that structural linguistics revolting against historical comparative linguistics has evolved its own comparative method: typology.

Having now two comparative linguistics the question arises what is common to both of them and what is different in them; if metalanguage is the language of languages, metatypology is the typology of all possible linguistic typologies. I shall deal now only with one theoretical and one practical question: what is common and different in historical linguistics (HL) and linguistic typology (LT) and what typology can contribute to the problem of linguistic relationship in one special case.

1.1 Method and aim. HL and LT both compare linguistic structures or sub-structures but the aim of HL is to reconstruct historical identity and contact, while LT establishes types of linguistic structures or sub-structures. Both have the common method of choosing identities and differences for the basis of comparison, but HL looks after material, LT after logical identities.

1.2 Classification. Both HL and LT establish higher classes on the basis of common constituents in lower sub-classes, but HL is interested in historically developed sub-classes while LT establishes the higher classes on a mere formal basis.

1.3 Causes and approach. Similarities in two or more languages can have the following causes: 1.31 Similarities caused by chance, 1.32 Similarities caused by convergent development inherent in the structures of the given languages, 1.33 Similarities caused by the elementary principles of using linguistic signs for information, 1.34 Similarities caused by areal factors, 1.35 Similarities caused by an adstratum (sub- or superstratum) common to the languages compared, 1.36 Similarities caused by mutual or unidirectional influence, 1.37 Similarities caused by common genetic origin. LT is interested in all causes while HL only in 1.34-1.37. But HL for ascertaining which similarities or identities are the results of historical causes has also to deal with the non-historical causes, otherwise HL cannot exclude them. Thus the approach of HL is restrictive and that of LT is extensive.

1.4 Material and typological identity. Both HL and LT try to establish identity on the basis of similarities. We can investigate – as Roman Jakobson has formulated it – the change of initial identity and the identity of
change. In the first case we have to do with a material identity, in the second, with a typological identity—both historical features.

1.5 Time-place continuum. Since development necessarily takes place in a time-place continuum, the object of both HL and LT is in the time-place continuum but in the case of HL with, and in case of LT not necessarily with, material contact.

1.6 Historical and general laws. The laws established by HL are or aim to be historically determined laws, while the laws stated by typology have the aim of being general or quasi-general. With HL we approach the history, with LT, the thinking of mankind.

1.7 Interdependence of history, thinking and language. History and thinking are two very pregnant manifestations of the homo sapiens, both HL and LT investigate them through their linguistic expression. History, thinking and language are interdependent, since none of the three is possible without the other two.

1.8 Same method and object—different aspect. The interdependence of history, thinking and language is based on the fact that they are special forms of motion of the same object. Thus HL and LT with the same method (comparison) investigate the same object (the forms of motion of the expression of the homo sapiens through linguistic signs) but from two different aspects: the historical and the logical.

1.9 Language is a form of motion. It is one of the greatest mistakes of modern linguistics to think that language in its synchronic state is static. This statement—as so many others—goes back to F. de Saussure: “Le changement opéré n’appartient à aucun des deux états: or les états seuls sont importants”.1 Neither is his famous analogy with chess-game valid. The situation in a chess-game is a dynamic and not a static one. The value of each piece depends not on its static characteristics but on the possible forms of its motion. If movement is impossible, chess cannot be played. Motion is present in each synchronic linguistic system. The meaningful signs of language follow each other in time, language is realized in repetition, the synchronic system is built up by the interaction of different subsystems (old and new forms, forms of territorial, dialectal and social groups, forms of the common and literary language); the validity of a linguistic structure is based on its possible transformation, that is: the synchronic system of the language is a dynamic and not a static one. The dynamics of language in synchrony is more important than its statics: as Schuchardt has already pointed out, “Werden” is more important than “Sein”. Thus LT has as its ultimate aim to investigate the general rules of the dynamics of the language, irrespective of its diachronic or synchronic aspects. HL investigates the historical realization of the same rules.

2.1 I should like now to give an example of how typology can help in solving a historical problem and try, at the same time, to give an illustration of what has been said earlier.

It is well known that the genetic relationship of the three branches of the Altaic languages is a debated and still unsolved question. In the dis-

---

1 F. de Saussure, Cours de linguistique générale. Paris 1922, 126.
cussion, from very early on, the typological argument has been used in favor of the genetic relationship. Moreover, the typological similarity was perhaps the first argument. Now let us choose a sub-system, the system of the bilabial stops. The question of the bilabial stops has a special place in the discussion on the Altaic linguistic family — it is enough if I refer to the works of Ramstedt, Poppe, Aalto, Clausen, Šćerbak, Iljić-Svityč and others, so it is convenient to select just this problem for investigation. For the sake of simplicity I single out one language from each branch: Ottoman Turkish from the Turkic group, Kalmuck from the Mongolian group, and Nanai from the Tunguso-Manchurian group.

Phonemic opposition of bilabial stops. In all of the three languages p : b : m are in a threefold opposition. 2.11 Ottoman: *bala* "baby" ; *pala* "scimitar, paddle" ; *mala* "bricklayer's trowel" ; *kab* "cover" ; *kap* "mantle" ; *kam* "cam" ; *taban* "sole, heel" ; *tapan* "harrow" ; *kamts* "reed" ; *kaps* "manner of seizing" . 2.12 Kalmuck: *ba:* "dark" ; *par* "sail" ; *ba:* "sign, mark" ; *pä:* "share" ; *mä:* "livestock" . 2.13 Nanai: *bia* "moon" ; *pia* "birch" ; *bodoko* "abacus" ; *modoko* "blunt" ; *môngo* "combustible" ; *pongo* "bush" .

2.2 Typological similarities. The opposition of the bilabial stops is 2.21 three-dimensional in all the three languages because bilabiality is present in these three phonemes and only in these three phonemes in each of the three languages. 2.22 The oppositions b : p, b : m and m : p are heterogeneous oppositions because in none of the three languages do we find such one-dimensional oppositions which could be placed between each of the constituents of the phonemic pairs. 2.23 The oppositions of the bilabials are proportional in all the three languages because the opposition-types of the bilabials are paralleled in each of the three languages by the dental series (d : t, d : n, t : n). 2.24 The oppositions of the bilabials are privatives in all the three languages because the presence and absence of characteristics give the difference between the two constituents of the oppositions: voicedness and/or nasality. 2.25 The threefold opposition p : b : m as a type is opposed to other types of three-fold oppositions, e.g. Khalkha p : b : m, and it is opposed to two-, four-, five- and manifold oppositions as e.g. Chuvash p : m, Tibetan p : b : m, Sanskrit p : p : b : f : m etc.

2.3 Typological differences. The system of bilabial stops is not the same in respect of their possible positions in the structure of the morpheme: 2.31 p : b : m are in phonemic opposition, in Ottoman Turkish in word-initial, intervocalic and word-end position, except for p : b before and after consonants, where they are neutralized and opposed to m. In Kalmuck b and p are in phonemic opposition only in word-initial position, in all other position they are neutralized and opposed to m. In Nanai b : p is neutralized word-finally and before but not after consonants. Word-finally the opposition of the neutralized b + p and m is restricted to non-substantives and non-verbs. 2.32 The system of the bilabials differs in the three languages according to the etymology of the words in which they occur. In Ottoman p : b opposition in word-initial position is possible only in word-pairs of which one or both are of non-Turkish origin, while the same opposition is possible in other positions between words irrespective of their origin.
In Kalmuck the \( p : b \) opposition occurs only in word-pairs where one or both of the words are of non-Mongolian origin and — as it has been said — in initial position. In Nanai \( p \) and \( b \) occur in words irrespective of their origin.  

2.33 The system of the opposition of the bilabial stops is different in the three languages according to the historical antecedents of the phonemes in question. Ottoman Turkish \( b, p, m \) in original Turkish words correspond to one phoneme in the proto-system: \( b \). Kalmuck \( p \) — as I have pointed out — is of non-Mongolian origin, while \( b \) and \( m \) have \( b \) and \( m \) as their antecedents in the proto-system. Nanai \( p, b \) and \( m \) go back to the same separate phonemes \( p, b \) and \( m \) in the proto-system.  

2.34 The functional frequency of the three phonemes is different in the three languages. The frequency (in per cent) of lexical types in initial position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmuck</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanai</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ottoman has a great functional load on the phoneme \( m \), Kalmuck an even greater on \( b \), while the system of Nanai is well balanced. Ottoman would give a quite different picture if we investigated the same feature in words of only Turkish origin. In this case \( b \) has a higher and \( m \) a lower frequency percentage. In the case of pure Mongolian words, Kalmuck would have zero percentage for \( p \), but this would not influence the distribution of \( b \) and \( m \). In Nanai the exclusion of non-Nanai words would give no difference. It would be very interesting to investigate the frequency of the given phonemes in non-initial position, further to calculate the token-frequency in several types of texts. To this we have not enough preliminary work at our disposal, but the results would not be essentially different.  

2.4 Historical comparison. For two of the three languages we can give an earlier segment. For Turkish I chose the lexicul stock of the work of Kašyari (1072 A.D.), for Kalmuck the lexical stock of the Secret History of the Mongols (13th century). For Nanai we would have to give the figures of Juchen but the material is not yet processed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kašyari</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Hist.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, Kašyari corroborates our analysis of Ottoman, \( b \) has 2.5 times greater frequency than \( m \). The Secret History has practically the same distribution as present-day Kalmuck. If we investigate the lexical stock with bilabial initials of Kašyari, we find that \( m \) is present in initial position only in three cases: (a) in words which have nasal consonant in the second syllable, (b) in words which have as variant forms with initial \( b- \) and (c) in words of non-Turkish origin. These show the obviously secondary origin of the phoneme \( m \) in initial position and allow us to state that \( m \) was not an independent phoneme in initial position in the earlier phase of development.
2.5 *Three types of development.* We can state three types of development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ottoman</th>
<th>Kalmuck</th>
<th>Nanai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p : b : m</td>
<td>P → p : b : m</td>
<td>p : b : m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>P B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diachronic dissimilarity is reflected by the positional and functional analysis of the synchronic system.

2.6 *Conclusions.* We have found significant typological similarities in the structure of the phonemic oppositions of the bilabial stops in the three investigated languages. (2.2) But behind the similarities — which are all of static character — we found important differences both in the static and the dynamic typology of the structure of the bilabial stops. These typological differences show a divergency. The present similar situation goes back to a historically antecedent dissimilar situation. The course of development in the three languages was also entirely different from the typological point of view. Kalmuck p is a loan-phoneme from Russian, Ottoman p is a secondary phoneme, the development of which was probably caused primarily by internal processes of the development of the Ottoman phonemic-system and only secondarily evoked by the massive influence of Arabic and Persian. Both Ottoman and Kalmuck p in initial position had not yet become organic parts of the respective phonemic systems but in different measure, while Nanai p is an ‘organic’ phoneme, as has been proved by the positional and functional analysis. Kalmuck p is restricted to one single, Ottoman p to more positions, while Nanai p is not restricted at all. Our analysis has shown that the system of bilabials in the three languages is not the result of a common genetic origin. I wish to emphasize that the above typological analysis does not constitute a sufficient argument for rejecting the genetic relationship of the three languages and of their groups. It is only one vote against it, but a vote to be counted.

My concrete example can be perhaps also taken as an illustration of my theoretical statements. Dynamic typology and historical linguistics are two aspects of one and the same science having the same object and the same method.
SOME PROBLEMS OF ANCIENT TURKIC

BY

A. RÓNA-TAS
Budapest

For anyone working in the field of Altaic linguistic history, it is essential to form some definitive views about the point of departure. Leaving aside the vexed question of the Altaic proto-language for each of the three Altaic language groups, a hypothetical Common Language is used for reconstruction: Common Turkic, Common Mongolian and Common Manchu-Tungusian. On the other hand, the period of the oldest monuments of these language-groups is usually labelled as Old Turkish, Old Mongolian and Old Manchu-Tungusian. Old Turkish can be divided into three sub-periods: Early Old Turkish from the time of the formation of the Turkish Khaganate up till the first known linguistic monuments in Runic script, Middle Old Turkish from these times till the arrival of the Arabs in the Turkish world, and Late Old Turkish till the time of the Mongols of Chingis khan.1

1 From the fact that the “Old” period is a period of the first documents of the language, it is clear that Old Turkish, Old Mongolian and Old Manchu-Tungusian are not necessarily overlapping periods. All end in the 13th century with the events of the rising Mongolian Empire, but the beginning of Old Mongolian, including Tu-ya-hun and Kitai, and the beginning of Old Manchu-Tungusian, including Juchen, is an open question.

2 There is also an other usage which marks the end of Old Turkish or Alltürkisch with the appearance of the Arabs, and calls Middle Turkish or Mitteltürkisch the later period. A. von Gabain (Alltürkische Grammatik, pp. 1–3) uses the term Alltürkisch in the sense of the language "der noch nicht vom Islam berührten Türken Mittelasien," which means that the late Uigur documents of Turfan (13th century) are Alltürkisch while Kāsyarīs Dhu’da (1074) is Mitteltürkisch, as it is also called by Brockelmann. Poppe uses Ancient Turkic for our Old Turkish, but for the period 6th–10th centuries, Middle Turkic begins with the 10th century and lasts till the 15th (see Introduction to Altaic Linguistics, Wiesbaden 1965, pp. 59–67). According
But what was there before Old Turkish, that is earlier than the 6th century? Was this period—which we could call Ancient Turkic—a linguistically homogeneous one? Are we confronted with a Common or Proto-Language from which all the phenomena of the later periods can be definitively and unambiguously interpreted? It is clear that the Turkic languages prior to the 6th century were far from being homogeneous. Theoretically, we can divide this Ancient Turkic language into two periods. The one nearer to Old Turkish was a period when the peoples and languages, later forming the Turkish Empire, were already independent but still in close contact with each other, or some of each other. This was bound to result in early linguistic contacts among the Turkish languages and language-groups.

In the earlier period of Ancient Turkic, the later languages were only dialects and these dialects existed in a more or less continuous but vast territory. This period must have lasted for a very long time, and if there ever was a homogeneous Proto or Common Turkic language, it could only have existed prior to this.

to Sînor (Introduction a l’étude de l’Eurasie Centrale, Wiesbaden 1963, p. 86) “turt-ancien” or “vieux-turc” covers the period from the 8th till the 14th century. Baskakov (Vvedenie v 1uđenie jurkiskoj jazykoj, Moscow 1962, p. 123) uses the term drevnejurkskij for the epoch lasting from the 5th till the 10th century with subperiods such as Tu-châlah (5th-8th centuries), Old Uigur (8th-9th centuries) and Old Kirghiz (9th-10th centuries). Malov (Pamjałnik drevnejurkskoj pis’mennosti, Moscow-Leningrad 1951, p. 3) uses the same term drevnejurkskij for the periods from 5th till the 15th centuries. Similar inconsistencies could be quoted from many other works, but I do not consider the question of periodisation very important. It is merely a methodological help to arrange events, and each periodisation can have good arguments in its favour.

I use the Ancient and Old Turkish terms for the so called x-languages, and Turkic for the combined x- and r-languages. Poppe’s Turkish is Modern Ottoman Turkish. We also have to speak about Old Bulgarian from the 6th till the 13th centuries (including the Danube and the Volga Bulgarians); thus Old Turkish means Old Turkish and Old Bulgarian. Ancient Turkic was called by Baskakov (op. cit., p. 118) and Poppe (op. cit., p. 57), the period of the language of the Huns. According to Baskakov, it lasted from 3rd century B.C. till the 4th century A.D. Since we know practically nothing about the language of the Huns, which was surely a more ethnical and political than a linguistical designation, I consider it more convenient to use the term Ancient Turkic.

Late Ancient Turkic is practically the same epoch as Baskakov’s “Hun period.”
I have sketched all this merely to make it clear that it is surely an oversimplification to assume a homogeneous Common Turkic—not to speak of Altaic—without taking into account Ancient Turkic and trying to interpret on its basis phenomena in Old Turkish, Middle Turkish and New Turkish. It could be counter-argued that we know nothing about Ancient Turkic. This is not a valid argument, since Common Turkic is also a reconstructed form, and if any period can be reconstructed from Turkish linguistic monuments and the present languages and dialects, then it is surely that form which is the nearest to Old Turkish and not that which is the farthest from it.\(^6\)

It seems to me, that quite a few problems of Turkish linguistic history can be solved more easily from a heterogeneous Ancient Turkic than from a homogeneous Common Turkic. To make this clear: if in a language \textit{B} we find a phenomenon \textit{b} and in a language \textit{C} we meet a feature \textit{c}, it is not certain that this can be interpreted if we only suppose a proto-language \textit{A} with the feature \textit{a} from which features \textit{b} and \textit{c} can be deduced genetically. This is the old problem of the "Wellentheorie" \textit{versus} the "Stammbaumtheorie."\(^4\) The two theories do not necessarily exclude each other; they can be combined, and general linguistic experience teaches us that they must be combined. I would like, now, to put aside the question of a hypothetical, homogeneous Common

\(^6\) It could be argued that there is no need to distinguish between Ancient and Common Turkic. I consider the difference between the homogeneous and heterogeneous (dialectal) stages essential.

\(^4\) The "Stammbaumtheorie" was put forward on the influence of Darwin by Schleicher (\textsl{Die Darwinische Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft}, Weimar 1863). The filiation of the languages was symbolized by the genetic tree similar to that of the living world. This theory was widely accepted, mainly by the influence of Max Müller. The "Wellentheorie" was outlined by Johannes Schmidt in his book \textsl{Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen}, Weimar 1872, and independently, similar ideas were pointed out in an early but then unpublished work of Schuchardt. Schmidt stressed that many features of the Indo-European languages can not be interpreted by the family-tree. The IE protolanguage had dialects, and some linguistic innovations spread over this dialectal territory as waves in the water. Although Schleicher never denied that there could have been contacts among the languages already separated, and Schmidt never denied that there was a homogeneous pre-Indoeuropean language, later studies tried to make two separate theories of them.
Turkic, leave sophistication about its reality to later research and concentrate on Early Ancient Turkic.

Having a more or less continuous linguistic area inhabited by speakers of various Ancient Turkic dialects, theoretically, we have to suppose that, in this period, things happened practically in the same way as they do in all similar cases. There were differences among dialects, but the isoglosses of the dialectal phenomena did not coincide in each case with the borders of the dialects. Moreover, there were features spreading over the territory—phonological, morphological and syntactical—but their isoglosses and the isoglosses of their realisations in concrete words, formatives etc., were not necessarily the same in each case. These are well-known facts to everyone acquainted with the theory of linguistic geography. Linguistic changes began as slowly consolidating tendencies with the old and new features coexisting in one synchronic unity. Some changes created doublets which then became stabilized and continued side by side in later periods as frozen survivals of an old variation. To illustrate what I mean I will now refer to the history of some non-Altaic languages.

In 16th century French there was a tendency in statu nascendi for a change: \( r \to z \). The French equivalent of Latin cathedra: chaire became, in the Paris dialect, chaise as père > pèse, mère >

---

*There is a general controversy about the reality of the protolanguages. The formulation of Bloomfield is ambiguous: "A reconstructed form, then, is a formula that tells us which identities or systematic correspondences of phonemes appear in a set of related languages, moreover, since these identities and correspondences reflect features that were already present in the parent language, the reconstructed form is also a kind of phonemic diagram of the ancestral form" (Language, pp. 302-303). Pulgram (The nature and use of proto-languages: Lingua X (1961) pp. 18-37) thinks that the proto-language is only a methodological device, a formula, but not a real language. Reformatskij (Voedenie v jazykознані, Moscow 1960, pp. 325-326) polemizing with Meillet, stresses that the proto-language was a historical reality. It can not be questioned that, in some cases, the starting point of a set of related languages was a homogeneous linguistic unit, in the measure that homogeneity exists at all. It is another question whether in all cases of related languages we have to depart from a homogeneous proto-language. Trubetzkoy writes: "Der Begriff "Sprachfamilie" setzt gar nicht die gemeinsame Abstammung einer Anzahl von Sprachen von einer einzigen Ursprache voraus" (Gedanken über das Indo-germanenproblem, Acta Linguistica, Copenhagen 1936, p. 81). I try to discuss these problems in a forthcoming work: Linguistic Theory and Linguistic Relationship".
mèse, bericles > besicle etc. But this tendency later lost ground and ceased. Only the doublet chaire and chaise preserved this dialectal tendency. In the 4th century B.C. Latin there was a tendency for a change of the intervocalic [-z] to [-r-], as in pecus ~ pecoris, (< pecosis) honos ~ honoris (< honosis) > (honor) or ēsa > ēra etc. But in the word positus, the [-z-] was preserved because of the clear etymological contact with situs. Thus, we had later a preserved [-z-] in front of a [-z-] > [-r-] in the same linguistic unity. Corresponding to German Haselnuss, we have English hazel-nut where intervocalic -z- is preserved while German Hase figures in English as hare with a sporadic [z] > [r] development, and thus we have historical doublets [-z-] > [-z-] and [-z-] > [-r-].

Doublets preserving older synchronic alternations are evidenced from all languages. In most of the cases, the semantics of the two words diverged. Such well-known examples are: German Reiter and Ritter, Bett and Beet, Rabe and Rappe, French plier and ployer, Finnish kaiuo "well, fountain," kaiou "pit, cavity"—and so on. It is especially interesting that in Hungarian we have such doublets as hajlik "to bend" and kajla "bent, awry." The Finno-

---

8 Cf. P. de Saussure, Cours de linguistique générale, Paris 1931, p. 214, K. Voretzsch-G. Rohlf, Einführung in das Studium der Altfranzösischen Sprache, Halle, 1951, p. 243, G. Guigenheim, Grammaire de la langue française du seizième siècle, Lyon-Paris 1951, p. 30, Grätz L., A stóhasadas (The word-split), Budapest 1962, pp. 16–17. This latter work is an excellent monograph on the theory and Hungarian realization of the linguistic doublets. I quote here and below examples with z > r and r > z developments in the hope that it will be clear from them, that the problem of rotaclism and lambdacism can not, be solved on pure phonetical considerations. It is a basic rule of historical phonology, that if and where, a phonetical development is possible, the reverse development is also possible. (See also B. A. Serebrennikov, O nekotoryh spornych voprosach aravnitel'noistoricheskaj fonetiki (Türkischen jazykov: Voprosy Jazykoznanija 1960, pp. 62-72).


10 See Bonfante, On reconstruction and linguistic method: Word I (1945), p. 130,
Ugrian velar \(q\)- became, in almost all cases, \(h\)- in Hungarian, but sporadically \(q\)- is preserved, as in the case above.\(^{11}\)

Let us now suppose that in a period of Early Ancient Turkic, in one area of its linguistic territory, the opposition of old \(r\):\(z\) and \(l\):\(î\) was weakened. What happened? In the epicentre of the phenomenon, the tendency of the fusion of the two phonemes was strong, while in farther places there was only, in a lessening degree, an alternation. In some places and in some words the fusion occurred while in others it did not. If this is true, we have to find the lexical isoglosses pertaining to this feature in the epicentre practically parallel, while in other places they are more or less intersecting. Furthermore, we have to find doublets which conserved this old situation. The study of the words with so-called rotacism and lambdacism fully proves that, in reality, this is what actually happened.

Before presenting my material to show that the distribution of the forms with \(z\) and \(r\) and \(î\) and \(l\) respectively looks entirely like a dialectal distribution, I must call attention to the fact that it is not in each case that we have to do with the remnants of this Ancient Turkic dialectal variation. In some instances of doublets we have to do with Chuvash or Mongolian loanwords.

In the case of Turkish \(kütük\) “heddle,” the Tatar equivalent of the word (\(körê\)) must be a Chuvash loanword because of phonological and linguistic-geographical reasons.\(^{18}\) It is certain that the name of the fish “pike perch, Lucioperca Sandra,” in Bashkir (\(śli\)), Tatar and Karakalpak (\(śli\)) are also of Chuvash origin.\(^{18}\) The Jakut word \(sırı\), “to write,” is of Mongolian origin.\(^{18}\)

\(^{11}\) For details and bibliography see Grétsy L., op. cit., pp. 16–19, 178.

\(^{18}\) Küütük (Küçeyt), küütük (Abdo Hayyân), küütük (Kürê), küütük (New Ulg), küütük yi.tp (TurkIT), güütg güyyî (Yellow Ulg). The Chuvash form is \(kärê\), \(kærê\) and the \(r\)-form is also present in Bashkir as \(körê\). The Altai \(kürük\) “petilja,” Baraba \(kürük\) “Hacken” and Jakut \(kürük\), \(kürük\) “krjuk” or at least the two second are surely Russian loanwords. The absence of the final -\(k\), the illabiality of the second vowel and the fact that the word occurs in this form only in languages being in contact with Chuvash are arguments in favour of the loanword character of Tatar \(körê\).

\(^{18}\) I have dealt with this word during the 27th Congress of Orientalists. The Chuvash form of the word is \(śli\) < \(śli\) < \(śli\) < \(śli\) < \(śli\) < \(śli\). Fortunately we have documentation for all stages. \(śli\) is present in Bashkir Tatar and Karakalpak, \(śli\) in Hungarian (\(śli\)u > \(śli\)u), all with the meaning “fish with teeth.”
SOME PROBLEMS OF ANCIENT TURKIC

(cf. Mongolian Juru- < Jiru- ~ Turkish yaz-) or Jakut boruo-šku, "calf," also points clearly to Mongolian borö (< birayu - Turkish yaz-). Such examples are numerous, we find them not only in i.e. "Lucioperca Sandra," which is calqued by Hugarian fogas "fish with teeth," by German Zahnfisch and Zander "id.," while the Hungarian word was borrowed by Rumanian (sălau, sălau), by Slovakian (šil, šilec), and by Old Bavarian (Schiele). The form šilak found its way into Mongolian where it figures as šilëi in the Secret History; later it is present in literary Mongolian as šilüge and in Buryat as šilüge with the meaning "two years old lamb," i.e. "the animal with full teeth; which dropped the milk-teeth." The same meaning has the Turkish word šilak, which is present in Husrav and Sîrin, in Ibn Muḥanna, in the Anonymous of Leiden, Abu Hayyān, Bulyat al-Mustāq and the at-Tuhfat. The modern Turkish languages know the word in the same or similar meanings (Tatar, Bashkir, Osmani, Uzbek, Turki, Baraba, Šor.) The term is calqued by Mongolian sidülen "two year old lamb" i.e. "the animal with full teeth (šidüin)." The form with the original š- is present in the Divod of Kāybar as šilak "two year old lamb," and in Jakut šilägä, šiläby also šilene, šilädä "trechëvnoe životnoe, telenok ili šerëbenok po tretemu godu (dvuchletnyy), dvuletok, strigun, toł'ko oseni etogo goda u nich vypadaet molochnoe zuža počemu nazivajut'jia takte šisir šilägä(y)dä" (Pekarskij). The word is a deverbal noun from šiläd- cf. šišă "nach den Milchzähnen die zweiten Zähne bekommen" (Kazak Radloff Wb III 1395). On the suffix see: E. V. Sevortjan, Âfšejy imennoj slovoobrazovanija v azerbajdžanskom jazyke, Moscow 1966, pp. 200-217. The word šilak was connected with šil- (<*šil-) "to swell" by Radloff (Wb., IV 1084), by Şerbak (Naravunjia domačnych i dîlkich životnych v türských jazykach: Istoričeskoe razvitie leksiki türských jazykov, Moscow 1961, p. 115) and Doerfer (Türkische und Mongolische Elemente Im Neupersischen IU, Wiesbaden 1967, p. 328 where the Persian and Armenian forms are also quoted). The counting an animal's age by its teeth is a well known practice among the Turks and Mongols (see K. Uray-Kőhalmi, Zwei Systeme der Altersbezeichungen des Viehes bei den Mongolen: Studia Mongolia 1: 31, Ulan Bator 1959, pp. 3-9.). The Mongolian form was re-borrowed by Hakkas (šileke) and Tuva (šileğî), while the Mongolian sidülen was borrowed by Jakut (šidülegen). The history of this word shows that the Mongolian word had to be a loanword from Old Bulgarian, since if we suppose a hypothetical "Altaic" *šil-ek we would then expect Mongolian *šilüge or *šileğî. The word is present in Old Bulgarian with š- (cf. Hungarian. In the Chuvash language, "tooth" is šal < *šăl and šală was borrowed by Cheremisa: šala "Pike perch"). The Mongolian form šile'i < šileği clearly shows the Bulgarian origin of the word. The history of this word not only shows a clear and unambiguous example of a Bulgarian loanword in Mongolian, but also gives a hint to a relative chronology. This word could be lent only in a time when animal-breeding was already highly developed. This says no more, but no less than that there was an Ancient Bulgarian and Ancient Mongolian contact. I have no place here to quote the well-known controversy around the "Altaic affinity," nor outline in full my opinion, which I try to do in my forthcoming work on the Altaic hypothesis.
the Siberian, but also in other Turkish languages. It is clear that such examples have to be separated.

In the case of Turkish baš, "head," and köz, "eye," we expect forms in Chuvash with l and r respectively. However this is not the case, because we find pus and kus. These Chuvash words cannot be loanwords and there is no reason for supposing a complicated starred form as e.g. bałtš. It simply happened that these two words, having a great functional frequency, did not undergo the fusion z > r and š > l, and thus preserved an earlier stage as Latin positus or Hungarian kajla. The fusion of z and r and š and l respectively was not an "ausnahmloses Lautgesetz," it was only a tendency which was very strong in the territory of the later Bulgarian languages.

While in the cases above we have z and š-forms preserved in Chuvash, in other cases we find r and l forms in Turkish.

The Turkish word öğüz "mucus" has an r-form in Kirgiz (öğör), in Altai (ögör) and in Jakut (ögür). It cannot excluded that these are Mongolian loanwords (cf. Mong. öngör "id."). But it is surprising that we also find the z-form in Jakut (ögūs < *öğüz) with the same meaning and this can hardly be reconciled with supposing the borrowing of the r-form. The Turkish word izdä-, "to seek, search" occurs in most of the Turkish languages with -z. Therefore, the Jakut form irdä-, irdiä- could, perhaps, be a Mongolian loanword, though we have not yet been able to find it. But, we do find the -r form in the work of Käşiari, and this points to the fact that here we have to do with an old isogloss.

The Mishär kőfěr, kiber 7 "proud," the Kirgiz kibir "medlitel’nyj (delovek), kopuSa, mjamlja" seems to be a Chuvash loanword (cf. Chuvash kapdăr "narjad" > Cheremiss: kovra, kovora "Stutzer," kaşTr "Stolz"). But if we take into account that we find

16 Cf. Bashkir ügeš "blesen", gribok", Jakut ügūs, őgūs "vjažkaja sils’, vjažkaja nečlota, pristajuščaja k stenkam moločnoj posudy" (Pekarskij).
18 The word is a denominál verb of Is "trace." The verb can be met with, among other sources, in the Amonymous of Leiden (āzdā- read āzdā-), in the Qawānin (īzdā-), in some Armeño-Kipchak documents (Isde-, izla-, Grunin, Deny).
17 Cf. küves (Käşiari), küwěž (Codex Čumanicus), kőďz (Tatar), kīwās (Misher), kūyex (Nogal), giyës (Osmanli dialect).
an r-form in the Qutadyu Bilig with Uighur script (Vienna Ms 24:15 kiber) corresponding to the form köves of the Namagan MS in Arabic (41:1) then we have to consider the early occurrence of the r-form in Turkish. The l-forms of the Turkish word tüš "dream" in New Uigur (? dîëlî- "to speak while dreaming"), in Yellow Uigur (tel) and in Jakut (tüll) do not seem to be Chuvash or Mongolian loanwords, since in Chuvash we have telëk (< *töläk), and in Mongolian tölge (< *töleg), the latter in the sense of "fortune-telling." On the other hand, Tuva tölge "fortunetelling" and Kirgiz tölgö "id." are Mongolian loanwords. The l of Jakut and Yellow Uigur must be very old because we find it in some of the old Uigur records of Turkestan.

The earliest occurrence of the word büz- "to fold, to press together" is found in the work of Abu Hayyân in 1313. The r-form can be found only in the Oguz languages, in Turkmen, Azeri and Osmanli. The r-form can be observed in KäSyarl's work, in Tatar, Bashkir, Kirgiz, Turkmen, Osmanli, New Uigur, Turki, Altai, Jakut and derivatives e.g. the word for "headshawl" is found in almost all Turkish languages.

18 But also kebes (134:7), kübes (68:20). Most of the Turkic -r-forms are of Arabic origin (< kîber). But Mongolian köger has preserved a Turkish r-form.

19 See Manchu tolgi- "trümen"; Evenki, Negidal, Nani tolkin "sno, snovidenie", Olça tolın "id.", Manchu tolgin "id.", the verbal form is in Evenki tolkîl-; Solon tolkîlî-, Negidal tolkîlî-, Even tolkât-, Orok tolkîlî-, Orok tolkîlî-ll,Nanaj, Manchu tolkëë-. The Manchu-Tungusian forms go back to a form *tolkîl-, which has to be a relatively old Mongolian loanword.


21 Türkmen: büz- "sokratit", süzïvat', süzîl' "Azeri büz- "stjagïvat', stïmat'. mortël'"; Osmanlî büz- "to contract, constric, make narrow."

22 Bür- "zusammendrücken" (KäSyarl), bûrt- "Falte, Runzel" (KäSyarl), bûrûnçûk "Frauenschleicher" (KäSyarl), bûrûnçûklûg "woman with veil" (Husrav and Şîrîn), bûrûnçûk, bûrûnçûk "shawl for the head" (Chagatal), bûrûkk "slack weather, heat" (Abû Hayyân, Bulhat al-Mustâq), bûrtît "women's over-dress" (at-Tuhfat), bûr- "delat* sborki, skladki" (Tatar, Bashkir), bûr- "zaäivat' na skoruju ruku, 'çintî', bûrîä- "pokryvat" (Kirgiz), bûr- "yigïrmak, bûrmek(1)" (Türkmen), bûrtî- "to cover up, to envelop, to wrap" (Osmanlî), pûr- "delat* skladki" (New Uigur), bûrtî- "to wrinkle" (Turki), bûrme "skladka, sborka (na plat'e)" (Altai), pûrke- "nakryvat', pokryt', zabernut' vo čtonibud'" (Altai Verbickij) pûr- "svlvat',
The verb köi-, "to make shadow, to cover," occurs in the Divan of Kâšyarî together with the derivatives such as: köiğä "shadow," köiik "shadow, cover." The derivative köiğe "curtain, cover" is present in Tatar, Kirgiz, Osmanli, Turki, Hakass, Tuva; perhaps, some of them are re-borrowings from Mongolian. The l-form in the basic verb is present in Hakass (köle-) and Altai (kölo-); its derivative kölik, kölägä "shadow" can be met with as early as Kâšyarî, in Middle Turkish documents as the tefsir published by Borovkov, in Husrav and Şirîn, among the Turkmen words of the Leiden Anonym, in Chagatai, at Abu Hayyân in the Bulyat al-Muštâq, in the at-Tuhfat, in the Qawänîn, and in almost all of the present languages.

In the cases enumerated, which could easily be multiplied, we find no semantic differences or, at any rate, not significant ones, between the doublets. But as I referred to in the cases of chaire and chaise, or Rabe and Rappe, etc., it is very common that there is not only a split in the form, but also a split in the semantic field.

**KSlik "Schatten", köläk "Tiefer Schatten" (Kâšyarî), köldä, köldä "ten" (Tefül), köldäk, köldä "shadow" (Husrav and Şirîn), köldägä "id." (Turkmen in the Leiden Anonymous), köläk (Chagatal), köldägä "id.", köläkgä "id.", köläkgä "id." (Abû Hayyân), köldägä "id." (Bulyat al-Muštâq), köldägä (al-Tuhfat), köldägä (Qawänî), köldägä (Tatar, Bashkir), köldäk (Kirgiz), köldäkgä (Kânak Radloff II 1271), köldägä (Turkm. Köngös, kerqâ (Afshar), gölşä (Osmanî), köldängä, köldänäk (New Ulgur), köldängä (Turki Turfan), köldängä (Turki Aksu), köldängä (Taraneî), köldäge, köldëxe (Yellow Ulgur), köldük (Altal), köldö (Altal Teleut Radloff II 1271), köldö "der Hinterhalt, Laueort, Anstand, Wall, die Schanze" (Baraba Radloff II 1272), köldük (Hakass Sagal, Kolbal, Şor Radloff II 1270), köldük (Şor, Hakass Sagal Radloff II 1270), köldö "verfinstern, beschatten, schärzen vom Rauche, Russa" (Altal Radloff II 1270), köle- "zaslonjat' kogo-eto-1., davat' ten" (Hakass), ködäge "ten" (Tuva), köldük "id." (Jakut).
The Turks had, and most of them still do, have two words for “to write.” *Biti-* was the word for writing with the brush, and *yaz-* for “cut, score, notch the Runic script.” *Yaz-* can be found in the Uigur monuments of Turfan, in Käšyari, in almost all of the Middle Turkish documents and in New Turkish, in the Kipchak, Oguz and Turkestan languages, but not in the Siberian languages and Jakut. The *-r-form (rar-*) developed in the sense “to split, carve,” and occurs in the Runic *Irk bitig*, in numerous old monuments, and from the recent languages in the Kipchak, Oguz, Turkestan and Siberian languages. It is important that these two words did not converge in Chuvash where we find *şır-* “write” and *şur-* “split.”

The word *täs-* “to pierce, to make a hole” occurs in Käšyari’s work only in the passive voice (*täšil-* “durchbort werden”), the stem can be met with in Husrav and Širîn, Chagatai, in the work of the Anonymous of Leiden, in the at-Tuhfat, in the Qawanîn, in the recent languages in the Kipchak, Oguz, Turkestan and Siberian languages and in Jakut. The *l*-form of the word shows

---


87 Cf. *tšă* “toporki (s lezviem, nasañennym poperek toporca)” (Tefsr), teš- “to pierce”, tšă “to make a hole”, tšă “hole” (Chagatai), dilš “to bore” (Leiden), *tešmek “hole”, tešik “Id.” (Codex Cumunicus), tšă “to bore, pierce” (at-Tuhfat), tšă “Id.” (Qawanîn), tešik “hole” (Armeno-Kipchak, Grunin), dilš “dyrjav’” (Tatar, Bashkir), teš- “prodyrjavit’, prolykat’”, tešik “dyra” (Kirgiz), deš “dyrjavit’, sverlit’” (Aseri), deš- “prodyrjavit’” (Türkmen), deš- “to incise, to lay open” (Osmanî), tešik “prodyrjavîvanija’”, tšăšik, “otverstie, dyra”, tšă, tšă- “dyrjavit’, delat’ dyru” (New Uigur), teš-, teš-, tšă-, tšă- “to pierce, to perforate, to penetrate, to make hole” (Turkl), tšăšik, tšăšik “hole” (Turkl), teš- “prodyrjavit’, protknut’” (Altaj), teš- “durchschossen, durchboren” (Hakass Sagal, Kolbal Radloff IV 1097), tis- “prodyrjavîvhat’” (Hakass), deš- ‘prodelyvat’ otverstie,
a duality already in the early dialects. In the Turfan documents and in Kāşyari’s work, it occurs with the meaning “to pierce, to make a hole,” while in the inscriptions of Kūl Tegin and Bilge Khagan, it has the meaning: “to split, to open.” This duality can also be met with later. In the Tefsir, both meanings are present, but in most of the present languages only the meaning “to split” occur, and it also has the meaning “to make long stripes.” This shows clearly the influence of the word til “tongue.” Influenced by the word til, the vocalism of the word has also changed, becoming -i- (and its developments), but Azeri and Osmanli preserved the older -ā-. 89

The first occurrence of the word qalbaq “spoon” is found in the records in Brahmi script; and in the Uigur documents of Turfan, it occurs in almost all Middle Turkish sources and in the Kipchak, Oğuz, Turkestan and Siberian Turkish languages. 90

The Mongolian form of the word (qalbaya) was borrowed by the Altai, Śör, Hakass and Jakut languages. 91 But the i-form qalb prodyrjavlivat’, vykalivat’ (glasa)” (Tuva), lās- “probivat’ (döhbit’), prokalyvat’, prodyrjavit’, proreyzivat’” (Jakut).

89 Cf. Kūl Tegin East 22 111-“durchlocht werden” Turfantexte I 8:32, cf. p. 18, Uigurica III 37:3, Heilkunde I 6:42, ĭl- “durchbören”, tālik “Bohroch” (Kāşyari), ĭl- “probivat’, dyrjavit’”, tālik, tālik “otverstle, dyra” (Tefsir), ĭl-, ĭl- “to pierce” (Husraw and Širin), ĭl- “to split” (Leiden), tālik “hole” (Abū Hāyyān), ĭlālik, dālik “ld.” (Bulyat al-Muštak), ĭl- “to split” (at-Tuhafat), ĭl- “šepat’ (lučinu), razrezat’ v ĭlnu” (Tatar), ĭl- “razrezat’, prorezat’ (lomtjami ili polosamli)” (Bashkır), ĭl- “rezat’ na uzkle poloski, na lomtikl” (Kirgiz), dīl- “dīlīm-dīlīm edîp kesmek, dīlīk aĕmak, yīrmez” (Türkmen), dāl- “probivat’, pronyzivat’” (Azeri), dēl- “to pierce, to perforat’ (Osmanli), ĭl- “rezat’ na kuski, razdeljat’” (New Uigur), ĭl- “rezat’ poloskami (napr. dinju)” (Turkī Hamīl), ĭl- “to split, to cut anything into strips lengthwise” (Turkī Shaw), ĭl- “otdyrat’, razdyrat’ na melkie časti, šepat’, rezat’ plastam, remnąjami” (Altai), ĭl- “otdirat’, razdirat’ eto-l. na melkie časti” (Hakass), ĭl- “plīt’, rapsilivat’ (drevno na dosku), rezat’, razrezat’ (kužu ne remnli)” (Tuva), ĭr-, ĭl-, ĭl- “razrezivat’, šepat’ (lučinu), rasšepljat’, otdeljat’ vdoł’ po slojam” (Jakut).

90 Cf. hakaloq (Brahmi M:24), qalbalq (Heilkunde II 18:63), qalbaq “Löffel” qalbqylv “zu Löffeln geeignet” (Kāşyari), qalbaq (Ibn Muhanna), qalb (Ibn Muhanna Ist), qalbaq (Chagatai), qalb (Leiden), qalbaq (Codex Cumanus), qalbaq (Abū Hāyyān), qalbaq (at-Tuhfat), qalbaq (Qayrīn), xal-balq (Armeno-Kipchak Deny, Gruinī), kašik (Tatar), qalb (Bashkır), kašik (Türkmen dial), qalb (Azeri), kašik (Osmanli), qalb (New Uigur), qalbaq, qalbaq (Turkī), xal-balq (Hakass), kašik (Śör Verbickij).

91 Cf. qalbaq “Löffel” (Kazak Radloff II 270), kašik “ld.” (Altat), qalbayan
in the meaning "little spoon, ladle, stirring wood" occurs in the Kipchak, Turkestan, Siberian languages and as a Tatar loan-word in Chuvash.\footnote{18}

The word \textit{bileziik} "bracelet" is a fusion of the words \textit{bilek} "wrist" and \textit{yiiziik} "ring." The earliest data is Kāšyari, and it occurs in the Kipchak, Oguz, Siberian, Turkestan languages and in Jakut. The \textit{-r}-form is present in Kirgiz, Azeri, Sart and Altai. It is remarkable that the Sart form (\textit{bilarziik}) and the Azeri form (\textit{bilerzik}) also contains \textit{-z-}.\footnote{19}

The word for "insect" is \textit{qoguz} in the Turkish languages. We find it in the Runic inscription of Toyok, in Uigur records of Turfan, and in Kāšyari's Divān. It occurs in almost all Middle Turkish documents, and in every recent Turkish language. Important is the Karaim of Troki, where instead of the intervocalic \textit{-y-} an \textit{-m-} (\textit{qomuz}), and the Altai where the \textit{-y-} disappeared and a secondary long vowel developed (\textit{qūs, qōzoq}), we find that the same happened in Hakass (\textit{xūs}).\footnote{20} This word cannot be separated

\footnote{18} "sirokonosja utka "(Šor, Hakass, Sagai Radloff II 270), zaibayas "vid utki" (Hakass), zaiba "utka iz sirokočajeva, sirokonoska, soksun, Anas Clypeata Bris", zaiba (zaib?!) kus = zaiba, zaibga "malaja ložka" (Jakut).

\footnote{19} Cf. kalak "ložka (metallčeskaja), lopatočka (berežannaja)" (Tatar), qalag "ložka, lopatka, lopatočka, špatel'" (Bąškir), kalak "sokov, doksa džja ruskatvaničja testa, veslo" (Kirgiz), qalag "ein Hölzchen mit flachem Ende, das man den Kindern statt eines Löffels giebt (Kazak Radloff II 228), galam "ložka" (Türkmen), qalag "a kind of cushion in ring-form used on the pan when boiling food in steam (to prevent the steam from escaping)" (Turkii), kalak "bolśaja ložka inogda s dirami džja vylavtvičja rybu i pelmenie, mešalka, tobit'naja dostojča džja propriavlenija kos (senokosnych)" (Šor Verbički), zaiz (Hakass Sagaj), zaizax (Hakass), "mutovka (palka džja razmeščevačia židkogo testa" (Hakass dial), kalagak "povarcšča, čerčak" (Tuva), see also Chuvash kalak "lopatočka, mutovka, veslo" (from Tatar).

\footnote{20} On this word, its history and distribution, see L. Ligeš \textit{Noma lurca pour 'fers; bracelet; bague' dans les langues slaves et dans le hongrois: Studia Slavica XII} (1966), pp. 249-250.

\footnote{19} Cf. qoguz (Toyok: 29), qonqus (Turfančete III 12-93), qoguz (Kāšyri), qonqus (Chagatal), qoguz (Buljat al-Muštāq), qonqus (read oguz, al-Tuhfat), kogîz (Tatar), qoguz (Tatar Radloff II: 900), qoguz (Bąškir), kogîz (Kirgiz), qoguz (Karaim Trocki, Radloff II: 671), kongus (Osmanlı), qonqus, qonqus (New Uigur), qonqus (Turkii), qongus (Turkii Shaw), kogîs (Altai), qōs (Altai Teleut, Tuba Radloff II: 623), kogîs (Altai Teleut, Kumandu Verbički), qogîzaq "ein kleiner Kütfer" (Altai Teleut Radloff II 522), qōzoq "id." (Altai Tuba Radloff II 650), xūs (Russko-Hakasskiy Slovar').
from the word for "ant": *qomursqa*. This word occurs first in the Runic Irk bitig, then in such Middle Turkish documents as the Anonymous of Leiden, Abū Hayyān, Bulyat al-Mustāq, at-Tuhfat, and in the Modern Kipchak, Siberian languages and in Jakut. The Oguz and Turkestan languages have another word for "ant." From the available data, I would only point out Hakass *qumursqa*, *qimirsqa*, *komiska* "ant" where -r- has been dropped, and Jakut *zomurdus*, *zogurdus*, where there is an alternation of -q- ~ -m-, we have -r but the meaning is not "ant" but "insect."

In most of the Turkish monuments and languages Turkish *qopuz* has the meaning "stringed musical instrument," already so quoted by Kâfişyarı. This is also the meaning of the word (quyur) in Mongolian. In the Siberian languages, there are other words: in Altai, *komuryay* and *körök*, in Hakass *kobark*, in Šor *kobisyay*- having the meaning "pipe". The two words are doubles. The developments of *qopuz* have, in some Turkestan and Siberian languages, the meaning "Jew's harp" an instrument with iron tongues on which one plays with the mouth and the fingers. In Jakut, the word *zomus* has the meanings "stringed instrument, Jew's harp and pipe."
I do not have space to discuss all similar doublets here. I enumerate only some of them: bätz “gland,” bärts “gland, udder,” boyaz “throat,” boyurdaq “oesophagus,” qız “girl,” qırqın and qırnaq “female slave,” omuz “shoulder, shoulder-blade,” omurtay, omurya “collarbones, vertebrae,” özek “pole,” örgen “peg,” söz “word,” sörtíek “speech,” tez “quick,” ter/r “quick,” baš “head,” paltšak “great face, with great head,” ašuq “knuckle-bone, dice,” Russian альчык “dice,” yaš “young” yaltšiq “young, young plant,” etc.38 I would like to quote only one more example:

The first occurrence of the word tîz “knee” is found in the Kül Tegin inscription, and it occurs in almost all of the linguistic records as well as in the present languages. The Hakass form with a diminutive suffix (tizek, tistenenek) is remarkable, the same is found in Tuva (diskek) and in Jakut (tisäx the “end of an object,” tisäx “the forepart of the femur, knee”).39 Its r-form

harp” (TurkL), qabuz, qopus “a Jew’s harp, also a rough guitar with horse-hair string” (TurkL Shaw), qobuz “Brummel” (Taranchi, Radloff II 662), qopis, qopus “musykal’nyj stručnyj instrument (u uygurov ja ne videl v 1910, 1911, 1913 gg. muz. instrumentov,” writes Malov) (Yellow Uigur), komus “vargan (metallitcheskij muzykal’nyj instrument v forme nebol’soj podkovki s tonkim metallitcheskim jasyekom, pripajennym k seredine ee, pri ispolnenii vkladyvayetsja v rot, svuki te izvlekaetsja kolesom, jasyek pal’cami)’ (Altal), zonnis “komus (muzikal’nij instrument)” (Hakass), konus, komus “musykal’nyj instrument, balalajka” (Hakass Verbleckl)), qobus Balalalika” (Sor Radloff II 661), zonmis “komus, vargan, drymba” (Tuva), zonmis “kobys, kobuz, vargan, dudka” (Jakut), sanmis “kobys, edinstvennyl Jakutskej muzikal’nij instrument sostojashhij iz obrazovannyi ramki s prozhdnoj posredine, na kotoryj izmenj pal’cami, vujavSh ramku v guby i vvarichu tony pomoshch’u soboy i jasyka” (Jakut). According to Professor Ligeti (Un vocabulaire sino-outgour des Ming: Acta Orient. Hung XIX (1966), p. 168) the form qubur “espèce de guitare (p‘i-pa)” of the Uigur vocabulary of the Ming-period “remonte au mongol”. The Siberian r-forms can not be of Mongolian origin because of the vocalism of the first syllable, the diminutive suffix and the meaning. 38 I deal with these words in my forthcoming work on the Altaic hypothesis. 39 Cf. tiszäx “who has knees” (Kül Tegin E2, 15, 18, Biige E3, 13, N10), tiz (Irk bitla 93), tiz (Turfoanteze V 4:4, Uigurca II 47:78, III 28:12, Uig. Sprachd. 101:3, Suv. 349:2, Hellk. II 32:1), tiz (Kâşari), tiz (Yugnaki Uigur), diz (Yugnaki Arab), tiz (Telstir), tiz (Husar and Şirin), diz (Ibn Muhamma), tiz (Chagatal), tiz (Leiden), tiz (Codex Cumancicus), diz, tiz (Abâ Hayyân), tiz (at-Tuhfat), tiz (Qawâ-nil), tez (Tatar), teb (Bashuir), tiz (Kirgiz South), tiz (Kirgiz), diz (Karakalpak), tiz (Nogai), diz (Turkmen), diz (Azeri), diz (Osmanli), tiz (New Uigur), tiz (Üzbeg), tiz (TurkL), tiz, tiz, tiz (Salari), tiz, tiz (Yellow Uigur), tiz (Altai), tiz (Altai, Teleut, Lebed, Sor Radloff III 1307), tiz (Cûlyyn Kâšrik Radloff III 1401), tiz (Hakass
is the word *tirsgák* "elbow" which can be found at Kâşyari, in the East Middle Turkish monuments; in the Kipchak, Oğuz, Turkestan and Siberian languages and in Jakut. The word *tirsek* has the meaning "Achilles tendon" in Kirgiz, "knee-cap" in Kûärik. The most interesting feature is that where Hakass *tirsek* also means "the knee of the animal's hind leg," it is a very clear reference to the way of the semantic split; the joints of the fore and hind extremities originally had the same designation, and this split later used both pieces of the doublet. The Hungarian word *térď* "knee" is a Bulgarian loanword, but it has a diminutive suffix of Hungarian origin.

It is not incidental that I have mainly quoted such examples where we find *z* and *r* and *l* and *s* forms respectively within the Turkish linguistic area where there is no morphological opposition of the type *kör- "to see", köz "eye." These examples were recently collected by Pritsak and Tekin. We have several reasons for not accepting the hypothesis that we have originally morphophonological reasons for such doublets:

1. If the *z > r or r > z* development had morphophonological

---

Koîbal, Kacha, Šagal Radloff III 1304), *tirsek*, *tistenek* (Hakass), *tis* (Hakass dial), *dtskek* (Tuva), *tisâx* "konec, konec koncov, v predmete, tilsâx "perednaja storona ljažki, kolenja" (Jakut).

46 Cf. *tirsgâk* "Armknochen" (Kâşyartl, *tirâtk* "Ellenbogen" (Türkmen in Leiden), *tirâtk* "id." (Chagatai Zenker, Bada'i'1), "ilen, jointure du bras, coude" (Chagatai Pavet de Courtelle), *tirsek* "lokot", *techn: kolen, kolenicre* (Tatař), *tezhăk* "lokot" (Bashkir), *tirsek* "achiloascu sochoțille" (Kirgiz), *tirsek* "lokot" (Karakalpak), *tirsek* "id." (Nogal), *tirsek* "id." (Turkmen), *dirsek* "lokot", *isqib* (Aseri), *dirsek* "elbow, (fig.) knee or angle (of pipe or timber), winding, bend," *dirsekil* "kneed, bent" (Osmanni), *tirsek* "lokot", (techn.) keleno (truby) (Üzbek), *tisgenek* "lokot" (Yellow Uilgur, Hill), *tirâtk* "Knekeheło" (Čulim Kûärik Radloff III 1377), *tirsek* "keleno zadnej nogi životnogo" (Hakass), *tisirginges*, *süsürges* "perednaja čast' bedra (ljažki), koleno" (Jakut), see also Chuvash čër, čörkë, čerzì, čerkux, čerkuzzi "keleno".

47 The Hungarian word corresponds to an Old Bulgarian form *tlr. The diminutive suffix -ő was productive in Old Hungarian and goes back to FU -nt.

48 O. Pritsak, Der "Rhotaximus" und "Lamdbazismus"; UAJb 1964 pp. 337–349. Here I can only refer to the very interesting paper, read by Tekin on the 27th Congress of Orientalists (Ann Arbor, Michigan) where I was also present and had the opportunity to discuss some of the details. I did not have the opportunity to read the full text which will be published in a forthcoming issue of Acta Orientalia Hungariae.
reasons, what are we to do with such words as: köüzän "polecat," azty "molar tooth,"osit "door," köüzük "hedge.," qozl "lamb," tiüzük "two year old lamb," yuzaq "lock," qazuyq "stake," asuq "knucklebone," esid- "to hear," köšek "camel-colt," sazaqyan "drake," stxil- "to tremble," qazan "coulron" etc.? In these words we would have to suppose an infix which is uncommon in the Altaic languages.48

2. If the r > z or z > r development were a morphophonological one, then we have to explain the cessation of the opposition of r:z and i:l in the Chuvash phonological system separately. This would mean that we have to work with two hypotheses, instead of one.

3. If the r > z or z > r development were a morphophonological one, how could we interpret that the isoglosses of the separate items of the doublets do not coincide. Why do we have izdä- in the Anonymous work of Leiden, in Qawänin or in the Armeno-Kipchak documents and irdä- in Käşyarl and Jakut, why tiüs in some Old Turkish monuments and tül in others?

48 I quote here only some r-forms and l-forms of the words above: kürene (Mongolian), görény "polecat" (Hungarian); urla lâl (Chuvash) araça "molar tooth" (Mongolian), alâk "door" (Chuvash), for köüzük cf. p. 214, qurayan "lamb" (Mongolian > Siberian Turkish languages), for tiüzük see pp. 214-216, sârâa "lock" (Chuvash), kârâ "stake" (Hungarian), azvûc (Russian) which is not Turkish alê "one side of the dice" < *a1, but Turkish aâq, cf. the Turkmen expression: ağızi ałâ otü- "bagtì getirmek", an Old Bulgarian loan-word in Russian). ill- "to hear" (Chuvash), göllû "pup" (Mongolian), kölûk "id." (Hungarian), sârdây "drake" (Hungarian), sârdâl- "to tremble" (Chuvash), zuran "coulron" (Chuvash). It can, perhaps, be argued that all these words are derivations and that the r-forms were present in the primary stem. But then we have to solve the following questions: a: the suffixes joined the stem later than the z/r + X fusion, but in such cases the -rt- is preserved, see kâz "Kerbe des Pfeiles" kâtâ- "einkerben", kârl- "einschnitte machen", kâtûk "Kerbe" (Käşyarl), b: this complex had the same history in intervocalic position as on the word-end, but e.g. -lû- is present in intervocalic position (cf. balûk "Schmutz," aliäuq "milde, fein" etc.), and then why not *këlêk "camel-colt" or *eölêk "door?" c: Here the problem raised under 4. below is especially difficult. If there was an X after the word end, which fused with the -r or -z preceding it, what has happened with the words which had other finals? Was this X specific to the stems undergoing rotaclism and lambdism (irrespective of the direction of this development)? Infixation is uncommon to the Altaic languages in the historically detectable past. But I would not adopt a wholly negative attitude to this question for a much earlier period.

15 Acta Orientallia, XXXII
4. If the \( r > z \) or \( z > r \) development were a morphophonological one, how are we to interpret such correspondences as Turkish \( \ddot{\text{ok}} \text{\'u}z \sim \text{Chuvash} \ddot{\text{v}}\ddot{\text{d}}\ddot{\text{k}}\ddot{\text{a}}r \)? If there has been something unknown \( x \) (say \(-ti\)) after the word-end, be it \(-z\) or \(-r\), why has it disappeared in Chuvash and not in Turkish or \textit{vice versa}. This could only have had dialectal reasons, and thus we have come back to my starting point. On the other hand, if there had been something in the case of the words ending in \( r \) and \( l \) or \( z \) and \( z \), then we should also expect it after other word endings. The supposition that this has disappeared in all phonetical situations seems to be too bold in my opinion.

It is another question that in a time, and in some places where the phonological opposition of \( r:z \) and \( l:i \) was weakened, the economy of the language worked in the direction of using this functionless duality for morphological reasons. As there were semantic doublets, morphological doublets may also have existed. These developed on the dialectal basis sketched above.

It is quite natural that the weakening of the opposition \( r:z \) and \( l:i \) was not the only dialectal feature which spread with different intensity and isoglosses over the dialectal area of Ancient Turkic. A similar feature was the development of the initial \( y \)-to-\( J \). The fact that we have \( J \)-languages with \( r \) and \( l \) and \( J \)-languages with \( z \) and \( z \) raises the problem of which was the relatively older development. I think that this question is not a necessary one. The \( J \)-development had a different isogloss from the discontinuation of the \( r:z \) and \( l:z \) opposition. The \( J \)-isogloss encircled the dialects from which developed later the Bulgarian, the Kipchak and some Siberian language.\(^{44}\)

\(^{44}\) I have no space here to discuss all opinions concerning the history of the \( y \)-and \( J \)-in Turkish, and its relative chronology in respect to rotacism and lambda-clasm. According to Ramstedt and Poppe (see Poppe, \textit{Vergleichende Grammatik der altaiischen Sprachen}, Wiesbaden 1960, p. 27 with bibliography) "Im Urtürkischen waren *d-, *J- und *y-s-samengefallen und hatten dort ein y-ergeben." This means that \( J \)-became \( y \)-in Ancient Turkic, and then later became \( J \)-in Old Bulgarian and in some Kipchak and Siberian languages. In this case, the Old Bulgarian (a \( J + r \) language) and the Kipchak and Siberian languages (\( J + z \) languages) have a common development in front of the other \( y + z \) languages. But this raises the question: if the \( y > J \) was an earlier development than \( r > z \), then in the \( J \)-languages and the \( y \)-languages, the \( r > z \) development had to be independent. If the \( r > z \)
Nogai. The Chuvash yâran (< *îran) cannot be a loanword from the later period, because of the r-form, it is Ancient Turkic. It was a lexical isogloss in a narrower dialectal area. For "sun," in addition to the common word kün, the Turkish languages have two other words: kûnes and quyâs (all three have, perhaps, a common origin). The word quyâs can be found in the Kipchak languages (Tatar, Bashkir, Karakalpak, Karaim of Troki), in the Turkestan languages (New Uigur, Turki), and in the Siberian languages, Sher and Altai. The word kûnes is present in some Kipchak languages (Bashkir, Kumûk), in the Ougz languages (Turkmen, Azeri, Osmanli) and in the Altai language. The word quyâs in the form xêvel occurs in Chuvash.

The word for "stirrup" üzâgi has labial initial in all available linguistic records: in Tatar, Bashkir, Kirgiz, Turkmen, Azeri, Osmanli, New Uigur, Turki, and Altai; while it has illabial initial in Yellow Uigur, Baraba, Hakass, Tuva and Jakut. The Chuvash equivalent yârana can only be connected with the latter, but the correspondence has to be an Ancient Turkic one because of the r-form.

Summing up my conclusions: between the very hypothetical Common or Proto-Turkic and Old Turkish, there was a long Ancient Turkic period. In its earlier period, the Ancient Turkic dialects existed in a more or less continuous linguistic area. Several linguistic developments in this area spread over the
territory with different intensity and different isoglosses. This more or less synchronic and geographical development crossed the diachronic one. What we have now before us is not a unilateral development and cannot be deduced directly from a homogeneous proto-language. Undoubtedly, this draws a more complicated picture, but I think it is closer to historical reality. Now, we are faced with the task of exploring the dialectal structure of Ancient Turkic.

I would add only one final point. What could the cause of the discontinuation of the z:r and l:s opposition be? It is always hazardous to seek the "causes" of linguistic changes. Nevertheless, I would venture to suppose the influence of a substratum. This language had to have a phonological system in which the opposition of z:r and l:s was not present, and it had to be a language which was in a long and close contact with at least some of the Ancient Turkic dialects. Could this language not have been Ancient Mongolian?
CORRIGENDA

p. 209 Note 1, line 1: documents of the read: documents of a
p. 210 line 7: homogenous read: homogeneous
p. 212 line 10: realisations read: realizations
p. 213 line 5: (< honosis > (honor) read: (< honosis > honor)
p. 214 line 4: opposition read: oppositions
   line 5: was weakened read: weakened
   Note 13, line 1: during read: at
p. 216 line 17: cannot excluded read: cannot be excluded
   Note 16, line 2: Amonymous read: Anonymous
p. 217 line 8: xtoplāk read: xtülük
   xtōleg read: xтолуğе
   Note 18. line 1: Mort read: Most
   Turkisk read: Turkic
   line 2: Turcic read: Turkic
   Note 22 last line below: zabernut' read: zavernut'
p. 218 Note 24 second line from below: Russa read: Russe
p. 219 line 1: still do, have read: still have
   line 12: šir- read: šir-
p. 220 line 7: occur read: occurs
   line 13: script read: script
   Note 29, line 2: 32, cf. read: 32 (cf.
   second line from below: kožu ne read: kožu na
p. 221 line 15: -g- an read: -g- we find an
line 16: (qōs, qōzoq), we find that read: (qōs, qōzoq) that
p. 222 Note 35, line 3: Altai Tölös, Čulym Kūārik, Hakass Kaibal read:
Altai, Tölös, Čulym, Kūārik, Hakass, Koibal
line 6: skripun nasekomoe ūuk vodoljub read:
skripun, nasekomoe, ūuk, vodoljub
Note 37, line 4: instrument" read: instrument)"

p. 223 line 3: qiz read: qlz
line 8: alʻčik read: alʻčik

p. 224 line 5: that where Hakass read: that Hakass
line 14: area where there read: area in which there
Note 40, last line: Čērxī, Čerkux, Čērkuxxi read: Čērāi, Čērkusi, Čērkusiā

p. 225 Note 43, line 4: sāra read: sāra
line 5: alʻčik read: alʻčik

p. 228 line 1: Iran read: Iran
lines 13-14: available linguistic records read: all available old records;
Note 45, line 2: dialects read: dialects
line 6: phenomena read: phenomenon
line 7: initial" read: initial"

The manuscript was completed in 1968.
ON THE CHUVASH GUTTURAL STOPS IN THE FINAL POSITION

BY

A. RÓNÁ-TAS

The history of the final guttural stops (-h, -f, -g, -q), transcribed usually as -g, -k, -y, -g), is not only one of the most debated questions in comparative Altaic linguistics but has remained and seems to remain one of the crucial points. Professor Ligeti summed up the situation in 1935: «The cause of those frequent irregularities which emerge from the study of not only the Old Turkic elements in Hungarian but also from the modern Turkic languages can be looked for perhaps in borrowings and intercrossings. Without any doubt this situation still exists as it can be demonstrated, and very probably it existed earlier too, perhaps in the source of the oldest Turkic elements of the Hungarian language, i.e. in Old Chuvash, where forms with final -q occurred in greater number there where we would expect the Proto-Turkic final -g, -k. This supposition is also corroborated by the facts of the present Chuvash language.3 Even now not too much can be added to this. I would like to try here to answer the question how old this special Chuvash feature is!


The Proto-Turkic final -q (ק) has a double representation in present-day Chuvash:

1. י: PTaq «arrow» ~ Chuvash узă, тул(aq) «orphan» ~ тăлăк, тураq «slength, width» ~ тăрăк (< турăq), гулаq «robbers» ~ урă, гулаq «ears» ~ тăлăк (< тăлăк), ураq «ears» ~ урă, аy(aq) «smoke» ~ увă, гирăq «forty» ~ тĕрĕк (< тĕрĕк), узăq «along», ~ вăрăк, etc.


The situation is the same with:

1. -к: илăк «door» ~ алăк, беăл(ик) «waist» ~ пĕлĕк, ерк «strengths» ~ ерк «strengths» (< ерк), кăк «roots» ~ кăк, кăк «blue» ~ кăвăк, тăлăк «flowers» ~ тăлăк (< тăлăк), бăрк «strange» ~ парка (~ бăрк (< бăрк), etc.


The double representation is not due to borrowing. In both groups we can find words with clear old Chuvash characteristics: алăк ~ елăк: сĕрэ ~ ûнăк, вăрăк ~ узă: ура ~ узă.

The voiced guttural stops disappeared:

Final -ы(г): бузăя(у) «calf, dice, lot» ~ пăрă, сибăя «dice, lots» ~ сăпă, адиy «abundance, rest» ~ урă, арăй «stops» ~ урă «waist, good, saints, арăй «rich, profits» ~ урă, арăй «yellow» ~ буăр, буăр, сăпăя «busts» ~ сăпăя, буăр «storm» ~ пăрă, тăлăи «busts» ~ тăлăи, etc.

Cf. Turkic тул «window» in most of the Turkic languages. The final -aq is a Chuvash suffix as in the Chuvash узăq «smoke» ~ Turkic аy, пĕлĕ «fives» ~ Turkic бăл, пĕлĕ «steers» ~ Turkic бăл etc.

1. On the Chuvash suffix -aş see the preceding note.

2. Kazan Tatar сăбăя, Башкир сăбăя, Казак, Кыргыз сăбăя with the same meaning are Mongolian loanwords. See Mucădimat al-Adab sibaqluqeto calculates, Literary Mongolian сăбăя «dice», Literary Khalkha сăбăя, sel.i, Selenga Buriat сăбăя «finish in a horse race», Kalmuck сăнă «dice», lots etc. Since the Mongolian -y is preserved everywhere, Chuvash сăпă is either not a Mongolian loanword or a very early one borrowed before the loss of the final -y. In the Mongolian loanwords of Chuvash borrowed after the 12th century the final -y is preserved: урăмама «abundance, rest», Mong. сăпăя, сăпăя «abundance, rest», Mong. сăпăя, năyta «shelter», Монг. нăyтă «shelter». In most cases it is very probable that the Middle Mongolian loanwords in Chuvash were borrowed through Tatar.
Final ɣ: bätäg «freckle, ulcer» ~ pata, küdeg «son-in-law» ~ kéré, kütiq «small bridge» ~ kaská, yeg «goods» ~ și «the upper», kög «melody» ~ këve, dütig «fifty» ~ allá, ulög «part» ~ valé (< dülö), bütug «pregnant» ~ pëte etc.

These final gutturals are of different origin. We can find among them monosyllabic words where they are in the stem-final position (yeg, kök, kık), words which are monosyllabic in Turkic, but disyllabic in Chuvash (erk, bärk, qorg-). They occur in Common Turkic suffixes (in most examples) or in special Chuvash suffixes (äyaq, tulaq, bëlik). They are present in polysyllabic words (sinék, këzük, buzay, këdeg) which cannot be analysed further at the present time. They appear in deverbal nouns (ady, tanig, ulög, bütug), verbs (qorg-) and nominal nouns (most of the examples). There is no phonetic difference in the realisation of the final gutturals according to their origin, position or function.

The final -eq is also present in the Turkic loanwords of Chuvash: yapaq «wool» ~ yupaq, aryamay «a kind of horse» (~ Mongolian) ~ uryamay, șek donkey ~ ask, șek, engëk «trouble, griefs» ~ inék, inek, karmak «hocks» ~ karmak. Most of these words are borrowings from Kazan Tatar. The -q/y > y of Tatar is reflected by -v: azay «molar» ~ azav ~ Tat azay, alday «uses» ~ ultav ~ alday, boilay «appointments» (~ Mongolian) ~ paltav ~ boilay, siltay «causes» ~ sáltay ~ sáltay, qaday «spegs» (~ Mongolian) ~ qutav ~ qaday > Bashkir qaday, but Tatar kudak.

The quality of the Chuvash vowel followed or not by a guttural stop depends on the original closed—open relation of the vowel. If it was originally closed it became «reduced», if it was open it remains a vowel with complete articulation.

The final voiced gutturals disappeared through a y-diphthong. This diphthong can still be observed in monosyllabic stems, where it is preserved in the oblique case: say- «to milk» ~ su/sav-, top, qto bears ~ tustav-, tág- «to break in mortar» ~ tut/tev-, gäy «butters» ~ hú/sav-, yay- «to rains» ~ hú/sav-. In polysyllabic stems with -u/il: buzay «calfs» pêru/pêrav-, kütig «stud» ~ këwu/këtev-. The reflexes of the diphthong can also be traced

* From a verb bete- «to covers», cf. Kazak betä-, Mongolian büte-. I have not found the Chuvash word in other Turkic languages.

* The word is a deverbal noun from ül- «to separates» which has no long vowel. The Chuvash form reflects clearly an old long front labial: ülüg or rather üluq. In Kkläyari we find ülög (can be read also ülüg). Türkmen has ülüs and üle «parts», derivatives from the same stem, but there is no üy (the Türkmen reflex of PT ü) before l in Türkmen. In Jakut we find üüü and üü «parts».

* From büt- «to be complete, full».
in some other cases. The Chuvash vowel ü has developed in some words from an earlier diphthong: püre «kidney» < pÜGRE < böGre, türü «seven» < tÖGRI < TOYRi < TOYri (not tüz!).

The disappearance of the final voiced guttural was already in progress in the Middle Bulgarian period, the time of the Volga-Bulgarian khanate. We find it in Old Permian: ėarla* sikles ← MB *ēarla < ėarlay, šūrï espools10 ← MB *şūrï < šūzük. It is reflected in the MB loanswords of the Volga-Kipchak languages: Tatar kōre sheddes ← MB *kūrā < kūrūg ~ küsük, Tatar škā < coarse linen ← MB *škā < sileg < sileg11 Tatar, Bashkir tāre «crucifix, icon» ← MB *tārî < tārî ~ tārî «Gods». The disappearance can be observed in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions: did j'i, alü «fifty» < ēuri ~ ēuri «God». The disappearance can be observed in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions: did j'i, alü «fifty» < ēuri ~ ēuri «God».

In the Old Bulgarian period, as has been shown by those who dealt with OB loanwords in Hungarian, the final voiced guttural had already been a spirant -γ or perhaps even a γ.12

The Chuvash representation is thus as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Chuvash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Chuvash z &lt; k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Chuvash zero &lt; y &lt; γ &lt; q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Chuvash k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Chuvash zero &lt; y &lt; γ &lt; q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Chuvash zero &lt; y &lt; γ &lt; q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Chuvash zero &lt; y &lt; γ &lt; q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, some of the unvoiced gutturals became voiced and then developed as their voiced counterparts.

Turning back to the question of the age of this double representation we have to investigate the Mongolian situation.

* Cf. Zuryen ėarla. The Votyak ėurlo is a later and independent borrowing.
10 Zuryen šūrî, Votyak šūrî espools, also Tatar, Bashkir šūre etc. The Chuvash word šērē espools can scarcely be separated from šērē strings.
11 Derived from the Turkic stem šil- sto wipes, cf. Chuvash šilä pir «a coarse linen» and šil- sto wipe, clean. This word has nothing to do with šil teeth. It denotes a coarse piece of linen used for cleaning.
The two old Mongolian guttural stops converged in the final position: 
g or g (written as γ) and k or k (written as q) became, g (written as γ),
g or a and k or £ became (written as γ):

**Mongolian**  
- turuy «size, breadth»
- aday «lower ends»
- čečeg «flowers»
- elkeg «sieves»
- arýy «clean»
- čerig «troops»

**Turkic**
- turug
- adaq «foot»
- čalak
- elgek
- arýy
- čerig

**Chuvash**
- târdyγ
- ura
- šaška
- ala
- ḥūd
- šarâ, šar.

In these cases the secondary Mongolian development prevent us from detecting the different Mongolian reflexes of the Chuvash final gutturals. But there are cases where the Mongolian guttural stops were not in the final position; they were followed by a vowel. In such cases the original unvoiced: voiced (or aspirated fortis: unaspirated media) opposition has been preserved. It is not without interest that here Mongolian exactly follows the Chuvash pattern and not the PT in the most cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Mong</th>
<th>Chuv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kōk</td>
<td>köke</td>
<td>kāvak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erk</td>
<td>erke</td>
<td>irtk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bēl(ek)</td>
<td>belke-gusun</td>
<td>piltek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bārk</td>
<td>berke</td>
<td>parka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qulaq</td>
<td>qulki «middle ears»</td>
<td>ḥalxa «ears»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sag-</td>
<td>saki-</td>
<td>sīγ «guards»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tul(aq)</td>
<td>tulaki kūmin13</td>
<td>tālāγ «orphans»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tig-</td>
<td>šiki-</td>
<td>ściγ- etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The meaning of the Mongolian *tulaki kūmin* is «foeble-minded person», see also *tulaki kituya* «blunt knives». I think these meanings are secondary and have developed from an original meaning «weak», needing supports and the word must be connected with *tul-* to lean on, supports. From the factitive form of *tul-* i.e. *tulya-* has been derived the Kalmuck word *tuly̱* «alleinstehend, verwaists».
PT $k/q$ | Mong $g/y$ | Chuv zero $< y < y < q, q$
---|---|---
ingek «cow» | ūniye $<$ ūniye | ēne
sirēk «fly, mosquito» | sinayul | dāna
șuyuk «bone» | sinaya «temple, cheek bone» | dāmā, dānā $<$ šuyuk
layuq «hen» | takiyan $<$ takiyan | dāzā $<$ tiyuq
yumdruq «fists» | nidurya | dāmār (dial) $<$ dāmrā $<$ yumduq
bolqa «porridges» | budayyan | pālā $<$ bolq

It has not escaped the attention of Poppe that to PT (according to him Proto-Altaic) -$q/k$ sometimes corresponds to the Mongolian -$q/k$, and sometimes to -$y/g$. According to him sonorization occurred in four groups of words:

1. In the final -$qa/ke$ in trisyllabic words.
2. In the suffixes -$qanjken$.
3. After -$r, l$ and in words with $l$ in the vicinity of the originally unvoiced guttural stops.
4. In some cases which are not clear.

It is true that -$qa/ke$ is rare on the end of trisyllabic words but there are some examples: $šūyike «head»$, $būleke «tendon»$, $ērike «garland»$, $teške «amulet»$, $šeške «saddle»$, $ūyike «the thin flesh of the belly»$; the causative -$qa/ke$ after -$d, -a$ : $teldke «to make public», yekdeke «to increase», $buridke «to take the census»$, etc. In back-vocalic stems: $vəriya «ring»$, $swuqiya «worm-woods»$, $quqiya «scalp»$, $ayuq «shamus»$, $atuq «male fish»$ and $bayuqqa «to cause joys»$, $quqiya «annals»$, $baltuq «to combine»$, $batudqa «to strengthen»$ etc. The diminutive -$qan/ken$ is very frequent: $šulken «little»$, $bīyakan «whitish»$, $swuyan «nice»$ etc. After $r$ and $l$ the unvoiced guttural is preserved e.g. in $serke «estrated goat»$, $sirkan «wounds»$, $šūrkei «terrible»$, $lakqan «powders»$, $šulki «pox»$ last but not least in $qalqa «shield»$, Khalkha. Thus the categories of Poppe can not be maintained. Let us sketch the situation:

14 This seems to have been the PT form, derived from $yum-KEE«press together» e.g. Karachay ğumduk, Hakaas munzuruk. From ğumduk, parallel forms such as ğudruq and ğumruq have developed.
For everybody who is acquainted with the basic problems of Altaic comparative linguistics it is clear that we are confronted here with a clear parallel to the famous «rotacism» and «lambdacism».

In recent times there were several attempts put forward to give an interpretation of the theory of Ramstedt on rotacism and lambdacism. Pritsak gave a morphonological interpretation while Tekin tried to offer a phonological solution. I do not wish to go into details here and shall point out only one question which is connected with the problem of the final guttural stops. Ramstedt supposed that the difference between r₁ and r₂ and ᵃ respectively was their palatalized or non-palatalized quality (r : ᵃ, ʳ : ᵃ). Poppe suggested that r₁ and l₂ were fricatives. This latter opinion was accepted by Tekin for Proto Altaic and by Doerfer for Proto Turkic. Since the proposed proto-languages must have existed more than a thousand years before our first sources of these languages, it remains a mere specula-

---

18 On p. 99 of his Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen I, 1963, Doerfer writes: Ob für Urtürkisch z und ᵃ oder aber ᵃ und ᵃ' gelten dürfte eine unentscheidbare Frage sein. But in his reconstructions he postulates in each case ᵃ and ᵃ' respectively, cf. Vol. I, pp. 277, 538, Vol. II, pp. 55, 65, 146 etc. In UAJb XXXIX (1967), pp. 53—70. Doerfer seems to have changed his opinion and suggests that the loanwords in Mongolian are not from sütürkisch but from frühbolgarisch and supposes for the latter ᵃ, e.g. in tez (p. 65), on p. 66 he hesitates between curtás bót and bőza, cf. also Indogermanische Forschungen LXXI (1968), p. 115; UAJb XI (1968).
tion as to what the actual phonetic value of these sounds could have been. It is more important in the theory of Ramstedt that \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) and \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \) respectively must have been in phonological opposition. Neither in Mongolian nor in Chuvash nor in any of their earlier sources do we have two kinds of \( r \), two kinds of \( l \) — and two kinds of final \( k/q \). The merger of older phonemically opposed sounds is a common feature in all languages. But it is more than a mere chance if this merger occurred both in Chuvash and in Mongolian in the same phonemic pairs, resulting in the same sounds, in the same words, in three parallel cases. It is impossible here to suppose archaic traits preserved by Chuvash and Mongolian because the archaic oppositions were not preserved but disappeared.

This contradiction in the Ramstedt-theory can only be eliminated by the supposition that we are dealing here with loanwords, and these Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences are due to borrowing. This theory, first formulated clearly by Németh, has also got many adherents but the above argument has not yet been put forward. I would like here to submit, only one additional consideration.

In the list given above for the correspondence of the Chuvash-Mongolian guttural stops in the final position I have quoted no single example in which there is at the same time rotacism or lambdacism. I would like to add one here.

The term for a two-year old lamb in Turkic is \( \text{sišek} \). In the Secret History

---

20 Middle Turkic \( \text{čiščik} \) (Husrau and Strin, Muqaddimat al-Adab, Tarjunán turk, Abu Hayyán, Bulyat al-mukták, Attulhafat), \( \text{siščik} \) (Ibn Muhanna). In modern languages: Kipchak: \( \text{čiščik} \) kuz egunynja vtoroj goda, \( \text{čiščik} \) kăčča ekona v vozraste posle vtorogoko okota, \( \text{čiščik} \) urik sowa v vozraste posle vtorogoko okota (Tatar), \( \text{čiščik} \) god, kăčča harig with the same meanings as in Tatars (Bashkir), \( \text{čiščik} \) vtorogodnij (ob ovoe i pšalj (Bashkir, Katarinskij), \( \text{čiščik} \) těček dvuchletnij values (South Kirgin, Judachin), \( \text{čiščik} \) molodoj nechološennoj barans (ibid), \( \text{čiščik} \) sokošennoj (godovalyj)barans (Karakałpak), \( \text{čiščik} \) sokošed rum (two years old) (Kazak), Oguz \( \text{čiščik} \) dvuchgodovalyj barans (Turkmen), \( \text{čiščik} \) lamb in his second years (Osman Turkish), \( \text{čiščik} \) sirk yulik kuzu, yen i kuzhuyacak koyuns Osmanli dialectal: SDD II, p. 799, Easterns \( \text{čiščik} \) sokošovolyj ili dvuchgodovalyj barans (Üzbek), \( \text{čiščik} \) in the second year (sheep or goat) (turki Shaw), Siberians \( \text{čiščik} \) ein zweijähriges Schaf das fett zu werden beginnt (Babara Tatar, Shor: Radloff IV, p. 1086). The loss of the initial \( s \) is regular of Carrakałpak \( is \)-to swolles (\( išč \)-), South Kirgiz \( iši \), South Kirgiz \( išč-\)suls, Karakałpak \( is \) epitsa (\( iš \)). The Oguz forms without initial \( s \) are loanwords. In Jakut we find \( iščxas \) dvuchtraunyj telenok (telka), no tolko s oseni vtorogogo goda (do togo on borosko), do tajaniya snega, vesonju, godovalyj telenok, vyrustok, \( iščxas \), \( iščxas \), \( iščxys \), \( iščxas \) struchtrunoše životnoe, telenok ili žerebenok po tretjemu godu (dvuchletnij, dvuletok, strugin tolko oseni lêto goda u nich vypadaju molodnye zuby počemu nazyvajutsja.
of Mongols we find the word *silegū* with the same meaning (§§. 124, 279, 280). Another word for an animal in its third year in Mongolian is *sidūlen*, a derivation from *sidān* *sto* teeth, *sidūle-* *sto* teeth, since it is in the third year that the full teeth of these animals develop. This arouses the supposition that the Turkic word *šišek* ought not to be connected with *šiš-* *sto* swells as was suggested by Radloff, Ščerbak, Doerfer, and Räsiainen, but with *šiš* *sto* teeth, *šiš*- *sto* teeth. The supposed earlier form *šišek* can be actually found in the Divān of Kāšyari with the meaning *szwejījähriges Schaf*. It is known that the Chuvash word for teeth is *šil* from an earlier *ši*. This word has been connected with the Turkic *tiš* by Zolotnickij, Pas sön, and Katona as a case of lambdacism. Katona supposed here a sporadic *t* > *š* development for the initial. I would rather suggest an assimilation, due to the original *-š* final. But independently of the interpretation of the initial *t* ~ *š* correspondence, in the light of the data on *šišek* animal with full teeth we have to accept the etymology of Katona in spite of the reservations of Ramstedt, and Poppe.

11 In *silegū* *gōmin* two-year old sheep, *silegū* *ırges* *tıdā*. In Literary Mongolian we find *silėge*. The word is rare in Mongolian dialects. In Literary Buriat: *silėge* *edvuchlentnyj baran* ( ila kozel), in Selenga Buriat *edvuchlentnaja ovca*. In Khalkha we have the interesting form *silėba* *edvuchgodlovalyj verblijuda*, also *šer silėba*. The Mongolian word entered the Turkic languages of Siberia: Kakass *silēka* *sholokshennyj barana*, Kacha *silākča* Hammels (Radloff IV, p. 711), Sagai *silākkā* (ibid.), Tuva *silēge* baran (na vtorom godu).

12 On the relationship between the terminology of age and the teeth of the animals see U. Köhalmi, Zwei Systeme der Alterbezeichnungen des Viehes bei den Mongolen: Studia Mongolica I: 31.}

13 Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türkdialecte, 1911, IV, p. 1084.
15 Türkische und mongolische Elemente III, p. 328.
17 Kornevoy tsašsko-russkij slovarj, 1876, p. 109.
18 Crusas szsőjezsgék, 1808, p. 148.
19 MNy XXIII (1927), pp. 190—193; KOn A II (1930), pp. 379—381.
20 See a similar interpretation by Doerfer, Türkische und mongolische Elemente, pp. 325—326.
21 Ramstedt (JSFOu XXXVIII, 1922—23, p. 23) and Poppe (AM I, 1924, p. 78; UJb VI, 1927, p. 116) connected Chuvash *šil* sto teeth with Turkic *šiš* spits. This latter word is surely a secondary development since *ši*- had not existed in initial position in PT. It is not impossible that *šiš* spits also goes also back to a PT *tiš*. I think that Turkic *šiš*- *sto* swells was also *tiš-. This form is preserved in Altai Turkic *tiš-, tiši-, Telent *tiš-* (Verbickij), Lower Bijd dialect *tiš-* (Verbickij), Baraba Tatar *tiš-*. (Radloff
If what was said above about the gutturals is valid then we have to expect in front of the Turkic $\text{SiSek} \sim$ Mongolian $\text{silegii}$ a Chuvash form $\text{Sdla}$. In Chuvash there is no special term for an animal two years old with full teeth. But we have a fish-name $\text{Sdla} \sim$pike-perch, Luciperca Sandra$. As Pallas, and Rääsänen had pointed out and then Katona proved, the Hungarian word $\text{sulló} (= \text{sulló} \sim$Old Hungarian $\text{sileg}) \sim$pike-perch is an Old Bulgarian loanword and has a Hungarian calque: $\text{fogas} (= \text{fogdó})$ which is derived from $\text{fog} \sim$tooth$, because this fish has extremely developed teeth. That means that Chuvash $\text{Sdla}$ had the original meaning $\text{animal with teeth}$ (cf. the expression $\text{Sdla puld} \sim$sudak; fish with teeth$).

We have here the expected triad:

Mongolian $\text{silegii} \sim$ Turkish $\text{SiSek} \sim$ Chuvash $\text{Sdla}$. In front of the Turkic $-s$ and $-k$ we find Chuvash the $-l$ and $-g$ in Mongolian. If this word had been a Proto-Altaic word we would have expected according to the Ramstedt-theory $\text{*tilekɨ} > \text{čilekɨ}$ in Mongolian.

I think this is evidence enough to prove that we have here an Old Chuvash-Bulgarian loanword in Mongolian. By this I gave one of my reasons why I think that the theory of Ramstedt, according to which there were no Old Chuvash loanwords in Mongolian, cannot be maintained.
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111, p. 140). The word for $\text{spits}$ is $\text{tiš}$ in Tuba-kίži (Baškakov, Dialekt čeremych. tatar, 1966, p. 155), and it is $\text{tiš}$ in the same dialects where $\text{tiš}$- to swell has preserved its $r$. (see Verbickij, Slovarj altaiskogo i aladagenskogo narоčitj türkskogo jazyka, 1884, p. 356). In Karachay $\text{tiš}$ (vertelj) is also preserved, while in Balkar we find $\text{tiš}$. The initial $\text{č}$ in Turkmen $\text{čɨ}$-to spits and $\text{čɨ}$-to swells can be interpreted as a dissimilation $\text{čɨ} > \text{č}-$, but also as a sporadic $\text{č} > \text{č}$ development as e.g. New Uigur $\text{čɨ}$-tooth. If my supposition that $\text{čɨ}$ $\text{spits}$ goes back to $\text{tiš}$, is valid then we have a clear parallel to what was said of Turkic $\text{šišek}$. Mongolian $\text{silegii}$-to stir with a pokers and Manchu-Tungusian $\text{sila}$-$\text{sile}$- $\text{sto}$ roast on a spits (cf. Evenki $\text{sılavun}$, $\text{sılavun}$, $\text{šılavun}$, $\text{šılavun}$, $\text{kılavun}$, $\text{Even}$ $\text{kılun}$, $\text{Nanai}$ $\text{sılon}$, $\text{šılıp}$, $\text{Orch}$ $\text{šılù}$, Manchu $\text{šılun}$ $\text{spits}$) pertain to $\text{šiš}$ in the same way as Mongolian $\text{silegii}$ to Turkic $\text{šišek}$. The etymology of $\text{šiš}$ suggested by Katona was accepted by Lígeti: NyK XLIX (1936), pp. 216–217; Németh: MNyXXXIII (1937), p. 139. See also Palló: UAjb XXXV (1964), pp. 62–63.


30 MNFSu XLVIII (1920) p. 264.

31 Ramstedt’s famous sentence: “Es genügt hier klargestellt zu haben, dass das tachuawische eine regelrechte Entwicklung der türk-sprache ist und zwar ohne jede direkte berührung mit dem mongolischen (JSFSou XXXVIII: 1, p. 34) has to be reformulated. Chuvash is a regular development of the Turkic proto-language, and during its early history, before the migration of the Chuvash—Bulgar—Oyur tribes to the West it had a long and close contact with Mongolian.
On the other hand I would like to point out that the fact that there were Old Chuvash loanwords in Mongolian does not defeat the hypothesis that Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguzian are genetically related. On the contrary, the removal of the old Chuvash-Bulgarian layer in Mongolian enables us to concentrate on a more archaic group of Turkic-Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguzian correspondences. These are — as can be expected a priori — very limited in number and their separated investigation will perhaps open up new possibilities for comparative Altaic studies.

To sum up: the Old Chuvash loanwords in Mongolian already reflect the sonorisation of the Chuvash final gutturals and thus we can conclude that this phenomenon developed before or during the Old Chuvash-Mongolian contacts.

In this point I deviate from the opinion of Németh, Sir Gerard Clauson, Ščerbak, Sinor, Doerfer and others, who deny the genetic relationship of the Altaic Languages. If there was an Altaic protolanguage, this must have existed three or four thousand years B. C. We have to advance to this very far time step by step.
In the Old Uigur texts we find an interesting word, the reading and meaning of which seemed to cause some problems for those scholars who have dealt with it.

Radlov quotes a word *tüläk* with the meaning «die Macht, das Vermögen, die günstige Gelegenheit». This word is cited from the dictionary of Redhouse where it figures among the meanings of Osmanli *tülük* «a hen-coop; a bird's perch; a bird's moulting season and condition; a young bird that has reached his first moult», from which it has to be separated. The word is written in Arabic as *tülk* and the second vowel is uncertain. In her *Alttürkische Grammatik* A. von Gabain lists the word as *tölüg* ?ö, (?k) «Kraft». In the *Türkische Turfan Texte* X4 she quotes the word as *tölük* (-u-, -l?) «Kraft». Malov gives in his book *Pamjatniki* *tölük* with a question mark and renders the meaning as «mečta, ekstaz, sozercanie». As we shall see below F. W. K. Müller read always *tülük* «Stärke, Kraft». The recently published *Drevnetjurkskij slovarj* has on p. 579 *tölük* with the meaning *sila, moäö, iz-za, po priöine*, but p. 413, last line reads *tölüg*. In his *Eski Uygur Türkqesi Sözlügü* Caferoglu gives *tölük* «dalma, heyecan, şüze, bakma, seyretme huğ: Suv6I5, 6. kuvvet, güç: Uig I 43,12».

The problem will be more clear if we consult the texts in which the word occurs. We find our word in a passage of an Old Uigur text published by F. W. K. Müller in *Uigurica I* and republished in *Uigurica IV* (p. 10: 45—49).8

---

1 Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialekte, 1905, III, 1568.
2 A Turkish and English Lexicon, 1890, p. 613 «Power, reach, opportunity».
3 1950, p. 349.
4 1959, p. 61, on p. 26 she reads *tölük*.
5 Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pisanosti, 1951, p. 433: *tölük* (frülük). Malov gives two possible etymologies: *Kirgiz tilek* from tile- «to ask, to wish» (1) which is phonetically impossible and *Chuvash telek* (read *tölük*) «dream» tüş; tüül «id.». As we shall see below this turned out to be the good solution.
6 The *Drevnetjurkskij slovarj* quotes UigII 127: 24 with strength: powers and UigII 25: 25 with therefore, because of. The texts see below.
7 1968, p. 249.
8 APA W 1908, p. 43, SPA W 1931, p. 10.
*A. Eóna-Tas*
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anta ötrü Ö(a)stani-i ilig bdg bar küíin öntürüp* tülükin 10 sikriyü barip Urumuki atl(i)y yák-nit) töpüeintdki saíin tutup «Immediately afterwards Chatana the king making his strength to grow, springing by (the force of) his tülük, went and the demon with the name Urumukha, he grasped the hair on its head». F. W. K. Müller translated tülükin sikriyü as «machtvoller Sprung».

In Uigurica II 11 (p. 25: 24—25) we can read the following passage: bu saviy äsidip Kilibi yak öpkasi tülükintâ ögsüz teg bolî. In the translation of F. W. K. Müller: «Als er dieses Wort vernahm, wurde Hidimbas des Dämons Zorn in seiner Stärke einem Sinnlosen gleich». The authors of the Drevnetjurksij slovarj, who have cited the same passage, gave a somewhat deviating translation: vulyşav éti slova, demon Hidimbas ot jarostal stal slovno bezumnyjs (p. 580). Here our word is rendered with cot in the meaning because of.

A few lines later 12 (p. 27: 24) the word occurs once more in the Uigur text: vüliyi buzis-si ûzd Kilibi yak tülükin urup anta og yirdâ gamî in with his Vaşra-sceptre he hit Hiûimba, the demon, by (the force of) his tülük and at the same time he layed him low to the earths. Here F. W. K. Müller translated: «mit Kraft schlug er».

It can be no doubt that in these cases we have to do with a special kind of strength. The context of another Uigur text corroborates our opinion. In Türkiache Turfan Texte X 13 (354—356) we find the following passage: tumlu yuylük Atavaki yak bûliyât tülükin ûrî burxanga yaqîn sikriyü barip ... «The dark-faced demon Atavaka by his fearful tülük sprung at the god Buddha». A. von Gabain translated: «Mit schrecklicher Kraft».

Our word also occurs in the Suvarnaprabhāsa. In the edition of Radlov and Malov 14 (p. 558, VIII, 33b: 23) we read: il ulus-nûn ičiini neče tenliq bar erer kişi yalanq-lar quwaray-a yûim-siz ikinči̇siz tûl-ûksuz (küçük) sözûnun-ûz bolur-lar ne iš koduk qûlduq-ta idi(-yin) bûturû ermez-le. 15 «As many may be in

---

9 A. v. Gabain in Türkiische Turfan тексте X, 1959, p. 27 reads öntürûp. The word can be found in some modern dialects. Türkmen has ön- sto be born, Kirgis ön- sto grows, Kazakh ön- sto increase, to gain wight, to rise, to succeed. New Uigur has both ön- and -ün sto rise, to grow while in Yakut we find ün-. The Drevnetjurksij slovarj reads öntürûp.

10 F. W. K. Müller always transcribed tölük, but for reasons discussed below I transcribed always tülük.

11 APAW 1910, p. 25.

12 Ibid, p. 27.


14 Suvarnaprabhāsa (Sutra zolotoj bleska) I—II, 1913.

15 It seems to me that we have here — as in many other places in the Suvarnaprabhāsa — to do with a verse with alliteration: il.../yûim.../id.../id... The Tibetan parallel texts is also in verse.
his country, all the people and the crowd will lose for ever their tülüük and strength so that they will not be able to remain the lords of their affairs. In the Tibetan text which has been translated from the same Chinese text of I-Ching the expression tülüksü külsü küsün süz bolurlar is: stobs-chu dpa'-bšor med-pas-na. An other passage of the same work (p. 359, Va8: 18) tülüük is an attribute of Buddha Mahasatva (tülüklüg bodistv maqastv). Finally in X9a: 5—9 (p. 615) we find the following passage: adra odüre sañaip štra M(a)qastvi tigis y(at)igini tülük-tä turur uly bädük käsüös küs ülip üly y(a)ri-gančüt küs ülip kurur kuril küss-in käsüös in yaqširdip. I would translate this text tentatively as follows: After having distinctively learned (all these) the prince M. being in a very great tülüük, submerging in a very great wish and reaching a great graceful thought, roused in his heart. The parallel Tibetan text III has: (ed. Nobel, II, p. 801: 26—27): de'i che rgyal-bu de šin-tu brtul-ba'i dpa'-sran-daš amon-lam čen-po btab-nas šini-rje čen-po beam-pas sens rtas-šin 'phel-bar gyur kyan. Here šin-tu brtul-ba'i dpa'-sran has to correspond to the same Chinese original as yäti qxnxy tülüük. The expression is uncommon. The word brtul-ba can not be here deportment, behaviour. The expression dpa'-sran is known from an Old Tibetan text with the meaning heroio, enduring. The Chinese original has been translated by Nobel as egresser Heldenmut(yung mëng). In an other Tibetan translation of the Suvarnaprabhasa we have a shorter version: šni-rje čen-po mäho-len-čan-pa'i šni-du gyur-pas de-ltar.

18 The expression yütineis ikineis is not quite clear to me. I have supposed that yütineis is written instead of yünineis endless and ikineis is without a second time, once, ytitm flax seeds does not make sense here.


20 Nar-thari: šor.

21 It seems that dpa'-bšor med-pa is here the parallel expression to tülüksü and stobs-chu is here the parallel expression to külsü küsün süz. As we shall see below in an other place dpa'-sran corresponds to tülüük.

22 Nobel has translated the Chinese text as follows (vol I, p. 338, 481C): Dann liess der Prinz grossen Heldenmut erthienen, äusserte mächtiges Gelüblde und mehrte mit dem Gedanken grossen Erbarmens sein Herz.

23 Cf. H. A. Jäschke, A Tibetan—English Dictionary, 1949: deportment, behaviour (according to Coorna) diligence, painstaking (acc. to Schmidt)

24 Cf. F. W. Thomas, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan II, 1961, p. 96, A3: Bod 'baši dpa'-sran-la stend-pa'i chül bši-du. Thomas translated this as . . . taking side with the stubborn heroic people of Tibet (p. 102) and on III, p. 41 stubborn heroic: Dpa'-sran sheroie, enduring.


26 See Nobel, p. 159: 9—12, This is the version I.
The Mongolian translation of Yon-tan bzan-po has been made from the shorter text: "degeṣü yeke niugleskui sedkii-i törögülüsen-iyen teyin sedkii-i yen nomoqadqafa bür-ün. From the Mongolian text it is clear that Tibetan brtvl-ba (in the shorter text) has been understood as the past tense of 'dul-ba,' and translated by nomoqad-q 'to conquer.' Thus the expression brtvl-ba'i dpa'-aran of text Tibetan III has to be translated as the heroic ability of conquering (himself) and this is the correct interpretation of the virtue of heroism in Buddhist thought. In the first text cited above from the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama tālāk is the term for the power of the soul and the hendiadys kut küsan denotes the physical strength.

I think that the occurrence of our word in the texts quoted above gives sufficient justification to my supposition that the meaning of the word tālāk in the Old Uigur texts has not been simply physical strength but a kind of spiritual strength, a magic power which could be used against enemies and for conquering the wishes of one's own soul.

The fact that the word could not yet be traced in sources other than Old Uigur deprived us from such help in ascertaining the proper reading of the word and in finding its etymology. Perhaps the situation is not so hopeless. In Yakut we find a word: tālāk the second meaning of which is according to Pekarskij: "sočenj, vesjma, siljno, črezmerno, pre-s. It figures in such expressions as: t. timni sočenj siljnyj choolod, siljnaja stuzsə, t. kujaa eznoj, t. ü skrepkij son. Thus it is a word denoting something very strong, heavy; it is used for expressing a kind of exaggeration. According to Pekarskij this is the same word as tālāk 'zavalij, davlonie, tježelij son, košmard and he connects it with Yakut tāl 'son,' and Chuvash tālāk 'id.' I think Pekarskij was right. The word for 'dream' in Turkic is tād:

Old Turkic: tād- 'to dream' (Uig1124: 27), tād tādā- 'to dream dreams' (Kasyari). Middle Turkic: tād (Yugnaki Uigur, Arabic), tād (Tefsir), dul (Oγυζ-...)

- Version I: tāld, Version II tālul (also in Peking ed.).
- Cf. S. Ch. Das, A Tibetan—English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyma, 1902: brtul-ba 'to conquer, pt. and fut. of 'dul-ba, brtul-phod = dpa'-bo sīlen stob-čan id hero, champion.'
- Both Tibetan 'dul- and Mongolian nomoqad- had the primary meaning 'to tame, to make peaceful.'
- Slovarj jakutskogo jazyka I—III, 1927.
name), tüä (Husrau and Širin), tüä (Rabyuzi), tüä, düs, tüä (Ibn Muhanna), tüä (Chagatai). New Turkic: Kipchak: tüä (Tatar), tüä (Bashkir) tüä (Kirgiz); Oguz: düä (Turanian), tüä (Osmanli), Turkestan: düä (New Uigur), tüä, düä (Turki), tüä (Salar); Siberian: tüä (Altai), tüä (Hakass), düä (Tuva) etc. In Yellow Uigur we find the verb tüüse-, tüüsi-, tüüse- etc «dreams», in Yakut the same verb is tüüsd-, tüüsoö-, tüüsoö-. The word came into Chuvash as a late loanword from Tatar: töüs in the expression ayšx tösäipe «so sna, sprosonku» (Asmarin XV, p. 106).

For the noun «dream» we find the form tüäl in the following sources: Uig110: 5, Uig1158: 1, Uig1124: 27, USuv 593: 23, 594: 5, 633: 15, UigSprachdenkm. 96: 79, Berliner Turfantexte I D: 298, G: 8. From the modern dialects the form with -ɨ has been preserved by Yellow Uigur: tel e.g. in tel tüüse- «dream dreams» and by Yakut: tüäl «dream». In Chuvash the word for «dream» is in the Virjal dialect töök, in Anatri and the literary language tölek. The first occurrence of the word known to me is in an unpublished manuscript from 1780 - 1790 in the form töök (read töök). The Chuvash word goes back to a former *tülök. From the fact that Chuvash also has a verb tullen- «to dream, to conjecture, to guess, to speak strange things, talk nonsense, unimportant things» (cf. töllek tullen- «to dream > Cheremiss tälä'n-»), we can conclude that the primary stem *tüäl has also existed in Chuvash, and its final -k is the same as in pilek «five» (Turkic bēş).

When the Uigurs converted to Buddhism they had to use a word for the Buddhist concept of spiritual power or virtue, and they chose a stem which in the past had been used to denote another, seemingly not a physical activity, the word for dream. And this has not been a unique case in the history of our word.

Before going on and tracing the history of our word I have here to answer one more question. It is a well known fact that in front of the final -ä in the Turkic languages we find -ɨ in Chuvash. But in our case the form with -ɨ is present also in Old Uigur, in Yellow Uigur and in Yakut. Similar cases have been collected by Németh, Pritsak and T. Tekin, but there is no common opinion about their cause. As I tried to show on other places, most of these cases are due to dialectal isoglosses and this is also the case here. The lexical

---

Note that the forms with -ɨ i.e. tüäl occur in the same texts as tüülık.

Leningrad, Saltikov–Shevidrin Library, Collection Ermitage, No 222, Slovarj jazyka çuvašskogo.


isogloss of the forms түүл: түүл did not coincide with the phonological isogloss ʃ : l which is a very common feature in the dialectal distribution of linguistic oppositions.

The word түүл has been borrowed by Mongolian from a Turkic language, most probably from an early Chuvash-Bulgarian idiom. It can be found in Mongolian in the form түүлгэ which goes back to an earlier form *түүлге as e.g. бүүлге «two years old lamb» < сүүлге < түүл, or балыасун стооns < балыасун < балыг. In some MSS a modern secondary form түүлге can be found.23

The phonetic correspondence is regular. In one group of the early Chuvash-Bulgarian loanwords of Mongolian, the Turkic closed labial corresponds to an open one. This reflects a phonetic development in the lending language. Let us see some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkic</th>
<th>Mongolian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>күүүл «loan»</td>
<td>колье «loan»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>көр «snow, drift»</td>
<td>көр (кисун)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>айыр «help»</td>
<td>айыр (чирп)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бүүлгэ «to convey»</td>
<td>бүүлгэ «to convey»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мөүүр «corn»</td>
<td>мөүүр «corn»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>көер «proud»</td>
<td>көер «proud»</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sonorization or rather the weakening of the final -k is also regular (see the examples above of балыг — балыасун, түүл — сүүлге and my paper on the history of the gutturals in final position in Chuvash).27

The first occurrence of our Mongolian word we find in the Secret History. The Chinese translation of the word is ква «to divine», чан пү «to divine by casting lots, to observe signs, to foretell» 88. It occurs twice in the SH. In the first case the story is about Jamuqa a former аnda or oath-friend of Chingis qan. Chingis qan is going to kill his rival and says: (§ 201) «... аnda minu аndu yafu bidan-tur amin-tur гor selkiyg'i inu esе sonodada je suraga qa'ан bale'e man аndu bolumui аndu 'llye ke'esu түүлге-tur аndu

24 G. Doerfer, Türkische und Mongolische Elemente I, p. 99, supposed three Pre-turkic labials: o, q and u respectively. g and u where q and g gave o and g in Turkic but u and o in Mongolian. I think that we have to interpret the fact that to Turkic o, g corresponds Mongolian o, ө and ү and to Turkic ө, ү, o and u, ө with chronological and dialectal differences.
26 E. Haenish, Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niua tobec'an (Yüan-ch’ao pi-shi) Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen, Leipzig 1939, p. 150.
The second story is about Ögödei, the son and successor of Chingis qan. He got a serious illness, lost his speech and then gave an order for divination: (§ 272) bö'es bö'es tölge'üölü'esü. «By all kinds of shamans and tölge-makers he let make tölge». There was a special kind of divination (abīla-) performed and it was found that somebody has to be offered to the offended spirits of the land of the Kitat. According to the SH Tolui the youngest son of Chingis, the rival of Ögödei, «voluntarily» offered himself and was killed, once more without a drop of blood in this case with poison.

It is not without any interest that in both cases the tölge has been consulted for justifying political murders of persons who should have been protected by the old customs. The tölge-makers had to contact the transcendental world and thus were able to force by their magic power the acceptance or allowance of something which was against the social order. The basic concept which underlies the divination is that the divinator is forcing the signs — be they cleft 05 shoulderblades, numbers on a dice, flights of birds, dreams etc. — to reveal something which they would not communicate for an ordinary person.

In the Mongolian sources tölge is mostly the divination made with help of signs. In the Muqaddimat al-Adab we find a sentence: tölge bariba sibawuna—which is translated into Chagatay Turkic by fāl tutti quš birle. Fāl is a word of Arabic origin with the meaning șomen, sign, fortune-tellings, thus the sentence could be translated «(he) made divination with (the help of) birds». In another passage tölge is translated by Chagatai āng which is a Mongolian loanword and has the meaning «presage, omen, signs». A third Chagatai word used for tölge is ġur'a which is of Arabic origin and has the meaning «divination dice».

In the dictionaries of the modern Mongolian dialects we find the following meanings: literary Mongolian tölge «fortune-telling, divination» (Lessing), Khalkha tölö «znamenie, predznamenovanie, gadanie», Ordos: tölö «art divinatoire, operation par laquelle le devin decouvre quelque chose de cacheé; instrument qui sert a la divination», Burjat ďülge «znamenie», Kalmyk tölä-

30 This word cannot be separated from abid intestines.

From these we can group the following meanings: 1. omen, sign; 2. the action of finding something which is hidden; 3. divination; 4. the instrument of these activities.

The instrument of the divination can be e.g. a coin (joyos-un tölge), a red thread (tölgen-ü uuyun uusan), shoulder-blade, dice, bow etc. The dream divination is also very old with the Mongols. It would deserve a special study to investigate the function of dreams in the SH. Its term is there jueüdün jueüdüle- (see e.g. § 63 where Dei seien speaks about his dream of Temüjin) or ja'arin üfe- (see e.g. in § 121 where Qoröi, the brother of Jamuqa speaks about the divine signs — ja'arin — which he saw and foretells the victory of Chingis qan above Jamuqa). In a text quoted by C. Bawden the diagram-tölge reveals among other things the dreams.

The Mongolian word entered the Turkic languages of Siberia: Altai tölgö vrogatka dlja opredelenija vlažnosti vozducha, rogatka ili luk, lőöök (dlja vorožby), tölgői vorožėjas, Shor tõłgëši, Altaik tõlgći, Hakass töłkći «gadatelj, vorožėjas» (Verbickij), Yakut tölkö, törkö t 존, sudja (buduščaja, opredelenije) (Pekarskij). We come across the word also in Kirghiz tölgö vorožba gadinie na kameškach ili na aljçeke kosulii, tölgëša «gadaljščik» (Judachin). In this connection it is especially important that in Yakut we find four forms of the same basic word: түсе- «to dream» (<<иле-), тул «dream», тулук «heavy dream, nightmare, very strong, heavy» and tölkö «fate, fortune». The first is the original Yakut word; the second is an early isoglossial feature; the third is seemingly a very old Chuvash—Bulgarian loanword, and the fourth has been borrowed from Mongolian. This shows how complicated the fate of a lexical item can be.

I have proposed above that we have to see in Mongolian tölgę an old Chuvash — Bulgarian loanword. Phonetically the correspondence is regular, but semantically I would like to offer one more argument. The word tölük has the meaning «dream» in Chuvash and Yakut and it can be translated in the quoted Uigur texts by «spiritual force, magic power». Now I would add to this that the
meaning «to find out» which could be the bridge between «dream» and «divination» can be found in Chuvash. In the modern Chuvash-Russian dictionary edited by Sirotkin we find a verb with the meaning «ugadyvatj, to find out». This word has the form тул-. The -ул- of the present-day Chuvash literary language is not the regular correspondence to an earlier -ул-. This would force us to exclude this word from the discussion — if this -ул- is authentical. The fact that there is no example or expression quoted in Sirotkin’s dictionary rises the suspicion that this word has been simply overtaken from earlier lexicography. It is indeed to be found in Ashmarin’s Thesaurus (XIV, p. 205) where it is neither provided with examples but in this case the source is given, it is quoted from the Načertanie pravil čuvashskogo jazyka i slovarj sostavlennagia ilja duchovnych učiličė Kansanskoj eparchii, published in Kazan 1836. Here on page 178 we find тюлесь «ugadatj». In the orthography of the Načertanie the Cyrillic letter  ý is used to render two Virjal phonemes, the reduced front labial  ý (Anatri, literary т) and у. See: тюлекь ethos (literary телек, толлянчась вно анти видежтj (тилён), тюлекь сестреčas (тел), тюлекь содуšina dija дымus (тёнě), тюлекь дно (тёп) etc., resp. тюлекь «mir, mirno» (тulek), тюлекь «платитj долга» (түлс), тюлекь «правда, prijamo» (түре), тюлекь «должа» (түпе), тюлекь «спорная» (түлек), тюлекь «стерпешь» (тие-) etc. The fact that the seemingly rare or even obsolete word has not been transcribed in the system of Ashmarin by  ý but by у may be traced to this ambivalence.49

The divination by dreams has been common among the Chuvash. Mészáros, who wrote a monograph on the old religious beliefs of the Chuvash, discusses the dream divination in a special chapter.50 The interpreter of the dreams (телек кюялакан) tells the meaning of the dreams which she had seen (түлён кур-) while putting an object of the person inquiring the future under her pillow. What had been seen (түз-) in the dream can be solved (туд-) also by common men. During the dream the soul of the man is leaving the body and wandering freely in the world. According to the Christian Chuvash, an angel is showing the world and the future to the soul.

Mongolian preserved only a secondary and special meaning of our word while it has a special word for dream: jegüdän. In the third group of Altaic languages in the Manchu-Tunguzian the basic word for dream is connected with a root which hardly can be separated from Turkic тул ~ тул. The Common Manchu-Tunguzian word for «to dream» can be reconstructed as *тölki-. Our

---

49 After having given this paper into print I got a letter dated of 6th July, 1971 from A. A. Alekmiov, Cheboksary, who was so kind as to have checked the word тул- of Sirotkin’s dictionary. He writes that тул- is a dialectal form of the literary and Anatri тел- and is still living. Its Virjal form is тул- and it has the same form as the word тул, name, place etc. According to him телек тилён has also the meaning «to find out, to foretell, to solve problems by dreams».

50 A csavas ósékvés emlékei, Budapest 1909, pp. 398—400.
first data is from Juchen, where we come across the form *tolging*. The other Manohu-Tunguzian forms are the following: Manohu: *tolgin, tolkin* «Trauma», Nanai tolki(<n>, tolkičin «son, snovidenie», tolkiči- «videtj son», NanaiU, Or tolkiči- -sid., NanaiU tolčin «son», NanaiNh, KU tol' sid., NanaiBk tolki(<n>) -sid., Ulecha tolči(<n>) «snovidenie, tolkiči- «videtj son», Oroč tolkiči- -son tolki -sid., tolkiči- «videtj son»; Oroč tolčin «son», Ude tosi- «videtj son»; Solon tolči-sniteja, videtj son, breditj, govoritj vo sne, Negidal tolki-, tolkič-, «videtj son», Even toltat-, tolkač- «videtj son». Evenki tolkin «son, snovidenie, tolki-, tolkič- «videtj son», EvenkiTol tolti- «videtj son». This wide-spread word has to be very old in the Manchu-Tunguzian languages, but not necessarily original.

The long and complicated history of the word — all details of which we are not in a position to see clear — is pointing to one of the sources of the supernatural concepts of the Altaic people. Dream, magic power, divination are going back to the same basic concept, something which is out of the physical every-day life, which is another kind of reality in the consciousness of the primitive Altaic people. We are at the sources of the religious beliefs of the Altaic world.

I have to offer here my sincere thanks to the Altaic Group of the Linguistic Institute, Leningrad and especially to V. I. Cineius for making it possible for me to consult the manuscript of the Comparative Etymological Dictionary of the Manchu-Tunguzian Languages compiled under her direction. This valuable work is in print and we can only but hope that it will be published in the near future.

A clear example of early borrowing from Mongolian is Manohu-Tunguzian *k’orin* «twenty», the regular development of which is present in each Manchu-Tunguzian language and which is an early Mongolian loanword, see L. Ligeti: Acta Orient. Hung. X (1960), p. 243.
DID THE PROTO ALTAIC PEOPLE KNOW THE 'STIRRUP?'

The metal stirrup is one of the most important technical inventions in the history of the nomadic peoples. Its appearance was connected with a new technique of riding and fighting. The age of the object is therefore an important question and deserves our special attention. From this point of view it is an essential question: did the Altaic languages have a common word for the stirrup? If they had, it is highly plausible that, in case if it is not a loanword, the Altaic proto-language lasted till the invention and use of the stirrup, or with other words, the stirrup has to be as old as the proto Altaic language.

In 1912 Z. Gombocz equated the Turkic řeæg׳ "stirrup" with Chuvash yäranä and Mongolian dūräge (sic) with the same meanings. Ramstedt in 1916 reconstructed a Turkic proto-form yūzāŋū and accepted the Chuvash and Mongolian parallels suggested by Gombocz. The Proto Turkic form yūreni was put forward by Poppe in 1927. Later Ramstedt succeeded in finding a corresponding word in Tunguz. Joki reconstructed the Proto Altaic form as (?) *yūrägʿ, the Proto Turkic, as *ūfāŋi. The word has been quoted since then as one of the most certain Proto Altaic words. Poppe in his paper read at the 24th International Congress of Orientalists in Munich in 1957, chose just this example to show the basic rules of comparative Altaistics. In his newly published etymological dictionary, Råsänen considered the Turkish, Mongolian and Tunguzian words genetically related.

Only G. Doerfer did not accept the equation. He had the following objections: 1. The Mongolian form is not dūräge but dörüge. 2. There does not exist a Turkic form with ř, i.e. yūzāŋi. 3. Mongolian ũ does not correspond to Turkic ũ. 4. There are difficulties in the correspondence of the word endings.

Doerfer's first objection has to be accepted and Råsänen already gives the correct form dörüge. But we find forms with ř, i.e. in Chagatai (Zenker: yūzāŋi) and Gagauz (yüzəŋi). Mongolian ũ can correspond to Turkic ũ in a group of words.
It is remarkable, that in all of these cases where there is a labial vowel, we find the correspondences Mongolian open; Turkic closed. Thus the objection of Doerfer is not strong enough to disregard this equation. But we can give other reasons which support the view that the stirrup had not a common word in the Altaic languages.

The Chuvash form yărana cannot be reconstructed as Poppe did in a proto-form *yrraŋi*. Its oldest form had to be *iɾaŋa*. The protetic y- only joins words with initial labial vowels: PT idiq "saint" = Chuvash yērēx, PT īkiz "double" = Chuv. yēkēr, PT īlge "loop" = Chuv. yēlä, etc. All words with labial initial got a protetic y-; PT üt- "to burn" = Chuv. yēt-, PT üt- (elsewhere u-) = Chuv. yēt-, PT ur- "to bark" = Chuv. yēr-, etc. The form with labial can be found in the Turkic dialects: Yellow Uighur isengo, Baraba īzăngi, Khakass Ḣzego, Tuvinian iszęi, Yakut isänä. The fact, that all the archaic dialects have an illabial vowel shows that this form has to be a very old one. The forms with initial y- and ü- are later developments, even if we find ʊrāŋū in the Namagan MS of the Qutadgu Bilig /1069/13th century.

The Turkic Xizängä, Chuvash Xiraŋä cannot be connected with Mongolian dörüge neither as corresponding forms to a common Proto Altaic form, nor as loanwords.

The Mongolian word for stirrup has a clear etymology. It is a denominal derivation from the word dörü "iron or rope ring". For the -ge suffix see: seko "opening" sekege "id.", sirul "earth" sirūga "id.", bajaga "preparation" bajagaša "id.", bodu "smallpox" boduša "id.", čime "noise"
Slimege "id.", from the same word dörü has been derived dörügebči "halter, dog leash, makeshift rope stirrup", dörügebči "rope stirrups for donkeys or camels". Since we know that the metal stirrup has developed from rope loops, this etymology reflects historical facts. Similar developments have been suggested for the Hungarian word for stirrup: kengyel (kégy "ring" + el "former part"), for the English word itself stirrup (OE stīgan "climb" and rap "rope"); for German Stegrelf (OHG stegareif: stigan "climb" and reif "rope"). Middle Latin stræupa, stræfus are German loanwords. The Solon dürębki and the Evenki forms durıkı (evkK, SB Nro), durek (evkk), durakı (evkk), durıkı (evkSB, Nro) are clearly loanwords from Mongolian. The old word for stirrup in Jurchen and Manchu was tufu(n).

The archæological data corroborate our opinion. According to Vajn-stajn, who investigated the historical sources, the archæological materials and the earlier literature, the metal stirrup appeared not earlier than the Turk Empire in the 6th century. All data supposed to be earlier were either erroneously dated, or were not stirrups. It is reasonable to suppose that the rope stirrup preceded the metal one, and it had to have been older a few hundred years, than the metal one. But even if we suppose that the word for stirrup denoted earlier the rope stirrup neither the object, nor the word can be earlier than the beginnings of our era. This is also clear from the fact, that neither metal, nor rope stirrup was known to the Romans who surely would have overtaken it, if it had been known in the East.

It is impossible to suppose that the hypothetical Proto Altaic language lasted till the beginnings of our era. Thus we have phonological, etymological and historical reasons which authorize us to reject the hypothesis that the Proto Altaic people knew the stirrup.

On the other hand it is of importance that Chuvash has a common word "stirrup" with the other Turkic languages. From this fact we can conclude that the separation of the old Chuvash-Bulgarian-Ogur tribes from the other Turkic groups occurred after the invention of the stirrup. Since Chuvash has a regular r-form (Kirânä) in front of the Turkic ʐ-form (Kizänä ~ Kizänj) we have a help for dating the famous Rhotacism. It has to be younger than the invention and use of the stirrup.

Notes
8. Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen II, pp. 148-149.
11. According to Ramstedt, the Tungus, Korean, Mongolian and Turkic languages and peoples had been separated already in 4000 B.C., see Einführung in die altaiische Sprachwissenschaft I, 1957, p. 15.
ВОПРОСЫ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЯ

ДИСКУССИИ И ОБСУЖДЕНИЯ

А. РОНА-ТАШ

ОБЩЕЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ ИЛИ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ?
(К проблеме родства алтайских языков)

Среди многих причин того, что старая проблема родства алтайских языков еще не разрешена и дискутируется весьма остро, две являются особенно важными. Первая — историческая. Как сторонники, так и противники генетического родства алтайских языков, признают существование исторических контактов между алтайскими народами и языками после XIII в. Однако те, кто защищает идею генетического родства, склоняются к отрицанию возможности более ранних контактов и считают все соответствия, датируемые периодом до XIII в., общим наследием из протоалтайского языка. В то же время противники генетического родства полагают, что все соответствия, которые возникли ранее XIII в., являются заимствованиями. Они не пытаются при этом дифференцировать различные пласты заимствований и не ставят перед собой вопроса: не может ли древнейший слой этих общих черт быть обусловлен генетическим родством?

Другая причина — методологическая. Соответствия между языками могут быть обусловлены следующими факторами: 1) случайность; 2) типологическое сходство; 3) конвергенция из независимых исходных пунктов; 4) исторические условия. В свою очередь исторические причины многочисленны, и к ним относятся, например: а) генетическое родство; б) ареалы взаимоотношений (родственных и неродственных языков), обусловливающие общие ареальные черты, которые могут развиваться в систему вторичных соответствий (языковой союз); в) общее влияние третьего языка (субстраты, внешнее влияние); г) исторические контакты, отражавшиеся в заимствованиях. Все факторы (за исключением случайности) порождают или могут породить регулярные соответствия, таким образом регулярность сама по себе является критерием, с помощью которого можно было бы различать типы соответствий.

Необходимо разработать специальные методы исследования, а это особенно трудно в отношении алтайских языков, многие из которых не имеют древних языковых памятников и располагают довольно небольшим числом своих ветвей по сравнению с другими языковыми семьями. Ниже предлагается методика, большая часть приемов которой хорошо известна и используема в других отраслях исторической лингвистики, а некоторые из

1 См.: А. М. Щербак, Об алтайской гибкоте в языкоznании, ВЯ, 1958, 6; Д. Клоссош, Лексикостатистическая оценка алтайской теории, ВЯ, 1969, 5; Н. А. Васильков, Ареальная консолидация древнейших наречий и генетическое родство алтайских языков, ВЯ, 1970, 4; Л. Легет, Алтайская теория и лексикостатистика, ВЯ, 1971, 3; Г. Дёрфер, Можно ли проблему родства алтайских языков разрешить с позиции индоевропеистики?, ВЯ, 1972, 3.
них привлекались также в алтайских исследованиях. Однако здесь эти методические приемы применялись в совокупности и на относительно одномородном материале.

Одной из самых трудных проблем является разграничение общего наследия и древних заимствований. Те, кто придерживается точки зрения на заимствованный характер древнеалтайских соответствий, должны приести свои доводы. Несколько таких аргументов будет предложено ниже. Здесь будут рассмотрены, главным образом, чувашско-монгольские параллели и, в первую очередь, известные соответствия так называемого ротационального, группе (конечно, подразделяемой на несколько хронологических и географических подгрупп, которые не всегда легко разграничить). Кроме того, эти соответствия, несомненно, относятся к более раннему периоду, нежели XIII в., и именно они рассматривались алтайцами как общее наследие. Со своей стороны, я не считаю их самым ранним общим фонцом в алтайских языках.

Подчеркнем далее, что аргументы, приводимые ниже, разумеется, не могут быть признаны «абсолютными». Использование одного из них может только с большей или меньшей степенью вероятности отделить древние соответствия от заимствований. Но с показаниями совокупности этих аргументов, полученными в результате анализа значительного по своему объему материала, исследователь обязан считаться.

Этимологический аргумент. Если слово встречается в языках А и Б в регулярно соответствующих формах, но в языке А для него нет этимологии, тогда, как его основа (и словообразовательный аффикс) могут быть найдены в языке Б, то это, скорее всего, заимствование в языке А из языка Б. Здесь всегда могут быть сделаны возражения, что основа слова и аффикс также существовали в языке А, но были там утрачены. Теоретически такая возможность не исключена; однако чем больше мы сможем представить примеров такого рода, что материалы для этимологии слов наличествуют в языке Б и отсутствуют в языке А, тем меньше вероятность «случайной» утраты соответствующих основ и аффиксов.


Семантико-исторический аргумент. Если слово встречается в языках А и Б в регулярно соответствующих формах, но имеет только одно конкретное или специализированное значение в языке А и в то же время го́рдо более широкий круг значений в языке Б, то, вероятнее всего, что язык А заимствовал его из языка Б, хотя вполне возможно и другое объяснение, а именно — что вторичное ограничение значения могло произойти на почве языка А. Однако если число примеров с подобными семантиче-
ОБЩЕЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ ИЛИ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ?


Свидетельство синонимов. Если два синонима обозначают один предмет в языке A и один из этих синонимов налицествует также в языке B, то вполне возможно, что он является заимствованным в языке A. Конечно, могут быть возражения и здесь. Прежде всего, в языке нет абсолютных синонимов; в то же время синонимы могут развиваться также в пределах одного языка. Тем не менее, при условии всестороннего анализа синонимов этот критерий также может быть применен для разграничения генетических соответствий и заимствований. Например: M körö «камень» и M *t’il «камень»; M *iür «молозиво» и M *ilbl «молозиво»; M *qumäki «песок» и M *qumaq «песок»; M *illüg «трехлетнее животное с полным набором зубов» и M *illüg «трехлетнее животное»; M *qasu «железо» (< др.-кирг.) и M *temür «железо».< ПТ *temüir «железо»; М *jöl «год» (календарный) и М *j’il «год» (возраст) — ПБ *j’il «год».

Аргумент основного словарного фонда. Чем больше соответствий может быть найдено в основном словарном фонде языков A и B, тем больше возможность их генетического родства. Естественно, что даже это положение не может быть принято безоговорочно. Основной словарный фонд имеет два определения: 1) слова, обозначающие самые элементарные реалии; 2) слова, употребляемые наиболее часто. Элементарность и частота, однако, также исторически обусловлены, и скорость их изменения — вопреки мнению представителей школы глоттохронологии — отнюдь не постоянная. Мы также должны иметь в виду, что языки не обозначают один сегмент действительности одинаком, в одном и том же слове ерунак обозначает часть конечности от кончика пальцев до запястья, а в другом — от кончиков пальцев до конца конечности в некоторых языках одно и то же слово обозначает «синий» и «лазоревый» (например, в древних тюркских и старовенгерском), в то время как в других языках (например, в русском, других индоевропейских, современных тюркских) имеются особые слова для обоих цветов и т. д. Именно в этом, мы не можем применить лексикостатистическую методику, хотя и должны признать ее важность в привлечении внимания к историческому анализу основного словарного фонда.

Мы вправе полагать, что теоретически любому наудачу выбранное слово основного словарного фонда может оказаться заимствованным, но с точки зрения языковой истории существенно лишь свидетельство большого количества связанных между собой слов. Правильным методом является не показ того, что не соответствуют в двух языках, а раскрытие природы соответствий. Если постоянные эквиваленты большинства основных слов, имеющихся в языке B, существуют в языке A, но они здесь не принадлежат к основному словарному фонду, то это обстоятельство можно рассматривать как весьма важный аргумент, подтверждающий, что эти слова заимствованные. В качестве примера приведем так называемый аргумент обозначени

Характерная черта этого типа соответствий состоит в том, что тюркское слово, обозначающее ту или иную часть тела, в монгольском представлено в определенной форме, но имеет вторичное (или переносное) значение, а для обозначения той же части тела используется другое, собственно монгольское слово. В отдельных случаях можно допустить, что имело место развитие вторичного значения, но данные слишком очевидны, чтобы принять это предположение для всей приведенной группы.


В этих примерах, однако, фонетический критерий подсказывает, что для монгольского это заимствованные слова. В случае тюрк. qar'i — монг. yar непонятно, почему в тюркском имеется -ı и почему он опущен в монгольском, або часто бывает как раз наоборот: монгольские слова имеют дополнительный гласный по сравнению с тюркскими (Т tıš — М dülü «почка»; ПТ tıš — М ḏülü «почка»). В примере Т topiq — М toyiŋ монгольское слово показывает озвончение конечного, что может быть результатом эволюции и на монгольской почве. А в случае Т bügræk — М bögere конечный -k в монгольском примере уже исчез, что напоминает чувашский тип развития, где звонкие гутуральные также исчезли (см. об этом ниже). Слово topiq, несомненно, имеет тюркское происхождение и произведено от top «нечто круглое». Подчеркнем, что на заимствование и здесь указывает снова система слов, а не отдельные слова.

Аргумент числительных. Числительные также составляют часть основного словарного фонда. Тот факт, что у алтайских числительных обнаруживается крайне незначительное количество общих черт и практически нет соответствий, был замечен давно. Г. Рамстедт пытался разрешить эту проблему, предполагая, что тюркские явыки разработали новую систему числительных в силу культурно-исторических и социальных предпосылок (в частности, потребностей, вызванных торговлей и развитием животноводства). Эта теория, которая не может быть доказана, содержит...

Согласно теории Рамстедта, в этих случаях чув. г l сохранили первоначальную форму; однако учёного в то же время считают числительные поздним вторичным явлением. А это означает, что в истории тюркских языков -г/-l формы не обязательно унаследованы из протоязыка. Если это верно, существует теоретическая возможность того, что слова с -г/-l были заимствованы позже. Во-вторых, как мы увидим ниже, лексика развитого животноводства является в значительной степени общей как в тюркском, так и в монгольском языках. Если же принять объяснение автономной эволюции тюркских числительных потребностями животноводства и торговли, тогда остаётся невопонятным, почему же эта эволюция не была синхронна с развитием животноводческой терминологии.

Были сделаны попытки доказать, что основы некоторых числительных существуют в обоих языках. Например, Рамстедт сравнивал T bir «один» и M bör «он, все, каждый», T toqas «девять» и M tokir «с негнущимися (от судороги, холода) пальцами» 6, но они не эквиваленты семантически. M ikire действительно соответствует T ikiz < ekt(iki) «два», но это животноводческий термин (первонашально оно означало двойню у животных); в этом случае и тюркском сохранилась основа слова (ekt<<два>, а в монгольском ikire является заимствованием. Итак, остается только один сомнительный пример тюркско-монгольских соответствий в области числительных: T tort, M dörben, тунг. dûgûn «четыре».

Отсутствие соответствий у числительных, конечно, могло быть только доказательством против родства алтайских языков, если допустить, что алтайский протоязык существовал и тогда, когда развивалась система десятеричных числительных. Если же предположить, что десятеричная система не была развита до времени распада алтайского протоязыка, тогда этот аргумент бесполезен в разрешении проблемы: родство или заимствование? Собственно, точно было бы ставить эту проблему не так: являются ли алтайские языки родственными друг другу или нет, а по-другому: или алтайский протоязык распался очень рано, или же он не существовал вообще.

Аргумент местоимений. Личные местоимения также являются важной частью основного словарного фонда языка. Сопоставим три реконструированные системы:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Тюркский</th>
<th>Монгольский</th>
<th>Тунгусский</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>би</td>
<td>bi ~ bûn(mân)</td>
<td>bi ~ mën</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tı</td>
<td>tı ~ tın</td>
<td>tı ~ tıa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ı</td>
<td>ta ~ tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>bida (нкл.)</td>
<td>bida (нкл.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чис (м. ч.)</td>
<td>ı</td>
<td>a ~ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чис</td>
<td>antar</td>
<td>mûnt (нн.кл.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

В алтайской системе местоимений наибольшее число соответствий приходится на 1 и 2-е лица ед. числа; известная соотносимость может быть замечена также в 3-м лице ед. числа (T ol является вторичным, первоначально местоимение 3-го лица ед. числа, вероятно, было i ~ in); n-овые формы скло-
нияемых основ также соотносны. Но во мн. числе наблюдается полное
расхождение, причем не только фонетическое, но и морфологическое. В
турском представлено мн. число на -z и -lar; в монгольском наблюдается
явление, похожее на ablaut; в монгольских и тунгусских местоимениях
1-го лица мн. числа можно обнаружить аналогичные и инициальные фор-
мы, которые не имеют следов в тюркском. Итак, ясно, что в системе алтай-
ских местоимений мн. число развивалось в отделившихся языках. В сепа-
ратной жизни тюркского языка развивалось мн. число на -z, однако
это случилось до распада тюркских языков, потому что в чувашском реди-
лярно проявляется -r-соответствие (epdr < a + bir; eydr < a + sir).
Этот факт наводит на мысль, что независимая жизнь алтайских протоязы-
ков должна рассматриваться как долгий исторический процесс.

Культурно-исторический аргумент. Если данный комплекс терминов
культуры, экономики и социальной истории совпадает в языках А и Б
и если этот комплекс начал существовать позже, чем разделение общего
протоязыка на языки А и Б, то можно предполагать, что рассматриваемая
терминология была заимствована или в языке А, или в языке Б, или же в
обоих этих языках. Разумеется, в этом случае должна быть ясна хотя бы
часть слов, в которых эта заимствованная терминология проявляется. Но
она же должна быть для этого слово.

В тюркском и монгольском языках существует терминология высоко-
развитого животноводства, которая связывается регулярными фонетиче-
скими соответствиями. В приводимых примерах первое слово — тюрк-
ское, второе — монгольское: ayuz — ururay «молозиво»; ašq — унг. al-
čuka скот; aš — araya скороспелый зуб; bīš — bülű «обивать»;
bús — būəyu бирать деньги; boyasla — boyorla «свалить»;
boyazla — boyorla «заколоть»;
bigа — bülși «сбивать (масло)»;
biİ — bülși «молозиво»; būr — būr «теленок»;
biI — bülși «заколоть; задушит 101 (животное);
bū crews — bīr «хрящ»;
būr — būr «осел»;
būr — būr «близнецы, двойняшки»;
būr — būr «молодой верблюда — gülge щенок»;
obas — obas «плечо» — obas — obas «ключица»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык»;
obas — obas «бык».

Вышеуказанные слова были подобраны с учетом явлений ротацизма и
ламбдаизма. Но факт заимствования происходит независимо от фонетиче-
ской формы слова. Поэтому мы вправе ожидать подобной картины и в ос-
тальной части животноводческой терминологии, где ротацизм и ламбдаизм
не наблюдается. Однако исторические и археологические исследования исключают
возможность этого объяснения, следует принять второе. Эта возможность
увеличивается, если принять в качестве, что говорилось выше об ос-
новном словарном фонде. Помимо животноводческой терминологии,
рассмотрим важные термины металлургии в тюркском и монгольском
(первый компонент пары — тюркский, второй — монгольский): tarqan
рабочий-металлист (> тат. dargan; qoryal — qoryal «свинец» — qoryal/jine
jес емелья — ler (febe) (монг. jес более позднее заимствование); jis — чилмывь;
В настоящем и в монгольском языке.

Аргумент лингвистических заимствований. Если два соответствующих слова имеются в языках А и Б и если можно доказать, что в языке Б это слово является заимствованием из третьего языка, тогда оно должно быть заимствованием в языке А. В калмыцком языке имеем слово dems — tärнk "тюркский табак"; уже само значение подсказывает, что мы, по-видимому, имеем дело с заимствованием. В казахском и в новоузбекском имеется слово dämст о "безвкусный" (däm "вкус" + -st аффикс) оно встречается в других тюркских языках. Основа этого слова — däm — арабского происхождения (араб, t'am "вкус") Если оно является заимствованием в тюркских языках, то оно должно быть заимствованием в калмыцком; вопрос только в том, каким образом т-ст превратился в т-ст. Это слово вошло в калмыцкий благодаря торговым связям, через посредство булгаро-турукских культов. В современном чувашском языке оно существует в форме têmsêr < temsir (ср. татар. ismis), которая является произодной от заимствования из арабского и образовалась при помощи чувашского привативного аффикса -sêr. В калмыцком это слово может быть довольно новым, но во всяком случае оно не могло быть заимствовано после переселения калмыков на Волгу: во-первых, к этому времени начальный булгарский d- превратился в t-; во-вторых, булгарские купцы играли важную роль на Волге до XIII—XIV вв. (об этом может свидетельствовать, например, широкое распространение слова bulyarl "сорт кожи"). В монгольском, несомненно, есть слова булгарского типа, заимствованные благодаря торговым связям.

Но имеется также большое количество древних слов булгарского типа, заимствованных в более ранние периоды. Т, м, тунг, yes — yes — yes ордын.; бронза — индоевропейского (токарского) происхождения. M yes имеет также параллель булгарского типа в сочетании jer jebe (бронзовое) ордын. И.-е. форма основы этого слова yes (лат. aurum — ausum, сабинск. ausum, литов. ausis, др.-русск. ausis, t. -sir) оно проникло также в уральские языки (оксэл — окэл), откуда через южносамодийский и древнеиранское посредничество попало в монгольский (др.-самодийск. yes — южносамодийск. ksas — др.-персг. qas — старомонг. qasu). Индоевропейская первоначальная форма доказывает, что здесь -s является первичным по отношению к M -t, а так как все слово является в тюркском заимствованием, то оно должно быть заимствованием и в монгольском.

Аргумент лингвистической географии. Если языки А и В генетически родственны, соответствия, унаследованные ими от общего протоязыка, должны быть распространены в них более или менее одинаково. Таким образом, когда в языках А и В больше количество соответствий, которые не являются общими для языков Б и В, а в свою очередь Б и В имеют много соответствий, которые не являются общими для языков Б и А, это, наконец, если практически в языках А и В нет соответствий (или их очень мало), то, вероятнее всего, что это соответствия — результат заимствований. В лингвистической географии это весьма важное обстоятельство. Если язык A в B больше количество соответствий, который не является общим для языков B и V, а в свою очередь B и V имеют много соответствий, которые не являются общими для языков B и A, это, наконец, если практически в языках A и B нет соответствий (или их очень мало), то, вероятнее всего, что эти соответствия — результат заимствований. В лин-
тературе уже указывалось, что именно так обстоит дело с тюркскими, монгольскими и тунгусскими языками. Имеется достаточное количество тюркско-монгольских и монгольско-тунгусских соответствий, но очень мало тюркско-монгольско-тунгусских и тюркско-тунгусских соответствий; к тому же большинство из них, которые существуют, являются поздними заимствованиями. Эти соответствия точно согласуются с историко-географическим положением соответствующих языковых групп, так что возможность заимствования поддерживается и лингвогеографической дистрибуцией.

Аргумент фонемной системы. Языки А и Б родственные, если каждый элемент их древнейшей реконструированной фонемной системы совпадает. Реконструкция фонемной системы алтайских языков во многих отношениях еще является дискуссионной (именно поэтому проблема внутренней реконструкции и вопрос об алтайском родстве нераздельны). Прежде всего бросается в глаза, что реконструируемые тюркская, монгольская и тунгусская фонемные системы существенно различаются между собой. Рассмотрим начальные согласные в этих трех системах:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Тюркский</th>
<th>Монгольский</th>
<th>Тунгусский</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>лабиальные</td>
<td>лабиальные</td>
<td>лабиальные</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т-</td>
<td>т-</td>
<td>т-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дентальные</td>
<td>дентальные</td>
<td>дентальные</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гуттуральные</td>
<td>гуттуральные</td>
<td>гуттуральные</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к-</td>
<td>к-</td>
<td>к-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аффрикаты</td>
<td>аффрикаты</td>
<td>аффрикаты</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>б-</td>
<td>б-</td>
<td>б-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>спиранты</td>
<td>спиранты</td>
<td>спиранты</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г-</td>
<td>г-</td>
<td>г-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сибилианты</td>
<td>сибилианты</td>
<td>сибилианты</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с-</td>
<td>с-</td>
<td>с-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>латеральные</td>
<td>латеральные</td>
<td>латеральные</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к-</td>
<td>к-</td>
<td>к-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Итак, рассмотренные три системы отличаются одна от другой по своей структуре: к тому же они несовершенные в самих себе, являясь результатом более раннего развития. Эти два обстоятельства наводят на мысль, что следует предполагать долгий путь индивидуального развития каждого протоязыка. Приведенные выше реконструкции являются древнейшими вероятными формами, которые восстанавливаются из диалектных данных и языковых памятников отдельных языковых групп. Эти реконструкции фонемных систем ранних, уже независимых языков отстоят друг от друга...
на целый эволюционный период. Если исходить из предположения, что тунгусская система сохраняла лучше всего основные черты древней алтайской фонемной системы, тогда сначала придется наметить в общих чертах путь, пройденный тюркской и монгольской системами до того, как они достигли указанной выше стадии. Необходимо попытаться восстановить относительную, а если это возможно, и абсолютную хронологию этого процесса. И эта работа еще нам предстоит.

Сравнительная алтаистика доказала наличие значительного числа соответствий между тюркской, монгольской и тунгусской системами начальных согласных, причем появились они, вероятно, раньше XIII в. Таковы соответствия:

- тюрк. j-/y ~ монг. d-, f-, n-; тюрк. t- ~ монг. t-, d-.

Вопрос в том, к какому времени эти системы начального консонантизма относятся? И принадлежат ли они одному хронологическому пласту? Согласно утверждению сторонников алтайской гипотезы, они относятся к одному периоду, и соответствия возводятся к общему протоязыку. Противники генетического родства алтайских языков полагают, что слова, в которых представлены указанные соответствия, заимствованы монголами из древнетюркского языка. Если это верно, мы должны предположить, что тюркская система — источник заимствований — была более богатой системой начальных согласных, чем реконструированная выше.

Сама рассмотренная подсистема наводит на мысль, что инвентарь тюркских начальных согласных был несколько различным, возводимым (отсутствие в этой подсистеме звонких зубных, гортанных и носовых звуков).

Единственным затруднением является то, что выдвинутые соответствия противоречивы. М d- соответствует как Т y- ~ j-, так и Т t-. Например, Т. yajis ~ М. dayir скороговорочный; олень; Т t'ab ~ М. düli «постель». Это противоречие можно разрешить двумя путями. Во-первых, предположить, что в алтайском протоязыке было три зубных фонемы: Т х- = М, Т t-

Т s- = М d- ~ Т t-; Т n- = М d- ~ Т п- ~ f. Во-вторых, допустить, что различные соответствия относятся к нескольким пластам заимствований. Во втором случае приходится предположить, что язык, источник заимствований — подвергается развитию, в то же время монгольский показывает два различных этапа этого развития: Т d'- > М d-, Т d' > j- > М j-, Т n- > М n-; Т n- > j- > М j-.

Первое из этих соответствий могло восходить к протоязыку, но могло также возникнуть в ип а счет заимствования, второе же на этих соответствий не может быть начьшным языком, как заимствованием. Первое предположение может быть доказано тем фактом, что только одно слово заимствовалось монгольским языком на тюркского дравыка. Такой случай редок, но не беспредельным: Т d'eg смолоду — М. dege-dö звериней; Т d'eg > jeg — М. jegi — соколиней; Т n'al смолоду — М nilga смолоду; Т n'al > jal — М jalayun смолоду.

Эта гипотеза дает ответ на вопрос, почему иногда монг. d- и f- противопоставлены тюрк. y- ~ d-, но не объясняет, почему в монгольском появляется то d-; то f- как соответствия тому же самому тюрк. t-. В тюркском т- был непридачительным глухим взрывным звуком, в то время как в монгольском он был придыхательным глухим взрывным звуком, противопоставленным глухому непридачительным слабозвуковому: [t']: [D]. Итак, тюрк. t- соответствует монгольскому т- как глухой сильный и в то же время монгольскому d- как непридачительный. В этом возводится возможность двойной субстанции фонем. Двойственное соответствие такое может быть

---
11 См.: Z. G o m b o s z, Zum Lautgeschichte der altaltschen Sprachen, K.Sz., XIII, 1912—1913, стр. 22—37; В. М. И л л и ч — C a v и т и ч, Алтайские дентальные: й, d, t, стр. 37—56.
объяснено различием тюркской и монгольской консонантных систем, а не только древним единством этих двух систем:


Из вопросов о неначальных согласных остановимся лишь на многократно обсуждаемой проблеме ротацизма и ламбдаизма. Здесь также существуют две противоположные точки зрения, которые можно продемонстрировать в виде двух схем, которые не показывают никаких фонологических различий, отличаясь одна от другой только фонетически:

I. алтайский
II. алтайский

тюркский
чувашский
прототюркский
монгольский
прототюркский
монгольский

Из обеих схем видно, что в алтайском протоязыке имелись две оппозиции, в то время как в чувашском и монгольском только одна. Итак, с точки зрения фонологической в чувашском и монгольском представлена инновация, в то время как тюркский сохранил старую систему. При этом возникает вопрос, происходили ли отдельно и независимо чувашский и монгольский процессы или же нет.

12 Н. Попп (см.: N. Р о п п е, Vergleichende Grammatik der altaiischen Sprachen, Tl. 1, Wiesbaden, 1963, стр. 34—36) полагает, что протоалтайский т- «...хуже всего сохранился в тюркских языках». Он также заметил, что т- перед носовыми является вторичным, таким образом он предполагает развитие т > раг. Но добавляет: «Во многих случаях довольно неясно, представлен ли в соответствующем корпусе первоначальный или вторичный р-т. Попп приводит восемь примеров монгольско-тюркских соответствий, в шести из которых перед носовым звуком второй консонантом является носовой гласный звук. Компонент meriγen в M eriγen-meriγen «равновесный, неправильный» является сложным и не имеет ничего общего с Т бαр· «украшать». Единственное оставшееся соответствие — ПТ blγ «бедро, бок» ~ M miγ «бедро» — вызывает семантические и фонетические трудности при его объяснении. В то же время существует много обоснованных соответствий М т- тунг. т-.

Если иметь в виду другие характерные черты, общие для монгольского и чувашского языков, возможность независимого развития должна быть признана незначительной. Но если эти два параллельных изменения связаны между собой и они не консервируют древние алтайские черты, а являются инновациями, тогда они должны быть результатом исторических контактов. Здесь могут быть предложены несколько гипотез, объясняющих, каким образом возникли эти чувашско-монгольские общие черты. Можно допустить, что в монгольском двойной оппозиции никогда не было, и в результате долгого чувашско-монгольского сосуществования чувашский также утратил одну из оппозиций. Не исключено, однако, что обе оппозиции когда-то были представлены и в монгольском, а изменение в двух языках произошло одновременно. И, наконец, можно принять во внимание влияние третьего языка (= субстрата). В любом случае явление ротации и ламбдаизма доказывает, что задолго до XIII в. существовала тесная связь между предшественниками чувашского и монгольского языков, что и отражается в заимствованиях.

Аргумент исторической фонологии. Если фонема языка А имеет два регулярных соответствия в языке B, то этому факту могут быть даны следующие два объяснения.

1. Фонема а₁, в языке А является результатом конвергенции двух старых фонем а₁ и а₂:

   А Протоэнзык Б
   а₁ — а₁ а₂ — а₂

2. Можно допустить развитие (историческое, диалектное или то и другое) а₁ > a₂ в языке A. В этом случае фонема a₂ в языке B может быть наследием или заимствованием, но синхронная фонема а₁ в языке B может быть только заимствованием.

Протозылк а₁ > a₂

Следует принять то объяснение, которое подтверждается и другими аргументами.

Между тюрко-монгольскими губными гласными обнаружены следующие типы соответствий:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Тюрк</th>
<th>Монг.</th>
<th>Тюрк.</th>
<th>Монг.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ḗpāz</td>
<td>ḗnggār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ḗkār</td>
<td>ḗkēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>ḗxen</td>
<td>ḗrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>ḗzēs</td>
<td>ḗrākēr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Здесь также можно предположить четыре алтайских передних губных, но можно допустить и следующие соотношения: T ḗ → M ə; T ə → ḗ → M ə; ḗ ə → ḗ → M ə.

Последнее решение подтверждается тем фактом, что в группе тюркских языков (в чувашском и некоторых кыпчакских) могут происходить переходы $\delta > \ddot{u}$ и $\ddot{u} > \delta$, т. е. сужение открытых гласных и, наоборот, сокращение и расширение узких.

Другой пример — тюркский конечный -к имеет два эквивалента в монгольском: а) $T$ -к $k$  ($k\ddot{e}$ касаний) $\rightarrow M$ -к + V ($k\ddot{e}k$); б) $T$ -к ($ingek$ корова) $\sim M$ -г + $V$ ($\ddot{u}nigge > \ddot{u}nige$). Здесь также можно предположить существование двух -к в алтайском протоязыке, один из которых сошел с монгольским -g. Но это предположение можно подтвердить только исходя из алтайской гипотезы, которая сама, как известно, требует доказательств.

Аналогичные два соответствия наблюдаются в чувашском: $T$ $k\ddot{e}k > \sim$ чув. $k\ddot{e}v$, но $T$ $ingek >$ чув. $\ddot{e}n$. Мы знаем, что в этом случае чувашский конечный -g исчез, превратившийся предварительно в спирант, следы которого остались в венгерском: $dr.$-чув. $\ddot{u}nig$ $\rightarrow$ венг. $\ddot{u}nig > \ddot{u}n$. Здесь можно допустить следующее развитие: $T$ -к $\Rightarrow M$ -к + $V$; $T$ -к $\Rightarrow -g$ ($\Rightarrow -g > V$) $\rightarrow M$ -г + $V$.

Что M *$\ddot{u}nige$ является заимствованием, подтверждается не только тем фактом, что M -g показывает более позднюю булгарскую -г-стадию. В тюркском протоязыке в середине слова часто имеется звук -g-, который в чувашском, как и в некоторых других тюркских языках, утрачен. Например: $T$ $qazyug >$ $dr.$-чув. $qaruy$ $\rightarrow$ венг. $kard$ (кора). $T$ $qazyan$ $\rightarrow$ $dr.$-чув. $\ddot{u}pam$ $\Rightarrow$ чув. $yupam$ (котел). Это же -g- исчез в слове $ingek$ как в монгольском, так и в древнечувашском (тунгусском); разумеется, не существует он и в современном чувашском. Монгольский, следовательно, отражает форму, более развитую, чем в прототюркском, причем даже в двух отношениях.

Мы видели, что первоначальный -k стал звонким -g-, затем — спирантом, а позднее исчез вообще, как и первоначальный -g. Этот процесс прослеживается и в монгольском; и, например: $T$ $bögrek$ (фонетические аргументы: $ПТ$ -к $\Rightarrow M$ $bögere$, $T$ $burtuk$ (фонетические аргументы: $ПТ$ -к $\Rightarrow M$ $börtük$, $T$ $köpek$ $\Rightarrow M$ $küpsün$ < $kikbiti$, $T$ $köpek$ пенац $\Rightarrow M$ $kôge-sün$, $T$ $qarsaq$ (стеная лиса) $\Rightarrow M$ $kîrsa$.

Анализ приведенных выше примеров показал, что несмотря на большие трудности, вызванные объективными и субъективными условиями изучения алтайских языков, мы располагаем методами для доказательства того, что монгольский язык имел тюркские заимствования раньше XIII в. Важно подчеркнуть, что это доказывается не анализом изолированных слов и не использованием разрозненных аргументов, а взятых в системе соответствиями и аргументами, которые усиливают друг друга.

Многие из рассмотренных слов подходят почти под все сформулированные выше аргументы; например, M *$\ddot{u}nige$ (фонетические аргументы: $ПТ$ -k $\Rightarrow M$ -гV, $ПТ$ -g $\Rightarrow M$ 0; географический аргумент: отсутствие слова в тунгусском; исторический аргумент: слово принадлежит к терминологии развитого скотоводства) или $\ddot{u}ker$ (фонетический аргумент: $ПТ$ -д $\sim M$ -д; фонемная структура: $ПТ$ -x $\sim M$ -r; иноязычное происхождение слова: тюрок.-$T$ $\rightarrow$ M; исторический аргумент: слово принадлежит к терминологии развитого скотоводства).

Примеры можно было бы умножить, но, думается, картина уже ясна. Тюркские заимствования в монгольском до XIII в. вполне определенно свидетельствуют о том, что заимствовались они из множества различных тюркских языков в различные исторические периоды. Одним из тюркских языков — источников подобных заимствований должен быть язык, принадлежащий к чувашско-булгарской группе. Надо думать, что после.
дующие исследования выявят еще больше пластов древних булгаро-монгольских контактов.

Роль гипотез. Как известно, наука не может существовать без гипотез, которые она стремится обосновать и превратить в доказательные законы. Одной из основных ошибок современной адтуалистики является то, что она занимается очень многими гипотезами одновременно, причем это характерно особенно для тех исследователей, которые разделяют идею генетического родства. Проиллюстрируем это лишь двумя примерами.

В своем весьма полезном этнолингвистическом словаре М. Рясянен предложил следующие соответствия:
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дующие исследования выявят еще больше пластов древних булгаро-монгольских контактов.

Роль гипотез. Как известно, наука не может существовать без гипотез, которые она стремится обосновать и превратить в доказательные законы. Одной из основных ошибок современной адтуалистики является то, что она занимается очень многими гипотезами одновременно, причем это характерно особенно для тех исследователей, которые разделяют идею генетического родства. Проиллюстрируем это лишь двумя примерами.

В своем весьма полезном этнолингвистическом словаре М. Рясянен предложил следующие соответствия: 


Но чтобы принять это урало-алтайское соответствие, нужно допустить, по крайней мере, 11 гипотез: 1) угорское слово должно быть уральского происхождения, хотя слово встречается только в венгерском, мансийском и хантыском; 2) мы должны допустить метатезу г и у в венгерском или обско-угорских языках; 3) если в венгерском была эта метатеза, тогда обско-угорская форма должна была сохранить незамененную форму уральского протоязыка; 4) рассматриваемое слово, имея такую структуру, не может представлять собой непроизводную основу; если же это производное слово, то мы должны предположить, что оно было сформировано во время урало-алтайского единства; 5) но в этом случае должны быть выделены основа и суффикс.; 6) если уральская форма была такова, то придется также допустить метатезу i и г в маньчжурском; 7) M ayII могло развиться из более древнего ayil; допустить форму payil было бы возможно только при пр.-монг. hauil и монгорском zayir; но на самом деле в среднемонгольском имеем ayil, а в монгорском ayir; 8) чтобы преодолеть эту трудность, можно было бы считать монгольское слово заимствованным из тюрского (что очень вероятно), но тогда из цепи доказательств выпадает один из членов алтайского единства, и нам опять придется объяснить, почему слово исчезло из монгольских языков и почему оно должно было быть заимствовано его; 9) если маньчж. faïya и faïra считать результатом метатезы (faïya < faïty < polty < payil), тогда следует отделить это слово от маньчж. faïal «акротное пространство», «округ» и от нанайск. palan «пол»; 10) в этом случае придется исключить возможность того, что маньчжурское слово является членом большого гнезда слов сахскими значениями мест и связано с тунг. *palflan «ладонь», также родственным M *palflan > da-loyan > aïyar (то же). Если же оно относится к этому гнезду слов, тогда корень здесь *pal, и все соответствие оказывается несостоятельным; 11) тюркское слово следовало бы тогда отделить от гнезда слов ay — «поднимать», ayil, ayis «высота», что было бы очень трудно, потому что первоначально слово означало «забор, огораживающий животных», «каменное укрытие, воздигаемое для защиты от ветра и т. д.

Уже теперь можно было бы принять во внимание одну или две из названных гипотез; возможно также, что некоторые из них будут доказаны в ходе дальнейших исследований. Тем не менее, очень рискованно иметь дело сразу с таким множеством гипотез.

В. М. Иллич-Свирич в посмертно опубликованной работе «Опыт сравнения ностратических языков» представил очень важные и новые для алтайства результаты, хотя его итоговые заключения не во всем удовлетворительны.

16 M. R, a a a в в, Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen, I, Helsinki, 1969, стр. 8.

17 «Опыт сравнения ностратических языков», [1], M., 1971, стр. 254. Иллич-Свирич был одним из ученых, глубоко понимавших фундаментальные проблемы сравнительного построения алтайских языков. Он писал (там же, стр. 69): «Родство трех алтей-
тельны. В частности, пытаясь установить родство, например, М oга- «войти» и Т oр- «подниматься», по необходимости он вынужден был принять следующие гипотезы:

1) В алтайском протоязыке не было гармонии гласных; 2) противопоставляемая монгольской форме древняя монгольская форма была не oра-, а oра-, потому что Илл. Святых исходит из построгородской формы Horä; 3) в монгольском языке место семантического развития «подниматься» отсутствовало; 4) или M oра- «расти» не связано со всеми названными словами, или это тюркское заимствование, или же существовало древнегерманское развитие (или варианта) oра- > oр-; 5) в этом последнем случае придется также допустить различие в значениях монгольских слов-пар; 6) M üre «семья»; плод; растение» или не относится к этому гнезду слов, или это заимствование; 7) долгий гласный в тюркском глаголе oр- «расти» не отражает древний долгий гласный, или в монгольском произошло вторичное сокращение, потому что в монгольском, по мнению В. М. Илл. Святых, древняя алтайская долгота должна быть сохранена, а в форме oра- гласный является кратким; 8) занайск. oйё «вырвать» восходит к форме *oра, но оно не родственно следующим тунгусским словам: эвен. oyu, негидальск., ульч., ул., орасск. oyu, венеск. oyu, маанькн. oyu «вырывать, рвать»; 9) долгий гласный в нанайском oйё является результатом вторичного удлинения; 10) баргуз. oро «войти», «вторгнуться» — не монгольское заимствование.

Помимо того, нельзя забывать, что постулированное исследователем родство рассматриваемого алтайского слова с индоевропейскими и дравидийскими формами само по себе требует новых гипотез.

В то же время было бы ошибкой отрицать, что эти гипотезы рождают мысли и полезны именно этим, однако всегда существует опасность, что они не помогут алтанстам обнаружить реальные связи.

Родственные ли алтайские языки генетически? После того как первоочередная, на наш взгляд, задача отграничения заимствований от общего наследия будет выполнена, появится возможность ответить на вопрос: остались ли такие алтайские соответствия, которые являются более ранними.

Алтайские Прототюрк. Протомонг. [Прототунг.

Примечания. *M ayurqat является заимствованием из ПВ *ayfr < *ay, < ay. ** M boyorla «перерезать горло, задушить» является заимствованием из ПВ boyar < boyas < boy. *** M toro «шампунь» (— ПВ to < idе) и tobra «шампунь, земля» (— *towards < to) являются заимствованиями. **** M tenggi выбор — заимствовано (— *teppa < toppa)
ними, чем древнейшие заимствования? В настоящее время было бы преждевременным отвечать определенно на этот вопрос, но не хотелось бы исключать возможность такого «остатка»; при этом следует сослаться на выше перечисленные соответствия (см. стр. 44).

Теоретически можно допустить, что: 1) такие соответствия не будут очень многочисленными; 2) соответствия будут действительны только для корневых морфем (ср. примечания *—****); 3) мы вправе предположить такие соответствия, которые не всегда согласуются с фонетическими правилами, постулированными до сих пор. Например, Т bent — М p'eki — тунг. p'eki «голова» не является «регулярным» из-за d- в тюркском.

В заключение подчеркнем: если алтайские языки генетически родственны, то доказывается это не на основании соответствий, а вопреки соответствиям, приводимым до сих пор в пользу алтайской гипотезы. Важнейшей задачей в изучении алтайских языков в историческом плане и условием для разрешения проблемы генетического родства алтайских языков является исследование исторических контактов в течение периода между началом второго тысячелетия до н. э. и началом второго тысячелетия н. э.

Перевел с английского B. О. Сергеев


5. In der Beilage sind 36 Etymologien angeführt (Nr. 18 ist ein Beispiel für späte Entlehnung). Der Vortrag faßt einige Hauptzüge der etymologischen Vergleiche zusammen.


* Ich lege hier einen kurzgefaßten Auszug meines Vortrages vor. Der vollständige Text wird in englischer Sprache an anderer Stelle veröffentlicht werden.
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Schwierigkeiten bereitet, während bei PT yēti "sieben" mit UtochB seute, TochB šukt, TochA spūt < Idg. *seput "sieben" (?) die Schwierigkeiten phonetischer Natur sind.

7. In der Liste finden wir zwei Metallnamen (Nr. 1, 35), fünf zur Großvischzucht gehörende Termini (Nr. 4, 9, 11, 12, 21, vielleicht auch 19 und 25), vier Wörter zum semantischen Bereich von „Wohnung“ (Nr. 23, 25, 27, 28) und drei mit der Jagd verbundene Ausdrücke (Nr. 15, 20, 24).

8. Von der phonetischen Seite her können wir folgende Bemerkungen machen:

8.1. Den prototürkischen Langvokalen entsprechen in drei Fällen Urtocharischer B-Diphthonge:

\[ töre \rightarrow tyere \text{ (Nr. 28)} \]
\[ tört.ı \rightarrow styer \text{ (Nr. 29)} \]
\[ söl \rightarrow sɥal \text{ (Nr. 31)} \]

Das kann man vielleicht so deuten, daß sich einige Langvokale des PT früh aus Diphthongen entwickelt haben oder daß die Langvokale des PT phonologisch mit den tocharischen Diphthongen gleichwertig waren. In drei anderen Fällen (Nr. 8, 21, 27) gehen die PT-Langvokale auf tocharische Langvokale zurück.


8.3. In Tocharisch B steht regelmäßig der Anlaut y- anstelle von Tocharisch A und Prototocharisch y-. Dieses y- findet sich in Nr. 34, 35 und 36.

8.4. Der berühmte idg. Laryngallaut, der im Hethitischen und Armenischen als ʰ im Anlaut erscheint und der im Spättocharischen noch als Langvokal und in anderen Erscheinungen nachweisbar ist, spiegelt sich in den PT-Lehnwörtern als ʰ (Nr. 7, 8, 9 und vielleicht auch Nr. 1, siehe monguörisch zarman „Gold“ < &lt; *halkan) wider. Dazu sei bemerkt, daß diese Erscheinung nicht unbedingt gegen die Annahme spricht, daß das ʰ in den altaischen Sprachen sekundär sein und sich aus *p- entwickelt haben könnte.


8.6. Der urtocharische Vokalismus ist in Nr. 3, 6, 10, 35 bewahrt, wo Tocharisch B schon eine Weiterentwicklung zeigt.

8.7. Das PT hatte im Gegensatz zum urtocharischen eine hintere und eine vordere Reihe der Vokale. In der Umgebung von Urtocharisch -k-, wo PT auch zwei k-Lauten hatte (k und q), gab es zwei Möglichkeiten. Entweder hatte PT den hinteren Vokalismus eingesetzt und das tocharische -k- durch -g- substituiert (oquz, qut), oder es hatte den -k- Laut beibehalten und dem Vokalismus angepaßt, also das Wort vordervokalisch gestaltet.
(öküz, büü). An den Beispielen Nr. 9 und 16 kann man beobachten, daß das PT beide Möglichkeiten parallel realisiert hat.

8.8. Die Konsonantenhäufung št-, st- war im Türkischen zu t- reduziert worden, weil das PT keine Doppelkonsonanten im Anlaut duldet (Nr. 27, 29).

8.9. Der stimmlose Anlautksononant p- wurde durch b- substituiert, weil das PT keinen p-Laut hatte (Nr. 8, 4, 5).

8.10. Die auslautenden Konsonantenhäufungen wurden in PT aufgelöst, und zwar mit dem Einschub eines Vokals, wie in Nr. 9, 19 und vielleicht sekiz.

9. Die phonetischen Besonderheiten der angeführten Wörter weisen klar auf eine utocharische Quelle, die Tocharisch B näher stand als Tocharisch A.

10. Einige der aufgeführten Wörter helfen uns, die strittige Frage zu lösen, ob l oder ŋ bzw. r oder z die primären Laute waren. Dazu sei bemerkt, daß dem PT-Laut š immer ein palatalisierter utocharischer S- oder z-Laut entspricht (wie auch in den türkischen Brahmi-Texten), während dem z-Laut des PT in der tocharischen Ursprache ein -s gegenübersteht:

10.1. Utocharisch koS → PT goS > Urmongolisch goS (Nr. 25)
Utocharisch peš → PT bēb > Urmong. bēl (Nr. 3)
Utocharisch peš → PT bēb > Urmong. bēl- ~ bēl- (Nr. 4)
Utocharisch kiš → PT kēl > Urmong. kēl (Nr. 15)

10.2. Utocharisch yas → PT yaz > Urmong. ḫar (Nr. 34)
Utocharisch yes → PT yez > Urmong. ḫer (Nr. 36)
Utocharisch kās → PT qäz > Urmong. qar (Nr. 24)
Utocharisch onuo → PT omuz > Urmong. omur (Nr. 19)
Utocharisch hokso → PT hoquz, höküz > Urmong. hökür (Nr. 9).

11. Zur chronologischen Seite kann folgendes gesagt werden: PT yam (Nr. 32) erscheint schon in den Topa-Glossen, die Mehrzahl der Wörter kommen im Urmongolischen (→ Urmongolisch), einige im Ursamojedischen (→ Urmongolisch), andere im Altungarischen (→ Urmongolisch) vor. Das weist auf das relativ hohe Alter der Entlehnungen hin. Zwei Wörter (Nr. 24 und 35) sind in einem noch früheren Stadium in die uralsischen Sprachen eingedrungen (uralisch *kyy "Gans" und *yes "Eisen"). Letzteres Wort ist durch südsamojedische und paläoasisatische (altkirgisische) Vermittlung ins Altmongolische gelangt (qaiu "Eisen"). Diese Angaben ermöglichen ein relatives chronologisches Netz aufzustellen:

Älteste Entlehnungen:
Prototocharisch → Uralisch

Alte Entlehnungen:
Protoch. B → Prototürkisch

Urtürkisch \\
Urbulgarisch \\
Urmongolisch \\
Altbulgarisch → Altungarisch
Späte Entlehnungen:
Tocharisch
Tocharisch A, B → Uigurisch → Mittelmongolisch.


Türkisch-tocharische Parallelen


2. PT aus(aq), aps(aq) „Espe“? – UTochB *ausa < Idg *apsā „Espe“ (PE 55), tocharisch nicht belegt.
3. PT bēš „fünf“ – UTochB *pēš „fünf“ | TochB pēš, TochA pān < PToch *pēh₂ < Idg *penkʷe (WE 90, PE 808).
5. PT bil- „wissen“ – UTochB *pel- „denken“ | TochB pāl.s.k-, pāl.s.k-, TochA pāl(t).s.k- < PToch pel.s.k- < Idg *bhel- „glänzen“ (WE 85, PE 118–119).
10. PT kele- „sprechen“ – UTochB *kālā- „hallen, nennen“ | TochAB kāl(n)-, TochB kāl(n)- „widerhallen“, TochAB kla-<, TochA kla-<...
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„melden, nennen“ < PToch *kele- < Idg *kel-, kelé- „rufen, schreien“ (WE 25, 39, PE 548–9).


12. PT keu- „kauen“ ← UTochB *keu- < Idg *g(i)eu-, *g(i)eu- „kauen“ (PE 400), tocharisch nicht belegt, oder: bu- „watsi- „essen“? (WE 133).


14. PT kert- „schneiden“ ← UTochB *kert- „schneiden“ | TochB kär.s.t- „Schwert“, TochA kär.s.t- „schneiden“, < PToch ker.s.t- < Idg *(e)ker- „schneiden“ (WE 27, PE 938, 945).


18. Uig. madar „Ungeheuer“ ← TochB mādār „Ungeheuer“, späte Entlehnung, via Uigurisch auch Mongolisch.

19. PT omuz „Schulter“ ← UTochB *omso „Schulter“ | TochB āntse, oni, TochA es < PToch *omso < Idg *om(e)so (WE 22, 82, PE 779).


23. PT qarši „Palast“ ← UTochB *karci „Palast“ | TochB kerci(ye) < PToch *keri.t- < IG ger.t- (WE 37, PE 385–6).

24. PT qāz „Gans“ ← UTochB *kāz < Idg *qāns „Gans“ (PE 412), tocharisch nicht belegt.

25. PT qos „Hütte, kleines Zelt“ ← UTochB *kös „Hütte“ | TochB kos.kiyе, kos.ko (Thomas, Elementarbuch II, 187) < PToch *keu.s.k < Idg *geu-, keu- „biegen“ (Windekers, KZ 1952, 111, PE 393; oder iranisch?).


28. **PT** tōr(e) „Ehrenplatz gegenüber der Tür“ ← UTochB *tyere „Tür“ | TochB tvere < PToch *tyere < Idg *dhū-er- (WE 144, PE 278).

29. **PT** tōr.t „vier“ ← UTochB *tyer „vier“ | TochB štver, TochA štwar < PToch *setuer < Idg *ksetuer (WE 133, PE 642).


32. **PT** yam „Weg“ ← UTochB *yam „Bahn, Pfad“ | TochA yoniya „Pfad“, TochA yəm „Spur“ < PToch ya.n < Idg *iā.n (WE 171, PE 296), cf. Skr. yāna „Pfad“.


34. **PT** yas „Sommer, Frühling“ ← UTochB *yas „Frühling“ < Idg *yes- „Frühling“ (PE 1174), tocharisch nicht belegt.


Some Problems of Uralic Vocalism from
an Altaist’s Point of View

Andrew RONA-TAS
Szeged

From the earliest times, those who have worked in the field of Altaic linguistic history have followed with the greatest interest the developments in Uralic studies. This interest has only been strengthened by the latest discussions of the problems of Uralic vocalism. I have personally learnt much from it in two respects: it was instructive from the theoretical point of view and it raised new problems in the field of the historical contacts of some Uralic and Altaic languages. Among the latter especially important are the connections of the Cheremis language with the Turkic languages of the Volga region.

It is well known that the questions of Cheremis vocalism have a key position in the recent discussions of the vocalism theories of Steinitz and Itkonen. The Common Cheremis vocalism is one of the rare points where Steinitz and Itkonen are of the same opinion. They both suppose reduced vowels there. On the other hand it has been long ago stated that the Volga Turkic (VT) languages, Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash, have reduced vowels too. The interpretation of these facts, however, gave rise to a lively discussion. Steinitz thought that the reduced vowels of Cheremis reflect an archaic state of FU vocalism. According to Itkonen these vowels are a secondary development. Décsy denied the reduced character of these vowels and interpreted them as very short (überkurz). Also Gruzov stressed that the relevant feature of these vowels is their shortness. This was denied by Itkonen. In the opinion of Steinitz the VT reduced vowels developed under Cheremis influence while Kazancev and Bereczki argued that the Cheremis reduced vowels are of Turkic (according to Bereczki, of Kipchak) origin.

Itkonen wrote: "Letzten Endes haben die Turkologen zu entscheiden, welcher Wert Bereczkis Hypothese zukommt, wonach die ischuw. Vokalreduktion auf tat. Einfluß beruhe" (UAJb. 41 1969, p. 219). I would join the discussion on this point.

What I am going to say is based on a yet unpublished monograph on the history of the Chuvash language. For the understanding of the history of the Chuvash vocalism me have to deal briefly with the system of Tatar-Bashkir vocalism. This can be outlined as follows:
We can observe here a clear shift of the whole system. The original PT opposition *open : close* has been replaced by a new one: *close : reduced*. In the meantime two old phonemes converged and a new open phoneme ą has developed. Phonetically speaking, the four vowels of the highest position of the tongue (ɨ, ɨ, ʉ, ʉ) were pushed from their earlier place of articulation by those of the lower tongue position respectively. The former close vowels became reduced in their articulation, somewhat more central and open. Their duration is shorter than the duration of those which had been originally open. This system can be observed only in the Volga-Kipchak (VK) languages (Tatar, Bashkir). In the other Kipchak languages all vowels are closer than their counterparts in other Turkic languages, the originally close vowels are somewhat more central and none of them is reduced. That means that the tongue position of the VK vowels differs essentially from that of the other Kipchak languages, and there is a difference in articulation and length.

How old is the VK system? The answer to this question is given by the Middle Mongolian (MMo) loanwords of the VK languages. These loanwords entered the VK languages after the 13th century:

- **MMo** bodune 'quail' → *bodune* > Tat buddne, Bashk biidana;
- **MMo** bdldurgence (< bdgoldurgence) 'leather handle of a whip' → *böl Durge* > Tat *büldürge* → Kazak büldürge, Kirg büldürge;
- **MMo** delbege 'reins' → *delbege* > Tat, Bashk dilbegâ;
- **MMo** dem 'help, counsel' → *dem* > Tat, Bashk dim;
- **MMo** noqta 'halter' → *noqta* > Tat, Bashk nuqta;
- **MMo** bosaya 'threshold' → bosaya > Tat, Bashk busaya.

In later loanwords the MMo vocalism is already preserved:

- **MMo** moqu- 'to be dull' → Tat moqit 'dull';
- **MMo** nöker 'consort, associate, comrade' → Bashk nöger.

This agrees with the results of Wichmann (MSFou XXXVI 1915, pp. 26, 31, 38, 48—49) according to whom the oldest Tatar loanwords in Votjak had been borrowed before the present Tatar system had developed.
We shall now move on to the Chuvash system. It is well known that the ancestors of the Chuvash, the Onogur-Bolgarian tribes came to the West about the end of the 4th century A.D. Earlier they lived in North Central Asia. According to my latest investigations the Onogur-Bolgars had before their departure to the West a close contact with the Mongolian tribes. I call this period Ancient Bolgarian (AB). The famous parallels between Chuvash and Mongolian are not a common heritage from an Altaic protolanguage as Ramstedt and Poppe suppose, but AB loanwords in Mongolian. These loanwords were borrowed during a relatively long period and during this time the vocalism of AB changed. This is reflected by the AB loanwords:

AB I. o → Mong o: PT *qoš- 'to unite' > AB *qol → Mong qolbo-;
   II. o > u → Mong u: PT *qopuz 'musical instrument' > AB *qṣur
        > *qṣur → Mong quyur;
I. ō → Mong ō: PT *ōŋūz, 'coating on the tongue, etc.' > AB
        *ǒŋur → Mong ōnggūr;
II. ō > ā → Mong ā: PT *hōkūz 'ox' > AB *hōkūr > *hūkūr → Mong
        ākūr;
I. ā → Mong ā: PT *kūzen 'weasel' > AB *kūren → Mong kūren;
II. ā > ō → Mong ō: PT *tūš 'dream' > AB *tūl > *töl → Mong
tölge 'fortune-telling';
I. e, ā → Mong e: PT *ǩaz- 'to wander' > AB *kār- → Mong
        ākār; PT *bediz 'decoration' > AB *bedir → Mong
        ābeder;
II. e, ā > ā → Mong ā: PT *ekiz 'twin, double' > AB *ekīrz >
        *ikīre → Mong īkīre; PT *kāndir 'hamp' > AB *kāndir > *kīn-
        dir → Mong *kīndir > kīnjūr 'rope'.

The developments under II were sporadic and probably dialectal but we can observe here the genesis of a process where the AB vowels became closer.

After the 4th century the Onogur-Bolgars came into contact with the Hungarians. The above-mentioned process can be followed further in the Old Bolgarian (OB) loanwords of Hungarian.

In such words as Hung ōkőr 'ox' the original OB form has been reconstructed as *ēkūr on the basis of the vocalism of this word in other Turkic languages (cf. Gombocz, BTLw., p. 111). But it is known that in Old Hungarian there prevailed a strong tendency according to which the close vowels became open ones. The present Hungarian ŏkőr goes back to an earlier ūkūr which is attested in the sources of the 13th—14th centuries. Unfortunately Ancient Hungarian had no ō and thus the ū in ūkūr can be also a substitution. But Ancient Hungarian had both the phonemes o and u. In such cases as PT bor 'wine' ~ Hungarian bor id., Hungarian had borrowed a form *bur which then developed into bor. In case of PT bors 'badger' Hungarian took over a form *burs and developed the present form borz. On the other hand the close labials have close correspondences in Hungarian. PT yůzuk 'ring' is in Hungarian győrű, PT būs 'vapour' is in Hungarian bűsz. It is not quite impossible that here we have to do with earlier Hungarian forms *győrū ⇌ OB jőrű, *bos ⇌ OB bos and we can assume a process of narrowing which was rarer in Hungarian linguistic history but which nevertheless occurred.
It seems to be very probable that the OB vowel system was not yet consistent but perhaps slightly more developed than at the end of the AB period. From this point of view we have to reconsider the question of the vocalism of the OB loanwords in Hungarian.

The developments in the Middle Bolgarian period (MB) can be first studied in the Volga-Bolgarian loanwords of Common Permic (CP). These loanwords entered CP before the CP denasalization but they cannot be earlier than the Moslem influence in the Volga region. That means that they date from the 9th—10th centuries. The process of narrowing can be observed also here: PT *qomda 'basket' > MB *xumda > CP kumda > Komi kud, Udm kudi.

Three hundred years later the Volga Bulgars came into contact with the newcomers to the region, the Tatars. The last dated source of Volga Bolgar is from 1357; the earliest inscription written in a non-Bolgarian Turkic language is from 1311—1312. The Volga Bolgar loanwords in the Volga Kipchak languages show that in the 14th—15th centuries the VK languages had already undergone this change and their vocalism has from these times remained practically the same:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Chuv</th>
<th>Anatri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*â</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*õ</td>
<td>*û</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*ä</td>
<td>ä</td>
<td>ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*û</td>
<td>*ê</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td>ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*ö</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>Õ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ã</td>
<td>*â</td>
<td>â</td>
<td>â</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*å</td>
<td>*ô</td>
<td>à</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ã</td>
<td>*ô</td>
<td>â</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this scheme that the MB system was the same as the present VK system. In other words, the VK system preserved the MB stage of the history of the Chuvash vocalism. The modern Chuvash development went further. In Virjal there occurred a second narrowing
(\(\ast \ddot{a} > o, \ast o > u > \ddot{a}, \ast \dddot{a} > \ddot{u} > \dddot{a}\)), and in Anatri a third one (\(\ast o > u, \ast \dddot{a} > \ddot{a}, \ast \dddot{a} > \ddot{e}\)).

In this connection I think the statements of Itkonen are proved when he wrote: “Es dürfte wohl nichts der Annahme entgegenstehen, dass die tshuw. reduzierten Vokale ein bulgarisches Erbe wären... Falls es also im Bolgarischen schon ca. im 11.—12. Jh. reduzierte Vokale gab, lässt sich denken, dass sie damals aufgrund der vorhandenen Kontakte auch in alle kiptschakischen [I would say: Wolga-Kiptschakischen] Sprachen gelangen konnten” (UAJb. 41 1969, p. 219).

Confronted with these facts we have to decide the question of the origin of the reduced vowels in Cheremis. This has to be done by experts in Uralic studies but I wonder whether there can be another solution than that the reduced vowels in the Volga region are of Middle Bolgarian origin. Here I would draw attention only to three points:

1) Most of the Chuvash loanwords in Cheremis were borrowed at a time when the Cheremis dialects already existed in some measure. The loanwords entered one dialect and spread from it gradually over the Cheremis territory. This can be one of the causes of the variegated Cheremis dialectal representations of the Chuvash vowels.

2) In Chuvash there were two, chronologically different, processes of reduction: an earlier reduction of the originally close vowels and later a second one of the secondary close vowels.

3) There is a difference in Chuvash between the reduced vowels in stressed and unstressed syllables. In the stressed position the reduced vowels have a more perfect articulation than in the unstressed syllables. But in both cases they are shorter and more central than the full vowels. There is stress on a reduced vowel only if there is no full vowel in the word. In case of suffixes with a full vowel, the stress moves to the latter even if the stem has no full vowel, e.g. \(\ddot{s}ääk\ddot{l}ä\)'having an opening' with the stress on the first syllable, but \(\ddot{s}ääk\ddot{l}ä\)'to make an opening' with the stress on the full vowel of the last syllable.
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Böz in the Altaic World

According to an earlier suggestion of Pelliot now made plausible by Ecsedy, the Chinese transcriptions p'o 蓬 ~ po 蓬 denoting a kind of linen cloth and given by the Turk kagan Tu-lan to the Chinese court as a gift in 588, is reflecting the word böz. This Altaic word had been connected long ago with Greek βοισος. The history of this word is important because it reflects the role played by the Altaic people in the early connections between China and the Western World. Two questions, however, have to be solved: What did the word actually denote, and how old is it in the Altaic languages?

1. The earliest occurrences of the word can be found in the Uigur monuments. In a Buddhist text published by F. W. K. Müller (Uigurica II p. 70 ll. 4—5) we read that one has to write the sacred text . . . toz-ta, yapirqaq-ta, kádá-ta, böz-ta, ban-ta . . . , i.e., "on birch-bark, (palm)-leaves, paper, böz and (wooden writing) tablet". F. W. K. Müller translated böz as "Baumwolle" and Sir Gerard Clausen (EDPCT 389) as "cotton cloth". In the Chinese text from which the Uigur text has been freely translated, we find only three names of material: hua-p'i 花皮 "birch bark"3, po-tieh 白絹 "white cloth"4, and shu-p'i 舒皮 "the bark of a tree"5. It is highly probable that böz of the Uigur text is a rendering of the Chinese po-tieh, but due to the fact that, in this case, we do not have to deal with a verbatim trans-

---

1 See the paper of H. Ecsedy above. On our teamwork see her note 1.
2 W. Bang, in: APAW 1921, 14.
3 Hua is translated in Matthews' Chinese-English Dictionary No 2219 as "a kind of birch found in Manchuria".
4 On po-tieh see the paper of Ecsedy above, pp. 149—150 and Hamilton, in: BSOAS 31 [1968], 332, 333.
5 I do not understand why there is made a difference between the two kinds of bark while there is no mention of paper, palm-leaves and the wooden tablet ban which is a Chinese loanword in Uigur. On the latter see Sir Gerard Clausen's excellent new etymological dictionary: An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish, Oxford 1972 (= EDPCT), 346. In any case the Chinese text seems to be corrupt and only po-tieh and böz correspond, which can also be due to the fact that the Uigur translator had another Chinese text before him, and/or he translated it very freely.
lation, the only certainty we can gain is that böz denoted in this text a material on which one could write and which was most likely of white colour.

In another text which is a translation of letters written to and by Hsüan-tsang (d. 664) we again encounter the word böz. From a letter of Jñānaprabha from Middle-India we learn that he sent a poem on the Ṛgveda with two böz (ll. 1809–1810: riśīvīd śok iki böz bīrlā) which had been acknowledged by Hsüan-tsang in his answer (ll. 2047–2052): yana īki böz, bīr gap riśīvid sudur sōkin ītim īsī tāqdi, “further your dispatch of two böz and one bundle of Ṛgveda-sudur poems reached me”. The Chinese original has in the first case tieh, in the second po-tieh. I do not think that this text is giving an argument in favour of böz being fabricated in and imported from India: The Uigur translation is at least two hundred years younger than the Chinese original,7 and the Uigur translator simply rendered the Chinese word with an Uigur one which he thought to be equivalent in his time. Yet it seems to be highly probable that böz for the Uigur translator was the name of a kind of valuable cloth suitable for a gift given by distinguished people to people of a similar social status.

A very interesting passage of the Uigur Sākiz yūkmāk8 gives some more hints as to the nature of böz. I quote here the translation of Bang-Gabain-Rachmati: „Wie auf dieser Welt (l. 391) die Kette und der Schuß beide längs und quer gehend sich bindend zu Seide (torqu), Brokat (eśgirti), Baumwollzeug (böz) (l. 392) usw., (d. h.) zu einer Materie werden und den Wesen Kleidung (Hend.) und andere Vorteile bietet, (l. 393) so werden auch die Lebewesen — indem die in diesem Sūtra befindlichen achterlei Bewußtseinsarten die Kette (l. 394) und das Glanz-Wissen (skr. amala-vijnāna?) der Einschlag (Schuß) sind und sich ständig binden — verstehend, (l. 395) begreifend und wissend den Buddha-Weg betreten und (anderen) Vorteil bringen“ (op. cit. 139). Böz is here a material which is like silk and brocade and woven with woof and warp. It was used for clothing and “other benefits” and must have been a kind of valuable material. But — at least for the translator — it was already not an exotic kind of cloth whose technique of manufacturing should be miraculous to him.

An Uigur medical text advises those who have a tooth-ache9 to put the following things in a small bag made of böz (böz gapčuy-ta): dung of a black ox cooked with vinegar and dung of a camel of the salty meadows (mixed)

---

8 W. Bang-A. von Gabain-G. R. Rachmati, Das buddhistische Sūtra Sākiz Yūkmāk, in: SPAW 1934, 138 there written turqu, ḫēkirti. The Mongolian and Tibetan parallel texts at my disposal do not contain this passage. But in case there should be such texts it would be irrelevant for our purposes, since they would reflect the Chinese original.
with reddish salt. These had to be ground, mixed with wine, and then warmed in a pot. Finally the whole bag had to be treated with the oil of sesame-seeds and put on the aching tooth. At the times when this text was written böz had already been a kind of material common enough for use in everyday life. It could not have been woven very loosely since otherwise it would not have been suitable to put the böz-bag with its contents into the mouth.

In the Uigur version of the legend of the princes Kalyânaipkara and Pâpaipkara this word also seems to occur. In the text transcribed by Hamilton we read: èmâr  tànlîy-ìar àyïràr âyîr  àyïràr  yuy àjj irdr  kentir àyïràr: böz bertâtip qare loqîyur taqï yemd adruq unlar kanîi kântu uz ìskâyûr. Huart read èfîqri and translated it as «rouet» while Pelliot supposed a name of a textile unknown to him and preferred the reading èfayay. Sir Gerard Clauson (EDPCT 412) writes: “The context indicates that it means some kind of textile fibre. Perhaps survives in SE Türkî çîge 'wild hemp, a cord made of wild hemp'.” The cited Uigur word is back-vocalic, the Turkic is front-vocalic. Hamilton is turning back to Huart's translation and quotes an inedited Tun-huang MS. where èkki èyîr-i böz is mentioned which Hamilton translated as «deux pièces de toile (tissée avec des fils filés) au rouet». The word èyîr has been translated by Pelliot as «cotton», while by Hamilton as «laine». Kâyîrî knows both meanings, in Uigur texts èyîr is also disseminated (tort-), therefore it is difficult to decide whether we are dealing here with wool or cotton. Its original meaning was “down, soft feather” and it has been only secondarily extended to new materials sim-


11 I should like to quote here only New Uigur ìyî “to tie together (with a knot), to plait, to weave”, ìyî, èyîk, èyîdı “knot”, èyîg “cord”, see also M. Räsänen, Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türkischen, Helsinki 1969, 110 (= EtWb) where the verb ìyî and the noun ìyîd “Pflanzenfasern, wilder Hanf, Bindfaden” are separated.

12 The early occurrences of the meaning “feather” are quoted in EDPCT 910, 941. Sir Gerard supposes a contamination between èyîg “wool” and ìyîg “feather” while Räsänen (EtWb 211) lists the two words under one heading. I think in this case Räsänen is right. The Chuvash word ìyîd “hair” cannot be the continuation of ìyî as it is commonly thought (so Räsänen EtWb 391; Egorov, Etimologischeskij slovar' čuvâskogo jazyka 224) but reflects an earlier ìâl, see Kâyîrî yâlî “fine goat’s hair”. The Soyot ìyîm, Altaï ìyum, ìüm, “feather, down, animal hair” point to a PT ìyîg ~ èyîg. The word has an extensive family and yümäq “soft” also pertains here. It is a derivation from ìyîm “wool” and is thought to mean “animal hair — soft”. The latter figures in the compound ìm kaiyk(ä) “name of several birds of prey” and denotes “feather(ed)”. Kâyîk in PT kaiyk “wild animal” which became later in Chuvash “bird” from the compound “feather(ed animal)”. The original meaning of kaiyk is preserved in many other compounds as, e.g., kaiyk ìnome “bear, wild pig”. Another word for “wool” is ìk < PT ìk. This word also has the meaning “feather” in Chuvash and in many other Turkic languages (see the data in Räsänen EtWb 503). As a semantical parallel to “feather — animal hair — soft” see also Chinese ìt'û “the fine hair on
ilar to it: wool and cotton. It is evident that the meaning “wool” became established with the nomads and entered the Mongolian language. The puzzle of the word read by Pelliot as *qar(i)š* was solved by Hamilton, who corrected the reading to *qarə*, fixing its meaning and the history of the word. The word read by Hamilton as *bərtətip* had been transcribed by Pelliot as *butətp*, by Clauson as *bodut*. Pelliot was uncertain of the translation, Clauson suggested “having dyed”. In the facsimile I do not see the *r*, it is either *b't'tp* or perhaps *burt'p* (the ligated *waw* would be in this case unusually small). Perhaps the expression has to be read as *bəz butətip* *qarə taqiyur* “have produced a *bəz* and weaved a *qarə*” where *bətiu*—would be the causative of *bət*—“to bring to an end, make, produce etc.”. In any case, if this word has to be read as *bəz*—which seems certain—it was in some relation to *qarə*.

From a late Uigur document (USp 73: 4, EDPCT 390) we learn that a slave-smith (*temirēi qaraboS*) and a female slave *bəzī* (*ebēi qaraboS bəzī*) got married. It is sure that *bəzī* is here “cotton cloth weaver” and not “seller of *bəz*”, the former is the meaning of the word not only in Sanglax quoted by EDPCT but also in Modern Kirgiz. Definitely in this case and perhaps also in the former one, we already meet with the fabrication of *bəz*. It became a common material.

In texts of the 11—13th centuries *bəz* denoted among others a material for a shroud (cf. Qutadyu Bilig, Yugnaki, Nahu'l-Faradis quoted by EDPCT 389, DTS 97 and Fazylov Starouzbekskij jazyk I, 269). This fact is very interesting, because, according to L. Kâkosy, the word ultimately originated from Old Egyptian and denoted there a “whitish-green material used for wrapping the corpse for mumification”.

In the modern languages *bəz* denotes a kind of coarse cotton. In most of the Turkic-Russian dictionaries it is rendered with “bjaz” which itself is the same word occurring first in 1589 in the Russian sources, and denoting “cotton cloth or material from Persia or Buchara”. In some other Turkic animals, the down on birds. Downy, soft” (Mathews No 6883). See Ecsedy’s paper above, note 20.

13 There are two Mongolian words for “wool”: *noyosun* and *ungyasun*. The two words are synonymous (cf. A. Róna-Tas, Feltmaking in Mongolia, in: AOH 16 [1963], 200) and of the same origin: *noyosun < nungyasun > ungyasun*, and this doublet pertains to Turkic *yug*. The Mongolian words do not have the meaning “feather”, which is a semantical argument in favour of its being a Turkic loan word in Mongolian. The original Mongolian word for “feather” is *hēdun ~ hōdun*. It is a problem to be investigated whether it has anything to do with *hūsūn* “hair”?

14 J. Hamilton-N. Beldiceanu, Recherches autour de *gara*, nom d’une étoffe de poil, in: BSOAS 31 [1969], 330—346. This very interesting paper gave much inspiration to our work.

15 Here I refer to an unpublished paper of L. Kâkosy.

16 Cf. M. Faenner, Etimologičeski slovar’ russkogo jazyka 1, Moscow 1964, 261.
Böz in the Altaic World

dictionaries (e.g., Kirgiz, Türkmen, New Uigur) it is defined as "mata", "a kind of home-manufactured coarse cotton cloth". In Hakass it is a generic name for textiles, cloths.

I think that the above data give some hints to the history of the semantical side of the word. The phonetical side will offer some conclusions for its chronology.

2.

The first problem which has to be investigated in connection with the phonetical problems of the history of the word böz is its representation in Chuvash. It has long been known that the Chuvash word pir "cholst, polotno; linen" is the same word according to its origin as böz. Since here a Chuvash -r corresponds to -z in other Turkic languages the word is of special importance. If -z has been in such cases the original sound and -r is secondary in Chuvash as it is supposed with good reason by some scholars then it could be argued that böz had entered Chuvash before the z > r development. This would be of mutual importance both for the history of the word böz and for the history of the z > r development. Benzing supposed that böz is a relatively late loanword in Turkic, and thus he found a chronological basis for his assumption that z > r occurred late in the history of Chuvash: first the original intervocalic -d- became -d- and -z- and then both this and the original -z- became r.10 Biišev has correctly pointed out that the development z > r and d (d) > z > r have occurred in different times, the second not earlier than the 11th–12th centuries, the former already in Proto-Turkic times. This is also clear from the Old Chuvash loanwords in Hungarian where Turkic z is r, but Turkic d is d and z,20 never r. For r we have the earliest data from 1230.21 Now we have two possibilities: the word böz

17 Cf. H. Paasonen, Csuvus szójegyzék, Budapest 1908, 103; Egorov, Étimológiai szlovár 161.
18 As I tried elsewhere to point out the essence of the question of the so-called rhotazism is not the quality of the original sounds X1 > r and X2 > z but the fact that in Chuvash the opposition X1: X2 disappeared and also does not exist in Mongolian (cf. Acta Orientalia Havniae 32 [1970], 229; Studia Turica, Budapest 1971, 396).
19 J. Benzing, Tschuwaschische Forschungen II, in: ZDMG 94 [1940], 391–398. On p. 398 we read: "Wir kommen somit zum Ergebnis, daß im Alttschuwaschischen das alte urtürkische σ als z ausgesprochen worden sein muß (bzw. sich im Lauf dieser Sprachperiode in z verwandelt hat) und daß sowohl dieses σ wie auch das ursprüngliche z gemeinsam zu r verschoben wurden."
21 Cf. Markwart in: UJB 9 [1929], 79–81 on the Russian transcription of the Volga Bulgarian turun ~ tudun already discovered by Munkácsi in 1903.
böz entered into the Turkic languages in Proto-Turkic times, at least before the Chuvash z > r development, or it was borrowed by Chuvash at a much later time, just when the original d was already a spirant d or even z, but before it became -r. I should exclude the first possibility because of the vocalism of the word. The Chuvash -i- can go back to a former e, but an original -d- (short or long) would never become an -i- in Chuvash. Thus the Chuvash word is reflecting an original form -bêz which can be found first in the work of Yugnaki (13th century, in copies of the 15th century) and in the Tarfuman turki of 1343. This form coexists with böz in many recent dialects, e.g., in Tatar, Bashkir, Salar, and the form with -e- is the common in the most Oghuz languages. The form with -e- is certainly of Arabic origin, where it is bazz, and we have no reason to suppose an Arabic loanword in Proto-Turkic times. On the other hand, we know that the Arabs and the Arabic language exercised a great influence on the Volga Bulgars, i.e., the close relatives of the Chuvash from the end of the 9th century on, i.e., just in the period when the original -d- had already changed into a spirant, but had not yet become -r. This case is parallel to the history of the Persian word adiná “Friday” which is on a Volga Bulgarian inscription of 1316 already arnt, and in Modern Chuvash erne.

Pir is not the only Chuvash word connected with böz, and this has been overlooked still now. We also find a form pit in such words as kàlampit, kàlampit (Aâm. VII, 111), kàlampit, kàlampit (Paas) and as a loanword Mishër kàlampit (cf. Paasonen; Râsanen EtWb 259). The word has several other dialectal forms as kàlampi (Aâm. VI, 39), kà lak pir, kàtan pir (Aâm. VI, 157), kàtan pîr, kàtan pîr (Sergeev, Slovar’ suvaâskich narodnych govorov, Materialy po suvaâskoj dialektologii IV, Ćeboksary 1971). The first word is Arabic كتان kàtan “flax”, Turkic kàtan, and the second is our word. In case of the form pit -i is a substitution for a sound which was not part of the Chuvash phonological system when the word was borrowed. This leads us to the assumption that the original sound which later developed...
into r had been substituted by Chuvash with the two phonemes nearest to it.

Chuvash later borrowed the word once more in the form pQs. This form came from Tatar bUz, and it denotes in Chuvash "mitkal, kolenkor; calico".

There is also a fourth form in Chuvash. We find the following dialectal forms: pisi, pitiki, pitiikk, pitiixi, piti (Ašm. IX, 235—236), pitiixi (Paasonen, P. Sp), pitiixi (Sirotkin), pitiixxi, piti, pitiki, pitixxi, piti, pitiki, pitixxi (Sergeev 98). The word denotes "girdle" and is a compound. The second part is most probably *tāi "tie", and the first is our word. The compound can be analysed as *pudi+tāx+t, a haplological form with a possessive suffix as ēneri "colostrum" from ēne irri (ēes + ira+i). The various dialectal forms are due to assimilations. The form *pudi is reflecting an original form *bēze, i.e., a di syllabic form. There is no disyllabic form in Turkic, but we can find it in the other Altaic language groups.

The earliest Mongolian data for bēz can be found in the Tarjuman (1345) in the Turkic form bōs, and in Ibn Muhanna (first half of the 14th century) as biż. In the Hua yi yi yu (1388—1389) we come across the Mongolian form bōs where Mongolian final -s is a substitution for Turkic -z absent from the Mongolian phonological system. Its meaning is "textile, linen, cotton, a material for making clothes". There is also another Mongolian word bā@c with the meaning "girdle (worn around outer garments and made of textiles)". The semantic differentiation of the monosyllabic and disyllabic forms in Mongolian is secondary and relatively late. The disyllabic word occurs first in the Secret History, it can also be found in Ibn Muhanna as biż, in the Hua yi yi yu, in Mukaddimat al-Adab and in the Vocabulary of Istanbul. The dialects show a variegated picture: Khalkha bōs, bā@c "cloth", bā@ (en) "girdle", Ordos bōs, bā@c "cloth", bās "girdle", Buriat bāz "cloth", bāhec "girdle", Mogol bāz "linen, cotton", Dahur bās (Martin), bār (Poppe) "cloth", bā@, bās (Poppe), pīza, bīc (Ivanovskij) "girdle", Tungshiang bōs "cloth", pide "girdle", Monguor bōs, bāc "cloth", pūdzē "girdle", Shera Yūgur pse (Mannerheim), bōs (Malov) "girdle".

The older form is the disyllabic one which came into contamination with the later monosyllabic form. This fact can be seen in the Manchu-Tungalian data. The oldest form can be found in Jurchen as bās (Grube 559), and it occurs in Manchu as bōs, in Nanaj as bōs, in Ulica as būs, in Oroch as būs, in Orok as būs, in Solon we find only bāsede- "to encircle", in Negidal bās, bāsēk, in the Evenki dialects bāse, bāhe. In Jurchen, Manchu

20 Long PT ă is sometimes u in Chuvash, cf. kūn "day" (the length is preserved only in West Osquami) > Volga Bulgarian küsen (kūes) > Chuvash kūn.

For the (secondary) length of biż see Turkmen bīz.

21 L. Ligeti, Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanboul, in: AOH 14 [1962]; 23 in this and in Ligeti's other works (AOH 4 [1956], 124—127, ib. 7 [1957], 111—113, ib. 13 [1962], 202—204) see the bibliography of the relevant sources.
and the Southern Manchu-Tunguzian dialects the meaning of the word is “linen, cotton cloth”, in the Northern Manchu-Tunguzian dialects it is in Negidal “linen” and in Evenki “girdle”, here also pertains the Solon data. The Southern Manchu-Tunguzian words preserved an earlier Mongolian form and meaning while the Northern dialects reflect the more recent Mongolian development.

These facts lead us to conclude that in the Altaic world we have to deal with at least two forms, a monosyllabic one (Turkic böz, bez) and a disyllabic one (Chuvash puse, Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguzian bāse, bāsū, böe) while both Chuvash (pir, pit, pūs) and Mongolian (būs, būs) have the monosyllabic forms as later loanwords.

The historical relationship between the mono- and disyllabic forms are of great importance, because it is a well-known fact that we find a series of words where Turkic has monosyllables (kök “blue”, ikiz “double, twins”) and Mongolian disyllables (kūke, ikire). Since here we have an undoubtedly foreign word it would not seem hopeless that this loanword can help us solve the debated question of the so-called Mongolian “plus vowel”. But this is only the case if we are dealing with one and the same word.

As we have seen the monosyllabic form is documented from the 6th century in the Chinese sources. This form could already be of Arabic origin which had been monosyllabic. The disyllabic form seems to be older. In cases before the 6th century we have to look for other non-Altaic languages. In the Semitic world the word is very old. It will be the task of scholars in Semitic studies to investigate the history of the word; I should like to quote here only the most important data: Akkadian bāṣu, Middle Hebrew, Phoenician bāṣ, Old South Arabic bāṣ, Arabic bāṣṣ, Arameic bāṣ ā (W. Baumgartner, Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon, Leiden 1967, 111 b), Syriac bāṣa (acc. bāṣu) (C. Brockelmann, Lexikon Syriacum, Halle 1928). There also exists a modern Arabic form bāṣā (Vollers, ZDMG 51 [1897], 293) which seems to be — as Ethiopian bāṣās — a reloan from Greek. The earliest Greek data is from the 6th century B. C. and is of West Semitic origin.

From the above two languages can be taken into account: Syriac and Greek. The Greek form definitely reflects an originally non-Greek word, but it is uncertain whether it had been monosyllabic (býsa) or disyllabic (byso or similar), both would have been adapted into the Greek system as byssos. Syriac had a disyllabic form. Syriac merchants and missionaries

28 For the Manchu-Tunguzian data I have also used the manuscript of the new comparative dictionary of the Manchu-Tunguzian languages compiled under the direction of V. I. Cinciua, Leningrad. This highly important work is in print, and its first volume will appear soon.

29 I have to offer my sincere thanks to H. Eosedy for checking the Chinese and to K. Czeglédy for his help in finding the Semitic data. Laufer, Sino-Iranica 674, wrote that the word is absent from the Iranian languages. This has to be reexamined.
reached China in the 6th century or earlier and had close contact with the rising power of the Turkic tribes. From the phonetic point of view the Syriac form appears more likely to be the original form, but there must be further studies to solve this problem.

It cannot be excluded that we have to deal with three original forms. It seems to be unlikely that the labial vowel of *bōz* is due to an internal Turkic development, though also we have to take into account this possibility. Since the Arabic form appears with an illabial vowel, the monosyllabic form with a labial vowel could then only be of Greek origin. Were this so, then only the Syriac form remains as a possible candidate for the origin of the disyllabic form. In this case we were confronted with a historical contamination of three different forms of the same original: Syriac *būs*, Greek *bûs* and Arabic *bazz*. This might then have caused the semantic variety of the word-group. *Bōz* denoted in Turkic a valuable textile of foreign origin. From the 8th century on it became a term of fine and later of coarse cotton cloth. It also denoted linen and girdle made of these materials.
The inscription which I shall discuss has been known for more than eighty years. In 1894 on behalf of the Society of Archeology, History and Ethnography of the Imperial University, Kazan, G. Achmarov conducted a series of archeological researches in the SE parts of the Kazan Province. In the course of his field-work he found and copied new Volga Bulgarian inscriptions. Ashmarin got his report in manuscript and used its material for his book *Bolgarija* published in 1902. Among the inscriptions found by Achmarov there were three inscriptions located by him to a Tatar village called by him Täb bilgi. Ashmarin quoted one of the three texts as follows: «Sud Bogu Vsevyšnemu, Velikomu. Syn Iljasova Ismagilova syna Muchammed. Milostj Boga emu, milostj širokaja. God 760 . . . mesjaca . . .». Ashmarin corrected Achmarov's translation: «Sud (prinadležit) Bogu Vsevyšnemu, Velikomu. Pamjačnik Muchammeda, syna Ismaila, syna Iljasasa, (Da budet) nad nim milostj Božija milostiju širokogo. Poločišleniju 706 goda . . . mesjaca (prestavljena?) . . .». Without having seen the original Ashmarin also corrected some of Achmarov's readings.

Achmarov: "ego znak"  
Ashmarin: "šestoj"  
He added that the word written by Achmarov as *izraz* in the eighth line reminds him of the word *izr* of the inscription of Tetjuši, but he was unable to decipher this word and the last line remained entirely unintelligible for him.

Achmarov in his book *Bulgær tarihi*, Kazan 1908, edited the inscription for the second time. There are some corrections in the revised text:

---

1 Ashmarin, op. cit., pp. 95—98.
2 . . . smysl štoj stroki, tak že, kak i poslednej, ostaje soveršeno zagadočnymy (p. 96).
As we shall see Aohmarov's corrections were mostly wrong and were carried out without a second study of the original.

The inscription has become known through Ashmarin's book and some of the words have been quoted by the later literature. As in many other cases the wrong readings wandered from one publication to the next. Having no access to a reliable print or photo I included this inscription among the non authenticated inscriptions in Epigraphica Bulgaria under No. IV.

In 1973 I had the opportunity to investigate the Volga Bulgarian (VB) inscriptions in the Chuvash ASR and the Tatar ASSR. In Kazan, thanks to the generosity of the Kazan Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences I could work through the archives of the Institute of Language, Literature and History. In the Archives I found an excellent photo of the inscription made presumably by G.V. Jusupov. Coming back from Kazan in Moscow I got hold of the latest volume of Epigrafika Vostoka XXI where the untimely deceased excellent Tatar scholar G.V. Jusupov published a series of inscriptions collected by him during an expedition of the Kazan Institute in the years 1961—1963. Jusupov republished here the above mentioned inscription without referring to the fact that this had been done earlier by Ashmarin and Aohmarov. He quotes, however, some of the readings by Aohmarov.

Jusupov's edition is superior to the former ones. He gives the name of the village as Tjaiberdino, in Tatar Räjäb and adds that Täb bilige is the name of the cemetery. He had also recognized that this inscription contains something which is unique among the hitherto known inscriptions. He writes: «V posled-

---

1 Rôna-Tas A.—Fodor B., Epigraphica Bulgarica: Studia Uralo-Altaica I (Szeged 1979), p. 166 (Further EB).
2 I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the direction of the Institute and especially to A. Ch. Chalklov for their kind and effective help.
3 Unfortunately also here some error has crept in. Jusupov (Ep. Vost. XXI, p. 51) locates Tjaiberdino, Tatar Räjäb into the Kujbyšev rayon. Tjaiberdino is in fact in the Aljkoovo rayon. The Tatar village Räjäb is called otherwise Staryj Baran and is in the Kujbyšev rayon (I quote a letter of A. Ch. Chalklov, dated 2nd March, 1975). Thus it remains an open question whether the inscription is in Tjaiberdino (Aljkoovo) or Räjäb — Staryj Baran (Kujbyšev). On the term täb bilgi see also Jusupov, Vvedenie v bulgara-tatarskuju epigrafiku, M.-L. 1980, p. 98.
nich strokach teksta my vpervye sredi mnogich bulgarskich epifastij vstre-
cham drevnebulgarskuju frazu, but he adds: soetdelnye slova kotoroj ne sob-
seme eshe ponjatny, poetomu perevod ee dastaja predpolozi telno. The main
deficiency of Jusupov’s publication is that he did not publish the original
and thus his readings could not be checked or verified. Not being a linguist
Jusupov made practically no comment: on this important inscription and my
aim is here to evaluate it from the linguistic point of view. In the notes to the
text in Arabic and the translation I indicate those places where I differ from
Jusupov in my readings, interpretation or translation.

The text and its translation are as follows:

1. al-hukmu li-l-lahi-l-'aliyyi-l-kabiri
2. Elyâs awi Ismâ’îl
3. awi Muhamad belawi k4
4. rahmatu-l-lahi ‘alayhi rahmatan
5. waâ’i’tan târif-a fiyet ‘ell
6. fi-r âlidi fâl gâl-gâl-dâ
7. ayyhi iâne e10 ci,21 č’rimage
8. šiune barsa veli

Jusupov has keera beneath the alif but I do not see it and an i- is very unlikely
here. Cf. ci.

Jusupov has Allah but I do not see the dama on the bâ.

There is a clear dot beneath the râ noted by Jusupov. In the case of kabiri
and rahmatu it is impossible to decide whether there is a dot or not beneath the râ.

Fatâba above sahe, keera and three dots beneath sin are not noted by Jusupov.

The dot beneath râ is not noted by Jusupov.

The place is somewhat damaged, the dot registered by Jusupov beneath f’m
is illegible, and so are the dots beneath y’d and keera beneath râ. But the fatâba on y’d
is good visible though not noted by Jusupov.

Jusupov has jâ. The fatâba is surely a misprint, since he correctly translated
thousand. There is no dot on the râ, i.e. it is not zdy. The line begins with the usual small
triangle characteristic to VB kâf (see Paleographical remarks). If this were a dot it would
have been placed higher. There is, however, a dot beneath râ noted by Jusupov.

The dot beneath f’m is not noted by Jusupov.

It is difficult to read the word. Jusupov gives [la]. This word occurs twice
in the authentically edited VB inscriptions EB 25 : 7 (EB 25) and EB 44 : 2 (EB 44).

Though the sofe is not very clear in this inscription it is the only possible reading. I do
not see the dots on qâf indicated by Jusupov, but the place is somewhat damaged and
perhaps a fatâba can be read. There is a dot beneath the ‘ain.

Jusupov did not indicate the fatâba and keera.

Jusupov gives ḫâ. I.e. ḫâ. There is no hamza but only keera beneath alif.
The nun clearly has its dot above and fatâba on the nun is clearly visible. There is no dot
1. The judgment belongs to God the Most High, the Great
2. Elyfis son Isma'il's
3. son Muḥammad's (sepulchral) monument (is) this.
4. The mercy of God, be upon him with mercy
5. abundant. According to history seven
6. hundred sixth year in the gu-l-qa'da
7. month (it) was. To the Čerimsen
8. river having gone, (he) died.23

Paleographical remarks

The inscription is written in the style which I call VB kufi. This style is
connected with the earliest phase of the history of the kufi style24 which later
developed into a decorative art of writing. The primitive variant of kufi has
been preserved mostly in the outlying provinces of the Muslim world. It is
adapted to the necessities of carving into stone, hence its lines are, where pos-
sible, straight. In the VB region a special variant of this style developed. Similar
inscriptions can be seen in Jusupov's Vvedenie Nos 14, 18, 10, 20 etc. The «heads»
of wāw is almost triangular, the independently written yā has a horizontal
stroke which is continued by a line leaning somewhat backwards thus resembling
an angle. The perpendicular lines of sin are straight, the one on the right is
somewhat longer and leaning a bit forward. The letter kāf has the special kufi
form sometimes very similar to the independent yā used in other styles but
never goes below the line. The oblique initial line of the initial fīm is short.
The letter dāl and some other letters have a small triangular «heads».

beneath the nūn. In this case Achrmarov and Ashmarin read the word almost correctly.
The final nūn has here its kāfis form, very common in other inscriptions, and in the same
form as in the words Čerimsen and Čerims in our inscription, where also Jusupov read -n.
23 Jusupov reads: (1) جرمسن. The dot and the keera beneath rā are clearly visible.
Above the initial fīm the space is somewhat damaged. The three dots beneath sin are
clearly visible, see the copy.
22 The three dots beneath sin and the dot beneath rā are not noted by Jusupov,
but see the photocopy.
21 Written fīm.
20 On fīm see p. 163 below.
19 Written ef.
18 Jusupov put the fatḥa on the lām though it is clearly on wāw.
17 Jusupov adds: (p. 52) «После даты جرمسن fraza načinaetaja slovom Čerims, (sic,
with -s), nazvaniem r(eki) Čerimsan (po-tatarski Čermešan) schodnym
s nazvaniem r(eki) Čermas (v zapadnoj Baškirii)».
16 See A. Grohmann, Arabische paläographie I—II, Österreichische Akademie der
Orthographical remarks

The very carefully written text has some orthographical peculiarities more or less in common with other inscriptions. The most important of them is the dot put beneath the letter ī. This shows that there was a special need in the VB territory to distinguish among the letters zayn Ẓ and ī to assure the correct reading. In an area, where two linguistic groups lived together with languages in which the distinction between e.g. sekiz and sekir was a question of ethnical identity, this orthographical usage has been of essential importance.

A similar procedure can be observed in the distinction between the letters rendering s and d. The letter ẓin has the usual three dots above, but the letter sin is especially marked by three dots beneath the letter ḫ. There have been some speculations about the meaning of these dots beneath, but since they occur in Arabic words as well,25 I see here a clear parallel to the distinction of z versus r. In the two languages such word pairs as sārī and sārī yellow, whites were important for the ethnical differentiation. It is also relevant that the system is the same. In the first case the dot above was placed beneath to distinguish the letter, in the second case the three dots were used in the same way for the same purpose.

In the VB inscriptions there were consequently used some letters denoting consonants. In those cases where Arabic had the so called emphatic consonants and Turkish had consonants near to their Arabic pronunciation, the Arabic emphatic consonant letters were used in back vocalic words — a usage which can be observed also in other Middle Turkish texts.26 This orthographical usage

25 See Elyas, Isma’il and was’at in our text.
26 On this usage of the emphatic consonants in Kipchak texts see S. Telegdi: KÖA Ergänzungsbänd, 1935—1939, pp. 287—288. According to O. Pritsak (Fundamenta I, p. 77) in the Mamluk-Kipchak orthography the emphatic consonants were also used to differentiate between the pairs a : ā, o : ō, ẓ : ẓ, ḫ : ḫ as e.g. by Abū Ḥayyān and the al-Qawānī. In the Tarjumān, 1343, published by Houtema and republished by Kuryshanov the emphatic consonants are only used in back-vocalic words, but there inconsistently e.g. جم: ẓopuql earth but طوق: ẓopuq ankle-bone, زم: ẓurma radish, but طم: ẓurma crane. A similar picture can be found also in the Khwarezmian orthography. The usage of the emphatic consonants in back-vocalic words is known also in the Osman-Turkish texts. I have no place to go in to details here but I would like to mention that in those epigraphical monuments of the Volga region which were written in the literary language of the same period or later, this usage of the emphatic consonants is absent. Only in one of the earliest inscriptions (Bolšie Tarchani 1314) do we find ẓalūndī (see Jumptov, Vvedenie (No. 12 : 12). Otherwise we find ẓalūndī goldsmiths (Bolgari 1317, ibid, No. 15 : 5) ژل ژئ: ẓalūndī thirty (Museum of Kazan, 1383, B. Nyrey 1399, Jumptov, op. cit., No. 45), ژل: ẓalūndī sixty (B. Nyrey 1399) in contrast to VB ژئ: ẓalūndī in our text. That means that there was not only a difference in the languages of the two types of the Volga inscriptions but also in their orthography.
enables us to judge the quality of the vowels in otherwise dubious cases, thus e.g. "fourth" can be read only with front vowels in spite of the fact that this word is back vocalic in present Chuvash (tăvădăm), otherwise we would have with ă as in "mix" or wăfur "thirty".

In the VB inscriptions, as in ours, the letter ăf ă is consequently used only in front vocalic words. In back vocalic words on place of the deep velar Proto-Turkish (PT) ă we find x- so there is no ăf in VB words. The consonant x- is written with ă in all inscriptions, but the dot is many times omitted since the distinction between ă and ă was unimportant.

The long vowels are always written plene, i.e. with uād, gā or diļ, the same system which can be found in Kăyarlı's Divan.56 The short vowels are denoted by the diacritics fathā, kasra and ǧammā, but often omitted, or illegible. This is the case in our text e.g. in Ṿ났 and Ṿήν. Sometimes on place of the PT long vowels we find the triphthongs -iye- and -āwe-, -āv-, -āni resp. In carefully written texts also the diacritics are places as in tăvădām or in Ṿήν. From this it seems to be clear that we have to interpret this clusters as [ije] and [āye] resp. containing the semivowels j and y.

It is remarkable that no distinction is made between j and ă though the orthography used the three dots in the case of ă.57

These and other regularities in the writing of VB words are very consistent in the VB inscriptions. This fact makes the assumption inevitable that there existed a literature written in the VB language with Arabic letters.58

57 This occurs in the word ăpip ăgir, daughters < PT ăz > Chuvash ăzr. The word occurs twenty times in the authentically edited inscriptions (see EB, p. 152) invariably with ăa and even in the word ă الصف ăhirām ăgir-slave, maidservants < PT ăgir > Chuv. ăähră the first letter is always ăa. In present Chuvash there is no difference among the initial of ă and the other words which have an initial x < PT ă. In one case (EB 22:4) Jusupov read ă but this is very uncertain.

58 This system was first discovered by Professor Ligeti, see Les voyelles longues en Turc: JA 1938, pp. 177—204. Lately J. A. Kelly has dealt with the orthography of Kăyarlı in a detailed and instructive study (UAJb 45, 1973, pp. 152—161) without, however, referring to the controversial opinions expressed by many authors.

59 There are many orthographical systems used for rendering Turkish words with Arabic letters. Those under Persian influence use three dots beneath jim to render ă. It is of interest that the VB orthography shows no Persian influence. It is another question why the VB orthography found it necessary to distinguish between s and j and not between ă and j.

60 Already Fraehn in a lecture delivered in 1830 (cf. Drei Münzen aor Wolga-Bulgharen aus dem X. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Mémoires de l'Académie Imp. des Sc., 1832, sér. VI, tome I, pp. 180—181) has supposed the existence of an early literature in Bolgarı referring to the Ya'arı Bulyır of Ya'qub ibn Nu'män al-Bulyarı (12th century). This work has been lost and we do not know whether it has been written in Arabic or in Turkish, nevertheless...
Remarks on the VB words

\( \text{awul} \), this son (2, 3). This reading is secured by a *sukun* written in \( \text{EB} \) 46:4 and is the form with the possessive suffix -i of the word *awul*. The dropping of the vowel of the second syllable is normal in VB see e.g. *ayix > ayxi* and known also in Old Turkish texts e.g. in the case of *ayis > ayxi* this mouths. It is, however, to mention that Chuvash preserved the *u* in form of the reduced vowel \( \ddot{a} \) in *beldik* this sons. Cf. PT *oyul + i*, Chuvash *solid + e*, Tatar *ul + i*.

\( \text{beldik} \), this (sepulchral) monument (lit. sign) (3). This word has been discussed many times. The most important remarks were made by K. Thomsen. He correctly rejected the former readings according to which the following *baif* belongs to the word. He was also right in pointing out that the final -g already disappeared and that to this VB *jil* slfifys < PT *dig* offers a clear parallel. Some problems, however, remained unsolved. Recently M. R. Fedotov has discussed the reading of the word. According to him the letters *waw* and *ya* denote together a Turkish *ü* mechanically following the Uighur orthography. According to him the word has to be read as *beül*. This is impossible for several reasons. It is true that the Uighur orthography exerted some influence on that of Arabic used for rendering Turkish texts mainly beginning with the Khwarezmian period of the East Turkish literary language. This occurred, mainly in the case of denoting the vowels where the originally used opposition long : short = plene : diacritic disappeared and the plene writing is used for all vowels, as in Uighur. This was partly due to the loss of the opposition of the long and short vowels. But I do not know of any Turkish texts written in Arabic — nor does Fedotov quote any — in which *waw* and *ya* denote *ü*. But this is not what is essential. In the system of the Uighur orthography *ü* is denoted by *waw* and *ya* only in the first syllable. Thus e.g. in the word *bölünüsi*, *bölünü-si* (Suv 618 : 21, 621 : 12) the *ü* is written only with *waw*. In the VB inscriptions we find many words where *ü* has to be read (e.g. *dür* or just in the particle *baif*) and it is never rendered by *waw* and *ya*.

we have evidence that Ya'qub was a Turk. Ābūl Hamīd al-Garnati has met him between 1132 and 1136 in Bolgari (see Bartolđ, *Soběsličí V*, p. 518, Hrbek; *Sedu 1307*). I quote here Prohn (Welcher Freund der vaterländischen Geschichte teilt nicht mit mir den Wunsch, dass diese Bulgarische Chronik, welche ich hier signalisierte, einmal mögte aufgefunden werden?) (op. cit., 181 note).


The readings, suggested by Fedotov — as bol-të (1) or bol-tö (1) for the correct bol-tüwi (not bol-tüwi as Fedotov quoted me) is indefensible. K. Thomsen has correctly quoted the parallel expression ziyarat-i küā ḥāštār-zīš, this sepulchral monument. To this I would only add that we have also ziyarat-i küā (EB 28 : 2) and in one case ziyarat-i bu (EB 8 : 3), i.e. in place of the VB -kā we find the regular Turkish bu which verifies beyond any doubt the interpretation of küā as an emphatic particle with the meaning «this (is)». Nevertheless one problem has remained open and this is the history of the word and its connection with the present Chuvash forms. In the Chuvash literary language and the dialects we find the following forms: palā, palāł, palāk, palkā. It is clear that the forms with k have to be excluded here and cannot be linked directly with the VB form. On the other hand the form with the possessive suffix of the third person of palā and palkā is palī. We know another type of words which have a form resembling the VB form belūwi this is ārū letters > ārūvé his/her letter, or kētyē herd > kētyēvē this/her herd, but this occurs only in words which end in -u or -i. Thus in the case of a perfect parallel we would expect in Chuvash not palā (palkā is a secondary form), but *palū which is, however, not the case. Chuvash palā can be a continuation of either *belig or *belēg the latter well attested in Old Church Slavic belęg itself a Turkish-Bulgarian loanword there. The Hungarian word bélyeg «mark» was — as Professor Ligeti is inclined to suppose — borrowed through Slavic. The Turkish words pertaining here have been thoroughly discussed by Professor Ligeti. He reconstructed two prototypes: PT *belgū and PT *bēlēk or *bēlak supposing that the -k > -g change occurred in Slavic. Considering the Chuvash form palā I would prefer a sonorization within Chuvash as in the type fiik «boots» > ad, özek the inner part of the tree etc. > vara, which occurred through the phases -g- > -β- > -β-. The Chuvash form palkā is a Kazan Tatar loanword reflecting an original *bēlgī or *bēlgū, the latter attested in a Tatar inscription dated 1695/6 where we read bèlgūsi. The form palkā is a metathetic form also borrowed from Tatar and reflects an original bèlgī. This is of great importance, because this is exactly the form which could be the etymon of VB *belū > belūwi. We know about numerous cases where Tatar has preserved VB words and some of them

32 ārūvé developed regularly from ārū, kētyē from kētyēvī.
33 These final -u/ā are secondary. The original -u/ā became -ə/ə. In most cases present -u/ā has developed from -y/igung.
34 Both palā and palkā have their form with the possessive suffix as palī. The form palkā is a secondary re-derivation from palī.
37 The actual Tatar form is bēlgī (see e.g. Tād bēlgī above) from an earlier *belgī < belgü (cf. Ligeti, op.cit., p. 433). The form bèlgūsi occurs e.g. in Jusupov, Vvedenie No. 74.
were later borrowed by Chuvash.\textsuperscript{38} Cf. PT belgœ, belag, belek, Chuvash pald, Tatar bilge.

$k$\textsuperscript{k} (3) On this emphatic particle see above. Fedotov\textsuperscript{40} and Poppe\textsuperscript{41} have expressed the view that this particle is unknown in the other Turkish languages. The syntactical function of $k\textsuperscript{k}$ resembles the Turkish particle oq/ôk common in Old and Middle Turkish\textsuperscript{43} and many modern Turkish languages. In Kazan Tatar it is $k\textsuperscript{k}$ in e.g.: telâdañ iriçâ ôk sîna yauçî fîbrâm \&If you wish I shall send you the matchmaker just to-morrow or Bashkir urmanyâ uq barip eteb \& to go just to the forests. In some languages and dialects we find, however, this particle in the form $k$\textsuperscript{k}, e.g. in Uzbek u keldi $k$\textsuperscript{k} the caves or South Kirgiz ol barat $k$\textsuperscript{k} 3on-to pojdet, da vedj on te pojdet; he is the one who is just coming.\textsuperscript{43} It seems that oq/ôk is the secondary form and we have to do here is just an old Turkish demonstrativ pronoun $k\textsuperscript{k}$ pointing to near in contrast to its back vocalic form *qu pointing far. The latter has been preserved by Yellow Uighur.\textsuperscript{43} Cf. Chuvash, $k$\textsuperscript{u} this (near).

$fje\textsuperscript{ti}$ (5) seven The fully vocalized form *$fje\textsuperscript{ti}$ can be found, e.g. in EB Nos 12 : 6, 42 : 4, 49 : 6. In an inscription dated 1338 (EB No 20 : 6) we find $fje\textsuperscript{ti}$ a transitional form to the present Chuvash $fje\textsuperscript{a}$. I have to remark that Kazan Tatar has $fje\textsuperscript{a}$ < *$fjej$ while in the inscriptions written in the literary language there is always $y\textsuperscript{ti}$.\textsuperscript{44} Cf. PT $y\textsuperscript{ti}$, Chuvash $si\textsuperscript{ti}$, si$\textsuperscript{ce},$ Tatar $fje\textsuperscript{a}$.

I quote only one example here PT $y\textsuperscript{ti}$ rings is regularly represented by Chuvash $d\textsuperscript{r}\textsuperscript{e}$ The word -- as a special term for weaving -- has been borrowed by Tatar (and other Volga languages) where it is $d\textsuperscript{r}$ spulka, cevka. This word was later reborrowed by Chuvash where we find $d\textsuperscript{r}\textsuperscript{e}$ with $d\textsuperscript{r}\textsuperscript{e}$ side-by-side. For more details see Some Volga Bulgarian words in the Volga Kipchak languages: (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{38} Op. cit., p. 106.


\textsuperscript{41} See Clauson, An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-thirteenth-century Turkish, p. 78, Sert, \textit{Etim. Slov. I.}, pp. 438—439, Râsânen (Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen: SO XX, 1957, p. 39) supposed that the Chuvash reflexive pronoun $z\textsuperscript{u}$ ~ $z\textsuperscript{a}$ and the particle $-\textsuperscript{a}$, $-\textsuperscript{a}$ is connected with $-oq$ by assuming an intermediate form *oa.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43} See S. E. Malov, Jazyk êleých ujgurov, Alma Ata 1957: $yu$ $etot$ daljnõj (< Chinese?) (p. 176), $qu$ $evon$ tos\textsuperscript{(1)}, $gua$ $skudas$ go $etots$ (p. 50), $yu$ $evon$ tos (p. 22). Malov adds (p. 177) that there is no parallel to $yu$ in the Turkish languages, however there could be a — perhaps only formal — similarity with Chuvash $ku$. Egorov (\textit{Etim. slov.}, p. 114) compares Chuvash $ku$ with Turkish $bu$ (a quite other particle with a similar function and equally developed from an old demonstrative pronoun) and among the Turkish data cited he quotes also Shera Jêgur $ku$ without indicating that it is back vocalic.

\textsuperscript{44} The -$d$- in the Oghuz languages is due to the long $i$ preceding the original -$i$-. In the Kipchak languages the sonorization of -$t$- is due to its intervocalic position. The -$d$- in some Kipchak languages is very old (Bulyat al-mudâq, 14th century, Al-tuhâf, 14th century, also in Armeno-Kipchak). In this word the -$d$- is however restricted to a small group of Kipchak languages including Tatar, Bashkir, Misher, Baraba, Karsalm. But even in the Eastern Tatar dialects of Siberia we find yette seven and yette weeks (cf. D. G. Turnâseva, \textit{Könbâtî Seber tautarlari tel}, Kazan 1981, p. 124).
fûr (8) "hundreds" always with plene written -û-. Cf. PT yûz, Chuvash òér, àîr, Tatar yûz.

altû (8) "sixths." It is of special importance that in this word the syllable -û- did not become -î- and we have also in Chuvash -ûî. On the suffix -û see below. Cf. PT altû, Chuvash uûû, Tatar altî.

fûl (8) "years." Most Turkish languages have two words one of which denotes the calendar year (yûl) and the other the age (yasl). In an inscription, dated 1311, we read that a certain Fatima-ilû died in her twenty second year: yûrmî îûk yûndûna (Jusupov, Vedenie, No. 10), in another inscription also written in the literary language in 1328 we find: -Hatun âûz bûk yûndûna . . . -Hatun (died) in her thirtyfifth years (op. cit., No. 22). It is interesting that the word for calendar year occurs relatively late in the inscriptions e.g. toûz yûs bûk yûlû ine the year 905 (according to Hegira, i.e. 1499/1500)*, or ürûmî ming yûl usûp yûrmî-da on thousand year and twenty (according to Hegira i.e. 1611/12). In the earlier inscriptions we find the type: hîfrat-da yetî yûz on birde (According to Hegira 710 (i.e. 1311—12)*. Most recently L. Bazin has dealt with the words yasl and yûl.** He stated that the opposition calendar year: year of age is present in all Turkish languages with the exception of VB, Chuvash and Karachay-Balkar. In the latter we find only yûl in both meanings which Bazin explains with the Bulgarian substratum in the Balkar Kipchak language. The common Turkic yûl, VB fûl and Chuvash âû are the original words for year, while yûl is according to him an old Mongolian loanword in the z-Turkish languages, most probably from Juanjuan and is etymologically the same word as Mongolian âûl-qa «young», while Mongolian fûl is a late reborrowing from Turkish. Bazin's proposal is very plausible, however I have to express some doubts. The Mongols had a very old native word for year which has to be reconstructed as *po(n) and — as Professor Ligeti has demonstrated — was present already in Kitan.*** It seems to me a somewhat overcomplicated view that the Mongols knew the word for year *ûûl, forgot its original meaning and then borrowed it back from Turkish. If âûl denoted the calendar year this is highly improbable, if not, what was the difference between âûl and pon, and where and when did the former obtain its meaning ? It is sure, as Bazin correctly pointed out, that yûl ~ âûl is a typical international word. If Turkish âûd estones pertains to Mongolian *ûûl-a-yun I see no reason why we could not connect yûl with Mongolian ûûl. Parallel to Mongolian ûûlûn and ûûl we have Chuvash ûûl and ûûl. That the Bulgarian form fûl was used for denoting the calendar year is attested. It is another question whether Turkish yûl is a borrowing from some early Onogur-Bulgarian language or it came to these languages by Mongolian mediation. Cf. PT yûlû, Chuvash ûûl, Tatar yûlû, yel.

** Cf. Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi; Mongolian Studies 1970, p. 308: Old Mongolian *pon, Khiian po, Jurchen(Kin) pon, Middle Mongolian hon.
ayxi is (17) site months. The stem has to be reconstructed as ayax or ayix, in case of ayax we would expect Chuvash uyax and not uydz which is the extant form. The PT dy lost the length of its vowel. The sukun on ya in the inscription of 1291 (EB No. 3:4) excludes the reading ayixi, and the Chuvash form uydz similarly pertains to another dialect as in the case of oxi. The -q is a typical Bulgarian suffix, which became in VB in back vocalic words -x, cf. PT til languages > Chuv čiše. Cf. PT dy, Chuvash uydz, Tatar dy.

idsen (17) sin (the middle of). The kiuru beneath the alif, also clearly written in EB No. 9:9, shows that this is the only possible reading. This word has been dealt with in detail by O. Pritsak. He corrected the earlier reading to the one occurring here and already suggested by Jusupov. Pritsak connected this word with di das Inneres and read idsen deriving the root of this form from PT ič. There are, however, some problems which are still unsolved. The word di interior, stomachs etc. has a labial vowel in the Viryal dialect, where it sounds či. This can be due only to the fact that it goes back to an older form with labial vowel which excludes the possibility of connecting the word with ič. The final -č results regularly in -č in Chuvash as PT ič-eto drinks > či-, PT ad-eto opens > ad-, PT ad-eto threes > ad(e) etc. Doerfer tried to explain the irregular final postulating an ič + ści. I think we have to do here with two or perhaps three different words which have been mixed together partly by the lexicographers and partly perhaps already by the native speakers. The first word is of Persian origin where it is huš poy and has the meaning conscience, mind, memory etc. This word can be found also in Tatar dialects in the form uš «memory», and among the meanings of Chuvash di in the dictionary of Sirotkin «sum, pamjatj» is equally mentioned as, of course, in Ashmarin's Thesaurus. There is also a word in Kâšyari of with the meaning the heart, the centre of a tree trunk, branch or horn. Though Räsänen has connected this word with Turkish di in his Etymological Dictionary this is highly improbable. Radlov's uş quoted from the Codex Cumanicus with the meaning das Gedächtniss, die Gelehricht, geistige Fähigkeit etc. has to be corrected to us < PT dz, but his etymology of Tatar uş deriving it from the quoted Persian word seems to me valid. Thus the labial variants pertain to

---

51 Tatar telenem diallektologik sűzlege (Kazan 1969), p. 469 equated with Tatar is and the Persian origin indicated.
52 Erreur, p. 366.
53 Opyt, col. 1772.
another word and we have to do with ðe, ðê and ðë and this latter has in the Viryal dialect also a form ðë. There are special conditions under which PT ð could become ð in Chuvash. This occurred mainly before consonants, as e.g. vëð. enë (PT ðaç not ðël) but vëðëke. spëked ða ðël (where) ða. The suffix of the so called purposive is in Chuvash -ðëñ/ðëñ from PT ðëñ perohaps through a form ðëñe. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix -ð corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -kal/ke. Though -ð- gives regularly ð- in Chuvash it seems to me very improbable that this very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkish reciprocal suffix •i corresponds in Chuvash ð, but in Mongolian -ka relate. Though -is- gives regularly -i- in Chuvash it seems very improbable that this, very common suffix was borrowed from Tatar. In some words ð has been preserved as in ðurad- sto reconcile oneself. To the Turkey
The three dots beneath the letter 'in' exclude, however; the reading Čerimšan or Čerimšen. In the Riaala tawarih Bulyariya written by Saraf-ud-din ibn Hisam-ud-din al-Bulyari three river-names occur: Čeremšan, Sarmsan and Qarmsan. The former is the Čeremšan the second two are located in the territory of the Bashkirs, because it is said in the work that several Bashkirs persons came from the valleys of the Sarmsan and Qarmsan to Bolgari to learn the teachings of Islam. These rivers flow into the Bjelaja and are called by the present Bashkirs Sarmsan and Qarmsan. The initial 's-' in present Bashkir goes back to an earlier 't'- thus Bashkir Sarmsan corresponds to an earlier Čeremšan or Čeremšen. The river is called by the Tatars and the Russians now-a-days Čermas. In the dictionary of Ashmarin we find a series of river names: Sarms, Sarmsam, Sardmaa, Sardmsem, Sardmaen, and Sarmsan, Sarmsan. All this river names are indentified with the Čeremšan but this is surely a lexicographical error. The first five denote the river Čeremšen and only the second two the river Čeremšan. In toponyms Chuvash 't' is the regular correspondence to Tatar 't'. The word for 'ravine, valley of a brooke' is in Chuvash ėrma < PT yarma from the verb yar- 'to split'. Already Egorov called the attention to the fact that in the territory of the former Kazan Province there are many toponyms ending in -érma as Orimérma, Ikérma, Karásirma, Jauširma. The last one seems to be identical with the hitherto unidentified Jaušir of Ibn Fadlan. Jusupov gives also the variant Jauširm. The relation of Jaušir and...
Jauđirma is clear if we keep in mind that Chuvash has beside ėrma ovrag, rečkas also the shorter form ėr obryv, krutoj bereg, jar, kraja ovraga, krutoj ovrag, po dnu kotorogo protekaet ručėj. From this we can conclude that the forms Šarđmankan, Šarmaškan i.e. the toponyms ending in -dan are the extant equivalents of the river name Čeremšan flowing into the Volga while the forms ending in -san are the Chuvash forms of the Čermasan flowing into the Bjelaja. The variants -sam, -sem, -sen are most probably forms developed under the influence of the Chuvash plural suffix -san/sen. The relationship between the two river names remains an open question. It has to be borne in mind that Čermisan is located by Ibn Fadlan in the territory of the Bashkirs who later wandered northward. Taking into consideration all these facts I suppose that the river Čerimšan in our inscription denotes the river Čermašan. Elyas went to this far river and died there perhaps in a battle.

The word for water in OT was ėstu or the like. The Chuvash form ėstu ~ ėstu has been for a long time enigmatic. The Bashkir form ėstu < ėstu shows clearly that this Chuvash form goes back to an earlier *stu. In fact this form is attested as early as the 8th century. To the Notitiae Episcopatuum composed between 733—746 an anonymous scholiast added some explanations. A river name ėgdorov figures in this text the meaning of which is given as *(iaiQov veqiv black water). Moravcsik read this as Kara-ču but Professor Ligeti — referring to the Chuvash form — proposed to read either Kara terbuch der russischen Gewässernamen, IV (1968), pp. 275—276, Nachtrag 1973, pp. 186—187. Beside Karaširmo quoted by Jusupov we find Karašor (Perm), Karašur (Viatka) with the Finno-Ugrian ending -šor.

Further derivatives are ėšor obryv, jar, otokos; bereg, ėšor diyal. ėšor skrutoj bereg, obryv; obmolna, ovrag obrazovavšiesja ot razliva vody.

Čeremškan is a very common river name in the Volga-Kama region. In the material collected by Vasmer we find several river names pertaining here (see Wörterbuch). Beside the well-known Bolšoj and Malej Čeremšan we find several river names which have the same origin. Two are in the former Kazan Province (Čeremšan, Čeremšanka), seven in the former Perm Province (three Čeremšanka, one Čermška, one Čermago also Čermas, Čormos, one Čermola, one Sermeya also Sermom, Sermoya, Sermoyka), two in the former Samara Government (Čermenska) one in the former Viatka Province (Čermenska) and three in the former Ufa Province (Sarmas, Sarmada, Sarmas) the fourth is the already quoted Saramaan. The Russian suffix -ka is late and secondary, joining many river names of non-Russian origin in this region (see V. F. Baraškov, Nazvaniya vodnych istočnikov Utjanovskoj oblasti: Onomastika Povoljja II, Gorkij 1971, p. 201). From the structure of these variants we can conclude that the second part denotes «waters» of Serm, yasik or Čerm, edu. The geographical distribution of the river name shows that it is of pre-Turkish origin. I have no place to go into details here, I would only stress the fact that the form quoted as Saramaan ~ Čerimšan is the only one having -san as its final syllable.


Further derivatives are ėšor obryv, jar, otokos; bereg, ėšor diyal. ėšor skrutoj bereg, obryv; obmolna, ovrag obrazovavšiesja ot razliva vody.

F.R. Baraškov, Naznaniya vodnych istočnikov Utjanovskoj oblasti: Onomastika Povoljja II, Gorkij 1971, p. 201). From the structure of these variants we can conclude that the second part denotes «waters» of Serm, yasik or Čerm, edu. The geographical distribution of the river name shows that it is of pre-Turkish origin. I have no place to go into details here, I would only stress the fact that the form quoted as Saramaan ~ Čerimšan is the only one having -san as its final syllable.


Su or Xara Su referring to the fact that a sometimes renders Turkish ı. On the basis of Bashkir ıSu Chuvash ıSu and the ıSu of our inscription I would prefer Xara ıSu. Since this river can be located to the Crimean peninsula the word is remnant from a language spoken in the 8th century, in the Khazar Khaganate. On -ne see below. Cf. PT ıSu, Chuvash ıSu, Tatar ıSu.

barsa ıSu *(接着)* (8) shaving gone. The dot under r ensured the reading with -r of the word which Jusupov translated as "utonuv" supposing here the verb bat- (Tatar bat-, Chuvash put-). In this case we would have -Ł-. Cf. PT bar-, Chuvash Anatri pır-, Viryad pur-, Tatar bar-. *veli »*(8) «died». This word is the VB equivalent of PT öl- «to die». Though the present Chuvash form of this word is vil-, its transitive form is viler- «to kill». Cf. PT öl-, Chuvash vil-, Tatar Hi-.

Remarks on the morphology

*i «possessive suffix of the third persons* cf. auli (:2,3), beldwi (:3), ayxi (:7). As is known this suffix is in Turkish V + ı and C + ı, but in Chuvash we find another distribution. After consonantal word final -e, after words ending with non-reduced vowels -ı, in case of reduced vowels also -i, but if the original word had a short consonant before the reduced vowel, this consonant became geminated. In words ending in -u/ü we meet with -dı, -evi: тал > талı, this/her son, лада > ладı this/her horses, пул > пулı this/her fish, and илу > илдөр this/her letters. All these suffixes go back to *ı which preserved its front-vocalic character also in back-vocalic words. This can be seen also in back-vocalic words ending in -t, where the -ı became -đe as e.g. in геt names > геdı this/her names. The old suffix -si has been preserved only in some words pertaining to kinship terminology as appa elder sisters > appadi this/her elder sisters, ama «mother» > amaldı this/her mothers, kérт «son-in-law, the husband of the younger sister or any younger female relatives > kérldı. This latter case shows that the -si > ı suffix had no honorific func-

In the Khazar Kaghanate — as in all other Turkish tribal confederacies — many languages, among them several Turkish languages were spoken. There can be no doubt that one of the languages has been of the Onogur-Bulgarian type. It is another question which Onogur-Bulgarian dialects were among them. There has been a lively discussion of the languages spoken in the Khazar Khaganate on which I cannot comment here.

With dot beneath rđ.

In some late inscriptions the cause of the death is sometimes given, e.g. 1382 (Jusupov, Vvedenie No. 44) ... Sahid (boldi) «became martyr», 1491 (op.cit. No. 53): тәріш сөзбізді тәкел сөзі құнғұр мен оның сон ерді қімТәгел (ібн) мәуілді Сейід Ахмәд жемірмен ұә бәрінде (сїулт) тәріш (According to the) тәріш in 697 16th day of the month құнғұр was, that Тәгел (J: Tavâkkel) son of the мәуілді Сейід Ахмәd in his twenty-third (year) in (water) having fallen. The expression кәдір жәндіді Sahid boldi «from the hands of the unbelievers became martyr» is occurring in many inscriptions of the 16th century.
tion as it has been supposed. It has also been preserved in some rare expressions as purd törtëli/törtësë ‘the back of the axe’, ald törtësë ‘the back of the hand’ (Ašm. XIV, p. 229). We find the PT -si also in the nominalized forms of the numerals, e.g. uydz xélilë ‘the seventh day of the lunar month’ and as the distributive form of the numerals e.g. inkë ‘two of them’, which functions also as nominal stem. The VB inscriptions show practically the same distribution as we have in present-day Chuvash, i.e. the -i suffix has been generalized after all word-finals. In Tatar the old Turkish system has been preserved: C + i/ə and V + s/ʃe, (however after the -u of the infinitive we find -i e.g. bulikmë tosilë ‘the catching of the fish’). For these reasons everywhere I have reconstructed front vocalic -i in the inscriptions.

-a suffix of the Dative cases cf. təriz-a (5). In most instances the fathā on the ə is not written or illegible (cf. EB p. 155), but in some cases it is clearly visible (cf. EB Nos 8 : 5, 12 : 5, 18 : 7, 22 : 6, 43 : 5) as in our inscription. Pritsak has dealt with these readings, and has correctly stated that we have to read here təriz-a, which he translated ‘im Datum’ and referred to the parallel literary form təriz-qa. To this I would add hifrat-qa of an inscription of 1328, which was misread (though with question mark) by Jusupov as hifrat-då (Vvedenie No. 22). This usage of the Dative case is very old cf. ol öddä ‘at this time’ (Kül Tegin E 21), qon yil-qa ‘in the sheep years (ibid, NE 1), bir yil-qa tört yolu sünüsādum ‘I fought four times in a year’ (Bilge Kagan E 30). The use of the Dative case, however, calls for some explanation. In present-day Chuvash the Locative -taralče serves for such purposes. Pritsak himself cites 1880 bulla ‘in 1880’. Benzing also cites this function of the Locative case: pär šund vəxətra ‘in der Zeit als es hagelte’. Beside this Benzing mentions that the Dative case (which converged with the Accusative), figures in some expression denoting time: yara-kuna ‘den ganzen Tag’, këšërxi ñere ‘diese Nacht/ in der diesmächtigen Nacht’) and adds that the Dative case expresses the time when an action takes place: mayán përrëmës kunne ‘am 1. Mai’, kër kunne ‘im Herbst’ etc. In present-day Chuvash the Dative case denotes the time span during which an action occurred, i.e. the duration of an action: vutä pər uydzë ñet ‘the combustible is enough for one month’, vəsem kunta përr-ik ernelëxe antax kilné ‘they came here only for one or two weeks’, kanału viqë kuna piral ‘the gathering lasts three days’. Thus yara kuna menas ‘während des ganzen Tages; v tečenie vsego dnja’, mayän përrëmës kunne ‘during the

---

46 This hypothesis put forward by O. Pritsak (Studia Altaica, Wiesbaden 1957, pp. 140—143) has been rejected by G. Doerfer (OLZ 66, 1971, col 337). More on the suffix see J. Benzing, Tschuwaschische Forschungen I, Das Possessiveffix der dritten Person: EDMC 94 (1949), pp. 251—267.
whole day of 1st of May etc. A similar function of the Dative case can be observed also in Tatar: ber yelga fîtarlek it is enough for one year. The Dative suffix -a figures also in other expressions in the VB inscriptions: fâni dunyâ-rân bâqi abîrat-a «from this world to the other remaining (he went)» (cf. EB p. 158). In five inscriptions we find fâl-a (EB Nos 5 : 8, 6 : 8, 22 : 7, 42 : 5, 49 : 7) and in one case kûzen-e (23 : 5). According to these facts I would distinguish between the durative and the momentaneous temporal functions, the first being expressed by the Dative, the second by the Locative. It is clear that the shorter the period the more the semantical function of the two converge. Pritsak’s translation «im Datum» is based on the Arabic equivalent fi tarih. If we keep in mind that the suffix -a here denotes duration, his translation seems to me somewhat loose. The concept behind the use of the Dative case in tarix-a is that the death happened during the «historical time», i.e. the date is according to Hegira, and for these reasons I would prefer Jusupov’s translation po letotisleniju, i.e. according to the tariﬁ, during the tariﬁ or in the course of history. One of the most important peculiarities of the VB inscriptions is that we never find -qa/ya only -a. On this see further below.

-ne the suffix of the Dative case of the possessive declension, cf. tâne (:7), òâne (:8). While the suffix of the Dative case was -qa in PT, in OT we find a development which was certainly secondary. After vowels it remained -qa, but in the possessive form of the third person the final -n and the voiced form -ya merged into -na, while after other consonantal finals of the possessive declension the voiced -ya dropped its -y-. In the Oghuz languages this development went further and the -y/g- was dropped in all cases, while e.g. in the Kipchak languages y/g and g/k resp. have been preserved. In Chuvash we find a quite different development. After vocalic word-finals there is always -n + a, while after consonantal word-finals -a irrespective of whether the stem is a bare root or has a possessive suffix: ene-ne to the cows, tinâ-na to the calf, ivâlne < *ivâlëne «to his son», xêrëne < *xêrëne «to his daughters», where in the latter two cases the late dropping of the final -ê before the suffix is demonstrable from the front vocalic character of -e in back vocalic words. On the other hand we have vârman-a «to the forests, tinë-e to the sea, ivdlam-a «to my son» and xërëm-e «to my daughters». The development was the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word-final</th>
<th>Vocalic</th>
<th>Consonantal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root</td>
<td>poss. suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>-qa</td>
<td>3P -i/-ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>-qa</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>-ya</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oghuz</td>
<td>-(y)a</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuvash</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The territory of the Voïga Bulgarians Khánate

Legend:
- Archeological finds (after Fokovskov)
- Epigraphical finds (after Jusepov)
- Administrative centers, villages
- Present administrative borders

Remark: The sites are only approximately given.
To this I would add that in the Viryal dialects the -n- is disappearing: lit. *xtia-na ~ Viryal *xtia-ya, lit. *pudna ~ Viryal *polla, lit. *tardna ~ Viryal *tarda. The final type with -u/ü is in the Anatri dialect and the literary language *-e, -iü while in some Viryal dialects *-e and *-ya: lit. *ktiive ~ Viryal *kötaye. In the dialects West of Murgau the suffix is only back vocalic, e.g. *ënëya. This is a very archaic feature pointing to the original back vocalic quality of the suffix which can be seen also in the declosion of the personal pronouns. 88 Thus we can see that the development of the suffix of the Dative case was determined by the word final. This has some implications for the interpretation of our inscription. In the case of *tene we have a secondary form where the vowel of the medial syllable was dropped as in *tulne < *tulëne. On the other hand, although all words ending in final consonants have -a, the word *dëv gets -na cf. *Atë *tëne *damaskën *budë *vitre *kirë *mar *eto *scoop *out *the *water *here *in *the *function *of *Accusative) *of *the *Volga *all *the *buckets *of *the *world *are *not *enough. This points to the (semi)vocalic character of the final -v [y] of *dëv, and this had to be the case also in our inscription.

As is known the Dative case has converged with the Accusative in present-day Chuvash. Since the Accusative does not occur in our inscription, I would only like to mention one fact. From the extant suffixes of the Accusative -y, -i, -ni only -y could converge with the Dative: *tana-y *the *calf (Acc.) has resulted in *tina as e.g. *carlay *sersp *in *durla. Taking into account the phonetic developments reflected by the inscriptions we have to suppose that the *-yV > -yV of the Dative and the -Vy of the Accusative converged already in the time of the VB inscriptions.

-*ë ordinal suffix of. *alëi (68). The ordinal suffix of the VB inscriptions has been discussed many times. Ashmarin saw in the Chuvash ordinal suffix -me/mës a compound form consisting of the primary -m (see *vidëm *kun *after-to-morrow, the third day) and the old possessiv suffix of the third person -ei > -ë, -ëë, -ëë, -ë, -ë. 70 Later discussing the form *fijërmëi *twenty-sixth, and *ibinëi *second of the VB inscriptions together with those ending in -m as *bilem *sifths, *fivëtem *fourths he maintained his earlier view 71 and assumed that the two kinds of the ordinal suffix are due to dialectal differences (*meenity govery). Benzing devoted a special paper 72 to the origin of the Chuvash ordinal suffix. He suggested that the two kinds of ordinal suffixes pertain to different dialects (Mundarten verschiedener Stämme). Accepting that -i in -mës is the possessive suffix of the third person, and leaving the question open whether

---

70 Materiały dlya izjedovaniia čuvaskago jazyka (Kazan 1898), pp. 181—182.
71 Bolgary i Čuvaši, Kazan 1902, p. 91.
içinî goes back to an earlier *içinî or *içinî, he tried to find an etymology for the suffix *m. Referring to the fact that this *m is present also in some Turkmen dialects (içininî, dBradininî), he connected the *m with the Iranian ordinal suffix (cf. Persian sevom "third") and saw in this a trace of old Turkish-Iranian contacts. The Iranian suffix has also been mentioned by Chuvash authors. Pritsak has called the attention to the fact that sometimes a köra can be seen beneath the consonant preceding the *m therefore it has to be read -im which he interprets as [-im]. Pritsak finds in the inscriptions a mixed use of the ordinal suffix (Vermischung der Ord. [inal]-Suffixe) and distinguishes six groups: 1. -im, 2. -nč, 3. -nči, 4. -nč, 5. -nči, 6. -č. According to him the form bel (quoted after Malov: EV 1947, p. 42) is nothing else than the form bel + š with the elision of -l. The inscription in question has been quoted by Malov according to Marjani's transcription and the reading is surely wrong. The words written there as חיירפ + _grad mean or perhaps י^ через plus which he have to read either as י^ + יג or perhaps י^ through as in EB 11 : 8, 12 : 6, 49 : 6. N. A. Andreev distinguished four groups: 1. The date is without any suffix, 2. the ordinal suffix is -m, 3. the ordinal suffix is -č, 4. the ordinal suffix is -nč. Andreev's conclusion is that the inscriptions contain all elements of the present Chuvash suffixes -mč, -m and -č (the nominal character of the latter is correctly stated by him) and therefore: "V bolgarskom jazyke do razvitija v nem kipčakso-tatarskogo nasloenija formy čislitelnych byli schodny s čislitelnymi sovremennogo čuvašskogo jazyka. Jusupov interprets -m as a dialectal variant in the Bulgar language (sleduet ob"jaan	j dialek- talnom javleniem v bulgarskom jazyke) while for -nč and -č he quotes several toponyms of Tataria where č corresponds to ś. Fedotov, while accepting Andreev's views, adds that the ordinal suffix in Cheremis -mos, -ši and Votjak -mos are of Bulgarian origin. In a recent paper, Hakimzjanov who does not specifically deal with the ordinal suffix, accepts Ashmarin's views on the dialectal differences within the VB language and corrects to ^š, i.e. belç to belç and contrasting this form with bijelš and bel, biš, ^š, which, thinks to


Die bulgarische Fürstenliste, p. 45.


Vvedenie, pp. 71—76.

have corroborated his opinion on the dialectal differences within the VB dialects.²⁸

It has escaped the attention of those who claimed to have found dialectal differences in the various suffixes that some facts contradict this assumption. The first is that the two suffixes occur in one and the same inscription: altiši and biyelem (1355, EB 40: 7,8). It is true that these cases are rare but it is self-evident from the structure of the inscriptions that two ordinal suffixes are rare in one and the same inscription. The rarity of such cases is also due to a second fact which has been hitherto neglected: the various suffixes are always bound to one and the same group of numerals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>VB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bir-</td>
<td>[bir-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ač-</td>
<td>več-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bör-</td>
<td>tuweit-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bēš</td>
<td>biyelet-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sākiz-</td>
<td>[sākir-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toqus-</td>
<td>[tozur-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ďąn-</td>
<td>vān-, van-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸ On the inscription of Nīnīe Jaki, 1340 (EB 39: 5) I read bējüp following Jurso-pov’s reading (Vvedenie No. 47). I have now a very good squeeze of this inscription and bējüp has to be corrected to bējü and bēru (line 3) into bēm. Independently of this fact the inscriptions of Nīnīe Jaki are of special interest. They contain many “irregularities” and point to a special dialect and orthographical usage. I obtained some hitherto unpublished inscriptions from the same cemetery and prepare to publish a separate paper on the results of their study. Thus we have no authentic data for the ordinal “first”. In accordance to the Turkish usage we expect however a word like Turkish ilk “firsts”, on which see later.


³⁰ See Bolgari i čuvash, p. 88, there sʰkʰm kʰwen.

³¹ This form is quoted after Asmarin, Bolgari i čuvash, p. 57: pʰkʰm (j3l).

³² This is an unpublished inscription: aňš.
If we try to find the difference between the two groups first we have to decide whether to start from the PT or the VB forms. There is only one difference between the two groups and this is that the numerals pertaining to the first group end in final consonants and those of the second in a vowel. Since ḍlig belongs to the second group it is clear that this distribution emerged only after the loss of -g of ḍlig and we can only start from the VB forms. Thus we can find a distribution -C + m and V + δ(i). There seems to be only one exception. In the inscriptions we find a word written ကြ. This word first occurred in an inscription published by Fejzhanov, where he read ကြ and transcribed ḍkinji seconds. This reading has been accepted by Ashmarin, but later correctly read as ကြ by Pritsak and Jusupov, who transcribed it as belifi and translated it as 'fifth'. The word occurs in four other inscriptions and the reading belifi has been generally accepted. There are, however, some difficulties hitherto overlooked. In the case 'fifth' we would have a numeral with two different ordinal forms: biyelim and belifi, the only case where such a doublet would exist. The second difficulty is more serious. The word ကြ occurs only after the word ayfai 'month' and before the word kilwen 'day' but is never denoting 'years'. The word biyelim occurs in both cases (the month is always given with its Arabic name). The third difficulty is that if belifi has to be read and its meaning were 'fifth', this would be the only case having the ordinal suffix form -i, -m or -δ(i) occurring in all other cases. Standing invariably before the word kilwen 'days' one would be inclined to suppose that we have to do here with a name of a day. This tempting idea, however, has to be abandoned.
In the inscriptions we find a few cases where the names of a day occur. Such are e.g. EB No. 2: tarih-a al'i (fur) tuhur wdn ali'di jil eti gu-1-(hi'fat) aqhi sakir kwen ini kwen eti. According to the tarih, six(hundred) ninety-sixth year was, Du-l-hija month, eight(th) day, Friday was. EB No. 11: tarih-a fizehi fur wdn ali'di jil mu'haram aqhi fiyermi'si erri kwen eti. According to the tarih sevenhundred sixth year, Mu'haram month, twentieth, Friday was. EB 25: tarih-a fizehi fur ali' sakir jil gu-1-ga (dasi) aqhi wdn sakir kwen eti, fizehi kwen e(ti). According to the tarih sevenhundred and fifty-eight(th) year, Du-l-ga'da month eighteenth(th) day, seven(th) day (of the week) was.

In an inscription published without photo by Jusupov he reads:

It is hazardous to correct readings without having access to the original; the inscription under scrutiny is a case in point. Nevertheless some of the readings are surely wrong. In the inscription three kinds of days are mentioned. The first is illegible but surely the ordinal number of the day of the month. The second is (if Jusupov's reading is correct) han kwen sbool day, a common name of the month according to Wednesday see, e.g. Chuvash yun kun, Tatar, Bashkir, Kirman kan kun. The second is kii erne kwen sllittle Friday i.e. Thirsdays in Chuvash ekerni kun < ekern erne kun, kii adina in other Turkish languages, e.g. Tatar kelatna < kece atna < kii adina. That means that after the word month the day of the month is given by the ordinal numeral and only then the day of the week, which usage is self evident, a «Wednesday of a month Mu'haram» is of course impossible, they have been at least four Wednesdays. According to the structure of the date of the inscription has to be a day of the month.

In the Turkish languages there is an expression denoting the first day of the lunar month, the new moon day: ay baii. It occurs — as has been pointed out by L. Bazin — in Hakaas, Æzbek, New Uighur, Kirghiz, Kazak, Tatar, Kumyk, Osman-Turkish, Azeri and Turkmen. To this I would add the Chuvash instead of y>jl I suggest jifesi, instead of fuz fur, instead of 1>h a>h. Instead of an I read arm erne.

form uyáx puáí see e.g. uyáx puáíče čuk tuná «On the first day of the month they offer a sacrifice».104 The original form of Chuvash puáí «head» had been reconstructed by Ramstedt as baláč.105 This could be corroborated by Mongolian tarbölʃi «sparrow hawk, lit. (the bird) with bald head» ~ Turkish tuzbań, and the fact that the cluster -lč- has developed in other cases regularly into -č-.106 Thus e.g. EB No. 3: 4—5 hifrat-rən altí för tuhur wənim ŋal da'ban ayhi bəli čůwen has to be translated as «According to the Hegira six hundred and nineteenth year, 80a'ban month, first day». If this hypothesis is valid, we have to delete *belifi as «fifth» and the usage of the ordinal suffix is regular and unexceptional. There is no dialectal difference in this case and the rule -Č + m and ŋ + i(ŋ) is working in all authentically edited inscriptions.

It is very tempting to suppose that VB had two ordinal suffixes -m and -č and by a compensating process the Chuvash -máč developed in a later period. There is, however, another possibility. The OT texts have the ordinal suffix -minči (in case of čki even čkinči). But there are traces of threefold compound suffix -minčili in the Turkish languages. In Kharakhandi we find -ilənci107 < -*iminči < -*iminči with assimilation and/or dissimilation of the two nasals. This form has been preserved by some Chagatay texts.108 In some Azeri dialects109 we find the form -mči/iči < -*iminči and this can be traced back to as early as the Babur-name110 where we find ikimči(si), akümči(si), törtümči(si), beşümči(si), altümči(si), yetimči(si) and sekizimči(si). It is of special interest that the connecting vowel is beşimči which is due to the analogy of

106 PT qilč < words > qilč > Chuv. zěd (homophonous with zěd eslayes), PT olččto mesurees > Chuv vič, PT belen onopordum achemiciuns = Chuv pisen statarnikő. The disappearance can be observed very early because in Proto Permic we already find it reflecting one of the Middle Bulgarian dialects: PP kii «slay» — MB *xls < qilč < PT qilč. In some other words the traces of the -č- in the cluster -lč- (which disappeared through -v-) can be even now observed, e.g. PT küldüün doans (— Hung, kötcön) > Chuv kiönden-dial. kiden (Ashm. VI, 247).
107 Cf. Yugnak: törtülenči ~ törtülenč <fourth>, Qutadyı Bilig: ekilänč, ikilänč <seconds>, see Fundamenta I, p. 102.
The Volga Bulgarian inscription is the focus of this section. It discusses the form -mëš in older Kumyk texts and compares it with Turkmen dialects. The text also examines the possibility that Chuvash -méá is a direct continuation of an earlier -mini. The negative form results in -në, as seen in verbal nouns such as sáviTiS «laddie of joy». The suffix -mëš can also be found in the verbal noun system of Chuvash. The development from -mini to -mëš is similar to the development in Tofalar and Yakut. The Chuvash ordinal suffix -mié can be of great antiquity and a direct continuation of the earlier -mint. The development of the ordinal suffix in VB inscriptions can also be traced in the suffix -i after the ordinal suffix -s. The distribution of the suffix of the Accusative-Dative case is also discussed.
The suffix of the simple past tense, third person of \( \text{velli} \) (\( \cdot \)). The suffix is present in Chuvash where it has the following distribution: \( l, n, r + \ddot{e} \), after all other consonants and the vowels \(-\ddot{e}\ also in back vocalic words. Since Chuvash \(-r-\) is the regular continuation of PT \(-d-\) (cf. adaq > Chuvash \( \text{uva} \) (foot)), and \(-\ddot{e}\) goes back to an earlier \(-\ddot{e}\, \ddot{e}\), we are confronted with the same distribution as in OT where we find \( l, n, r + \ddot{e} \), and in all other cases \(-\ddot{e}\. It is important for the history of this suffix that the final vowel remained front vocalio in all cases. The \(-\ddot{e}\ > \ddot{e}\ development is relatively a late one\(^{117}\) which can be seen from the fact that in the first person we find \(-\ddot{a}m/\ddot{r}m\), in the second \(-\ddot{a}n/\ddot{r}n\) (resp. with \(-i\) according to the vowel harmony). As I have pointed out above, the VB inscriptions show just an intermediate stage of this development, and in our inscriptions both forms occur.

\(-\ddot{a}\) suffix of the coordinate converbs, cf. \( \ddot{ae}sa \) (\( \cdot \)). Its grammatical function is similar to Turkish \(-ip\), but its usage is more extended and resembles that of Mongolian \(-\ddot{u}\. There is no direct parallel form to this suffix in other Turkish languages. According to Fedotov,\(^{118}\) Poppe\(^{119}\) and others it is a special Chuvash form. Wiedemann,\(^{120}\) Wichmann,\(^{121}\) Ashmarin,\(^{122}\) Egorov\(^{123}\) thought it to be of Votyak or Perme origin. Other authors are inclined to see in it a correspondence either to the OT conditional \(-\ddot{a}a\) or to the gerundial \(-\ddot{a}\-\ddot{a}\) sur. I. P. Pavlov\(^{124}\) refers to the fact that its negative form is \(-\ddot{m}\ddot{a}dr\) where \(-\ddot{m}\) is the suffix of the negative stem and \(-\ddot{a}dr\) is the same as \(-\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\, \ddot{a}\, \ddot{a}\), only preserved its final \(-\ddot{r}\ and became reduced because of its unstressed position, and has nothing to do with the privativ suffix \(-\ddot{a}dr \sim PT \-\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\. I agree with Pavlov’s last statement but it remains unclear why the final \(-\ddot{r}\ has been dropped. Priteak has also dealt with this suffix.\(^{125}\) In two inscriptions from Ašit he read \( \ddot{k}\ddot{a}v\ddot{a}d\ddot{a}dr\ and thus thought to have corroborated his and others’ opinion that this suffix

\(^{117}\)The \( \ddot{e}\ > \ddot{e}\ development is reflected also in Russian loanwords as e.g. \( \text{gostinec} \) presents – Chuvash \( \text{b}uk\ddot{b}\ddot{e}nd\ddot{e}n\), \( \text{m}o\ddot{a}\ddot{c}a\) \( \text{g}\ddot{a}r\ddot{d}\ddot{r}\) – Chuvash \( m\ddot{a}\ddot{a}d\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\. Before secondary \( i < \ddot{e}\ or \( = \ddot{e}\ the \( \ddot{i} > \ddot{e}\ development has not occurred cf. Tatar \( \text{d}i\ddot{g}\ddot{e}z\) \( \text{s}\ddot{e}\\ddot{a}\)\ddot{a} \sim \text{Chuv tines} \sim PT \( t\ddot{e}\ddot{g}\ddot{a}\).\n
\(^{118}\)Istoričeskie sujazi čuvašskogo jazyka s volšekimi i permekimi finno-ugorskimi jazyками, Čeboksary 1968, p. 124.


\(^{120}\)F. J. Wiedeman, "Grammatik der Syrjäischen Sprache mit Berücksichtung ihrer dialektie und des Wotjakischen," SPDg. 1884, pp. 178–179 where he only points to the similarity of Votyak, Cheremis and Chuvash.


\(^{122}\)N. I. Ashmarin, Materiały dlya iselandovanija čuvašskogo jazyka, Kazan 1898, 314.


\(^{125}\)Bolgaro-Tschuwaschica, pp. 275–283.
still had its full form -săr/sâr in VB. I have checked the places in question on reliable photos in Kazan and was able to find that the form is kâwelfed. The emphatic - has a similar final stroke as ra and presumably this was what misled Pritsak. The use of the emphatic șa in a frontvocalic word is irregular, but just in the two inscriptions in question we find parallel cases to this. The -lf- is also irregular. In other texts we find dumba-rân kâfwa while in this case dumya-ran kâwelfed, ... batuvi. Pritsak supposed that we have to do here with the OT verb kôl- ‘to wander’ with the reflexive suffix -l kôl-l-; this became in VB kôvâ-l- and with metathesis kôvâ-l-.. This seems to be guesswork. I think we have to suppose here a primary kâwel- (< PT kôl- ‘to wander’) pointing to a long -ê- and the -l- is an anorganic sound which has been inserted for securing the affricate pronunciation of -ê- before -ă, otherwise the affricate quality of -ă would have been lost under the assimilative influence of -s-. In any case the suffix -să/să seems to be clearly attested in VB and if it had earlier a final -r it has been already lost. The presence of this suffix absent from any other Turkish languages shows the close connection between VB and Chuvash.

Remarks on the phonology

PT a > VB a

PT short a is denoted in initial position by ălif with fathe (altiši, ayxi), in all other cases by fathe (tarih-a, barsa). The opinion expressed by Katanov that we have to read here according to Persian usage (na persidskiy lod) a, is a misunderstanding unfortunately followed by some later authors. VB had two kinds of a, a labial ă and an illabial vowel. The former – as Serebrennikov had rightly pointed out – can be found all over the Middle Volga area, so in Cheremis, Votyak, Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash either at the present or at an earlier stage. The present Viryal a, Anstri u corresponding to Turkish a has surely developed through a phase ă. The ălif and the fathe could denote a labial ă, but not an o, the latter being denoted by waw and/or damma. More problematical is the illabial counterpart of labial ă. I postulate such a sound because of the following reasons:

1. The sound a of Arabic and Persian words frequently developed in Chuvash not into o/u but ū: Ar. masbara → Chuv. miskara ‘ridicule’, Ar. hasma → Chuv. xiana ‘treasury’, Ar. harâj → Chuv. xira’d ‘taxes’ etc.
2. In such cases some Viryal dialects have not o but u, as e.g. muskara (see

128 See e.g. a name in the Ašt inscription (EB, 26) written Twqfar, ăšeš or in the other Ašt inscription the name Tatar is written: ăšeš (EB 26).
129 N. F. Katanov, Čuvašskie slova v bolgarskih i tatarskih pamjatnikah, Kazanj 1920.
above). In words in which PT $a$ became $i$ in Anatri, in Viryal we find $u$ e.g.: PT $bal >$ An $pil$, Viryal $pul$ shoneys. In most of these cases Cheremis reflects $u$ and not $i$.

3. Original PT $i$ became $a$/, and this development has to be later than the $a > i$ development, because otherwise the two sounds would have converged.

4. Though $i$ became $e$ before $i/i$ in those cases where an $i$ corresponds to OT $a$ in Chuvash, this development never occurred: $tla < talaq$ shamp breakers, $timar < tamar$ roots, $tina < tanaq$ witness etc.

5. In our text we find barsa in place of later Chuvash pirsä. These facts show that the PT $a >$ Chuv $i$ development did not reach the $i$ stage in the VB period and is of a relatively late age. In apparent contradiction with this, in the OB loanwords of Hungarian we already find $i > i$: as in tindó scalfs (~tana), tilő hemp-breakers (see above), ir- sto writes (yaz-) etc. For this reason Németh and Gombocz supposed that the $a > i$ development had already run its course before the 8th—9th centuries. On the other hand Doerfer supposed that already in PT we had $a$ and $i$.

Neither of the two opinions are convincing. It is true that in place of $a$ of most Turkish languages, we find sometimes $i$ in Tuva and Yakut, but in the overwhelming majority of the cases not in the same words as in Chuvash. Thus we have no ground for supposing that this sound had already existed in PT as an independent phoneme. The Hungarian correspondence is connected with the much debated question of the chronology of Hungarian labial $a$. If Hungarian had a labial $a$ already in the time of OB— Hungarian contacts than the illabial $a$ or $i$ could be substituted by $i$. The Hungarian words of the type gyertya (derta) scandles ~ OT farta, béka frogs ~ OT baga had been interpreted by Gombocz as secondary Hungarian dissimilation features $a > e/a$. It is however equally possible that these $e$- sounds unusual in Hungarian in back vocalic words is another substitution for $a/ø$. The two sounds $a$ and $ø(a)$ were only allophones in earlier times and their distribution varied in the Bulgarian dialects. This can be seen by Hungarian dara ~ Chuv. tira grains (~tarîy ~ taray) or Hung gyertya ~ Chuv derta. The $u$- of the Viryal dialects in front of the $i$ in Anatri also corroborate this fact. The $a$ of barsa in our text shows that this illabial sound did not became $i$ in the dialect and in the time of the VB inscriptions. See further PT $a$- below.

\[ PT \tilde{a} > VB \tilde{a} \]


130 Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache: MSFOL XXX (1912), pp. 139, 144. This opinion is commonly accepted and the Hungarian etymological dictionary (A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára) contains also reconstructions based on this hypothesis.


132 BTLw, p. 143.
PT long \(\ddot{a}\) is rendered by a plane \(\ddot{a}\) in word medial position (\(\ddot{a}\)). There has been also a secondary long \(\ddot{a}\) in VB in the case of the initial \(\ddot{a} > \ddot{d}\) (see \(\ddot{a}\) in the ATA stem). The long \(\ddot{a}\) developed either through \(\ddot{a}\) into \(\ddot{a}\) or was shortened \(\ddot{a} > \ddot{u}/\ddot{u}\). The presence of the -\(\dddot{y}\)- can be traced in word-initial position and after \(-t, s, x-\). There are no traces in the VB inscriptions of the -\(\dddot{y}\)- of \(\dddot{y}\) though in the case of -\(\ddot{y}\)- we find -\(\ddot{y}\)-.

\[\text{PT} \ddot{e} > \text{VB} \ddot{e}\]

PT \(\ddot{e}\) had been preserved in VB (\(\ddot{e}\), bel\(\ddot{u}\)w, \(\ddot{e}\)næ, \(\ddot{e}\)w) always denoted by \(\ddot{a}\) with the exception of the word initial position where we find \(\ddot{a}\) and \(\ddot{a}\). It is certain that in VB we have to suppose an open \(\ddot{a}\) and a closed \(\ddot{a}\). The former became in Chuvash \(\ddot{a}\), the latter \(\ddot{e}\). This fully corresponds with the facts of Turkish language structure. However, it must be mentioned that Chuvash \(\ddot{a} < \ddot{a}\) and \(\ddot{i} < \ddot{e}\) do not occur always in the same distribution as in those sources and languages where the opposition \(\ddot{a} : \ddot{e}\) has been preserved.

The existence of a closed \(\ddot{e}\) in VB can be corroborated by the fact that in the bilingual inscription of Šapkino\([123]\) we find VB \(\ddot{a}\) corresponding to literary \(\ddot{a}\), though here the \(\ddot{a}\) is omitted but this same word is written with \(\ddot{a}\) in another inscription as \(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\).\([124]\) If close \(\ddot{e}\) had become \(\ddot{i}\) already in VB, we would find \(\ddot{a}\) and not \(\ddot{a}\). On the other hand if \(\ddot{a}\) had already become back vocalic \(\ddot{e}\), we would find an emphatic consonant and \(\ddot{a}\) in such words as \(\ddot{a}\), which is not the case.

\[\text{PT} \ddot{i} > \text{VB} \ddot{i}\]

Long PT \(\ddot{i}\) and short close \(\ddot{e}\) converged in Chuvash cf. PT \(\ddot{i} \ddot{e} > \text{VB} \ddot{i} \ddot{e}\). In Tatar close and open \(\ddot{e}\), regardless of their original length, became \(\ddot{e}\). This is not the case in Chuvash, where long open \(\ddot{e}\) became \(\ddot{e}\).

\[\text{PT} \ddot{i} > \text{VB} \ddot{i}\]

This sound had been preserved in VB; it is denoted with \(\ddot{a}\) in initial, and only with \(\ddot{a}\) in all other positions (\(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{a}\), \(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{e}\), \(\ddot{e}\)).

\[\text{PT} \ddot{i} > \text{VB} \ddot{i}\]

It has to be left open whether \(\ddot{i}\) in \(\ddot{e}\) represents an original \(\ddot{i}\), but this seems to me very improbable because \(\ddot{i}\) became \(\ddot{e}\) in Chuvash and in our case \(\ddot{i}\) has been preserved. If so, we have to exclude this word. Cf. \(\ddot{a}\).

\[\text{PT} \ddot{a} > \text{VB} \ddot{a}\]

---

\[\text{[123]}\text{Jussupov, Epigr. Vost. XXI (1972), p. 53.}\]

\[\text{[124]}\text{Inscription of Bolgari, 1291, cf. EB No 4: 7.}\]
This sound is not marked by *damma* as in the other inscriptions in the word *ka*.

**PT δ > VB ve**

Short δ in initial position became in Chuvash either vë/vê, vë/vë (cf. vëkovə, vëkdr < ΔKS <oXa>) or vi- as in vi- sto dies. That means that we have a double development vi < vë < δ > vë > vë/vë/vë/vë. To this we find a clear parallel in the case of initial o: vi- < vë- < *o > vi- > vë/vë e.g. viran < places < orun and vörman, adram < forests > orman. These regular correspondences are of essential importance for the history of Chuvash vocalism. They show that the splits in the history of the PT vowel system had not yet been finally completed in the time of the emergence of the prothetic v-. It is also of some importance that the secondary vowels developing after the prothetic v- have in most cases joined the original sounds of the same quality, as e.g. in the case of velti.

**PT · ã > VB ã**

PT long ã is noted as a long vowel in our inscription (fdr) as in other VB inscriptions. The long close labial vowels became as a rule short ones in Chuvash in contrast to the open long labials — a rare exception is PT tîz > Chuv tůvar. There is also a difference according to the front or back vocalic character of the vowels in question. While in most instances of long ò we find -dva- as in kòk < blues > Chuv kâvak, bôrt > Chuv tâvat(tà), in the case of the back vocalic ò we meet with non-reduced u as in yõl < ways > Chuv ñul, qôz- sto stirs (mostly mistakenly contaminated with PT qod- sto pour outs with which it converged in Chuvash) > Chuv xuř-. In such examples we have to assume an -dva- > -u- development. The case is similar with a group of words where we find in place of PT long ò- and -u- in present-day Chuvash as in PT yûrt < dwelling places > Chuv čurt. This can be demonstrated in the case of Chuv kun < days going back to a PT form kûn the intermediate form of which is fixed in the inscriptions as kûven. Since in the case of fûr < hundreds we find Chuv sêr, sôr here once more we are confronted with a double development ò, ò < u < û > õu > õwe ~ u. The alternating forms in Chuvash as tâvarni < carnival, maslenica > ñe < ñe < øav < arini < õune > p. adina + i) ~ dial. õvni shows that even in such secondary cases -dua- became u, though normally õwe, õwe is preserved or became qa, ãe in the NW dialects.

**PT oyu > VB aw(i)**

This cluster became awi in VB though the exact quality of the second vowel remains, for the time being, unascertainable. The -γ- > -w- development is normal also in non-intervocalic position as in tegri < god > tevri (→ Tat täre < cross, ikon) > tayri > turâ. For the intervocalic position see e.g.: PT tuyan < relatives > Chuv tâvan, PT bügen < horsefly > Chuv pâteun, PT
yoyaq «mourning (place)» > Chuv dəva «cemetery», PT yayaq «near» > Chuv dəx etc. The γ > β > u development at the end of words is clearly attested. It remains, however, an open question for me whether in clusters -VγV we have to do with a VγV > VβV > δ > dwa development or the intermediate stage -δ- has to be deleted.

PT -oq > VB ã(w)

The development has been discussed in detail above in connection with the word beluwi and is paralleled by the history of the cluster oyu.

Remarks on the VB vowel system

The question of vowel correspondences has always been the most complicated part of the Chuvash linguistic history. The VB inscriptions help to solve some of these problems.

1. The phonematization of the allophones in the case of d/δ ~ a ~ d and e ~ e ~ e > d has to be later as the development of the prothetic v- and has not yet been finished in the VB period. Later on the developments d > i, d > o/u, e > i, a > a wholly changed the structure of the Chuvash vowel system.

2. The double development of the PT primary long vowels Diphthongue < Long > Monophthongue — a general type of development in all Turkish languages — can be observed in VB. The diphthongs became triphthongs and than either remained as such or developed further into a full closed vowel in case of the labials. The monophtongs converged with their originally short counterparts. In case of the illabials a similar development can be observed, only the diphthong contained not the semivowel y but the semivowel i and developed accordingly. This is the cause of such double developments as PT qdn «blood» > Chuv yun (d > j d > ju) and qaz «goose» > Chuv xur (d > ã > u).139

3. The general tendency Open > Closed, Closed > Reduced developed fully only after the VB period, and is later than the first stage discussed under 1.

4. The developments back vocalic > front vocalic (e.g. qiz > xur «girl, daughters») and front vocalic > back vocalic (e.g. dört > dvat «hours») being the result of various causes had not yet been accomplished in the VB period.

PT ã > VB x

139 There has been much speculation about this double development. Doerfer suggested that in cases like Chuv yun we have to reconstruct a Common Turkish *kîdn while in case of Chuvash xur a CT kîn (Khalaj materials, p. 279). Levitskaja (Istudovania po türkoloji, Alma Ata 1969, pp. 63—68) suggested the existence of two PT k-sounds, the one preserved in Tuva as k- the other which developed into x-. This second would have resulted in Chuvash in y- before long illabial vowels.
The deep velar $\chi$ which occurred in back vocalic words became $\chi$ in VB (cf. $axi$) and this rule is without exception in VB. At least in some Onogur-Bulgarian dialects this development is of an early age demonstrable already in the 8th century.\footnote{See \textit{Xara} $diu$ above.}

\[ PT \ y > VB \ d\bar{\delta} \]

It is a much discussed question in Turkology whether in the case of OT $y$- we have to reconstruct $f$, $d$, $d'$ or $y$- in PT. In any case both the $f$- and the $y$- dialects are very old and Bulgarian had very early $f$- and this only in word-initial position. In Chuvash this voiced affricate became devoiced and spirantized, i.e. $\delta$. It is also clear that this development occurred in different Bulgarian dialects in different times and perhaps in different ways. In the VB inscriptions we find three types of affricates corresponding to PT $y$, $\varepsilon$ and $ti$ respectively. All the three are rendered with the Arabic letter $fim$, though the first two have developed in Chuvash into $\delta$ while the third one remained $\varepsilon$. In two special cases ($i\varepsilon$ne and the ordinal suffix -$\delta$($i$)) we can observe a $\varepsilon > \delta$ development. For the solution of this problem we can put forward two hypotheses: 1. The phonetical development of VB $\delta$ (< PT $y$-, $\varepsilon$) > $\delta$ was just at its beginning and the orthography did not follow this development. At the same time $ti > \varepsilon ti$ was also at its beginning, and the orthography sometimes denoted it sometimes not. 2. We are confronted with dialectal differences i.e. the VB is not the immediate predecessor of that dialect from which Chuvash developed.

It is not quite sure that these two hypotheses exclude each other. We have a series of facts supporting both. In any case the neutralization of the opposition $f : \varepsilon$ (< PT $y$-: $\varepsilon$) can be safely assumed.

\[ PT \ si-> VB \ \delta \]

The consonant $s$- before primary and secondary $-i$- became very early $\delta$ (see the name of $\text{\c{S}arkel}$ and the OB loanwords in Hungarian). In our inscription $\text{\c{S}iv}$ pertains to this group.

The well-known rhotacism (cf. $j\bar{\alpha}r$) and lambdaism (cf. $f\bar{\alpha}l$) can be clearly observed in the inscription. All other PT consonants preserved their earlier character as PT $l$ (awli, belawi, ali\v{s}"i), PT $b$ (belawi, barsa), PT $k$ ($ki$), PT $-y$-(ayzi), PT $t$ (ali\v{s}"i, fiyetti, velti), PT $r$ (barsa), PT $s$ (barsa), PT $n$ ($i\varepsilon$ne, $\varepsilon$ume).

\footnote{In the Arabic and Byzantine sources many Turkish words and names are denoted with $\varepsilon$: $axan$, $azar$, $azpabaly$ etc. There is no forcing argument according to which Hungarian $\text{homok}$ and $\text{szand}$ had to be borrowed before the Hungarian $k > h$ development. A Khazar *$\text{zumaq}$ could have been borrowed as $\text{humok}$ or $\text{homok}$ without any difficulty. The Hungarian etymological dictionary is not considering this possibility (op. cit. II, p. 139).}
Remarks on the dialect of the inscription

Between the time of the VB inscriptions and the present-day Chuvash language more than six hundred years elapsed. It is self evident that the bulk of the differences between the language reflected by the VB inscriptions and the present Chuvash language is due to those developments which occurred during that long time. It is also clear that if we try to reconstruct the predecessor of the Chuvash language in the 13th—14th centuries it shows a very close relationship to the language of the VB inscriptions. It remains, however, an open question whether we have to do with slightly different dialects or VB is the immediate predecessor of Chuvash. This question has not yet been put because of several reasons. Those attempts which have tried to find dialectal differences in the distribution of the ordinal suffixes, as I hope to have succeeded to demonstrate above, cannot be maintained. Neither can Hakimzjanov’s attempt be defended to classify the VB dialects according to the $t$ > $ch$ development. Nevertheless the basic idea of Hakimzjanov can be accepted because even within the VB inscriptions we can find some dialectal traces. All this, however, does not settle the question of the relationship of 13th—14th century VB and 13th—14th century Chuvash. Even in our inscription there are some minor facts which call into question a simple equation between the two. I remind to the discussion of aveli, ayxi and bešwai. If we bear in mind that in place of PT $y$- in some loanwords of Hungarian we have an $s$ instead of $f$ (as e.g. in szél = $śl$ < PT $yě$, szűcs = $śčs$ = $śčs$ < PT $yćś$) which are surely earlier than the end of the 9th century and that the Middle Bulgarian loanwords in Proto Permio show a similar case, we have enough reason to suppose the existence of several Bulgarian dialects. On the analogy of similar cases we can assume that the Onogur-Bulgarian groups which began their migration in the second half of the 7th century were not composed according to their original dialect but according to political reasons. We have also no reason to suppose that the Bulgarian group which reached the Middle Volga region at the end of the 8th century was the only or the last one of the Bulgarian tribes which came to this region. All these suggest that further research needed into the dialectal relations among the Bulgarian tribes of the Middle Volga region in the 9th—14th centuries. A detailed investigation of the language of the VB inscription is urgently called for to clarify problems of this kind.
The Permanent International Altaistic Conference convened in 1974 for the 17th time. The meaning of the term "Altaic" seemed to be so obvious that no one tried to define its content. The ordinary meaning is of course that Altaists are studying the languages and cultures of the so-called Altaic peoples, and in case of necessity we have to give a taxonomic enumeration: Altaic languages are spoken by the Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus peoples. Nevertheless, the fact that we label our subject with the name of a mountain-range suggests some caution.

The concept of "Altaic" has evolved through long development. Three periods can be distinguished. In the first period, the name itself was uncertain. Von Strahlenberg used the term "Tatar", for the group now called Ural-Altaic, Rask offered the name Scythian languages, but extended the content to groups such as Paleo-Asiatic, Eskimo, Caucasian and other non-Indo-European languages of Europe and Northern Asia. Max Müller tried to find common traits in the nomadic character of the people and introduced the term Turanian, including even the non-Indo-European languages of South Asia such as Siamese, Tibetan, Dravidian, and Malayan. It was perhaps Castrén who first used the term Altaic, but with the meaning of the present Ural-Altaic. Schott adopted the term, but used the terms Chudic and Tatar alternately, the former for Uralic, the second for Altaic.

The term Altaic as the common designation for the Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus language groups received its well-shaped and clear-cut meaning only in the second period through the works of Ramstedt and Poppe. In their fundamental works they laid down the basis of the theory of the genetic relationship of the Altaic languages. While in the first period the characteristics of the language group were amorphous, mainly typological, although thought to be historical, Ramstedt and his followers used the comparative methods of the 19th century to prove the genetic identity of the Altaic languages. Nevertheless, even within this framework some important questions remained open. The relationship of Korean (and Japanese) to them and the position of Chuvash within the Altaic group have not been solved.

In the third period faith in the genetic relationship of the
Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus languages was shaken. This necessarily brought with it efforts to reformulate the content of Altaic. I would mention only three attempts. T.A. Sebeok—dealing with the meaning of Ural-Altaic—suggested abandoning the genetic foundations and basing it on typologically common traits. G. Doerfer tried to introduce the terms homological and analogical affinity, the first for the genetic and the second for the secondary, Sprachbund-like features. He sees in Altaic a linguistic situation where the two can hardly be distinguished. The other way out seemed to be to abandon the name and concept and use purely geographical terms. Sinor's Central Eurasian for Ural-Altaic or Central Asiatic used by many universities and a journal is opting for the areal aspect. On the other hand an extension into another dimension can be observed. While Altaic in the sense of Ramstedt means only a linguistic group, Sinor's Introduction includes history, and the practice of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference is to embrace all possible aspects of culture.

I think that from this short and necessarily superficial summary it is clear that we are far from having a well-defined term. From a purely theoretical point of view, "Altaic" has to denote common traits in different units. "Common" cannot be identical in a synchronic sense but it can be due to genetic identity. This was Ramstedt's idea and we have to ask the question: Is genetic identity the only possible cause for common traits in the different Altaic units?

In the first period similarity was the principle according to which the group was constructed. In the second period similarity was replaced by correspondence because regular correspondence was found to be the result of genetic unity. The enthusiasm over this fundamental discovery overshadowed, however, the fact that correspondences among languages and cultures can be due to other factors. On the other hand those few who were aware of them (or some of them) tried either to replace the genetic identity with the typological one or tried to blur the difference between the two.

I think we have to distinguish among the following six types of correspondences according to their different causes, and by the use of different methods: 1. Typological correspondences, 2. Convergence, 3. Areal features, 4. Common substratum, 5. Loan-relation, and 6. Genetic relationship. I have not mentioned chance, because chance can give identity or similarity but not correspondence. The first two are not, or are not necessarily, historical; the remaining four are all historically determined factors. It has to be stressed that "correspondence"
is understood as "regular correspondence," thus regularity is not an aspect according to which the six factors and their results can be distinguished. This is also the reason why statistical methods cannot be used for the determination of genetic relationship, since the law of probability helps us to select only identical features caused by chance from correspondences caused by all the other factors.

Instead of giving a theoretical analysis of the differences among the six factors I propose to offer a concrete example from which I shall try to demonstrate the problem.

T. Kowalski, reviewing Kotwicz's excellent monograph on the Altaic pronouns wrote, "Die Arbeit behandelt monographisch die altaischen Pronomina personalia, interrogativa und demonstrativa, also ein Gebiet, auf dem die Verwandtschaft der Altsprachen besonders deutlich zutritt" (OLZ 1973, 444). As the pronominal system is thought to be one of the most "Altaic" features, let us see what a complex analysis has to say. The three reconstructed proto-systems are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkic</th>
<th>Mongolian</th>
<th>Manchu-Tungus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi män-</td>
<td>bi min-</td>
<td>bi min-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si sân-</td>
<td>ti tin-</td>
<td>si sin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i in-</td>
<td>i An-</td>
<td>i in-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typologically common features. The system is three-fold, 1st, 2nd and 3rd P are opposed to each other and their respective plurals. The 3P shows a general trend to be replaced by demonstrative pronouns [T ol, M ene, tere, MT nuga]. The 3P plural is facultative; the 1st and 2nd persons denote—normally—living persons taking part in the speech, while the 3rd is out of the speech situation. In the 3rd person there is no difference according to the oppositions: close-far, visible-invisible, known-unknown, determined-undetermined though some of the demonstrative pronouns show such differences. In the primary
system there is no difference according to the social status of the speaker or the person addressed, no difference according to grammatical gender or sex. There is no distinction made according to word classes. The Altaic systems have no special pronouns in emphatic position (as English he), nor special pronouns for impersonal sentences (as German man). The primary system of the non-singular pronouns had no opposition of dual/plural; the formation of the plurals are different from the formation of plurals of the nouns in the respective languages. There is a common tendency to form personal possessive and personal verbal suffixes from the pronouns. Morphologically the Altaic systems have different stems for the nominal and the oblique cases in the singular. I have surely not exhausted the common traits of the Altaic pronouns and I have no room here to contrast them with typologically different systems. I hope it is clear, however, that we are entitled to speak about a certain typological correspondence among the three protosystems.

In contrast to the common features we find typologically differing ones. Such are, e.g., the formation of the plurals, which happens in T with suffixation /-g, -lar/, in M by an Ablaut-like feature /bi-boa, ti-ta, i-ga/ and in MT we find a suppletive ti in the 3P opposed to i in the singular. The development of the possessive and personal suffixes of pronominal origin are at different stages. In contrast to T and MT in M the development is just beginning. The T oblique stem is extended to the nominal case /ban, > san/ while it is not in M and MT. In T the demonstrative ol is gradually intruding in the paradigm, replacing the an- stem, but this process is only at its beginning. In M ene and tere replaced entirely the old i and g- stems. The stem-vowel alternates according to the presence or absence of the final -n in T, while this is not the case in M and MT. In M we find a relic of the distinction of sex (M: ko ggbel, gbbl "gave masculine") which could be of pronominal origin. On the exclusive/inclusive opposition see later.

The typological differences within the Altaic pronoun-system are essential. It is, however, to be admitted that the contrasted systems are not of the same age, neither according to their absolute chronology nor according to their possible relationship to a common proto-language. I would furthermore point out that typological contrasting was made both according to structures and to trends.

Convergence. The disappearance of different traits causes secondary correspondences, e.g., in the case of M sex-distinction. On the other
hand the appearance of new traits can also result in secondary correspondences. Thus, e.g., the development of the Mongolian possessive suffixes or personal endings in the verbal system can be observed in relatively recent times. The T nasalisation of the initial b- through the influence of the following nasal -n is secondarily approaching the oblique stems in M (cf. bin > min —> M mingyan "thousand").

**Areal features.** Distinctive to the areal features is the fact that they disregard the borders of the linguistic groups. In respect to the formation of the plural of the pronouns, three areas can be distinguished in Eurasia. The area of the singular-dualplural opposition is typical of the Laponian, Samoyéd and Ob-Ugric languages and of the primitive Indo-European languages as well. The exclusive-inclusive opposition in the 1P sing. is peculiar to the East Asian languages (e.g., Sino-Tibetan), to Dravidian and some languages of Caucas. On the contact area both systems can be found. In Nivkh, e.g., we find min "we without you", min "we with you" and men "we two" (Sakhalin dialect). There have been opinions that T big, siz were originally duals, but the arguments are not wholly convincing. M and MT have the inclusive-exclusive oppositions thus pertaining in this respect to the East Asian area. M bida is consisting of "I" and "you" (plural), while MT mönti formally can be segmented into "I" and "they". This is surprising, because semantically "I" and "they" are exclusive and not inclusive. The only possible solution to this enigma can be that ti, being now-a-days clearly the marker of the 3P plural (in suffixes) has been earlier the pronoun for the 2P. While the exclusive-inclusive opposition is disappearing in M, it is vital in MT, where it infiltrated into the verbal system which has a distinction between "we take (with you)" and "we take (without you)". As it is in contact with the area of singular-dualplural, we find in Tofalas in the 1P the triad menibl'si bl'ster "I/we two/many" it is, however, very unlikely to see an old T or even Altaic feature in this; it is clearly secondary, due to areal influence.

**Adstratum influence.** Languages, although they have disappeared themselves, indirectly influenced those languages which absorbed them. Substratum influences on the primitive Altaic languages have not yet been investigated, and it seems to be very unlikely that much result can be expected in the field of the personal pronouns. A possible language would be, e.g., Ketic. Ketic has in the 3P sing. the pronoun
bu, but this is surely a loan from Turkic. There is an Ablaut plural in gd "I" and ed "we". This is clearly secondary. In some dialects (e.g., Imbat) we find etin with the plural suffix -in, thus it is clear that the development was et + in > etin > et. This could be a welcome typological parallel to the M Ablaut-like plural, without any historical contact of course. In Tofalar there is a fourfold opposition in 3P sing.: bi, pi, etbus, etar, "my he", "your he", "our he", and "your he". Morphologically this is purely Turkic consisting of the stem of possessive suffixes, but semantically it is non-Altaic, similar structures being known in Indian languages and Japanese. The opposition of the honorific plural to the normal plural as M təstənər or T səzəsələr show clearly a superstratum influence of European. It is, however, an Altaic feature that in most languages where this opposition exists the basic difference is in the respective age of the speakers and not in the social status. Thus, e.g., in Mongolia the chauffeur of a minister addresses his boss as ṣi "you" if the former is the older, and the minister says tı to his driver if he is older than he. Similar distinctions are mentioned in Turkic languages. In Ozbek, according to Kononov,8 bi and ai refer to collectives not differentiated by their members, while bišər, aišər denote groups where the members are distinguished (cf. English much and many). In Tofalar, in contrast to the 1P, in the 2P only aišər is used in the Russian meaning of "vy", both for the honorific and non-honorific plurals.

Loan contacts. Borrowings within the Altaic group are frequent. In the pronoun-system, however, borrowing is very rare. That it is not impossible we have seen in the case of Ketic bu. Not only can lexical and morphological units be borrowed but also systems (lexical and grammatical calques). It is of special interest that the use of personal suffixes in the nominal and verbal sphere can be found only in the Western and Northern Mongolian dialects. Since these dialects were and are in contact with the Turkiic ones it is not completely impossible that the development in question was caused or perhaps only influenced by the Turkic languages.9 It is of great importance that, e.g., in Buryat only the vocative verbal forms have personal endings, while the others do not. This can be an interesting typological analogy for the development of the verbal systems of the other Altaic (and non-Altaic) languages.

Identical origin. What does remain for genetic relationship? Is
everything else due to genetic identity? My friend E. Schütz has recently demonstrated convincingly that the labial initial in the 1P and the dental complex in the 2P go back to very early glottogonical processes. This undoubtedly true fact is of course not an argument against the genetic identity of the pronouns in question, it says only that the labial and dental initials in themselves are not arguments in their favor. Very disturbing is the correspondence of the initials of the 2PrT g-, M ṣ, NT ınt, because they are not regular and demonstrable in other word classes. Can we suppose that the relationship among the three Altaic proto-systems of the pronouns pertain to a much earlier period than the bulk of the words with which we demonstrate the regular sound correspondences? I would not exclude this possibility.

On the other hand I referred above to a possibility that in an earlier period, 3P ı could be the MT pronoun of the 2P by a similar shift as German sie > Sie. The possessive suffix of the 3P—after vocalic finals—is in T -si, which also admits a hypothesis that the 2P pronoun of T /si/ was formerly that of the 3P and perhaps suppressed the original 2P pronoun beginning with ı. All this is very hypothetical. It seems certain only that the stem-vowel, which was in all persons and all language groups front ı, and the "pronominal" -n, are the possible candidates for genetic identity.

I chose consciously a very difficult field to demonstrate the complexity of the meaning "Altaic". Perhaps it will help to develop a new type of Comparative Altaic Grammar. In such a grammar "Altaic" will have a meaning different from that which we used earlier. Its constituents will be:

- A real contacts
- Loan relations
- Typologically common features
- A stratum influence
- Identical origin
- Convergent development
NOTES

1. The meaning of "Ural-Altaic": Lingua II (1950), pp. 124-139.
3. See his Introduction a l'étude de l'Eurasie centrale, Wiesbaden 1963, a second edition of which is an urgent necessity.
5. V.I. Rassadin, Fonetika i leksika to focal'skogo jazyka, Ulan Ude 1971. This excellent book is a monograph on the dialect hitherto known as Karagass.
6. I have dealt with the Turkic pronoun-system in general and with the problem of the so-called dual in particular in a paper "Principles and methods of etymology in Turkology /The Turkic system of pronouns/" to be published in the Proceedings of the Conference on the Principles and Methods of Etymology, Budapest, August, 1974.
8. N.A. Kononov, Grammatika uzbekskogo jazyka.
9. Turkic influence on the Western Mongolian phonetical system can be well demonstrated.
11. This would solve the enigma T ti : W ti : MT si. T and MT si would not be an "irregular" development of Altaic ti, but would earlier have had another function and then suppressed ti.
In a short paper published 1927 in Hungarian in the journal *Magyar Nyelv* Professor Ligeti called the attention to the work of Fakhru’d-Din Mubârakh Shâh written about A.D. 1206 where besides reporting on the Sogdian and East Turkish runic script the author also refers to the script of the Khazars. Unfortunately the late copyist of this work left out the Khazar letters and so all that we know is that it was different from that of the Eastern Turks. Allegedly it originated from the Rus and ran from the left to right. This led Sir Denison Ross to the tentative conclusion that we might have to do here with the Cyrillic script. However the presence of two kinds of k, the interdental spirant (beside the normal stop d) raised some doubts about this hypothesis. In any case Professor Ligeti recognized that we are here confronted with a possible link between the East Turkish and the Hungarian runic scripts.

Since 1927 a few runic inscriptions have been found in the territory of the former Khazar Khaganate, with letters different from the Orkhon-type. Professor Németh in his last paper on the runiform script of Eastern Europe pointed out that the territory from which runic inscriptions are known in East Europe seems to be expanding. The easternmost find is the wooden stick of Talas having different letters from the other Talas inscriptions. The southernmost occurrence of this script is known from Khumara near the Elbrus Mountain. The westernmost territory is Hungary where as many as

1. A kazar irda és a magyar rovadsírás ([The Khazar Script and the Hungarian Runic Script]: *MNy* XXIII (1927), pp. 473—476.
three different types of runic letters have been found, the runiform signs on Avar objects, the treasure of Nagy Szent Miklós and the runiform script of the Hungarian Seklers. On the shores of the Black sea the inscriptions of Mutaflar (Romania) offer new material. The northernmost line of the finds has hitherto been marked by the inscriptions of Sharkel, Novocherkask and Elista. It would be of great importance if the frontiers of this territory could be pushed out still further.

During my last visit to Cheboksary in 1973 I collected Volga Bulgarian inscriptions. Many of my Chuvash colleagues and friends gave me valuable information about inscriptions known to them. Among these there was one which was not Volga Bulgarian or Kazan Tatar in Arabic script. G. F. Yumart (Trofimov), a member of the Chuvash Scientific Institute, handed over to me a record of an inscription of BoljSoe Mikuškino. I quote his record verbatim in English translation:

«The stone of Mikuškino»

In the neighbourhood of the village BoljSoe Mikuškino (Isaklinskij rayon, Kujbyševskij oblastj, former Buguruslanskij uezd, Province of Samara) on a mountain called Kartli tu there was a big stone with inscription. It had the following form:

\[ \text{[Image of a stone with inscription]} \]

I. Vásáry, Runiform Signs on Objects of the Avar Period (6th—8th cc. A. D.): Acta Orient. Hung. XXV (1972), pp. 335—347. I quote here Vásáry: «The runiform script of Turkish origin could have been known only in a very narrow circle of the Avar society. What seems to be strange is that certain letters of the Avar script display a resemblance to the western runiform alphabets of Turkish origin (Khazar and Székely-Hungarian script). And that is all we can say about them.» (p. 344).

See the paper of Németh cited above with further bibliography.

For more details see the paper of Németh cited and a paper of I. Vásáry published in Hungarian in the journal Keletkutatás 1974 [1975], pp. 159—172.


The text written on a bull's skull has not yet been published. S. G. Klástornyj and I. Vásáry are working on its publication.
Its height above the earth was ca. 1.5 m, its length about 4—5 meters and its breadth no less than 3 meters. According to the remembrances of Anna Ignatieva Mikeeva (born 1911) they danced roundelay (on the stone) and sung songs. The letters had a breadth about one arshin. How many letters there were we do not remember. But they say that there were two lines. There were also dots into which one could place a fist. The stone lay in the earth. After the Great Patriotic War [World War II] they split the stone into parts and with the help of a tractor the stone [in parts] was dragged to the building constructions of the farm. Above, on the borders there were small carvings spaced tightly. According to A. I. Mikeeva no legends were connected with the stone. The village is Chuvash, it seems that [the settlement] occurred in the beginnings of the 18th century. Now there are about 1,000 yards [i.e. houses]. The mountain is about two kilometres away on the SW side of the village. According to Mikeeva there were [also] letters like ☼ and ♯. In both lines there were about 5—6 letters.
Since according to the record the stone was destroyed and it is unlikely that we shall ever get a better description of it, I considered it worth for publication.

We have enough experience with inscriptions copied by hand to know that such copies made by people not knowing the script are in most cases unreliable. It is also a risky task to try to decipher so short an inscription, or rather fragment. In any case we have seven letters: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. It cannot be a mere chance that all of them are similar to signs found on the flask-inscriptions of Novocherkask. The fact that there were 5—6 letters in either line seems to exclude the possibility that we have to do with simple tamgas. The slight differences between the letters of Mikuškino and those of Novocherkask seem also to exclude the probability that we have to do here with a late falsification. Some other facts also speak against it.

The village is situated not very far from the river Suk, an affluent of the Kundurča, about 180 kms NE from Kujbyšev. The river Suk is mentioned already by Ibn Fadlan who crossed it on his way to the Volga Bulgars. According to Ibn Fadlan this territory was then inhabited by the Bashkirs. If the Mikuškino inscription was a runic one it had not been written necessarily before the introduction of Islam into this region, i.e. the early 10th century. The case of the Hungarian runiform script shows that in spite of Christianity and the domination of the Latin alphabet, an earlier script could survive and be preserved for long a time in remote areas. But even in the case of a relatively late date of the inscription itself it has to be connected with the pre-Islamic period and if not itself prior to the 10th century, it was a continuation of a pre-10th century tradition.

G. F. Yumart is certainly right when he points out that the Chuvash inhabitants of the village Boljăo Mikuškino are settlers of the 18th century.
This is backed by facts known from historical sources and the dialect of the village. Therefore we cannot speak about the continuity of the inhabitants in this region.

In this connection the name of the mountain is of special importance. *Kartá tu* is a purely Chuvash composition. *Kart* means in Chuvash «zarubka, narez, metka; notch, cut, marks and pertains to the verb *kart*- «to cut notoh, to gash» < PT *kärt*-. The composition *kart patakki* is now the term for the notched tally stick. If the Chuvash had a runiform script it is very likely that they used the term *kart*- «to incise runio letters», but this has been forgotten with the disappearance of the script. The new Chuvash settlers coming to Boljšoe Mikūškino named the mountain after the incised stones dominating the landscape whether they had or had not any idea about the fact that this was an inscribed stone. The name of the mountain shows clearly that the stone is earlier than the 18th century and thus we can discount falsification with great probability. If so, we are confronted with the northernmost runio inscription pertaining to the Khazar group of the East European runiform scripts. The geographical distribution of these inscriptions will help us to connect them with the people who used them.

There is no reason to consider one language more important than others from a general or a historical point of view. However, there are always key languages which have a distinguished place in the consideration of certain historical problems. In the very complex context of the history of the Altaic languages Chuvash undoubtedly plays such a role. For the reconstruction of the history of the Turkish languages Chuvash is essential because it pertains to and is the only living member of a group of Turkish languages which separated the earliest from the main body of the Proto Turkish dialects. Thus it is impossible to reconstruct Proto Turkish without considering the linguistic data received from the study of Chuvash. In the debated question of the relationship between the Turkish and Mongolian languages Chuvash has a special position in that it shows a series of peculiarities common to Mongolian and Chuvash, but not shared by the other Turkish languages. Chuvash itself has a very complicated interrelationship with the Kipchak Turkish languages of the Volga region, Tatar and Bashkir on the one side and with the Finno-Ugric languages of this area, the Permian (Votyak, Pernyak and Zyryan) and Volga (Cheremis and Mordvin) group on the other. None of the linguistic and ethnogenetic problems of these languages and peoples can be solved without a correct interpretation of the Chuvash data. Finally neither the linguistic nor the ethnic and political history of the Hungarians can be investigated without reference to the background information contained in the history of the Chuvash language.

Thus one could be entitled to think that the history of the Chuvash language is one of the most carefully studied aspects of Turkology and Altaistics in general. But this is not the case. Though we do have fundamental works on several specific and detail questions of Chuvash linguistic history, the basic works themselves seem to be unduly neglected. There is no serious academic edition of any of the monuments of the history of the Chuvash language; most of them are not even published and not a few are unknown at least to those scholars who are interested in the problems referred to above.

This specific situation has, of course, its special causes. If we disregard scattered glosses and proper names, there are two groups of written documents which contain linguistic material concerning the history of the Chuvash language

A. RÔNA-TAS

AN UNPUBLISHED CHUVASH WORDLIST
IN THE LIBRARY OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
and the dialects nearest to it. The first group consists of words and a very few sentences scattered in epigraphical texts written in Arabic and dated to the 13th and 14th centuries. Though most of them have been known for more than 250 years we are only now in the position to undertake a thorough investigation of them because their earlier editions were unreliable.[1]

To the second group pertain relatively late wordlists and texts collected, written and partly published in the 18th and the first half of the 19th century. The earliest of these is a short word-list collected by the Swedish prisoner of war Ph. L. STRAHLENBERG before 1721 and published in 1730 in his famous 'Das Nord- und Ostlliche Theil von Europa und Asia'[1/a]. From the following period we know of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>collected or compiled</th>
<th>published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>J. E. FISCHER's two manuscripts, same as No. 1, but rearranged and commented[3]</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>An answer to the questionnaire compiled by TATIŠČEV[4]</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Materials in PALLAS' 'Reise...'[9]</td>
<td>1768-1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16.</td>
<td>Word-lists drawn up according to the instructions of PALLAS and used for the compilation of No. 19, [13]</td>
<td>1784-1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Russian-Chuvash word-list[14]</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tatar, Chuvash, Mordvin and word-list of DAMASKIN[15] -[16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The 'Sravnitel'nye slovari' of Catherine II, compiled by PALLAS[17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Texts from the seminar of Nizhny Novgorod[18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Lord's Prayer in Chuvash translated by P. TALIEV[20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chuvash sermons by J. ROZANSZKIJ[21]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The 2nd, rearranged edition of No. 19[22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Religious texts translated by I. RUSANOVSKIJ[23]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Lord's Prayer translated by P. T. IVANOV[24]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Prayers translated by G. ROZANSKIJ[25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Conversation texts translated by G. ROZANSKIJ and I. RUSANOVSKIJ[26]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A Russian-Chuvash-Mordvin-Cheremis word-list[27]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>An occasional poem written in Kazan[28]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Catechism translated by A. ALMAZOV[29]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chuvash-Tatar comparative word-list compiled by NEUMANN[30]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Translation of the four Gospels under the guidance of P. TALIEV[31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Folklore texts collected by A. FUCHS[32]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Religious texts translated by S. ELPIDIN[33]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>D.P. OZNAKHIN's record of a Chuvash song[34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With these texts ends the first period of the historical monuments and records on the Chuvash language.

The second period saw the publication of such important works as the Chuvash grammar of VIŠNEVSKIJ (1836) [36], the comparative Russian-Chuvash-Hungarian grammar of E. DEŠKO (1856) [36], it also witnessed the fieldwork of two outstanding scholars, A. REGULY (1843, 1846) [37] and A. AHLQUIST (1856-1857) [38], the literary and scientific activity of S.M. MIHAJLOV (1821-1861) [39], the publications of V.A. SBOEV (1856) [40] and the Russian-Chuvash dictionary of V.P. GROMOV (before 1841) [41], to mention only those works which contain original Chuvash material.

Between these two periods a small wordlist was collected, in 1835, by F.A. VOLEGOV, a clerk in the court of Count Stroganov. Previously — in 1833 — VOLEGOV (1790-1856) had collected a Permyak word-list of about 3,000 items which was published by K. RÉDEI in 1868 [42]. The Chuvash words are contained in a smaller pentaglott wordlist where, beside the Chuvash and Russian Permyak, Züryen and Votyak words are listed. Both the great Permyak word-list and the pentaglott word-list were handed over to REGULY in 1843, and are now kept in the Department of Manuscripts and Old Books of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The latter under the sigla M. Nyelvtud 4/14/III.

In his above mentioned book K. RÉDEI drew attention to the hitherto unpublished Chuvash word-list. It will be published by my student Klára AGYAGÁSI, but I would like here to underline its importance for Chuvash studies by giving some examples.

The phonemic system of Chuvash differs in many points from that of the other Turkish languages. One factor influencing the development of the present system was surely Finno-Ugrian linguistic contacts but also some important inner developments played a significant role. This confused so much the shape of Chuvash that some scholars were inclined to see in it a Turkicized Finno-Ugrian language, others considered it impossible to find any regular correspondence between Chuvash and the other Turkish languages at least as far as its vocalism was concerned. This impression was also strengthened by the inadequate description of Chuvash texts and words. The Cyrllic script used from the beginning to record the Chuvash language had evident shortcomings and could not distinguish in many cases among phonologically relevant sounds. This was mainly the situation before the orthographical reform of JAKOVLEV, who aimed at the construction of a phonemic rather than a phonetic orthography of Chuvash; he succeeded in his efforts in a measure unparalleled in any other orthography. The situation before JAKOVLEV's reform was also rendered confused by the mixing of forms from the two main dialects of Chuvash, the Higher or Viryal and the Lower or Anatri. Further, over the course of time three centres were active in collecting and publishing Chuvash materials: Nižnij Novgorod (now Gorki), Kazan and Simbirsk (now Uljanovsk). In all of these certain orthographical traditions developed and as far as we can judge, their slight differences also hamper the work of reconstructing the Chuvash linguistic system of the 18th and early 19th centuries. In this context the word-list of VOLEGOV is of special interest. It contains Chuvash words
taken from the 'Sočinenija prinadležačija k grammatike čuvašskago jazyka' compiled under the guidance of V. PUCZEK-GRIGOROVIC (1767, No. 7). As VOLEGOV has remarked in his letter to REGULY dated on the 4th March of 1841 he "collected" (sobral) the Votyak and Chuvash words during "he changed horses at the post-stations in the regions of Vjatka and Kazan". He came to the conclusion that the Chuvash language — which in his times has been considered by most of the scholars as a Finno-Ugrio one — is not related to Zuryen, Permyak and Votyak. We have to suppose that "collected" means "checked" since discrepancies between VOLEGOV's material and the 'Sočinenija' made by a linguistically untrained person 68 years after its publication.

The alveolar spirant -x- in intervocalic position becomes systematically a media lenis spirant in Chuvash. The older orthography denoted this by the Cyrillic letter т, the new orthography used х because this change is conditioned and thus the media lenis character is allophonic. Also VOLEGOV used т to render the allophone of -x- in intervocalic position e.g. in the word coramě "beard" (present orthography čaxan which we shall transliterate in the following with Latin letters), however in the case of the word sãxan "raven", where we would expect in VOLEGOV's text *corama we find instead čoxaxāb with the х denoting the tensis spirant counterpart. This unexpected notation is corroborated by the 'Thesaurus' of A&MARIN [43], where he gives in his phonetic transcription sōhan for the Viryal and šahan for the Anatri dialect. We know that for several reasons A&MARIN's work has to be used with great caution, but in this case VOLEGOV and A&MARIN corroborate each other. And this gives us the key to the etymology of the word. It is clearly a secondary form from an earlier sōtxan "gluttonous" derived from the verb sōt- "swallow". In fact we find beside the meaning "raven" for sãxan also the meaning "glutton" as well. The unvoiced character of the -x- has been preserved by the preceding unvoiced -s-, and secondary voicing did not occur in most dialects until recent times. Since the word sōt-/-sānt- goes back to the Proto Turkish form yut- "to swallow", well attested in old Turkish texts and modern dialects, we can reconstruct the proto form of the Chuvash word as'yutxam, an old Turkish name for the raven, hitherto unknown to me from other sources.

The Russian word дуо "barrel" became pǐčke in Chuvash. The front vocalic character is somewhat puzzling and can only be explained by a supposed and intermediate form pỉčka. VOLEGOV has this form as пчиккa. All Turkish languages have for the word "rich" bay or its regular developments. It is only Chuvash and Mongolian which have an underlying form bayan which developed regularly in Chuvash into puyan. This extended form was identical to the name of the famous Avar ruler Bayan and thus the history of the word is of wide historical interest. VOLEGOV has the longer form, but he also recorded the shorter form duńču both with the preservation of the initial b-, though Turkish initial consistently became п- in Chuvash. This is also reflected in VOLEGOV's material in such words as rijp "hail" < PT*buz, nyć, p39 "flea" < PT*bura or nỳp "throat" < PT *boraż etc. If duńču is not a
mistake (it cannot be the verb puy- "to be rich", because VOLEGÖV quotes all verbs in the first person present, and never in their stem form. In this case the Sočinenija has buy "richness") it raises the suspicion that in old Chuvash bay was the original word, and bayan is a Middle Mongolian loanword, which gradually took the place of the original Turkish form. In this case the name of Bayan can only be of Mongolian origin.

It is highly significant to the history of the Chuvash language that the consonant became spirant and disappeared in certain positions. On the other hand the picture is obscured by the few cases where -1- has been preserved. Two such examples are mîltar "star" from PT *yultuz and iltan "gold" from PT *altan. Now in VOLEGÖV we find CbOÇap i.e. sîdar with the meaning "star", where the -1- has disappeared. This could happen only through a form sîvtîr which is not attested, but its parallel form for iltan i.e. lvtan can actually be found in ĀŞMARIN's Thesaurus. Thus the two data corroborate each other once more and we see that the tendency for -1- to disappear was also present in Chuvash in these cases.

VOLEGÖV's material gives us the key to the hitherto unsolved etymology of the word šantalâk "climate, weather". JEGOROV[44] has proposed that the first part of the word embodied the Persian Jahan "world" while the second was the Chuvash word talâk "something round" as in šultalâk "the round year" cf. Bashkir yil täülege "the round year". This is however impossible for semantic and phonetic reasons. The right etymology was suggested by BUDENZ[45] who was, however, unable to solve the semantic and phonetic problems involved. BUDENZ connected the word with the demonstrative pronoun šav-. šavâ and referred to a parallel dialectal form šavtalâk with the same meaning. He argued that it meant "the one which is there, far". Now "climate, weather" and "far" cannot be connected. Neither can the first syllable of šantalâk be connected with šav or šavâ. A form šavân- would have developed into šun-. Therefore RASANEN[46] rejected BUDENZ's etymology and JEGOROV joined him.

But in the word-list of VOLEGÖV we find the form CbOÇalâk i.e. šundalâk, and not with the meaning "climate, weather" but as Heško "sky". This solves both problems connected with the etymology of BUDENZ. On the semantic side it is clear that the sky was euphemistically called "the one far above", as kûk "the blue" is also a similar expression for "sky". As in many Mongolian and Turkish languages the words for "sky" and "weather" are the same and the restriction to the second meaning is recent. The phonetical side also became clear. The original form was šundâlîk, the regular development from šavâ-na-talâk. This is corroborated by ĀŞMARIN, who cites the following data: šantâlîk, šantâlîk, šavântalâk, šavântalâk "pogoda, svet", in the Sočinenija we find also the form šantalâk CbKažâlîk with the meanings "vek, svet ili vešlenaja", while in the grammar of VIŞNEVSKIJ (1836) šundalîk "mir, pogoda" is given. Thus the regular development of -avâ- i.e. u can be found in the Sočinenija and at VOLEGÖV, while the -avâ- > a development due to the stress on the syllable after it and being originally a parallel form to šundalîk became generalized.
These are only a very few examples to indicate the value of the Chuvash word-list of VOLEGOV. I hope that the scholarly publication of this and other historical monuments of the Chuvash language will provide a solid foundation for a historical grammar of Chuvash, which will be essential if all the problems which I have mentioned above are to be solved.

Notes


2. The name of the author was originally Tabbert. He was raised to the nobility in 1707 by King Charles XII who bestowed on him the family name, Strahlenberg. In his works published in German he used the form Strahlenberg. The full title of his work runs: Das nord- und ostliche Thell von Europa und Asia, in so welt solches das ganzte Russische Reich mit fiberien und der grossen Tataray in sich begreift, in einer historisch—geographischen Beschreibung der alten und neueren Zeiten, und vielen andern unbekannten Nachrichten vorgestelt, Nebst einer noch niemals ans Licht gegebenen 'Tabula Polyglotta' von zwoy un dryssegigeral Arten Tatarischer Völcker Sprachen und einem Kalmuckischen 'Vocabulario', Forderlich aber einer grossen richtigen Land—Charte von den benannten Ländern und andern verschiedenen Kupferstichen, so die Asiatisch-Syctische Antiquitat betreffen; bey Gelegenheit der Schwedischen Kriege—Gefangenschaft in Russland, aus eigenen sorgfaltigen Erkundigung, auf denen verstateten weiten Reisen zusammengebracht und ausgefertlget von Philipp Johann von STRAHLENBERG, Stockholm, in Verlegung des Autoris, 1730. It is possible that there existed also an other edition with an altered title-page, published in Leipzig. Reprint of the original in the series 'Studia Uralo-Altaica', Egered 1976, contributed by J. BENJAMINE Amsterdam. There exist an English (1736, 1736) a French (1757), a Spanish (1780) and a Russian translation of the book. The English version is somewhat altered, in some places it is rearranged and complemented with additional remarks by its translator. The French edition does not contain the complete text, however, it was published together with three smaller papers on the Mongols by other authors. The Spanish translation follows the French one. The 6th, 7th and 8th chapters, and at a later date the 12th were translated into Russian by TATJACEV. There also exists a complete (?) Russian translation, which in spite of a number of references to it, has been never published. The manuscript of this translation has now been found and located by A.N. KONONOY (1972, 49) in the (rakopisy) otdel Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR, Leningrad. No. 16, 13, 18 STRAHLENBERG was captured by the Russians in 1709 and was sent to Siberia. He arrived in Tobolsk on the 26th of August, 1711 and here he made the acquaintance of several scholars, among them TATJACEV and MEESERSCHMIDT. He stayed in Siberia until May 1722 arriving in Moscow at the beginning of 1723. In August he left Moscow and returned to Sweden on the 8th of August, 1723. Now the following question arises: when, where and from whom did he obtain his Chuvash material. We know that he returned to Russia for a second time, in 1736; in St Petersburg he learnt Tatar, Kalmuck and Chinese, but only after the publication of the above mentioned book. Doubts has been raised as to whether STRAHLENBERG himself collected the Kalmuck material (see KRUEGER's work cited below), and in connection with this, one has also to put the question whether his Chuvash material has been written down by himself. Answers to these questions will perhaps be given by the unpublished manuscripts of TATJACEV. In
his introduction STRAHLERG mentions several works which he could not include in
his work because "Hatte ich solche Stücke zu gegenwartigem Thal brauchen wollte, würde
ich nicht allein den Praeannuations-Prothes haben höher setzen müssen, sondern es würden
auch die Herren Praeannuranten über den langern Verzug sich sehr beschwert haben,
nachdem sich mit diesem die Zeit schon weiter hinaus gezogen, als ich anfänglich ver-
muthet habe" (C2v). There does exist an announcement from 1731 that the second volume
of this book, evidently containing those materials, will be published in 1732. But nothing
is known of this second book. Among the works listed by STRAHLERG in his introduc-
tion item No. 3 is Relation einer Reise in die Kalmuckey nach den Torgauthischen
Kalmucken am Wolga-Schram. There are three different reviews by TATIŠČEV on
STRAHLERG's work: 1. 'PrlmeSani|a na knigu, u&lnennuju gospodlnju Stralenbergom,
imjanovanoj Severnoj vostočnoj strany Evropy i Asli, pečaľananoj v 1730 g., v Stokol'me
(CGADA f. 199, d.2, No.4, ROBAN 17.9.7). 2. Přimečanija Tatščeva na knigu
Strelenberga: O kalmykah, bolgarah, o narodah sarmatikah, o baškirah, o Tomane i
Tumeni, roščeljanah, o Beloj i Červonoi Russia (CGADA, Portfel' MlUera f. 199,
No. 46-13). 3. 'Tatiščev's observations on Strahlenberg's data on the Yakuts'
(LOAAN f.21 op. 5, No. 149, see KONONOV 1972,49). It is not quite impossible
that the second manuscript of TATIŠČEV refers to the second and lost book of
STRAHLERG. A great deal of research work is being carried out into STRAHLER-
BERG's life and activities (see the works of KRUEGER and JARRING cited below, and
their bibliography). At the present moment we are not in position to come to definite
conclusion concerning the origin of STRAHLERG's Chuvash material. In any case
it has to be dated prior to 1723 when he left Russia. Bibl.: A. ĊAMÁŁAIENEN, "Nachrich-
ten der nach Sibirien verschickten Offiziere Karls XII über die finnisch-ugrische Völker":
JSpOu 49(1939) pp. 1-55; G. M. NOVIJANSKAJA, Filipp logan Strahlenberg, ego roboty po
isledovaniyu Sibirii, Moscov-Leningrad 1966; G. JANOŚ, "F.I. Tabbert-Strahlenberg —
spuntik isledovaniyu Sibirii D.G. Messeržāmida": Inv. Sibirskego Otd. AN ESSR, Ser.
Kalmik-Mongolian Vocabulary in Stralenberg's Geography of 1730, Stockholm 1975; J.R.
KRUČEO's introduction to the 1976 Szeged reprint; G. JARRING, 'Strahlenberg in
Ewchweiser Literatur und Wissenschaft', Eine bio-bibliographische Übersicht: UAJb
48(1976) pp. 121-123.
2. See his 'Sammlung Russischer Geschichte. Des dritten Bandes viertes Etueck: Nachricht
von dreyen im Gebiete der Radi Kam an wohnhaften heidnischen Völkern, des Tscheremi-
schen, Tschuwaschen und Wotjakern, StPbg 1768, pp. 305-412. Some parts of this work
were published earlier in the 'Elemenjy osloženlju v pol'ze i uveselenlju ' slulačiče', 1756, July, pp. 33-44, 119-145. There exists a Russian translation from
1791: 'Opisanie iivu&lh v kazanskoj gubernlj Jazytesklh narodov etc. eoíinennoe G.F.
Millerom, imp. AN professorom po vosvrafiienll ego v 1743 godulz KamSatkoj ekspedicii',
StPbg 1791, G. F. MILLER, or to give the German form of his name, Gerhard Friedrich
Müller together with J. G. GMELIN took part, in the Great Eastern or Second Expedition
to Kamchatka (1732-1734), being member of the so called "continental branch" of that
expedition. One of his tasks was to collect linguistic materials and the Chuvash material
he collected in the Autumn of 1739 in Kazan. He published 275 words, 38 numerals and
the Chuvash text of the Lord's Prayer. His manuscripts can be found in CGADA and
LOAAN. Bibl.: M. I. BORGQAKOV, 'Sbornik G. F. Millera po tjurkskim Jazykam
Sibirii': Turkskaja leksikologija i leksikografija 1971, pp. 122-130; JEGOROV 1949,
pp. 111-142; GOHKSJ 1959, p. 27; DOERFER 1965, pp. 13-14; PETROV 1967, p.100;
3. The title of the Göttingen MS runs: Vocabularium continentæ trecenta vocabula trilinguæ quatuor
genium, maximo ex porte strahlenburg, Cod. ms. philol. Göttingen 261. Facsimile
dition in DOERFER 1965. The Leningrad MS is in LOAAN, Razr)ad III, op. 1, No. 135.
J. E. FISCHER was a friend of SCHLÖZER and a collaborator with G. F. MILLE.
He
donated the Göttingen MS to the Historical Institute of Göttingen in 1756. There exist several opinions concerning the origin of FISCHER's material. According to BARTOL'D (istorija izuchenija Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii, L. 1925, 215) the material was in fact collected by TATISCEV and given to FISCHER before 1725, ADELUNG writes (Catherine's der Grossen Verdiendte um die vergleichende Sprachkunde, SPbg 1815, p. 21) that the material was collected by FISCHER himself, DOERFER suggested (1965, 12) that the basic (Russian, German) list was compiled by FISCHER and given to TATISCEV, who arranged it for the collection of the material which then was written up by FISCHER, perhaps with addition of his own materials and those of MESSERSCHMIDT. L.P. SERGELEV was the first, to recognize that the Chuvash material of MILLER and FISCHER is practically identical (1969, 228-263 but GULYA believed that FISCHER's material is his original collection pointing out that the Göttingen MS contains several important etymological observations written by FISCHER see GULYA's work below). Hovdhaugen (1975) made a detailed study of these Chuvash materials of MILLER and FISCHER, concluding that they are essentially the same. Now two questions of detail have been cleared up, A.P. FEOKTIISTOV (istoriki mordovskoj pis'mennosti, M. 1968, pp. 88-86) found MILLER's instructions to FISCHER when the latter was sent "in place of him" (CGADA f. 199, Portfolio Miller). To this Miller appended a thematically arranged list of about 700 words in Russian and German. This latter was published in 1900 (Ebornik Mutela po antropologii i etnografii pri AN, pp. 37-108). By collating the Göttingen and Leningrad MSS KONONOV (1972, p. 54) showed that the Göttingen MS must be the draft copy and that the Leningrad MS is in many parts different from the Göttingen MS. He also quotes MILLER (istorija Akademii nauk G.F. MILLERA, S prodelenjeniami L.G. STRITTTERA: Materialy dlia istorii Imp. Akademii nauk VT, (1890) p. 285), who writes that he (MILLER) gave the materials collected on the instructions of TATISCEV to FISCHER who presented them to the Historical Institute of Göttingen. By comparing the Chuvash material of the Göttingen and Leningrad MS and the material published by MILLER or, at least those parts concerned with the Chuvash material, I can corroborate the statement of KONONOV. The Göttingen MS is much closer to MILLER's material than Leningrad MS. Blbl.: DOERFER 1965; SERGELEV 1969, pp. 228-263; KONONOV 1972, pp. 53-55 Hovdhaugen 1975, 274-286 and GULYA J., 'A magyar nyelv első etimológiai szótára' [The first etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language]: A magyar nyelv története és rendszere: Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 58(1967) pp. 87-90.

4. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first 107 questions were connected with history, geography, statistics and economy: questions Nos. 108-197 concerned ethnography. To this a word list was added with the aim of obtaining the equivalents in the local languages. The questionnaire was compiled by TATISCEV in 1736, was submitted to the Russian Academy in 1737 and distributed in the same year. The last part, concerning the linguistic material, was entitled: 'Lekesköe, soсinanyj dlia prilisvíania inożyčnych slov obrejsiđh羲ja v Rossii narodov dlia kotoroj vybrany tomta skle slova, kotorye v prostom narode upotrebljaemy'. The provincial chancellery office of Simbirsk sent an answer to the questionnaire which can be found now in the Archives of the Soviet Academy (fond 21, op. 6, No 149) under the title 'Vedomost Simbirskoj provinčnoj kancelarii iznenanja v otvet na voprosnye punkty, kotorye javstvuju v prislannoj s predloženija kopi'. It was written by V. BELLOUSOV and signed by I. MURAMCOV and M. BAZENOV. The answers to the questions contain some Chuvash words, terms and geographical names. On the Chuvash linguistic material contained in the answers see Dmitriev 1960, pp. 270-273, 280-186. On the materials connected with the third part i.e. the word-list, see Nos. 3-4. I would remark here that a part from the word-lists connected with the name of TATISCEV K.A. KONOBATOVIĆ also has compiled a Chuvash-Russian word-list in about 1727-1738, but its fate is unknown (see KONOBATOVIĆ 1972, p. 72; Biobibl. 1974, p. 193). There also exists an interesting ethnographical description of Chuvashia from 1740, in this year N.I. DEIL's led an expedition to Berezov to observe the passing of the planet Mercury in front of the sun, T. KÖNGSFELD wrote an account of this expedition and this and his diary were published in French in 1775, Amsterdam in volume XXIV of
"Histoire générale des voyages". The manuscript of DELIL's account and the diary of KÖNIGSFELD, translated from German into French, was given by Prince L.A. DOBRUKOV to the Russian Geographic Society in 1849. It was described by V. Ja. STRUEV in the "Zapiski Geograficheskogo Obščestva" III(1849) pp. 60-67, and used by P.P. PEKARSKIJ in his work: "Putešestvie akademika Nikolaja Iosifa Delija v Berezov v 1740 godu". The original was studied by DMITRIEV (see DMITRIEV 1960, pp. 277-279, 299-302) according to whom the original text contains a great deal of data not or not correctly cited by the French and Russian versions. On the questionnaires of TAT'TSCEV and the answer from Simbirsk, see also M. NOGMAN, XVII-XVIII yuzhlerde rusça-tatarça kul'jauma süažleker, Kazan 1969, pp. 27-29.


Also compiled on the initiative of TAT'TSCEV in the same regions as No. 5, Bibl.: DMITRIEV 1960, pp. 270-307; PETROV 1967, p. 100.

"Pelmestapar abir' tja min' baras parnja..." Written in the theological seminar of Kazan on the occasion of the visit of Catherine II. Published in: 'Duhovnaa ceremoolja proizvolivaji vo vremia vsevoidelennejajego prlautstva eja Imperatorskogo VelÌestva... Eksterin yol'jaja v Kazane', 1767. The text is republished in SHOTKIN, loc. Bibl.: GOŠKIJ 1959, p. 30; SHOTKIN 1967, p. 10; V. Ja. KANJUKOV, 'O etn'ka k p'ia mennosti, Čeboksary 1971, p. 13; SERGEEOV 1972, p. 59.

'Sočinenija prirazdaščko k grammatike čuvajskogo jazyka, SPb 1769, second edition 1775. This work, the first grammar of a Turkish language written in Russia, was compiled in the theological seminar in Kazan under the guidance of the bishop of Kazan and Svijazek Veniamin, - V.G. Pucek-Grigorovič, as stated by DMITRIEV (see bibl.). This work was translated into French by P. Ch. LEVERQUE ('Grammaire abrégé de la langue des Tchouvaches': JA 1825, pp. 213-224, 207-278). Klaproth's paper was based on this work: 'Comparaison de la langue des Tchouvaches avec les idiomes turcs': JA 1828, pp. 237-246, Bibl.: JEGOROV 1951; GOŠKIJ 1959, pp. 27-30; DMITRIEV 1967, pp. 153-162; SERGEEOV 1969, pp. 228-232; PETROV 1967, p. 100; ALEKSEEOV 1970, pp. 204-207; SERGEEOV 1972, pp. 53-54; KONONOV 1972, p. 181; Biobibl., 1974, pp. 240-241.

"Avai k'axine jure naa atraažane,..." Written on the occasion of the opening ceremonies of the theological seminar in Kazan. Published in: Sočinenija v proze i stihab... na raznyh jazykov govorenyh, Kazan 1761. Bibl.: SHOTKIN 1967, p. 11 (reproduction of the text); SERGEEOV 1972, p. 59.

The land-surveyor K. MIL'KOVK collected materials on the Bulgars and Chuvash. His manuscript is dated to 1781, but it was published first in 1827, then by MAGNICKIJ, later NIKOLEKIJ has also dealt with this manuscript. It contains prayers, the names of gods and articles of clothing Bibl.: 'K. Mil'kovsk o čuvašah': Severnyj Arhlv 1827, c. 27 No 9, 47-67; No. 10 120-139, No. 11, 210-232; N. V. NIKOLEKIJ, 'Ètnografičeski očerk Mil'kovskoj pisatel' [a XVII vokna o čuvašah]: IOAJE 22(1906), pp. 31-37. The 1827 edition was reedited by MAGNICKIJ in 1888, under the title 'O čuvašah'. See also: 'Ètnografičesko oprisanie o Kazanskoj gubernii kapitana Mil'kovskoj': IOAJE 14(1898), pp. 236-253; SERGEEOV 1972, pp. 54-56; KONONOV 1972, p. 80. The second worklist in an augmented version of the former. The additions were made on the request of PALLAS.
14. Slovar' jazyka suvajakogo (ROGPB Ermitažnaja No. 222), unknown author. This is the largest wordlist from this period, contains about 3,000 words. Bibl.: JEGOROV 1949, 124-130; KONONOV 1972, 94.

15-16. The full title reads: Slovar' jazykov raznyh narodov i Nizhgorodskoj eparchii obitayushchih, imjanno Rossijan, Tatar, Çjuvaj, Mordvy i Čeremis. Po vyscafjemu sozvaniem i poveleni Eja Imperatorskogo Velikomučenika premudroj Gosudarnyj Ekateriny Alekseevny, imperatoricy i samoderjcy vse rossijskoy, po alphavit ot znajushch onyj jazyki svjajčenikov i seminaristov pod prsimrhom prerosviataenoj Damaskina, episkopa Nizhgorodskogo i Aiatorskogo, sobrannoy 1785 goda. There exist two copies of this important and frequently cited work. The first copy is in the ROGPB (Ermitažnaja No 223). The second which was the draft copy is now in the Archives of the Gorki (formerly Nizhgorod) region. (Kollekcija Nizhgorodskoj gubernskoj učenoj arhivnoj komissi, f. 2013, op. 602, d. 187 and 186) in two volumes. This second copy is more complete and also contains a Votyak word-list. The Chuvash material was compiled by J. ROŻANSKIJ, G. ROZANSKIJ, I. RUSANOVSKIJ and P. TALIEV. The lay-name of Damaskin was D. Semenov-Kudnev. Bibl.: JEGOROV 1949; GORSKIJ 1959, p. 31; SERGEEV 1972, pp. 57-59 and A.P. FEOKTISTOV, Russko-mordovskij slovar", M., 1971.

17. Čravnitlj'anye slovari vseh jazykov., Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa, Catherine II began her linguistic studies under the influence of Lomonosov and Lebontz. She used the comparative word-lists of Dumaresque and Bacmeister and also obtained materials from F. Nikolai. Later she instructed the clergy and the civil administration to gather further materials. After a while the Empress tired of the work and entrusted it to the naturalist Pallas. Pallas planned his research in 1785, he compiled instructions in 1786 and appended to them a word-list of 442 items in Russian, German, Latin and French. This list was sent to the clergy, the civil administration and to Russian diplomats abroad. On the Russian title-page the date of the first volume is 1786, on the Latin 1786. The second volume dates from 1789, in this the African and American languages are included. The Chuvash material was compiled by J. ROŻANSKIJ, G. ROZANSKIJ, I. RUSANOVSKIJ and P. TALIEV. The lay-name of Damaskin was D. Semenov-Rudnev. Bibl.: JEGOROV 1949; GORSKIJ 1959, p. 91; SERGEEV 1972, pp. 57-59 and A.P. FEOKTISTOV, Russko-mordovskij slovar", M., 1971.

18. Dejstvie nizhgorodsko) duhovno) Komiteta, prorabotannoe vo onoj pri okončani učelčenog učeni jv prissudstv... Damaskina episkopa Nizhgorodskogo i Alatorskogo...pročeh znamenitých osob...1788-goda ljuanja 30-go dnya. Compositions in Chuvash. Now in the State Archives of the Goriki (formerly Nizhgorod) territory (f. 2013, op. 602, No 1150), therefore from other sources.

19. Kratkij katihizls perevedennyj na čuvaskij jazyk s nabljudeniem rossijskogo i čuvaskogo prostoředstva radi udobnejšego onogo poznavanja vosprjaviščeh svjatoe kreščenje. Compiled by J. ROŻANSKIJ in the seminary of Nizhgorod. Published in Sittb 1800. The MS is now in the Adelung collection (ROGPB, f 7, arh. Adelanga No. 26), Bibl.: PETEHOV
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1967, p. 104; KONONOVA 1972, p. 79.


23. Blmvol very. The MS has been received on the 16th January, 1791. (ROGPB f. 7, arh. Adelunga No 26,18/1). Bibl.: KONONOVA 1972, p. 79.


25. Molitva vostav 'ana. Molitva pered obedom. Molitva posle obed (ROGPB f. 7, arh. Adelunga No 20,14) Bibl.: SERGEVEY 1972, p. 56 (according to SERGEVEY one prayer was supplied by 1. RUSANOVS|).
36. E. DESKO, Vengerskaja grammatika s russkim tekstom i v arvanenti s čuvašskim i čeremskim jazykom, Simbirsk, 1856. DESKO rejected the Finno-Ugrian relationship of the Hungarian language and he wrote his book to prove his point. Since he thought that Chuvash is a Finno-Ugrian language he contrasted Chuvash and Hungarian to demonstrate that there is no relationship between them. Desko wrote his book in 1854 in Simbirsk where he was a teacher in the local gymnasium. Bibl.: LIGETI L., 'Deskó Endre csuvs-magyar nyelvhasonlítása' (Endre Deskó's comparative linguistic studies in Chuvash and Hungarian: Közéleti Csoma Archivum 71 (1921-1923) pp. 319-320), ALEKSEEV 1970, pp. 218-217.
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41. I found the first reference to GROMOV in AHLQUIST's above cited letter to SCHIEFNER where he writes "Zweitens zog mich der Umstand hin, dass der Geistliche Gromov in Kozmodemjansk lebt, welcher eine Reihe von Jahren an einem Tschuwaschischen Wörterbuch gearbeitet hat, das er vor mehreren Jahren handschriftlich nach St. Petersburg sandte wo es 'post varios causas' an die Akademie der Wissenschaften gelangt ist" We know from SERGEEV that the work was passed by the censor in 1842 (SERGEEV 1972, p. 69). In the Archives of N. V., Nikolskij kept in the Naučno-isledovatel' ski Institut, Čeboksary (old. 1, No. 192) there is a Russian-Chuvash dictionary, in which notes have been added by more than one person at a later date. The first: Slovar se razmatrival čeboksarskogo uzužda, selu Janulevskaja avjaščennik Petr Vasilevskij. The second: Prinnadlež Pavlov Fedorovič Mokinu 1888 Kazan Mostovaja, Sobstvennyj dom. Then in the hand of Nikolskij: Nastojščeh slovar est' kopija a čuv.-rus, slovarja V.P. Višnevskogo, napečatannogo v konce grammatiki, N.N.-lj, 25,1,1911. Somebody deleted this and wrote: Nastojščeh slovar est'
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Debates on prehistory do not perish; they just get transmuted. The so called "Ugro-Turkish" war long ago has ceased, and nobody today would dispute the Finno-Ugric origin of the Hungarian language, yet there is a latent and at times vehemently eruptive debate going on concerning the extent to which the economic-cultural-ethnical as well as anthropological characteristics of the conquering Hungarians was determined by the Finno-Ugrian origin and the Turkic component respectively. While according to one view the Hungarians, having separated from the rest of the Ugrians, had gradually achieved, due to internal development and complex external influences but basically of their own effort, the highly developed half-nomadic way of life, the level at which they appear to us at the time of the Conquest of Hungary; the other extreme view holds that the Turks had organized a primitive equestrian people of hunters and fishermen, providing them with a high culture. Between these two end points all shades of the spectrum can be encountered.¹

¹ I think the question of "Turkish or Finno-Ugrian" has become outmoded not only in the sense that the Finno-Ugrian origin of the Hungarian language can no longer be doubted, but outmoded also in the sense that the study of prehistory can no more be restricted to the study of the origins of the language. Clearly the origin of the language is not identical with ethnic origin, and it is the task of the researcher to discover those historical factors that appear in the different subsystems of the ethnic unit. Thus for example in the economic system of the conquering Hungarians we have to examine what is the exact origin and conditions of development of the various means, techniques and experiences of production. In examining pre-Conquest Hungarian agriculture we also have to see what was formed by tradition, what by autochthonous internal development, and what by external influences. Making any side absolutely predominant would be a serious methodological mistake. The problem of agriculture at the time of the Conquest has been much discussed by historians too. Some of the more important studies recently published in this field are P. Váczy, A korai magyar történet néhány kérdéséről, in: Šezadok XIII. (1958), 285—348; Gy. Győrfi, A magyar tatorténet néhány kérdéséről, in: Történelmi Szemle IV. (1961) 417—426; I. Szabó, A falu rendszer kialakulása Magyarországon, Budapest 1966; A. Bartha, A IX—X. századi magyar társadalom, Budapest 1968, 26—28; A. Bartha, Gazdaságtörténet és szakasz, in: Magyar Nézete LXV (1969), 14—26; T. Hoffman, Vor- und Frühgeschichte der ungarischen Landwirtschaft, in: Agrártörténeti Szemle, X. Suppl. (1968); Z. Újvéry, Az agrárkultusz kutatása a magyar és az európai folklórban, in: Műveltség és Hagyomány XI. (1969) 204—205; L. Balassa, Az eko és a szándék története Magyarországon, Budapest 1973, 248—261.
The debate centres round the Turkic loanwords of Hungarian. On one side it is said that these loanwords clearly reflect the character of the Turkic influence; on the other side it is retorted that the conclusive force of these words is very slight. It is highly probable that the Hungarians had danced even before the borrowing of the word "tánc" "dance" from Middle High German, and we would have no reason to doubt the existence of ancient Hungarian sheep-breeding even if we only had the Czecho-Moravian loanword "birka" in the Hungarian language. Moreover, the fact that the words "kar," "arm," "térd," "knee," "gyomor," "stomack" and "köldök," "navel" are of Turkic origin, should not induce us to assume a lack of these parts of the body in the Ugrian age. Or of "ész," "mind" for that matter. Generally speaking, the question is to what extent we can rely on the testimony of the word stock in problems of ethnogenetics, economy or social history; and specifically, what historical processes are reflected in the well-known thematic groups of our Turkic loanwords?

It must be stressed from a methodological point of view—as it has been stressed by others too—that the inherited or borrowed status of words cannot simply be equated with the history of the object or activity they denote. Even in the case of correspondences impeccable both phonetically and semantically, we can only venture to draw conclusions after considering numerous other criteria and aspects. In every case it is necessary to examine together the whole system and the material-historical background.

Furthermore, it is clear that in the light of the latest findings of history and archaeology the theory of "the great leap of the primitive hunting-fishing Ugrians" is untenable. As Antal Bartha says, "It is no longer possible to speak of the encounter between the Proto-Hungarians, standing at the level of the Ob-Ugrians, if not more primitive still, with the much more advanced Turkic peoples. Our words borrowed from Western Turkic testify a modification of the advanced level of our prehistoric culture, not its beginning". Or, to quote a recent statement by Gyula László: "We thus needed no Turkic 'influence' whatsoever to change over to the agriculturally stockbreeding form of life." Gyula László's keen insight, however, does not halt at this point, for he adds, "Of course this still leaves us our layer of Turkic words, but their appearance will have to be accounted for by some other hypothesis." This other hypothesis would be the theory of

---

*The latest exposition of the problem in this form comes from D. Sinor (UAJb, XLIII, 1960, 277), but he failed to give an explanation of Hungarian names for parts of the body which are of Turkic origin. It is now possible to prove for all these words that they were originally borrowed as names for the parts of the animal body; thus they are really part of our stockbreeding terminology taken from Turkic.*


*A honfoglalókról, Budapest, 1972, 17.*

*It is not clear to me how the theory of the double Conquest can account for our layer of Turkic words. If the Hungarians settled in the Carpathian basin in two waves, we either have to suppose that both groups had Turkic loanwords, or that only one group did (the third possibility would be that they were borrowed here). If both groups had Turkic loanwords, then this obviously does not solve the problem, not speaking of the fact that in this case it ought to be possible to distinguish with linguistic means between the two kinds of Turkic loans of the two layers. If only one*
the double conquest of Hungary. In my opinion Gyula László's theory cannot solve this problem. What can help us here is finding a suitable historical analogy. The closer this will be to the Hungarian-Turkic contacts in age, character and content, the greater its convincing force.

Such a parallel, in direct relationship with Hungarian prehistory, is provided by the Mongolian links of our pre-Conquest Turkic loanwords.

It has long been observed that many loanwords in the Hungarian language have perfect Mongolian parallels. Several theories can be brought up to account for this. They are the following: 1. Hungarian has words directly borrowed from Mongolian; 2. Mongolian words have got into Hungarian by way of Turkic mediation; 3. Hungarian borrowed from some old Turkic language which was very close to Mongolian; 4. the Turkic loanwords of Hungarian are related to their Mongolian counterparts because both the Turkic and the Mongolian words derive from a common Altaic parent language, and Hungarian has borrowed from the Turkic; 6. The Mongolian parallels of our Turkic loanwords have been borrowed from Turkic, just as they have been by Hungarian.

It is clear that whichever of the above views is accepted, it will directly bear on Hungarian prehistory, while the last supposition contains the hope of a possible analogy.

Lajos Ligeti, in a fundamental work nearly forty-five years ago, outlined the main aspects of the question. He showed that there was no reason to suppose direct borrowing from Mongolian, or of Mongolian borrowings by way of Turkic. Recently the problem has re-emerged, partly because historical contacts between Hungarians and Mongolians are not wholly unlikely (cf. the recent suggestions by Károly Czeglédy for Balangar and Chungar), and partly because of the Mongolian character of the language of the Avars, not yet proved, but not yet refuted either. As I see it, however, there is as yet no reason to revise our previous standpoint.

The pre-Conquest Turkic loanwords in Hungarian can be divided into two groups with respect to their Mongolian characteristics. One group displays linguistic features which exclude a Mongolian origin; the other is

had possessed a Turkic element, we would still face a number of unsolved problems. If for instance our Turkic words had been brought with the second wave, including words of agriculture, then we would have to examine the type of agriculture of the first group, and its transformation under the influence of the agricultural technology of the second group. In this case it will be difficult to explain why names for plants native in the Carpathian basin, too, like kőris "ash", som "cornel", alma "apple", körte "pear", kender "hemp", komló "hop", etc. were borrowed from the language of the second group only?

See Mongolos jövevényszavaink kérdése, in: Nyelvtudományi Közlemények XLIX (1939), 190-271.

indifferent as to a Mongolian derivation. There is no group, however, with clear-out Mongolian features distinguishing them from Turkic.

As for Turkic mediation, the situation has slightly modified. We know from the investigations of Lajos Ligeti and Gyula Németh⁸ that there are items of Mongolian origin in our so-called “middle Turkic” layer of loanwords, (e.g. daku, nyögér), but no trace so far can as yet be detected among our pre-Conquest Turkic loanwords.

Poppe’s view on Hungarian loanwords from Pre-Turkic, a language stage close to the Altaic parent language,⁹ has been convincingly refuted by Lajos Ligeti,¹⁰ but chronological considerations also lead us to exclude this point from among the possibilities.

All this being so, two possible theories remain for the explanation of the Mongolian parallels: the hypothesis of the common Altaic inheritance, and the hypothesis that Mongolian has a group of Turkic loanwords.

In the Hungarian literature on prehistory it is usually the first of these that is widely known, though Gyula Németh very soon suggested that the Turco-Mongolian correspondences were due to borrowing rather than inheritance.¹¹ In the more cautious wording of Lajos Ligeti: “... the Turkic and Mongolian languages have been—as testified by historical sources, mainly Chinese—in permanent contact with each other for nearly two thousand years... It cannot be doubted that as a result of these contacts we have to reckon with intercrossings and borrowings from various ages and of varying intensity. ... it may often be the case that a correspondence, thought to derive from the Altaic parent language is in fact nothing but the trace of a contact that took place after the separation of the two languages. The danger of misunderstanding is especially great if the correspondence due to this interaction comes from an age prior to the oldest extant textual documents of the Turkic or Mongolian language.”¹²

The problem, however, has a so far undiscussed aspect that concerns Hungarian prehistory.

The mere quantity of the Mongolian parallels of our Turkic loanwords is very significant. If we accept the number of our pre-Conquest Turkic loanwords to be about 300, it seems remarkable indeed that more than a hundred of these, or one in every three, have a perfect Mongolian parallel.

⁸ The problems of Hungarian nyögér have been discussed by J. Németh (AOH III. [1953], 1—23) and L. Ligeti (Nyelvtudományi Közlönyek XLIX. [1935], 242., AOH XIV. [1962], 68—59); on daku see “A mongolok titkos története” ed. L. Ligeti. Budapest 1982, 148. Hungarian telegen (←Mong. telege) has reached us by Slavonic mediation, see L. Ligeti, op.cit., 168.
¹¹ Some participants of the international debate that has flared up around the “Altaic hypothesis” seem to be unfamiliar with J. Németh’s views on the historical relations of the Altaic languages. His major contributions to this field are: Die türkisch-mongolische Hypothese: ZDMG LXVI (1912), 549—576. A török—mongol nyelvviszonyokhoz, in: Nyelvtudományi Közlönyek XLIII (1914), 126—142.
We must haste to add, however, that these one-hundredodd Mongolian equivalents are in greatly differing relations with the respective Hungarian words. For chronological reasons we must exclude those which are demonstrably recent in Mongolian, so for example the immediate Mongolian counterparts of Hungarian *tenger* "sea", *társ* "store", *kőris* "ash-tree" and *ildom* "good manners" though the Manchurian parallel of this last word point to an earlier Mongolian form. The remaining words can be divided into two morphological groups. One will contain those Mongolian parallels whose morphological (but not phonetic) structure corresponds to the Hungarian word (either because both are stem words, or because both contain the same stem and derivational suffix). The second group consists of words where only the stems correspond, such as *kérődzik* "ruminates", *ök* "urine", *szúcs* "furrier", *tanú* "witness", *tér* "knees" etc. It seems advisable, with respect to the problem under discussion, to put this second group aside for the time being. From a semantic point of view, we can again divide the correspondences into two groups. To the first belong those instances where the meaning of the Hungarian and Mongolian word is identical or very close. To the second group belong those words where, either in Mongolian or in the immediate source of the Hungarian loan, we have to do with some special semantical development. Thus for example our *fükör* "mirror" means simply a round object in Mongolian and in the majority of the Turkic languages, while in Chuvash, in Slavonio which borrows from Bulgarian, as well as in Hungarian it has the meaning "mirror". Likewise the Mongolian parallel of our *sülő* means also a toothed animal, but there it refers to domestic animals with a full denture, while in Hungarian the meaning is "toothed fish, pike-perch" just like in Chuvash. It is better to put aside this group, too, temporarily, so as not to disturb the certain with the hypothetical.

The remaining Mongolian-Hungarian parallels still make up for more than a quarter of the Turco-Hungarian correspondences. The core of this group is constituted by words that display a clear so-called "Chuvash criterion", viz. for Common Turkic *s* they have *r*, for *z* they have *r*. Therefore we have every reason to include into the group under discussion those Turco-Mongolian correspondences which, even though they have no Hungarian counterpart, display the same clear phonetic criteria.

If we give the material thus collected a semantic look, we arrive at the remarkable conclusion that the Turco-Mongolian correspondences, just like the Turco-Hungarian ones, reflect a developed level of stockbreeding and a significant agriculture. Besides the words *borjú* "calf", *bika* "bull", *mongolian* *jü dam* 'good skier' is from Turkic. Manchurian *iđa* 'to be nimble', *iđamu* 'refined, elegant, educated, nimble', however point to an older Mongolian *iđam*. Chuvash *yállam* can be the correspondent of an earlier Chuvash *lldam*, but could be a loanword from Misher-Tatar.

13 Mongolian *jü dam* 'good skier' is from Turkic. Manchurian *iđa* 'to be nimble', *iđamu* 'refined, elegant, educated, nimble', however point to an older Mongolian *iđam*.

14 As is well-known, the most important criterion of our Bulgaro-Turkic loans is that they have *r* and *l* in place of Common Turkic *s* and *s* respectively. In the corresponding Mongolian words we also find *r* and *l*. In the opinion of some (Ramstedt, Poppe, Rästynen) both Chuvash and Mongolian have equally preserved Primitive Altaic *r* and *l*. According to a more recent but more and more widely accepted view the Mongolian words in question are ancient Bulgaro-Turkic loanwords.
ökör “ox”, ünő “roe”, sürü “wether”, teve “camel”, béklyő “hobble” etc.,

we find in Mongolian the equivalents of our árpa “barley”, kender “hemp”,
bor “wine”, búza “wheat”, dió “nut”, dara “groats”, tarló “stubble-field”,
gyékény “bulrush”, dröl “to grind”, töl “hemp-breaker” etc. We also find
many parallels of words reflecting the way of life of the steppe south of
the forest region, like űröm “artemisia”, tűzok “bustard”, görény “polecat”,
karraly “sparrow-hawk”, toroniái “a kind of hawk”, teve “camel” and
so forth. Of the words without a Hungarian parallel, the group includes
abdominal fat’, ‘progeny’, ‘lean-to roof’, of the names of animal colours
‘grey’ and ‘brown’ etc.¹⁸

Our first impression, then is that Mongolian came under the same
economic-cultural influence as Hungarian; what is more, phonetic evidence
—which is at least as important—proves that the influence came from one
and the same Turkic culture.

But we can further elaborate this picture from several aspects. Take,
for instance, the question of agriculture. We first learn of the Mongolians
in the 13th century as of a typically nomadic, stock-breeding people. It is
all the more remarkable that the Monguors, who have been surrounded
by Chinese since the 14th century and thus isolated from the rest of the
Mongolians, and speak an archaic variety of Mongolian, have an agricultural
terminology which is not Chinese, but Mongolian even today;¹⁹ many of
its words have a Hungarian equivalent e.g. árpa, búza, dara, tarló, dió,
álma “apple”, tyúk “hen”. This means that the Mongolians had their
own agriculture coexisting with their stock-breeding as early as the 13th
century and before, and in the light of the linguistic and historical evidence
we have to reject once and for all the image of "nomads without an agri-
culture".

The Turco-Mongolian and Turco-Hungarian contacts show typological
agreement in a number of other features as well. Hungarian ődör “tent”
and kádor “stake” indicate, besides the evidence of archaeology and the
sources, that the Hungarians knew the dwelling of the yurt type. The
Mongolians live mainly in yurts; moreover, it is demonstrable from a
morphological-historical aspect that the Mongolian and the Turkic yurt
stem from a common original. In spite of this, the terminology of the Mon-
golian tent differs considerably from that of the Turkic. As much as there.
is in Mongolian of Turkic origin, can be found in Hungarian as well (ődör,
kádor, kapu “door”, terem “chamber”)

¹⁸ Cf. Mong. araya ~ Tu. qal qal ‘molar tooth’, Mong. bili ~ Tu. bid ‘to churn’,
Mong. eljigen ~ Tu. eljek ‘sses’, Mong. kimir ~ Tu. qirze ‘koumiss’, Mong. qurayan
~ Tu. qiri ‘lamb’, Mong. quljan ~ Tu. qold ‘blaze (on forehead)’, Mong. qurbing ~
Tu. qar ‘abdominal fat’, Mong. tolj ~ Tu. tid ‘progeny (of animal)’, Mong. qaiq ~ Tu.
yad ‘lean-to roof’, Mong. boro ~ Tu. boz ‘grey’, Mong. dayir ~ Tu. yo; ız ‘brown’.

1⁹ On the agricultural terminology of Mongolian origin of the Monguor language
see D. Schröder, Aus der Volksdichtung der Monguor, as well as the review by A.
Róna-Tasa in: Anthropos LXVIII. (1973), 329–331; furthermore A. Róna-Tasa, Some
Notes on the Agriculture of the Mongols, in: Omușcules Ethnologica, Ludovici Biró
Sacra, 1969, 445–472.
The terminology of Mongolian literacy points to several Turkic layers. These include a younger, Uiguric group, but there is an older one as well. Is it mere coincidence that we find the equivalents of Hungarian ír "to write" and betű "letter" in this older group? Actually, the equivalent of belü occurs in the oldest record of Mongolian character, the Tabgach Glosses from the 3rd–5th centuries. In the system of Hungarian numerals it has been impossible to reveal Turkic elements, with the sole exception of Hungarian tömény, originally meaning 'ten thousand', and used also as a military term, which is undoubtedly from Turkic. This word again exists in Mongolian, where the only other Turkic correspondence is the numeral meaning 'thousand'—which was again probably used as a military term. In the lower values of numerals, with the exception of the disputed number 'four', not one Turco-Mongolian equivalence can be proved. Besides the numerals used as military terms, however, Hungarian sereg "army" also has a perfect Turkic-Mongolian parallel.

Amongst negative correspondences the most conspicuous is horse-breeding. As is well-known, Hungarian horse breeding has no Turkic terms. Likewise, the oldest layer of the terminology of Mongolian horse-breeding is devoid of Turkic parallels, though of course the picturesque here is slightly more complicated as the long symbiosis of Turks and Mongols gave rise to some borrowings both ways; however, these are of a later date. If—without being able to go into further detail—we add to the above that not only numerals are absent from Turco-Mongolian correspondences, but also terms for fishing and hunting, wild animals, natural phenomena, basic social concepts, parts of the body, etc., confronting this to the fact that contiguous groups of the terminology of developed stockbreeding, military organization, literacy, (and in the Turco-Mongolian field, that of advanced metallurgy) agree with each other, then we have drawn a

19 The Turkic word is probably of Tocharian origin. As a loanword or loan translation it appears very early in the Slavonic languages too. See Pusiner, etymology slovar IV, 34.
20 For Mongolian morin 'horse', gegün 'naro', and unayan 'foal' we find in Turkic at, be and tay respectively. For a comparison of Turkic and Mongolian stock-breeding terms see A. M. Sborshik, Naznaniya domashnyh i detskikh zhivotnyh v turkskih jazykakh, Moscow 1981, 82—172., and the same work for such relatively late loans as Mong. ajirya — Tu. adir (88b.).
plastic picture of the historical-typological analogy of Mongolian–Turkic and Hungarian–Turkic correspondences.

(I should like to add parenthetically that it does not necessarily follow from the above, as is often assumed nowadays, that the Turkic and Mongolian languages were never related to each other. All that is shown by a thorough analysis of the material is that the linguistic relationship between the Turkic and Mongolian peoples is relatively very remote, and the majority of the agreements are relatively late loans, a process possible between related languages.\textsuperscript{22}

It would be a mistake, however, to leave it unsaid that besides the fundamental agreements there are essential disagreements as well. First of all, in the quantitative field. According to seemingly reliable counts the Mongolian–Turkic correspondences in the group under discussion are more than five times as many as the Turkic–Hungarian correspondences.\textsuperscript{23} This can follow from the duration and intensity of contacts, and from the difference between the stage of economic development of the peoples in contact. It would be difficult to separate these at the moment but it seems that all the three factors were slightly different in the case of Turco–Mongolian and Turco–Hungarian contacts respectively.

The semantic analysis, too, shows some discrepancy. I have already mentioned that Hungarian metallurgy, in spite of all its nomadic and Turkic parallels, is devoid of Turkic elements, while the basic vocabulary of Mongolian metallurgy (‘copper’, ‘bronze’, ‘iron’, ‘tin’, ‘lead’, ‘to found’, ‘mine’, etc.) shows Turkic correspondences. Hungarian pig-keeping is evidenced by our disznó “pig”, serte “bristle”, artány “barrow”, all from Turkic, while the basic words of the quite insignificant pig-keeping of the Mongolians (yaqai, megefi) are not Turkic; on the other hand, the terminology of the wild boar (gaban, torui) shows Turkic parallels. It is interesting that the equivalent of Hungarian disznó is missing not only from Mongolian, but from all the Turkic languages, with the sole exception of Chuvash.

Phonetic analysis, in turn, reveals some disagreements as well. Though the particular Turkic layer of Mongolian we are dealing with points to the same Onogur–Bulgarian language as the Hungarian data, we must not ignore minor dialectal differences. While both Hungarian dél and Mongolian dűl show a voiced initial as opposed to Common Turkic tüä, in the case of our görény “polecat” the Mongolian has a voiceless (kürene), but in the case of our kölyök “puppy, young”, a voiced initial (gölüge). We do not have to look for a Hungarian or Mongolian development behind these phenomena, for it can now be proved that the Bulgaro–Turkic language

\textsuperscript{22} For a more thorough treatment of this problem see Voprosy Jazykозnanija, 1974, 2, 44–45.

\textsuperscript{23} The calculations are based on the r/I words. In Hungarian 16 or 16 words belong to this category, in Mongolian 96 to 98. If the total number of Bulgaro–Turkic loan-words in Hungarian is about 300, then in Mongolian there must be about 1,500 such words.
preserved its sporadio voiced initials down to the 13th or 14th century.*

That Hungarian came into contact with at least two Bulgaro-Turkio dialects before the Conquest can no longer be doubted.

Still more important for us, however, is the fact that phonetic analysis reveals some chronological discrepancies as well. We are now able to outline relative chronologies both within the common Turco-Mongolian and the Turco-Hungarian vocabulary, which are then complicated in dialectal variants not only on the Turkio side, but on the Hungarian and perhaps on the Mongolian side as well.** This complex picture, however, does not conceal from us the conclusion that the Turco-Hungarian correspondences reflect a somewhat later stage of development of the Bulgaro-Turkio or Onogur language than does the relevant group to Turco-Mongolian correspondences. Thus for example the -d- of Hungarian idő “time” still agrees with the -d- of Mongolian üde, but our túzok and búza, with their internal -z-, point to a more advanced stage than the stop consonant reflected in Mongolian joyudaq and buyudai. As opposed to Géza Bárczi,** I still do not consider it impossible that the ö of Hungarian sereg, borsó “pea”, kos “ram” to have originated in the language they were borrowed from—for they can be found in the Bulgaro-Turkio elements of Common Permian—, whereas Mongolian preserves the ö in these words. It is also likely that the vocalism of the initial syllable of Hungarian béka, béklyó, gyertya goes back to a Turkio original,** but in a later form than that reflected in the Mongolian. As I have elsewhere examined the chronology of the word final gutturals in some detail,** I do not wish to dwell on that here. These and some aspects of the vocalism show together that Hungarian-Turkic contacts have to be dated somewhat later than the bulk of the Mongolian-Turkio contacts.

---

* Of course we still have no reason to doubt the sporadio, internally-motivated voicing of Mongolian and Hungarian voiceless initials; after all, this happened in non-borrowed words as well. Cases like Proto-Permian *gombē (~Zyrian gob, Votyak gubi etc.) ~ Volga Bulgarian gūmbē ~ Russian gōka (cf. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények LXXIV, 1973, 283) indicate that voiceless initials were not unknown in 9th-century Bulgaro-Turkic, otherwise there would have occurred sound substitution. Tatar and Bashkir gōmbe~gūmbe~Volga Bulgarian gūmē~Chuv. körmpa, körmpa, on the other hand, show that the voiced initials of Volga Bulgarian were preserved down to the time of the contacts with the Kipchak languages.

** See L. Ligeti, A propos des éléments “alatiques” de la langue hongroise, in: ALH XI (1961), 34.


** This is usually explained by assuming dissimilation, while cases of Hungarian i for Turkic a are accounted for by supposing that Hungarian borrowed a back vocalio i: Chuvash i, however, developed relatively late in place of earlier a, certainly after the Turkio-Hungarian contacts, while its original i became ñ or ë. We have to postulate as a middle stage of the development PT a > Chuv. i a sound that was replaced partly by ñ and partly by e in Hungarian.

The background of Hungarian prehistory, as outlined above, offers the possibility of drawing two different conclusions. We are witnessing the linguistic reflexion of processes that agree in their main lines from a historical-typological point of view. It would be inappropriate to think in the case of the Mongolians, too, that they learnt stockbreeding and agriculture entirely and exclusively from the Bulgar Turks; for example, the Mongolian word for 'plough' has no Turkic parallels. Archaeological findings, too, would contradict this. But the fact that both the Mongolians and the Hungarians borrowed the same terms indicates a well-definable economical-technical complex, a new technology of agriculture and stockbreeding, which involves the borrowing of new words.

As for Hungarian prehistory, the Turkic influence on the Hungarians has received a new depth of focus. The beginnings of the economical-cultural complex that came into contact with the Hungarians do not fade into an inscrutable distance; we get information on an earlier phase, and can make inferences on its internal development.

As for the historical side of the problem, the picture here outlined is in accordance with the results of the latest research. We know from the studies of Károly Czeglédy that the Ogur tribes occupied a territory from the Altai to Lake Baikal and to Manchuria,* that is, in contiguity with the Mongolians. It is from here that they set out for the West; they are first mentioned in Europe in 468.

---

THE PERIODIZATION AND SOURCES OF CHUVASH LINGUISTIC HISTORY

BY

A. RÓNA-TAS (Szeged)

I.

Periodization in diachronic linguistics is a practical device. Since language changes continually, and there are no leaps and bounds in the stream of linguistic history, we cannot accept any periodization based on the specific

1 More than ten years ago, I began to write a monography on the history of the Chuvash language. I had to choose an appropriate starting point, so I set out to investigate the issue of the relationship between Chuvash and Mongolian. I could not evade the "Altaic theory", the problems connected with the reconstruction of the oldest kind of Turkish, nor those of the relationship between the Chuvash-type and the Standard Turkish languages. I tried to clear the way in a dissertation: Az altaji nyelvrokonság vizsgálatának alapjai. A nyelvrokonság elmélete és a csuvas-mongol nyelvviszony. (The Foundations of Research on the Altaic Linguistic Relationship. The Theory of Linguistic Relationship and Chuvash-Mongolian Linguistic Relations.) Budapest 1970, 1025 p. Manuscript. In 1978, I published the theoretical part of this work (A nyelvrokonság [Linguistic Relationship]. Budapest 488 p.). The next step was to give a periodization and to discuss the sources of Chuvash linguistic history. The text prepared for publication grew enormous. For my students, I provided a brief sketch in Bevezetés a csuvas nyelv ismeretébe (An Introduction to the Chuvash language). Budapest 1978, pp. 16-83. Instead of publishing a bulky monograph on the sources — which would have delayed the work several years — I decided to restrict myself to giving a sketchy overview. I am aware of the fact that almost all of the questions dealt with in this paper would need more explanation, a more thorough treatment of earlier views, more data and more arguments, but had I stopped to give these, even this paper would never have reached the reader. In any case, I hope that this overview will be of help to those who feel lost in the complicated history of the Chuvash language. I greatly appreciated having had Egorov’s introduction (Yvedenie v izuchenie chuvaskogo jazyka, Moskva 1930); in its time, it was more than useful — it was fundamental. Egorov’s later comprehensive work (Sovremennyj literaturnyj čuvaskij jazyk v eramnastoj — intirovokom erawtěštěi Čeboksary 1954, 2nd revised edition 1971) is disappointing, but does not lessen our admiration of this great scholar to whom we owe the Etimológičeskij slovarj čuvaskogo jazyka (Čeboksary 1964) and many other works. I cannot here give even a brief history of the study of Chuvash linguistic history (for an outline, see my Bevezetés..., pp. 99-114), but I should like to acknowledge the help Professor Ligeti’s work has been to me. Most of the questions raised in this paper have been solved or at least tackled by him. Unfortunately, most of his papers, written in Hungarian, have not reached Turkologists living abroad (see the reprint of his papers
internal features of the language. The segmentation we give, the time in which the changes in a language occur, depends on our concept of the language situation, on our methods of linguistic reconstruction and on the character of the sources at our disposal.

The past few decades have given rise to vivid discussions on the problem of linguistic reconstruction both in general linguistics and in Turkology. The basic problem involved in these discussions is the question of the relationship between reconstructed and existed languages. The answer was already given by Bloomfield, who clearly distinguished occurred languages and reconstructed ones. The latter has to try to reflect the former as closely as possible, but, by definition, it can never be identical with it. Therefore,

A mezgyer nyelv törtéhez hasposolásai és ami hertüléstek van I–II [Turkish–Hungarian Linguistic Contexts and Some Attendant Problems]; Budapest 1977, 1978). I owe much not only to his published works, but also to his lectures and to our personal discussions. Originally, we had hoped to publish this volume as a token of our esteem, for his 75th birthday. (The manuscripts of the papers of this volume were completed in 1977 and sent to the publisher in 1978.) Though we did not succeed in doing so, I hope this volume appearing on his 80th birthday will reflect the great influence he had had on Turkish, and more specially, on Chuvash studies.

I. Dyen (in his Reconstruction, the Comparative Method and the Proto-Language Uniformity Assumption; Language 46 (1970), pp. 609–618.) distinguished five types of protolanguages: 1. Disintegrant protolanguage — the last phase before the disintegration; 2. Glottochronological protolanguage — the total basic vocabulary; 3. Occurrent protolanguage — which really existed, e.g. the vulgar Latin in case of the Romance languages; 4. Reconstructed protolanguage — the language reconstructed only with the help of the related languages; 5. Implied protolanguage — the language which we have to assume by implication from the reconstructed language, but which is not identical with it. I think it is unnecessary to overcomplicate the question. We have reconstructed and implied proto-languages, and the implied were occurred ones. Recently Serebrennikov (Prajazyk nab neobschisnaya model); OQIFU. Budapest 1976, pp. 61–69.) treated protolanguages “as indispensable models” which help us get to know the really existed ones. On the theoretical problems and earlier literature, see my Nyelv可供的, pp. 288–303.

According to Tenev (K povyazhu “obshstjenie sovremennosti” ST 1971, 3, pp. 18–16), Common Turkish is the hypothetical language of the Turkish tribes, one we can reconstruct through comparative historical methods. Tenev considers Common Turkish as an “organisatory device” for the various types of reconstruction. For Besakov’s very interesting views, see: Archejana konsolidacija drevnejshikh narodov i geneticheskoe rodatse alaikskikh jazykov. In Problemy obshnosti alаikskikh jazykov. Ed. O. P. Sunik, Leningrad 1971, pp. 315–322; and Periodizacija utori razvitiia i formirovaniia tjurtskich jazykov; MSFOu 168 (1977), pp. 41–48; he stressed the importance of the areal processes of consolidation in the Altaic and later the Turkish languages.

we have to distinguish between Proto-Turkish and Ancient Turkish, the first being a language system arrived at through reconstruction, the second the really existed language which Proto-Turkish can only approximately reflect.

A third term used in the literature is Common Turkish. Sevortjan, whose views on the concept of Common Turkish are the clearest, raised a very real problem. In the daily work of linguistic reconstruction, the linguist is always confronted with "contradictions". Some can be eliminated simply by assuming or recognizing secondary developments, some are due to our lack of knowledge and, therefore, can be solved when new material comes to light; but some remain. Since the famous controversy between Schleicher's Stammbaumtheorie and the wave theory of J. Schmidt; many attempts have been made to master this problem. Let me here refer only to the theory advanced by Trubetzkoy. He tried to find the cause of the contradictions in Indo-European reconstruction by assuming that IE developed from different languages, through a secondary process. He assumed that what could be reconstructed without contradiction originated from the secondarily converged Sprachbund, with the "contradictions" being due to the original differences in the componenta.

There is both theoretical and historical evidence for the role of areal convergence, yet Trubetzkoy's theory is unacceptable. Another way out is suggested by the group of scholars whose representative figure in Turkology is Doerfer. According to Doerfer, wherever we have "contradictory" correspondence, what we have to do is to reconstruct the different prototypes. For instance, if we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chuvash</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Chuvash Turkish</td>
<td>- Chuvash Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr- &quot;to get tired&quot;</td>
<td>dr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xur &quot;goose&quot;</td>
<td>qdz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

we have to reconstruct different proto-phonemes, say a₁ and a₂, for Proto-Turkish. No doubt, in some cases this procedure is justified. But let us extend this series to Yakut:

---

1 E. V. Sevortjan, O soderžanii termina "obšetjurskij": ST 1971. 2, pp. 3–12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chuvash</th>
<th>Yakut</th>
<th>Other Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ir- ‘to get tired’</td>
<td>ir-</td>
<td>ār-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xur ‘goose’</td>
<td>ĕs</td>
<td>ĝāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uyaz ‘moon’</td>
<td>ĭy</td>
<td>āy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñur- ‘to split up’</td>
<td>ñr-</td>
<td>ĭār-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yun &lt; xfün ‘blood’</td>
<td>ŋān</td>
<td>qān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case we have to reconstruct five proto-phonemes. Now, if we add that the Tuvianian ay does correspond to the Yakut įy ‘moon’, while both the Tuvianian ĭrîn and the Chuvash īrdm correspond to the Yakut ĭrîn ‘belly’ we find that we have either to give up, or to reconstruct as many proto-phonemes as there are “contradictions”.

This was the problem which Sevortjan realized, and which led him to look for another solution. According to Sevortjan, all these “contradictions” were already present in the oldest form of the Turkish languages. Turkish forms such as et- and ôt- ‘to sing’ cannot be reduced to one form, he claims (Sevortjan, op. cit., p. 6), and their coexistence is the most important trait of what he calls Common Turkish (obšchē tjurkskoe sostojanie). This solution, in the form Sevortjan suggested it, is likewise unacceptable. In case of et- and ôt-, Sevortjan speaks of the “alternation of ē ~ ô in the Turkish languages”. This is an abuse of the term “alternation”. The term “alternation” can be used only in cases of free variants within a dialect. This, however, is not what we have in the case of et- and ôt-. There is no Turkish language where these two forms are freely interchanged — and we have no reason to suppose that such ever existed. If we say that ô alternates with ē, ē alternates with i, i alternates with ĭ, ô alternates with u, as Sevortjan supposes, then we reconstruct a language where practically all vowels can be freely used instead of one another. This would mean the neutralization of their phonemic opposition (labial for illabial, and front for back being explicitly suggested by Sevortjan, op. cit., p. 8).

As we see, Doerfer’s approach menaces with overcomplication (in Khalaj Materials he suggests 30 vowel phonemes for PT), Sevortjan’s, with oversimplification.

If we distinguish proto-languages and occurrent languages, it will be clear that any reconstructed proto-language projects its findings on a synchronous screen, although the features themselves existed in a number of different places and at various times. This is the first reason why we see “contradictions” on the screen. In the case of the Turkish languages, I propose to call the earliest stage Ancient Turkish, which has to be divided into two periods; Early Ancient Turkish (EAT) and Late Ancient Turkish.
EAT lasted from the dissolution of the Altaic unity until the appearance of those dialects which later became the respective nuclei of the several Turkish languages and language groups. In the EAT period, there was what might be called a heterogeneous linguistic unity. There was one language, spoken with a number of local differences. The differences, like the groups speaking them, were unstable. The various groups understood each other, and had contacts of varying degrees of intensity. Along with the historical changes taking place, the language situation slowly changed, too. Some groups became more stably connected and slowly dialects appeared. With the appearance of dialects, LAT took shape. The dialectal features appeared — as in all languages — as isoglosses. Many of the latter coincided and formed a bundle of isoglosses, some others, however, transgressed them. Unless we keep in mind this finding of modern dialectology, we will be unable to understand the problems connected with the reconstruction of Proto-Turkish. For instance, whenever we assume a phonological isogloss, say X in one territory, and Y in another, its existence can be reconstructed on the strength of a number of words in which X is typically used in one place, and Y in the other. There are, however, always some "undisciplined" words which do not "respect" the main phonological border and transgress it. We have this situation whenever we have to do with dialects which were in close contact. When those speaking these dialects went their separate ways for historical reasons, they took with them also the "undisciplined" words which cause the apparent "contradiction".

There is also a third reason for these "contradictions". Language never changes in an instant. There develops a tendency to change a feature X in a language to Y. Such tendencies (e.g. the voicing of unvoiced plosives, the narrowing of a vowel) effect most of the words in the given category. But all these words do not change at once. Frequency of use, more stable occurrence in frequently used expressions can delay the change. If the tendency to change is just starting when the speakers of the various dialects go their separate ways, the change always takes place with varying intensity in the different dialects. The shortening of the primary long Turkish vowels is a tendency which can be well observed in many of the Turkish languages. The speed with which this change took place, however, differed greatly. We have no reason to assume that LAT was a language where the rules governing the lives of dialects did not apply.

Late Ancient Turkish is as far as we can get with the help of the sources at our disposal. There are no insoluble contradictions within Proto-Turkish, it is only that the complex dialectal, areal and historical facts are projected on a two-dimensional screen. Our task is not to form as many hypotheses
as there appear to be contradictions, but to try to reconstruct a complicated situation as it was. No doubt, such a reconstruction can never be perfect. But it might be an approach to Proto-Turkish reconstruction which will help us see more of Ancient Turkish as it really existed.

Accordingly, I suggest the following periodization of Turkish linguistic development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altaic</td>
<td>Altaisch</td>
<td>алтайский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Turkish</td>
<td>Urgänisch</td>
<td>пратюркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Ancient Turkish</td>
<td>Früh-Urtürkisch</td>
<td>ранне-пратюркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Ancient Turkish</td>
<td>Spät-Urtürkisch</td>
<td>поздне-пратюркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Turkish</td>
<td>Altürkisch</td>
<td>древне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Old Turkish</td>
<td>Früh-Altürkisch</td>
<td>ранне древне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Old Turkish</td>
<td>Spät-Altürkisch</td>
<td>поздне древне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Turkish</td>
<td>Mitteltürkisch</td>
<td>средне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Middle Turkish</td>
<td>Früh-Mitteltürkisch</td>
<td>ранне средне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Middle Turkish</td>
<td>Spät-Mitteltürkisch</td>
<td>поздне средне-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Turkish</td>
<td>Neutürkisch</td>
<td>ново-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early New Turkish</td>
<td>Früh-Neutürkisch</td>
<td>ранне ново-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late New Turkish</td>
<td>Spät-Neutürkisch</td>
<td>поздне ново-туркский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Turkish</td>
<td>Modernes Türkisch</td>
<td>современный тюркский</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Altaic is a term used for the common language presumably spoken by the ancestors of the Turks, the Mongols, and the Manchu-Tungus, and probably of other groups as well. It has to be stressed that this language, too, must be thought of as having the (long) history, the territorial variants and the areal sub-groups had by all other languages. Unlike those who deny that such a language existed, I admit the possibility of its occurrence; but unlike those who take its existence for granted, I want to emphasize that it had to exist much earlier than is commonly supposed and that the bulk of the much-debated Chuvash-Mongolian parallels do not pertain here. For those who deny the existence of the Altaic community, the neutral term Pre-Turkish can be recommended.

Ancient Turkish denotes the stage following the separation of the Turkish-speaking people from their Altaic relatives. Early Ancient Turkish — as stated above — lasted until the formation of the LAT dialects. It was in LAT that there developed the so-called rotacism and lambdaism which later became typical of the Bulgar-Chuvash group. Although this was an important feature — one that divided the LAT into Ancient Bulgarian and Ancient Standard Turkish — it was not the only one; on the other hand, there were several features which connected AB with an AST group, and there were other features common to both AB and some AST groups.
Old Turkish began with the separation, formation and consolidation of the independent Turkish languages. This was a long historical process, and by "independent Turkish language" I do not mean the ancestors of the present Turkish languages. The first two groups which emerged were Old Bulgarian (with more dialects, and perhaps even languages) and Old Standard Turkish. The latter very early broke up into groups such as Old Oghuz, Old Kipchak etc. The modern independent Turkish languages developed from these in the Middle Turkish period.

Old Turkish has to be divided into two sub-periods. Early Old Turkish is the period which lasted until the formation of the great Western and Eastern Turkish Empires. Late Old Turkish is the period when we first have at our disposal texts written by the Turks themselves. LOT can be divided into further subperiods. LOT I is a short period which lasted from the formation of the First Turkish Khanate until the formation of the second. At the present time we have no reliable Turkish texts from this period. The most important events of LOT II were the formation of literary languages, and the development of a kind of koine in the whole Turkish Empire. The beginning of the Arabic-Persian influence marks the beginning of LOT III. The OT period ended with the Mongolian invasion.

Middle Turkish begins with the Mongolian invasion, which brought a considerable rearrangement of the language situation both in respect of the interrelationship of the Turkish languages to each other and in respect of the impact of the Mongolian language on the Turkish languages. The gradual formation of literary languages, and the formation of those language groups which later became the independent languages of today were events which occurred at different times in the several parts of the Turkish world. Therefore, the sub-periods, Early and Late Middle Turkish, have to be fixed separately in the case of each language.

New Turkish begins with the conclusive formation of the present Turkish languages. Its first sub-period ties in with the struggle between the old literary languages and the spoken ones, while the later sub-period is characterized by the appearance of purism.

Modern Turkish is every language whose synchronic structure and dialects can be investigated.

The above sketch needs some qualification. As we have seen, the criteria for periodization are extralinguistic, and take into account several aspects: the type of interrelationship among the language units (local groups, dialects, languages, etc.), the historical events importantly though indirectly influencing the history of the language, and the types of sources available for reconstructing the system of the period. The terms "Ancient", "Old",

119
and "Middle" are of relative significance. All are terms for the occurrent languages. Of course, in the course of reconstruction, we can speak of Proto-Oghuz or Proto-Ottoman, but Proto-Ottoman can only be the approximation of those dialectal groups which developed within the Oghuz dialectal unit.

Although all these periods are but more or less of relative value, we cannot do without some chronological coordinates for orientation. The first event which we can date with some degree of probability is the separation of the /r/ and /z/ language groups.

The word for 'stirrup' is common to all Turkish languages including the Bulgarian group. The proto-form of Chuv. șdrana can be reconstructed as *irärfi. In case of the Standard Turkish languages, we can reconstruct two prototypes: *ızengē (for Oghuz, Kipchak and Turkestan) and *ızenge (for Baraba, Khakas, Tuvanian, Yakut and Yellow Uighur). Since we find rotacism in the word, its development has to have preceded the separation of the AB and AST dialects. On the two-dimensional screen of reconstruction we find three data. We are confronted with two isoglosses. The r-isogloss included only Bulgarian. The i-e-e vocalism of the word was general in Bulgarian and Siberian (of the migration of the Yellow Uighurs, we are well informed from historical sources). The dropping of the g in Chuvash is a special secondary development. The z-isogloss characterized Siberian, and other Turkish groups wherein the i-e-i vocalism extended to a narrower area. This is a typical dialectal situation of the kind referred to above. The three types certainly went together, and most likely, they had an earlier common form. Theoretically, we have several means of reconstructing this, the first being the reconstruction of the Altaic form.

Gombocz,8 Ramstedt9 and more recently Poppe10 and Sevortjan11 connected the Turkish word with the Mongolian dörüge, 'id'. This interpretation, however, is unacceptable for phonetical, morphological and semantic reasons.12 A second possible approach is to find the etymology of the word.

12 Mongolian dörüge is a derivative of dörü 'iron or rope nose-ring (for cattle); lead rope (for cattle); rope handle of a basket; splint, cotter pin', see further dörüheči 'halter, dog leash; makeshift rope stirrups', dörügebči 'rope stirrup for donkey and
Already Bang\textsuperscript{18} had suggested deriving this word from ṣe, an idea which Doerfer (\textit{TMEN} II, p. 149) found not implausible. Clauson, in view of the problems of the vocalism of the first syllable, did not treat the word as derivative (Clauson, p. 289). The question then, is whether we opt for the i-e or the a-e vocalism. It seems very unlikely that the farthest archaic dialects each independently came up with a common innovation, while the central ones preserved the original vocalism. It seems unlikely, but it is not impossible. If the Siberian, Yellow Uighur i.e. Old Uighur and the Bulgarian dialects were in contact during the LAT period, it was a situation quite different from what it is now. In that case, we don't have to assume that the same innovation occurred in the same word among speakers many thousands of kilometres form one another. In fact it probably occurred in a contact area, whence the speakers later moved on in different directions.

Through internal reconstruction, we can say that the -z- of Standard Turkish and the -r- of Bulgarian goes back to one and the same phoneme. According to some scholars, whom I agree with, this phoneme was -z-; according to others, it was r of whatever phonetic shape (r, f).

What can be concluded from the above? If we go only so far as the facts allow, we can reconstruct a protoform like *3zeng3 where 3 stands for a front vowel. We can state that as early as in LAT there existed dialects and the word is of earlier origin than the z: r opposition. From this we can go one step farther.

There is lively debate as to the time of the appearance of the stirrup. According to Vajnštejn,\textsuperscript{14} the first reliable finds which can be connected with the stirrup originate from between the 4th to the 6th centuries A.D. Kyzlasov\textsuperscript{15} argues for between the 4th and the 3rd centuries B.C. The

\textsuperscript{18}W. Bang, \textit{Vom Kütürkischen zum Osmanischen} III: \textit{APAW} 1919, p. 48.


contradiction, however, is only apparent. From the historical data, it is clear that the appearance of the stirrup on a large scale is connected with the Turks. Using metal stirrups on both sides of the horse, the Turks revolutionized the technique of war. But the double iron stirrup was preceded by various similar devices, such as rope stirrups, wooden stirrups, small stair-like implements on one side of the horse making it easier for old people or pregnant women to get into the saddle. The existence of such devices is also mentioned by Vajnútejn for an earlier period. Thus, the existence of the stirrup and its rapid spreading by the Turks over the whole world need not be identically dated. We can assume that the object was already known in the first centuries B.C. In this case, we have a terminus ante quem for the appearance of rotacism. And we also have an insight into the time-depth of LAT.

The chronology of the appearance of rotacism, and with it, of Ancient Bulgarian, can be corroborated by the AB loanwords in Samoyed. Donner¹⁸ had discussed these words, but owing to the open question of whether Proto-Turkish had r or z, no conclusions on the chronology could be drawn. Common Samoyed *yär 'hundred' < LAB *yër ~ ST yěz¹⁷ leave no doubt that the word was borrowed before the separation of the Northern and Southern Samoyeds, i.e. before the beginning of the 1st century A.D. Thus we have two independent sources pointing approximately to the same time.

---

¹⁷ K. Sonner, Zu den ältesten Berührungen zwischen Samojeden und Türken; JSFOu 40 (1924), pp. 3-42.
A *terminus post quem* can be extrapolated from the Old Tokharian loanwords in AT.\(^\text{18}\) Such words as OTokh. *yes ‘metal’ → AT *yez > yez ~ yer* came into AT earlier than rotacism appeared. Early Turkish–Tokharian contacts (much earlier than those which are well known from Turkestan in the 8th–10th centuries A.D.) have been assumed by Németh\(^\text{19}\) and Winter.\(^\text{20}\) According to the latter the time was “close to the beginning of the Christian era” (p. 248). We are left to the hypothetical arguments of archaeology, and to interpretations of Chinese sources (Yutaj-chi–Tokharian identity) as to when the early Turkish–Tokharian contacts began. The whole issue of the North-East migration of the centum-Tokharians seems too obscure to me; I would venture to say no more than that it might have occurred in the first half of the first millennium B.C. That would, then, be the *terminus post quem* for the formation of LAT.

Even less certain is the time of the formation of EAT, i.e. the formation of Turkish itself. Ramstedt assumed\(^\text{21}\) that 4,000 years ago the Altaic languages were already separated. Ligeti\(^\text{22}\) was of a similar opinion; recently\(^\text{23}\) he wrote: “about 2,000 B.C., perhaps 3,000 B.C.”. In his posthumous work, Illič-Svityč\(^\text{24}\) stressed that the common Altaic language broke up significantly earlier than the other five linguistic unities: Uralic, Dravidian, Indo-European, Kartvelian and Semito-Hamitic. All these speculations reckon with the great differences which existed among the earliest reconstructed forms of Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu–Tunguzian. I shall return to some aspects of this question later. For now, I should simply like to say that LAT is the stage where we can begin to work. If we can give a more or less adequate reconstruction of LAT, we shall perhaps get a new starting point for going further back to EAT — and Altaic.

---

Given the above context, we can now sketch the periods of the history of the Chuvash language. Before going into the details, however, we need to solve a terminological problem. The ethnic name “Chuvash” is relatively new. The Europeans learnt it from Herberstein who visited Russia in 1517 and 1526. Herberstein’s data were taken over from Russian sources. In the Russian chronicles, the name Chuvash occurs under the year 1553 in connection with the occupation of Kazan (PSRL 1914, 20, p. 483, 1935, 20, pp. 62, 163); the other sources referred to the Chuvash as Moscow Cossacks (Čeremisian Languages; cf. J. Tardy’s paper below) for quite some time as well. Although several etymologies have been suggested for this ethnic name, to date we have no reliable data on its occurrence earlier than the beginning of the 16th century. The use of the name Bulgar is somewhat misleading, not only because the Slavonic Bul-
gars living in the Balkans bear the name of their early Turkish rulers, but also because Chuvash is only one of the Bulgarian-type languages. The term Bulgar-Turkish — introduced by Gombocz under the influence of Afimarin — is ambivalent, having originally been used by Gombocz to denote the Volga Bulgars. We have, however, to reckon with Onogur-Bulgarian tribes in many other places. Moreover, it seems highly likely that the ancestors of the Chuvash spoke a language very similar but not necessarily identical to the language reflected in the Volga-Bulgar inscriptions. Taking all these problems into account, for the sake of simplicity, I shall call all languages with */l* Bulgarian, while the */z* languages I shall call Standard Turkish. For the periodization, I suggest using the following terms:

*Ancient Bulgarian.* This is the period when the Bulgarian dialects developed within the LAT unity. This lasted from the first centuries B.C. until the beginning of the 4th century A.D. when the Ancient Bulgarian tribes together with other Western Turks moved to the West.

*Old Bulgarian.* Old Bulgarian can be divided into two sub-periods. Early Old Bulgarian lasted from the appearance of the Onogur-Bulgarian tribes in Khazakstan around the middle of the 4th century, until the dissolution of the Great Bulgarian Empire around 670. Late Old Bulgarian can be further subdivided. LOB I lasted until the 9th century. This is an important turning-point in the history of the Old Bulgarian people. The Turkish-speaking Bulgars living in the Balkans were rapidly assimilated by the Slavs towards the end of the 8th century (see pp. 147-161). The Magyars living in close contact with the Onogur-Bulgarian people conquered the Carpathian basin and lost contact with them (for more detail, see pp. 141-147). The Volga Bulgars slowly moved to the north and founded the Volga Bulgarian Empire in the 9th century, first under Khazar supremacy. Late Old Bulgarian II is the period between the 9th century and the Mongolian conquest in 1235/1236. The Khazar Empire, in which Bulgarian-speaking groups played an important role, ceased to exist in the 10th century. We have, however, no reliable data on the fate of the inhabitants of the Khazar Empire.

*Middle Bulgarian* begins with the destruction of the Volga Bulgarian Empire. During the reign of the Golden Horde we have to reckon with the massive immigration of Kipchak tribes. Some Volga Bulgarian groups were Tataricized, while others evaded the Kipchak intrusion, but got into close contact with the Finno-Ugria people living in the forests. This is the time when the formation of the present Chuvash language began. Early Middle Bulgarian lasted until the organization of the Kazan Khanate in
the 1430s. In Late Middle Bulgarian, the influence of the Kipchak-Tatar grew considerably. Late Middle Bulgarian lasted until the fall of Kazan in 1551/1552.

New Bulgarian can also be called Chuvash if we speak about the periodization of the history of the language. In fact, the Tatars of the Kazan territory called themselves Bulgars until recent times, for ethnically, and in respect of political tradition they had much in common with the Bulgars. Though the influence of the Kipchak-Tatar language did not diminish in the new Bulgarian period, the Russian influence grew significantly. The Christianization of the Chuvash began. Early New Bulgarian or Early Chuvash is the period from the fall of Kazan until the first written source in the Chuvash language: 1723, the compilation of Strahlenberg's word-list (published in 1730). The second sub-period lasted until the formation of the Chuvash literary language at about the end of the 19th century. After the October Revolution, Modern Chuvash began to develop.

II.

The sources of Chuvash linguistic history can be divided into two groups: written and linguistic sources. Among the written sources, we can distinguish those written in some Bulgarian language, and those written in a language other than Bulgarian. Within the second group, we have to distinguish glosses (proper names, personal names, toponyms, titles, scattered common words, etc.) and glossaries. These latter originate from communications by native Bulgarian speakers, or non-Bulgarian individuals who spoke a Bulgarian language, or are second and third hand. From the methodological point of view, we have to distinguish also those glosses of Bulgarian origin which were used by the authors of the texts in question as a word in their own language.

The linguistic sources can be grouped into four sub-groups. For Chuvash linguistic reconstruction, the data on the Standard Turkish languages are indispensable, helping us as they do to reconstruct the AT forms in those cases when we are dealing with original Chuvash words, and helping us to reconstruct the original in the cases of borrowing. The Chuvash language itself is of great help; through inner reconstruction, we can arrive at the original form. The third group consists of loanwords which entered the Chuvash language, while the fourth group contains those linguistic elements which were borrowed from Bulgarian by another language. All these sources complement each other, and thus our task is to give a reconstruction of the
changes in the Chuvash language which is consistent with or at least is not inconsistent with the data of the various sources.

Since the Bulgarian languages are part of the Turkish language-family and Turkish belongs to the Altaic group of languages, theoretically the Altaic common language would be our first source. Although there is no reason to deny the Altaic linguistic unity, for the time being the reconstruction of Altaic seems to be farther off than ever. Until we reconstruct Ancient Turkish, Ancient Mongolian and Ancient Manchu-Tunguzian and then find systematic correspondences among the three, we have only vague hypothetical forms to operate with. Let me illustrate this with just two examples. By means of inner reconstruction, we can assume the following system of oral guttural stops in initial position:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Ancient Turkish} & \text{Ancient Mongolian} & \text{Ancient Manchu-Tunguzian} \\
\text{k} & \text{k} & \text{k} \\
\text{A priori, we can consider none of the three systems as reflecting the original Altaic. It is very probable that the AT system is secondary, but until we know the conditions under which and the way in which the Altaic system was simplified, we cannot figure out how AT corresponds to AMo. and AMTung. Neither do we know whether it is AMo. or AMTung. which is secondary; perhaps both derive, say, from a quaternary system of opposition k: k': g: g' as in Sanskrit. We could also assume for the whole series an undefined K but this would be nothing more than the symbol of our ignorance.}
\end{array}
\]

In case of the Chuvash əw- 'to count, to reckon', sum 'number', sun- 'to wish' etc. we can reconstruct with the help of other Turkish languages a stem əd-. In Mongolian, we find sana- 'to think' and in MTung. we can reconstruct a verb əd- 'to know'. It can hardly be doubted that these words pertain together. Ramstedt and Poppe did not hesitate to reconstruct an Altaic stem əd-. Some problems, however, remained unsolved. The vowel is long in Common Turkish, but short in Bulgarian (otherwise we would expect əw-). Of course this can be a secondary development. The Mongolian sana- is isolated; no other derivations of əə- are available, and the length of the vowel is undetectable. We can assume that the Mongolian sana- is the only form to be preserved, with all other derivatives having somehow disappeared. But it is suspicious that the extended form sana- is present in Old Turkish, where it can hardly be a Mongolian loan. The MTung. əə- has a very extended word-family with regular correspondences in all MTung. languages. From a semantical point of view, AT 'to count,
to reckon', AMo. 'to think' and AMTung. 'to know' can all be the semantical developments of a common Altaic word, but we can only guess which of the three meanings — if not a fourth — was the original meaning of the word.

With the above examples I wanted to show not the impossibility, but only the complexity of the problem of Altaic reconstruction. A sweeping scepticism would close the way forward. But denying or overlooking the difficulties would only lead us astray. The more urgent task of the moment seems to be to reconstruct AT.

The problem of the sources of AT begins with the much mooted language of the Asian Hsiung-nu and the European Huns. Németh and others were of the opinion that at least a group of the Huns spoke a Turkish language. Recently Doerfer drew a wholly negative conclusion. From a historical point of view, we cannot a priori deny that some Turkish tribes took part in the formation of the Hunnish federation. The material hitherto available is, however, too scanty for us to draw any — positive or negative — conclusion. If some of the etymologies suggested by Németh and others do turn out to be correct, the language which they reflect was certainly not a Bulgarian one. I have mentioned the problem of the Huns only because Baskakov and many scholars following him derive the Bulgarian languages from the "Western Hun" group.27

As we have seen above, the Bulgarian dialects developed in LAT; since this paper is devoted to the sources of Chuvash linguistic history, let us begin with the LAT sources.

Among our sources on LAT, I have already mentioned the Old Tokharian loanwords borrowed before the formation of the Bulgarian dialects. Tokharian documents are known originating from the 5th to the 8th centuries, when in Turkestan two (according to others, even three) Tokharian languages existed, Tokharian A and Tokharian B. The reconstruction of Common Tokharian has not yet been accomplished. In view of the fact that the two Tokharian languages were quite different from the 5th to the 8th centuries, first Old Tokharian A and Old Tokharian B has to be reconstructed, and then their common ancestor. Thus e.g. TokhB. piś "five", TokhA. pĕś both go back to an IE *penkUe, most probably through an Ancient

27 G. Doerfer, Zur Sprache der Hunnen: CAJ 17 (1973), pp. 1-60, with a detailed discussion of the earlier literature. For Baskakov's classification, see N. A. Baskakov, Vvedenie v izuchenie tjurkskich jazykov, Moskva 1969, Prilozenie 2. Western Hun in Baskakov's terminology is practically Western Ancient Turkish; he, however, insisted (cf. Periodizacija... p. 44) that lamblacism and rotacism were peculiar to Western Hun, for which I found no corroborating data.
Tokharian *peM3. With the regular drop of the preconsonantal nasal in TokhB., an Old Tokharian B *peš can be reconstructed, one which regularly gave the Turkish bêš. The length of bêš could be due to the disappearance of the nasal. TokhB. yasê. TokhA. wás ‘gold’ is a regular development of IE *yes. The Old Tokharian B form can be reconstructed as *yes (the á in yasê is secondary). This has been borrowed by the Turks as yez. The Old Tokharian loanwords have, of course, to be separated from the Tokharian loanwords which entered OT and which, in the main, are part of Buddhist terminology (in some of these cases, Tokharian was only a mediator of Prakrit forms). Tokharian peš is attested in VB bêš and Chuv. pilêk, while Tokharian yes is present in Mongolian fer jêbseg ‘(bronze) weapons’, and further, in Permian and Mordvinian as LAB loans (see pp. 155-156). Chuv. ysa ‘brass’ is a late Tatar loanword of the same ultimate origin.

A very neglected field is the question of Old and Early Middle Iranian loanwords in AT. The IE etymology of many Turkish words has been discussed, but the chronological problems and the possible lending languages or dialects are mostly as yet undiscovered. In Turkish, we have to distinguish the loanwords borrowed by AT and by OT: those borrowed in the OB period, and those which came into LOB with Finno-Ugrian mediation. It is very likely that we have to do with Iranian loanwords in the case of the Chuv. sêna ‘heifer’ (AI dhešina, Avestan dašnav > dāna → LAT tana > Chuv. tina), while the same word had been taken over much earlier by FU (see Hung. tehén → AI). More complicated is the question of Chuv. adra, Tu. atra ‘beer’, which most recently has been compared with Iranian by Aalto. Here the difficulties with the vocalism (AI suról) and with the initial a- which became a- in OI seem to be insurmountable. Joki is surely right when he separates the Turkish words from the Zyryan and Votyak sêr which are of Iranian origin. As in the case of Tokharian, so also in the case of Iranian borrowing: we have to keep separate the words borrowed during the OB period.

The question of the Finno-Ugrian–Ancient Turkish contacts is obscured by the problem of the Ural-Altaic relationship. A great number of parallel forms have been collected. Some authors are inclined to assume that most


of these parallels pertain to a common Ural-Altaic period. At the 19th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference held in Helsinki in 1977, once more the question of the UA relationship was discussed. There were enthusiastic, reserved and negative opinions expressed (see MSFOu 168, 1977), without any generally acceptable conclusion being drawn. As I have already pointed out, there are serious problems even with the reconstruction of the Altaic common language. These problems only cumulate if we try to go further.

At this point, the question seems more like a theological than a theoretical question.

I have chosen one of the most evident examples to demonstrate the kinds of problems that are involved. Räskänen (Etym. Wb. p. 8.) — an adherent of the idea of the UA unity — has suggested the genetic relationship of the following words: Tu. ayt ‘an enclosure for livestock, village’ ~ Mo. ayt ‘settlement, group of tents, neighbourhood’ ~ Ma. fahya, halga ‘family, village’ ~ Hung. fahu ‘village’, Ostyak pgyyl, Votyak pyyl. The etymology is old. It has already been discussed by Gomboez (Etz) who connected the FU words with Tu. baqq ~ Mo. ba’yasun ‘town’; and by Sauvageot, Menges, Collinder and others. The possible Altaic correspondence is also mentioned by the MSzFE (I. p. 180.). Now, if the word would be of common UA origin, we would have to accept the following hypotheses:

1. The word is present only in the Ugrio languages (Hungarian, Vogul and Ostyak). The suggested Samoyed equivalent has been rejected by Collinder and most lately by MSzFE, with reason. Other FU correspondences suggested hitherto are likewise out of question. Thus we have also to assume that although the word is present only in Ugrio, it is a Uralic word which has been lost in all other U languages.

2. If payyl was the Uralic form, we have to assume a metathesis in Hungarian. If the metathesis occurred in Ob-Ugrio we have to reconstruct a form *pyyl — as MSzFE does.

3. For an Altaic comparison, the form payyl fits better. If we chose this form, than we have to assume that the word is a derivative. An U or FU -
derivative suffix can, of course, be assumed, but we do not know anything about the stem, for it appears nowhere. We have to assume that it has disappeared.

4. If Tu. ayil Mo. ayil and Ma. faqqa pertain together and are from Common Altaic, we have to assume an Altaic *payil. In this case, we have to assume MMo. kayil and Monguor ẓayir, but in fact it is MMo. ayil and Monguor ayir that are attested.

5. This difficulty can be removed if we assume that Mo. ayil < ayil is a Turkish loanword. This is very probable (see Doerfer, TMEN II, pp. 83–84.) but in this case the Mo. member is not an Altaic word, and we have the word preserved only in Tu. and MT.

6. If we confront MTung. fayla and Tu. ayil, we have to assume that p- was lost in Tu., and that once more, a metathesis occurred in only one of the two.

7. If we assume that the metathesis occurred in MTung. (fayla < *faliy < *paliy < *payil) we have to separate the MTung. word from the following word family: MTung. palan (Nanai, Ulcha, Orok, Negidal, Udihe palan; Ma. falan) 'ground, court, yard place of birth' MTung. palyan 'sole, palm' (Evenki halgada- 'to go by foot', Solon algy 'foot, sole, palm', Even halyan 'sole', Negidal halyan 'sole', Oroch laga 'paw', Ude laga 'id. (of a bear)', Ulcha płączan 'sole', Nanai pala 'id.', Ma. falanyu 'palm', cf. Mo. alaya, MMo. halaya < *pala-yan etc.) This word family has the common root pal 'flat place'.

8. If Tu. ayil is an Altaic word, we have to separate the word from the Tu. verb ay- 'to rise', ayin 'a single act of rising', ayan 'prostration(?)', ayil 'ascent, rise'. This is difficult because ayil had the primary meaning in Tu. 'an enclosure raised for protecting the cattle'.

I have presented this UA comparison to show how many hypotheses have to be accepted to consider the words historically identical. I chose an example in which each hypothesis could, in itself, be a possible one, or at least cannot be rejected outright. But though sometimes we do have to work with some hypothetical forms, so long a chain of hypotheses is hardly admissible.

Németh, who did not accept the Altaic relationship, suggested another way. According to him, Uralic and Turkish were in a close "relationship."

\[\text{All data quoted from Srewniętli:Hryj slovarj tunguso-mančučkých jazykov I-II. Ed. V. I. Cincius. Leningrad 1975–1977.}

like” contact before 5000 or 4000 B.C. Németh discussed some morphological correspondences and 27 words which he thought to pertain to this period. With one exception (U *máksa 'liver' Tu. *bayr) Ligeti accepted Németh's comparisons as a sound basis for further research. However, he called attention to such words as Tu. *boje 'fat' which is present as mai only in the Volga Kipchak (→ Kirgiz) and the Siberian Turkish languages. Today, we can add to this list the Türkmen *may, but the OT and MT correspondences are still missing. Thus, it is very probable that these words are of later origin, and are loans from various FU languages. All FU data have an initial non-nasal bilabial or dentilabial spirant; therefore, we have to assume a Turkish *bay from which *may developed secondarily. If this was an AT word, then the b > m change would necessitate that we be able to reconstruct an AT *baḥ. On the other hand, it seems improbable that the b > m change occurred in several Turkish languages separately, and that the initial b- remained unchanged in none of them.

Another example illustrating the complexity of the early FU-Turk linguistics contacts is the history of the Chuvash word *kunta 'basket, osier, birch-bark basket'. As its phonetical shape (with k-) clearly shows this word is a loanword in Chuvash, but it was present in LAB and was borrowed from the Volga-Turkish languages by Permio, Cheremiss and Mordvinian (cf. Wichmann, *Tschuw. Lehnu., p. 76). The word is present in the Tatar dialects, in Bashkir, Tobolian, Shor, Khakass, Altai and Kyzyyl and goes back to an earlier *gomdu (for which see Mo. *gobdu, MT *gobdu). This is a FU loanword, whose original form can be reconstructed as *komtu3 'knapsack of birchbark' and which is present in Finnish, Vogul and Ostyak. As we have seen, the Volga-Finnish and Permio languages have reborrowed the word from Turkish. The word is present only in the northern area, where birchbark is an important material, and is surely a cultural word. The chronological coordinates are given by its existence in Finnish and in LOB; thus it can be safely dated back to AT. This may be an important hint as to the location of the original homeland of the Ancient Turks, which had to be somewhere in South Siberia (see the part on the Samoyed-AT contacts above, p. 122; and p. 188 below).

Serious problems arise in connection with the question of the AT loanwords in FU. It is well known that the Siberian, the Volga Finnish and the Permio languages have many relatively late Turkish loanwords; but these can be easily distinguished. The only FU group wherein serious attempts have been made to sort out early — i.e. AT — loanwords is the Ugrian

* As uráli és altáji nyelvek etc.
group. Poppe has discussed the so called "Altaic", in fact early Turkish, loanwords in Hungarian, separating from the OB layer, a yet older one.

In *op. cit.*, p. 145 he wrote: "The general conclusion is, that in the light of present Altaic comparative studies, Altaic loanwords in Hungarian need not necessarily have been taken from Volga Bulgarian or Ancient Chuvash which might have been either one and the same, or two dialects close to each other. Some of the loanwords display undoubtedly pre-Turkish features (*nyár*). Consequently, these forms were borrowed at a time much earlier than the period of the establishment of the Volga Bulgarian kingdom in the seventh century A. D. Other borrowings possibly invaded Hungarian later..." Ligeti in his answer discussed the phonological questions raised by Poppe and clearly demonstrated that of the archaic features dealt with by Poppe only the problem of AT *ñ-* is of relevance. While discussing the examples where AT *ñ-* > OT *ý-* corresponds to Hung. *ñ* (orthographically *ny-*), he concluded that there exists only one word in the case of which we can not exclude the possibility of AT or even earlier borrowing, and this is Hung. *nyár 'summer' ~ Tu. *yaz*. The Hungarian Historical-Etymological Dictionary (*TESZ* II, p. 1036) considered two possible etymologies for the Hungarian word; the above, and its etymological identity with the homophonous word *nyár 'moor', nyára* 'poplar' (*fa 'tree'). The latter is of Uralic origin. Poppe insisted that the word is of Altaic origin; while some words wherein the Altaic *ñ* corresponds to the Uralic *ñ* he supposed to be from the common UA language.

An AT origin has been suggested for those words in which the Hung. *ñ*-does correspond to the Tu. *ý*- because in words containing back vowels, FU *k* became *h*. In most of the OB-Hung. correspondences, *q* remained *k* in words containing back vowels. Therefore, those in which it became *k*- had to have been borrowed earlier. From the five words pertaining to this group, Ligeti has deleted Tu. *qazan 'kettle' ~ Hung. *hárang 'bell' (originally a little one used in falconry). The four words that remained are Tu. *qumtuz 'beaver' ~ Hung. *hód*; Tu. *qotan 'swan' ~ Hung. *hattyú*; Tu. *qumaq 'sand' ~ Hung. *hótok*; Tu. *qayý 'boat' ~ Hung. *hajó*. These

90 L. Ligeti, *A harang mint csengő, csengettyű és kolomp* (The Hungarian Word “Harang” as Denoting a Hand-bell, a Small Bell, and a Sheep Bell); *M Ny* 84 (1988), pp. 75-78.
words do not seem to pertain to the same group. In case of Hung. *kód > Vogul *kunt3 ~ Tu. qumtus the Turkish origin of the word is dubious because the reconstructed Tu. *qum is nowhere attested; moreover, a final -mt is phonologically impossible. In case of Hung. *kóti < *kókan, Vog. *kócan, Osty. *kókan ~ Tu. *gótan ~ *kütan (~ Hung. gő- dény) ~ Mo. *gotan ~ Tunguzian kunan (~ Yakut), Ma. *qutan (~ Mo.), the direction of the borrowing is uncertain. If common Ugrio dissolved in the middle of the first millennium B. C. even an Ugrio -> AT -> Mo. -> MTung. borrowing can not be excluded. The reconstructed Ugrio -tt- (if we assume a short -t-) this should have changed into Hung. -y-) remains without explanation if we assume AT -> Ugrio. But if we assume Ugrio -> AT there is no problem, because -tt- can easily have been replaced by -t- in Tu. The Turkish, Mongolian and Manchou-Tunguzian forms with final -n can be secondary developments of an *n, while Ugrio *n can hardly be a substitution for Tu. *n. The Hungarian word homok has no Ob-Ugrio parallels, and we cannot exclude the possibility that it has been borrowed from a Tu. language or dialect where q > ḡ had already occurred. Hung. *hajó can be only a Bulgarian loan, but the chronology of the Bulgarian q > ḡ is not yet settled.

Two explanations have been given for the correspondence Tu. yaz- 'to write' ~ Hung. ír- 'to write, to draw'; according to these explanations, we should assume not an OB origin — as do most authors — but an AT origin. In view of the Osty. yer- 'to draw', Kispál and others (see MSzFE II, pp. 321-322) assumed an early AT yer-. This has certain difficulties;

41 We can, of course, assume a Tu. qumtu, but then the illabial vowel in the second syllable in Vogul becomes problematic. A Tu. qumt would contradict the Turkish data where we have *u- everywhere in the second syllable. The Tatar -t- in qumtu is secondary.

42 Recently Sinor (On Water-Transport in Central Eurasia: UAJb 33 [1981], pp. 168-169) suggested that Hung. *hajó 'ship, boat' is a Turkish loanword borrowed before the ḡ > ḡ development. Doerfer (TMEN III, pp. 408-410) gives a plausible etymology (gay- 'to glide' gayuvq > gayuvq), which is accepted by Clauson (p. 676). According to Doerfer, the Hung. *hajó is not very likely to pertain to the Turkish word (p. 410 "was nicht sehr sicher scheint"). The MSzFE II, p. 248 quotes this as one of the two possible etymologies. The problem involved here is that in all Turkish data, wherever we have a final -q, Hungarian points to a final -y. This was also remarked by Sinor, who, however, evaded the problem, writing: "Its discussion would lead us far away from our present subject" (op. cit., p. 168). The voicing of the final Turkish ḡ/q in such cases is a typical Bulgarian feature (see A. Róna-Tas, On the Chuvash Guttural Stops in the Final Position. In Studia Turcica. Ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest 1971, pp. 389-399); thus, in this case, we have a word with a sure Bulgarian final and an initial ḡ in Hungarian.
for one thing, y- does not usually disappear before a in Hungarian. The etymology is possible only if we assume an a > i > i change in Hungarian, certainly not an unprecedented step. Even in this case, however, we need not postulate that the word had been borrowed by the common Ugric. Both Ancient Ostyak and Hungarian could have borrow the word independently. In the latter case, however, we could not specify the Tu. initial. In later OB loanwords, the OB, f- yielded the Hungarian d'- which was a new sound in this position, and no doubt developed under the influence of the massive influx of Turkish words. At this time, when Hungarian did not yet have an initial d', both a Tu. y- and a f- could have been replaced by y-. The problem with the hypothesis that this occurred in an OB word is that -t- is relatively late in this word in Bulgarian (see pp. 159-160. below), and surely later than y- > f-. In Turkish, the disappearance of y- before i is normal or, at least possible; its disappearance before f- however, is unlikely.

Another solution for Tu. yaz ~ Hung. år- has been recently suggested by Sinor, who assumed that the Chuv. å in år- preserved an original AT å- while the y- etc. of the other Turkish languages was secondary. The supposition is that the form år- was borrowed by Early Hungarian along with a substitute ar-, and that the initial å regularly disappeared (through å-) as in other FU words. Sinor's arguments for postulating an AT å- are not convincing, and the problems on the FU side also seem to be insurmountable.

I have above referred to the possible Samoyed-AT contacts already suggested by Donner and recently rediscussed by Janhunen. Below, I shall discuss one more Turkish-Samoyed parallel (pp. 160-161).

The importance of the Paleo-Siberian Ket group for Turkish linguistic history has been stressed by Ligeti. Possible connections between the
Ket group and the language of the Huns have been suggested by Ligeti\textsuperscript{46} and Pulleyblank.\textsuperscript{47}

The Ket group consists of the already extinct languages of Arin, Assan, Kot, Pumpokol, and of the languages spoken by the small groups which lived among the Teleuts (Aškįštįm) and the Koybals (Koybal–Kištįm). On these languages we have some linguistic material collected in the 18th century.\textsuperscript{48} The Ket still living has two dialects, Imbat and Sim. Ket has many Turkish loanwords, most of which are relatively recent, and were borrowed from the Siberian Turkish languages. Some of them could, however, be of earlier origin. Assan yaš, Imbat dił, dul, Pumpokol duľ 'child, young boy' (Duljzon op. cit., p. 166) can, perhaps, be connected with Tu. yaš ~ Mo. ėląjąń, niľą ~ MT ėl 'young, fresh'. On the other hand, Assan ėši, Imbat tšes, tši, čiši, Kot čiš, Pumpokol čiš 'stone' (Duljzon op. cit., pp. 168–169), can hardly be separated from Tu. taš ~ Mo. čiląjąń. In the cases of the Arin tep, tep, Assan tip, Kot tip 'iron' (Duljzon, op. cit., p. 167) their connection with Tu. temüri is clear if we take into account the Shor, Lebed and Sagai tebür. Imbat iede, Yeloguy 'iš', Kureyka 'išre, 'šišre 'spring' (Duljzon, op. cit., p. 180) could, perhaps, be a word connected with Tu. yaz (cf. id- in 'idumä:t 'book' ~ Tu. yaz- 'to write').

Imbat čšs 'weasel' is a relatively late loan from Tu. čšs 'sable', while Assan ėša, ėša, Imbat 'eđeđe, 'ędēđe, Kot ėša, Pumpokol ėši'yu (Duljzon, op. cit., p. 182) 'sable' is of Samoyed origin,\textsuperscript{49} and raises some problems regarding the old comparison Tu. čšs ~ kil Samoyed, *kili. The Ket data point to a Samoyed ki, and in this case -i in the Kamassian sili would be a suffix. If so, then we have two possibilities. Either ki goes back to kil' with a regular loss of final -' in Samoyed, or the Turkish word is of Samoyed origin. To these, I would add the Kureyka deš Ket (Messerschmidt) deš 'sea' (Duljzon, op. cit., p. 173) — which, if it has anything to do with LAT te̱nir is interesting because of its initial d- as well as the Arin ke'dilci, the Pumpokol ka'lu 'to speak' (Duljzon, op. cit., p. 162) which can perhaps be connected with the Tu. kele- (> Chuv. kala-), and the Mo. kele-. Since Duljzon and his collaborators have begun to work on the Ket material,

\textsuperscript{46} Mots de civilisation.
we know a lot more of these languages. A systematic comparison will be possible only after the Ancient Ket forms are reconstructed through inner reconstruction.

The most important source of LAT is the Mongolian language. All Altaists agree that in case of the Tu.-Mo. parallels, we have to separate the pre-13th century from the post-13th century layer. The only moot point is whether the pre-13th century layer is a monolithic one, or whether it should be further divided into several chronological layers. In the past, the adherents of the Altaic hypothesis had supposed that all pre-13th century Tu.-Mo. parallels originate from the common Altaic language. The opponents who denied the existence of a common Altaic language assumed that these parallels were borrowed from an early Turkish idiom by Mongolian. Now it seems that this rigid distinction is slowly disappearing. Even from a theoretical and historical point of view, it seems unlikely that during the long period lasting from the dissolution of the Altaic community to the 13th century A. D. we have to do with only one contact. But if we have to reckon with more layers, only one of them can pertain to the common Altaic language, and all others will be instances of historical contacts, i.e., of loanwords. I think that the assumption that the Turkish and Mongolian languages were separated by an impenetrable wall from the time of the dissolution of the Altaic language until the 13th century is a postulate which cannot be maintained. It is, of course, a more difficult task to specify the characteristics of the different layers than to merely declare their existence. But unless we postulate their existence, we have no chance of making progress in comparative Altaistics. In another paper I have suggested some criteria which might help us distinguish among genetically inherited and borrowed words.

As we have seen, the OT period began with the separation and southwestward migration of the Western Turkish tribes. This radically changed the type of contact there was between the Turkish and Mongolian groups. Here, we have to consider the following: the Eastern Turks extended their power toward the east, and not only remained in contact with the Mongolian tribes, but perhaps grew more influential. It is possible that although the bulk of the OB tribes migrated to the southwest, some groups remained in their original homeland — something often seen in the history of nomads. Their prestige, and influence on the Mongolians could not, however,
match that of the Eastern Turks. The Onogur–Bulgarian tribes moved away from the vicinity of the Mongols, but some long-distance contacts cannot be excluded. The steppe was always more of a connecting than a separating factor. It was not only the famous silk-road that served as a transmitter of objects and their names: as far as the forested South Siberian region, we find traces of old East-West contacts. Along these avenues some Old Bulgarian words may have reached the Mongolians even after the 4th century. Nevertheless, these post-4th century contacts had quite another character.

In discussing the Mongolian side of the AT-Mo. contacts, we have also to take into account a few other considerations. Because of the great structural-typological similarity between the Turkish and the Mongolian languages, the chronology of some loanwords will always remain unspecifiable. The chronological ordering of the several layers is hampered also by our scanty knowledges of Old Mongolian. Old Mongolian consisted of a number of languages (such as Sien-pi, Tabgach, Kitan, Tu-yl-hun etc.). Middle Mongolian, as it appears from our sources, was the continuation of only one Old Mongolian language. The formation of the Chingisid Empire began with the uniting of several Mongolian tribes some of whom probably spoke yet other, now extinct, Mongolian languages.

This has often been stressed by Ligeti, who demonstrated this problem with the words for 'iron'. The common word for 'iron' in Mongolian, semur, is well attested in all written sources and dialects. The word qasu 'iron' has been preserved only in Dahur. Ligeti traced back this word to

Moskva-Leningrad 1952, pp. 81-83). Its language is eastern Turkish and not Bulgarian. The name of the deceased in his childhood was Subul Indi, and his adult name was Kümül Öge. It is said in the inscription that he became Öge in his thirtieth year. He calls his people Kümül bodunum. The inscription uses the sign A for ə throughout the text, also in words containing front vowels e.g. bes yafe 'in my fifth year'; both əs are written with A and so is Subul. Kümül is written with Y i.e. with ɪ as in ɛ (line 4) tön (lines 6,9) "(tuy) nation". So the letter Y cannot be a mistake for ʏ ʏ ʏ which is used in other inscriptions for ə. The same enigmatic Kümül people occurs in the second inscription of Klil Çira as kümül bodunum: here the name of the deceased was Küül Toyun, and his father's name was Arslan Küül Tirg. Malov (op. cit., p. 80, also Pamjatniki drevnejjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii. Moskva-Leningrad 1959, pp. 69–70.) reads Kümül budun here, but he had only second-hand copies which contained many errors. In the last edition of this inscription by Batmangov and Kunaa (Pamjatniki drevnejjurkskoj pis'mennosti Tuvy I, Kyzyl 1963, p. 57.), the -ɬ of kümül is clear. Perhaps this "Silver People" were OB tribes who had already lost their original language and spoke an Eastern Turkish idiom.

L. Ligeti, Mots de civilisation, pp. 150–108.
Kitan, where it was a loan from Old Kirgiz (most probably a non-Turkish language of Old Paleosiberian, more precisely, of Ket affinity). The Old Kirgiz word had been borrowed from Samoyed where it pertains to the Uralic stock (U *y-adjusted with further IE affinities).

The great task of the future will be to separate the AT words which invaded Ancient Mongolian from those which came into one or more Old Mongolian languages. In this connection, I can only quote Ligeti who, in connection with the reconstruction of the Tabgach words, wrote: "A propos des équivalents turcs et mandchous-tongous des mots mongols énumérés dans ce travail je n'enterai pas dans la discussion de l'hypothèse altaïque qui, à mes yeux, reste encore toujours à prouver aussi bien que la thèse des adversaires de cette théorie. Je tiens pourtant à faire remarquer qu'on peut établir dès maintenant plusieurs couches d'emprunts réciproques entre le turc et le mongol d'une part et entre le mongol et le mandchou-tongous de l'autre. La chronologie de se couches reste à faire ainsi qu'il reste à voir si la couche la plus ancienne (dans le domaine de la grammaire et du lexique) nous autorise ou non à admettre la parenté altaïque".

Let us look at one example by way of illustration. The existence of a palatal nasal in non-initial position can be reconstructed for AT and AB with inner reconstruction. The word for 'neck' Chuv. mây can be compared with the ST boyun and its regular developments. In the Kipchak and Siberian languages, we have moyun, while in Yakut moy and moyun (not moj). The Chuvash word goes back to the AB boš. The nasalization of the initial b- occurred before a nasal. As in case of the Tu. qoyun 'sheep', where we have to reconstruct the AT goňi the -y- goes back to ʰ. In the latter case, we also find the shorter form goň in some languages and in the Runic inscriptions — where a separate letter existed for ʰ — so that goň is well attested (see Clauson, p. 631). In some dialects, ʰ became denasalized. In others, depalatized, and Kââyari noted both variants: qoy and goň. The Mo. goňin < *goňin also preserved the trace of ʰ-. This development occurred also in OT loanwords such as the Sanskrit punya "merit" → OT *bûya > buyan. Similarly, we can reconstruct a palatal nasal in the Chuvash word mâyrika 'horn' with the help of the the OT mâyûz, the Oghuz boynuz, the Kipchak and Siberian mûzûz, the Turkestan munûz and its regular developments. The final -ka is a diminutive suffix (OB *hûyûr-ke > *mûyûrke > mâyarka > mâyrika).

---

The denasalization of these palatal nasals in initial position began earlier than in non-initial position. The later development coincides with the history of the y- of other origin. This AT change can be reconstructed only with the help of Mongolian. The word šul ‘tears’ in Chuvash kusšul (kus ‘eye’) goes back to the AB šul. With the help of Tu. yăš ‘id.’, we would be able to reconstruct only yăš, but with the help of Mo. nil-busun ‘id.’, the initial ă can be secured.

The Chuv. yaś, yeš ‘young’ is a late Tatar loanword. An original word would have developed into *šul. In this case, the initial ă is likewise secured by the Mongolian nilga and the MT šul. The Turkish word was borrowed by Mongolian later, as was šala-yun ‘young’ (it is present only in a few MT languages, such as Solon and Evenki, where they are late Mongolian loanwords). In such very rare cases where we have to do with a double Mongolian representation of one and the same Turkish word, we are in the position to state that at least one of the two has to be a loanword. In case of the Turkish yaś ~ Mo. nilga, šala-yun, šala-yun is undoubtedly a loanword, though it has an -i- in front of the Turkish š.

We know from Chuvash linguistic history that the open vowels became closed and the closed, reduced. With just inner Turkish reconstruction, it is difficult to tell when this change began. In the case of the Tu. boz ‘gray’ Mo. boro the Mongolian form shows the vowel to be unchanged. But in the case of the Tu. qozi ‘lamb’ Mo. quri-yan, we may assume that in the lending language the process had already begun, and that the borrowed form was quri or quri.

The AT unvoiced guttural stops in final position (q/k) became voiced in some cases in OB, and from then on, their history coincided with that of the original final voiced -q/-g. The beginning of this change can be traced back in some OB loanwords to Mongolian. This I have demonstrated in another paper and I shall cite one example below (p. 150).

Even more difficult than the question of OB loanwords in Mongolian is the problem of OB loanwords in Standard Turkish. Once more, from a theoretical point of view, we cannot deny the possibility that the Turkish languages borrowed from each other in the earliest periods, as they are still doing now. Though the problem is difficult, it is not hopeless.

First we have to distinguish the processes going on in the LAT and in the OT periods. I have already referred to the peculiarities of the dialectal features (see p. 117–120). Now I would cite one example. The word for ‘dream’ in Chuvash is tăšk. By means of inner reconstruction, we have to reconstruct

On the Chuvash Guttural Stops.
an OB tülek where -ék is a special Chuvash suffix as in pilék 'five' (see ST bēl) or uyāx (see ST ējy). In most of the other languages, we find tüš 'dream', but in Old Uighur, in Late Uighur, and in Yellow Uighur we find tāl, while in Yakut tāl. Both Uighur and Yakut are È-languages, but in this case the -I word transgressed the phonological isogloss, and established itself in the language of the ancestors of the Uighurs and Yakuts.

Another problem is posed by the Turkish word for 'year'. In ST, the word yaş denotes 'age', while yıl is a special term for the calendar year. Bazin who dealt with the term in detail, rightly pointed out that yıl is a cultural word connected with the spread of the use of the calendar of the twelve animals. Bazin proposed a Mongolian etymology for the word, one which seems highly improbable for several reasons. Since in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions jāl is used for the calendar year (as is ēul for both senses in Chuvash) it can be assumed that ST yıl is an OB loan. For historical reasons, it seems less probable to assume an OB → Mo. → ST loan than e.g. an OB → Zhuan-zhuan → OT loan.

After their great migration towards the southwest, the Bulgarian tribes got into contact with the peoples living in Eastern Europe. Among them, the most important for Chuvash linguistic history were the Magyars. The controversy over the question of when and where the ancestors of the Magyars lived together with the Old Bulgarian tribes is yet unsettled. According to Gombocz's older theory, the Magyar–Bulgar contacts began in the 7th century in the Volga–Kama region and lasted until the end of the 8th century. Later, Gombocz changed his mind and placed the Magyar–Bulgar contacts in the region between the Kuban River and the Azovian Sea, and dated it as lasting from the 5th to the 7th century. After this, the Magyars had contacts with the Khazars whom Gombocz thought to have spoken a non-Bulgarian type of language. The common opinion expressed in the volume edited in 1943 by Ligeti was far different. Here,

it was assumed that the Magyars whose homeland was around the Belaya and Kama did not come directly to the south, but had migrated to the east earlier, had met the Onogur-Bulgars somewhere on the eastern slopes of the Urals, and had come south together with them. In the 1960s, Németh returned to Gombocz’s first theory. This theory, which has its supporters among Hungarian scholars even today (see e.g., Fodor who, however, assumes East Ural → West Ural → Azovian Sea → Don) seems improbable because of the serious chronological difficulties it raises. In Gombocz’s time, there was only indirect evidence of the time the Bulgars reached the Volga-Kama region. Today, a wealth of archaeological material helps us to date this migration. The earliest of the Volga Bulgarian finds is from Bolshiie Tarohani, quite in the south of the later Volga Bulgarian Empire. Among the excavated material, an Abbaside dirhem was found, one which Janina dated to around the years 775–809. Even on the most generous assumption, the coin could not have got buried before the 780s. This is the earliest post quem date at our disposal for the appearance of the Bulgars in this region, and not the 750s, as most of the authors used to assume. Since we meet the Magyars on the shores of the Black Sea at the very beginnings of the 9th century, we cannot assume that the considerable impact that the Bulgars had on the Magyars occurred in the Middle-Volga region. In view of the linguistic material, we have to assume at least two or three hundred years of close contact, if not more. Since the Onogur-Bulgars arrived in Southeastern Europe in the middle of the 5th century, this is the terminus post quem. The territory had to be the Cis-Caucasian—Kuban—Don—Azovian area, which was under Bulgarian and Khazarian domination. No source refers to the Volga Bulgars as Onogurs (see Vasáry’s paper in this volume). The Bulgars of the south, however, are

64 I. Fodor, Verecke térzés utáni... A magyar nép őstörténése és a konjoglálás (On the Famous Route of Verecke... The Prehistory of the Hungarian People and the Conquest of Hungary), Budapest 1975.
called Onogurs, as are the Danube Bulgars. If the Magyars had come directly from the Middle-Volga region to Levedia the name used for them by the European sources — Qgre, wengri, (h)ungarus — all of them deriving from the name Onogur, would be inexplicable. We can easily account for the presence of the Magyars in the Middle-Volga region in the 13th century (as Munkácsi and Gomboz did) if we assume that they migrated to the north with the Volga Bulgars. This is exactly what we might expect. For if the Magyars lived with the Bulgars in the south, surely it makes sense that some of them joined those Bulgars who moved to the north, as later the three Kavar tribes joined the Magyars when they left the Khazar Empire. Thus, I see no impressive argument on the strength of which we should abandon Gombocz’s second theory, though today we might slightly modify some of its details.

Until recent times, the Magyars’ conquest of the Carpathian Basin was considered the only possible terminus ante quem. This event is usually put at 896 A.D., although it is clear that the process began earlier and lasted for several years. Recently, László published a series of papers and monographs in which he suggests that the Magyar tribes who settled in the Carpathian basin at the end of the 9th century found an earlier Magyar population already there.* According to László, the first wave of Hungarian-speaking immigrants reached the Carpathian basin at about 670, when the archaeological material shows a significant change. László’s arguments are convincing in that the change in the ethnic composition of the inhabitants of the Carpathian basin is surely connected with the migrations into Southeastern Europe around 670. The most important of these was the migration of the Onogur-Bulgarian tribes, which began after the dissolution of the Great Bulgarian Empire of the south, and in consequence of which the Bulgars went as far as the lower Danube region, and founded Bulgaria in the Balkans. Though we can be sure that the change in the Carpathian Basin was connected with this migration, there is no indication that Magyar groups took part in it to any great extent. What is of relevance from our point of view, however, is that we have to reckon with sizeable Onogur groups in the late Avar period, part of which could well have survived until the Magyar conquest. If so, some of the Bulgarian-type loanwords in Hungarian could have been borrowed when the two groups were already in the Carpathian Basin, i.e. in the period after the conquest.

*The best summary of László’s view is to be found in his recent work A “kettős honfoglalás” (The “Double Conquest” of Hungary). Budapest 1978, see also Die ungarische Landnahme und ihre Vorereignisse: CQIFU I, Budapest 1975, pp. 195-208, and its discussion in CQIFU II, pp. 196-238.
It is known from Constantine Porphyrogennetos’ work that three Khazar tribes, called Kavars, joined the Magyars when they left the Khazar empire. Although we know nothing about the language of these tribes — they could have spoken either a Bulgarian or a non-Bulgarian Western Turkish idiom — their assimilation by the Finno-Ugrian-speaking Magyars might well have taken a number of decades even after the conquest.

The Slavicization of the Danube Bulgars is generally thought to have been completed by about the end of the 8th century. Some Danube Bulgarian groups could, however, have played some part in the history of Southern Transylvania, and we can not exclude the possibility that some of them were not yet Slavicized.

But even if we allow all three possibilities, the relevant sources refer to no Turkish-speaking group after the 10th century, except for the Muslim groups (the Khaliz and Besermen); therefore, we have no reason to update the terminus ante quem much more than the middle of the 10th century.

The group of Old Turkish loanwords in Hungarian is not homogeneous. Some words are definitely of OB origin. Some have linguistic features which do not necessarily mark them as OB, but which appear together with specifically OB features. Some others are neutral from this point of view, still others clearly show a non-Bulgarian character. There can be no doubt that even those words which do have OB features or can be considered as OB belong to several chronological layers and dialects.

In his university lectures, Gombocz enumerated the following OB criteria:

1. Tu. s ~ Hung. r ~ (Chuv. r)
2. Tu. z ~ Hung. l ~ (Chuv. l)
3. Tu. s ~Hung. ĉ ~ (Chuv.  ĉ)
4. Tu. ĉ ~ Hung. ĝ (~ ĝ > Chuv. ğ)
5. Tu. k/q ~ Hung. a (~ ĝ > Chuv. a)


Gombocz delivered several lectures at the university of Budapest on the history of the Hungarian word-stock and on the Turkish elements in the Hungarian language. The last series — of 1930 — has been published by Ligeti: Gombocz Z., Honfoglalás előtti bolgár–török jövővényszavaink (The Pre-Conquest Bulgar-Turkish Loanwords in Hungarian): Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 24, Budapest 1980, 32 p.
6. Tu. y- ~ Hung. s- ~ (Chuv. ñ-)
   Hung. d ~ (Chuv. ñ > ñ-)
7. Tu. -d- ~ Hung. z ~ (Chuv. ñ > z > r, only in -gd-)
8. Tu. -n ~ Hung. -m ~ (Chuv. -m)
9. Tu. a ~ Hung. i < í ~ (Chuv. í).

In the case of Tu. e- ~ Hung. ñ-, Gombocz assumed a preserved archaism in OB, while Ligeti clearly pointed out that this was a secondary development which occurred before i/í and long ñ, which became ña. As for Tu. ñ ~ Hung. ñ, Bárczi and Ligeti have expressed the opinion that ñ in these cases is a Hungarian development; the borrowed form had had ñ. Gombocz and then Ligeti have stressed that the -z- grade of AT -d- is present only in the -gd- cluster, while Palló insisted that the z grade is to be found also in other positions. Németh and Ligeti raised the problem of the presence of protethio v- and y-, while Palló tried to prove that the protethio v- is attestedly present.

Doerfer and others suggested that in those cases where in Hungarian an -l£- is present in place of the ST ñ, the -l- is not an anorganic, secondary sound as was supposed by Gombocz but rather reflects the OB -l£-. Ligeti,

67 L. Ligeti, Les voyelles longues en turc: JA 1938, pp. 177-204.
69 Ligeti L., A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai.
75 Róm-Tus A., Írvedetek, p. 18.
76 In Old Hungarian, the -l- in postvocalic position disappeared, and the preceding vowel became long. At the same time, as a compensatory hyperurbanic feature, the secondary -l- developed. This happened in words of Finno-Ugrian and also of Turkish origin. Thus, in Old Hungarian, besides the “normal” form ñcs (ńc) ‘carpenter’ < ayabök we also find the form ñlch (ńlč) attested as early as 1233 A. D. This means that secondary, anorganic -l- is undoubtedly present in words of Turkish origin. The only question is whether we are entitled to operate with this feature in each case, and especially in cases when we find an ñ in ST. It is difficult to suppose that Chuvash
in a recently written paper assumed that in such cases Hungarian borrowed an s sound which was ST, but figured also in the ST loanwords of OB, and this s became c secondarily in Hungarian. Before this c the -i- developed, also secondarily. In another paper, Ligeti raised the question of the voiced initial d- in front of the ST i-, and by implication this can be extended to the g-.

To the phonetical criteria, some lexical and semantical ones can be added. We have lexical evidence in cases where the Hungarian word is present only in Chuvash (as in Hung. disznó 'pig' -> fsna > Chuv. siena < *sena), or where it is a derivate whose stem is common to other Turkish languages, but where the derivate itself is to be found only in Chuvash and Hungarian (as Hung. eke 'plough' ~ Chuv. ake from Tu. ak- 'to sow'). A direct semantical criterion is when a word is common to the Turkish languages, but its special, secondary meaning is to be found only in Hungarian and in Chuvash (as e.g. Hung. tükrő 'mirror', Chuv. tükér, which in all other Turkish languages and in Mongolian means 'a round object'). An indirect semantical criterion is when a word pertains to the terminology of a cultural complex having OB criteria, as in the case of the Turkish words for viticulture in Hungarian.

To the above we can add some chronological evidence. In some cases, either the history of the Hungarian word, or its fixed first occurrence leaves no doubt of its being a pre-conquest loanword. In the case of the Hungarian décs 'carpenter' ← Tu. ayačí > Chuv. yivddé, the development -aya > a and the disappearance of the final -i prove that the word is a very old one borrowed a word such as púi 'head'. It is well known that in Chuvash in words where the -č- cluster corresponds to the ST -č- the -i- disappeared through a spirant -p/β and ē became ś; cf. ST gütč 'sword' > güt > Chuv. ač, etc. We have at least one word which is also attested in Hungarian: kőüčén (köüčén) 'loan', which in Chuvash has the forms: kivén, kien [Afm. VI, pp. 106, 247], where the -i- is etymological (cf. Mo. kőüčén), and its disappearance can be observed in current dialects.

Ligeti L., Régi török eredetű neveink (Old Hungarian Personal Names of Turkish Origin): MNy 74 (1978), pp. 256-274. According to Ligeti, all Chuvash words in which we find ś in front of the ST ś are loanwords borrowed at various times, mostly early on.

Ligeti L., A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai, p. 17. According to Ligeti the initial d- in Hungarian dól- 'to bend down, recline etc.' ~ ST töl- points to a hitherto unnoticed dialectal feature of OB.

See Róna-Tas A., Bevezetés, p. 22. To this category pertains e.g. Hung. görény 'polecat' ~ ST küzén 'id.'.

In Modern Chuvash, the name for the plough is akapu, but in earlier sources and the dialects, aža also has the meaning 'plough' (Afm. I, p. 66).
indeed. Phonetically speaking, the Hungarian word árok 'chanel, ditch' could be even Ottoman, but its occurrence as a geographical name in a document from 1056 shows beyond a doubt that it is from pre-conquest times (cf. Tu. oriz).

The 250 or so common words of Turkish origin adopted by the Hungarians before the conquest of the Carpathian Basin can be augmented if we include the early onomastic material on the Hungary of between the 11th and the 13th centuries and can be augmented further if we count the dialectal words, and some words which were adopted by neighbouring languages from Hungarian, but have disappeared from Hungarian. We know that with the immigration of Cumanian and Pecheneg tribes in the 13th century, a new layer of Turkish loanwords appeared in Hungarian. The criteria of the separation of this layer, called "the middle layer" (the last being the Ottoman loanwords) is in some cases difficult, if not impossible. Altogether, the OB loanwords in Hungarian are our most important sources on the linguistic history of OB.

A further group of sources is offered by the linguistic material of the Danube Bulgars. Here we can separate three groups. In the Greek (and Slavic) inscriptions of Bulgaria there can be found scattered words, names and titles of OB origin, or as they are called by our Bulgarian colleagues, of Proto-Bulgarian origin. A special problem is posed by the so-called Proto-Bulgarian list of rulers. These are glosses embedded in non-Turkish texts. To a second group pertain those texts which are written in Danube Bulgarian. We know of one longer text, and a few fragments, and it is very likely that the Turkish language of the famous Treasure of Nagyszentmiklós is not Pecheneg-Kipchak — as Németh was inclined to think — but Danube Bulgarian. The third group consists of the Danube Bulgarian words borrowed by either Early Old Church Slavic or Slavio Bulgarian.

Of the Turkish language Greek inscriptions, the most interesting is the inscription of Byal Brag (near Preslav). In this inscription, we find the word

81 The basic work is Gombocz's Árpád-kori török személyneveink (Hungarian Fore-names of Turkish Origin from the Arpadian Age): MNy 10 (1914), pp. 241-249, 293-301, 337-342; and MNy 11 (1916), pp. 145-152, 245-262, 341-346, 433-438. See also Ligeti's paper quoted in footnote 76. The work of L. Kiss, Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szövedra (An Etymological Dictionary of Geographic Names). Budapest 1978, is a very instructive and useful handbook, but its Turkish material has to be used with great caution.

'chain mail' (cf. Chuv. képe 'shirt') four times. In a fragment of another inscription, from Chatalar, we can read the word küpeşî three times. In Modern Chuvash, the possessive suffix of the third person is -i ( > -ë), regardless of the ending of the stem, while in other Turkish languages, we find -si after vowels and -i after consonants. The AB -si is to be found in only a very few Chuvash words, and scholars could not be sure whether the simpler Chuvash or the more complicated ST system was the original. Now, with the help of the Chatalar inscription, we can prove that the ST distribution was also present in OB.

The title figuring as Ifirjcgycuv fkavXa in a number of inscriptions can be found with in Selishte (near Preslav) written in Old Cyrillic letters as īirgü bille. The first word has been compared by Venedikov88, Deny84 and Beşevliev85 with the Tu. ītreki 'the interior; those who belong to the royal court'88 while the second, which occurs in the forms bonyğa, bonyğa, boyla etc. to the OT title boyla. The first is not without morphological, the second not without phonetical problems; nevertheless, from them, the sound -ë- can be safely assumed to have existed in 9th century Danube Bulgarian.

More difficult is the evaluation of the material contained in the Proto-Bulgarian List of Rulers. The original, from the 10th century, is preserved in three copies from the end of the 15th and of the 16th century, respectively. The text of the list is so mutilated and full of clerical errors that the past great efforts notwithstanding,87 they can be put to no real use. Let us look at two examples by way of illustration. After the names of the Danube Bulgarian rulers follows the old Church Slavonic expression at m emoy 'his year', and then a Danube Bulgarian expression. Such a year is given in MSA as ABânuexTë in MSB as ABâHuiexTeMb, in MSC as ABâMiiexTeMi. Pritsak (op. cit., pp. 56–68) suggested the following decipherment:

91 On this system, see I. Dujdev, Les bulgares dîte intérieux et extérieux de la Bulgarie médiévale: AOIH 3 (1953), pp. 167–177.
1. The word has to be segmented as *dvan*-festem.
2. The copyist thought that the first word is the same as the Russian *dva* ‘two’. Old Church Slavic orthography permits a so-called *kendema*-sign (two gravis signs on a vowel letter) in case of such monosyllabic words.
3. In the original, there was another sign which the copyist changed to this *kendema*-sign.
4. This original sign was probably (‘Es scheint so’) a suspended *l*. Therefore we have to assume an original form *dv'an*.
5. The form *dv'an* is to be read as *dval'an*.
6. The word for ‘hare’ is *tabilyan* in Tu., which would give the Danube Bulgarian *tabilyan*.
7. This *tabilyan* changed: *tabl'yan* > *tavl'yan* > *tavl'an*.
8. The initial *t-* became *d-* under the influence of the following consonant: *tavl'an* > *davl'an*.
9. Finally we have to assume a metathesis: *davl'an* > *dval'an*; and all this gives us the Danube Bulgarian word for ‘hare’, which would have functioned for the Year of the Hare in the twelve-animal cycle.

With a similar argumentation, Pritsak tried to prove that the year of Asparuch *verenialem* consists of *vereni* and *alet*, where the first word would reflect a Bulgarian *bôräh*, an equivalent of the Tu. *bôrî* (op. cit., pp. 52-55). Bazin connected *vereni* with the OT *ewren* ‘dragon’. He derived the word from the verb *ewrî* ‘to turn round’. A similar etymology of the OT *ewren* is given by Clauson (p. 13). Clauson connected the word for ‘dragon’ with the word *ewren* ‘a thing built in the shape of a blacksmith's oven in which bread is baked’. To support this, he quotes the Qutadyu Bilig, where we read: *yaratt'i kôr ewren tuči evrîlar* ‘(God) created the firmament which revolves continuously’. The firmament was so called because it revolves, the oven, because it was similar to the firmament. Clauson's etymology seems to be convincing. In a newly published Volga-Bulgarian inscription the name of the dead person is: Āwûrân awlit Wûrum Alîb. ‘The son of Āwûrân, Wûrum Alîb’. *Wûrum Alîb* is the Tu. *Uzun Alp*, and the inscription is one of the rare ones where the names are not Moslem names. Hence we can assume that Āwûrân is also a Volga Bulgarian word.

Both meanings, ‘firmament’ or ‘dragon’, are possible. In the light of the Volga Bulgarian *āwûrân*, Bazin's suggestion is already burdened with difficulties. We have either to assume a metathesis *ewren* → *weren* or a
change ewiren > ören > weren. The underlying verb is present in Hungarian as ör- (cf. öröl ‘to grind’, örvény ‘whirlpool’), but Hungarian ö is a Hungarian development from ew. Moreover, Hungarian has an OB word for ‘dragon’ sárkány (cf. Tu. sázayan).

It is surprising that so few words which can be safely qualified as OB have been found in Slavio Bulgarian. One of the safe comparisons has been suggested by Boev. Boev compared the Bulgarian šile ‘young lamb’, šilegar ‘herdsman of the šile’s’, further Serbian šileg ‘two year-old lamb’, and Albanian shilek ‘young lamb’ with the Tu. šišek ‘id.’, and proposed an OB etymology in view of its -i-. The Tu. šišek is a secondary form from šišek, to be found in Kásyari where it has the meaning ‘a two-year-old sheep’. As I have shown, the word can be derived from tiš ‘tooth’, tišen ‘to get or lose teeth’ and refers to the age when the animal finally has all its teeth. This is the etymology of the Hungarian word süllő (= süllő) ‘pike’ which goes back to an earlier šileg (on the evidence of some early Hungarian documents from the 12th century).

Pike perch has another early name fogas which is a calque of the former (cf. Hung. fog ‘tooth’). The word is present in Mongolian as silegü (Secret History of the Mongols) with the meaning silegü gonin ‘two-year-old sheep’. In this case, we have a unique example from which we can reconstruct the entire history of the word:

AB šilek3 ~ AST šišek3 > Tu. šišek

| šileg3 → Mo. silegū → Khak, Tuv. silaka |
| silegū |

Bulgarian šile(g) ← OB šiley → Hung. siley > süllő → Bavarian Schiele

| Hung. → Rumanian sâldu |
| Hung. → Slovak šul |

Serbian šileg ←

Albanian shilek ←

MB šila → Tat. šila (Pallas) → Kklp. šila

| → Bashk. šila > hila |

Chu. šila → Cher. šila


From the language of the Danube Bulgars, some words have been borrowed by Old Church Slavic. The OChS word кап 'figure, idol' and its derivative капиште 'a pagan church; the place of the idols' (see Fasmer II, p. 185) is interesting not only because of its importance for our knowledge of the old religion of the Bulgars, but also because it offers evidence of an open a in Danube Bulgarian (cf. Chuv. кап, Hung. kép, which was substituted by Slavic a and was not, of course, borrowed after a < a, which is a very late development in Chuvash).

A similar word is the Bulgarian beleg, earlier бéлég (cf. Бéлгарски диалоги, ч. III, 1971, p. 41), Russian бéлég (Fasmer I, p. 147) etc. Ligeti⁵ has discussed the way this word might have got into Hungarian (cf. бéлég). In his opinion, it is slightly more probable that the word — one ultimately of Turkish origin (see Chuv. пальд, Volga Bulgarian belü-u-i with a possessive suffix) — came in to Hungarian with Slavic mediation rather than directly, as was assumed by TESZ. This is of importance since Slavic mediation cannot be excluded in the case of a number of other Turkish words either.

With the close historical connections between Danube Bulgarian and Middle Greek, one would expect to find OB words in Greek. The Byzantine sources are full of Bulgarian names, titles and glosses⁶ but as far as I know, no serious attempt has ever been made to find Danube Bulgarian words in the spoken language of Byzantium.

For the history of OB, the words borrowed from Greek are also of importance. The ultimate origin of the Chuvash word пир 'linen' ~ Tu. бóз, бéз 'cotton, linen' is Old Egyptian.⁷ It is very likely that the word was borrowed a number of times by the Altaic peoples, and that it came into Chinese with Altaic mediation.⁸ The earliest Chinese data are from 629 A.D. The earlier words seem to have come through Greek mediation (see βεβάσα); the later, through Arabic. The history of this word is important because of its final -r in Chuvash. Benzing⁹ used this word to argue that the z > r change was a late one. This, however, is very improbable. We know that the original AT d became an r in Chuvash through θ > z (see

---

The word entered Chuvash when \(d\) was already \(\sigma\) or \(z\), and then changed into \(r\). The history of this word also sheds some light on the controversial problem of the so-called "plus vowel" in Mongolian (see Tu. \(k\)\(\ddot{o}\k 'blue' \sim\) Mo. \(k\)\(\ddot{o}\k,\) Tu. \(ik\)\(\acute{i}\k 'twillings' \sim\) Mo. \(ik\)\(\acute{i}\k etc). The word was borrowed twice by Mongolian. The first borrowing was of the word \(b\)\(\ddot{u}\)\(e\)\(\acute{e}\k 'girdle or belt', a word that denoted a girdle made of cotton or linen (see also Juchen \(b\)\(e\)\(\acute{s}\u,\) Ma. \(b\)\(o\)\(\acute{s}\o\k 'linen, cloth'; further Negidal, Oroch, Udie, Orok, Nanai).\(^{88}\) The Mo. \(b\)\(\ddot{o}\k 'linen, cloth' is a later loan. The final -\(e\) in Mongolian is of Turkish origin, where it was adapted to the AT word structure.

The great commercial routes through the steppes helped the transfer of western words towards the east, but also facilitated movement in the opposite direction. The Chuvash word \(y\)\(\acute{e}\)\(n\)\(c\)\(\dot{e}\k 'ornaments on women's clothing' is a Tatar loanword. Its earlier form was \(in\)\(f\)\(i\k (cf. the Tat. \(en\)\(fe\k > \(in\)\(f\)\(i\k 'pearl'). From the Cher. \(\ddot{c}\)\(i\)\(n\)\(c\)\(\acute{e}\k,\) \(\ddot{c}\)\(i\)\(n\)\(d\)\(\acute{e}\k 'beads', we learn that a parallel form \(\ddot{f}\)\(i\)\(n\)\(f\)\(i\k, \(\ddot{f}\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\acute{\ddot{c}}\)\(u\k existed along with the Volga Turkish \(*in\)\(f\)\(i\k < \(in\)\(\ddot{u}\k.\) Ligeti\(^{90}\) has shown that Tu. \(yin\)\(\ddot{u}\k \sim \(f\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\ddot{f}\)\(u\k is of Chinese origin (see also Hung. \(g\)\(y\)\(o\)\(ng\)\(y\k 'pearl'). With the help of Chuv. \(y\)\(\ddot{e}\)\(n\)\(c\)\(\dot{e}\k \sim\) Tat. \(*in\)\(f\)\(i\k \sim \(*\)\(f\)\(i\)\(n\)\(f\)\(i\k \sim \(*\)\(\ddot{f}\)\(i\)\(n\)\(f\)\(i\k (most probably itself a Tatar word of Volga Bulgar origin), the enigmatic final -\(g\) of the Russian \(x\)\(e\)\(m\)\(n\)\(y\k 'pearl' can be explained.

The Chuv. \(s\)\(\ddot{a}\k 'paint' is also a Tatar loanword (\(\sim\) Tat. \(s\)\(ir\k). The Tatar word is ultimately of Chinese origin (cf. Chinese \(ch\)'\(i\k < \(*t\)\(e\)'\(j\)\(p\k. See Clauson, pp. 842–843.) It is very probable that this word came into the other Turkish languages through early eastern Turkish mediation.

The scattered Khazar words in various sources have made a special contribution to our knowledge of OB. The material Golden has collected will prove a handy manual to those who wish to investigate the language of the Khazars. To be sure, Turks who spoke one or more OB dialects lived together in the Khazar Empire with other Western Turkish tribes. The famous and much discussed name of the city \(\ddot{s}\)\(a\)\(rk\)\(e\)l 'white house' displays definite OB features. Another important data is the river name \(\ddot{x}\)\(a\)\(\ddot{a}\k \(a\)\(\ddot{v}\)\(\ddot{e}\)\(\acute{v}\k glossed with \(\ddot{f}\)\(i\)\(a\)\(\ddot{v}\)\(o\)\(v\k \(\ddot{e}\)\(y\)\(d\)\(v\k 'black water' by an anonymous scholiast, who added some explanations to the Notitiae Episcopatum composed between 733–746.\(^{100}\) This river name on the Crimean peninsula had a Khazar name which we can reconstruct as \(x\)\(a\)\(\ddot{a}\k \(\ddot{h}\)\(u\k.\(^{101}\)

---

\(^{88}\)Ravnitelnyj istorii tunguso-manji$turkich jazykov, I. p. 78.

\(^{90}\)Ligeti L., A török szikiadét, etc.


\(^{100}\)A. Róna-Tas, A Volga Bulgarian Inscription from 1307: AOH, 30 (1976), pp. 166–167.

The Chuvash place name Xura sìv (Asm. XVI., p. 210) and xura sìv 'muddy water' (ibid) is of the same origin. In contrast to xura sìv we also find Sur sìv (Asm. XVII., p. 240), Sur sìv (ibid), Suršu (Asm. XVII., p. 244). Suršu is also the collective name of eight villages; and the Russian name of a village is Belo-Voľžok 'White Volga' from the name of a small river Suršu Šoršu 'Belaya Voľžka'. Sur Atal — meaning 'clear' — is the name of both the Kama and the Belaya (Russian: 'the white'). The Khazar Xura sìv has its counterpart in the Hungarian river name Krassó (14th century Karaso, Karasu — read Karašu) where the second part shows a clear OB character in front of the CT sùu 'water'.¹⁰³ Not, however, from sùu but from sìu. In Constantine Porphyrogennetus we find πέξ as the title of the subking of the Khazars. The final -γ reflects the spirantization of the AT -g and is corroborated by Ibn Fadlan's -γ (read -ηγ) < Βηγ Βουγ, bê γ and the Chuvash pu (on which see K. Czeglédi's paper in this volume).

One of the most important peoples living with the Turks of South Russia were the Alans. In the Ossetian Nart epic, a people — AgyrjAgur — is mentioned as a legendary, warlike tribe, great in numbers and nomadic in character.¹⁰³ The reference is probably to the Oghurs. We know that in the Saltovo-Mayak culture, Bulgars and Alans lived together; we also know that both the Alans and the Onogurs had been their neighbours in the Cis-Caucasian region.¹⁰⁴ Thus, the Alanian-Bulgarian linguistic contacts cannot have been negligible.

The Ossetian language is closely related to Alan, and has quite a wordstock of Turkish origin. They pertain, however, to the later period of Turkish-Ossetian symbiosis, when Kipchak or Kipchakized tribes settled in the neighbourhood. In the first two volumes of the Ossetian etymological dictionary published by Abaev, I could find no Turkish word which was clearly of OB character. The historical background of the Ossetian czxtjivjíd 'cheese' was recently settled by Ligeti.¹⁰⁵ The word is present in Hungarian sájt (read: sájt) and in Chuvash as iákat. Earlier (see TESZ III, 1976, p. 474), the Hungarian word was thought to be an OB loan, and the Ossetian word was also presumed to be of OB origin. Ligeti has pointed out that the Chuvash word is of Tatar origin (cf. Tatar dialectal ēyht), something well attested by some early Kipchak sources. The word has a sound Ossetian

¹⁰³ See Kiss L., Földrajzi nevek, p. 317 where sùu has to be corrected as sìu.
¹⁰⁵ Czeglédy K., Nomád népek, p. 106.
etymology, and the Hungarian word, for phonetic reasons, has to be a direct loan from early Ossetian or Alan. The word entered the Kipchak languages from the same source. The hypothesis that the Ossetian word entered the Kipchak language through OB mediation — while in Chuvash, it was lost and then reborrowed — is not entirely implausible, but is difficult to prove.

The Chuvash word ёйгте 'a kind of sausage filled with chopped intestines' was connected by Egorov (Егов) with Ossetian doormae/zormae 'id.'. The word is present in Georgian (furma), in Kabardian (ёрмад) and in Ubih (ferme). It has no etymology in Ossetian. The word can be found in Georgian (furma), in Kabardian (ёрмад) and in Ubih (ferme). It has no etymology in Ossetian. The word can be found in Mongolian as forne 'chip, shaving; thin strips of meat, stuffing'; here, it is a Turkish loan. The Turkish word can be found in Altay (yörgööm), in Soyot (ёрменe) in Karachay-Balkar (förne), and in Bashkir (yärme). In Kaskar we find yörgeme 'the paunch or intestines wrapped and folded in the smaller intestines and then cooked by roasting' (Clauson, p. 966). The Turkish word is a derivative from the verb yör- ‘to wrap’, yörgе- ‘to wrap up’ etc. Thus the Ossetian and the Caucasian words are of Turkish origin. The history of the Chuvash word can be reconstructed as follows: ьрзмем > ьрзем > йгте.

We have to make further efforts to clear up the Alanian language's relations to OB, and our task is by no means hopeless. The Chuvash purтa 'hatchet axe' is surely of Iranian origin. The Ossetian feraet 'id.' is, according to Abaev (op. cit., p. 451), an Old Persian loanword in Ossetian. The word is present in Zyryan and Votyak as purт 'knife', but, for phonetic and semantic reasons, these words have to be independent of the Chuvash word. It is possible that this word is of immediate Alan origin; for chronological reasons, Old Persian has to be excluded. In this case, we can assume OP parađu → Alanian paratu (> Ossetian feraet) → OB bарату > Chuv. purта.

III.

Towards the end of the 8th century, the Bulgarian tribes reached the Volga-Kama region and came into close contact with the Finno-Ugrian peoples. The oldest contacts with the Permians began at a time when the two Permian languages, Zyryan and Votyak, had not yet separated. These early contacts with the common Permian language lasted approximately until the 10th century when the Zyryans moved far to the north. Later,

the Volga Bulgarians remained in contact only with the southern group, the Votyaks. The speakers of the Permyak dialect of Zyryan slowly moved back to the south, and came into contact with Votyak. The details of the oldest — i.e. LOB — PP layer — have been dealt with in a separate paper (NyK 74, 281–298, NyK 77, 31–44). Here I would only mention two questions of chronological importance. The LOB—PP contacts had to have begun before the common Permian denasalization, and to have lasted to the time of the early Islamization of the Volga Bulgars\textsuperscript{1} (Pe. \texttt{b} (LOB) \texttt{w} (PP)). The history of the word \texttt{g} (Old Russian (LOB) \texttt{w} (PP)) shows that the word was borrowed before the Old Russian denasalization into LOB and before the Permian denasalization into PP. These considerations allow us to suppose these contacts to have taken place some time during the 9th—10th centuries.

\textsuperscript{1}The beginnings of the Islamization of the Volga Bulgars can be dated to a time before Ibn Rusta’s account (written around A.D. 930); he already mentions the mosques and madrasas, the muezzins, and the imams of the Volga Bulgars. I am not quite sure about the date of this passage in Ibn Rusta, but in any case even Ibn Fadlan admits that there was a Mohammedan community among the Volga Bulgars before his arrival. The newly found coin of \texttt{Ja’far} (Old Russian \texttt{b} (LOB) \texttt{w} (PP)) also points to the same time, since the names of the Caliph al-Muktafi (902–908) and of the Samanid Emir Imsa’il (892–907) can be read, on this one coin. The coexistence of these two names place the origin of the coin between 902 and 907, which accords with Ibn Rusta’s account, as Janina, who published the data on the coin, noted. She may also be right when she sees no contradiction in Ibn Fadlan’s having given the name \texttt{Ja’far} to \texttt{AlmuS}; \texttt{AlmuS}, if he were already Moslem, was very unlikely not to have a Moslem name. This is how we should interpret the whole story of the Friday prayer told by Ibn Fadlan; he ordered that the name \texttt{Ja’far} be used in the prayer, but he did not then give this name to the king, who may have been using both his Turkish and Moslem names simultaneously for a while. But even on the hypothesis that \texttt{AlmuS} simply erased the name of the former ruler from an older coin and put his own on instead and that Ibn Rusta’s account was a later interpolation, there can be no doubt that the Islamization of the Bulgars began at the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century. The close contacts of Chwarezm and the Samanids were of a commercial and a political nature — it was not by mere chance that Ibn Fadlan chose this route to the Volga Bulgars. These economic and political contacts were certain to bring Islam with them. However, we can be just as sure that the first contact did not affect the whole population, only the courts of the tribal chiefs and the upper strata in the centres of Bulgar and Suvar. Therefore, the Arabic and New Persian loanwords which came along with Islamization needed a few generations to become part of the language of the Volga Bulgars. In any case, even if we assume that \texttt{P} \texttt{w} (LOB) \texttt{w} (PP) was borrowed in the earliest times, the religious meaning of this word in PP shows that it originates not from the first decades of superficial contacts, but from an already Moslem population which could hardly have developed before the end of the 10th century.
From the point of view of LOB linguistic history, I would mention one more fact here. The presence of the initial voiced \( g \)- in the Zyryan \( gub < PP \) gombi 'mushroom' shows that LOB had a voiced \( g \)- initial (and that the \( k \); in the Chuv. \( kämpa \) is a late development). This has been mooted by Poppe,\(^{109}\) who considered this word a direct loan from Russian. However, the Tatar gömbe is a loan from the same Bulgarv word, and corroborates the existence of this initial.\(^{109}\)

The Old Russian nasal was preserved in the Chuv. \( kändële, kändala \) 'tow' (see the OR \( këdëja \), also \( \rightarrow \) Finnish \( kuontalo \)), and pertains to the same layer as \( kämpa \). The Chuv. \( munä \) 'bath house' is surely Russian\(^{110}\) баня and not *муня, as Räsanen (TSchuw. Lehnw., p. 154) suggested. The Turkish data with -\( i \)-(Chuv. dial. \( molla, Aâm. \) VIII., p. 263), the Altay \( mičä, the Kacha \( muł'a, mił'a \)→ Kamassian \( mułła, mułłä,\(^{111}\) the Teleut, Lebed, Shor, and Segay \( miłča, the Tobol \( mułča, miłča \) and also \( munča \) and the Kurduk \( mołča \) are either due to dissimilation, and/or developed under the influence of the Russian \( muļo \) 'soap'. The Kazak \( mondə, the Kirg. \( monö, the Kklp. \( monda, the Tkm. \) dial. \( monča, mončo, as the Tat. \( munča, the Bashk. \( munča, the Cher. \) \( muhja, moča, muńča \) (and also moļča), the Voty. \( muńčo \) all seem to be from Volga Bulgarv. The Russian word had to be borrowed before the \( a > o \) development, but the second series points to an \( o \)- and not to \( -u \)-, which is important for the chronology of \( o > u \). (For \( ny > nč \), see Ar. \( dünča \) 'world' \( > \) Chuv. \( těneče \).

There are a few LOB loanwords in Mordvinian which have already been dealt with by Paasonen\(^{112}\) and recently by Feoktistov\(^{113}\). Such are the Moksha Mordvinian \( aytr, ayira, ayra \) 'ool (of weather)' \( \sim \) LOB \( ayar \) \( \sim \) Tu. ayaz, the Moksha Mordvinian \( serä \) 'brass, yellow copper' \( \sim \) LOB \( ser \) \( \sim \) Tu. yez, the Moksha Mordvinian \( sırık, and the Erza Mordvinian \( sır'te, sırt', sırdık, sıry' ash-tree' \( \sim \) LOB \( şerek or şirek \) (cf. Tat. \( yirek, Misher \) \( yerek \) \( \sim \) Yak. \( sësit \)).

\(^{109}\) N. N. Poppe, \( Čuvait i ich zvocit. Čeboksary 1927, p. 36.\)

\(^{109}\) On the Hungarian correspondence of the voiced OB initials, see p. 146 above.

\(^{110}\) So also B. Scherner, \( Arabische und neupersische Lehnwörter im Tschuwassischen. \) Wiesbaden 1977, p. 90.

\(^{111}\) Cf. A. J. Joki, \( Die Lehnamter, p. 233.\)

\(^{112}\) H. Paasonen, \( Die türkischen Lehnwörter im Mordvinischen : MSFOu 16; Helsinki 1897.\)

\(^{113}\) A. P. Feoktistov, \( K problemu mordovsko-tjurkskih jazykovych kontaktov. In Etnogenez montovskogo naroda, Ed. B. A. Rybakov, B. A. Serebrennikov, A. P. Smirnov, Saransk 1985, pp. 331-343.\)
In the course of their contacts with the FU peoples of the Middle Volga region, the Volga Bulgarian tribes not only lent but also borrowed a number of words. Some of the FU words in Chuvash we knew to be recent, in other cases, we have no criteria for a chronology. A few seem to be early loans, most probably from the LOB period — e.g. the PP *pelif → Chuv. pileš 'ashberry' (Ašm. IX., p. 209 → Tat. Bashk. miled), the PP pūrič → Chuv. pörēš, pörēš 'ice-axe' (Ašm. X., p. 232 → Tat. dial. bōrōš, Bashk. bōrōz).

The FU languages of the Volga–Kama region have transmitted some Iranian words into LOB. One of them is the Chuv. дур, дур, вудр 'otter (the English word is of the same IE origin) → Cher. удр, удр (or the Cher. is a direct loan from Iranian). The Permian vurd (Zyryan), vudor (Votyak) has developed from *udor where the v- is secondary under the influence of the word vurdis,burdis 'mole'. There does exist a secondary v- in Zyryan, but where it occurs we have quite different reflexes in the dialects and in Votyak, thus, the v- in the Zyryan vurd and in the Votyak vudor cannot be a spontaneous Permian development. The Iranian word has to be reconstructed as *udro. It is well known from the historical sources that the early Volga Bulgarian empire had close contacts with the Russians. It was at this time that LOB words were borrowed by the Russians.

The Russian word ponam 'a church of non-Christians' is mentioned by the Russian chronicles in connection with Bolgari, where the envoys of the Grand Duke Vladimir (969–1015) saw in the town како ся покланяють въ храмЪ рекше ропати, стояще бес пояса i.e. "how they prostrate themselves in their church called ropat, standing without girdles". Pritsak who quoted these lines assumed that we have to do here with a Volga Bulgarian word of Arabic origin (*u-), and stressed that the Russian -p- can be interpreted only if we suppose that the -b- was already an unvoiced media in Bulgarian, as it is now. More convincing is the suggestion of

114 On the primary v- in the latter word see T. E. Uotila, Zur Geschichte des Konsonantismus in den permiischen Sprachen: MSFOn 65, Helsinki 1933, p. 57.
116 See Osetlian urd, urda, Awestan urdō etc., Joki, Uralier, etc. p. 347 for another explanation of the FU and Chuvash words.
Vasmer, who derives the word from the Middle Greek γανατον, going back, of course, to the same Arabic source. The weak point in Pritsak’s suggestion (already mentioned by Fraehn) is that an initial r- is impossible in Volga Bulgarian (see Râs > orus > vîrdas ‘Russian’). Moreover, if this word had already been part of the Bulgarian language (i.e. had no longer been felt to be a foreign word, so that -b- had become -a-) then a prothetic vowel, here an a-, would have developed. The expected prothetic a- is, in fact, present in the old district-name of Moscow, Arbat, which, Pisani suggests, has the same etymology, but this is cited with some reservation by Vasmer (cf. Etim. slov. I, p. 83).

More conclusive is the word ṱpyvòse in the Chronicle of Troick, occurring under the year 1230 with the meaning ‘a nobleman of the Volga Bulgars’ (see Fasmer IV, 1973, p. 108). Munkácsi119 and later, quite independently, Sachmatov120 and Samojlovich,121 identified this word with the Tu. tudun, and reconstructed a Volga Bulgarian *turun. This is, at present, the earliest evidence of the OB change d > 관광 > r. (For this word in Chuvash toponymy, see C. Czeglédi’s paper in this volume, p. 34)

Recently, many scholars have dealt with the possible OB or MB words in East Slavonic and Russian.122 One can only hope that the voluminous monograph of Dobrodomov123 will soon appear so that further conclusions might be drawn.

We are in a better position in respect of another important source on LOB. The monograph published by Scherner124 on the Arabic and New Persian loanwords which came into Bulgarian along with Islamization

120 A. A. Sachmatov, Zametka o jazyke voltskich bolgar: Sbornik Muzeja Antropologii i Étnografii 5 (1918), pp. 385–397.
122 See N. Poppe, Jr., Studies of Turkish Loanwords in Russian. Wiesbaden 1971; and Dobrodomov’s review: K istoriografii tjurkizmov v rusekom jazyke: ST, 1974. 5, pp. 72–76; also A. N. Kononov, Istorija-izuchenija tjurkskich jazykov v Rossii. Leningrad 1972, pp. 251–266.
123 I. G. Dobrodomov has defended his dissertation Problemy izuchenija bulgarskich leksičeskich elementov v slavjanskich jazykach in 1974. In this work, he synthesized the results of about a hundred of his earlier papers scattered in many journals and anthologies. Since Dobrodomov has revised some of his earlier views, we must wait until this important work is published.
124 B. Scherner, Arabische und neupersische Lehnmörter im Tschuwschischen. Wiesbaden 1977, with the bibliography of the earlier works.
of the Bulgarians enables us to draw some important conclusions. Scher-
ner's greatest merit is that he separated the Arabic/Persian loanwords
which came into Chuvash with Tatar mediation from those which are of
earlier prevalence. This earlier group is by no means homogeneous; most
of the words pertaining here are also indirect loans, but some of them could
be direct. The early layer is most important for the chronological evidence
it gives of some changes in the Chuvash phonological system. We have
historical reasons to assume that the Arabic and Persian words of the earlier
layer — perhaps with the exception of a very few commercial terms — are
not earlier than the end of the 9th century (see note 105). Thus, irrespective
of the question of whether they were direct or indirect loans, any change
in these Arabic and Persian words along with the Chuvash had to be later
than the 9th century.

We can easily work out a chronology for the complicated history of Chu-
vash vocalism with the help of the early Arabic and Persian loanwords.
Most important here is the \( a > i \) change. See:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ar. } & \text{habar 'news' } \rightarrow \text{Chuv. zipar} \\
\text{Ar. } & \text{haraf 'land tax' } \rightarrow \text{Chuv. xiró} \\
\text{Ar. } & \text{bazna 'treasure house' } \rightarrow \text{Chuv. xişna} \\
\text{Ar. } & \text{mašara 'to ridicule' } \rightarrow \text{Chuv. miskara 'joke' etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

Most of these words came through New Persian mediation, and the last
surely through another Turkish language (because of the \(-k\)-). In view of
these words, the change \( a > i \) in Chuvash has to be dated after the 9th
century. This is corroborated by the etymology of the Chuv. \pišÁK 'big'
suggested by Levitskaja.\(^{122}\) This is an early Kipchak loan (cf. \baziq in Codex
Cumanicus), earlier than the Chuvash \( a > i \) change. These findings appar-
ently contradict those OB loanwords which show a Hung. \( i(>i) \) change
corresponding to Turkish \( a \) (as in \tinó 'steer', \tiló 'hemp-breaker', \disznó,
'hog' \tyúk 'hen'). Doerfer\(^{120}\) suggested — as we have seen above (p. 115) —
reconstructing a special AT phoneme. Scherner (op. cit., p. 28) distinguished
between \( a_1 > \text{Chuv. } i \) and \( a_2 > \text{Chuv. } o,u \). I am inclined to assume that
this is a special Bulgarian — and not AT — phenomenon, and that in OB
we have to reckon with a labial and an illabial \( a \), the second perhaps more
central. The question of the Hungarian short \( a \) (which is labial) is one of the
most controversial problems of the history of Hungarian vocalism. For

\(^{120}\) Khalaj Materials, pp. 179–180.
reasons not to be discussed here, I assume that the Hung. \( i' > i \) in the above cases is a substitution, and does not reflect an OB \( i \).

The chronology of the special Chuvash consonant changes also gains support from Arabic and Persian words. One of the most debated questions is the chronology of the spirantization of the consonants \( f \) and \( \delta \). In view of the NP \( f\dot{\alpha}n \rightarrow \text{Chuv. } \dot{\alpha}n \) 'man, human being', the NP \( \chi\dot{\alpha}a \) 'cross' \( \rightarrow \text{Chuv. } xu\dot{a} \), NP \( \chi\dot{\omega}a\dot{\alpha} \rightarrow \text{Chuv. } xu\dot{u}\dot{a} \) 'master, merchant' and the above cited \( xir\dot{\alpha}a \), we can state that these changes occurred in Chuvash later than the 9th century. The NP \( \chi\dot{\omega}a\dot{\alpha} \) was borrowed from LAB not only by PP but also by Old Russian, as \( x03\delta\text{-HH} \). This can narrow the time of borrowing to between the 9th and the 10th centuries. Both the PP and the Old Russian show a palatalized voiced affricate \( d'\dot{z} \), the intermediate stage of \( d\dot{z} > d'\dot{t} > d' \).

For the chronology of the \( ti- > \dot{c}i- \) change, we have clear evidence in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions.\(^a\) The only example cited by Scherner — (op. cit., p. 49) NP \( t\dot{\alpha}z \rightarrow \text{Chuv. } \dot{\alpha}z \) 'quick, swift' — has nothing to do with the \( ti > \dot{c}i \) development; the Chuvash word is of Russian origin.

Of great interest is what the Arabic and Persian loanwords contribute to our knowledge of rotacism and lambdacism. Scherner (op. cit., p. 67) accepts the chronology suggested by Doerfer \( TMEN \ II, \) p. 523):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{AT} \ &*d' > \text{eight} \ &\text{century} \ &\delta > \text{tenth} \ &\text{century} \ &rz > \text{thirteenth} \ &\text{century} \ &\text{fourteenth} \ &\text{century} \ &\text{Chuv. } \ &r \\
\text{AT} \ &*z > \text{eight} \ &\text{century} \ &rz > \text{fourteenth} \ &\text{century} \ &\text{Chuv. } \ &r \\
\text{AT} \ &*\gamma d' > \text{eight} \ &\text{century} \ &z > \text{fourteenth} \ &\text{century} \ &\text{Chuv. } \ &r
\end{align*}
\]

For the \(-rz-\) we have no clear criteria, while for \( r \) we do. In place of AT \( \delta \) we find \( r \) in the 13th century (\textit{turun}), for the AT \( z \) we find \( r \) in Mongolian and Hungarian.

Scherner cites three examples in which \( z > r \) might have occurred in loanwords that were neither Arabic nor Persian. Chuv. \( xir(\dot{a}) \) 'pine tree' he connects with the Uralic word for Pinus abies (Finnish \( kuuei \), Mordv \( kyz \), Cher. \( ku\dot{u} \), Zyr. \( koz \), Voty. \( kiz \), etc.)\(^b\). The two words pertain together, but Scherner did not put the question of which form was borrowed, and


when. The Common Permian form has to be reconstructed as *kouše> *köze. The Voty. -i- is a late development, and the word had a labial vowel in Permian, from which the Chuv. -i- cannot be deduced. Räsänen (Etym. Wbs., p. 218) reconstructed *kadi without a hint at the FU parallels. In Soyot, we find Ӄađi, in Tuv. Ӄađi, in Tofalar hadi, in Niźne Iyus Ӄaṣi, in Khak. Ӄaṣi, Ӄaḥa Ӄaṣi. The Turkish words pertain together, and their protoform can be reconstructed as *gadi. This is a loan from Ancient Samoyed Ḋaṭi ‘pine’ (cf. Nganassan kuo, ku’a, Eneta ka, kari, kadi, Yurak cha, Nenets Ӄađi, Ḋaṭi, Ḋaṭi, Sülpük qat, Ḋu’d, Ḋeṭe, Ḋeṭe, Khamsus Ḋo’d, Ḋ’o’ ’o’, Tsvgi Ḋat). The final -i/l in the Samoyed data is a derivative suffix (*qadi > i/l).

The P. o-Samoyed form has to be reconstructed as *kadi-iqí > kadi, and it was this that was taken into the Turkish languages. PS Ḋaṭi is the same word as the FU words enumerated above. Thus in this case, the Chuv. ṕira is an example for Ḋ > ṕ, and not for Ḋ > r.

Scherner’s second etymology is the Chuv. ṕaṭvr ‘narrow, close’. According to him, this is a loan from the Tu. ṕiqiz; if it were an original word, we would find *čaṭvr or *čeṭvr, he argues. The Turkish word is a derivative of the verb ṕiq- which we do, in fact, find in Chuvash as Ḋaṭ-, along with its derivative Ḋaṭras. The Turkish word ṕiqiz is present in Chuvash as a loanword in the form Ḋaṭis ← Tat. ṕiqiz < ṕiqiz. But in Tatar, we find the word ṕigrik, in Bashk. ṕigrijk ‘a narrow path, passage’, which with the suffix -ri, has been taken over by Chuvash, where we find ṕaṭvr ‘a narrow path’.

These latter words are from the same verb ṕiq-, plus the deverbal suffix -r (see the OT ṕetra- ‘to be tough, turdy’ Clauson, p. 472). The Chuvash word ṕaṭvr occurs in the earliest documents as ṕuvirs” (Soč, Viš), and in Viryal has the following forms: ṕuvr, ṕetvr, tor (words I collected in the village of Morguš and Ryla Kasi) and ṕur (Ašm. XIV, p. 156); it was taken over by Cheremiss as tor, tor (Räsänen, Tschuw. Lehnw., p. 222). In view of the labial vowel in the first syllable, we have to reconstruct the first syllable as *to- (or *tu-); in fact, in Shor we find tobir, in Sagay, too, we find tobir ‘blunt, short’, so for the Chuvash ṕaṭvr we have to reconstruct an earlier *tobur.

The Chuv. tir- ‘to thread, to string (beads etc.), to arrange in a row’ Scherner considers a loan for similar reasons. The fact that the proposed Turkish equivalent ṕiz- has the vowel -i- makes it improbable that there is

121 V. I. Rassadin, Fonetika i leksika tofalarekogo ýazyka, Ulan Ude 1971, p. 185.
122 See Janhunen, Samojedischer Wortschatz, p. 61.
a direct connection between the two, because the AT i became ĭ or ď in Chuvash. Here we have to reconstruct an AB ter-. We find parallels for this in the Turki tex- and the Lohnor tex- (the Tatar tex- does not pertain here, being secondary from į江北-. The case we have here is similar to that of ydrana cited above (p. 120), where the AB vocalism already had dialectal features. To this I would add that ĭ- before a back vocalic ĭ does not always change into ė even in original Chuvash words. A good example is the Tu. yeti 'seven', adit 'six' > Chuv. ďid but ueld. The ĭ > ė development was preceded by the ĭ > ĭ change which is the main trend in Chuvash (see qtd > xër etc.).

Thus we have no clear examples for the z > r development in loanwords.

Quite another case is that of the Chuvash pîr 'linen' (see pp. 151-152 above). This word entered Chuvash when the ď > ď > ĭ > ĭ change was either in its ď stage or its ĭ stage. The same is true of the NP adîna 'Friday' → Chuv. erne, both occurring by the 13th century (the latter occurs twice with -r- in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions); these loanwords help our chronology only for ď > ĭ and not for ĭ > ĭ.

More complicated is the question of the fate of the deep velar ĝ in Arabic and Persian loanwords. For the sake of a chronological order, Scherner distinguishes three layers:

AT qarin 'belly' ~ Chuv. xîram (original word)
AT qârindâq 'brethren' Tat. → Chuv. xurdîkâ
AT qarinîq 'peritoneum' → Chuv. kardinîk

There is also a fourth layer:

Tat. kapka 'gate, door' → Chuv. xapxa
Tat. gavîr 'to throw' → Chuv. xayîr-
Tat. kâkaya 'border, curtain' → Chuv. xadâkâ
Russian gazéta 'newspaper' → Chuv. xadat

The following pattern emerges:

I. in original word ĝa > xu
II. in loanwords ĝa → Chuv. xa > xu
    ĝa → Chuv. xa
    ĝa → Chuv. ka

As Scherner maintains, the last layer is clearly later than the ď > ĭ change. Before this change, Chuvash had no initial ka-. Either kâ (later >
ka), or xa was substituted. This a could have been borrowed before the a > u change, or, given the Tat. qa ~ Chuv. xu- after the a > o, u development was completed. After that, xa remained unchanged (as in zapxa, etc.). For this reason, the Arabic and Persian loanwords which have q- do not help us to work out the chronology of the q > x development. Theoretically, the Ar. qumma 'strength' → NP qumma → Chuv. xivat could have occurred before the q > x development, but also after it, in which case we are dealing with a case of substitution. Theoretically, the Chuvash word xtreemeslen- 'to become red' can be a NP loan, a form of qirmiz 'pur- ple, red' (cf. Scherner, op. cit., p. 80) but in this case, under the influence of the Chuv. xir- 'to be hot, to be red', xiriz 'red' it would have developed into x irrespective of the fact that it had been borrowed with a q.

Connected with the problem of the chronology of q > x and d > ž > z is a word in Ibn Fadlan's work. As is well known, Ibn Fadlan visited the Volga Bulgars in 921/922. The word qumma occurs five times in his account of his journey. The word is the name for the birch tree, and occurs in the Hudud al-ālam (982-983) and in the writings of many other Persian and Arab authors mostly in the same form. The evidence in the Hudud al-ālam is of special interest: from it, we find that the tree grew in the land of the (Old) Khirghiz; from there, it was brought in great quantities. Birch was used in the manufacturing of weapons (bows, arrows, spears, etc.), of various vessels, and its bark was used for writing on, and to make baskets. Marwazi (of 1120) remarks that qumma is the most widely-spread tree in the land of the Bulgars. The word can be found in Kakhkari as well. He states that the word is spelled qadxi in Kharakhanid, but the Yaghma, Tukhsi, Kipchak, Yabayu, Tatar, Khay Chumul and Oghuz call it qadxi (see Clauson, p. 602). Clauson remarks that perhaps it is a Persian loanword not translated in the ordinary dictionaries of either language. Doerfer (loc. cit) regards the Persian word as a Turkish loan. Since we have zuhun in Chuvash, in Tuvinian zadın, gazın in Khakass and Shor, and qadin in Yakut, while we have gaim in most other Turkish languages, it is surely a very old word in Turkish. For reasons of natural geography, we can hardly assume it to be an early Persian or Iranian word. The very early spread of this commercial word raised doubts about the usefulness of Ibn Fadlan's data to arrive at a chronology of the q > x change in OB. It could be argued that Ibn Fadlan may have known the word already before

---

his visit, and in this case the \( \chi \) would not necessarily reflect a LOB \( \chi \). If we opt for this interpretation, the \( \chi \) here reflects a Turkish \( q \) > \( \chi \) (and not an Iranian \( \chi \), as do \( xan \), \( xayan \), \( xatun \), etc.). But if the initial \( \chi \) in this word had become established in other Turkish languages, it is unlikely that Kâşyari, who noted \( \chi \) in other cases, would have failed to remark on it. Therefore we can assume with some probability that the initial \( \chi \) in Ibn Fadlan’s word reflects either a Khazar or a Volga Bulgar \( \chi \). If \( \theta \) had already been \( r \) in the language of the Volga Bulgars Ibn Fadlan would hardly have missed noting it.

Although a great deal of work has been done on some important details, a thorough investigation of Ibn Fadlan’s work as a source of Chuvash linguistic history is an urgent task still to be accomplished.\(^{132}\) Mead is called \( \varepsilon \) by Ibn Fadlan. This has to be read as \( s\ddot{u}\ddot{u} \). In this word, the \( -\ddot{u} \) is still an affricate, while the final \( -g \) has already disappeared (cf. OT \( s\ddot{u}\ddot{u}g \), Clauson, p. 706). The goblet in which the \( s\ddot{u}\ddot{u} \) is kept during the wedding ceremonies is called \( s\ddot{a}\dot{a}\ddot{r} \) which Togan, corrected to read \( s\ddot{a}\dot{a}\dot{r} \). The word is listed in Kâşyari as \( s\ddot{a}\dot{y}r \) ‘cup, goblet’ and is a diminutive of \( s\ddot{a}\dot{y}r \). The latter is surely a Persian loanword — as Clauson has noted (cf. P. \( s\ddot{a}\dot{g} \), \( s\ddot{a}\dot{g} \)). Ibn Fadlan’s \( s\ddot{a}\dot{h}r\ddot{a}\ddot{b} \) reflects a Volga Bulgarian form \( s\ddot{a}r \) — if Togan’s emendation is correct. But the form \( s\ddot{a}r \) would also be possible, analogously to the Tu. \( b\ddot{a}\ddot{g} \) ‘copper’ > \( b\ddot{a}r\ddot{a}\ddot{t} \) ‘kettle (of copper)’. The name of the river in the “land of the Bashkirs” Ibn Fadlan writes as \( s\ddot{i}\ddot{y} \) (\( Suh \)) the present Sok. This is conclusive evidence of \( q \) > \( \chi \) in this region, and thus \( s\ddot{a}r \) is phonetically possible. The name of the river CüremiSan Ibn Fadlan wrote as \( s\ddot{a}\ddot{m} \). The river is called SarımSAN in contemporary

\(^{132}\) We have to be very cautious with Ibn Fadlan’s linguistic data. Not only because of the possible scribal errors, of the slips made by the later copyists (one such slip is the \( n \) on the end of Suwar, which, amended to \( -z \) by Kovalevskij, brought the word into connection with the ethnic name Chuvash, an impossible hypothesis for several reasons), but also because he might have misunderstood the local informants, especially as he knew no Turkish and used interpreters. One of them was Tekln al-Turk, and the other Bârs al-Saqlabi, i.e. a “Turk” and a Bulgarian (for the Saqaliba-Bulgarian problem, see Czeglédy, Zur messede Handschrift, pp. 227-231). Now Bârs is written once in the MS as \( F\ddot{a}r\ddot{a} \) and Togan (p. 17) considered him as identical with the \( F\ddot{a}r\ddot{a} \) \( \ddot{y}n\dot{d} \) mentioned in 325 A. H./936-937 A. D. Yandî is perhaps to be read as \( Yn\dot{d} \), and is the OT title \( \dot{I}n\dot{d} \) (see Clauson, p. 189). One of the leaders of the Oghuz is called by Ibn Fadlan (or his interpreter) as \( \dot{I}n\dot{d} \) (the minor \( Yn\dot{d} \)). In this case, we would have a good parallel to \( \ddot{y}n\dot{d} \) \( \sim \) \( \ddot{y}n\dot{d} \) (see below p. 168-167). But even in this case we do not know whether the title was pronounced \( \ddot{y}n\dot{d} \) in the language of the Oghuz, or was only explained to Ibn Fadlan this way by one of his interpreters.
Another river name is Chuvash. Whether or not the latter is identical with Jauširma, Yaùširma in the Cistopol rayon, here, as in the former river name, we have an affricate in initial position, one which became ș- in Chuvash.

The Arabic sources call our attention to another important source for a study of LOB. Ibn Rusta (cca 930) wrote that the Volga Bulgars had no money, but used marten furs in their commercial dealings. One marten fur was exchanged for two and a half dirhem. The white, round dirhems were procured from the territories of the Islam. Not much earlier, in 921 A.D., Ibn Fadlan related that when he met the ruler of the Bulgars, the ruler greeted him by throwing dirhems on him. These, of course, could well have been imported. We know a lot about the dirhems minted by the Volga Bulgars from the works of Fraehn, R. Vasmer, and Janina. The most important new finding is a coin bearing the name of Jafar ibn Abdallah, i.e. Almu, the ruler whom Ibn Fadlan met. (See note 107.) Since the names of the Samanid emir Ismail ibn Ahmed (892-907) and of the Caliph al-Muktafi (902-908) can be identified on the coin, the date of its emission can be fixed to have been between 902 and 907 (see Janina, op. cit., p. 181). The coin was found in 1956 in Novgorod, another evidence of the close contacts between the Russians and the Volga Bulgars. In her present paper,

116 For the details, see Röna-Tas, A Volga Bulgarian, pp. 164-166.

R. Vasmer, Beiträge zur mohamedanischen Münzkunde II. Über die Münzen der Wolga-Bulgaren: Numismatische Zeitschrift 58 (1926), pp. 63-84; R. R. Faemer, Ob monetach voliskich bolgar X. veka: Izvestija Občestva Archeologii i Ètnografii 33 (1928), pp. 29-60. On the distribution of the Volga Bulgarian coinage, see also R. R. Faemer, Ob izdani novoj topografii nachodok kuříčskich monet v Vostočnoj Evrope: Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR Otd. Obč. nauk, ser. 7 (1933), pp. 473-484. Bălînt Cs. has kindly called my attention to the following two publications: A. A. Bykov, Three Notes on Islamic Coins from Hoards in the Soviet Union. In Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Ed. D. K. Kouymjian, Beirut 1970, pp. 203-210. In a hoard found at Kohõla-Järve (Estonia), a coin was found which can be dated to 936 A. H./975-976 A. D. On it the name of Suwar is written with an emphatic ş. This emphatic ş, as has already been pointed out by Kovalevskij, is also to be found in Idrisi’s work. V. V. Kropotkin, Torgonya svajie volšekoj Bulgarij v X. v. po numizmatičeskim dannym: In Dremsë starfane i ich sosedi. Ed. Ju. V. Kucharenko, MIA 176 (1970), pp. 146-165 gives a good overview of the distribution of VB coinage.

Janina has clearly shown the Samanid origin of early Volga Bulgar coinage, a fact of great importance for the way the early Persian and Arabic loan-words came to reach the Bulgars.

Recently, Linder Welin has found a coin in a collection in the parish of Högdarve, Rone in Gotland, Sweden. The hoard was hidden around 1000 A.D. The coin was dated, with some hesitation, at 365 A.H. (975-976 A.D.). It is from the time of the Bulgar ruler Mu'min ibn al-Hasan, and bears his title: محمد. All other, hitherto known coins of Mu'min Ibn al-Hasan were issued in 366 A.H. with a Bulgar inscription, but did not bear the title of the king. There is, however, one coin on which something like جمال or جمال has been read on the various specimens. R. Vasmer has thoroughly investigated the two specimens kept in the Hermitage in Leningrad, and the one belonging to the collection of Leningrad University. He was sure that the first two and the last three letters were د. The third letter he tentatively read as ر, and identified the word with the الملاط of Ibn Fadlan, assuming that ر ژ stand for ج. The word became the subject of lengthy discussion. Kovalevskij, and Togan (op. cit.) read it as يلیت‌فار. Czeglédy finally identified this word with the Turkish title علی‌بیکر, supposing an OB form with a prothetic y-. Czeglédy read the second part of the word with a back vowel because of the use of the emphatic و. On the coin discussed by R. Vasmer, in front of the word he read as الملاط there stands the title الأمير. Janina (op. cit., p. 187) found it very unlikely that another title would occur after the title, and therefore rejected Kovalevskij's and other proposed readings. She suggested reading the الإيین as al-asfar Barsal, i.e. the Emir of the Barsulas. For my part, I see no problem in the conjoining of an old and a new title by the Bulgarian ruler. While retaining his old title (got from the Khazars) he added the new one which he got from Ibn Fadlan's mission in the name of the Caliph. In the Secret History of the Mongols, the Kerie ruler Tööril is called Ongqan. The first
part of the title is the Chinese wang given to allied rulers; while qan is an old title used also by the Mongols. In the Secret History, To'oril is most frequently called simply Ongqan i.e. by title only, without his name. A similarly hybrid title is to be read on a coin studied by R. Vasmer where, most probably, \( \text{امیر یلتونر} \) has to be read as \( \text{al-amir yiltever} \). I see no good reason for reading the second part of the word with back vowels. It is true that in later usage, the emphatic Arabic letters were used for words containing back vowels. This was true also in the case of most of the Volga Bulgar inscriptions. But this was not yet practice in the 10th and 11th centuries (Suwar is mostly written with \( \text{س} \), and only rarely, and later, which \( \text{ش} \)) and was not followed by, for example, \( \text{که} \). The emphatic character can be due to the preceding \( \text{-} \). The title yiltever is surely of Khazar origin; but the Khazar yiltewer and the Turkish ilteber \( \sim \) elteber is not necessarily of Turkish origin. We cannot tell whence the prothetic \( y \)-originated. We can be sure, however, that \( y \)-in initial position was possible in the language of the Volga Bulgars. And since in place of the Common Turkish \( y \)- we find \( j \) in Volga Bulgar, the existing \( y \)-initials could only be prothetic. The word is further evidence for the existence of \( -v \)- in intervocalic position.

On some coins, the place of issue is given. We find \( \text{بیلار} \) and \( \text{بیلار} \). The first place is \( \text{Bulyar} \), the third, \( \text{Suwar} \). The second was identified by Janina (op. cit.) as Biljar. In any case, we have to read the form \( \text{B.lar} \). \( \text{B.lar} \) is well known from pre-Mongolian times. In the Hungarian chronicle written by Anonymus, we find the geographical name \( \text{terra bular} \) (Chapter 57) from where — with many other Moalens — came the noblemen \( \text{Billa/Billa} \) and \( \text{Bocsu} \) (read \( \text{Boksu} \)), who were brothers. The latter had an offspring \( \text{Ethey} \). From the same territory came a Moslem with the name \( \text{Hetem} \).144

144 J. Németh in a paper entitled \( \text{Das wolga-bulgarische Wort baxa "gelohter Herr"} \) in \( \text{Ungarn} \). In \( \text{Islam Tekikleri Emtiteli Dergiesi V} \) (1973), pp. 165-170 identified the name \( \text{Bocsi} \) with Tu. \( \text{باچا} \). The name \( \text{Billa/Billa} \) had earlier been identified by Gy. Györffy \( \text{Tanulmányok a magyar állam eredetéről} \) (Studies on the Origins of the Hungarian State), Budapest 1959, p. 81, with the Turkish title \( \text{boyla} \), which Németh accepted. For Ethey and Hetem, Németh tentatively suggested a connection with the Tu. \text{ed} \). The names \( \text{Bylla} \) is very plausible, that of Bocsi possible but not without some difficulties. The last two names can hardly be connected with \( \text{ed} \). Here, I would only call attention to the initial \( h \)- of \( \text{Hetem} \), which can not be a Hungarian orthographical peculiarity (a "superfious" \( h \)- is used in early Hungarian orthography, but this word is known from present geographical names with an initial \( h \)-). If the name is of Volga Bulgar origin, we have here one of the earliest data on the Volga Bulgarian \( g > v \).
In the Chronicle of Simeon de Kéza, written around 1283 relying on older sources, we come across the name Belar. Belar was the name of a man who lived close to the Maeotis with his sons. The eponymous ancestors of the Hungarians Hunor and Magor abducted the wives of Belar’s sons. Belar has long been identified by Hungarian scholars with the name Bulgar, and the story was taken as a legendary reminiscence of the early Bulgar-Magyar contacts around the Azovian Sea. The Hungarian/Latin forms Bular/Belar can be connected with early place-names in Hungary: Bolar 1268 and Belar 1291. The form Bular, Bolar is present also in the post-Mongolian sources (on its occurrence in maps, see J. Tardy’s paper in this volume). It has to be added that in the same Hungarian chronicles, the name Bulgar denoted the Danube Bulgars. But in the relation of Friar Julian, who visited the Volga Bulgars in 1235, this country is called Magna Bulgaria.

I should like to conclude this review of the sources of LOB with a brief look at the work of Káshyari. The relevance of Káshyari’s data on the Bulgars has been discussed by Benzing and Pritsak. According to Benzing, Káshyari’s data pertain to the Chuvash-type languages. According to Pritsak, Káshyari had no first-hand data on the Volga Bulgars; his data originate from merchants living in Bulgar and Suwar, but not speaking a Chuvash-type language. Pritsak’s arguments are convincing, and I would add only one more. The word şiţ' aşag ‘foot’ cannot be a LOB word, not because of its -ţ-, but because of its final -q. In Káshyari’s time, the final -q was already either -χ or -γ > ŋ (see Chuv. urd < *aţi < adag). The same holds true of qanag ‘butter’. There is, however, a remark of Káshyari which deserves more attention than Pritsak gave it. Káshyari writes: “Some
of the Kipchaks, and the Yimeks and the Suwars and the Bulgars and those who live in the vicinity of Rus and Rum put a jä (in place of jä)". I think this remark refers to a feature which we would now call areal. Since we have conclusive evidence that d > š > z > r took place in Chuvash (see P. adîna → Chuv. erne ‘Friday’, and Ar. bez → Chuv. pîr) we can be sure that there was a time when they used ‘ä jä’; instead of ‘iä’. This, as we have seen, must have been before 1230. I see no reason why the -z- grade of LOB could not pertain to the kind of areal feature that Kâşyârî refers to. This would mean that we have a terminus post quem for the z > r change; thus, we can assume that the (d) > š > z > r change occurred in the period between 1072 and 1230.146

146 The sources of Middle and New Bulgarian will be dealt with in another paper. I would only like to remark here that the overwhelming majority of the Chuvash loanwords in Cheremis pertain to the Middle Bulgarian period and will, therefore, be dealt with in the forthcoming paper. The Volga Bulgarian language reflected by the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions pertain also to the Middle Bulgarian period. The earliest such inscription is dated 1281. I do not agree with those who consider the VB material in the inscriptions as a “dead”, “sacred” language. On the other hand it is clear that most of the words are rendered with a more or less standard orthography and the orthography shows many consistent traits which surely developed earlier than their use in the inscriptions.
ЯЗЫКОВОЕ ВЛИЯНИЕ МОНГОЛЬСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ XIII-XIV ВВ.

Ранняя история монгольской империи имеет богатый фонд письменных источников. Эти источники делятся на две большие группы. В первую группу входят источники, написанные монголами или составленные под их надзором. Вторую группу составляют письменные источники тех народов, с которыми монголы имели непосредственные или косвенные связи. Хотя большинство этих источников историкам хорошо известно, мы еще далеки от того, чтобы иметь в каждой области обработку этих материалов, удовлетворяющую современным требованиям. Таким образом хотелось бы лишь отметить, что среди источников того времени, касающихся истории монголов, может быть самый старый сохранившийся текст — это донесение венгерского монаха Юлиана за 1237 год. Донесение было опубликовано в Венгрии в 1937 году Bendefy 1938, затем вскоре и на русском языке Ш.Я. Аннинский 1940, а недавно вышло и его немецкое издание Dörrie 1956. Хотя монгольские отношения донесения были изучены уже многими Sinor, Ligeti, Györffy, Dörrie, его углубленный анализ с точки зрения монгольской истории еще лишь предстоит. Этот источник показывает многие параллели с текстом Петра йеро-вича, игумена киевского Спасо-берестовского монастыря 1245 и был написан на десять лет раньше, чем хорошо известный доклад Плано Карпини. В донесении Юлиана сохранилось, к сожалению, только в переводе, то письмо, которое было написано "ханом" либо Эгедеем, либо Батыем "языческими буквами, но на татарском языке" венгерскому королю. Если Rachewiltz 1976 прав в том, что знаменитый "Камень Чингиса", известный также под названием "Ясунгке-надпись", относится не к 1224-25 годам, как предполагали раньше, а примерно к 1250 году, то письмо в донесении Юлиана, правда, известное нам лишь в переводе, является самым старым памятником монгольского языка, поскольку оно на три года опережает монгольские строки Тэргене.

Здесь мы намерены рассмотреть другую группу источников, которая, хотя до сих пор и была хорошо известной, но ее историческая оценка не стояла в центре исследования. Как известно, монгольская империя оказала не только политическое, общественное, экономическое и культурное влияние на историю Евразии, ее влияние отражается также во всех языках, с носителями которых монголы состояли в непосредственных или косвенных контактах. Вопрос можно ставить и следующим образом: к каким историческим выводам приводят нас среднемонгольские заимствования евразийских языков?
Чтобы на этот вопрос дать исчерпывающий ответ, необходимо было бы провести совместную монографическую работу ученых многих стран. В данной статье нам хотелось бы высказать лишь некоторые предварительные мысли относительно такой монографии, возможной в будущем.


Что касается монгольских заимствований русского языка, то можно указать отчасти на этимологический словарь Фасмера, русское издание которого под руководством Трубачева содержит богатую литературу, отчасти же на работы Ынгеса. Многочисленные труды посвящены среднемонгольским элементам тюркских языков. Из обобщающих работ выделяются этимологические словари Рясянена и Севортяна. Среди крупных трудов о среднемонгольских заимствованиях в отдельных тюркских языках можно отметить: в якутском Kaluziñüki 1961, в чувашском Poppe 1966, в чувашском Копа-Тас 1982, в караянском Zajączkowski 1956, в куманском Poppe 1962, в казахском Конкаспаев 1962, в киргизском Юнусалиев 1959, в турки Копа-Тас 1966, в венгерском Уйбердин 1979. Хотелось бы отдельно отметить недавно вышедшую книгу В.Н. Рассадина "Монголо-бурятские заимствования в сибирских тюркских языках" 1980 и упомянуть еще не опубликованную диссертацию венгерской исследовательницы Ева Чаки о монгольских заимствованиях татарского языка. Множество очерков посвящено тематическим группам слов, и почти необозримо количество работ, исследующих то или иное слово или термин. Накопленный материал очень богат. В то же время необходимо указать и на то, что есть еще важные, и пока нерешенные задачи. Мы не располагаем удовлетворительными обработками в области ранних тюркских литературных языков хорезмийского, чагатайского или староузбекского, турки, староосманского. А что касается тибетского языка, то вышеупомянутая работа Лауфера, несмотря на ее значительные достоинства, давно устарела.

Научный уровень разных исследований, разумеется, весьма различен. Есть среди них и выдающиеся работы, но также такие, в которых говорится просто о "параллелях" и не различаются древние, старомонгольские и новомонгольские соответствия. Вместо критического анализа предшествовавшей литературы нам здесь хотелось бы высказать несколько замечаний методологического характера.

1. Среднемонгольское происхождение того или иного слова имеет преж-
девсего лингвистические фонетические и морфологические критерии, которые могут быть установлены лишь в результате основательного знания истории и источников монгольского языка. Поэтому метод сопоставления слова с формами, выписанными из современных монгольских словарей, следует признать неправомерным. Необходимо учитывать также и среднемонгольские диалекты. Конечно, имеется немалое количество слов, у которых нет языковых критериев, по которым можно было бы считать их среднемонгольскими.

2. Необходимо принимать во внимание также структуру и историю заимствующего языка. Так, например, в современном тибетском разговорном языке Лассы слово со значением "почтовая служба" или "почтовая служба" звучит как ItemType. Оно восходит к ранней тибетской разговорной форме ulā. Тибетское слово в принципе могло быть заимствованием среднемонгольского ula'a, ulа или тюркского ula'. Однако, учитывая данные историй тибетского языка, засчитываются только тибетское слово, а монгольское происхождение отпадает. Современная же тибетская форма umusu "чулки", напротив, соответствует литературному монгольскому слову oyimasun, а не тюркскому oyum. Следовательно, данное тибетское слово монгольского, а не среднемонгольского происхождения, поскольку в среднемонгольском оно имело начальное h- hoyimasun . Начальное среднемонгольское h-, которое, как известно, в монгольском языке исчезло, в тибетском сохранилось, например, в слове hulan "красный" ср. среднемонг. hula'an . Тибетское слово umusu происходит из одного из южномонгольских диалектов.

3. Согласно историко-лексикологическому критерию, если то или иное слово встречается в каком-либо немонгольском языке еще до среднемонгольского периода, то оно не может считаться среднемонгольским заимствованием. Правда, тибетское слово Tambah "некоторый-светлый" о глазах монгольского происхождения ср. שקיר "быть белым", но так как оно встречается в произведениях Махмуда Кашгарского 1072-74, то оно не может быть среднемонгольским заимствованием. Возникает вопрос, куда же следует отнести слова, происходящие из монгольского языка киданов. Дело в том, что кара-киданы, постепенно ставшие тюрками, несколько монгольских слов передали своим соседям, и этот процесс закончился в начале XII века. Таким словом могло быть и _THANIR.

5. Следует различить слова, заимствованные из живой разговорной речи, то есть настоящие заимствования, от глосс, цитат, терминов, употребляемых как иностранные слова. Так, например, если в труде Рашид-ад-Дина, написанном на персидском языке, мы читаем, что "у монголов есть обычай называть младшего сына otšiyn см. Doerfer 1963, 156", то это слово не является среднемонгольским заимствованием в персидском языке.

6. Значительная часть среднемонгольских заимствований попала из монгольского в данный язык не непосредственно. Так, например, подавляющее большинство среднемонгольских элементов чувашского языка вошло в чувашский через татарское посредство ср. Poppe 1977, Róna-Tas 1982. Современное чувашское слово чунтар "игреневый о масти лошади" является заимствованием татарского чантар, а это последнее, в свою очередь, не что иное, как заимствование западномонгольского Kabdar, которое соответствует литературному монгольскому Kabidur.

7. В случае опосредованного заимствования необходимо ставить и решать вопрос о том, через разговорный или литературный язык то или иное слово попало в данный язык. Слово Niugaere, встречающееся в хронике Отто фон Штейнемарка, написанной между 1305 и 1320 годами, ср. Németh 1953 входит в конечном итоге к западномонгольской форме nöker. Но эта форма перешла в кыпчак-коман и оттуда, наверное, посредством венгерской латыни, попада в немецкий.

8. Словарный состав монгольского языка состоит не только из древних монгольских слов. Среднемонгольским заимствованием может быть и такое слово, которое в конечном итоге тюркского, китайского или иранского происхождения. По мере возможности такое происхождение должно быть прослежено и указано. Так, например, слова пайза и bagši китайского происхождения, но в Евразии они распространились через монголов. Последнее слово bagši попало в монгольский не прямо из китайского, а из уйгурского.

9. Очень важно принимать во внимание распространенность среднемонгольского слова. Имеются слова, распространенные по всей Евразии. Таково, например, слово qara'ul, которое хорошо известно повсюду, от маньчжурского до суахили, и от русского до арабского. Другие слова распространялись лишь на ограниченной территории, например, на территории Золотой Орды. На основе распространения того или иного слова можно сделать выводы относительно обстоятельств заимствования. Так, например, в случае киргизского darqan "кузнец, уважаемый человек" может быть установлено не только его монгольское происхождение, но и то, что оно попало в киргизский эпос, в том числе и в "Манас", из языка монгольских
эпосов. То же слово в китайский язык, например, вошло из киданьского.

10. Следует учтивать и изменения значения того или иного монгольского слова, на различных этапах развития языка. Так, монгольское küre-gen "ять", которое уже в империи чингисидов обозначало знамного человека, входившего в царствующую династию, позже стало титулов.

11. Наконец, мы должны считаться и с кальками монгольского происхождения. Очевидно, что в случае тюркского basqaq и монгольского daruğa одно из них является калькой другого ср. тюркское bas- "давать" и монгольское daru- "давать". В последнее время происхождением данного слова занимался Н. Заваркин, по его мнению, монгольское слово является калькой с тюркского. На основе исторических данных можно предположить, что здесь мы имеем дело с киданьским термином, который был заимствован монголами. А тюркское слово, которое возникло в языке кера-китаней, по степенно отдавалось тюрками, перешло от них в караханскую империю, а потом к сельджукам и в Иран. Все это опять свидетельствует о важности учёта киданьского языка.

Из сказанного выше следует, что языковое исследование монгольской империи, с одной стороны, требует чрезвычайно большой предосторожности, а с другой, обработка богатого материала обещает новые важные результаты.

Нужно ожидать, что в результате работы мы получим новые данные, касающиеся особенностей государственной, политической, административной и военной систем империи. Всё уже были отмечены термины специального характера, как например, nöker, küre-gen, garu-ul, paiza, daruğa. Перечисление можно было бы расширить: Korbi, Karda-ul, Kinsang, oğ, Şecen, gorbi, kebte-ul, kesikten, noyan и т.д. и т.п. Этими терминами занимались многие и после фундаментального труда Владимирцова. Мы, в свою очередь, считаем необходимым здесь выделить еще группу другого типа словарного состава.

Основное значение монгольского глагола bolTa- "договориться о сроке", из которого возникло bolTal, bolTar "определенным сроком". Данное слово попало в тунгусский, персидский, грузинский и почти во все тюркские языки. Первоначально оно распространялось как военный термин и обозначало место и время встречи военных отрядов. Первоначальное значение монгольского слова atra "хитрость, обманчивость", а слово распространилось в значении "военная хитрость". Позже значение слова изменилось и в монгольском языке, и, как известно, оно в настоящее время имеет основное значение "способ, метод", то есть оно почти целиком утратило военное и отрицательное содержание своего значения. Монгольское слово sanglai "чело, лоб" стало известным не как название части тела, а в
значением "передовая часть, авангард" армии. В то же время монгольское qo'olun "передняя часть губ и т. п." обозначало "продвигенный клин" в армии. В современном монгольском языке данное слово существовало до революции и в качестве наименования административных районов. В отличие от продвигенных отрядов, названием задних вспомогательных войск было dem, а заднее резервное войско называлось se'üng. Основным значением этого последнего слова, как это было и в прошлом, является "кось волось ". Название левого и правого крыльев - barüngar и se'ünür, последнее сохранилось и в названии Дэунгария. Центральный военный отряд назывался daqgol, современное же значение этого слова - "центр, середина", однако и это слово распространялось как военный термин. Преследующая разбитого часть войска имеет название neke'Ol, которое в обиходной речи значит "погоня, гонец".

Уже ранее отмечалось многими, что среди среднемонгольских заимствований поразительно велико количество слов, относящихся к терминологии коневодства. Причем эти слова заимствовались и такими языками, носители которых имели высоко развитое коневодство. Так, например, для названия трех- и четырехлетнего коней даже в турецком языке, где относительно мало среднемонгольских заимствований, употребляются слова funan и dOnen. То же самое можно сказать и о названиях мастей лошадей. О слове Khabidun уже говорилось, таковы же, например, еще слова kürang "коричневый, бурий", le'erde "рыжий", gail'un "буланица"; из названий сбруи noftta "недоузок", delbege "вожжи", Tilu'fa "поводья", Gilbü'ur "повод". Среди заимствований фигурирует и монгольское aota "мерин, холощенный жеребец", однако вряд ли можно предположить, что здесь речь шла о введении какой-то специальной формы коневодства, скорее всего этот термин был заимствован народами, служившими в монгольской коннице.

В таких заимствованиях дело не только в том, что с их помощью мы можем реконструировать организацию монгольского государства и войска XIII-XIV вв., но и в том, что мы можем получить данные об историко-общественном фоне заимствований. Такие заимствования всегда предполагают какое-то определенное двуязычие. Однако оно может быть различным по степени и характеру. В какой степени владели монгольским языком немонгольские народы империи чингисидов и какие слои общества были двуязычными? Это очень важные вопросы, которые пока ждут ответа.

В "Кодексе Куманикусе", написанном в 1324 году, встречается слово manjai. Grönbech 1942, издавший этот кодекс, приписывает этому слову немецкое значение Stirn "лоб". Poppe в своей статье о монгольских заимствованиях команского языка отмечает, что слово со значением "лоб" начина заимствовали у монголов. Но здесь, в кодексе встречается и ориги-
нальное тюркское слово alin в том же значении. В подлинном тексте, помимо слова manlai, стоит латинско-итальянское fronte. Это слово в самом деле обозначает "лоб", однако уже у Тацита оно имеет значение "передовая часть", которое сохраняется и в средней латыни. В отличие от него, немецкое слово Stirnне имеет военного значения. В случае команского слова речь идет о том, что команы заимствовали слово в обоих значениях, а это указывает на высокоразвитую форму двуязычия. Об этом мы знаем и по свидетельству тюркских языков, в большей части которых происходило то же самое: военное значение постепенно померкло, и осталось лишь обозначение части тела, вытеснив оригинальное тюркское слово. Этот процесс был возможен только в том случае, если, как это мы предполагаем, довольно широкие массы были двуязычными. То есть положение было иное, чем, например, в Австро-Венгрии, где венгерские или чешские крестьяне учили несколько немецких военных терминов. Связи между монголами и тюрками были намного теснее. Вещественный и языковой фон слов, употреблявшихся первоначально как административные или военные термины, стал после XIV века постепенно исчезать. Значительная часть монгольского слоя вдвинулась в языки, но большинство терминов продолжало жить, и это чрезвычайно важно и с точки зрения общего языкознания. Распространено мнение о том, что слова, принадлежащие к основному словарному фонду, не могут быть заимствованными. Данный тезис не без исключения, однако заимствования такого типа имеют свою вещественно-историческую основу. В нашем случае мы приводили пример на причину заимствования тюрками названий частей тела, имеющих среднемонгольское происхождение.

Заимствованные военные термины постепенно потеряли свое военное значение. Уже упомянутое монгольское слово bolyal ныне в Поволжье обозначает "говор о дне свадьбы". Монгольское слово neker в XIII-XIV вв. имело значение "член вооруженного экскорта", как старое русское слово дружина ср. русск. друг. В современном чувашском языке слово нукер обозначает "дружка при женнике". Следовательно, эти военные термины стали очень мирными не только в современном монгольском, но и в тех языках, которые заимствовали их.
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ON THE HISTORY OF THE TURKIC AND FINNO-UGRIAN AFFRICATES

BY

A. RÓNÁ-TÁS (Budapest)

In the Old Turkic loan-words of the Hungarian language, in the overwhelming majority of the cases Turkic ç is represented by ç (orthographically ș) and in a limited number of words by ç (orth. ș). Three explanations have been offered for this peculiar feature. According to the «classical» view accepted mainly on the authority of Gombocz, Hungarian ç represents an original Proto-Turkic ç. There is indeed a difference between his opinion published in 1912 (Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache, MSFoU 30, pp. 182—183) and that expressed in his last university lecture in 1930 (published in 1960 by L. Ligeti: Honfoglalás előtti bolgár-török jövevényszavaink, pp. 16—17). I quote the relevant passages, the second in English translation: «Das urturk. ç wird im teohuw. regelmässig durch ç vertreten. Die doppelte Vertretung des urtürk. ç im Ungarischen durch as einerseits und s anderseits kann daher meines Rücksichts nur so erklärt werden, wenn wir annehmen, dass der Wandel ç > ş im Altchuvashischen zur Zeit der Berührungen noch nicht in allen Mundarten (t nicht in allen phonetischen Stellungen) vor sich gegangen war. Da das teohuw. ç < ç im Ungarischen in allen sicher fällen (szál, aszödős, ezérő, szöllő, szécs, vgl. 70 §) durch as wiedergegeben wird, kann man nicht umhin anzunehmen, dass die ursprüngliche palatale Affrikata ç im teohuw. durch die Zwischenstufe as übergangen ist, und dass ung. sereq, szapő, boró u. s. w. altchuv. Formen, wie *japörk, *jóaprő, *burkay u. s. w. wiederspiegeln. The Chuvash correspondence of Proto-Turkic ç (= Ş) is today ş, e. g. Ottóm, čuvir~ Chuv. čuvir- toma, Ottóm čilek~ Chuv. čisle ččes, etc. The intermediate stage of the development ç > ş was most likely ç. To this point that the Hungarian reflex of Proto Turkic ç is s (= ș), while that of Chuvash ç < ç. In the word initial Proto Turkic ç = Hung. s- (…) in word middle position Proto Turkic ç = Hung ş (…). All examples where to Common Turkic ş Hungarian ç does correspond are either doubtful comparisons (…) or do not pertain to the earliest layer of the Chuvash type, but perhaps may be regarded as later, perhaps Kazar borrowings: ccač, ccač, čeja, csébenő, bicsak. In the case of csáčan (see 1214: villa Soltchan, 1234 Salon, EtSz. I, 936) and kecske < *kašče the ç could be a secondary Hungarian development. Accordingly Gombocz in 1930 thought that all words with Hungarian ç are of Chuvash origin and in some words with ç a secondary Hungarian ç < ç change occurred. Paasonen in his review of the BTLw (NyK 42, 1913, p. 59) seems to accept Gombocz’s view on ç → Hung. ş, however, he draws attention to the fact that Gombocz did not evaluate those cases where to PT ç Hungarian ş and ç correspond as in bőč→ Hung böč(di)-, bőcs(in)-, bősőr, bőlök→ Hung bülök, yemő→ Hung gyömöcs. Paasonen saw a possibility for reconstructing here an original Turkish çč. Paasonen’s proposal was
intermediate stage between OT Ğ and Chuvash ɿ, namely ɿ. Recently Bárczi\footnote{In his two fundamental works on Hungarian historical phonology (*Magyar hangtörténet*, Budapest 1958, pp. 116—117) and on the origin of the Hungarian lexical stock (*A magyar szókincs eredete*, Budapest 1968, pp. 74—75) already pointed to the problems involved here. He gave a more appropriate discussion of the question in: *Le traitement de ɿ et de Ğ turcs dans les mots d'emprunt turcs du proto hongrois*, Studia Turcica, ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest 1971, pp. 39—46. He writes: "Il est probable que le Ğ turc n'était identique — du moins dans les langues qui jouaient un rôle dans l'enrichissement du vocabulaire hongrois — ni au Ğ ni au ľ hongrois. Les mots d'emprunt turcs devaient donc s'adapter au système consonantique hongrois par une substitution des sons. Deux solutions s'offraient. Ou bien le Ğ turc a été identifié à ľ protohongrois et dans ce cas-là il a évolué plus tard en ľ (≡ ɿ) . . . D'autre part le Ğ turc a pu s'identifier à ľ protohongrois et alors il avait toutes les chances de rester un ce jusqu'à nos jours. Parfois la même mot peut présenter les deux variantes, ainsi kis et kicsiny petits < t. kői (BTLw; Hődősnem s.v. kői) (op. cit., pp 41—42)."} and Ligeti\footnote{See Ligeti, loc. cit. and MNy 72 (1976), pp. 22—23, where he discusses the Hungarian word sajf cheeses hitherto considered to be of Turkic origin. Ligeti pointed to the possibility that this word was directly borrowed from Alanian in the form *çigi, *çiys and this implies that the ľ > Ğ change occurred in Hungarian, not in the Turkish, but also in other early loan-words, e.g. Hungarian vásár market — Persian vāsār already quoted in this connection by Bárczi (*Hangtörténet*, p. 117).} expressed their opinion, according to which Ancient Hungarian borrowed in all cases ɿ and the Hungarian ľ is a secondary, dialectal, Hungarian development. T. Halasi-Kun\footnote{T. Halasi-Kun, *Kipchak philology and the Turkic loanwords in Hungarian I*, AEMAn I (1975), pp. 165—210.} forwarded a new hypothesis, he supposes that ľ existed already in the original Turkic language and this Turkic ľ reflects a ľ > Ğ development peculiar to some Kipchak and Siberian languages. Since all three hypotheses have an important bearing both on the history of the Turkic and Finno-Ugrian languages and their respective contacts, it seems to be appropriate to review the problem of the history of the affricates in the Turkic and Finno-Ugrian languages.
The main lines and the history of the FU affricates are well known since the works of Setätä, Wichmann, Paasonen, Toivonen and others. In the FU protosystem, an opposition of two voiceless affricates existed. The one was a kind of apical, post-alveolar consonant rendered for convenience by $f$ the other a palatalized alveolar one rendered usually by $d$. Three phonetical features distinguished the two sounds: the place of their formation, the position of the tip of the tongue and the presence or absence of the palatal component. In general the FU languages have preserved the opposition by either retaining the affricate quality or by the opposition of the sibilants developed from them by spirantization.

Leaving aside some secondary developments, the picture is the following:

**Finnish**

$\begin{align*}
&*\xi > *\delta > (\*\chi \, \breve{\imath}) > h \\
&*\delta > *\breve{\imath} > s
\end{align*}$

**Cheremis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ufa</th>
<th>Mount. Medow Malmýž NW Yoshk. Ola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* H. Paasonen, Die finnisch-ugrischen anlautenden Lauten, MSFou 41, 1918. [= 1903].

I have normalized and unified the transcriptions. $\breve{c}$ renders $\breve{t}$, $\breve{d}$, $\breve{\imath}$, etc., while $\breve{c}$ is $\breve{t}$, $\breve{d}$, etc. I have treated only word initial position.

---

* See L. P. Gruzov, Fonetika dialeklov marijskogo jazyka v istorichekom osveščenii, Yoškar Ola 1966, pp. 174—190. Gruzov clearly outlined the phonetical process as: $\breve{\imath} > \breve{d} > c$ and $\breve{\imath} > c$. His view that the $c$ of the NW and YO dialects is much older than $c$ of Mountain Cheremis may be true, the datation to the loth—11th centuries (p. 189) seems to me too early, see also Wichmann, FUF 1906, p. 30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mordvin &amp; Votyak</th>
<th>Erza</th>
<th>Moksha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ж</em> (ж)</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ч</em> (ч)</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most dialects</th>
<th>Ufa, Kazan</th>
<th>Besermyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ж</em> (ж)</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ч</em> (ч)</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zyryan &amp; Vogu</th>
<th>Komí-Zyryan</th>
<th>Permyak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ж</em> (ж)</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ч</em> (ч)</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ж</em></td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж, (с)</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ч</em></td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 The phonetical description of Cheremis ж (cf. Sovremennyy meryjskij jazyk, Fonetika, Yoshkar Ola 1960, pp. 88—91) shows that the occlusive element is very weak, i.e. we have ж or even ж. The authors write on the experimental investigation of ж: сопевидно ж привлекает право того, что иногда на палатограмме смывка его не полулalia её. The other hand, they remark that ж has no palatal component and even in front-vocalic words, where all consonants are more palatalized, ж smjagienie noeit neznafiitol'nyj haracter (p. 90).


Ostiak

East  South  North  Obdorsk

\*\(\check{c}\)  \(\check{c}\)  \(\check{c} \sim \check{\varepsilon}\)  \(\varepsilon\)  \(\varepsilon\)

\*\(\varepsilon\)  \(\varepsilon\)  \(\varepsilon\)  \(\varepsilon\)

Hungarian

\*\(\check{c}\)  \(\check{c}\)

\*\(\varepsilon\)  \(\check{c} \sim \varepsilon\)

It is clear from this sketchy overview that, irrespective of the fate of PFU \(\check{c}\) and \(\varepsilon\) in the FU languages, the most important distinctive feature was and is the absence or presence of the palatal component. This opposition has been preserved in all FU languages with two exceptions: Hungarian lost the palatal element, while on the contrary, in some Cheremis dialects the palatalized pair of the doublet gained the upper hand.

Before offering a solution to the «deviant» Hungarian and Cheremis developments, some comments are needed on the Hungarian stock. In the new etymological dictionary of the FU stock of Hungarian basic words, 28 words are cited with initial \(\check{c}\) (i.e. ca). Their FU etymology is labelled as sure (S), «possible» (P₁), «perhaps» (P₂) and «problematical» (P₃). Out of the 28 words only five are treated as S, but one of them²² has to be moved to the sincere thanks to L. Honti for his help in giving a clear-out overview of the rather complicated dialectal representations. As in other cases, only word-initial position is dealt with.

²² See Bárózi, Hungtörténet³, pp. 116–117, Bárózi, in Bárózi—Benkő—Berrár, A magyar nyelv története, Budapest 1967, p. 112. Bárózi on loc. laud. gives the following picture:

PFU  PHung

\(\check{c}\)  \(\check{c} \sim \varepsilon\)  \(\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon\)

²³ L. Benkő in his Magyar nyelv története, Budapest 1967, p. 88 writes clearly on the Hungarian depalatalization \(\check{c} > \varepsilon > \varepsilon\) and adds: «to the fact that in the [Late Ancient] Hungarian, dialects with \(\varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon\) can be distinguished, indicates the behaviour of the Iranian and especially the Turkic loan-words in Hungarian. In these loan-words both foreign \(\check{c}\) and \(\varepsilon\) correspond to Hungarian \(\varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon\) according to the dialect in which they were adopted, i.e. \(\check{c} \rightarrow \varepsilon\), \(\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon\). He also cites such doublets as Hungarian kiesz ~ kisz emalls ~ Tu kiei, kizi.

²⁴ A magyar szókezetek finnugor elemei I, Budapest 1967.

²⁵ If the etymology is considered as sure no qualification is given. P₁ is egyeztethetős it can be compared with, P₂ is ekképes egyezzethetős perhaps to be compared with, P₃ is vitatottas controversials.

²⁶ Hung. odatoi sto klos is not labelled as P₁, though it has only two dialectal correspondences in Vogul and none in the other FU languages. The word is, as stated, clearly onomatopoelo, all other similar cases are given as P₁.
group P₁, so four remain. Twelve of the 28 are onomatopoeic, descriptive or from children's language, three have *f and not c origin. An equal number, 10 P₂ and 3 P₃. Out of 20 words with initial s 11 are s, 7 of them go back to *(, 2 to *c² and 2 to *c³. From the P categories 5 point to *f, 2 to *c² and one either to *c or to *c. To this we have to add that in intervocalic position
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*d > ç is a rare exception (only 3 sure examples),28 while in the main we find ง, ง and their further developments.29

A considerable group of Hungarian words does exist, which go back to Proto Ugric *d (> Hung s), but they have, mostly in the Permian languages, a *ç counterpart, so here we have to suppose an early *ç > ç development. This seems to be a partial (dialectal, areal) feature.30 In PHung *ç became either ç or ç. Later on in late PHung and early OHung ç became ç with rare dialectal variants, but ç was retained in onomatopoeic words31 and this group was then extended by internal Hungarian developments. These changes, however, did not effect the main trend: Hungarian lost the palatal component of *ç (and ç < *ç, ง) and in this respect it is the only FU language in which this change occurred.

Proto Turkish had only one voiceless affricate: ç. In place of the initial y, çç developed very early in some languages and later in others,32 but this only in initial position. This secondary voiced affricate does not concern our problem, so for the time being we can put it aside. There are three types of changes in PT ç:

Type I: ç is preserved in all Southern (Ottoman, Turkmen, Azeri, and Gagauz), in all Eastern (Ozbek, New Uygur, Turkestan, Salar, and Yellow Uygur) and in some Kipchak (Kirgiz, Karaim, Kumük, and Balkar) languages, and in a few Siberian dialects.

Type II: ç became ç in Chuvash.

Type III: ç became ç in the remaining languages.

It is worth while giving a more detailed picture of these languages and dialects beginning from the outmost east:33

28 facsar «winden» < PFU pudz-ç-, öcs der jüngere bruder < PFU ečč, vicnč < Steinzur, Polizei oristatus < PFU wečče (-čče !), further fecske «Schwalbe» < PFU pöčke, but this was earlier Hung fale. If Hung, déit ghoensa and döserog, döringörkeich sehnen, herumtreiben pertain together, then in the latter perhaps also its < ç.

29 In the case of ñe we find Hungarian gy (~ ngy) < nžž.

30 Such are e.g. szalad elauem, szar «Schüsser, szug «Schüsser, szel schmieden, szti «Bohrenkäfer, szürke grawu.

31 I think that Fgr. ç is preserved mostly in onomatopoeics (cf. Steinitz, Fingr. Koms. p. 20—27) and therefore I doubt the existence of a separate ç- dialect.

32 I have no place here to go into details on PT y > çç. That this has to be an early change can be demonstrated by the Turkic loan-words in Old Mongolian (type yidr fresh, youngs > dal > Mong, dalayun) and by the Turkic loan-words of Hungarian, where to OT y- Hungarian dič corresponds, which later developed into d' (orthog, gy) and even to d (see recently L. Benkö, Az Árpádker magyar nyelv szavgemeldkei, Budapest 1980, pp. 78—78 with a detailed discussion of the question and earlier literature).

33 I treat below only word initial position. In many of the Siberian languages, the voiceless consonants are voiced in intervocalic position and after sonants.
Jakut

Literary, Soyon

Tofalar (Karagas)

Tuva

Lit., Sayai, Boltir, Koibal

Qacha, Salba, Hak.-Shor, Kondakovo

Hakas (some Qacha: ə)

Shor

Most dialects

Lower Kondoma

Kondoma ə ~ ə

Chulim

Lower Chulim

Middle Chulim ə

Oirot (Altai)

Tuba Kii ə ~ ə

Kumandu Kii ə ~ ə

Literary ə

---


46 M. I. Rassadin, Fonetika tofalarekogo jazyka, Ulan Ude 1971, pp. 46–47.

47 O. Pritsak, Das Abakomtürkische (Chakasische), in: Fundamenta, p. 608. According to Joki in Kyzyl is halbpalataliierter, apikokoronaler Laut. Rassadin writes in Mongolo-burjatskxe zaimetvovanie v aibirakih tjurlcakih jazykoh, Moscow 1980, p. 91, that the Qacha dialect has ə. This is surely under the influence of Sagai. In Donner's material (cf. Joki, Kas Donneres kleinere Wörterverzeichnisse, JSFOu 52, 1955–1956, pp. 18–26: Kastenhatarisch from Abalakowa, 1914) we find ə.

48 N. F. Dyrenkova, Grammatika sorskogo jazyka, Moscow 1944, pp. 17–18, O. Pritsak, Das Schörisch, in Fundamenta, p. 638. It is interesting to remark that in some dialects around the Kondoma river back ə changes to front ə after ə (Dyrenkova, p. 18).

49 O. Pritsak, Das Oulymtürkische, in Fundamenta, p. 623.

50 N. A. Baskakov, Dialekt tibetskych tator (Tuba-kii), Moscow, 1966, pp. 22–23. According to Baskakov ə and ə are in free variation both in Tuba-kii and in Kumandu-kii.

51 N. A. Baskakov, Dialekt Kumandincev (Kumandu-kii), Moscow 1972, p. 28: In some dialects ə (and əə).

52 O. Pritsak, Das Altaitürkische, Fundamenta, p. 570: North ə, South ə. The three northern groups are: Tuba, Kumandu and Qalqan ~ Salqan (i.e. the Lebed or Qa Tatars).
The theory that the Kazak (former Kirghiz) language has no dialects prevailed among linguists for a long time. This was accepted on the authority of Radloff, and was formerly also adopted by Melloranski, who changed his opinion later after reviewing the grammar of Katarinskij (ZVOIRA XI, 1897—1898, p. 381). Ignorance of Kazak dialects later hampered the studies on the dialects, and a systematic research began into the dialects only about 1937, the first results were only published after 1947. I have treated the areal features of Kazak, Karakalpak and Nogai in: Notes on the Kazak yurt of West Mongolia: AOH XII (1961), pp. 90—92. The literature on the с-dialects see there and further A. Amaniolov, Voprosy dialektologii i istorii Kazahskogo jazyka I, Alma Ata 1959, on с and the southern dialect pp. 238—239. The bibliography on Kazak dialectology see Kazak dialektologijasi, Almatt 1966, pp. 287—302 and earlier in the volumes Voprosy istorii i dialektologii Kazahskogo jazyka I—IV. On the dialect of the Kazaks living in W. Mongolia see B. Bazilhan, Mongoliyada turat-qi qazagqaridin tilindii keybir berylikti erkekilikin: Kazak dialektologijasi, pp. 34—60, on с pp. 35—38. On с in Nogai, see N. A. Baskakov, Nogajskij jazyk, in Jazyki narodov SSSR II, Moscow 1960 p. 282.

On с in the southwestern dialects of Karakalpak, see N. A. Baskakov, Karakalpakskij jazyk II, Moscow 1955, p. 75. According to S. Wurm (The Karakalpak language, Anthropos 44, 1951, p. 497) т is present in the Kungrad subdialect and less frequently in the subdialect of Shakh Abas Ball. Mangas, Qaraqalpaq Grammar, 1947, noted only Tuk- men words as с, while the original Karakalpak word is сиёл (spower). The Bashkir dialectological material is summarized in: N. H. Makajutova, Vostochnyj dialekt bashkirskogo jazyka, Moscow 1976, and S. F. Mirjanova, jugnyj dialekt bashkirskogo jazyka, Moscow 1979. The PT с > Bashk. σ is regularly represented in the dialects. Sporadically both р (voiceless, interdental spirant) interchange with с, original PT с became ж in Bashkir, in a few cases secondary с (< PT с) take part in this. Bogo-roličkij (Vestenec v takarevo jazykovisanie, Kazan' 1934, p. 51) supposed that Bashkir с (< PT с) emerged through с, and thus joins the Siberian dialects of Tatar.
If we project these data on the map, what we get is more a kind of a bundle of isoglosses. In the outmost NE the PT $\delta$ reached the stage $\epsilon$. In the middle of Siberia we find $\epsilon > \sigma > \delta$ where, with exception of Tofalar, $\delta$ is very palatalized. The $\delta$ is dominant in the northern Kazak, Karakalpak and Nogai dialects, however, in the South $\delta$ has been preserved. In West Siberia and...

---

40 H. Passonen (Zur tatarischen Dialektkunde, KSz III, 1902, p. 47) writes: "Der $\delta$-Laut des Kasan-tatarischen ist in allen Stellungen ein mouillirtes $\delta$ übergangs in the dialect of the Tatars in and around Tatarskie Jurtkuli, Sposok. The spirantization also occurred in place of Kazan Tatar $\delta$, which became $\epsilon$. On $\delta > \epsilon > \sigma$ as a dialectal feature see N. B. Buzganova, L. T. Mahmutova, К въпросы об истории образования и изучения татарских диалектов и говоров, Материалы по татарской диалектологии II, Казань 1968, p. 11, on the geographic distribution see Map No. 4 of the first and second volume of the Диалектологический Atlas Татарского Языка in Материалы по татарской диалектологии III, Казань 1974 p. 242 and suppl.

40 See L. T. Mahmutova, Основные характеристы мариских говоров по территории пензенской области, Материалы II, pp. 129-130 and map No 1. on p. 162. Unfortunately the Atlas does not distinguish among the variants where the occlusive element is weak or in disappearance, only $\delta$, $\epsilon$ and $\sigma$.

40 The southern dialect is spoken in the valleys of the Ill and Chu rivers, (see Amaniolov's map, op. cit., p. 351) and their speakers pertain to the Kazak Great Horde (Ulu Ės). The literary language is based on the language of the Middle Horde (Orta Ės). The problem of the chronology of $\sigma$ in place of $\delta$ is connected with the history of the mutual relationship among the Kazak groups. Since $\delta$ is preserved in the outmost south and very far from it in the NE, in W. Mongolia, the question arises whether this relates to an archaic, preserved Kazak phenomenon or $\delta$ is in both areas due to assimilation of local groups, or one territory has been settled by immigrants from the other. The Kazaks of West Mongolia pertain to the Kerei tribe. According to Potanin (Ocherki Severo-zapadnoj Mongolii II, SPbg 1881, pp. 2-3) the Kazaks living along the Black Irtish are divided into two groups. The Kara Kirei live in the eastern part of the Irtish-Zaysan valley, the Abak-Kirei in the western part. The Abak-Kirei are also called Aşınañlı Kirei. According to Levíln and Aristov, the Kirei tribes pertain to the Middle Kazak Horde. Here we find the following tribes: Kerei, Uvak or Vak Kerei, Kara Kerei, Abak Kerei, Sihan Kerei, Kaban Kerei, Burlaart Kerei, etc. (cf. Amaniolov, op. cit., p. 9). In the Greater Kazak Horde no Kerei tribe is enumerated. In the Smaller Horde (Kii Ės) of the West, perhaps the Kerei tribes and the Kereit tribes or their name could have something to do with Kerei, but this is uncertain and if so it has nothing to do with our problem. I would not become involved here in the problem of the origin of the name Kerei (cf. Németh, A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása, Budapest 1930, pp. 264-268) or with the possible connections among Kerei, Kirei, Girei, Kerez, etc. If these ethnic names have anything to do with each other, this leads us into a period earlier than the formation of
in the Eastern Misher dialects k is appearing. In the Misher dialects k is present in the contact areas with the FU languages. Both in Misher and in Kazan Tatar the occlusive element is weak or totally absent and whether we consider ts > t or ts > t' > 6 both series have a strong palatal component (i.e. tš, tš, 6).

That means that in the contact area of the Turkic and FU languages from the Penza region up to South Siberia, the PT 6, preserved or not, acquired a palatal element, while more to the south, where no considerable FU-T contacts can be supposed, the 6 was not palatalized or 6 remained 6.

That all Turkic types of 6 where perceived as palatalized *6 can be shown by the Tatar loan-words in the FU languages. The Tatar loan-words joined the history of PFU 6 and not 6.\(^{41}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tatar} & \quad \text{PVogul} \quad \text{PMordwin} \\
*6 & \rightarrow \quad 6^3 \\
*6 & \rightarrow \quad 6^{53} \\
*6 & \rightarrow \quad 6^{53}
\end{align*}
\]

the Kazak tribal union of the Three Hordes. From our point of view, it is sufficient to state that according to the data available, the Kazaks of W. Mongolia are not immigrants from the south, i.e. from the Greater Horde, but came from the Middle Horde, the language of which served as a basis for the formation of the Kazak literary language. It is of interest that these Kazaks, living together with the Oirat population of W. Mongolia, borrowed some words from these dialects (on them see G. Kara, Notes sur les dialects oirat de la Mongolie occidentale, AOH VIII, 1966, pp. 118—168 with further literature). In this group original Mongolian t (< si-) is substituted by Kazak 6: Literary Mongolian sugumda-: Tatar sugumda, Kalm. sugumda: — MKazk sugumda, LM silya-: Tatar examine > Kh. šeqar, Kalm. šilya: — MKazk šilya, LM silyuššu-: to discuss, criticses > Kh. šeqarša — MKazk ėkikšuša, LM šikša-: šidke-: to punish > Kh šiygeš, Kalm šide- (< ĕqide-): MKazk šiče-: etc. (The MKazk. words cited after Bazilhanov, op. cit.). This substitution did not occur with non-initial Mongolian s which remained as such. The late Mongolian loan-words of MKazk. have a clear W. Mongolian (Oirat) character. It is impossible to suppose that the Kazaks of W. Mongolia once had an 6, which they later abandoned in W. Mongolia and restored their original 6. The Oirat dialects have 6 (< Mong 3-) and otherwise the MKazk. dialects show clear Kazak phonetic and grammatical traits.

\(^{41}\) Special, secondary and sporadic features are not taken into account here. The material and the evaluation of the Turkic loanwords in the Uralic languages will be the subject of my forthcoming book Uralic and Turkic. See further a brief sketch: Turkic and Mongolian influence on the Uralic languages in: Handbook of Uralic Studies, ed. D. Siner, in press.

\(^{42}\) A. Kannisto, Die tatarischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen, FUF 17 (1925), pp. 1—264. Räsänen's review in FUFAnz. 19 (1928), pp. 82—84.

\(^{43}\) H. Paasonen, Über die türkischen Lehnwörter im Ostjäkischen, FUF 2 (1902), pp. 81—137 and the works of Steinitz.

Since the Tatar loan-words cannot be earlier than the 14th century, it can be concluded that the palatalization of the PT ğ continued at least from the 14th century on in the Volga region.

In the early Chuvash-type loan-words of Proto Permian PT ğ has a double representation: *ğ and *ṭ. This shows that the early Chuvash immigrants in the Volga—Kama region from the 9th century on had also adjusted their system to the FU palatal ğ. This ğ became later ğ, but Chuvash developed (most probably in the 14th century) a secondary ğ from the sound combination PT *ṭṭ.

The great influx of Chuvash loan-words into Cheremis caused basic changes in its phonemic system. This was later superseded by the Kazan Tatar influence. Since both had only a palatal ğ it is now clear that why did some Cheremis dialects lost their opposition ğ: ğ in favour of ğ. In the Volga

---

**Notes:**

3. I speak here of the Misher, Kazan and Siberian Tatar influence. These linguistic groups were formed during the 13th—14th century against the background of the immense changes, migrations and interactions of the Turkic groups within the Chingisid Empire. This does not mean that earlier Kipchak groups may not have existed in these areas, but their trace could not have been identified hitherto. The Tatar characteristics can be clearly distinguished.
5. The earlier view that the Chuvash-type language speaking population arrived in the Volga—Kama area in the 7th or 8th century can no longer be maintained. The rich archeological material from the excavations found here since the 1960s shows that the Volga Bulgars arrived at the Bol'sie Tarhany—Cheremshan line at the end of the 9th century and reached the Kama only at the end of the 10th century.
6. The ğ > ğ development was just at its beginning at the time of the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions: see *A Volga Bulgarian inscription from 1307*: AOH 39 (1976), pp. 153—158. Hakimzjanov’s idea that two dialects existed in Volga Bulgarian, one with ğ > ğ and the other in which ğ remained preserved (cf. F. S. Hakimzjanov, *Jazyk épicheskikh budjar*, Moscow 1978) cannot be accepted in this form. The ğ > ğ development occurred in some words, in some places earlier and in others later, a typical phenomenon of a period of transition.
region a complicated process can be observed: the immigrant Turkic groups changed the type of their affricate under the influence of the FU substrate and neighbouring languages, but later on they became the languages of higher social prestige and reinfluenced the FU neighbours.

The spirantization of the affricate occurred in Chuvash very early. But later on, the same happened with Bashkir and as a last member most of the Tatar dialects joined this process. This spirantization process influenced the Votyak dialects, where e.g. in Besermyan a systematic shift can be observed:

\[ *\xi > \delta \quad *\xi > \varepsilon \quad *\xi > \zeta \]

Serebrennikov is correct when he ascribes this to Tatar and not, as Tepljaschina, to Bulgar influence.

From this it can be concluded that the spirantization of the PT *\xi occurred in the Volga region in different languages at different times, but we are in a position to give some chronological intervals of its beginnings. Do we have any means for giving a chronology for the spirantization of the PT \( \xi \) in the NE Kipchak and the Siberian languages? The answer is offered by the Middle Mongolian loan-words in these languages.

The Mongolian loan-words of the Siberian Turkic languages can be roughly divided into two chronological groups. In the 12th—14th centuries, the Middle Mongolian of the Chingisid Empire had a major impact on these languages. After the disintegration of the Empire and the forming of the Kalmuck, Khalkha and Buriat languages, these and their dialects got or remained in contact with the Turkic people in Siberia. A good report on these linguistic contacts can now be read in Rassadin's latest book. The history of MMO \( \xi \) depended on the fact whether it was followed or not by an original -i:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMO</th>
<th>Kalmuck</th>
<th>Khalkha</th>
<th>Buriat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \xi )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

63 Е.В. Рассадин, Монголо-бурятские саиметований в сибирских тюркских языках, Москва 1990.
The representation of Mongolian £ in the loan-words of Siberian Turkic is the following:\(^{24}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yakut} & \quad s \leftarrow \text{MMo} \ (\varepsilon) \\
& \quad s \leftarrow \text{Burj.} \ s \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\varepsilon) \\
& \quad s \leftarrow \text{Burj.} \ s \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\varepsilon) \\
& \quad \varepsilon \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\varepsilon) \\
\text{Tofalar} & \quad \delta \leftarrow \text{MMo.} \ (\delta) \\
& \quad \delta \leftarrow \text{Burj.} \ \delta \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\delta) \\
& \quad s \leftarrow \text{Burj.} \ s \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\varepsilon) \\
\text{Tuva} & \quad \delta \leftarrow \text{MMo.} \ (\delta) \\
& \quad s \leftarrow \text{Khalkha.} \ s \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\delta) \\
& \quad \varepsilon \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ (\varepsilon), \text{Khalkha} \ \varepsilon \leftarrow \text{MMo.} \ (\varepsilon) \\
\text{Chulim} & \quad \varepsilon \\
\text{Shor} & \quad \delta \\
\text{Hakass} & \quad s \leftarrow \text{Lit.} \ s \\
& \quad \text{Sagai, Beltir.} \ \text{Lit.} \ s \\
& \quad \text{Shor, Kyzyl.} \ s \\
\text{Altai} & \quad \varepsilon \\
\text{W. Sib. Tat.} & \quad \varepsilon \\
\end{align*}
\]

As can be seen from the above, the earliest Mongolian loan-words took part in the spirantization of the Siberian Turkish £. Later on in some of

\(^{24}\) The results of my investigations concerning the representations of £ and $ are by and large the same as those of Rassadin. He had access to a larger material than I and could verify some questions on the spot. He also had access to some local publications not available to me. It is to be regretted that his basic material was not published, only the results with a few examples. The lack of a general overview does not help the use of the otherwise excellent book. However, he does discuss the problem of the representations of Mongolian £ in detail on pp. 78—84. The correspondence Yakut $ \leftarrow \text{Mong.} \ £$ was supposed to be a Burjat phenomenon by Kaluyfiski (\textit{Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache}, Warszawa 1961, p. 45), i.e. Mong. £ $> \text{Burj.} \ s \leftarrow \text{Yakut.} \ s$. Rassadin is right when he differentiates an early Mong £ $\rightarrow$ Yakut £ $> \delta > s$ and a Burj. £ $> s \rightarrow$ Yakut £. I only doubt that the preserved Mongolian £ in type: Mong. \ ı̇ (flint) $\rightarrow$ Yak. ı̇ (flint) $\sim$ ı̇ (flint) would be very early.

\(^{25}\) See Kaluyfiski, \textit{op. cit.}, Rassadin, \textit{op. cit.}

\(^{26}\) See Rassadin, \textit{op. cit.} and \textit{Fonetika}, p. 109.


\(^{28}\) On the remaining Siberian languages, I can refer only to the material published by Rassadin \textit{op. cit.}, with some works cited there. My investigations, based on the available and published material also took into consideration the Uralic languages into which some of the Mongolian words found their way via the Turkic languages of Siberia.
them a secondary ę developed (from PT \( y^- > d\mathring{\varepsilon}^- > \varepsilon^- \)) and therefore in the newest layer we also find ę representation of Mongolian ę. In Yakut the original PT ę, ı (\(< y^- \)) and ę converged in ą, thus in the cases where other criteria are absent it is difficult to tell whether we have to consider an early MMo loan, where ę took part in the ę > ę > s development, or it was the Burut ą or ę which joined this change. However, Burut effects the picture only in the case of Yakut and Tofalar. In all other cases it is clear that the spirantization of the PT ę in the Siberian Turkic languages occurred after the 13th—14th century.

Is the Kazak, Karakalpak and Nogai ę an earlier development? In some Middle Kipchak documents of the 14th century the PT ę sound is found rendered by Arabo ăng. Since this letter can render a foreign ę, not existing in Classical Arabic, it is necessary to look for independent sources to decide the question.

In Arabo-Turkic literature there exist theoretically the following possibilities to render a Turkish ę: with jim, with jim and superscribed ăng, with jim written with three dots above, with jim written with three dots below (the Persian ę), and ăng. If the dots are absent then, of course, ăng can be read as ăng. Practically, however, only jim and ăng occur, the latter mostly on Syrian territory. The question deserves a detailed study, in which the evaluation of the tomb inscriptions would be of considerable assistance. (On the problem see O. Pritsak, *Das Kiptschakische, Fundamenta I*, pp. 76, 77, Telegdi, *Eine türkische Grammatik in arabischer Sprache aus dem XV. Jhd.*: KCA Suppl. (1935—1939), p. 286, Halasi-Kun, Op. cit., pp. 167—168).

Some methodological problems concerning the Arabic transcription of Turkic ę seem to be hitherto neglected. I would propose dividing the sources into three major groups: 1. Turkic texts written in Arabic script, 2. Arabic texts describing or dealing with the Turkic languages and 3. Arabic texts in which occasionally Turkic words or onomastic material occur. In the case of the Turkic texts in Arabic script, several factors have to be taken into account. In some cases Turkic ę is rendered by the three-dotted Persian ăng and in such texts the three dots or two of them can be omitted, the reading is in all cases ę. On the other hand, in such languages where the Turkish ę became a spirant (ı or ş) the canonized literary orthography preserved either the jim or the şang independently of the fact that it was read as ı or ş. This was the case with common words or proper names, the origin of which was clear and the orthography of which had a tradition, while in those local words and onoma where this was not the case, the secondary ı or ş was written with şang or şang. Good examples can be found in the Bashkir genealogical legends (see *Bashkirskie Šifere*, ed. R. G. Kuzeev, Ufa 1960) where words and names, which were surely read with ą (< PT ę) at the time of the writing of the texts, were written with jim or şang, and even one and the same in two different ways in the same text (e.g. Qıđag, Qıpsag). In these cases, the orthography with jim or şang does not necessarily prove that in the given language at the given time PT ę remained ę. In the voluminous Arabic grammatical literature on Turkic, the first of which is Kâyârî’s *Dīvān* the unvoiced affricate ę is quite accurately described in the descriptive part. E.g. Kâyârî states that a voiceless thards jim (i.e. ę) does exist in Turkic while the (Arabic) jim is rare in Xaqanvî-yak (see J. M. Kelly, *Remarks on Kâyârî’s Phonology*: UAJb 44, 1972, pp. 186—187). But in fact Kâyârî denotes all Turkish ę sounds with jim in the corpus of the work. The
author of the At-Tuhfah writes that in Turkic a ǧim mixed with ǧim does exist (i.e. a ǧ: algim al-mašhôba bi-ǧ-ǧim). In the corpus in a few cases the three dotted ǧim or jin with four dots below are used, in most cases, however, this is not the case (see T. Halasi-Kun, La langue des kiptchaks d'après un manuscript arabe d'Istanbul, II, Budapest 1942, Š. I. Fazylov, M. T. Zijeva, Izyekannij dar tjurškomu jazyku, Tashtkent 1978 where further bibliography). In an Arabic source written on Turkic, as the at-Tuhfah, we find three types of rendering ǧ: 1. ǧ ~ ǧ (type ǧog ~ ǧog, both forms occur), 2. ǧ (type ğeber only ǧ-form occurs, but this is MMe ğeber i) and 3. ǧ (type ğeber- only ğ-form, but this is from ǧog in the first type i). I would insist on accepting Halasi-Kun’s earlier opinion that this refers to transcription difficulties (a «mixed one») rather than to the presence of a ğ > g change. In current Arabic texts their authors were, in most cases, not aware of the fact that they fixed a sound not present in Arabic. They used that letter for the foreign ğ which they felt to be pronounced nearest to the original heard from the speakers of the language, or their interpreters. Recently an interesting discussion has arisen following the discovery of the Al-Muqtabas of Ibn Ḥayyān. P. Chalmelte drew attention to a passage in Vol. V, which refers to the raid of a Hungarian army in Spain, in A.D. 942 (see Rivista degli Studi Orientali 50, 1976, 337-351). This fifth volume of the Al-Muqtabas was edited in Madrid, 1970. The relevant passage has been discussed by K. Czeglédy (Magyar Nyelv 75, 1979, pp. 273—282, ibid 77, 1981, pp. 413—419), Gy. Györgyffy (Magyar Nyelv 76, 1980, pp. 308—317, ibid 77, 1981, pp. 512—513) and I. Elter (Magyar Nyelv 77, 1981, pp. 413—419). In the focus of the discussion is the list of seven Hungarian amirs, chiefs, enumerated in the text. In his first paper K. Czeglédy proposed to identify the word ǧala as the transcription of a Hungarian Ćana or Ǧana pointing out that ǧin could render both Hungarian ğ or j (there existed a well known personal name Ǧanad in Old Hungarian, this would have been its short form without the suffix -d). Since the name has the standard form with ğ in Old Hungarian, this would have been a case for Arabic ģin rendering a ğ (the other possibility being a Hungarian dialectal variant with ğ-). In the later discussion (see Chalmelte 1979, Elter 1981 and Czeglédy 1981) it has been cleared that this is a misinterpretation, the actual word is Arabic Ǧañan and does not reflect a Hungarian name. With this fell the emendation of Györgyffy (1980) who read instead of ǧala a ġala and identified the name with Old Hungarian Ćaba (also a well known name from Old Hungarian). There is only one item in the list in the interpretation on which all Hungarian authors cited above agree. This item is written ġala and read by Czeglédy as Ǧyla, interpreted as Dyila which he identified with the Old Hungarian title and personal name ǧula ~ jula. He supposes that the letter combination ǧy renders either an Old Hungarian palatalized ď or an affricate ǧ. The existence of a palatalized ď can be most probably excluded here. In a recent monographic study L. Benkő (Az Árpád-kori magyar nyelv szöveg emlékek [The linguistic textual monuments of the Árpád [dynasty’s] age], Budapest 1980, pp. 76—78) gave good reasons that in Early Old Hungarian only ġ (dstraint) was present and the palatalized ď’ (later orthographically ǧy-) is a later development. The word in question occurs in Ibn Rusta as dż- and in DAI of Constantine Porphyrogenitos as ydlar. But even if we would suppose that in 10th century Hungarian a palatalized ď did occur it would be a surprisingly accurate transcription if ǧy- would reflect it. With equal right we could then suppose a ġ ~ j and read Ǧyabala(h) reflecting Ćaba (cf. the Ćaba above) or Ćebela (reflecting Čepeli another well known Hungarian name from this period) or any other combination. However, I doubt, that such transcriptions in a current Arabic text might exist. Moreover, since the stress was on the first syllable in the Hungarian, one would expect that the first ǧḥ — if it is ǧḥ — denotes a vowel. A way out would be that the Hungarian ǧ in ǧula was a retroflex affricate (adjusted
The Turkic and the Mongolian yurts have the same basic structure, but differ in slight details. The terminology of the Turkic and the Mongolian yurt is basically different. In the contact area of the Turkic and Mongolian nomadic tribes, the borrowing of a few terms in both directions occurs. The most characteristic part of the yurt is the roofring. Its Old Turkic name is tügünük. The word can be found in Kāšgāri’s Divan (tünlük), Fazylov cites it from the Nahoul Faradis and the Husraw and Sirin (tüŋük), it is well known to Chagatai literature (tünlük, tünlük, tümliik), from the recent languages I quote only Türkmen, Uzbek, New Uigur Taranchi, Baraba, Lebed, Teleut, Altai, Oirat Tuva, Karagas, Yakut, Siberian Tatar, Kazan Tatar, Bashkir and what is the most interesting: Chuvash. In Modern Chuvash it is also the name of the chimney, but earlier ‘the hole on the roof of the kitchen where the smoke was ventilated’, also ‘small window’. In Yakut it is the name of the roofring, otherwise it remained everywhere, where yurts exist, the name of the roofring. The exception is Kazak where it means ‘felt, covering the smoke-opening of the felt hut’ (tündik, tűnik), the same seems to be the case in Nogai (tunlık «savesa kibitki»). A very common shift of term occurred; the name of the object was passed to the name of its cover. This happened because the Kazaks, Nogais and Karakalpaks borrowed a special type of roof-ring from the Mongols and called it: šayraq, šayrak, the Karakalpaks šayıraq, šayraq, the Nogai šayıraq, šıraq. The word can also be found in Bashkir as šayıraq, šayıraq, in Siberian Tatar as šayıraq (here «wood-sticks laid across fire-wood to protect it») further as šıgarag in Kirgiz. As pointed out above, the š of the literary Kazak, Karakalpak and Nogai represents the northern dialects, and in the southern dialects the earlier š is preserved to the č which as we have seen lost its palatal component) and in word initial position it was nearer to an Arabic š than to a š. In this case šıyıla has to be read and interpreted as šıyla. All these are, however, speculations with a very low probability. The final solution will be given only if all the seven names will be deciphered and they offer some system. Until then hardly anything can be said about a possible new Arabic rendering of a Turkic or other foreign č.

73 Clauson, op. cit., p. 320 with further OT and Middle Turkic data.
75 See the data in my Notes on the Kazak yurt, p. 94, to which now some more can be added. On Chuvash šıňe see V. G. Egorov, Etichologičeskij slovar’ čuvashkoj jazyka, Čeboksary 1964, p. 246, further Doerfer, TMEN II pp. 643—645.
76 N. I. Alšarin, Slovar’ čuvashkogo jazyka XV, Čeboksary 1941, pp. 52—63.
77 Some special meanings are noted by Clauson, loc. cit., as e.g. «stormer window», «windows, upper storey of the house», «lattice windows».
as it is in the Kazak dialect spoken in Mongolia. This is also the case with our word, which I noted as *çasaraq* among the Kazaks of Mongolia. The word, as demonstrated, is of Mongolian origin. The original Mongolian word for "roof-rings" is *toyono*. The original meaning of Mongolian *çasar* is "rings", but it denotes the rim or hoop of the roof-ring among the Dörböts and Sartuls. In the dialects of West Mongolia and in Kalmuck it became the term of the roof-ring. This special West Mongolian word was borrowed by the quoted Turkic languages, so there can be no doubt that the *s* in the word is secondary and later than the 14th century.

The case is not isolated. All Middle Mongolian loan-words in these languages underwent the same change:

Kaz: *sabdar* «yellow with white tail and mane (horse)», Shor *samdir*, *samdar* *sabdar*, Tel *sabdar*, Alt *saptar*, Bar., Kürük *saptar*, Kirg. *tabdar* — MMong *tabdar*.


Kaz: *Şeber* shobble (for horses), Shor *ćider*, Kirg. *ćider* etc. — MMong *ćider* shobbles.


Some of these words are present in early Kipchak documents. For example, *şirai* and *şeber*, as already noted by Poppe, can be found in the Codex Cumanicus. The great Middle Mongolian impact on the Kipchak lan-

---

18 Notes on the Kazak yurt, pp. 90, 94.
19 Notes on the Kazak yurt, p. 95. It is irrelevant for our study whether Mongolian *çasar* does or does not have anything in common with the group of Indo-European words to which pertain Sanskrit *sakra* Avesta *sār*, wheels, on which see M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Alttürkischen I*, 1966, p. 366.
20 Originally the frame of the roof-rings, hence smoke-hole in the top of a yurt (Lessing, Mongolian-English dictionary, p. 817). The smoke-holes are *erüge* in the Secret History par. 24. See also *érüke*, *örke* etc. A further term for the roof-ring is *gurayabii*, *yarayabii*. A similar terminological shift occurred with *érüke* most which denotes in dialects the cover of the roof-ring (see Preliminary report, p. 62).
languages has yet to be investigated, but I hope that from the above it is clear that the $\delta > \d$ change in the Kazak, Karakalpak and Nogai languages is roughly of the same age as the spirantization of the $\delta$ in the South Siberian Turkic languages.

If so then we have to exclude them from the circle from where the Hungarian words with $\d$ in place of Turkic $\delta$ have been borrowed.

At the same time another conclusion can be offered. The loss of the palatal element in the Hungarian reflexes of the FU $\delta$, unique in the history of the Finno-Ugrian languages, can be ascribed only to such a linguistic environment, where the $\delta$ had no palatal component. As stated above, there are data on the fact that at least in the 9th—10th century in the language of the Chuvash-type Turkic speaking groups immigrating to the Volga—Kama area the palatalized $\delta$ was already present. The Hungarian language had to lose this palatal component under the influence of such Turkic groups which had not yet contacted the Finno-Ugrian languages. This could have happened only in the southern area.
To the memory of Professor B. Collinder

DE HYPOTHESI URALO-ALTAICA

"I like people with whom I disagree, they are not dull" (B. Collinder)

In a paper entitled "Pro hypothesi Uralo-Altaica" (1977) Björn Collinder has summarized his views on the relationship between Uralic and Altaic. The problem has been in the focus of his interest for a long time (see his earlier papers, 1948, 1952, FUV\(^1\) 1955, 1965, 1970 and FUV\(^2\) 1977) and therefore a discussion of his 1977 paper from an Altaist's point of view may provide a good opportunity to continue a discussion which has been going on for more than 250 years.

Collinder's conclusion is the following: "Angesichts des Tatbestandes gibt es m.E. nur zwei theoretische Wahlmöglichkeiten: Urverwandtschaft oder non \textit{liquet}" (1977: 73). I think there do exist more theoretical possibilities.

First I would like to make some general remarks. I do not wish to go into the discussion about what \textit{Urwir} \textit{wandtschaft} is (see Röna-Tas 1978), rather, I should only like to reflect on a few of the problems raised by Collinder 1977. We agree that only such linguistic facts can be considered as pertaining to a common proto-language the regular correspondence of which can be demonstrated and the loan character of which excluded. In this case we consider "regular" a correspondence if the forms reconstructed in conformity to the history of the respective languages are identical in their phonemic structure and semantics. It is also clear that in historical reconstruction we cannot avoid hypothetical, "asterisked" forms, the question is only how many hypothetical forms are acceptable. I think that one of the reasons why the "Ural-Altaic" and the "Altaic" problem is not yet settled is that those who are in favour of it admit more intermediate "asterisked
forms" while those who are against admit fewer or none at all. Another problem with the reconstructed forms is that scholars are inclined to be more rigorous with the reconstructions of their fellow scholars than with their own.

Collinder recognizes that the numerals are not common in U and A. This is, according to him, not a decisive argument against the relationship. Of course everybody will agree that this fact is not an argument in favour of it either. Collinder tries, however, to compare the Hungarian háróm 'three' with Mongolian yurban. First we have to mention that the word is not U but FU. The PFU form can be reconstructed as *kolma or *kulma (cf. MSzFE). To make this comparison plausible Collinder suggests that the H and Vogul -rm- in the word is the original cluster and all other FU languages changed it to -l(V)m-. Further it has to be supposed that -m is a suffix. We can accept as a fact that -ban is a suffix in yurban (it occurs in the numerals for 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10) but it is a hypothesis that Mongolian alone preserved the "Altaic" numeral for 'three', and since there exists a γ:q opposition in Mongolian we have to suppose that either the k- in PFU or the γ- in M is secondary. This means that in order to accept the comparison H háróm - M yurban as pertaining to the original UA stock, we have to accept five hypotheses.

It is easy to agree with Collinder's statement that a series of typological similarities exists between U and A (vowel harmony, inadmissible consonant clusters, agglutination etc.). Then he states: "Die strukturelle Ähnlichkeit hat zwar keinen Beweiswert, sie erleichtert aber die etymologische Vergleichung" (69). I fully agree with Collinder concerning the first part of his statement. For a long time these features have been the main arguments in favour of the Ural-Altaic hypothesis and it is of importance to stress that they are not themselves proof of it. I hesitate, however, to accept the second part of his statement. If something is hampering the etymological work it is just the structural similarity of these languages. Collinder cites e.g. the possessive suffixes: Lappish uatepm, Turkish doatum 'my friend'. It is evident that both suffixes are later developments. In most of the Mongolian languages the possessive personal suffixes do not exist, while in some of them they are just in statu nascondi and it is in Mongolian where the syntactic procedure of the birth of the personal possessive suffixes can be observed. If we were
not be helped by general considerations and historical facts, the FU and T Pxl -m would be a reasonable candidate for being a common UA suffix (as was in fact suggested in earlier literature). I call this type of correspondence structurally conditioned convergency (see Rūna-Tas 1974: 31).

I shall not discuss here the parallels of the U and A suffixes. The comparison of suffixes which consist of one consonant and have different functions which can be reduced to a common denominator using a series of hypotheses but nevertheless remain isolated and do not form a system is not particularly promising. We shall arrive at a more complex picture if we discuss the lexical material listed by Collinder. This list is a revised variant of former ones and it consists of 62 comparisons. Collinder writes: "Nur 8 sind aus sämtlichen Zweigen des Uralaltaischen belegt, 25 aus je zwei Zweigen, 29 aus je einem. 16 findet man nur im Tg., 9 nur in Tk., 4 nur in Mg. In den drei ersten Wörtern ['Vater', 'Mutter', 'saugen'] kann es sich um sog. elementare Verwandtschaft handeln. Die darauf folgenden drei Wörter ['Nadel', 'Schl', 'Schlitten'] sind Kulturwörter und deshalb für den Verwandtschaftsnachweis kaum vom belang" (71-72).

Accepting for the time being the validity of the comparisons, this means that we have only 8 UA comparisons, 25 are U and present in two of the A languages and the remaining 29 are either PFU or PS and are present only in one of the A languages. If it is true, as Collinder claims, that about half of his comparisons are either only FU or only S this itself should have raised the possibility of early contacts among FU and S on the one side and some A languages on the other.

One can only agree that such items which he labels as pertaining to "elementare Verwandtschaft" have to be excluded at the first stage of the argumentation. We agree also that "Kinderwörter" and onomato-poeia are meant here. In addition I think that deictics should also to be kept separate. The various pronouns are of deictic origin and reflect a very early layer of linguistic history. Collinder mentions if he considers the word to have also been present in Indo-European. Out of seven U-A-IE comparisons six are pronouns. It can not be a mere chance that out of Collinder's 8 UA comparisons 4 are pronouns. The phonetical history of deictics, just because of their emphatic character, does not always follow the general lines of linguistic
history. Therefore I suggest putting them aside. If the UA relationship is eventually proved then they can be considered, then nobody would deny that "Kinderwörter" and onomatopoeia can also be inherited; on the other hand, it is inadmissible to use them to prove a relationship.

If we put the four pronouns aside four words remain which Col- linder considers to be UA words. Curiously enough two are words dealing with reindeer breeding (see below) and two denote "basic concepts". Let us look at the second two first.

PU ala 'space below sg., below, under, what is beneath'

The PU reconstruction is not without problems. The PFU may well be *ala but PS is slos (see Janhunen 1977: 24 i instead of щ is a misprint). MSzFE and UrEt see no problem in reconstructing PU ala. Sammaliahti (1979: 53) states that out of 34-38 words with PFU a 19 have щ in PS and only three have щ. Janhunen (1981: 9-10) reconstructs PU sjla assuming in PFU an щ - a > a - a assimilation. If we accept this, more plausible, solution then only PFU can be compared with the words to be quoted below.

In T we have two series of words. To the first pertain: alt, alt'y, alt'n (?< alt-tin) 'below' and to the other alt'n, alya etc. 'before, ahead, face etc.'. Clauson writes s.v. al "if really an ancient word, [it] meant 'front, facing, prior position' but there is a great doubt whether it was. In the early period it occurs only with 3rd Person Poss. Suff. in the Dat., Abl. and Loc. and these words might equally be the same cases of alt'n q.v. The earliest authorities for the existence of al as such are Vel'jaminov-Zernov's Chagatai dictionary and San'glax a Chagatai-Persian dictionary but in Cag., too, the word is attested only in suffixed oblique cases; it is possible, that by this period a word al had been formed by a kind of false etymology fr. oblique cases of alt'n. There is a parallel problem in the question whether there was an ancient word alt or whether this, too, is a back formation fr. alt'n" (123). Räsänen (1969: 14) has no doubts that the two words are the same. Sevortjan (1974: 124-5, 140-1) treats the two words in two entries. He distinguishes *al 'front' and *al 'below, bottom'. This is far from certain. This is based on Türkmen alt'n 'forehead, before' but in Haji we find alt, alt 'below' and neither vowel is long in Yakut. The geographical distribution of the se-
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Mantical side is the following: \textit{alt(En)} is 'below etc.' in OT, MT, Ottoman, Azeri, Gagauz, Halaj, Yellow Uyghur, Hakaas, Tuwan and Tofalar. But it is 'before etc.' in Tatar, Bashkir, Kazak, Nogay, Kara-kalpak, Kumuck, Karachai-Balkar, Uzbek, New Uyghur and Altai (Oirot). This shows that the semantical difference is distributed in two mutually exclusive areas. There is only one T language where the word has both meanings. In Kirgiz \textit{ald}, \textit{ald} is both 'before' and 'below'. This is in perfect conformity with our knowledge that the speakers of the Kirgiz language moved in the not very distant past from the South Siberian area to their present homeland. While \textit{alln} is in the most T languages 'before' it means 'below' in Yakut. Considering these facts one is inclined to suppose that even if we disregard the doubts of Clausen and accept that -t and -n in \textit{alt} and \textit{alln} are suffixes, in PT there was only one \textit{al}. It is also improbable from a general linguistic point of view that two words denoting two different directions would have been differentiated only by the opposition \textit{si}. This PT *al could have a broader meaning 'the lower, the front side' which may have been connected with the body of animals, that is the lower part of the quadrupedal animals is equivalent to the front part of the human body.

The T word has been compared by Ramstedt (1957: 106) with Mong. \textit{aliusun} 'Unterholz', Manchu \textit{alisun}. Mong. \textit{aliusun} simply does not exist. There is a Mong. \textit{alireun} \textit{> aliusun} 'red bilberry' (to \textit{al} 'red') and the same or homophonous word with the meaning 'after-grass' (see e.g. Buriat \textit{aliyhan} 'brusinka; WburDial otava, trava vtorogo kosa'). This latter was borrowed by some Tungus dialects and Manchu. Poppe (1960: 75) connected the T word with M \textit{ala(n)} 'joint of the thighs, groin, crotch; pubic region, genitals' - Evenki \textit{ala} 'bedro, bercovaja kost' (perednyj nogi olenja); kostnyj mozg, golen' (olenja)' (cf. Cincius 1975: 29), \textit{aldan} id. Mongolian \textit{ala(n)} pertains to \textit{al} 'distance', \textit{aldayi} 'for the legs to be spread apart', \textit{alda} 'fathom (distance between the tips of the middle fingers of a man's outstretched arms)''. To the last word pertains the MT word \textit{alda} 'fathom, space in-between' and is a Mongolian loanword correctly treated as such by Cincius (1975: 30). Evenki \textit{alas} which is restricted to a few Evenki dialects is either a Mongolian loan (with the Mong. plural -s) or is another word pertaining to the North (see below).

Thus instead of a clear UA comparison we have only a FU-T one.
If Janhunen's suggestion for the PU reconstruction is accepted then the T word can be only a loanword from FU. It is surely not purely fortuitous that in FUV Collinder does not cite Mongolian and adds: "Uncertain correspondences in Tunguz".

PU ang 'opening, incision, cavity'

Here once more the PFU and the PS vocalism is in contradiction. PFU may well be ang or ana but PS is âη (Janhunen 1977: 20). Therefore Sannailahti (1979: 27) compared the PS word with PFU ənə 'chin' which is semantically improbable. MSzFE and UrEt accept PFU as PU, Janhunen (1981: 57) reconstructs PU ənə.

The word has long ago been compared with T ayıız 'mouth'. The final -z may be a suffix (not dual!), but ayıiz is nowhere attested. It is true that in one type of T words -γ can be a secondary development from an -nγ-, but this is not the case with the word for 'mouth'. It occurs everywhere with -γ or its developments. In Yakut we find wos (< ayıız) 'lips, the upper lips, mouth', e.g. in bayana uoka 'a cutting in a pillar with a form of a half circle' (bayana 'pillar' -m), while the par excellence word for 'mouth' is ayax (< ahaq). Further in Yakut we find ana 'open', anazai 'a hole', anaiz- 'to be wide open'. As Kajuszyński pointed out (1961: 130) these latter words are Mongolian loanwords. In some other T languages we find a verb anaiz- 'to wonder, to open wide the mouth', also from Mongolian. The only possibility of connecting the Turkic word with the Uralic is if we suppose that Yakut *ayıız goes back to an earlier ahaq, the -q is a suffix and then we have an âη. Räsänən (1949: 200-203) treated this interesting η but did not cite this word, presumably, because the Yakut word is isolated. The only argument in favour of an older Yakut -η would be the fact that this would fit into the U pattern and account for the difference in PFU and PS: PFU ana < PU âna > PS âη. But this kind of argumentation would convince nobody.

In Mongolian we find ang 'crack, chink, cleft, fissure, crevice; ravine' (→ Kirg. an 'ravine'), angya 'bifurcation, branch', angwayi- 'to open up, to be wide open', angyar 'crevice, cranny, fissure, cleft' etc. The word for 'mouth' is ama(n) in Mongolian and has to be compared with T am, 'vulva' and not with ayıız 'mouth'.

In the Manchu-Tunguzian languages we find a very interesting semantic differentiation (though not always consequent). The word for
'human mouth' is ἀμνά in Evenki, Even, Negidal, Oroch. The word for animal mouth (R 'past') is ἀνά in Evenki, Negidal; further we find ἀνα in Jurchen and Manchu but in the meaning 'human mouth' while in Udihe, Ulcha, Orok and Nanai ἀμνά and ἀρνά alternate and mean both. Solon has ἀμμάτι 'mouth' (cf. Cincius 1975: 38-39, 43). Benzing (1955: 38) reconstructed ἀργά, Cincius l.cit., ἀμνά < ἀμγα < ἀμγαί. I suppose that ἀμνά is a crasis of ἀμα and ἀνά; the first pertains to Mongolian ἀμα(n) and the second to M ἀγ(α), and the latter word exists also independently in MT.

Thus T ἀμ - M ἀμα(n) - MT ἀμα- must be kept separate from M and MT ἀγ(α), while both must be kept separate from T ἀγία.

Of course we find in this word η > γ in the Ugric and η > m in the Permian languages but these are late and independent changes. Should T ἀγία be in connection with the U word this would be possible only if it were an Ugric loan. So we have in this case a U word with MT and M connections if we accept that PS ἀ is secondary. If not, then it is only a PFU — MT — M correspondence.

I have discussed these two words because they represent two types of U and A correspondences and many similar words could be added. Now for the two types of correspondences we can give two explanations.

The first is the "Stammbaumtheorie". The second type was first suggested by J. Németh, who wrote in a somewhat altered version of a paper written originally in 1928: "Auf Grund der bisher festgestellten Übereinstimmungen können wir keineswegs annehmen, dass die uralischen, türkischen, mongolischen und mandschu-tunguischen Sprachen auf eine in einer bestimmten Periode der Vorzeit und einer bestimmten Urheimat gesprochene Ursprache zurückzuführen sind, und noch viel
weniger, dass etwa das Indogermanische oder das Koreanische aus dieser Einheit abzuleiten wären. Für die Erklärung der vorzeitlichen Beziehungen der erwähnten Sprachen möchte ich eine sich von Osteuropa bis Ostasien erstreckende, ununterbrochene – wenn auch nicht synchronisch ununterbrochene – Sprachenkette annehmen, deren nebeneinander oder einander nahe stehende Glieder Übereinstimmungen aufweisen, die auf eine enge urzeitliche Verbindung, und bei gewissen Gliedern der Kette eventuell auch eine urzeitliche Spracheinheit schliessen lassen. Unsere Betrachtungsweise lässt die Möglichkeit offen, dass auch zwischen solchen Sprachfamilien, die sich nicht unmittelbar berühren (etwa zwischen dem Indogermanischen und Türkischen, zwischen dem Uralischen und Tungusischen) Übereinstimmungen bestehen können. Wir sind auch – wie schon erwähnt – berechtigt, urzeitliche Wanderungen anzunehmen" (1942-1947: 86-87). A similar idea has been expressed by Tolstov (1950). The model was later developed by Sinor (1975) who stressed, among other things the FU – S – MT connections.

We have to deal with two further questions, with the 'where' and the 'when'. Now let me return to Collinder's other two UA comparisons:

PU kunta 'reindeer'

The word is present in Lappish and Fi. kuntu is a L loanword. Vogul has *konka (< ? kontka < kunta+ka) while Yenisei kére?, hère? kode, kese? and Kamas xouna. The vocalism is not regular and I agree with UrEt: "Möglicherweise ist es ein eurasisches Wanderwort". The role of the Lapps could have been here decisive.

In the MT languages we find kanda yä 'elk' (only in one dialect of Evenki). This seems to be a derivative from kanda 'dewlap (podgrudok) of an elk, cow' cf. Manchu qanda id. qandayat 'elk (male)', qandatu 'a mythological animal resembling a bull with red tail'. The same word is M qandayat 'elk'. The word is present also in Yakut where we find: xanda 'an evil demon' alip xandayat, alip xandayat id. It is an open question whether Even (Lamut) kende 'reindeer (draught, of Koryak or Chukchee race)' pertains here, but if so it is of foreign origin. In FUV² Collinder is not citing T data.

PU tewä 'elk or reindeer'

The U word is present in L and Fi. In this case it is more likely that Fi tewa 'male elk', tev:a 'female elk' have been borrowed by L
but the other way can also not be excluded. The UrEt connects with this word the Hungarian *tehén* with a ? mark, not accepting its IE origin (Joki 1973: 326-327). The S words occurring in Tawgi, Yenisei, Yurak, Selkup and Kamass have been reconstructed by Janhunen as PS "tëgë" (1977: 155), but he did not include this word in his list of PU common words (1981).

In the MT languages this word has been borrowed from Yakut and appears in Evenki where we find *tōbo* 'reindeer'.

In T we find *teve*, in older texts also *tevey* 'camel', Yakut *tebìän*, *temiän* are Mongolian loanwords (Katużyński 1961: 16). The word for 'reindeer' is *taba*, that for 'elk' is *taŋax* (*takaq*). The first is surely a S loanword later passed over to Evenki. T *tebe* and M *tamegen* 'camel' belong surely together though there is no good reason for the T *-b-* - M *-m-* as has been pointed out by Doerfer (1965: 669-671). The M word was borrowed by MT languages, Evenki *tavën* 'camel', (through Yakut), *tamegen* directly from Mongolian. So also was Solon *tamegë* and Manchu *tamege* (Cincius 1977: 235).

I think that even if one would accept the semantic correspondence 'elk, reindeer' - 'camel' everything points to the suggestion that here we have a cultural wandering word. These two words are not isolated.

PU *poē* 'reindeer (calf)'

*Po pooro* is in a not clear relationship with the other U words (see FUV, Urkt). Especially problematical is the semantic side in the cases of the S words, Kamass 'Capra sibirica', Koibal 'goat, Cervus capreolus'. Zyryan *peē* is an Ostyak loanword. The vocalism is also here irregular and I suggest PL *poda* - PCher *puda* - PÜgr *poda* - PVoty *poda* - PObūgr *peē* and if the S words pertain here PS *poda*. Irregularities of this kind may be accepted if we assume that the word is an inner (early) loan in U.

The word is present in the MT languages: Evenki *bësēn* 'roe(deer)', Even *bësēn*, *budēke* 'Moschus moschiferus', Negidal *bošēn* 'Cervus elaphus', Oroch *bùša(n)* id., Ulcha *bùša(n)*, *bùša(n)* Nanai *bošē* and Manchu *budēn* 'mythological animal similar to the reindeer with long tail'. Yakut *bùšen*, *biden* 'Moschus moschiferus' is an Even loanword. The *-n* is a MT suffix.

The Votyak or Permian word was borrowed by Tatar, Bashkir, Tobol
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Tatar and Russian (see Rédei-Röna-Tas 1982: 167-168).

**PU sarta 'elk; young reindeer'**

The word which is present in Mordvin, Cheremiss, Ostyak, Vogul, Yurak and perhaps in Selkup shows a variation in its semantics. In Mordvin E, M both 'elk' and 'reindeer' (dial.) occur. In Cher it is only 'elk', in the Ob Ugric languages it denotes a one-year-old elk, reindeer or other animal, in Yurak the one-year-old reindeer cow, heifer. The problematical Selkup word is *sjaera* 'cervus tarandus'. The word was borrowed by the Yakut dialects: *sartč, sattč, hatč* 'female reindeer in her second year'. With a suffix *-q* the word is present in several Siberian Turkic languages: Shor *sartak*, Sagai, *koibaardak*, Mator *sardak* 'reindeer', Tuvan *sardžik* 'one-year-old wild he-goat'.

The M word for 'yak' is *sartay, sartuy* (?< *sard-lay* < *sarta-lay*).

A very early correspondence is also the following:

**PU anγ 'Harelda glacialis, Anas hiemalis; polar duck'**

The L word has been compared with Yur *naanu* by Collinder with ? mark (PUV² 35). Janhunen (1977) reconstructs PS *dād* citing Yen *aba* and with ? Sk and Km. The Urt cites also Tawg and Karagass further Yenisei *nau* and connects it with Ostyak *ṅk*, *enx* and Vog *ṅghā, ṅkhe* (< PObUgr *ṅṅk, cf. Honti, 1982: 127). The "irregularities" can again be explained only if we suppose that the word was a wandering cultural one of the Siberian hunters.

The word is present in Kāšgārī's work on the Turkic languages (A. D. 1072-1074): *an* 'the name of a bird whose fat is used for medical purposes; if it is rubbed on the palm of the hand it penetrates to the other side' (see Clauson). We find it in Turkmen as *anq* 'the red goose (ogar')', in Ottoman dialects *ang, anqa* 'a yellow bird as big as a nightingale also ankitch, ankut, angurt', in Yakut dialects, in the North, between the Lena and the Indigirka: *ängna, ańna* 'sea duck'. There are two other bird names which belong together and cannot be separated from the above: T *ančit* 'ruddy goose (Anas cassarea)', M *anggir* 'a kind of yellow duck, reddish yellow'. These go back to an earlier form *ančirt* which in fact occurs in Üzbeğ. Bazin (1971: 55-59) suggested that *an* is of onomatopeic origin, supposing that *-qir* is a
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verbal, and -t a deverbal noun suffix. Most bird names are of onomato-poetic origin and this may be the case with our word as well. This does not exclude, however, that it may have existed at a very early period and subsequently been borrowed.

Evenki anni, an, andi, Negidal ani 'Anas nigra' are Yakut, while Evenki anir, Nan angi, Manchu angir are Mongolian loanwords.

These words point to the North Eurasian taiga region and to a hunting, most probably a reindeer — elk hunting population. The fact that people who later came to the south preserved the terms as "mythological animals" or used them for naming other, newly encountered ones as the 'yak', the 'camel', seems to be a strong argument in support of this view.

It would be a considerable argument against the circular model if there were a certain amount of U-M correspondences which had no counterparts in T and MT. Collinder writes that he has four. One of them is Hung. három - Mong yurvan dealt with above. The second is the second person singular pronoun which has no relevance to this discussion. The third is Fi ǎla 'don't' and its family which cannot be connected with Mongolian álā for phonetic reasons. As we shall see, the fourth is also not a U-M correspondence. Its discussion will, however, give some further insights.

PU kūei or ka'ei 'Picea, Pinus, Abies; conifer'

Collinder compared this word with Mong. quaei 'cedar, Siberian pine'. Its MT parallels have been suggested by Sauvageot (1929: 96-97) and recently by Sinor (1975: 252). I have demonstrated that the PS form has been borrowed by PChuvash (1960: 382, 1982: 160-161). The word existed in OT where we find in Kâsgarî quaei 'pine kernel'. The T word was borrowed by M as quaye 'nut, walnut' (on this type of T → M borrowing see Róna-Taa 1971: 389-399). In Ossetian we find k'ozaa which is of PPermic origin (cf. Abaev 1958: 638). The MT form is kazi-ktt ( -ktt is a common MT suffix).

Here the "Western" data i.e. T and M and the "Eastern" i.e. the MT data are in contradiction. There is also a problem with the U reconstruction. Based on the Finn-Permian data kūei, taking into account the (Qh) Ugric kows as suggested. The PS form is kâst and based on this, now Jahnunen suggested for PU kâzai (1981). Either the long vowel or the diphthong was the original. Let us suppose that
the diphthong was the earlier:

- Finn-Permian: $ka'ei > k\breve{u}i$
- (Ob)Ugric: $ka'ei > k\breve{a}t\breve{i} > k\breve{u}i$
- PSamoyed: $ka'ei > k\breve{a}t+i$

In this case MT kaai may be a very early loan from PU $ka'ei$ or a later one from a period common to OB-Ugric and PSamoyed, the T word can be not earlier than the Finn-Permian period and is surely a loan

word. In the other case:

- Finn-Permian: $kuai > kuai$
- (Ob)Ugric: $kuai > kuai > ka\breve{u}i > k\breve{a}t\breve{i} > k\breve{u}i$
- PSamoyed: $kuai > ka\breve{u}i > k\breve{a}t$

T and M could be early PU words or later Finn-Permian ones, the MT words only loanwords from either Pugric or PS.

The cross references help us to reach some chronological results. Since PChuv borrowed a form *qadi from some early Samoyed language and the ancestors of the Chuvash left South Siberia in the 4th century at the latest, the PS form can be dated back to the first centuries B.C.-A.D. On the other hand the type of borrowing T quaq $\rightarrow$ M queiqa can also be dated to the first centuries B.C. and A.D. This means that the ancestors of the Turks had to borrow this form earlier. The Ossetian form points to a Permian *k\breve{q}a3 which was a PPermian form. We have to assume that this word was borrowed by the Alans, the ancestors of the Ossets, prior to the invasion of the Volga-Kama region by the Bulgar Turks, i.e. before the 8th century. A.D.

I am aware that these data do not give too much to the Uralists, according to whom the PFU—PS separation was about 4,000 B.C. and the Fi-Fe—Ugr separation about 2,000 B.C. For the Altaist, however, these data are of importance, since we are in a period when the Huns appear on the steppe and, on their northern border, people are becoming important and are therefore mentioned in the Chinese sources.

A more thorough investigation of the semantic side of the comparisons offers a similar picture.

PU $k\breve{u}le(u)$ 'sister-in-law'

Here the semantics of the "Western" and "Eastern" languages are different. Finn-Permian: 'female relative through a male in-law relative' (Fi: BW, HS, WS, Est: HB, HBW, L: HBW, BW, Mord: HS, Voty: sW, Zyryan: HBW, for the abbreviations see Szij 1979). (Ob)Ugric: 'younger female relative through the wife' (Ost: WS, WB-d, Vog: WS), 'male relative through wife' (Ost: WSH, WB), 'male in-law relative through
the sister' (Vog: SH). Samoyed: 'male in-law relative through a female relative' (Yur: WSH, Tvg, Slk: SH, WSH). In the West basically 'younger female in-law relative through a male member' and in the East 'a male in-law relative, originally through a female member'.

In T we find kalın 'daughter-in-law, bride' and in the MT languages keli 'brother-in-law (of husbands of sisters)'.

It is almost a general view in Turkic studies that kalın is a derivative of kel- 'to come', hence kalın 'the one who comes (into the clan, the house etc.)'. I have serious doubts about this etymology but no room to discuss it in detail here. In most cases the dictionaries are inaccurate. In Chuvash the word (kín < kalın) has the meaning "the wife of a relative is generally so called if the latter is younger than the speaker" (Asmarin VI: 223). The Yakut word (kít, kinit < kín < kalın) has the following meanings: 'the wife of a younger relative; also son, grandson, brother, member of the clan, husband's brother'. I think the -n is here the same suffix as in qadin 'elder in-law relative', yegen 'sister's child' etc. and has to be connected with the "pronominal n".

As we see (Ob)Ugric once more shows an intermediate place between Finno-Permian and Samoyed. Turkic is near to Finno-Permian and Manchu-Tunguz to Samoyed. It is not difficult to recognize the areal features which are of course from different ages. The Votyak "Sw" is due to a late Turkic influence (see Szij 1979: 250), the Yakut "HB" and the other 'male relative' meanings came into being after the ancestors of the Yakut moved to the North and settled down among the Samoyeds and Tunguz people. I think that the Ob-Ugric semantics is also relatively late and developed during the later, secondary Ob-Ugric — Samoyed contacts forming one of the well-known Ob-Ugric — Samoyed isoglosses.

With this example I would like to show that I do not consider the above model to be a rigid and synchronic one. The ante quem limit is the time around the 4th-5th centuries A.D.; later areal contacts can be separated from those earlier than this period.

I only have space here to discuss one more question. The fact that Collinder separated the three "Kulturwörter": 'needle', 'ski', 'sledge' from the remaining ones, suggests that he considered the latter as "basic words". On the other hand, while discussing the absence of common numerals he remarks: "Zahlwörter können unter günstigen Umständen entlehnt werden..." (1977: 57). I think all types of words can be borrowed
under favourable circumstances. Among the undoubtedly Turkic loan-words in Hungarian we find *gyomor* ‘stomach’, *kar* ‘arm’, *kőldők* ‘navel’, *tőrd* ‘knee’ to mention only those which denote parts of the body. They were borrowed not because the ancient Hungarians did not have stomachs, arms etc., but as denominations of the parts of body of the animals while taking over a new type of animal husbandry. Later on they were generalized (see Róna-Tas 1981). The two examples above (PU *ala* - ălă and PU *ana* - ănă) are also connected with animals (see the semantic problems with the T data of *al* and the MT meaning of *ană*).

Some of Collinder’s comparisons have to be deleted, the qualification of others has to be modified but some others not occurring in Collinder’s 62 item list can be added. New material and more rigorous methods will always change the picture. But this is the normal way of progress in scholarship.

Summing up: Collinder’s alternative: “Urverwandtschaft” or “non liquet” does not bring us further forward. We have to reckon with early contacts existing for a longer time — for hundreds, perhaps even thousands of years in the taiga region of North Eurasia. A Western and an Eastern area can be well established. Our first task is to investigate the correspondences due to these early contacts. They are of paramount importance because they shed light on the early history of the peoples speaking the Uralic and Altaic languages. Only after having separated what is due to the early contacts can the following question be posed: are the U and A (and also the A among themselves) genetically related? Thinking in historical terms: if we accept that the FU and S languages separated around 4,000 B.C. when did the U and A languages diverge? In the paleolithic? I seriously doubt that with the material being at our disposal and with our present methods we would be able to go beyond the neolithic age when the stabilization of most language families occurred.

PS. The material used in this paper is based on a work in progress bearing the title “Uralic and Turkic”. As a consultant to the editors I had the opportunity to use the manuscript of the UrEt. I would like to offer them my sincere thanks for having provided me with this opportunity.
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While investigating the knowledge on Tibet prevailing in Hungary prior to Csoma de Körös' trip to Asia I came across a curious and dubious entry in the Hungarian Dictionary of Old Documents. The entry runs: *Eg veg tibet* and is dated from 1556. As source the Archives of the Nádasdy family is given where the original was kept under No. 49. To the word *tibet* the Dictionary also gives a German translation: "Eine Art sehr feiner, dichter Wollenzeuge". Since these data seemed to me of importance both for the history of the geographical name Tibet and for Hungary's early relations with Central Asia I tried to check them.

The Hungarian Dictionary of Old Documents is a supplement to the Historical Dictionary of the Hungarian Language published in 1890-1893. Its material was collected first by I. Szamota and then revised and augmented by Gy. Zolnai who published it in 1902-1906. Unfortunately that part of the archives of the Nádasdy family from which our data were excerpted by Szamota, disappeared because of some disorder, and even were no longer accessible when Zolnai revised the material. I made several efforts to find the document in the present National Archives, but without any success. Thus we have to deal not only with a *hapax*, but we are also in doubt whether the term given is not a miswriting or misunderstanding.

Nevertheless it seemed authentic to me. The orthography is in accordance with similar texts of the same period. *Eg* is in modern Hungarian orthography *egy* "one" and *veg* is *vég* in this case "bolt, roll of cloth, textile" i.e. it has to be translated as "one bolt or roll [of] tibet". The German translation was given from a contemporary German Encyclopaedia, by Zolnai.

While going through all Encyclopaedias and dictionaries available to me, I learned with some surprise that the name of the *tibet* cloth is not documented in Europe before 1827. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary on Historical Principles (3rd. ed. 1952 repr.) gives this date and in the great Oxford English Dictionary vol. XI (1933) it is quoted from W. Scott's *The surgeon's daughter* published in 1827: "Tiber, Thibet 1827. Name of a country in Central Asia; used attrib, of wool obtained thence, or of cloth or garments made from this or in imitation of it: … absol. Tibet cloth, or a gown or shawl made of it". I shall quote only one more Encyclopaedia, the Brockhaus, which has s.v. Tibet: "1. Pelzgewerbe: Felle der eineinhalb bis zwei Monate alten Lämmer einer in Nordchina lebenden..."
Schafart. 2. Textilkunde: ein weicher Kleiderstoff aus dem Haar der Tibetziege (Kaschmirwolle) oder als Imitat aus feinem Wollkammgarn; auch eine Reißwollqualität aus gerissenen Kammgarnstoffen (Bd. 18, p. 674, ed. 1973).

Since this had effected the credibility of the early Hungarian data I had to investigate the historical circumstances of the appearance of the name of the tibet cloth in Europe.

As it is known the kingship of Ladak rose to great power in the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. Its glory was short and its decay begun with the piece of 1683. The Mogul rulers of Cashmere asked a great price for their help given to the Ladakis in the battle of Basra against the Mongol-Tibetan troops. Among the terms imposed by them there was "... [to] grant to the Kashmiri merchants the monopoly of the raw wool trade - the great Western Tibetan staple and the raw material for the manufacture of the famous shawls, one of Kashmir's most important industries" - wrote L. Petech in his fundamental work on the Ladak Chronicle.

The Cashmere monopoly of the Tibetan raw wool was more or less complete until the beginning of the 19th century. One of the reasons for the increasing English interest in Tibet was just the famous Tibetan wool, and among the tasks of Moorcraft - who played such an important role in turning Csoma de Kőrös' interest to Tibetan studies - it was not the last to find a way to exclude Cashmere and get a direct access to the exceptionally fine Tibetan sort of wool. This was made possible at the end of the Anglo-Nepalese war (1814-1816) which ended with the defeat of the Gurkhas and opened a direct access for the English trade agents to the Tibetan wool. Thus it is understandable that the Tibetan wool, the raw material of the famous Cashmere shawls, became known, through massive English trade, in Europe only after the end of the 1810's.

Though I could not find earlier data in European sources I did in Persian. In the dictionary of Steingass (1892, my quotation is from the 2nd ed. 1930) we find tibit "soft goat's hair, from which the finest shawls are made; - tibbat, tubbat "Tibet in Tartary, whence comes the finest musk", - tibid "soft goat's hair". Steingass took this entry from Vuller's dictionary (1855) where we read (p. 419) i.q. तिबित् "lana mollis et tenera, quam efundo lanae caprinae depectunt et supparo grandióri (J. U.) texendo adhibent" and as a separate entry तिबि "nom. urbis in confiniis Sinarum e qua moschi optimo species afferetur. Tibetum". Vullers took his entry from the Burhán-i qātī published by Roebeck in 1818. The Burhán-i qātī was written by Muhammad Husayn b. Khalaf in 1652 as a practical dictionary based on the Farhang-i Jahāngiri (written between 1596/7-1623) and this means that our word existed in Persian at least in the first part of the 17th century.

The word is also known in some Turkic languages and dialects. We find it in
Chagatai as "Flaumfedern, feine Wolle" (Vámbéry), tibit "id., Daunen" (Radlov), see further written Turki "Mongolian noylur "soft wool, down". Manchu nungyari "down", Tibetan khul "the soft down of furs" (vocalised as tebit in the Wu t’i), Uzbek tivit "puh". New Uyghur tivit “puh (koz, ovec; ptc)” (Nadjip), Uyghur of Ferghana tivit "puh (pod šerstju u životnyh)” (Sadvakasov), Tatar dialectal tebet = angel “vjazannyj platok, šál” (Dialect of Ljambir, Penza), tibit = yörek “pelenka” (Dialects of Glazov, Udmurtia and Nokrat, Kirov), tebet “kozyj puh, utinyj puh (Siberian Tatar dialect, Tumashseva). In Modern Turkish tirit "the soft down of the goats of Thibet and Cashmire; Thibet cloth of the same downy wool" (Redhouse).

From the phonetical structure and the geographic distribution of the Turkic data one can conclude that we deal here with a word of commerce, and if we exclude the modern Turkish data (not recorded in earlier lexicography) its distribution corresponds to an area which can historically be well defined. From the chronological point of view the data of the Tatar dialects are of importance. The people who now speak the dialects of Glazov and Nokrat moved north from the Kazan Tatar central territory in the early 16th century and had no direct contact with it. The vast territory from Penza to Siberia also hints to a relatively early spreading of the word. Of special interest is the meaning of the Glazov and Nokrat data. The “swaddle” (pelenka) is nothing else than a fine, soft material for swaddling babies; this meaning developed from “cloth made of downy wool”, and could also have been the meaning of the Hungarian data.

At this point further problems arise. Is the word connected with the geographical name Tibet at all, and if so, what is the historical background of the earlier Central Asian distribution of the material and the word denoting it.

For the history of the turn of the 15th to the 16th century one of the most important sources is the Tarix-i Rashidi of Mirza Haidar. This work, well known to the historians of Central Asia including Tibet, consists of two parts. The second part is a kind of autobiography with a detailed description of the events of its own time and was written in 1541–1542; the first part was written later, in 1544–1547, and is more of a historical survey. The English translation was edited by N. Elias and translated by E. D. Ross in 1895. The work, though its author was a Turk, was written in Persian and there exists a later Turkish translation. The author was a commander of the army of Sultan Sa’id Khan (about 1490–1533) who became ruler of Kashgar. Sa’id Khan, a protegé of Babur, occupied Kashgar and Yarkend in 1514: His elder brother Mansur reigned over Uyguristan, Turfan, Karashar and Kucha. The two brothers concluded peace, and a short but prosperous time followed in the vexed history.
of Central Asia. About this period the historian Mirza Haidar wrote: "From this peace and reconciliation between the two brothers resulted such security for the people, that any one might travel alone between Kamul or Khitai and the country of Fergana, without provision for the journey and without fear of molestation" (Ed. Elias and Ross, p. 134). These circumstances favoured the flourishing of trade.

The relations between Kashgar and Ladak began earlier. The ruler of Kashgar before Sa'id Khan was Abu Bakr. His commander Mir Yali "brought under his power much of Karatigin and Badakhshan and the district of Balur and Tibet as far as Kashmir" (op. cit. p. 320). Elias is right when he points out that in this and in other similar sources Tibet was the name of Ladakh, though it was extended also to Baltistan (Little Tibet, in opposition to Great Tibet, i.e. Ladakh) and to Central Tibet (Ursang i.e. Dbu-Gtsan in the Tarix-i Rashidi) and therefore it is difficult to tell in some cases which of the three, or all together, are meant. (cf. pp. 134, 136). According to Petech (op. cit., p. 120) "it is very doubtful that Ladakh was reached by this first invasion, which probably stopped at Skardo or Nubra". I hesitate to join Petech on this point because it could not have been a mere coincidence that Abu Bakr, after his defeat by Sa'id Khan, fled to Ladakh (see Tarix-i Rashidi pp. 327–328 with a detailed description of the pursuit of Abu Bakr). It was only a consequence of this fact that after 1516 the Emirs of Sa'id Khan "had frequently invaded and plundered that country" (op. cit., p. 403). Mirza Haider further tells us, that in the spring of 1532 "the Khan resolved a holy war against Tibet". This was justified because "... on account of their ignorance and folly, Islam had no progress, and there were still numberless infidels in Tibet, beside those whom the Emirs had subdued" (op. cit., p. 403). The military expedition is related in great detail. Sa'id soon became ill and withdrew. He died on his way back while crossing the Suget pass in 1533 (see Petech, op. cit., p. 124). His successor, Rashid, showed less interest in the affairs of Ladakh. Mirza Haidar himself remained in Ladakh for three more years. Later he left for Cashmere because he was afraid to turn back to Kashgar. Rashid, the new ruler, executed some of his relatives. With this the direct connections between Turkestan and Ladakh seem to diminish to a degree of unimportance.

The "holy war against Tibet" surely had some non-religious purposes in the background. One of them must have been the fact that Ladakh was the place where Abu Bakr had fled to. From Mirza Haidar's fascinating description of Tibet it is also clear that gold mining was of special interest. But equally Tibetan wool and the cloth made of it must have been very attractive. Indirectly this is also made clear from the later aspirations of the rulers of Cashmere, the land where Mirza Haidar had fled to.
The linguistic data quoted above are in accordance with the assumption that the wool and cloth named after Tibet, i.e. Ladakh, became an important object of trade in Turkestan at the beginning of the 16th century. The rulers of Kashgar, and especially Sa'id Khan, had good relations with the Kipchak tribes of the successor states of the Golden Horde. In 1514 – so Mirza Haidar tells us – he went "to the court of Kasim Khan, who was ruler of the Desht-i-Kipchak. At this time his army numbered 300000 men. Kasim Khan received him (Sa'id Khan) with so much favour that the Khan remembered it for years later" (op. cit., p. 133 and in detail on p. 276). Kasim was the son of Jani beg and died in 1518. Mirza Haidar writes about him (p. 273): "Kasim Khan now brought the Desht-i-Kipchak under his absolute control, in a manner that no one, with the exception of Jochi Khan, had ever done before" and in 1513 Kasim Khan "in order to look to his own kingdom, went to Ubaira-Subaira" (p. 282). Elias remarks that in this case he transliterated the fully vocalized Turkic translation but the name has to be the usual Ibir-Sibir. The winter-quarters of Kasim Khan was at Karatal (p. 274) along the river of the same name running into the Balkhash. The nephew of Kasim Khan, Baranduk, lived in Saraichuk in the South Urals, and we know that Saraichuk or Saraichik was one of the most important stations on the trading route connecting Europe with Turkestan.¹²

I think that without going into further details it is clear that the historical background of the spread of the Tibet wool and Tibet cloth is in favour of the hypothesis that the material and the word denoting it had an earlier and a later history, and that the enigmatic Hungarian data can be connected with the first one.

The Turco-Persian data reflect a tebet ~ libit form and can perhaps help us to solve a further problem. The earliest authentic data on the name Tibet we find in the Runic inscriptions in the form Twput.¹³ What is the relationship between this form and the later forms with an illabial vowel in the first syllable and a voiced bilabial stop in the middle? The early Sogdian forms (twput, twp'yt) the Late Middle Persian forms (twpyt) are related, and the Arabic ṭbbṭ as well as the Mongolian Töbed all reflect a double Turkic form Twpwt and Twp't. New Persian reborrowed the Arabic orthography, preserved its vocalisation, but parallel with it, under later Turkic influence, the vocalisation changed and we find ṭebe and ṭepe beside the "Arabic" ṭepe.

For understanding the phonetical changes in the geographic name let us see the history of a Turkic word of similar structure Old. Turkic: tōpū "hill, top", Runic tōpā, Uyghur tōpū, Arabic töpū. Middle Turkic: tōpe, tepe (13th century, Tefsir) tōpe (Ibn Muhanna ed. Melioranskij), tepe (id. ed. Kilisli Rifati), tōpe (Hwarezmian, Qub, Nahcul al Faradis), tepe, tōpe (with -p- Chagatai, Sanglax), tebe (Codex Cumanicus) tepe (Houtsma), tepe, depe (with -p-, Abu
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Hayyan), töpe (Buḫyat al-Muṣtaq), töpe (Kawanin), töpe (At Tuḥfat, on the margin depe, tepe) for all data see Clauson14 p. 436. With the exception of Runic, in all cases the word is written with b, and if -p- is indicated in the source it is quoted "with -p-". In the Modern Turkic dialects the picture is as follows: Oghuz: Ottoman tepe, Azeri tāpā, Türkmen depe; Halaj tāpā (← Azeri) Kipchak: Kazan Tatar tūbe, Bashkir tūbe, Karakalpak tōbe Kumük tōbe, Karachai-Balkar tōpe, Karaim-Trocki ṭob'a; Eastern Uzbek tepa, New Ujghur tōpā, Turki tōpā, Siberian: Altai tōbe, tōbō, ? Hakas tey, ? Tuvan tey, Yakut tōbō, tābā, Chuvash tūpe.15 The word was borrowed by New Persian as tāpā, see Doerfer, TMEN II, p. 450, with other languages which also borrowed the word.

From the modern dialects it is clear that the word had an original -p- and the -b- is secondary. Doerfer (loc. cit.) suggested that -e- is original in this word, and the -o- is due to the labialising effect of the -p-. Sevortjan16 argues that the -o- is original because it is documented earlier. This is not a stringent argument but for our present purpose we do not have to decide the question. What is of importance for our case is the fact that an original Turkic word which is tōpū in the Runic inscriptions is tebe in the language of the Desht-i-Kipchak, as reflected by the Codex Cumanicus. This is the form which prevailed in the Golden Horde in the first half of the 14th century.17

Turning back now to the geographical name Tibet we find that in the records of the two most important travellers of the 13th century, Rubruk and Marco Polo, we find the geographical name as Tēbet.18 This is in full conformity with the data of the Codex Cumanicus on the OT word tōpū, so we can now reconstruct the Runic form as Tōpūt (and not Tūpūt) and from the fact that the common word tōpū was borrowed by New Persian as tāpā and the geographical name as Tēbet we can conclude that they reflect two different Turkic languages. The latter was used for the denomination of Ladakh by the Turco-Persian writers but also by the merchants, and this form was spread as the name of the tībet wool and cloth. Once the name of Tibet became the name of an object of trade, its phonetical history separated itself from its original. In some cases it coincided with that of the geographical name, in others it went its own way. The history of geographical names and the fate of the names of trade-objects have their own rules.

In conclusion I would say that the doubtful and enigmatic Hungarian data of 1556 gave a help to reconstruct the history of the trade relations with Tibet and further threw some light on the perplexing question of the history of the name Tibet.
3 G. Bethlenfalvy in a paper read before the Csorna de Körös Society dealt with the historical event in NE India before and around the arrival of Csorna de Körös. In this paper he has also dealt with the wool trade in detail. I hope that his paper will soon be published.
5 Interesting is the quotation of W. Scott’s The surgeon’s daughter in the Oxford Dictionary: “How could you … collect all these hard words about India? … Like the imitative operatives of Paisley, I have composed my shawl by incorporating into the woof a little thibet wool, which … Colonel Mackerris … had the goodness to supply me with.” It is clear that in this context the word is yet a foreign word. In the next entry cited from 1857: “Edinburgh had thibet in the manufacture” it already became a professional term.
6 I have used the Teheran reedition of A.H. 1341.
9 I did not find the word in Zenker’s dictionary (1866), in the historical dictionary of Ottoman Turkish (Tarama sözlüğü, vol. V., 1971) and in some other older dictionaries available to me.
10 The most important recent paper on the dialects of Glazov and Nokrat (or Karino) is: N. Burganova, Govor karinskib i glazovskib tatar, in: Materialy po tatarskoj dialektologii, Kazan, 1962, pp. 19–56. See there the earlier literature.
13 Kul Tegin inscription E4, Bilge kagan inscription E5, see T. Tekin, A Grammar of Orkhan Turkish, Bloomington, 1968, Altun KöI II, line 8, see S.E. Malov, Enisejskaja pis’mennost’ tjurkov, Moscow–Leningrad 1952, p. 57.
15 The Chuvash data are irregular, the expected form would be täpe, tipe. The -i- shows Tatar influence.
17 I quoted the Turkic word only as a phonetical parallel form to the geographical name Tibet. The question whether Turkic tôpû — têpe and Tibet pertain together also etymologically is another problem not dealt with here.
18 Rubruk has Tebec, var. SL Tebet (ed. Wynaert I, 234), Thebec, var. D. Thebet (op. cit., I, 271) Marco Polo Tebet (ed. Yule-Cordier, p. 48) where we read: “They have also in this country plenty of fine woollens and other stuffs ….”
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