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the Turkic term bayrótor ‘hero of toads’.

On the other hand, the word tor which is not attested except in the word bayrótor in Turkic, continues in Korean in the form of tōri (< *tor + denominal suffix -i) meaning ‘a brave boy’ or the like.

11. Ko. Ꮿ Ꮿ ‘a dog like wolf’: In the southern parts of Korea, people call a big and wild dog like wolf Ꮿ. This word occurs in the Orkhon Inscriptions, which is the oldest Turkic inscriptions, in the form of bőri meaning ‘wolf’ in the sentence bőri teg ermis “(the kagan) was like a wolf” (KT E 12, BK E 11). The word also was used in the proper name Er Bőri ‘male wolf’, as well as in the title Bőri Karja ‘the king of Wolves’ in Ancient Turkic. The word bőri is attested in most of the historical languages of Turkic, i.e. Uyghur, Karahan, Chagatai, etc., in the form of bőri or börü. The word which, as far as I know, never occurs in both Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus, was borrowed into non-Altaic languages, i.e. Yenisey Ostyak börü and Russian birık, etc. (Doerfer II 784).

ABBREVIATIONS
ACh.: Ancient Chinese

1. In his work “A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic” (Bloomington, 1968) our esteemed colleague Talat Tekin explains the Ancient Turkic (T) word balbal ‘statue’, assuming a syncope, < balbal < barmal (p. 73). On p. 99 he explains the word as deriving from *barmal, comparing it with 13/14th century Yüan Mongolian (Y) barimal (progressive distance assimilation -m- > -b-) and, some lines further, by a regressive distance assimilation: balbal < *bimal < *barmal. The common feature of these alternative explanations is the derivation from Y barimal, which in some fashion developed into balbal.

2. I entirely agree with Tekin that the T word is of Mongolian (Mo.) origin. Cf. Y barimal ‘sculpture’, consisting of the root bari- ‘to construct, to shape’ + a well-known suffix -mal. This form, however, must not be the direct predecessor of balbal. I am inclined to prefer a development from proto-Mo. *barmal > *barmal (in an ancient Mo. dialect) → T balbal (with double assimilation: -r- to -l- and -m- to -b-). This means (1) there are ancient Mo. loanwords in T, and (2) they do not coincide with Y. For particulars cf. A = my article “Mongolica im Alttürkischen” (submitted to Lewin-Festschrift in March 1988, forthcoming) and B = Mongolo-Tungusica, Wiesbaden 1985, 148-198.

3. But from which Mo. dialect are the T words derived? With certainty it is not Y (not documented before the 13th century). One may assume that Y was the particular dialect of Cinggis Khan’s tribe, which by its political dominance has suppressed all other dialects - with the exception only of Daghur (D), which has gone its own way, divergent from Y.

In this article we shall take the following languages into account (cf. the
4. We shall investigate the material according to 15 criteria. (For lack of space I shall normally quote only one or two examples.)

4.1. S and M, in contrast to Q, Y and D, quite often show an additional -n; e.g., S agan ‘older brother’ = Y aqa, D aqa (v. 4.4), M ağıran, etc. Q and D, on the other hand, frequently show forms without -n, e.g., Q saqā ‘bird’, jay ‘100’ (D sowō, jaq) = Y sibarun, jaryn. T shows some traces of the ‘additional -n': qalqan ‘shield’ (Y qalqa), tayran ‘greyhound’ (Y tayiŋ). We have also to consider the many T titles in -n, such as qaran, qatan, tarzan, tegin, erkin, sudun, saqan, etc., all of them presumably borrowed from S, cf. qaran, qatan, degin, and furthermore such words as toqan, lacin ‘kinds of falcons’, colpan ‘Venus’, aqan ‘gelded camel’, etc. (v. 4. 15).

The formula is: T = S (and M), = Y/Q/D.

4.2. The consonantal -j (normally transcribed -i), presumably an old class suffix *-gi, is characteristic of Y, but is often lacking in Q/M/D. (S may show just one example of this lack: silu ‘high’, whereas Y sili < silui, just as toli ‘mirror’ < tolui.) Cf. Q nööge ‘dog’ M xalga ‘thief’ = D xulza, M arfa ‘barley’ = Y noqai, qalqai, arbaį. However, we find in the Mongol. languages two situations: (1) words containing -j also in S/D, e.g., S qırqagin ‘executioner’ (= qırqay ‘dagger, sword’ with a suffix -gin, in Y qırqaygi would correspond), D dalai ‘ocean’ = Y id.; (2) words in which -j is lacking in S/D. v. supra. Seemingly, in Q/M - j is always lacking, in S/D only in some cases, in Y -j it is almost always ‘preserved’. T shows both situations: words with -j, such as talaj ‘ocean’ (in inherited T taço), umai ‘godess of love and parturition’, but also tābaj – tāba ‘camel’, buyday – buydą ‘wheat’ (Y dalai, umai ‘matrix, womb’, teme-gen - where *gi has been replaced by *-gen - , buyda). The formula is: T = in part Y (and S/D), ≠ Q/M, and in part = Q/M. ≠ S/ D.

4.3. The suffix -sun, characteristic of Y, is frequently lacking in M/D. Since these languages are close to pre-Yüan Mo, it is likely that -sun often lacked in S/Q, too. (The example Q u ‘river’ = Y u-sun is not satisfactorily secured.) Here are some examples of M: anqasun (h)utasun, (h)øyimasun; D anqas ‘plov’, gata ‘stake’ = Y yadasun (Buriat gatahan, Barguzin Evenki gata-hun). In T -sun never appears, cf. yez ‘esparto grass’ = Y dere-sün, olma ‘felt for boots’ = Y hoyimasun, baliq ‘town’ = Y balarqasun. M shows, along with the forms mentioned above, such examples as deresu, which are loanwords from Y, and so does D (derese, anjas).

The formula is: T = M/D, presumably also = S/Q, ≠ Y.

4.4. ‘Older brother’ is agan in S, aqa in D, but aqa in Y (apparently a baby word). We find -G- instead of -K- also in Q, e.g., toqo ‘buckle’ (Y tuqqai < *toqoqai, M tooxan). The same holds true for M: xalga ‘thief’ (v. 4.2), ferge ‘thumb’ (Y herekei). The original consonant -K-, preserved in Y, is also found in T: toqo ‘buckle’, torqo ‘silk’, saqal (D sagal), baliq (v. 4.3). Y, however, which preserved -K- only at the outset of a second syllable after a vowel (e.g. saqal), mostly changes it to -G- after a consonant or in a third syllable (torqo, balarq-sun).

The formula is: T=Y (but representing a still earlier stage), ≠ S/Q/M/D.

4.5. The proto-Mo. combination *ti/idi had been preserved in S: bitigcin ‘secretary’ (Y bitigcii, modi ‘chief of a province’ (Y maqii). (N.B., alleged S gučin ‘30’ = M guşen, but Evenki gučin ← proto-Mo. *gučin is non-counterproof, since this is no S word, but Tu-yü-hun of the 8th century, cf. Ligeti in Mongol. Studies, Amsterdam, 1970, 290-1.) No example of this combination could be found in Q; but *ti/idi is likely there, since Q has loaned many words to M. To be sure, Manchu of the 17th century shows *ti > *či > si and *di > ji, but the older Manchu dialect Jurchen, 16th century, still shows such forms as tifa ‘mud’ = M čifaxan, dirga ‘to rejoice’ = M jirga-, in Y ji, ci are usual: čiinaa- ‘to listen’, jirga-. In T tidi have been preserved, e.g. in ady ‘stallion’, tayla ‘to listen’ = Y ājirja-, čiinaa-. However, in Y the change di > jii (and presumably also ti > ci) is a recent and secondary phenomenon, v. B 181: in the Mo. history of the 12th century a tribal chief was called Qadir (= T
qadr ‘powerful’), whose name was later on pronounced Y qa juris.

The formula is: $T = S/Q/M$, formerly also $= Y/D$.

4.6. In S a feminine suffix -tun is documented: qai(y)tuun ‘queen’, (a)matun ‘mother’. This suffix is lacking in all other Mo. (and Tungus) languages. In T, too, it is found only in the S loan-word qa tun. (The same word is found in Y and M.)

4.7. It may be supposed that Y $\acute{y}$ has developed a) from older *dia-, etc.,

b) from older *gia-, etc. Some traces of *gia- are still found: S giamcin ‘chief of a post-office’ (Y jamci), borrowed $\Leftarrow$ Chinese giam. Cf. as non-Chinese term: Q gia to invite (Y jala, D jalo). For M cf. giamun ‘post-office’ $(\rightarrow$ D giamn). For T cf. yalava ‘ambassador’ (v. 4.11). The question of whether T j- derives from a Mo. form with jâ- or gia- cannot definitely be resolved; however, a derivation from S is likely, as will be shown in 4.11.

4.8. S/Q and older M (Gin-Jürcen) have preserved Mo. (and Tungus) *p-, e.g., S pirtiçin ‘post-office clerk’ (Y irtiçi), Q po ‘time’ (Y on ‘year’), M ferje ‘thumb’ (Y erekei), as to older M $p$- cf. P. Pelliot: Les mots à $h$ initalie ..., Journal Asiatique 1924, pp. 193-4 (e.g. puangwen ‘young lad’ = M fiyanggù). In older Y we find h- (hon, herekei, etc.). Some dialects show zero, others h-, x-: oō $\sim$ hon, etc. The change *p-> h-/x- > zero in D is recent, as the loanwords prove: akur $\sim$ akur ‘trousers’ $\leftarrow$ M fakiri $\sim$ eiji ‘brick’ $\leftarrow$ Chinese pêz (v. B 155), and even xulug/hulug ‘plough’ $\leftarrow$ Russian plug. (The Dagur-Russian contacts belong to the middle of the 17th century!) For T cf. B 148-150: Proto-T had *p-, which has become h- in about the 7th century (terminus ad quern). Cf. Y hoyimasun ‘felt boot’ = M fomon = T oima (Samoyed pāymā); T araq, Khalaj haraq = Y harq $\sim$ M fa $\hat{\imath}$an $\sim$ pargan.

Conclusion: all “Altaic” languages had *p-, which nevertheless became h- in T at a very early date.

4.9. In Y the former *p- has (via *-θ-) become *- (transcribed -γ-).

Therefore cf. T qap(a)- ‘to cover, to close’, qapay ‘door’ = Y qa $\hat{\imath}$a, qa $\hat{\imath}$a-$\acute{\imath}$a-

In S ano Q we still find -b- (perhaps to be pronounced -p-, bilabial fricative):

S qabagci ‘doorkeeper’ = Q qagaci = Y qaagci (pronounced xa $\acute{\imath}$agci, later on xaga $\acute{\imath}$e) = T qapay $\acute{\imath}$. In D -g-/-$g$- has vanished, just as in the other modern dialects: xa $\acute{\imath}$- ‘to close’, xalga ‘door’. In M -$f$- (> older -$p$-) has been preserved, e.g., xefeli ‘womb’ = Y kegeli, read ke $\acute{\imath}$eli, kēlī, D kēlī. In T -$p$- has been preserved, v. supra.

The formula is: $T = S/Q/M, \neq Y/D$.

4.10. Y preserved the vowel of the middle syllable of trisyllabic (or polysyllabic) words, but some of its dialects drop it in a very recent development. Therefore we find, e.g., qula $\hat{\imath}$a ‘thief’ (modern Khalkha xulga). The situation in D is sophisticated; we find, e.g., xulag $\sim$ xulag $\sim$ xulag $\sim$ xulaga $\sim$ xula $\hat{\imath}$a, etc. We may explain these variants a) as partly influenced by Western Mo. dialects (xula $\hat{\imath}$a $\sim$ xula $\hat{\imath}$a) or b) as secondary vowel dropping (xula $\hat{\imath}$a $\sim$ xula $\hat{\imath}$a). At any rate, there are some cases where D secondarily even inserts vowels, e.g., Y ma $\hat{\imath}$a $\hat{\imath}$a ‘forehead’ = D ma $\hat{\imath}$a $\hat{\imath}$a. This may also have happened in such cases as *qula $\hat{\imath}$a(i), and that means: proto-Mo. *qula $\hat{\imath}$a(i) $\sim$ D *qula $\hat{\imath}$a $\sim$ xula $\hat{\imath}$a $\sim$ xula $\hat{\imath}$a. M shows dropping: xilka ‘thief’, ferje ‘thumb’, argān ‘canine tooth’, dabun ‘salt’, gurgi ‘(wild) animal’, kurz $\hat{\imath}$a ‘pike’, etc. = Y qula $\hat{\imath}$a(i), (h)erekei, araga, dabun, do $\hat{\imath}$a, darg $\hat{\imath}$a, duraq $\sim$ turquai. Vowel dropping (or reduction) is found in both older Mo. languages: S kelmiçin ‘interpreter’, pirtiçin ‘post-office clerk’, qirtiçin ‘executioner’, sagsagci ‘quiver-bearer’, etc. (8 examples) = Y kelmerci, irtiçi, *girikiçi, sacraci. For Q cf. tawasa ‘dust’ (Sien-pi tawucin, Y tawsun, T toγ), also 4.12 (dabusun < dabun); by the way, the loanwords in M are in all probability from Q. T baltal shows dropping, and so do bu $\hat{\imath}$a $\hat{\imath}$a ‘wheat’, yag $\hat{\imath}$an ‘brownish’, barga $\hat{\imath}$a ‘whip’ = Y bura $\hat{\imath}$a, jeferen, beriye.

4.11. Final vowels of final consonants is characteristic of Q. M is not concerned, since at the end of the word only vowels and -n are admissible. The situation in S is not very clear, since most of its words end in -n (25 of 33), v. 4.1. However, preservation of auslaut vowels is likely, cf. čino ‘wolf’, modi ‘province’, toki ‘old’, törō ‘law’ = Y čino, moji, toki, tōrō. Y preserves the final vowels, and so does D (where, however, secondary dropping occurs). Q shows reduction or dropping: míro ‘river’, nōrd $\sim$ nōrd ‘day’, sēr ‘month’, taula ‘hare’, tawasa ‘dust’ = Y mōren, naran, sara, taula (D taula), tawsun. T shows dropping, e.g., in yalava ‘ambassador’ (cf. 4.7.), lār- ‘to be dimly visible’ = Y lērē- (the root is ile ‘visible’). However, this may represent an
internal T development: T and Q may have dropped auslaut vowels independently from each other (cf. author in Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı - Belleten 1975-1976, 19-22, 37-39).

The formula is: T = Q, ≠ S/M/Y/D.

4.12. Proto-Mo. -b- has been preserved in Y and M: Y dabusun ‘salt’ = M dabsun. It is also found in S: tabaqcin ‘infantryman’, cf. Y tabaq ‘foot sole’. Q shows dropping of -b- (at least before u/ü): dausu ‘salt’, tau ‘five’, oo/ö ‘winter’ = Y dabusun, tabun, öüb. (The exception ebeüe ‘old man’ may be explained as < *ebge). D has tau ~ twu ‘five’, but u clinically ~ şule ~ agul ~ eule ‘winter’; before -a- -b- became -w- , e.g. dawa- ‘to cross over’ ~ dua- (Y daba-); cf. Khalkha tawan, daw-. This may (but must not) have been an early development: tabun > twun > taw(w)u. In T -b- (or -p-) has been preserved, later on becoming -v- > -w-: yalaça (4.7), təbəi (4.2), yabcan ~ yavcan ‘wormwood’, also in such words as may be of T origin: Y aba ‘hunt’. This is a conservative form.

The formula is: T = S/M/Y, ≠ Q, (?) D.

4.13. Q shows palatalisation in such cases as när, sär (v. 4.11), så ‘good’ (Y/M/D sain, T sar). nöyp ‘dog’ (Y noqai). It is unclear if M niıxor ‘wolf’ may be compared to nöyö; even at any rate, M does not normally palatalize. S/Y/D show conservative, unpalatalized forms, and so does T.

The formula is: T = S/Y/D, ≠ Q, (?) M.

4.14. Y -ı- finds its parallel in modern -ıv2- (V2 = vowel of the following syllable, which phenomenon is called i breaking), e.g., Y singgor ‘a kind of falcon, Hierofalco gryfaico’ = Ordos sinxor or Y sibær ‘bird’ = Khalkha suwe (siibun > diboun). S has i, as has Y: cinı ‘wolf’; giriücin ‘executioner’ (> girıqıcin). Q has breaking: saua ‘falcon’ (D sısör) = Y sibagun. M follows (like D) the pattern of Q: şıgkon ‘falcon’, sara- ‘to whiten’ (Y sira ‘yellow, pale’, sira- ‘to gild, to roast’), nıxun ‘to stamp’ (Nanai nıxor ‘to knead’; Y niqı-). In T we find singgor (11th century, i.e., before the Yüan period), but Singgor in personal names of the Yüan period, as a loan from Y. (Han-Woo Choi, in Central Asiatic Journal 35, 1991, 48 explains T singgor from Ancient Chinese ziwong ‘pine and kindred trees’ + ku ‘t’ migratory bird, larger than but resembling the crested lark, a falcon.’ A thorough evaluation of this assertion would cover at least four pages; here only I want to hint at the fact that ziwong-ku’t as an ensemble, and that means: as a word, is not documented in Chinese and that songgor means Hierofalco gryfaico, wingspan 51-56 cm, without crest, a northern bird of prey - which by no means resembles the crested lark, wingspan 17 cm, a song-bird.) A further sample may be čuglan ‘title of the Qarluq tribe’, perhaps comparable to Y ĉiŋli- ‘to gather, to collect’ (rather than to čupa-’same meaning). Yet we also find T čıpį- ‘sparrow-hawk’ = Y čıpį (ords xarqı). We may assume several layers of borrowing, partly from S (with i), and partly from Q (with breaking); the T forms of the Yüan period go back to Y, as I explained. That is to say, Q is a progressive dialect which has influenced both T (partly) and M.

We may presume: T forms with i ← S (and Y), such ones with breaking ← Q.

4.15. ‘Iron’ is tımür both in T and S. In the small vocabulary of S this notion is not documented, M has Tungus sele. In Q, on the other hand, we find not on gaso, to which D kaso (and also Bargu Mongolian xasu) may be compared. For the history of this word cf. Ligeti in Acta Orientalia Hungarica 1, 150-156 (8th century Kirghis qasa, perhaps a loanword from South Sa-moyed). Further samples of the Mo. Vocabulary in T cf. in A and B. These are mostly titles, astronomical terms, (such as colpan ‘Venus’, hulkăr ‘the Pleiades’) and terms of camel breeding.

Of interest is the preservation of -ı- in D, e.g., colpon (Y ĉolbon, colbon), cf. also M arfa ‘barley’, not ← T arpa, but ← S/Q *arpa (Y arba), cf. 4.2.

5. Let us summarize:

1) D must clearly be distinguished from Y (and all its modern dialects). The tradition of the Daghir people that they are descendants of the Qitai can be confirmed from the linguistic view-point. Other features link it with Y. (These may, but must not, be secondary.) D takes a middle place between Q and Y; but Q is in most cases the older layer (found in 4.2/4/8/12/14/15).

2) M shows features both of S (4.1) and Q (4.13/14); several features are common to S and Q, in contrast to Y (4.2/4/7/8/10). It takes a middle position between S and Q. (Recent loanwords from Y are also to be found.)

3) T shows some features resembling Y which, however, are rather ar-
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The runic graffiti at Yar Khoto

Marcel Erdal
(Jerusalem)

Quite some time ago, Talat Tekin’s Grammar of Orkhon Turkic, a model of structuralist description, served me as introduction to runic Turkic. It is natural, therefore, that I honor Professor Tekin’s 65th birthday with an edition of some runic texts. The contribution of these scribblings to our knowledge of the life and language of the early Turks may not be all too significant; this is no reason for them to be forgotten, however. The information to be gleaned from the character inventory of the Yar Khoto inscriptions, e.g., certainly adds something to our understanding of Turkic runic epigraphy in general, many products of which are still quite obscure.

The 13 graffiti to be dealt with here were discovered in 1898 by D. Klementz, who made squeezes of them by using black coloring on textile. The squeezes were kept in the Asiatic Museum in St. Petersburg, together with those of Chinese and Uyghur inscriptions and a single Tibetan one found, like them, in Yar Khoto. Information about the local circumstances of the discovery is supplied by Klementz in Klementz and Radloff, especially p. 24 ff., 34 ff. and 46ff. In the same publication, in his part named Altuiurige Sprachproben aus Turfan, Radloff reproduced, transcribed and translated the graffiti nr. 3, 4, 6 (p. 80-83) and the second half of 7 (p. 24 of the above). There is an important remark on them in Thomsen, 1910, to which we return below. The only other scholar to deal with the Yar Khoto graffiti was Orkun, 1940: 205-6. He based his account on what was offered in the publication of Klementz, reprinting the retouched photographs of two of the graffiti, 4 and 7. The most recent mention of the Yar Khoto graffiti which I have come across is in Vasil’ev, 1983: 38. Vasil’ev’s only source for these graffiti appears also to have been the joint work of Klementz and Radloff. The readings and interpretation appearing below differ significantly from what was proposed both