STUDIA ORIENTALIA

EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA

XXVIII: 3

# ON SOME ALTAIC NAMES OF DWELLINGS

NICHOLAS POPPE

Сектор алтейских языков

HELSINKI 1964

# On Some Altaic Names of Dwellings

## NICHOLAS POPPE

The Altaic languages <sup>1</sup> do not have names of dwellings of common origin, spread in all or in most of the languages concerned. One of the few exceptions is Ev. V 471 <sup>2</sup> harān »place for a dwelling, place for the hearth, fireplace; yurt, dwelling; encampment; bed», Ev. B 57 <sup>3</sup> harān »a place owned by somebody», Ev. B 57 harāmi »a place abandoned by the inhabitants, a place from which people have moved to another place, a place in which a yurt used to be before», Lam. C 453<sup>4</sup> harān »sleeping place» = MT <sup>5</sup> aran »stable», Tob., Kūr., Bar., Chag., Kar. aran »anteroom, yard, cow-shed» = Mo. aran

<sup>2</sup> Evenki (Tungus) after G. M. Vasilevič, Evenkijsko-russkij slovaŕ, Moskva 1958. The numbers refer here and elsewhere to pages.

<sup>3</sup> Evenki of Barguzin after N. N. Poppe, Materiali dlya issledovaniya tungusskogo yazika, Narečie barguzinskix tungusov, Leningrad 1927.

<sup>4</sup> Lamut (Even) after V. I. Cincius i L. D. Rišes, Russko-ėvenskiį slovar, Moskva 1952.

<sup>5</sup> Middle Turkic after Maḥmūd al-Kāšgharī, *vide* Besim Atalay, Divanü Lûgat-it-türk dizini »Endeks», Ankara 1943, p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Unless the source is indicated, the Turkic forms are always quoted from Radloff's dictionary.

2 X 9

¹ Abbreviations: Alt. — Altai Turkic, Az. — Azerbaijan Turkic, Bar. —
Baraba, Bash. — Bashkir, Bur. — Buriat, CA — Common Altaic (Altaic

»Ursprache»), CMo. — Common Mongolian, Chag. — Chaghatai, Crim. —
Crimean Tatar, ET — Eastern Turki, Kach. — Kacha, Kalm. — Kalmuck,
Kar. — Crimean Karaim, Kar. L — Karaim of Lutsk, Kaz. — Kazakh, Kh. —
Khalkha, Kir. — Kirghiz, Koib. — Koibal, Küär. — Küärik, Kür. — Kurama,
Lam. — Lamut (Even), Ma. — Manchu, MMo. — Middle Mongolian, Mo. —
Written Mongolian, MT — Middle Turkic, Nan. — Nanai (Goldi), Neg. —
Negidal, Oroch. — Orochi, Orok. — Oroki, Osm. — Osman Turkish, Sag. — Shor.
Sagai, Tel. — Teleut, Tob. — Tatar of Tobolsk, Turkm. — Turkmenian, Ul. —
Ulcha (Olcha), Yak. — Yakut.

»people», MMo. haran < CA \*parān. It should be remarked, in defense of this etymology established by Ramstedt, who compared the words in question with Korean param »wall, partition wall»¹, that the semantic divergence »dwelling, yard» and »people» should not raise doubts in view of Latin domus, Greek  $\delta \acute{o}\mu o \varsigma$  »house», Ionian  $\delta \mu \acute{o} \varsigma$  »prisoner of war, servant»,  $\delta \mu \phi \acute{\eta}$  »maid servant», and Cretan  $\mu \nu \acute{\phi} a$  »serfs».² It should also be added that the MMo. term haran referred mostly to ordinary, subordinated people.³ But this word is one of the few exceptions, and most words for all kinds of dwellings occur only in few Altaic languages, not having cognates in other Altaic languages and being strictly regional terms. Suffice it to say that Turkic \* $\ddot{a}b > \ddot{a}v$ ,  $\ddot{o}g$ ,  $\ddot{o}i$ ,  $\ddot{u}i$ ,  $\ddot{u}$  »house» is not found in all Turkic languages: whereas it occurs in all the »proper» Turkic languages with the exception of Yakut, it does not occur in Chuvash.⁴ It is also unknown in Mongolian and in the Manchu-Tungus languages.⁵

Some regional terms for dwellings have been discussed in literature, e.g., Mo. ayil < CA \*agil \*yurt, family, neighbor\* = Turkic ayil, aul, etc. \*enclosure, village, etc.\*; MMo. geyid < CA \*gebit \*wdwelling\* = Cuman <math>kebit \*shop\* > MMo. k'ebid \*shop\* and Russian kibitka \*yurt\*. Some terms are borrowings from one language into another language, e.g., Yak.  $ji\ddot{a}$  \*house\* < Mongolian jige.

In this article a few more Altaic terms will be dealt with.

#### 1. Buriat sōl.

Bur. sōl Alar, Tunka »house», Tunka »wall of the house», Alar, Bokhan »stove»<sup>4</sup> has no cognates in other Mongolian languages. It is mentioned but not explained in Sanžeyev's comparative grammar.<sup>5</sup> Although it is an isolated word in Buriat, it has, however, cognates in Turkic.

It is known that Bur. s goes back to CMo. \* $\mathcal{E}$ .6 Consequently, the older form must have been \* $\mathcal{E}\bar{\partial}l$ . It has been also established that long  $\bar{\partial}$  originated either from \* $\partial \gamma a$  or \* $u\gamma a$  7,  $\gamma$  standing for \*g, \*b,

Tintsius compares the Tungus and Lamut forms with Neg. palan \*floor\*, Oroch. pala id., Orok. palla id., Ul., Nan. palā id. Cf. Prof. V. I. Cincius, Sravniteľnaya fonetika tunguso-mańčžurskix yazīkov, Leningrad 1949, p. 156. This comparison raises, however, doubts in view of the correspondence r=l which otherwise does not occur and is not explained in Cincius's book. Mr. Unensechin of the University of Washington told me that in his native dialect, Khorchin, \*floor\* is also  $p'ala\eta$ . The origin of this word being obscure, I chose to exclude Neg. etc., palan and Khorchin  $p'ala\eta$  from discussion.

 $<sup>\</sup>ensuremath{\mathcal{E}}^{-2}$  J. Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3. Lieferung, Bern 1949, p. 199.

<sup>9 °</sup>s Cf. č'eri'udun noyadda »to the commanders of armies» versus č'erig harana »to the soldiers» (lit. »to the army people», obviously »ordinary people of the army»): N. Poppe, The Mongolian Monuments in hP'ags-pa Script, Second edition translated and edited by J. R. Krueger, Wiesbaden 1957, pp. 52—53. Cf. also haran »ordinary person» in N. N. Poppe, Mongol'skij slovaŕ Mukaddimat al-Adab I—II, Moskva-Leningrad 1938, p. 437.

 $<sup>\</sup>div$  \*Proper\* Turkic languages are z- and š-languages, descendants of the z-dialect of Proto-Turkic. Chuvash is an r- and l-language, a descendant of the r-dialect of Proto-Turkic.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1A</sup> <sup>5</sup> Unless this word can be connected with MMo. e'ede »Zeltgerüst, Türrahmen», cf. E. Haenisch, Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-

ch'ao pi-shi), Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen, Wiesbaden 1962, p. 42. The form e'ede may have originated from \*ebède which may be a derivation from \*ebe = Turkic äb \*house\*. The element -de in e'ede being obscure, this comparison cannot be regarded as doubtless.

<sup>12. 1</sup> Z. Gombocz, Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache, Helsinki 1912, pp. 108-109.

<sup>15 &</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> B. Ya. Vladimircov, Sravniteľnaya grammatika mongoľskogo piśmennogo yazīka i xalxaskogo narečiya, Vvedenie i fonetika, Leningrad 1929, p. 272. Cf. N. Poppe, The Turkic Loan Words in Middle Mongolian, CAJ 1 (1955), p. 39.

N. Poppe, Jakutische Etymologien, UAJb 23 (1961), pp. 136-137.

<sup>4</sup> K. M. Čeremisov, Buryat-mongolsko-russkij slovar, Sostavil — pod redakciej C. B. Cidendambaeva, Moskva 1951, p. 405.

AC 5 G. D. Sanžeev, Sravniteľnaya grammatika mongoľskix yazīkov, t. I. Moskva 1953, p. 47.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> N. Poppe, Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies, MSFOu 110 (1955), pp. 111-112.

<sup>13 7</sup> N. Poppe, The Groups \*uya and \*üge in Mongol Languages, StO 14: 8 (1950).

and some other consonants in weak position. From this the conclusion can be drawn that  $s\bar{o}l < *\check{e}\bar{o}l$  must have developed either from  $*\check{e}ug\grave{a}l$  or  $*\check{e}ub\grave{a}l$ , i.e., in the same manner as CA  $*\check{e}up\grave{a}kur > CMo$ .  $*\check{e}u\beta\bar{a}qur > Bur$ .  $s\bar{o}\chi or$  »motley, dappled» = Özbek  $\check{e}ipor^2$  id.; CA  $*kub\grave{a} > CMo$ .  $*qu\beta\bar{a} > Ordos$   $\chi\bar{o}$  »yellow, pale» = Tel., Shor., Soyot quba »pale», etc.

The Turkic word corresponding to Bur.  $s\bar{o}l$  »house, stove» is Kūr.  $\check{c}ual$  »chimney, smoke-pipe», Bash.  $s\check{u}al < *\check{c}ubal$  »kind of a fireplace or an ancient stove»<sup>3</sup>.

Bur.  $s\bar{o}l$  »house» and (original meaning) »stove» is a regular development of \* $\check{e}ub\grave{a}l$  = Turkic \* $\check{e}ubal$  > Kūr.  $\check{e}ual$  »chimney». It occurs also as a loan-word in Russian:  $\check{e}uval$  »fireplace, hearth, the front side of a Russian stove with the chimney».

#### 2. Buriat ursa.

Bur. ursa »a conic hut» corresponds to Kalm. urtsp »hut, tent without a smoke-opening in the roof». Otherwise this word is little known in Mongolian. It corresponds to Yak. urasa (pronounced as uraha) »summer-dwelling in the shape of a high conic hut made of rods covered with birch-bark or skins; a transportable hut or tent; the carcass or framework of an urasa; rods put together in the shape

of a cone». As far as it is known, no other Turkic language has this term.

Yak. urasa may be connected with Yak. urayas rod, shafts of an ox cart, poles of a yurt, fence. Yak. urā rchimney, the top of a summer yurt (urasa) with an opening for the purpose of letting the smoke out is certainly to be regarded as cognate with urasa. The fact that Yakut has urasa, urā, and urayas makes the assumption that urasa might be a borrowing from Mongolian rather improbable. It should be added that Kaluziński does not list it as a loan-word taken from Mongolian.

CMo. \*urača, Bur. ursa, Yak. urasa, urā, and urayas have cognates in Tungus: cf. Lam. C 680 uradan »hut made of tree-branches», Lam. B uran »summer yurt, tent made of tree-bark».<sup>5</sup>

The suffixes present in the forms discussed are, to a large extent, known. Mongolian  $-\check{c}a$  (> Bur. -sa) and Turkic  $-\check{c}a$  is a diminutive suffix. It is unproductive in Mongolian but occurs, i.a., in Mo.  $\check{o}r\check{o}\check{c}e$  < \* $\check{o}re\check{c}e$  \*diaphragm\* from Mo.  $\check{o}r\check{o}$ , MMo.  $\check{o}re$  \*inside, mind\*, Mo.  $u\gamma u\check{c}a$ , Kh.  $\check{u}^*t'sv$ , Kalm.  $\check{u}tsv$  \*sacrum\* from \* $u\gamma u$ , etc. It is productive in Turkic, e.g., Özb.  $-\check{c}a$  in  $kitob\check{c}a$  \*a small book\*,  $oyoq\check{c}a$  \*little foot\*, etc.\*, Karakalpak  $-\check{s}a$  in  $\check{j}ol\check{s}a$  \*a small road\*,  $qut\check{i}\check{s}a$  \*a little box\*, etc.\*

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> N. Poppe, Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen, Teil I, Vergleichende Lautlehre, Wiesbaden 1960, pp. 70-71.

<sup>2.</sup> Uzbeksko-russkiį slovaŕ, Glavniį redaktor . . . A. K. Borovkov, Moskva 1959, p. 522.

<sup>21 3</sup> Baškirsko-russkij slovaŕ, Moskva 1958, p. 493.

<sup>22.4</sup> Max Vasmer, Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bd. 3, Heidelberg 1955, p. 350. The present article has originated from a paper read at the Inner Asia Seminar, University of Washington. During the discussion of that paper, Professor O. Pritsak suggested to connect Kūr čual with MT čuvāč (Besim Atalay, op. cit., p. 162) \*tent\*. Being unable to explain the different endings of čual and čuvač and the difference in meanings (\*stove, house\* — \*tent\*), I hesitate to accept this comparison. I wish to remark, however, that other suggestions made by Professor Pritsak have been accepted with appreciation. 25.5 Čeremisov, op.cit., p. 487.

<sup>24 6</sup> G. J. Ramstedt, Kalmückisches Wörterbuch, Helsinki 1935, p. 451.

<sup>1</sup> E. K. Pekarskii, Slovaŕ yakutskogo yazīka, tom III, Leningrad 1928, p. 3062.

<sup>24</sup> Pekarskij, op.cit., p. 3057.

<sup>24 8</sup> Pekarskij, l.c.

<sup>4</sup> S. Kałużiński, Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache, Warszawa 1961, p. 120.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24)</sup> <sup>5</sup> J. Benzing, Lamutische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Sprachproben und Glossar, Wiesbaden 1955, p. 246.

<sup>%</sup> Poppe, Mongol'skii slovar Mukaddimat al-Adab, p. 382: öre ailatba  $t\ddot{u}nd\ddot{u}=$  Chag. mihribanliq qildi ana she had compassion for hims.

A. N. Kononov, Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo yazika, Moskva-Leningrad 1960, p. 126.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> N. A. Baskakov, Karakalpakskii yazīk II, Fonetika i morfologiya, Časť I, Časti reči i slovoobrazovanie, Moskva 1952, p. 180.

O. Böhtlingk, Über die Sprache der Jakuten, Teil 1, Einleitung, Jakutischer Text, Jakutische Grammatik, St. Petersburg 1851, p. 248.

As for Yak. -\(\gamma as\), it occurs as an unproductive suffix on a number of verbal stems,\(^1\) occurring also in other Turkic languages, e.g., in Turkish,\(^2\) Karakalpak,\(^3\) etc. Although it forms nouns and adjectives from verbal stems, it occurs also on some noun stems, e.g., Chag. \(\alpha rk\alpha\epsilon\) buck\(^3\) from \(\alpha r\) male\(^4\).

### 3. Turkic \*ōpay.

MT oba (probably  $\bar{o}ba$ ) \*tribe\*5, Turkm.  $\bar{o}ba$  \*village\*6, Cuman oba \*hill 7, Crim., Osm., Chag. oba \*yurt\*, Az. oba \*stone or mud hut of herdsmen\*, all going back to \* $\bar{o}pa\gamma$  8; Kaz., Shor., Küär., Koib. obā \*heap of stones, cairn\*, Sag. obā \*stombstone\*, Alt., Tel. obō \*cairn\*, correspond to Mo. oboyā < CA \* $\bar{o}pag\dot{a}$ , Bur. obō, Kh. owō, Kalm. owā \*cairn, landmark, frontier mark, heap of stones made in honour of mountain-ghosts\*.

Whereas Turkm.  $\bar{o}ba$  and Chag., Az., etc. oba are regular correspondences to Mo.  $oboy\bar{a}$  and go back to  $*\bar{o}pay$ , Kaz., Shor., etc.  $ob\bar{a}$  and Alt.  $ob\bar{o}$  are obvious borrowings from Mongolian, this being evident from the final long vowel in  $ob\bar{a}/ob\bar{o}$  and from the meaning \*cairn\* which is identical with that of the Mongolian forms.

Another form, namely  $*\bar{o}pak$ , is found in Mo.  $obog_*$  and Kh. owok »clan» \* which has the suff. -\*k.

An interesting word is Mo. oboyāqai »a conic roof; a yurt con-

sisting of the upper part of a normal yurt, placed directly on the ground, a hut», Kh.  $ow\bar{o}\chi^n\bar{e}$  id.¹, Bur.  $ob\bar{o}\chi oi$  »heap, cairn».² It has the diminutive suffix -qai, e.g., Bur  $\check{s}ub\bar{u}\chi ai$  »a little bird» from  $\check{s}ub\bar{u}n$  »bird».³ Thus Kh.  $ow\bar{o}\chi^n\bar{e}$  is »a little  $ow\bar{o}$ , a small heap», in this case »a small yurt».

Written Mongolian has also oboyādai »a conic hat of the lamas», Kh.  $ow\bar{o}p^{\nu}\bar{e}$  id.<sup>4</sup> which is provided with the diminutive suffix -\*dai, cf. Bur.  $ul\bar{a}dai$  (name of a plant) from  $ul\bar{a}n$  »red»,  $a\chi adai$  »dear little brother» from  $a\chi a$  »elder brother», etc.<sup>5</sup>

The Mongolian words Mo.  $oboy\bar{a}$ ,  $oboy\bar{a}qai$ , and  $oboy\bar{a}dai$  have further cognates such as Bur. obogor »rising, towering, heaplike», oboi- »to protrude, to tower, to rise above, to be heaplike». The original meaning of Mo.  $oboy\bar{a}$  was, consequently, »heap, cairn». It is interesting to note that obog in Buriat means both »clan» and »heap». The meaning »clan» is obviously a secondary one: »heap» > »dwelling» > »clan» (»heap» > »a heap which is inhabited» > »those who live in the latter»).

## 4. Turkic \*ōtaγ.

MT, Chag, ET  $ota\gamma$  »temporary dwelling», Turkm., Az.  $ota\gamma$  »room», Kirg.  $ot\bar{o}$  »tent», Koib., Kach.  $oda\gamma$  »hut made of tree-branches», Alt., Tel.  $od\bar{u}$  id., Kaz. otau »the new yurt of the bridegroom», Tar., Chag. otaq »hut made of branches» go back to \* $\bar{o}ta\gamma$ , the evidence being presented by Osm., Crim.  $oda < *\bar{o}ta\gamma$  »room». This word has undergone complicated developments due to numerous instances of borrowing: Az., Turkm.  $ota\gamma$  »room» and Osm. otaq »hut» are loan

A. N. Kononov, Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo yazīka, Moskva-Leningrad 1956, p. 123.

⅓ Baskakov, op.cit., pp. 406-408.

<sup>36</sup> Ahmet Cevat Emre, Türk Dilbilgisi, İstanbul 1945, pp. 179-181.

<sup>33</sup> Sesim Atalay, Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk dizini »Endeks», Ankara 1943, p. 421,

M. Räsänen, Türkische Miszellen, StO 25: 1 (1960), p. 10.

K. Grønbech, Komanisches Wörterbuch, Türkischer Wortindex zum Codex Cumanicus, København 1942, p. 173.

w & M. Räsänen, Zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen, Helsinki 1949, p. 171.

Moskva 1957, p. 291.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1/2</sup> Luvsandėndėv, I.c.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> <sup>2</sup> Čeremisov, op.cit., p. 361.

<sup>40 3</sup> N. Poppe, Buriat Grammar, Bloomington, Ind. 1960, p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> Luvsandėndėv, l.c.

Poppe, op.cit., p. 86.

 $<sup>^{4}</sup>$   $^{6}$  Čeremisov, op.cit., p. 361, cf. obog-tobog »heap», tobogor »towering, protruding, hill-shaped», toboi- »to protrude, to tower», Čeremisov, op.cit., p. 435.  $^{4}$   $^{7}$  In Osm., Crim. intervocalic \*t has resulted in d only after an original long vowel, cf. Räsänen, Zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen, p. 160.

words taken from other Turkic languages because of the intervocalic t which, after an original long vowel, results in d in the languages in question. In Turkmenian it should have resulted in  $*\bar{o}da$  if it had not been borrowed from another Turkic language. Yak.  $ot\bar{u}$  is also a borrowing because Yakut preserves the long vowels, and  $*\bar{o}$  would have developed to uo. Yak.  $ot\bar{u}$  was, furtheron, borrowed by Lamut which also has  $ot\bar{u}$  \*hut\* and \*bonfire\*.

The primary stem of \* $\bar{o}ta\gamma$  is CT \* $\bar{o}t$  \*fire\*. The suffix - $\gamma$  is here on \* $\bar{o}ta$  which is a verb formed with the suff. -a-. Consequently, \* $\bar{o}ta$ - must have had the meaning of making fire, heating, or burning. There is the verb ota- in Tar., Chag., ET \*\*to graze, to be on the pasture\* which is formed from ot \*hay\*, but the verb \* $\bar{o}ta$ - \*\*to make fire\* has disappeared, the result being that  $ota\gamma$  etc. might have been reinterpreted as being a noun derived from ota- \*\*to graze\*, i.e., as a hut which is made for herdsmen on or near the pasture, like \*yailay\*, Kaz. \*jailau\*\* summer-dwelling\* from \*yaila-/jaila-\*\* to spend the summer\* from \*yai/jai\*\* summer\*. However,  $ota\gamma$  is to be regarded, for phonetical reasons (> oda) as a noun formed from \* $\bar{o}ta$ -, ultimately from \* $\bar{o}t$  \*fire\*.

The Turkic words discussed have further parallels in Mongolian: Bur. otog »hut made of branches on a meadow», Tumet oʻtʻok »village», Kh. oʻtʻok »group of yurts, clan, group of hunters; extinguished hearth, ashes and coals remaining after a bonfire, a place in which a bonfire was some time ago», Kalm. otok »clan», Mo. otog »group of yurts, clan» and »traces of an old fire», like Lam. otak »hut» and »bonfire», thus corroborating the etymology \* $\delta tay$  < \* $\delta t$  »fire» + -a + CA -\*g.

Mongolian has preserved other words derived from  $*\bar{o}t$  »fire»: cf. Mo.  $od\check{c}igin$  »youngest son»  $< *\bar{o}t$  »fire» + \*tigin »prince», a borrowing from Ancient Turkic; Mo. odqan »youngest son», »deity of fire» <

\* $\bar{o}t$  »fire» + qan »khan»¹, also a borrowing from Turkic; Mo.  $o\check{e}i < *od\check{e}i < \text{CA} * \bar{o}t\check{e}i$  »spark» (like Turkic  $o\check{e}aq$  »fireplace»  $< *\bar{o}t$  »fire» + suff.  $-\check{e}aq$ ).

The word \*ōtay is also found in Tungus but there it is a borrowing from Mongolian, cf. Ev. Nerchinsk otok »outdoor lavatory»<sup>2</sup>, Ev. Nerch. and B otog »hut made of bark or grass».<sup>3</sup> It also occurs as a loan-word in Sayan Samoyed.<sup>4</sup> As for Titov's opinion that otog is of Sogdian origin <sup>5</sup>, it lacks supporting evidence.

In conclusion, it may be remarked that the Altaic languages possess a number of words for dwellings. The etymologies of most of them are obscure. Thus, Lam. C 689 has  $un\bar{e}n$  »yurt» (also  $e\bar{o}ra$   $un\bar{e}n$ ) and Olekma Ev. V 449 has  $unenk\bar{i}$  »lower cover of a yurt» which correspond to Mo. unin, Kh. uni »rods of the roof of a yurt» Bur.  $un\bar{a} < CMo$ . \*uni- $g\hat{a}$  id. It is hard to say whether rods for the roof» or syurt» is the primary meaning and what the primary stem \*uni was.

As for the few words discussed in this article, two of them reflect the idea of fire or hearth. These are Bur.  $s\bar{o}l$  and Turkish oda. Further investigation might tell what the origin of Turkic \* $\ddot{a}b$ , Mongolian ger, and some other words is.

<sup>1</sup> Cincius i Rišes, op.cit., p. 680.

 $<sup>5 \</sup>circ {}^{2}$  Cincius i Rišes, op.cit., p. 235.

si <sup>3</sup> Čeremisov, op.cit., p. 379.

<sup>52 4</sup> Luvsandendev, op.cit., p. 311.

<sup>83 5</sup> Ramstedt, Kalmückisches Wörterbuch, p. 291.

<sup>7</sup> N. Poppe, Zum Feuerkultus bei den Mongolen, Asia Major 1 (1925), p. 132.

<sup>55 &</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Vasilevič, op.cit., p. 329.

<sup>16.</sup> Poppe, Materiali dlya issledovaniya tungusskogo yazika, p. 52.

<sup>7.3 4</sup> Aulis Joki, Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen, Helsinki 1952, p. 249.

<sup>🤧</sup> E. I. Titov, Tungussko-russkij slovać, Irkutsk 1926, p. 124.

<sup>&</sup>gt;> 6 Luvsandėndėv, op.cit., p. 457.

Ceremisov, op.cit., p. 482.