boring this statement, it can be remarked that the etymologies quoted are not only correct but also sufficiently complete. The author of these lines would like to expand and supplement some of them. Thus, Ev. *deer* ‘bird’ (cf. *deleg* ‘to fly’) is, indeed, to be compared with Mongolian (Buriat) *degde* ‘rider’, *degde* ‘to rise’, and with Mo. *dege- *deger ‘on, above, *degde* ‘up, upward’, Chuv. *deger* ‘upper part, up, on’, AT *dyg* ‘good’. There is no doubt that Manchu (Ma.) *dele ‘top, on, *dergi ‘top, above’, Lam. *de*n, *de* ‘above, on’, *de* ‘to move’ on, (along) the top also belong here. As for Ev. *deger* ‘upper, *deger* ‘above, *des* ‘upper part’, etc., it might go back to *de*-s, consequently, also belong in this group of words. This expanded etymology still corroborates the statements made by Tsintsurs. It is to be mentioned, in this connection, that Tsintsurs carefully points out loan words which occur side by side with genetically related words, e.g., Ev. *deger* ‘to rise’ < Mong.

Spoking of the words for the bird, also Buriat (Bur.) *dalbar* ‘young bird’ should be mentioned which is etymologically connected with Mo., Khalkha (Kh.), Bur. *dai* ‘wing’. Another word for wing is Mo. *dalabão* < *dalabáo* from Mo. *dac* ‘scapula’, Mongol (Mng.) *dań* ‘shoulder’ = Turkm. jál ‘mane’, Yak. *söl* ‘the fat under the manes of a horse’. Mo. *dalabáo* is formed with the well-known suffix for covers -boi, e.g., Mo. *elgeboi* ‘waistcoat’ from eligen ‘liver, abdominal region’. As for Ev. *dal* ‘scapula of a deer’ it is a borrowing from Mongolian.

It is quite possible that Mo. *dac* ‘scapula’ and *dai* ‘wing are etymologically related. In this case, the primary stem *dal* can be established. Cf. also Mo. *dalan* ‘nape, fat on the nape’ > Ev. *dal* Anyway, Bur. *dal* ‘young bird’ and Mo. *dai* ‘wing’ belong together and can probably be connected with Turkic (Lev., Kumd.) *jalaj* ‘name of a bird’, Tel. *jalayay* ‘name of a bird’, Tel. *jala* *dai* ‘to hover’ (said of birds). Mo., Kh. *dai* *to swing, brandish the arms, flap the wings’ etc. > Tel. *talaj* probably also belong here.

The pattern of *bird* < *fly*, *to rise, top, above* is corroborated by AT *wu* *predatory bird* < *wu* ‘to fly’ or Yak. *kibar* ‘bird’ < *kib* ‘to fly’ (cf. *kibar* ‘to lift, raise’ = Mong. Kalm. *kib* and Lam. *kuger*). Moreover, the existence of several groups of words for bird which are connected with the idea of flying or rising or top, on, above makes it very probable that the same ideas underly some other words for bird. Thus, the etymology established by Tsintsurs for Ev. *nii* ‘duck’, Ma. *nī* ‘id.’ and Mo. *nīs* ‘fly’ is quite plausible. The difficulty is, however, that Mo. *nīs* has no etymology in Mongolian, and it is hard to say whether final -s is a suffix or belongs to the stem, although Mongolian has a number of verbs formed with -s. On the other hand, Ev. *nii* < *ni-kei* ‘duck’ can be compared with Mo. *nuqewn* < *nuqewn* < *nuqit* + *nu* ‘duck’. The objection can be made that *nuqit* is back-vocalic whereas *ni-kei* is front-vocalic. However, Mo. *nīs* ‘to fly’ is originally a stem of back vowels because the causative

* Called lexikalischer modul, i.e., lexical module at Tsintsurs, op. cit., p. 4.
* G. J. Rawicz: Zur Verbeambildungsliebe der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen.

Excerpts from the Vocabulary of the Altai Languages

By Nicholas Poppe (Seattle)

One of the new trends in Altaic linguistics in the USSR is the awakening interest in comparative studies. A few years ago, a conference on the Altaic affinity took place as a result of which a valuable symposium appeared 1. The initiative belonged to the Soviet scholars in the Tungus field whose accomplishments belong in the most remarkable achievements of Soviet Oriental studies.

Not long ago, an interesting book on comparative lexicology of the Altaic languages appeared 2 which will have a strong influence on the future development of Altaic comparative studies.

The Altaic languages possess a large body of common words. Many of them are borrowings from one Altaic language in another language but many words are of common origin. The existence of loan words in one Altaic language taken from another has never been denied 3. However, all words common to the Altaic languages are not borrowings. In most cases, borrowings and cognate words can be distinguished from each other. The criterion is the sound correspondence. Thus, knowing that Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus have 4 versus Turkic 5, Ev. N. *gamsik* ‘the omentum of the reindeer’ and Mo. *sengjii ~ sengyi the omentum of domestic animals’ must be regarded as borrowings from Turkic, cf. Chuv. *samdor* ‘fat, thick’, Uig. *sanship ‘fat’. Likewise, Ev. V.-L. *giti* ‘cous’ is an obvious borrowing from Ancient Mongolian (Amo.), cf. Amo. *gelide > Mo. *gige ‘cous’, because the regular correspondence is Ev.P.-T *gelimik ‘occupant’, Neg. *gelumluk, whereas Lam. Yu. *kiti* ‘occupant’ is a borrowing from Yakut, cf. Yak. *kudze ‘occupant’. Consequently, there are criteria which enable the investigator to distinguish between borrowings and words of common origin.

1. In her introductory article 6 the tasks of comparative lexicology of the Altaic languages, the editor of the volume mentioned and a prominent scholar in the Manchu-Tungus field, Tsintsurs, rightly states that the comparative lexicology ultimately leads to the problem of establishing the original common vocabulary of genetically interrelated languages, the shortest way to achieve this purpose being comparative study of entire semantic groups of words such as kinship terms, names of parts of the human body, names of animals, etc. Taking as an example the concept ‘bird’ (bird in general, particular birds), Tsintsurs finds that the Altaic languages use at least three lexical models, the first of them being composed of words derived from the verb ‘to fly’ 7. Speaking of the examples corroborated

2 Očekát ravnovenčích lexikologických altajských jazykov. Leningrad 1972, 382 pages.
4 Cf. Ev. *gér* ‘to seek, to go around, to search a place’ = Mo. *kerti* ‘to roam, to wander’ = Chag. *kar* Uig. *kitse ‘to go through, to run through’, Osm. *kis* ‘to go around, to go for a walk, to wander’.

Remarks
verb *nieqa* - 'to fly' is back-vocalic in the dictionary *Mukaddimat al-Adab*. It is known that many original stems of back vowels have become front-vocalic in Mongolian. The conclusion drawn from this examination of the etymology of Ev. *sik* 'duck' is that its validity cannot be proven beyond doubt.

The fact that words are often formed on the same pattern in different Altaic languages can be helpful in establishing etymologies. Thus, knowing that Mong. *čalgin* 'lightning' is a noun formed from the verb *čal* - 'to flash, to sparkle', cf. Tel. *jālyān* - 'lightning', Tub. *jālyān* - 'id.' from AT jala - 'to flare up, to catch fire', cf. also AT jān - 'to burn', Osm. jāj - 'to burn' (tr.), primary stem *ja-*, one would expect the word for lightning to be in Tungus also a noun from the verb *ja* - 'to flash, to glitter, etc.'. Indeed, Ev. *tšwara* 'lightning' is formed from the primary stem *tša-*, cf. Orok. *tša* - 'to light up'. It is true that lightning goes back to the verb to light or sparkle in many languages but it should not be noted that this is not always the case, cf. Russ. molnitaja 'lightning'.

A model can also be discovered in Burjat *üdegei tüdey* 'the depressions on both sides of the patella' (lit. 'the eyes of the knee'), Kh. *vudogni mūd* 'id.', cf. Chuv. čerküdхи 'knee' < čer* 'id.' = Turk. *te* 'knee' + Chuv. küdхи = Turk. küs 'its eyes', cf. Uzb. tizَ xis* 'kneecap', cf. Tat. toz *kis* 'a patch on the knee'.

The examples given above are easy but the same method is applicable to doubtful cases which need careful examination. Thus, Mong. *erike*, Kh. *erg* 'the smoke opening in the roof of a yurt' is probably a noun derived with the suffix *ke* from er* - 'to dig'. On the other hand, Turk. *esk*, Turkm. *esk* 'door', Az. *esk* 'outside, yard', Chuv. *alak* 'door' could be nouns derived with the suffix -k from *esk* - 'to dig', cf. Az. *esk* - 'id.', Chuv. al* - 'to plough', al* - 'to dig'. If this etymology is correct, a pattern could be established, namely, 'opening in a wall or roof from digging' which would point in the direction of a primitive underground dwelling with an entrance (which could also have served as a smoke opening) in the roof. It should be emphasized that this is a hypothesis which is, however, worthwhile to be worked on.


11 For the suffix *-ke* cf. Mong. *sik* 'clay for plastering walls' from sik* - 'to smear, to plaster'; *meka* 'stones falling from mountains', cf. *meka* - *to shed* (a causative verb) from *mea* - Mong. *sige* 'origin, meaning, significance' from *sig* - AT id - 'to follow'; *sige* < *siga* 'a large nose' from *siga* - *to prick, to perforate*, cf. Mong. *siga* 'hairpin', etc.


13 It should be mentioned that the comparison of Mong. *erike* 'smoke opening' and Ev. *wir* 'door' has already been made by O. A. KOSTANZINA: *Tungus-iran* dekstsa eksis, svjastanaja s zilisëm, op. cit., pp. 240-241. She also mentions the obsolete Ev. word *form* which denotes a type of dwelling through which the entrance. Mong. *erike* is a noun derived from er* - 'to dig'. In evenki, however, the verb 'to dig' is *ri* which corresponds to the Mongolian form. It is, however, difficult to connect Ev. *wir* with *erike* as a borrowing from Mongolian.

Speaking of patterns or models, one should not forget, however, that some cases may be explained as calques. Thus, although Mong. *gorg* and Turk. *ebh* 'wife' can be regarded as words formed after the same model, Mong. *gorg* - 'to marry' (lit. 'to acquire a house') and Crim. *Osm. *edih* - 'to marry' could be calques. Calques may also be Kh. *naxin* *nɔk* 'sweetbread' (lit. 'dog's snout'), Bur. *nɔxin* *nɔk* 'id.' (id. 'dog's snout'), cf. Tel. *i tørn* 'id.' (lit. 'dog's snout'), Osm. *i türn* 'id.' = Kaz. *i türn* 'id.'.

Calques are also Bur. *uğ* *męng* 'gold' (lit. 'red silver'), Yak. *kysyl* *küm* 'id.' (lit. 'red silver'), and Ev. *ular* ~ *ular* *męng* 'id.' (lit. 'red silver'), *męng* being a Mongolian loan word.

Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between calques and expressions of independent origin, e.g., Mong. *šag* *sib* *wan* Kh. *teqən suwa* 'sawan' (lit. 'white bird') and Turk. *agq* *swan* (lit. 'white bird') because the swan is white and is also called 'a white bird' in many languages, cf. Russ. *lebed* = Middle German *leip* ~ *leip* 'id.' (original meaning 'white') = Lat. *albus*.

One can agree with what TARKHANSAYS about the necessity of investigation of entire semantic groups of words such as the names of parts of the human body. Thus, when it is found that a given language possesses a number of such words borrowed from another language, this may shed light on the origin of some other words belonging to the same group. Let this be illustrated with the following examples. It is known that the Turkic words for domestic animals of a particular age are borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Chag. etc. *důn* 'a four-year-old horse' and Oir. *tanjan* 'three-year-old foal'. Likewise, Turk. *ulan* 'a five-year-old animal' is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Oir. *tala* ~ *sib* from Mong. *labu* 'five'; Tuva *gjalag* < Mong., cf. Kh. *xiadalan* 'a four-year-old horse'; Tuva *sjojlan* < Mong., cf. Kh. *sjojlan* 'a five-year-old horse'; *Tsuq* *üj* 'a horse' *üj* < Mong., cf. Mong. *üj* 'three to five-year old stallion', Kh. *üj* 'id.'; Tel. *radloff* *ünöölö* 'a young marmot'; *ünöölö* < Mong., cf. Kh. *mon* 'a one-year-old marmot'. In view of these examples it is doubtful that Mong. *seli* 'three-year-old sheep' could be a borrowing from Old Bulgarian because in all the examples given above Mongolian is the lending language. Besides, Old Bulgarian *seli* is nowhere attested, and the only evidence — if it can be called so — is Chuv. *šil* 'tooth'.

Similarly, Mong. *daga*, Kh. *daga* < *dak* 'one-year-old foal' can hardly be regarded as being a Mongolian loan word (cf. Osm. *jap*, Kaz. *jaboj*, etc.) because neither Mong. *morin* 'horse' nor *goyul* 'mare' nor *ug* 'a foal in its first year' are borrowings. In general, before declaring a word a borrowing, it should be carefully analyzed as a member of a given semantic group of words.

14 Cf. the calques Russ. *snabubuna* and German *Verpflichten* 'for get-me-not', a calque of Middle French *nez louchus me*.


17 SCHRECK, op. cit., p. 94.

18 SCHRECK, op. cit., p. 93.

19 SCHRECK, op. cit., p. 146.

2. The article by Tantsiusi : Contributions to the etymology of Altaic kinship terms 21 deals with the words *eme, *ene, *eke, *epe, *apa, *a-i, *ere, *a-de, *aka, and *pûre. The kinship terminology constitutes a large group of terms. Like any other semantic group (e.g., parts of body, names of animals, etc.), the kinship terminology does include borrowings in many languages, e.g. Engl. cousain, aunt, nephew, and niece which are borrowings from Old French, and ultimately go back to Latin original forms; cf. Czech komotra ‘godmother’, from Czech komor ‘godfather’, OSl. kometra ‘godmother’ from Latin commater; cf. Finnish morsian ‘bride’ < Balt., tytär ‘daughter’ < Balt.; cf. Turkish hemhîre ‘sister’ < Pers. hâm-hîre, etc. However, the borrowed kinship terms refer mostly to more or less remote but not to immediate relatives like parents. Thus, the English terms father, mother, son, daughter are not borrowings, and to give here a few examples of native words from another language which has a large number of loan words, the following Finnish (Suomi) kinship terms are supplied: taä ‘father’, emä (emö) ‘mother’, lapsi ‘child’, pois ‘son’ (but tytär ‘daughter’ < Balt.), veli ‘brother’, sisä ‘sister’ which are genuine Finno-Ugric or at least Finnic words. Therefore, when examining the kinship terminology, Tantsiusi 22 is on a safe ground although, among the kinship terms, there are loan words, e.g., Ev.Barg. bahä ‘husband of the younger sister’ 23 = Mong., cf. Mo. bajä ‘husbands of two sisters’ > Tat. bajä ‘husband of the sister of one’s wife’; Kaz. böle ‘children of two sisters’ = Mong., cf. Mo. böle ‘sons of two sisters’; Ev.Barg. jä ‘nephew, niece’ = Mong., cf. Kh. dzês, Bur. zê, Mo. jëge ‘grandchild (child of the daughter)’ = Turkm. jegen ‘nephew’, Osm. jâgün ‘id.’ also ‘grandson’; Yak. äûrüng ‘wife of the elder brother of the husband’ < Mong., cf. Kh. bergén ‘wife of the elder brother’, Mo. bering < *berink ‘id.’; Ev.V-L. kürüng ‘brother-in-law (husband of the younger sister)’ < Mong., cf. Mo. kürügen < *kürükén, Kh. khürügen ‘husband of one’s daughter or sister’; Ev. kûëg ‘husband of the younger sister’ < Yak. kûëg ‘husband of one’s elder sister, husband of one’s aunt’, cf. AT. kûrüt ‘son-in-law’, Tat. kûȝ ‘id.’, Chuv. kû ‘id.’; all Turkic forms < Mong. kû ‘id.’ < kû ‘depil ‘younger brother of the wife’, etc. According to Tantsiusi, the total number of kinship terms occurring in individual Altaic languages amounts to about thirty, and they are investigated in great detail in her article. Many words had been compared, and good etymologies had been established by the predecessors of Tantsiusi but the value of her discussion is in its thoroughness and the abundance of details such as words etymologically connected with the kinship terms, e.g., Mo. emege- ‘to grow old’, emebile- ‘to act in the manner of women’, emegeti ‘woman’, etc. The great value of her article is also the detailed discussion of the morphemes forming the words in question. Thus, the words denoting persons who are substitutes for blood relatives (e.g., stepmother) are investigated in detail from the point of view of the suffix forming them, e.g., Ev. amirta ‘stepfather’ from amit ‘father’. Tantsiusi is right when she says that some suffixes are rather obscure 24. Indeed, words as emegeti ‘female’ from eme ‘woman’ belong to a rare morphological type. Such words are Mo. eregi ‘male’ from ere ‘man’, nojagi ‘prince’ from nojan ‘id.’, gurugi ‘woman’ from gatun ‘lady, wife of a prince’. It is obvious that the suffix is -teš ~ -teš which is probably a compound one and is to be analysed as -teš where -teš is well known but -š is obscure. On the other hand, -gən 25 is a well-known suffix and occurs mostly on nouns denoting colours. It forms e.g. male suffixes for female animals, e.g., gara ‘black’ (female) from gara ‘black’ (male). A few other stems also take this suffix, e.g., eme-e ‘female’ from eme ‘woman’ (and by analogy ereg ‘male’ from ere ‘man’), urug ‘a bow covered with a thin layer of horn’ from uru ‘long’, anege ‘maid servant’ (from ‘). Here again the suffix is composed of -gən ‘of unknown function and -š. Analysing emege ‘female’ as eme-gən (23), Tantsiusi identifies emeg with AT e Москвы ‘emik ‘breast’ (24). If this etymology is correct, Mo. *emeq in emege and emegeti must be a noun in -g formed from *emeq- ‘to suck’, cf. AT em- ‘id.’, Az. am- ‘id.’, Turkm. em- ‘id.’. It is a tempting etymology but, in view of absence of the verb *emeq in Mongolian and obscurity of the elements constituting the suffixes -ge and -gən, this etymology is hypothetical. As for Mo. eme ‘woman’, female and Chuv. ama < *eme ‘female of an animal’, similar words are found also in the Uralic languages, of Finnish emä ‘mother, female’, emánti ‘housewife’, etc. 26.

Speaking of Mo. egeči ‘elder sister’ (31), cf. egečim ‘the elder one’ (as opposite of dög in ‘younger one’ from dög ‘the younger sister’ in the Secret History) 27, the interesting Şagai form negü ‘sister-in-law’, wife of the elder brother, aunt, wife of the younger brother of the father is to be mentioned which, in spite of resemblance to Mo. nagüa ‘maternal uncle, relatives of the mother’, has nothing in common with the latter. Continuing the discussion of eke, egeči, etc., it should be remarked that comparison with A a ‘iğ ‘mother’ (31) is doubtful because as a rule, Türkik o does not correspond to Mo. e. The ancient *e does not become rounded unless it is followed by a labial consonant, e.g., ıpiki ‘lung’, cf. Mo. obäği < *ıpäği, Kh. қişt ‘breast’, Ev. ıpiki ‘lung’, Ma. uführt < *ıpäği ‘lung’, Ev. ügü ‘rib’, etc. However, Mo. öküi, Kh. қәi ‘elder sister’ (31) and Ordos ökch ‘aunt’ belong to AT ök ‘mother’. Proceeding to *epi< *apa, the author of these lines agrees with Tantsiusi that the vocalism e/i poses difficulty (32). However, no difficulty arises

23 Dobrosi regards Mo. bajä as a borrowing from Turkic although the word bajä is not attested in A andor Middle Turkic. He deduces, with an interpolation mark (?), bajä from bajh, baji ‘bajh, older woman’ etc. but this is doubtful and Mongol. baji ‘bajh, older woman’ etc. is doubtful because as a rule, Turkic *bajh does not correspond to Mo. bajh. The ancient *bajh does not become rounded unless it is followed by a labial consonant, e.g., ıpiki ‘lung’, cf. Mo. obäği < *ıpäği, Kh. қişt ‘breast’, Ev. ıpiki ‘lung’, Ma. uführt < *ıpäği ‘lung’, Ev. ügü ‘rib’, etc. However, Mo. öküi, Kh. қәi ‘elder sister’ (31) and Ordos ökch ‘aunt’ belong to AT ök ‘mother’.
24 Chmielov: op. cit., p. 23. The suffix -tas can be compared with Mo. -ay in words with derogatory connotations, e.g., fašaray ‘a contemptible ruler’ from fašar ‘ruler’: ‘contemptible ruler’ — ‘somebody who is not exactly a ruler but only acts as such’. The suffix -tas consists of -ta of verbal stems -g of verbal nouns.
25 Chmielov: op. i, c.
because of the consonants *p ~ *b since Mo. -b - in strong position goes back to *p so that Mo. aba < *dpa. What makes the Mongolian-Turkic correspondence established by Tsinthuis doubtful is that aba etc. in Mongolian denotes the father whereas Turkic apa is 'elder sister, aunt', i.e., a male relative versus a female relative. Although the undersigned agrees with what Tsinthuis says about the so-called Lallwörtar, Mo. aba 'father' and 'Turkic apa 'sister, aunt' are probably, in origin, children's words formed irrespectively of any rules. Likewise, Bur. bābāi 'father' and Turkic babaj 'id.' are Lallwörtar and hardly include the Mo. word aba as a component (cf. p. 39).

Tel., Kaz., Kirg., Khak., Shor abyysyn, Bashk. ophysn, Uzb. oseyn 'sister-in-law (wives of two brothers)' are borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Mo. abiesun 'the wife of the elder brother in her relation to that of the younger brother'. The suffix -sun > Turk. -sun ~ -sus is a typical Mongolian suffix. It is not to be analysed as -*z ~ -us as Pokrovskaja quoted by Tsinthuis believes, and abysyn is not a noun formed from the Turkic verb abyys- 'to hide'.

An interesting problem is the correspondence of front vowels to back vowels in cases as Turkic ata 'father' and Tat. åts 'id.' (p. 39). This occurs, however, mainly when the diminutive and caessive suffix -i < -oi is added to the final vowel 80.

In connection with Mo. ere = Turk. er 'man, male', a number of words etymologically related are discussed on pp. 46-48 of the article of Tsinthuis. Some of them really belong to the same primary stem but others have to be excluded. Thus, one would expect er 'man' and erkek 'male' to belong together as Tsinthuis believes. However, Turkm. är 'man' (also årlik 'courage') has the long vowel d in the initial syllable whereas Turkm. erkek 'man, male' and erk 'freedom, power of will' have the vowel e. Cf. also Az. år 'man, husband' but erük 'male' (cf. also Az. årlik 'the leading buck'), cf. Chuv. ar 'man' but irek 'freedom, free' which make such an etymology doubtful especially in view of the wider vowel in Turkm. är, Az. år, Chuv. är versus the narrower (and also short in Turkmenian versus long) in Turkm. erk, erkek, Az. årlik, Chuv. irek. Let it be added that Khalaj has år ~ här 'man' and årlik ~ hırlik 'male' 81, the primary stems of the words concerned lacking full uniformity. It is obvious that the respective Turkic words (and the Mongolian ere 'man' and erke 'power, strength') do not belong together.

An interesting group of words are Mo. üre 'fruit, child, posterity, result'. As 'result' and 'remuneration' this word occurs in the expression Mo. adi üre (p. 53). This adi should not be confused with Mo. adi 'grandson': cf. Mo. adi < *adi 'nephew, grandson' = AT adi 'id.', but Mo. adi 'merit, benefit' is hachi 'gratitude' in the Secret History 82 and, therefore, cannot be connected with Mo. adi 'grandson'.

The form hut Ç goes back to *hut Ç, cf. Orok put Ç < *pukts Ç, Ulcha pikt Ç < *pükt Ç. Tsinthuis analyses the form hut Ç as hū-t Ç and states that the

Uloha and Nanai form pikt Ç occupies a separate place. She also regards the reason for the development of the original vowel to i in Oroki as obscure (p. 55). In the opinion of the author of these lines, Ev. hut Ç < *puct Ç obviously goes back to *purt Ç. In Uloha, Nanai, Oroki, and Negidal 91 has resulted in j in cases investigated by Tsinthuis 82. Consequently, Nan. and Ulcha pikt Ç is easily explained as going back to *pükt Ç < *purt Ç. The primary stem is *pur and huril is the regular plural form with the suff. -i and the connective vowel i. As for Ma. fuse to propagote, to multiply', Tsinthuis correctly separates it from Mo. āre < hūr Ç < *pūre Ç (p. 59).

The article discussed in this section ends in a summary to which a useful table of correspondences is appended (pp. 65-70).

3. The following item in the book under discussion is Kolesnikova's article on the names of parts of body in the Altaic languages 34. Kolesnikova justly states that the names of the parts of the human body represent one of the most stable groups of words in the vocabulary of the Altaic languages. This is also the case in many other languages, e.g., Slavic, Finno-Ugric 35, etc. Her article deals with the following etymologies: *amun 'mouth', *kōkōn 'breast', *ar(u)-ka 'spine', *nirī 'spine', *dagār(u)- 'various parts of the spine', *mörō 'shoulder', *eg-in 'shoulder, collar bone', *omur 'breast, collar bone, shoulder', *ūom(u)-gān 'collar bone', *mōč 'various organs', *gari 'gara 'hand, arm, branch', *bîlek(n)-'wrist', *ebir 'hip joint', *tamir 'vein', *gede/gedi 'occupet'. There is very little one could add to the thorough examination of each word concerned. Only a few points are open to criticism which concerns the interpretation of the following words.

Mo. amasun 'grits, pap, porridge' (p. 74) is a misspelled form. The correct form is amusun which is formed with the suffix *-sun (cf. adyasun 'animal' from adyasun 'horses') from amun 'millet' which has nothing in common with amun 'mouth' with which it is compared on p. 74.

Turkic art is incorrectly explained as a borrowing from Mongolian, i.e., art 'behind' (p. 87) which is a new colloquial dative-locative form from what is art in Script Mongolian. The form art is old and already attested in Middle Turkic 84. The suffix -Ç in art (cf. or-ga 'spine') is comparable to t in art-Ç 'lower part' from al 'front', āt-Ç 'lower part', āt-Ç 'upper part, top' from (Kaz., Tel.) āt-Ç 'id.'.

Ud. āmug and Oroki āmog 'collar bone' can hardly be of the same origin as AT (Middle Turkic would be correct) 85 āmgān ~ āmgān 'the spot by the neck' (p. 94) because these words are rather isolated and occur in languages very far apart. Anyway, the form *ūom(u)-gān is hardly Common Altaic.

Kolesnikova's article demonstrates clearly that the Altaic languages

---

32 Czermjuzižlu skalun. Leningrad 1984, p. 384, with reference to Swarncarabhasa which is a Middle Turkic text.
undoubtedly possess a number of anatomical terms of common origin which is much larger than what is discussed in her article. Common Altaic names of organs of the body include also Mo. őr < *őr 'diaphragm, heart artery, inside' = Ev. ur < *őr 'stomach, abdomen' = Chuv. uur < *őr < *őr 'stomach, inside', Turk. öz 'self', Turkish öz 'inside, marrow', etc. 22; Mo. esőgüns < *eső-güns 'breast, sternum' = Ev. őtség 'lung, liver and lung', őtség 'rib' = Turk. özkö (< *) őskön 'lung', etc.

4. The zoological terminology of the Tungus languages has drawn the attention of Novikova whose excellent article on the names of animals borrowed from other languages 22 should serve as an example for future works on related subjects. The loan words in question are divided into several groups, namely, Mongolian, Turkish, Chinese, and other loan words in the Manchu-Tungus languages. The names of animals borrowed from Mongolian constitute the largest group. There is very little one can add to Novikova's discussion of the words concerned.

Mo. turosa 'mule' goes back to Chin. lo-tuši, and the Mongolian form lauosa is the 'archaicized' spelling of the same word. 20. It is not formed with the suffix *-ušan from Chin. *aš as the author believes (p. 111) which explanation contradicts, by the way, Novikova's analysis of Mo. loose < Chin. lo-tuši with the suffix -tuši given on p. 144. Indeed, Mo. loose is a direct borrowing from Chinese but not through Mongolian.

Ev. unukän 'feal' clearly demonstrates that the older Mongolian form was *unukän but not *unakän (p. 117). Mo. unagan an assimilated form with a < *u in the second syllable.

Ev. k̠p̠d̠g̠ 'a lamb born in summer' (p. 121) is an interesting form which evidences to the fact that Mo. k̠n̠je, Bur. zense 'late born' go back to *k̠n̠ji < *k̠nd̠ (< Chag. k̠nd̠ 'younger daughter').

Mo. čindagan 'white hare' goes back to *čindákän as Novikova correctly states (p. 123). Šőrérzak's etymology of this word (< šin 'true' + dagan 'feal') is justly rejected by Novikova because it is utterly fantastic.

Mo. taulisi 'hare' has never been compared with any Georgian word by Vladimírov as Novikova says (p. 123, note 133). She was misled by Vladimírov's abbreviation Grusin. ( = English Georgian) 41 which stands for an anonymous Georgian author of the 14th century. 24 Mo. omn 'wild (Anatolian horse) < Mong. of. oyon (p. 127), indeed, correspond to Chag. huna 'mule, stag' which is a borrowing from Middle Mongolian, and goes back to either *pśyama or *pśžama. Novikova, is however, right when she separates it from Tuv. wuna which is Mo. uwana (ibid.).

Novikova's etymology of Mo. činuk 'wolf' as going back to *činukna > Ev. činuka + i (p. 129) is close to our interpretation of these words 42. The Mo. form has, nothing in common with Bur. sōnogor 'having a sharp muzzle'.

It is correct to say that Ev. sājniya 'magnie' is a borrowing from Mongolian (p. 138). The latter language has borrowed it, in its turn, from Turkic because Turkic -ż- is always -z- in genuine Mongolian words whereas Mo. ž is a substitute for Turk. ž in borrowings 44. The genuine Mongolian form of this word would be *žijivični.

Speaking of Yakut, Novikova remarks that, in the opinion of Soviet scholars, the process of forming of the Yakut nation took place in the 13th-14th century (p. 140) which agrees with the opinion of the undersigned with regard to the separation of the Yakut language in the 14th century 45.

5. Dmitrieva's article on the plant names in Turkic and other Altaic languages 46 represents a valuable synopsis of words referring to the vegetation, grouped according to their general meanings in Russian, birch bark, bud, branch, etc. Each group includes the Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus words with the same meanings. The total number of groups amounts to 37 groups dealing with the anatomy of plants (grain, ear, stalk, etc.) and 139 names of plants. The same words occur often in different groups, e.g., Turk. dal 'twig' (p. 156) and dal 'willow tree' (p. 185), Turk. terek 'tree' (p. 157) and 'poplar' (p. 207). In all cases cross reference is given.

In many cases, comparison with forms in other languages is made, and in cases of borrowing, the direction of borrowing is indicated. However, in some instances, obvious loan words have not been marked as such, e.g., Khakas salaa 'branch' (p. 156) which is a borrowing from Mongolian. Likewise, Middle Turkic (but not AT) urya 'high tree' (p. 157) is a Mongolian word, cf. Kh. urzā mod 'high tree'.

The Script Mongolian form for 'ear (of corn) is not türiigûn (p. 160) but terigiijn. 47

Kara Kalpak tovaj 'forest' (p. 163) does not belong into the same group as Yak. taŋ 'forest' < *tay 'mountain' because tovaj < toqaj is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. toqai 'elbow, bend of a river, bay', Kh. tozoi 'id.' = Ev. tōkīkän < *tōkākän 'bend, turn of a river'.

The Turk. correspondence to Mo. gōlige < gōlīkē 'bud' (p. 167), the primary meaning being 'young animal, pup, young dog', is Osmn., Chag. kōšk 'young animal, an one-year old camel', cf. Hungarian kőlyök 'young dog, young of an animal' < Bulgar. 48

Turk. of 'grass, hay' does not go back to *ēt (p. 172). The form *ōt is 'fire'. Consequently, there is no reason to regard ót as a borrowing from Tokharian 49.

51 L. V. Dmitrieva: Nizvänya rastenij v türkicax i drugix al'tskax jazykax, op. cit., pp. 156-172.
53 Cf. also Khalaj: Of 'medicicine', see Dorfer: Khalaj Materials, p. 196. Khalaj has preserved the long vowels better than any other Turkic language.
DIMITRIEVA’s article is fairly complete, and only a few etymologies of plant names, established before are missing, e.g., Az. jovek ‘Artemisia’ (O Russ. evian), Mong. budurkama ‘Artemisia absinthium’ (Turk. burs‘jan’).

6. KONSTANTINOVA’s article is devoted to Manchu-Tungus words connected with dwellings. It deals with the names of various types of dwellings and their parts, such as beam, rod, door, etc. The author of the article has collected and put together a rich material which will be of great value for further research. At the same time, the article contains also a large number of words compared with those of other Altaic languages. Most of the comparisons are convincing but some of them need correction. Thus, Mo. koryian ‘fence (for cattle)’ and Ev.Nrč. koriyan ‘fence’ should be separated from Ma. korya < Mo. korya ‘shelter’ (p. 229) because Ma. koryian goes back to Mo. koryian > koryian ‘fence’ from korya ‘to forbid, to lock in’ = Turkm. qorya ‘to protect, to fence in’ whereas Mo. korya ‘shelter’ is to be connected with Chag., Kaz. qorya ‘to fortify’, qoryyan ‘fortification’, Turkm. qoryyan ‘tumulus’.

Ma. basiy < house, building’ < Mo. baijiny ‘id.’ (p. 232). It can be added that the Mongolian form, in its turn, is a borrowing from Persian, cf. Pers. pīdā bānān ‘balcony or gallery in front of a house, a terrace’ > Uzb. pēkajyvan ‘verandah on the front side of a house’.

Ev. balayan ‘dwelling, winter dwelling, dwelling under the ground, etc.’ (p. 232) is probably a borrowing from Russian (cf. balagan) which, in its turn, goes back to Turkic balayan < Pers. bālā xanī ‘upper room, balcony’.

It is doubtful that Ma. maqiy ‘tent’ and Oroc. majkan ‘id.’ could have anything in common with Chinese mu ‘tent’ (p. 234).

Ma. čačeri ‘tent’, Jurč. čāč-i-č ‘id.’ are identified with Mongolian (p. 234). The ultimate etymology is Middle Persian sātur. This word was probably borrowed first into Turkish: MPers. > MT sātur > Mo. čačer > čačer.

Mo. togoyan, Kh. tōgā ‘cauldron’ is, indeed, to be compared with Ev. togo ‘fire’ (p. 237) but Mo. togoya, Kh. tōnō ‘the wooden circle forming the edges of the smoke opening of the yurt’ is to be separated because togoya belongs to the same word family as Mo. togoya ‘to go around’, cf. Ev. Uzr. tōgor ‘to meander’ (e.g., river), cf. tokor ‘to circle, to rotate’, tokor ‘to be bent, to be encircled’, cf. Shir. toloq ‘round’, Kaz. toyaq ‘a round pretzel’, Russ. baranka, Tel., Uzb. toloq ‘round, a round log’, Tel. toloym ‘towel’, etc.

Ev. sōna ñ swona ‘smoke opening’ is certainly a borrowing from Mongolian as stated correctly on p. 237. There are very few cases in which Mo. t- appears as s- in Manchu-Tungus, cf. Mo. sefren ‘cart’ < Mo. tergen ‘id.’, Ma. sefore ‘a bundle, twenty strips of meat tied together’ < Mo. teberi ‘an armload’. It is difficult to explain the substitution of s- for t-.


RĂMMEN: Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türkischen Sprachen, 282. 1911.

VLADIMIROV: op. cit., p. 281.


The word balagan has nothing in common with Mo. balagan ‘palace, city’ and Turkic bāşq ‘city’.

Ew. sėraŋ ‘pole’ (p. 239) could be connected with Mo. sirug, Kh. ʃəraŋ ‘id.’, Sag. ʃraŋ ‘id.’, Tel., Alt., Leb., Kaz. ʃyry ‘id.’. The comparison made by the author of these lines of Mo. unin ‘rods forming the roof of a yurt’ and Ev. unin ‘curtain in a yurt’, and mentioned on p. 239 is incorrect. The correct identification of Mo. unin and Ev. unie is given by KONSTANTINOVA on the same page.

Nan. and Sol. bandā ‘bench’ (p. 249) is a borrowing from Chinese, cf. pan-teng.

Ev. and Neg. nęku ‘a platform on high posts which serves as a pantry’ is formed from nę ‘to put in’ = Mo. nęge, Bur. nę ‘to make a storage’ (p. 250). It is a genuine Tungus word but not a borrowing, whereas Mo. tagua ‘tower, storied building’ is a borrowing from Mo. tagua which could be of ultimate Persian origin, cf. Pers. zad ‘board’.

Ev. kurē ‘fence’ (p. 252) is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. kūrūjīn ‘id.’, Kh. kūl ‘id.’ but it has nothing in common with Turkic qur ‘to arrange’. Ma. quvaran ‘fence, yard, camp, barricades, etc.’ (p. 253) is probably to be connected with Mo. qoryian, Kh. zorō ‘fence, yard’. The development *u or *o > *a (uva) is known in Dagur, cf. dōnda < dūnda ‘middle’, dūgār < doora ‘below’. It is possible that Ma. quvaran was borrowed through Dagur.

7. KOLENNIKOVA’s interesting article is devoted to the names of parts of the human body in Manchu-Tungus languages, thus supplementing her article discussed in Section 3 of the present article. It contains a rich material and numerous comparisons with Mongolian. The borrowings and cognates are usually indicated as such. Most comparisons are irreproachable but some of words investigated may be interpreted differently.

Ev. ikere ‘bone, skeleton’ is deduced from the original form *kiki-ri and connected with Orok. esyγe-ii=sēri ‘vertebral column’ and Ma. ikurun ‘marrow’ (p. 64). The author of these lines believed Ev. kikere and Lam. kikri ‘skeleton’ to be akin to Mo. ikre ‘twin’ and Osm. ʃik ‘id.’ (the skeleton being, so to speak, one’s alter ego) but this is incorrect. On the other hand, Orok. esyγe-ii=sēri ‘vertebral column, skeleton’ and Ulcha stori ‘id.’ is, in the opinion of the undersigned, a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. sgeγ ‘spine, backbone, vertebra, nape of neck’, Kh. stē ‘the vertebral column from the neck to the sacrum’ whereas Ma. tγرع ‘spinal marrow’ is Mo. nγerun, Kh. nγara < *nγurun ‘id.’.

Ev. jal ‘joint’ (p. 265) can be connected with Mo. fal-ga ‘to add, to make longer by adding a piece’.

Ma. ʃolo ‘crown of the head, scalp’ could be a borrowing from Chinese (p. 273) but Mo. ʃala is certainly to be separated.

Ev. sēγi ‘cure’ (p. 276) is probably a borrowing from Mongolian, cf. West Bur. sēγa < *sēγi ‘id.’, and in view of the initial *s cannot be connected with Turk. ʃaγ ‘hair’.

Ma. ʃuaγa in jasa-i ʃuaγa ‘eye-socket’ (this meaning is more correct than ‘eye-ball’, p. 280) is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. qudagan, Kh. ʃuadaγa ‘goblet, bowl’.


Ev. kešte 'protuberant (eyes)' and Ma. bülçeyn 'id.' (p. 281) are probably borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Mo. bülceger 'id.' from bülçeji 'to open widely (eyes).'

Ma. qaşar 'the bridge of the nose' and Mo. qaşije 'gqapjej 'muzzle, snout' (p. 283) find good correspondences in Turkic, cf. Tel. Radloff gaygay 'vomer, the partition between the nostrils', ET gaygur < Mong. Ev. ornalar 'nostril' is declared to be a Mongolian loan word (p. 285). However, there is no such Mongolian word. It has, of course, nothing in common with Mo. samaa 'nose'.

Yak. jayjyk ~ čančyk (p. 286) cannot be connected with Turkic jan 'side'. It is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. sanqiq, Kh. sandiq 'the short hair which is not made into a cue', Bur. xanlag 'hair on the temples, sideburns'.

Ev. čaurgej 'temple' (p. 286) is an obvious Yakut loan word, the latter, in its turn, being a borrowing from Mongolian.

It is correct that Yak. boyo 'something protuberant or protruding', Sol. sozo 'temple', and Ma. boči 'protuberance on the brow' are of Mongolian origin, cf. Mo. boq < *bọga 'protuberances on the forehead' (p. 286), but Ev. bakač 'temple' has nothing in common with this word. Its origin is obscure.

Ev. kör 'mandible' (p. 287) can be connected with Mo. kőbehe, Kh. xovq, Kalm. kör 'edge'.

Ma. xefel 'abdomen' (p. 303) has been borrowed from Mongolian, cf. Mo. kefel < *kefeleine 'id.'.

Ev. muñur 'verniform appendix of intestine' (p. 305) goes back to Yak. muñur < *muñuñ 'blunt, closed, cul-de-sac' < Mong., cf. Mo. muñur, Kh. muñur 'id.'.

Ev. eligen 'liver' (p. 306) is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. eligen, Kh. eleg, Mho. heliken 'liver'. The genuine Ev. form should have h- However, hakān 'liver' cannot be connected with Mho. helikén because of different vowels.

To Ev. kūbāk 'bladder' < Turk. qawq < qawq (p. 307), Mo. quqanag < *qawqanag 'scrotum' are to be added.

8. Some Altaiic names of means of transportation are investigated in Muratov's article 64. It represents an interesting discussion of the words tergen 'cart, vehicle', čirqa 'sledge', čana/sana 'ski', sledge, tšgän 'wheel', tšgšt 'axle', tškär 'wheel', *toko' 'id.', mör 'id., čiyyry 'id., urapa 'id., norid 'id., köpēk 'id., and čær 'id.'.

Muratov reconstructs the Ma. form toooxy 'wheel' correctly as *toooryq, and compares it with Mo. toooryiq 'round, circle' and Kh. duqarag (p. 346). The correct Mo. form is toooryq < *tʊqärk but Kh. duqarag is to be excluded because of d- versus Mo. t-. Yak. tworang 'cone of a pine tree, etc.' is also to be excluded, because Mo. toooryq< *tooɔrąk 'cone' = Kum. tooɔrąk 'round', Tel. Slur. toooryq 'a knot at the end of the whip, Bar. tooɔrąk 'cone of a spruce'.

AT šakir < Skr. cauca 'prayer wheel' is, of course, etymologically connected with Iranian *dāra > Pers. ērī 'wheel' (p. 349) but the AT word is to be separated from čiyyry 'wheel, water wheel'. Muratov gives two possible explanations: 1. Turkic čiyyry etc. may be a genuine Altaic word, and 2. it may be a borrowing from Ancient Indian and Iranian. Doebner, however, doubts that čiyyry is an Iranian borrowing 65, and he does not compare it with Mo. čagāriq 'circle, ring, tire of a wheel'. Indeed, Turkm. čagāryk 'the cross-like connections of the upper part of the yurt' is an obvious borrowing from Mongolian. For phonological reasons — y versus a — Turk. čagāryk cannot be connected with Mo. čagāriq. Rasanėn regards čiyyry as a word neither having Mongolian cognates nor being a loan word from Iranian 66.

9. Systematic investigation of words belonging in various semantic categories, e.g., nature, celestial bodies, etc. will demonstrate that some semantic groups of words include almost no cognates and a few borrowings. Thus, the article by Dmitrieva on the plant names has demonstrated that there are no names of trees common to all Altai languages, and the few common names occur only in two language families but not all families of the Altaic language group. Thus, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus have a name of the aspen or poplar, cf. Mo. ulışasun, Kh. ulas, Bur. ulasun, Kalm. ulas 'aspen, poplar' = Ev. hula, Lamas. hul, Neg. örel, Oroq pulu, Nan. polo, Ma. fulq. (And there is no corresponding word in Turkic).

On the other hand, the category 'earth - sand - stone' includes a number of words of common origin which will be given here.


Ev. Osm. tʊmas 'blizzard, snowstorm' = Ev. toqap 'dust' = Ev. kh. tʊm 'dust' = Ev. kalm. tʊm 'dust' = Ev. olkm. tʊm 'dust' = Ev. tung. tʊbəg 'dust cloud'.

Ev. toqap 'dust', Osm. tʊmas 'blizzard, snowstorm', Chag. čuğür < *čuğür < *čuğ 'dust' = Ev. čuğ 'dust' = Ev. kalm. čuğ 'dust' = Ev. Olkm. čuğ 'dust' = Ev. Tung. čuğ 'dust'.

Ev. čuğ < *čuğ 'dust', Mo. čuğ < čuğ 'dust', Kh. gür 'iron stone' = Ev. Z. Urm. gür 'small pebbles', Skh. gür 'sand bank, sand', Neg. gür 'sand bank', Lamos. gür 'river bank strewn with pebbles', Oroq gürmi 'sand bank of a river'.

Ev. čuğ < *čuğ 'dust', Mo. čuğ < čuğ 'id.', Kh. gür 'iron stone' = Ev. Z. Urm. gür 'small pebbles', Skh. gür 'sand bank, sand', Neg. gür 'sand bank', Lamos. gür 'river bank strewn with pebbles', Oroq gürmi 'sand bank of a river'.

Ev. čuğ < *čuğ 'dust', Mo. čuğ < čuğ 'id.', Kh. gür 'iron stone' = Ev. Z. Urm. gür 'small pebbles', Skh. gür 'sand bank, sand', Neg. gür 'sand bank', Lamos. gür 'river bank strewn with pebbles', Oroq gürmi 'sand bank of a river'.

Notes:
64 S. I. Muratov: Nekotorye naimenovaniya suzputnyx sredstv perevedeniya i ix detal'j v altaiskix jazykax, op. cit., pp. 337 ff.
Diffusion des chansons de Djangar en Mongolie

Par Yōngsiyebū Rintchen (Oulanbator)

A l’aube des études mongoles en Europe tout au début du XIXe siècle un savant allemand Benjamin Berkmann dans son œuvre Nomadische Streferegien unter den Kalmaken I-IV, publié à Riga en 1802-1803, donna l’exposé de deux chansons épiques de Djangar notées parmi les Kalmouks de la Russie. Plus tard un mongolisant russe de l’origine polonaise M. J. Kowalewski trouva les chansons de Djangar aussi parmi les Kalmouks Torgoute et les mongolisants postérieurs à lui tels Pospieszły, Kotwicz, Vladimirtsov et les autres continuaient de noter et de publier des versions nouvelles et inconnues de ce grand cycle des chansons de Djangar, toujours les liant avec le nom des Kalmouks.

M. Kosine, un mongolisant soviétique très érudit, brillamment traduit en langue russe quatre chansons de la version Torgoute de Djargiade et dans son introduction fit un essai sur la formation de ces chansons chez les Kalmouks et chez les Mongols Oirats dont ils sont une branche 1.

Nous savons que le nom des Torgoutes remonte au nom de la garde de jour de Gengis formée de meilleurs guerriers de divers clans mongols du XIIIe siècle. Étant primordialement le nom d’unité militaire et administrative le nom Torgoute, avec le temps, changea en nom de tribu et nous trouvons parmi les Torgoutes d’aujourd’hui les noms des clans qui existent parmi les Mongols contemporains et étaient jugés représentés dans cette unité militaire et administrative de la garde impériale. Ce fait lui-même dit que les Torgoutes — si hétérogènes de leur origine — sont les héritiers de la culture spirituelle de tous les clans incorporés à l’unité de garde de jour, et la constitution de l’Union Oirate dont les membres étaient les Torgoutes fut un fait postérieur à l’Empire Mongol. Et M. l’académicien S. Kosine en établissant la date de la naissance de chansons de Djangar et n’osant de référer le temps de l’organisation de l’unité Torgoute bien connue de tous les sources historiques préférait de choisir le XV° siècle quand après la chute de l’Empire Mongol l’Union Oirate jouait une rôle dominante parmi les Mongols.

Cela n’excluait mais incultait la conservation des éléments de la culture spirituelle des Mongols chez les Oirates et l’existence des chansons épiques de Djangar non seulement parmi les tribus Oirates mais aussi parmi les autres tribus Mongoles. Et nous savons maintenant que les chansons de Djangar sont répandues non seulement parmi les Kalmouks de la Volga mais aussi parmi les Oirates du Sin-Kiang Chinois, de la frontière du Tibet et de la République Populaire de la Mongolie.

En 1928, dans l’aimak Oirate de Tegus Küllükh khan des Dörbetes, je rencontrais beaucoup de chantres de Djargiade et le dernier khan des Dörbétès — qui lui-même connaît par cœur quelques chansons de ce cycle