

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Turkish Ghost Words

Author(s): Gerard Clauson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 3/4 (Oct., 1955), pp. 124-138

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25222750>

Accessed: 22/08/2012 05:32

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Turkish Ghost Words

By GERARD CLAUSON

(PLATE III)

THIS is a fuller version of the paper which I read at the recent International Congress of Orientalists at Cambridge. It has been prepared in compliance with several requests from those who heard it for something on paper which they could study at leisure.

For the last two and a half years I have been engaged in compiling a historical dictionary of Turkish ; it cannot be completed for a good long time to come if, indeed, I am ever able to complete it, and it does seem useful that I should at any rate publish a paper on one particular aspect of the matter which has emerged from the work so far done.

My principal working tools are a large collection of dictionaries and indices of Turkish words in various dialects, together with the basic texts on which they rest. The astonishing thing is that nearly all of these books contain numbers, some more and some less, of what I have called "ghost words", that is words which either

- (1) never existed at all,
- or (2) never had the meanings ascribed to them,
- or (3) are foreign words which were never really used in Turkish,
- or (4) are genuine Turkish words but never occurred in the dialect to which they are attributed.

Let me say at once that I do not suggest that there is anything improper, or indeed unusual, about making a few mistakes of this kind, particularly in such a difficult subject as Turkish etymology. Even the greatest scholars have made some. Very often they are due simply to insufficient knowledge, which it is the duty of us and our successors to rectify. But it is important that mistakes, when discovered, should be corrected, for experience shows that once a ghost word gets into one dictionary, it is repeated in subsequent ones. Until these ghost words are identified and unmasked, they will remain to mislead future generations of Turkish etymologists. Indeed, some may already have done practical damage to the Turkish language. For a good many years past attempts have been made in Turkey to purge the language of foreign elements and revive genuine old Turkish words which have fallen into disuse. These attempts have aroused violent controversies in Turkey, in which it would be improper and indelicate for foreign scholars to take part.

But we can at any rate help all participants to establish some of the facts round which the controversy rages, and that is one purpose of this paper. Not even the most fervent advocate of "pure Turkish" wishes to "revive" in modern Turkish words which never existed at all, except in some disordered imagination; nor presumably is he interested to press the claims of one foreign word to be used in preference to another.

Finding out how ghost words have got into the dictionaries is a most fascinating occupation; it is nearly always the result of a mistake of some kind, and hunting down the mistakes can be just as exciting as a good detective story. Deliberate invention is practically unknown. In saying this, of course, I do not mean that a great many words have not been invented in recent years in what I call Republican Turkish (the most convenient name in English for the Turkish used in Turkey since the adoption of the present official Turkish alphabet) and in the various Turkish dialects used in the Soviet Union, but these words cannot be called "ghost words" when they are made of genuine Turkish roots and genuine Turkish suffixes; they are merely neologisms. But it is a known physiological fact that ghosts cannot breed, so a word which is made out of a ghost root like *epit-*, to which I shall refer below, or with a suffix like *-sal/-sel*, which was never a real Turkish suffix, still remains a ghost, even if one of its parents is genuinely Turkish.

There is only one class of ghost words which may well be deliberate invention. It is known that when Şeyh Süleyman Eff. was compiling his *Çağatay-Osmanlı Dictionary* he was so anxious to make it complete that he offered small monetary rewards for previously unknown "Çağatay" words, and it is hard to believe that some unscrupulous people did not cash in on this and provide him with bogus words. I have never seen the original book, but I. Kunos's abbreviation and German translation of it (Budapest, 1902) (quoted hereafter as "Kunos") contains a small hard core of words for which it seems impossible to find any etymological or other explanation. If such a word cannot be found earlier than Kunos it may well be a word invented to qualify for the reward.

FOREIGN GHOSTS (CLASS 3)

This is a relatively unimportant class, so I will get it out of the way first.

Foreign words have, of course, been used in Turkish from the

earliest period that we know. Some have been identified only recently. For example, until a few years ago **ton/don** "clothing" would have been considered as about as genuine an *öz Türk* word as you could find. Now it is known to be just the Khotanese word *ṭauna* (same meaning). No doubt there are plenty more to be discovered and some may never be discovered at all. For instance, I am personally convinced that **beg** "tribal, or clan, chief", *prima facie* a typical *öz Türk* word, is really Chinese. It seems to me more than a mere coincidence that the Chinese word *po* (see Plate III),¹ which means exactly the same thing as **beg**, was in the early centuries of the Christian era pronounced *pig* or *big*. (The word itself does not occur in the Tibetan transcriptions of Chinese texts published in this *Journal* by Prof. F. W. Thomas and myself in 1926 and 1927, but homophones do, and that is how they are spelt.) Some foreign words which are now known to be in fact foreign are still being advocated by the enthusiasts for "pure Turkish" as substitutes for other foreign words. For example, in place of **dunya** "this world", an Arabic word which has been used in Turkish certainly since the middle of the eleventh century (it is common in the *Kutadḡu Bilig*), they recommend the use of a Sogdian word **acun** (originally **ajun**) which was introduced into Turkish in the eighth century by Manichæan missionaries. When I talk of foreign words as "ghosts" I am not thinking of words of this kind, which seem to me as much Turkish as words of Latin, Greek, and even Turkish origin now used in English are English.

What I am thinking of primarily are certain Mongol words, which are included in Mirza Mahdi Xan's Çağatay-Persian dictionary, the *Sanlax*, and clearly labelled as Mongol and not Turkish words. He seems to have included them not because they were ever used in Turkish, but because they were the basis of Mongol proper names or were mentioned as Mongol words in some Turkish text. How they got into the standard dictionaries is a curious story. The *Sanlax* is by far the best Çağatay dictionary but unfortunately it is very rare. The best MS. is one in the London School of Oriental and African Studies (of which I have had a photograph made for my own use) and there seem to be only two more in England. I have heard rumours, but nothing definite, about copies elsewhere. Neither Pavet de Courteille nor Şeyh Süleyman nor Radloff had ever seen

¹ To facilitate the type-setting I have assembled all the words in non-Latin script on a single Plate.

a copy (Pavet de Courteille—hereafter referred to as “P. de C.”—mentions it in the Preface to his *Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental* as work of supreme value and exceptional rarity which he could not get hold of) and they all had to use later abridgments like the *Xulāṣa-yi ‘Abbāsī*, mentioned by P. de C., and the *Risāla-yi Faḍlū’llah*, Calcutta, 1825 (the so-called “Calcutta Dictionary”). These abridgments abound in errors and miscopyings, and in particular they omit the vital information in the *Saḡlax* that certain words are “Mongol” and others “Rūmi”, that is in effect “Osmanli”, with the result that all these words have found their way into later dictionaries as “Çağatay”. Some of the Mongol ones have even got into the *Türkçe Sözlük* (quoted hereafter as “T.S.”), which was published by the Türk Dil Kurumu in İstanbul in 1945 as an authoritative list of pure Turkish words.

These Mongol ghosts are quite different from the rather numerous Mongol words which have been fully naturalized in various Turkish dialects. The problem of the relationship between Turkish and Mongol is much too complicated to discuss here. I am not myself one of those who believe that the two languages have a common ancestor. It is, of course, possible, but the words for numbers, ordinary actions (giving, taking, sitting, standing, etc.), and ordinary things (parts of the body, etc.) are so completely different that it seems to me to be very improbable. On the other hand there have been at least three periods when massive importations of Mongol words into Turkish occurred, and indeed vice versa. First we know that in the dawn of Turkish history Turkish and Mongol tribes were living side by side in Eastern Asia in a state of relatively peaceful coexistence. During this period some interchange of vocabulary must have taken place. For example, *irbis* “the Siberian panther, *Felis irbis*” occurs in Uyğur as early as the eighth or perhaps ninth century (in the *Sekiz Yükmek*). It also occurs in Mongol (Kovalevski, p. 324). With its final *-s* it looks more Mongol than Turkish, but who can say? Again *itavun* “a partridge” occurs even in contemporary Anatolian (*Derleme Dergisi*, p. 800); by its shape it must be a Mongol word, but it may well have been used a long time in Turkish; it is listed in the *Saḡlax* as a Mongol word but, as usual, is shown in P. de C. and Radloff as “Çağatay”.

The second big mass of Mongol words came into Turkish during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries when Cingis Ka’an and his successors ruled over many Turkish tribes. Most of these words are

military terms like **karawul**, **herewül/erewül**, and **yasawul**, or administrative terms like **alban** "head-tax". There are plenty of them in *Çağatay* and its successors, and some in *Kıpçak*.

The third big mass is to be found in the Siberian dialects, Altaian, Xakas, and so on. Contact with Mongol speakers continued to a much later date in these areas and the Mongol component in the language is correspondingly greater.

What I regard as Mongol "ghosts" are such words as the following, which are only a small selection of the whole :—

öbüçin "disease" (*Sanlax* ; P. de C., p. 40 ; Kunos, p. 153 ; Radloff, i, 1313 (in Mongol *ebeçin*, Kovalevski, p. 177).

ötege "bear (animal)", *Sanlax* ; P. de C., p. 41 ; Kunos, p. 155 (**ötke**, Şeyh Sul. **ayi/ayık**, translated by Kunos "bear : sober" !), Radloff, i, 1268 (**ötke**) (in Mongol *ötege*, Kovalevski, p. 517).

ödür "day", *Sanlax* ; P. de C., p. 155 ; Kunos, p. 157 (**udur**) (in Mongol *edür*, Kovalevski, p. 201).

axsawurğa "a belt for a quiver", *Sanlax* ; P. de C., p. 8 ; Radloff, i, 138 (**axsawurğa** and **axsadurğa** !) (in Mongol *axsarğa/axsağa*, Kovalevski, p. 134) ; Kunos, p. 6, has the same word as **ağavurka** which is a "double ghost", as he translates it "a kind of hut made of timber and brushwood", a meaning which must have been transferred from some other word, probably **alaçuk** ; this is one of many examples of the omission of a badly written nasta'liq s in these dictionaries.

eçiçe "father", in P. de C., p. 99 ; Kunos, p. 81 (**içke**) is exceptional, in that it goes back not to the *Sanlax* but to a statement in Abu'l-Gazi's *Şacaratu'l-Atrāk* that the Mongol word for "father" is **eçiçe**.

Perhaps the worst case of all is **ülçey** (Kovalevski, p. 534), mentioned in the *Sanlax* as a Mongol word properly meaning "good fortune, blessing", which was used as a proper name for Mongol princesses and as the base from which the name of the Emperor **Ülçeytü** was made ; on the basis of this entry it was listed as a *Çağatay* noun meaning "good fortune" in P. de C., p. 76, and Kunos, p. 150 (**olçay**) ; from there it passed to the *Tarama Dergisi*, published by the Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti in 1934, and from there to T.S., p. 447 (**olçay**), as a recommended substitute for **baht**, **talik**, and **ikbal**.

Many other purely Mongol words have found their way into

Republican Turkish by the same route, including some which are now very common like **kurultay** and **sayın**.

WORDS ASCRIBED TO THE WRONG DIALECT (CLASS 4)

This, too, is a relatively unimportant class and can be disposed of fairly briefly. It is, of course, often impossible to say categorically that a particular word was *never* used in a particular dialect, but there are many cases where it can be demonstrated that the ascription was based on a misapprehension and has no evidential value. There are three main categories of such words.

The first are those which are listed in the *Sağlax* as "Rumi", i.e. Osmanlı, words but have found their way, via the abridgments into P. de C. and Şeyh Süleyman and thence into Radloff as "Çağatay" words. Very often they can be identified by their non-Çağatay spelling, even without reference to the *Sağlax*. **Dede** "grandfather" and **arvana** "female camel", spelt as in Plate III, No. 2, are cases in point; there are many more.

The second are those labelled in Radloff and other authorities with the debatable name "Uyğur".

It is a great misfortune that texts in what was believed to be the Uyğur script became known to scholars about a hundred years before the first genuine Uyğur MSS. were discovered, and that it was further supposed that any texts in this script must necessarily be in the Uyğur dialect. In fact both of these suppositions are wrong. The script was, indeed, derived from Uyğur, but it was, in fact, the Mongol official alphabet devised on the orders of Cingis Ka'an in the circumstances described in the Chinese histories and used by him and his successors, originally for Mongol and later for Turkish (mainly Çağatay) when that became the official language of the successor states. I know that some Turkish scholars, e.g. Dr. Arat, disagree with this view, but it seems to me not only inherently probable but also demonstrable. On the title page of the first discovered MS. of the *Atabatı 'l-Hakayık*, that published by Necib Asim and subsequently reproduced by Dr. Arat in his admirable critical edition of that work, there is a note in Arabic that the book is "in the Mongol language and the Mongol script, translated into Turkish". The reference to the Mongol language is, of course, nonsense, but that to the Mongol script seems to me correct.

The majority of the texts in this script are ordinary Çağatay; two, the Vienna MS. of the *Kutadğu Bilig*, and the *Atabatı 'l-Hakayık*

are in Xakani (in both these cases there are also MSS. in Arabic script); and one or two, e.g. the *Oğuz Nama*, of which the best edition is that by Bang and Rahmeti (i.e. Dr. Arat), and one of the two MSS. of the *Muhabbat Nama* of Xorezmi are in Western dialects, probably Oğuz or Kıpçak.

The only genuine "Uyğur" words in Radloff are those taken from the late (fourteenth century) Uyğur-Chinese Dictionary.

The third category are the words ascribed to Çağatay because they are included in the vocabulary to Vambéry's *Çağataische Sprachstudien*, Leipzig, 1867 (quoted hereafter as "Vambéry"). Some of these Vambéry himself specifically ascribed to other dialects (Chinese Turkestan, Kazak, Xiva, Xokand, etc.); others are taken from the abridgments of the *Sanlax* and are easily identifiable as such; the rest seem to be nineteenth-century Özbek (Uzbek), like the majority of the texts in this book.

PURE GHOSTS AND GHOST MEANINGS (CLASSES 1 AND 2)

I will deal with these two classes together, for the sake of convenience. The main sources of these words in a rough order of ascending magnitude are:—

- A. Misunderstandings or misreadings of words in the Runic script.
- B. Misunderstandings or misreadings of words in early Uyğur texts.
- C. Misunderstandings or misreadings of the Vienna MS. of the *Kutadğū Bilig*.
- D. Misunderstandings or misreadings of words in Arabic script.

There are many cases falling under C which really involve D, that is cases in which the scribe of the Vienna MS. misread the Arabic MS. which he was transcribing in the Mongol official alphabet. This MS., like the two surviving MSS. of that work in Arabic script, must have been rather short of diacritical points (*nuqtas*), and the scribe, who was clearly unfamiliar with the Xakani dialect, which had passed out of use before he was born, very often when confronted with an unpointed or underpointed word, supplied the wrong ones. For example, he generally writes **yayığ**, "fickle", the standard epithet of **dawlat** "fortune", as **tatığ**, **yatığ**, or **tayığ**, seldom as **yayığ**. Now that we have Dr. Arat's admirable critical edition of that text (İstanbul, 1947) it

is child's play to spot this kind of ghost word and see how it came into existence. But some of them have travelled a long way ; from thence to Radloff, thence to the *Tarama Dergisi* and, sometimes, thence to T.S. The *Tarama Dergisi* also picked up a few ghost words from the vocabulary to Vambery's pioneering and extremely inaccurate partial edition of the *Kutadğu Bilig* (*Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, Innsbruck, 1870).

Ghost words derived from the Arabic script (Category D) come from a wider range of sources. The most copious immediate sources are the *Tarama Dergisi* and Şeyh Süleyman, with considerable additions by Kunos, but even Radloff is not free from errors of this kind. Nearly all the Çağatay ghost words, which form the major part of Category D, go back to the abridgments of the *Saṅlax*. One or two Xakani ghost words go back to Brockelmann's and Atalay's otherwise admirable Indices to Kaşğari's *Divānu 'l-Luğati't-Türk*.

A. GHOST WORDS FROM THE RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS AND DOCUMENTS

This is a small group. These texts have nearly all been edited more than once and most of the ghost words have been eliminated from the later editions, which, unlike the earlier, were prepared after the rediscovery of Kaşğari.

Most of the surviving ghost words are merely what I consider to be misspellings, mainly **b** for **v** and **d** for **ḍ**. These may seem at first to be trivial, but they have been made the foundation for what I consider to be false theories regarding the history of Turkish phonetics. It is now generally agreed that the Runic alphabet is based mainly on some form of the Aramaic alphabet used to write some Iranian dialect (perhaps, as Prof. Tolstov has suggested, Khorezmian), but from this the logical conclusion has never been drawn that the Turks must have used the Aramaic letters as the Iranians used them, that is in some cases with two phonetic values, i.e. *beth* to represent both **b** and **v**, *daleth* to represent both **d** and **ḍ**, *pe* to represent both **p** and **f** and so on ; and yet there is ample evidence to show that this was so. First the Runic **k** with back vowels is taken not from *qoph* but from *kheth*. Second the Iranian word reproduced in Plate III, No. 3, which occurs in one of the Toyok documents (*Eski Türk Yazıtları*, ii, 177) and is admitted to mean "praise", could never have been pronounced *ābrīn*, it must have been *āvīn*, and is the modern Persian word *āfrīn*. Third the phrase

in Plate III, No. 4, taken from the list of foreign countries which sent delegations to the funeral of Elteriş Kağan, must have been intended to represent **Afar Forom**, i.e. the Avars and Rome (Byzantium). Even when it had been established that this was the meaning of the phrase, the final step from **Apar Porom** to **Afar Forom** was not taken although the former is an obvious phonetic monstrosity. And so it seems to me an unnecessary complication to transcribe the words in Plate III, No. 5, as **sub** "water" and **Tabğaç** "the Toba Dynasty" (hence simply "China") and to base on this a theory that the sound which was **v** in the late eighth century (the early Uyğur script texts) was **b** in the early eighth century.

It is unfortunate that Malov in preparing his admirable edition of the Kül Tegin inscription for his chrestomathy, *Pamyatniki Drevnetyurkskoy Pismennosti* (Moscow, 1951) was unable to use the edition of the same inscription in Dr. von Gabain's *Alttürkische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1941) and has thus perpetuated a few earlier errors corrected by her, for example, the impossible transcription and translation of Plate III, No. 6, as **alkadımız** "we dedicated" instead of **alkdımız** "we completed" (Kül Tegin's tomb) in the last line of the inscription, but these are small matters.

The Yenisei inscriptions are a different matter. Not all the obvious errors and obscurities which they contain can be blamed on the editors. There is ample internal evidence that the masons who carved some of the inscriptions were unable to understand the drafts from which they were working and that the actual composers of the inscriptions were sometimes illiterate men who merely took a few phrases or words from earlier inscriptions and strung them together to form what looked like an epitaph. (The Ongin inscription from the Orkhon area is a similar pastiche from earlier sources.) Malov, in his *Yeniseyskaya Pismennost Tyurkov* (Moscow, 1952), has produced much the best edition so far available, but if every word in his Index was included in the dictionaries, it would add a monstrous brood of ghosts to them.

The *Tarama Dergisi* includes a few complete ghosts professedly taken from "the Orkhon Inscriptions", e.g. **ad-** "to subjugate" (*râm et-*, i, 649, and *tahakkum et-*, i, 727), and **edir-** "to direct, guide" (*irşat et-*, i, 385). There is no trace of these words, or anything like them, in the inscriptions.

Thomsen's edition of the *Irk Bitig* in 1912 was a masterpiece of scholarship, considering that it was published before the rediscovery

of Kaşğari; Orkun's edition in *Eski Türk Yazıtları* (İstanbul, 1939) and Malov's in his *Pamyatniki Drevnetyurkskoy Pismennosti* have made great improvements, but even Malov's edition still harbours some obvious ghosts.

Para. 17 starts off: "A riding horse got tired in an **ön** place." **Ön** is not "first", as Thomsen translated it, or "sunny" (Orkun), or even "eastern" (Malov); it means "deserted", a sense which fits the context perfectly. Prof. Bang, in his "Turcica" (*MVAG.*), 1917, p. 286, collected most of the scanty Uyğur evidence which proved the existence of an **ön** with this meaning.

Para. 23 starts **oğlan kekük tezeki:n bulıtı:** (the colon indicates a long vowel). Thomsen translated "a boy found a cuckoo (?) wandering about (?)". Orkun, on the basis of Kaşğari's entry "**kekük** means *zumma:c*", corrected "cuckoo" to "golden eagle"; Malov found in Yudahin's dictionary an obsolete Kirğiz word **tezgin** meaning "rudder" and substituted "a golden eagle's rudder, i.e. his tail". But the word **tezek** is a very familiar and earthy one in Turkish. What the boy found was just "a golden eagle's dung", a subject of interesting folk-lore in many countries.

Para. 38 starts **kamı:ş ara: ka:lmi:ş teñri: una:madı:k avı:nçu: katu:n bo:lzum.** Malov's translation, "she lived among the reeds. As heaven was unfavourable, let the queen be a consolation (i.e. let her decide)," though better than the earlier ones, still misses the point. Kaşğari says **avı:nçu:** means "concubine", and the sentence really means "let the concubine who lived in a reed-bed without the favour of heaven become a queen".

Para. 47 starts **er öme:leyü: barmi:ş teñri:ke so:ku:şmi:s.** Thomsen translated it, "A man went crawling and encountered a god," and the others have blindly followed him. Thomsen had found a Tarançi word **ömüle-**, meaning "to crawl" (primarily of an infant) in Radloff, and without thinking of its etymology assumed that it occurred here. But the Tarançi word is merely the last stage of phonetic decay of a word which in the eighth century and for several centuries after that was pronounced **emgekle-** and meant "to do something with great effort" and hence, of a child "to crawl". Kaşğari again supplies the answer, he does not list **öme:le-** but he does list **öme:** (or **üme:** ?), *al-dayf al-nāzil fi'l-bayt* "a guest who comes to stay with one", and **öme:le-** is obviously a Denominal Verb from it; the sentence means "a man went on a round of visits and encountered a god".

There are one or two other errors in the existing texts of the *İrk Bitig*, but also some passages which are obviously corrupt. The mere fact that the essential information whether an omen is good or bad is frequently omitted is sufficient evidence that we have here not the author's original MS. but an imperfect copy.

B. GHOST WORDS FROM GENUINE UYĞUR TEXTS

It is fatally easy to misread a text in Uyğur script, particularly a late one, and I do not suppose that anyone has ever edited one with complete accuracy. The traps are innumerable, but on the whole the loop which appears as part of the letters **b/f/p/v**, **d/d/t**, and **o/u/ö/ü** seems to be the most successful one. To save space I give here only a few specimen ghosts from this source.

In line 6 of the first "peg inscription" published in F. W. K. Müller's "Zwei Pfahlschriften . . ." (*APAW.*, Berlin, 1915) occurs the word in Plate III, No. 7. Radloff first edited this text (as Müller pointed out with many inaccuracies, it is horribly illegible) and read the word **evir**. He connected it with the verb **evir-** "to surround", which is etymologically impossible, and translated it "surroundings". Müller saw that it should be read **evin** and translated "seed" (a word well authenticated from other dialects), but somehow both forms and meanings succeeded in surviving side by side in the dictionaries. The *Tarama Dergisi* makes three entries of the word, **evir** "surroundings" (*daire*, i, 183) and both **evin** and **evir** "seed" (*dane*, i, 184), and from there **evir** found its way into T.S., p. 193, as a preferred alternative to *daire*.

ebiri is listed in Radloff, i, 932, on the authority of the Uyğur Chinese dictionary as meaning "virtue" (Chinese *tê*); this is undoubtedly an error for **edrem** a common metathesis of **erdem**, which really does mean that. See Plate III, Nos. 8 and 9, for the two spellings.

alañu- in Pelliot's Uyğur text of the Tale of the Two Brothers (*T'oung Pao*, 1914) and **alañur-** in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (St. Petersburg, 1913 ff.) are both misreadings of **alañad-** "to be exhausted, get weak" written without the third **a**, see Plate III, Nos. 10-12.

C. GHOST WORDS FROM THE VIENNA KUTADĞU BİLİĞ

There are dozens of these in Radloff, but as the references to page and line are given there is no difficulty in unmasking them by

looking up the passages quoted in Dr. Arat's edition. However, I give one particularly choice specimen below. It is more difficult to trace their history when they come ultimately from the vocabulary to Vambéry's *Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, since there the references are either wrong or nonexistent.

Epit- "to create something incomparably beautiful" in T.S., p. 184, is a case in point. It was taken from the *Tarama Dergisi* (*ibda et-*, i, 337, and four other references), where it is recorded as an "Uyğur" word, taken from the *Büyük Türk Luğati*, and supported by the quotation **epitli bayatım** "my God, the Creator". This looked very like a quotation from Vambéry's *Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, so I turned it up there. It was obvious that an adjective in -li could not occur in the *Kutadğu Bilig* and that **epitli**, as an adjective, could not be derived from a verb **epit-**; it is only fair to Vambéry to say that he never suggested that it was. The word is a misprint. In fact Vambéry records several words beginning with **epi** . . ., all of them ghosts. Among them is **epikli** [*sic*], translated "artistic, creative", supported by two quotations, **epikli bayatım**, without reference, and **epikli saray** "an artistic palace", from "page 91". The reference is wrong, but by looking up **saray** in Radloff I got what I think must be the right reference, verse 1419 in Dr. Arat's edition (p. 58 of the Vienna MS.), which reads **ediz kén beđizlig sarayın kalıp** "your lofty wide well-adorned palace remains (but you in time will die)". Plate III, No. 13, shows the word which Vambéry, for some inexplicable reason, read **epikli**. I had a much longer hunt for **epikli bayatım**, but it looked like the beginning of a line in an invocation of some kind, probably near the beginning or end of the book, and finally I came on verse 6520, which begins **tegür ay bayatım** "grant, oh my God", which must be the passage. Plate III, No. 14, shows how the opening words are written. The resemblance to **epikli** is remote.

Vambéry also lists **epit-** "to make ready, prepare, complete, build, gladden" supported by the quotation **negü ol igin körme könlün epit** from "page 90". This reference, too, was wrong and finally, after a long hunt, I found it in verse 6282 (p. 179 of the Vienna MS.) which read **negü ol igin kör me könlün avıt**, "see how his illness is, and make glad your heart". **Avıt-** (also **avut**) is, of course, a well-known Turkish word, though the spelling, Plate III, No. 15, is not particularly clear.

The most startling piece of nonsense in Radloff is **ügü** "water" in

i, 1810 ; it goes back to a piece of fatuity by a medieval annotator. In verse 145, " God created and picked out man (from the animals) ", man (*yalıkuğ*) is written in three pieces in the Vienna MS. as shown in Plate III, No. 16, and, as shown there, some medieval annotator had written the Persian words *bād*, *āb*, and *xāk* " air, water, and earth " under these three pieces.

D. GHOST WORDS IN ARABIC SCRIPT

The Arabic script is even easier to misread than Uyğur. Misplaced diacritical points (*nuqtas*) are the most prolific source of error, but the trouble sometimes comes from reading one letter for another. Numerically the largest group of errors in this category is that of mere false vocalizations, which are common in Kunos and not unknown elsewhere. Generally these are easy to correct, but can sometimes be troublesome especially in short words and where gutturals are involved. It took me some time to discover that the supposed word *uru* in such phrases as *uru tur-* " to stand up " is merely *örü*, the gerund of *ör-* " to rise ". Similarly it was not at first sight easy to see that *utkar-* " to pass through, to learn by heart " is merely *ötger-*. The " Rumi " spellings in *Saylax* frequently caused trouble to later authors. Thus *ulur* " people, tribe ", etc. (the Mongol form of the old Turkish word *ulus* " country ", which became very common in Turkish from the fourteenth century onwards), appears twice in P. de C. and Kunos, once with initial *alif wāw* correctly translated " tribe ", and once with initial *alif* translated in P. de C., p. 37, " état, condition " (this must have come from some earlier French authority who meant " état " to be understood as " state " in the political sense), and in Kunos, p. 63 (*elus*), translated (from P. de C.) " hal, iş, şğıl ".

The following are a few cases where more than mere false vocalization is involved :—

egü " individual " in *Saylax* (one of the very few errors in that work) which reappears as *av* in P. de C., p. 39, and Kunos, p. 17, and as *aku* in Kunos, p. 9, is merely the second half of the distributive numerals *biregü* " one by itself ", *ikegü* " two together ", etc., cut off and treated as a separate word.

idü (?) " trouble, distress " in Brockelmann's and Atalay's Index to Kaşğari and *öd* " mountain " in the latter both go back

1. 伯 (pō/ting) 14. صصرت
2. ددة ارونه 15. سوبل
3. ١٢٤٥٥ 16. سب سوبه ثعتن
باد آب خاك
4. ٥٤١٤١ 17. اوئو
5. ٨١٢٥٥ ٥٦٣ 18. اونو
6. ٤ ٥٥٥٥ 19. اونزل
7. سحر 20. اوترك
8. سوبه 21. البوتو (البرتو؟)
زينت تاج كمر
9. سوبه
10. سوبه 22. البوتو (البرتو؟)
رعيت باج كذر
11. سوبه
12. سوبه 23. وهو امج
13. سوبه 24. وهو اصح

to a difficult verse in Kaşğari, i, 110 (of Atalay's translation), which reads :—

aydı: senin u:du: emgek telim i:du: (?)
yumsar katıg u:du: könlüm saña: yügrük

which Kaşğari explains as follows ; “ this describes a vision of a man's beloved ; he says ‘ How did you get to me over this difficult trail ? ’ and the vision replies ‘ I endured hardships for you, and the mountains became soft because of it and my heart swiftly reached you ’.” This is a free translation ; the first line, “ He said ‘ following you ’,” and the last, “ my heart hastens to you,” are easy. In the third line *u:du:* is probably to be taken in its secondary meaning and the line translated “ *thereupon* the hard became soft ”. *I:du:* (or *i:du:*) in the third line is a real crux, *-ıd* means “ to send ” and there is no trace of a verb *ıd-* ; it may be *u:du:* in a slightly different sense again “ *following on* many sufferings ” ; the one thing certain is that *ıdū* “ suffering ” and *öd* “ mountain ” are ghosts.

öt “ sound ” in *Tanıklariyle Tarama Sözlüğü*, i, 569, in the phrase *tavul ötü* “ the sound of the drum ” (for *ünü* from the well-known word *ün* “ sound ”), and *onzel (önzel)* “ lie, falsehood ”, in P. de C., p. 82, and Kunos, p. 151 (for *ötrük*), are good examples of ghosts derived from omitted or misplaced points. See Plate III, Nos. 17–20, for the ghost and genuine forms.

The most remarkable Çağatay ghost (a triple one) which I have yet discovered is in the translation of the Mongol word *albantu* “ liable to *alban*, i.e. head tax ”. This word occurs in the Altaian dialects as *albattı* and in *Sanğax* as *albutu*, which is probably an error for *albantu*. I first found this word in P. de C., p. 30, where it is translated “ ornament, couronne, ceinture ”. I traced it back to Şeyh Süleyman, where the entry is as in Plate III, No. 21, and the translation is the same. Then I looked it up in *Sanğax*, where the entry is as in Plate III, No. 22. By a few quite minor changes “ peasant, tax-payer ” had become “ ornament, crown, belt ”. No doubt one of the abridgments of the *Sanğax* was responsible for this perversion.

Finally I come to the pearl of my collection, a ghost in the almost impeccable MS. of Kaşğari. In Kaşğari, i, 140 (of Atalay's translation), *armağan* is translated “ a gift to his neighbours brought back by someone from a journey, in the Oğuz dialect ; also pronounced *yarmağan* ; *wa huwa amuş* ”. The phrase (see Plate III, No. 23) is

quite clear in the facsimile, and both Brockelmann and Atalay included **amuç** as a word meaning " gift " in their Indices. But this seemed to me a very odd entry, and then it occurred to me that when Kaşğari records two pronunciations of a word he nearly always adds after the second *wa huwa aṣaḥḥu* (Plate III, No. 24). That is no doubt what he did this time, and the phrase " and the latter is more correct " seems a very appropriate one with which to end this paper.