

*Clark, Mongol Elements*

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN SEURAN

AIKAKAUSKIRJA

JOURNAL

DE LA

SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-UGRIENNE

75

HELSINKI 1977

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN SEURAN

# Mongol Elements in Old Turkic?

LARRY V. CLARK

Indiana University

## Introduction

1. The last two decades have witnessed the emergence of clear positions on the part of most scholars in regard to the relationship of the Turkic and Mongol and other Altaic languages. Whatever the respective merits of the arguments of those who view the similarities between these languages as evidence of a genetic relationship, and those who hold that such similarities may be explained in terms of a contact relationship, no scholar is prepared to deny that the intense cultural and social contacts between Turkic and Mongol peoples throughout the centuries have resulted in mutual borrowings between their languages. A number of studies have contributed to the identification of these loanwords, so that we are presently able to confirm that there are Turkic loanwords of both the Bulghar (*r/l*) and Common Turkic (*z/š*) types in Pre-XIII century Mongol, Middle Turkic loans in Middle Mongol and the reverse, and a number of contact situations in the modern period.<sup>1</sup> The substance and extent of many of these contacts, as well as fundamental questions of the periodization of certain layers of loanwords, are as yet not fully understood. But such studies of specific contacts, as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor András Róna-Tas, to whose teaching I owe so much, has provided us with the firmest demonstration of a Bulghar loanword into Mongol (Tü *tışek*, *šışek*, Bul \**šilegü* → Mo *šilegü* 'two-year old lambs'), cf. On the Chuvash Guttural Stops in the Final Position, *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, pp. 396–398. Loanwords into Mongol from older stages of Turkic are identified throughout the pages of Doerfer's TMEN I–IV; also cf. G. Clauson, The Earliest Turkish Loan Words in Mongolian, *CAJ* IV, 1958, pp. 174–187. For the XIII c. and later, see: G. Clauson, The Turkish Elements in 14th Century Mongolian, *CAJ* V, 1960, pp. 301–316; Id., *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, London 1962, pp. 222–247; N. Poppe, The Turkic Loan Words in Middle Mongolian, *CAJ* I, 1955, pp. 36–42; Id., Die mongolischen Lehnwörter im Kommanischen, *Nemeth Armağanı*, Ankara 1962, pp. 331–340; Id., *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*, Wiesbaden 1965, pp. 157–159, 161–162; Osman Nedim Tuna, Osmanlıcada Mogolca Ödünç Kelimeler, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XVII, 1972, pp. 209–250.

studies that present carefully considered sets of criteria by which to distinguish borrowed from inherited elements,<sup>1</sup> may be taken as heartening signs of a many-sided, realistic approach to the question of the Altaic relationship.

One subject in this area that has not yet received full attention is the problem of the existence of Mongol elements in Pre-XIII century Turkic literary languages. Certain general views on the topic have been expressed in the literature, but none of these is of a conclusive nature. Annemarie von Gabain was of the view that Mongol loanwords in Uyghur could not be recognized as such with any certainty due to the lack of distinguishing phonetic criteria (ATG § 42; cf. TMEN I 6). Karl Menges believed that the possibility of borrowings from Mongol into Pre-XIII century Turkic could not be excluded (but see below, Nr. 31), but that such words appeared in Turkic in large numbers only during and after the Mongol Conquest.<sup>2</sup> Lajos Ligeti was more specific: «Dans les documents turcs de l'époque pré-mongole les éléments mongols se font plutôt rares. Même chez *al-Kāšgarī*, dans son vocabulaire du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle, on peut relever à peine deux ou trois mots mongols: *tuturqan* 'riz' est certainement à rattacher au mongol *tuturyan*, par contre l'étymologie mongole du *mal* 'ainsi' (mongol *mayad* 'vraiment, effectivement') est déjà sujet à caution» (see below, Nrs. 43, 89).<sup>3</sup>

Sir Gerard Clauson, on the other hand, completely denied the existence of such loanwords: «In the whole of this large vocabulary, there are no words which could be identified as Mongolian loan words by employing the methods enumerated above». <sup>4</sup> For Clauson, too, Mongol loanwords first appear in Turkic languages in the XIII century, and the bulk of them later in Chaghatay.<sup>5</sup> Gerhard Doerfer

<sup>1</sup> Beside the works cited in note 1, see: A. Róna-Tas, *Obščee nasledie ili zaimstvovanija? (K probleme rodstva altajskikh jazykov)*, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1974, Nr. 2, pp. 31–45; Nicholas Poppe, *Einige Lautgesetze und ihre Bedeutung zur Frage der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachbeziehungen*, *UAI* XXX, 1958, pp. 93–97.

<sup>2</sup> K. H. Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies*, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 174.

<sup>3</sup> L. Ligeti, *Histoire du lexique des langues turques*, *RO* XVII, 1951–52, p. 87; cf. Doerfer, TMEN I 5.

<sup>4</sup> G. Clauson, *The Earliest Turkish Loan Words . . .*, pp. 177–178.

<sup>5</sup> G. Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, pp. 51–52; for Mongol loanwords in Chaghatay, cf. his introduction and indexes to: *Sanglax. A Persian Guide to the Turkish Language by Muhammad Mahdī Xān*, *Gibb Memorial Series, New Series* XX, London 1960, pp. 16–17, 91–99.

has not completely excluded the possibility of such loanwords: »Gewiss mögen auch einige wenige alte mo. Lww. ins Tü. eingedrungen sein (s. Band I, S. 551), jedoch kann es sich dabei nur um sehr wenige Fälle handeln».<sup>1</sup> Otherwise, Doerfer has expressed himself more negatively on the subject, and has stated that Mongol loanwords first entered Turkic after the Mongol Conquest (cf. TMEN I 5, 6).

One further issue dealing with the chronology of attested Turkic vocabulary was raised in these opinions. Thus, for Clauson, if a word common to Turkic and Mongol occurred in Pre-XIII century Turkic, then the word was native Turkic and a borrowing into Mongol; if the shared word appeared in Turkic only after the Mongol period, then the word was a Mongol loanword into Turkic (presumably barring clear indications to the contrary).<sup>2</sup> This is a very stringent principle, and Doerfer has rightly, in my view, insisted that it is subject to exceptions, that there are indeed native Turkic words that happen not to be attested in Pre-XIII century sources (cf. TMEN II 553, IV 420, 422). If such a principle were to be maintained, the present topic would be divested of its problem. Clearly, each possibility of a borrowing into or from Mongol during the Old Turkic period must be viewed individually in the light of criteria of borrowing.

The present paper attempts to provide an extensive examination of the possibility that Mongol grammatical and/or lexical elements entered the Turkic literary languages prior to the XIII century. As such, two kinds of possible evidence are analyzed: (1) the so-called »Mongol plurals» found in a few Old Turkic words; (2) the existence of Mongol loanwords in Old Turkic texts as proposed by other scholars or as read in such texts by their editors.<sup>3</sup>

2. The existence of Turkic loanwords in Mongol prior to the XIII century presupposes historical contacts between speakers of these

<sup>1</sup> Doerfer, TMEN IV 344. The reference here (TMEN I 551) is to OTü *yadaŷ* »on foot» (ED 887), which has been compared to WMO 422 *yada-* »to have no strength or power, to exhaust, etc.»; this cannot be a Mo loanword in OTü, however, since Chuvash *suran* ~ *šoran* »on foot» (cf. Çay, Ott *yayan* < \**yadayın*?) assures that the word is very old in Turkic. Doerfer himself proposes an Iranian etymology as an alternative.

<sup>2</sup> Clauson, *The Earliest Turkish Loan Words* . . . , pp. 177–178.

<sup>3</sup> This is the first of a two-part study, the second to deal with the 200 or so Mongol loanwords in Middle Turkic texts of the XIII–XIV centuries. The etymologies in this second part, to be published in the very near future, are referred to as »MTü» plus the Nr. of the relevant etymology.

language families and, in itself, provides the basis for the *a priori* possibility of Mongol loanwords into Pre-XIII century Turkic.

At least from the V century on, the presence of Turkic-speaking peoples in the Western regions of Eurasia may be taken as an established fact. However, if we place in abeyance the question of the linguistic identification of the «runiform» inscriptions from this area,<sup>1</sup> it is the case that no native Turkic literary traditions were established — but if so, none of their monuments has survived — prior to the XIII century in Western Eurasia. Moreover, no one has yet succeeded in demonstrating that Mongol-speaking peoples had penetrated into these areas prior to military incursions of the early XIII century.<sup>2</sup> Thus, it is presently impossible even to approach the question of whether the Mongol elements that exist in various Oghuz, Kipchak and Bulghar languages, could have entered at older unattested stages of these groups. However, on present evidence, this does not even constitute a reasonable possibility.

So far as the contacts between Turks and Mongols in the Eastern region of Inner Asia are concerned, the historical evidence is clear.

<sup>1</sup> See most recently: Gyula Németh, The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* XXI, 1971, pp. 1–52; I. Vásáry, Runiform Signs on Objects of the Avar Period (6th–8th cc. A.D.), *AOH* XXV, 1972, pp. 335–347; for a novel view: G. F. Turčaninov, *Pamjatniki pis'ma i jazyka narodov Kavkaza i Vostočnoj Evropy*, Leningrad 1971.

<sup>2</sup> But not, it must be said, for want of trying. From this sphere of problems, I would cite only the following: Z. V. Toğan, Ibn-Faqlān's Reisebericht, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* XXIV/3, 1939, pp. 217–220; K. Czeglédy, *Études slaves et roumaines* I, Budapest 1948, p. 64; A. Gusejnzade, K étimológii toponima Bilājāri, *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 1972, Nr. 5, pp. 58–63 [these on the name *Balanjar* ~ *Baranjar*, identified as *Mo barānyar* «right flank»] — L. Ligeti, *Mongolos jövevényszavaink kérdése, Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* XLIX, 1935, pp. 190–271; I. Fulaky, *UJF* XLIII, 1971, pp. 178–180 [these on the problem of Mo loanwords in Hungarian] — L. Ligeti, L'étymologie mongole du slave *chorogŭ* 'drapen', *Études slaves et roumaines* II, 1949, pp. 46–56 [on an imputed Mo loan in Common Slavic] — K. H. Menges, *The Oriental Elements in the Vocabulary of the Oldest Russian Epos, the Igor' Tale* (Supplement Nr. 1 to *Word*), New York 1951 [cf. Doerfer, *Oriens* XXIII–XXIV, 1974, pp. 591–593]; N. Pritsak, *Polovtsiana*, 1. A Proto-Mongolian Word from the Year 1103, *Reşid Rahmeti Arat İçin*, Ankara 1966, p. 380; Id., Two Migratory Movements in Eurasian Steppe in the 9th–, 11th Centuries, *Proceedings of the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists* II, New Delhi 1968, pp. 157–163, esp. p. 159; Doerfer, *TMEN* I 345–347 [these on possible Mo loans in Old Russian].

One can cite, in the first place, the constant Türk military campaigns against Mongol-speaking peoples (*Tatar*, *Tatır*, *Qitañ*) to the East, which are recorded in the major runic inscriptions of the Second Türk Dynasty (682–742). There is the odd and surely not coincidental convergence of nomenclature between the major tribal confederations of the *Toquz Oγuz* and *Toquz Tatar*, and the *Otuz Türk* and *Otuz Tatar*, which recently attracted the attention of Professor Czeglédy.<sup>1</sup>

One of the clearer cases of at least partial merger of Mongol- and Turkic-speaking peoples is found in the Chinese annals concerning the dispersal of one group of Uyghur tribes following the defeat of their steppe empire by the Kirghiz in 840. Thus, at least a portion of the thirteen tribes that encamped along the Northern marches of China, still hounded by Kirghiz and Chinese troops, were to seek refuge, albeit temporary, among the *Shih-wei* on the borders of Eastern Mongolia.<sup>2</sup> Whatever the full composition of the *Shih-wei* tribes, it is known that one of them was the *Mong-wu*, or Mongol tribe.<sup>3</sup> The probability of intermixture in this case, which can not be considered an isolated example, constitutes the kind of historical contact that leads to the exchange of cultural and linguistic elements between peoples.

To this may be added the irregular diplomatic contacts between the Uyghur of Kan-su and East Turkestan and the court of the Qitañ/Liao Dynasty (947–1125), the still unresolved question of the Runic or Uyghur origin of the so-called «small Qitañ script», and the entirely obscure question of the linguistic affiliation of the ruling classes of the Western Liao or Qara-qıtay (1130–1211), with whom the Uyghur of the Northern Tarim had contact.<sup>4</sup> Even although

<sup>1</sup> K. Czeglédy, On the Numerical Composition of the Ancient Turkish Tribal Confederations, *AOH* XXV, 1972, p. 281, n. 24.

<sup>2</sup> J. Hamilton, *Les Ouighours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties d'après les documents chinois*, Paris 1955, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> L. Hambis, L'histoire des Mongols avant Gengis-Khan d'après les sources chinoises et mongoles, et la documentation conservée par Rašidu'd-Dīn, *CAJ* XIV, 1970, pp. 125–133; L. Ligeti, Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi, *Mongolian Studies*, Budapest 1970, pp. 265–308, esp. pp. 268–269.

<sup>4</sup> Karl A. Wittfogel — Feng Chia Shêng, *History of Chinese Society, Liao* (907–1125), *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S.* 36, 1946. Among the information to be gleaned from this work is that inter-marriage took place on a large scale between one Qitañ clan and the Uyghur

we are unable to speak with any depth or authority on these historical contacts of Turks and Mongols prior to the XIII century, it is certain that they did occur, thereby providing the historical opportunity for borrowing of Mongol elements into Pre-XIII century Turkic literary languages.

3. The chronological limits of the Turkic material considered in this study are the VIII century, when literary languages were initiated in Mongolia and in East Turkestan, and the XIII century, at the beginning of which Mongol-speaking peoples intermix with speakers of Turkic at every level of society and in every area of Asia. Between the two dates fall the Turkic literary languages which I shall call Old Turkic.<sup>1</sup> Within Old Turkic, I shall distinguish four groups of texts according to geographical, cultural or other criteria:

- I. Runic inscriptions of Mongolia (VIII—IX) and the Yenisey (IX—X); in these one could postulate the reflection of linguistic contacts with Mongol-speaking tribes to the East of the Türk and Uyghur;
- II. Manichean literature from East Turkestan and Kansu written in Runic (manuscripts), Manichean and Uyghur scripts (VIII—X), whose language is closer to that of Group I than of Group III; in these, one could postulate the possibility of Mon-

(p. 142), and so forth. Beside the basic bibliography on the Qitañ and Qara-qitay in Denis Sinor's *Introduction à l'étude de l'Eurasie Centrale*, Wiesbaden 1963, pp. 248—249, and G. Kara's *Knigi mongol'skikh kočevnikov (Sem' vekov mongol'skoj pis'mennosti)*, Moskva 1972, pp. 9—13, 152—153, see: S. Murayama, *Der Zusammenhang der Kitan-Schrift mit der türkischen Runenschrift, Proceedings of the XXII International Congress of Orientalists*, II, Leiden 1957, pp. 386—398; E. V. Šavkunov, *K voprosu o rassifrovke maloj kidan'-čžur-čžen'skoj pis'mennosti, Ėpigrafiika Vostoka* XV, 1963, pp. 149—153; G. Toyoda, *An Analysis of the Major Ch'i-tan Characters, Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* XXIII, 1964, pp. 119—135; H. Franke, *Bemerkungen zu den sprachlichen Verhältnissen im Liao-Reich, Zentralasiatische Studien* III, 1969, pp. 7—43; G. Doerfer, *Altäische Scholien zu Herbert Frankes Artikel . . . , Op.cit.*, pp. 45—49.

<sup>1</sup> The periodization of the older Turkic literary languages remains an unsettled issue. In practice, some scholars distinguish between «Islamic» and «Non-Islamic» texts, more or less equating the first with Middle Turkic and the second with Old Turkic, although this approach clearly distorts the chronological implications of the terms «Old» and «Middle». Nearly all such approaches are rooted in the unfortunate title of Brockelmann's index to the *Divān*: «Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz». Here, I adopt the approach of Clauson, Róna-Tas, and a few other scholars.

gol linguistic influence that entered the languages of the Uyghur and other Türk tribes prior to their migration to these regions;

III. Uyghur literature in Uyghur and Brāhmi scripts from East Turkestan and Kansu, consisting primarily of Nestorian (VIII—X?), Buddhist (VIII—XII ff.), secular and a few other kinds of texts; in these, one might envision some Mongol influence as a result of contacts with the Qitañ and Qara-qitay, or through some other means; it is especially in the context of «Uyghur» literature, that we must pay closest attention to the chronological limits of Old Turkic; from this period we must exclude the Uyghur civil documents (XIII—XIV),<sup>1</sup> all blockprint literature,<sup>2</sup> translations or copies of Buddhist texts that date to the Mongol period,<sup>3</sup> and so forth;

IV. Karakhanid literature in Arabic and Uyghur scripts from Kashghar and Yarkand (XI—XII);<sup>4</sup> in these, one might postulate Mongol linguistic influence from the Qara-qitay or other equally obscure sources; the three surviving copies of Yūsuf Xāṣṣ Ḥājib's *Qutadγu Bilig* (wr. 1069) are several centuries more recent than the original: Namangan, the oldest in Arabic script, is no earlier than the XIII c.; Cairo, also in Arabic script, is a copy of the XIV c.; Herat (presently in Vienna), written in the Mongol ductus of the Uyghur script, is a copy completed in 1439; the presence of a Mongol element in such late manuscripts, particularly in the Herat copy (see below, 5), does not assure a Mongol loanword in Old Turkic; the surviving copy of Maḥmūd al-Kāshgarī's *Dīrān Luḡāt at-Turk* (wr. 1072—1077)

<sup>1</sup> The date of three-quarters of these documents has been established in Chapter Three of my *Introduction to the Uyghur Civil Documents of East Turkestan* (13th—14th cc.), Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University 1975, pp. 97—207.

<sup>2</sup> For an introduction to this literature: A. von Gabain, *Die Drucke der Turfan-Sammlung, Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1967, Nr. 1.

<sup>3</sup> This literature will be detailed in the second part of this study; in the meantime, cf. the remarks of Peter Zieme, *Die Uiguren und ihre Beziehungen zu China*, *CAJ* XVII, 1973, p. 292, n. 50; *Zur buddhistischen Stabreimdichtung der alten Uiguren*, *AOH* XXIX, 1975, p. 189.

<sup>4</sup> For the Uyghur script contracts from Yarkand, see: Şinasi Tekin, *Bilinen En Eski İslami Türkçe Metinler: Uyğur Hatflerile Yazılmış Karahanlılar Devrine Ait Tarla Satış Senetleri* (473, 483 = 1080, 1090), *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* IV, Ankara 1975, pp. 157—186.



is similarly late (c. 1266), and there is some evidence that the original Karakhanid language of this text has been subjected to Middle Turkic influences; Professor Robert Dankoff writes that the copyist of Kāšyari's autograph «might have incorporated glosses that are not attributable to K., and he certainly made many errors in copying, the extent of which has only recently become clear. Beyond this, there is good evidence (from ink color and the shape of certain vowel signs) that much of the vocalization of the Turkic (not to speak of the Arabic) was done by a later hand than the original copyist. There are in addition Ottoman glosses in the margins, but they do not count»;<sup>1</sup> of the ten or so possible Mongol elements in this text (see below, 5), none is specifically discounted as a result of problems in the transmission of the text of the *Dīvān*, but nor can this possibility be entirely discarded as yet.

At present, we have little more than vestigial evidence of Old Mongol period languages. Were we able to discover Mongol loanwords in these Old Turkic sources, we should have at our disposal primary linguistic evidence pertaining to the structure of some form of Old Mongol. It would be entirely rash to postulate within the confines of the present study a series of hypothetical Old Mongol forms that could or could not have been the original of a given Old Turkic word. For that reason, I do not enter into the problem of what constitutes Old Mongol here, and throughout I use as a comparative base the Written Mongol language and occasionally other Middle Mongol or modern Mongol forms (but see below, Nrs. 91 and 93).<sup>2</sup>

4. In addition to the possibility of Mongol loanwords in Old Turkic, it is necessary to examine the issue of the plural suffixes *+s*, *+n*, *+t*, that occur in a handful of words, and that some scholars regard as native Turkic plurals, and others as «foreign plurals».<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Letter of 19. 4. 76; here, I wish especially to thank Prof. Dankoff for several communications that helped to clarify problems in the *Dīvān*.

<sup>2</sup> I intentionally use the term «Old Mongol» in a general, perhaps too vague sense, to encompass what were probably distinct branches of this group of languages (Hsien-pi, Tabṣač, Tatbi, T'u-yü-hun, Qitañ, Mongol) which, due to the historical prominence of one branch, we term «Mongols».

<sup>3</sup> Cf. D. Sinor, On Some Ural-Altaic Plural Suffixes, *Asia Major* II, 1951, pp. 208–210 (*+n*), 212–213 (*+t*), 219 (no *+s* in Tü); N. Poppe, Plural Suffixes in the Altaic Languages, *UAI* XXIV/3–4, 1952, pp. 68–69 (*+t*), 71–72 (*+s*), 74–75 (*+an*); Id., Studies in Altaic and Uralic Plural Suffixes, *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* XXXI, 1953, pp. 26–31. More recent views and

Indeed, it was Pelliot's view that the marker *+t* was a Mongol plural suffix borrowed from the Juan-juan who, in his view, spoke a variety of Mongol.<sup>1</sup> Others compare one or all of the markers to the Mongol plurals *+s* (GWM § 264), *+n* (§§ 270–272), and *-d* (§§ 265–268).<sup>2</sup> Without wishing to take up this material in any depth, I would offer here a few remarks on these three suffixes.

The marker *+s* occurs at the end of a single title *İšbara*, found as a member of proper names in several runic inscriptions (see ED 257), in a single text: BĈ S 2 *išbaras tarzat anta ančuladım* 'I presented (the Čik people) there *išvaras* and *tarzats*' (cf. ED 175). The title itself is either directly, or indirectly through Tokharian, adopted from Sanskrit *īśvara* 'lord, prince', and the suffix is surely just the Indo-European plural *+s*.<sup>3</sup>

The marker *+n* occurs in a handful of words: *eren* 'fighting men' < *er* 'man' (cf. MK *eren* 'men; an irregular plural', ED 232), *oylan* 'sons' < *oγul* 'son' (cf. MK *oγul* 'it forms the irregular plural *oylan*, but *oγullar* is also permissible as plural; this is like the word *eren* for 'men'; and both of them are used in the singular', ED 84), *bođun* 'tribe' < *bođ* 'clan'.<sup>4</sup> In the first two cases, the marker is actually *+an/+en*, and it may be postulated that in *bođun* as well, we have *bođ + an*, with labial assimilation to *bođun*. There can be little doubt that the marker *+an/+en* on these three words which form a socially related unit, is simply the Sogdian plural suffix *+n*.<sup>5</sup>

The marker *+t*, which Pelliot considered to be a Mongol plural, occurs in a few titles: *tarzat* < *tarzan* 'an official' (ED 539), *tegit* < *tegin* 'prince' (ED, 483), and, by analogy with the preceding,

bibliography may be found in: A. N. Kononov, *Pokazateli sobirateĭ'nosti-množestvennosti v tjurkskikh jazykakh*, Leningrad 1969; Doerfer, *UJ* XLII, 1970, pp. 244–250.

<sup>1</sup> P. Pelliot, L'origine de t'ou-kiue, nom chinois des Turcs, *T'P* XVI, 1915, pp. 687–689; Id., Sao-houa, sauça, sauçat, saquate, *T'P* XXXII, 1936, pp. 235–236; Ligeti, Histoire du lexique des langues turques, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Tekin, GOT 121–122; von Gabain, ATG § §65, 172; Brockelmann, OTG 150–151.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the references to *İšbara* in: S. G. Kljaštornyj, *Drevnetjurkskie runičeskie pamjatniki kak istočnik po istorii Srednej Azii*, Moskva 1964, p. 113, n. 174.

<sup>4</sup> Other examples of this marker are sometimes cited, of which the likeliest is *qırqın* 'maiden(s)' (cf. ED 654); the difficulty here is that the word cannot be a plural of *qız* 'girl, daughters', and the stem *\*qırq* is otherwise unknown (but cf. *qırnaq* 'slave girls', ED 661).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ilya Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford 1954, p. 180, § 1189.

*begit* < *beg* 'chief'.<sup>1</sup> It is also said to occur in a few other words,<sup>2</sup> and as a component of the deverbal nominal suffix *-yut/-güt*,<sup>3</sup> but neither assertion is acceptable. Occasionally, Yaquut words with a plural +*t* are cited in support of the Mongol thesis, but these are irrelevant in view of the known Mongol influence on that language.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Uyghur contracts provide us with attestations of several of these plural forms, including *begit*. In the penalty clause of a contract for the sale of a vineyard, we find: 18–21 *uluy süke bir altun yastuq iğeri ayılıqqa bir kümüşt yastuq begellerke birer iderke yaraşu at qızıyut birip sözleri yorımazun* 'he shall pay as penalty one gold *yastuq* to his Imperial Majesty, one silver *yastuq* to the Royal Treasury, one horse suitable for riding to each of the *bega*, and his statements shall not be valid' (edited R. R. Arat, Among the Uigur Documents, II, *UAS* XXXVI, 1965, pp. 263–272). In the transfer of merit section of a manumission document for the slave Pintong, we find: 2ff. *uluy suuqa [sic!] buyanı tegzün anta basa aqa ini oyullarya buyanı tegzün basa beg(i)tleriñe . . . meniñ öz bodumqa kisimke oylanlarımqa . . . buyanı tegzün* 'May its merit [accrued from freeing the slave] reach to his Imperial Majesty, and after that may its merit reach to the Royal Princes [the Emperor's brothers and sons], and also may its merit each to the *bega* . . . and to my own clan, to my wife, to my sons . . .' (the facsimile is published by Feng Chia Shêng – E. Tenišev, 'Tri novykh uigurskikh dokumenta iz Turfana, Problemy Vostokovedeniya 1960, Nr. 3, between pp. 145–146; cf. the remarks of L. Ligeti, À propos d'un document ouïgour de l'époque mongole, *AOH* XXVII, 1973, p. 8, where *beg-d* is taken as an error). With *beget* ~ *beg(i)t*, however, it might be a question of the Arabic plural *-āt* (thus *begāt*), as proposed by Brockelmann, OTG 151, and J. Eckmann, *Chagatay Manual*, IUP.UAS 60, Bloomington 1966, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Von Gabain considers *taqşut* 'verse(s)' an example of this plural (ATG § 65), but this is derived from \**taqış-* 'to attach' (cf. *taq-* 'to fix, attach', *taqşur-* 'to compose') through the deverbal nominal suffix *-ut* (cf. ED 474). It has also been suggested that the following three Tü words contain this marker: *süt* 'milk' (on the strength of Mo *sün* 'id.', although it is difficult to imagine that 'milk' would be conceived as plural in one, but not the other group of language, or, for that matter, in any language), *qanat* 'wing' (on the strength of a highly dubious connection to Mo *qana* 'section of a lattice wall of a yurt', although the latter has clearly contaminated the form in Saṅlax *qanat* 'the wall of a tent, a felt tent', cf. ED 635), and *bulut* 'cloud' (for reasons that are not made clear) (cf. TMEN I 416, II 323, III 519).

<sup>3</sup> The derivational suffix *-yut/-güt* forms nominals from verbs, e.g., *bayayut* 'wealthy merchant' < \**baya-* 'to be rich' < *bay* 'rich' (ED 385), *alpayut* 'brave warriors' < *alpa-* 'to be brave' < *alp* 'brave, firm, tough' (ED 128), which are neither plural (as ATG § 65, and others), nor connected with the Mongol plural *-yud/-güd*, a post-vocalic variant of *-ud/-üd* (GWM §§ 273, 274).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Kałużyński, MEJ 116–118. Another late case of a direct borrowing of a Mongol plural is found in a XV c. Ottoman historical work: *ulayat* 'couriers, messengers' ← Mo *ulaya* 'post horses' + *t(d)* (cf. *Tarama Sözlüğü* VI, Ankara 1972, p. 3930).

Ethnonyms, too, are cited as examples of this marker; e.g., the ethnonym *Taḡut* occurs in BX E 24, but it is by no means clear that this is a plural formation (the form *\*Taḡun* is unattested), nor that it is a Turkic designation of this people.

The best known case of an ethnonym with the marker *+t* is that of the Chinese form of the name of the Türk, a form that happens to provide the key to a solution of the origin of this suffix. Pelliot had long ago reconstructed the Chinese rendering as *\*türküt*, a reconstruction that has been subjected to various disagreements and criticisms since<sup>1</sup>. It now appears to be certain that Pelliot's reconstruction was correct, and that he erred only in regarding the *+t* of this reading as one of his «Mongol» plurals in Old Turkic. J. Harmatta has recently shown that the Chinese *\*türküt* as a designation of the people of the First Türk Dynasty (552–630) was received by the Chinese through the intermediary of a Sogdian report, and that the form *\*türküt* is to be analyzed as the ethnonym *türk* plus the Sogdian plural marker *+t*.<sup>2</sup>

Confirmation of Harmatta's brilliant demonstration became available only recently in the Sogdian language of the VI century inscription from Bugut in Mongolia.<sup>3</sup> The text of this inscription, written for a ruler of the First Türk Dynasty in the 580's and evidently commemorating a Buddhist mission among the Türks, contains just the form predicted by Harmatta: Bugut, Bl. line 1 *tr'ıcht* «Türks», cf. line 2 *tr'ıcke* «Türk (language)». The editors of the text, Kljaštornyj and Livšits, do not recognize the Sogdian plural here, but instead falsely refer to the old Pelliot etymology: *türk* + Mongol plural *+t*. However, the text is otherwise devoid of Turkic, let alone

<sup>1</sup> See p. 118, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> J. Harmatta, *Irano-Turcica*, *AOH* XXV, 1972, pp. 263–273; for the plural, cf. I. Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, p. 163 (§ 1069), 179 (§ 1184), 183 (§ 1217). Both Pulleyblank (*The Chinese Name for the Turks*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* LXXV, 1965, pp. 121–125) and Doerfer (*TMEN* II 483–495 (esp. 483–485), IV 440–441) argue that the Chinese characters merely transcribe *Türk*, not *Türküt*. As I am virtually helpless before Sinological puzzles, I must rely on the argumentation of Harmatta which, on the face of it, meets and disposes of the objections put forward by Pulleyblank (and Doerfer) against the reading *Türküt*. In any case, the fate of *Türküt* does not impede consideration of my proposal of a Sogdian origin for the Old Turkic marker *+t*.

<sup>3</sup> S. G. Kljaštornyj — V. A. Livšits, *The Sogdian Inscription of Bugut* Revised, *AOH* XXVI, 1972, pp. 69–102.

Mongol grammatical elements, and the form *tr'wkt* is simply the Sogdian plural form of the ethnonym as reflected in the Chinese annals.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the determinant cultural, linguistic and historical influences on the early Turks was, in addition to Chinese, Sogdian in origin.<sup>1</sup> To underline this influence, we have only to refer once more to the Bugut inscription, B2, line 2ff., where we find the first occurrences of titles that are later found among Turks: *š'ōpyt* [= *šadapit*, cf. ED 867], *tryw'nt* [= *tarran/t*, see above], *ywry'pynt* [not, so far as we know, used by Turks], and *twōwnt* [= *tudun*, cf. ED 457]. The existence of the Sogdian Bugut inscription provides us with a firm historical setting with which to postulate the identification of the Old Turkic markers *+an/+en* and *+t* with the Sogdian plurals *-n* and *-t*. The Pelliot thesis of «Mongol plurals» is, and was in his own time, unwarranted.

5. The glossary below consists of an examination of some 110 Mongol etymologies for Old Turkic words or readings of Mongol words in Old Turkic texts. Of this number, some 56 etymologies are rejected for one or more reasons stated below, 48 of which were proposed by Räsänen in VEWI, the other 8 by various scholars. Although it may appear that I have concentrated too much attention upon the statements in VEWI, it should be taken into consideration that this work is stamped with a name of authority and that a study with the present theme must be based upon sufficient material to constitute a thorough examination. For these reasons, it is necessary to say a few words on the composition of the VEWI.

Essentially, the VEWI consists of an index to the vocabulary in Radloff's *Wörterbuch*, arranged alphabetically, together with additional material and some etymological notices.<sup>2</sup> For the Old Turkic

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. G. Kljaštornyj, *Drevnetjurkskaja pis'mennost' i kul'tura narodov Tsentral'noj Azii (po materialam polevykh issledovanij v Mongolii 1968—1969 gg.)*, *Tjurkologičeskij sbornik* 1972, Moskva 1973, pp. 254—264; Jes P. Asmussen, *A\*āstvanīft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, pp. 149—150; Harmatta, *Irano-Turcica* (cited note 34); Clauson, *Asia Major* XVIII, 1973, pp. 212—214; also cf. P. Aalto, *Iranian Contacts of the Turks in Pre-Islamic Times*, *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, pp. 29—37.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the comparisons made by Poppe in VGAS, frequently cited in VEWI, appear to have been misconstrued, and thereby formed the basis of some of Räsänen's Mongol etymologies; e.g., Nr. 47 *Tü otači* ← *Mo otači*, because VGAS 98 cites *Mo otači* but only *Tü ot*; Nr. 92 *Tü ulam* ← *Mo ulam*, because VGAS 75, 101, cites *Mo ulam*, but only *Tü ula-*; Nr. 93 *Tü uyma-*

vocabulary, Räsänen draws from the glossary in ATG and occasionally other sources, Brockelmann's MTW, and the «Uighur» indications in the *Wörterbuch*. By «Uighur», Radloff understood the Herat copy of the *Qutadyu Bilig* and the Hirth manuscript of the Sino-Uyghur vocabulary,<sup>1</sup> so that by transferring such words into the VEWT without any textual corroboration, Räsänen was led to repeat a number of erroneous readings and to posit a number of Mongol etymologies for «Uighur» words.

Generally, the Mongol etymologies of Old Turkic words that are found in the VEWT may be considered false on one or more of the following grounds:

(1) *Phonetic*. Ideally, the proposed etymologies ought to display some phonetic feature typical of Mongol as opposed to Turkic; e.g., Tü  $z/k \sim$  Mo  $r/l \rightarrow$  OTü  $r/l$ .<sup>2</sup> None of the etymologies proposed by Räsänen have such features, although several are false in that he does not observe such phonetic laws (see point 6.). In lieu of clear phonetic criteria, then, we might expect at the very least that the phonetic shape of the Mo word is more or less accurately reflected in that of the proposed Tü borrowing; if not, the differences ought to be explained. The following etymologies are weak on phonetic grounds: Nrs. 2, 12, 14, 19, 20, 38, 42, 48, 49, 57, 58, 60, 64, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 97, 102, 108, 110.

(2) *Semantic*. Relationship between the vocabularies of two languages must be based upon firm sound-meaning correspondences. Many of Räsänen's etymologies are in fact based upon weak semantic comparisons, particularly between the primary meanings of roots and stems. Occasionally, scholars may disagree on what is semantically comparable, but I do not think that the weakness of the following would be especially controversial to most: Nrs. 1, 2, 17, 42, 45, 56, 58, 67, 73.

(3) *Structural*. Turkic and Mongol languages are minimally composed of three parts of speech: nominals, verbals and particles (or indeclineables). In research to date, no one has made a case for the existence of borrowings between these two language groups such

Mo *oimasun*, because VGAS 67 has Mo *oimasun* and Tü *uyuq*, whereas VGAS 11 omits the Tü; and possibly several others.

<sup>1</sup> Occasionally, Räsänen interprets the latter as QB; e.g., VEWT 12: QB *aymaq* is actually KY 127 *aymaq* «district» Mo *aimay* (W I 63-64 cites it as «Uig»); also KY are VEWT 327 *maral*, 341 *möndür*, 348 *nayajı*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Poppe, *Einige Lautgesetze* . . . (cited n. 2); also TMEN I 6.

that a nominal is borrowed as a verbal, a particle as a verbal, nor for any other transformations between the parts of speech. Thus, comparisons must be made only between words belonging to the same part of speech; false on these grounds: Nrs. 1, 20, 25, 49, 56.

(4) *Etymological*. Räsänen frequently gives a Mongol etymology for a Turkic word that otherwise has a good Turkic etymology, that is, one for which a root and suffixes can be found in Turkic. Such etymologies are surely false: Nrs. 1, 14, 17, 36, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 62, 76, 87, 92, 93, 102, 110.

(5) *Areal linguistic*. Several of Räsänen's etymologies are based on Ramsted's KW, that is, upon a Mongol word found only in Kalmyk, but given a WMo equivalent by Ramstedt. Occasionally, these equivalents do not in fact exist, but are meant only as the presumed WMo form were it to exist.<sup>1</sup> Even in other cases, the word may be isolated in Mongol, and thereby not support the Mongol origin of the Turkic word. The intensity of the areal or temporal distribution of a given word can not be taken as a conclusive indicator of its origin, but can provide support for what is more probable when other criteria are lacking.<sup>2</sup> See Nrs. 2, 4, 94, 101, 105.

(6) *Methodological*. Under this heading, I would place a variety of considerations that tend to falsify Räsänen's etymologies.<sup>3</sup> As one consideration, there are several cases in which both the Turkic and the Mongol words are borrowed from a third language and lack any criteria that would point to a Mongol mediation (e.g., Nr. 54). Often, Räsänen fails to pay attention to established sound correspondences between Turkic and Mongol (e.g., Nrs. 12, 57, 69, 71, 93, 110). Again, the VEWI shows signs of hasty compilation in that a Mongol etymology may be given for a Turkic word in one place, but another view for the same word in another place (e.g., Nrs. 20, 33, 108). Those etymologies false for one or more methodological reasons consist of: Nrs. 4, 12, 14, 20, 21, 25, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 76, 87, 93, 94, 97, 98, 101, 102, 108, 110.

<sup>1</sup> On specific problems connected with citations in KW, see: John R. Krueger, *Circularity in Kalmyk Dictionaries*, *The Mongolian Society Bulletin* XIII-2, 1973, pp. 52-70.

<sup>2</sup> Ligeti has utilized this principle in: *Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou*, *AOH* X, 1960, pp. 231-248, see p. 232.

<sup>3</sup> Valuable methodological remarks on Altaic comparisons are assembled as a set of «Bedingungen» by Doerfer, *TMEN* IV 325-336.

Of the total of examined words, some 37 are *errors*, that is, scribal or editorial mistakes, and another 5 are *unclear* readings that could be errors. Räsänen's acceptance of the QB citations in the *Wörterbuch* accounts for half (19) of the errors, and his adoption of words from the ATG and MTW led to other Mongol etymologies that could hardly be correct. Another source is the reading of words in various Old Turkic texts that could only be identified as Mongol words. Here is the distribution of the erroneous and unclear readings:

- I. *Runic*: Nr. 18 (Yen), 44 (KT, BX), 81 (BX), 103 (KT), 107 (Toñ); unclear are: 26 (KT, BX), 39 (BX), 96 (Yen);
- II. *Manichean*: Nr. 8 (IB), 16 (IB), 40 (IB), 55 (T II D 173e), 79 (Xuast); unclear: 99 (M III 8);
- III. *Uyghur*: Nr. 6 (US 42 = TT VII 37), 23 (H I), 78 (TT VI), 100 (H II 4), 104 (Stake Inscription I), 107 (HT); unclear: 50 (U I = U IV A; U II 10);
- IV. *Karakhanid*: errors in MK: Nrs. 15, 77, 90; errors in Herat copy of QB: 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 41, 63, 70, 80, 83, 95, 106, 109.

Of the five unclear cases, two involve readings that with very little doubt cannot be read as Mongol words (Nrs. 39, 99), and the other three are words that may in fact be Turkic rather than Mongol (Nrs. 39, 50, 96). However, each of these readings is shrouded in textual and other difficulties, so that even though I have not personally been able to find more viable solutions to these passages, the fact remains that they do not qualify as cases of Mongol loanwords. One may indeed cite here «Dempwolff's principle» to the following effect: that which is unclear is not clear (TMEN IV 323).

With the exclusion of the false etymologies, the reading errors, and the unclear cases, we are left with elements of two types: (1) Mongol loanwords in QBII; (2) possible Mongol loanwords in MK.

That there is a Mongol influence on the language of the scribe or scribes who copied the Herat manuscript of the *Qutadgu Bilig* in 1439 at the court of Shahrukh (1405-1447) is incontestable. At Herat, as well as at other Timürid centers, the language which we call Chaghatay was evolved during the XV century; it is this language which interferes with the Karakhanid original of the QB in the Herat copy, and it is this language which felt the Mongol influence. Thus, Nrs. 11, 84, 85, not to mention the Mongol ductus of the Uyghur script in which Herat is written, constitute Mongol



elements in Chaghatay. This is confirmed by the lack of such elements in the two older manuscripts — Namangan and Cairo — of QB, which more closely reflect the Karakhanid original.

There remains a group of words which first appear in the *Divān* of MK, and are either isolated there or occur sparingly elsewhere. The isolation and the existence of Mongol counterparts for such words render Mongol etymologies possible. This group consists of: Nr. 22 *čaqır* 'blue, blue-grey (of eyes)?' ← Mo *čakır*, 52 *qalqan/qalqaŋ* (also QB) 'shield'? ← Mo *qalqa*, 66 *qom* 'camel's pack-saddle'? ← Mo *qom*, 68 *qon* (et) 'muscle'? ← Mo *qong*; 72 *siri-* 'to quilt, sew'? ← Mo *siri-*, 82 *torum* 'camel colts'? ← Mo *torum*, 86 *turumtay* 'hawking birds'? ← Mo *turumtai*, 89 *tuturqan* 'rice'? ← Mo *tuturyan*, 91 *ula* 'mound in the desert that serves as a landmarks'? ← Mo *ayula*. Of these, those which stand the best chance of being Mongol loans are: 22 *čaqır*, because of the root \*ča in Mongol, 86 *turumtay*, because of the suffix *-tai* in Mongol, and perhaps 91 *ula*. For each of these, I have registered objections and difficulties, but have admitted the possibility. Three of the words lack any criteria by which they could be said to be loanwords: 66 *qom*, 68 *qon*, 82 *torum*. The remaining three words encounter difficulties that appear to me to be insurmountable, but still not conclusively so: 52 *qalqan*, 72 *siri-*, 89 *tuturqan*.

In my opinion, apart from the questionable Nr. 91, each of these words could as easily be borrowings from Turkic into Mongol as the reverse. Under such circumstances, I think it would be rash to utilize them as evidence for the existence of Mongol loanwords into Old Turkic.

6. The existence of Mongol loanwords in Old Turkic was admitted to be an *a priori* possibility. However, it is the conclusion of this study that this remains only a possibility and not, therefore, a working hypothesis. Specifically, of the 110 possible Mongol loanwords examined below, five are found to be unclear possibilities (but probably reading errors), nine to be possibilities (without any clear cases), and three to be Mongol elements in the XV century Herat copy of the *Qutadγu Bilig*. This finding does not preclude disagreement on the part of scholars with my analyses of individual cases, nor the citation of etymologies not noticed by me. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that in the consideration of so many possibilities, the low number of remaining unclear cases is indicative of an improbable thesis.

Moreover, it is my view that the fact of historical contacts and Turkic loanwords into Mongol prior to the XIII century, does not entail the existence of Mongol loanwords in Old Turkic. Uni-directional loan contacts are not entirely unknown.<sup>1</sup> One can cite several Inner Asian cases. A cultural and economic symbiosis between Turks and Sogdians existed for centuries, one result of which was the adoption by the Turks of numerous Sogdian words as well as terms from other languages mediated through Sogdian, not to mention the Sogdian plural suffixes discussed above. Yet, apart from onomastica and some kinds of foreign words occurring in Sogdian texts, no Turkic words, to my knowledge, were borrowed into the Sogdian literary language. Nearly the same can be said of the Turk-Tokharian and Turk-Chinese connections.

Furthermore, some historical contacts seem not to have resulted in the exchange of linguistic elements. This appears to be the case, for example, with the contacts over several centuries between the Turks of the Northern Tarim and the Iranians of Khotan. Although, to be sure, there are Turkic titles and names in Khotanese texts, as well as a brief Turk-Khotanese vocabulary, these do not represent Turkic loanwords into that language, nor have direct Khotanese loanwords thus far been isolated in Turkic texts.<sup>2</sup> With less certainty on my part, much the same may be said for the early contacts between Turks and Tibetans.

These cases unquestionably require further research, and are cited here merely to underscore the fact that a possibility — such as Mongol loanwords in Old Turkic — is little more than that. On present evidence one may state with some confidence that the influence of the Mongol languages is first exerted on the Turkic languages in the Middle Turkic period.

### Glossary

Since it is not the purpose of this paper to document the existence of the examined vocabulary, I have kept citations of forms to their

<sup>1</sup> Doerfer has pointed to the case of German influence on Gypsy (Romani), without the reverse being true, cf. TMEN IV 344. Professor Sinor, in conversation, has cited to me the example of Austrian influence on Hungarian, but not the reverse.

<sup>2</sup> See the excellent study of Even Hovdhaugen, *Turkish Words in Khotanese Texts, A Linguistic Analysis*, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* XXIV, Oslo 1971, pp. 163–209, see p. 166.

barest minimum. For Turkic, I refer most frequently to ED, citing the occurrence of a word, if applicable, in each of the four major groups outlined above (pp. 115–7), and to VEWT, particularly for modern forms. For Mongol, I refer to the WMo form in Lessing's dictionary, and secondarily in Kowalewski's, but only rarely to Middle Mongol and modern Mongol sources. A list of abbreviations may be found at the end of the glossary; other abbreviations used throughout are: Tü = Turkic, OTü = Old Turkic, MTü = Middle Turkic [also, MTü followed by a Nr. refers to the second part of this study, see note 3. p. 112]; Mo = Mongol, OMo = Old Mongol, MMo = Middle Mongol, WMo = Written Mongol.

1. MK *abāči* «a bogy; to frighten a child, one says *abāči keldi* 'the bogy has come'» (ED 6); Räsänen links MK *abāči* and Yaqt *abāsi* «evil beings, devil, etc.» (VEWT 1), and accepts Poppe's etymology of the Yaqt word from WMo 2 *abači*-/3 *abayači*-/5 *abuyači* «to remove, take away with one, carry off», Bur *abāša*, Xal *avāči* «one who takes off, recipient» (N. Poppe, *Jakutische Etymologien*, *UdJ* XXXIII, 1961, pp. 137–138). There are several objections to this etymology: (1) Bur *abāša* and Xal *avāči* are both to be analyzed as the root *aba-* and the deverbal nominal suffix *-yači* (GWM § 147), whereas the WMo verbs are formed with the deverbal verbal suffix *-či* (GWM § 253); only the nominal forms may be compared with the Yaqt noun, but it is known that the suffix *-yači* in Mongol loans in Yaqt is always reflected as *-āčči/-ččči* (MEJ 70), so that Yaq *abāsi* cannot be borrowed from Mo; (2) with MK *abāči* must also be placed MK *abāqi* «a figure put up in kitchen gardens to avert the evil eye» (ED 8; it remains problematic whether Persian *ēbak* «idol» belongs here, cf. TMEN II 173, IV 422), so that a nominal root \**aba* must be posited which may or may not reflect, in some remote mythological sense, Tü *apa/aba* «bear» (ED 5); (3) the semantic connection between «bogy» and «someone who takes away» seems to be secondary.

2. H I 23, MK *āy* «the space between the legs, crotch» (ED 75); Räsänen considers this word a borrowing from KW 2 *ag*/20 *āg* «small holes, space» (cf. WMo 12 *ay* «smallpox virus», Ord 6 *āg* «husks of millet, bran», and other divergent meanings in Mo dialects), and takes the Mo *ay* to be cognate to Tü *āy* «hunting or fishing net» (VEWT 7). To this: (1) Tü *āy* «crotch» is semantically equivalent to WMo 26 *ala* «joint of the thighs, groin, crotch», but not to Mo *ay*; (2) the meaning «crotch» is not necessarily implied by KW *ag/āg*

«small holes, spaces», but in any case the latter meaning is isolated in Qalmyq and ought there to be borrowed from Tü rather than the reverse; (3) there are no phonetic criteria to indicate a borrowing from Mo into Tü.

3. QBH 10: 29 *aĵu* «father» (W I 526) is to be read *aĵü* = QB 10 *eĵü* «ancestor» (cf. ED 20), but neither reading could be borrowed from WMo 8 *aĵi* «grandson, granddaughter; nephew, niece» (as VEWT 3--4).

4. KP XXXVII: 2, Suv 610: 18ff. *alaŋad-* «to become weak, lose one's strength», *alaŋadtur-* «to weaken» (ED 149; see here for spellings *alaŋu-* in KP and *alaŋur-* in Suv); Räsänen takes the Uyğur verbs and modern forms of the root \**alaŋ* to be borrowed from Mo, cf. KW 7 *aly* «surprised, sceptical, undecided», *alyŋa-* «to be surprised and doubtful, not to believe», 8 *alyŋr-* «to become disconcerted, not to accept, etc.», where WMo forms *alaŋg*, *alangua-*, *alaŋtura-*, are cited (VEWT 16). Now, these Mo words are lacking from Kowalewski, Lessing, Ord, Xal, Bur, and are found only in KW. On areal linguistic grounds, then, it is far more probable that the Qalmyq forms are borrowings from Qzq *alaŋ bol-* «to be worried, disturbed», *alaŋda-* «id.», or Qr *alaŋ* «absent-minded, distracted, etc.», *alaŋda-* «to look around uneasily, etc.».

5. QBH 49: 26 *alĵi-* «to lose strength, etc.» (W I 426--7) is to be read \**leĵip*, a scribal error for *keĵip* in the other manuscripts (QB 1175); in any case, hardly a loanword from Mo, cf. KW 9 *altšā-* «to pamper (children)», where a postulated but otherwise unknown WMo form *altšiya-* is given (as VEWT 17).

6. US 42: 5 *amsaq* «taste» (US 262) is a reading error for *amraq* «beloved» (for the best edition of this text, see Rachmati, TT VII 37: 6), which is based on WMo 39 *amsa-* «to taste», found as a Mo loanword in Siberian Tü (VEWT 19).

7. IB 31 *ay* «wild game» (ED 166, incorrectly as *ey*), IB 49 *aŋla-* «to hunt wild game» (ED 186, as *eyle-*), U II 8: 9, TT IV A 56 (both Buddhist confession texts) *aŋŋi* «hunter of wild game» (ED 173, correctly as *aŋŋi*). This series of words is isolated in OTü beside the normal series *aß*, *aßla-*, *aßŋi*, used for hunting (ED 3, 6, 10). Corresponding sets may be found in Mo, cf. WMo 43 *ang*, *angŋi*, 45 *angla-/angna-* 2 *aba*, *abaŋi*, 3 *abala-*. Thus, it might be argued, on the grounds of isolation, that the OTü *aŋ* series was borrowed from Mo; Clauson, for example, considers the relationship between the Tü and the Mo word obscure, but largely because he has changed the vowel from *a-* to *-e*, despite the clear Uyğur spelling of *a-*. However, there is

an argument by which both series, that based on *aŋ* and that on *aβ*, ought to be considered Tü loanwords into Mo. It is known that there existed among these peoples essentially two styles of hunting: individual and battue. Individual hunting is reflected in the Tü terms based on *aŋ* 'wild games', whereas battue hunting is reflected in those based on *aβ* 'hunting'. In support of the latter, cf. OTü *aβla-* 'to crowd around, to surround', a verb listed as separate from *aβla-* 'to hunt' by Clauson (ED 10), but which surely reflects the battue style of surrounding the game and drawing it into an increasingly smaller circle. Moreover, there exist in Mo native terms for both types of hunting: WMo 387 *göröge(sün)* 'animal, wild games', *görögele-* 'to hunt wild games', *görögeči* 'hunter of wild games' (individual), and WMo 961 *qomor-* 'to encircle', *qomorya* 'the circle formed by hunters in a battue' (TMEN I 411–414, with literature). Thus, native unrelated terms for both styles of hunting exist in Tü and Mo, but in Mo there are additional terms or synonyms that correspond to the Tü terms. In other lexical spheres, of which anatomy provides the best example, this relationship is indicative of Tü loanwords into Mo (cf. A. Róna-Tas, *Obščee nasledie ili zaimstvovanija?* (K probleme rodstva altajskikh jazykov), *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1974, Nr. 2, p. 33) — as must be the case here.

8. IB 60 *aral* 'thicket' (ATG 295; PDP 359; DTS 50) is to be read *ar(a)lı* in the sentence *toquz ar(a)lı sıynun kiyik men* 'I am a nine *ar(a)lı* male deer' (cf. ED 230), possibly to be connected with *ara* 'space, interval', in the sense of 'a deer with a measure of nine spaces between its horns(?)', but certainly not with WMo 48 *aral* 'island' (as VEWT 23).

9. QBH 128: 21 *arda* 'family' (W I 319) occurs in a couplet that is out of place in the Herat ms. (= QB 4483) and is Radloff's misreading of *erde eri* '(0) pious man' (Radloff read it correctly in *Das Kudatku Bilik*, II/2, SPb. 1910, p. 383, but changed it in the *Wörterbuch* due to a misleading similarity with Qzq *arda*, *q.v.*); thus, the ghost word *arda* 'family' cannot be construed as a loan from WMo 51 *arduy* 'inexperienced; untrained (of horses); pampered (of children)' (as VEWT 24–25).

10. QBH 74: 9 *ayi* 'pure' (W I 218) is an error for *ay* 'speak (well)' of the other manuscripts (QB 1923); in any case, hardly a loan from WMo 22 *aya* 'aptness, proper manners, etc.' (as VEWT 11, citing KW 4 *ay<sup>4</sup>*, where the WMo forms *ayi/aya* are given, although *ayi* is not otherwise attested; also cf. VGAS 94.)

11. QBH 131: 7 *ayu* is glossed with Arabic *ḥawl* 'fear' in a passage where the other manuscripts have *ayı bolma qoßdaş* 'do not be excessively [*ayı* < \**añıy*] quarrelsome' (QB 4599; cf. below, Nr. 62); this is clearly a confusion on the part of the scribe of Herat with WMo 24 *ayu-/ayı* 'to fear' (as seen by Clauson, ED 274), and therefore represents one of the several Mo elements in that copy (wr. 1439).

12. MK *azma* 'gelded ram' (ED 288); Räsänen takes this and some modern Tü forms to be borrowed from WMo 56 *asaman* 'monorchid, having only one testicle; animal castrated after maturity' (VEWT 33). This is clearly false for the following reasons: (1) Mo -s- would remain as -s- in Tü [cf. MTü Nr. 11 *asra*-]; (2) Mo *asaman* is obviously borrowed from Tü *azman*, since the regular correspondence would be Mo \**araman*; (3) MK *azma* is otherwise connected to Abū Ḥayyān *azman* 'a horse gelded when fully grown' (ED 288), Turkish *azma/azman* 'monstrous, hybrid, castrated, etc.' (Redhouse 112), Gagauz *azman/razman* 'monstrous, extra-large' (*Gagauzsko-russko-moldavskij slovar'*, Moskva 1973, pp. 30, 506), Qzq *azhan* 'castrated animal', and is surely to be read in KT N5 *Kül Tegin azman aqıy binip oplayı tegdi* 'K.T. mounted the gelded white (horse) and attacked furiously' (Tekin, GOT 307, *azman* 'yellowish' is certainly false and seems to be based on KT N5, N8 *az yayızı*, which Tekin, GOT 306, takes to be 'yellowish brown', but which is 'the bay horse (taken) from the Az', cf. ED 277). Further pertinent remarks on Tü *azman* have been made by Kalużyński (RÖ XXXII/1, 1968-69, pp. 91-92).

13. QBH 68: 32, 129: 1 *azrayı* 'a domestic (servant)' (W I 578: < *azra*- + -ıy); both Radloff's transcription and his etymology from *azra*-, that is, WMo 56 *asura*- 'to take care of' [see MTü Nr. 11], are incorrect; the word in these passages is simply Tü *asraqı* '(situated) below' (ED 252; DTS 61).

14. Xuast (9) *baly* *başlıy* 'wounded (Hend.)', MK, QB 5430 *bāly* 'wounded' (ED 335); Räsänen takes MK *bāly*, as well as modern Tü forms, to be borrowed from WMo 68 *baḡula*-/78 *bala*- 'to form a scab, to suppurate', and the Mo forms to be derived from a root \**ba* that is cognate to the root of Tü *bāš* 'wound' (VEWT 60). To this: (1) it is unclear whether Räsänen considers Mo *bala*- or the root \**ba* to be the origin of Tü *bāly*, either of which encounters phonetic or methodological difficulties (the root could be the base of both the Tü and Mo forms, but it would be difficult to prove that it was borrowed from one to the other); (2) Bang has proposed that *bāly*

is derived from \*bāl- through -γ/-g, the deverbal nominal suffix that is also found in *bilig* »knowledge» < *bil-* »to know» + -g, etc. (Manichaeische Laien Beichtspiegel, *Le Muséon* XXXVI, 1923, pp. 177—179); the stem \*bāl- is also found in MK *balıq* »to be wounded» (ED 337), which has the emphatic suffix -q- (Clauson's derivations *balıγ* < \*bā + -lıγ and *balıq* < *bala-* + -q- are to be discarded); (3) the root \*bā may be analyzed only within Tü, on the basis of \*bāl- »to wound» and *bāš* »wound», whereas Mo has only the thematic *bala-*, which is a regular correspondence to Tü \*bāl-, but certainly not the origin of the latter; (4) one problem remains, that of the WMo form *bayala-*, for which several possible explanations suggest themselves: (a) -aya- here represents the Tü -ā-, cf. WMo 520 *mayajin* = *majing*, Xal *mādžin(g)*, KW 258 *mādži* »varnish, lacquer» (← Chinese); WMo *Čayatai*, SH *Ča'adai*, al-<sup>c</sup>Umarī *Čadai*, Carpini *Chianday* (= \*čādai; see J. A. Boyle, Some Additional Notes on the Mongolian Names in the History of the Nation of the Archers, *Researches in Altaic Languages*, Budapest 1975, pp. 36—37); or the practice in the Mongol orthography of the *Uyğur* script »Legend of Oğuz Xayan», where *qār* »snow» is written as *qayar*, *qātır* »mule» as *qayatır*, *tām* »wall» as *tayam*, *šām* »Syria» as *šayam* (see L. Ligeti, Les fragments du *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* mongol en écriture 'phags-pa, *AOH* XVII, 1964, pp. 289—291); (b) the pair *bala-/bayala-* »to suppurate» reflects contamination with WMo 68 *bala-/bayala-* »to fine, impose a penalty», derived from WMo 64 *ba/67 baya* »fine» (← Chinese; cf. Ordos 41), or with WMo 67 *baya-* »to excrete», the latter in the sense of »to emit some obnoxious substance» + »to suppurate»(?).

15. MK *heder burzan* »painted idol» (MTW 33; Atalay I 436—9; questioned in DTS 91); Räsänen accepts the reading of MTW which, if it were correct, would surely be a loan from WMo 103 *bider* = *beder* »ornament, pattern engraved on metal, stone or wood, etc.» (VEWT67); however, the manuscript of MK is very clear: *bediz burzan* »painted idols» (*Tıpkıbasım* 219: 10; ED 310); thus, only *bediz* occurs in OTü, to which Mo *beder* is the regular correspondence.

16. IB 37 *bič* »small» (PDP 371; DTS 98); because of its similarity to WMo 102 *bičiqan* »small», Malov read this meaning into the passage *bir qarı öküzüg bilin biče qumursya yimiš* »ants ate an old ox, cutting into its waist» (cf. ED 292—3; *bič*-, a front vowel variant of *bič*- »to cut»).

17. IT 1843ff., MK *bileγ* »a gift which a traveller brings back for his neighbors, or one sent from one place to another» (ED 338);

Räsänen considers the OTü *bileg* [= *béleg*] to be a loan from WMo 97 *beleg* 'gift, present', and the latter to be cognate to Tü *bölük* 'section, part' (VEWT 69). To this: (1) Tü *bölük* is derived from *böl-* 'to divide, separate' (lacking in Mo), and is, in any case, found as a loanword in WMo 147 *bülük* [read *bülök* < *bölek*] (cf. TMEN II 323–326); it has nothing to do with Mo *beleg*; (2) Tü *bileg* is derived from *bile-* 'to swaddle' (ED 332), in the sense of 'a gift that is wrapped up (usually in fine cloth)' (for the fact, cf. von Gabain's note to HT 1843); the root is thus found only in Tü. Similarly false is the binding of Mo *beleg* 'gift' with WMo 97 *beled-* 'to prepare', *belen* 'ready', as proposed by Poppe (VGAS 104; the source of Räsänen's error?); the semantic connection between 'gift' and 'to prepare' is, at best, strained, while the connection between the roots 'to swaddle, to wrap up' and 'to prepare' is far-fetched.

18. Yen 45: 8 *bodraq* 'scattered, dispersed, free (of livestock)' (EPT 82; DTS 121); Malov has supplied the vowel quality and meaning of this word in the passage *biñ bodraq ħunt* '(I was separated from my) 1,000 *bodraq* horses' on the basis of its similarity to PdC 161, W IV 1676 *botraq* 'scattered, dispersed' [read *butraq*!]; the Čaytatay word is a derived form of a loanword from WMo 141 *butara-* 'to break to pieces, smash, disperse, scatter', so that Yen *bodraq* could also be a loan. The word in question also occurs in Yen 55: 1 *ūē yūz bodraq ħunt* '300 *bodraq* horses', and in both passages is spelled 𐰽 𐰺 𐰾 > 𐰽 which may be read *bodr<sup>a</sup>q* or *budr<sup>a</sup>q* [= *bodraq*/ *budraq*]. The meaning of this word is not known, although Clauson suggests that it might be 'sturdy' (ED 307, where the origin of Čay *botraq* is falsely given as WMo *böte're-*).

19. MK, QB 1310 *boq-* 'to cross (the legs)' (ED 311); Räsänen takes this word to be borrowed from Mo, cf. KW 49 *bokī-* 'to bend, cross (the legs)' (Ramstedt cites WMo *bokiyi-*, which is not found in Kowalewski or Lessing, but cf. WMo 114 *bokiski-* 'to bow, bend, bend the knees') (VEWT 79). However, the root of the Mo verbs is clearly \**boki-* < \**boq-*, which is comparable to but not the source of Tü *boq-*.

20. Suv 137: 4, MK *bög-* 'to collect, gather together (people or things); to collect or dam up (running water)' (ED 324); in one place, Räsänen groups with MK *bük-* [read *bög-*] also Alt, Tel, etc. *pük* 'stopper, cork, plug', and a variety of modern Tü verbs meaning 'to dam up', and considers these to be borrowed from a Mo root \**bög* found in WMo 125 *bög-ür* [read *bögür* < *böger*] 'greedy' and WMo 125 *bög-le-* 'to fill an opening, stop up' (VEWT 83); in a second



place, Räsänen considers the Mo root *\*böğ* to be cognate to Tü *\*böğ* found in Yaq *büö* «plug, stoppers», *büölē-* «to stop up», Alt, Tel, etc. *pök* «plug» (VEWT 82; as VGAS 58); thus, for Räsänen, Tü *\*böğ* «stopper, plug» = Mo *\*böğ* «id.» → Tü *bög-* «to collect or dam up». The etymological ramifications of this group of words actually extend beyond Räsänen's indications, but here it will be pointed out that this etymology is false for the following reasons: (1) the root of Mo *bögle-* is *bög*, which is attested in Ord *bög* «cork, stoppers»; the nominal Mo root cannot be compared with the Tü verbal root, let alone postulated as the origin of the latter; (2) the Yaqut and Siberian Tü forms — the latter entered under both etymologies! — are clearly borrowings from the Mo nominal root *bög* (as demonstrated in TMEN I 228—229); (3) Mo *bögör* «greedy» cannot be morphologically connected to Mo *bögle-* «to stop up», but is either derived from an unattested Mo verb *\*böge-* «to collect, gather» (comparable, to, but not the source of Tü *bög-*) through the Mo deverbal nominal suffix *-r* (GMW § 178), or is simply a loanword from Tü *bög-er*, the aorist of *bög-*, «someone or something that collects or gathers» > «greedy».

21. KT E2, IB 28, Xuast 12, KP VII:2, TT VIII A1, MK *buluŋ* «corner, angle, cardinal point, a quarter of the world» (ED 343); Räsänen proposes that Tü *buluŋ* is a loan from WMo 136 *bulung* «corner, angle» (VEWT 88—89). His argument is as follows: Mo *bulung* is a metathesized form of Mo *\*bunqul*, where the final *-l* is a regular correspondence to Tü *-š*, so that there once existed a Tü form *\*bunquš*, which survives as Yaq *muŋnuq/munnuq* «corner, out-of-the-way place, edge», and as Tü *müŋüş* «a corner» (ED 771: Rah-yūzī, Xvarazm, CC, Čayataŋ; cf. VEW 344—345). Ingenious as is this etymology, it must be rejected: (1) the starting points of Räsänen's argument, Mo *\*bunqul* and Tü *\*bunquš*, are teleological; (2) the metathesis *l-ŋ* < *ŋ-l* is not otherwise attested in Mo; (3) Yaq *muŋnuq* does not belong here, but is derived from Yaq *muŋ* «limit, boundary, extreme degree», the Yaq reflex of Tü *buŋ* «grief, sorrow» (ED 347; for the semantic extension, cf. TMEN IV 31), as correctly recorded elsewhere by Räsänen himself (VEWT 344); (4) Tü *müŋüş* (? < *mün-güş*) «corner» is perhaps, as Clauson proposes, «an unusual secondary form of *büñüz* «horn» (ED 771), which would, however, require the postulation of a root *\*bün* with different derivational suffixes; this is unclear; (5) even were we to accept *müŋüş* as a development of Tü *\*bünqüş*, how can the latter be aligned with the hypothetical Mo *\*bunqul* on the Altaic level?

22. MK *čaqr* 'blue, blue-grey (of the eyes)', Taf *čaqr közlüg* Abū Hayyān *čaqr gözlü* [Trkml] 'grey-eyed', Čaγ *čaqr qanat* '(grey-wing) a kind of water fowl' (all cited ED 409); Räsänen considers Tü *čaqr* to be a loan from WMo 162 *čakir* 'very white, light snow white; white spots on finger nails or on the feathers of a bird' (VEWT 96). Indeed, the relationship between the two is problematic, primarily because the root of the word *čaqr* appears to be identical to the root \*ča which may be analyzed in the following Mo words: ča-γi- 'to become white', ča-l 'white', ča-sun 'snow', ča-γan 'white', ča-γa-sun 'paper', ča-ng-gir 'whitish, bluish', ča-bi-dar 'having a white mane, pale, grey (horse)' (cf. N. Poppe, Remarks on Some Roots and Stems in Mongolian, *Silver Jubilee Volume*, Kyoto 1954, p. 296). Compounding the problem is the lack of a Tü etymology for *čaqr* (for the later semantic development, 'blue-grey' > 'wine', see TMEN III 77–78). On the other side, however, Mo *čakir* is difficult to analyze as the root \*ča + a suffix -kir. The latter suffix could only be identified with the Mo DVN suffix -gir [sometimes -ger/-γar], that is, with -g- and not -k-; cf. belči- 'to pasture, graze' > belčigir/belčiger 'pasture, grazing grounds'; bujiγi- 'to curl (hair)' > bujiγir 'curly', etc. (N. Poppe, Die Nominalstammbildungssuffixe im Mongolischen, *KSz* XX, 1923–27, pp. 105–106). The semantic comparison 'blue-grey' and 'white' is not quite exact, but in view of the shades of reference of color terms (cf. Mo čangγir 'whitish, bluish'), it would be pedantic to insist on this point. In view of the Mo root \*ča and the susceptibility of color terms to borrowing, the possibility of a Mo loanword in the present instance cannot be excluded. At the same time, it must still be shown that a suffix -kir exists otherwise in Mo.

23. H I 151 *čaqlγ* '(pertaining to) time' (thus Rachmati, followed by DTS 140) is to be translated 'thoroughly, sufficiently' in the passage *edgüti čaqlγ čin bolmašda* 'when (the stuffed grape) has become thoroughly done (or cooked)' (cf. ED 407); thus, *čaqlγ* is derived from the adverb *čaγ* 'precisely, exactly', and is not the WMo 156 *čay* 'time', which first appears in MTü as a loanword [see MTü Nr. 34].

24. QBH 18: 3 *čerke* 'row, rank, line' (W III 1970) is a scribal error in Herat, cf. QB 192 *tilekim süz erdi ay bilge böğü/kidin kelde-čike* [H: *kelti čerke*] *özüm sözlegü* 'My wish, O wise sage, was to speak a word that would remain for those who came after me'; otherwise, were Radloff's *čerke* [for *jerge*] correct, Räsänen might have been

right in taking it as a loan from WMo 1045 *jerge* »sort, kind, class, rank, etc.: (VEWT 105). [See MTü Nr. 59].

25. MK *ēiŋ* in *ēiŋ tolu köl* »a lake full of waters» (ED 424); the particle is considered by Räsänen to be a loan from WMo 188 *ēiŋ* »firm(ly)», 189 *ēiŋya* »strong, sturdy, etc.» (VEWT 111–112). To this: (1) MK *ēiŋ* is connected to the intensifying particle *ēim* in Ibn Muḥannā, Abū Ḥayyān (ED 424), and surely to MK *ēiŋ* »a ringing or buzzing sound» (id.); both are of onomatopoeic origin and do not specifically mean »firm, strong»; (2) Mo *ēiŋ*, *ēiŋya*, do not function as intensifying particles (which may not take derivational suffixes), but as simple attributes (which may and do take suffixes, cf. Mo *ēiŋda* »strict, firm», *ēiŋdala-* »to strengthen, tighten», *ēiŋyara-* »to become strong», etc.); (3) criteria for borrowing are lacking between MK and Mo *ēiŋ*, whereas MK *ēiŋ* could not phonetically reflect Mo *ēiŋya*.

26. KT E4 [= BX E5] *ēōlig il* in the list of countries that sent representatives to Ištemi Xayan's funeral: *büklü, ēōlig il, tabyač, tōpöt* »Korea, the *ēōlig* nation, China, Tibet» (ED 420). Some editors of this passage have read the word as *ēōl(l)ig*, that is, as *ēōl* »desert, steppe» + *-lig* (IOD 98,139; PDP 376; DTS 155; GOT 323); the same word has been read in Toñ 23 *ēōlgi az eri bultım* »(I searched for a guide and) I found an Az man from *ēōlgi*(?)» (cf. ED 420; PDP 376; DTS 155; GOT 323). Because of this disputed occurrence in the inscriptions, both Räsänen (VEWT 117) and Doerfer (TMEN III 122–123; IV 458) consider *ēōl* »desert, steppe» to be an originally Tü word which was borrowed into Mo (see TMEN for citations). For my part, I consider *ēōl* a Mo word that first certainly appears in Čay (cf. ED 420), and is found in Central Asian and Siberian Tü languages. As to the present passages, it should be pointed out: (1) the exact phonetic interpretation of the word is uncertain: KT *ēōl<sup>2</sup>g* = *ēōlig*, *ēūlig*, *ēōleq*, *ēūley*, *ēōlüg*, *ēūlüg*, etc.; Toñ *ēōl<sup>2</sup>gi* = *ēōlgi*, *ēūlgi*, *ēōlegi*, *ēūlegi*, *ēōligi*, *ēūligi*; (2) the meaning of neither word is known, nor is the connection between the two certain (*ēōlig il* comes between Korea and China, whereas *ēōlgi* is associated with the Az tribe, always mentioned in connection with the Čik and the Qırız of the Southern Sayan); (3) it might be possible to postulate *ēōl(l)ig* for *ēōlig*, but there is no suffix *-gi* in Tü or Mo for *ēōlgi*; (4) the formation *ēōl + lig* is not otherwise known, nor does the construction *ēōl-lig il* »(lit.) nation having or possessing the quality of a steppe» make very good sense; (5) both *ēōlig* and *ēōlgi* (as read)

could be placenames or tribal appellatives drawn from a non-Turkic language. Because the two words are attended only by uncertainties (phonetic, morphological, contextual, semantic), it is rash both to seek the word *čöl* 'desert, steppe' as their root, and to consider *čöl* as OTü on the basis of these words.

27. QBH 97:23 *ebügen* 'old man' (W I 933) is Radloff's misreading of Herat *ādūken begi* = QB 2682 *ölūken begi* 'Lord of the Ötūken', and thus is not the WMo 290 *ebügen/öbügen* 'old man' [see MTü Nr. 91].

28. QBH 118:14 *ende-* 'to quarrel, accuse falsely' (W I 740-1) is Radloff's misreading of Herat *anda* = QB 4113 *anda* 'there, then', and thus has nothing to do with WMo 315 *ende-* 'to err, be mistaken . . .' (as VEWT 44).

29. QBH *ep* 'suitability, agreement' (W I 916-7) was misread in the following places: 40:19 "P [cursive for YYP] = QB 748 *yip* 'thread', 61:11 "PY = 1524 *čβi* 'his house', 85:8 "P = 2125 *aβ* 'hunts'; thus, it is not the WMo 284 *eb* 'agreement, harmony . . .' (as VEWT 45-46).

30. QBH 37:23 ff. *erič* 'hope' (W I 770-1) is written in numerous passages for *ereč* 'happiness' of the other mss. (cf. QB 677, 926, 3105, 5491 ff.); the latter appears to be a corruption of Sogdian *ryč* (ED 200) and, therefore, for this and obvious phonetic and semantic reasons is not a loanword from WMo 326 *eri-* 'to seek, long for . . .' (as VEWT 47).

31. MK *ilmya* 'the secretary who writes the Sultan's letters in Turkish (i.e. Uygur) script' (ED 158); according to Menges: 'Of Proto-Mongolian Qytan (Qy!añ) origin seems to be *atymya* 'secretary'» (*The Turkic Languages and Peoples*, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 167-168). Menges there cites the form of the word as found in MTW 7 (cf. Atalay I 143 for the correct reading), and overlooks the fact that *ilmya* is a compound of Tü *el* 'realm, nation' and the obscure title *mya* which MK defines as 'the treasurer in charge of (public) monies and the superintendent over their collections' (ED 158, also in QB and in the Letter A2 *Reg Bars Amya*, cf. S. Tezcan — P. Zieme, *Uigurische Brieffragmente*, *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, p. 453; Clauson, *Asia Major* XVIII, 1973, p. 218). The title *mya* has never existed in Mo, so that the etymology cannot be retained; also cf. Doerfer, *Oriens* XXIII-XXIV, 1974, 593-594.

32. MK (Oguz dial.) *kelečü* 'talk, conversation'; Clauson considers

this to be one of the corrupted foreign words in the Oğuz material cited by MK, »but definitely not connected with Mong. *kele-* 'to speak', since *-čü* is neither a Turkish nor a Mong. Dev. Suff. after a vowel and the word antedates the first Oğuz contacts with Mongols» (ED 716; also MTü: Xvarazm, Čayataj, Qıpčaq, Oğuz, largely western MTü texts). Clauson is right to point to the difficulty with the suffix *-čü*, to which it may be added: (1) Mo *-ču/-čü* is a denominal nominal suffix that forms words denoting social groups only (GWM § 115; e.g. *qara* »black» > *qaraču* »common people»); (2) on the other hand, the labial vowel here seems to be peculiar to XI c. Oğuz, since all later forms have *keleči*; the suffix *-či* is the normal agentive in both Tü and Mo, and also forms agentives from verbs in Tü [see below, Nr. 47], but it cannot be equated with the *-či* in *keleči* (not agentive). Apart from this, the major difficulty with this word is the great similarity among verbs with meanings connected to »to speak, to say» in languages of Asia: Tü *keleči* »talk, conversation» (above), *kile-* [?kēle-] »to ask, wish» (VEWT 270), the root \**ké-* in *kéne-* »to settle an affair», *kéneš-* »to discuss», *kéneš* »advice», *kénren-* »to grumble, mutter» (ED 727, 733, 734), Čuvaš *kala-* [< \**kele-*] »to speak, say»; WMo 447 *kele-* »to speak, say», 450 *keme-* »id.», 372 *ge-* [< \**ke-*] »to say»; Tunguz *gelē-/kēlē-* »to ask for», *ken-* »to say, speak», *kēn'e-* »to praise», *rese* »word, speech» (*Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tungusoman'čurskikh jazykov*, I, Leningrad 1975, pp. 179, 447, 448, 449, 483); Uralic: Finnish *kieli* »tongue, speech», Mordvin *kel'*, Voljak, Zyryan *kyl* »id.», Vogul *kelä* »word, report», etc. (B. Collinder, *An Introduction to the Uralic Languages*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1965, p. 139); there are also similar forms in Indo-European and Semitic (cf. TMEN I 471: Tokharian *klaw-/klāw-* »to announce, call out», IE *kel-* »to cry out», Swahili *kelele* »cry»; also Arabic *kalām*, *kalīma* → Turkish, Qrym *kelime*, *kelam* »word», VEW 249). Even beyond this broad distribution of similar words for »to speak, to say», two facts militate against the view that OTü *kelečü*, MTü *keleči*, is a borrowing from Mongol: (1) there is no Mo form *kelečü* ~ *keleči*, nor may the suffixes *-čü*, *-či*, be analyzed as Mo in this function; thus, in order to be borrowed from Mo, only the root *kele-* »to say» could have been borrowed — yet, there are no traces of the root or other derived forms in OTü or MTü [MTü *kelemeči* is a separate case, clearly a borrowing from Mo, cf. MTü Nr. 66]; (2) the existence of Čuvaš *kala-* »to say», a regular Bulğar development of \**kele-*, speaks in favor of the presence in Proto-Turkic of the verb \**kele-*, so that

we need not have recourse to the theory of a Mo loan in OTü, which theory would not, in any case, explain the Buġar form.

33. U II 42:7, TT VII 28:5, MK, QB 1057 *kem* »illness« (ED 720 [Note: US 283 falsely reads US 60:IIb6 *kemsiz* »without defect« and 102:b25 *ig kem* »defect«; both are »illness«]); Räsänen takes OTü *kem* to be a loan from WMo 375 *gem* »defect, fault, mistake, wrong, harm, crime, sin, vice; disease, ailments« (VEWT 250). There are a number of similarly shaped words in Tü and Mo languages which could lead to confusion here: 1. Qzq *kem* »few, little, deficiency« (W II 1024) ← Per *kam* (VEWT 228); 2. WMo 450 *kem* »measure, size, proportion« → Tü *kem* »id.« (W II 1203; Alt, Tel, Leb, Tar, KarL; cf. VEWT 250); 3. Tü *kem* »illness« (as above) → Mo \**kem* »id.« > *gem* (that is, fell together with 4.); 4. Mo *gem* »defect, fault, harm« (as above). It should be noted that Räsänen considers both 4. Mo *gem* »defect, fault« and 1. Tü *kem* »few, deficiency« to be borrowed from Per *kam* (VEWT 228, 250), but at the same time takes 3. Tü *kem* »illness« to be borrowed from 4. This implies the following: Per *kam* »few, little, deficiency« → Qzq *kem* »id.«, → Mo *gem* [why not *kem*?] »fault, defect« > »illness« → Tü *kem* »illness«. The etymology lacks cogency; in fact, Tü *kem* is connected to Uyġur *kégen* »illness«, and implies a root \**ke-/ké-* (cf. ED 712), so that a Mo loanword is for this, and other reasons, out of the question.

34. MK *kimsen* »thin gold leaves which are used on hats« (ED 723); Menges had cited WMo *kimse* (Kowalewski 2539) »scraps of paper with gold and silver flecks, shaped like money, which one burns in honor of the dead«, and indicated the Chinese original (*Glossar zu den volkskundlichen Texten aus Ost-Türkistan*, II, Wiesbaden 1954, p. 67); Räsänen somehow construed this notice to mean Mo *kimse* → MK *kimsen* (VEWT 271), but the word in MK is clearly from Chinese (see DTS 307 for the etymology), and contains no feature indicating a Mo intermediary.

35. QBH 137:30 ff. *köjek* »a man's pigtails« (W II 1290); in several passages, Herat has *küček* »a lock of hair« for *küsek* of the other manuscripts [cf. Nr. 30 *erič* for *ereč*], which is, because of the -č-, probably of Iranian origin (ED 696); it is not connected in any obvious way with WMo 381 *gejige* »nape of the neck, plait or braid of hair, pigtail« (as VEWT 270).

36. Toñ 15, M III 6:1v18, TT VIII A:37, KP XXVIII:3, MK *kölük* »baggage animal« (ED 717); Räsänen considers this OTü word to be borrowed from WMo 484 *köl-* ~ 485 *kölle-* »to harness or hitch

(an animal) to a vehicle» (VEWT 288). To this: (1) *Mo kölle-* is from *köl* »foot, leg» + *-le-*, which forms verbs from nouns only (GWM § 245), and thus does not belong here; (2) *Tü kölük* is derived from *Tü köl-/kül-* »to harness» [on the vowel, see Nr. 38], and thus has a good *Tü* etymology; (3) Räsänen compares *Tü kölük* and *Mo köl-*, but ignores the proper parallel of WMo 485 *kölge* »mount or other means of transportation»; (4) Räsänen also ignores the connection of *Tü köl-* to *Mo küli-* [see Nr. 38].

37. M II 8:19, MK *kūg* »song, melody» (ED 709); Räsänen adopts MK *kög* as falsely read by Brockelmann (MTW 110), and so considers it to be a loan from WMo 478 *kög* »id.», and the latter cognate to *Tü kūg* (VEWT 286). Arabic script does not permit distinctions between labial vowels, so that MK could be read either *kög* or *kūg*; however, modern *Tü* forms militate for the latter, cf. Az, Qzq, Bar, Qrč, Qmq *kūy*, Qır, Bar, Tel *kū*, Tat *kōy* [*< \*kūy*], Čuv *kēvė* (cf. VEWT 307, whereas Siberian *Tü kög*, because of retention of *-g*, is ← *Mo*). At the very least, an etymology based on the quality of a vowel as recorded in Arabic script is methodologically unsound (also see below, Nr. 98).

38. IB 25, MK *kül-* »to harness (an animal to a plough, cart, etc.)», MK *kültür-* »to have (an animal) harnessed» (ED 715, 717 [Note: the root vowel ought to be *-ā-*, not *-ō-* as Clauson, because of Trkm *gūyl-*, Tel, etc. *kül-*, and the definition of Abū Ḥayyān *kül-* »to laugh, and to fasten the legs of a sheep for slaughter» (ED 715), which indicates that the verb was homophonous with *kül-* »to laugh»; however, some Siberian *Tü* language have *köl-*, which must have been the base for Nr. 36 *kölük*; this is still another example for the still unresolved issue of root *o* ~ *u*, *ö* ~ *ü*, cf. *bo* ~ *bu* »this», *sor* ~ *sur* »to ask», *toy-* ~ *tuy-* »to be born» (cf. TMEN I 99 ff., IV 331: *< \*ō, \*ö*)); Räsänen takes the verb *köl-* to be a loan from WMo 499 *küli-* »to tie, bind, lighten» (VEWT 308). However, the monosyllabic *Tü* root cannot reflect the bisyllabic *Mo* root (one would expect MK *\*küli-*), and the length reflected in Trkm *gūyl-* [*< \*kūl-*] clearly points to an original *Tü* verb.

39. BX S 15 *may* »praise(?)» has been read in *ertipü eti may iḷdi?* [... *türk beglerin bodunin ertipü eti may iḷdi* »?] (cf. IOD 131; DTS 335; GOT 76); editors of this passage, too damaged to permit a sensible reading, have compared *m<sup>a</sup>γ*, only by virtue of its phonetic shape, to a word *may* ~ *maq* »praise» found in Siberian *Tü* languages, where it is a nominal abstraction from the verb *mayta-* ~ *maqta-*

»to praise« (← Mo, cf. MTü Nr. 77). However, *may* ~ *maq* occurs only as a secondary form in Siberian Tü, and its insertion into this passage does not in the least clarify its interpretation. Not clear. [Also see Nr. 41]

40. IB 75 *mayu* »snake(?)« (V. Thomsen, Dr. M. A. Stein's MSS in Turkish »Runes« script from Miran and Tun-huang, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1912, p. 205; PDP 83, 91) was compared to WMo 541 *moyai* »snakes« by Malov (PDP 398; also DTS 335); the reading is an error for Tü *amyu* »wild mountain goat« (ED 158).

41. QBH 47:11 *mayu* »praise« (W IV 2002), QBH 29:25 *mayud-* »to praise« (id.), are errors for H 47:11 *kəpül ta-mayu arti* = QB 1089 *kəpül bama-yu erdiq*, H 29:25 *səz mayud-qi qəzi* = QB 547 *səz ma qodq əzi*, and thus have nothing to do with WMo 520 *mayta-* »to praise« (as VEW 321; PDP 398, 399). [See above, Nr. 39, and MTü Nr. 77].

42. MK *manən* »a craftsman's wages« (ED 767); Räsänen suggests (with a question mark) a borrowing from WMo 528 *manja/manča* »prepared tea (honorific in reference to lamas)« (VEW 325). The Mo word is borrowed from Tibetan (Lessing gives Tib *mang ja*, KW 256 gives Tib *dmang-kyi*), which is unlikely to have occurred before the XI c., in time for the borrowing of the Mo form into MK. Otherwise, the phonetic and semantic comparison is strained.

43. MK *mat*, a particle that occurs in such contexts as the following: Atalay I 170 *qış qay bile toquştı/qıqr közün baqıştı/tutuşyalı yaqıştı/utyalımat uyrasur* »Winter and Summer fought one another / They looked at each other with blood-shot eyes / They drew near one another in order to seize one another / Each wished to conquer the others; I 325 *Ertiş sufu Yemekı / sıtyap tutar bileki / kürmet anıy yürcki/kelqelımet ırkışür* »The Yemek of the Ertiş River/Roll up their sleeves/Their hearts are courageous [kür + mat]/They assemble in order to come (at us); I 397 *telim başlar ııpaldımat/ıayrı andın ııpaldımat/küci anıy keşıldımet/qılç qıncı kücün sıyde* »Many heads rolled down/As as result, the enemy became quiet/Their strength was weakened/(Our) swords barely fitted into the scabbards (because they were so covered with blood)«. In these examples, *mat/met* is postposed to the purposive converb (*-yalı/-qeli*), a nominal (*kür*), and the past tense marker (*-dı/-di*); also cf. MK I 321–2 *anday mat* »thus, in that manner«, QB 6578 *kimi mel* »whoever«, and ETS, 12:6 *bolarnı mat bälser* »if one separates these very ones«, 15:57 *mona bo mat monadıncıy edgün erür* »so, this very thing shall be your



marvellous goodness». The particle is rare and not well understood (cf. DTS 338, 343; OTG 191; Mansuroğlu, *Fundamenta* I, p. 105; Ščerbak, *Grammatičeskij očerk jazyka tjurkskikh tekstov X—XIII vv. iz Vostočnogo Turkestana*, M.-L. 1961, p. 191). Nonetheless, there is no solid foundation for a comparison of Tü *mat* and WMo 519 *mayad* «sure(ly), true(ly), etc.», particularly not as a Mo loan in OTü. Not only do the two elements function within the sentence entirely differently, but Mo *mayad* would be reflected as MK *mayat*, not *mat*, if we can judge by the Mo loan in CC 161 *mayat* some two centuries later [see MTü Nr. 74]. Thus, the comparison offered by Brockelmann (OTG 191) and the caution voiced by Ligeti (*Histoire du lexique des langues turques*, RO XVII, 1951–52, p. 87: «... par contre l'étymologie mongole du *mat* 'ainsi' (mongol *mayad* 'vraiment, effectivement') est déjà sujet à caution») need no longer be heeded.

44. KT S11, BX N8, S13, S14 *matı* «beautiful» (W IV 2045), «loyal, faithful» (GOT 355), is compared to WMo 91 *batu* «firm, strong, loyal, etc.» by Tekin (GOT 76) and to *matır*, etc., «hero» in Siberian Tü dialects, where it is a borrowing from Mo *bātur*, by Joki (LSS 223); however, this *matı* is no more than a misreading of Tü *amtı* «now, present(ly)» (see ED 156–7).

45. MK *meңde-* «to pluck out» (ED 768); Räsänen considers this verb a loan from WMo 536 *mengde-/meңde-* «to be excited, worried, embarrassed, troubled, etc.» (VEWT 334). Semantically incompatible, but also MK *meңde-* may be derived from Tü *meñ* «bird seed, grain» and originally meant «to pick up grain» (ED 768).

46. IB 60, MK *müңre-* «to bellow, low, bleat» (EI 770); Poppe writes the following: «mo. *mügere-* < \**münēre-* 'brüllen' (Kühe), mmo. *mö'ere-/mö'örö-* id. = AT *büñür-* id., dagegen uig. *münrä-* < mongol.» (VGAS 35). To this: (1) \**büñür-* does not exist in OTü nor in later Tü languages; (2) Mo *mügere-* or even the starred (but otherwise dubious) \**münēre-* ought to be reflected as such in IB, MK, but are not (thus: trisyllabic ≠ bisyllabic, -*g* ≠ -*η*); (3) otherwise, OTü *müңre-* is a regular development from \**büñre-* (*b* > *m* before *n*, *η*, *ñ*), so that \**büñre-* ≠ Mo *mügere-*.

47. M I 15:6, U I 7:3, MK *otači* «physician» (ED 44); Räsänen takes this to be a loan from WMo 625 *otači* «id.» (VEWT 366). Here, Räsänen bases himself on the well-known correspondence between Tü -Ø ~ Mo -*V* (*er* ~ *ere* «man», *kök* ~ *köke* «blue», etc.), and derives Mo *otači* from Mo \**ota* «grass, herb» ~ Tü *ot* «id.» (> Tü *otči* ~ Mo *otači*). To this: (1) Mo \**ota* is not attested; (2) Tü *otči* is not

attested until KY 189 (XV—XVI cc.) and later Ottoman (ED 44); (3) Tü *otači* has a good Tü etymology, as proposed by Clauson (id.), from M I 15:7, H II 3:93, QB 158 *ota-* 'to treat with medicinal herbs' (ED 42) plus the rare deverbal agentive suffix *-či*, also found in QB 36 *oqiči* 'preacher, reader' < *oqi-* 'to read', QB 1741 *ködezeči* 'guardian' < *ködez-* 'to watch over' (further exx. in OTG 92) thus, it is quite unnecessary to have recourse to a Mo etymology for this word.

48. BČ E9, IB 1, TT II A68, HT 1814 *örġin* 'throne' (ED 225); Räsänen groups the Uyğur word together with Čayataı and modern Tü *örġē/örġö*, etc., 'palace', which is borrowed from WMo 641 *örgege/örġöge* 'residence or tent of a prince, palace of a khan or a person of rank, etc.' (VEWT 374). Although it is true that *örġē* and so forth are loans from Mo, the OTü *örġin* must be kept distinct from these: (1) phonetically, Mo *örgege/örġöge* ≠ OTü *örġin*; (2) Tü *örġin* has a good Tü etymology from *ör-* 'to rise' plus the deverbal suffix *-yin/-gin*, which is also found in *törġin* 'gathered together, a concentration' < *tör-* 'to gather together', *yelġin* 'one who rides fast, traveller' < *yel-* 'to trot, amble', *kevgin* 'indigestible food (that which must be chewed thoroughly)' < *kev-* 'to chew' (other exx. in OTG 113—114; note that this etymology of *örġin* is to be preferred to that in ED 225).

49. MK *örġü* 'protuberance, hump', *örġüč* 'wave' (ED 223), M III 4:v3, BTT I B88, MK *örġüčlen-* 'to be lumpy, humped' (ED 228); Räsänen considers both *örġü* and *örġüč* to be borrowed from WMo 641 *örġü-/ergü-* 'to raise, lift up', Middle Mongol *hörgü-* 'id.' (VEWT 375). To this: (1) MMo *hörgü-* in fact occurs only in MA 186, whereas *örġü-* is the normal form in that dictionary (MA 278 ff.); moreover, SH and the *Hua-i I-yü* have *ergü-* 'to lift, to raise', so that the single spelling with *h-* may be viewed as non-etymological, of which there are quite a few cases in MA (cf. L. Ligeti, Notes sur le vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul, *IOII* XVI, 1963, p. 144); thus, MMo *hörgü-* may be stricken; (2) the original form of the Mo verb is clearly *ergü-* with labial assimilation of the initial vowel; phonetically, this form does not compare well with the Tü words; (3) Tü *örġü/örġüč* are nominal, whereas Mo *ergü-* is verbal, thus, not comparable; (4) Tü *örġü/örġüč* may both be derived from the Tü verb *ör-* 'to rise' plus the deverbal nominal suffixes *-gü* and *-güč* (as ED).

50. U II 10:24, Suv 517:4, 566:3 *üs-* 'to grow' (cf. ATG 324; DTS 391) appear to be either textual or editorial errors of a verb *üs-*

that could otherwise be identified with WMo 645 *ös-* 'to grow, increase, multiply'. Certainly, the passages in the late copy of Suv are to be corrected as follows: 517:4 *üzgen* [not *ösgen*] *yaymur ödince üstürti qodı tökülür* 'the destructive rain pours down from on high in due season' (ED 244, under *üstürti*; also so written in the older Berlin mss. of Suv, cf. U I 26:15—16), 566:3 *üzgen* [not *ösgen*] *yaymur tökülür* 'the destructive rain pours down' (ED 241). Clauson would also correct U II 10:24 to read: *erniñ çaqması ürmişi* [not *ösmişi*] 'the striking (of the flint) and blowing of a man (along with a drill and tinder will produce a fire)' (ED 195). However, the facsimile of this page of the *Maitrisimit* clearly shows that 'WYSMYSY, thus -s- not -r-, was written (cf. A. von Gabain, *Maitrisimit. Faksimile der alttürkischen Version eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*, II, Berlin 1961, Pl 151; my thanks to Dr. Zieme for this reference). Moreover, in support of the existence of the verb *ös-* in OTü (as native or as borrowed), there appears to be a causative form, *ösür-* 'to raise' in U I 43:17 [= U IV A:53] *ünlerin ösürüp* 'raising their voices', which Clauson would correct to *ünlerin üntürüp* 'raising their voices' (ED 251). In a letter of 19. 3. 76, Prof. Zieme writes: 'das Wort ist in der Tat undeutlich geschrieben, jedoch im Vergleich zu Z. 47 *üntürüp* ist dies hier auf keinen Fall zu lesen. Vielleicht kann man [*qlarşurup* 'vereinigend' lesen, aber auch dies ist nicht sicher.' (cf. ED 588 *qavşur-* 'to collect, bring together, put together'). Thus, against the reading *ösür-* may be cited: (1) obscurity in the manuscript; (2) lack of attestations in any other Tü texts or languages; (3) the use of the imputed *ösür-* in the sense of 'to raise one's voice', which is not found for the Mo verb *ös-*, nor the causative *öske-*, both of which connote 'to (cause to) increase in numbers', not 'to grow (in size, volume, etc.)'. The remaining problem is with U II 10 *ös-*, which must be considered in context: 22—25 *qaltı otluy ir quruy qawayı erniñ çaqması* 'WYSMYSY *bo üc türlüg tılayda ölgürü ol b(e)lgülüg bolur*. If we read here *üşmişi*, that is, the verb *üş-* 'to perforate, bore with an awl, cut a hole in' (ED 256), and connect this activity with the *otluy ir* 'fire drill' (ED 192: *ir* 'drill, awl'), we may translate the passage as follows: 'If (there is) a fire drill, dry tinder, a man's striking (of the flint) and perforating (with the drill), as a consequence of these three causes, it (the fire) will become manifest.' This reading may be confirmed or disproven by reference to various fire-making techniques that existed or continue to exist in this region — I have not the literature at hand —

but certainly the reading *ös-* must be seriously questioned here. As a final note, it should be pointed out that the phrase *erniñ äq-miñ ösmiñ* 'the striking and growing of a man', as formerly read, does not really make any sense. [Cf. MTü, Nr. 94]

51. MK *ötgün-* 'to narrate, imitate' (ED 52); Räsänen groups this verb together with MK *ötür-* 'to remind', Tat *ülän-*, Čuv *viten-* 'to request, to pray', and takes them to be loanwords from WMo 628 *öñi-* [*< \*öti-*] 'to say, answer, testify, etc.' (VEWT 376). To this: (1) MK *ötür-* is from *ö-* 'to think' + the causative *-tür-* (ED 68), and does not belong here; (2) Tat *ülän-*, Čuv *viten-*, develop from *ötün-* 'to request, to pray' (ED 62), not from *ötgün-*; (3) the verb *ötgün-* is derived from *ötüg* 'a request, memorial' through the denominal verbal suffix *-n-*, and thus has a good Tü etymology; (4) the root of Tü *ötüg* [*? < \*ötig*], *ötün-* [*? < \*ötin-*], is either *\*öt-* or *\*öti-*, comparable to but not borrowed from Mo *öñi-* [*< \*öti-*].

52. MK, QB 4263 *qalqan*, MK *qalqan* 'shield' (ED 621); Räsänen considers this word to be a loan from WMo 922 *qalqa* 'shield' (VEWT 227). It is difficult to discount this possibility, since even although the Qaraxanid forms with *-n/-ŋ* cannot be explained from the Mo *qalda*, it is possible that the older form of the Mo word was *qalqan* (see on this, TMEN III 502). The word has no Tü or Mo etymology, and belongs to a cultural domain that is greatly susceptible to borrowing. Nonetheless, the problem with the final *-n/-ŋ*, and the lack of a Mo etymology, must be resolved before this etymology advances beyond the stage of possibility.

53. MK *qamdu* 'a piece of linen four cubits by one span in dimension, sealed with the seal of the Uyğur *xān* and used in commercial transactions' (ED 626); Räsänen mistakenly places this word together Čaytatay *qamtu* 'together, etc.', which is a loanword from WMo 925 *qamtu* 'together, along with, etc.' (VEWT 229).

54. QBH 145:30 [= QB 5154] *qant* 'sugar' (W II 121–122; DTS 418); Räsänen recognizes the Persian origin of this word but, for some unaccountable reason, derives it as follows: QB, etc. *qant* ← WMo 927 *qanda* 'syrup, jelly, etc.' ← Persian *qant* ← Sanskrit (VEWT 231). Obviously, the word has entered the QB directly from Persian.

55. The Mo verb *qara-* 'to look at, glance, etc.' has been read in a Manichean text in Uyğur script, T II D 173e (recto, lines 1–4): *ötrü bodisñ t(e)gin* [...]*ig atın tinin tartap turdı: qarap ėinakke mēa tip ayttı* 'Then, the Bodhisattva Prince reined in his [...] horse and

stopped. Looking, he spoke thus to Chandaka . . . (so read: A. von Le Coq, *Ein christliches und ein manichäisches Manuskriptfragment in türkischer Sprache aus Turfan* (Chinesisch-Turkistan), *SPAW* 1909, p. 1208; W. Bang, *Manichäische Erzähler*, *Le Muséon* XLIV, 1931, pp. 7–12; also DTS 424; US 97:4 and US 279). The back of the same text begins (verso, lines 1–3): *bodisv t(e)gin činakde* [ . . . ] *bo savay ešidip: tini[n]* [ . . . ] *kir'ū qay-ti tartap* 'The Bodhisattva Prince heard these words [ . . . ] from Chandaka. He pulled his reins and turned back'. In this passage, von Le Coq (*Op.cit.*, p. 1210) read *γ(a)rtu* 'raffte er(?)' for *qay-ti*, whereas Bang read *qay-ti*, but took *kir'ū qayti* as a Hendiadys ( *Op.cit.*, p. 10, n. 21: 'qait-ū'). In fact, the latter phrase should be compared to MK *kirū qaydi* ' (and one says) he turned back' (ED 674), which contains the verb *qay-* 'to turn away, to turn back'. Moreover, the passage on verso of this text contains a scribal error of translation – frequent in Turkic Manichaica! – in that *tartap* ought to follow the phrase beginning *tini[n]*: 'he reined in (his horse)' (cf. the passage on recto). Now, despite the Buddhist elements in this text, it reflects the typical Manichean spelling of *-ap* for the converb *-ip*; cf. *tartap*, not *tartip*; v15 *barap*, not *barip* (also v2 *savay*, not *savip*). Thus, the word *qarap* in the first passage above could be from *qara-* + *-p*, but also from *qar-* + *-ip*, with the Manichean writing *qar-ap*. Moreover, just as von Le Coq's *γ(a)rtu* on verso is clearly *qay-ti* in the facsimile, so, too, von Le Coq's *qarap* on recto may be read *qayap*, that is, the verb *qay-* + *-ip* in the Manichean spelling *qay-ap*. Confirmation of this new reading lies in the parallel structure of the passages on recto and verso: rl-4 'The Bodhisattva Prince reined in his [ . . . ] horse and stopped. Turning back (toward Chandaka), he spoke thus to Chandaka' (there follows an exchange of words), vl-3 'The Bodhisattva Prince heard these words [ . . . ] from Chandaka, reined in (his horse) and turned back (toward his camp)'. Peter Zieme (Letter of 3.3.76) suggests that it is possible to read here *qazap*, that is, the verb *qaz-* 'to dig, dig out', for which MK cites *at qazdi* 'the horse was restive and dug up the ground with its feet' (ED 680; also cf. Abū Ḥayyān *qazdi atni* 'he stopped his horse'). This is certainly possible. However, it is less probable than the reading proposed above, for the reason that the text says 'the Bodhisattva Prince reined in his horse and stopped (*turdi*)', which renders the proposed *qazap* repetitious. What is certain is that the Mo verb *qara-* does not occur in OTü, and here one might confirm the ety-

mology of OTü *qaraq* 'eyeball' as a diminutive of *qara* 'black' (ED 652; TMEN III 436), rather than as a derivative of the verb *qara* 'to look' (as VEW 235, 236; Ligeti, *Histoire du lexique des langues turques*, RO XVII, 1951-52, p. 84). [Cf. MTü, Nr. 102].

56. MK *qarma* 'pillaging, theft' (ED 660); Räsänen takes this as a loan from WMo 940 *qarma*- 'to rake up, to gather together' (VEWT 238). Apart from the semantic disparity, MK *qarma* is nominal while Mo *qarma*- is verbal, and thus not comparable.

57. IB 49, TT VII 29:13, MK, QB 6393 *qaya* 'rock, rocky cliff' (ED 674); Räsänen takes the OTü word as a loan from WMo 902 *qada* 'rock, cliff, crag' (VEWT 221). The connection between the Mo and Tü words remains to be clarified, but the present etymology violates accepted phonetic laws (*d[ð]* remains in IB, etc.; Mo *d* would be assimilated as Tü *d*), and is thus untenable.

58. MK *qayır yir* 'a place at an angle from the main road' (ED 676); Räsänen considers MK *qayır* to be borrowed from WMo 915 *qayaya/qaya* 'edge, border, etc.' (VEWT 221). As it stands, the etymology is phonetically and semantically unacceptable. In addition to this, the entry in MK is a certain error for *qıyır* 'cut at an angle' (cf. ED 676, there falsely derived from a root \**qıd-* > \**qıdıy* > *qıyır*). Professor Dankoff (Letter of 24. 1. 76) has confirmed this error, and correctly established that the root is *qıy-* 'to cut at an angle'.

59. QBH 143:2 *qayr* 'kindness, favor' (W II 20, there incorrectly cited as 143:21) is Arabic *qayr* خبر (so written in other manuscripts of QB 5062; also cf. DTS 635), and not a loan from WMo 913 *qayıra* 'love, grace, etc.' (as VEW 223; Räsänen himself gives the correct etymology at VEW 152!).

60. M III 27:v15, U IV A52, MK *q'β* 'divine favor' (ED 579, nearly always in Hend. with *qut*); Räsänen considers this word and various other modern Tü words to be borrowed from WMo 976 *qubi* 'part, share, destiny, fate, etc.' (VEWT 268-9). On phonetic and semantic grounds, clearly unacceptable; otherwise, the Mo word first appears in MTü as a loan, specifically as *qubi* in the Uyğur civil documents. [See MTü Nr. 121].

61. BTT I B236, 240, MK *qırayu* 'the hoarfrost which falls from the sky in cold weather' (ED 656), KY 166 *qırayu* 'frost'; concerning the KY entry (and thus, by implication, the MK and Uyğur), Ligeti has written: 'Emprunt au mongol. Cf. mong. *kirayu*, Hy *kira'u* . . . 'Les fragments du *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* mongol en écriture

Phage-pa, *AOH* XVII, 1964, p. 290). It is true that the word is not widespread in Tü (but see TMEN III 569), and that, with its tri-syllabic structure, it has a Mo appearance. For all that, a good Tü etymology can be found for *q'rayu*, which belongs to the following morphological type: *tonayu* 'clothing' < *tona-* 'to dress' < *ton* 'clothes'; *qanayu* 'lancet' < *qana-* 'to bleed (s.o.)' < *qan* 'blood'; *yirayu* 'singer' < \**yira-* 'to sing' < *yir* [~*ir*] 'song', etc. The last example is especially instructive, in that the postulated denominal verb \**yira-* is not actually attested. Just so, Bang has derived *qirayu* in this manner: *qirayu* 'frost (falling from the sky in cold weather)' < \**qira-* 'to be grey' < *qir* 'grey' (*Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen*, *APAW* 1919, Nr. 5, p. 38). The derivation parallels that of *yirayu* and the other examples quoted, thereby rendering a Mo etymology for *qirayu* unnecessary and unacceptable.

62. QB 4672 *qoβdaq* 'uncivil, rude(?)' (W II 655; DTS 461), 'notorious' (ED 582); Räsänen takes this word as a loan from WMo 949 *qobdoy* 'gluttonous, covetous, greedy, rapacious' < WMo 949 *qob* 'gossip, slander, disparagement' (VEWT 273), and the latter as cognate to Tü *qoβ* 'id.' (VEWT 281); also cf. WMo 949 *qobla-* 'to slander, villify'. To this: (1) Tü has a series parallel to the Mo, cf. Abū Hayyān *qov* 'backbiting' (ED 580), Xuast 104 *qovla-* 'to persecute', Abū Hayyān *qovla-* 'to backbite' (ED 582), QB *qoβdaq* in the obscure passage above, and QB 4599 *qoβdaš* 'quarrelsome', also in an obscure passage (ED 582; DTS 461); thus, the root and derived forms exist in Tü; (2) Räsänen paid attention only to the spelling with *-b-* in the Herat copy of QB (= *β* of the other manuscripts), which renders this word more similar, phonetically, to the Mo form; however, if Mo *qobdoy* were the origin of the word in QB, then the other mss. ought to have spelled this word unambiguously as *-b-* (Ɑ); (3) a denominal nominal suffix *-doy* [< \**-daq*] is unknown in Mo, but a rare suffix *-daq* is found in a few Tü words (cf. ED xli; OTG 97). Both *qoβdaq* and *qoβdaš* in the QB require separate study, but they are not Mo loanwords.

63. QBH 31:34, 150:10 *qoyur* 'little, small' (W II 517) is an error for *qoqus* 'emptiness' of the other mss. (QB 617, 5296), but even the error *qoyur* could not be a loan from WMo 950 *qobur* 'scarce, rare' (as VEWT 274).

64. MK *qolan* 'girth' (ED 622); Räsänen considers this and modern Tü forms to be borrowed from Mo *qolang* ~ *olang* 'id.' (VEWT 277). In view of the fact that the form *qolang* is not attested in Mo (lacking

in Lessing, Kow, MMo; cf. SH, MA, WMo 610 *olang/olong* 'the right hand saddle girth', KW 285 *oly*, etc.), one may reject this etymology outright. However, it may not be inappropriate to offer a few remarks on the so-called 'Mo alternation  $q \sim \emptyset$ ' on whose unsteady legs the present etymology attempts to stand. The 'alternation' was proposed long ago by Pelliot (*Les formes avec et sans q-(k-)* initial en turc et en mongol, *T'P XXXVII*, 1944, pp. 73–101), but is supported, on internal Mo evidence, by only one example: WMo 50 *arbing* = 935 *qarbing* 'the fat on the abdomen of an animal', where the form without  $q$ - is otherwise found only in Bur *ar'ban* and KW 24 *ärwŋ* [= 178 *xärwŋ*] – despite major difficulties, the Mo word is usually compared to Tü *qazı* 'id.' (ED 681; but see TMEN III 359–360). Hardly correct is Pelliot's comparison of WMo 898 *qabirya* 'rib' and SH *abit* 'intestines', whether the latter is or is not a plural of \**abisun* (Pelliot, *Op.cit.*, pp. 91–92), nor of WMo 474 *kituza/qutuza* 'knife' and KW 452 *utr* 'id.' (see the correct explanation of KW *utr* in TMEN I 486, 496; IV 398–399). The other examples cited by Pelliot do not support a 'Mo alternation  $q \sim \emptyset$ ': Tü *qotaz*, Mo *otos* 'yak' (because of -s a loan from Tü; cf. TMEN III 485–487); MK *rafsı* 'small box' (ED 587, also CC 193 *qapsa*), KW 20 *awsa* 'id.' (a loan from Tü, since it is a loan into Tü; see V. Drimba, *Quelques leçons et étymologies comanes*, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* XI, 1966, p. 487); Tü *qarpuz*, Mo *arbus* 'watermelon' (because of -s a loan from Tü; cf. TMEN III 380–383). This set of examples reflects the Middle Qipčaq development  $q/k- > x- > \emptyset$ , that was so ably elucidated by Tibor Halasi-Kun (*Orta-kıpçakça q-, k- ~ O meselesi, Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar*, I, Ankara 1950, pp. 45–61, with many Qipčaq exx.). That is, the correspondence of Tü  $q \sim$  Mo  $\emptyset$  reflects a Middle Qipčaq (where  $q$ - frequently became  $\emptyset$ ) loanword into Mo. To this group belong Mo *otos*, KW *awsa*, Mo *arbus* and the present example of Mo *olang*. The sole remaining example of Mo *qarbing*  $\sim$  *arbing* (above) may have a sociolinguistic explanation as suggested by Poppe ('... may originally have been forms of the women's language', *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, MSFOu 110, 1955, p. 135), or another explanation, but, whatever the case, cannot constitute a significant contradiction to what has been said above concerning this spurious 'alternation'.

65. M I 26:21, TT VII 8:3 *qolu* 'a period of time, a period of ten seconds' (ED 617); Räsänen falsely groups this Uyğur word together



with modern Tü forms borrowed from WMo 946 *qauli* 'usage, custom, etc.' (VEWT 278).

66. MK *qōm* 'a camel's pack-saddle' (ED 625); Räsänen considers this to be a borrowing from WMo 960 *qom* 'a piece of felt placed under the pack on a camel' (VEWT 278). The word, also found as a late Mo loan in Manchu *komo* (cf. L. Ligeti, *Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou*, AOH X, 1960, p. 247), is a typical cultural word and thus easily borrowed. In this case, phonetic criteria for the direction of borrowing are lacking, so that it is *a priori* possible that MK *qōm* is ← Mo *qom*.

67. MK, QB 3854 ff. *qomı-* 'to long for' (ED 626); Räsänen sees the verb in QB (without citing MK) as a loan from Mo, cf. KW 150 *yom* 'complaint, discontent', 151 *yomda-* 'to be dissatisfied, to regret' (VEWT 278). To this: (1) it is unclear whether R. believes the origin of Tü *qomı-* to be the Mo nominal *yom* or the verbal *yomuda-* (thus WMo 360, Kow 1034); if the first, then the Tü verbal root cannot be compared with the Mo nominal, if the second, then the phonetic comparison is amiss; (2) otherwise, the correct comparison would be Tü *qomı-* ~ Mo \**yomu-*, the latter abstracted from Mo *yomuda-* and *yomurqa-* 'to be dissatisfied' (Kow 1035); (3) Tü *qomı-* ≠ Mo \**yomu-* on both phonetic (*-ı-* ≠ *-u-*) and semantic ('to long for' ≠ 'to complain, to be dissatisfied') grounds.

68. MK *qonj et* 'muscle, firm flesh' (ED 632); Räsänen takes MK *qonj* to be borrowed from Mo, cf. KW 185 *xonj* 'rump, the thick flesh on the rear end', where WMo *qong* is cited (VEWT 280). In WMo 962, we find only the phrase *qong keriye* 'raven', but Poppe also cites WMo *qong* 'rump', and attaches to it the following words: WMo 962 *qondolai* [Poppe: *qongdolai*] 'rump, hip', and *qonjıyasun* [Poppe: < \**qongdığāsun*] 'rump, posterior' (VGAS 71). Thus, we are left with the impression that only the root is isolated in MK, whereas both the root and derived forms occur in Mo, a situation that might be indicative of a Mo loan in MK. However, this picture is obscured by the following: (1) Poppe's *qongdolai* and \**qongdığāsun*, which imply the root \**qong*, do not seem warranted; cf. WMo *qondolai*, Ord *xonbolı*, Xal *xandloi*, and SH *qonjıyasun*, Monguor *quın-ıziüse*, *qonbıziöse*; (2) a third Mo word seems to belong with these: WMo 963 *qonjısu* 'the junction of the two thighs, crotch' (cf. Kow 'the extremity of the excretory organs, the organ of excretion'); although \**qong* occurs here, it should be pointed out that the word is found as a loan in Manchu *qonjısu* 'rear, rump' with the root \**qon*

cf. L. Ligeti, *Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou*, *AOH* X, 1960, p. 247); (3) thus, the word *qong* 'rump' is actually isolated in Mo, occurring only in KW, Ordos, and WMo (as cited by KW and VGAS); (4) phonetic criteria indicating a loan either from Mo *qong* into MK *qon*, or the reverse, are lacking, so that the present etymology remains only a possibility.

69. MK *qoruyžin* 'lead' (ED 656); Räsänen groups the MK entry together with several modern Tü forms, some of which (e.g. Yaquṭ *qorjoljun*) are borrowed from WMo 966 *qoryoljin* 'id.' (VEWT 282). The MK form clearly does not belong with these (-ž ≠ -j-l, etc.) (further, see TMEN III 452–454).

70. QBH 16:28, 81:1 *quda* 'friend, comrade' (W II 998) was read by Radloff in these passages on the basis of Čayataṭay and modern Tü *quda* (see VEWT 296 for forms), which is borrowed from WMo 979 *quda* 'the heads of two families related through the marriages of their children' (see TMEN I 423–425). However, at least the second passage should be read: QB 2262 *razina köpeđür qutađur yılı* 'his treasures become abundant, and his years become divinely favored (*qutađ-ur*)' (ED 688). The second passage is not found in the Cairo copy, but occurs in the other two mss. as follows: QB 158 *yort ay biligsiz iğiniñ otu/biligsiz otın sen ay bilge quta* [H: *quda*; N: *q.ta*]. Arat translated the couplet: 'O, ignorant man, go and have your disease treated! O, fortunate scholar, speak of the medicine (that heals) ignorance!' (*Tercüme*, p. 23). The reading is not quite clear, since *quta* in the meaning 'fortune, divine favor' is an otherwise unknown form (it is always *qut*); nonetheless, the word is clearly spelled with a -t- in the Namangan copy, and the -d- is simply -t- in the Mongol ductus of the Uyğur script used to write the Herat copy. Consequently, the Mo *quda* is not found in OTü, nor in MTü until Čayataṭay.

71. H I 67–68 *şıpar* occurs in the passage *kürküm qonay mini şıpar birle borqu qadıp* 'mix together with wine: saffron, millet flour and *şıpar* (musk)'; as Rachmati, the editor, pointed out, the same prescription occurs in H I 94–95 *kürküm qonay mini yıpar bor birle iğün* 'have (the patient) drink (a mixture of) saffron, millet flour and musk, with wine'. Thus, *şıpar* (~ *sıpar*) is either a scribal error or a dialect variant of *yıpar* 'musk'; it cannot be, as Räsänen indicates, a loanword from the corresponding word in WMo 1023 *jaγar/jiγar* 'musk' (VEWT 418). The forms *şıpar* and *jiγar* are too disparate to permit direct comparison. Nonetheless, the initial š-, or less prob-

ably *s-*, of *šipar* deserves a few words of comment. Two other cases of this type of writing are known: KY 198 *šipgin* 'purple' for Uyyur *yipgin* (ED 876); KY 198 *šuldurya* 'a plant; iris, gladiolus', for H I 168 *yuldurya* 'a plant', MK *yuldruya* 'thistle' (ED 924). Bang and von Gabain have interpreted this initial as a historical reflex in these words (TT V, pp. 333–334, n. A:12): 'Jedenfalls glauben wir nun den Weg zu sehen, auf dem das gemeintürkische *y-* im Jakutischen und Tschuwaschischen zu *s-* geworden ist (*y- > š- > s-*).' This indication is not very accurate, since in Čuvaš the development is from \**j-* > \**č-* > *ś-*, and in Yaqut from \**j-* > \**č-* > *s-*; moreover, it is unlikely that a few such words could evade the sound change that resulted in *y-* for the literary language of East Turkestan. Now, the form *šipar* occurs in a section (lines 61–80) of this medical text that has a clearly discernible Chinese character; the scribe there uses Chinese signs for numbers, inserts Chinese loanwords (line 64 *šan xuma*, cf. ED 424), and makes several errors not characteristic of the surrounding sections. From the facsimile of lines 79–88 provided by Rachmati (Heilkunde I, Plate VI), it is evident from the handwriting that a different scribe begins line 80. One may hypothesize that the scribe of lines 61–80 was either a Chinese bilingual in Uyyur or an Uyyur translating from a Chinese medical handbook. The clinching argument for this unique setting of *šipar* comes from the occurrence of *yipar* in the nearly identical prescription just a few lines farther on (H I 94–95 cited above). Therefore, all three examples of initial *š-* in place of the expected *y-* (*šipgin*, *šuldurya*, *šipar*) occur in a distinctly Chinese setting. Clauson has suggested, à propos of *šipgin*, that the *š-* is based on a substitution of the Chinese character *shih* for the similar and synonymous character *i/yi* (cf. ED 876). Whether or not this is correct I am unable to judge, but these spellings are of undeniable interest and deserve special study by a Sino-Altaicist.

72. MK *siri-* 'to sew firmly, quilt, smock', ol *kibiz sırıdı* 'she sewed with reinforced stitches, in Türkmen fashion, the felt' (ED 845), TT III 53 *sırl-* 'to be attached to (i.e., to be sewn firmly to something?)' (ED 851; note that *sırl-* here could be a passive derived either from *sır-* or *siri-*); Räsänen considers this verb to be a loan from WMo 717 *siri-* 'to quilt, stitch' (VEWT 419). The basis of this etymology is clear: Räsänen takes the bisyllabic structure of the OTü verb to directly reflect the structure of Mo *siri-* which, in his opinion, is cognate to Tatar, Teleut *sır-* 'to quilt', Xaqas, Tuva *siri-*

vid., CC *sirma* «quilted» (VEWT 418). To this: (1) CC *sirma* «quilted» is an error of Räsänen for Radloff's *srman* (W IV 651), which is an error for CC 229 *sir* [*sirri men*] «to rub, polish»; (2) it is unclear why Räsänen considers Xaqas, Tuva *siri-* to be cognate to Mo *siri-*, but at the same time takes MK *siri-* as a loanword; (3) modern Tü languages have both forms: *sir-* (Tatar, Altay, Qazaq, Qaraqalpaq, Uzbek) and *siri* (Azeri, Nogay, Qumyq, Başkir [*huri-*], East Turki [Jarring], Xaqas, Tuva), whereas Yaqut *siri-* is clearly a loanword from Mo (because of *s-*, which is lost in native Tü words; cf. MEJ 75); it is unlikely, in an areal linguistic sense, that Tatar would retain the Turkic form, but that Başkir would borrow the Mo form, and similarly for Qazaq (Tü) and Nogay (Mo), Uzbek (Tü) and East Turki (Mo), Altay (Tü) and Xaqas (Mo); (4) it is possible that those languages with *sir-* reflect a perceived connection on the part of their speakers with the word *sirma* «lace or embroidery of silver or silver gilt thread» (Turkish, etc.), which is a borrowing from Greek *σέρμα* (see TMEN III 248–249); thus, the word *sirma* could be analyzed as *sir-* «to embroider» + the Tü deverbal nominal suffix *-ma* and, subsequently, the false *sir-* could have affected the structure of the Tü verb *siri-* «to sew, to quilt». The latter is only a suggestion, but, on present evidence, it is difficult to admit that MK *siri-* (as well as the modern forms cited above) is to be viewed as a loanword from Mongol. Unclear.

73. MK *talyay* «snowstorm» (ED 496, see below on the correction to *\*tolayay*); Räsänen considers this to be a loan from WMo 259 *dolgi-* «to wave, undulate», and the latter to be cognate to Tü *tolquy* «an inflated skin container or bladder» (VEWT 458). Semantically, each link of this comparison is dubious: «snowstorm» ≠ «undulation» ≠ «inflation». Moreover, MK *talyay* is not devoid of problems in itself. Clauson corrects this form to *\*tolayay*, which he places together with *tolayay* «dysentery» and derives from *tolya-* «to twist» in the sense of «something swirling» ≠ «snowstorm» (ED 496). Professor Robert Dankoff (Letter of 1. 24. 76) insists on Kāšyari's Arabic definition of *talyay* as «a blizzard that strikes a man and almost kills him», which connects this word to MK *taltur-* «to almost faint» (ED 494), *talq-* in *talqar* «injures, harms» (495), and other words with a root *tal-* that means «to strike down; to be struck down»; at the same time, Professor Dankoff admits to an unclear connection between this root *tal-* and the root *tol-*, but does not see any reason to change *talyay* to *\*tolayay*. Here, it is sufficient to note that the resolution of

these problems belongs to Turkic — more precisely, to the vocalizations in our manuscript of MK — in which Mo *dolgi-* should play no part.

74. MK *talpin-* »to flutter, palpitate» (ED 493 [reflexive of *talpi-<sup>id.</sup>* which is first attested in MTü]); Räsänen takes this verb to be borrowed from Mo, cf. WMo 225 *dalbayi-* »to be wide and flat», *dalbaya* »flag, sail», *dalbayur/dalbagir* »wide, broad, flat» (VEWT 459). The comparison is semantically and phonetically precarious. Moreover, one can hardly separate from the cited Mo words the following: WMo 232 *darbayi-* »to be wide and flat», *darba-/darbalja-* »to float, billow, flutters», *darbul'a* »flag, sail». The fluctuation of resonants (*r/l*) is indicative of an onomatopoeic origin, which is also surely to account for the similarity of the Tü and Mo words.

75. KT S3, Toñ 18, 19, HT 1986 *taluy* »sea» (ED 502). Denis Sinor, in an article devoted to another subject (The Mysterious »Talü Sea» in Öljeitü's Letter to Philip the Fair of France, *Analecta Mongolica* [Owen Lattimore Festschrift = The Mongolia Society Occasional Papers, Nr. 8], Bloomington 1972, pp. 115–119), writes the following (p. 118): »It is safe to assume that *taluy* is originally a Mongol word borrowed by Old Turkic where its use remained very limited. The standard Turkic word for 'sea', *tenqiz* displaced *taluy* everywhere with the exception of later Uighur, while the standard Mongol word *dalai* was borrowed by some Turkic dialects.» The »later Uighur» here refers to KY 258 *taluy*, Sarıy Yuğur *tah, tali, taley* [the latter taken to be »certainly a loan from Mongol *dalai*], while the »some Turkic dialects» refers to LOX 158 *dalai* [see MTü Nr. 149] and W 111 878 *talai* (Alt, Tel, Leb, Šor, Tuva, Qoyb, Sag, Qača, Küer). Even although Sinor here provides neither historical nor linguistic arguments to favor his assumption of a Mo loan in OTü, it must be admitted that it is possible. One might conjecture, for example, that during the Türk expeditions into Shan-tung which are recalled in these passages of KT and Toñ, the Türks for some reason adopted a Mo name for the sea, as it is sure that Mongol-speaking peoples lay to the East of them (Tatar, Tatbi, Qitañ, in the inscriptions); thus, it could be argued, the *taluy* in these passages could be the assimilated form of the Mongol name of the Yellow Sea. There is not, however, any support for such a conjecture. What is more, there is a strong linguistic argument that speaks against the supposed Mo *dalai* → OTü *taluy* »sea». This argument is based on the set of cognates — in my view, Tü loans into Mo — which displays the

following correspondence: OTü -u/-ü ~ Mo -a/-e ~ MTü -a/-e; cf. *balu* ~ *balta* ~ *balta* »axes», *ordu* ~ *orda* ~ *orda* »royal camp», *torqu* ~ *torqa* ~ *torqa* »silk», *törü* ~ *töre* ~ *töre* »traditional laws», etc. It can be seen that OTü *taluy* ~ Mo *dalai* ~ MTü *dalai* (LOX) also fits this quite regular correspondence. Unless one is prepared to say either that all of these words are borrowed from Mo into Tü in two stages (1. Mo -a → OTü -u; 2. Mo -a → MTü -a), or that the words with these reflexes go back to »Proto-Altaic» etymons, which would, in any case, defeat the present hypothesis, there is no reason to retain this etymology. [See below, Nr. 88; also MTü Nrs. 16, 27, 39, 90, 114, 116, 164, 172, 173].

76. MK *tayyan* »a slim lop-eared kind of dog», IM *tayyan* »greyhound» (ED 568); Räsänen gives the following etymology of IM *tayyan*, which would apply to MK as well: ← Mo, cf. KW 388 *tayyan* »hunting dog, forest-dog [Waldhund]» < Mo \**tayi* »forest» + Tü \**qan* »dog» (VEWT 456). Räsänen presumably postulates \**tayi* »forest» on the basis of WMo 768 *taiya* »taiga, thick coniferous forests», whereas his Tü \**qan* »dog» seems to be sheer fantasy. In fact, WMo 768 *taiya noqai* »greyhound» has nothing to do with *taiya* »forests», but is surely just the Tü word as a loan in Mo. Furthermore, the etymology proposed by Räsänen is methodologically improbable since it rests on a compound of a Mo and a Tü word (the latter non-existent!). Finally, *tayyan* »greyhound» has a good Tü etymology (see TMEN II 446).

77. MK *tekšü* »inferior exchange [minderer Ersatz]» (MTW 202) is an error of Brockelmann for MK *tegšüt* »an exchange of something» (ED 487; Atalay I 451), which Räsänen accepted and took as a loanword from WMo 794 *tegsi* »even, level, straight» (VEWT 471). MK *tegšüt* is derived from *tegiš-* »to meet one another, to exchange», which is a reciprocal from *teg-* »to reach, to be worth, etc.» — the etymology is false.

78. TT VI 215 *ten-* »to go astray» (ATG 340) is an error for *tan-* »to deny» in the following passage: *esrük kiši teg tana muna yorıyurlar* »they wander about like drunken men denying (their faith) and raving» (ED 513); Räsänen accepted the error and took it to be a loan from WMo 804 *tenü-* »to roam, to go astray» (VEWT 473).

79. Xuast 6 *tirnegül-i* »his collector» is the mistaken reading of most editors for the word in the following passage of the Stein manuscript: 5—7 *y(a)ruq[ı]n[ı]n tözi [yılızı] tirnegüsü: (de)ri [yirin-gerü] barsar* »if one goes to the land of gods, the origin, root, and

rallying-ground of all prophets» (see J. Asmussen, *X<sup>a</sup>štvānift. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, pp. 170, 210 [n. 6]; the suggestion of ED 552 is based on the false reading). Were the old reading correct, the element *-göl* would be a deverbal nominal suffix of Mo origin (see MTü); indeed, this reading and other factors led Bang to consider the suffix *-göl/-yul* as an originally Tü suffix (cf. W. Bang, *Manichäische Laien Beichtspiegel, Le Muséon XXXVI*, 1923, pp. 182–183; also the relevant section on this suffix in Mo → MTü).

80. QBH 20:23 ff. *tō* «many» (W III 1140) was read by Radloff in several passages of the Herat manuscript, where the other mss. (QB 304, 1106, 1512, 1979) have the correct *tü*, a particle used as a numerative (cf. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, II, Paris 1963, p. 861; VEWT 504; ED 433); since Radloff grouped this mistaken *tō* «many» together with Alt, Tel, Leb, Šor *tō* «numbers», which is a recent loanword from WMo 813 *toya* «id.», Räsänen uncritically followed suit (VEWT 482).

81. BX E2 *toḡla-* «to stop, become fixed» (Malov, *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii*, M.-L. 1959, pp. 11, 16, 20, 104; cf. IOD 178) is certainly an error in the older editions of BX for a word that is clearly inscribed *to[.]tm(i)š*, that is, with one rune damaged and in need of restitution; the reading *to[q]ta-* is based on WMo 815 *toyta-* «to stop, etc.», which is first found as a loanword in MTü [see MTü Nr. 163]. Doerfer has restored this passage as follows: *toḡtamış közi yūgerü körti* «ihre (vor Trauer) niedergeschlagenen Augen schauen nach oben» (TMEN I 273). Clauson considers *toḡta-* to be an error, and prefers the reading: *ūgirep serinip toḡtamış közi yūgerü körti* «(when I ascended the throne the Türkü people, who were expecting to die soon), rejoicing and being glad raised their downcast eyes and looked up» (ED 518). For Clauson, *toḡit-* is a back vowel variant of *tōḡit-* «to bow down, to bend down» (ED 517); in support of this, it should be noted that the causative of this verb, *tōḡder-*, is indeed written in Uyḡur as *toḡdar-/toḡtar-* «to turn something over, to invert» (ED 518). The reading *toḡit-* (= *tōḡit-*) is preferable to *toḡta-*, if only for the reason that the latter does not otherwise occur.

82. MK *torum* «a camel colt» (ED 549); Räsänen takes this to be a loan from WMo 827 *torum* «a young camel in its second year» (VEWT 491). The etymology lacks criteria in favor of a Mo loanword into OTü. Doerfer recommends that this word should be viewed

within the context of camel terminology, the major part of which is Tü- Mo (TMEN IV 286; after A. M. Ščerbak, *Nazvanija domašnikh i dikikh životnykh v tjurkskikh jazykakh, Istoričeskoe razvitie leksiki tjurkskikh jazykov*, Moskva 1961, pp. 106—110). It might also be pointed out that the root of *torum* is also evident in other Tü words designating animals: MK *torpi* «a calf which still follows its mothers», East Turki, etc. *torpaq* «a calf in its second year» (ED 533; VEWT 490), MK *toray at* «a bay horse; also used of camels and cattle» (ED 538; TMEN II 475—477). Thus, the root \**tor* in *tor-um*, *tor-pi*, *tor-paq*, *tor-ay*, might designate the color of the coat of a camel or other animal at a certain stage of maturation?

83. QBH 64:5 ff. *tos-* «to attain, endure, suffer» (W III 1208) is Radloff's erroneous reading of *tus-* «to be useful» (ED 554) in the other mss. (QB 1622, etc.), and thus cannot be a loanword from WMo 828 *tos-* «to receive, encounter, etc.» (as VEWT 491).

84. QBH 9:22, 10:6, 34:12 ff. *töre* «traditional laws» = *törü* in the other manuscripts (QB Fihrist 54, 69; Text 828, etc.), and is certainly one of the few Mo elements in the Herat copy; cf. WMo 835 *töre* «id.» [MTü Nr. 172]. In QBH 19:5, however, Radloff's *töre* (written TWRÄ) is an error for QB 256 *tura*.

85. QBH 4:13, 10:22, 23, 24, 11:3, 4, 5, 11, 16:8 *töret-* «to create» = *törüt-* in the other manuscripts (QB Verse Preface 2; Text 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 21) is the causative of the verb *törü-* «to come into being», which appears in WMo 836 *türe-* «id.»; the Mo form of the verb is at the base of the Herat copy *töret-* [see MTü Nr. 173].

86. MK *turumtay* «a predatory bird used for hawking» (ED 550); Räsänen considers this to be a loanword from WMo 827 *turamtai/turimtai* [not *toramtai/torimtai*] «male of any kind of hawk, small-sized birds of prey» (VEWT 501). On a merely superficial plane, the element *-tay* speaks in favor of the Mo etymology, on the condition that it is to be identified with the Mo suffix *-tai/-tei*, which forms nouns designating possession, connection with, or containment in something (as GWM § 138). Doerfer has shown that in the oldest attested stage of Mo, *-tai* was a feminine form of the suffix (Beiträge zur Syntax der Sprache der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen, *Central Asiatic Journal* I, 1955, pp. 263—265), so that *turamtai* should have to be feminine in some sense (see TMEN II 504). Generally, this etymology is not acceptable for the following reasons: (1) a morphological element of the form *-tay* is also found in the following Tü words: *buyday* «wheat» (ED 312), MK *boxtay*



«a bale of clothing» (ED 313), MK *ēildey* ~ *ēildey* «an ulcer . . .» (ED 419); it is beyond probability that the Turks borrowed the word for «wheat» from the Mongols, whatever the status of the other two examples (both aberrant in some way); (2) there are no phonetic criteria which would indicate a Mo borrowing into OTü; (3) the word *turumtai* does not have a good etymology in either Tü or Mo (on the latter, see TMEN II 502–503); moreover, it belongs to a terminological area in Tü — names for falcons and hunting birds — which has a largely foreign appearance; cf. the following terms: *čibek*, *čaplı*, *čayrı*, *lačın*, *qartıya(y)*, *qırıyay*, *sinğur*, *toyan*, *toyrıl*, *turumtay*; the names for such birds, as well as the special area of falconry, among the Turks and Mongols deserve a special study. Unclear.

87. KT E39, TT III 87, U III 35:21, MK *turuq* «lean, emaciated» (ED 539); Räsänen takes OTü *tur-uq* (so analyzed by him) to be borrowed from Mo *tura-y* (so), which is the WMo form given by KW 411 (VEWT 500). In fact, the relevant Mo forms are: WMo 843 *tura-* «to become lean, emaciated», *turaqa(n)* «thin, lean, emaciated». Moreover, Tü *turuq* is obviously derived from Tü *tur-* «to be weak or emaciated» (ED 530), and neither the root nor the derived nominal can be borrowed, for phonetic reasons, from Mo *turu-*, *turaqa(n)*.

88. Yen44:3, TT III 105, KP XXI:5, MK *tusu* «benefit, use, advantage» (ED 554–555); Sinor takes this word to be borrowed from WMo 845 *tusa* «id.» (Two Altaic Etymologies, *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics Presented to Shiro Hattori*, Tokyo 1970, pp. 540–544). In support of this etymology, Sinor cites the case of binoms in which one member is native Tü, the other foreign, so that in the binom *asıy tusu* «advantage» (see ED 244), the first member *asıy* is considered the Tü word, the second *tusu* the Mongol loanword. To be sure, such binoms occur in OTü (*xıua fečeg* «flower», *liv aš* «food (offering)», etc.), but the examples cited by Sinor (*ev barq* «dwelling and movable property», «household», *arıy süzük* «pure») contain purely Tü members and thus hardly support his argument. Moreover, *tusu* is not always used in compound with *asıy*; cf. TT IV B26–27 *ne tusu bolyay* «what use will it be?». Furthermore, *tusu* has a good Tü etymology, as a derivation from the verb *tus-* «to be useful» [see above, Nr. 83], a verb lacking in Mo. Finally, the argument presented above [Nr. 75] with regard to Tü *taluy*, Mo *dalai*, is to be enforced with regard to Tü *tusu*, Mo *tusa*, as well.

89. HT 1941, TT VIII 1:13, MK *tuturqan* «rice» (ED 460); in his

consideration of possible Mo loanwords in MK [see also Nr. 43], Ligeti writes: *«tuturqan 'riz' est certainement à rattacher au mongol tuturyan»* (Histoire du lexique des langues turques, RO XVII, 1951 — 52, p. 87). It is not clear whether Ligeti takes MK *tuturqan* to be a loanword from Mo (which is the context of this portion of his article), or whether he is merely presenting a comparison. There is little probability that a word for this typically Southeast Asian grain could be an originally Mo word, or that the Mongols of the X—XI cc. had anything to do with its cultivation. The phonetic identity of MK and Mo impairs any conclusive statement, and so this case remains unclear.

90. MK *učraš-* «to meet one another» (MTW 227) is Brockelmann's error for *učruš-* «to mate; to cause (birds) to fly off together» (ED 30--31), which occurs in the following verse: *senden qačar sondılač/ mende tınar qaryılač/talıy öter sanduvač/erkek tiši učrušur* «the *sondılač*-bird flees from you/ the swallow rests (perches) on me/ the nightingale sings sweetly/ the male and female mate»; Räsänen accepted Brockelmann's *učraš-* and considered it to be a loan from WMo 859 *učura-/učira-* «to meet» (VEWT 509). Even Poppe accepted this form, and took it as evidence for a Tü ~ Mo, or «Altai» etymon (VGAS 63, 136).

91. MK *ula* «a mound which serves as a landmark in the desert» (ED 126); Räsänen takes this as a loanword from WMo 17 *ayula* «mountains», Xalxa *ül(an)*, KW 454 *ül<sup>a</sup>, ül<sup>u</sup> sid.* (VEWT 512). From which Mo language could such a form have been borrowed? Contemporary to MK of the XI c. is the Mongol language of the Liao/ Qitañ dynasty in which, according to the best evidence, the syllabic group *ayu* had developed to *au*, not to *ü*, as in Qitañ \**čaur* «soldier» < *čayur*, \**čau* «100» < *čayu(n)* (cf. L. Ligeti, Les fragments du *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* mongol en écriture Phags-pa, AOI XVII, 1964, pp. 287—288). Moreover, the semantic comparison encounters difficulties. Unclear.

92. QB 31, 61, 1348, 3714 ff. *ulam* «continuous, constantly attached, permanently» (ED 146); Räsänen does not cite QB (lacking in W), but does consider CC and modern Tü *ulam* to be borrowed from WMo 871 *ulam* «further, still more, gradually» (VEWT 512). Indeed, *ulam* does first appear in MTü (US, Xvarazm, CC), to which the QB occurrences could potentially belong as well (XIII—XV cc. manuscripts). However, both the root *ula-* «to join together, to attach» (ED 126—7), and the deverbal nominal suffix *-m* are found only

in Tü, so that *ulam* is purely Tü (cf. TMEN II 107–108).

93. MK *uyma* 'the (Türkmen) felt out of which boots are made' (ED 273) [on the vowel, see below]; Räsänen takes this word to be borrowed from WMo 605 *oimasun/oimosun* '(felt) sock, stockings' < \**poima* (VEWT 359; here follows LSS 135: *sim Mtü wohl mo. Lehnworts*). It is well-known that in Middle Mongol the word is found as *hoimasun* (Ibn Muḥannā), in Manchu as *fomon*, and in Samoyed as *peiima*, *faema*, *pīme*, etc. (LSS 134–136; Ligeti, *Mots de civilisation de Haute Asie en transcription chinoise*, AOH I, 1950, p. 145), all of which constitute the basis for postulating initial \**p*- in this word. It is sure that during the Old Mongol period, both Tabṣač and Qitañ retained \**p*- (cf. Liget, *Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou*, AOH X, 1960, pp. 237–238; Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi, *Mongolian Studies*, Budapest 1970, p. 306), and that during the MMo period, \**p*- had become *h*- in all attested varieties of this language (Ligeti, *Les fragments du Subhāṣitaratnanidhī* . . . , pp. 282–285). Thus, if MK *uyma* were indeed a borrowing from Mo, it is reasonable to expect that the Old Mongol \**p*- or, at the very least, the MMo *h*-, to be reflected in the Arabic script of MK which has sufficient graphical representations for both sounds. This alone constitutes sufficient grounds to reject the Mo etymology of this word. As to the vowel *u*- in *uyma*, which is normally read *oyma* (see references above, and Doerfer, OLZ LXVI, 1971, cc. 334, 440) it is posited by Clauson (ED 267) on the basis of its connection to Tü *uyuq* 'felt stockings', cf. Tatar, Baškir *öyöq* [< \**uyuq*], etc. (VEWT 511; ED 271: *uyuqluy*; also note KY 273: *uēuq*; LSS 244–245). Both *uyma* and *uyuq* ought to be derived from MK *uy-* 'to squeeze' (ED 267), a verb whose vocalism is fixed by Clauson on the basis of *uyuq*, and thus somewhat in a circular manner. However, this verb ought to survive in Qzq *uyis-* [< *uy-* + *-š*] 'to become lumpy (hair, fur), to curl, to lay down (grass)', in the sense of 'to become matted, pressed' = 'to be squeezed together'.

94. IB 56, M III 32:3, MK *ügür* 'herd' (ED 112 [on the vowel, see below]); Räsänen takes this as a loan from Mo, cf. KW 461 *ür* 'companion, companionship, herd', where WMo *ügür* is cited (VEWT 369). The Tü word must be read with *ü*- not *ö*-, as Clauson and others; cf. Tatar, Baškir *öyör* [< \**üyür* < \**ügür*], Qır *üyür* (already proposed by Bang, *Manichäische Erzähler*, *Le Muséon* XLIV, 1931, pp. 22–23). The WMo form cited by Ramstedt is lacking in Lessing, Kow, but cf. WMo 301 *egür* 'nest, lair', Xal 488, Bur 577 *ür* 'id.'.

Thus, Qalm "companion" is isolated, which seems to indicate a borrowing from Tü into Mo, not the reverse.

95. QBH 183: 28 *ülgür* »maxim« (W I 1859) is written *ülgür-e* in Herat, which is an error for QB 6495 *ülgüle* »measuring (my words)« (cf. ED 145), and thus not a borrowing from WMo 1005 *üliger* »pattern, sample, example, instance, story, etc.« (as VEWI 520).

96. Yen24:2 *ülke* »province, region« (DTS 625, with question mark) is based on Mo *ölke* »the southern side of the mountains, etc.«, which became a loanword in Çayataı and modern Tü languages as *ölke/ülke* »country, territory, etc.« (see TMEN I 145–147; IV 372–373). As many of the Yenisey inscriptions, Yen24 is clumsily inscribed and poorly edited (cf. Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, London 1962, p. 71). The photograph in Radloff's *Atlas der Alterthümer der Mongolei*, LXXIX 2c, shows the following text (line 5ff.): *Inanču Külüg Čigši Beg erde erdemim ünün Qara Seçir* [Q.S. written in opposite direction!] *ülküti altı bay keşdimde ben yeg erdüküm ol erinč Qara Seçirig yerledim* »It was presumably because of my manly qualities that I, Inanču Külüg Čigši Beg, was the best in the *Altı Bay Keşdim* (?and the) *Qara Seçir ülküti*, I settled the *Qara Seçir*.« The *Altı Bay* or »Six Confederations« is mentioned in other Yenisey inscriptions (1, 5, 49) (cf. ED 310), and the *Keşdim* must have been one component of this confederation (see: L. Ligeti, *Transcriptions chinoises de trois noms propres dans l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols, Collectanea Mongolica*, Wiesbaden 1966, pp. 124–128). *Qara Seçir* is known also from MK as the name of a place near Barsıyan, distinct from that mentioned here, and consists of the word *qara* »black« and *seçir* »hill, mountain, the projecting part of a mountain« (ED 840). The next group of letters is *НҮҢ* *ö/ü l'k n'li*, set off by punctuation marks from the preceding, so that there is no reason to suppose that this group is also written backwards. Radloff had read the word as *ülken* + the possessive *-i* and translated the passage as »der höchste unter sechs Geschlechte(r)n« (*Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, III, SPb. 1895, pp. 326, 360; followed by H. N. Orkun, *Eski Türk Yazıtları*, III, Istanbul 1936, pp. 89–92; IV, p. 127, also cf. EPT 44–45, 111). This reading is based on Çayataı, Qazaq, Tatar, etc. *ülken* »tall, big« (VEWI 520), but it ignores the fact that *n* is written with the back vocalic graph, and so should not be attached to *ülk*— nor should it be a question here of the definite object marker *-nı/-ni*, which is not used in Yenisey Runic. Other readings are possible: *nı* could be read as *anı*, the definite object of the third

person pronoun, or as *Anı*, which occurs as the name of a river in Toñ 27 that rises in the northern slopes of the western Sayan and joins the Abaqan River in the country of the Qırız (cf. G. Clauson, Some Notes on the Inscription of Toñuquq, *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, p. 129). The word spelled *ö/ülk* could be compared to Qazaq *ölge* 'mountain stream or river', cited also in W I 1253 as *ölge*, which is distinct from Qazaq *ölke* 'province, realm'. The insertion of these alternatives after *Qara Senir* and before *Altı Bay* hardly leads to anything more than syntactic distortion, but the same must be said of the readings proposed by Radloff *et al.* and by the editors of the DTS. The paleographical context suggests an error here, but, in any event, the passage is unclear.

97. Yen 42:3, IB 53, TT III 138, U I 6:5, TT VIII B14, MK, QB 120 ff. *ün-* 'to rise, to sprout' (ED 169); Räsänen considers MK, QB *ön-* [read *ün-*] to be borrowed from Mo \**ön-*, a root that he abstracts from WMo 636 *öndei-/öndöi-* 'to raise one's head' and 637 *öndür* 'high, tall' (VEWT 372). To this: (1) the connection between Mo *öndür* and the verb *öndei-* is improbable, since *-dur/-dür* is not a recognized deverbal nominal suffix in Mo, and a derivation of *öndür* from a stem \**önde-* is impossible; semantically, the connection between 'to raise one's head' and 'tall, high' is merely superficial; (2) the Mo root \**ön-* is entirely teleological and, in any case, identical to the Tü root *ön-* [i.e., *ün-*] as cited by Räsänen; there are no phonetic criteria for borrowing; (3) the Tü verb is found throughout OTü and later Tü languages in a full panoply of derived forms, rendering the possibility of a borrowing virtually nil. As a final methodological note, it is interesting to observe that Räsänen here takes Tü *ön-* [*ün-*] as a loan from Mo \**ön-*, but in other places, Tü *ös-* 'to grow' as cognate to Mo *ös-* [see above, Nr. 50], and Tü *ör-* 'to rise' as cognate to Mo *öre-* (VEWT 373; WMo *öre-* cited in KW 299, but lacking in Lessing). Not to belabor an obvious point, but it is impossible to distinguish the principles by which Räsänen posits a loanword or a cognate.

98. TT VII 23:5, MK *üpüp*, MK *üpgük* 'hoopoe' (ED 9); Räsänen accepts the reading of Brockelmann for MK *öpkük*, *öpüp* (MTW 134, 135), and takes these to be borrowed from Mo *öbüg* 'hoopoe' cited by KW 302 (cf. WMo 628 'tuft, crest of birds') (VEWT 368), and then accepts the reading *ühüp* for TT VII (cited in ATG 348), and takes this to be cognate to Mo *öbüg* (VEWT 518). The methodology here, as for the etymology of MK *käg* (see above, Nr. 37), is unac-

ceptable, and the word is otherwise clearly of onomatopoeic origin.

99. M III 8(iv):v10 *üren* 'seed' was read by von Le Coq in the following passage: 9–11 *qamy-qa edgü saqinçı yıklıyür üren yaşaru[r] yadılır* '... für alles gute Denken mehrt sich; der Samen gedeiht und breitet sich aus.' On this reading, *üren* could here be a loanword from WMo 1011 *üre* 'seed, grain, fruits', which has been borrowed into some modern Tü languages (VEWT 522). Clauson remarks that 'there is no reasonable doubt that this word is a misreading of *evin*' (ED 233), that is, of Tü *evin* 'seed, grain' (ED 12), which would fit the context nicely: 'the seed (crop) turns green and spreads'. However, in reply to my inquiry after the original manuscript, Peter Zieme most graciously informs me (Letter of 19. 3. 76): *ürän* ist unsichere Lesung, wirklich sehr schwierig. Jedoch folgendes lässt sich sagen: auslautendes -n ist nicht sehr wahrscheinlich, weil keine Verbindung zum folgenden Wort besteht, wie es sonst in dieser (und anderen) Handschriften der Fall ist, demnach wäre wahrscheinlicher: -z. Im übrigen ist der letzte Buchstabe nur teilweise erhalten, die linke obere Ecke fehlt. Weiterhin fehlt die untere Hälfte der zwei letzteren Buchstaben, was aber nicht bedeutet, dass man für -r- -l- lesen könnte, denn vom l-Haken müsste noch etwas zu sehen sein. Zusammenfassend: Notfalls kann man *ürän* lesen (auf keinen Fall jedoch *ävin*)! . . . To these paleographical difficulties, I would only add that the Mo form is *üre* (MMo *küre*), and the plural is formed with -s (*üres*), which is added to nominals ending in a vowel or the diphthong -ai/-ei (GWM § 264). This is not, in that case, one of the numerous Mo words with the so-called 'unstable -n', which is retained in the nominative or subject position of a sentence. This alone renders the proposed Mo identification less likely than the possibility of some sort of scribal error or alternative reading. Unclear.

100. H II 4:31 *ürgesin* 'thorn(?)' (DTS 626) was so read in the following passage: *qızıl ürgesin mıré inçe soqup elgep* 'crush and sift finely red *ürgesin* ('thorn') and pepper'. The reading is based on Çayataş *ürgesün/ürgesün* 'thorn' (W I 1839, PdC 55), which is borrowed from WMo 641 *örgesün/örgösün/örgegösün* 'thorn, splinters'. Clauson suggests that this is not the Mo word, but is a misreading of *övkessin* 'his lung (Def.Obj.)' (ED 228). In support of this correction, quite in conformity with the ambiguities of Uyğur script, cf. H I 60 *tevenin övkessin qutırıp* [error for *qutırıp*] *soqup elgep* 'dry, crush and sift a camel's lung', and Sağlax *qızıl* '3. a kind of red bird; 4. a kind of falcon' (ED 683). Thus, *qızıl övkessin* could mean

\*(crush and sift) the lung of a red bird (or falcon)\*. Apart from this, it is obvious that the *urgesin* (spelled 'WRK'SYN) read by Rachmati could not be the Mo word, if only because *-sin* is not a possible variant of the Mo suffix *-sun/-sün*.

101. MK *yanu-* 'to sharpen, to whet' (ED 944); Räsänen considers MK and modern Tü forms to be borrowed from Mo, cf. KW 466 *zan-* 'to whet, slide, sharpen (a knife)\*; where WMo *janu-* 'to whet; threaten' is cited (neither Kowalewski nor Lessing gives the meaning 'to whet\*!); moreover, Räsänen takes Mo *janu-* 'to whet, to threaten' to be cognate to Tü *yan-* 'to threaten, menace' (ED 942) (VEWT 184). To be clearly distinguished in Räsänen's notice are: (1) Tü *yan-* 'to threaten', which corresponds to WMo 1036 *janu-* 'id.\*; (2) MK *yanu-* 'to sharpen, whet', which is possibly found in KW 466 *zan-* 'to whet, slide, sharpen (a knife)\*, but not elsewhere in Mo; thus, in this case, Räsänen only inferred this meaning for the WMo *janu-*. To go one step farther, it is possible that Ramstedt has used a Russian source for this Qalmyq form, a source which defined the word as in Xal 192 *dzanax* 'to threaten; to bear a grudge against s.o.\*, where Russian has the phrase *točit' zuby na kogo-l.* 'to sharpen the teeth on s.o.\* = 'to bear a grudge\*(?); semantically, cf. Tat, Qzq *qayra-* 'to sharpen, to gnash the teeth at s.o.\* (W II 21; VEWT 222; ED 605). [Cf. MTü, Nr. 189].

102. TT VIII A:16, MK, QB 1027 *yanşaq* 'loquacious, chatterbox' (ED 953); in VEWT, this word is considered to be a loan from WMo 427 *yangsi-* 'to bore with nagging or empty talk; to prattle, etc.\* (VEWT 186—7). To this: (1) Räsänen overlooks the Tü verbal stem, QB 174 ff. *yanşa-* 'to chatter, babble' (ED 953), as well as the connected Tü words, *yanra-* 'to make a sound of some sort; to clatter; to blurt out' (ED 952) and *yanqu* 'echo' (ED 949), which imply a root \**yan*; (2) both the Mo and the Tü words have onomatopoeic flavors (cf. English 'to yak; yak yak' = 'to chatter'), which necessarily obscures any etymological connection between them; (3) Mo *yangsi-* is not phonetically equivalent to Tü *yanşaq*, *yanşa-*, and, at the very least, cannot be the immediate source of the latter.

103. KT N 10 *yasa-* 'to construct, arrange' (IOD 164, n. 60; ATG 353; PDP 386; DTS 245) is the oldest example of a misreading that introduced a Mo word into the OTü vocabulary, cf. WMo 1039 *jasar* 'to put in order, fix, repair, etc.\* [see MTü, Nr. 191]. Doerfer has corrected the passage: *üd tenri aysar kiki oylı qop ölägli törümış* 'Wenn der Himmel die Zeit bestimmt ('sagt'), dann (zeigt sich:)

das Menschengeschlecht ist sterblich (bzw. zum Sterben) geboren» (TMEN IV 72–73; OLZ LXVI, 1971, c. 450; LXVII, 1972, c. 69). With minor differences in the reading of certain words, Clauson's reading agrees with this: *öd tenri aysar kişi oyli ölgei törümiş* »(all) sons of men have been born to die when heaven prescribes the time» (ED 974; omits *qop*). The reading *aysar* for the former *yasar* may be considered firm.

104. Stake Inscription I 6 *yasaq* »standard measure» (F. W. K. Müller, Zwei Pfahlschriften aus den Turfanfunden, *APAW* 1915, Nr. 3, pp. 6, 7) is a misreading of *yayaq* »nut», which was evidently based on WMo 1039 *jasay* »rule, law, etc.» [see MTü, Nr. 192]. the passage should be read: *kim qayu ünli yayaq qalbuqlınca vrxar itser* »whatever mortal makes a monastery the size of a nut-shell (and adorns it with a statue of Buddha the size of a grain of wheat . . .)» (thus corrected in ED 900, 974).

105. H II 14, 128, MK *yigde*, MK (Oyuz Türkmen) *yigte* »jujube tree» (ED 911); Räsänen considers this word to be borrowed from Mo, cf. KW 471–2 (Ölöt dialect) *zeyde* »a shrub whose roots are used as firewood and which grows in the desert», where WMo *jegde* is cited (lacking in Kowalewski, Lessing, etc.; the Mongol section of Ibn Muḥannā has *jigde*, but probably there adopted from the Tü section) (VEWT 202). As the designation of various trees and shrubs, *yigde* ~ *jigde* occurs in nearly every modern dialect of East Turkestan (see the works of Raquette, Katanov-Menges, von Le Coq, Malov, Jarring), where the Ölöt dialect cited by Ramstedt, KW, is spoken, and also in Central Asia (Ibn Muḥannā, Čayataj, Qazaq, Qırqız). It is safe to assume that the word is not borrowed from Mo (lacking there), but is an autochthonous (Iranian?) word.

106. QBH 43:23 *yilya* »river, stream» (W III 486) is an error in Herat for QB 971 *tl-qā* (thus, *ṣ* without dots taken as *ṣ* by Herat scribe), and so cannot be a loan from WMo 1055 *jilya* »ravine, etc.» (as VEWT 200).

107. Toñ 26 *yobal-* »to be tormented» (PDP 389), HT 1968 *yoplun-* »to torment oneself» (von Gabain, Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie, *SPAW* 1938, p. 403, n. 1968); both words are so read by the editors on the basis of WMo 1065 *joba-* »to suffer, worry, grieve, etc.» [see MTü, Nr. 198]. However, Toñ 26 *yobal-* is to be read *yubul-* »to be rolled down» in the passage: *Ibarlıq aşdırmız yubulu intimiz* »we crossed the Ibarlıq (Mountain?), and went rolling down hill» (ED 871, 877; DTS 277; GOT 407). The word in HT 1968–9



is to be read *yubluŋ*- 'to be neglected': *yubluŋmaqly köñülümin uryu yir bulmas men* '(now that my master is dead) I cannot find any place in which to place my neglected mind' (ED 878).

108. MK *yoydu* 'the long hair under a camel's chin', *yoyru* 'a camel's long hair'; also called *yoyruy*; the *-r-* is changed from *-d-*... the Turks call 'a camel's long hair' *yoydu*, and they [the Oğuz and Qıpçaq] *joydu* (ED 899); Räsänen groups MK *yoydu* together with Tuva *čoydur* 'hair under the chin of a camel or ox', Xaqas *čoydır* 'bristles', Čuvaš *śātar*, *śātar* 'bedding, head cushions', considers Čuvaš the source of Old Church Slavonic *ДОХТОРЬ* 'head cushion', and takes the entire group to be borrowed from WMo 1067 *joydor* 'long hair on the throat of a camel; mane of a lion' (VEWT 204-5). Logically, this cannot be, for if the Mo word with *j-* is the origin of the Čuvaš word with *ś-* < \**j-*, then the Old Church Slavonic word with *d-* cannot be a borrowing from the Čuvaš. Otherwise, Doerfer has shown that the Čuvaš forms do not belong to this group of words (cf. OLZ LXVI, 1971, cc. 453-454). Phonetically, Mo *joydor* cannot be the source of MK *yoydu*, etc. (because of *-r-*), which alone disqualifies this etymology. Furthermore, it should be noted that Räsänen elsewhere considers the entire group of Tü words to be genetically related to Mo *joydor* (VEWT 127).

109. QBH 95:16 *yosun* 'law, custom' (W III 443; followed by DTS 275, VEWT 207) is Radloff's misreading of *yosüg*, which is a scribal error in Herat for QB 2600 *yörüg* 'explanation, interpretation' (that is, *y* is read as *ü* by the scribe, who writes it as *-S-* = *-Z-* in the Mongol Uyğur orthography of the Herat copy). Otherwise, WMo 435 *yosun* 'law, rule, custom, etc.' first appears in MTü as a loanword [see MTü, Nr. 199].

110. MK, QB 1809 *yükse-* 'to be high' (ED 916); Räsänen groups QB *yükse-* [read *yükse-* as W III 592] together with Teleut *öksö-*, Yağut *öksöy-*, Turkish, Çayatağ *yüksek*, and takes these to be borrowed from WMo 632 *ögse-/ögsä-* 'to ascend, to go upstream' (VEWT 207). To this: (1) Teleut and Yağut are indeed borrowings from the Mo verb, but are to be kept distinct from the other words cited by Räsänen; (2) Tü *yükse-* is derived from the root \**yük* that is also found in *yügerü* < \**yükgerü* 'upwards' (ED 915), and thus has a good Tü etymology; (3) Tü *yükse-* is not phonetically comparable to Mo *ögse-*; presumably, Räsänen here thinks of the internal Tü development *yü-/yi-* > *i-/i-* (*yıl* ~ *ıl* 'year', *yitig/yiti* ~ *iti* 'sharp', etc.), but this is hardly relevant to the present case.

- APAW Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse
- AOH Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
- Atalay Besim Atalay, *Divanü Lügat-it-Türk*, I—III, Ankara 1939—1941
- ATG A. von Gabain, *Altürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1950<sup>a</sup>
- BC Runic inscription of Bayan Çor (d. 759), cited after ED (there 9u), or as otherwise indicated
- BTT I G. Hazai — P. Zieme, *Fragmente der uigurischen Version des 'Sin'gangjing mit den Gāthās des Meister Fw, Berliner Turfan-texte I*, Berlin 1971
- Bur K. M. Čeremisov, *Burjatsko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1973
- BX Runic inscription of Bilge Xayan (d. 784), cited after ED (there II)
- CAJ Central Asiatic Journal
- CC K. Gronbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch*, København 1942
- Čuv M. Ja. Sirotkin, *Čuvaško-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1961
- DTS *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*, Leningrad 1969
- ED Sir Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford 1972
- EPT S. E. Malov, *Enisejskaja pis'mennost' tjurkov*, Moskva-Leningrad 1952
- ETS R. R. Arat, *Eski Türk Şiiri*, Ankara 1965
- GOT T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, IUP.UAS 69, Bloomington 1968
- GWM Nicholas Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian*, Wiesbaden 1954
- H I—II G. R. Rachmati, Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren, I—II, SPAW 1930, pp. 451—473; 1932, pp. 401—448
- HT A. von Gabain, Die uigurische Übersetzung der Biographie Hüen-tsangs, SPAW 1935, pp. 151—180; Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie, SPAW 1938, pp. 371—415
- IB Runic manuscript of the *Irq Bitig*, cited after ED (there IrkB)
- IOD Vilhelm Thomsen, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, MSFOu V, Helsinki 1896
- Kow J. E. Kowalewski, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*, I—III, Kazan 1844—1849
- KP James Hamilton, *Le conte bouddhique du bon et du mauvais prince en version ouïgoure*, Paris 1971 (story of Kalyāṇapāra and Pāpaṇkara)
- KT Runic inscription of Kül Tegin (d. 731), cited after ED (there I), or as otherwise indicated
- KW G. Ramstedt, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*, Helsinki 1935
- KY Louis Ligeti, Un vocabulaire sino-ouïgour des Ming. Le Kao-tch'ang-kouan Yi-chou du Bureau des Traducteurs, AOH XX, 1967, pp. 253—306; XXI, 1968, pp. 45—108
- LSS Aulis Joki, *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen*, MSFOu 103, Helsinki 1952
- M I—III A. von Le Coq, Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho, I: APAW 1911, Nr. 6; II: 1919, Nr. 3; III: 1922, Nr. 2

- MA N. Poppe, *Mongol'skij slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*, I—III, Moskva-Leningrad 1938—1939
- MEJ Stanisław Kalużyński, *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*, Warszawa 1962
- MK Mahmūd al-Kāšyārī's *Diwān luyāt at-turk* (wr. 1072—1077; ms. copy of 1266), cited after ED (there Kāš), Atalay, MTW, or the *Ṭıpkıbasım* (facsimile ed.) published by the *Türk Dili Kurumu*, Ankara 1941
- MTW C. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz, nach Mahmūd al-Kāšyārī's Diwān luyāt at-Turk*, Budapest 1928
- OLZ Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
- Ord A. Mostaert, *Dictionnaire ordos*, I—III, Peking 1941—1944
- OTG C. Brockelmann, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Literatursprachen Mittelasien*, Leiden 1954
- PdC A. Pavet de Courteille, *Dictionnaire turc-oriental*, Paris 1870
- PDP S. E. Malov, *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pis'mennosti*, Moskva-Leningrad 1951
- PP N. Poppe, *The Mongolian Monuments in hP'ags-pa Script*, Second edition translated and edited by John R. Krueger, Wiesbaden 1957
- QB Yūsuf Xāss Hājib's *Qutadyu Bilig* (wr. 1069; mss. of XIII c. [Namangan], XIV c. [Cairo] and 1439 [Herat/Vienna]), cited after R. R. Arat, *Kutadgu Bilig, I. Metin*, Istanbul 1947; *Tercüme*, Ankara 1959; *Ṭıpkıbasım*, I—III, Ankara 1942—1943
- QBII Herat copy of QB
- Qir K. K. Judakhin, *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1965
- Qzq B. N. Shnitnikov, *Kazakh-English Dictionary*, IUP.UAS 28, Mouton 1966
- RO Rocznik Orientalistyczny
- SH E. Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an/Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, Leipzig 1939
- SPAW Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse
- Suv V. V. Radlov — S. E. Malov, *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*/(*Sutra zolotogo bleska*), *Bibliotheca Buddhica* XVII, SPb. 1913—1917
- TMEN I—IV Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, I—IV, Wiesbaden 1963—1975
- Toñ Runic inscription of Toñuquq (wr. circa 725?), cited after ED (there T), or as otherwise indicated
- T'P T'oung Pao
- TT I—VI W. Bang — A. von Gabain — G. R. Rachmati, *Türkische Turfan-Texte*, I—VI, SPAW 1929—1934
- TT VII G. R. Rachmati, *Türkische Turfan-Texte*, VII, APAW 1936, Nr. 12
- TT VIII A. von Gabain, *Türkische Turfan-Texte*, VIII, *Texte in Brāhmischrift*, APAW 1952, Nr. 7
- U I—III F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica I—III*, APAW 1908, Nr. 2; 1910, Nr. 3; 1920, Nr. 2

- U IV F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica IV*, Herausgeg. von A. von Gabain, SPAW 1931, pp. 675—727
- UAJ Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher
- US W. Radloff, *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler. Materialien nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Malov herausgegeben*, Leningrad 1928
- VEWT Martti Räsänen, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk Sprachen*, Helsinki 1969
- VGAS N. Poppe, *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen, Teil I, Vergleichende Lautlehre*, Wiesbaden 1960
- W I—IV W. W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialects*, I—IV, SPb. 1893—1911
- Xal A. Luvsandende, *Mongol'sko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1957
- Xuast Jes P. Asmussen, *Xuastwäntft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, pp. 166—230
- Yen Runic inscriptions of the Yenisey, cited after EPT or ED (there mal.), or as otherwise indicated

# The Adoration of Jaya Pandita by the Dzakhachins of the Kobdo District

RINCHEN YÖNGSIYEBÜ (†)

In the European literature on Mongols the Western Mongols or Oirats are known by the name of Kalmucks. Alexis Bobrovnikov, the author of the best Russian-language grammar of written Mongolian, which was published in the mid-nineteenth century, wrote that «the Oirats were the ancestors of the present-day Jungar and Volga Kalmucks.»<sup>1</sup>

The name Kalmuck is of Mongol origin — *Qalimay* (*qa-li-ma-y*), «those who went out of their territory», and the Oirat tribes of the western part of the present-day Mongolian People's Republic also called themselves *qalimay*-Kalmuck, because their territory exceeded the bounds of their ancient land of Jungar in present-day Chinese Turkestan. Furthermore, all the Kalmucks of the Volga, Mongolian People's Republic and Hsin-Kiang (Chinese Turkestan) also called themselves *Dörben Oyiradiyin tasurqai* («The Shivers of the Four Oirats»).

Historically this name dates from the seventeenth century when the Kingdom of the Four Oirats was annihilated by the Manchu conquerors. Before the Manchu conquest Oktorguin dalai, one of the distinguished Oirat scholars, who was known by the honorary title of Jaya Pandita Guru, had created a special Oirat script in 1648 on the basis of the Mongol national script *qudm-a üsüg*.<sup>2</sup>

The Oirat national script *todo üsüg* («The clear characters») conformed to all the dialects of the Four Oirats and because it was based on the Mongol national script common to all the Mongols, who spoke a variety of dialects, it was received enthusiastically by all the Four Oirats.

The Pandita Guru, the originator of the Oirat national script, was a skilled translator of philosophical works from Tibetan into the

<sup>1</sup> Bobrovnikov, A., *A Grammar of the Mongol-Kalmuck language* (Kazan, 1859), p. iv.

<sup>2</sup> *Qudm-a üsüg* was explained by the older generation of Mongol intellectuals as *nom-un üsüg* or «Precept's script», «Script of the Teachings».