

Remarks on Comparative Study of the Vocabulary of the Altaic Languages

By NICHOLAS POPPE (Seattle)

One of the new trends in Altaic linguistics in the USSR is the awakening interest in comparative studies. A few years ago, a conference on the Altaic affinity took place as a result of which a valuable symposium appeared¹. The initiative belonged to the Soviet scholars in the Tungus field whose accomplishments belong in the most remarkable achievements of Soviet Oriental studies.

Not long ago, an interesting book on comparative lexicology of the Altaic languages appeared² which will have a strong influence on the future development of Altaic comparative studies.

The Altaic languages possess a large body of common words. Many of them are borrowings from one Altaic language in another language but many words are of common origin. The existence of loan words in one Altaic language taken from another has never been denied³. However, all words common to the Altaic languages are not borrowings. In most cases, borrowings and cognate words can be distinguished from each other. The criterion is the sound correspondence. Thus, knowing that Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus have *r* versus Turkic *z*⁴, Ev.N *semgšik* 'the omentum of the reindeer' and Mo. *semeŋi* ~ *semeŋi* 'the omentum of domestic animals' must be regarded as borrowings from Turkic, cf. Chuv. *samăr* 'fat, thick', Uig. *sämiz* 'fat'. Likewise, Ev. V-L *gedikēn* 'cud' is an obvious borrowing from Ancient Mongolian (AMo.), cf. AMo. **gedikē* > Mo. *geŋge* 'cud', because the regular correspondence is Ev.P-T *gdīmuk* 'occiput', Neg. *gedēmuk*, whereas Lam. Yu. *keŋke* 'occiput' is a borrowing from Yakut, cf. Yak. *kättär* 'occiput'. Consequently, there are criteria which enable the investigator to distinguish between borrowings and words of common origin.

1. In her introductory article 'The tasks of comparative lexicology of the Altaic languages', the editor of the volume mentioned and a prominent scholar in the Manchu-Tungus field, TSINTSIUS, rightly states that the comparative lexicology ultimately leads to the problem of establishing the original common vocabulary of genetically interrelated languages, the shortest way to achieve this purpose being comparative study of entire semantic groups of words such as kinship terms, names of parts of the human body, names of animals, etc. Taking as an example the concept 'bird' (bird in general, particular birds), TSINTSIUS finds that the Altaic languages use at least three lexical models, the first of them being composed of words derived from the verb 'to fly'⁵. Speaking of the examples corro-

¹ N. POPPE: A Symposium on the Altaic Theory. ČAJ 16 (1972), pp. 37 ff.

² Očerki sravnitel'noj leksikologii altajskix jazykov. Leningrad 1972, 362 pages.

³ Cf. N. POPPE: Introduction to Altaic Linguistics. Wiesbaden 1966, p. 167 ff.

⁴ Cf. Ev. *ker-* 'to seek, to go around, to search a place' = Mo. *kerü-* 'to roam, to wander' = Chag. Kar.L. Uig., etc. *kiz-* 'to go through, to run through', Osm. *gez-* 'to go around, to go for a walk, to wander'.

⁵ V. I. ČIRČOV: 'Zadači sravnitel'noj leksikologii altajskix jazykov'. *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

borrowing this statement, it can be remarked that the etymologies quoted are not only correct but also sufficiently complete. The author of these lines would like to expand and supplement some of them. Thus, Ev. *deŋi* 'bird' (cf. *deŋ-* 'to fly') is, indeed, to be compared with Mongolian (Buriat) *deŋdeŋei* 'fledgling', cf. *deŋ-de-* 'to rise, to get up', and with Mo. *dege-* in *degere* 'on, above, upper', *degegei* 'up, upward', Chuv. *si* 'upper part, up, on', AT *jüg* 'good'. There is no doubt that Manchu (Ma.) *dele* 'top, on top', *deŋi* 'top, above', Lam. *dēn*, *dēŋ* 'above, on', *dēŋi* 'to move) on, (along) the top' also belong here. As for Ev. *diŋu* 'upper', *dilē* 'above', *din* 'upper part', etc., *di-* might go back to **de-*, consequently, also belong in this group of words. This expanded etymology still stronger corroborates the statements made by TSINTSIUS. It is to be mentioned, in this connection, that TSINTSIUS carefully points out loan words which occur side by side with genetically related words, e.g., Ev. *deŋdeŋ-* 'to rise' < Mong.

Speaking of the words for the bird, also Buriat (Bur.) *dalbarā* 'young bird' should be mentioned which is etymologically connected with Mo., Khalkha (Kh.), Bur. *dali* 'wing'. Another word for wing is Mo. *dalabé* < *dalubé* from Mo. *dalu*, Kh. *dal* 'scapula', Mongour (Mngr.) *dālū* 'shoulder' = Turkm. *jāl* 'mane', Yak. *sāl* 'the fat under the mane of a horse'. Mo. *dalubé* is formed with the well-known suffix for covers -*bé*, e.g., Mo. *eliŋebé* 'waist-coat' from *eliŋen* 'liver, abdominal region'. As for Ev. *dalu* 'scapula of a deer' it is a borrowing from Mongolian.

It is quite possible that Mo. *dalu* 'scapula' and *dali* 'wing' are etymologically related. In this case, the primary stem **dāl* can be established. Cf. also Mo. *dalay* 'nape, fat on the nape' > Ev. *dalay*. Anyway, Bur. *dalbarā* 'young bird' and Mo. *dali* 'wing' belong together and can probably be connected with Turkic (Leb., Kumd.) *jalbaj* 'name of a bird', Tel. *jalbayaj* 'name of a bird', Tel. *jalbayda-* 'to hover' (said of birds). Mo., Kh. *dalai-* 'to swing, brandish the arms, flap the wings' etc. > Tel. *talaj-* probably also belong here.

The pattern 'bird' < **fly*, '*to rise, top, above' is corroborated by AT *učuŋ* 'predatory bird' < *uč-* 'to fly' or Yak. *kötör* 'bird' < *köt-* 'to fly' (cf. *kötör-* 'to lift, raise' = Mong. Kalm. *köt-* and Lam. *kuŋ-*). Moreover, the existence of several groups of words for bird which are connected with the idea of flying or rising or *top, on, above* makes it very probable that the same ideas underly some other words for bird. Thus, the etymology established by TSINTSIUS for Ev. *nikī* 'duck', Ma. *neze* 'id.' and Mo. *nis-* 'to fly' is quite plausible. The difficulty is, however, that Mo. *nis-* has no etymology in Mongolian, and it is hard to say whether final -*s* is a suffix or belongs to the stem, although Mongolian has a number of verbs formed with -*s*. On the other hand, Ev. *nikī* < **ni-kei* 'duck' can be compared with Mo. *nigusun* ~ *nigusun* < **niku* + *-sun* 'duck'. The objection can be made that **niku* is back-vocalic whereas **ni-kei* is front-vocalic. However, Mo. *nis-* 'to fly' is originally a stem of back vowels because the causative

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁷ Called *leksikoteknički modeli*, i.e., lexical models; by TSINTSIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁸ G. J. RAMSTEDT: Zur Verbetammildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen. JSFOu 28:3 (1912), pp. 50-51.

verb *nisqa-* 'to fly' is back-vocalic in the dictionary *Muqaddimat al-Adab*. It is known that many original stems of back vowels have become front-vocalic in Mongolian¹⁰. The conclusion drawn from this examination of the etymology of Ev. *niki* 'duck' is that its validity cannot be proven beyond doubt.

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

A model can also be discovered in Buriat *ubdegei niden* 'the depressions on both sides of the patella' (lit. 'the eyes of the knee'), Kh. *owdogni nud* 'id.', cf. Chuv. *čerküsi* 'knee' < *čér* 'id.' = Turk. *tiz* 'knee' + Chuv. *küsi* 'id.' = Turk. *közi* 'its eyes', cf. Uzb. *tizza közi* 'kneecap', cf. Tat. *tez közo* 'a patch on the knee'.

The examples given above are easy but the same method is applicable to doubtful cases which need careful examination. Thus, Mo. *erüke*, Kh. *eręp* 'the smoke opening in the roof of a yurt' is probably a noun derived with the suffix *-ke* from *erü-* 'to dig'¹¹. On the other hand, Turk. *eşik*, Turkm. *işik* 'door', Az. *eşik* 'outside, yard', Chuv. *aläk* 'door' could be nouns derived with the suff. *-k* from *eš-* 'to dig', cf. Az. *eš-* 'id.', Chuv. *al-* 'to plough', *al-* 'to dig'. If this etymology is correct, a pattern could be established, namely, 'opening in a wall or roof' from 'digging' which would point in the direction of a primitive underground dwelling with an entrance (which could also have served as a smoke opening) in the roof¹². It should be emphasized that this is a hypothesis which is, however, worthwhile to be worked on¹³.

⁹ N. N. POPPE: *Mongol'skij slovar'* Mukaddimat al-Adab. I-II. Moskva-Leningrad 1938, p. 287.

¹⁰ N. POPPE: On Some Honorific Expressions in Mongolian. Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics. Presented to Shirō Hattori on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. Tokyo 1970, p. 489.

¹¹ For the suff. *-ga* ~ *-ke* cf. Mo. *siğa* 'clay for plastering walls' from *siğa-* 'to smear, to plaster'; Mo. *asa* 'stones falling from mountains', cf. *as-ga-* 'to shed' (a causative verb) from **as-*; Mo. *udga* 'origin, meaning, significance' from **ud-*, cf. AT *ud-* 'to follow'; Mo. *siğäke* < **siğäke* 'a large needle' from *siğ-* 'to prick, to perforate', cf. Ma. *siğü* 'hairpin', etc.

¹² Such a dwelling resembles the winter dwelling of the Khakas. It represents a hole in the ground covered with a roof. See A. A. POPOV: *Zhikiše. Istoriko-etnografičeskij atlas Sibiri*. Pod redakcijoj M. G. LEVINA i L. P. POTAPOVA. Moskva-Leningrad 1961, pp. 183-185.

¹³ It should be mentioned that the comparison of Mo. *erüke* 'smoke opening' and Ev. *urkų* 'door' has already been made by O. A. KONSTANTINOVA: Tunguso-man'šurakajis leksika, svjazannaja s žilkičem, op. cit., pp. 240-241. She also mentions the obsolete Ev. word *čoräke* which denotes a type of dwelling with the entrance through the smoke-opening. Mo. *erüke* is a noun derived from *erü-* 'to dig'. In Evenki, however, the verb 'to dig' is *eri-* which corresponds to the Mongolian form. It is, however, difficult to connect Ev. *urkų* with *eri-* unless *urkų* is a borrowing from Mongolian.

Speaking of patterns or models, one should not forget, however, that some cases may be explained as calques. Thus, although Mo. *gergei* and Turk. *ebbi* 'wife' can be regarded as words formed after the same model, Mo. *ger-le-* 'to marry' (lit. 'to acquire a house') and Crim., Az., Osm. *ävün-* 'to marry' could be calques. Calques may also be Kh. *nozoin zobü* 'sweet-briar' (lit. 'dog's snout'), Bur. *nozoin zoxör* 'id.' (*zoxör* 'snout'), cf. Tel. *itumburu* 'id.' (lit. 'dog's snout'), Osm. *it burunu* 'id.', Kaz. *it murun* 'id.'¹⁴. Calques are also Bur. *ülän müggen* 'gold' (lit. 'red silver'), Yak. *kyysil kömüs* 'id.' (lit. 'red silver'), and Ev. *hularin* ~ *ularin meyyun* 'id.' (lit. 'red silver'), *meyyun* being a Mongolian loan word.

Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between calques and expressions of independent origin, e.g., Mo. *čagan sibayun*, Kh. *tsagan šuwü* 'swan' (lit. 'white bird') and Turk. *ağ quş* 'swan' (lit. 'white bird') because the swan is white and is also called 'a white bird' in many languages, cf. Russ. *lebed* = Middle German *eiptr* ~ *alptr* 'id.' (original meaning 'white') = Lat. *albus*.

One can agree with what TSINTSIUS says about the necessity of investigation of entire semantic groups of words such as the names of parts of the human body. Thus, when it is found that a given language possesses a number of such words borrowed from another language, this may shed light on the origin of some other words belonging to the same semantic group. Let this be illustrated with the following examples. It is known that the Turkic words for domestic animals of a particular age are borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Chag. etc. *dönän* 'a four-year old horse' and Oir., Tel. *qunan* 'three-year old foal'¹⁵. Likewise, Turk. *tulan* 'a five-year old animal'¹⁶ is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Oir. *tülq* < **tabulan* from Mo. *tabun* 'five'; Tuva *qyŋalay* < Mong., cf. Kh. *xadžälän* 'a four-year old horse'; Tuva *sojälän* < Mong., cf. Kh. *sojölön* 'a five-year old horse'¹⁷; Az. *ürjü* 'a horse in its third year'¹⁸ < Mong., cf. Mo. *ürjü* 'three- to five-year old stallion', Kh. *üré* 'id.'; Tel. RADLOFF *möndölö* 'a young marmot'¹⁹ < Mong., cf. Kh. *möndöl* 'a one-year old marmot'. In view of these examples it is doubtful that Mo. *silüge* 'three-year old sheep' could be a borrowing from Old Bulgarian²⁰ because in all the examples given above Mongolian is the lending language. Besides, Old Bulgarian **silüge* is nowhere attested, and the only evidence — if it can be called so — is Chuv. *šäl* 'tooth'.

Similarly, Mo. *däga*, Kh. *däga* < **dapähä* 'one-year old foal' can hardly be regarded as a Turkic loan word (cf. Osm. *japaq*, Kaz. *jabayy*, etc.) because neither Mo. *morin* 'horse' nor *gegiütü* 'mare' nor *unugan* < **unukän* 'foal in its first year' are borrowings. In general, before declaring a word a borrowing, it should be carefully analyzed as a member of a given semantic group of words.

¹⁴ Cf. the calques Russ. *nezabudkas* and German *Vergißmeinnicht* 'forget-me-not', a calque of Middle French *ne m'oubliez mye*.

¹⁵ M. RÄSÄNEN: Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der türkischen Sprachen. Helsinki 1909, pp. 140, 300.

¹⁶ A. M. ŠÖRBAK: Nazvanija domašnix i dikix životnyx v tjurkakix jazykax. Istoričeskoe razvitie leksiki tjurkakix jazykov. Moskva 1967, p. 95.

¹⁷ ŠÖRBAK: op. cit., p. 94.

¹⁸ ŠÖRBAK: op. cit., p. 93.

¹⁹ Cf. ŠÖRBAK: op. cit., p. 148.

²⁰ A. RÓNA-TAS: Some Problems of Ancient Turkic. Acta Orientalia 32 (1970), p. 215.

2. The article by TSINTSIUS 'Contributions to the etymology of Altaic kinship terms'²¹ deals with the words *eme, *ene, *eke, *epe, *apa, *eti, *ere, *ede, *aka, and *püre. The kinship terminology constitutes a large group of words. Like any other semantic group (e.g., parts of human body, names of animals, etc.), the kinship terminology does include borrowings in many languages, cf. Engl. *cousin*, *aunt*, *nephew*, and *niece* which are borrowings from Old French, and ultimately go back to Latin original forms; cf. Czech *kmotra* 'godmother', cf. Czech *kmoř* 'godfather', OSL *koumetra* 'godmother' from Latin *commater*; cf. Finnish *morsian* 'bride' < Balt., *tytär* 'daughter' < Balt.; cf. Turkish *hembire* 'sister' < Pers. *häm-šivā*, etc. However, the borrowed kinship terms refer mostly to more or less remote but not to immediate relatives like parents. Thus, the English terms *father*, *mother*, *son*, *daughter* are not borrowings, and to give here a few examples of native words from another language which has a large number of loan words, the following Finnish (Suomi) kinship terms are supplied: *isä* 'father', *emä* ('emo) 'mother', *lapsi* 'child', *poika* 'son' (but *tytär* 'daughter' < Balt.), *veli* 'brother', *sisko* 'sister' which are genuine Finno-Ugric or at least Finnic words. Therefore, when examining the kinship terminology, TSINTSIUS is on a safe ground although, among the kinship terms, there are loan words, e.g., Ev. Barg. *bafa* 'husband of the younger sister'²² < Mong., cf. Mo. *bafa* 'husbands of two sisters' > Tat. *bafa* 'husband of the sister of one's wife'²³; Kaz. *böle* 'children of two sisters' < Mong., cf. Mo. *böle* 'sons of two sisters'²⁴; Ev. Barg. *šē* 'nephew, niece' < Mong., cf. Kh. *džē*, Bur. *zē*, Mo. *šige* 'grandchild (child of the daughter)', cf. Turkm. *jegen* 'nephew', Osm. *jägün* 'id.' also 'grandson'²⁵; Yak. *bärgün* 'wife of the elder brother of the husband' < Mong., cf. Kh. *bergen* 'wife of the elder brother', Mo. *berigen* < **berikēn* 'id.'; Ev. V-L *kurigen* 'brother-in-law (husband of the younger sister)' < Mong., cf. Mo. *kürgen* < **kürikēn*, Kh. *zürgen* 'husband of the daughter or sister'; Ev. *kütē* 'husband of the younger sister' < Yak. *kütüö* 'husband of one's elder sister, husband of one's aunt', cf. AT, Uig. *küdagü* 'son-in-law', Tat. *kežüü* 'id.', Chuv. *kerü* 'id.', all Turkic forms < Mong. *kürdü* < *kürü degüü* 'younger brother of the wife', etc.

According to TSINTSIUS, the total number of kinship terms occurring in individual Altaic languages amounts to about thirty, and they are investigated in great detail in her article. Many words had been compared, and good etymologies had been established by the predecessors of TSINTSIUS but the value of her discussion is in its thoroughness and the abundance of details such as words etymologically connected with the kinship terms, e.g., Mo. *emegere-* 'to grow old', *emečile-* 'to act in the manner of women', *emegetei* 'woman', etc. The great value of her article is also the careful dis-

ussion of the morphemes forming the words in question. Thus, the words denoting persons who are substitutes for blood relatives (e.g., stepmother) are investigated in detail from the point of view of the suffix forming them, e.g., Ev. *amirān* 'stepfather' from *amin* 'father'. TSINTSIUS is right when she says that such suffixes are rather obscure²⁶. Indeed, words as *emegetei* 'female' from *eme* 'woman' belong to a rare morphological type. Such words are Mo. *eregetei* 'male' from *ere* 'man', *nojagtai* 'prince' from *nojan* 'id.', *qatugtai* 'woman' from *qatun* 'lady, wife of a prince'. It is obvious that the suffix is *-gtai* ~ *-gtei* which is probably a compound one and is to be analysed as *-g-tei* where *-tei* is well known but *-g* is obscure. On the other hand, *-gčün*²⁷ is a well-known suffix and occurs mostly on nouns denoting colours. It forms colour adjectives for female animals, e.g., *qaragčün* 'black (female)' from *qara* 'black (male)'. A few other stems also take this suffix, e.g., *eme-gčün* 'female' from *eme* 'woman' (and by analogy *eregčün* 'male' from *ere* 'man'), *urtugčün* 'a bow covered with a thin layer of horn' from *urtu* 'long'; *sibegčün* 'maid servant' (from ?). Here again the suffix is composed of *-g-* of unknown function and *-čün*. Analysing *emegetün* 'female' as *eme-g-čün* (p. 23), TSINTSIUS identifies *emeg* with AT *emig* ~ *emik* 'breast' (p. 24). If this etymology is correct, Mo. **emeg* in *emegetün* and *emegetei* must be a noun in *-g* formed from **eme-* 'to suck', cf. AT *em-* 'id.', Az. *äm-* 'id.', Turkm. *em-* 'id.'. It is a tempting etymology but, in view of absence of the verb **eme-* in Mongolian and obscurity of the elements constituting the suffixes *-gtei* and *-gčün*, this etymology is hypothetical. As for Mo. *eme* 'woman, female' and Chuv. *ama* < **eme* 'female of an animal', similar words are found also in the Uralic languages, cf. Finnish *emä* 'mother, female', *emäntä* 'house-wife', etc.²⁸

Speaking of Mo. *egeči* 'elder sister' (p. 31), cf. *egečimed* 'the elder one' (as opposite of *döyimed* 'the younger one' from *döyi* 'the younger sister' in the Secret History)²⁹, the interesting Sagai form *negüči* 'sister-in-law, wife of the elder brother, aunt, wife of the younger brother of the father' is to be mentioned which, in spite of resemblance to Mo. *nagaču* 'maternal uncle, relatives of the mother', has nothing in common with the latter. Continuing the discussion of *eke*, *egeči*, etc., it should be remarked that comparison with AT *ög* 'mother' (p. 31) is doubtful because, as a rule, Turkic *ö* does not correspond to Mo. *e*. The ancient **e* does not become *ö* unless it is followed by a labial consonant, e.g., *öpkü* 'lung', cf. Mo. *ebčügün* < **eptügün*, Kh. *owšü* 'breast', Ev. *ewte* 'lung', Ma. *ufuzaru* < **öptügü* 'lung', Ev. *ewtış* 'rib', etc. However, Mo. *öküi*, Kh. *qai* 'elder sister' (p. 31) and Ordos *ökxī* 'aunt' belong to AT *ög* 'mother'.

Proceeding to **epe* ~ **apa*, the author of these lines agrees with TSINTSIUS that the vocalism *e/a* poses difficulty (p. 32). However, no difficulty arises

²¹ V. I. ČINČIUS: K etimologii altajskix terminov rodstva, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 ff.

²² G. M. VARILEVICH: Evenkijsko-russkij slovar'. Moskva 1958, p. 47.

²³ DOERFER regards Mo. *bafa* as a borrowing from Turkic although the word *bafa* is not attested in Ancient or Middle Turkic. He deduces, with an interrogation mark (?), *bafa* from *bafy* 'elder sister, older woman' etc. but this is doubtful. See G. DOERFER: Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Bd. II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen. Wiesbaden 1965, p. 232. It is more probable that Turk. < Mong. because of *-f-* which does not occur in Old Turkic languages.

²⁴ RÄSKÄNEN: *op. cit.*, p. 84.

²⁵ RÄSKÄNEN: *op. cit.*, p. 194.

²⁶ ČINČIUS: *op. cit.*, p. 23. The suff. *-rān* can be compared with Mo. *-rap* in words with derogatory connotations, e.g., *jasarap* 'contemptible ruler' from *jaasay* 'ruler': 'contemptible ruler' = 'somebody who is not exactly a ruler but only acts as such'. The suff. *-rap* consists of *-ra-* of verbal stems + *-g* of verbal nouns.

²⁷ ČINČIUS: *l. c.*

²⁸ See Y. H. TOIVONEN: Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja. Helsinki 1955, p. 38.

²⁹ E. HANRISSER: Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuce tobos'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi). Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Wiesbaden 1962, p. 38.

because of the consonants *p ~ *b since Mo. -b- in strong position goes back to *p so that Mo. *aba* < **dpa*. What makes the Mongolian-Turkic correspondence established by TSINTSIUS doubtful is that *aba* etc. in Mongolian denotes the father whereas Turkic *apa* is 'elder sister, aunt', i.e., a male relative versus a female relative. Although the undersigned agrees with what TSINTSIUS says about the so-called Lallwörter, Mo. *aba* 'father' and Turkic *apa* 'sister, aunt' are probably, in origin, children's words formed irrespectively of any rules. Likewise, Bur. *bābāi* 'father' and Turkic *babaj* 'id.' are Lallwörter and hardly include the Mo. word *abai* as a component (cf. p. 33).

Tel., Kaz., Kirg., Khak., Shor *abyzyn*, Bashk. *aphyn*, Uzb. *ovsin* 'sister-in-law (wives of two brothers)' are borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Mo. *abtsun* 'the wife of the elder brother in her relation to that of the younger brother'. The suffix *-sun* > Turk. *-syn* ~ *-zyn* is a typical Mongolian suffix. It is not to be analysed as *-*z + yn* as Pokrovskaja quoted by Tsintsius believes, and *abyzyn* is not a noun formed from the Turkic verb *aby-* 'to hide'.

An interesting problem is the correspondence of front vowels to back vowels in cases as Turkic *ata* 'father' and Tat. *āti* 'id.' (p. 39). This occurs, however, mainly when the diminutive and caressive suffix *-i* < *-aj* is added to the final vowel ³⁰.

In connection with Mo. *ere* = Turk. *er* 'man, male', a number of words etymologically related are discussed on pp. 46-48 of the article of TSINTSIUS. Some of them really belong to the same primary stem but others have to be excluded. Thus, one would expect *er* 'man' and *erkük* 'male' to belong together as TSINTSIUS believes. However, Turk. *är* 'man' (also *ärlik* 'courage') has the long vowel *ä* in the initial syllable whereas Turk. *erkek* 'man, male' and *erk* 'freedom, power of will' have the vowel *e*. Cf. also Az. *är* 'man, husband' but *erkük* 'male' (cf. also Az. *erküd* 'the leading buck'), cf. Chuv. *ar* 'man' but *irék* 'freedom, free' which make such an etymology doubtful especially in view of the wider vowel in Turk. *är*, Az. *är*, Chuv. *ar* versus the narrower (and also short in Turkmenian versus long) in Turk. *erk*, *erkek*, Az. *erkük*, Chuv. *irék*. Let it be added that Khalaj has *är* ~ *är* ~ *här* 'man' and *ärkük* ~ *hirkük* 'male' ³¹, the primary stems of the words concerned lacking full uniformity. It is obvious that the respective Turkic words (and the Mongolian *ere* 'man' and *erke* 'power, strength') do not belong together.

An interesting group of words are Mo. *üre* 'fruit, child, posterity, result'. As 'result' and 'remuneration' this word occurs in the expression Mo. *ači üre* (p. 53). This *ači* should not be confused with Mo. *ači* 'grandson': cf. Mo. *ači* < **ati* 'nephew, grandson' = AT *aty* 'id.' but Mo. *ači* 'merit, benefit' is *hači* 'gratitude' in the Secret History ³² and, therefore, cannot be connected with Mo. *ači* 'grandson'.

The form *hutę* goes back to **huktę*, cf. Orok *putię* < **puktę*, Ulcha *piktę* < **puktę*. TSINTSIUS analyses the form *hutę* as *hu-tę* and states that the

Ulcha and Nanai form *piktę* occupies a separate place. She also regards the reason for the development of the original vowel to *i* in Orok as obscure (p. 55). In the opinion of the author of these lines, Ev. *hutę* < **putę* obviously goes back to **purktę*. In Ulcha, Nanai, Orok, and Negidal **r* has resulted in *j* in cases investigated by TSINTSIUS ³³. Consequently, Nan. and Ulcha *piktę* is easily explained as going back to **pujktę* < **purktę*. The primary stem is **pur*, and *huril* is the regular plural form with the suff. *-l* and the connective vowel *i*. As for Ma. *fuse-* 'to propagate, to multiply', TSINTSIUS correctly separates it from Mo. *üre* < *hüre* < **püre* (p. 59).

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

3. The following item in the book under discussion is KOLESNIKOVA'S article on the names of parts of body in the Altaic languages ³⁴. KOLESNIKOVA justly states that the names of the parts of the human body represent one of the most stable groups of words in the vocabulary of the Altaic languages. This is also the case in many other languages, e.g., Slavic, Finno-Ugric ³⁵, etc. Her article deals with the following etymologies: **ama(n)* 'mouth', **köke(n)* 'breast', **ar(u)-ka* 'spine', **hiri* 'spine', **daga(ri)* 'various parts of the spine', **möire* 'shoulder', **eg-in* 'shoulder, collar bone', **omur* 'breast, collar bone, shoulder', **öm(ü)gän* 'collar bone', **möči* 'various organs', **gari*/**gara* 'hand, arm, branch', **bile(k/n)* 'wrist', **ebir* 'hip joint', **tamir* 'vein', **gede*/**geäs* 'occiput'. There is very little one could add to the thorough examination of each word concerned. Only a few points are open to criticism which concerns the interpretation of the following words.

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

Turkic *art* is incorrectly explained as a borrowing from Mongolian, i.e., *ard* 'behind' (p. 87) which is a new colloquial dative-locative form from what is *aru* in Script Mongolian. The form *art* is old and already attested in Middle Turkic ³⁶. The suffix *-t* in *art* (cf. *ar-ga* 'spine') is comparable to *-t* in *al-t* 'lower part' from *al* 'front', *as-t* 'lower part', *üs-t* 'upper part, top' from (Kaz., Tel.) *üs* 'id.'.

Ud. *ęmuge* and Orok *ęmoge* 'collar bone' can hardly be of the same origin as AT (Middle Turkic would be correct) ³⁷ *ömgän* ~ *ümgän* 'the spot by the neck' (p. 94) because these words are rather isolated and occur in languages very far apart. Anyway, the form **öm(ü)gän* is hardly Common Altaic.

KOLESNIKOVA'S article demonstrates clearly that the Altaic languages

³⁰ V. I. CINCUS: Sravnitel'naja fonetika tunguso-man'čžurekijazykov. Leningrad 1949, p. 246.

³¹ V. D. KOLESNIKOVA: Nazvanija častej tela čeloveka v altajskijazykaz, op. cit., pp. 71 ff.

³² Cf. the long list of genuine Finno-Ugric terms in Finnish, see L. HAKULINEN: The Structure of the Finnish Language. Bloomington (Indiana) 1961, p. 217.

³³ BEZIM ATALAY: Divanı lügat-it-türk dizini 'endeke'. Ankara 1948, p. 37.

³⁴ Drevnetjurkajij slovar'. Leningrad 1964, p. 384, with reference to Suvarnaprabhāsa which is a Middle Turkic text.

³⁰ M. RÄSÄNEN: Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen. Helsinki 1949, p. 79.

³¹ G. DOERFFER: Khalej Materiala. Bloomington (Indiana) 1971, pp. 49, 163, 292, 293.

³² HARNISOB: op. cit., p. 74.

undoubtedly possess a number of anatomical terms of common origin which is much larger than what is discussed in her article. Common Altaic names of organs of the body include also Mo. *örö* < **öri* 'diaphragm, heart artery, inside' = Ev. *ur* < **öri* 'stomach, abdomen' = Chuv. *var* < **ör* < **öri* 'stomach, inside', Turk. *öz* 'self', Turkish *öz* 'inside, marrow', etc.³⁸; Mo. *ebügün* < **epi-gün* 'breast, sternum' = Ev. *epü* 'lung, liver and lung', *epülü* 'rib' = Turk. *öpkü* (< ?) **ep-kü* 'lung', etc.

4. The zoological terminology of the Tungus languages has drawn the attention of NOVIKOVA whose excellent article on the names of animals borrowed from other languages³⁹ should serve as an example for future works on related subjects. The loan words in question are divided into several groups, namely, Mongolian, Turkic, Chinese, and other loan words in the Manchu-Tungus languages. The names of animals borrowed from Mongolian constitute the largest group. There is very little one can add to NOVIKOVA's discussion of the words concerned.

Mo. *huusa* 'mule' goes back to Chin. *lo-tü*, and the Mongolian form *layusa* is the 'archaized' spelling of the same word⁴⁰. It is not formed with the suffix **-yusan* from Chin. **la* as the author believes (p. 11) which explanation contradicts, by the way, NOVIKOVA's analysis of Ma. *loose* < Chin. *lo-tü* (with the suff. *-tü*) given on p. 144. Indeed, Ma. *loose* is a direct borrowing from Chinese but not through Mongolian.

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

Ev. *kenü* 'a lamb born in summer' (p. 121) is an interesting form which evidences to the fact that Mo. *kenje*, Bur. *xenze* 'late born' go back to **kenji* < **kendi* (> Chag. *kenji* 'younger daughter').

Mo. *čindagan* 'white hare' goes back to **čindakän* as NOVIKOVA correctly states (p. 123). ŠCERBAK's etymology of this word (< *čin* 'true' + *dagan* 'foal') is justly rejected by NOVIKOVA because it is utterly fantastical.

Mo. *taulai* 'hare' has never been compared with any Georgian word by VLADIMIRTSOV as NOVIKOVA says (p. 123, note 133). She was misled by VLADIMIRTSOV's abbreviation *Gruzin*. (= English *Georgian*)⁴¹ which stands for an anonymous Georgian author of the XIV century⁴².

Ma. *onon* 'wild buck' < Mong. cf. Mo. *oyono* (p. 127), indeed, correspond to Chag. *hona* 'male deer, stag' which is a borrowing from Middle Mongolian, and goes back to either **pyana* or **pušana*. NOVIKOVA is, however, right when she separates it from Tuv. *xuna* which is Mo. *uquna* (*ibid.*).

NOVIKOVA's etymology of Mo. *čnuua* 'wolf' as going back to **čnuka* > Ev.

³⁸ V. D. KOLESNIKOVA: K karakteristike nazvanij častej tela čeloveka v tunguso-man'čurskix jazykax, op. cit., p. 302.

³⁹ K. A. NOVIKOVA: Inozazyčnye elementy v tunguso-man'čurskoj leksike, otnosjaščejse k životnomu miru, op. cit., pp. 104 ff.

⁴⁰ Cf. what RAMSTEDT says about Mo. *nyajusa* and other forms for porcelain < Chin. *ch'achung*: G. I. RAMSTEDT: Sravnitel'naja fonetika mongol'skogo pis'mennogo jazyka i xalxak'ogurginskogo govora. Perевod pod red. A. D. RUDNICKA. S.-Peterburg 1908, p. 4.

⁴¹ B. Ja. VLADIMIROV: Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skogo pis'mennogo jazyka i xalxak'ogo narečija. Vvedenie i fonetika. Leningrad 1929, p. 255.

⁴² VLADIMIROV, op. cit., p. x. See B. Ja. VLADIMIROV: Anonimnyj gruzinskij istorik XIV veka o mongol'skom jazyč. Bull. de l'Acad. Imp. des Sciences 1917, p. 1459.

čnuka + *i* (p. 129) is close to our interpretation of these words⁴³. The Mo. form has, however, nothing in common with Bur. *šognogor* 'having a sharp muzzle'.

It is correct to say that Ev. *säfiya* 'magpie' is a borrowing from Mongolian (p. 138). The latter language has borrowed it, in its turn, from Turkic because Turkic *-z* is always *-r* in genuine Mongolian words whereas Mo. *f* is a substitute for Turk. *z* in borrowings⁴⁴. The genuine Mongolian form of this word would be **siyariga*.

Speaking of Yakuts, NOVIKOVA remarks that, in the opinion of Soviet scholars, the process of forming of the Yakut nation took place in the XIIIth-XIVth century (p. 140) which agrees with the opinion of the undersigned with regard to the separation of the Yakut language in the XIVth century⁴⁵.

5. DMITRIEVA's article on the plant names in Turkic and other Altaic languages⁴⁶ represents a valuable synopsis of words referring to the vegetation, grouped according to their general meanings in Russian, e.g., birch bark, bud, branch, etc. Each group includes the Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus words with the same meanings. The total number of groups amounts to 37 groups dealing with the anatomy of plants (grain, ear, stalk, etc.) and 139 names of plants. The same words occur often in different groups, e.g., Turk. *dal* 'twig' (p. 156) and *dal* 'willow tree' (p. 188), Turk. *terek* 'tree' (p. 157) and 'poplar' (p. 207). In all cases cross reference is given.

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

The Script Mongolian form for 'ear' (of corn) is not *türügün* (p. 160) but *terügün*.

Kara Kalpak *toyaj* 'forest' (p. 163) does not belong into the same group as Yak. *tya* 'forest' < **täy* 'mountain' because *toyaj* < *toqaj* is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. *toqot* 'elbow, bend of a river, bay', Kh. *taxoi* 'id.' = Ev. *tökikän* < **tökäskän* 'bend, turn of a river'.

The Turk. correspondence to Mo. *gölüge* < **gölikē* 'bud' (p. 167), the primary meaning being 'young animal, pup, young dog', is Osm., Chag. *kösük* 'young animal, an one-year old camel', cf. Hungarian *kölyök* 'young dog, young of an animal' < Bulgar.⁴⁷

Turk. *ot* 'grass, hay' does not go back to **ot* (p. 172). The form **ot* is 'fire'. Consequently, there is no reason to regard *ot* as a borrowing from Tokharian⁴⁸.

⁴³ See N. POPPE: On Some Mongolian Loan Words in Evenki. CAJ 16 (1972), p. 97.

⁴⁴ N. POPPE: Einige Lautgesetze und ihre Bedeutung zur Frage der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachbeziehungen. UJG 30 (1958), p. 94.

⁴⁵ N. POPPE: Das Jakutische. Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta. Tom. I, Aquin Mattiacci 1959, p. 671.

⁴⁶ L. V. DMITRIEVA: Nazvanija rastenij v tjurkskix i drugix altejaksix jazykax, op. cit., pp. 151 ff.

⁴⁷ Z. GOMBOCZ: Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache. Helsinki 1912, p. 104.

⁴⁸ Cf. also Khalaj 'of medicine', see DONNER: Khalaj Materials, p. 196. Khalaj has preserved the long vowels better than any other Turkic language.

DMITRIEVA's article is fairly complete, and only a few etymologies of plant names, established before are missing, e.g., Az. *jovšan* 'Artemisia' (> ORuss. *evšan*), Mong. *budurgana* 'Artemisia absinthium' (> Turk. > Russ. *bur'jan*)⁴⁹.

6. KONSTANTINOVA's article is devoted to Manchu-Tungus words connected with dwellings⁵⁰. It deals with the names of various types of dwellings and their parts, such as beam, rod, door, etc. The author of the article has collected and put together a rich material which will be of great value for further research. At the same time, the article contains also a large number of words compared with those of other Altaic languages. Most of the comparisons are convincing but some of them need correction. Thus, Ma. *χoriyan* 'fence (for cattle)' and Ev. Nrö. *koriyan* 'fence' should be separated from Ma. *χorχo* < Mo. *qorqu* 'shelter' (p. 229) because Ma. *χoriyan* goes back to Mo. *qoriyan* > *gorijan* 'fence' from *qori-* 'to forbid, to lock in' = Turk. *qory-* 'to protect, to fence in' whereas Mo. *qorqu* 'shelter' is to be connected with Chag., Kaz. *qorqa-* 'to fortify', *qorqan* 'fortification', Turk. *qorqan* 'tumulus'⁵¹.

Ma. *baisiy* 'house, building' < Mo. *bajisij* 'id.' (p. 232). It can be added that the Mongolian form, in its turn, is a borrowing from Persian, cf. Pers. *piš ävân* 'balcony or gallery in front of a house, a terrace' > Uzb. *pešajvon* 'verandah on the front side of a house'⁵².

Ev. *balayan* 'dwelling, winter dwelling, dwelling under the ground, etc.' (p. 232) is probably a borrowing from Russian (cf. *balagan*) which, in its turn, goes back to Turkic *balayan* < Pers. *bälâ xânâ* 'upper room, balcony'⁵³.

It is doubtful that Ma. *nuigan* 'tent' and Oroč. *majkan* 'id.' could have anything in common with Chinese *nu* 'tent' (p. 234).

Ma. *čäčäri* 'tent', Jurč. *čäh-čih-lî* 'id.' are identified with Mongolian (p. 234). The ultimate etymon is Middle Persian *čatur*. This word was probably borrowed first into Turkic: MPers. > MT *čäčyr* > Mo. *čäčir* > *čäčär*.

Mo. *togoyan*, Kh. *togö* 'cauldron' is, indeed, to be compared with Ev. *toyo* 'fire' (p. 237) but Mo. *toyona*, Kh. *töno* 'the wooden circle forming the edges of the smoke opening of the yurt' is to be separated because *toyona* belongs to the same word family as Mo. *toyori-* 'to go around', cf. Ev. Učr. *togor-* 'to meander' (e.g., river), cf. *tokor-* 'to circle, to rotate', *tokorivo-* 'to be bent, to be encircled', cf. Shor *toylaq* 'round', Kaz. *toyaš* 'a round pretzel', Russ. *baranka*, Tel., Leb. *toyolog* 'round, a round log', Tel. *toyolon-* 'to roll', etc.

Ev. *söna* ~ *suona* 'smoke opening' is certainly a borrowing from Mongolian as stated correctly on p. 237. There are very few cases in which Mo. *t-* appears as *s-* in Manchu-Tungus, cf. Ma. *sejen* 'cart' < Mo. *tergen* 'id.', Ma. *seferä* 'a bundle, twenty strips of meat tied together' < Mo. *teberä* 'an armload'. It is difficult to explain the substitution of *s-* for *t-*.

⁴⁹ O. PRITSÄK: Two Names of Steppe Plants. Intern. Journ. of Slav. Ling. and Poet., VIII 1964, pp. 37 ff.

⁵⁰ O. A. KONSTANTINOVA: Tunguso-man'čürskaja leksika, svjaznannaja s žilistiem, op. cit., pp. 224 ff.

⁵¹ RÄSÄNEN: Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türkisprachen, p. 282.

⁵² VLADIMIROV: op. cit., p. 291.

⁵³ N. M. ŠANSKI: Ètimologičeskij slovar' ruskogo jazyka, I, vyp. 2. Moskva 1965, p. 18. The word *balagan* has nothing in common with Mo. *balgasun* 'palace, city' and Turkic *balgy* 'city'.

Ev. *sëray* 'pole' (p. 239) could be connected with Mo. *sirug*, Kh. *šurag* 'id.', Sag. *syrag* 'id.', Tel., Alt., Leb., Kaz. *syryq* 'id.'

The comparison made by the author of these lines of Mo. *unin* 'rods forming the roof of a yurt' and Ev. *unęn* 'curtain in a yurt', and mentioned on p. 239 is incorrect. The correct identification of Mo. *unin* and Ev. *unie* is given by KONSTANTINOVA on the same page.

Nan. and Sol. *bandä* 'bench' (p. 249) is a borrowing from Chinese, cf. *pan-teng*.

Ev. and Neg. *nęku* 'a platform on high posts which serves as a pantry' is formed from *nę-* 'to put in' = Mo. *nöge-*, Bur. *nö-* 'to make a storage' (p. 250). It is a genuine Tungus word but not a borrowing, whereas Ma. *tagtu* 'tower, storied building' is a borrowing from Mo. *tagtu* which could be of ultimate Persian origin, cf. Pers. *täzte* 'board'.

Ev. *kürä* 'fence' (p. 252) is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. *kürjien* 'id.', Kh. *züre* 'id.' but it has nothing in common with Turkic *qur-* 'to arrange'.

Ma. *quvaran* 'fence, yard, camp, barracks, etc.' (p. 253) is probably to be connected with Mo. *qorijan*, Kh. *xorö* 'fence, yard'. The development **u* or **o* > *ya* (*uwa*) is known in Dagur, cf. *dönda* < *dunda* 'middle', *dgar* < *doora* 'below'. It is possible that Ma. *quvaran* was borrowed through Dagur.

7. KOLESNIKOVA's interesting article is devoted to the names of parts of the human body in Manchu-Tungus languages⁵⁴, thus supplementing her article discussed in Section 3 of the present article. It contains a rich material and numerous comparisons with Mongolian. The borrowings and cognates are usually indicated as such. Most comparisons are irrefragable but some of words investigated may be interpreted differently.

Ev. *ikeri* 'bone, skeleton' is deduced from the original form **kiku-ri* and connected with Orok. *seyeri* ~ *sëri* 'vertebral column' and Ma. *ikursun* 'marrow' (p. 64). The author of these lines believed Ev. *ikęri* and Lam. *ikęri* 'skeleton' to be akin to Mo. *ikire* 'twins' and Osm. *ikiz* 'id.' (the skeleton being, so to speak, one's alter ego)⁵⁵ but this is incorrect. On the other hand, Orok *seyeri* ~ *sëri* 'vertebral column, skeleton' and Uelha *stori* 'id.' is, in the opinion of the undersigned, a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. *seger* 'spine, backbone, vertebra, nape of neck', Kh. *sër* 'the vertebral column from the neck to the sacrum', whereas Ma. *iqursun* 'spinal marrow' is Mo. *nigursun*, Kh. *nugars* < **nigursun* 'id.'

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

Ma. *g'olo* 'crown of the head, sinciput' could be a borrowing from Chinese (p. 273) but Mo. *julas* is certainly to be separated.

Ev. *säfi* 'cue' (p. 276) is probably a borrowing from Mongolian, cf. West Bur. *säza* < **čä'äfi* 'id.', and in view of the initial **č* cannot be connected with Turk. *saf* 'hair'.

Ma. *yuntayan* in *jasa-i yuntayan* 'eye-socket' (this meaning is more correct than 'eye-ball', p. 280) is a Mongolian loan word, cf. Mo. *qundagan*, Kh. *xundaga* 'goblet, bowl'.

⁵⁴ V. D. KOLESNIKOVA: K charakteristike nazvanij častej tela čeloveka v tunguso-man'čürskix jazykax, op. cit., pp. 257 ff.

⁵⁵ N. POPPE: Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. Teil I. Vergleichende Lautlehre. Wiesbaden 1960, p. 55.

Ev. *beltege* 'protuberant' (eyes) and Ma. *bultaxum* 'id.' (p. 281) are probably borrowings from Mongolian, cf. Mo. *bülteger* 'id.' from *bülteji*- 'to open widely (eyes)'.

Ma. *qaysari* 'the bridge of the nose' and Mo. *qaysjar ~ qoysjar* 'muzzle, snout' (p. 283) find good correspondences in Turkic, cf. Tel. Radloff *qanyryq ~ qonyryq* 'vomer, the partition between the nostrils', ET *qanşar* < Mong.

Ev. *sarmaka* 'nostril' is declared to be a Mongolian loan word (p. 285). However, there is no such Mongolian word. It has, of course, nothing in common with Mo. *samsa* 'nostril'.

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

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

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

Ev. *kečē* 'mandible' (p. 287) can be connected with Mo. *köbege*, Kh. *xwōč*, Kalm. *köwē* 'edge'.

Ma. *xefeli* 'abdomen' (p. 303) has been borrowed from Mongolian, cf. Mo. *kebeli ~ kegelü*, Kh. *xeli* 'id.'.

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

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

To Ev. *kabak* 'bladder' < Turk. *qayruq ~ qaruq* (p. 307), Mo. *quqanag* < **qaqanag*, Kh. *xūzanag* 'scrotum' are to be added.

8. Some Altaic names of means of transportation by land are investigated in MURATOV's article⁵⁶. It represents an interesting discussion of the words *tergen* 'cart, vehicle', *čirga* 'sledge', *čanaşana* 'ski, sledge', *tilgün* 'wheel', *tiŋgü* 'axle', *täkür* 'wheel', **tokor* 'id.', *mör* 'id.', *čyryr* 'id.', *urapa* 'id.', *narıa* 'id.', *köpčäk* 'id.', and *čary* 'id.'.

MURATOV reconstructs the Ma. form *toşoro* 'wheel' correctly as **toşoroq*, and compares it with Mo. *toşorig* 'round, circle' and Kh. *duşarag* (p. 348). The correct Mo. form is *toşorig* < **toşarik* but Kh. *duşarag* is to be excluded because of *d-* versus Mo. *t-*. Yak. *tuoraz* 'cone of a pine tree, etc.' is also to be excluded because it is to be connected with Mo. *toşurčag* < **toşurčak* 'cone' = Kum. *toşurčag* 'round', Tel. Shor. *toşyrčyq* 'a knot at the end of the whip', Bar. *toşurşuq* 'cone of a spruce'.

AT *čakır* < Skr. *cakra* 'prayer wheel' is, of course, etymologically connected with Iranian **čaxra* > Pers. *čarx* 'wheel' (p. 349) but the AT word is to be separated from *čyryr* 'wheel, water wheel'. MURATOV gives two

⁵⁶ S. I. MURATOV: Nekotorye naimenovanija suxoputnyx sredstv peredviženija i ix detalej v altajskix jazykax, op. cit., pp. 337 ff.

possible explanations: 1. Turkic *čyryr* etc. may be a genuine Altaic word, and 2. it may be a borrowing from Ancient Indian and Iranian. DOERFFER, however, doubts that *čyryr* is an Iranian borrowing⁵⁷, and he does not compare it with Mo. *čagaryk* 'circle, ring, tire of a wheel'. Indeed, Turkic. *čagaryk* 'the cross-like connections of the upper part of the yurt' is an obvious borrowing from Mongolian. For phonological reasons — *y* versus *a* — Turk. *čyryr* cannot be connected with Mo. *čagaryk*. RÄSÄNEN regards *čyryr* as a word neither having Mongolian cognates nor being a loan word from Iranian⁵⁸.

9. Systematic investigation of words belonging in various semantic categories, e.g., nature, celestial bodies, etc. will demonstrate that some semantic groups of words include almost no cognates and a few borrowings. Thus, the article by DMITRIJEVA on the plant names has demonstrated that there are no names of trees common to all Altaic languages, and the few common names occur only in two language families but not all families of the Altaic language group. Thus, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus have a common name of the aspen or poplar, cf. Mo. *ulijaxum*, Kh. *uläs*, Bur. *ulāhan*, Kalm. *ulāşn* 'aspen, poplar' = Ev. *hula*, Lam. *hül*, Neg. *xöl*, Orok *pülü*, Nan. *polo*, Ma. *fulxa*. (And there is no corresponding word in Turkic). On the other hand, the category 'earth - sand - stone' includes a number of words of common origin which will be given here.

Osm., Crim., Chag., Kaz., Kum. *topraq* 'earth', Kaz. *toبراq* 'dust' = Mo. *toşorag* < **toşarak*, Bur. *tōroq* 'dust', Kalm. *tōrm ~ tōry* 'dust, dust cloud' > Ev. Barg. *tōraq* 'blizzard' ('clouds of snow' < 'clouds of dust'), Ev. Olkm., Tng. *tōraq* 'blizzard', Ma. *toron* 'flying dust, dust storm' < Mong.

ET, Chag., Tat., Kum., Kaz., Kirg. *saz* 'swamp, clay', Chuw. *şur* < **šār* < **šira* (cf. Hung. *šár* [šár] 'swamp, marsh, muck' < Bulg.) = Mo. *širuyai* ~ *širuya*, Kh. *šoro* 'earth, dust' = Ev. *širugi* < **širugai* 'sand', *širgi* 'sand, sand bank in a river'.

Mo. *gürü* < *gürü* 'stone', MMo. *gürü* ~ *gürü* 'id.', Kh. *gür* 'iron stone' = Ev. *Z*, Urm. *giri* 'small pebbles', Skh. *giri* 'sand bank sand', Neg. *giri* 'sand bank', Lam. *giri* 'river bank strewn with pebbles', Orok. *girini* 'sandy bank of a river'.

Ev. *şolo* 'a large stone, boulder, rock', Lam. *şöl* 'stone', Nan. *şolo* 'id.' = Kor. *tol* 'stone, pebble'⁵⁹. RAMSTEDT was uncertain when comparing these two words, and put a question mark. Indeed, Ev. *ş-* versus Kor. *t-* is doubtful. On the other hand, Kor. *tol* (nom. *tor-i*) 'stone' was compared with Turk. **tāş*, Yak. *tās*, Turkic. *dāş*, Chuw. *čul* < **čilä* 'stone', and Mo. *čilayum* < **čilä* 'stone' by POLIVANOV⁶⁰. It is difficult to connect Ev. *şolo* with **tāş* (**čilä*), **čilä* for phonological reasons. Consequently, *şolo* may not be akin to Mo. *čilä* < **čilä* and Turk. *tāş* but may be an independent word. However, because of some resemblance of *şolo* to Mongolian, cf. Kh. *šulü*, Kalm.

⁵⁷ G. DOERFFER: Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Band III: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen. Wiesbaden 1967, p. 72.

⁵⁸ RÄSÄNEN: op. cit., p. 108.

⁵⁹ G. J. RAMSTEDT: Studies in Korean Etymology. Helsinki 1949, p. 272.

⁶⁰ E. D. POLIVANOV: K voprosu o rodstvennyx otnošenijax korejskogo i altajskix jazykov. Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de l'URSS 1927, p. 1201.

tšulän 'stone', etc., it is tentatively placed together with the Korean, Mongolian, and Turkic forms.

Mo. *qajır* 'gravel, coarse sand, pebbles', Kh. *xair* 'id.', Bur. *xair* 'pebbles, sand in a river' = (or? <) Turk., Osm., Crim. *qajr* 'fine sand in a river bed, sand bank', *qajr-a-* 'to hone, to grind'.

Mo. *qumaki* 'grain of sand', Kh. *xumzi* 'particle of dust' = (or? <) Turk., cf. Alt., Shor., Kaz., Chag. *qumag* 'grain of sand, particle of dust' from Uig., Kum., Chag., Osm., Turkm., etc. *qum* 'sand' > Kalm. *xum* 'sand', *xumag* 'particle of dust, grain of sand'.

Ev. *kadar* 'rock, cliff', Ev. Ald. 'mountain ridge', Z 'boulder', Ev.P-T, N, etc. *kadaga* 'shingle, debris lying on mountain slopes', P-T 'rock, cliff', Nřř. 'mountain' = Mo. *qada*, Kh. *zad* 'rock, cliff' = Turk. (in all languages) *qaja*, a borrowing from an *ajag*-language of the Kipchak type.

Ev. Skh. *bor* 'a hill grown with brush', Ev.Z, Ald., Učř. *bori* 'a rocky hill', Urm. 'a height covered with burned trees' < Mong., cf. Bur. *bōri* 'height, elevated place'.

Ev. E-S *kira* 'side, edge', Nřř., Tng., Z, Ald., etc. *kiragin* 'slope, high bank', Ev. Ald., Učř. *kiragikta* 'small hill', Ev.Čmk. *keragin* 'high bank', Orok *keran* 'bank', Nan. *kerani* 'edge', Lam. *kergin* 'elevation' = Mo. *kira* 'summit or ridge of a mountain', Kh. *xiar* 'the crest of an elevation' = Turk. Crim., Alt., Tel., Leb., Shor., etc. *qyr* 'corner, edge, high bank, crest of a mountain', Tat., Kum. *qyryj* 'edge', Chag. *qyryj* 'id.', Sag., Koib., Kač. *qyryj* 'edge' > Ev.Skh. *kirin* 'edge', P-T etc. *kiru* ~ *kirun* 'id.'.

Such comparisons of words can be continued considerably. They will demonstrate that side by side with obvious borrowings, the Altaic languages possess a large body of words which are undoubtedly not borrowings.

Diffusion des chansons de Djangar en Mongolie

Par YÖNGSIYEBÜ RINTCHEN (Oulanbator)

A l'aube des études mongoles en Europe tout au début du XIX^e siècle un savant allemand BENJAMIN BERGMANN dans son œuvre *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmücken I-IV*, publié à Riga en 1802-1803, donna l'exposé de deux chansons épiques de Djangar notées parmi les Kalmouks de la Russie. Plus tard un mongolisant russe de l'origine polonaise M. J. KOWALEWSKI trouva les chansons de Djangar aussi parmi les Kalmouks Torgoutes et les mongolisants postérieurs à lui tels POZDNEYEV, KOTWICZ, VLADIMIRTSOV et les autres continuaient de noter et de publier des versions nouvelles et inconnues de ce grand cycle des chansons de Djangar, toujours les liant avec le nom des Kalmouks.

M. KOSINE, un mongolisant soviétique très érudit, brillamment traduit en langue russe quatre chansons de la version Torgoute de Djangariade et dans son introduction fit un essai sur la formation de ces chansons chez les Kalmouks et chez les Mongols Oïrates dont ils sont une branche¹.

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

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

En 1928, dans l'aïmak Oïrate de Tegis Küllüg khan des Dörbêtes, je rencontrai beaucoup de chanteurs de Djangariade et le dernier khan des Dörbêtes — qui lui-même connaît par cœur quelques chansons de ce cycle

¹ *Djangariade, une poème héroïque des Kalmouks*. Introduction à l'étude du monument et sa version Torgoute traduite (en russe) par S. A. KOSINE. Moscou-Leningrad 1940.