TRACTATA ALTAICA

DENIS SINOR

sexagenario
optime de rebus altaicis merito
dedicata

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

B 27979



TRACTATA ALTAICA

DENIS SINOR

sexagenario
optime de rebus altaicis merito
dedicata

redigerunt

Walther Heissig
John R. Krueger
Felix J. Oinas
Edmond Schütz

1976

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

SZEGED

B 87949

SZTE Egyetemi Könyvtár

J000188692

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Tractata altaica : Denis Sinor, sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata / red. Walther Heissig ... – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 1976.

ISBN 3-447-01798-8

NE: Heissig , Walther [Hrsg.]; Sinor , Denis : Festschrift

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1976
Alle Rechte vorbehalten
Photographische und photomechanische Wiedergaben jeder Art nur mit ausdrücklicher Genehmigung des Verlages
Gesamtherstellung: Buchdruckerei Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

Contents

Pentti Aalto
The "Elementa Linguae Tartaricae" by Ferdinand Verbiest, S. J. . . . 1

Françoise Aubin
Cadenas et clef - note d'ethno-linguistique mongole 11

Robert Austerlitz
L'appellation du renne en japonais, ainou et surtout en ghiliak 45

N. A. Baskakov
Über die Herkunft des Ethnonyms "baškir" 51

Charles R. Bawden
On the Evils of Strong Drink: A Mongol Tract from the Early 20th Century 59

Lajos Bese
Some Investigations on the History of the Verbal Inflection in Mongolian 81

A. J. E. Bodrogligeti
The Authorship and Sources of the Muʿīnu' l-Murīd 87

John Andrew Boyle
Alexander and the Turcs 107

Gyula Décsy
Ein k. und k.-Phänomen 119

Linda Dégh
Two Letters from Home 125

Vladimir Drimba
Devinettes tatares de Dobroudja 147

Joseph Fletcher
Confrontations between Muslim Missionaries and Nomad Unbelievers in the Late Sixteenth Century 167

Herbert Franke
Two Chinese-Khitan Macaronic Poems 175

Walter Fuchs
Jušen-manǰurische Wortgleichungen 181

István Futaky, Peer Buchholz, Hans G. Hoyer
Zur Geschichte des Tabaks in Westsibirien 189

Annemarie von Gabain
Ein chinesisch-uigurischer Blockdruck 2o3

Eric P. Hamp
Palatalization and Harmony in Gagauz and Karaite 211

Gombojab Hangin
Na. Sayinčoγtu's (Sayičungγa) Works:
The Period of Nationalistic Realism 215

Arthur T. Hatto
The Catalogue of Heroes and Heroines in the Kirgiz "Joloi-Kan" 237

Shirô Hattori
Some Problems on the Reconstruction of the Mongolian Sounds
of the Secret History of the Mongols: On the Word Gu-un 261

Georg Hazai
Ein uigurisches Kolophon zu einem Avalokiteśvara-Lobpreis 273

Walther Heissig
Die Čaγadai-"Bilig" und ihre Historizität 277

Erkki Itkonen
Etymologische Beiträge 291

Sechin Jagchid
The Manchu Ch'ing Policy towards Mongolian Religion 3o1

Aulis J. Joki
Some Samoyed-Tunguz Word Comparisons 321

Zsuzsa Kakuk
Zur Frage des tschuwaschischen -n und -m 325

Béla Kálmán
Aus der Geschichte des Futurs im Ungarischen 337

György Kara
Writing, Symbols and Ornaments on Two Mongolian Scrolls 345

John R. Krueger
A Decree on the Origins of Lamaism Among the Kalmyks (1756) 355

László Lőrincz
Die Heldenepik der Altai-Türken - inhaltlich-typologische Analyse . . . 365

Julius Mägiste
Zum eventuellen Dual im Ostseefinnischen 381

Iben Raphael Meyer
Zur Geschichte des vierfachen Wechsels im Türkischen 385

Roy Andrew Miller
Old Japanese Sirö "Fortress, Citadel" 397

N. Ts. Münküyev
A Mongolian Hunting Practice of the 13th Century and the
Buryat Terms zeegete aba and aba khaidag 417

Shichiro Murayama
Ramstedt und Polivanov als Altaist-Japanologen 435

Felix J. Oinas
The Tragedy of Kalevipoeg and of the South Slavic Heroes 447

Nicholas Poppe
Ancient Mongolian 463

Omeljan Pritsak
The Hsiung-nu Word for "Stone" 479

Igor de Rachewiltz

Some Remarks on the Stele of Yisüngge 487

Paul Ratchnevsky

La condition de la femme mongole au $12^{e}/13^{e}$ siècle 5o9

Alo Raun

The expression of 'Best' in the (Balto-) Finnic Languages 531

András Róna-Tas

On the Meaning of "Altaic" 549

Jean-Paul Roux

A propos des osselets de Gengis Khan 557

Maria Salga

On Initial Images in Mongolian Folk-Poetry 569

Alice Sarkőzi

A Mongolian Manual of Divination by Means of Characteristics of the Land 583

Edmond Schütz

Bolgaro-Turkic Term -- Hungarian Horsemanship 6o5

Bertold Spuler

Le christianisme chez les mongols aux $XIII^{e}$ et XIV^{e} siècles 621

E. Tenišev

Mongolische Entlehnungen in der Sprache der "Šir-a Uighuren" 633

Kaare Thomsen

Über einige Vokalphoneme im Mongolischen 641

Edward Tryjarski

An Armeno-Kipchak Sermon by Anton Vertabed from the 17^{th} Century 647

Steven Bela Vardy

The Birth of the Hungarian "Kulturgeschichte" School A Study of History of Hungarian Historical Studies 675

Andrew Vászonyi

The Star-Boarder - Traces of Cicisbeism in an Immigrant Community 695

Wolfgang Veenker

Zum Typ CVC der ersten Silbe im Vogulischen 715

Vilmos Voigt

Formation of Metric Systems on the Balkans 733

Hartmut Walravens

Übersicht über chinesische Steinabklatsche mit mandjurischen Inschriften in amerikanischen Sammlungen 743

Michael Weiers

Ein Schreiben südostmongolischer Stammesfürsten an den Mandschuherrscher Sure Han aus dem Jahre 1636 755

Peter Zieme

Singqu Säli Tutung — Übersetzer buddhistischer Schriften ins Uigurische 767

SZEGED

Edmond Schütz (Budapest)

BOLGARO-TURKIC TERM — HUNGARIAN HORSEMANSHIP

1. In the stock of loanwords borrowed from Turkic languages by Hungarians the differentiation as to the period of the loan,or the type of the pertinent Turkic language is based mainly on phonetic principles. Phonetic criteria enabled linguists to separate the main class,the Chuwash type of loanwords. The case of the Kipchak languages (Coman,Pecheneg) is much more ambiguous, as neither the periods, areas nor linguistic peculiarities of the components of the group could be definitely ascertained as yet. The third group of old Turkic loanwords in Hungarian have no special phonetic mark, by virtue of which the Turkic ancestor could not precizely be defined.

The background to the linguistic contact is given by the historical surroundings of Hungarian people in the 5th-9th centuries. The Chuwash type (Bulgaro-Turkic, Onogur) word stock might have issued from the close contact either in the Volga-Kama region (the ancient site of the later Bolghar Khanate), or in the neighbourhood of the estuary, or the middle course of the Don river, or both in subsequent epochs.

Nomadic confederations were always a variegated unity, where dialectical or linguistic differences did not hinder the cohabitation or cooperation of the different tribes.

In the 6th century with the advance of the Western Turks towards the steppeland of the Atil-Don-Caucasus triangle the motley crowd of Turcic tribes became politically united under the scepter of the Western Turks, under the name of Khazaria, the later Khazar Khaghanate, which comprised different language units: Common Turks, Bolgaro-Turks, Kipchaks.

In our case — due to the absence of a special phonetical criteria — the loanword tart- cannot be attributed to any special turkic language.

Because old Hungarian records date from late centuries so the first appearance of a word (the terminus ante quem) is no firm landmark for linguistic inferences, so in such cases one must take recource to semantic deliberations having ascertained the social-economic level of the people, or tribal confederation at a given epoch.

2. The Hungarian verb tart- ' to hold, keep, etc.' has been de-

rived from the Turkic verb tart- ('to pull, draw, ect.') already 187o by Arminius Vámbéry in his treatize Magyarés török-tatár szóegyezések [Hungarian and Turkic-Tatar word equations][1], a number of which have been quoted also in his book A magyarok eredete [The Origin of the Hungarian people][2], meant an answer - 'a counter-criticizm' - to Budenz's Comments, and again in his posthumus work A magyarság bölcsőjénél [At the Cradle of Hungarian People][3].

Vámbéry in his above mentioned treatize and books advanced his theory of the Turkic origin of Hungarians, and this did let loose a lively discussion or rather embittered polemics in Hungarian linguistic circles, called the "Turkic-Ugric Battle".

Vámbéry's theory and also the Turkic etymology of the Hungarian verb tart- was rejected by J.Budenz in his Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar-török-tatár szóegyezéseiről [Report on A. Vámbéry's Hungarian-Turkic-Tatar word-equations], and by J.Szinnyei in his Eszrevételek V.Á. 'A magyarok eredete' c. müvének nyelvészeti részére [Comments of the linguistic part of Á.V.'s book 'The Origin of the Hungarian People'][4].

Budenz's authority and the rigid application of the notion and term "basic meaning" to loanwords resulted in the total disregarding of Vámbéry's conjecture by Hungarian linguists.

Budenz in his Report (and subsequent treatizes) proposed a Finno-Ugric solution instead, taking the final -t for a suffix of momentaneity.[5] G.Bárczy took the tentative of Budenz "unconvincing",[6] and both G.Bárczy and J.Berrár labelled the verb tart- of "uncertain origin", though Berrár did not totally exclude the Finno-Ugric issue: "probably a heritage from the Finno-Ugric age".[7]

Another Turkic solution has been put forward by K.M.Palló, deriving the verb from an Old Turkic root tïd- 'verhindern'.[8] The Turkic conjectures, at large, have been earmarked for "erroneous" by the TESz.

2.1. As to my opinion, Vámbéry's equation is acceptable. Phonetically the Hungarian and Turkic words are identical. In linguistic training the axiome is current: in etymologies not the complete identity is the real proof of common origin of the words, but the regular similarity. I wonder, if this precize phonetical identity deterred linguists from the re-evaluation of Vámbéry's etymology.

The phonetic structure of the Turkic word has always been identical through all ages, from the Uighur period up to the present (Uighur, Kashghari, Qutadgu Bilig, Chaghatai, Codex Cumanicus, etc.)[9]

Each sound corresponds also in almost all modern Turkic languages, with some exceptions. In Oghuz languages the initial sound is d-; Turcoman: dart-, tart-. Modern Turkish dictionaries list tart- only in the meaning 'weigh'[10], in Anatolian dialects the initial is d-; dart-.[11] As a matter of fact, tart- is not an Oghuz word, in Oghuz languages the common term for 'to pull' is: ček-.

Sound varieties show up in the vowel: The verb sounds tïrt- in Tuva Turkic, in Chuwash turt-.[12] Räsänen is of the opinion that Chuwash tït- is not related to Turkic tut-, but to tart-[13]. He adds also a Finn correspondency: tarttu-, which in Hungarian literature has been equated to the Hungarian tart-.[14]

Even on Altaic field a correspondency was put forward by Ramstedt: Mongol tata-.[15] An antagonist to Altaic genetic affinity would expect rather a loanword from tart-, because the cluster -rt- (liquid + explosive) is generally preserved in Turkic languages: e.g. art 'back', ört- 'cover', qart 'old man', qurt 'wolf', yurt 'territory', etc. – and the -r- is not missing in Turkic languages bordering Mongol territory. And in Mongolian -rt- cluster is retained, or altered to -rč- before an -i, e.g.: T. arït- 'reinigen' ~ Mo. *arti > arči; T kert- 'Einschnitte machen' ~ Mo. *kerti- > kerči-; T ärk 'Kraft' ~ Mo erke.[16] The final vowel -a of the root tata- is by no means an obstacle to the equation, because such cases are the frequent occurrences of a Systemzwang, so e.g. T kök ~ Mo. köke; T ärk ~ Mo erke; T bärk ~ Mo berke.[17]

2.1. The difficulty in Vámbéry's equation arises in the field of semantics. Vámbéry presents two varieties, in the first he gives two semantic correspondencies, in the second case he concentrates his equation on the time concept: tartani 'durare' (tartozni vmiről 'sich enthalten') Chaghatai tartmak 'tartani, eltartani, húzni (to hold, keep, pull)' ... tartinmak 'tartózkodni vmitől (to abstain)'...[18] In his book A magyarok eredete his comments are meant for an answer to Budenz's critical remarks. Essentially he does not refute Budenz's criticism, he merely repeats his former equation, emphasizing that the meaning 'to pull, draw, lead, etc.' were the secondary ones.[19] In his posthumus work A magyarság bölcsőjénél the examples refer only to the time concept: tart 'halten', or rather 'anhalten, dauern, in die Länge ziehen' e.g. napokig eltart 'es dauert lang', tartós 'dauerhaft' – Turkic tart- 'huzni, tartani (ziehen, anhalten'), e.g. jïllargaǰe tartanir 'évekig tart (es dauert Jahrelang'), tartik 'tartós (dauerhaft)'.[20]

3. In connection with Budenz's critical comments on Vámbéry's equation we should like to enlarge on two issues: the lack of "bona fide"

demonstration of evidences, as a charge against Vámbéry, and secondly the linguistic concept of the "basic meaning" of a word in the case of a loanword.

3.1. Vámbéry's method to elucidate or to prove linguistic problems cannot be called blameless. As a matter of fact he did not explain his arguments, did not even argue at all, he merely enumerated the Turkic-Hungarian equations collected, and let the correspondencies speak in his favour. Still it was not only his unprofessional way for which he was blamed, but even more for the minor "corrections, adjustments" of the evidences, sometimes in their phonetic shape, sometimes in the meanings of the word, in order to fit closer, and so to prove better the equation proposed.

Vámbéry had an alert ear and with a number of the old Turkic loanwords the few centuries, or at most one millenium did not cause such a considerable phonetic change that a connoisseur of Turkic languages could not have detected correspondencies. So further researches proved that a number of his equations were acceptable even by a high critical standard. The major deficiency in his "method" was, that he did not present arguments of phonetic history, of general linguistical parallels, and semantic correspondencies in favour of his proposition, and did not explain or refute neither phonetic, nor semantic discrepancies.

3.2. Another issue in Budenz's and Szinnyei's (and others') comment touch on a principal issue of general linguistics, i.e. the "basic meaning". The critics do not differentiate the concept of "basic meaning" in the case of the fundamental word stock and the borrowings. In case of the Finno-Ugrian (or Uralic) word stock it is a justified requirement to find out the basic meaning and take it for a starting point. The requirement is quite different in the case of loanwords because, as a rule, special terms are taken over, the meaning of which does not always coincide with the basic meaning.

In the epoch after the disunion of Finno-Ugric people in Hungarian already all the verbs existed by the aid of which most of the varities of basic activities or happenings could be expressed, and they have already attained a level of general sense, so that newly emerged, or invented actions or happenings could be derived from them, or expressed by their aid. So there could hardly have been an urgent necessity to adopt a Turkic word tart- for the denotation of an action "to pull, to draw" for which terms already existed in the Finno-Ugrian stock: "huz, von".

At the stage of their social-economic evolution there was no more need for such an enrichment of the vocabulary, and this is shown by Budenz himself quoting the Turkic verb tut- 'to hold,to catch'.[21] This verb had not been taken over from Turkic, as verb in this wide sense of action already existed in Hungarian: (meg) fog,(meg) ragad, etc.

The problem concerning the "basic meaning" was viewed at from the angle of formal logic also by J. Szinnyei in his critical paper.[22] Still his theoretical remark on the development of meanings is of fundamental importance. Undoubtedly, originally nouns and verbs were closely connected with concrete objects, or activities. On the stage of the disunion of Finno-Ugric languages the verbs could already denote abstract actions, or happenings, i.e. their semantic realm expanded,the characteristic features diminished proportionally. E.g.the Hungarian verb fon 'to weave' (of Finno-Ugrian origin) originally could have denoted either the weaving of a sedge-matting, or of lattice partition walls (cf. winden - Wand), the weaving of a basket, or eventually the weaving of a net[23], but soon it was applied to any similar activity, so its signifying capacity was considerably extended.

But there is another way of denotation new processes. With the adoption of new productive procedures the new procedure can be also expressed by the aid of a loanword taken over from the people they have learned it from. So e.g. the Turkic word szür- 'to filter' surely was not taken over in a general sense, but originally it served for a special activity of wine manipulation.

From the period of the old Turkic contacts mostly technical terms had been taken over[24]. In the case of seemingly general meanings, it is probable,that the professional origin of the term is hiding in the background, and was not detected yet. Of course, in the course of linguistic consciousness convergent variants may issue forth independently, similar general physic factors being instrumental in their evocation.

A similar conglomerate process must have been at work in the case of the loanword tart- the stages of which were: a) adoption of a professional skill, and the relevant term, b) the extension of the range of meanings independently from the Turkic ancestor, c) a (partly) divergent evolution in the semantic area.

4. The stages of this semantic evolution can be traced back only by minutuous analysis of the semantic variants both of the Turkic and Hungarian verb, to detect the contacting points.

4.1. The basic meaning of the Turkic verb tart- beginning from the old Turkic languages (Uighur, Middle Turkic, Comanic, etc.) up to the

present common Turkic dialects was 'to pull, to draw, to stretch',etc.[25]

The basic meaning is corroborated by its general synonym: ček-. In the expressions with the verb component tart- in Common Turkic in Oghuz languages one encounters correspondingly ček-: e.g. CommonT yük tart- 'to pull a load', yay tart- 'to draw a bow', un tart- 'to grind flour', uzaqqa tart- 'to last long', etc.. Oghuz languages have ček instead of tart- : yük ček, un ček-, uzaqqa ček-, etc.

This correspondence is present also in the figurative sense: därd tart- 'to be afflicted by pain', ziyan tart- 'to suffer a loss', qïyïn tart- 'to suffer a pain'; in Oghuz languages därd ček, ziyan ček-, qïyïn ček-. This compound construction might have been primordially not Turkic, but modelled on a Persian pattern: dard kašidan, ziyan kašidan, so the Turkic expression was a Persian calque (Lehnübersetzung).[26]

The second next meaning "to stretch, to draw": CT yay tart-, Kir. jay t. (Jud.708) 'to draw a bow', Alt. jänï t. (R III, 857.); ayl tart- 'Gürtel schnallen' (CC, 236). Intransitive use of the same: Kir. boy tartqan qïz 'grown-up girl' (Jud. 709.).

tart- is often used to denote work, productive activity: Kir. čalyi tart- 'to mow', Tel. qamčï t. 'to weave a whip' (R III, 859); Kir. tuzaq t. 'to set a trap' (Jud.708), Alt. un tart- 'to grind flour' (R III, 858), Kir. arïš t. 'grind barley'.

The notion "to pull down" underlies the expression signifying weighing. The expression is valid since the earliest records on (QB, Chaghatai, Chwar., Ott. see Clauson, 534.): tarazaga tart- 'to weigh', though also in this case a Persian model might be instrumental (with kašidan) as taraza 'balance, scales' is also a Persian word. A noun derived from it: tartïγ, tartïq, tartuq, tartu, tartï 'weight'.[27]

An adjoining meaning of a figurative sense: sözi tart- 'seine Worte bedenken (R III, 860.), to ponder'; Ott. tartï 'Maaß in Worten, Überlegung' (R III, 861.), though this shade of meaning could also be motivated with the basic meaning 'to hold back', as shown in the explanation given by Radloff: 'langsam reden'; cf.: tiliŋ tart! 'hold your tongue!'(see below).

Tart- is also a perfect counterpart to the English verb 'to draw' (a picture). The modern extension of the meaning in Common Turkic: surat tart- 'describe, to draw, to portrait', or even 'to take a photography of sb.'.

A whole set of meanings pointing in both directions; towards ahead or backwards: 'to breathe, to exhale, to blow - to inhale, to

hold one's breath' (Clauson, p.534.). This meaning makes it most fitting to describe playing activity on wind instruments - but also in case of stringed instruments we encounter this verb component; in the latter case it denotes: 'to draw the cords'. E.g. Kir. čor tart- 'to blow a pipe', surnay t. 'to play zurna', Alt. sibizga t. 'Flöte spielen', Kazakh dombra t. 'to play tamburine' (R III. 857.).

A contiguous meaning with "inhale, exhale" is'to smoke': Kir. tameki t.; tämäkä t. (R III, 857.).

'To coat, to overlay', e.g.: Kir. kõ t. 'to soot', in the figurative: Kir. quba t. 'to become white', qubalǰïn t. 'to grow pale', but this meaning might be derived from the semantic change pointing towards forward: to move ahead > to become > to turn, to grow sth.

In the expressions 'to entertain a guest' the basic meaning must have been 'to offer, to hand over': e.g.Kir. aš tart-, tabaq t. 'to offer, to hand over a dish, a plate', Kazakh 'to entertain a guest, to keep sb for guest' (R III, 858.). Derivate: tartu: 'entertainment'. Käšγ.: tartïn 'Verproviantierung' (Brock. 197.) ; a figura etymologica: tartïn tarttï 'he drew provisions' (Clauson, 534.). 'To deal cards' can have set forth from a basic meaning 'to hand over' (Jud. 709.).

A further extension of this variety of meaning is 'to present a gift, a tribute, peškeš, a "voluntary" gift to the feudal lord' is to be found in all Turkic languages: tartïγ, tartïg, tartïq, tartï, tartu[28]. A figura etymologica: tartïγ tart- 'offrir des présents' (PdC, 197.).

The figurative sense 'to draw into the length' is an organic evolution of the basic verb starting from the meaning of space, and naturally applied also to the space of time: uzaqqa tart- 'to last long' (R III, 858.), Kir. altïn-čidan tartïp 'from 6 o'clock on' (Jud.709.).

Another expression for a person to move forward or backward,e.g.Kir. ǰol tart- 'to head for, to go towards', tart beri! 'come hither!'; anï-yar tart! 'go towards him!' (R III, 859.).

To the group of meanings denoting 'to hold back' belongs the chain of meanings 'comprehend, contain; contents, quantity > quality' in Common Turkic tartïm, e.g. Kir. tartïmï ǰaxši 'of good quality'; Common Turkic: tartïmli, e.g.Kir. tartïmdū ǰigit 'a clever, intelligent youth'.

As basic meaning to tart- generally a forward movement is attributed, but there is a rather wide variety denoting the backward movement, so e.g. Kazan Tatar, Kir. išten baš tartar 'to withdraw from labour'

(R III,859.,Jud.7o9.), and a good number as seen above.

The most significant variety of this special meaning 'to withhold, to keep back, to pull back, to withdraw' is common usage in horseman terminology; e.g.Kir. boǰu tart-, attïn bašïn tart- 'to keep the bridle firm, to draw the reins', Alt. atïŋdï tart! 'ziehe die Zügel an!' (Jud. 7o9., R III, 859.). Osm. R. tartqï 'a gradual pulling in of the reins of the horse' (R III, 866.).

Vámbéry's alert eye did notice that the same semantic element 'to withdraw, to hold back' was present in the reflexive derivates:tartïn- Hung. tartózkodik in two disparate meanings, a) 'to withdraw from', and b) 'to sojourn, stay somewhere' (R III, 861; Jud. 711.). The noun derivate: tartï 'Maaß in Worten, Überlegung' (R, III, 861.).

The same backward direction is indicated in the derivate adjectives: tartïnčaq, -ǰaq, -čaɣ (Kazan Tatar, Tel, Shor, Bar,Kir., R III, 861-62.) 'eigensinnig, halsstarrig, stetig, widerspensig (especially horses), schüchtern'. The root is valid also in maritime terminology: Kir. tartqïn 'ebb (the withdrawal of the flow)'.

4.2. And now let us subject the semantic varieties of the Hungarian verb tart- to a scrutiny. The Hungarian Nyelvtörténeti szótár [Dictionary of old Hungarian Texts] enumerates the basic meanings under 14 headings,the New Hungarian Etymological Dictionary separates 43 shades of meanings, the Hungarian Explanatory Dictionary classifies the meanings under VII major categories, and subcategories.[29)]

The comparision of the Hungarian and the Turkic verb tart- shows contiguity in the following semantic realms: 2. sustineo, aufrecht halten; 3. protendo, hinhalten; 4. contineo, complector, enthalten; 7. asservo, custodio, bewahren, verwahren; lo. duro, dauern; ll. nutricor, nähren.[3o)]

A number of semantic varieties are nowadays expressed by the aid of prefixes in Hungarian. In the period of the Bulgaro-Turkic contact (because the lack of prefixes) orientation in space (and time) could be expressed only by the help of adverbs, the other solution was to adopt special verbs indicating the direction (or the modalities) of the verb. This was the case in Hungarian; there existed already verbs to denote the action: ' to pull, to hold, to keep', but there was no special term for 'to pull back, to hold back, to keep back', for horse-drilling.

One of the widest realms on the area of basic meaning of the Hungarian verb tart- is the orientation pointing towards the rear: 'to

hold back, to keep back, to withhold'. The importance of this direction is clearly expressed in the varieties enumerated under cols. I, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 1o, 11, 12, 13, 14 in the Explicative Dictionary. I,1: to keep back sb from changing place, to prevent sb from falling down, etc.; I,2: to withhold sb from moving away; I, 3: to make, to compell sb (or: sth) to keep his (its) state, position; I, 6: to detain, to impede, to retard, etc. from leaving, from doing sth; I,8: to restrain, to check oneself; I,1o: to keep within rules, etc.etc.[31)]

The enumerated examples are in accordance with one item of the basic meanings of the Turkic verb tart- 'to pull back, to hold back, to keep back'.

The second next corresponding meaning of tart- (eltart-) corresponds to Turkic aš tart- 'to keep, to entertain (with food)', or the derivate tartïɣ 'provisions'.

The close contact of space and time concept is shown by the denotation of duration in both languages, Turkic and Hungarian alike: tart. (Idő) tartam is a newly applied word for 'space of time', but the word tartalom 'contents' is to be met with in Turkic tartïm, and the adjective tartïmlï. The expression valamerre tart has its counterpart in Turkic yol tart-, tart beri! (see above).

The Hungarian tart- has also many derivates both verbal and nominal: tartózkodik valamitől:'to restrain, to refrain from sth' - cf. Turkic tartïnmaq.

The adjective tartózkodó 'restraining, refraining' is an exact counterpart of the Turkic tartïnčaq.

In enumerating all these semantic varieties I did not mean to say, that all correspondencies should have been taken over from Turkish into Hungarian, because the common mental creativity may have brought about some of the coincidences in meanings by themselves.

But at the same time it should be a mistake to suppose that only the widest, the most general, fundamental meaning could serve a basis for loanword. Loanwords are taken over mostly together with the objects unknown up to that time to the language community, of (though more rarely) a special verb, a term for an action unfamiliar to them.

4.3. But the discrepancy between the basic meanings objected by Budenz and Szinnyei is not so wide at all, even in the roots, as they supposed, because there is no unbridgeable gap between the meaning of

the Turkic and the Hungarian verb. The semantic area of a word-group from the realm of Indoeuropean languages will suffice for a parallel of general linguistics. Let us quote the Latin correspondences of the word group denoting 'to extend, draw, stretch, etc.' and 'to hold, to keep, etc.' both being derived from the Indoeuropean root ten- /tend-: teneo 'to hold, to keep',tendo 'to draw, to stretch'; tenor 'ununterbrochener Lauf, Fortdauer', tenax 'festhalten, zäh' (cf. Turkic tartïnčaq), tempus 'Zeitspanne', tenus 'erstreckend bis ...' (exact counterparts of the verbs tart- denoting duration both in Turkic and Hungarian); English: contents (cf.Turkic tartïm, Hungarian tartalom/, attendo 'heading for' (cf. tart, yol tart-), contendo, to fight' (cf. Turkic tartïš-)[32]

A similar semantic correspondency is reflected also in the doublets of the Russian verbs dergat' 'to pull, etc.' and deržat' 'to hold, keep'.[33]

5.1. Vámbéry in his above quoted treatize and books among his equations emphasized the meaning relating to the time concept: tart 'to last, to take time, etc.'. This seems to signify that he took this meaning as the basic one which might have served for the basis of adoption. This hypothesis has a weighty supporting argument, as the term denoting the time concept in Hungarian idő 'time' is a loanword from Turkic. (Cf. Uighur, etc. öd 'time').[34]

The main reason which is counterindicating against this supposition is, that the meaning 'to last, etc.' is clearly a secondary one even in Hungarian, as the main concept underlying as basis for the Hungarian verb must have been - according to the above analysis - also 'to pull, stretch, pull back, hold tight'. So I should like to submit a more likely, and more concrete version for the solution of the original motif of the adoption of the verb.

5.2. By the middle of the first millenium there ensued a fundamental change in the social and economic life of the Hungarian tribes, they have changed their dwelling places from the forest zone towards the steppe zones, where the importance of the horse for transport, as saddle animal, for breeding purposes was considerably enhanced. In my opinion the development of horsemanship may have been instrumental in the adoption of the term tart- a drilling term for horsebreeding, and mounting purposes; tart- in the meaning 'to pull back, to hold back, to keep back'.

The issue of Hungarian horsemanship is an old feud of Hungarian early history. Half a century after the subsiding of the storm of the "Turkic-Ugric battle" of the 1870-80ies, at the turning of the 20th-

3oth years of the present century a passionate dispute arose around the Ugrian or Turkic origin of Hungarian horsemanship.

It was a commonly accepted viewpoint among Hungarian linguists that already at the period of the Ugrian unity Hungarians were acquainted with the use of horse, used common terms for the grassing period (másodfü, harmadfü ló 'two, three years old horse'), for the gear of the saddle horse: nyereg 'saddle', ostor 'whip', (orr) fék 'muzzle halter'. The Finno-Ugrian,or Ugric etymologies of these terms had been accepted in linguistic literature ever since the acknowledgement of the Finno-Ugric origin of the Hungarian language.[35] Moreover major specialists dealing with the Turkic impact on early Hungarian society took this viewpoint for a decided fact.[36]

Even an eminent protagonist for the Turkic origin of the Hungarians (the alledged substitution of the Finno-Ugric idiom instead of the Trukic vernacular maternal tongue), Stephen Zichy, did take the Finno-Ugric descendancy of the mentioned terms for granted.[37]

The vital issue in the debate was the role of the horse played in the life of Hungarians before the impact exerted by the Bulgaro-Turks on Hungarians in the 5th-9th centuries.

In Hungarian historical textbooks and in the general opinion on early history the opposite viewpoint prevailed that Hungarians became horseback archers, ("kriegerisches Reitervolk") by the Turkic impact.[38]

Against this view it was G.Mészöly, who in 1929/3o joined battle; the banner in his argumentation were the four terms as evidence of the Ugric origin of Hungarian horse breeding.[39]

In the course of the debate Zichy (as mentioned) did not deny the Ugric essence of the preliminary terms related to the use of horse, the emphasis in his argumentation was laid on the Hungarian way of life, and military organisation often stressed by medieval chroniclers; he asserted that Hungarians became "horseman poeple" under Turkic impact.

A solution of this vital problem could not be met, because the basic issue, the social-economic structure of the Hungarians in that period has not been elucidated. Moreover, the terms characterising the social status of early Hungarians were not equivocal. Mészöly himself in his triggering article used the term "people riding horseback" in the initiating paragraph, and "horseman people" in the concluding, which is far from identical, the one meaning occasional use of the horse for riding purposes, the second a fundamental feature of life. [4o]

The debate did not clarify the phases, stages of the acquaintance with the horse, its keeping, breeding, economic and military use. The sway of horse keeping cannot be decided solely on basis of the enumerated terms, but the terms as features characterising the social-economic development do give a reasonable answer.

If the primary requirements to the use of the horse for riding purposes did exist with the Ugric tribes, or peoples, even then the innuendo presumably came from Turkic neighbours, as the basic term, the name of the horse ló (as also the similar Vogul and Ostiak word for it) came from Turkic side, prior to the separation of the three components of the Uric unity.[41)]

The elevation of horse breeding to a higher level with the Hungarians after their separation from the Ugric unity was evidently in connection with the advance towards the steppe land where geographic conditions favoured the more vigorous development of horse breeding.[42)]

By the southward migration the increase of pasture land enhanced the extent of horse-breeding, and especially the increased use of the animals for saddle horse was a great implement in changing their way of life.

5.2.2. The development, or advancement of economic and military use of the horse is characterised by two Turkic loanwords, the gyeplő 'bridle' and kantár 'harness', both of which represented a higher stage of skill in horsemanship, than the former: muzzle halter (fék)[43)]

The bridle and the rein have meant a great advance in the use of the horse both for hauling power and riding purpose, making the horse easier manageable. The different stages of horsemanship has been reached, of course, at different times by people on different level of social-economic evolution, and under different geographic conditions.[44)]

5.2.3. It is interesting to note that there is a peculiar correspondence in some Indoeuropean languages between the term bridle and rein, and the action exerted by their help, which is adequately characterised by the verb in Turkish and Hungarian alike: tart- 'to pull back, to hold tight, etc.'

Bridle (Anglosaxon brigdel) is a derivate from the verb bregdan 'to pull (to pull back)', the same Middle-High-German term bridel has been taken over by the French as: bride. The modern German term for 'bridle' Zügel is a direct descendant of the verb ziehen 'to pull'.[45)]

The German term Zaum (bridle' (synonyms of which are: Zugriemen, Zugseil - derivates of ziehen also) goes back to the German root tuh (tug) 'to pull'.[46)]

The term rein, French rein derives from Vulgar Latin ^retina, a derivate of retinere[47)] - the Turkic and Hungarian counterpart of which is equally: tart-.

In my opinion the verb tart- is the proper verbal term for the handling of the horse by the aid of the bridle and the rein (Hung.kantár, gyeplő), and it was taken over at the same epoch of the early Turkic impact (Bulgaro-Turkic epoch). The present form of tart- in Chuwash turt- must not lead us astray, as in Proto-Chuwash it sounded also tart-.[48)]

Footnotes

1) Nyelvtudonányi Közlemények (NyK) VIII (187o), p.178.
2) A magyarok eredete, Budapest, 1882, pp.549-55o.
3) A magyarság bölcsőjénél, Budapest, 1914, p.212.
4) J.Budenz: NyK, X, p.72, 111; J.Szinnyei: Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny, 1882, pp. 55-56.
5) NyK, X,111 (and also NyK XVIII, 224, etc.); MUSz No.2o3, p.184.
6) Szófejtő Szótár (SzófSz.) p.3o3.
7) A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára (TESz) vol.III. in manuscript (to which by the courtesy of the Editor I had access in spring 1974.)
8) UAJb XXXI (1959), pp. 244-245.
9) See Drevnetjurkskij Slovar', Leningrad 1969, pp.538-539; G.Clauson, An Etimological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish, Oxford, 1972, pp. 534-535.
1o) New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary, Istanbul, 1968. p.1o99.
11) Derleme Sözlüğü, vol.IV, Ankara, 1969. pp.1373-1374.
12) E.R.Tenišev, Tuvinsko-Russkij Slovar', Moscow, 1968. p.43o.
13) Versuch eines Etymologischen Wörterbuches der Türksprachen, Helsinki, p.465.
14) Ural-Altaische Wortforschungen, Studia Orientalia, XVII/3, p.46.; TESz, vol. III. (MS).
15) Kalmückisches Wörterbuch, Helsinki, p. 383-384. - Cf. Doerfer, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, vol.II., Wiesbaden, 1965, p.437.

16) Poppe, N., Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen, vol.I, p.87.
17) Kotwicz, W., Issledovanie po altajskim jazykam,Moscow,1962,pp.38-4o.
18) NyK, VIII, 178.
19) A magyarok eredete, p. 549-55o.
2o) A magyarság bölcsőjénél, p.212.
21) NyK, X, 72.
22) Egy. Phil. Közl. pp. 55-56.
23) Hajdu, P., A magyarság kialakulásának előzményei, Nyelvtudományi Értekezések, No.2. p.29.
24) Of course, besides loanwords adopted because of their euphemistic and atmospheric effect.
25) The word is widespread in all Turkic languages, it would have been superfluous to bring all similar examples, so the following major reference dictionaries have been quoted:
Radloff, Wb., vol.III.; Clauson, Etym.Dict.; Drevnetjurkskij Slovar' (DTSl.). From modern dictionaries I quoted only the Kirghiz Dictionary of K.K. Judachin, Kirgizsko-russkij slovar', Moscow, 1965, pp.7o8-71o. (Jud.), P.de Courteille, Dictionnaire Turk-Oriental, Paris, 187o, (PdC) 195-196.
26) We can meet reverse cases also Persian expressions could be coined on Turkic model. The ferocious tug-of war for the possession of a goat-skin, (a beheaded carcass), filled with sand weighing approximately 35-4o kgs is called in Turkic: oylaq tart-, ulaq tart-, 'to fight for (to pull) the goatskin'. Among Afgani Turkomans in Persian surroundings it sounds: buz kaši a Persian calque of the same meaning. (A lively description of this fierce fight with artistic photos see: National Geographic Magazine, vol. 144, No.5. pp. 661-667.).
27) Clauson, op.cit. p.535.
28) Clauson, p.535; R III, 861; Doerfer, II, p.436.
29) Magyar Nyelvtörténeti Szótár (NySz), Budapest, 189o-1893, III. cols. 458-489; TESz. Vol.III; A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára (ÉrtSz) vol. VI, 1962, pp. 522-527.
3o) NySz, III, col. 458.
31) ÉrtSz., VI, pp. 522-524.
32) Pokorny, Indogerm. Etym. Wb., I, pp.1o64-1o66; Walde-Hofmann, Lat. Etym. Wb., vol.II, pp.662-664; 664-665; Ernoult-Meillet, Dict.etim. langue latine, p. 683.
33) Vasmer, Russ. Etym.Wb., I, p.341.

34) Gombocz, Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache (BTLw), 85-86; Ligeti: MNy LVI, 298; MNy LXII, 395.
35) Munkácsi, B.: Ethnográphia, V. (1894) pp. 166-17o; same: Ethnográphia XVI (19o5), pp. 71-72; Ethnogr. XLII (1931), p.13;Szinnyei, Die Herkunft der Ungarn, p.31.; Hajdu: Nyelvtud. Ért. No.2.,p.49.
36) Németh, Gy., A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása, pp. 124-125.
37) Zichy, I., A magyarság őstörténete és müveltsége a honfoglalásig. (A magyar nyelvtudomány kézikönyve, I/5.) p.5o; Later he reconsidered this point of view; MNy, XXVII, (1931) p.13.
38) Cf. KSz, VI, p.194.
39) Mióta lovas nép a magyar ?: Népünk és Nyelvünk (NéNy) vol.I,2o6-212, 214.; Munkácsi: Ethnogr. XLII (1931), pp. 11-13.
4o) NéNy, I, 212, 214.
41) Vámbéry, A magyarság eredete, p.287.; A magyarság őstörténete,1934. (Edited by: L.Ligeti), p. 59.; Ligeti: AOH XXIX/3, (1975),p.279.
42) Hajdu: Nyelvtud. Ért. No.2, p.5o.
43) Gombocz in 1912 (BTLw, p.78) was not convinced that kantár 'bridle' belonged to the early layer of Turkic loanwords in Hungarian. But his hesitation was mostly due to the late appearance of the word in Hungarian sources (A.D.16o7), and because of the scarce evidence in Turkic for his time. (But see: TESz, II, p.35o.)
Zichy in his earlier work (A magyarság őstörténete és müveltsége a honfoglalásig,p. 5o.) did not find the etymology of gyeplő (< Turkic iplik) convincing from the semantic view, saying that iplik in Turkic languages meant only 'rope, string, thread'. Later on he changed his mind MNy XXVII (1931) p.13., having acquired new evidence and having come to the conviction, that his former starting point was erroneous, as loanwords were not always taken over in their "basic meaning". (See TESz, I, 1127).
44) Cf. the same stages of evolution of the classical nomads of the southern Eurasian steppeland: U. Kőhalmi, K., A steppék nomádja lóháton, fegyverben. Budapest, 1972. pp.63-66.
45) Mayer-Lübke, Roman.Etym.Wb. p.117; Dauzat, Dict.Etym.p.113.;Klein, E., Compreh.Etym.Dict.Engl.Lang. vol.I, p. 1ii.
46) Kluge, Etym.Wb. d.deutschen Spr. 11th ed. p.7o4.
47) Mayer-Lübke, op.cit. p. 6oo; Klein, Compreh.Dict.Engl.vol.II,p.1322; Dauzat, Dict.Etym. p.623.
48) Gombocz, Z., Honfoglalás előtti bolgár-török jövevényszavaink, ed. L. Ligeti, 196o, p.19.