STUDIA TURCICA

EDIDIT

L. LIGETI

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST 1971

ADIUVATOR

I. VÁSÁRY



© *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1971*

PRINTED IN HUNGARY

INDEX

Suzanne Kakuk, Cent ans d'enseignement de philologie turque à l'Université de Budapest 7
P. Aalto (Helsinki), Iranian Contacts of the Turks in Pre-Islamic Times 29
G. Bárczi, Le traitement de *š* et de *č* turcs dans les mots d'emprunt türcs du proto-hongrois 39
Н. А. Баскаков (Москва), Природа и функциональное значение связки в составе предложения в тюркских языках 47
L. Bazin (Paris), Note sur **angγïrt*, nom turco-mongol d'une variété de «canard» 55
H. Bicari, Fuzulinin allegorik eserleri 61
J. Blaskovics (Praha), Türkische Quellen, das Wort *kuruc* betreffend 73
A. Bodrogligeti, A Grammar of Mameluke-Kipchak 89
A. Bombaci (Naples), The Husbands of Princess Hsien-li Bilgä 103
G. Clauson (London), Some Notes on the Inscription of Toñuquq 125
K. Czeglédy, Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor on the Nomads 133
J. Eckmann (Los Angeles), Eastern Turcic Translations of the Koran 149
G. Fehér jr, Recent Data of the Turkish Campaign of 1543 161
A. v. Gabain (Anger), Frühe Zeugen der Scherengitter-Jurte 169
Gy. Györffy, Der Aufstand von Koppány 175
T. Halasi-Kun (New York), Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary. Ottoman: *nām-i diğer* 213
G. Hazai (Berlin), Zur Frage der historischen Entwicklung der Personalendungen im Osmanisch-Türkischen 231
Ann Horváth, The Cattle Trade of a Hungarian Town *(Szolnok)* in the Period of Turkish Domination 235
Gy. Káldy-Nagy, The Effect of the *Tīmār*-System on Agricultural Production in Hungary 241
С. Г. Кляшторный (Ленинград), Руническая надпись из Восточной Гоби 249
Zeynep Korkmaz (Ankara), Wer ist der Übersetzer des Qābūs-nāme und des Marzubān-nāme? 259
Käthe U.-Kőhalmi, Drei alte innerasiatische Benennungen des Waffengürtels 267
Ilse Laude-Cirtautas (Seattle), Uzbek Matrimonial Forms of Adress 281
L. Ligeti, Autour du *Säkiz yükmäk yaruq* 291
L. Lőrincz, Parallelen in der mongolischen und altaitürkischen Epik 321

E. Mándoky, Chants *šïng* des Tatars de la Dobroudja recueillis en Bulgarie ... 331
J. Németh, Noms ethniques turcs d'origine totémistique ... 349
D. Pais, A propos de l'étymologie de l'ethnique *oyur* ... 361
Margit K. Palló, Ung. *gyúl* «sich entzünden» und *gyújt* «anzünden» und ihr türkischer Hintergrund ... 375
J. Reychman (Warschau), Tschuwassisch *salygaj* = Nachtigall (luscinia luscinia)? ... 385
A. Róna-Tas, On the Chuvash Guttural Stops in the Final Position ... 389
E. Schütz, Jeremia Čelebis türkische Werke (Zur Phonetik des Mittelosmanischen) ... 401
А. Щербак (Ленинград), Замечания о тексте и языке Таʿашшук-наме ... 431
Э. Тенишев (Москва), К истории тюркского условного наклонения ... 441
S. Tezcan (Göttingen)—P. Zieme (Berlin), Uigurische Brieffragmente ... 451
E. Tryjarski (Warsaw), A Note on the Relations between the Pechenegs and Poland ... 461
I. Vásáry, *Käm*, an Early Samoyed Name of Yenisey ... 469
E. Vass, Éléments pour compléter l'histoire de l'administration des finances du vilayet de Buda au XVIe siècle ... 483
N. Yamada (Osaka), Four Notes on Several Names for Weights and Measures in Uighur Documents ... 491

Studia Turcica, Budapest 1971, pp. 29–37

IRANIAN CONTACTS OF THE TURKS IN PRE-ISLAMIC TIMES

BY

PENTTI AALTO (Helsinki)

At the beginning of our historical era the Eastern European steppes were dominated by the so-called Scythians whose ruling tribes probably spoke an Iranian language. It is, however, possible that under their domination there were also tribes speaking Uralic and Altaic («Proto-Turkic») languages. The Scythian culture extended eastward to the Altai where several magnificent burial sites have been excavated. These have yielded close parallels to Scythian burial finds in the Russian steppes from the 7th to 5th centuries B. C. On the other hand the Scythian cultural influence is obvious even in the Hunnic burials detected and excavated at Noin Ula, north of Ulan-Bator (see the publications of Rudenko).

One characteristic of this culture is the «animal style» represented by subtle gold, silver, and bronze objects, rock drawings etc.[1]

All over the area covered by this culture we find stone statues, «kamennye baby», and carved stone ram's heads.[2]

Various artistic remains as well as archaeological finds show that weapons, clothing, wagons etc. were very much alike throughout the steppe area.[3]

The stirrup seems to be a «Scythian» invention.[4]

Ownership marks similar to the Turkic *tamγas* are known at least since

[1] See e.g. F. Hančar, *The Eurasian Animal Style and the Altai Complex: AA* XV, p. 171 ff.; A. M. Tallgren, *Inner Asiatic and Siberian Rock Pictures: ESA* VIII (1933), p. 175 ff. and *Some North-Eurasian Sculptures: ESA* XII (1937), p. 109 ff.

[2] See Passek—Latynine, *Sur la question des «kamennye baby»: ESA* IV (1929), p. 190 ff.; A. Salmony, *Notes on a «Kamennaya Baba»: AA* XIII, p. 5 ff.; K. Jettmar, *The Slab with Ram's Head in the Richtberg Museum: AA* XXVII, p. 291 ff.

[3] J. G. Andersson, *Der Weg über die Steppen: BMFEA* 1 (1929), p. 148 ff.; T. Sulimirski, *Scythian Antiquities in Western Asia: AA* XVII, p. 282 ff.

[4] W. W. Arendt, *Sur l'apparition de l'étrier chez les scythes: ESA* IX (1934), p. 206 ff.

the days of the (likewise Iranian-speaking) Sarmatians who conquered the Scythians around 300 B. C.[5]

From Homer and Hesiod onwards our sources tell of the use of mare's milk and *kumys* among the steppe peoples, and Herodotus' description of the preparation of *kumys* shows a striking resemblance to modern Turkic methods.[6]

Christensen once compared the Old Iranian way of life as reflected in the Avesta with that of the late Turkmens and stated: «Les peuples se succèdent dans l'Asie centrale, mais les états de civilisation sont restés les mêmes jusqu'aux temps modernes» (*AO* IV, p. 84 ff.).

The languages of the Iranian Scythians, Sarmatians and Alans are very fragmentarily known: their nearest living relative is known to be Ossetian. Likewise, only small fragments of the languages of the oldest Turkic peoples such as the Huns, Avars, Khazars, and Bulgars, have been preserved. It is not even certain that the ruling tribes of the Hun and Avar federations actually spoke a Turkic language, though several scholars have wanted to regard the (Turkic) Bulgars and the Chuvash as descendants of Hunnic tribes. The Chuvash language shows some old words which might prove cultural contacts with Iranians in distant times. In his dictionary (*Etimologičeskij Slovarj Čuvašskogo Jazyka*, Čeboksary 1964) Yegorov pays considerable attention to possible Iranian connections of Chuvash words; because of the complicated phonetic history of the latter language, many details call for a more thorough investigation.

The Aryan name of kumys was probably *surā* (= Sanskr.), Avestan *hurā*, preserved even in the Germanic languages as an adjective *sour* etc.: Turkic *sïra*, Chuvash *sə̑ra* «beer»:[7] it is of further interest that we meet the same word in Ziryen and Votyak *sur* «beer», and, perhaps borrowed from them, in Ostyak *sər*, Vogul *sə̑rᵉ*. Other probable loan words are Turkic *tāna*, Osm. *dana*, Chuv. *tĭna* ~ *tə̑na* «heifer»: Avestan *daēnav-* «female of larger quadruped», Sanskrit *dhena* «id.», «cow», *dhenu* «cow»; Chuv. *śək-lɛ-* «to load», Tu. *yük* «load»: Av. Sanskr. *yuga* «yoke»; Tu. Chag. *torak* «cheese», Chuv. *turə̑χ* «kind of sour milk» seems to correspond to Mongolian *taray*, but on the other hand also to Avestan *tūirya-* «cheesy» and to the name of the Scythian tribe *Τοριχ-αδαι* interpreted by Abaev as «cheese-eaters» (?); Chuv. *mə̑zə̑r* «couple»: Av. *miθwara-* «coupled, in couples»; Chuv. *ə̑ɒə̑r* «otter»: Av. *udra-*, Sanskr. *udra* «id.»; an apparent enigma is Chuv. *ə̑və̑s*

[5] E. I. Solomonik, *Sarmatskie znaki severnogo Pričernomorja*, Kiev 1959.

[6] See my *Le «lait noir» chez Pline l'Ancien : Reşid Rahmeti Arat Için*, Ankara 1966, pp. 1—4.

[7] Cf. V. Brøndal: *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* III (1928—29), p. 17.

«aspen», Kar. Tat. *ūsak*, Sag. Koib. *ōs* which suggest an original **absa*, i.e. exactly like the original of the corresponding Indo-European tree-name: Pedersen has considered it as a borrowing from Proto-Armenian into Turkic. A very widely spread cultural word is represented by *-kar* «fort, town» in names like *Shupashkar* (Cheboksary), *Murkar* etc., which is found even in the neighbouring Ziryen, Votyak *kar* «town», Ostyak *χăr*, Vogul *χar* «place»: Khotanese Saka *kara* «town» (e.g. in the name *Kashgar*), in Avestan perhaps in *satō.kara-* «having a herd of a hundred»: **kara* «herd, family», in Old Persian *kāra-* «people» (in a political sense),[8] in Tibetan we meet *kar ; khar, 'khar, mkhar* «town»; Uig. *yadu*, Chag. Osm. *yada*, Mong. *ǰada* «rain-stone»: Av. *yātu-*, Sanskr. *yātu* «witchcraft»; Chuv. *karɒa*, Kazan Tatar *kirtä* «gate, enclosure, pen»: Ossetian *kœrt* «gate», Arm. *k'ert*, «town», Middle Ir. *kart* «town» (Semitic *qart* «town»?), a Germanic origin (Goth. *garda* etc.) of the above Chuv. word may also be possible; very widely spread is again Chuv. *χə̑mla*, Turkic *qumlaq* «hop» (> Osset. *χumœlle* «id.»): Sogdian *xwm*, Av. *haoma*, OP *hauma (-varga)* (in the name of a Scythian tribe) «the holy beverage», Sanskr. *soma*.

The name Ѣспєрихъ or Испєрихъ in the list of the Proto-Bulgarian rulers has been connected with Iranian and very similar personal names have even been quoted from Chuvash (see Beševliev, p. 312 ff.). I would refer also to the name *Īśparaka* of a vassal Śaka in North-West India at the beginning of our era.[9] The *Ǐšbara* of the Kül-Tegin inscription E 33 might also belong here.

In Central Asia the Scythian influence is later succeeded by that radiating from the Iranian empire of the Achaemenians and their successors. In the archaeological monuments of the Türk and Uigur dynasties we can still see the influence of the Scythian animal style. Especially in connection with the spread of the western religions the Iranian influence then grows stronger and becomes dominant, in competition only with the Chinese.[10]

The Huns seem to have worshipped the Sun and the Moon as especially royal divinities as did the Iranians under the Achaemenid dynasty (ca. 650—331 B. C.) and later. It is thus possible that e.g. the crescent, the imperial emblem of the Turks, goes back at least to Sassanian (A. D. 226—642) or even older models. The same symbolism lies behind the Uigurian royal

[8] Can the word be of Semitic origin?

[9] E. Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, Louvain 1958, p. 509. Cf. further Pelliot: *TP* 1929, p. 210.

[10] See Mario Bussagli, *L'Influsso classico ed iranico sull'arte dell'Asia centrale: Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte*. NS. II, Roma 1953, pp. 171—262.

title in the Kharabalgasun monument *Ay tŋridä qut bulmiš*, etc. According to Humbach (*Kušān und Hephthaliten*, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft C, 1961) the title of Kanishka *διοο-κεδο* corresponds precisely to a Hunnic **täŋri qut*: Schaeder had much earlier proposed to derive Turkic *qut* from an Iranian **kauta*. Winter[11] connects Tokharian A *koṃ-ñkät* ~ B *kauṃ-ñäkte* with Turkic *kün tŋri* and A *mañ-ñkät* ~ B *meñe-ñäkte* with *ay tŋri* and wants to see in *kün* a borrowing from the above Tokharian *koṃ* ~ *kauṃ*: the borrowing had taken place in the above combination, the latter component of which had been translated. We also have in Sogdian *ywyr βγ (χwēr bayγ)* = *kün tŋri*, and in Mordvin *kov-pavas* «Moon-God» and *ši-pavas* «Sun-God» *(pavas* < Ir. *baga)*. In Avesta the third Nyāyišn and the seventh Yašt are dedicated to the Moon, and the Moon-God *MAO* occurs also on the coins of the Kushan rulers.[12] Humbach however, *(l. c.*, p. 22) wants to interpret the Kanishka title *μαναο βαγο* as «God of the Household». In Manichaean texts, e.g. Xwāstwanēft 40 *kün* and *ay tŋri* occur while the original seems to use only *xuaršet* and *māh*.

Foreign sources record that the Turks of the sixth century and later used the name of the wolf as a military title and the picture of the animal as a military emblem (cf. Beševliev, p. 235). This might be compared to the name and emblem of the Aryan sacral leagues of young men («Männerbund»), in Avesta *vəhrka* (Wikander, *Der arische Männerbund*, Lund 1938, p. 65). Räsänen seems to approve the etymology of Abaev who connects Turkic *büri* etc. with the Scythian word as reflected by Oss. *biræg* ~ *beræg*, according to him a taboo form instead of **wærx*. Since the same word seems to have been borrowed into the Volga Finnic languages, it seems in fact to be of Scythian origin. On the other hand, the wolf was the ancestral mother of the Turks and in the Oγuz-Qaγan legend a wolf leads the Turkish army.

There is a great likelihood that the Turkic runic script derives from an Iranian script of Arsacid (250 B. C.—226 A. D.) or Sassanian type. The composition and style of the great Turkic und Uigurian inscriptions show, in my opinion, certain similarities to the monumental inscriptions of the Persian rulers, which might thus reflect an Iranian tradition. E.g. Kül-Tegin E 1: *üzä kök täŋri asra yaγïz yir qïlïnduqda ikin ara kiši oγlï qïlïnmïš kiši oγlında üzä äčüm apam bumïn qaγan istämi qaγan olurmïš* is reminiscent of certain solemn passages in the Old Persian inscriptions, cf. e.g. the begin-

[11] *Tocharians and Turks: Aspects of Altaic Civilization* (Indiana University Publ. Uralic and Altaic Ser. 23, Bloomington 1963), p. 245 ff.

[12] See M. Molé, *La lune en Iran ancien*, Paris 1962, pp. 217—230; cf. Humbach, *l. c.*, p. 29.

ning of the Naχš-i-Rustam inscription of Xerxes: «A great god is Ahuramazda who created this earth, who created yonder heaven, who has created man, who created welfare for man, who made Darius king . . .».[13] The battle accounts of Darius and Sapor are largely parallel to those of the Old Turkic monuments, cf. e.g. Bilgä-Qaγan E 27—28: *türgäs buduniγ uda basdïm türgäs qaγan süsi otča borča kälti bolčuda süŋüšdimiz qaγanïn yabγusïn šadïn anda ölürtim ilin anda altïm* with Sapor III, 3[1] «In the third war when we attacked Carrhae and Edessa . . .Valerian Caesar came upon us with . . . him a force of seventy thousand. And on that side of Carrhae and Edessa with Valerian Caesar a great conflict took place. And Valerian Caesar himself with own hands (we) made captive. And the rest, the praetorian prefect, senators and generals whoever of that force were officers, all we made captive and away to Persia we led. And Syria, Cilicia and Cappadocia (we) burned with fire, laid waste and led captive.»

It is furthermore possible that certain enigmatic names and expressions in the Turkic inscriptions might be explained by comparing them with contemporary Iranian facts. E.g. Kül-Tegin E 4 enumerates the peoples which mourned the death of Istämi Qaγan. It seems that the list is intended to begin from the east, go through the south to the west and then through the north to the east again: *öŋrä kün toγusïqda bökli čölig il tabγač tüpüt apar purïm qïrqïz üč qurïqan otuz tatar qïtay tatabï:* if now the unclear *bökli čölig il* could be understood as an opposition to the sunrise, *čöl* might be interpreted as the Middle Iranian name *čōl* of the Hephthalite horde *jaüvla*, in coin legends *SOHO ZOBOL (ṣāhi Zabul)*, in inscriptions of Hūṇa rulers in India, e.g. in the Kurā inscription of the Turuṣka Mahārāja Toramāṇa *ṣāha jaūvla*.[14] As allies of Xosrau Anōšurvān, the Turks under Istämi had conquered the Hepthalites in 565 A. D. According to Tabari's statement (Zotenberg's translation II, p. 128) the name of the Hephthalites denotes «a strong man»: if the *bökli* could be connected with Tu. Osm. *bükä* = Mong. *bökö* «hero, wrestler, athlete» it might be understood as a translation of that name.

The name *apar* in the above list has in general been connected with the Avars. Schaeder (*Iranica*, p. 40) and others have pointed out that this identification is not without difficulties. I would therefore submit the suggestion that it might refer to the Iranian province *Abarshahr*, in Armenian *Apar ašχart*, on Sassanian coins *Apr, Aprš, Apršs*, in certain Manichaean

[13] Sukumar Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions of the Achaemenian Emperors*, Calcutta 1941, p. 96.

[14] See e.g. Widengren, *Xosrau Anōšurvān, les Hephtalites et les peuples turcs: Orientalia Suecana* I (1952), p. 69 ff.

sources *šahr . . .čē abar*, and its capital, also named Nishapur (founded by Sapor I, 240—272 A. D.).[15]

Purïm, the name of the East Roman Empire, occurs in the Sapor inscription as *prwmyn*, in Tibetan as *phrom*, in MIr. as *fromīn* etc., in Chinese as *fu-lin*, all obviously through Greek and Middle Iranian intermediaries. In the MIr. Bahman Yašt II 49 the Turks are mentioned together with the Huns, Hephthalites, Sogdians and *Hrōmāyīk* as future rulers of Iran.

In Kül-Tegin N 12 *soγd b(ä)rč(ä)k(ä)r buqaraq*, the unclear name might perhaps be connected with the *Barčuq* language mentioned in certain Central Asiatic colophons and which Bailey (*BSOS* VIII, 1935—37, p. 895) proposes to identify with the language called in Arabic *Kanǰākī*. This latter name probably occurs in Khotanese as *kāñcake* and as *kāńčāk* in the dictionary of Kashgari, who says that it is the language of the districts belonging to Kashgar.

It seems that the social order of the ancient Turks corresponds to the «feudalistic» system of other nomadic peoples which prevailed in the Sassanian empire. A great number of titles seem to be common to the nomadic nations of Central Asia. Some of them have a more or less plausible Iranian etymology while others are of unclear origin (see especially Ligeti: *AOH* I, 1950, p. 149). Old Turkic *yabγu* (Kashgari: «a rank two grades below the Qaγan»; cf. Beševliev, p. 250) thus corresponds to MIr. *yavuga*, derived by Iranists from *yam-* «to lead» + *-uka*, like Parthian *ymg*, MPers. *žmyγ*.[16] The same title was used as *Khusan yavuga* by the Kanishka dynasty (ab. 3—98 A. D.) in India, and it is obviously to be seen in the title of Kanishka *ζαοο*; in MIr. Māhrnāmag we meet *yβγω* ~ *žβγω*. The Annals of the Later Han speak of Kujula Kadphises as *hsi-hou* of *Kuei-shuang-hou* = *yavuga* of the *Kushana* (Konow: *AO* III, p. 64 ff.).[17]

Kül-Tegin S 1 *šadapït* is perhaps to be compared with OP **satapati* and Niya *śadavida*; the latter seems to be an administrative official mentioned together with *karsenava* (**kāra-senāpati*); as to its formation it seems to be parallel with *daśavida*.[18] *śada* and *daśa* would of course be connected

[15] W. B. Henning, *Mitteliranisch: Iranistik*, p. 95; I. Walker: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* I, p. 5; R. Fry, *The Histories of Nishapur: HOS* 45, The Hague 1965.

[16] Bailey in *Iranistik*, p. 136; Fry: *Oriens* XV (1962), p. 356; Pulleyblank: *JRAS* 1966, p. 28, however, proposes to derive the word from Tokharian A *yapay*, B *ype* «land, country».

[17] See further Bosworth-Clauson, *Al-Xwārazmī on the peoples of Central Asia: JRAS* 1965, p. 1 ff.; Pritsak: *UAJb* 36 (1965), p. 391; Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhague 1936, p. 496.

[18] T. Burrow, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, Cambridge 1937, p. 124. The existence of an alleged MIr. title *astabad* ~ *astabid*,

with the numerals «100» and «10». There might have been in the Turkic empire a decimal structure of society similar to that we know from the Sassanian and from the later Mongolian empire. In the Old Persian court the Chiliarch *hazahrapati* seems to have been the Grand Vizier. Perhaps the *bïŋa baši* in the Šine Usu inscription is a translation of that Persian title.

Old Turkic *šad* has been connected with MIr. *šāδ*, Sogd. *γš'yδ*, North-Ir. *iχšēδ* (< OP *χšāyaθiya* «king», Christensen, *l. c.*, p. 497; it might also be possible to derive *šad* from Av. *χšaēta* «chief»[19]); the probable phonetic development of this word seems to have been parallel to that of MIr. *šahr* from OIr. *χšaθra*.

OTu. *čor* might correspond to Karaim *čora* «servant», and Chuv. *t'šura* «slave, servant» seems also to occur in Tokharian as *čor*, while in modern Iranian we meet Sariqoli *čor* «strong young man».

OTu. Uig. etc. *qatun* «queen» has been connected with Sogd. *χwt'ynk (xwatēn)* «wife»; however, Benveniste considers (p. 32) the Turkic word to be totally independent. It corresponds to *qayan* «emperor, king», which has been used as title even by Iranians, e.g. the author of the so-called inscription of Ladakh, a Christian from Samarkand, calls the king of Tibet *γ'γ'n,;* in Khotanese we meet *khahani* (cf. Benveniste, p. 33 with further references).

OTu. *toŋa*, according to Gabain «hero» or NPr., according to Malov a title («hero» ~ «great, powerful»), acc. to Kashgari «tiger», occurs in the Niya documents as the title of an official. Burrow derives it from Iranian **tuvānaka* without quoting its meaning; it is also known in Khotanese as *ttuṃga*.

The Turkic titles *tarqan* and *tigin* are also to be found among Iranians, e.g. the ruler of Samarkand was called *tarkhân*, and at least the latter among the Hepthalites and Kushans *(tgin hwrsān ŠAH)*. In Armenian *tikin* has the meaning «queen» (Benveniste, p. 27 Fn. 4 and p. 46): perhaps its original sense was something like «viceroy». On the basis of Oss. *tærxan* «judge» Abaev gives the word an Indo-European etymology.

The Old Turkic expression *irti birti* «labour duty and tributes» (in Mongolian under the Chingis-dynasty *alba qubčiri*) seems to be very close to Iranian *harg ud bār* (= Akkadian *ilku* > Aramaic *halak* > Persian *haraka* + OP **bāra)*, but, interestingly enough, still closer to its Akkadian model *ilku biltu;* cf. MTu. *birt* «tribute paid by a slave to his master».

There are particularly many parallel expressions among the so-called binomials (cf. *Linguistics* 5, 1964, pp. 69—78). Uigur binomials containing

which might have been connected with the above Turkic title, has recently been denied by Marie-Louise Chaumont: *Muséon* 81 (1968), p. 235 f.

[19] E. Benveniste, *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien*, Paris 1966, p. 20.

köŋül «heart», such as *köŋül saqïnč* «heart-mind» = «sentiment» which I connected with Tokh. A *āriñc pältsäk* «heart-thinking», seem to have much older correspondences in Gathic Avestan *zərᵊdāčā manāŋhāčā* and Vedic Sanskrit *hṛdā́ mánasā*.

The Sogdians are mentioned in the inscriptions of the Türk dynasty (ab. 552—745 A. D.), and under the Uigur dynasty (745—840 A. D.) Sogdian was used in royal inscriptions side by side with Uigur and Chinese. The qaγan built a special town for Sogdians, and the Sogdian alphabet was adopted in writing Uigur. In his paper *Die Iranier in Zentralasien* (*AO* XXVII, 1963, p. 119 ff.) Jes P. Asmussen represents the view that the Sogdians and Khotanese Sakas had once professed Zoroastrianism, before they adopted Manichaeism or Buddhism. According to him, this is shown by the many Zoroastrian technical terms to be found in the literary languages of these peoples.

There seem to be no clear proofs of Zoroastrianism ever having been adopted by the Turks, but we meet some very interesting conceptions and words. E.g. in the Kül-Tegin monument N 10: *öd täŋri yasar kiši oylï qop ölügli törümiš* is strongly reminiscent of the Iranian god of time Zurvan[20]: Bundahisn I 43 says: «of mortal men none can escape from it (= Time = Zamān)»

Together with the adoption of Buddhism and Manichaeism the Uigurs borrowed from Sogdian numerous terms forming part of the central religious vocabulary. In the Manichaean «Treatise» (Gabain, p. 268) the word *tawγïrd*, left without explanation in Gabain's glossary (p. 338), and — as far as I have been able to see — also in the dictionaries, should probably be read **tanuγïrd* < Sogdian **tnwγyrd* (Gershewich 1641 *ṭnygyrδṭ)* «corporeal», Avestan *tanu.kərəta-* «von der eigenen Person gemacht, selbst gezeugt» von Söhnen (Bartholomae, col. 636), in Pahlavi Škand Gumānīk Vičār XIV 35 *nun ka ōi mainyō hast nē tani-kard* «but because (God) is spiritual and not corporeal»; in Sogdian we find *w'xšyq'ṭly ṭnygyrδṭ* «spiritual and material».

The Iranian, especially Sogdian, commercial colonies forwarded many important words referring to everyday life. Thus even Tu. *biti-* «to write» could be derived from Khotanese *pīr-*, participle *pīḍa, pīḍaka* «document» etc. < Iran. *pati-kar-* «to copy», since there seem to be some other common words referring to the scriptorial culture, e.g. Man. Sogd. *q'γδ'*, Buddh. Sogd. *k'γδ'kh*, Uig. *qaγada* ~ Mong. *qaγudasun* «leaf of paper» (Bailey: *BSOS* XI, p. 787); Chin. *mo* < *mək* > Sogd. *m'k:* Uig. *mäkä* «ink» (Henning: *BSOS* XI, p. 723).

[20] R. C. Zaehner, *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*, London 1961, p. 238 f.

It looks strange that even such words as Uig. *käd* «very» MTu. *käd* ~ *käδ* ~ *käi* «good, well»: Sogd. *k'dy*, Khot. *kəde* (cf. further Arm. *kari* «very») or OTu. *ïyar* «strong»: Sogd. *yy'r* are common. Bang regarded even Uig. etc. *qamaγ* «all» as borrowed from MIr. *hamāg* (< Ir. *ham-* < IE **sam-*); the matter is, however, somewhat complicated because of the Mongolian family of obviously related words in *qam-*.

An interesting group is formed by some words for colours: Uig. etc. *āl* «red»: Pahlavi *āl*, NP *āl* < Old Iran **harda* (H. W. Bailey: *Asiatica*, Leipzig 1954, p. 18 f.); perhaps even Altaic *qara* «black» as well as the original of Turkic *yaγïz* = Mongol *dayir* «hirschfarbig» might be compared with Ir. *hara-* ~ *hala-*, Avestan *harəta-* etc., and Avestan *dawra-* «dark». On the other hand *yaγïz* as an epithet of the earth or world might be compared with Av. *gao-čiθra* as an epithet of the world (cf. Humbach, p. 6; Bailey, *l. c.*, p. 16 f.). A puzzling case is OTu. Uig. etc. *ala*, Chuv. *ula*, Mong. *alaγ* «variegated» since we meet in the same sense in Niya *palaga*, MIr. *palang* < Ir. **parda* (cf. Bailey: *BSOS* XI, p. 774): are we entitled to reckon with the known development **p-* > ZERO?

The Tokharians are mentioned in runic inscriptions and the form of several Buddhistic terms in Uigurian show that they have been transmitted through a Tokharian intermediary (Hansen: *ZDMG* 94, 1940, p. 139 ff. calls them «formal loans»). The details of such borrowings are often very difficult to clear up, since there have also been close contacts between the Tokharians and the Iranian peoples. Frequent use of pairs of synonymous words (binomials) as well as the «group flexion» seem to have been common both in Uigurian and in Sogdian and Tokharian. Translation loans can also be identified, both from Iranian to Uigurian and vice versa. E.g. the Uigurian rendering *ayaγ-qa tegimlig* of Sanskrit *arhant* seems to be a translation loan from Sogd. *ptβy 'ščy'n'k* or from Khotanese *pajsamāṇä āṣa'na* ~ *āṣana vajsana*. Even the Tokharians adopted Turkic loan words, e.g. A *aḍapahutti* < Tu. *alpaγut* «nobility» (cf. Minorsky *apud* Bailey: *BSOS* VIII, p. 884 and p. 918). It has been pointed out that the syntactical use of the Sogdian demonstrative *'γw* in the function «is, are» is identical with the use of the demonstrative *ol* in Turkic (Gershevich, *A Grammar of Manichaean Sogdian*, Oxford 1954, 1409).

The areas inhabited by the Sogdians, Sakas, and Tokharians came under Uigur domination in the 8th century and towards the end of the 10th century the population in these areas was already Turkic-speaking.[21]

[21] P. Pelliot, *Les influences iraniennes en Asie Centrale et en Extrême-Orient* (*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* III, 1912), p. 111.