seats another one to the croup of the horse», *türk-bändi* «bale fastened to the croup of the horse», *türkät* «quiver».[22]

I will not venture to solve the question concerning the priority of this word in this or that language, but etymological researches and archaeological data will probably much contribute to clarifying the origin of the Mongolian word *tereg*.[23]

[22] B. M. Miller, *Persidsko-russkij slovarj*, 1953, p. 116.

[23] Although in the present paper I wanted to treat only one side of the problem, *i.e.* the origin of the Mongolian cart, here I cannot restrain myself from pointing to the relation of the Russian word *telega* and the Turkic-Mongolian *tereg*. Maybe it is a borrowing from the Mongolian. This supposition is all the more probable because in Russian there is a synonym for cart: *povozka* a word of Slavic origin.

RAL 1975

THE ALTAIC THEORY AND THE HISTORY OF A MIDDLE MONGOLIAN LOAN WORD IN CHUVASH

BY

A. RÓNA-TAS (Budapest)

I would like to demonstrate some theoretical and methodological problems of the Altaic theory on a concrete example. Correspondences among the Altaic languages can be due to the following reasons: 1. Historical contacts, 2. Areal convergencies, 3. Typological parallelisms, 4. Convergencies of independent origin, 5. Chance, 6. Genetic relationship. Our approach to the correspondences due to genetic relationship can be scientifically justified only if we go ahead and remove the correspondences caused by the first five other reasons. One of the most difficult procedures is the separation of the genetic correspondences from those which are due to old historical relations because both are systematic. In the Altaic field we are especially in a difficult situation before the 13th century because of lack of datable sources on the Mongolian side. Though we have some scattered evidence on the pre-13th century Mongolian languages, these are for the time being scanty.[1] Complicating the picture also is the fact that the same word has been frequently borrowed more than once within the Altaic world, and because of the great structural similarity of these languages we are not always the in position to prove this. Therefore, I hope, it will be of some interest to present a case where we can do this.

If we find in Chuvash *usra-*, in other Turkic languages *asra-*, *asïra-*, in Mongolian *asara-*, in Manchu *asara-* with the meaning «to feed, to nourish, to take care of etc.» at the first sight it is tempting to suppose that we have to do with a Common Altaic word.

A closer investigation will show however, that the Chuvash word is of Middle Mongolian origin. To prove this we have to place our word into the

[1] The most recent paper on the pre-13th century Mongolian languages is Professor Ligeti's *Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi*, *Mongolian Studies*, Budapest 1970, pp. 265–308, with further references.

framework of the other Middle Mongolian loan words of Chuvash. Let us see them in brief:[2]

1. MMo *ab(u)ra-* «to save, to protect» → **abra-* > Chuv *upra-*.
   (cf. Tatdial *abra-*, LCC, Tuv, Yak ← Mong *abu* + *ra-*).
2. MMo *as(a)ra-* «to nourish, take care of» → **asra-* > Chuv *usra-*
   (cf. Tat *asra-*, Bashk *asïra-*, Kirg, Kazk, Nog, Kklp, Kum, Krč, Alt, Hak, Tuv, Üzb, Nuig, Turki, Salar, Yellow Uig← Mong *asa* + *ra-* → Manchu; see Turkic *aš* «food», *aša-* «to feed».
3. MMo *berke* «difficult, skilfull, strong» → **bärkä* > Chuv *parka* «healthy, strong, firm» (→ Cher *parya*, cf. Tat *berket-* «to strengthen», *e* instead of *i* !; see Turkic *berk*)
4. MMo *bolǰaγ* «arrangement, agreement, appointed time» → **bolǰaγ* > *bolǰau* → Chuv *pălčav*
   (cf. Tat **bolǰau* → Votj *bolžou*, see No. 5)
5. MMo *bolǰal* «id.» → **bolǰal* > Chuv *pălčăl*, *pănčăl*
   (cf. Tatdial *bulčal*, **bunčal* → Cher *punčal*; Chag, Kazk, Kirg, TatT, Koib, Hak, Tel, Nujg, Sag, Yak, Kmk, Tung, Persian, Georgian ← Mong *bolǰa* + *l(γ)*
6. MMo *bosaγa* «threshold» → **bosaγa* > Chuv *pusaxa*
   (cf. Tat *busaga* ; Chag, Nujg, TatB, Oir, Tel, Leb, Yak ←Mong *bosa* + *γa*)
7. MMo *bödene* «quail» → **bödene* > Chuv *putene (*→ Cher *pot'ana)*
   (cf. Tat *büdänä*, Bashk *büδänä* → Votj *bod'ono*, Vog *pitän*; Chag, Nujg, Tar, Üzb, Tkm, Blk, Kzk, Persian, Afg ← Mong)
8. MMo *büral* (< *buyural*) «grey, greyish» → **bürïl* ~ *bürlï* > Chuv *păvărlă*, *purlă* (→ Cher *purlă*)
   (cf. Tat *burlï*, Bashk *burïl*; Tar, Kzk, Soy, Oir, Yak everywhere with *ü* ← Mong *buyu* + *ra* + *l*)
9. MMo *büldürge* (<*bügüldürge)* «loop on a whip handle» → **büldürge* > Chuv *păltărka* (→ Cher *pel'dărma*, *maldărya*)
   (cf. Tatdial *böldörkä*, *möldörkä*, *möldörmä* ; Chag, Kzk ←Mong *bükü-*, *bügü-*, *bögö-* + *ld* + *rge-*, see Turkic *bük-*)

[2] I deal with the Middle Mongolian loan words of Chuvash in a paper entitled: *Középmongol jövevényszavak a csuvasban I*, Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány, XV–XVI (1971–1972), pp. 77–88; *II* ibid. XVII–XVIII (1973–1974), pp. 125–142. In this paper I give the history of the question, a detailed documentation and the discussion of several problems connected with the etymologies for which I have no place here.

10. MMo *čab(i)dur* «reddish-yellow, with white tail and mane» → **čabdur* > Chuv *čuptar*
    (cf. Tat *čaptar*, Bashk *saptar*; Chag, Tel, Oir, TatB, Kirg, Küär, Kzk, Shor → Kamass, ← Mong *čā* + *b* + *dur*)
11. MMo *čeber* «clean, pure, neat» → **čeber* > Chuv *čiper* «good, excellent, beautiful»
    (cf. Tat *čibär*, Bashk *sibär* → Cher *čeβer*, Vog *sĕpĕr*, Ostj. *k'epär-* Oγ, Tar, Oir, KarT, Kazk, Soy, Yak ← Mong)
12. MMo *čida-* «to be able» → **čida-* > Chuv *čăt-* «to endure» (→ Cher *čït-*)
    (cf. Tat *čïda-*, Bashk *sïδa-;* Late Uyg, Chag, Tel, Kar, Krm, Oir, Leb, Tar, Kzk, Kč, Shor, Sag, Koib, Hak, Kmd, KarT, Yak ← Mong)
13. MMo *delbeg(e)* «reins» → **delbege* ~ **delgebe* > Chuv *tilxepe*, *tilkepe*, *kilkepe*
    (cf. Tat *dilbegä*, *tilbüge*, *tilbägä*, *tilbigä*, *dilbägä*, *dilbegä*, *zilbigä*, Bashk *dilbegä* → Ostj *tetpou*, Vog *tilpĕŋ;* LCC, Kzk, TatB ← Mong *delbe* + *ge*)
14. MMo *dem* «help, aid, dexterity, method or way of doing something» → **dem* > Chuv *tim*
    (cf. Tat *dim*, Bashk *dim*, Oir, Koib, Hak, Soy, Kzk ← Mong)
15. MMo *elbeg* «abundance» → **elbeg* > Chuv *ilpek*
    (cf. LCC, Oir, Soy, Hak, Yak ← Mong, see Turkic *ălăk* «many»)
16. MMo *yoiqan* «beautiful» → **yoiqan* > Chuv *xüxĕm*, *xüxxĕm*
    (cf. Mong *yoi* + *qan*)
17. MMo *ǰa'učï* «matchmaker, go-between» → **ǰa'učï* > 17a Chuv **śauśï* (→ Cher *saus*), 17b Tat → Chuv *yevčĕ*
    (cf. Tat *yäučï*, TatO *ǰaučï*, TatSib *sautsï*, Bashk *yausï*, Chag, Kklp, Oir, Kirg ← Mong *ǰayu* + *či*)
18. MMo *kirǰaya* «nervous» → **kirǰaya* → Chuv *kărsaka*
    (cf. Bur *xirzaga)*
19. MMo *malayai* «hat» → **malayai* > 19a Chuv *mulaxay*, 19b Chuv *malaxay* (→ Cher *malaxai*, Russian *malaxai*)
    (cf. TatR *malaxai*; Tel, Korean ← Mong *malayai* ~ *maya-la(i)*
20. MMo *mergen* «who shoots straight, wise» → **märgän* > Chuv **markan* (→ Cher *maryan* «straight»)
    (cf. Bashk *märgän* → Ostj *margan*, Vog *märgan*, Kamass

mergen; Tel, Tkm, Shor, Koib, Kzk, Sag, Soy, Hak, Yak ← Mong)

21. MMo *moqā* (< *moqaγa*) «dull». → **moqa* > Chuv *măka*
(cf. Tat *mokïl*, Tatdial *mokïy*, Bashk *moqot*; LCC, Kzk, Tar, Shor, Oir, Tel, TatB, Soy, TatT, Yak ← Mong *moqo* + *γa*)

22. MMo *narad* (pl) «conifers» → **narad* → Chuv *narat*
(cf. Tat *narat*, BashkP *narat jilüge* «red cowberry»; Krč, Blk ← Mong or Bulg?)

23. MMo *niγ* «solid, dense» → **niq* > Chuv *năk*, *năkă* (→ Cher *năk*)
(cf. Tat *nïk*, Bashk *nïq*, Hak ← Mong)

24. MMo *noγta* «halter» → **noγta* > 24a Chuv *năxta*; 24b Chuv *năktav*
(cf. Tat *nukta*, Bashk *nuqta* → Cher *nukta*, Udm *n'ukto*, MordM *nokta*, MordE *novta*, Vog *noxta*; LCC, Chag, Kzk, Shor, Tar, Krč, Az, Hak, Tkm, Suig ← Mong)

25. MMo *nökər* «friend, comrade» → **nöker* > *nüger* > Chuv *(kĕr)neker*, *(kĕr)nüker* «comrade of the bridegroom»
(cf. Tat → Cher *ńuγar*, *nügar*; LCC, Chag, Tel, Leb, Kirg, Kzk, Blk, Krč, Suig; Russian, Hungarian ← Mong *nökö* + *r*)

26. MMo *qaiči* «scissors» → **qaiči* > Chuv *xayčï*, *xačă*, *xayčă*
(cf. Tat *kaïčï*, Bashk *qaysï* → Cher *kače*, *kači*; Kmk, Oir, Tel, TatT, Kzk, Soy ← Mong *qayi* + *či*, see Turkic *qapï* + *tï*, cf. LCC *qaptï* «id.»)

27. MMo *qara'ul* «guard» → **qaraul* > Chuv *xural* (→ Cher *orol*)
(cf. Tat *karavïl*, Bashk *qarawïl*, all Turkic languages, Russian, reborrowed by Turkic, many other languages ← Mong *qara* + *γul*, cf. Turkic *qaraq* «eye»)

28. MMo *qarčiγa(i)* «falcon, hawk» → **qarčïγa* > Chuv *xurčăka*, *xurčka* «hawk»
(cf. Tat *karčïga*, BashkP *karsega* → Mord *kaŕčĕgan*, Vog *karčekan*; LCC, Chag, Sag, Krm, Sag, Krm, Tel, Kazk, Oir, Kmk, Kč ← Mong, see Turkic *qartïγa*)

29. MMo *quda* «in-law relation or relatives» → **quda* > Chuv *xăta*
(cf. Tat *koda*, Baskh *qoda*; Chag, Tar, Kirg, Kzk, Oir, Tel, Hak ← Mong)

30. MMo *sarana* «a lily with an edible bulb, Lilium tenuifolium» → **sarana* → Chuv *sarana*
(cf. Tat *sarana*, Bashk *harïna* ← Mong)

31. MMo *sayi(n)* «good» → **sayï* > Chuv *sayă*
(cf. Tat → Cher *say*)

32. MMo *šibā* (< *sibaγa*) «dice, lot» → **sïba* > Chuv *šăpa* (→ Cher *šĕβa*)
(cf. Tat *šïbaga*, Bashk *šïbaγa* → Cher *šăbaγa*, Votj *šïbaγa*; Kzk, Srt ← Mong → Manchu)

33. MMo *siltaγ* «cause, excuse, pretext» → **sïltaγ* > 33a Chuv *săltăk*, → Cher *šiltik*; 33b Chuv *săltav*
(cf. Tat *šïltau*, Bashk *hïltau*, Hak, Kzk, Tel, Kmd, Yak ← Mong *silta* + *γ*)

The material above permits us to make some conclusions about the Middle Mongolian language from which these words originated:

1. The two-syllables with the same vowels (type *aγa* etc.) are already contracted in the first two syllables (Nos 8, 9) and in the non-first ones (Nos 21, 32), while in other cases the intervocalic guttural stop is preserved (Nos 6, 13, 18, 19).

2. The two-syllables with different vowels (type *ayu* etc.) are represented as diphthongues (Nos 17, 27).

6. Original diphtongues with *i* (type *ai* etc.) are preserved (Nos 16, 19, 31).

4. The vowel of the second open syllable is dropped (Nos 1, 2, 10).

5. The Mongolian *e* developed in two cases as Chuvash open *ă* (Nos 6, 20).

6. The vocalism of the second syllable is illabial in accordance with other West Middle Mongolian sources (Nos 6, 7, 24, 25).

7. There is no breaking of *i* (Nos 12, 18, 32, 33).

8. Though the reflex of Mongolian velar stop *q (k)* is fricative *x-*, this can be due to substitution both in initial (Nos 26, 27, 28, 29) and in other positions (No 16). It is *k* in late borrowings (No 21).

9. The velar voiced or voiceless media *γ (g)* is reflected as its fortis counterpart by *x*, in early (Nos 6, 16, 19, 24a) and as *k* in late borrowings (Nos 18, 23, 24b, 28, 33).

10. *S* before *-i-* became *š* in No. 32 but this can be also a Chuvash development. See also No. 33 where it did not occur.

These traits point to a west Middle Mongolian dialect.

Perhaps even more important are the conclusions which can be drawn concerning the history of the Chuvash language:

1. The typical Chuvash evolution of the vowel-system of the first syllable is later than the loan words:

a) Mongolian *a* has been taken over as labial *ă* and only later became *o* in Virjal and *u* in Anatri (Nos 1, 2, 10, 19a, 27, 27) Thus the items 19b, 22, 26, 30, 31 are late Tatar loan words.

b) Mongolian *o* and *u* became both *u* and then developed into Virjal labial reduced *ŏ* and Anatri illabial reduced *ă* (Nos 24, 29). Similar developments are to be supposed with Mongolian *ȏ* and *ū*, but there is no relevant example in our material.

c) Nos 7, 9 have been borrowed after the development of primary and secondary *u* into a reduced labial.

d) Mongolian *e* has been overtaken as closed *e* and then developed into *i* in Nos 11, 13, 14, 15.

e) Mongolian *e* has been overtaken as open *ă* and developed into *a* in Nos 3, 20.

f) Mongolian *i* in back-vocalic stems has been overtaken as back vocalic *ĭ* and then it developed into reduced *ă (ĭ)*.

This means that the present back vocalic full *ĭ* in Chuvash has developed from an illabial *a* and this development is younger than the loan words, see Nos 12, 18, 23, 32, 33.

g) The diphthongue *oi̯* became *ui̯* in Chuvash and then developed into *ü* in No 16.

h) The secondary long *ū* has been preserved and then developed into the triphthongue *ăvă* or remained full *u*. (No 8).

2. a) The diphthongue *aɣ* has been overtaken as *aɣ* and then developed into *a* in the nonfirst syllable (No 27).

b) In the non-first syllable all closed vowels became reduced (No 9, 31), while in the remaining cases, the open vowels have been preserved.

6. In the consonant system we find the following:

a) The velar stops — as has been pointed out above — are reflected in early loans as fricatives.

b) In early cases both the voiced affricate *ǯ* and its unvoiced counterpart *tš* became palatalized sibillant *ś* (No 17a).

c) In later loan words *tš* remained preserved (No 10, 11, 12, 26, 28), *ǯ* became *tš* (No 5). In case 17b the Mongolian *ǯ* has been substituted by Tatar *y-* and borrowed by Chuvash in this form.

d) The Tatar development of final *-g* into *-ɣ* is reflected by Chuvash *-v* in Nos 4, 33b, while the final guttural is preserved in Nos 15, 23, 33a.

e) The voiced or voiceless medial stops became unvoiced in Nos 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 16.

From the above it can be concluded that the following words surely are of Tatar origin: Nos 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17b, 19b, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33. These words are not of the same age in Chuvash. It is clear that

items 10 and 28 with their *a* → *ă* > *u* developments are earlier to 19b, 22, 26, 30 and 31 where *a* have been preserved.[3] In case of Chuvash *usra-* (and *upra-*) we have no criteria for the Tatar medium and thus we cannot decide whether they are directly borrowed from MMo or through Tatar; but the second possibility is more probable.

We can make two other important observations:

1. The main traits of the present Chuvash vowel system have developed after the 13th century, *i.e.* after the time when the Middle Mongolian loanwords have been borrowed.

2. Most of the Chuvash loan-words in Cheremiss are later than the 13th century, because we find words in Cheremiss which came through Chuvash or Tatar from Middle Mongolian and these (cf. Nos 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 17a, 20, 27, 32) show the same phonological peculiarities as the other Cheremiss words of Chuvash and Tatar origin.[4]

As can bee seen, Chuvash *usra-* fits well into the group of Chuvash words of direct or indirect Middle Mongolian origin. That this is not only a possibility but a fact, can be proved if we succeed in demonstrating that the Turkic word *asra-*, *aširа-* has a special Mongolian feature. This will be evident if we contrast Mongolian *asara-* with the Turkic word *aša-* «to feed» from which it hardly can be separated. Mongolian *asara-* ~ Turkic *aša-* is not the only example in our material where the Chuvash word points to a Mongolian form of a word which at the same time has a fair Turkic parallel. Such are e.g.: MMo *berke* ~ Turkic *berk* (No 3), MMo *elbeg* ~ Turkic *ƚläk* (No 15), MMo *qayiči* ~ Turkic *qapïtï* (No 26), MMo *qarčiyai* ~ Turkic

[3] We can distinguish among three layers of Tatar loan words in Chuvash: 1. Tat *kaška* → Chuv *xuška* «white spot on the front of animals», 2. Tat *kapka* → Chuv *xapxa* «door», 3. Tat *karčik* → Chuv *karčăk* «old woman». From these examples it is clear that after the *ă* > *o*(*u*) development in Chuvash the Tatar syllables *qa-* (*ƙa-*) were substituted by Chuvash *χa-* because at this time in Chuvash there were only *ka* and *xo* syllables but no *qa-* (*ƙa*). (Cf. Ramstedt: JSFOu XXXVIII, 1922—23, pp. 19—21, Poppe: UJb VII, 1927, pp. 154—158). The original velar stop *q* (*ƙ*) became *x-* in the first half of the 10th century (at least in some dialects), while the *ă* > *o*(*u*) development occurred after the 14th century.

[4] There is a long and unsettled discussion on the chronology of the Chuvash loan words in Cheremiss. The most recent publications on this problems are Bereczki, Nyelvtudományi Közlemények LXX, 1968, pp. 23—34, Itkonen, UAJb XLI, 1969, pp. 212—251, FUF XXXVIII (1970) pp. 257—273; Aalto, Linguistics 1970 aug., p. 117 and my paper read on the Congress of Finnougrists, Tallin 1970: *Some Problems of the Uralic Vocalism from an Altaist's point of view*, to be published in the Proceedings of the Congress.

qartiya. The *-b-* in *elbeg*, the final *e* in *berke*, the *-d-* in *qayiči* and *qarčiyai* show that the corresponding Chuvash words have been borrowed from Mongolian though Ancient Chuvash could once have their corresponding Turkic forms as original heritage. The same has been the case with MMo *asara-* ~ Chuv *usra-*. But here we have to say some more about the relation of the Mongolian form *asara-* to the Turkic verb *aša-*. Turkic *aša-* «to eat», *aš* «food, meal» is an old Turkic word, to be found already in the Turfan texts.[5] Now a Mongolian form with *-l* had to correspond to Turkic *aš* if it would be a very early correspondence. In fact Ramstedt[6] and recently Räsänen[7] have equated Turkic *aš* with Kalmuck *ālsn*, Mongolian *alisun* «chaff». This is hardly acceptable, because *alisun* pertains to Mongolian *qalisun* «outer layer of something, peel etc.» and constitutes a pair of the wellknown doublets with and without *-q* which have been discussed by Pelliot.[8] But perhaps Turkic *aša-* can be connected with Mongolian *alirsun* «red bilberry» as Mongolian *ǰimis* «fruit» pertains to Turkic *ye-* «to eat».

In Turkic loan words of Mongolian, two phonemes can correspond to a Turkic *-š*: namely *š* and *s*. For the first type see: Turkic *qaš* «something protruding, eyebrow etc.» → Mongolian *qaši-* «to obstruct the way», *qaš* «fence» etc., Turkic *tüš-* «to lean against» → Mongolian *tüši-* «id.», *tüšimel* «minister», Turkic *tuša-* «hobble» → Mongolian *tuši-* «id.», etc. For the second correspondence see: Turkic *bišlay* «cheese» → Mongolian *bisalay* (but also *bišilay*, *bašilay*), Turkic *yemiš* «food, fruit» → Mongolian *ǰimis*, Turkic *arviš* «magic formula» → Mongolian *arbis* etc. To this second group pertains Mongolian *asara-*, which we find already in the *Secret History*.

[5] The *Drevnetjurkskij Slovarj* (Moscow 1969, p. 62) quotes *Türkische Turfantexte* V, B: 45, Qutadγu Bilig, Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler, Suvarṇaprabhāsa, Kalyāṇamkara and Pāpamkara, Oγuznāme. We find the verb *aša-* also in *Berliner Turfantexte* I (ed. G. Hazai and P. Zieme, 1970, D: 257); the noun *aš* occurs in the same texts twice (C: 2, C: 5). The noun *aš* can be also found in the Brahmi texts, C, E, M, I of *Türkische Turfantexte* VIII etc. Both the noun and the verb are quoted by Kāšγarī.

[6] *Studies in Korean Etymology*: MSFOu XCV, 1949, pp. 6—7, *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft I: MSFOu* 104:1, p. 109, see also Joki, *MSFOu* 103, 1952, p. 78.

[7] *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuche der Türksprachen*, 1969, pp. 29—30 (where Turkm *ač-pāz* is a misprint for *aš-p.*). Seemingly Poppe does not accept Ramstedt's Turkic *aš* ~ Mongolian *alisun*, because he is not quoting it in his *Vergleichende Grammatik*.

[8] *Les mots avec et sans q-* (*k-*) *initial en turc et en mongol: TP* XXXVII (1944), pp. 73—101.

The word is a derivation with the suffix *-ra* of a verbal stem **asa-* as *ebde-* «to destroy» > *ebdere-* «to break down», *daba-* «to climb over» > *dabara-* «to exceed», *bulγa-* «to fight» > *bulγara-* «to be uprooted» etc.

The semantic side is also clear. The basic meaning «to feed» developed into the secondary meanings: «to nourish», «to care of», «to protect». The original meaning can be found in the *Codex Cumanicus*. Here we met with the meaning «zu essen geben, ernähren». Some modern languages have also preserved this meaning.

In the Mongolian sources of the 13th—14th centuries the word *asara-* has several kindred meanings. In § 25 of the *Secret History*[9] Bodončar catched a hawk (*qarčiyai*, incidentally another word of our list, No 28) and reared it *(asaraba)* till he began to train it. In most of the passages our word denotes a special social relation. In § 111 the Merkit robbed Börte, the wife of Chingis qan. The beautiful lady has been given into the custody of Čilger-bökö, who took care of her *(Čilger bökö-de asara'uluqsan aǰu'u tere asaraqsa<n>'ar aǰu)*. From the following verse we learn that this care was not limited to food-giving. In § 155 Yisügei-qatun, a Tatar girl got into the protection of Chingis qan. In § 231 Chingis qan ordered that his successors shall take care *(asaraqun)* of his body-guards.

In the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338[10] Diwubala, the Qonggirat adopted Jigüntei into the Qonggirat clan and cared of him *(... imayi masi dotunalun asaraquibar inu ...)* According to the inscription of 1335[11] Način Noyan adopted Cheng Ying-jui and once more the protection given to the new-comer is rendered with the word *asara-*. In the Muqaddimat-al-Adab[12] we find the expression: *asaraba ōnečini* «to nourish the orphan». Though the word had also other shades of meaning we can state that in the times of the Mongolian Empire our word has been used to denote the protection and care of people who originally did not pertain to the family or clan. This could be the historical background of the great diffusion of this word in the times of the Mongols.

[9] I quote the *Secret History* according to the edition of L. Ligeti: *A Mongolok Titkos Története, Mongol Nyelvemléktár* III, Budapest 1964.

[10] See F. W. Cleaves, *The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jigüntei*: HJAS XIV 1951, lines 2, 20.

[11] See F. W. Cleaves, *The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1335 in Memory of Chang Ying-jui*: HJAS XIII, 1950, lines 15, 19, 50, 51.

[12] N. N. Poppe, *Mongoljskij slovarj Mukaddimat al-adab* I—II, Moscow-Leningrad 1938, p. 107.

We find the earliest Turkic occurrence of the word *asara-* in the *Codex Cumanicus*, where Poppe correctly recognized our word as a Middle Mongolian loan.[13] Our word occurs in the monuments of the Xwarezmian period of the Turkic literary language *i.e.* after the Mongolian invasion. The word occurs in Saifi Sarayi's *Gulistan*, in the Husrav and Širin of Qutb, in the Muhabbat name of Xwarizmi and in the Nadǰul Faradis.[14] It is well known in later Chagatay literature too.[15] From the Modern Turkic languages it is present in all Kipchak, Siberian and Turkestan languages, in Yellow Uigur, but as far as I know it is absent from any Oguz language.[16]

The Manchu word *asara-* is isolated, it cannot be found in other Manchu-Tunguz languages. Already Hauer recognized the Mongolian origin of the Manchu word.[17]

[13] Cf. K. Grønbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch*, 1942, p. 42: *asra-* «zu essen geben, ernähren». N. Poppe, *Die mongolischen Lehnwörter im Komanischen: Németh Armaǧan*: 1962, p. 334. Here Poppe writes: «Auch dieses Wort oder richtiger gesagt, sein Stamm, scheint ein altes Lehnwort zu sein, vgl. im Qutadğu bilig, (Malov, S. 361) *asraq* «zum Haus gehörend, Zögling». But here we have a misunderstanding. In the quoted passage, which is the title of a chapter in QB we read: (54) *elig asraqïnï edgü tutmaqïnï aytur*. This has been translated by Malov: «(glava) govorit o vospityvaemych knjazem i ego blagotvoritelnosti» (*Pamjatniki*, p. 230). In the wordlist on p. 361 Malov writes: *asraq* «domašnij, vospitannik», QBQ (ogl. gl. 54); *(asraqy ?)*. The expression *elig asraqï* quoted from line 326:7 of the Namagan MS of QB has been translated in the *Drevnetjurkskij slovarj* as «sluga, podčinennyj». The original meaning of the expression has been «(the one who is) under the hand» from *elig* «hand» and *asra* «beneath-under» + suffix *-qï* with the function of expressing «pertaining to». This expression had two semantic developments: «(the one who is) under the hand of his parents, *i.e.* ungrown» and «(the one who is) under the hand of a lord, *i.e.* servant». In the wordlist of *Pamjatniki*, *elig* has been omitted and the meaning of the whole expression has been given to its second member. Since the word *asraqï* is a derivation from *asra* «beneath» it has nothing to do with the verb *asara-*.

[14] The data for Kwarezmian *asra-* are collected by E. J. Fazylov (*Starouzbekskij jazyk* 1, Taškent 1966, pp. 75—76). See also A. Bodrogligeti, A *Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Sa'dï's Gulistan*, Budapest 1969, p. 204.

[15] P. de Courteille, *Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental*, Paris 1870.

[16] Tat *asra-*, Bashk *aşïra-*, Kirg *asïra-*, Kazk *asïra-*, Nog *asïra,-* Kklp *asïra-*, Kumük *asïra-*, Krč *asïra-*, Alt *azïra-*, Hak *azïra-*, Tuv *azïra-*, Üzb *asïra-*, Uig *asrï-*, Turki *asra-*, Salar *asra-*, Yellow Uyg *asra-*, *asïra-*. In the *Türkiye' de Halk Ağzindan Derleme Sözlüǧü* (Ankara, 1963, p. 347) we find the verb *asra-* «hayvan beslemek, büyütmek», but this is a Crimean word and of Kipchak origin.

[17] E. Hauer, *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache*, Wiesbaden 1952, p. 59.

Thus, what seemed to be at the first sight a Common Altaic word turned out to be an Altaic word in quite another sense. A word of Turkic origin entered the Mongolian language prior to the 13th century. It became generalized and can be found in the earliest Middle Mongolian sources. After the 13th century it has been reborrowed by some Turkic languages and at the same time it entered the Manchu language. The rapid spread of the Mongolian word during the Mongolian period had been made easy by its special social content. The Mongolian word reached the Chuvash language probably through Kazan Tatar.

I hope that the discussed example will make easier to accept at least two important conclusions:

1. The presence of a word in all the three Altaic branches is not by itself an argument in favour of the Common Altaic origin of the word in question.

2. There have been long and complicated contacts between the Altaic speaking peoples also prior to the 13th century. The time which elapsed between the dissolution of the Altaic protolanguage and the 13th century lasted six-seven times, if not more, longer than the period after the 13th century. This fact in itself recommends that we investigate the historical relations of the pre-13th century Altaic languages. This is true, and becomes more and more difficult as one goes back in time and is deprived of written sources. Nevertheless, we have to undertake this task, because without undertaking it, we shall be unable to deal with a yet older period. We have to proceed from the known to the unknown, going ahead step-by-step.