

LOAN-WORDS OF ULTIMATE MIDDLE MONGOLIAN

ORIGIN IN CHUVASH ⁺

by

A. RONA-TAS

The reconstruction of Middle Mongolian is at present, at the centre of research in Mongolian linguistic history. The earliest monuments of the period are from the thirteenth century and some of its features are retained even in copies written in the seventeenth century. Sources of the Middle Mongolian language may be divided into two main groups. Written sources of Mongolian constitute the first group. Naturally, linguistic monuments written in the own script of the Mongols, the so-called Uighur-Mongolian and hP' ags-pa script stand in first place. Chinese written records are also rather significant, e.g. it is well-known the great literary work of the Middle Mongolian period, the Secret History of the Mongols, has come down to us in Chinese transcription and the original text in the Uighur-Mongolian script is lost and only extracts from it survive in another work in Uighur-Mongolian writing. Considerable linguistic material is contained in the Middle Mongolian words recorded in Tibetan, Armenian, Georgian, Persian, Arabic and Latin scripts. An edition of these monuments with internal philological criticism is in an advanced stage

⁺ See Postscript. First published in Hungarian: Középmongol eredetű jövevényszavak a csuvasban; Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae Sectio Ethnographica et Linguistica XV-XVI (1971-1972), pp. 77-88 and XVII-XVIII (1973-1974), pp. 125-141.

and thanks to this work the outlines of the Mongolian language and its dialects are beginning to unfold.

The second group of sources of the Middle Mongolian period consists of the Middle Mongolian loan-words in languages that came into contact with the Mongolian Empire. Papers have been published on the early Mongolian loan-words in the Korean (Pelliot 1930), Yakut (Kałużyński 1961), Cumanian (Poppe 1962), Manchu (Ligeti 1960), and Persian (Doerfer) languages and stray references may be found in literature to Middle Mongolian contacts with other languages as well.¹

A somewhat neglected field of research on the loan-words of the Middle Mongolian period is the study of the Mongolian elements of the Volga Turkic languages, of Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash. The question of the Mongolian parallels naturally did not escape the attention of those who studied the lexicology of the languages of the Volga-region. In the works of Räsänen (1923, 1935, 1937) and Wichmann (1903, 1923-24) written about the Turkic elements of the Volga-Finnish and Permian languages there are several references to Mongolian equivalents of Turkic words. In the works of Zolotnickij (1875) and Paasonen (1908, 1897) on Chuvash lexicology there are also references to Mongolian words. These however only figure as correspondences to Turkic etymologies and the historical connection between

the Turkish and Mongolian data, the chronological and geographic nature of these connections have remained without closer scrutiny.

It is commonly known that two scholars of Mongolian linguistics, Ramstedt and Poppe have written a number of fundamental papers on the history of the Chuvash language. But both of them were only interested in the ancient connections between the Chuvash and the Mongolian languages and any possible late contacts were only occasionally mentioned by them. Ramstedt in his epoch-making work on the situation of the Chuvash language mentions a few international loan-words of Mongolian origin (e. g. bayatur, emneg) but he draws a negative conclusion to the question of the historical contacts of Chuvash and Mongolian: "Es genügt hier klargelegt zu haben, dass das tschuwassische eine regelrechte Entwicklung der Türk-sprache ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen" (1922, p. 34). Here Ramstedt expresses his opposing views primarily against the concept that the ancient Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences had evolved as a consequence of historical contacts, but in the meantime he shies away from the question of their later historical connections.

Poppe adds in his review of Ramstedt's above mentioned work: "In dieser Arbeit gelangt Dr. Ramstedt zu dem Ergebnis, dass das Tschuwassische eine regelrechte Ent-

wicklung des Urtürkischen ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen. Mit dem letzten Teil dieser Behauptung dr. Ramstedts erkläre ich mich für vollständig einverstanden, da es auch meine Überzeugung ist, dass wir im Tschuwassischen keine Spuren irgendeines Einflusses seitens des Mongolischen nachweisen können..." (1924, p. 776). Poppe, in a later work (1927a) already mentions some words of Mongolian origin among the words of the Chuvash languages of Volga Kipchak origin (e. g. quda » Chuv. xāta 'suitor', qabčiy » Chuv. xăpcăk 'small pincers', čeber » Chuv. čiper 'good, -decent', ureji » Chuv. ěrče- 'to multiply', etc.) but without referring to their age and the circumstances of their assimilation.

The very fact that the question of the loan-words in the Chuvash language of the Middle Mongolian period has hardly emerged, if at all, is well-reflected in Egorov's work (1930), in which the author goes into detail about the Turkic, Arabic, Hebrew, Russian, Finnish (Ugrian), Chinese and Indo-European elements of the Chuvash language but the Mongolian loan-words are not even mentioned.

Ligeti (1935, pp. 268, 271) when dealing with the loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Mongolian epoch, briefly refers to the Mongolian elements of the Volga Kipchak languages, and goes on to say: "Our attention is concentrated mainly on this latter group of Turkic

languages, when we want to consider the Mongolian elements of the Chuvash language. It is an self-evident idea, that the modest number of Mongolian loan and international words in Modern Chuvash can hardly be explained in any other way than the similar elements of e.g. the Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, or Kumyk languages," and later: "In Chuvash there are, and in the Bulgar-Turkic there may have been Mongolian loan and international words; but they are insufficient for considering more enduring Bulgar-Turkic (Chuvash) - Mongolian connections."

Unfortunately, Ligeti's note, published in Hungarian, was not followed by any specialized research. It is true that Egorov (1954) does contain a chapter "Mongolian words in the Chuvash language" (pp. 118-122). Here he divides the Chuvash words with Mongolian parallels into two groups. The words which fall into the first group exist both in the Chuvash and Turkic, as well as in the Mongolian language, and it cannot be decided whether they are of Turkic or Mongolian origin. Egorov classified in the second group words where the Turkic equivalent of the Chuvash word is completely missing or where the Turkic equivalent phonetically or semantically differs from the Chuvash.

According to him, in these cases the Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences originate "not only from the time of Mongolian rule but from a much earlier period." In this

group such ancient correspondences as the Chuv. yěķĕr 'twins' ~ Mong. ikire (the modern ixir form is mentioned by him) are completely mixed with such loan-words of the Mongol epoch as the Mong. nōķĕr → Chuv. neķer (here he quotes a nūķķĕrĕ form as well). Unfortunately the majority of the enumerated correspondences are erroneous (e. g. Chuv. nar ~ Mong. nara 'Sun', Chuv. njuxa ~ Mong. noqai 'dog', Chuv. kakaj ~ Mong. ġaqai 'swine', Chuv. tixa ~ Mong. dayan 'two-year old colt', etc.² and there are only two loans that are really from the Mongol epoch (Mong. nōķĕr, siltaj).

Sinor (1964, p.7) writes: "I am not speaking here of recent Mongol loan words in Chuvash. To my knowledge, these have never been studied or even mentioned, although their importance is obvious. The presence of Mongols in the Volga-region has left its traces and a methodical survey of these would help in shedding new light on a number of relevant problems." Unfortunately, Sinor did not deal with the question in greater detail.

Egorov's (1964) Chuvash etymological dictionary is a great step forward in the research of Chuvash lexicology. This is an excellent work, which, despite its methodological shortcomings will remain as an indispensable source for Altaistics. He quotes Mongolian parallels for several Chuvash words and occasionally expressly raises the Mongolian origin of a Chuvash word (e. g. Mong. bosoġa ~ Chuv.

pusaxa, Mong. elbeg ~ Chuv. ilpek, Mong. malapai ~ Chuv. mulaxxay, Mong. nöker ~ Chuv. neker, Mong. qarayul ~ Chuv. xural, etc.).

A new stage is represented by Räsänen (1969) in the history of the study of the problem. Räsänen does not separate the various chronological groups of Mongolian loan-words in the Turkic languages, yet in the great majority of cases he correctly points out the Mongolian origin of some Turkic, and Chuvash words among them, and in a few cases he indicates that the Mongolian word in question had reached the Chuvash language through Kipchak mediation.

The study of the Middle Mongolian loan-words of the Chuvash language offers several conclusions. 1. It offers an opportunity to isolate the earlier Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences from those of the Mongolian epoch. 2. It offers data having source value es regards the reconstruction of the Middle Mongolian dialects. 3. It lends basis to the clarification of the hitherto unsolved chronological questions of Volga Kipchak and Chuvash phonology by offering a terminus post quem to the estimation of those phonetic changes which took place even in the Mongolian loan-words. 4. Indirectly it offers help to the chronological definition of the Chuvash and Tatar loan-words in the Cheremis language. Keeping these points in view in the following I should like to study some words of Middle Mongolian

origin of the Chuvash language.

Before going into details, I should however briefly deal with the chronology of the Mongolian loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Volga-region. The way to the West and North-West was opened by the Mongols after their victory over the Russian-Cumanian army (1223) in the battle at the River Khalkha. From then onwards they were at permanent war with the Empire of the Volga Bulgarians. The record of Friar Julianus from 1235-1236 reports the following however: "The Tatar people are their neighbours but these Tatars, engaging in combat with them could not overcome them at war, moreover in the first battle the Tatars suffered defeat. But already in the aforementioned friar met Tatars in this land of the Eastern i.e. Volga Hungarians and also met with the envoy of the Tatar chief who spoke Hungarian, Russian, Cumanian, German, Saracenic and Tatar. He says that the Tatar army which is situated five days' distance from here prepares to march against Germany ..." (Gyórfy 1965, p. 43). But we know that on his second journey, in the summer of 1237, Julianus could only reach Susdal because the Mongols had occupied and completely destroyed the Empire of the Volga Bulgarians. According to Russian chronicles the fall of the Volga Bulgarian Empire took place in the autumn of 1236. (Istoriija 1966-1967).

Thus the earliest time limit of the Mongolian loan-words of the Volga Kipchak languages is the end of the thirties in the thirteenth century. Direct Mongolian linguistic influence may already have been insignificant by the end of the fourteenth century, but naturally we should take into account the continued spread of Mongolian words among the population of the Golden Horde for a long time. Mongolian words that were absorbed by the Volga Bulgarian, and subsequently by the Kipchak languages continued on their way in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. Among the late Tatar loan-words of the Chuvash language there are also some of Middle Mongolian origin. In the meantime there is no criterion for deciding in several cases whether a word was borrowed by Chuvash with Volga Kipchak mediation or directly. Moreover, as in the Volga Bulgarian Empire there were at least two distinct dialects, one may even consider the possibility that the Middle Mongolian words of Modern Chuvash were transmitted through another Bulgarian Turkic dialect of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries.

The great structural identity of the Turkic and Mongolian languages further hampers the study of the Mongolian loan-words in Chuvash. In the following only those words will be discussed, for which we may infer an ultimate Middle Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word with a high degree of probability on the basis of phonetic, and histori-

cal criteria and of criteria of linguistic geography and cultural history. No doubt the number of words recognised as being of Middle Mongolian origin in the Chuvash language will increase with the advancement of research and even in the case of words without criteria we may reckon with some of them belonging to this group.

1. MMo abra- 'to save, to preserve'

Mongolian: MMo: E: abura- 'to help, to rescue' (SH), abura- 'id.' (Hy, HyB), abura- 'id.' (Ph); W: -. MoL: abura- 'to help, rescue; protect' (Lessing) ModMo: E: avra- 'to save, rescue' (KhL), abar- 'to save, protect, defend' (BurL), awura- 'to save'; (Ord.) W: awra- 'to save, preserve' (Kalm).

Chuvash: upra- 'to guard, protect' (Sirotkin 1961), upra- 'id' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: abra- 'to save, guard' (Tat DS).

The Mongolian word belongs to the family of ab- 'to take, get hold, etc.' from which it was formed by a deverbal -ra suffix (Cf. ebde- 'to break down, > ebdere-, bögle- 'to fill an opening' > böglere-, daba- 'to transgress' > dabara- etc.). The sound -u may have already disappeared in the lending Mongolian dialect, moreover, it is probable that we may reckon already with an abra- ~ abura- variant as is shown by the relevant derivatives: abuča 'receiving, adoption', abuḡul-fakt., abuḡča- coop., aburi 'behaviour' etc.,

but abquɣul- caus., abčaldu- recipr.

The first occurrence of the word is in the Cumanian material of the Codex Cumanicus where Poppe (1962, p. 334) considers it to be of Mongolian origin. The word was also transmitted to Tuvanian as well as to Yakut (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p.2, Kažužyński 1961, p.41). It cannot be decided whether the word in the Chuvash language is of Volga Kipchak^o mediation or not, but it is certain that it was assimilated by Chuvash before the Chuvash a > o development. This word was considered to be of Mongolian origin already by Räsänen (1969, p.2).

2. MMo as(a)ra- 'to take care'

Mongolian: MMo: E: asara- 'to take care' (SH), asara- 'id.' (Hy), asara- 'id.' (Ph); W: asara- 'id.' (MA), asara- 'id.' (AL).

MoL: asara- 'to be compassionate, to take care, nourish, raise, support somebody by charity' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: asra- 'to extend hospitality, to take care of somebody' (KhL), asara- 'to protect, to take care, to rescue, to serve somebody' (Ord), asara- 'to take into protection, or care' (DahMu); W: asr- 'to protect, raise, to be kindly compassionate' (Kalm).

Chuvash: usra- 'to raise, to take care, to guard', usrav 'adopted (boy, girl)' (Sirotkin 1961), usra- 'to bring up' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: asra- 'to raise, nourish' (TatL),
asira- 'to maintain, to hold' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word which has spread in several Turkic languages (Cf. Räsänen 1969. p.29) and exists also in Manchu, is of Turkic origin. It is the adoption of the Turkic aša- 'to feed' to which had been associated a -ra deverbal verb forming suffix marking intensity (Cf. above). In one group of the Turkic loan-words in the Mongolian language the Turkic -š- corresponds to -s-: Tu. yemiš 'fruit' → Mong. Yimis, Tu. arviš 'magic formula' → Mong. arbis, Tu. bišlaš - 'cheese' → Mong. bisalaš - (but bišilaš as well). The Mongolian word had become the term for the acceptance of non-relatives into the family in the Mongol epoch, and had spread as such (see in detail Róna-Tas 1975). The word reached the Chuvash language by Tatar transmission which is indicated by the form usrav ← Tat. asrau as well. Already Räsänen (*loc. cit.*) considered this word to be of Mongolian origin.

3. MMo berke 'strong'

Mongolian: MMo: E: berke 'difficult, hard' (SH),
berke 'difficult' (Hy, HyA); W: berkā 'difficult, coarse' (IMM), bêrké 'difficult' (IMI), berket- 'to become strong' (MA).

MoL: berke 'difficult, clever, able to do something'

(Lessing).

ModMo: E: berch 'difficult, complicated, serious, experienced in something' (KhL), berche 'id.' (BurL), berkxe 'difficult' (Ord), berke 'difficult, very, strongly' (DahHP), piege 'difficult' (Mgr), W: berkə 'difficult, wicked, rare' (Kalm).

Chuvash: parka 'healthy, solid, strong' (Sirotkin 1961), parka 'strong, thick' (Paasonen 1908), parka 'healthy, whole, enduring, big(eyed)' (Ašmarin IX, p.110).

Cheremis: parʒa 'quick (horse)' (Räsänen 1920, RMS).

The word is well-known in Old Turkic in the form berk. But in Chuvash the ancient final -rk sound group is solved by inserting a closed (> reduced) vowel: PT erk ~ Chuv. irĕk (< ⁺erik) 'freedom', PT ürk- ~ Chuv. ĕrĕx (< ⁺ürük-) 'to wake suddenly', PT bürk- ~ Chuv. pĕrĕx- (< ⁺bürük-) 'to spurt', PT turq ~ Chuv. tărăx (< ⁺turuq-) 'width, measure', PT qirq ~ Chuv. xĕrĕx (< ⁺qirig) 'forty'. The modern Chuvash form can be directly traced to a ⁺bārkā form. It is conspicuous that in Tatar and Bashkir a berket- 'to strengthen' verb is to be found where, instead of a closed -i- there is an -e- also indicating that the word is a loan, particularly corresponding to the Middle Mongolian MA item. The word was adopted into Chuvash before the Chuvash ä > a development.

The Cheremis word was taken over from Chuvash. Its meaning indicates that the word may have spread with horse breeding. Among the loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Mongolian epoch the proportion of terms relating to horse keeping is rather high. There are several such words among them that are of ultimate Turkic origin but had spread in the Turkic languages by Mongolian mediation. Presumably the Chuv. laša 'horse' and urxamax 'fiery, untame horse' also belong to this group.³ Both words are of Turkic origin but had spread in the Mongolian epoch through the Mongolians (see Mong. alaša, arxamax).

4. MMo boljal, boljaχ 'deadline, time agreed upon in advance'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bolja- 'to discuss (in advance), to agree upon, to state', boljal 'date agreed upon' (SH); W: boljal 'deadline' boljaldu- 'to agree upon something (in advance)' (MA).

MoL: bolja-, bolju- 'to agree upon (in advance), to know in advance' boljača(n) 'agreement, rendezvous', boljol 'agreement, stipulation' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: boldzol 'agreement' (KhL), bolzor 'deadline', bolzoo 'agreement' (BurL), boldžō 'place, time agreed upon' (Ord), bolejō 'id.' (DahM) W: boldzōtā 'the person who has a rendezvous' (OirK), bolzār, bolzōg 'deadline, agreement, stipulation' (Kalm).

Volga Kipchak: bulčal (Tat, Cf. Räsänen 1920, p. 184) → Voty. bolz'ou.

Chuvash: pälčav 'agreement on the day of the marriage' (Sirotkin 1961), pälčav 'gift bought or made by the bride for the bridegroom, etc.' (P), pälčav, pälčal, pänčal 'final agreement on the day of the marriage' (Ašmarin X, pp. 110-111, 118).

Cheremis: punčal 'resolution' (Räsänen 1920, pp. 183-184, MRS).

The Mongolian words are substantives derived from the verb bolja-. From the point of the much debated question of the so-called Mongolian stem final vocals it may not be without importance to note that the word bolja- has a boljaŋa form as well. The word is a loan in Chuvash because of the retained -č- (= -Dž-), which in ancient Chuvash words had become š (= ž) after -l-, e. g. PT qilič 'sword' ~ Chuv. xěš (< ⁺qilč), PT qilič 'weaver's reed' ~ Chuv. xěš (< ⁺qilč), PT ölč- 'to measure' ~ Chuv. viš-, PT belčen 'thistle' ~ Chuv. pišen, PT külčün 'loan' ~ Chuv. kivšen, küšen, PT yulič 'hair' ~ Chuv. šús (< ylč and not sač!) etc. The Chuvash word was taken from the Volga Kipchak languages, which is also indicated by the terminal av ← au < aŋ development, or correspondence. The Mongolian word was adopted by Tatar before the o > u development of the Volga-region

where today it is regarded as a rare word, but the Votyak word was also taken from Tatar. The Chuvash adoption took place prior to the $\underline{u} > \underline{\ddot{o}}, \underline{\ddot{a}}$ development. The sound -n- is the result of the dissimilation under the effect of the final -l ($\underline{l-l} > \underline{n-l}$). The Mongolian word had spread almost among all the Turks and was adopted by the Tunguz, Georgian and Persian languages as well (see the data in Doerfer I, pp. 229-230, Räsänen 1969, p. 79). Doerfer (*loc. cit.*) interpreted the Turkic word to be of Mongolian origin, as did Räsänen (1969, p. 79), and the Mongolian parallel is also quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 147).

5. MMo bosaqa 'threshold'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bosoqa 'threshold', boso- 'to block (the door)' (SH), bosoqa 'threshold' (Hy), bosqā- 'to erect (religious monument)' (Ph); W: bos- 'to stand up' (IMM, IMI), bos- 'id.' (AL), bosqa- 'to lift' (MA).
MoL: bosoqa 'threshold, vertical, erect' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: bosgo 'threshold' (KhL), bošog 'upper cross-bar of door' (Drg), bogoho, bohogo 'threshold' (BurL), bošogo 'id.' (Ord), bošog (Ujüm), bosguo 'id.' (Mgr);

W: boks^o, bokáxa, bos^o, bosxa (Kalm).

Chuvash: pusaxa 'threshold; stirrup, hay rack, stair, stairstep' (Sirotkin 1961), pusaxa 'id.'. (Ašmarin X, p. 8.)

Volga Kipchak: busaga 'threshold' (TatL).

The word is deduced by Poppe from an earlier Mong ⁺basuḡa < ⁺basurga form and he links the stem of the word to the Mong. basu- 'to hurt', Tu. bas- 'to press' family of words. (Poppe 1960a. p.65). This is apparently supported by DahHP basurga, DahMu basarxa and Tunguz (Vitimo-nerčinsk dial., Vasilevič 1958), basurga, Solon basarga 'threshold'. According to Doerfer (I, pp. 227-228) the Dahur word changed in Mongolian under the effect of the verb basu- because of taboo reasons and subsequently it got into Tunguz and Solon. Whatever the emergence of the Dahur word was (perhaps it is an early Yakut loan, though this word cannot be traced on the basis of Modern Yakut), it has no relationship to the Mong. bosoḡa the stem of which is the Mongolian verb bos(o)- 'to stand up'. The Mong. bosoḡa 'vertical, erect' adjective is derived from this stem, which is identical with the word in question. Regarding the suffix -ḡa see Poppe (1927, p.94). In this context the Secret History of the Mongols is quite remarkable where the following can be read in section 245: Yirqo'an Qonggotan kō'ūt inu e'ūten bosoḡu, "The six Kongkotan boys had blocked the door." In this sentence the verb boso- occurs in the sense 'to block, to close' and a few lines earlier there is the expression e'ūten bosoḡa 'the threshold of the door'. The cultic function of the threshold as

an addition to the door is really 'blocking the way' of evil. Up to the present time Mongols are not supposed to tread on the threshold and this was already mentioned by Rubruk in his account of the court of the Mongolian khans. (see Doerfer, I. p. 227).

The Chuvash word is directly adopted from Mongolian, which is also indicated by -x-. This sound is a voiced spirant (χ) in Modern Chuvash pronunciation, as all unvoiced consonants become voiced in Chuvash in an intervocalic position if they are not lengthened. Regarding the MB period it can only be stated that the sound was already a spirant by that time. The Chuvash word went through a semantic extension. The ancient Turkic bas- 'to press' had become pus- in Chuvash, i. e. the old bas- and bos- syllables coincided. Consequently the modern meanings of the word such as 'stair', 'stair-shaped object' developed. The Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word was correctly recognized by Doerfer (I, p.227), and also by Räsänen (1969, p.81). The Mongolian word was adopted by several Turkic languages, see the corresponding data in the quoted works of Doerfer and Räsänen.

6. MMo būral 'apple-grey (horse)'

Mongolian: MMo: E: - W: būrūl (read būrul) 'grey' (MA).

MoL: buḡural, buḡurul 'grey' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: būral 'grey, apple-grey' (KhL), būral 'id.' (BurL) bōral 'grey' (Jar), būral, būrul 'grey, reddish grey (horse colour)' (Ord), bōral 'greyish' (DahP); W: būrl_o 'white (haired), white furred' (Kalm).

Chuvash: pāvār, pāvārlă, purlă 'apple-grey' (Egorov 1964), pāvārlă, purlă 'id.' (Sirotkin 1961), purlă 'greyish, yellowish-greyish' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: burfi 'apple-grey' (TatL), buril 'id.' (BashkL).

Cheremis: purlo 'id.' (Räsänen 1923, p. 56, MRS).

The word spread in the Turkic languages was not collated by Räsänen (1969, p. 89) to the corresponding Mongolian one, and he reconstructed the PT shape in būr(liŋ) form. In the majority of the Turkic languages the long Mongolian vowel was preserved: Taranchi būrul, Kazakh būrul, Soyot būrul, Altai pūlur, which would not have taken place in the case of original Turkic length. It is probable that, even in those lexical items where this is not indicated orthographically, the first syllable has a long vowel. The Chuv. āvă ~ u correspondence is a regular one with an adopted long ū.

The Mongolian word had spread as a horse colour. The Mongolian parallel of the Chuvash word is quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 146).

7. MMo bödene 'quail'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bödene 'quail' (Hy); W: bödene 'id.' (AL), bödene 'id.' (VI), bödene 'id.' (Qaz)

MoL: büdüne 'id.' (Kowalewski, Lessing), bödüne (Gol'-stunskij).

ModMo: E: bödnö 'id.' (KhL), büdne 'id.' (KhC, Lessing), büdene 'id.' (BurL), bödönö 'id.' (Ord) puduri, puduru 'id.' bodono 'tailless', bodono gū 'tailless bird' (Mgr);

W: bödn^ö, böd^önə 'quail' (Kalm), bodana 'id.' (MogMSL).

Chuvash: putene 'quail' (Sirotkin 1961), putene 'id.' (Paasonen 1908), pot'ene 'id.' (PR), putene, put'ana, pot'ana 'id.' (Ašmarin X, pp. 44-45, 54).

Cheremis: pot'ana 'id.' (Räsänen 1920, p. 182).

Volga Kipchak: büdünä 'id.' (TatL) büdünä (Bashk)

→ Voty. bod'ono.

The Buryat form of the Mongolian word penetrated into the Khalkha dialect as well, hence the ü reading of Khalkha and of the literary forms. The Monguor form is rather interesting, as it may have retained the original meaning of the word. The Chuvash word may be of direct Volga Kipchak origin prior to the time when the Chuvash secondary ü evolved, but it could be an adoption directly from Mongolian. It is remarkable that the forms of the Chuvash dialects show a change to the back vocalic set which is frequent in the case of ancient Chuvash

words (Cf. ⁺ökür > vākār 'ox' ⁺ör > var 'middle' etc.). The Chuvash word got into Cheremis and the Volga Kipchak word to Votyak. The word is known in several Turkic languages and they had conveyed it to Persian and Vogul. The Mongolian origin of the Turkic word was already recognized by Räsänen (1920, p.182), and Ligeti (1962a, p.21) held a similar view, together with Egorov (1964, p.167) and Doerfer (I, p.218) and most recently Räsänen (1969, p.82), see the Turkic, Persian, Afghan and Vogul data in the same works.

8. MMo būldürge 'loop made of leather on a
whip handle'

Mongolian: MMo: --

MoL: bögeldürge, bögöldürge 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: bögöldörgö 'id.' (KhL) bügelderge 'a strap of a saddle, loop on a whip handle' (Ord); W: --.

Chuvash: pältärka 'strap on the handle of lash' (Sirotkin 1961), pältärka 'strap or string, or loop for the hand at the tip of whip handle' (Paasonen 1908).

Cheremis: melderğa, pelDerGa 'id.' (Räsänen 1920, p.40, 1923, p.46, 1908).

Volga Kipchak: böldörkă, möldörkă 'id.' (TatDS), möldörmă (TatPaasonen 1908).

The Mongolian word belongs to the family of bökö-
~ bögö- < bükü- ~ büg- 'to bend' (see Tu. bük- 'id.').

The word bügürge 'saddle bow, pommel' (see KhL büreg, bürgen, Kalm bür^üg, bürgə) also belongs to this family of words. I have not found this word in the Middle and Modern Mongolian sources of the western Mongolians. But as a Mongolian loan it can be found in the Muqaddimat al-Adab (as büldürge), in Kazakh (büldürgö), and in Kirghiz (büldürgö, büldürgü), where the Middle Mongolian long vowel is represented by a short sound just as well as in Volga Kipchak and Chuvash. The Chuvash word may have been taken over directly or by Tatar transmission, the Cheremis word may be of Chuvash or Tatar transmission. On its Mongolian origin see Räsänen (1969, p. 92).

9. MMo čabidur 'light brown, with white mane and tail'

Mongolian: MMo: E: --; W: čabdar 'light brown (horse colour) (MA).

MoL: čabidar 'reddish-yellow, with white mane and tail' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: cav'dar 'light brown (horse colour)' (KhL), savidar 'id.' (BurL), tšawidar 'red with white mane and tail' (Ord), tšāwdar 'id.' (Üjüm); W: tsābdr_o 'dark or of brown colour but with white mane and tail' (Kalm).

Chuvash: čuptar 'cream, light brown (horse colour)' (Sirotkin 1961), čuptar 'it is said of the colour of the horse, ? cream' (Paasonen 1908).

Volga Kipchak: čaptar 'light brown' (TatL), saptar 'id.' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word derives from the čā- 'to be white' stem. The Chuvash word is a loan from Tatar prior to the Chuvash â > o transition but after the č > ś change. The word was already explained by Joki (1952, p.278) as a Mongolian loan-word in the Turkic languages and in Kamassian, which was accepted by Räsänen (1969, p.94), the Mongolian parallel is given also by Egorov (1954). See the Turkic data in these works.

10. MMo čida- 'to be able'

Mongolian: MMo: E: čida- 'to be able, to be capable of defeating' (SH), čida- (Hy, HyAB), čida- 'id.' (Ph); W: čida- 'to do correctly' (IMI), čida- 'to be able, to know' (MA).

MoL: čida- 'to be able' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: čad- 'to be able, to know' (KhL), šada- 'id.' (BurL), tšida- 'id.' (Ord), šad- 'id.' (Jar), šad-, šada- 'id.' (DahHP), šad- 'id.' (DahIv), šade- 'id.' (DahM), sda- 'id.' (Mgr); W: tšad^a- 'id.' (Kalm), čidān 'power, strength' (MogZ,K), čidā- 'to be able' (MogMrL).

Chuvash: čät- 'to tolerate, to endure, to expiate, to hold out, to return (expenses)' (Sirotkin 1961), čät- 'to tolerate, to endure, to bear' (Paasonen 1908).

Cheremis: čit- 'to bear, to endure, to suffer' (MRS, Räsänen 1920, p.90, 1923, p.78).

Volga Kipchak: čida- 'to tolerate, to endure, to suffer' (TatL), čâda- 'to endure' (TatP); sida- 'to tolerate, to endure, to suffer' (BashkL).

It requires further study to see if the Mongolian word is related to the Turkic verb tid- 'to hold up', as it is considered by Poppe (1960a, p.15) and Räsänen (1969, p.477). The meaning of the Mongolian word is 'to be capable of doing something, to hold something in somebody's power' and the 'to endure, to tolerate' meanings of the Mongolian form adopted by several Turkic dialects are closely interrelated (Cf. Hung. bírni, kibírni). The Chuvash and Cheremis words are late loans from Tatar. The Mongolian origin of the Turkic words was pointed out also by Ligeti (1964, p.36) besides Poppe and Räsänen (loc.cit.), and see the other Turkic data at the same place.

11. MMo delbege 'bridle, reins'

Mongolian: MMo: E: delbege 'id.' (SH); W: --.

MoL: delbeg 'rein(s)' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: delbeg 'id.' (KhL); W: --.

Chuvash: tilxepe 'bridle, reins' (Sirotkin 1961)

tilxepe, tilkepe 'reins' (Paasonen 1908), tilkepe, tilxepe, kilkepe (Ašmarin VI, p.22) 'id.'

Volga Kipchak: dilbegä 'reins' (TatL), tilbüge, tilbägä, tilbigä, dilbägä, dilbegä, zilbigä (Räsänen 1969,

p. 471), dilbegā 'id.' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word may belong to a family of words meaning 'flat, broad', Cf. delbeg 'wide, large', delbeyi- 'to be wide, to become wide', delbeng, delbing 'protruding (something flat, eg. an ear)'. In Turkic languages there is a word tāl meaning 'thread, wire' which at least may have been mixed with the Mongolian forms adopted by Turkic (see Kumyk telbavlar 'bridle' (RKmk), (Grønbech 1942), telbuḡa 'ground-rope' (Räsänen 1969, p. 471). The Mongolian origin of the Volga Kipchak words is clearly indicated by the Tatar and Bashkir forms with d- initial. The Turkic word was considered to be of Mongolian origin by Doerfer and Poppe (Cf. their proof notes to Räsänen 1969, p. 471), but Poppe does not discuss the tel-buḡa item among the Mongolian loans in his article on the Mongolian elements of the Codex Cumanicus. Egorov (1954, p. 251), who refers to the Mongolian word among others, derives the Chuvash word from til 'tongue', and baḡ 'rope' which cannot be accepted either because of semantic or phonetic considerations (see bosaḡa). The word came from Siberian Tatar to the Ob Ugrian languages (Osty. tetpou, Vog. tilpen, see Räsänen 1969, p. 471). The Mongolian word was borrowed by these languages prior to the Volga Turkic e > i development.

12. MMo dem 'help, assistance'

Mongolian: MMo: E: dem 'auxiliary-, rear troop' (SA);

W: --.

ModMo: E: dem 'way of action, capacity, skill' (KhL). dem 'id.' (BurL), dem 'help, skill obtained by practice' (Ord),

W: dem 'help, assistance' (Kalm).

Chuvash: tim 'wish, ambition, effort, inclination, initiative, activity, firmness, perseverance, resoluteness, courage, daring, self-consciousness' (Sirotkin 1961), tim 'ambition, effort, decision' timle- 'to look after, to make an effort, to convince' (Ašmarin XIV, p. 40).

Volga Kipchak: dim 'persuasion, warning, advice, conviction' (TatL), dim 'id.' (BashkL).

The initial d- of the Volga Kipchak word clearly indicates its Mongolian origin and this is further supported by the fact that the word is lacking in Turkic antiquity. Of the Modern Turkic languages it can be found only in Altaic, Koibal, Soyot and Kazakh. The Chuvash word is presumably of Tatar mediation which is mainly indicated by its semantic development; anyhow, the adoption had taken place prior to the e > i development. The word was considered to be of Mongolian origin by Räsänen (1969, p. 135), see the Turkic data there.

13. MMo elbeg 'abundance, remains'

Mongolian: MMo: -

MoL: elbeg 'abundance, abundant' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: elbeg 'abundance, abundant' (KhL), elbeg 'id.' (BurL), elbek 'id.' (Ord), elweg 'rich, abundant' (Üjüm), W: elwäg 'abundant, surplus' (Kalm).

Chuvash: ilpek 'abundance, surplus' (Sirotkin 1961), ilpek 'abundance' (Ašmarin III, p. 111).

The first occurrence of the Mongolian word in Turkic is in the Codex Cumanicus where Poppe (1962, p. 335) considers it to be a Mongolian word. It was borrowed from Mongolian by the Altaic, Tuvanian and Yakut languages. Further investigation is needed to see how the Mongolian word is related to the Tara and Kürdek Turkic äläk 'many' and to the Kalmuck elēde 'richly, in great abundance, much' quoted by Rāsänen (1969, p. 39). It cannot be excluded that the -b- of elbeg is similar to the -b- of qalbaqa or qarbing where -b- is missing from the corresponding Turkic forms. The Turkic words were originated from Mongolian according to Rāsänen (*loc. cit.*) and the Chuvash one according to Egorov (1964, p. 69).

14. MMo foiqan 'beautiful'

Mongolian: MMo: -

MoL: foyuqan 'graceful, beautiful', foyida 'excellent, the best', foyi, foyu 'beautiful, smart, elegant' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: goyochon 'very beautiful, fairly beautiful', goyo 'beautiful', qoyd 'very' (KhL), goyochon 'pretty', qoyo 'beautiful' (BurL), goi 'id.' (DahHP); W: gög? 'woman of easy

virtue' (Kalm).

Chuvash: xüxëm 'beautiful, smart, of good quality' (Sirotkin 1961) xüxëm, xüxxëm 'beautiful, smart, good, excellent, tall, strong' (Ašmarin XVI, p.287).

The Chuvash word was related to the Mongolian ɣaiqa 'to be surprised' according to Ramstedt (1957, p.48, 1952, p.107) and classified among the ancient Altaic correspondences. But this etymology has phonetic problems. An ancient ai diphthong has two equivalents in Chuvash: äi, or ui : PT qayir 'sand' ~ Chuv. xäyär, PT qaymaq 'cream' ~ Chuv. xäyma, PT sayla- 'to select' ~ Chuv. suyla-, PT bay- 'to become rich' ~ Chuv. puy-. This double equivalence is parallel to the double Chuvash equivalence (i, u) of the PT a. Thus the Chuvash -ü- cannot originate from an ancient ai diphthong.

Egorov (1964) in his etymological dictionary gave the Tu. körkem 'beautiful' as the equivalent of the Chuvash word. This is again unacceptable for phonetical reasons. The original palatal k- does not become ɣ- in Chuvash. The Tu. körkem is a derivative of the verb kör- 'to see' and this word in Modern Chuvash is kur-.

At first sight the Chuvash word offers a contradictory phonetic character. Its initial and medial ɣ can only go back to a back k whereas its vocals at present form a front set. But this contradiction is only apparent. The original oi > ui

diphthong in Chuvash has become u: PT soy- 'to skin' ~ Chuv. sũ- (< sui soi), PT quyma 'fence', ~ Chuv. xũme, PT quytu 'defence wall' ~ Chuv. xũtĕ, PT buyur- 'to order' ~ Chuv. pũr- (< buir-), etc. This development is fairly recent in Chuvash, as such words were involved as, Chuv. pũ 'body' (< bui < boi ← boy < bod), thus these are loan-words of an age when the d > ð > y change had already taken place in the lending language.

The final -m is a regular Chuvash development: PT altun 'gold' ~ Chuv. iltäm, PT qirqin 'slave girl' ~ Chuv. xärxäm (-m already exists in this word in the VB inscriptions), PT barčun 'velvet' ~ Chuv. pursäm etc. This -m appears at an early stage as it can be observed in some of the Turkic loan-words in the Hungarian language prior to the age of the Conquest (see e. g. szám ← säm < sän), but there it is not without exceptions (see e. g. bársony). On the other hand the development had taken place in recent Tatar loan-words as well, e. g. yaxäm 'near' ← Tat. yakin. How can this apparent contradiction be explained? In Chuvash dialects one can observe an n ~ m change even today: yaxän ~ yaxäm, iltän ~ iltäm, xärxän ~ xärxäm, pursän ~ pursäm. Thus the final -m does not necessarily refer to an ancient word. As has been demonstrated, the Chuvash x can equally well correspond to a transmitting q or a ç. One need not unconditionally imagine a

spirant meditating form as in Chuvash, after the $q > x$ development temporarily there were no ka, ko, ku, ki syllables, consequently in such cases a substitution of sounds took place. Thus the Mong. foigan, or foiqun form had to become xoixǎn in Chuvash from which the form xtxěm regularly evolved through a xuixǎn form.

The word should be regarded as a Mongolian loan-word because it has a clear etymology in Mongolian (foyi 'beautiful' + -qan diminutive suffix), whereas this word has no etymology in Chuvash. The Chuvash x- may be derived from a Mongolian q whereas the reverse cannot be done, the word is unknown in the other Turkic dialects. Further investigation is needed to see how the Mongolian foyi, foyu 'beautiful' is related to the Turkic word goyi, goyu 'fat'. This may be traced back to a primary +qo- stem.

For the time of the adoption the period prior to the $o > u$, $ui > ũ$ development should be considered. But it is known, that the $ui > ũ$ development took place in Chuvash after the ST $d > \check{d} > y$ development, i. e. at any rate after the tenth-eleventh centuries (see qudrug $>$ quyrug \rightarrow xŭrě). Thus the adoption has no chronological obstacle. The Mongolian word has not been traced so far in the Volga Kipchak languages, and for this and additional phonetic reasons it is indicated that most probably we have to deal

with a direct borrowing.

15. MMo horam 'trace, road'

Mongolian: MMo: E: horum 'trace (of stag), (forest) trail; lane' (SH); W: --.

MoL: orum 'trace, footprint, stream, foundation, origin' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: orom 'trace, footprint' (KhL), orom 'id.' (BurL), orom 'trace, surface, plan', džamīn orom bān 'the way has a trace' (Ord); W: orm 'mark of something, trace, distinguishing mark, place, office' (Kalm), oram 'place' (MogR).

Chuvash: uram 'way, line' (Sirotkin 1961), ǎram, uram (Paasonen 1908), uram (Sp) 'street', oram 'id.' (PR), uram, oram 'street, merchants' row in the bazaar' (Ašmarin III, p. 268-9), ǎram 'id.' (Ašmarin IV, p. 55).

Volga Kipchak: uram 'street' (TatL, BashkL).

Cheremis: urem, orem 'street' (Räsänen 1923, RMS).

The word is unknown in Old Turkic. Our earliest Turkic data are from the thirteenth century (Yugnaki, Tef-sir), thus from a time subsequent to the appearance of the Mongolians. The word of corresponding meaning is oruq in Turkic, and this Turkic word and the Mongolian one are related in all probabilities, but their common basic word is not clear? hor- 'to turn (to the other side)'. The Mong. oro- 'to enter' cannot be related to our word as it has no h- initial in Middle Mongolian. In the Mon-

golian word there is a deverbal -m (Cf. Poppe 1927, p. 102), which is known in the Turkic languages, consequently in Chuvash as well (Cf. e.g. vilēm < ölüm 'death' < öl- 'to die'). The Mongolian word has spread to some other Turkic languages as well (Cf. Räsänen 1920, p. 82, 1969, p. 364). Ramstedt (1935, 1949) includes under this heading the Korean poram 'distinguishing mark'. The spread of the word in the Mongolian epoch may be related to the Mongolian administration. The Chuvash word could be of Volga Kipchak mediation, but it is more probable that it was directly adopted.

16. MMo Ya'uči 'matchmaker, go-between,
suitor'

Mongolian: MMo: E: Ya'ura 'between' (SH, Hy, HyAB, Ph), W: ŷura 'in between' (MA).

MoL: ŷaŷuči 'mediator, go-between' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: dzūč 'suitor, matchmaker' (KhL), zūrŷa 'go-between, suitor' (BurL), džutši 'matchmaker' (Ord), džioro 'between' (Mgr) džogon (= džōgon) 'between' (Pao); W: zūtši, zūltši 'mediator, spy' (Kalm), ŷaurā 'from among' (MogZ), ŷurō (MogR), ŷaurā (MogMrL); ŷaura (MogML), 'half, middle'.

Cheremis: saus, savuš (MRS), s'äus, saus, s'aŷas, s'aŷus, sagus, savus (Räsänen 1923, p. 190) 'wedding groomsman, witness to marriage, bridesman' ← Chuv.

[†]šausi.

Chuvash: yevčě 'suitor' (Sirotkin 1961), yevče (read yevčě) 'proxy, groomsman' (Paasonen 1908), yevčě 'suitor, procurer, go-between' (Ašmarin IV, p.264).
Volga Kipchak: yāuči 'suitor' (TatL) ŷauci 'id.' (TatO), yausi 'id.' (BashkL), sautsi 'id.' (Siberian Tatar).

The word was adopted by Chuvash in two variants. The first form has been preserved only by Cheremis, the other one is a late Tatar loan. The word was derived by Paasonen (1902, p.242) from the Tu. ŷauš 'commander, guard', by Räsänen (1920, p.190) from the Tu. yauči 'matchmaker', subsequently from a Mong. ŷabuči (1949, p.125) and most recently (1969, p.176) from a Mong. yabulči form. The word ŷauš and the Mong. yabulči cannot belong to this heading because of phonetic reasons, and the Tu. yauči is a Mongolian loan-word, in fact identical with our item. The Mongolian word consists of the [†]ŷaju 'in between' stem (Cf. ŷajura 'middle place, in between', ŷajurmaŷ 'mid-way, at a place betwixt and between' ŷabsar 'inter', ŷayi 'middle place, distance') (regarding the stem see Kotwicz 1953, pp. 334-335) - and of the nomen actoris suffix -či. I have not met the word in Middle Mongolian sources, only in Literary Mongolian and in the modern dialects, but as a Middle Mon-

golian loan-word it exists in Chagatay (yauči), in Karakalpak, with the Altai Turks and the Kirghiz. Cheremis had adopted the word after the Chuvash ŷ > ś development, but prior to the ś > s development that had taken place in the majority of the Cheremis dialects (Cf. Cher. surt 'house' ← Chuv. śurt < ŷurt, Cher. sorta 'candle' ← Chuv. śorta < ŷarta etc.). The Cheremis and the Volga Kipchak words have retained the MMo diphthong. The late Chuv. jevčě is from a time following the Tatar ya > yā development.

17. MMo malaŷai 'cap'

Mongolian: MMo: E: maqalai 'cap' (SH), maŷala (Chy);
W: maŷala (IMM, IMI), maqalai 'id.' (MA).

MoL: malaŷa, malaŷai 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: malgay 'id.' (KhL), malgay (BurL), malaga (Ord), malay (Ūjūm), magal (DahHP), magala, maxala (DahIv), max'la, mahal (DahMu), malexe (DahM), marga (Mgr), magala (Tung), malge (Pao); W: malxā (OirK), maxlā, malxā (Kalm), malŷai (MogZ,K), malŷei (MogR), malghai (MogL), malŷai (MogMrL), malŷei (MogML, MogMSL), all with identical meaning.

Chuvash: mulaxxay 'cap, a malahay' (Sirotkin 1961), malaxay 'pointed winter cap' (Paasonen 1908), molaxay (PR), mulaxay, mulaxxay (Ašmarin VIII, p.260), malaxay, malaxxay (loc. cit. p.183).

Volga Kipchak: malaxai 'pointed fur cap' (TatR IV, 2037).

Cheremis: malaxai 'fur cap' (Räsänen 1920, p. 135, 1923, p. 45).

The word passed into Russian from Mongolian (Cf. Fasmer, II, p. 562, Räsänen 1969, p. 324) and the malaxai items in the Volga languages are partly re-borrowed from Russian. The Mongolian word passed into Teleut (Räsänen 1969, p. 324) and Manchu (maxala). Data of Mongolian linguistic history indicate that of the maɣala(i) ~ malaɣa(i) variants the first is the older one and the second is the result of metathesis, but until the etymology of the word is definitely identified, the problem cannot be finally solved. The Chuv. mulaxxay may be a regular adoption of a MMo malaɣai form. The survival of the final -ai (Cf. Note 2) is an important criterion of its being a loan. Egorov (1964, p. 135) refers to the Mongolian parallel, and Räsänen (loc. cit.) also considers the word to be of Mongolian origin.

18. MMo mergen 'a good marksman, wise'
Mongolian: MMo: E: mergen 'honest, clever (woman)'
(SH), mergen 'clever (in everything)' (Hy), mergen 'wise,
learned' (Ph); W: --.
MoL: mergen 'a good marksman, wise, experienced'
(Lessing)

ModMo: E: mergen 'excellent archer; clever, wise, punctual', mergen buudagč 'exact marksman' (KhL), merge(n) 'excellent archer, clever, wise, punctual' (BurL), mergen 'clever, cunning' (Ord), mergē 'wise' (Üjüm), mergen 'id.' (Jar), mergen 'wise, hunter' (DahM), miergän 'clever, able, wise' (Mgr), mergen 'exact, wise' (Tung);
W: mergn 'artist, clever, one who understands his craft, hunter' (Kalm).

Cheremis: margan 'punctual' (Räsänen 1969, p. 335, MRS).

Volga Kipchak: mārgän 'exact archer', 'a master shot, exact, exactly' (BashkL).

The word was adopted by several Turkic languages as well (Cf. Doerfer I, p. 498, Räsänen 1969, p. 335) and subsequently it has also spread among the Ob-Ugrian and the southern Samoyed languages (Cf. Joki 1952, p. 228). It reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation as was correctly stated by Räsänen (loc. cit.) and Doerfer (loc. cit.), but the word is unknown in Modern Chuvash. On the other hand, it is known in several Manchu-Tunguz languages. Mongolian loan-words are the Manchu mergen (Cf. Ligeti 1960, p. 243, Doerfer, loc. cit.), the Evenki mergen 'sorrow' and the Even mergen 'reason', the Ude mejge 'id.' and the Nanay mergen 'successful, good son'. In Mongolian only the verbal form of the word, derived from the mergen substantive, occurs, but the Manchu merki- 'to

be conscious', the Evenki merge- 'to despair, to be sad, to ponder, to meditate', the Even merge- 'to think' and the Negidal meygen- 'to be sad, to feel sorry for something', the Ude meisi- 'to think', the Oroch miyči- 'id.' refer to the existence of a verb ⁺merge-. As one would expect, there is a Y- in Manchu in the original place of -rg-, the family of words at least in part should be regarded as loans. The Even and Evenki -rg-, the Nederal -yg- may be ancient as well as loans, but in the place of the Oroch -yč-, the Ude -ys- one would expect -gg/kk-, or k/g ~ yg forms in the case of an ancient Manchu-Tunguz -rg- (Cf. Cincius 1949, pp.230-231, 236-237, Benzing 1955, pp.995-996, Ligeti 1960, p.241), therefore even the Manchu-Tunguz verbal forms should be regarded as loans keeping open the alternative that not every Manchu-Tunguz dialect had borrowed the word directly from Mongolian, but the image is confused by loans within the Manchu-Tunguz group itself. Thus the basic meaning of the Mongolian verb is approximately 'to be in trouble' (as to the context of the meanings of 'sorrow', 'to be sad' and 'to think' Cf. the connection between the Hungarian gond 'trouble' and gondolkodni 'to think'), of this the meaning 'to be conscious, resolute' and subsequently 'to do something well, exactly, consciously (e. g. to shoot to target)'. The semantic development is explained by Doerfer (loc. cit.) in a different manner.

Thus the Indo-Iranian etymology suggested by Fasmer (Cf. Sanskrit mrgayus 'hunter', III, p. 660) should be regarded improbable primarily because of reasons of semantic history. The Mongolian word passed into Chuvash after the Chuvash ā > a development.

19. MMo moqa 'blunt'

Mongolian: MMo: E: moqodaq 'blunt' (Hy); W: moqadaq 'id.' (MA).

MoL: moqoḡa 'blunt', moqo- 'to be blunt' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: mochdog, mochoo 'blunt' (KhL), moxor 'curved, blunt tipped' (Drg), mochoo 'blunt' (BurL), muxudak, muxuduk, muxugur, muxun, muxur 'id.' (Ord), mḡxḡr 'blunt, lower or external part' (Ujūm), mogordur, mogodur 'blunt', mugur 'dead-end' (Mgr), mugutu 'blunt' (Tung); W: mokā, moxā, moxā 'blunt' (Kalm).

Chuvash: māka 'blunt' (Sirotkin 1961), maka (Paasonen 1908), muka (Sp, UČP) 'id.' mōka (Ašmarin VIII, p. 294), muka, moka (loc. cit. p. 257) 'id.'.

Volga Kipchak: mokit 'stupid, dull' (TatL), mokiy 'id.' (TatDS), moqot 'dull-witted, dull of comprehension' (BashkL).

The word in Chuvash is a loan from Kipchak because of the retained -k-, where the basic word cannot be traced. The Mongolian word was adopted by several other Turkic languages (Cf. Doerfer I, pp. 509-10, Räsänen 1969,

p. 340), and also by Votyak and southern Samoyed (Joki 1952, pp. 103, 232). The word moxdaq 'blunt' occurring in the Codex Cumanicus also belongs to this family which was regarded to be of Mongolian origin even by Grønbech, but the word was not discussed by Poppe (1962) among the Mongolian elements of the Cumanian language. This is our oldest Turkic item. The word was considered to be of Mongolian origin already by Doerfer (loc. cit.) and by Räsänen (loc. cit.) without Chuvash. The Mongolian parallel was already referred to by Egorov (1964, p. 131).

20. MMo narad (plural) 'forest pine'

Mongolian: MMo: E: narat (plural) 'spruce' (SH), narasun 'pine' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: narasun, plural narad 'conifers' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: nars 'id.' (KhL), narha(n) 'id.' (BurL), narasu 'id.' (Ord), nars (DahHP) 'id.' narese 'cypress, cedar' (DahM); W: narasn 'pine' (Oirk).

Chuvash: narat 'pine' (Sirotkin 1961, dial.), narat 'Pinus silvestris (only in riddles)', narat, nart 'id.' (Asmarin IX, pp. 9, 11).

Volga Kipchak: narat 'pine' (TatL), narat yiläge 'cowberry' (BashkP).

The word in Chuvash is a Tatar, whereas in Tatar it is a Mongolian loan, as has already been rightly stated by Räsänen (1969, p. 350). The reason is that n- in initial

position does not occur in original Turkic words. It is remarkable that the word is known only in Karachai-Balkhar of the Turkic languages (narat). The Turkic relatives of the Hungarian kóris have a similar prevalence, as the word occurs only in Chuvash (kavrěś) and in Karachai (kūrūč), further on in the western Mongolian languages (Cf. Kalm. kūr^us). The affinity to this group of the Tat. korič aḡaç and the Bashk. koros agas quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 84) is doubtful, but the Ossetian kaerz, kaerzæ is related to the word kóris. Yet it is not sure that the history of the two words was identical. The word narat has so far been found only in sources of the eastern Mongolian dialects and it cannot be excluded that the Oirat word collected by Kara (1959) is also a Khalkha loan. Yet the word may have existed in old western Mongolian dialects as can be inferred from its presence in the Volga Languages.

21. MMo niḡ 'solid'

Mongolian: MMo: E: niyitaitala 'tightly' (SH < + niḡi-);

W: --.

MoL: niḡ 'solid, dense, condensed' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: njag 'dense, solid' (KhL), nigta 'id.' (BurL),

nigta 'id.' (Ord); W: nig 'dense, hard, strong (eg. scarf)' (Kalm).

Chuvash: nākā 'hard, strong' (Sirotkin 1961), nākā

'firmly, steadily' (Paasonen 1908), nāk 'densely filled (e. g. flour in the sack, etc.)' nāk, nākā 'strong, solid' (Ašmarin IX, p. 52).

Volga Kipchak: nik 'strong, solid, hard' (TatL), niq 'id.' (BashkL)

Cheremis: nək 'strong' (Räsänen 1923, p. 47).

The word exists in some other Kipchak and Siberian languages as well (Cf. Egorov 1964, p. 138), where, as has been correctly pointed out by Räsänen (1969, p. 353), it is a Mongolian loan-word. In Chuvash it is a Tatar loan because of the medial -k-. The final -ä is a secondary Chuvash phenomenon. It occurs in several other late Tatar loans: Tat. yāš → Chuv. yašě 'young', Tat. čik → Chuv. čikě 'border', Tat. kül → Chuv. külě 'lake' etc. The reason of this phenomenon is, that in Chuvash the original final reduced vowels are always in an unstressed position, thus their disappearance has begun. Under the impact of the alternative occurrence of the forms with a reduced or zero ending, the word finals were reduced even in cases where the process is etymologically unjustified. The Khalkha njaq goes back to an original ⁺niqa form, its corresponding item should have been nāka in Chuvash (in the case of an East Mongolian word mediated by Tatar), or nāxa (if the borrowing were direct).

22. MMo noxta 'halter'

Mongolian: MMo: E: --, W: noqta 'halter' (AL), noxta 'id.' (MA).

MoL: noyto 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: nogt 'id.' (KhL), noxt 'part of the halter' (Drg), nogto 'halter' (BurL), nogto 'id.' (Ord), noxt 'id.' (Üjüm), nogdō 'id.' (Mgr); W: nokt^o 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: nǎxta 'id.' (Sirotkin 1961), nǎxta (Paasonen 1908), nǒxta (Sp) 'bit (made of rope)', nǎxta (Ašmarin IX, p. 57), nǎkta (loc. cit. p. 53), nǎktov (loc. cit. p. 53) 'halter'.
Volga Kipchak: nukta 'id.' (TatL, BashkL), nokta 'id.' (TatP).

Cheremis: nukta 'id.' (Räsänen 1923, p. 48, MRS).

The Mongolian word was in extensive use in the Mongolian epoch, existing in several Turkic languages (Egorov 1964, p. 138, Doerfer I, pp. 517-18, Räsänen 1969, p. 354), and it appeared for the first time in the Codex Cumanicus (Cf. Poppe 1962, p. 336). The word was rightly considered to be of Mongolian origin by Poppe, Egorov, Doerfer and Räsänen. Chuvash had adopted the forms with -x- presumably from Mongolian at an early date, whereas the forms with -k- came from Tatar. The Cheremis word also originates from Tatar (Cf. Räsänen 1923, p. 48).

23. MMo nöker 'companion'

Mongolian: MMo: E: nökör 'companion' (SH), nökör

'id.' (Hy), nökör 'id.' (Ph); W: nöker 'friend' (IMM), nökör 'id.' (IMI), nöker 'id.' (MA), nöker 'companion' (VI).

MoL: nökör 'friend, companion, husband' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: nöchör 'comrade, companion, friend, husband' (KhL), nücher 'id.' (BurL), nökxör 'id.' (Ord), nóxör 'id.' (Üjüm), nügür 'husband' (DaHP), nokuor 'id.' (Mgr), noke 'companion' (Tung), nöker 'id.' (Pao), W: nökör 'companion, spouse' (Oirk), nökr 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: kérneker, kěrnüker 'bridesman of the bridegroom' (Sirotkin 1961) neker (Ašmarin IX, p.18), nüker (loc. cit. p.46) 'id.'.

Cheremis: nuŋar, nügar in: yes n. 'child, family, servant' (Räsänen 1923, p.47).

The word was extensively dealt with by Vladimircov (1934, passim), Németh (1953), Ligeti (1935, p.242, 1962, pp.58-59), Doerfer (I, pp.521-526) and Räsänen (1969, pp.354-5), where the spread of the word in the Turkic languages and elsewhere can be found, together with the related literature. The Chuvash correspondence has hitherto escaped the attention of the researchers. The first part of the word kérneker is identical with the word kěrü 'son-in-law, bridegroom' (< ⁺küdeg), the expression indicates the 'companions' of the bridegroom. The Mongolian word itself may be the direct antecedent of the Chuvash

word, in this case the lack of the expected $\bar{o} > \bar{ö}, \bar{ě}$ development may be attributed to the condition that the nö-syllable did not fall in initial position. The word has not occurred so far in the Volga Kipchak languages but the Cheremis word is presumably of Tatar origin.

24. MMo qaiči 'scissors'

Mongolian: MMo: E: qaiči 'scissors' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: qaiči(n) 'scissors, pincers' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: chayč(in) (KhL), xaetš (Drg), chayša (BurL), xātši (Ord), xetš (Ujum), xēš (Jar), xaič, xaiči (DahHP), kaiči (DahM), xēdzi (Mgr), kaiči (Tung); W: xātšⁱ (Kalm), qaiči (MogR), the meaning being identical everywhere with that of Literary Mongolian.

Chuvash: xačă (Sirotkin 1961), xayčă (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xayčă (Ašmarin XVI, p. 16), xač, xačă (loc. cit., p. 74).

Volga Kipchak: kaiči (TatL), qaiče, kajče, kačê, kašê (TatP), qaysi (BashkL).

Cheremis: kači, kače (Räsänen 1923, p. 5, MRS).

Poppe (1927a, p. 165) had already pointed out the Mongolian origin by Tatar mediation of the Chuvash word, and the word is discussed also by Doerfer (I, pp. 448-50) and Räsänen (1969, p. 221, 1920, p. 67, 1923, p. 35).

Egorov (1964, p. 284) who quotes the Mongolian word as well, wrongly considers the Chuvash word to be of Per-

sian origin. The word spread into several other languages besides the Turkic ones (see the data in Doerfer and Räsänen loc. cit.). It is the derivative of the Mongolian verb qayi- 'to cut', which originally meant 'to pinch, to catch'. This Mongolian verb is related to the Turkic verb qap- 'to catch', and its derivative, that is parallel to the Mongolian one is qapiti (Cf. Grønbech 1942), qipti, Khak. xipti-, Yak. kipti. (I have not found the form xapti, quoted by Poppe and adopted by Räsänen). Because of the retained -č- the Chuvash word is a relatively late loan presumably from Tatar.

25. MMo qara'ul 'watch'

Mongolian: MMo: E: qara'ul 'reconnaissance (party), scouting (patrol)' (SH); W: qara'ul 'guard' (MA).

MoL: qaračul 'guard, watch, scout' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: charuul 'karaul, watch, guard' (KhL), charuul 'id.' (BurL), xarēl 'custody' (Üjürn), xarōl 'karaul' (DahHP), karō 'id.' (Dahlv); W: xarūl (OirK), xarūl 'border sentry' (Kalm), qaraūl 'outpost' (MogZ).

Chuvash: xural 'watch, guard, karaul' (Sirotkin 1961), xural tär- 'to be on guard', xuralśě 'watch, bodyguard' (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xural, xoral 'watch, guard, night guard' (Ašmarin XVI, p.211).

Volga Kipchak: karavil 'guard' (TatL), qaravil 'id.' (BashkL).

Cheremis: orol' 'guard' (Räsänen 1920, p.170, MRS).

The word spread from Manchu to Swahili, from Russian to Arabic everywhere as a military term of the Mongolian epoch (see the data in Doerfer I, pp.399-403, Räsänen 1969, pp.235-6, Egorov 1964, p.304). The word is the derivative of the Mongolian verb qara- 'to see, to watch' with a -yul suffix (Cf. Poppe 1927, p.101). The Chuvash word is a direct adoption from Mongolian. The Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word had already been pointed out by Räsänen (1920, p.171). The second vowel of the Chuvash word originally may have been an -o-, as is indicated by the Cheremis form.

26. MMo qarčığa 'falcon'

Mongolian: MMo: E: qarčiqai 'falcon' (SH), qarčiqai 'id.' (Hy); W: q^arčiqai 'id.' (AL), qarčığa 'hawk' (MA).
MoL: qarčaya, qarčayai 'falcon, hunting bird' (Lessing).
ModMo: E: charcaga, charcagay 'hawk' (KhL), charsaga 'id.' (BurL), gartšagā 'buzzard' (Ord), xaršig 'id.' (Jar); W: xartaag 'falcon' (Oirk), xarts^a-ā 'hawk' (Kalm).
Chuvash: xurčka 'hawk' (Sirotkin 1961), xurčaka 'buzzard' (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xurčka, xorčka, 'hawk' (Ašmarin XVI, p.236).
Volga Kipchak: karčiga 'hawk' (TatL), karčəğa, qarčəğa 'id.' (TatP), qarsığa 'id.' (BashkL), karsəğa 'buzzard' (BashkP).

The word reached several Turkic languages, and moreover Mordvin, Vogul, Ostyak, Manchu, Russian, Persian, and the languages of the Caucasus, and even Korean (Cf. Doerfer, I, pp.404-405, Räsänen 1969, p.237, Egorov 1964, p.309, Lee 1964, p.191) as a hunting term. Because of -č- the word is a rather late loan in Chuvash, presumably of Tatar mediation, but its adoption was at a time prior to the a > o development. The initial x- can be a substitution as well from a time when there was no initial qa- in Chuvash.

27. MMo quda 'relative obtained through marriage'

Mongolian: MMo: E: quda 'brother-in-law' (SH), quda 'two families related through marriage of their children' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: quda 'heads of two families related through marriage of their children' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: quda 'father-in-law (svat)' (KhL), chuda 'id.' (BurL), xuda 'heads or male members of two families related by marriage, male guests invited to marriage feast' (Ord), gudā 'id.' (Mgr); W: xud^u 'in-laws, relations by marriage' (Kalm).

Chuvash: xāta 'suitor' (Sirotkin 1961), xāta, xōta 'suitor, sponsor' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: koda 'male relatives of the bridegroom, for the bride and her relatives, suitor' (TatL), koḏa 'id.'

(BashkL).

The word, which was adopted by several Turkic languages, and by Mordvin, Votyak and Persian (Cf. Doerfer I, pp.423-25, Räsänen 1969, p.296, Egorov 1964, p.295, Poppe 1927a, p.155) is consequently regarded by Doerfer (1962, p. 260) as a Tatar loan in Chuvash. This has no criterion whatsoever. If it still happens to be a Tatar loan then it belongs to the most archaic layer, because the Tat. ko < ⁺qu syllable had preserved its initial k- in the later loans (Cf. PT qural 'tool' > Tat. koräl → Chuv käräl, see below p). The definite Mongolian origin of the word is testified by the retained -d- (the -t- of Chuvash orthography is pronounced as D), which, in the case of original -d- would have been -y- in the Volga Kipchak languages, and -r- in Chuvash.

28. MMo siltaŋ 'cause'

Mongolian: MMo: E: šiltaŋ, šilta'a 'cause' (SH), šiltan, šilta'an 'id.' (Hy, HyAß), šiltā 'id.' (HyB), šilt'a- 'to give a handle for something, to use evasions' (Ph); W: šiltaq 'pretext' (MA).

MoL: siltaŋ 'cause, pretext, trick' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: šaltag 'id.' (KhL) šaltag 'id.' (BurL), šiltak 'id.' (Ord); W: šaltag 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: sältav 'occasion, pretext, motive, cause' (Sirotkin 1961), sältav (Ašmarin XI, p.243), sälttav (loc. cit.).

p.244) 'id.' sältäk 'fault, shortcoming, cause, manner' (Sirotkin 1961, dial).

Volga Kipchak: siltau 'pretext, excuse' (TatL), silta- 'to seek pretexts, to use excuses, to make excuses' (TatL); hiltau 'excuse, pretext' (BashkL), hiltaula- 'to seek excuses, to use pretexts, to make excuses'.

Cheremis: siltik 'occasion, cause, stratagem' (MRS, Fedotov 1965, p.110).

The earliest occurrence of the word in the Turkic languages is in the Codex Cumanicus, the editor of which regarded our item to be a Mongolian word. It exists in several Turkic languages as well (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p. 416, Doerfer I, pp.358-360). The Volga languages, including Cheremis too, indicate a transferring si- and not a ši- syllable. In the Volga Kipchak languages the ši- syllable was originally unknown, thus it may be in part the result of sound substitution. In Chuvash the word is of Tatar origin but it is interesting to note that the form with -k- has not yet been traced in the Volga Kipchak languages. The -av terminal refers to a fairly recent adoption (Cf. Chuv. karlav 'forked curry-comb' ← Tat. karlau, Chuv. xutav 'peck' ← Tat. qadau). The Volga Kipchak verbal forms are secondary derivatives of Mongolian origin. The ancient, and perhaps related Turkic word is filtaq, which would have been tiltau in Ta-

tar and ⁺čelte in Chuvash.

29. MMo sayi 'good'

Mongolian: MMo: E: sayi, sayin 'good, correct' (SH), sayin 'id.' (Hy, HyA), sayin (Ph); W: sayin 'true, healthy' (IMM, IMT), sayin 'good' (AL), sayin 'id.' (MA), sayin 'id.' (VI).

MoL: sayin 'good' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: sayn 'good' (KhL), hayn 'id.' (BurL), sān 'id.' (Ord), sān 'id.' (Jar), sen 'id.' (Dahlv), sain 'id.' (DahM), šai 'id.' (DahTsL), sēn 'id.' (Mgr), saŋ 'id.' (Pao): W: sān 'id.' (Oirk, Kalm), sāin 'right' (MogR, MrL, ML).

Chuvash: sayă 'good' (Sirotkin 1961, dial., Ašmarin XI, p.4).

Cheremis: say 'good' (Räsänen 1923, p.58, MRS).

The word occurs in Kirghiz too, but there it is only used in connection with race-horses and this may have been the cause of its spread in the Volga-region as well. The word has not yet been traced in the Volga Kipchak languages, but both the Chuvash as well as the Cheremis words are of Tatar origin. The Mongolian word cannot be separated from the PT saŋ 'good, healthy, clean, right side' (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p.394, the word saŋ is missing from its alphabetic place, Poppe 1960a, pp.29,61,137), and goes back to an earlier ⁺saŋi form. A PT saŋ would

have become su in Chuvash (Cf. su- 'to milk' < saɣ-).

Conclusions regarding the MMo

linguistic condition

The MMo disyllables of identical vowels (V₁V₂) had already become long (6, 8), whereas the disyllables containing different vowels (V₁V₂) are still reflected in the diphthongs (16). The vowel of the second open syllable had frequently been dropped (1, 2, 9), or alternating can be traced (26). The most important feature is the western Mongolian characteristic of the vocalisation of the second syllable as reflected in our material which shows the il-labial variant without exception (4, 5, 7, 15, 19, 22, 23). The 'breaking' of i has not yet taken place (10, 28). The MMo h- is not reflected in this material (15). Chuvash x- corresponds to the Mongolian velar q (14, 24, 25, 26, 27), but this may be a Chuvash substitution as well. The same applies also to the back ɣ (5, 14, 17, 22). In late loans and in those of definitely Tatar transmission the original guttural plosives appear in Chuvash as plosives (19, 26, 28), but since there was no x- Tatar, therefore this phenomenon does not provide any footing to the chronology of the western Mongolian q > x development. The dual Tatar correspondence of the terminal -ɣ (-u ~ -k 28) suggests the inference that in the lending language there was a voiceless medial G, as in the case of a voiced plosive

one would expect only an -u, and in the case of a voiceless fortis a -k correspondence. The si- syllable has not yet become ʃi- in a back voiced word, but this may be a Tatar substitution as well.

Conclusions regarding Chuvash Phonology

The most important conclusions are of a chronological nature. The following changes are later than the words of Mongolian origin:

1. $\overset{\circ}{\underline{a}} > \underline{o}, \underline{u}$ (1, 2, 17, 25, 26). Consequently the words where an a has been retained - a Chuvash e reflects a Tatar $\underline{a} > \overset{\circ}{\underline{a}}$ development - are of rather late Tatar origin (20, 24, 29 and 16).

2. $\overset{\circ}{\underline{a}} > \underline{a}$ (3, 18), $\underline{e} > \underline{i}$ (11, 12, 13). The fact that the Mongolian e has two different reflections in Chuvash, may have several reasons. It is possible that there was an original $\overset{\circ}{\underline{a}}:\underline{e}$ opposition in the borrowing language, and Mongolian (where such an opposition did not exist) had such an e sound which did not coincide with either of the two. Thus two kinds of sound substitution evolved. We may imagine also that the $\overset{\circ}{\underline{a}}$ and e were not in phonemic opposition in Chuvash but that they occurred as phonetic variants which subsequently phonematized. But it is definite in both cases, that the $\overset{\circ}{\underline{a}} > \underline{a}$ and $\underline{e} > \underline{i}$ changes in Chuvash, and the latter in the Volga Kipchak languages, are from a time after the Mongolian epoch.

3. $\underline{o} > \text{Viry. } \underline{\ddot{o}}, \text{ An. } \underline{\check{a}}, \underline{u}, \underline{u} > \text{Viry. } \underline{\ddot{o}}, \text{ An. } \underline{\check{a}}$ (4, 9, 22, 27). Whereas in two cases the reduction did not take place (5, 7), which may have had dialectal reasons, at the same time a change may be observed also e.g. in word 13, and in the word puśaxa, where the analogic impact of the word puś- may have played some role. The Tatar adoption may also explain the lack of reduction.

4. $\underline{i} > \underline{\check{x}}$ (10, 11, 28) which indirectly means that the appearance of the Chuvash i corresponding to the PT a is quite a new phenomenon.

5. $\underline{u} > \underline{\check{a}v\check{a}} \sim \underline{u}$ (6), but $\underline{u} > \underline{u} > \underline{\ddot{o}}, \underline{\check{a}}$ (8). The long ū as represented by āvā, is not unknown in Chuvash. (PT ū 'tinder' $> \underline{\check{a}v\check{a}} \sim \underline{u}$).

6. $\underline{oi} > \underline{ui} > \underline{u}$ (14) which is important as regards the chronology of the development of secondary Chuvash ū.

7. The reduction of the closed vowels in other than first syllables (4, 8, 14, 29) is also reflected in the loan-words, where sound substitution may also have taken place naturally.

In the sphere of consonants the unvoicing of the initial voiced ones can be observed: $\underline{b} > \underline{p}$ (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), $\underline{d} > \underline{t}$ (11, 12), but here the Mongolian loan-words do not provide any footing to the chronology of the phenomenon, though it is highly probable that the process began later than the thirteenth century, yet in theory sound sub-

stitution may have also taken place. If already at the time of borrowing there was only initial p- in Chuvash, then the lending b- could only be reflected with p-. The spirantization of the back guttural plosives (k, g) of Chuvash may have already taken place before the Mongolian epoch as is indicated by the Volga-Bulgarian inscriptions among others, therefore the Mong. q, ɣ > Chuv. x ~ xx correspondences are most probably also the results of sound substitution. In one case (16) the Mongolian ɣ and ɣ̣ had become ś, and ɣ̣ in all other cases (4, 9, 10, 16, 24, 26). This indicates that the spirantization of the affricates was practically complete by the time of adopting the Middle Mongolian loan-words. As until the end of the fourteenth century there are still affricates in the Volga-Bulgarian inscriptions, these words should be regarded as borrowings later than the fourteenth century. As in two of the above words (9, 26) the ā > o, u development also occurs, on this basis it can be definitely dated as post-fourteenth century.

On the n > m development, and the n > m alteration see p .

Conclusions regarding the Chuvash Loan-
-Words in the Cheremis Language

The very fact, that out of the 29 Middle Mongolian words of Chuvash 17 exist also in Cheremis, indicates,

that the bulk of the Chuvash and Tatar loans in Cheremis are later than the Mongolian epoch, i. e. later than the thirteenth century. The greater part of the Middle Mongolian words adopted by Cheremis are of Tatar transmission, and for the remaining portion we have no criteria to decide whether the given word is of Tatar, or of Chuvash origin in Cheremis. Words 3, 16, 18 and 25 are definitely of Chuvash origin. These indicate that the $\underline{\acute{s}} - > \underline{s} -$ and $\underline{x} - \sim \underline{\emptyset} -$ developments in Cheremis are from the post-Mongolian epoch and item 28 shows that the $\underline{s} > \underline{\acute{s}}$ development is also later than the Mongolian era. From the very fact that the Chuvash $\underline{\acute{a}} > \underline{o, u}$ or $\underline{\acute{a}} > \underline{a}$ development is also reflected in Cheremis words 25, 3 and 18, we may infer that all those other Chuvash loan-words, where the same phenomenon is reflected, were borrowings after the thirteenth century. And this is a statement concerning the majority of the Chuvash loan words in Cheremis.

It is commonly known that there is a debate going on among scholars on the correspondences of Meadow Cheremis $\underline{a} \sim$ Mountain Cheremis $\underline{\acute{a}}$, and Meadow $\underline{o} \sim$ Mountain \underline{a} . According to Gombocz (1909-10, p. 249), Wichmann (1923-24, pp. 44-45) and Itkonen (1969, pp. 243-246) the $\underline{\acute{a}}$ and $\underline{a/\acute{a}/}$ are older, whereas according to Räsänen (1920, pp. 79-81), Beke (1935, pp. 68-69) and Bereczki (1968, p. 30, 1971, pp. 25-27) the Mountain Cheremis $\underline{\acute{a}}$ and \underline{a} are sec-

ondary. Two of the words of Middle Mongolian origin occur in Mountain Cheremis: parʃa (13) (Ramstedt 1902, Tr, Bud, Cf. Räsänen 1920) and orolâ, orolaš, xoro'laš (25) (Ramstedt 1902). But in these two words there is no ä, or a. In the Chuvash loan-words of the Cheremis language the following correspondences are known:

$\begin{array}{l} x \\ \underline{ä} \end{array} > \text{Chuv. } \underline{a} \rightarrow$	$\begin{array}{l} 1. \text{ Meadow, Mountain } \underline{a} \\ 2. \text{ Meadow } \underline{a} \sim \text{ Mountain } \underline{ä} \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{l} x \\ \underline{ä} \\ x \\ \underline{o} \\ x \\ \underline{u} \end{array} \left. \begin{array}{l} / \\ / \\ / \end{array} \right\} \text{Chuv. } \underline{o} \rightarrow$	$\begin{array}{l} 1. \text{ Meadow, Mountain } \underline{o} \\ 2. \text{ Meadow } \underline{o} \sim \text{ Mountain } \underline{a}. \end{array}$

Though in our material there are only two such words that belong to this group, yet it is remarkable that both of them can be classified under category one. The question is what is the chronological relationship between the two categories.

It has not yet been considered that the $x \sim \emptyset$ correspondence is characteristic of the words belonging to the first category in Meadow and Mountain Cheremis (PT qadın 'brother-in-law, father-in-law' > gayın → Chuv. gayn > xon → Mountain on, Meadow on, see further examples in Räsänen 1920, p. 83, whereas in words of the second category in Mountain Cheremis the x- has been retained (PT qan 'khan' > Chuv. xon → Mountain xan ~ Meadow on, or Arabic → Chuv. xarsär 'diligent'

→ Mountain xārsar, Meadow arsar, see further 15 examples in Räsänen 1920, p.22). Had Cheremis adopted words of the second category prior to those of the first one, it would be incomprehensible for a ~~ʃ~~ to be retained in Mountain Cheremis.

The most probable solution seems to be the following: Common Cheremis had no initial ~~ʃ~~-. The earlier Chuvash loan-words, which had an initial ~~ʃ~~ - were adopted without this sound. Later under the massive influence of Chuvash the initial ~~ʃ~~ - developed in Mountain Cheremis and in consequence in later, already separately borrowed Chuvash words the ~~ʃ~~ - has been preserved.

It is rather interesting that those Tatar loan-words in the Cheremis language that belong to category one still show the conditions prior to the Tatar o > u development (see examples in Räsänen 1923, pp.14-5). Words belonging to the second category are of a time after the u > o development, e.g. PT yuldaš 'companion' > Tat. yoldaš → Mountain yaldaš, Meadow yoldaš, PT yumaq 'legend' > Tat. dial yomak 'riddle' → Mountain yamak, Meadow yomak. A section of the Tatar words reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation. Thus e.g. the PT qān- 'to rest, to repose' > Tat. kan- → Chuv. kan- → Mountain kān- ~ Meadow kan-. The fact that this word reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation is shown by a derivative of

the verb: Chuv. kanáśśär 'turbulent, restless' → Mountain kānəsər, Meadow kanəsər. In fact three chronological layers of Tatar loan-words in Chuvash can be easily isolated:

1. Tat. ka → Chuv. xu- (e. g. kaška 'white spot on head of horse' → Chuv. xuška)
2. Tat. ka → Chuv. xa- (e. g. kapka 'gate' → Chuv. xapxa)
3. Tat. ka → Chuv. ka- (karčik 'old' → Chuv. karčäk).

Thus the Mountain Cheremis kānəsər belongs to the third layer and as such it is a very recent one, yet the a > ā development has taken place in it. Therefore it appears, that the Middle Mongolian loan-words, the internal and related sound-changes in Chuvash and Tatar all indicate that the Mountain Cheremis a > ā, and o > a development is relatively new and it is by no means a retained archaism.

One problem however still remains to be solved. If we presume that Cheremis took over the Chuvash o as o in the words of category one, and later both Cheremis dialects retained it as o, then why did the Chuvash o become an a in Mountain Cheremis of the second category? The two sounds, i. e. the one remaining o and the other becoming a cannot be of identical origin in Mountain Cheremis. We have to presume that in the words of the second category Mountain Cheremis did not adopt the Chu-

vash o as o, but as ȯ, and not a as a, but as ȧ:

Category one

Meadow					
Chuv.	<u>o</u>	→	o ↑ o ↓ o	a ↑ a ↓ a	← Chuv. <u>a</u>
Mountain					

Category two

Meadow					
Chuv.	<u>o</u>	--	o ↑ a ↓ a	ȧ ↑ ȧ ↓ ȧ	← Chuv. <u>a</u>
Mountain					

The existence of the labial ȧ in Cheremis has been postulated by several scholars (Cf. Serebennikov 1957, pp.224-230, Itkonen 1969, p.217, Collinder 1960, p.153, etc.), and the slightly palatalized ȧ exists until now in the Mountain dialects of Cheremis (Cf. Sovremennyj 1960, p.48). At the time of category two there was obviously a phonetic difference between the Chuvash o and the o of Mountain Cheremis, this is why Mountain Cheremis adopted the Chuvash o as ȧ and the position of a may have been similar. For the final settlement of these problems Chuvash-Cheremis contrastive phonetics is needed.

+++

In conclusion a few words should be devoted to the role of the Mongols in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries as reflected by the loan-words. It is not by coincidence that most of the Mongolian words here referred to, can be

found not only in the Volga languages but in several other ones as well, in all the languages that had come into contact with the conquests of the Chinggissid empire. Though it is true that the words adopted by Chuvash represent only a fragment of the words borrowed from the Mongols by the various other languages, yet they faithfully represent those three main fields where the Mongolian impact was the strongest. With the Mongols a special kind of horse breeding had spread (3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 22, 29), and it is again under the influence of the Mongols that one kind of hunting with birds of prey had become common practice (7, 18, 26). The Mongols had an impact on the social relations and organization that should not be underestimated (1, 2?, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 25). The full image will naturally unfold only after the compilation of all the loan-words of the Mongolian epoch. This image will reflect the impact which the Mongolian conquest had on Eurasia.

ABBREVIATIONS

Mongolian

- AL Mongolian glosses of the anonymous work, the Tarjūmān turkī wa aĵamī wa muġati (Houtsma 1894, Kuryšĵanov 1970 and Poppe 1927)
- BurL Literary Buriat (Čeremisov 1951)

- Dahlv Dagur (Ivanovskij 1894)
- DahHP Dagur, Hailar dial. (Poppe 1930)
- DahM Dagur (Martin 1961)
- DahMu Dagur, Muromsky (Kałużyński 1969-70)
- DahTsL Dagur, Tsitsikar dial. (Ligeti 1933)
- Drg Dariganga (Róna-Tas 1961)
- E Eastern
- Golstunskij Literary Mongolian (Gol'stunskij 1893-1896)
- Hy The Chinese-Mongolian dictionary Hua-yi
yi-yu (Ligeti 1968, Lewicki 1949-1959 and
Haenisch 1957)
- HyA, B The documents of the Hua-yi yi-yu, see Hy
- IMI The Istanbul manuscript of Ibn Muhannā's
dictionary (Poppe 1938, Eren 1950 and
Weiers 1972)
- IMM The Melioranskij manuscript of Ibn
Muhanna's dictionary (Melioranskij 1904)
- Jar Jarut (Kara 1970)
- Kalm Kalmuck (Ramstedt 1935)
- KhL Literary Khalkha (Luvsandéndév. 1957)
- KhC Literary Khalkha (Cével 1966)
- Kowalewski Literary Mongolian (Kowalewski 1844-1849)
- Lessing Literary Mongolian, as found in Lessing's
dictionary
- MMo Middle Mongolian

- MA Mongolian words of a 15th-century manuscript of the Mukkadimat-al-Adab (Poppe 1938)
- Mgr Monguor (Smedt-Mostaert 1933)
- ModMo Modern Mongolian
- MogK Moghol, Kudir manuscript (Shinobu Iwamura 1961, Ligeti 1968 and Homan 1972)
- MogL Moghol, Leech's material in Ligeti 1954
- MogMrL Moghol, Marda dial. (Ligeti 1964)
- MogMSL Moghol, Marda dial. Ligeti's collection from the Sabit and Arzanabad region, see MogMrL
- MogR Moghol (Ramstedt 1905)
- MogZ Moghol, see MogK
- OirK Western Mongolian oirat (Kara 1959)
- Ord Ordos (Mostaert 1942-1944)
- Pao Pao an (Todaeva 1964)
- Ph Middle Mongolian linguistic monuments in the ḥP'ags-pa script.
- Quaz Hamdullah Qazvinni's Mongolian glosses (Pelliot 1931)
- SH Secret History of the Mongols (Haenisch 1939 and Ligeti 1971)
- VI Mongolian words of the quadrilingual

dictionary of Istanbul (Ligeti 1962)

W

West

Volga Kipchak

TatL

Literary Tatar (TRS 1966)

Tat REW

Räsänen 1969

TatDS

Data of Tatar Dialects (TTDS)

TatP

Data of Tatar Dialects according to
Paasonen (Kecskeméti 1965)

TatR

Tatar (Radloff 1893)

BashkL

Literary Bashkir (BRS)

BashkP

Bashkir (Pröhle 1903-1905)

Chuvash

Ašm

Chuvash data of Ašmarin's Thesaurus,
Cf. Ašmarin.

L

Literary Chuvash (Sirotkin 1961)

P

Paasonen's Chuvash glossary (Paasonen 1908)

Sp

Data from Spask in Paasonen's glossary
(Paasonen 1908)

PR

Räsänen's manuscript notes to Paasonen's
glossary from 1915-1917, quoted by
courtesy of I. Kecskeméti

UChP

Paasonen's data from a Chuvash text-book

POSTSCRIPT

This is an unaltered translation of my paper written
in Hungarian (Róna-Tas 1971-1972, 1973-1974). At the

14th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference held in 1971, Szeged, Hungary, I read a paper on The Altaic Theory and the History of a Middle Mongolian Loan Word in Chuvash, where I dealt with some theoretical implications concerning the "Altaic theory" in connection with the origin of the Chuvash usra- (No. 2 above). This paper was published in English in Researches in Altaic Languages (Ed. by L. Ligeti, 1975). In a paper entitled On Chuvash-Mongolian Linguistic Contacts (Poppe 1977) Poppe commented on my paper published in 1975. He summed up his view in the following: "The Mongolian loan words in Chuvash, investigated by A. Róna-Tas, entered Chuvash through the medium of a neighboring Turkic language, such as Tatar, Bashkir, etc. All of the words in question occur also in Turkic and appear in their Turkic forms and with Turkic semantics in Chuvash. Only one does not occur in Turkic, but nor is it Mongolian" (p. 111). Poppe is right when he rejects the ultimate Mongolian origin of Chuv. kărsaka 'quick, tempered, nervous' which I included in the list given in Róna-Tas 1975 but myself deleted from Róna-Tas 1971-74 which was written later, but published earlier.

As to the essence of the question I quote the relevant passage from Róna-Tas 1975 (p. 206, i. e. from the paper which Poppe discussed): "From the above it can be conclud-

ed that the following words surely are of Tatar origin [15 items enumerated]. It is clear that items 10 and 28 with their a → ä > u development are earlier than 19b, 22, 26, 30 and 31, where a has been preserved. In the case of Chuv. usra- (and upra-) we have no criteria for the Tatar medium and thus cannot decide whether they are directly borrowed from MMO or through Tatar: but the second possibility is more probable." I think that from this quotation it is clear that I myself was also of the opinion that the bulk of the loan-words in question came into Chuvash with Tatar mediation (Bashkir is less probable). I have, however, to admit that the term 'Middle Mongolian loan-word in Chuvash' is somewhat misleading, and therefore I use the formulation 'Loan-words of ultimate Middle Mongolian origin in Chuvash' as suggested by Poppe. Where I disagree with Poppe is more a methodological question. In all cases where we have clear phonetic criteria for Tatar mediation we agree with Poppe. Poppe's two other criteria are, however, not conclusive. The fact that "all of them occur not only in Ch[uvash] but also in the neighboring T[urkic] languages. There is not a single word among them that occurs only in Ch[uvash]" would not be a relevant argument even if it were true. Chuvash itself is a Turkic language, spoken in the Volga-region in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, so their

ancestors also could borrow from the Mongolian upper strata loan-words, and for historical and cultural reasons the very same ones, which the other languages did in the same area. As to the "Turkic semantics" of the Middle Mongolian loan-words we have to distinguish two features. In some cases the Volga Turkic semantics reflect a special Western Mongolian one - as does their phonetic shape. In some other cases we have to deal with a special areal development not limited to Tatar but relevant to all Volga Turkic languages. As to the details I have nothing to add with the exception of one case. To the disyllabic form parka (as in Mongolian) versus the monosyllabic form in Turkic i.e. berk Poppe adds: "it is well known that Chuvash often has an epithetic vowel on words corresponding to T[urkic] monosyllables" (op. cit. p. 114). Poppe has overlooked the fact that in all relevant cases this epithetic vowel is a reduced one which is not the case with parka. The etymological final -ǎ/ě is on its way to disappearance because of its unstressed position and in such cases hyperurbanic -ǎ/ě is appearing also in words where earlier there had never been vocalic finals.

Since the above text is an unaltered translation of Róna-Tas 1971-1974 I have not made special references to Poppe 1977.

Notes

- ¹ See e.g. Serruys (1967). Mongolian glosses in Chinese script naturally have to be separated from the Mongolian loan-words incorporated into the Chinese language. Serruys's article deals with real loan-words. Cf. also Laufer (1916), Mayrhofer (1960), Konkaspæv (1959), Németh (1953). Ligeti (1962, p. 148) has pointed out that the Hungarian dialectal word daku 'short overcoat like a sheepskin waistcoat' is a Middle Mongolian word of Cumanian transmission. The same word also exists in Chinese in the form ta-hu (see Serruys, op.cit.). It will suffice to run through the Russian etymological dictionary of Vasmer to see how many Middle Mongolian words are adopted in Russian, mainly with Turkic mediation.
- ² Egorov identifies the word nar, occurring in the Chuvash expression nar pek xitre but unknown in Chuvash in independent use, with the Mongolian word nara, obviously having in mind some meaning such as 'beautiful like the Sun'. The word nar occurs in Modern Chuvash in several instances expressing intensity: nar pek xërlë 'very red', nar pek samăr 'very greasy'. Ašmarin (IX, p. 8) notes that the word, the ancient meaning of which is now forgotten, may express some specifically good quality with such features as 'complete', 'flourishing', 'pure', 'beautiful', since it is frequently used to describe girls. He suggests that the word may be in some relation to the nar meaning 'pomegranate' quoted in Radlov's dictionary. This view has been accepted by Räsänen (1969, p.350) as well. The word cannot be Mongolian because of phonetic reasons too, as in Chuvash a Mongolian a, would have become o, u. It is an obvious loan from Tatar where there are two such words: nar 'pomegran-

ate' and nar 'dromedary', both of Persian origin. It cannot be excluded that the two words mixed in Chuvash in so far as the original meaning was 'pomegranate' ('as beautiful as a pomegranate') but its function expressing intensity developed by a semantic extension covering the meaning of the other one (see beastly large etc.). Even the phonetic form of the Chuvash word njuxa is curious. The word is transcribed by Egorov in his quoted work with n and ju whereas in his etymological dictionary it is given with an n and palatalization mark. In the old Cyrillic-Chuvash alphabet of Jakovlev there was no doubt a letter n̄. But such an initial sound exists in Chuvash only in a single group of words, those of children's language. Such are the words e. g. nam 'food', nanne 'grandmother', nani, nana 'dear', nanam 'my dear', etc. Ašmarin (IX, pp. 62-64) lists among these words the word naxxa 'dog' noting, that this is a word of children's language. The word nuxa is also such a word as I experienced for myself while collecting among the Chuvash people. Incidentally the Chuvash word cannot be an ancient Mongolian loan-word either because of phonetic considerations (though it cannot be excluded that the initial sound of the Mongolian word was originally also a palatalized n̄). The terminal -ai has become -i in Chuvash: PT buɣdai 'wheat' > Chuv. p̄ari, PT turɣai 'larch-tree' > Chuv. t̄ari, PT sičɣai 'mouse' > Chuv. š̄ši, etc. Similarly, the word kakaɣ 'meat' is also of children's language but it has become a common word. This word cannot be identified with the Mong. ɣaqai 'swine' either, because of phonetic reasons (the a did not remain, the ɣ had become q and x and the final sound should have become -i etc.). Egorov already correctly explains the Chuvash word tixa from a taɣa (tayxa) in his etymological dictionary and mentions that the Chuvash dialects still retain a tiyxa form as well. Yet he quotes here also the Mongolian word daaga.

3 Though it is probable that these words reached the Turkic peoples of the Volga-region with Mongolian mediation, I do not discuss them under separate headings because their Mongolian origin is questionable. The Mong. arɣamaɣ ultimately goes back to an ar- 'to mislead, cheat' stem which at present can be traced only in Turkic. The substantive arɣa 'contrivance, manner' and the verb of similar form arɣa- 'to machinate, to find a way' derive from it, and both exist in Mongolian. To this the -maɣ suffix is added which is also well-known in Mongolian (qarɣur-maɣ 'cheating', qoli-maɣ 'mixture', yada-maɣ 'weak', ɕida-maɣ 'able'). But this Mongolian nominal suffix -maɣ cannot be separated from the Tu. -maq suffix of identical function. The word alaša is only known from the Secret History of the Mongols, where it indicates a horse robbed from the Jurchen Altan khan. This word indicates a species of small horse in some Turkic languages, consequently it is related in all probabilities to the Turkic word al 'short, lower' though the derivation is not clear.