

REVIEW ARTICLE  
TURKISH PHILOLOGY IN HUNGARY  
by SIR GERARD CLAUSON

This volume has\* been produced to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Chair of Turkish philology at Budapest University. Its editor is Professor Louis Ligeti, whose substantive appointment is in the Chair of "*Haute Asie*" (the best English equivalent is perhaps "Inner Asia"); he is also temporarily in charge of the Chair of Turkish philology. It contains thirty-nine articles, one written by two authors in collaboration, contributed by twenty-two Hungarians, three of whom hold academic posts abroad (including Professor János Eckmann whose recent death we all deplore), four Soviet scholars, three Germans, one holding an academic post in the U.S.A., three Turks, two holding academic posts abroad, two Poles and a Czech, an Englishman, a Finn, a Frenchman, an Italian, and a Japanese. Rather more articles are in English than in any other language, but there are nearly as many in French and German, four in Russian and one in Turkish.

It opens with an introductory article by Suzanne Kakuk, Professor in the faculty of Turkish philology, which she entitles "Cent ans d'enseignement de philologie turque à l'Université de Budapest", but in fact it covers a wider field, tracing the contacts between Hungarians and Turks back to the middle of the first millennium A.D. and explaining why Hungarians have always been more interested than other Europeans in Turkish philology. It is a little ironical that one of the most powerful stimuli for these studies was the discovery in the sixteenth century that there were various resemblances in the fields of morphology and vocabulary between the Hungarian and Turkish languages, which suggested that the two languages must be in some way related. In the nineteenth century Arminius Vambéry (1831-1913) went so far as to suggest that Hungarian was an aberrant form of Turkish. This was soon disproved, but the theory that morphological resemblances are a proof of genetic relationship still lingers on in other fields. One beneficial result of the controversy was the discovery that the Finno-Ugrian languages really were genetically related.

---

\* L. Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Turcica* (Biblioteca Orientalis Hungarica XVII). Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971, 498 pp., 19 unnumbered plates. £8.

The remaining articles cover a wide field: history, folklore, various branches of philology, textual and literary criticism, and some articles covering two or more of these subjects. It was only to be expected that most of the Hungarian contributions would be in the traditional fields of Hungarian Turcology, the history of eastern Hungary during the Turkish occupation and Turkish loanwords in Hungarian, but the balance between the various subjects listed above has been successfully achieved. Chronologically the articles cover the whole period from the earliest times to the present day, linguistically from eighth, perhaps even seventh, century Türkü inscriptions in "runic" script to some modern languages, with one or two references to Turkish words of an even earlier date preserved in foreign transcriptions. It goes without saying that the scholarly level of the articles is extremely high. No-one, except perhaps another Hungarian, would venture to criticize articles by leading experts like Gy. Györffi on Hungarian history or the article by Karl Czeglédi on the early history of the nomads in south-east Europe; and the articles on grammatical subjects by Nikolai Baskakov and several other scholars are in fields which they have made particularly their own. Special attention should be drawn to Louis Ligeti's article "Autour du *Sâkiz Yûkmeç Yaruk*", a masterly essay in textual criticism which adds much to our knowledge of this well-known Uyğur *sûtra*.

I might, however, perhaps be permitted to make some observations on points which have caught my eye in some other articles and seem to require further consideration or correction. First one general point. English scholars are always delighted when their foreign colleagues are so kind as to write articles in English, particularly such good English as that in this volume, but they do greatly deprecate the increasing use of the word "Turkic". They have always used and will continue to use "Turkish" as the generic name for all languages spoken by Turks, qualifying it when appropriate by such adjectives as early, mediaeval, modern, standard and L/R for the two great branches of the language, Republican for the modern language of the Turkish Republic and so on. They also use "Turkish" as the appropriate adjective for qualifying such nouns as "peoples, tribes, literature" and so on. They see no more justification for substituting Turkic for Turkish than they would for substituting Hungaric for Hungarian or Englic for English.

Pentti Aalto's most interesting article, "Iranian contacts of the Turks in pre-Islamic times", is largely based on the assumption that all the early Turkish contacts with Indo-Europeans were with Iranians and that the chieftains buried in the Pazyryk and other kurgans in the Altay mountains were Iranians. I think, however, that most scholars who have recently studied this question would now agree that, although these chieftains were certainly Indo-Europeans, they were not Iranians but ancestors of the peoples who were still speaking the Tokharian languages in Chinese Turkestan in the middle of the first millennium A.D. Sergey Rudenko in *Kultura naseleniya Yuzhnogo Altaya v Skifskoe vremya*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960, p. 339, suggested that they were Yüeh-chih and E. G. Pulley-

blank has since shown that the Yüeh-chih were almost certainly Proto-Tokharians. The Tokharian loanwords in early Turkish seem to be an earlier layer than the Sogdian and other Iranian loanwords, perhaps even earlier than the Chinese. It is no longer safe to identify the "animal style" exclusively with the Scythians who, on the historical evidence at present available, seem to have moved west from the original Iranian homeland when the other Iranians moved south-east, and when they moved east in the first millennium B.C. never got further than Assyria.

Louis Bazin, in his article, "Note sur Angyirt nom turco-mongol d'une variété de canards", has incautiously accepted Gerhard Doerfer's suggestion that a "Turco-Mongolian" word *angyirt* lies behind the Turkish word *anıt* and the Mongolian word *angir*. There are two objections to this. The first is that, while both words begin with *ay-* and are the names of water birds, they are the names of different birds. *Anıt*, first noted in the eleventh century and still in use, means "Anas casarca, the ruddy goose (or shelldrake)". The history of *angir* is more complicated. It occurs in the Secret History (thirteenth century) and the *Hua-li-yü* of A.D. 1389 and in both is translated by the Chinese phrase *yüan yang* "Aix galericulata, mandarin duck"; in Classical and modern Mongolian it means "Anas nigra, black diver", in Russian *turpan*. The second is that no word longer than a monosyllable in early Turkish and no word of any length in early Mongolian ended in a consonantal cluster like *-rt*.

Alessio Bombaci in his article, "The husbands of Princess Hsien-li Bilgä" has assembled in his usual masterly fashion all the references in Chinese texts to the tragic history of this daughter of Kapğan Xağan, the second *xağan* of the Second Eastern Türkü Empire, and studied in depth the various problems which arise from them.

One of these is whether the Turks practised exogamy or endogamy. It has always been supposed that the Turks, like the Chinese and Mongols, were exogamists, but some incidents in the Princess's life, if the texts have been correctly translated, which cannot be taken as certain, suggest the contrary. Precise evidence is scarce. There were in early Turkish two words *böşük* "a tribe or clan to members of which one's daughters can be given in marriage" and *tünür* "a tribe or clan from which daughters can be taken in marriage". The equivalent Mongolian words were *quda* and *anda*. These terms point clearly in the direction of exogamy, but it is not clear whether they were mutually exclusive, that is that a tribe or clan could not be both *böşük* and *tünür*, in which case neither of the parents of a girl whom a man married could belong to his own tribe or clan, or whether it could be both in which case the girl's mother might belong to the man's tribe or clan, but on the whole the second alternative is the likelier. The A-shih-na clan was the royal clan of the Eastern Türkü Empire; the next most aristocratic was the A-shih-tê. These were certainly both *böşük* and *tünür*; Bilge Xağan A-shih-na married a daughter of the great Toñukuk A-shih-tê, and A-shih-tê Mi-mi married a daughter of Ka pğan Xağan A-shih-na. One other document is possibly relevant, but it is a very late Uyğur one dating from the period of Mongolian rule in Chinese Turkestan. This document, No. 78 in V. V. Radloff's *Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, Leningrad, 1928 is, in Radloff's edition, almost unintelligible. In the skilled hands of R. R. Arat, who published it in the records of the fifth meeting of P.I.A.C. in Helsinki (*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* LXV) p. 62, it turned out to be a testamentary document addressed by the writer to his wife, in which he instructed her not to marry again after his death, but to take over his house and bring up his son Altmış Kaya, and also declared that if his sons Kosañ and Esen Kaya said "she is our step-mother and belongs to us, we will take her" they should be subject to various penalties. This could be taken as a reference to the practice that sons could marry the wives, other than their own mother, of their deceased father, but I do not think that this was a Turkish practice; it is much

more likely that the testator anticipated a possible attempt by his elder sons to get hold of the old lady's money.

One word of caution is perhaps necessary. Pelliot was an unrivalled master of Chinese, but his hold on Turkish was less sure; in particular some of his reconstructions of Turkish words from Chinese transcriptions are open to criticism. For example (p. 111) *tenriken* "pious" is not a possible equivalent of *shêng t'ien* "dieu saint", though *tenridem* "god-like" possibly might be. I do not personally regard *Ho-lu* as a possible transcription of *uluğ* "great"; indeed for the reasons stated below in my observations on an article by Klyashtorny and Livshitz, it is very likely that *Ho-lu* is not a transcription of a known Turkish name or word.

In her interesting article, "Frühe Zeugen der Scherengitter-Jurte" Annemarie von Gabain poses the question of the age of the Turkish collapsible tent, but has very uncharacteristically overlooked two early literary references to it. In the *Irk Bitig*, the Türkü fortune-telling book tentatively ascribed to the ninth century, and possibly, but probably not, translated from some other language, paragraph 18 is a series of questions about such a tent: "What is the interior of the framework (*kere:kü:*) like? It is [all right?]. What is the smoke-hole like? It is [all right?]. What is its window like? It can be seen through. What are its curved stays (literally, 'shoulders') like? They are good. What is its girth-rope like? It has one. Know that this is a very good (omen)." In Kāşğari's *Dīwān luğātī'l-turk* (third-fourth quarters of the eleventh century) there is a saying which is quoted twice with slightly different translations; "one says of a destitute man, 'he was so badly off that he had to carry his tent-framework (*kere:kü:*) on his own back for lack of a baggage animal'" (I 404 and I 448 in Atalay's translation).

Sergey Klyashtorny in his article (in Russian), "A runic inscription from the eastern Gobi", has made a gallant attempt to translate an "inscription" on a Turkish memorial statue which was found about 180 kilometres south-east of Ulan Bator and is now in the Central State Museum in that city. Edward Tryjarski made a squeeze of it when he was there on a mission from the Polish Academy of Sciences, and showed it to me when I was in Warsaw in 1968 as the guest of the Academy. It seemed to us fairly certain that it was not a formal inscription contemporary with the statue but a series of graffiti, some of them unfinished and unintelligible, of a kind found in other places in Mongolia. What is important in it is the phrase *Élteriş xağanka*. *Élteriş* founded the Second Eastern Türkü Empire in A.D. 682 and ruled till about 693. If these words were inscribed in his lifetime they are some thirty years older than any other known specimen of the "runic" script.

Perhaps I might take this opportunity to call attention to another recent article of major importance of which Klyashtorny is the joint author, since it appeared in a serial publication in which Turkish inscriptions are not often published and may have escaped the notice of many Turcologists. In an article (in Russian), "A Sogdian inscription from Bugut", *Strany i Narody Vostoka*, X,

Moscow, 1971, he and Livshitz published and commented on an inscription which was recently discovered near Bugut in the Arakhangay *aymak* of the Mongolian People's Republic. The inscription had originally been mounted on a figure of a tortoise on the top of a kurgan. The kurgan was robbed in antiquity but was obviously a royal tomb of the First Eastern Türkü Empire, the only such tomb which has so far been discovered. The inscription is very much damaged and not more than half of it can be read, and that only with frequent lacunae between the passages which are legible. The inscription on three sides is in Sogdian; that on the fourth was tentatively described in the article as Chinese, but Klyashtorny has since told me in a letter that it is almost certainly in Brāhmī, and has suffered even more than the Sogdian part. From what has survived of the Sogdian part, which contains several references to *My'n tykyn* (Mağā:n, or Maka:n, Tégin), it seems to be the obituary of a prince of that name of the ruling family, but there does not seem to be any record of his existence in the relevant Chinese documents. There is a key sentence in II 10 "he ordered 'create the great new *saigha* (*snk*)'", which seems to indicate that he took an active part in encouraging the spread of Buddhism among the Eastern Türkü. As regards the date of the inscription, it mentions, though not in chronological order, the first five *xağans* of the First Empire: *Bumun*, the founder of the Empire, also mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions, called *T'u-mên* in the Chinese histories, who died in A.D. 552, his eldest son, called "the brother of Muğan" in this inscription and *Ko-lo* in the histories, who died in 553, *Muğan* (or *Mukan*?) who died in 572, his younger brother *Taspar*, who died between 580 and 582, and *Nivar*, his nephew, the son of "Ko-lo", who died in 587. The last three names have hitherto been known only in Chinese transcriptions, *Mu-han* or *Mu-kan*, *T'o-pa* and *Erh-fu* (probably an error for *-fa*). The *terminus post quem* date is 572, the accession of *Taspar*, the *terminus ante quem* probably 580-2, since *Taspar* appointed his nephew "junior *xağān*" during his lifetime, but in any event not much later than 587.

For some time now it has been realized that some of the highest titles of the Empire like *xağān* and *tarxān* had been inherited from earlier "Empires" and did not conform to the ordinary Turkish phonetic rules. It is also almost certain that *Bağā:tar*, which later became a common noun meaning "mighty warrior" or the like, but occurs as a personal name in the well-known "Tung-huang letter" (H. N. Orkun, *Eski Türk Yazıtları*, Istanbul, 1939, II p. 100) is the same as *Mao-tun*, the name of a famous Hsiung-nu *shan-yü*, but the logical conclusion has not so far been drawn that other Turkish names which occur in Chinese transcription and do not look really Turkish, might equally be of foreign origin. This is fairly certain now that we have some of these names in Sogdian transcription. None of them look really Turkish, neither initial *m-*, nor initial *n-* (except in *ne*: "what?" and words derived from it) existed in early Turkish, and *-sp-* did not occur as an intervocalic consonantal cluster.

Another of the surviving isolated fragments of the text (II 2) is a list of high officials in the plural, *š'ðpyt*, *tryw'nt*, *yury'p'ynt*, *twðwnt*. Except for the third, which has not so far been traced elsewhere, these are all familiar titles. The spelling *tryw'nt* kills three birds with one stone: (1) it explains the two irregular plurals in *-t* in Turkish *tarxa:n*—*tarxa:t* and *tégin*—*tégit*; although neither word is by origin Sogdian the Turks used a Sogdian plural suffix for them; *tarxa:t* was the nearest that the Turks could get to *tarxwa:nt*, since there was no *w* in the language, and no Turkish word longer than a monosyllable could end in a consonantal cluster; (2) it explains why the Chinese sometimes transcribed this word as *ta-kuan*; (3) it adds further weight to E. G. Pulleyblank's theory that the Hsiung-nu title of the supreme ruler, *shan-yü* in Modern, *jen-hjou* in Middle and *\*dān-hwāh* in Old Chinese was the origin of the title *tarx(w)an*, see A.M., N.S., IX 256. If it is confirmed that the inscription on the fourth side is in the Brāhmī script it must surely be in Buddhist Sanskrit, and the authors must be right in linking the reference to Buddhism in the inscription with the history of

Jinagupta as related in the Chinese Buddhist texts translated in Liu Mau-tsai, *Die chinesische Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-kü)*, Wiesbaden, 1959, pp. 38-9. Jinagupta was a native of Gandhāra who led a party of missionaries to preach Buddhism in China. He arrived at Ch'ang-an in 559 and was well received by the northern Chou Emperor; but there was a change of emperors and policy in 574 and the preaching of Buddhism was prohibited. Jinagupta and his party received permission to leave the country and took refuge with T'o-pa (Taspar) who received them cordially and urged them to stay with the Eastern Türkü. They stayed there for over ten years preaching Buddhism, until another change of policy enabled them to return to China. Indeed it is possible, and even likely, that the Brāhmī text, which was probably inscribed on the monument while Jinagupta was with the Eastern Türkü, was composed by Jinagupta himself.

Käthe Uray-Köhalmi's article "Drei alte innerasiatische Namen der Waffengürtel" is a study of the Turkish and Mongolian names for three articles of military equipment, the belt, the quiver, and the bow-case. She rightly calls attention to the fact that in some modern languages there is a great deal of confusion between the names of the last two but has not spotted the reason for it. This is quite simply the fundamental difference between the methods of carrying the bow as a cavalry and as an infantry weapon. The mounted archer slung as much of his gear as possible from his saddle and two articles only, the quiver and the bow-case, from his belt which was high enough above the ground to give them ample clearance. The infantryman, as all of us who have served in the infantry know, slings as much as he can from his shoulders and as little as possible from his belt, which he reinforces with a shoulder strap if anything heavy is slung from it. A bow-case slung from the belt would have been an intolerable nuisance, particularly when climbing obstacles; at the worst it might get between a man's legs when he was running and bring him down. The foot-archer, whether soldier or hunter, put his left arm, and perhaps his head, between the string and the bow and carried it over his shoulder or across his back. The bow, and with it the bow-case, long ago became obsolete as a cavalry weapon; it survived much longer as a weapon for use on foot particularly by hunters chasing fur-bearing animals in the forests. Carrying a bow necessarily involved carrying also a quiver, so it is perhaps not surprising that the words for quiver and bow-case became confused.

The basic Turkish word for "belt" was *kur*, hence *kurşa*:—"to put on a belt", hence a second word for belt *kurşa:ğ*. It is this word, in its L/R form \**kurla:ğ*, and not *kurluk* (see below) that is the base of the T'o-pa title (p. 273 of the article) *hu-lo-chên* (Middle Chinese *you-lâk-tšien*), which represents \**kurla:ğçi*:, one of the words which proves that the T'o-pa (Tavgaç) spoke an L/R language and pronounced *ç* as *l*.

There were two Turkish words for "quiver" *ké:ş*, noted from about the ninth century but apparently surviving only in Karaim, which according to Kāşgārī was not known to the Oğuz, and *okluk*, derived from *ok* "arrow", noted from the eleventh century onwards and no doubt the word used by the Oğuz.

There were three Turkish words for "bow-case": *yasık*, noted only in Kāşgārī, and presumably derived from *yas-* "to unstring (a bow)", *kuşluk*, ultimately derived from *kur-* "to string (a bow)", noted from the eleventh

century and surviving in abbreviated forms like *kurluk*, and the Oğuz/Kipçak word *kurma:n*, also noted in Kāşgārī, which was not derived from *kur-*, although the first vowel may have been influenced by it, but was a corruption of the Perso-Arabic word *qirbān* "a bow-case". As Kāşgārī points out, there were a good many corrupt Persian words in eleventh-century Oğuz.

There is no etymological connexion between *kur* "belt", the homophonous noun *kur* "rank, grade" and in some modern languages "a course of brickwork", the verb *kur-* (and the words derived from it) or *korı-* "to enclose (e.g. a burial ground or game reserve)". Similarly there is no etymological connexion between *kés* "quiver", *kiş* "sable", *kişe-* "to hobble (a horse)", the Kırğız/Karakalpak word *kise* "a purse, or bag", which is the Persian word *kisa*, the Mongolian word *keseneg* "a box for spare arrows carried across the back", or *keşik* "Wachtposten", quoted from Brockelmann's Index to Kāşgārī. The last is a pure ghost-word. The word in the passage to which Brockelmann refers is *kişig*, the accusative of *kişi*: "man". There is a Mongolian word *keşig/keşik*, but it does not mean "Wachtposten"; it is borrowed from Turkish *kesik* (< *kesük*) "a piece (cut off, *kes-*, from something else)", with the usual Mongolian sound change *si > ši*. In the thirteenth century it was used in the specialized sense of "a section" (the day or night shift) of Chinggis Khan's personal bodyguard.

The Mongolian words for the three articles were: "belt" *aysarya*; "quiver" *saydaq*; and "bow-case" *qaromsaya*. Oddly enough, although these must all be old words, I have not been able to find them in any pre-Classical text or vocabulary. *Saydaq* is certainly a word which has travelled a long way, but there is nothing particularly mysterious about it. The authoress rightly discounts the possibility that the words enumerated in pp. 271-2, a Hsiung-nu word for "boot", the name of a tribe in Jordanes, and T'o-pa title have any connexion with it. The word really began to travel only after the Mongolian expansion in the twelfth-thirteenth centuries; it soon displaced the native words for "quiver" in some Turkish languages like Çagatay and, probably *via* Turkish, found its way into other foreign languages.

Julius Németh, the doyen of Hungarian Turcologists, and the oldest Turcologist still actively at work, has contributed an article "Noms ethniques turcs d'origine totemistique", which is full of interesting matter. I must, however, enter a mild protest at the suggestion that the facts which he has assembled prove, or even suggest, that the Turks were once "totemists". Totemism proper is a very idiosyncratic form of primitive religion or superstition which is peculiar to some tribes of North American Indians: "totem" is itself a corruption of an Algonquin word. About the beginning of this century, when ethnology was still a rather new science, it seems to have been the fashion to assume that all primitive peoples, particularly those outside Europe, were, or had at some time been, "totemists".

Gombocz, who was the first scholar to take up this suggestion as applying to early Hungarians and Turks, seem to have done so without seriously considering whether the use of animal names as personal and tribal names, and the use of representations of animals as national, tribal, family and other corporate or personal badges really was peculiar to primitive peoples and proved that they were totemists. In fact, of course, this is not so; these uses are common all over the world, and perhaps commoner in Europe than anywhere else. In England many animal names are more or less common family names, for example Bird, Bull, Hart, Hawk (and Hawke), Lamb, Peacock, Sparrow, Stag (and Stagg) and Wild-bore; one of the best known Turcologists of Gombocz's generation was von Le Coq, and the new President of Italy is Signor Leone. Representations of animals

are common everywhere. There are lions on the royal arms of England, Scotland and the Netherlands. The national emblem of the United States is the eagle, and eagles figured on the arms of imperial Russia and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Romans used the figure of an eagle as their legionary standard, a practice which was revived by Napoleon. The coins of many Greek city-states bore representations of animals, the owl at Athens, the dolphin at Syracuse, and so on. Other animals including horses, appear on many family coats of arms, on the arms of British counties and towns, and as regimental badges. The junior branch of the Boy Scouts is called "wolf-cubs". No-one, so far as I know, has ever suggested that all the European peoples were therefore once totemists. Surely a more reasonable explanation is that early men took the names of certain animals as their personal names and representations of them as their badges because they thought, or wished, that they possessed the qualities of those animals. This would have been particularly common at a time when bravery and ruthlessness were regarded as the supreme human virtues. The use of **Toğrul**, which, as Németh points out, is the origin of Hungarian *Turul*, is a good example. **Toğrul** is common as a personal name, and rare as a noun; indeed it is not quite certain what kind of a bird of prey it was. Németh has quoted the meanings given by Kāşğari and Abū Hayyān; in addition Kāşğari, translating *sıḡkur* "gerfalcon", says that it was smaller than a **toğrul**, and in the Sanglax (228r.22 of the facsimile) it is said that *zaganos* in *Rūmī* (i.e. Osmanlı) meant the same as **toğrul** in Çagatay. *Zaganos* is a Greek loanword meaning "*Bubo maximus*, the hunting owl", which can be trained like a falcon. The reluctance to eat an animal which was one's badge (which is rather a *taboo*, a Polynesian word, than totemistic) may well have been due chiefly to the fact that beasts and birds of prey like lions, eagles and hunting owls, are not nice to eat.

I do not think that many scholars will be found to agree with D. Pais's article "A propos de l'étymologie du nom ethnique *Oğur*". His suggestion is that this Turkish tribal name, which occurs by itself and in compounds in early Byzantine and other western authorities, is not, as is generally accepted, the L/R Turkish form of Oğuz but a quite different name derived from a homophonous noun meaning "time, cause" etc. which he enumerates at length. Unfortunately he based this suggestion on the form given to this noun in various secondary and outdated authorities. In fact the noun always was, and where it survives still is, pronounced **uğur** and not **oğur**, which undermines his whole thesis. The plain fact is that nearly all Turkish names of tribes and sub-tribes, like Kıpçak, Kirgiz, Oğur/Oğuz, Tavğaç, Türkü, Uyğur etc. are simply names without any connexion with any known noun or verb and therefore have no "meaning".

Margit K. Palló in her paper "Ung. *gyül*- 'sich entzünden' und *gyüyt*- 'anzünden' und ihr türkischer Hintergrund" makes rather heavy weather of what is really a very simple matter, because she has been far too conscientious in reproducing the errors of scholars who have discussed this problem in the past.

She points out that there was once a basic Turkish verb \**ya*:- which meant "to set fire to (something)", but had become obsolete by the eighth century leaving numerous progeny: *yak*-, intensive, "to set fire", *yal*- passive, "to be ignited, to catch fire", *yan*- reflexive/intransitive, "to catch fire, blaze" and perhaps \**yat*- "to make something catch fire", if that is to be taken as the origin of Chuvash *şut*-. It may also be the ultimate base of *yaru*:- and *yaşu*:- "to shine",

two synonymous verbs often used in hendiadys, which a good deal later became *yar*- and *yaş*-. The passive nature of *yal*- had been so completely forgotten by the eleventh century that, like a few other intransitive and passive verbs, it was occasionally used as a transitive synonymous with *yak*-. The suggestion that *yal*- should be severed from the rest of the family and regarded as a "lautmalendes Wort" is surely not very plausible. There can be no doubt that *gyül*- is a loanword from *yal*-, but *gyüyt*- is a different matter. It cannot be Turkish because the causative form of *yal*- was *yaltur*-; it could never have been *yalt*- because the causative suffix -*t*- is attached only to verbs ending in vowels and occasionally (but I think only in the case of disyllables) -*r*-. *Gyüyt*- must therefore be a Hungarian causative formed after *gyül*- had been thoroughly assimilated. It is a matter for regret that the learned authoress has disinterred from pre-scientific nineteenth century authorities two obvious false etymologies, Vambéry's suggestion that there was a genetic connexion between *yal*- and *yultuz* "star", and Körösi Csoma's suggestion that there was a similar connexion between *yal*- and Sanskrit *jval*-. I would add that I know of no Turkish phonetic law which would justify connecting the Uyğur (and later) noun *yula*:- "torch, lamp" and *yal*-.

Andras Róna-Tas's article, "On the Chuvash guttural stops in the final position", is devoted to a searching examination of the kind which we have learnt to expect from this exact scholar of the reasons for certain inconsistencies in the evolution of the "Proto-Turkish" final guttural stops (in my terminology post-palatal *k* and *g* and velar *k* and *ğ*) in standard Turkish on the one hand and Chuvash and early Turkish loanwords in Mongolian on the other.

It is unnecessary to summarize here his ingenious explanation of these inconsistencies, but it is worth pointing out that he has shown that this explanation provides an additional argument against Ramstedt's theory that there were in Proto-Turkish, or as Ramstedt would have said "Altaic", no *ş* and *z* sounds but instead two varieties of *l* and *r* sounds, the first of which became *ş* and *z* respectively in standard Turkish and *l* and *r* in Chuvash and the early Turkish loanwords in Mongolian, while the second remained *l* and *r* everywhere. He describes these earliest Turkish loanwords in Mongolian, as "Old Chuvash (properly Çävaş) - Bulgarian". I am sorry, however, that he did not take the final step and for "Old Chuvash" substitute "Tavğaç". The last time that I discussed this with him in his home in Buda in August 1971 he said that he had some doubt whether this equation could be justified phonetically. I suggest however that the following table of known equivalences between early standard Turkish and Chuvash prove that this doubt is not justified:

Meaning	Early Turkish	Chuvash	
"stone"	ta:ş	çul	
"to shiver"	t-	çetre-	ç-
"mountain"	ta:ğ	tu/(dialect) täv	
"whetstone"	-a-	kadrak > kayrak	-ä-
"to water" (the ground etc.)	-vğ-	şavar-	-v-
	-a-		-a-
"lion"	arsla:n	araslan	
"for the sake of"	üçün	-şan/-şen	
	-ç		-ş
"interior"	iç	äş	

The history of the evolution of the Turkish languages and the differences which divide the L/R languages (Tavğaç in the far east and Old (Turkish) Bulgar

and Chuvash in the far west) from the rest, are most easily explained if it is assumed that the Tavğaç tribe was isolated from the rest of the Turks in the far eastern corner of Mongolia by the late Hsiung-nu kingdoms in Mongolia and during this period of isolation evolved the phonetic peculiarities of the L/R languages, that either during this period or a little later when the Tavğaç founded the northern, or Yüan, Wei dynasty which ruled northern China from A.D. 386 to 535, some ancestors of the Mongols, presumably the Kitañ, emerged from the forests, made contact with them and borrowed words from them, and that a section of the Tavğaç, together with the Bulgar who spoke a similar language but are not mentioned under that name in the Chinese histories, formed part of the heterogenous hordes which were led by Attila to southern Europe in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. and somehow managed to retain their identity, their language and their name. In his concluding paragraphs Róna-Tas says that he thinks that, when this earliest layer of Turkish loanwords in Mongolian has been identified and isolated, there may still be found some words common to Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus which will prove that these languages are genetically related. I wish him well in his search for these elusive words, but I feel bound to say that I am at present tackling this problem of genetic relationship from a different angle, calling in aid the data of vocabulary analysis, ethnology and archaeology, and confidently hope that I shall be able to prove that he is wrong.

In "Uigurische Brieffragmente" Semih Tezcan and Peter Zieme have done a masterly job in deciphering and translating some particularly difficult texts, and I have one or two observations.

In Text A they have silently passed over the title of the writer. This is spelt quite clearly **emğa**, but I have no doubt that it was actually **ımğa**: translated by Kāşğari (I 128) "the treasurer of public funds and supervisor of their collection". In Text B they have been in some difficulties with the "runic" scrawl on the verso which has the dubious distinction of being about the most difficult and probably the latest surviving specimen of this script. I would tentatively suggest the following alternative reading: 1-2 . . . **teñri**:- 3[-**m** . . . **alınmı:şı**:- 4 -**m savı**: **tap**. **Yarlı:ğı**: **bar erdi**:. 5 **Bolayı:n teñri:m küsi**: **küç**- 6-i: **Uluğ kut berzü:n**. **Tü**- 7[-**n**]le: **küntüz yori:sar t**- 8 . . . **b[érser eşi**: **tapsar t** . . .

In line 3 **alınmı:şı:m** looks the likeliest restoration of this word. I think that the first "indecipherable" letter is identical with the letter in line 6 transcribed by the authors **p** with a diacritical mark, and that it is a very aberrant form of **t**<sup>1</sup>; **kut**, not **kup**, is the obvious reading in line 6. The second "indecipherable" letter must surely be **p**, **tap** in line 3 and **tapsar** in line 8 make reasonable sense. If the latter is right, **bul-**, which also means "to find", is unlikely in line 5 and the nominatives **küsi**: **küçi**: seem to require **bol-**. "His fame and strength" do not make convincingly good sense, but it is difficult to accept the authors' suggestion of a hendiadys meaning "strength". There is such a hendiadys but it is **küç küsün** (or **kösün**); **küç** always comes first and **küs** is not a likely alternative form of **küsün**. The authors are certainly right in reading the odd letter in **yori:sar** as **s**<sup>1</sup>; it is not unlike the usual manuscript form of that letter which is very unlike the monumental form. I think there is a dot over the letter after **b[érser**, making it **eşi**:; the word is not obviously relevant, but it is difficult to think of an alternative. It seems reasonable to suppose that **teñri:m** means "my (earthly) Lord", not "my God". The text therefore might mean something like: ". . . my Lord . . . The message which I have received(?) from him is sufficient. There has been a command from him. May I become the fame and strength of my Lord! May he grant great favour! If he goes by day and night, if he gives . . . if he finds his companion . . ." Text D is difficult to read, but I have a hunch that the first few words are nouns and not personal names. The second word is damaged; could it be a badly written **toyınka**? The others seem to be **erenke**, . . . , **tariğçika**, **konakka** "to the men, the monks(?), the farmer(s), the guest(s), the boys and

girls led by the daughters-in-law (here, I think, **kelin** in its normal meaning) of the family". The next word, if it is the name of the writer, is more likely to be **Komak** than **Komana**, which does not look Turkish.

In "Four notes on several names for weights and measures in Uighur documents" Nobuo Yamada has brought together a very useful list of words. As he points out, although **bağ** "a roll of (silk) cloth", **kap** "a wine skin" and **batman** a unit of weight which over the centuries has varied from about two pounds, the probable figure at this period, to over half a ton recently in Chinese Turkistan, are good Turkish words, several of the others are Chinese loanwords. His identification of **iki bağ** as "a roll of double length" is particularly shrewd. **Tembin/tenpin** a liquid measure, "one thirtieth of a (standard) wineskin", is certainly a Chinese phrase; the suggestion has been made that it represents *t'ung p'ên* 銅盆 "brass bowl"; the phonetic differences make this difficult, but in any event the word has nothing to do with the word **ti:m** (or **té:m**) translated by Kāşğari (III 136) "'a skin filled with wine', and **ti:mçi**: is 'wine-merchant'. Some people call a wine-merchant **tim** but this is wrong because **-çi**: is the suffix (of nouns) for people carrying on a trade." This is probably a mistranslation. It is likely that the word is the Chinese word *tien* 店 (Middle Chinese *tem*) "a (wine) shop, inn". If this is its true meaning it is easy to see that people might have used it also as the word for the man owning such a shop.

There is a stupid slip of the pen in my own article. In line 3, page 131, the words "son of the" were omitted between "the" and "Son".