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Alfred BAMMESBERGER (Eichstätt)

URGERMANISCH *mann-:
ETYMOLOGIE UND WORTBILDUNG


¹ Einige der gotischen Belege stellen sich zu einem Stamm *mann-, während andere zum Paradigma von *mann-an- passen; vgl. dazu etwa Streitberg 1910: 114: *manna ‘Mann’ flektiert teils wie baïrgs., teils als regulärer n-Stamm’.
² Ausgewählte Nachweise aus der Sekundärliteratur zu den beiden Vorschlagen werden in den folgenden Paragraphen gegeben.
in idg. \( ^*dh(e)\dot{g}h \) bleibt problematisch, teilweise ist wohl \( ^*ghdh- \) (vgl. auch gr. \( \chi\theta\omega\nu \)) eingetreten.


5. Unsicher bleibt freilich, ob wir wirklich eine Lautentwicklung \( ^*ghm- \rightarrow \text{urg.} \ ^*gm- \rightarrow ^*m- \) annehmen dürfen. Mańczak 1998 hat die Frage eingehend untersucht und sich dafür ausgesprochen, daß urg. \( ^*mann- \) nicht mit \( ^*dhe\dot{g}h-m- \) zu verknüpfen ist. Man sollte aber erwähnen, daß es zwar keine Parallelen für die postulierte Lautentwicklung gibt, daß freilich auch keine Gegenbeispiele vorliegen.

6. Im Hinblick auf den Anlaut ist die Verknüpfung von urg. \( ^*mann- \) mit der Wurzel idg. \( ^*men- \) lautgeschichtlich problemlos. In urg. \( ^*mann- \) ist dann die \( o \)-Stufe der Wurzel zu erkennen. Die folgenden Ausführungen gehen davon aus, daß urg. \( ^*mann- \) wirklich zur Wurzel idg. \( ^*men- \) gehört. Im Zusammenhang mit der Geminata -\( nm- \) ist insbesondere die Stammbildung von \( ^*mann- \) zu behandeln.

7. Unter der Annahme, daß urg. \( ^*mann- \) zur Wurzel \( ^*men- \) gehört, wird meist eine unmittelbare Gleichsetzung mit ai. \textit{mánu-} anvisiert. Dabei liegt der  

---

\(^4\) Pokorny 1959: 726 gibt die Bedeutung der Wurzel \( ^*men- \) ‘denken, geistig erregt sein’ an.
\(^5\) Normier rekonstruiert ein idg. Paradigma “\( ^*/mánu-/ (\text{st. Kas.}) \sim ^*/mánu-/ (\text{schw. Kas.}) \)” (Normier 1980: 61), gibt aber dafür keine etymologische Verknüpfung; jedenfalls die germanischen Formen können von einem derartigen Paradigma aus nicht erklärt werden.


9. Man- wird man wohl am ehesten als Wurzelnomen einstufen. Die weiteren Überlegungen gehen davon aus, daß im Urgermanischen ein Wurzel-

8 Die Entwicklung von *manw- > *mann- wird etwa bei Kluge 1913: 76 vertreten.

10 Vgl. dazu noch Ramat 1963.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>*manōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>*man-n-az</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akk.</td>
<td>*man-an-u'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In den schwachen Formen dieses Paradigmas trat eine Form *man-n-auf, die als Grundlage für ein neues Paradigma diente: Nach dem Vorbild der Wurzelnomina des Typs *fōi- trat zu *mamm- ein neues Paradigma hinzu, dessen Nom. Pl. etwa *mamm-ez (> ae. menn etc.) lautete.


---


12 Es ist freilich auch denkbar, daß die Bildung auf -an- direkt vom Wurzelnomen aus erfolgt.


14 Daß *mann- auf der schwachen Alternante des Paradigmas *man-an- beruht, nimmt auch Brugmann 1906: 303 an; für entsprechende Entstehung der Geminata -n-n- gibt Brugmann weitere Beispiele (z. B. got. sunno ‘Sonne’).
Literaturhinweise


THE ATTRIBUTIVE AND CONCLUSIVE FORMS
OF MODERN JAPANESE AND RYUKYUAN DIALECTS
IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

This article focuses on the issue of the differences which existed, and partly still exist, between the attributive and conclusive forms of verbs and adjectives in Japanese and Ryukyuan dialects.

The verbs of the dialects of the tiny island of Hachijōjima, about 290 kilometers southwards from the coast of Tōkyō, differ in both forms, which is shown in different vowels. The conclusive form (shūshikei) has an ending in the vowel -u, as in all modern Japanese dialects; the attributive form (rentaikei) has an ending in the vowel -o. The dialects of Hachijōjima belong to the so-called eastern group of Japanese dialects, to which the dialect of Tōkyō also belongs.

Both forms differ in the Ryukyuan dialects also. The difference in the endings here is not a different vowel, however, but an ending in -ŋ for the conclusive and in -ru for the attributive form.

In Old Japanese there is also a difference between the conclusive and attributive forms. These forms lasted until the Kamakura period (12th century) when the attributive form adopted both functions. As early as the Nara period (8th century) some of the verb classes of Old Japanese were subjected to the difference between conclusive and attributive forms. This difference is evident in vowel stem verbs and irregular verbs but is absent in consonant stem verbs. A marked exception lies in some of the eastern dialects in which there is seemingly a difference between conclusive and attributive also in the consonant stem verbs. Examples of these dialects are only to be found in some poems (parts 14 and 20) of the Man'yōshū. The difference found here is a change in the vowel of the ending, exactly as in the modern dialect of Hachijōjima.

The two modern systems of the Hachijōjima and Ryukyuan dialects are similar in syntax but different in morphology, while the system of Hachijōjima seems to be a continuation of the eastern system of Old Japanese.

This article attempts to make an inventory of the systems of the modern dialects of Hachijōjima and Ryukyuan, as well as of the eastern dialects in the Man'yōshū. Further, I will compare the modern forms with the old forms to try to establish a link between the old and modern systems.
The attributive and conclusive forms in modern Japanese and Ryukyuan

Table 1 gives an overview of the attributive and conclusive forms in the modern dialects of Ryukyuan and Hachijōjima. As an example of the Ryukyuan dialects I have chosen the dialect of Shuri/Naha. Shuri is the former capital of the kingdom of Ryūkyū. Naha, originally the harbour town of Shuri, became the capital of the prefecture Okinawa after the annexation of the kingdom by Japan in 1879. Shuri was then reduced to a mere section of this new capital. The dialect of both towns however is the same. This dialect had the status of being the standard language during the period of the kingdom although the written language was Chinese. The dialect of the village Katsdate serves as an example of Hachijōjima.

For both Ryukyuan and Hachijōjima dialects holds that they essentially do not differ in their forms for the attributive and conclusive, despite sometimes considerable differences between the dialects constituting one group.

Table 1: The attributive and conclusive in the modern dialects of Ryūkyū and Hachijōjima

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Japanese</th>
<th>Shuri / Naha</th>
<th>Katsdate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kakuy</td>
<td>'write'</td>
<td>kacuruy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oyoguy</td>
<td>'swim'</td>
<td>?wizuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dasuy</td>
<td>'send out'</td>
<td>?najuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motsuy</td>
<td>'hold'</td>
<td>mucuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yomuy</td>
<td>'read'</td>
<td>junuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kau</td>
<td>'buy'</td>
<td>kojuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toby</td>
<td>'fly'</td>
<td>tuburyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toru</td>
<td>'take'</td>
<td>tujuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>'come'</td>
<td>cuuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suru</td>
<td>'do'</td>
<td>juryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shinu</td>
<td>'die'</td>
<td>jinuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aruy</td>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>?aruy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiruy</td>
<td>'put on'</td>
<td>cijuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukeruy</td>
<td>'receive'</td>
<td>?ukijuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deruy</td>
<td>'go out'</td>
<td>?najuryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takaiy</td>
<td>'high'</td>
<td>takasaru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
function. Standard Japanese on the other hand does not distinguish between both forms, neither morphologically nor syntactically. The only exception in modern Standard Japanese is the informal form of the copula da. The form da is conclusive while the attributive is na, for example, kuruma ga kirei da ‘the car is beautiful’, but kirei na kuruma ‘a beautiful car’.

Earlier research on the Ryukyuan verbs (Hattori 1959) made clear that the difference between attributive and conclusive is a relatively new development. It is certainly not a descendant of some earlier Proto-Japanese form as later researchers still maintain (Shibatani 1990:190). My research on a Korean source on the Ryukyuan language of the year 1501, enabled me to reconstruct the process and provide a relative chronology of the process as well. I offer here a brief summary of my findings which I have presented in a previous publication (Hagers 1997).

The difference between both forms suggests that it is an old mechanism, also because a comparable difference existed in Old and Classical Japanese. Also there is no trace of differences between both forms at an earlier stage of development of the language. The forms for the attributive and conclusive listed above are all compounds of the original infinitive form (cognate to the so-called ‘renyōkei’ in Japanese grammar) and a form (either the attributive or the conclusive) of the verb for ‘to be’ un cognate with the Old Japanese verb wori (modern Japanese oru). The modern adjectival forms, however, are reformed in analogy to the verb un, cognate to the Old Japanese verb ari (modern Japanese aru). The adjectives adopted the endings of un and agglutinated to the (so-called) -sa forms.

I will illustrate this process in the verbs with the cognates for the Japanese verbs kaku ‘to write’ and ukeru ‘to receive’.

*kaku ⇒ *kak+wor > *kaci+woru > *kaci+uru > *kaciuru > kacuru (attributive)
*kaku ⇒ *kak+wo(r) > *kaci+wo > *kaci+u > *kaci+u > kacu ⇒ kacu+ŋ (conclusive)
*ukuru ⇒ *u+ri+woru > *ukiji+uru > *ukijiuru > ?ukiju (attributive)
*uku ⇒ *u+ri+wo(r) > *ukiji+u > *ukijiu > ?ukiju ⇒ ?ukiju+ŋ (conclusive)

As for ‘to write’ there was first an original attributive and conclusive. For the sake of convenience I will presume that these forms were identical to the Old Japanese forms. In reality they were much closer to the modern forms, but probably not exactly identical in all cases. At one point in time, probably in the Middle Ages, these forms were replaced by a compound form, which originally was a progressive form, now serving both functions. I have placed the ending of the conclusive -ri between brackets because this ending in Japanese is an irregular ending which did not necessarily exist in Ryukyuan also. From this point on the development of both forms is somewhat diverging. The ending of the conclusive,
although probably not *-ri, wore off, while the ending -ru of the attributive remained. Palatalisation of the -k- took place under the influence of the infinitive ending -i according to a regular sound rule. Sound rules caused changes in almost every other verb class in a similar way, as the list indicates. Then the rising of the mid vowels took place: o > u and e > i. There was the subsequent assimilation of the compound form and finally the attachment of a new conclusive ending -ŋ.

The origin of the conclusive ending -ŋ is uncertain. According to the Okinawago jiten (1983) the conclusive ending is supposedly identical to the presumptive auxiliary -(a)mu which lost its function in Ryukyuan as presumptive auxiliary. The presumptive form in Ryukyuan is equal to the so-called presumptive base (mizenkei) in Classical Japanese. Although this sounds reasonable, this supposition is somewhat problematic. The Old Japanese presumptive auxiliary is not *-mu but -(a)mu, so what in traditional Japanese grammar is regarded as a verbal base or stem (the presumptive base) is really part of the auxiliary. What is the origin of this conclusive ending is still unclear. That it originally must have been -mu, however, is clear from the interrogative form, which is built with the suffix -i, is with a -m:- kacumi ‘do you write?’. The interrogative form of the negative kakan on the other hand is: kakani ‘don’t you write?’. This negative ending -ŋ originated in the form *-nu.

The reconstruction of ‘to receive’ is much more complicated. In this verb class of Old Japanese there was a difference between attributive (ukuru) and conclusive (uku). In the Kamakura period (12th century) the attributive form retained its earlier suppressed underlying stem vowel -e, and also the original conclusive form disappeared and was replaced by the new attributive ukeru. This was a long time after Japanese and Ryukyuan grew apart, so it is not probable that same process took place in Ryukyuan. Although the process seemingly repeated itself, it was even more complicated in Ryukyuan than in Japanese. The whole class changed from a vowel stem verb class to an r-stem verb class. It changed by adding the infinitive ending of the r-stem verbs to the original infinitive form. From that point on the same process took place as in the other verb classes: palatalisation (r > j), rising of the mid vowels, assimilation and attaching of a new conclusive ending.

Through my research on the Korean source I found that the palatalisations were just taking place around 1500, so the assimilated forms did not yet exist. I also discovered that at that time the conclusive form was different from the compound one, namely, the original infinitive form served as the conclusive. So at that time there was a conclusive form which was separated from the progressive form and was identical to the infinitive. Later this conclusive form was completely replaced by the original progressive, which had from then on two functions. The same is still seen in some Amami dialects from the northern Ryūkyū islands.

We can conclude from Table 1 that Hachijōjima forms are also very regular. Especially the forms of the vowel stem verbs look much like the modern Stan-
standard Japanese forms. They have retained the underlying stem vowel in their forms, as the Standard Japanese forms have. We know that these modern Japanese forms date from the Kamakura period and so these forms in Hachijōjima must be the result of coincidence or analogical reformation under the influence of the Standard Japanese forms. Since I do not believe pure coincidence, I opt for the last possibility: analogical reformation.

Table 2: The attributive and conclusive in western dialects of Old Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Japanese</th>
<th>attributive</th>
<th>Old Japanese</th>
<th>conclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaku</td>
<td>‘write’</td>
<td>kaku</td>
<td>kaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kogu</td>
<td>‘row’</td>
<td>kogu</td>
<td>kogu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dasu</td>
<td>‘send out’</td>
<td>idasu</td>
<td>idasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motsu</td>
<td>‘hold’</td>
<td>motu</td>
<td>motu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yomu</td>
<td>‘read’</td>
<td>yomu</td>
<td>yomu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kau</td>
<td>‘buy’</td>
<td>kafu</td>
<td>kafu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tobu</td>
<td>‘fly’</td>
<td>tobu</td>
<td>tobu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toru</td>
<td>‘take’</td>
<td>tworu</td>
<td>tworu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suru</td>
<td>‘do’</td>
<td>suru</td>
<td>su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shinu</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
<td>sinuru</td>
<td>sinu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aru</td>
<td>‘be’</td>
<td>aru</td>
<td>ari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiru</td>
<td>‘put on’</td>
<td>kyiru</td>
<td>kyiru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okiru</td>
<td>‘rise’</td>
<td>okuru</td>
<td>oku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukeru</td>
<td>‘receive’</td>
<td>ukuru</td>
<td>uku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deru</td>
<td>‘go out’</td>
<td>iduru</td>
<td>idu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takai</td>
<td>‘high’</td>
<td>takakyi</td>
<td>takasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utsukushii</td>
<td>‘beautiful’</td>
<td>utukusiky</td>
<td>utukusi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the forms of the modern Hachijōjima dialect with the forms of Old Japanese (Table 2) indicates that the forms of the consonant stem verbs differ only in that the Hachijōjima forms possess an alternative vowel in the attributive, but that the forms itself are much like the Old Japanese forms. In the vowel stem verbs and irregular verbs on the other hand the forms of Hachijōjima differ much from the Old Japanese forms. A striking fact is that the Hachijōjima forms have the same alternative vowel as the consonant stem verbs, while the Old Japanese forms differ between attributive and conclusive, but not with an alternating vowel. As I have remarked earlier that the modern Hachijōjima forms are relatively new in view of their strong regularity and striking similarity with modern Standard Japanese forms. It is most probable, however, that the alternating vowel -o of the attributive is really an old vowel and in turn may represent an old difference between attributive and conclusive.

For Old Japanese I have adopted the spelling which Martin employs (Martin 1987). This system is especially different in the treatment of the vowels which possess the so-called kō-otsu distinction.
Type A (kō-rui): Cyi Cye Cwo
Type B (otsu-rui): Ciy Cey Cg
Neutral: Ci Ce Co

It uses the notation Cyi and Cye for the palatal, type A or kō-rui, and Ciy and Cey for the non-palatal variants, type B or otsu-rui. Likewise it employs the notation Cwo for type A and Cg for type B. This system refers to a phonetic reality and leaves the simple notation i, e and o for those cases where the distinction is not found or where the distinction is unattested or unknown.

To judge the validity of this hypothesis a comparison of the Hachijōjima forms with the Old Japanese eastern forms as they appear in the Man'yōshū is necessary. Owing to the difference between attributive and conclusive, which is still existent in the Hachijōjima dialect, the eastern dialects are seem to stand apart from the other Japanese and Ryukyuan dialects. They are supposedly descended from Pre Proto Japanese, while the central (and western) dialects and Ryukyuan are descendants from Proto-Japanese (Shibatani 1990:192 following Hattori 1976:26,29). Eventually the difference between attributive and conclusive in the eastern dialects was lost in the consonant stem verbs as well as in the vowel stem verbs, irregular verbs and adjectives, except for the Hachijōjima dialect.

Martin (1987:811) cites some forms of the eastern dialects found in the Man'yōshū which have an attributive in C(w)o as well as some adjective attributives ending in -ke (either -key or -kye as the eastern dialect is said not to distinguish between the palatal and non-palatal front vowels e and i, as the western dialects did). As far as the verbs are concerned, the forms which Martin presents are all consonant stem verbs. He remarks that there are exceptions where we find attributives in -u instead of -o. Martin does not offer any example of a vowel stem verb attributive. I am especially interested in those forms, because the modern Hachijōjima forms are so different from the Old Japanese western form of these verbs. I wondered whether these forms would look like the western forms of Old Japanese or not. Since I could not find the answer in the literature, I decided to search for these forms myself.

The attributive and conclusive forms in the Eastern dialects of Old Japanese

In order to make a complete inventory of all the attributive and conclusive forms I searched through all of the 230 Azuma songs of part 14 and the 93 songs of sakimori ‘border-guards’ sent from eastern Japan to Kyūshū. Each of the 323 poems is numbered. The poems of part 14 are numbered from 3348 to 3577. The poems in part 20 have numbers between 4321 (the first one) and 4436 (the last one), but only 93 poems of these are in the eastern dialect, so not every number is used. All poems are waka or tanka ‘Japanese songs’; in principle every poem has the 5-7-5-7-7 syllables pattern. However, from some poems there are alternative parts, or even alternative (plagiated) poems which are listed under the same number in the Man’yōshū. The total amount of songs is thus somewhat higher
than the number of 323. The results of my search are listed in the Appendix 1. These listings are ordered according to the stem:

1. consonant stem verbs on: k, g, s, t, m, f, b, r;
2. irregular conjugations of the stems on: k, s, n, r;
3. vowel stem verbs on: i (+/1 and +/-2), e (only +/2);
4. auxiliaries: negation -(a)zu and -(a)nafu, presumptive -(a)mumu and past tense -kemu, past tense -(ki);
5. adjectives on: -ku and -siku.

Of each stem (or ending) I have listed the conclusive form, shūshikei, and the attributive form as we would expect it also in the western dialects of Old Japanese. These I have called here rentakei 1 and the attributive form that is typical for the eastern dialects, which I have called here rentakei 2.

The first part, the consonant stem verbs, are the items which normally receive the most interest, because they deviate from the western forms. Not every stem consonant is represented in the poems in all forms. The irregular conjugations are the so-called henkaku katsuyō. These are not always very irregular, but are sometimes different from the regular verbs in only one aspect. There is but one irregular k-stem verb (ka-hen): ku ‘to come’ and only one irregular s-stem verb (sa-hen): su ‘to do’. These are very irregular. In some forms they look like consonant stem verbs, but in others like vowel stem verbs. The irregular n-stem verbs (na-hen) are only few, but all n-stem verbs belong to this group; in fact there are no regular n-stem verbs. In essence the n-stem verbs are consonant stem verbs, whereas in Old and Classical (western) Japanese they are similar to vowel stem verbs in the attributive form. Only three verbs belong to this class: sinu ‘to die’, inu ‘to depart’ and -nu auxiliary for the past tense. The r-stem verbs (ra-hen) are irregular; they have an irregular conclusive form, which is identical to the infinitive form (renyōkei). The only verbs belonging to this group are ari and wori ‘to be’ and all verbs which are compounds with these two verbs.

There are only two stem vowels possible in vowel stem verbs: i and e. The vowel stem verbs on i and e are both divided into two classes: the ‘upper (lower) monograde’ (kami (shimo) ichidan katsuyō) and the ‘upper (lower) bigrade’ (kami (shimo) nidan katsuyō). The terms ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ are related to the Japanese syllabic system; i comes before (above) e. The difference between monograde and bigrade lies in the fact that monograde verbs have their stem vowels in the attributive and conclusive forms, and that there is no difference between both forms. Monograde verbs always have a stem of one syllable. The symbols which are used to represent ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ are a plus sign and a minus sign, for mono- and bigrade the symbols are 1 and 2. The following four classes cited in Classical (western) Japanese are:
• upper monograde: miru (both attributive and conclusive) mi (infinitive) ‘to see’;
• lower monograde: keru (both attributive and conclusive) ke (infinitive) ‘to kick’, the only verb in this class. It is not certain that this class existed in Old Japanese;
• upper bigrade: oturu (attributive) otu (conclusive) oti (infinitive) ‘to fall’;
• lower bigrade: ukuru (attributive) uku (conclusive) uke (infinitive) ‘to receive’.

Not all of the auxiliaries in the list are interesting. I have included those which I thought would be potentially interesting, but only the presumptive auxiliary proved to be interesting. Other auxiliaries which belong to a regular conjugation are not included in this section, but are listed in their verb class. The auxiliary -mu for the past tense, which belongs to the n-stem verb class is an example.

Lastly, there are two adjective classes. In modern standard Japanese there is no difference between both classes, but in Old Japanese the difference lies in the way the conclusive is formed. The ku-class has an attributive in -kyi and a conclusive in -si. The adjectives in the siku-class always have a stem ending in -si. While they have an attributive ending in -kyi like the other adjectives, the conclusive does not have an ending; the last stem syllable, which is homophonous to the conclusive ending serves as an ending (also Table 2). Adjectives in the eastern dialect differ from that of the western dialect in that the attributive form is not -kyi but -kye or -key. The conclusive form is identical to the western form.

I was very surprised with my findings. The literature invariably remarks about the difference which existed in the eastern dialects of Old Japanese between attributive and conclusive, but there is never mention of this difference occurring in only a few instances. Appendix 1 indicates that there are many instances of the rentaikei 1, but only a few of rentaikei 2. Appendix 2a lists the enumeration of all forms. Of all 378 attributive forms, only 75 belong to the category rentaikei 2. This finding made me curious about the exact numbers and percentages. In the appendices 2b and 2c I have divided the number of forms in parts 14 and 20 of the Man'yōshū and in Tables 3a to 3c, I have calculated the percentages.
### Table 3a: Parts 14 and 20 of the Man’yōshū

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rentaikai 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rentaikai 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All forms</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant stems</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel stems</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkaku katsuyō</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-amu</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-siku</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3b: Part 14 of the Man’yōshū

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rentaikai 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rentaikai 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All forms</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant stems</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel stems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkaku katsuyō</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-amu</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-siku</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rentaikei 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rentaikei 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All forms</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant stems</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel stems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkaku katsuyō</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-amu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-siku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all attributive forms only 20 percent belong to the *rentaikei 2* type, and thereby form the bulk of instances taken by the adjectives. The only exception in the verbs are the *ka-hen* and *na-hen* verbs. These are very interesting, and I will analyse them below.

What are the causes for this mere 20 percent? Although the figure is low, it is still too high to be judged as incidental. The difference must certainly have existed in eastern Old Japanese, but the difference must have been in the process of vanishing at the moment the *Man'yōshū* was compiled. It would not be the only thing in Old Japanese that was vanishing in the Nara period (8th century) If you look at the eight vowel system in Nara period Japanese, you will find that it is defective; none of the three (extra) vowels of Old Japanese is present with each consonant. Moreover, in the syllable *mo* there are both vowels *mo* and *mwo* in the *Kojiki* (712), but only one *mo* appears in the *Man'yōshū* some forty years later. After 800 at the beginning of the Heian period only five vowels which we also know from modern Japanese remained. As I have previously mentioned there was no (longer any) difference between *Cey* and *Cye* in eastern Old Japanese, and there is also some confusion between the other vowels. The Nara period must have been a turbulent age in the linguistic field with a multitude of changes taking place in such a short time. The vowel stem verbs in the eastern dialect are completely the same as those in the western dialect. They were probably always the same since measures to have a different vowel for the attributive were not necessary when there already was a different form, except for monograde verbs. As yet, there is no proof for a different form or vowel for these verbs in the *Man'yōshū.*
Table 4 shows an overview of the forms in the eastern dialect in their ‘ideal’ form, the *rentaikei* 2, and the conclusive, and a comparison of these forms with the western forms. The list has been made as complete as possible.

Table 4: The attributive and conclusive in the western and eastern dialects of Old Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Japanese</th>
<th>Nara / Kuoto</th>
<th>Azuma-uta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>conclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iku</em></td>
<td>'go'</td>
<td><em>yuku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kogu</em></td>
<td>'row'</td>
<td><em>kogu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kosu</em></td>
<td>'cross'</td>
<td><em>kwosu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tatsu</em></td>
<td>'stand'</td>
<td><em>tatu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sumu</em></td>
<td>'live'</td>
<td><em>sumu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hau</em></td>
<td>'crawl'</td>
<td><em>phiau</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tobu</em></td>
<td>'fly'</td>
<td><em>tobu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>furui</em></td>
<td>'fall'</td>
<td><em>furui</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kuru</em></td>
<td>'come'</td>
<td><em>kuru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>suru</em></td>
<td>'do'</td>
<td><em>soru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(-nu)</em></td>
<td>past tense</td>
<td><em>-nuru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aru</em></td>
<td>'be'</td>
<td><em>aru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>miru</em></td>
<td>'see'</td>
<td><em>myiru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ochiru</em></td>
<td>'fall'</td>
<td><em>oturu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>neru</em></td>
<td>'sleep'</td>
<td><em>nuru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>yasui</em></td>
<td>'calm'</td>
<td><em>yasukyi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>utsukushii</em></td>
<td>'beautiful'</td>
<td><em>utukusikyi</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a form is not at all found, the places are left blank. In some other cases the form of the particular verb which is given for the western dialect and the attributive of the eastern dialect is not present in the conclusive of the eastern dialect. In those cases I have placed the conclusive of a different verb between brackets.

There are neither *g*-stem verbs nor *b*-stem verbs in the conclusive forms and only one verb of each in the attributive form, in the *rentaikei* 1 only. This fact should not be of much concern because these stems are relatively rare. Moreover, the corpus of 323 poems is so small, that I am rather surprised that I am able to produce this almost complete list. I do not think that I should interpret this as due to the fact that the original eastern attributive no longer existed with these stems at the time of the *Man'yōshū*. It is more likely a coincidence. Further, there is nothing worth special mention with the regular consonant stems.

There are some remarkable points with the irregular conjugations, especially with *ka-hen* and *na-hen*. The *sa-hen* verb is like what we would expect, also when we consider the vowel stem verbs. In the western dialect there is a difference between attributive and conclusive which is reflected in the eastern dialect; a different vowel would not be necessary. The *ra-hen* verb has the eastern vowel in the attributive but also the ‘strange’ alternative vowel in the conclu-
sive. One would be inclined to think that the different vowel in the attributive would not be necessary as it is in the sa-hen verb. But the ra-hen verbs are in essence consonant stem verbs, while the sa-hen verb is actually irregular. Martin (1987:666) states that the conclusive in -i in these verbs is due to the fact that the infinitive is used instead of the conclusive, and that 'this can be treated as a syntactic peculiarity, rather than an irregularity of the morphology'. When this is the case, then it is logical that the attributive has an ending in -o. One cannot be certain, however, whether the conclusive in -i is very old and descended from Pre-Proto-Japanese. If so, Ryukyuan would have possessed originally probably the same difference; otherwise it would be a relatively new development. For the first possibility pleads the fact that we do not find any conclusive on -u. In the latter case one would expect that the attributive would be one of the first attributives to be replaced by the new one, but we still find attributives on -wo.

I will leave the ka-hen and na-hen verbs for the next chapter, where I will analyse them extensively, and now turn to the rest of the forms.

In the vowel stem verbs we do not find any instance of an attributive form which differs from the western attributives. Even the conclusive and attributive of the monograde verbs are probably homophonous, although we cannot be absolutely certain because examples of this conclusive form of these verbs have not been found. There would not be a necessity for the bigrade verbs to have a distinctive vowel in the attributive because the attributive and conclusive already differed in a different way.

Most auxiliaries do not have special alternative attributives. This is logical when one considers that the conclusive and attributive already differ in form. This is the case with the negation auxiliary -zu and the eastern one -naμu; also in the past tense auxiliary -ki. In the presumptive auxiliary -(a)mu and past tense -kemu < -ki + -amu, both forms do not differ in the western dialect, but do differ in the eastern dialect in the same way as the consonant stem verbs, as can be observed in the auxiliary -(a)mu; the instances of -kemu are probably too few to show the difference, but this does not mean that the difference did not exist.

There is one problematic form with the negation auxiliary -zu, however. In number 4344 we find: wasuramu te mwo yukyi yama yukyi ware kuredo wa ga ttitipaφa φa wasuresenwo ka mo 'Although I came marching through plains and over mountains thinking, I will forget them, my father and mother, ah I cannot forget them!'

In this poem we find the word for 'field' mwo written with the character 努 which is transcribed in Kojima (1973 and 1975) as ؤ no while the auxiliary mwo is also written with 努, but transcribed with μu. See also the next chapter on this phenomenon. The form wasuresenwo in the English translation, based upon Pierson's translation, is interpreted as a negation of a potential form of the verb wasuru (-2) 'to forget not by will', as opposed to the form wasuramu with which the poem starts, from wasurumu (consonant stem) 'to forget deliberately'. Here this could be rendered as 'I will put them out of my mind' (but he cannot forget about
them). The interpretation of a potential form is not that obvious. The form -se
would be the negation base (mizenkei) of an auxiliary which is a sa-hen verb. In
Old Japanese there is such a verb, but this verb is an original causative auxiliary,
in Old (western) Japanese already exclusively used for politeness to the subject
(sonkei). This would be impossible here because the poet himself is the subject,
while the persons for whom he should show respect, his parents, are the object. It
is difficult to judge whether this -se here is from the afore mentioned -su. Its
meaning of politeness conveys that it is not. Thus this -su is likely to have an-
other meaning in the eastern dialect, which is only found in this poem, or has its
original meaning of causative auxiliary. The meaning of the poem could be then:
‘Although I came marching through plains and over mountains thinking, I will
forget them, my father and mother, ah it doesn’t make me forget them!’ Another
possibility is, that this -su is a completely different verb, which is found in this
poem only. It could be a lower brigrade verb; the form -se could then be the in-
finite (renyōkei) as the negation base as well. In that case the possibilities for
the origin of -mwo would be doubled. It could still be the negation auxiliary, but it
could also be the auxiliary for the past tense -mu. The meaning of the whole poem
would undoubtedly change: ‘Although I came marching through plains and over
mountains thinking, I will forget them, my father and mother, ah I have forgotten
them!’ The meaning of this is admittedly strange, but the traditional interpreta-
tion is equally strange, if one considers the meaning of potential to the auxiliary
-su. This -su probably conveys a special mood like ‘completely’ -te shimau in
modern Japanese, or ‘still, yet’. I prefer the interpretation with the causative
meaning, although a problematic form remains: an attributive in -wo where we
would expect a -u.

Lastly, there are the two adjective classes. The alternative attributive is ap-
parently more often present in these classes than in the verbs, although there is
much confusion between attributive and conclusive like those in the western
dialect also.

Syntactic aspects of the two different attributives

With the ka-hen verb I have placed the ending -ru in the attributive between
brackets in Table 4, to include not only the attributive kuru which is present in
the western dialect (compare also the form suru), but also a form ku, which is
unlike the western form, strangely enough homophonous to the conclusive form.
So in this verb the western dialect would just discriminate between attributive
and conclusive instead of the eastern dialect.

In number 3411 there is a form ani ku ya which is given as ‘unidentified’ by
Kojima (1973 and 1975), but translated as ‘Well, does it come?’ by Pierson. On
the premise that Pierson is right, this ya would be the interrogative particle which
calls for a preceding attributive. All other instances of the short attributive,
whether alone or bound with the verb kaheyyru ‘return’, are before the particle
made ‘onto’. This particle also normally calls for a preceding attributive, but
Kojima (1973 and 1975) says that it sometimes calls for the conclusive in the eastern dialect; Pierson follows this opinion. I do not think that this is necessarily so, although the form *araqarwo* in number 3414 is a bit problematic on this point (see Appendix 3c). Also considering the form in 3411 I would say that this is an eastern attributive and that the earlier form might even have been *kwo* when we also consider the *na-hen* verbs.

In the *na-hen* verbs we find a *rentaikei 1* twice, but an attributive in -*nwo* six times. If we count the three cases of an attributive in -*mu* to these forms, we have nine cases of *rentaikei 2* against only two cases of *rentaikei 1*.

The *man'yōgana* (Chinese characters used phonetically to write Japanese syllables) with which the syllable -*nwo* is written, are 努 (5 times) and 忍 (only in number 4403). These characters are traditionally read as *no*, which should be *nwo* when the eight vowel system is considered. In Japanese publications there is normally no contrast between type A and type B vowels. This is partly tradition, partly owing to the modern Japanese script that cannot discriminate between both kinds of vowels and the necessity to make special devices. Although good publications remark on the nature of the different vowels in notes, most publications of literary rather than linguistic nature neglect to do so.

Pierson reads these characters as *mu*, but does not make clear why he does so. He also reads them thus, when they are used to write the word for ‘field’ *nwo* (modern Japanese *no*). In Kojima (1973 and 1975) they are read as *no* when they are used to write words such as ‘field’, but *mu* in this particular case of the attributive of *na-hen* verbs. This must be due to tradition. Notes generally explain that although the syntactic construction calls for the attributive, the conclusive shows up in this case which would be a peculiarity of the eastern dialect.

Appendices 3a and 3b show an inventory of all attributive forms of the *na-hen* verbs *ka-hen* verbs and in 3c examples of some verbs from the other conjugations of which both attributives are present in the corpus. All forms are shown in their context as they are found in the *Magyōshū* and are accompanied by a translation and, if necessary, an explanation.

The instances of the *rentaikei 1* of the *na-hen* verbs are both conclusive verbs which take the attributive form due to an emphatic particle earlier in the sentence, while the instances of the *rentaikei 2* occur mostly before particles which call for a preceding attributive, although not exclusively. With this use of the attributive before a particle, one could speak of a conjunctively used attributive. One could think that this might mark a difference between *rentaikei 1* and *rentaikei 2*, but the number of these forms are too few to be judged. In the case of the *ka-hen* verbs the *rentaikei 2* cases are all such conjunctively used attributives, while the cases of the *rentaikei 1* are all attributives which are called for by other syntactic constructions: a following noun which, of course, calls for a preceding attributive, or particles which appear earlier in the sentence and call for a conclusive verb taking the attributive form. In the case of the *ka-hen* verb the syntactic construction seemingly prescribes the form of the attributive: *rentaikei 1* or ren-
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Taikei 2. This may be true for the ka-hen verbs and perhaps even the na-hen verbs, but the examples of the verbs of the other conjugations do not confirm this observation (see Appendix 3c). Both attributives are observed in all possible syntactic functions which are present in the corpus.

Conclusion

The observations made in this article, lead me to the following conclusions.
1. The modern Hachijōjima forms of the attributive and the conclusive cannot directly descend from the eastern dialect of Old Japanese.
2. Likewise, the modern Ryukyu forms are neither direct descendants from Proto Japanese.
3. In the eastern dialects of Old Japanese (Nara period, 8th century) there existed a difference between attributive and conclusive in all verb classes (including the adjectives), except for the higher monograde vowel stem verbs. This difference was the same as the difference between attributive and conclusive in the western (and central) dialects of Old Japanese for those verb classes where a difference existed. In the other verb classes the difference was marked by a different vowel for the attributive (-u) and conclusive (-um).
4. In the Nara period the difference between attributive and conclusive was vanishing, and the original eastern attributives were replaced by forms that were equivalent to the western forms, which resulted in a system which was the same as the western system.
5. Probably the ka-hen verb is the only verb for which the conclusion stated in 3 is not true. This verb had at the time of the Man'yōshū an attributive form which was equivalent to the conclusive form. Originally this verb probably had a different vowel too, but it is not present in the Man'yōshū.
6. In the modern Hachijōjima dialects the 'thematic' vowel -(w)en for the attributive probably descends from an old Pre Proto Japanese form, but it has spread over verb classes which originally did not possess the thematic vowel to establish a different form from the conclusive.
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Appendix 1:
Conclusive and attributive forms found in parts 14 and 20 of the Man'yōshū

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem on ...</th>
<th>Shūshikei</th>
<th>Rentaiki 1</th>
<th>Rentaiki 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>sawaku 3349</td>
<td>natuswoboyiku 3348, 3381</td>
<td>φyikwo 3431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ōku 3361, 3427, 3551</td>
<td>naku 3352, 3390, 3521</td>
<td>yukwo 3541, 4385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yuku 3366, 3510, 3519, 3526, 3567, 4325, 4372, 4376, 4414</td>
<td>tuku 3448, 3514, 4327, 4338, 4416, 4425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iku 4374, naku 3458, ayoku 4390</td>
<td>yuku 3362, 3443, 3522, 4436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kanumaduku 3409 (the same as)</td>
<td>ikyiduku 3388, 3527 ikuduku 3458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kanwomaduku 3518</td>
<td>ōku 3422, 3560, 3564, 4371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sakuzu 3504, 3551 sekuzu 3545 (2x)</td>
<td>tanabyiku 3511, 3516, 3520, 4380 tônobyiku 4403 (= tanabyiku) myiduku 4340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>nasu 3456</td>
<td>sarasu 3373</td>
<td>kwoswo 4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mawosu 4372</td>
<td>-su 3535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narasu 3546</td>
<td>ōsu 3428, 3530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sasu 4382</td>
<td>sasu 3457, 3492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ywosu 3548</td>
<td>orosu 4363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masu 3557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omososu 3552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tatu 3349, 3449, 4373</td>
<td>tatu 3360, 3396, 3414, 3454, 3515, 4429 utu 3473</td>
<td>tatwo 3476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matu 3433, 3546</td>
<td>momyitu 3494</td>
<td>matwo 3561 (2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>(to)ku 3384</td>
<td>φaku 3364</td>
<td>aφo 3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iku 3536</td>
<td>swofu 3485</td>
<td>φako 3525, 4352, 4421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aru 3390</td>
<td>aphi 3401, 3413, 1535</td>
<td>kaywoφo 3526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>otafu 3409, 3518</td>
<td>nīphi 3427</td>
<td>mofo 3552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fərafu 3489</td>
<td>arafu 3440</td>
<td>tamaφo 4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mofu 3494</td>
<td>tukaφu 3446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omofu 3496</td>
<td>təofu 4425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sinwofu 3532</td>
<td>iφafu 3460, 4402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sinofu 4427 (= sinwofu)</td>
<td>φanadiraφu 3448 iφu 3462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>isaywofu 3512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>isaywofu 3512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mofu 3470, 3494, 3542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>(το)ψυ 3478, 3521, 4323</td>
<td>tobu 3381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>koru 3433</td>
<td>naru 3358, 3445, 3548, 4340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>okuru 4429</td>
<td>φαβακαρυ 4372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waturu 3549, 4328 αφυι-</td>
<td>φυρυ 3358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yworu 3483</td>
<td>κοδαρυ 3433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>katayworu 3565</td>
<td>kakaru 3459, 3518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>myiökuru 4375</td>
<td>moru 3436, iru 3553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φυρυ 4379</td>
<td>osqburu 3960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>naru 4405</td>
<td>karu 3499, kyitari 4326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sakaru 3420, 3502 (this</td>
<td>ιφαγοκουρυ 3554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>form, before gaφey, is</td>
<td>φυφυμαρυ 3572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>said to be a rentaikei, but</td>
<td>meyguru 4339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it could be a shūshikei as</td>
<td>karamaru 4352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well, in my opinion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ka-hen | ku 3412, 3449, 3521 | kuru 3362, 3461 (but | [ku 3411] |
|        |                    | might be used here as a | ku 4340, 4404 |
|        |                    | shūshikei), 4353, 4430 | kaφυιρυκυ 4339 |
|        |                    |                           | kaφυερυκυ 4350, 4372 |

| sa-hen | (niφey)su 3386 | suru 3524, 3539, 4382, | |
|        | su 3438 | 4391 | |
|        | susu 3487, 3564, 4386 |  |

| na-hen | kyinu 3356, 3425, 3540, | inuru 3470 | narinwo 3395 |
|        | 4385, 4387 | kyinuru 3571 | akeynu 3461 |
|        | tarayinu 3359 |       | kyinwo 3480, 3527, 4401, |
|        | τοφοσκυίνυ 3389 |       | 4403 |
|        | arakusadatinu 3447 |       | yokyikatenwo 4341 |
|        | narinu 3543, 4388 |       | kyinu 4364 |
|        | kogynu 4363, 4365 |       | wasurayenu 4407 |

<p>| ra-hen | keyri 3348, 3352, 3374, | φυραρυ 3351 | arwo 3509 |
|        | 3422, 3453 | naru 3352, 3397, 3400, | φαραρυ 3546 |
|        | kari 4388 (= keyri) | 3408, 3427, 3508, 3536, | [norarwo 3469] |
|        | ari 3422 | 3574, 4415, 4416, 4423, |
|        | meyri 3450 | 4429 | |
|        | nari 3492, 4382 | fosaru 3351 | |
|        | [ομοφυερυ 3531] | -tari 3507, 4375 | |
|        | tatari 4375 (= tateri) | woru 3380, 3401 | |
|        |                     | nareru 3364 | |
|        |                     | keyru 3393 | |
|        |                     | kyeru 4404 (= keyru) | |
|        |                     | asikaru 3391 | |
|        |                     | tateru 3575 | |
|        |                     | δυερυ 3413, 3463 | |
|        |                     | aru 3430, 4345 | |
|        |                     | motoru 3440, | |
|        |                     | kwoφυσικαρυ 3476 | |
|        |                     | nigoreru 3544 | |
|        |                     | φακυερυ 4347 | |
|        |                     | tukureru 4342 | |
|        |                     | karu 4431 (= keyru) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>maseru 4431</th>
<th>iφaru 3512 (= iφyuru)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i (+/1)</td>
<td>wiru 3357, 3523</td>
<td>myiru 3405, 4330, 4415, 4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/2)</td>
<td>kwoφu 3476</td>
<td>oturu 3392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sugu 3493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sugu 4378 (used nominally here)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/2)</td>
<td>katu 3353</td>
<td>oφaru 3359, 3562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>naku 3362</td>
<td>iduru 3368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kuyu 3365</td>
<td>nakuru 3362, 3471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yasu 4343</td>
<td>karu 3367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nu 3477, 3505</td>
<td>-tur 3371, 3473, 3485, 4346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du 3376, 3466</td>
<td>-ruru 3372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tayu 3380, 3398</td>
<td>nurunuru 3378, 3501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yosu 3384</td>
<td>miyiyuru 3391, 3441, 4355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miyu 3449</td>
<td>kwoyuru 3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tu 3402, 3418, 3443, 3475, 3482, 3528</td>
<td>oφaru 3452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kyikyo 3438</td>
<td>oφaru 3501 (= oφuru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tagu 3451</td>
<td>nuru 3465, 3504, 3554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-su 3457, 3498</td>
<td>wofuru 3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>twonaφu 3468</td>
<td>naru 3576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kanukanu 3487</td>
<td>yesuru 4345 (= yosuru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omoφo 3522</td>
<td>ywosoru 4379 (= yosuru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moφayu 4357</td>
<td>φyumakuru 4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wakaru 4381 (here, used nominally instead of rentaikei)</td>
<td>(= φyumakuru?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aφasu 3479 (this form, before gafey, is said to be a rentaikei, but it could be a shishihkei as well, in my opinion)</td>
<td>kamyisaburu 4380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (a)zu | adazu 3355, 3599 | noranu 337 |
|       | kozu 3406 | kakurenu 3389 |
|       | kadosakazu 3432 | akenu 3404 |
|       | umazu 3484 | φukanu 3422 |
|       | seis 3424, 4425 | katenu 3423 |
|       | narazu 3492 | kyisanu 3469, 3495, 3521 |
|       | wasurarezu 4322 | miyiyenu 3506 |
|       | sirazu 4384 | sanaru 3513 |

| (a)nafu | aφanafu 3375 | aφanafu 3478 |
|        | senafu 3419 | nenafu 3482, 3529, 3555 |
|        | myitanafu 3444 | tokeynafu 4383 |
|        | aranafu 3516 | |

wasuresenwo 4344
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>amu</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>njafu 3525</td>
<td>wasuresena njafu 4378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tóókamey 3348</td>
<td>tugsinyamu 3360</td>
<td>afanamo 3405 (2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aramu 3355</td>
<td>myitunamu 3366</td>
<td>nemo 3473, 4422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngeôkamu 3357, 3459</td>
<td>makasamu 3369</td>
<td>myimo 4329, 4423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tugamu 3360</td>
<td>nemu 3370, 3442, 4321, 4348, 4428</td>
<td>wataramo 4355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itaramu 3381, 3428</td>
<td>aramu 3376, 3433, 3471</td>
<td>fuemukamo 4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñórisemu 3383</td>
<td>ñúramu 3376</td>
<td>wasuremo 4367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñaywôfamu 3387</td>
<td>ñifàmu 3379, 3472</td>
<td>yukuamo 4406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñúmasinuma 3399</td>
<td>ñemû 3404, 4329</td>
<td>myitemo 4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= ñúmasinamù)</td>
<td>yûkamu 3387, 3439, 4352, 4366</td>
<td>otimo 4418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñyìñôfamù 3400</td>
<td>nakyiwatarinamu 3390</td>
<td>mofoamo 4419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ納famù 3406, 3455, 3493,</td>
<td>netemù 3395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makaramu 3430</td>
<td>myimu 3396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwoññìfùmu 3415, 3477</td>
<td>tayesemù 3397, 3434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sëmo 3418, 3426]</td>
<td>motamu 3424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yûkamu 3447, 3519, 4325,</td>
<td>tayêmu 3507, 3523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afañâmu 3463</td>
<td>itaramu 3441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worsamu 3475, 3574</td>
<td>ñyìñêramu 3467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñàyûñòfamù 4324</td>
<td>nageñekamu 3474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nemu 3490, 4416</td>
<td>ñìdemù 3488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[nemo 3494]</td>
<td>ñìnamu 3491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kômù 3510, 3536, 4368</td>
<td>wasuremu 3515, 3520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñinwôfamu 3520, 3570, 3575, 4327</td>
<td>tatamu 3528, 4364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasuramu 4344</td>
<td>ñaywôñóñamu 3549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñirsemù 4366</td>
<td>sugwosamu 3564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñìmu 3556 (instead of</td>
<td>ñàrìnamu 3565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semu)</td>
<td>ñòññòfese 3566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tòwôfamu 4392</td>
<td>karasamu 3573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myimu 4424</td>
<td>ñòrámu 4327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyìnasamù 4436</td>
<td>ñìfàñâmù 4350, 4372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kyinañâmù 3472]</td>
<td>wataramu 4394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[nérâmù 3562] (this form is said to be</td>
<td>makyìñòmù 4413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is used, but the character used, is,</td>
<td>yaramu 4417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as far as 1 know, always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kemu</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>njafu 3558</td>
<td>myidàresômeykeymu 3360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kòzukêmu 4323</td>
<td>motômeykeymu 3415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ki</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ñfàñìyisi 3381</td>
<td>ñfàñìyisi 3381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myisi 3517, 3537, 4345</td>
<td>desì 3506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dési 3506</td>
<td>yùñìyisi 3427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñfàñìyìñìisi 3434</td>
<td>ñfàñìyìñìisi 3434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyìsesi 3453, 4388</td>
<td>kyìsesi 3453, 4388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakuresi 3475</td>
<td>kakuresi 3475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñìñìyisi 3513, 4346, 4358, 4429</td>
<td>ñìñìyisi 3513, 4346, 4358, 4429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ku</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katasi 3401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasi 3390, 3405, 3430, 3442, 4321, 4330, 4353, 4401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nasi 4381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọọsọ 3478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesi 3530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọdọdakasi 3555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigyesi 3556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samusi 4351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>siku</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasi 3349, 3438, 4322, 4427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọọsọ 3350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masizi 3353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayasi 3364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanasi 3403 (2x), 3408, 3466, 3479, 3537 (2x), 3556, 3567, 4343, 4429, 4432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makyiraṣi 3407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yworasi 3435, 3446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gurusu 3481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurusi 3568, 4406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utukusi 3496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyasi 3544, 3577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikyidukasi 3547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itaborasi 3550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>φuresi</strong> 3537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tayenisi 3517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesi 3534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myitateşi 3534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katametesi 3559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tatişi 3569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakyisi 3569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiynisi 4349 (= kynisi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kynisi 4370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aφyimyîtesi 4354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakyisi 4356, 4357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kogynisi 4384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katameyọsi 4390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawidekynisi 4393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukyesi 4404, 4405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayusufyisi 4427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọọfysi 4436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nagakyi</strong> 3356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beykyi 3365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byekyi 4364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakyi 3379, 3504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigyekyi 3396, 3464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ywoky 3411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omosirokyi 3452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọọfoki 3453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takakyi 3514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samukyi 3570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egatakyi 3573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasikwoyki 4321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yasukey</strong> 3483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesi 3509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagaky 4394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ywoky 4419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>kanasikyi</strong> 3351, 3373, 3386, 3451, 3465, 3549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keysikyi 3482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭọmosikyi 3523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyasikyi 3337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kagụfaksiyi 4371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makanasikyi 4413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kanasıkey</strong> 3412, 3517, 3533, 3548, 3551, 3564, 3576, 4369 (2x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magụfasi 3424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asamasik 3429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oyazi 4364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanasi 3480, 3486, 3577, 4432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uraganasikkey 3500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nayamasikej 3557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arasi 3472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyasike 4376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asikiye 4382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utukusi 4392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utukusikye 4414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2a: Total of forms in both part 14 and part 20 of the Man'yōshū (323 poems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem on ...</th>
<th>Shūshikei</th>
<th>Rentaikei 1</th>
<th>Rentaikei 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>22 forms</td>
<td>29 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(9 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>7 forms</td>
<td>7 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 words)</td>
<td>(5 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
<td>(4 words)</td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>10 forms</td>
<td>22 forms</td>
<td>7 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(15 words)</td>
<td>(5 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>11 forms</td>
<td>18 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9 words)</td>
<td>(14 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td>6 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td>12 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 words)</td>
<td>(1 word; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>12 forms</td>
<td>35 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(18 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(3 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/-2)</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words; 1 form used nominally)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/-2)</td>
<td>29 forms</td>
<td>28 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20 words; 1 form used nominally)</td>
<td>(16 words of which 1 word with 2 and 1 word with 3 different forms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)zu</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
<td>14 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)나무</td>
<td>6 forms</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>44 forms</td>
<td>48 forms</td>
<td>13 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40 on -u and 4 on -o)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kemu</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>15 forms</td>
<td>14 forms</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 words of which 1 is independent as well as bound)</td>
<td>(11 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(4 words; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siku</td>
<td>30 forms</td>
<td>11 forms</td>
<td>23 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 words of which 1 is independent as well as bound)</td>
<td>(6 words)</td>
<td>(11 words; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2b: Total of forms in part 14 of the Man’yoshū (230 poems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem on ...</th>
<th>Shūshikei</th>
<th>Rentaikei 1</th>
<th>Rentaikei 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>16 forms</td>
<td>19 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(7 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>6 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 words)</td>
<td>(4 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td>8 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
<td>(4 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 words)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ō</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
<td>19 forms</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>(14 words)</td>
<td>(4 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>6 forms</td>
<td>13 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 words)</td>
<td>(10 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td>7 forms</td>
<td>2 form</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td>(1 word; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
<td>24 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 words)</td>
<td>(15 words)</td>
<td>(3 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/2)</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 words)</td>
<td>(1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/1)</td>
<td>26 forms</td>
<td>22 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17 words)</td>
<td>(14 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)zu</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>11 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)naōu</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td>5 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>33 forms</td>
<td>34 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29 on -u and 4 on -o)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kemu</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>9 forms</td>
<td>12 forms</td>
<td>2 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 words)</td>
<td>(10 words)</td>
<td>(2 words; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siku</td>
<td>24 forms</td>
<td>8 forms</td>
<td>15 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 words of which 1 is independent as well as bound)</td>
<td>(3 words)</td>
<td>(7 words; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2c: Total of forms in part 20 of the Man’yōshū (93 poems)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem on...</th>
<th>Shūshikei</th>
<th>Rentaikei 1</th>
<th>Rentaikei 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>6 forms (2 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>10 forms (5 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>1 form (1 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>2 forms (2 words)</td>
<td>1 forms (1 word)</td>
<td>1 form (1 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>1 form (1 word)</td>
<td>1 form (1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1 form (1 word)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>1 form (1 word)</td>
<td>3 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>3 forms (2 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>5 forms (5 words)</td>
<td>5 forms (5 words)</td>
<td>5 forms (1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-hen</td>
<td>1 forms (1 word)</td>
<td>2 forms (1 word)</td>
<td>5 forms (1 word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-hen</td>
<td>5 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>2 forms (1 word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-hen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-hen</td>
<td>3 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>11 forms (7 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td>5 forms (1 word; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (+/2)</td>
<td>1 form (1 word)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (-/2)</td>
<td>3 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>6 forms (5 words of which 1 with 2 different forms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)zu</td>
<td>4 forms</td>
<td>3 forms</td>
<td>1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)naifu</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>11 forms</td>
<td>14 forms</td>
<td>10 forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kemu</td>
<td>1 form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>6 forms (2 words of which 1 is independent as well as bound)</td>
<td>2 forms (2 words)</td>
<td>2 forms (2 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silku</td>
<td>6 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>3 forms (3 words)</td>
<td>8 forms (5 words; 2 different appearances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3a: Inventory of the attributive forms of na-hen verbs

3395 aphiida ywo fa safa da narinwo wo mata netemu ka mo
‘The nights in between became manifold, ah, when could we sleep together again?’
Here we find an attributive narinwo ‘became’ before the exclamatory particle wo. This wo calls for a preceding attributive form. We also find the presumptive auxiliary netemu ‘let us sleep’, which is in the attributive here because of the following exclamatory particle ka which also calls for a preceding attributive. So we find one attributive in -wo and one in -u.

4401 naku kwora wo okyite so kyinwo ya
‘Leaving behind my children who cry, I have gone! (lit.: come [here])’
There are two reasons for the attributive kyinwo ‘came’ here: first, the emphatic particle so causes the conclusive verb to take the attributive form; second, the exclamatory particle ya calls for a preceding attributive. In this sentence too we find another attributive on -u instead of on -wo: naku ‘to cry’.

3480 kanasi imo ga tamakura fahare ywodati kyinwo ka mo
‘I have seperated from my dear wife’s arm-as-cushion, and, ah, have gone away in the beginning of the night! (lit.: come [here])’
See 3395. In this sentence there is a conclusive adjective kanasi ‘dear’ used as an attributive. Already in Old Japanese, either western or eastern, both forms are often confused (Appendix 1).

3527 okyi ni sumo wokamo no mokoro yasakadori ikyiduku imo wo okyite kyinwo ka mo
‘Like the little duck that lives in the offing, [takes a] eight-feet-deep breath, my dear wife will sigh deeply, ah, as I have come, leaving her behind!’
See above. Here are two other attributives sumo ‘to live’ and ikyiduku ‘to sigh’, one in rentaikei 2, the other in rentaikei 1. A possible and perhaps even better translation would be: ‘Like the in the offing living little duck’s eight-feet-deep breath, my dear wife will sigh deeply.’

4341 titi wo okyite myiti no nagati fa yukyikatenwo ka mo
‘I have left my father, the long way, ah, was difficult to go!’
See above.

4403 awokumu no tonyobyiku yama wo kwowyote kyinwo ka mu
‘I have come, crossing over the mountain, where blue clouds pass in layers.’
See above. Here also an other attributive tonyobyiku ‘to hang over’ on -u, and two syllables mu which should be mo: awokumu ‘blue cloud’ should be awokumu; ka mu should be ka mo.

4364 idye no imu ga narubyekyi koto wo ifazu kyinu ka mo
‘I have gone away (lit.: come [here]), without talking about the means to live of my wife at home!’
See above, but here the vowel is -u instead of -o.

4407 imo ga kwofyisiku wasurayenka mo
‘My longing for my wife, ah I cannot forget!’
See above.

3461 mafoyi kurete ywofoyi na fa kona ni akeymu sida kuru
'After the sun has set, in the night there is no coming; after it has dawned, he will come!'
This is the only instance of a rentakei 2 where no particle is involved. Here it is the noun sida ‘time’ which causes the attributive form. The verb kuru ‘to come’ stands in this sentence in its rentakei 1 form, but we would expect a conclusive form here since there are no particles which call for a conclusive verb in the attributive form.

3470 aPHYIMyite fa tipto se ya imuru
‘After I have seen you, have [not] passed a thousand years?’
In this sentence the interrogative particle ya calls for a conclusive verb in the attributive form.

3571 oFoFoSiKu myitu tu so kyinuru konseg myiti no aphyida
‘Gloomily looking back, I have come along this whole road!’
This sentence contains an inversion, the part konseg myiti no aphyida would normally come before so. So the attributive form here is not called for owing to the following noun phrase, but because of the emphatic particle so.

Appendix 3b: Inventory of the attributive forms of ka-hen verbs

3411 ywosuredomo ani ku ya
‘Though I try to bring it nearer, well does it come?’
See page 25 for comments on this form.

3430 siratama igrite ku made ni
‘Until I take the pearl and come back!’
This and the following instances of the rentakei 2 occur all before the particle made which calls for a preceding attributive.

3440 nanifadi wo yuykite ku made to
‘Going along the road to Nanifa until I come back.’

3439 kaphyiriku made ni iPhaPhyite matane
‘Until we come back, pray and wait for us!’

3450 are fa iPhaFaamu kaPhyiriku made ni
‘Let me pray until you will return.’

3472 tuKusi no sakyi ni timari wite are fa iPhaFaamu moromoro fa sakeyku to mawosu kaPhyiriku made ni
‘Making a halt at the cape of Tukusi I will pray, that all at home, may be happy and safe, thus I will pray, until I will return!’

3362 sagamune no wonyine myikakusi wasurekuru imo ga naywobyite a wo ne si naku na
‘When the fine peak of Sagamune is hidden for sight, I come, forgetting for a moment (my wife left at home), but when I hear the name of my dear wife, ah don’t let me cry!’
Here we find a clear instance of a rentakei 1, but the form here should be conclusive. The poet is ‘the one who comes forgetting’, so this form cannot be attributive to imo ‘dear wife’, because the translation should then be read: ‘My dear wife’s name is called who comes forgetting, when the fine peak of Sagamune is hidden for sight, ah don’t let me cry!’ This would convey a rather
JAPANESE AND RYUKYUAN DIALECTS

3461  mAfuji kurete yuofyu na fa kon na akeynu sida kuru
‘After the sun has set, in the night there is no coming; after it has dawned, he will come!'
Here we would also expect a conclusive form because there are no special words which call for an attributive.

3535  wagiyokwo ga ifeygoto motite kuru fyuito mo nasi
‘There is nobody who comes bringing tidings of my dear wife.’
This is the only instance where the form is attributive to a noun. The form is rentaikei 1.

4430  idete to a ga kuru
‘Going out, I will start my journey! (lit.: I will come)’
Here we also find a conclusive verb in the attributive form. Here this form is called for because of to. This to is said to be a dialect variant of the emphatic particle so (also 3561 in Appendix 3c below).

Appendix 3c: Comparison of the use of both attributives of non na-hen and ka-hen verbs

3443  yuku ‘to go’
ura mo naku wa ga yuku myiti ni
‘On the road which I tread without sorrowful thoughts’

3522  kumo no ifey yu nakuyiku tadu no
‘[Far away as] the cranes flying, crying over the clouds!’

4327  tabyi yuku are fa
‘I who go on a journey.’

4338  fafa wo fanarete yuku ga kanasisa
‘Having left my mother, how sad is my going!’
The particle ga calls for an attributive form. The adjective kanasi is standing here in the so-called sa-form. This form is in modern Japanese a derived abstract noun and therefore called a ‘direct predication’ by Martin (1987:804) in Old Japanese. The resemblances of this form with the modern Ryukyuan forms, prompt me to believe that this form in Old Japanese is a verbal rather than a nominal element (Hagers 1997:39 passim).

4416  kusamakura tabyi yuku sena ga maruneseba ifa naru ware fa fuyimo tokazu nemu
‘If my husband, who is on a grass-as-cushion journey, sleeps fully dressed, then I, who remain at home, will sleep without loosening my sash!’
Here we find, except for the attributive yuku, the attributive of a ra-hen verb naru of the copula nari ‘to be’. Both are in the rentaikei 1.

4425  sakimori ni yuku fa ta ga se to twofyu fyuito wo myiru ga tomosisa mono modyoi mo sezu
‘Whose husband is that man who goes away as coast guard? The thus asking persons, I am envious of seeing them, for they have no sorrowful thoughts.
Here the particle fa calls for an attributive. The construction of an attributive with following particle like in number 4338 above is in fact a nominalisation.
The forms would be in modern Japanese *iku no ga* and *iku no wa*. We find two other attributives here *twafu* ‘to ask’ and *myiru* ‘to see’. See also the remarks about the *sa*-form above with number 4338.

4436 yamiy no ywo no yukusakyi sirazu yuku ware wo itu kyimasamu to tophiisi kwora fa mo
‘When will you return? Thus my love will have asked me, who goes without knowing the destination, as a night of darkness!’
Twice the same attributive in this poem. The first one *yukusakyi* is a transparent construction ‘ahead where I go’ in modern Japanese also *yukisaki*.

3541 azyfe kara kwoma no yukwo nso ayafato mo fuyitoduma kworo wo mayukaserafu mo
‘Though it is dangerous like the gait of a horse from a precipice, oh that dear wife of another! How fond I am of her!’

4385 yukwo sakyi ni
‘Before my departure’
Here the same combination appears as that in 4436, but not in its specialized meaning ‘destination’, and written with *rentaikei* 2.
*tatu* ‘to stand up’

3360 idu no umyi ni tatu siranamyi no
‘Like the white waves rise and fall constantly in the sea of Idu’

3396 konoma ywo tatu tori no
‘birds, rising from between the dense trees’

3414 ikafo no yasaka no wide ni tatu nwozi no arafoarwo made mo sane wo saneteba
‘Even till the degree of revelation, like a clear rainbow standing over the bank of Yasaka in Ikafo, if we have only slept enough together, I don’t mind anymore!’
Here we find also a form *arafoarwo* ‘to appear’ before the particle *made* which calls for a preceding attributive. However, this verb should be a lower bgrade verb, so there would not be an alternating vowel in the attributive, but there is. Another problem with this form is that it looks like a conclusive because the attributive would be *arafoaruru* as opposed to the conclusive *arafoaru*. An explication could be that this verb in the eastern dialect was not a lower bgrade verb, but a *r*-stem verb instead. This presumption would not be that strange since many vowel stem verbs have consonant stem partners. A good example is *naku* ‘to cry’ in number 3362 (Appendix 3b). This verb is normally a consonant stem verb, but in the eastern dialect it is a vowel stem verb.

3454 niifa ni tatu asade kwobusuma
‘Oh bedding of hemp growing in our garden!’

3515 a ga omo no wasuremu sida fa kuni fafuriru ne ni tatu kumo wo myitutu sinwodase
‘The moment you might forget my face, seeing the clouds, overflowing the country and rising on the peaks, think of me!’
Also the attributive of the presumptive -(a)mu appears before the noun *sida* ‘time’ in this poem (also 3461).

3476 tatwo tuku no mwohanafu ye yukeva kwofusikaru namo
‘As there is the passing on of the rising moon, there will be my longing for you.’
matu ‘to wait’

3563 tatimyidaye wa wo ka matu namo kyisq mo kowei mo
‘With her heart in confusion, will she have waited for me, yesterday night and this night too?’

Two reasons here for an attributive; the interrogative particle ka calls for it, but also the emphatic particle namo (namu in the western dialect) calls for a preceding attributive.

3561 kanawoda wo (...) φyi ga tworeba amey wo matwo nosu kyimyi wo to matwo mo
‘The field before the gate (...) when the sun shines, as if waiting for the rain, so I wait for you, my love!’

sumu ‘to live’

3547 adi no sumu susa
‘Susa where teals live’

3527 okyi ni sumo wokamo no
‘Like the little duck that lives in the offing’
Also see above in Appendix 3a, the same number.

aφu ‘to meet’

3401 nakama na i kyivrophi wpin no koweyenaba aφu koto katasi kyeyu ni avasu φa
‘The boat drifting at Nakamana, if it starts rowing out, then a meeting will be difficult. If it is not today!’

3413 nami ni aφu nosu aφyeyu kyimyi kamo
‘As the meeting with the waves, ah is the meeting with you!’

3535 ono ga wo wo oφo ni naomobyisq niφa ni tat wemasu ga kara ni kwoma ni aφu monq wo
‘My lord, don’t think carelessly of me! Standing in the garden to smile at you, I only met (the eyes of) your horse though!’

There is another attributive in this poem wemasu ‘to smile’; the verb is polite by affixing the causative verb -su which was a consonant stem verb in Old Japanese.

3478 aφo sidq mo aφanobyey sida mo
‘Whether we meet or not meet’

φαθu ‘to crawl’

3364 φαθu kuyu no φυικαβα
‘If I pull you as one pulls a creeping vine’

3525 kamo no φαθo nosu
‘Like the crawling of ducks’

4352 φαθo mamey no karamaru
‘Like creeping wildbean twines’

4421 asigara no myine φαθo kumo
‘The clouds that draw over the peak of Mount Asigara’

moφu ‘to think’

3470 aφuimyite φa titése ya inuru ina wo ka mo are ya sika moφu kyimyi matigate ni
'After I have seen you, a thousand years seem to have passed. Isn’t it so? At least so it seems to me, for it is difficult to wait for you my lord!’

An attributive is called for here because of the interrogative particle ya.

3494  nemo to wa fa mofo na fa afo ka mofo

‘I think we’ll sleep together. What do you think of it?’

The first mofo is a conclusive here because there are no special words which call for a conclusive verb taking the attributive form. Here the particle to is the quotative particle, not the emphatic particle. The second mofo is in the attributive because of the preceding interrogative particle ka. The presumptive nemo ‘let us sleep’ has the form of an attributive, but should be a conclusive here.

3552  wa ga mofo nasu

‘Like I think.’

ϕuru ‘to fall’

3358  ϕuzi no takane ni ἱφυ ρυκυη νασυ

‘Like the snow that falls on the top of Fuzi.’

3423  ikafo no nego ni ϕυρυ ρυκυη

‘The snow falling on the peak of Mount Ikafo.’

aru ‘to be’

4345  kuϕusiku mey aru ka

‘How lovely it is!’

3509  kworo ga osokyi no arwo koso yesi mo

‘To have my love’s outer-garment (as a keepsake) is indeed a good thing!’
Eugene HELIMSKI (Hamburg)

**ON PROBABLE TUNGUS-MANCHURIAN ORIGIN OF THE BUYŁA INSCRIPTION FROM NAGY-SZENTMIKLÓS**
*(preliminary communication)*

1.1. The famous treasure of Nagy-Szentmiklós was found exactly two hundred years ago, in 1799. It consists of 23 gold bowls, dishes, jars, and cups, and belongs now to the exposition of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. It was found in Banat, near the village of Nagy-Szentmiklós (today Sânnicolau Mare, to the north-west of Temesvár – Timișoara). The detailed description of the treasure and the history of studies is given in László, Rác 1983; see also an ample bibliography compiled by Mária Ivanics (in Göbl, Róna-Tas 1995: 59-77).

There are no direct indications for dating and attribution of the objects. Most estimates place them in the period between the 5th and the 10th centuries, the first half of the 9th century being the most wide-spread (and still, rather likely then proven) dating, see Róna-Tas 1990: 9; in his more recent publication András Róna-Tas (1997: 110) gives however preference to the second half of the 8th century\(^1\). Therefore the treasure is usually referred to as “Avar” or “Late Avar”, sometimes also as “Protobulgarian” (e.g. Mavrodinov 1943 as well as later literature from Bulgaria). This, however, does not necessarily characterise its provenance: as far as analogues to goldsmiths’ work, vessel forms, pictorial representations, and ornamental motives are concerned, references has been made to the Carpathian basin and to the entire Eurasian steppe zone, to Byzantium and to Southern Europe, to the Caucasus and to Iran.

1.2. The objects belonging to this treasure have inscriptions of three kinds which received recently a detailed palaeographic analysis in Göbl, Róna-Tas 1995. An inscription in Greek (the reading of which remains non-unproblematic, see Vékony 1973) is repeated twice on two paired bowls. The famous “Buyła inscription” (Inscr. 17 on buckled bowl [Schnallenschale] XXI) is written also with Greek letters, but in a non-Greek language. 13 objects have short inscriptions written with an unknown script of the “runiform” type.

It has been confirmed many times and by various study methods that the Nagy-Szentmiklós inscriptions differ not only in language and script, but also

---

\(^1\) A very late (not before the 12th century) dating of the treasure suggested by Hugo Mötefindt (1925) found no support in further research.
were not made by the same hand and therefore may originate from different (geographically as well as chronologically) artisan shops – as well as the gold objects themselves. “Die einzelnen Stücke des Schatzes stammen sicher aus verschiedenen Zeiten. [...] Die griechische Schrift des in griechischer Sprache geschriebenen Textes und die der Buyla-Inschrift sind paläographisch sehr weit voneinander entfernt” (Róna-Tas 1990: 10; see also László, Rácz 1983: 176-180; Göbl, Róna-Tas 1995: 29, 33-35). It is therefore permissible to restrict here the discourse to only one inscription, which always attracted more attention than the others.

2. The reading of the Buyla inscription causes no difficulties:

+ ΒΟΥΗΛΑ · ΖΩΑΠΑΝ · ΤΕΣΗ · ΔΥΓΕΤΟΙΓΗ ·
  ΒΟΥΤΑΟΥΛ · ΖΩΑΠΑΝ · ΤΑΓΡΟΓΗ · ΗΤΖΙΓΗ · ΤΑΙΣΗ

This text should be probably transliterated as follows:

buila (-jl-) · zoapan (z-, z-, z-) · tesi (-i) · dugetuji (dugetuji, dujetuji; -i)
butaul · zoapan (z-, z-, z-) · tagrogi (-roj--; -i) · icigi (icigi; i-; -c--; -i) · tesi (-i)

The variants of transliteration (shown in brackets) are determined partly by the impossibility to distinguish some sounds with the means of the Greek alphabet, partly by the instability and dialectal heterogeneity of the Byzantine Greek graphics. At least two problems deserve special mention:

2.1. The merger of η and τ, abundantly attested in post-classical Greek, has never been complete and universal (the archaic pronunciation of η as ë survives even in the Pontic dialects of Modern Greek). In the Byzantine period a trend can be observed – maybe due to learned efforts – to use in foreign names η for rendering a stressed (long) vowel, and ι for rendering an unstressed (short) one. See Debrunner 1954: 103-104 (“in nachchristlicher Zeit scheint ï die herrschende Aussprache [des η] geworden zu sein”) and Schwyzer 1939: 185-186, as well as the material in Moravcsik 1958. Therefore the presence of both symbols η and τ in the Buyla inscription may raise suspects that they rendered two quantitatively (or even qualitatively?) different vowels (cf. below 4.3.3). On the other hand, this may be a variation like that of οαι and οι, e and αι in other words of the same inscription.

2.2. Another post-classical and especially Modern Greek feature, the pronunciation of γ as j before ι η ε, has been taken into consideration for the reading of the Buyla inscription by Marcel Erdal (1988) and András Róna-Tas (1990) though disregarded in other deciphering attempts. The issue seems to be controversial. Gyula Moravcsik (1958: 32) accepts the reading γ = j before palatal vowels for Turkic glosses in Byzantine sources (most of which are however younger than the Buyla inscription), but he also mentions very late examples where γ even in this position obviously stands for g (Γεμήσι κατί = Γεμί καστί 16th c. = Turk.
Gemi qapisi ‘ship gate’, ὀρταγγί 1453 = Turk. ortayi ‘his companion’; ibid. 32, 114, 22. Numerous other facts (e.g. the usual rendering of γ as g in Slavic words and proper names of Greek origin, as well as the onomastic materials collected in Свод... 1995) leave no doubt that the preservation of the non-palatal γ was, at least as a feature of learned pronunciation, absolutely possible throughout the Middle Greek times and that therefore the letter sequences γε, γη could be freely used for rendering foreign ge or gi. Additionally, there always existed an opportunity of rendering a foreign intervocalic j with ɛ (as in Байровоς = Bulg. Bajan [ibid. 228-229] etc.). Therefore the traditional reading of all γαμμας in the Buyla inscription as “g’s” (or aspirated “γ’s”) must be considered much more probable than the new suggestion.

3. The book by R. Göbl and A. Róna-Tas contains on pp. 18-19 a collection of 14 attempted decipherments of the Buyla inscriptions; some earlier attempts are mentioned on pp. 11-16. The vast majority of scholars started with the assumption that the text belongs to a Turkic language (or even took its Protobulgarian origin for granted). However, this common starting point produced most variegated results, as the comparison of selected translations (belonging to specialists whose Turkological knowledge stands beyond question) shows:

Le zoapan Bouila a achevé la coupe, (cette) coupe à boire qui par le zoapan Boutaoul a été adaptée a être suspendue (Thomsen 1917: 24).

Der Zoapan Buila hat graviert den Kampf; der Zoapan Butaul hat das innere Kreuz graviert (Mladenov 1927: 335).

Die Schale des Boila Čaban, in seinem Auftrag wurde sie ausgeführt; Botaul Čaban hat ihr die Schnalle machen lassen, seine Trinkschale ist sie (Németh 1932a: 1; cf. also 1932b : 10, 1972: 13).

(paraphrased) Der Buila čupan tayši hätte hiernach seinem älteren Bruder (içıkä), dem himmlischen erhabenen Prinzen (täyrogi tayši), diese Schale geweiht (Haussig 1985: 30).

It is Buyla Žoapan who carries the bowl. Drinking bowl, made by But Aul Žoapan (Erdal 1988: 233).


Needless to say, each of these tentative interpretations demanded both introducing numerous conjectures and amendments in the text of the inscription it-

---

2 This example is especially important due to the likeness of spellings between ὀρταγγί and ῥαγγεη from the Buyla inscription.
self\(^3\) and constructing a Turkic idiom with otherwise unattested (and sometimes hardly imaginable) combination of phonetic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities. The detailed analysis of weak points in these interpretations is hardly necessary: they obviously contradict and disarmilitate each other, and the fact that A. Róna-Tas in his summary report from 1995 refrained from supporting any of the versions (including his own) is enough eloquent. The idea that the language of the Buylla inscription is Turkic remains natural and attractive (taking the history of the corresponding area into consideration), but it repeatedly leads the studies to a deadlock.

4. My search in another direction was prompted mainly by the following two observations:

4.1. The inscription includes three words with the same ending -gi (-ji ?) preceded by a vowel: ΔΥΓΕΤΟΙΓΗ, ΤΑΓΡΟΓΗ, ΝΤΖΙΓΗ. It is natural to assume that all three stand in the same grammatical form and fulfil the same syntactic function, most likely the predicative one; so one must think of languages which have this or a similar ending. This observation is not new (cf. already Keil 1888, cited after Göbl, Róna-Tas 1995: 14). However, this circumstance could not be taken into consideration in the numerous attempts to decipher the text: the Turkic languages do not know an ending like -Vgi in systematic grammatical use.

It is Tungus-Manchurian that fits this demand: here one of the most frequent, wide-spread and archaic verbal forms of 3Sg. is reconstructed as *-ra-gi (with harmonic variants like *-re-gi and with variants determined partly by the assimilation of the initial consonants and partly by the conjugation class like *-da-gi, *-ta-gi, *-sa-gi, *-ca-gi, *-la-gi, resp. *-de-gi, etc.), see Menges 1943: 243; Benzing 1955: 128-133; Сунник 1962: 215-228. In modern Tungus-Manchurian languages this form underwent contraction\(^4\) and appears as Manchu -ra, Nanai -ri (dial. -raj) after long and -j after short vowels, Ulcha -ri, Oroch -i, Udehe -i, Solon -ri, Negidal -j, Evenki Even -ri (with numerous variants which either go back to the above mentioned proto-language allophony [see e.g. Janhunen 1991: 79] or result from later morphonological changes). Like most finite and semi-finite verbal forms in the Altaic languages, this form seems to originate from a participle (or gerund) and combines at least in some languages non-finite and finite meanings: Nanai xolaj naj ‘the reading man’, naj xolaj ‘the man is reading’

\(^3\) It is almost universally assumed that the engraver – poor devil! – knew neither the Turkic language nor the Greek script, and that nobody possessing this knowledge cared to control his work. The entire philological experience proves, however, that assumptions of that kind (and they occur, regretfully, too frequently) signalise only the inadequacy of interpretations – not of the texts in question.

\(^4\) Incidentally, through the intermediary stage *-ra-jí etc.; this contraction, which affected all Tungus-Manchurian languages, must have occurred quite early. This means that even the interpretation of all -TH in the inscription as -ji or -jí (see 2.2) remains compatible with the Tungus-Manchurian reading suggested here.
reads’ (Суник 1962: 223); Evenki (dial.) emerī ‘coming, приход’, emerīw ‘I have come, я недавно пришел’ (ERSI 706). It is qualified as nominal aorist form (Benzing), as present participle serving as the base for finite forms of the (immediate) past tense (Sunik), etc. Below it is referred to as (predicative) participial aorist or (attributive) aorist participle.

4.2. For one of the two proper names in the inscription, BOYTAOYΛ, a Turkic interpretation has been suggested by Gy. Németh (1932b: 8) and accepted in later research (Göbl, Róna-Tas 1995: 23): Butaul = Bota-ul < Bota-oyul ‘Bota’s son’, cf. the Turkic name Bota. This explanation is not faultless because: a) the contraction oyū > u (ū, ō) in the word for ‘son’ is a relatively late development of Kipchak and Siberian Turkic unknown in Ancient Turkic and Bulgar Turkic; b) according to the dominant model of Ancient Turkic (as well as Modern Turkic) patronyms, one could expect the construction ‘Bota’s son’ to include the possessive form oyli, oylu rather than the absolute form oyul (ul); this second model of patronyms (represented e.g. by the Tuvinian names in -ool) is – according to Peter Zieme’s personal communication (March 1999) – either very scarcely attested or even totally absent from Ancient Turkic sources.

On the other hand, the name BOYTAOYΛ shows striking similarity to the typical masculine proper names in -wul which are wide spread in Evenki (Guriwul, Berkewul, etc., cf. ERSI 748). If the name in question sounded Butawul, the absence of a special letter for -w- before -u- in its rendering with Greek letters is expectable. One can naturally only guess about the meaning of the stem Buta-, but the TM languages provide us with at least one very likely explanation: *buta- ‘to hunt, to fish’ (TMS 1: 108, attested in Juchen, Manchu, Nanai, Ulcha, Udehe, and Oroch), hence Butawul ‘Hunter, Fisher’. Cf. Also the Evenki clan name Buta ~ Butan (Василевич 1969: 265).

4.3. The above considerations can be regarded only as indicative, but by no means decisive. The crucial moment consists, in my opinion, in the fact that after “extracting” the probable endings of participial aorist from ΔΥΓΕΟΙΓΗ, ΤΑΓΡΟΓΗ, ΗΤΖΙΓΗ one easily and immediately recognises three verbal stems which: (a) are attested throughout the Tungus-Manchurian family and occur in many sources dealing with the Proto-Tungus-Manchurian reconstruction; (b) form together a uniform and relatively transparent semantic context.

These three stems in question are *žuge(t)- ‘to change, to exchange, to replace’ (TMS 1: 270; Старостин 1991: 225 as *žugē-), *tāg- ‘to recognise, to acknowledge, to learn’ (TMS 2: 149; Janhunen 1991: 79 as *taag-, with the aorist suffix *taag-ra-), and *ič(e)- ‘to see, to look, to observe’ (cf. Циничус 1949: 308; Benzing 1955: 22 as *ičē-; TMS 1: 334-335; Старостин 1991: 214 as *ičē-). Placing these verbs into the context of the inscriptions we obtain a text saying that two regional leaders (zhupans) replace, recognise and supervise somebody (or each other), or maybe are themselves being replaced, recognised
and supervised – in other words, behave like regional leaders of all times and are involved into normal political and administrative activities⁵.

4.3.1. ΔΥΓΕΤΟΙΓΗ.

The TM stem *ẑüge- (perf.), *ẑüget- (imperf.) ‘to change, to exchange, to replace’ (TMS 1: 270) is well attested in most languages, e.g. as Evenki ẑüget-, Orok du(w)e-li-, etc. The form of 3 Sg. of participial aorist of the imperfective stem: *ẑügettegī or *ẑügetegī < *ẑüget-regī. In Manchu, where this stem is not preserved, the development *ẑū- > dü- (> Late Manchu du-) could be expected, as in the Orok form of this stem or in Manchu duksi ‘bilberry, whortleberry’ < TM *ẑūxi-kte- (Циньчус 1949: 211; Benzing 1955: 36, 42). The phonetic development *ẑ > d occurs also in other TM languages (systematically, however, only in Orok). Another process that is not uncommon in TM is the weak labial attraction (Benzing 1955: 20), which could produce the effect *ā > ő (ū) after the labial vowel of the first syllable. Therefore the spelling ΔΥΓΕΤΟΙΓΗ may render not directly the proto-form like *ẑüget(t)egī⁶, but rather its dialectal developments like ǒ düget(t)egī, ő düget(t)ōgī, ő düget(t)ūgī resp. (with shortened end vowel) ǒ düget(t)egī, ő düget(t)ōgī, ő düget(t)ūgī, being transcriptionally exact.

4.3.2. ΤΑΙΓΡΟΓΗ.

The reconstruction of TM *tākrägi ‘recognition, (has) recognised’ raises no doubts. One may perhaps speculate on the phonetic reasons of rendering the long ā in the first syllable with A, and of the short ā in the second syllable with O (the first type of rendering occurs also in BOYHAA, ZOAΠAN ~ ZΩAPAN, BOYTAOYΛ). An explanation that lies close at hand consists in assuming that the Tungus-Manchurian language of the inscription was (partly) affected by the phonetic development which was in the 8th and 9th centuries gradually spreading through the Proto-Slavic dialect continuum: the change of *ā to a and of *ā to o. The symbiosis with the Early Slavs (see the rich literature on the issues of the Avar-Slavic relationships) could in principle be responsible for the penetration of this phonetic innovation also in the language of the Buyla inscription.

4.3.3. ΗΤΖΙΓΗ.

The participial aorist of TM *iće- ‘to see, to observe’ should be probably reconstructed as *içeregī or (if the stem belonged to the conjugation classes II or III, see Benzing 1955: 123-128) resp. *ičesegī or *ičedegī. However, the consonantal stem in Even ić- and Orok it-, as well as the variation of vowels in the second syllable in the derivatives of other TM languages (cf. Evenki ičuľi- ‘to check, to investigate’, Nanai ičuči- ‘to show’, Solon isǒ- ‘to appear’, see TMS 2:

---

⁵ Rather than into producing, engraving, and buckling bowls (as it is suggested by most popular versions of reading the inscription in Turkic).

⁶ In this case we were to assume the rendering of ʒū with ΔΥ (dü) – which looks by no means impossible.
may bear testimony to the archaicity of the corresponding stem without
the final vowel. If so, the expected form of the participial aorist could have been
(with assimilation) "iččegi, (after degemination) "iččegi and even (with attrac-
tion/assimilation of vowels) "ičči. It can be even assumed that the spelling
HTZIFH correctly renders stressed character and length of the initial and final
vowels as opposed to shortness of the medial vowel (cf. 2.1 on the usage of ñ and ñ).

5.1. The proper names and titles in the Buyla inscriptions have always been
more or less clear. My suggestion concerning the presumably Tungus-Manchu-
rian origin of the name BOYTAOYΛ has been formulated above (4.2).

Perhaps it were possible to find a tentative TM etymology also for the name
BOYΗΛΑ, but this is hardly necessary: on the one hand, it received a most per-
suasive treatment in Gobl, Rona-Tas 1995: 22-23 and, on the other hand, it must
not and cannot be expected that personal names belong either to the language of
the name-bearers or to the language of the document mentioning these names (cf.
ibid. 23) 7.

The title zhupan (in its different phonetic version) was in the last centuries of
the 1st mill., and remained afterwards, so wide spread in the Carpathian basin and
adjoining lands that additional comments to the word ZOAΠAN, ΖΩΑΠΑΝ are
also hardly necessary (see ibid. 24-25 as well as rich etymological literature
devoted to this title, e.g. Zett 1975 and Gołąb 1986). The only striking circumstance
consists in the Greek spelling with -οα-, -ωα-: one could rather expect this word
to be spelled with ον, ο, or ο, as in numerous other Greek renderings of the same
title (see Moravcsik 1958: 131-132). As long as otherwise the Greek transliteration
seems to be very exact, it can be suspected that this unique spelling renders
the pronunciation of the title in the language of the inscription. And, if so, its first
part can be tentatively compared with TM *ĵu(w)a(n) ‘ten’ (Benzing 1955: 26,
101; TMS 1: 248), Nanai žoa, žoa(n-) id., Manchu žuwanda ‘foreman (in a group
of ten units or persons)’. If a plausible Tungus-Manchurian source also for the
second part -pan can be found (my search in this direction remained fruitless),
this comparison may constitute a sound alternative to other suggested etymologi-
cal treatments of zhupan (to Slavic župa ‘district’ – unless this word is not itself a
back formation from the title, etc.). If not, this comparison may explain the folk-
etymological phonetic change underwent by the foreign title zhupan in the lan-
guage of the Buyla inscription.

5.2. ΤΕΣΗ, ΤΑΙΣΗ (the identification of both spellings is a commonplace of
former studies, and I do not see any need to reject this tradition).

In the framework of the suggested interpretation testi (tesi) remains the last
lexical riddle of the inscription – and obviously must play the key role in its
reading. There seem to be no obvious “candidates” for direct (without conjec-

7 An additional consideration: at least one of the resulting interpretations of the text (see
below, 6.3) suggests that it was Buta(w)ul, but not necessarily also Buyla, whose na-
tive language was a Tungus-Manchurian idiom.
tures, etc.) identification in the lexical material of contemporary Tungus-Manchurian languages. Still, I venture to suggest a solution which is by no means the sole one – but looks very probable.

The TM verbal stem *teg(e)- ‘to sit down’ (Ev. tege- etc, see Benzing 1955: 30 as *tägä-; TMS 2: 226-8; Старостин 1991: 214 as *tege-) is attested as Manchu te- with the meanings ‘to sit, to sit down; to sit enthroned; to hold a post, a seat’ (‘сидеть, садиться, восседать; занимать должность, место’). The “administrative” meaning of this stem is evidently archaic, perhaps even common TM, as evidenced by the following derivative of *teg(e)-: Evenki tegemër, Even təyəmər / təyəmər / tegemër, Orok təyəmeri ‘tsar’ (TMS 2: 228)\(^8\).

In Manchu this (or a similar) derivative is, according to TMS, not attested – a fact that can hardly be surprising, because all political terminology of this language consists of Chinese and Mongolian loan-words. However, the most commonly used suffix of nomina agentis in Manchu is -si (adalasi ‘herdsman’ from adula- ‘to graze’, medesi ‘messenger’ from mede ‘message’, uculesi ‘singer’ from ucule- ‘to sing’, etc.; s. Болдырёв 1987: 55). That determines the semantic transparency and derivational plausibility of the non-attested *tesi ‘king, monarch’ (or maybe only ‘seat-holder, high-ranked person’), semantically parallel to Evenki təyəmər, in a TM language relatively close to Manchu\(^9\).

The fact that, similar to the title zhupan, the word in question is repeated in the inscription twice strengthens the probability of treating it as another title.

6. Summing the above interpretational and etymological suggestions up, we receive the following word-for-word translation of the Buyla inscription:

zhupan Buyla “king” replaced zhupan Butaul recognised supervised “king”

(the quotation marks signalise that the “king” may be actually any privileged person, from a senior district official up to the Byzantine basileus, the Emperor of the Franks, or the Avar kaghan).

The absence of grammatical markers (with the exception of the verbal / participial ones) makes the syntactic roles of individual words unclear. This is a most serious obstacle to understanding the text unequivocally.

---

\(^8\) It is worth mention that the same semantic derivation is attested also in Selkup, a language with a long history of Tungus-Manchurian influences: Selkup (Taz) ɑmtɑl’ qon ‘tsar, king’, derived from ɑmtɑ- ‘to sit’.

\(^9\) I must mention, however, a phonetic problem that arises in connection with this explanation: one must assume the early loss of intervocalic (or stem-final) -g- in *teg(e)-, while in other cases the language of the Buyla inscription seems to have preserved this consonant (see above). It can only be remarked that problems of that kind frequently accompany the attempts to give an accurate description of the reflexes of “weak” consonants in Tungus-Manchurian (and in other Altaic, as well as non-Altaic) languages. Just one example: TM *daga ‘root’ is attested in Negidal as dâ, though normally -g- is preserved here (TM *daga ‘near’ > Negidal daya).
6.1. One possibility consists in treating the text as composed of nominal predicative phrases with omitted copula (existential verb)\(^{10}\) and with aorist participles used – in accordance with the syntactic rules of Tungus-Manchurian – in preposition to substantives:

Zhupan Buyla (is the) "king". (The) replacing zhupan Butaul (is the) recognising (and) supervising "king". (Alias: Zhupan Buyla is and remains the king, but – during his absence or disease – his deputy zhupan Butaul fulfils the administrative duties.)

This reading is perhaps the simplest one. However, I can hardly imagine a situation when such a message should be engraved on a gold bowl (for whom?) rather than announced through horse-riding heralds, etc.

6.2. Another, and perhaps a better, reading, can be obtained by ascribing the passive meaning to aorist participles:

Zhupan Buyla, (the) "king", (is) replaced. Zhupan Butaul (is the) recognised (and) supervised "king".

I am, however, inclined to reject this version as long as the aorist participles in *-ra-gi are normally employed in the Tungus-Manchurian languages as active participles (unless the verb itself is supplied with a passive marker).

6.3. A principally different, and more sensible, reading derives from the following considerations:

(A) Though all Tungus-Manchurian languages inherit the object (accusative) marker *ba, its usage is in the Southern group non-obligatory, especially with indefinite objects (Benzing 1955: 79). V. A. Avrorin in his book on Nanai syntax devoted a big chapter to nominative objects, indicating that in some texts they occur as frequently as the accusative ones (Avrorin 1981: 151-158).

(B) Though the canonical word order in the Tungus-Manchurian languages is SOV, all grammatical descriptions as well as texts indicate ample possibilities of deviating from this word order in emphatic construction. The text of the Buyla inscription can be expected to be declarative (with an emphasis) rather than narrative.

(C) If the Buyla inscription is a translation from some other language (e.g., from Greek, from Slavic), it can be expected to be a word-for-word rendering of the original text, with the non-Tungus-Manchurian (or untypical) syntax preserved.

These considerations permit me to suggest the following third version of interpreting the text (taking the employment of Greek letters into consideration, it is the basileus who can be considered the most probable candidate for ΤΕΣΗ / ΤΑΙΣΗ):

---

\(^{10}\) There are numeral examples of such syntactic constructions in Evenki (Колесникова 1966: 119), in Nanai (Avrorin 1981: 93ff.) and in other Tungus-Manchurian languages.
The basileus has displaced (or: displaces) Buyla as zhupan. The basileus has recognised and supervised (or: recognises and supervises) Butaul as (the new) zhupan.

or even (treating the text of inscription as a performative speech act):

The basileus declares the displacement of Buyla as zhupan. The basileus declares his recognition and watch over Butaul as (the new) zhupan.

Such a text may be authentic, though syntactically aberrant (from the viewpoint of dominating syntactic models in the contemporary Tungus-Manchurian languages). Even more likely, it can be a word-for-word translation from an Indo-European language with a free word order – for example, the translation of the text which corresponds syntactically to the following, syntactically adequate, Russian text: Буйлу-жупана император сменяет. Бутаула-жупана признает и контролирует император.

It is this last reading version that produces perhaps the most plausible scenario, explaining also the circumstances under which the Buyla inscription came into being: After a political change in the southern part of the Avar khaghanate, which could have occurred even without any direct Byzantine participation, Constantinople seeks the ways to reaffirm its (formal rather than real) sovereignty over the region and to strengthen the ties to the new zhupan Butaul. The latter is therefore presented with a gold bowl (and possibly other gold objects belonging to the treasure of Nagy-Szentmiklós). An inscription engraved on the bowl serves as the act of diplomatic recognition on the basileus’s side. As a token of special respect, this inscription is translated into Butaul’s native language.

6.3.1. This last reading version (which seems to be more promising than those in 6.1. and 6.2.) and the corresponding scenario lead to the following suggestions concerning the gold bowl XXI and perhaps also the other objects belonging to the treasure:

(a) they were produced in Byzantine artisan shops, so that e.g. the portrayal of a victorious nomad warrior on gold jar II (László, Rácz 1983: 53-55) and other engraved scenes can be viewed as the continuation of the tradition of the famous “Scythian” vases (which were produced in ancient Greece) and not as specimens of “steppe art”;

(b) they can be dated with the time when the Byzantine presence or even domination in (contemporary) Banat and in adjoining regions was possible, perhaps before the invasion of Danube Bulgarians (ca. 670-680) or, less likely, after the victories of Byzantium over Bulgaria (mid-10th century). However, the issue of borders between Byzantium, Avaria, and Bulgaria, as well as of political de-

---

11 The weak point of this scenario lies in the fact that, according to S. A. Ivanov (personal communication, February 2000), the use of “barbarian” languages was most uncommon in the Byzantine diplomatic practice. Normally the “respect” to a barbarian was expressed by addressing him in Greek.
pendence/sovereignty, was never quite clear even to the contemporaries – to say nothing about the modern historians.

Both suggestions remain however within the limits delineated by the previous studies on the treasure from Nagy-Szentmiklós.

6.4. It goes without saying that the above three versions do not exhaust the possibilities of interpreting the Tungus-Manchurian text, and especially of speculating on its possible historical connotations.

7. The assumption that a Tungus-Manchurian idiom was spoken in the Carpathian basin in the Avar times is naturally a much more serious claim. It must be stressed, however, that: (a) neither Turkic nor Mongolic origin of the Avars has been until now proven; (b) according to the wide-spread view, the Avar tribal confederation was not linguistically uniform; (c) the Tungus-Manchurian affiliation of the language of the Buyla inscription certainly does not suggest that this was the only or the dominating language of the Avars.

Another, and extremely important, piece of evidence must necessarily be mentioned in this connection. István Futaky in two articles (1970, 1973) indicated the probable borrowings from Tungus-Manchurian into Hungarian, and at least four of his etymologies (for Hung. beteg 'ill', oldal 'side', hamar 'quickly', kanál 'spoon') appear to be faultless. One can see here another trace of the Tungus-Manchurian presence in the Carpathian basin, or at least far enough in the West to reach the Proto-Hungarians.

7.1. The language of the Buyla inscription appears to be relatively close to the Proto-Tungus-Manchurian – closer anyhow than to any of the later or contemporary daughter idioms, though some features can be viewed as Southern Tungus-Manchurian or even Early Manchu. This agrees with the relatively late dating of the dissolution of the Tungus-Manchurian unity (first half or middle of the 1st Mill.) which the author assumed in some previous studies (see e.g. Хелинскій 1985: 210).

7.2. If the above assumptions concerning the Buyla inscription are correct, both the person who prepared the Greek transliteration and the goldsmith who engraved it deserve our gratitude: the text contains no misspellings and needs no amendments.

12 "It should hardly be surprising that the European Avars were an entirely mixed tribal confederation, with an Inner Asian core, in which a number of Altaic and non-Altaic languages were spoken" (Golden 1992: 111). Cf. also Ligeti 1986; Goľob 1992: 394 ff.
13 The fact that they are not accepted in the contemporary Hungarian etymological lexicography is a problem of the latter – not of the quality of I. Futaky's comparisons. I use this opportunity to express to István Futaky my gratitude for his valuable comments on this paper, some of which hopefully be incorporated into his monograph (in preparation) on Hungarian-Tungus and Hungarian-Mongol language connections.
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HOW TO NAME A DRAGON IN ALTAIC

The instructive study of C. Watkins (1995) sets forth in exemplary detail virtually everything one needs to know about how to cope with Western, i.e. Indo-European, dragons; but it leaves entirely open many of the questions with which dragons confront us in the Eurasian realm of the Altaic languages. Nor is this in the least surprising. We all must admit that for the present at least our command of comparative Altaic materials can hardly hold a candle to the accumulative resources that our L.-E. colleagues are able to bring to bear upon their studies. But even granting this, the questions that arise as we come to confront dragons in the Altaic realm are refreshingly different from those treated by Watkins.

Unlike the Indo-Europeans, who were mainly and typically concerned with subduing and eventually killing their dragons, in the Altaic world we mostly honor and revere ours; it might even be said that the major concern of Altaic speakers across Asia over the millennia has been not to exterminate but to denominate their dragons. This situation has in turn generated a rich repertory of dragon names and terms stretching from one extreme of the Altaic domain to the other, not excluding Korea and Japan; and in the present contribution we propose to explore a few of the salient representations of this repertory in historical-linguistic terms, an especially appropriate study for this “Dragon Year”.

We begin, at the easternmost extreme of the Altaic linguistic realm, with OJ tatu, NJ tatsu ‘dragon’, a form apparently isolated among all the Altaic languages, and one that as a result has, especially in Japan, given rise to a variety of unconvincing folk-etymologies. These begin with the speculations of the mid-Kamakura lexical-grammatical compendium Myōgoki (first draft, 1268; completed 1275). This text (cited Nihon kokugo daijiten 13.83°) suggested three equally implausible sources from within Japanese itself for this word, finding in it either an abbreviation of (1) taka.tobu ‘to fly high’, or (2) taka.taru ‘to be sufficient (for heaven) on high’, or (3) taka.taru ‘to drip down from on high’, the last with reference to the dragon’s virtually universal rain-making associations.

In one manner or another these 13th-century speculations have been repeated in Japanese scholarship ever since. The only substantial addition to these guesses
has been to abandon the “abbreviation” hypothesis and instead attempt to associate the noun NJ *tatsu* ‘dragon’ with the verb NJ *tats.u* ‘to stand erect’ (thus also in *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, loc. cit.), but of course without attempting to explain the details necessarily involved in the proposed unique derivation of a noun from a verb by zero-morpheme suffixation, unattested anywhere else in the language.

All that these etymological speculations, whether 13th-century or 20th-century, make clear is that it is clearly fruitless to attempt to find the historical sources for this dragon-term entirely from within Japanese itself. The word obviously must have a history; but in order to trace the details of the same we must be prepared to look further than, and indeed beyond, Japanese.

Before we may begin such an investigation, however, we must briefly note at the outset two important points in terms of which we shall pursue our search for possible extra-Japanese etymologies for this word. The first involves phonological, the second semantic considerations.

1. J. Norman (1977) first brought historical-linguistic order to an important set of Tungus forms where we find Ma. *s*- for pTg. *t*- He pointed out that this change “invariably occurs” when Ma. *-j*—immediately follows between two succeeding vowels, and further that an important and typical source for this *-j*, over and above the expected pTg. *-f*-, is pTg. *-rg*-, while also *-nj*- < pTg. *-ng*-functioned in a parallel fashion. Unfortunately Norman did not realize that two years earlier K. H. Menges (1975.95) had discussed the same phenomenon as “eine im Altajischen gelegentlich zu beobachtende Mutation” (Menges 1993.176 again returned to this same theme). It is in these larger terms that we shall here suggest that the initial *-f*- > *s*- shift has application to Altaic in general, rather than to the more limited Tungus domain proposed by Norman. But even in Altaic in general, this shift appears to have been particularly favored before an immediately following *-rg*- or *-rk*- sequence, so that Norman’s formulation still provides a useful guide to identifying its larger Altaic occurrences. Typical, and not yet discussed in the literature, is the etymon represented by WMo. *taryu(n)* ‘fat’, *taryula*- ‘to become fat’, Ma. *tarhú(n)*, Nan. *targó*, Jrč. *tawun* ‘id.’, but MKor. *sǎl.h*- < *sǎl.g*- ‘flesh; meat on the bone’, *sǎlči*- ‘to grow fat’, Nkor. *sal, salčči*- ‘id.’ (Neither *SKE* 220 nor *TMS* 2.168a-b recognize the Korean reflex for this Mo.-Tg. comparison, despite its early appearance in Shiratori 1914-16.164-5, no. 342; with MKor. *sǎl.h*-, cf. MMo. *sarqud* (in *Sec. Hist.*, 132) ‘meat for sacrifices’, Trk., Kir. *sarqūt* ‘the leftovers of food given to inferior persons’, Poppe 1955.41).

2. On the semantic level, it must be kept in mind that in the case of dragon names we are obviously dealing with a somewhat special area of vocabulary, one where we must be prepared to recognise and accept a considerable number and degree of variation in lexical meanings. After all, no one has ever actually seen a dragon; and so in this sense at least any name or names that may be applied to the
creature must necessarily be based upon some conjectural semantic parallel believed to obtain between that which has not, and cannot, ever been seen, and other more prosaic but easily observed creatures in the natural world.

In all parts of the Far East, wherever the Sinitic culture has had an impact, the dragon has had well-documented associations with water in the very broadest sense, both as the rain-maker \textit{par excellence} and as the mythic aspect of a variety of water-dwelling creatures, notably (and in South China in particular) with the crocodile. Hence it will come as no surprise when we discover, as we shall, that more than one dragon name in the Altaic world reflects, and in its turn draws upon, what we may tentatively describe as an aquatic-zoological lexical store. This reveals itself to be a semantic cluster that in different times and various places yielded not only terms for the vividly visualized but invisible dragons, but also designations for entirely real denizens of the land, or more often water, particularly when they were notable for variegated or otherwise desirable furs, and also for slim, lithe bodies that in turn carried connotations of speed.

Two secure points of phonological departure offer themselves as we begin our attempt to establish the earlier linguistic history of OJ \textit{tatu} ‘dragon’. One is the OJ form itself, being as it is of impressive antiquity; the other is Trk. \textit{sazyan} in the \textit{Codex Cumanicus} ‘dragon; serpent’, whose ancestor-form was borrowed into Hungarian as \textit{sákány} ‘dragon’ (on the \textit{Cod. Cum.} attestation, Gronbech 1942.216, with ‘dracon’ in 108,12 and ‘serpens’ in 108,29 of his 1936 facs. ed.; on the Hungarian loan, Ligeti 1975.283; 1980.237).

From these forms it is difficult to isolate Kāšyarī’s early 11th-century \textit{tavyān} ‘a slim lop-eared dog’ (\textit{EDT} 568b), now usually understood as ‘greyhound, borzoī’, and also from this last, Ott. \textit{tazī} ‘greyhound’, even though the Turcological consensus is that \textit{tazī} is identical with the ethnonym \textit{Tājīk}, and hence ultimately of I.-E. origin. But with \textit{tavyān} the situation is unclear; Doerfer (\textit{TME}N 2.446 § 866) considered this word “ursprünglich tü[rkisch]”, although his etymology explaining it as a participle in \textit{-yan} on the verb \textit{tay}- ‘to slip, sink (as of a man or animal in rain or mud)’ (cf. \textit{EDT} 567a) is hardly convincing. Even though obviously not directly related etymologically the earlier \textit{tavyān} and the later \textit{tazī} appear not to be entirely unconnected; and at any rate, when the former at least is taken together with OJ \textit{tatu} on the one hand and the \textit{Codex Cumanicus} \textit{sazyan} on the other, it is not at all difficult to understand that here we very likely have to deal with yet another striking instance of the same Altaic initial *\textit{r}- > *\textit{s}- shift discussed by Menges, moreover found here in one of its typical phonological contexts particularly well established by Norman.

It is also immediately clear that in all these words, with their -\textit{z}-, we have to deal with pA *\textit{r}2-, and moreover that this is clearly an instance where, thanks especially to the early Hungarian loan \textit{sákány}, we may at one and the same time trace this *\textit{r}2- to earlier *\textit{r} + \textit{C}-, with \textit{C} = *\textit{k}, as well as establishing the long-
quantity of the immediately preceeding vowel *ä. This apparently leads us at first to two proto-forms, *tärk- and *särk-. But since the *-rk- combination is one of the most abundantly documented phonological triggers for the Menges-Norman *t- > s- initial mutation, we may with confidence work from this point on in terms of only one proto-form, *tärk- > *tär2-. We already know from other comparative evidence that *-r2- following an original Altaic long vowel regularly corresponds to OJ *t-, as against *-r2- following an original short vowel which instead yielded -r- (Miller 1994.93-94); and so with these several well-established and documented correspondences in hand, we may immediately and regularly relate OJ tatu ‘dragon’ < *tär2- to Trk. sazyan and beyond that, by phonological implication, to *tärk- as well.

We have already seen that most of the Japanese secondary literature on the question of the history of OJ tatu does not rise above the level of folk-etymology; but one ought not to pass over in silence the single marginal case of an “exception that proves the rule”, even though it does not directly involve the form tatu. Osada (1972.81, 133) collected a small amount of Korean-Japanese evidence for the same *t- > s- mutation with which we are here concerned, and in this connection further suggested that NJ tanuki ‘badger’ is cognate with MKor. sällk ‘wildcat; lynx’ (an important word that we treat in detail infra). The suggestion is not entirely implausible semantically; and in Japanese folklore the tanuki is an important figure, frequently in league with the fox (see the many citations in Ikeda 1971.341, s.v. ‘badger (tanuki)’). While Osada’s characteristically original suggestion raises more problems than it solves, it nevertheless deserves attention if only because of its virtually unique attempt to relate a Japanese form to a Korean one within the *t- > s- mutation paradigm.

The semantic component of our proposed etymology may at first glance appear somewhat strained; but that is more apparent than real. The element of meaning common to both the original *t- forms and their secondary *s- mutations is that of a slim, lithe, swiftly-moving being. And if we are willing to expand this semantic web to embrace yet another sine qua non of the Far Eastern dragon, i.e. its universal affinity for water (whether dwelling in aquatic habitats or itself producing rain), then we may add to the forms already cited several more that will help to broaden the etymological picture, not only semantically but phonologically as well.

Especially important among these secondary forms are a number of words still preserving the unmuted initial *t-, represented by Nan., Ulč. targa ‘otter; beaver; fur-seal’ (cf. Benzing 1955.1014 § 76e). Ramstedt, SKE 251-252 was surely correct (as so often) when he suggested that Sino-Korean tal ‘otter’ was somehow connected with these Tungus words. But today, instead of thinking of a Sino-Korean loan into Tungus, it would appear somewhat more satisfactory rather to suggest that in Chin. �⇄ t’ā < *t’āl < *t’āt ‘otter, beaver, fur-seal’ we
have an important and hitherto unrecognized early loan from Altaic, resp. Tungus, into Chinese, where the word is attested since at least the Shuo-wen of 100 A.D., and remarkably enough, also in the received text of the Mencius (IV.A.9: "C’est la loutre qui fait fuir les poissons aux profondeurs des eaux", S. Couvreur, Les quatre livres... IV, 471). If this text is authentic, it would effectively push the documentation of this Tungus loan into Chinese back into the first decades of the third century B.C. And further continuing the semantic link from ‘aquatic dweller’ and ‘fur-bearer’ is most likely also Ma. ṭargaṅ. This form is variously glossed in our lexical sources: ‘Tigerkatze’ (Hauer Hndwrb., 3.890 [1955]; ‘small tiger’ (Norman, Dict., 272b); ‘tigrenok’ (TMS 2.168). The great Ch’ing dynasty pentaglot (Wu-t’i Ch’ing-wen-chien, ed. J. Tamura et al., Kyoto, 1966-68, no. 15946) explains it as “an animal resembling a tiger but smaller in size”, but also equates it with Chin. 彃 piao ‘a tiger-cat; stripes on an animal’. Novikova (1972.145) is not informative on this word. Nor does the literature clarify the obvious etymological connection that must exist between Ma. ṭargaṅ and Ma. šurjan, šurhan ‘a three-year old tiger’ (TMS 2.430a; Wu-t’i no. 15945), as well as Ma. šurha ‘a wild boar (of two years)’, and Jrč. širha ‘a young stag’ (TMS loc. cit.; surely these š- forms provide further examples of the *t-* > s- mutation before *-rg-). These and other Tungus “quasi-tiger” terms must preserve in their etymologies more than a few hints of the extremely ancient interrelations between tigers and dragons, and of their respective roles in the cosmological world view of Sinitic Eurasia (cf. Antoni 1982 passim, esp. p. 206ff.). And this cannot but remind us, in turn, of what Hopkins concluded after a survey of all the early Chinese epigraphical evidence for the Chinese lǐng- dragon available to him half a century ago: he found the lǐng to be “quite a terrestrial creature, as reminiscent (to my eyes) of a Tiger as of a Dragon” (1931.803, with Figs. 13-17).

Secondarily, and with the mutation-initial s-, we encounter two main sets of ultimately related forms, the first embracing terms specifically designating thin, elongated aquatic creatures, the second having to do with land-animals notable for their variegated and often economically important pelts.

In the first category we must place the large repertory of Turkic forms (conveniently collected in Tenişev 1997.179) for ‘carp’, variously sazjan, sazar, sazan, certain of which have been borrowed into Russian as sazan, var. šaran, in that same sense. And significantly, these terms bring us full circle in our quest for the proto-type of OJ tatu since the Cod. Cum.’s sazjan ‘dragon; serpent’ can only be understood as preserving one of the original semantic extensions (if not the original sense) of this etymology before it was displaced in this meaning by the virtually wholesale borrowing throughout the Altaic domain of Chin. 龍 lǐng ‘dragon’ as Trk. lu, specifically in the context of the Sinitic animal cycle. But even in this wide-spread fish-name, the Turkic -z- forms are paralleled by Tungus forms that testify to the origin of this phoneme through *-r₂- and ultimately from
*-rk-, viz. Ma. sarga in sarga nimaha ‘Siberian salmon’ and sargani nimaha ‘n. of a river fish with a long mouth’ (Norman, Dict., 234a; other Tungus cognates all reverting to pTg. *sarga in TMS 2.65b; the voicing of *-k->*-g- in Tungus is obviously secondary).

In the second category, and equally worthy of further study in this connection, are a number of Tungus forms that have several times in the literature been connected with MKor. sàlk, NKor. salk.kwang’i ‘wildcat; lynx’ (Yu, Dict., 427a: Martin, Dict., 901a).

Shiratori (1914-16.166, no. 346) first brought together these words with the many Tungus forms deriving from pTg. *sulakī ‘fox’ (Benzing 1955.1014 § 76h), e.g. Ev. sulakì, Sol. sulaki, Lam. hülæ, Neg. solaxì, Nan. soli, etc. (TMS 1.124b), as well as with Ma. solohi, variously glossed as ‘sabel’, ‘polecat’, and ‘weasel’, i.e. Mustela sibirica. Both SKE 221 and Yi Ki-mun (1958.117 no. 197) made basically the same etymological associations; and later commenting with approval upon the former, N. N. Poppe (1955.579) further suggested adding Mo. solomī to this constellation of presumably related animal names, thus in effect expanding an essentially limited Tungus etymology into a broader Altaic one.

From what we now know of Korean historical phonology, no particular problems are involved in associating this MKor. sàlk (which glosses Chin. 狸 li ‘fox; wild-cat; raccoon; civet’) and the Tungus forms with labial vowels in their first syllable brought together with it by Shiratori, Ramstedt, and Poppe. MKor. ā was not an original inherited phonological element in the system of the language, but rather a neutralization or reduction of any one of three distinct Altaic vowels, *a, *o, *e. Moreover, it typically appears when, as here, the original vowel in question was immediately followed by two consonants in close juncture (cf. MKor. pal ‘foot’ but :pālp- ‘to tread underfoot’; MKor. tālk ‘chicken’, OJ tōri ‘bird’; other examples and further discussion in Miller 1994.88-90).

We encounter a surprisingly wide semantic range for the Tungus and Mongolian cognates of this etymon as we find it represented in our available lexical sources. These have been usefully surveyed by Ledyard (1964.19), who found them to include everything from ‘weasel’ to ‘le putois, la martre de Siberie’, ‘the fitchew’, ‘polecat’, and even ‘mole’. Ledyard was understandably unable to make much of this lexicographical-zoological cornucopia, except to point out that ‘Solānqa’, var. ‘Sulangka’, ‘Solange’ is a Middle Mongolian designation for ‘Korea’ from the time of the Secret History on, and to suggest, very plausibly, that behind this terminology lies the fact that the Koreans were famous, particularly during the Koryŏ period, as trappers and fur-traders in the skins of otters (cf. supra!) and weasels. Actually, we know also from other sources that skill in the trafficking in squirrel pelts, frequently passed off on the Japanese as sables, distinguished the foreign trade of the Po-hai kingdom, so much so that the Po-hai
word for ‘squirrel’ is one of the only two Po-hai words that have survived to our day (Miller 1989; 1999).

Ledyard also notes that WMo. solungya is not only ‘weasel’, but also ‘rainbow’ (cf. Räsänen, VEWT 427a; Lessing, Dict., 726a); but he goes no further with this fascinating semantic pairing. Novikova (1972.131 note 186) was surely correct when she speculated that this linking of ‘weasel’ and ‘rainbow’ is no mere lexicographical Zufall: it can only be understood as arising from an implicit association between the iridescent, light golden-rust hues of the animal’s fur and the colours of the rainbow.

Of other important etymological implications inherent in this ‘rainbow’ semantic association we shall have more to say shortly below; for the moment, however, it is important to return briefly to considerations of historical phonology and to note that within this larger MKor. sälk :: pA *sol(a)ki ety whole we once more encounter yet more important evidence for the initial *t- ~ s- mutation upon which our proposed etymology of OJ tatu ‘dragon’ rests. Long ago, Ramstedt (EAS, 2.213 [1952]) perceptively suggested bringing together forms that he cited as “tung. sula, sulaki ‘Rofuchs’, kor. salk, solk ‘Wildkatze’”, and “ü. tülti, tülti, tülgü, tilgi ‘Fuchs’”. He ventured no explanation for the mutation of the initials, but of course (and particularly in light of the Turkic forms, cf. Claussen, EDT 498-9) both the Tungus and the Turkic data fall perfectly together to provide yet another genuinely pertinent example of *t- > s- before -lk/g-, exactly as posited by Menges and Norman and precisely as invoked in our Altaic etymology supra for OJ tatu ‘dragon’. (On the initial mutation in the ‘fox’ words in Turkic and Tungus see also now Menges 1993.256-57.)

Just as much that was (and is) said, written, and believed about the OJ tatu ‘dragon’ parallels, and in great measure draws upon, the lore of Chin. lüng ‘id.’, so also for a lesser-known and clearly secondary but still important imaginary composite animal, the OJ mituti, NJ mizuchi, frequently written in the early texts with Chin. 蛟 chiáo as a semantogram. The chiáo has been described as “[s]piritually akin to the crocodile, and perhaps originally the same reptile ... a mysterious creature capable of many forms ... sometimes it was manlike, and sometimes it was merely a fish. ... We might name [it] a ‘basilisk’ or a ‘wyvern’ or a ‘cockatrice’ ...” (E. Schafer 1967.217-18; for further detailed discussion of lüng as against chiáo see Eberhard 1968.238ff., 378ff.).

Like the creature itself, its OJ linguistic shape is “capable of many forms”: whether the first vowel should be understood as OJ i or i is somewhat open to question, as is the problem of whether the consonant immediately following was originally -t- or -d-. The reading of OJ miduti found in many sources is largely based on the word’s NJ development on the one hand, and on an obvious folk-etymology that identifies the first part of the form with OJ midu ‘water’ on the other; well-attested otherwise is OJ mî ‘serpent (esp. in the animal cycle)’. The
argument that would find in the form in question this same mī morpheme, probably followed by OJ *tu (gen.), seems well worked-out and convincing in most particulars (e.g., Omodaka et al., 1967.697a), and is the basis for the form adopted here, OJ mituti.

The correspondences in form and meaning between OJ mī ‘serpent’ and certain Tungus forms are so striking that one begins to suspect earlier parallel but independent borrowings from some unidentified third source rather than routine genetic inheritance. On the Japanese side we know that OJ ì was, even at the earliest stages for which we may recover it, an already secondary vowel, the result of crisis of *ui or *oi (Miller 1993b.197, 200). After reinterpretting our OJ mī along these lines as originating in *mui or *moi, we can hardly overlook Ulč. mui, Orok. mu, Jrč. *mûxe, and Ma. meihe ‘snake’ (TMS 1.537b-538a; Cincius 1949.103 [Tabl. 12], 313; Starostin 1991.36, 217, 293 [no. 437, his pA *mûk ‘V’]). The various steps and stages that would be necessary in order to link Starostin’s Altaic protoform with his pTg. *mûkū (p. 217) and pMo. *mogai (p. 239) are less than adequately explained, as for that matter are also the internal Tungus relations that somehow must connect the mui forms most of interest to us with other, less obviously relevant such as Neg. mîki, Udh. mîki. And Starostin 1991.36 may well be wrong in suggesting the TMS errs in putting together this ‘snake’ etymon, no matter what its original shape may have been, with forms related to Ev. mirki- ‘to crawl, creep’, since an early *miri-, *miriki- would point in the direction of OJ mī < *muri or *mori in terms of a well-documented *Vru > VOV shift already studied in detail for a number of other Altaic and Korean forms (Miller 1997.93). But for the moment at least there is little more that can be said about the etymology of OJ mī ‘serpent’. It is certainly related to Tungus, and hence probably also to Altaic, but the precise details of its etymological connections remain tantalizing obscure.

Fortunately, the morpheme OJ -ti that in mituti immediately follows the genitive case-marker .tu, so that mituti must be understood as mī.tu-ti, ‘the serpent’s ti’, is rather less obscure on the comparative-historical level. Traditional Japanese scholarship has, at least in this century, routinely explained this suffix as a bound-morpheme OJ -ti ‘divine power; the force of nature’, in the sense of Chin. 精 ling ‘spirit(ual)’. Wholesale refutation of this mostly baseless etymological speculation would take us too far afield; for our present purposes it is sufficient to note that, as we have already explained in some detail, another OJ term for a fabulous animal, OJ wōrōti ‘a great serpent (in the myth)’ embodies what must be the same suffix in a compositum that may most easily be understood, and explained historically, as meaning no more than ‘the tailed one’, completely parallel to Ev. irgići ‘wolf’, lit. id. (Miller 1987.45, 51). De Visser (1913; rpt. 1969.137), who cites NJ misuchi and renders it as ‘river-gods’, reports an etymology that would identify the final -chi with NJ chichi ‘father’, hence mī-
zuchi ‘water-fathers’; this suggestion has not been found in any Japanese source available to us, and may well have been original with de Visser. At any rate, it gets us no further than does the usual Japanese school-etymology.

Thinking along these lines, we are inclined to see in OJ mituti a petrified case-suffix formation that probably meant little more than ‘possessing [the qualities?] of a snake’. Of course this etymology does not rule out the possibility that early in its history in Japan this word (with its mī- < *mui- initially at least a transparent continental borrowing?) was reinterpreted along the later traditional lines of folk-etymology, the same lines that saw in its (foreign?) mī- the more easily understood native mī-, midu ‘water’.

Be that as it may, the ultimate history of this word is vastly, and indeed one is even tempted to say unduly, complicated by the existence of a poorly documented but nevertheless important autochthonous early Korean word for ‘dragon’ that has barely survived in the scholarly record and memory of the peninsula, even while it has almost totally disappeared from the modern language. This is MKor. milū, which glosses both Chin. lōng and Chin. 辰 ch‘én in Hummong čahwi, the Chinese-Korean bilingual glossary of 1527; the word is also put together with Chin. lōng in the so-called ‘Sŏkpong’ glossing of the Chinese Thousand Character Classic of 1583 (Nam, Dict., 233b; Yu, Dict., 345b). In the case of both of these bilingual lexical sources it was obviously necessary to cite a native term for ‘dragon’ if at all possible; and this MKor. milū, whatever its ancestor-form may have been, was apparently still sufficiently alive to serve the purposes of the authors of these glossaries. But one surely suspects, from the evidence of these purely lexical sources, that already by the early and later 16th-century, the borrowing of Chin. lōng familiar today as NKor. yong ‘dragon’ had all but driven the earlier autochthonous form into the near oblivion that engulfs it today. A lonely exception is a gloss (in Chinese!) in a manuscript etymological miscellany of 1819 by Chong Yak-yong (1762-1836), who recalled that Korean had indeed had a word for ‘dragon’ ‘pronounced like [the word for] ‘previous’’ (Yu, Dict., 346a), i.e. like NKor. mili ‘beforehand, previous’ (Martin, Dict., 688b). It would appear that Chong had no access to texts for this word; at any rate, he got the final vowel incorrect. We have already discussed these forms in connection with a wide spectrum of problems in early and middle Korean cults and myths (Miller 1993a, passim, but esp. p. 253 with n. 8, and p. 273ff.). Little remains to be said now in that connection, except first to speculate upon some of the possible sources that may lie behind the curious half-life survival of this apparently old form, despite the inroads of Chin. lōng, and then also to note some attempts to associate this word with OJ mituti, another vexing question which we hardly touched upon in our earlier contribution.

In the first connection, the most probable clue is likely still to be found in our 1993 suggestion that “a now-lost Silla Old Korean form [with] phonetic
similarity to Kor. milûk ‘Maitreya’ ... propelled the devotion to the future Buddha into conjunction with the autochthonous ‘dragon-king’ cult” (p. 263). There we also cited (n. 8) a possible Old Korean phonogram attestation of ‘dragon’ as †mil. Today further notice should be taken of a highly speculative suggestion involving Old Korean place-names by Yi Pyong-sôn (1988.93-94).

The earliest Chinese sources for the history of Korea (details in Lee/Lewin 1977.33) frequently speak of the ‘Three Hans’, i.e. ‘Three Koreas’ in the southern portion of the peninsula. One of these is called Chin-Han, Chin. 辰韓 ch‘ên hán ‘dragon Korea’, using Chin. ch‘én ‘dragon’, the usual Chinese term for the ‘dragon’ when understood not as an animal per se but rather as one of the cyclical animals. This state was located in the east of the country; and since in the Sinitic system of cardinal orientation it is the dragon that particularly “rules” the east, Yi attempts on this admittedly somewhat thin basis to gloss as ‘dragon’ an otherwise obscure OKor. 畏知 †mici < *miti placename from this Chin-, or Eastern, or ‘dragon’ Han-state. And this word he would in turn associate with the milû of the 16th-century lexica by the familiar Korean scholarly invocation of a ‘lenition of t to l’. We have explained elsewhere why this all-too familiar postulation of a sporadic phonological shift at different times and places within the history of Korean is both unconvincing and uninformative (Miller 1997/1998); and ‘lenition’ serves us no better here than it does elsewhere in our study of the history of the language. This in turn means that Yi’s conjectured Old Korean form for ‘dragon’, even if it is valid, actually raises in its turn more questions than can conveniently be answered.

In the second category too, little can be said with final certainty. Here we have to reckon with Ōno Susumu’s one-on-one comparison of MKor. milû (written mirû in Ōno’s system) with OJ mitutti (1952, rpt. 1973.544) (his midu-ti of 1952 was altered to mitutti in his Kogo jiten [1974], 1228c, where it is flatly asserted that the two forms, OJ and MKor., are cognate). No further details are given in either source, and one can only guess that Ōno too was thinking in terms of the convenient ‘lenition’ deus ex machina; nevertheless, the confrontation of these two words, which appears to have been original with Ōno, and of course predates his later strident claim to have identified Japanese as a Dravidian language, if not as identical with Tamil (Miller 1996.225f.), is worth noting if only because it is representative of the now almost forgotten heyday of Japanese-Altaic and Japanese-Korean linguistic comparison. Unfortunately, and much like Yi’s putative Old Korean form, it too does not get us very far along the road to solving the etymology of OJ mitutti. For that, we must still probably in future look once more in the direction of the hints earlier put forward, in our attempt to link the Korean form with pTg. *piru ‘blood-sucking insect’ (Miller 1993a.274-276).

Apart from these few possible traces of earlier forms, autochthonous dragon-hunting in pre-Middle Korean is a unrewarding experience. For the Late OKor.
language of the Koryŏ kingdom we have a remarkable Chinese-Korean bilingual glossary probably coming from the beginning of the 12\textsuperscript{th}-century (ed. Sasse 1976). It records the Koryŏ word for ‘dragon’ (Chin. lūng) with Chin. 稗 chéng ‘to praise’, var. ch'eng ‘a steelyard’, ch'ën ‘corresponding to’ used as a phonogram (ed. cit., p. 109, no. 105). Not much can be made of this, except to note that the textual-emendation suggested in Sasse is without merit. The phonogram may represent OKog. †t'eng or †t's'eng (cf. Karlgren, GSR 894g), and this in turn might reflect an early stage of the *

\textit{i} \rightarrow s- mutation (through intermediate *

\textit{i}, *t's ?), with assimilation of *-rg- \rightarrow *-ng. This would at least put us within reasonable reach of a prototype *tārg:-; but there the trail of early native dragon-terms in Korea ceases.

Finally, it is important in connection with the study of this word to evaluate in some detail an Altaic etymology recently advanced by S. A. Starostin and his colleagues, introducing into the discussion certain other forms which also deserve investigation. We begin by quoting the somewhat laconic etymological rubric as now published, and then proceed to comment upon it chiefly by expanding it with relevant linguistic data:


1. The form(s) that may be presumed to support these Turkic reconstructions must be related to if not identical with Kašy. batrak ‘a lance with a piece of silk at its head which a champion used as a badge on the day of battle’ (Clauson EDT 307b: “probably a l.-w., possibly received through Sogdian”). But none of Clauson’s sources hints at the zoomorphic element which is the essential tertium quid for the proposed etymology.

2. Tg. *muturi introduces Ma. muturi ‘dragon’ and virtually identical words in Sol., Oroč., Ulč., Nan. and Jrč. (TMS 1.550b). Direct comparison, as here, with Kor. milu again disappoints, since it leaves unsolved the question of whether the Kor. -l- continues the Tg. *-d- or *-r- (or perhaps both?), not to mention the problem of the vocalization of the first syllable. Comparison of Tg. *muturi ‘dragon’ with OJ mitiuti appears to have much more to recommend it. pA *mudur\textsubscript{2} would regularly have yielded an OJ form in -ti; unfortunately, and at least for the present, Turkic evidence that would confirm the reconstruction of *-r\textsubscript{2} in this word is lacking.

Another promising, and still mostly unexplored, etymological direction along which the history of this particular Altaic dragon-term may usefully be explored hinges upon the well-known and (thanks now mainly to Diény 1987) elaborately documented Sinitic conceptual association between ‘dragon’ and
‘rainbow’: “L’arc-en-ciel est un nuage coloré qui ressemble à un dragon” (loc. cit., § 6.14, p. 182; see also his full account of the texts associating dragons and rainbows, pp. 179-83). This easily understood connection, only natural in the light of the Chinese tâng’s rain-making proclivities, was hardly limited to the Sinitic culture-area proper; and it is not difficult to point out linguistic evidence that, while still evading complete philological control, clearly indicates that the rainbow and the dragon together have long shared significant areas of lexical-historical commonality throughout the Altaic realm of Eurasia, a commonality that is strikingly exemplified in the seemingly curious but actually significant semantic dichotomy of WMo. solongyo, solungya, ‘1Siberian weasel; 2rainbow’ already cited above. Clearly each half of this bifurcated semantic complex is related to the other. The veritable menagerie of animals, many if not all of them aquatic, prized for their valuable iridescent pelts embraced by the former part of the gloss relates intimately to the equally obvious aquatic adumbrations of the iridescent rainbow of the later. And of course it is the dragon who is uniquely able to link together these several disparate strands, being at the one and the same time aquatic, iridescent, and also an animal.

Thinking along these lines, it is tempting to compare Tg. *muduri with MKor. mûcìkòi, Nkor. mu’cikai ‘rainbow’ on the one hand, and with MKor. mûl-tû-, Nkor. multûl- ‘be colored, dyed, imbued with color’ on the other. All these Korean forms incorporate, in one way or another, either MKor. mûl ‘water’ or its combining-form mû- (cf. OJ midu, combining-form mî- ‘id.’). A great number of modern non-standard Nkor. dialect forms for ‘rainbow’ are collected by Choe Hak-kun (21994.35-36); almost all of them revert to a *mudžige prototype. Interesting however is a single attestation of [mudžilge]; and five dialect areas from among the sixteen studied are further distinguished by forms that suppose a *hwanggodži prototype (with Chin. 鳳 húang ‘golden yellow?’).

For Nkor. mu’cikai ‘rainbow’ Martin (Dict., 666b) simply repeats an old folk-etymology that earlier appeared in Ramstedt, SKE 15b, attempting to explain the formation as ‘water A-frame’. But this is obviously beside the point, both because the rainbow does not carry the rain “as in an A-frame” (rather, it signals the end of the same), and also because the traditional Nkor. cikòi ‘a coolie rack, an A-frame’ does not remotely resemble the shape of a rainbow (cf. the illustration in Ulî mal k’iûn sačon [1992], 3.3869b). Somewhat more likely is the etymology suggesting that the second morpheme in this compound has nothing to do with či- ‘carry on the back’ but instead is to be identified with MKor. čikòi ‘gateway; door’ (glossing Chin. 幕 hù, Yu, Dict., 681a; this and other less satisfactory etymologies are now found in Kim Min-su 1997.389a). Middle Korean citations for the -kai, -kòi suffix involved in this word are conveniently collated in Yi Sung-nyông (31974.84-65, § 119); it was also studied in Ramstedt (1939.175, § 315: “it is almost impossible to be sure whether the stem [with this
suffix] is a noun or a verb”). Martin (1992.600 [cf. also pp. 164, 257, 612] is probably closest to the mark when he postulates a bound-noun kay₂ as in ssůlkai ‘the gall’ < ssū- ‘to be, taste bitter’, and aměůlkai ‘the seat of a loom’ < amě- ‘to sit, squat’, though he does not make the further association with mućěkai ‘rainbow’. In other words, the suffix in this ‘rainbow’ form, like that in the ‘gall’ and ‘loom seat’ forms, apparently indicates the representative locus or situs of an activity or state, and so the ‘rainbow’ would easily be understood as the locus classicus of water, resp. rain.

On the phonological level, the Korean ‘rainbow’ words, as well as the verbs meaning ‘be colored, etc.’ cited above, all in one way or another put one in mind of Tg. *muduri, which in turn must lead to the eventual consideration in future of a possible connection with OTrk. bediz ‘Ornament, Schnitzerei, Verzierungen’ (DTS 90b), WMo. beder ‘Streifen, Linien’ (Poppe 1960.53, 126), EV. bugdi, Lam. būdi ‘motley, variegated’, Orok büržd ‘id., esp. of deer’ (TMS 1.101b), MA. bederi ‘stripe(s) on the hide of tigers and other wild animals; spots on animal hides or bird feathers’ (TMS 1.120a). Despite the problem presented by the vocalization of the first two syllables (probably to be solved by taking pA *bādār₂ as the oldest protoform that we can recover, and assuming that early labial-attraction accounts for the equally well attested *būdār₂; cf. also OTrk. bodu-, bodā- ‘to stain, color, dye’, DTS 109a, 107a), we are obviously here close to recovering an early, widespread Altaic term for a variety of animals, both real and imagined, especially notable for their colors and stripes or their mottled and variegated (i.e., rainbow-like!) coats. Novikova (1972.135 and note 215) has again pointed us in the right direction when she suggested that together with these words for ‘motley, variegated’ and ‘animal-skin markings’ (our pA *bādār₂ > *būdār₂) it is correct also to link etymologically a considerable range of Mongolian and Tungus animal and bird names (e.g., WMo. bōdöne [< *bedene] ‘quail’, Yak. bādar ‘lynx’). What we are able to suggest now is that within this etymological hunting-net we may capture still more variegated prey, ranging from the dragon itself to the rainbow from which he cannot easily be separated, as we know from both the overall Sinitic tradition and the Mongolian lexical evidence. And here, it is important to note, will easily be accommodated not only OJ mituti (with unvoicing of the second syllable */d* regularly by Lyman’s Law [Miller 1985], and -t- */r₂/) but also MA. muduri.

Two further problems of rainbows and dragons may be discussed only briefly in passing. MA. nioron ‘rainbow’ is treated very badly in TMS 1.601b-603a, s.v. noyon ‘green’ (where inter alia Nkor. nok ‘id.’ is an obvious Chinese loanword!). Instead we are inclined to look in the direction of OJ nuzi, nizi ‘rainbow’, and modern non-standard Japanese dialect forms for id. such as Akita [myoozi] and Fukuoka [menzi] (Martin 1987.498-99). Martin’s suggestion (loc. cit.) that NJ niji is a “contraction” of *nimusi and hence means ‘red/beautiful
snake’ is of course absurd; but the dialect forms he cites show that a *n- ~ m-* alteration (or, mutation?) in these ‘rainbow’ terms is not out of the question. (But his OJ nwozi, i.e., nōzi, is a lexical ghost, cf. Omodaka et al., 1967.553d-554a.) And here also, for that matter, probably belongs the elusive word †nimiao, thus in Chinese phonograms in the Wu Yüeh ch‘un-ch‘iu, a Later Han text of extremely devious transmission, purporting to relate events during the early part of the fifth century B.C. (J. Lagerwey in M. Loewe, ed., 1993.473-76), where it is said to transcribe the (foreign?) name of roof-figures “resembling dragon horns” (Diény 1987.231 § 7.35). Future study of this *n- ~ m-* alteration must of course involve such other sets as pTg. *miαban ‘heart’ (Benzing 1955.988 § 53a), Ev. mēvan ~ mēyan, Lam. miavun ~ mēvan, Ulč., Orok. mēva(n-), Nan. miavā, Ma. niyaman ‘id.’ (Kolesnikova 1972.290; TMS 1.533b-534a; SKE 136) :: MKor. mazām, NKor. ma‘ām ‘heart; mind, spirit’, which provide an exact parallel (Tg. *m- but Ma. niy- i.e. n- :: Kor. m-) to the sets of forms cited above for ‘rainbow’.

Further, there is the question of the rainbow’s color(s), and its (their) connection with the dragon. The Sinitic dragon was archetypally ‘golden yellow’, Chin. huáng (Diény 1987.26, § 1.20, with many other passages passim too numerous to cite here). Down to the time of the Manchu dynasty, gold brocades and embroideries in gold thread distinguished the so-called “dragon-robes” of the Aisingioro court; common to these curious garments was “a background of writhing cloud scrolls in the five auspicious colours ... yellow, red, blue, black [and] white” (Camman 1951.299, 305, 313). But early texts make it clear that the ‘golden yellow’ of the dragon was something over and above these five colours with their obvious evocation of the rainbow: we are told in specific terms of “une dragon jaune, qui avait les cinq couleurs” (Diény 1987.117, § 4.55). Thus we see how the circle that brings together rainbow and dragon continually closes in upon itself, and this in more than one case of linguistic interest, of which one example must here suffice.

Šarukan, the name of the Polovtian ruler attested in the Russian chronicles from the 11th and into the beginnings of the 12th-century, is understood to have been based upon “Hunno-Bolgarian *sārkān ‘serpent; dragon’” (Pritsak 1976.28 with note 52). But the initial morpheme of this compound name may equally well be understood as a reflex of pA *sjōr- ‘be white, light, yellow’, Chu. šur-‘become white’, Ma. šara- ‘id.’, WMo. sira, sirya ‘yellow’, OJ sirō ‘white’, OKog. †sirap ‘id.’ (also borrowed as Hung. sárő ‘yellow’); and this is surely how the morpheme suru- in Trk. Karačaj sarubék ‘dragon; crocodile’, and surū- in Trk. Balkar sarūvêk ‘Lindwurm’ (Pröhle 1909.130; 1914/15.250) is to be understood, cf. Karč. sarī ‘gelb, blond’, and Balk. sari ‘gelb, rötlich, fuchsfarbig’. And, as Menges has pointed out, both these Caucasian Turkic forms sarubék and sarūvêk are transparent folk-etymological formations made up on
the basis of şarukan (i.e. Saru.qan) by replacing qan with beg (Menges 1979.172).

Rich materials for the further study of the dragon and its rainbow counterpart are still available. Räsänen (1946) has discussed, inter alia, the implications of the rainbows figured on the variegated maral-deer skin, with its yellow blaze, used on the shaman-drums of the Altai Tatars; and Hentze (1966) excitingly extended the exploration of this theme to Ancient China and the New World (it is worth noting in passing, that his Chin. i ‘rainbow’, pp. 263, 264, Abb. d, is the first morpheme of our *nimiao ‘dragon horn(s); rainbow (?)’ already noted above). But all this must wait for future investigation, since here our main concern is only with linguistic materials.

Among these, we ought finally to take note of the recent attempt by Starostin to provide another and different Altaic etymology for OJ tatù, as follows:


The Tungus forms behind Starostin’s *ţjabdar are numerous, and include Ev. jakdăr, Sol. jaydā-, Lam., Oroč. jabda, Neg. jabdan, jabdar, Ulč. jabda(n)-, Orok. dabda, Nan. jahjā, Ma. jabjan, all glossed ‘large snake, viper’, also Neg., Ulč. ‘boa constrictor’, Ulč., Nan. ‘grass snake’ (TMS 1.239b-240a). This, together with his unclear Turkic glosses, leaves serious semantic questions concerning his putative juxtaposition of such forms with OJ tatù; like all his Altaic and Sinitic breathen, the Japanese dragon was a benevolent, life-giving creature far removed from monsters and horrors such as vipers and boa constrictors. The phonological problems of the Starostin etymology are, if anything, even greater than its semantic short-comings. The *u- of his “Jap. *datua” seems entirely ad hoc, inserted to account for the -u of tatù, while the *a of his protoform just as conveniently disappears without reason from OJ where it is not wanted; similarly ad hoc is the putative behavior of the labial-stop element internal in the same protoform. All things considered, the cluster of unsolved questions on all levels that distinguish this etymology make it impossible to favour it over the semantically straightforward and phonologically rigorous historical-linguistic scenario that would relate OJ tatù ‘dragon’ to pA *türk- > *tăr- as set forth supra.

This proposed Altaic etymology has, over and above the light it throws on the OJ lexical store, further implications for the ultimate history of the 12-animal cycle in Asia. Chavannes (1906, esp. pp. 52-3, 117) perceptively noted the critical role necessarily played by term(s) for ‘dragon’ in tracing the early history of the cycle, and somewhat reluctantly opted for Turkic groups as inventors rather than solely as transmitters of this intellectual artifact. Halévy (1906, esp. pp. 277, 286ff.) retorted that the “Turco-mongolian” ‘dragon’ term lu, lü supposedly
spread by the Turks being itself obviously a borrowing from Chinese, "[l]e dragon étant en haute Asie une création exclusive de l'imaginaire chinoise", it was necessary to look back at least to China, and possibly beyond there to the Middle East, in establishing the origins of the cycle and in particular of its single imaginary animal.

Unfortunately this far from resolved question of where the animal-cycle, and especially its dragon, ultimately came from apparently did not interest Pelliot as he went about, with characteristic precision and attention to detail, clarifying the readings of and possible etymologies for several relevant terms found in Arab-Mongolian glossaries, in particular that of Qamdu'llāh Qazwīnī dating back to 1339. In 1925 N. N. Poppe (not seen; citation in Pelliot 1927.279 note 2) had attempted to explain bslqun, a "nom mystérieux" that Qazwīnī supplies as the Mongolian term for 'crocodile', as somehow related to Trk. baliq 'fish'. Pelliot (1927.289) was unconverted, but he did even then suggest that the dragon was somehow connected with the nomenclature problems of these mysterious animals; after all, the Mongols had no more seen a crocodile than they had encountered a dragon. Twice in 1930 Pelliot again returned to these and related words, which appear to have fascinated him (1930a.18, on a glossing where 'dragon' is replaced by 'fish'; 1930b.567, 569, once more on 'crocodile' for 'dragon', and finally, if reluctantly, admitting that he is unable to improve upon Poppe's 1925 suggestion). There the philological trail apparently ceases. But one must ask why, somewhere along the way, it was never suggested that the form bslqun, whether crocodile or pseudo-dragon, that lies at the heart of all these notices might plausibly be connected with the basilisk < Grk. basilikós, that "fabulous serpent, lizard or dragon whose breath or even look was fatal".

For all that, perhaps the most significant point to be identified in Pelliot's many scattered comments on all this is the way in which he twice comes back to Trk. sazyan (1927.289; 1930b.567), as if to remind himself (and us) that there was another entirely, and earlier, Altaic dragon still to be found lurking behind the later Sinitic "turco-mongole" lu, lü < Chin. lüng. If it tells us nothing else, then at the very least the etymological net ultimately linking Trk. sazyan and OJ tatu demonstrates that indeed, we must still look beyond China for the Urheimat of many, if not most, of our Eurasian dragons.

As we have seen, earlier attempts to look for Eurasian dragons beyond China have mostly bogged down in speculations about the early, if not Old, Middle East (e.g. Chavannes 1906.119-20; Halévy 1906.295). Perhaps it is not necessary to go so far afield. Tangut †molu 'Wurm', attested in the Hsi-hsia-Chinese bilingual of 1190, seems to have excellent Tibeto-Burman cognates (Laufer 1916.33-35), and can hardly be isolated from MKor. miliá discussed supra. Tenišev (1997.179) reminds us that NE shark has no solid etymology, yet seems difficult to isolate from this same Trk. sazyan; the unsolved problem of this word is hardly trivial, if
only because Chin. chiao (cf. supra) was frequently described as what can only have been a shark (Schafer 1967.57, 221; Carr 1990.131). Many if not most of the literally hundreds of Chinese dragon-names conveniently collected by Carr (1990) still call out for etymological analysis and may well supply missing-links that will clarify the early lexical genesis of this elusive creature across Greater Eurasia. The only major difficulty liable to be encountered in that work will be to reinvestigate Carr’s data unhampered by the veritable “cascade d’hypothèses hasardeuses”, not to mention “la recherche hasardeuse des parentés phonétiques” (Diény 1987.III, note 1) originating with the late P. Benedict that unfortunately obscure so much of Carr’s otherwise useful compilation.

And finally, lest we forget, there is of course Indo-European. “The connection of [Grk.] ἀράκων with the verb δέρκομαι, aorist ἔδρακον, was in antiquity psychologically real enough, whether a ‘true’ or a folk etymology... I suggest that in the second element of the Old Irish compound muir-drís, ‘sea-drís’ [where] drís may ... convey the notion ‘monster’, ‘dragon’, or the like ..., we see a cognate of the Greek word ἀράκων... . Both [I.-E.] branches then, Greek and Celtic, would attest both the verbal root *derk- ‘see’ and a word for ‘dragon, serpent’ *drk-. If the latter two should turn out not to be cognate – which I doubt – the folk etymology itself could be of Indo-European date” (Watkins 1995.447; cf. Frisk 1957.5, 414, on “[d]ie seit alters herrschende Ansicht, der Drache sei nach seinem bannenden, lähmenden Blick benannt ... “, and on the question of the connection of the root-noun *drak(n) with Skt. drś- ‘Blick’).

So it would seem that we have good authority for positing an I.-E. dragon-name *drk-. Is it too fantastic to suggest, in conclusion, that there might have been some more-than-accidental connection between this word, or at least this root, and our pA *tārk-? And if comparison with Lat. serpēns and Grk. ἔχθρατος did not reveal that Skt. sarpa- ‘snake’ goes back to I.-E. *serph- ‘crawl’ (Gambkrelidze and Ivanov 1995.1.444-45), these words as well might in their turn be compared with our initial-mutation forms in s-; the alternation here of *-k/g- ~ *-p- might well be understood as a reflection of Poppe’s important but now mostly, and unfortunately, neglected scheme for explaining parallel alternation of pA *-p- and *-b- as -g-, -b- and -p- in the various languages (Poppe 1960.46-49, §§ 32-33). But with these two admittedly bold I.-E. excursions, it is time to emulate the good example of Hopkins (1932.97), “and ... [bid] good-bye to Dragons and all that!” at least until the next “Dragon Year”.
Literature Cited

Antoni, Klaus
1982 Der weiße Hase von Inaba. Vom Mythos zum Märchen, Wiesbaden, (Münchener Ostasiatische Studien Bd. 28).

Benzing, Johannes

Carr, Michael

Camman, S.

Chavannes, Éd.
1906 Le cycle turc des douze animaux, in: T'P sér. 11, vol. 7.51-122.

Choe Hak-kun

Cincius, V. I.
1949 Sravnitel'naja fonetika tunguso-mančžurskix jazykov, Leningrad.
–, ed.
1972 Očerki sravnitel'noj leksikologii altaiskix jazykov, Leningrad.

Diény, Jean-Pierre

Eberhard, Wolfram
1968 The Local Cultures of South and East China, Leiden.

Frisk, H.
1957 Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Lieferung 5, Heidelberg.

Gamkrelidze, T. V. and V. V. Ivanov

Grønbech, K.

Halévy, J.

Hentze, Carl
Hopkins, L. C.
Ikeda, Hiroko
Kim Min-su et al., eds.
1997 Uli mal 'ówôn sačôn, Seoul.
Kolesnikova, V. D.
Lagerwey, John
Laufer, Berthold
1916 The Si-hia Language, in: T’P 17.1-203.
Ledyard, Gari
Lee Ki-moon (Yi Ki-mun)
Ligeti, L.
1975 Quelques problèmes étymologiques des anciens mots d’emprunt turcs de la langue hongroise, in: AOH 29.3.279-88.
Martin, S. E.
Menges, Karl H.
Miller, Roy Andrew
1997/98 Altaic Implications of the Korean -t/- verbs, in: UAJbr N.F., Bd. 15.139-69.
Norman, J.
Novikova, K. A.
Omodaka et al., eds.
1967  Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten, Jōdaihen, Tokyo.
Ōno Susumu
Ōno Susumu, Satake Akihiro, Maeda Kingorō, eds.
1974  Iwanami Kogojiten, Tokyo.
Osada Natsuki
1872  Tōga okutakushō, Kobe, (Kōbe Gakujutsu Sōsho, 2).
Pelliott, Paul
1930a Notes sur le “Turkestan” de M. W. Barthold, in: T’P 27.1-54.

Poppe, N. N.
1955 The Turkic Loan Words in Middle Mongolian, in: CAJ 1.36-42.

Pritsak, O.

Pröhle, W.

Ramstedt, G. J.
1939 A Korean Grammar, Helsinki, (MSFOu 82).

Räsänen, Martti

Sasse, Werner

Schafer, Edward

Shiratori Kurakichi

Starostin, S. A.
1991 Altajskaia problema i proisxoždeniye japonskogo jazyka, Moskva.

Tenišev, Ė. R.

de Visser, M. W.

Watkins, Calvert
1995 How to Kill a Dragon, Aspects of Indo-European Poetics, New York.
Yi Ki-mun (Lee Ki-moon)
Yi Pyong-sŏn
Yi Sung-nyŏng

**XV.**

Finnisch *kypärä* 'Helm' – entlehntes Grundlexem oder einheimische Ableitung?

*kupa-ra), kavas ‘Flösse’ (← *kupa-s) und kupu (Ableitung -a → -u) ‘Vogelkropf; Wölbung’ sprachintern erklären.

Einige weitere Beispiele, vornehmlich aus dem Germanischen, sollen illustrieren, wie man sich ein solches angenommenes Adjektiv vorstellen kann.


Germanic vocabulary is full of monosyllabic roots like kub/kob, supposedly meaning ‘lump, round object, soft object, etc.’. They lie at the foundation of numerous animal names.

Ferner (op. cit. S. 98):

There are about two dozen words in Germanic that mean ‘cap’, ‘cup’, and ‘cop’ (that is, ‘head’) with synonyms in Romance and in non-Indo-European languages [...] They may show no evidence of the First Consonant Shift (cf., for instance, Medieval Latin cuppa and English cup); sometimes only one stop is shifted (as in German Kopf ‘head’). In all probability, they are Wanderwörter that influenced one another’s sound shape and semantics.

Und er schließt (op. cit. S. 107-108):

A late Germanic root kab/-kob/-kub/-keb/-kib- is no worse than any of the asterisked roots in Brugmann or (Walde-) Pokorny, and it is typical of such roots to designate small animals, useless animals, etc. Cob ‘stout horse’ is not a central meaning of English cob, and no traces lead from it to Latin caballus [...] I conclude that cub is related to cob and that the history of both needs little further elucidation.


Die These von R. Beekes (1996), daß es sich bei Wörtern wie lat. caput und cacūmen eher um nicht-indoeuropäisches Lehnwort handle, dürfte als unbeweisbar gelten können. Er geht ja u. a. davon aus, daß das Vorkommen von a solche Wörter automatisch als nicht-indoeuropäisch brandmarkt; für mich wäre aber hier geradezu ein Paradebeispiel eines lautsymbolischen Elements kak- ‘spitzig, Gipfel’ zu sehen, mit dem wir synchron gesehen gut vertraut sind (darüber bes. Elmevik 1967). Es verwundert dann ein bißchen, daß eben das uns interessierende
Element *kup-* von Beekes schließlich (1996: 223-227) folgendermaßen ausgelegt wird: “Thus it is a typical Wanderwort” [wobei man sich fragen kann, ob Wurzeln wandern können]. Insgesamt ist die Auffassung Libermans, loc. cit. wie oben, meines Erachtens wesentlich überzeugender denn Beekes’.

**XVI.**

Fi. *peukalo* ‘Daumen’, ein Lehnwort – aber aus welcher Grundform?


---

1 Koivulehto hätte mit seinem Gedankengang m. E. eine sicherere Etymologie finden können, hätte er nur statt *peukalo* ein anderes fi. Wort einbezogen: *pukama ‘kyhmy; Beule, Buckel, Geschwür auf Haut oder Baum’. Wie schon gesagt ist diese Bedeutung besonders für die nordischen tiefstiffigen Wörter charakteristisch. Das fi. Wort *pukama, das eine Ableitung auf *-ma ist, könnte also auf ein frühes (Lehn)wort *puka
Meine Meinung bleibt nach wie vor, daß der Ansatz *'Bieger, einer, der beugt/bückt', ev. 'gebeugter/krummer Gegenstand' eine wahrscheinlichere Bedeutung der Quelle des finnischen Lehwortes peukalo ist als z. B. 'Anschwellung, Beule'. Wie im Fall kyppäärä muß aber die Möglichkeit sprachinterner Ableitungsvorgänge erwogen werden, wobei das anzusetzende Lehwort zuweilen ein kürzerer Wortstamm haben kann als das neuteiliche Wort, das sich erst später, in der entlehnden Sprache seine erweiterte Form zugelegt hat.

XVII.

Finnisch runo und altnordisch rúna


Wilbur (1957) lenkt die Aufmerksamkeit auf die Unwahrscheinlichkeit einer Herleitung des nordischen Schriftzeichenwortes ‘Rune’ aus der Wortsippe, die ‘whisper, flüstern’ bedeutet. Er schreibt (S. 14-15): “I do not believe that the verbal idea “to whisper” plays any part in this etymology. I suggest rather that the verbal forms OE rúnan, OHG rūnēn, ON rýna are denominative verbs whose form and content are secondary derivations from the Germanic nominal stem rūna-. Rather than to comb through all the vastness of Indo-European for roots and cognates it is better to search for the meaning of this form within Germanic and within its range of attested meanings. I believe that the cleanest explanation for the developments in this etymological group is to be obtained by assuming that the basic meaning of *rūna- is “that which is private or esoteric”.”

zurückgehen, das wiederum mit dem Wortstamm im oben erwähnten neuschwed. böglā, *bugliōn usw. in irgendeiner Verbindung stehen könnte. Diesem nachzugehen war aber hier nicht beabsichtigt.


Eine Lehnwortetymologie für fi. runo darf m. E. nicht aufgestellt werden, weil in dieser Sachlage die Richtung des Entlehnungsvorganges nicht festgestellt werden kann (Nilsson 1996b: 50).

XVIII.

Die ostseefinnische Benennung der Schweden: ruotsalainen


Im Finnischen ist der Langvokal später diphthongiert worden so daß das Wort uns schließlich dort als ruotsa- begegnet, im Estnischen wiederum heißt es rootslane, was den älteren Lautstand widerspiegelt.

XIX.

Baltisch galas: Nicht nur ′Ende′, sondern auch *′Qual, Tod′

In Nilsson (1997) habe ich das finnische kuolla ′sterben′ zusammen mit Mordwinisch kulo ~ kula ′tot; Verstorbener′ usw. als altes indoeuropäisches Lehngut erklärt, wobei insbesondere die germanischen Ableitungen vom starken Verb *kwelan, vom Typ dt. Qual, ae. cwellan ′töten′ sowie slav. žalb ′Leid,
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Hiermit entfällt wohl die Semantik von neutitauisch galas ‘Ende’ als Gegenargument gegen meine Lehnwortetymologie indoeur. gwol- > frühurfi. kola ‘Tod’.

XX.

Zur Aussagefähigkeit der Namensforschung in der Frage nach der Heimat der Goten


Auch für mich ist es ohne weiteres klar, daß solche sekundären Namen nicht als Ausgliederungskriterien Aussagewert beigemessen werden können, wir sind also diesbezüglich mit W. Mańczak einig. (Aber sein französisches Zitat oben muß als mißlungen gelten: die Polen und die Westrusser sind ja beide Nordslavon und insofern besonders nah verwandt; das Slowakische wiederum gilt als eine Übergangszone zum Südslavischen, weshalb die [nur partielle!] Namengleichung Slovensko – Slovenija nicht überrascht: Meine Aussage, “Dies deutet auf eine


Fest steht, trotz Mańczaks Kritik, was ich im vorigen Aufsatz in Anlehnung besonders an Andersson (1996) geschrieben habe: daß die altgermanischen Ethnonyrne götar – gutar – goten eine beachtungswerte Namensgemeinschaft um die Ostsee im ersten Jahrtausend n. Chr. darstellen.
Literatur

Bezeichnungen für 'cervellum, cranium, caput' in altdeutscher Zeit. In:
Festschrift für Karl Bischoff, S. 40-70. Hg. Günter Bellman, Günter Eifler,
Sprachforschung 109, 215-236.
studier över ett norrländskt nybyggarmål och dess granndialekter. 2.
Eckert, Rainer. 1991. Studien zur historischen Phraseologie der slavischen
Sprachen (unter Berücksichtigung des Baltischen). München: Verlag Otto
Sagner.
Elmevik, Lennart. 1967. Nordiska ord på äldre käk- och käk(s)-. En etymologisk
och ljudhistorisk undersökning. Skrifter utg. av Institutionen för Nordiska
språk vid Uppsala Universitet, 15.
García, Luisa García. 1995. Die deverbalen jan-Verben im Gotischen. Inaugural-
Grönvik, Ottar. 1994. Kan de gamle runeinskriftene fortelle oss noe om
begravelsesriter og om kontakten med de døde i førkristen tid i Norden? In:
Jens Peter Schjødt, Hg. Myte og ritual i det førkristne Norden, S. 41-62.
Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.
Castrenianumin toimitteita 51. Helsinky
ethnonymsic complex. In: Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia 2, 159-165.
1935, 105-106.
Kolb, Eduard. 1957. Alemannisch-nordgermanisches Wortgut. Frauenfeld: Huber
& Co.
LÅGLWO 2 = Lexikon der älteren germanischen Lehnwörter in den ostseefin-
nischen Sprachen. Bd. II. Begründet von A. D. Kylstra, fortgeführt von
Sirkka-Liisa Hahmo, Tette Hofstra, Osmo Nikkilä. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
General Linguistics 35 [Gedenkschrift Ernst A. Ebbinghaus], 97-130.
XL, 125-130.


Polish Names of Armenians
Ormiańczyk ... Kabzan

Armenians were present in Poland since the middle of the fourteenth century, after the incorporation of Halicz Ruthenia into Polish kingdom. They lived mainly in Lvov and were called in Polish: Ormianin (sg.), Ormianie (pl.). This form or a similar one like Ormiańczyk / Ormieńczyk (sg.), known from a document dated 1453 (Słownik staropolski PAN, vol. 5: 628), with initial ‘ο’ (!) was indirectly attested by the privilege given to Lvov Armenians by the Polish king Casimir the Great. In that Latin document written as early as in 1356 we find the form Ormenorum (Tryjarski: 12, footnote 16) and not Armenorum as we should have expected. In 1564 Marcin Bielski wrote in Polish in his World’s Chronicle: Ormianin (Bielski: 438 b). But in the Polish translation of the Armenians’ statute book made in 1528 from Latin we read yet: armenyn (Wydra, Rzepka: 408).

This substitution, in Polish, by ‘ο’ of the original ‘α’ (the Polish name came from Latin Armenus, Armeni) was due to the general tendency, present in early Slavonic dialects, of avoiding initial ‘α’ which was rare in native vocabulary (PIE short *α had yielded *ο in proto-Slavonic, cf. Krahe: 68). We find in Old Polish other examples of this substitution: German personal name Albrecht was rendered by Ołbracht, Lithuanian Algirdas – by Olgięrd.

Ukrainians call Armenians Virmeny (sg. Virmen) according to the regular correspondence: Ukrainian initial vi-, in closed syllables = Polish, Russian o-, cf. Polish and Russian on ‘he’ = Ukrainian vin. It is possible that the Ukrainian form was derived from the Polish but we can not exclude the intermediate Old Ukrainian (Ruthene) *Ormen. Hungarian örmény (‘Armenian’) could be derived from the Polish form as well.

Besides the form Ormianin applied by Poles till now mainly for modern Armenians (especially Polish ones) another form Armeńczyk has also been used. But its occurrence is restricted to ancient Armenians mainly. Juliusz Słowacki (1809-49) wrote in his famous poem Król Duch (‘The Spirit King’): “Ja, Her, Armeńczyk...” (rhapsody I, canto 2) “I, Her, Armenian...” obviously with reference to old legendary times.

In the sixteenth century Ukrainians called (abusively) Armenians Serkizy (sg. Serkiz) after a very popular Christian name used by Armenians: Serkis, Sarkis (Old Arm. Sargis from Syriac, Hübschmann: 298), cf. Łoziński: 297.
In the nineteenth century or, perhaps, even earlier, another surname denoting Armenians appeared in Polish: Kabzan (Hanusz 1886: 425, Vincenz: 53, Pelczyński: 52). It makes one think of the Polish kabza, an almost obsolete word meaning ‘money-bag, purse’. By the fact Kabzan had pejorative character suggesting that Armenians were people loving money, anxious to cram their purses (kabzas) with money (Pelczyński: 52).

The first investigator of the Polish Armenians’ dialect, Jan Hanusz (1880’s) linked Kabzan not only with Polish kabza but also with Turkish kabza (borrowed from Arabic qabda) ‘the grip of the hand; the handle of a sword’ (Redhouse: 692) interpreting the Turkish word with French ‘poignée’ (Hanusz 1886: 425). In the German version of his Polish work on the phonetics of Kuty dialect (Hanusz 1889: 14) Turkish kabza was indicated as the only source of Kabzan.

H. Adjarian in his study of the Armenian dialect of Ardeal-Transilvania (to which the dialect of Polish Armenians was closely cognate) in the commentary on Kabzan (Adjarian: 195) refers to Hanusz’s works but labels the word in question as ‘amazing’ (zamanali).

The deriving of Kabzan from Polish kabza is a folk etymology. Also linking the word with Turkish (Arabic) kabza is wrong. It is true that many Turkish loan words were present in the dialect of Polish Armenians but they never called themselves Kabzan. They used their own name Hay common to the overwhelming majority of Armenians. (The early Polish Armenians speaking Turkic Kipchak called themselves Ermeni). The Polish word kabza ‘purse’, by the way, does not originate from Turkish (Arabic) kabza but from Latin capsia ‘closet, cubby, safe’.

In my opinion the Polish name of Armenians Kabzan was derived from the West-Armenian dialectal form karzan corresponding to Old Armenian gawazan (a loan-word from Iranian). The original meaning of gawazan was ‘switch, twig, stick, goad (used to driving cattle)’, Greek hrábdoς, Latin virga (so translates the word NBHL, I: 532).

The semantic development of Old Arm. gawazan will be commented on later. First phonetic aspects are touched. The word was borrowed from a Middle Persian form which was not attested in written documents preserved till now but can be reconstructed as *gāw(ā)zan. The first part of that compound word was gaw ‘cow’ (Avestan gav-, Old Ind. go-, gava-, Lat. bos, bovis, Old Arm. kov). Such an explanation is given by H. Adjarian in his etymological dictionary (HAB, I: 526). He also quotes New Persian forms: gavāz(a), gāvzanā (after Stein: 1100, 1073, both meaning ‘an ox-goad’) as well as Avestan gav-āzā- (after Bartholomae: 511 ‘Gerät zum Antreiben des Viehs’). Adjarian refers to Hübschmann (126) who puts gawazan ‘Stab, Hirtenstab, Gerte, Ruthe, Zweig’ together with New Persian gavāz ‘stimulus quo asini et boves impelluntur’ (after Vullers II: 903) and Old Ind. go-ajana- (= gav-ajana-) ‘Rinder antreiben’.

As far as the second part of gawazan is considered Adjarian points to the root present in Old Ind. ajati (Pokorny: 4 ‘treibt’) corresponding to Avestan
azaiti, Greek and Latin ago, Old Arm. acem ‘führe, bringe’ (Pokorny: 4) which meant ‘to drive, to lead’ in Old Ind.

Another Old Arm. word xarakzan ‘scourge’ (NBHL, I, 929 translates it by Greek phragéllion, Latin flagellum) with final -zan parallel to gawazan was borrowed, according to Hübschmann (158 ‘Geissel, Peitsche’), from Middle Persian *xarāzan (with long ā !) corresponding to Avestan *xarāzan- ‘Eseltreibe-bend’ (cf. New Persian xar ‘donkey’).

It is surprising that none of the above mentioned scholars put forward a possibility of linking the second part of gawazan and xarakzan with the IE root known from Old Ind. hanti (‘schlägt, trifft, erschlägt, tötet’, Pokorny: 491-3), Avestan jainti idem, jata- ‘getötet’ (Bartholomae: 604), Hittite ku-en-zi ‘tötet’, Old Arm. gan ‘Schläge, Prügel’ etc. (Pokorny: 491-3).

In the material presented above we have to deal, probably, with two series of derivatives. In Avestan gav-āza- as well as in New Persian gavāz (a loan-word from North-Western Iranian dialects, as in a native Persian, South-Western word we should expect ‘d’ in place of ‘z’) we find, in the second part, the root ‘to drive’ (Old Ind. ajati, Avestan azaiti etc.). On the other hand, in Middle Persian *gāw-ā-zan and *xar-ā-zan we have, I think, another root, parallel to Old Ind. hanti, Avestan jainti etc.

Middle Persian (but not Parthian where we should face *ţan-) present stem of zadan ‘to hit, ... to strike’ (MacKenzie: 97) was zan- (as it is in New Persian, too). This form accounts perfectly for the final -n in gawazan, xarakzan, obscure if we persist in viewing the words in question as derived from the first root (Old Ind. ajati, Avestan azaiti etc.).

However gawazan and xarakzan show another problem. How should the medial -a- between gav- and -zan be explained? Middle Persian did not use any link vowel in compound words and we should expect (in Armenian borrowings, too) forms like *gāw-zan and *xar-zan rather than gāw-ā-zan, xar-ā-zan. I suppose the last forms, based on the root continuing Old Ir. *jan-., were influenced by the forms derived from the Old Ir. root *az- represented by Avestan gav-āza-continuing long vowel ‘ā’ due to the link vowel ‘a’ (present in Old Iranian languages) merged with the initial ‘a’ of the root *az: *gav-a-az-a- > gavāza-. New Persian gavāz probably is a continuation of a North-Western word borrowed from an Old Iranian dialect and not formed in the Middle Iranian times where the Old Ir. root *az- was probably obsolete (Middle Persian *adēn- ‘to bring, to lead’ is, according to MacKenzie: 5, doubtful).

Let us now examine the semantic development of gawazan. In modern Armenian it has the following meaning (Malxaseanc I: 416):

1. a long wooden rod used to drive cattle, goad
2. stick, bar, cudgel used to beat people
3. mace, staff, sceptre (symbol of authority)
4. succession; symbol of authority transmission
5. a list of successive kings (succeeding one another)
6. a diocese administered by a bishop
7. a stick (used to defend oneself or to lean on)
8. any material shaped like a very small rod
9. the colours of the rainbow.

Besides, according to Malkhasiants, gawazan could also mean a divining rod (of a dowser) or a wand (of a magician). The word was also used in the ecclesiastical terminology (like above point 6) as well as in expressions vardapetakan gawazan ‘symbol of a vardapet’s (Armenian theologian’s) authorization to preach’ and episkoposakan gawazan ‘a pastoral staff’ (compare Polish pastoral, with the same meaning, borrowed from Latin pastoralis ‘shepherd’s, pastoral’, also Italian pastorale).

In Kuty on Czeremosz (Cheremosh) river (now in Ukraine), the last town where the dialect of Polish Armenians was spoken (in 1885 by about 1400 people) until 1945, kav(a)zan was the Armenian name of a ‘wooden staff taller than an adult man’s height with a figure (statue) in a wooden ring at the top’ (Pełczyński: 41). Such objects have not been preserved, so it is not known whose figure was represented at the top of a kav(a)zan. The available descriptions do not mention it.

A kav(a)zan was held by a marshal of the Armenian religious brotherhood after the morning Mass on Christmas. The members of the brotherhood used to pay greeting visits, in the same afternoon (Pełczyński: 41) and on the days following Christmas, to Armenian as well as Polish families (going carolling). The Armenian name of that pastoral staff being a symbol very characteristic of Armenians unknown among Poles was very likely to become a Polish nickname of Armenians, humorous perhaps at the very beginning and abusive, to some extent, later on (as associated with Polish kabza ‘purse’ being a metaphor for greed).

There is, however, one phonetic difficulty with kabzan. Namely, Hanusz in his dictionary of Polish Armenians’ dialect gives the form kavazan ‘bâton, sceptre, manche’ (Hanusz 1886: 427) and not kavzan. Still, on the other side, Pełczyński (41) quotes only kavzan (spelled kawzan) as the name of the ‘pastoral staff’ in question. In many West-Armenian dialects (including Kuty) the vowel ‘a’ was syncopated in non-stressed medial syllables (cf. Kuty: haskálnalu ‘to understand’ from Old Arm. haskanal, Hanusz 1886: 413, where Russian у stands for schwa). It is possible that kavzan was such a dialect form (not registered by Hanusz) whereas kavazan was a variant influenced by the literary West-Armenian form where no vowel reduction took place in this word.
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ETYMOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE VALUE OF THE MIDDLE KOREAN GRAPHEME Δ

1. MK Δ, a tricky triangle

In 1446, when Seycwong officially proclaimed the Korean alphabet, it contained 28 letters\(^1\). One of them was a now obsolete and troublesome triangle sign, MK Δ. The *Hwunmin cegum* classified MK Δ as 半音音似穂字初音声 ‘a half

---

\(^1\) In this paper all Korean forms referred to by the author, are written in Yale Romanization. The following conventions have been made to account for now obsolete Middle-Korean graphemes: ɐ (alay a) [a], ə [wo], ʌ [woy], o [G or o], ʊ [ng], ɬ [W], ʡ [Q]. Because they could be susceptible to misinterpretation uppercase G and W is preferred to lowercase g and w for the representation of the voiced fricatives. The Middle-Korean orthographical convention Δ is represented as such in order to avoid taking a priori position about its phonetic value. The dots in the Middle-Korean words represent the distinctive pitch of the following syllable: one dot for high, two dots for rising and unmarked syllables are treated as low. For all Korean and non-Korean data referred to by different authors, we respect the originally chosen romanization and pitch conventions.

\(^2\) As for the chronological division of Korean, we have chosen to start from bibliographical data. Ideally a language periodisation should be based on linguistic data, but then we need a reliable diachronical analysis, which we lack in the case of Korean. The reconstructed pre-hankul data are too trivial to support the transition of one language stage to another. Therefore, everything we find in the sources preceding the invention of hankul we will reduce to the same denominator, ‘Old-Korean’, specifying the particular source of the word in question. With the term proto-Korean we refer to the oldest stage of Korean, not attested but still possible to reconstruct on the basis of purely internal data.

It is only through the literature that followed the publication of the *Hwunmin cegum* that we get a detailed picture of Korean as it was spoken in and around the capital in the 15\(^{th}\)-16\(^{th}\) century. For methodological reasons we will call this historical dialect Middle-Korean, but with this convention we certainly do not imply that the invention of the Korean script made any difference for the development of the Korean language. As dividing-line between Middle- and New-Korean, we chose 1592, the year of Imjin. Not that the arrival of Hideyoshi in Korea had any revolutionary impact on the Korean language, but it is around that time that some fundamental changes in the written language took place, such as disappearance of initial consonant clusters, of the graphemes
The triangle grapheme is described in the Hwumin cengum hayley as representing a neither clear nor muddy sound and further as standing for the relaxed opposite of a tense ʌ [s], along with four other contrasting pairs: relaxed ø [ŋ] and tense ɾ [k], c [n] and e [t], o [m] and a [p], o [G or ø] and o [q]. Although this description conforms to the traditional label ‘half front-tooth sound’ of the Early Middle Chinese palatal nasal\(^3\), it is generally accepted that MK ʌ represents a voiced fricative [z]\(^4\). Resting on Chinese loanwords and on comparative Altaic evidence, Ramstedt was the first to suggest that MK ʌ stood for a palatal nasal [n], something like a weak nasalized [j], and his theory has been supported through some of Starostin’s external comparisons and through Vovin’s examination of Korean internal evidence\(^5\).

The main purpose of the present paper is to gather and weigh external evidence suggested by different scholars, supporting either the palatal nasal hypothesis or the voiced fricative hypothesis for MK ʌ.

But first we would like to make some general reflections on the phonetic value of this Middle-Korean grapheme. The distribution of MK ʌ in native words is limited to the intervocalic position, between [n], [m] and a vowel and between a vowel and [W], [G]. In some MK verbal stems ending in a surface -s, ʌ- regularly replaces -s- when an ending with initial vowel is attached. Among these -s- irregular stems we find verbs as MK ‘as-‘ rob, take away’, inf. a’ʌa, MK ‘cis-‘ build’, inf. ci’ʌe, MK ‘nas-‘ get better, go forward’, inf. na’ʌa, MK ‘nis-‘ to connect, link, join, couple’, inf. ni’ʌe, MK pes-‘ remove’, inf. pe’ʌe, MK ‘wus-‘ laugh’, inf. wu’ʌe, etc. The regular Middle-Korean verbal stems with final -s-, like MK sis-‘ wash’, inf. sise, maintain the -s- in intervocalic position.

In modern Korean the plain obstruents /p/, /t/, /k/ and /l/ become phonetically voiced in intervocalic position. There is no reason to assume that in Middle-

\(^3\) Baxter 1992, 55: MC ny-. Karlgen 1923, 10: MC nz-. Pulleyblank 1961, 65, 67: MC fl-. Pre-T’ang and early T’ang transcriptions value this phoneme as a simple palatal nasal. During the T’ang period it became partially denasalized ň- > ŋ and finally it completely lost nasality in all northern dialects and in some central ones. In Mandarin for example it resulted in a voiced retroflex fricative, written r-.

Karlgen’s MC ŋ- accounts for this voiced fricative reflexes in some dialects, but it is widely agreed that the original value was a plain palatal nasal. It is interesting to note that Chinese syllables with nasal finals were last to be affected by denasalization, so that precisely the character MC 穩, cited as example in the Hwumin cengum, was still used for the transcription of Sanskrit na when MC 者 was already used for Sanskrit ja. The stability of the palatal nasal in MC 穩 gives us reason to believe that its naso-palatal reading is still reflected in the Hwumin cengum.


Korean this intervocalic voicing worked in a different manner. So the easiest and most obvious way to determine the phonetic value of MK Δ would be by way of analogy with the above plain obstruents. If MK Δ would be the voiced allophone of [s] in intervocalic position, then it would go without saying that its phonetic value is [z].

But the question is, why did Seycwoong create an extra symbol for the voiced counterpart of [s], but not for the allophones of [p], [t], [k] and [c]? Besides considering Middle-Korean near minimal pairs such as ‘citis- ‘build’, inf. ci Δe and sis- ‘wash’, inf. sise, kodom ‘material’ and ka som ‘chest’, sado ‘die’ and sa som ‘deer’, we cannot but answer that we are dealing here with two different phonemes and not with allophones. Demonstrating the fact that in the Hamkyeng and Kyengsang dialects the reflexes of MK [s] and Δ have fallen together as the phoneme /s/, while in the Seoul dialect the reflex is differentiated into zero for MK Δ and [s] for MK [s], Vovin reached the same conclusion⁶.

Like modern Korean, Middle-Korean had no phonological opposition of voice for its obstruents /p/, /t/, /k/ and /c/. Intervocically these obstruents could be phonetically voiced, but there certainly was no distinction between [b], [d], [g], [j] and [p], [t], [k], [c]. From a cross-linguistic point of view it is very unlikely for a system that does not show phonological voicing, to make an exception for only one set of phonemes, [s] and [z]. We were unable to find a single language with such a peculiar phonology.

Other arguments in favor of the palatal nasal hypothesis for MK Δ can be found in Korean readings of Chinese characters and in Chinese loanwords, for which we refer to Vovin 1993, 254-55.

In consideration of the above internal approach it is doubtful that MK Δ represented a mere voiced allophone of [s], but one can also think of an internal argument against the interpretation of the triangle symbol as a palatal nasal [ŋ]. If MK Δ represented [n], then it denasalised and devoiced before consonants, as the infinitive MK na Δa ‘get better, go forward’ becomes ‘nas-ta before the ending of the dictionary form. The problem is, why did the palatal nasal undergo denasalisation in this position, while the other nasals [n] and [m] did not? Examples of this are easily found in verbs like MK ‘anta ‘embrace’; MK ‘sinta ‘wear as footgear’, MK ‘tenta ‘wager, bet’, MK ‘namta ‘leave it, exceed’, MK ‘samta ‘make (it into)’. A possible answer to the question could be found in a similar development within Chinese historical phonology. The Middle Chinese palatal nasal gradually denasalized, completely losing nasality in all northern dialects and in some central ones, but partially retaining its nasal articulation in voiced fricative reflexes in other dialects. Therefore there is a possibility that at the time that Middle-Korean was spoken, the triangle grapheme stood for a naso-palatal fricative, similar to Karlgren’s ņ- in Middle Chinese.

⁶ Vovin 1993, 250.
From the internal point of view, we find ourselves in this positon, but how can etymology contribute to a solution of our problem? It is commonplace in linguistic theory to argue that phonological reconstruction should always rely on the examination of internal data before any external comparisons can be made. However this is a methodological paradox because pure internal reconstruction without external support can be misleading. Therefore it seems methodologically more appropriate to balance and combine internal and external evidence.

So, what can a comparison of Korean with Japanese and Altaic languages teach us about the phonetic value of the Middle-Korean triangle sign? In order to answer this question, it is useful to examine etymologies proposed for Middle-Korean lexical and morphological items in which MK Δ was written.

2. Evaluation

This evaluation will be based on a number of etymologies proposed by various authors listing Middle-Korean forms written with Δ. For the list of etymologies we refer to the appendix at the back of this article.

2.1. Lexical support for z

The evidence that can be found in the comparative literature supporting the z hypothesis for MK Δ is rather scarce. If the triangle symbol indeed represented a voiced allophone of [s] in intervocalic position, then its origin would be pK *-s- and the following Altaic correspondences would be most plausible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pA</th>
<th>pTk</th>
<th>pMo</th>
<th>pTg</th>
<th>pK</th>
<th>pJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
<td>*-s-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 In the list of etymologies appearing in the appendix the foreign language data are cited respecting the transcription and other conventions chosen by the author of the particular etymology. With regard to the evaluation of the external evidence it should be noted that the Japanese, Korean, Tungusic and Mongolic data are relatively accessible to the author, but being a newcomer to the field of Altaistic, she still encounters difficulties evaluating the Turkic evidence. Of course not being a Turkologist is not much of an excuse for somebody who is involved in the field of Altaistics, just as is it is impossible to study Indo-European without knowledge of Sanskrit. But for the purpose of the present article, which is an investigation of the phonetic value of a single Korean phoneme in the light of external evidence, it is the Japanese and Tungusic material that will prove particularly relevant. The Turkic material is only of peripheral importance here. I can only hope that this article will not add to the scepticism of many Turkologists about the Altaic theory, but rather encourage them to overcome their relative inaccessibility of East Asian language material.

8 We adopt here the regular correspondences proposed by Starostin 1991 and in his database accessible via internet.
Lexical comparisons starting from a sibilant nature for MK Δ are present in Martin’s etymologies for MK *kos ‘side, edge, border’, for MK koΔol ‘autumn’, for MK *nas- ‘get better, go forward’, for MK na‘Δi ‘shepherd’s purse’, for MK pus-, pos- ‘break down, demolish’ and in his remark on MK moΔol ‘village’. Furthermore, we find MK Δ as [z] in Miller’s etymology for MK kye’Δol ‘winter’ and Whitman’s comparison of MK kus- ‘draw (a line); demarcate, delimit; stop, hold (of rain); pull, drag’ and MK moΔom ‘mind, spirit, heart’. A morphological indication can be found in Martin’s suggestion for the Middle-Korean topic particle -Δa.

The problem with Martin’s etymology for MK *kos is that the Middle-Korean variant with intervocalic Δ for this word is not taken into account. Martin proposes an underlying form *koΔ as a contraction of MK ko’cang ‘extreme’, but this internal development is rather far-fetched. Moreover, the correspondence of K -c- with J -s- is weak. A better candidate for the match with J kisi ‘brink’ is the other cognate Martin suggests, K kis ‘lapel’. Turkic and Dagur correspondences are phonologically doubtful.

In the database Starostin makes a phonologically and semantically convincing quadruple comparison for his MK kāh ‘edge’. Relying on the same Mongolic evidence with intervocalic -j- Ramstedt already reconstructed a palatal nasal for this Korean form, back in the forties. The etymology lacks a Japanese participant, but maybe we could suggest here J kumi ‘side’ as in the nominal verb J kumi suru ‘be aligned with, side with, be on the side of’. A disyllabic origin would explain the rising tone in the Middle-Korean word.

Relating MK koΔol to J áki ‘autumn’, Martin reconstructs pKJ *(a-)ky: (..l), with a zero as predecessor of the phonetic value of MK Δ. Ramstedt also mentions K kahj hr:qda ‘to harvest’ and North-Korean kahjr but we have been unable to trace these forms with medial -h- in any Korean dialect. The only basis that remains for his reconstruction of pK *kasj- or *kas- is the medial -s- reflex in North-K kajsr. As mentioned above, it has been demonstrated by Vovin that this -s- corresponding to Seoul zero can not possibly originate from the same phone /s/ as dialectal -s- corresponding to Seoul -s-. But the alternative that Vovin suggests, considering the word for ‘autumn’ as MK koñol(h) LL, does not carry much conviction either because it implies a prefix a- in the Japanese word and because there is no correspondence to the triangle phoneme in Japanese. Obviously the Turkic forms Tk. kyr ‘autumn’ and Tk. qış ‘winter’ have been switched in his etymologies for ‘winter’ and ‘autumn’. But even then, the supposed development pTk *gjr2 ‘autumn’ < gy(?)yr2 < gyŋyjr2 remains a poor basis to demonstrate the palatal nasal value of the triangle grapheme in the Middle-Korean word for ‘autumn’.

Another season that could throw some light on our problem is MK kye’Δol ‘winter’. Miller compares his MK kyó ‘zül ‘winter’ with OJ kisaragi ‘second lunar month’ and OTk. qış ‘winter’. If we were to suppose an underlying *-ş- in the
original language, Miller’s suggestion could make sense phonetically and semantically. But Starostin adds Tungusic material to this etymology and reconstructs pTg *gîl- ‘cold’. These new data speak for the reconstruction of *-l- in Altaic and eliminate the Korean participant from the etymology. Vovin agrees with this reconstruction of *-l-, but still relates MK kye.ñul(h) LH ‘winter’ to pTk *gîl₂ ‘winter’, supposing a similar development as in the ‘autumn’ case, namely *gîl₂ < gî(?)=il₂ < gînil₂. But in consideration of the short vowel in Turkic and of pTg *gîl- ‘cold’ it seems better to abandon the idea of a contraction. The alternative that Starostin proposes for MK kjâni, kjâñr, kjâñr raises some doubts because of the irregular behavior of the nasal velar in this etymology. Besides we have been unable to find attestations of MK kjâni and kjâñr. Starostin seems to confuse modern K keil, probably meant is kail ‘autumn’, with kyewul ‘winter’. However, the comparison of Starostin’s suggestion OJ koyu- ‘freeze’, put together as a doublet with Vovin’s proposal OJ kohor- ‘id.’ with MK kyeΔol ‘winter’ gains credibility in the light of Whitman’s theory of medial *-r- loss in pre-Old-Japanese. This cognate pair can be considered as a palatal variation on cognate sets of the shape MK /-nol/ corresponding to OJ /-órV/ with eventual loss of medial *-r-. A similar example will be cited later with MK moΔol ‘village’. It should be noted that the Old-Japanese doublet OJ koyu- ‘freeze’ ~ OJ kôr- ‘id.’ provides internal evidence for such a process of *-r- loss itself.

Whitman suggests a relationship between OJ kozU- ‘pull out by the roots’ and MK kûž < *kûsûl- ‘pull’. The voiced fricative in Japanese makes us suspect an original form of the shape *kon-su-, maybe a secondary derivation of the noun J kon ‘root, radical’. The Korean form is thought to be a bad participant in this etymology because the meaning ‘pull’ seems secondary. MK kus- ‘draw (a line); demarcate, delimit; stop, hold (of rain); pull, drag’ shall be discussed later in connection with derived nouns as MK kuΔey ‘hidden place’, MK kuΔuk ho- ‘to be secret, hidden’ and MK kuΔum ‘limit, demarcation’.

Reading Martin’s remark on J murá ‘village’ and K mail < MK moΔilh ‘village’, it appears that his treatment of MK Δ as [z] kept him from establishing a genetic relationship. Acceptance of the palatal nasal hypothesis can possibly lead us to a solution. Applying Whitman’s rule of medial *-r- loss in pre-Old


OJ mye ‘woman’, OJ -mina ‘woman, MK myênôl ‘wife, son’s wife’

OJ swora ‘sky’, MK hânôlh ‘sky’

OJ kwo- ‘small’, MK kónôl- ‘fine, slender’.

He supposes that proto-Japanese-Korean medial *-n- underwent assimilation to final *-l- and was lost medially, with loss of the original final *-l as well in pre-Old Japanese ‘woman’ and ‘small’. The Old-Japanese compound form -mina ‘woman’ would preserve a non-assimilated *-n-.
Japanese to OJ mura ‘village’, Vovin proposes progressive assimilation of \(*-n\)- to \(*-\text{-}\)- in *munura, followed by medial \(*-\text{-}\)- loss, resulting in the development pJ *murura > *mura. Comparing it to MK mo.\ñol(h) LL ‘village’, he obtains a regular phonological and semantic fit. Interpreting the final pJ *ra and MK -l(h) as a common suffix, Starostin extends the comparison to Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic. The vowel length and the nature of the nasal in Tungusic are somewhat troublesome, but apart from these phonological doubts, the suggested etymology is rather convincing.

It is interesting to observe that Whitman points out a connection between OJ münà- / mûnèy ‘chest, heart’ and MK mòzöm ‘heart’, but just like in the above etymology his interpretation of MK Δ as [z] causes a problematic n: z correspondence. In his dissertation of 1985 he reconstructs pJK *mosom, leaving him with an unexplainable reflex \(*-n\)- in Japanese. Later he tries to solve this problem with the reconstruction of medial \(*-z\)- in the proto-form, assuming a somehow forced nasal assimilation in Japanese. A nasal interpretation of MK Δ seems to be a perfect way-out for this troublesome correspondence. Starostin amplifies the binary comparison with Tungusic material, for which the reconstruction looks contrived according to Martin. This particular case is interesting because we can compare it to the Tungusic root for ‘dawn’ in Starostin’s database, with surprisingly similar phonology: Neg. gêwan to Neg. mèwan, Olc. Gêwa(n) to Olc. mêwa(n), Orok Gêwa(n) to Orok mêwa(n), Ev. gêwan to Ev. mèwan. For ‘dawn’ Jurchen and Manchu have only a derivate, namely Jur. gen-gien ‘light, clear’ and Ma. gen-ğen ‘id.’, but also pointing to a nasal. Keeping in mind the external fit pTk *guñâl ‘sun’ a reconstruction of pTg *giánam is plausible and a parallel reconstruction of pTg *miñanam ‘heart’ seems less contrived as it originally did.

In his etymology for K. na(s) ‘get, be better’, Martin does not mention the corresponding Middle-Korean verb and its attestations with the triangle sign. The modern Seoul reflexes with intervocalic zero lead him to comparison with J nápo ‘more, further’, J napôr- ‘get better’ and to reconstruction of a labial stop in pKJ \(*nap\)-. It is needess to say that this \(*-p\)- cannot possibly be the phonetic value underlying MK Δ. But with a doublet in mind like K cwup- ‘be cold’, inf. cwüwe ~ MK ’cwus- ‘id.’, inf. cwü‘de, we cannot exclude the possibility of a variant \(*nap\)- ‘go forward’, inf. nawa alternating with the attested MK ’nas- ‘id.’, inf. na‘de. Even if Starostin’s alternative is more convincing, we still meet with a phonological problem, lying in the plain nature of the nasal reflected in the other participants of this etymology. Just like in the case of MK aðo ‘a man’s younger brother, a woman’s younger sister’ a possible explanation could be that MK -ń- here stands for earlier \(*n\), probably because of early palatalization. But it remains unclear why a process of palatalisation has been started up here and not in other similar environments.

According to Martin there is also a semantic reason that makes inclusion of the Korean stem in the etymology suspect because the weight of the Korean stem is ‘forward, upward’, while in Turkic and Tungusic it is ‘away, down’. However
as in all participants a movement is expressed with only some slight nuance in its direction, this seems a rather poor argument. A second objection of Martin is that the causative K naswu- < na.zwo- indicates a sibilant, but I have not been able to trace an attestation of this causative in Korean.

Comparing MK na'zi 'shepherd's purse' with J nadu- in naduna 'shepherd's purse', Martin runs up against a troublesome s: d correspondence, which leads him to the reconstruction of *-j- in pKJ *naju. Even after analyzing the Japanese word as nan- 'shepherd's purse' followed by genitive particle tu and na 'greens', the proposed correspondence still remains strange, i.e. s: n. Departing from the palatal nasal hypothesis Starostin and Vovin were able to find a way out for this problem. The reflex of the supposed original Altaic palatal nasal in Turkic is not completely regular, but Starostin considers the possibility that the Turkic form was rather *jor-inčka and then it does not belong here. It should be remarked that Vovin also provides us with dialectal evidence for traces of nasality\(^\text{10}\). The Seoul reflex of this form, nayngi is no exception.

For MK pus-, pos- 'break down, demolish' Martin finds Turkic and Tungusic evidence pointing to an original Altaic *-s-. Apart from the fact that the Mongolic form on -t is phonologically aberrant, I was not able to trace the proposed forms.

As a conclusion we might say that there is little cogency in etymologies for Middle-Korean words written with Δ that propose protoforms with *c, *Ø, *p or *j corresponding to the previous value of the grapheme. This leaves us with Miller's etymology for MK kye.Δol 'winter', that can be shown to be a bad participant in the Altaic comparison. Whitman's comparison of MK moΔom 'mind, spirit, heart' involved a problematic n: z correspondence and for MK kus- 'draw (a line); demarcate; pull' there exists a better alternative. Martin's suggestion for MK pus-, pos- 'break down, demolish' caused difficulty tracing the underlying members.

### 2.2. Morphological support for z

The correspondence that Martin proposes for the Middle-Korean topic particle -Δa with J ...sa! 'indeed', OJ deictic sa 'so / that' and the OJ emphatic particle si- makes a nice phonological and functional match, pointing towards the voiced fricative hypothesis for MK Δ. However the Seoul reflex of this particle is -(i)yə, bearing a trace of palatalisation. Vovin 1993, 254 remarks that only an unstable sound as *n̥ could give us such a huge range of different reflexes [n], [Ø], [y] and [n] as we find in the Korean dialects.

Another internal indication for the nasality of this particle is traceable in the relation between MK howollwɔ ‘alone, by oneself' and MK howo{}'.Δa ‘alone, by oneself'. These forms can be explained as the result of suffixization to MK

\(^{10}\) Vovin 1993, 251. Seoul nayngi; Kyebgki neņi; Phyengpuk neņi; Phen[g]nam neņi.
ho'wol 'single-' of -lwo, particle expressing manner, function, status etc., in the former case and topic particle -Δa in the latter case. MK ho'wol 'single-', modern Seoul hwol, probably goes back to an imperfect adnominal form of an original verb *hopo-'be single'. The nominalising function of this modifier -l appears from -l(q) alternations, in which the final glottal stop is a trace of a genitive -s.11. The original verb *hopo-'be single' could also underly K hwoth 'with one layer, single' (< *hopo-tek), if we consider this word as a derivation by means of the suffix -tak / -tek that makes impressionistic adverbs. Modern Seoul hwollo 'alone, by oneself' is easily understood as a development from MK howollwo, but the development of MK howo'Δa into modern Seoul hwonca 'alone, by oneself' is somehow more problematic. There is a morphophonemic rule that suppresses the Korean liquid -l- before the apicals [n], [l], [s] and Δ. An example of this suppression can be cited from the Hwummmwong cahwoy where nadoy is given as the combined meaning (nal 'day') and pronunciation (Δoy) of the character 旦. This explanation accounts for the loss of -l- but not for the development of MK Δ to -nc- in modern Korean. A solution we can think of is similarly to Karlsgren's re- construction of MC nì-, to account for a process of gradual denasalization of n- resulting in voiced fricative reflexes in some Chinese dialects explaining -nc- as a trace of nasal fricative pronunciation of the Middle-Korean phoneme in question.

Another solution is to assume that a possible reflex of the phoneme corresponding to MK Δ was the voiced fricative -c- with nasal insertion once affrication had set in. Appearance of nasals before -c- is sporadically attested in Korean, as in MK te'ti-'throw' > K tenci- 'id.'. But even in the second case the position is tenable that MK Δ represented a nasal fricative and reflected the preliminary denasalization of pK *n on its way to total erosion in the central language.

In spite of some external parallels suggested by Martin the sibilant nature of MK Δ in the topic particle MK -Δa is questionable on the basis of internal evidence.

2.3. Lexical support for nì

Skimming through the Altaic literature, we were able to find quite some external indications for the hypothesis that the phonetic value of the Middle-Korean triangle grapheme goes back to a palatal nasal. For the lexical evidence we refer to the etymologies mentioned in the appendix and external morphological indications can be found in the Middle-Korean genitive particle -Δ and in the deferential bound auxiliary - 'Δop-'.

11 Martin 1996, 53. "The word howo'za < hoWo'za 'alone' is probably from hon' po(l) sa 'just in one layer". This explanation is semantically slightly forced and in this scenario it is unclear why the final -n of hon 'one' disappeared.
If we suppose that MK Δ represented a stage somewhere in the process of denasalization of pK *-ň-, it should confirm the following regular correspondences.12

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{pA} & \text{pTk} & \text{pMo} & \text{pTg} & \text{pK} & \text{pJ} \\
* \text{-ň-} & * \text{-ň-} & * \text{-n/-j-} & * \text{-ň-} & * \text{-ň-} & * \text{-n/-m-} \\
\end{array} \]

Let us now evaluate the evidence cited in the appendix in the light of this set of correspondences.

For MK adi ‘at first, from the beginning’, Starostin extends the Mongolic comparison suggested by Ramstedt, with Turkic and Tungusic material. The semantics of both these reconstructions are somehow distant from ‘beginning’ and the quality of the nasal reflexes is deviant.

The etymology that Starostin proposes for MK āň- (āňā-) ‘to rob, seduce’ has nice fourfold vocalic and consonantal correspondences, but is semantically rather dissatisfactory.

The comparison of Middle-Korean kinship terms written with MK Δ raises some doubts. In Middle-Korean there were many terms for ‘mother’: MK emani, MK e’mi, and MK e’di. As all forms have a nasal in medial position, one is tempted to think that MK Δ represented a nasal here as well. But this general impression is not much of an argument. An interesting form that could be related here is emni ‘elder sister’ that appears in the central and Cenla dialect.

As for Starostin’s comparison of MK e’di, the Tungusic parallel with palatal nasal pTg *eňi- ‘mother, female’ was pointed out by Ramstedt already and provides an interesting indication. But it seems better to leave out the Japanese participant. Whether we agree with Martin’s internal analysis of both Old-Japanese words or not, when we consider polite forms and forms of address like o-ne(e)-san ‘(your) sister’ and o-ni(i)-san ‘(your) brother’ it is clear that OJ ane ‘older sister’ must be considered in close connection with OJ ani ‘elder brother’. This brings us to the etymology of MK aDo ‘a man’s younger brother, a woman’s younger sister’, which Starostin and Vovin agree to relate to OJ ani ‘elder brother’. The Middle-Korean word must have some relation with other phonologically close kinship terms as MK a’dom ‘relative, kinsfolk’ and MK *e’di ‘child’. We have been unable to find a plain attestation of the Middle-Korean word for ‘child’, written with MK Δ, but it could be present in the compound MK keΔ Gwa’di ‘prodigal son’. From an Altaic perspective the quality of the Korean nasal is problematic because the regular correspondence we expect here is pK. *-n-. Starostin mentions the possibility of palatalisation in āňi ‘child’ before -i, followed by analogical change in the other forms. Because this solution is somehow far-fetched, it seems safer for phonological reasons to remove MK aDo, MK a’dom and MK a’di from the Altaic etymology. A binary comparison of these kinship

12 We adopt here the regular correspondences proposed by Starostin 1991 and in his database accessible via internet.
terms with OJ ani and OJ ane still points to a nasal nature for MK $\Delta$ and leaves open its palatal quality.

On the basis of dialectal material, Martin and Vovin reconstruct a final velar in the protoform. This final might be understood as a suffix, preserving a common Altaic velar suffix.

Although we have thrown doubt upon some aspects of the Altaic comparisons for these kinship terms, the position that the Middle-Korean triangle sign represented a palatal nasal in development stays tenable.

For MK "$\textit{cis}$- ‘make, build, cultivate’, inf. $ci\Delta e$, Starostin proposes a dubious etymology. The only regular fit we can find, lies in the initial consonants of the suggested protoforms, but the vowel and nasal correspondences as well as the Japanese and Korean semantics are weak. Omitting J $\textit{tinam}$- ‘connect’ and K $\textit{cis}$- ‘make, build, cultivate’ for phonological and semantic reasons, would in the mean time allow us to reconstruct an original velar nasal instead of a palatal nasal in Altaic. J $\textit{tomu}$ ‘be abundant’ could be a semantically and phonetically acceptable participant in the Altaic etymology. As for MK "$\textit{cis}$-", a binary comparison with J $\textit{tum}$ ‘heap up’ is better in our opinion for the reason that ‘build’ is semantically somehow nearer to ‘heap up’ than to ‘connect’.

From a phonological viewpoint OJ $\textit{tane}$ ‘seed’ is a regular match to MK $co\Delta o$ ‘kernel’ and also the semantics involved in this comparison are satisfactory. As Vovin points out OJ sane ‘kernel, seed’ is indeed likely to be a Korean loanword in Japanese, considering the weak $s: c$ correspondence and the not yet palatalized articulation of the dental affricate [ts] in Middle-Korean.

The etymology provided for MK $e\Delta o l u m$ ‘dusk, dim light’ is troublesome in many ways. First we have to think of ‘lightning’ as ‘a light in the dark’, analyzing J $\textit{ina}$-(bikari) as a compound from $\textit{ina}$- ‘darkness’ and $\textit{hikari}$ ‘light’. But no other cases of J $\textit{ina}$- meaning ‘darkness’ are traceable in Japanese. A second opposition is that the quality of the nasal in the participating protoforms varies from plain *-$n$- in Japanese and Tungusic over palatal *-$\hat{n}$- in Korean to velar *-$\eta$- in Turkic. Even if pK *-$\hat{n}$- would actually result from an earlier pK *-$n$- through a process of palatalization, the Turkic protoform remains aberrant. In the third place pTg *$\textit{ine}$-$\eta$- ‘sun, day’ makes a pretty dubious semantic fit with ‘dusk’. So, this is not a really convincing case.

Starostin offers an etymology with evidence from all other branches of Altaic for MK $ilGwes$- ‘to steal’, inf. $ilGwe\Delta e$. He reconstructs pA *$\textit{ali}$ ‘to deceive, be angry, nervous’ without reflex of the phoneme corresponding to the Korean triangle symbol, considering it as an individual Korean addition. But an internal analysis makes the Korean member suspect. This verb seems to be an eroded alternation of MK $ilpes$- ‘to steal’, inf. $ilpe\Delta e$. Most cases of -$G$- represent a lenited velar, but some cases of the spelling of -$G$- result from a lenition from -$p$-, by way of reducing -$W$- to -$Gw$-. We assume that the -$Gw$- notation in this verb is a way of writing a transitional stage of the bilabial fricative on its way to -$w$-. Probably the verb is a compound with MK $pes$- ‘remove’ as the second compo-
The first syllable could be MK "il ‘thing, affairs’, but in this case we would expect a rising tone on the first syllable of the verb. Another possibility is that the first member of this compound is related to MK ilh- ‘lose’, but then it is unclear what happened to the -h-. In any case, the word does not seem to belong to the proposed etymology.

The resemblance between MK ka’domyel- ‘to be rich, wealthy’ and the Japanese compound J kanemotii ‘wealthy person’ is indeed striking, but the phonological correspondences are merely coincidental. As the use of coins is already mentioned in the Nihon Shoki and their circulation was increasing gradually in Japan since the eighth century, the rich were distinguished from the poor on the basis of the ‘money’ (kane) they ‘disposed of’ (motu). In Cwosen Korea, people continued to use cloth as a medium of exchange until after the seventeenth century, despite the government’s attempts to circulate paper money or copper coins. Unlike the Japanese kanemotii, the wealthy amongst the speakers of Middle-Korean were rich in cloth. Therefore I suspect that MK ka’domyel- ‘to be rich, wealthy’ can be analysed as a compound of MK ko’dom ‘material, texture, cloth’ with the vowel already shifted to -a- as in modern Korean and of MK ‘yellow- ‘bear (fruit), be abundant with’, but the accentual behaviour of this compound is obscure. As will be discussed further on, it is possible to find external evidence pointing to the palatal nasal nature of the triangle symbol in MK ko’dom ‘material, texture, cloth’.

Vovin compares MK ke’d Gwa’ai ‘prodigal son’ with OJ kōnom- ‘to love (often in sexual sense), to take pleasure’, but considering the structure of the Middle-Korean word, an internal explanation seems more likely in this case. MK ke’d Gwa’ai ‘prodigal son’ is attested in the Kumkangkyeng samkahay as following: 蕃子 non ke’d Gwa’ai ra, literally meaning [prodigality child] is ke’d Gwa’ai. We get the impression we are dealing with a Middle-Korean compound of some nominalized verb and the noun MK *a’ai ‘child’. A possible candidate for the verb in question could be *:kes-, inf. ke’d Ge < *ke’duk- ‘be rough, wild, stubborn’. Indications for its existence could be found in MK ke’ sul- ‘oppose, offense’ and K kesul kesul ha- ‘be rough, wild, stubborn’. There is also MK *ke’cu s ‘falsehood’ and K keci ‘a good-for-nothing’. If we add to the proposed verb stem a suffix K -wu- / -wo-, that derives adverbs and nouns from verbs as in K nalwu ‘ferry’ < nal- ‘carry, transport’, we would get MK *ke’d Gwu/o. A compound with *e’ai ‘child’, exactly imitating the structure of the Chinese equivalent, would result into MK ke’d Gwa’ai ‘prodigal son’.

The same logic could be followed for MK ke’dGwe’di ‘kind of dog’, considering it as a compound of MK *ke’d Gwu/o ‘wildness’ and MK ye’di ‘dog, fox’. Ultimately we could even interpret MK ke’d Gwi ‘intestinal worm, mawworm’ as a derivation from MK ke’d Gwu/o with a common Korean suffix -i referring to animals, treating it as a ‘stubborn animal’. However, in this case we find a more reliable etymology in Starostin’s database, comparing it with a Tungusic ‘larva’,
a Mongolic ‘nit’ and a Turkic ‘mot’. Apart from *γ- in proto-Mongolic, the phonological correspondences are regular and there is also a nice semantical fit.

The etymology that Starostin suggests for MK $ki\Delta um$ ‘weed’ is plausible except for its irregular reflex of the supposed original palatal nasal in the Turkic and Mongolic proto-forms pTk $konak$ and pMo $k\breve{y}ene$.

Less convincing is the Korean participant MK $k\beta si$- ‘make a nest’ in the reconstruction of pA $k\beta ni$ ‘hollow, empty’. First we would expect a velar nasal instead of a palatal nasal in the Korean word and second the match between ‘nest’ and ‘hollow’ is not really convincing.

As mentioned in the above evaluation, there is a strong external indication to assume that the triangle grapheme indeed represented a palatal nasal in MK $\dot{k}os$ ‘side, edge, border’. For MK $k\breve{o}do\beta$ ‘autumn’ and MK $k\breve{ye}\Delta ol$ ‘winter’ the external material turned out to be less convincing.

In his etymology for pA $k\breve{e}n\beta i$ ‘thread, cloth’, Starostin includes OJ $kin\breve{u}$ ‘silk, cloth, robe’, WMo. $ke\beta ey$ ‘edge of cloth (on both sides)’ and MK $k\beta n$ ‘string, tassel’ with a plain nasal. However Vovin’s choice of MK $ko\tilde{n}om$ LL ‘material, cloth’ would be a better fit because of the quality of the nasal and the closer meaning. In this way we are provided with some other evidence, pointing to the palatal nasal nature of MK $\Delta$.

Vovin compares a root MK $ku\breve{n}-$ which he finds in MK $ku\Delta ey$ ‘hidden place’ and MK $ku\Delta uk ho$- ‘to be secret, hidden’ with OJ $kagey$ ‘shadow, shade, hidden place’ < pJ $kanka$. But there is also an exact semantic equivalent and regular phonological fit for the Japanese word in K $ki\breve{n}il$ ‘shadow’. Apart from the irregular reflex of the Korean nasal, Starostin’s Altaic comparison is inviting. Probably there is an internal connection between all Korean roots involved, pointing to a feature of nasality. A possible candidate for further derivation could be the verb MK $kus-$, inf $ku\Delta Ge-$ ‘to draw (a line); demarcate, to stop, hold (of rain)’. This verb developed a secondary sense ‘pull, drag’ which is now the primarunit meaning. MK $ku\Delta uk$ ‘excluded, private’ might be an adverb derived with the suffix -(u)k and MK $ku\Delta ey$ ‘hidden place’ can be a trace of the modifier $ku\Delta um$ followed by MK -ngey ‘on a place’, the sequence of palatal, plain and velar nasal contracting to one palatal nasal. There is also the word MK $ku\Delta um$ ‘limit, demarcation’ that may be a deverbal noun from the verb in question. MK $kunul$ ‘shadow’ could be an original imperfect adnominal with lost palatalisation but maintained nasality. MK $kus$ ‘end’ and MK $kus$ ‘stroke, line’ are probably derived from the same root.

Apart from the irregular behaviour of the nasal in the Mongolic and Tungusic proto-form, the etymology of MK $ku\breve{t}urum$ ‘soot, black dirt’ is pretty convincing. We wish to point out the existence of the Middle-Korean verb $ku\breve{t}uri-$ ‘smoke, fume’, from which this noun is derived. This verb probably makes a better basis for comparison.

Vovin provides us with a nice fourfold comparison for MK $ku\breve{w}u\Delta i$ ‘manger, trough’. A reconstruction of pTg $*x\breve{o}n(i)$- instead of pTg $*k\breve{o}n(i)$- seems possible
on the basis of Ma. xuño and Sol. xongē. In that way we get completely regular phonological correspondences in all branches, so we could reconstruct pA *k’oňe ‘bucket’\(^{13}\).

Starostin confines himself to a comparison of Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic forms, only making an oblique reference to K konägi ‘high pitcher’, for which we have been unable to find an attestation. But even if we did, MK kwu’Ai ‘manger, trough’ would still be a better match.

As for MK mo∆ol ‘village’ and MK mo∆om ‘mind, spirit, heart’ we have seen above how treatment of MK as [z] causes a troublesome OJ n : MK z correspondence, while the acceptance of a palatal nasal nature of the MK grapheme can lead us to a solution.

For MK ‘’mwoy’Aari ‘echo’ we would like to refer to following evaluation of morphological data, because we think that the appearance of MK ∆ in this word should be seen in close connection with MK -∆ genitive particle.

The meaning of MK mwɔ’Ai- is more or less equivalent to that of modern Seoul meki- ‘feed, make drink’, so Starostin’s ‘to graze’ should be interpreted in the transitive sense of the verb. This makes the semantic fit in the proposed etymology even weaker. However, apart from the irregular behaviour of the nasal in Tungusic, the phonological correspondences are regular. To say the least, we can agree with the Japanese-Korean match, another support for a nasal interpretation of MK ∆.

MK ‘’nas- ‘get better, go forward’ and MK na’Ai ‘shepherd’s purse’ have been dealt with in the above evaluation.

For MK ‘’neĄi ‘bustard’ Starostin offers a nice threefold comparison but the internal reconstruction of a velar nasal in Turkic is somehow doubtful. If we reconstruct a common Altaic velar suffix reflected in Tungusic and Turkic, we can explain the velar quality of the nasal in these branches and the reflex of the palatal nasal is regular.

Aside from the plain *-n- in pTg *ŋanı-, all correspondences that Starostin suggests for MK ‘’nis- ‘to connect, link, join, couple’ seem perfectly regular. From the semantic viewpoint a connection as proposed is not impossible.

In the case of MK pis- ‘to ornament, decorate’, we find again a non-palatalized nasal in Tungusic. But if we consider this as a frequent phenomenon of palatal variation in Tungusic, then we find a beautiful threefold comparison from the phonological point of view. However, inclusion of J hina ‘chick, duckling, doll’ seems suspect because considering compounds as hinagata ‘miniature’ and hinaso ‘boy priest’ its semantic weight seems to be rather ‘miniature, little one’ than ‘piece of decoration’. This would leave us with a binary comparison between Korean and Tungusic, but the Tungusic reconstruction pTg *pani- (/-ā-) ‘l

\(^{13}\) We adopt the correspondence rules proposed by Starostin in 1991 and in his database accessible via internet. The regular reflexes of the initial aspirated velar stop in Altaic are as following: pA *k‘-; pTk *k-; pMo *k-; pTg *x-; pK *k-; pJ *k-. 
to attire 2 attire’ with initial *p- is only based on forms in two languages Neg. xâni- ‘1’, Ev. hani-sin ‘2’. As there are no Manchu forms with initial f- or other Tungusic forms with initial p- attested, we can not exclude the possibility that an initial velar *x- should be reconstructed instead of *p-. This leaves us with a phonologically and semantically doubtful comparison.

MK *pudaylem ‘tumor, abscess, swelling, boil’ is most probably derived from the verb MK pus- ‘swell’, inf. puda. Starting from this verb, Vovin’s suggestion becomes even more convincing for semantic reasons. If we explain the -ra- in his reconstruction pl *panara- as a suffix, we get also a nice phonological fit. It is difficult to add Starostin’s Altaic comparisons to this Japanese-Korean cognate set, because the semantics involved should be ‘swell’ and not ‘scar, pimple’ or ‘rot’. Moreover, we lack a nasal reflex in the Mongolian participants and although pTk *beñir makes a nice external phonological fit, it can be doubted whether the internal reconstruction is reliable. However, confining ourselves to the Japanese-Korean core etymology, there is evidence for the nasal interpretation of the triangle grapheme.

Considering the meaning of the Middle-Korean verb skudî- ‘insert in water, dip’, we can interpret it as a case of secondary reinforcement by means of an intensive prefix s(u/o)-, stressing the force of the action through a tense articulation of its initial. Other examples of this kind, where both the plain and the prefixed versions are attested in the literature, are MK ‘tulp- ‘poke, bore’ to NK stwal- ‘id.’, MK *sus- ‘wipe, clean, wash’ to NK ssus- ‘id.’ and MK kwoc- ‘pierce, insert’ to NK skwooc- ‘id.’. If the initial s- of skudî- ‘insert in water, dip’ indeed is a prefix, then we obtain a plausible binary match with OJ kum- ‘to dip’ and at the same time an indication for nasal reading of MK Δ.

The etymology offered for MK ‘tios- ‘to love’ is weak and should be dismissed. First the original Japanese initial *t- is an irregular reflex of Altaic *d- according to Starostin’s own correspondence rules14. Secondly it seems better to leave out the Turkic participant because it can be considered as the result of suffixization with *nad-. And thirdly the semantic connection between the suggested members is weak.

For MK ‘twade ‘two-three’ we refer to the evaluation of genitive particle MK -Δ.

The comparison made with MK ‘wus- ‘laugh’ contains a perfect semantic fit and a regular reflex of the supposed original palatal nasal. The Korean vowel correspondence is somewhat confusing, but this can be due to the fact that despite Starostin’s thorough investigation of Altaic vocalism, the system is not fully elaborated yet.

14 In Starostin’s database the correspondence rule for initial Altaic *d- proposed in Starostin 1997 has been revised as following: pA *d-; pTk *j-; pMo *d-/ʃ[i]; pTg *d-; pK *t-; pl *d-/t[V+*p’, *t’, *k’, *c’].
Starostin himself remarks that the etymology he offers for MK yeło ‘fox’ is dubious so that one might prefer to place it in another etymology for ‘dog’, going with pA *ŋinto. Then we would compare MK yeło ‘fox’ with pJ *inu ‘dog’, pTg *ŋinda- ‘dog’ and pTk *it / *it ‘dog’. But in that case the reflex of the original nasal velar initial in Korean is irregular because we expect that it yields pK *n-. External evidence supporting the palatal nasal reading for MK Δ is weak in this case, but Vovin offers some interesting dialectal indications for this hypothesis from Phyeng dialects.

2.4. Morphological support for ň

As for the comparative morphological evidence in favor of the palatal nasal interpretation of the orthographic convention Δ, we have already dealt with the topic particle -Δa above.

Phonologically there is nothing wrong with the comparison of OJ mawi infinitive of a non-attested verb *mawu ‘humbly do/be’ and the deverential verbal suffix MK -‘Δop-. But rejecting MK ‘solp- ‘to report, state’ as the origin of this suffix, there are no cases attested of MK -‘Δop- being used independently as an auxilliary like in Japanese. We think it is safer to abandon comparing this Japanese verb with a Korean verbal suffix and prefer to put the etymology aside for the moment.

The strongest morphological case seems to be that of genitive particle MK -Δ. Unlike present day -uy which combines both genitive functions, Middle-Korean used two different genitive particles. The source of modern -uy, MK -u/oy, was attached to nonhononific animates while the allomorphs -k, -t, -p, -Δ, -s and -q were used to express a possessive or attributive relationship, following inanimates or honorific animates. Soon after the publication of the Yongpi echenka in

---

15 According to Starostin’s database the correspondence rule for initial Altaic *ŋ- is as following: pA *ŋ-; pTk *O-; pMo *O-; pTg *ŋ-; pK *ŋ-. The regular correspondence between Altaic *ŋ- and Korean n- is supported by the etymologies listed in the appendix for MK ‘nis- ‘to connect’ and MK ‘nas- ‘get better, go forward’. Furthermore we find in Starostin’s database pA ŋa first person pronoun with MK nā; pA *ŋāji ‘lower side’ with MK nārī- ‘to go down’; pA *ŋākča ‘nose, part of nose’ with MK nāch ‘face’; pA *ŋōču with MK nās-kā- ‘low, inferior’; pA *ŋōla ‘long, extend’ with MK nārī- ‘be extended, extend’; pA ŋōk’e ‘dog, wolf’ with MK nəkori ‘badger’; pA *ŋōlu ‘red, pink, yellow’ with MK nūř- and pA *ŋ(u) ‘what, who’ with MK nu- ‘who’.


17 Martin 1987, 722. *mau < *mawu < *maba. ‘humbly do/ be’: occurs only in the infinitive mawi < mab[a-C]i, as in mawi kure (Kojiki and Nihonshoki), mawi komu (Man’ōshū), mawi te[m]i (Bussokuseki 8). Nihonshoki mawi- > mau-. See maideru, maitaru, mair-u.
1446, the usage of these allomorphs was reduced to -Δ, -s and -q and finally it
was limited to -s. Traces of the Middle-Korean genitive particle -s can still be
found in numerous modern compounds such as twi-s-mun ‘back gate’, hay-s-sal
‘sunbeams’ and pay-s-nwolay ‘boatman’s song’ etc.

On the basis of a series of internal assimilation rules Vovin suggested MK -Δ
as the main allomorph for the genitive and reconstructed pK *-n\(^\Delta\)\(^18\). Externally, it
is possible to support his view, by means of a well known Altaic etymology, ini-
tially suggested by Ramstedt. This fivefold comparison seems phonologically and
functionally safe, so we can reconstruct an original genitive marker pA *-n.

On the basis of Middle-Korean compounds like MK ‘twuΔe ‘two-three’,
MK ‘mwoy’Δari ‘echo’ and MK ‘phu’Δeli ‘a patch of ground overgrown with
weeds, a weedy plot’ with an orthographical representation of \(\Delta\) in morpheme-
initial position, Vovin reconstructs pK *-n- in initial position\(^19\). But as there seems
to be a tendency in Korean to avoid palatal nasals in initial position and because
this reconstruction involves a problematic correspondence between pA *-n- and K
s- we suggest another explanation\(^20\).

Possibly the above compounds can be analysed as two members connected
with a morpheme pK *-n. So, MK ‘twuΔe would originate from ‘tul ‘two’ + -n
conjunctive + se ‘three’ and MK ‘phu’Δeli from ‘phul ‘grass, weed’ + -n con-
junctive + ‘seli ‘among many’. Considering the rule that the Korean liquid -l-
drops at compound boundaries before apicals [n], [t], [s] and \(\Delta\) and supposing a
partial assimilation from -s- to -n- affecting voice and place of articulation, we
would get ‘twuŋže in the former case and ‘phu’nżeli in the latter. If MK Δ were to
represent a palatal-nasal it would be perfectly logical to use this orthographic
convention here for the nž sound. A remark that can be made is that the relation
between ‘two’ and ‘three’ in ‘twuΔe ‘two-three” is not strictly genitive in the
sense of possession or attribution, but that we rather deal with a conjunctive
morpheme here. Conjunctive use of the genitive particle is also traceable in Japa-
nese. The Japanese genitive -no is also used in compounds like yama-no-ie
‘mountain hut’ where it usually expresses an attributive relationship. In many
cases like J yamaga ‘a cottage in a mountain’ < *yama-n-ka we find that voicing
is the only trace left by an original *-n morpheme. There are also examples of

\(^{18}\) Vovin 1993, 253.

\(^{19}\) Vovin 1993, 253-54.

\(^{20}\) Yi Ki-mun 1978, 238-39. In 18\(^{th}\) century Korean we find a general phenomenon of
palatalization in that affected various consonants when followed by -i- or -y-. Also n-
underwent palatalization in this environment, but the next step was that ni- was re-
placed by i- in initial position. In the Sipkwu salyak enhay, edited in 1772, NK imkum
‘king, ruler, sovereign’ appears instead of earlier nimkum ‘id.’ We find a similar de-
velopment for MK nirum ‘name’ over nirum into NK irum and for MK niruta ‘arrive,
attain’ over *niruta into NK iruta. This development leads to the assumption that a
palatal nasal in initial position was unstable and therefore tended to drop soon after it
appeared.
purely conjunctive use of this genitive morpheme, as in OJ *yamagapa ‘mountains and rivers’ < *yama-n-kapa. This suggests that what is usually described as ‘genitive’ in Altaic can be interpreted as a morpheme expressing a set of interwoven relations of possession, attribution and conjunction between nouns.

It seems possible to explain the triangle grapheme in MK *mwoy’Dari ‘echo’ in a similar way as in the above mentioned compounds. The first member of this compound unquestionably is MK *mwoy(h) ‘mountain’, but the second component is somehow more obscure. Vovin suggests MK ~*nali H.L ‘sound’, but this involves a problematic initial palatal nasal. Besides, comparing J *nar- ‘sound, chirp (etc.)’ with MK *nol- ‘play, loaf’ Martin offered a convincing etymology for ‘sound’, reconstructing a plain nasal in initial position. The Middle-Korean verb in question means ‘to play’, but taking into account a nominalisation as MK nwo*l’Gay ‘song’ < *nwo*l- ‘to sound’ + -*kay postnoun ‘implement’, we reconstruct an original *nwo*l- ‘to sound’. We were unable to find an attestation of the derived verb K hi-nol- ‘sigh for’ that Martin offers to support this reconstruction. Parallel to OJ ne ‘sound’ that can be analysed as a case of medial -r- loss following suffixization of nominalizing -i to nar- ‘to sound’, we suggest suffixation of Korean – maybe common Altaic – nominalizing -i to pK *nwo*l- ‘to sound’ yielding MK *nari ‘sound’. That we find a triangle grapheme in MK *mwoy’Dari ‘echo’ could be explained as a trace of genitive particle MK *-*n, that is MK *mwoy(h) ‘mountain’ + *-*n genitive + MK *nari ‘sound’, contracting to MK *mwoy’nari ‘echo’.

The above explanation avoids reconstruction of a Middle-Korean palatal nasal in initial position and provides us with supplementary evidence for an original genitive pK *-*n.

3. Conclusion

Although now obsolete MK Δ is described in the Hwunmin cengum in exactly the same way as MC ń, it became widely accepted that it represented a voiced fricative [z]. Considering the distribution of MK Δ, often replacing -s- in intervocalic position, one might jump to the conclusion that it indeed reflected a voiced allophone of [s]. However it can be demonstrated that MK Δ had a phonemic status, so it would be strange for a system without phonological voicing like Middle-Korean to make an exception only in case of [s] and [z]. On the other hand we also found some internal argumentation against the interpretation of the triangle symbol as a palatal nasal [ń].

In this paper we have tried to gather and evaluate external evidence undermining or supporting the palatal nasal and voiced fricative hypotheses for MK Δ. We have concluded that comparisons starting from the interpretation of the triangle grapheme as [z], tracing it back to pK *s, are few in number and often difficult to maintain. Evidence pointing to an original pK *ń appeared to be more
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numerous but of varying conviction. Weak cases are to be found under MK ‘cis-
‘make, build, cultivate’, MK eΔolum ‘dusk, dim light’, MK ilGwes- ‘to steal’,
MK kis- ‘make a nest’, MK keΔ.Gwa’Δi ‘prodigal son’, MK koΔol ‘autumn’,
MK moΔi- ‘feed, make drink’, MK pis- ‘to ornament, decorate’, MK ‘tos- ‘to
love’ and MK ‘‘Δop- deferential bound auxiliary.

For more plausible support we refer to MK ‘as- ‘rob, take away’, MK aΔi
‘at first, from the beginning’, MK aΔo ‘a man’s younger brother, a woman’s
younger sister’, MK aΔom ‘relative, kinsfolk’, MK coΔo ‘kernel’, MK eΔi
‘mother’, MK kiΔum ‘weed’, MK koΔom ‘material, texture, cloth’ along with
MK kaΔomyel- ‘to be rich, wealthy’, MK kuΔey ‘hidden place’, MK kuΔuk ho-
‘to be secret, hidden’, MK kuΔurum ‘soot, black dirt’, MK kwuΔi ‘manger,
trough’, MK kyeΔol ‘winter’, MK ‘nas- ‘get better, go forward’, MK ‘neΔi
‘bustard’, MK puΔurum ‘tumor, abscess, swelling, boil’, MK skuΔi- ‘insert in
water, dip’, MK ‘wus- ‘laugh’ and MK yeΔo ‘fox’. For MK ‘‘Δa topic particle
external evidence can be given for a voiced fricative interpretation, but internal
analysis pointed towards a palatal nasal underlying MK Δ in this particle.

Really strong evidence for the palatal nasal hypothesis is provided under MK
keΔ Gwi ‘intestinal worm, mawworm’, MK ‘kos ‘side, edge, border’, MK moΔol
‘village’, MK moΔom ‘mind, spirit, heart’, MK ‘mwoyΔari ‘echo’, MK naΔi
‘shepherd’s purse’, MK ‘nwΔe ‘two-three’ and MK -Δ genitive particle.

In consideration of the above external evidence we may assume that the
original phoneme yielding the value underlying MK Δ was a palatal nasal, pK *n.
Some internal examples have shown that the phonetic value of MK Δ probably
represents an early stage in the denasalization of this pK *n and was possibly
pronounced as a nasal fricative n̂z.
Appendix: list of etymologies proposed for Middle-Korean forms written with Δ

1. Lexical evidence

MK 'as- ‘to rob, take away’, inf. a’Δa
Sta., DB: MK aǹ- (aǹa-), pK *aǹ- (aǹa-) ‘to rob, seduce’, Olč. eše-, Orok en(n)e-, pTg *eše- ‘to sin’ (STSM 2, 456), WMo. ende-, Khal. ende-, Mong. > Ev. ende- etc., pMo *ende- ‘to be mistaken’ (MT 111), OTk. aǹy, Yak. aǰi’, pTk *aǹįg ‘sin, evil’ (EDT 182), pA *eňa ‘sin’

MK aΔi ‘at first, from the beginning’
SKE 5: K āi ‘from the first, at once, altogether’ (Gale 1911, 651), āje ‘id.’, ā-sie ‘at the beginning’ (Sino-K si ‘time’). In āje the ending is that of the locative -ai > e, also found in si-e. In ā-i there is the suffix -i of the instructive (Ram 1939, §99) and the stem is thus *aŋ or (*aŋa). Uig. aŋ ilki ‘the very first’, Mo. aŋ-qa, aŋ- qa ‘the beginning, the first’
Sta., DB: MK aǹi, pK *aǹi ‘beginning, from the beginning’, Na. anam, Cf. also Oroč. ana, pTg *ana- ‘very’ (STSM 1, 41), WMo. aŋqa, Khal. anx, pMo *aŋ-ka ‘original, very, extremely’, OTk. ęŋ, Tat. in, Tkm. in, Kirg. en, pTk *en ‘very’ (VEWT 45; ĖSTJ 1, 365-366). Turk. > Mong. ęŋ (TMN 2, 130), pA *ani ‘very’ (SKE 5; EAS1, 119)

MK aΔo ‘a man’s younger brother, a woman’s younger sister’
SKE 11: MK anię-a ‘wife’ (Maema) > qa, ao, au ‘id.’, Tg. ana-ka ‘wife’ (Titow 10), diminutive to *ana, *aha ‘mother’, Tk. ana ‘mother’
SKE 12: ao, au ‘younger brother, I (in epistolary style)’, North-K asu (cakkı, akki), pK *asıği (?). Gil. aşx ‘younger brother’ (Sternberg), Tg. ahuvw-kăn ‘(the) youngest (son, brother)’ (Mat. 168). Possibly also Olč. nau-džua, nau-džuaka, Na. nauţua, nauţuka ‘a young man, a youth’ (Schmidt 268), *nau<∩pK *nau ∼ au.


MK a’Δom ‘relative, kinsfolk’
Sta, DB: Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257-58: see MK aΔo ‘a man’s younger brother, a woman’s younger sister’

MK ‘cis- ‘to make, build, cultivate’, inf. cιΔe
SKE 37: K čittā ( : čiľe : čiň, čiın) ‘to build, to fix, to make, to compose’ (Gale 1911, 906), North-K čikkı ‘id.’, (?) Tk. juy- ‘to collect, to gather, to build up’, Kas. Kırk. çiij- < *ziuy-’, MTK. jyyym, jyyyy ‘collected, composed’, Mo. çigu-, Khal. dzö-, Kalm. zo- ‘to put together, to collect, to heap”, dzöři, dzöeri, Kalm. zöri ‘treasury, collection’
Sta, DB: OJ tiná-m- J chinám-, Kyo. chinám-, Kagal. chinám-, PJ *tiná-m- ‘be related, connected’ (The J accent is irregular, PJ *chinam- would be expected), MK čiŋ-tá, PK *čiŋ- ‘to make, produce’, Neg. žiŋ, Lit. Ma. žin, žiŋ, Ołč. žiŋ, Orok žiŋ, Ev. žiŋ, PtG *žiŋ ‘very, extremely, really’ (SSTM 1, 258), WMo. činege, Khal. činęič, Kalm. čiņęič, Darg. čine, PMo *čineye ‘force, strength, ability’ (KW 441), Tk. dixe ‘only’, Yak. tiŋ, diŋ, Kaz. tiŋ (VEWT 478), Tk. > WMo. čiŋ, čiŋya (KW 437, 441), whence Na. čiŋqı et al. (SSTM 2, 397), Pa *čino ‘power, force’

MK co’Δo ‘kernel’
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257: OJ same ‘kernel, seed’ < PJ *sana-Ci 2.3 (?), OJ tane ‘seed’, MJ tane LH < PJ *tana-Ci 2.4 (Ma 1987, 518), MK co’ho LH ‘kernel’. OJ same semantically better fits than OJ tane, but because of the initial s- it should be considered to be an early Korean loanword in Japanese.
MK e’Δi ‘mother’
Ram 1939, 10: K ěi ‘mother (of animals)’, pK *eňi, Tg. eňe ‘mother’


MK eΔolum ‘dusk, dim light’

MK ilGwes- ‘to steal’, inf. ilGweΔe

MK ka’Δomyel- ‘to be rich, wealthy’
Vo. BSOAS 1993, 257: J kanemoti ‘wealthy person’ < kane ‘money’ + moti ‘to have’, MK ka’nö.myel- LHL ‘to be rich’. (J word is certainly a compound and its first attestation is only for EMJ, but the phonetic and semantic fit is ideal. Since we do not know how to analyse the MK word, I prefer to preserve this comparison.)
MK keΔ′Gwa′Ai ‘prodigal son’

MK keΔ′Gwi ‘intestinal worm, mawworm’

MK kiΔum ‘weed’
SKE 112: K kîm ‘weeds’ (Gale 1911, 147) < kîm, dial. kîsm, kim meda (or māda) ‘to weed’, kîsm formed from a verb *kis- (?).
Sta. DB: OJ kome, J komé, Kyo. kômë, Kag. komë, pJ *kômâi ‘rice’, MK kiîmû, pK. *kiîm ‘weed’, WMo. kôgene, Khal. xâmö, pMo *kôyene ‘a creeping weed’, OTk. goqag ‘1’, pTk *konak ‘1 millet; 2 Timothy grass’ (EDT 637; leksika 458-459) OTk. qojaq is a ghost-word. pA *kâño (~ k-) a k. of weed. The tone correspondence between K and J is irregular. Note, however, that the reconstruction of low tone in pJ in this case is based only on the Kag. form (MJ accentuation is unattested, while Kyo. and J may point both to *LL and to *HL). Therefore a reconstruction *kômâi for pJ is not completely excluded.

MK kis- ‘to make a nest’, inf. kiΔe
MK "kos 'side, edge, border', MK koΔeps- 'have no border'
SKE 81: K ka 'a side, an edge, a border, a bank, a margin', mul-ka, mulkka 'the border of a river, the beach', padakka 'the seashore', etc. < *ka’a < kaŋa, WMo. qaja, qajaga, Khal. xaŋa 'the side or border', xaŋa-p'i 'the felt wall (on both sides of the yurt)', MTK. qajyj jir 'von der Hauptstrasse abseits liegendes Land' (Brockmann 142)

Ma. Lg 1966, 227: J kisi 'brink', K "ka < "kas < MK "kos < *kɔc = ko'cang (> kacang 'extreme', kacang cali 'brink'), pKJ *koςuηỵi. Is K kis 'lapel' connected? Dag. keci 'edge, bank, shore', Tk. kiyi 'edge, border (etc.)', kit 'side'

CL 37: J kisi < OJ kiysi LL < pJ *ku/piCisi 'bank, shore', MK 'kis 'collar, lapel', MK kisul 'edge, border', K kā 'brink, edge, limit' < MK "koz or "kos < *ko'so < *ko'co (cf. ko'cang 'end, extremity; extremely, most', s ko'ci > khaci 'till, all the way to')

Sta. DB: K ka, MK kān, pK *kān 'edge', Ulch. xe̍ne̍, pTg *xe̍ne̍ 'dull side of blade' (SSTM 1, 481), WMo. qajya, Khal. xajā, Kalm. xajā, pMo *kajaya 'edge' (KW 161; TMN 1, 446), Otk. qajy (MK) 'outsid', Chuv. xiṽu, xiṽ-ма, Yak. kijia 'deroga po obryvistomu kraju', Kaz. kijik 'ein im Kleide eingesetzter Keil', pTk *Kaj (~ -η) 'edge, Saum' (VEWT 221), pA *k'i'ño 'edge'. A derivate of the same root may be Mo. kegov 'mountain ridge'.

MK koðol 'autumn'
SKE 86: K kaïl 'autumn' (Gale 1911, 8), kahir hâda 'to harvest', North-K kajir, kahir < *kaži- or *ka-, ? Tg. kasi- 'to tear off, to destroy – as leaves, grasses', kasirga- 'to become destroyed, to be torn off'. Tg. kasi- can be connected with K kasýr, supposing the original sense has been 'the falling of leaves' (English 'fall') or perhaps the harvesting or withering of vegetable plants.

Ma. Lg 1966, 247: J áki 'autumn', K kaïl < MK kožol 'id.', pKJ *(a-)kyɔ(.l)

Vo. BSOAS 1993, 256: MK koñol(h) LL 'autumn' < pK *koñor-Vy. Cf. pTk *gyr2 'autumn' < gy(?)/yr2 < gyûy2. E. Polivanov compared this Korean word with Tk. qiş 'winter' (Polivanov, 1927/1968, 163) [mistake for Tk. kûz 'autumn']

MK koðom 'material, texture, cloth'
Vo. BSOAS 1993, 256: OJ kyinu 'garment, silk', MJ kinu LH(-H) < pJ *kinu 2.4 (Ma 1987, 451), MK koñom LL 'material, cloth'

Sta. DB: OJ kiní J kinu, Kyo. kiní, Keg. kiní, pJ *kini 'silk, cloth, robe', MK kin, pK *kin 'string, tassel', WMo. keñ, Khal. xejen, pMo *kejen 'edge of cloth (on both sides)', pA *këni (~ k-, -i-) 'thread, cloth'

MK kus- 'draw (a line); demarcate, delimit; stop, hold (of rain); pull, drag', inf. kuΔGe

Whit. Baldi 1990, 517: OJ kozU- 'pull out by the roots', MK kîz < *kûsûl- 'pull'
MK ku’Aey ‘hidden place’

MK ku’Auk ho- ‘to be secret, hidden’
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257: see MK ku’Aey ‘hidden place’

MK kuAurum ‘soot, black dirt’
Sta, DB: OJ kwøgår- J køgaréru, Kyo. køgaré-rú, Kag. kogaré- (Kag. points to high tone, but other dialects rather to a low one), pJ *kuǎnkàr- ‘to be burnt’, MK kâńrım, pK *kâńrım ‘soot’, Na. xëngi-, Ev. enguré- (SSTM 2, 457), pTg *xun- (gV-) (*k-) ‘be burnt’, WMo. keñsigi, Khal. xenšì, Kalm. kiñšün, Dag. kunšun (KW 246) Mo. > Ma. kunšun, pMo *keñsigi ‘have a burnt taste or smell’, OTk. köŋ-, köj-, Tat. köjder- ‘2’, Uigh. köjdür- ‘1’, Turkm. köj- 3, Chuv. (Ašm) kø÷-, káš”vajt ‘4’, Yak. køf-, Kirg. kijdür- ‘1’, pTk *koń- ‘burn (itr.) 1 burn (tr.); 2 kindle; 3 get burnt 4 soot’ (VEWT 309; EDT 726, 730; ÆSTJa 5, 88-89, 133; leksika 362)
Yak. køf- is somewhat unclear here: it means ‘to become fermented, yeasted’ and is irregular phonologically (ð instead of the expected ùo – maybe the form reflecting a derivate like *koń-ün-). It seems thus safer to base the vowel length reconstruction on the Turkmen form and reconstruct *koń-. pA *k’unë ‘burn, get burnt’. (Cincius 1984, 110-111; APJ 11, 286) MMo (MA) kije, Mo. köye ‘soot’ probably belongs here, too (cf. also WMo köjüre-, Kalm. köjr- ‘to sweat’), although Ščerbak 1997, 196 regards it as a Turkism (cf. Kaz. kije etc., see the whole list in leksika 371, despite Ščerbak, however, MTK. kije ‘soot’ does not exist, so all the Turkic forms most probably have a Mo. origin).
MK kwu’Ai ‘manger, trough’

MK kye’Dol ‘winter’
Mi, UAJ 1986, 47; LH 114: OJ kisaragi ‘second lunar month’, MK kyö’zûl ‘winter’, OTk. qis ‘winter’, OTk. qislay ‘winterquarters, baracks’
Sla, DB: OJ kisaragi, pJ *kisara- ‘second month’, Neg. giëgli, Na. giš-si, Olc. gîtul, Orök giçûli; Ev. gîldi, pTg *gil- ‘cold’ (SSTM 1, 15), OTk. qis, Tk. kis, Tkm. Gis, Chuv. xal, Yak. kis, pTg *Kil ‘winter’ (VEWT 268, TMN 3, 479, leksika 75-76), pA *gil’o ‘cold’ (EAS1 110; leksika 76)
Sla, DB: OJ k(w)oju, pJ *kaju- ‘to freeze’, K keil, MK kjëni, kjëni, kjëvar, pK *kjëvni ‘winter’, Neg. inijûgi, Na. sîngu 1, Olc. sînguni- 1; Orök sînga- 1; Ev. ininipçu, pTg *xinû ‘cold 1: freeze’ (SSTM 1, 321), WMo. köten; Khal. xîjten; Kalm. kîn, Dong. kuîçien, Bao. kituç, Dag. kuiten; Yogh. kiûtên; Mng. kûiden, pMo *köiten ‘cold’ (KW 234), pTk *Kuçu ‘rheumatism’ (TMN 3, 562), pA *k’êjho ‘cold’ (APPJ 53-54, 290; Oz 1960, 82-84) The cluster *-ji explains the somewhat irregular behaviour of -j-i.

MK moDol ‘village’
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257: OJ mura ‘village’, MJ mura HL < ? pJ *mura-(Ci-) 2.2b (Ma 1987, 488), possible development due to medial -r- loss: pJ *mura < *munura. Cf. kôru, MK mo.nîl(h) LL ‘village’. There is also the point of view that the MK and OJ words are not related (Ma, Lg 1966, 229).
*maji-kan ‘tent’ (SSTM 1, 520; despite MT 80, hardly Mo. < Tg.), pA *meñ(o) ‘dwelling place, village’.

The K-J form is a derivate in *-rV (*-lV). The Tungus form fits very well semantically, but raises some phonetic doubts: vowel length and the quality of -n- (instead *-n-) do not correspond to other languages. Cf. perhaps Tk. (Alt.) man ‘fence’ (VEWT 325).

Ma, Lg 1966, 229: J murá ‘village’ is probably not connected with K mail < MK mozolh ‘village’.

MK moDéom ‘mind, spirit, heart’

Whit, Baldi 1990, 524, 543: OJ muna-imuney ‘chest, heart’, MK mózöm ‘heart’, pJK *mozom + i. This assumes nasal assimilation of medial *-z-.

APPJ 48, 253, 272, 290: J muné ‘grud’ [breast], OJ mune, pJ *múnà-i (202), Phyeng-nam. mai’m ‘serdce [heart]’, MK mánám, pK *mánām (42), pTg *miánam ‘serdce [heart]’ (57), pA *miánV ‘serdce [heart], grud’ [breast]

Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257: OJ mune < *muney (stem muna-) ‘chest’, MJ mune HL < pJ *muna-Ci 2.1a (Ma 1987, 488), MK mo.ñom LL ‘soul, heart’ This comparison was offered for the first time by Whit 1985, 237. But because of the interpretation of the MK word as mozom it looked inconvincing [unconvincing]. Cf. Sta 1986, 109.)

CL 67: In (APPJ 48) the Tg. reconstruction looks contrived and the Tg. words may have nothing to do with MK mozom, for which the phonograms found in 1400 + Kwan-yek indicate an earlier pronunciation mo-com.

Sta, DB: J munë; Kyo. mûnè; Kag. mûne, OJ mûnè, pJ *mûnà-i ‘breast’, K maím, MK. mánâm, pK *mánām heart, Neg. mëwán, Ma. niámaj, Lit. Ma. ñaman; Na. mëwa(n), Olc. mëwa(n), Orok mëwa(n), Jur. miqillé/n-be, Ev. mëwan, pTg *mënham ‘heart’ (SSTM 1, 533-534), pA *máñu ‘heart; breast’ (SKE 136; EAS1 79; APPJ 48, 290)

MK ‘mwoy’Déari ‘echo’

Vo, BSOAS 1993, 256: OJ nar- ‘to sound’, OJ ne ‘sound’, (MJ ne H(-H)) < *ney < pJ *na(r)i HH(H) (2.1) < *nar(a-C)i (Ma 1987, 495), MK ~ñoli H.L ‘sound’ in mwoy.ñoli LH.H.L ‘echo’ < pK *ñar-i

MK mwó’Déi- ‘to feed, make drink’
Sta, DB: OJ mâmör- J mamór-, Kyo. mâmór-, Kag. mamór- (Accent in Kag. is irregular), pJ *mâmò-r ‘to guard, protect’, MK móñí-, pK *móñí- ‘to graze’ (An old derivate is probably MK mánár ‘office’ (> Ma. mejren etc.), Ev. munni-li-, mundi-, mundè- ‘to comprehend’, pTg *mun-di- ‘to look, observe’ (SSTM 1,
MK "nas- ‘to get better, go forward’, infinitive na’Δa
SKE 162: K nāta (nāā, nā: nājn) ‘to excel, to be better than, to have recovered’ (Gale 1911, 182), pK *nā- or na- (?), ? Mo. naj ‘very, best’ (SH), n. jōb ‘the best’ (Haenisch 1939, 113), Tg. naka ‘well, excellent’ (?) see nakta
Ma. Lg 1966, 226: J nápo ‘more, further’, J napör- ‘get better’, J napós- ‘make better’, K na(s)- ‘get, be better’, “na-ke, na-u ‘better, more’, MK n∞y ‘again, further’, nawi (= nawi-i) ‘(not) enough to, more’, pKJ *nap-
CL 66: In (Sta, MLJ 1993) the semantics of the Korean stem make its inclusion in the etymology suspect, and the causative K naswu- < na.zwo- indicates a sibilant. The Japanese participant in Sta’s etymology is also doubtful and it is the only basis for his ‘away’ rather than ‘down’.

MK na’Δi ‘shepherd’s purse’
Sta. JIES 1997, 338: J nàzuna ‘shepherd’s-purse’, OJ nàdima ‘id.’, pJ *nàntuna (The Kyoto accent is irregular), MK nān ‘shepherd’s-purse’, pK *nāni, pTg *nuniV, pMo *nimniya, pTk *jon-irčgā, pA *nına ‘a k. of grass’
Sta. DB: OJ nàdima J nàzuna, Kyo. názúna, Kag. nazuná, pJ *nàntina ‘shepherd’s purse’ (The Kyoto accent is irregular), MK nān ‘shepherd’s-purse’, pK *nāni, Lit. Ma. nodo ‘sitnik; vodjanoj luk’, Ev. nuna̋ldiwin ‘nazv. rastenija’, pTg *nuniV ‘a k. of plant’ (SSTM 1, 605, 646), WMo. nimniya, pMo *nimniya ‘dandelion’, OTK. jorînčyā, jonička, Turk. jonţa, Tkm. jorunţa, Kirg. jonugčka, Kaz. ʒonî(r)iška, pTk *jon-irčka ‘clover’ (VEWT 207; TMN 4, 228-229; EDT 971; ÊSTJa 4, 227-228; leksika 126-127), pA *n(u)nà ‘a k. of grass’ (Ma, Lg 1966, 240; Dybo 1996, 10. The tone correspondence between K and Ir is irregular. If the Turk. form is *jor-ınčka ‘kaška’, it does not belong here.)
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 257: OJ naduna ‘shepherd’s-purse’, MJ naduna LH?, pJ *nan(V)-tu na, where tu is OJ genitive marker (Ma 1987, 494: pJ *nantu-na), MK na.ńi ‘shepherd’s-purse’. (This etymology was proposed by Ma, Lg 1966,
241. But his treatment of MK [Δ] as [z] caused a problematic correspondence MK [z]: OJ [n])

MK ‘neΔi ‘bustard’

MK ‘nis- ‘to connect, link, join, couple’, inf. niΔe

MK pis- ‘to ornament, decorate’, inf. pīΔe

MK pus-, pos- ‘to break down, demolish’, inf. puΔe, poΔGa
CL 29: MK pulozG- / poz- < pulosu/ulG- < *pulosu/ol- vt ‘crush, smash’, pTg *poso- (Kim Tongso 1981, 26. But he fails to state the forms from which he reconstructs; they probably include Ma feser seme ‘broken into small pieces’ and perhaps ejule- ‘break, destroy it’ and ejiye- ‘be broken/destroyed’), Mo. but nerge- ‘smash into pieces’, Chuv. pusar ‘crunch’, Tk. bu:z- ‘destroy’.

MK puΔurum ‘tumor, abscess, swelling, boil’
MK skuΔi- ‘to insert in water, dip’

MK ‘tos- ‘to love’, inf. to’Δa
Sta, DB: OJ tànō-si- ‘1’, tànō-m- ‘2’ J tanoshii ‘1’, tanomu ‘2’, pj *tànò- ‘1 pleasant, glad; 2 to ask’, MK tàån-, pK *tàn- ‘to love’, Olč. daŋala-, pTg *daŋa-la- ‘to joke, mock’ (SSTM 1, 196), Tkm. jajna-, pTk *jajna- ‘to long for’ (VEWT 179; ESTJa 4, 80), pA *daŋo ‘to love, be friendly’

MK ‘twuΔe ‘two-three’
SKE 275: K tue ‘some few’ (Gale 1911, 263) < tu ‘two’ and se ‘three’
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 256: OJ myì- ‘three’, (MJ mi- H (?) < pj *mi- 1,1 ? (Ma 1987, 482), MK -ńe L ‘three’ in twu.ńe(h) L.H.L ‘two-three’, sey(h) LH ‘three’ < pK *ńe(C)i ‘three’, pTg *ńiil-an ‘three’ (SSTM 1, 1975, 305-6)
CL 66: if MK *seys ‘three’ < *ńeys, it would require a delicate technique for speakers of MK to keep it distinguished from MK *neys ‘four’ and it would (less often) clash with *ńey s ‘of old’.

MK ‘wuś- ‘to laugh’, inf. wuΔe

MK yeΔo ‘fox’
Sta, DB: OJ inù, J inù, Kyo. inù, Kag. īň, pj *inù ‘dog’ [pj *inù appears in the same etymology], Neg. īnaxin/ninaxin, Ma. jinëhui, īnëhui, Lit. Ma. īndaxuin, Na. īnda, Ulch. īnda, Orok īnda,Jur. īndaxiun, Ev. īnakin, ginakin, pTg *ginda- ‘dog’ (SSTM 1, 661-662), OTk. īt, Tk. it (apx.), Tat. et, Uigh. īt, Chuv. īšť, Yak. īt, Kirg. īt, Kaz. īt, Bash. et, Sal. īšt,
pTk *ŋi / *ŋi ‘dog’ (VEWT 174; TMN 2; 173-4; EDT 34; ĖSTJa 1, 385; leksika 188), pA *ŋĩŋo ‘dog’ (APPJ 18, 49, 72, 101, 274; Dybo 1996, 9; leksika 189)
Sta. DB: K jŭu, MK jŏni, pK *jŏni ‘fox’, Neg. janda, Lit. Ma. jandači ‘ščenok barsuka’, Na. jandaqo, Olč. jandaqy, Ev. jantakă, pTg *jandaku ‘raccoon dog’ (SSTM 1,341, 249), OTk. andik (Chag.), Tk. anduk, pTk *anduk (~ ānt-) ‘a k. of lynx’ (leksika 159), pA *janda(-kV) ? ‘badger, lynx’ (Dybo 1996, 9; leksika 159). The word may be the same as *ŋinto ‘dog’, if one assumes that the Tungus forms are secondary (borrowed from Manchu ‘dog’).

2. Morphological evidence

MK -DMIN genitive particle
Ram 1939, 41-42: Δ the sign for an nasalized j, used in old books for a short genitive. pK *-ŋ after vowels, pK *-gű, -jů after consonants. e.g. MK nummum ‘the tear’ from nun ‘eye’ and mul ‘water’. J -no, -nu < *-n, Tg. -n, Mo. -un, jin, Tk. -iŋ (original *-in) as genitive endings.
Vo, BSOAS 1993, 256: OJ no < pJ *nə genitive marker, MK ŋ ‘id.’, pTg *ŋi ‘id.’, pMo *n ‘id.’, pTk *ŋ ‘id.’

MK -‘Δa topic particle ‘only if it be, if (it be), when it comes to, even, indeed’
Ma, Baldi 1990, 494: J …sa! ‘indeed’, OJ sa ‘so / that’ = deictic, OJ si = emphatic particle, K ya / iya < i(əz)a and dialectal sa < (i/l) za = focus particle

MK -‘Δop- deferential bound auxiliary

Abbreviations

1. Languages

Chag. Chaghatai
Cey. Ceycwutwo (Korean)
Chu. Chuvash
Dag. Dagur
Ev. Evenki (Tungus)
Ewen Ewen (Lamut)
Gil. Gilyak (Nivhk)
Ham. Hamkyengtwo (Korean)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hat.</td>
<td>Hateruma (Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(new, modern, standard Tokyo) Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jur.</td>
<td>Jurchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>(new, modern, standard Seoul) Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kag.</td>
<td>Kagosima (Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalm.</td>
<td>Kalmuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang.</td>
<td>Kangwentwo (Korean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kas.</td>
<td>Kazan (Idil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaz.</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khal.</td>
<td>Khalkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirg.</td>
<td>Kirghiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwo. OK</td>
<td>Kwokwulye Old Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksang</td>
<td>Kyengsangtwo (Korean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyo.</td>
<td>Kyoto (Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma.</td>
<td>Manchu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Middle Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Middle Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMO.</td>
<td>Middle Mongolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mng.</td>
<td>Monguor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMo.</td>
<td>Written Mongolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTk.</td>
<td>Middle Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na.</td>
<td>Nanai (Goldi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>Negidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>Old Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olč.</td>
<td>Olcha (Ulcha, Ulchi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroč.</td>
<td>Orochi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orok</td>
<td>Orok (Uilta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTk.</td>
<td>Old Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pA</td>
<td>proto-Altaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyeng.</td>
<td>Phyengantwo (Korean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyeng-nam.</td>
<td>Phyenganntwo (Korean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pKJ</td>
<td>proto-Korean-Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pMo</td>
<td>proto-Mongolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pTg</td>
<td>proto-Tungusic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pTk</td>
<td>proto-Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol.</td>
<td>Solon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat.</td>
<td>(Volga) Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tk.</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkm.</td>
<td>Turkmenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ud.</td>
<td>Udehe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uig.</td>
<td>Uighur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yak.</td>
<td>Yakut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo.</td>
<td>Yonaguni (Japanese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Texts

KK  Kojiki kayō
SH  Secret History of the Mongolians (Manghol un niuca tobca’an)

3. Authors

Ma  Martin Samuel Elmo.
Mi  Miller Roy Andrew
Oz  Ozawa Shigeo
Ram Ramstedt Gustaf John
Sta Starostin Sergei Anatolevič
Vo  Vovin Alexander
Whit Whitman John Bradford
YKM Yi Ki-mun
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Kenneth SHIELDS, Jr. (Millersville)

ON THE INDO-EUROPEAN ORIGINS OF LATIN ipse

A persistent problem of historical/comparative Italic linguistics has been the origin of the Latin intensive pronoun ipse ‘selfsame; exactly; very’, which sometimes functions as a reflexive. In his recent New Comparative Greek and Latin Grammar, Sihler endorses the view that “the starting point of the familiar paradigm is nom. sg. m. *is-pse, that is, a member of the usual is, ea, id paradigm plus an element -pse”; however, he is quite tentative in his comments about the etymology of that element: “One theory takes the source to be the acc. sg. m. f. forms, such as *eompse < *eom-se ... ← *inse < im-se. Evidence for the element *-se/o is very slender, which is to say better than evidence for *-pse (which is nonexistent). It is nevertheless not easy to accept the spread of the element from these two forms” (394-395). Of course, Kent (1946: 71) is the primary proponent of the theory involving “a parasitic p” which was subsequently “extended throughout the paradigm,” although he openly admits that “the emphatic pronoun ipse is of uncertain origin”; and it is Buck (1933: 226) who posits an original “particle -pse” added to *is. I believe it to be extremely significant that neither Sihler (1995) nor Buck (1933) makes reference to an early theory of the origin of ipse proposed by Kretschmer (1894), in which he connects -pse to the Sicilian Doric 3rd pers. acc. pl. personal and reflexive pronoun psé. Kretschmer (1894: 70) rejects any relationship between Sicilian Doric psé and Gk. enclitic sphé when he says: “Nun ist aber Entstehung von psé aus sphé lautlich vollkommen ausgeschlossen: die umgekehrte Metathesis lässt sich nachweisen..., aber in keinem griech. Dialekt hat sph- Umstellung in ps- erfahren”1: Therefore, he concludes that an original form in *pse with the signification ‘selbst, sich’ became an enclitic attachment to the demonstrative is in Latin. Kent (1946: 71) curtly dismisses “the view that it [nom. sg. masc. ipse] is is + enclitic -pse, to be equated with Sicilian Doric acc. pse = sphe ‘them’, starting in the accusative and extended from that case” as “not convincing”. More recently, Markey (1982: 352-352) also characterizes this proposal as “unproductive” when he briefly alludes to the possibility that “the longstanding attempts to etymologize ipse” may find

1 “The forms in sph- (with the appropriate endings for case and number) occur in the non-reflexive 2nd dual, 3rd dual, and 3rd plural, and the reflexive of the 3rd plural. The enclitic sphé was used by the tragic poets (c.600-450 B.C.) for the accusative of the 3rd person, both masculine and feminine, singular and plural” (Meyer 1997: 98).
resolution in the observation of "the globally limited number of strategies open to the construction of emphatic reflexives". In this brief paper, I wish to take another look at the plausibility of an etymological connection between Latin ipse and Sicilian Doric psé in light of what Adrados (1992:1) calls "the new image" of Indo-European morphology, in light of patterns of demonstrative pronoun formation in Indo-European, and in light of common sense observations about sound change. In the end, I hope to provide a reasonable defense for such a connection.

Much recent research in Indo-European morphology is firmly founded in the theoretical viewpoint which Adrados (1992: 1) refers to as "the new image". The central thesis of this approach is simply that the highly elaborate system of inflection attested in Greek and Sanskrit and many of the grammatical categories associated with that system, "in which an earlier generation saw prototypes of exemplary Indo-European grammatical structure..., is nothing but a recent common development of this subgroup of languages" (Polomé 1982: 53). Thus, according to proponents of "the new image," the categories of number and case are much more primitively developed in Indo-European than assumed by the traditional Brugmannian reconstruction. Indeed, Adrados (1985: 31) argues at length that "ohne Zweifel gab es im PIE keinen Plural," while Lehmann (1974: 201-202), too, endorses "the late development of the number system" (cf. Lehmann 1993: 174-175). In regard to case, Lehmann (1993: 154) asserts: "[W]e may state that the evidence in the Anatolian languages supported by that in dialects like Germanic... indicates that even for a late stage of Proto-Indo-European we cannot assume the set of inflections for eight cases... that have traditionally been posited on the basis of Sanskrit". Similarly, Fairbanks (1977) rejects traditional reconstructions of the Indo-European cases in favour of a simpler system. Since the plural number is largely a dialectal phenomenon, especially great dialectal variation is seen in its case markers. As Schmalstieg (1980: 80) notes, for example, "the o-stem plural ending *-ōs was specialized in the Sanskrit nom. pl. (dev-)ās 'gods', Gothic (dag-)ōs 'days'.... The ending *-ōs was specialized in the acc. pl. masc. Latin (lup-)ōs, Lith. (vilk-)ūs 'wolves' (< *-ōs with nasalization from the *u-stems in some dialects)". Because the individual dialects frequently ascribe different case functions to the same formal marker in the plural, it would not be surprising, despite Kent's assertions to the contrary, that *pse could have very different case assignments in two dialects. Moreover, if, as I shall argue below, *pse has a demonstrative origin, such a tendency toward dialectal variation in case assignment would have been exacerbated by the fact of "the relative lateness

---

2 According to Markey (1982: 352-352), "A plausible etymology is derivation from an IE *poti- 'chief of the group' in the syntagma *is potis 'this (very) dominant one'. Cf. Skt. pātis, Gk. pōsis and note, particularly, Baltic use of pats 'husband, master of the house' as an emphatic, cf. (possibly) Hitt. pat 'same'."

3 The dual is a still later development (cf. Shields 1992: 13-14, 65-83).
of... inflection” in demonstrative stems, evidenced by “the parallelism with nominal o- and a-stems, the most recent PIE inflection” (Lehmann 1974: 207).

It is well known that “PIE had no personal pronoun for the third person, like so many other languages. For that purpose a demonstrative was used” (Beekes 1995: 207). Lehmann (1993: 158) notes that these demonstratives “vary ... much from dialect to dialect.” He also observes that “the reflexive arose in the dialects as the middle lost its force... [T]he late formation of the reflexives may be illustrated by the difference between dialects as late as Germanic” (cf. Engl. herself : Germ. sich) (1993: 158). Now reflexives, too, are generally demonstratives in origin since, like demonstratives, they assume an anaphoric value (Schmidt 1978: 164, Seebold 1984: 78-79, Fillmore 1992: 282), although demonstratives themselves are primarily deictic in signification. Ipse, as an original demonstrative, manifests both anaphoric (including reflexive) and deictic properties (cf. Schmid 1972: 16). It also manifests the tendency for a demonstrative “to become weaker and weaker in its deictic force” so that it “is... reinforced by being compounded with itself or with other demonstratives or with adverbs” (Lane 1961: 469). Although ipse is frequently viewed as a contamination of *is with the “particle” pse, the assumption of an inflected *is is unnecessary. In origin, demonstratives evolve from deictic particles (Brugmann 1911: 311); and, of course, Indo-European possessed a deictic in *i (cf. Hirt 1927: 11), which appears, for example, in Latin i-bi ‘when, then’, i-ta ‘so, thus’, and i-tidem ‘likewise”. It seems quite reasonable that *ipse may very well show this deictic/demonstrative *i, especially if one sees in ipse a potentially ancient form in light of the fact that the nominative singular in *-s is a late replacement of an original *-O (Kuryłowicz 1964: 199). A similar contamination of demonstratives appears in Greek pronouns in sph-, according to my arguments in Shields (forthcoming). Like Meyer (1997), I believe the Greek pronouns in sph- to represent very archaic lexical items, although I hold a different position regarding their origin. In short, I see sph- as a contamination, where the first element is the demonstrative stem *(e/o)s, reconstructed on the basis of such demonstrative forms as nom. sg. “osk. es-idum ‘idem’, umbr. es-to- ‘iste’, ir. ē (hē)...; ahd. er, aisl. er run. eR; gthav. ā und as- (in as-čið)” (Brugmann 1911: 326-327), as well as the Hittite nom. sg. 3rd pers. enclitic personal pronoun -aš (< *-os), an etymological demonstrative (Friedrich 1974: 63). The zero grade of this deictic/demonstrative is widely distributed in the dialects, appearing, as deictics frequently do, as a grammaticalized (cf. Markey 1979: 65) locative (plural) marker, attested in contamination with deictics in *i and *u (*-s-i: Gk. -si; *-su; Skt. -su, OCS -xu, Lith. -su, cf. Shields 1992: 29). In addition to the zero grade of the demonstrative *(e/o)s, the pro-

---

4 See Shields (forthcoming) for further discussion. In my view, the demonstrative stem *se/o- “derives from the contamination of *(e/o)s and the deictic *e/o [cf. Hirt 1927: 10-11] or from the thematicization of *(e/o)s)” (Shields 1992: 29). On the reconstruction of a deictic in *u, see Hirt (1927: 11-12).
nouns in *sph- contain a deictic/demonstrative in *bh-, reconstructed by Markey (1979: 65-66). This item is manifested dialectally as a component of such forms as Lat. u-b-i ‘where, there’, i-b-i ‘when, then’, and Hitt. kwa-pi ‘where, when’ and, following grammaticalization, as the adverbial case suffix *-bh- (e.g., inst. pl. Skt. -bhís, Armen. -bh; dat.-abl. pl. Skt. -bhíás, Lat. -bus; Gk. abl.-inst.-loc. sg./pl. -phi(ν)). Since “Lat. ibi is an adverb of place and a relative and interrogative pronoun, it unifies grammatical notions of time, place, and relationship (prior reference)” (Markey 1979: 65) and establishes the presence of *bh- in pronominal declension. According to Markey (1982: 356-358), deictic/demonstrative *bh- appears also in the paradigm of the Germanic pronoun in *se-l-b- ‘self’ (cf. Go. silba, OHG selb); “outside Germanic, a formation directly analogous to selb- is found only in Venetic sselboisselboi ‘sibi ipsi’ (Canevoi Inscription), where reduplication is merely another facet of intensification” (356). Hirt (1927: 13) and Misra (1968: 82) similarly ascribe a deictic/demonstrative in *bh- to the proto-language.

What I want to propose is that the -pse of Lat. ipse, Sicilian Doric psé, and Greek sphé are all to be derived from the same etymon, although Latin attests a contamination of this deictic/demonstrative with the deictic/demonstrative stem *i-, not *(e/o)s. This hypothesis is reasonable in terms of the grammatical roles which the element manifests in these dialects – all can easily be traced to a common deictic/demonstrative function, with attested variations resulting from changes consonant with the “new image” view of the evolution of the proto-language. Of course, it remains to explain the phonological relationship among the dialectal reflexes. In my opinion, the original phonological form of the element was *s-bhe, which would have passed naturally to *sphe according to Sieb’s Law (cf. Collinge 1985: 155-158). Since “metathesis can be sporadic in both a linguistic and temporal sense”, that is, “a certain shift of order may affect a given sequence in one or a few words, once or on occasion...”, and since “metatheses are, for the most part, restricted to certain types of sequences of segments, namely clusters that include a sibilant and a stop, as well as sequences of liquids and vowels or consonants” (Jeffers & Lehiste 1979: 7), I see no problem in ascribing independent sporadic metatheses of *sphe to Latin and Sicilian Doric. After metathesis, the labial stop would have become *p before *s in both Latin and Doric (Sihler 1995: 203). If it is assumed that *bh-se is the original form, reflecting the relative order of segments in Latin and Sicilian Doric, then the development of labial stop plus *s to *ps would eliminate the aspiration of the stop, and the subsequent metathesis would produce *sp-, not the attested *sph- in Greek.

---

5 As a parallel to the metathesis which I have proposed, I would cite Trask (1997: 141), who notes, for example, that “English wasp has become wops in some areas, with metathesis of p and s”.
The etymology of *ipse which I have just presented provides reasonable explanations of some related data. In the first place, it has often been observed that, in Latin, -pse appears with other demonstrative forms such as ea-pse, eum-pse, eam-pse. Of course, this situation is in keeping with the tendency for demonstratives to undergo contamination with other demonstratives. However, once the demonstrative pse lost its productivity and its morphological makeup became obscured, “the way was open for reinterpretation of the form as parallel to ille and iste: accordingly there arose ipsa for Plautine eapse, ipsum for eumpse, ipsam for eampse, and so on” (Sihler 1995: 395). Moreover, Latin also attests an alternate form in -pte (cf. eōpte), which Markey (1982: 352) uses to support his derivation of *ipse from IE *is potis ‘this (very) dominant one’, with -pse representing an original exponent of nominative function and -pte, oblique function. In the absence of any direct dialectal evidence to support this functional differentiation, I would argue instead that -pte is simply another remodeling of -pse on the basis of iste, which “may contain the stem *to- (Skt. ta-, G. to-)” (Buck 1933: 226). The original association of the stem *se/o- (still evident in early Latin sum, sam, etc.) and the stem *te/o- in the same demonstrative paradigm may also have contributed to the analogical replacement.

Although much of what I have proposed here can be ascribed to the century-old theory of Paul Kretschmer, I have attempted to revise and refine his hypothesis in the context of recent research so that the viability of an etymological connection between Lat. *ipse and certain Greek pronominal forms can indeed be demonstrated.
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Dies hat mich dazu veranlaßt, nach der Quelle von öbüš in anderen Sprachen Sibiriens zu suchen, ein wohl gerechtfertigtes Verfahren, da gerade diese semantische Gruppe häufig tabuisiert wird und deswegen der Entlehnung von fremden, unverständlichen und daher milder klingenden Wörtern besonders stark ausgesetzt ist. Daß auch diese Lehnwörter mit der Zeit vulgär werden können (wie es vermutlich bei öbüš der Fall war), ist eine andere Sache, die eine Entlehnungsetymologie aber in keiner Weise beeinträchtigt.


Zum einen haben wir im Ket. das Possessivpronomien abyš ‘mein’ (Wern. KS 72) vorliegen. Wenn wir nun dieses abyš semantisch mit dolg. bágy ~ mágy ‘1. das ihr/ihm Gehörige; 2. [Euphem. für:] Geschlechtsorgan der Frau oder des Mannes’ (DWS 52) vergleichen, dann wird die Annahme nicht als ganz unbegründet abzuweisen sein, daß öbüš auf das euphemistisch gebrauchte ket. abyš ‘mein(er)’ zurückgehen könnte. Dabei müßte jedoch auch angenommen werden, daß ket. -y- im Jak. durch -ü- wiedergegeben wurde (d.h. ket. abyš > *abüš > *äbüš > jak. öbüš), was, rein phonetisch gesehen, durchaus möglich ist,

Die semantische Seite dieser Zusammenstellung ist vorstellbar, jedoch schlecht nachweisbar.


H. Werner machte mich aber in seinem Brief dankenswerterweise auf eine andere Möglichkeit aufmerksam, und zwar auf die Entlehnung einer jenissej. Possessivform. Sollte das Wort aus dem Ket. entlehnt worden sein, so stünden uns zwei Possessivformen zur Verfügung, die sich beide lautlich relativ gut für ein Etymon von öbüš eignen, und zwar ket. ab by’s ‘mein Penis’ und ug by’s ‘dein Penis’. Ich selbst würde aber auch mit einer älteren und nicht unbedingt einer ket. Quelle rechnen, so z.B. mit kott. *au puš ‘dein Penis’ (zu kott. au

Darüber, welche von diesen Möglichkeiten am stichhaltigsten ist, wird hoffentlich die zukünftige Forschung eindeutig entscheiden können. Einer Antwort bedarf auch die Frage, ob die Ähnlichkeiten von jak. dolg. öbus und dem im Tung. vereinzelt dastehenden ewk. opito ‘Penis’ (SSTM II 22) einerseits sowie die zwischen jenissej. by̠‘s ~ puś usw. und moL mōčā ~ mōći ‘limb of the body’ (Lessing 544; zur Semantik vgl. dt. Glied) = xlx. mōc, bur. müsā id. andererseits rein zufällig sind.
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GOTHIC $pl$- : $fl$- VARIATION IS DUE TO ABLAUT, NOT INTERDIALECTAL BORROWING

1. Thanks to the convenience of the nearly full catalogue of Gothic items containing initial clusters $pl$- and $fl$- and the detailed research overview provided by Davis/Iverson (1994: 155f.),$^2$ it is now possible to come to the conclusion that the variation between the stated onsets is not a matter of interdialectal variation and borrowing, but of ablaut.

2. The theory of interdialectal variation is based on the observation that $fl$-forms occur only in Luke and some of the epistles, viz. 1. Cor., 1. Tim. and Gal. However, both Luke and 1. Tim. have plenty of forms with $bl$- (cf. $ga$-$plaihan$, $ga$-$plaihs$, $blaihs$, $blingan$ and $ga$-$blingan$ in Davis/Iverson 1994: 155f.). Consequently, the fact that there is not a single instance of a set of doublets having $bl$- in one of these texts and $fl$- in another, even allowing for the small total number of the latter, is a cause for concern.

3. This concern gives way to justifiable consternation when it is observed that, contrary to all previous attempts to account for it, the difference between the two sets of forms corresponds to a very simple rule of ablaut, viz. $pl$- is followed by $e$-grade or zero grade in the same syllable, $fl$- by $o$-grade. A brief justification of this statement follows.

3.1. The following have obvious $e$-grade:

3.1.1. $ga$-$plaihan$ ‘admonish; embrace; comfort’, $ga$-$plaihs$ ‘consolation’, which (pace Lehmann 1986 s.v. $ga$-$plaihan$, whose semantically inept, but nevertheless $e$-grade based laryngeal etymology simply will not work) bear an obvious phonological$^3$ and semantic$^4$ relation to OHG $fleihn$, $flehen$, OS $fleho$n

---

$^1$ Missing is only $ga$-$plaihandans$ 1.Thess. 2.11, which, along with all the attestations (Belegstellen) actually given in the catalogue, is duly recorded in the appropriate place in Streitberg’s (1928) glossary.

$^2$ Cf., however, Woodhouse 1998 for a properly motivated account of the development of $bl$-.

$^3$ The Germanic variants with long root vowels cited here appear to be due to affectivity.
'flatter, implore', Lat. sup-plex 'begging', sup-plicare 'beg' (cf. Kluge/Seebold 1989 s.v. flehen).

3.1.2. pliuhan and its various compounds.

3.2. The following have obvious zero grade:

3.2.1. plahsjan, ga-plahsman 'frighten' to Gk. πλήσσω, Lith. plàkti 'strike', with Germanic -a- < *-h₂- (cf. Lehmann 1986 s.v.); a "golden opportunity" for the forms in Luke and 2. Cor. to have differed "dialectally" in their root onsets.

3.2.2. plauhs 'flight', cf. Olcel. flugr (Lehmann 1986 s.v.).

3.2.3. plaqus not **'tender' but 'striking (shoots, roots)' (cf., e.g., OED 1971 s.v. strike, vb., sense 54) to Gk. πλήγη 'a blow', with zero grade of u-stem, as in Gk. βάπτις, Skt. gurū-, and Germanic -a- < *-h₂- (cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.) and either (1) not fully explained loss of labiality of the backvelar in Greek, or (2) Gothic non-distinctive labiality due to following u.

3.3. The following have obvious o-grade:

3.3.1. flodus 'stream' < *plow/h₁- (cf. Lehmann 1986 s.v.).

3.3.2. flat-flatun 'bewail' (pret. = PIE perf. with leveled o-grade), cf. plaqus (3.2.3. above).

3.3.3. flahta 'braid', root as in Lat. plecto 'braid', o-grade as in Gk. πλοκή 'braiding' (cf. Lehmann 1986 s.v.).

3.3.4. flauts 'vainglorious' (ablaut as in Gk. τομός 'cutting, sharp' beside τόμος 'piece (cut off)') and its denominative flautjan 'boast', whatever the further relationships of these words may be (cf. Lehmann 1986 s.v.).

4. Thus Gothic fl- preserves the labiality of *φl- in the labializing environment in which *o dominates (or is) the next following syllabic nucleus, whereas in the absence of this environment, even when the root contained zero grade *u,\(^5\) proto-Germanic *φl- shifted to Goth. bl-. This discovery has implications for the relative chronology of the Germanic spirantization of PIE tenues by Grimm's law, the Germanic unrounding or delabialization of PIE *o and the fate of both zero grade and a laryngeal phoneme (or phonemes?) in proto-Germanic.

---

\(^4\) *'Request a certain behaviour' and *'clasp (e.g. by the knees, by the torso) in order to persuade to a certain behavior' seem to supply the necessary common ground for all attested semantic development.

\(^5\) This non-labializing behaviour of zero grade *u constitutes further evidence in favor of a new theoretical position outlined in Woodhouse (in press, fn. 4), according to which systemic or phonological zero grade is realized on the surface as phonetic variation between zero and a reduced vowel (no doubt generally reduced e or i). Thus *φl- loses labiality also in zero grade sequences having the phonetic form *φl u-/*φl u-.
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Dolg. = Dolgan       OAT = Old Anatolian Turkish
dTI = different Turkic languages       Og. = Oguz
fn. = footnote           O Ott. = Old Ottoman
FY = Fu-Yü Kirghiz   ornith. = ornithological
Gag. = Gagauz         OT = Old Turkic
Kar. = Karaim          Ott. = Ottoman
Karač. = Karachai     OUyg. = Old Uygur
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Li, Yong-Söng: Türk Dillerinde Akrabalik Adlari, İstanbul 1999.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


INDEX

aba (Yak.) ~ agu (dTl) ‘poison; bitterness’. – StachM M passim; StachM N 102
abagaj ~ abâj (Oyr.) ‘the wife’s elder brother’. – Kargi 143
abâj see abagaj
abakaj (Oyr.) ‘wife; lady’. – Kargi A 143
abanat ~ amanat (SibT; Kirg.) ‘Schuld’. – StachM B 107
abar- (Dolg.) ‘sich ärgern’. – StachM M 22, 25
abygaj (Oyr.) ‘wolf’. – Kargi A 143
äbyja see ämyja
äcykäjy (Yak.) ‘Eidergans, -ente’. – Kaluž. A 23
adân (Oyr.) ‘defense, protection’. – Kargi A 143
adar- (Oyr.) ‘to envy, to imitate’. – Kargi A 143
adarak (Oyr.) ‘jealous’. – Kargi A 143
agaru (Oyr.) ‘holy, sacred’. – Kargi A 143
agary (MT) ‘upwards’. – Kargi A 144
agas see aksyg-as
agu see aba
agyl- (Šr.) ‘bringen, holen’. – StachM B 113 (s.v. + ēä)
Ağâyjy (Yak.), Eigennname. – Kaluž. A 23
ajbuñ see ajvun
ajby (dTl) ‘request; command’. – Kargi 144
ajda- (Oyr.) ‘to drive away’. – Kargi A 144
ajla- (Oyr.) ‘to turn, rotate’. – Kargi A 145
ajlan-kuskaš (Tuv.) ‘Nachtigall’. – Helimski A 126
ajvun ~ ajbuñ (Čul.) ‘Schleppnetz’. – StachM A 243
akbur see akpur
akpur ~ akbur (Čul.) ‘Kalk’. – StachM B 113
akpus ~ akvos (Čul.) ‘weiß; sauber’. – StachM B 113 (s.v. akpur)
*aksyg-as (SibT) ‘Hermelin’. – Helimski A 126. – Cf. agas
aksyman (Oyr.) ‘whitish’. – Kargi A 144
aksos see akpus
alâgy ~ alâjy (Yak.) ‘Weizenmehlfladen’. – Kaluž. A 23
alaha (Yak.) ‘Bauernhof’-gut; [Adj.] Heim’. – Kaluž. A 40
alâjy see alâgy
allasg (Dolg.) ‘nördlich’. – Ölmez C 272
alt (dTI) ‘lower part’. – StachM O 235
almyš (dTI) ‘60’ – Miller D 117; Miller F 10; StachM O 238
ama see amma da
amaj (Oyr.) ‘brainless, stupid’. – Kargl A 144
amanat see abanat
ambar ~ ampar ~ anbar (dTI) ‘Speicher’. – Anikin A 22f.
amdara ~ aptara ~ apyra (SibT) ‘Schatulle, Kiste’. – StachM B 107
amma da ~ ama (Dolg.) ‘ach, wie sehr...’. – StachM J 43
ampar see ambar
ämmyja ~ äbyja (Yak.) ‘1. jemand, der vor Alter oder wegen einer Krankheit das
   Gedächtnis verloren hat; 2. mißgestaltet, häßlich’. – Kaluž. A 33
ananula (Anat.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschl. A 64
anbar see ambar
ann (Dolg.) ‘der untere Teil’. – StachM F 88
ämmär (Tuv.) ~ maamär (Tof.) ‘Vorratskammer’. – StachM L 196f.
añna (SibT) ‘jagen’. – Erdal A 74
ap (Yak.) ‘Hexerei’. – StachM M 21, 24
apagaš see appagaš
Apar (OT), ethnonym. – Ölmez A 175
ap(p)agaš (Sr.) ‘intensiv weiß’. – StachM B 109 (s.v. koppagäš)
apr – opr – (OUyg.) ‘hexen (?)’. – StachM M 22
aptara see amdara
apyra see amdara
arbä- (Yak.) ~ arba- (dTI) ‘hexen, bezaubern; zanken, schelten’. – StachM M 22
arbag (Čag.) ‘Lüge, Betrug’. – StachM M 22
arbak (Kır. kir.) ‘Geister, Gespenster’. – StachM M 22
arbyja (Yak.) ‘Gerät zum Aushöhlen, Ausmeißeln’. – Kaluž. A 29
arbyś (SibT) ‘Murren, Zauberei’. – StachM M 22
argült (Sr.) ‘Quecksilber’. – StachM B 107f.
ark (dTI) ‘excrement’. – Miller F 32, fn. 34
*arkaly(g) (SibT) ‘eine Fischgattung, Salmo fluvialis’. – Helimski A 126f.
arkan (Kipč.) ‘Tau, Leine’. – Anikin A 23
arpagy see arpaygy
arpagy ~ arpagy ~ arpakęy (Ott.) ‘Zauberer’. – StachM M 22f.
arparkey see arpaygy
art I (dTI) ‘hinder part, back’. – StachM O 235
art II (Yak.) ‘rein; sauber’. – StachM J 49, fn. 11
artynčyk (Sr.) ‘Last’. – StachM B 108
arūbāt (MT) 'tamarind'. – Rybatzki A 63
arvūd (OYug.) 'eine Droge'. – Rybatzki A 63
arvyš (OYug.) 'Zauberformel, -text'. – StachM M 22
arži (OYug.) 'saint, hermit'. – Tezcan A 158
āš (d'T) 'food'. – Miller F 9
Ašina (OT), Name eines Herrschergeschlechts. – Kljaštorný A passim
āšne see īśnā
atāki (Yak.) 'Spinne'. – Kałuż. A 25
at manāl see rakš at manāl
atty (Dolg.) 'der Platz daneben'. – StachM F 88
avu (Anat.) ~ āvī (Trkm.) 'poison'. – StachM M passim; StachM N 102
Az (OT), ethnonym. – Ölmez A 175
azym 'a pinch'. – Kargi A 145
azyš 'error, mistake'. – Kargi A 145
āzyndýra (Oyr.) 'in advance, beforehand'. – Kargi A 145
āzyra (Oyr.) 'from inside'. – Kargi A 145
āzyt 'barrier, handicap'. – Kargi A 145
ābač (Cul.) 1. Rubel [Währungseinheit]; 2. Fetzen'. – StachM B 113
ābārāhā (Yak.) 'milder Wind'. – Kałuż. A 39
ābāš ~ āvāš ~ ābac (SibT) 'ein wenig'. – StachM B 113
ājlā- (Kzk.) 'to turn, be turned'. – Kargi A 145
ākāl- (Śr.) 'bringen, holen'. – StachM B 113 (s.v. účā)
ākkāji see ārkāji
ālāpān s. ālōpān
ālājkā ~ ālājkā ~ ālājkā ~ ālājkā (Yak.) 'Schöpfkelle'. – Anikin A 51
ālig ~ ālig (OT) 'König, Herrscher'. – Miller E 291, 292
āljalājī s. ālōpān
ālōpān ~ ālāpān ~ ālōpār ~ āljalājī (Anat.) 'Eidechsenart'. – Hauenschild B 145f.
āmāgān ~ āmilğān ~ āmirğāk (Anat.) 'Eidechsenart'. – Hauenschild B 148
āmāhā (Yak.) 'Hintern'. – Kałuż. A 35
āmilğān s. āmāğān
āmirğāk s. āmāğān
āmnā ~ āmnā- (SibT) 'heilen'. – Erdal A 74
ānārāl (Brb.) 'General'. – StachM G 251
ānijā (Yak.) 'Abhang, Böschung'. – Kałuż. A 34
āp (Tel.) 'Fetzen, Lappen'. – StachM B 113 (s.v. ābāč)
ārabillāk (Dolg.) 'zuverlässig, sicher'. – StachM E 181
ārāhā I (Yak.) 'Bohrer'. – Kałuż. A 36
ārāhā II (Yak.) 'Sieb'. – Kałuż. A 40
ärdäŋ (Kipč.) ~ ärdäx (Yak.) ‘jungfräulich; Jungfrauschaft’. – Zieme F 177
ärdini (OUyg.) ‘jewel’ – Tezcan A 158
äriägiä (Yak.) ‘buntscheckig [von Kühen]’. – Kałuż. A 34
ärkäjí ~ äkkäjí (Yak.) ‘Zeichen; Kerbe’. – Kałuž. A 22
äšgiti see išgiti
eš šáptul (Uyg.) ‘a kind of peach’. – Jarring A 22, fn. 19; 27, fn. 7
ätäč (Tat.) ‘Hahn’. – StachM B 113f.
atük (Čul.) ‘Hahn’. – StachM B 113f.
äväš see äbäš
bačäjax see badäjy II
bačna (Bulg.) ‘at the beginning’. – StachM H 151, 154, 155
badäjy I (Yak.) ‘groß, unfine’. – Kałuž. A 18
badäjy II ~ bağıäjax ~ bačäjax (Yak.) ‘großes Gefäß’. – Kałuž. A 18
badara (Uyg.) ‘stake, pole’. – Jarring A 63, fn. 3
baga (dTI) ‘klein; jung’. – Ölmex A 175f.
bağıäjax see badäjy II
baššy (OUyg.) ‘Meister, Lehrer’. – Ölmex B 273
bajak see bajrak
bajrak ~ batrak (dTI) ~ bajak (Uyg.) ‘flag’. – Tezcan A 160f.
bakaj (Kzk.) ‘ankle-bone of a horse’. – Nügteren A 687f. – Cf. bakäjy
bakäjy (Yak.) ‘Strick, mit dem Beine des Pferdes gebunden werden’. – Kałuž. A 18. – Cf. bakaj
bakalšak (Kzk.) ‘ankle-bone’. – Nügteren A 687f. – Cf. pakalčak
bakan (Trkm.) ‘pastern’. – Nügteren A 687f.
balbal (OT) ‘Denkmal’. – Ölmex A 176
ballax see balläxy
balläxy ~ ballas (Yak.) ‘Aalquappe’. – Kałuž. A 23
balltyrk see battaryk
balty (Dolg.) ‘jüngeres Geschwister’. – StachM F 88f.
baltyrk see battaryk
baltyga (Dolg.) ‘Fisch’. – StachM F 90
bäňha (Tof.) ‘Büchse, zylindrisches Gefäß’. – Anikin A 25
bantatu see myndatu
bäňyk ~ bäňyk (Yak.) ‘Sauna, Dampfbad’. – Anikin A 25; StachM L 196
baňky ~ maňky (Yak.) ‘Griff am Netzschack’. – StachM L 196
baňy ‘a kind of flower’. – Jarring A 42, fn. 12
baňpky (Yak.) ‘Knöchel’. – Anikin A 24
bars (dTI) ‘1. Leopard; 2. Eigennname’. – Ölmex A 177
barý (Yak.) ‘Zinsen, Profit’. – StachM L 197
barys (Yak.) ‘Gewinn’. – Anikin A 25f.
bärys ~ părys (Yak.) ‘Segel’. – Anikin A 59f.
basguk ~ baskuk ~ bašgok (OUyg.) ~ baskak (Kırk.) ‘Bergpaß’. – Zieme A 310
baskak see basguk
baskuk see basguk
basky (Ott.) ‘Presse; Zange’. – StachM B 109
bastyryk see battaryk
baš (dTL) ~ puš (Čuv.) ‘head’. – Miller C 163, fn. 62; StachM A 43
bašgok see basguk
baška (dTL) ‘another’. – Miller F 26
batatu see myndatu
bat-bat (Kzk.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 147
batrak see bajrak
battaryk ~ baltaryk ~ baltyryk ~ bastyryk (Yak.) ‘Art Stange’. – Anikin A 26
batty (Kzk.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 147
batyja (Yak.) ‘Art Säbel’. – Kaluž. A 30
bačimā (Yak.) ‘Schlepptau, Zugseil’. – Anikin A 27; StachM L 196
bađarā (Yak.) ~ bedürā (Tuv.) ~ bidr5 (Tof.) ‘Eimer’. – Anikin A 30
bayāhā (Yak.) ‘gestern’. – Kaluž. A 27 s.v. bayāsāgigia
bayāsāgigia (Yak.) ‘unlängst, vor einigen Tagen’. – Kaluž. A 27
bākči (OUyg.) ‘(? watchman, guard’. – Zieme E 261
bālāk (OUyg.) ‘gift’. – Tezcan A 159
bāniz (Az.) ‘Gesicht’. – StachM B 116
bārāki (Yak.) ‘harnäckig, stur’. – Kaluž. A 26
Bārčik (OT), ethnonym. – Čułmez A 177f.
bārgāhā (Yak.) ‘Mütze’. – Kaluž. A 35
bārkā (Dolg.) ‘stark, heftig; sehr’. – Schönig A 224; StachM I 227
bāspiāl see bāstīāl
bāstīāl ~ bājspār ~ piāspāl ~ bāspiāl (Yak.) ‘Korb; Eimer’. – Anikin A 60
bāšmāk (Bšk.) ‘Pilz’. – StachM B 110
bečin see bičin
bedürā see bādarā
bi (OT) ~ bi (Yak.) ‘blade, edge’. – Tekin D 170f.
bīänik ~ miäänik ~ mīnik (Yak.) ~ mēēnīk ~ mēlīk (Tof.) ‘Badequast’. – Anikin A 31f.
bīarāstā see bīaristā
bīaristā ~ bīarāstā (Yak.) ~ byrystā (Tuv.) ~ bōrsa (Tof.) ‘Wurst’. – Anikin A 32
bīaspār see bāstīāl
bībi ~ būbi (OUyg.) ‘lady’. – Jarring A 13, fn. 2
bīčak see byčak
*bičūlōr (dTL) ‘Käse’. – Helimski A 127
bīdr5 see bādārā
bibilax (Yak.) ‘seal-ring’. – StachM C 168
bilä- (dTl) ‘to sharpen’. – Tekin D 171
biš- see byš-
biti- (OT) ‘to write’. – Ölmex A 180
bizak see byçak
bočumukku (Yak.) ‘Achtelpfund’. – Anikin A 34
bodač ~ budač (Uyg.) ‘a kind of plant’. – Jarring A 55, fn. 34
bodak ~ budak (Uyg.) ‘fattened’. – Jarring A 48, fn. 35
bogaz (dTl) ‘neck, throat’. – Miller A 42f.
bokusa (Uyg.) ‘plough’. – Jarring A 16, fn. 45
bolo ho (Yak.) ‘starke Wind od. Regen’. – Kaļuž. A 40
bolox see boluok
boluok (Dolg.) ~ bolox (Yak.) ‘Art Renterkutsche’. – Anikin A 28
boppoolja ~ poppuoolja (Yak.) ‘Raum unter dem Fußboden’. – Anikin A 63
bor (OT) ~ buor (Yak.) ‘dust, sand, earth’. – Zieme G 193f.
borča see oča borča
boroxu (Yak.) ‘einzjähriger Auerhahn’. – Kaļuž. 24
börsa see bičrista
boskuja (Yak.) ‘kleiner Heuschober’. – Kaļuž. A 31
bospuja (Yak.) ‘gemütlich’. – Kaļuž. A 31 s.v. boskuja
bot (Uyg.) ‘grey’. – StachM O 235
boz- see buz-
bozmuk s. bozumga
bozumga (Anat.; Tksh.) ~ bozmuk (Khal.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 143
böd (OT) ‘throne’. – Tezcan A 161
bój see bük
bözürüöp see buobrap
bölük püntük ~ pölük pöntük ~ bölük pürçük/pörçük (Anat.) ‘ein bißchen’. – Yüce A 421
bölün (OT) ‘minister, high official’. – Ölmex A 181
börtü böğük (Ott.) ‘insects and the like’. – Tekin B 216; Yüce A 420f.
bötnök (Tat.) ~ bötönök (Bšk.) ~ bütnük (Kzk.) ~ petnek (Čuv.) ~ pinä ~ pinne
(NUyg.) ‘Minze’. – Tezcan B 264
bötönök see bömök
budač see bodač
budak see bodak
buòun (MT) ‘annihilated’. – Tekin C passim
bugnaj see bugunaj
bugunaj ~ bugnaj (Yak.) ‘Karo [Spiekartenfarbe]’. – Anikin A 28f.
büjla see bůla
buj-syn (Tat.) ‘body, figure, stature’. – Tekin D 170
bū́řa ~ pū́řa ~ bū́jla (Yak.) ‘Patrone’. – Anikin A 66
bulat (dTL) ‘steel’. – Rybatzki A 62
bult (Yak.) ‘bag; Jagdeuthe’. – StachM Q 235
bū́nta ~ pū́nta ~ mū́nta ~ fū́nta (Yak.) ‘Pfund’. – Anikin A 82
buobrap ~ bōyārūōp (Yak.) ~ pūgrāp (SibT) ‘Keller, Grube’. – Anikin A 62f.
buor see bar
buorax ~ puorax (Yak.) ‘Pulver’. – Anikin A 64f.
buorsa ~ puorsa (Yak.) ‘Art geräuchterer Fisch’. – Anikin A 65
bū́t ~ pū́d ~ pū́t (Yak.) ‘Pud [Gewicht]’. – Anikin A 65f.
buz- ~ boz- (dTL) ‘to destroy’. – Miller C 167
bübi see bibi
bū́k ~ bōj (Anat.) ‘Staudamm, Sperre’. – StachM A 244
bū́ō (Yak.) ‘Pfropfen’. – StachM A 244
bū́škūk see pūkčūk
bū́tnūk see bōtnāk
bū́tījā (Yak.) ‘verschlossener, ungeselliger Mann’. – Kaluž. A 33
byčak (dTL) ~ bičāk (OT) ~ bižāk (Tuv.) ‘knife’. – Tekin D 171
byhar kurgaya (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 153f.
bū́yktājy ~ bū́ytājy (Yak.) ‘eine Wasservogelgattung’. – Kaluž. A 20
byłāxy (Yak.) ‘dickes Brett, Holzstück’. – Kaluž. A 26
byłśyk (Kzk.) ‘pus in eyes’. – Nogteren A 689
byndatu see myndatu
byntadu see myndatu
byrystā see biāristā
byś- ~ biś- (dTL) ~ piś- (Čuv.) ‘to cook, boil’. – StachM H 155
bytāky (Yak.) ‘klein, bescheiden’. – Kaluž. 24
bū́ytājy see bū́yktājy
čabaya see čyḥājy
čabydak see japyldak
Čačā (OT), proper name. – Ölmez A 182
čačak see čağıgak
čaččyṇa see starsyṇa
čačxų́ ~ čačxų́ (Čul.) ‘Lanze; Mistgabel’. – StachM A 243
čagdā- (Khak.) ‘sich nähern’. – Helimski A 128
čaja (Tat.) ‘gewandt, schlau’. – Helimski A 131
čajgak see čağıgak
*čaktyn- (SibT) ‘sich nähern’. – Helimski A 128
čaŋyja (Yak.) ‘eine jak. Speise’ . – Kaluž. A 27
čalayän (Čag.) ~ čalikan (Oyr., Kirg.) ‘nettle’. – Berta A passim
čalikan see čalayän
*čăluk see *căgăluk
čaly (Az., Ott.) ‘Hecke, Gebüsch’. – Berta A 34
čamgur (Uyg.) ‘turnip’. – Jarring A 15, fn. 35
čan (OT) ‘cup’. – Tekin D 171
čanač (N.Uyg.) ‘cu, cone’. – Tekin D 171f.
čanak (d.Tl.) ~ čynak (S.Uyg.) ‘bowl, cup’. – Tekin D 171
čanmar ~ šalbyr (Sib.T) ‘Hose’. – StachM B 108. – Cf. šaravara
čan I see jaŋ
Čan II (OT), proper name. – Ölmez A 182
čąŋyg (Tuv.) ~ jaŋyg ~ jannyg (S.Uyg.) ‘having the character/form of, like’. – Tekin D 172
čapak (N.Uyg.) ~ šapak (Kzk.) ‘gum in the eyes’. – Nugteren A 689
ča"pkyš (Tof.) ‘Fledermaus’. – StachM K 131f.
čara (Chuv.) ‘kahl’. – StachM N 102
čarbak (Šr.) ‘Säge’. – StachM B 108
čarčyňa see starsyňa
čardät I ~ ěrdät (Yak.) ‘Art Eisch’. – Anikin A 41
čardät II ~ čardat (Yak.) ‘Dach über dem Grab; Grabstein’. – Anikin A 84
čarnat see jarasa
ča"ský (Tuv.) ‘Fledermaus’. – StachM K 131; 132f., fn. 9
Čat see Šat
čaukan see čorkan
čăčki see čăńčki
čăčxỳ see čačxỳ
čăkmän (d.Tl) ‘Art Uberrock’. – Anikin A 74
čălăk ~ šălăk (Čul.) ‘Eimer’. – StachM A 243
čălik (Og.) ‘steel’. – Rybatzki A 59
čăńčki ~ čăčki (Sib.T) ‘Gabel’. – StachM 243
čăŋkāji ~ kănčāji (Yak.) ‘Holzstück, das es dem Tier unmöglich macht, weit weg zu laufen’. – Kaluž. A 22
čără (Tat.) ‘kahl’. – StachM N 102
čibăči see sibăči
čilge ~ čilgi (Uyg.) ‘early ripening; the first of the fruit to ripen’. – Jarring A 22, fn. 22
čilgi see čilge
čimăčči see sibăči
čińgi see jinčů
čircă (Sib.T) ‘Trinkglas; Teeschale’. – StachM B 114
čize (Uyg.) ‘eggplant’. – Jarring A 55, fn. 25
čorýl (Khak.) ‘does not exist’ – Tekin E 663. – Cf. jök
čoj see čojun
čojguč (Čul.) ‘Waschbecken’. – StachM A 243. – Cf. čojun
čojun ~ čūjiún ~ čivān ~ čoj ~ soj ~ šoj ~ šojun (dTL) ‘bronze; cast iron’. – Rybatzki A 69. – Cf. čojguč
čok (dTL) ‘sehr, viel’. – Berta D passim.
čok ~ čōx (SibT) ‘Rede; Wort; Gespräch’. – Helimski A 128
čok- (Trkm.) ‘überfließen’ – Berta D 20, fn. 66
čokan see čorkan
čokčolo- (Oyr.) ‘aufhäufen’. – Erdal A 72
čoksyra- (Khak.) ‘ruiniert werden, herunterkommen’. – Erdal A 69
čor (OT), a title. – Ölmез A 183f.
čorkan ~ čokan ~ čōkān ~ čaukan ~ ģūgan (Uyg.) ‘a newly married woman’. – Jarring A 54, fn. 16.
čorug (Sr.) ‘Grützbrei’. – StachM B 108
čōx see čōk
čoxōju (Yak.) ‘Holzhammer’. – Kaluž. A 18
čōkān see čorkan
čōrkōkū see čyrkāky
čōrōk (Yak.) ‘eine Flasche Wodka’. – Kaluž. A 30
čōrōkūjā (Yak.) ‘Kuh mit nach oben gebogenen schmalen Hörnern’. – Kaluž. A 30
čōsōukkā see sōsōukkā
čual (Čul.) ~ syual (Bšk.) ~ čual (Tat.) ~ sōl (Khak., Tof.) ~ šōl (Sr.) ‘Ofen; Feuerstelle’. – Anikin A 84f.
čub (OT) ‘Gebiet, Zone’. – Ölmез A 184
čugaj I (Tuv.) ‘Kalk’. – Ölmез A 184
čugaj II (OT), a geographical name. – Ölmез A 184
čuk (SibT) ‘durchgedrängte Masse’ – Berta D 9f., fn. 15
čumpūr ~ čūmpur (Yak.) ‘Wisch-, Ladestock’. – Anikina A 91f.
čuorājy (Yak.) ‘eine Entengattung’. – Kaluž. A 20
čuoxaryja (Yak.) ‘[Adj.] schmalen Hals habend’. – Kaluž. A 27
čuragaj (Tat.) ~ šuragataj (Kzk.) ‘Hecht’. – Anikin A 86
čual see čual
čučkān ~ čūskān (SibT) ‘Maulwurf; Wasserratte’. – StachM B 114
čübāči see sibāči
čūjiún see čojun
čūmāči ~ čūmāči see sibāči
čūmākī see tūmākī
čūrkū s. čirkū
čūskān see čučkān
čūvān see čojun
čūzgün konak (Uyg.) ‘a kind of maize’. – Jarring A 15, fn. 29
čybauy see čybäjy
čybyk (Trkm.) ‘rod, stick’. – Tekin E 659, fn. 3
čyčaxyja (Yak.) ‘Herz’. – Kałuż. A 30
čyk- (dTL) ‘hinausgehen’ – Berta D 11, fn. 19; 20 + fn. 67
čykyja (Yak.) ‘der kleine Finger’. – Kałuż. A 31
čykryja (Yak.) ‘flüssig’. – Kałuż. A 27
čylybykyja (Yak.) ‘leer [von Ähren]’. – Kałuż. A 31f.
čylpak (Kırğ.) ~ šylpyk (Kklp.) ‘gum in the eyes’. – Nugteren A 689
čynačyk ~ čynağak ~ šynašak ~ šynataj (dTL) ‘little finger/toe’. – Tekin B 224
čynağak see čynačyk
čynak see čanak
čyntan (OUyg.) ‘Sandelholz’. – Ölmex A 183; StachM F 95
čyrkäky ~ čörkökü (Yak.) ‘Krickente, Anas crecca’. – Kałuż. A 26
däne ~ tane (dTL) ‘shell, ball, bullet, grain, bread’. – Maciuszak A 21
d'aq (Oyr.) ‘habit, custom’. – Tekin D 172
*daŋaj ~ *daŋaj (Tof., Tuv.) ‘Schneeschuh’. – Helimski A 129
daŋza (Tof., Tuv.) ‘Pfeife’. – Helimski A 129
daš- see taŋy-
dağı ~ tągul (dTL) ‘is not’. – Tekin E passim
*dąŋaj see *daŋaj
daŋgi (Ott.) ~ targs (MK) ‘portable table’. – Miller F 32
dilmac see ylmač
döš (Uyg.) ‘a mound of mud inside an irrigated field after irrigating’. – Jarring A 15, fn. 41
dük ~ düp ~ lük (Yak.) ‘Eiche’. – Anikin A 36, 93
dalaha s. tulaha
dumčuk see tunčuk
düp see dük
dülük see dűš dülük
dümö see dömö
dürğa ~ dürhe see türka
dűş dülük (Anat.) ‘Traum’. – Yüce A 422
dygdy see dygdyja
dygdyja ~ dygdyja (Yak.) ‘dünne Schneekruste’ . – Kałuż. A 33
dygyr ~ dygyr (FY) ‘Himmel’. – Schönig B 329
dygyr see dygyr
dyrdyja (Yak.) ‘Frühherbst’. – Kałuż. A 27
fodula (Ott.) ‘a kind of bread; a fine cake’. – Tezcan C 34
fünta see bünta
gačy see kaču

gang (Tuv.; Uyg.) ~ kaŋ(ur) (Sal.) ‘steel’. – Rybatzki A 63. – Cf. kaŋ

găp (Trkm.) ~ kap (Šr.) ‘Behälter; Sack’. – StachM B 109 (s.v. kaptýra)
găz- see kăz-
găzi (Ott.) ‘Art Stoff’. – Zieme B 154, 155

gibi (dTL) ~ kimi (Az.) ~ kebekkük (Kzk.) ‘like [postpos.]’. – Tezcan A 162

giğitkânansy (Az.) ‘Taubnessel’. – Hauenschild B 152, fn. 74

giz-giz (Trkm.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 146

golobo ~ goluba ~ kuluba ~ kulūba (Yak.) ‘Haupt, Leiter’. – Anikin A 35

goluba see golobo
gontu see goğa gontu

göt (Tksh.) ‘backsie; Hintern’. – StachM O 235

gözsüz tăbăk (Ott.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 74, 75

guštăr s. kuşdiri
guštiri s. kuşdiri

gyzar-gyzar (Trkm.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 144

gabyja (Yak.) ‘geebnet, ausgetreten’. – Kaluž. A 27

gayaha s. näyaha
gajdak see jajdak

galpyz (Kirg., Kzk., Kklp.) ~ jalpiz (Uzb.) ~ narpyz (Anat., Trkm.) ‘Minze;
Majoran’. – Tezcan B 263, 266. – Cf. jarpuz

gām (Yak.) ‘Poststation’. – Anikin A 94

gan (Kirg.) ‘gesture, movement’. – Tekin D 172

gangak see jagak

gapălak see japkulak

gardăt see ćardăt

găgdijă (Yak.) ‘Hof vor dem Haus’. – Kaluž. A 32

gipăk see jipăk

guğan see ċorkan

guţyna bula- (Tat.) ‘to be annihilated, to die’. – Tekin C 265

guškăky I (Yak.) ‘Mitbewohner’. – Kaluž. A 26

guškăky II (Yak.) ‘weiblicher Geist’. – Anikin A 75. – Cf. söstitčkă

guors ~ guorš see guos

guorus see guos

guos ~ guorš ~ guors ~ guorus (Yak.) ‘Kaulbarsch’. – Anikin A 38

giğăki (Yak.) ‘verarmt, heruntergekommen’. – Kaluž. A 24

gulün (Kirg.) ‘Rückenmark’. – StachM F 89

haby see sabỳ

hăgyla (Dolg.) ‘Kieme’. – StachM L 197

hăj(n) (Tof.) ~ xăj (Tuv.) ‘nose’. – MaVoSi 123

hamanna (Dolg.) ‘genau hier’. – Ölmez C 273
haŋardý (Dolg.) ‘seit kurzem, neulich’. – Ölmex C 275
häppat (Dolg.) ‘West’ ~ säppas (Yak.) ‘west wind’. – StachM O 236
harsynytyyn (Dolg.) ‘am nächsten Morgen’. – Schönig A 224; StachM I 227
hasanbalyyy (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 152
häm see käm
hemšebar (Uyg.) ‘mallow’. – Jarring A 47, fn. 33
heprañg (Uyg.) ‘a kind of flower’. – Jarring A 42, fn. 15
hîkäj (Dolg.) ‘frisch; roh’. – Ölmex C 271
hîrgit (Dolg.) ‘Führer’. – Ölmex C 273
hoksâkî ~ hoksökî [!] (Yak.) ‘eine Eichelhähnergattung’. – Kaluz. A 26
hon (OUyg., Tuv.dial.) ‘ten’. – Zieme D 65
horozabella (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 152
hotun- (Dolg.) ‘sich abtrocknen’. – Ölmex C 274
hîtööl (Dolg.) ~ jîtä ~ jötül (dTL) ‘Husten’. – Ölmex C 274
hunduk see sundük
hulûpî (Tof.) ‘Schloß’. – Anikin A 47
hurka (Dolg.) ‘zu Hause’. – StachM K 131
hünâû (Dolg.) ~ sürün (Yak.) ~ sülün (Yak.) ‘Rückenmark’. – StachM F 89
hyqta- (Dolg.) ‘sich die Nase putzen’. – Ölmex C 275
ibäc see äbäš
ibäce (SibT) ‘Baumstumpf; Abgehauenes’. – StachM B 113 (s.v. äbäč)
iccitax (Yak.) ‘desert, desolate (place)’ ~ iccitâk (Dolg.) ‘leer’. – Tekin E 660
ihirbäji ~ ihirgâj (Yak.) ‘dichter junger Wald’. – Kaluz. A 21
ihirgâj see ihirbäji
ikäbibä (Yak.) ‘Reisetasche oder Kasten für Geschirr’. – Kaluz. A 33
ilâjkâ ~ ilâjki see aliâjkâ
iliâjkâ see aliâjkâ
ilâs (Khak.) ‘pain, sorrow’. – Tekin B 214
ilig see âlig
imäki see ymäky
innâ- see âmnâ-
indist (MT) ‘bread soup’. – Tezcan A 163
inî see jînčû
ipâk see jîpâk
Iräji (Yak.), Eigennname. – Kaluz. A 23
îrâki (Yak.) ‘verrückt’. – Kaluz. A 23
ışgitì ~ ışgitî (OT) ‘a kind of embroidered Chinese silk brocade’. – Tekin D 165
išnâ (Bulg.) ~ âšne (Čuv.) ‘in, within’. – StachM H 151
îtîär- (Yak.) ‘to warm’. – StachM O 234
îwan (Kipç.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 134
îz (dTL) ‘traces’. – Miller A 41
îzâ- (Khak.) ‘to destroy, to demolish’. – Tekin B 220
izinč (Kar.) ‘unpleasant, disgusting’. – Tekin B 220
jab see jap
jagak (dTl) ~ jaŋak (NUyg.) ~ gaŋgak (Kzk.) ‘nut, walnut’. – Nugteren A 692; Tekin E 659, fn. 2.
*jagtynd- (SibT) ‘sich nähern’. – Helimski A 128
jagy (dTl) ‘rötlichbraun’. – StachM N 101
jajdak ~ gaŋdak (dTl) ‘unsaddled’. – Tekin E 659
jal- (dTl) ‘to blaze, burn’. – Miller C 154
jalpiz see galpyz
jalb see jaŋla
jalyn (dTl) ‘flame’. – Miller C 154
jama ṣaptul (Uyg.) ‘the cloven peach’. – Jarring A 22, fn. 18
jannyg see čanŋyg
jan (OUyg.) ‘pattern; kind, manner’ ~ jaŋ (Brb., Oyr.) ‘soul, state of mind’ ~ jaŋ (Kzk.) ‘habit’ ~ čan (Tuv.) ‘habit’ ~ saŋ (Yak.) ‘character, feature’. – Napol-skich A 119f.; Tekin D 172; Zieme D 65f.
janak see jagak
janla ~ janaŋg (MT) ~ jąly (Trkm.) ‘like’. – Tekin D 172
janyeg see jaŋla
janynyeg see čanŋyg
jap (Trkm.) ~ jāb (Uzb.) ‘irrigation canal’. – Tezcan A 163
japalak see japkulak
japkulak (Brb.) ~ japalak (Anat.) ~ jýblak (Kipč.) ~ gaŋpalak (Kırğ.). ‘Eule’. – StachM K 133
japtak see japyldak
japyldak ~ čabydak ~ japtak (dTl) ~ japytk (MK) ~ sybytax (Yak.) ‘nacked; not seddled; bare-footed’. – Tekin E 659; Yüce A 425
japyš- (OT) ‘to stick or adhere’. – Tekin A 129
japýtak see japyldak
jär (Chuv.) ‘traces’. – Miller A 41
janan (Chuv.) ‘mark, stain, blot’. – Miller A 41
jarasa ~ jarkanat (dTl) ~ čarnat (Sr.) ‘Fledermaus’. – StachM K passim
jarkanat see jarasa
jarpu (MT) ‘Minze (?); Mangust (?)’. – Tezcan B passim. – Cf. galpyz
jarym (Tel.) ‘Fehler, Verfehlen’. – Miller C 153
jat (OUyg.) ‘Zauber (?)’. – Zieme A 309
jaš I (dTl) ‘tear’. – MaVoSi 122
jaš II (dTl) ‘year; age’. – Tekin A 129
jašu- (dTl) ‘to shine, to flash’. – Miller C 154
javaš (dTl) ‘delicate, tender’. – Miller F 10
javyšgū (dTl) ‘foliage; kind of fruit’. – Miller F 10
jaz- (dTl) ‘to make an error’. – Miller C 153
jämä (OT) ‘and, also’. – Tekin A 129
jämiš (dTL) ‘fruit; food’. – StachM O 238f.
jämiš (dTL) ‘70’ – Miller D 117; Miller F 10; StachM O 238
jezā- (OT) ‘to patrol, to watch’. – Tekin B 220f.
jincū (OT) ~ ingü (dTL) ~ čingi (Tuv.) ~ ningü (Khak.) ‘pearl’. – Tekin D 166f.
jipāk ~ ipāk ~ ibāk (dTL) ‘silk’. – Tekin D 166
jirik (Trkm.) ‘split, cracked’. – Tekin B 213
jirîn ~ ţirîn (NUyg.) ‘pus’. – Nugteren A 689
jirJâ (Oyr.) ‘Napf’. – StachM B 114
jöd- (OT) ‘to destroy’. – Tekin E 659 (fn. 2) 661
jodun see jok jodun
jog (Ott.) ‘dickflüssig’. – StachM B 108
jög (OT) ‘funeral’. – Tekin E 661
jökö (dTL) ‘non-existent, absent’. – Tekin E 661. – Cf. čoyyl
jok jodun/jozun bol- (OUyg.) ‘to perish’. – Tekin C passim
jor (OUyg.) ‘Grützbrei’. – StachM B 108 (s.v. čorug)
jožun see jok jodun
jögümeč ot (Uyg.) ‘bindweed’. – Jarring A 47, fn. 25
jötäl ~ jötäl see hötöl
jöktür- ~ jüktür- (SibT) ‘to cough’. – StachM O 236
jurdruk see jydruck
jügän ~ tüjgän (Śr.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 70
jüskäk (Oyr.) ‘Wasserratte’. – StachM B 114
jütkür- see jöktür-
jüz (dTL) ‘face’. – Miller F 32
jüz (dTL) ‘a hundred’. – Miller F 28
jylblak see japykulak
jydruck ~ jurdruk (OUyg.) ‘fist’. – Tekin A 129f.
jygyyn- (OT) ‘to collect; to restrain’. – Ölmez D 283
jylana-agγ-verän (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 150
jylanéyr (Trkm.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 153
jylan-jastyyý (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 153
jylzaj (Čul.) ‘jedes Jahr’. – StachM A 243 (s.v. ajvunγ)
kabak (Kirg.) ‘Augenlid’. – StachM B 115
kabarčak see kapyrčak
kábyg (Čul.) ‘Tür’. – StachM B 115 (s.v. kavvak)
kabyš- (OT) ‘to come together, to assemble’. – StachM H 150, 154
kaču ~ kačur (MT) ~ gačy (Trkm.) ~ kašy (Kklp.) ‘dyke’. – Tezcan A 163f.
kačur see kaču
kadyraš (Śr.) ~ kydyraš (Tuv.) ‘Heft’. – StachM B 109
kagan (dTl) ‘Kaghan’. – Miller E 289
kajak see kajmak
kajata (Dolg.) ‘Berg’. – StachM F 90
*kajłygak see kujůlgůk
kajmak (dTl) ~ kajak (SUyg.) ‘skin on milk’. – Nugteren A 689
kajtar- (OT) ‘to turn back’. – Tekin B 214
kajyk ~ kojůk (dTl) ‘Boot’. – Anikin A 45
kajłygak see kujůlgůk
kakār ~ kōkůr (Čuv.) ‘breast’. – Berta B 36
kakulga (Čul.) ‘Puppe’. – StachM B 115
kakvak (Čul.) ‘Deckel’. – StachM B 115
kala- (Čuv.) ‘to speak’. – Miller A 36
kalabatun see kalabutun
kalabuk (Śr.) ‘Taube’. – StachM B 109
kalabutun ~ kalabatun ~ kalavatu ~ kalavatun (Uyg.) ‘fine material’. – Zieme B 151f., fn. 14
kalajyk (Brb.) ‘Volk’. – StachM G 250
kalaš (Śr.) ‘Art Gebäck’. – StachM B 109 (s.v. kadyraš)
kalavatun(n) see kalabutun
kallana (Dolg.) ‘Himmel’. – StachM F 90
kalt a s. kältā
kamdyk s. kamnak
kamdyt s. kamnak
kamka ~ kimxa (dTl) ~ kimxāb (Uzb.) ‘Art Seide; Brokat’. – Anikin A 43
kamnayy s. kamnak
kamnak ~ kamnayy ~ kamdyk ~ komdyt ~ komdat ~ kamdyt ~ kamyk (SibT) ‘Natter; Fischotter; ein kleiner Fisch; Schlangenart; Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 154f.
kamyk s. kammak
kangarlagič (Čul.) ‘Schwalbe’. – Önal A 94
kaŋ, in: kaŋ tämir (Tuv.) ‘Stahl’ ~ kaŋ (SibT) ‘Zinn’. – Rybatzki A 57. – Cf. gang
kaŋur see gang
kanýryk (Kirg.) ‘dry nose’. – MaVoSi 123
kap see gâp
kapytra (Śr.) ‘Koffer’. – StachM B 109
kapyrčak ~ kabarčak (dTl) ~ xärgäk (Tuv.) ~ xaračax (Khak.) ~ kuorčax (Yak.) ‘coffin; box’. – Tekin F 12.
karašı see xarašı
karlygan (Tat.) ‘schwarze Johannisbeere’. – Önal A 94
kars (OUyg.) ‘sort of linen or wool’. – Tezcan A 158
karšyn ‘émeute; Aufruhr, Tumult’. – StachM F 94
karū see karyw
karūdak (Oyr.) ‘week, powerless’. – Tekin E 660f.
karuw see karyw
karyw ~ karuw ~ karū (Kipč.) ‘power’. – Tekin E 661
kās (Tof.) ‘Zeichnung’. – StachM J 47
kastuk (SibT) ‘Art Pfeil’. – Helimski A 131
kaš (OT) ‘a kind of textile’. – Zieme B 155
kašy see kaču
kata (Dolg.) ‘dafür (aber)’. – StachM F 92f.
kazy (dTL) ‘the fat on a horse’s belly; a sausage’. – Miller C 150f.
kābāji (Yak.) ‘Art Waffe’. – Kaluž. A 18
kāčahā I see kāsahā
kāčahā II (Yak.) ‘Sünde’. – Kaluž. A 38
kāčiāmān ~ kāčiāmān (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 149
kārāhā (Yak.) ‘heimlicher Neid, Zorn’. – Kaluž. A 40
kālakāj pol- (Brb.) ‘Krüppel/Invalide sein’. – StachM G 249
kālāmāči see kālμāč
kālāmiš (Kirk.) ‘Feldmaus’. – Hauenschild B 136f.
kālār ~ kālāz (dTL) ‘Eidechse’. – Hauenschild B 133-137
kālāskān ~ kōlōskōn ~ kilāskān ~ kilāski ~ xālāskā ~ sāłāskā (SibT) ‘Eidechse’.
   – Hauenschild B 137
kālāz s. kālār
kālišafra ~ kolisavra (Anat.). ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 152, fn. 70
kālmāč~ kālāmāči (dTL) ‘Dolmetscher’. – Miller A 32. – Cf. kelēčū
kālpāžā (Trkm.) ‘Eidechse’. – Hauenschild B 137
kāltā (Kipč.) ~ kalta (Čuv.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 140f.
kāltāhā I (Yak.) ‘Augenlid’. – Kaluž. A 35. – Cf. xartaha II
kāltāhā II ~ kāltāhā(n) (Yak.) ‘Lippenbläschen, Gerstenkorn [Auge], Pickel’. –
   Kaluž. A 37
kāltāhā(n) see kāltāhā II
kāltakālār s. kārtānkālā
kāmn ~ hāmn (SibT) ‘Fluß’. – Bilecik A 165f., fn. 4
kān (Sal.) ‘tīn’. – Rybatzki A 65
kānčāji see ēṅkāji
kāndir ~ kāntir (dTL) ‘hemp’. – Miller E 276
kāntir see kāndir
kāp ~ kīb (dTL) ‘model, pattern’. – Tezcan A 161
*kār- see kir-
kārāhīt (Yak.) ‘Zeuge’. – StachM F 96
kārāki (Yak.) ‘geizig; unentschieden’. – Kaluž. A 23
kārātā (Yak.) ‘Ersatz; Stellvertreter; anstelle’. – StachM F 96
kärtäkälär s. kärtänkälä
kärtänkälä ~ kältäkälär ~ kärtäkälär (dTL) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 141
kärtiš ~ kumakärtiš (Anat.; Ott.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 142
kärü (dTL) ‘zurück’. – StachM O 235
käsähä ~ käčähä (Yak.) ‘ein Weg mit frischem, nicht ausgetretenem Schnee’. –
Kaluž. A 37
käsälækä (Anat.; Karač.) ~ käsälïka (Balk.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 139
käsälïka s. käsälækä
käsälïti s. käsältki
käsältki ~ käsälti (Kipč.) ~ kázältků (Brb.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 138
käsärtkä (Kipč.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 139f.
käsïligü (OUyg.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 138
käskäk (Kirg.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 139
käskäldäk (Kklp.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 139
käskäldirük (Kirg.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 139
käslän (Kipč.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 138
käsrä (Uyg.) ‘jenseits’. – StachM O 235
kät ~ kääd (Uyg.) ‘end, tail’. – StachM O 235
käväl (OT) ‘Pferd’. – Zieme G 194
käz (OT) ‘Gaze’. – Zieme B 155
käz- (OT) ~ gäz- (Ott.) ‘to travel; to walk about’. – Miller B 92; Miller C 150
käżïltkï s. käsïltki
kelečü (dTL) ‘talk, conversation’. – Miller A 29. – Cf. kälmäč
kërepenkke ~ kërenkke (Čuv.) ‘monetary unit (ten-kopek piece)’. – Dobrovolsky
A 206
kereš ~ kyryš (Čul.) ‘Bogensehne’. – StachM A 244
kib see käp
kibäš (Dolg.) ~ kîpis (Čul.) ‘Senkblei’. – StachM A 244
kikääxtä see kükäkï
kilär (Yak.) ‘glänzend, schimmernd’. – Hauenschild B 134
kiläskän s. käläskän
kiläski s. käläskän
kiliš (Sr.) ‘Schlüssel’. – StachM B 109 (s.v. kadyras)
kimäji see kýmäjï
kimxa ~ kimxäb see kamka
kinäs (Yak.) ‘Fürst’. – Anikin A 47
kip ~ kirp (Anat.) ‘fitting, exactly’. – Tezcan A 162
kîpis see kibäš
*kir- ~ *kär- ‘spannen’. – StachM A 244 (s.v. kereš)
kirp s. kip
kobuordäx ~ xobordöx ~ xobuordäx ~ xomordöx ~ xoburdäx (Yak.) ‘Bratpfanne’. – Anikin A 71; StachM L 197
kojük see kajyk
kökör see kākār
kokoviča (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 146
kolisavra s. kālišafra
komdat ~ komdyt s. kammak
komna (Dolg.) ‘Zimmer’. – StachM F 93
koŋyr (Tel.) ‘saddle of the nose’. – MaVoSi 123, fn. 8
koruobuja see xoruobuja II
kös see kuas
ködö (Yak.) ‘dick(bäu.chig)’. – StachM O 235
köryöl ~ kūyūl (Yak.) ‘Locke’. – StachM J 45
köhüjja ~ kühüjja (Yak.) ‘kleiner Kochtopf’. – Kaļuž. A 28
kölöhö (Yak.) ‘Rad’. – Kaļuž. A 40
kölösköön s. kālāskān
kölūjja (Yak.) ‘kleiner See’. – Kaļuž. A 28
kömkör- ~ köŋkör- (Oyr.) ‘mit dem Gesicht nach unten legen/werfen’. – Helimski A 129
köŋkör- see kömkör-
köpğaš see köp(p)ągaš
köp(p)ągaš (Sr.) ‘intensiv blau’. – StachM B 109
kör ~ kür (OYug.) ‘false accusation, slander’. – Tezcan A 160
körküsnnen see kösnū
körsąpąk see körsąbąk
körsąbąk (Ott.) ~ körsąpąk (Anat.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 74
körtöstit see kösnū
kösmär (Brb.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 72
kösnū ~ körküsnnen ~ körtöstit (Anat.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 66
köståbąk ~ küståbąk ~ köståbąk ~ köståmąk (Og.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 74-76
köståmąk see köståbąk
köståbąk see köståbąk
köısıgğı see köısırgan
köısırgan ~ köısıgğı (MK) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 71-72
köısız tämąk (Kıpč.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 74
köısıl see küül
köttür- (dTI) ‘to lift up, to raise’. – Miller C 166
kuas ~ kös (Cul.) ‘schön; Zeichnung’. – StachM J 47
kujaš ~ kūnaš (dTI) ~ kūnät (Oyr.) ‘sun; hot weather, heat’. – Miller F 9, 12f.; StachM O 235, 238
kujułgąk (Lerb., Tel.) ~ *kajylgąk ~ *kajylgąk ‘Wasserwirbel’. – Helimski A 130
kukäky (Yak.) ‘eine Eichelhähnergattung’. – Kałuż. A 25
kulluja (Yak.) ‘Art Socken’. – Kałuż. A 34
kuluba ~ kulüba see golobo
kumakärtiš s. kärtiš
kuopuja (Yak.) ‘Kopie, Abschrift’. – Kaluż. A 33
kuorčax see kapyrcak
kuortam (Yak.) ‘Pacht’. – Anikin A 48
kuräjy (Yak.) ‘Dürre, Trockenheit’. – Kałuż. A 19
kurč (dTL) ‘steel’. – Rybatzki A 59
kurgum (Dolg., Yak.) ‘Unterteil des Bauches’. – Zieme C 441
kurgun (OUyg., Šr.) ‘Flügel’. – Zieme C 441
kuryājy (Yak.) ‘Staub; trockener Boden’. – Kałuż. A 20
kurgax s. byhar kurgaya
kurtaš ~ kuttax (Yak.) ‘Magen’. – Kałuż. A 31 s.v. tutuja
kuruya (Yak.) ‘immer wieder, ewig’. – Kałuż. A 33
kurūk (Yak.) ‘immer wieder, unaufhörlich’. – Kałuż. A 33
kurupasky (Dolg.) ‘partridge’. – StachM O 236
kušdiri ~ guširi ~ guštär (Anat.). ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 152, fn. 70
kuttax see kurtaš
kutuja (Yak.) ‘Magen (im allg.); Labmagen’. – Kałuż. A 31
kūtuja (Yak.) ‘Eichhörnchennest’. – Kałuż. A 32
kuturguja (Yak.) ‘Furunkel’. – Kałuż. A 32
kūz see kūzāj
kuzāj ~ kūz (dTL) ‘north; northern side’. – Miller F 27
kūčak (OT) ‘strong(ly)’. – Miller D 114
kūyūl see köyūl
kūhūjā see köhūjā
kūkāji ~ kūrkāji (Yak.) ‘stößig’. – Kałuż. A 22
kūkākr ~ kikāxtā (Yak.) ‘ein Vogel, Anas nigra’. – Kałuż. A 25
kūlār (SibT) ‘bronze; steel’. – Rybatzki A 66
kūlūk see kūrūk
kūlūmān ~ kūlūŋkā (Yak.) ‘Art Jagdfalle’. – Anikin A 48
kūlūŋkā see kūlūmān
kūmgūrā- (Kmnd.) ‘mit dem Gesicht nach unten liegen’. – Helimski A 129
kūnāš see kūjāš
kūnāt see kūjāš
kūndūri (OT) ‘in the south’. – Itabashi A 388
kūnkargar (Uzb.) ‘Steppenagame’. – Hauenschild B 147
kūnsaj (Čul.) ‘jeden Tag’. – StachM A 243 (s.v. ajvūnj)
kūŋkūjā (Yak.) ‘schmale Schlucht mit Bach’. – Kałuż. A 34
kūōnāx s. xara kūōnāx
kūört (Dolg., Yak.) ‘grau’. – StachM J 49
küöxtüjä (Yak.) ‘Faulenzer’. – Kaluž. A 32
kür see kör
kürgäl (Yak.) ‘Wasserratte’. – Hauenschild B 153, fn. 77
kürgüjä (Yak.) ‘Schaufel’. – Kaluž. A 29
kürkäji see kükäjä
kürük ~ külük (Yak.) ‘Haken’. – Anikin A 48
küstäbäk see köstäbäk
küšmär (Brb.) ‘Ratte’. – Hauenschild A 72
kütär (Yak.) ‘Wasserratte; Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 69; StachM O 234. – Cf. küzär
küz (dTl) ‘autumn’. – Miller F 29
küzän (dTl) ‘polecat’. – Miller 168 – Cf. küzär
küzänč (OT) ‘shame’. – Tekin B 220
küzär (dTl) ‘polecat’. – Miller B 101. – Cf. kütär, küzän
küzöt (Kirg.) ‘to guard, to watch’. – Tekin B 221
küzük (dTl) ‘shuttle’. – Miller C 150
küžül see küšül
kyamäjä see kymäjä
kydäjä (Yak.) ‘groß’. – Kaluž. A 18
kydyaš see kadyaš
kyha (Yak.) ‘Schmiedeherd’. – Kaluž. A 27 s.v. kyhyja
kyhyja (Yak.) ‘Goldschmelztiegel’. – Kaluž. A 27
kyhylläjä (Yak.) ‘Plötte’. – Kaluž. A 18
kyjmyrük (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 154
kyjıñjä (Yak.) ‘nervös, sensibel’. – Kaluž. A 24
kymäjä ~ kyamäjä ~ kımäjı (Yak.) ‘Kriebelmücke, Gnitz’. – Kaluž. A 20
kymäjı (Yak.) ‘whip’. – StachM H 151
kynatirä (Anat.). ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 152, fn. 70
kyradäjä see kyrđäjä
kyrdäjä ~ kyrdäjä ~ kyryläj (Yak.) ‘Kriebelmücke, Gnitz’. – Kaluž. A 22
kyrk (dTl) ‘40’. – Binnick A 439
kyrk- (dTl) ‘to shear, to cut off’. – Binnick A 437
kyrlangyč (Ott.) ‘Schwalbe’. – Önal A passim
kyrp- (Ott.) ‘to shear’. – Binnick A 437
kyrpala- (Dolg.) ‘schneiden’. – StachM K 131
kyryläj see kyrđäjä
kyryš see kereš
kysaha (Yak.) ‘schneefreier Platz vor dem Haus’. – Kaluž. A 38
kytaräjı (Yak.) ‘Plötz’. – Kaluž. A 18
kytarbäjä I (Yak.) ‘sibirischer Marder’. – Kaluž. A 20
Kytarbäjä II, Eigennname. – Kaluž. A 23
kýttäjy (Yak.) ein Vogel. – Kaluž. A 20
kýtya see kýtja
kýtja ~ kytja (Yak.) ‘Holzschale’. – Kaluž. A 29
kývrásjyk ~ kyrásjyl (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 146
kýz (MK) ‘rare, scarce’. – StachM O 235
kýza (dTl) ‘Mäusegeier’. – Miller C 156, fn. 44
kýzlarjoldašy (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 149
kýzyl (dTl) ‘red’. – Miller F 29
lábás ~ lábys (Yak.) ‘Art Gestell, Bank’. – Anikin A 50
lábys see lábas
laglaryja (Yak.) ‘stämmtig, untersetzt’. – Kaluž. A 28
laŋxar (Uyg.) ‘cauliflower’. – Jarring A 55, fn. 30
lápky ~ láppy (Yak.) ‘Geschäft’. – Anikin A 51
lappâky (Yak.) ‘Schulterblatt’. – Kaluž. A 26
láppy see lápky
láppyha (Yak.) ‘Windschutz’. – Kaluž. A 39
lar- (Čuv.) ‘sich setzen; sitzen’. – Berta C 36
läjkkä see aläjkkä
läpâk (Anat.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 66
läppiäski ~ läppiäski (Yak.) ‘Fladenbrot’. – Anikin A 52
Lisäbiätä (Dolg.) ‘Elisabeth’. – StachM F 93 s.v. komna
lozunga (Dolg.) ‘Losung’. – StachM F 91
lörüjä (Yak.) ‘Schmetterling’. – Kaluž. A 28
lük see dük
lyglyja (Yak.) ‘eine Gansgattung’. – Kaluž. A 29
mačmač (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 146
mayat- see maŋxat-
maŋ (Čuv.) ‘Richtung, Seite’. – Agyagási A 10
maŋak (Čuv.) ‘Stange, Pfahl [als Zeichen]’. – Anikin A 55
maŋâlä- (Yak.) ‘sparen’. – Kaluž. A 25 s.v. maŋâxy
maŋâxy (Yak.) ‘Baumstümpfe, Klötze an der Rodung’. – Kaluž. A 25
maŋmîl (Brb.) ‘Affe’. – StachM G 252
maŋčyk ~ mončük (Yak.) ‘gezähmtes Rentier, das als Locktier bei der Rentier-
jagd gebraucht wird’. – Anikin A 53f.
mandaya s. myndaха
amaŋal see rakš at maŋal
maŋâryja (Yak.) ‘[Adj.] mit weißem Maul’. – Kaluž. A 32
maŋky see banjky
maŋmâr see aŋmâr
maŋxat- ~ mayat- (Yak.) ‘weiß machen’. – Kaluž. A 18 s.v. maxatâjy
maŋs ~ pás (SibT) ‘Fliege; Pferdebremsen’ ~ masa (Kzk.) ‘Mücke’. – Helimski A 129; StachM B 115
masa see mās
maxatājy (Yak.) ‘eine Mōwengattung’. – Kaluž. A 18
māśkā ~ pāśkā (SibT) ‘Pilz; Schwamm’. – StachM B 110
mě'ik see biāńik
měńik see biāńik
miänik see biāńik
miğiät see pācät
mīńik see biāńik
mīs (Čul.) ‘Gesicht’. – StachM B 116
mogalak (Čul.) ‘Bär’. – StachM B 116
moγox see moγox
mombuš (Tuv.) ‘Hilfe’. – Anikin A 64
mönčük see mančyk
moγox ~ moγox (Yak.) ‘Doppelkinn’. – StachM B 116
möröhö ~ mörōhō ~ mörūōhā (Yak.) ‘Beutelnetz’. – Kaluž. A 40
mörūōhō s. mörōhō
-mytrak, inferior intensification suffix. – StachM O 235
muč (Uyg.) ‘pepper’. – Jarring A 54, fn. 13
mukszun ~ mukszün (Yak.) ‘eine Fischgattung’. – Anikin A 56
munnu (Dolg.) ~ purdu (Śr.) ~ pyrda (Khak.) ‘Nase’. – StachM F 89, 95
mūnta see biūnta
muntada (OT) ‘besides this’. – Itabashi A 388
munzurux (Khak.) ‘fist’. – Tekin A 129
muora (Dolg., Yak.) ‘1. Meer; 2. Tundra, Taiga’. – Anikin A 55
musta- (Khak.) ~ mysta- (Tel.) ~ pusta (SibT) ~ mykta- (Khak.) ‘brüllen’. – Hellimski A 129
mūčrā see pūčūrā
mykta- see musta-
myndaha ~ mandaya (Yak.) ‘Elchleder’. – Kaluž. A 40
mysta- see musta-
myttarńāk (Čuv.) ‘horse dealer’. – Dobrovolsky A 206
nāda (Yak.) ‘man soll’. – Anikin A 56f.
nān (dTI) ‘bread’. – Maciuszak A passim
narpyz see ɡalpyz
natruška (Tof.) ‘Patronengürtel’. – Anikin A 57
něr (Chuv.) ‘appearance, beauty’. – Miller F 32
ningi see jinčū
nukuja (Yak.) ‘sehr schwach, indolent’. – Kaluž. A 28
ūąąaha ~ ńąąaha ~ ńąyar(a) ~ ɣąąaha (Yak.) ‘kleiner, wertloser Fisch’. – Kaluž. A 41
úňráji see ſňřájy
ňňoxůxu (Yak.) ‘eine Eichelhähergattung; Garrulus infaustus L.’ – Kaluż. A 24
úňřájy ~ úňřájji (Yak.) ‘Schöbling, Trieb’. – Kaluż. A 21
úňrdąjy (Yak.) ‘eine Wasservogelgattung’. – Kaluż. A 20
ňęcąt see pśćąt
ōbu see uōbu
oč- ~ ošo- (SibT) ‘sitzen’. – Berta C 34, fn. 64
odug ~ ojag (dTL) ‘wach’. – Őlméz E 39-40, 42
odyręyx (Khak.) ‘Hocker’. – Berta C 34, fn. 66
ohogdo ~ ohonđo (Yak.) ‘kleine Fische; Stint’. – Kaluż. A 22 s.v. yahăjy
ohonđo see ohogdo
ojag see odug
oji (Kzk.) ‘wach werden’. – Őlméz E 40f.
*ojluk (Tat.) ‘Schweißtuch; Filz’. – StachM B 118; StachM L 197
oldrum (OT) ‘Krüppel’. – Berta C 32
oldy- see uldy-
olgurt- (OT) ‘setzen’. – Berta C 32, fn. 46
olor- see olur-
oltur- see olur-
oru (Yak.) ‘außergewöhnlich, unüblich’. – Kaluż. A 30
olor- ~ olor- ~ oltur- ~ otur- (dTL) ‘sitzen’. – Berta C 31-38
olut see olok
onian (dTL) ‘1. billig; 2. leicht’. – StachM B 116
ōňča (Čul.) ‘Leder’. – StachM B 116
onōju (Yak.) ‘Kriebelmücke, Gnitze’. – Kaluż. A 19
opra- see apra-
or- (Tuv.) ‘sitzen’. – Berta C 30
orba (Sr.) ‘Trommelschlägel’. – StachM M 22
organ (Khak.) ‘Bett’. – Berta C 30
orō- (Dolg.) ‘liegen’. – Berta C 30
orsōxu (Yak.) ‘Wasserratte’. – Kaluż. A 24
orun (dTL) ‘Platz, Stelle; Bett’. – Berta C 25-31
oskovör (Tof.) ‘Bratpfanne’. – StachM E 182
oskūrā s. ľeskūrā
ôsmųška (Tof.) ‘Achtelpfund’. – Anikin A 34
oşo- s. oč-
*őtak (PT) ~ *vątag (Bulg.) ‘Abteilung; Sippe; Zelt’. – Stach S A 385
otča boric (OT) ‘wie Feuer und Staub’. – Zieme G passim
ottuk (Čul.) ‘Stück Stahl zum Feuerschlagen’. – StachM A 244
ottur- (Tuv.) ‘wecken’. – Őlméz E 39-40, 42
otur- see olur-

ovjöt (Tof.) ‘oats’. – StachM O 236

ögüz ~ öz (dTl) ‘Bach; Fluß’. – Bilecik A 165, fn. 4. – Cf. öz III

öksür- (Ott.) ‘to cough’. – StachM O 236

ön dürti (OT) ‘in the east’. – Itabashi A 388

örgüjä (Yak.) ‘ein Stück Krummholz am Fischfangnetz’. – Kaluž. A 28

*örküč (PT) ~ *värkäč (Bulg.) ‘Geflochentes; Haarzopf’. – StachS A 383f.

örögö see örögötö

örögötö (Dolg.) ‘Bauch/Magen des Fisches’. – StachM F 91

öröhö I (Yak.) ‘Diaphragma’. – Kaluž. A 36


örümkä see ürümkä

örütä (Dolg.) ‘nach oben’. – StachM F 91. – Cf. ürdü

ös- (dTl) ‘to grow, to rise’. – Miller C 151

ötök (Dolg.) ‘alles Alte’. – Tekin E 660

ötö (Yak.) ‘a place where earlier there was a house’. – Tekin E 660.

ötüjä (Yak.) ‘Hammer’. – Kaluž. A 32

ötür- (Kipč.) ‘to cough’. – StachM O 236

öz I (dTl) ‘spirit, self’. – StachM B 118

öz II see ögüz

öz III ~ uez(y) (dTl) ‘valley, mountain pass’. – Miller F 28. – Cf. ögüz

pagryz (Trkm.) ‘Minze’. – Tezcan B 266

päj (dTl) ‘share’. – Tezcan A 164

pakalčak (NUyg.) ‘part of the leg below the knee (of animals)’. – Nugteren A 687f. – Cf. bakalšak

pärys see bärys

päs see mās

paspagaš (Šr.) ‘Falle’. – StachM A 244

paspak (SibT) ‘Falle’. – StachM A 244

passak (SibT) ‘flacher Mehlstein’. – StachM A 244

pasxa see maska

patmičuk (NUyg.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B147

patyr (OUyg.) ‘Bettelschale’. – Zieme A 309

paza (UYg.) ‘rake’. – Jarring A 53, fn. 4

päčat (SibT) ~ ćecat (Tof.) ~ mićat (Šr.) ‘Stempel’. – Anikin A 61

pältä (Ott.) ‘eine Süßigkeit’. – Tezcan C 31f.

päs see päš

päš (Ott.) ~ päs (Kurg.) ‘unter; unterer Teil; platt’. – StachM B 110

päsškä see māškä

pätik (Šr.) ‘Hahn’. – StachM B 113f.

pětněk see bötněk

piäspäl see bástiäl
pičirö see püčirä
pinä see bötnäk
pinne see bötnäk
piš- see byš-
poppuolja see boppuolja
por (Šr.) ‘Rowdy, Hooligan’. – StachM B 110
poramzyk (Šr.) ‘trüb’. – StachM B 110f.
poras (Šr.) ‘Finsternis, Dämmerung’. – StachM B 110f.
porat (Šr.) ‘graues Pferd’. – StachM B 110f.
pöntük see böltk
pörcük see böltk
pruoška (Yak.) ‘Schnupftabak’. – StachM E 181
püd see büt
pujan (Čuv.) ‘rich’. – Róna A 306
püľa see bula
pünta see bünta
puorax see buorax
puorsa see buorsa
purdu see munnū
pusi (Čuv.) ‘body, figure, stature’. – Tekin D 170
pusta- see musta-
puş see baš
püė see büt
pū (Čul.) ‘Fangnetz für Fische’. – StachM A 244
püčirä ~ pičirö (Khak.) ~ müčrä (Šr.) ‘Käse’. – Helimski A 127
pügrāp see buobrap
pükük ~ bükük (Sib T) ‘bucklig’. – StachM B 116. – Cf. tujak
püntük see böltk
pürčük see böltk
püzlär (Kyz.) ‘Käse’. – Helimski A 127
pyrda see munnū
pyslak (Sib T) ‘Käse’. – Helimski A 127
rakš at maňal (OUyg.) eine Beschwörungsformel. – Zieme A 308
rümka see urümka
sabỳ (Yak.) ~ habỳ (Dolg.) ‘covering, blanket’. – Tekin E 660
sayaha (Yak.) ‘Spänen o.ä. zum Anmachen des Feuers’. – Kaluž. A 38
saharbäjy (Yak.) ‘sibirischer Marder’. – Kaluž. A 20
sażyra- (Tuv.) ‘sich verbessern’. – Erdal A 70
säk see sök
saka (OT) ‘foot of a mountain’. – Miller A 37
säkmän ~ sëxman ~ söxman (Čuv.) ‘Kaftan’. – Anikin A 74
sakpyja see sappyja
säkyr ~ säxar ~ säxyr (Yak.) ‘Zucker’. – Anikin A 69
salabär see samabär
salda (Šr.) ‘Pflug’. – StachM B 111
salgym (Trkm.) ‘mirage’. – Tekin E 659, fn. 3
salkabaj see solkuobaj
salkovaj see solkuobaj
salma (NUyg.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 147
samabär ~ salabär ~ sylabär ~ slybär (Yak.) ‘Samowar’. – Anikin A 68
sämza (Čuv.) ‘Nase; Schnabel; Rüssel’. – StachM B 112
sandyk see sundük
sanny (Dolg.) ‘Schulter’. – StachM F 89
saŋ see jay
saŋun ~ săŋün (OT) ‘general’. – Tekin D168
sapke (UYg.) ‘the handle of a plough’. – Jarring A16, fn. 55
säppas see hääpat
sappija ~ sakpyja (Yak.) ‘kleines Säckchen, kleine Tasche’. – Kaluž. A 29
sär- (Yak.) ‘haaren, die Federn verlieren’. – StachM K 130
sara (Yak.) ‘ein Vogel, dem die Federn ausgefallen sind’. – StachM K 130
saramana s. sarymana
sargaš ‘Kornschwinge, Wurfelmaschine’. – StachM B 111
sary (Yak.) ‘dickes Leder’. – StachM K 129, fn. 4
sarymaja s. sarymana
sarymana ~ saramana ~ sarymaja (Anat.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 149
sat (Tof.) ‘gum mastic’. – StachM O 235
savagat (OUyg.) ‘gift’. – Tezcan A 159
säxar ~ säxyr see säkyr
säxman see säkman
säxtyja (Yak.) ‘Wildente’. – Kaluž. A 32
saz (dTń) ~ šur, šor (Čuv.) ‘swamp, marsh’. – Miller F 28
sábáhá (Yak.) ‘Schnur, Strick’. – Kaluž. A 35
Sábiá (Yak.) ‘Elisabeth’. – StachM F 93 s.v. komna
sälämä (Tuv.) ‘Säbel’. – Anikin A 75
säläsälä s. käläskän
sälläki (Yak.) ‘Zwergmaräne (Fisch)’. – Kaluž. A 26
sănjijä (Yak.) ‘Kinn’. – Kaluž. A 31
săŋün see saŋun
siärrä (Yak.) ‘Schwefel’. – Anikin A 70
sibči ~ sümäči ~ tůmäči ~ čibči ~ čibäči ~ čümäčči ~ čümäčči (Yak.) ‘Kerze’.
    – Anikin A 69; StachM O 236
sídä ~ sitä (Yak.) ‘Sieg’. – Anikni A 71
sin I see syn II
sin II (OT, Anat.) ~ syn (MT) ‘tomb, grave’. – Tekin D 169
sîr- (Yak.) ‘to split, to break into two pieces’. – Tekin B 213
sîtä see sîdä
sivrig (OT) ‘sterlet’. – Róna B 624
skabra see skobra
skobra ~ skabra ~ yskobra (Khak.) ‘Bratpfanne’. – StachM L 197
sogak (SibT) ‘Mörser’. – StachM A 244f.
sogdöxu (Yak.) ‘alte Rentierkuh’. – Kaluž. A 25
soj see čojun
sök ~ sâk (SibT) ‘Mörser’. – StachM A 244f.
sokka ~ sokko (SibT) ‘Mörser’. – StachM A 244f.
sokko see sokka
sokkuobaj see solkuobaj
sokma see sokva
sökur ~ šökur (Yak.) ‘eine Fischgattung’. – Anikin A 91
sokva ~ sokma (SibT) ‘Mörser’. – StachM A 244f.
soky (Šr.) ‘Mörser’. – StachM A 244f.
söl see čual
solbu (Čul.) ‘Schöpfkelle’. – StachM A 245
solhöbaj see solkuobaj
sokkuobaj ~ solkuomaj ~ sokkuobaj (Yak.) ~ salkovaj ~ salkabaj (Khak.) ~
solhöbaj (Tof.) ‘Rubel’. – Anikin A 83
solkuomaj see solkuobaj
somorso (Yak.) ‘Labmagen’. – Kaluž. A 35
son (Yak.) ‘outer, garment, coat’. – StachM O 235
sonpyr see şompyr
söxman see sâkman
soxso (Yak.) ‘Falle, Fanggerät’. – Kaluž. A 38
sökmän (OT) ‘Reicher; Held’. – Anikin A 74
sömiüjä ~ suimús ~ süömiüjä (Yak.) ‘Zeigefinger’. – Kaluž. A 28
sösöökkä ~ čösöökkä (Yak.) ‘Hausgeist’. – Anikin A 75. – Cf. ĝukäky
sözürbä (Šr.) ‘Schleppnetz’. – StachM B 111
starsëna ~ ystarsëna ~ tarčëna ~ čarčëna ~ čačëna (Yak.) ‘Ältester, Obmann’.
– Anikin A 73f. – Cf. taršina,
suburgan ~ subuzgan (OUyg.; MT) ‘sepulchre for relics’. – Miller E 280-283
subuzgan see suburgan
sujaký (Yak.) ‘[Adj.] mit neuem flaumigen Fell’. – Kaluž. 24
sujutâký (Yak.) ‘unordentlich’. – Kaluž. A 26
sunčug (?) sunčuk (OUyg.) ‘Matte; Bettelschale (?).’ – Zieme A 309
suncug see sunčuk
sundük (Yak.) ~ sunduk (dTL) ~ hunduk (Dolg.) ~ sandyk (Tat.) ~ synduk
(Kipč.) ‘Kiste, Truhe’. – Anikin A 75
suoduja (Yak.) ‘Erschöpfung’. – Kaluž. A 34
suor- (Yak.) ‘schneiden, abhobeln’. – StachM O 235
suoska (onňů) (Yak.) ‘Art Spiel’. – Anikin A 41
surük see surüp
surulájy (Yak.) ‘klingend, kllirrend’. – Kaluž. A 19
surüp ~ surük (Yak.) ‘Schraube’. – Anikin A 92f.
sus (SibT) ‘Schöpfkelle’. – StachM B 111 (s.v. susku)
suska (Sr.) ‘Netzsack’. – StachM B 111 (s.v. susku)
susku (Sr.) ‘Schaufel; Schöpfkelle’. – StachM B 111. – Cf. sus, suska
sutaky (Yak.) ‘abgemagert, mager’. – Kaluž. A 24
súxara ~ súxura (Yak.) ‘Zwieback’. – Anikin A 76
súxura see súxara
súbō see súmbō
súgmän see súkmän
súkmän ~ súgmän (SibT) ‘Art Überrock’. – Anikin A 74
súkrä s. üskürä
súllükän ~ súllükän ~ súlükän (Yak.) ‘Wassergeist, Wassermann’. – Anikin A 89-91
súllük (dTl) ‘Egel, Blutegel’. – Anikin A 90
súllükän ~ súllükän see súllükän
súlin see hümńü
súmäči see sibäči
súmbä see súmbō
súmbō (Kzk.) ~ súmbä (Az.) ~ súmō ~ súbō (Oyr.) ‘Wisch-, Ladestock’. – Anikin A 92
súmō see súmbō
súmūjá see sómūjá
súöm (Yak.) ‘Spanne [Abstand zwischen Daumen und Zeigefinger]’. – Kaluž. A 28 s.v. sómūjä
súömüjä see sómūjä
sürrün see hümńü
*súskü (SibT) ‘stößig’. – Helmski A 132
sütük (Yak.) ‘thimble’. – StachM O 234
süz- (dTl) ‘mit den Hörnern stoßen’. – Miller C 156, fn. 44
syalğa (Yak.) ‘Hose’. – Kaluž. A 33
sybalTyja (Yak.) ‘Erdauuschüttung’. – Kaluž. A 33
sybytax see japylđak
syhý (Yak.) ‘plain, pasture’. – Tekin E 660
*syjby (Tof., Tuv.) ‘der kleine Finger’. – Helmski A 131
sylabär see samabär
sylbyja (Yak.) ‘Tauwetter im Frühjahr’. – Kaluž. A 34
sylybär see samabär
symala (Yak.) ‘Pech, Teer, Harz’. – Anikin A 72
symnayas (Yak.) ~ šamša ~ šemše (Čuv.) ‘soft’. – StachM H 152
symyja (Yak.) ‘Lüge, Unwahrheit’. – Kałuż. A 31
syn I see sin II
syn II (dTI) ~ sin (NUyg.) ‘body, stature’. – Tekin D 170
syndu ~ syndy (dTI) ‘scissors’. – Tekin D 172
synduk see sundük
syndy see syndu
sỹŋ (Yak.) ‘Nasenschleim’. – Ölmез C 275
sųŋa (Yak.) ‘nach außen gewölbter Rand eines Gegenstandes’. – Kałuż. A 35
sųš (~ sĩš) (dTI) ‘spit, skewer, fork’. – Miller F 10
syttä- ‘to put pillows’. – StachM O 234
syual see čual
šamša ~ šemše see symnayas
šam (Čuv.) ‘Mittel, Motiv; Ordnung’. – Napoljskich A 119f.
šul (Čuv.) ‘year’. – Tekin A 129
šypaš- (Čuv.) ‘to stick or adhere’. – Tekin A 129
šabyr (SibT) ‘Art Kittel oder Mantel’. – Anikin A 87
šadora see šadyrax
šadyrax (Khak.) ~ šadora (Tat.) ‘pockennarbig’. – Anikin A 87
šagzyra- (Šr.) ‘kriegerisch sein’. – Erdal A 70
šajan (Bšk., Tat.) ‘scherzhaft; Witzbold’. – Helimski A 131
šajgy (Çul.) ‘kleiner Hammer’. – StachM A 245
šalən (Čuv.) ‘thirny bush’. – Berta A 33, 37
šalbyr see čanmar
šalča see šalsə
šalyam ~ šalyan (dTI) ‘thorny bush’. – Berta A 33f.
šalsə ~ šalča (Čuv.) ‘Stange, Pfähle’. – Helimski B 63
šapak see čapak
šaravara ~ šarovar (SibT) ‘Hose’. – StachM B 111. – Cf. čanmar
šarovar see šaravara
šat ~ čat (Çul.) ‘Tatar’. – StachM B 116
šatra (Brb.) ‘Pocken’. – Anikin A 87
šatu (OUyg.) ‘Leiter’. – Tezcan B 267, fn. 42
šalək see čalək
šanisə see šisə
šərəp (Çul.) ‘Erdhütte’. – StachM B 116
šelle (Čuv.) ‘folk music instrument’. – Dobrovolsky A 211
šine (Uyg.) ‘grape syrup’. – Jarring A28, fn. 30
šisə ~ šanisə (Tof.) ‘Weizen’. – StachM E 182
šiš see sỹŋ
šoj see čojun
šojun see čojun
šokčyła- (Sr.) ‘auf einen Haufen legen’. – Erdal A 72
šokur see sökur
šöl see ĝual
šompýr ~ šopčýr (Sr.) ~ sonyr (Khak.) ‘Wisch-, Ladestock’. – Anikin A 91
šopčýr see šompýr
šor see saz
šupár (Čuv.) ‘Arbeitskittel’. – Anikin A 87
šur see saz
šurá (Čuv.) ‘white’. – Miller A 37
šuragataj see čuragaj
šülgän (Bšk.) ‘böser Geist’. – Anikin A 90
šylbyk (Kipč.) ‘rod, stick’. – Tekin E 659, fn. 3
šylpyk see ĝylpak
šynašak see ĝynačyk
šynataj see ĝynačyk
tabužak (Čul.) ‘Märchen’. – StachM B 116
tadun ~ tazyn (dTI) ‘calf’. – Tekin B 224
tahyj- (Yak.) ~ däš- (Trkm.) ‘über seine Ufer treten’ – Berta D 15, fn. 50. – Cf. taš-
tajbáxy (Yak.) ‘Hand; Bein’. – Kaluğ. A 24
tajynša (Kzk.) ‘one–year–old calf’. – Tekin B 224
talahra see dalaha
tan (OYug.) ‘Gefäß’. – Zieme H 237, fn. 4
tane see dâne
tap (MT) ‘spot, dot’. – Tezcan A 163		
tappyha(r) ~ taptajar (Yak.) ‘Schi’. – Kaluğ. A 38
taptajar see tappyha(r)
tar- see tâz-
taraha (Yak.) ‘Bauchfell; Bauchsehnen’. – Kaluğ. A 38
tarčyna see starsyńa
taršina (Tof.) ‘Ältester, Obmann’. – StachM E 182. – Cf. starsyńa
taskağak (Čul.) ‘Eule’. – StachM B 117
tâstya I (Yak.) ‘1. Teesudkessel; 2. ungehorsam’. – Kaluğ. A 32
tâstya II (Yak.) ‘Preis, Taxe’. – Kaluğ. A 33
tâš (dTI) ‘stone’. – Miller A 36; Miller F 9, 12f., 24
tâš- (OT) ‘überfließen’ – Berta D16. – Cf. tahyj-
tâskyn (Kipč.) ‘Hochwasser’ – Berta D 12, fn. 25; 14, fn. 36
tâšu- (OT) ‘to carry, transport’ – Berta D 13, fn. 30
tāvar see tūz
tazyn see tadun
tābāk see gözsüz tābāk
tāgūl see dāgīl
tākkā an (Šr.) ‘Mammut’. – StachM B 111f.
tālgāhā (Yak.) ‘schnee- freie Stelle, an der Vieh gefüttert wird’. – Kaluž. A 38
tālgijā – tāllijā (Yak.) ‘Schweißdecke’. – Kaluž. A 29
tāllijā see tālgijā
tāmāk see köszüz tāmāk
tānsi see tinski
*tāŋ (SibT) ‘rund’. – Helimski A 132
tāppihā (Yak.) ‘niedrige Lärche’. – Kaluž. A 38
tāpsī (Ott.) ‘Anrichteplatte’. – StachM A 245 (s.v. töpšü)
tārāhā (Yak.) ‘Sommerschuh(e)’. – Kaluž. A 39
tārgi see dārgī
tārmāč (Čul.) ‘eiserner Ofen’. – StachM A 245
tārzājāk (Oyr.) ‘Maulwurf’. – Hauenschild A 67, 70
tāv (Ülyg.) ‘trick, device’. – Tezcan A 159f.
tāz- (dTL) ~ tar- (Čuv.) ‘to run, to rush’. – Miller C 150, 167
tēlek see tūl
tīārbās (Dolg.) ‘ein Ring am Schlitten’. – Ōlmez C 274
tīgāji ~ tygājy (Yak.) ‘Insekt; Wespe’. – Kaluž. A 19
tilijā (Yak.) ‘angrenzend, benachbart’. – Kaluž. A 30
tinsi ~ tānsi (OT) ‘son of heaven’. – Tēkin D 167
tirā (dTL) ‘part of a tribe’. – Miller E 277, fn. 26
tō (Šr.) ‘Zahl’. – StachM B 112 (s.v. tōgy)
tōgy (Šr.) ‘Mathematik’. – StachM B 112
tōyōho I (Yak.) ‘Schneeklumpen’. – Kaluž. A 39
tōyōho II ~ toŋoŋo (Yak.) ‘Stab; Pfahl; Nagel’. – Kaluž. A 39
tōjbox (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 154, fn. 79
tokmak see tokvak
tokpak see tokvak
tokvak ~ tokpak (Čul.) ~ tokmak (Ott.) ‘Hammer’. – StachM A 245
tol (dTL) ‘pool’. – Miller F 10
tōl see tūš
tolkūha (Yak.) ‘eine Speise’. – Kaluž. A 41
tōmtōj.- (Yak.) ‘sich erheben’. – StachM B 112
tōmtor (Yak.) ‘Erhebung’. – StachM B 112
tōyōho s. toyōho II
tōr (Oyr.) ‘schnitzeln’. – StachM O 235
tōrčuk (Šr.) ‘Nachtigall’. – StachM B 112
torku ~ torko ‘silk’. – Zieme B 150
torug (dTL) ‘grau-braun’. – StachM B 112 (s.v. torçuk)
totôčçu see totôju
totôju ~ totôčçu (Yak.) ‘sättigend’. – Kaluž. A 19
toxu (NUyg.) ‘chicken’. – Nugteren A 691
tozgu (OUyg.) ‘a gift of food given to a traveller’. – Tezcan A 159
tögrüüčü (Dolg.) ‘um...herum’. – Ölmez C 274
tölöhö ~ tülähä (Yak.) ‘Feuer; Lagerfeuer; Brand’. – Kaluž. A 36
tönün- (Yak.) ‘zurückkehren’. – StachM E 181
töpšü (Čul.) ‘Trog’. – StachM A 245
tördü (Dolg.) ‘Wurzel; Stamm, Sippe’. – StachM F 89
törüküjä (Dolg.) ‘von Anfang an’. – Kaluž. A 28
töşäk (dTL) ‘mattress’. – Miller F 26
töz (dTL) ‘root, basis, origin’. – Miller F 27
*tugok see *tygok
tulaha ~ dulaha (Yak.) ‘Hof, in dem Vieh gefüttert wird’. – Kaluž. A 39
tumsu (Dolg.) ‘Bootsbug; Fußspitze’. – StachM F 89. – Cf. tunçuk
tumzuk see tunçuk
tunç (dTL) ‘bronze’. – Tekin A 132
tunçuk ~ tumzuk ~ dumçuk ‘Schnabel; Rüssel; Nase’. – StachM B 112. – Cf. tumsu
tundara (Yak.) ‘Tundra’. – Anikin A 80f.
tuşak (Čul.) ‘bucklig’. – StachM B 117. – Cf. pükçük
tuotägy (Yak.) ‘eine Wasservogelgattung’. – Kaluž. A 17
tuox (Yak.) ‘what?’. – StachM O 238
tüp (Khak.) ‘Art Leder’. – Anikin A 35
türäki see türäxy
türäky (Yak.) ‘ganz, völlig’. – Kaluž. A 24
türka (Yak.) ~ dürğä (Tuv.) ~ dürhe (Tof.) ‘Schrotbüchse; Art Gewehr’. – Anikin A 81
turpa see turba
turuja (Yak.) ‘Kranich’. – Kaluž. A 32
tusaha (Yak.) ‘Hof, auf dem Vieh gefüttert wird’. – Kaluž. A 36
tuš (dTL) ~ toł (Čuv.) ‘equal; opposed to’. – Miller F 9
tüz (dTL) ~ tąvar (Čuv.) ‘Salz’. – Miller 151f.
tühäji (Yak.) ‘Rast; Lager’. – Kaluž. A 19
tüjgän see jügän
tüktögä (Čul.) ‘Fell’. – StachM B 117
tüktüjä (Yak.) ‘Gefäß aus Birkenrinde’. – Kaluż. A 30
fül (Yak.) – tēlēk (Čuv.) ‘Traum’. – Miller F 35; StachM D 177f.
tūlāji (Yak.) ‘Stör’. – Kaluż. A 17
tūmāči see sibāči
tūmāki – čūmāki (Yak.) ‘Art Kauz oder Eule’. – Kaluż. 24
tūnā-kūnū (Dolg.) ‘tags und nachts’. – StachM F 93. – Cf. tūnū
tūnnūk (Dolg.) ‘Fenster’. – Ölmez C 273
tūnū (Dolg.) ‘Nacht’. – StachM F 89. – Cf. tūnā-kūnū
tūŋāhā (Yak.) ‘ein Brauch, dem gemäß ein Jäger das Fleisch der von ihm erlegten Tiere den Nachbarn schenkt’. – Kaluż. A 39
tūŋāji (Yak.) ‘Waldesdickicht’. – Kaluż. A 21
tūptāx (Yak.) ‘Kochtopf’. – Kaluż. A 30 s.v. tūktūjā
tūrktūn (Oyr.) ‘1. Maulwurf; 2. (frauenspr.) Schwein’. – Hauenschild A 73
tūtūn (Oyr.) ‘Maulwurf’ . – Hauenschild A 73
tūš (dTL) ‘to fall’. – Miller C 153f.
tyala (Dolg.) ‘Wind’. – StachM F 91
ţyáltajy (Yak.) ‘Bär’. – Kaluż. A 21
tyg (OUyg.) ‘seven-hole flute’. – Miller E 283
ţişajy see tįşajı
*ttygok ~ *tugok (SibT) ‘nur’. – Helimski A 132f.
tyjmēt (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 154
tyAk (Yak.) ‘Geschlechtsorgan der Frau’. – Kaluż. A 27 s.v. tylēja
tyblās (Yak.) ‘Dolmetscher’. – Anikin A 77; StachM L 197
tyimāč ~ dilmāč (dTL) ‘Dolmetscher’. – Anikin A 77; StachM L 197
tylyja (Yak.) ‘Kloritis’. – Kaluż. A 27
tynnājy ‘Fisch’. – Kaluż. A 19
tyrāxy ~ turāktı (Yak.) ‘Möwe’. – Kaluż. A 25
typtājy (Yak.) ‘Berühren’. – Kaluż. A 19
tyba ~ uγaha (Yak.) ‘Fohlen’. – Kaluż. A 39
učitela (Dolg.) ‘Lehrer’. – StachM F 93
ţug (dTL) ‘upper part, top ribs of a tent’. – Miller F 25
ţugaha s. uţba
ţugājy (Yak.) ‘Lockmittel; Falle; Schläue’. – Kaluż. A 19
ţuňuja see uoĥuja
uţan- (Ott.) ‘wach werden’. – Ölmez E 40
uţar- (Ott.) ‘wecken; anregen’. – Ölmez E 40
ţuk (SibT) ‘Filzstrumpf’. – StachM B 117
ţuląjy (Yak.) ‘halbausegetrockneter Baum’. – Kaluż. A 18
ulaxanągā ~ ulaxanunąjy (Yak.) ‘sehr groß, riesig’. – Kaluż. A 21
ulaxanunąjy see ulaxanągā
uldük (MK) ‘unshod’. – Tekin E 662
uldy- ~ oldy- (MK) ‘to go barefoot’. – Tekin E 662
umakî see ymâky
una (Dolg.) ‘rechter’. – StachM F 91
unaj (Tat.) ‘Richtung’. – Agyagási A 10
unou ~ öbu ~ uopça (Dolg.) ‘Bissen, Happen’. – StachM F 93
uohâjy (Yak.) ‘vom Flußwasser ausgespülte Vertiefung’. – Kałuż. A 21
uohuja ~ ühuja (Yak.) ‘Meerbusen, Bucht’. – Kałuż. A 28
uopça see uobu
uraha (Yak.) ‘Stangenzelt’. – Kałuż. A 40
urçuk (NUyg.) ~ ûrşyk (Kzk.) ‘spindle’. – Nugteren A 687
ûrşyk see urçuk
urtû ~ urtûs (Yak.) ‘mercury, quicksilver’. – StachM O 236
urug (dTL) ‘progeny, descendants’. – Miller B 94
us (MT) ‘reason’. – Tezcan A 164
usan (Uyg.) ‘lettuce’. – Jarring A 55, fn. 23
uz(y) see ûz III
ûčâ (Šr.) ‘Großmutter väterlicherseits’. – StachM B 113
ûčâhâ s. ûtâhâ
ûkûs (OT) ‘viel’. – Ölmez D 283
ûlät (Bšk.) ‘Seuche’. – StachM B 108f.
ûli (Tat.) ‘dead’. – Rôna B 621
ûlik (Tat.) ‘corpse’. – Rôna B 621
ûnâji (Yak.), eine Pflanze. – Kałuż. A 17
ûrdü (Dolg.) ‘Oberfläche’. – StachM F 89. – Cf. örütä
ûrt- (Dolg.) ‘Angst bekommen’. – StachM I 227
ûrüjä I (Yak.) ‘Bach, kleiner Fluß’. – Kałuż. A 30
ûrüjä II ~ ürüö (Yak.) ‘Maulkorb für Kälber’. – Kałuż. A 27
ûrümkä ~ rûmkä ~ ürüŋkä ~ örümkä ~ ürümpä (Yak.) ‘Schnapsglas’. – Anikin A 67
ûrümpä see ürümkä
ûrüŋkä see ürümkä
ûrüö see ürüjä II
ûrüt see üzüt
ûskirä ~ oskûrâ [sic!] ~ sükrâ (Anat.; Ott.) ‘an earthen dish; saucer’. – Tezcan C 36
üst (dTL) ‘upper part’. – StachM O 235
üştürdi (OT) ‘from above’. – Itabashi A 388
ütâhâ ~ ütühâ ~ üčâhâ (Yak.) ‘Bratspieß’. – Kałuż. A 39
ütâk see ütük
ütühâ s. ûtâhâ
üttük ~ ütük (Anat.) ‘sensitive to cold’. – StachM O 235
üz (dTl) ‘fat’. – Miller C 151
űzütt ~ üütiit (dTl) ‘Grab; Seele; Geist’. – StachM 118
vakla- (Trkm.) ‘rauschen [Wasser]’. – StachM B 115 (s.v. mäs)
*värkēc see *ōrkūc
*vātag see *ōtak
vyrān (Čuv.) ‘Platz, Stelle; Bett’. – Berta C 30
vyrt- (Čuv.) ‘liegen’. – Berta C 30
xadyha ~ xodūha (Yak.) ‘Heuwiese’. – Kaluž. A 36
xağgyk (Trkm.) ‘Eidechsenart, Agame’. – Hauenschild B 146
xağyna (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 151, fn. 67
xāj see hāj(n)
xajmāxy (yak.) ‘größter’. – Kaluž. A 23
xalynaha (Yak.) ‘im Fluß schwimmende Eissstücke’. – Kaluž. A 40
xalıgaj ı (Yak.) ‘Wasserfall’. – Kaluž. A 18
xalıgajy II (Yak.) ‘Abhang’. – Kaluž. A 18
xaltaha see xartaha II
xämajy I (Yak.) ‘Armer, Bettler’. – Kaluž. A 17
xämajy II (Yak.) ‘Anker am Fischfangnetz’. – Kaluž. A 21
xan (dTl) ‘Khan’. – Miller E 289
xänṭar (Yak.) ‘Balkenwaage’. – Anikin A 43
xanajy (Yak.) ‘Eisschicht ohne Wasser darunter’. – Kaluž. A 21. – Cf. xanıkrya
xanıkrya ~ xıkıkura (Yak.) ‘Eisschicht ohne Wasser darunter’. – Kaluž. A 21 –
Cf. xanajy
xappax (Yak.) ‘Deckel’. – StachM B 115 (s.v. kakvak)
xaptányja (Yak.) ‘flach; glatt; Wanze’. – Kaluž. A 27
xaracax see kapyṛčak
xarāččyja (Yak.) ‘[Adj.] mit schwerem Fell [vom Rindvieh]’. – Kaluž. A 27
xaraki~karakky (Yak.) ‘Birk-, Haselhuhn’. – Kaluž. A 25
xara kiiōnāx (Yak.) ‘Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 154
xarāl (Yak.) ‘Viehhürde’. – Anikin A 44
xargyja (Yak.) ‘Rabe’. – Kaluž. A 31
xargyja (Yak.) ‘einfacher Schi’. – Kaluž. A 28
xartaha I (Yak.) ‘Darmfett’. – Kaluž. A 35
xartaha II ~ xaltaha (Yak.) ‘Augenlid’. – Kaluž. A 35. – Cf. kältähä
xaryja (Yak.) ‘Fichte’. – Kaluž. A 31
xaryk (Tuv.) ‘power’. – Tekin E 661
xarykčok (Tuv.) ‘powerless’. – Tekin 661
xäržak see kapyṛčak
xätyja (Yak.) ‘Abfluß’. – Kaluž. A 32
xälāskā s. kälāskā
xîrlü (Čuv.) ‘Bogensehne’. – StachM A 244
xobordöx see koboordăx
xoboordăx see koboordăx
xoburdăx see koboordăx
xoduhă see xadyha
xoyocho (Yak.) ‘Kopfschuppen’. – Kaluž. A 35
xolbo (Yak.) ‘ausgehöhlter Baumstamm; Wasserrinne; Sarg’. – Kaluž. A 27 s.v.
xolbujă
xolbujă (Yak.) ‘Kästchen, Schatulle’. – Kaluž. A 27
xolohō (Yak.) ‘Ähnlichkeit’. – Kaluž. A 37
xomordöx see koboordăx
xompuš (Trk.) ‘Eidechsenart, Agame’. – Hauenschild B 144
xonača see xonoho
xonobo (Yak.) – xonača (Tuv.) ‘ein Gast, der über die Nacht bleibt; Schlafgast’.
   – Kaluž. A 37
xonū (Yak.) ‘Feld; Waldlichtung’. – Kaluž. A 27 s.v. xonūja
xonūja (Yak.) ‘kleines Feld’. – Kaluž. A 27
xönkura see xāŋkyra
xoroho (Yak.) ‘Grube’. – Kaluž. A 37
xört- (Yak.) ‘Angst haben’. – StachM I 227; StachM J 49, fn. 11
xoruobuja I (Yak.) ‘Geldbüchse’. – Kaluž. A 33
xoruobuja II – koruobuja (Yak.) ‘Dach, Überdachung’. – Kaluž. A 33
xos (Khak.) ‘Zeichnung’. – StachM J 47
xospuja (Yak.) ‘Abstellkammer; kleiner Raum’. – Kaluž. A 29
yayaja see yayja
yahājy (Yak.) ‘kleine Fische’. – Kaluž. A 22
ygājy (Yak.) ‘eine Wasservogelgattung’. – Kaluž. A 17
yjayaja see yayja
ykčäky (Yak.) ‘eilig’. – Kaluž. A 23
   A 26
yrāhyja (Yak.) ‘Waldlichtung’. – Kaluž. A 30
yräky (Yak.) ‘Art Schlitten’. – Kaluž. A 26
yryl- (OAT) ‘weggehen’. – Tekin B 213
yskämaya – yskamajka (Yak.) ‘Sitzbank’. – Anikin A 71
yskobra see skobra
ysla- (Tat.dial.) ‘dörren’. – StachM B 118
ysysz (Tksh.) ‘empty, deserted’. – Tekin E 660
ystarsyńa see starsyńa
yšbara (OT), a title. – Ölmez A 184f.
yšta- (SibT) ‘rauchen’. – StachM B 118
yštyk (Čul.) ‘Topf’. – StachM B 118
ytājy (Yak.) ‘Versteck des Jägers’. – Kaľuž. A 19
ytarga see ytyrga
ytyar- (Yak.) ‘to lift, raise’. – StachM O 234
ytyrga ~ ytarga (Dolg.) ‘Ohrring’. – StachM F 94
ýz (Trkm.) ‘mark, stain, blot’. – Miller A 41; Miller F 30
yzan (Tat.) ‘furrow’. – Miller A 41
zām-zām (Az.) ~ zāmzān (Trkm.) ‘Wüstenwaran’. – Hauenschild B 146
zeper gül (Uyg.) ‘a kind of flower’. – Jarring A 41, fn. 4
zārändoly ~ zāränduly ~ zārändüli (Ott.) ‘eine Speise’. – Tezcan C 36
zyihk (Anat.) ‘Heuschrecke; Eidechsenart’. – Hauenschild B 153
žan see janj
žiřiq see jirīj

The dictionary is preceded by a long introduction (Giriş, pages I-LXXVII) composed of five parts. Their contents are as follows:
1. information on Old Turkish (Eski Türkçe) as well as on Osmanlı Turkish of East Anatolia,
2. some phonetic features of Turkish dialects spoken in East Anatolia,
3. a study (deneme) on Turkish dialects of East Anatolia, Kurdish Kurmancî dialect included (!),
4. a study (deneme) on word formation and word structure in the (Turkish) dialects of East Anatolia, Kurdish dialects being treated as Turkish (!),
5. information on some phonetic features of the Kurdish dialects of Palu region (ilçe) being a part of Elâçığ province (vilayet, il).

The dictionary itself (pages 3-155) contains alphabetically ordered Kurdish words (Kurmandî dialect) followed by material divided into six columns (sections) presenting:
1. meaning of the Kurdish word explained in Turkish,
2. the corresponding Osmanlı Turkish form (if it existed),
3. its meaning which sometimes differs from the meaning of the Kurdish word,
4. the corresponding Modern Turkish form (Türkiye Türkçesi = Turkish of Turkey, Türkeitürkisch),
5. the corresponding forms attested in Turkish dialects of Anatolia.

The book opens with a preface (Söz başı) by Prof. Dr. Reşat Genç (p. VII-VIII) and is closed by a short biography (p. 157-8) of the author, a professor and prorector of the Fırat Üniversitesi at Elâçığ.

Before 1994 no etymological dictionary of the Kurdish language had existed, so the issue of Prof. Dr. T. Gülensoy’s book seemed to fill that gap within Iranian linguistics. Unfortunately it is not the case since we have to deal with a work, let me state it bluntly, of a pseudo-scientific character. It is true that T. Gülensoy uses linguistic terminology and meticulously quotes pages of the used sources, but – on the other hand – he totally ignores the past output of Indo-European linguistics which convincingly explained the genetic relationship of the Kurdish language as early as in nineteenth century.

Kurdish dialects belong to the North-Western group of Iranian languages which, together with Indo-Aryan languages, form the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family of languages. There is no doubt about it. A relatively great number of Turkish loan-words in Kurdish dialects (according to T. Gülensoy
Turkish words make 17% of the dictionary*Kürtçe-Türkçe Sözlük* written by Mehmet Emin Bozarslan, see*KES*: XLVIII-XLIIX) does not testify to their affiliation to the Altaic family of languages to which the Turkish belongs, just as the great amount of Latin and French words does not make English a Romance language. The same applies to the Turkish language which is not a Semitic language despite of a great number of Arabic lexical borrowings which had penetrated its vocabulary.

Prof. T. Gülensoy not only ignores the historical comparative phonetics but also disregards entirely the grammar. He knows, in fact, that — compared with Persian (South-West Iranian) “zelf” — Kurdish (North-West Iranian) dialects reveal “zelf” written <j> in the official Kurmanci spelling based on the Turkish-Latin alphabet. On page LIII we find pairs like: Persian zehr ‘poison’ – Kurdish jehr etc. But, in order to account for that correspondence, the author uses an inexact expression: dönüştür ‘it turns, it is transformed’.

Prof. T. Gülensoy takes it for granted that Kurdish dialects are Turkish and does not become discouraged by the fact that all Kurdish grammar is obviously Iranian (though not all details have been historically explained). No Turkish/ Turkic inflectional suffixes occur in Kurmanci: neither markers of case category in nominal inflection nor personal endings in verb conjugation, to say nothing about vocal harmony, so characteristic of Turkic languages but absent in Kurdish.

It is not true that, according to Prof. T. Gülensoy’s statement (p. XLVII, item 4), Kurdish grammar makes an entanglement (confusion, mixture) of Arabic, Persian and Turkish elements (“...Arapça, Farsça ve Türkçe unsurlardan mürekkep, karmaşık bir tablo”). The vocabulary of Kurdish dialects does have such a mixed character, just as it is the case in the vocabulary of the Turkish language. But Kurdish grammar is not a mixture of elements borrowed from various languages. It is purely Iranian.

Prof. T. Gülensoy misuses his erroneous premise about the allegedly mixed character of Kurdish grammar to make a statement that “the Kurmanci dialect is nowadays a dialect of the Turkish language” (“Kürmanç ağızı bugünkü halî ile de Türkçe’ nin bir ağzıdır”, p. XLVII, item 7). He bases his statement exclusively on the existence of numerous Turkish lexemes in Kurdish vocabulary. This statement has nothing in common with the scientific study of the Turkish language and serves purposes of political propaganda. It is even indicated in the very first sentence of Prof. R. Genç’s preface (p. VII) where we read that the author, Prof. T. Gülensoy, “by his scientific work entitled <An Etymological Dictionary of the Kurdish Language – a Study> gave answer to propagandist activities aiming to shake the unity of the Turkish language” (“...Türk dil birliğini bozmaya yönelik propaganda faaliyetlerine <Kürtçe’nin Eitimolojik Sözlüğü – Deneme> isimli ilmi eseri ile cevap verdi”). It is obvious that the author’s intention was to offer argu-
ments to those Turkish politicians who refuse to acknowledge the Kurds living in Turkey as a national minority, distinct from Turks, and to grant them any rights.

In his efforts to make Kurdish material conform with the assumption that it is a Turkish dialect Prof. T. Gülensoy has sometimes recourse to surprising associations. He derives, for instance, Kurdish (Kurmanji) 1. person sg. pronoun (casus rectus) form ez, spelled az on p. XLVI, from Turkish öz ‘essence’. However, for many years it has been known that Kurdish (Kurmanji) ez ‘I’ corresponds exactly to Avestan azəm, Old Ind. aham, Greek and Latin ego, Old Church Slavonic azb etc. (Cabolov 1978: 18-19). On page 75 Turkish word ez ‘lord, sahib’ from an Anatolian dialect is quoted as a form corresponding to Kurdish ez, too.

The fact that izafe-forms of Kurmançî (this typical Iranian structure has been adopted in Turkish from the Persian language) distinguish grammatical gender (absent in Turkish) and can be evidently traced back to old Iranian relative pronouns (Cabolov 1978: 9) does not discountenance Prof. T. Gülensoy who is not interested in Kurdish grammar.

How grammar is neglected in the reviewed dictionary can also be seen in the interpretation of the Kurmançî form bi-k-im (1. pers. sg. conjunctive of kirin ‘to do’ equal to Persian be-kon-am of kardan) in the example of a sentence on p. XLVI. The form is shortly “explained” by: < Farsça (= Persian) bi-kerden.

Kurdish infinitives ending in -in (Persian -an) do not arouse Prof. T. Gülensoy’s suspicion that we have to deal with an Iranian language. So he derives (on p. 28), with unconcern, the Kurdish infinitive bûn (bûyîn) ‘to be’ (= Persian bu- dan) from the Persian substantive (!) bon ‘root, basis’. The last example shows clearly that Prof. T. Gülensoy puts freely words together without any respect to strict rules. Some phonetic similarity is sufficient for him. Another example of such inadmissible freedom is Kurmançî agir ‘fire’ (p. 3) which is linked, without reason, to Persian ăzar.

Sometimes the author’s lack of acquaintance with Iranian linguistics (e.g. his ignorance of Kurdish word formation) leads to embarrassing misunderstandings. So the new-coined Kurdish word pê'nûs (p. 118) meaning ‘pen’, literally ‘write-with-it’, composed of pê (being a combination of preposition bi with the archaic pronominal suffix of the 3. person sg. -ê < *hê, cf. Late Avestan hê, cf. Cabolov 1978: 26-27, 79) and the verbal root nûs (infinitive: nûsin, nivîsandin ‘to write’), is derived from ... Latin penes, of course through the Turkish mediation.

Prof. T. Gülensoy does not differentiate native Kurdish (Iranian) lexical material from Persian loan-words. Both (!) are labelled as borrowed from Persian. Sometimes, in fact, Kurdish and Persian forms are identical or very similar. But in many cases both forms are evidently distinct, e.g. ‘eye’ is in Kurdish çav which regularly corresponds to Persian čašm (Blau: 329). T. Gülensoy interprets çav as borrowed from Persian čašm (which is wrong) the same way as Kurdish
dest ‘hand’ which is really a loan-word from Persian dast, as in Kurdish we should have *zest (cf. Avestan zasta-). Kurdish dot ‘girl’ (p. 66) remains unexplained as the author does not know that Kurdish dot corresponds regularly to Persian doxt(ar) like sotin ‘to burn’ = Persian suxtan etc.

Sometimes etymological doublets occur in Kurdish, e.g. bajar (= baṭar) is a native word meaning ‘town’ whereas bazar ‘market’ is a Persian loan-word (like English bazaar). Prof. T. Gülensoy does not remember the Kurdish “z” – Persian “z” correspondence (although he quotes some pairs of the kind on p. LIII) and tries to interpret bajar (baṭar) as a Turkish word related to dialectal Turkish bayar ‘unsowed field’ (p. 8: “ekilmemiş toprak”).

There are also inconsistencies of another type, e.g. in bexşiş ‘present, gift, prize’ T. Gülensoy justly sees a borrowing from Persian (cf. English baksheesh), but, unexpectedly, he derives Kurdish infinitive bexšiñ ‘to offer, to present (a gift)’, related to Persian baxšidan, from ... Turkish bağış ‘forgiveness’ (p. 17).

Sometimes a Kurdish item is followed by information that the word has been borrowed from Persian but the Persian word is not quoted, e.g. çû ‘to go’ (p. 43), wrongly for çûn (çûyîn). The author does not know that it is a native Iranian (not Persian) Kurdish word corresponding historically to Persian šodan ‘to become’ (originally ‘to go’ as in Kurdish) parallel to Old Ind. root cuy- ‘to fall, to go’ (Cabolov 1976: 38). After its derivative çûn-geh ‘road, passage’ (KES: 44 “yol, geçit”) there follows information: < Fars. çûn + geh ‘road, way’ (Turkish “yol”). F. Steingass’s Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary does not know such (çûn-gah) word and gah (gah) means ‘place’ in Persian. Persian çûn (< cûn), cf. Old Persian či- ‘what’ and Avestan gauna- ‘manner, way’, Middle Persian či-yün (Horn: 100, MacKenzie: 23) has nothing in common with Kurdish çûn (= Persian šodan) which is a verb. Similarly, after Kurdish čiya ‘mountain’ (p. 42) we find no information on what the Persian correspondence is. Actually čiya is a native Kurdish equivalent of Persian čakâd ‘forehead’ (Cabolov 1976: 29).

On the other hand, Kurdish erzan ‘cheap’, an evident borrowing from Persian arzân (in a native Kurdish word we should have “z” in place of “ç”), is not followed by qualification: < Fars.

The number of such inconsistencies and misinterpretations in T. Gülensoy’s dictionary is great. Its another disadvantage is the lack of many important native Iranian Kurdish words like: birçi ‘hungry’ (= Persian gorosne, cf. Cabolov 1976: 38), anûn ‘to bring’ (related to Old Ind. root nû- ‘to lead’), hatin ‘to come’ (cf. Old Persian and Avestan av- ‘to go’, cf. Cabolov 1976: 14), to say nothing about words the etymology of which is not clear like din ‘another’, ali ‘side’ etc.

By reason of the objections mentioned above one could hesitate if Prof. T. Gülensoy’s dictionary, based on false assumptions, does have any value and can be recommended to anybody. Well, I think it does have, after all, some value, because:
1. It identifies many Arabic loan-words in Kurdish (although some etymologies are highly doubtful, e.g. Kurdish reş ‘black’ < Arab. rasš ‘splashing, drizzle’, or false like war < wašr, see below). Their majority have penetrated Kurdish dialects through the mediation of the Turkish language. But it would be interesting to separate these from those borrowed directly from Arabic (perhaps from dialects spoken in Turkey). Probably such a direct loan-word, from Arabic hawd, is Kurdish hewd ‘bath tub, basin’ for in Turkish we have hav(u)z.

2. The words marked by an asterix are meant by T. Gülensoy as native Kurdish-Turkish words. They are not, but they are given Turkish “equivalents”, so they can be identified, as loan-words, with corresponding Turkish words. We can draw conclusions that (contrary to the author’s opinion), for instance, Kurdish iş ‘work’ (p. 99) has been borrowed from Turkish iš etc.

3. Paradoxically, once more contrary to T. Gülensoy’s intentions, the last column (section) in his dictionary, where Turkish dialectal material from East Anatolia is given, can be viewed as a potential field of borrowings from ... Kurdish. It could be shocking, probably, for the author, but it is true. Many a Kurdish word (as well as Armenian) has penetrated Turkish dialects. It has been proved by Dr. Uwe Bläising of Leiden University in his studies (see bibliography, below). The source of Turkish dialectal words (quoted by T. Gülensoy on pages: 12, 75, 81, 85, 92, 146 s.v.) are such Kurdish lexemes as: belengaz ‘poor, beggar’ (maybe from Arabic-Persian belā-qazā ‘without food’, cf. Skalmowski: 175), ēzing ‘wood’ (not from Turkish odun, as T. Gülensoy thinks, p. 75, but a native Iranian word related to Persian hizom, cf. Horn: 249, Bläising 1997: 98), gav ‘step’ (= Pers. gam!, different from Pers. gāv ‘cow’ which corresponds to Kurdish ga), golik ‘call’ (Bläising 1997: 98), hēsin ‘green, blue’, war ‘place for spending the night, camping-ground’ (not from Arabic wašr but an archaic Iranian word corresponding to Avestan var- ‘Schloss, Burg’, cf. Bartholomae: 1363).

As far as the Iranian lexical elements present in Kurdish are concerned, T. Gülensoy’s dictionary is almost useless because – as it was showed above – it does not differentiate between native (Iranian) Kurdish words and those (also Iranian) borrowed from Persian.
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Jörundur Hilmarsson (1946-1992), a well known linguist in the field of Tocharian studies and the editor of the excellent journal *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* (*TIES*, vol. 1-6) began to write an etymological dictionary of Tocharian in 1991. This work was intended to form the basis for the Tocharian part of the Leiden project of a new Indo-European Etymological Dictionary. Unfortunately, the author’s untimely death on 13th August 1992 suddenly interrupted his research. Hilmarsson only managed to finish most entries for the letter *k*- and many ones for the initial letters *a*-*, å*- and *ā*-. The manuscript which Hilmarsson left behind “is not what he would have considered a perfectly publishable work”, but the editors have prepared it to be published as the fifth volume in the *TIES Supplementary Series*. They have followed carefully the author’s manuscript with minimal corrections of the English text, adding only a foreword (pp. VII-VIII) and an index of non-Tocharian forms (pp. 239-246) and also completing the list of bibliographical references (pp. 219-238).

Though the reviewed publication is not a complete whole, it appears to be a significant development after Van Windekens’ etymological dictionaries of 1941 and 1976. Hilmarsson’s etymologies are better founded than those proposed by Albert J. Van Windekens. Both old and new suggestions demonstrate a close connection of Tocharian with Germanic, Baltic and Slavic. In fact, there are

---


2 A. J. Van Windekens, *Lexique étymologique des dialectes tokhariens*, Louvain 1941; the same, *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indoeuropéennes*, vol. 1: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*, Louvain 1976. There also exists an unpublished etymological dictionary of Tocharian B prepared by D. Q. Adams (it was quoted and used by Hilmarsson in his *Materials*).

many isoglosses connecting the Tocharian and Balto-Slavic languages\(^4\). However, it is possible to extend the number of the isoglosses between Balto-Slavic and Tocharian. Below I provide some loose observations which appear during my reading of the reviewed publication.


[p. 84] Both Toch. B kare (adj.) and A kär (adj.) ‘good’ derive from CT *kāræ and IE. *gheros (adj.) ‘good’, cf. Lith. gēras (adj.) ‘good’\(^5\) and Arm. gel (adj.) ‘id.’ (with an incidental development of IE. *r to l, e.g. IE. *ōstér ‘star’ > Arm. astl, gen. astel ‘id.’, IE. *kápros ‘he-goat’ > Arm. k’al ‘id.’, and so on). Note that both the Tocharian and Armenian equivalents reflect IE. velar *gh initially, not the labiovelar *gh\(^4\) which is regularly palatalized before -e- to Toch. š and Arm. j. Thus, the Lithuanian, Tocharian and Armenian adjectives cannot be connected with the Greek comparative φέρτερος ‘braver, better’ and the superla-

---


\(^5\) The relationship between Lithuanian gēras ‘good’ and the Tocharian adjectives (B kar / kartse ‘good’, A kär / krats, etc.) was first proposed by Specht in 1947, but his premature analysis (IE. *gʷH\(^2\)-) remains impossible phonologically.
tives φέρτατος, φέρτιστος ‘the bravest, the best’ (from *bher-,
harly from
*gh*er- or *gher-). Hilmarsso repeats an old equation with OIr. carae m.
‘friend’ (so originally H. Pedersen in 1925), which is less persuasive from both
the semantic and phonological view-points.

[p. 71] Toch. B kâlpške, kâlyške, kâlske (m.) ‘youth, boy’ (< CT.
*kâlyp’tásákæ) reminds me the Slavic diminutive term for ‘young servant, boy’,
*cholpvočkũ. Both derive from the Indo-European root *khalp- by means of the
same diminutive suffix -k(w)iko-. For the equivalence of Toch. B -ške and Slavic
-čkũ, see Toch. B kântwâške ‘little tongue’ and Slavic *języčkũ ‘id.’ (both from
IE. *[d]ňghũ-k(w)iko-). The connection with Ocel. halr ‘man’ (< IE. *kali-),
preferred by Hilmarsso, does not explain the Tocharian forms with -p-. Also
semantical aspects support the etymology suggested above.

pl. kârwâmsam) ‘id.’ derive securely from CT. *krâm’ěnã and IE. *kreměn-i-
‘flintstone’, cf. Slavic *kreměn ‘flintstone, silex’ (also ‘rock, stone’ in the
dialects, e.g. OCzech křemen ‘rock’, Ukr. krémń m. ‘flintstone’, dial. kremen
‘mountain, rock, flintstone, stone’ and so on), Latv. krems, krams m. ‘flintstone’,
Lith. (Eastern) krams m. ‘id.’ (see Trautmann BSW 141). Note also Gk. dial.
χέρμα n. ‘flintstone’ (after Slawski SEJP III 216). Hilmarsso repeats the traditional
etymological association between Skt. grávan- ‘stone for pressing soma’, OIr.
bráu ‘mill-stone’, which is phonologically impossible.

[p. 126] Toch. B kele ‘navel’ “is attested only in the singular and, therefore,
theoretically, could reflect either an original masc. thematic o-stem or a neuter s-
stem”. According to J. Hilmarsso, “the radical -e- < IE. *-o- would favour the
first alternative”. Unfortunately, the author did not take into consideration the
Slavic word for ‘wheel, circle, disk’, *kolo (gen. sg. *kolese), which represents a
neuter es-stem with the radical vowel -o-. Thus it seems equally possible that the
Tocharian B kele, as well as Slavic *kolo, goes back to IE. *k’ólos (an es-stem
neuter). It is worth noticing that the o-stem nouns contain not only the root o-
vocalism (e.g. Gk. πόλος m. ‘turning point’ and OIr. cul ‘wagon’, originally dual
*k’oló), but also radical -e- (cf. Ocel. hvel ‘wheel’ and OPrus. kelen ‘id.’).

[p. 147] Toch. B klâwi m. ‘renown’ (also in the compound ņem-klawi
‘renown’) represents the same root vocalism like Lith. šlovè f. and Slavic *slava
f. ‘renown’ (all from *klaw- < *klowH1-). This base is a simple reinterpretation of
IE. *kléwH1-os- ‘renown’ (but ‘word’ in Iranian and Slavic), cf. Toch. B -kâlywe,
A -klyu ‘renown’ and Slavic *slovo (es-stem neuter) ‘word’.

animal), leg, paw’ with Slavic *golëm ‘leg, shinbone’ (cf. OChSl. golëm ‘leg’,
SC. göljen, Pol. golen m. ‘shinbone’, Czech holeñ), suggesting an Indo-

---

6 Cf. Arm. bari adj. ‘good’, Av. bairišta- adj. superlat. ‘der am besten pflegt, hegt’
(Pokorny IEW 128-129).
European protoform *gol-oi-. However, the Slavic term is related to the adjective *gol-_o_ ‘naked, bald’ (< IE. *gh”alós ‘id.’, cf. Gk. φαλακρός adj. ‘bald at head’s crown’, φάλανθος adj. ‘bald in front’). Thus, the Indo-European archetype for the Tocharian and Slavic words for ‘(hind)leg’ should be reconstructed as *gh”alénd- or the like.

[p. 174] Toch. B. kranko ‘cock, cockrel’ (< CT. *kr’anko) is derived from the Indo-European root *krenk- ‘to croak, caw, make a rough sound’. Hilmarsson quotes only the Balto-Slavic verbs for ‘to croak, caw’ (Lith. krankti and PSl. *krékati, see ESSJa 12, p. 143), but a closer equivalent is Slavic dial. *kréký f. ‘wild duck’ (cf. Russ. krjakva f. ‘id’, BRus. krákva f. ‘a kind of wild duck, Anas strepera’).7

[p. 191] Toch. A kum ‘wisp of (white) hair’ goes back to CT. *kwáemmâ and IE. *k’osmu-, cf. Slavic *kosmâ, dimin. kosmykâ m. ‘tuft of hair or fibres; hair’ (OPol. kosm ‘wisp of hair’, Pol. kosmyk, ORus. kosmâ m. ‘hair, wisp of hair’, ChSl. kosmâ ‘hair’, Ukr. kósm m. ‘tuft of hair or wool’, see Sławiński SEJP II 524-525). Hilmarsson’s derivation from IE. *kwid-mo- ‘the white (wisp)’ is not persuasive.

The etymologies and supplements suggested above confirm V. Georgiev’s theory about very close connections between the Tocharian and Balto-Slavic languages. But Tocharian is a separate branch of the Indo-European family, which demonstrates exclusive isoglosses with other related languages. Here I cite only these isoglosses, which Hilmarsson omits in his dictionary.


[p. 145] Toch. B klautso (f.) ‘ear’ and A klots (f. du.) ‘ears’ reflect CT. *klout’â and IE. *kloustå f. ‘ear’ (by metathesis of -st-). The Celtic languages attest the same formation (e.g. Welsh clûst f. ‘ear’ < IE. *kloustå f.) and an analogous metathesis (cf. OIr. clúas f. ‘ear’ < Goidelic *klout’â < IE. *kloustå).

[p. 204] Toch. B kwarsâr (m. sg.), A kursâr (m. sg.) ‘vehicle, means of salvation’, also ‘league, mile’ (originally u-stem) cannot be dissociated from Scythian kara País (pl.) ‘nomadic vehicles’ (u-stem).


---


8 Note that intervocal IE. -m- yields Toch. -w-. Thus Tocharian A -m- reflects a cluster, e.g. -mb(h)-, -sm-, -d(h)m-, or the like.
A number of Tocharian words give a useful information on the prehistory of the Tocharian people, e.g.

[p. 192] Toch. A Ḃaṇaṣ ‘fight, conflict’ is, according to my opinion, an early borrowing from Hurrian gunuše ‘id.’. The opposite direction is possible, but not conclusive.

Finally, I would like to pay attention to the regressive dissimilation of n-n > ń-n in Tocharian, whose presence is constantly ignored by Hilmarsson. This process, however, explains not only initial ń- in the Toch. B ṇem, A ḃom ‘name’ (< CT. * ńemān < IE. *H₂yómān)¹⁰, but also such instances as:


[p. 82] Toch. B kām ‘song’ < CT. *kāmān (with the nasal dissimilation) < IE. *kāmny n. ‘id.’. A regressive dissimilation of similar nature appears also in Lat. carmen n. ‘song’ (< *canmen, cf. Lat. cano ‘I sing’). The West Tocharian verb kām- denoting ‘to sing’ (rather than ‘to play’) seems to be derived from the above noun.

It is clear that the Tocharian etymology plays an indispensable role in the recent flourishing of Indo-European reconstructions. The reviewed dictionary, which is a posthumous work of a prominent young Icelandic linguist, the last (but not least) pearl in his numerous and precious contributions to the Tocharian studies¹¹, will become a useful aid in preparing a new Indo-European Comparative and Etymological Dictionary in Łódź, as well as in Leiden. Thus it is necessary to continue the work started by Hilmarsson. But the question: who is able to manage this task? – remains for the moment without answer.

Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK (Łódź)
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