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Names of Cereals in the Turkic Languages
The work presents etymologies of the Turkic names for the seven most important cereals: barley, corn, millet, oats, rice, rye and wheat. Altogether, 106 names are discussed.

As yet, this subject has not been dealt with as a whole. Propositions for etymologies of various names in single languages are scattered in dictionaries and articles, usually only accompanied by a brief explanation. Here, the author tries to provide a possibly comprehensive commentary.

Each entry presents a list of phonetic variants of the word, an overview of previous etymologies and the author’s standpoint expressed as exhaustively as possible but without loquacity.

The work closes with an enumeration and brief commentary of the most common naming patterns and semantic types which can be distinguished in the presented material.
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Introduction

Aim and Scope of This Work
The aim of this work is to work out the etymologies of the names of the seven most important cereals (barley Hordeum L., corn Zea mays L., millet Panicum L., oats Avena L., rice Oryza Sativa L., rye Secale Cereale L., and wheat Triticum L.) in the Turkic languages.

The current, rather uneven state of comparative dialectology and lexicography of the Turkic languages does not allow us to perform full comparisons. We have therefore limited ourselves to literary names, and only included selected dialectal forms. For the same reason, the names of subspecies and varieties have been excluded.

State of Art and Sources
Our subject has not as yet been dealt with as a whole. Of the papers in the Turkic languages that are devoted to the names of plants (not just cereals) the most detailed has been written L. V. Dmitrieva (1972). This, however, only contains an extremely limited commentary. Etymological propositions for various names in single languages are scattered in etymological dictionaries, generally only accompanied by a brief explanation, and in numerous articles where a more comprehensive commentary is usually provided.

The bulk of the sources used in this paper are dictionaries, mainly Russian post-revolutionary ones (abbreviated RKirgS, TuwRS &c.), also etymological dictionaries (an especially large amount of data is to be found in ESTJa), various articles and publications devoted to the vocabulary and/or grammar of single languages, and descriptions of dialects (mainly Turkish).

Structure of an Entry
- Alphabetical list of forms ordered by pronunciation
  Enables a preliminary investigation of the phonetical diversity of names. All variants are ordered alphabetically and linked with a system of cross-references.
- Alphabetical list of forms ordered by languages
  Presents the diversity of the names in one language. Comparing the stock of names in languages from one group can help to find out which forms should be treated as the standard ones.
- Brief overview of previous etymologies
  For lesser investigated words, we have tried to summarise the entire literature available to us. For those which are better known, we have only selected the most important works. All papers have been treated equally, including the ones which we cannot be ready to accept, given the present state of art.
- Commentary
  The commentary consists of a discussion with the propositions summarised before and a presentation of our own views.
Transcription

We have tried to present all Turkic forms in a unified, phonological transcription. The distinction between palatal \( k, q \) : velar \( q, \gamma \) has only been preserved for OUyg., Uyg. and Uzb., as in all the other languages it is unequivocally determined by the position. By the same token, we have abandoned the marking of labialization of \( a \) in Uzb. (as resulting systematically from the orthography) and of spirantization of \( s \) and \( z \) in Trkm.; however, we have preserved it in Bšk. where it has a phonological significance. Apart from this, a dual transcription has been employed for \( e \): wide \( ã \) vs narrow \( e \) for languages where they are separate phonemes, and neutral \( e \) for the others.
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- László Károly, MA (Szeged, Hungary) for helping me access some of the more inaccessible literature,
- Doctor Kinga Maciuszak (Cracow, Poland) for professional advice and Iranistic help,
- Professor Andrzej Pisowicz (Cracow, Poland) for professional advice and Iranistic help,
- Professor Marek Stachowski (Cracow, Poland) for a great amount of help and time without which this work would not be completed,
- Professor Alexander Vovin (Honolulu, USA) for Sinological help.
Barley was one of the first domesticated cereals in the world. The oldest grains of spelt are thought to be nine thousand years old, and have been found in Jarmo, Kurdistan from where it probably originates. Its cultivation had spread westwards from this region around the 5th millennium BC, to Mesopotamia, Egypt and elsewhere.

Domesticated barley (Hordeum vulgare) is believed to have originated from the eastern part of the Central Asian Centre, from where it spread West and South-West, i.e. to India, Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt, and later to Greece and Italy (4th c. BC) and even further.

The area between Siberia and the Pacific is now used for the cultivation of barley, but the plant was only introduced there in the 19th c.

Compared to other cereals, especially to wheat which is equally old, or perhaps even older, barley has very few varieties: 29 species, including 16 stable, but they already existed in the second half of the 4th millennium BC. In the ancient world, barley was very popular; almost every higher culture cultivated it.

Names for ‘barley’ are most uniform in the Turkic languages. Almost all languages have the word arpa, and all the other names only have a very limited range. Interestingly, barley is quite often identified or confused with oats, and while Tel. sula ‘barley’ < ‘oats’, all the other examples of this confusion display just the opposite direction of development. This is understandable given the chronology of domestication of these two cereals – cf. commentary on julaf (point 2), and arpak and harva ‘oats’, and footnote 1.

FORMS:

| apa → arpa | as | řísemen → Žehimien |
| arba → arpa | aš → as | orpa → arpa |
| arbay → arpa | erpe → arpa | sula |
| arpa | harva → arpa | ša’ır |
| arpa | jačmeň | tak-tak |
| arpa | köče | urpa → arpa |
| arpağan | köže → köče | Žesemen → Žehimien |
| arpak | nečimien → Žehimien | Žeh |
| arva | nehimien → Žehimien | Žehimien → Žehimien |
| arvaj | nečimien → Žehimien | Žesemen → Žehimien |

LANGUAGES:

<p>| Az.: arpa | Com.: arpa | Čuv.: orpa, urpa |
| Blk.: arpa | Crm.: arpa | Gag.: arpa |
| Brb.: aš | CTat.: arpa | Kar.: arpa |
| Bšk.: arpa | Čag.: arpa | KarC: arpa |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apa</td>
<td>Uyg.: Raquette 1927, ÊSTJa, Dmitrieva 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arba</td>
<td>Khak.: Dmitrieva 1972, ÊSTJa, Dmitrieva 1979, Çevilek 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel.: arba, sula, Tksh.: arpa, Tksh.dial.: þeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kkkl.: apa</td>
<td>Tof.: jačmeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmk.: apa</td>
<td>Trkm.: arpa, arpagan, Tuv.: arbab, arvaj, köže</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr. Blk.: apa</td>
<td>Uyg.: apa, arpa, erpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küür.: arba</td>
<td>Uzh.: arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyzyl: arba</td>
<td>Yak: :nečimien, nehimien, þesemen, þehimien, þesemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kzk.: arpa, tak-tak</td>
<td>Sag.: arba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc. : apa</td>
<td>SarUyg.: arva, harva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.H: apa</td>
<td>Sr.: aš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRkc.MA: arba, arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRkc.MA.B: arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTkc.MK: arba, arpa, ṣarqaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTkc.MK: arba, arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nog.: arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oghuz.Ir.: arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTkc.: arpa, arpagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūär.: arba</td>
<td>Oyl.: arpa, sa‘îr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kzk.: arpa, tak-tak</td>
<td>Sag.: arba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.: apa</td>
<td>SarUyg.: arva, harva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.H: apa</td>
<td>Sr.: aš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARPA**

**FORMS:**

- **apa** Uyg.: Raquette 1927, ÊSTJa, Dmitrieva 1979
- **arbay** Tuv.: RTUwS, Egorov 1964, Tatarchev 2000–, Çevilek 2005
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arpä MTkc.MA:B: Borovkov 1971: 99
arva SarUyg.: Çevilek 2005
arvaj Tuv.: ESTJa, Dmitrieva 1979
erpe Uyg.: Çevilek 2005
harva SarUyg.: Çevilek 2005

languages:

etymology:
1949: Räsänen: 236; limits himself to a comparison with Mo. arbaj, Ma. arfa, Afg. orbūsah, Gr. ἀλφα [sic; cf. KWb 1976 and Steblin-Kamenskij 1982]
1952: Joki: the Altaic forms belong to the same group as Afg. and Gr., ‘but not directly’ against uniting PIE *albhâ-, Gr. ἄλφα and Alb. elp [elbi]
1963: TMEN 445: Tkc. > Mo. (> Sal., Tuv.; Ma.), Hung. et al. against the possibility of PIE *albhâ- > Ir. *arpa-, but does not exclude the possibility of IE origin in general
1964: Egorov: limits himself to enumerating forms from various Tkc. languages
1969: VEWT: limits himself to providing bibliography and remarking that Hung. árpa ‘barley’ < Çuv. urpa
1972: Clauson: ? < IE (? Toch.) (referring to TMEN 445)
1974: ESTJa: limits himself to summarizing previous propositions
1976: KWb: puts together Tkc. arpa and Ma. arfa, Afg. orbūsah, Gr. ἀλφα
1979: Dmitrieva 164f.: < OIr. or old IE; or common in Alt. and IE MTKc.MA arbaj, Tuv. arvaj < Mo.
1982: Steblin-Kamenskij: puts together Afg. orbēši, urbēši et al. < ? *arpasyā- (after EVP) and maybe Gr. ἄλφι, ἄλφην ‘(pearl) barley (porridge); flour’
1990: Róna-Tas: 31: quotes the comparison with Gr. alflōn, Alb. elp and Ir. *arb/pa allowing the possibility of < Ir. *arb/pa, but remarks that the Ir. form has only been reconstructed basing on the Tkc. ones; Ma. arfa, Mo. arbaj < Tkc.
1993: EWU: probably from some IE language
1998: Jarring: 14: probably < IE (? Toch.)
1999: Eren: limits himself to summarizing previous propositions
2000: Tatarkin: * 'to multiply oneself, to be numerous' + *p intens. + -a
Joki's 1952 proposition not grounded sufficiently
2000: Tietze: limits himself to quoting Doerfer's 1993: 85 opinion on borrowing from Mo. to Tkc.
2005: Çevilek: accepts Clauson's 1972 proposition

COMMENTARY:
This word is unusually common in the Tkc. languages, and, at first glance, the phonetic
diversity of all its forms is surprisingly small. This commonality might be understood
as a sign that the Tkc. people became acquainted with barley very early on, perhaps as
one of the first cereals. The uniformity of the sounding should probably be attributed
to the phonetically very simple structure of the word, which does not provoke any seri-
ous changes by itself. The meaning of the word is the same everywhere, too, except for
1. SarUyg. *harva which means both 'barley' and 'oats' (cf.), 2. for an obvious influence
of Russ. in Bšk., Tat. and Tksh. meanings of 'stye' (after ESTJa; see also VEW), and
3. for a simple semantic shift in Az. dial. 'ladies' barley grain shaped decoration' &c.
(after ESTJa).

The name is also present in the Mo. and Ma. languages, where it is probably a loan-
word from Tkc. cf. ESTJa for further bibliography.

Almost all the etymologists dealing with this word limit themselves to quoting previ-
ous works (often quite inaccurately) about the possible Ir. origin. Only some of them
add their own commentary, which is usually not particularly innovative.

1 Perhaps Sal. *arfa and Tuv. *arva deserve a bit more interest, as the spirantization of p could be
regarded as a trace that these forms are not a continuation of OTkc. *arpa, but rather borrowings
from one of the Mo. languages (cf. Klmk. dial. *arva – however, meaning 'oats'), or alternately,
though this does not seem very probable due to cultural-historical reasons, from Ma. *arfa 'oats;
barley' (cf. julaf 'oats'). However, it might be equally probable that the spirantization is a trivial
innovation in these languages, cf. SarUyg. *harva 'oats'.
Also Sal. *ahr'arar 'barley flour' < *arfa *un (Kakuk 1962: 175) has a strange sounding which does
not seem to be explicable by any regular phonetic law.

2 However, beyond the Tkc. languages the situation is not so simple any more. A Ma. form *arfa
quoted by Räsänen and Ramstedt is not entirely clear phonetically. Cincius 1949: 163f. gives
two examples of such a correspondence: Ma. *gabta- 'shoot a bow' = Even, Evk., Nan., Sol.,
Ulč. -rp-, Mo. -rv- and Ma. *arfuku 'мухогонка' = Even, Evk., Ulč. -rp-, both quoted by Benzing
1955: 48; but the derivation, and additionally the word *gabta- are marked with a question mark
(although the entire expression is unclear).

3 It seems to us that this proposition is relatively improbable. The word is not found beyond
eastern Ir. languages, has no etymology there, and apparently no cognates, either. See below.
To our knowledge, the only exception here has been made by Tatarincev 2000 – who submitted his own – and more importantly a very probable – proposition: *ar-* ‘multiply oneself, be numerous’ + *-p intensification + *-a*, cf. OTkc. *arka* ‘multitude; collection; crowd; group’, Mo. *arbin* ‘plentiful’ et al.

Possibly, an interesting addition to this hypotheses might be made of OJap. *apa* ‘millet’ (Martin 1987: 388, Omodaka 2000) which, it seems, may be genetically related to the Tkc. form – and then to the Mo. and Ma. ones, too. If this was indeed true, it would give added weight to Tatarincev’s proposition.

It remains to be determined whether Pashto *orbəša* &c. are borrowings from Tkc. (not very plausible for cultural-historical reasons but definitely not impossible), another realization of a much older cultural wanderwort of unknown origin (which seems to be quite probable but is absolutely impossible to determine, at least for now), or whether the similarity of these words is a pure coincidence. The current state of art does not allow for a final answer.

**ARPAGAN**

**FORMS:**

*arpagan*  
OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972 ‘wild barley’  
Tat.: ÈSTJa ‘wild barley; a plant similar to barley’, Dmitrieva 1972  
Trkm.: Dmitrieva 1972 ‘agropyron’

*arpagān*  
MTkc.MK: Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85 ‘a plant similar to barley’

*arpakan*  
Kirg.: ÈSTJa ‘wild barley; common wild oat (*Avena fatua*)’

**LANGUAGES:**

Kirg.: arpakän  
MTkc.MK: arpagān  
OTkc.: arpagan  
Tat.: arpagan  
Trkm.: arpagan

**ETYMOLOGY:**

1974: ÈSTJa: < *arpa* ‘barley’ + *-gan*

**COMMENTARY:**

This form has a very clear structure. *-gan* is quite a popular suffix for plant names, here with a distinct meaning of ‘similar to, such as’. Cf. *arpakan* ‘oats’.

The MTkc.MK long *-ā* in the suffix is supposedly a transcription of alef, and not an actual length of the vowel, otherwise completely incomprehensible.

---

4 This word is attested as early as the oldest Jap. monument, Man’yōshū (8th c.). Interestingly enough, it is written with the 穂 sign, nowadays used for Mand. *sū* < MChin. *šwök* > OTkc. and others *sök* ‘millet’ (cf.).

5 If so, then probably from a PstSg form (in a compound?).

6 Such a solution should also be considered for Hung. *ápa*, whose origin from Čuv. is not likely for phonetic reasons (Čuv. *o/u*- vs Hung. *á*). From among the possible sources quoted in EWU, Com. *arpa* seems to be most probable phonetically and cultural-historically but perhaps other sources with non-Čuv. sounding can not be entirely excluded, too.
AS

FORMS:
- as Khak.: Dmitrieva 1972
- aš Brb.: R I 58s ğb || Šr. R I 58s ğb

LANGUAGES:
- Brb.: aš || Khak.: aš || Šr.: aš

ETYMOLOGY:
- 1974: ĖSTJA: < Ir āš 'soup'

COMMENTARY:
Corresponds with Tkc. aš ‘food’ et al., including Khak., Kmk. ‘cereal’; Oyr., Tat.dial. ‘cereal in ears and the like’; Khak., Oyr. ‘grain’, presumably < Ir. (ĖSTJa). The word appears in many Tkc. languages in different meanings (ĖSTJa) which can be reduced to three groups: 1. ‘soup’, ‘pilaff’; 2. ‘food, nourishment’, and 3. ‘cereal’, ‘grain’. ĖSTJa believes the first group to be a Čag innovation (even though such a meaning is attested in Mr where the word originates from), the second group represents the original meaning (this is the only meaning attested in older Tkc. monuments), and the third one to be a later concretization of meaning 2. (it only appears in Brb., Khak., Kmk., Oyr., Tat.dial. and Šr.).

In the oldest monuments, the word is only attested in the meaning of ‘food, nourishment’ (ĖSTJa). However, it does not seem to be very probable that such a meaning would evolve into ‘cereal’, ‘grain’ and so on in Khak., Kmk., Oyr., Tat.dial. &c. We would rather believe that it is these languages that preserved the original meaning from before the OTkc. period. This hint, together with the commonness of the word in Tkc. could suggest that its relationship to Ir. aš ‘kind of soup’ has just the opposite direction than the one suggested by ĖSTJa. However, the Ir. word has an established etymology: Pers. āš < Skr. āśa ‘food, nourishment’ (Turner 1966–69: 66), Skr. aca- in prataraca- ‘breakfast’, Av. kahrkasa- ‘Hühnerfresser’ (Horn 1893: 29). Thus, we should probably accept the slightly strange evolution from ‘food’ to 1. ‘soup’, 2. ‘cereal’, where 1. must have come into existence still in the OTkc. period.

Whether Khak. has evolved the meaning of ‘barley’ from ‘cereal; grain’, or independently (i.e. from the original ‘food, nourishment’), cannot be determined with certainty. The latter seems, however, to be more plausible because: 1. it has almost always been wheat and not barley, that was the most important cereal for the Tkc. peoples, and so we would rather expect ‘cereal; grain’ to evolve into ‘wheat’, rather than ‘barley’; 2. barley was an important part of nourishment in the form of a gruel or a pulp; also, beer was made from it (Tryjarski 1993: 54, 123) which seems to point to the evolution from the meaning of ‘soup’ rather than ‘cereal; grain’.

Cf. aš(lyk) ‘wheat’.

JAČMEŇ

FORMS: jačmeň Tof.: RTofS

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY: < Russ. jačměn id.
KÖČE

FORMS:
köče Khak.; RChakS, ĖSTJa, Tatarincev 2000
köže Tuv.; RTuwS, Tatarincev 2000

LANGUAGES:
Khak.: köče || Tuv.: köže

ETYMOLOGY:
1974: ĖSTJa s.v. köże: < Pers. گوجه gowže 'Prunus divaricata Ledeb. [species of plum]'
2000: Tatarincev: < ‘kőč- ‘to reduce (oneself)’

COMMENTARY:
This word is quite common in the Tkc. languages in different meanings. Almost all of them are names of various dishes or their components (most often, flour) made of cereals (barley, corn, millet and wheat, very occasionally rice and sorghum as well), and only in a few cases of cereals or grains. In dialects other meanings sporadically appear, too (see below). A comprehensive list can be found in ĖSTJa.

The geographical distribution of the meanings does not seem to contribute much to our understanding. Only Tksh. dialects have all four meanings of the most important cereals at once, and only in eastern Siberia is there no other meaning present but ‘barley’. Apart from Tksh. dialects, ‘barley’ appears in the North and East, ‘corn’ in the South, and ‘millet’ and ‘wheat’ in the centre, which corresponds quite precisely to the ranges of cultivation of these cereals. When taking all of this into account, one could try to suppose that all these meanings are relatively young, but it must not be forgotten that the word is attested in the Tkc. languages from the 14th c., and the choice of cereals for cultivation is mainly influenced by climate, which has not changed significantly in the last few centuries.

The etymology proposed by ĖSTJa does not seem to be grounded very well from the semantic point of view, as it assumes the following evolution: Pers. ‘species of plum’ (a) Tkc. ‘mulberry fruits flour’ (b) ‘flour made of roasted barley or wheat’ (c) ‘flour of various cereals’ (d) ‘various dishes of cereals’ &c., which is only supported by the following facts: 1. [in the Pamir. languages] ‘mulberry fruits flour’ and ‘flour made of roasted barley or wheat’ was designated by one word; 2. Uzb. dial., Tksh. dial. gőža, kőžūt ‘species of mulberry’; 3. Uzb. dial. gőža ‘species of plum’. While (c) > (d) is trivial, (a) is not very likely, and it must be remembered that (b) refers to the Pamir. languages, not Tkc. Whether the information that mulberry fruits flour became so popular in Pamir that it ousted flour made of cereals, also refers to Tkc. is unclear (cf. Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 87, quoted by ĖSTJa). We believe that these difficulties provide sufficient reason to discard the etymology. The still unclear forms 2. and 3. may be understood as a quite strange evolution, probably under Pers. influence, especially in the case of 3.

Tatarincev 2000 is against this etymology, too.

Tatarincev’s proposition seems to be much more likely. He derives köče < ‘kőč-, and supports this reconstruction with words like Tkc. q/kűčük ‘puppy; young of an animal’,
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also 'bud', köş/čeč 'young of a camel', also 'young of an animal', and Tksh. gūžük 'short; without tail', gōč(k)en '(one year old) hare' and so on.

As to the derivation, it might be regarded as being problematic, that the word has a long vowel in Trkm. (köže). But a secondary evolution in Trkm. is possible, too – under the influence of Pers. goğže?

The reconstruction of *köč- is very interesting but it seems to us that the examples listed by Tatarincev point quite clearly to the original meaning of 'to be small' rather than 'to reduce (oneself)'. Actually, this seems to fit köže even better (barley grains are quite small).

**SULA**

**FORMS:** sula Tel.: Ryumina-Surkaševa/Kučigaševa 1995  
**ETYMOLOGY:** see süle 'oats'  
**COMMENTARY:**  
This word is one of the examples of the quite common identifying/confusing of ‘barley’ and ‘oats’: cf. commentary on julaf (point 2) and arpakän, harva and tayarpasy ‘oats’. Only the direction is unclear here: this is the only word where ‘barley’ < ‘oats’.

**ŠA’ĪR**

**FORMS:** ša’īr Ott.: (شَعِیر) Wiesentahl 1895, ša’īr Redhouse 1921  
**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed  
**COMMENTARY:** < Arab. شَعِیر ša’īr ‘barley’.

**TAK-TAK**

**FORMS:** tak-tak Kzk.: ‘wild barley’ DFKzk  
**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed  
**COMMENTARY:**  
This name is completely obscure. Presumably, Kzk. tak ‘1. throne; 2. odd number’ corresponds to Uyg. tay ‘1. mountain; 2. odd number’, but the semantic relationship is utterly unclear. Also, the word has a strange structure which we cannot explain. Cf. tay-arpasy ‘oats’.

**ŢEH**

**FORMS:** ţeh Tksh.dial.: Pisowicz 2000: 239  
**ETYMOLOGY:** 2000: Pisowicz: 239: < Kurd. ţeh ‘barley’  
**COMMENTARY:** We can see no flaw in the etymology presented by Pisowicz 2000: 239.
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ŽEHI MIEN

FORMS:

nečimien Yak.: Pekarskij 1917–30, Anikin 2003
nehimi en Yak.: Anikin 2003
ńesemen [ɔː -h-] Yak.: Pekarskij 1917–30, Anikin 2003
źesemen [ɔː : źehimen] Yak.: (жэсэмэн [ɔː : дь-]) Dmitrieva 1972
źehimien Yak.: RJakS, Anikin 2003
źesemen [ɔː -h-] Yak.: Pekarskij 1917–30, Anikin 2003

ETYMOLOGY:

1964: Slepcov: < Russ. jačmen’ ‘barley’
1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. jačmen’ ‘barley’
2003: Anikin: Russ. jačměn (alternately. Sib. ‘jažměn’) > Yak. źesemen > other forms,
cf. Ubrjatova 1960: 23 for ź- ~ n- / ń-, and indicates Russ. člen > Yak. čišen,
silen for -s- ~ -č- and refers to Slepcov 1964: 109

COMMENTARY:

The etymology presented by Slepcov 1964 and more comprehensively by Anikin 2003 is undoubtedly true in general. However, it is unclear to us why Anikin 2003 believes that źesemen is the oldest form, from which źesemen and źečimien evolved by means of assimilation.

It seems that his reasoning is based solely on the sounding of these forms, but it is impossible to unambiguously settle the chronology of their borrowing, as assimilation depends not so much on the time of borrowing, as on how well the borrower knew Russian, and therefore it can only help to establish a chronology expressed in generations, not in absolute years; cf. Stachowski, M. 1999b: 23. The differences between the forms are: 1. anlaut (ź-, n-, ń-), 2. adaptation of Russ. -s- (h-, -č-), 3. epentetic vowel (-e-, -i-) and 4. yielding or not of the Russ. accent (-ie-, -e-). From among these features only 3. lets us draw some conclusions regarding chronology: in the Tkc. languages epentetic vowels are high7, and so -e- should be understood as a result of assimilation.

We believe therefore that jačmen’ > Yak. *Jačimien > Ječimien > Ječemen. Regarding phonetics, cf. ebies ‘oats’.

---

7 This is a constant feature of the Tkc. languages; cf. e.g. the necessity of Tkc. mediation in Hung. kirly ‘king’ << Southern Slav.dial. ‘krať’ or similar (Helimskij 2000: 434). Cf. also arys’ ‘ye’. 
arpa ‘barley’
Corn originates from the Mesoamerican centre. The first traces of cultivation of corn were found in the Tehuacán valley, Mexico. They are dated around 5th millennium BC, while the domestication probably happened between 10th and 5th millennium BC. The oldest remains of cobs of a cultivated form are dated 3000–3500 years BC and were found in the fifties in Bat Cave, Mexico (cobs from these period are just 25 mm long). The oldest pollen of a wild form was discovered in the city of Mexico and is about 80 thousand years old. All presently known forms of corn are domesticated; wild forms have not survived at all.

Corn was extremely important for all the cultures of Central and South America, and was also known in North America. It appeared very often, and it still does, as a motif in art, and it played a role in mythology and religious rituals. Columbus mentioned it as early as 5 November 1492, and brought it to Europe a year later when he came back from his first voyage. From Spain (cultivations in Andalusia since 1525), it spread to Southern and Central Europe (Fr. blé d’Espagne, G. Welschkorn), and to Middle East and Anatolia from where it diffused further. Eastern and Central Europe (for the second time) learned about it later, from the Turks (cf. e.g. Slvn. turščica; Cz. turkyně; Pol. pszenica turecka and Fr. blé de Turquie, G. türkischer Weizen and türkisch Korn, It. granturco et al.). The Portuguese played a great role in its circulation by delivering it to Java as early as 1496, to Angola about 1500, to China in 1516 and to the Philippines in 1520 (Nowiński 1970: 193–202).

The Latin name is a compound of Lat. zēa 'type of grain' + mays < Sp. más, más < mahíz < Taino maisí, majísí 'corn'. Fr. maïs and Eng. maize are borrowings from Spanish (Lokotsch 1926).

In the Tkč. languages there are altogether 16 different names for 'corn'. Nine of them are compounds built of an attribute + name of another plant, or are an abbreviation of this model. In three (four?) of them the attribute is a place name, always referring to an Arabic country (Mäkke, Msir, Şam, ? kábû bödoj).

**FORMS:**

- aži bijdaj
- ažy bijdaj → aži bijdaj
- basadohan
- bordoq
- čüzgün qonaq
- dary
- gargydyaly
- habiž(d)aj
- kábû bodaj → kábû bödoj
- kábû bödoj

- kargi-dali → gargydyaly
- kokoroz
- köma qonaq → (kömme) qonaq
- kömbö konok → (kömme) qonaq
- qonaq
- kömek → (kömme) qonaq
- köme qonaq → (kömme) qonaq
- kömme qonaq
- körnîr qonaq → (kömme) qonaq
- konag → (kömme) qonaq
- konag → (kömme) qonaq
- kukkurus → kokoroz
- kukurūša → kokoroz
- kukuruza → kokoroz
- makkažavari → meke žügörü
- makkažûxori → meke žügörü
- makka(-)şuari → meke žügörü
mäkke
mäkke žueri → meke žügörü
meke žügörü
mekgeţöven
mekke ǯeven → meke žügörü
mekgeţöven
mokka-ǯavari → meke žügörü
mysir boğdaj → mysyr (bugdajy)

|[116x718]20
aži bijdaj || CORN
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**LANGUAGES:**

Az.: gargydaly
Bosn.Tksh.: kukuruz
Bšk.: kukuruz || kukuruza
CTat.: mysir boğdaj
Čuv.: kukkurus || kukuruza
Čuv. dial.: kukuruz
KarC: kokoroz
KarH: basadohan || sary
Khak.: kukuruza
Kirg.: meke žügörü || žügörü
Kirg. dial.: kömbö konok
Kklp.: mäkke || mäkke žueri
Kmk.: habiţdaj

Krč.Blk.: nartux || nartüx || Tksh. dial.: dary || kokoroz ||
Kz.: žügéri
Kz. dial.: žasymyk
Nog.: aži bijdaj || ažy bijdaj
|| nartük
Ott.: kokoroz || ? mysyr boğdaj
| | | | || mysyr buğdaj || šam
darysy
|| | | | | | || kümme qaqa || kümke
Sal.: konag
Tat.: kääbä bodaj || kääbä bödoj
Tksh.: mysyr (bugdajy)

**AŽI BIJDAJ**

**FORMS:** aži bijdaj

**ETYMOLOGY:** 1972: Dmitrieva: < ažy ’bitter’ + bijdaj ’wheat’

**COMMENTARY:**

While it is not easy to present a convincing counterargument for the etymology proposed in Dmitrieva 1972, neither can one accept it without reservations. Semantics is definitely its weak point. Grains of wheat might indeed have a sweetish taste when compared to other cereals, but they certainly cannot be regarded as sweeter than corn, which has a very distinct sweet flavour. Certainly it is not sweet enough to make it a distinctive feature.

Though we are not able to present a counterproposition, we do not want to accept Dmitrieva’s solution, either. Not at least, in so brief a form. Perhaps she knows of more ethnographic data which could provide a more convincing argument in favour of her proposition.
BASADOHAN

FORMS: basadohan KarH: KRPS 105, Mardkowicz 1935 '1. corn; 2. corn gruel, polenta'
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:

We believe that this word is a compound of basa 'pasha' + dohan < Hebr. דּוחן dohan 'millet'. Millet is quite often unified or confused with corn (cf. žasymyk). Such a compound has a nice semantic parallel in Bulg. carevica 'corn'.

Cf. cebedogan 'millet'.

BORDOQ

FORMS: bordoq Uyg.: 'roasted corn'
ETYMOLOGY:

1974: ÈSTJa: Tkc bürtük ~ bürcük '1. grain; 2. bread; 3. little bite; 4. et al.' < PTkc. *bürt-'come off, fall off'. The Uyg. form is not quoted here; all quoted forms (except for Čuv.) have vowels e, i, ö and ü

COMMENTARY:

Despite phonetic difficulties (front vs back vowels), we are convinced that this word belongs to the family of bürtük. A semantic shift from 'grain' to 'species of cereal' is absolutely natural; cf. e.g. Witczak 2003: 128–30. Cf. also Trkm. bürdük 'oats'.

ČÜZGÜN QONAQ

ETYMOLOGY: 1998: Jarring: 14: Ž indicates a non-Tkc. origin; the word is enigmatic
COMMENTARY:

Jarring 1998: 15 only remarks that Ž indicates a non-Tkc. origin, and that the word is enigmatic. He also mentions čüzgün 'green bristlegrass (Setaria viridis)' (after Schwarz 1992: 356) which is yet another example of calling 'corn' and 'millet' with one word (cf. dary, mlysır bugdajy, žasymyk and žügörü). It is not out of the question, that the word is etymologically identical with čüzgün, cf. čüzgün 'green bristlegrass (Setaria viridis)' in chapter Millet.

DARY

FORMS: dary Tksh.dial.: Tietze 2002–
ETYMOLOGY: see dary 'millet'
COMMENTARY: See šam darysy 'corn'.

---

8 Although it could alternately be Hebr. דָּגון dagan 'cereal'.

---
GARGYDALY

FORMS:
- gargydały Az.: RAzS, Dmitrieva 1972: 213
- kargj-dały Tat.: خارج دالي Tanievъ 1909

LANGUAGES:
- Az.: gargydały || Tat.: kargi-dali

ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < gargy 'reed' + daly 'its branch'

COMMENTARY:
The structure of this word is so clear, and the similarity of corn to reed so obvious that we can see no reason to question the etymology presented by Dmitrieva 1972.

HABIŻ(D)AJ

FORMS: habiž(d)aj Kmk.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213, RKmkS

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:
This word is unclear morphologically. It is possible that -biž(d)aj corresponds to Tkc. buğdaj 'wheat' (with a simplification of the consonant cluster). The ha- in anlaut remains however, utterly incomprehensible.

KÄBÄ BÖDOJ

FORMS: käbä bödoj Tat.: R IV 1714t || käbä bodaj Voskresenskij 1894

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:
This name is not entirely clear. Its second element, bödoj raises no doubts about its Tkc. origin (Tkc. buğdaj 'wheat'), even though its vocalism is not quite so comprehensible. As to käbä, it seems most likely to us that it is in fact a place name, Kaaba. A very nice semantic parallel for such a naming is provided by Trkm. mekgezovun and similar names in Kirg., Kklp. and Uyg., Tksh. maysr buğdajy and Ott. šam darysy. However, front vowels in this form remain a mystery to us. Possibly, although this does not seem very likely, this word is identical with Tksh. kaba 'simple, coarse'?

Naming one species of cereal with the name of another one, and an attribute raises no doubts (corn was brought to the Tkc. peoples relatively late).

KOKOROZ

FORMS:
- kokoroz KarC: 'roasted corn grains' Levi 1996 || Ott.: R II 509b موز قوقورس, MiklTürkEl قوقورس, Redhouse 1921 قوقورس, Qogvoros | Tksh.: Eren 1999 قوقورس, Qogvoros
- kukkurus Čuv.: RČuvS-A قوقورس
- kukurus Tat.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213 قوقورس
kukurūza  Yak.: Slepcov 1975 (from 1935)
kukuruz  Čuv.: Nikolaskij 1909

LANGUAGES:

ETYMOLOGY:
1930: Nikolić; Tkc. [ʔ o: Tksh.] koku (or mum for the form mumuruz) ‘stink’ + uruz ‘rice’ > ‘rice of poor species’

This proposition is thoroughly false for the following reasons: 1. there is no such word in the Tkc. languages as mum ‘stink’; 2. there is no such word in the Tkc. languages as uruz ‘rice’; 3. a compound of two nouns in Nom. which would have this kind of a meaning is impossible in the Tkc. languages; 4. to the best of our knowledge, the Tkc. peoples never considered corn to be a worse kind of cereal (and neither did the Slavic peoples, cf. e.g. Bulg. carevica ‘corn’), in fact, the exact opposite was true; 5. it is very hard to find a major similarity between corn and rice, and we know of no parallel for unifying these two meaning in the Tkc. languages.

1972: Dmitrieva: Tat. kukuruz, Bšk. kukuruz; Bšk., Khak., Čuv., Yak., Oyr., Tat., Tuv. kukuruza < Russ.

1999: Eren: Tkc. kokoroz from the Balkan languages; cf. Bulg. kukuruz, Serb. kukuruz, Rom. cucuruză; ultimate source unclear

COMMENTARY:
We believe that this word was borrowed to the Tkc. languages from Slav., as Dmitrieva 1972 and Eren 1999 proposed it. In particular, the fact that the word has a very rich family in the Slav. languages and absolutely no relatives in the Tkc., speaks in favour of this proposition.

The sounding does not allow for a precise determination of the Slav. source. We can only make a guess based on historical and cultural-historical premises. In the case of Asian Tkc. languages it was most probably Russ.; in the case of Bosn.Tksh. we may suspect a borrowing from one of the Slav. languages of the Balkans or, less likely, from Tksh. (Ott.); and finally in the case of Tksh. (Ott.) – history seems to support the idea of a borrowing from the Balkans (as proposed by Eren 1999) rather than from Russ. (as Dmitrieva 1972 wants it).

All this might seem somewhat strange given the fact that Europe (except for Spain and Portugal<sup>10</sup>) has learned about corn from the Ottomans (see above). However, the

---

9 Nikolić, Agronomski glasnik 1930 and 1931; quoted after Skok 1971–74 s.v. kukuruz.
10 From Spain corn spread to France among other regions, and from there to Germany, but it only gained popularity later, probably under Turkish or Hungarian influence.
linguistic data does not allow for any other solution. Most probably, the whole thing might be explained by the following facts:

1. in Ott. (and later in Tkc.) the forms *kokoroz ~ kukuruz* are dialectal; corn was more popular among the Slavic people than it was among the Turks; in a limited area, a Slav. word could out its Tkc. equivalent, and then find its way to the literary language

2. a) all the other Tkc. languages where this word is present, have been under a strong Russ. influence

    b) it is possible, that these Tkc. nations only learned about corn from Russians

The differences in auslaut among the Tkc. forms (-uz vs -uza) should probably be explained by variations in Russ. dialects (although Filin 1965—only attests *kokuróz*), or by a borrowing from Tkc. (Ott.) rather than from Russ.

The only thing that might still be regarded as being problematic is that our word has no established etymology in the Slav. languages. An overview of previous solutions (chronologically) and our proposition is presented below.


1. < Tkc. *kokoroz, kukuruz* ‘corn’

   pro: Muchliński 185812; MikITEl, Karłowicz 1894–190513; Lokotsch 1927; Weigand14; Holub/Lyer1967; Skok 1971–74; Witczak 2003: 124

   contra: MikITElN; SEJP; Bańkowski 2000

   The word is incomprehensible on the Tkc. ground. Vast family in the Slav. languages.

   No related words in the Tkc. languages.

2. native word; cf. Slav. *kakurjav* ‘1. curly; 2. splayed out’ (from ‘hairs’ protruding from corns)

   pro: Berneker 1908–1315, Brückner 1927; Holub/Kopečný 1952; SEJP; Machek 1968; Zaimov 195516; Schuster-Šewc 1978–89; ESUM; Černych 1993

   contra: Vasmer 1986–87

   See below.

3. < Rom. *cucuruz* ‘1. cone; 2. corn’


   See below.

4. < *kukuru* used when luring birds with corn grains

   pro: Vasmer 1986–87

---

11 Jungmann 1835–39; quoted after Machek 1968.
12 Muchliński 1958: 71; quoted after SEJP s.v. *kukurydza*.
13 Karłowicz 1894–1905: 323; quoted after SEJP s.v. *kukurydza*.
14 Weigand, G.: Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache XVII-XVIII: 363f.; quoted after SEJP.
contra: SEJP

Very unlikely. Would require an assumption that the name for ‘corn’ only came into existence after its grain had been acquired in some way, and used to lure birds while shouting (why?) kukuru. Apart from the above, it is not known which language the proposition refers to.

5. = ? Alb. kūqur ‘baked; roasted’ or = ? Alb. kökërr ‘1. grain of pea; 2. berry’

pro: Bańkowski 2000

Kökërr (< kokë ‘head; bulb; berry; grain’; Orel 1998) seems to be more probable, but as a source of borrowing, rather than an equivalent. It also has, however, a very likely Slav. proposition (see below), this coincidence should probably be regarded as accidental. What is important, though, is the idea proposed by Bańkowski 2000 that the word might have been borrowed via two routes (see below).

SEJP suggests that the word should be derived from PSlav. *kokor*, a reduplicated form of *kor- (> *korens*), such as bóbr, gogotka or popiól; cf. also kąkol ‘corncockle (*Agrostemma githago*)’ and kuklik ‘geum urbanum L.’. In the Slav. languages there are very many names of plants with a very similar sounding, cf. e.g. Bulg. kukurják || Cz. kokořik || LSorb. kórik || Pol. kokornak, kókorycz || Slvk. kórik, kukurík || Ukr. kókorička || USorb. kókorac (more examples e.g. in SEJP s.v. kokornak). The semantic basis were most probably curly (crooked?) leaves or tendrils, or some kind of curls or ‘locks’ characteristic of the given plant (cf. Machek 1968; SEJP). Cf. Slav. S. kukurjav ‘curly(-headed)’.

We believe that PSlav. *kor- ‘bent’ can with quite a high degree of probability be accepted as the root of our word: cf. also Russ. dial. kokóra ‘trunk [...] together with a crooked root [...]’, Hung. dial. kukóra ‘crooked; bent; [...]’ and Pol. and others krzywy ‘crooked’, maybe also Lat. curvus.

Many Slavists point out phonetical difficulties. Two routes of borrowing, proposed by Bańkowski 2000, seem to offer the best explanation. Only instead of the Alb. etymons, we would rather assume native Slav. names either shifted from another similar plant, or neologisms created in the same way as the already existing names. Presumably, some of the forms may be explained by a contamination of two (or more?) forms (for Pol., cf. Bańkowski 2000).

---

17 NB: Probably also Hung. kankalék ‘primrose’ (in the same way as konkoly ‘corncockle’) is a borrowing from the Slav. languages – against EWU, where it is regarded as an ‘Ableitung aus einem fiktiven Stamm, Entstehungsweise aber unbestimm’t. Cf. also Lith. känkalas ‘(little) bell, something clanging’ (Spólnik 1990: 64).

18 From Cz., where it meant among others ‘monk’s hood’; cf. Spólnik 1990: 84, though an unclear expression.

19 Also Hung. kőkőrű ‘curly(-headed)’, which probably from the Slav. languages, too – against EWU, where it is derived from kukóra ‘crooked, bent, [...]’, which is an ‘Ableitung aus einem relativen fiktiven Stamm’.

Finally, we should also consider whether it would be desirable to assume a Paleo-Europ. source, which could be connected with OBask. and Pre-Romance 'kuk(k)ur-'Kamm; Spitze' (more: Hubschmid 1965: 39), and the Rom. form (originally 'cone'), instead of deriving it directly from Bulg. (cf. Cihac 1879: II 86 vs. Cioranescu 1966). An Ott. meaning attested by Redhouse 1921: 'any tall, ill-shaped thing', might also be used to support this idea. We suppose that Arm. qogar and the like. 'hooks with two points used for hanging pots over a fire' (Bläsing 1992: 58) could also belong to the same family, such as finally. Tksh. kokoreq 'meat dish roasted on spit'.

**KÖMME QONAQ**

**FORMS:**

köma qonaq Uyg.: (Turfan) Jarring 1998: 14
kömbö konok Kirg.dial.: ÉSTJa 'corn'
kömek Uyg.: Jarring 1998: 14 'special species of corn'
köme qonaq Uyg.: Jarring 1998: 14 'special species of corn'
kömme qonaq Uyg.: Jarring 1998: 14 'special species of corn'
kömür qonaq Uyg.: Jarring 1998: 14
konag Sal.: ÉSTJa
qonaq Uyg.: Raquette 1927, ÉSTJa

**LANGUAGES:**

Kirg.dial.: kömbö konok || Sal.: konag || Uyg.: köma qonaq, kömek, köme qonaq, kömme qonaq, kömür qonaq, qonaq

**ETYMOLOGY:**

1998: Jarring: 14: ? kömme < köme ~ kömer 'coal' (cf. kömür qonaq), or ? kömme < kömek 'r'

**COMMENTARY:**

KÖMME:

Jarring’s 1998: 14 proposition which is based on the form kömür qonaq, and derives kömme from kömür (~ Uyg. köme(r)) 'coal' is interesting but, semantically, rather enigmatic. It seems more plausible to us that kömme is a deverbal noun from the verb köm- ‘to bury, dig in the ground’. Such an attribute may result from the way corn is planted: rather than simply sowing seeds onto ploughed ground, its seeds are thrown into specially prepared pits, and then covered with soil. For semantics, cf. also the somewhat enigmatic in this regard, sokpa. Although this proposition does not explain forms with -r in auslaut, which still remain incomprehensible to us, it still, nonetheless, seems be more plausible. It is probable that the same root that can be found in Tkc. kömč ‘1. bread; 2. pie; dumpling’.

QONAQ: See konak ‘millet’.

**MÄKKE**

**FORMS:** mäkke (plant and dish) Kklp.: RKklpS-B, RKklpS-BB, RKklpS-ST

**ETYMOLOGY:** see meke žügörü and mekgežöven
COMMENTARY:
Mäkke as a name for ‘corn’ is certainly an abbreviation of mäkke žueri, created by the same token as mysr buğdajy > mysr in Tksh. According to Dmitrieva’s 1972 explanation, it means ‘Mecca’ – cf. Kirg. meke among others ‘Mecca’, and comes from Arab. makka (quoted by Dmitrieva as Meke s.v. meke žügörü, and as Mekke s.v. mekgeǯöven).
Cf. meke žügörü and mekgeǯöven, and mysr buğdajy and šam darysy.

MEKE ŽÜGÖRÜ

FORMS:
makkažavari Uzb.: مكة جواري Nalivkin 1895
makkažŭxori Uzb.: RUzbS-A, RUzbS-S
makka(-)ǯuari Uzb.: Lapin 1899, Smolenskiy 1912
mäkke żuerei Kklp.: RKklpS-BB
meke žügörü Kirg.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213, RKirgS-Ju44, RKirgS-Ju57
mokka-ǯavari Uzb.: Smolenskiy 1912

LANGUAGES:
Kirg.: meke žügörü || Kklp.: mäkke žueri || Uzb.: makkažavari, makkažuhori, makka(-)ǯuari, mokka-ǯavari


COMMENTARY:
MEKE: See mäkke.
ŽÜGÖRÜ: See žügörü.
Cf. mäkke, mekgeǯöven, and mysr buğdajy and šam darysy.

MEKGEǯÖVEN

FORMS:
mekgeǯöven Trkm.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213, Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962, RTkms
mekke şeven Trkm.: Alijiv/Böörijif 1929


COMMENTARY:
MEKGE-: See mäkke and mäkke žügörü.
-ŞOVEN:
This word is etymologically unclear. Though not listed among equivalents by Eren 1999, it is presumably the same word as Tksh.: çöven ‘kökü ve dalları sabun gibi köpürlen bir bitki’ < çöven Eren 1999, dial. çoğan, çögen, çovan, çöiven, çuven DS || Az. çögan || OKitp. çögan || Trkm. çögan (kökü) ‘çöven’.
We believe that it might be closely related to čigin ‘millet’, which unfortunately is unclear, too. We should not completely discount the notion that its ultimate source is Pers. šoʃ ‘barley’ (see julaf ‘oats’), or alternately, that čigin < čüžgün – which would probably rule out such a connection.
Cf. mäkke, mekgeǯöven, and mysr buğdajy and šam darysy.
MYSYR (BUGDAJY)

FORMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>CTat.:</th>
<th>KarC.:</th>
<th>Ott.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mysir bogdaj</td>
<td>Zaatovь 1906</td>
<td>Levi 1996: 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mysyr bogdaj</td>
<td>Wiesentahl 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mysyr-boqdaj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mysyr bugdaj</td>
<td>Wiesentahl 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mysyr (bugdajy)</td>
<td>Tksh.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>CTat.:</th>
<th>KarC.:</th>
<th>Ott.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mysir bogdaj</td>
<td>mysyr-bogdaj</td>
<td>mysyr bugdaj</td>
<td>mysyr bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mysyr (bugdajy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETYMOLOGY:

1972: Dmitrieva: < Arab. Misr 'Egypt'
1999: Eren: does not explain the word – presumably, because he assumes it is obvi-
ous – that this name is a compound of a place name + a name of another plant
(cereal), i.e. mysir bugdajy liter. 'Egyptian wheat'
2000: Bańkowski s.v. kukurydza: Tksh. mysyr < common Europ. mais (Sp. mais, Fr. maiś et al.)

COMMENTARY:

Bańkowski’s 2000 proposition seems to be deeply problematic for serious phonetical
and historical reasons. We think that a much better solution has been presented by
Dmitrieva, and we believe, that also Eren implied that he had the same solution.

Currently, an abbreviation of mysyr bugdajy to mysyr caught on in Tksh., just as
Kklp. mäkke żueri > mäkke. Cf. šam darysy, and mäkke, meke žügörü and mekgeţöven.

An exact semantic parallel (a calque from Ott.? ) is offered by Arm. egipt-a-c‘oren
‘corn’, liter. ‘Egyptian wheat’.

It remains somewhat enigmatic to us why this name has been formed with the help
of a word for ‘wheat’ if in all the other compounds of this kind, a word for ‘barley’ has
been used. Interestingly enough, in dialects mysyr bugdajy might actually mean ‘barley’,
too: cf. mysyr ‘barley’ and dary, jasymuk and jügür id.

NARTÜK

FORMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Nog.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213, RNogS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nartuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nartux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Nog.: nartük</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krč.Blk.</td>
<td>nartux, nartüx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:

This word is etymologically incomprehensible. We can see two ways of trying to explain
it, but neither of them is anything more than a conjecture, and none of them is fully
clear. However, the first seems to be more probable:
1. Osset. nartxor ‘corn’, liter. ‘food of the Narts’
   Semantically, such a connection raises no doubts. It is, however, quite inexplicable
   phonetically. One might believe that it is a Tkc. derivative from *nart ‘Nart’ with
   a meaning calqued from Osset. nartxor, but a non-harmonic vocalization undermines
   this solution.

2. common Europ. nard
   The word nard is present in many European languages (Lat. nardus, Eng., Fr., Pol.,
   Russ. et al. nard) but to the best of our knowledge, it has no etymology. The plant
   originates from the region of India and Tibet, and has been known to Europeans
   since antiquity as a material for perfume production. It does not look similar to corn,
   but it should be remembered that ‘corn’ happens to be the same word for ‘millet’
   (see čüzgün qonaq, mysyr bugdajy, əzəmyk and əzğörü), and that the popular terms for
   ‘millet’ might in fact mean various, not necessarily closely, related species (see com-
   mentary on ‘millet’). A distant analogy is that ćećin ‘millet’ may also mean ‘French
   lavender’22, and the word nard is not always entirely monosemantic as well, e.g. Gr.
   vαγός, except for Nardostachys Jatamansi might in various compounds also mean
   ‘Valeriana Celtica’, ’Cymbopogon Iwaraneusa’, or ‘nard oil’ (Lidell 1968) and others.

SARY

FORMS: sary  KarH: KRPS
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY: From corn’s extremely distinct colour.

SHA DARYSY

FORMS: šam darysy  Ott.: Eren 1999 sv. mysyr
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY: Cf. mysyr bugdajy, and mäkke, meke əzğörü and mekgeǯöven.
   For a comparison to millet, cf. dary and mysyr bugdajy, and čüzgün qonaq, əzəmyk
   and əzğörü.

21 The Narts were a race of giants described in the mythology of the peoples of Caucasus, including
   the Ossetians. According to the legends, a long time ago, out of pride they rose against God.
   God punished them by sending upon them a terrible famine. At night, they would shoot with
   their bows grains glittering in the sky and eat them but there were not enough, and eventually
   the entire race starved to death. After that, the grains fell to the ground and corn sprouted
   from them. (Dumézil 1930: 14)
   Other languages of Caucasus might also be taken into consideration, see Dumézil 1930: 11:
   ’Peut-être qu’on songe que dans une bonne partie du Caucase du nord […] le mais, n’a d’autre
   nom que « l’alliment des Nartes »’.
22 The expression in Clauson 1972 is not entirely clear to us: ‘čećin […] (3) the name of a plant
   called ušťūxdaš ‘French lavender’ […]; ćećin same translation; […]’.
ŽASYMYK

FORMS: žasymyk Kzk.dial.: ĖSTJa
ETYMOLOGY: see jasymuk 'millet'
COMMENTARY: For naming ‘corn’ and ‘millet’ with one word, cf. dary, šam darysy and žügörü, and čüzgün gonaq.

ŽÜGÖRÜ

FORMS:
žügori Kirg.: Mašanovъ 1899
žügörü Kirg.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213, RKirgS-Ju-44, RKirgS-Ju57
žüxorı Uzb.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213
žügeri Krč.Blk.: RKrčBlkS

LANGUAGES:
Kirg.: žügori, žügorù, žügeri || Krč.Blk.: žügeri || Kzk.: žügeri || Uzb.: žüxorı

ETYMOLOGY:
1972: Dmitrieva: only points to a connection with OTkc. jügür, jür, ügür, üjür and Čuv. vir 'millet', and with Oyr. üre 'кашица из толченой крупы', Tat. öjrä, üre 'кашица; крупяной суп', Mo. ür 'grain; seeds', OTkc. jügürgün 'plant similar to millet'

COMMENTARY: Žügorü as a name for ‘corn’ is presumably an abbreviation of meke žügorü (cf. also meke-ǯöven). Similarly mäkke.

However, the word is not entirely clear from the etymological point of view. The -ü in auslaut is probably a possessive suffix which originally created the so-called second izafet in compounds such as Kirg. meke žügorù – cf. Tksh.dial. cöğür ‘species of grass’ DS, and Tksh. myşyr bugdajy ‘corn’ and Ott. šam darysy id. Eren 1999, Tksh.dial. dary TS. We believe that Dmitrieva’s 1972 proposition to connect the word with OTkc. ügür &c. has much to commend it (see ügür ’millet’).

Cf. meke žügorü.
kokoroz 'corn'
mäkke, meke žügörü and mekgeşöven ‘corn’
Millet 
*Panicum* L.

Millet is one of the first plants ever to be cultivated by mankind. It is understandable then, that the name for ‘millet’ encompasses in colloquial use many different, and not necessarily closely related species (see below). India, Central Asia, China and Africa’s tropical savannahs are considered to be the homeland of millet. An exact dating of the beginnings of cultivation is very difficult, as distinguishing separate species in the archeological materials raises serious problems. In Europe, which is not the homeland of this cereal (or rather, cereals), it has been discovered in neolithic finds, and in China it had already been one of the five most important cereals sown by the emperor himself during the vernal equinox as early as in the 28th c. BC. Proso millet has been traditionally cultivated in China, Central Asia, Turkestan and Transcaucuses.

The two most important species are colloquially both called millet: proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum* L.) and setarias, especially foxtail millet (*Setaria italica* P.B. = *Panicum italicum* L. and others). Also, some species of sorghum are sometimes called millet, too. Both the colloquial and even the botanical terminology is somewhat in confusion (see table in Nowiński 1970: 186), mainly because of numerous synonyms and polysemantic names. There is no reason to believe that the situation is any clearer in the Tkc. languages. We believe that some of the names we list with the meaning of ‘millet’ refer in fact to some other species than proso millet, or that they refer to many species at once. Unfortunately, the lexical data we have had access to usually does not allow us to make these kinds of distinctions.

The lexical data itself does not let us determine whether it was millet or wheat that was the first cereal the Tkc. peoples became acquainted with. The fact that we know of no examples of a semantic shift ‘millet’ > ‘wheat’, and that we know of two examples in the opposite direction (unfortunately, both non-Tkc.: Nan. *būda* ‘millet’, *Zu-čen pūh-tuu-kai* ‘millet’ as opposed to Tkc. *bugdaj* ‘wheat’ (Joki 1952: 107)) might suggest that it was wheat that came first.

Interestingly, names for ‘millet’ are sometimes mixed or unified with names for ‘corn’ (cf. *čüž-ğün*, *dary*, *jasymuk*, *jügür* and *mysyr*). Possibly, it results from the fact that the grains of these two cereals are similar to each other, both in shape and colour, though the grains of millet are smaller and flatter. It is also possible, perhaps even more probable, that this unification arose from the fact that corn had in many regions become the most important cereal, thus taking, at least to some extent, the place of millet. One could suppose, for historical reasons, that the direction of the shift would always be ‘millet’ > ‘corn’ but this is not the case with *mysyr* (see below).

---

23 This refers to both the most important species: proso and foxtail millet (see below).

24 In fact, it is just the opposite: many of the names we list have a meaning such as ‘a species of millet’ or ‘a plant similar to millet’ &c.

25 Cf. also e.g. Pol. *burak* ‘borago’ > ‘beetroot’ resulting from beetroot’s displacing borago and taking over its place (Boryś 2003).
FORMS:
cbebedogon kunak → konak kunak → konak taryg → dary
cčigin mysyr mysyr buğdajy → mysyr taryk → dary
ciağit mysyrda(ry) → mysyr teri → dary
cčikin mysyrjan → mysyr teriy → dary
cčingetarā → tarā nardan terik → dary
čüzgün oğür → ügür törq → dary
čygyt → čigin ijür → ügür tőgi → tőgü
dari → dary prosa tőgü
daru → dary qonaq → konak tüş → tüşü
dary qunoq → konak tüşi → tüşü
indää sök tüş → tüşü
itkonak → konak sokpa tüş → tüşü
jasymuk sök → sök tüşi → tüşü
jügürgün → ügür tarā tüşjary
josmik → jasymuk tarağan tüşyq → dary
jügür → ügür taray → dary tüşür
jügürğän → ügür tan → taragan ügürgän → ügür
jügürğün → ügür tan → taragan ügürgän → ügür
jūr → ügür tari → dary iüşü → ügür
kojak → konak tariq → dary ür → ügüür
kon → konak tariq → dary vir → ügüür
konak tariq → dary xonak → konak
konak → konak taru → dary xotarā → tarā
konakaj → konak tarā → dary żavers
konok → konak tary → dary

LANGUAGES:
Az.: dary KarH: cbebedogon MTkc.: čikin || jügürgün || jügüür
Blk.: tary Khak.: prosa || taryg || kojak || konak || ügüür
Brb.: taran Kır.: konak || konak || tariq || tary || tüşi || ügüür
Bsk.: tary Kırkp.: konak || tary || oğür || taryg || taryk ||
Com.: tary (tari) Kırkg.: konak || konak || tarih || tary || tüşi || ügüür
CTat.: dary MTKc.H: tary
Čag.: ĉikin || čigin || indää || taryg || konak || sök ||
|| konag || konak || sök ||
rariq || tariq || taryg || tüşi ||
Čuv.: taryg || vir MTKc.1M: taryg
Fuyū: nardan KırK.: itkonak || konak || sök ||
Gag.: dary || tary || tüşjary ||
KırÉ.: tary MTKc.KD: tari || tüşü
Kr. Blk.: tary MTKc.KA: kojak ||
Km. Kır.: tariq || tariq || tari || taryg ||
Kmnd.: tarağan || tüşi
Kmnd.: tarağan || tüşi
Krē.: tary || tüşi || tüşi || tüşi ||
Kır. Blk.: tary || tüşi || tüşi || tüşi ||
MTkc.MK: jügüür || jügürgän ||
|| taryg || tüşi || tüşi || tüşi || ügüür ||
ČIGIN

**FORMS:** čäkin Čag., čigin Čag., čäkin MTkc., čigin OTkc., čigin Ott., čäkin Uzb.

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not proposed

**COMMENTARY:**

This name is unclear, and to the best of our knowledge no etymology has been proposed for it as yet. It seems to us that it might be etymologically the same word as unfortunately the equally unclear žöven in mekgežöven 'corn'. This is entirely possible both phonetically and semantically (for naming 'millet' and 'corn' with one word cf. čüzgün, dary, jasymuk, jügür and mysyr). If it turned out, however, even though it is not very likely that žöven << Pers. žow- (cf. julaf 'oats'), than the possibility of connecting čigin with čüzgün and žöven should probably be excluded.
ČÜŽGÜN

ETYMOLOGY: 1998: Jarring: 14: ğ indicates a non-Tkc. origin; enigmatic word
COMMENTARY:
Cf. čüžgün qonaq ‘corn’.
This word is unclear. One cannot help noticing the phonetic similarity to čügin ‘millet’ (cf.) which is unclear, too. If these two words were to be related, čüžgün is probably the older form.

DARY

FORMS:

dari Tat.: تاریک Tanievъ 1909
daru Ott.: ESTJa
dary Az.: RAzS, VEWt, Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999 || CTat.: ESTJa || Gag.:
ESTJa || KarC: ESTJa, KRPS, Levi 1996 || Ott.: (داری) Wiesentahl 1895, طاری, داری,
uuung R III 1627m, VEWt || Tksh.: Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999, Tierze 2002–
Trkm.: Alijiv/Böörjijif 1929, RTrkmS, Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962, VEWt, Dmitrieva
1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999
taray OUGy.: ESTJa
tari Kmk.: Dmitrieva 1972
tarī Kmk.: ESTJa
tariq Čag.: تاریق R III 850m, VEWt
tarik Čag.: تاریک ‘Ackerfeld’ R III 850m, ESTJa || Otkc.: تاریک R III 850m || Uzb.:
Eren 1999
taru MTKc.KD: تارو || Tel.: Ryumina-Sırkaşeva 1995
1999 || Tel.: R III 850m, Eren 1999
tary Błk.: VEWt, Eren 1999 || Bśk.: RBśkS, Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999 ||
|| Kır.: Maşanovъ 1899, ESTJa || Kkłp.: RKklpS-BB, RKklpS-ST, RKklpS-B,
Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999 || Kmk.: RKmkS || Krč.: VEWT || Krč.Błk.: RKrčBłkS,
Dmitrieva 1972 || Kzk.: RKzkS-46, RKzkS-54, Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa,
1972, ESTJa, Eren 1999 || Ott.: R III 986b || Tat.: R III 846m, III 10,47m, IV 18,75b,
Voskresenskij 1894, Imanaevъ 1901, RTats-D, RTats-S-G, Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa,
KWb 180, Eren 1999 || Tat.Gr.: Podolsky 1981 || Tel.: R III 850m || Tob.: ESTJa
taryg Čag.: ESTJa || Khak.: ESTJa || MTKc.: ESTJa, VEWt ‘1. grain; 2. millet’, Eren
1999 ‘sowing; plant; barley; wheat; grain’ || MTKc.IM || MTKc.MK: Dankoff/
Kelly 1982–83 || Otkc.: Dmitrieva 1972 ‘millet; grain; grass, Eren 1999 ‘sowing’ ||
SarUyg.: ‘1. grain; 2. millet’ VEWt || Trkm.: (تاریق) Nalivkinъ 1895
taryy Uyg.: VEWt ‘1. grain; 2. millet’
taryk MTkc.KD: طارق || Uzb.: Lapin 1899, (‘ крупное’) Smolenskij 1912
teri Uyg.: ‘1. grain; 2. millet’ VEWT
teriy Uyg.: ĖSTJa
teri R Uyg.: R III 850m, VEWT
teriγ Uyg.: '1 grain; 2 millet' VEWT
teriq Uyg.: Menges 1933, RUjGS, Dmitrieva 1972
tyră Ćuv.: VEWT ‘grain; millet’, Eren 1999 ‘cereal’
? tyryq Uyg.: Raquette 1927

LANGUAGES:

ETYMOLOGY:
1969: VEWT: ~ Mo. tarijan ‘sowing; cereal; land, soil; grain’
1972: Clauson: < tary ‘to cultivate land’; d- by contamination with Pers. dārū ‘medicine, drug’
1972: Dmitrieva: OTkc. taryγ ‘millet; grain; grass’ < tary ‘to sow’ + -γ
1979: Dmitrieva: < tary ‘to sow’ + -γγ ‘result, outcome’
1999: Eren: < tary (‘ekin) ekmek’ + -ğ
2002: Tietze: < OTkc. taryγ (after Clauson 1972)

COMMENTARY:
This word has relatively uniform meanings in all the languages (after ĖSTJa):
1. The form without -γ apart from ‘millet’ can mean: ‘grain’, ‘cereal’, ‘groats’ and the like, and other cereals. All these meanings are understandable given the etymology and, except for the last group, are of a very limited range (at most one of the following languages: Oyr., Tof., Tuv.).

For Tksh.dial. meaning of ‘corn’, cf. mysyr, the commentary at the beginning of this chapter, and čüğgün, jasyumak and jügür.

2. The form with -γ means also ‘wheat’, ‘barley’, ‘grain’, ‘cereal’, ‘fodder’, ‘sowing’, ‘crops’, ‘harvest’, ‘cultivation’, ‘descendant’ and the like. All these meanings are older and, except for the last possibility which is not fully clear, understandable in view of the etymology.

The morphological structure of this word and its deverbal origin are quite obvious. The problematic part is the final vowel of the verbal stem (see tari and tarağan). It has been,
however, solved by ESTJa in a very convincing way by interpreting -y ~ -a as a denominal suffix and deriving the verbal tary ~ tarə from nominal *tar ‘sowing; harvest; field’, which at the same time explains dary (< tar-), taryg (< tar-(-y)) and such forms as Sag. and others tarlay ‘fodder’, and OUGyg, taray ‘cereal’ and the like (< tar-(-a)). Cf. tarə, tarağan.

The contamination with Pers. dârū ‘medicine, drug’ assumed by Clauson 1979 to explain the voiced anlaut in Oghuz, is, as has been justly remarked by ESTJa, not very likely (although it seems to us that the semantic difficulty, not mentioned by ESTJa, might be even more important than the fact that the Pers. dârū is unknown to SW Tkc. languages), and moreover, absolutely superfluous since the voicing of occlusives in anlaut is a regular change in the Oghuz. languages, and the d- forms in Kipč. (KarC. and Tat.) may be easily, and with a very high degree of plausibility, explained by an Oghuz. influence or borrowing.26

For further bibliography cf. first of all ESTJa and Eren 1999.

Dmitrieva 1979: 161 has suggested that the fact that this name derives from the verb ‘to sow’ might be regarded as a testimony that millet was the first cereal cultivated by the Tkc. peoples. But, it might also not be true since, she continues, D. tarə ‘wheat’. AS tare ‘tare, vetch’ et al. < [sic] OInd. dûrvā ‘millet’ < PIE *der- ‘to rip off; to skin’. This seems to us to be quite poor reasoning. OInd. and the Grmc. languages are only very remotely related with one another, and the fact that what originally was one word now has different meanings is not actually very surprising. The Tkc. languages are related much more closely, and dary has a very uniform meaning (with a few exceptions, see above) of ‘millet’, only in a few of the languages does it include ‘grain’, ‘cereal’ and the like. The situation is then, quite different. However, even in these, much more favourable conditions we do not believe – as Dmitrieva apparently does – that it is possible to establish which was the first cereal cultivated by the Tkc. peoples using only the etymology of one word. One could equally well suppose that the first cereal was named with a borrowing rather than a native word, and such a guess could not be proved any more.

Cf. also ( )tarə and tarağan.

INDÄÜ

FORMS:

indäü Čag.: [ ] родъ проса, изъ котораго приготовляeтся масло [ ] R I 1449m

ETYMOLOGY: R I 1449m: < indä+−ā

COMMENTARY:

The etymology offered by Radloff is rather odd. indä appears in various languages, but with the meaning of ‘to call, to summon’. Thus, the semantic connection – if it even exists – would require a comprehensive commentary, which Radloff fails to provide. Regrettably, we cannot offer a more convincing proposition, either.

26 They could also be understood as the result of an assimilation to the next consonant, i.e. t-r > d-r, which is however not very convincing since such a change is characteristic of Oghuz., not Kipč. languages.
MILLET || konak

JASYMUK

FORMS:
jasymuk OTkc.: ‘millet’ DTS, Dmitrieva 1972, ÈSTJa
josmik Uzb.: ‘?’ VEWT

LANGUAGES:
OTkc.: jasymuk || Uzb.: josmik

ETYMOLOGY:
1969: VEWT: Čag. jasmuk ‘lentil’ < jasy ‘wide’
1972: Clauson: jasymuk, ? jasmuk ‘a flat (seed)’ < jas-
1974: ÈSTJa: < jas- ‘to flatten’ or jasy ‘flat’

COMMENTARY:
This word is quite common in the Tkc. languages. It has many meanings, the most basic definitely being ‘lentil’, and not ‘millet’.27

Etymologically, there can be no doubt that the word is a derivative from jas- ‘to flatten’ or jasy ‘flat’; what does raise doubts though, is whether it is a deverbal or a denominal derivative; for bibliography cf. ÈSTJa. We believe that the former is much less likely due to the fact that -muk is in fact a denominal suffix (see Erdal 1991: 100). Two-syllable forms are surely the result of dropping the high vowel in the middle syllable, which is a completely natural phenomenon in the Tkc. languages.

The meaning of ‘millet’ most probably results from the fact that the grains of millet are quite flat. Their shape can actually be used as an auxiliary argument for the denominal origin of the word: the suffix -myk with the meaning of ‘low intensity of the feature’ fits the shape of millet grains better than any other would.

Cf. also jasmyk ‘wheat’ and žasymyk ‘corn’.

KONAK

FORMS:

tkonak Kzk.: DFKzk
kojak MTkc.: ‘mediocre species of millet’ VEWT || MTkc.MK: DTS, ÈSTJa ||
OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972 ||
konag Čag.: قوناق ‘species of millet’ R II 538m; VEWT, ÈSTJa
konay Uyg.: ÈSTJa

konak Čag.: فوناق ‘родъ крупнаго проса’ R II 535b; ‘mediocre species of millet’
VEWT || Kirg.: Dmitrieva 1972 || Kklp.: ÈSTJa || Kzk.: ‘родъ крупнаго проса’
R II 535b || MTkc.: ‘mediocre species of millet’ VEWT || MTkc.MK: Dankoff/ Kelly 1982–85 || OTkc.: R II 535b ‘فوناق ‘родъ крупнаго проса’; VEWT ‘mediocre

27 A comprehensive list is available in ÈSTJa. However, it does not contain some interesting related forms in -mak, such as: Khak. naspax, Tuv. čáspek ‘pearl millet mixed with boiled potatoes or fat’, Tat. dial. jasmak ‘lentil’ < jas- ‘to flatten’ (here the descent from jasy must be excluded due to a clearly deverbal character of -mak) (Stachowski, M. 1995: 151f).
species of millet’, Dmitrieva 1972 || Trkm.: ESTJa || Uyg.: ‘mediocre species of millet’ VEWT || Uzb.: ESTJa
konak MTkc.MA.B: Borovkov 1971: 106
konak Kirg.: ESTJa ‘Setaria italic var. mogharium Alef.’, Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 36 ‘Setaria italic var. mogharium Alef.; setaria (Setaria P.B.); foxtail millet (Setaria italic P.B.)’ || Uyg.: VEWT
kunak Uzb.: (‘мeлкoe’) Smolenskij 1912
qonaq OUyg.: DTS ‘species of millet’, Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 36 || Uyg.: Jarring 1964,
Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 36
qunoq Uzb.: Dmitrieva 1972, Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 36
xonak ‘Tuv.: ESTJa ‘Setaria viridis P.B.’

LANGUAGES:

ETYMOLOGY:
1969: VEWT: ~ Mo. qonay, qonuy ‘millet’
1974: ESTJa: limits himselft to quoting two previous comparisons with Mo.
against Clauson 1972
1976: KWb 185; only points to the comparison with qonay, qonuy

COMMENTARY:
This word is common in the Tkc. languages and has many meanings28, ‘millet’ being the most common one.

Clauson’s 1972 etymology is, as ESTJa has stated, very improbable for phonetic (konak, not *kōnak) and semantic (kōn- ‘to sit’, not ‘to seat’) reasons. Unfortunately, no other etymology has been proposed, and we are not able to provide one, either.

About borrowing this word to the Pamir. languages, see Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 35f.

MYSYR

FORMS:
msyr ‘Tksh.dial.: DS
msyr bugdajy ‘Tksh.dial.: ‘millet’ Eren 1999
mysyrda(ry) ‘Tksh.dial.: DS
mysyrgan ‘Tksh.dial.: DS

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed in the meaning of ‘millet’

28 Most of them are related to cereals – as a general term, or as the name of some species. Apart from ‘millet’, they are: ‘setarias’ (Tuv.), ‘corn’, ‘sorghum’ (Kirg.) and others (ESTJa). See also (kōmme) konak ‘corn’.
COMMENTARY:

Usually *mysyr* means ‘corn’ in Tksh. Using one word to name these two cereals often happens (see čüžgün, dary, jasymuk and jügür) but the direction is always natural from the historical point of view, i.e. ‘millet’ > ‘corn’. To assume that some of the Anatolian Turks learned about millet from Egypt would be totally unrealistic, given the history of the cultivation of millet. Probably, the only acceptable guess would be that corn displaced or at least surpassed millet in importance in some regions of Turkey (which is quite likely), and hence the secondary meaning (cf. footnote 32). To some extent, such a scenario is pointed to by Tksh dial. *mysyrdar(ty)* and *mysyrgan* with a clear suffix -gan which is used very often to form names of plants, usually with the meaning of ‘similar to; -like’ (cf. *arpakan* ‘oats’ and *arpagan* ‘(wild) barley’). *Mysyr* itself is probably an abbreviation of one of these forms, or simply a shift from *mysyr* ‘corn’.

NARDAN

FORMS: *nardan* Fuyü: Zhen-hua 1987
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:

Probably from Pers. *nārdān* ‘pomegranate seeds; (= nārdānag) dried seeds of wild pomegranate used as a spice’ (Rubinčik 1970), though the semantic is not entirely clear. A desirous connection with *nartük* ‘corn’ should probably be ruled out despite of some remote associations.

PROSA

FORMS: *prosa* Khak.: RChakS, Dmitrieva 1972, Brands 1973
ETYMOLOGY:

1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. proso ‘millet’
1973: Brands: < Russ. proso ‘millet’

COMMENTARY:

The final -a might be a result of two possible events: 1. a phonetical, not graphical borrowing; 2. borrowing of the Gen. form used as Part.29 It seems impossible to determine, which is more likely. In reality, probably both these factors were present at the same time and separating them would be but an artificial operation, which would result in a more methodical description of the change mechanism.

---

29 Similarly to e.g. Yak. pruoška, boruoska, Šr. prašqa &c. ‘snuff’ << Pol. prazka (Helimskij 1990: 41, Anikin 2003) || Dolg. hildįj ‘herring’ < Russ. seldej Gen.Pl. < selde ‘herring’ (Stachowski, M. 1999b) || Tuv. köpäk ‘kopeck’ < Russ. kopeek Gen.Pl. < kopejka ‘kopeck’ (Pomorska 1995: 99) &c. The phenomenon is absolutely understandable, given that borrowings are usually made during conversation when Nom. is normally used less frequently than oblique cases, cf. also Yak. ostolobuoj < Russ. stolóvaj Gen., Praep. or Dat. Sg. < stolóvaja ‘canteen’ || Tuv. laptū ‘kind of baseball’ < Russ. (igrat v) laptú (Pomorska 1995: 102 and 100 respectively) and others.
PROSO

FORMS: proso
Yak.: RJakS, Dmitrieva 1972

ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. proso 'millet'

COMMENTARY:
It is difficult to criticise the etymology proposed by Dmitrieva 1972. A complete lack of assimilation (cf. ebies 'oats') indicates that the borrowing was made only very recently, or alternately that the orthography does not in fact render the actual Yak. pronunciation.

SÖK

FORMS:
sök Čag.: SKE 2.40, TMEN, VEWT 'husked millet' || Kzk.: SKE 2.40, TMEN, VEWT 'husked millet', DFKzk, DKzkF || OTkc.: VEWT 'husked millet' ||
Uyg.: SKE 2.40
sük Tat.: 'millet pap' VEWT

LANGUAGES:
Čag.: sök || Kzk.: sök || OTkc.: sök || Tat.: sük || Uyg.: sök

ETYMOLOGY:
1935: KWb: 333: = Mo. sög, Klmk. sōg 'chassed millet'
1949: SKE 2.40: < Chin.
1969: VEWT: < Chin., KorS (after: SKE 2.40) sök
= Mo. sōg 'millet; spelt'

COMMENTARY:
This word appears also in Kirg., Kzk., Trkm., Uyg. and Uzb. meaning 'spelt'. The origin proposed by SKE 2.40 seems very likely (see below).

TMEN, reasoning from the fact that the word is only attested as late as Čag., suggests the possibility of a borrowing from Pers. sōk 'ear of corn, beard of corn' which would directly, or via Tk. dialects, originate from Chin. This proposition can not be completely discounted, even though it seems to complicate the route of borrowing beyond what is necessary. That a word was not attested earlier than Čag. does not mean it did not exist before.

As has been proposed by TMEN, the Chin. etymon SKE 2.40 most probably meant is 穀 sù 'foxtail millet (Setaria italica P.B.)'. We believe that its MChin. sounding, *sjowk (Baxter: 129, oral information from Prof. A. Vovin [Honolulu]), *sök+ (Tōdō 2001) raises no doubts about the phonetics, and neither about the meaning.

30 The change of harmony from back to front could be explained by the palatal pronunciation of -k in Pers. The semantic change could be explainable as easily.
31 The same sign is used to write OJap. *apa 'millet' (Martin 1987: 388, Omodaka 2000), cf. arpa 'barley'.
SOKPA

FORMS: sokpa SarUyg.: Tenišev 1976
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:
While morphologically this word is absolutely clear (sok- ‘to stick, to poke’ + -ma), its meaning is quite strange. The literal meaning of *‘seedling’ indicates ‘rice’ or ‘corn’ rather than ‘millet’. One could try to look for a semantic parallel in tögü32 but the meaning of *tög- ‘to beat, to hit’ enables an evolution to basically any cereal, and makes it impossible to compare with sok. Perhaps this is an example of unifying/mixing ‘millet’ with ‘corn’ (cf. (kömme) konak)?

TARĀ

FORMS:
čingetarā Tuv.: RTuwS, Dmitrieva 1972
darā Tof.: ÆSTJa
tarā Tuv.: R II 135b (in: kara ~ ‘black millet’), Brands 1973: 33, ÆSTJa
xōtarā Tuv.: RTuwS

LANGUAGES:
Tof.: darā || Tuv.: čingetarā, tarā, xōtarā

ETYMOLOGY:
1972: Dmitrieva: < Tuv. činge ‘thin’ + tarā ‘grain; cereal’
1973: Brands: 33: < Mo. tarijan, tarān ‘harvest; cereal’
1979: Dmitrieva: Tuv. tarā, Oyr. tarān, Brb., Tat. tarań ‘millet’ < Mo. tarijan ‘grain’, where -ān < -yan

COMMENTARY:

TARĀ
As opposed to tara[(ga)n], this form has no -n in auslaut, and thus it can be hardly expected to contain a trace of -gan, as has been proposed by Dmitrieva 1979, or that it is borrowed from Mo., as Brands 1973: 33 has suggested (cf. taragan). What seems much more probable is that they are -g derivatives from tar-a-. For. tar-a- and the semantic of OUyg. forms cf. ÆSTJa’s commentary on dary ‘corn’.

ČINGETARĀ
Dmitrieva’s 1972 etymology is quite obvious, and it would be wrong to assume any other origin of this word. ‘Thin’ surely refers to the shape of this plant: millet stalks are much thinner than those of other cereals. They are also more elastic, making millet bend and lie down which makes the impression of thinness even stronger.

KARA TARĀ: name fully clear etymologically and semantically
XŌTARĀ: name unclear

32 Perhaps also tüjtary.
**TARAGAN**

**FORMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Kmnd.</th>
<th>Oyr.</th>
<th>Tel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taragan</td>
<td>Eren 1999</td>
<td>R III 840b</td>
<td>R III 840b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>R III 841m, ESTJa, KWB 380</td>
<td>R III 841m, ESTJa, KWB 380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārān</td>
<td>Oyr.: RAktS, Dmitrieva 1972, Brands 1973: 33, ESTJa, KWB 380, Eren 1999</td>
<td>Tel.: R III 841m, ESTJa, KWB 380, Eren 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brb.</th>
<th>Kmnd.: taragan</th>
<th>Oyr.: taragan, tārān</th>
<th>Tel.: taragan, tārān</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taran</td>
<td>taragan</td>
<td>tārān</td>
<td>taragan, tārān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETYMOLOGY:**

1935: KWb 380: Brb. tarian, Oyr., Tel. tārān < Mo.
1960: VGAS: Mo. tarjian ‘field; sowing’, tarijad ‘sowing; cereal’ &c. = OTkc. taryg ‘crop; cereal’
1973: Brands: 33: < Mo. tarjian, tārān ‘sowing; cereal’
1974: ESTJa: < tar-a-; against deriving < Mo. tarija(n)
1999: Eren: < Mo.

**COMMENTARY:**

ESTJa is against KWb 380 for phonetic reasons (Mo. -iijá : Tkc. -aγa-), and supports VGAS 62 assuming a parallel evolution tar-a- + -jan > Tkc. taragan &c., Mo. tarija.

We too, support this conception. Cf. dary, -tarā.

**TÖGÜ**

**FORMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>MTkc.MK: (Oghuz.) Eren 1999 ‘husked millet’</th>
<th>OTkc.: TMEN 979, ESTJa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tögi</td>
<td>OTkc.: TMEN 979, ESTJa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tögü</td>
<td>OTkc.: ESTJa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>töhö</td>
<td>OTkc.: ESTJa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tögä</td>
<td>OTkc.: VEWT ‘husked yellow millet’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tügi</td>
<td>Čag.: ‘husked millet’ TMEN 979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarty/Kelly 1982–85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uyg.: VEWT ‘husked millet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tügü</td>
<td>MTkc.KD: نكو ‘husked millet’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tui</td>
<td>Trkm.: طوی, نو</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūi</td>
<td>Krč.: Pröhle 1909, VEWT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Čag.: tügi</th>
<th>Krč.: tūi</th>
<th>OTkc.: tügi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.: tügi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.KD: tügä</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.MK: tügä, tügi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.MK: tügi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETYMOLOGY:** see tüvi ‘rice’

**COMMENTARY:**

See tüvi ‘rice’; also dövme ‘wheat’.

Trkm. tui (توی, نو), so tüvi and tuvi can not be excluded either; cf. Trkm. tüvi ‘rice’) is most probably, as suggested by TMEN 979, borrowed from Čag. or another Kipč source, as is indicated by the voiceless auslaut (cf. also dary).
TÜJTARY

FORMS: tüjtary  Kzk.: TMEN 979 'foxtail millet'
ETYMOLOGY: 1963: TMEN 979: < *tügi-taryg

COMMENTARY:
The etymology offered by TMEN 979 appears to be quite probable, although the meaning is a little surprising. One could expect such a compound to yield a meaning like ‘husked millet’ or something similar (cf. tüvi ‘rice’), not ‘foxtail millet’.

While from the semantic point of view a compound ‘tüj-tary’ millet with hair’ would seem much more likely, and would be a nice parallel to the European names (cf. Eng. foxtail bristlegrass, Slav. włośnica or Lat. setaria (< Lat. saeta (sēta) ‘(hard) animal hair, horse hair’; Genauft 1976)), such a solution raises phonetic doubts: in Kzk. ‘hair’ is called tük. Maybe a borrowing from one of the Oghuz. languages?

Though not very probable, it nevertheless cannot be ruled out that tögü &c. < *tügī ‘hair’ (adj.) < tük ‘hair’ + -i adj. (< Pers.), cf. tüvi ‘rice’. This idea is interesting semantically but it seems that it, too, leaves the sounding of tüjtary unexplained.

ÜGÜR

FORMS:
jögür  MTkc.: VEWT
jügür  MTkc.MK: MK III 9 (DTS) || OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972
jügürgün  OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972
jügürgün  MTkc.MK: ‘plant similar to millet’ Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85
jür  OTkc.: DTS, Dmitrieva 1972
öjür  MTkc.: VEWT
öjür  OTkc.: Egorov 1964, VEWT, Fedotov 1996 ‘millet; spelt’
öjür  MTkc.MK: MK I 54, II 121 (DTS), Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85, Eren 1999 s.v. darı || OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972
ügürgün  MTkc.MK: ‘grain eaten by Qarluq T urkmān’ Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85
üjür  MTkc.MK: (Oghuz,) Eren 1999 s.v. darı || OTkc.: DTS, Dmitrieva 1972 || Uyg.:
Eren 1999 s.v. darı
*üör  Yak.: Fedotov 1996 tarān ~e ‘millet; groats’
är  OUyg.: Çevilek 2005

LANGUAGES:
Čuv.: vir || MTkc.: jögür, jügür, öjür, öjür, üjür || MTkc.MK: jügürgün, jügürgün, jügürgün, jüjür || OTkc.: jügürgün, jüjr, üjür || OUyg.: är || Uyg.: üjür || Yak.: *üör

ETYMOLOGY:
1957: Ramstedt: Čuv. vir = Mo. üre ‘seed; fruit’
1964: Egorov: limits himself to a comparison to Mo. ür ‘grain; seeds; crop’
This word has quite a large number of phonetic shapes which is understandable given its phonetical structure. It appears in a relatively large number of meanings, of which only the ones connected with 'millet' have been listed here; see Egorov 1964, Stachowski, M. 1995, Fedotov 1996.

To the best of our knowledge, the only etymology to date is the one proposed by Stachowski, M. 1995: 158. It seems to be based solely on the meanings of the type 'gruel', 'pap', 'soup' and the like, but connecting these two words does not pose any major problems. We know that the Turks have been eating various cereals, including millet, in the form of gruels, mashes and the like (cf. Tryjarski 1993: 120 and others). Shifting the name from 'gruel (or something similar) made of millet' to 'millet' itself is only natural.

However, the morphological structure does pose a problem here. While the 'gruel' &c. words have a vocalic auslaut (Khak. ügära 'soup', OUyg. ügära 'gruel; pap', Tat. öjrä 'soup with gruels' &c.), the 'millet' ones have a consonant at the end. In OTkc., the existence of nomen and verbum with the same sounding is not a rare phenomenon, but a unification of meanings 'to grate; to squeeze; to grind' and 'millet' in one stem, with no suffixes, is hardly probable. 'To grind' and 'gruel' would make a more likely couple, but it is the meaning of 'gruel' that has the suffix, and of 'millet' that does not.

It hardly seems plausible that the forms meaning 'gruel' &c. would not be related in this or another way to the words mentioned above but it is impossible to establish the exact nature of this relationship at the moment.

Further bibliography in Eren 1999. Cf. also öjrä 'wheat', and for the final semantics – tüvi 'rice' and dövme 'wheat'.

**Commentary:**

From Pers. ژاورس (ژاورس) ~ گاورس Gawres 'foxtail millet (Setaria italic P.B.); Setaria viridis P.B.'

On the surface, the semantics might raise doubts here. But setarias, like in all probability other grasses, too, are named in various languages of the world, including those in Asia, with the word for 'millet' and some kind of an adjective (cf. Nowiński
1970: 186), cf. e.g. Russ. просо венгерское ‘foxtail millet’. This pattern is even reflected in the biological nomenclature: *Setaria italica* P.B. = *Panicum italicum* L. and others, *Setaria viridis* P.B. = *Panicum viride* L.
dary 'millet'
In comparison to other cereals, the cultivation of oats began relatively late, only about the beginning of the Common Era. The plant was known much earlier but was regarded as being more of a usable weed, a supplement to wheat or barley. This is most probably the reason why names for ‘oats’ are so often mixed with names for ‘barley’ (cf. commentary on julaf (point 2), harva, tay arpaşy ‘oats’, and sula and arpagan ‘barley’). Because the cultivation of oats began so late, it is not entirely clear which region is its homeland. Ancient Greece only knew it as a medicinal weed, the most important cultures of ancient Asia and Africa did not know it as a cereal at all. In China, it appeared in the former role, as late as the 7th c. It seems the the Tkc. peoples had already known oats in the period before written monuments (cf. commentary on süle). Presumably, however, it was not highly regarded, for in ancient texts it is rarely mentioned, unlike e.g. wheat or barley.

The basic name is definitely süle. It appears in very many phonetic variants, surprisingly many given its simple sounding. The range of the word julaf, the second most common name, is huge, but it is absolutely understandable from a cultural-historical perspective.

### FORMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arman</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Özbek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arpakhan</td>
<td>ovjot</td>
<td>sula → süle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at tārāzy</td>
<td>ovsā</td>
<td>sūli → süle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a”tarāzy</td>
<td>şēlē → sūle</td>
<td>suly → süle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>būrdāk</td>
<td>sinir bozan</td>
<td>sūly → süle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ebies</td>
<td>sōlē → sūle</td>
<td>sūly → süle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gara gyjak</td>
<td>sōlō → sūle</td>
<td>sūlē → sūle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harva</td>
<td>sōlō → sūle</td>
<td>tay-arpaşy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hūlā → sūle</td>
<td>sula → sūle</td>
<td>urus arpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hūly → sūle</td>
<td>sūlē → sūle</td>
<td>uvus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jōlap → julaf</td>
<td>suli → sūle</td>
<td>uwsys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>sūli → sūle</td>
<td>zynhtxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyxa</td>
<td>sully → sūle</td>
<td>*şi lap → julaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ovjot</td>
<td>sula → sūle</td>
<td>şi lap → julaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Az: jualaf</td>
<td>Kmk.: nyxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brb.: suly</td>
<td>Koyb.: sulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bšk.: holo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.: sulu</td>
<td>Kř.: sula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTat.: *țilap</td>
<td>Kz.: sulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čuv.: séře</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gag.: jualaf</td>
<td>Ott.: jualaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar.: súli</td>
<td>Oyr.: sula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarC: jualaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarT: uvus</td>
<td>SarUyg.: harva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khak.: sula</td>
<td>Sr.: sula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirg.: sulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kklp.: sully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Etymology:

**Arpakan**

Forms: *arpakan* Uyg.: R I 334m

Commentary: Uyg. form as yet not discussed

The structure of this word is absolutely clear: *arpa* + -kan. What seems to be more enigmatic is its meaning, given Tkc. *arpa* ‘barley’. However, these two cereals are to some extent unified or mixed by numerous peoples, cf. commentary on *julaf* (point 2), *harva* and *taγ-arpasy*, and *arpagan* ‘barley’.

### Atarâzy

Forms: *at tarâzy* (am tarâzły) Tuv.: Dmitrieva 1972: 213 || *a*tarâzy RTuwS

Commentary: This name is absolutely clear from both morphological and semantic point of view, and it is very difficult to offer an explanation different than the one presented by Dmitrieva 1972.

### Bûrdük

Forms: *bürdük* Trkm.: R IV 1892m

Commentary: The original meaning of ‘grain’ is a perfect tertium comparationis for the seemingly unconnected meanings of ‘oats’ and ‘corn’. Cf. bordøq ‘roasted corn’.
EBIES

FORMS: ebies Yak.: Slepcov 1964, RJakS, Dmitrieva 1972

ETYMOLOGY:
- 1964: Slepcov 77: < Russ. ovës ‘oats’ with an irregular correspondence ie < jó, maybe from a dial. pronunciation ‘ovjes’
- 1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. ovës ‘oats’
- 2003: Anikin: < Russ. ovës ‘oats’

COMMENTARY:
Dmitrieva 1972 and Anikin 2003 are undoubtedly right, but they entirely disregard the somewhat strange phonetics of the Yak. form, only briefly mentioned by Slepcov 1964 where an unattested Russ.dial. form ‘ovjes is proposed. Although there is no proof for this, it seems to be a quite plausible explanation. Another possibility – rather unlikely though, given the cultural realities – would be a graphical borrowing with regressive vocal harmony caused by long (a rendering of the Russ. accent), accented -ie in the second syllable (cf. žesemen and žehimien ‘barley’).

GARA GYJAK

FORMS: gara gyjak Trkm.: (Kara-kala) Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:
GARA:
‘Black’ is most likely used metaphorically here, meaning ‘worse; bad’ which is a very common phenomenon in the Tkc. (and other) languages. Such a meaning certainly is derived from the fact that oats were treated as a weed for such a long period.

GYJAK:
Trkm. gyjak has a couple of meanings, but the one meant here is definitely ‘пырей волосатый; пырей ползучий’.

HARVA


COMMENTARY:
The etymology proposed by Tenišev 1976, although presented with a question mark, seems to be very probable. At least, it raises no doubts from the phonetic point of view: for h- ~ x- cf. SarUyg. harqa ~ xårk ‘back’ < *arka, or horta ‘middle’ < *orta (Tenišev 1976: 29); and for -rv-: SarUyg. terve- < terbe- ‘to sway’ and others (Tenišev 1976: 27).

What might not be viewed as being absolutely convincing is the semantics (Tkc. arpa ‘barley’). It must be remembered, however, that these two cereals are mixed to some extent, or unified: cf. arpa and the commentary on julaf (point 2) and arpakan, also sula ‘barley’. (H)arva also means ‘barley’, too.
Steblin-Kamenskij 1982: 36 suggests that yazg and OVanj. xarban ‘millet’ is somehow connected with Tkc. arpa ‘barley’, though the SarUyg. form is not listed among the Tkc. words. Due to its initial $x \sim h$, it is precisely this form that appears to be the closest to the Pamir. words. However, semantics might raise much more serious doubts here, than in the case of a simple comparison of SarUyg. and Tkc. forms.

**JULAF**

**FORMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Az.</td>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>RAzS, Dmitrieva 1972; ESTJa, Wiesentahl 1895, Redhouse 1921; Tat.: jolap, Taniev 1909; Tksh.: Dmitrieva 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarC</td>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>ESTJa, Dmitrieva 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ott.</td>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>ESTJa, Wiesentahl 1895, Redhouse 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat.</td>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>Taniev 1909, Wiesentahl 1895, Redhouse 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat.Gr.</td>
<td>jolap</td>
<td>Podolsky 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tksh.</td>
<td>julaf</td>
<td>Dmitrieva 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETYOLOGY:**

1969: VEWT: only mentions the word, without providing any etymology


**COMMENTARY:**

The etymology proposed by ESTJa seems a little strange from both phonetic and semantic point of view:

1. We can see no reason, why Pers. dial. jəv should render *ju in Tkc.

2. In the Tkc. languages, noun + noun compounds – such as the one suggested by ESTJa – render in the great majority of meanings a material something is made of, or a comparison to something. Therefore, the meaning one should expect from such a form should rather be ‘barley grass’, ‘grass such as barley’ and the like. From this point, the road to ‘barley’ is not long. Particularly in that, as it is noted by ESTJa, in many languages including Pers. and Taj., the name for ‘barley’ evolved into ‘oats’, or the name for ‘oats’ originates from the name for ‘barley’, cf. Klmk. dial. arva ‘oats’ (Tkc. ‘barley’), and Ma. arfa ‘oats; barley’; cf. also arpakan and harva, also sula ‘barley’. All this is fairly understandable with regard for the history of oats (see commentary at the beginning of the chapter).

However, none of this information can explain why ESTJa assumes a shift from ‘grass’ to ‘hay’ on the Tkc. ground.

Deriving julaf from a compound of Pers. چاو × چاو or Pers. dial. jav seems to have an advantage from the point of view of the Tkc. j- × ʒ- alternation in anlaut but it creates another phonetic obstacle (see above) which we believe is quite serious.
We would like to suggest a slight modification of this etymology, and – as no ultimate proof can be presented here – another proposition for explaining this word.

In anlaut, the alternation \( j \sim \ddot{y} \) can be explained by a purely Tkc. alternation which, however, has not been studied thoroughly enough to allow for a full verification of this assumption. However, what seems to be more problematic is the lack of \(-v\) and a change from the remaining \(-aa,-aə\) &c. into \(-u\). This is why we believe that the first part of this compound should have rather been borrowed from a form such as liter Pers., i.e. \( \ddot{y} \nu \).

The second part definitely should have been a word of back vocal harmony. We could take into consideration such forms as Talyš., Arab. or Pers. (dial., not liter., with non-palatalised short a’s). Arab. can probably be excluded, as it would require an assumption, that on the dial. Tkc. ground a presumably local borrowing from dial. Pers. / Talyš was compounded with a borrowing from Arab. which is quite unlikely. On the other hand, a compounding of a form such as the liter. Pers. \( \ddot{y} \nu \) (which could have appeared in dial., too) with a Pers. dial. / Talyš form [alaf], seems to be quite realistic.

There is still at least one more way of explaining this word. Namely, it could be regarded not as a compound, but as an iotated borrowing form Arab. \( \dddot{a} \ell \) ‘dry grass; hay; fodder’. Iotation is not a common phenomenon, and definitely not a regular one, which is certainly a weakness of this proposition. Tekin 1975: 205 gives only three examples of modern ju- deriving from MTkc. long vowel: *ī-, *ō-, *ȫ-, and all of them come from SarUyg. As far as our knowledge goes, it has not yet been established what the conditions allowing for iotation were in dial. Tksh. (Ott.). If they were the same, one could believe that ‘a-’ was rendered as \( \ddot{v} \rightarrow ju-\).\(^{34}\) In such a case, only the Arab. form could be taken into consideration, the Pers. ‘a-’ being nothing but a graphical tradition with no importance for the actual sounding.

From the semantic point of view, ‘grass; hay; fodder’ > ‘oats’ is at least as probable as ‘barley grass’ or similar > ‘oats’, given that oats are often used for fodder.

None of the three propositions is completely convincing. Ultimately, the modified version of ESTJa’s explanation appears to be the most realistic.

**NYXA**

**FORMS:** nyxa Kmk.: RKmkS, Dmitrieva 1972

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed

**COMMENTARY:**

The sounding of the word clearly suggests a borrowing, presumably from one of the Cauc. languages, but we have not managed to establish the exact source.

---

\(^{34}\) Although cf. Tksh.dial. alaf, alef ‘fodder for animals; hay’ (Tietze 2000).
OVJOS
FORMS: ovjós Trkm.: RTrkmS
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:
This word is undoubtedly a borrowing from Russ. ovjós id. The initial o- supposably indicates that it must have been borrowed from some dial. with an ‘okanye’ pronunciation, though it would be difficult to confirm this solution, as the Russ. dialectal texts, especially the older ones, do not render the actual sounding precisely. Another possibility would be to assume a partly graphical borrowing. This, however, is definitely less likely from the cultural-historical point of view.

OVJOT
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:
This form is undoubtedly a borrowing from Russ. ovjós id. The final -t is supposably the result of a common but not fully described and not fully predictable alternation s ~ t, present in languages of various linguistic families across Siberia, including Tkc. (cf. Stachowski, M. 1999a for further bibliography).

OVSA
FORMS: ovsa Bšk.: Dmitrieva 1972
ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. ovës ‘oats’
COMMENTARY:
This form was most probably borrowed from Russ. Gen. in the function of Part. Cf. prosa ‘millet’.

SINIR BOZAN
FORMS: sinir bozan Ott.: R IV 696m
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:
This name is unclear. Maybe it is a substantivised participle in the expression (birinin) sinirlerini bozmak ‘to annoy’? Such an explanation could be justified by the fact that oats was often regarded as a weed.

---

35 Or even a fully graphical one, if one takes into account that Russ. è is usually printed as e.
SÜLE

FORMS:

hōlō  Bšk.: Egorov 1964
hālī  Bšk.: ĖSTJa
hulī  Bšk.: Joki 1952
sōlē  Ėuv.: VEWT
solo  Tat.: Voskresenskij 1894, Joki 1952
sōlo  Ėuv.: Räsänen 1920 || Tat.: سولو R IV 591b, IV 730m, I 1335b, Räsänen 1920, Joki 1952, EWT, ĖSTJa
sōlı  Tat.: Ėvmae 1901
soly  Brb.: ĖSTJa || Tat.: RTatS-D, Egorov 1964, KTLS, Dmitrieva 1972, RTatS-G, Fedotov 1996
sōlō  Tat.: Imanova 1901
sūle  Trkm.: Joki 1952, Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962, KTLS, VEWT, Dmitrieva 1972, ĖSTJa
sulī  Ėuv.: Joki 1952 ‘wild oats (Avena fatua)’, RUzbS-A, Egorov 1964, VEWT, Dmitrieva 1972, ĖSTJa, RUzbS-Ś
sōli  Trkm.: Ėvmae 1901, Joki 1952, Voskresenskij 1894, RIV 772b, KTLS, VEWT, Dmitrieva 1972, ĖSTJa, RIV 772b, Fedotov 1996 || Uzb. KTLS
sulī  Kklp.: RKklpS-B, Dmitrieva 1972
sūli  Kklp.: Joki 1952
sūli  Kar.: ĖSTJa
sulū  Tat.: ĖSTJa
suluy  Kz.: RKzkS-46, RKzkS-54
śēlē  Ėuv.: Dmitrieva 1972
śēlēli  Ėuv.: Dmitrieva 1972
süle || OATS

LANGUAGES:

Brb.: soly || Bšk.: holø, holò, hòlà, húly || Com.: sulu || Čuv.: sêltè, sülê, sölê, sêlê, sêlêlli ||
Kar.: sülê || Khak.: sula || Kirg.: sulu, sulà, sulêy || Kklp.: sully, suly || Kmke.: sulu, suly ||
Koyb.: sula, sulà || Krč.: sula || Kyzyl: sulu || Kzk.: sula, suly, sîły || Leb.: sula || Nog.: suly ||
Oyr.: sula || Šag.: sula, sula || Šr.: sula || Tat.: sölö, sölê, soly, sûly || Tel.: sula ||
Tob.: sula || Trkm.: sülê, sülî || Tuv.: sula || Uyg.: sula, sula || Uzb.: sulı, sülî

ETYMOLOGY:

1920: Räsänen: ~ Mo. soli
1952: Joki: ~ or rather < Mo. soli &c.; Uzb. soli ‘common wild oat (Avena fatua)’, Trkm. süle < Mo.; Čuv. = or < Tat.
further etymology unclear; maybe a common PAlt. name
1969: VEWT: Čuv. sëlê, sëlî < Tat. sölö; Trkm. süle, Uzb. soli < Mo. soli
1972: Clauson: < suv ‘water’
1974: ÈSTJa: limits himself to summarizing and commenting previous propositions: against Clauson 1972 and Dmitrieva TÈ 97–8 (quoted after ÈSTJa), who < suv ‘water’ + -lu (phonetics)
1976: KWb: expression unclear; perhaps = Mo. soli &c.

COMMENTARY:

This word is also common in the Mo. languages, usually meaning various wild species of grass. As it is supposed by Joki 1952, this is most probably the original meaning, which is understandable since oats were for a long time considered to be a weed, and its cultivation only began at the beginning of the Common Era; cf. also Genaust 1976.

The proposition of Clauson 1972 and Dmitrieva TÈ 97–8 (quoted after ÈSTJa) is, as it is noted by ÈSTJa, deeply problematic for phonetic reasons (cf. Khak., Tuv. sulà, Uyg. sulu, Uzb. soli instead of expected *suvluk, *sûlû if they were to come from *suv/vlua). Dmitrieva’s attempt at explaining the semantics by stating that oats are a fodder liked by horses, and that they salivate when eating it (for ‘water’ > ‘saliva’ cf. Tksh. ağiz suyu and others), is even more problematic than ÈSTJa rates it. However, it needs to be noted in defence of this proposition, that Khak., Tuv., Uyg. and Uzb. forms could actually be borrowed from other Tkc. or Mo. languages.
Still, this would by no means solve the difficulties with the semantics. For more on the phonetics cf. below.

Unfortunately, to date this is the only full etymology that has been presented. Joki’s 1952 suggestion that the word might originate from the times of the PAlt. union36 appears to be very pertinent but does not in fact explain anything. It merely moves the question back in time. We cannot, however, offer a more exhaustive explanation, either.
We believe that the original form of our word should have sounded *solo, and even this statement can we only support by guesses: 1. the Mo. forms indicate a front vocalism; the fluctuations in Tkc. are apparently the result of the as yet undescribed alternation front ~ back vocalism; 2. it is rather improbable that the u in the first

36 Or at least from the period of close contacts between the Tkc. and Mo. languages, i.e. of areal union, were a genetic relationship to never have existed.
syllable should > o; 3. we believe that the evolution ‘solo > sola, sula > suly, sulu, süle’ is more natural for the Tkc. languages than any other, which would have to be assumed for a different set of original vowels.

This reconstruction does not explain all of the Tkc. forms. What the source of long vowels in Kirg. sulā and Kzk. sūly is, we do not know.

The diffusion of this word in the Alt. languages and a very high number of phonetic variants, especially high for a word of such a simple structure, indicates that it must be old, perhaps as old as PAlt. Cf. also footnote 23.

For borrowings from Tkc. to other languages see bibliography in ESTa and Kannisto 1925.

TAΓ-ARPASY

FORMS: taγ-arpasy Uyg.: تاغ ارپاسی Raquette 1927
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:

Being absolutely clear morphologically (lit. ‘mountain barley’), this name is utterly obscure semantically.

The Uyg. word taγ – which is perhaps closely related to Kzk. tak-tak ‘barley’ (unclear, too) – has two meanings: ‘mountain’ and ‘odd (number)’. It would be difficult to assume, that the one in question is the latter, but it is also quite impossible to explain why the Uyghurs should call ‘oats’ a ‘mountain barley’. Climatic requirements of oats are much higher than those of barley; in the mountains it does not grow above 2000 m above sea level while barley sets the world record in this regard, growing as high as 4646 m above sea level in Tibet (Nowiński 1970: 182).

The second part of this compound could be regarded as another example of a very common unification/mixing of oats and barley (cf. commentary on julaf (point 2) and arpakan, also sula ‘barley’), though the existence of Uyg. arpa ‘barley’ seems to speak against it.

Maybe then taγ (presumably, etymologically different from Tkc. tag ‘mountain’) has originally had a meaning of ‘wild’ or something similar, a trace of which would be a modern ‘odd (number)’? This, given that oats were held in low esteem, could explain such a compound as Uyg. tay-arpasy but would be useless if not preventing in the case of Kzk. tak-tak ‘barley’, in light of the strange structure of the latter. Unless, of course, the two words turned out not to be related in any way after all.

URUS ARPA

FORMS: urus arpa Uzb.: Smolenskij 1912
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:

Urus does not appear in modern Uzb. dictionaries (UzbRS, Mařrufov 1981). We believe, however, that it is just a better assimilated version of the modern word rus ‘Rus-
sian". The name would then mean literally 'Russian barley'. This would suggest that the Uzbeks knew barley before they learned about oats from the Russians, or that oats was the basic cereal grown by the Russians living in Uzbekistan, while the Uzbeks mainly cultivated barley. The former of these two possibilities seems to be the more plausible, but one does not really exclude the other.

**UVUS**

**FORMS:** uvus  

**ETYMOLOGY:** 1893: Radloff: < Russ. ovës 'oats'

**COMMENTARY:**

The etymology proposed by Radloff 1893–1911 appears to be correct, although 1. another Slav. language cannot be excluded (cf. Pol. owies || Ukr. oves); 2. it completely omits the question of the unusual vocalism in Kar. Unfortunately, we cannot explain it in a fully convincing way, either.

We believe that the vocalism indicates that the word was not borrowed to Kar. directly from Russ., but via MTat.

There exists another, though less likely, possibility of a double mistake (copyist’s? printer’s? Radloff’s?) and reading? writing? 1 instead of †, i.e. uvus instead of ovos, which would be a much more understandable form, and really pointing to Russ. as the source of the borrowing. However, it still requires the assumption of a double mistake in a five-letter word.

**UWYS**

**FORMS:** uwys  

**ETYMOLOGY:** 2005: Adjagaši: < MTat  *ovus* < ORuss. / Russ.N.dial. [ovós]

**COMMENTARY:**

We can see no reason to cast doubt upon Adjagaši’s 2005: 153 etymology. Cf. uvus.

**ZYNTXY**

**FORMS:** zyntxy  

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed

**COMMENTARY:**

The sounding of this word suggests a borrowing, presumably from one of the Cauc. languages. Unfortunately, we have not managed to establish the exact source.

---

37 In such a case, a double borrowing of rus would need to be assumed. An earlier one, when Russ. was not yet so widely known by the Uzbeks, and a later one, when it was already the mother tongue for many of them. Or alternately, that the sounding was corrected some time after the borrowing. It cannot be excluded either, that urus is nothing but the real Uzb. sounding, while rus corresponds faithfully to the Russ. orthography. As a matter of fact, all these possibilities seem to be reasonably plausible.
Rice is one of the most important cultivated plants in the world. It originates from the Indian and SE Asian centres. In India, where it had probably been domesticated, it was already known in the 2nd millennium BC; it spread to China about three thousand years BC (in year 2700 BC it had already been one of the five most important plants sown by emperor Chen-Nung himself during the vernal equinox). It was brought relatively late to Persia, but must have already been known there in the 4th c. BC when the Greeks learned about it from the Persians (see *pirinč*). It then spread to Syria, and later to Egypt (brought by the Arabs in the 8th c.). In the 15th c., the Portuguese took it to the western coast of Africa, and the Arabs to the Eastern. By 1493 it had already reached America thanks to Spaniards.

Nowadays, there exist more than ten thousand varieties of rice, 800 in India alone. It is the most basic source of nourishment in many countries, especially in the Far East (Nowiński 1970: 202–3).

Given the above information, it might be surprising that none of the names for ‘rice’ in the Tkc. languages is of Chin. origin. It seems scarcely possible that such a borrowing would never have occurred. We probably should presume that this word (or words?) was later displaced by borrowings from other languages (of higher prestige?) and native names (more understandable, like *akbydā* or *döge*).

**FORMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ak bydā → akbydā</th>
<th>dögō → tüvi</th>
<th>gürünč → gürüč</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akbydā</td>
<td>dögō → tüvi</td>
<td>gürüč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ak h(ă)rüpē</td>
<td>dögü → tüvi</td>
<td>iris → ris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aryš</td>
<td>dügi → tüvi</td>
<td>kürüş → gürüč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birinč → pirinč</td>
<td>dugu → tüvi</td>
<td>kürüş → gürüč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birinč → pirinč</td>
<td>dügü → tüvi</td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bryndz → pirinč</td>
<td>dügü → tüvi</td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bürinč → pirinč</td>
<td>dügü → tüvi</td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bürünč → pirinč</td>
<td>dügü → tüvi</td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? buryž → pirinč</td>
<td>erz</td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltik</td>
<td>görbc → gürüč</td>
<td>ris → ris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltik pirinči → čeltik</td>
<td></td>
<td>pirinč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltuk → čeltik</td>
<td>guriš → gürüč</td>
<td>saly → šaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltük → čeltik</td>
<td>gürüş → gürüč</td>
<td>šal → šaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltük arpasy → čeltik</td>
<td>guruc → gürüč</td>
<td>šaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čeltik → čeltik</td>
<td>gürüč</td>
<td>šaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>döge → tüvi</td>
<td>gürünč → gürüč</td>
<td>šeltük → čeltik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
akbydā || RICE

 Languages:
 Az.: dügü || düjü
 Bšk.: dögö || risa
 Com.: tuturkan
 CTat.: prinč
 Čag.: čeltük || tuturgu
 Čuv.: ris || risb
 Gag.: pirinč
 KarC.: prinč
 KarH.: bryndz
 KarT.: bриńč
 Khal.: birinǯ || dügi
 Kirg.: kürüč || kürüš || šaly
 Kklp.: guriš || gürüč || šaly
 Kmk.: dügü || dügü
 Krč Blk.: prinč
 Lang.

 Forms: ak bydā  Tuv.: Dmitrieva 1972 || akbydā RTUWŠ

 ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < ak 'white' + bydā 'gruel'

 COMMENTARY:
 This name is absolutely clear morphologically: Tkc. ak 'white' + Tkc. bugdaj 'wheat'.
 The absence of bydā in Tuv. does not appear to be a serious argument against such an
 explanation. However, the short ą-y might be surprising in the light of the original
 ąg-. It is possible, though, that this is only a spurious incompatibility: 1. the length of
 vowels in non-first syllables is marked in an irregular manner in Tuv.; 2. it could have
 been shortened secondarily, resulting from the proximity of another long vowel.

 AKBYDĀ

 Forms: ak bydā  Tuv.: Dmitrieva 1972 || akbydā RTUWŠ

 ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < ak 'white' + bydā 'gruel'

 COMMENTARY:
 This name is absolutely clear morphologically: Tkc. ak 'white' + Tkc. bugdaj 'wheat'.
 The absence of bydā in Tuv. does not appear to be a serious argument against such an
 explanation. However, the short ą-y might be surprising in the light of the original
 ąg-. It is possible, though, that this is only a spurious incompatibility: 1. the length of
 vowels in non-first syllables is marked in an irregular manner in Tuv.; 2. it could have
 been shortened secondarily, resulting from the proximity of another long vowel.

 AK H(Ü)RÜPĒ

 Forms: ak h(ą)rüpē  Tof.: RTofS

 ETYMOLOGY:
 1971: Rassadin: hürpē < Russ. kroupa 'gruel'
 1995: Buraev: h(ą)rüpē < Russ. kroupa 'gruel'

 COMMENTARY:
 This name is absolutely clear. We can see no reasons to assume a metaphorical use of ak here.
 The shift from 'gruel' to 'rice' is obvious, given the most popular method of preparation.
ARYŠ

FORMS: aryş Tat.: Voskresenskij 1894

COMMENTARY: as yet not discussed in the meaning of ‘rice’

ETYMOLOGY:

Aryš is a common name for ‘rye’ in the Tkc. languages. We know of no other word that has both these two meanings simultaneously. Perhaps, the similarity of sounding to Russ. riš was of some significance here; at any rate a separate/repeated borrowing must be ruled out as then the prothesis could not be expected to sound *a:- it would have to be at least *y- or more probably *i-(riš) (cf. aryş ’rye’). Perhaps then a contamination?

ČELTIK

FORMS:

čeltik Ott.: Čeltik ‘unhusked rice and others’ R III 1980m, ’rice field’ Wiesentahl 1895;

čeltik pirinǯi Ott.: čeltik pirinǯi ‘unhusked rice’ Redhouse 1921
čeltuk Ott.: čeltuk ‘provincial for čeltik’ Redhouse 1921
čeltük Čag.: čeltük id R III 1980m
čeltük arpasy Ott.: Tietze 2002– s.v. čeltik
čeltuk Ott.: čeltuk ‘rice on the field’ R III 1980m
šeltuk Ott.: šeltuk vulg. čeltik ‘rice field; rice on the field’ Redhouse 1921

LANGUAGES:

Čag.: čeltük || Ott.: čeltik, čeltik pirinǯi, čeltuk, čeltük arpasy, čiltik, šeltük || Tat.: čeltik

ETYMOLOGY:


COMMENTARY:

We can see no reason to doubt Eren’s 1999 proposition. A few details, however, remain to be explained. The Pers. form has a different anlaut and vocalism than the Tkc. ones. Presumably, the change in the anlaut happened during or very shortly after the borrowing since there are no š- forms in Tkc. As for the vowels, we have two contradictory hints:

1. Ott. čeltük arpasy indicates that the front harmony of the Tkc. forms results from the influence of palatal ç-, and a secondary ‘reharmonization’ of the whole word: Pers. šaltuk > ? Ott. > Pre-Ott. çaltuk > čeltuk > čeltük or čeltuk > čeltik, čeltük. This route is also pointed to by Tksh.dial. čeltik.

2. Russ. čaltyk ’čeltik’, due to the initial ç- should be considered a borrowing from Tkc. rather than Pers. In such case, however, the following chain of changes should be

---

38 Though not attested, in theory a MPers. *ç- form could be assumed, too, as it would still yield š in NPers.; cf. e.g. Maciuszak 2003: 94.
39 Also Vasmer 1959, even if without giving a reason, derives the Russ. word from Tksh. or Az.
assumed: Pers. šaltūk > ? Ott. ? Pre-Ott. *čaltuk > *čaltyk > *čeltūk. This solution, as opposed to 1., gives no convenient base for explaining čeltūk. Perhaps the only way to reconcile these two arguments, is to assume different evolutions of our word in Tksh. dialects (possibly, resulting from repeated, independent borrowings) which, however, finally yielded a single sounding.

ERZ

FORMS: erz (ظر) Ott.: Wiesentahl 1895, erz Redhouse 1921
ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed
COMMENTARY:
This name is unclear. The sounding seems to point to Gr., but the Gr. form is ὀρίζων, ὀρίζα (Woodhouse 1910). Perhaps from a dialectal form or from an oblique case?

GÜRÜNČ

FORMS:
görüş Uzb.: VEWT
gréč OTkc.: VEWT || Uyg.: Menges 1931
gurinǯ MTkc.MA.B: Borovkov 1971: 102
guriš Kklp.: RKklpS-BB, Dmitrieva 1972
gürüš Kklp.: RKklpS-ST, RKklpS-B
guruč Uzb.: (‘husked’) RUzbS-A, (no description) RUzbS-A, Dmitrieva 1972
gürüň OTkc.: VEWT, Dmitrieva 1972 || Uyg.: گورنچ Raquette 1927
gürüńe OTkc.: Dmitrieva 1972 || Uzb.: (گورنچ) Nalivkinъ 1895
gürüńi Uyg.: گورنچ Raquette 1927 || Uzb.: ‘gruel’ Lapin 1899, Smolenskij 1912
küriš Kzk.: RKzkS-46, RKzkS-54, Dmitrieva 1972, DKzk
dikürüş Kirg.: ‘husked rice’ RKirgS-Juças, RKirgS-Ju57, VEWT, Dmitrieva 1972
dikürüş Kirg.: Mašanovъ 1899, Katanovъ 1909 || Tat.: VEWT

LANGUAGES:
Kirg.: kürüş, kürüş || Kklp.: guriš, guriš || Kzk.: kürüš || MTkc.: guryń, guryń || OTkc.: görüş, gürüş, gürüš, gürüńe || Tat.: kürüş || Uyg.: görüş, gürüş, gürüń, gürüńe, gürüńi || Uzb.: görüş, guruč, gürüńe

ETYMOLOGY:
1969: VEWT: considers gürüńe to be the same word as MTkc. kürüş ‘millet boiled in water or milk with butter’ and, (with a question mark) Krč. gysyn ‘bread’ (? Çuv. > *kürüş > Fi. kyrsä ‘bread’)
1972: Dmitrieva: Kirg. kürüş, Kklp. guriš, Kzk. kürüš, OTkc. guryńe(n), Uzb. guruč < Ir. gürüńe ‘rice’

COMMENTARY:
The etymology offered by Dmitrieva 1972 may well be true, although it does raise some phonetic doubts. As for the Ir. etymon, the shape guryń seems to be much more realistic (Hübschmann 1897: 27). This word was presumably borrowed at least
a couple of times, as is indicated by the different assimilations of the vowels (u-u, ü-ü, ü-ı) and the incomprehensible forms with ö and Kklp. u-ı) and consonants (g-(n)č, g-š, k-č, k-š) but the exact routes of its penetration are impossible to reconstruct, not at least within the current state of the subject of historical phonetics of individual Tkc. languages.

The comparison to MTkč kuršek proposed by VEWT seems realistic phonetically, but a little odd on the semantic side. To the best of our knowledge, there are no parallels for one word having the meanings of ‘rice’ and ‘millet’ at the same time.

Cf. pirinč.

PIRINČ

FORMS:
birinǯ Khal.: Doerfer 1987 || Uzb.: ‘groots’ Lapin 1899, Smolenskij 1912
birinč KarI: KRPS
bryndz KarH: KRPS
būrinč Trkm.: Alijiv/Bōrijif 1929
būrūnč Trkm.: RTrkmS, Dmitrieva 1972
< buryž Nog.: RNogS, Dmitrieva 1972
čeltik pirinǯi Ott.: (چلتیک برنج ‘) ‘unhusked rice’ Redhouse 1921
pirinč Gag.: Dmitrieva 1972 || Ott.: (پرنچ) Wiesentahl 1895 || Tksh.: Dmitrieva 1972
pirinǯ Ott.: Redhouse 1921

LANGUAGES:

ETYMOLOGY:
1972: Dmitrieva: Gag. pirinč, Krč.Blk. prinč, Nog. buryž, Trkm. būrūnč, Tksh. pirinč < Ir. pirinč ‘rice; латунь’
1999: Eren: < Pers. birinǯ

COMMENTARY:
Dmitrieva’s 1972 proposition seems very plausible. We can only add, that Pers. birinǯ ~ gurinǯ < Skr. vṛihī or Afgh. vrišē (Lauffer 1919: 393). Lauffer also believes that reconstructing Av. *verenǯa (Horn 1893: 208) or Ir. *vrinǯi? ‘vriši? (Hübschmann 1897: 27) is wrong for historical reasons: according to his sources, rice only gained

40 The evolution ö > ü is natural in the Tkc. languages; the opposite is not.
41 At least some of the forms were probably borrowed with the mediation of another Tkc. language.
42 Tüvi &c. ‘rice’ = təg ‘millet’ is an exception here. However, in this example the differentiation of the semantics results from the source of this word: ‘təg- ‘to beat, to hit’, being absolutely neutral with regard to species.
43 The missing “<” sign in Dmitrieva 1972: 216 is perhaps a typographical error.
RIS

FORMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>risa</td>
<td>Bšk.</td>
<td>Dmitrieva 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risa</td>
<td>Čuv.</td>
<td>Nikol'skij 1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETYMOLOGY:

1972: Dmitrieva: Čuv., Khak., Oyr., Tuv., Yak. ris < Russ. ris, and points to a comparison with OInd. vrīhis 'rice' (after: Vasmer 1986–87)

COMMENTARY:

It is difficult to find fault with the etymology proposed by Dmitrieva 1972.

ŠALY

FORMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sal</td>
<td>Uyg.</td>
<td>šal 'unhusked' DFKzk</td>
<td>Jarring 1998: 14 'rice; rice as a plant; rice on field; unhusked rice'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šal</td>
<td>Uyg.</td>
<td>šal 'unhusked' DFKzk</td>
<td>Jarring 1998: 14 'rice; rice as a plant; rice on field; unhusked rice'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šəli</td>
<td>Uzb.</td>
<td>šəli 'unhusked' RUzbS-A, (no description) RUzbS-Ş, ('unhusked') Dmitrieva 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šəli</td>
<td>Uzb.</td>
<td>šəli 'unhusked' RUzbS-A, (no description) RUzbS-Ş, ('unhusked') Dmitrieva 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kirg.</th>
<th>šal</th>
<th>Kklp.</th>
<th>sal</th>
<th>Kzk.</th>
<th>šal</th>
<th>Trkm.</th>
<th>šaly</th>
<th>Uyg.</th>
<th>šal</th>
<th>Uzb.</th>
<th>šaly, šəli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ETYMOLOGY:
1972: Dmitrieva: only points to a comparison with Mo. sali

COMMENTARY:
We can see no reason to discard the etymology proposed by Jarring 1998: 14. We would only remark that -i was probably understood as a Px in Uyg, and hence the form šal.

TOKURGAK

FORMS:
tok(u)rag MTkc.MA.B: Borovkov 1971 ‘rice for pilaff’
tokurgak MTkc.MA.B: Borovkov 1971: 108

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:
The etymology of this word is not clear. We believe that it is a morphologically adapted (folk etymology) version of tuturgan (probably < Mo., cf.) associated with tok- ‘to knock, to tap, to hit’ (for semantics cf. tüvi, also dövme ‘wheat’) and with a Tkc. suffix -ak. The suffix -gan is there in the Tkc. languages, too, so here an adaptation would not be necessary. However, if the meaning was to be similar to ‘beaten (out)’, -ak would seem to suit it better.
Cf. tuturgan.

TUTURGAN

FORMS:
tuturgan Com.: R III 1484m || MTkc.H: طوطورغان || MTkc.IM
tuturgu Čag.: توتورغو R III 1484m

LANGUAGES:

ETYMOLOGY:
1951: Ligeti: 87: < Mo. tuturyan id.
1963: TMEN: limits itself to scepticism towards Ligeti: ‘[…] hier dürfte der strikte Nachweis Mo. Herkunft allerdings schwerig sein’ (TMEN I: 5)
1972: Dmitrieva: only points to the comparison with WMo

COMMENTARY:
This word is not wholly comprehensible. Its Mo. origin, as proposed by Ligeti 1951–52: 87, is possible but to the best of our knowledge, the word remains equally unclear on the Mo. ground. This could suggest that the opposite direction of borrowing is no less probable. However, were our proposition of explaining tokurgak to prove true, it would point to the direction proposed by Ligeti. Finally, the word could have been borrowed to Mo. and Tkc. from yet another language independently.
Not knowing the eventual etymology of our word, we cannot determine whether the final -gan is a native Mo (Tkc.? ) suffix, or a morphologically (phonetically?) adapted part of a foreign etymon.

Cf. tokurgak.

TÜVI

FORMS:

döge  Tat.: RTatS-D, TMEN 979, RTatS-G, Dmitrieva 1972
dögö  Bšk.: RBškS, TMEN 979, Dmitrieva 1972, Eren 1999 || Tat.: Voskresenskij 1894
dögö  Tat.: VEWT, TMEN 979
dögü  Tksh.dial.: ‘fine groats’ Eren 1999
duğu  Kmk.: Németh 1911/12, VEWT
dügü  Az.: R III 1802m, VEWT, TMEN 979 || Kmk.: Németh 1911/12, TMEN 979, RKmkS, Dmitrieva 1972
dügü  Tksh.dial.: ‘fine groats’ Eren 1999
düjü  Az.: R AzS, TMEN 979, Dmitrieva 1972
tögi  OTkc.: Erdal 340 ‘husked and/or ground cereal’
tügi  Uyg.: ‘husked rice’ R III 1539m, VEWT
tüvi  Trkm.: Alijiv/Böörijif 1929, RTkmS, VEWT, TMEN 979, Dmitrieva 1972,
Eren 1999 ‘rice; pilaff’

gültü  Tksh.dial.: ‘fine groats’ Eren 1999
dügü  Khar.: Doerfer 1987

dügü  Kmk.: Németh 1911/12, TMEN 979, RKmkS, Dmitrieva 1972
dügü  Tksh.dial.: ‘fine groats’ Eren 1999
dügü  Khar.: Doerfer 1987

tögi  OTkc.: Erdal 340 ‘husked and/or ground cereal’
tügi  Uyg.: ‘husked rice’ R III 1539m, VEWT
tüvi  Trkm.: Alijiv/Böörijif 1929, RTkmS, VEWT, TMEN 979, Dmitrieva 1972,
Eren 1999 ‘rice; pilaff’

LANGUAGES:

Az.: düzü, düigungü  || Bšk.: düögö  || Khar.: düzü  || Nog.: düügi  || OTkc.: tögi
   || Tat.: düge, düögö, düögö  || Tksh.dial.: dügü, dügüı  || Trkm.: tüvi  || Uyg.: tüügi

ETYMOLOGY:

1963: TMEN: ‘tügi’
1969: VEWT; limits itself to enumerating the forms
1974: ESTJA s.v. dary: OTkc. tügi, töhö probably do not belong to the same group as dary
1991: Erdal: 340: OTkc. tügi ‘husked and/or ground cereal’ < tüg ‘to grind; to crush’

COMMENTARY:

This word is quite common in the Tkc. languages, and is found in two basic meanings:
‘(husked) rice’ (more common) and ‘millet’ (less common).

It seems that TMEN’s 979 reconstruction of *tügi might perhaps need a modification of the first vowel: ö seems to be much more probable for phonetic reasons (the ö > ü change is natural in the Tkc. languages; the opposite direction is not).

We believe that the word comes from OTkc. *tögi (~ *töv-) ‘to beat, to hit’. The differences in auslaut (low : high vowels) probably suggest two separate derivates from Tkc. dögü- ~ dögü- ‘to beat, to hit’

44 Perhaps also Tat. düügi ‘wheat’ (cf.) speaks in favour of such a distinction.
1. in -ī: "tögi (> dügü, tüvi, tüğī > düği > dügü > dügü and dügü and duğu\(^45\))
   Cf. e.g. bèni 'broken (animal)', biti 'writing', japy 'building' (Zajączkowski 1932: 105)
2. in -ē: "töge (> dügü, dügü)
   Cf. e.g. jara 'wound', jaja 'rainbow', tuda 'handle', üörü 'happiness' (Pomorska 2004: 120, Zajączkowski 1932: 105).

For semantic development, cf. Slav. prosō < "pro- 'to hit' ~ "pro- + -s, i.e. 'something hit, something beaten' > 'husked millet grain' > 'millet grain' > 'grain' (Sędzik 1977: 11), and it is quite possible that this parallel is not coincidental. Anyway, it is interesting that millet (cf. tögü 'millet') came to Europe from the East (Nowiński 1970: 189). One might venture then, to suppose that the Slav. name is not entirely a native neologism, but rather a calque deriving eventually from some very old name, on which the Tkc. *tögi/e* is also based. Naturally, such a convergence also might be a purely coincidental one. The semantic development presented here is in fact, quite trivial.

Dövme 'wheat' provides a nice semantic parallel, too.

On the other hand, we should not discount the possibility that the name came from "tügü 'hair (adj.)' < tük 'hair' + -i adj. (< Pers.). While seemingly acceptable from the phonetic point of view (although the -ē, -ö auslaut is unclear), this proposition raises some doubts on the semantic side. The meanings of 'hair' and 'millet' are quite close to each other (cf. tüjtary 'millet') but we know of no parallels for 'hair' and 'rice'. Such a shift does not seem to be impossible, though, as rice and some species of millet (especially setarias) look quite similar.

Both ideas seem probable but only the first one assumes a more likely "ö in the first syllable, requires no further semantic assumptions (for which perhaps no parallels exist), and explains the meanings of 'husked rice' and 'husked millet' in a more natural way.

Cf. tögü 'millet' and dügü 'wheat', and (semantics) dövme, ügür and tüjtary 'millet'.

---

\(^{45}\) The reason for the harmony shift in Kmk. is unclear. Most probably it can be treated as a result of the front:back alternation which, while it definitely exists, has not yet been properly examined, and is therefore unpredictable.
Rye is a secondary cultivable plant (formed from a weed), and is still found as a weed in some parts of the world, especially in the Indochinese and Central Asian Centres. Its requirements are rather moderate, allowing it to dominate in mountainous areas and in low quality soils, but it tends to be displaced by other plants in more fertile lands.

Rye probably originates from the area of Asia Minor, Iran and Armenia. Numerous primitive taxons with clearly weed-like features can still be found in the region and its surroundings. They surely can not have been ever been domesticated before as there never existed intentional cultivations of pure rye in this part of the world.

Seeds of rye turn out to be stronger when mixed with the seeds of other cereals. In Central Europe mixing equal amounts of rye and wheat, and then continuously seeding with the material of the same origin, results in nearly pure rye harvests in just a couple of years. It is probably this feature, in connection with a very old tradition of seeding mixtures of seeds rather than pure species, that gave birth to legends (Tkć., among others) of gradual change (a deterioration) of wheat into rye. (Nowiński 1970: 176–79.)

The relatively few names and their character (borrowings and descriptive names) show that rye has never been a particularly important plant for the Tkć. peoples. Presumably, it was treated, as it still often is in Asia, more as a weed than a cultivable plant.

**FORMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rye Name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ārəš → aryš</td>
<td>ārəš → aryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ārša → aryš</td>
<td>ārša → aryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arsānaj</td>
<td>arsānaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arys → aryš</td>
<td>arys → aryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aryš</td>
<td>aryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aryš bidaj → aryš</td>
<td>aryş bidaj → aryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aržanaj → arsānaj</td>
<td>aržanaj → arsānaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aržanaj tarā → arsānaj</td>
<td>aržanaj tarā → arsānaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aslyk</td>
<td>aslyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašlych → aslyk</td>
<td>ašlych → aslyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čadagān → jadagan</td>
<td>čadagān → jadagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čadygan → jadygan</td>
<td>čadygan → jadygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čavdar</td>
<td>čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čavdary → čavdar</td>
<td>čavdary → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čovdar → čavdar</td>
<td>čovdar → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čovdary → čavdar</td>
<td>čovdary → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čovdary → čavdar</td>
<td>čovdary → čavdar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čovdar → čavdar</td>
<td>čovdar → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dargan → darikan</td>
<td>dargan → darikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darikan</td>
<td>darikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darkān → darikan</td>
<td>darkān → darikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jadagan → jadygan</td>
<td>jadagan → jadygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jadygan</td>
<td>jadygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jadygan āryš → jadygan</td>
<td>jadygan āryš → jadygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jatkan → jadygan</td>
<td>jatkan → jadygan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jatkan āryš → āryš</td>
<td>jatkan āryš → āryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bašak</td>
<td>kara bašak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bidaj → karabugdaj</td>
<td>kara bidaj → kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bijdaj → kara bugdaj</td>
<td>kara bijdaj → kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kēk naļza</td>
<td>kēk naļza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Language</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kēk tarā → kēk tarā</td>
<td>kēk tarā → kēk tarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kēk tarā → kēk tarā</td>
<td>kēk tarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kēktarā</td>
<td>kēktarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oruos</td>
<td>oruos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qara bugdaj → kara bugdaj</td>
<td>qara bugdaj → kara bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rožb</td>
<td>rožb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rži</td>
<td>rži</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūle → suly</td>
<td>sūle → suly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulli → suly</td>
<td>sulli → suly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suly</td>
<td>suly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tereke → darikan</td>
<td>tereke → darikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yraš → āryš</td>
<td>yraš → āryš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žavdar → čavdar</td>
<td>žavdar → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žavdar bugdaj → čavdar</td>
<td>žavdar bugdaj → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žavdar bugdaj</td>
<td>žavdar bugdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žovdari → čavdar</td>
<td>žovdari → čavdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žaudar → čavdar</td>
<td>žaudar → čavdar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Az.</td>
<td>čovdar</td>
<td>қойб: арыс</td>
<td>Tel.: арыш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk.</td>
<td>kara budaj</td>
<td>Кр.: кара будай</td>
<td>Tksh.: чавдар</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brb.</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td>Кр.: Blk. арыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bšk.</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>kara budaj</td>
<td>Куйр.: aрыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crm.</td>
<td>čavdar</td>
<td>жаткан</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTat.</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td>Кызыл: āraš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čuv.</td>
<td>yräš</td>
<td>Кж.: арыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar.</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarC:</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td>Кеб.: арыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarH:</td>
<td>астык</td>
<td>Ног.: арыş</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarT:</td>
<td>алыч</td>
<td>Отт.: чавдар</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khak.</td>
<td>aрыş</td>
<td>Оыр.: арыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krg.</td>
<td>kara bijadaj</td>
<td></td>
<td>kara būdaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kklp.</td>
<td>aрыş</td>
<td></td>
<td>жпдан</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmk.</td>
<td>aрыş</td>
<td>Ш.: арыш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob.:</td>
<td>арыش</td>
<td>Тат.: aрыş</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trkm.</td>
<td>aрыш</td>
<td>Tat.Gr.: чавдар</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyg.</td>
<td>kara bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzb.</td>
<td>žavdar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya.</td>
<td>arsānaj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arsānaj

**Forms:**

- **Arsānaj** Ya.: Dmitrieva 1972
- **Arsānay** Tof.: Anikin 2003 s.v. ржаной
- **Arsānaj tarä** Tof.: RTofS
- **Arsānaj taryg** Tof.: RTofS

**Languages:**

- **Tof.** арзанай, арзанайтаря, арзанайтаря | **Ya.:** арсāнай

**Etymology:**


**Commentary:**

While we do not intend to negate the previous propositions, we believe they require a little more commentary.

Long vowel in the last but one syllable of the Yak. form is discordant with the Russ. accent. Such an adaptation can probably be explained by the fact that the Russ. adjective suffixes -oj and -ój are always treated in Yak. as non-accented, which allows for shifting the trace of the accent (the length of the vowel) to another syllable.

The connection with тарä ~ таряг in Tof. is probably a calque from a Russ. dial. compound *арзано žito 'rye', where žito 'cereal in sheafs; cereal in seeds; rye; wheat' (Fedotov 1979), although it is also possible that a very popular model in Tof. of naming cereals by composition with тарä could have played some role here as well, cf. тарä 'millet'.
ARYŞ

FORMS:

ārəş  Kyzyl: Joki 1953
ārša  Čuv.: Adjagaşi 2005: 175 ‘зной и марево во время поспевания ржи’
arya


arya bidaj  Kmk.: RKmkS
jatkan aryş  Kūár.: R I 278b

LANGUAGES:


ETYMOLOGY:

1972: Dmitrieva: aryş &c., Čuv. yraş
   Khak., Kzk. aryş < [unclear expression] Brb., CTat., Kar., Oyr., Tat. aryş
   CTat., Kar. aryş, Khak., Kklp., Kzk. aryş < Tat.
1996: Fedotov: aryş &c. (but rož not listed) < Russ. rož 'rye'
1998: Anikin RTür: Tat., Bšk. aryş < Russ. rož 'rye'
1999: Eren sv. çavdar: quotes VEWT
2005: Adjagaşi: Čuv. yraş < OČuv. *āraš < [late OERuss.? early ORuss.?] [rož'] < OESlav. rož
   Bšk., Tat. aryş < MBšk., MTat. *aryş < VBulg.2 *aryş < OESlav. rož
COMMENTARY:

We can see no reason to doubt the essential part of the etymology first proposed by VEWT, and later accepted by many scholars, but we believe that it needs to be slightly modified. Epentetic vowels are high in the Tkc. languages (cf. also žëhimien 'barley'), and so, as has been pointed out by Achmetjanov 1989: 48, Russ. rožь should rather yield an *şryš*-like form. This is why we believe that it was not the liter. form that was the source of the borrowing, but a dial. form *āryž* (ORuss. 12th c. rožь), which we believe raises no doubts about the phonetics. The uniformity of the Tkc. forms might suggest that the word was borrowed very early, and preserved in an almost or completely unchanged form in various languages. However, such an early borrowing from Russ. is not very likely for cultural reasons. Given that it appears over a wide area, we would rather believe that it was borrowed repeatedly, and independently. This does not contradict with the proposed Russ. dial. etymon, as it is found in very many of Russ. dial.

As to the sounding of our word, the vocalism of the Yak. form is the only exception, resulting surely from it being borrowed independently.

The source of rožь is, obviously, Russ. rožь, too. This form only appears in Trkm. and Khak. In Trkm. it is probably a very young borrowing, and for the Khak. form, we can see two possible explanations:

1. the word was not borrowed for the second time; only its spelling was changed to the Russ. one although the pronunciation (especially among the less educated) most probably remained unchanged. This explanation seems to be more probable.
2. the word was borrowed for the second time. Such an explanation is possible due to the spelling which suggests a different sounding, but seems to be less probable due to the practice often used in the Soviet Union, of restoring the original spelling of Russ. borrowings in various languages.

Cf. rožь.

ASŁYK

FORMS:

asłyk KarH: Mardkowicz 1935, KRPS
ašłych KarT: KRPS

---

46 Achmetjanov 1989: 48 does not fully accept it but his argument is expressed unclearly. He mentions, however, an important phonetic detail, that OESlav. rožь should not receive the protetic a- in the Tkc. languages; cf. below.

47 Or, less probably, as Achmetjanov 1989: 48 suggests it, *yreš.

48 Filin 1965– does not list such a form. He does list, however, aržanój 'rye [adj.],’ in numerous dial., including Siberian ones. According to Barchudarov 1997, aržanoj is attested since the 13th c. The existence of Russ. dial. *āryž* is also suggested by Čuv. Anatri ķrša ‘зной и врeмe ня пoспeванийa ржь’ (Adjagaši 2005: 175) which could easily be explained by a borrowing of *aržа (*arša?) in Gen. Sg., and by hardly anything else.
Languages:
Karb: aslyk || KarT: ašlych

Etymology: see aš 'barley'

Commentary:
We do not know of any semantic parallel for combining the meanings of 'rye' and 'barley' in one word. However, it is not necessarily surprising in this case, as the etymology of this word would allow it to develop quite freely.

Čavdar

Forms:
čavdar  Trkm.: Aljiv/Böörjiif 1929
čavdar  Az.: RAzS, Dmitrieva 1972 || Trkm.: KTLS
čavdar  Trkm.: RTrkmS, Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962, Dmitrieva 1972
čavdar  Az.: KTLS
žavdar  Uzb.: UZbS-A, UZbS-Š
žavdar buγdoj  Uzb.: UZbS-Š
žavdar buγdoj  Uzb.: UZbS-A
žavdar  Uzb.: Dmitrieva 1972
žaudar  Uzb.: Lapin 1899, Smolenskij 1912

Languages:
Az.: čavdar, čavdar  || Crm.: čavdar  || CTat.: čavdar  || KarC.: čavdar  || Ott.: čavdar  || TatGr.: čavdar  || Tksh.: čavdar  || Trkm.: čavdar, čavdar, čavdar, čavdar, čavdar buγdoj, čavdar buγdoj, čavdar buγdoj, čavdar

Etymology:
1969: VEWT: < Pers. čûdar
1998: Stachowski, S.: < N Pers. čûdar 'rye (Secale cereale)'
1999: Eren 1999: < Pers. čûdar 'rye', quoting for comparison Pers. žaudar 'a herb growing in wheat', žaudara 'a herb growing amongst wheat', gaudar, gaudara 'a plant growing amongst wheat and barley', žau, žav 'barley, a grain of barley'

Commentary:
1. VEWT's proposition, and its acceptance by Eren 1999 seems absolutely incomprehensible. In the modern liter. Pers., there exist two forms of this word: čûdar [-ou-] and žaudar [-av-]. Even though the alternation of ou ~ av ~ ū is quite common in Pers., we can see no reason to assume, as VEWT and Eren 1999 suggest it, a borrowing of the -ū- form when the Tk. forms point clearly to the -av- one.
2. The Tk. alteration of -a- ~ -o- is probably to be explained by borrowings from different dialects of Pers. or, even more probably, from Taj. (Pers. ā = Taj. o; Pers. a = Taj. a).
– The Uyg. č- in place of the expected ž- or č- is not clear to us, not least because in Uyg. (at least in its liter. version), all the three consonants exist in anlaut (see e.g. Tömür 2003).
– The Uzb. alternation of -a- / -o- ~ -ā- is presumably to be explained by the pala-lalizing influence of č, quite common in the Tkc. languages, and a secondary adaptation of the second syllable to the vowel harmony.
– In Trkm. and Uyg. there appears a final -i / -y. Although we cannot prove it directly, we suppose that they are of entirely different origin:
  – The Uyg. -i is an adjective suffix (cf. e.g. Uyg. تقهقاسادي ‘economical’ or تقهقاسادي ‘revolutionary’ (Tömür 2003: 121f)). (Lack of the į umlaut results from the original length of the vowel of the final syllable in the Pers. source; cf. Jarring 1933: 91: ‘Der Vokal in dieser [final] Silbe ist immer a oder u’.)
  – The Trkm. final -ry could in theory be a harmonized version of čavdari (cf. Tömür 2003: 121f), abstracted from a čavdari bugdaj (?)-like compound. Since, however, such a compound is not attested, the proposition of Eren 1999, to explain the final -y by a contamination with Trkm. dary ‘millet’, seems to be more probable. Such a solution would cast some light on the order in which the Tkc. peoples learned about these cereals; similarly köktarı (cf.) suggests such an ordering for Tuv.

3. On naming ‘rye’ with the name for ‘wheat’, cf. kara bugdaj.

DARIKAN

FORMS: dargan, darikan, darkan, tereke Tksh.dial.: Dankoff 1995: 702

ETYMOLOGY:

1995: Dankoff: 702: < Arm. տարեկան tarekan ‘rye’

COMMENTARY:

Dankoff’s 1995: 72 etymology is probably true (although cf. also (Arm. >) Kurd. tariɡan, Dankoff 1995: 702). His Arm. etymology also seems to be very plausible: < Arm. տարո ‘year’, liter. ‘annual’ > ‘harvest’ > ‘rye’, which easily explains such Tksh.dial. meanings as tereke ‘cereal’, tereklik ‘vegetable garden’ or tereke ‘wheat’ (cf.) &c, if assuming a borrowing from before the semantic shift in Arm. (attested in Ott. since the 14th c.).

JADYGAN

FORMS:
čadagan Sag.: ‘Winterrogen’ VEWT 177a
čadygan Sr.: VEWT 177a
jadagan Oyr.: RAItS, Dmitrieva 1972
jadagan Sag.: Eren 1999 sv. çavdar || Sr.: Eren 1999 sv. çavdar, R III 211b
jadygan aryš Küür.: R III 203b
jatkan Küür.: R III 203b
jatkan aryš Küür.: R I 278b
LANGUAGES:

Küär.: jadygan aryš, jatkan, jatkan aryš || Oyr.: jadagan || Sag.: ědadagan, jadygan ||
Sr.: ěđadygan, jadygan

ETYMOLOGY: 1969: VEWT: < jat- ‘to lie’

COMMENTARY:

The etymology proposed in VEWT is semantically plausible but it has some weaknesses, too:

– for:

– semantics: Rye, being a weed, has more fragile stems, and ripens faster than cereals, thanks to which its seeds scatter very early, even before the harvest. Thus, on a field where wheat and rye grow together, broken rye stems are visible quite clearly among wheat. (Nowiński 1970: 178)

– against:

– suffixation: Generally, the suffix used here has a form -gan, not -Vgan, and is consistently attached to nominal, not verbal, bases in the names of animals and plants. (Poppe 1927: 116; Frankle 1948: 55f).

– distribution: If -gan was indeed the suffix used here, Küär. would be the only language to preserve its original form. This is not very likely since Küär. is not a peripheral language and it does not preserve such old forms very often. The possibility exists, however, of a partial defence against the objection from the point suffixation: the appearance of -y- (-a- in Sag. ědadagan) is surely secondary (< ěđadygan) and results from the not fully clear alternation of a ~ y) could have been caused by an analogy to quite numerous derivates in -gan(a) from roots ending in -y. They are also common in the Mo. languages which influenced quite heavily the Tkc. languages with the -y- forms: cf. Mo. üni-gen < üni-gen ‘cow’, kulu-gana ‘mouse’ (Poppe 1927: 116). Besides, -a- in Sag. ědadagan, too, could be explained by an analogy to Mo. forms such as kila-gana ‘a species of steppe grass’, üne-gen ‘fox’, teme-gen ‘camel’ (Poppe 1927: 116). This is probably how the Brb. form küșügän ‘eagle’ came into existence: < küč ‘eagle with a white tail’ (Frankle 1948: 55f).

Still, this defence does not explain why such a derivate should be made from a verbal, and not a nominal, stem. In theory, one could assume that an unknown nominal *jat was in fact the base, and it would not be an unacceptable assumption as this is actually the case with most names of animals and plants with the -gan suffix, cf. Poppe’s opinion (1927: 116): ‘Was dieses Suffix -γan ursprünglich bedeutete und welche Funktion es hatte, ist unbekannt, da entsprechende Stämme sonst in der Sprache nicht vorkommen’.

Perhaps the unknown *jat could be identified with Čag., Kar., Oyr., Tat., Uyg. jat ‘foreign, strange’ R III 190b? Then the meaning would have to be something like ‘foreign cereal’. Unfortunately, it seems to be impossible to determine when the Sag., Sr. and Küär. became acquainted with rye.49

49 Although it seems to be at least possible to say for Küär. that the words jatkan ~ jadygan must be older than aryš, i.e. older than perhaps the 17th c. (or maybe even older?). This is not, however,
However, ‘foreign, strange’ could also be understood as ‘not sown, and still appearing’ rather than ‘coming from someone foreign’. Then, such a derivate would be understandable, given the weed-like character of rye. This explanation seems to be quite likely but very difficult to prove.

Finally, it might also be that it is not the above mentioned ļat ‘foreign, strange’ that explains our word, but some unattested semantic change such as Čul. Šat ~ Ė- ‘Tatar’ (Stachowski, M. 1998: 116). But whether the Sag., Šr, and Küär, became acquainted with rye from the Tatars, is unknown. A semantic parallel could be provided by Pol. tatarka ‘a species of groats’, gryka and others (cf. also Mańczak 1999: 95f).

Yet another possibility would be to assume the existence of some unknown nominal stem *jady. The fact that such a stem is unknown would not in itself be a strong argument against such a proposition. However, the Küär, form of jatkan would then become quite incomprehensible. Perhaps the most probable explanation would be to assume that the word had been shortened in Küär., which is a fairly common phenomenon with three-syllable words with a high vowel in the middle syllable.

Additionally, it is rather puzzling that none of the above propositions can explain the concurrent existence of ļ- and Ė- forms in Sag, and Šr. Generally, Ė- is the counterpart of Tkc. ļ- in these languages, including in borrowings, e.g. Sag. ďablak ‘potato’ < Russ. jabloko (Räsänen 1949: 162). Perhaps the most likely explanation is that of a late borrowing, and most probably from Oyr.

There exist in fact three explanations of our word, and none of them are wholly convincing:

1. jat- ‘to lie’; for: semantics; against: suffixation (partial possibility of defence), distribution
2. ļat- nominal (ļat ‘foreign, strange’); for: semantics; against: phonetics (-ygan)
3. ļady- nominal; for: phonetics, suffixation; against: not attested (not a very strong argument), Küär, jatkan

Most probably, this derivate is very old, as is suggested by the facts that the base is utterly unclear, and that the derivational model is nowadays essentially unproductive. The possibility of a very old borrowing, adapted both morphologically and phonetically, cannot be ultimately discounted. Determining the exact period of borrowing seems, however, to be impossible given the complete lack of old, and abundant, data.

---

50 Although one can not definitively exclude the possibility of a later, irregular change in Küär, causedprobably by folk etymology and an association with jat ‘foreign, strange’? ‘to lie’?
KARA BAŠAK

FORMS: kara bašak  Orc.: R IV 1551b

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY:

Literary ‘worse ear’; on kara cf. kara bugdaj. This is understandable, given that rye was for a very long time, and sometimes still is regarded, as being a weed rather than a cereal.

KARA BUGDAJ

FORMS:


kara bidaj  Klr.: RKlrS-Ju44, RKlrS-Ju57, Dmitrieva 1972

kara bugdaj  Com.: R IV 1807b || Uyg.: KTLS

qara buγdaj  Uyg.: RUGS

languages:


ETYMOLOGY:

1961: Laude-Cirtautas 1961: describes the metaphorical meaning of kara as ‘usual, common; of lower quality’ when dealing with its usage in plant names (see 34f), and exemplifies it with Blk., Kmk. kara budaj, Com., Uyg. kara buγdaj meaning ‘wheat of lower quality’

1972: Dmitrieva: < kara ‘black’ + bugdaj51

COMMENTARY:

This name is a composition of two words, both of which requires a separate explanation.

KARA:

We can see two possibilities of explaining the usage of kara here:

1. according to the description proposed by Laude-Cirtautas 1961: 34f. This option is very plausible, especially because using the names of colours metaphorically is quite common in the Tkc. languages, and also because rye has never been highly regarded in Asia, to the extent that it is often considered to be a weed.

2. by linking it with ergot (Secale cornutum), i.e. sclerotium of a parasitic fungus in the genus Claviceps, which attacks rye among others, and can be noticed as little black

51 In Dmitrieva 1972, only the etymology of Klr. kara būdaj is given directly, but we believe it should be assumed that it concerns all the names of this kind which are quoted here.
spots on the ears. This possibility appears to be less probable as 1. ergot attacks wheat, too (though less commonly); 2. it seems quite strange, that the name of a cereal should be derived from a fungus which attacks it, and is therefore a symptom of an illness and not an integral part of the plant.

**BUGDAJ:**
Calling rye with a name for 'wheat’ can be explained in two planes:

1. **biological:** Rye behaves as a weed, i.e. it grows on the fields where other cereals had been sown, very often on fields of wheat. Because it ripens faster, and its stems are more fragile and break earlier, it soon equals the sown cereals in number, or even surpass them.

2. **ethnographical:** In connection with the above, the Tkc. peoples, who never greatly appreciated rye, have developed legends about wheat gradually turning (deteriorating) into rye. This fact shows clearly the relative order in which the Tkc. peoples became acquainted with these cereals, and is also supported by the fact that while the name bugdaj 'wheat’ is widespread, and is native or borrowed as early as the PTkc. period (or even earlier, perhaps?), the names for 'rye' are more numerous and are all descriptive (including by comparison to wheat) or borrowed in the historic times.

**KÖK NAJZA**

**FORMS:** kök najza  Kzk.: R III 635m

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed

**COMMENTARY:**
The meaning of kök is not entirely clear here. For certain, it is more about a shade of green rather than blue: rye does not have a blue tint, neither as a plant nor as a grain. It is also possible, though, that this word is not used as a simple colour name here. Given that rye is often considered to be an inferior type of cereal, perhaps we should assume a semantic development such as 'green' > 'unripe' > 'inferior', even if, to the best of our knowledge, there is no attestation of such a shift. At least in respect to animals, kök can have meanings far from 'blue' or 'green', e.g. 'gray', 'silver' and even Uzb. kök koj 'brown sheep' (Laude-Cirtautas 1961: 79).

Kzk. najza means ‘lance’ and is derived (VEWT) from Pers. َنَازِيهَ nāyze (~ نَازِيٰ nāye) ‘1. bronchus; 2. bugle, tube’. The usage of this word is not accidental; the hair on the ears of rye is exceptionally stiff and prickly.

**KÖKTARÄ**

**FORMS:**
kök tara  Tuv.: Dmitrieva 1972  kök tara Dmitrieva 1979
köktara  Tuv.: RTuwS

**ETYMOLOGY:**
1972: Dmitrieva: < kök ‘blue’ + tara ‘grain’
1979: Dmitrieva: liter. ‘dark millet’

Assuming the meaning of ‘blue’ rather than ‘green’ seems to be strange. To the best of our knowledge, no cereal or its grains are blue. Cf. kök najza.
COMMENTARY:

Literary 'green grain (?)'. On kök see kök najza.

Tarā corresponds to Tkc. dary 'millet' (see) and means in Tuv. '1. cereal; 2. grain; 3. millet'. It is difficult to determine with any certainty which is the meaning employed in this case.

'Grain' seems to be the most probable one. Grains of rye do indeed have a green tint to them, more clearly visible than with other cereals. This is not, however, enough, to exclude all the other possibilities. If we assumed a semantic development such as with kök najza, the meaning of 'inferior cereal' would seem to render the attitude of the Tkc. peoples towards rye quite accurately.

Finally, one can not rule out the possibility that the meaning used here is 'millet', and that the whole name is but another confirmation of the fact the Tkc. peoples became acquainted with rye after wheat. The last possibility seems, however, to be the least probable.

ORUOS

ETYMOLOGY: 1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. rožь 'rye'
COMMENTARY:
Dmitrieva 1972's etymology appears to be true, and requires no further commentary.

ROŽb

FORMS:


LANGUAGEs:

Khak.: rožb || Trkm.: rožb

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY: < Russ. rožь 'rye'. Cf. aryš.

RŽI

FORMS: rži Bšk.: Dmitrieva 1972

ETYMOLOGY: as yet not discussed

COMMENTARY: < Russ. rži Gen. < rožь 'rye'. Cf. also prosa 'millet'.

SULY

FORMS:

sûle Trkm.: (Kopet-Dag) Nikitin/Kerbabaev 1962
sulli Kklp.: RKklpS-BB
suly Kklp.: RKklpS-B || Nog.: Eren 1999 s.v. çavdar
82. suly || RYE

LANGUAGES:
   Kklp.: sulli, suly || Nog.: suly || Trkm.: süle

ETYMOLOGY: see saly 'rice'

COMMENTARY:
   This word is widespread in the Tkc. languages, but usually in the meaning of 'rice'.
   Also in Kklp. it is present in this meaning, in the form of saly.
   The unusual meaning here might result simply from a lack of orientation or, less probably, from the weed-like character of rye; cf. budaj (although rye grows mostly in fields of wheat, not rice).
aryš 'rye'
Wheat is one of the oldest, perhaps the oldest, and also perhaps the most important cereal of the world. The Triticum genus is composed of numerous species and varieties. Despite the unusually long history of cultivation, wheat can still often be found growing wildly.

It is very difficult to determine exactly when the cultivation of wheat began. The oldest grains of *Triticum dioccum* are dated seven thousand years BC. The domestication probably happened in Egypt and/or in the Fertile Crescent. It spread to Europe, North Africa and Asia as early as the time of the primitive farming cultures, even thousands of years BC (Nowiński 1970: 155). The oldest of the cultivated species of wheat is *Triticum dioccum*, once very widespread in Asia and elsewhere, and originating probably from the region of Syria and Palestine. Another once very popular species is spelt (*T. spelta*). Its origin is not fully understood but it is probable that it came into being in Central-Eastern or Eastern Asia. Nowadays, common wheat (or bread wheat; *T. vulgare* = *T. aestivum*) is definitely the most popular. It originates from the Middle East and is over four and a half thousand years old. It displaced all the other species to a considerable degree.

Among the Tkc. names for 'wheat', *bugdaj* is very clearly the most common. This fact can be interpreted as an indication that the Tkc. and Mo. peoples became acquainted with wheat very long ago, perhaps before the decay of the Tkc.Mo. union52. The absence of the word from the Ma.Tung. languages (not counting a later borrowing from Mo.) only confirms the relative chronology of the decay of the Alt. union.

**Forms:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tkc</th>
<th>Bugdaj</th>
<th>Bugdaj</th>
<th>Buğdaj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aktarā</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astyy → aš(lyk)</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aš → aš(lyk)</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašlik → aš(lyk)</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašlyk → aš(lyk)</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīdaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bijdaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bödaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>böδaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>böδaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>böδaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bödaj → bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td>bugdaj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

52 We use the term union here to avoid the discussion on what was its exact character.
aktarā || WHEAT

**Languages:**

- **Az.: bugdaj**
- **Blk.: bugdaj**
- **Brb.: pugdaj**
- **Bšk.: bodaj**
- **Com.: bugdaj**
- **CTat.: bogdaj**
- **Čag.: bodaj**
- **Čuv.: pāri**
- **Fuyü: mejzā**
- **Gag.: bodaj**
- **Kar.: bugdaj**
- **KarC: bugdaj**
- **KarH: bugdaj**
- **KarT: bugdaj**
- **Khak.: bugdaj**
- **Khal.: bugda**
- **Kirg.: bijdaj**
- **Kklp.: bidaj**
- **Kmk.: bidaj**
- **Krč. Blk.: bidaj**
- **Küär.: pūdaj**
- **Lad.: mejzā**
- **MTkc H.: bodaj**
- **MTkc IM: bugdaj**
- **MTkc KM: bugda**
- **MTkc M.A:B: bugdaj**
- **MTkc MK: ašlyk**
- **MTkc. B.: bugdaj**
- **Nog.: bijdaj**
- **Oghuz.Ir.: bugda**
- **OTk.: bugdaj**
- **Otr.: bugdaj**
- **Oyr.: asljyk**
- **Oyr. dial.: būtaj**
- **Sel.: bugdaj**
- **Sr.: bugdaj**
- **Tat.: bodaj**
- **Tel.: pūdaj**
- **Tksh.: bugdaj**
- **Tksh. dial.: buldej**
- **Tob.: bugdaj**
- **Tof.: šišse**
- **Trkm.: bugdaj**
- **Tuv.: aktarā**
- **Uyg.: ašlyk**
- **Uzb.: astyy**
- **Uzb. dial.: buvajdaj**
- **Yak.: selehinej**

**Forms:** aktarā  Tuv.: RTuw$^S$, Dmitrieva 1972

**Etymology:** 1972: Dmitrieva: < ak ‘white’ + tarā ‘grain; cereal’
COMMENTARY:
This name is absolutely clear morphologically; it needs, however, a brief semantic explanation missing from Dmitrieva 1972.

Tarā corresponds to Tkc. dary ‘millet’ (cf.), here probably in the meaning of ‘cereal’ rather than ‘millet’. Ak is presumably to be understood metaphorically, as ‘good, better’ which would be connected to the high importance attached to wheat.

Calling wheat with the name for ‘millet’ should indicate the order in which the Tuvinians became acquainted with these cereals. However, the data from the remaining Tkc. languages shows that wheat was probably the first cereal known to the Tkc. peoples. Perhaps millet took over the role of being the most important cereal for the Tuvinians, and this is where a secondary name for ‘wheat’ comes from? Cf. also kōktarā.

AŞ(LYK)

FORMS:

- asty Uzb.: Çevilek 2005
- ăş Oyr.: Çevilek 2005
- ašlik Uzb.: Çevilek 2005

LAPUAGES:

- MTkc.MK: aşlyk || OUyg.: aşlyk || Oyr.: aş || Uyg.: aşlyk || Uzb.: astyy, ašlik

ETYMOLOGY: see as 'barley'

COMMENTARY:

Given the original meaning of aş, ‘soup’, the fact that this word means both ‘wheat’ and ‘barley’ is no surprise, even in the absence of semantic parallels. The suffix -lyk is probably not used here in its most common meaning of ‘abstractum’, cf. the following characteristic: ‘The suffix -lyx, -lik, -lux, -luk is in Karaim productive and forms denominal verbs denoting abstract concepts (nomina abstracta), also names of people (originally names of status, posts), things, and especially of plants, cf. e.g. ałmalyx ‘apple-tree’, borłałyx ‘grapevine’ and others.’ (Zajączkowski 1932: 30f; own translation). We believe that this information is relevant to other Tkc. languages, too.53

BUGDAJ

FORMS:

- bidaj Kzk.: Joki 1952

53 Cf. Čul. aŋnyk ‘1. trap, 2. morel’ (Pomorska 2004: 74) << aŋ ‘wild animal, beast’ (Birjukovič 1984: 13), although in this case the meaning of ‘morel’ evolved probably from the meaning of ‘trap’ rather than ‘wild animal’.
bugdaj | WHEAT

**bugdaj**

**Bšk.**: Brands 1973: 45

**Gag.**: Güngör/Argunşah 1991 | **MTkc.H** | **Tat.**: Voskresenskij 1894, RTatS-D, Brands 1973: 45, RTatS-G

**bödāj**

**Bšk.**: Joki 1952 | **Tat.**: Joki 1952

**bödaj**

**Gag.**: ESTJa, Dmitrieva 1972, Güngör/Argunşah 1991 | **Tat.**: Imanaevъ 1901, VEWT

**bödaj**

**Tat.**: ESTJa

**bögđaj**

**Bšk.**: Joki 1952

**bögdaj**

**Bšk.**: Dmitrieva 1972, RBškS, Brands 1973: 45

**bögdaj**

**Tat.**: Joki 1952

**bögđaj**

**Bšk.**: Dmitrieva 1972, KRPS, Kowalski 1929

**bögđaj**


**bögđaj**

**Gag.**: ESTJa | **Sal.**: ESTJa | **Tat.**: Joki 1952, Dmitrieva 1972, VEWT | **Tu.**: Tatarincev 2000–

**bögđaj**

**Kirg.**: RKirgS-Ju57, Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa | **Kklp.**: Joki 1952 | **Oyr.**: Dmitrieva 1972, ESTJa

**buddaj**

**Uzb.**: Witczak 2003: 95

**budgaj**

**CTat.**: Joki 1952 | **Čag.**: Joki 1952 | **Kar.**: Joki 1952 | **OTkc.**: DTS (one attestation in MK) | **Ott.**: Joki 1952 | **Trkm.**: Joki 1952

**būdaj**

**Oyr.**: Dmitrieva 1972, RAzS | **Khal.**: Doerfer/Tezcan 1980

**bugdaj**


**budgaj**


**budgaj**

**MTkc.MK**: Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85

**bugyfaj**

**Uyg.**: *BUGDA* RUjgSR, Dmitrieva 1972, Fedotov 1996 sv. pări
buγdaj  Uyg.: RUjgSA || Uzb.: RUzbS-A, RUzbS-Š, Dmitrieva 1972
buγuδaj  Uyg.: Menges 1933, ĖSTJa
buγdaj  Kirg.: Mašanova 1899 || Kzk.: Joki 1952, VEWT || Tob.: VEWT
buγdaj  Bšk.: ĖSTJa
bildej  Tksh.dial.: UA
buraj  Bšk.: Räsänen 1946: 198, VEWT
bütäj  Oyr.dial.: ĖSTJa || Tuv.: Tatarinecev 2000–
buvδaj  Kklp.: Tatarinecev 2000– || Uzb.dial.: ĖSTJa
pöri  Čuv.: Anatri ‘spelt’, Róna-Tas 1990: 31
Tel.: Ryumina-Sırkaşeva 1995 || Tuv.: Tatarinecev 2000–
pugdaj  Brb.: VEWT || Khak.: Dmitrieva 1972, RChakS
languages:
Az.: bugda || Blk.: budaj || Brb.: puqdagaj || Bšk.: bodaj, bödaj, böδaj, boδaj, boraj, buγdaj, buraj || Com.:
bugdagaj || ĖSTJa || Ĉag.: boγdaj, budaj, buγdaj || ĖST. || pōri, pūri, pőri ||
Gag.: bodaj, bödaj, buγdaj || Kar.: boγdaj, budajag || Kar.Č.: boγdaj || Kar.T.: budaj ||
Khak.: puqdagaj || Khe.: boγda, bugda || Kirg.: biδaj, būdaj, bugdaj, pūdaj || Kklp.: bidaj, biδaj,
būdajag, buγdajag || Kk.: bidaj, budaj || Kū. || pūdaj || Kzk.: bidaj, biδaj, bugdaj, bugδaj, bugdajag,|| MTkc.H.: bodaj, boγdaj, budaj, buγdajag ||
MTkc.I.M.: buγdajag || MTkc.KM.: bugdajag, buγdajag
| OTkc.: budajag, bugdajag || Oyr.: boδaj, būδaj, bugdajag || Oyr.dial.:
būtaj || Sal.: boγdaj, biδajag, potā || Šr.: buγdajag, pūdajag || Tat.: bodaj, böδaj, boδaj, biδajag, bugδajag, būdajag, būtajag, bugdajag, bugδajag, bugdajag,
| Tat.Gr.: boγdajag || Tel.: pūdajag || Tksh.: bugdajag, bugδajag ||
Tksh.dial.: bildej || Tob.: bugdajag, bugδajag || Trkm.: bugdajag || Tuv.: bugdaj, bugdaj, bugδajag, pūdajag
| Uyg.: boγdaj, bugdajag, bugdajag, buguδajag || Uzb.: bugdajag, bugδajag, bugdajag || Uzb.dial.: buγdajag
etymology (an overview of the most important propositions):
Tkc. buγdaj:
1952: Joki: < OChin. m*ok ‘wheat’ or OChin.N. *m*ok id. + OChin. lāi ‘wheat’
Tkc. buγdajag is a metathesis; Mo. ~ (or <?) Tkc.
Both words are attested in Chin. in the oldest monuments of the Yin period. the old
Chin.N form *m*ok is derived by being based on Mand. mo. ‘The change -gl- >
-gd- as in Nog. čiqlik, Trkm. čiqelek ‘Erdbeere’ ~ MTkc. jiqdā ‘rote Brustbeere’. This
proposition should be treated as obsolete now. Currently, Mand. mai- is
derived from MChin. mEk < OChin. *mrık ‘wheat’; OChin. lāi is probably to be
understood as modern li-4, as in mai-li-4 ‘wheat grain’, which however < OChin.
*C-r-间的 (oral information from Prof. A. Vovin [Honolulu]).

54 The compound m*ok lāi is written without an asterisk. This is probably supposed to mean that
both its components are attested, as opposed to *m*ok-lāi where the first element is reconstructed
writing with or without hyphen after Joki 1952: 108).
1969: VEWT; OTkc. buyudaj < Mo. buyudaj
1972: Clauson: OTkc. bugdaj, bugdaj
1972: Dmitrieva: only indicates a comparison with OTkc. boguz 'хлеб в зерне; фураж', boj 'пажитник'
1974: ĖSTJa: summarizes and comments on other propositions without offering its own. It only proposes to assume the possibility of final -g instead of -j, however, basing solely on Uzb.dial. forms buγdaj ~ buγdak. What seems to be more probable is an expansion of original *boguda (see TKC. FORMS below) with a common suffix -(a)k on the Uzb. ground. Such an explanation is not in contradiction to the commonness of final -j in almost all Tkc. languages – which suggests a very old derivation – as -a forms appear quite often in dialects, especially in the Az. and Tksh. ones (cf. e.g. Tksh.dial. bağda ĖSTJa; boğda AA, RA; byjda OA; Az.dial. boyda, buyda ĖSTJa) which leads us to believe that the non-deminutive (see ETYMOLOGY below) form must have been in use for quite a long period.
2000: Tatarincev: *bug/k (nominal or verbal) 'greater quantity; multiplication; spreading' for multiple grains on the ear + the -(a)d- suffix forming verbs > 'накапливаться, скапливаться (напр., о зернах в клюве)' + suffixes forming nouns -(a)i, -a and -(a)g.
To support the reconstructed *bug ~ *buk the following examples are listed: Yak. bugij 'пододвигать с краёв к середине горящее в костре дрова', OUyg. pukul 'накапливать', Lob. buγ-ana(k) 'насыпанные, пригнанные ветром бугры песку около деревьев' and others, also Kzk. buγa 'густая кашица', OTkc. boguz 'хлеб в зерне; фураж', Uyg. bogaz (in aš bogaz), boguz ~ bogus 'провиант для людей; корм для скота', and finally Tkc. bug ~ buγ 'пар, испарения, дым' and such coincidences as Kklp. buγdaj 'wheat'; buv 'steam' &c., and others. This proposition does not seem to be particularly convincing. The reconstruction of *bug/k with the above meaning is perhaps not so well grounded. Also the question of alternating o ~ u in the first syllable remains unsolved, particularly as it would be very hard to explain it by using the assumption of the original *u. Also the explanation of the differences in the auslaut of the Tkc. forms appears too brief.
2002: Tietze: < OTkc. buvāj (according to Clauson 1972)

Čuv. ľăr:
1946: Rășănen: 25f./ = Tkc. buγdaj
1973: Brands: 45: = Tkc. buγdaj
1990: Róna-Tas: 51: Čuv.Virjal pōrī, Anatri pārī < OTkc. buγdaj; meaning influenced by Russ. pyrej 'spelt'.
Róna-Tas assumes a disappearance of γ, spirantization of d > z, the Chuvash rhota-cism and later, a reduction of u, yielding finally pōrī in Virjal and pārī in Anatri. An explanation of the phonetic evolution of the last syllable is somewhat missing.
It might be impossible to present any proof, for or against, such an evolution. We believe however that Fedotov’s proposition is more realistic because it assumes less phonetic changes, and the ones it includes are easier to explain, and involves no semantic change at all.

1996: Fedotov: < OSlav. pyro ‘spelt’

Criticises connecting the word with Tkc. bugdaj, as has been done in the past. Instead, he offers a comparison with OSlav. pyro ‘spelt’, which seems quite convincing – both from the semantic and phonetic points of view (although the final -i still remains incomprehensible: an influence/contamination with pyrej ‘spelt’?). A long-lasting and very thorough influence of Russ. on Čuv. is another argument in favour of Fedotov’s 1996 proposition, even though he does not mention it himself.

COMMENTARY:
This word is very common in the Tkc. languages and, as one would expect, it appears in a multitude of phonetic shapes. It is also present in the Mo. languages, its forms being equally diversified there. In addition, we know that wheat is generally one of the oldest, or perhaps the oldest, cereal cultivated by man (Nowiński 1970: 162). A combination of these facts allows us to assume that this word existed as early as the stage of the Tkc-Mo. union (of whatever nature it was: genetic, areal or something else) or even earlier. Unfortunately, our knowledge is not deep enough to try to produce an acceptably probable reconstruction on a stage of evolution that was so long before the oldest texts. This is why we are going to limit ourselves to offering some remarks on previous propositions, and presenting some possibilities for future investigation.

Tkc. FORMS
Many of the Tkc. forms could be comfortably explained by a borrowing from another Tkc. language. This phenomenon has been and still is, quite common; in the past it was additionally facilitated by the nomadic way of life of many Tkc. tribes. An exact investigation into the routes of such borrowings is only possible to a very limited degree due to the poor and young attestations of many languages, and the orthographical tradition of literary koines, almost always very strong.

However, even without knowing precisely what the routes of our word are, it is possible to explain a great majority of its forms with just a few phonetic processes:
– spirantization and disappearance of -g-, along with possible substitute lengthening of the preceding vowel and possibly, its shortening later
– change of -g- > -v- or -j-, and

55 Its absence from the Ma.Tung. languages seems to indicate some transitional period between the Tkc.Mo.-Tung. and Tkc.Mo. unions. It is not, however, a very sound argument: all these peoples mainly made their living from nomadism well into historic times, and only regarded farming as an additional source of food for a very long time. Agricultural terms then, did not not necessarily spread fast and reach all the languages.
An attempt to ascertain whether the Ma.Tung. peoples were powerful enough to possess lands adequate for wheat cultivation would require an assumption of when our word is present in the Alt. languages, and would thus lead to a vicious circle.
– palatalization of a before j are all common phenomena in the Tkc. languages. Individual forms in some of the languages might raise doubts but most of them can be explained quite easily.

– Brb., Khak., Oyr., Sal. and Tuv. forms have initial p- instead of b-. In Khak. and Sal. it is a regular change but it is not in the remaining languages. We believe that borrowing is the most likely solution – perhaps from Khak., given the area of its usage.

– Čag., CTat., Kar., OTkc., Ott. and Trkm. budγaj are most probably the result of a metathesis.

– Kklp., Kzk. and Nog. -i- in the first syllable might be understood as a result of an irregular process present in a part of the Tkc. languages where the dropping of a consonant is accompanied by the change of the preceding vowel into ī.

– Tat. and Bšk. bóraj are most probably borrowings from Čuv. (Fedotov 1996 s.v. pǎrī). Also Bšk. buraj can presumably be interpreted in this way. Still, a direct influence of Russ. pyrej ‘spelt’ should not be ruled out, either.

– Tat. and Bšk. -ā- in the first syllable probably results from the influence (contamination?) of the form bóraj which has been borrowed from Čuv. (see below).

– Uyg. three syllable long buyudaj is presumably a borrowing from Mo. It is very unlikely that Uyg. would conserve the original (see below) high vowel in the middle syllable of a three syllable word.

It seems then, that a great number of Tkc. forms (not counting Čuv. forms (see below) and borrowings such as Uyg. buyudaj) can in fact be reduced to one initial shape of *boguda, because:

– Tkc. languages generally tend to avoid o in the first syllable, and so raising the original o is much more likely than the opposite process

– Tkc. languages generally shorten three syllable words with a high vowel in the middle syllable, while the Mo. languages do not (at least until quite recently)

– final -j is probably a diminutive suffix. This assumption has already been made (e.g. ÈSTJa, Tatarincev 2000 and others), as it allows for an easy explanation of the -a ~ -aj alternation in auslaut. For auslaut cf. also commentary on ÈSTJa’s proposition in ETYMOLOGY above, and Tuv. arbaj, arvaļ

For Čuv. pǎrī, we believe, Fedotov’s 1996 proposition (see ETYMOLOGY above) is the most probable. If it is, however, true, it makes deriving Hung. búza ‘wheat’ from Čuv. (TESz, EWU) impossible.

Ptkc. Mo. nativeness

None of the propositions for explaining our word on the Tkc. ground which have been made so far is fully convincing. Tatarincev 2000 has certainly presented the most probable proposition, though even this has a number of weak points: especially semantics and connecting the word finally with ‘steam’ seems to be a little too far-reaching. Also, as Tatarincev himself admits, the morphological structure is not fully explained, either.
The Tkc. final -aj (though other forms exist, too) could have influenced Bšk., Kzk. and Tat. form borrowed from Čuv. We believe that this is more probable than trying to derive the word directly from the Čuv. form.

**Borrowing to PTkc.Mo.**

Perhaps then, we should look for the source of our word beyond the Tkc. and Mo. languages. The Chin. proposition in Joki 1952 is unacceptable for phonetic reasons (ESTJa, Tatarincev 2000). While an IE origin is probable for the Čuv. word (< Russ.), it is highly unlikely for all the remaining Tkc. languages, again, for phonetic reasons (PIE or IE -r- could not have yielded Tkc.Mo. -γd-).

We believe that the facts that, 1. the cultivation of wheat began in Mesopotamia, and 2. agriculture (together with the first cultivated cereals) seems to be a borrowing among the Tkc. (and Mo.) peoples, allows us to assume with equal probability that the name for ‘wheat’ was borrowed along with the plant itself, or that it was formed on the PTkc. or Mo. ground.

Currently, the situation appears to be a stalemate and allows for nothing but guesswork. We believe, nevertheless, that the lack of a convincing native explanation, and the incomprehensible morphological structure indicate a foreign origin, even if no probable etymon can be presented at the moment.

**Nostratic**

Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1984 see the possibility of connecting the Tkc. and Mo. forms with PIE *pūròs, Hung. búza and NPers. buza ‘wheat’. As Witczak 2003: 95 has rightly remarked, however, this comparison is mainly based on their phonetic similarity, and should be considered wrong. The forms which he proceeds to list later show clearly the extremes such comparisons could lead to: Arab. burr ‘wheat’, Fi. puuro ‘groats, grits’, Melan. pura ‘fruit’, Polyn. pura-pura ‘grain’ and others.

Finally, we would like to mention a word which is not very often mentioned in this context: Tkc. buza ‘wheat beer’ and perhaps Slav. and other braga ‘various types of

56 Witczak 2003: 96 also provides further bibliography of negative opinions on this proposition.
57 Also Hung.dial. buza ‘alcohol beverage made of cereal, similar to beer’, which however, is most probably a borrowing from Tkc. (Čuv.?).
alcohol beverages. The connection with bugdaj, even if self-evident to some extent, is very difficult to thoroughly establish, at least in the case of buza, and requires further investigation, presumably reaching far beyond Turkology – like the ultimate etymology of bugdaj itself.

**DÖVME**

**FORMS:** dövme  Tksh.: Eren 1999 'husked wheat; and others'  
**ETYMOLOGY:** 1999: Eren: < döv- 'to beat, to hit'  
**COMMENTARY:** This word is absolutely clear. Cf. also tögü 'millet', tüvi 'rice'.

**DÜGI**

**FORMS:** düği  Tat.:  
**ETYMOLOGY:** see tüvi 'rice'  
**COMMENTARY:** In Tat, this word appears also as döge and dögö, and meaning 'rice'. Generally, the word originates ultimately from *töğ- ~ *töv- 'to beat, to hit' and is common in the Tkc. languages with the meanings of 'rice' and 'millet'; 'wheat' might then come as a surprise. We believe it might turn out to be an interesting confirmation of our proposition on the two-fold origin of modern forms (see tüvi 'rice'). We can see in theory four possibilities of explaining this form:

1. < *tög-i (while döge, dögö < *tög-e).

   If we accept the view of the original two-fold derivation, we may believe that both forms have been conserved in Tat., and that their meanings diversified in the following way: the old -ö derivative preserved the most common, and probably the original meaning, 'rice', and the -i derivative gained a new one, 'wheat'. It might be viewed as surprising, however, that it is 'wheat' and not 'millet', the former being the second most common meaning of our word in the Tkc. languages (see tögü 'millet'). We suppose this could have resulted from the fact that wheat has always been one of the most, or even the most important cereal – not only for the Turks, but for a considerable part of Eurasia. Such an explanation seems to be reasonably plausible, probably more so than the others.

---

58 Scherner 1977: 17: Russ. brága 'type of weak beer (Dünnbier)' < MČuv. *bura + -ka (Vga), which is however, not very convincing due to Russ. accent not on the last syllable. Presumably, the IE counterparts, especially Celt. (cf. e.g. Černych 1993, Vasmer 1986–87) indicate an IE origin of this word. We believe that if the connection with the Tkc. forms exists at all, than the direction of influence is just opposite to the one proposed by Scherner 1977: 17.

59 Cf. Tietze 2000, where Tksh. boza 'weak alcohol beverage made of millet' is derived from Pers. biža 'millet' (cf. however Rubinčik 1970, where boza, buza exclusively in meaning 'millet beer' and buz 'mould, fungus' and bozak 'yeast, sourdough'), and where a further bibliography can be found.
2. ‘rice’ > ‘wheat’.
One could assume that this change is a later innovation in Tat. It could be explained then by the fact that after the Tatars departed westwards, away from the influence of the Chin. culture, they moved onto an area where the Pers. culture was dominant. For the Persians, wheat was the primary cereal. However, in Persia rice was known and popular, too: four out of nine names for ‘rice’ in the Tkc. languages, whose etymology is acceptable, are of Pers. origin. Moreover, this proposition does not explain the difference in sounding between dügi and döge, dögo.

3. It cannot be completely discounted that our word was borrowed from some other language. This, however, hardly explains its non-standard meaning.

4. Some kind of unification or mixing of ‘rice’ and ‘wheat’, such as e.g. ‘millet’ and ‘corn’ (see myṣyr ‘millet’ where further references can be found), or ‘oats’ and ‘barley’ (see julaf ‘oats’ where further references can be found). This possibility is, however, not very likely as it would be the only example of such a phenomenon involving these two cereals.

**GENIM**

**FORMS:** genim **Tksh. dial.:** Bläsing 1995: 25  
**ETYMOLOGY:** 1995: Bläsing: 25: < Zaza genim  
**COMMENTARY:** Bläsing’s 1995 etymology appears to be irrefutable.

**GÖŞE**

**FORMS:** göşe **Tksh.:** ĖSTJa ‘husked wheat’  
**ETYMOLOGY:** see köče ‘barley’  
**COMMENTARY:** The only semantic parallel we know of is aš(lyk) (cf. as ‘barley’, aš(lyk) ‘wheat’), combining in one word the meanings of ‘barley’ and ‘wheat’.

**HINTA**

**FORMS:** hinta **Ott.:** حنطة Wiesentahl 1895, Redhouse 1921  
**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed  
**COMMENTARY:** < Arab. حنطة hinta ‘wheat’.

**JASMYK**

**FORMS:** jasmyk **Uzb. dial.:** ĖSTJa ‘species of wheat’  
**ETYMOLOGY:** see jasymuk ‘millet’  
**COMMENTARY:** While this word is absolutely clear morphologically, its meaning of ‘wheat’ is enigmatic. When taking into consideration the original meaning of this word, ‘something
flat\(^60\) (> ‘lentil’, also ‘millet’), one can only guess that one of the species of wheat has characteristically flatter grains, or perhaps some similarity to ‘millet’.

**KYZYL BODAJ**

**FORMS:** kyzyl bodaj \(\text{Tat.}:\) Voskresenskij 1894 ‘wheat (with red grains)’

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed

**COMMENTARY:**
This word is absolutely clear: kyzyl ‘red’ (from the colour of grains) + bodaj ‘wheat’.

**KYZYL TAYS**

**FORMS:** kyzyl tas \(\text{Tuv.}:\) Dmitrieva 1972 || kyzyltas RTuwS

**ETYMOLOGY:** 1972: Dmitrieva: < kyzyl ‘red’ + tas ‘bald; naked; with scarce vegetation’

**COMMENTARY:**
This word may be more complex than has been presented by Dmitrieva 1972. While the first part of her etymology seems to be highly plausible (cf. kyzyl bodaj), its second element and the type of the compound are rather odd: 1. it is unclear why ‘wheat’ should be described as ‘bald, naked’; perhaps the word in fact means not ‘wheat’ but just one of the species, which could be characterised as such? 2. to the best of our knowledge, in the Tkc. languages there are no compounds with a nominal meaning, which would be made up of two adjectives\(^61\). Unfortunately, the second part\(^62\) of this word remains puzzling for us, too.

**MEJŽƏ**

**FORMS:** mejžə \(\text{Fuyü}:\) Zhen-hua 1987

**ETYMOLOGY:** as yet not discussed

**COMMENTARY:** < Mand. mai‘zi ‘wheat’ (oral information from Prof. A. Vovin [Honolulu]).

**ÖJÜR**

**FORMS:** öjür \(\text{OTkc.}:\) Egorov 1964, Fedotov 1996 ‘millet; spelt’

**ETYMOLOGY:** see ügür ‘millet’

**COMMENTARY:**
The etymology of this word has not been fully ascertained. However, from the original meaning of ‘gruel, pap’, a semantic evolution to any cereal is possible. Given that wheat

\(^{60}\) This meaning is most probably, though not definitely, simply a methodological support.

\(^{61}\) Although this distinction can hardly ever be justified for the Tkc. languages, in this very case the adjectival nature of ‘red’ and ‘bald’ on one hand, and the nominal of ‘wheat’ on the other is exceptionally explicit.

\(^{62}\) It cannot be discounted that the word is not in fact a compound but a borrowing whose sounding is by chance (or perhaps as a result of contamination or adaptation?) identical to that of kyzyl ‘red’.
has always been one of the, or even the most important cereal, it might seem odd that this word has mainly survived in the meaning of ‘millet’, but not ‘wheat’. Cf. taryg.

SELIEHINEJ

FORMS: seliehinej Yak.: RJakS
seliesenej, seliesinej Yak: [i: -e/i-] Pekarskij 1917–30, Dmitrieva 1972, Anikin 2003

ETYMOLOGY:
1964: Slepcov: 91: < Russ. pšeničnyj ‘wheat [adj.]’
1972: Dmitrieva: < Russ. šilosnyj ‘silo [adj.]’

COMMENTARY:
The etymology proposed by Slepcov 1964: 91 is much more probable on the semantic side. Phonetically, Russ. n happens to yield l in Yak., as in e.g. Alampaǯȳs < Russ. Anemlodist, Yak. balakaǯỳla < Russ. panikadilo (Slepcov 1964: 91). Anikin 2003 additionally allows the possibility of simplification pš- > š- still on the Russ. ground, which indeed cannot be ruled out, but also in all likelihood cannot be proved.

The etymology offered by Dmitrieva 1972 is not only very unlikely semantically, it also raises doubts about its phonetic nature: it is not absolutely clear why Russ. i-o-y or even i-o-y63 should yield e-i-e-i in Yak.

ŠENĪSE


ETYMOLOGY:
2003: Anikin: ? šīse, šīse < Russ. pšenica
šenīse < Bur. šenīse < Russ. pšenica (after Rassadin 1971)

COMMENTARY:
It is difficult to find a major weakness in the etymology proposed by Rassadin 1971: 23. The expression in Anikin 2003 is not fully clear: it gives the impression that he wants to derive šīse, šīse directly from Russ. without the Bur. mediation, which seems to be less likely. We believe that Russ. pšenica > Bur. šenīse > Tof. šenīse > šīse > šīse.

TARYG

FORMS: taryg MTkc.MK: Dankoff/Kelly 1982–85

ETYMOLOGY: see dary ‘millet’

63 There also exists, though it is considered to be incorrect, the form silósnyj, see Ageenko 2001: ‘silósnyj, not silósnyj’.
COMMENTARY:
This word is very common in the Tkc. languages, but generally signifies 'millet'. The reconstruction of its original shape and meaning "tar-yg (what was) sowed" raises no serious doubts. For the meaning of 'wheat' cf. öjür.

TEREKE
FORMS: tereke Gag.: Özkan 1996
ETYMOLOGY: see darikan 'rye'
COMMENTARY:
This name is ultimately of Arm. origin, and most probably came to Gag. through one of the Tksh. dialects, together with settlers from Anatolia, who were displaced onto the conquered territories in the Ottoman Empire. This word, sounding tereke existed in Ott. between the 14th and 18th centuries meaning 'harvest; cereal' (Dankoff 1995: 702), from where a shift to 'wheat' is trivial, given great importance of this cereal in the region.
Cf. darikan 'rye'.

TULA
FORMS: tula Čuv.: Dmitrieva 1972
tulă Čuv.: Nikol'skij 1909, RČuvS-D, RČuvS-E || (sără) tulă, RČuvS-A
ETYMOLOGY:
1972: Dmitrieva: < Georg. doli 'husked wheat', dola 'bread of husked wheat' (after: Abaev, I 400), at the same time indicating a comparison to Mo. talx(an) 'хлеб печеный', Bur. talx(an) 'flour; dough; хлеб', Gr. *talxan 'жареные и молотые зерна бобовых'
COMMENTARY:
The etymology proposed by Dmitrieva 1972 does not seem to be totally unrealistic, although it does have several weaknesses. It tacitly assumes a Georg. influence on Čuv. which is possible but unlikely, especially in the case of the name for 'wheat' which the Turks had presumably already known well; and thus borrowing it from Georgians – a nation of highlanders, not known for their farming – would be strange. Cf. nartük 'corn', in this case, though, the geographical distribution (Krć.Blk. and Nog.) definitely makes this kind of borrowing much more likely.
We would like to mention that in theory this word could also be identified with sula &c. 'oats' by means of a quite common but not described, and thus unpredictable alternation s : t. However, this is perhaps not very probable as it would be the only example of combining in one word the meanings of 'wheat' and 'oats'.
Wheat

bugdaj

bugdaj 'wheat'
FINAL REMARKS

STATISTICS
The table below shows the number of words (not entries) dealt with in this work. The following rules have been observed during its preparation:

- words which are eventually the same but appear in different meanings (e.g. dary Tkc. ‘millet’, Tksh.dial. ‘corn’) were counted as one
- compounds and abbreviations were counted as one: e.g. mysyr (< Arab.; an abbreviation of mysyr bugdajy) and mysyr bugdajy (< ?), were both counted as one native word with an acceptable etymology, since the compound has most probably been created on the Tkc. ground
- one word borrowed in different morphological forms, or adapted phonetically in different ways (e.g. Bšk. ovsa, Tof. ovjot, Trkm. ovjos ‘oats’) was counted as one

The overall number of words counted according to the above rules is 86. However, for ease of usage they have been divided into 106 entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cereal</th>
<th>etymology</th>
<th>Tkc.</th>
<th>&lt; Arab.</th>
<th>&lt; Chin.</th>
<th>&lt; Pers.</th>
<th>&lt; Russ.</th>
<th>&lt; other</th>
<th>overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millet</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Most common naming patterns

Almost a half of the words discussed here are borrowings, and thus cannot be taken into consideration when describing the Tkc. naming patterns. Most of the native words, however, are not built on the basis of any repetitive pattern. In fact, merely two general patterns can be clearly distinguished, and they both have a fairly limited geographic and/or semantic range:

1. **attribute + ‘cereal’. name of a cereal or something similar**
   
   Ten names are built according to this pattern, which can be divided into two, partly overlapping subgroups:
   
   a) the attribute is a colour name
      
      - **kara**: Tuv. akhyda, Tof. ak h(u)rūpē ‘rice’; Tuv. aktarā ‘wheat’
      
      - **kök**: Kzk. kök najza, Tuv. kūk tārā ‘rye’

   b) the second part is tārā ‘1. cereal; 2. millet’
      

2. **place name + name of a cereal**
   
   This patterns only appears with the names for ‘corn’:
   
   - Tat. kābā bödoj
   
   - Kklp. mākke (abbreviation of a compound), Kirg., Kklp., Uyg., Uzb. meke žūgörü Trkm. mekgeǯöven
   
   - Tksh. mūṣyr (bugdajy)
   
   - Ort. şam darysy

3. **derived from ‘to hit, to strike’**
   
   dövme || düği || ǧūr

4. **derived from ‘to bury, to dig’**
   
   kömme qonaq || sokpa

5. **borrowed from an oblique case**
   
   Most probably these are forms of Gen.Sg., presumably used in the function of Part. There are exclusively borrowings from Russ. here.

   ovsa || prosa || rži

---

### Table: Cereal etymology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dubious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall | acceptable | 39            | 2      | 2      | 7       | 10      | 7       | 67      |
|         | dubious    | 5             |        |        |         |         |         | 5       |
|         | unknown    |               |        |        |         |         |         | 14      |

| Overall | 44         | 2            | 2      | 7      | 10      | 7       | 86      |

---
Semantic types

Three, partly overlapping semantic types can be spotted:

1. names meaning exactly one cereal
   This is the dominant type. There are borrowings, compounds and rare native names here, e.g. *ebies* 'oats', *pirinč* 'rice', *šaǐr* 'barley', *tereke* 'rye'; *mekgeǯöven* 'corn'; *sary* 'corn' and others.

2. names, the etymology of which allows for diverse semantic development
   For obvious reasons, there are native names only in this group: *aš*(lyk) 'barley; wheat', *bordoq* 'corn; oats', *dary* 'corn; millet', *dügi* 'millet; rice', *jasmyk* 'corn; millet' and *őjür* 'corn; millet; wheat'.
   Perhaps also *arpagan* 'barley; oats' could be considered a member of this group, too.
   Words which belong to this type, mostly belong to type 3, as well.

3. names which can mean different cereals in a non-chaotic way
   a) 'barley' > 'oats'
      *arpa* || *arpagan* || *julaf* || *sula*64 || *tay* *arpsy*
   b) 'barley' and 'wheat'
      *aš*(lyk) || *kőǯe*
   c) 'millet' > 'corn'
      *basadohan* || *çüžgün*65 || *dary* || *jasmyk* || *őjür* || *šam* *darysy*
   d) 'rice' and 'rye'
      *aryš* || *suly*

---

64 *Sula* is the only name here, which developed in the opposite direction, i.e. 'oats' > 'barley'.

65 In the case of *çüžgün* the direction of the development remains unknown. Surely, Uyghurs became acquainted with corn later than millet but we do not know for how long this word has existed in Uyg, and what its original meaning was.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Language Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afgh.</td>
<td>Afghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alb.</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt.</td>
<td>Altaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Az.</td>
<td>Azerbaijani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk.</td>
<td>Balkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blr.</td>
<td>Belorussian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosn.Tksh.</td>
<td>Bosnian Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brb.</td>
<td>Baraba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bšk.</td>
<td>Bashkir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulg.</td>
<td>Bulgarian (Slavic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bur.</td>
<td>Buryat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc.</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celt.</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>Coman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crm.</td>
<td>Crimean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTat.</td>
<td>Crimean Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz.</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čag.</td>
<td>Chagatai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čul.</td>
<td>Chulym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čuv.</td>
<td>Chuvash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial.</td>
<td>dialectal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolg.</td>
<td>Dolgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evk.</td>
<td>Evenki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fi.</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gag.</td>
<td>Gagaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg.</td>
<td>Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grmc.</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebr.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung.</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir.</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap.</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar.</td>
<td>Karaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarC</td>
<td>Karaim of Crimea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarH</td>
<td>Karaim of Halych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarL</td>
<td>Karaim of Luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarT</td>
<td>Karaim of Trakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.</td>
<td>Khakas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khal.</td>
<td>Khalaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kip.</td>
<td>Kipchak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirg.</td>
<td>Kirghiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klkp.</td>
<td>Karakalpak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klmk.</td>
<td>Kalmuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmky.</td>
<td>Kumyck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmnnd.</td>
<td>Kumandin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KorS</td>
<td>South Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koyb.</td>
<td>Koybal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krč.</td>
<td>Karachay-Balkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kük.</td>
<td>Küürük</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurd.</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kzk.</td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leb.</td>
<td>Lebedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liter.</td>
<td>literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lith.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lob.</td>
<td>Lobnor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSorb.</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma.</td>
<td>Manchu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand.</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBšk.</td>
<td>Middle Bashkir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChin.</td>
<td>Middle Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melan.</td>
<td>Melanesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIr.</td>
<td>Middle Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMo.</td>
<td>Middle Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Mongol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPers.</td>
<td>Middle Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTat.</td>
<td>Middle Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.</td>
<td>Middle Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.DH</td>
<td>Houtsma 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.1M</td>
<td>Battal 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.MA</td>
<td>in Muqaddimah al-'Adab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTkc.MA.B</td>
<td>in the Mahmud al-Kashgari's dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan.</td>
<td>Nanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nog.</td>
<td>Nogai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npers.</td>
<td>New Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBask.</td>
<td>Old Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OChin.</td>
<td>Old Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OČuv.</td>
<td>Old Chuvash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEslav.</td>
<td>Old East Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oghuz.</td>
<td>Oghuzic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oghuz.Ir.</td>
<td>Oghuzic in Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldn.</td>
<td>Old Indic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr.</td>
<td>Old Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJap.</td>
<td>Old Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKip.</td>
<td>Old Kipchak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORuss.</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSlav.</td>
<td>Old Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osset.</td>
<td>Ossetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTkc.</td>
<td>Old Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ott.</td>
<td>Ottoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUyg.</td>
<td>Old Uyghur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVanj.</td>
<td>Old Vanjan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyr.</td>
<td>Oyrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Europ.</td>
<td>Paleo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAlt.</td>
<td>Proto-Altaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamir.</td>
<td>Pamirian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyn.</td>
<td>Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sag.</td>
<td>Sagal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.</td>
<td>Salar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SarUyg.</td>
<td>Sary-Uyghur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb.</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib.</td>
<td>Siberian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skr.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slav.</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slvk.</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slvn.</td>
<td>Slovenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol.</td>
<td>Solon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šr.</td>
<td>Šor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taj.</td>
<td>Tajik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat.</td>
<td>Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat.Gr.</td>
<td>Podolsky 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel.</td>
<td>Teleut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkc.</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkc.Mo.</td>
<td>Turkic-Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tksh.</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob.</td>
<td>Tobol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toch.</td>
<td>Tocharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tof.</td>
<td>Tofalar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trkm.</td>
<td>Turkmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung.</td>
<td>Tungusic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuv.</td>
<td>Tuvinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr.</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulč.</td>
<td>Ulča-Tungusic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOyr.</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyg.</td>
<td>Uyghur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzb.</td>
<td>Uzbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBulgh.2</td>
<td>Volga-Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMo.</td>
<td>Written Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xl.</td>
<td>Khalkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yak.</td>
<td>Yakut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazg.</td>
<td>Yazghulami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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