

TURCOLOGICA 115

Éva Kincses-Nagy

Mongolic Copies
in Chaghatay

Harrassowitz Verlag

TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 115

2018

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Éva Kincses-Nagy

Mongolic Copies in Chaghatay

2018

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2018

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743

ISBN 978-3-447-11055-6

e-ISBN 978-3-447-19765-6

*Thanks to my children, András, Bálint, and Anna
for their patience and understanding*

Contents

Introduction	9
Historical background of Turkic–Mongolic language contacts	11
Chaghatay and its relation to the other Turkic languages	15
History of research	18
Chaghatay data: texts and dictionaries	20
Middle Mongolic sources	25
Questions of transcription	27
Etymological studies	29
The structure of the Lexicon	36
Lexicon	37
Conclusions	240
Phonological remarks	240
Changes in semantics	243
Verbal copies	246
The copying of morphemes	247
Mixed copies	250
Hendiadys	251
Models of copies: The characteristic features of Middle Mongolic	251
Regressive assimilations	253
Dissimilation in the first syllable	256
The disyllables	256
The word-final diphthongs in Mongolic	259
The elision of the vowel in the middle open syllable	260
The word-final <i>-ŋ</i>	260
The final <i>-n</i>	260
Bibliography and abbreviations	263

Introduction

The nature of Turkic–Mongolic language contacts has been central to Altaistics since the birth of the discipline. In the beginning the hypothesis of an Altaic language family directed attention to the Turkic–Mongolic language contacts. In the middle of the 20th c., however, one of the basic tenets of comparative linguistics that only an “ancient heritage” could lead to a grammatical similarity between languages, began to shatter. Therefore, the focus of research shifted to that of copying via historical contacts.

The rise of the Mongol Empire in the 13th c. meant a turning point in the aspect of the Turkic – Mongolic language contacts as well. Before the Mongol Era, Turkic was the dominant language, whereas after the conquest, Mongolic took over: several hundred words entered the Middle Turkic languages. Among these, Mongolic had the strongest influence on Chaghatay, the Eastern Middle Turkic literary language, which, however, has not been thoroughly analyzed until now. That is what I aim to undertake here based on about 300 words of Mongolic origin. I collected these words from records of the Eastern Turkic literary language (from dictionaries and texts) based on the criteria described by Clauson (1975) and Róna-Tas (1978: 261–265).

Code copying always presumes some extent of bilingualism, therefore it is necessary to sketch out the historic background surrounding the language contacts. In our case, we find a continuous diglossia, spanning over several thousands of years, in which language dominance could change from time to time. Though a thorough analysis of historical connections is not part of my work, I keep their significance in view throughout.

Our first written information pertaining to Turkic–Mongolic bilingualism comes from the *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects* of Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, who introduced the Turkic language in the 11th c. Even after the Mongol conquest, we must assume varying degrees of bilingualism in different geographic areas and at different time periods, in areas where the Eastern Turkic literary language was created and was in use.

The Turkic and Mongolic languages are close typologically, which makes code copying rather easy. Factoring in the history of the steppes, on the other hand, we must consider both of the basic types of language contact: copying and substratum influence. The Chaghatay literary language emerged in the 15th c. and reflects clearly how the different languages and dialects blended and merged together. In each case, I endeavor to uncover the history of words in both Turkic and Mongolic languages, which enables a wide and general examination of language contact during and after the Mongol Era. Therefore, one question is what kind of language contact these words reveal. The research methodology I employ is based on the research of bilingualism, primarily the code copying model developed by Johanson (2002). In consequence, the research will provide useful information and results not only in

the fields of Altaistics and comparative-historical Turkology and Mongolistics, but also in the study of bilingualism, linguistic interference, code copying, and many others.

Turkic – Mongolic language contacts pertain primarily to vocabulary, and research has focused on copyings almost exclusively, while the study of the impact on other linguistic subsystems has been neglected. In my research, I also focused on the lexicon, but I examined the influence on the other grammatical systems as well. The question whether Mongolic languages may have played a role in certain Turkic sound shifts has not been thoroughly researched. Similarly, the literature has neglected to examine the discernible Mongolic influence on semantics.

I examine the appearance of Mongolic copies in the Turkic languages both in space and time. Some words have been documented from early on, since the 13th c., others since the 15th or 17th c. Some words were momentary, maybe literary copies, while some were habitualized and conventionalized, and so widely spread, and became strongly embedded. Others proved to be short-lived and dropped out of usage, or maybe became part of usage for only a particular group. By using areal examination we can draw conclusions about the chronology of code copying, taking into consideration, of course, the possibility of conventionalization and rapid spread caused by the intensity and dynamism of language contacts. (Johanson 1999: 53) In my database I included the Mongolic glosses that appear in the texts but did not become part of the Chaghatay lexicon, since these words can be of importance for Mongolic language history.

I examine the Mongolic verbal copies in their own chapter. Until quite recently, the concept has been widely accepted in the literature that during language contact, verbs are copied in the nominal form (see, e.g. Moravcsik 1978: 110), and that their verbal adaptation into the base code can only occur by using a denominal verbalizer or an auxiliary verb. The verbs of Mongolic origin, however, were adopted into Chaghatay consistently without denominal verb formative suffix. Mongolic verbal stems do not require an embedding suffix, they function like the Turkic verbal bases, whereas e.g. Slavic verbal stems need “embedding morphemes,” which are denominal suffixes, or light verbs.

In general, one can conclude that bound morphemes are not attractive in copying. Their adoption is likely to occur only during intensive language contact. I examine what kind of affixes were copied into the Turkic languages after Turkic–Mongolic contact during and after the Mongol Era, and if the function of affixes had changed due to Mongolic influence.

Historical background of Turkic–Mongolic language contacts

Several Turkic and Mongolic peoples had lived alongside one another and commingled throughout millennia, as well as comprised the tribes and peoples of several large empires. This common past, which is evident in the Turkic–Mongolic historical traditions, can be traced in the written sources as well – first primarily in the Chinese and Muslim, later in the Mongolic and Turkic ones. Speakers of Oghuric and Common Turkic were equally participants of the pre-Mongolic era language contacts.

According to historical sources, the first important nomadic empire formed in the eastern regions of Inner Asia around 300 B.C., where, presumably, both Turkic and Mongolic peoples resided. Though the debate¹ about the linguistic relation of the ruling tribe in the Hsiung-nu-led power structure has not been concluded yet, similarly to later developments, this nomadic empire may have been multi-lingual, and may have provided the political framework of the earliest Turkic–Mongolic language contacts. This contact may have continued later, such as in the Hsien-pi-led confederations in Eastern-Inner Asia. The Hsien-pi themselves emerged from the eastern barbarian Tung-hu, in whom most scholars appear to recognize the predecessors of Proto-Mongolic peoples. In turn, from the Hsien-pi, the Tabghach and Khitan emerged, about whose linguistic relations rather lively debates have taken place. Clauson considered the Tabghach, who conquered even North China, to be Turkic-speaking, or, more precisely, to be the predecessors of the Chuvash, and surmised that the early Turkic elements of the Mongolic languages originated from this language. The question of the language of the T'o-pa, or Tabghach, has been mostly settled; the majority of scholars, Ligeti among them, assume that they spoke Mongolian, though Turkic-speaking groups may have lived among them as well. Another debate that has not been put to rest yet, though it is strongly connected with the European Avars' language, is about the linguistic relations of the Juan-Juans, who established their empire between the end of the 4th and the middle of the 6th centuries on present-day Mongolian territories. Some scholars consider them Mongolic, others Turkic-speaking, whereas Ligeti thinks it probable that some of them spoke Turkic and some Mongolic.² The Juan-Juan Kaghanate itself was also multi-lingual. It included the Tarim Basin, and extended to the Khingan Mountains in the east and to the Lake Baikal in the north. The tribes that brought down the empire

-
- 1 On the Hsiung-nu language Ligeti changed his opinion several times. According his early view they spoke a Mongolic or Turkic language (Ligeti 1940: 47). Later he raised the possibility of the Paleosiberian origin of their language (Ligeti 1950), which was advanced and supported with further arguments by Pulleyblank (1962). Recently A. Vovin (2000) expressed support for Pulleyblank's conclusions.
 - 2 Futaky (2001) has suggested the possibility of the Manchu-Tungus origin, which idea, however, Kara (2002) rejected. Vásáry (2003: 50) thinks it possible that Pelliot is correct in perceiving an early Mongolic in the language of the Juan-Juans.

and created the Türk Empire in the middle of the 6th c. had also emerged from this conglomerate.

Early language contact took place between Mongolic-speaking groups and a community speaking a Bulghar Turkic or Oghuric Turkic-type language. Until about the middle of the 4th c., it may have been at its most intensive; at that time, however, the Bulghar Turkic tribes moved west, away from the areas occupied by the Mongols. The first, separate sources of Turkic peoples appeared relatively late, during the 7–8th centuries. According to the runic inscriptions found primarily in the area of the current Mongolia, the supposedly Mongolic-speaking Otuz Tatar and Toquz Tatar peoples belonged to the Türk Empire as well. The proceeding Türk, Uyghur, and Kirghiz empires practically overlapped the area where Mongolic peoples resided as well. After the collapse of their empire, some of the Uyghurs found refuge with the Mongolic Otuz Tatars, while others migrated to East-Turkistan, where they founded the Turfan Kaghanate.

The Uyghur–Mongolic cultural and trade relationships were also important. The Mongols adopted the Uyghur writing, and the Uyghurs played a significant role in the Buddhist missions among the Mongols.

In his work written in Arabic in 1074 (or 1077), Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī mentions³ that the *Čömül*, *Qāy*, *Yabāqu*, *Tatār* and the *Basmil* all speak their own language, but they also speak Turkic.⁴ Of them, the *Qāy* and the *Tatār* spoke some kind of Mongolic.⁵ In the eastern part of Inner-Asia during the three centuries preceding the Mongol era, the Mongolic-speaking Khitan possessed significant political power. According to Chinese and Turkic sources, beginning in the 5th c., the Khitan tribes continued warring with the Türks and later with the Uyghurs who made them into their tributaries occasionally. The Uyghur–Khitan relationship was strong, e.g. the majority of Khitan titles are of Uyghur origin, and the Khitan adopted the so-called “small-Khitan” writing from them as well (Vásáry 2003: 98–101). At the beginning of the 12th c., a group of the Khitan, the Kara-Khitan, migrated to Central-Asia, conquered the Uyghur and Karakhanid territories, but then a few decades after the death of the Kara-Khitan Yelü Taši, the Nayman–Merkit alliance occupied the Turkistan region, having fled from the ever-strengthening Mongols of Chingis. It is conceivable, though linguistically not yet demonstrable, that from these languages Mongolic elements may have entered the Turkic languages.⁶ Many surmise that

3 His book is about Turkic grammar, but also contains a substantial amount of ethnographic and historical commentary.

4 “Among the nomadic peoples are the *Čömül* – they have a gibberish of their own, but also know Turkic; also *Qāy*, *Yabāqu*, *Tatār* and *Basmil* – each of these groups has its own language, but they also know Turkic well.” (Dankoff–Kelly 1982: I 83).

5 Golden considers the *Yabāqu* to be Turkic, because their name can be etymologized from Turkic, but later (p. 230), because of the Mongolic parallel (*da’aga(n)*) of the Turkic common noun *yapāqu* ‘matted hair or wool, an animal whose hair has grown long and matted, a colt’, he considers their contact with the Mongols conceivable (Golden 1992: 164–165, 230, 275).

6 About the Khitan adoptions, see Doerfer 1993; Doerfer 1993a.

some of the peoples mentioned in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, such as the Kereits and Naymans spoke Turkic as their primary or secondary language.

The formation of the Mongol Empire brought about changes in the ethnic relations and organizations of the steppes, which can be traced very clearly in the sources. Turkic and Mongolic tribal groups, having left their earlier settlements, came into close contact with and mixed with one another. The Mongol conquest reached the Kirghiz, the Uyghur, and the Karluks first, and then the Kipchak-Kangli tribes. The Mongols systematically drafted the conquered Turkic and non-Turkic peoples, as well as included them in their military-administrative system. Not only the ethnic boundaries but also the language boundaries broke down. Even though the number of Mongols was not relatively significant in the conquered territories, they left substantial traces in the ethnogenesis of the current Turkic nations. According to Golden, the “Mongol” troops brought in from Inner-Asia were possibly part Turkic, e.g. Uyghur and Kirghiz, who, then, very likely blended into the local Turkic population quickly.⁷ As an imprint of the Mongolic ethnic and linguistic presence,⁸ several Mongolic tribal names have survived in Turkic tribal and clan names, and a part of the Mongolic elements in the present-day Turkic languages are likely to be a linguistic substratum of those Mongolic communities.

After the collapse of the Mongol Empire, the Mongolic influence in the successor states was still discernible for a while, primarily in the concentrations of the ruling powers. We do not know by exactly what time the usage of the Mongolic language had diminished or ceased completely. It had taken place in different ways in the different territories, though the ruling elite may have spoken Turkic as early as the 13th c. as well. From a few sources we know that Mongolic was used in the Golden Horde in the second half of the 14th c. From the era between 1290 and 1370, four *payzas* in Uyghur script survive in Mongolic (Vásáry 1986: 213–219; Vásáry 1986a: 63; Vásáry 1987: 71–72). According to the Muslim sources, diplomatic correspondence was conducted in Mongolic and Arabic, besides Turkic, and that Uzbek Khan, the ruler of the Golden Horde, knew Mongolic himself. Al-Nuwayrī writes in 682 [1283/1284] that Tudan-Mengü’s delegates presented a letter to the Sultan of Egypt written in Mongolic (Tizengauzen 1884: Ar. 144, 165 in Russian translation). According to the Egyptian Sultan’s secretary, Al-‘Umārī, “Presently those [the Kipchaks] are under the rule of one of Özbeg khan’s sons. Correspondence with them is conducted in Arabic [...] yet most often in Mongolic” (Tizengauzen 1884: Ar. 228, 251 Russian trans.). Al-Waṣṣāf Persian chronicler: “Özbeg khan said in Mongolic to Temür Qutlugh and Isa gürgen: “The man we are searching for is upon us. Where could we go?” (Tizengauzen 1941: 87, Russian translation). The Uyghur script, asso-

7 Golden (1992: 292) cites al-‘Umārī’s (d. 1348–49) description of the Mongol – Kipchak cohabitation.

8 The *Jalair* name at the Kazakhs and Turkmens, the *Nayman* among the Bashkir, Uzbek, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Nogay, and Crimean Tatar; the *Merkit*, *Kereit* among the Bashkir, Uzbek and others (Golden 1992: 292; 299–300).

ciated with the traditions of the Mongol Empire, was well-known in the Golden Horde and even at the Russian Chancellery in the 14th and 15th centuries (Vásáry 1987: 71–72). Mongolic texts in Uyghur script have been discovered even from Anatolia as parts of Arabic written documents dating back to the second half of the 13th and the 14th centuries. E.g. a *waqfiyya* in Arabic from 1272, at the bottom of which there is a 70-line text in Mongolic, and nine lines in another document. This latter document is Muḥammad al-Samarqandī's poem written in 1324, which survived at the end of Juwaynī's historical work (Sertkaya 1974: 181).

The area of our interest in Inner-Asia existed under Mongol rule until the second half and last third of the 14th c. Beside the Golden Horde, the Ilkhanate and the Chaghatay Khanate belonged here as well, as they also included the earlier Uyghur and Kara Khitan-ruled areas. After the Mongol conquest, Turkestan presented a motley picture of ethnicity, cultures, and languages. This is where the so called Chaghatay literary language developed – the language Eckmann called the Muslim Eastern Turkic language. The cultural assimilation is marked by the Islamization of the Mongol ruling class. In this slow process, Rabḡūzī's work also played an important part. Rabḡūzī was born in Western Turkistan in the middle of the 13th c. and as a judge by profession, he had a good relationship with the members of the Mongol ruling class. He records that in 1309–10, the Mongol Prince Toq Buḡa asked him to assemble the stories of the Prophets (Boeschoten et al. 1995: xviii, 5–6). During the same year, Esen Buḡa came to the throne. Under his rule the Chaghataids' conversion to Islam became complete. Rabḡūzī wrote his work in Turkic, therefore the language for the Mongol ruling class was already the preferred Turkic literary language.

During the 14th c., in 1346 the *Chaghatay ulus* separated into two parts: in the west the Turkistan area, which is the actual Chaghatay ulus; and Moghulistan, which consists of present-day Southeastern-Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, and East-Turkestan. In both areas further Turkic peoples settled next to the original Turkic populace, some of whose names refer to their origins or that of their leaders (Golden 1992: 303–304, 307). The separation and commingling of tribes affected mostly the Kipchak and the Mongols themselves. Golden (1992: 307) emphasizes that though the power structure forming here resembled the former one and could be considered its continuation, significant differences can be observed, especially in the organization of the army, which shows a considerable Mongolic influence.

The Western-Mongolic influence on the Central Asian – the Chaghatay, among others – and Siberian Turkic languages after the establishment of the Oirat Junghar Khanate in the 15th c., may have received a renewed push to copy further Mongolic linguistic elements. The boundaries of the Oirat Empire are the Khangai Mountains to the east, the upper Yenisei and Irtysh rivers to the north, the Gobi Desert to the south, and Moghulistan to the west. From the middle of the 17th c., the separation of the Kalmuck tribes from the empire and their migration to the lower Volga may have created a distinctly bilingual situation in these areas. During the internal power struggles among the Turkic and Mongolic peoples, the defeated often found refuge

in one another's courts, such as the Khivan khan, 'Abu'l-Ġāzī Bahādur at the Kal-mucks (Hofman 1969: 12, 13), or the Oirat Amursana at the Kazakhs (Birtalan – Rákos 2002: 20).

Chaghatay and its relation to the other Turkic languages

The word Chaghatay was originally a proper noun; it was the name of the second-born son of Chingis Khan. The core of the Chaghatay ulus was the part of the Empire in Central-Asia that was left to him after his father's death and whose boundaries continually changed during the struggles for supremacy. In the 14th c. during the reign of Tamerlane (Timur), it consisted of the Iranian and Turkic-populated Transoxania, Khwarezm, Khorasan, and North-Afghanistan, as well as the Mongolic, Turkic, and Iranian-populated Moghulistan, encompassing East Turkestan and Semirechye.⁹ Following Timur's conquests, not only did the Mongolic and Turkic nomads of the Chaghatay ulus play a leading role in the steppes, but also in largely urban and rural cultures of the huge area of present-day Iran and Afghanistan. The Timurid Empire fell in the 16th c., but the name Chaghatay survived as the designation of the shared ethnic identity and to distinguish their group from the conquered sedentary rural peoples who spoke Iranian languages, and also from the Turkmen nomads, as well as from the Turkic–Mongolic ruling elites of the surrounding areas (Khwarezm, the Russian steppes, and Moghulistan).¹⁰ It is self-designation and this is how they are named in foreign sources (Ottoman, Byzantine, etc.) as well (Eckmann 1966: 2–4). Consequently, the name Chaghatay no longer designated a bloodline in the 16th c., but the ruling Timurids and their commoners, who are not Uzbeks, not Turkmens, what's more, not Moghuls, Chaghatay Khan's Chingisid descendants living in Moghulistan; even though the name survives in clans' names among the Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and others.

The Chaghatay language (*Čaġatay tili*), therefore, means the language of the nomadic Turks living in the Chaghatay ulus; however, in the 15th – 16th c. it is the developing literary language of the Timurid Renaissance, and during its history, reaches far beyond the boundaries of the Chaghatay ulus. Language played a decisive role in Chaghatay identity, and in the Timurid courts, there were Turkic and Iranian scribes writing in Persian, as well as Turkic scribes writing in Arabic and Uyghur script. Furthermore, at the very end of the 15th c., Navā'ī literary manifesto, the *Muḥākamatu'l-luġatayn*, proclaimed the superiority of the Turkic literary language ("Türki") over the Persian, thereby reinforcing ethnic consciousness ex-

9 Timur's campaigns imposed on huge areas; the Golden Horde, Armenia, Asia Minor, Iran, Iraq, and India suffered from the attacks of his army.

10 Manz 1992: 27. In her article, she examines the defining elements of the Chaghatay *ethnic* consciousness during the Timurid era, which are: a distinctive common culture, social structure, identity, and economic and political interests, which are all different from the surrounding cultures.

pressed and practiced through language. Over the centuries, Navā'ī enjoyed vast popularity throughout the Central-Asian territories, and was also admired and emulated even in the Ottoman Empire (Tuna 1972: 218; Sertkaya 1970, 1971; Birnbaum 1976; Péri 2005: 60–61).

János Eckmann distinguished three periods in the history of the Turkic literary language of Muslim Central-Asia: 1) the Karakhanide literary language used during the 11–12th c., primarily in Kashgar and Balasagun; 2) the Khwarezmian literary language used in literary works during the 13–14th c., in Kwarezm, situated at the lower end of the river Sir Darya as part of the Golden Horde territory; and 3) the Chaghatay literary language, which was the literary – official language in Transoxania, Khorasan, Ferghana and Eastern-Turkestan, where it was primarily used in the major cultural centers, like Kashgar, Bukhara, Samarkand, Herat, Khiva or Kokand, but in addition, it was known and practiced in the Volga area, in the Crimea, and in the Great Moghul Empire, moreover in the Ottoman Empire as well. Eckmann further distinguishes three periods of the Chaghatay language history. The pre-classical period begins at the beginning of the 15th c., and ends with the publication of Navā'ī's first divan. The classical period lasts from 1465 to 1600, and its most significant figure was Mīr 'Alī-Šīr Navā'ī, whose works greatly contributed to the development of the literary language. The post-classical period spans between 1600 and the latter half of the 19th c., and is characterized by grammatical and lexical innovations that originated in the Central Asian Turkic languages and then entered the literary norm (Eckmann 1957; 1959; 1966: 1–10).

Čagataische Sprachstudien, Hermann (Ármin) Vámbéry's seminal work introducing Central Asian literature, was published in 1867, after which Chaghatay became a literary-linguistic technical term in the scientific literature of Turcology. In their contemporaneous works, Pavet de Courteille (1870) and Zenker (1866–76) still call the language “turc-oriental” or “osttürkisch”, respectively.

Researchers in the former Soviet Union used the anachronistic phrase Old Uzbek (*starouzbekskij jazyk*) indicating that they considered this literary language the precursor to present-day Uzbek.¹¹ At the same time, they use the term Chaghatay for a concrete linguistic state of Old Uzbek, but disagree about its chronological boundaries. Ščerbak (1962: 12–16) considers all works produced in Central Asia, and in khanates not occupied by the Oghuz between the 14th and 17th centuries, Chaghatay. According to others, the language of all Central Asian literary work is Old Uzbek, but only the literary language of the 13–14th c. is Chaghatay (e.g. Baskakov 1960: 178–179). Kononov (1958) draws the chronological boundary in the 13–18th c., and he regards the literary language of the following period as a revised version of the Uzbek common language. Boeschoten and his colleagues consider

11 By no means could we talk about an Uzbek literary language already existing during the 11–16th c., even if we can trace characteristics partly akin to ones in modern Uzbek, and can also be found in classical Chaghatay. In addition, Uzbek linguists and literati of the 19–20th c. consciously incorporated elements of literary Chaghatay into modern standard Uzbek.

Khwarezmian Turkic pre-Chaghatay in that it can be deemed a transition between Chaghatay and Karakhanid, emphasizing that one cannot discern a unified literary language during the period preceding Navā'ī's (Boeschoten et al. 1995: xiv; Boeschoten – Vandamme 1998: 166–178). In his recently published monograph on Chaghatay grammar, Bodrogligeti considers Khwarezmian and Chaghatay an inseparable and non-divisible unit. "...the principle to treat Chaghatay as a cultural-historical entity embracing works from as early as the fourteenth century and covering all social levels of the language...With this we come closer in concept to Brockelmann's *Osttürkische Grammatik* although we do not include Karakhanide and Mamluk-Kipchak works into our survey due to their overwhelming linguistic and to some extent cultural differences." (Bodrogligeti 2007: 7). As of late, Benedek Péri has focused on the question and he deems the designation *Turkī*, or *Türkī* more precise (Péri 2003; 2005: 20–61). He determines correctly that the authors of Chaghatay works hardly ever used the name in allusion to their language, and that to Navā'ī, the preeminent character of the classical period, as well as to some of his followers, Chaghatay meant more of a literary style than anything else. Péri's suggested *Turkī*, however, does not denote anything by itself; after all, all the different writers writing in all the different Turkic languages would call the language they used thus.

The Chaghatay literary and official language was used in the vast area populated by peoples who spoke several idioms of Iranian, Turkic, and in some places, Mongolian. Therefore, the language that developed in the 15th c. clearly reflects the comingling and blending of diverse languages: thus it is replete with characteristics of Kipchak, Oguz, and Turki languages, as well as shows an extraordinarily strong Arabic–Persian influence in all areas of grammar.¹² Those who wrote in this language spoke very different Turkic languages and dialects. In their literary works, the writers endeavoured to fashion these spoken tongues to a common literary language, thereby continually enriching it, and in turn also enriching the spoken languages themselves. Chaghatay was not merely a written language, but was in a dynamic contact with the Oghuz, Kipchak, and Turki languages of the Turks, and similarly to Persian, became a *lingua franca*, a bridge of communication among the different peoples.

Considering its structure, Chaghatay belongs in the Turki type of Turkic languages, with Uzbek and modern Uyghur as most similar to it from among today's languages. Those language variants that appear in the texts are not necessarily or merely the imprints of consecutive phases of a linguistic progression, but also the results of later code copyings, as well as similar to variants that may even appear

12 A. Inan conducted a statistical study on the works of Navā'ī, Bābur and 'Abu'l-Ġāzī Bahādur Khan in order to determine the ratio of words of Arabic, Persian, and Turkic origin. Based on the three writers' prosaic works, this ratio nears 50% at Navā'ī, 20% at his quasi-contemporary Bābur, and approximately 10% in 'Abu'l-Ġāzī's *Šajara-i Turk* (Inan 1957: 29–33).

naturally within the same text in a literary language that is based on the different dialects of tribes spread over expansive geographic areas.

The languages of poetic and prose works differ somewhat. Because of the preexisting literary models, poetic works show strong Arabic–Persian influences, but the influence of the unique literary style Navā’ī created can be traced in poetry throughout the ages. In prose works, however, especially from the 17th c. on, there is an ever stronger influence of local languages notable: Uzbek, Uyghur, Turkmen, Kirghiz, Kazakh, and Tatar. Today, several Turkic nations consider the literary works written in Eastern Turkic as part of their culture heritage.

History of research

Many researchers have focused their study on the similarities among Altaic languages for a long time. In their seminal works, G. J. Ramstedt, the plausible father of Altaistics, and his pupil and follower N. Poppe attempted to prove the so-called genetic relationship among the Turkic, Mongolic and Manchu-Tungusic languages, employing the methodology of comparative linguistics (Ramstedt 1946–1947; 1952; 195; Poppe 1960; 1965). Based on the discernable existence of regular sound correspondences and the large number of shared morphological and lexical elements, they traced these languages back to a common proto-language. During the second half of the 20th c., however, following the arguments of G. Clauson (1956; 1962; 1964; 1968) and G. Doerfer (1963; 1975: I 51–105), a significant number of researchers turned against the theory of a genetic relationship among Altaic languages, and they began to explain that the linguistic correspondences were the result of the long and tight historical contacts among the speakers. Maintaining the theory of genetic relationship among Altaic languages, even N. Poppe recognized the necessity of such research. In his *Introduction to Altaic linguistics* (1965), he already states that one-fourth(!) of the Mongolic lexicon is of Turkic origin, and that in the question of the Altaic hypothesis, the copyings must be separated from the words of the common Altaic layer in order to move forward in the research (Poppe 1965: 159). The debate has not been settled yet, rather, it has flared up in the most varied forms; what’s more, the number of languages categorized into the Altaic language family has been broadened by adding Korean and Japanese (Miller 1971; Starostin et al. 2003; Robbeets 2005; see also Georg et al. 1999; Vovin 2003).

The analysis of language contact is inevitable for studying the relations of the Altaic languages. Taking a stand on the question of a common source is only possible once we remove the layers of continuous and massive mutual copyings, and then study the remaining elements (free and bound morphemes, structural agreements). The earliest Turkic–Mongolic contacts were examined by Clauson (see above), Doerfer (Doerfer 1963–1975; 1993; 1995; 1996), Clark (1977), and Ščerbak (1996; 1997). It had long been maintained that in the earliest period of the Turkic–Mongolic language contacts, copying occurred almost exclusively in one direction:

from Turkic to Mongolic. In his articles published primarily in the 1990s, Doerfer is already proving that in this very early period, during the time of the Hsien-pi Empire, as well as from Tabghach and Khitan, Mongolic elements could have been copied into the Turkic language or languages. These copyings are reflected in the texts of the Old Turkic period (Doerfer 1993; 1993a; 1995; 1996). At the same time, the direction of copying from Turkic to Mongolic before the Mongol Era is undoubtedly more significant, in correspondence with the political and cultural prestige relations. The picture, however, changes after the emergence of the Mongol Empire. The Mongol political and cultural influence strengthens, and it duly changes the direction of language copying. A large number of lexical elements enter the Middle Turkic languages and dialects.

In addition to the monographs examining the Mongolic influence on various languages (Yakut: Kałużyński 1961; Tuvan: Tatarincev 1976, Khabtageva 2009; Siberian Turkic languages: Rassadin 1980; 8–14th c. Turkic–Mongolic contacts: Ščerbak 1997; Oguz languages: Schönig 2000, Schönig 2000a; Volga Kipchak languages: Csáki 2006), several articles have been published. From among the historical languages, they have studied the Mongolic words of Codex Cumanicus and the lexemes copied into Osmanli (Poppe 1962; Tuna 1972; 1976). A number of studies have also been published about the Mongolic elements of modern Turkic languages (Azeri: Caferoğlu 1954; Karaim: Zajączkowski 1960; Chuvash: Róna-Tas 1975; Róna-Tas 1982; Salar: Drimba 1976; Bashkir: Išberdin 1979; Nogay: Birtalan 1992; Birtalan 1994; Kazakh (and Kyrgyz): Poppe 1991 and Somfai-Kara 2003; Turfan Uyghur dialects: Yakup 2005; Karachay-Balkar: Csáki 2006a; Uzbek: Rybatzki 2013; 2015; 2017). In addition, of course, the etymological dictionaries of Turkic languages also discuss Mongolic copies (ESTJa 1974–2003; VEW; Tatarincev 2000–2004). The topic of Mongolic influence on Turkic languages other than lexical is becoming more widely researched (Ščerbak 1997; Erdal 1991; 1998; Vásáry 1995; Schönig 1997, 1998; 2003).

Doerfer's and Rozycki's research is of primary interest to us in regards to the Mongolic elements of non-Turkic languages. The former studied the Mongolic elements in New Persian and in Manchu-Tungus, whereas Rozycki explored the Mongolic elements in Manchu (Doerfer 1963–1975; Doerfer 1985; Rozycki 1994). Both endeavored also to define the relative chronology and layers of copying.

If I wanted to evaluate the above works briefly and summarily, I conclude that most authors are content with comparing the Turkic and Mongolic – generally Literary Mongolic – words. Even the monographs of the last decade are no exception (Ščerbak 1997; Schönig 2000; Csáki 2006). Besides the articles of Róna-Tas (1971–2; 1975; 1982; 1986), Khabtagajeva's monograph (2009) is the first of its kind to try to reconstruct the model, to provide the etymology of the copied word, and to sketch out the history of the word on both the Turkic and the Mongolic sides.

Researchers are divided about the significance and the number of Mongolic elements in Chaghatay. In one of his early works, Ligeti maintains that the number of Mongolic elements and their linguistic significance are greater than in any other

Turkic language (Ligeti 1935: 277), while according to Boeschoten and Vandamme (1998: 167) only the military and administrative terms were copied from Mongolic. The truth is somewhere in the middle; the number of Mongolic copies is significantly smaller in Chaghatay than in Tuvan, Yakut, or Kirghiz, but bigger than in the western and north-western Kipchak or any of the Oguz languages.

A comprehensive study of Mongolic elements in the eastern Turkic literary language has not been undertaken. In 1960 Clauson published the list of Mongolic words included in the *Sanglah* (pp. 91–99), and we find a lot of data in Doerfer's seminal *Die türkischen und mongolischen Elemente im Neupersischen* (Doerfer 1963–1975). In his work exploring the early Turkic–Mongolic contacts, Ščerbak (1997: 190–226) dedicates a whole chapter to the Mongolic copies of 13–14th c. pre-Chaghatay Turkic (his Old Uzbek); however, he mentions several words that are first dated in the 15–16th c. Published in 1992, Sertkaya's article lists 30 Mongolic copies from four 15th c. eastern Turkic texts written in Uyghur. In my 1997 article, I present the research aspects of Mongolic elements in Chaghatay through a few examples (Kincses Nagy 1997). Finally, I must mention Zuhā (Kargı) Ölmez's works published in 2007 and 2014, in which she explores the Mongolic elements in Navā'ī's works.

Chaghatay data: texts and dictionaries

TA: Sugahara M. 2007. *Tazkira-yi Awliya in the Uyghur script. I. Introduction and text in transcription*. Kobe.

Eastern Turkic translation of Farīdaddīn 'Aṭṭār's (d. 1221) work in Persian, written in Uyghur, prepared in Herat in 1436. The manuscript is housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The French translation of the text was published by A. Pavet de Courteille in 1889. The new edition contains the transliteration and transcription of the original. The number of Mongolic elements is not significant.

ML: BARUTÇU ÖZÖNDER, F. S. 1996. (ed.) *'Alī Šīr Nevā'ī : Muḥākemetü'l-luġateyn. İki dilin Muhakemesi*. Ankara.

The *Muḥākamatu'l-luġatayn* is the earliest philological work pertaining to the Eastern Turkic literary language, written by Mīr 'Alī-Šīr Navā'ī in 1499. Comparing Chaghatay to Persian, its purpose was to prove that the Turkish language was much richer and much more expressive than Persian. He supports his argument by providing a long list of examples, quotes synonyms, and lists words by topic in order to prove the richness of Chaghatay. There is a number of Mongolic copies among his examples that are sometimes rare, unusual, what's more, some may never had been in common usage, and unavoidably sound like elements of an artistic language. In his grammatical tract, Navā'ī discusses Chaghatay word derivation, and mentions several affixes, like *-(A)Gul* or *-(I)l*, that are important from our point of view as

well. Navā'ī does not always include the meaning of words, which makes using his work difficult. We often also cannot be sure of their reading.

The latest edition is the work of Barutçu Özönder, based on the manuscript at the Topkapı Sarayı Museum in Istanbul, but also utilizing manuscripts of the Süleymaniye Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the MTA Oriental Library in Budapest (Barutçu Özönder 1996: 1–2). The critical edition contains the facsimile of the Topkapı manuscript, the transcription and translation of the text, as well as Barutçu Özönder's lexical-etymological analysis.

Bab: THACKSTON, W. M. JR. 1993. (ed.) *Zahirüddin Muhammad Bâbur Mirza: Bâburnâme*. I–III. *Chaghatay Turkish Text with Abdul-Rahim Khankhanan's Persian translation*. Harvard University.

This is the work of Bâbur, the founder of the Moghul Empire (1483–1530), a masterpiece of 16th c. Chaghatay narrative prose, which, among others, depicts hunting and military events, and the flora and fauna of the conquered lands. Thackston's edition contains the transcript and English translation of the original text reconstructed from four manuscripts, as well as the Persian translation from the end of the 16th c.

Ag: KONONOV, A. N. 1958. (ed.) *Rodoslovnaja turkmen. Sočinenie Abu-l-Gazi, xana xivinskogo*. Moskva – Leningrad.

‘Abu'l-Ġāzī Bahādur Khan's work entitled *Šajara-i Tarākima* was completed in 1659 or 1661. His sources are Rashīd al-Dīn's work, the *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, written in 1310–1311 in Persian, and numerous *Oğuznâme* versions. Kononov's critical edition is based on seven manuscripts. The text in printed Arabic script and a Russian translation can be found in the book.

KARGI ÖLMEZ, Z. 1996. (ed.), *Ebulgazi Bahadır Han, Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soykütüğü)*. Ankara.

Based on the Tashkent and Leningrad manuscripts, Z. Kargi Ölmez also published the *Šajara-i Tarākima*. Her publication contains a transcription, a Turkish translation, a dictionary, and the facsimile of the two manuscripts.

AG: DESMAISONS, P. I. 1871, 1874. *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghâzi Bêhâdour Khan*. I. Texte. II. Traduction. St.-Petersbourg.

‘Abu'l-Ġāzī Bahādur Khan's¹³ work entitled *Šajara-i Turk* was finished by his son in 1665 after the author's death in 1664. The book narrates the history of the Shaybanid dynasty of Khwarezm, embedded in the history of the Mongols. His sources are Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, Sharaf al-Dīn's *Zafarnâme*, seventeen Chingis-legends (Činggisnâme), and the 17th c. oral tradition. The language called post-classical Chaghatay by Eckmann shows a strong influence of the contemporary

13 About ‘Abu'l-Ġāzī Bahādur Khan, see Hofman 11–13.

Khiva Uzbek. The publication contains the printed text in Arabic script and the French translation.

ČN: Ivanics, M. – Usmanov, M. A. 2002. *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende (Dāftār-i Čingiz-nāmā)* I. Szeged. Studia uralo-altaica 44.

Dictionaries¹⁴

MA: POPPE, N. 1938–1939/1971. *Mongol'skij slovar Mukaddimat al-Adab* I–II.

A Mongolic – Chaghatay glossary written about 1492; a complement to the bilingual Arabic – Persian dictionary of the 12th c. scholar Zamaḥṣārī.

Aided by Navā'ī 's extraordinary literary undertaking, the formation of a unified literary language had gained momentum, and his followers attempted to emulate his art. Shortly after his death in 1501 and influenced by his pioneering work, a host of grammatical and lexicographical works were produced that aspired to introduce and explain the grammar and lexicon of the Chaghatay language. The authors based their work primarily on Navā'ī 's texts, but used other writers' and poets' works as well.

TIH: Borovkov, A. K. 1961. „*Badā'i' al-luġat*”. *Slovar' Ṭālī' Īmānī Geratskogo k sočinenijam Ališera Navoi*. Moskva.

Ṭālī', the author of the dictionary, was born in Herat and was Navā'ī 's contemporary. Navā'ī mentions him in his literary history, the *Majālis al-Nafā'is*. He compiled his dictionary in Persian, probably at the end of the 15th c.,¹⁵ and his purpose was to provide an interpretation of Navā'ī 's work. It contains about 1000 words. The basis for the publication is not the original text but a copy from 1705/06.¹⁶ The later lexicographical works use this manuscript as a source, e.g. the *Sanglaḥ*, Faṭḥ-¹Ali Kājār Kazwinī, etc.,

Ab: Atalay, B. 1970. (ed.) *Abuşka Lugatı veya Çağatay sözlüğü*. Ankara.

The author of the Chaghatay – Old Ottoman dictionary, which got its name after the first word as *Abuşqa*, is unknown. The work was written sometime after Navā'ī 's death (1501), but not later than 1552. Primarily, it provides the Ottoman interpretation of the words in Navā'ī 's works, but refers also to other 15th c. poets as well (Luṭfī, Mīr Haydar). According to Borovkov (1960: 156), the *Abuşqa* is a reworking of *Badā'i' al-luġat* or a similar work, or they may go back to a common source. It contains approximately 2000 words. Occasionally it indicates the pronunciation of words. Atalay's edition is in the Latin alphabet, but there is an index in Arabic script

14 About Chaghatay lexicography, see Vámbéry 1867: 198–202; BL 3–11; Eren 1950; Borovkov 1960: 10–12; Ščerbak 1962: 54–57; Kargi Ölmez 1998; Caferoğlu 2001: 223–229.

15 The Timurid Sultan Husain reigned 1469–1506, and Ṭālī' dedicated his dictionary to him.

16 Vámbéry also had a manuscript, a copy from 1715 (Vámbéry 1867: 199).

at the end of the book. I used the Besim Atalay edition; on occasion, however, I considered the other two editions as well, which I indicated in footnotes: The Viennese manuscript dates to 1552. It was published by Vámbéry, with Budenz's foreword and commentary: Vámbéry, Á. 1862. (ford.) *Abuska. Csagatajtörök szógyűjtemény*. Pest. The date of the St. Petersburg manuscript is 1553, published by Veliaminof-Zernof: Veliaminof-Zernof, V. de. 1869. *Dictionnaire djagatay-turc*. St. Petersburg.

S: Muhammad Mahdī Xān, *Sanglax. A Persian Guide to the Turkish Language*. Facsimile text with an Introduction and Indices by Sir Gerald Clauson. London 1960.

This is a handbook in Persian, completed in 1758–1760; a Chaghatay grammar and glossary. The most important information about the author and his work can be found in the introduction of the edition by Clauson (1960: 5–32). Mīrzā Mahdī Khan was Nāder Shah's court historian and personal secretary. He was familiar with almost all of Navā'ī's works, and he used and also often corrected the *Abuṣṣa*. He quotes the Bāburnāma often and other Chaghatay authors as well. Besides Chaghatay words, he also includes Ottoman and Mongolic words, but he never explains why. He surmises that basically there is only one Turki language, which has two barely different literary languages, Chaghatay and Rumi, as well as a few local dialects. He seems to have been most familiar with Uzbek, knew of the Anatolian dialects, was aware of how these languages were different from the Azeri language, knew that the language of Chinese Turkestan was a separate language, and knew a few Turkmen dialects, as well as the Volga Tatar, but his references to Khwarezmian are not clear.

BL: Thúry, J. 1903. *A „Behdset-ül-lugat” czimű csagatáj szótár*. Budapest.

Chaghatay–Persian dictionary, compiled by Faṭḥ-‘Alī Kaṣār in 1862, titled *Luġat-i atrākīya* or *Bahjatul-luġat*. Thúry considers it an entirely independent Chaghatay dictionary. Clauson (1960: 11) and Borokov (1960: 158–159) have pointed out that it can be considered a compilation based on *Sanglaḥ* and *Badā'i' al-luġat*. The dictionary exists in two unpublished manuscripts, and the Thúry edition is incomplete.

The Great-Moghul lexicographical tradition

Dictionaries compiled in India during the time of Great Mogul Empire in 16–18th c. introduce the Chaghatay Turkic language used there. They contain not only word lists, but also grammatical paradigms. I had no chance to see the so-called *Calcutta Dictionary* (*Luġat-i Turkī*), which is the work of Faḍl Allāh Khān published in 1825 in Calcutta, and was used by several 19th c. lexicographers (Budagov, Radloff). According to Caferoglu (2001), the publication contains many mistakes.

KN: Ibragimov, A. 1982. (ed.) *Muhammad Yakub Čingi, Kelür-nāmā*. Taškent.

This is a thematic Chaghatay–Persian dictionary compiled in the 17th c. Muḥammad Yaqub Čingī prepared it by the order of Bābur’s great-grandson, Aurangzeb (1658–1707). Its manuscripts can be found in Tashkent and London. The manuscript at the British Museum is made up of 14 fragmentary parts. Ibragimov’s edition is strongly “Uzbekized”.

19th c. Dictionaries

As evidenced by the following, the data have been circulating from one dictionary to the other. We frequently find in the literature that a scholar quotes historical data from from several dictionaries; however, the word may well be a hapax legomenon.

Z: Zenker, J. Th. 1866–1876. *Türkisch – arabisch – persisches Handwörterbuch*. Leipzig.

Concerning Chaghatay, Zenker’s most important sources are the *Muqaddimatu’l-adab*, the *Sanglaḥ*, the *Calcutta Dictionary*, and the *Ḥulāsa-i Abbāsi* (a dictionary made from the *Sanglaḥ*, and contains a lot of mistakes). Its manuscripts can be found in Tehran and Paris. The abbreviation for Chaghatay data is ‘to.’, which stands for ‘turc-oriental’. Transcription often contains mistakes.

ČSpr: Vámbéry, A. 1867. *Čagataische Sprachstudien*. Leipzig.

The approximately 5000–word dictionary of his chrestomathy contains the lexicon of the selected literary passages. From among the earlier dictionaries, he used the *Badā’i’ al-luġat*, the *Abuṣqa*, the *Luġat-i Turkī* (*Calcutta Dictionary*) and the *Ḥulāsa-i Abbāsi*.

Bud: Budagov, L. 1869–1871. *Sravnitel’ nyj slovar’ turecko-tatarskih narečij*. Sanktpe-terburg.

In support of Chaghatay data, he often cites the works of Bābur and ‘Abu’l-Ġāzī. From among the earlier dictionaries, his most important sources are *Abuṣqa*, the *Calcutta Dictionary*, Vámbéry’s *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, and the words in *Sanglaḥ* he cites from Zenker.

PC: Pavet de Courteille, A. 1870. *Dictionnaire turk-oriental*. Paris.

Pavet de Courteille used the *Abuṣqa*, *Ḥulāsa-i Abbāsi*, *Bāburnāma*, ‘Abu’l-Ġāzī’s *Šajara-i Turk*, and the *Sanglaḥ*. Quoted material without citations comes from the *Abuṣqa*. He quotes the words written in Arabic script without a Latin transcription, and he does not separate the homographs.

ŠS: Šeyḥ Suleymān Efendi-yi Buḥārī. 1298 [1882]. *Luġat-i Čagatay ve Turkī-yī Osmani*. Istanbul.

Chaghatay – Ottoman Dictionary, containing 6775 words,¹⁷ without transcription. Thúry had already stated that the author used the *Abuṣṣa*, the *Ḥulāsa-i Abbāsi*, and Ahmed Vefik Pasha's *Lehce-i Osmanī* (Thúry 1903: 8). Samojlovič, and later Borovkov (1960: 160–161) pointed out that in compiling his dictionary, Šeyḫ Suleymān Buḥārī relied heavily on Pavet de Courteille's work but did not mention this fact. Ignaz Kúnos published the German edition. This publication is fraught with mistakes; the transcription of words is entirely untrustworthy and heavily "Ottomanized." Kúnos's translations from Ottoman are also teeming with mistakes (Borovkov 1960: 161). In spite of all this, the Kúnos edition is still often cited in Turkological literature.

R: Radloff, W. 1893–1911/1960.^{repr.} *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte. (Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narečij.) I–IV.* Mit einem Vorwort von O. Pritsak. Gravenhage.

Radloff's primary sources for Chaghatay are the *Calcutta Dictionary*, the *Abuṣṣa*, and the dictionaries of Zenker, Budagov, Vámbéry, Pavet de Courteille and Šeyḫ Suleymān.

ČTS: Ünlü, Suat 2013. *Çağatay Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Konya.

A dictionary containing 26,665 words, based on 23 publications of texts and dictionaries in Chaghatay published in Turkey.

Middle Mongolic sources

To examine the Mongolic elements of Chaghatay, we can rely primarily on Middle Mongolic sources because these two periods of Turkic and Mongolic linguistic history partly overlap. The Middle Mongolic monuments were written in the 13–16th c., and after a transitional period the literary works of Classical Literary Mongolian appeared (Poppe 1954: 1–2). Middle Mongolic was continued by the formation of Modern Mongolic languages and dialects. We only know Middle Mongolic from written documents. Based on these, a relatively uniform, undifferentiated spoken language is assumed, which, from the point of view of methodology, is usually separated from Pre-Classical Mongol, surviving purely in written form in Uyghur-Mongol script.

Eastern Middle Mongolic monuments

SH: Haenisch, E. 1939. *Wörterbuch zu Mangḥol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-cha'ao pi-shi)*. Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Leipzig.

17 Many thanks for the information to Mustafa Kaçalın.

Sections 1–268 was probably prepared in 1228, while the following ones could have been written later.

ZY: Kara, G. 1990. Zhiyuan Yiyu. Index alphabétique des mots Mongols: *AOH* 44/3. 279–344.

Chinese–Mongolic dictionary from 1264–1294.

HY: Mostaert, A. 1977. *Le matériel Mongol du Houa i i iu de Houng-ou (1389)*. Rachewiltz, I. de, Schönbaum, A. (eds.) Bruxelles.

Chinese–Mongolic dictionary in Chinese characters; compiled in 1389, containing 849 words and 12 letters from the correspondence between the court of the Ming Dynasty and Mongol tribal leaders.

PhP: Poppe, N. 1957. *The Mongolian monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script*. 2.ed. Krueger, J. R. (transl., ed.) Wiesbaden.

The lexicon of 13 monuments in the official script of the Yuan Empire used between 1269 and 1368.

Western Middle Mongolic monuments

K: Ligeti, L. 1965. Le lexique mongol de Kirakos de Gandzak: *AOH* 18. 241–297.

Armenian–Mongol wordlist from Armenian history of Kirakos dated before 1271.

LA: Poppe, N. 1927–1928. Das mongolische Sprachmaterial einer Leidener Handschrift: *IAN SSSR*. 1927: 1009–1040, 1251–1274. 1928: 55–80. = Poppe, N. N. 1972. *Mongolica with an Introduction by the Author*. Westmead, Farnborough. 1.

The so called *Leiden Anonymous* (LA) written in 1343¹⁸ is a dictionary in four languages (Mamlūk-Kipchak, Mongol, Persian and Arabic). The Arabic–Mongolic and the Persian–Mongolic parts, which were recorded in Iran or Transoxania, were probably compiled by the anonymous author based on a verbal source. The two glossaries together contain approximately 600 words.

IMP: Poppe, N. 1938/1971². *Mongol'skij slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab. I–II*. Moskva – Leningrad. pp. 432–451.

The Arabic–Mongolic glossary of Ibn Muḥannā, probably recorded in the 14th c. in the area of present-day Iraq. Kilisli Rifat published the glossary in 1921. In an

18 The Turkic–Mongolic glossary was published by Houtsma: Houtsma, M. I. *Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*. Leiden. Houtsma erroneously dates the glossary to 1245.

abbreviated form and according to the Latin alphabet, Poppe re-edited it in the appendix of the *Muqaddimat al-Adab*.

Q: Pelliot, P. 1931. Les formes turques et mongoles dans la nomenclature zoologique du Nuzhatu-'l-kulub: *BSOAS* 6/3. 555–580.

Poppe, N. 1925. Mongol'skie nazvanija životnyx v trude Xamdallaxa Kazvini. *Zapiski Kollegii vostokovedov* 1. Leningrad. 195–208.

An Arabic–Mongolic list of names of animals and plants from 1339.

RH: Golden, P. B. 2000. *The King's Dictionary. The Rasūlid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. Halasi-Kun, T., Golden, P. B., Ligeti, L., Schütz, E. (transl.), Golden, P. B., Allsen, T. (introd. essays) Golden, P. B. (ed., notes, commentary). Leiden – Boston – Köln.

A dictionary in six languages, compiled in Yemen in the second half of the 14th c., which includes Arabic–Mongol and Arabic–Persian–Turkic–Mongol glossaries. Its author is al-Malik al-Afḍal al-'Abbās bin 'Alī.

MA: Poppe, N. 1938–1939/1971. *Mongol'skij slovar Mukaddimat al-Adab* I–II.

The Middle Mongolic material of the aforementioned dictionary.

VI: Ligeti, L. 1962. Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul: *AOH* 14/1. 3–99.

The glossary of the *Šamil ūl-luġat* dedicated to Sultan Bayazīd b. Muḥammad b. Murād (1481–1512). The manuscript published by Ligeti is a 1528–29 copy.

Literary Mongolian

LMO: Lessing, F. 1973. (ed.) *Mongolian – English Dictionary*. Bloomington.

Questions of transcription

The bulk of the Muslim Eastern Turkic works was written in Arabic script, but during the Timurids they used even the Uyghur script. In this form, neither the Arabic, nor the Uyghur script is suitable to reproduce the Turkic and Mongolic sound system, and based on the orthography alone, it is impossible to ascertain the phonetic realization of a given word. The Chaghatay works written in Arabic script follow the Old Uyghur writing tradition i.e. the vowels are written plene, the suffixes are often written separately, diacritics are seldom used, and many consonant letters are ambiguous as well.

The orthography in different areas and eras developed independently (Clauson 1960: 24). Pronunciation varied in time and space, and the orthography did not denote it or did not denote it consistently. We find different spellings for the same

word within the same text. All these could be proof of coexisting dialectal forms, but also of underdeveloped, unstable orthography. In general, we can conclude that though spelling is not subjective, neither is it strictly regulated. Though it stabilized in individual literary centers, there were local variants in a much wider geographic area, even if it could be considered culturally uniform.

When quoting data, it is hard to find the balance between transcription (phonetic reconstruction) and transliteration. Transcriptions are often the result of convention, though in many cases, as we shall see later, references to the same word in diverse forms can be found in literature. During transcription both etymological analysis and modern linguistic data helped me, and in some cases even the annotations in the dictionary gave some information, such as those of the author of *Sanglah*. Therefore, besides a transcription, I also note the transliteration of words in square brackets.

The Arabic letter *l* basically denotes /a/ and /ä/ phonemes, but in the initial position it can represent any of the vowels. The *g* : represents the /v/, /w/, /o/, /ö/, /u/, /u/ sounds, and the *ʿ* the /y/, /e/, /i/, /i/ phonemes.

We must note the difference between the spelling of Arabic and Persian words, and that of the lexicon of Turkic origin. In case of the former, the Arabic and the Persian spelling is valid. When recording Turkic words, the plene written vowel does not denote length, and diacritics are rarely used. In Chaghatay long vowels existed only as allophones, diphthongs only in copyings, and in some cases we can be sure of the presence of a hiatus-filler /v/.

Among the letters to represent consonants, the *ḥ* letter can be read both as /b/ and /p/. The *ḥ* is seldom found in the material; based on the data, however, it likely denotes both /p/ and /b/ see *bätäkä*.

In Chaghatay the voiced palatal affricate /j-/ only occurs in copyings (Arabic, Persian, Mongolic, Kipchak). In the orthography, especially in the early texts we experience confusion. The letter *ç* (*jim*): denotes both /j/ and /č/ (see *čumča* [jWMj'], *čida-* [jYD'-], whereas the use of the letter *č* /č/ for the Mongolic etymological /j/ refers to transphonemization (substitution of Mongolic /j/ with /č/, see *čirğa-* instead of *jirğa-*).

The *ḥ* represents both /k/ and /g/; in the initial position, it is always /k/. The letter *ḡ* is rarely used, more so in later texts, to denote the /g/ sound.

In Chaghatay there was no /q/ : /ġ/ opposition in the syllable-final or word-final position; therefore, the letter *q* can denote both /q/ and /ġ/, and the letter *ġ* can denote both /ġ/ and /q/ in either anlaut or auslaut position. We can observe similar confusion in Pre-Chaghatay already (Clouston 1960: 24; 1962: 193). Occasionally, we can observe a similar dental confusion in case of /d/ and /t/ as well.

Etymological studies

Methodological framing

As a result of research in the last decades, we are able to understand more clearly numerous elements of current, modern bilingual situations. However, as Johanson (2002: 1) emphasizes, “diachronic linguistics still lacks theoretically sound and empirically proven hypotheses to accommodate the processes in question.”

Turcological research received a rather strong impulse from Lars Johanson’s 1992 monograph,¹⁹ *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*, and a number of his other articles, in which he examined primarily the non-lexical consequences of long-lasting and intensive Turkic language contacts. Even though he refers to examples mainly from living, spoken languages, his conclusions can be considered and employed in etymological analyses as well.

Language only exists as a characteristic of concrete human beings; consequently, it is in contact with other languages via the speaker even if the channel of copying is writing and not speech. Every language possesses a historically determined technique for change and innovation, but the extent and manner of change is also influenced by the languages in contact. Language contact results from cultures existing next to one another, and its natural outcome is that languages mutually influence and modify one another. Basically, the consequence of language contacts can be of two kinds: either copies²⁰ or substrates, resulting from ethnogenetic processes with code switching (Johanson 2002: 3).²¹ During copying, an interferential element from one of the languages in contact integrates into the other code, and by its conventionalization the interference ceases. Some extent of bilingualism is always a condition of copying.

Copying and substratum can be considered the two opposite poles of the same process, but naturally this does not mean that all language influences beginning with copying would lead to code switching. Some linguists do not perceive a theo-

19 I used the 2002, revised English translation of his book. Beside Johanson’s work, the following works aided me in developing my methodology: Róna-Tas’s theoretical overview entitled *Language and History*, published in 1978, as well as Haugen’s, and Thomason’s and Kaufmann’s contact-linguistic works.

20 Johanson proposes the use of the terms *copying* and *copy* instead of *borrowing*, or *transfer*, for he does not deem the word *borrowing* and its metaphoric associations suitable for describing the linguistic situation. Haugen (1950: 211) had already pondered this, but he proposed the term *adaptation*. From the same consideration, Johanson suggests avoiding the terms *recipient* and *donor* as well. The usage of the term *basic-code* for the “recipient language”, however, can also be confusing, as both languages participating in the contact have their own basic code.

21 Here Haugen’s “adoption” term is used by Johanson in case of copying, and the term “imposition” is used in case of substratum influence. For more details on substratum see Róna-Tas 1978: 265, 272–286; and for further examples of the substratum-characteristics of Turkic-paired contact, see Johanson 2002: 66–69.