

Sonderdruck aus/Offprint from

Turkic Languages

Edited by
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with
Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,
Éva Á. Csató, Peter B. Golden, Tooru Hayasi, Birsal Karakoç,
Astrid Menz, Irina Nevskaya, Sumru A. Özsoy, Elisabetta Ragagnin,
Saule Tazhibayeva and Abdurishid Yakup

27 (2023) 1

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The journal **TURKIC LANGUAGES** is devoted to linguistic Turcology. It addresses descriptive, comparative, synchronic, diachronic, theoretical and methodological problems of the study of Turkic languages including questions of genealogical, typological and areal relations, linguistic variation and language acquisition. The journal aims at presenting work of current interest on a variety of subjects and thus welcomes contributions on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. It contains articles, review articles, reviews, discussions, reports, and surveys of publications. It is published in one volume of two issues per year with approximately 300 pages.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Department of Slavistics, Turcology and Circum-Baltic Studies, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. The email address johanson@uni-mainz.de may also be used for communication.

Books will be reviewed as circumstances permit. No publication received can be returned.

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; fax: 49-611-530999; e-mail: verlag@harrassowitz.de.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://www.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 on the internet at <https://www.dnb.de/>.

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2022

This journal, 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.

Printing and binding by Customized Business Services GmbH

im Auftrag der KNV Zeitfracht GmbH

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

<https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/>

ISSN 1431-4983
eISSN 2747-450X

DOI Zeitschriftenreihe 10.13173/1431-4983
DOI Titel 10.13173/TL.27.1

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 27, 2023, Number 1

Editorial note by Lars Johanson	1
---------------------------------------	---

Articles

Lars Johanson: Two-consonant conjuncts in Turkic runiform texts	3
Dorian Pastor: Zero-derivation and apophony in Old Turkic. A new approach to noun-verb pairs	10
Orçun Ünal: A word of Turkic origin in Altaic languages: * <i>pīrū</i> - ‘to foretell’	35
Özlem Yigitoğlu: Notes on the naming of some constellations in Northern and Central Eurasia	48
Tacettin Turgay: Generic markers in Turkish	65
Ao Pan: How women speak Salar: The relationship between gender and evidentiality	90
Ninel V. Malyševa & Marina A. Osorova: Yakut names of medicinal plants	117
Vacide Köse & Javanshir Shibliyev: Languages compete and communities coexist in a peaceful Cypriot mixed village	125

Reviews

Karl Reichl: Review of Daniel Prior (trans.) <i>The Memorial Feast for Kōkötöy Khan. A Kirghiz Epic Poem in the Manas Tradition. Composed in oral performance by Saghimbay Orozbaq uulu. Translated from the complete text.</i> London: Penguin Books, 2022	143
--	-----

Appendix. Transcriptions and Notations

Editorial Note

Turkic Languages, Volume 27, 2023, Number 1

The present issue of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* contains some contributions on Old Turkic.

Lars Johanson deals with the use of consonantal cluster conjuncts in the ingenious East Old Turkic runiform script system, which follows syllabic principles distinguishing front and back syllables. When two consonants meet, conjunct letters may indicate that no inherent vowel is to be pronounced before the second consonant. Special signs are added for combinations such as *ld* and *nd*, which have developed into characters in their own right.

Dorian Pastor's article discusses zero-derivation and proposes that apophony was a strategy of derivation in pre-Old Turkic. The semantic features of the East Old Turkic noun-verb pairs based on the bare root correspond to the "ergative formation" for suffixal derivation involving deverbal suffixes, which describes the fact that transitive verbs correspond to object nouns or adjectives, and that the subject nouns or adjectives stem from intransitive verbs. The transitive verb *kış-* 'to pressure' yields the object noun *kışıy* 'constriction'. The intransitive verb *kürä-* 'to desert' plus the same suffix yields the subject noun *küräg* 'deserter'. Noun-verb pairs follow the same pattern, for instance, *kes-* 'to cut' (tr.) and *kes* 'piece, part' (object noun), or *qarī-* 'to become old' (itr.) and *qarī* 'old' (subject adjective). Non-suffixed nouns are derived from verbs: *toŋ-* 'to be frozen hard' (itr.) → *toŋ* 'frozen' (subject adj.). Derivation through apophony was another form of derivation, e.g. *toz-* 'to become dust' (itr.) → *tōz* 'dust' (subject noun).

Orçun Ünal shows the unignorable influence of Turkic on the other Altaic languages, featuring the verb **hür-* 'to foretell', which is the base of the nouns **hürō*, **hürk*, **hürim*, **hüriz* 'omen'. This verb and a nominal derivative of it are the sources of Kitan **pur-*, Jurchenic **piru-*, Proto-Korean **piru- :pil-*, and Proto-Mongolic **hüröye-* 'to bless', 'to pray'. It made its way from Turkic through Mongolic and Tungusic into Korean in a variety of forms.

Özlem Yigitoglu deals with the naming of the constellations Great Bear (Ursa Major), Little Bear (Ursa Minor) and Orion, in ancient and modern Turkic languages, as well as the alternations of these names across these languages. She aims to ascertain the cultural and sociological interactions of Turkic-speaking peoples based on the forms these astronomical terms take in neighboring languages including Mongolian, Tungus and Chinese, and their variations in Turkic.

Ao Pan examines how women speak the Turkic language Salar, exploring the relationship between gender and the use of evidentials in describing perceived observation. Previous research has shown that all areas of language can differ between men and women. Focusing on the use of evidentials in expressing perceived information in Salar, the paper adopts a corpus-based methodology, including qualitative and

quantitative statistical analyses of speech data. Female speakers are said to have a tendency to use evidentials in reporting perceived information.

Ninel Malyševa and Marina Osorova deal with the factors determining the choices of names of medicinal plants in Yakut. Fifty-six names of medicinal plants, including the names *ārbāhin*, *nā:m*, *boḡsuryan*, *kulun kuturuga* and *börö si:r oto*, are examined. These were selected via sampling from dictionaries and lexicographic sources. The analysis shows that two and three-component phytonyms are predominant in Yakut, and that the main criteria for giving names are the plant's place of growth, its appearance, or a scientist's name. Yakut has a significant layer of Russian words, which were mainly copied into the Yakut vocabulary in the pre-revolutionary period. Most of these are pronounced and written according to Yakut norms. Russian certainly prevails in the naming of plants. A rich vocabulary of the plant world has formed, reflecting the cultural, historical, social, and everyday experiences of Yakut speakers and their attitude to nature.

Tacetin Turgay discusses generic markers in Turkish, the nominal and verbal morphosyntactic markers involved in their derivations, and the interpretations they allow. He claims that aorist is the only true verbal marker of characterizing genericity. The nominal predicate marker {-DIr} is compatible with a characterizing reading if an individual-level predicate is present, but never encodes a generic reading on its own. The analysis accounts for a number of facts about Turkish generics built on verbal as well as nominal predicates. Against the argument that all generic expressions are bipartite structures involving reference to kinds, the analysis supports the proposal that statements of characterizing genericity are tripartite structures involving a generic operator.

Vacide Köse and Javanshir Shibliyev describe the linguistic vitality of Greek, Turkish and English in Pile / Pyla, a peaceful, ethnically mixed village in Cyprus. English is the most powerful language, while Greek enjoys more prestige and has a huge amount of instrumental value. Both Greek and Turkish Cypriots prefer English on bilingual signs. Turkish-Greek or Greek-Turkish bilingual signs are lacking. A great majority of monolingual signs are in English. Russian is now emerging and inserting itself among the signage. The English-language university in the village has contributed greatly to the vitality of English. The present situation with Turkish currency has made the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus an attractive 'shopping mall' for Greeks, and all these factors contribute to the mushrooming of public signs in Greek in the areas inhabited by Turks.

This issue also contains Karl Reichl's review of Daniel Prior's book on a Kirghiz epos.

It is my sad duty to report that two excellent Turcological scholars have recently passed away: Heidi Stein, Leipzig, in January 2023, and Celia Kerslake, Oxford, in February 2024.

Lars Johanson

A word of Turkic origin in Altaic languages: **pīrū-* ‘to foretell’

Orçun Ünal

Ünal, Orçun 2023. A word of Turkic origin in Altaic languages: **pīrū-* ‘to foretell’. *Turkic Languages* 27, 35–47.

In Turkic, there are four nouns, *(h)irō*, *hirk*, *(h)irīm*, and *(h)iriz*, all of which roughly denote ‘omen’ and ‘divination’. The present study traces them back to the Proto-Turkic verbal base **pīrū-* and regards the latter as the source of Kitan **pur-* ‘to bless’, Jurchenic **piru-* ‘to pray’, ‘to curse’, Proto-Korean **piru-* > Middle Korean *:pil-* ‘to pray’, and Proto-Mongolic **hiröye-* ‘to wish well’, ‘to bless’. These borrowings are taken as a confirmation of the cultural impact of the Turkic-speaking peoples on the other Altaic peoples and their languages in the prehistoric era.

Keywords: Proto-Turkic, Altaic, language contact, loanword, divination

Orçun Ünal, Göttingen University, Heinrich-Düker-Weg 14 37073 Göttingen, Germany.
E-mail: orcununal@live.com

1 Introduction

The so-called Altaic languages, Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Koreanic, and Japonic share numerous grammatical structures and vocabulary items. In this study, I would like to illustrate how Turkic has exerted an unignorable influence on the other Altaic languages. The example features a verb that is deeply rooted in Turkic. The verb in question is **(h)ir-*. It is the verbal base of the Common Turkic nouns **(h)irō*, **hirk*, **(h)irīm*, and **(h)iriz*. This verb made its way from Turkic, through Mongolic and Tungusic, into Koreanic in a variety of forms. Following a presentation of the relevant data from Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, and Koreanic, I will discuss the history and apparent issues with this correspondence set.¹

2 Data set

2.1 Turkic

**(h)ir-ō*: Old Turkic *irü* ‘omen’, ‘sign’ (Clauson 1972: 197), Old Uyghur *iru* ~ *irü* ‘Merkmal’, ‘Zeichen’, ‘Anzeichen’, ‘Omen’, ‘Orakel’, ‘Lakṣaṇa’, ‘Schöheitszeichen’ [feature, sign, omen, oracle, Lakṣaṇa, beauty sign] (Wilkens 2021: 291, 310), Yakut *ira* ~ *irā* ‘predčuvstvie’, ‘predrekanie’, ‘zagadyvanie vpered’, ‘optimističeskij ili

1 I owe many thanks to the two anonymous reviewers who commented on earlier drafts of this paper. Any remaining errors are mine.

pessimističeskij vzgljad na svoju sud'bu', 'ščastie', 'lučšaja učast'; 'čto-to srednee meždu ponjatijami: ideja, poželanie, privyčka' [premonition, prediction, guessing ahead, an optimistic or pessimistic view of one's fate, happiness, best fate, something in between the concepts idea, wish, habit] (Pekarskij 1958–1959/III: 3808–3809), Yakut *ira* 'gute Vorahnung', 'gutes Vorgefühl', 'gute Voraussage'; 'heimlicher Wunsch', 'Wunschtraum' [good premonition, good foreboding, good prediction; secret wish, wishful dream] (Monastyrjew 2006: 206).

**hīr-k*: Old Turkic *irk* 'an omen', 'taking omens', 'divination' (Clauson 1972: 213), Common Turkic *irik* ~ *irk* '1a. 'znak', 'primeta', 'predznamenovanie', 'xorošee predznamenovanie'; 1b. 'predskazanie', 'proročestvo', 'gadanie', 'gadatelnij'; 1c. 'buduščee'; 'orakul'/'proricatel', 2. 'sud'ba', 'prednačertanie', 'učast', 'žrebij', 'dolja'; 3. 'ščas'e', 'ščast'e', 'udača', 'blagodenstvje', 'mirnoe sučestvovani', 'žizn' v soglasii'; 4. 'želanie'; 5. 'nastroenie'; 6. 'sovet', 'soveščanie' [1a. sign, sign, omen, good omen; 1b. divination, prophecy, fortune-telling, divinatory; 1c. future; oracle/diviner; 2. fate, destiny, fate, lot, share; 3. happiness, happiness, luck, prosperity, peaceful companionship, life in harmony; 4. wish; 5. mood; 6. council, meeting] (Sevortjan 1974: 665–666), Western Yugur *hīrq^h* ~ *hīrq^h* (among other forms) 'divination device', 'omen', 'prophecy' (Roos 2000: 306), Chuvash *irex* 'vygodnost' [benefit, profitability] (Skvorcov 1982: 103).

*(*h*)*ir-im*: Common Turkic *irim* ~ *irīm* '1a. 'znak'; 'primeta'; 'predznamenovanie'; 1b. 'vera v primety', 'predznamenovanija', 'sueverie'; 1c. 'gadanie', 'gadatelnij', 'propočestvo', 'predskazanie'; 1d. 'zaklinanija', 'zaklinanie kak lečebnoe sredstvo'; 1e. predčuvstvje; 2. sredstvo lečenija; 3. nadežda, ximera, pustaja mečta; 4. obyčaj, privyčka' [1a. sign; omen; portent; 1b. belief in omens, portents, superstition; 1c. divination, fortune-telling, prophesy, foretelling; 1d. spells, incantation as a remedy; 1e. premonition; 2. means of treatment; 3. hope, chimera, empty dream; 4. custom, habit] (Sevortjan 1974: 666, Róna-Tas & Berta 2011: 459–460, Doerfer 1963–1975/II, §463), Chuvash *irīm* ⇐ Tatar '1. 'zaklinanie', 'nagovor', 'zagovor'; 'čaro-dejstvo', 'volšebstvo', 'volšebnyj'; 2. 'snorovka', 'navyki umenie', 'masterstvo' [1. spell, incantation, conspiracy; sorcery, magic, magical; 2. dexterity, skill, mastery] (Skvorcov 1982: 53); cf. Codex Cumanicus <ranzilik> *rančilik* 'Wahrsagen' (Grönbech 1942: 209), *rämillik* 'gadanie', 'proricanie' [fortune-telling, divination] (Garkavec 2015: 1203).

*(*h*)*ir-iz*: Common Turkic *iris* ~ *iriz* '1. 'primeta'; 'predznamenovanie'; 'ščastlivoe predznamenovanie'; 'predrassudok'; 2. 'dolja'; 'ščastlivaja dolja'; 3. 'ščast'e'; 'blagosostojanie'; 'bogatstvo'; 'dobro (bogatstvo)'; 'sostojanie'; 'uspex' [1. omen; augury; happy omen; superstition; 2. fate; lucky fate; 3. happiness; prosperity; wealth; good (wealth); fortune; success] (Sevortjan 1974: 666–667, Róna-Tas & Berta 2011: 459–460), Chuvash *irīs* ⇐ Tatar dialectal 'ščast'e', 'ščastlivaja sudba', 'dolja' [happiness, good fortune, fate] (Skvorcov 1982: 54).

?*(*h*)*ir-gin*: Turkish dialect (Sarayköy, Denizli) *irgin* 'kader', 'talih' [destiny, fortune] (*Türkiyede halk ağzından söz derleme dergisi* 2: 772).

2.2 Mongolic and Kitan

Proto-Mongolic **hiröe-* ‘to wish well’, ‘to bless’ (Nugteren 2011: 357), **pürüge-* ‘to pray’ (Krippes 1992: 140) < Pre-Proto-Mongolic **piröge-*; cf. Khüis Tolgoi inscription 1: 4 *pürö-* ‘to sin’, ‘to be evil’ (Vovin 2018: 306), *pUrO-* ‘to sin’ (?) (Vovin 2019: 187).

Kitan 𐰇𐰏 [241.041] <pu.r> **pur-* ‘to bless’ (Shimunek 2014: 110, Shimunek 2017a: 362).

Proto-Mongolic **iro* ‘omen’, ‘premonition’, etc.’ (Nugteren 2011: 373) > Muqaddimat al-Adab ايرا *ira*, Written Mongol *irua*, *iruua*, *irva*, Khalkha *yor*, Ordos *yoro*, Buriat *yor*, Kalmyk *yor^o*, *yor*, Dagur *yor*, Eastern Yugur *yor*.

Proto-Mongolic **hilgat* > West Middle Mongol هيلغ *hilgab²* (al-fa’l) ‘alamet, işaret, belirti’ [omen, sign, manifestation] (Gül 2016: 134), West Middle Mongol هيلغت *hilgat* (al-fa’l) ‘gutes Vorzeichen’ [good omen] (Weiers 1972: 20).

West Middle Mongol ايركه *erke* (read *irke*) ‘žrebij’ [lot] (better: ‘divination’) (Chaghatay *fal*) (Poppe 1938: 164a, Saitō 2008: 195).

2.3 Tungusic

Jurchen (非如兒) *firu-r* ‘spirit (神)’ (Jin 1984: 237, 276), Manchu *firu-* ‘1. ‘to curse’; 2. ‘to implore’, ‘to pray’; 3. ‘to blaspheme’ (Norman 2013: 115), Spoken Manchu (Sanjiazhi, Fuyu County, Heilongjiang) *fi.ru-/fi.rú-* ‘祷告, 诅咒’ [to pray, curse] (Enhebatu 1995: 236).

Evenic **hirügē-* ‘to predict; to ask for good luck; to bless’ (Cincius 1975–1977: 327–328) > Evenki *hirugē-* ‘zaklinat’, ‘predskazyvat’ ploxoe [to conjure, predict bad things] (Boldyrev 2000/II: 264), Evenki *hirugō-* ‘blagoslovljat’ [to bless] (Poppe 1927: 58), Sakhalin Evenki *hirgē-* ‘1. ‘skazat’; 2. rasskazyvat’ [1. to say; 2. to tell] (Bulatova 1999: 111), Solon *irugē-* ‘proiznosit’ blagopoželanie [to pronounce good wishes] (Poppe 1931: 56), Even *hirge-* ‘1. ‘poklonit’sja’, ‘pomolit’sja’, ‘poprosit u boga, xozjaina tajgi, reki sčast’ja, udači’; 2. ‘zagovorit’, ‘okoldovat’ kogo-l.’ [1. to bow, pray, ask the god, the master of the taiga, the river for happiness, good luck; 2. to cast a spell, to bewitch sb.] (Robbek & Robbek 2005: 295), Negidal *hīyā- ~ hīyē-* ‘prosit’ sebe sčast’ja’, ‘udači’ [to ask for happiness, good luck] (Cincius 1982: 288)

2.4 Korean

Middle Korean 빌 *:pil-* ‘to pray’ (祈, 祝) (Nam 1997: 744–745, Lee & Ramsey 2011: 18, 25) < Proto-Korean **piru-* (Vovin 2013).

3 Borrowing scenarios

1. Common or Bulgar Turkic **pürü-* ‘to foretell’, ‘to augur’ [approximately 1 CE] ⇒ (Pre)-Proto-Kitan **piru-* ‘to bless’ (> Kitan **pur-*) ⇒ Jurchenic **piru-* ‘to pray’, ‘to

2 The final *-b* is likely to be a miscopying.

curse' (> Jurchen *firu-*, Manchu *firu-*, Spoken Manchu *fi:ru-*) ⇒ Proto-Korean **piru-* 'to pray' (> Middle Korean *:pil-*).

2. Common or Bulgar Turkic **pīr-ō ~ *pīr-ō̃* 'omen', 'sign' (> **hīro ~ *hīrō*) [approximately 1 CE] ⇒ Pre-Proto-Mongolic **pīrō* > **pīrō+ge-* > Proto-Mongolic **hīrōye-* 'to wish well', 'to bless' ⇒ Evenic **hīrügē-* 'to bless'.

3. Common or Bulgar Turkic **pīr-kā* 'omen', 'sign', 'divination' (> **hīrk*) [approximately 1 CE] ⇒ Pre-Proto-Mongolic **pīrka(t)* > Proto-Mongolic **hīlkat* 'omen', 'sign'.

4. Common Turkic **(h)īrō* 'omen', 'sign' [approximately 1100–1200 CE] ⇒ Proto-Mongolic **īro* 'omen', 'premonition'.

5. Common Turkic **(h)īrk ~ *(h)irk* 'omen', 'divination' [approximately 1200–1300 CE] ⇒ Middle Mongol *irke* 'divination'.

4 Comments

4.1 History of the Altaic Etymology

In his article on the Mongolo-Turkic historical phonology, Ramstedt (1915–1916: 70) already connected Mongolic *irua* with Old Turkic *īrk*, Common Turkic *īrim* and *īrīs* without further commenting on their morphological structures. It was also Ramstedt (1916–1920: 5) who established the connection between the Mongolic and Manchu verbs and later added the Evenki and Korean verbs to this cognate set (1949: 201). However, he was unable to discern the correct Turkic cognate. He only compared it with Sagai *iz-in-* 'auf etwas hoffen', 'sich auf Jemand verlassen', 'jemandem vertrauen' [to hope for something, rely on someone, trust someone] (Radloff 1893–1911/I: 1541), which, however, goes back to Common Turkic *išān-* 'to trust', 'to believe in', 'to rely on (someone + dative)' (Clauson 1972: 264).

Vladimircov (1929: 294–295), responding to Bang and Gabain (*Türkische Turfan-Texte* I 242–243), traced Mongolic *iruwa* back to **īriwa ~ *īrūwa* and derived it from *īri-* ~ *īrū-*. He connected this base etymologically with Turkic **ir-*, which he considered to be the common base of *īrim* and *īrk*. Vladimircov further regarded Mongolic *irü* (> *irügel ~ irüger, irüge-*), Turkic *irü*, and Manchu *firu-* as cognates.

Lee (1958: 109) compared Manchu *firu-* 'to pray' with Middle Korean *pir* 'id.' and Mongolic *irüge-* < *hirüge-* < **pīrüge-* 'id.' and referred to Ramstedt (1949: 201).

Poppe (1960: 60, 127) traced the Mongolic word back to **pīrügē-*, which he considered the donor form of Evenki *hirügē-* and a cognate of Manchu *firu-* and Korean *pil-*.

Doerfer (1985: §23) regarded all Tungusic forms as borrowings from Mongolic *hīrūye-* 'beten'. Rozycki (1994: 77) classified *firu-* as an Early Mongol loanword in Manchu, adding that "the N[orth] Tu[ngus] forms came through a different route". Shimunek (2014: 110, fn. 39), notwithstanding Rozycki, considered the Manchu verb "a loanword from an earlier variety of Kitan or a closely related language".

Vovin (2013) deemed Middle Korean *:pil-* a loanword from Manchu. However, he separated the Manchu verb from other (non-Manchu) Tungusic forms and regarded the latter as “Mongolian loans, because they all reflect the Mongolian suffix *-ge-*, which must be the causative marker *-ya-* ~ *-ge-*”. Based on this wrong assumption, Vovin concluded that Middle Mongol **hirü-* primarily signified ‘to listen’ and dismissed any relationship of the Mongolic form with the Manchu and Koreanic verbs on morphological and semantic grounds.

Robbeets (2005: 771–772) traced Proto-Mongolic **pīrū-* < Pre-Mongolic **pīrū-gē-*, Proto-Tungusic **hiru(-ye)* and Proto-Korean **pilʷ/o-* ‘beg’, ‘pray’; ‘borrow’ back to Proto-Altaic **pīrū(-ge)-* ‘pray’, ‘ask’, and argued that the latter is “perhaps related” to Proto-Japanic **pwoka-* ‘pray’ and **posaka-* ‘pray’, ‘speak’; ‘congratulate’; ‘curse’.

In her book on the Mongolic loanwords in Evenki, Khabtagaeva (2017: 88–89) treated Barguzin Evenki *hirugē-* ‘to bless’ as a borrowing from Mongolic **hirüge-*.

4.2 Etymology of the Turkic words

Thomsen (1912: 193) regarded *īrk* as “unquestionably related” to *īrim* and further compared it with *īrīs*. The cognateness of all four Turkic nouns was already recognised by Bang & Gabain (*Türkische Turfan-Texte* I 242–243), who derived these nouns from **ir-*, which was identified with Shor *īril-* and Common Turkic *yar-*. Räsänen (1956: 30) considered CT *īrīs* ~ *īrīz* a borrowing from Arabic *rizq* ‘livelihood’, ‘means of living’, ‘boon’, ‘blessing (of God)’. In some modern Turkic languages, a contamination of CT *īrīs* ~ *īrīz* with the Arabic word is possible, but the latter cannot be regarded as the sole origin of the former. Róna-Tas (2004), as well as Róna-Tas & Berta (2011: 459–464), identified the base with Common Turkic *īr(i)-* (Bashkir *īrī-*, Tuvan *īrī-*, Yakut *īr-*) ‘to split’, ‘to cleave’, which they compared with Mongolic *ira-* ‘to expose’, ‘to open wide’, ‘to thrust or to draw open’, ‘to cut open’, ‘to draw back (as covering)’. I reject this etymology for the following two reasons. Unlike Common Turkic *īr(i)-*, the Turkmen nouns *īrim* and dialectal *īrz* ‘umīt’, ‘nadežda’ [hope] (Annanurov 1977: 207) as well as *Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk* *īrk* all have short vowels. Furthermore, none of the derivatives denote anything concrete similar to the supposed base. In Bashkir, there are two *īrims*. The first is a survival of Common Turkic **(h)īrim*, whereas the second is a derivative of *īrī-* and has the meaning ‘paz’, ‘fal’c’, ‘utor’ [notch, groove, croze] (Uraksin 1996: 785) as expected. On the basis of the data in Codex Cumanicus, the second anonymous reviewer argued that *īrim* is a borrowing from Arabic *raml* ‘sand’, *ilm ar-raml* or *darb ar-raml* ‘geomancy (divination by means of figures or lines in the sand)’. Although it is not possible to discard this etymology, I find it unlikely that the Turkic word with the wide range of meanings given above originated from Arabic *raml*. Wilkens (2021: 290) compared Old Uyghur *īrk* with Soghdian *rk* (< **arkā*) ‘work’, ‘action’, ‘business’ (Gharib 2004: 57), ‘work’, ‘activity’, ‘business’ (Sims-Williams & Durkin-Meisterernst 2012: 18). This comparison is semantically not convincing.

In my opinion, all the Turkic nouns concerned derive from **hir-* ~ **hīr-* ‘to foretell’, ‘to forebode’, ‘to augur’. The onset **h-* is based on the Western Yugur forms *hīrq^h* and *hīq^h*. Unfortunately, none of the nouns in question is attested in Khalaj. If Proto-Mongolic **hilgat* is indeed a loanword from Turkic, it likewise suggests **p-* in Turkic.

According to Severtjan (1974: 666), this verb lives on in Turkmen *ir-* ‘ugovarivat’ na čto-l., ‘sklonjat’ k čemu-l.’ [to persuade to do sth., induce to do sth.] (Baskakov et al. 1968: 772). *-(O)k*, *-(X)m* and *-(X)z* are well-known deverbal formatives. *-O* is rare and less known. This formative is best seen in Common Turkic **alkō* (> *alko* ~ *alku*) ‘all’, ‘everyone’, ‘everything’, **örō³* (> *örü* ~ *örä*) ‘upwards’, ‘height’, ‘elevation’, ‘pillar’, ‘support’, **tōlō* (> **tōlo* ~ **tōlu*) ‘full’ and **tusō* (> *tusu*) ‘benefit, advantage’, which derive from *alk-* ‘to use up, to finish’, *ör-* ‘to rise’, *tōl-* ‘to be filled, to be full’ and *(*)tus-* ‘to be useful’ (> *tusul-*).⁴

Old Uyghur *maṇu* ‘Lauf’ [run] (Wilkens 2021: 469) and *baru* ‘alles’, (verneint) ‘überhaupt nicht’ [all, (negated) not at all] (Wilkens 2021: 145), derived from *maṇ-* ‘to walk’ and *(*)bar-* ‘to exist’ (see below) respectively, also belong to this formation.

The derivation **hīr-(O)k* > **hīrk* is also problematic because, according to Erdal (1991: 224–226), the formative *-(O)k* drops its vowel only after monosyllabic bases containing a rounded vowel and ending in /r/. Nonetheless, similar derivations can be found with monosyllabic roots containing an unrounded vowel:

1. Common Turkic *bark* ‘movable property, ‘household goods’ (Clauson 1972: 359–360) < *(*)bar-* ‘to exist’ > Kül Tegin and Bilgä Qagan inscriptions *är-* *bar-* ‘to exist₂’, ‘to live₂’ (Uçar 2019: 495), Common Turkic *bar-īm* ‘property’, ‘wealth’ (Clauson 1972: 366), Šine-Ussu inscription (West side 1) *bar-ī* ‘hepsi’ [all] (Şirin 2016: 283), Old Uyghur *bar-īnč* ‘alles’ [all] (Wilkens 2021: 144), Old Uyghur *bar-u* (< **bar-ō*) ‘alles’, (verneint) ‘überhaupt nicht’ [all, (negated) not at all] (Wilkens 2021: 145), Common Turkic **bar-Vr* > *bār* ‘existent’ (Clauson 1972: 353), Ottoman Turkish *barīn-* ‘geçinmek’, ‘kendini yaşatmak’ [to make a living, keep oneself alive] (*Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklarıyla tarama sözlüğü* 401), Chuvash *purīn-* (< **barīn-*) ‘1. ‘žit’, ‘suščestvovat’; 2. ‘služit’, ‘zanimat’ kakuyu-l. dolžnost’ [1. to live, exist; 2. to serve, hold an office] (Skvorcov 1982: 314).

2. Common Turkic *tärk* ‘quickly’, ‘very soon’ (Clauson 1972: 542) (cf. Written Mongol *derkire-* ‘to run’, ‘to race’ [L 253]) < **tär₂-* > Common Turkic *täz-* ‘to run away’, ‘to fly’ (Clauson 1972: 572), cf. Khalaj *täz-* ‘laufen’, ‘fliehen’, ‘eilen’ [to run,

3 Erdal (1991: 226) explained Old Turkic *örü* (Brāhmī script *örö*) as a petrified converb of *ör-*. However, the aorist and converb vowel of this verb is /ä/. See Daśakarmapathā-vadānamālā *örä käl-* ~ *k(ä)l-* ‘entstehen’, ‘sich erheben’ [to arise, to rise] (Wilkens 2016/III: 1032), T II D 173d (v16) *örärčä* (Özertural 2008: 88) and *örär* (Kasai 2011: 7459, Lieu & Mikkelsen 2017: 56).

4 Except for *tuso*, all words are attested in the Old Uyghur texts in Brāhmī and Tibetan script with /o/: *alko* (Maue 1996: 218, Maue & Röhrborn 1985: 80), *örö* (Maue 1996: 151), *tolo* (Maue 1996: 29).

flee, hurry] (Doerfer 1987: 313), E-44 *täzig* ‘bystryj’ [fast, quick] (Kormušin 1997: 292).

3. Common Turkic *ärklä-* ~ *erklä-* ‘to trample on’, ‘to trample down’, ‘to tread down/underfoot’ (Clauson 1972: 226, Wilkens 2021: 310, Eckmann 1976: 78) < **er₂-* (cf. Written Mongol *erü-* ‘to dig’, ‘to cut’, ‘to hack’ (Lessing 1995: 332)) > Common Turkic *ez-* ~ *äz-* ‘to scratch’, ‘to crumble and dip’, ‘to crush’, ‘to melt (something)’ (Clauson 1972: 279), Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā *ez-* ‘ausmerzen’ [to eradicate] (Wilkens 2016: 37/III: 969).

4. Common Turkic *ärk* ‘1. ‘authority’ 2. ‘free will’, ‘independence’ (Clauson 1972: 220) < *är-* ‘to be’ (Clauson 1972: 193–194).⁵

The unsynopated derivatives *ir-ök* and *ar-ok* given by Erdal (1991: 228, 233) must be dated to a younger period in which the rule for the elision of the suffix vowel after unrounded bases was no longer operative.

Notwithstanding Róna-Tas (2004: 57), Yakut *ira* ~ *irā* is not borrowed from Mongolic **iroga*. Yakut /ā/ is the regular reflex of Common Turkic **/ō/*; cf. Yakut *sarā-*⁶ ‘to become bright’ < Common Turkic **yarō-* > Old Turkic *yaro-* ‘id.’. Kirghiz *joro* ~ *jorō* and Noghay *yoru* are neither related to Turkic **(h)ir-ō* nor borrowed from **iroga*.⁷ They both come from *yorug* ‘interpretation (of a dream)’ < *yor-* ‘to interpret dreams/omens’ (Clauson 1972: 955; Boeschoten 2022: 421).

4.3 Etymology of the Mongolic words

Pre-Proto-Mongolic **piröge-* is derived from an unattested noun **pirö* with the formative **+gA-*. Other derivations with the same suffix are Proto-Mongolic **kubīa-* ‘to divide’ (Nugteren 2011: 429) < Pre-Proto-Mongolic **kubī+ga-*, cf. Proto-Mongolic **kubī* ‘part’, ‘share’ (Nugteren 2011: 429) (see also Godziński 1985: 58–59, Kempf 2013: 200), and Proto-Mongolic **daurīa-* ‘to imitate’, ‘to follow the example of’ (Nugteren 2011: 313) < Pre-Proto-Mongolic **daurī+ga-* < **daurī* ‘sound’, ‘echo’, cf. Proto-Mongolic **daurīs-* ‘to (re)sound’ (Lessing 1995: 220, Rachewiltz 2004–2013: 312). The denominal verbal suffix *+gA-* in Evenki (Nedjalkov 1997: 301) is possibly a borrowing from Mongolic. Pre-Proto-Mongolic **pirö* is borrowed from Common Turkic or Bulgar Turkic **pirō*, that is, the front vocalic variant of the primary **pürō*.

Proto-Mongolic **hilgat*, which probably goes back to Pre-Proto-Mongolic **pürka(.t)*, is borrowed from Common Turkic or Bulgar Turkic **pürkā*, which is the etymon of Common Turkic **(h)ürk*. The change of /r/ to /l/ in Mongolic is sporadic. The final *.t* of the Mongolic form is likely to be a petrified plural suffix.

- 5 Common Turkic *ärk* might be a loanword from Tocharian B *erk* ‘testicle’ (Wilkens 2021: 116).
- 6 The development of Common Turkic **iyāt* ‘shame’ (Old Uyghur *iyat*) > **yāt* > Yakut *sāt* ‘id.’ makes it clear that the Yakut onset *s-* comes directly from Common Turkic *y-*.
- 7 Ramstedt (1915–1916: 70) already argued that Karaim *yora* ‘interpretation’ and Teleut *yoro* ‘meaning’ are borrowings from Mongolic **yoro* < **iro*. This is also incorrect.

Proto-Mongolic **iro* is a significantly younger loanword from Turkic **(h)irō*, most probably from Common Turkic **iro*. Despite Róna-Tas (2004: 57), we do not need to reconstruct a form in **iroga*, which is supposedly borrowed from Turkic **irogā*,⁸ to explain the Mongolian *iro*.

Middle Mongol *irke*, a hapax in *Muqaddimat al-Adab*, is also borrowed from Common Turkic *irk* or *irk*. The final vowel in the Mongolic form is epenthetic. It is inserted to conform with the syllabic structure of Mongolic.

4.4 Etymology of the Kitan word

The conventional reading of the Kitan verb is <pu.su>. This reading was maintained by Wu & Janhunen (2010: 118, 147), Chinggeltei et al. (2017/III: 1995), and Wu & Róna-Tas (2019: 71–72). First Shimunek (2014: 110) amended this reading to <pu.ru> and identified it as a cognate of Middle Mongol *hirü* 'e-. Later, Shimunek (2017a: 362) refined his reading to <pu.r>. The correct sound value of the glyph *𐰺* [041] has been shown to be <r> by Shimunek (2017a: 340, 2017b: 261) through the identification of *𐰺* [067.041] <eu.r> 'eternal (長)' with Middle Mongol *e'üri* ~ *e'üre* 'a long time', 'for a long time', 'forever'. There is at least one more word that confirms this sound value. Kitan *𐰺𐰺* [028.067.041] <š.eu.r> **šeur* 'dew (露)', a cognate of Proto-Mongolic **siüderi(n)* 'dew' (Nugteren 2011: 498), comes from **šiüler* and ultimately from **sigüder(i)*.⁹ Shimunek's Common-Serbi-Mongolic reconstruction **p^hiru-* 'to bless' is correct.

I interpret the form in the Khüis Tolgoi inscription as an intermediary between **pīru-* and **pur-*, something like **purǔ-*. The derivative *puro-r* must have signified 'curse'. The whole sentence *tuwa puro-r čēči-re pūgtig ħele-n* can then be interpreted as follows: 'In order to break the curse, Tuwa joined the saved, and...'

4.5 Etymology of the Tungusic word

Evenic **hirügē-* is borrowed from Mongolic **hirüge-*. In view of the well-known contact between the Kitanic and Jurchenic languages, the Jurchenic forms must have been borrowed from Proto-Kitan **pīru-*.

4.6 Semantics of the etymology

The primary meaning of Turkic **pīrǔ-* seems to be 'to foretell', 'to forebode', 'to augur'. The basic meaning 'sign', 'omen' of the nominal derivative **pīrō* ~ **pīrō* comes from 'something that foretells a future event'. The semantic development of

8 Róna-Tas' (2004: 57) opinion regarding the twofold representation of the Turkic cluster /rk/ in Mongolic does not hold water. It is not a merger of the earlier **/rg/* and **/rk/*. Instead, it corresponds to Mo. /rg/ (< **/rk/*) in older loanwords and to /rk/ in younger ones. The final vowels of the loanwords ending in /rkV/ are a result of epithesis, because Mongolic disallows consonant clusters in coda position.

9 The hitherto unnoticed change of *d* to *l* in Kitan has been dealt with by Ünal (2022: 16).

Pre-Proto-Mongolic **pirö+ge-* must be as follows: ‘to foretell something good for someone’ > ‘to wish well’, ‘to bless’ > ‘to pray’ / ‘to foretell something bad for someone’ > ‘to curse’. The meaning ‘to pray’ has developed from ‘to wish well (for oneself)’.

5 Possible internal connections

Provided that there was a noun **(h)ür ~ *(h)ür̄* in Common Turkic, which has survived as *ür* ‘Entfernung (?)’, ‘Zukunft (?)’, ‘Glück (?)’ [distance (?), future (?), happiness(?)] (in *ür kördörör jon* ‘ljudi pokazyvajuščie buduščee’ [people showing the future]) and *ür̄* ‘Glück’ [happiness] (Stachowski 1998: 279, 281) in Dolgan, we must reckon with a nomenverbum **(h)ür±*.

6 Conclusion

We have demonstrated above that the Common Turkic verb **hür-* ‘to foretell’, ‘to augur’, from which the nouns **(h)ür̄* ‘omen’, ‘sign’, **hirk* ‘omen’, ‘divination’, ‘prophecy’, **(h)ürim* ‘omen’, ‘divination’, ‘prophecy’, ‘prediction’ and **(h)üriz* ‘omen’, ‘good omen’, ‘happiness’, ‘welfare’ are derived, goes back to Proto-Turkic **pür-*, and that this verb and a nominal derivative of it are the sources of Kitan **pur-* ‘to bless’, Jurchenic **piru-* ‘to pray’, ‘to curse’, Proto-Korean **piru-* > Middle Korean *:pil-* ‘to pray’ and Proto-Mongolic **hiröye-* ‘to wish well’, ‘to bless’.

The two older borrowing chains discussed above attest to the impact of Turkic on the other Altaic languages and demonstrate that not only the material culture but also the spirituality of the Turkic-speaking peoples exerted an influence on adjacent cultures. These borrowing chains also speak against the recent tendency to see “Old Mongolian” loans in Turkic words that earlier were regarded as borrowings in Mongolic (Shimunek 2017a, Vovin 2021).

References

- Annanurov, Ata (ed.) 1977. *Türkmen diliniň gisgaça dialektologik sözlügi / Kratkij dialektologičeskij slovar' turkmenskogo jazyka* [Concise dialectological dictionary of the Turkmen language]. Aşgabat: Ylym.
- Bang, Willi & Gabain, Annemarie von 1929. Türkische Turfan-Texte. 1. Bruchstücke eines Wahrsagebuches [Turkic Turfan Texts. 1. Fragments of a divination book]. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1929, 15. Berlin. 241–268. [Reprinted in: Sprachwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der deutschen Turfan-Forschung, Band 2. 1972. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. 3–30].
- Baskakov, N. A. & Karyev, B. A. & Xamzaev, M. J. 1968. *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'* [Turkmen-Russian dictionary]. Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- Boldyrev, B. V. 2000. *Ėvenkijsko-russkij slovar'* 1–2 [Evenki-Russian dictionary 1–2]. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo SO RAN Filial “Geo”.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik 2022. *A dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*. With the editorial assistance of John O’Kane. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One, Ancient Near East 169.) Leiden & Boston: Brill.

- Bulatova, Nadežda J. 1999. *Jazyk saxalinskix évenkov* [The Sakhalin Evenki language]. Sankt-Peterburg: B. & K.
- Cincius, Vera Ivanovna (ed.) 1975–1977. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov. Materialy k étimologičeskomu slovarju* 1–2 [Comparative dictionary of the Tungus-Manchu languages. Materials for the etymological dictionary 1–2]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Cincius, Vera Ivanovna 1982. *Negidal'skij jazyk. Issledovanija i materialy* [Negidal language. Research and materials]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Chinggeltei [Qingge'ertai] 清格尔泰, Wu Yingzhe 吴英喆 and Jiruhe 吉如何 2017. *Qidan xiaozi zai yanjiu* 契丹小字再研究 1–3. [Further research on Khitan Small Script 1–3]. Beijing: Neimenggu Daxue Chubanshe.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1963–1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* 1–4 [Turkic and Mongolian elements in New Persian 1–4]. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1985. *Mongolo-Tungusica*. (Tungusica 3.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1987. *Lexik und Sprachgeographie des Chaladsch. Textband und Kartenband* [Lexicon and linguistic geography of Khalaj. Text volume and map volume]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Eckmann, János 1976. *Middle Turkic glosses of the Rylands interlinear Koran translation*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 21.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Enhebatu 恩和巴图, Merden 1995. *Manyu kouyu yanjiu* 满语口语研究 [A study of spoken Manchu]. Hohhot: Neimonggu Daxue Chubanshe.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon* 1–2. (Turcologica 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Garkavec, Aleksandr 2015. *Codex Cumanicus* 1–4. Almaty: Baur.
- Gharib, B. 2004². *Sogdian dictionary (Sogdian-Persian-English)*. Tehran: Farhangian Publications.
- Godziński, Stanisław 1985. *Język średniomongolski. Słowotwórstwo. Odmiana wyrazów. Składnia* [Middle Mongolian. Word formation. Inflection of words. Syntax]. (Rozprawy Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 258.) Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Grönbech, Kaare 1942. *Komanisches Wörterbuch: Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* [Cuman dictionary: Turkic word index to Codex Cumanicus]. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Gül, Bülent 2016. *Moğolca İbni Mühennâ Lügati* [Mongolian dictionary of Ibn Muhanna]. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- Jin Qiqong 金启琮 1984. *Nüzhenwen cidian* 女真文辞典 [Dictionary of Jurchen]. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.
- Kasai, Yukiyo 2011. *Der alttürkische Kommentar zum Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-Sūtra* [Old Turkic commentary on the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-Sūtra]. (Berliner Turfantexte 29.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Kempf, Béla 2013. *Studies in Mongolic historical morphology. Verb formation in the Secret History of the Mongols*. (Turcologica 95.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Khabtagaeva, Bayarma 2017. *The Ewenki dialects of Buryatia and their relationship to Khamnigan Mongol*. (Tunguso-Sibirica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kormušin, Igor V. 1997. *Tjurkskie enisejskie épitafii. Teksty i issledovanija* [Turkic Yeniseian epitaphs. Texts and studies]. Moskva: Nauka.

- Krippes, Karl Anthony 1992. *The reconstruction of Proto-Mongolian *p-*. PhD Thesis. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Lee, Ki-Moon 1958. A comparative study of Manchu and Korean. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 30/1–2, 104–120.
- Lee, Ki-Moon & Ramsey, S. Robert 2011. *A history of the Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lessing, Ferdinand D. (ed.) 1995³. *Mongolian-English dictionary*. Compiled by Mattai Haltod, John Gombojab Hangin, Serge Kassatkin and Ferdinand D. Lessing. Bloomington: Mongolia Society.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. & Mikkelsen, Gunner B. 2017. *Tractatus Manichaicus Sinicus* 摩尼教殘經. *Pars Prima: Text, translation and indices*. In association with Lance Eccles, Enrico Morano, Nils A. Pedersen, Nicholas Sims-Williams and Aloïs van Tongerloo. (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Sinica 1.1.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Maue, Dieter 1996. *Altürkische Handschriften. 1. Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift* [Old Turkic manuscripts. 1. Documents in Brāhmī and Tibetan Script]. (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13,9.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Maue, Dieter & Röhrborn, Klaus 1985. Ein „buddhistischer Katechismus“ in alttürkischer Sprache und tibetischer Schrift 2 [A “Buddhist catechism” in Old Turkic language and Tibetan script 2]. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 135/1, 68–91.
- Monastyrjew, Wladimir 2006. *Jakutisch. Kleines erklärendes Wörterbuch des Jakutischen (Sacha-Deutsch)* [Yakut. Small explanatory dictionary of Yakut (Sakha-German)]. (Turcologica 68.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nam, Kwangwu 1997. *Kyohak koe sacen* [Kyohaksa’s dictionary of the Pre-Modern Korean language]. Seoul: Kyohaksa.
- Nedjalkov, Igor 1997. *Evenki*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Norman, Jerry 2013. *A comprehensive Manchu-English dictionary*. With the assistance of Keith Dede and David Prager Branner. Cambridge (Massachusetts). London: Harvard University Asia Center, Harvard University Press.
- Nugteren, Hans 2011. *Mongolic phonology and Qinghai-Gansu languages*. (Linguistics in Leiden.) Utrecht: LOT (Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap).
- Özertural, Zekine 2008. *Der uigurische Manichäismus. Neubearbeitung von Texten aus Manichaica 1 und 3 von Albert v. Le Coq* [Uyghur Manichaeism. Revision of texts from Manichaica 1 and 3 by Albert v. Le Coq]. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 74.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pekarskij, Ėdvard Karlovič 1958–1959 [1907–1930]. *Slovar’ jakutskogo jazyka* 1–3 [Dictionary of the Yakut language]. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
- Poppe, Nikolaus 1927. Altaisch und Urtürkisch [Altaic and Proto-Turkic]. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 6, 94–121.
- Poppe, Nikolai Nikolajevič 1931. *Materialy po solonskomu jazyku* [Materials on the Solon language]. Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Poppe, Nikolai 1938. *Mongol’skij slovar’ Mukaddimat al-Adab* [Mongolian dictionary Muqaddimat al-Adab]. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Poppe, Nikolaus 1960. *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. 1. Vergleichende Lautlehre* [Comparative grammar of the Altaic languages. 1. Comparative phonetics]. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie 4.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rachewiltz, Igor de 2004–2013. *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian epic chronicle of the thirteenth century* 1–3. (Brill’s Inner Asian Library 7/1–3.) Leiden & Boston: Brill.

- Radloff, Wilhelm 1893–1911. *Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narěčij. Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* 1–4 [Attempt at a dictionary of Turkic dialects 1–4]. Sanktpeterburg: Nauka.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John 1915–1916. Zur mongolisch-türkischen Lautgeschichte 3 [On the phonological history of Mongolic and Turkic 3]. *Keleti Szemle* 16/1–3, 66–84.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John 1916–1920. Ein anlautender stimmloser Labial in den mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen [An initial voiceless labial in the Mongolic-Turkic languages]. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 32/2, 1–10.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John 1949. *Studies in Korean etymology*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 95.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Räsänen, Martti 1956. Review of Björn Collinder, Fenno-Ugric vocabulary. An etymological dictionary of the Uralic languages. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1955. *Studia Orientalia* 18/5, 29–31.
- Robbek, V. A. & Robbek, M. E. 2005. *Ėvensko-russkij slovar'* [Even-Russian dictionary]. (Pamjatniki étničeskoj kultury korennyx maločislennyx narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka 6.) Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Robbeets, Martine Irma 2005. *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* (Turcologica 64.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Róna-Tas, András 2004. Some notes on Old Turkic *ırq*. *Turkic Languages* 8, 53–61.
- Róna-Tas, András & Berta, Árpád 2011. *West Old Turkic: Turkic loanwords in Hungarian* 1–2. (Turcologica 84.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Roos, Martina Erica 2000. *The Western Yugur (Yellow Uyghur) language. Grammar, texts, dictionary*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- Rozycki, William 1994. *Mongol elements in Manchu*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 157.) Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.
- Saitō, Yoshio 2008. *The Mongolian words in the Muqaddimat al-Adab: Romanized text and word index (as of January 2008)*. Tōkyō: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.
- Sevortjan, Ėrvand V. 1974. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i meztjurkskie osnovy na glasnje* [Etymological dictionary of Turkic languages. Common Turkic and Inter-Turkic stems starting with vowels]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Shimunek, Andrew 2014. A new decipherment and linguistic reconstruction of the Kitan–Chinese bilingual inscription of 1134 A.D. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 67/1, 97–118.
- Shimunek, Andrew 2017a. *Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and North China*. (Tunguso-Sibirica 40.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Shimunek, Andrew 2017b. Toward a decipherment and linguistic reconstruction of the 1101 A.D. Kitan eulogy for Empress Xuanyi, with notes on Mongolic cognates: Lines 1–6. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 70/2, 253–272.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas & Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond 2012. *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Dictionary of Manichaean Texts 3, Texts from Central Asia and China 2.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Şirin, Hatice 2016. *Eski Türk yazıtları söz varlığı incelemesi* [Vocabulary analysis of Old Turkic inscriptions]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Skvorcov, Mixail I. 1982. *Čuvaško-russkij slovar'* [Chuvash-Russian dictionary]. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Stachowski, Marek 1998. *Dolganischer Wortschatz. Supplementband* [Dolgan vocabulary. Supplement volume]. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

- Thomsen, Vilhelm 1912. Dr. M. A. Stein’s manuscripts in Turkish “runic” script from Miran and Tun-Huang. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 44, 181–227.
- Türkiyede halk ağzından söz derleme dergisi* 2 = *Türkiyede halk ağzından söz derleme dergisi* 2 [Journal of compilation of folk speech in Turkey 2]. 1940. Istanbul: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklarıyla tarama sözlüğü 1–8 [Survey dictionary with witnesses collected from books written in Turkish since the 13th century 1–8]. 1996². Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Uçar, Erdem 2019. Orhun yazıtlarındaki *er- bar-* ikilemesi üzerine [On the reduplication *är-bar-* in the Orkhun inscriptions]. *Journal of Old Turkic Studies* 3/2, 471–501.
- Uraksin, Zinnur Gazizovič (ed.) 1996. *Başkirsko-russkij slovar’* [Bashkir-Russian dictionary]. Moskva: Digora.
- Ünal, Orçun 2022. *On *p- and other Proto-Turkic consonants*. (Sino-Platonic Papers 325.)
- Vladimircov, Boris Jakovleviç 1929. Zametki k drevnetjurkskim i staromongol’skim tekstam [Notes to the Ancient Turkic and Old Mongolian texts]. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR. Ser. B* 16, 289–296. [Reprinted in: Vladimircov, B. J. 2005. *Raboty po mongol’skomu jazykoznaniju* [Works on Mongolian linguistics]. Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura. 854–860].
- Vovin, Alexander 2013. Why Korean is demonstrably not related to Tungusic. In: *Proceedings of the Conference Comparison of Korean with Other Altaic Languages: Methodologies and Case Studies, November 15, 2013*. Gachon University, Seongnam, Republic of Korea.
- Vovin, Alexander 2018. An interpretation of the Khüis Tolgoi inscription. *Journal Asiatique* 306/2, 303–313.
- Vovin, Alexander 2019. A sketch of the earliest Mongolic language: The Brāhmī Bugut and Khüis Tolgoi inscriptions. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 1, 162–197.
- Vovin, Alexander 2021. The directionality of the earliest Turco-Mongolian language contacts revisited. The data from Mongolic Brāhmī Bugut and Khüis Tolgoi inscriptions. In: Nevskaya, Irina & Şirin, Hatice & Ağca, Ferruh (eds.) *Ayagka tegimlig bahşı: Festschrift in Honor of Marcel Erdal*. *Journal of Turkish Studies, Special Edition* 1, 527–534.
- Weiers, Michael 1972. Ein arabisch-mongolischer Wörterspiegel aus der Biblioteca Corsini in Rom [An Arabic-Mongolian dictionary from the Biblioteca Corsini in Rome]. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 6, 7–61.
- Wilkens, Jens 2016. *Buddhistischen Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien. Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* 1–3 [Buddhist tales from ancient Central Asia. Edition of the Old Uyghur Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā 1–3]. (Berliner Turfantexte 37.) Turnhout: Brepols.
- Wilkens, Jens 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch-Deutsch-Türkisch. Eski Uyğurcanın el sözlüğü. Eski Uyğurca-Almanca-Türkçe* [Concise dictionary of Old Uyghur. Old Uyghur-German-Turkish]. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Wu Yingzhe & Janhunen, Juha 2010. *New materials on the Khitan Small Script. A critical edition of Xiao Dilu and Yelü Xiangwen*. (Corpus Scriptorum Chitanorum 1, Languages of Asia 9.) Kent: Global Oriental.
- Wu Yingzhe & Róna-Tas, András 2019. Khitan studies 1. The glyphs of the Khitan Small Script 3. The consonants, 3.1 Labial stops. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 72/1, 47–79.