

OLD TURKIC LOAN WORDS IN HUNGARIAN

OVERVIEW AND SAMPLES

ÁRPÁD BERTA–ANDRÁS RÓNA-TAS*
(Szeged – Budapest)

The paper gives an overview of earlier research on the Turkic loan words in Hungarian from the Middle Ages until the work of L. Ligeti. It discusses the main achievements of Ligeti, who would be a hundred years old this year. Finally the paper outlines the main aims and methods according to which the authors work on a new etymological dictionary of the Old Turkic elements in the Hungarian language. Three sample articles close the paper.

Key words: Turkic languages, Old Turkic, etymology, history of the Turkic languages, history of the Hungarian language, OT *ığaçčī*, *öp-*, *baqa*.

One of the main topics of the life-work of Lajos (or as he used his name in non-Hungarian publications Louis) Ligeti was the research of the early contacts between the Turkic and Hungarian languages and peoples. We shall reflect on his work in this field below. To understand his legacy it is necessary to give a brief overview of the earlier research, the state-of-art of the present investigations and we would also like to put forward three samples of items in a planned work, which we consider as a fulfilment of his last will.

1. A brief overview of earlier research

The comparison of Hungarian words with similar Turkic ones is as old as the Hungarian records, chronicles and diplomas. In the early Hungarian chronicles such as the *Gesta* of the so called Anonymus (around 1200) and in that of Simon de Kéza¹ (written 1282–1285) mainly Hungarian names occur which are claimed to be of

* Árpád Berta, Egyetem u. 2., Szeged, Hungary, H-6722, e-mail: berta@sol.cc.u-szeged.hu
András Róna-Tas, Csörsz u.1., Budapest, Hungary, H-1123, e-mail: aronatas2@axelero.hu

¹ On the Old Hungarian chronicles, facsimile and text editions, translations etc. see Róna-Tas (1999, p. 58).

Turkic origin.² Some titles also crop up. The ruler of the Danube Bulgars is called in the work of Anonymus *Keanus magnus dux Bulgariae* (cap. 11), which is a Hungarian rendering for the title *qān* where the original long vowel is adapted as a diphthong.³

The chronicles are full of fantastic popular etymologies in the style common to similar works in contemporary Europe. The Latin name of the Hungarians *hungarus* is derived from a place-name Hungvár, which in fact is a composite of the river name Ung and the Hungarian word *vár* ‘castle’, while *hungarus* is going back to a Turkic form *onugur* (Róna-Tas 1999, pp. 282–289). The name of Álmos, father of Árpád, the leader of the Conquest, founder of the Hungarian royal dynasty, is derived from the Hungarian word *álmom* ‘dream’, because his mother was visited in her dream by the (totemic) bird the *turul* (Turkic *toğrı̄l*). In fact the name is Turkic *Almūs*.⁴ The fact that popular folk etymologies are used to underpin ideologies and historical claims can be observed until the recent days.

The Ottomans occupied great parts of Hungary (16–17th centuries) and as a result bilingualism was not unusual among Hungarians. The famous Hungarian poet Bálint Balassi (1554–1594) wrote poems both in Turkish and in Hungarian (Németh 1952; 1955). Hundreds of Turkish words were used by Hungarians in their daily speech or in their written documents (Kakuk 1973). The comparison of Hungarian and Turkic words was nothing special, Ottoman words were written in Latin script but with Hungarian orthography. In the work of Laurentius Toppeltinus de Medgyes (1641–1670)⁵ Turkic words were compared with Hungarians, while the Turkic ones were cited with Hungarian orthography as *satorlar* ‘tents’ with Hungarian *sátor* ‘id.’. The Hungarian scholar Ádám Ferenc Kollár (1718–1783) editing in 1763 the work *Hungaria et Atila* of Nicolaus Oláh (1493–1568), remarked in one of his notes that though the Hungarian language seems to be related to the Oriental languages and among them to Turkic, their structure is more similar than their lexical stock. Kollár had a good knowledge of Ottoman Turkish.

In the middle of the 18th century three non-Hungarian scholars made some remarks on the relationship between Hungarian and Turkic. Martinus Fogelius (1634–1675)⁶ wrote a book with the title: *De Turcarum Nephente libri IV., quibus accedit commentatio de affinitate linguae Turcicae et Ungaricae*. Though this work seems to be lost, some data about it survived and we know some of his sources.⁷ Fogel was the first scholar who made a systematic comparison of Hungarian and Finnish, but this

² As e.g. *Oluptolma* or *Ed*, who are said to be of Cuman origin but allegedly lived before the Conquest of Hungary, and joined the Hungarians during the Conquest. In fact the appearance of the Cumans in the Hungarian chronicles are reflections of events in the 12th century and were anachronistically flashed back three hundred years.

³ It is possible that the diphthong was already present in the copied form.

⁴ On the Hungarian name Álmos see Ligeti (1926; 1978) and Berta (2001).

⁵ His work: *Origines et occasus Transylvanorum* was first published in Lyon in 1667, later edited by G. Schwarz as *Originum et occasuum Transilvaniae auctore Laurentio Toppeltino recensio critica etc.* in 1766. See Bárczi (1958, p. 60); Togan (1968).

⁶ On Fogel see Bárczi (1958, pp. 60–61); Kangro (1969); Lakó (1969).

⁷ See Clauser (1935), Kangro (1969, pp. 15, 31).

for him did not exclude the comparison of Hungarian and Turkic. Behind these activities it is not difficult to recognise the influence of Leibniz. Johann Eberhard Fischer (1697–1771)⁸ wrote a book (originally a lecture before the Academy of St. Petersburg) *De origine Ungrorum* (written in 1756, published by A. L. Schlözer in 1770),⁹ stating that the Hungarians, who speak a language near to Finnish, came from Yugria. Yugria is the ancient homeland also of the Yugurs, who were, according to Fischer and Schlözer, the Uighurs, hence the Turkic words in their language. This work had a great influence on later research. His famous *Vocabularium Sibiricum* on which Fischer worked until his death, remained during his life unpublished. A first version is mentioned in 1747. The two manuscripts kept in St. Petersburg and Göttingen respectively were used by later scholars. Among his comparisons we find some which were later “rediscovered” and are still acceptable, as Hungarian *szél* ‘wind’ compared with the Turkic word **yel* as it occurs in Chuvash, Tobol, Kazan, Kacha, Chat, Chulim. Other Hungarian words of Turkic origin are compared with words which have nothing to do with the Hungarian word, as e.g. *dél*, which Fischer compared with Samoyed (Selkup) and Georgian items. Philipp Johann von Strahlenberg in his book *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* etc. (1730)¹⁰ places Chuvash among the Turkic languages together with Yakut and the Siberian Turkic languages, together with the languages of the Usbeck, the Bashkir, Kirgiz, the “Turkoman Tatars”, who are all Turks and have “fast einerey Dialect”. This is important, because later for a long time Chuvash was considered as a Finno-Ugric language and compared with Hungarian as such. Strahlenberg correctly compared Hungarian with Finnish, Vogul, Mordwin, Cheremiss, (Komi-)Permjak Votjak and Ostyak, but their common ancestor was, according to Strahlenberg, the Hunni or Unni. Strahlenberg has to be mentioned, because his work was widely used in Hungary in the second half of the 18th century.

Thus it was Fischer and not Georgius Pray (1723–1801) who first compared Hungarian words with Chuvash.¹¹ Pray published his comparisons in his books (*Annales veteres Hunnorum, Avarorum et Hungarorum* 1761; *Supplementum* 1764; *Dissertationes* 1775).

From the end of the 18th century on many scholars compared Hungarian words with Turkic ones, and slowly it became clear that these words may have been borrowed from one or another Turkic language and thus cannot be used for determining the origins of the Hungarians. Small steps in methodology were also made. Samuel Gyarmathi (1751–1830) stated, that to the borrowed words a Hungarian robe was given (...*a quibus plura vocabula mutuata, hodie civitate hungarica donavimus in Affinitas* 1799, quoted after Bárczi 1958, p. 62). István Horváth (1784–1846) seems to have been the first who tried to clearly distinguish words of Ottoman origin and those words, which have been copied earlier (Horváth 1833, p. 37; Bárczi 1958,

⁸ See Doerfer (1965); Gulya (1967; 1984; 1994; 1995).

⁹ On the influence of Fischer and Schlözer on the Hungarian scholars, among them on Csoma de Kőrös, see Szilágyi (1987).

¹⁰ See the Preface of Krueger in the reprint of the book (1975).

¹¹ As it was claimed by Bárczi (1958, p. 61).

p. 62). In the next phase scholars refined the chronology of the borrowings, but postulated that the oldest layer shows that the Hungarian language is somewhere in the middle of the continuum of Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages, being related with both. One of the most influential scholars in the second half of the 19th century was Pál Hunfalvy. According to him (1877) Hungarian is somewhere in the middle between Finno-Ugric and Turkic, but perhaps “a bit” nearer to the Finno–Ugric languages. This was the time when Ármin (Herman) Vámbéry (1832–1913) joined the discussion.

The next phase of the research is usually called “the Ugric–Turkic War”. The scholarly discussion was heated, some of the overtones were not devoid of romantic, sometimes of nationalistic features. The discussion was accompanied by newspaper debates. The “Turkic party” defended not only etymologies or the place of the Hungarian language among the other languages, but also the “heroic past” and persons of Hungarian gentry descent accused the other party of endangering the self-confidence of the nation. The central figure of the “Turkic party” was Vámbéry, who had an unprecedented command of modern and old Turkic languages, a vast knowledge on secondary literature, but at the same time he was an autodidact, who never learnt linguistics, in fact never frequented any course at any university.¹² In 1867 he left Hungary for Turkey and after four years of study and a short interval, he visited (sometimes risking his life) the Turkic-speaking people of Inner Asia. He was interested as much in the role of Russia and England in Central Asia as in the origins of the Hungarians.

The main protagonist of the “Ugric (Finno-Ugric)¹³ party” was József (Josef) Budenz (1836–1892),¹⁴ who was born in Germany. After having finished his studies at the University of Göttingen, where he was the pupil of, among others, Theodor Benfey, he came to Hungary in 1858. Budenz, who worked in Hungary first as a teacher at a *gymnasium*, was later invited by P. Hunfalvy to the library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He became “Privatdozent” in 1868 and full professor of Altaic¹⁵ Studies at the University of Budapest in 1872.

Budenz gave a painstaking review (1871) of the first work of Vámbéry on the Hungarian and “Turco-Tatar” word comparisons (1870). Budenz in (1871) and in his later papers refuted the claim of Vámbéry, that Hungarian has Turkic words, which are of the genetic inherited stock of the Hungarian lexicon. He claimed that all words which are of Turkic origin are loan words, and also pointed out that in the great material collected by Vámbéry (about 740 etymologies), there are acceptable Turkic etymologies, words the Turkic origin of which has to be refuted (“illusiv comparisons” and comparisons which are not even “illusiv”), “unimportant comparisons”

¹² The best bibliography of the works of Vámbéry is Coco (1986). See also Kakuk (1971), Hazai (1976). A book in English on his life is Alder – Dalby (1979).

¹³ On the history of the term *Ugric* see Róna-Tas (1996).

¹⁴ On Budenz see Futaky (1968), Lakó (1974) and Lakó (1980) with a comprehensive bibliography of and on Budenz.

¹⁵ “Altaic” denoted then, following the usage of W. Schott, what we now would call Ural-Altaic.

(onomatopics, words which are loan words also in Turkic) and there are some words with obscure or uncertain origin. According to Budenz more or less acceptable loan words number 146 out of which since then about 30 more had to be deleted.

Even more dangerous was what the opponents of Vámbéry called ironically the “neologisms”, Turkic words created by Vámbéry. One of these non-existent “ghost words” misled even some well-known scholars. In his work on the Chagatai language¹⁶ Vámbéry gave an item as *ķazmak* with the meaning ‘graben, herumirren, herumstreifen; creuser, error’. To the well-known verb *qaz-* ‘to dig, to dig out’ he added a non-existing homophonous word. This was derived from Turkic *az-* ‘to go astray’. Vámbéry observed that in some cases there do exist doublets with and without initial *k-* in Turkic¹⁷ and simply created the verb *qaz-* ‘to go astray’ from the existing *az-*. The ghost-word was then incorporated into the Chagatai dictionary of Pavet de Courteille (1870) and from it the word began its history in the scholarly literature. Among others the etnyonyms Khazak and Khazar were derived from this ghost-word.¹⁸

The long debate ended with the “victory” of the “Ugric party”. Vámbéry, who became full professor of Turkology at the University of Budapest in 1870, changed his positions during the debate, but remained faithful to his basic ideas until his death.¹⁹ Two clear theses are the results of the debate: 1. The Hungarian language is of Finno-Ugric origin, the words of Turkic origin in the Hungarian language are all loan words. 2. A great amount of those words in Hungarian, which are of Turkic origin show features peculiar to the Chuvash language.

The work of Budenz was continued by József Szinnyei (1857–1943), who first taught at the University of Kolozsvár (today Cluj, Romania) and from 1893 he occupied the chair for “Comparative Ural-Altai Studies” at the University of Budapest. In 1883 he wrote a severe review on the book of Vámbéry, published both in Hungarian (Vámbéry 1882a) and in German (Vámbéry 1882b). Szinnyei was a Finno-Ugrist. However, his book *Herkunft der Ungarn, ihre Sprache und Urkultur* (1920; second edition: 1923) was of the few works which made the results of the earlier research known to a readership which did not read Hungarian. He was also the mentor of Julius Németh.²⁰

¹⁶ Vámbéry (1867) has the title *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, but since he could not distinguish between Chagatai and contemporary written Uzbek material, he considered both to be “Chagatai”. This misled e.g. even Radloff, who quotes sometimes in his great dictionary written Uzbek forms as Chagatai.

¹⁷ Such doublets are of different origin. Turkic *karpuz/karbus* and *arbuz* ‘water melon’ is of Iranian origin and the initials with and without *k-* may be due to problems of substitution. See Doerfer (1967, pp. 380–381), on the feature in Mongolian see Pelliot (1944), in the Kipchak languages Halasi-Kun (1950).

¹⁸ Since the publication of the Old Turkic inscriptions of Terh and Tes we know that the Turkic name of the Khazars was Kasar. The hypothesis that the Khazars spoke a *z*-Turkic language was built on this ghost word (see Gombocz below). On the history of the question and the origin of the name of the Khazars see Róna-Tas (1982a; 1983).

¹⁹ Vámbéry (1914). An overview on the “Ugric–Turkic War” is Puzstay (1977).

²⁰ On Szinnyei see Lakó (1986).

While Szinnyei made no original studies in Turkology, Bernát (Bernhard) Munkácsi (1860–1937) undertook field-work among the Chuvash in 1885. Munkácsi wrote a long series of works in which he dealt with Hungarian words of Turkic origin.²¹ The works of Vámbéry, Budenz, Szinnyei and Munkácsi were the most important forerunners on which Zoltán Gombocz (1877–1935) could build his work.

Gombocz, professor of Altaic Studies at the University of Kolozsvár from 1914 and professor of Hungarian language at the University of Budapest from 1920, was a linguist who studied the history of the Hungarian and the Finno-Ugric languages. However, it became clear very early to him, that the contacts with the Turks and their languages may offer indispensable data and important solutions to questions otherwise difficult to deal with. He had an excellent command of comparative and historical Altaic studies of his time²² and worked with original Chuvash material.²³ After a long series of studies on Turkic elements in Hungarian²⁴ he wrote the first synthesis on the Old Turkic loan words in Hungarian (Gombocz 1912). The work in German was preceded by two Hungarian publications in 1907 and 1908 respectively.²⁵ The research on Hungarian common words of Turkic origin was completed by another monograph on the early Hungarian personal names of Turkic origin (1914–1915). In his famous *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache* (Gombocz 1912) published as a monograph in the series *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* as vol. 30, he dealt with 231 loan words. The high scholarly value of this book can be seen also from the fact that after a hundred years of research only about 20 words²⁶ had to be deleted from his list, the remaining ones are still acceptable.²⁷ To the main list 78 entries have been added, which had been considered

²¹ On Munkácsi see Kálmán (1960) with additions by J. Harmatta and M. Palló. His complete bibliography is in Oláh (1967).

²² His paper *Zur Lautgeschichte der altaischen Sprachen* (1912–1913) has been unduly neglected.

²³ He compiled a small Chuvash wordlist (1906) and published e.g. a paper on the Chuvash *praesens futurum* (1924).

²⁴ See his bibliography in Zsirai (1935). In 1907 Gombocz wrote a review on an inedited Hungarian–Turkic comparative dictionary of J. Thury. Thury (1861–1908) was for a short time (1906–1908), as successor to Vámbéry, professor of Turkology at the University of Budapest. On Thury see Kakuk (1971).

²⁵ On his later views see Gombocz (1960), his university lectures from 1930, edited by Ligeti.

²⁶ The words which Gombocz considered to be of Turkic origin and proved to be not, are the following: *agár* ‘greyhound’, *bakó* ‘hangman’, *béke* ‘peace’, *bodor* ‘curly’, *cége* ‘fish-weir’, *csihol* ‘to strike fire’, *csóka* ‘jack daw’, *csoport* ‘group’, *gyáva* ‘coward’, *igér* ‘to promise’, *kancsó* ‘jug’, *kelengye* ‘dotal gift’, *kopó* ‘foxhound’, *köd* ‘fog’, *kút* ‘well, fountain’, *öböl* ‘gulf, bosom’, *pödör* ‘to twirl’, *sajt* ‘cheese’, *szaru(fa)* ‘rafter’, *szemölcs* ‘wart’, *tűnik* ‘to vanish, to change in another form’. Most of these words have no better etymologies, but those of Gombocz cannot be accepted. Some are inner Hungarian derivations and/or onomatopoeica (*csoport*, *csihol*, *kopó*, *pödör*, *szemölcs*), some are Uralic or Finno-Ugric (*köd*, *szaru*), a few are Slavic (*agár*, *cége*), one is Iranian (*sajt*).

²⁷ This means that the word is of Turkic origin, but does not mean that the etymology or the argumentation is necessarily good, or has to be accepted without any addition, see below.

by the earlier research as Turkic, but which were not acceptable for Gombocz as such.²⁸

For Gombocz the historical implication of the early Hungarian–Turkic linguistic contacts were of paramount importance. He called first the loans “old loans from Turkic”, later “the Turkic loan words borrowed before the Conquest”.²⁹ The notion “bulgarisch-türkisch” was due to the studies of Ashmarin on the language of the Volga Bulgars.³⁰ In his monograph Gombocz excluded Khazar as a source language.³¹ Gombocz first suggested the Volga-Kama region and the language of the Volga-Bulgars as the place and source language of the borrowings. He suggested as the time for the beginning of the Hungarian–Turkic contacts the period “after 600” (Gombocz 1912, p. 205). In 1921 Gombocz changed his opinion and placed the first contacts to the North of Caucasia, to the region of the Kubans, its beginnings to the 5th and its end to the 7th century.³²

Gyula (Julius) Németh (1890–1976),³³ who got in 1919 the chair for Turkology at the University of Budapest, many times returned to the problems of the Turkic loans in Hungarian. He succeeded in separating the so called “middle layer” of the Turkic loan words in Hungarian, those words which were borrowed after the Conquest (895) from the Cumans and Pechenegs who migrated into the land inhabited by the Hungarians (Németh 1921). Important are also his works in which he used the newly discovered Old Turkic material, the Orkhon inscriptions and the Turfan material. In some of his works he added new data or arguments to the earlier research, in others he suggested new etymologies.³⁴ Németh considered as his *opus magnum* his book on the formation of the conquering Hungarians published in 1930.³⁵ This was based on the etymologies of the early Hungarian tribal and personal names, the overwhelming majority of which he considered to be of Turkic origin.

Németh in his earlier works placed the first Hungarian–Turkic contacts, following Gombocz’s second opinion, to the Kuban region. Later he changed his views,

²⁸ Out of the 78 a few are nevertheless of Turkic origin as *apol* ‘to kiss’, *dió* ‘nut’, *herjó* ‘a small predatory bird’, *karvaly* ‘sparrow hawk’, *katáng* ‘chicory’, *orvos* ‘doctor, physician’, *vályú* ‘trough’, *vék* ‘a hole in the ice for fishing’.

²⁹ The Conquest of the Carpathian Basin by the Hungarians was not without antecedents, begun in 895 and ended in 902, see Róna-Tas (1999).

³⁰ See Ashmarin (1902), to which Munkácsi called the attention of Gombocz.

³¹ His main argument was that the *-z-* in the ethnonym Khazar, which he considered to be a self-nomination excludes that the Khazars spoke a language with *-r-* in place of Turkic *-z-*, a feature typical to Chuvash and the loans in Hungarian. See note 18 above.

³² See Gombocz (1960). One of his arguments for his second opinion was the supposed place of Khuvrat’s Bulgaria. On this problem see Róna-Tas (2000).

³³ On the life and activities of Németh see Róna-Tas (1978). The bibliography of the works of Németh can be found in Németh (1990) which is a reprint edition of his papers written in Hungarian.

³⁴ See the two bibliographies of Németh, the first in 1960 in the Németh volume of *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, and the second in 1990 in the second volume of the reprint collection: Németh (1990).

³⁵ He worked on the second edition until his death. The manuscript was edited and published in 1991 by Árpád Berta. A critical review of the problems of the origin of the early Hungarian tribal names with other Turkic etymologies is Berta (1998).

and based mainly on some Bashkir tribal and clan names, he returned to the first opinion of Gombocz.³⁶

An important step in the comprehensive study of the Turkic loan words in Hungarian was the activity of Géza Bárczi (1894–1975). The former Romanist Bárczi was professor of Hungarian linguistics, first at the University of Debrecen and later at the University of Budapest. His paper on the earliest contacts of the Hungarian and Turkic languages did not find wide acceptance.³⁷ In three excellent papers (Bárczi 1965; 1971; 1972) he analysed the adaptation of the Turkic loan words by the Hungarian language. His short etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language published in 1941 contained 228 items of Turkic origin from the old and the middle layers. Due to his profound knowledge of Hungarian historical linguistics, sound critical methodology and his good knowledge of the secondary literature in Turkology, very few of the 228 items are not acceptable as being of Turkic origin.³⁸

The first great and full synthesis³⁹ of the origins of the Hungarian lexical stock has been compiled by a group of scholars led by Loránd Benkő (1921–), professor of the Hungarian language at the University of Budapest and was published between 1967–1984 in three plus one volumes.⁴⁰ The aim of the work was to give a critical view of the earlier studies. It adds at the same time the earliest data of the Hungarian words, thus uniting the historical data and the etymology in one article. The bibliography closing the paper covers the most important earlier Hungarian literature. For any further studies this work became an indispensable tool.⁴¹

³⁶ See Németh (1972) which is a biography of Gombocz. The only Turkologist who tried to defend Németh's second opinion was L. Rásonyi.

³⁷ Bárczi claimed that Hungarians had contacts with Turkic people already in the time of the Ugric period, that is when the ancestors of the Hungarians, Voguls and Ostyaks lived together, see Bárczi (1952). The etymologies underpinning these contacts are unacceptable (*nyak* 'neck', *nyár* 'summer', *harang* 'bell', *hattyú* 'swan'). The word *homok* 'sand' is of Turkic origin, but pertains to the old loans of the Chuvash type. On the problem of the earliest contacts of Hungarian with the Turkic languages see Róna-Tas (1988a).

³⁸ These are *bán* (a title), *kút* 'well, fountain', *pödör* 'to curl', and *sajt* 'cheese'. His close personal friendship with L. Ligeti secured him a good access to the latest results of Turkology. An important feature of the book is the fine distinction grading the etymologies according to their certitude or well-foundedness.

³⁹ The first etymological dictionary by Florián Mátyás (in three volumes 1868–1871) is only of historical interest. The etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language written by János Melich (1872–1963), a Slavist, from 1914 until 1936 together with Gombocz and alone until 1944 reached only the first items beginning with *g-*. It contains less than a third of the Hungarian word stock but includes proper names, titles, etc. of historical importance. Some items written by Gombocz contain new data and signalled changes in his opinion.

⁴⁰ The research group has consulted Susanne Kakuk on the Turkic material. Her data and suggestions were supervised by L. Ligeti. Two important remarks have to be made. Ligeti corrected only mistakes but did not give his own opinion, and Benkő did not always accept the views of Kakuk and Ligeti.

⁴¹ Out of the 10 714 basic words treated by the etymological dictionary about 220 are marked as being of sure or very probable Turkic origin and pertaining to layers before the Ottoman contacts.

In 1993 appeared the first fascicle of the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen* under the editorship of L. Benkő. The six fascicles contain about a third of the lexical stock separately treated in the Hungarian forerunner,⁴² and include the new opinions (among them a few new Turkic etymologies)⁴³ published since the Hungarian version and in some cases changes in the view of L. Benkő.⁴⁴

The more detailed Hungarian and the very condensed German monographs close a long period of research. They weighed the results of earlier Turkological research⁴⁵ and pointed decisively to the Hungarian side of the etymology, in many cases convincingly demonstrating that notwithstanding the Turkic side, serious problems have to be envisaged on the Hungarian side of a given, earlier suggested etymology. Unfortunately the great progress in Turkology in the last twenty years is not reflected in the two works.

2. The work of L. Ligeti

The Turkic elements in the Hungarian language were always in the focus of interest of Lajos (Louis) Ligeti (1902–1987), professor of Central Asiatic languages at the University of Budapest.⁴⁶ His first paper published in 1924 was connected with the research of Chuvash, his first etymological remarks on the etymology of the Hungarian name of Turkic origin (Álmos)⁴⁷ appeared in 1926. In 1978 he began to publish a series of studies on old Hungarian names of Turkic origin, which were later republished with his earlier papers on Turkic loan words in Hungarian in a two-volume reprint publication in 1979.⁴⁸ In the last days of 1986, a few weeks before his death was published one of his major works on the Turkic connections of the Hungarian language before the Conquest and in the Age of the Árpáds (Ligeti 1986). This book is the summary of his research of more than 50 years.

The main chapters deal with the Chuvash criteria of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin, the convergent development of the Turkic and Hungarian historical phonologic systems, and the main characteristics of the non-Chuvash Turkic lan-

⁴² Many of the items dealt with separately in the Hungarian volumes were grouped into one item. A few neologisms were added.

⁴³ As e.g. *ászok* 'gauntry (for supporting barrels)'.

⁴⁴ The consultant for the Turkic material before the Ottoman period was A. Róna-Tas. He, however received only those words for commenting which were considered by L. Benkő as being of Turkic origin.

⁴⁵ Here only the most important Hungarian scholars can be mentioned, whose work added new etymologies to the earlier ones: Tibor Halasi-Kun, Antal Horger, Elemér Moór, Dezső Pais, Lajos Katona, Margit K. Palló, László Rásonyi, Gábor Bereczki, István Mándoky Kongur, István Vásáry.

⁴⁶ After the retirement of J. Németh as chair of the Department of Turkology, Ligeti followed him as the chair of Turkology retaining the chair of Central Asiatic Studies, founded by him. Ligeti retired in 1973 and S. Kakuk followed him in the chair for Turkology.

⁴⁷ He later changed his views on the name of Álmos, father of Árpád, the founder of the first Hungarian dynasty, see Ligeti (1978).

⁴⁸ See the bibliography in this volume pp. 5–23.

guages. A chapter summarises the results of the research on the early contacts of Hungarian with other languages before the Turkic contacts. The longest chapter deals with the mutual influence of Turkic and Hungarian, in detail only with the Turkic impact on Early Hungarian. The second part of the book gives the ethnic and historical background of the Turkic–Hungarian contacts. There are no elaborated etymologies in the book (which we can find in the separate papers of Ligeti), the Hungarian words of Turkic origin are only quoted as illustrations of linguistic or historical, cultural statements. Ligeti treated or quoted altogether about 280 Hungarian words of Turkic origin. It is very difficult and it is surely not the task of this paper to evaluate his contribution to Turkology and especially to the study of the early Turko–Hungarian contacts. Two things characterised his works. A profound knowledge of all relevant data and a rigorous, always critical methodology. He was one of the very few scholars who never worked with isolated data, but involved all knowledge which may have been useful to understand and correctly interpret the data. He was always keen to present the “background”, the historical implications, the cultural setting. The legacy of Ligeti is a difficult one: to continue his work.⁴⁹

3. Towards a new etymological dictionary of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin

Both the great achievements in Turkology and in the research on the history of the Hungarian language made it possible and desirable to fulfil the last will of Ligeti.

This work, as we hope, will serve the advance of Turkology. After the discovery, collection, conservation and first, in many cases, tentative, publication of the huge Old Turkic material from the Eastern part of Turcia, Turkology faces now the task of the detailed elaboration of the Old Turkic linguistic material. The Old Turkic material is, however, in most cases restricted to what we call East Old Turkic – texts and glosses written in Asia. With the foundation of the first Turkic Khaganate in 552 AD, the political situation changed in Eurasia. Turkic became a language of social and political prestige, and was written in a number of alphabets. The spread of the Turkic *koiné* during the second Khaganate, the missionary work of the great religions among the different Turkic tribes, produced a Turkic literature of admirable richness, and glosses in the literature of all nations which were in contact with the Turks. Less

⁴⁹ Even in this very sketchy overview we must mention those scholars, who were not Hungarians, but have dealt with the Turkic loan words in Hungarian. Excluding earlier works of only historical interest, it was H. Paasonen who was among the first scholars interested in the non-Finno-Ugrian words in Hungarian. The wife of Paasonen was Hungarian and he had an excellent command of Hungarian and the literature written in Hungarian. Two scholars N. Poppe and G. Doerfer made remarks which went beyond single etymologies. Their work was, however, hampered by the fact that there was no up-to-date history of the Hungarian language available to them in a non-Hungarian language. Of great value is the Turkish etymological dictionary of H. Eren (1999). Eren was a pupil of Németh and has an excellent knowledge on Hungarian linguistics. If a Turkish word has even a remote connection with a Hungarian word, this is usually mentioned in his dictionary with reference to earlier literature.

is known of the language or languages contemporary to East Old Turkic and spoken West of the Urals and Lake Aral. Though we have a few uncertain hints that Turkic people used some scripts in East Europe, it is only the so-called East European Runiform Script which is known from this time in that area. We know about more than a hundred, mostly short inscriptions, but until now the script resisted deciphering. Among the sources helping the study of the West Old Turkic⁵⁰ languages, glosses, names and titles can be mentioned in non-Turkic sources. In Byzantine, Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Georgian, Latin and Slavic sources⁵¹ scattered material has been preserved. Another source is the history of the Chuvash language, the only living language which is pertaining to the West Old Turkic group. For the study of Old West Turkic an important source, though with restricted value, is Volga Bulghar from the end of the 13th until the middle of the 14th century.⁵² Even less is known of the language of the Danube Bulghars,⁵³ the Khazars⁵⁴ or the Avars⁵⁵. Taking into account the scantiness and scarcity of other data, the Old Turkic loan words preserved in Hungarian offer a welcome and rich source for the reconstruction of West Old Turkic.

The importance of the Turkic loan words for the reconstruction of the history of the Hungarian language and people, as we mentioned above, has always been in the foreground of the research. The Hungarian scholars, however, have never seen this problem as a narrow task of Hungarian Turkology. An eminent Slavist, learned in Turkology, István Kniezsa,⁵⁶ following the steps of such scholars as János Melich, always called the attention to the close connections among Old Turkic, Old Hungarian and Old Slavic. Ligeti has dealt with the question in some of his papers in de-

⁵⁰ West Old Turkic is a regional term denoting all Turkic languages which were spoken West of the Urals and the Aral Lake, in East Europe, until the end of the Old Turkic period, i.e. until the establishment of the Mongol Empire of the Chingisids. Languages of the Chuvash type were typical of this region, but we cannot exclude the existence of other non-Chuvash-type Turkic languages. A non-Chuvash-type language was spoken by the Pechenegs, who entered East Europe after clashes with the Khazars and after having occupied the former homeland of the Hungarians called *Etelkuzu*. The migration of Kipchak – Cuman and Oguz – Uz groups into East Europe can also be detected in the sources from the end of the 9th century, maybe even earlier. On West Old Turkic see Róna-Tas (1988b; 1998).

⁵¹ A good overlook on these sources is Golden (1980).

⁵² On the language of the Volga Bulghar inscriptions see Róna-Tas–Fodor (1973); Hakim-zjanov (1978); Róna-Tas (1982b); Tekin (1988); Erdal (1993).

⁵³ The decipherment of the so-called List of the Danube Bulghar Royal Princes remained unsuccessful in spite of the monography of O. Pritsak (1977). Scattered Danube Bulgharian glosses and two short inscriptions have been published by Beševliev (1963; 1979) and others.

⁵⁴ See Golden (1980) and the results of the Khazar symposium in Jerusalem 1999 (yet unpublished).

⁵⁵ There is a debate about the language of the Avars which by some scholars was considered as Mongolian, by others as Turkic, in the near past also Manchu-Tunguzian came into consideration. We have no place here to go into details of these discussions. Turkic was surely spoken among the Avars. The question is how far the Slavisation of the Avars had gone at the time when the Hungarians conquered the Carpathian Basin.

⁵⁶ Turkological remarks are scattered among others in his major work on the Old Slavic elements in Hungarian, see Kniezsa (1955).

tail.⁵⁷ There exists a sizeable group of words which are present in both Old Hungarian and Old Slavic and are of Turkic origin. Though their relationship is not always clear, their study offers important conclusions both for the linguistic and the historical–cultural connections among Turks, Hungarians and Slavs, three dominating ethnic groups in East Europe of the Early Middle Ages.

The authors of this paper have set as their aim the compilation of an etymological dictionary of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin. We have, however, excluded the words of Ottoman origin on which an excellent monograph exists in French by S. Kakuk (1973).

As to the Hungarian word stock we have included words **(1)** present in the modern Hungarian language, **(2)** words which are present only in some Hungarian dialects and **(3)** words which are not used in present Hungarian, but the earlier existence of which can be shown by historical sources. We have excluded proper names used by the Hungarians, but included ethnic names in use in Old Hungarian.

The Turkic origin means that the word was copied from a Turkic language, but does not necessarily mean that the word is of ultimately Turkic origin. There are words of Chinese (H *gyöngy* ‘pearl’ ← OT *jinjü*), of Indo-European (H *alma* ‘apple’ ← OT *alma*), of Indic (H *bors* ‘pepper’ ← OT *burč*) or of other origin, which were only mediated by a Turkic language. In these cases “etymology” means to give the source of the Turkic word. Concerning the words which are not demonstrably of non-Turkic origin, “Turkic etymology” means that we give, as far as possible, the morphological structure of the Turkic word. We agree with the views of Erdal and his methodological rigour as explained in Erdal (1991, pp. 32–33) and use also his symbols. Turkic words can be divided into two groups. Into the first group pertain those Turkic words which have a clear morphological structure. They contain a lexical base and derivational suffix(es). In this case the function of the suffix has to be demonstrated in Old Turkic and not supposed *ad hoc*, as it has been done in many cases before. To the second group pertain those Turkic words which have not, or seem not to have a structure where a base and a derivational suffix can be separated. This group surely contains words with suffixes already not productive in the earliest sources of Old Turkic and those which never had derivational suffixes. While in the first case the demonstration of the Turkic origin of the word is given by its morphological analysis, in the second case only the distribution of the word in the Old, the Middle and/or the New Turkic languages can be adduced as argument. Therefore we introduced a new structure of the presentation of the Turkic data which can be seen in the following three samples. This type of presentation is based on former ideas of Ligeti⁵⁸ and was first used in the dissertation of Róna-Tas in 1970.⁵⁹ The different

⁵⁷ See Ligeti (1966; 1975; 1977, etc.).

⁵⁸ A system of grouping the Turkic data by Ligeti has been published in the introduction of Bárczi (1941, p. XV), and can also be seen in many of the papers Ligeti published.

⁵⁹ We do not follow the system of Räsänen (1969–1971) or Sevortjan (1974), who grouped the words according to their (seemingly) identical or similar outlook.

groups have “leading” representatives.⁶⁰ If we have no data from these languages we always indicate this with a “–” sign.⁶¹ Additional data from other languages or other sources of the “leading” languages are cited only if their testimony is of etymological relevance. In a group of cases the word which is or could be the etymon of the Hungarian word is present only in a very restricted number of Turkic languages, but the word base and the suffix are present in a wide range of sources and languages. In these cases we cite the base word from the sources where it is present. However if the word formation with clear morphological structure is present in more than one of the branches of the Turkic languages and it is present in Old Turkic, we, as a rule, do not cite the base from other branches.

The words are arranged according to the alphabetical order of their present Hungarian form. Indexes, among them an Old Turkic one, will help to find a Turkic word.

The item begins with the “head”, where we summarise the essence of the etymology, reconstruct the form which was copied and the form which has been adapted by the Hungarian on the two sides of the arrow (←). Of the Hungarian historical data we give the earliest one, mainly after the Hungarian historical-etymological dictionary (*TESz*, see Benkő 1967; 1970; 1976; 1984) or the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen* (*EWUng*, see Benkő 1993; 1995; 1997). Sometimes it is necessary to give the first occurrence in the early diplomas and the first occurrence in a word-list or a text where the meaning is given or indicated. The old Hungarian data are given in their original orthography and their tentative contemporary pronunciation in square brackets [] in a simplified English transcription for the convenience of the reader. After the “head” we give an indication to the grade of probability of the etymology. If the etymology is, according to us, sure, there is no indication. However if the etymology is of debated origin, or only probable but not sure, or it may pertain to different Turkic etymons, we indicate this after the “head”. Etymologies which have been convincingly refuted by *TESz* and/or *EWUng* are not included. In an appendix we plan to treat those etymologies which have been suggested since the closing of *EWUng* but we consider them as unacceptable or highly problematical.

The second part contains the Turkic data in a reasonable transcription. In the case of the Old and Middle Turkic data the abbreviations begin with a siglum denoting the script in which the source was written (eg. U – Uighur, R – Runic etc.). The meaning of the word is given as it can be found in the source publication cited. The Turkic data are followed by the Mongolian data if they give a hint to the chronology of the Turkic one. If the Turkic word has entered other languages, this fact, as a rule, is not mentioned. The data are followed by a short discussion of the main problems with or around the etymology. We have, however, avoided long discussions of other opinions. Such discussions have to be published in separate papers. If our opinion is different from that of *EWUng*, this is indicated.

⁶⁰ The selection of the “leading” sources had sometimes principal reasons, but in other cases simply practical ones.

⁶¹ This means of course only that we did not find data and not that they do not exist.

The bibliography closing the item gives only the most important and the recent literature. As a rule works which do not deal with the etymological problems of the Hungarian words are not cited. Cited are, however, those which figure in the discussion. Preference was given to literature in non-Hungarian.

The work is helped by a small group of our pupils in Szeged and a Board of Consultants: M. Erdal (Frankfurt), Lars Johanson (Mainz), Jens Peter Laut (Freiburg), Klaus Röhrborn (Göttingen), Claus Schönig (Mainz/Istanbul), Marek Stachowski (Krakow), István Vásáry (Teheran/Budapest), Peter Zieme (Berlin). The work was and is helped by several institutions and funds.⁶²

4. Three samples from the Etymological dictionary of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin

We have selected three samples from the items beginning with the letters A, Á and B. The first word has problems on its Turkic side, the second raises a principal question of language borrowing and the third offers a new insight into the structure of the Turkic word, at the same time has an irregular feature in the history of the Hungarian word.

- **ács** ‘carpenter’. 1222// ?PN *Afu*, 1230 ?PN *Alchi* [a:lčī], 1233 PN *Alch* [a:lč], ca. 1395 *alch* [a:lč] *ács* ← **agaččī* < *agač* + *čI* | OT *iğacčī*, T *agaččī*.

OT *iğacčī* (UPfahl 19 before *titigčī* ‘maison, wall-maker’), *iğacčīlar* ‘vārddhakina = vardhakinah’ (B5:12), *yīgač* ‘ağaç’ (AQB), *yīgač* ‘wood, tree or shrub, penis, parsang’ (AK); **MT** *yīgač* ‘ağaç’ (UY-A 76:2,3, -B 33:7, 34:1), *iğac* (8x), *yīgač* (1x) ‘Baum’ (UOg), *yīgač* ‘bois, arbre’ (UHy, UHyS), *Agač* ‘personal name’ (UCiv-SA:09), *iğac* ‘Holz’ (UCiv-WP:03); *agač* ‘tree’ (ABF), *agač* ‘tree, wood, fuel, stick’ (AGul), *agač* (1x), *yīgač* (25x) ‘ağaç’ (AHMA), *agač*, *yīgač* ‘derevo, derevjannaja palka; mera dliny’ (AHŠF), *agač yoničī* ‘oblesyvajuščij derevo’ (AIM), *agač yongičī* ‘dülger’ (AIMI), *agač* ‘tree’ (AKD), *yīgač* ‘tree’ (AKor), *agač*, *yīgač* ‘derevo, derevjannaja palka; mera dliny’ (ANehF), *yīgaččī* ‘carpenter’, *yīgaččī yongučī* ‘id.’ (ARbg), *yīgač(čī)* ‘plotnik’ (ATef), *yīgač* ‘ağaç’ (AY-C); *agač*, *iğac*, *yīgač* (AChag), *yīgač* (?); ‘farsah (mera dliny), derevo plodovoe i neplodovoe’ (AChagB), *yīgač* ‘derevo’ (AChagMA), *yīgač* ‘wood, parsang’ (AChagS); *agač* ‘Baum’ (LCCI, G), *agač* ‘bugünkü manasında’ (AAH), – (AAHI), – (ABul), *agaš* ‘bois, gaule, baton’, *hurma agači* ‘dattier’ (ADurI), *qayyin agaši* ‘bois de peuplier ou de bouleau’ (ADurII), *agač* ‘Baum, Holz’ (AHou), *agač* ‘Stock’, *alma agači* ‘Apfelbaum’ (AKav), *agač* ‘tree, branch, stem (of a bamboo), pole, wood, wooden part (of a lance)’ (AMGh), *agaš* ‘palka, les, derevo (material)’ (ATuh); *agač* ‘arbre, objet en bois, barre, madrier,

⁶² We have to offer our thanks to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, to the University of Szeged, to the OTKA (the Research funding council of Hungary), and we got a special research fund granted by the Ministry of Education.

hampe' (AmTr); *agač* 'sopa, deĝnek; bir kilometre kadar olan bir uzunluk (ölçüsü)' (AOtT); **NT** *Chuv yiväs* 'derevo'; **K** *agač ostasi* 'stoljar' (RTat), *agas* 'derevo' (Bashk), *agas oštahī* 'stoljar' (RBashk), *jīgačči (usta)* 'stoljar, plotnik' (Kirk), *agašši* (Kaz), *agašši usta* (Kklp), *agaš ustasi*, *agaš usta* (RKklp), *agašši* 'stoljar' (Nog), *agač* 'derevo' (CrTat), *agac* (KarH), *agač* 'derevo' (KarT,Š), *agač usta* 'stoljar' (KumB), *agač usta* 'stoljar' (Krch-Blk); **O** *agačči (ussa)* 'plotnik' (Tkm), *agačči* (TkmAB), *agaccilalayan* 'wood polisher' (AzE), *ağaççı* 'čelovek, sažajuščij ili vyraščivajuščij derev'ja' (Tt); **Kh** *hayač* 'Baum, Holz, Stock, Parasange' (KhalD); **T** *yogoč ustasi* 'plotnik' (Uzb), *yayačči*, *yay'ačči*, *yay'ačči* 'woodworker, carpenter, joiner' (TurkiJ), *yagačči*, *yagašči* 'stoljar, plotnik' (MUyg), *ayašči*, *ayšči*, *ayačči* 'stoljar, drevoobdeločnik' (Sal), *ayašči* 'menuisier, charpentier; bucheron' (SalK), *yīgašči* 'stoljar' (YUyg); **S** *agas* 'derevo' (Alt), *agas (agač-)* 'derevo' (Khak), *agaš*, *agiš* 'wood' (FY), *īyašči* 'lesnik, lesnoj storož' (Tuv), *neš (nejš)* 'derevo' (Tof), *naš*, *naiš* 'derevo' (Karagas? see Radloff 1893, p. 149). **Y** *mas* 'derevo na kornju i srublennoe, kak stroitel'nyj material', *mas uuha* 'plotnik' (Y), *mas*, *mās* 'Baum, Holz, Wald' (DolG).

The relationship between T *īgač* and *agač* is unclear, yet they surely belong together. If the word *īgač* is a der. of *ī* 'vegetation' (see *ī tarīg* 'Getreide' USitātāpP: 187), the suff. is + *gAč* (Erdal 1991, p. 84) and all word forms with initial *y-* are secondary. In this case *agač* is a form due to assimilation. However Halaj *h-* may point to a PT **p-*. In this case the *yī-* Anlaut is the earlier: *hi-* > *yī-* (> *ī-*) and *ha-* > *a-*. It cannot be excluded that the hend. *ī* *īgač* may, however, go back to an earlier **ī* *agač* and in this case *īgač* would be a secondary form which then became independent, got a *y-* and reinfluenced *agač*. Chuvash *yiväs* points to an earlier **agač*. Some MT sources have *yagač*, and it cannot be decided whether this is due to the neglect of a *kesra* or it is reflecting a data close to Turki and MUyg. The *-q-* in the data from the AChagB seems to be a misreading of the MS. Tofalar *neš* goes back to an earlier *naš*, which probably comes from *nāš* < *nagač* < *yagač*. In a few cases we find a secondary nasal where there is or was no nasal consonant in the following syllable: cf. Tofalar: *nūt* 'molodoj' < *yigit*. More difficult is the case of the origin of Yakut *mas* and Dolgan *mas*, *mās*. It is unlikely that it would have a common origin with Manchu-Tunguzian **mō* 'tree, wood' **mōsa* 'wood, forest', Mongolian *modu(n)* 'id.'. Excluded can be also Chinese *mu* 'tree', which goes back to an earlier form with a final *-k*. Yakut final *-s* can go back to *-s*, *-z*, *-š* and *-č*. A **magač* would, however, result in something like **mias*, a **mīgač* in **mīs*.

Some T languages form the word for 'carpenter' with the suffix +*čI*, other use the composition *agač ustasi* 'master of wooden objects' or similar expressions.

The OH *-l-* is due to hypercorrection alternating with long vowels, see **böles**, **búcsú**, **bocsát** etc. This secondary *-l-* disappeared only after the 16th century. The disappearance of the intervocalic guttural occurred in H. Two earlier PNs (1222, 1230) quoted by Benkő (1993, p. 5), both placenames, can hardly pertain here. The H word denoted 'carpenter' from the earliest times. In OH the word presumably had also the meaning 'master manufacturing the wooden parts of the yurt'.

* Vámbéry (1882a, pp. 227–228); Radloff (1893, p. 149); Munkácsi (1901, pp. 190, 196); Gombocz (1912, pp. 35, 168); Vámbéry (1914, p. 136); Gombocz

(1914, p. 27; 1940, pp. 87, 93); Bárczi (1958, p. 7); Németh (1965, p. 55); Doerfer (1965, p. 73); Ligeti (1965, p. 288); Benkő (1967, p. 94); Räsänen (1969, p. 7); Clauson (1972, p. 80); Sevortjan (1974, p. 71); Ligeti (1986, pp. 298–299); Róna-Tas (1987/1988, p. 216; 1988a, p. 755); Erdal (1991, p. 84); Benkő (1993, p. 5); Stachowski (1995, pp. 270–274).

- **ápol** ‘to nurse, take care of’. D: p1372/c1448 ‘to kiss’, 1589 ‘to caress’, 1784 ‘to care of’ | *a:pol ~ apol* < **op* + HDVSuff -*l* | cf. OT *öp-* ‘to kiss; to sip or suck in the air or a liquid’, *op-* ‘to gulp down, swallow’.
Of doubtful Turkic origin.

Back vocalic verbal stem:

OT *op-* ‘to swallow’: *azū turūk suv ärsär opōyīn* ‘oder wenn (es) klares Wasser ist (so) will ich es trinken’ (RTToyI:1–3); *op-* ‘to swallow’ (AQB), *öp-* ‘to gulp down (water or other)’: *är sūw opdi* ‘the man gulped down (abba) the water (or other)’ (AK); **MT** – (UOg), – (UY, UHy, UCiv); – (ABF, AGul), *op-* ‘(nőpürdeterek) içmek’ (AHMA) – (AHŞF), – (AIM), – (AIM, AKD, AKor), – (AM), – (ANehF, ARbg, ATefs); *op-* ‘baiser’, (AChag but *öpmek* ‘embrasser’), – (AChagB, AChagMA, AChagSC); *oparmac* ‘obsculo’, *opmac* ‘obszulum’ (LCC,-I), *op-* ‘abba’ (AAH), – (AAHI), – (ABul), – (ADur, AHou, AMGh) *op-* ‘proglatyvat’, *vypivat* ‘srazu, osušat’ (read by Fazylov as *öb-* see *öp-* ‘celovat’), *obur* ‘zloj duh, čudovišče’ (ATuh), *op-* ‘baiser, embrasser’ (AmTr no *ö* in Am), *op-* ‘somurup yutmak’ (AOt); **NT Chuv** *vup-* ‘(ust.) portit’, *napuskat* ‘porču, prinosit’ nesčaste (*o zlyh duhah*), *vopaška* ‘ovrag’ (ChuvA), *vupār, vupkän* ‘zloj duh’; **K** *up-* tr. ‘provalivat’sja (*o zemle*), (*prost.*) žrat’, *lopat’, treskat*’ (Tat), *up-* ‘zasasyvat’, *zatjagivat*’ (Bashk), *opkok* ‘nenasytnyj, prožorlivyj’ (Kirg), *opsor* ‘(čujsk.) žadnyj, prožorlivyj’ (Kirg), *op-* ‘to eat up, gorge, swallow’, *obir* ‘glutton, insatiable; vampire’ (Kaz), – (KKlp), *op-* ‘zasasyvat’, *zatjagivat*; *požirat’, s’edat’ vse srazu*’ (Nog), – (CrTat), *op-* ‘pohiščat’; *pogloščat*’ (KarTH), *op-* ‘küssen’ (KumN, Sev), *uppa* ‘poceluj’ (Krch-Blk); **O** intr. *op-* ‘provalivat’sja, osedat’’, *hop-* ‘provalivat’sja, obvalivat’sja, obrušivat’sja (vnutr’ čego-l.)’, (Tkm); *hop-* ‘vpityvat’sja’ (Az); *obur* ‘greedy, gluttonous’ (Tt), *up-* ‘to kiss’ (TtDapud Clauson 1972); *obur, hobur* ‘prožorlivyj, žadnyj; obžora; (*mif.*) oboroten’, *vurdalak*’ (Gag); **Kh** –; **T** *üp-* ‘celovat’ (Uzb), – (TurkiJ), *opqan* ‘obžora, prožorlivyj’ (MUyg); – (Sal), *op-* ‘celovat’ (YUyg); **S** *opčoniš-* ‘celovat’sja, pocelovat’sja’ (AltT); *op-* ‘vtjagivat’, *vsasyvat*; *einsaugen, einziehen*’ (AltTelR), – (Khak), *op-* ‘vtjagivat’, *vsasyvat*; *einsaugen, einziehen*’ (ChulR), *upqan* ‘liven’, *silnyj dožd*’ (Tof); **Y** tr. *uop-*, *uoba-* ‘brat’ v rot (*ili deržat’ vo rtu*) čto-libo tverdoe ili gustoe – stol’ko, skol’ko možet udobno pomestit’sja; *vkładyvat’ sebe v rot kusok, klast’ (brat’) sebe v rot pomnogu (piščī)*, *žrat’, lopat’, požirat’, pogloščat’; hapnut’ (o vzjatke)*’ (Yak), *uobu, öbu* ‘Bissen, Happen’ (Dlg).

Back vocalic nominal stem:

OT –; **MT** –; **NT Chuv** –; **K** – (Tat), – (Bashk), *op* ‘vdyhanie, vtjagivanie dyhaniem v sebja’ (Kirg), – (Kaz), – (KKlp), – (Nog), *op* ‘laska’ (CrTat), – (Kar), *upay* det. =

öbüw ‘imja dejstvija’ of *öpme* ‘celovat’ (Kum), – (Krch-Blk); *O xopuk-* ‘zadyhat’sja; pugat’sja, strašit’sja, ispityvat’ strah, bojazn’ (Tkm), – (Az), – (Tt); *Kh* –; *T* – (Uzb), *upli-* ‘vzdyhat’, ohat’ (MUyg), – (Sal), – (YUyg); *S* – (Alt), – (Khak), *xoptak* ‘žadnyj, alčnyj, prožorlivyj’ (Tuv); *Y uop* ‘kusok, vkladyvaemyj v rot za odin raz, ževok’ (Yak), *uopča* ‘Bissen, Happen.’ (Dlg).

Front vocalic verbal stem:

OT *öp-* ‘to drink, kiss (the ground)’ (AQB), *öp-* ‘to sip’: *mün öpdi* ‘he sipped (hasā) the soup (or other)’ (AK); *öp-* ‘to kiss’: *ol māni öpdi* ‘he kissed (qabbala) me’ (AK); **MT** – (U), – (ABF), *öp-* ‘to kiss’ (AGul), *öp-* ‘öpme’ (AHMA), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (AHŠF, ANF), ? (AIM), *öpüş* ‘buse, öpme’ (AIMI), *öp* ‘kiss!’ (AKD), – (AKor), ? (AN), – (AMGh), – (ARbg), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (ATefs), – (AYC); *öp-* ‘embrasser’ (AChag), – (AChagB), *öpti* ‘pocelovat’ (AChagMA 263); *öp-* ‘küssen’ (LCC,-G), *öp-* id. (AHou, imp. *öpgil*), *öp-* ‘baiser, embrasser’ (ADurK), *öp-* ‘küssen’ (AHou), *öp-* ‘küssen’ (AKav), – (AMGh), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (ATuh); *öpmejik* ‘öpücük’ (OTtT); **NT** *Chuv* –; **K** *üp-* ‘celovat’ (Tat), *üp-* ‘celovat’ (Bashk), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (Kirg), *öp-* ‘id.’ (RKaz), *öp-* ‘celovat’, *rascelovat’* (Kklp), *öp-* ‘celovat’, *rascelovat’* (Nog); *öp-* ‘celovat’, *rascelovat’* (CrTat); *öp-* ‘celovat’ (KarT), *ép-* ‘celovat’ (KarH), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (Kum), – (Krch-Blk); **O** *öp-* ‘celovat’ (Tkm), *öp-* ‘celovat’, *pocelovat’* (Az), *öp-* ‘to kiss’, *höpürdet-* ‘to sip noisily’, (Tt), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (Gag); **Kh** *ep-* ‘küssen’ (Kh); **T** *öp-* ‘celovat’ (UzbDSev), *öp-* ‘celovat’ (TurkiL), *öp-* ‘celovat’, *ljubzat’* (MUyg); – (Sal), – (YUyg); **S** –; **Y** –.

Front vocalic nominal stem:

K *öpte-* ‘to kiss’ (Kaz).

Mongolian: *ugu-* ‘to drink, to eat liquid food, to absorb liquids’.

The Turkic word family is of onomatopoeic origin. It described the noise of sipping, sucking. The fact that in some T languages we find an initial *h-* may be due to the onomatopoeic character of the word and is not necessarily the reflex of an old **p-*. In the later languages a semantic differentiation occurred. The front vocalic forms were associated with a lighter noise with a higher pitch and hence the semantic connection with ‘kiss’, while the back vocalic forms with a somewhat more noisy action ‘swallow, sip’ expressed at a lower pitch. The OT data show that the differentiation occurred relatively late and it is not complete in some languages. From the meaning ‘to swallow’ developed the meaning ‘glutton’ and ‘evil demons who suck as vampires’. The late and not total differentiation of the front and back vocalic words is also evident from the fact that the T word for ‘lungs’ *öpke* surely pertains here. In some languages the semantic connection was lost and derivations as Middle Kipchak *obur* or Chuvash *vupār*, *vupkân* (the latter a Tatar loan word) can denote other evil demons as well. The connection of T *obur* with such Slav words as Russian *upyr*, Bulgarian *upir*, Czech and Slovak *upir*, Polish *upiór* and perhaps German *Vampir* is

debated (see Vasmer 1953–1958). The T word also denotes the action of imbibing water into the soil. Derivates denote places which sip the water as ravines, etc. It is interesting that we find the nominal base *op/öp* and the verbal base *op-/öp-* without any morphological differentiation. In some sources it is impossible to differentiate the readings *op/öp*.

The original form of the H word was with short *a-* and it denoted ‘to kiss’, then through the meaning ‘to caress’ developed the present meaning ‘to care of, to nurse’.

The H word was connected with the Turkic already in the middle of the 19th century. The comparison was also mentioned by Vámbéry (1870, p. 121) and the otherwise severe critique of Budenz dealt with it as a possible comparison (1871, p. 77). The comparison was refused later by Gombocz (1912, pp. 211–212) because of “lautliche schwierigkeiten”. This was surely based on the fact that Gombocz could not see a possibility of T *o* → H *o* > *a*. However he himself pointed to such words as H **apró** in which before the second long *ó* the original *o* became *a* (Gombocz 1912, p. 147). From the phonetic point of view it is important that the H /*a*/ is a labial vowel and therefore a foreign /*o*/ could also be replaced by a H /*a*/. The chronology of the labiality of H /*a*/ is debated, but it was surely present in Old Hungarian. According to Benkő (1967, p. 165) the word is of unknown origin, its connecting with T is “erroneous”. Palló pledged for the T origin and under the influence of her arguments Benkő (1993, p. 41) slightly changed the opinion to “Herleitung aus dem Atürk ist kaum warsch[einlich]” and claimed that the word is a derivate from a fictive stem of unknown origin. Horpácsi suggested that the stem of the H word had to be an onomatopoeic one, and Berta has demonstrated that the T words have to be traced back to an onomatopoeic base. This leaves us with two onomatopoeic bases. On the T side we have *op/öp(-)* and on the H side *ap* (< *op*). There is a H denominal verbformative suffix *-l* and a deverbal one, the latter has a frequentative function, it was earlier very productive, but now it is obsolete. Thus the base of the H word *apol* (> *ápol*) can be either a verbal or a nominal stem.

The T origin of the H word cannot be proved. We cannot exclude that onomatopoeics might be copied, but since these words have the motivation in imitating real sounds it always remains a possibility that the same or very similar onomatopoeic words appear independently in different languages.

* Vámbéry (1870, p. 121); Budenz (1871, p. 77); Munkácsi (1902, p. 274); Gombocz (1909, p. 24); Kora (1913, pp. 281–282); Benkő (1967, p. 165); Gombocz–Melich (1914–1930, pp. 111–113); Clauson (1972, p. 4b); Sevortjan (1974, pp. 464–465 [*op-*], pp. 539–542 [*öp-*]); Palló (1982, p. 19–21); Kakuk (1985, pp. 267–269); Horpácsi (1993, pp. 340–341); Benkő (1993, p. 41); Berta (2001, pp. 395–408).

- **béka** ‘frog’. 1295 PN *Bekafolo*, 1308 GN *Bykató*, ca. 1395 *beka* ← **baka* < *bāka* +*gA* | OT *baqa* ‘frog’.

OT *baqa* ‘frog’ (U II, 35,21, AK); MT – (U), – (ABF), *bağa* ‘frog’ (AGul), – – (AHMA), *baqa* (AHŠF), – – (AIM), – (AIMI), – (AKD), *baqa* ‘frog’ (AKor), – –

(AM), *bağa* 'ljaguška' (ANehF), – (ARbg), – (ATefs, AYC); *baqa*, *baqačanaq* 'tortue, grenouille' (AChag), – (AChagB), *baqa čanak* 'tortoise' (AChagSC); *baga* 'rana' (LCCI), ? (AAH), *baka* 'kurbağa' (AAHI), *qabırçaqlı bağa* 'tortue' (ABul), *boğa* 'tortue' (ADur), *boğa* 'Frosch, kröte' (AHou), – (AKav), *bağa* 'frog' (AMGh), *bağa* 'ljaguška, morskaja čerepaha' (ATuh); *bağa*, *baha* 'grenouille' (AmT), *bağa* 'kaplumbağa, kaplumbağanın kabuğu' (AOttTS), NT **Chuv** –; **K** *baka* 'ljaguška; (fig) zapor, derevjannyj zasov (dveri) basovaja klaviša; balansir (pripodoblenie na mel'nice)' (Tat), *baqa* 'ljaguška, ulitka' (Bashk), *mağa*, *maqa*, *bağa*, *pağa* 'ljaguška' (SibT), *baka* 'ljaguška; (fig.) suhoparyj čelovek; čelovek (hudoj) kak palka' (Kirg), *bağa* 'ljaguška' (Kar, H, T), *baqa* 'id.' (Kar. K), *baqa* 'frog' (Kaz), *baqa* 'ljaguška' (Kklp), *baka* 'ljaguška' (Nog), *baqa* 'ljaguška; ljagušačij' (Crmtat), *baqa* 'ljaguška' (Kum), *maqa* 'ljaguška, ljagušačij' (Krch), *baqa* 'Frosch', *maq'a* 'Frosch, Kropf' (KrchP); **O** *gurbāga* 'ljaguška' (Tkm), *baqa* 'id.' (TkmD.), *bağa* 'ob"edinjajušče po-njatje: ljaguški i čerepahi' (Az), *bağa* 'tortoise shell', *kurbağa* 'frog' (Tt), (*gur*)*bağa*, *baqqa*, *bağa*, *bağə*, *baqa*, *baği*, *bağga*, *baqqa*, *bağga*, *bağgä*, *bağga*, *bağa* 'Frosch' (Khor), *baqa* 'Frosch' (SOgh); **Kh** *bāqa* 'Schildkröte' (KhalD); **T** *baqa* 'ljaguška' (Uzb), *paqa* 'frog' (TurkiJ), *baqa*, *paqa* 'a frog' (TurkiSh), *paqa* 'ljaguška' (HUyg), *pağa*, *paga*, *paqa* 'ljaguška' (Sal), *pağa*, *pağa* 'grenouille' (SalK), *paqa* 'ljaguška' (YUyg), *pağa*, *paqa* 'ljaguška' (YUygM), *paqa* 'muskuly ruki (vyše loktja)', (YUygM); **S** *paga*, *paqa* 'ljaguška' (AltB), *baka*, *paga* 'ljaguška' (AltBQK), *paga*, *paga-pagalčax* 'ljaguška' (Hak), *mağa* 'ljaguška' (CChulR), *paga* 'ljaguška' (Tuv), *bağa* 'ljaguška' (Tof); **Y** *bağa* 'ljaguška' (RY), *bağa* 'Frosch' (DlgS).

Mo. *baqa* 'frog, toad' (L).

The T word is a deverbal noun from the onomatopoeic word *bāk-* with a simplification of the consonant cluster (**bak-ga* > **bakka* > *baka*). Chuvash *šapa* 'frog' is a Russian loan word (← *žaba*).

The H GN *Begas tow* 'frog lake' recorded from 1315 does not pertain here, but points to Kipchak (Cuman) origin. The H historical data (as *Byka*, see above) show that we have to suppose in the original T language an illabial *a* in the first syllable which was substituted by H *e*, see **disznó**, **gyertya** and not a H dissimilation.

* Vámbéry (1870, pp. 130, 1914, p. 139), Budenz, (1871, p. 77), Gombocz (1912, p. 42), Németh (1935–1939, p. 528), Räsänen (1937, p. 252), Benkő (1967, pp. 269–270), Doerfer (1967, p. 438), Clauson (1972, p. 311), Sevortjan (1978, p. 40), Benkő (1993, p. 91), Emmerick–Róna-Tas (1992, p. 229), Fedotov (1996, p. 435), Berta (2000a, p. 57–69).

Wörterverzeichnis.

1. **ács** [in den älteren sprachdenkmälern bis zur ende des 15. jh. fast ausschliesslich **ács**, geschrieben **alcz**, **alch**, **álts**, s. NySz., OkISz.; **ács** kom. Gömör, MTsz.] 'zimmermann; handwerker'.

< alttschuw. ***ayaččy**, vgl. tar. RADL. **jayašči** 'der holzarbeiter, zimmermann' zu **jyač** 'baum, holz' = tel. alt. leb. kking. kas. osm. krim. kar. T. RADL. **ayač** | koib. KATAN. **ayas**, **ayyš** | baschk. KATAR. **ayas** | karg. CASTR. **úaiš** | schor. king. RADL. **ayaš** | tölös RADL. **aḡaš** | uig. RADL. **jyač** | tschuw. PAAS. *jövös*, *jvös* id.

Zusammengestellt von VÁMBÉRY, Magy. Ered. s. 300; vgl. noch MUNKÁCSI, NyK XXXII, 271. Anders wird das ungarische wort verbunden von FÁBIÁN, NyK II, 2.

2. **apol** 'küssen' < ***op-**, vgl. uig. kom. osm. dsch. RADL. **öp-** | kas. Bál. **üb-** 'küssen'. Vgl. VÁMBÉRY, NyK VIII, 127, BUDENZ, NyK X, 77, MUNKÁCSI, NyK XXXII, 274, 277.

Apol 'küssen' kann von **ápol** 'pflegen', 'warten (jmden)' nicht getrennt werden: in der älteren sprache waren beide formen in beiderlei bedeutungen gebräuchlich, und die bedeutungsdifferenzierung ist erst später vor sich gegangen. Wegen lautlicher schwierigkeiten abzulehnen.

16. **béka** [**beka** JordC. 20, 21, 941 (o: *bekâ*); **béka** kom Sopron, Vas, MTsz., **biéka** kom. Veszprém, NyelvFüz. XXXIV, 76; dagegen: **bika** kom. Komárom, Nyitra, Nagy-Kúnság, MTsz.] 'frosch'.

< alttschuw. ***byka**, vgl. osm. ZENK. kom. CCum. **baga** 'nom général des animaux batraciens', 'rana' | dsch. KÜN. kas. BÁL. baschk. KATAR. **baka** 'frosch' | koib. KATAN. **paya** | alt. VERB. **paga**, **pagan** | jak. BÖHTL. **baya** | burj. CASTR. **baka**, **baḡa** | mandschu. ZACH. **vakšan**, **vaksan** (= **vak-šan**?) id. Zu mong. **b-** = ma. **v-** vgl. mong. **barayun** 'droit, côté méridional ou occidental' = ma. **wargi** 'unterhalb, westlich, westen'. S. SCHMIDT, Journal of Peking Or. Soc. IV, 44–5.

Source: Gombocz, Z. (1912): *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*. Helsingfors.

Bibliography

- A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. See Benkő (1967, 1970, 1976, 1984).*
- Alder, L.–Dalby, R. (1979): *The Dervish of Windsor Castle. The Life of Arminius Vambery*. London.
- Ashmarin, (1902): *Bolgary i Čuvaši. Kazan'*. (See now the reprint Cheboksary 2000.)
- Bárczi G. (1941): *Magyar szófejtő szótár*. Budapest.
- Bárczi G. (1952): Török jövevényszavaink legrégebbi rétegének kérdéseiről. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 2, pp. 347–359.
- Bárczi G. (1958): *A magyar szókincs eredete*. ²Budapest.
- Bárczi, G. (1965): A propos des vieux mots d'emprunt turcs du proto-hongrois. *AOH* Vol. 18, pp. 47–54.
- Bárczi, G. (1971): Le traitements de š et de ž turcs dans les mots d'emprunt turc du proto-hongrois. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Studia Turcica*. Budapest, pp. 39–46.
- Bárczi, G. (1972): Quelques conclusions tirées de l'étude des plus anciens mots d'emprunt turc du hongrois. *AOH* Vol. 25, pp. 383–390.
- Benkő L. (1967) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1970) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 2. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1976) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 3. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1984) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. Mutató*. Vol. 4. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1993) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1995) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Vol. 2. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1997) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen. Register*. Vol. 3. Budapest.
- Berta, Á. (1998): On the Turcic Origin of the Names of the Hungarian Tribes. *Turkic Languages* Vol. 2, pp. 32–48.
- Berta Á. (2000a): Béka és boka. In: Piti F.–Szabados Gy. (eds): *Magyaroknak eleiről. Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendősk Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*. Szeged, pp. 57–69.
- Berta Á. (2000b): A magyar nyelv korai török jövevényszavainak törökségi hátteréhez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 97, pp. 183–195.
- Berta, Á. (2001): Álmos and táltos. *Shaman* Vol. 9, pp. 99–117.
- Beševliev, V. (1963): *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Beševliev, V. (1979): *Párvo-bálgarski nadpisi*. Sofija.
- Budenz J. (1871): Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar–török szóegyezéseiről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 10, pp. 67–135.
- Clauser, M. (1935): Fogel Márton könyvtárának jegyzéke. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 49, pp. 405–407.
- Clauson, G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Coco, C. (1986): Vámbéry Ármin műveinek bibliográfiája. In: *Vámbéry Ármin emlékezete*. pp. 26–50. Budapest.
- Doerfer, G. (1965): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd. 2. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer, G. (1967): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Bd. 3. Wiesbaden.
- Dybo, V. I. (2000): see Levitskaja–Dybo–Rassadin (2000).
- Emmerick, R. E.–Róna-Tas, A. (1992): The Turkish–Khotanese Wordlist Revisited. *Central Asiatic Journal* Vol. 36, pp. 199–241.
- Erdal, M. (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation*. Vol. 1–2. Wiesbaden.
- Erdal, M. (1993): *Die Sprache der wolgabulgarischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden.
- Eren, H. (1999): *Türk dilinin etimolojik sözlüğü*. ²Ankara.
- Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov. See Severtjan (1974, 1978, 1980); Severtjan – Levitskaja (1989); Levitskaja – Dybo – Rassadin (2000).*

- Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. See Benkő (1993, 1995, 1997).
- Fedotov, M. R. (1996): *Étimológičeskij slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka*. Vol. 1–2. Čeboksary.
- Fischer, J. E. (1770): De origine Ungrorum. In: *Questiones Petropolitanae*. pp. 3–40. Gottingae–Gothae.
- Fodor, S. (1973) see Róna-Tas – Fodor (1973).
- Fogarasi J. (1862) see Czuczor – Fogarasi (1862).
- Futaky, I. (1968): Budenz und Benfey. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* Vol. 40, pp. 1–2.
- Golden, P. B. (1980): *Khazar Studies. An Historico-philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. Vol. 1–2. Budapest.
- Gombocz Z. (1906): Csúvas szójegyzék. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 36, pp. 1–23, 141–164.
- Gombocz Z. (1907a): Régi török jövevényszavaink. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 3, pp. 17–29, 62–72, 105–116, 153–165, 213–224, 250–263, 307–318, 357–370, 395–406.
- Gombocz Z. (1907b): Thúry József „Magyar-török összehasonlító szótára”. *Akadémiai Értesítő* Vol. 18, pp. 508–515.
- Gombocz Z. (1908): *Honfoglaláselőtti török jövevényszavaink*. Budapest.
- Gombocz Z. (1909): Régi török jövevényszavaink. *Magyar Nyelv*. Vol. 3, pp. 17–29.
- Gombocz, Z. (1912): *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*. Helsingfors.
- Gombocz, Z. (1912–1913): Zur Lautgeschichte der altäischen Sprachen. *Keleti Szemle* Vol. 13, pp. 1–37.
- Gombocz Z. (1914): Török jövevényszavaink hangtanához. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 10.
- Gombocz Z. (1914–1915): Árpád-kori török személynéveink. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 10, pp. 241–149, 293–301, 337–342, Vol. 11, 145–152, 245–252, 341–346, 433–439.
- Gombocz, Z. (1924): Das tschuwassische Praesens-futurum, *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum* Vol. 1, pp. 262–266.
- Gombocz Z. (1938): *Összegyűjtött művei*. Vol. 1. [Ed. Zsirai, M.] Budapest.
- Gombocz Z. (1940): *Összegyűjtött művei*. Vol. 2. [Eds Lazicius, Gy.–Pais, D.] Budapest.
- Gombocz Z. (1960): *Honfoglalás előtti bolgár-török jövevényszavaink*. Budapest. [After his 1930 lectures edited by L. Ligeti.]
- Gombocz Z.–Melich J. (1914–1930): *Magyar etymologiai szótár*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Gombocz Z.–Melich J. (1934–1944): *Magyar etymologiai szótár*. Vol. 2. Budapest.
- Gulya, J. (1967): A magyar nyelv első etimológiai szótára. *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* Vol. 58, pp. 87–90.
- Gulya, J. (1984): J. E. Fischer (1697–1771) und die uralistische Etymologieforschung. *Linguistica et Philologica. Gedenkschrift für Björn Collinder (1894–1983)*. Wien, pp. 183–189 (Philologica 6).
- Gulya, J. (1994): Zur Frühgeschichte der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft: J. E. Fischer (1747) und S. Gyarmathi (1799). In: *Bopp-Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Akten der Konferenz*. [Hrsg. R. Sternemann]. Heidelberg, pp. 91–104.
- Gulya, J. (1995) [Hrsg]: *Johann Eberhard Fischer Vocabularium Sibiricum (1747). Der etymologische-vergleichende Anteil*. Frankfurt a. M.
- Gyarmathi, S. (1799): *Affinitas linguae Hungaricae cum linguis Fennicae origins grammaticae demonstrata*. Gottingae.
- Gyarmathi, S. (1983): *Grammatical Proof of the Affinity of the Hungarian Language with Languages of Fennic Origin*. [Transl., annot., introd. Hanzeli, V. E.] Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- Hakimzjanov, F. S. (1978): *Jazyk épitařij volžskih bulgar*. Moskva.
- Halasi Kun, T. (1950): Orta kipçakça q-, k- ~ 0 meselesi. *Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar* Vol. 1, pp. 45–61.

- Halasi Kun, T. (1975): Kipchak Philology and the Turkic Loan Words in Hungarian I. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* Vol 1, pp. 155–210.
- Harmatta J. (1960): Munkácsi Bernát mint a finn-ugor–iráni kapcsolatok kutatója. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 16, pp. 392–397.
- Hazai Gy. (1976): *Vámbéry Ármin*. Budapest.
- Horpácsi I. (1993): Ápol és megbékél. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 89, pp. 340–342.
- Horvát I. (1933): Magyar szovakhoz hasonlító török szovak. *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* Vol. 17, No. 6, pp. 51–65, No. 7, pp. 11–39.
- Hunfalvy, P. (1877): *Ethnographie von Ungarn*. Budapest.
- Kakuk, S. (1971) [Kakuk Zs.]: Cent ans d'enseignement de philologie turque à l'Université de Budapest. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Studia Turcica*. Budapest, pp. 7–28.
- Kakuk, S. (1973) [Kakuk Zs.]: *Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue osmanlie des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles. Les éléments osmanlis de la langue hongroise*. Budapest.
- Kakuk Zs. (1985): K. Palló Margit: Régi török eredetű igéink. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 87, pp. 267–269.
- Kálmán B. (1960): Munkácsi Bernát emlékezete. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 16, pp. 381–391.
- Kangro, H. (1969): Martin Fogel aus Hamburg als Gelehrter des 17. Jahrhunderts. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* Vol. 41, 14–31.
- Kniezsa I. (1955): *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényszavai*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Kora F. (1913): Apol. *Magyar Nyelvőr* Vol. 42, pp. 281–282.
- Krueger, J. R. (1975): Preface to the Re-printing. In: Strahlenberg, Ph. J. von, *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia*. Szeged, pp. 1–11.
- Lakó, Gy. (1969): Martinus Fogelius' Verdienste bei der Entdeckung der finnougri-schen Sprachverwandtschaft. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* Vol. 41, pp. 3–13.
- Lakó, Gy. (1974): József Budenz und die zeitgenössische vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft. *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio linguistica* Vol. 5, pp. 13–42.
- Lakó Gy. (1980): *Budenz József*. Budapest.
- Lakó Gy. (1986): *Szinnyei József*. Budapest.
- Levitskaja, L. S. (1989) *see* Sevortjan – Levitskaja (1989).
- Levitskaja, L. S.–Dybo, V. I.–Rassadin, V. I. (2000): *Étimológičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 5. Moskva.
- Ligeti L. (1924): Desko Endre csuvas-magyar nyelvhasonlítása. *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum* Vol. 1, pp. 319–320.
- Ligeti L. (1926): Álmos. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 33, pp. 80–82.
- Ligeti L. (1965): Bilincsek, bilincs. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 61, pp. 281–289.
- Ligeti, L. (1966): Nom turcs pour « fers; bracelet; bague » dans le langues slaves et dans le hongrois. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* Vol. 12, pp. 249–258.
- Ligeti, L. (1975): Quelques problèmes étymologiques des anciens mots d'emprunt turcs de la langue hongroise. *AOH* Vol. 29, pp. 279–288.
- Ligeti L. (1977): *Börtü* és világosan török eredetű szavaink. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 73, pp. 146–154.
- Ligeti L. (1978): Régi török eredetű neveink I. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 74, pp. 257–274.
- Ligeti L. (1979): *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van*. Vols 1–2. Budapest.
- Ligeti L. (1986): *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*. Budapest.
- Melich J. (1914–1930) *see* Gombocz – Melich (1914–1930).
- Melich J. (1934–1944) *see* Gombocz – Melich (1934–1944).

- Mátyás Flórián (1868–1871): *Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár-kísérlet*. Pest–Pécs.
- Munkácsi, B. (1901): Hunnische Sprachdenkmäler im Ungarischen. *Keleti Szemle* Vol. 2, pp. 186–198.
- Munkácsi B. (1902): Adalékok a magyar nyelv régi török és mongol elemeihez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 32, pp. 271–302, 369–398.
- Németh Gy. (1921): Török jövevényszavaink középső rétege. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 17, pp. 22–26.
- Németh Gy. (1930): *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*. Budapest.
- Németh, J. (1935–1939) [Németh Gy.]: Zur Kenntnis des geschlossenen *e* im Türkischen. In: *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum I. Ergänzungsband*. pp. 19–39, 515–531. Budapest–Leipzig.
- Németh, J. (1952) [Németh Gy.]: Die türkischen Texte des Valentin Balassa. *AOH* Vol. 2, pp. 23–61.
- Németh, J. (1955) [Németh Gy.]: Türkische Balassa-Texte in Karagöz-Spielen. *AOH* Vol. 5, pp. 175–128.
- Németh, J. (1960) [Németh Gy.], The Bibliography of the Works of — (ed. G. Uray). *AOH* Vol. 11, pp. 11–28.
- Németh, J. (1965) [Németh Gy.]: Das Zimmerhandwerk der Turko-Bulgaren im Spiegel der alttürkischen Lehnwörter der ungarischen Sprache. *AOH* Vol. 18, pp. 55–60.
- Németh, J. (1972) [Németh Gy.]: Zoltán Gombocz. Ein ungarischer Sprachforscher (1877–1935). *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* Vol. 22, pp. 1–40.
- Németh Gy. (1990): *Törökök és magyarok*. Vol. 1–2. Budapest. [Reprint edition of papers written in Hungarian.]
- Németh Gy (1991): *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*. ²Budapest. [Revised and enlarged version, ed. Berta, Á.]
- Oláh É. (1967): Munkácsi Bernát munkássága. Bibliográfia. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 24, pp. 397–413.
- Paasonen, H. (1913): A magyar nyelv régi török jövevényszavai. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 42, pp. 37–68.
- Palló M. (1960): Munkácsi Bernát jelentősége a magyar turkológiában. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 16, pp. 397–402.
- Palló M. (1982): *Régi török eredetű igéink*. Szeged.
- Pavet de Courteille (1870): *Dictionnaire turk-oriental*. Paris.
- Pelliot, P. (1944): Les formes avec et sans *q-* (*k-*) initial en turc et en mongol. *T'oung Pao* Vol. 37, pp. 35–72.
- Pritsak, O. (1977): *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren*. Wiesbaden.
- Pusztay J. (1977): *Az „ugor-török” háború után. Fejezetek a magyar nyelvhasználat történetéből*. Budapest.
- Radloff, W. (1893–1911): *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. Sanktpeterburg.
- Räsänen, M. (1937): Über die langen Vokale der türkischen Lehnwörter in ungarischen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 24. pp. 246–255.
- Räsänen, M. (1949): Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen. *Studia Orientalia* Vol. 15, p. 153.
- Räsänen, M. (1969–1971): *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuches der Türksprachen*. Helsinki.
- Rassadin, V. I. (2000) *see* Levitskaja – Dybo – Rassadin (2000).
- Róna-Tas A. (1970): *Az altaji nyelvrokonság vizsgálatának alapjai. A nyelvrokonság elmélete és a csuvas-mongol nyelvviszony*. Budapest. [Manuscript.]
- Róna-Tas, A. (1978): Julius Németh. Life and Work. *AOH* Vol. 32, pp. 261–284.
- Róna-Tas A. (1982a): A kazár népnévről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 84, pp. 349–380.

- Róna-Tas, A. (1982b): The Periodization and Sources of the Chuvash Linguistic History. In: Róna-Tas, A. (ed.): *Chuvash Studies*. Budapest–Wiesbaden, pp. 113–169.
- Róna-Tas A. (1983): Újabb adatok a kazár néprév történetéhez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 85, pp. 126–133.
- Róna-Tas A. (1987/1988): Ligeti Lajos és a magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 89, pp. 211–219.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1988a): Turkic Influence on the Uralic Languages. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden, pp. 742–780.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1988b): Problems of the East European Scripts with Special Regard to the Newly Found Inscription of Szarvas. In: *Popolo delle Steppe: Unni, Avari, Ungari, Spoleto 23–29 aprile 1987*. Spoleto, pp. 483–511.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1992) *see* Emmerick – Róna-Tas (1992).
- Róna-Tas, A. (1996): Ugor, Ogur or Ugur? Remarks on the Name “Finno-Ugrian”. In: Mészáros, E. (ed.): *Ünnepi könyv Mikola Tibor tiszteletére*. Szeged, pp. 265–269.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1998): Western Old Turkic. In: Johanson, L. (ed.): *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3–6, 1944*. Wiesbaden, pp. 619–626.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1999): *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*. Budapest–New York.
- Róna-Tas, A. (2000): Where was Khuvrat’s Bulgharia? *AOH* Vol. 53, pp. 1–22.
- Róna-Tas A. – Fodor, S. (1973): *Epigraphica Bulgarica. A volgai bolgár-török feliratok*. Szeged.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1974): *Étimológičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 1. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1978): *Étimológičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 2. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1980): *Étimológičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 3. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. – Levitskaja, L. S. (1989): *Étimológičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 4. Moskva.
- Stachovskij, M. (1995): Jakutisch und dolganisch *mas* ‘Baum’. *Central Asiatic Journal* Vol. 39, pp. 270–274.
- Szilágyi F. (1987): *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor élete nyomában*. Budapest.
- Szinnyei J. (1883): *A magyar nyelv eredete. Észrevételek Vámbéry Ármín „A magyarok eredete” c. művének nyelvészeti részére*. Budapest.
- Szinnyei, J. (1920): *Die Herkunft der Ungaren, ihre Sprache und Urkultur*. Berlin–Leipzig. [Second edition 1923].
- Tekin, T. (1988): *Volga bulgar kitabeleri ve Volga Bulgarcasti*. Ankara.
- Togan, G. (1968): Zur Frage nach der Herkunft und Sprache der Rumänen bei Laurentius Toppeltinus. *Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde* Vol. 11, pp. 55–58.
- Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. *See* Doerfer (1965; 1967).
- Vámbéry, Á. (1867): *Čagataische Sprachstudien. Enthaltend grammatikalischen Umriss, Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch der čagataischen Sprache*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1870): Magyar és török–tatár szóegyezések. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 8, pp. 109–189.
- Vámbéry, Á. (1878): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der turko-tatarischen Sprachen. Ein Versuch zur Darstellung des Familienverhältnisses des turko-tatarischen Wortschatzes*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1882a): *A magyarok eredete. Ethnologiai tanulmány*. Budapest.
- Vámbéry, H. (1882b) [Vámbéry Á.]: *Der Ursprung der Magyaren. Eine ethnologische Studie*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1914): *A magyarság bölcsőjénél. A magyar–török rokonság kezdete és fejlődése*. Budapest.
- Zsirai M. (1935): Gombocz Zoltán irodalmi munkássága. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 49, pp. 17–23.