

ALTAIC AND INDO-EUROPEAN

MARGINAL REMARKS ON THE BOOK OF GAMKRELIDZE AND IVANOV

Good comprehensive studies enable new steps forward in scholarship. This is especially the case with the excellent work of T. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoeuropejcy* I—II. (Tibilisi 1984). The authors reinterpreted the earlier results of IE studies and gave a clear cut and in many details a new outline of the reconstruction of the IE protolanguage, its phonology, morphology and syntactical features. They deal with the original lexical stock, offer a hypothesis for the original homeland of the Indoeuropeans and sketch the earliest migrations of the peoples speaking the early IE dialects. In their research they use up-to-date methods of linguistic analysis with the claim that the IE protolanguage was a spoken language, which has to be analyzed with the same methods as any other language. As to the phonology they reinterpreted the IE system of stops assuming that the trinary system consisted of a glottalized voiceless, a voiced aspirated and a voiceless aspirated series (K' : Gh : Kh) where for the phonological opposition of the series II and III the voicing was relevant, but for the history of the consonants their aspirated quality was of importance as well. The three types of gutturals of the earlier reconstructions are preserved: "normal", palatalized and labialized, open remained the question of labialized dentals and the postvelars. They postulate three sibilants, a non palatalized, a palatalized and a labialized one, where the last one was also palatalized.

The scheme of the primitive areal distribution of the IE dialects is the following (p. 398):

Germano—Balto—Slavic	Aryan—Greco—Armenian	
Anatolian	Tokharian	Italo—Celts—Illyrian

The isoglosses are important which can be identified in the common area and the gradual dissolution of this common area. The homeland of the IE speaking people is localized to the North of the classical Mesopotamia, where very early contacts were possible with Proto-Semitic, Proto-Kartwelian and with such languages of the Near East as Hatti, Elamian, and Hurritan

etc. The gradual dissolution of the Proto IE language begun at the end of the 5th, about the beginning of the 4th millennia.

The Germano—Balto—Slavic, the Italo—Celts—Illyrian and Tokharian have some common isoglosses, and the first two groups in contrast to Tokharian are also called Old European. This is the point where according to the authors, possible contacts occurred with the Finno-Ugrian and the Altaic languages. They suppose that the “Old Europeans” and the Tokharians migrated together to Central Asia then the Old Europeans, somewhere around the Aral sea turned back to the West, while the Tokharians moved further to the East. The “Old Europeans” arrived at the North of the Black Sea and the Lower Volga region, which the authors consider as the last common homeland for the “Old Europeans” before their separation. Here they met with a branch of the Aryan group which earlier crossed the Caucasian range from the South and moved towards the North. I would not go here into the discussion of the reinterpretation of the Finno-Ugric and IE contacts. I see advantages in separating, if possible, “Old European”, Tokharian and Indo-Iranian, and then later Iranian contacts. The authors mainly rely on Joki (1973), but also here they reinterpret some aspects and are critical of others. I would only mention that what they call “the commonly accepted chronology in Finno-Ugric historical studies” is basically dependant on the IE loanwords and the IE chronology, so it cannot help in reinterpreting IE chronology itself. My concern is the possible early contacts with the Altaic languages.

The possible early contacts with IE have long interested those scholars who investigated the Altaic languages. We can put aside the early research period when Uralic and Altaic languages were thought to be of the same genetic stock and we can for the time being put aside the Iranian contacts of the several Altaic languages. This can be done, since this was also the correct approach of G & I. For what does concern the possible Altaic connections of IE, in fact of Tokharian and Old European, the authors mainly rely on Ramstedt (1946—47) and do not seem to have access to Németh (1942—47) where Németh also gave a short overview of earlier studies.¹ In principle the authors distinguish loanwords from migrating cultural words, but this is not always consistently done. This inconsistency is in some cases inevitable and it can be admitted as far as it does not influence the main conclusions.

In the following I shall discuss the Altaic comparisons made by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov.

¹ Németh first published his paper in two parts in Hungarian (1928) and (1934) resp., and then a revised version in German. Unfortunately the German version is almost inaccessible, since most of the already printed volumes were destroyed in World War II. Németh also gave a short but comprehensive overview on earlier studies mainly stressing the merits of Munkácsi (see Munkácsi 1894, 1900, 1905, 1906a, b) and mentioning the negative critics of Gombocz 1906.

Manchu-Tunguzian words

There are only four words, which are mentioned at all. One of them has to be excluded. Manchu *xalmari* (cited as *xal-mari*) is compared with Uralic *kur3* "knife" and Lit. *kirvis*, Gothic *hairus*, Old Icelandic *hjorr* and is considered to be an old migrating word (932—33). The idea comes, as in most cases, from Ramstedt and is quoted by Joki (1973). The Manchu word has the meaning in Hauer (1952): "bei Geisterbeschwörungen in der Hand gehaltenes schwertartiges Zaubermesser der Schamanen" seemingly a good semantic field for comparison. The first problem is, however, with the structure of the word. The Manchu words with final *-ri* are special derivations cf. *xalhūri* "pepper" from *xalxūn* "hot" (cf. Mong. *qalayun* "hot"), *xoošari* "paper, adj." from *xoošan* "paper, noun (Chin)", etc. Thus the basic word is *xalman* or *xalmin*. And in fact Cincius (1975. I, 365) gives the correct etymology *xalmari* "nož ploskij (u šamana)" from MT **kalbin* "flat", Manchu *xalfiyan* "id.". The Manchu-Tunguzian word has Mongolian parallels quoted by Cincius *loc. cit.* and in Buriat we find the same *-ib- ~ -im-*: *xal'mi-* "to be flat and thin".

The remaining three are loanwords from Mongolian, Mo. *ge'ün* "mare", *morin* "horse" and *hūker* "bovine animal". In some respect the MT forms are of interest in all the three cases. In the case of *ge'ün* it is clear that the word has been borrowed in a relatively recent time and separately in the MT languages and dialects: Evenki *gēγ*, EvenkiDial *gōγ* (Brg), *gōn* (Tit), *geyen*(VI), *gēk*(K) "kobyła", *goyo* "samka dikogo olenja" (S—B), Solon: *gēγ* "kobyła", Manchu *geo* "kobyła, korova, samka", *geo murin* "kobyła", spoken Manchu *geu*, *geo* (Kałużyński 1977, 179), Juchen *ge murin*. (The Juchen word is transcribed with the Chinese word *ke* (Mathews' 3397 *k'o*) which has the same meaning and seems to be a loanword in Chinese, the phonetical element of the hieroglyph had in Ancient Chinese an initial cluster *klw-*.) The Mongolian word is recorded in the Secret History in forms as *ge'ü*, *ge'ün* and has the regular plural *ge'üd*. The plural *-d* replaces the *-n* final of the singular (cf. *Qitan* pl. *Qitad*, where the final *-n* goes back to *-ñ* which became in Turkic *-y*, hence *Qitay*). In most of the present Mongolian languages and dialects *gū(n)*, but in Dahur *geü*. The *-g-* in the written Mongolian forms as *gegü(n)*, *gegüü*, the *-w-* in such forms as Muqqadimat al-Adab *gewün* (with two *wavs*) are secondary, as seem to be the guttural finals in Evenki and Solon. The word is absent from Turkic, and can be reconstructed for the Mongolian as **ge'ün*, where the final *-n* pertains to the unstable *-n* category and may be secondary. Its meaning is "mare", "cow". The Mongolian word cannot be separated from the Tokharian cf. Tokh A *ko*, *ki* (acc. sing.), Tokh B *keu* "cow" (Windekens 1976, 226—227). G&I do not see any problems around the Tokharian word, but Windekens remarks (*loc. cit.*) that from the IE form a Tokh B **kau* would have been expected. The Tokharian word has to be connected with Tokh A *kayurş*, Tokh B *kaurşe* "bull" from IE

k'ou-urs- (G&I op. cit. 566) and the palatal element in Tokh A *ki* and Tokh B *keu* is an inner Tokharian problem. In any case this *-i-* element does not seem to be present in any of the other IE languages and is typical of Tokharian (see also the declension of the Tokharian word in Windekens *loc. cit.*). The Mongolian reflects the Tokharian and not the Old European forms. The IE word has been connected with several Chinese words. Modern Pekinese Chin. *yu* was ACh *ngiüg* / MCh *ngiäu* (Karlgren 998) the initial nasal and the final *-g* cannot be of IE origin, Chin *ku* 'bull, a male' (M. 3457) is not noted in the earliest documents, but its phonetical element is Ancient *ko*, Middle Chinese *kuo* (Karlgren No. 49), this is unlikely to be the word in Tokharian and in Mongolian.²

The Chinese word which can hardly be separated from the Tokharian-Mongolian word is Chin. *ke* quoted above with the meaning 'female of horses, mules etc.' used as an adjective with words for 'horse', 'mule', e. g. *ke ma* 'mare' (M 3397). G&I hesitate about the origin of Mong *ge'u* (→ MT) and leave open whether it is from Tokharian or from another IE language (see op. cit. 935 N1). According to what has been demonstrated above only the Tokharian → Mongolian and Tokharian → Chinese lending is possible.

The next word is *morin* 'horse'. This word is present in all MT languages. The first vowel is, however, *-u- (: ü)* in Evenki *murin*, Oroch *muri(n)*, Udihe *mui*, *muji*, Ulcha *mürin*, Orok *mürin*, while it has *-o-* in Solon *mori~*, Negidal *mojin*, Nanai *mori~* and Manchu *morin*, but Juchen *murin*, perhaps to be read even *mürin*, which is behind some of the MT data. Nevertheless the front vocalic forms as Kalmuck *mörn* (→ Russian *merin*) are surely secondary, see Kalmuck *morda-* 'to ride a horse'. The word has been compared with some Eastern Asiatic words, but without any sound reason. Chinese *ma* had in Archaic Chinese no *-r-*, its *a* was perhaps somewhat labialized. Burmese has *mrang* 'horse' where *m-* is a prefix, cf. Kanauri *rang'*, Manchati *hrang*, Bunan *srangs*, Chepang *serang*, Kachin *kumrang*. Tibetan has *rta* 'horse'³ which has nothing in common neither with Burmese nor with Chinese. Ramstedt compared Mongolian *morin* with the Germano-Celtic **markho-* reconstructing **mor* and adding a diminutive suffix *-qa*, thus getting **morqa* (Ramstedt 1947 25). The suggestion of Novikova (1979) that the original MT form would have been *murkin* preserved in the Evenki dialect of Tokkin is impossible, since MT *-*rk-* has in the MT languages the following representation: Evenki *-rk-*, Even *-rk*, Negidal *-jk-*, *-t'k-*, *s'k-*, Solon *-kk-*, *-rk-*, Oroch *-kk-*, Udihe *-k-*, *-jg-*, Orok *-t-*, Ulcha *-č-*, *-r-*, Nanai *-jk-*, *-k-*, *-r-*, Manchu *č*, *dž* see Cincius 1949,

² Perhaps Chin. *kü*, ACh. *küu*, MCh *küu* 'colt' (Karlgren 108r) could also be mentioned, but this seems to have connections with IE **equo* 'horse'.

³ Old Tib **rmang* quoted on p. 554 does not exist, it has been constructed *ad hoc* from the Burmese form.

230), thus a MT **murkin* would have had to become **mučín* in Manchu as **irke* ‘new’ is *iče*. This rule was working even in the earliest Mongolian loanwords (see Ligeti 1960). This means that there was no **morqa*, at least not in MT, and one wonders why this form should have disappeared in Mongolian, not to speak of the problems with the vocalism: Mongolian *o-a*, Germano-Celtic *a-o*. I would not claim that the Mongolian—Germano-Celtic comparison is impossible, but I would hesitate to build migration theories on such shaky foundations.

The last MT word is Middle Mongolian *hüker*, which is represented in a few MT languages: Evenki *hukur* (Biug., Z, Ald, Hng, Učr), *uku* (Z, Vmt), Even *hukén*(Ju), *heken* (S, L), Solon *eggěl* (P), *üxür*(P), *ekür* (Li), *ukuru*, *uγur* (Iv) *eregil* (O) *ukuri* (L). The MT words are loans from Mongolian, some of the Middle Mongolian *hüker*, *hükür*, others of more modern forms without the *h*-. Mongolian *hüker* cannot be separated from Turkic *öküz*, Chuv *väkär* < **ökür* (→ Hung. *ökör*). There do exist two IE comparisons of this much debated ‘Altaic’ word. The one proposed by Ramstedt (op. cit. 25) from IE **p^[h]ek^[h]u-* is also quoted by G&I op. cit. 579 Note 1., where they seemingly realized some of the difficulties and supposed that the word was borrowed during the period of ‘Altaic dialect unity’. The idea of Ramstedt was that the *h*- of Middle Mongolian goes back in all cases to an Altaic *p*-, thus he reconstructed **pökür* and compared this with Old Indic *paçu*, Latin *pecus*, *pecoris*. Of course Ramstedt knew that the *-r*- of the Latin declensional root is a late secondary development, the famous rhotacism, the existence of which in Chuvash and Mongolian he denied. But the comparison became popular just because some authors supposed to have a clear case in favour of the priority of *-r*- versus the *-z*- in Turkic. Ramstedt himself supposed the *-r*’ to be an Altaic suffix. The comparison of an ‘Altaic’ **pökür* (if we base on Turkic), or **püker* (if we depart from Mongolian) with IE **p^[h]ek^[h]u-* is not without problems. The suffix is unclear, the vocalism and even the *p*- is not beyond doubt, because not every *h*- goes back to *p*-. In Turkic we have Üzbek *hükiz*, New Uighur *höküz* where the *h*- is secondary, and it is beyond doubt that in Monguor *fusuor* the *f*- developed from *h*- before the labial vowel and is not a stage in the change *p > f > h*. There does exist another IE comparison of the same word. Zolotnickij, Munkácsi and others have long ago proposed it, and Németh suggested it in his paper quoted above. The same Turko-Mongolian word was compared with IE **uk^[h]os-en* and it has been supposed to be borrowed from Tokharian B *okso*. In favour of this comparison we find that in Turkic there are also back vocalic forms such as Yakut *oyus*, Yellow Uighur *okus* (< **oquz*) and the double form *öküz* ~ *oquz* itself points to a loan because foreign *-k-* indicates front vocalism, while the foreign vocalism was a back one. Turkic had no *-ks-* cluster and the substitution of *s*- by *-z* is also normal. The only problem is the *h*- which is unlikely to be of IE origin, it has to be assumed that is secondary

in Turkic (as Üzbek and New Uighur). As can be seen both IE comparisons have they problems, but the second is chronologically more likely. Whatever the case may be none of the Manchu-Tunguzian words can be directly compared with IE, all are Mongolian loanwords. This has serious consequences. It means that the Altaic protolanguage, if it ever existed⁴ had no historical contacts of any linguistic consequence, since it is impossible to suppose, that all IE loanwords, which would have been borrowed into the Altaic protolanguage, disappeared in Manchu-Tunguzian and only in Manchu-Tunguzian consequently.

Mongolian and Indo-European

Three Mongolian words have already been dealt with: *morin*, *ge'ü(n)* and *hüker*. The Turko-Mongolian word family *buɣday* was compared by G&I with IE **phur*- "wheat". This was done surely with regard to the Chuvash form, which is *päri*. This is, however, unacceptable. The Chuvash form goes back regularly to an Old Turkic *buɣday*, the *ɣ* disappeared, the *-d-* became through *z* (cf. Hung. *búza*) regularly *r*, OT *u* is becoming reduced labial *ö* in Viryal where we find *pöri* and a reduced illabial *ä* in Anatri: *päri*.⁵ The late Chuvash form gives no support to the comparison, which has to be abandoned. Two further Mongolian words are beyond any doubt loanwords from Turkic, so is *bars* (see the final *-rs*) and *teke* "uncastrated or wild goat".⁶ The first has to be an Iranian loanword in Turkic,⁷ the second was compared by G&I with the IE etymon of German *Ziege*: **ig^h*- (op. cit. 586 N1). The word had to be borrowed from a language where *-gh-* became *-k-*. Tokharian is such a language, but the word is absent from the lexical stock hitherto known. Less clear is the case of Mongolian *esige* ~ *isige* "young goat, kid".⁸ In Turkic we have two words for "goat" *ečki* and *keçi* (second has a form *kečke*, cf. Chuv. *kačaka* → Hung. *kecske*), the first is the "Eastern", the second the "Western" form (see the latest discussion of the word in Ligeti 1986, 283—284 without the Mongolian

⁴ I never denied the possibility of the existence of a common Altaic protolanguage, I only claim that the comparisons hitherto quoted in favour of such a protolanguage by Ranstedt and Poppe and their followers are clear loanwords, see Róna-Tas 1974, 1976.

⁵ The only problem with the Chuvash word is its semantical shift from "wheat" to "spelt; polba". This occurred under the influence of Russian *pyrej*, which resulted in Chuvash also in *päri*, but this word has no *-ö-* in Viryal as the other has.

⁶ The quoted Mongolian form *tex* is secondary and the *ä* in the quoted Turkic *tekä* is an arbitrary transcription.

⁷ The form quoted as *p'ars* (500) is not a Written Mongolian form, but a Georgian transcription of the Mongolian word.

⁸ The quoted Mongolian form *isig* is a modern secondary form.

word). It is unclear whether the two Turkic words pertain together or not and whether they are of onomatopoeic character or more precisely they can be derived from call words for animals. The comparison of Mongolian *esige* "kid, young goat" with Turkic *ečki* "goat" is problematical, because to the Turkic -č- the Mongolian -š- or even -s-⁹ is not a regular correspondence.¹⁰ I see even greater problems in the affricate of the Turkic words. The IE form is *q^[h]ok' (G&I 589) and one has to suppose that the sibilant (cf. Slavic *koza*) developed through an affricate and this would be a reflection of the affricate stage. The vocalism is also problematical. In a note G&I (589 N2) mention that Turkic *gočqar* "ram" may also pertain to the IE word. The basic word in Turkic is *goč* and in Mongolian *quča*, all other forms are inner developments. To an IE *qhok'* this would fit better phonetically, nevertheless the semantical side (IE "goat", Turkic "ram") is problematical though both are "animals with great horns". Mongolian *elʒigen* "donkey" and Turkic *ešgek* (all other forms are secondary) "id." have been compared (G&I 564) with **šek^[h]uo-, an earlier form of IE *ek^[h]uo- "horse". This would be a very early wandering word (see Egyptian *šk*, Coptic *sēḡ*), but none of the IE data (see G&I 544) can be pointed out as the prototype for the Turkic form. Mongolian *elʒigen* is an old loan from a Chuvash-type language where the change from š to l was in its first phase. The last Mongolian word is *gotan* which G&I consider as an old wandering word pertaining to the family of Finno-Ugrian *kota* "house" and to be found in some IE languages and further in many other languages of Eurasia. In this case the Turkic words are of Mongolian origin, the word does not have the meaning "house",¹¹ and has nothing to do with the quoted Finno-Ugrian word in spite of the opinion of Räsänen and Joki. On the Uralic word (see now Rédei 1986 190). It is in fact a migrating word, and has to be compared with Uralic *woča* "fence" (Róna-Tas 1988 748).

I have dealt with all Mongolian words quoted by G&I as having possible IE origin. With the exception of Mongolian *ge'ü(n)*, where I see a possible Tokharian origin¹² all other words have either no connection to IE or the word is of Turkic origin and hence any direct connection with IE can be excluded.

⁹ Old Mongolian *si-* became *ši-* while there was no original *š* in Old Mongolian.

¹⁰ The *š* on place of OT *č* in Kazak and in some dialects of Nogay and Karakalpak is a late secondary development (see Róna-Tas 1983).

¹¹ The Uzbek word quoted usually from Jarring 1938 with the meaning "house" is a loanword in Uzbek of Afghanistan from the Persian in Afghanistan. The sentence runs: *gajtip kelip kotasiya keldi* in the translation of Jarring: "He returned in his room (where he stayed)" and adds in a footnote: *kota* "house, room", cf. Bogdanov, 88, *kūta* (کوته) Hindustani. In the glossary the word is given as *kota* "house, room" as a H(indostani) loanword. Bogdanov's paper was published in JASB 27, 1930.

¹² Of course *ge'ü* can also have been borrowed through Turkic, but for this we have no evidence.

These hard facts are of consequence for the localization of the respective homelands of the IE, Manchu-Tunguzian and Mongolian peoples. But before going further we have finally to review the comparisons with Turkic words.

Turkic and Indo-European

We have above dealt with nine comparisons having Turkic connections. One has to be abandoned because inner Turkic problems (*buyday*), one is a Mongolian loanword but has nothing to do with IE (*gotan*), one is Iranian and thus pertaining to a later period not dealt with here (*bars*), the other six (*öküz*, *teke*, *ečki*, *keči*, *qoč* and *ešgek*) have special and yet unsolved problems. If the problems mentioned can be solved one thing remains sure, they do not pertain to the same chronological layer and their sources have to be different. The following botanical terms are important: IE **ablu/amlu* ‘apple’ ~ T *alma* (→ Mong. *alima* → Solon *alim*, cf. Joki 1963 *Studia Orientalia* 28). IE **(H)osp^[h]* ‘asp’ ~ Turkic **absa(q)*, cf. Chuv *äväs*, Hakass *os*, Oïrot *apsaq* (Kuu kiži dial.), Tat *usak* (< *ausaq* < *avsaq*¹³). Greek *alfiton*, Albanian *el’p*, Iranian **arba* ~ Turkic *arpa* ‘barley’ (→ Mong. *arbai*, → Manchu *arfa*, see Doerfer TMEN II, 1965, 24). OGreek *cannabis*, English *hemp* etc., Ossetic *gaen* / *gaenae* (cf. Abaev 1958, 512–513), Turkic *kendir* (→ Mong. **kentir* > *kenčir*, *kendir* > *kenjir* see Doerfer TMEN III, 1967, 608–609, in some Turkic languages as Türkmen, Kazakh, etc. *kenep* ‘hemp’ is a Persian loan). What does concern T *alma*, this pertains to a great family of an early cultural word, but it is uncertain when and where the Turks borrowed this word. The fact that it was borrowed by Mongolian and Hungarian brings us near to the beginnings of the first millennium A. D. It may be much earlier, but no data or criteria help us. T *absa(q)* seems to pertain to a narrow region, the Western part of South Siberia and the Volga Region.¹⁴ If all Turkic data pertain together, that is the word was not borrowed twice (*absaq* > > Chuv *äväs* and not *absa* > Chuv *äväs*) it is of considerable age, and surely pertaining to the Common Proto Turkic period. If the two groups do not pertain together, that is *absaq* is an

¹³ The Chuvash and Hakass forms are not necessarily pertaining directly together with the Tatar (and Bashkir) and Oïrot forms. A final *-q* disappeared in Chuvash through voicing and spirantization, thus *absaq* could have changed in the following way: *absaq* > > *absay* / > *absa* > *äväs*, but same would be the result of an **absa*. In Hakass the final *-q* is mostly preserved, thus an *os* is going back most likely to a form like *abas* if it is not a loanword from an Old Chuvash dialect. This we cannot exclude since we know of a few South Siberian–Chuvash isoglosses among them such a tree name as Chuv. *xira* ‘pine-tree’. (see Róna-Tas 1988, 745–746).

¹⁴ Interesting is the occurrence of this word in the so-called Anonymous of Leyden (1342 1 ed. Houtsma 1894): *avsaq*, the prototype of the Kazan Tatar and Bashkir words.

inner development and **absa* is another borrowing of the same word, then it is not necessarily a very old word, but neither in this case can we exclude their early borrowing. Turkic *arpa* could have been borrowed from an Iranian **arpa*, yet the word seems to be lacking in the Iranian languages. The idea came from Jokl (Festschrift Kretschmer 90, see Joki 1952 70) who insisted that the Afghan data quoted by Ramstedt 1935 do not pertain to the IE word family, but an Iranian form **arpa* or **arba* can be reconstructed. Unfortunately until now this can be done only on the strength of the Turkic data. In the case of the words for "hemp" three forms can be separated: *kan(a)* (cf. Ossetic *gaen/gaenae*, Swan *kan*, Abkhaz *a-k^cnə*, Kabardian *ganä* and Cheremis *kə'ne*, (seemingly from Alanian)), *kanap* in Greek (quoted as Scythian), Latin, Baltic, Slavic, Germanic, and further from the Iranian languages in Saka (the latter has *kamha* < *kanabha* and *kumba* < *kanamha*-), Sogd (*känbä*) and Persian (*kanab*) (see Balley 1979, Abaev I, 1958). To this we can join Turkic *kendir*, with a second part *-dir* which is not clear,¹⁵ perhaps even not of Turkic origin, but hitherto not documented outside of the Altaic world.

Further Turkic words dealt with by G&I: *kelin* "bride, wife of the son or younger brother" (942: *kalin* is a misprint), which is connected by some authors (e. g. Clauson 1972 719) with the Turkic verb *kel-* "to come", i. e. who comes into the house of her husband, most probably a folk etymology, but the association is very old (Róna-Tas 1983, 383) cf. Manchu-Tunguzian *kelin* "brother-in-law (the husbands of sisters)", IE **k'al(ou)-* (760, Latin *glos*, Russian *zolvka*).

In the following I shall mention some comparisons made by Németh and not mentioned by G&I. Old Turkic *murč* ~ *burč* "pepper" was compared to Skrt *marica* "id."¹⁶ Turkic *sira* "beer" was compared with Skrt *sūra* (this word was otherwise dealt with by G&I 653 without the Turkic and Finno-Ugrian parallels), Turkic *tana* "young cow" with Skrt *dhénā* (dealt with by G&I 567, 570, 933 without the Turkic comparison), *tām* "wall, building" ~ Skrt *dāma* (G&I **t'om* 741 without the Turkic comparison). In a footnote Németh

¹⁵ We find a few nouns in Old Turkic ending in *-dir*: *ögdir* "reward", *beldir* "the junction of two or more roads or rivers", *baldir* "pertaining to the last period (crop sown in the beginning of spring, lamb born at the beginning of the lambing season)", *bıldir* "last year", *qandir* "the membrane on the flesh (of a slaughtered beast) which remains after the hide which is suitable for tanning has been stripped off it", *čaldir* onomatopoeic for rattling of the arrows in the quiver, none of them has a clear etymology. In most cases the dental is after a sonorant, which cluster is much debated, see Johanson 1979.

¹⁶ Most of these comparisons were made earlier and suggested by other scholars. A key role has been played by B. Munkácsi who wrote a bulky work on the (Indo)-Aryan and Caucasian elements in the Finno-Ugrian languages (1901), and parallel with this wrote a series of papers dealing with IE elements in the Turkic languages (see Munkácsi 1894, 1900, 1905, 1906). He was severely criticized by other Hungarian scholars, among them by Gombocz 1906.

(op. cit. 92, N1) added as possible comparison Turkic *arpa* "barley" dealt with above. On these words I quote the opinion of Németh: "Wann und wo wurden diese altindischen Lehnwörter ins Türkische entlehnt? Wahrscheinlich sehr früh, dieses oder jenes etwa noch vor Christi Geburt. Es ist anzunehmen, dass die Entlehnung der einschlägigen Wörter ins Türkische nicht auf einmal, auf einem Orte, ja dass sie eventuell gar nicht unmittelbar erfolgt ist. Das Wort *tana* ist höchstwahrscheinlich älter, *burč* anscheinend ein aus Indien später übernommenes Wanderwort. Auch das ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass — zum mindesten in einzelnen Fällen — die betreffenden Wörter ins Türkische eigentlich nicht aus der bekannten altindischen Sprache, sondern aus irgendeiner anderen vorzeitlichen indoiranischen Mundart entlehnt worden ist. Man muss diese indoiranischen Lehnwörter des Türkischen, die m. E. in älteren Zeiten übernommen worden sind, von jüngeren — wie z. B. *šad* — trennen." (op. cit. 92—93). As we can see, Németh did separate the early Indo-Iranian loanwords, many of them migrating cultural words, from the later Iranian words. From this two groups he separated two others, those which have been borrowed from Tokharian (according to him from Tokharian B). Such parallels as Turkic *kün* "sun" ~ Tokh *kom* "day, sun", Turkic *čäk* "to pull" ~ Tokh. *tsäk* "to pull out", Turkic *yap* "to make" ~ Tokh *ya*-, *ypa* "id." he considered as similarities caused by chance, but two others the Turkic *tümen* "ten thousand" ~ Tokh *tumane*, *tmane* "id." and the Turkic *öküz* ~ Tokh *okso* quoted above he considered to be very important for the reconstruction of the Turkic prehistory. According to Németh, the Tokharian—Turkic contacts occurred during the migration of the Tokharians from West to East. Such words as the Old Turkic title *čor* may have pertained to a much later layer if it was of Tokharian origin (a suggestion made by F. W. K. Müller). All these Németh considered as supplementary arguments to his hypothesis that the original homeland of the Turks was in West Asia (and not in East Asia as Ramstedt supposed).

In a paper published in 1971, P. Aalto dealt with the early Iranian contacts of the Turks. A few of the quoted words may be older, as Chuv *turax*, Mongolian *taray* "sour milk" (← Turkic *tarag*), Turkic *toraq* "cheese", Chuv. *turax* (→ Hung. *túró* "curd") which may pertain to Greek *tyros*, Russian *tvarog*. I suggested in 1974 a few new Turkic—Tokharian parallels. These suggestions have been reviewed by V. V. Ivanov in a lecture given in Tashkent in 1986 and published in 1988 (V. V. Ivanov 1988).

Though some of the 1974 suggestions I have since then abandoned, some deserve to be mentioned here, because G&I deal with the respective IE words. To the stem **ǵaH-* "to go, to travel" (724) pertain words as Skrt *yāna* "road" Tokh A *yom* "trace of the feet" (Windekens 1976, 604) which I compared with a very old cultural word of the steppe. This is Old Turkic *yam* "a posting station", already noted in the language of the Tabgach (T'o-pa—Wei) where it was reconstructed by Ligeti as *γiam* (see Ligeti 1970, 294—295, there also the

Mongolian *jam*, and about its later history into Persian, Manchu etc. (see also Russian *jamšč'i*).¹⁷ Ivanov is right (1988, 102—103) when he remarks that only the stem seems to be of IE origin, the suffix is *-n* and the suffix in *yam* is *-m*. In connection with the IE word for "gold, metal" **Hau-s-/Hu-os* G&I quote Aalto 1959 (713) and the Finno-Ugrian parallels (710, 932), but not the two Altaic words pertaining here as Turkic *yez* "copper" (→ Mong. *yer* "weapons") and Old Kirghiz *qaša*, Khitan *qašo*, Dahur *qaso* etc. "iron" (see the very detailed study on this word of Ligeti 1950).¹⁸

A few further words should be mentioned which are dealt with by G&I and have Turkic parallels not quoted by them. On op. cit. 603 they call the attention to the fact that in the IE dialects there were two words for "honey" **mel-i-th* and **medhu-*. Long ago were these words associated with the Turkic word *bal* "honey" (cf. recently Clauson 1972, 330, 771 on the latter page also the special form *mir* which is undoubtedly from Chinese *mīet*, itself from Tokharian). The problem is only with the vocalism, which points to Iranian, which has the *medhu* variant (Avest. *mađu* "wine, honey" etc. see apud Bailey 1979, 340) and not the *mel-* variant. To the same IE word family pertains the Turkic *bor* "wine" (→ Mongolian, Turkic → Hungarian) with the same *m* → *b* substitution as *marica* → *burč* "pepper". Op. cit. 543 they reconstruct the IE word for "duck" as **anHth*, this word has to be compared with Turkic *aŋ*, *aŋit*, *aŋgirt*, for various words denoting "goose, duck etc.". From Turkic into Mongolian *aŋgirt*, from Yakut into Evenki and Negidal, from Mongolian into Evenki, Nanai, Manchu. I have dealt this word in detail (Róna-Tas 1983, 10—11) and compared it with a "Proto Uralic" *aŋa* "polar duck", (see now Rédei 1986, 13) a typical wandering cultural word of hunters in Eurasia. Interesting is the Turkic, (Uralic, Mongolian) *-ŋ-* in contrast to the IE *-n-*, where the original sound has to be the *ŋ*.

¹⁷ The *γ* initial, which is reflected not only in Tabgach, but also by Manchu *giyamun* (= *γiam*), points to a substitution of *y-* by *ŷ-* (see Mongolian *jam*) and then the substitution of *ŷ-* by *γ̣-* in a language where *ŷ-* was impossible in word initial position. According to Ligeti the Manchu form is an early loan from Hsien-pi. Clauson (1972) compared the Turkic word with Chinese *chan* (cf. Mathews' 128, the word had a final *-m* in MChin) the Middle Chinese form shows irregularities in the initial.

¹⁸ Ligeti is also, among others, dealing with the word for "house" in the Ketic languages (1950, 148), where he connects the word (Ket *xuos*, *xus*, *k'uoš*, Kot *hūs*, Arin *kuss*, etc.) correctly with Turkic *qoš* "tent", Mongolian *qoš* "id.", which cannot be compared with the Germanic word *Haus* and its etymon as done by G & I (742) following the suggestion of Dul'zon. My suggestion (1974, 503) that this Turko-Mongolian word would be of Tokharian origin has to be abandoned.

Without going in further details and the discussion of a few other words not dealt with above¹⁹ the conclusion seems to be clear. Though more than forty years elapsed since Németh's work and scholarship advanced in many fields, we do not have to change the final conclusion of Németh, namely that there was no Altaic—Indo-European linguistic contact whatever, there was neither a very early Turkic IE contact, which would point to a time earlier than the separation of the Indo-Iranian branch. On the other hand, we find a handful of IE words in early Turkic which are typical wandering cultural words. That early Turkic was not closed from these words is of importance if we bear in mind that practically no such words intruded Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguzian. Further the fact that most of them were borrowed by Mongolian from Turkic and by Manchu—Tunguzian from Mongolian helps us to reconstruct inner contacts in the Altaic world. As to possible "homelands" or early localisations, it seems to be sure that neither the place where IE was spoken nor the secondary homeland of "Old European" was in close contact with Turkic. If we contrast the IE contacts with Uralic or Finno-Ugrian and those of IE with Turkic I see a great difference. The presentation of the Altaic material makes it obvious that this was also the opinion of G&I.

A. Róna-Tas

¹⁹ E.g. with IE **khormi*- "worm" (527 N2) the Turkic word group for "ant" *q̄mürsqa*, *q̄mürsqa*, *qormusqa*, *qumrusqa* etc. (cf. Clauson 1972, 628) can be compared (cf. Róna-Tas 1974, 503) though other etymologies of the Turkic word also seem to be possible (*qoŋuz* "insect, worm", *qoŋuz* "dark brown", Chuvash *xämär*). In his paper (1988) Ivanov suggested to compare Juchen *ančun* "gold" with Mong. *altun* on the one hand and with Tokh. B. *enčuwo* "iron" on the other. In Cincius (1975) Manchu-Tunguz *aiši*, Juchen *anču* is kept separate from *altun*, and this has its good reasons. Ligeti (1953, 225) reconstructed *alcun* for Juchen, and connected this with *altun*. Unfortunately the Chinese transcription is ambivalent. The first hieroglyph used in the transcription (Karlgren 146) had the value 'an which can be the transcription of both a foreign *an* or *al*, thus the Juchen may have been equally *ančun* or *alčun*. The Manchu *aišin* "gold" can only go back to an earlier *alšin* < *alčín* < *altín*. This would favour a reconstructed Juchen *alčín*, *alčun*. But we have in Manchu *ančun* "Ohrgehänge der Frauen". *ančurahi* "mit Goldschlägerhaut hergestelltes Blattgold" (Hauer 1952) which are surely, as Cincius supposed, Juchen loanwords in Manchu. The solution of this riddle seems to be easy. The name of the Juchen dynasty was "Gold", and this caused changes due to the tabooization of the word. To the Khwarazmian word *hnčw* "steel", quoted by Ivanov, *op. cit.* we have to remark, that this is a reconstruction. Its meaning is seemingly "Speerspitze, Lanzenspitze" (Benzing 1983, 319), *᠓. hanšw* "having an iron tip". I agree with Ivanov, that these words are likely to be old substratum words, but their connection remains for the time being obscure.