

## AN OLD TURKIC NAME OF KIEV<sup>1</sup>

ANDRÁS RÓNA-TAS

(Budapest)

The most important meanings of Chuvash *mǎnǎ*, *mǎn* are the following: 'great, big, vast, wide, basic, original, old, dense, low (of sound)'. Chuvash also has another word for 'great' *pisǎk*. Although Ashmarin writes in his Dictionary (VII, 305) that the meaning of *mǎn* is "generally speaking" the same as that of *pisǎk*, this is in fact not the case, there is a difference in the usage of the two words. First of all *mǎn* is used in kinship terminology with the meaning 'elder, great': *mǎnakaj* 'the elder sister of the father', *mǎnasanne* 'great-grandmother, mother of the grandmother', *mǎnasatte* 'great-grandfather, father of the grand-father', *mǎninke* 'the wife of the brother of the grandfather', *mǎnkokki* 'the brother of the mother', etc. It occurs in wedding ceremonies as: *mǎnkǎrǎ* 'the elder groomsmen'. The word is frequently used in geographic names denoting the greater in opposition to the little as: *Mǎn Xoračka* 'Bolshoe Karachkino, Greater Karachkino', *Mǎn Xura Šiv* 'the Greater Black Rivule' and according to Ashmarin the river Dneper is also called *Mǎn Šiv* 'Great River'. We see the word in names of vegetables as *mǎnxǎyar* 'pumpkin', *mǎn mira*, *mǎn mǎyǎr* 'nut' or groups of animals, such as *mǎn kǎtǎ* 'stud'. It occurs in historical terms as *mǎnpǎ* 'grand duke' whereas 'Tsar' is *ǎmpǎ* which had originally the same meaning. We find the word in the old Chuvash calendar as in the name of 'Easter' *munkun* a *calque* of Russian *velikodnju* or *mǎn kǎrlač* 'January', in the terminology of folk religion: *mǎn čǎk* 'a kind of pagan prayer', *Mǎn kel-ilen* 'the name of a god'. All this points to the fact that we are dealing with a relatively old part of the Chuvash lexicon.

The origin of the word is obscure. Paasonen (1908, 89) compared the word with Yakut *mǎngǎ* 'great, wide', but this word is, as it was already pointed out by Pekarskij in his Dictionary (1917) a loan from the Mongolian *mǎngke*, *mengke*, itself a loan from Turkic cf. Turkic *beŋǎ* 'eternal'. Rǎsǎnen suggested in his Morphology (1957, 50) that the Chuvash word *numay* 'many, numerous',

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this paper was read at the PIAC meeting 1987 in Bloomington. I had the opportunity to discuss some of the problems involved with Tibor Halasi-Kun who showed a keen interest and gave me useful advice for which I am sincerely indebted. This paper is devoted to his memory.

which can be found also in Türkmen *lomay*, *nomay* 'wholesale (Russian *op-tovyj*)' could perhaps be connected to Chuvash *măn*. Räsänen claimed further that the word also has in Chuvash such forms as *mon*, *mun*. He extended his comparison to Yakut *mogol*, *mogul* 'great' and Korean words. First we have to state that in Chuvash there do not exist forms, such as *mon*, *mun*. The *-u-* of *munkun* 'Easter' is due to regressive assimilation and is a late feature. We find the word *numay* also in Üzbek with the meaning 'rich, round (of a sum)'. The full vocalism of the first vowel of the Chuvash word and its final *-ay* shows that Chuvash *numay* is a late loanword. Original and early final *-ai* diphthongs became *-i* in Chuvash. The Yakut and Korean parallels have to be, for the time being, excluded. Perhaps the word is of foreign origin. If *numay* is a metathetic form of *\*munay* it can be an extension of Old Turkic *bun* 'basis, foundation', Sogdian *pwn*. In his etymological dictionary (1969, 326) Räsänen gave up his etymology, reconstructed a form *man* and suggested a comparison with the old Ottoman *mankafa* 'blockhead, fool, stupid'. Jegorov had no suggestion for the etymology of the word (1964, 326).

An important contribution to the solution was the publication of new Volga Bulgarian inscriptions by Hakimzjanov in the 1986 volume of *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*. In the inscription of 1308 we find a geographical name which was written as *Muwn Suwar yali*. Above the *mim* there is a *damma* and after it a *waw* and a *nun*. Hakimzjanov read it as *Mün* and gave no explanation. In my paper read in 1987, I pointed out that the word has to be read as *Mon* and the word is identical with the Chuvash *măn*. It had the meaning 'great'. The word has to be connected with the words which we find in the geographic names *Mangishlak* (*Man Kishlak*), *Man Kend* (both in the *Divan* of Kashgari) and in the old name of Kiev which occurs as *Men Kermen* in the Secret History of the Mongols. The original reading may have been *Man Kermen* in the Kipchak language which is the source of the Mongolian data. Since the original of the Secret History was written with the Uighur alphabet there was no difference between the forms *Man* and *Men* (see the late Uighur copy in Blobzang Bstandzin's *Altan Tobchi*, ed. Ligeti 1974, 194) and it may be that the form *Men* is only the reading of the Mongolian who took part in the compilation of the text in Chinese transcription and was uncertain of the correct reading. It is also possible, that the change occurred already in Kipchak and from an earlier *Mankermen* the name changed to *Menkermen* in the source language. Kipchak *Man Kermen* is a translation of the Slavic name of Kiev: *Velikij Gorod* 'the Great City'. Thus the word *man* 'great' can be traced back to the eleventh century in the Karakhanid Empire and to the thirteenth in the Desht-i-Kipchak.

There does exist, however, an unsurmountable difficulty in connecting Chuvash *măn* with Old and Middle Turkic *man*. The vowel of the Chuvash word is a reduced one, and in the Viryal dialect the word has a reduced labial vowel: *mōn*, in the Anatri dialect the labial element was lost and it is a reduced illabial: *măn*. The *mănă* forms seem to be late secondary forms, that is, the final reduced vowel did not pertain to the original word. The reduced Chuvash vowels *ă/õ*

cannot go back to an original *a*. An original *a* would be in Chuvash *o/u*, that means that if *man* were the original form then it would be in Chuvash *\*mun*. This difficulty was overseen by T. Tekin, who dealt with it in his book (1988, 190–191) using the 1308 inscription. He read *Mun* instead of *Mün* and compared the word with *man* of *Man Kishlak*, *Man Kend*, without mentioning the name of Kiev. Tekin pointed out that original *a* changed to a *u* in Chuvash but it escaped his attention that the word does exist in Chuvash and is not pronounced with *u* but with a reduced vowel. Fedotov published a monograph in 1992 on his etymological studies of Chuvash words. He compared the Chuvash word with the geographical name *Mangishlak*, he also referred to Räsänen's earlier comparisons and added that according to Vámbéry and Barthold, the *Man* element in *Mangishlak* originally had the meaning 'ten thousand'.

Before offering a new solution to the enigmatic origin of the Chuvash word I will recapitulate what we know: a Turkic word *man* from the eleventh century Karakhanid territory and from the early thirteenth century Desht-i-Kipchak had the meaning 'great' and was connected with names of cities. At the same time we find a word among the Volga Bulgars in the form *mon* with the same meaning. To the latter pertains a hitherto misread data in the work of Abul Hamid al-Garnati, who wrote his work in 1155, where he described his journey from the Volga Bulgars to Hungary. In the work the author mentions the name of the capital of the Slaves. The name is written in the edition of Dubler as *Gwr Kwman* عور كو مان which has been emandedated by Hrbek (1954) to *grd Kwy'w* that is 'gorod Kuyaw'. Pritsak (1955) read the place as *Gwr Krm'n* 'Gur Kermen' and added that *gur* would be the same as in the Karakitai title *gurkhan* while Kermen is the Turkic name of Kiev. Korzuhina suggested that we have to read *Gwr Kwman*, i.e. Gur Kuman which she interpreted as the 'city of the Cumans' and claimed that this were the late name of Sharkel. This was rejected by Bolshakov (1971) who turned back to the reading of Hrbek. Al-Garnati's work was also translated into Hungarian by T. Iványi with remarks by K. Czeglédy. They accepted the reading of Hrbek and Bolshakov.

In my 1987 paper I accepted the *Kermen* reading of Pritsak, but suggested that the first word should be read *mwn* instead of *gwr* which is a very easy misreading in the Arabic script: مون instead of عور. *Mwn Kermen* was the Volga Bulgarian name of Kiev. Al-Garnati used the Volga Bulgarian and not the Kipchak name of the city because he came from the land of the Volga Bulgars. The year of the compilation of the work was 1155, the time of the journey has to be placed between 1131 and 1153. This means that besides the data of *Mon Suwar* from 1308 we now have the data *Mon Kermen* from the first half of the twelfth century. This means that the Bulgarian *mon* was already different from the Karakhanid and Kipchak *man* in the twelfth century.

It may be very likely that the two words somehow pertain together; but the labial reading of the Bulgarian data and the present Chuvash data exclude a direct connection with *man*.

If the word is of Turkic origin we have to reckon with the existence of an initial *b-*. The nasalisation of the initial *b-* before nasal stops is a well-known feature in Old Turkic. It is enough to point to the change of the pronoun *ben* to *men* or that of *biŋ* to *miŋ*, cf. Mongolian *minggan* 'thousand'. The Old Turkic word *ban* 'ten thousand' did pertain to this category. It is rare, but it occurs in Uighur texts (see Clauson 1979, 346). Barthold (1936) pointed out that the name of Mangishlak appeared only in the 12th century. In the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam (1988) Y. Breghel corrected this, and referred to Kashgari's item. There we read: "*Man Qišlaq* a place in the land of the Oghuz". To this Breghel adds that in the work of Biruni there is a name of a harbour in the land of the Oghuz which is called *Binqishlag*. To Breghel's remark we can add that this *Bin* is surely *biŋ* 'thousand', but in the meaning 'great'. It is unlikely that *man* is coming from *miŋ*, more likely it is coming from the Old Turkic *ban* 'ten thousand' with the same semantic change 'great number' > 'many' > 'great'. A similar change can be detected in the meaning of Old Turkic *tümen* which was borrowed into Hungarian as *tömény* (see Gombocz 1912, 131). The word *tümen* 'ten thousand' replaced the word *ban*.

The foreign origin of *tümen* has been clear for a long time. It is an early loan from Tocharian, cf. Tocharian A *tma:n*, Tocharian B *tumane*. Clauson mentioned in his dictionary that according to a verbal communication of Pulleyblank, the Tocharian word might be of Chinese origin, a borrowing from a form like *\*tman*. The Chinese origin of the Tocharian word has already been suggested by Blochet, but he compared a binominal structure. The first part might have been Chinese *to* 'many' and the second a word to which we shall come back (see Doerfer, TMEN II, 641). According to Windekens (1976, 642), the Tocharian word is a loan from Persian, or more precisely from Middle Iranian. Doerfer, after reviewing the earlier opinions, excludes the Persian origin of the word. Doerfer thinks it is unlikely that the Turkic word would be of Tocharian origin. His argument is that the Turkic word is front vocalic. This is, however, not conclusive. We do not know how "palatal" the Tocharian language was, however a shift to a more palatal pronunciation can be observed. We find similar features in earlier loans as Tocharian *okso* → Turkic *öküz*. On the other hand, *tümen* was a cultural loan, a *Wanderwort* and in such cases the phonetical changes and substitutions had a different history.

The Old Turkic *ban* 'ten thousand', as it was mentioned by Clauson (1972, 346), is of Chinese origin. It has the form *wan* in the present language of Peking. The earlier forms have been reconstructed by Karlgren (1957, 267a) as Old Chinese (Archaic Chinese according to Karlgren) *miwǎn*, and Middle Chinese (Karlgren: Ancient Chinese) *miwen*. Kantonese has *ma:n* (this was the form referred to by Blochet). This means that the initial was nasal which became in most Chinese dialects denasalised. This change is also reflected by Vietnamese as was pointed out by Pulleyblank (1985, 357). Vietnamese has the Chinese word *muôn*, while in Sino-Vietnamese we find *vàn*, *van*. On the basis of the Sino-Vietnamese data, Pulleyblank reconstructed *muan<sup>h</sup>* for Early Middle

Chinese and *vjan* > *vaan* for Late Middle Chinese (see also Pulleyblank 1991, 318). Takata (1988, 370) referred to the Tibetan transcription of the Middle Chinese form which occurs as *'ban*. To this we can add that this orthography reflects a pronunciation which was on its way to change from a stop *b-* to a fricative *β*.

The Old Turkic word *ban* is a clear reflex of the same form as the Tibetan. It cannot be excluded that the Turkic *man* is a form which reflects that the Chinese initial was originally a nasal and later prenasalised oral stop. It is also possible that the form *man* is the result of an inner Turkic change from *ban* or it may be even the result of both. On the other hand, Old Bulgarian *mon* is a borrowing of an earlier Chinese form of the same word, perhaps even from another dialect and reflects the Chinese form *\*muon*.

If these considerations can be substantiated by further research we can make the following statements:

1. The ancestors of the Bulgarian language and that of Common Turkic were already separated when they borrowed these words.
2. Chuvash *\*mon* > *mõn*, *mǎn* and Turkic *ban* > *man* are independent borrowings from Chinese.
3. The ancestors of the Chuvash came from a territory where they had the possibility to borrow early Middle Chinese words. This was not necessarily at the Chinese border. Such words wandered on the Silk Route as did e.g. Turkic word of Chinese origin: *yenčü* 'pearl'. Such words may have become even parts of geographic names as it happened with *yenčü* in *Yenčü Ögüz*, the Old Turkic name of the Syr Darya in the Kül Tegin inscription.
4. Kiev had two closely related Turkic names: *Man Kermen* was the Kipchak-Oghuz name and *Mon Kermen* was the Volga Bulgarian name.<sup>2</sup>

### References

- Ashmarin (1935). Ashmarin, N. I., *Slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka VIII*, Čeboksary.
- Barthold (1936). Barthold, W., *Manghislak* in: *Enzyklopaedie des Islam*, III.
- Bolshakov (1971). *Putešestvie Abu Hamida Al-Garnati v Vostočnuju i Central'nuju Evropu (1131–1153)*, Moskva.
- Bolshakov – Mongajt (1985). *Abu-Hámid Al-Garnáti utazása Kelet- és Közép-Európában*. Közzétette O. G. Bolsakov és A. L. Mongajt. Budapest.

<sup>2</sup> The Chinese form borrowed by the ancestors of the Chuvash points to a Chinese form earlier than the end of the 6th century. The form borrowed by the Common Turkic may originate from the 7th or 8th century. The idea of Pulleyblank that a much earlier form of the same word had an initial *t-* and this would be the source of the Tocharian word is uncertain, but if it would be proved this would mean that the word, through Tocharian entered Turkic and thus Old Chuvash *mon*, Old Eastern Turkic *ban*, Oghuz-Kipchak *man*, and Old Eastern Turkic *tümen*, would ultimately go back to the same Chinese word.

- Breghel (1988). Breghel, Ju., *Manghishlak* in: *Éncyclopédie de l'Islam* VI, livr. 105–106.
- Clauson (1972). Clauson, G., *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*, Oxford.
- Doerfer TMEN, Doerfer, G., *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, Bd. II, Wiesbaden, 1965.
- Dubler (1953). Dubler, C. E., *Abu Hamid el Granadino y su relación de viaje por tierras Eurasiaticos*, Madrid.
- Fedotov (1992). Fedotov, M. R., *Materialy k istoriko-étimologičeskomu slovarju čuvaškogo jazyka*, Čeboksary.
- Gombocz (1912). Gombocz, Z., Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache, *MSFOu* 30, Helsinki.
- Hakimzjanov (1986). Hakimzjanov, F. S., New Volga Bulgarian Inscriptions, *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 40, 173–177.
- Hrbek (1955). Hrbek, I., Novy arabsky pramen o vychodny a sredni Evrope, *Československa Etnographia* II, No. 2, 157–175.
- Hrbek (1955). Hrbek, I., Arabico-Slavica. I. Abu Hamid al-Andalusi und sein Werk Mu'rib, *Archiv Orientalni*, 13, 109–135.
- Jegorov (1964). Jegorov, V. G., *Étimologičeskij slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka*, Čeboksary.
- Karlgren (1957). Karlgren, B., *Gramata Serica Recensa*, Stockholm.
- Korzuhina (1978). Korzuhina, G. F., *Put' Abul Hamida al-Garnati iz Bulgara v Vengriju* in: *Problemy arheologii II*, Sbornik v pamjat' professora M. I. Artamonova, Leningrad, 187–194 (quoted after Bolshakov–Mongajt 1985).
- Ligeti (ed.) (1974). *Histoire secrète des mongols. Text en écriture ouïgoure incorporé dans la chronique Altan tobči de Blo-bzan Bstan-'jin par Louis Ligeti*, Budapest.
- Paasonen (1908). Paasonen, H., *Csuvas szójegyzék*, Budapest, repr. 1974.
- Pekarskij (1917). Pekarskij, É. K., *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka (1907–1930)*, repr. 1958.
- Pritsak (1955). Pritsak, O., Eine altaische Bezeichnung für Kiew, *Islam* 32, 1–13.
- Pulleyblank (1985). Pulleyblank, E. G., *Dentilabialization in Middle Chinese* in: *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*, ed. J. McCoy and T. Light, Leiden, 345–367.
- Pulleyblank (1991). Pulleyblank, E. G., *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver.
- Räsänen (1957). Räsänen, M., Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen. *Studia Orientalia* 21, Helsinki.
- Räsänen (1969). Räsänen, M., Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen, *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae* 17, 1, Helsinki.
- Takata (1988). Takata, Tokio, *A historical study of the Chinese language based on the Dunhuang materials*, Tokyo.
- Tekin (1988). Tekin, T., *Volga Bulgar kitabeleri ve Volga Bulgarcağı*, Ankara.
- Windekens (1976). Windekens, A. J. van, *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, Vol. 1, *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*, Louvain.