

MAREK STACHOWSKI

ETYMOLOGICAL STUDIES ON KHAKAS FOOD NAMES

The publication of a small, but very interesting book *Национальные блюда хакасов* [= Khakas national dishes] (Abakan 1994, 32p.) by V. Ja. Butanaev was an important stimulus for the present author to make a modest attempt at an etymological study on some food names presented there.

**asxyl̄dym** 'sour spice for soups' (But. 20, Nr. 4) < \**aškylytm* < \**akšylytm* (but see below) < \**akšy* ~ \**äkši* > Ott. *äkši*, Krim-Kar. *äkši* ~ *äxši* 'sour' (ĖSTJa I 259; KRP 658, 672). — The main problem in this etymology is that *äkši* 'sour' and *äkši* 'to become sour' are normally attested in Oghuz and Kipchak languages only, but not in Siberia. — Cf. also Bšk. *äskilt̄m* 'bitterish' ~ *äskilt* 'sourish', Tat. *äčkil̄m* ~ *äčkilt* 'sourish' ~ *ač-kyl̄t̄m* 'bitterish' (Šč. MI 115f.). — Since the Volga Tatars migrated eastwards as early as in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and their migration increased considerably after they had received special trade privileges in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Kapp. 35f.), by 1990 over 27,000 Volga Tatars lived in different Siberian colonies (Fors. 196), and they played an important role in the cultural life east of the Urals (Fors. 300; for Tat. influence in Middle Asia see also Bald. *passim*). Therefore, it seems

quite legitimate to treat the Kh. word as a loan from Tat., maybe, connected with Tat. trade activities in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, in view of Kh. *-sx-* < \**-šk-* < \**-kš-* (cf. Kh. *taxax* 'Regal (-brett/-fach)' < \**taškak* < \**tak-čak*, see StachM EChE), the modern Tat. form *ačkyltym* cannot possibly have been the direct source of Kh. *asxyltym*, because it would have yielded a form like \**ačxyltym* rather (cf. Kh. *xaračxaj* 'swallow' with *-čx-*). Thus, the following treatment is plausible: Kh. *asxyltym* < Older Tat. (18<sup>th</sup> c.?) *aškyltym* (< \**akšyltym*) > Modern Tat. *ačkyltym*.

**čalbax** 'flat cake made of leaven and "ayran"-yoghurt' (But. 18, Nr. 9) < \**jalmak* < \**jalma-* (< \**jal-* > Ott. *jala-* 'to lick') > Kirg. *galma-* 'to take into one's mouth, to eat greedily, to feed, to stuff'; cf. Trk.dial. *jalma-č* 'fodder made of flour and bran' (ĖSTJa IV 95). — Concerning Kh. *-b-* < \**-m-* see *čarba* below.

**čarba**, in: *čarba ügrä* 'meat soup with pearl barley' (But. 7, Nr. 18). — The original meaning of *čarba* was \*'minced meat', \*'something minced' or the like, cf. Tuv. *čarba* 'Häcksel für Vieh' (> Yak. \**čarba* > *barča* '1.Zerstückeln; 2.Schutt') < \**jārma* < \**jār-* 'to split, to chop' (StachM PEJ 110f.; Tekin 175). — Note the different reflexes of the suffix \**-ma* in *čarba* and in *xyjma* (see below). The reason for the different evolution of the original \**-m-* lies in the phonetic position. As can be seen in Kh. *čalbax* (see above) < \**jalmak* and Kh. *čarba* < \**jārma*, the rule was: \**-r/lm-* > *-r/lb-*. This is the reason why we cannot accept the assumption that Selk. both *ēarba* ~ *oarba* 'barley' (with the word-initial diphthong reflecting Tu. \**ā*) and *ārma* ~ *arma* id. go back to Tu. *arba* (Fil. 75) < \**ārpa* [cf. Hungarian *árpa* id.]. Apart from the inner-Tu. evolution ([1] \**jārma* > \**jarma* > \**jarba* > Kh. Tuv. *čarba*), we are faced with two different Tu. etyma, as far as the Selk. forms are concerned: [2a] \**jārma* 'something minced' > \**ārma* (> Selk. *ārma* 'barley', Fil. 75) > \**arma* (> Selk. *arma* id., Fil. 75); [2b] \**ārpa* 'barley' [> Old Uig. *arpa* '1.Gerste, Gerstenkorn; 2.Gersten-', UigWb. 3: 201] > \**ārba* [> Southern Selk. *ēarba*, *oarba* id., Fil. 75] > Kača-Kh. *arba* id. Fil. 75 cites also "tuba *arma*" after SIGF 320 where, however, no source is given; in any case, no Tu. forms like *arma* can be found in ĖSTJa I 176f.

(s.v. *arpa*) and Rass. LFT 155-158. This is why we have every reason to suspect that "tuba *arma*" is a ghost-form and that Selk. *ēarba* and *ārma* cannot possibly reflect one and the same Tu. word *arba*. The *j-m* variants (like Brb. *jarma*, Kirg. *ğarma* 'pearl barley') are clearly results of the semantic evolution of \**jārma* and should not be connected with \**ārpa* (contra Fil. 113f.). — See also *porča* below. \*)

**īpāk** see *ītpāk*.

**ītpāk** 'brown bread' (But. 21, Nr. 6) ~ *īpāk* 'bread' (KhR 67b) = Chul. *itvāk* ~ *itpāk* 'bread' (Bir. 34) = Tat. *ikmāk* id., Tat.dial. *itmāk* ~ *ūptōk* id. (Tum. 61, 229) = Alt. *ōtpōk* 'roll' (Tyd. 158), Leb.-Alt. *ūtpōk* 'bread' (Bask. 219) = Krim Tat. *ōtmāk* 'bread' (Jank. 378) = Ott. *ākmāk* 'bread' = MTu. *ātmāk* ~ *āpmāk* ~ *āpāk* 'bread' (MK Comp. 29. — Contra ĖSTJa I 254: "в словаре М. Кашгарского приводится лишь одна форма *epmek*") < \**āpmāk* < \**āp-* '?' > Tat. *ipi*, Bšk. *āpāj* 'bread' (ĖSTJa, l.c.). — For *ippāk* as a Tu. loan in Kamass see Veen. 283 and Hel. TMV 70, Nr. 162. — Because of Tat. *ipi*, Bšk. *āpāj* < \**āp-*, the original word-medial cluster must have been \**-pm-*, not \**-tm-* (contrary to Joki 138f.). — The labialization of the word-initial vowel results from the influence of the original \**-p-*: Alt. *ōtpōk* (~ *ūtpōk*) < \**ōtmāk* (> Krim Tat. *ōtmāk*) < \**ōpmāk* < \**āp-māk*.

**kömäčäk** 'flat cake made of unleavened dough with milk, spread with milk cream or fat and baked in ashes' (But. 17, Nr. 6) < \**kömäč* (> Brb. *kömäč* 'roll' [Dm. 161], Uig.dial. *kömöč* ~ *kömäč* ~ *kümäč* 'bread baked in ashes' [Ten. 96]) < *köm-* ~ *göm-* 'to bury (in earth, ashes, etc.)' (Ten. 96).

**mirāk** 'kind of dumpling, stuffed with meat and onions [= Russ. *pel'meń*]' (But. 19, Nr. 14) = Sh. *päräk* 'pie [= Russ. *pirog*]' (RŠ 53 s.v. *pirog*) = Chul. *pöräk* 'pie' (Bir. 55). — This word seems to be unknown in other Tu. languages of Siberia; for some (not very numerous) records from non-Siberian Tu. languages see ĖSTJa II 219 (the existence of Ott. *böräk* id. excludes the possibility of Slavic [cf. Russ. *pirog*] origin of the

\*) I am very much indebted to E. Helinski for his comments and the discussion on this and some other words in this paper.

Tu. word), where, however, the Siberian data are lacking; cf. also TMEN II 331, Nr. 781: "Da das Wort innerhalb der Türk-sprachen nur in einem begrenzten Gebiet erscheint (fehlt u.a. südsibir., jak.) [...]". — It is generally accepted that *m-* occurs sometimes in place of *b-* in words with a nasal as the following consonant (as in *bän* ~ *män* 'I', etc.), but there is no nasal in the second syllable of *miräk*. This phenomenon recurs over and over in different Tu. languages, as it seems, rather chaotically, cf. for instance Siberian Tat. *mirtäk* = Literary Tat. *birtäk* 'sick, disable' (Tum. 152), Brb. *mic* [-c = -ts] ~ *mič* 'stove, oven' (Dm. 165) < Russ. *peč* 'id., Leb.-Alt. *mörü* 'wolf' (Bask. 178) < \**börö* (StachM GJV 91, § 22.4), Leb.-Alt. *mötik* 'cock' (Bask. 178) < Russ. *petux* id., Ott. *meşe* 'Eiche' = Anatolian Trk.dial. *mеше* id. < Pers. *bīša* 'forest, wood' (Pom. 110), Ott. *bahane* 'Vorwand, Scheingrund' = Anatolian Trk.dial. *mahana* id. < Pers. *bahāna* id. (Pom. 95) and so on; for the word-medial *m* < *b* cf. also Ott. (1591) *seğmen* 'Hundewärter, Janitschar' = Anatolian Trk.dial. *seğmen* id. < Pers. *sag-bān* 'dog-keeper' (Stach. PL V 101, Nr. 490; Pom. 117); see also *potxy* and *tamax* (in this study) and Hitch 138f. The *p-/b- > m-* change cannot be explained here but the existence of the *b- ~ m-* alternation itself is evident. — Another difference between the Kh. word *miräk* and its counterparts in the other Tu. languages lies in the vowel of the first syllable. Before continuing this reflection, let us take a look at etymologies proposed so far. — One finds four etymologies of *böräk* in ÈSTJa II 219: [1] < *bör-* ~ *bür-* 'to fold, to pleat, to put/stick/pull together' [= Ott. *büz-* 'to tie, to pull together'] (L. Z. Budagov); [2] < Pers. (J. Th. Zenker); [3] cognate with *börk* 'cap', *bört-* 'to swell' (M. Räsänen); [4] < *bürü-* 'to cover, to wrap up' (G. J. Ramstedt). È. V. Sevortjan accepts Budagov's etymology as the most reliable. — Now, the problem arises, how *-i-* in Kh. *miräk* can best be explained. In ÈSTJa II 219, the phonetic variants *bör-* and *bür-* are given side by side as equal stems, but the fact is that *bör-* does not exist except in one Ott. record: *böz-* (Zenker), alongside with the usual *büz-* (ÈSTJa II 294). The reduction of *ü* in the Tat. and Bšk. form *bür-* (ÈSTJa, l.c.) also points to an original *ü*, not *ö* (see Berta 182: Volga Kipchak \**bürül-*; Berta

GT 112: \**ö* > *ü*, \**ü* > *ü*). The assumption that *bür-* is the original variant fits very well to Kh. initial *mi-*. It seems, however, somewhat strange to accept also the consequence, i.e. the fact, that Kh. is the only Tu. language which preserved the original vowel (by the way, in a delabialized form *-i-*, not *-ü-*), whereas all the other Tu. languages changed it to *-ö-*. The opposite change appears more likely. — This is why we would rather accept M. Räsänen's suggestion. The verb *bör(ü)t-* < \**bör(ü)-* has several meanings in different Tu. languages, such as 'to swell' (Tat.), 'to swell in water' (Trk. dialects), 'to absorb water' (Kklp.), '[intrans.] to cook/boil slightly' (Trk. dialects), see ÈSTJa II 224. Pies and dumplings do really absorb water and "swell". This would mean that *-i-* < \**-ü-* < \**-ö-* in Kh. is secondary in comparison with *-ö-* of the other Tu. languages.

**mün** 'soup, broth' (But. 24, Nr. 2) = Tuv. Tof. Alt. Chul. Sh. *mün* id. = Yak. *mün* id., Dolg. *min* id. (StachM DW 179) ~ *mīn* id. (Fuj. 267) = Leb. *mün* ~ *min* id. (Bask. 177) = MTu. *mün* ~ *mūn* ~ *būn* 'soup, noodles' (MK Comp. 120). — Neither the attempts to treat Tu. *mün* ~ *būn* as a loanword from Proto-Sam. \**weñz* nor the assumption of Proto-Sam. \**weñz* being loaned from Tu. are satisfactory due to phonetic shortcomings. If we accept the Tu. etymology of Proto-Sam. \**weñz*, the Tu. *bü-* > Proto-Sam. *we-* change remains inexplicable, "because PS [= Proto-Sam.] had both *wü-* (cf. *wüt* 'water') and *pü-* (cf. *pü-* 'to spawn')" (Róna-Tas 746, Nr. 19). If we treat the Tu. word as a loan from Proto-Sam., we can explain the dropping of the original word-final vowel in \**weñz*, but the different treatment of \**-ñ* in \**weñz* (> Tu. *-n*) and in Tu. \**koñ* 'sheep' (> Tu. *-j(u)n*) remains unclear (for \**koñ* see Róna-Tas 747, Nr. 27). As E. Helimski rightly says, "it would be much better to see here an accidental and, besides, only partial resemblance" (Hel. Nr. 12). Consequently, A. J. Joki's idea of Chin. origin of both the Sam. and the Tu. word still deserves our attention (Joki 229: [1] Tu. *min* < Chin. \**mjān*; [2] Chin. compound \**mjān* + \**jak* 'fluid, juice' > \**mīn-jä* > \**mīñä* > Sam.).

**naspax** 'pearl barley mixed with boiled potatoes or fat' (But. 17, Nr. 5) = Tuv. *čašpak* id. (ibid.) = Tat.dial. *jasmak* 'lentil' (ÈSTJa IV 154, where the Kh. and Tuv. examples are lacking).

Cf. Sal. *jasmux* 'pea' (ĚSTJa IV 154) = Old Uig. *jasymuk* 'millet' (DTS 245), etc. — Of the two etymological models ([1] < *jas-* 'to make flat, to flatten'; [2] < *jasy* 'flat') presented in ĚSTJa IV 154, only [1] can be taken into consideration here, because *-mak* produces deverbal nouns. As far as *-muk* words are concerned, the second proposal cannot be excluded. — The Tuv. variant contributes to the reconstruction of the relative chronology of the Tuv. phonetic evolution: as *-š-* developed from *-s-* under the influence of the initial *č-*, the latter must have developed < *j-* earlier than *-s-* became *-š-*, i.e. (1) *j-* > *č-*; (2) *\*č-s* > *č-š* (but see below *\*jäšpäk*). Another chronological chain can be reconstructed for Kh. *naspax*: < *\*nasmak* < *\*jasmak* (= Tat.dial. *jasmak*, see above), i.e. (1) *\*j (-m)* > *n (-m)*; (2) *\*(s)m-* > *-(s)p-*. — Because of semantic differences, it is not quite clear whether Kam. *ñěšpäkc* ~ *ñěšpäkc* ~ *nešpäk* 'dick, groß' also belongs to the same word family. Joki 243 tried to connect it with Salbin-Koyb. *t'yš* 'dick' and the like, but in that case the identification of the second syllable of the Kam. word with Tu. *\*-mäk* is impossible because, *\*-mäk* is a deverbal formative. Moreover, the word *t'yš* seems to have no counterparts in the other Tu. languages so that Joki (l.c.) says finally: "[...] die Etymologie ist also fraglich". Phonetically, the Kam. word can be traced back to Tu. *\*jäšpäk* (< *\*jasmak*, with the palatalization resulting from the influence of *\*j-*) which, possibly, was a phonetic variant of Old Tuv. *\*jaspak* (cf. first of all Kam. *ñěšpäkc*). Unfortunately, no direct trace of *\*jäšpäk* could be found in the Tu. languages of Siberia.

**nymyrt** 'bird cherries, mixed with boiled milk cream or melted butter and groats' (But. 21, Nr. 8-9) [= Chul. *jomurt* (Bir. 35) ~ *čumurt* (Bir. 74) 'bird cherry', Sh. *nybyrt* id. (ŠRŠ 34b) = Siberian Tat. *jomyrt* (Tum. 82) ~ *jumrut* (Tum. 86) ~ *šomrot* (Tum. 251) id., Literary Tat. *šomyrt* id.] < *\*jomyrt* < *\*jumyrt* (< *\*jomyrt*) \*'globule, something globular (?)' > *\*jumyrka* > Old Uig. *jumurđa* 'Ei' (Zieme BSU 247a), Trkm. *jumurtga* 'egg', Ott. *jumurta* id., Tuv. *čürga* id. — One finds a lot of phonetic variants of *\*jumyrka* in ĚSTJa IV 250f. (cf. also Kh. *nymyrxa* 'egg'), but *\*jumyrt* itself is missing there. See also Joki NT 57,

where Tu. *jumurt* is connected with Ur. *\*δ'ōme* > Fi. *tuomi* 'Traubenkirschbaum, Ahlbaum, Prunus padus'.

**örämä** 'sour milk cream' (But. 9, Nr. 7) ~ *örinmä* ~ *ürünmä* ~ *ürügmä* 'cream, sour cream, milk film' (Russ. MBZ 37) = Sag.-Kh. *ürügmä* 'saure Sahne' (Radl. I 1834) ~ *ürümä* 'Rahm, Sahne, saure Sahne' (ibid. 1834) ~ *örünmäk* 'cream' (ŠRŠ 133a) = Tuv. Tof. *örämä*, Alt. *örömö* 'milk film' (Russ. MBZ 27) = Yak. *örümä* ~ *ürümä* 'Rahm, Haut auf Flüssigkeiten' (Kał. MEJ 19) < Mo. *örümä* id. (Kał. MEJ 19; Russ. MBZ 27). — The *-g/-ŋ-* variants occur only in Kh. and Sh. It was probably a southern dialect of Kh. (or Sh.?) which inserted the unetymological *-g/-ŋ-* before the original *-m-* of the Mo. etymon; cf. Kh. (Beltir) *poronmaj* 'Sperling, Spatz' < *\*poromaj* < *\*porobaj* < Russ. *vorobej* id. (StachM EChE s.v. *porātaj*). We have at any rate to distinguish between Kh. *örämä* and *örinmä* ~ *ürünmä* ~ *ürügmä*.

**poğa** see *poza*.

**porča** 'dried meat, mixed with cooked groats' (But. 3, Nr. 3) = Kzk. *borša*, Yak. *puorsa* 'Trockenfleisch, -fisch', ultimately < Sam. *\*por-sā* (Janh. passim). — For the connections between *porča* and *čarba* see also StachM PEJ 110f.

**potxy** 'dish made of cooked grains or groats, soup of pearl barley' (But. 8-10, 14-16, 19, 21-23) ~ Kača-Kh. (18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century) *botxu* id. (Sp. 139) = Alt. *botko* ~ *potko* ~ *motka* id. (ĚSTJa II 201) ~ Leb.-Alt. *motka* id. (Bask. 178) [for *m-* instead of *b-*, *p-* see *miräk* above] = Sh. *motka* 'Brei aus Gerstenmehl mit saurer Sahne' (Joki 104) = Brb. *pōtka* 'soup of pearl barley' (Dm. 177) = Siberian Tat. *potka* id. (Tum. 176b). — Etym.: < *\*bot(a)-* ~ *\*but(a)-* \*'to stir' (ĚSTJa II 201). — The word is relatively well attested in all Tu. language groups with the exception of the extreme East and North (Tuv., Tof., Yak. and Dolg.). Yenisei seems to be its eastern border. This fact points possibly to a Western channel of borrowing (in all probability, through Brb. and Siberian Tat. dialects, see the data above). — As long as *\*-ky* (instead of *\*-ka*) occurs in Kh. only (cf. also Yak. *butugas* 'Grütze' < *\*butukač* < *\*butka-č*; see Kał. IM 110; StachM GJV 116, § 35.2), it would be plausible to speak of the *-a* > *-y* change rather than of two different suffixes (con-

tra ÈSTJa II 201: \**bot-* + \**-ka*, \**bot-* + \**-ky*), even more so if *potxy* ~ *botxu* is (in view of its geographical distribution, see above) an inner Tu. loanword in Kh., which indicates to *-a* as the original final vowel. — However, the reconstructed stem \**bot(a)-* ~ \**but(a)-* along with its meaning \*‘to stir’ (ÈSTJa II 201) are purely hypothetical, so that a borrowing from a non-Tu. source cannot be excluded either.

**poza** ~ **poğa**. — The precise meaning of these words is unclear, cf. *poza* ‘хмельной напиток [= alcoholic beverage]’ (But. 25, Nr. 6), *poğa* ‘барда [= distillery refuse, dregs]’ (But. 26); *poza* = *poğa* ‘dregs’ (KhR 155, 159). — The ultimate source of both words seems to be Pers. *boza* ‘rice beer’ > Tu. *boza* > [a] Kh. *poza*; [b] Mo. *boğa* (Vlad. 332, Nr. 8) ~ *boğo* (Clark 40) > Kh. *poğa*. — The opposite loan direction (i.e. Pers. < Tu.) would, however, also be possible, but *poza* has no unequivocal etymology on the Tu. ground. For a discussion (without any solution) see TMEN II 337-341. — In any case, the Kh. form *poğa* is (because of *-ğ-*) a loan from Mo.

**pōrsax** ‘a kind of pastry made of milk cream, milk, fat and eggs’ (But. 18, Nr. 10) = Alt. *bürzak* ~ *borsok*, Kirg. *bōrsok* ‘little cake baked in sheep fat’, etc. (ÈSTJa II 22) < *bagyrsak* > Ott. *bagyrsak* ~ *bāyrsak* ‘entrails, guts’ (ib.). — It is not quite clear which type of food exactly made the semantic change from ‘entrails’ to ‘pastry, cake’ possible. It may have been a kind of guts stuffed with paste, cf. Fr. *pâte*, Engl. *paste*, *pasta*, *pastry*, Ott. *pasta*.

**tamax** ‘food, dish’, as in: *ax tamax* (But. 7f.) ‘milk food, dairy products’; *as-tamax* (KhR 33 s.v. *as*) ‘food (stuffs)’. — In all likelihood, the same as Kh. *tabax* ‘1. plate, bowl; 2. food, dish’ [cf. KhR 211b: *tabax* ‘тарелка, блюдо’; RKH 65a: *блюдо* (= *кушанье*) ‘[...] as-tamax’], ultimately < Ar. *tabaq* ‘plate, bowl’ (StachM APS 255, Nr. 3.18). — The semantic (‘food’ ~ ‘plate’) and phonetic (*-m-* ~ *-b-*) distinctions between *tamax* and *tabax* indicate that these two words belong to different layers of Ar. loans in Kh. Both the semantic and the phonetic features of *tamax* (1. ‘food’; 2. *-m-* < *-b-*) are unequivocally older than their counterparts in *tabax*. Consequently, *tamax* is an older loanword and *tabax* a newer one. — At some risk, we

may accept Mo. in the period between the thirteenth (Genggiz Khan) and the end of the sixteenth century (the Russian conquest of Siberia) as the most probable direct source of borrowing for Kh. *tamax* ~ *tabax* (for Tuv. and other South Siberian parallels see StachM APS Nr. 3.18), so that a fair division of the period into two subperiods (13<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century for *tamax* and 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> century for *tabax*) would be quite acceptable, but for the time being nothing more can be said on the chronology of both words. — For the *m* ~ *b* alternation see *miräk* above.

**tärtpäk** ‘pie or dumpling made of a round piece of dough’ (But. 18, Nr. 8, 13) < \**tägirtmāk* < \**tägirt-* < \**tägir-* ~ \**tägär-* (? \**tögir-* ~ \**tögär-*, see below Tuv. *tögär-ik*) \*‘to roll’ > Tat.dial. *tägärmäč* ‘wheel’ (ÈSTJa III 172), Brb. *tägärek* ‘round’ (Tum. 206), Siberian Tat. *tigärček* ‘wheel’ (Tum. 209), Alt. *tägärik* ‘round; circle’ (RAS 267a); cf. Old Uig. *tägr-ik-lä-* (< \**tägir-ik-lä-*) ‘to surround’ (ÈSTJa III 172). — Kh. *tärtpäk* ‘round’ is either the next step in the phonetic evolution of Kh. *tärtpäk* or another morphological form (< \**tägir-*, not < \**tägir-t-*). For the \**ägi* > *ä* change cf. also Kh. *älğäk* ‘biegsam’ < \**ägil-čäk* < \**ägil-* > Kh. *äl-* ‘sich biegen’ (StachM EChE). — The exact phonetic relation between Tuv. *därbäk* ‘circle’ and Tuv. *tögärik* ‘round’ remains unclear. — Chul. *tärmäč* ‘iron stove’ (Bir. 63) is probably another derivative (< \**tägirmäč*) of this verb; the change of meaning is possibly due to the round form of traditional iron stoves.

**tom**, in: *tom xalas* ‘a kind of roll of wheat flour’ (But. 18, Nr. 12). — The second component of the compound is etymologically clear (see below *xalas*) but the first is not. V. Ja. Butanaev (l.c.) refers to Mahmūd al-Kāšyarī’s item *top* in DTS 575: ‘кушанье, приготовляемое из пшеницы и овсяной муки’ (should this word be identified with [MK Comp. 197] *tōp* ‘boiled wheat?’), but it does not appear very convincing because of different final consonants. See also MK Comp. 195 *tōp* ‘ball’, which al-Kāšyarī interprets as a contraction < *topyk*; the editors of MK Comp. rightly put a “sic” to this interpretation; *tōp* is the original base of numerous derivatives, such as \**tōpyk*, see e.g. StachM GJV 83, § 16.6, with further refer-

ences. — We are rather inclined to connect Kh. *tom* with Uig. dial. *tom* ‘round’ (Ten. 168), cf. especially the usage of the word in the Uig. dial. syntagma *tom jaγ* ‘жир в комках’ = ‘fat in (round) lumps’ (op. cit.). — Three problems arise in this context. In the first place, one may ask if there actually exists no connection between (Kh.) *tom* ‘round’ and (MK) *tōp* ‘ball’. The question is quite legitimate, because the meanings and the phonetic forms show a great resemblance, especially if one considers the shortening of long vowels in Kh. which enables us to posit hypothetically an older Kh. form *\*tōm*. Now, the further analysis is possible due to Kh. gerunds like *tāp* < *\*tabyp* < *tap-* ‘to find’, *sāp* < *\*sab-yp* < *sap-* ‘to strike, to hit’ (Iskh. 26). If Kh. *ā* < *\*aby*, then possibly Kh. *ō* < *\*oby* (or *\*ōby*), which means that Kh. *tom* may go back to *\*tōm* < *\*tōbym* < *\*tōpym*, and the latter is then a derivative < *\*tōp* in the same way as *\*tōpyk*. — The difference between the reflex of *\*tōbym* and that of *\*tabyp* is that *tom* has a short vowel and *tāp* a long one. This feature seems to point to a different chronology of both formations. In his lecture on the analogy in the Turkic languages (Berlin, Autumn 1994), Professor A. M. Ščerbak (St.-Petersburg) suggested that the so-called Kh. locative suffix with directive function (*-ta*) is in reality only secondarily identical with the actual locative suffix *-ta* and that it goes back to *\*tā* < *\*taba* (< *tap-a*, which was used as a directive postposition in Old Tu.). The shortening of (*\*tōbym* >) *\*tōm* > *tom* is then parallel to that of (*\*taba* >) *\*tā* > *ta*, and both *tom* and *-ta* belong to an older layer, whereas verbal forms like *tāp* and *sāp* belong to a younger one. — Another question concerns the relation between (Old ?) Kh. *\*tōm* and Yak. *\*tuom* in *tuomtā* ‘einen Knoten machen’ (StachM GJV 77, § 13.5). At first sight, *\*tōm* and *\*tuom* seem to fit perfectly to the well-known equation: Yak. *uo* = Old Yak. / Proto-Tu. *\*ō*. The problem is that a derivative like *\*tōm-lā-* would in any case yield *\*tuom-nā-* in Yak., not the really existing *tuom-tā-*. There is only one possibility to explain a combination “voiced consonant (A) + voiceless consonant (B)” in Yak.: (B) became voiceless under the influence of another voiceless consonant which stood originally between (A) and (B). That is why Yak. *tuomtā-* is to be

traced back to *\*tōmktā-* < *\*tōmuktā-* < *\*tōmuklā-* < *\*tōmuk*, and the latter goes back to *\*tōpyk* or is a secondary derivative < *\*tōm* [= (Old ?) Kh. *\*tōm*]. — The third problem to be mentioned here is the existence of Kh. dial. (Radl. III 1234: Kača; KhR 231b) *tom* ‘medicine, medicament’ and Eastern Tu. (Radl. III 1234) *tom* ‘dick, dickflüssig (hauptsächlich von Drogen gesagt)’. It appears to us quite plausible to accept a semantic evolution \*‘something round, ball’ to \*‘pill, tablet’ and further to ‘medicine (generally)’. This would at the same time mean that *tom* in the syntagma *tom xalas* may be interpreted in its original meaning as \*‘something round, ball’, so that *tom xalas* means literally ‘round roll’. It is hard to say whether the Eastern Tu. meaning ‘thick (-flowing)’ is a next step in the same semantic evolution, e.g. ‘medicine (generally)’ > \*‘syrup’ > ‘thick’. — An interesting conjecture was proposed by E. Helimski who thinks that the whole phrase *tom xalas* is a Kh. equivalent of Russ. *\*томский калач* ‘*xalas*-roll/loaf of Tomsk’. Really, the older Kh. form of the town name *Tomsk* was *Tom* (KhR 346a), and *\*томский калач* fits the Russ. pattern of naming cakes and loafs quite well (cf. *тульский пряник*, *рижский хлеб*). But it is, regretfully, not clear if there ever existed a *\*томский калач*. Another problem is the absence of the possessive suffix (*xalas*, not *xalazy*), but an analogy can perhaps be found in phrases like Kh. *xakas kizi* ‘Khakas’, *tadar kizi* ‘Tatar’ (KhR 78b), although this analogy is not quite reliable (formations like *kizi-zi* may easily lead to haplology [*kizizi* > *kizi*] or phonetic changes like the loss of the middle syllable in a three-syllabic word [*kizizi* > *\*kizzi*] and next to the facilitation of the pronunciation of the unusual geminate *-zz-* [*\*kizzi* > *kizi*]; nothing like this could occur in *xalazy*). A further problem is why *\*томский (калач)* did not yield *\*tomskaj (xalas)* rather than *tom (xalas)*.

*уҕба* ‘blend of ground roots and barley, used as an ingredient for soups or milk foods’ (But. 20, Nr. 3) < *\*ugma* < *\*ug-* > Kh. *уҕ* ‘to rumple, to crumple’ = Chul. *ug-* ‘to break’ (Bir. 67), Tuv. *ug-* ‘to crush, to break’. — The verb *\*ug-* seems to be unknown from other Tu. languages of Siberia (cf. ÈSTJa I 401 where Kh. and Tuv. verbs are only cited). — The Kh. meaning

'to rumple' is – according to the data in ÈSTJa I 402 – probably secondary, the original meaning apparently being \*'to rub'. — The voiceless *-k-* in Uzb.dial. *ukala-* 'to pulverize, to grind' (ÈSTJa I 204) results from a long consonant in \**ukkala-* < \**ugkala-* < \**ug-*.

**ügrä** 'soup' (But. 7, Nr. 18) = Sag.-Kh. *ügrä* ~ *ürgä* id. (Pat. SD 37) = Leb.-Alt. *ürgä* id. (Bask. 219) < \**ügrä* (< \**ügürä* [> Koyb.-Kh. *ügürä* id.] < \**ügür-* \*'to rub, to crush') > Old Uig. *ügrä* 'Brei' (Zieme BSU 241b) = Tat. *öjrä* 'Graupensuppe' (Schön. 248), Kar.ŁH *iwre* 'каша, kasza' (KRP 192b) = Yak. *üörä* id. (StachM GJV 133, § 41.3).

**xalas** 'a kind of roll or small round loaf' (see above *tom*) < Russ. *kalač* id. (> Sh. Alt. *kalaš* id., Brb. *kalač* id.) > *kalač-ik*, Dimin. (> Tuv. *kalačyk* id., Yak. *xalāčyk* id., Dol. *kalāčyk* id.).

**xyjma** 'a kind of sausage, stuffed with minced meat, horse fat, onions and pepper' (But. 6, Nr. 16) < \**kyjma* (< \**kyj-* \*'to chop, to mince, to hack'). — Note the different reflexes of the suffix \**-ma* in *xyjma* and in *čarba* (see above). — Concerning the popularity of food names with \**-ma* in the Tu. languages cf. the possibility to attach this suffix even to foreign and nominal stems, as in Anatolian Trk.dial. *muxlama* 'eine Speise, die zubereitet wird, indem man Käse im Fett brät' < Ar. *muqla* 'Pupille, Augapfel' (Bläs. 44, Nr. 11).

### Abbreviations

**Alt.** = Altaian; **Ar.** = Arabic; **Brb.** = Baraba; **Bšk.** = Bashkir; **Chin.** = Chinese; **Chul.** = Chulym; **dial.** = dialect, dialectal; **Dol.** = Dolgan; **Engl.** = English; **Fi.** = Finnish; **Fr.** = French; **Kam.** = Kamass; **Kar.** = Karaim (H – Halicz; Ł – Łuck); **Kh.** = Khakas; **Kirg.** = Kirghiz; **Kklp.** = Karakalpak; **Koyb.** = Koybal; **Kzk.** = Kazakh; **Leb.** = Lebed; **Mo.** = Mongolic; **MTu.** Middle Turkic; **Ott.** = Ottoman-Turkish; **Pers.** = Persian; **Russ.** = Russian; **Sag.** = Sagay; **Sal.** = Salar; **Sam.** = Samoyedic; **Selk.** = Selkup; **Sh.** = Shor; **Tat.** = Tatar; **Tof.** = Tofalar; **Trk.** = Turkish; **Trkm.** = Turkmen; **Tu.** = Turkic; **Tuv.** = Tuvinian; **Uig.** = Uighur; **Ur.** = Uralic; **Uzb.** = Uzbek; **Yak.** = Yakut.

### References

- Bald.** = Baldauf, I.: Tatarismus in Mittelasien. Das tatarische Vorbild in der Entwicklung der uzbekischen Sprache. – Laut, J. P. / Röhrborn, K. (eds): *Sprach- und Kulturkontakte der türkischen Völker* (= Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altica 37), Wiesbaden 1993: 13-49.
- Bask.** = Baskakov, N. A.: *Dialekt lebedinskikh tatar-čalkancev (kuu-kiži). Grammatičeskij očerk, teksty, perevody, slovar'*, Moskva 1985, 233p.
- Berta** = Berta, Á.: *Lautgeschichte der tatarischen Dialekte* (= Studia Uralo-Altica 31), Szeged 1989, 304p.
- Berta GT** = Berta, Á.: Graphische Probleme des Tatarischen. – O. Werner (ed.): *Probleme der Graphie*, Tübingen 1993: 107-120.
- Bir.** = Birjukovič, R. M.: *Leksika čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka. Posobie k speckursu*, Saratov 1984, 88p.
- Bläs.** = Bläsing, U.: *Armenisch – Türkisch. Etymologische Betrachtungen ausgehend von Materialien aus dem Hemşingebiet nebst einigen Anmerkungen zum Armenischen, insbesondere dem Hemşindialekt* (= Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature 4), Amsterdam 1995, 207p.
- But.** = Butanaev, V. Ja.: *Xooraj as-tamaxary. Nacional'nye bljuda khakasov*, Abakan 1994, 32p.
- Clark** = Clark, L. V.: Turkic loanwords in Mongol, I: The treatment of non-initial *s, z, š, ž*. – *CAJ* 24 (1980): 36-59.
- DKh** = Patačakova, D. F. (ed.): *Dialekty khakasckogo jazyka. Očerki i materialy*, Abakan 1973, 158p.
- Dm.** = Dmitrieva, L. V.: *Jazyk barabinskikh tatar (Materialy i issledovanija)*, Leningrad 1981, 224p.
- DTS** = Nadeljaev, V. M. et al. (ed.): *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*, Leningrad 1969, XXXVIII + 676p.
- ÈSTJa** = Severtjan, È. V.: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskikh jazykov*, Moskva, vol. I (vowels): 1974, 767p.; vol. II ("b"): 1978, 349p.; vol. III ("v, g, d"): 1980, 395p.; vol. IV ("ğ, ž, j") [& Levitskaja, L. S.]: 1989, 293p.
- Fil.** = Filippova, T. M.: *Tjurkskie zaimstvovanija v sel'kupskom jazyke*, Novosibirsk 1991, 268p. [unpublished typescript].
- Fors.** = Forsyth, J.: *A history of the peoples of Siberia. Russian North Asian colony 1581-1990*, Cambridge 1992, XX + 455p.
- Fuj.** = Fujishiro, S.: Materials of the Dolgan language in Taymyr [in Japanese]. – *Gengogaku Kenkyu. Linguistic Research* 11 (Kyoto 1992): 261-284.
- Hel.** = Helimski, E.: Samoyedic loans in Turkic: check-list of etymologies [in press].
- Hel. TMV** = Helimski, E.: Two Mator-Taigi-Karagas vocabularies from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. – *JSFOu* 81 (1987): 49-132.
- Hitch** = Hitch, D.: Old Turkic *b* and *p*. – Sagaster, K. / Eimer, H. (eds): *Religious and lay symbolism in the Altaic world and other papers* (PIAC 27), Wiesbaden 1989: 130-146.

- Iskh.** = Iskhakov, F. G.: *Khakasskij jazyk. Kratkij očerk po fonetike*, Abakan 1956, 75p.
- Janh.** = Janhunen, J.: "Porsa" – a Siberian cultural term. – *StO* 47 (1977): 103-107.
- Jank.** = Jankowski, H.: *Gramatyka języka krymskotatarskiego*, Poznań 1992, XVIII + 455p.
- Joki** = Joki, A.: *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen* (= MSFOu 103), Helsinki 1952, 395p.
- Joki NT** = Joki, A.: Die altaische Einwirkung auf die uralische Naturterminologie. – *TUBA* 4 (1980): 57-60.
- Kač. IM** = Kałużyński, S.: Issledovanija po morfologii jakutskogo jazyka, I. – *RO* 31/2 (1968): 107-119.
- Kač. MEJ** = Kałużyński, S.: *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*, Warszawa 1961, 170p.
- Kapp.** = Kappeler, A.: *Russland als Vielvölkerreich. Entstehung – Geschichte – Zerfall*, München 1993<sup>2</sup>, 395p.
- KhR** = Baskakov, N. A. / Inkižekova-Grekul, A. I.: *Khakassko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1953, 487p.
- KRP** = Baskakov, N. A. / Zajczkowski, A. / Szapszał, S.: *Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski. Karaimsko-russko-pol'skij slovar'*, Moskva 1974, 688p.
- MK Comp.** = Dankoff, R. / Kelly, J. (eds): *Mahmūd al-Kāšyarī – Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luḡāt at Turk)*, Part III (= Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 7), Harvard 1985.
- Pat. SD** = Patačakova, D. F.: Sagajskij dialekt. – *DKh* 28-48.
- Pom.** = Pomorska, M.: New-Persian loanwords in Anatolian-Turkish dialects (1). – *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 1 (1995): 91-123.
- PrJ** = Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Językoznawcze, Kraków.
- Radl.** = Radloff, W.: *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, St.-Petersburg 1893-1905, vol. I-IV.
- RAS** = Baskakov, N. A. (ed.): *Russko-altajskij slovar'*, Moskva 1964, XXXIV + 875p.
- Rass. FLT** = Rassadin, V. I.: *Fonetika i leksika tofalarskogo jazyka*, Ulan-Ude 1971, 251p.
- Rass. MBZ** = Rassadin, V. I.: *Mongolo-burjatskie zaimstvovanija v sibirskikh tjurkskikh jazykakh*, Moskva 1980, 115p.
- RKh** = Čankov, D. I.: *Russko-khakasskij slovar'*, Moskva 1961, 967p.
- Róna-Tas** = Róna-Tas, A.: A Turkic influence on the Uralic languages. – Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences*, Leiden et al. 1988: 742-780.
- RS** = [author ?] *Russko-šorskij slovar'*, Novosibirsk 1940, 97p.
- Šč. MI** = Ščerbak, A. M.: *Očerki po sravnitel'noj morfologii tjurkskikh jazykov (Imja)*, Leningrad 1977, 192p.

- Schön.** = Schönig, C.: Bemerkungen zur Lautgruppe öy in der tatarischen Schriftsprache. – *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* 30/1-2 [= Prof. Dr. Ahmet Temir'e Armağan] (1992): 243-250.
- Sp.** = Spasskij, G. I.: Slovar' jazyka, upotrebljaemogo kizil'cami, kačincami i sagajcami, sobrannyj v 1804 godu [with comments by D. F. Patačakova]. – *DKh* 136-156.
- ŠRS** = Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. / Aponkin, F. Ja.: *Šorsko-russkij i russko-šorskij slovar'*, Kemerovo 1993, 150p.
- Stach. PL** = Stachowski, S.: Studien über die neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen, V. – *FO* 18 (1977): 87-118.
- StachM APS** = Stachowski, M.: Beiträge zur Kenntnis der arabischen und persischen Lehnwörter in den südsibirischen Türksprachen. – *FO* 29 (1992-93): 247-259.
- StachM DW** = Stachowski, M.: *Dolganischer Wortschatz* (= PrJ 114), Kraków 1993, 264p.
- StachM EChE** = Stachowski, M.: Einige chakassische Etymologien [in press].
- StachM GJV** = Stachowski, M.: *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków 1993, 208p.
- StachM PEJ** = Stachowski, M.: Persische Etymologien in der Geschichte der jakutischen Wortforschung. – *ZDMG* 142/1 (1992): 105-119.
- Tekin** = Tekin, T.: *Türk dillerinde birincil uzun ünlüler* (= TDA Dizisi 13), Ankara 1995, 192p.
- Ten.** = Tenišev, Ė. R.: *Ujgurskij dialektnyj slovar'*, Moskva 1990, 200p.
- TMEN** = Doerfer, G.: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, Wiesbaden 1965, vol. II: 4 + 671p.
- Tum.** = Tumaševa, D. G.: *Slovar' dialektov sibirskikh tatar*, Kazań 1992, 256p.
- Tyd.** = Tydykov, P. P.: *Altaj-la orus söstü bičik*, Ulala 1926, 192p.
- UigWb.** = Röhrborn, K.: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*, Lfg. 3, Wiesbaden 1981: 149-224.
- Veen.** = Veenker, W.: *Materialien zu einem onomasiologisch-semasiologischen vergleichenden Wörterbuch der uralischen Sprachen* (= Hamburger Uralistische Forschungen I), Hamburg 1975, XXV + 445p.
- Vlad.** = Vladimircov, B.: Mongolica I. Ob otnošenii mongol'skogo jazyka k indoevropejskim jazykam Srednej Azii. – *Zapiski Kollegii vostokovedov* 1 (1925): 305-341.
- Zieme BSU** = Zieme, P.: *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren* (= Berliner Turfantexte 13), Berlin 1985, 247p. + 89 tables.