

Mongolica Pragensia '16
9/1

Mongolica Pragensia '16

Ethnolinguistics, Sociolinguistics,
Religion and Culture
Volume 9, No. 1



Publication of Charles University
Faculty of Arts, Department of South and Central Asia
Seminar of Mongolian and Tibetan Studies
Prague 2016

ISSN 1803-5647

This journal is published as a part of the Programme for the Development of Fields of Study at Charles University, *Oriental Studies*, sub-programme “The process of transformation in the language and cultural differentness of the countries of South and Central Asia”, a project of the Faculty of Arts, Charles University.

The publication of this Issue was supported by the TRITON Publishing House.

Mongolica Pragensia '16
Linguistics, Ethnolinguistics, Religion and Culture
Volume 9, No. 1 (2016)

© Editors

Editors-in-chief: Veronika Kapišovská and Veronika Zikmundová

Editorial Board:

Daniel Berounský (Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic)

Agata Bareja-Starzyńska (University of Warsaw, Poland)

Katia Buffetrille (École pratique des Hautes-Études, Paris, France)

J. Lubsangdorji (Charles University Prague, Czech Republic)

Marie-Dominique Even (Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques, Paris, France)

Veronika Kapišovská (Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic)

Marek Mejor (University of Warsaw, Poland)

Tsevel Shagdarsurung (National University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia)

Domiin Tömörtogoo (National University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia)

Veronika Zikmundová (Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic)

English correction: Dr. Mark Corner (HUB University, Brussels)

Department of South and Central Asia, Seminar of Mongolian and Tibetan Studies

Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Celetná 20, 116 42 Praha 1, Czech Republic

<http://mongolistika.ff.cuni.cz>

Publisher: Stanislav Juhaňák – TRITON

<http://www.triton-books.cz>

Vykáňská 5, 100 00 Praha 10

IČ 18433499

Praha (Prague) 2016

Cover Renata Brtnická

Typeset Studio Marvil

Printed by Art D – Grafický ateliér Černý s. r. o.

Publication periodicity: twice a year

Registration number of MK ČR E 18436

ISSN 1803-5647

CONTENTS

BAYARMA KHABTAGAIEVA, SZEGED UNIVERSITY
Morphological peculiarities in Yeniseian loanwords of Altaic origin
7–25

J. LUBSANGDORJI, CHARLES UNIVERSITY
A Critique of Translations of the Synecdoche in the Secret History of the
Mongols: *Chingis Khan Lost in Translations of the SHM?*
27–38

ILYA GRUNTOV, OLGA MAZO, ALEVINA SOLOVYOVA
Mongolian euphemisms and taboos. Animals and hunting
39–58

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK, MICHAL SCHWARZ, ONDŘEJ SRBA
Mongolian – Ossetic/Alanic relations reflected in lexicon
59–70

Review Section

71

Отгонбаатар, Р., Цендина, А.Д., 2014, Образцы письменной
традиции Северной Монголии. Алфавиты, транскрипции, языки
(конец XVI – начало XX в.). Наука – Восточная литература,
Москва, 240 pp. – 1 map – illustrations; Hardcover, price: not specified;
ISBN 978-5-02-036559-9 – Reviewed by Veronika Kapišovská
73

Blažek, Václav, *Tocharian Studies*, Works 1, edited by Michal Schwarz,
Brno: Muni Press 2011, 496 pp.; Paperback, price: not specified;
ISBN 978-80-21056008 – Reviewed by Martin Gális
76

Our Contributors

79

Authors of Review

82

Morphological peculiarities in Yeniseian loanwords of Altaic origin*

BAYARMA KHABTAGAEVA, Szeged University

Summary: This paper is a part of my work *Altaio-Yeniseica*, which is now in a preparatory stage. The paper presents 24 different Yeniseian words of Altaic origin, where the native Yeniseian suffixes have been identified, or have lost the Altaic suffixes in the final position.

The topic of my current research is the exploration of Altaic elements in Yeniseian languages.¹ Most loanwords in Yeniseian from Altaic languages are nouns and adjectives. Usually they change according to typically Yeniseian phonetic features which are atypical for Altaic languages such as amalgamation, syncope, metathesis, aphaeresis, or absence of synharmony.² From a morphological point of view there are cases which are used only with native Yeniseian suffixes.

The main source of my research was the Comparative Dictionary of Yeniseian languages by Werner (Werner 2002) and his Yeniseian materials (Werner 2005). In these works we can find all of the lexical material of Yeniseian languages published so far. Another source for my work was the *Etymological Dictionary of Yeniseian languages* by Vajda and Werner, which is currently in a preparatory stage (Vajda & Werner: in preparation).

*) This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor Jaroslav Vacek.

- 1) Previous studies only focused on the Turkic elements, e.g. see the papers of Timonina (1986; 2004) and Stachowski (1996; 1997). Vajda published a valuable paper on different loanwords (Russian, Uralic, Altaic) in Ket, which aimed at examining loanwords (Vajda 2009). The Mongolic and Tungusic loanwords have not been discussed yet.
- 2) The Yeniseian languages are characterized by highly complicated grammatical features, which are absent in Altaic and Uralic languages. For example, there is a class division between masculine animate, feminine animate, and inanimate or neuter. There is a highly elaborated verbal morphology (e.g. see: Vajda & Zinn 2004; Georg 2007). One of the important distinguishing features is the existence of four monosyllabic tones (Vajda 2000) and the absence of vowel harmony.

Yeniseian languages

Yeniseian languages belong in the Paleo-Siberian language group. It has been suggested that Yeniseian languages are connected with the Sino-Tibetan, Burushaski (Karasuk) Caucasian and Na-Dené³ language families. Nowadays it is possibly correct to regard the Yeniseian language family as isolated with no known relatives among the world's languages.

According to the most recent works on historical linguistics by Starostin (1982), Vajda & Werner (in preparation), Vajda (personal communication) the Yeniseian languages are divided into at least three sub-branches: Ket-Yugh, Arin-Pumpokol, Assan-Kott, with Arin either connected with Pumpokol or Ket-Yugh or representing a fourth sub-branch. Today the Yeniseian language family is represented only by the three surviving dialects of Ket.

Yeniseian suffixes in Altaic loanwords⁴

Arin suffix *-ok*

Some Arin words of Turkic origin have the Yeniseian suffix *-ok*, which resembles the Russian diminutive suffix and typical for loanwords (For the origin of the Arin suffix see Werner 2005, p. 149):

- (1) Arin *buturčīnok* 'quail' (Werner 2002/1, p. 153) < *buturčīn-ok* < Turkic **budurčun* 'quail, Coturnyx' < **buldur+čXn* {? Turkic NN}:

cf.⁵ Old Turkic *bildürčīn* ~ *budursīn*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *pudurčun* ~ *püdürčün*; Sagai *püdürčün* (R); Altay Turkic -; Sayan Turkic -; Chulyum Turkic -; Yakut *bild'irūt* 'Siberian

3) Recently Vajda (2010) presented some linguistic facts that the Yeniseian languages display genealogical connections with the Na-Dené languages of North America, but this question remains open.

4) The transcription for Yeniseian and Altaic (Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic) data employed here follows general principles employed in Yeniseian and Altaic Studies respectively. E.g. the palatal glide consonant is given as /j/ in Yeniseian, while in Turkic it has been kept as /y/.

Important to note that the traditional transcription system which is used in most publications on Mongolic and Tungusic is close to the transcription used in Turkic Studies (see Johanson & Csató 1998, pp. xviii–xxii).

5) I follow the classification of Turkic languages according to Johanson (1998, pp. 82–83). Of the Turkic languages, only Siberian Turkic had direct linguistic contacts with Yeniseian. Besides Siberian Turkic (Yenisey Turkic, Altay Turkic, Sayan Turkic, Chulyum, Yakut and Dolgan), examples of Siberian Tatar dialect are also cited. Also Fu-yü and Yellow Uyghur

snipe'; Dolgan - ; Siberian Tatar *büldürçün*; Kirgiz *bulduruk* (< *buldur* + *Ak* {Turkic diminutive}) 'sandgrouse'; Fu-yü - ; Kazak *buldırıq* 'grouse'; Yellow Uyghur - .

From an etymological point of view, the root of the Turkic word is the forms **buldur* ~ **bıldır*, which are probably of onomatopoeic origin. The presence of the suffix +*čIn* assumes the Kirgiz *bulduruk* and Kazak *buldırıq* forms, where the diminutive suffix +*Ak* is found. Cf. also the Mongolic word *bilduur* 'small bird'⁶. (Nugteren 2011, p. 282), which is possibly of Turkic origin (On etymology see Räsänen VEWT, pp. 73b–74a; Clauson ED, pp. 335b; 309a; ESTJa 1978, pp. 305–306; SIGTJa 2001, p. 173).

- (2) Arin *xamčook* 'whip' (Werner 2002/1, p. 407) < *xamčo-ok* ← Turkic **qamčū* < *qamčī* 'a whip' < *qam-* 'to strike down' -*čI* {Turkic VN};

cf. Old Turkic *qamčī*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *xamji*; Sagai *qamji* (R); Kyzyl *χamžže*; Shor *qamčī*; Altay Turkic: Altay *qamčī*; Tuba *kamčī*; Qumanda *kamčī*; Quu *kamdži* ~ *kamži* ~ *kamčī*; Teleut *qamčī*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *kimčī*; Tofan *qimšī*; Chulym Turkic *qamčū*; Yakut *kimn* 'ī; Yakut dial. *kimn* 'ī 'pole to control deer'; Siberian Tatar *qamčī*; Kirgiz *kamčī*; Fu-yü - ; Kazak *qamšī*; Yellow Uyghur - .

The Yeniseian word clearly was borrowed from Turkic. The root of the Turkic word is the Common Turkic verb *qam-* 'to strike down' and the non-productive deverbal noun suffix -*čI* (Clauson ED, p. xliii). The etymological background of the word was examined by Räsänen (VEWT, p. 229a), Doerfer (TMEN 3, pp. 509–511), Clauson (ED, p. 626a) and ESTJa (1997, pp. 247–248). Besides Yeniseian, the Turkic word was borrowed by the Samoyedic⁷, Siberian Russian (Anikin 2000, p. 252) and Tungusic⁸ (Dorfer TMEN 3, p. 510; Romanova, Myreeva & Baraškov 1975, p. 188) languages.

- (3) Arin *kajakok* 'oil, butter' (Werner 2002/1, p. 404) < *kajak-ok* ← Turkic **kayak* 'butter, sour cream' < *qañak* 'the skin on milk, clotted cream' < *qañ-* (> *qayin-*) 'to boil' -(A)K {Turkic VN};

are important because of some similarities with Yenisey Turkic. The Fu-yü variety is classified in the Kipchak group with Kazak and Kirgiz.

- 6) Turkic → Mongolic: Middle Mongolic: Secret History *bilji'ur* 'small bird, sparrow', *bildu'ur* 'lark'; Rasulid *bildür*; Literary Mongolian *biljuuqai* 'any small bird'; Modern Mongolic: Buryat *bilžūxai* ~ *bolžūxai* ~ *bulžūxai* 'small bird'; Khalkha *byalzūxai* 'a small bird' (*bilju* + *KAi* {Mongolic Diminutive}); Dagur *bellur* ~ *beldur* 'lark' (Engkebatu); Khamnigan -
- 7) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *kamju* ~ *kamd'u* 'whip' (Joki LS, p. 156); Mator *kamji* 'whip' (Helinski 1997, p. 265).
- 8) Turkic: Yakut → Tungusic: Ewenki dial. *kimni* 'whip'.

cf. Old Turkic *qañaq* ‘the skin on milk, clotted cream’; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *xayax* ‘butter’; Sagai *xayax* ‘the food prepared from clotted cream or butter’ (Butanaev), Koibal, Kachin *qayaq* ‘butter’ (R); Kyzyl *xaymax* ‘sour cream’ (Butanaev); Shor *qaymaq* ‘sour cream’; Altay Turkic: Altay *qaymaq* ‘sour cream, cream’; Qumanda *kaymak* ‘sour cream’; Teleut *qaymaq* ‘sour cream’ (R); Sayan Turkic: Tuvan -; Chulym Turkic *qaymaq* ‘cream’; Yakut *xayax* ‘butter’; Siberian Tatar *qaimaq* ‘boiled thick sour cream’ (R); Kirgiz *kaymak* ‘cream’; Fu-yü -; Kazak *qaymaq* ‘cream, sour cream’; Yellow Uyghur -.

The Arin word was obviously borrowed from Turkic. The borrowing from Siberian Turkic proves the presence of the intervocalic consonant *VyV* instead of the original *VíV*. The Samoyedic forms were also borrowed from Siberian Turkic.⁹ For details on Turkic etymology see works of Doerfer (TMEN 3, pp. 410–412), Räsänen (VEWT, p. 231b), Clauson (ED, p. 636b) and Levitskaja (ESTJa 1997, pp. 200–201).

- (4) Arin *altinok* ‘gold’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 27) < *altin-ok* ← Turkic **altin* ‘gold’ < *altün*:

cf. Old Turkic *altün*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *altin*; Kyzyl *altin*; Shor *altin*; Altay Turkic: Altay *altin*; Tuba *altin*; Qumanda *altin*; Quu *altin*; Teleut *altin*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *aldin*; Tofan *a'tlan*; Chulym Turkic *altun*; Yakut *altan* ‘copper’¹⁰; Dolgan *altan* ‘copper’; Siberian Tatar *altin*; Kirgiz *altin*; Fu-yü *altin*; Kazak *altin*; Yellow Uyghur *altin*;

The Common Turkic word *altun* ‘gold’ belongs amongs the category of cultural words and is registered in almost all Modern Turkic languages. It was borrowed to Mongolic¹¹ (Rybatzki 2006, pp. 102–104; Nugteren 2011, p. 269), Tungusic¹² (SSTMJa 1, p. 33a), Samoyedic¹³ (Joki LS, p. 64; Filipova 1994, p. 45) and Russian (Anikin 2000, p. 84) languages. The etymology of the word is unknown. Some researchers connect it with Turkic **äl* ‘red’ and Chinese *ton* ‘copper’ (for details, see Doerfer TMEN 1, p. 142; Räsänen VEWT, p. 18a; Rybatzki 2006, pp. 102–104).

-
- 9) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *kajac* ~ *kajak* ‘butter, oil’ (Joki LS, p. 151); Mator *kajak* ‘butter, oil’ (Helinski 1997, p. 261).
 10) Yakut ← ? Tungusic, cf. Negidal *altan* ‘copper’ (SSTMJa 1, p. 33a).
 11) Turkic → Mongolic ‘gold’: Middle Mongolic: Secret History; Hua-Yi Yiyu; Muqaddimat al-Adab, Leiden *altan*; Istanbul *altat* (< *altan* + *t* {Mongolic plural}) ‘piece of gold money’; Literary Mongolian *alta(n)*; Modern Mongolic: Buryat *alta(n)*; Khalkha *altan*; Oyrat dial. *altän*; Dagur *alt* ~ *altä* ~ *altän* (Engkebatu); Khamnigan *alta(n)*.
 12) Turkic → Mongolic → Tungusic: NorthernT: Ewenki *altan* ‘gold’; Negidal *altan* ‘copper’; SouthernT: Oroch *akta* ‘tin, zinc’; Udehe *alta* ~ *arta* ‘tin, zinc’; Nanai *altä* ‘tin, tin utensils’ (SSTMJa 1, p. 33a).
 13) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *altin* ‘gold’ (Joki LS, p. 64); Selkup *altin* ‘money’ (Filipova 1994, p. 45).

Yeniseian plural suffix *-ŋ / -n*

There are some Yeniseian loanwords, which were used with the Yeniseian plural suffix *-(V)ŋ* or *-(V)n*. In some cases the suffix plays role of derivation words with collective meaning. For details on function of suffix in Yeniseian see Werner (1990, pp. 57–58), Porotova (2004, pp. 129–134) and Georg (2007, pp. 92–102). The suffix is found in Turkic and Tungusic loanwords, e.g.

- (5) Kott *kubúrgeŋ* ~ *kabúrgeŋ* ‘onion’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 447) < *kubúrgeŋ-ŋ* ~ *kabúrgeŋ-ŋ* < Turkic **köbürgän* ‘wild onion’ < **köbür* + *GAN* {Turkic NN};

cf. Old Turkic *kömürgän* ~ *köbürgän*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *köbirgeŋ*; Sagai, Koibal *köbürgän* (R); Shor *köbirgeŋ*; Altay Turkic: Altay *köbirgeŋ*; Quu *köbirgeŋ*; Teleut *köbirgeŋ*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan Toju *kögürgün*; Tofan *kögürhen* ~ *kögürhen*; Chulym Turkic - ; Yakut - ; Siberian Tatar - ; Kirgiz *köbürgön*; Fu-yü - ; Kazak - ; Yellow Uyghur - .

Due to absence of vowel harmony in Yeniseian, the Altaic loanwords regularly lost it. From etymological point of view, the Turkic word derived from the non-productive base **köbür* and Turkic denominal noun suffix +*GAN*, which forms names of plants and animals (For details on suffix function see Erdal 1991, p. 85). The base of Turkic word possibly connects with Mongolic *kömöl*.¹⁴ The Turkic word was borrowed also to Samoyedic.¹⁵ On etymology of Turkic word see Räsänen (VEWT, p. 285a), Clauson (ED, p. 691b), Rassadin (1971, p. 204), Sevortjan (ESTJa 1980, p. 100) and Tenišev (SIGTJa 2001, p. 124).

- (6) Pumpokol *aniŋ* ‘legs, feet’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 34) < *an-iŋ*¹⁶ < Turkic **yan* ‘the hip; the side, flank of the body or in other contexts’ < *yān*:

cf. Old Turkic *yān*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *nan*; Sagai *čan* ~ *nan*; Shor *čan*; Altay Turkic: Altay *d’an*; Tuba *d’an*; Qumanda *d’an* ~ *yan*; Quu *ńan*; Teleut *yan*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *čan*; Tofan *nan*; Chulym Turkic *yaŋ* ~ *čan*; Yakut - ; Siberian Tatar - ; Kirgiz *jan*; Fu-yü - ; Kazak *žan*; Yellow Uyghur *yan*.

The source of borrowing possibly was Siberian Turkic form with palatal consonant *y-*, which disappeared. This phonetic feature is also typical for

14) Cf. Middle Mongolic: - ; Literary Mongolian *kömöl* ~ *kömöli* ‘wild onion’; Modern Mongolic: Buryat - ; Khalkha *xömöl*; Oyrat dial. *kömöl* ~ *kömül*; Dagur - ; Khamnigan - .

15) Turkic → Samoyedic: cf. Kamas *köbörgän* ‘onion’ (Joki LS, p. 199).

16) Cf. the usage of plural marker in the original Yeniseian word ‘foot’ in Ket, Yugh and Kott languages: Ket *bū:l* > *bul-aŋ* ‘feet’; Yugh *bül* > *bul-uŋ*, Kott *pul* > *pul-aŋ* (Vajda & Werner: in preparation).

Tungusic loanwords.¹⁷ For etymological background of Turkic word see Räsänen (VEWT, p. 184b), Rassadin (1971, p. 208), Clauson (ED, p. 940a), Doerfer (TMEN 4, p. 120) and ESTJa (1989, p. 113).

- (7) Ket *húktenŋ* ~ *hukten* 'taboo bear eyes' (Werner 2002/1, p. 328) < *hukte-ŋ* ← Northern Tungusic **hugdī* 'rapacious, predatory' < *hug* 'bear, predator' + *dī* {Ewenki NN/Adj.}:

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *hugdī* < *hug* ~ *hüg* 'bear'; Lamut *hukečēn* 'bear'; Negidal *xūyēčēn* ~ *xūxēčēn*; Southern Amuric: -; Southern Manchuric: -.

The etymology of the Ket word is unknown. It possibly originates from the Ewenki adjective *hugdī* 'rapacious, predatory' with Yeniseian plural suffix *-ŋ*. The base of Tungusic word is *hug* with Ewenki productive denominal noun suffix +*dī*, which forms adjectives (For suffix function see Vasilevič 1958, p. 755). In Tungusic the word also belongs to the category of taboos, the original meaning of the word is 'predator' and later 'bear' (SSTMJa 2, p. 337a).

- (8) Southern Ket *ijīnes* 'spring' (Werner 2002/2, p. 421) < *iji-ŋ* + Yeniseian *e's* 'weather' (Werner 2002/1, p. 273):
iji ← Northern Tungusic **ije* 'horn':

cf. Northern: Ewenki *ije* 'horn'; Lamut *ij* ~ *ije*; Negidal *ije*; Southern Tungusic: Oroch *ije*; Udihe *jē*; Ulcha, Orok *hujē*; Nanai *hujī*; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen *wúh-yè-hēi*; Manchu *ujhe* ~ *wejhe*; Sibe -.

The Ket word belongs to hybrid compound words. In ethnographic works the word is mentioned as a taboo replacement word for the Yeniseian form *ir* (Vajda: personal communication). The word probably consists of the Tungusic word *ije* 'horn' with the Yeniseian plural suffix *-ŋ* and the Yeniseian word *e's* 'weather' (Werner 2002/1, p. 273). My assumption can be confirmed by the observation that reindeer shed their antlers during the spring season. On the etymology, derivation and correspondences of Common Tungusic word see SSTMJa (1, pp. 298b–299a).

17) E.g. Ket *enna* 'really?' (Vajda & Werner: in preparation) ← Northern Tungusic: Ewenki *yēnan* < *yē* 'what; how; really?' + *ŋĀn* {Ewenki NN}, cf. Common Tungusic *yē-* 'quest. verb what to do?'; Central Ket *aqtul* 'spring (water coming out of the ground)' (Werner 2002/1, p. 55) < *aqtu-l* ← Northern Tungusic: Ewenki *jūkte* 'spring, brook' < *jū-* 'to go out, come out' -*ktA* {Ewenki VN}.

Yeniseian nominalizer -s

One of the productive suffixes in Yeniseian is the nominalizer *-s* (Ket *-s*, Yugh *-si*, Kott *-še*, Arin *-šu*), which forms nouns from words belonging to other parts of speech (Georg 2007, pp. 122–125; Vajda: personal communication), e.g.

- From adjectival roots: Ket *ēt* ‘sharp’ → *ēts* ‘something sharp, a sharp one’;
- From inflected nouns and pronouns: Ket *ām* ‘mother’ > *ámdi* ‘mother’s’ → *ámdis* ‘which belongs to mother’; Ket *ū(k)* ‘you’ > *ūk* ‘yours’ → *úkis* ‘which belongs to you’;
- From verbal roots: Ket *kī* ‘to fly away’ → *kīs* ‘a bird, which is flying away or has flown away’; Ket *béd* ‘to do, make’ → *bèds* ‘something which is done, made’; Ket *dǎldaq* ‘he lived’ → *dǎldaqs* ‘one who lived’; Ket *dban-bun* ‘they repeatedly give me something’ → *dbanbuns* ‘those who repeatedly give me something’; etc.

The Yeniseian nominalizer among Altaic loanwords is typical of Tungusic loanwords, but was found only in one Turkic loanword, namely

- (9) Arin *bajšu* ‘wealth’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 99) < *baj-šu* ← Turkic **bay* ‘rich; a rich man’ < *bāy*:

cf. Old Turkic *bāy*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *pay*; Sagai, Koibal, Kachin *pay* (R); Kyzyl *pay* ~ *bay*; Shor *pay*; Altay Turkic: Altay *bay*; Tuba *bay*; Qumanda *bay*; Quu *pay*; Teleut *pay*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *bay*; Tofan *bay*; Chulym Turkic *pay*; Yakut *bāy*; Dolgan *bāy*; Siberian Tatar *pay*; Kirgiz *bay*; Fu-yü *bay*; Kazak *bay*; Yellow Uyghur *paj* ~ *päy*.

In Turkic the word is used as noun and adjective. The Turkic word in Arin was probably borrowed as an adjective and changed to a collective noun. The etymological background of the Common Turkic word was examined by Doerfer (TMEN 2, p. 59), Clauson (ED, p. 384a) and Sevortjan (ESTJa 1978, pp. 27–28). The Turkic word in the Siberian area was also borrowed by Samoyedic¹⁸, Mongolic (Nugteren 2011, p. 279) and Tungusic (SSTMJa 1, p. 65b).

- (10) Yugh *boŋsi* ‘dead (person)’ (Werner 2002/1, pp. 145–146) < *boŋ-si* ← Northern Tungusic **bun* < *bunī* ‘dead person; cemetery, grave’ < *bu-* ‘to die’ -*nī* {Ewenki VN}:

18) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *bai* ‘rich, wealthy; wealth, fortune’ (Joki LS 80); Mator *baj* ‘rich’ (Helimski 1997, p. 213).

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *bunī* 'death; dead corpse; burial place, grave; hell, ghost; dead person'; Lamut *buni* 'dead person; long-lived people'; Negidal *bunī* 'death; afterworld'; Southern Amuric: Oroch *buñi* 'afterworld'; Udihe *bunige* ~ *bunije* 'afterworld'; Ulcha *bu-* 'to die'; Orok *bu-*; Nanai *bu-*; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen *pūh-ē-ē-hēi*; Manchu *bude-* ~ *buče-* 'to die'; Sibe - .

The Tungusic word was also borrowed by Ket *bō'ŋ* 'dead person' and its derived form *boŋnij* 'cemetery; grave'. As in Ket, the Yugh form also lost the original final Tungusic vowel. From an etymological point of view (SSTMJa 1, pp. 98–99), the Tungusic word is derived from the verb *bu-* 'to die' and the Ewenki productive deverbal noun suffix *-nī*, which forms nouns designating state, condition or natural phenomenon, e.g. *d'uganī* 'summer' < *d'uga-* 'to be (about summer)', *binī* 'life' < *bi-* 'to be', etc. (For details on suffix function see Vasilevič 1958, p. 782).

- (11) Ket *toqtis* 'slope of a riverbank or hill' (Vajda & Werner: in preparation) < *toqti-s* ← Northern Tungusic **tukti-* 'to go up a slope or mountain':

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *tūkti-* ~ *tukti-*; Lamut *töt-* ~ *tüöt-*; Negidal *tukti-*; Southern Amuric: Oroch *tukti-*; Udihe *tukti-*; Ulcha *tō-*; Orok *tōqpo-* ~ *tōpgo-*; Nanai *tō-*; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen - ; Manchu *tuk'e-*; Sibe *tuqi-*.

Through the Yeniseian nominalizer *-s* the Tungusic verb changed to a noun in Ket. The Tungusic verb is widespread in almost all Tungusic languages; for derivations and correspondences see SSTMJa (2, p. 209b).

Yeniseian adjective-forming suffix *-Xŋ/-Xn*

There are some Turkic and Tungusic loanwords in Yeniseian derived using the Yeniseian non-productive denominal noun suffix *-Xŋ/-Xn*, which forms adjectives, e.g. Ket *qà* ~ *qàn* 'big', *bɔ'l* ~ *bɔlan* 'fat', *ugde* ~ *ugdeŋ* 'long', *hılan* 'sweet' < *hi'l* 'birch sap', etc. (Vajda 2004, p. 38). The Yeniseian suffix is found in Turkic and Tungusic loanwords, e.g.

- (12) Assan *esrolagin* ~ *esrolokon* 'drunk' (Werner 2002/1, p. 268) < *esrolag-ŋn* ~ *esrolok-on* ← Turkic **äsäriklig* 'drunk, intoxicated' < *äsär-* 'to be or become drunk, intoxicated' -(X)K {Turkic VN} +IXK {Turkic NN/Adj.}:

cf. Old Turkic *äsür-*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *izirik*; Sagai, Koibal, Kachin *ezirik* (R); Kyzyl *ezirik*; Shor *azirik* (R); Altay Turkic: Altay *ezirik*; Tuba *ezirik*; Qumanda *ezir-*; Quu *ezirik*; Teleut *ezirik*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *ezirik*; Tofan *ecsirik*; Chulyum Turkic *ezerek*; Yakut *itirik*;

Dolgan *itirik*; Siberian Tatar *izerek*; Kirgiz *esirik* 'stupid'; Fu-yü *izür-*; Kazak *esiriktik* 'intoxication; irresponsible state'; Yellow Uyghur *iser-* ~ *eser-*.

The Assan forms underwent the metathesis *-kl-* > *-lk-*, which is peculiar for Altaic elements in Yeniseian. From the etymological point of view, the Turkic word is derived from the verb *äsär-* 'to be or become drunk, intoxicated' with productive deverbal noun suffix *-(X)K* and denominal noun/adjective suffix *+LXK*. For other Turkic data and etymology see Räsänen (VEWT, p. 50b), Clauson (ED, p. 251a) and Sevortjan (ESTJa 1974, pp. 309–310). From Siberian Turkic the word also was borrowed by Samoyedic¹⁹ (Joki LS, p. 129).

- (13) Yugh *itiñsi* 'stinking' (Werner 2002/1, p. 385) < *ĩ't* 'smell, aroma' *-iñ -si* {Yeniseian nominalizer} ← Turkic **yit* 'scent, odour, smell' < *yid*:

cf. Old Turkic *yid*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *čis*; Sagai *čis* (R); Koibal, Kachin *yis* (R); Shor *čizig*; Altay Turkic: Altay *d'it*; Tuba *d'it*; Qumanda *d'it*; Quu *yit*; Teleut *yit*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *čit*; Tofan *čit*; Chulym Turkic -; Yakut *sit*; Dolgan *hit*; Siberian Tatar *yis* ~ *is* ~ *yes*; Kirgiz *žit*; Fu-yü -; Kazak *is*; Yellow Uyghur -.

The source of borrowing may be Altay Turkic **yit* with initial *y-* and devoiced consonant *t*. The disappearance of the initial *y-* is a typical feature for Yeniseian loanwords. Cf. above Pumpokol *aniñ* 'legs, feet', where the Turkic initial *y-* is dropped also. For the etymological background of the Turkic word see Clauson (ED, p. 887b) and Sevortjan (ESTJa 1974, pp. 380–382).

- (14) Ket *táñijen* 'careful, thorough' (Werner 2002/2, p. 299) < *táñi-enj* ← Northern Tungusic **tañni* 'counting, calculation' < *tañ-* 'to count, to read, to think, to calculate; to sum up' + *nī* {Ewenki NN}:

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *tañni* < *tañ-*; Lamut *tañ-*; Negidal *tañ-*; Southern Amuric: Oroch *tañæ-* ~ *tañi-*; Udihe *tañi-*; Ulcha *taun-*; Orok *tawun* ~ *taun-*; Nanai *taon-*; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen *táo-wên-lâh* 'to read'; Manchu *ton* 'number'; Sibe -.

The Ket word is probably linked to the Ewenki noun *tañni* 'the person, who counts, calculates', which is derived from the verb *tañ-* 'to count, to read, to think, to calculate; to sum up' with productive deverbal nomen suffix *-nī* (for suffix function see Vasilevič 1958, p. 782). The Tungusic etymology assumes the lexical meaning of the Common Tungusic verb, which is further developed in Ket as 'the person, who counts, calculates' → 'careful, thorough person'.

19) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *ēzirek* ~ *izirek* 'intoxicated, drunk'; Motor *isür* 'drunk' (Joki LS, pp. 129, 140).

For more derivations of the Tungusic verb and correspondences see SST-MJa (2, pp. 161–162).

Yeniseian adjective-forming suffix *-tu*

Some Altaic loanwords take the Yeniseian suffix *-tu*, which usually forms adjectives. According to Georg, the Yeniseian denominal adjectives with this suffix may be rendered as ‘having sg., endowed with sg.’ E.g. Ket *kūl* ‘beard’ → *kūltu* ‘bearded’, *ūl* ‘water’ → *ūltu* ‘wet’, *du* ‘smoke’ → *dūtu* ‘smoky’, etc. (Georg 2007, pp. 141–142). It is often found in Turkic loanwords, e.g.

- (15) Kott *kuštu* ‘very strong’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 458) < *kuš-tu* ← Turkic **küš* (cf. Kyzyl, Shor) < *kūč* ‘strength, power, energy’:

cf. Old Turkic *kūč*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *kūs*; Sagai, Koibal *kūs* (R); Kyzyl *küš* ~ *kuš*; Shor *küš*; Altay Turkic: Altay *kūč*; Tuba *kūč*; Qumanda *kūč*; Quu *kūč*; Teleut *kūč*; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *küš*; Tofan *küš*; Chulyum Turkic *kūč*; Yakut *kūs*; Dolgan *kūs* ~ *küs*; Siberian Tatar *kūc*; Kirgiz *kūč*; Fu-yü *güštih* (< *küclüg* < *kūč*+LXG) ‘strong’; Kazak *kūs*; Yellow Uyghur *kuš*.

The Kott word was obviously borrowed from Siberian Turkic. Judging from its form, the source should be the Yenisey Turkic form with final consonant *-š*, which changed from *-č*. There are similar forms with suffix *-tü* in Samoyedic²⁰ (Joki LS, p. 220; Helimski 1997, p. 296). In these cases the source of borrowing is unclear. They may be borrowed from Yeniseian, or directly from Turkic. On the etymology of the Turkic word see Clauson (ED, p. 693a) and Sevortjan (ESTJa 1980, p. 96).

- (16) Kott *thantu* ‘snow flurry, storm’ (Werner 2002/2, p. 315) < *than-tu* ← Turkic **tan* ‘a cool breeze’ < *tān*:

cf. Old Turkic *tān*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *tan* ‘breeze’; Sagai, Koibal, Kachin *tan* ‘wind, north wind’ (R); Altay Turkic: Altay -; Qumanda *tan* ‘sharp wind’; Sayan Turkic: Tuvan-; Chulyum Turkic -; Yakut -; Siberian Tatar -; Kirgiz -; Fu-yü -; Yellow Uyghur -.

The Kott word was possibly borrowed from Turkic *tan* ‘breeze, wind’ with native Yeniseian suffix. The aspirated consonant *th-* in the initial position suggests an early period of borrowing or the difference of Kott sources. The strict difference between *t-* and *th-* in the Kott sources is absent. In Modern Turkic languages the word has been preserved only in Yenisey Turkic and

20) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *küštü* ‘strong, powerful, vigorous’ (Joki LS, p. 220); Mator *küštü* ‘strong, powerful’ (Helimski 1997, p. 296).

Altay Turkic dialects. The word is present in the Middle Turkic source Kāšgārī with the original long vowel *tān* ‘a cold wind, which blows at dawn and sunset’ (Clauson ED, p. 510a; Räsänen VEWT, p. 460b; SIGTJa 2001, p. 42). From Turkic the word was also borrowed by Samoyedic.²¹

- (17) Kott *turkatu* ‘quick, rapid’ (Werner 2002/2, p. 290) < *turka-tu* ← Turkic **türgen* ‘quick, rapid’ ← Mongolic *türgen* ‘quick, swift, rapid, speedy; hurried; soon’:

cf. Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *türgün* ‘quick, hurried’ (Butanaev); Shor -; Altay Turkic: Altay *türgen* ‘quick, rapid; quickly, soon’; Tuba *türgen* ‘quick, rapid; quickly, hurried’; Qumanda *türgen* ‘quick, hurried’; Teleut *türgän* ‘hurry, fast’ (R); Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *dürgen* ‘quick, rapid; speed’; *fig.* irascible, hotheaded’; Tofan *türgen* ‘quick, rapid’; Chulym Turkic -; Yakut *türgän* ‘speed; quick, fast’; Dolgan *türgän* ‘quick’; Siberian Tatar -; Kirgiz *dürgü-* ‘to run in fear’; Fu-yü -; Kazak -; Yellow Uyghur *türgen* ‘quickly’

Turkic ← Mongolic *türgen* ‘quick, swift, rapid, speedy; hurried; soon’: Middle Mongolic: Secret History *türgen* ~ *türgün*; Muqaddimat al-Adab *türgen*; Hua-Yi Yiyu *türgen*; Literary Mongolian *türgen*; Modern Mongolic: Buryat *türgen*; Khalkha *türgen*; Kalmuck *türgn*; Dagur *turyun*; KhamniganT *türgen*.

The Kott word was borrowed from the Siberian Turkic form **türgen* and took the native Yeniseian denominal noun suffix. Due to the absence of vowel harmony in Yeniseian, the borrowed Turkic form *türgen* changed to *turkan* in Kott. The Turkic consonant cluster *-rg-* regularly devoiced in Kott. From an etymological aspect, the Turkic form is of Mongolic origin (Rassadin 1971, p. 104; 1980, p. 71; Schönig 2000, p. 183; Khabtagaeva 2009, p. 242). The Mongolic word is present in almost all Middle Mongolic sources and Modern Mongolic languages (Nugteren 2011, p. 528). Possibly the Mongolic word derived from the dead base **türge*^{±22} and the productive deverbal noun suffix *-n*, which forms adjectives²³ (see Poppe GWM, §175; Khabtagaeva 2009, p. 287). The Mongolic word was also borrowed by Tungusic²⁴ (SSTMJa 2, p. 219; Doerfer 1985, p. 82; Rozycki 1994, p. 213) languages.

21) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *tan* ‘cold, gentle winter wind; north’ (Joki LS, pp. 308–309).

22) Cf. Literary Mongolian *türged-* ‘to be rash; to be too quick; to fly into a temper’ (< **türge* +*d-* {NV}); *türgedke-* ‘to accelerate, speed up; to urge, incite’ (< **türge* +*dKA-* {NV}); *türgele-* ‘to speed up; to hurry, hasten’ (< **türge* +*lA-* {NV}); *türgedügün* ‘rash, hasty’ (< **türge* +*dA-* {NV} -*GÜn* {VN}), etc.

23) Literary Mongolian *dolgin* ‘hot-tempered, quick-tempered, passionate; imprudent’ < *dolgi-* ‘to wave, undulate; to splash out; to be restless’; *singgen* ‘fluid’ < *singge-* ‘to be absorbed’; etc.

24) Mongolic → Tungusic: Northern Tungusic: Ewenki dial. *türgen* ‘quick, rapid; vigorous, energetic’; Lamut *turgun* ‘quick, fleet-footed’; Negidal *tujgen* (< **turgen*) ‘quick, clever’; Southern Tungusic: Oroch *tuggen* (< **tujgen* < **turgen*) ‘quick, rapid’; Udihe *tuge* (< **tuggen* <

The final *-l* of unknown origin

During my research I found several Turkic and Tungusic loanwords with a final consonant *-l* of unknown origin. According to Yeniseian forms, it should be a Yeniseian peculiarity, but we do not have any information about this feature. Mostly it is peculiar to Tungusic loanwords in Ket, whereas among Turkic loanwords only one case has been found.

- (18) Kott *bišól*; Assan *bišol* ‘calf’ (Werner 2002/1, p. 153) < *bišo-l* ← Turkic **pizō* ‘calf’ < *buzāḡu*:

cf. Old Turkic *buzāḡu*; Yenisey Turkic: Khakas *pizo* ~ *pizā*; Sagai *puzā* ~ *puzū* ~ *pizā* ~ *pizō* (R); Shor *piza*; Altay Turkic: Altay *biza* ~ *bozu*; Tuba *bōzu*; Qumanda *pozū*; Teleut *pozū* (R); Sayan Turkic: Tuvan *bizā*; Tofan –; Chulym Turkic –; Yakut –; Siberian Tatar *posau*; Kirgiz *muzō*; Fu-yü *buza* ‘bull’; Kazak *buzaw*; Yellow Uyghur –.

The source of borrowing is possibly one Yenisey Turkic variety. The change of Turkic intervocalic *VzV* through unvoiced **VsV* to *VšV* in Yeniseian occurred due to the absence of *VzV* consonant in Yeniseian. For the etymological background of the Turkic word see Räsänen (VEWT, p. 74b), Clauson (ED, p. 391a), Sevorjan (ESTJa 1978, pp. 239–242) and SIGTJa (2001, pp. 438–439). The Turkic word was also borrowed by Samoyedic²⁵ (Joki LS, pp. 110–112) and by Mongolic with rotacized form.²⁶

- (19) Central Ket *aqtul* ‘spring (water coming out of the ground)’ < *aqtu-l* ← Northern Tungusic **jukte* < *jükte* ‘spring, brook’ < *jū-* ‘to get out; to leave’ -*ktA* {Ewenki VN}:

The disappearance of Tungusic initial *j-* is peculiar to some Ket loanwords, e.g. Ket *enna* ‘really?’ ← Northern Tungusic: Ewenki **jēḡan* < *jē* ‘what; how; really?’ + *ḡAn* {Ewenki NN}, cf. Common Tungusic *jē-* ‘quest. verb what to do?’ The root of the word is the Common Tungusic verb *jū-* ‘to go out, come out’. The borrowing from Ewenki is evident from the presence of the Ewenki productive deverbal noun suffix *-ktA*

**tujgen* < **turgen*) ‘quick’; Ulcha *turgen*; Nanai *turge*; Manchu *turgen* ‘quick; fast; urgent; serious illness’.

25) Turkic → Samoyedic: Kamas *buziüi* ~ *buso* ‘calf’ (Joki LS, pp. 110–112).

26) Turkic → Mongolic: Middle Mongolic: Secret History *burā’u*; Muqaddimat al-Adab *burū* ‘three-year-old calf’; Literary Mongolian *birayu(n)* ‘calf in its second year’; Modern Mongolic: Buryat *burū* ‘calf under the age of one year (bear, lynx, moose, red deer)’; Khalkha *byarū* ‘calf in the second year’; Oyrat dial. *bürū* ~ *bürō* ~ *börū* ‘calf’; Dagur –; KhamniganT *burū(n)* ‘calf in the second year’.

(for function see Vasilevič 1958: 764), which is absent in other Tungusic forms (see also SSTMJJa 1, pp. 348b–349a).

- (20) Ket *saŋɔl* ‘chimney of a dug-out’, cf. Central Ket *sɔnal* ‘smoke hole of a dug-out’ (Vajda & Werner: in preparation) < *sona-l* ← Northern Tungusic **sōna* ~ *sōŋa* ‘chimney’:

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *sōna* ~ *sōŋa* ~ *suona* ~ *hōna* ~ *šōna* ‘smoke hole of a dug-out; chimney of a dug-out’; Lamut *hōnan* ~ *hōnān* ‘smoke hole of a dug-out; rafter’; Negidal *sōna* ‘id.’; Southern Amuric: Oroch *sōno* ‘smoke hole of a dug-out’; Udihe - ; Ulcha *sōn* ‘roof rafter’; Orok *sōno* ‘smoke hole of a dug-out; rafter’; Nanai *sō* ‘roof rafter; pole’; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen - ; Manchu *son* ‘pole’; Sibe - .

The Ket forms are possibly connected with Ewenki. There are two different phonetic forms in Ket, which probably were borrowed from different Ewenki dialectal forms. For correspondences with the Tungusic word see SSTMJJa (2, p. 110). The Ewenki word was also borrowed by Yakut²⁷, where the Ewenki long vowel -ō- is present as the diphthong -uo- (Romanova, Myreeva & Baraškov 1975, p. 175).

The loss of Altaic suffixes

There are some of Turkic and Tungusic loanwords, where the suffixes have been dropped. This feature can be explained by the monosyllabic structure of Yeniseian words and the polysyllabic structure of Altaic words, especially Tungusic words. Most loanwords belong to the names of plants, birds and insects, e.g.

- (21) Kott *tīpar* ~ *tīpar* ‘fog’ (Werner 2002/2, p. 265) ← Turkic **tumarik* ‘haze’ < *tum* ‘cold’ + *Ar-* {Turkic NV} -(X)K {Turkic VN}:

cf. Old Turkic *tum* ‘cold’, cf. *tuman* ‘mist, fog’; Yenisey Turkic: - ; Altay Turkic: Altay *tumarik* ‘mist, haze’, cf. *tuman* ‘fog’; Tuba -; Qumanda *tumarik* ‘mist, haze, dim’; Quu -; Teleut *tumarik* ‘the fog; cloudy, foggy’, cf. *tuman* ‘fog, darkness’ (R); Sayan Turkic: - ; Chulym Turkic - ; Yakut *tumarik* ‘darkness, gloom’; Siberian Tatar *tumariqla-* ‘to be overcast (weather)’; Kirgiz *tunarik* ‘misty distance, fog, haze’; Yellow Uyghur - .

The etymology of the Kott forms is unknown. I assume that they were borrowed from the Turkic form *tumarik* ‘haze’. The source of the borrowing was possibly the shortened form **tīmar*, where the Kott vowel -ī- in the first

27) Tungusic → Turkic: Yakut *suona* ‘chimney of a dug-out’.

syllable was assimilated by the original Turkic *-i-* in the last syllable. Besides this, a change in the intervocalic *VmV > VpV* occurred.

From an etymological aspect, the base of Turkic word is *tum* 'cold', cf. Old Uyghur *tumluğ* (< **tum*+*IXG*) 'dark, overcast', Tatar dial. *tumsa* 'gloomy, unfriendly' (< **tum*+*sA*), Turkish dial. *dumçuk* (< **tum*+*čXK*) 'cloudy weather' (for details, see ESTJa 1980, p. 295). According to Erdal (1991, pp. 387–388), the Turkic word *tuman* 'fog' is derived from the verb **tum-* and the deverbial noun suffix *-mAn*. This possibility strengthens the morphological structure of the form *tumarik*, where the base is the reconstructed verb **tum-* with the suffix *-Ar-* and the deverbial noun suffix *-(I)K*.

- (22) Ket *tə'qtə ~ tə'qt* 'wagtail (several species of birds of the genus *Motacilla*)' (Werner 2002/2, p. 305) ← Northern Tungusic **tigdewkī* 'lark' < *tigde*- 'to rain' -*wkī* {Ewenki VN, see Vasilevič 1958, p. 747}:

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *tigdewkī* 'lark' < *tigde* 'rain'; Lamut *tīd* 'rainy, cloudy'; Negidal *tigde*; Southern Amuric: Oroch *tigde*; Udihe *tigde*; Ulcha *tugde*, cf. *tugdeku-* 'to herald rain (about birds)'; Orok *tugde ~ tugje*; Nanai *tugde ~ tigde*; Southern Manchuric: - .

The Ket forms probably connect with the Ewenki word *tigdewkī* 'lark'²⁸. Despite the fact that the Ewenki and Ket words designate various names of birds, both birds belong to the same class *Aves* and order *Passeriformes*. From the phonetic aspect, the devoicing of Tungusic cluster *-gd-* > *-qt-* and the change of Tungusic vowel *-i-* > *-ə-* in Ket are regular changes.

It is interesting to consider the etymology of the Ewenki word. Possibly the word was derived from the verb *tigde-* 'to rain' and the productive deverbial noun suffix *-vkī*, which forms the names of vocations (Vasilevič 1958, p. 747). According to signs relating to superstitions, the lark is one of the birds heralding rain. For the etymology of the Tungusic word see SSTMJa (2, p. 175b).

- (23) Northern Ket *tīl* 'gadfly'; Ket *tīl* 'horsefly, reindeer fly' (Vajda & Werner: in preparation) ← Northern Tungusic **dilkēn* 'fly' < *dil*+*kĀn* {Ewenki NN/Diminutive}:

cf. Northern: Ewenki dial. *dilkēn ~ delkēn ~ dīlkekēn ~ delkekēn*; Lamut *dileken ~ dilken ~ deliken*; Negidal *dirkēn ~ dilken*; Southern Amuric: Oroch *giluwe ~ giluyē*; Udihe - ; Ulcha *gilekte*; Orok *jīl'o*; Nanai *jīlekū*; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen - ; Manchu *derhuwe*; Sibe - .

28) Despite of that fact, the other Tungusic languages use word without suffix, I suppose the word was borrowed from Ewenki. Due to the absence of loanwords from other Tungusic languages.

Possibly the Ket forms were borrowed from the Ewenki form *dilkēn* ‘fly’ with diminutive suffix *+kĀn* (for suffix function see Vasilevič 1958, p. 759). The devoicing of initial Tungusic *d-* is atypical. Usually it is preserved, but it may have occurred because of the following vowel *-i-*. The Tungusic word is present in almost all languages (SSTMJa 1, p. 207a).

(24) Ket *ullen* ~ *úlen*; Yugh *úljan* ‘pochard (diving duck, *Aythya ferina*)’ (Werner 2002/2, p. 341) ← Northern Tungusic **ulanmukī* ‘pochard’ < *ula-* ‘to get wet’ -*n* {Ewenki VN} +*mukī* {Ewenki NN}:

cf. Northern: Ewenki *ulanmukī* ‘pochard’ < *ula-* ‘to get wet’; Lamut *ul-* ~ *ula-*; Negidal *ola-* ~ *ulla-*; Southern Amuric: Oroch -; Udihe *ula-*; Ulcha -; Orok *ula-*; Nanai *ularikō* ‘dial. wet’; Southern Manchuric: Jurchen -; Manchu *ulya-*; Sibe -.

The etymology of Yeniseian words is uncertain. Werner connects them with the native Yeniseian word *u’l* ‘water’ and puts into question the element *-en* (Werner 2002/2, p. 341). The Yeniseian forms were possibly borrowed from Ewenki *ulanmukī* with the same lexical meaning ‘pochard’, where the final Ewenki suffix²⁹ disappeared in Yeniseian. From an etymological point of view, the Ewenki name of bird is derived from the Common Tungusic verb *ula-* ‘to get wet’, which is present in almost all Tungusic languages. It is possible to connect the Tungusic verb with the native Yeniseian word **Huλ* ‘water’, cf. Ket *ū’l*; Yugh *ūr*; Pumpokol *ul*; Arin *kul* ~ *kūl*; Assan *ul*, Kott *ul*. For more derivation and correspondences in Tungusic languages see SSTMJa (2, pp. 257–258).

Conclusion

The etymological analysis of Altaic loanwords in Yeniseian shows that some native Yeniseian suffixes regularly appear. In most cases the identification of them is not difficult, as in the case of the diminutive suffix *-ok*, the plural suffix *-(V)ŋ* ~ *-(V)n*, the nominalizer *-s* or the adjective suffixes *-Xŋ* and *-tu*; but there are some endings whose origin is unclear, such as *-l*. In several polysyllabic words, the suffixes at the end of the word dropped out, a feature which can be explained as a Yeniseian phenomenon. For Yeniseian languages typically contain monosyllabic words.

29) The suffix *+mukī* is productive in Ewenki, forming the names of animals, e.g. *ōranmukī* ‘a kind of duck’ < *ōran* ‘rapids’, *solonmukī* ‘small bug’, etc. (for details on the suffix function see Vasilevič 1958, p. 776).

Abbreviations

- NN = denominal noun suffix
 NN/Adj. = denominal noun suffix forming adjectives
 NV = denominal verbum suffix
 VN = deverbal nomen suffix

References

- ALTAY = BASKAKOV, N.A.; TOŠČAKOVA, T.M., 1947, *Ojratsko-russkij slovar'* (Altay Turkic – Russian Dictionary). Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej, Moskva.
- ANIKIN, A.E., 2000, *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkix dialektov Sibiri: zaimstvovanija iz ural'skix, altajskix i paleoaziatskix jazykov* (Etymological Dictionary of Siberian Russian Dialects: Loanwords from the Uralic, Altaic and Paleo-Asiatic Languages). Nauka, Novosibirsk.
- BASKAKOV, N.A.; INKIŽEKOVA-GREKUL, A.I., 1953, *Xakassko-russkij slovar'* (Khakas – Russian Dictionary). Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej, Moskva.
- BURYAT = ČEREMISOV, K.M., 1973, *Burjatsko-russkij slovar'* (Buryat – Russian Dictionary). Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija, Moskva.
- BUTANAEV, V.JA., 1999, *Xakassko-russkij istoriko-ėtnografičeskij slovar'* (Khakas – Russian Historical-Ethnographical Dictionary). UPP Xakasija, Abakan.
- CHULYM TURKIC = BIRJUKOVIČ, R.M., 1984, *Leksika čulymsko-tjurskogo jazyka. Posobie k speckursu* (Lexicon of Chulyum Turkic. Textbook for a Specialist Courses). Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Universiteta, Saratov.
- CLAUSON ED = CLAUSON, G., 1972, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- DOERFER TMEN = DOERFER, G., 1963–1975, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 1–4. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- DOERFER, G., 1985, *Mongolo-Tungusica*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- ERDAL, M., 1991, *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon*. Wiesbaden.
- ESTJA 1978 = SEVORTJAN, Ė.V., *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na b* (Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. Common Turkic words with initial consonant *b*). Tom 2. Moskva.
- ESTJA 1980 = SEVORTJAN, Ė.V., *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov: Obščertjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na v, g, d* (Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. Common Turkic words with initial consonant *v, g, d*). Tom 3. Moskva.
- ESTJA 1997 = LEVITSKAJA, L.S.; DYBO, A.V. & RASSADIN, V.I. (eds.) *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvy «k, q»* (Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. Common Turkic words with initial consonant *v, g, d*). Moskva.
- EWENKI = BOLDYREV, B.V. 2000, *Ėvenkijsko-russkij slovar'* (Ewenki – Russian Dictionary). 1–2. Izdatel'stvo SO RAN, filial GEO, Novosibirsk.
- FILLIPOVA, T.M., 1994, *Leksičeskie zaimstvovanija iz tjurkskix v sel'kupskix dialektax* (Turkic Loanwords in Selkup Dialects). In: *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 85. pp. 41–70.
- FU-YÜ = ZHEN-HUA, HU; IMART, GUY, 1987, *Fu-yü Ğirĝis: A tentative description of the easternmost Turkic language*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- GEORG, S., 2007, *A descriptive grammar of Ket (Yenisei-Ostyak)*. Introduction, phonology, morphology. Global Oriental, Folkestone/Kent.

- HELIMSKI, E., 1997, *Die Matorische Sprache. Wörterverzeichnis. Grundzüge der Grammatik. Sprachgeschichte*. Szeged.
- JOHANSON, L.; CSATÓ, É.Á. (EDS.), 1998, *The Turkic languages*. Routledge, London & New York.
- JOHANSON, L., 1998, The history of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London, pp. 81–125.
- JOKI LS = JOKI A.J., 1952, *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen*. Helsinki.
- KALMUCK = RAMSTEDT, G.J., 1935, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Société Finno- Ougrienne, Helsinki.
- KAZAK = BEKTAEV, K., 1999, *Bolšoj kazaxsko-russkij slovar' i rusško-kazaxskij slovar'* (Complete Kazakh – Russian and Russian – Kazakh Dictionary). Almaty.
- KHABTAGAEVA, B., 2009, *Mongolic elements in Tuvan*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- KHAKAS = BASKAKOV; Inkižekova-Grekul, 1953, Butanaev 1999
- KHALKHA = BAWDEN, CH., 1997, *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. Kegan Paul International, London & New York.
- KIRGIZ = JUDAXIN, K.K., 1965, *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'* (Kirgiz – Russian Dictionary). Sovetskaja enciklopedija, Moskva.
- KYZYL = JOKI, A., 1953, *Wörterverzeichnis der Kyzyl-Sprache*. Druckerei-A.G. der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, Helsinki.
- LM = LESSING, F.D., 1996, *Mongolian-English dictionary*. The Mongolia society, Inc., Bloomington.
- NUGTEREN, H., 2011, *Mongolic phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu languages*. Landelijke Onderzoeschool Taalwetenschap, Utrecht.
- OLD TURKIC = see Clauson 1972.
- OYRAT DIAL. = COLOO, J., 1988, *BNMAU dax' mongol xelnii nutgiin ayalguunii tol' bičig. Oird ayalguu* (Mongolian Dialects in the Mongolian People's Republic. Oyrat Dialect). Ulsyn xevleliin gazar, Ulaanbaatar.
- POPPE GWM = POPPE, N., 1964, *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- POROTOVA, T. I., 2004, Patterns of plural formation in Kott nouns and adjectives. In: Vajda, E. J. (ed.) *Languages and Prehistory of Central Siberia*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 129–134.
- QUMANDA = BASKAKOV, N.A., 1972, *Dialekty kumandincev (kumandy-kiži). Severnye dialekty altajskogo (ojrotskogo) jazyka. Grammatičeskij očerk, teksty, perevody i slovar'* (Kumandi-Kizhi Dialect of Altay Turkic. Grammatical Overview, Texts, Translations and Dictionary). Nauka, Moskva.
- QUU = BASKAKOV, N.A., 1975, *Dialekt lebedinskix tatar-čalkancev (kuu-kiži). Grammatičeskij očerk, teksty, perevody i slovar'* (Kuu-Kizhi Dialect of Altay Turkic. Grammatical Overview, Texts, Translations and Dictionary). Nauka, Moskva.
- R = RADLOFF, W., 1893–1911, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. 1–4. St. Petersburg.
- RASSADIN, V.I., 1971, *Fonetika i leksika tofalarskogo jazyka* (Phonetics and Lexicon of Tofan). Burjatskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo, Ulan-Ude.
- RÄSÄNEN VEWT = RÄSÄNEN, M., 1969, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk-sprachen*. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.
- ROMANOVA, A.V.; MYREVA, A.N.; BARAŠKOVA, P.P., 1975, *Vzaimovlijanie evenkijskogo i jakutskogo jazykov* (Linguistic Interference between the Ewenki and Yakut Languages). Nauka, Leningrad.
- ROZYCKI, W., 1994, *Mongol elements in Manchu*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- RYBATZKI, V., 2006, *Die Personennamen und Titel der mittelmongolischen Dokumente. Eine lexikalische Untersuchung*. Helsinki.
- SIBERIAN TATAR = TUMAŠEVA, D.G., 1992, *Slovar' dialektov sibirskix tatar* (Dictionary of the Dialects spoken by Siberian Tatars). Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo universiteta, Kazan'.

- SIGTJA 2001 = TENIŠEV, Ė.R. (ed.), 2001, *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Leksika* (A Comparative Grammar of Turkic Languages. Lexicon). Nauka, Moskva.
- SSTMJA = CINCIUS, V.I. (ed.), 1975–1977, *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskix jazykov* (Comparative Dictionary of Tungusic Languages). 1–2. Nauka, Leningrad.
- SCHÖNIG, C., 2000, *Mongolische Lehnwörter im Westoghusischen*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- SHOR = KURPEŠKO-TANNAGAŠEVA, N.N.; APON'KIN, F.JA., 1993, *Šorsko-russkij i rusško-šorskij slovar'* (Shor – Russian and Russian – Shor Dictionary). Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo, Kemerovo.
- STACHOWSKI, M., 1996, Über einige altaische Lehnwörter in den Jenissej-Sprachen. *Studia Ety-mologica Cracoviensia* 1, pp. 91–115.
- STACHOWSKI, M., 1997, Altaistische Anmerkungen zum "Vergleichenden Wörterbuch der Jenissej-Sprachen". *Studia Ety-mologica Cracoviensia* 2, pp. 227–239.
- STAROSTIN, S.A., 1982, Prajensejskaja kul'turnaja leksika tjurkskogo proisxoždenija (Yeniseian Reconstructions and External Contacts of Yeniseian Languages). In: *Ketskij sbornik. Studia Ketica*. Nauka, Leningrad, pp. 144–237.
- TELEUT = RUMINA-SYRKAŠEVA, L.T.; KUČIGAŠEVA, N.A., 1995, *Teleutsko-russkij slovar'* (Tel-eut – Russian dictionary). Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo, Kemerovo.
- TIMONINA, L.G., 1986, Jenisejskaja kul'turnaja leksika tjurkskogo proisxoždenija (Yeniseian Cultural Lexicon of Turkic Origin). In: Vall, M. N. (ed.) *Issledovanija po grammatike i leksike jenisejskix jazykov* (Research on the Grammar and Lexicon of Yeniseian Languages). Nauka, Novosibirsk, pp. 69–79.
- TIMONINA, L.G., 2004, On distinguishing loanwords from the original Proto-Yeniseic lexicon. In: Vajda, E. J. (ed.) *Languages and Prehistory of Central Siberia*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 135–142.
- TOFAN = RASSADIN, V.I., 1995, *Tofalarsko-russkij slovar'*. *Rusško-tofalarskij slovar'* (Tofan – Russian Dictionary. Russian – Tofan Dictionary). Vostočno-sibirskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo, Irkutsk.
- TUBA = BASKAKOV, N.A., 1966, *Dialekt černevyx tatar (tuba-kiži), Severnye dialekty altajskogo (ojrotskogo jazyka). Grammatičeskij očerk i slovar'* (Tuba-Kizhi Dialect of Altay Turkic. Gram-matical Overview and Dictionary). Nauka, Moskva.
- TUVAN = TENIŠEV, Ė.R. (ed.), 1968, *Tuvinsko-russkij slovar'* (Tuvan – Russian Dictionary). Sov-etskaja ěnciklopedija, Moskva.
- VAJDA, E. J.; WERNER, H. (in preparation): *Etymological Dictionary of the Yeniseian Languages*.
- VAJDA, E. J., 2000, *Ket Prosodic Phonology*. Lincom Europa, Munich.
- VAJDA, E. J.; ZINN, M., 2004, *Morphological dictionary of the Ket verb*. Tomskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij universitet, Tomsk.
- VAJDA, E. J., 2009, Loanwords in Ket, a Yeniseian language of Siberia. In: Haspelmath, M.; Tadmor, U. (eds.) *Loanwords in the World's languages: a comparative handbook*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 471–494.
- VAJDA, E. J., 2010, Siberian Link with Na-Dene Languages. In: Kari, J. & Potter, B. (eds.) *The Dene-Yeniseian Connection. Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* 5. University of Alaska Fairbanks, Department of Anthropology, Fairbanks, pp. 33–99.
- VASILEVIČ, G.M., 1958, *Ėvenkijsko-russkij slovar'* (Ewenki – Russian Dictionary). Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej, Moskva.
- WERNER, H. [= Verner, G. K.] 1990, *Kottskij jazyk* (Kott Language). Izdatel'stvo Rostovskogo universiteta, Rostov-na-Donu.
- WERNER, H., 2002, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Jenissej-Sprachen*. 1–3. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- WERNER, H., 2005, *Die Jenissej-Sprachen des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

- YAKUT = SLEPCOV, P.A., 1972, *Jakutsko-russkij slovar'* (Yakut – Russian Dictionary). Sovetskaja ěnciklopedija, Moskva.
- YAKUT DIAL. = AFANAS'JEV, P.S.; VORONKIN, M.S.; ALEKSEEV, M.P., 1976, *Dialektologiĉeskij slovar' jakutskogo jazyka* (Dictionary of Yakut Dialects). Nauka, Moskva.
- YELLOW UYGHUR = MALOV, S.JE., 1957, *Jazyk želtyx ujugurov. Slovar' i grammatika*. (The Language of the Yellow Uyghurs. Dictionary and Grammar). Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR, Alma-Ata.

A Critique of Translations of the Synecdoche in the Secret History of the Mongols: *Chingis Khan Lost in Translations of the SHM?*

J. LUBSANGDORJI, Charles University

Summary: The translators of the Secret History of the Mongols neglected synecdochical expressions in the Mongolian and translated them literally, as a result of which the image of Chingis Khan turned out to be that of a murderer and slayer. Thus, the aim of this paper is a critical view of the fact that quotation of this mistranslation by many historians, politicians and journalists from around the world has resulted in the spread of the myth of Chingis Khan as the world's most cruel murderer and committer of genocide.

At the 10th and 11th International Congresses of Mongolists I presented a paper in which I criticized mistranslations of metaphorical and metonymical expressions in the Secret History of the Mongols. Earlier I also published the article “The Steeds Lost in Translation of the SHM” (Лувсандорж 2010). This time, based on specific examples, I focus critically on mistranslations of a very interesting figure – synecdoche.

Synecdoche – *a figure of speech whereby the whole of something is represented by one of its parts, or when a larger abstract whole represents one of its concrete constituents* (Ахманова 1969, p. 405). Synecdoche possesses the ability to extend greatly the effect of the expression. For example, in modern Mongolian it is possible to replace *төгрөг* ‘tugric’, *доллар* ‘dollar’ with a word *цаас* with a very general meaning (lit. ‘paper’). With the name of a part such as *шөл* ‘soup’ one can replace the whole term *хонь* ‘sheep’ or *хонины мах* ‘lamb’, as for instance in *манайх өнөөдөр шөл гаргана* lit. ‘we are going to slaughter soup today’ = *манайх өнөөдөр хонь гаргана* ‘we are going to slaughter sheep today’.

Some examples of synecdoche in Early Mongolian can be found in the *Secret History of the Mongols*: *шувуу* ‘bird’ for *шонхор* ‘falcon’ (§ 54, 266); § 129 *хөвүүд* ‘boys’ for *хунтайж нар* ‘princes’ (§ 129); *үхэр* ‘cow’ for *бух* ‘bull’ (§ 121); *өглөөний унд* ‘morning drink’ for *өглөөний зоог* ‘morning meal’ (§124), *үдшийн унд* ‘evening drink’ for *үдшийн зоог* ‘evening meal’ and also *шөл* ‘soup’ for *зоог* ‘food’, *шинэ мах* ‘fresh meat’ occur quite frequently.

The question arises as to what is the reason for such uses of synecdoche and why things are not named directly. It is a very complex question involving the

many-sided phenomenon of the ethnography of communication, language culture and the way of thinking of the given language speakers. For instance, it is possible that people who have held white silver and coins in high esteem since long ago did not respect banknotes when they appeared and their displeasure might have brought the synecdoche *цаас* 'money' (foreign currency) into being.

The diet of the Mongolians comprises mainly meat and they like eating meat, but it is considered inappropriate and disagreeable to use the word *мах* 'meat' in honorific communication and that could be possibly the reason why a synecdoche with a word *шөл* lit. 'soup' was invented. Mongolians pay great respect when communicating with their nobility and therefore there are a lot of honorific expressions and words in the Mongolian language. Nevertheless, the nobles did not use honorific expressions among themselves. To use them was considered harmful and so khans and nobles when speaking among themselves substituted *зоог* 'meal' or *мах* 'meat' with *шөл* 'soup'. For example, when Ögedei Khan in one of his edicts speaks of himself he says as follows: *эзэн хааны шөлөнд жил бүр сүргийн нэг шилдэг ирэг гаргавал зөв бий* 'it is good to provide one castrated ram of superior quality each year for the khan's meal (lit. soup)' (§ 280). Due to the literal translation of the word *шөл* by the foreign translators the real meaning of it as 'khan's meal' has been lost.

Let us move on from the brief introduction to the main critical part of the paper. Those are the consequences of the fact that the main usage and synecdochal meaning of the Middle Mongolian word *иргэн* (*irgen*) was misunderstood and the word appeared in its literal meaning instead – that is the mistake that led to Chingis Khan being added to the black list of murderers and destroyers of entire nations. *Иргэн* is a word with a variety of meanings that appears many times in the SHM. In most cases it bears its main meaning of *хүн, хүмүүс, хүн ард* 'man, people', although in some specific context it also often appears with the shifted meaning of 'khan(s) and prince(s) of the other states and tribes', 'aristocracy', 'nobles of the dynastic houses of other nations'. I consider that the reason why khans, kings and nobles were referred to as *иргэн* is that in those days the palace language used by the Mongolian khans referred to the kings of enemy countries not with the honorific word *хаан* 'khan, king', but instead the word *иргэн*, which was used to express hatefulness and humiliation. This synecdochical meaning of the word *иргэн* is no longer present in Modern Mongolian and the word *амьтан* (lit. 'animal') is used with this meaning instead. Hence, the synecdoche of *иргэн* of the Secret History of the Mongols can be replaced by the Modern Mongolian word *амьтан*.

The translators of the Chinese interlinear translation and compilers of the abridged Chinese translation did not recognize the synecdochical meaning

of the word *иргэн* and therefore it is given only the meaning *Volk* or ‘people’.¹ This gave rise to such mistranslations and misinterpretations as “*Чингис хаан... ард түмнийг устгасан*” ‘Chingis Khan ... destroyed the ... people’.

EXAMPLE 1 (§ 154):

The expression used in the Mongolian original, *tatar irgen* (with the figurative synecdochical meaning of ‘the Tatar kings and princes, the Tatar dynastic houses’), is a compound expression which is mistakenly translated into English as ‘the Tatar people, the Tatar tribesmen’.

The English translation of F. Cleaves stays as follows:

From days of old **the Tatar people** have been making an end of [our] grandfathers and fathers.
 A venging
 The avengement,
 Requiting
 The requital
 of [our] grandfathers and fathers, let us comparing [their height] unto [that of] a linchpin, destroy and slay [them] for [them]. [In other words, killing all except the little children].²

The English translation of Igor de Rachewiltz stays as follows:

From olden days **the Tatar people**
 Have destroyed our fathers and forefathers;
 To avenge our fathers and forefathers,
 And requite the wrong, for them
 We shall measure *the Tatars* against the linchpin of a cart,
 And kill them to the last one,
 We shall utterly slay them. [Only those taller than the linchpin would be killed]³

In this manner, the sentence found in the Mongolian original “The Tatar dynasty [i.e., the lineage of the Tatar khans] was destroyed” has been rendered in all translations as “[All] the Tatar people were destroyed”.

The same is observed in the translations into Mongolian; the passage is translated to say that the Tatar people were measured by the hub of the cart wheel and destroyed.

1) The complete Chinese interlinear translation of the SHM in Chinese characters with German equivalents is shown in E. Haenisch’s well-known dictionary. See E. Haenisch 1939 [1962]).

2) Cleaves 1982, p. 82.

3) Rachewiltz 2006, p. 77.

Finally, in the Secret History the story of destroying the Tatar people is described as follows: “*tatar-i muqutqaju daulin baraju ulus irgen anu ker kikiün ke'en cinggis –qahan yeke eye uruk-iyar-iyān qačqa ger-tür orojū eye-tüldüba*” (§ 154).

Here the expression *ulus irgen* (lit. state – man) constitutes a lexical pair with the synecdochical meaning of *хаад ноёд, хан угсаатан, эрхтэн дархтан* ‘khans and nobles’, ‘aristocracy, nobility’, ‘authority’. Therefore, in order to render the exact meaning of this sentence it should be translated into Modern Mongolian as follows: *Татаар [хант улс]-ыг сөнөөж, эзлэн авч дуусаад эрхтэн дархтаны нь (хаад ноёды нь) явал таарах вэ? гээд Чингис-хаан Их-Эе хийж шийдвэрлэе гэж, ургаараан нэг гэрт цуглаж зөвлөлдөв* ‘After wiping out the Tatar [kingdom] and conquering it Chinggis Khan [arranged] a great council of his clan in one yurt to decide what to do with the [Tatar] nobility [of the dynastic house] (khans and nobles)’.

EXAMPLE 2 (§ 268):

In the Mongolian original, the expression *tang’ut irgen* (with the synecdochical meaning of ‘*the Tang’ut kings and princes, the Tang’ut dynastic houses*’) is translated as ‘*the Tang’ut people*’.

The English translation of F. Cleaves is as follows:

Because the Tang’ut people, [after] speaking a word, kept not to the word, Činggis Qahan went to a warfare a second time against the Tang’ut people, destroying the Tang’ut people, coming [back] in the Year of the Pig [1227] Činggis Qahan is ascended to Heaven.⁴

The English translation of Igor de Rachewiltz is as follows:

Because the Tang’ut people gave their word but did not keep it, Činggis Qa’an for the second time took the field against them. Having destroyed the Tang’ut people, Činggis Qa’an came back and in the Year of the Pig (1227) ascended to Heaven.⁵

In this manner, the section containing the words ‘The lineage of the Tang’ut Khans was destroyed’ has been rendered in every translation as: ‘All the Tang’ut people were destroyed.’

While the expression *tangyut irgen* has been translated into Modern Mongolian by Ts. Damdinsuren and D. Purevdorj very nicely as *Тангуд улс*

4) Cleaves 1982, p. 209.

5) Rachewiltz 2006, p. 200.

‘Tangut state’, the other translators just copied the expression *тангуд иргэн* ‘Tangut people’, into their languages. The meaning of the word *иргэн* has become ‘citizen’ (Rus. ‘гражданин’) in Modern Mongolian. In the Mongolian original of the Secret History it is written as follows: *tang’ut irgen üge ügülejü üge-tür ülü gürgü-yin tula tang’ut irgen-tür cinggis-qahan nökö’te ayalaju tang’ut irgen-i muqutqaju* ‘**Because the Tangqut people made promises that they failed to keep, Chinggis Qahan hunted them them down for the second time**’. It is clear that it was not the Tangut people who made promises, but the Tangut kings. Therefore the precise translation of the synecdochical expression *тангуд иргэн* that occurs more than once here has to be ‘the Tangut king’. And if we want to replace this synecdoche by the Modern Mongolian synecdoche it is *тангуд амьтан* (lit.) ‘the Tangut animal’.

This mistranslation has been used as a source for citations by countless scholars and historians.

EXAMPLE OF THE QUOTATIONS IN LITERATURE - 1:

Quoting Eric Margolis, Jones observes that in the 13th century the Mongol horsemen of Temüjin Genghis Khan were genocidal killers (*génocidaires*) who were known to kill whole nations, leaving nothing but empty ruins and bones. He ordered the extermination of the Tata Mongols and all the Kankali males in Bukhara “taller than a wheel” using a technique called ‘measuring against the linchpin’.⁶

Thus, due to Cleaves’ mistranslation into English of the cultural-specific term *Tatar irgen* as ‘all of the Tatar people’, his text has become a scholarly basis on which to base the view that Chingis was indeed a genocidal killer of the Tatars and others, and this was extended by the above mentioned passage concerning the Kankali male inhabitants of Bukhara. Similarly, the phrase “all Kankali males” (taken to mean: “all the Kankali males of the royal dynasty”) is clearly a mistranslation as well. In Middle Mongolian, the phrase *Kankali irgen* has the literal meaning of ‘the Kankali people’, but the synecdochical meaning—the sense in which it is being used here—of ‘the Kankali dynastic house’ refers to the ruling class only. The Kankali dynastic house (the Turkic Kangali or Kipchak rulers of Khwarezm) was considered to be the bitterest enemies of Chingis Khan. Compare with Example 1 above.

Why were the Khwarezm such avowed enemies of Chingis Khan? Chingis Khan had previously sent one hundred merchants to this land; they

6) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genocides_in_history#cite_ref-FOOTNOTE_Jones20064_note_12_19-0.

were seized and murdered.⁷ According to the view of the religion of Tenggerism, which Chingis Khan followed, this was an act of opposition to the will of Tenger. Therefore, the decision of Tenger must be to “repay terror with terror”.⁸ This is how the chief reason for Chingis Khan sending his men to kill the descendants of the Khan of the Kankalis should be interpreted.

EXAMPLE OF THE QUOTATIONS IN LITERATURE – 2:

In some modern texts with reference to historical sources Chingis Khan’s attitude towards his enemies is described as follows: “According to the chronicles Temujin ordered the elimination of all the Merkits”.⁹ “Cruelty has to be outside the bounds of imagination, as only that could help to execute the will from above.” “When a noble Mongolian soldier was killed, in return all the subordinate people were killed, and when a chieftain was killed, in return the whole nation was destroyed. When Chingis Khan’s father was killed..., in return all the Tatar people were killed, including women and children.”¹⁰

-
- 7) Chingis Khans asks, rhetorically (in the translation of Francis Cleaves): “How was my ‘golden tether’ broken by the Sarta’ul people?” (SHM §254). *Алтан аргамж* ‘golden tether’ is a hyperbolic metaphor that refers to commercial relations. Cleaves explains the passage in the following way: “The ‘golden tether’ seems to be the bond of suzerainty which, besides commercial relations, the Mongolian envoys had had a mission to establish between Čingis and the sovereign of Hwārezm” (Cleaves 1982, p. 189).
- 8) For the instructions and formulations relevant to decisions concerning transgressions, see: *Beri’e-yin qari’u beri’e-gü nudurqa-yin qari’u nudurqa-gü* (SHM, §227), i.e. бэрээгийн хариу – бэрээ, нударгын хариу – нударга” in Modern Mongolian. F.W. Cleaves translated this passage as follows: “Let one repay strokes of the rod as repayment of strokes of the rod and fists as repayment of fists.” Cleaves refers to the well-known Biblical passage in Leviticus XXIV §20: “... breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth” (Cleaves 1982, p. 166, see note 56).
- 9) <https://carabaas.dreamwidth.org/92434.html?style=site>. This is taken from a Russian translation made by S. Kozin: *Женици и детей в полон всех заберем; ... народ до конца истребим...* “We will take all the women and children; [we] will destroy all the nation to the last man.” The word *истребим* lit. ‘exterminate’ is *qa’uluuya* (lit. ‘to rip off, with the metaphorical meaning “to take prisoner” in Mongolian origin; it resulted from the mis-translation made by the compilers of the Chinese interlinear translation as they translated the word *qa’uluuya* as “to destroy, exterminate, do away with” (see Лувсандорж 2014, p. 246, footnote 17).
- 10) This is a similar instance to the English translation quoted above. V. Babushkin (2015) added his own misinterpreted comment *включая женщин и детей* ‘including women and children’ to the passage *Истребим же их полностью, равняя ростом к тележной чече... . Дотла истребим их, а остающихся (малых детей, ростом ниже тележной чечи) обратим в рабство и раздадим по разным местам)* “[We] will destroy them all by comparing [their height] to [that of] a hub of the wheel ... [we] will make a clean sweep

Thus, the mistakes in the transcription of the Secret History into the Chinese characters and the Chinese interlinear translation of its text turned Chingis Khan into a murderer of the utmost cruelty.

In addition to the inaccurate translations described above, many misinterpretations are based on Persian, Chinese and Russian sources, such as

“Chingis Khan murdered and massacred peaceful and ordinary people by the millions,” “As for the Khwarezm Empire, he killed three million. In the capital city of Urgench, 1.2 million were killed,” “Chingis Khan murdered 40 million people altogether”

frequently appear in books throughout the entire world.

But it is important to recall that such historical chroniclers were always of necessity “propagandists”, and not conveyers of established, truth-based facts. The artifice inherent in these figures will perhaps be evident to the observer of today. The fact that Chingis Khan has been described as a murderer and committer of genocide in so many scholarly volumes from the pens of esteemed Mongol experts of so many different nations, and continues to be described as such to this day, is really lamentable.

With what kinds of powerful weapons could Chingis Khan have murdered so many millions? The question could be posed: Did he possess the atom bomb?

As for what really happened in Bukhara:

In the third month of the year 1220, Chingis Khan’s army encircled the city. The Sultan’s army, 20,000 men strong, who had been defending the city, fled during the night. The next morning, the representatives of the city of Bukhara and imams opened the gate of the city wall, and invited Chingis Khan into the city. Inside the city, in the inner fortress, 400 of the Sultan’s soldiers had been left behind while the others fled. They resisted Chingis Khan with force. Chingis Khan had the ordinary people of the city walk from the place of battle to the Musallah (prayer space) outside the city; as they gathered there, he addressed them.¹¹

Chingis Khan’s occupation of Bukhara did not involve a murderous battle, nor did it involve genocide; on the contrary, the city delegates and imams

of them and the rest of them (small children lower than the hub of the wheel) make our slaves and distribute round to different places)” previously translated by S. Kozin.

11) For more about Chingis Khan in Bukhara see Сайшаал 2004, p. 635.

welcomed the Mongolian army. The delegates of Bukhara accepted Chingis Khan as their Khan, states one source.¹²

This is confirmed by the fact that in 1221, in the midst of the battle for Khwarezm, in both Gazna and Bukhara, gold coinage was stamped with the words “The Khan of Khans / The Great Lord Chingis Khan”, as well as “Chingis Khan, the Great, the Just” in Arabic script.¹³ These inscriptions can be accepted as solid historical evidence. In many regards, their witness is much more trustworthy than that of historical chronicles.

The question as to whether the people of Khwarezm truly welcomed Chingis Khan with open arms can be posed. This is the answer given by the well-known Russian historian L. Gumilev (1993, pp. 43–44) when he wrote: “The governance of Khwarezm was not in the hands of the cultural descendants of the Sogdians, but instead in the hands of the Kankalis, i.e. Eastern Pechenegs, and their allies the Karluks and Khalajs (in Western Afghanistan). The Turkish *gulyam* – mercenary-army, behaved with extreme brutality in Iran. From 1200 to 1212 this gave rise to a series of spontaneous uprisings in all the larger cities, including Nishapur, Herat, Bukhara, and Samarkand. Following this, in retaliation, the *gulyam* army plundered the cities where uprisings had occurred for three days.” “The Mongolians did not defend themselves from the raids of the local inhabitants of China or Iran, but fought against the armies of the former invaders and enslavers: the Jurchens and Turks who withdrew after defeat, but never laid down their arms. The conclusion: the Mongols did not attempt to overmaster the sedentary inhabitants, but sought to establish a reliable border to ensure the safety of their own country to protect it from the raids of strong and merciless enemies.”¹⁴

In the process of conducting wars, it is clear that the number of soldiers killed by the Mongolian army was in the thousands. Similarly, thousands of

12) Badarch Nyamaa 2005, p. 116.

13) Ibid, p. 117.

14) “Власть в Хорезме принадлежала не культурным потомкам согдийцев, а тюркам-кангалам, т.е. восточным печенегам, и их союзникам карлукам и халаджам (в западном Афганистане). Тюркские гулямы (наемные воины) вели себя в Иране так грубо и жестоко, что с 1200 по 1212 г. во всех крупных городах – Нишапуре, Герате, Бухаре, Самарканде – вспыхивали восстания, после которых города отдавались карателям на трехдневное разграбление.” “Как в Китае, так и в Иране монголы отражали нападения отнюдь не местного населения, а отдельных отрядов бывших завоевателей и поработителей: чжурчженей и тюрков, отступивших после поражения, не сложивших оружия. Вывод: монголы непытались покорить оседлое население, а стремились установить надежные границы, обеспечивающие безопасность их собственной страны от нападений сильных и безжалостных врагов...” (Гумилев 1993, pp. 43–44).

Mongolian soldiers were killed. Chingis Khan, however, never laid a hand on ordinary people.

The third Khan of the Great Mongolian Empire, Güyük, in his letter to the Roman Pope of 1246, stated: “**How could it be possible to kill ordinary people or place them in prison?**” Via a rhetorical question, Güyük alerted the Pope to the stance of the Mongolian Empire regarding the fate of ordinary people caught up in battle (this was after the Pope had accused the Mongolian army of murdering innocents).

In summary:

1. If one wishes to translate accurately from the Mongolian sources, the word *irgen* ‘people’ should be rendered as ‘kings and princes’.¹⁵
2. As for the question of who did Chingis Khan actually kill: the Khans and nobles of enemy dynasty houses were killed, as well as their male children and their male descendants. The wives and girl children of kings, princes, and nobles were taken as trophies of war. Ordinary people were unaffected. As the *Secret History* states (§ 112):

The three hundred Merkit who had *once* circled *Mount Burqan*
 Were exterminated, down to
 The offspring of their offspring;
 They were blown *to the winds* like *hearth-ashes*.
 Their remaining wives,
 Those suitable to be embraced
 We embraced;
 Those suitable to be let into *the tent*
 Through the door *and serve as slaves*
 Were let in through the door.¹⁶

In this manner, the descendants of the ruling class of Mongolia’s enemies were eliminated, and replaced by the descendants of Chingis Khan, who was ‘Fated by the Heavens’. This was the express intention of Chingis Khan in fighting every war, whether on the territory of Mongolia or elsewhere. And so the line of descendants of the Sartuul Kingdom (Khwarezm) was also interrupted.

15) Due to the errors in the Chinese transcription and interlinear translation contained in The Secret History, there are many resulting errors in the various translations. For an accurate transcription, translation into Modern Mongolian, as well as an explanation of many cultural-specific terms, see Лувсандорж 2014.

16) Rachewiltz 2006, pp. 42–43.

Chingis Khan's intention is well-reflected in the following modal construction from Middle Mongolian, attested in historical documents:

name of tribe/kingdom/state + irgen-i da'uli

Merkit irgen-i da'uli-

literally: *to subjugate the Merkit people*, figurative: *to destroy the Merkit kings and princes*;

Tatar irgen-i da'uli-

literally: *to subjugate the Tatar people*, figurative: *to destroy the Tatar kings and princes*;

Tang'ut irgen-i da'uli-

literally: *to subjugate the Tang'ut people*, figurative: *to destroy Tang'ut kings and princes*;

Sarta'ul irgen-i da'uli-

literally: *to subjugate the Sartool (Muslim) people*, figurative: *to destroy Sartool (Muslim) kings and princes*; and so on.

Unfortunately, the Ming-era literal interlinear Chinese translation which gives the literal translation of Mongolian, significantly distorts the actual meaning of the events narrated in the *Secret History*.

Concerning the example above, there is only one case where the construction name of tribe/kingdom/state + *irgen-i da'uli*' was actually translated correctly. The phrase *sarta'ul irgen-i da'uli-* is rendered as 'the seizure of power from the Sartools', 'after the victory over the Sartools'. How did this translation end up being correct? The reason is that these words do not originate from the *Secret History*, but from the Stone of Chingis Khan, which is unencumbered by any Chinese interlinear translations.

3. Translators and scholars of the *Secret History* labour under the false presumption that the Chinese interlinear glosses and the abridged Chinese translation entitled *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* is the Original Tongue of SHM.¹⁷ This presumption, that persists in research into the *Secret History*, is a false conception. It is impossible to regard either the Chinese interlinear

17) See Cleaves' English translation, which states on the title page: "Done into English out of the Original Tongue and provided with an Exegetical Commentary by Francis Woodman Cleaves." It remains a question as to how far he, or any of the other translators, actually translated from the original Mongolian text.

translation or the abridged translation—both completed 150 years after the *Secret History* was written—as bearing any relation to the “original” language.

4. I believe that it is crucial for international researchers in Mongolian studies to firmly distance themselves from the practice of relying upon the Ming interlinear translation as any kind of reliable source when discussing the *Secret History*. In this way, I believe that a translation, not of the Ming interlinear version, but of the actual original text, the *Secret History of the Mongols* (*The True Story of Chinggis Khan*) will be made possible.

Abbreviations:

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| lit. | literally |
| Rus. | Russian |
| SHM | The Secret History of the Mongols |

References:

- АХМАНОВА, О.С., 1969, *Словарь лингвистических терминов* (A Dictionary of Linguistic Terms). Изд-во “Советская Энциклопедия”, Москва.
- БАБУШКИН, В., 2015, *Великий хан Повелитель Вселенной* (Great Khan - the Ruler of the Universe). On: <https://www.proza.ru/2015/03/11/1225>.
- ГУМИЛЕВ, Л.Н., 1993, *Ритмы Евразии: Эпохи и цивилизации* (Rhythms of Eurasia: the Epochs of the Civilisations). Прогресс, Экспрос, Москва.
- ЛУВСАНДОРЖ, Ж., 2010, Монголын Нууц Товчооны орчуулгаар угаагдсан хөлөг морьд (The Steeds Lost in Translation of the Secret History of the Mongols). In: *Acta Mongolica*, Vol. 10 (321), МУИС, Монгол судлалын төв, Улаанбаатар, pp. 70–85.
- ЛУВСАНДОРЖ, Ж., 2014, *Монголын Нууц Товчоон* (The Secret History of the Mongols). Monograph Series Volume 6. Антоон Мостаэрт Монгол Судлалын Төв, “Бэмби сан” ХХК, Улаанбаатар.
- САЙШААЛ, 2004, *Чингис хааны товчоон* (The History of Chinggis Khan). Доод дэвтэр (The second volume). Хаан Принтинг ХХК, Улаанбаатар.
- BADARCH NYAMAА, 2005, *The Coins of Mongol Empire and Clan Tamgha of Khans (XIII–XIV)*. Ulaanbaatar.
- CLEAVES, F.W., 1982, *The Secret History of the Mongols*, Harvard University Press., Cambridge, Massachusetts, London.
- НАЕНИСЧ, Е., 1939 [1962] *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca’an (Yüan-chiao pi-shi): Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Harrassowitz, Leipzig [F. Steiner, Wiesbaden].
- RACHEWILTZ, I., 2006, *The Secret History of the Mongols: a Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. Brill, Leiden-Boston.

Internet sources:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genocides_in_history#cite_ref-FOOTNOTE_Jones20064_note_12_19-0.

<https://carabaas.dreamwidth.org/92434.html?style=site>.

Mongolian euphemisms and taboos. Animals and hunting¹

ILYA GRUNTOV, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences

OLGA MAZO, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

ALEVTINA SOLOVYOVA, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

Summary This article looks at euphemisms and folk beliefs in the semantic field of animals in traditional Mongolian culture, among them wolf, bear, snake, fox and marmot. Sources of the article include materials collected by the authors during annual fieldwork² in different parts of Mongolia. We would like to propose a series of papers devoted to the studying of euphemisms and word taboo in Mongolian language and culture, and this article is intended to start a number of publications.

Introduction

It is not infrequent that while dealing with sacred objects or actions people prefer (or are even compelled) not to name them directly, but to use special descriptive or metaphorical expressions. The same holds true for actions and objects considered as impure, offensive or able to bring evil into one's life. In many cases, people try to conceal the evil nature of an object by using a "good" word for it. For example, the Arabic word *maymūn* 'monkey' is originally a euphemistic usage: the word literally means 'auspicious, favorable' and was used to denote a monkey because the sight of this animal was held by the Arabs to be unlucky.

The semantic fields where one most often finds euphemistic substitutions are birth, death and funerals, sexual relationships and private parts, various diseases, dangerous or game animals. In many cultures it is prohibited to express the corresponding concepts directly. In addition, there are many religious and matrimonial customs prohibiting the use of certain words. Substitute names for taboo words can have an occasional usage (taboos apply

1) This research was financially supported by the Russian Scientific Foundation (RNF), grant No. 14-18-00590 "Texts and practices of folklore as a model of cultural tradition: A comparative-typological study".

2) Russian-Mongolian expeditions conducted by The Center for Typology and Semiotics of Folklore Studies of Russian State University for the Humanities, 2006–2015.

at particular times), or be used for certain groups of people (e.g. married women).

Mongolian traditional culture restricts human behavior through a detailed network of hundreds of interdictions and taboos which are called *ceer* (*цээр*). E.g. one shall not put a knife into the fire, one shall not kill a snake, one shall not break birds' eggs. These restrictions also regulate the speech behavior of a person. Some words become taboo words and euphemistic words or expressions are used instead of them in order to avoid direct mention of an object. Some taboos are permanent while others undergo euphemistic substitution in specific situations only.

Nature for Mongols is inhabited, regulated and controlled by local deities *lus*, *savdag* considered to be the masters (*eʒen*) of every single landscape object: river, lake, mountain, hill, pond or lonely tree in the steppe. Every act of a person in traditional culture should respect those deities otherwise they can punish this person. Luck in hunting, luck in cattle breeding also depends on the spirits' benevolence. Thus, people have to use the right words in order neither to insult the deities nor to attract their attention to a person's deeds.

Potanin in his 'Essays of North-Western Mongolia' described a special situation, when the words became taboo because a spirit disliked them: 'There are no birch-trees, deers, tarbagans on the mountain Bajtyk-bogdo, because the Master doesn't like them, thus these words became taboos: tarbagan – *xulygyr*³, deer – *olon salad*⁴, birch-tree – *kecünertai*⁵ (Potanin 1881, p. 93).

We will start by presenting our research in the domain of animals and hunting including the naming of wild animals and their actions, animals' meat, bones and body parts; words for killing domestic animals, for hunting and hunters' belongings, all of which is very important for Mongols leading the nomadic style of life. We intend this to be the first article in the series. Our research is mainly based on fieldwork materials collected in different parts of Mongolia during annual expeditions. We include also data from existing publications and from dictionaries. The euphemistic changes are widely spread across the Mongolic world thus we also use the examples not only from Khalkha Mongolian, but from other Mongolic idioms as well.

Euphemisms can be divided into several groups according to their usage. The first group is part of common language and can be used by all groups of people. The second group of euphemisms may only be used by married

3) *lit.* short-eared.

4) *lit.* with many bifurcations.

5) *lit.* difficult to name.

women and was also used by Kalmycks, Oirats and Ordos Mongols. Thus, Kalmyck women were forbidden to address their husband's elder relatives by their name and to use common words that sound like, or are close to, them. So they had to use synonyms or to change the first consonant of the word (see Aalto 1959). We will discuss this type of euphemisms in our forthcoming paper. This special restricted speech style that should be used in the presence of or in reference to certain relatives occurs all over the world, including Australian aboriginal languages, Austronesian, Caucasian, Cushitic, Turkic and North American languages (see e.g. Dixon 1980, Simons 1982). The third group is used by hunters and is a part of hunting language, the special idiom used by hunters in order to get prey and not to anger the deities of forests etc. This professional slang can be found in languages of different groups, especially in the region where hunting was or is the main activity. Although Mongols are first of all nomads and cattle breeders, and hunting is nowadays prohibited for the vast majority of animals in Mongolia and Inner Mongolia (China), traces of this professional slang are still preserved in modern Mongolic languages. The last group is so-called road language, which is used when a person is outside his home place. While travelling he or she should replace common names with special words in order not to draw the attention of deities (for more details, see Zelenin 1929a, pp. 119–122, 127–129).

Firstly we will observe the beliefs and euphemisms concerning such wild animals as wolf, bear, snake, marmot, fox and some others, then discuss hunting language, restrictions on naming the meat, bones and body parts of domestic animals and some elements of Khalkha road language.

I. Euphemisms concerning wild animals

WOLF

The vast majority of Mongolian animal euphemisms concern the wolf, the only large predator of the Mongolian steppe. The wolf plays an important role in folklore. It is a totem animal for Chinggisids: according to the *Secret History of the Mongols* one of the ancestors of Genghis Khan was named *Börte činua* 'Grey wolf'. One of the most popular folklore motives describes a she-wolf who fosters her cubs in the chest of a famous wrestler.⁶ It is considered a luck to meet a wolf or if it crosses your path. To kill a wolf is a great honor

6) Gruntov, Mazo, Solovyeva 2016, pp. 26–54.

for a man. Informants told us that if a man kills a wolf he can wear the wolf's fang or talus bone in order to obtain the wolf's *xiimor*⁷ (*Expedition materials, Khovd, Mongolia, 2014*). And Mongolian men quite often actually wear a talus bone (*šagai*) of a wolf (sometimes silver-framed), but it is forbidden for a woman to wear wolf's bones.

Because the wolf according to lore is a very strong and dangerous animal, its symbols, bones or images are prescribed to be situated on "lower" part of a human person, so that "a man will be higher than a wolf, and the wolf wouldn't suppress him" (*Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2010*). A man shall wear the wolf bone on a belt or lower, and the image of a wolf might be put only at the foot of the bed, not at the headboards (*Expedition materials, Khovd, Mongolia, 2014*).

The nomads prefer not to use the common wolf's name *čono* because of a hunting taboo. The wolf attacks livestock, so nomads do not call it by name, otherwise *it will have sharp teeth or the name can attract it to the herd* (*Expedition materials, Khovd, Mongolia, 2015*). Buryats believe that if you kill a wolf who attacks the livestock in your yard, your loss will increase greatly (*Tsyden-dambaeva 2010a, p. 119*). Mostaert (1968, p. 700) mentions that Ordos do not pronounce the wolf name before the fire or in front of the animal (see also *Sárkózi 1995, p. 447*). In traditional Mongolian magic spells a member of the family before leaving their cattle in the steppe for a night should take a pair of scissors, tie a rope around the blades say "just as I'm closing these blades, I'm closing the mouth with fangs" (*Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2009*).

Another folklore connotation of a wolf concerns the Mongolian character *šulmas*, a demoness, presented both in epic tradition and in actual demonology. In the epic tradition *šulmas* is one of the antagonists of the main hero, a deceiving and struggling monster, which often has the appearance of an ugly old woman. According to actual folk beliefs, this demoness can look like an ordinary woman but has the ability to turn into a wolf. In collected narratives *šulmas* in her human shape was living with a hunter as his wife, caring for their child and household, making food. Once when the hunter took their son for hunting in the forest, the son saw bones and said that they looked like the back of his mother. The next time the hunter pretended that he was leaving for hunting again, hid near their house and started to look out for his wife. Soon he saw how she came out from the *ger*, wallowed in ashes and turned into a big grey wolf. After that she came back to the house,

7) *hiimor'* in Mongolian folklore and culture is the concentrated essence of life energy and luck of a person.

to get milk from her breasts and started to prepare tea. The hunter watching all this decided to leave his house and never come back (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2008).

The euphemistic names for a wolf can be divided into the following classes.

1. Animal of deity

Most examples of naming are attributive constructions, where the attribute is the name of a deity (Tengri, Buddha, Erleg-khan, Altai, Khangai) and the noun means 'animal', 'dog', 'thing', 'thief'. All these nouns (except the last one) are also used in other euphemisms for wolf. The animal can also be named directly by using the name of a deity ('Khangai' or 'rich Khangai') or by the form of word "Tengri" – *tengertei* 'with Heaven/Tengri'.

Khalkha *xangai* 'Khangai'⁸; *xangain amitan* 'the animal of Khangai'; *tengriin amitan* 'the animal of Heaven/Tengri'; *tengertei amitan* 'the animal of Heaven/Tengri' (Oberfalzerová 2006, p. 71); *tengertei* 'with Heaven/Tengri; lucky'; *altain noxoi* 'the dog of Altai' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54);⁹ *xangain yum* 'the thing of Khangai' (Expedition Materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015); *bayan xangai* 'rich Khangai' (MXITT); *erleg xulgaič* 'thief of Erleg-khan' (BAMRS, IV, p. 509). The last euphemism is not connected directly with the name of a deity and does not have parallels in other Mongolic languages.

Buryat dial. *burxanai noxoi* 'the dog of Buddha' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699); *təngəriin noxoi* 'the dog of Heaven/Tengri' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699).

2. Connection to supernatural powers

Khalkha *gaixal* 'wonder'; *gooxoi* 'mystery', *erööč göröös*, *yorč göröös* 'prophetic animal (tiger and wolf)'

Buryat *booxoldoi* 'a ghost, devil, obstruction' (Rassadin 2005, p. 65); Oirat *booxoldaa* 'a ghost, devil, obstruction' (Todaeva 2001, p. 72). Names for both wolf and evil spirit might be derived from the verb *boo-* 'to bind; to obstruct; to strangle'. Cf. also Khalkha (*sürtei*) *booxoi* 'dreadful obstruction; wolf', *uulyu*

8) Khangai is the name of the Lord of the Khangai mountains, one of the powerful local deities.

9) Sometimes one euphemistic name does not relate only to one group, e.g. this name includes two main concepts: 'dog' and the name of a deity, so it belongs to two groups: 'wolf as a dog' and 'animal of deity'.

booxoi ‘mountain obstruction’, Ordos *muu yorot’u* ‘harbinger of great misfortune’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 404).

3. Descriptive names

3.1. PLACE OF LIVING

This phrase is usually an attributive construction: the place of living (attribute) and the noun. According to the data the typical place of leaving is the steppe, but the wolf is also regarded as a mountain or countryside animal. The nouns are of various semantics: ‘dog’ (the most frequent name), ‘thing’, ‘master’, ‘obstruction’, ‘grandfather’, ‘old man’.

steppe: Khalkha *xeeriin noxoi* ‘steppe dog’, *xeeriin yum* ‘steppe thing’. Buryat dial. *xeeriin noxoi* ‘steppe dog’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 633); *xeeriin yume* ‘steppe thing’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699). Kalmyk *keerin noxa* ‘steppe dog’ (Artaev 2010, p. 9). Altai Uriankhai *xeeriin noxoi* ‘steppe dog’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54). Ordos *k’eeiin awaGää* ‘Master of steppe’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 36); *k’eeiin noxöö* ‘steppe dog’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 39);

mountain: Khalkha *uulyн booxoi* ‘mountain obstruction’; Buryat *uulyн noxoi*, *xadyн noxoi* ‘mountain dog’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 65);

countryside: Buryat *xüdüögei taabai* ‘countryside grandfather’; *xüdüögei übgen* ‘countryside old man’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119).

3.2 APPEARANCE, MANNER

3.2.1 SINGLE TRAITS

Many names single out a specific feature of the wolf’s body parts (fur, tail, mouth, teeth, eyes, ears, whiskers). In most cases, the animal is named after the particular body part (‘hairy head’) or by a noun in the Comitative case.

Body shape: Khalkha *boočgo* ‘barrel’, cf. Oirat Mongol *boočgo* (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54);

Fur: Khalkha *bor daxт* ‘in grey fur coat’; Oirat *bor daxт* ‘in brown fur coat’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54). Buryat *noohon tolgoito* ‘with hairy head’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 65); *noohon tolgoi* ‘hairy head’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119), *godon gutaltai* ‘wearing shoes made from reindeer-leg fur’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119).

Color: brown Khalkha *mölxöö xüreng* ‘brown crawler’, Oirat *mölxöö xüren* ‘brown crawling’; *bor daxт* ‘in brown fur coat’ (Erdenebold 2012,

p. 54); **grey** – Khalkha *bor daxt* ‘in grey fur coat’, *bor gölög* ‘grey puppy’; **blue** – Khalkha *xöx noxoi* ‘blue dog’, Altai Uriankhai *xöx noxoi* ‘blue dog’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54).

Covered with scabs: Khalkha *xamuut* ‘scabby’, Buryat *xamuuta* ‘scabby’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699).

Tail: with tail Buryat *hüülte* ‘with a tail’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 64), *hüültei yumen* ‘thing with a tail’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119); **long-tailed** Buryat *uta hüülte* ‘long-tailed’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 671), dial. *urta süülte* ‘long-tailed’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699), dial. *gonzogoi hüülte* ‘long-tailed’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699).

Teeth: naked/glittering Khalkha *aralzuur šüdet* ‘with bare teeth’; Buryat dial. *arżagar šudā* ‘with bare teeth’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699), *altan araata* ‘gold fangs’; Altai Uriankhai *jaralzur šuudet* ‘with glittering teeth’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54); **fanger** Khalkha *araanga* ‘fanger’, Buryat *araata* ‘fanger’ (in hunters’ slang) (Cheremisov 1951, p. 59–60).

Mouth: quick Khalkha *šuurxai amt* ‘fast mouth’, Oirat *šuurxai amt* ‘fast mouth’; **big** Khalkha *languu amt, ix amt* ‘big mouth’;

Eyes: narrow Khalkha *žiitgar* ‘with narrow eyes’, *žoodgoi* ‘with narrow eyes’; **yellow** Kalmyk *šar nüdte* ‘with yellow eyes’ (Artaev 2010, p. 9).

Ears: Ordos *GoşoGor žiřet’uu* ‘with straight ears’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 196).

Whiskers: Buryat dial. *hanšagta* ‘having whiskers’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699).

3.2.2. BASIC ACTIVITIES

Howl: Khalkha *uliač, učuuxai* ‘howling’, Altai Uriankhai *uliač, učuxai* ‘howling’; (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54).

Means of movement: crawl Khalkha *mölxöö* ‘crawler’, *mölxöö xüreng* ‘brown crawler’, Oirat *mölxöö xüren* ‘brown crawling’; **wander** Buryat *xeeriin zolbo* ‘steppe wanderer’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010b, p. 36), *hüinin zuiguul* ‘night stroller’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010b, p. 36); **trot** Ordos *segeldii* ‘trotter’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 569), *segeldii awaGää* ‘mister trotter’ (Mostaert 1968, p. 569).

Eating: *yasan tuuxan* ‘bones collector’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54); Buryat *malyñ daisan* ‘livestock’s enemy’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010b, p. 36), *gurinxaxa* ‘hungry’ (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119).

3.2.3 SEVERE, RUDE CHARACTER

Buryat *šanžete* ‘cold, inhospitable looking’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699), dial. *šäriün* ‘rude, severe’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699), dial. *xüütän šäriün* ‘inhospitable and rude’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699).

4. Wolf as a human being

Wolf can be referred to as an elder relative, a hero or a monk or a religious person. Khalkha *sürxii baatar* 'powerful hero'; *čawganc* 'old nun'. Buryat *axai, abga* 'elder brother' (naming of wolf by people from the wolf clan) (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699); *sagaan taabai* 'white maternal grandfather' (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119); *nagasa* 'maternal uncle' (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119); *nagasai taabai* 'maternal grandfather' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54); *xüdüögei taabai* 'countryside grandfather'; *xüdüögei übgen* 'countryside oldman' (Tsydendambaeva 2010a, p. 119); *ubša* 'layperson who took the simplest vows without becoming a monk' (Sanzhina 2009, p. 146); *gəndən ubša* (*gəndən* 'clergyman' + *ubša*) (Rassadin 2005, p. 65). Oirat *čawganc* 'old nun'; *surxii baatar* 'powerful hero' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54). Ordos *Darma awaGää* 'mister Darma' (Darma = Langdarma (Mostaert 1968, p. 123); *langdarma* 'Langdarma' (Mostaert 1968, p. 444). Buryat: *genden žamsa* (Rassadin 2005, p. 64).

The speakers of Mongolic rarely use the anthroponyms as euphemisms for animals, however we should mention two notable exceptions: in Ordos wolf bears the name of the king Langdarma¹⁰, the persecutor of Buddhism, while Buryat *genden žamsa* goes back to the name of the Dalai-Lama II Gendun Gyatso.¹¹

5. Wolf as a dog:

Khalkha *altain noxoi* 'the dog of Altai'; *xöx noxoi* 'blue dog'; *xeeriin noxoi* 'steppe dog'; *bor gölög* 'grey puppy'. Buryat dial. *burxanai noxoi* 'the dog of Buddha' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699); dial. *təngəriin noxoi* 'the dog of Heaven/Tengri' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 699); dial. *xeeriin noxoi* 'steppe dog' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 633); *uulyñ noxoi, xadyn noxoi* 'mountain dog' (Rassadin 2005, p. 65). Kalmyk *keerin noxa* 'steppe dog' (Artaev 2010, p. 9). Altai Uriankhai *xeeriin noxoi* 'steppe dog'; *xöx noxoi* 'blue dog' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 54). Ordos *k'eeeriin noxöö* 'steppe dog' (Mostaert 1968, p. 39).

10) Langdarma – (tib. Glan dar-ma) king of Tibet (?–841), anti-Buddhist, follower of Bon.

11) Gendun Gyatso (1475–1542).

6. Total taboo (names that doesn't refer to any characteristic of an animal, but just stating the impossibility to name it):

Khalkha *xeciüü nert* 'with hard name'; *ter amitan* 'that animal'.

7. Unclear:

Buryat *yongoi*, *yongoi taabai* (Rassadin 2005, p. 64–65), dial. *gaizuun* (Cheremisov 1951, p. 155); *gar'uuxan* (Sanzhina 2009, p. 146; cf. *gari* 'dogs' or wolfs excrement').

Similar semantic shifts (or possibly Turkic-Mongolian loan translations) can be observed in Turkic languages, e.g. Tuvan *kokaa/kokaai/kokaak* 'scary, frightening', *kokai ašak* 'scary oldman', *taiga idi* 'taiga dog', *kök bör* 'blue wolf', *kokaarak* 'with blue eyes', *uzun kuduruk* 'long tail' (Suvandii 2016, p. 139); Oïrot *kok-ujak* (*kok* 'scab') (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 85); *uluči* 'howling' (in female language) (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 167), *abiğai* 'mister' (< Mong.) (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 11). Mangyshlak Kirgiz and Tajik *uzunkudruktich* 'long-tailed', *uldrug* 'howling', *kukkarak* 'blue-eyed' (Zelenin 1929b, p. 40); Kachin Tatar *uzun-kuzruk* 'long tail' (Zelenin 1929b, p. 40); Yakut *kuturuktax* 'with tail' (Zelenin 1929b, p. 40); Chuvash *vurum-xüre* 'long-tailed' (Zelenin 1929b, p. 40).

Sometimes euphemisms from Altaic languages were borrowed into the Siberian dialects of Russian, e.g. *kakui*, *kakan*, *kakarra* 'wolf' in Russian regional variety in Tuva (loan from Tuvan) (Anikin 2000, p. 238); *irgičen* 'a fierce wolf; a wolf leader' in Russian regional variety of Transbaikal < Evenk. *irgičeen* 'taboo wolf' (*irgi* 'tail' + pejorative suffix *čeen*) (Anikin 2000, p. 224).

Not only can the wolf's name be forbidden, but also the words describing wolf's attacks: Khalkha *hangaid uruul-* 'to be torn to shreds by a wolf' (Oberfalzerová 2006, p. 71); (*honi*) *av-* 'to take sheep'; euph. 'to devour (sheep)'; it can be used only about the wolf (Oberfalzerová 2006, p. 71). Cf. Tuvan *aglaar* 'to raid' euph. for 'to hunt a wolf' (Suvandii 2016, p. 140).

The data suggests that the euphemisms reflect the mixed attitude to the wolf. It is treated with respect as the animal of deity (Khangai, Tengri, Altai, Burkhan) or as relative, hero or Buddhist monk. On the other hand its name has negative connotations, like *langdarma*, the name of Tibetan king, persecutor of Buddhism, 'harbinger of great misfortune' in Ordos or 'livestock's enemy' in Khalkha. The vast majority of euphemisms are descriptive names,

depicting peculiarities of its living area, appearance, manner of walking etc. Total taboos reflect the high degree of fear and respect.

BEAR

The bear is a sacred animal all over the Northeast Asia, often respected as the Lord of Animals. It has a lot in common with human beings: it can walk on two legs, its paws look like hands, without the skin it looks like a naked person etc. Thus the bear is considered to be of human kin, and there is a common belief that earlier it was a human being (for more details see Zelenin 1929, Janhunen 2003). That explains why a lot of euphemisms for the bear are kinship terms. Bears are mainly the forest inhabitants, so the majority of euphemistic terms for the bear is found in Buryat.

1. Elder relative, respected person:

Khalkha *baavgai* < *baavai* dial. 'father' + *avgai* 'respectful address to the elderly' (Rassadin 2005, p. 63); *ötög* 'old man; elder'. Buryat *xan xün* 'khan-man' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 65); dial. *daxatai übgen* 'old man in a fur coat' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 494); dial. *jexe übgen* 'great old man' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 494); *baabae* 'father' (Tunka dialect) (Rassadin 2005, p. 63); *taabae* 'grandfather' (Tunka dialect) (Rassadin 2005, p. 63). Oirat Mongol *xüçit baatar* 'strong hero'; *tom bietei baatar* 'hero with big body' (Erdenebold 2012, p. 64).

2. Deity:

Buryat *taigyn ezen* 'master of the taiga' (Sanzhina 2009, p. 34).

3. Descriptive name

According to the data the main characteristics of the bear in euphemistic names are its large size, fur, short tail, brown or grey color. It is considered to be a strong and brave animal.

Khalkha *maaxai* 'big old male bear; male of Gobian bear', Buryat and Khalkha *šar maaxai* 'big tailless male bear' might be connected to Khalkha

maaxai ‘big-foot’, Buryat *maaxai* ‘animal forehead’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 63). Buryat *bartaxi* cf. *baratgar* ‘shaggy-haired; clumsy’, *bartaa* ‘clumsy, bulky’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 63); *dial. baaxaldai* (Rassadin derives it from *baa-* ‘defecate’ although this etymology looks “suspicious”, it might be, however, a local dialectal form of *booxoldoi* ‘obstacle, evil spirit’ as in case of wolf: see above); *dial. nüüteger* ‘shaggy-haired’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 350); *xilgaahan gutalta* ‘wearing pampalai (kind of winter shoes made of horse hair)’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 568); *oxor hüülte* ‘short-tailed’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 63). Oirat Mongol *eremgii bor* ‘brave brown’; *xüder bor* ‘strong brown’; *üsen bürxüült bor* ‘grey with hair cover’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 64); Shira Yughur *tulugh xara* ‘hairy black’ (Nugteren 2005, p. 283).

4. Bear as game:

Khalkha *xar göröös* ‘black game’. Buryat. *xara güroöhen* ‘black game’; *sagaan güroöhen*, *dial. saagaan xara güroöhen*, ‘white bear’ (lit. ‘white black game’) (Cheremisov 1951, p. 182). The last form suggest that word-internal analysis of the form as ‘black’ + ‘game’ is already lost. Oirat Mongol *baraan an* ‘dark animal’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 64).

Not clear: Buryat. *dial. hüülte morgo* ‘big male bear with a tail’ (*hüül* ‘tail’, cf. perhaps Evenki *moro-* ‘to roar (of an animal)’ (Vasilevich 1958, p. 257; (Cheremisov 1951, pp. 317, 671). Buryat Tunka *dial. hüülte burgal* ‘male bear with a tail’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 671).

Similar semantic shifts can be observed in Siberian Turkic languages, e.g. Altai Telengit *abaai* ‘wife’s elder brother; kinsman’; *karındaš* ‘brother’; *taai* ‘maternal uncle’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 64–65). Tuvan *ire-irei* ‘grandfather’, *taiga eezi* ‘master of taiga’, *kara čüve* ‘like something black’, *türlüg čüve* ‘something terrible’, *xaiirakan* ‘merciful’ (Suvandii 2016, p. 139). Oiroi *abagai* ‘respectful way of addressing elders’ (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 11), *apšijak* ‘old man’, ‘husband’ (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 19). Examples of some other semantic shifts: Tuvan *čaaš* ‘calm, quiet’, *čimčak-buttug* ‘with smooth foot’, *čymčak bazar* ‘gentle treading’, *čaglig-biürek* ‘kidney with fat’, *čorganig* ‘with a blanket’, *čer-kulaktig* ‘with sharp ear’ (Suvandii 2016, p. 139). See also Manchu-Tungus (Oroch, Udeghe, Ulcha, Orok, Nanai, Manchu) *mapa/mafa* ‘old man; bear’ (Tsintsius I, 551).

Sometimes euphemisms from Altaic languages were borrowed into Siberian dialects of Russian language and used as common words: *aba* ‘bear’, ‘father’ < Khakas id. (Anikin 2000, p. 72); *abšah* < Khakas ‘old man’ (euphemism

for 'bear') (Anikin 2000, p. 73); *amakam* 'brown bear', *amikaniha* 'female bear' < Evenki 'grandfather; ancestor' (euphemism for 'bear') (Anikin 2000, p. 85); *bahalda* < Buryat (Anikin 2000, p. 123); *hairakan*, *hairikan* < Tuvan 'merciful' (Anikin 2000, p. 603). There are also some loan translations: *deduška* 'grandfather' (Anikin 2000, p. 180); *starik* 'old man' (Anikin 2000, p. 508).

Tuvan hunters also use special words for 'hunting a bear': *dajalaar* 'hunt a bear', *aaldar*, *ižeen aaldar* 'to visit the bear' (Suvandii 2016, p. 140).

SNAKE

In Mongolian folklore the snake is the animal of *Lus* (the lord of a body of water). In some local traditions this connection is represented in folk beliefs and descriptions of ritual practices of rain invoking: *If there hasn't been any rain for a long time in some area and nothing helps, one should find a snake and smear it in soot, then it will definitely rain. You would ask why? Because the deity can't allow his animal to be dirty and will send rain to wash it. I heard it from people* (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2009). And there is traditionally a strict prohibition of killing snakes, Mongols have a proverb: *Muugiin šivšig uuland, mogoin cus tengert* "Bad fame reaches the mountains, snake's blood reaches the sky" (Expedition materials, Xovd, Mongolia, 2014). Those who hurt or kill a snake will fall under the *lus*'s curse (*lusyn xorlol*).

Our informants told several stories about that. *Three men drove a car and saw a knot of snakes (mogoi čuulgan). Two of them decided to burn it, one was against. At last they burned the snakes, those two died, the third one stayed alive* (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

One old man killed young snakes. Later his family, their things and tractor were washed away by the heavy rain while they were migrating to a new place (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

One young soldier threw a stone that cut a snake into two pieces. After that all his children were born sick (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

It is a good omen if a snake crawls into the yurt. One should sprinkle milk on its head and shouldn't kill or even touch it with the hand. In that case the family will be wealthy. It is a good omen if the snake crawls to the khoimor. It is a bad omen if it crawls from the north side or towards the entrance. (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2014–2015).

*If one meets a snake one should walk in front of it or wait till it crawls away. It is a good omen if it crawls from the right to the left*¹² (*Expedition materials, Khovd, Mongolia, 2014*).

To meet a knot of snakes is a good omen. In that case one should say prayers, sprinkle milk, spread a garment hem or white cloth in front of it. Snakes will crawl onto it and leave something. If you keep it, you'll be wealthy (*Expedition materials, Arkhangai, Bayankhongor, Khovd, Mongolia, 2013–2015*).

1. Animal of deity

Khalkha *lusyn elč* ‘messenger of the Lus’; *lusyn amitan* ‘the animal of Lus’; *lusyn ezen* ‘master of Lus’; *mušgia xairxan* ‘winding merciful’; *urt xairxan* ‘long merciful’. Oirat Mongol *lustyn elč* ‘messenger of the one related to Lus’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 61).

2. Descriptive name

Euphemisms in this group refer to the form of the snake’s body, its long tongue and way of moving. As in many other languages, the common euphemistic name for snake is ‘worm’.

Khalkha *urt xorxoi* ‘long worm’, *gürvelžüür xorxoi* ‘wriggling worm’; *matigar xorxoi* ‘curved worm’; *ereen deesen* ‘motley rope’; *urt xelt* ‘long tongue’; *sunadag* ‘stretching’; *gürvelžin* ‘wriggling’; *dusal biet* ‘with spotted body’; *xii ideet* ‘air-eater’; *nomxon bor* ‘peaceful grey’ (Oberfalzerova 2006, p. 72). Buryat dial. *guldaraaša* ‘crawler’ (Cheremisov 1951, p. 175). Tsongol Buryat *mergen degée* ‘wise hook’ (Rassadin 2005, p. 73). Some of these euphemisms are recorded also in Oirat: cf. Oirat Mongol *gürveldzüür xorxoi* ‘wriggling worm’; *matigar xorxoi* ‘curved worm’; *ereen deesen* ‘motley rope’; *urt xelt* ‘long tongue’; *sunadag* ‘stretching’ (Erdenebold 2012, p. 61).

12) According to traditional beliefs, the movement of animals in that direction in front of you is a good omen, because it corresponds to the movement of the hand putting something into one’s bosom. So it means that you are receiving something good. Moving in the opposite direction is associated with taking away something from the bosom, in other words, with loss.

OTHER ANIMALS

Fox. The common name for a fox in Khalkha is *üneg*, which is sometimes euphemistically replaced by *araat* ‘having fangs’ (cf. Buryat *araata* ‘1. wolf; 2. dial. fox; Khalkha *araatan* ‘predators’). Moreover, in Kalmyck the originally euphemistic form *araatə* became the main word for ‘fox’, while in common Mongolian *üngen* now means not only ‘fox’, but also female animal in general, see Kalmyck *üngen čono* ‘she-wolf’, *üngen bürged* ‘she-eagle’ (Munieiev 1977, p. 551)). Shira Yughurs call it *malaghaici* ‘hatter’ (Nugteren 2005, p. 283). The informants told us, that to meet a fox on your way hunting is a bad omen. It means that you will not catch any prey. In that case it’s better to return home, or, according to another hunter, only killing the fox allows the good hunting. To meet this animal on your way is a bad omen in any case. But if it moves from the right to the left, the situation may be not so unlucky. Meeting a fox can cause a road accident, especially in the place where many foxes live. If a driver sees a fox, it means that the fox wants to say something to him. The only way to escape the misfortune is to leave the car and urinate.¹³ Our informant told us that once he drove tourists in the steppe and saw a fox. He asked everyone to leave the car and urinate. Other drivers didn’t stop and continued driving. After a while he caught up with them and found out that their cars were damaged by hail (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

There is also a widespread tradition connecting foxes to children. All over Mongolia fathers make a fox from felt, cutting out the shape of the animal, and hang it over the child’s cradle (this practice is followed for under three-year old children). According to collected opinions of our informants there can be a range of interpretations of this protective practice: to protect a child from everything bad and evil (*muu yum*); to make a fox to nurse the child and protect its sleeping; to frighten off a “real” fox which is believed to come to infants for tricking and teasing them. This fox is invisible by adults but can be detected by the behaviour of the baby, when it is not able to quieten down and sleep. In this situation informants believe that *a fox is talking to the child, saying “your mother died”, then the child starts to cry, and after [the fox says]: “oh, no, I lied, your mother is alive”, the child starts to smile* (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2009–2015). So when this trickster fox comes to

13) Urination is the best way to escape the influence of any bad spirit, e.g. if you meet some mysterious forces and your car cannot move, you should urinate on the wheel. However, it is forbidden to urinate on the road.

a family which has already made a protection and hung the felt figure, the fox “looks at it and thinks that here is already another fox, and goes away seeking for another place” (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2011–2015).

Marmot. Another animal of the steppe whose name is tabooed is the *targagan*, ‘marmot’, which is descriptively called *xulgar* ‘crop-eared, short-eared’. Marmots are considered to have the same origin as people. In Mongolian tradition there is a very popular old mythological topic concerning Erxii Mergen, a shooter, who vowed to shoot down all the suns but was unable to knock down the seventh, the last one, and then cut off his thumb and turned into a marmot. Thus marmot is believed to have human flesh and bones somewhere near the collarbone, and to have human kidney and human flesh in the armpits. Eating these parts is therefore tabooed. Mongols give dried marmot paws to a sick person to lick in order to cure him. A horse trainer told us that the rider shall not eat marmot’s meat before the race, and he himself observes that rule. *The head of the marmot family runs to the salt marsh, rolls in the salt water and all the family lick him. It is a bad omen to kill such an animal* (Expedition materials, Khovd, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2014–2015).

A single-fanged marmot is a lucky animal. People preserve his single fang or bones in order to have luck. (Expedition materials, Tsagaan nuur, Arkhangai, Mongolia, 2012).

Derbets believe that to wound a marmot and let him enter its hole, is very bad for the hunter. In that case people should do their best to dig it out from the hole. (Potanin 1883, p. 132). According to our informants, it is also regarded as a bad situation if a marmot carries off an arrow of the hunter into its hole. For this reason, they said, it is forbidden to hunt marmots with a bow and arrows. In addition to these characteristics forming an image of marmots as animals dangerous for people there is a popular belief that they spread “arrows” of plague¹⁴ (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2009).

The method of hunting marmots is rather interesting. They are believed to be very curious creatures, so the only way to coax them out of their hole is to dance in strange clothes (of white color, or like a fox skin etc.), waving a yak’s or sheep’s tail. Marmots will be so fascinated that they leave the hole and one can catch them. Khamnigans of Inner Mongolia told us that in the past in winter they dug the hole and put a long rope into it. Marmots were awakened by the moving rope, sleepily crawled out of their hole and were shot (Expedition materials, Inner Mongolia, 2013).

14) This belief is actually based on the fact that marmots sometimes are carriers of bubonic plague.

Sometimes Mongolian loanwords are used as euphemisms in other languages, e.g. *qojon* 'hare' is replaced by *tulai* in Oirot hunters' argot (from Khalkha *tuulai*) (Baskakov, Toschakova 1947, p. 158) and in the Kumanda dialect of the North-Altai language (Schönig 2003, p. 404).

There are many other taboo names of descriptive origin, e.g. Khalkha *čixtei* 'wild ass' (lit. 'with ears') (borrowed into Russian Transbaikal dialect as *čikičei* 'wild mule' (Anikin 2000, p. 661). Buryat *xalzan* 'bold' > 'coot bird' (Cheremisov 1951, p. 541); *turag* 'large, huge' > 'red deer' (Rassadin 2005, p. 98); dial. *erjeen güröohen* 'lynx' (lit. 'spotted game') (Cheremisov 1951, p. 182), dial. *xabtagai xülte* 'wolverine' (lit. 'flat-footed') (Cheremisov 1951, p. 530). Shira Yughur *nag noqoi* 'squirrel' (lit. 'tree-dog') (Nugteren 2005, p. 283). Sable in Buryat is called *bambagar* (dial. 'furry') and *xangaen xešeg* 'mercy of Khangai' (Rassadin 2005, p. 68).

II. Remarks on hunting language and word taboo

Mongolian hunters don't name the prey with its common name, for otherwise it will know about your plans or the spirits will be displeased (for details about hunters' taboos see also Zelenin 1929a). Khalkha *an* 'game' also means 'hunting' and the same root is used as a euphemism for hunted animals in other Altaic languages, e.g. Buryat dial. *an sagaan* 'deer' (lit. 'white game') (Cheremisov 1951, p. 55), dial. *anda jabagalxa* 'to hunt a sable' (lit. 'to go on a hunt') (Cheremisov 1951, p. 56). Oirot, Altaic *aŋ* 'game', 'maral, Siberian stag' (cf. semantic loan *zver'* (lit. 'game') which also means 'maral' or 'elk' in Russian Siberian dialects – Anikin 2000, p. 211); Tuvan *šaraš aŋ* 'sable' (lit. 'beautiful game') (Anikin 2000, p. 85).

Khalkha *göröös* 'kind of deer; game' is also used as a euphemistic means of naming wild animals, e.g. *xar göröös* 'bear' (lit. 'black game'), *cagaan göröös* 'white deer' (lit. 'white game'). Buryat *erjeen güröohen* 'tiger, dial. lynx' (lit. 'spotted game') (Cheremisov 1951, p. 182).

If a hunter meets a beautiful, outstanding animal, he shall not kill it, because it can be the *lusyn ezen* of Khangai. The hunter shouldn't sing while on his way hunting (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

On their way home the hunters don't tell what game they have caught, but say "saddlebags are not empty". In this situation the ganzaga 'saddle-thongs' are called bogts 'bags, saddlebags', but not ganzaga (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

The hunter should kill only the minimally required amount of animals and shouldn't kill a lot of game/animals or just wound them (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

In Mongolic languages there are special words, concerning killing game or cattle. Khalkha *xon* 'garga-' 'to lead out a sheep'; *xon* 'töxööröx' 'to prepare a sheep'. Buryat dial. *xorooxo* 'reduce; kill big beasts; kill off (wolves)'; *anjuulxa* 'to order eyes to be closed; to kill' (not only for animals) (Sanzhina 2009, p. 27). See also Tuvan *aglaar* 'to raid' euph. for 'to hunt a wolf' (Suvandii 2016, p. 140).

It is also forbidden to name the flesh of the game with common names. This is done in order to conceal the fact of killing from the deity, so a possible strategy is to change the animal's name and to use instead of them a descriptive adjective ('grey', 'lean') or the euphemistic name of the animal. *The flesh of the deer and other hoofed animals is called bor max* 'grey meat', *the flash of prey: turax max* 'lean meat'; *xecüü nertiin max* 'meat of the marmot' (lit. 'meat of the one with a hard name') (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

When a local nomadic community does not approve eating some type of meat then those who violate these rules also use tabooistic replacements even for the meat of the domestic animals, e.g. camel meat: *öndriin max* (lit. 'meat of the high one'); horse meat: *xulangiin max* (lit. 'meat of the wild ass'), *xatuu cixtei max* (lit. 'meat of the one with hard ears'), *bituu turaitainy max* (lit. 'meat of the odd-toe hoofed one') (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015).

Mongols have special restrictions for naming meat and bones when they are far from their yurts. The situation of travelling makes a person unprotected and exposed, and that is why travelers in the steppe often use a special language subsystem, which might be called "road language". This is not a unique Mongolian feature, for example a very elaborated system of road taboos was described for Yakut (Pavlova 1996). During our expedition to South Mongolia in 2015 we collected a lot of these euphemisms.

When a person eats not in the yurt but in the open steppe he/she shall not use the standard names for animal bones and body parts but use adjectives that describe their physical characteristics: *šömbüü* 'prolongated, oblong' instead of *öwçüü* 'breast bone'; *xawtgai* 'flat' instead of *dal* 'shoulder blade'; *xar't* 'humerus' instead of *čömög* 'marrow bones' etc.

The shoulder blade has a special meaning in Mongol culture. It was used for fortune-telling (Potanin 1881, p. 88–91). In contemporary culture it is believed that a skillful person can find out everything about a family where

this bone has been eaten if it is not broken, “*it is as a hard disk of the computer*” (Expedition materials, Mongolia, 2011). After eating, the bone should be broken into many pieces and only after that is it to be thrown away. One can't eat the meat from that bone alone, the owner of the yurt gives it to everyone except young girls. The bone should be cut with a knife. One informant said that meat from the bone should be shared among 70 people (because *dal* 'shoulder-blade' is homonymous to *dal* '70') (Expedition materials, Bayankhongor, Mongolia, 2015). Potanin noted that Alar Buryat forbid handling the sheep's shoulder blade in the presence of relatives from the mother's side. (Potanin 1883, p. 38).

Conclusion

In this article we have analyzed a number of euphemisms, taboos and folk beliefs concerning different objects and situations in Mongolian culture. Among them are some which are very important and popular in Mongolian folklore, namely wild animals, hunting and a road language. Studying euphemisms gives new data about traditional models of perception and connections between different objects and actions in the surrounding world, describing objects in their variety of meanings and emphasizing the important of the subject for understanding cultural characteristics.

The data suggests that euphemistic names are used in common life in order not to attract the wild animal (wolf) or, on the contrary, not to let it know your intention to kill them (hunting language) or not to displease the deities and spirits (hunting, women's and road languages).

Among the most common models of euphemisms for animals is naming them by using descriptive names (appearance, place of living, way of moving etc.), kinship terms (uncle, old man, elder), names of persons (historical persons, heroes), deities, animals as game, etc. The bones are named by adjectives that describe their physical characteristics and for naming the flesh Mongols add the animal's euphemistic name to the word 'meat'.

Sometimes euphemisms replace the common words and are used instead of them, or are borrowed into other languages as common words.

References

- AALTO, P., 1959, Über die kalmyckische Frauensprache. *Studia Mongolica*, T.I, Fasc 3, Ulaanbaatar.
- ANIKIN, A.E., 2000, Etimologičeskij slovar' russkikh dialectov Sibiri. Zaimstvovanija iz ural'skikh, altaiskih i paleoaziatskikh jazykov (Etymological dictionary of Russian dialects in Siberia. Borrowings from Ural, Altaic, paleoasiatic languages). 2 ed., Nauka, Moscow, Novosibirsk.
- ARTAEV, S.N., 2010, Rol' tabu i evfemizmov v kommunikativnom povedenii kalmykov (The role of taboos and euphemisms in the communicative behavior of the Kalmyks). In: *Humanitarian research*, 1(33), pp. 6–9.
- BAMRS: Bolshoi akademičeskij mongolsko-russkij slovar' (Comprehensive academical Mongolian-Russian dictionary), vol. I–IV, 2001–2004. Moscow, Academia.
- BASKAKOV, N.A., TOSCHAKOVA, T.M., 1947, Oirotsko-russkij slovar' (Oirat-Russian dictionary). OGIZ, Moscow.
- CHEREMISOV, K.M., 1951, Burjat-mongol'kso-russkij slovar' (Buryat-Russian dictionary). Gosudarstvennoje izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovarei, Moscow.
- DIXON, R.M.W., 1980, Speech and song styles: Avoidance styles. In: *The languages of Australia* (Sections 3.3–3.4). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 58–68.
- ERDENEBOLD, L., 2012, Tradicionnye verovanija ojrat-mongolov, konec XIX – nachalo XX vv. (Traditional beliefs of Oirat Mongols, the end of 19th – beginning of 20th centuries). BNC SO RAN, Ulan-Ude.
- GRUNTOV, I.A., MAZO, O.M., SOLOVYJEVA A.A., 2016, Heroes of Modern Mongolia. In: *Genius Loci: collection of articles in honor of the 75th anniversary of S.Y. Neklyudov*. Forum, Moscow, pp. 26–54.
- JANHUNEN, J., 2003, The traces of bear myth in Northeast Asia. In: *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, 20, pp. 1–20.
- MOSTAERT, A., 1968, *Dictionnaire Ordos*. 2nd ed. New York, London, Johnson Reprint Corporation.
- MUNIEV, B.D., 1977, *Kalmycko-Russkij slovar'* (Kalmyck-Russian dictionary). Moscow.
- MXITT: Mongol xelnii ix tailbar toli, <https://mongoltoli.mn>
- NUGETREN, H., 2005 Shira Yughur. In: *The Mongolian languages*. Routledge, London and New York, pp. 265–285.
- OBERFALZEROVÁ, A., 2006, *Metaphors and Nomads*. Triton, Prague.
- PAVLOVA, I.P., 1996, *Leksicheskaja sistema evfemizmov jakutskogo jazyka: semantika i struktura. Dissertacija po gumanitarnym naukam* (The lexical system of euphemisms of the Yakut language: semantics and structure. PhD Dissertation in Humanities). On: <http://cheloveknauka.com/leksicheskaya-sistema-evfemizmov-yakutskogo-yazyka-semantika-i-struktura#ixzz4MKyEwbWw>).
- POTANIN, G.N., 1881, *Očerki Severo-Zapadnoj Mongolii* (Essays on North-Western Mongolia). II. St Petersburg.
- POTANIN, G.N., 1883, *Očerki Severo-Zapadnoj Mongolii* (Essays on North-Western Mongolia). IV. St Petersburg.
- RASSADIN, V.I., 2005, Sravnitel'noje issledovanije animalističeskoj leksiki burjatskogo jazyka (A comparative study of animalistic vocabulary of the Buryat language). In: *Vestnik of Kalmyk Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences*. RAN, KIGI RAN, Elista, pp. 55–79.
- SANZHINA, D.D., 2009, Burjatskij jazyk: stilističeskij aspekt leksičeskoj sinonimii (Buryat language: stylistic aspect of lexical synonymy). Burjatskii universitet, Ulan-Ude.
- SÁRKÖZI, A., 1995, Taboo in the "Dictionnaire Ordos" of A. Mostaert. In: *Acta orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 48 (3), pp. 443–448.

- SCHÖNIG, C., 2003, Turko-Mongolic relations. In: *The Mongolian languages*. Routledge, London and New York, pp. 403–419.
- SIMONS, G., 1982, Word taboo and comparative Austronesian linguistics. In: *Pacific Linguistics*, C–76, Canberra, Australian National University, pp. 157–226.
- SUVANDII, N.D., 2016, Tabu I evfemizmy v okhotnichej leksike tuvinskogo jazyka (Taboo and euphemisms in the hunting vocabulary of the Tuvan language). In: *Philologičeskije nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. N 5, vol.2, pp. 138–141.
- TODAEVA, B.X., 2001, Slovar' jazyka oiratov Sin'tzjana (Dictionary of Oirat from Xinjiang). Kalmyk Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences RAN, Elista.
- TSINTSIUS V.I. eds., 1975, *Sravnitelny slovar' tunguso-manchzhurskih jazykov* (Comparative Dictionary of Manchu-Tungusic language). Vol. I., Leningrad.
- TSYDENDAMBAEVA, O.S., 2010a, Semantics of euphemisms (on the materials of Buryat, English and German languages). In: *Vestnik of Buryat State Universit.*, N 11, pp. 117–122.
- TSYDENDAMBAEVA, O.S., 2010b, Tabu kak istočnik voznikovenija evfemii (Taboo as a source of euphemy). In: *Vestnik Vjatskogo Gumanitarnogo Universiteta*, N 2, vol.4, pp. 33–37.
- VASILEVICH, G.M., 1958, *Evenkijsko-russkij slovar'* (Evenk-Russian Dictionary). Giins, Moscow.
- ZELENIN, D.K., 1929a, Tabu slov u narodov vostočnoj Evropy i severnoj Azii: Chast' I: Zaprety na ohote i drugih promyslah (Taboo words among the peoples of Eastern Europe and Northern Asia. Part 1: Taboo in hunting and other fields). In: *Sbornik muzeja antropologii i etnografii*. V. VIII. Izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Leningrad.
- ZELENIN, D.K., 1929b, Tabu slov u narodov vostočnoj Evropy i severnoj Azii: Chast' II: Zaprety v domashnej zhizni (Taboo words among the peoples of Eastern Europe and Northern Asia. Part 2: Taboo in everyday life). In: *Sbornik muzeja antropologii i etnografii*. V. IX izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Leningrad.

Mongolian – Ossetic/Alanic relations reflected in lexicon

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

MICHAL SCHWARZ, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

ONDŘEJ SRBA, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Summary: This contribution studies the lexical relations between Ossetic and Mongolian languages from the semantic point of view. It demonstrates that military terminology and proper names belonging to warrior-heroes from the Nart epics are dominant features.

We discuss (A) 21 probable borrowings of Mongolian origin in Ossetic and (B) 2 possible borrowings in Mongolian, which could be of Alanic origin.

A. Mongolian > Ossetic

1. Iron *ældyġ, yldyġ*, Digor *ulduġ* “tanning, tannic dissolution” (A IV, p. 276) Written Mongol *elde-* “to dress, soften, tan (of leather), knead”, *eldelge* “tanning” (Lessing 1960, pp. 307–308), Khalkha *eldex* & *eldleg*, Buryat *elde-* “to tan”, *eldexe* “tanning”, Kalmyk *eldʰχə* “(Häute) gerben oder bereiten (durch reiben und schlagen)” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 119), Ordos *elde-*, Baoan *fəla-* (*Alt-EDb*), IM *əldəx / eldek / eldex* (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 256).

Comments: A source of Common Ossetic **ælduġʰ* could be a Kalmyk form, corresponding to Written Mongolian *eldelge*, Khalkha *eldleg* “tanning”, reconstructible as **eldl_og*.

2. Iron *bæġatyr*, Digor *bæġatær* (A I, pp. 245–246), cf. *Os-Bæġatyr* (A II, p. 231); *qəbtyr* (A II, p. 278)

Middle Mongol *baʼatur*, Written Mongol *bayatur* “hero, knight; heroic, courageous, valiant, brave”, Khalkha *baatar* (Lessing 1960, p. 68), Kalmyk *batur* (Witsen), *bātŕ* “hero” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 38), Monguor *Bātʼur*, IM *ba:tar / ba:tər / ba:tr*, Dagur *ba:tur*, Yellow Yugur *ba:tar*, Dongxiang / Santa *jincin badulu* (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 128); Mongolian > Turkic: Cumanish, Karaim of Trakai *bayatyr* “hero; brave”, Shor *payattyr*, Tobol-Tatar *bayadyr*, besides *makattyr*, *mādyr*, further Teleut *pätttyr*, Baraba *padyr*, Yakut *bättyr*, *bötur* (Räsänen 1969, p. 55; *ESTJ* 2, pp. 82–85), and the disyllabic variant: Old

Turkish, East Turkish *batur*, Kazan Tatar, Turkmen etc. *batyr* etc. (Räsänen 1969, p. 65). See discussion of Doerfer in *TMEN* II (pp. 366–377, §817), where the Old Bulgarian form βαγατουρ, known from the Byzantinian sources of the 9th cent. (p. 369), is also quoted. With respect to historical and geographical circumstances, it could be a direct source of the Ossetic forms, although the Mongolian origin of the Old Bulgarian title remains probable.

The Ossetic forms were known first in the inscription from Zelenčuk (10th–12th cent.) as Πακαθαρ. In the Georgian chronicle *Kartlis Cxovreba* the Ossetic rulers are called *Os-Bayatari* “Ossetic hero” from the 5th to 14th centuries. These time limits exclude both Mongolic and Turkic as possible sources. Abaev thought that a more probable source seemed to be the Persian *bahādur* or its Middle Iranian predecessor, but it is not attested, and the Persian word itself is probably adopted from a source of the Middle Mongol type *ba'atur*. The Mongolian origin is probable in the case of the name *Batraz*, one of the heroes of the Nart epics.

3. Ossetic (place name) *Bæraǰʷyn* (Guriev 1974[2016], p. 330)

Written Mongol *barayun* “righthand side; West” (Lessing 1960, p. 84), Middle Mongolian *bara'un* (*SHM*), *barān* (Ibnu Muhenna), *bārawun* (*Muqqadimat al-Adab*), Khalkha, Buryat, Kalmyk, Ordos, Yellow Yugur *barūn*, Dongxiang/Santa *borun*, Dagur *baran*, *baren*, Monguor *baroŋ*, *waroŋ*, *waran*, Mogol (Zirni ms.) *baranyıl* (*AltEDb*; Sun Zhu 1990, p. 145).

4. Iron *byǰ*, Digor *buǰæ* “rubbish, trash, rag, rummage” (A I, pp. 276–277)

Written Mongol *boy* “sweepings, filth, garbage, rubbish, refuse”, Khalkha *bog* (Lessing 1960, p. 110), Kalmyk *boG* “Schmutz, Kehrlicht” (Ramstedt 1935, pp. 48–49); Turkic: Middle Turkic, Chaghatai *bok* “Mist, Ton, Schmutz”, Kazakh *buk* “dregs” (Räsänen 1969, p. 79; *ESTJ* 2, p. 183).

Comments: The Mongolian voiced final indicates more probably Mongolian than a Turkic source, although Mongolian forms may be of Turkic origin (*TMEN* 2, p. 349, #800).

5. Iron *eǰaw*, Digor *iǰaw*, *eǰaw* “big, great, large” (A I, p. 411)

Middle Mongol *yeke* (*SHM*), *ike*, *ikā* (Ibnu Muhanna), *yikā* (*Muqqadimat al-Adab*), Written Mongol *yeke* “great, big, large” (Lessing 1960, p. 431), Buryat *yexe*, Khamnigan *yeke*, Oirat *yeke* / *ik*, Kalmyk *ik* / *ik^e* (Ramstedt 1935, pp. 205–206), Khalkha *ix*, Ordos *iχ(χ)e*, Mogol *ikā* / (*j)ekā*, Dagur *xig(e)*, *šige*, *šihe*, Baoan *hgo*, *fgo*, *fguo*, Dongxiang / Santa *fugie*, Monguor *šge*, Yellow Yugur *šige*, *šge* (*AltEDb*; Sun Zhu 1990, p. 415; *TMEN* I, p. 553).

Comments: The Ossetic forms seem to be a compound consisting of the first component representing a borrowing from a language close to Middle Mongol from the 13th cent. The final Ossetic syllable *-aw* may represent Iron (j)aw, Digor *aw(æ)* “strength, power, activity” (A I, p. 85).

6. Iron *kærz*, Digor *kærzæ* “ash-tree” (A I, p. 587)

Kalmyk *kūr^us* “ash-tree” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 250), ?Mongol [Bálint, quoted by Räsänen 1969, p. 245] *küjriš*, Khalkha *xüjrs* id. (RMS); Turkic: Karakhanid *kevrík* “hornbeam / Vitex agnus castus” (Mahmud of Kashghar), Turkish dial. *kürüç*, *küvrüç*, Azerbaijani *göjriš*, Kumyk *güjriüç*, Noghai *küjriš*, Karachai *kürüç*, Balkar *küjriüç*, Tatar *qorič-ayaç*, Bashkir *qoros-ayas*, Chuvash *kavârâs*, *kavrâs*, *kavrâs* “ash”; cf. also Hungarian *kôris(-fa)* < Old Bulgarian (AltEDb; Räsänen 1969, p. 245: **käbrüč*).

Comments: One source could be Old Chuvash/Old Bulgar (cf. Norman-skaja 2006, p. 427), as in the case of the Kalmyk dendronym. With respect to the reduced vowel of the second syllable in Kalmyk the mediation of this language is quite possible. It remains to explain the presence of the dendronym in Khalkha. With respect to its isolation and absence from older sources, the inherited status of the Khalkha dendronym proposed in EDAL I (pp. 786–787), is hard to conceive.

7. Ossetic (place names): *Nar*, *Nar-gom*, *Nary-don* (Guriev 1974[2016], p. 327) Middle Mongol *naran* (SHM, *Muqqadimat al-Adab*), *narân* (Ibnu Muhanna), Written Mongol *nara(n)* (Lessing 1960, p. 565), Khalkha, Buryat, Ordos *nar(an)*, Kalmyk *narn*. (Ramstedt 1935, p. 272), Dongxiang / Santa, Yellow Yugur *naran*, Baoan *naraŋ*, Dagur *nar(e)*, Monguor *nara*, Mogol *naran*, (Zirni ms.) *nârân* (AltEDb), IM *nar* (seldom *nara* / *narn* / *naraŋ*) (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 500).

Mongolian > Turkic: Chuvash *nar-tăvan*, Kazan Tatar *nar-tuyan* “feasts”, lit. “birth of sun”.

With the help of the Common Mongolian word **naran* “sun” Abaev tried to explain the crucial term of the Nart epics, Digor *Nartæ*, Iron *Nart*, designating collectively the heroes of the epics (A II, pp. 158–60). His analysis of *Nartæ* as “descendants of **Nar*” is undoubtedly acceptable, but the direct identification of **Nar* with the Mongolian designation of “sun” is based on the folk-tales from South Ossetia: “The Sun had children, the heroes-Narts”. Bailey (1979, p. 172) connected Digor *Nartæ*, Iron *Nart* with Khotanese *nađe*, pl. *nađaune* “man, person, hero” < **ŋrtā(vā)h*, pl. **ŋrtāvanah* and this solution is unambiguous from the point of view of semantics. The corresponding

t-derivatives are known from Celtic: Old Irish *nert*, Welsh *nerth* “virility”, Breton *nerz* “force, strength”, and Old Irish *so-nirt*, Welsh *hy-nerth* “brave, strong” (Pokorny 1959, p. 765). The Ossetic stem **nart-* reflects the lengthened grade **(H)nārt-* in proto-Iranian. With respect to these transparent parallels it seems that an inherited Iranian origin is most probable, while the solar context looks as if it is secondary, caused by contamination with the quasi-homonymous Mongolian word “sun” which came with the Mongolian campaign in the Caucasus in the 13th century.

8. Iron (*w*)*obaw*, Digor (*w*)*obaj* “kurgan, grave-mound” (A II, pp. 223–224) Middle Mongol *obo’o*, Mongol *obuya(n)* “heap, pile, mass; heap of stones on the grave-mound, tumulus” (Lessing 1960, p. 598), Khalkha *ovoo*, IM *obo.*, Hejing *oba.* (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 523), Buriat *obō*, Kalmyk *owā* “Kegel, Hügelchen, Haufen; Steinhaufen an der Wegeseite oder auf einem Hügel” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 291), Ordos *owō*, Dagur *obō*, Yellow Yugur *owō*, Monguor *ōbō* (*AltEDb*; *TMEN* I, pp. 153–156); Mongolian > Turkic: Cumanic *oba* “hill”, Kazakh *obā* “heap, hill, mound, kurgan”, Oirot *oboyo* “kurgan(-stone)”, Karachai *oma* id., Khakas *obā* “kurgan-stone”, Chuvash *juBa* “Säule” (Räsänen 1969, p. 356).

9. Ossetic *ox* “cause, reason”; cf. Hungarian *ok* “cause, reason” (A II, pp. 233–234) Written Mongol *uxa-* “to understand, know, comprehend, realize”, *uxaya(n)* “intellect, mind, intelligence, reason, meaning, essence”, Khalkha *uxax* v., *uxaan* n. (Lessing 1960, pp. 890–91), Kalmyk *ux^hγv* “verstehen, begreifen, denken”, *uxān* “vernunft, verstand, Berechnung” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 447), Buryat *uxa-* & *uxā(n)*, Ordos *uxa-* & *uxān* id. (*AltEDb*); IM *uxa.n* / *uxa:ŋ*, Dagur *uka.* “mind, sense, intellect” (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 684); cf. also Turkic: Old Uyghur *uq-* “to understand”, *uq* “meaning, understanding”, Modern Uyghur (dial.) *uχ-* & *oq-* “to understand, hear” etc. (*ESTJ* 1, pp. 584–85; Räsänen 1969, pp. 511–512).

Comments: A source could be a *n*-less variant of Kalmyk *uxān* “Berechnung”, corresponding to Written Mongol *uxaya* & *uxayan* “intellect, mind, intelligence, reason, meaning, essence”, Buryat *uxā* & *uxān* etc. The umlaut *u...a > o...(a)* is explainable from Ossetic itself, cf. Iron *boğ*, Digor *boğa* “bull-breeder” < Turkish of Anatolia *buğa*, Azerbaijani *buya* etc. (A I, p. 264; II, p. 234).

10. Ossetic Digor *sağadaq*, *sağædaq*, *sæğædaq*, *sağændaq*, etc. “set of bow, arrows and quiver” (A III, pp. 18–19)

Written Mongol *sayaday* “arrow case, quiver”, Kalmyk *sādvG* “bow and arrows; quiver”, Khalkha *saadag* (Lessing 1960, p. 656; Ramstedt 1935, pp. 316–317), IM *sa:dag / sa:dæg / ha:dag / sa:dg*, Yellow Yugur *sa:dag* “quiver” (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 584). Mongolian > Turkic: Chaghatai *saydak* “quiver”, Sary Yugur *sayadak* id. (TMEN I, pp. 336–340; Räsänen 1969, p. 393; ESTJ 7, pp. 140–141).

Comments: With respect to Written Mongol *sagali* “automatic bow used for trapping animals; arbalest, crossbow”, Khalkha *saal*, Kalmyk *sālī* “Stellbogen, z.B. ein gespannter Bogen am Pfade der wilden Tiere” (Lessing 1960, p. 657), Ramstedt speculated about the primary stem **saga-* “to draw up, abridge”, cf. Kalmyk *sāχv* “näher ziehen, an sich ziehen, abkürzen”, e.g. *köptš:sāχv* “die Sehne des Bogens kürzer spannen”, Khalkha *saax*, Written Mongol *saga-* “to shorten, contract, abridge” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 317; Lessing 1960, p. 656).

11. Ossetic (personal name) *Sajnæg* ‘one of the heroes of the Nart epics’; together with *ældar* translating Mongol *xan*, it is a calque on Middle Mongol *Sain-xan* “glorious xan”, the epithet of Batu (A III, p. 22)

Written Mongol *sajin* “good” (Lessing 1960, p. 660), Middle Mongol *sajin* (SHM), *šājn* “healthy” (Ibnu Muhenna), *sajn* (*Muqqadimat al-Adab*), Khalkha *sajn* “good”, Buryat *hajn*, Kalmyk *sān* (Ramstedt 1935, p. 319), Ordos *sān*, Dongxiang *sain*, Baoan *saŋ*, Dagur *sain*, Yellow Yugur *sain*, Monguor *sān / sain*, Mogol *sōin* (AltEDb; Sun Zhu 1990, p. 588).

Comments: Ossetic *-æg* is a frequent derivational suffix reflecting Iranian **-aka-*, cf. e.g. Ossetic *bæġnæg* “nude, naked”, Sogdian *βyn’k / βaynāk/*, Khotanese *būnua* id. **baynaka-* < **maynaka-* vs. Avestan *mayna-* (A I, p. 247). Abaev (A III, p. 22) thought that the suffix was added to the foreign word in analogy to such names as *Wærææg*, *Xsærtæg*, *Wyryzmæg* etc.

12. Iron *sælavyr*, *sælabyr*, Digor *salaur* “marten / *Mustela martes scythica*” > Chechen *salor*, Ingush *soalor* id. (A III, pp. 61–62: third independent language as a source?)

Middle Mongol *šile’usun*, Written Mongol *silegüsü(n)*, *silügüsü(n)*, Khalkha *šilüüs* “lynx” (Lessing 1960, pp. 706, 708), Kalmyk *šülüsn.*, *šilüsn.* id. (Ramstedt 1935, p. 371), Buryat *šelühe(n)*, Ordos *šölüs*, Dagur *šulus*, Monguor *šele* (AltEDb); Mongolic > Turkic: Kazakh *siläüsün*, Uzbek *silä-v-sin*, East Turkish *sülejsün*, Teleut *šülüžün*, Oïrot *šülüžij*, Karachai *sülösün* “lynx”, Uyghur of China *šiläzün* “leopard”, Kumyk *sileüsüt* “panther”, Chuvash *šuleväs* id. (Räsänen 1969, p. 421; ESTJ 7, pp. 257–58).

Comments: The semantic shift “lynx” → “marten” is not trivial, but possible, cf. Dolgan *ūs-kis* “sable” = Yakut-Dolgan *kīs* “sable” + Yakut *ūs* “lynx” (Räsänen 1969, p. 272). A similar compound may be proposed for Mongolian, as in the example of Written Mongol **silegü(-sü)-sowsar*¹ “lynx-marten” with subsequent haplology and levelling of the vocalism leading to **silewüw(s)ar* > **silawur* > **salawur* vel sim. in the process of borrowing, perhaps through several mediators.

13. Iron *sīvyr*, Digor *sebur* “a big trough-like bowl with small holes for outflow of liquids” (A III, p. 115)

Middle Mongol *šīur*, Written Mongol *sigür* “broom, filter, strainer, fine comb”, Khalkha *šüür* “sieve, sifter, screen” (Lessing 1960, p. 703), Kalmyk *šūr* “sieve; net” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 372), Baoan *šir*, Yellow Yugur *šūr*, Monguor *šūr* (*AltEDb*), IM *šu:r / šy:r / šyrgyl*, Dongxiang / Santa *su* “fine comb” (Sun Zhu 1990, pp. 211, 727).

14. Iron *syxsy*, Digor *suxsu* “blackberry / *Rubus saxatalis*” < **sufsu?* (A III, p. 216)

Kalmyk *suwsŋ* “pearl”, *suwsŋ tarān* “black-currant / *Ribes nigra*” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 339), cf. Written Mongol *subusun*, IM: Hejing *subsn* “pearl” (Lessing 1960, pp. 733–734; Sun Zhu 1990, p. 611).

15. Iron *s(y)re*, Digor *sire* “wooden divan with headrest”; cf. Georgian *seli* “armchair” (A III, p. 208)

Middle Mongol *širǎ*, Written Mongol *sirege(n)* “table, desk; throne, seat; offering table, altar table”, Khalkha *širee(n)* (Lessing 1960, p. 716), Kalmyk *širē* “Tisch, Stuhl, Sessel” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 359), Buryat *šerē*, Ordos *širē(n)*, Dongxiang/Santa *šäre*, *širǎ / širǎ*, Baoan *šele*, *šile*, Dagur *širē*, Yellow Yugur *šere*, Monguor *širē*, IM *širǎ: / šire: / širǎ:* (*AltEDb*; Sun Zhu 1990, p. 719); Mongolian > Turkic: Chaghatai, Osman, Karaim *širǎ* “ein viereckiger Tisch”, Kazakh *širǎ* “die ledernen Teekasten”, Salar *šira* “table”, Teleut *širǎ* “Altar, Unterlage aus Birkenruten”, Shor *sirē* “bed”, Khakas *sirē* “bench, armchair, divan, throne” (Räsänen 1969, pp. 447–448; *TMEN* II, pp. 367–68).

16. Iron *tyxxǎj*, Digor *tuxxǎj*, *tuxxǎen* “with regard to, because of, due to, about”; maybe contaminated by Ossetic *tyx* “strength” (A III, pp. 348–49)

1) *Mongolian* **sowsar* “marten” > Written Mongol *sowsar* (Lessing 1960, p. 741), Khalkha *sūsar*, Kalmyk *suwsŋ* (Ramstedt 1935, p. 339), Ordos *sūsar* (*AltEDb*).

Written Mongol *tuxaj* e.g. in *eneen tuxaj* “about it” = Ossetic *ūj tyxxæj* id.; Written Mongol *man tuxai* “for us” (Lessing 1960, pp. 847–848) = Ossetic *max tyxxæj*. IM *tuxæ:* / *tuxai* / *duxai* / *tuxæ:* / *toxæ:* “about” (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 655).

17. Digor *utug* “troop, clan, band”; cf. Kabardin *utuk*, *utəkw*, Adyghean *utəgw* “troop, band, square, circle” (A IV, p. 22)

Written Mongol *otuy* “tribe, race, clan”, Khalkha *otog*, Kalmyk *ot^oG* “Stamm, Gemeinde, Nation, Reich” (Lessing 1960, p. 625; Ramstedt 1935, p. 291; *TMEN* II, pp. 67–68); the Turkic parallels are too distant in meaning: Middle Turkish, Chaghatai *otay* “tent” (Räsänen 1969, p. 366).

18. Iron *Xæmyc*, Digor *Xæmic* ‘name of one of the heroes of the Nart epics’ (A IV, p. 173)

Mongol *Xabiči-Batyr* ‘hero of the Mongol epics’. In “History {of the Mongolian dynasty} Yuan” (元史 *Yuán Shǐ*) by Song Lian (1370) the commander *Xa-bi-ši* of Mongols together with Eliah, the commander of Asses-Alans, are mentioned in the same campaign. See also the same name *Qabichi-ba’atur* (formerly as a boy named *Barim-shi’raju-qabichi*) in the *Secret History of the Mongols* (1[43] and later) (Onon 2001, p. 49). The name *Xabiči* is derived from the verb attested in Written Mongol *xaba* & *xabu* “skill in hunting, handling a bow”, Khalkha *xav* (Lessing 1960, p. 900); cf. Kalmyk *χawtšj* “ausgezeichneter Bogenschütze” ~ Written Mongol *xabuci* (Ramstedt 1935, p. 174). Cf. Temujin’s ancestor *Qabul Qahan* in the *SHM* (1[48] and later) (Onon 2001, p. 52).

Comments: The name is widespread in various Caucasian traditions, including the vacillation *m//b*: Balkar *Xamič* // *Xabič*, further Kabardinian *Xəməš*, Inguš *Xamč*, but Svan *Xəbəš*. Similarly Ossetic Digor *Amistol* “June-July” // Balkar *Abəstol*, in reality adapted Greek ἀπόστολος, with regard to the day of the Apostles of Peter & Paul, namely July 29 (A IV, p. 173; I, p. 51).

19. Digor *xarazast* ‘epithet of some heroes from the Nart epics’, where the second component is Ossetic *cæst* “eye” (A IV, p. 141)

The first component is of Mongolian origin, cf. Buryat *xara-nüdətäy* “black-eyed” = *xara* “black” + *nüdə* “eye” (*KRBS* 566, p. 102), with Common Mongolic components “black” & “eye”. Cf. also Turkic: Balkar *qara-köz* id.

Comments: The Turkic sequence *ka-* is adapted into Ossetic as *ka-*, cf. *kataj* “worry”, perhaps of Turkic origin, cf. Teleut *kadaya* “Sorge” (Radloff II, p. 309; A I, p. 573). In this case, the Ossetic component *xara-* with probable meaning

“black” should be borrowed from some Mongolian language, where Common Mongolian **kara* “black” changed into the forms *xara*: Khalkha *xar*, Buryat, Ordos, Dagur, Yellow Yugur, Monguor *xara*, Kalmyk *χar*”, Dagur *xar(a)* etc. vs. Written Mongol *qara*, Middle Mongol *qara* [*SHM*, *HY*, *IM*], Dongxiang *qara*, Mogol *qarō* etc. (Lessing 1960, p. 931; Ramstedt 1935, p. 168; *AltEDb*), while in the case of Common Turkic **kara* the most widespread forms are *qara*, *Gara* or *kara* and the initial *x-* is limited only to geographically remote languages as Yakut and Khakas *xara*. Geographically closest is Chuvash *xora* with different vocalism (Räsänen 1969, p. 235; Clauson 1972, pp. 643–44; *ESTJ* 5, pp. 286–89, pp. 299–300; *TMEN* 3, pp. 426–32).

20. Iron *xæzar*, Digor *xæzaræ* “house, dwelling” (A IV, pp. 159–60) Middle Mongol *qažar*, Written Mongol *gažar* (*yažar*) “ground, soil, earth, land, terrain”, Kalmyk *gazr* “earth, land, place, site”, Buryat, Khalkha *gazar*, Oirat *yazar*, Mogol *yažar* etc. (Lessing 1960, p. 355; Ramstedt 1935, p. 148), Ordos, Yellow Yugur *Gažar*, Monguor *Gažar*, Dagur *gažir* (*AltEDb*), Baoan *gateir*, Dongxiang/Santa *gadza* (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 277).

Comments: From the point of semantics the comparison is not trivial, but possible, cf. the semantic dispersion of the Indo-European root **ueiǵ-* “to dwell”: Vedic *viś-* “dwelling, house, homestead, settlement”; pl. “community, tribe”; Avestan *viś-* “homestead, community”; Greek οἶκος “house, household”; Albanian *vis* “place”; Latin *vicus* “village, block of houses”; Gothic *weihs* “village, settlement”; Lithuanian *viėšpats* “(house-)lord”; Old Church Slavonic *vъsv* “village”; Tocharian B *ike* “place, location, position” (Pokorny 1959, p. 1131).

21. Iron *zyğar*, Digor *zæğar*, *zæğar* “having a white stain on the forehead of an animal” (A IV, p. 318) Written Mongol *žagal* (*jajal*), Kalmyk *zayvl* “having dark spots on the neck or breast of a horse”, Khalkha *zagal* “grey” (Lessing 1960, p. 1022; Ramstedt 1935, p. 463), Buryat *žagal*, Ordos *žaGal* (*AltEDb*).

22. Iron *zybyty*, Digor *zubuti* “perfectly, absolute”; it is the gen. or loc. pl. from **zyby* / **zuba* (A IV, p. 317) Written Mongol **žöb* “straight, right” > Written Mongol *žöb* (Lessing 1960, p. 1072), Middle Mongolian *žuep* (*Huya-yi yi-yu*), *žob* (*SHM*), Khalkha *žöv*, Buryat *züb*, Kalmyk *zöb*, Ordos *žöb*, Dongxiang/Santa *žo*, Dagur *žugi-*, *žuhi* “correct”, Monguor *žo*, *žwo* “vrai, véritable” (*AltEDb*), *IM* *đöb* / *đub* / *zub* / *đob* / *đöb* / *đob* / *zöb* “right, correct, true” (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 456). In Khakha also used with sociative: *žövtej* “all right, correctly”.

Written Mongol *žeb* (*žeb*), Khalkha *zev* “intensifying particle preceding adjectives or adverbs” (Lessing 1960, p. 1042) (for example: *zev zerleg* “very fierce, very ferocious”). According to Lessing (1960, p. 1042) *zev* is not just “intensifying particle preceding adjectives or adverbs” it is “intensifying particle preceding adjectives or adverbs **beginning with the syllable ze**”. It is not correct in academic terms to abbreviate the dictionary definition before the most important part. It is the same morphological object as intensifying reduplicating particles used before other syllables: *cav cagaan* “very white”, *xav xar* “very black”, *böv böörönxij* “very spherical”. It has nothing to do with the Mongolian **žöb* “straight, right”. Any connection to Ossetic forms is highly dubious.

B. Alanic/Ossetic > Mongolian

1. Ossetic *ældar* “lord, prince”, Sarmatian man’s names such as Ἀρδαρος, Ἀρδάρακος, Ἀρδαρισκος (Zgusta 1955, pp.68–69, §56: 2nd-3rd cent. CE), Hungarian *aladár* “centurio cohortis praetoriae; Gardekapitän” (A I, p. 127: **ærm-dar* “hand-keeper”, cf. *ærm daryn* “to protect”)

Middle Mongol *aldar*, Written Mongol *aldar* “fame, renown, reputation, popularity”, Khalkha *aldar* (Lessing 1960, p. 30), Kalmyk *aldır* “Ehre, Ruhm; Herr” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 6), Buryat *aldar*, Ordos *aldar*, Dagur *aldar*, *aldür* (AltEDb), IM *aldar/aldär* “fame, popularity, glory” (Sun Zhu 1990, p. 102).

Note: This word is not present in small Gansu-Qinghai Mongolic languages.

Comments: Transparent Ossetic etymology supported by North Pontic onomastic material from the 2nd-3rd century CE imply Alanic as the donor-language.

2. Iron **rdyn*, Digor *ærdunæ/ænduræ* “bow”, cf. Sarmatian man’s names Ἀρδοναστος “with eight bows”, Ἀρδοναγαρος “with many bows” (Zgusta 1955, p. 189: Tanais, 3rd CE; further Sogdian *dr’wn /drōn/* “bow”, *dr’wn-p’δ’γ*, *drwn-p’δ’k /drōn-pāθē/* “archer”, *drwn-stn /drōn-stan/* “quiver” (Gharib 1995, #3570, 3571, 3610, 3611), Khotanese *durna* “bow”, Yidgha *drūn*, Middle Persian *dlwn /drōn/* “bow”, Persian *durūna* “bow, rainbow” (A II, p. 404; Bailey 1979, p. 162).

Kalmyk *ad’rvnv* “das dicke Ende des Pfeiles, das an die Sehne gelegt wird”; “big bow of heroes”; cf. also Bashkir *ädrinä* “ein Bogen mit gespannter Sehne” (Ramstedt 1935, p. 2; Räsänen 1969, p. 36).

Note: The prothetic vowel *a-* indicates as a source the Sarmatian sub-branch of Iranian, where it is a characteristic feature in the word “bow”. On the other hand, the ‘Sarmatian metathesis’, **-Cr- > *-rC-*, may determine the chronology of the borrowing. In the North Pontic onomasticon it is possible to register it first around 100 CE, the date of the man’s name from Olbia Πουρθακης < Iranian **puθra-* “son”. Later in the Tanais city a man’s name was recorded based on the same Iranian word, Φουρτας, dated to 228 CE. It already resembles Ossetic Digor *furt*, Iron *fyr̄t* “son” (Zgusta 1955, p. 135, §185; p. 167, §249). It is possible to conclude that before this metathesis the Iranian word **druna-* “bow” was transformed into Early Sarmatian/Alanic **adruna-* and just at this time, i.e. in the 1st century CE or earlier, the adoption of this term by ancestors of Mongols and/or Turks was realized.

Conclusion

The borrowings and their semantic affiliations may be arranged according to their frequencies as follows:

- I. Military terminology & hierarchy: A2, A10, A17, B1, B2.
- II. Mythological personal & ethnic names: A7, A11, A18, A19.
- III. Objects from the civilian life: A13, A15, A20.
- IV. Tree & plant names: A6, A14.
- V. Animal names & animal features: A12, A21.
- VI. Technical procedures: A1, A4.
- VII. Place names: A3, A7.
- VIII. Adjectives & adverbs: A5.
- IX. Burying: A8.
- X. Juridical lexicon: A9.
- XI. Grammatical words: A16.

The mythological names from Group II are usually from the Nart epics and belong to various warriors. This is no surprise since the Narts represent a specific brotherhood of warriors. This means that the Groups I and II cover more or less a common semantic field. Its share, 9 out of 23 terms, i.e. 37.5%, expresses the dominance of the set of military terms and proper names with a warrior’s connotation.

Abbreviations:

IM Inner Mongolian dialects according to Sun Zhu 1990
 SHM Secret History of the Mongols

References

- A = ABAEV, V.I., 1958-1973-1978-1989-1995, *Istoriko-ëtimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, I. Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk, Moskva-Leningrad; II-III-IV. Nauka, Leningrad; V. Institut jazykoznanija RAN, Moskva.
- ALEMANY, A., 2000, *Sources on the Alans. A Critical Compilation*. Brill, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- ALTEDB = ALTAIC ETYMOLOGICAL DATABASE, based on EDAL.
- <<http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/query.cgi?root=config&morpho=o&basename=\data\alt\altet>>
- BAILEY, H.W., 1979, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. University Press, Cambridge.
- BECKWITH, C.I., 2009, *Empires of the Silk Road*. Princeton – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- EDAL = STAROSTIN, S., DYBO, A., MUDRAK, O., 2003, *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages*. T. I-III, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
- ESTJ = ÈTIMOLOGIČESKIJ SLOVAR' TJURKSKIX JAZYKOV, 1 (glasnye), 2 (B), 3 (V, G, D) by È.V. Sevortjan, Moskva: Nauka 1974, 1978, 1980; 4 (ž, Ž, J) by V. Sevortjan & L.S. Levitskaja, Moskva: Nauka 1989; 5 (K, Q), Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kultury 1997 & 6 (K) by L.S. Levitskaja, A.V. Dybo, V.I. Rassadin, Moskva: Indrik 2000; 7 (L, M, N, P, S) by L.S. Levitskaja, G.F. Blagova, A.V. Dybo, D.M. Nasilov, Moskva: Institut jazykoznanija RAN 2003.
- GOLDEN, P.B., 2011, *Central Asia in World History*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- GURIEV, T.A., 1974 [2016], Toponimy mongolskogo proisždždenija v Severnoj Osetii. In: *Issledovaniya po Vostočnoj filologii*, pp. 62–72. Reprint in translation in Mongolian as: Умард Осетин дахь Монгол гаралттай газар нутгийн нэр (Umarđ Osetin dax' Mongol garalttaj gazar nutgijn ner). In: *Дэлхийд тархсан Монгол газар нутгийн нэр* (Delxijd tarxсан Mongol gazar nutgijn ner). Ed. Э. Равдан. Улаанбаатар, pp. 327–331.
- HALPERIN, C.J., 2000, The Kipchak Connection: The Ilkhans, the Mamluks and Ayn Jalut. In: *BSOAS* 63, No. 2, pp. 229–245.
- KOSHELENKO, G.A.; PILIPKO, V.N., 1994, Parthia. In: *History of civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. II. The development of sedentary and nomadic civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250*. Ed. János Harmatta et al., UNESCO Publishing, Paris, pp. 131–150.
- KRBS = KRATKIJ RUSSKO-BURJATSKIJ SLOVAR', sostavili Cydendambaev C.B.; Imenexov M.N.. Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo inostrannyx i nacionalnyx slovarej, Moskva.
- KYZLASOV, L.R., 1996, Northern nomads. In: *History of civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. III. The crossroads of civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*. Ed. B. A. Litvinsky et al., UNESCO Publishing, Paris, pp. 315–325.
- LESSING, F. ET AL., 1960, *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. University of California Press, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- NORMANSKAJA, JU.V., 2006, Rastitelnyj mir. Derev'ja i kustarniki. In: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Pratiurkskij jazyk-osnova. Kartina mira pratiurkskogo ètnosa po dannym jazyka*. Ed. Tenišev E.R. & Dybo A.V. Nauka, Moskva, pp. 387–435.
- ONON, URGUNGE, 2001, *The Secret History of the Mongols. The Life and Times of Chinggis Khan. Translated, Annotated and with an Introduction by Urgunge Onon*. RoutledgeCurzon, London – New York.

- POKORNY, J., 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Francke, Bern-München.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J., 1935, *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 111, Helsinki.
- RÄSÄNEN, M., 1969, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksp Sprachen*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XVII.1, Helsinki.
- RADLOFF, W., 1899, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, 2. Band. Académie Impériale des Sciences, St. Pétersbourg.
- RMS = *OROS-MONGOL TOE*, T. 1–2, by Cendijn Damdinsüren; Amgaagiin Luvsandendev. Ulaanbaatar: Ulsyn xevlelijn gazar 1967–1969, 2nd ed. 1982.
- SCHUESSLER, A., 2009, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- SUN ZHU (Ed.), 1990, *Menggu yuzu yuyan cidian*. Qinghai renmin chubanshe, Xining.
- TMEN = DOERFER, G., 1963–1975, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit I: Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen; II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen: alif bis tā; III: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen: gim bis kāf; IV: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen (Schluß) und Register zur Gesamtarbeit*. Steiner (Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 16 & 19–21), Wiesbaden.
- ZADNEPROVSKIY, Y.A., 1994, The nomads of northern Central Asia after the invasions of Alexander. In: *History of civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. II. The development of sedentary and nomadic civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250*. Ed. János Harmatta et al. UNESCO Publishing, Paris, pp. 457–472.
- ZGUSTA, L., 1955, *Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste*. Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, Praha.

Acknowledgement:

The present study was prepared thanks to a grant from the The Czech Science Foundation (GAČR), GA15–12215S. We are grateful for valuable comments to an anonymous referee.

Review Section

Отгонбаатар, Р., Цендина, А.Д., 2014, Образцы письменной традиции Северной Монголии. Алфавиты, транскрипции, языки (конец XVI – начало XX в.). Наука – Восточная литература, Москва, 240 pp. – 1 map – illustrations; Hardcover, price: not specified; ISBN 978-5-02-036559-9 – Reviewed by Veronika Kapišovská

In Mongolia the term ‘alphabet book’ customarily refers to a manuscript or xylograph that contains the letters of the alphabet, usually with some basic explanation as to the orthographic rules and various other pieces of information such as an overview of the history of the script, etc., are often included. These books range from just a set of letters up to a treatise and their purpose also varies. The book under review describes several types of alphabet books to which the authors have added some other types of texts, thereby showing the diversity of scripts and languages that were in use in Mongolia from the 16th to the beginning of the 20th century.

The book is divided into six chapters that are preceded by a short, but sufficient introduction about the development of Mongolian writing systems and traditional works in linguistics in general. The list of terms comprises those frequently found in traditional Mongolian linguistic tractates with corresponding translation into Russian, for some of which a detailed explanation is also provided in the introduction (pp. 9–13).

The first three chapters focus on the Mongolian alphabets proper (pp. 15–50), the Mongolian alphabets written in Tibetan (pp. 51–93) and the Tibetan alphabets for the Mongols written in Mongolian and Tibetan script (pp. 94–127). Each of these categories is represented by several manuscripts or xylographs covering the period from the 16th to the beginning of the 20th century. All the texts receive a brief account as to their appearance, technical characteristics, authorship (if known) and description of their unique features, followed by the translation into the Russian and transliteration of selected parts of the text. When applicable, the texts within a category are compared with each other. Besides the letters of the Mongolian alphabet as such, traditionally syllabically structured according to the same principle as that under which the Tibetan alphabet is arranged, the texts often contain an account of the basic principles of the orthography (i.e. ‘how the letters should be correctly put together’), a description of special letters for transcription of non-Mongolian words (*galik* or *ali gali*) and details of the history of the Mongolian script.

The Mongolian alphabets in Tibetan included in the second chapter date mainly from the 19th – 20th century, as a result of the expansion and strengthening of the position of the Tibetan language and script among Buddhist

monks throughout Mongolia. These alphabets were used by Mongols with knowledge of Tibetan for learning Mongolian script, as well as by Tibetan monks invited as teachers to the Mongolian monasteries and both Mongolians and Tibetans in Amdo (p. 52). The system of learning Mongolian script on the basis of the Tibetan alphabet is known to have been used by monks up to the beginning of the 20th century for the purpose of eradicating illiteracy (p. 51). The alphabets analysed in this chapter are bilingual or contain at least some part in Mongolian. An exception worth noting is a purely Tibetan versed text that covers the basic grammar rules of the Mongolian script (pp. 89–93).

The third chapter deals with the selected ten Tibetan alphabet books (five of them versed) and starts with a detailed description of a traditional way of facilitating learning the Tibetan script and orthography applied by Mongolian monks (pp. 94–99). As some Tibetan phonemes were hard to recognise and pronounce properly by Mongols, a system of mnemonics, a sort of “nicknames”, attached to the letters to ensure their correct spelling, was introduced, based on the pattern, presence in a particular word or any other attribute of the given letter, as for example, *qayarqai ya* ‘broken ga’ for ᠠ *ka*, *morin-u da* ‘da as in horse’ for ᠮ *ta*, etc. (table on pp. 94–97). This method is said to have originally come from Tibet (p. 94), but became very popular among the Mongols¹ and later was used to denote several letters of the Mongolian script and Cyrillic alphabet, too.

The next chapter includes two kinds of texts: 1) the transliteration alphabet for foreign texts (*galik* or *ali gali*), among them one in Oirat clear script xylographed per order of the abbot of the Arvaikher monastery Tsevel-Vanchigdorj in the second half of the 19th century (pp. 131–133) and the transliteration alphabet for Chinese and Manchu invented by scholar Chimesiin Demchigdorj (1863–1932), known as Dandaa-chinsan, probably while he was working on the translation of the History of Yuan (*Yuanshi*) in 1917–1923 are worth special mention; 2) four texts that are transliterations of different Tibetan and Tibeto-Sanskrit texts into Mongolian.

The fifth chapter offers a selection of miscellaneous Mongolian texts (prayers, including Megdzem, incantations, a list of monastic inventories, a list of healing herbs and minerals, travel permissions and two phrasebooks) written in the Tibetan script. This system of writing was widespread and used for a fairly wide variety of manuscripts and xylographs (a list is given

1) According to my personal experience the teachers of classical Tibetan in the Mongolian State University still keep using this traditional method in the late 1980s.

on p. 148), including the magazine for the monks (*Lam nar-un sedkül*) published in the 1930s. For better orientation and making the peculiarities of the different ways of transcription of the Mongolian in Tibetan script more visible, a transliteration into modern Mongolian and parallel texts in Mongolian script are added. From among the texts in this chapter two phrasebooks – Chinese-Mongolian (pp. 183–194) and Mongolian-Russian (pp. 194–196) – seem to provide a rather unusual example of using the Tibetan script.

The last, sixth chapter focuses on a few texts in Mongolian written in Soyombo and a few others in the horizontal square script: several travel permissions in Tibetan and a Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary (pp. 219–223).

It is not that the texts included in the book have not been described ever before. B. Rinchen (2015, pp. 111–155) described various alphabets, U. Zagdsuren (1975, pp. 318–358) included a Mongolian book of songs written in Tibetan script in his volume, and many other scholars, duly referred to by the authors of the book under review, touched upon or analysed these texts or topics. But as mentioned above the way the texts are elaborated, i.e. completed with thorough additional information, and presented in the form of translated and transliterated selected representative parts of most of them, enables one to acquire an understanding not only about these particular texts, but about each category presented, and moreover about the whole diversity of writing systems and customary practices related to them that was so peculiar to Mongolia in the past.

Slightly more than a half of the entire book is made up of a valuable illustrative section with the scanned pictures of those parts of the texts that were transliterated and translated in the previous chapters. The pictures are published on high-quality glossy paper and even though some of them are quite small, most details are well readable. This section is unpaginated, pictures are marked with the respective number of the text.

The book was simultaneously published also in Mongolian as Отгонбаатар, Р., Цендина, А.Д., 2014, Монгол үсэг бичгийн дээж. Цагаан толгой, галиг зэрэг дурсгал (XVI зууны эцсээс XX зууны эхэн үе). Наука – Восточная литература, Москва. 224 с. ISBN: 978-5-02-036567-4.

References

- Ринчен, Б., 2015, Монгол бичгийн хэлний зүй. Тэргүүн дэвтэр, Удиртгал. In: *Эрдэм шинжилгээний бүтээлийн чуулган, I боть*, Соёмбо принтинг, Улаанбаатар.
- Загдсүрэн, У., 1975, *Монгол дууны судлалын тойм*. Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum. Т. XIX., Fasc. I., Шинжлэх Ухааны Академийн Хэвлэл, Улаанбаатар.

Blažek, Václav, *Tocharian Studies, Works 1*, edited by Michal Schwarz, Brno: Muni Press 2011, 496 pp.; Paperback, price: not specified; ISBN 978-80-21056008 – Reviewed by Martin Gális

The work under review presents a collection of Professor Václav Blažek's (henceforth VB) writings on Tocharian edited by Michal Schwarz. The vast majority of the papers are written in English. The only exception is the Outline of Tocharian Historical Grammar (*Nástin tocharské historické gramatiky*, pp. 83–111) in cooperation with Michal Schwarz, which is written in Czech. The range of topics discussed is wide and has been divided into four thematic fields: I. Etymology (pp. 1–78), II. Grammar (pp. 82–111), III. Ethno-Linguistics & History (pp. 112–148) and IV. Bio- & Bibliographies (pp. 148–210). The work is accompanied by an Index of Words (pp. 211–225) with a section for each of the two Tocharian languages A and B.

As mentioned above, the main bulk of the present work consists of etymological studies. These handle mostly separate lexemes, but also the isoglosses between Tocharian and other Indo-European (mostly Anatolian and Slavic) languages and lexical borrowings between Tocharian and non-IE languages. They are characterized by diligence and detailed knowledge of the material from primary to secondary sources. The first article, entitled *Tocharian Linguistics during the Last 25 Years* (pp. 2–9), sums up the research in this specific field and also takes into account a number of important titles that normally are not mentioned in the latest works in this field; this might be caused by the fact that the titles are written in less well-known languages of IE studies (e.g. Russian or Hungarian). Furthermore, VB analyses the etymology of single Tocharian lexemes. In some cases, the laryngeals on the IE level are missing. For instance, instead of *h₂enk- “biegen” (cf. LIV² 268) we read (p. 6) *ank- “to bend, curve, bow” or instead of *h₁ékwo- “Pferd” (cf. NIL 230ff.) we read *ékwo. In some reconstructed forms, the alternative or older notation of laryngeals such as ə_x is used, e.g. *pə_xtr-ī (p. 89). The fact that in some cases the reconstructed form is given with the laryngeal and in others without the laryngeal, but with coloration of the adjacent vowel could be misleading for beginners.

A further formal discrepancy is represented by the notation of reconstructed labiovelars, which are sometimes noted with an upper index by X^w (e.g. p. 12: *k^wetwores “four”) and sometimes by X^v (e.g. p. 58: *k^vetūōr “four”). The same holds true for the notation of glides (*w* vs. *u*, *j* vs. *i*). But one can imagine that this lack of homogeneity reflects the long time-span over which the different articles were written.

The chapter entitled *Tocharian Grammar* (pp. 82–111) informs us briefly about the most important works in the field of Tocharian. The remaining part is conventionally divided into phonology, morphology and syntax. The phonological development from Proto-Indo-European to Tocharian (A and B) is exemplified on the basis of single lexemes in a well-arranged table (pp. 86–87). The section on morphology informs us how the single nominal and verbal word classes are built up and inflected (pp. 88–109). Finally, the uninflected word classes (pp. 107–108) and – in a few words – the syntax are discussed.

Especially interesting is the third thematic part of VB's book dealing with *Ethno-Linguistics and History* (pp. 112–148). This article sums up the history of early research from the beginning, comprising the discovery of Tocharian, its transmission to the western world and its identification as an IE language. Furthermore, VB gives information about the chronological extent and geographical sphere of the preserved manuscripts. In section 4 VB presents historical sources from antiquity in which Tocharians were mentioned. Section 5 considers the Tocharians in the light of Chinese sources. Section 6 examines exhaustively the exo- and endonyms of the Tocharian people. Section 7 discusses, on the basis of five etymons borrowed by other non-IE languages (Finno-Ugric and Samoyedic, the two hypotheses concerning the migration (northern and southern) of the Tocharians. The relation between Tocharian and Finno-Ugric is also demonstrated with the help of the glottochronological method. In appendix 1 VB tries to establish the date of divergence of Tocharian A and B on the basis of lexicostatistical analysis. In appendix 2 he offers diagrams of several scholars showing the position of Tocharian among the other IE languages.

The last chapter is devoted to Bio- and Bibliographies, namely of the renowned Indo-Europeanist and Tocharologist Werner Winter (pp. 149–172) and of the Czech philologist Pavel Poucha as an expert on Central Asian studies (pp. 173–210).

At the end of VB's *Tocharian Studies* there is the Index of Words (pp. 211–225), which makes orientation in the work easier.

Despite a few slightly disturbing orthographical and grammatical mistakes (for example p. 68: 4rd cent. instead of 4th cent., p. 127: laguages instead of languages, p. 131: ecological nica instead of niches?, p. 136: asycronic instead of asynchronous), VB's work is very readable and highly recommendable for everybody interested in Indo-European and Finno-Ugric linguistics, language contact or the history (not only) of Central Asia.

References

- LIV= Rix, H.; Kümmel, M. (eds.), 2001,² *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Reichert, Wiesbaden.
- NIL = Wodtko, D.S.; Irslinger, B.; Schneider, C., 2008, *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Winter, Heidelberg.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

BAYARMA KHABTAGAEVA, Szeged University, Hungary
baiarma@hung.u-szeged.hu, baiarma@hotmail.com

Postal address: Szeged University, Department of Altaic Studies, Egyetem u. 2, HU-6722 Szeged, Hungary

Bayarma Khabtagaeva (born 1975) graduated in Buryat and Mongolic Studies at Buryat State University (1997). She obtained her PhD degree (2007) in Altaic Studies at University of Szeged. Her current research interests are Altaic Studies, Mongolic, Turkic and Tungusic languages, the external linguistic contacts of Altaic languages. In 2011, for international scientific and publishing activity, she was granted the Young Scientist Award of the Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

J. LUBSANGDORJI, Charles University, Czech Republic
zuluvsan@yahoo.co.uk

Postal address: Department of South and Central Asia, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. J. Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic

J. Lubsangdorji (b. 1939) graduated at the Mongolian State University (MSU, 1961). In 1985 he obtained the title Assistant Professor at MSU. He worked as a Senior Assistant at MSU (1968–1987), as a Visiting Professor at Leningrad University (1971–1973) and since 1987 he has been teaching Mongolian at Charles University (since 2015 part-time). Author and co-author of a number of monographs, textbooks and research papers on Mongolian language and literature. Special interest in the *Secret History of the Mongols* and in Mongolian nomadic traditions (ethnolinguistic fieldwork 1999–2014). His new translation of the SHM (2014) with philological-cultural commentaries summarizes his previous research and corrects the “traditional” misinterpretations of the SHM based on the Chinese transliteration.

ILYA GRUNTOV, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia
altaica@narod.ru

Postal address: 119311, Russia, Moscow, ul. Stroitelei 7–3, 39

ILYA GRUNTOV (born 1977) graduated from Russian State University of Humanities, Linguistics department in 1999. PhD in Altaic studies (Reconstruction of Proto-Altaic declension) 2002.

Since 2012 he participated in the Mongolian folklore expeditions (2006–2016) of the Centre for Typological and Semiotic Folklore Studies at RSUH (a project headed by S. Neklyudov).

Founder and author of the web-site devoted to Mongolian, Turkic, Manchu-Tungusic, Korean and Japanese linguistics "Monumenta Altaica" (<http://altaica.ru>).

OLGA MAZO, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia
olga_mazo@list.ru

Postal address: 115573, Russia, Moscow, ul. M.Djalilya, 30–1–102

Olga Mazo (born 1975) graduated from Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow), Linguistics department in 1997 and received her PhD in Sino-Tibetan studies (The Comparative Morphology of Sino-Tibetan languages) in 2004, was a lecturer (2004–2010) and assistant professor (2010–) in the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies (Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow). Since 2013 she has participated in annual folklore and linguistics expeditions to Mongolia and China.

She is a co-author of 2 monographs, 3 textbooks and author of 15 articles. From 2012 she participated in Mongolian folklore expeditions (2006–2016) of the Centre for Typological and Semiotic Folklore Studies (project headed by S. Neklyudov) at RSUH.

ALEVTINA SOLOVYOVA, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia
asolovyova@yandex.ru

Postal address: 125493, Russia, Moscow, Kronshtadtskij bulvar, 25–4

Alevtina Solovyova (born 1981) graduated from Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow), the Centre for Historical Anthropology (named in honour of Marc Bloch) in 2008. A member of the Centre for Typological and Semiotic Folklore Studies, a lecturer at the Department for Chinese History and Philology and at the Department of Mongolian and Tibetan History and Philology of the Russian State University for the Humanities in Moscow, Russia. From 2007 she participated in - and from 2011 was in charge of - the Mongolian folklore expeditions (2006–2016) organized by the Centre for Typological and Semiotic Folklore Studies (a project headed by S. Neklyudov) at RSUH. Her research interests include Mongolian studies, Chinese studies, cultural anthropology, folklore, and mythology of Central Asia.

A co-author of 2 monographs, an author of 20 articles.

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
blazek@phil.muni.cz

Postal address: Department of Linguistics and Baltic Languages, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Born in 1959, graduated from Charles University in Prague (1983), RNDr., Charles University 1984, CSc., Masaryk University, Brno (1993), named docent at Masaryk University (1998), designated professor at Masaryk University (2003). He taught math and physics at the High School of Technology, Příbram from 1984 to 1993, received a Humboldt Fellowship to the University of Cologne (1993–1994); he was also an assistant professor at the Department of Linguistics (& Baltic Studies) at Masaryk University, Brno from 1995 to 1998, an associate professor of comparative Indo-European linguistics in the same department from 1998 to 2003, and was designated professor there in 2003.

He has published 8 monographs and over 450 papers in comparative linguistics or mythology.

MICHAL SCHWARZ, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
schwarz@phil.muni.cz

Postal address: Department of Linguistics and Baltic Languages, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Born in 1978, graduated at the Masaryk University in Brno (2005), Ph.D. Masaryk University (2013). He worked as a researcher at the Centre for the interdisciplinary research of ancient languages and earlier stages of modern languages (2009–2011) at Masaryk University, was an assistant (2012) & assistant professor (2013) at the Department of Linguistics and Baltic Languages at Masaryk University, and has served as the founding person of the Centre of Vietnamese studies (2014-).

He is an author or editor of 8 monographs and 37 articles.

ONDŘEJ SRBA, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
ondrejsrba@gmail.com

Postal address: Department of Linguistics and Baltic Languages, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Arna Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Ondřej Srba (b. 1986) is Ph.D. Student in Prague and Brno, focusing on oral traditions as source of history of Oirats and palaeography of Mongolian script. Since 2010, he has been repeatedly conducting field research in Western Mongolian regions. Since 2015, he has been assistant at the Department of Linguistics and Baltic Languages at Masaryk University.

AUTHORS OF REVIEWS

VERONIKA KAPIŠOVSKÁ, Charles University, Czech Republic
uvs@seznam.cz

Postal address: Department of South and Central Asia, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. J. Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic

Veronika Kapišovská (b. 1969) graduated in Mongolian and Russian Philology at Charles University in Prague (1993). After teaching and lecturing at the Faculty of Foreign Relations of the Mongolian State University she returned to the Czech Republic and obtained authorization for court-certified translating and interpreting in 1997. She started to work at the Charles University on a regular basis in 2001 as a researcher and lecturer in Mongolian Literature. She obtained her PhD. in Mongolian Philology in 2011. Her research is in Mongolian socio- and contact linguistics, modern language and literature.

MARTIN GÁLIS, Charles University, Faculty of Arts, Institute of Comparative Linguistics, Czech Republic
rapsod@azet.sk

Postal address: Mánesova 41, Praha 2, 12000, Czech Republic

Born on April 14, 1987, he graduated in Classical Philology at Comenius University in Bratislava (2013). He has finished his master's degree in the Institute of Comparative Linguistics, where he is currently a PhD. student. His primary interests include the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family and above all the Avestan language as well as the interface between Anatolia and the Aegean world in the Late Bronze Age. In addition to this, he works on etymology, language contact, language typology, Greek and Latin philology, grammar and historical linguistics.