ACTA ORIENTALIA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

ADIUVANTIBUS

B. CSONGOR, K. CZEGLÉDY, G. KARA, J. NÉMETH, S. TELEGDI

REDIGIT

L. LIGETI

HOC VOLUMEN REDEGIT

G. KARA

TOMUS XXV

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST

1972

Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XXV, pp. 369—381 (1972)

REMARKS ON INITIAL *D-* IN KIPCHAK LANGUAGES

BY

E. SCHÜTZ

1. In most of the modern Kipchak languages a good many words are to be found with the initial *d-*. This feature, deviating from their Common Turkic characteristics, has often been a concern of scholars dealing with the pho netics of Kipchak languages. The most obvious explanation seemed to be that this group of words bearing an initial *d-* were borrowings from Oghuz languages.

Historically these two groups of Turkic languages have always been neighbours, and before they set out to conquer the Western regions (the Seljukids to the South-west and the various Kipchak tribes to the Dešt-i Kipčak) they lived East and West of the northern shore of the Aral sea. The strongest and most lasting linguistic impact was exerted by the Ottoman Turks from the Seljukid era through all the subsequent centuries on the various neighbouring tribes, constituent parts of the Golden Horde; there even resulted an interesting intermingling of these affiliated languages in the territory of a third state, the Mameluke Egypt.

This influence kept on in the successor states also after the collapse of the Golden Horde. After the conquest of the Crimea by the Turks in 1475, the Kipchak tribes of the peninsula were directly influenced by the Ottomans. Ottoman Turkish found its way into the neighbouring dialects and in the course of time spread even further to the North.

Therefore Ottoman Turkish features in these dialects are corroborated by direct historical contact. But apart from the Ottoman Empire other Turkish languages of the Oghuz line became contiguous with other Kipchak languages, so *e.g.* Kumyk owes many of its Oghuz features to Azeri, or the south-west dialects of the Karakalpak show many Turkman characteristics. Thus the Oghuz influence is a general feature of Kipchak languages, but how far back this influence goes historically and to what extent, is still open to discussion.

2. G. Doerfer in his characterisation of Crimean dialects has put a special stress on the impact of Ottoman Turkish, with the well-founded assertion that «Ottoman forms have advanced considerably and appear sporadically as far as

the Noghay».[1] This remark is also appropriate for our present topic, the initial *d-*.

The *Fundamenta* is a work summarising the main results in the description of each language, thus the authors generally have no space to discuss problems of linguistic history. For example with Karachay-Balkar, O. Pritsak does not enlarge on this topic of secondary importance, merely mentions some sporadic occurrences of the initial *d-*: *de-*, *dön-*, *dört*, *doŋuz*.[2]

K. Thomsen remarked briefly on initial *d-* in Kazan Tatar and Siberian Tatar languages (*dürt*, *diŋez*).[3] The same reserved position has been held by J. Benzing for Bashkir as regards some of the isolated occurrences: *dürt*, *darï*, *duŋïð*, *diŋgěð*, *dut*.[4] Some more examples were presented, but no hint of explanation was given by N. K. Dmitriev either.[5] With Kumyk *d-*, a consideration of similar Tatar occurrences induced J. Benzing to viewing these words as borrowings from South-west Turkic «somewhat problematic».[6]

The phenomenon of «isolated occurrences» of voiced initials in Kipchak languages long ago aroused the interest of K. Menges, who returned to the survey of this phenomenon from time to time first in his Qaraqalpaq Grammar, later in his monography of South-Siberian languages and also in his substantial article on the Aralo-Caspian group.[7] The main stimulus which encouraged him to analyse the intricate net of initial mediae was his concept that Oghuz voiced initials were «surely» to be regarded as Proto-Turkic and Altaic.[8]

The last stage in the chain of his inferences was presented in his book on Turkic languages and peoples, where on the basis of Karagass and Tuvin correspondences, linked with the Oghuz ones, he established his theory of the possible existence of the initial mediae, resp. lenes, *d-* and *g-* in Proto-Turkic.[9]

A rather interesting feature in K. Menges' thesis related to our present problem was, that in developing his ideas — besides Oghuz voiced initials — he showed that catalysors have always been present in isolated occurrences in Kipchak languages, he did not, however, connect them with Proto-Turkic. He was of the opinion that the major part of these initials was to be explained by the impact exerted by neighbouring Oghuz languages, and the rest by internal evolution.

[1] *PhTF* I, 378.
[2] *Ibid.*, 350.
[3] *Ibid.*, 413.
[4] *Ibid.*, 426.
[5] *Grammatika baškirskogo jazyka*, 1943, 30.
[6] *PhTF* I. 396.
[7] *Qaraqalpaq Grammar*, 1947. 33—36.; *CAJ* I, 114, 120, IV, 99.
[8] *PhTF* I. 451.
[9] *The Turkic Languages and Peoples* (*Ural-Alt. Bibl.* XV), 86. I do not wish to enlarge on this stimulating theory now.

3.1. The knot of problems can and must be tackled both in the diachronic and synchronic directions. In our study of the problem still it is appropriate to disregard the testimony of Kāš arī as his terms for linguistic affiliation were not quite satisfactory even for the exact designation of the relevant language, let alone mutual contact.[10]

3.2. Our main source of information, as always, has been the Codex Cumanicus; and turning to it for *d-* initials, there was no trace of the rich vocabulary of today, just a small group of words: *-da, dagi* (*dagen*), *degri,* (*deyri*), *dein, de-, deul* (*devl*).[11]

Another important group of records which should be consulted on this matter is that of the Kipchak spoken by Armenians in the 16—17th century.[12] These literary records are not appreciated adequately, mainly because they present a uniform dialect without considerable variations. But it should be taken into consideration that they contain a rich vocabulary not very far from the Codex Cumanicus, so initial *d-*s are to be found in almost the same words as in the CC: *-da*[2], *dayï* (*dayïn, dayïda*), *dek* (*dera, diŋra, diyin*), *de-, dugul/tugul, -dur/-tur, dort.*[13]

Another language-preserve for 14th century Coman is the Karaim with the following *d-* initials: *-da, dayï, d'eịiń, d'eŕa, d'ort'*, but *t'uẃul.*[14]

But this phenomenon is not restricted to the Kipchak area. If one turns to East Middle Turkic, one can find almost the same examples in early Chagatay: *-da, dayï, -dur/-durur, degrü, degin, deginčä, degünčä, degül, de-*. The occurrences with initial *t-* seem to be recurrences of literary tradition: *tegrü, tegürä* and *-tur/-turur* are assimilated forms.[15]

According to the unanimous testimony of medieval literary monuments — apart from the Oghuz vocabulary — these were the only lexemes with initial *d-* in Western and Eastern Middle Turkic.

4. In order to follow up this linguistic phenomenon let us take the words one by one.

4.1. The enclytical conjunction *-da*[2]*/-ta*[2] existing in all Turkic languages can be traced back to Old Turkic. It takes its origin from the adverb and con-

[10] *KCsA* I/1, 39; *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*, 644—648; etc.

[11] *Komanisches Wörterbuch*, 79—83; Gabain: *PhTF* I. 53.

[12] Recently G. Clauson launched the idea that these Armeno-Kipchaks could have been a group of Kipchaks converted to Monophisitism (*RO* XXXIV, No. 2. 7—13).

[13] See Schütz, *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle* . . . 100; J. Deny, *L'Arméno-Coman et les «Éphémérides» de Kamieniec* (*1604—1613*), 1957. 49—50; E. Tryjarski, *Dictionnaire Arméno-kiptchak*, I/1. 1968. 202—4, 207—8, 214, 218—9; Schütz, *Armeno-kiptschakische Ehekontrakte und Testamente*, in: *AOH* XXIV, 287, etc.

[14] T. Kowalski, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*, 180, 271.

[15] J. Eckmann, *Chagatay Manual*, 44—45, 125, 182.

junction *taqï* attested in the Orkhon inscriptions,[16] as an adverb of degree in the meaning of «more», and as a constituent part of the coordinate compound conjunction *anča-taqï* «moreover», and also in Uighur.

Taqï was originally a Gerund of the verb *taq-* «to affix, attach» and so of the same type as a good many of the adverbs developing into postpositions and conjunctions.[17]

Taqï > *dayï* has kept its original meaning «more, moreover» up to the present, but because of its character of amplifying the context not only of words, but also of clauses, it adopted the role of a conjunction. The slow evolution towards the role of a conjunction can be seen to take place from Old Turkic literary records onward. The original structure in Turkic consisted mainly of a juxtaposition of co-equal words and coordinate clauses without any conjunction at all. The parsimony of Old Turkic in conjunctions was also felt in Uighur, but soon a decisive change ensued. Under the frontal advance of Islam, the Turkic prose underwent a great impact from Arabic and an even stronger influence was exerted on poetry by Persian. In reading the Qutadġu Bilig one encounters the constant use of the conjunction *häm*; *birlä* which connects only parts of the sentence is rather rare, and *taqï* «moreover» appears only a few times to introduce copulative clauses with emphasis. The same syntactical structure also was present in Chagatay.[18]

The scarcity of conjunctions was also noticeable in folklore texts, differing solely according to the preponderance of Persian or Arabic: *häm* or *vä*, *ū*. Even modern folk poetry reveals a similar picture, *e.g.* in a collection of Kumyk texts *häm* is the common conjunction for copulative clauses, on twenty pages *taqï* occurs only three times and with the meaning «moreover» and the enclytic *-da*[2]/*-ta*[2] also mainly in the sense of «also, too».[19]

A counterpart of this course of development is to be encountered in the Mameluke Kipchak literature. Besides a considerable amount of Arabic and Persian vocabulary in the Kipchak translation of the Gulestan, it contains a very wide use of *dayï* as a conjunction, bearing all the various meanings «and, also, too, moreover».[20] So in this case one cannot avoid attributing its ample use to Oghuz influences.

As the connecting link between the *dayï* and the enclytical *-da* form is

[16] Gabain, *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 173—74; *DTS* 536; T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, 160, 169.

[17] Bang, *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen*, in: *ABAW*, 1917. *Phil.-hist.Kl.* No. 6. 44—46; idem, *Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türksprachen*, II. in: *SBAW* 1917, 924; Deny, *Grammaire de la langue turque*, 265—72; Räsänen, *MTS* 236, etc.

[18] Eckmann, *op. cit.*, 200.

[19] *KSz* XIII, 129 sqq.

[20] Bodrogligeti, *A fourteenth century Turkic Translation of Sa'dī's Gulistān*, 241, and passim in the text.

not found in literary monuments (as *e.g.* in *tägi* > *teg/tek* > *deg/dek*, see below), one would be inclined to suppose that there was a leap between the two stages. It is imaginable that in the course of the Persian impact — many compound conjunctions having *ki* as a second part — might have caused speakers to feel that *taqï* was also a compound. The Persian conjunction *tā ki* «as soon as, since, until»[21] might have stimulated such a disposition.

But the short form of the enclytic can also be explained by contraction; there ensued a weakening of the original fortis *q* to > *γ* and > *h*, as attested especially by Ottoman Turkish. Such contracted forms exist in many Turkic languages, *e.g.* in Kirghiz or Koibal *-dā*; the Crimean Tatar *daa* and the Gagauz *dā* were the most likely direct descendants of Turkish *daha*.

An extraordinary stage in the evolution of this enclytic was the independent form *da* in Armeno-Kipchak, but this was due to the impact of the surrounding Slavic population.

An interesting feature in the development of this enclytic was that the original word also remained alive in most of the Turkic languages. This double existence was most likely caused by the dichotomy in the meanings: «and, also, too < moreover, further» which has even been emphasized by the form: *daγïda*.[22]

As to the initial *d-* the enclytic underwent assimilation both in the consonant and in the vowel: *-da/-ta*, *-de/-te* in all Turkic languages, but the longer form did not become an enclytic and kept the initial *t-* (*tayï*) in most Kipchak languages (Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, Noghay, Kirghiz, etc.), so the forms with *d-* initial in Chagatay and elsewhere should be most probably regarded as the result of the Oghuz impact.

4.2. The origin of the postposition *deg/dek* can be traced back to the Old Turkic Gerund *tägi*, derived from the verb *täg-* «to attain, etc.» A good many examples of this word were already present in the Orkhon Inscriptions, being on the verge of a Gerund and a postposition, so *e.g.* (KT E2) *qadïrqan yïšqa tägi* «up to the Qadïrqan Mountains» which can be translated as well: «attaining the Qadïrqan Mountains».[23] The same form and use is also to be encountered with Rabγūzī: *batarγa tägi* «bis zum Westen», etc.[24]

The vitality of the original form is most likely due to literary tradition, as by the beginning of the 14th century the worn off variety had already become current.

In the Codex Cumanicus the root form *deg* did not occur, only the derived

[21] Eckmann, *op. cit.*, 145, 185, 208.

[22] Very common in the text of the Armeno-Kipchak *Tora Bitiki*: *RO* XXI, 160r5, 163v20, 22, 164r6, 13, 165v4, 166v8, 17, 167r16, 167v8, etc.

[23] Tekin, *op. cit.*, 166—167, and Glossary 378—79. Uighur; *ATGr*, 166.

[24] J. Schinkewitsch, *Rabγūzīs Syntax*, in: *MSOS* 2. XXIX, 150.

varieties, but in Armeno-Kipchak the worn off form of this limitative postposition together with its derivatives were widely used.[25]

As to modern Turkic it is in dialectal use in Ottoman Turkish,[26] is to be found in Uzbek (*dek*),[27] in other Turkic languages it underwent a further phonetic evolution, to *-day*, *-dey* as in Kazakh and Karakalpak, etc.

Nonetheless the derived forms enjoyed a much wider popularity. Not only the root form served for a stem, but also the factitive *tägir-* (*tegür-*). The Gerund **tegiri* was represented in the CC as *degri*.

Another variety with a labial vowel became popular in the Khwaresmian period: **tägirü* > *tägrü*, e.g. in the *Qiṣaṣu'l-anbiyā*, or in the Mameluke Kipchak translation of the *Gulistan*, further with Quṭb and in the *Muʿīnu 'l-murīd*.[28]

In Chagatay, besides the initial *t-*, an inheritance from literary East Middle Turkic, we meet with the initial *d-* with increasing frequency: *qulaqqa tegürä* «as far as the ears», *qïyāmat bazmïġa tegrü* «till the meeting of resurrection», *tan͡gġa degrü* «until dawn».[29] (Modern Kipchak examples always with *-i* suffix: Qarachay *deri* ~ *deričin*, Balkar *deyri* ~ *deyir* > *yeri* ~ *yer*.[30])

Besides the *-i*, *-ü* Gerund the *-a*, *-ä* Gerund was also often used in early Kipchak, in the Armeno-Kipchak records: **tegirä* > **tiyrä* > *dirä*.[31] Modern varieties were quoted by Budagoff: *tigrä*, *tirä*. The same suffix in Kirghiz: *deyre*; a contracted form occurs in the Abakan region: *tārä*; an exact counterpart is present in Karaim: *d'eŕa*. A more problematic derivate is the Armeno-Kipchak: *diŋra* > *dinra*. The nasalisation of stops is a peculiar feature of onomatopoetic verbs,[32] but in this context it was more likely the impact of a sister-postposition instrumental: *soŋra*.

A rather cherished form of the limitative was the derived form: *tegin* < *degin* > *diyin*. The Gerund *-in* of the same verb *täg-* > *deyin* seems to be the most viable among the derivatives. The earliest appearance of the postposition in Kipchak was the *dein* in the Codex Cumanicus. It enjoyed ample

[25] Deny, *Ephem.*, 49; Tryjarski, *Dict.* 207, etc.

[26] Deny, *Gramm.* 612—14.

[27] A. N. Kononov, *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, 285.

[28] Schinkewitsch, *op. cit.*, 150; Bodrogligeti, *Gulistan*, 399; A. Zajączkowski, *Najstarsza wersja turecka* Ḫusräv u Šīrīn *Quṭba*, 177.

[29] Eckmann, *Chagatay Manual*, 125; Eckmann, *Zur Charakteristik der islamischen mittelasiatisch-türkischen Literatursprache*, in: *Festschrift N. Poppe*, 58.

[30] *PhTF* I, 358.

[31] Deny, *Ephem.*, 50; Deny—Tryjarski, *Hikar*, 30; Tryjarski, *Dict.*, 210; *RO* XXI, 181r2, 210r21, etc. Hrunin, *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke*, 391; Schütz, *Ehekontrakte*: *AOH* XXIV, 287, etc.

[32] Cf. Bang, *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen*, 2. *Über einige schallnachahmende Verba*, 22, sqq.

use in Armeno-Kipchak texts, but it also became just as popular in other Kipchak languages: *deyin* in Kazakh, Karakalpak, Noghay; *ďeįiń* in KaraimT.[33]

In the SW branch it was much in vogue: *deyin* > *diyin* from Old Ottoman on.[34] The suffixed form with *-ča*: *tägінčä* ~ *tiginč* (*tėginč*), (*e.g.* in Rabγūzī *ol künkä tėginč* «till that day») does not show up later.[35]

The general view on enclytics is that the shortest form is always the most viable, but this case is exceptional, because it occurred only in a few Turkic languages where the *deg/dek* is used, as mentioned above. In all probability it was its homonymity with the comparative *-deg* which was instrumental in its disappearance.

4.3. A most characteristic feature of Turkic syntax from Old Turkic onwards up to the present time has always been the preference for coordination in the vernacular. The direct discourse was juxtaposed with the main clause, bearing a *verbum sentiendi, cogitandi* or *dicendi*. Originally a single verb sufficed, the first stage in development being one *verbum regens* opening, and later also closing, the direct discourse. The further stage was marked — most probably by foreign influence — by an introductory pleonastic compound consisting of a Gerund and a finite verb. Stereotype compounds of this kind are to be found from early times, of course, in tales containing a great deal of direct discourse, so *e.g.* in Uighur texts:

inčä tip tidi ... (quotation) ... *tip* 271[1,4]
tip ötünti ... (quot) ... *tip tidi* 271[6,12]
inčä tip kiginč birti ... (quot) ... *tip tidi* 271[26]—272[1] [36]

In such a context the *tip* formula was used so often that it became a sort of quotation mark. It was also applied in cases when it substituted for the conjunction of various types.[37]

The pleonastic use of the introducing verb and the closing formula has been preserved throughout in the language of the people, so *e.g.* in Kazan Tatar:

[33] *PhTF* I, 467; Räsänen, *MTS*, 138, etc.; Kowalski, *op. cit.*, 180.
[34] Zajączkowski, *Vieux osm.* II, 18; Deny, *Gramm.*, 613.
[35] S. E. Malov, *Pamjatniki drevnetjurkskoj pisjmennosti*, 325[10] and further *DTS*, 548.
[36] Gabain, *ATGr Gr.* (The Hungry Tigress).
[37] See the use of *tip* and *tiyin* in the Orkhon Inscriptions: Tekin, *op. cit.*, 171, 172, and in Uighur: Gabain, *ATGr.*, 192—193, 179, 142. (I keep the transliteration by *i* instead of *ė*, so *tip* — *tėp*.) The variegated use of the *tip/dep/dejü/dej* formula has been fully characterised in different modern languages: Turkish: Deny, *Gramm.*, 915—918; Kononov, *Gramm. sovr. tureckogo lit. jazyka*, 540—544; Uzbek: Kononov, *Gramm. sovr. uzbekskogo lit. jaz.*, 421—22; Kumyk: N. K. Dmitriev, *Stroj tjurkskich jazykov*, 392; Kazan Tatar: Bálint, *Kazáni-tatár nyelvtan*, 152—158, etc.

. . . *äjtte dej* (quot.) *dide dej* (or simply: *dip*)
. . . *soragan dej* (quot.) *digän dej* . . .[38]

In this case, by the repetition of the formula, the storyteller wished to increase the trustworthiness of his story, by repeatedly referring to an existing or a fictitious person as an authority.

If one took the inverted word-order — *dide dej* — as starting point for deducing the origin of the initial *d-* the case would provide exact evidence, as in most cases the past tense ends with a vowel. Even if one took a *-ken* perfect the liquid would also be instrumental in producing a sandhi *D-*. Of course, in cases, when it followed an unvoiced consonant, *tep* was preserved. But a statistical analysis would show the frequency trend. For example, I took 34 half-pages of a text of Karachay folklore, and it showed a 126 : 31 proportion, *i.e.* a fourfold advantage in favour of the voiced initial.[39] But the *tip tidi* formula would also lead to development in the same direction, as the formula closing direct discourse would lose its accent in any case, and turn into a lenis. The very frequent *dep* formula induced the whole paradigme to change into *de-*. So in almost all Turkic languages the initial became unchangeably voiced.[40]

4.4. The case par excellence of enclytic development in Turkic languages was that of the copula *dur*. The verb *tur-* as well as its original meaning «to stand, stay, etc.» also used to express existence in Uighur, and as an auxiliary verb joined to several Gerunds, and was also further applied to form descriptive verbs.[41]

During the Karakhanid period characterised by Kāšğarī, it also figured mostly as a main verb, but the basic meaning was slowly disappearing and in auxiliary use it served to denote continued permanent action or a lasting state. In the *Qutadğu Bilig* the Aorist had already been shortened to *tur-* by haplology.

Besides *turur* > *tur* with the Khwaresmian period and early Chagatay there also appeared the forms *durur* > *dur* in the Kipchak branch.

4.5. The copula *tägül* serves for the negation of a nominal predicate.[42]

Regarding its earliest appearance, there is a passage in the Kül tegin Inscription (1 S6): *biriyä čoγay yiš, tögültün* (S7) *yazï qonayïn tisär* «if you intend to settle [. . .] at the Čoγay mountains . . .» the second half of which was interpreted in two different ways: by some scholars it was taken for a geo-

[38] Bálint, *Kazáni-tatár szövegek és fordítás*, 23—64 passim.
[39] *KSz*, X, 270—304.
[40] Including the tenues mediae initials of the South Siberian languages, *PhTF* I, 451; *CAJ* I, 114 sqq.
[41] Gabain, *op. cit.* 131—2; *DTS* 586.
[42] Räsänen, *MTS*, 233; etymologies: Deny, *Gramm.*, 283; Kononov: in *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, VI, 98—100.

graphic name and translated: «and on the Tögültün plain in the south», by others *yiš tügül-tin* was interpreted as a negation: «not in the wooded region».[43]

This isolated occurrence of *tägül* and even more of *tügül* would be quite unexpected and, as it had no counterpart for centuries, the reading as a negative copula would be rather doubtful. In East Middle Turkic *tägül* is not to be encountered.[44]

The first certain evidence came from Kāšġarī, who asserted that *tägül* was in use with the Ghuzz.[45]

As for the later career of the word, it was the standard negation for nouns with the SW and NW group. In the Oghuz branch the initial, of course, is always *d-*: Ott.-T. *dägil, deġil,* Azeri *deyil,* and contracted forms in Turkman *dāl,* and Gagauz *dīl.*[46]

In the literary records of Mameluke Kipchak the case is similar with the initial: *e.g.* the form *dägül* appears in the *Gulestan* translation of Sayf-i Sarāyī, and in the folk-song scribbled on the margin of page 185v *dögül, dögäl,* etc.[47]

But also in the Kipchak group of Western Middle Turkic *d-* is present e.g. Codex Cumanicus: *deul, devl.* Armeno-Kipchak, however, does not give an unequivocal picture: Deny quotes a wide variety of forms, both with initial *t-* and *d-*: *tugul, dugul, tügül, tigul, tiyul.*[48] In the Kamenets Chronicle the initial is invariably *d-*, but in the Introduction of the *Tora Bitiki* the proportion of representation is 50 : 50 percent, *tugul* ~ *dugul,* the forms with *d-* appeared mostly succeeding a voiced word final, the forms with *t-* after a colon, or semicolon.[49]

In Karaim — the sister-language of Armeno-Kipchak — the initial is mostly *t-*: Troki *ťuv́ul,* Halitch *tiwil,* but *d-* is also represented in Halitch: *diwil.*[50]

In the modern Kipchak languages the balance is in favour of the unvoiced initial, so Tatar *tügel, tögöl,* Bashkir *tügĕl,* Karachay-Balkar, Lit. lang. *tül* ~ *tüyül/ťügül* ~ *ťüyül* > *ťül,* Balk. *tüyül.*), Kumyk *tügül,* Noghay *tuwul, duwul.* In Kazakh and Kirghiz beside *ärmäs, tügäl* is also attested, and in Karakalpak the form *tüwel.*

From Crimean Tatar many forms are quoted from the different dialects: *dägil, diil, däyil; dügül, tügül, tuə* ~ *tuəl.* Of these the ones with initial *d-*

[43] Tekin, *op. cit.*, 231, 262; Malov, *Pamjatniki,* 34, etc.

[44] The only instance mentioned with Rabγūzī by Brockelmann, *Osttürkische Grammatik,* 188, is absent in Schinkewitsch, *op. cit.* II. 136.

[45] Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz,* 201.

[46] Deny, *Gramm.*, 283; *PhTF* I, 206, 212, 302, 312, 268.

[47] Bodrogligeti, *op. cit.* 242, 18. A possible reading of *dügül* would give the contemporary Kipchak form.

[48] *Ephem,* 76. I did not encounter the two latter forms.

[49] Schütz, *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle,* 100.

[50] *PhTF* I, 334.

seem to belong to dialects exposed to the impact of the Ottoman population in the south of the peninsula.

To elucidate the origin of the initial let us turn to the Eastern group. The records of the Middle Ages furnish the clue. *Dägül/tügül* is not a standard literary form for the negation copula, as shown above. The case was similar in Chagatay, the negation here was also *ermäs*, but the poets before Nevā'ī sometimes used also *degül* or *degül dur*. J. Eckmann ascribed it to the Oghuz impact.[51] As this negation verb was not in use in the Eastern branches of Turkic languages throughout, so one must share J. Eckmann's opinion.

Thus the use of *tägül/dägil/dügül* was restricted to the SW and NW branches, but there was no complete uniformity between the two, in the Oghuz branch naturally *d-* prevailed, but in the Kipchak branch the *t-*.

4.6. A rather extraordinary case in the group of *d-* initials is *dört*, which in all records of Western Middle Turkic was represented by a voiced initial: Codex Cumanicus *dört*, Armeno-Kipchak *dort*, Karaim *d'ort'*, (also in Mameluke Kipchak glossaries) and also in a good many modern languages of the Kipchak branch, so in Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, Noghay, Kumyk, Kazakh.

For the explanation of the voiced sound, supporters of the Altaic theory often took recourse to Mongolian *dörben*, but this tentative motivation rested on a frail basis, because of the prevailing correspondence Altaic *d-* ~ OT *y*.[52] Though with K. Menges' new theory of the dichotomy of Altaic *d-* it would seem easy to find an explanation for this case, still K. Menges and even V. M. Illič-Svityč did not insert *dört* into the group of specimens where initial *d-* would go back to Proto-Turkic and Altaic *d-*.[53] And most probably so, because it was not common to all Turkic languages, the regular correspondence being *tört* even in a number of Kipchak languages, as in Kirghiz, Karachay-Balkar, Kipchak-Uzbek.

Another frail attempt to explain the sonorization was made by way of the compound numeral *on tört*, in which case the initial *d-* would be a sandhi phenomenon. The weak point of this explanation was that the compound is hardly so frequent that it should have exerted such a retro-effective impact.[54]

The most possible solution seems to be the supposition of the Oghuz impact, still I think a later direct Mongolian influence should not be entirely excluded.

4.7. The words analysed above, belong to different grammatical categories: *-dur* the most common copula, *degül* a negative copula of still unsolved

[51] Eckmann, *Chag. Man.*, 182.

[52] Though the correspondence Mong. *dönen* Turk. *dönen* were corroborating evidence. Ramstedt, *Kalm. Wb.* 99.

[53] *Voprosy Jazykoznania*, 1963, No. 6. 43.

[54] Even in the compound one has a specimen of unvoiced in Kipchak Uzbek: *on tört*.

origin, the Gerunds derived from the verb *täg-* having become limitative postpositions or even suffixes with the meaning «until, up to», the coordinative conjunction *-da*, a worn off form of a similar Gerund *taqï* ~ *dayï*; *dep* (*dej*) a Gerund qualifying direct discourse.

This heterogeneous group of words is still united by a single, but important feature, they all are enclytics; as a result of their use as auxiliary components for syntactical purposes during their career — which could be observed in the records throughout the ages — they have lost their independence and accent, and so their initial became a lenis.

This peculiar feature was recognised long ago with one or the other, and recently pointed out as specially referring to the whole group appearing in the Codex Cumanicus, or the Kamenets Chronicle, etc.,[55] They are still frequently enumerated separately along with the group of words with initial *d-* of quite different origin, eventually used as evidence for Oghuz affinity.

The group belonged together throughout Middle Turkic, as shown by the Codex Cumanicus, the Armeno-Kipchak material, and was not restricted only to the Oghuz and Kipchak area, but was also to be found in East Middle Turkic as can be seen in the early Chagatay poetry. The thought must not be entirely dismissed that these initial *d*-s might have penetrated into medieval Kipchak through a Chaghatay channel. Nonetheless their scope of extension over the whole Turkic area is confirmed by modern Turkic languages, even as far as the Yakut area, where we find: *da*, *dayanï*, *diä*/ *dïbin* (Ger.: *diän*), *diäri*.[56]

Enclytics become generally worn off in the course of their development, including the enclytics dealt with, but in most of these cases it was not the shorter forms which proved the most viable: with *-da* also the original longer form was preserved because of the partial split in the meanings; among the numerous derivatives of the Gerunds of *täg-* there were the two-syllable forms which became more popular; in the case of *tägül* ~ *dügül*, the longer forms prevail against the sporadical contracted forms.

Thus they belong only partially to this group: *taqï*/*dayï* and *tügül*/*dügül*, and the word *dört* has come to it quite by chance.

5. K. Menges never used the abundant material of initial *d-* in modern Kipchak languages to support his theory of the dichotomy of Altaic *d-*, because he was well aware of their later origin. Neither did V. M. Illič-Svityč in his article elaborating and developing the theory in detail.[57]

The trouble with the initial *d-* was generally that the words were enumerated mechanically without any regard to their origin. A good attempt

[55] Gabain: *PhTF* I. 53; Schütz, *op. cit.* 100; *Vopr. Jaz.* 1963. No. 6. 43. etc.

[56] O. Böhtlingk, *Über die Sprache der Jakuten, II. Jakutisch—deutsches Wb.*, Indiana Univ. Reprint. 114, 116—117.

[57] *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, 1963, No. 6. 37—56.

towards systematic classification was made by K. Menges in his chapter on the Aralo-Caspian languages, where the main groups were taken separately into account: 1) loanwords, with special attention to Oghuz; Mongol and Persian still awaiting special research, 2) evident specimens of onomatopoetic words, 3) words the initial of which still remained problematic.[58]

The lesson which can be drawn by a cursory survey is that the words of onomatopoetic origin were more numerous than was generally realised and that they should be dealt with one by one, different factors of phonetic and semantic nature being at work.

I think V. M. Illič-Svityč was right to attribute the initial *d-* in *deŋiz* «sea», *doŋuz* «swine, boar» to the combinatory effect of the laryngal nasal. Eventually the Kirghiz *daŋir* «sound» could also be attached to this group, if not influenced by the same semantic group Noghay, Karakalpak *dawus*, Kirghiz *dïbïš*, *dobuš*, etc. also meaning «sound». Or Kazan Tatar *dulgin* «wave» could owe its initial to a similar combinatory effect, if it had no relation to the Kalmyk word, which again could be a loanword from Turkic. This single case is made more complicated by the fact that all other Kipchak languages had a fortis. But in a distant Turkic language, in modern Uighur one again encounters *d-*: *dolkun*.

A number of verbs denoting sounds of nature or of some device can be inserted into this numerous group, however the derivations are also fairly extended. So e.g. Noghay *dumala-*, *dïmala-* «to roll», Kirghiz *doŋγolon-* «to be revolved» should evidently be inserted into the onomatopoeic group, and also derivatives to be attached: *e.g.* Noghay *dumalaq* «round», or Bashkir *düngelek* «clod (of earth)».

A chain of words can follow in the semantic sequence: «to roll > round > wheel». So from *tägir-* there is a number of words derived in Kipchak languages Kara-Noghay *degeršik*, Central-Noghay *dögörök* «wheel», dem. *digirčik*, Kumyk *dögürek*, Karakalpak *dögörek* «circle», Kazakh *döŋölök*, Kkalpak *döŋgelek* «round, wheel», emph. *döp-dögerek*. The specimens show that even with onomatopoeics it is not compulsory that all relevant languages should have equally voiced initials, thus Ak-Noghay *tegeršik*, *tegeršek*, Kazakh *töŋörök* «environment», etc. At the same time even a cursory glance shows that dictionaries generally contain only or mostly the literary form and the dialectal forms with emotional saturation are lacking.[59]

Possibly Uighur dialectal *dop* «ball» may also owe its voiced initial either to the thump of the ball, or already to the next link in the combinatory chain «round». It is strange, that even Oghuz languages prefer unvoiced initial to denote «ball» (*top*), and even the rather noisy «cannon» had *t-*. This is an addi-

[58] *PhTF* I, 451—453. The following remarks were based mainly upon this material.
[59] Räsänen, *Etym. Wb.*, 492.

tional problem to the lack of consequence in possible onomatopoeia. A word of similar acoustic effect is the East Turkic, Taranchi *dāp*, *dap* «drum», but eventually there may be the Persian responsible for the voiced initial.

Further links of this group may be words denoting «hollowness», for example, the words for «cave» in Noghay *dorbin* and Karachay-Balkar *dorbun*, the *d-* of which might be due to resonance. A further step could lead us to Noghay and Crimean dialectal *dorba* «sack» for the customary *torba* even in the Oghuz line.

These brief remarks were meant to emphasize the importance of the research of special lines of inner evolution: the varieties of phonetic lines and semantic chains.