Doch scheint die Form des Fleckens auch wichtig zu sein.[18] Darüber wissen wir aber noch gar nichts. Wörterbücher pflegen nur allgemein vom "weißen Fleck auf der Stirn" zu sprechen.[19]

Auch nur allgemein sind wir unterrichtet über die weißen Flecke an den Füßen. Daß die Türken ihnen aber auch eine Bedeutung zumessen, wie die Engländer und Franzosen, ist u.a. dem anat. (*Derleme Dergisi*, IV: Emirler, Kas. Bâlâ, Vil. Ankara; Isparta; Vezirköprü, Vil. Samsun; Gaziantep) *čapraz* bzw. *čapras* zu entnehmen: "weiße Stellen am rechten Vorder- und linken Hinterfuß bzw. linken Vorder- und rechten Hinterfuß des Pferdes". Gilt dies als eine glückliche Markierung oder ist es, wie in Frankreich,[20] ein schlechtes Zeichen?

Die obigen Ausführungen beabsichtigten, Zusammenhänge zwischen Farbe und Pferd aufzuzeigen, mit denen die türkischen Pferdezüchter- und -kenner wohl gut vertraut sind, über die wir Nichttürken aber nur spärlich unterrichtet sind.

[18] Eine Sanskritabhandlung über Pferde, geschrieben von dem großen Weisen Indiens Salihotra, die auch ins Tibetische und Mongolische übersetzt wurde, sagt uns z.B. das folgende über die Markierungen auf der Pferdestirn: "The mark in the forehead of a horse is called *lalama*. Horses with lalamas in the form of moon, crescent moon, sun or star are good ones. If the lalamas are shaped like a drum, or like the foot of a crow or leaning towards left, they are bad" (*Salihotra of Tanjur*, Section I, Chapter 19). Diese Stelle ist mir freundlicherweise von Herrn Dr. Lokesh Chandra, New Delhi, übersetzt worden.

[19] Mit Ausnahme von čag. (*WB*) *tügür* "mondförmiger Fleck auf der Stirn des Pferdes".

[20] Vgl. M. Oldfield Howey, *op. cit.*, S. 221, 222.

CAJ 10, 1965

TURKISH AND MONGOLIAN HORSES AND USE OF HORSES, AN ETYMOLOGICAL STUDY

by
SIR GERARD CLAUSON
London

My purpose in this paper is to present the etymological evidence regarding the relationship between the Turks and Mongols respectively and horses. I should emphasize that this study is purely etymological. I have not searched the early texts to find references to horses and so to build up a corpus of references of this sort for historical use. The etymological evidence can stand on its own feet and is in some ways more valuable than the scanty references to horses in the early texts. In presenting it I must make one reservation. While I am now in a position to state with some confidence whether any particular Turkish word is native or a loan word, and usually the earliest date at which it is known to have been used, I am not in the same position in regard to Mongolian; my knowledge of the language is much scantier, and there is no historical dictionary of the language to help me.

It is now, I think, generally recognised that a careful analysis of the words in any given language relating to a particular subject like that now under discussion will disclose whether the things and ideas concerned are native to the people who spoke that language or whether they were acquired from some other people speaking a different language. Experience shows that if a people acquires an exotic object it nearly always acquires the exotic name for it. To take a simple example, the orange has now been carried either as a tree or as a fruit from its home in Asia to nearly every part of the world and nearly everywhere it has carried its own native name more or less distorted with it.

Thus in favourable circumstances vocabulary analysis will provide evidence on such subjects which goes much further back into the past than the earliest surviving texts in a language, and may also as far as later periods are concerned provide an approximate date for the acquisition of exotic objects and practices.

The comparative study of the Turkish and Mongolian vocabularies in

the fields of agriculture and animal husbandry has shown that the Mongols acquired nearly all their field and orchard crops and most of their domesticated animals from the Turks, but in the latter field the horse constitutes an important exception. Vocabulary analysis makes it abundantly clear that the Turks and Mongols domesticated the horse independently from one another, and no doubt long before they even met one another.

The Turks had an extensive native vocabulary for horses, kinds of horses and other related matters. The basic words, all going back as far as we can see, are as follows: "horse", in general, *at*; a herd (usually but not necessarily) of horses *ögür*; "stallion" *aḍğır*; "mare", in general, *bé:*; "a mare that has not yet foaled" *kısrak*. This last word seems to be a Diminutive of *kısır*, "barren, unable to conceive", a word used of human beings as well as animals. In the mediaeval period both words for "mare" slightly changed their meanings, *kısrak* came to be used for "mare" in general, and *bé:* then came to mean "a mare with a foal". There are three words for "foal", "under one year old" *kulun*, from "one year old" upwards *ta:y* or *sip*.

There is an extensive range of words for the colours of horses' coats, some quite general in character, like *ak* "white" and *kara:* "black, and others which are apparently used only of horses', or at any rate animals', coats. It is extremely difficult to determine the exact meanings of some of these words; in every country horse-breeders seem to have a private language of their own which laymen, including compilers of dictionaries, find unintelligible, so that even if you have the Arabic and Persian equivalents of a particular Turkish word, you are not really very far on the way to discovering its exact meaning if you have to rely on the ordinary Arabic and Persian dictionaries. There are also a few technical terms applied to horses, but not necessarily only to horses. I have collected here only two of them – *igdiş* "cross-bred, the offspring of parents of different breeds" and *özlük*, a word used in the Türkü inscriptions and in Kāşğarī for "a horse of superior quality reserved by a ruler or chief for his personal (*ö:z*) use".

The earliest loan word that I can trace in this field is "gelding" *axta*, a Persian word, the Past Passive Participle of *axtan* "to geld". This word is found in Mongolian as early as the 13th Century in the Secret History, in Turkish I have not found it earlier than 15th Century Çağatay, and my guess is that the Mongols got it from the Persians and the Turks from the Mongols. Be that as it may, it seems reasonable to conclude that neither the Turks nor the Mongols gelded their horses until they

learnt the technique from the Persians. By the 15th Century the Çağatay-speaking Turks had borrowed quite a number of Mongolian words relating to horses including those for "two year old" and "three year old", although if the *Sanglax* is to be relied on they did not always use them in the right sense. The conclusion seems to be that until the Turks met the Mongols they had not felt the need for special technical terms for these age groups and contented themselves with periphrases as we do in English.

The Mongols seem to have had an equally extensive native vocabulary in this field, but my collection of such words is incomplete and open to correction by my better informed colleagues. "Horse" is *morin*; "a herd of horses" *adu'un*; "mare" *ge'ün*; "foal", presumably under a year old, *unuγan*. Oddly enough for "stallion" they used a Turkish loan word *aγirγa*, which was as near as they could get to *aḍğır*, a Turkish word which presented almost insuperable difficulties of pronunciation to the Mongols. I have already mentioned the word for "gelding" *axta*. They no doubt had an equally extensive list of words for the colours of horses' coats, but for some inscrutable reason they had a very limited range of native words for colours and even general words, also used specifically for horses' coats, are Turkish loan words like *boro* "grey" from Turkish *bo:z*. I have also noticed in the Secret History one or two stray technical terms like *da'ayan* "two year old", *eremüg* "barren (mare)" and *isgel* "a mare that has not foaled for some years".

Coming now to the use of horses, it is certain that the Turks rode horses from a very early period and almost certain that they used them also as pack-animals. On the second point the difficulty is that we cannot be certain that their pack-animals were horses. The word for "pack-animal" *kölük* goes back to the earliest period, its first appearance is in the inscription of Toñukuk, line 15, "the Oğuz came from the Toğla river *ingek kölükin* (with cows and pack animals)", but Kāşğarī translates *kölük* "any animal (Arabic *dābba*) on which goods can be loaded". Etymology cannot therefore help us to determine how soon the Turks used horses and other animals like oxen as pack-animals.

So far as riding is concerned there is an extensive vocabulary for harness and horse furniture; "saddle" *eḍer*; "saddle pad" *eḍrim*; "saddle-bow" *yaliğ* (a word which originally meant "cock's comb"); "bridle" *yügü:n*; "reins" *ti:n* and *tizgin*, the first perhaps also meaning "leading-rein"; "stirrup" *üzengü:*; "girth" *kola:n*; "halter" *yula:r*; "straps for fastening packages to the saddle" *tergü:*; "hobble" *kişen*; "horse blanket" *öçürgü:* and a number of others. Oddly enough I have not found any

early word meaning specifically "an iron bit". Even the three mediaeval classified Arabic-Turkish vocabularies, the Houtsma vocabulary (13th Century), ibn Muhanna (14th Century) and *al-Qawānīnu'l-kullīya* (15th Century) although they have sections for horse furniture have no specific word for "iron bit"; their authors may perhaps have regarded it merely as a constituent part of the bridle (*yügü:n*). There are two mediaeval (15th Century) words which survive in some modern languages, *ağızlık* which simply means "mouthpiece", and *suvluk*, derived from *su:v* "water" which has a very odd semantic history. Originally it must have meant "a water container, trough" and the like. Kāşğarī translates it "towel" and "headcloth", that is "things for wiping off water", which is good negative evidence that in the 11th Century it did not mean "bit", but in Çağatay the *Sanglax* translates *suluk* "a water container" and also "a horse's bit", the connotation presumably being that it made the horse dribble. There is of course abundant archaeological evidence from Turkish graves with horse burials that the Turks had iron bits as well as iron stirrups from an early date, but the absence of a specific name for "bit" almost tempts one to suppose that the earliest form of Turkish bridle incorporated not an iron bit but merely a strap passing through the mouth.

When it comes to the question of using the horse for traction, the position is not at all clear. We know that carts and wagons were in use in Innermost Asia from a very early period; one was for example found in one of the Pazyryk kurgans in the Altay, datable to about the 3rd Century B.C. But these contain burials of an Indo-European, probably Iranian, tribe and provide no evidence regarding the Turks. In any event the existence of such vehicles is not by itself evidence that horses were used to draw them. They may well have been drawn by bovines, or perhaps in the northern forests reindeer.

It is of course well known that the Chinese called one early Turkish tribe *kao-ch'ê* "tall carts", allegedly because they transported their goods from one pasture ground to another in these vehicles, but it is not impossible that this is merely a folk etymology, and that *kao ch'ê* was merely an attempt to respresent some Turkish name phonetically. In any event even if the explanation is correct it does not prove that the tall carts were drawn by horses.

The early Turkish word for "wagon, cart" etc. is *kaŋlı:*. This is the word used in the Sanskrit-Turkish bilingual texts in *Türkische Turfantexte* VIII to translate Sanskrit *śakaṭa* "wagon" and *ratha* "chariot". It is also the word used in the Turkish translation of Hsüan-chuang to

translate the *yāna* "vehicle" in Mahāyāna (Buddhism). There is therefore no doubt that *kaŋlı:* did mean some kind, or indeed several kinds, of vehicle, but *Kaŋlı:* is also the name of a Turkish tribe, and we have here the same kind of fascinating conundrum of priority as that of the chicken and the egg. It is commonly said that the tribe was called *Kaŋlı:* because its people used carts, and indeed it is fashionable for this reason to identify this tribe with the tribe called "tall carts" by the Chinese. But it seems to me equally possible to suppose that carts were called *kaŋlı:* because it was the *Kaŋlı:* tribe that learnt the use of these convenient vehicles from their Indo-European neighbours and introduced them to the other Turks. The word *kaŋlı:* almost died out in the middle ages but still survives, in the distorted form *kaŋa*, in some north eastern, Southern Siberian languages. The earliest occurrence of *kaŋa* is in the 13th Century *Oğuz Nāma* text in the Bibliothèque Nationale, where it seems to originate in a false etymology (of which there are many in this text) of the name *Kaŋlı:* in order to explain the latter as meaning "possessing carts". But the name is recorded in this form much earlier than the earliest date at which the possessive suffix *-lığ* lost its final guttural and became *-lı*, so the etymology is obvious nonsense.

Except in the languages just mentioned *kaŋlı:* has been displaced almost everywhere by the word *araba*; this appears first in about the 15th Century and is not a native word. The statement in the *Sanglax* that it is a corruption of the Arabic word *'arrāda* is entirely plausible, particularly since in some languages like Osmanli it is spelt with an initial *'ayn*.

I have had great difficulty in finding any early words for parts of carts. "Wheel" in Buddhist Uyğur is *tilgen*, but this word is also used for "the disc" of the sun, so is clearly not specifically "wheel". It is not traceable in any later language. Other early words may exist, but I have no notes of them, and there are no lists of parts of vehicles in the mediaeval classified vocabularies already mentioned. The words for such things as "wheel, spoke, axle, shaft" and the like in modern languages are not ancient words, at any rate in these senses, and most of them occur only in a limited range of languages. Some are loan words; for example one fairly common word for "spoke", *kegey* and the like, is Mongolian. One word, which has given rise to a good deal of misunderstanding, is *arış* "shaft of a cart". It is alleged that it is a very old word cognate to the synonymous Mongolian word *aral*, and if it was a very old word the equation would be phonetically irreproachable, but it isn't. The earliest trace of it is in Abu'l-Gāzi (17th Century) quoted in Pavet de Courteille's Çağatay dictionary. There is an early word which might be *arış*, but

is more likely to be *eriş*, but it means only "the warp on a loom", as opposed to *arğaç* "the weft"; *arış* "shaft" is merely the Arabic word *'ariş* with the initial *'ayn* eliminated, as it is in *araba*.

The Mongols no doubt had quite as extensive a native vocabulary for harness and horse furniture as the Turks, but I have not collected more than a few words of it. So far as pack transport is concerned there is a word *iŋgirčay* which means specifically "a pack- (and not a riding) saddle" and the contexts in which it is used in the Secret History indicate that it was put on a horse. Thus it seems clear that by the 13th Century the Mongols were using horses for pack transport, but this date, although it is the earliest accessible to us, is not early in their history.

So far as riding is concerned the basic words which I have collected are: "saddle" *eme'el*; "bridle" *qača'ay* and *čilbur*; "reins" *jilo'a* and *qada'ar*; "stirrup" *dörö'e*; "bit" *ja'uja/joja* and *amayay*. The last is merely "mouthpiece" and may be modern. The others go back to the 13th or at any rate 14th Century (the *Hua-I i-yü*), so the Mongols may have had a specific word for "bit" a little earlier than the Turks but how much earlier, if any, we cannot tell.

So far as traction is concerned we are in the same dilemma as in the case of the Turks. There is a better collection of native technical terms for vehicles and parts of vehicles, but no etymological evidence of the kinds of animals that were used to draw them. The words listed in the *Hua-I i-yü*, all of them native are: "wagon or cart" *tergen*; "wheel" *gürdün*; "spoke" *kekesün*; "hub" *bulu*; "felloe" *mö'er*; "shaft" *aral*. The first three occur in the Secret History and all survive in modern Mongolian.

To sum up, if we leave out of account, as we should, the frequent exchanges of vocabulary between Turkish and Mongolian which took place in mediaeval and modern times and have resulted, for example, in Tuvan being saturated with Mongolian loan words, the two sets of words which I have collected are, with the few exceptions specifically mentioned, entirely distinct. Indeed we can, I suggest, go further and say that they are entirely self-contained. While I am hardly competent to express an authoritative opinion, there does not seem to me to be in either list a single word which looks Indo-European or Sino-Tibetan by origin. Morphologically the Turkish words look good Turkish and the Mongolian words good Mongolian. The conclusion is that the Turks and the Mongols both domesticated horses on their own and without help from one another or any third party.

THE HORSE IN TURKIC ART

by
EMEL ESIN
Istanbul

The Turks are in the lineage of the ancient Inner-Asian nomadic peoples, such as the Hiung-nu, and appear on the scene of history with the features of horsebreeders.[1] The Chinese could say of the Turks: "Their life is dependent . . . on their horses". In early Turkic texts, in Chinese and Arabian sources the life of the Turkic horse-breeders is described in accents of perennity, valid for the period of late antiquity as well as today in what concerns the nomadic Turkic stems of Inner-Asia who still live from horse-breeding and deliver horses to neighbouring countries. Then, as now, the Turks were seen to throw the noose to catch the wild horse

[1] Hiung-nu customs connected with horses: Eberhard, *Çin kaynaklarına göre Orta Asya at cinsleri*; id., *Çin'in şimal komşuları*, pp. 67, 69, 75, 76, 84, 94, 111; id. *Çin tarihi*, pp. 17, 59. The Turks used the noose: Gabain, . . . *Chotscho*, ill. 28 B. Turks noose and shoot backwards: Al-Jāḥiẓ, pp. 28-31. Customs of various Turkic horse-breeders: Eberhard, *Çin kaynaklarına göre* . . .; id., *Çinin şimal komşuları*, pp. 68, 86. Al-Jāḥiẓ, pp. 10, 11, 29, 331. Kök-Türk and Uygur horses: Liu Mau-Tsai, pp. 452-3. Togan, *Traditions and historical records on the training of horses by the ancient Turks*; id., *Umûmî Türk târihine giriş*, part III, p. 167, notes 330, 331 and part IV, p. 209, note 106; id., *The ethnography of Inner-Asia*, p. 86. Shen horses: N. Togan and notes by Z. V. Togan, *Peygamber çağında Orta Asya*, ps. 6, 41-2, 51-3 and notes, pp. 60-1. Various Turkic and Khorasan horses: Minorsky, *Ḥudūd al-'ālam*, ps. 99, 100, 116, 119. Gïr-tis horses: Bacot, p. 10. Uygur king's horses: Kashgarī, art. *Barsgan*. On the identification of Barsgan: Minorsky, *Ḥudūd* . . ., p. 116. Hephtalite, Tu-yü-hun, Soghdian horses: Eberhard, *Çin kaynaklarına göre*; N. Togan, p. 28, note 6 on Shen horses of Soghd. Identification of Hephtalites and Karluks: Togan, *Eftalitlerin ve Bermekilerin menşei meselesi*. Tu-yü-huns assimilated to Turks: Minorsky, . . . *Marwazī*, p. 99, note 3. Riding games: Kashgarī, arts. *Çöğen, çoğanmak, bandul*. Modern Turkic horses: I am indebted for most of the information given without reference to Mr. İsâ Alptekin of Eastern Turkestan and Turkey and to Mr. 'Abd al-Raḥīm Koşmak, once veterinary in Kashgar and now established in the same capacity in Taif. Prof. Togan and Mr. Yund have also kindly helped me not only with their works, but with verbal information and advice, in what concerns Inner-Asian horses and the breeds extant in Turkey. The late General 'Omar Sardār Han, Ambassador of Afghanistan in India in 1963 has been kind enough to give particulars on the Türkmen *argamak* raised in Afghan territory. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the persons cited above for their generous help without which it would not have been possible to attempt this work.