

## TATAR MATERIAL IN OLD RUSSIAN.

By J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

(Read April 25, 1919.)

It seems to have been a characteristic of Russia from the earliest times until the present moment to take a morbid pleasure in her own failures. Whatever one may think in general of Stephen Graham's<sup>1</sup> opinions regarding Russia, he was certainly correct in emphasizing the prevalence of what may be termed the gospel of incompetency among the Russians of to-day. Public sympathy has been at all times in Russian history with the unsuccessful, rather than with the triumphant hero, and nowhere is this disconcerting trait more cogently evident than in some of the literature of the old Russian period, best exemplified by the "Epic of Igor," or, more fully, the "Tale of the Armament of Igor" (1185 A.D.).<sup>2</sup> This poem relates in grandiloquent style, often verging upon that of a Scandinavian Saga, the defeat of the ancient Russian Prince Igorj<sup>3</sup> Svjatoslávič by the well-disciplined Tatar hordes of the Pólovtsy in southern Russia. The epic abounds with words and other traces of the influence of this and perhaps of other Tatar civilizations, a fact which is all the more interesting, because this literature antedates by about two generations the advent of the Golden Horde under the succes-

<sup>1</sup> Stephen Graham, "The Way of Martha and the Way of Mary," London, 1915.

<sup>2</sup> The name Igor (*Igorj*) like so many other princely names of this period is pure Norse (= Ingvar); cf. Rjurik = Hrörekr; Truvor = Thorvardr; Oleg = Helgi; Rogvolod = Rognvaldr, etc. For the poem, cf. L. A. Magnus, "The Tale of the Armament of Igor," Oxford, 1915.

<sup>3</sup> The phonetic system of transcription in the present article is essentially the Serbo-Croatian. Note, however, that the apostrophe is used to denote the Russian hard sign = stop or short vowel (*Schwund*) and that the *j* after a consonant = palatalization (Russian soft sign). The Russian vowel *yery* (= *i* in English *lid*) is represented by *y*. As regards the abbreviations, C. = Cumanian; CC. = "Codex Cumanicus"; OR. = Old Russian; OS. = Old Slavonic. and R. = Russian; ZDMG. = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.



sors of Jenghis Khan. These rulers held the Russians in well organized tributary thralldom for nearly two centuries (from 1223 A.D.).

As attention to the Oriental material in Russian has been called quite recently, perhaps for the first time in English, by Mr. Magnus, I have in the present paper ventured to advance some of my own views as to this subject and to emphasize the points regarding which I am at variance with the work of that scholar, as well as to set forth some of the facts now established with tolerable certainty concerning this early period of Slavo-Turkic intercourse. The information herein gathered is not intended to be exhaustive and may be supplemented on the lexicographical side from such works as Berneker's "Slavisch-Etymologisches Wörterbuch" and Radloff's "Wörterbuch der Türk-Dialekte."

The first question confronting the student of this Tatar<sup>4</sup> influence in Igor is that of the identity of the Pólovtsy, who appear throughout the Epic as the successful and often not unchivalrous foes of the adventurous hero and his company.

We have direct and convincing evidence in the Chronicle of Nestor (1096) as follows: "And Ismael begat twelve sons, whence come the Turks, Pečenegs<sup>5</sup> (White Huns), Torks (remnants of the Pečenegs) and Kumans, that is to say the Pólovtsy who 'came out of the desert.'" In other words, the Turkic tribes known to us as Cumanians were identical with the Pólovtsy. It is highly probable that the word *Kuman* is a popular etymology from *qum*, "sand," indicating that these tribes originated in the sandy steppe; *i. e.*, "came out of the desert," but that the original of the word was *Kun* = Hun.

Our chief source of information as to the idiom of these Kumans

<sup>4</sup> Tatar is a name generally applied to all Turkic, Mongolian and Hunnic tribes; in short, to every Oriental non-Russian people in the former Russian Empire. See below, note 9. Turkish of practically every variety is more or less intelligible in essentials to all the Turkic tribes. Hunnic (Finno-Ugric), however, differs very much in its various dialects.

<sup>5</sup> The Pečenegs, or White Huns, were also called *Bissen*, *Byssen*, Παῖζινάκται in Arabic *Badžak*, etc. Cf. Anna Comnena, Bonn Ed. p. 404): πρόσεισι τοῖς καμάνοις ὡς ὁμωγλώσσοις "they are very close linguistically to the Cumanians."



or Cumanians is the "Codex Cumanicus,"<sup>6</sup> edited by the Hungarian Count Geza Kuun, and, in spite of many errors, a most valuable record of the speech of the Cumanians, giving a sketch of the grammar, word-lists, and texts with late Latin-Persian-Cumanian in the first part, and Cumanian-Old-German in the second part.<sup>7</sup> Besides this, mention should be made of the brief "Interpreter of the Language of the Pólovtsy," found in a Russian manuscript of the sixteenth century,<sup>8</sup> which gives a small number of so-called Pólovtsian words with Russian translation. As to the term "Pólovtsy" itself, it would seem to be a cognate with the race-term "Palocz," found in the Hungarian Chronicle, used interchangeably with Kun = Hun = Kuman.<sup>9</sup> In the Chronicle of Nestor, the word Pólovtsy was

<sup>6</sup> Comes Geza Kuun, "Codex Cumanicus Bibliothecae ad Templum Divi Venetiarum," Budapest, 1880; "Additamenta ad Codicem Cumanicum, Nova Series," Budapest, 1883; W. Radloff, "Das türkische Sprachmaterial des Codex Cumanicus," St. Petersburg, 1887 (*Académie Impériale des Sciences*), criticized by W. Bang in the following works: "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Komanischen Hymnus," in *Nachrichten der kön. Ges. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1910, pp. 61-78; "Über einen komanischen Kommunionshymnus," in *Académie royale de Belgique*, Bruxelles, 1910, pp. 1-12; "Zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus, Librairie universitaire des trois rois," Louvain, 1910, pp. 1-17; "Beiträge zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus," in *Académie royale de Belgique*, Bruxelles, 1911, pp. 13-40.

<sup>7</sup> As Bang has pointed out ("Beiträge," pp. 32 ff.), the first part of the "Codex" was probably written by Italians and the second half by Germans, both parts having been composed under Franciscan influence, as is evident from the prominence accorded to St. Francis. The scope of the work was undoubtedly missionary and not commercial, as the chief stress in the vocabulary and texts is laid on religious material. The "Codex" in both parts belonged to the library of the poet Petrarch, 1350-1370. Before that date, the documents were in the possession of one Antonius de Finale ("Codex," p. 218). Both parts were probably brought from the Black Sea missions to Italy, where the manuscript was compiled and edited by Genoese and Venetians. It seems clear that this "Codex" had nothing to do with the Cumanians settled in Hungary, who kept their idiom as late as 1744.

<sup>8</sup> P. K. Simoni in *Proceedings of the Department of the Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences*, 8, 179-191; 185-197, St. Petersburg, 1909.

<sup>9</sup> See Friedrich Hirth, "Die historisch-geographischen Beweise der Hiung-nu = Hun Identität," Budapest, 1910, and cf. also his "Ancient History of China," pp. 31-35, New York, 1908.



plainly associated with Slavonic *polje*, "field"; hence "desert," but *polje* is a soft noun and would have produced the derivative *póljevec* and never *pólovec*.

A brief examination of the material found in the "Interpreter" mentioned above and a comparison with the Cumanian of the Codex and with modern Osmanli will satisfy the most cursory reader as to the true Turkic character of the Cumanian-Pólovtsy language.

POLOVTSIAN INTERPRETER.	CUMANIAN.	OSMANLI.	
<i>ten̄gri</i> <sup>10</sup>	<i>tengri</i>	<i>tan̄gri</i>	"God"
<i>kok</i>	<i>kok</i>	<i>kjök (gjök)</i>	"heaven"
<i>kujáš</i> (probably error for <i>kunjš</i> )	<i>kujáš</i>	<i>güneš</i>	"sun"
<i>iluduz</i> <sup>11</sup>	<i>juldus</i>	<i>jildiz</i>	"star"
<i>aan</i>	<i>ay</i>	<i>ay</i>	"moon, month"
<i>kar</i>	<i>kar</i>	<i>k(j)ar</i>	"snow"
<i>amgur</i>	<i>yamgur</i>	<i>jaghmur</i>	"rain"
<i>suuk</i>	<i>suk, saok, saogh</i>	<i>soúk (soghúk)</i>	"cold"
<i>isi</i> <sup>12</sup>	<i>isi</i> hot	<i>yšyq</i>	"light" ( <i>sydžak</i> hot)
<i>etmen̄k</i>	<i>etmac</i>	<i>ekmek</i> (original <i>etmek</i> )	"bread"

The grammatical structure of the Cumanian was also strikingly similar to that of Sart and Osmanli, as may be noted from the following few examples of the pronouns, nouns and tenses of the verb:

<sup>10</sup> In the "Interpreter," the first vowel is the 39th letter of the OS. alphabet, often wrongly transcribed *ja* in Russian. Its real value was a nasal *e*, as in *eng* (= Polish nasal *e*), but the vowel frequently corresponds to Russian *ja*.

For a similar comparison between Cumanian and Tatar, see the work cited above note 8, and note the incorrect vocalization in *tjagri*, *op. cit.*, p. 191. This universal Turkish word is very probably connected with the ancient Sumerian *dingir* "God" (soft form *dimmer*); cf. Prince, Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon, p. viii, Leipzig, 1909.

<sup>11</sup> Scribal error for *iluduz* = *juldus*.

<sup>12</sup> Written *aan*; evidently scribal error for *aai*.

<sup>13</sup> *Isi* = *ysy*, with obscure vowel *y*; not *iš* (Radloff, *op. cit.*, p. 120). Radloff's readings of the *Codex* are not always trustworthy.



## PRONOUNS.

## CUMANIAN.

men; man  
mening  
manga; man ga  
meni; menj  
mendan  
biz  
bizing  
bizga  
bizni  
bizdan

## SART.

män  
mening  
manga  
meni  
mendin  
biz  
bising  
bizga  
bizni  
bizdin

## OSMANLI.

ben  
benim  
bana (baŋa)  
beni  
benden  
biz  
bizim  
bize  
bizi  
bizden

"I"  
"of me"  
"to me"  
"me" (acc.)  
"from me"  
"we"  
"of us"  
"to us"  
"us" (acc.)  
"from us"

## CUMANIAN.

sen; san  
sening  
sanga  
(saha; saa)  
seni  
sendan  
siz  
sizing  
sizga  
sizni; siznj  
sizdan

## SART.

sän  
sening  
sanga  
seni  
sendin  
siz  
sizing  
sizga  
sizni  
sizdin

## OSMANLI.

sen  
senin  
sana  
(saŋa)  
seni  
senden  
siz  
sizin  
size  
sizi  
sizden

"thou"  
"of thee"  
"to thee"  
"thee" (acc.)  
"from thee"  
"you"  
"of you"  
"to you"  
"you" (acc.)  
"from you"

## NOUN.

## CUMANIAN.

su  
suning  
suga  
suni  
sudän

## SART.

su  
suning  
suga  
suni  
sudin

## OSMANLI.

su  
sunyn  
suja  
suju  
sudan

"water"  
"of water"  
"to water"  
(acc.)  
"from water"

## CUMANIAN.

sular  
sularning  
sularga  
sularni  
sulardan

## SART.

sular  
sularning  
sularga  
sularni  
sulardin

## OSMANLI.

sular  
sularnyn  
sulara  
sulary  
sulardan

"waters"  
"of waters"  
"to waters"  
(acc.)  
"from waters"



## VERB.

## PRESENT TENSE.

CUMANIAN.	SART.	OSMANLI.	
<i>anglarmen</i>	<i>anglamen</i>	<i>anglarym</i>	"I understand"
<i>anglarsen</i>	<i>anglasen</i>	<i>anglarsen</i>	"thou —"
<i>anglar</i>	<i>angladur</i>	<i>anglar</i>	"he —"
<i>anglarbiz</i>	<i>anglamiz</i>	<i>anglaryz</i>	"we —"
<i>anglarsiz; -sis</i>	<i>anglasiz</i>	<i>anglarsynyz</i>	"you —"
<i>anglarlar</i>	<i>angladurlar</i>	<i>anglarlar</i>	"they —"

## PRESENT TENSE NEGATIVE

<i>anglarman</i>	<i>anglamaimän</i> (-men)	<i>anglamam</i>	"I do not understand"
<i>anglarmasen</i>	<i>anglamaisen</i>	<i>anglamazsen</i>	"thou —"
<i>anglamas</i>	<i>anglamaidur</i>	<i>anglamaz</i>	"he —"
<i>anglamasbiz</i>	<i>anglamaimiz</i>	<i>anglamajyz</i>	"we —"
<i>anglamassiz</i>	<i>anglamaibiz</i>	<i>anglamazsynyz</i>	"you —"
<i>anglamaslar</i>	<i>anglamaidurlar</i>	<i>anglamazlar</i>	"they —"

## FUTURE.

<i>anglagaymen</i>	<i>anglarmen</i>	<i>anglajadžaghym</i>	"I shall understand"
<i>anglagaysen</i>	<i>anglarsen</i>	<i>anglajadžaqsyn</i>	"thou —"
<i>anglagay</i>	<i>anglar</i>	<i>anglajadžaq</i>	"he —"
<i>anglagaybiz</i>	<i>anglarmiz</i>	<i>anglajadžaghysz</i>	"we —"
<i>anglagaysiz</i>	<i>anglarsiz</i>	<i>anglajadžaqsynyz</i>	"you —"
<i>anglagaylar</i>	<i>anglarlar</i>	<i>anglajadžaqqlar</i>	"they —"

As will be observed, the Sart Tatar of Eastern Russia is even more similar to Cumanian than is Osmanli, as the *m*-form of the pronoun of the first person *man-men* constantly appears instead of the Osmanli *ben*. The inserted *n* before the nominal-pronominal genitive-ending *-ing* (*-yn*), which remains in Osmanli only in words ending in a vowel, is still common in Sart, as it was in Cumanian.

In 1338 A.D., the Franciscan Friar Pascal of Vittoria wrote that he learned the *lingua Chamanica* and the Uigur letters, "which are used commonly throughout these kingdoms;" that is, throughout the empires of the Tatars, Persians, Chaldæans, Medes and Cathay.<sup>14</sup> In other words, Pascal states that Cumanian was the idiom in common use as a vernacular throughout Central Asia as far as China

<sup>14</sup> Cited Bang, *Beiträge*, p. 33.



and that it was written with Uigur characters. Cumanian was evidently a term applicable to Tatar in general, including Uigur.<sup>15</sup> There can be no doubt that the material of the "Codex Cumanicus" is of great value, therefore, in fixing the philological status of all præ-mediæval and mediæval Tatar and especially of the Pólovtsian idiom, with which it was practically identical.

I am particularly indebted to Mr. Feliciu Vexler, Assistant in Slavonic in my Department in Columbia University, for his able assistance in collecting most of the following Tatar material, bearing directly on the language of the Epic of Igor.

#### TATAR MATERIAL IN IGOR.<sup>16</sup>

*Bľvan* (Igor 112) = modern R. *bolvan*, "block, blockhead, statue, idol" (Berneker, p. 41), C. *balaban*, "falcon," possibly owing to the statue-like attitude of the bird when perched. In Magyar, *bálvány* = "idol of any sort"; Rumanian *bolovan*, "cobble-stone," formerly "idol" (Slavonic loanword). There may be two words here, the first referring to a bird of some sort; cf. Turkish *bülbül*, "nightingale" (in CC. *rosignolus*); and the second actually meaning "block" or "idol." The word is clearly of Tatar origin.

*Bojan* (Igor, *passim*). For full discussion, cf. "Prince, Trojan and Boyan," in Proc. of the Amer. Philos. Soc., 56, 152-160 and see below, s. v. *kur*. Vyazemski (Magnus, p. xlvii-xlviii) has already connected this word with Slavonic *bajati*, *bojati* "speak, relate." The meaning of *bojan* may therefore, be "singer"; cf. R. Gypsy *bagan*,<sup>17</sup> "to sing," and note Slav. *bajan*, "enchanter," in Dan. 5, 11 (OR. version). It is possible, however, that the word may be of Tatar origin (cf. Magnus, p. xlvii). Note that Turkish *boj* = "person"; Mongol *boj* = "clever archer" or "person"; Altai *pajana* = "God"; Čuvaš *pojan* = "rich" and *bajan* is a tribal name of the Altai. See below, s. v. *bojarin*. The word *bajan* appears also as a proper name, *Vajanos* (but note the Greek *v*), son of Kubra. Dubious words of this type are often the result of a compound

<sup>15</sup> Cited Bang, *Beiträge*, p. 33.

<sup>16</sup> Arranged in the order of the Russian alphabet.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. P. Istomin (Patkanoff), "The Gypsy Language (in Russian)," Moscow, 1900.



derivation, possibly originally Tatar with a superimposition of a later Slavonic folks-etymology, based on resemblance of sound (see *s. v. buj-tur, jar-tur*, below).

*Bojarin* (Igor, *passim*); the common OS. word for "magnate" (Berneker, p. 72), usually employed for Slavonic *boj*, "fight," following the idea that the boyars were essentially warriors. It may however be connected as a loan-word with the above mentioned Turkish *baj-*, *boj-* "rich," since the probably cognate R. *barin*, "gentleman" does not seem to be from a Slavonic stem *boj-*, "fight." The words *barin*, *bojarin*, therefore, are possibly Tatar. In OS. and Bulgarian, *boljarin*, the *l* is probably due to the influence of the Slavonic *bolj-*, "great." See the Tatar material cited above, *s. v. Bojan*.

*Buj-tur* (Igor, 80) varies with *buj* (Berneker, p. 98) and is an epithet of Prince Vsevolod. Here again is a word of possible double etymology. The Slavonic elements appear to be *buj*, "bull," and *tur*, also "bull," meaning "aurochs" in modern R. A similar popular combination is *buj-vol*, "buffalo," from *buj*, "bull" and *vol*, "ox."

The *buj*-form is apparently cognate with Greek, *φύω* "to sprout, be born"; cf. Rumanian *buiac*, "lustful." The word *buj* alone appears in Igor, 465; *Buj Rjuriče* "O hero (bull) Rurik"; the genitive is *bu-j-ego*. This *buj*-element can have no connection with *C. boga*, *buga*, Turkish *bugha*, Cagatai *buka*, etc.

All through the Tatar idioms we find variants of the word *bahadur*, "noble, mighty," now a common word in Hindustani dialects borrowed through the Mogul (Mongol); cf. *C. bahadur*, Mongol *batur*, Manchu *baturu*, Nogait *matur*, beautiful, Kazanj *mater*, etc.

Note CC. 145: *bahadur sen degelim*, "*te potentem esse dicamus*"; CC. 116: *bagat* = "*probus*." In spite of Magnus, Igor, p. 51, I believe that *buj-tur* is a Slavonic popular etymology from Tatar *bahadur*, or its cognate; cf. *s. v. jar-tur*, below.

*Bus*: *busovi vrani* "the crows of Bus" (Igor, 375), altered by Magnus from *bosuvi*, but better = "steel gray crows," a variety common in Russia to-day. Magnus, Igor, p. 50, associates it with



Booz = Bluz (Baluš), a leader of the Pólovsty in 1054, during the first invasion; cf. *pojút vrémja búsovo*, "they sing the times of Bus" (in this passage, plainly a proper name). The word *búsovi* (Igor, 375) is more likely connected with *bosy* (Igor, 685): *bósym vólkom*, "like a gray wolf," not "bare-footed" and hence "swift-footed" (Magnus). For the idea of color, see C. *buz* = "caeruleus" (CC. 145); note also *boxag* (= *bozag*) "fuscus" and cf. Turkish *boz*, "steel-gray," and Osmanli *buz*, "ice." These Slavonic expressions are all certainly loan-words from Tatar *buz*, "blue; gray."

*Bjes*: *djéti bjésovi* (Igor, 186); translated by Magnus "children of Baal," i. e., "devilish children" (cf. Berneker, p. 56). Magnus thinks *bjes* is a variant of *bus*-, but this is probably incorrect, although it suggests the Cummanian *bus*, *bos*, seen in *busov* = "ruina" (CC. 195). The phrase *bjésovi djéti* must mean "children of the devil," from the Slavonic stem *bjes* (*bês*) "rage."

*Ženčjug*, "a collection of pearls" (Igor, 371); an older form than the present *žemčug*. Prof. Friedrich Hirth states that this is an international word, known also in China; cf. Lithuanian loan-word *žemczugas*. This same stem is seen in Magyar *gyöngy* and in Osmanli *inču*, pronounced *indži*. Note that the change of *j* or *i* to the palatalized *dž* is not unusual in Turkish; cf. C. *ingču* (CC. 109), Orkhonski Tatar *jänčü*, etc. This word does not appear in the non-Russian Slavonic languages.

*Kaninu* (Igor, 225): *na Kaninu zelenu papolomu polstla* "and bedded in him in the Kanina with a garment"; thus Magnus. Note that *papoloma* = Greek *πέπλωμα*. Magnus, p. 74, rejects a Tatar derivation, but C. *kan* and Turkish *kan* = "blood." This word *kanina* is probably a hybrid adjective meaning "bloody" and the phrase should be translated: "and bedded him on a blood-stained green garment"; viz., in the earth. I question as to whether Kanina in Igor is a place-name = Kajala; cf. 229: *s toj-že kajaly* ought probably to be read: *s toj-že kaniny* "from that place of blood." The hero's father-in-law ordered his body to be carried to Kiev.

Kogan (Igor, 746): *na kogana* "against the Khan" = Tatar *kaghan* (Orkhonski inscriptions; cf. Berneker, 468). This title



was given to Vladímir in Chron. 1171: *kagan* and *kan* in 1191. The gutturalized *khan* is a later form; Greek *χάνης*; *χαγάνος*, old Mongol and Avar *khaganus* (-us=Latin ending), Osmanli *khan* and C. *han*=“God.” In Cumanian the *h* represented a guttural. The Tunguz of Nerčinsk say *kan* with hard *k*.

*Koščej* (Igor, 360): *v. sjedlo koščievo* “in a captive’s saddle” (not “slave’s,” with Magnus). Cf. Berneker 585. The word is clearly a Tatar element from *koš*, “military camp,” from which comes R. *koš*, “camp of the Zaporozhian<sup>18</sup> Cossacks”; hence, the word used so often in Gogol’s “Tarás Búlba,” *koshevój*=“chief of the Cossack camp.” The word *košči* must originally have meant “prisoner, servant, groom.” There can be no connection here with C. *cuč* and *cučermen*, “coerce,” as some have suggested. In the R. ballads *koščej* meant “magician, giant.” It is possible that the modern R. *koščej*, “skinflint, miser” may be the same word misapplied under the popular etymological influence of *kostj*, “bone.” The stem *koš* may be the same as that seen in Osmanli *qawas* (?)

*Komonj*, “horse” (Igor, *passim*) is probably not a Tatar word. It has been connected with a supposed *kobmonj*, the same stem as that seen in R. *kobyła* and English-Celtic “cob”=thick-set horse (*cob* in Celtic=“tuft, abundance”), but Berneker, 555, rightly rejects this as a doubtful derivation. The usual R. word for “horse” is *lóšadj*, *q. v.*, below.

*Kur* (Igor, 595): *doriskaše do kur Tjmutarakanja*. There is no reason to alter to *čur* with Magnus=“he raced to the precincts of Tjmutarakanj.” Magnus’s emendation would refer to Čur, a deity (?) of boundaries. The word *kur* is Tatar *qur*, “enclosure,” with which *kurgan* (see the following word) is probably connected.

*Kurgan* “tumulus, grave-mound,” a common modern R. word (Berneker, 648) appears also in Rumanian *gorgan* and is clearly Tatar. Note C. *gurgan*, “burgh” and *gurgatmen*, “strengthen,” and cf. Osmanli *kurkhane*. See the preceding word in this list.

*Lóšadj*, “horse” (not in Igor, which always uses *komónj*, *q. v.*). The word *lóšadj* (Berneker 734) appears in *Nestor’s Chronicle*, 1103

<sup>18</sup> The Zaporozhian Cossacks were the “Backfallsmen” of the Dnieper who played so important a part in Polish mediæval history (cf. Gogol’s *Taras Bulba*, etc.).



and 1111, used by Vladímír Monomákh in the council regarding the Polovtsian expedition. The term was unknown to the Pólovtsy and was of southern Russian origin, passing into Russian, perhaps, by way of the Viatici tribe (cf. Šakhmatov, *Introd. to the History of the Russian Language*, I. 81). The word appears in OR. as *loša*; gen. *lošáte* (*t*-stem) and has had the form *lóšadj* since the thirteenth century; cf. *lošák*, "mule," Pol. *loszak*, "horse," etc. It is unquestionably a Tatar loan-word; cf. Turkish *alâša*, "gelding," and Magyar *lo*, "horse."

There were wild horses on the Asiatic steppes, as Vladímír Monomákh speaks of catching and taming ten or twenty of them at Cernígov.

*Nogata* (Igor, 460): *to byla by čaga po nogatje a koščěj po rézanje*: "then a female slave would be worth twelve pence and a groom for five pence."

This is a loan-word through the Tatar from the Arabic *naqd*, "small coin." The intermediate form seems to have been *nagd*. For the values in furs, one *grivjenj* = twenty *nogaty*, or fifty *rezany*, see Magnus, p. 113. See below *s. v. čaga*.

*Ovlur* (Igor, 675) is a proper name; probably the same as *Lavor* in Nestor's Chron. 1185. This appears to contain the same elements as are seen in the Turkish *oghlan*, "servant, lad"; we have the record in Nestor of the Tatar servants of David Igorevič, named Oulan, Kolča, etc. The form *Lavor* is certainly not as correct as *Ovlur*. The final *r* in both forms is difficult to explain, unless it is a variant of the *-n* in *oghlan*, *oulan*.

*Oljber* (Igor, 101) is clearly not Tatar ölybyr, "weak, ill" (rejected also by Magnus, p. 102). Magnus is probably right in attributing this name to the series of geographical terms referring to the Tatar territory, now in Czecho-Slovakia. Note that there is a Polish village Olbierzowice, not far from Warsaw (Magnus, *loc. cit.*). Vexler derives this from Pol. *olbrzym*, "giant," applied to the Avars. Cf. *s. v. šeljbir*.

*Or'tama* (Igor, 142; only once): *or'tmami i japončicami kožukhi*, "with the mantles, cloaks and coats" (they bridged the mire, etc.). This is plainly the same as C. *ortma* = "mantica"; cf. *art*, "back,



top" (CC. 146), *artarmen*, "I excel" (CC. 54). In Osmanli, *örtmek* = "to cover," and we find in Persian the noun *örtme*, "covering" from a plainly Turkish formation which, however, does not occur in modern Osmanli. This is undoubtedly our *or'tma* = Osmanli *ürtü*, "covering."

*Saltany* (Igor, 489): "thou shootest from the golden throne of thy father the Saltany who are beyond Russia" (= *za zemljami*). Every authority but Magnus regards this as the Arabo-Tatar *saltân*, *sultân*, a reference to the chiefs of the Tatars. Magnus, however, considers, that it alludes to the men of Salatyn on the lower Tatra mountains in Hungary, whence came the barbarian auxiliaries of Igor, such as the Topchaks. It must refer to an attack on the Tatar foe, but the term *saltân* (*sultân*) is not commonly used to denote the Tatar khans.

*Tl'kovin* (Igor, 369): *poganykh tl'kovin*, "of the heathen *tl'koviny*"; perhaps the Ταλμάτσιοι of Ptolemy. The term is very difficult. It is usually rendered "nomads," from R. *tolčák*, from *tolkátj*, "roam," as the form occurs in Nestor, 907, alluding to the Varjags, Slovenes and Tivercy. A. Weseloffsky (ZDMG, 1877, p. 301) refers the term to the Torki, the remnants of the Pečenegs. This is not possible, since the Varjags (Norsemen) and Slovenes (southern Slavs) were certainly not Torki. The derivation of the word *tl'koviny* is uncertain. The proper pronunciation is *tlkoviny* or *tolkoviny*, as the hard sign in Igor *tl'koviny* is a mere stop. Šakhmatov thinks it means "bi-lingual," comparing it with *tolmač* "interpreter," from *tolkováti* (*op. cit.*, p. 98).

*Tjmutarakan* (Igor, 384) was the last outpost of the Russo-Hellenic influence and had heathen temples even in Strabo's day. It was on the Tamán peninsula, bordering on the Sea of Azóv and the Black Sea. Constantine Prophyrogenitus calls it Ταμάταρχα.,

*Topčak* (Igor, 432) alludes to the barbarian allies. Magnus states "this word has an unmistakable Turanian form" and refers to C. *toprak*, "corn" (CC. 208). In Osmanli *topraq* = "soil, territory," and also "clay." It may refer to the nature of the soil of a certain territory. Magnus identifies it geographically with Topczewo, a village in the province of Grodno, twenty versts from



Bielsk, or with Topczykaly, seven miles from Grodno. There can be little doubt that these people were Tatars.

*Šeljbyry* (Igor, 432) may be cognate with Kalmuck *šilbyr*, "long whip," but the term seems to accord with the rest of the geographical series; cf. *s. v. Oljber*, and Magnus, p. 101. It is probably another reference to the barbarian allies of the Russians from the Tatra. Note that Pol. *szalbierz* means "rogue."

*Šereširy* (Igor, 462; only once):

*ty by možeši po sukhu*  
(*živymi*) *s šereširy streljati*  
*udalymi*<sup>19</sup> *syny Gljebovi*

Thou canst on dry land  
shoot with bold *šereširy*  
the sons of Gljeb.

The sons of Gljeb were princes of Rjazanj. The passage is very obscure and it is apparent that the copyist himself did not understand it. Cf. Magnus, pp. 106 ff., for seven views. I believe that *šereširy* must have been an implement. The Persian fire-hurling machines were known as *tir-čar*, an iron pipe filled with explosive powder and employed very early in the East. Magnus, p. 107, suggests that *šerešir* may be cognate with Magyar *seres*, "worry, trouble," but this seems improbable. Vexler suggests that the initial *š* may be a scribal error for *t*, as the letters are not dissimilar in Cyrillic, but this is not necessary, as a *t* palatalized before the *i*-vowel might become *s*. The word *šereširy* suggests a Pólovtsian word *čiričar* and seems in this passage of Igor to be a synonym of the *plamenny rog* "flaming horn," of Igor, 312; note also *smaga*, "fierce heat" (Igor, 311), a Little-Russian word. "Live *šereširy*" must mean "loaded implements."

*Kharalužny* (Igor, 194): *méči kharalúžnymi*, "with steel swords" (Berneker, 385; 100) is undoubtedly connected with C. *karalic*, "blackness," used for *atramentum*, "ink," in CC. 94, but referring in Igor to the dark color of tempered steel. It is interesting to note that in modern Osmanli, *qaršilyq* is used for the steel of a flint-lock gun, but this really means "the opposite thing," *i. e.*, the thing opposite (*qarši*) the flint." On the other hand, *qaršilyq* may

<sup>19</sup> It is not necessary with Magnus to separate *-mi* from *udaly* and to regard *mi* as the 1st personal possessive "my brave sons of Gljeb"; *udalymi* is instrumental plural agreeing with *šereširy*.



be a popular etymology containing an original *qara*-stem = "black steel (?)." Perhaps *qaršilyq* stands for *qar-čelik*, "black steel," as *čelik* = "steel" in Osmanli. In the Russian ballads, *bulatny* means the same as *kharalužny* = Turkish *bulat*, which is from Persian *pulad*; thus, in Zadonščina; *kopija kharalužnymi, meči bulatnyja, topory legkie*, "steel spears, steel swords (and) light battle-axes." Note that *k* and *q* often become *kh*, especially in Azerbaijan and Mariópol Tatar (cf. Blau, "Ueber Volksthüm u. Sprache d. Kumanen," ZDMC. 29, 1876 [556–567], pp. 569 f.).

*Khinovy* (Igor, 403). This original form Magnus has needlessly altered to *khinju*; *khinovy* is probably an adjective and means simply "Hunnish" (thus Sobolevsky, A. S. P., xxx, p. 474). It is derived by Magnus from Tatar *khan* and taken to mean "belonging to the Tatars" (*khans*), a theory based on the change of *o* to *i* in Little Russian, seen, for example, in Little Russian *pid* for R. *pod*, "under"; *wikno* for *okno*, "window," etc. But this change of *o* to *i* is a very late phenomenon in the Ukraine. It is not likely that this word has any connection with C. *kinov*, "crooked" (CC. 138), *kingir*, "curved" (CC. 140).

*Khorjúgov* (Igor, 146); cf. Berneker, 398. This word has been derived from Mongol *orongo* "standard" and also from Gothic *hrugga* "shaft," pronounced *hrunga*, which is not even identical in meaning. The word occurs in Old Bulgarian *khorangv*, "pennant" and in modern *khorúgv*, "church banner," Pol. *choragiew*, etc. It is more probable that this is a Tartar loan-word and not Gothic *hrugga* which is the same word as English "rung" of a ladder. The Mongol *orongo* may be a modification of an original *khorongo*.

*Japončica* (Igor, 142) "Capuchin cloak" (Berneker, p. 445). Magnus has wrongly *japoncica* (p. 115). This is identical with OR. *epanča* and Turkish *iapanča*, or *iaponča*; in Polish *oponcza* means "rain-coat." Note Cagatai *japonči* "cloak." See s. v. *or'tma*, below.

*Jaruga* (Igor, 92) "rill" (Berneker, 445) is clearly the same as in Čagatai *jarugh*, "left, split." The *jar*-stem appears in OR. *jar*, "cliff, ravine"; Old Bulgarian *jar* "steep shore," Rumanian *eruga*. In modern R., we have *jarug* (Tula dialect), and *eruk*; *jaruška* Little-Russian.



*Jar-tur* (Igor, 190; Magnus, p. 117; Berneker, 447). This is an epithet applied to heroes; conventionally = "fierce bull." See *buj-tur*, above. There is a modern word *jary* "fierce, grim," which probably does not belong in this connection. As *buj-tur* seems to be a popular etymology of Slavonic elements suggested by a primitive Tatar form, it is highly likely that the same is true of *Jar-tur*, with which the Indo-Germanic elements *jar*, "fierce" and *tur*, "bull" have been associated. Note that R. *jary* appears in a number of Slavonic proper names, as *Jarosláv*; *Jaromír*, etc.

This Indo-Germanic *jar* is usually connected with Greek ζῶπος, "fiery"; possibly it has the same stem as the Latin *ira* "wrath" (?). According to Berneker, p. 448, this *jar* has no connection with the Tatar *iar*, "light, bright," which occurs CC. 254. The question is confusing, as *jary*, "bright" is also a Slavonic stem, R., etc. It is conceivable that *jar-tur* might readily be a variant of Tatar *iardur*, "he is (*dur*) splendid," a form which subsequently might have been confounded with Slavonic *jary* (?).

As to the possible connection between Slavonic *jary* and Tatar *iar* (*iariklich* = "lumen," CC. 154; *jaricte*, "illuminavit," CC. 159; *iarkin*, "splendor," CC. 193), this opens up the whole question as to the primitive common origin of the Indo-Germanic and Ugro-Turkic idioms which cannot be discussed here.

*Čaga* (Igor, 460) "female slave" (Nestor, Chron. 1018) is undoubtedly Tatar and should not be rendered "potentate" (Magnus, p. 113). See above *s. v. nogate*.





Prince, John Dyneley. 1919. "Tatar Material in Old Russian." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia for promoting useful knowledge* 58(220), 74–88.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/86409>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/212418>

**Holding Institution**

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

**Sponsored by**

University of Toronto

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: Not provided. Contact Holding Institution to verify copyright status.

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.