

OTTOMANS – CRIMEA – JOCHIDS

*Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*



# Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids

*Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*

Edited by István Zimonyi

Szeged – 2020

This publication was financially supported by the  
MTA–ELTE–SZTE Silk Road Research Group

Cover illustration:  
Calligraphy of Raniya Muhammad Abd al-Halim

Text:  
And say, “O my Lord! advance me in knowledge” (Q 20, 114)

*Letters and Words. Exhibition of Arabic Calligraphy.* Cairo 2011, 72.

© University of Szeged,  
Department of Altaic Studies,  
Printed in 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by other means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing of the author or the publisher.

Printed by: Innovariant Ltd., H-6750 Algyő, Ipartelep 4.

ISBN: 978 963 306 747 5 (printed)  
ISBN: 978 963 306 748 2 (pdf)





## Contents

Preface .....	9
Klára Agyagási К вопросу о хронологии изменения $-d(r)- > -\delta(r)- > -y(r)-$ в волжско-булгарских диалектах .....	13
László Balogh Notes to the History of the Hungarians in the 10 <sup>th</sup> Century .....	23
Hendrik Boeschoten Bemerkungen zu der neu gefundenen Dede Korkut-Handschrift, mit einer Übersetzung der dreizehnten Geschichte .....	35
Csáki Éva Kaukázusi török népek kálváriája a népdalok tükrében .....	47
Éva Csató and Lars Johanson On Discourse Types and Clause Combining in Dāftār-i Čingiz-nāmā.....	59
Balázs Danko A Misunderstood Passage of Qādir ‘Ali-beg Jālāyirī’s <i>Jāmī at-Tawārīḫ</i> .....	71
Géza Dávid The Formation of the <i>sancak</i> of Kırka (Krka) and its First <i>begs</i> .....	81
Mihály Dobrovits Pofu Qatun and the Last Decade of the Türk Empire.....	97
Pál Fodor A Descendant of the Prophet in the Hungarian Marches Seyyid Ali and the Ethos of Gaza.....	101
Tasin Gemil The Tatars in Romanian Historiography .....	111
Csaba Göncöl Remarks on the <i>Čingiz-nāmā</i> of Ötāmiš Hājjī.....	123
Funda Güven Imagined Turks: The Tatar as the Other in Halide Edip’s Novels .....	133
Murat Işık The Animal Names in the Book of Leviticus of the Gözleve Bible (1841). Part I: Mammal, Insect and Reptile Species.....	145
Henryk Jankowski The Names of Professions in Historical Turkic Languages of the Crimea .....	165

Mustafa S. Kaçalın Joannes Lippa: Türkçe Hayvan Masalları .....	181
Bayarma Khabtagaeva On Some Taboo Words in Yeniseian .....	199
Éva Kincses-Nagy Nine Gifts.....	215
Raushangul Mukusheva The Presence of Shamanism in Kazakh and Hungarian Folklore .....	229
Sándor Papp The Prince and the Sultan. The Sublime Porte's Practice of Confirming the Power of Christian Vassal Princes Based on the Example of Transylvania.....	239
Benedek Péri Places Full of Secrets in 16 <sup>th</sup> Century Istanbul: the Shops of the <i>ma'cūncıs</i> .....	255
Claudia Römer “Faķır olub perākende olmaĝa yüz tutmuşlar” the Ottoman Struggle against the Displacement of Subjects in the Early Modern Period .....	269
András Róna-Tas A Birthday Present for the Khitan Empress .....	281
Uli Schamiloglu Was the Chinggisid Khan an Autocrat? Reflections on the Foundations of Chinggisid Authority .....	295
Hajnalka Tóth Entstehung eines auf Osmanisch verfassten Friedenskonzepts Ein Beitrag zu der Vorgeschichte des Friedens von Eisenburg 1664.....	311
Вадим Трепавлов Московский <i>Чаган хан</i> .....	325
Беата Варга «Крымская альтернатива» – военно-политический союз Богдана Хмельницкого с Ислам-Гиреем III (1649–1653) .....	331
Barış Yılmaz Deconstruction of the Traditional Hero Type in Murathan Mungan's <i>Cenk Hikayeleri</i> .....	339
Илья Зайцев – Решат Алиев Фрагмент ярлыка ( <i>мюльк-наме</i> ) крымского хана Сахиб-Гирея.....	355
István Zimonyi Etil in the <i>Dāftār-i Ćingiz-nāmā</i> .....	363

## Preface

Mária Ivanics was born on 31 August 1950 in Budapest. After completing her primary and secondary education, she studied Russian Language and Literature, History and Turkology (Ottoman Studies). She received her MA degree in 1973. In the following year she was invited by the chair of the Department of Altaic Studies, Professor András Róna-Tas, to help to build up the then new institution at the József Attila University (Szeged). She taught at that university and its legal successors until her retirement. First, she worked as an assistant lecturer, then as a senior lecturer after defending her doctoral dissertation. Between 1980–86, she and his family stayed in Vienna (Austria), where she performed postdoctoral studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the University of Vienna. She obtained the “candidate of the sciences” degree at the Hungarian Academy of Science in 1992, and her dissertation – The Crimean Khanate in the Fifteen Years’ War 1593–1606 – was published in Hungarian. From 1993 to 2009 she worked as an associate professor. Her interest gradually turned to the study of the historical heritage of the successor states of the Golden Horde, especially to publishing the sources of the nomadic oral historiography of the Volga region. As a part of international collaboration, she prepared the critical edition of one of the basic internal sources of the Khanate of Kasimov, the Genghis Legend, which she published with professor Mirkasym Usmanov in 2002: (Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende. (Däftär-i Dschingis-nāmā) 1. Vorwort, Einführung, Transkription, Wörterbuch, Faksimiles. Szeged: University of Szeged, 2002. 324 p. (Studia Uralo-Altaica 44).<sup>1</sup> In 2008, Mária Ivanics was appointed to the head of the department and at the same time she became the leader of the Turkological Research Group of the Hungarian Academy operating at the department. In 2009, she defended her dissertation entitled “The Nomadic Prince of the Genghis Legend”, and received the title, “doctor of sciences” from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. It is an extremely careful historical-philological study of the afore-mentioned Book of Genghis Khan, published in Budapest in 2017 as a publication of the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences entitled Exercise of power on the steppe: The nomadic world of Genghis-nāmā. She was the head of the Department of Altaic Studies until 2015. Between 2012 and 2017, she headed the project “The Cultural Heritage of the Turkic Peoples” as the leader of the MTA–SZTE Turkology Research Group operating within the Department of Altaic Studies. She has been studying the diplomatic relations between the Transylvanian princes and the Crimean Tatars and working on the edition of the diplomas issued by them.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ojs.bibl.u-szeged.hu/index.php/stualtaica/article/view/13615/13471>

Her scholarly work is internationally outstanding, well known and appreciated everywhere. Her studies have been published in Russian, German, Turkish, Hungarian and English.<sup>2</sup>

She actively involved in scientific public life. She has been a member of the board of the Kőrösi Csoma Society, a member of the Oriental Studies Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and the Public Body of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. From 2005 she was the editor and co-editor of different monograph series (Kőrösi Csoma Library, and *Studia uralo-altaica*. From 2008 to 2017, she was the vice-president of the Hungarian–Turkish Friendship Society. Her outstanding work has been rewarded with a number of prizes and scholarships: in 1994 she received the Géza Kuun Prize, in 1995 the Mellon Scholarship (Turkey). She received a Széchenyi Professorial Scholarship between 1998 and 2001 and István Széchenyi Scholarship between 2003 and 2005, the Ferenc Szakály Award in 2007 and the Award for Hungarian Higher Education in 2008.

In addition to her scientific carrier, she has given lectures and led seminars on the history and culture of the Altaic speaking peoples, she has taught modern and historical Turkic languages to her students. She has supervised several thesis and dissertations of Hungarian and foreign BA, MA and PhD students. Through establishing a new school of thought, she has built a bridge between Ottoman studies and research on Inner Eurasian nomads.

Szeged, 2020.

István Zimonyi

---

<sup>2</sup> Complete list of her publication:  
<https://m2.mtmt.hu/gui2/?type=authors&mode=browse&sel=10007783&paging=1;1000>

*Tabula Gratulatoria*

<i>Almási Tibor</i>	<i>Hoppál Krisztina</i>
<i>Apatóczy Ákos Bertalan</i>	<i>Hunyadi Zsolt</i>
<i>Baski Imre</i>	<i>Károly László</i>
<i>Bíró Bernadett</i>	<i>Keller László</i>
<i>Csernus Sándor</i>	<i>Kocsis Mihály</i>
<i>Csikó Anna</i>	<i>Kósa Gábor</i>
<i>Czentnár András</i>	<i>Kovács Nándor Erik</i>
<i>Dallos Edina</i>	<i>Kovács Szilvia</i>
<i>Deák Ágnes</i>	<i>Kövér Lajos</i>
<i>Emel Dev</i>	<i>Molnár Ádám</i>
<i>Felföldi Szabolcs</i>	<i>Polgár Szabolcs</i>
<i>Fodor István</i>	<i>Sándor Klára</i>
<i>Font Márta</i>	<i>Sipőcz Katalin</i>
<i>Gyenge Zoltán</i>	<i>Szántó Richárd</i>
<i>Hamar Imre</i>	<i>Szeverényi Sándor</i>
<i>Hazai Cecília</i>	<i>Vásáry István</i>
<i>Hazai Kinga</i>	<i>Vér Márton</i>



## Nine Gifts

Éva Kincses-Nagy\*  
Szeged

In many ancient cultures, number ‘nine’ has an eminent role, think of the nine Muses, the nine heads of the Hydra, or the nine-headed dragon of the tales. Many examples could prove that the number nine occupied a high place in the Turko-Mongol tradition, too. Not only the punishment but also a gift should consist of nine pieces. From Eastern Europe to East Asia, it is a still living custom in many traditional communities. In my paper, I offer nine Crimean and Dobrujan Tatar words meaning ‘gift’ to Mária Ivanics on the occasion of her birthday.

### CrT *armağan*; DobT *armagan* ‘gift, present’

The word is attested from the 11<sup>th</sup> century on and according to a remark by Kāshgharī and other Turkic data, it belongs to the lexicon of Oghuz Turkic. In the Compendium, it is recorded in two forms (*armāgān* and *yarmāgān*), meaning ‘a gift (*hadiyya*) which a man returning from a successful journey brings for his relatives’ (Dankoff – Kelly 1982: 160). Though the latter form is considered to be “more correct” by Kāshgharī, besides this datum we cannot meet this form in Turkic languages later. Sporadic attestation of *armāgān* is found in the Middle Turkic sources of the 14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> centuries (Fazylov 1966: 65), especially from the territory of the Golden Horde, which included the territories of the Crimea and Khwarezm with extensive contacts with the Oghuz Turkic population and many Oghuz Turkic speaking people, mostly mercenaries, from the Mamluk territory (Toparli et al. 2003; Golden 2000). Of the modern Turkic languages, the word exists only in TTu *armağan*, CrT *armağan*, Dobrujan Tatar *armagan* and CrK *armağan*. In Azeri, it can only be found as a historical term in the explanatory dictionary (Orucov et al. 2006): *armağan* ‘hədiyyə, bəxşiş, pay, sovgat, töhfə’. On the base of this areal attestation, one must suppose that these words are loans from (Ottoman) Turkish. The CrT phonetic variant *armayal* mentioned in Radloff’s dictionary (R I: 339) is

---

\* This research is supported by the project nr. EFOP-3.6.2-16-2017-00007, titled Aspects on the development of intelligent, sustainable and inclusive society: social, technological, innovation networks in employment and digital economy. The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund and the budget of Hungary.

not recorded in the modern dictionaries. Due to the Ottomans' impact, it became a loanword in the languages of the Balkans as well (cf. TMEN II: 46).

There is no plausible Turkic etymology of it. Many of the scholars (Fazylov 1966: 65; Nadeljaev et al. 1969: 53; ED: 232, 969; Tietze 2002; Pomorska 2013: 19, etc.) consider the word of Iranian origin, compared with Persian and Tajik: Tajik *armuġān* 'gift' (Rachimi – Uspenskaja 1954); Per *armaġān* ~ *armuġān* ~ *armaġānī* 'a present brought from a journey, an offering; a piece of money', *yarmaġān* 'a curiosity or rarity brought from afar as a present to a great man' (Steingass 1975: 39, 1530). Tezcan (1997: 159) and Eren (1999: 18) leave open the question, considering the origin unknown. Doerfer (TMEN II: 45–6) assumes the borrowing in the opposite direction, from Turkic to Persian without further explanation on the etymology. According to the opinion of Starostin–Dybo–Mudrak (2003: 315), *armaġān* is of Turkic origin. They consider it a deverbal noun with the suffix *-GAn*, where the verbal stem is the cognate of the Kirg word *arna-* 'to dedicate, design for'. It would be an interesting case since the verbal stem comes only up in one Kipchak language, but the supposed derivation is only attested in the Oghuz languages as we could have seen above.

### DobT *baġıŝ* 'donation, gift'

A loanword in Turkic of Persian origin, see *baχš* 'fortune, lot, part, portion', the verbal form *baχš kardan* 'to give; to make a present, give in alms' (Steingass 1975: 159). The one-syllabic Persian *baχš* was adapted with a linking sound in most of the Turkic languages as *baġıŝ*. The first attestation is a verbalized form in the Compendium of Kāshghari: *baġıŝla-* 'to present' (ED: 321; Dankoff – Kelly 1984: 320, 325, 326). While the verbal forms can be found in many Turkic languages meaning 'to give (present); to dedicate' (Az *baġıŝla-*; Tkm *baġıŝla-*; Bšk *baġıŝla-*; Tat *baġıŝla-*; Nog *baġıŝla-*; KrčM *baġıŝla-*; Kzk *baġıŝta-*; Kirg *baġıŝta-*; Kum *baġıŝla-*; Kmk/Blk *baġıŝla-*; Uzb *baġıŝla-*; UygD *bäyŝla-*), the nominal form is only attested in the translation of Gulistan by Sibicâbî (14<sup>th</sup> c.): *baġıŝ* '(Ünlü 2013) and in Codex Cumanicus: *baγγŝ* 'Geschenk; donum' (Grønbech 1942: 47), and in some modern Turkic languages in verbal constructions or independently: Tkm *baġıŝ et-* 'to give (a present), to grant'; Nog *baġıŝ et-* 'id.', Kum/Blk *baġıŝ* 'Geschenk'; Tat *baġıŝ* 'baġıŝ, hibe'. In other languages the phonetic shape of the word (one-syllabic and/or with  $\chi$ ) is nearer to the New Persian original; these are considered to be later borrowings: Uyg *bäχŝ* (in the verbal construction *bäχŝ ät-* 'to give', cf. Persian *baχš kardan*); (Ottoman) Turkish *bahŝ*, *baġŝ* 1. 'giving; gift'; 2. 'forgiving'; and *bahŝ it-* 'to give, donate' (see also Pomorska 2013: 27); CrK *bahŝ* 'donation, grant, gift'; Krčk *baχŝla-* 'to give, to dedicate'; the latter two data must be considered a borrowing from (Ottoman) Turkish. The Modern Turkish *baġıŝ* 'grant, donation' is a neologism as it was stated by Redhouse (1974), a backformation from the verbal form *baġıŝla-* 'to present', see also Nişanyan 2018. Because of the lack of sources

for historical DobT data, we cannot make a definite statement: the word *bağış* ‘donation, gift’ can either be a modern borrowing from Turkish, or can represent the old Kipchak form, cf. Kzk *bağış* ‘id.’.

In the modern CrT dictionary, only the verbal form *bağışlamak* ‘to give, donate’ and its derivations (*bağışlama*, *bağışlav*, *bağışlanmak*, *bağışlanma*, *bağışlangan*) are registered.

### CrT *baxşış*; DobT *bahşış* ‘gift, present; donation’

A loanword of Persian origin in Turkic languages, cf. Per *baḡšīš* ‘a gift, a present’ (Steingass 1975: 159). The word appears first in the Middle Turkic sources as *bahşış* in *Atebetü'l-hakayık* (Arat 1951) and in the Şuŝter manuscript of the Mukaddimat al-Adab (dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century by Yüce 1993: 11). In the Middle Kipchak monuments, it is recorded as *bağşış* and *bahşış* (Toparlı et al. 2003: 21–2), and in Navā’ī’s works as *bahşış* (Ünlü 2013: 95). Of the modern Turkic languages, it can be found in Az (*bəhşış*), TTu (*bahşış*), CrK (*bahşış*); CrT (*baxşış*); DobT (*bahşış*); in the languages of the Crimea and Dobruja supposedly through Turkish (Ottoman) mediation. The word entered into the languages of the Balkans via Ottoman Turkish mostly in the meaning ‘tip; gift, present’, cf. Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian *bakšiš*, Albanian *bakshish*, Romanian *baçşiş*, Greek *παζίσι*, and finally it became a cultural word, see German *Bachschesch*, *Bakschisch*, English *baksheesh*, Hungarian *baksis* (TESz I: 225) etc.

The word *bahşış*, similarly to Turkish, can be used as an adjective in the CrT and DobT: CrT *Baxşış atnıñ tişine bakılmaz*. ~ DobT *Bahşış atnıñ tişine karalmaz* ~ TTu *Bahşış atn dişine (veya yaşına) bakılmaz* ‘Don’t look a gift horse in the mouth.’

### DobT *bülek* ‘gift, present’

A very old word attested first in the 8<sup>th</sup> c. Old Turkic as *beläk* ‘a gift’ (according to Clauson *beläg* ~ *beleg*) (ED 338), Kāshgharī *beläg* [recte: *beläk*] ‘gift which a traveller brings his relatives, or which is sent from one spot to another’ (Dankoff – Kelly I: 195); *bēläg* [recte: *beläk*] ‘gift’ (Dankoff – Kelly I: 310); *beläglä-* ‘to present’ (Dankoff – Kelly I: 249, II: 322). It is recorded in Middle Turkic: AtH *belek* (Arat 1951); Chagatay: *bäläk* ~ *bilek* (recte: *beläk*) and *bölek* (R IV: 1762, 1700, cf. also TMEN II: 413). Among Modern Turkic languages, it can be found in TTu as *belek* (dialectal *benek*: DS 1993 II: 609, 627); Kirg *belek*; Tat, Bšk *büläk*; YUyg *pelek*; Tuv *belek* and *belek selek* (the latter definitely from Mongolian); Tob, Tar *büläk* (R IV: 1894); BarT *piläk* (R IV: 1338), Alt *belek* ‘a gift or deposit from the bride to the groom to show her consent to the elopement’; Yakut *bäläχ*; the word means everywhere ‘gift, (engagement) present’.

The first problem we meet is the quality of the word final consonant. Since the scripts for Old Turkic are ambiguous in this respect, scholars give different transcriptions of the historical data, namely *beläk* and *beläg* ~ *beleg* due to their opinion about the etymology and origin of the word. As we can see above, Clauson, Dankoff – Kelly considers a -g, while other scholars suggest that the phonetic shape of the word must be *belek*. Erdal (1991: 230) convincingly argues in favour of the final voiceless velar. Räsänen (1969: 69) proposes Mongolic origin of the Turkic word (cf. WrMo *beleg* ‘gift, present’), and he supposes that Mongolic *beleg* is a cognate of Turkic *bölük* ‘part; gift’, which is rightly rejected by Clark (1977: 132). Tuna (1973–5: 284) also considers the Mongolian etymology to be correct. Sevortjan (1978: 112–3) rules out the possibility of its Mongolic origin. He thinks that (similarly to the noun *belge* ‘sign’) the word could be a derivation of the verb *\*bel-* ‘come into sight’ which can hardly be substantiated. Schönig (2000: 69) leaves open the possibility of both the Turkic and the Mongolic origin. According to Starostin–Dybo–Mudrak (2003: 926) the verbal stem of the Turkic *belek* ‘gift’ is a cognate of Mongolic *melže-* ‘to bet, wager’, which is hardly acceptable. Doerfer (TMEN II: 413–5), Clauson (ED: 338), Erdal (1991: 230), Tietze (2002) are probably right in supposing that the word *beläk* ‘gift’ is an object noun from the verb *belä-* ‘to wrap (up)’ with the deverbal suffix *-(O)k* (cf. Erdal 1991: 224–261). Kyz *pälä* ~ *pälägä* (R IV: 1243) are results of other derivation with the suffix *-gA*, for the suffix (see Erdal 1991: 376–382). The word *belek* was copied by Mongolian as *beleg* (for the data see Khabtagaeva 2009: 197), the final -g in Mongolic is a substitution for a final -k in Turkic. The Tat and DobT *bülelek* goes back to *bölek*, the *e* > *ö* labialization after *b-* is a frequent development in Kipchak languages, which might be strengthened by the contamination with the word *bölek* ‘part, share, unit’. The *ö* > *ü* change occurred in Tatar and DobT.

#### CrT *ediye*; DobT *ediye* ~ *hediye* ‘gift’

It is an Arabic loanword in Turkic from the stem [*hdy*] هدى ‘to lead on the right way, to guide etc.’. The first attestation of the Arabic هدية *hadīya* ‘gift, present, donation; offering, sacrifice’ as a loan in Turkic is in AtH *heḍye* ‘gift’ as: *heḍye kıl-* ‘to present, to grant’, and *heḍyeni қаbul kıl-* ‘to accept one’s gift’ (Arat 1951). It spread in Turkic languages also via Persian هدیة *hadiya*, *hadya*, cf. Khwarezmian *heḍye*, *heḍiyye* (Arat 1951, Yüce 1993), Middle Kipchak *hediyye* (Toparli et al. 2003), Chagatay *hediye*, *hediyye* (Ünlü 2013), TTu *hediye*, Az *hādiyyä*, Tkm *hedye*, Uyg *ḫādiyä*, Uzb *ḫadya*. Besides the languages of the Crimea and Dobruja (cf. CrK *hediye*, CrT *ediye*; DobT *ediye* ~ *hediye* ‘gift, present’), the word seems to not exist in modern Kipchak languages, therefore one must suppose that these are borrowed from Turkish. The disappearance of onset *h-* happened in the Tatar idioms.

CrT, DobT *ihsan* ‘gift’

A word of Arabic origin in Turkic, cf. Ar *ihsān* إحسان ‘beneficence, performance of good deeds’ (Wehr 1980: 178), which was originally a religious term of Islam. The semantic shift from ‘performance of good deeds’ to ‘gift’ seems to have taken place in Turkic quite early. The earliest datum in Turkic in the latter meaning is AtH *ihsan* ‘grant, gift’ (Arat 1951: 46), Middle Kipchak *ihsān* ‘ihsan, bağış’ (Toparlı et al. 2003). In TTu, it means 1. ‘a favour, benevolence, kindness’ 2. ‘gift (granted by a superior)’. In the languages of the Crimea and Dobruja, it must be a borrowing from (Ottoman) Turkish. In both languages it has the meanings ‘beneficence, mercy, good deed; gift, grant’. In CrK, it can be found in the verbal construction *ihsan et-* ‘to endow; to bestow’. The Tat *ihsan* is a bookish word meaning ‘a good deed; help; beneficence; gift’; *ihsan it-* ‘to give a present; to endow’. It is also very popular as a proper name (mostly for men) in almost all Muslim cultures.

DobT *körümlük* ~ *körümlük* ‘gift’

It is a word (and custom) of Turkic origin. The morphological structure is clear; in archphonemic transcription: *\*kör-(X)m+LXk*; about the function of the suffixes, see Erdal 1991: 290–300; 121–131. The verbal stem is identical with the well-known and widespread verb *kör-* ‘to see’, therefore *\*körümlük* means ‘an act of seeing’, and *\*körümlük* ‘a thing (worth) to see’ with a semantic shift ‘a gift given for seeing something or somebody for the first’. The word initial *k-*, the vocalism of the suffixes, and the allomorph *-nik* clearly reflect Kipchak features. DobT dictionary lists the following meanings of *körümlük* ~ *körümlük* are listed: 1. ‘Yalnız görülmek için bulundurulmuş nesne; görmelik’ 2. ‘İlk kez görmeye geldiğinde erkek tarafından nişanlısına verilen armağan’ 3. ‘Yeni doğan bebeği ilk defa görünürken verilen hediye’ 4. ‘Nevruz kutlamalarında ev ev dolaşarak türküler söyleyip ellerindeki nevrüz çiçekleriyle ilkbaharın gelişini müjdeleyenlere verilen armağan’. While in TTu, the phrase *yüz görümlüğü* refers only to ‘the gift given by the groom to the bride on the occasion of seeing her face first’, which traditionally happened often only after the wedding, in DobT *yüz körüml/nığı bermek* refers to a gift given to a new-born child, or to the bride’. The custom existed in Turkic cultures almost everywhere, and though the modern dictionaries may not always contain this derivation, in many cases one can suppose, that it is an element of the vernacular. See also Kzk *körümlük* ‘a gift presented at the show of a bride or of a newly born child’; KrëM *körümlük* ‘id.’; Tat *küremlek* ‘id.’.

CrT *savğa* ‘gift’

The history and the etymology of the word is not clear in every detail. The direction of borrowing cannot be determined unambiguously—the word history shows successive waves of interlinguistic borrowing. The word can be found in many historical and modern languages of Eurasia, namely in Turkic (with the exception of Siberian Turkic and the Volga region), (Middle) Mongolic, Chinese (← Mongolic, as it was proposed by Pelliot 1936; Rachewiltz 2000: 433), Persian and other Iranian languages, languages of the Caucasus, Russian etc. (Pelliot 1936; Doerfer TMEN I: 345–347, IV: 388).

Considering the data, the first attestations are from the 13<sup>th</sup> century on in both in Turkic and Mongolic languages. Khwarezmian *savgat*, *savqat* ‘hediye’ (Yüce 1993: 78:8); Ottoman *savgat* (*savkat*) ‘hediye, armağan, bahşiş, ihsan’ (TS V: 3341); Chagatay *savgat* ~ *sogat* ‘pişkeş, armagan, inam’ (Atalay 1970: 273, 290); *savğat* ‘gift’ (Thackston 1993: 246a); *savğat* ~ *sogat* ‘id.’ (P. de Courteille 1870: 344, 356); *soğa* ‘das Geschenk eines von der Jagd, vom Markte oder von der Reise Angekommen’ (Vámbéry 1867; R IV: 527), *soğat* ‘das Geschenk’ (R IV: 529), *savğat* ‘id.’ (R IV: 431), *sauğat* ‘id.’ (R IV: 234); *savğat* ‘Geschenk’ (Kúnos 1902: 168); Turkish dialects *savğa* ‘armağan’, *savga* ~ *savgtı* ‘bir acıdan kurtulmak ya da başarı kutlamak için verilen yemek, şölen’ (DS X: 3553); Tkm *sovğat* ‘gift’; Az *sogat* ‘id.’ (R IV: 529), *sauğat* ‘ein Geschenk, eine Gabe, eine Belohnung’ (R IV: 234), *sovqat* ‘is. Birinə göndərilən pay; hədiyyə, bəxşiş’ (Orucov et al. 2006, IV: 140); Kzk *savğa* ‘hist. war booty or (hunting) bag of game’; Kir *sōga* ~ *sōgat* ~ *sōgo* ‘id.’; Kkalp *sauğa* ‘id.’; Kar *savğa*; CrT *savğa* ‘gift; a tax paid to the khan from military booty in money or in kind’; Nog *savga* ~ *savkat* ‘gift’; KrĕM *savga* ‘hediye, armağan; ödül’; Kum *savğat* ‘gift; prize’; Uzb *sāvğa* ‘id.’; Uyg *soğa*, *soğat* ‘id.’.

In Mongolic, the word can be found only in Middle Mongolic sources: *sauqa* ‘gift’ (Haenisch 1962: 132 (*saohua*), Mostaert 1956: 7–8; Rachewiltz 2004: 433); *sauğat* ‘a salutatory gift’ (Poppe 1938–9: 319, 446); *sauğat* ‘= Turkic *armağan*; present’ (Golden 2000: 291); *sauqat* ‘Geschenk, welches man von einer Reise mitbringt’ (Poppe 1927/1972: 59); WrMo *sauqa* ~ *sauğa* ~ *sauğad* ‘gift, present’. It is not attested in any modern Mongolic languages. According to Rachewiltz (2000: 433–4) *sauqa* ~ *sauqat* “designated presents one took on a journey to repay the hospitality one received, hence a sort of due which the receiver expected by custom.” In the Secret History of the Mongols, young boys, prisoners of war, were sent as *sauqa* to Hö’elün. In Rashīd al-Dīn’s work, the *Jāmi’ al-Tawārīkh* (1310–1311), a daughter of the Tangut ruler was asked and sent to Čiŋgis as *sauqa*; for further examples see Doerfer TMEN I: 346. In the Middle Turkic, sources the meaning is ‘a gift from one who has returned from a journey’ (Thackston 1993: 246a), ‘a gift from one who has been on a journey’ (Desmaisons 1970: 313). It is interesting to observe that in multilingual dictionaries, such as the Leiden Anonym,

the Rasūlid Hexaglot, and the *Muqaddimatu'l-adab* (edited by Poppe) the word is recorded only in the Mongolian part, but not in the Turkic one. Despite that, since the cognate word *sajgat* 'loot, booty' is attested in Russian chronicles (1174, 1193, 1258, 1260, 1262), Pelliot (1936: 234) considers it as an argument in support of the existence of the word in Turkic as early as in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. As one could see from the data above, there are forms with and without a final *-t*, often both forms registered in the very same language, both in Turkic and in Mongolic languages. Following Melioranski, Pelliot (1936: 235) considers it as a plural. He states that there is a plural suffix *-t* in Old Turkic in common with Mongolian and Sogdian. He proposes that plural *-t* in Turkic comes from a language which disappeared, e.g. Ruanruan, which is considered to be Mongol by Pelliot (1936: 236). Doerfer (TMEN I: 345–347) and Schönig (2000: 163) follows him and argues in favour of the Mongolic origin. At the same time Doerfer (op.cit.) does not exclude the possibility that *savgat* may also be of Old Iranian origin transmitted by the Naimans to Turkic and Mongolic languages.

Other scholars consider the Mongolic word of Turkic origin without giving an etymological explanation (Poppe 1927/1972: 59; Räsänen 1969: 406; Eren 1972: 237–242; Kara 2001: 107). The latest etymological proposal is that of Doerfer – Tezcan (1980: 185), which was completed by Tenišev (2001: 349–50). Based on the Halaj verb *sa-v-* 'bewirten', a Turkic etymology is suggested. The Turkish dialectal *savga* ~ *savgi* 'bir acidan kurtulmak ya da başarı kutlamak için verilen yemek, şölen' (DS X: 3553), the Tatar dialectal *sawām* 'wedding gifts' (Tenišev 2001: 350), and the word *sawġa(t)* are supposed to be its derivations. The base word, however, later became obsolete and, with the exception of Halaj, disappeared. The weak point of this hypothesis is that the function of the suffix *-gA* is to form agent nouns, cf. Erdal 1991: 376. The word calls for further research.

DobT *tokuz* ~ *tokız* ~ *dokuz* ~ *dokız* 'a gift of nine pieces given at weddings or at wrestling-matches'; CrT *dokuz* ~ *doķız* 'a set of linen given by the bride to the groom'

As I have mentioned in the dedication above, a gift should have consisted of nine times nine units of the thing given in the Turko–Mongol steppe tradition (cf. The Travels of Marco Polo). Therefore, the word 'nine' in many Turkic languages also have the meaning 'gift (of nine pieces)', cf. DobT *tokuz* ~ *tokız* ~ *dokuz* ~ *dokız*, CrT *dokuz* ~ *doķız*, Kzk *toġız*, Kirg *toguz*, Nog *togız*, Uzb *to'kkiz* etc. The word in this meaning was also borrowed from Uzb into Tajik: *tâqquz* 'Geschenk, bestehend aus neun Gegenständen (Kleidung, Schuhe, Tücher), das der Bräutigam der Braut vor der Hochzeit zurüstet' (Doerfer 1967: 34).

The tradition was respected even by those peoples who had contacts with Turks or Mongols when they sent or gave gifts. Due to the close political and cultural contacts with the Tatars, we can find the calque of the Turkic word *tokuz* ‘nine; nine-item gift’ in Slavic languages (Russian *devjat’* ~ *devet*, Polish *dziewięć* etc.). Kołodziejczyk (2011: 738. n.15) gives some examples for sending *dziewięć* to the Crimea. In the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the Lithuanian chancery was about to send three sets of nine presents to Mengli Giray. In 1607 the Polish court wanted to send presents to Khan Ghazi II Giray and prepared a list of “three sets of nine gifts”. Another time, Khan Bahadır Giray requested gifts of nine objects in 1640. Mária Ivanics (1994: 106) also deals with the history of giving *tokuz* to the Crimean Tatars.

Due to the Oghuz influence in modern Crimean and Dobrujan Tatar, the words display a *t* ~ *d*- alternation. The meaning, similarly to other Kipchak languages, seems to denote different nine-piece gift sets given at engagements or weddings and at other important events, such as the traditional wrestling or racing festivals. According to an ethnographic description, a *dokuz* consisted of the following items in the Bakhchisaray district: *kise* ‘tobacco pouch’, *saat-χane* ~ *saat kap* ‘watch-case’, *yemen yavluq* ‘kerchief with which the henna is tied to the hand of the groom’, *yader yavluq* ‘kerchief to cover the henna bowl’, two *kol'mek* ‘shirt(s)’, *čorap bay* ‘sock suspenders’, *učkur* ‘string for fastening trousers’, *yipişli kuşak* ‘marriage belt’, *yedegi yavluq* ‘kerchief/shawl as souvenir’ (Abljamitova 2008: 25). Among the Noghays in Gebze (Turkey), the *tokuz* was given by the groomsman to the young men who accompanied the newly married couple to the house of the groom. It consisted of nine pieces, socks, handkerchiefs, towels etc. put on a table cloth (Koksal 1996: 77). In Turkish, I could not find the ‘gift’ meaning of *dokuz*, if ever existed, it has faded away.

### Abbreviation

Alt = Altay, see Radloff 1960; Baskakov – Toščakova 1947.

Ar = Arabic; see Wehr 1980.

AtH = Arat 1951.

Az = Azeri, see Orucov, Ə. et al. 2006; Tağryev et al. 2006.

BarT = Baraba Tatar, see Radloff 1960.

Bšk = Bashkir, see Ahmerov 1958.

CrK = Crimean Karaim, see Aqtay – Jankowski 2015; Baskakov et al. 1974.

CrT = Crimean Tatar, see Useinov 2008.

DobT = Dobrujan Tatar, see Karahan 2011.

DS = Derleme Sözlüğü.

ED = Clauson 1972.

- Kar = Karaim, see Baskakov et al. 1974.  
 Kirg = Kirghiz, see Judahin 1965.  
 Kklp = Karakalpak, see Baskakov 1953.  
 Krčk = Krymchak, see Rebi 2004.  
 KrčM = Karachay-Malkar, see Tavkul 2000; Tenišev – Sujunčev 1989.  
 Kum = Kumyk, see Bammatorov 1969.  
 Kum/blk = Kumyk, Balkar, see Németh 1911.  
 Kyz = Kyzyl, see Radloff 1960.  
 Kzk = Kazakh, see Koç et al. 2003; Shnitnikov 1966.  
 Nog = Noghay, see Baskakov 1963.  
 Per = Persian, see Steingass 1975.  
 R = Radloff 1960.  
 Tar = Taranchi/Uyghur, see Radloff 1960.  
 Tat = Tatar, see Ganiev 2005; Koç et al. 2003.  
 TESz = Benkő 1967.  
 Tkm = Turkmen, see Baskakov et al. 1968.  
 TMEN = Doerfer 1963–1975.  
 Tob = Tobol Tatar, see Radloff 1960.  
 TS = Tarama Sözlüğü.  
 TTIL = Ganiev 2005.  
 TTu = Turkish, see Redhouse 1974.  
 Tuv = Tuvan, see Tenišev 1968.  
 Uyg = Uyghur, see Nadžip 1968.  
 UygD = Uyghur dialects, see Jarring 1964.  
 Uzb = Uzbek, see Borovkov 1959.  
 WrMo = Written Mongolian, see Lessing 1973.  
 Yak = Yakut, see Pekarskij 1907–1930.  
 YUyg = Yellow Uyghur, see Malov 1957.

## Bibliography

- Abljamitova, L. 2008. Simboličeskie aspekty nacional'nogo krymskotatarskogo kostjuma v svadebnom obrjade: *Narodna Tvorčist' ta Etnografija*. 1/2008. 24–31.
- Ahmerov, K. Z. et al. 1958. (eds.) *Baškirsko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Aqtay, G. – Jankowski, H. 2015. *A Crimean Karaim-English Dictionary*. Poznań.
- Arat, R.R. 1951. *Edib Ahmed B. Mahmud Yükneki, Atebetü'l-hakayık*. İstanbul.
- Atalay, B. 1970. (ed.) *Abuşka Lugatı veya Çağatay sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- Bammatov, Z. Z. 1969. (ed.) *Kumyksko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A. – Toščakova, T. M. 1947. *Ojrotsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1953. (ed.) *Karakalpaksko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1963. (ed.) *Nogajsko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A., Karryev, B. A., Hamzaev, M. Ja. (eds.) 1968. *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A., Szapszał, S.M., Zajączkowski, A. 1974. (eds.) *Karaimsko – rusko – pol'skij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Benkő L. (ed.) 1967. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* I. 1967. Budapest.
- Borovkov, A. K. 1959. (ed.) *Uzbeksko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Clark, L. V. 1977. Mongol Elements in Old Turkic? *JSFOu* 75: 110–168.
- Clauson, G. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Dankoff, R., Kelly, J. 1982–1985. (ed., transl.) *Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Lugāt at-Turk)*. I–III. Harvard University.
- Derleme Sözlüğü: Türkiye'de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü I–XII*. 2. baskı. 1993. Ankara.
- Desmaisons, P. I. 1871, 1874/1970<sup>2</sup>. (ed.) *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghâzi Bèhâdour Khan*. I. Texte. II. Traduction. St.-Petersbourg.
- Doerfer, G. 1963–1975. *Die türkischen und mongolischen Elemente im Neupersischen*. I–IV. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer, G. 1967. *Türkische Elemente im Tadschikischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer, G., Tezcan, S. 1980. *Wörterbuch des Chaladsch*. Budapest.
- Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. I–II. Wiesbaden.
- Eren, H. 1999. *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- Fazylov, E. 1966, 1971. *Starouzbekskij jazyk. Horezmijskie pamjatniki XIV veka*. I–II. Taškent.

- Ganiev, F. Ä. (ed.) 2005. *Tatar Teleneñ Añlatmalı Süzlege*. Kazan.
- Golden, P. B. 2000. *The King's Dictionary. The Rasūlid Hexaglot. Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. Halasi-Kun, T., Golden, P. B., Ligeti, L., Schütz, E. (transl.), Golden, P. B., Allsen, T. (introd. essays) Golden, P. B. (ed., notes, commentary). Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- Grønbech, K. 1942. *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus*. Kopenhagen.
- Haenisch, E. 1939. *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-cha'ao pi-shi). Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Leipzig.
- Ivanics, M. 1994. Entstehung und Quellenwert der Krimtatarischen *tiyiş defters*. *AOH* 47/1–2. 105–112.
- Jarring, G. 1964. *An Eastern Turki – English Dialect Dictionary*. Lund.
- Judahin, K. K. 1965. *Kirgizsko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Karahan, S. O. 2011. *Dobruca Kırımatar Ağzı Sözlüğü / Dicționarul Graiului Tatar Dobrogean* 1–3. Köstence.
- Khabtagaeva, B. 2009. *Mongolic Elements in Tuvan*. Wiesbaden.
- Koç, K. et al. 2003. *Qazaqşa-Türükçe Sözdik*. Ankara.
- Koksal, H. 1996. Türk Dügünlerinde "Saçı" Geleneği, Buna Bağlı Ritler-Pratikler: *Bilig* 1996/1. Bahar: 75–81.
- Kołodziejczyk, D. 2011. *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th–18th Century). A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*. Brill.
- Kúnos, I. 1902. *Šejx Sulejman Efendi's Čagataj-Osmanisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest.
- Lessing, F. D. 1973. *Mongolian – English Dictionary*. Bloomington.
- Malov, S. E. 1957. *Jazyk želtyh ujugurov. Slovar' i grammatika*. Alma-Ata.
- Mostaert, A. A. 1956. Remarques sur le paragraphe 114 de l'Histoire secrète des Mongols: *Central Asiatic Journal* 1956. 2/ 1: 1–11.
- Nadeljaev et al. 1969. (eds.) *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*. Leningrad.
- Nadžip, E. N. 1968. *Ujgurso-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Németh, Gy. 1911. Kumük és balkár szójegyzék: *Keleti Szemle* 12: 91–153.
- Nişanyan, S. 2018. *Nişanyan Sözlük. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojisi*. Genişletilmiş, Gözden Geçirilmiş Yeni Basım. [s.l.]
- Orucov, Ə. et al. 2006. *Azərbaycan Dilinin İzahlı Lüğəti* I–IV. Bakı.
- Pavet de Courteille, A. 1870. *Dictionnaire turk-oriental*. Paris.
- Pekarskij, E. K. 1907–1930. *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka*. I–XIII. St. Peterburg – Leningrad.

- Pelliot, P. 1936. Sao-hua, sauya, sauryat, saguate: *T'oung Pao* 32: 230–237.
- Pomorska, M. 2013. *Materials for a Historical Dictionary of New Persian Loanwords in Old Anatolian and Ottoman Turkish from the 13th to the 16th Century*. Kraków.
- Poppe, N. 1927/1972. Das mongolische Sprachmaterial einer Leidener Handschrift: *Mongolica*. Westmead, Farnborough.
- Poppe, N. 1938–1939/1971. *Mongol'skij slovar' Muqaddimat al-Adab*. I–II. Moskva – Leningrad.
- Rachewiltz, I. de 2004. *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. Leiden – Boston.
- Rachimi, M.V. – Uspenskaja, L.V. 1954. *Tadžiksko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Radloff, W. 1960.<sup>repr.</sup> *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte. (Opyt slovarja tjurkskih narečij)*. I–IV. Pritsak, O. (intr.) Gravenhage.
- Räsänen, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk Sprachen*. Helsinki.
- Rebi, D. 2004. *Krymčakskij jazyk. Krymčaksko russkij slovar'*. Simferopol'.
- Redhouse, J. 1974. *Yeni Türkçe – İngilizce sözlük*. İstanbul.
- Schönig, C. 2000. *Mongolische Lehnwörter im Westghusischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Sevortjan, È. V. 1978. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežturkskie osnovy na bukvu «B»*. Moskva.
- Shnitnikov, B. N. 1966. *Kazakh – English Dictionary*. London – The Hague – Paris.
- Slepčova, P. A. 1972. (ed.) *Jakutsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Starostin, S. A., Dybo, A. V., Mudrak, O. A. 2003. *An Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages*. Leiden – Boston.
- Steingass, F. 1975. *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. Beirut.
- Tağıyev, M. T. et al. 2006. *Azərbaycanca Rusca Lüğət*. I–IV. Bakı. *Tarama Sözlüğü. XIII. Yüzyıldan Beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle Yazılmış Kitaplardan Toplanan Tanımlarıyla*. I–VIII. 2009. Ankara.
- Tavkul, U. 2000. *Karaçay-Malkar Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- Tenišev, E. R. 1968. (ed.) *Tuvinsko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Tenišev, E. R. 2001. (ed.) *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskih jazykov. Leksika*. 2.ed. Moskva.
- Tenišev, E. R., Sujunčev, H. I. 1989. *Karačaevo – balkarsko – russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Tezcan, S. 1997. Additional Iranian Loan-words in Early Turkic Languages: *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 7: 157–164.

- Thackston, W. M. Jr. 1993. (ed.) *Zahirüddin Muhammad Bâbur Mirza : Bâburnâme*. I–III. *Chaghatay Turkish Text with Abdul-Rahim Khankhanan's Persian translation*. Harvard University.
- Tietze, A. 2002., 2009. *Tarihi ve etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı = Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Türkei-Türkischen*. Cilt I–II. İstanbul.
- Toparlı, R. et al. 2003. *Kıpçak Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- Tuna, O. N. 1973–1975. (1976.) Osmanlıcada Mogolca Ödünç Kelimeler: *Türkiyat Mecmuası* (1973–1975) 18: 281–314.
- Ünlü, S. 2013. *Çağatay Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Konya.
- Useinov, S. M. 2008. *Qırımtatardža-Rusça-Ukraindže Luğat / Krymskotatarsko-russko-ukrainskij slovar'*. Simferopol'.
- Vámbergy, H. 1867. *Çagataische Sprachstudien*. Leipzig.
- Wehr, H. 1980<sup>REPR</sup> *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*. Ed. by J Milton Cowan. Beirut – London.
- Yüce, N. 1993. *Mukaddimetü'l-Edeb. Hıvârizm Türkçesi ile Tercümeli Şuşter Nüshası*. Ankara.

