

² & 3 \$ #
 % Keanus magnus dux Bulgariae & , ,) #
 qān (

³ % # %
 rus (% 4 & ! # hunga-
 # (5) # (

6 # vár 7 8) hungarus \$
 onugur 9 , : :) & -1- -1: &)
 5) ; <) # % % % (

álom 7 8) \$ (%) (

\$% \$ turul togril & * Almış⁴

\$ \$ (% & # % , = , >
 # & #

\$, 22? , 2: ? \$ # @0 %
 , : 2-A , : 22 & # \$% #

/ , : >B & # !
) ! C %

\$ # %& * ! #)
 , =? , , => . ⁵ #

satorlar 7 8 # sátor 7 &&&
 5 D / 5 , > , 1 , >1B , =>B
 # Hungaria et Atila @ 5 , ? : B , 2=1)
 # \$

) E & /

* , 1 % # & C D , =B?
 , =>2 ⁶ \$ F De Turcarum Nephente libri IV., quibus accedit
 commentatio de affinitate linguae Turcicae et Ungaricae&

\$) \$ ((& ⁷ D
 % # D) \$

² As e.g. *Oluptolma* or *Ed*, who are said to be of Cuman origin but allegedly lived before the Conquest of Hungary, and joined the Hungarians during the Conquest. In fact the appearance of the Cumans in the Hungarian chronicles are reflections of events in the 12th century and were anachronistically flashed back three hundred years.

³ It is possible that the diphthong was already present in the copied form.

⁴ On the Hungarian name Álmos see Ligeti (1926; 1978) and Berta (2001).

⁵ His work: *Origines et occasus Transylvanorum* was first published in Lyon in 1667, later edited by G. Schwarz as *Originum et occasuum Transilvaniae auctore Laurentio Toppeltino recensio critica etc.* in 1766. See Bárczi (1958, p. 60); Togan (1968).

⁶ On Fogel see Bárczi (1958, pp. 60–61); Kangro (1969); Lakó (1969).

⁷ See Clauser (1935), Kangro (1969, pp. 15, 31).

(E # ! \$ & G 4\$
 D ,=:> ,>>, 8 \$ % \$ \$ % & I &
 H \$ *De origine Ungrorum* ,>2=) \$ \$% &!& I
 ,>>.)⁹ #) D)
 J & J J))
 D I) 6) &
 D) & # *Vocabularium Sibiricum*
 (D ,>?>& \$ &
 (% \$% & H \$ +I
 K (L \$) # *szél* 7 8
 Myel ; () \$) /) /)
 ;) ; & #) & & *dél* D
 (% + & H G () \$
 \$ *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* & ,>B. ¹⁰
 ; (J \$) /)
 K L) (K L) 6 \$) /)
 # & \$) 72()-90()0()14()-90(#)-8()6()
 ,>=?A Dis- \$) # 6 &

15 (

)5()-79()13(&)-8015)-315.0
 58()6()-1()-158()6()-1471\$ 7 \$

& = - & * E % \$) \$
 % D 6 #) \$
 \$ & H5 # (%& , 1>> # \$
 D 6) \$ # K \$ L D 6 \$
 & # N5 \$0 % , 1B- , : , B "
 & E % K 6 ' L&
 %) ((\$%)
 \$ & K %L % % K L #
 # %) \$ K L
 # & % K %L N5 \$0 %
 %) \$ () (%&¹² * , 1=>
 # % % % % () (& #
 # & 4 ;
 # & K6 D 6 ¹³ %L G9 G
 , 1B= , 1: -)¹⁴ \$ + %& ()
 6 (% +1) # % , 121&) # %
 %) (# % , 121&) # %
 gymnasium) & # \$ KH (L , 1=1
 % & # \$ KH (L , 1=1
¹⁵ 6 (% , 1>-&
 # (K L (, 1>, N5 \$0 %
 , 1>, & , 1>,)
 N5 \$0 % # E & #
 %) \$% N5 \$0 % \$ >?. %) \$ K (L
 L (K (L) K L

¹² The best bibliography of the works of Vámbéry is Coco (1986). See also Kakuk (1971), Hazai (1976). A book in English on his life is Alder – Dalby (1979).

¹³ On the history of the term *Ugric* see Róna-Tas (1996).

¹⁴ On Budenz see Futaky (1968), Lakó (1974) and Lakó (1980) with a comprehensive bibliography of and on Budenz.

¹⁵ "Altaic" denoted then, following the usage of W. Schott, what we now would call Ural-Altaic.

)
 \$ \$, ?=
 4(\$ B. \$ & \$
 K L) \$% N5 \$0 %& N5 \$0 % %
 K L) \$% N5 \$0 %& * E
 16 N5 \$0 % (*kazmak* 7 \$))
 A) 8& (\$ qaz 7) 8
 E & (az 7
 %8& N5 \$0 % \$ (17 % (\$ qaz 7 \$ %8
 k
 E az-&
 H (; , 1>. \$ / / % (%
 & 18 % / / (%
 \$ \$ K(%L K6 %L& N5 \$0 %
 \$) \$ 6 (% , 1>.)
 & 19 \$ F , & #
 D 6) # #
 & -& #)
 ; (\$% G9 % , 12> , : ?B)
 6 (% / (5 % ; ") , 1: B
 K; (6 L 6 (% &
 * , 11B ((\$ N5 \$0 %) \$ \$ #
 N5 \$0 % , 11- + N5 \$0 % , 11-\$ & % D
 6 & # () \$ *Herkunft der Ungarn, ihre Sprache und Urkultur* , : - . A
 F , : -B
 # & #
 G @0 & 20

¹⁶ Vámbéry (1867) has the title *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, but since he could not distinguish between Chagatai and contemporary written Uzbek material, he considered both to be “Chagatai”. This mislead e.g. even Radloff, who quotes sometimes in his great dictionary written Uzbek forms as Chagatai.

¹⁷ Such doublets are of different origin. Turkic *karpuz/karbus* and *arbuz* ‘water melon’ is of Iranian origin and the initials with and without *k-* may be due to problems of substitution. See Doerfer (1967, pp. 380–381), on the feature in Mongolian see Pelliot (1944), in the Kipchak languages Halasi-Kun (1950).

¹⁸ Since the publication of the Old Turkic inscriptions of Terh and Tes we know that the Turkic name of the Khazars was *Kasar*. The hypothesis that the Khazars spoke a *z*-Turkic language was built on this ghost word (see Gombocz below). On the history of the question and the origin of the name of the Khazars see Róna-Tas (1982a; 1983).

¹⁹ Vámbéry (1914). An overview on the “Ugric–Turkic War” is Puzstay (1977).

²⁰ On Szinyei see Lakó (1986).

C 5 , 1= . , : B> ; (%) 5
 # (, 112& C 5
 &²¹ N5 \$0 %)) % C 5
 P 5 + \$, 1>> , : B2 \$ &
 + \$) # 6 (% / (5 &
 , : , ? # 6 (% , : - .)
 & # () \$ (% %) D 6
 % & # \$ <
 & #²² E (&²³
 # ; 24 (&
 % # + \$, : , - &
 + \$ % # \$, : . > , : . 1 (% &²⁵
 # \$ %
 % # , : , ?
 , : , 2 & * *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*
 + \$, : , - \$ *Mémoires de la Société*
Finno-Ougrienne (& B.) -B, & % (%
 \$ \$²⁶ \$ %
 % \$ - . \$
 \$ &²⁷ >1 (\$) \$

²¹ On Munkácsi see Kálmán (1960) with additions by J. Harmatta and M. Palló. His complete bibliography is in Oláh (1967).

²² His paper *Zur Lautgeschichte der altaischen Sprachen* (1912–1913) has been unduly neglected.

²³ He compiled a small Chuvash wordlist (1906) and published e.g. a paper on the Chuvash *praesens futurum* (1924).

²⁴ See his bibliography in Zsirai (1935). In 1907 Gombocz wrote a review on an inedited Hungarian–Turkic comparative dictionary of J. Thury. Thury (1861–1908) was for a short time (1906–1908), as successor to Vámbéry, professor of Turkology at the University of Budapest. On Thury see Kakuk (1971).

²⁵ On his later views see Gombocz (1960), his university lectures from 1930, edited by Ligeti.

²⁶ The words which Gombocz considered to be of Turkic origin and proved to be not, are the following: *agár* ‘greyhound’, *bakó* ‘hangman’, *béke* ‘peace’, *bodor* ‘curly’, *cége* ‘fish-weir’, *csihol* ‘to strike fire’, *csóka* ‘jack daw’, *csoport* ‘group’, *gyáva* ‘coward’, *igér* ‘to promise’, *kancsó* ‘jug’, *kelengye* ‘dotal gift’, *kopó* ‘foxhound’, *köd* ‘fog’, *kút* ‘well, fountain’, *öböl* ‘gulf, bosom’, *pödör* ‘to twirl’, *sajt* ‘cheese’, *szaru(fa)* ‘rafter’, *szemölcs* ‘wart’, *tűnik* ‘to vanish, to change in another form’. Most of these words have no better etymologies, but those of Gombocz cannot be accepted. Some are inner Hungarian derivations and/or onomatopoeica (*csoport*, *csihol*, *kopó*, *pödör*, *szemölcs*), some are Uralic or Finno-Ugric (*köd*, *szaru*), a few are Slavic (*agár*, *cége*), one is Iranian (*sajt*).

²⁷ This means that the word is of Turkic origin, but does not mean that the etymology or the argumentation is necessarily good, or has to be accepted without any addition, see below.

\$ + \$ ³6
 # (% +0 5 , 1: ? , : > 2 & 5
 6 (% & #) 6 (% 3 \$ #
 ³7 * E #
 5 , : = 2A , : > , A , : > - % \$ %
 # & # % #
 \$, : ? , --1 #)
 % & 3 % # %)
 (% --1 % \$ \$ ³8 %)
 \$ \$ % % 39 \$ # E
 # \$ % ! 5 R , : - ,) \$
 , : => , : 1? (&sup40 % (\$
 (& *) % % & # \$ \$
 % (\$ \$ # &sup41 & D

³⁶ See Németh (1972) which is a biography of Gombocz. The only Turkologist who tried to defend Németh's second opinion was L. Rásonyi.

³⁷ Bárczi claimed that Hungarians had contacts with Turkic people already in the time of the Ugric period, that is when the ancestors of the Hungarians, Voguls and Ostyaks lived together, see Bárczi (1952). The etymologies underpinning these contacts are unacceptable (*nyak* 'neck', *nyár* 'summer', *harang* 'bell', *hattyú* 'swan'). The word *homok* 'sand' is of Turkic origin, but pertains to the old loans of the Chuvash type. On the problem of the earliest contacts of Hungarian with the Turkic languages see Róna-Tas (1988a).

³⁸ These are *bán* (a title), *kút* 'well, fountain', *pödör* 'to curl', and *sajt* 'cheese'. His close personal friendship with L. Ligeti secured him a good access to the latest results of Turkology. An important feature of the book is the fine distinction grading the etymologies according to their certitude or well-foundedness.

³⁹ The first etymological dictionary by Florián Mátyás (in three volumes 1868–1871) is only of historical interest. The etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language written by János Melich (1872–1963), a Slavist, from 1914 until 1936 together with Gombocz and alone until 1944 reached only the first items beginning with *g-*. It contains less than a third of the Hungarian word stock but includes proper names, titles, etc. of historical importance. Some items written by Gombocz contain new data and signalled changes in his opinion.

⁴⁰ The research group has consulted Susanne Kakuk on the Turkic material. Her data and

& %
 # \$ #) & %
 \$ 4 % # & \$ (%
 \$ # & \$) # %
 % < !) #)
 & ! % < \$ -1. #)
 & * (% % % % % #
 \$ & % & % % % #
 () % & %& # (%
 % (\$) \$ ((& # %
 % ! K\$ L)) & # &
 % F &⁴⁹

3. Towards a new etymological dictionary of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin

(% % & (%
 #)) () (() %& ! & (%
 %)) ()) %) () \$ %
 4)) %
 \$ & E
) () 4 / 22-
 3) & ' 4 & \$ \$ &
) \$ \$ &
koiné /) % \$))
 \$) \$ & !

⁴⁹ Even in this very sketchy overview we must mention those scholars, who were not Hungarians, but have dealt with the Turkic loan words in Hungarian. Excluding earlier works of only historical interest, it was H. Paasonen who was among the first scholars interested in the non-Finno-Ugric words in Hungarian. The wife of Paasonen was Hungarian and he had an excellent command of Hungarian and the literature written in Hungarian. Two scholars N. Poppe and G. Doerfer made remarks which went beyond single etymologies. Their work was, however, hampered by the fact that there was no up-to-date history of the Hungarian language available to them in a non-Hungarian language. Of great value is the Turkish etymological dictionary of H. Eren (1999). Eren was a pupil of Németh and has an excellent knowledge on Hungarian linguistics. If a Turkish word has even a remote connection with a Hungarian word, this is usually mentioned in his dictionary with reference to earlier literature.

' 6 ! & 4 4) (% 4
) %) \$ & ' 4 4 \$
 &)) \$) ! (51 & * %))
 \$) H)) +) ! (; () % ()
 \$ (&) , ' & D %
 , B)) () N
 3 \$)⁵³ / , ?⁵⁴ %⁵² 4 (⁵⁵_a
 # %) ()
 & # %
 # \$ () % \$
 \$ & #) () (()
 %) * (5 /)⁵⁶ %& ()
 %) # 65 C)
 (& ! <

⁵⁰ West Old Turkic is a regional term denoting all Turkic languages which were spoken West of the Urals and the Aral Lake, in East Europe, until the end of the Old Turkic period, i.e. until the establishment of the Mongol Empire of the Chingisids. Languages of the Chuvash type were typical of this region, but we cannot exclude the existence of other non-Chuvash-type Turkic languages. A non-Chuvash-type language was spoken by the Pechenegs, who entered East Europe after clashes with the Khazars and after having occupied the former homeland of the Hungarians called *Etelkuzu*. The migration of Kipchak – Cuman and Oguz – Uz groups into East Europe can also be detected in the sources from the end of the 9th century, maybe even earlier. On West Old Turkic see Róna-Tas (1988b; 1998).

⁵¹ A good overlook on these sources is Golden (1980).

⁵² On the language of the Volga Bulghar inscriptions see Róna-Tas–Fodor (1973); Hakim-zjanov (1978); Róna-Tas (1982b); Tekin (1988); Erdal (1993).

⁵³ The decipherment of the so-called List of the Danube Bulghar Royal Princes remained unsuccessful in spite of the monography of O. Pritsak (1977). Scattered Danube Bulgharian glosses and two short inscriptions have been published by Beševliev (1963; 1979) and others.

⁵⁴ See Golden (1980) and the results of the Khazar symposium in Jerusalem 1999 (yet unpublished).

⁵⁵ There is a debate about the language of the Avars which by some scholars was considered as Mongolian, by others as Turkic, in the near past also Manchu-Tunguzian came into consideration. We have no place here to go into details of these discussions. Turkic was surely spoken among the Avars. The question is how far the Slavisation of the Avars had gone at the time when the Hungarians conquered the Carpathian Basin.

⁵⁶ Turkological remarks are scattered among others in his major work on the Old Slavic elements in Hungarian, see Kniezsa (1955).

⁵⁷ E \$ # %
) (& \$ ()
 4 4 4 % C & ()
 (% # & ' () () E
 E E
 D \$% & / , : > B &
 # # ((1)
 #) (2)
 (3) #) \$ # E
 \$% #) \$ \$% & ' (E # &
)
 \$ % &
 ; # gyöngy 7 8 S jñjü) * 4 # alma 7 8
 S alma) * # bors 7 8 S burč)
 % \$% & * K % %L (\$%
) K ; % %L () \$)
 & ' 4 , : , ,) & B- BB 4
 % \$ & \$ (& * & % E E
 \$ (E & * & % E \$ %
 \$ & ad hoc) \$ () %
 (% \$ (E \$ &
 % (E % (E & '
 ((E \$%)
 C %) % \$ \$ &
 T @ \$ &
 \$
 ! 28 & % 9 \$, : > . &²⁹

⁵⁷ See Ligeti (1966; 1975; 1977, etc.).

⁵⁸ A system of grouping the Turkic data by Ligeti has been published in the introduction of Bárczi (1941, p. XV), and can also be seen in many of the papers Ligeti published.

⁵⁹ We do not follow the system of Räsänen (1969–1971) or Severtjan (1974), who grouped the words according to their (seemingly) identical or similar outlook.

(K L (&⁶⁰ * (&⁶¹ % K L K L % % % # (&* % (% \$ \$ %) \$ # \$ E % (% \$ & # (\$ \$ \$ &))) # &* E) \$) % \$ K L) % % # S & # % () % # % % TESz) R , : =>A , : > . A , : > =A , : 1? Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen EWUng) R , : : BA , : : 2A , : : > & % (E (& # % < \$ UV 4 ((% % & K L (\$ \$ % % %))) & # (% % \$)) % \$ \$ \$) % \$ K L & 4 % (\$ (% % TESz T EWUng &* E EWUng \$ (\$ % \$ & &* C \$\$ (\$ & 6 6) & & (\$ C % (\$)) % &* & \$% () () (\$ \$ () (& 4' 6) &

⁶⁰ The selection of the “leading” sources had sometimes principal reasons, but in other cases simply practical ones.

⁶¹ This means of course only that we did not find data and not that they do not exist.

\$ \$ % (% \$
 & ;) () % \$
 # & H (# &
 \$%
 ; F C & 4 D) ! G C) G H ! D \$)
 / I \$ + I) ; I C T* \$) C
 /) * (5 N 5 % T) H P &
 \$% (&⁶²

4. Three samples from the Etymological dictionary of the Hungarian words of Turkic origin

' (\$) &
 \$) <
 \$) % #
 &

- **ács** 7 8& , ---TT WH@ *Afu* , -B. WH@ *Alchi* U F XV) , -BB H@ *Alch* U F XV) &
 , B: 2 *alch* U F XV *ács* S **agačči* Z *agač* [*čI* \ *igačči*, *agačči* &

OT *igačči* 6H FXV-2020 8 & 0) _ 0) ' 5 8 0 T fy 2 [*č* *č* (
 p22013) 034-) 062/ ([1-09 6. 2 f 8JT]) F 032- 41 (/) 61 0 2) 7 081-0 36) 0 35 96 & 4 1 (034 9 14-089 77 (03) 00

8 A *agač* 7) - A \$ I 'Q Q 8
 A NT *Chuv* *yiväs* 7 (8A *K* *agač ostasi* 7 " 8) *agas* 7 (8
) *agas oštahi* 7 " 8) *jiğaçči (usta)* 7 ") 8 /) *agašši*
 /) *agašši usta* /) *agaš ustasi, agaš usta* /) *agašši* 7 " 8 @)
agač 7 (8 ;) *agac* / #) *agač* 7 (8 /) b) *agač usta* 7 " 8
 /) *agač usta* 7 " 8 / A *O* *agačči (ussa)* 7 8) *agašči*
) *agaccilalayan* 7 8 4) *ağaççı* 7X () e " cX " (%
 cX (" cX " (f" 8 A *Kh* *hayač* 7) #)) H 8 / 3 A *T* *yo-*
goč ustasi 7 8 6 \$) *yayači, yay'ači, yay'ačči* 7) " 8
 G) *yagačči, yagašči* 7 ") 8 C 6%) *ayašči, ajšči, ayačči* 7 ")
 (\$ X 8) *ayašči* 7) A \$ 8 /) *yigašči* 7
 " 8 J 6% A *S* *agaš* 7 (8) *agas (agač-)* 7 (8 /) *agaš, ağıš* 7 8
 DJ) *iyašči* 7) " e8 () *neš neji* 7 (8) *naš, naiš* 7 (8
 / W , 1: B) & , ? : & *Y* *mas* 7 (" \$)
 f % 8) *mas uuha* 7 8 J) *mas, mäs* 7) #) ' 8 3 (X] T Q **i**

i
 00078-381.95920-TTF 10

,:,:) & ->A ,:?) & 1>):BA 5 ,:21) & >A@0 ,:=2) & 22A 3
 ,:=2) & >BA! ,:=2) & -11A R ,:=>) & :?A h h ,:=:) & >A ;
 ,: >-) & 1. A (" ,: >?) & >, A! ,: 1=) & -:1 -: : A 9
 ,: 1>I, : 11) & -, =A ,: 11) & >22A 4 ,: ,) & 1?A R ,: :B) & 2A
 ,: :2) & ->. ->? &

- **ápol** 7) & 3F ,B>-I ,??1 7 8) ,21: 7 8) ,>1? 7
 8 \ a: pol i apol Z Mop [#3N -I\ & öp 7 A
 < 8) op 7) &
 \$ &

Back vocalic verbal stem:

OT op 7 8F azū turūk suv ärsär opöyīn 7 ' 8 a) öp 7
 8 %*F, BA op 7 \$\$\$
 8F är sūw öpdi 7
 / A **MT** 6) 6J) 6#%) 6; (A D) +) op- 7 I Q 8
 ' 8 #C #bD) *C) *C) /3) /) C) @ D)
 \$) A op 7\$ 8) ; \$ öpmek 7 \$ 8) ;) ; C)
 ; ; A oparmac 7 \$ 8) opmac 7 \$ 8 ! ; ; *) op 7 \$\$\$ 8 #)
 #*)) 3) #) C+ op 7 %(f) (% (f) c f8
 %D % (öb- öp- 7 (f8) obur 7 ")X (cX 8) op
 7\$) \$ 8 ö) op 7 % 8 **ANT Chuv** vup
 7 usf& f) f X) f X f o zlyh duhah 8) vopaška 7 (8
 ; () vupär, vupkän 7 " 8A **K** up & 7 ((f" o zemle A prost& e f)
 f) f8) up 7 %(f) " (f8) opkok 7 % %) e
 (%8 /) opsor 7 čujsk. e %) e (%8 /) op 7))
 8) obir 7) \$ A (8 /) //) op- 7 %(f) " (fA
 e f) ff f(8 @) ;) op 7 cX fA cX f8 / #)
 7 Q 8 / @) () uppa 7 "8 / A **O** & op 7 ((f") f8)
 hop 7 ((f") \$((f") \$ c(f" (fX & 8) A hop 7(%
 (f" 8 A obur 7 %) 8) up 7 8 3 ; ,: >- A
 obur) hobur 7 e (%) e %A \$e A mif& \$ f) (8 + A **Kh** A
T ūp 7 (f8 6 \$) G) opqan 7 \$e) e (%8 C6% A) op
 7 (f8 J6% A **S** opčoniš 7 (f") (f" 8 A op 7(" (f) (f)
 %(fA) 8) /) op 7(" (f) (% (fA))
 8 ;) upqan 7 (8) %" e f8 A **Y** & uop) uoba 7\$ f(ili
 deržat' vo rtu X \$ (f) f e \$ f
 " A (% (f \$ () f brat' \$ (piščī) e f) f)
 e f) cX fA f o vzjatke 8 J) uobu, ōbu 7) # 8 3 &

Back vocalic nominal stem:

OT A **MT** A **NT Chuv** A **K**)) op 7(%) (" (%
 (\$" 8 /) /) /) @) op 7 8 ;) /) upay & ^

öbűw 7 " " (" 8 öpmek 7 (f8 /) / A O xopuk-7 % f
 " A f") c f") (% f) \$ " f8)) A Kh A T
 6 \$) upli 7 (% f) f8 C6%)) J6% A S) /) xoptak
 7e %) X %) e (%8 (A Y uop 7) (% (%" ()
 e (8 J) uopča 7) # 88 3 &

Front vocalic verbal stem:

OT öp 7) 8 a) öp 7 8F mün öpdi 7 h]
 8 / A öp 7 8F ol mäni öpdi 7 < \$\$ 8 / A
 MT 6) D) öp 7 8 +) öp- 7l 8 #C) öp 7 (f8
 #bD) @D) W *C) öpüş 7\$) l 8 *C*) öp 7 j8 /3) /)
 W @) C+) \$) öp 7 (f8) J; A öp 7 \$ 8
 ;) ;) öpti 7 (f8 ; C --B A öp 7 Q 8 ! ; ;) +)
 öp & #) & öpgil) öp 7\$) \$ 8 3 /) öp 7 Q 8 #)
 öp 7 Q 8 / () C+) öp 7 (f8 A öpmejik 7l Q Q 8 A
 NT Chuv A K üp 7 (f8) üp 7 (f8) öp 7 (f8 /) öp
 7 88 /) öp 7 (f) (f8 /) öp 7 (f) (f8 @ A öp
 7 (f) (f8 ; A öp 7 (f8 /) ép 7 (f8 / #) öp
 7 (f8 /) / A O öp 7 (f8) öp 7 (f) (f8
) öp 7 8) höpürdet 7 %8)) öp 7 (f8 + A Kh ep 7 Q
 8 / A T äp 7 (f8 6 \$ 3 () öp 7 (f8 !) öp 7 (f8 " \$ f8
 C6% A) J6% A S A Y &

Front vocalic nominal stem:

K öpte 7 8 / &
 C Fugu 7) <) \$ \$ < 8&
) & % & * \$ h % \$
 Mp & * & % (E
 7) 8 E \$ (& %
 7 8 ((% & D
 8& 7 8 7 (((& D
 (7 8 öpke \$ (& *
 ((C / obur
 ; (vupär, vupkän (upyr)
 & obur ((upir) H 5! () TJ 6

C) *bağa* 7" c 8 @ D) \$)) J; A *baqa*, *baqačanaq* 7)
 8 ;) ;) *baqa čanak* 7 8 ; ; A *baga* 7 8
 ! ; ; *) W #) *baka* 7 \$ - 8 #*) *qabirčaqli bağa* 7 8) *boğa*
 7 8 3) *boğa* 7D) | 8 #) / () *bağa* 7 8 C+) *bağa*
 7" c) " X 8 A *bağa*, *baha* 7 8) *bağa* 7
 \$ -) \$ - Y \$ - 8) NT **Chuv** A **K** *baka* 7" c A
) (" %" ((\$ (" (c A \$ \$ f 8
) *baqa* 7" c) 8) *mağa*, *maqa*, *bağa*, *pağa* 7" c 8 \$)
baka 7" c A & %" X (A X (" 8 /) *bağa*
 7" c 8 /) #)) *baqa* 7 88 / & /) *baqa* 7 8 /) *baqa* 7" c 8
 /) *baka* 7" c 8 @) *baqa* 7" c A " c X"8 ;) *baqa* 7" c 8
 /) *maqa* 7" c) " cX c"8 /) *baqa* 7D 8) *maq'a* 7D) / 8
 / H A **O** *gurbāğa* 7" c 7) *baqa* 7 8& 3&) *bağa* 7 \$ff " " cX
 " F " c X 8) *bağa* 7 8) *kurbağa* 7 8) *ğur bağa*
baqqa) *bağa*) *bağə*) *baqa*) *baği*) *bağğa*) *baqqa*) *bağğa*) *bağğä*) *bağğa*) *bağa* 7D 8
 /) *baqa* 7D 8 A **Kh** *bāğa* 7 | 8 / 3 A **T** *baqa* 7" c 8
 6 \$) *paqa* 7 8 G) *baqa*, *paqa* 7 8) *paqa* 7" c 8 #6%)
pağa, *paga*, *paqa* 7" c 8) *pağa*, *pağa* 7 8 /) *paqa* 7" c 8
 J6%) *pağa*, *paqa* 7" c 8 J6% C) *paqa* 7 % (%c " 8)
 J6% C A **S** *pağa*, *paqa* 7" c 8) *baka*, *paga* 7" c 8 a/) *paga*,
paga-pagalčax 7" 8 #) *mağa* 7" c 8 ; ;) *paga* 7" c 8 ()
bağa 7" c 8 A **Y** *bağa* 7" c 8 J) *baga* 7D 8 3 &

C & *baqa* 7) 8 ! &
 (\$ bāk-
 (**bak-ga* g *Mbakka* g *baka* & ; (*šapa* 7 8
 S *žaba* &
 # +@ *Begas tow* 7 8 , B, 2)
 \$ / ; & # *Byka* \$ ()
 (\$ a
 % \$ \$ % # e) **disznó, gyertya** #
 &

MN5 \$0% ,1>.) & ,B.) ,: ,?) & ,B:)) ,1>,) & >>) + \$
 ,: , -) & ?-) @0 ,: B2 ,: B:) & 2-1) h h ,: B>) & -2-) R ,: =>)
 & --: -> .) 3 ,: =>) & ?B1) ; ,: >-) & B, ,) (" ,: >1)
 & ? .) R ,: : B) & : ,) 4 9 ,: : -) & --:) D (,: : =)
 & ?B2) -...) & 2> =: &

runge ist erst später vor sich gegangen. wegen natürlicher Schwierigkeiten abzulehnen.

16. **béka** [beka JordC. 20, 21, 941 (o: *békâ*); **béka** kom Sopron, Vas, MTsz., **biéka** kom. Veszprém, NyelvFüz. XXXIV, 76; dagegen: **bika** kom. Komárom, Nyitra, Nagy-Kúnság, MTsz.] 'frosch'.

< alttschuw. *byka, vgl. osm. ZENK. kom. CCum. **baga** 'nom général des animaux batraciens', 'rana' | dsch. KÜN. kas. BÄL. baschk. KATAR. **baka** 'frosch' | koib. KATAN. **paya** | alt. VERB. **paga**, **pagan** | jak. BÖHTL. **baya** | burj. CASTR. **baka**, **baça** | mandschu. ZACH. **vakšan**, **vaksan** (=vak-šan?) id. Zu mong. b- = ma. v- vgl. mong. **barayun** 'droit, côté méridional ou occidental' = ma. **wargi** 'unterhalb, westlich, westen'. S. SCHMIDT, Journal of Peking Or. Soc. IV, 44 - 5.

Source: Gombocz, Z. (1912): *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*. Helsingfors.

Bibliography

- A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. See Benkő (1967, 1970, 1976, 1984).*
- Alder, L.– Dalby, R. (1979): *The Dervish of Windsor Castle. The Life of Arminius Vambery*. London.
- Ashmarin, (1902): *Bolgary i Čuvaši. Kazan'*. (See now the reprint Cheboksary 2000.)
- Bárczi G. (1941): *Magyar szófejtő szótár*. Budapest.
- Bárczi G. (1952): Török jövevényszavaink legrégebbi rétegének kérdéseiről. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 2, pp. 347–359.
- Bárczi G. (1958): *A magyar szókincs eredete*. ²Budapest.
- Bárczi, G. (1965): A propos des vieux mots d'emprunt turcs du proto-hongrois. *AOH* Vol. 18, pp. 47–54.
- Bárczi, G. (1971): Le traitements de š et de ž turcs dans les mots d'emprunt turc du proto-hongrois. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.): *Studia Turcica*. Budapest, pp. 39–46.
- Bárczi, G. (1972): Quelques conclusions tirées de l'étude des plus anciens mots d'emprunt turc du hongrois. *AOH* Vol. 25, pp. 383–390.
- Benkő L. (1967) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1970) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 2. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1976) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 3. Budapest.
- Benkő L. (1984) [ed.]: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. Mutató*. Vol. 4. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1993) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Vol. 1. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1995) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Vol. 2. Budapest.
- Benkő, L. (1997) [Hrsg.]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen. Register*. Vol. 3. Budapest.
- Berta, Á. (1998): On the Turcic Origin of the Names of the Hungarian Tribes. *Turkic Languages* Vol. 2, pp. 32–48.
- Berta Á. (2000a): Béka és boka. In: Piti F.–Szabados Gy. (eds): *Magyaroknak eleiről. Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendősk Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*. Szeged, pp. 57–69.
- Berta Á. (2000b): A magyar nyelv korai török jövevényszavainak törökségi hátteréhez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 97, pp. 183–195.
- Berta, Á. (2001): Álmos and táltos. *Shaman* Vol. 9, pp. 99–117.
- Beševliev, V. (1963): *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Beševliev, V. (1979): *Párvo-bálgarski nadpisi*. Sofija.
- Budenz J. (1871): Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar–török szóegyezéseiről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 10, pp. 67–135.
- Clauser, M. (1935): Fogel Márton könyvtárának jegyzéke. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 49, pp. 405–407.
- Cl uson, G. SJz5S-zFlm:CC5 .áQ?ov1x

- Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. See Benkő (1993, 1995, 1997).
- Fedotov, M. R. (1996): *Étimologičeskij slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka*. Vol. 1–2. Čeboksary.
- Fischer, J. E. (1770): De origine Ungrorum. In: *Questiones Petropolitanae*. pp. 3–40. Gottingae–Gothae.
- Fodor, S. (1973) see Róna-Tas – Fodor (1973).
- Fogarasi J. (1862) see Czuczor – Fogarasi (1862).
- Futaky, I. (1968): Budenz und Benfey. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* Vol. 40, pp. 1–2.
- Golden, P. B. (1980): *Khazar Studies. An Historico-philological Inquiry into the Origins of the tduztUhfqa*

- Halasi Kun, T. (1975): Kipchak Philology and the Turkic Loan Words in Hungarian I. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* Vol 1, pp. 155–210.
- Harmatta J. (1960): Munkácsi Bernát mint a finn-ugor–iráni kapcsolatok kutatója. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 16, pp. 392–397.
- Hazai Gy. (1976):

- Mátyás Flórián (1868–1871): *Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár-kísérlet*. Pest–Pécs.
- Munkácsi, B. (1901): Hunnische Sprachdenkmäler im Ungarischen. *Keleti Szemle* Vol. 2, pp. 186–198.
- Munkácsi B. (1902): Adalékok a magyar nyelv régi török és mongol elemeihez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 32, pp. 271–302, 369–398.
- Németh Gy. (1921): Török jövevényszavaink középső rétege. *Magyar Nyelv* Vol. 17, pp. 22–26.
- Németh Gy. (1930): *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*. Budapest.
- Németh, J. (1935–1939) [Németh Gy.]: Zur Kenntnis des geschlossenen *e* im Türkischen. In: *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum I. Ergänzungsband*. pp. 19–39, 515–531. Budapest–Leipzig.
- Németh, J. (1952) [Németh Gy.]: Die türkischen Texte des Valentin Balassa. *AOH* Vol. 2, pp. 23–61.
- Németh, J. (1955) [Németh Gy.]: Türkische Balassa-Texte in Karagöz-Spielen. *AOH* Vol. 5, pp. 175–128.
- Németh, J. (1960) [Németh Gy.], The Bibliography of the Works of — (ed. G. Uray). *AOH* Vol. 11, pp. 11–28.
- Németh, J. (1965) [Németh Gy.]: Das Zimmerhandwerk der Turko-Bulgaren im Spiegel der alttürkischen Lehnwörter der ungarischen Sprache. *AOH* Vol. 18, pp. 55–60.
- Németh, J. (1972) [Németh Gy.]: Zoltán Gombocz. Ein ungarischer Sprachforscher (1877–1935). *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* Vol. 22, pp. 1–40.
- Németh Gy. (1990): *Törökök és magyarok*. Vol. 1–2. Budapest. [Reprint edition of papers written in Hungarian.]
- Németh Gy (1991): *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*. ²Budapest. [Revised and enlarged version, ed. Berta, Á.]
- Oláh É. (1967): Munkácsi Bernát munkássága. Bibliográfia. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 24, pp. 397–413.
- Paasonen, H. (1913): A magyar nyelv régi török jövevényszavai. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 42, pp. 37–68.
- Palló M. (1960): Munkácsi Bernát jelentősége a magyar turkológiában. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei* Vol. 16, pp. 397–402.
- Palló M. (1982): *Régi török eredetű igéink*. Szeged.
- Pavet de Courteille (1870): *Dictionnaire turk-oriental*. Paris.
- Pelliot, P. (1944): Les formes avec et sans *q-* (*k-*) initial en turc et en mongol. *T'oung Pao* Vol. 37, pp. 35–72.
- Pritsak, O. (1977): *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren*. Wiesbaden.
- Pusztay J. (1977): *Az „ugor-török” háború után. Fejezetek a magyar nyelvhasználat történetéből*. Budapest.
- Radloff, W. (1893–1911): *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. Sanktpeterburg.
- Räsänen, M. (1937): Über die langen Vokale der türkischen Lehnwörter in ungarischen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 24. pp. 246–255.
- Räsänen, M. (1949): Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen. *Studia Orientalia* Vol. 15, p. 153.
- Räsänen, M. (1969–1971): *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuches der Türksprachen*. Helsinki.
- Rassadin, V. I. (2000) *see* Levitskaja – Dybo – Rassadin (2000).
- Róna-Tas A. (1970): *Az altaji nyelvrokonság vizsgálatának alapjai. A nyelvrokonság elmélete és a csuvas-mongol nyelvviszony*. Budapest. [Manuscript.]
- Róna-Tas, A. (1978): Julius Németh. Life and Work. *AOH* Vol. 32, pp. 261–284.
- Róna-Tas A. (1982a): A kazár népnévről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 84, pp. 349–380.

- Róna-Tas, A. (1982b): The Periodization and Sources of the Chuvash Linguistic History. In: Róna-Tas, A. (ed.): *Chuvash Studies*. Budapest–Wiesbaden, pp. 113–169.
- Róna-Tas A. (1983): Újabb adatok a kazár néprév történetéhez. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 85, pp. 126–133.
- Róna-Tas A. (1987/1988): Ligeti Lajos és a magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 89, pp. 211–219.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1988a): Turkic Influence on the Uralic Languages. In: Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences*. Leiden, pp. 742–780.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1988b): Problems of the East European Scripts with Special Regard to the Newly Found Inscription of Szarvas. In: *Popolo delle Steppe: Unni, Avari, Ungari, Spoleto 23–29 aprile 1987*. Spoleto, pp. 483–511.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1992) *see* Emmerick – Róna-Tas (1992).
- Róna-Tas, A. (1996): Ugor, Ogur or Ugur? Remarks on the Name “Finno-Ugrian”. In: Mészáros, E. (ed.): *Ünnepi könyv Mikola Tibor tiszteletére*. Szeged, pp. 265–269.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1998): Western Old Turkic. In: Johanson, L. (ed.): *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3–6, 1944*. Wiesbaden, pp. 619–626.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1999): *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*. Budapest–New York.
- Róna-Tas, A. (2000): Where was Khuvrat’s Bulgharia? *AOH* Vol. 53, pp. 1–22.
- Róna-Tas A. – Fodor, S. (1973): *Epigraphica Bulgarica. A volgai bolgár-török feliratok*. Szeged.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1974): *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 1. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1978): *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 2. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. (1980): *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 3. Moskva.
- Sevortjan, É. V. – Levitskaja, L. S. (1989): *Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov*. Vol. 4. Moskva.
- Stachovskij, M. (1995): Jakutisch und dolganisch *mas* ‘Baum’. *Central Asiatic Journal* Vol. 39, pp. 270–274.
- Szilágyi F. (1987): *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor élete nyomában*. Budapest.
- Szinnyei J. (1883): *A magyar nyelv eredete. Észrevételek Vámbéry Ármín „A magyarok eredete” c. művének nyelvészeti részére*. Budapest.
- Szinnyei, J. (1920): *Die Herkunft der Ungaren, ihre Sprache und Urkultur*. Berlin–Leipzig. [Second edition 1923].
- Tekin, T. (1988): *Volga bulgar kitabeleri ve Volga Bulgarcasti*. Ankara.
- Togan, G. (1968): Zur Frage nach der Herkunft und Sprache der Rumänen bei Laurentius Toppeltinus. *Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde* Vol. 11, pp. 55–58.
- Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. See Doerfer (1965; 1967).*
- Vámbéry, Á. (1867): *Čagataische Sprachstudien. Enthaltend grammatikalischen Umriss, Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch der čagataischen Sprache*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1870): Magyar és török–tatár szóegyezések. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 8, pp. 109–189.
- Vámbéry, Á. (1878): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der turko-tatarischen Sprachen. Ein Versuch zur Darstellung des Familienverhältnisses des turko-tatarischen Wortschatzes*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1882a): *A magyarok eredete. Ethnologiai tanulmány*. Budapest.
- Vámbéry, H. (1882b) [Vámbéry Á.]: *Der Ursprung der Magyaren. Eine ethnologische Studie*. Leipzig.
- Vámbéry Á. (1914): *A magyarság bölcsőjénél. A magyar–török rokonság kezdete és fejlődése*. Budapest.
- Zsirai M. (1935): Gombocz Zoltán irodalmi munkássága. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* Vol. 49, pp. 17–23.