

Boglarka Szigeti

Terzo anno di dottorato (XXXI° ciclo)

Rapporti tra bizantini e turchi - Facoltà di Lettere

Some agricultural words common to Old Turkic and Greek

Abstract:

In this paper, some agricultural words will be examined that are usually considered originally Turkic or, in any event, are encountered in Old Turkic texts, but are also present in ancient Greek in very similar forms. It is believed that the comparison of the words, ‘bull’, ‘honey’, ‘apple’ and ‘mow-‘ between Turkic and Greek has not been contemplated before.

Are these words loanwords? Which one is the recipient language? In the case of borrowings were they borrowed directly from the other tongue or is there a transmitter language acting as intermediary? Could it be coincidental that both Turkic and Greek share these words with similar form and the same meaning? In the present article, these questions will be investigated to as great an extent as possible.

Why should a comparison be made particularly between Turkic and Greek? It shall be seen that the words under investigation occur in other languages too. However, the opinion of some is that the occurrence of these words in Turkic could possibly be explained by Turkic-Greek contact in the Anatolian region.

The historical backgrounds of Ottoman Turkish (13th – 20th century) and Greek elicit a straightforward answer in this particular instance. If however the enquiry is in regard to the comparison between Old Turkic (7th – 13th century) and Greek, it is more difficult to imagine a linguistic exchange between these languages, since Turkic and Greek populations only started living in close proximity to each other in the 11th century. Despite this, they apparently started

to share some words between the 8th (see the term ‘bull’) and 11th (see the terms ‘apple’, ‘honey’ and ‘mow-‘) centuries in the same semantic field: agriculture.

Actually, in this instance, a new investigation is required. How is it even thinkable that old Turkic and Greek share common agricultural words? Why is it exceptional for Old Turkic and Greek to have agricultural words in common? It is particularly so, in the first place, due to their geographical and cultural remoteness.

In regard to agriculture, Turks had engaged in livestock farming instead of raising crops because the climate was unsuitable for the latter activity in Central Asia¹. Nonetheless, Turks have a wide terminology related to the raising of crops. Hasan Eren states that the Turks who came to Anatolia had ancient knowledge and extensive traditions in the field of cultivation. He adds that Turks did not need to learn the primary terms in this field from the local or foreign tribes in their new homeland as they already possessed these (1978:27-28). For instance, the verb *tari-*² ‘to cultivate (ground)’ is one of the oldest words in Turkic and it has many derivatives. It is shown in *Divanü Lügati’t-Türk*³, that barley and wheat were amongst the most important crops for the Turk populations during the 11th century (Kâşgarlı I: 152). In general, the quantity of food and beverages produced from these grains was extremely high (Çetin 2005:185). Turks used the word ‘wheat’ in Old Turkic⁴ even if they could not cultivate it efficiently. According to Clauson (EDPT: 312b), it is an original Turkic word, not borrowed from any other language. If this word was a part of the Old Turkic vocabulary and well documented in other Turkic languages too, it can be assumed that this word played a vital role for the Turkic people. Its first appearance was in the 8th century, but we can also assume that the Turkic language did not arise in that century but earlier, as it has a very rich vocabulary according to its texts of that period. Consequently, it can be presumed that likewise the word ‘wheat’ did not first occur in the 8th century, neither did the other agricultural terms. Turning to the original statement, Turkic people used the word ‘wheat’ although they could not cultivate it productively. This invites the question: why do they have an originally Turkic word for a

¹ It was evident that propagation was not suitable in the fields of the Turks when Kagan Kağan, the ruler of Göktürks wanted 1250 tons of wheat from the Chinese but after the seeds were sown, nothing germinated. They had to procure the wheat in harvested form from the Chinese (Koca 2002: 19).

² in Ouygh. 8th century: *tariğ tarimakta* ‘by cultivating the ground’ (EDPT: 532b)

³ It is the first comprehensive dictionary of Turkic languages written by Mahmud Kâşgarlı in the 11th century

⁴ *buğday* ‘wheat’ in Ouygh. (8th century) (EDPT: 312b).

product that they had to import? Why not import it using its foreign name? Did they do so and from whom? They were importing wheat from China, but they did not use the Chinese term for that. It would be enlightening to comprehend how they derived these terms if they were not typically a cultivating population in Central Asia, but that is a subject for another article.

It is now opportune to examine the words under consideration being ‘bull’, ‘honey’, ‘apple’ and ‘mow-’ which belong to the category of agriculture. According to documented knowledge, livestock farming was very important for the Turks and they practiced it in Central Asia hence ‘bull’ is explicable without difficulty. However, the other words belong to the category of cultivation which activity was somewhat unsuitable for their particular soil. According to the etymological dictionaries, these are originally Turkic words. How is it feasible that they had an originally Turkic word for these products when they did not cultivate them? Is it probable that they had already discovered these products before going to Central Asia and that is why they had a wide terminology for cultivation?

These words are found in Greek in very similar forms. Are these words loanwords? Which one is the recipient language? In the case of borrowings were they borrowed directly from the other tongue or is there a transmitter language acting as intermediary? Could it be coincidental that both Turkic and Greek share these words with similar form and the same meaning?

Now consider what the etymologies of these words reveal!

As far as the methodology is concerned, all the possible forms that were available at the time of writing this article will be considered and although the connection is apparently inexplicable, it is preferable to not exclude the forms in different languages from the etymology of a certain word. . In the view of some, it must be taken into account that if there is even a minimal possibility that two words are related, it will be of great value to analyze them together. Finally, regarding the method of analysis, only words with similar meanings and forms will be considered. The ‘proto’ roots of the words will be indicated but with the knowledge that the root words are constructed and hypothetical. Although the impossibility of finding the very first root of a word is apparent; an attempt to collate data regarding the comparison between the Turkic and Greek forms will still be made. Moreover, an attempt at identifying the nature of the words under investigation in the Turkic side (word of Turkic

origin, loan word, Wanderwort, etc.) and uncovering the possible transmitter languages will be undertaken.

Even though the proposed hypothesis of the etymologies of Turkic words by the literature will be discussed, the first occurrence of the Turkic word as ‘tangible’ reference for comparison, will only be taken into consideration knowing that it cannot be recognized as the first real use of a word in a language.

Etymology of ‘apple’, ‘honey’, ‘bull’, ‘mow-‘:

alma

Meaning: ‘apple’

The origin of the word:

TR *elma* ‘apple’ < OT *almıla* (same meaning) (ETIM)⁵ < PIE (EDPT: 146a; TET: 157a) and also Gre *μήλον* ‘Apfel’; Lat. *mālum*, *mēlum* (Frisk II: 226) < PIE (Dnghu: 247)

According to Greek etymological dictionaries the word *μήλον* had Greek or Indo-European origins, however, the Turkish etymological dictionary (EDPT) not only shows the Turkic version, but affirms the possible Indo-European origin.

The apple originates in Central Asia and the root of the term may be linked to the Indo-European *mal-* ‘being soft’, thus having a connection with ‘malva’ and ‘honey’.

According to EDPT it is very likely that Turkic forms have been borrowed from an Indo-European language because this plant is not native to Turkic territories (EDPT: 146a – b). However, this explanation cannot be considered for the etymology because other sources say that the apple was a significant fruit for the Old Turks and they cultivated it for an extensive period (Eren 1978:3).

⁵ Beyond the form *elma* in modern Turkish or *alma* in old sources, the form *almıla* also exists in Middle Turkic. According to Kaşgarî, this last form was used by Turks while the Oguz used *alma* (TES: 133).

In the writer's opinion, it is highly probable that the Greek and the Turkic forms have the same origin. Firstly, the forms are very similar and the meanings are identical. Secondly, it is well known that the apple has mythological and religious importance in many cultures like the Norse, the Greek and the European-Christian traditions. This fruit played a very important role in Turkish culture too (Altun 2008). If the mythological-cultural facts and the similarities between the forms of this word among different languages are taken into consideration, it is possible that this term was an international term or so-called Wanderwort in that period and was introduced into the vocabulary of many languages. If account is taken of the geographical origin of this fruit, it is not impossible to also discover the origins of the word in Central Asia, which before the expansion of Turkic peoples, was populated by Iranians, Bactrians, Sogdians, Chorasmians, Scythians, and Parthians. In this case, an Indo-Iranian origin is possible (if it is accepted that all these languages belong to the Indo-Iranian/European language group).

Which language did this word transmit into Turkic? The word was first attested in the 11th century in Turkic, more precisely in the first comprehensive dictionary of Turkic languages, in *Divan-i Lughat-it Türk* of Mahmud al-Kashgari. Turkic populations were already present in Anatolia in the vicinity of the Byzantine Greeks. As recorded, EDPT mentions possible PIE origins of the Turkic word. Based on the data available, it may be plausible that PIE language is a Greek language.

Oldest attestations in Turkic:

11th century: *almıla* 'same meaning'; *alma* in Kaşgarî, *Divan-i Lughat-it Türk*, 1073

bal

Meaning: 'honey'

The origin of the word:

**medhu* > Arm. *metr*, Gre *μέλι* ‘honey’ (Dnghu: 2033) > (?) OT *bal* ‘honey’

In the Turkological literature, there are different points of view on this word. This term is found in several Turkic languages⁶, where according to the EDAL the proto-Turkic form is Turk. **bał* ‘honey’ which has parallels in (other) Altaic languages⁷. In EDAL a Mongolian or Tunghuz-Manchu origin of the word is indicated: Mong **milaya-* ‘to smear with oil’, MMong. *maliĵa-* ‘to offer’, *mali’an* ‘service’; WMong. *milaya-*; Kh. *malā-*; Bur. *mila* ‘satiety’, *milāŋ* ‘birthday’; Kalm. *melé-*, *malī-*, *malā-* ‘to smear with oil (on occasion of birth etc.)’; TM **mala* ‘sesame oil, plant oil’ < PA **malV* (EDAL: 41; 897), however, these forms are hypothetical and demonstrate different meanings.

According to Ramstedt *bal* is an onomatopoeic term, but is also compared to the Korean *pal* ‘bee’, whose root originates in Chinese **pat* (KWb: 30b). In Kaşgarî, however, the term is returned to the Mongolian *bal* (the same sense). Another point of view is expressed in the theory that leads the term to an Indo-European matrix (TES: 34). Kaşgarî also indicates it as a Western word (EDTP: 330a). Indeed, the Indo-European forms are apparently more alike and have similar meanings. The Sanskrit form is *madhu* ‘honey’ (EDTP: 330a), Hitt. *mil-i-t* ‘honey’ (Dnghu: 2034). **mAdû* > NaIE **med^hu* - ‘honey’ > OI *madhu-* ‘honey, mead’, Av. *mađu* ‘berry wine’, D. *mud* ‘honey’ > Gre. *μέθυ* ‘wine, alcoholic drink’ > OIr, *mid* (gen. *medo*); Sl. **medь* (gen. **medu*) ‘honey’ > OCS. *медь*, *medь* ‘honey, mead’ (Dolgopolsky: 1295-6.), etc. In IE this word is very well documented⁸. However, this word is also found in Uralic languages: Finn. *mesi* ‘Honig, Met’, Est. *mesi* ‘Honig’, Mord. *med* ‘Honig’, Hun. *méz* ‘Honig’ (UEW: 273).

⁶ PTurk. **bał* honey (мед): Karakh. *bal* (MK Suvar, Kypchak, Oghuz); Tur. *bal*; Gag. *bal*; Az. *bal*; Turk. *bal*; Sal. *pal*; MTurk. *bal* (Sangl.); Uzb. *bol*; Uygh. *bal*; Krm. *bal*; Tat. *bal*; Bashk. *bal*; Kirgh. *bal*; Kaz. *bal*; KBalk. *bal*; KKalp. *bal*, *pal*; Kum. *bal*; Nogh. *bal*; Khak. *pal*; Shr. *pal*; Chuv. *pil* (EDAL: 898).

⁷ There are debates on the classification of Turkic languages as Altaic languages in the literature, however that question is not the topic of this article. For opinions on the ‘Altaic language family’ see ex. Anna V. Dybo, Oleg A. Mudrak, Nicholas Poppe G. J. Ramstedt, George Starostin. Talat Tekin, etc. For different views: Gerard Clauson, Gerard Doerfer, Juha Janhunen, Alexander Shcherbak. Joseph Greenberg, Lars Johanson, etc.

⁸ For further forms see: Dolgopolsky: 1295-6.

What is possible to extract from the linguistic picture is that two main “groups” of the word ‘honey’ evolved. One group is that where the final consonant is *-l* (mainly Altaic languages including Turkic, some IE languages such as Hittite, Greek and Latin), the other is that where the final consonant is *-D* (*-d, -t >/< -δ, -z, -s*) (mainly Uralic languages and some IE languages such as Avestian, Old Indian, Dravidian, Greek, Slavic languages, etc.). According to Dnghu, two roots exist for ‘honey’: *meli-t* and *médhu*, and the second root derives from *mel-* ‘to grind, hit; fine, ground’ (2033).

The Turkic forms seem to be more related to the IE forms. It is also plausible that Turkic has a close connection with Gre *μέλι* due to the final *-l*. However, EDTP indicates the Latin *mel* form as the closest form to the Turkic (330a), *mellis* (**melnés*) ‘honey’ (Dnghu: 2033). Among IE, the Hittite *mil-i-t* ‘honey’ (Dnghu: 2034) form can be related as well. The Turkic *bal* form was probably derived in a period of time when *m-* was unacceptable as the initial sound and for this reason was replaced with *b-* (EDTP: 330a).

The Oghuz were in the Balkans in the 7th century according to Byzantine sources. Is it possible that they learned the word directly from Byzantine Greeks and transmitted it to the Kipchaks too? If the geographical proximity and the first attestation of the Turkic word (11th century) are taken into account, this explanation seems correct; however, the other forms in the above mentioned languages should be noted. Generally speaking, this word appears to be widely distributed amongst Altaic (if their relationship is accepted), Indo-European and Uralic languages. It probably could be defined as a Wanderwort. If all the forms are accepted as those related to the Turkic version of the words, it would mean that they all have the same root, which could be the Indo-European form and not necessarily implying a Greek origin of the Turkic form. In any event, it is likely that the Greek and the Turkic word are related and have the same origin.

An attempt to discover the transmitter language is now necessary. As far as the honey-maker bee is concerned, this figure was considered a sacred being throughout

the Indian, Ancient Near East and Aegean cultures. That means, it is absolutely reasonable to assume that words related to the bee cult, could easily enter diverse languages of the surrounding populations, hence also Turkic. Bee-worship spread out amongst the Ancient Greeks (see the Minoan-Mycenaean “Mistress” and the Melissa-priestesses) too. The first attestation of the Turkic *bal* is in the 11th century. We know that Turkic populations had already entered Anatolia, so that it cannot be excluded based on the data that the word entered directly from Greek into a Turkic language, maybe directly into Oghuz.

Oldest attestations in Turkic:

11th century: Kaşgarî: Divan-i Lügat-it Türk, II: 267, 354

boğa

Meaning: ‘bull’

The origin of the word:

1.) Gre

Gre *βοῦς* ‘Rind, Kuch, Ochse’ borrowed from Sumer < Sux. *gu*, **gud* ‘Stier, Rind’ (Frisk: 260-61); other forms: Lat. *bōs*, Ir. *bo* ‘cow’ (EG: 36);

2.) Turk

This word is one of the oldest attested in Turkic and is very well documented in Turkic languages.⁹ TR *boğa* ‘damızlık erkek sığır’ (TET: 364b) < OT *buka* ‘bull’ (EDPT: 312a). In EDAL the word originates from Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguz. Turk **būka* ‘bull’; Mong **mok* ‘2-year-old male deer; penis’: TM **muxa-* ‘man, male’ < PA **mūk’o* (EDAL: 42).

⁹ PT **būka* ‘bull’: OT *buqa* (Orkh., OUygh.); Karakh. *buqa* (MK, KB); Gag. *buğa, bua*; Az. *buğa*; Turkm. *buğa*; MTr. *buğa*; Uzb. *buqa*; Uygh. *buğa, buqa*; Krm. *buğa*; Tat. *buğa*; Bashk. *buğa*; Kirgh. *buqa*; Kaz. *buqa*; KBalk. *buğa*; KKalp. *buğa*; Kum. *buğa*; Nogh. *buğa*; SUygh. *puqa*; Khak. *puğa*; Oyr. *buğa*; Tof. *buxa*; Yak. *buga* (EDAL: 951).

The KKLTL indicates that this is a common word: Gre *βοας* ~ Turk *boa* (KKLTL: 19).

OT *bogra/bugra* ‘male animal, especially camel’. Slav A. *byku* ‘bull’, Celtic languages *bukko*, Avesta (Zend) *būza-* ‘goat’, Hun *bika* ‘bull’; Eng *buck* ‘goat, male deer’ < PIE **bhugo-* ‘double male ungulate’ (ETIM).

This word exists in several languages in similar forms, supposedly with the same origin. The worship of the sacred bull is very widespread throughout the ancient world. The bull was regarded as a sacred animal in Anatolia and in the Near East since the Stone Age, and in Mesopotamia, the bull represented a lunar divine figure, also worshiped by other cultures in Egypt, East Anatolia, Crete, Indo Valley, Greece, etc. It is well-known that the bull is also a very important figure in Greek mythology (Cretan Bull, Zeus in the form of the bull, Hera's epithet Bo-opis ‘ox-eyed’, etc.).

It was also a very significant symbol for the Turks. In the Turk, Mongol and Altaic myths there is a god, called Udu Ata who is in the shape of a bull (TSS: 768). Since the worship of the bull was widespread, the word could circulate among the people and reach the Turks (or vice-versa).

Where does the Turkic ‘bull’ derive from? The Oghuz used the term ‘bull’ as an ethnonym (see *öküz*¹⁰). It is known that this term is present in several Turkic and also in Altaic languages. In Turkic the term is among the earliest attestations. These facts

¹⁰ Theories on the origin of the word are different. According to the Turcologists such as Ramstedt (1957: 18, 103-104) and P. Pelliot (1920), the word derives from an Altaic language in the form *pökür*. According to Clauson OT *öküz* ‘ox’ < was probably lent to the Tocharian tongue in the form of *okso*; in the l/r Turkic languages the form is *öker* (EDPT: 120a) < **bökür/pökür* (Bayat: 73) < PIE **peku-*; other forms ancient Hindi *peśu*, Lat. *pecu*, *pecus*. Mid. Tr. *öküz*; old Kipciak *öküz* (TES: 314b). Munkácsi compares it with other Indo-European forms like Sansk. *ukṣā*, Avesta *uxša* and even Pedersen pointed out that the word had an Indo-European root. Other scholars like Gombocz have linked the term to Mongolian *üker* and to the Hungarian form *ökör* (TES: 315).

Some Turcologists have linked the *oguz* name to the term *öküz* (see Aristov 1896; Sinor 1950:5; Ercilasun 1988: 69-89). Other Turcologists presumed that the Oghuz had a belief system in which God was a lunar god in the shape of a bull (in Turkish *öküz*) (see Bayat 1993; Tanrıverdi 1999). This word would be derived from the root *ok* (the name of their tribe) and *oguz* would be another derivative of the same root as the name of the people (Bayat: 72). According to Berta the root of *öküz* is Turkic and not Indo-European. He says that the final base in the ancient Turkish is **pök +kVr-* and this form, the re-constructible form is **pökkVr-*. For the Mid. Tr. form: from **pök+kVr-* verb + *-(X)z* suffix **pökkVr-(X)z > *pökkXz > *pökXz*. (Berta 2001: 178-181). In the opinion of the writer it is possible that all the above mentioned forms of this word should be considered for the etymology of Turkic *öküz*. Is it possible that the Turkic form is the original and the Tocharian acquired the Turkic form? The bull figure occurs many times in Turkic mythology, so it seems that this figure was significant for Turkic people hence the relationship between the ethnonym *oguz* and the word *öküz* is not excluded. If this relationship is considerable, it implies the likelihood that one of the oldest sources of *ox* has to be searched for in a Turkic language. Oldest attestations 9th century: Irk Bitig: éki öküzüg bir bugursıka kölmiş (EDPT: 120a).

imply that the term could be of Turkic or Altaic origin. However, it is also known that the same term exists in IE languages as well. According to Frisk, the Greek form is a loanword from Sumerian. Based on the data, it is possible to assume that the final root of the Turkic term is Sumerian, while the transmitter language could be some Anatolian or Iranian languages, since a significant proportion of the terms for domestic animals in Turkish originated from Iranian languages.

In this case, the Greek and Turkic forms both derive from the same final root, but they did not directly transmit this term into each other's language.

Obviously it should be remembered that these are only hypotheses. The only 'tangible' data is the first occurrence of the Turkic word from the Turkic side, and the abundance of data in the above listed languages.

Oldest attestations in Turkic:

8th century: *bukası aşnu ünüp* 'his bull came out first and' in Orkhon Inscriptions (EDPT: 312a)

8th century: *boyun yal bedüttün buka teğ kılıp* 'you have made your neck and the back of your neck bigger like a bull's' in KB (EDPT: 312a)

or-

Meaning: 'to mow (grass), to harvest (crops)'

The origin of the word:

- 1.) Gre *ἀρόω* 'pflügen, ackern, pflanzen, bauen' (Frisk 1960: 147) < PIE (Chantraine 1968: 113b). See also Gk. *ἄρουρα* 'arable land'. Other IE forms: IE **aro-* and **arə-*; Toch. *āre*; Arm. *araur* 'plow'; Lat. *arō, -āre* 'to till, plow, farm, cultivate'; M.Ir. *airim* 'to plough', Welsh *arddu* 'to plough' and maybe **ar-*, (*a*)*re-*, *arə-*, *rē-*, *rēi-* 'to move, pass' is also related (Dnghu: 168-174).
- 2.) Turk *or-* 'to mow (grass, etc.), to reap (crops)' (EDT: 194b); other etymological dictionaries indicate the term *or-* as originally Turkic (Nişanyan; ETIM; TDK) < OT

or- ‘to cut’ (TES: 308) < PT **or-* (EDAL: 1063) but the term *-örV* ‘to mow, hay’ exists in Tung **orā-hta* as well; other derivations: *orak* < OT *orğak* ‘a tool to cut the grass’ < OT *or-* ‘tagliare’ +*gAk*; *oran*: OT *orum* ‘cut’ < OT *or-* ‘to cut’

In Greek, the term is derived from Indo-European but an Indo-European root is not mentioned for the Turkic forms. In the literature, these two words are not considered to be related, but since the meaning and form are similar, the possibility of a common root is not entirely excluded.

The existing knowledge about the cultivation habits of Turks –though there are very few works in this field – is that they had already been raising many crops (wheat, barley, rice, and millet) before moving to Anatolia (for this view see Eren 1978:3-6). It implies that they had already known the propagation terms as well – amongst them the term *or-* ‘to mow’. Moreover, according to the above mentioned dictionaries, this term is a very old original Turkic word.

However, according to Eremeev, the Turks learned about propagation in Anatolia from other populations like Rums, Armenians and Kurdish people and also learned the propagation terms in conjunction with the technics and tools (1971: 233). If Eremeev is correct, it is also possible that the Turks learned this term directly from Byzantine Greeks. This assumption is confirmed by the first occurrence of the word in Turkic as well (11th century).

Oldest attestations in Turkic:

11th century: *bir orum ot* ‘erba tagliata’ in Kaşgarî, *Divan-i Lugati't-Türk*, 1073

Conclusion:

As is observed, all terms examined in this article are etymologically problematic at least from the Turkic point of view. 'Bull' and 'mow-' are considered originally Turkic words while the root of 'honey' in Turkic is uncertain. Only the term 'apple' seems to have a certain origin. It can be seen that these words are found in Greek in very similar forms. Analysing the vocabulary it can be said that, generally, the common words between Greek and Turkic are words adapted and assimilated to the rules of the language and their meanings have not been modified, having remained the same for centuries. These words have not changed, or have only been slightly changed in Turkic. It can, therefore be stated that their form is resistant to change. The fact that these are resistant words in both languages makes the analysis more difficult and raises other questions, including the true linguistic origin of these terms, leading one to query the derivation from Greek, Turkic, or some other common language to the previous ones. At this point, it would be very difficult to make a clear statement about the manner and direction in which these words were introduced in those languages. The examined words are important cultural words and they seem to be internationally known in that period. Every word encountered mainly in Anatolia, might have traversed through the peoples of these areas, entering their languages. However, it must be remembered that the Turks had wide agricultural terminology and they probably did not need to borrow very much vocabulary including the examined words, from other languages. In this case, it could be assumed that they had already encountered these crops before going to Central Asia and that is why they had wide propagation terminology. According to some theories, Turks already existed in 3500 BC, and lived in the Near East (for these views see Korkmaz 2010: 34-37). Therefore, it would not be surprising that their language also has an extensive history. Orkhon and Yenisei Inscriptions demonstrate very rich vocabulary and very complicated grammatical structure in the Göktürks' language (Korkmaz 2010: 34), so that one could assume that the age of the language has to be quite old. In this case, it is also possible to speculate that the examined words originate from a Turkic language. Unfortunately, this hypothesis remains a hypothesis until the opportunity to collect concrete evidence for this arises.

Abbreviations:

Names of languages, language groups and language families:

Arm: Armenian

Av = Avestan

Az: Azerbaijani

Bur: Buryat

Bashk: Bashkir

Chv: Chuvash

Eng: English

Est: Estonian

Finn: Finnish

Gag: Gagauz

Gre: Greek

Hitt: Hittite

Hun: Hungarian

Ir: Irish

Karakh: Karakhanide Turkic

Kaz: Kazakh

KBalk: Karachay-Balkar

Kalm: Kalmyk

Kh: Khalkha

Khak: Khakas

Kirgh: Kirghiz

KKalp: Kara-Kalpak

Krm: Karaim

Kum: Kумыk

Lat: Latin

MMong: Middle Mongol
Mord: Mordvin
MTr: Middle Turkish
NaIE: Narrow IE (IE languages except Hittite- Luwian)
Nogh: Noghay language
OCS: Old Church Slavonic
OI: Old Indian
OIr: Old Irish
Orkh: Orkhon Old Turkic
OT: Old Turkic
Ouygh: Old Uyghur
Oyr: Oyrot (Mountain Altai)
PA: Proto-Altaic
PIE: Proto-Indo-European
PT: Proto-Turkish
Sansk: Sanskrit language
Sl: Slavic
Sux: Sumer
SUygh. - Sary-Uyghur
Tat: Tatar
TM: Tungus-Manchu
Tof: Tofalar
TR: Turkish
Tung: Tungus
Turk: Turkic
Turkm: Turkmen
Uyg: Uyghur
Uzb: Uzbek

WMong: West Mongol

Yak: Yakut language

Titles of works:

Dnghu Adsoqiation - Indo-European Language Association (2007): *Proto-Indo-European Etymological Dictionary*, A Revised Edition of Julius Pokorny's Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, <<http://dnghu.org/>>[latest viewing: 11/10/2017]

EDAL: Starostin, S. A.; Dybo, A. V.; Mudrak, O. A. (2003), *An Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages*, Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch Der Orientalistik - Part 8: Uralic & Central Asian, Section 8 Uralic & Central Asia Studies, Leiden

ETIM: <http://www.etimolojiturkce.com/>

ETYM: <http://www.etymonline.com/>

EDPT: Clauson, Gerard (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary Of Pre- Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Ely House, Glasgow, New York, Toronto

EG: Wharton, E. R. (1890). *Etyma Graeca, An etymological lexicon of classical Greek*, London

Kâşgarli: Atalay, B. (1939), *Dîvânu Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi*, I. Ankara

KB: Kutadgu Bilig

KWb: Ramstedt, G.J. (1935). *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 3., Helsinki

KKLTL: Millas, H. (2008). *Κατάλογος Κοινών Ελληνικών και Τουρκικών Λέξεων, Εκφράσεων και Παροιμιών*. Athen

TDK: Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü < <http://www.tdk.gov.tr/>>

TES: Eren, H. (1999). *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*, Ankara

TET: Tietze, A. (2002). *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati*. Istanbul-Wien

TSS: Karakurt, D. (2011). *Türk Mitoloji Ansiklopedisi. Türk Söylence Sözlüğü*. "Türk Söylence Sözlüğü"nün Ansiklopedik Versiyonudur.

<http://www.academia.edu/11557648/T%C3%BCrk_Mitoloji_Ansiklopedisi_Deniz_Karakurt_> [latest viewing: 06/08/2018]

UEW: Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, ed.: K. Rèdei; Budapest, 1986-91.

Bibliography:

Altun, I. (2008), *Türk halk kültüründe elma* in Turkish Studies International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 3/5 Fall

Aristov N.A. (1896), *Ethnic structure of Türkic tribes and nations and information on their numbers*. Olden time alive, Issue 3-4, 1896

Bayat, F., *Oğuz Kelimesinin Etimolojisi. Uz ~ Ğuz ~ Oğuz Kavim adının etimolojisi* <http://www.karam.org.tr/Makaleler/790182865_bayat.pdf> [latest viewing: 06/08/2018]

(1993): *Oğuz Epik Ananesi ve Oğuz Kağan Dastanı*, Baku

Berta, Á. (2001), *A magyar nyelv korai török jövevényszavainak törökségi hátteréhez II* in Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 98. 175–185.

Chantraine, P. (1968), *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris

Çetin, E. (2005), *Divanü Lügati't-türk'teki yiyecek içecek adlari ve bu Adlariin türkiye türkçesindeki görünümüleri* in Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Cilt 14, Sayı 2, 185-200

Eski türkçedeki insan yapımı nesne adlarında ödünclemeler üzerine, <<http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/ESKI%20TURK%20DILI/engin.pdf>>, [latest viewing: 16/10/2017]

Eremeev, D. E. (1971), *Etnogenez Turok: proiskhozhdenie i osnovnye etapy ethicheskoi istorii*, Moskva, 1971

Eren, H. (1978), *Türklerde ekinciliğin gelişmesine katkılar*, I. Ulusal Türkoloji Kongresi, İstanbul

Ercilasun, A. B. (1988), *Dede Korkut Kitabı ile Oğuz Destanı Arasındaki Münasebetler*, TDAY –Belleten, TDK Yay., 69-89., Ankara

Dolgopolsky, A. (2008), *Nostratic Dictionary*. Cambridge

Frisk, H. (1960), *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1960.

Koca, S. (2002), *Eski Türklerde Sosyal ve Ekonomik Hayat* in Türkler/ 3. İlkçağ

Korkmaz, Z. (2010), *Oğuz Türkçesinin tarihi gelişme süreçleri* in Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 5/1 Winter.

Nişanyan, S., *Sözlerin Soyağacı. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojik Sözlüğü* in <www.nisanyansozluk.com> [latest viewing: 14/09/2017]

Pelliot, P. (1920), *A Propos des Comans* in Journal Asiatique, XV. Paris.

Sinor, D. (1950), *Oğuz Kağan Destanı Üzerine Bazı Mülâhazalar* in Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi, çev. Ahmet Ateş, IV/1-2, İstanbul, 1-13.

Ramstedt: Lautlehre - Ramstedt, G.J (1957), *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft. I. Lautlehre*, MSFOu 104, 1, Helsinki