

FILIP DE DECKER
Universiteit Gent
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

ETYMOLOGICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE ⟨PG⟩ AND ⟨PG?⟩ VOCABULARY IN ROBERT BEEKES'S ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF GREEK: N

Keywords: substrate, inherited lexicon, Indo-European phonology, Greek

Abstract

This article presents an etymological case study on Pre-Greek (PG): it analyzes about 20 words starting with the letter *N* that have been catalogued as ⟨PG⟩ or ⟨PG?⟩ in the new *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (EDG), but for which alternative explanations are equally possible or more likely. The article starts by discussing the Leiden etymological dictionaries series, then discusses the EDG and the concept of PG and then analyzes the individual words. This analysis is performed by giving an overview of the most important earlier suggestions and contrasting it with the arguments used to catalogue the word as PG. In the process, several issues of Indo-European phonology (such as the phoneme inventory and sound laws) will be discussed.

1. General observations on the EGD and the Leiden etymological dictionaries series¹

The Leiden etymological dictionaries series intends to replace Pokorny (1959), no longer up-to-date in matters of phonology and morphology, by publishing separate etymological dictionaries of every Indo-European language (Beekes 1998). While an update of Pokorny is necessary, some remarks need to be made. First, most etymological

¹ For a (scathing) assessment of the Series, see Vine (2012) and Meissner (2014). For a detailed discussion of the EDG, the reader is referred to Meissner (2014).

dictionaries in the series only discuss the inherited lexicon and words that are considered borrowings are left out. As no language has only inherited words, excluding the (allegedly) borrowed words makes the etymological dictionary incomplete. Moreover, what is a borrowing for one scholar, could be inherited according to another. This does not apply to the EDG, as it wants to analyze as many words as possible as foreign (cf. *infra*). Second, the basis for the reconstruction is the Leiden view of Indo-European, which differs in a number of aspects from other scholars and from the *communis opinio*, the most famous one being the denial of a phoneme *a. This is not a problem in itself, because the generally accepted opinion is not necessarily correct, but given the fact that these dictionaries are meant to be used by a broad audience, it should be stated clearly that the opinions used are not mainstream. This is not the case, however: the Leiden view is presented as if it were scientific fact. Third, the dictionaries are prepared in a relatively short period of time. The authors are not to be blamed for this, but this inevitably influences the work (see Meissner 2014: 26 and [especially] Vine 2012). A fourth observation involves the EDG itself. A new etymological dictionary of Greek was needed, because Frisk deliberately refused to use laryngeals in his reconstructions and Chantraine focused on the *histoire des mots* and less on the reconstruction (there is a 1999 update of Chantraine and additional etymological observations are being published in the *Cahiers d'étymologie grecque* in the journal *Revue de Philologie*, but they cannot act as a new dictionary) (Frisk 1960: v–vi). Frisk and Chantraine could not yet make use of the Mycenaean evidence to the fullest extent, as the Mycenaeanology was still *in statu nascendi*. It is then all the more surprising and disappointing that Beekes stated that he would not systematically use material from inscriptions and Mycenaean Greek (Meissner 2014: 2–3). As such, the EDG is incomplete in this respect. A fifth and last observation does not only apply to the Leiden Series, but also to works such as the LIV, NIL, older etymological dictionaries and to reconstructions in general: what makes a good Indo-European etymology?² How many attestations are needed to guarantee that a word can be reconstructed for PIE? Which languages provide conclusive evidence? In particular, the question is if a word attested in European languages alone or a word only attested in Greek and Indo-Iranian is enough to posit Indo-European heritage.³ The close relationship between Greek and Indo-Iranian had been noted before (Kern 1858: 272–274, especially 274: „das griechische fast wie ein arischer dialekt“; Grassmann 1863a: 85, 94, 109, 1863b: 119; Sonne 1863: 273; they are also mentioned in Bonfante 1976: 92; Euler 1979, 1980; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995: 794–795), but was (and is) mostly interpreted as being the result of the loss of inherited features in the other languages. One can always argue that all the other languages lost a specific word (and *argumenta e silentio*

² Kroonen (2013) is an exception to this, as he distinguished between North-European, European and Indo-European etymologies.

³ These questions are not new. Already Fick, writing before the discovery of Hittite and Tocharian, distinguished between European languages and Indo-Iranian (see the subtitles in his two works: Fick 1876, 1890). Meillet (1910: 17–23) introduced the term *le vocabulaire du nordouest*, see Porzig (1950) who distinguished between vocabulary of the East and the West, and Oettinger (1997, 2003) who discussed the *Nordwestindogermanisch*.

remain somewhat problematic), but, following Mallory and Adams (2006: 107–111), we would reconstruct a common PIE word only if there are attestations in an Eastern and a Western language, if not only Greek and Indo-Iranian have the word or if Hittite and another language have the word.

2. The notion “Pre-Greek” and the EDG⁴

The EDG stresses the presence of a large number of words of non-Indo-European origin in the Greek lexicon. This had been noted before (Kretschmer 1896: 401–410; Schwyzler 1939: 58–63). See also Chantraine (1933 *passim*).⁵ When the (Proto-)Greeks arrived in Greece, other peoples were already living there, speaking their languages (plural). Given the fact the Greeks arrived in a new region with new fauna and flora and came into contact with cultures that might have been superior to theirs, it is expected that many words of technical and/or fauna and flora were taken over, which explains why so many words with those meanings were not found outside Greek. Later during their history, when the Greeks came into contact with other cultures from the East, they continued to borrow words. In this respect, we agree with Beekes that many words in Greek are not inherited. What is more problematic, however, is his assumption that the vast majority of borrowings came from a single non-Indo-European language which he called “Pre-Greek”. We believe that there are some issues to be raised about this.⁶ First of all, there is the method. In order to reconstruct this language, Beekes started from the words without Indo-European etymology and tried to account for the phonetic differences found in semantically similar words (or in words he considered to be semantically close). In doing so, he built on Furnée (1972) and assumed that any word that was non inherited was PG unless it could be shown that it had another origin.⁷ As Furnée’s work was met with skepticism,⁸ Beekes tried to rehabilitate the Pre-Greek theory pointing out that the assumptions of this theory were solid (Beekes 2014: 2 “his [i.e. Furnée’s, FDD] method, however, was sound”). We believe that this is an *ad obscurum per obscurius*. Beekes started from words without an established etymology (which is sometimes just a matter of personal opinion). He then took words that differed in form and

⁴ Beekes expanded this in Beekes (2014), a book dedicated to the PG phonology, morphology and lexicon.

⁵ According to Morpurgo Davies (quoted in Hajnal 2005: 193 and Meissner 2014: 6), only 40% of the Greek vocabulary is inherited.

⁶ In-depth and critical observations on PG can be found in Verhasselt (2009a [in Dutch], 2009b, 2011) and De Decker (2015 = review of Beekes 2014). For a general discussion on the non-Indo-European elements and borrowings in Greek, see Hajnal (2005).

⁷ This is stated explicitly in Beekes (2014: 45): “however, I think that it is methodologically more sound to start from the assumption that non-Greek words are Pre-Greek. Only when there is reason to do so should we assume that they have a different origin” (underlining is ours).

⁸ Furnée’s work was not just met with criticism; most reviews pointed out both negative and positive elements. We refer especially to Heubeck (1974: 277), who described the work as follows: “seine Arbeitsleistung – ... – ist bewunderenswert”.

sometimes also in meaning. These words were often found in different writers of different periods. And from the differences in those words, he tried to derive the phonemic system of a language that allegedly provided all these words but that had left no traces whatsoever. Secondly, it is unclear to us why most of these words would have been borrowed from one and the same language.⁹ Thirdly, the words are attested in a number of different authors and dialects, and in lexica. This poses a time-depth problem, because in order to “qualify” for PG, they would all have to be borrowed at the earliest stage of Greek (when PG still existed), but this is by no means certain.¹⁰ If a word is only attested in a lexicon of the 3rd century AD or even in the Byzantine period, it is possible that the word was borrowed at that period. In addition, the question of the reliability of the lexica needs to be raised as well (although this is not a remark that applies to the PG question alone). Fourthly, when an IE etymology and a PG origin could both be possible, Beekes preferred a PG origin, but it is unclear why that would be the case. Fifthly, it is not because most of the words referring to technical objects and plant names are of non-Indo-European origin, that they are all of non-IE origin. Sixthly, it is possible that Greeks borrowed words from other Indo-European languages in the area (be this called Pelasgian or not) (Georgiev 1941, 1945; Van Windekens 1960; Sakellariou 1976), but this does not mean that all words are borrowed from that language (as was argued by Georgiev 1941: 162). The seventh observation involves the reconstruction of PG itself. What constitutes a PG word? Beekes (2010: xxiii, 2014: 13) claimed that this could be stated *relatively easy*, namely the absence of an Indo-European etymology and one of the criteria mentioned below. Besides the fact that accepting an IE etymology is sometimes a matter of personal conviction (Meissner 2014: 8), the variations adduced by Beekes raise eyebrows. We list some of the features that are allegedly the result of Pre-Greek sounds:¹¹

- a) an *m* can be alternate with another labial;
- b) a single vowel can appear a diphthong with *w* sound;
- c) a word can have a nasal infix or not;
- d) a plosive can appear as voiced, voiceless or aspirated;
- e) a word initial or intervocalic *s* can appear or not;
- f) an *s* can precede a consonant or follow it, examples are *ps* and *sp*, *ks* and *sk*;
- g) a dental can alternate with a liquid;
- h) a dental at the beginning can appear or not;
- i) a velar at the beginning of a word can appear or not.

⁹ This had been noted already by Verhasselt (2011: 279): “the wide geographical distribution of the Aegean substratum, however, makes a linguistically diverse continuum (perhaps even comprising IE elements) more plausible” and by Meissner (2014: 6–7): “Das Schwierigste hierbei ist wohl die Annahme selber: hierbei wird versucht, eine Sprache aufgrund von aus dem idg. Erbe des griechischen nicht verständlichen Teilen des griechischen Wortschatzes zu rekonstruieren, wobei weder klar noch naheliegend ist, daß es sich hier um *eine* Sprache gehandelt haben muß”.

¹⁰ Hajnal (2005: 194): „bei naher Analyse erweist sich der Fremdeinfluss auf das griechische Lexikon und die Toponymie zwar als quantitativ erheblich, aber eben auch als als geographisch und chronologisch heterogen“ (underlining is ours); Verhasselt (2009b).

¹¹ This list is not exhaustive. We refer for a more detailed criticism to De Decker (2015: §3.13).

The author argued that it is not surprising that such variations occurred, since “we cannot predict how a Pre-Greek form will appear in Greek” (Beekes 2010: xvii, 2014: 5). As Pre-Greek was a non-Indo-European language, the Greeks needed to adapt the individual sounds and clusters from that language with a different inventory to their own phonemic system. While it is true that Greek might not have had all features of the Mediterranean languages, Beekes’s classification is in our opinion more than problematic: it allows for almost any variation,¹² it excludes falsification and enables to connect words that have no clear link and have them catalogued as Pre-Greek. In addition, Beekes assumed that certain suffixes proved PG origin. Even if PG did provide suffixes that were taken over by the Greek language (which is not certain at all),¹³ it is still possible that these suffixes became productive and that they were added to inherited words as well. Beekes also argued that certain endings, such as a feminine nominative singular in short *a* or in *eús*, were indicative of PG, but these endings can be explained otherwise and also appear in words that are clearly inherited.

Beekes is right that one should not be trying to find an Indo-European etymology for each Greek word, but we do not think that finding words that could be of Mediterranean origin should be a goal per se. As was the case with earlier attempts to find large volumes of Semitic or Afro-Asiatic words in Greek, the PG theory seems overzealous to find words that confirm the theory. The objective should be to provide etymologies for each word and in our opinion, a borrowing or non-Indo-European origin should only be considered if all other options are excluded. As a result, not all borrowing suggestions made by Lewy, Bernal, Furnée or Beekes are wrong, but some caution is needed.¹⁴

3. Our approach

In this article, we have taken about 15 words starting with an *n* that were catalogued as <PG> or <PG?> in the EDG, but for which an alternative explanation might have been possible. It was not our intention to analyze all of them nor to rewrite the entire dictionary. We gave an overview of previous scholarship, i.e. (the literature quoted in) Frisk, Chantraine and Beekes (when needed, reference was also made to earlier works such as Curtius, Prellwitz, Boisacq and Hofmann), and contrasted this with the PG analysis.

¹² Meissner (2014: 9): “es entsteht der Eindruck einer unkontrollierbaren Beliebigkeit”.

¹³ Hajnal (2005: 209) argued that there were no substrate or adstrate influences on Greek phonology or morphology.

¹⁴ For a more moderate approach to loanwords in Greek, one is referred to Rosól (2012), where all possible Semitic loans in Greek were discussed. Bernal (1987) was criticized for his debatable linguistic reconstructions (see Nussbaum, Jasanoff 1996: (especially) 194). In later writings, he attempted to address the criticisms (unsuccessfully in our opinion).

4. Individual etymologies¹⁵

1. *naío*: ‘live’ (Beekes 2010: 994). Brugmann (1900: 84, 1904: 100, 123) linked this word with the root **nes* ‘return’. In the name *Néstōr* and the noun *nostos* ‘return’, the *e* grade and *o* grade were regularly represented. He interpreted the verb *naío*: as a zero grade formation. While this would regularly have given **aío*:, an initial *n* was reintroduced under the influence of the forms with *nes* and *nos*. The zero grade **ns* gave *as* in Greek which is still visible in the adjective *ásmenos* ‘happy’ (Wackernagel 1897: 6). This explanation has been accepted by Hofmann, Pokorny and LIV² (Hofmann 1950: 211; Pokorny 1959: 766–767; Zehnder 2001a: 454–455), but was doubted by Frisk because of the difference in meaning,¹⁶ and by Chantraine (1980: 733) because of the phonetics. Beekes suggested that *nas-* could be PG, but starting from a meaning ‘heimkehren, ungeschadet davon kommen’ (Zehnder 2001a: 454–455), *naío*:, *ásmenos* and *nóstos* can be explained from within Greek.
2. *naós* ‘temple’ (Beekes 2010: 995–996). This word is in all likelihood linked to *naío*: and represents **nas-wos* ‘place to live (for the gods)’, hence ‘sanctuary, temple’ (Pokorny 1959: 766–767). Beekes (2010: 996) considered the Indo-European etymology *quite possible*, but mentioned that Furnée (1972: 338) argued for PG origin, because there were variants with *i* as in *neió*s and *naió*s, but since these forms are late, their probative value is limited. We see no reason to doubt the inherited nature of this word.¹⁷
3. *néktar* ‘drink of the gods, nectar’ (Beekes 2010: 1004–1005). The meaning and etymology of this word are debated.¹⁸ In the *Iliad*, it means ‘drink of the gods’ but it also refers to the balsam used to preserve Patroklos’s corpse from decaying (*Iliad* 19,38). Indo-European etymologies have been suggested, but the word has been explained as PG and as a borrowing from Semitic. The first etymology was by Güntert, who linked the word with the Hesykhian gloss *ktéres nekroi* ‘*ktéres* means ‘corpses’’. He explained *néktar* as *ne-ktar* ‘not dead’ (Güntert 1919: 161–163). This suggestion is not tenable (Frisk 1970: 300–301), because the negative prefix **ne/n* is not attested in the form *ne* in Greek, but only in the form *a*, *n* or *an*.

¹⁵ We decided to transcribe the Greek. In doing so, we used the accents ´ (acutus), ` (gravis) and ^ (circumflexus). We use the sign : to indicate vowel length. Vowel length is not indicated when a vowel is written with a ^, because vowels with a circumflex are always long. In our Indo-European reconstructions, we decided – with some hesitation – to follow the principle used by the Leiden School and the dictionaries not to distinguish between vocalic and consonantic resonants. We admit that this might be confusing, but it is uncertain whether PIE had a phonemic distinction between vocalic and consonantic resonants. In certain forms, different resonants are syllafied in different languages. As such, an *i* can refer to the vowel but also to the glide.

A sign H refers to any laryngeal, a C to any consonant, a P to any plosive, an R to any resonant and a V to any vowel.

¹⁶ Frisk (1970: 286–287) who described the motivation to link these words as: “mit zweifelhaftem Recht”.

¹⁷ Chantraine (1980: 734): “il n’y a aucune raison de supposer que le mot ait été emprunté”.

¹⁸ Chantraine (1980: 742): “pas d’étymologie établie”.

The most commonly accepted explanation is that the word is a compound of **nek* ‘death’ and **terh₂* ‘beat, overcome’, the meaning thus being ‘overcoming death, salvaging from death and destruction’.¹⁹ Semantically, this explanation is fine, but there is a formal problem. If one assumes that the reconstruction **nektrh₂* is correct for the nominative singular, the Greek *néktar* is not the regular outcome.²⁰ One would either expect *néktra*: or *néktara* in the nominative, and *néktaros* in the genitive (Beekes 1969: 160–161 with reference to Pisani). Pisani (1953: 121) argued that the stem form was taken over from the genitive singular, but Schmitt (1965: 156–157) objected to this and claimed that the genitive could not have influenced the other cases as the nominative/accusative was much more common than the other cases. He (Schmitt 1965: 156–157) suggested that a final laryngeal could be dropped in sentence sandhi comparable to Kuiper’s (1955) analysis of the vocatives which lost the word final laryngeal *in pausa*. Pisani’s explanation is much more likely, however, since such a sandhi drop of a laryngeal would be unparalleled in Greek. It is more likely that the Greek nominative was replaced by the stem of the oblique cases because it looked too aberrant: a neuter nominative singular **néktra*: besides a genitive *néktaros* would be too atypical and a nominative singular **néktara* would have been interpreted as a plural (Beekes 1969: 160–161, agreeing with Pisani). The genitive *néktaros* besides the ‘ending’ *ar* in other neuter nouns, such as *ónar* ‘dream’ and *hêpar* ‘liver’ also contributed to the creation of the nominative *néktar*. This etymology is not generally accepted, however (Frisk 1970: 300–301).²¹ Furnée objected to this etymology on the ground that the compounding was “too Indo-Iranian in character” (the quote comes from Beekes 2010: 1005). He pointed out that nectar was also used to preserve Patroklos’s corpse and that a meaning ‘overcoming death’ could therefore not be correct. He referred to the word *nikáron* ‘eye-salve’ and concluded from that that the word was PG, especially since it ended in *ar* (Furnée 1972: 320, followed by Beekes 2010: 1004–1005). The word was also interpreted as a Semitic loanword. Lewy (1895: 80–81) considered the word as a borrowing from *niqtār* ‘mit Gewürzen versetzter (Wein)’. Levin (1971) noticed that nectar smelled good, and linked it with *muqtór* ‘incense’. He saw a connection between *néktar* and *thu:mós* which means ‘character, spirit’, but also ‘smoke’, and referred to the Hesykhian gloss *nektárthe: ethu:mó:the*: “*nektárthe*: means ‘he started fuming / became angry’”.²² Drew Griffith (1994) linked it with the Egyptian *ntry* ‘divine’, a *kenning* to denote sodium carbonate, which was used in mummification. This Egyptian word is also borrowed in Greek *nítron* (Spiegelberg 1907: 130). This makes it less likely that *néktar* was borrowed from that word. If *néktar* were the same as *ntry*, Greek would have rendered the Egyptian *t* by *kt* but the word is also

¹⁹ Prellwitz (1905: 308, who stated that this meaning had been suggested already by Jacob Grimm); Boisacq (1938: 660–661, all without the laryngeal); Schmitt (1961, 1965: 154–157), with reference to Thieme (1952).

²⁰ Pisani (1953: 121); Schmitt (1965: 155–157), with reference to Thieme (1952); Beekes (1969: 160–161).

²¹ Pokorny (1959: 732) and Beekes (1969: 160–161) had already voiced doubts about the etymology.

²² We tried to render both the notion of ‘spirit’ as that of ‘smoke’ in our translation.

borrowed in Hittite and Akkadian without a *k*. As such, the *k* in Greek is unaccounted for (Beekes 2010: 1005). An additional question is why the Greeks would have rendered the word by *néktar* if they could also render it as *níttron* which is much closer to the Egyptian form. Rosól (2010: 196) rejected the Semitic origin of the word, because of the difference in meaning and form between the Semitic words and the Greek. We believe that there is no need to assume either a PG word nor a Semitic loanword. Furnée, Levin and Drew Griffith started from the passage where Patroklos's body was treated with *néktar* and assumed that 'preventing decay' had been the original meaning. This does not have to be an argument against the inherited meaning, however. One can also explain the use of *néktar* in the preservation process starting from the meaning 'overcoming death'. The first meaning was 'overcoming death and destruction coming from death' which means that it would protect Patroklos's body against physical degradation. As to the "too Indo-Iranian" compounding, we believe that this is not a valid argument. As the word belonged to the old poetic lexicon, it is logical that it shares word formation types with words from Indo-Iranian poetry. In short, this word can be explained from an Indo-European perspective and consequently, there is no need to assume a borrowing from Semitic or Pre-Greek.

4. *nêsos* 'island' (Beekes 2010: 1018). The Indo-European word for 'island' cannot be reconstructed and Greek *nêsos* has no cognates in other languages. Earlier, it was linked with the root *snā* 'swim' (**sneh₂* in laryngealistic terms). Already Curtius suggested that the word *nêsos* might be linked to *snékho:* (in Doric *snakho:*, from **sneh₂-g^h-o:*) 'I swim' (Curtius 1879: 319; Prellwitz 1905: 314; both without the laryngeal reconstruction). Others argued that the word was non-Greek, because it had no cognates outside Greek. Ernout, Meillet argued that *nêsos* was related to Latin *insula* 'island' and that both words were of Mediterranean origin (Ernout-Meillet 1967: 467, see also Skok 1936). Chantraine (1980: 758), however, dismissed the connection with *insula* and the Mediterranean origin. Frisk (1970: 317 "ägäisches Lehnwort") and Beekes (2010: 1018 "Pre-Greek") assumed that this word was non-Indo-European, because the words for 'island' in other languages were unclear as well. This in itself is no argument, however. It is not because a word denoting X has no etymology in languages A and B, that it is necessarily true for the word denoting X in language C. It is true that there is no reconstructable word for 'island', but in other Indo-European languages such as Germanic, the word is derived from a word for 'water': Dutch *eiland* and English *island* are compounds from the word for 'water' and 'land' (from **h₂e/ok^w*- as in Latin *aqua* 'water')²³ and the Dutch suffix *-oog* (which is also derived from the word for water) means 'island' in place names such as *Schiermonniksoog*, while German *Insel* is a borrowing from Latin (Van Veen, Van der Sijs 1997: 251 and 653).²⁴ As such, a link with water or something similar

²³ The Indo-Iranian word *apa-* is derived from **h₂e/op*, which seems a dialectal variation (Mayrhofer 1992: 81–82, *dubitanter*).

²⁴ The English writing *island* with *s* can be ascribed to the Middle French *isle* 'island'.

is not a priori excluded, but the link with **sneh₂* is not without problems: if the word is a derivation from the root **sneh₂* directly, the intervocalic *s* is a problem, because Greek usually does not have a single intervocalic *s*. If it is a derivation from *sna:kho:* the single *s* in Attic is a problem, because it cannot be derived from a cluster with a velar. Meier-Brügger (1993) derived it from *sna:kho:* and started from a form **na:khyos* ‘the swimming one’ which became *nēssos* in Ionic and *nēsos* in Attic.²⁵ He assumed that the treatment of single *s* was reminiscent of that in *tósos* ‘so many as’ (from **tot-ios*) contrary to *mélitta* ‘bee’ (from **melit-ia*). There is one problem, however. Both *tósos* and *mélitta* are derived from a stem in a dental. In such cases, a treatment by *tt* or *s* is possible, but there are no examples for an evolution velar plus yod becoming single *s* in Attic.²⁶ The normal treatment of velar plus yod in Attic Greek is *tt*, as can be seen in the verbs in *tto:* from velar stems or in the comparative *elátton* ‘fewer’ from **elakhyo:n* (Kühner-Blass 1890: 103–105, 1892: 151). Although a link between ‘swim’ and ‘island’ seems obvious, this etymology is uncertain.²⁷ Maybe Rix’s (1991) solution for the Indo-European and Greek word for ‘duck’ can solve the problem.²⁸ In the other Indo-European languages that preserved the inherited word for ‘duck’, the form seems to be (*transponat*) **h₂neh₂t-*. The Greek forms *nāssa* (in Doric) and *nētta* (in Attic) cannot directly be explained from **h₂neh₂t-ih₂* as this would have given ***ána:ssa*. Peters (1980: 26) argued that **h₂nh₂* gave *na:*, but there are no clear examples that could confirm such an evolution.²⁹ Rix (1991) argued that the original form **h₂neh₂t-ih₂* was remodelled after the root **sneh₂* ‘to swim’ and became **sneh₂t-ih₂* and became Proto-Greek **sna:tya*. This form, in turn, was remodelled after the verb *sna:kho:* and became *sna:khya* which became regularly *nētta* in Attic and *nēssa* in Ionic. Rix added this extra step, because he could not explain the double *tt* in Attic *nētta*, if it came from **sne:tya* (but this step is not strictly necessary in our opinion). If we now apply Rix’s analysis for *nētta* to *nēsos*, we could hypothesize that the word for ‘island’ was not derived from the verb *sna:kho:* but was a secondary creation on the inner-Greek root *sna:t*. The duck would then have been **sna:tya* ‘the swimming (bird)’ and the island *sna:tyos* ‘the swimmer’. The only remaining problem is the different outcome of the cluster *ty*. This can, in our opinion, be explained by the fact that the cluster *tya* gave *tta/ssa* in Greek (*nty* gave *sa* with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in the feminine adjective form *pāsa* ‘entire, all’ from

²⁵ Meier-Brügger (1993), following Rix (1991); Abbenes (1996a), following Rix (1991) but not Meier-Brügger (1993).

²⁶ See the schema in Wyatt (1968: 9).

²⁷ Chantraine (1980: 752) described it as: “ni probable ni démontrable”.

²⁸ Rix explained this word, because it was one of the clearer counterexamples to his own sound law (Rix 1970) that stated in a word initial sequence **HR*, the laryngeal vocalized and not the resonant. This law was doubted by Lindeman (1990, 1994, 1997: 53–54, 2004, using this example). We have been unable to consult Nikolaev’s Russian article from 2005 in which he addressed the “Lex Rix”.

²⁹ In earlier times, Greek *nētta* was explained as an ablaut type *aNa/Nā* (see, among others, Schwyzler 1939: 361; Kuhn 1954: 146; Frisk 1970: 318), but this is impossible in laryngealistic terms.

- *pantya*), but that the cluster *tyos* yielded *ttos/ssos* as in *bussós* ‘depth’ from **buthyos*,³⁰ or *sos* as in *tósos* from **totyos*.³¹ This explains the difference between *mésos* ‘middle’ from **methyos* and *mélitta* from **melitya*. As such, *nétta* comes from **sna:tya* and *nêsos* from **sna:tyos*. The feminine gender of *nêsos* originated under the influence of its opposite *épeiros* ‘mainland’. The exact details are unclear, but we believe that it is possible to explain *nêsos* as an inner-Greek creation and not as PG.
5. *ní:ke*: ‘victory’, *ni:káo*: ‘I win’ (Beekes 2010: 1021–1022). Several attempts at an etymology have been made, but none of them is free of problems. Osthoff and Brugmann linked it to Sanskrit *nīca* ‘going downwards’ and OCS *nicŭ* ‘forward, in the face’, and reconstructed **ni-(ə)qo* ‘downwards’. *ni:káo*: would then mean ‘I put down’ and the derived noun ‘the act of putting down, victory’ (Osthoff 1881: 223–224; Brugmann 1888: 403). There are two problems. First, the preverb *ni* is not attested in Greek. Second, the reconstruction they suggested, would be **nih₃k^wo* in the current terms (Mayrhofer 1996: 60), but then we would expect a labial sound in Greek and not a plain velar (Beekes 2010: 1021). This etymology is therefore uncertain.³² Schmitt linked *ní:ke*: with Lithuanian *apnikti* ‘to attack’ and pointed at Gothic *sigis* ‘victory’ and Sanskrit *sahas* ‘violence, force’ to explain the semantic relationship (Schmidt 1889: 395–396, mentioned in Boisacq 1938: 670). Hofmann (1950: 213) and Pokorny (1959: 761) added *neikéo*: ‘I attack, I chastise’ to these words,³³ but the link is problematic on semantic and phonological grounds: an ablaut schema *ei/i* is difficult (for the semantic problems, see Chantraine 1980: 755 and Beekes 2010: 1022). This etymology is therefore not certain either (although leaving out *neikéo*: would make the etymology less problematic). More recently, Klingenschmitt (1975: 162) analyzed the word as a compound of a preverb **ni* ‘down’ and a form **ih₁-k* from the root **Hieh₁* ‘throw’ (as in Greek *hí:emi* ‘I throw’).³⁴ The word would then mean ‘the act of throwing down’. This is possible, but the problem is that the preverb *ni* is not attested in Greek (cf. supra). As such, we agree with Beekes that there is no convincing etymology,³⁵ but we doubt that this means that word was of PG origin.
 6. *nóthos* ‘bastard, child born outside a legitimate marriage’ (Beekes 2010: 1022–1023).
 7. *noúthos* ‘dull’ (Beekes 2010: 1025).
 8. *nuthós* ‘numb, dark’ (Beekes 2010: 1025).

³⁰ We do not think that this word was borrowed from Egyptian, as assumed by Spiegelberg (1907: 128–129).

³¹ For the data, see Kühner-Blass (1890: 104–105) and Rix (1992: 90).

³² As had already been observed by Boisacq (1938: 670) and Frisk (1970: 320–321). This suggestion was not even discussed by Chantraine (1980: 755). This word is discussed in Trümpy (1950: 191–196), but no etymology is suggested.

³³ The link between *neikos* and Lithuanian *apnikti* had already been made by Fick, Bezzemberger (1881: 238). See also Trümpy (1950: 145).

³⁴ For the reconstruction of the root with initial laryngeal, see Peters (1976, 1980: 107) and Kümmel (2001a).

³⁵ As was noted by Chantraine (1980: 755 “étymologie inconnue”) and Frisk (1970: 321 “eine überzeugende Etymologie fehlt”); Beekes (2010: 1021–1022).

9. *no:thés* ‘indolent’ (also used for an ass that is unwilling to move); the form *no:thrós* ‘slack, indifferent’ is more common (Beekes 2010: 1029–1030).

Beekes listed these four words as <PG?>, but only linked the last three. Bezenberger linked *nóthos* with *nuthós* and *noûthos* suggested to link it with Sanskrit *andhas* ‘blind’ (Bezenberger 1877: 342; Prellwitz 1905: 315). He started from the word *nothogénne:tos* ‘born as a bastard’ and argued that the prefix *notho-* originally meant ‘blind, unseen’ and was reinterpreted as ‘bastard’ only later. This is problematic, because the word *nóthos* is already attested earlier and the compound *nothogénne:tos* is only attested in Hesykhios. Besides the semantics, the phonology makes the equation impossible.³⁶ As such, this word has no etymology, in spite of its “Indo-European looking” form: one could, for instance, suggest **not^h* or **nod^h* but there are no cognates in the other Indo-European languages.

The words *noûthos* and *nuthós* are not common. The latter is attested in a gloss in Hesykhios *nuthón ápho:non, skoteinón* “*nuthón* means ‘speechless, numb, dark’”, while the former only occurs in an Hesiodic fragment:³⁷

“noûthos dè podón húpo doûpos oró:rei”

“A quiet sound rose up from under their feet” [Hesiod, fragment 118 in Most (2007)].

Noûthos and *nuthós* can be linked with one another, the latter being the zero grade of the root and the former the *o* grade. Solmsen (1909: 75) linked the Greek word with Latin *nūbēs*, Avestan *snaoda* and Cymrian *nudd* (all these words mean ‘cloud’).³⁸ These words could be reconstructed from a root **sne/oud^h* and this connection was accepted by later etymological dictionaries.³⁹ Furnée (1972: 120), followed by Beekes, connected *nuthós* and *noûthos* with *no:thés* and assumed a PG origin for all these words, but just like *nuthós* and *noûthos* are inherited and not PG, *no:thés* can also be explained as an inherited or inner-Greek formation. Three suggestions have been made for it (which were all rejected by Beekes). First, it was explained as a negative compound **n* and *óthomai* ‘I care about’. The word would then mean ‘who does not care’.⁴⁰ The second suggestion was a negative compound with *o:théo*: ‘I hit, push’. The word would then mean ‘who does not let himself be pushed away’.⁴¹ The third suggestion is from Johansson (1893), who linked the word with Sanskrit *ādhra-* ‘schwach’ and *nādhra* ‘sich

³⁶ This suggestion is not mentioned in Chantraine (1980: 755) nor in Mayrhofer (1992: 78–79) and rejected in Boisacq (1938: 671) and Frisk (1970: 322).

³⁷ This is fragment 158 in Merkelbach, West (1967) and 118 in Most (2007). The translation is taken from Most (2007: 178–179).

³⁸ The link between the Latin and Celtic cognates had been made already by Thurneysen (1890: 488).

³⁹ Boisacq (1938: 672), Walde, Hofmann (1954: 183), Pokorny (1959: 978), Frisk (1970: 325), Chantraine (1980: 758), but it was not mentioned in Mayrhofer (1992, 1996), and considered unclear by Abbenes (1996b).

⁴⁰ This connection was first made by Doederlein (1850: 154–155), Bechtel (1914: 237).

⁴¹ This connection was first made by Clemm (1870: 325). Frisk (1970: 331) and Chantraine (1980: 761) also referred to Müller, Graupa (*BPW* 63: 94 *non uidimus*).

in Not befinden'.⁴² In laryngealistic terms, the words could be reconstructed as **n(e)h₃d^hr-*.⁴³ Phonetically, the first and the third suggestions are possible, but the second is more problematic. If one starts from **h₃d^h-* for *óthomai*, the negation would regularly yield *no:thés*; the same applies to **nh₃d^hros*, as this would also yield *no:thrós*. The second reconstruction is less likely: as the verb *o:théo* originally started with *w*, one would expect the negation to be *a(w)o:thés* and not *no:thés*.

To conclude, we believe that Bezenberger's (1877) connection between *nóthos*, *noûthos* and *nuthós* is untenable and do not think that *no:thés*, *noûthos* and *nuthós* are related and would point at a PG etymon. With the exception of *nóthos*, all words have an Indo-European or inner-Greek etymology: *noûthos* and *nuthós* belong to the root **sne/oud^h* and *no:thés* is related to either *óthomai* (in which case the word would be an inner-Greek creation) or to **nh₃d^hros*, in which case the word would be East-Indo-European as it is attested in Greek and Indo-Iranian. There is no need to assume that all these words are PG.

10. *nótos* 'wind, southwest wind' (Beekes 2010: 1025).⁴⁴ This word means 'southwest wind', and this is the wind that usually brings rain. As such, a link with Armenian *nay* 'wet, fluid' cannot be excluded (Scheffelowitz 1905: 46; Prellwitz 1905: 316; Brugmann 1906: 220; Boisacq 1938: 673; Hofmann 1950: 219). Theoretically, one could add Latin *nāre* 'swim' as well, but as Umbrian has *snata* 'washed' with an initial *s*,⁴⁵ the word is better linked with **sneh₂* 'swim' (Zehnder 2001c; Weiss 2009: 169). The Greek and Armenian forms could be reconciled into **nh₃t* which gives *not* in Greek,⁴⁶ and **nat* in Proto-Armenian.⁴⁷ As such, it is more likely that this word represents an Helleno-Armenian isogloss rather than a word from PG.⁴⁸

⁴² Johansson (1893: 40–41) and also Brugmann (*Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 1897: 29 *non uidimus*; quoted in Boisacq 1938: 676). It was recently reiterated by Mayrhofer (1992: 165–166, 1996: 34).

⁴³ The laryngealistic reconstruction was made by Mayrhofer. See also Garnier (2012), with reference to Peters (1999 *non uidimus*).

⁴⁴ Beekes (2010: 1025).

⁴⁵ When quoting forms from Osca and Umbrian, the bold face is used when the form was written in the local alphabet, which was an adaptation of the Etruscan one (Weiss 2009: 14).

⁴⁶ We refer to Beekes (1988) for the treatment of **#Rh_{1/2/3}C* as *#Re/a/oC*. See also Weiss (2009: 100), who called this "Beekes's Law". Fritz's (1996: 5) criticism that Beekes applied his sound law only to the word for 'nose', is unjustified, because the Latin word *lassus* 'tired' from **lh₂d^htos* proves the correctness of the sound law.

⁴⁷ We refer to Mondon (2008: 171) for the rule that (in Armenian) "interconsonantal laryngeals were lost when flanked by two non-syllabic sonorant consonants, the second of which was a nasal". In other positions, they were preserved. Exceptions to the preservation could be explained by either the Schmidt-Hackstein rule (this rule stated that a sequence CH.CC was already reduced to CCC in PIE itself; it had been noted for Indo-Iranian by Schmidt (1973) and for PIE by Hackstein (2002) or by the Saussure Effect. In its limited version, this sound law states that in a sequence #HRORC or CORHC the laryngeal was lost. This was first noted by De Saussure in 1905 (quoted in Bally, Gautier 1922: 582), without linking it to laryngeal loss, by Meillet (1908: 68) and by Hirt (1921: 185–186), who linked it with "schwa". See Rasmussen (1989: 175–230), Nussbaum (1997), Weiss (2009: 113) and Yamazaki (2009). For a critical assessment, see Van Beek (2011) and Pronk (2011), cf. *infra*.

11. *nuktálo:ps* ‘seeing in the night, day blind’ (Beekes 2010: 1025–1026). Bechtel argued that the original form was *nukt – an – o:ps* and that the meaning was ‘who does not see at night’ (Bechtel 1913: 229–230, accepted by Prellwitz 1927: 154 and Schwyzer 1939: 259). This form was then dissimilated into *nuktálo:ps*. Formally, there are no real problems with the dissimilation, as they do occur in Greek: *argaléos* from **algaléos* ‘painful’, *lé:thargos* from **lé:thalgos* ‘suffering from forgetting, lethargic’.⁴⁹ What speaks against this explanation, is the fact that the word does not mean ‘who does not see at night’, but ‘who only sees at night, day blind’. Chantraine (1980: 758) referred to Greek medical literature and suggested that the original meaning might indeed have been ‘who does not see at night’ after all (which would agree with the suggested etymology). Beekes rejected the Indo-European origin of the suffix *o:ps* and explained the resemblance to *núks* ‘night’ as folk etymological and considered the word to be PG. In our opinion, this word is clearly a compound of *núks* ‘night’ and *o:ps* ‘seeing’. Beekes argued that the compounds in *o:ps* were PG, but there is the adjective *múo:ps* in the meaning ‘short sighted’, which certainly contained the suffix *o:ps* in the meaning ‘seeing’.⁵⁰ As such, there is nothing that excludes the meaning ‘seeing’ here either and there is no need to catalogue this word as PG.
12. *númphe*: ‘young lady’ (Beekes 2010: 1026). There is no agreement on the etymology of this word. Kretschmer (1909) suggested to link the word with Latin *nubere* and Russian *snubiti* ‘to couple’.⁵¹ This was accepted by Boisacq (1938: 673–674), Hofmann (1950: 219), Pokorný (1959: 977–978) and LIV² (Kümmel 2001b: 574), but was rejected by others, either because *nubere* was said about the woman and *snubiti* about the man (Wiedemann 1902: 212–213; Ernout, Meillet 1967: 449),⁵² and/or because the nasal infix was not sufficiently explained.⁵³ Beekes pointed at the nasal infix and assumed that this reflected a “pre-nasalized” consonant, which would be characteristic for PG. In addition, the short *a* in the Homeric vocative could have been the original nominative and a nominative in short *a* was also a sign for PG words. None of the arguments is conclusive. The short *a* in the Homeric vocative *númphe* does not have to be a sign of a PG vocalism, but might be an archaism and could be explained by Kuiper’s Law of laryngeal loss in pausa (such as in vocatives):⁵⁴ a vocative (transponat) **numphaH* would have become *numpha* with short *a* in pausa. The nasal infix is more difficult to explain and

⁴⁸ This word was not discussed in Clackson (1994) nor in Mondon (2008).

⁴⁹ Bechtel referred to Schulze (1888: 257, 1895: 226) for examples of *n* dissimilation in Greek. One can also refer to Grammont (1948) and Lejeune (1972) for more examples. See already Kühner, Blass (1890: 279).

⁵⁰ See Schwyzer (1939: 426) on the compounding with forms in *op*- and *o:p*-.

⁵¹ Kretschmer (1909: 325–331), referring to a Festschrift in which he first made this suggestion. He pointed out that the connection between *númphe*: and *nubere* had already been made in Antiquity.

⁵² De Vaan (2008: 416) stated that the link had to be dismissed, but did not say why.

⁵³ Chantraine (1980: 759), Frisk (1970: 326), Beck (1996a) stated that the etymology was unclear.

⁵⁴ Kuiper (1947: 210, 1955); see also Weiss (2009: 26) and Byrd (2015: 26).

has been explained as “expressive” (Chantraine 1980: 758) or as a relic from an old nasal present (Kümmel 2001b: 574), for which there is no evidence in any of the languages that have the word. Van Windekens (1982) explained the word as a compound of *en* ‘in’ and **uemb^h* ‘womb’ in the zero grade (this is the root of English *womb*). He explained the word as ‘in the womb’, hence ‘pregnant woman’. There are two observations to be made: first, it is unlikely that the preposition *en* would give *n* in the zero grade (assuming that it did not start with a laryngeal, because then the form *n* would be impossible). Second, Hesykhios glossed this word as *hè: neo:stì gametheîsa* ‘a woman who has been married recently’, which means that the word did not mean ‘pregnant woman’, but ‘woman ready to be married’. This gloss is in our opinion an additional argument to link the word with *nubere*. The semantic objections to the link between Latin, Greek and Slavic are not convincing, but the nasal is more problematic. As the word is only attested in European languages, it is not certain that it can be reconstructed for PIE, because it could belong to the European vocabulary. PG seems excluded as it is attested in Latin and Slavic as well.

13. *nússō*: ‘I thrust, sting’ (Beekes 2010: 1028).

14. *nússa* ‘turning point in a race’ (Beekes 2010: 1028).

The word *nússa* does not have an etymology that is generally accepted. There are two etymological explanations and three borrowing explanations. Curtius (1879: 546) linked *nússa* with the verb *nússō*. Schulze (1888: 262–263) pointed out that the word *nússa* was scanned in Homer as if it started with two consonants (*Iliad* 23,758). He assumed that it initially started with *sn* and linked it with Sanskrit *sānu* ‘back’. Bloomfield (1891: 13) repeated this equation and reconstructed *snukya*. Others have argued that the word was borrowed from a Semitic word for ‘flagpole’,⁵⁵ from an Aegean non-Indo-European language,⁵⁶ or from Pelasgian.⁵⁷ Boisacq (1938) doubted the link with *nússō*: and rejected the link with *sānu*.⁵⁸ Curtius’s suggestion was accepted by Prellwitz (1905: 316), Frisk (1970: 328–329) and Chantraine (1980: 760) and was not ruled out by Beekes. As we argued above, an inherited etymology is to be preferred over assuming a borrowing. As such, we believe that *nússa* is not Semitic, Pelasgian nor PG. The connection with Sanskrit *sānu* is impossible and thus only the link to *nússō*: remains. We therefore have to determine what the etymology of that verb is. Brugmann connected *nússō*: to MLG *nucken* ‘to move the head in a menacing manner’ and OCS *njukati* ‘encourage’ (Brugmann 1902: 154; Walde, Hofmann 1954: 189; Pokorny 1959: 767; Frisk 1970: 329 *dubitanter*), and also linked the verb with Latin *nuō* ‘I nod’ and Greek *neúo*: ‘I nod’, assuming a velar extension (Brugmann 1902: 153–155; Boisacq 1938: 675). The link between *neúo*: and *nússō*:

⁵⁵ Lewy (1927: 28–29), but he was unsure whether the language was Hebrew, Aramaic or Assyrian

⁵⁶ This suggestion was made by Huber (quoted in Lewy 1927: 29), by Juthner (1939: 251, quoted in Frisk 1970: 329 and Beekes 2010: 1028) and by Hofmann (1950: 220).

⁵⁷ Carnoy (1955: 20) assumed that *nússa* and *nússō*: were Pelasgian borrowings.

⁵⁸ Boisacq (1938: 675) described the link with *nússō*: as “??” and the suggestion by Bloomfield (1891: 13) and Schulze (1888: 262) as *autres avis, non plausibles*.

is not evident, because it would mean that the basic meaning of the root **neu* was ‘to thrust’ (Frisk 1970: 329; also Mader 1996a, 1996b; Beekes 2010: 1028). Chantraine (1980: 760) accepted the connection of *njukati* and *nucken* to *neúo*: but rejected the link with *nússō*: because of the different meanings.⁵⁹ As the velar extension is only attested in European languages, it might be a later innovation referring to a more intense ‘nodding’. As such, the basic meaning of the root **neu* might have been ‘nod’, and that of **neuK* (with K referring to any velar) might have been ‘nod strongly, thrust’.

To conclude, we believe that the meaning ‘thrust’ for the verb *nússō*: allows a link with the word *nússa* as a turning point in the race might very well have been marked by an object thrust in the ground. As such, *nússa* is an inner-Greek creation and not a borrowing. As to the verb *nússō*:, the velar extension to the root **neu* is only attested in European languages and might thus be of later date.

15. *nôkar* ‘lethargy’ (Beekes 2010: 1030). This word is generally linked with *nekrós* and *néku:s* ‘corpse’ (Fick 1890: 262; Prellwitz 1905: 317; Boisacq 1938: 676; Hofmann 1950: 220; Pokorny 1959: 762; Frisk 1970: 321). Chantraine (1980: 741) agreed that the word had to be linked with *nekrós* but suggested that the *o*: was due to the influence of *kôma* ‘lethargy’ and the *ar* was taken from *ónar* ‘dream, sleep’. That *nôkar* took the ending *ar* from *ónar* cannot be ruled out, but the long vowel is in all likelihood not taken from *kôma*. Schindler (1975: 8) asked if the *o*: could be the result of an existing ablaut type, as a type *o/ō* was without parallels. Beekes denied the link with *nekrós* because of the long vowel, rejected the translation *Todesschlaf* used by the German dictionaries, because it was based on a false etymology and suggested that the word was PG (Beekes 2010: 1030, referring to Furnée 1972: 133). He referred to Furnée, who linked the word with *no:khelé:s* ‘slow, dull, sluggish’.⁶⁰ This is unnecessary. As the word is only attested in later writers, it is possible that this word is just a poetic creation on *nekrós*, maybe influenced by the existence of series such as *némo*: ‘I divide’, *nómos* ‘law’ and *no:máo*: ‘I distribute’.
16. *Nôrops* (Beekes 2010: 1031). The meaning of this word is unclear (Prellwitz 1905: 317; Boisacq 1938: 676; Leumann 1950: 214; Frisk 1970: 331; Chantraine 1980: 762; Beck 1996b), but there is a gloss in Hesychios *nôrops lamprós, oksúpho:nos, éne:khos* “*nôrops* means ‘shining, sharp-sounding, resounding’”. Chantraine (1980: 762) argued that the meaning was unclear in Antiquity and that the glosses are therefore untrustworthy. It is used in Homer in the verse final formula *nó:ropa khalkón* in the accusative or *nó:ropi khalkôi* in the dative.⁶¹

“hò:s ár’ éphan Aía:s dè korússeto nó:ropi khalkôi”

“So they spoke, but Aias armed himself with his gleaming bronze” (*Iliad* 7,206).

⁵⁹ This connection was not mentioned in Zehnder (2001b).

⁶⁰ This equation goes actually back to at least Clemm (1870: 325).

⁶¹ The instances of the accusative are *Iliad* 2,578; 11,16; 14,383 and *Odyssey* 24,467; 24,500 and those of the dative are *Iliad* 7,206; 13,406 and 16,130.

Bechtel linked the word with the verbal form *no:reî* which is attested in the Hesychian gloss *no:reî energeî* “*noreî* means ‘he is powerful, he is very active’” and argued that the adjective originally described a warrior’s characteristic, but that this was transferred to the weapon used by the warrior (Bechtel 1914: 238). The verb *no:reî* is often linked to Greek *anér* ‘man’ and to Lithuanian *nóras* ‘desire’.⁶² This was expanded by Kuiper (1961: 226–227) who argued that the original form was **nōros* but that this was remodelled after *aítho:ps* ‘gleaming, fearfully looking’ to avoid a spondaic fifth foot. He (Kuiper 1961: 224–227) also linked the word with *anér* ‘man’ and argued that the original form was **h₂nōros* which could have lost its laryngeal because of the *o* in the following syllable (although he stated that the exact vocalizations were unclear). The original meaning would therefore have been ‘manly looking, brave’. Beekes (2010: 1030–1031) argued that the acute accent in *nōras* ruled out a laryngeal and that the suffix *op-* could point at PG origin.⁶³ An alternative explanation is that of Kretschmer’s (1950), who referred to the grammarians Epaphroditos from Khaironeia (1st c. AD), who was quoted in Stephanos from Byzantion (a Byzantine lexicographer and grammarian from the 6th c. AD) as saying that the word *nōrops* referred to copper of the town Norikos, and to Clemens from Alexandria (1st–2nd c. AD) who stated that *nōrops* denoted an inhabitant of Norikos, a town where metallurgy was an important occupation. Kretschmer (1950: 3–4) interpreted the Homeric formula as “bronze from Norikos”. This is possible, but we believe that the explanation as “manly steel” is better. There are no formal problems with this analysis, if one assumes that the so-called Sausure Effect applied to a sequence **HRo* and *oRH* as well.⁶⁴ Most scholars assume that a laryngeal was lost in a word-initial sequence **HRoRK* or word internal *KoRHK* (cf. *supra*). The best example for the broader formulation of the rule are the name *He:síodos* and the Hesychian gloss *godân klaíein* “*godân* means ‘to weep’”, if both forms are the *o* grade of the root **h₂ued* ‘sing, make noise’. The apparent counterexamples *agé:no:r* ‘leading men’ and *ané:no:r* ‘unmanly, cowardly’ are inner Greek creations based on the nominative *anér*. The forms *amoibé* ‘exchange’ comes from **h₂moig^w*- but the laryngeal was restored after the verb *ameíbo*: ‘exchange’ (Viechnicki 1994); the same applies to *agorá* ‘marketplace’ coming from **h₂gor-* which should have lost the laryngeal but had it restored under the influence of the verb *ageíro*: ‘I gather’. As such, the words *nōrops* and *no:reî* can be explained as an inner-Greek creation and there is no need to explain it as PG.

⁶² This equation goes back to Fick (1890: 502–503). See also Bechtel (1914: 238), Hofmann (1950: 220), Walde, Hofmann (1954: 165 with doubts), Pokorny (1959: 765).

⁶³ Kuiper (1961: 225) admitted that this suffix could be used in PG words as well.

⁶⁴ As was assumed by Peters (1980: 14).

5. Conclusion

While it was not our goal to rewrite the dictionary, we hope to have shown that many of the words catalogued as ⟨PG⟩ or ⟨PG?⟩ allowed for other explanations as well. In order to do so, we often had to analyze many different opinions. We found that in several instances, there was no agreement on an etymology or there was no established etymology altogether, but that in other instances, an Indo-European etymology was available. We never argued (nor will we ever argue) that each and every word in Greek has to have an Indo-European etymology nor that there were no borrowings, but b-finding borrowings should not be the primary goal of an etymological dictionary: when establishing etymologies, one should look at the evidence and not be searching for borrowings when they are not there, and use strict and falsifiable rules.

References

- Abbenes J. 1996a. *Nésos*. – *LfgrE* 16: 378–380.
- Abbenes J. 1996b. *noûthos*. – *LfgrE* 16: 438.
- Bally C., Gautier L. 1922. *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand De Saussure*. Genève.
- Bechtel F. 1913. *Parerga*. – *KZ* 45: 225–230.
- Bechtel F. 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer*. Halle.
- Beck W. 1996a. *Númphe*. – *LfgrE* 16: 440–443.
- Beck W. 1996b. *Nôrops*. – *LfgrE* 16: 452–453.
- Beekes R. 1969. *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.
- Beekes R. 1988. RHC in Greek and other Indo-European languages. – *IF* 93: 22–45.
- Beekes R. 1998. Een nieuw Indo-Europees etymologisch woordenboek. – *MKNAW* 61: 9.
- Beekes R. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden.
- Beekes R. 2014. *Pre-Greek. Phonology, morphology, lexicon*. [edited by S. Norbruis]. Leiden.
- Bernal M. 1987. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization*. London.
- Bezzengerger A. 1877. Etymologien: Gr. *nóthos*, *núthos*, skt. *Andhá*. – *BB* 1: 342.
- Bloomfield M. 1891. On adaptation of suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives. – *AJP* 12: 1–29.
- Boisacq E. 1938. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg.
- Bonfante G. 1976. *I dialetti indoeuropei*. Brescia.
- Brugmann K. 1888. Lateinische Etymologien. – *RhM* 43: 399–403.
- Brugmann K. 1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.
- Brugmann K. 1902. Wortgeschichtliche Miscellen. – *IF* 13: 144–163.
- Brugmann K. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.
- Brugmann K. 1906. Die *phôkai népodes* der Odyssee. – *IF* 20: 218–225.
- Byrd A. 2015. *The Indo-European syllable*. Leiden.
- Carnoy A. 1955. Etyma Pelasgica. – *AC* 24: 5–28.
- Chantraine P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec*. Paris.
- Chantraine P. 1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. [vol. 2: Λ–Ω]. Paris.
- Clackson J. 1994. *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford.

- Clemm A. 1870. Beiträge zur griechischen und lateinischen Etymologie. – CS 3: 281–348.
- Curtius G. 1879. *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*. Leipzig.
- De Decker F. (rev.). 2015. A new book on Pre-Greek. – *IJDL* 12: 1–23.
- De Vaan M. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden.
- Doederlein L. 1850. *Homerisches Glossarium*. Erlangen.
- Drew Griffith R. 1994. Nektar and Nitron. – *Glotta* 72: 20–23.
- Ernout A., Meillet A. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.
- Euler W. 1979. *Indoiranisch-Griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren Indogermanische Grundlagen*. Innsbruck.
- Euler W. 1980. Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen. – Mayrhofer M., Peters M. (eds.). *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: 173–179.
- Fick A. 1876. *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 2; 3rd edition]. Göttingen.
- Fick A. 1890. *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 1; 4th edition]. Göttingen.
- Fick A., Bezzenberger A. 1881. Nachträge zum indogermanischen Wörterbuch. – *BB* 6: 235–240.
- Frisk H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 1: A-Ko]. Heidelberg.
- Frisk H. 1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 2: Kr-O]. Heidelberg.
- Fritz M. 1996. Das urindogermanische Wort für ‚Nase‘ und das grundsprachliche Lautgesetz *RHV > RV. – *KZ* 109: 1–20.
- Furnée E. 1972. *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. Amsterdam.
- Gamkrelidze I., Ivanov V. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. [translated from the Russian original by J. Nichols]. Berlin.
- Garnier R. 2012. *No:thés*. – *CEG* 12: 314.
- Georgiev V. 1941. *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*. [part 1]. Sofia.
- Georgiev V. 1945. *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*. [part 2]. Sofia.
- Grammont M. 1948. *Phonétique du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Grassmann H. 1863a. Über die aspiraten und ihr gleichzeitiges vorhandensein im an- und auslaute der wurzeln. – *KZ* 12: 81–110.
- Grassmann H. 1863b. Über das ursprüngliche vorhandensein vom wurzeln, deren anlaut und auslaut ein aspirate enthielt. – *KZ* 12: 110–138.
- Güntert H. 1919. *Kalypso. Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Halle.
- Hackstein O. 2002. Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. – *KZ* 115: 1–22.
- Hajnal I. 2005. Das frühgriechische zwischen Balkan und Ägäis? Einheit oder Vielfalt? – Meiser G., Hackstein O. (eds.). *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: 185–214.
- Heubeck A. (rev.). 1974. Furnée 1972. – *IF* 79: 272–277.
- Hirt H. 1921. *Indogermanische Grammatik. II. Der indogermanische Vokalismus*. Heidelberg.
- Hofmann J. 1950. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*. München.
- Johansson K. 1893. Sanskritische Etymologien. – *IF* 2: 1–63.
- Juthner J. 1939. Herkunft und natürliche Grundlagen der griechischen Nationalspiele. – *Die Antike* 15: 231–261. [*non uidimus*].
- Kern H. 1858. Ueber die Italer. – *KZ* 5: 272–275.
- Klingenschmitt G. 1975. Tocharisch und Indogermanisch. – Rix H. (ed.). *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Wiesbaden: 148–163.
- Kretschmer P. 1896. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
- Kretschmer P. 1909. Zur griechischen und lateinischen Wortforschung. – *Glotta* 1: 323–333.

- Kretschmer P. 1950. Zu den ältesten Metallnamen. – *Glotta* 32: 1–16.
- Kroonen G. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden.
- Kuhn H. 1954. Ablaut, a und Altertumskunde. – *KZ* 71: 129–161.
- Kühner R., Blass F. 1890. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. [vol. 1]. Hannover.
- Kühner R., Blass F. 1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. [vol. 2]. Hannover.
- Kuiper F. 1947. Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. – (n. ed.). *India Antiqua*: 198–212.
- Kuiper F. 1955. Shortening of final vowels in the Rig Veda. – *MKNAW* 18: 253–290.
- Kuiper F. 1961. Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. – *Die Sprache* 7: 14–31.
- Kümmel M. 2001a. **Hieh*₁. – *LIV*²: 225.
- Kümmel M. 2001b. **Sneub*^h. – *LIV*²: 574.
- Lejeune M. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Leumann M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Zürich.
- Levin S. 1971. The etymology of *néktar*: Exotic scents in Early Greece. – *SMEA* 13: 31–50.
- Lewy H. 1895. *Die semitischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Berlin.
- Lewy H. 1927. Etymologien. – *KZ* 55: 24–32.
- LfgfE 16 = Meier-Brügger M., Beck W. (eds.). 1996. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. [nee:níes – hodós]. Göttingen.
- Lindeman F. 1990. Indo-European laryngeals and fallacious reasoning. – *KZ* 103: 17–19.
- Lindeman F. 1994. Phonology and laryngeals. Some critical observations on the “Lex Rix”. – *IF* 99: 42–49.
- Lindeman F. 1997. *Introduction to the laryngeal theory*. Innsbruck.
- Lindeman F. 2004. On the vocalization of ‘laryngeals’ in Indo-European. – *KZ* 117: 118–133.
- LIV² = Rix H. et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Mader B. 1996a. *Nússa*. – *LfgfE* 16: 448–449.
- Mader B. 1996b. *Nússö*. – *LfgfE* 16: 449–450.
- Mallory J., Adams D. 2006. *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. Oxford.
- Mayrhofer M. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [vol. 1]. Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer M. 1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [vol. 2]. Heidelberg.
- Meier-Brügger M. 1993. Zu griechisch *nésos*. – *KZ* 106: 302.
- Meillet A. 1908. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris.
- Meillet A. 1910. *Les dialectes indo-européens*. Paris.
- Meissner T. (rev.). 2014. Beekes 2010. – *Kratylos* 58: 1–31.
- Merkelbach R., West M. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Mondon J. 2008. The development of interconsonantal laryngeals in Classical Armenian. – *KZ* 121: 162–180.
- Most G. 2007. *Hesiod. The Shield; Catalogue of women; Other Fragments*. Cambridge (MA).
- NIL = Irslinger B., Schneider C., Wodtko D. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.
- Nussbaum A. 1997. The Saussure Effect in Latin and Italic. – Lubotsky A. (ed.). *Sound law and analogy*. Amsterdam: 181–203.
- Nussbaum A., Jasanoff J. 1996. Word games. – Lefkowitz M., MacLean-Rogers G. (eds.). *Black AthenarRevisited*. Chapel Hill: 177–205.
- Oettinger N. 1997. Grundsätzliche Überlegungen zum Nordwest-Indogermanischen. – *IL* 20: 93–111.
- Oettinger N. 2003. Neuerung in Lexikon und Wortbildung des Nordwest-Indogermanischen. – Bammesberger A., Vennemann T. (eds.). *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: 183–193.

- Osthoff H. 1881. Die tiefstufe im indogermanischen vocalismus. – Brugmann K., Osthoff H. (eds.). *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Hildesheim: 1–407.
- Peters M. 1976. Attisch *hí:ēmi*. – *Die Sprache* 22: 157–161.
- Peters M. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien.
- Peters M. 1999. Ein tiefes Problem. – Eicher H., Luschützky H., Sadovski V. (eds.). *Compositiones indogermanicae: In memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: 447–456. [non uidimus].
- Pisani V. (rev.). 1953. Thieme P. 1952. – *OLZ* 48: 120–121.
- Pokorny J. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.
- Porzig W. 1950. *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Heidelberg.
- Prellwitz W. 1905. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
- Prellwitz W. 1927. Noch einmal *ánthro:pos* und die griechischen Wörter auf *o:ps*. – *Glotta* 16: 151–154.
- Pronk T. 2011. The Saussure effect in Indo-European languages other than Greek. – *JIES* 39: 177–193.
- Rasmussen J. 1989. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.
- Rix H. 1970. Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechischen. – *MSS* 27: 79–110
- Rix H. 1991. Nochmals Griechisch *nētta nēssa nāssa*. – *KZ* 103: 186–198.
- Rix H. 1992. *Historische Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. [2. verbesserte Auflage]. Darmstadt.
- Rosól R. 2010. The etymology of Greek *súbakkhos*. – *Mnemosyne* 63: 445–449.
- Rosól R. 2012. *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Frankfurt.
- Sakellariou M. 1976. *Peuples préhelléniques d'origine indo-européenne*. Athens.
- Scheffelowitz J. 1905. Zur armenischen lautgeschichte. – *BB* 29: 13–70.
- Schindler J. 1975. L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en r/n. – *BSL* 70: 1–10.
- Schmidt G. 1973. Die iranischen Wörter für „Vater“ und „Tochter“ und die Reflexe des interkonsonantischen H (ə) in den indogermanischen Sprachen. – *KZ* 87: 36–83.
- Schmidt J. 1889. *Die pluralbildungen der indogermanischen neutra*. Weimar.
- Schmitt R. 1961. *Nektar*. – *KZ* 77: 88.
- Schmitt R. 1965. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. [PhD thesis]. Saarbrücken.
- Schulze W. 1887. Das lateinische v perfectum. – *KZ* 28: 299–274.
- Schulze W. 1888. Miscellen. – *KZ* 29: 255–271.
- Schulze W. 1895. Alt- und Neugriechisches. – *KZ* 33: 224–233.
- Schwyzler E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.
- Skok P. 1936. Zum insula Problem. – *Glotta* 25: 17–222.
- Solmsen F. 1909. Zu lat. *Nūbō*. – *Glotta* 2: 75–81.
- Sonne W. 1863. Sprachliche und mythologische untersuchungen angeknüpft an RigVeda I.50. – *KZ* 12: 267–298.
- Spiegelberg W. 1907. Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache. – *KZ* 41: 127–132.
- Thieme P. 1952. *Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Thurneysen R. 1890. Lateinisches. – *KZ* 30: 485–503.
- Trümper H. 1950. *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos*. Basel.
- Van Beek L. 2011. The Saussure effect in Greek: A reinterpretation of the evidence. – *JIES* 39: 129–175.
- Van Veen P., Van der Sijs N. 1997. *Groot etymologisch woordenboek*. Utrecht, Antwerpen.

- Van Windekens A. 1960. *Études pélasgiques*. Louvain.
- Van Windekens A. 1982. Gr. *númphe*: “femme enceinte”. – *KZ* 96: 93–94.
- Veitch W. 1879. *Greek verbs, defective and irregular*. Oxford.
- Verhasselt G. 2009a. *Het Pre-Griekse substraat. Recente tendenzen binnen het taalkundig onderzoek*. [MA thesis]. Leuven.
- Verhasselt G. 2009b. The Pre-Greek linguistic substratum. An overview. – *LEC* 77: 211–239.
- Verhasselt G. 2011. The Pre-Greek linguistic substratum. A critical assessment. – *LEC* 79: 257–283.
- Viechnicki P. 1994. *ameibo*: An interdisciplinary approach. – *JIES* 22: 113–132.
- Vine B. (rev.). 2012. De Vaan 2008. – *Kratylos* 57: 1–40.
- Wackernagel J. 1897. *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. Basel.
- Walde A., Hofmann J. 1954. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 2: M-Z]. Heidelberg.
- Weiss M. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.
- Wiedemann O. 1902. Etymologien. – *BB* 27: 193–261.
- Wyatt W. 1968. Greek Names in *ssos/ttos*. – *Glotta* 46: 6–14.
- Yamazaki Y. 2009. The Saussure effect in Lithuanian. – *JIES* 37: 430–461.
- Zehnde T. 2001a. **nes*. – *LIV*²: 454–455.
- Zehnder T. 2001b. **ney*. – *LIV*²: 455–456.
- Zehnder T. 2001c. **sneh*₂. – *LIV*²: 572–573.

WILLIAM SAYERS
Cornell University, Ithaca
ws36@cornell.edu

ENGLISH ETYMOLOGIES FROM THE POPULAR REGISTER (I)¹

Keywords: English etymology, lexical transfers, *balderdash*, *gander*, *gawk*, *hurdy-gurdy*, *shenanigan*, *snook*

Abstract

Difficulties in tracing the etymology of lexical isolates and loans from other languages are exemplified in the discussion of a gathering of English words previously without satisfactory explanations of origin. In particular, recognition of the adstratum effects of the Irish language on British English over several centuries prompts a call not only for numerous revisions to entries in our standard lexicographical reference works but for a fundamental rethinking of relations between these multiply overlapping speech communities.

A surprising number of words in the vocabulary of English, as recorded in the authoritative *Oxford English Dictionary*, are without satisfactory etymologies. Among these are isolates, if we borrow a term from historical linguistics, which present particular difficulties for the etymologist. The status of isolate entails that no attested or reconstructed Old English form is seen as antecedent and none of the likely sources of a loan, e.g. Old Norse, Norman French, Middle Dutch, offers comparable evidence. Without cognates in other languages, often not part of a word cluster of noun, adjective, and verb, and subject to the shaping influence of the sound system where they are now found, isolates prompt an appeal to extra-linguistic paths of inquiry, such as the likely geographical provenance or specific properties of the designated item.

Lexicographical conventions often entail that the etymologies of loan words in English are not traced back farther than to their immediate source language and

¹ This is the first part of a planned three-part study, succeeding components of which will appear in this journal.

culture. While Middle English vocabulary without Old English antecedents is often projected against the relatively well known backdrop of French and Norman-French, as times even the Old Danish brought to the Danelaw and the future Normandy, and their authoritative historical and etymological dictionaries, occasional loans from other European languages that were not part of sweeping, wholesale linguistic change, as exemplified by the introduction of French to England, often fare less well. Clearly, in our dictionaries, individual English words cannot, like royal pedigrees or, in the current vogue, family histories, be traced back to Adam and his speech, and it seems reasonable to settle for the best available information on the donor vocabulary as found in standard reference works.

Examined in the following is a selection of English words, most of which came to the author's attention in random fashion and which are thus far without satisfactory etymologies or, often, other lexical affiliations. Some few are from the medieval and Renaissance periods, more from early modern and modern times. Several have been subsequently categorized as popular, slang, or cant, and reflect, in a broad sense, earlier public life in the streets and courts of Britain with its ongoing verbal interactions and judgments. When the deeper historical roots of these words are explored, they illustrate the processes and consequences of transcultural adaptation. We begin with some street sounds.

*

Hurdy-gurdy: In its etymological note for *hurdy-gurdy*, the *OED* states simply: 'apparently a rhyming combination suggested by the sound of the instrument' (*OED* s.v. *hurdy-gurdy*, n.; accessed 1 September, 2015). In pursuing a more satisfactory explanation of the name, one that need not totally preclude an imitative or echoic factor, we do well to bear in mind the make-up of the early instrument, before the extension of the term *hurdy-gurdy* to the barrel organ:

A musical instrument of rustic origin resembling the lute or guitar, and having strings (two or more of which are tuned so as to produce a drone), which are sounded by the revolution of a rosined wheel turned by the left hand, the notes of the melody being obtained by the action of keys which 'stop' the strings and are played by the right hand; thus combining the characteristics of instruments of the bowed and the clavier kinds. (*OED*)

In many of the alliterative or rhyming compounds that were formerly common in popular English, more than a superficial association of sounds is at work. The initial relationship of the parts was not one of parity. In the reconstructed pattern of development, a primary lead element with distinct semantics and phonetics attracts a secondary complement that can be seen as a phonetic variant with both similar and dissimilar qualities. The overall pattern of the two elements may be a common initial consonant or cluster followed by varying vocalism, as in *flim-flam*, or differing initial sounds and similar vocalism and concluding consonantism, as in *hurdy-gurdy*. The ubiquitous *-y* ending completes the parallel and seems to have

a familiarizing function, expressing a slight condescension on the part of the speaker toward the object or phenomenon under consideration.

This coloration is apparent in the first attestations of *hurdy-gurdy* in the 1740s and in its association with foreign, more exactly northern Italian, and popular origins: 'Receive this incorrect epistle ... not for its wit or its beauty: for it has no more pretence to either, than a hurdygurdy has to harmony' (Luxborough 1775 [Letter 10, 1749]: 152); 'A sightly clown! – and sturdy! Hum! – plays, I see, upon the hurdy-gurdy' (O'Hara 1764: i. 7); 'Hetty went as a Savoyard, with... a Vielle or Hurdy Gurdy round her waist' (Burney 1988 [Journal 10, 1770, I.]: 100). Despite these assumed origins, English *hurdy-gurdy* is, as the *OED* states, without parallels in Italian, French and German, where we find such denominators as *organetto*, *manivella*; *orgue de Barbarie*, *orgue à manivelle*, ~ à cylindre, *limonaire*; and *Drehleier*, *Drehorgel*, *Radleier*, respectively, with an emphasis on how the sound is produced.

In a renewed search for a satisfactory origin for the English term, we should note the appreciably earlier (from 1568) northern English and Scots forms *hirdy-girdy*, mock Latin *hirdum-dirdum*, and *hurly-burly*, which refer not to a musical instrument but to tumult, uproar, disorder, in particular its accompanying noise.² Is this then a basic meaning which has been applied, metaphorically, to the musical instrument with its unsophisticated melodies and underlying drone, as the *OED* laconically goes on to suggest?

Were an independent origin for the name to be pursued, one could imagine yet another reference to the make-up of the instrument. Thus, a hypothetical late medieval French **orgue à gourde* 'organ with a gourd-shaped body' (French *gourde* < Latin *cucurbita*). In the subsequent development, the first element would have aligned itself with the second: *orgue* > *horgue* > *horde* > *hurd-y*. Yet we have no evidence of a putative **orgue à gourde*. Medieval French did, however, have a term *hourdis*, *hourdeis* that referred both to wooden scaffolding, fencing, or hurdles (< Old Frankish *hurd*; cf. the Middle English loan of *hurdis*, *hord* from French, modern English *hoarding*) and to a *mêlée* or massed struggle. It appears that the woven or plaited composition of the hurdle is the source of the metaphorical extension to *mêlée*. This accords well enough with the meanings of Scots *hirdy-girdy*, English *hurly-burly*, etc. but leaves the second element unexplained. Old French *gourdir* (modern French *engourdir*) meant 'to paralyze, deaden, render inert'. Paradoxically, in reference to wine, *gourdlgourdi* meant 'to have body' and, in terms of clothes, to be fashionable.³ Thus, we may imagine a **hourdis gourdi* to be a muffled tumult, noisy, dense *mêlée*, or such like. Scots *hirdy-girdy* and *hirdum dirdum* would then have retained the basic meaning of the collocation.⁴

² The *OED* notes speculation that *dirdum* 'tumultuous noise' may have an origin in Scots Gaelic.

³ Medieval French knew the expression *huré ou gourdi* 'bad [wine] or good (full-bodied)'; the initial element referred to hair on the head of a person or animal; Godefroy (1881–1902), s.v. *huré*.

⁴ Since *hourdis gourdi* is not recorded from France, we must concede that perhaps only *hourdis* migrated to England and that the future compound was the result of the common reduplicating process outlined above.

If this were, indeed, at the origin of *hurdy-gurdy* as the name of the musical instrument, it would mean that the formation was NOT initially directly echoic and reduplicative, although such stimuli would have contributed to shape the final phonetic outcome and strengthen the affect (rustic, simple-minded). The name for the instrument must then be seen as metaphorical: the rumbling rasp of the drones and other strings, amplified by the sound-box, being likened – none too favourably – to the growling tumult of a crowd. This extended signification of Middle English *hurdis* plus complement will then have been a second such transfer: first, *hourdis* ‘hurdlings’ > ‘dense interactive crowd’, second ‘noisy crowd’ > musical instrument.⁵ The transfer of the term *hurdy-gurdy* to the instrument may have been relatively late in English, as the first attestations from the eighteenth century suggest, with their urbane, lightly xenophobic condescension. From this consideration of common street sounds, the essay turns to those that walked those streets.

*

Gander: For *gander* as the designation of the male goose, the *Oxford English Dictionary* provides an etymological commentary whose fullness and richness reflects the greatly enlarged entry parameters afforded by electronic publishing as the *OED Online*. Excerpted, it reads:

The original stem is perhaps **ganron-*, the *d* being a euphonic insertion between *n* and *r* ... Outside of English the word is found only in Dutch, Low German and South German *gander*, Middle Low German *ganre*; the other Germanic languages show different formations. ... Although used as the masculine of *goose* n., (Old English *gós* < Old Germanic **gans-*) there is some doubt whether it is etymologically cognate with that word. ... It has been conjectured that *gander* may have been originally the special name of some kind of water-bird, and that its association with *goose* is accidental, perhaps arising from the alliterative phrase ‘goose and gander’ (*OED* s.v. *gander*; accessed 1 September 2015).

As *ganra/gandra*, the term is attested in Old English and continues little changed into modern English. Under *Phrases and proverbs*, the dictionary offers early attestations, some of which will be relevant for the following discussion. From the English translation of Brant’s *Ship of Fools*: ‘That gose that styll about wyll wander... Shall home come agayne as wyse as a gander’ (Brant 1509: f. lxxiii). Skelton writes: ‘Doctoure Pomaunder, As wise as a gander, Wotes not wher to wander’ (Skelton 1843: II. 434, iii [from about 1540]). From 1701, a familiar saw: ‘What is Sawce for a Goose is Sawce for a Gander’ (Brown 1701: iii, 100). In these pairings are two associations, of rather different kinds: *gander* with *goose* as the male and female of the species, with alliterating names; and *goose/gander* and *wander* in an equation of

⁵ The semantic slot left open by the application of *hurdy-gurdy* to the musical instrument would seem to have been filled in standard English by *hurly-burly*, whose origin is also given by the *OED* as ‘uncertain’ but which seems likely to be an off-shoot of the terms discussed here.

behavioural characteristics (hardly exclusive to these birds), with a rhyme *gander/wander*. To these examples may be added the familiar nursery rhyme, first recorded in 1784, that begins ‘Goosey, goosey, gander, Whither shall I wander’.⁶

The *OED* goes on to identify a figurative use of *gander* as a designation for ‘a dull or stupid person; a fool, simpleton’. Then, finding a source in American slang, the dictionary calls attention to *gander* in the sense of ‘a look or glance’ and refers for further detail to the entry for the verb *to gander*. Here, the above-noted proverbial phrasing finds a parallel, if not an explanation: ‘To wander aimlessly, or with a foolish air like that of a gander. Also, to look or glance; to ramble in talk.’ (*OED* s.v. *gander*, v.; accessed 1 September, 2015). From *The great French dictionary*: ‘To go a gandering, whilst his Wife lies in, *chercher à se divertir ailleurs*’ [etc.] (Miège 1687, s.v. *gonder*). The first recorded coupling of the ideas of wandering and rubber-necking is found in 1887: ‘*Gonder*, to stretch the neck like a gander, to stand at gaze’. ‘What a’t gonderin’ their fur?’ (Darlington 1887, s.v. *gonder*). Detached from the notion of rambling, *gander* achieves independent status as a noun, as in the phrase ‘take a gander’. Here, the etymologists of the *OED* may also have gone a-gandering, although these words and their various meanings do raise the methodological question of how best to treat words that have discrete and independent origins but later coalesce both phonologically and semantically, albeit often with bizarre results in the latter case.

The verb *to wander* descends in unproblematic fashion from Old English *wandrian* and the *OED* notes such cognates as ‘Old Frisian *wondria* (West Frisian *wanderje*, North Frisian *wāneri*), Middle Dutch *wanderen*, Flemish (Kilian) *wanderen*, Middle Low German *wanderen* (Low German *wandern*), Middle High German, German *wandern*, Norwegian, Swedish *vandra*, Danish *vandre* < Old Germanic **wandrōjan*. Not recorded in Old Norse or Old High German. ...’ (*OED* s.v. *wander*, v.; accessed 1 September, 2015). Among early Germanic forms as reconstructed by comparative philology should also be noted the related but not identical Frankish **wandjan* as brought to northern Gaul by the Franks in the sixth century. The core semantics here are ‘to turn’. The Old French and more specifically Anglo-French reflexes are *gandir* and *guandir* with significations ‘to turn aside, dodge, escape’ (Rothwell 2005, s.v. *gandir*, *guandir*). For example, in the Anglo-French *Life of St. Edmund*, written by Denis Pyramus of St Edmunds Abbey in the early thirteenth century, viking raids by the sons of Ragnar Loðbróka (Hairy-Brecks) on East Anglia around 865 are presented as irresistible: ‘Cil ki d’Ingar poet eschaper ... A l’encontrer ne puet guandir D’Hubbe, que il n’estuet morir’ (Kjellman 1935: v. 2079; ‘He who could escape Ingvar ... could not dodge Ubba when meeting him but must die’, my translation). The same Germanic root is represented in Old English *wandian* ‘to deviate, flinch, hesitate.’

Anglo-French *gandir* in the sense of deviating from a path must then have entered Middle English, although it is not recorded, and would appear both to have been assumed into the bird name and, in light of the obvious semantic affinities,

⁶ Opie, Opie (1977: 191–192). The rhyme continues “Upstairs, downstairs / In my lady’s chamber” and suggests that the vocalism of *gander/wander/chamber* was once closer than at present.

to have been attracted to the semantic field of English *wander*, while retaining its distinct form. Over time the coincidence of the verb *gandir* with the bird name *gander* helped to bring the verb *wander* into association with geese (well illustrated by the quotations above), at which point folk etymology credits geese with a particular propensity to aimless circumambulation and, rather more specific to the species and based on accurate observation, with a craning of the long neck. “Ganders gander”, as Old English gnomic verse might have said. On the regular pattern in English of noun formation from verbs, *gander* then achieved independent status, not as a kind of walk but as the kind of look that might occur during certain kinds of walking.

*

Gawk differs from *gander* in that the act of looking is not disengaged and mildly curious but uncomprehending and incredulous. The *OED* offers the definition ‘to stare or gape stupidly’ (*OED* s.v. *gawk*, v.; accessed 1 July 2015). As for origin, the verb may be formed on the noun (which also doubles as a term for an unsophisticated person) or, according to the *OED* be ‘possibly, on the other hand, an iterative < *gaw* v. (with suffix as in *tal-k*, *wal-k*, *lur-k*), in which case it may be the source of the noun’.⁷ *Gaw*, now obsolete, is, in turn, stated as cognate with Old Norse *gá* ‘to heed’ (not exactly a sight act, it should be noted). But this derivation, however attractive, is to disregard Modern German *gucken* ‘to look’ and its several related forms, for which an Old High German **gukkan* or **guckan* has been reconstructed (Köbler 1993, s. vv. **gukkan*, **guckan*). An unrecorded Old English cognate is then possible. In addition to the above-noted meaning, the *English dialect dictionary* records *gawk* (var. *gouk*) with the meaning ‘to wander aimlessly about’ (Wright 1898–1905: 2.583, s.v. *gawk*). This reverses the situation with *gander*, which moved from locomotion to gaze. It is not etymology that is driving the evolution of these words but phonetic resemblance or suggestion, register, and topic. Something similar to the intertwined relations of Anglo-French *gandir*, and English *wander* and *gander* appears to attend *gawk*. This can be illustrated and summed up in the near-equivalence in usage of *gawky* and *awkward*. There is a linear motif here: the *gawky* or the *gawks* are often thin or tall as well as undersocialized. Like the long-necked goose gazing about, they look in vain for social cues. *Awkward* was originally an adverb on the model of *forward* and meant ‘in the wrong direction, in the wrong way’, before developing the modern range of meanings descriptive of situations, objects, persons. The now obsolete *awk* is traced to Old Norse *afug* (with variants) ‘turned the wrong way, back foremost’ and alone was used in English as ‘directed the other way or in the wrong direction, back-handed, from the left hand’ (*OED*; Wright 1898–1905: 2.583). Interaction between the *gawk*- and *awk*- forms explains the compounds listed in the *OED* entry for *gawk* as adjective: ‘of difficult etymology; apparently a contraction of a disyllabic word which appears in many

⁷ Evidence for the noun is late, and the usage may have emerged in Ireland; see the *OED* citations.

north-English dialects as *gaulick-*, *gallo-*, *gaulish-* (*hand, handed*)' (*OED* s.v. *gawk*, adj.; accessed 1 September 2015). The etymological matter is resolved, if we see in *gaulick* a dissimulated form of **gawk-lick*, and in *gawk-* a substitution for *awk*. In support of this explanation, *gawk-handed* is also recorded (*OED*).

In an etymological note that is part of the entry for *gawk* as adjective (and not well integrated with the treatment of *gawk* as noun or verb), the *OED* briefly entertains the possibility of a source in French *gauche* and then rejects it, a rejection supported by the other evidence here reviewed. But since *gauche* is now fully at home in English and also belongs in the semantic field of geese and gawks, brief comment is warranted. Middle French *senestre* 'left' was replaced by *gauche* in the fifteenth century. An excellent work in progress, *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*, reviews the early evidence for *gauche*-looking words in Renaissance French dialect but is unable to determine an exact etymon (Baldinger et al. 1971–: G 387–388, s.v. *gauche*). Given the negative associations of the left, one might speculate on a tabu-related substitution of the native term by an import from an "innocuous" foreign language, on the model of Spanish *izquierdo*, from Basque.⁸ A Frankish reflex of Old High German *walah/walask* 'alien, foreign' (cf. English *Welsh*) might have been brought to sub-Roman Gaul and could have led an underground life in French dialect before being called on to replace *senestre*, since, both foreign and referring to foreignness, it had the requisite affective value of alterity and incorrectness (Köbler 1993, s.vv. *walah/walask*). Certainly, the derivation is plausible in purely phonological terms (*w-* > *g-* or *gu-*; post-vocalic *-l-* vocalized as *au*; *-h* or *-sk* realized as Gallic *-che*). In all of the foregoing, the largely pejorative affect of these words (when *goose* and *gander* are used figuratively of persons) is to be noted. In conclusion, we may recall the nursery rhyme, "Goosey goosey gander, whither shall I wander ..." to illustrate the indeterminate nature and affinities – almost the secret life – of several of these terms and, more pointedly, the persistent association in English motif-clustering and speech of *goose*, *gander*, and *wander*, long after folk etymology had supplanted any awareness of an imported French *gandir*, another word that seems to have realized in English its inherent signification, 'to deviate'.

*

To cock a snook. The *OED* explains *snook*, as used in the expression *to cock a snook*, as 'a derisive gesture' (*OED* s.v. *snook*, n.³; accessed 1 September, 2015). The earliest attestation is in the diary of Elizabeth Wynne Fremantle from 1791: "They *cock snooks* at one on every occasion" (Wynne 1935–40: I. 90 [7 Dec. 1791]). A more analytic statement is found in Martin Cumberland's *Murmurs in the Rue Morgue*: "With his right hand he made the somewhat coarse gesture known as 'cocking a snook'. The thumb and extended fingers, spread in front of the face, made a baffling disguise" (Cumberland 1959: 38). The *OED* calls *snook* "of obscure origin".

⁸ Cf. the use of native resources in Italian *stanca* 'the tired one' and *manca* 'the lame one' for the left hand.

The word was once widespread in English dialect and Wright's dictionary offers the meanings 'to smell as a dog; to poke about with the nose, to pry about' (Wright 1898–1905: 5,591, s.v. *snook*). In Scots, however, the semantics of the verb *snoke* are richer: 'To sniff, smell, scent out, as a dog, snuff, poke with the nose; *fig.*, to scorn, despise.' (*Dictionary of the Scots language* 2014, s.v. *snoke*; found as early as Gavin Douglas's translation of *The Aeneid*, 1513 [Douglas 1957–1964]). The *OED* knows the verb *to snoke* and the explanation, with one exception, is congruent with usage in Scots: 'To snuff or smell; to go snuffing or smelling (at); to poke about with the nose. Also *fig.*, to sneak about, to keep watch *over*.' But here the element of derision is lacking. The *OED* suggests a Scandinavian origin for *snoke*, citing Norwegian dialect *snōka* 'to snuff, smell' but a cognate, *snaka*, 'to rummage, snuff about' is found in Old Norse (Cleasby et al. 1957, s.v. *snaka*). It then seems plausible to conclude that "to cock a snook" has a specifically Scottish origin but how was the noun *snook* and the manual gesture it implies derived from the verb?

In a separate entry, the *OED* explains *snook*, n.¹ as 'A projecting point or piece of land; a promontory'. Usage is northern and Scottish, and the term is now judged obsolete. An early example as a toponym is found in a thirteenth-century charter "In illa parte agri quæ vocatur le Snoc" (Fowler 1878: 55 [from c. 1236]). Cf. "In factura pontis castrî Berwyci, muri lapidei juxta mare subtus le Snoke" (Palgrave 1837: II. 160 [from c. 1297]).

With the phrase "to turn up one's nose at something" in mind, the following development may be proposed: (1) to *snoke* is to deride; (2) a derisive gesture extending the nose, with perhaps very deep European roots (cf. "to give someone the *fig*"), becomes the manual sign expressing this feeling; (3) the extension to the nose effected by the spread hand is likened to a headland or point (*snook*, n.¹) on the seacoast; (4) the *snook* (n.³) is cocked by the hand being spread and raised with the thumb facing backwards toward the face at nose level. The bit of word-play available in *snook* and *cock* may have dictated the choice of verb or the rear-facing thumb may have suggested a cocked firearm. Other deviations from standard public conduct are explored in the following.

*

Shenanigan: Of *shenanigan*, the *OED* writes: 'trickery, skullduggery, machination, intrigue; teasing, "kidding", nonsense; (usu. *pl.*) a plot, a trick, a prank, an exhibition of high spirits, a carry-on'. The term is said to have emerged in the U.S. but, as for etymology, we find "origin obscure" (*OED* s.v. *shenanigan*; accessed 1 September, 2015). First attestations are from the mid- to late nineteenth century and support the geographical attribution. From the journalism of California: "Are you quite sure? No shenanigan?" (*Town Talk* 1855, 25 April, 2); "These facts indicate that there is some *shenanigan* going on" (*Spirit of the age* 1857: 20 April, 2C); "Race came off Whiskey Bill winner, the Mare's rider held in, and Smith pronouncing it shenanigan" (De Long 1930: 156, 15 August, 1930). And from Mark Twain: "Consider them all ... guilty (of 'shenanigan') until they are

proved innocent” (Clemens 1917: May, 1862, I. iii. 77). In the following, the origin of *shenanigan* is traced to one of the immigrant communities that established itself on the American west coast.

In Irish, *sean*, regularly ‘old’, is also employed as an adjectival prefix to denote originality, elevated age, known habits, etc. and often carries an intensifying or deprecatory colouring, e.g., *seanaimsir* ‘old times’, *sean-pheacath* ‘an inveterate sin’, *sean-bheo* ‘a grudge, old quarrel’, *sean-urchóid* ‘an old offense, old villainy’, *seana-deich a’ triuch* ‘a wretched old ten of clubs’, and the like (Dinneen 1927, s.v. *sean*). It is proposed that *sean* was combined with *anachain* ‘harm, damage, calamity, accident’ (often viewed with exasperation), to form *seananachain* (*Jananəχan*) with the meaning habitual deleterious action by a human agent or, more familiarly, someone’s “old tricks”. Other Hibernicisms also seem to have taken root, or at least first appeared, in the San Francisco area of the U.S. with its international port (Sayers 2002; for a recent, none too rigorous, but lively account, see Cassidy 2007).

With late-nineteenth-century London peopled by Finnegans and Flanagans, Hallorans and Houlihans, *shenanigan* would surely have had a familiar ring to the first editors of the *OED*, even if perceived as originally a term of North American slang. One can only speculate why James Murray and his colleagues did not look to John Bull’s other island for a source for the term, particularly in light of its negative connotations. Even closer to home were the London *Hooligans*, a name for a street gang first recorded in 1898. Popular etymology has suggested an origin in *Hooley’s Gang* or some other such misapprehension (and the *OED*’s speculation stops here) but it is also possible that the name was chosen by its bearers. *Houlihan*, seen above, originated in Irish *Ó hUallacháin*, whose basis lies in *uall-* ‘pride’; negatively coloured derivatives are *uallach* ‘vain, boastful’, *uallachán* ‘coxcomb’ (Dinneen 1927, s.v. *uall-*). The street toughs may then have thought of themselves as something like “the Cocks of the Walk”.⁹

*

Balderdash: *Balderdash* is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as (1) froth or frothy liquid? (*obsolete*), (2) a jumbled mixture of liquors, (3) a senseless jumble of words; nonsense, trash, spoken or written (*transferred sense*), and (4) filthy, obscene language or writing (*dialect*) (*OED* s.v. *balderdash*, n.; accessed 1 September, 2015). As for origins: “etymology unknown”. Yet there is a reference to an appended note, where we read, *inter alia*:

Most etymologists have ... assumed 3 to be the original sense, and sought its explanation in the obvious similarity of *balder* to dial. *balder* ‘to use coarse language,’ Dutch *balderen* ‘to roar, thunder,’ Norwegian *baldra*, Icelandic *baldrast*, *ballrast* ‘to make a clatter,’ and of *-dash* to the vb. *dash* in various senses. The Welsh *baldoroddus* adj., < *baldordd* ‘idle noisy talk, chatter,’ has also been adduced.

⁹ On London bully boys and their speech, see Sayers (2007, 2008, 2010a and 2010b).

First sure attestations of the noun and related verb *balderdash* are from the early seventeenth century. Of these, Ben Jonson may be cited for the meaning ‘mixed liquors’ (“Beare, and butter-milke, mingled together... It is against my free-hold... To drinke such balder dash”; Jonson 1631: I. ii. 25) and Andrew Marvell for ‘a senseless jumble of words’ (“Did ever Divine rattle out such prophane Balderdash!”; Marvell 1674: ii. 243).

The Welsh evidence is of considerable interest, although the transformation of the adjective based on *balordd* ‘babble, chatter, clamour’ into a noun is problematic and, more generally, Welsh is not a significant source of English vocabulary in the period in question. On the other hand, at the time when *balderdash* makes its appearance, Irish and the English of Ireland was beginning to make a contribution to English and English letters.¹⁰

Early modern Irish *béal* ‘mouth’ (Old Irish *bél*) is found in numerous compounds describing the quality of speech, e.g., *béalban* ‘soft, blandishing language’, *béilbinn* ‘sweet-mouthed’, *béalgach* ‘babbling, deceitful’, *béalchainnteach* ‘loquacious’, *béalar-tán* ‘idle prater’. Irish *diardanach* ‘churlish, angry’ could have combined with *béal* and have been accommodated in English as *balderdash*, initially with meaning ‘coarse speech’. The earliest attestations make no suggestion that such a manner of speech is especially characteristic of the culture that supplied the term. Put more plainly, *balderdash* has none of the affect of *blarney*. The Scots Gaelic equivalent of Irish *béal* ‘mouth’ is *beul* [bel] and it enters into many of the same kinds of compounds and formations as seen above. *Beul* in combination *diardachd* ‘angriness, surliness’ would yield a model even phonetically closer to English *balderdash* than the hypothetical Irish form.

While an Irish or Scottish origin offers the most economical solution to the origin of the word *balderdash*, it is still possible that, once introduced into English, it was further influenced, at least in some quarters, by English *balder* ‘to use coarse language’, although the Germanic cognates of this latter word point toward true auditory effects (‘roar, thunder, make a clatter’). The evolution here outlined would have offensive language at the original semantic core, with “nonsense” a subsequent, somewhat attenuated development. Among the effects of intemperate speech is astonishment on the part of the hearer.

References

- Baldinger K. et al. (eds.). 1971–. *Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien français*. Québec.
 Baugh A., Cable T. 1993. *A history of the English language*. [4th edition]. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
 Brant S. 1509. *The shyp of folys of the worlde*. [= *Stultifera nauis*, trans. by Barclay A.]. London.

¹⁰ See Cronin (1997); histories of the English language, such as the authoritative Baugh and Cable (1993: 312–13), and Nevalainen (1999) devote some space to the English of Ireland but little attention to lexical imports from Ireland to the English of England, save for a conventional listing of five or six well known words, *brogue*, *colleen*, and the like.

- Brown T. 1701. *Laconics, or, new maxims of state and conversation relating to the affairs and manners of the present times*. [part 1]. London.
- Burney F. 1988. *The early journals and letters of Fanny Burney*. [vol. 1: 1768–1773]. Oxford.
- Cassidy D. 2007. *How the Irish invented slang: The secret language of the crossroads*. Petrolia (Ca).
- Cleasby R., Gudbrand V., Craigie W. (eds.). 1957. *An Icelandic-English dictionary*. [2nd edition]. London.
- Clemens S. 1917. *Mark Twain's letters*. [ed. by Paine A.; 2 vols.]. New York.
- Cronin M. 1997. Rug-Headed Kerns Speaking Tongues: Shakespeare, Translation, and the Irish Language. – Burnett M., Wray R., McGuinness F. (eds.). *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, politics, culture*. Basingstoke, New York: 193–212.
- Cumberland M. 1959. *Murmurs in the rue Morgue*. London.
- Darlington T. 1887. *The folk-speech of South Cheshire*. London.
- De Long E. 1930 = *California Historical Society Quarterly* 9. [journal].
- Dictionary of the Scots Language / Dictionar o' the Scots Leid*. 2014. Edinburgh. [<http://www.dsl.ac.uk/>].
- Dinneen P. (ed.). 1927. *Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla. An Irish-English dictionary*. Dublin.
- Douglas G. 1957–1964. *Virgil's Aeneid translated into Scottish Verse by Gavin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld*. [ed. by Coldwell D.; 4 vols.]. Edinburgh.
- Fowler J. (ed.). 1878. *Chartularium abbatiae de Novo monasterio, Ordinis cisterciensis, fundatae anno M.C. XXXVII*. Durham.
- Godfrey F. (ed.). 1881–1902. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*. Paris.
- Jonson B. 1631. *The Works of Benjamin Jonson – Bartholomew Fayre*. [vol. 2]. London.
- Kjellman H. (ed.). 1935. *La vie saint Edmund le Rei*. Göteborg.
- Köbler G. (ed.). 1993. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. [4th edition; <http://www.koeblergerhard.de/ahdwbhin.html>].
- Luxborough H. 1775. *Letters written by the late Right Honourable Lady Luxborough, to William Shenstone, Esq.* London.
- Marvell A. 1674. *The rehearsall transpros'd: The second part*. London.
- Miège G. (ed.). 1687. *The great French dictionary*. London.
- Nevalainen T. 1999. Early Modern English lexis and semantics. – Lass R. (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language*. [vol. 3]. Cambridge: 332–458.
- O'Hara K. 1764. *Midas: An English burletta*. London.
- Opie I., Opie P. 1977. *Oxford dictionary of nursery rhymes*. [2nd edition]. Oxford.
- OED = Oxford English Dictionary*. [online version]. 1989–2014. Oxford. [<http://www.oed.com/>].
- Palgrave F. (ed.). 1837. *Documents and records illustrating the history of Scotland*. London.
- Rothwell W. et al. (eds.). 2005. *Anglo-Norman dictionary*. [2nd edition]. London.
- Sayers W. 2002. Malarkey and its etymology. – *Western Folklore* 66: 209–12.
- Sayers W. 2007. *Moniker*: Etymology and lexicographical history. – *Miscelánea* 35: 91–97.
- Sayers W. 2008. Contested etymologies of some English words in the popular register. – *Studia Neophilologica* 80: 15–29.
- Sayers W. 2010a. Some 'Alsatian' etymologies from eighteenth-century London. – *Notes and Queries* 57: 79–83.
- Sayers W. 2010b. Some disputed etymologies: *Kidney, piskie/pixie, tating, and slang*. – *Notes and Queries* 57: 172–79.
- Skelton J. 1843. *Image ipocrysy – The poetical works of John Skelton*. [ed. by Dyce A.]. London.
- Spirit of the age*. 1857. Sacramento (Ca).
- Town talk*. 1855. San Francisco.
- Wright J. (ed.). 1898–1905. *English dialect dictionary*. London, New York.
- Wynne F.E. 1935–1940. *The Wynne diaries, 1789–1820*. [ed. by Fremantle A.; 3 vols.]. London.

MICHAEL KNÜPPEL
Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen
michaelkneuppel@gmx.net

ÜRLÜKSÜZ NOMLAR IN THE “MANICHAEAN POṬHĪ-BOOK”

Keywords: Buddhist-Uyghur terms in Manichaeic texts; “Manichaeic Poṭhī-book”; “momentary elements of consciousness” (skr. *anityatā dharma*)

Abstract

In the article the author deals with the meaning of the Buddhist-Uyghur term *ürlük-süz nomlar* in a passage of the so-called “Manichaeic Poṭhī-book”. As many specific Buddhist terms *ürlük-süz nomlar* can be found in no other Manichaeic-Uyghur texts and has to be translated in this context as “momentary elements of consciousness”.

In the so-called “Manichaeic Poṭhī-book” in lines 182–183 [according to the numbering in Clark (1982: 186), which corresponds to lines 142–143 in Bang, v. Gabain (1930)] we come across the *ürlük-süz nomlar*, which were interpreted by W. Bang Kaup and A. v. Gabain as “die vergänglichlichen Lehren” (“transitory doctrines”). The passage in question (*ürlük-süz nomlarig bükünüp • üç yavlak yolka k[o]rkinčin • ü[s]tünki yeg oronta tuggalı üç tamgalarig bütürt[i]*) is translated as follows:

Die vergänglichlichen Lehren verwerfend und aus Furcht vor den drei üblen Wegen • erfüllten sie, um auf dem höchsten Orte (im Götterlande) wiedergeboren zu werden • die drei Siegel. (Bang, v. Gabain 1930: 199)

This interpretation was erroneously adopted by L. V. Clark in his edition of the Poṭhī-book from the year 1982 and recently again in his re-edition of the “Great Mani-hymn” (Clark 2013) [“Recognizing the impermanent [doctrine]s [...]” (Clark 1982: 186); “They recognized the transitory doctrines [...]” Clark (2013: 162)¹], although *bükün-* (against Bang, v. Gabain 1930) is at least correctly translated in the sense

¹ From Clark (1982) this interpretation has also found its way into at least one of the manichaeological works of H.-J. Klimkeit.

of ‘acknowledge/ recognize’. W. Bang and A. v. Gabain were, however, quite cautious with their interpretation and also with the translation of *bükün-* and already suspected a connection with a Buddhist term, though the plural caused them some difficulties:

Zu *pük-*, *pök-* vgl. *Neg. Verbum* 129 und KOsm. III 68 Anm. Oder heißt *ürlüksüz nomlar* etwa „die Lehre von der Unbeständigkeit alles Irdischen“?? Dagegen spricht doch wohl der Plural *nomlar*. Für *pükün-* müßte dann jedenfalls eine andre Bedeutung gefunden werden. (Bang, v. Gabain 1930: 211)

The well documented *ürlüksüz nom*, as debated in Bang, v. Gabain (1930), is indeed a specific Buddhist term: the “dharma of impermanence”, actually the “doctrine of impermanence” (Skr. *anityatā dharma*), and can be found in numerous Buddh.-Uyghur. texts (e.g. in *Altun yarok sudur*² or in *Kšanti kılğuluk nom bitig*³) – admittedly (as Bang and v. Gabain have already noted) not with *nom* in the plural! In Buddhism, *anityatā*, along with suffering (*duḥkha*) and not-self (*anātman*), is one of the three marks of existence (*trilakṣaṇa*).⁴ Clauson traced *ürlüksüz* back to an undocumented **ürlük* ‘transitory’.⁵ In Manichaean-Uyghur texts, *ürlüksüz* is not documented elsewhere, which is not particularly surprising, as many specific Buddhist terms can be found in the “Manichaean Poṭhī-book” that are not otherwise encountered in Uyghur Manichaica – which leads us to the question as to how *ürlüksüz nomlar* are to be interpreted here.

Manichaeism had two different ways of handling Non-Manichaean religious terms and concepts when incorporating them in the Manichaean edifice of teachings: (1) largely retaining the contents of the terms and concepts in question (without infringing on the basic Manichaean dogmata) and (2) reinterpreting them in a Manichaean sense. Now, although it is clear that the *Anityatā-Dharma* was adopted here, what is not clear is how this very specific Buddhist concept could have been integrated into the Manichaean system. If one considers that the term *ürlüksüz nomlar* appears in the “Manichaean Poṭhī-book” in a context that deals with the commandments for the electi, and bears in mind the range of meanings of *nom* in Manichaean texts, one has to assume this is a case of reinterpretation – especially since the commandments play a central role and are based on the fundamental ethical rules of Manichaeism. Precisely the passage in which the *ürlüksüz nomlar* are mentioned contains a total of three borrowings from Buddhism in a single sentence, which shows particularly clearly the different ways of handling Buddhist terminology in the “Manichaean Poṭhī-book”. First, we have here the *ürlüksüz nomlar*, then the “three evil ways” (*üç yavlak yol*) and finally the “(re)birth in the supreme place” (*ü[s]tünki yeg oronta tug-*). In the case of the “three evil ways”, a Buddhist concept (three bad karma rebirths: 1. as daemon, 2. as preta and 3. as animal) was

² In Suv. *akıglıg ürlüksüz beş yapığıg* ‘the five unstable, transitory attachments’ (Suv 704, 14–15).

³ There correctly translated “*dharma* (der) Unbeständigkeit”.

⁴ For this cf. Buswell, Lopez (2014: 47–48).

⁵ Clauson (1972: col. 231 a).

adopted, since Manichaeism was already familiar with two evil ways (the so-called “poisonous ways”⁶) and this could therefore appear to be formally compatible with their own system.⁷ In the case of the “(re)birth in the supreme place”, a cosmological notion was reinterpreted with a Manichaeen sense. Although it is not possible to fully clarify what is meant by this “supreme place” in the “Manichaeen Poṭhī-book”, it corresponds to Nirvāṇa in Buddhism [or at least an “equivalent concept” (“temporary Nirvāṇa”, “Parinirvāṇa”), which will be addressed by the author in more detail elsewhere]]. Of course, according to Buddhist teaching one enters Nirvāṇa rather than being (re)born in it – here, again, there is a Manichaeen reinterpretation of a Buddhist concept. It is probably a very similar case with the *ürlüksüz nomlar*.

Is it conceivable that here the “transitory doctrines” are referred to? And which doctrines were supposed to be meant? Since our text deals with the recognition/acknowledgement of the *nomlar* and not with their transience, it can hardly be assumed that it refers to the teachings of Buddhism. It is also very unlikely that the transience of the teachings of the Apostle of Light is meant. Precisely the Manichaeans placed utmost importance on their teaching being set out in writing, safeguarded and kept pure, which elevated the teaching above that of Mani’s precursors – as seen for example in the *Kephalaia*.⁸ The recognition/acknowledgement of the impermanence of Manichaeen teachings would be diametrically opposed to the understanding of Manichaeism. Clark seems either to have not taken this fact into consideration or to have related the passage to the teachings of Buddha – which admittedly also makes no sense. For in that case, the recognition/acknowledgement of the transitory doctrines would be a prerequisite for a favourable reincarnation or even redemption.

The whole thing makes sense, of course, if one takes into consideration the above-mentioned ways of handling Buddhist terminology in our text. Either the “doctrines of impermanence” are meant here and the aim is to emphasize by analogy with Buddhism that even the teachings of the Manichaeans (recorded in the writings of the Apostle of Light) posit impermanence or, however, the term *dharma* was adopted here not as “doctrine” but rather in one of its other possible meanings: as “momentary elements of consciousness”. The *Anityatā-Dharma* was certainly familiar to the Manichaeans but probably not known in its entirety and it can be supposed that its incorporation into the Manichaeen system confronted the electi with some difficulties. The concept of the impermanence of the momentary elements of consciousness, on the other hand, was well understandable and also compatible with the dogmata of their own teachings. Furthermore, this interpretation does not contradict the views of the “religion of light”, as it always was the case in previous attempts of interpretation and suggested translations. Therefore, the passage should be translated as follows:

⁶ For this, cf. for example the texts of Ch’āstvānīfts.

⁷ Furthermore, the “three evil ways” correspond here to the three seals as fundamental ethical principles of the Manichaeans. A. van Tongerloo recently commented in detail on this in his lecture “Die drei Siegel als Tore der Religion” on 12 March 2015 at the workshop of the commission “Manichäische Studien” of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences.

⁸ Ibscher (1940: 7, Z. 18; 8, Z. 35).

Recognizing the momentary elements of consciousness and for fear of the three evil ways • they completed, to be (re)born in the supreme place (the realm of the gods) • the three seals.

References

- Bang W., v. Gabain A. 1930. Türkische Turfan-Texte III. Der große Hymnus auf Mani. – *SPAW. PH* 13: 183–211.
- Buswell R.E. jr., Lopez D.S. jr. 2014. *The Princeton dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton, Oxford.
- Clark L.V. 1982. The Manichaeian Turkic pothi-book. – *AoF* 9: 145–218.
- Clark L.V. 2013. *Uygur Manichaeian texts. Texts, translations, commentary. Volume II: Liturgical texts*. [= *CFM: Series Turcica* II]. Turnhout.
- Clauson Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Ibscher H. 1940. *Kephalaia*. [1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)]. [= *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin I*]. Stuttgart.

LUCIANO ROCCHI
University of Trieste
lrocchi@units.it

ADDENDA FROM PRE-MENINSKI TRANSCRIPTION TEXTS TO STANISŁAW STACHOWSKI'S "OSMANLI TÜRKÇESİNDE YENİ FARŞÇA ALINTILAR SÖZLÜĞÜ". PART I

Keywords: Ottoman-Turkish, New Persian, lexical borrowing, transcription texts

Abstract

Stanisław Stachowski wrote a series of articles devoted to studies on the New Persian loanwords in Ottoman-Turkish, which were published in *Folia Orientalia* in the 1970s and later republished in 1998 as a single volume. Since then, however, a good number of editions of new Ottoman texts have appeared, especially transcription texts dating from before Meninski's *Thesaurus* (1680), which provide much new lexical material. Within this material there are many Persianisms – predictably enough where Ottoman-Turkish is concerned. This paper aims to supplement Stachowski's work with words of Persian origin taken from pre-Meninski transcription texts. It is divided into two parts, the first including data to be added to entries already recorded by Stachowski (eight articles), the second containing data that constitute new entries (three articles). A short historical-etymological note on the words dealt with also features at the end of each entry.

Introduction

Stanisław Stachowski's "Studien über die neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen" were published in *Folia Orientalia* between 1972 and 1979. This series of articles was republished in 1998 as a single volume under the title *Osmanlı Türkçesinde Yeni Farşça Alıntılar Sözlüğü / Wörterbuch der neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen* (Simurg, İstanbul). In the foreword to this new edition Stachowski states:

Die „Studien“ umfaßten einen relativ kleinen Zeitraum (15. – 18. Jh.), und ihre Quellenbasis bildeten anschließend sog. Transkriptionstexte. Heute, nachdem ein Viertel Jahrhundert seit dem Erscheinen der ersten Folge meiner „Studien“ vergangen ist, ist die Sachlage in der Türkologie etwas anders. Die türkische historische Linguistik hat sich inzwischen um eine Reihe von neuen Sprachquellen bereichert, denen auch Wörterverzeichnisse beigefügt wurden, publiziert wurden mittlerweile auch zahlreiche Dialektwörterbücher sowie monographische Beschreibungen der Sprache von einzelnen Denkmälern. All diese Veröffentlichungen haben unsere Kenntnis der osm.-tü. Sprachgeschichte wesentlich vertieft. Bei dieser Sachlage könnte und sollte man neue Monographien zum pers. Lehngut im Osm.-Tü. schreiben. Es ist zwar noch nicht dazu gekommen, doch ich will weiter hoffen, daß sich die Erforschung der Geschichte des osm.-tü. Wortschatzes schon bald noch intensiver entwickelt wird.

I welcome the wish expressed by the great Polish scholar and, as a first step, in this paper will supplement Stachowski's work with addenda exclusively taken from pre-Meninski transcription texts.

Besides bilingual dictionaries and glossaries, I have included other texts such as literary works on the Turks, travel accounts, *Relazioni* of the Venetian ambassadors. Obviously, the list of these texts is selective, according to the sources I was able to consult.

The criteria used for presenting my addenda are as follows:

1. The material was divided into two parts: a) simple addenda to entries already recorded by Stachowski, b) addenda that provide new entries.
2. The entries are structured according to the rules adopted by Stachowski. In the first part, the number and headword of each entry are the original ones; the date put in parentheses after the headword refers to its oldest occurrence given by Stachowski; if this occurrence is formally different from the headword, the variant is cited in italics before the date. Those of my addenda that present forms not recorded in Stachowski's entry are entered after a semicolon with their respective dates. Variations of a word separated by a slash (/) were given by the source itself, whereas if separated by a double slash (//), they are possible alternative readings of a graphically ambiguous form. The addenda are listed in chronological order, preceded by the dates of their occurrences printed in bold; derivatives and phrases are put separately and listed in alphabetical order. Uncertain readings or meanings are marked with (?).

In the second part, if a word is only attested in forms different from the standard Ottoman-Turkish one, the latter is put in square brackets as headword of the entry.

3. Stachowski sometimes quotes Argenti's or Ferraguto's data (from Bombaci's works) in an incorrect or incomplete way. In these cases I insert the correct/complete data into my addenda by indicating that with the abbreviation [add.].
4. The Persian etymon is put at the end of each entry after the symbol • and its form and meaning are drawn, unless otherwise indicated, from Steingass' dictionary. I also add the dates (Roman numerals refer to centuries) of the first occurrence of the word in Ottoman-Turkish sources according to Nişanyan's (N.) and Pomorska's (P.) dictionaries. If the word is missing in these works the symbol (–)

is used. Occasionally, data from other lexicographical works such as TS and TETTL are also cited.

5. A number of Ottoman-Turkish words of Persian origin were recorded in Western sources in various formal (especially morphological) adaptations and sometimes turned into regular borrowings. As I have pointed out in each of the relative entries, words of this kind have not been taken into account.
6. Stachowski's following entries have been excluded because they are in all probability not of Persian origin: 6. *ahd* (< Ar.); 40. *biber* (< Gr.); 51. *cebe* (< Mong., see TMEN 1: 284–286); 63. *çanak* (for etymological proposals see TETTL 1: 472); 101. *dede* (a typical “Lallwort”); 297 *mercan* (probably < Ar.); 326. *nacak* (Pers. *nāčax/načak* very likely comes from Turkish: TMEN 4: 35–36); 432. *pezevenk* (< Arm., see DankoffArm. 29); 493. *sene* (< Ar.); 535. *sırdaş* (a der. with the T. suff. +*Daş*); 605. *tepsi* (see ErenTDES 403).

I have however kept two entries that are not proper Persian loanwords, but were coined in Ottoman with Persian lexemes: 91. *çohadar*, 223. *kahpezne*.

Entries whose etymology is uncertain are put in square brackets: [13. *armagan*], [174. *gülülü*], [534. *sirke*], [743. *çadır*], [797. *ferdaş*], [878. *küp*].

Addenda to entries recorded by Stachowski

2. **abdes** (1591; *abdest* 1680); **aptas*/abdās** (1481), **aptest** (1677) – **1481** “*tertia lotio vocatur *anpatz vel abdas*” (GUnSt. 46); **1646** “*a to omycie [rytualne] zowię swym językiem Abdes*” (Sz. Starowolski: StachSHET. 4); **1668** “*the Abdest or washing*” (RycautPSt. 121); **1672** *abdest* (abdeft) ‘*prima ablutionis species, quę praeparant se ad precandum vel ad Alcoranum legendum*’ (HarsColl. 484).
Phr. – **1677** *aptest mahraması* (aptest mahramassi) ‘sciugamano’ (Masc-Voc. 189).
• < Pers. *ab-dast* ‘the ablution or washing of the hands, face, and other parts, with certain ceremonies by the Mohammadans before prayer’. – N. 1 (XIV); P. 13 (1332).
3. **abhana** (1668); **apane** (1574), **apana** (1611) – **1574** *apane* (apane) ‘necessario’ (VNAd. 61); **1611** *abhana* (abhana) ‘necessario’ (RJT Majd. 166); **1611** *apana* (apanā) ‘*chiauica di bruttezza*’ (FerrR. 52).
Phr. – **1611** *apana(y)a git-* (apanaa ghidérum) ‘andar del corpo’ (FerrR. 52).
• < Pers. *ābxāna* ‘water-closet, cess-pool, or gutter’. – N. (–); P. (–).
4. **aferin** (1591) – **ca. 1630** *aferim* (afferim) ‘euge, macte’ (MontR. 44); **1672** *aferim* (aferim) ‘euge’ (HarsHaz. 66–67).
Phr. – **1533** *aferum de-* (afferúm derum) ‘lodo’, (afferúm dederúrum) ‘fo lodare’ (ArgAd. 132, ArgR. 27).
• < Pers. *āfirīn, āfrīn* ‘praise, glory, applause; well done!, bravo!’. – N. 6 (XV); P. 14 (1430).

5. **ah** (ca. 1450) – **1533 ah** (ahách, aach) ‘sospiro’ (ArgAd. 133, ArgR. 29); **ca. 1630 ah** (ah) ‘susprium’ (MontR. 45); **1650 ah** (ah, ach) ‘ah, *lamento*; haimè; sospiro’ (CarrR. 53); **1677 ah** (ah) ‘sospiro’ (MascVoc. 215).
 Phr. – **1533 ah et-** (ah/aah edérum) ‘sospiro’, (ah etterúrum) ‘fo sospirare’ (ArgAd. 133, ArgR. 29); **1677 ah et-** (ah etmech) ‘sospirare’ (MascVoc. 215) – **1650 ah edici** (ah edigi) ‘sospirante’ (CarrR. 53).
 • < Pers. *āh* ‘sigh’. – N. 8 (XIV); P. (–).
7. **ahd-i name** (*āhtname* 1680); **ahtename** // **ahtname** (1533), **ahdname** (1672) – **1533 ahtename** // **ahtname** (achtenamé) ‘capitolatione, capitulationi’ (ArgAd. 134, ArgR. 30); **1672 ahdname** (ahdname) ‘diplomata permutanda, id est literas juramenti seu foederis juramento interveniente initi’ (HarsColl. 263).
 • < Pers. *āhd-nāma* ‘letters of agreement, articles of peace or capitulation’. – N. (–); P. (–).
9. **ahenk** (1680).
 Phr. – → 484. *saz*.
 • < Pers. *āhang* ‘concord, symphony, harmony’. – N. 9 (XV); P. 16 (1368).
10. **ahur** (1591); **agir*** (1584) – **1533 ahur** (achér) ‘stalla’ (ArgAd. 133, ArgR. 29); **1574 ahur** (acher) ‘stalla’ (VNAd. 61); **1584 agir*** (*saguer) ‘equirie’ (PalPD. 524–525; [*saguet (PalBern 320)]); **1587/88 ahor** (achor) ‘Stall’ (LubAd. 33); **1611 ahur** (achīr, akchir) ‘caualleriza’ (RJTMajd. 167); **ca. 1630 ahur** (achur) ‘stabulum’ (MontR. 46); **1650 ahur** (acher) ‘albiolo, truolo da porci, mangiatoia’ (CarrR. 53); **1672 ahur** (ahirim [+ poss.]) ‘meum stabulum’, (ahira [+ dat.]) ‘in stabulum’, (ahirda [+ loc.]) ‘in stabulo’ (HarsHaz. 66–67); **1677 ahur** (ahir) ‘stalla, stanza d’animali’ (MascVoc. 228).
 Der. – **1641 ahorcı** (achorgi) ‘stalliere, *stallato [*recte* stallaiio or stallaro]’ (MolDitt. 429); **1677 ahırcı** (achirgi) ‘stalliero, stallaiio’ (MascVoc. 228).
 Phr. – → 496. *serāhor*, 791. *emir ahur*.
 • < Pers. *āxwūr* ‘stable, stall’. – N. 9 (XI); P. 17 (1451).
11. **alemdar** (1791) – **1668** “Their (= of the Emirs) second Officer is called *Alemdar*, who carries the Green Flag of Mahomet” (RycautPSt. 111).
 • < Pers. *‘alam-dār* ‘standard-bearer’. – N. 17 (XIV); P. (–).
12. **ambar** (1641); **amber** (1533), **hambar*** (1668) – **1533 ambar/lamber** (ambár, ambér) ‘granaio; maghazino; ripostiglio di panni et simili cose; sentina’ (ArgAd. 136, ArgR. 33); **1611 ambar** (ambár) ‘sentina del vascello’ (FerrR. 55); **1646** “szpichlerzow (...) kilkaset, (...) zowią je po turecku *Ambar*” (Sz. Starowolski: StachSHET. 21).
 Der. – **1668 hambarcı** (hambargy) ‘obsonarius’ (IllNém. 174).
 Phr. – **1677 boğday hambarı** (boghdai hambari) ‘granaio’ (MascVoc. 59) – **1650 gemi amberi** (ghiem amberi) ‘corpo della naue’ (CarrR. 58).
 • < Pers. *anbār* ‘pond, reservoir’. – N. 21 (XIV); P. 18 (1445).

[13. **armagan** (1603) – **1533** *armagan* (armaghán) ‘presente, dono’ (ArgAd. 138, ArgR. 35); **1611** *armagan* (armagan) ‘don, present’ (RJTMajd. 169); **1611** *arma[gan]* (arma[...]) ‘presente, dono’ (FerrR. 56); **ca. 1630** *armagan* (armagan) ‘donum’ (MontR. 50).

- Oghuz word of controversial etymology. ErenTDES 18 refutes its derivation from Pers. *armağān*, *armuğān* ‘a present brought from a journey, an offering’. Also Doerfer thinks that the Persian word was borrowed from some Turkic language (TMEN 2: 45). – N. 35 (XI); P. 19 (XIV)].

14. **armut** (1544/48); **armult** (1584) – **1533** *armut* (armútt) ‘pera, fructo’ (ArgAd. 138, ArgR. 35); **1574** *armut* (armut) ‘piro’ (VNAd. 61); **1575** *armut* (armut) ‘poire; pyrum’ (PostelInstr.); **1584** *armult* (armoult) ‘poires’ (PalBern. 323); **1587/88** *armud* (armud) ‘Birne’ (LubAd. 33); **1611** *armut* (armut) ‘pera’ (RJTMajd. 169); **1611** *armut* (armút) ‘pero, frutto’ (FerrR. 56); **ca. 1630** *armut* (armut) ‘pyrum’ (MontR. 50); **1672** *armut* (armut ([...] zemani gyeldi)) ‘pyrorum ([...] tempus adest)’ (HarsHaz. 72–73).

Phr. – **1533** *armut ağacı* (armútt aghaggi) ‘pero, albero’ (ArgAd. 138, ArgR. 35); **1611** *armut ağaç* (armút agácc) ‘pero, albero’ (FerrR. 56); **1677** *armud ağacı* (armud agagi) ‘pero albero’ (MascVoc. 123) – **1677** *armud meyve* (armud meiuè) ‘pero frutto’ (MascVoc. 123).

- < Pers. *amrūd*, *armūd* ‘pear’. – N. 35 (XI); P. 19 (1445).

15. **arşin** (1603); **arsin** ([1574]; 1587/88) – **1533** *arşin* (arscín) ‘picco da misurare’ (ArgAd. 138, ArgR. 36); **1574** *arsin* // *arşin** (*arsiui [+ poss.]) ‘brazzo’ (VNAd. 48); **1587/88** *arsin* (arsin) ‘Elen’ (LubAd. 34); **1611** *arşin/larsin* (arschin, arsin) ‘caña’ (RJTMajd. 170); **ca. 1630** *arşin* (arsin) ‘vlna’ (MontR. 50); **1672** *arşin* (arsin) ‘ulna’ (HarsHaz. 94–95).

- Morphological variant of Osm. *arış/arş* ‘cubit’ (TETTL 1: 201) < Pers. *arāš* ‘cubit, fathom’. According to Nişanyan < Middle Pers. *arišn* ‘elbow, upper arm; a unit of length’. – N. 36 (XIII); P. (–).

16. **arzu** (1455/56) – **1641** *arzu* (arsu) ‘brama’ (MolDitt. 73); **1677** *arzu* (arzu) ‘brama’ (MascVoc. 22).

Phr. – **1641** *arzu et-* (arzu etmech) ‘bramare, desiderare’, (arsu eden) ‘voglioso, desideroso’ (MolDitt. 73, 486) – **1672** *arzu gel-* (arzum gyeldi) ‘desidero’ (HarsHaz. 152–153).

- < Pers. *ārzū* ‘desire, wish, will’. – N. 37 (XI); P. 19 (1430).

17. **aster**, **astar** (1680) – **1533** *astar* (astár) ‘rouescio, soppanno’ (ArgAd. 139, ArgR. 37); **1611** *astar* (astár) ‘in forra’ (FerrR. 55); **ca. 1630** *astar* (astar) ‘subductura uestis/ uestium’ (MontR. 51).

Der. – **1611** *astarla-* (astarlárum) ‘inforrare’ (FerrR. 55).

- < Pers. *āstar*, *astar* ‘kind of coarse thin stuff fit for lining garments; inside of anything, lining of a garment’. – N. 40 (XIV), P. 20 (2/XV).

18. **aşikâre** (1603); **eskere** (1533), **askâra** (1611), **aşkâre** (1641), **aşker/aşkere/eşker** (1677) – **1533 eskere** (eschieré) ‘jm palese; manifesto, palese, publico’ (ArgAd. 180, ArgR. 96); **1611 eşkere** (eschkere) ‘diuulgar’ (RJTMajd. 186); **1611 eskere/askâra** (eschieré, aschiará) ‘alla scoperta, manifestamente’ (FerrR. 82); **1641 aşkâre** (asc=kiare, asc=kiarhe) ‘noto, manifesto; alla palese, alla scoperta’, (asc=kiarede [+ loc.]) ‘in publico’ (MolDitt. 33, 198, 273); **1650 eşkere** (eschiere) ‘certamente’ (CarrR. 147); **1672 aşikâre** (asikare) ‘palam, aperte’ (HarsHaz. 96–97, 190–191); **1677 eşkere/aşker/aşkere/eşker** (esc=chiere) ‘certo, euidente, publico, palese’, (asccher) ‘chiaro’, (asccherdur [+ copula]) ‘è manifesta’, (ascchiere) ‘illustre; in palese, noto, manifesto’, (esc-chier) ‘uulgarmente’ (MascVoc. 27 passim).

Der. – **1641 eşkerelik** (esc=kierelik) ‘publicamento, publicatione’ (MolDitt. 327); **1650 eşkerelik** (eschierelich) ‘euidenza’, (eschierelich ileh) ‘euidentemente’ (CarrR.147).

Phr. – **1641 ayan eşkere et-** (aian esc=kiere etmek) ‘publicare, palesare’ (MolDitt.,327); **1533 eskere et-** (eschieré edérum) ‘publico’, (eschieré etterúrum) ‘fo publicare’ (ArgAd. 180, ArgR. 96); **1677 aşkere et-** (asc-chiere etmech) ‘uulgare, palesare’ (MascVoc. 277) – **1641 eşkere edici** (esc=kiere edigi) ‘publicatore’ (MolDitt. 327) – **1641 eşkere ol-** (esc=kiere olmisc) ‘publicato, diuolgato’ (MolDitt. 327); **1677 eşkere ol-** (escchiere olunmisc) ‘publicato, diuolgato’ (MascVoc. 142).

• < Pers. *āškārā/āškāra* ‘clear, evident, manifest, open, public’. – N. 41 (XII); P. 21 (XIII/XIV).

19. **ateş** (1641) – **ca. 1630 ateş** (ates) ‘ignis’ (MontR. 51); **1650 ateş** (atesc) ‘fuoco’ (CarrR. 64); **1677 ateş** (atesc) ‘foco, fuoco’ (MascVoc. 51, 54).

Der. – **1650 ateşçik** (atescgich) ‘fuocarello’ (CarrR. 64) – **1650 ateşli** (atescli) ‘fuocososo’ (CarrR. 64); **1677 ateşili** (atescili) ‘focososo’ (MascVoc. 51) – **1650 ateşlik ile** (atesclich ile) ‘fuocosamente’ (CarrR. 65); **1677 ateşligile** (atesclighile) ‘focosamente’ (MascVoc. 51).

Phr. – **1650 ateş sineği** (atesc sineghi) ‘luciolia’ (CarrR. 64).

– **1650 ateşi çak-** (atesci ciacharum) ‘batter il fuoco’ (CarrR. 101) – **1641 ateşi yak-** (atesc=i iakmak) ‘accendere il fuoco’ (MolDitt. 7); **1650 ateş(i) yak-** (atesc/atesci iaqarum/iacharum) ‘accendere il fuoco, attizzar fuoco, raccender il fuoco’ (CarrR. 342).

• < Pers. *ātiš* ‘fire’. – N. 42 (XIV); P. 22 (2/XV).

22. **avaz** (1641) – **1533 avaz** (auás) ‘uocce’ (ArgAd. 140, ArgR. 38); **1587/88 avaz** (awas) ‘Stim’ (LubAd. 34); **1611 avaz** (auás, auás) ‘boz, voix; clamor’ (RJTMajd. 171); **1611 avaz** (aguás) ‘tono’ (FerrR. 57); **ca. 1630 avaz** (auas) ‘vox’ (MontR. 51); **1650 avaz** (auas) ‘melodia, canto soaue; rimbombo’ (CarrR. 65); **1677 avaz** (auas) ‘suono’ (MascVoc. 237).

Der. – **1611 avazla-** (auaslamak) ‘eco’ (RJTMajd. 171).

Phr. – **1641 ötücü avaz** (otugi auas) ‘ecco, voce che risponde’ (MolDitt. 65); **1650 ütücü avaz** (vtugi auas) ‘ecco, voce’ (CarrR. 65).

– **1650** *avazleri boz-* (auasileri bosmach) ‘melodia, canto soaue; rimbombo’ (CarrR. 65) – **1641** *avazı dut-* (auasi dutulmisc) ‘rauco’ (MolDitt. 338); **1677** *avazı tut-* (*auassi tutulmisc) ‘rauco, roco’ (MascVoc. 151) – **1650** *avaz ver-* (auas verirum) ‘rimbombare, risonare’ (CarrR. 65) – **1650** *avaz verici* (auas verigi) ‘rimbombante, risuonante’ (CarrR. 65).

– **1641** *avazlı söz* (auasli sos) ‘vocabulo, che ha voce’ (MolDitt. 486).

• < Pers. *āwāz* ‘voice, sound, noise, clamour’. – N. 44 (XIV); P. 23 (XIII/XIV).

23. **ayna** (1603) – **1533** *ayna* (ainá) ‘specchio’ (ArgAd. 142, ArgR. 40): **1587/88** *ayna* (ayna, aijna) ‘Spigel’ (LubAd. 34); **1611** *ayna* (ainà) ‘specchio’ (RJT Majd. 172); **1611** *ayna* (ainá) ‘specchio’ (FerrR. 58); **1641** *ayna* (aina) ‘specchio’ (MolDitt. 418); **1677** *ayna* (ainà) ‘specchio, spera’ (MascVoc. 220, 221).

Der. – **1533** *aynacı* (ainaggi) ‘specchiaio’ (ArgAd. 142, ArgR. 40).

– **1641** *aynala-* (ainalanmach) ‘specchiarsi’ (MolDitt. 418).

Phr. – **1611** *aynaya bak-* (ainaiá baccárum) ‘specchiarsi’ (FerrR. 58).

• < Pers. *āyina* ‘mirror, looking-glass’. – N. 47 (XIV); P. 23 (XIII/XIV).

24. **azad** (ca. *azat* 1450) – **1533** *azat* (axátt) ‘libero’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 41); **ca. 1630** *azad* (azad) ‘liber’ (MontR. 53); **1677** *azat* (aszat) ‘libero, non soggetto ad alcuno’ (MascVoc. 82).

Der. – **1611** *azatlı* (asatlı) ‘franco, libero’ (FerrR. 58); **1677** *azatlı* (aszat-li) ‘libertino, di seruo fatto libero’ (MascVoc. 82) – **1533** *azatluk* (asattlúch) ‘libertà’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 41); **1611** *azatlík* (asatlíc) ‘franchezza, libertà’ (FerrR. 58); **ca. 1630** *azadaluk* (*assadaluk) ‘licentia, libertas licentiosa’ (MontR. 53); **1677** *azatluk* (as(z)atluch) ‘liberazione, libertà, soluzione, assoluzione’ (MascVoc. 82, 211).

Phr. – **1533** *azat et-/eyle-* (axátt edérum/eilérum) ‘libero’, (axátt etterúrum) ‘fo liberare’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 41); **1650** *azad et-* (aszad, asad ederum) ‘assoluere, liberare, dar libertà’; (aszad etmech) ‘liberazione’ (CarrR. 69); **1677** *azat et-* (as(z)at etmech) ‘liberare, mettere in libertà, soluere’, (aszat eden) ‘liberatore, quello che libera’ (MascVoc. 82, 211) – **1650** *azad edici* (aszad/asad edigi) ‘assolvente, liberatore’ (CarrR.); **1677** *azat edici* (aszat edigi) ‘liberatore, quello che libera’ (MascVoc. 82) – **1533** *azat ol-* (axátt olúrum) ‘liberomi, mi fo libero’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 41); **1650** *azad ol-* (aszad olurum) ‘liberarsi’ (CarrR. 69); **1677** *azat ol-* (aszat olunmisc) ‘liberato’ (MascVoc. 82).

• < Pers. *āzād* ‘free, independent, liberated’. – N. 48 (XI); P. 24 (XIII/XIV).

25. **baç** (1591); **bay** (1678) – **1533** *bac* (bággi) ‘ghabella che si pagha’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 43); **1611** *baç* (bácc) ‘gabella’ (FerrR. 59); **1673** *badj* [French spelling] (Capitulations Louis XIV: SchweickTurk. 4); **1677** “tutti li banduri e martolossi (...) prendono il loro *bagg*” (Doc.Ragusa: SchweickTurk. 4); **1678** “i banduri pigliano il *bay* da tutti li mercanti che passano” (Doc.Ragusa: SchweickTurk. 4).

• < Pers. *bāğ* ‘tribute, toll levied by the road-patrol’. – N. 49 (XIV); P. 25 (XIII/XIV).

27. **bağ** (1544/48) – *ca.* **1520 /1525/30** *bah* (bachda [+ loc., LupisON.]; bach [ITSprAd.]) ‘vigna’ (LupisON. 3a; ITSprAd. 236); **1533** *bağ* (bagh) ‘uigna’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 43); **1575** *bağ* (bagh) ‘vigne; vitis’ (PostelInstr.); **1587/88** *bağ* (bag) ‘Weingarten’ (LubAd. 36); **1611** *bağ* (bág) ‘pergola, vigna, vite d’uua’ (FerrR. 59); **1650** *bağ* (bagh) ‘vigna’ (CarrR. 70); **1672** *bağ* (báglár [+ pl.]) ‘vineta’ (HarsHaz. 70–71); **1677** *bağ* (bagh) ‘vigna’ (MascVoc. 270).

Der. – **1650** *bağcı* (bagghi) ‘vignarolo’ (CarrR. 70).

Phr. – **1641** *bağ bozumı* (bagh bosumi) ‘vendemie’ (MolDitt. 476) – **1533** *bağ çibuğı* (bagh cibughı) ‘fascina di uermene; uite’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 44) – **1677** *bağın pudacısı* (baghin pudagissi) ‘potatore di vigne’ (MascVoc. 130).

– **1533** *bağı boz-* (baghı bosárum) ‘uendemmio’, (baghı bosdurúrum) ‘fo uendemiare’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 44); **1641** *bağları boz-* (baghlari boszmak/bosmak) ‘vendemiare, vindemiare’ (MolDitt. 476, 481); **1650** *bağ boz-* (bagh bosarum) ‘vendemiare’, (bagh bozmisc) ‘vendemiato’ (CarrR. 70); **1677** *bağileri boz-* (baghileri bosmach) ‘uendemiare, far la uendemmia’ (MascVoc. 265) – **1641** *bağ bozucu* (bagh bosigi) ‘vindemiato’ (MolDitt. 481); **1677** *bağı bozucu* (baghi bosugi) ‘uindemiato’ (MascVoc. 270).

• < Pers. *bāğ* ‘garden; vineyard’. – N. 50 (XI); P. 25–26 (XIII).

29. **bahçe** (*bahçı* 1603); **bahca*** (1525/30), **bahça** (1587/88), **baça** (1611) – **1525/30** *bahca** (*bağça* Adamović) (*barchga) ‘orto’ (ITSprAd. 222; missing in LupisON.); **1533** *bağça* (baghcia) ‘giardino’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 43); **1587/88** *bahça* (bachtszcha) ‘Garten’ (LubAd. 36); **1611** *baça* (baatschà, baatscha) ‘huerto’ (RJTMajd. 27, 172); *ca.* **1630** *bakça* (bakchia) ‘hortus’ (MontR. 55); **1672** *bakçe* (bakcsei [+ acc.]) ‘hortum’, (bakcseler [+ pl.]) ‘hortos’ (HarsHaz. 118–119, 92–93); **1677** *bakca/bağca* (bachgia) ‘giardino’, (baghgia) ‘orto’ (MascVoc. 56, 114).

Der. – **1533** *bağçacı* (baghcciaggi) ‘giardinere’ (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 43); **1650** *bakçacı* (bachgiagi) ‘giardinere’ (CarrR. 72) – **1641** *bakçacık/bakçacuk* (bakgiagich, bakgiagiuch) ‘giardinetto, orticello’ (MolDitt. 163, 285); **1650** *bakçacık* (bachgiagich) ‘giardinetto’ (CarrR. 72); **1677** *bakçacık/bağçacık* (bachgiagich) ‘giardinetto’, (baghciagich) ‘orticello’ (MascVoc. 56, 114).

Phr. – **1679** *bahçe kapısı* (bachcze-capysi) ‘pałac wezyrski’ (J. Gniński: StachSHET. 42).

• < Pers. *bağça, baxča* ‘garden’. – N. 51 (XII); P. 27 (XIII).

30. **bahçevan** (*bakçıvan* 1641); **bakçavan** // **baççavan** (1611), **bakvan** (1611), **bakçevan** (1668) – **1611** *bakçavan* // *baççavan, bakvan* (bacciaguán, bacuán) ‘giardinero’ (FerrR. 59); **1668** *bakçevan* (bakcsevan) ‘hortulanus’ (IllNém. 154); **1672** *bakçevan* (bakcsevan) ‘qui hortos colunt’ (HarsColl. 146); **1677** *bağçavan* (baghciauan) ‘ortolano’ (MascVoc. 114).

• < Pers. *bāğčiwān* ‘gardener’. – N. 51 (XV); P. (–).

31. **bähşiş** (*bağşiş* 1641); **bakşis** (1611), **başis** (1611), **bahişiş** // **bakişiş** (1677) – **1533** *bahşiş* (bachscisc) ‘dono, presente’ (ArgAd. 144, ArgR. 44); **1555** ‘quello dovea esser

bachsis" (A. Berengo: SchweickStrat. 12); **1611** *bakşis/başis* (backschis) 'beneficio', (baschis) 'donacion' (RJTMajd. 172, 174); **1677** *bahişiş // bakişiş* (bachiscisc) 'dono' (MascVoc. 42).

Phr. – **ca. 1630** *bağış et-* (b[a]ghsis etmek) 'dono mittere, donare' (MontR. 54) – **1641** *bağış ver-* (baghsc=isc vermek) 'premiare' (MolDitt. 316); **1650** *bahşış ver-* (bachscisc vermech) 'dedicatione', (bachscisc verilmisc) 'dedicato' (CarrR. 71).

• < Pers. *baxšiš* 'gift, present'. – N. 51 (XII); P. 27 (1291–1312).

33. **bari** (1533); **mbari** (1611) – [add.] **1533** *bari* (bàri) 'al mancho' (ArgAd. 145, ArgR. 46); **1611** *mbari* (mbàre) 'almeno, al manco' (FerrR. 60).

• < Pers. *bāri* 'once; a time, a turn; sometimes; at least'. – N. 57 (XIV); P. 29–30 (1332).

34. **bazargin** (1603); **bezaryen** (ca. 1520), **bezaryem** (1525/30), **bazirgen** (1533), **bezirgan** (1567), **bezergen** (1574), **bezeryen** (1580), **bezeryan** (1611), **barzığân** (1650), **pezirgân** (1677) – **ca. 1520** *bezaryen* (bezarien) 'mercante' (LupisON. 1b); **1525/30** *bezaryem* (bezariem) 'merchadante' (ITSprAd. 219); **1533** *bazirgen* (baserghiên) 'mercante' (ArgAd. 150 [*bezergen*], ArgR. 49); **1567** *bezirgan* (bezirgani [+ poss.]) 'mercante' (LettBomb. 138); **1574** *bezergen* (besergen) 'mercante' (VNAd. 62); **1580** *bezeryen* (bezerien) 'mercante' (BVenON. 2); **1611** (*dört*) *bazirgen* (dort basergan) '(cuatro) mercadores' (RJTMajd. 34); **1611** *bezeryan* (bezerián) 'mercante' (FerrR. 61); **ca. 1630** *bazirgân* (basirgian) 'mercator' (MontR. 57); **1650** *barzığân* (barzeghian) 'arrichito' (CarrR. 75); **1672** *bezirgân* (bezirgian) 'mercator' (HarsHaz. 164–165); **1677** *pezirgân* (peszirghian) 'mercante' (MascVoc. 93).

Der. – **1533** *bezergenlük* (beserghienlúch) 'mercantia' (ArgAd. 150, ArgR. 52); **1611** *bazirgalık* (basergalik) 'contrato' (RJTMajd. 175); **1611** *bezeryanlık* (bezerianlíc) 'mercantia, trafico' (FerrR. 61); **ca. 1630** *bazirgânlık* (basirgianlik) 'mercimonium' (MontR. 57); **1650** *bazirgânlık* (basarghianlich) 'mercanzia' (CarrR. 77).

Phr. – **1611** *bazirgalık et-* (basergalik etmek) 'contratar, cōmuniquer' (RJTMaid. 175); **1611** *bezeryanlık et-* (bezerianlíc edérum) 'traficare, far mercantia' (FerrR. 61); **1630 ca.** *bazirgânlık et-* (basirgianlic etmek) 'mercari' (MontR. 57); **1641** *bazirgânlık et-* (basirghianlich etmech) 'traficare, mercantare' (MolDitt. 462); **1677** *pezirkânlık et-* (peszirchianlich etmech) 'traficare, mercantare' (MascVoc. 252).

• < Pers. *bāzargān* 'merchant, trader'. – N. 69 (XIII); P. 31 (XIII/XIV).

35. **beduva** (1641); **betdova** (1533), **betua** (1630 ca.), **bettua/bettuva** (1677) – **1630 ca.** *betua* (betua) 'imprecatio mala' (MontR. 59); **1677** *bettua* (bettua) 'bestemmia' (MascVoc. 21).

Der. – **1677** *bettuvacı* (bettuuagi) 'maldicatore, quello che maldice' (MascVoc. 87) – **1677** *bettuvalı* (bettuuali) 'maledetto' (MascVoc. 86) – **1677** *bettuvalık* (bettuualich) 'maledizione' (MascVoc. 86).

– **1677** *bettuvala-* (bettuualanmisc) 'maledetto' (MascVoc. 86).

- Phr. – **1533** *betdova et-* (bettdouá edérum) ‘oro, fo imprecatione che Dio ti mandi male’, (bettdouá etterúrurum) ‘fo orare in male’ (ArgAd. 149, ArgR. 52); **1677** *bettuva et-* (bettuua etmech) ‘maledire’ (MascVoc. 86).
- < Pers. *bad-duiā* ‘imprecation, malediction’. – N. 61 (XIV); P. (–).
36. **beli** (1680) – **1611** *beli* (belhi, bellhi) ‘si’ (RJTMajd. 175).
- Phr. – **1641** *beli sultanum* (beli sultanim) ‘si, signorsi’ (MolDitt. 403).
– **1641** *beli de-* (beli demek) ‘arendersi’ (sic) (MolDitt. 60).
- < Pers. *balī* ‘yes’. – N. (–); P. 34 (XIV).
37. **belki** (1455/56) – **1533** *belki* (bélcchi) ‘forse’ (ArgAd. 148, ArgR. 50); **1611** *belki* (bélchi) ‘forse’ (FerrR. 61); **ca. 1630** *belki* (belki) ‘forte, fortuna’ (MontR. 58); **1672** *belki* (belki) ‘forte’ (HarsHaz. 38–39); **1677** *belki* (belchi) ‘forse’ (MascVoc. 52).
- Phr. – **1650** *belkide* (belchide) ‘inforse’ (CarrR. 78).
- < Pers. *bal-ki* ‘but, however, perhaps’. – N. 64 (XIV); P. 34 (1291–1312).
38. **beraber** (1603); **barabar** (1533), **peraber** (1677) – **1533** *barabar* (barabár) ‘pari’ (ArgAd. 145, ArgR. 46); **ca. 1630** *barabar* (barabar) ‘similis, aequalis, simul’ (MontR. 55); **1641** *beraber* (beraber) ‘eguali, vguali, paro, vguale’ (MolDitt. 131, 292); **1650** *baraber/barabar* ‘bilancio, pari; vguale’ (CarrR. 79); **1672** *beraber* (beraber) ‘aequales’ (HarsHaz. 122–123); **1677** *beraber/peraber* (beraber) ‘eguale’, (peraber) ‘paro, vguale’ (MascVoc. 44, 118).
- Der. – **1641** *beraberlik/beraberlük* (beraberlik) ‘agguagliamento, agguaglianza, egualità’, (beraberluk) ‘vguaglianza’, (beraberlighile) ‘egualmente’ (MolDitt. 26, 132, 479); **1650** *beraberlik* (beraberlich) ‘equità; vguaglianza’, (beraberlich ileh) ‘vguagliatamente’ (CarrR. 79); **1677** *beraberlük/-lik** (beraberluch) ‘vguaglianza’, (beraberlighile) ‘ugualmente’ (MascVoc. 268, 269) – **1611** *baraba[r]siz* (*barabasis) ‘disigual’ (RJTMajd. 45).
- Phr. – **1641** *beraber degil* (beraber deghil) ‘disparo, disuguale’ (MolDitt. 124)
– **1650** *beraber/baraber et-* (beraber/barabar ederum) ‘agguagliare, equiparare, pareggiare, spianare, appianare, vguagliare’, (beraber/baraber etmech) ‘agguagliamento, equiparatione, pareggiamento’ (CarrR. 79) – **1650** *beraber/barabar edici* (beraber/baraber edigi) ‘agguagliatore, equiparatore, pareggiatore, vguagliatore’ (CarrR. 79) – **1641** *beraber ol-* (beraber olmak) ‘vguagliare’, (beraber olmisc) ‘agguagliato’ (MolDitt. 479, 26); **1650** *beraber/baraber ol-* (beraber olurum) ‘agguagliarsi, vguagliarsi’, (beraber olmaqleh) ‘agguagliatamente’, (beraber/baraber olmisc) ‘agguagliato, bilanciato, fatto del pari, equiparato, pareggiato, spianato, vguagliato’ (CarrR. 79).
- < Pers. *bar-ā-bar* ‘equal, alike, on a par’. – N. 65 (XII); P. 35–36 (1332).
39. **bezestan** (1591) – [This word has been documented in a very large number of variations and adaptations in Italian sources since 1453, in German sources since 1496 ca., in French sources since 1519; SchweickOsm. 235–239 gives a complete list of these records. Only some of them are here cited] – **1453** “in *baxestan* come fuori

del *baxestan*" (Doc.Venezia: SchweickOsm. 235); **1496** "in *besastan* a Costantinopoli" (M. Sanudo: SchweickOsm. 235); **1519** "les marcha[n]s q[ui] se tie[n]nent à *bisistan*" (Th. Spandouyn: SchweickOsm. 237); **1545** "Il mercato de Schiaui si fa in vn luogo nel mezzo della Città, detto *besestàn* (...): ha Botteghe de imbrocatti, velluti & altri drappi e le cose di preggio tutte si vendono quiui (...). In questo medesimo *Besestàn* si vendano i Caualli di valuta" (BassR. 62); **1557** *bezestan/ bezesten* [‘rynek przedny’] (E. Otwinowski: StachSHET. 74); **1568** "le lieu appelé *Bezestan* (...) est vne maison grande (...), ayant quatre portes, & autant des rues dedans, tout à l’entour garnies de boutiques bien fournies de toutes marchandises rares, & de grand pris" (NicQLivr. 75); **1587/88** "Es hatt sonderlich ausserhalb der Stadt zwei fornehmer, groser Kaufheuser, welche die Turcken *Besenstein* heisen" (LubAd. 37); **1608** "im *Besasten* /das ist das Kauffhaus" (SchwSt. 226); **1641** *bezestan* (besestan) ‘fondaco’ (MolDitt. 151); **1677** *bezesten* (besesten) ‘fondaco’ (MascVoc. 51).

• < Pers. *bazzāzistān* ‘market-place’. – N. 61 (XVII Meninski); P. (-).

42. **birader** (*bilader* 1641); **brader** (1672), **brazier** (1672) – **1672** *brader/brazier* (brader, brazer) ‘frater’ (HarsHaz. 42–43).

• < Pers. *birādar* ‘brother’. – N. 73 (XII); P. (-).

43. **bostan** (1612); **mostan*** (1507), **musta(n)*** (1513), **bustan** (1522), **bonstan*** (1548), **(v)ustan*** (1587/88), **vostan*** (1622) – **ca. 1520** *bostan* (bostan) ‘orto’ (LupisON. 3a; missing in ITSprAd.); **1533** *bostan* (bostán) ‘orto; parco, giardino’ (ArgAd. 153, ArgR. 56); **1560** "Des autres Serrails, ou *Bostans* [Fr. pl.], ou jardins, il y en a quasi par toutes les bonnes villes" (PostelTPart. 22); **1611** *bostan* (bostán) ‘horto, orto di foglie, etc.’ (FerrR. 64); **ca. 1630** *bostan* (bostan) ‘pomarium’ (MontR. 60); **1650** *bustan* (bustan) ‘horto’ (CarrR. 92).

Der. – **1507** *mostanzi* [without translation] (M. Sanudo: MancT. 97); **1522** "bustangi giardinieri" (T. Contarini: RelPedF. 35); **1533** *bostanci* (bostangi) ‘ortolano, il giardinieri’ (ArgAd. 153; ArgR. 56); **1539** "giardinieri chiamati *bostangi*" (RambLibT. 15r); **1548** "*bonstangiler*, cioè giardinieri" (MenTratt. 128); **1560** "*Bostangi* jardinier" (PostelTPart. 23); **1611** *bostanci* (bostangi) ‘hortolano, ortolano’ (FerrR. 64); **ca. 1630** *bostanci* (bostangi) ‘qui ad hortos, hortulanus’ (MontR. 61); [From **1630** as *bustanci* and **1633** as *bostanci* the word appears variously morphologically adapted several times in Polish sources especially in the meaning ‘member of the corps of imperial guards’: StachSHET. 84]; **1650** *bustanci* (bustangi) ‘hortolano’ (CarrR.92); **1668** "*Bostangi*’s or Gardiners" (RycapPSt. 40); **1672** *bostanci* (boštangsi) ‘hortulanus; hortorum regionum incolae, horti incola’ (HarsHaz. 110–111, 186–187).

Phr. – **1501/1504/1510** *bostazibassa, bostanzibassa, bostangibassa* ‘zardiniero del Signor Turco’ (M. Sanudo: MancT. 97); **1507/1511/1513/1529** *mostanzibassi, mostazibassa, mustazibassi, mustazibassa* ‘l’ortolan del signor’ (id.); **1538** "*Bostanzibassi*, che vuol dire capo di giardinieri" (SpandSath. 205); **1539** "il *bostangibassi*, cioè capo de giardinieri" (RambLibT. 15r); **1545** "un Capitano che lo domandano

Bostanci Basi, cioè capo di giardinieri, il quale gouerna il timone della Fregata, doue passa il gran Turcho in Asia” (BassR. 63); **1548** “a questi [= gardeners] è ordinato el loro superiore chiamato *bostagibascia*” (MenTratt. 129); **1553** “questi giardini hanno un capo sopra gli altri capi, chiamato *bostangi-basci*, il quale è timoniero del brigantino del Gran-Signore” (B. Navagero: RelAlb.I 52); **1560** “*Bostangi başi*, maistre des jardiniers (...) qui seruent de labourer le jardin, & de mener la fuste du Seigneur & celle de sa suite, quant il va a l’esbat” (PostelT-Part. 11); **1568** “le **Bostaugi Bassi* qui est le Capitaine des iardins & des iardiniers” (NicQLivr. 66); **1584** “Le grand Seigneur va souvent se promener en un beau jardin (...). [De] les fruicts duquel, & de tous ses autres jardins, (...) le *Bostangybassy* a charge, qu’est capitaine des jardins” (PalBern. 272); **1587/88** *bostanci/(v)ustanci başa* (bostangi bassa) ‘Obriste uber die Gertner und garten’, (*uztanschi bassa) ‘Obrister Gertner’ (LubAd. 38); **1596** “seguivano i giardinieri co’l loro capo, chiamato *bustangibasi*” (CardonaVOr. 7); **1608** “etliche Atschamoglan/... welche die Arbeit im Garten müssen verrichten / die haben einen vorsteher *Bostansiwasha* genant /der sie anweiset” (SchwSt. 226); **1622** *vostancı başa* (Vostanzi Bascha) [‘Befehlshaber einer Garten- und Palastleibgarde’] (WennStach. 599); **ca. 1630** *bostancı başı* (bostangi bassi) ‘hortor(um) praefectus’ (MontR. 61); **1643** *bostancı paşı/bası* (bostandsi paszy, bostandzi basze) (St. Oświęcim: StachSHET. 85); **1646** *bustancı başa* (bustandzibasza) ‘ogrodnik starszy’ (Sz. Starowolsi: StachSHET. 85); **1672** *bostancı başa* (boštangsi basia) ‘purpuratum bostangiorum’ (HarsHaz. 120–121) – **1560** “*Bostangi Iazgisi* (= *bostancı yazıcısı*) (...) contrerolleur des jardiniers” (PostelTPart. 25).

• < Pers. *būstān*, *bustān* ‘garden, kitchen garden’. – N. 78 (XII); P. 48 (XIII).

44. **bulbul** (1590/91) – **1533** *bilbil* (bilbíl) ‘lusignolo, rusignuolo’ (ArgAd. 150, ArgR. 53); **1630 ca.** *bilbil*, *bulbul* // *bülbül* (bilbil, bulbul) ‘philomela’ (MontR. 59); **1650** *bilbil* (bilbil) ‘lusignolo, rosignolo’ (CarrR.82); **1672** *bülbül* (bülbül) ‘philomela’ (HarsColl. 425); **1677** *bulbul* // *bülbül* (bulbul) ‘lusignuolo, rosignuolo, vccello’ (MascVoc. 85, 169).

Der. – **1677** *bulbılcık* // *bülbülcik* (bulbulgich) ‘rosignuolo piccolo’ (MascVoc. 169).

Phr. – **1677** *çıplak bulbul* // *bülbül* (ciplach bulbul) ‘rosignuolo gniudo’ (MascVoc. 170).

• < Pers. *bulbul* ‘nightingale’. – N. 84 (XIII); P. 49 (1430).

Abbreviations

abl. = ablative	com. = comitative
acc. = accusative	dat. = dative
add. = see Introduction, 3)	der. = derivative(s)
Ar. = Arabic	dial. = dialect(al)
Arm. = Armenian	Fr. = French
cf. = compare	Engl. = English

G. = German	phr. = phrase(s)
gen. = genitive	pl. = plural
Gr. = Greek	Pol. = Polish
It. = Italian	poss. = possessive
Lat. = Latin	prob. = probably
loc. = locative	Sp. = Spanish
Mong. = Mongolian	stand. = standard
Osm. = Osmanlı	suff. = suffix
Pers. = Persian	T. = Turkish

References

- ArgAd. = Adamović M.(ed.). 2001. *Das Türkische des 16. Jahrhunderts. Nach den Aufzeichnungen des Florentiners Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Göttingen.
- ArgR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2007. *Ricerche sulla lingua osmanlı del XVI secolo. Il corpus lessicale turco del manoscritto fiorentino di Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Wiesbaden.
- ArvAdd. = Arveiller R. 1999. *Addenda au FEW XIX (Orientalia)*. Tübingen.
- BassR. = Rocchi L. 2006. Esotismi nell'italiano cinquecentesco. Il corpus alloglotto dell'opera di Luigi Bassano da Zara. – *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia* 8: 57–84.
- BodrogPVCC = Bodrogligeti A. 1971. *The Persian vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*. Budapest.
- BVenON. = Venetiano B. 1580. *Opera Nova de Vocaboli Turcheschi, & Gregheschi (...)*. Venezia.
- CardonaVOr. = Cardona G.R. 1969. Voci orientali in avvisi a stampa romani del '500. – *Lingua Nostra* 30: 5–9.
- CarrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2011. *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)*. Trieste.
- ClausonED = Clauson G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford.
- COED = *The compact Oxford English dictionary*. 1991². Oxford.
- DankoffArm. = Dankoff R. 1995. *Armenian loanwords in Turkish*. Wiesbaden.
- DankoffEÇGl. = Dankoff R. 1991. *An Evliya Çelebi glossary. Unusual, dialectal and foreign words in the Seyahat-name*. Boston.
- DeiCr. = Dei B. 1984. "Cronica", a cura di R. Barducci. Firenze.
- DELI = Cortelazzo M., Zolli P. 1979 – 1988. *Dizionario Etimologico della Lingua Italiana*. [vol. 1–5]. Bologna.
- DernBab. = Babinger Fr. (ed.). 1923. *Hans Dernschwams Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55)*. München, Leipzig.
- DValCard. = Cardini C. (ed.). 2001. *La Porta d'Oriente. Lettere di Pietro Della Valle: Istanbul 1614*. Roma.
- ErenTDES = Eren H. 1999. *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- ÈSTJa = Sevortjan È.V. et al. 1974–2003. *Ètimologičeskij Slovar' Tjurkskih Jazykov*. [vol. 1–7]. Moskva.
- FerrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2012. *Il "Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca" di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)*. Trieste.

- GeorgHeff. = Heffening W. (ed.). 1942. *Die türkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544–1548*. Leipzig.
- GIITR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). [forthcoming]. Il glossario italo-turco contenuto in un codice fiorentino del XVI secolo. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*.
- GUngSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1995/6, 1997. Das Türkische Sprachgut im “Tractatus de Moribus, Conditionibus et Nequicia Turcorum” (1481) des Georg von Ungarn. – [1] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14: 39–78; [2 (Lautgeschichtliches)] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15: 89–118.
- GülensoyKBS = Gülensoy T. 2011. *Türkiye Türkçesindeki Türkçe Sözcüklerin Köken Bilgisi Sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–2]. Ankara.
- HaimFarh. = Haim S. 1953. *Farhang Moaser Persian-English dictionary*. Tehran.
- HarffSt. = Stumme H. 1914. Das Arabische und das Türkische bei Ritter Arnold von Harff. – (n. ed.). *Festschrift für Ernst Windisch*. Leipzig: 127–137.
- HarsColl. = Nagy de Harsány J. 1672. *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina (...)*. Coloniae Brandeburgicae.
- HarsHaz. = Hazai Gy. (ed.). 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakob Nagy de Harsány*. Budapest.
- IllNém. = Németh J. (ed.). 1970. *Die türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. [Edition of the Illésházy-Codex (1668)]. Amsterdam, Budapest.
- ITSprAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1975. Ein italienisch-türkisches Sprachbuch aus den Jahren 1525–1530. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 67: 217–247. [A copy of → LupisON with a few variations].
- JunkerAlaviW. = Junker H.F.J., Alavi B. 1965. *Wörterbuch Persisch-Deutsch*. Leipzig.
- LettBomb. = Bombaci A. (ed.). 1939/1949. Una lettera turca in caratteri latini del dragomanno ottomano Ibrāhīm al veneziano Michele Membrè (1567). – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 15: 129–144.
- LubAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1977. *Das osmanisch-türkische Sprachgut bei R. Lubenau*. München.
- LupisON. = Lupis P. ca. 1520. *Opera Nova de M. Pietro Lupis Valentiano. La qual insegna a parlare Turchesco*. Ancona.
- MachDisc. = Machiavelli N. 1984. *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio. Premessa al testo e note di Giorgio Inglese*. Milano.
- MancT. = Mancini M. 1990. Turchismi a Roma e a Venezia. – Poli D. (ed.). *Episteme. In ricordo di Giorgio Raimondo Cardona*. Roma: 75–112.
- MascVoc. = Mascis A. 1677. *Vocabolario Toscano e Turchesco*. Firenze.
- MegILLT. = Megiser H. 1612. *Institutionum Linguae Turcicae Libri Quatuor*. Lipsiae.
- MegThP. = Megiser H. 1603. *Thesaurus Polyglottus vel Dictionarium Multilinguae (...)*. Francofurti ad Moenum.
- MenTratt. = Menavino G.A. 1548. *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*. Firenze.
- MinHist. = Minadoi G. 1587. *Historia della guerra fra Turchi et Persiani*. Roma.
- MolDitt. = Molino G. 1641. *Dittionario della lingua Italiana, Turchesca*. Roma.
- N. = Nişanyan S. 2009. *Sözlerin Soyağacı. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimoljik Sözlüğü*. [4th edition]. İstanbul.
- NicQLivr. = de Nicolay N. 1568. *Les quatre premiers livres des navigations et pérégrinations orientales*. Lyon.
- P. = 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.

- PalBern. = Palerne J. 1991. *D'Alexandrie à Istanbul. Pérégrinations dans l'Empire Ottoman 1581-1583*. [Introduction et annotations d'Yvelise Bernard]. Paris. [Palerne's manuscript dates back to 1584].
- PalPD. = Palerne J. 1606. *Peregrinations (...). Plus est adiousté un petit dictionnaire en langage françois, italien, grec vulgaire, turc, moresque, ou arabesque, & esclauon (...)*. Lyon. [See PalBern].
- PaszStach. = Stachowski M. 2013. Marcin Paszkowski's Polish and Turkish dictionary (1615). – *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8: 45–55.
- PostelInstr. = Postel G. 1575. *Instruction des motz de la langue turquesque les plus communs*, put as an introduction (without page numbering) to the book by the same author *Des Histoires orientales et principalement des Turkes ou Turchiques (...)*. Paris.
- PostelRepT. = Postel G. 1560. *De la Republique des Turcs (...)*. Poitiers.
- PostelTPart. = Postel G. 1560. *La tierce partie des Orientales Histoires (...)*. Poitiers.
- RambLibT. = Ramberti B. 1539. *Libri tre delle cose de Turchi*. Venezia.
- RamNav. = Ramusio G.B. 1550. *Delle Navigazioni et Viaggi*. Venezia.
- RäsänenVW. = Räsänen M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk-sprachen*. Helsinki.
- RelAlb.I = Alberi E. (ed.). 1840. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol 1]. Firenze.
- RelAlb.III = Alberi E. (ed.). 1855. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol. 3]. Firenze.
- RelPedF. = Pedani-Fabris M.P. (ed.). 1996. *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al Senato. Volume XIV. Costantinopoli – Relazioni inedite*. Padova.
- RJTMajd. = Majda T. (ed.). 1985. *Rozwój języka tureckiego w XVII wieku (rękopis z 1611 r., ze zbiorów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu, sygn. M. 1529)*. Warszawa.
- RycautPSt. = Rycaut P. 1668. *The present state of the Ottoman Empire (...)*. London.
- SchwSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1987. Das türkische Sprachmaterial in Salomon Schweiggers Reisebuch (1608). – *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41.2: 217–266.
- SchweickOsm. = Schweickard W. 2011. Osmanismen in den europäischen Sprachen. Vorüberlegungen zu einem vergleichenden historischen Wörterbuch. – *Lexicographica* 27: 221–239.
- SchweickStrat. = Schweickard W. 2011. La stratificazione cronologica dei turchismi in italiano. – *La Lingua Italiana. Storia, Strutture, Testi* 7: 9–16.
- SchweickTurk. = Schweickard W. 2013. *Turkisms in Italian, French and German (Ottoman period, 1300–1900). A historical and etymological dictionary*. [<http://www.uni-saarland.de/lehrstuhl/schweickard/turkisms.html>].
- SchweickTW. = Schweickard W. 2014. Türkische Wortgeschichte im Spiegel europäischer Quellen. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 130.2: 815–832.
- SorOtt. = Soranzo L. 1598. *L'Ottomanno*. Ferrara.
- SpandSath. = Spandugnino Patritio Constantinopolitano Th. 1890. *De la origine de li imperatori ottomani, ordini della corte, forma del guerreggiare loro, religione, rito, et costumi della natione*. – Sathas C.N. (ed.). *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*. [vol. 9]. Paris: 133–261.
- StachSHET. = Stachowski S. 2014. *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny turcyzmów w języku polskim*. Kraków.

- StachWMong. = Stachowski M. 2012. Written Mongolian *čamča* 'shirt' and its etymological counterparts in Europe. – Hyytiäinen T. et al. (eds.). *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue*. Helsinki: 445–451.
- StanWSPA = Stanisławski J. 1994. *Wielki słownik polsko-angielski / The great Polish-English dictionary*. Warszawa.
- Steingass = Steingass F. 1892. *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*. London.
- TETTL = Tietze A. 2002, 2009. *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı / Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Türkei-Türkischen*. [vol. 1: A–E]. İstanbul,Wien; [vol. 2: F–J]. Wien.
- TietzePAbl. = Tietze A. 1964. Persische Ableitungssuffixe im Azerosmanischen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 59–60: 154–200.
- TLIO = (n. ed.). 1997-. *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini*. [<http://www.tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/>].
- TMEN = Doerfer G. 1963–1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. [vol. 1–4]. Wiesbaden.
- TS = (n. ed.). 1963–1977. *XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklariyle tarama sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–8]. Ankara.
- UrbanTTEt. = Urban M. 2015. *The treatment of Turkic etymologies in English lexicography. Lexemes pertaining to material culture*. Kraków.
- VNAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1976. *Vocabulario nuovo* mit seinem türkischen Teil. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38: 43–69.
- WennStach. = Stachowski M. (ed.). 2015. Osmanisch-Türkische Appellativa im Reisebuch von Adam Wenner (1622). – Ragagnin E., Wilkens J. (eds.). *Kutadgu Nom Bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: 593–607.

LUCIANO ROCCHI
University of Trieste
lrocchi@units.it

ADDENDA FROM PRE-MENINSKI TRANSCRIPTION TEXTS TO STANISŁAW STACHOWSKI'S "OSMANLI TÜRKÇESİNDE YENİ FARŞÇA ALINTILAR SÖZLÜĞÜ". PART II

Keywords: Ottoman-Turkish, New Persian, lexical borrowing, transcription texts

Abstract

Stanisław Stachowski wrote a series of articles devoted to studies on the New Persian loanwords in Ottoman-Turkish, which were published in *Folia Orientalia* in the 1970s and later republished in 1998 as a single volume. Since then, however, a good number of editions of new Ottoman texts have appeared, especially transcription texts dating from before Meninski's *Thesaurus* (1680), which provide much new lexical material. Within this material there are many Persianisms – predictably enough where Ottoman-Turkish is concerned. This paper aims to supplement Stachowski's work with words of Persian origin taken from pre-Meninski transcription texts. It is divided into two parts, the first including data to be added to entries already recorded by Stachowski (eight articles), the second containing data that constitute new entries (three articles). A short historical-etymological note on the words dealt with also features at the end of each entry.

45. **cadı** (1641) – **1533 cadı** (giadı) 'maliarda, strega' (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 61); **1545** "la Sultana [= Hürrem Sultan, also known as Roxelana, Suleiman the Magnificent's wife] (...) la chiamano *Ziadi*, che vuol dire strega" (BassR. 83); **1603/1612 cazu** (gasu) 'magus' (MegThP. 2: 10), 'incantator' (MegILT.); **1611 cazu** (giasú) 'fattucchiaro' (FerrR. 67); **ca. 1630 cazu** (giasu) 'magus; miraculum' (MontR. 65); **1650 cazı** (giazi, giasi) 'ammaliatore, maliarda, strega' (CarrR. 96); **1677 cazul/cazi/cadı** (giasu) 'mago, incantatore', (giasu, giade) 'strega' (Masc-Voc. 86, 233).

Der. – **1650** *cazıcı* (giazigi) ‘maliarda’ (CarrR. 96) – **1533** *caduluk* (giadilúch) ‘malia’ (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 61); **1650** *cazılık* (giazilich, giasilich, giazlich) ‘malia, fattura; breue di superstitione; fascino; magia, arte’ (CarrR. 96); **1677** *cazuluk/cazulik* (giasuluch) ‘fattura, stregonerie, stregheria’, (giasulich) ‘ueneficio, incantesimo’ (MascVoc. 48, 233, 265) – **1650** *cazulukcı* (giasuluchgi) ‘ciurmatore’ (CarrR. 96).

– **1533** *cadila-* (giadilárum) ‘ammalio uno che non possa farmi se non bene et piacere et che non mi possa negare cosa alcuna’, (giadilatterúrurum) ‘fo ammaliare’, (giadilanmísc) ‘ammaliato da un altro o altra in modo che a suo dispetto bisogna che li uoglia bene et facci ad suo modo; stregato’ (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 61); **1650** *cazil-* (giasilmisc) ‘maliato’ (CarrR. 96) – **1677** *cazuludıcı* (giasuludigi) ‘incantatore’ (MascVoc. 65).

Phr. – **1650** *cazılık/cazuluk/cazuluk et-* (giasilich/giasiluch/giasuluch ederum) ‘ciurmare, incantare, fascinare, maliare’ (CarrR. 96); **1677** *cazuluk et-* (giasuluch etmech) ‘stregare’ (MascVoc. 233) – **1650** *cazılık ol-* (giazilich olmisc) ‘fascinato, fatturato’ (CarrR. 96).

- < Pers. *ğādū* ‘conjunction, magic; conjurer’. – N. 87 (XIV); P. 51 (XIII/XIV).

46. **cam** (1680) – **1587/88** *cam** (*essscham, *scaim) ‘Glasscheiben; Fensterglas’ (LubAd. 15, 39); **1611** *cam* (tscham) [without translation] (RJTMaid. 179).

- < Pers. *ğām* ‘cup, chalice, goblet, bowl; glass’. – N. 88 (XIV); P. 51 (XIII).

47. **camadan** (1641); **camadam** (1532) – [Italianised forms such as *gamadano*, *giamadano* were recorded in 1594 (SchweickTurk. 9)] – **1532** “*zamadam*, zoè la valisa de pelle zala” (M. Sanudo: MancT. 109); **1533** *camadan* (giamadán) ‘ualigia’ (ArgAd. 162–163, ArgR. 61); **ca. 1630** *camadan* (giamadan) ‘it. valise’ (MontR. 64); **1677** *camedan* (giamedani [+ poss.]) ‘ualigia’ (MascVoc. 261).

Der. – **1677** *camedancı* (giamedangi) ‘ualigiero’ (MascVoc. 261).

- < Pers. *ğāmadān* ‘wardrobe, clothes-bag’. – N. (–); P. (–).

48. **can** (1455/56); **d(i)yan** (1496/1501), **yan** (1560) – **1496/1501** “[Turczy] duszę zową **Diar* [vv.ll. dean, dijan, dian]’ (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSHET. 162); **1533** *can* (gian) ‘anima’ (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 61); **1560** (*benüm*) *yan(uma var)* (benun *ianuam var) ‘(soit pour mon) ame’ (PostelRepT. 59); **1575** *can* (gian) ‘ame; animus’ (PostelInstr.); **1584** (*benüm*) *yan(um)* (benō ianō) ‘(mon) ame’ (PalPD. 540–541); **1587/88** *can** (*ischam) ‘Sehl’ (LubAd. 39); **1611** *can* (tschan) ‘alma’ (RJTMajd. 179); **1611** *can* (gián) ‘anima, spirito’ (FerrR. 67); **ca. 1630** *can* (gian) ‘anima’ (MontR. 64); **1650** *can* (gian) ‘anima; animo, coraggio, ardire’ (CarrR. 95); **1672** *can* ((nicse bin) gsan) ‘(quot millia) animarum’, ((bukadar) gsan (üzerinde)) ‘(tot) animabus’ (HarsHaz. 38–39, 122–123); **1677** *can* (gian) ‘anima’, (gianile) ‘animosamente’ (MascVoc. 13, 14).

Der. – **1533** *canlı* (gianlí, gianlj) ‘animoso, ardito, audace’ (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62); **1650** *canlı* (gianli) ‘animoso, coraggioso, intrepido’ (CarrR. 96); **1677** *canlı* (gianli) ‘ardito’ (MascVoc. 16) – **1533** *canlık* (gianlích) ‘animosità, ardire,

audacia' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62); **1650** *canlık* (gianlich) 'ardimento, audacia, intrepidezza', (gianlich ile) 'animosamente' (CarrR. 96) – **1677** *cansuz* (giansus) 'inanimato' (MascVoc. 65).

– **1533** *canla-* (gianlárum) 'riommi, riho lo spirito' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62).

Phr. – **1533** *can alici* (gián alligí) 'Sancto Michele' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 61). – **1587/88** *can evi** (dschan *eni) 'Hertzgrublein' (LubAd. 39); **1650** *can evi* (gian eui) 'stomacho' (CarrR.95) – **1611** *can günülä* (tschan gunullà/gunalla) 'de muy buena gana' (RJTMajd. 31, 32); **1672** *can-ı gönülden* (gsani gyönülden) 'ex toto corde' (HarsHaz. 192–193).

– **1650** *can al-* (gian alerum) 'ripigliar animo' (CarrR. 95) – **1630** *ca. canından ber-* (= *ver-*) (gianından bermis) 'desperatus' (MontR. 64) – *ca. 1630* *can çek-* (gian chekmek) 'animã trahere, angustiari, laborare' (MontR. 64) – **1611** *can çekiş-* (tschan tschekischmek) 'agonia' (RJTMajd. 39); **1611** *can çekiş-* (gián cicsciér) 'sta facendo il tratto' (FerrR. 70) – **1533** *cana kal-* (gianá chalmás) 'spiritello' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 61).

– **1650** *canlık et-* (gianlich ederum) 'bottinare, far bottino' (CarrR. 96).

• < Pers. *gān* 'soul, vital spirit, mind'. – N. 88 (XI); P. 51–52 (XIII).

49. **canavar** (1533) – [add.] **1533** *canavar* (gianauár) 'animale, bestia, fiera' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62); **1575** *canavar* (gsianauar) 'beste; altilia' (PostelInstr.); **1611** *canavar* (gianauár) 'animale' (FerrR. 67); **1630** *ca. canavar* (gianauar) 'sus' (MontR. 64).

Phr. – **1533** *kara canavar* (chará gianauár) 'porcho cignale' (ArgAd. 211, ArgR. 138).

• < Pers. *gānwār/gānwar* 'living, alive; animal; fierce beast, wild boar'. – N. 88 (XII); P. 52 (XIII/XIV).

50. **canbaz** (*d'ambaz* 1668) – **1533** *cambaz* (giambás) 'chozone; giocolatore' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 61); **1611** *cambaz* (giambás) 'saltatore, che fa proue' (FerrR. 67); **1630** *ca. cambaz* (giambas) 'funambulus; proxeneta equorum' (MontR. 64); **1672** *cambaz* (gsambaslarun [+ poss. gen.]) 'qui negotiationem equorum exercent' (HarsHaz. 100–101).

Phr. – **1533** *at cambaz* (at giambás) 'chozone' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 38).

• < Pers. *cān-bāz* 'staking his life; rope-dancer; horse-dealer'. – N. 87 (XIV); P. 52–53 (XIII/XIV).

52. **cebhane** (*d'ebhana* 1668) – **1533** *cebhana* (giebchaná) 'munitione, il loco doue si tiene la poluere et l'arme' (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62).

• < Pers. *gūba-xāna* 'armoury, arsenal'. – N. 91 (XIV); P. 53 (XIV).

54. **cendere** (1641); **çendere** (1533), **cendre** (1630 ca.) – **1533** *cendere/çendere* (genderé, cenderé) 'mangano, strettoio' (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 69); *ca. 1630* *cendre* (gendre) 'torcular' (MontR. 65); **1650** *cendere* (gendere) 'torchio, stringitoio' (CarrR. 98); **1677** *cendere* (gendere) 'strettoio' (MascVoc. 234).

• < Pers. *gāndara* 'calender, mangle'. – N. 91 (XV); P. (–).

55. **cenk** (1641); **ceng** (1672) – **1533 cenk** (gench) ‘battaglia, combattimento’ (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 63); **1611 cenk** (giénc) ‘combattimento, guerra’ (FerrR. 67); **1650 cenk** (giench) ‘azzuffamento, battaglia, combattimento, guerra’ (CarrR. 98); **1672 ceng** (gsengte [+ loc.]) ‘in proelio, conflictu’ (HarsHaz. 62–63); **1677 cenk** (gienchi [+ poss.]) ‘combattimento, guerra, scaramuccia, zuffa’ (MascVoc. 30 passim).

Der. – **1611 cenkci** (giençgi) ‘combattente’ (FerrR. 68); **1650 cenkci** (gienchgi) ‘azzuffatore’ (CarrR. 98); **1677 cenkici** (gienchigi) ‘combattente, guerriero’ (MascVoc. 30, 60) – **1650 cenkli** (gienchli) ‘guerriero’ (CarrR. 98).

– **1672 cengleş-** (gsenglesüp) ‘invicem digladiantes’ (HarsHaz. 108–109).

Phr. – **1677 cenk(i) gemisi** (gienchi ghiemissi) ‘naue da guerra’ (MascVoc. 104).

– **1611 cenk et-** (giénc edérum) ‘combattere, far battaglia’ (FerrR. 68); **1650 cenk et-** (giench ederum) ‘azzuffarsi, far zuffa, scaramucciare’ (CarrR. 98); **1677 cenk(i) et-** (gienchi etmech) ‘scaramucciare’ (MascVoc. 184) – **1650 cenk edici** (giench edigi) ‘scaramucciatore’ (CarrR. 98) – **1677 cenke gel-** (gienche ghielmech) ‘uenire a battaglia’ (MascVoc. 265) – **1677 cenke oku-** (gienche ocumach) ‘inuitare a quistione, ò a combattere’ (MascVoc. 74) – **1677 cenk(i) ol-** (gienchi olunmisc) ‘combattuto’ (MascVoc. 30) – **1611 cenkde ül-** (giençde ulúrum) ‘morire nella guerra’ (FerrR. 67).

• < Pers. *ğang* ‘war, battle, combat, fight’. – N. 91 (XIV); P. 54 (XIV).

56. **civa** (1603); **zivah // zivah** (1630 ca.) – [Note: the <i> of the records may be read also as]- **1533 civa** (giuà) ‘argento uiuo’ (ArgAd. 164, ArgR. 63); **1611 civa** (tschiua) ‘azogue, uif argent’ (RJT Majd. 180); **1611 civa** (giuá) ‘argento uiuo’ (FerrR. 68); **ca. 1630 zivah // zivah** (ziuah) ‘mercurius, argentū uiuū’ (MontR. 213); **1677 civa** (giua) ‘argento viuo’ (MascVoc. 17).

• < Pers. *ğīwa* ‘quicksilver’. – N. 96 (XIV); P. (–).

57. **ciger** (1533); **şiger** (1587/88), **çiker** (1677) – [add.] **1533 ciger** (gighiér, gighér) ‘curatella; fegato’ (ArgAd. 164, ArgR. 63); **1611 ciger** (giger) ‘*segato [recte fegato]’ (RJT Majd. 180); **1611 ciger** (gighér) ‘fegato’ (FerrR. 68); **1650 ciger** (gigher) ‘fegato’ (CarrR. 99); **1668 ciger/çiger** (gÿger) ‘renes’; (csiger) ‘pulmo; iecur’ (IllNém. 165); **1677 çiker** (cichier) ‘fegato’ (MascVoc. 282).

Der. – **1533 cigercik** (gighiergích, gighergích) ‘curatellina; fegatello’ (ArgAd. 164, ArgR. 64) – **1641 cigerli** (gighierli) ‘ardito, audace’ (MolDitt. 58); **1650 cigerli** (gigherli) ‘fegatoso’ (CarrR. 99).

Phr. – **1587/88 akşiger** (akschiger) ‘Lung’ (LubAd. 33); **1603/1612 akçiger** (aktschiger) ‘pulmo’ (MegThP. 2: 362; MegILT.); **ca. 1630 akciger** (akgigher) ‘pulmo’ (MontR. 46); **1641 ak ciger** (ak gighier) ‘polmone’ (MolDitt. 309) – **1587/88 karaşiger** (karaschiger) ‘Leber’ (LubAd. 53); **ca. 1630 karaciger** (kara gigher) ‘iecur’ (MontR. 124) – **1650 kırmızı ciger** (chremesi gigher) ‘polmone’ (CarrR. 215) – → 386. *para*.

• < Pers. *ğigar* ‘liver’. – N. 94 (XIII); P. 54 (XIV).

58. **cömert** (1641); **cümert** (1603), **çömert** (1603), **yümert** (1630 ca.) – **1533 cömert** (gioomért) ‘prodigo’ (ArgAd. 164, ArgR. 64); **1603/1612 cümert/çömert** (gumert,

tschomert) 'liberalis' (MegThP. 1: 797; MegILT.); **1611** *cümert* (giumért) 'cortese, liberale' (FerrR. 68); *ca.* **1630** *yümert* (iumerth) 'liberalis' (MontR. 210); **1650** *cömert* (giomert) 'amorevole, generoso, cortese, prouido' (CarrR. 100); **1672** *cömert* (gsömmert) 'liberalis' (HarsHaz. 80–81); **1677** *cümert* (giumert) 'largo, liberale, splendido, magnifico' (MascVoc. 78, 82, 225).

Der. – **1677** *cömertili* (giomertili) 'generoso' (MascVoc. 55) – **1533** *cömertlük* (giomertlük) 'prodigialità' (ArgAd. 164, ArgR. 64); **1611** *cümertlik* (giumertlik) 'liberalità' (FerrR. 68); **1650** *cömertlik* (giomertlich) 'amorevolezza, splendidezza, liberalità', (giomertlich ileh) 'cortesemente' (CarrR. 100); **1672** *cömertlik* (gsömmertlik) 'liberalitas' (HarsHaz. 74–75); **1677** *cömertilik/cümertlik* (giomertilich) 'generosità', (giumertlich) 'liberalità' (MascVoc. 55, 82).

• < Pers. *ğū-mard* 'liberal or generous man'. – N. 98 (XIII); P. 56 (XIV).

60. **çakal** (1680) – **1611** *çakal* (ciaccál) 'contadino, rustico, uillano; volpe' (FerrR. 69); *ca.* **1630** *çakal* (chiakal) 'genus vulpis similis lupo' (MontR. 67); **1633** "*Ciakaly* [Pol. pl.] – zwierzęta z Azyjej" (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 109).

• < Pers. *šagāl, šikāl* 'jackal'. – N. 102 (XIV); P. 59 (1445).

62. **çamaşır** (1641) – **1533** *çamaşır* (ciamascír) 'lauandara' (ArgAd. 175, ArgR. 67); **1548** "venti huomini, i quali chiamano **chiamastir* [recte *chiamascir*]; delli quali duoi solamente sono deputati a lauare i panni della propria persona del gran Turco, & gli altri a lauare i panni di tutta la brigata" (MenTratt.133).

Der. – **1677** *çamşircı* (ciamascirgi) 'lauandara, lauandaia' (MascVoc. 79).

• < Pers. *ğāma-šūy* 'washer of clothes'. See, however, the remarks by StachW-Mong. 446–448. – N. 103 (XVI Argenti); P. 51 (XV/XVI).

[Note: in the following entry Stachowski puts together *çay/çan* 'bell' and *çeng/çenk* 'harp' by deriving them from the same Persian etymon. However, the former is in all probability a different word (see ErenTDES 78). Therefore only *çeng/çenk* will be taken into account in my addenda].

64. **çenk** (*çeng* 1641); **çek** (1630 ca.) – **1533** *çenk* (cench) 'arpe' (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69); *ca.* **1630** *çek* (chiek) 'instrom(en)tū turcicū ad psalendū et cantandum' (MontR. 69); **1650** *çenk* (cench) 'alpa, arpa da sonare' (CarrR. 105); **1677** *çenk* (cienchi [+ poss.]) 'arpa' (MascVoc. 17).

Phr. – **1677** *çenk(i) çalcısı* (cienchi cialgissi) 'sonatore d'arpa' (MascVoc. 212).

• < Pers. *çang* 'harp, lute'. – N. (-); P. 63 (XIII/XIV).

65. **çapraz** (1680); **çafras** (1672) – **1672** *çafras* (csafrasle [+ com.]) '(vestes) vermiculatae' (HarsHaz. 188–189).

• < Pers. *çaprāst* 'silk button; buckle, breastplate', *çaprās* 'badge'. – N. 103 (XV); P. (-).

66. **çardak** (1680); **çartak** (1650)– **1533** *çardak* (ciardách) 'terrazo' (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67); **1545** "vna loggia coperta di piombo (...) la quale loro chiamano

Ciardach” (BassR. 70); **1611** *çardak* (tschardak) ‘balcon’ (RJTMajd. 180); **1611** *çardak* (ciardác) ‘capanna’ (FerrR. 69); **1650** *çartak* (ciartaq) ‘balchetto sopra la porta’ (CarrR. 102).

Phr. – **1574** *çardak oda* (zardach oda) ‘camera’ (VNAd. 63).

• < Pers. *čār-ṭāq* ‘four columns, i.e. a principal room on the top of Eastern houses, open in front and supported by four pillars’. – N. 104 (XIV); P. 61 (XIII/XIV).

67. **çare** (1680); **cara** (1533), **çara** (1611) – **1533** *cara* (giará) ‘rimedio’ (ArgAd. 163, ArgR. 62); **1611** *çara* (ciára) ‘ricapito’ (FerrR. 69); **ca. 1630** *çare* (chiare) ‘remedium’ (MontR. 68); **1641** *çara* (ciara) ‘rimedio’ (MolDitt. 349); **1672** *çare* (csare) ‘remedium’ (HarsHaz. 38–40); **1677** *çara* (ciarà) ‘rimedio’ (MascVoc. 157).

Der. – **1641** *çarasuz* (ciarasus) ‘reuocabile’ (MolDitt. 343).

– **1677** *çarala-* (ciaralanmisc) ‘rimediato’ (MascVoc. 157).

Phr. – **1641** *çarasin bul-* (ciarasin bulmak) ‘rimediare, prouedere’ (MolDitt. 349).

• < Pers. *čāra* ‘remedy, cure’. – N. 104 (XI); P. 60 (XIV).

68. **çark** (1641); **çarh** (?) (1533) – **1533** *çarh* // *çark* (ciárch) ‘ruota’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67); **ca. 1630** *çark* (chiark) ‘rota; rota sclopetti’ (MontR. 68); **1677** *çark* (ciarchi [+ poss.]) ‘rota di ogni strumento’ (MascVoc. 170).

Der. – **1533** *çarhçı* // *çarkçı* (ciarchcǰ) ‘rotatore’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67); **1677** *çargıcı* (ciarghigi) ‘rotatore’ (MascVoc. 170) – **1641** *çarkacılık* (ciarkagilik) ‘scaramuccia’ (MolDitt. 379).

– **1533** *çarhla-* // *çarkla-* (ciarchlárurum) ‘arruoto’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67); **1677** *çarkile-* (ciarchilemech) ‘rotare’ (MascVoc. 170).

Phr. – **1641** *çark sahati* (ciark sahati) ‘horologio’ (MolDitt. 176).

• < Pers. *čarx* ‘wheel’. – N. 104 (XIV); P. 60–61 (XIII/XIV).

69. **çarköşa** (1641); **çarköşi** (1533), **çarköşe** (1677) – **1533** *çarköşi* (ciarchioscí) ‘quadro’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67); **1677** *çarköşe* (ciarchiosce) ‘quadrato’ (MascVoc. 144).

Der. – **1533** *çarköşili* (ciarchioscil j) ‘quadrato’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 67).

• < Pers. *čār gūša* ‘four-cornered’. – N. (-); P. (-).

70. **çarmih** (1455/56); **çarmuh** (?) (1533), **çarmık** (?) (1650) – **1533** *çarmuh* // *çarmuk* (ciarmúch) ‘sarte d’una naue’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 68); **1608** “*Dsarmuck die Seylleiter zu beyden seiten*” (SchwSt. 229); **1650** *çarmuk* // *çarmık* (*ciar = črmk) ‘sarchiame’ (CarrR. 102).

• < Pers. *čār mīx* ‘the rope upon which rope-dancers walk or tumble’. – N. 104 (XV); P. (-).

71. **çarşaf** (1612); **safrac*** (?) (1584), **şarşaf*** (1587/88) – **1533** *çarşaf* (ciarsciáff) ‘lenzuolo’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 68); **1574** *çarşaf** (*harchaff) ‘linciolo’ (VNAd. 63); **1584** *safrac** (?) (*saffiac [recte saffrach?]) ‘linceuls’ (PalB. 321); **1587/88** *şarşaf** (*schar-schaft) ‘Leilach’ (LubAd. 39); **1611** *çarşaf* (tscharschaf) ‘linceoli’ [? or ‘lenzuoli’?];

tentative reading from the picture of the manuscript reproduced on page 56; Majda reads 'tirnacli' (!) (RJT Majd. 30); **1611** *çarşaf* (ciarsciáf) 'lenzuolo' (FerrR. 69); **ca. 1630** *çarşaf/çarşav* (chiarsaf, chiarsau) 'linteroli, linteri, sindon' (MontR. 68); **1650** *şarşaf* [*sciarscia] 'lenzuolo' (CarrR. 306); **1677** *çarşaf* (ciarciáf) 'lenzuolo' (MascVoc. 80).

• < Pers. *čārşaw* 'lenteamina' (BodrogPVCC 122), *čārşaf* (quoted by UrbanTTet. 124) = *čādari šab* 'bed-sheets'. – N. 104 (XIII); P. (–).

72. **çarşembe** (*čerşomba* 1615); **çarşemba** (1525/30), **çarşambe** (1533), **ceharşanbe** (1603), **çarşanba** (1611), **çarşanpa** (1677) – **1525/30** *çarşemba* (chiarsemba) 'mercordi' (ITSprAd. 237; missing in LupisON.); **1533** *çarşambe* (ciarsciambé) 'mercoledi' (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 68); **1574** *çarşamba* (zarsamba) 'mercure' (VNAd. 63); **1587/88** *çarşamba* (dsar schamba) 'der virdte Tagk (Mittwoch)' (LubAd. 39); **1603** *çarşamba/ceharşanbe* (dsarschamba, geharschanbe, zarsamba) 'dies Mercurii' (MegThP. 1: 423); **1677** *çarşanpa* (ciar-scianpa) 'mercoledi' (MascVoc. 93).

Phr. – **1584** *çar[şamba] yön* (*carion [PalPD.], *cation [PalB.]) 'mercredy' (PD. 536–537; [*ieudy' (PalB. 324)]; **1611** *çarşanba günü* (tscharschanbà guni) '*iueues' (RJT Majd. 28; see 412. *perşembe*); **ca. 1630** *çarşamba gün* (chiarsamba giun) 'Mercurij dies' (MontR. 68); **1672** *çarşamba günü* (csarsamba (...)) gyüninden (mada) '(exceptis) diebus Mercurii' (HarsHaz. 142–143).

• < Pers. *čahār-šambih*, *čār-šambih* 'Wednesday'. – N. 104 (XIII); P. (–).

73. **čarsu** (*çarşı* 1615); **čärşu** (1587/88), **carsı** (1611), **čarsa** (1611), **çarçı** (1650), **şarcı** (1650), **şarşı** (1650) – **1533** *çarşı* (ciarsci) 'strada oue si uendono robe et oue sono botteghe assai' (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 68); **1587/88** *čärşu* (tscherschu) 'Markt' (LubAd. 39); **1611** *çarşı/čarsı/carşı* (tscharschi, tscharsi, giarsschi) 'strada, gasse; plaça; calle' (RJT Majd. 181); **1611** *çarşa* (ciarsciá) 'piazza' (FerrR. 69); **1650** *çarçı/şarcı/şarşı* (ciarci, sciargi, sciarsci) 'drapperia doue si fa; foro, piazza' (CarrR. 102); **1672** *çarşı* (ciarsia [+ dat.]) 'ad forum', (csarsida [+ loc.]) 'in foro' (HarsHaz. 96–97, 130–131).

• < Pers. *čar-su* 'square; market-place; cross-road'. – N. 104 (XIV); P. 61 (XIII/XIV).

75. **čavdar** (1615); **čudar** (1650) – **1533** *čavdar* (ciawdár) 'segola' (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 68); **1650** *čudar* (ciudar) 'spelta' (CarrR. 111).

• < Pers. *čüdār* 'rye'. – N. 105 (XV); P. (–).

76. **čehre** (1641); **şehre** (1650), **čehr*** (1672) – **1650** *şehre/čehre* (scehre) 'aere, aria, ciera; (cehrelor [+ pl.]) 'tempie' (CarrR. 103); **1672** *čehr*/čehre* (csehrin [+ 2nd person poss.]) 'vultus tuus'; (csehreşini [+ poss. acc.]) 'vultum' (HarsHaz. 34–35, 118–119); **1677** *čehre* (cehre) 'uiso, uolto' (MascVoc. 272).

Der. – **1677** *čehrecik* (cehregich) 'uisetto piccolo' (MascVoc. 271).

Phr. – **1650** *adam čehresi* (adam cehresi) 'ciera di huomo' (CarrR. 103).

• < Pers. *čahra*, *čihra* 'face, countenance'. – N. 106 (XIV); P. 62 (1445).

77. **çember** (1641); **ce(m)ber** (1538), **cämber** (1587/88) – **1533 çember** (cembér) ‘cerchio’ (ArgAd. 158, ArgR. 69); **1538** “Portano esse donne in capo un lor concier qual domandano *Geber*, che è una cosa fatta in modo di un pan di zucchero, et è molto longa et piramidale” (SpandSath. 234–235); **1587/88 çember/cämber** (tschenber) ‘Reif oder Bandt’, (gschamber) ‘Schlaier’ (LubAd. 39); **ca. 1630 çember** (chiember) ‘strafiolum quadratū quo sibi mulieres Turcae front(em) uelant’ (MontR. 70); **1650 çember** (cember) ‘circolo, cerchio’ (CarrR. 104); **1677 çember** (cember) ‘benda, fascia’ (MascVoc. 21, 48).

Der. – **1641 çemberle-** (ciemberlemek) ‘fasciare, infasciare’ (MolDitt. 142); **1650 çemberle-** (cemberlerum) ‘conuolgere, vilupparsi, fasciarsi’, (cemberlemech) ‘conuolgimento, viluppamento’; (cemberlemisc, cemberlenmisc) ‘conuoltato, viluppato’ (CarrR. 104); **1677 çemberle-** (cemberlemech) ‘fasciare’, (cemberlenmisc) ‘fasciato’ (MascVoc. 48) – **1650 çemberleci** (cemberlegi) ‘conuoltatore, viluppatore’ (CarrR. 104).

Phr. – **1650 adamler çemberi** (adamler cemberi) ‘cerchio d’homini’ (CarrR. 104).
– **1677 çember bağla-** (cember baglamach) ‘abbendare’ (MascVoc. 1) – **1650 çember ko(y)-** (cember qorum) ‘cerchiare’, (cember qoimaq) ‘cerchiamento’, (*cemberi qoimisc) ‘cerchiato’ (CarrR. 104) – **1650 çember koyıcı** (cember qoigi) ‘cerchiatore’ (CarrR. 104).

• < Pers. *čanbar* ‘circle, hoop’. – N. 107 (XIV); P. 62 (1445).

78. **çengel** (1612); **çengâr** (1587/88), **çenkel** (1677) – **1533 çengel** (cenghiél) ‘gancio, oncino’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69); **1587/88 çengâr** (tsengiar) ‘Haken’ (LubAd. 39); **1603 çengel** (tschengel) ‘anchora’ (MegThP. 1: 86); **ca. 1630 çengel** (chienghel) ‘vncus’ (MontR. 70); **1650 çengel/çangel** (cienghiel, cianghiel) ‘graffio di ferro, oncino, raffio, rampino’ (CarrR. 105); **1677 çenkel** (cienchiel) ‘oncino, rampino’ (MascVoc. 112).

Der. – **1533 çengel(l)e-** (cenghielemisc) ‘jnganciato’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69).

Phr. – **1611 demir çengeli** (demir cengeli) ‘crocco di ferro’ (FerrR. 70) – **1677 gemi çenkeli** (ghiemci ciencheli) ‘uncino da naue’ (MascVoc. 273) – **1641 kuy(i) çengeli** (kui ciengheli) ‘vncino da pozzo’ (MolDitt. 484).

– **1533 çengele vur-** (cenghielé uurúrum) ‘jngancio’, (cenghielé uurdurúrum) ‘fo inganciare’, *çengele vurulmuş* (cenghielé uurulmısc) ‘jnganciato’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69).

– **1533 çengelli düğme** (cenghielj dughmé) ‘ghanghero di maniche et giubboni et simili’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69).

• < Pers. *çangâl* ‘fingers, claws, talons, pounces’. – N. 107 (XV); P. 63 (XIV).

79. **çerçive** (1641); **çercive** (ca.1630), **şerşive** (ca. 1630), **çerciven** (1677) – **1533 çerçive** (cerciué) ‘soglia di sopra et di sotto’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 69); **ca. 1630 çerçive/çercive/şerşive** (chierchiue, chiergiuè, scersciue, scierssiue) ‘tela fenestrarum, tela cera obducta, uel aliud ad fenestras, *it.* impanata; *it.* spazzarina’ (MontR. 70); **1677 çerçiven** (cerciuen) ‘impanata’ (MascVoc. 65).

• < Pers. *çâr-çüba* ‘frame’. – N. 102 (XVI Argenti); P. (–).

80. **çeşme** (*çesme* 1603); **çişme** (ca. 1630), **çeşim** (1677) – **1533** *çesme* (*cesmé*) ‘fonte’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 70); **ca. 1630** *çeşme/çişme* (*chiesme, chisme*) ‘fons’ (MontR. 70); **1672** *çeşme* (*cesmeler* [+ pl.]) ‘fontes’ (HarsHaz. 116–117); **1677** *çeş(i)me/çeşim* (*cescime*) ‘fontana, fonte’, (*cescim*) ‘fontana’ (MascVoc. 51).

Der. – **1641** *çeşmecük* (*cesc=meğiuk*) ‘fontanella’ (MolDitt. 151); **1677** *çeşimecik* (*cescimegich*) ‘fontanella’ (MascVoc. 51).

• < Pers. *čašma* ‘fountain, source, spring’. – N. 108 (XIV); P. 64 (1430).

81. **çeşni** (1641); **keşni** (1533), **şeşni** (1650), **çiş(i)ni** (1677) – **1533** *çeşni* (*cescini*) ‘credentia che si fa alli signori da credentieri’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 70); **1650** *şeşni* (*scescni*) ‘gusto’ (CarrR. 308); **1677** *çeş(i)ni/çiş(i)ni* (*cescini*) ‘credenza, assaggio’, (*ciscini*) ‘saggio, proua’ (MascVoc. 35, 174).

Phr. – **1677** *çişini al-* (*ciscini almach*) ‘gustare’ (MascVoc. 60) – **1677** *çeşini dut-* (*cescini dutmak*) ‘esperienza’ (MascVoc. 46) – **1533** *keşni et-* (*chiescini edérum*) ‘fo la credentia a uno signore’, (*chiescini etterúrum*) ‘fo fare la credentia’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 146) – **1650** *çeşni tat-* (*cescni tatarum*) ‘assaggiare’, (*cescni tatmak*) ‘assaggiamento’, (*cescni tatmisc*) ‘assaggiato’ (CarrR. 105) – **1650** *çeşni tatçı* (*cescni tatgi*) ‘assaggiatore’ (CarrR. 104).

• < Pers. *čašni*, *čašni* ‘taste; relish; a taste by way of a sample’. – N. 108 (XIV); P. 61 (XIII/XIV).

82. **çeşnigir** (*çaşnegir* 1612); **çesnegir/çesnigir** (1496/1501); **çeşniger** (1530), **çişnäyir** (1538), **çesinyir** (?) (1548), **şeşnigir** (1560), **şişniger** (1571), **çeşniyir** (1587/88), **çeşneger** (1668) – [Forms morphologized according to the Italian plural often occur in our sources, f. ex.: **1522** “80 *cesnigiri*” (T. Contarini: RelPedF. 36); **1530** “*zesnigeri* che sono credenzieri del Signor” (M. Sanudo: MancT. 106); **1538** “*Cisnairi* (...) ordinati alla tabula over mensa del signore; el loro officio è in trinciare” (SpandSath. 205)] – **1496/1501** “A ci co jedlo noszą, zowią je *czesnegirler/czesnigirler* [with variae lectiones]; hetmana ich zowią *czesnigirbasz/czesnegirbasza*” (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSHET. 129); **1533** *çeşnigir* (*cescinighir*) ‘credentiere’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 70); **1539** *casnegir* (see below); **1548** *cesnigir* (see below); **1553** “li *casnigir*, li quali sono (...) quelli che portano il mangiare al Gran-Signore” (B. Navagero: RelAlb.I 59); **1560** “Le seigneur ha d’ordinaire cent autres jeunes hommes, qui s’appellent *Ssesnigirilar*, c’est adire Escuyers, qui le seruent a apporter les viandes sur table” (PostelTPart. 5); **1571** “*sisnigier*, che vuol dir gentil huomo che serve alla tavola del Signor” (Anonymous: RelPedF. 165); **1587/88** *çeşniyir* (*zeschnihir*) ‘Trucksessen’ (LubAd. 39); **1608** “*Zeschnihir* Truchsessen” (SchwSt. 229); **1630 ca.** *çeşnigir* (*cesnigir, zesnigir*) ‘cellarius, dapifer’ (MontR. 70); **1668** *çeşneger* (*cesneger*) ‘dapifer’ (IllNém. 164); **1677** *çeş(i)nigir* (*cescinighir*) ‘scalco’ (MascVoc. 182).

Phr. – **1496/1501** (see above); **1503** “*cesnegirbassi* senescalco” (M. Sanudo: MancT. 106); **1522** “*cesnegiri bassi*, servidor de tavola” (T. Contarini: RelPedF. 36); **1538** “[The *cisnairi*] hanno uno capo adimandato *cisnairbassi*” (SpandSath. 205); **1539** “il *casnegirbassi* capo de i credentieri (...) ha sotto di lui cento *casnegir*”

(RambLibT. 15r); **1548** “il *cesignir bascia* è vno soprastante (...) il cui officio è andare auante alli *cesignir* che sera & mattina inel Serraglio portano le viuande del gran Turco & fare la credenza d’ogni cosa ch’el Signore magna” (MenTratt. 146); **1560** “[The *ssesnigirlar*] ont vn chef appellé *Ssesnigir Başı*, Capitaine des Escuyers” (PostelTPart. 5); **1608** “*Zeschnihir Wascha*, *Zeschnigirwascha* der Oberst über die Truchseß /der die Speisen credentzet /fürlegt vnd fürschnet” (SchwSt. 230); **ca. 1630** *çeşnigir başı* (cesnigir bassi) ‘archit[r]ichlinus’ (MontR. 70); **1668** “the *Chesneghir Bashee*, the chief Sewer” (RycautPSt. 29); **1672** *çeşnegir başı* (csesnegir basi) ‘archipincerna imperatoris, item structor ac praegustator ciborum, omniumque dapiferorum magister’ (HarsColl. 322).

• < Pers. *čāšnīgīr* ‘taster to a prince; cupbearer’. – N. (–); P. 61 (1482).

83. **çeyrek** (*çeyreg* 1641); **çerek** (1611), **çegrek** (1650) – **1533** *çeyrek* (ceiréch) ‘quarto di misura’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 70); **1611** *çerek* (cieréc) ‘quarto, parte’ (FerrR. 71); **1650** *çegrek* (ceghrech) ‘quarta parte’ (CarrR. 103); **1672** *çeyrek* ((bir) csejrek (gross)) ‘quadrantis (Talleri)’ (HarsHaz. 98–99); **1677** *çeyrek* (ceirech) ‘quarto’ (MascVoc. 145).

Der. – **1533** *çeyrekle-* (ceirecchlérum) ‘squarto’, (ceirecchletterúrum) ‘fo squartare’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 70); **1611** *çerekle-* (ciereclérum) ‘squartare’ (FerrR. 71) – **1650** *çeyrekleci* (ceirechlegi) ‘squartatore’ (CarrR. 106).

Phr. – **1677** *dört çeyrek et-* (dort ceirech etmech) ‘squartare’ (MascVoc. 227).

• < Pers. *čāryak* ‘one of four; a fourth’. – N. 109 (XVII Meninski); P. (–).

84. **çınar** (1641) – **1533** *çınar* (cinár) ‘ginepro’ (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 71).

• < Pers. *čanār* ‘plane-tree’. – N. 109 (XV); P. 64 (1489).

85. **çırak** (1591); **çıra** (1641) – **1533** *çırak* (cirách) ‘chandelliere’ (ArgAd. 103, ArgR. 161); **1611** *çırak* (tschirak) ‘candil, lampe’ (RJTMajd. 181); **1611** *çerak* (cierác) ‘candelliere’ (FerrR. 70); **1641** *çıra* (cira) ‘lucerna’ (MolDitt. 237); **1650** *çıra* (cira) ‘lucerna’ (CarrR. 107).

Der. – **1611** *çırakçı* (tschiraktschi) ‘candilero’ (RJTMajd. 181); **1650** *çıracı* (ciragi) ‘lucerniero’ (CarrR. 107).

Phr. – **1677** *çıra fitil* (cira fittil) ‘lucignolo della lucerna’ (MascVoc. 84) – **1677** *çıra yapıcısı* (cira iappigissi) ‘lucernaio, quello che fa le lucerne’ (MascVoc. 84).

– **1641** *çırayı yak-* (cirai iakmak) ‘accender la lucerna’ (MolDitt. 7).

• < Pers. *čīrāg* ‘lamp; light; the wick of a candle’. – N. 110 (XIII); P. 64–65 (XIII/XIV).

86. **çift** (1615) – **1533** (cift, ciftt) ‘pari; paio’ (ArgAd. 159, ArgR. 71); **1611** *çift* (tschift) ‘ambos’ (RJTMajd. 181); **1611** *çift* (cift) ‘coppia, paro’ (FerrR. 71); **1650** *çift* (cift) ‘coppia, paio, paro’ (CarrR. 108); **1672** *çift* (csift) ‘par’ (HarsHaz. 98–99).

Der. – **1575** *çiftçi* (tsiftsi) ‘laboureur; agricola’ (PostelInstr.); **1611** *çiftçi* (tschiftschi) ‘arador’ (RJTMajd. 182); **1611** *çiftçi* (ciftgi, ciftci) ‘agricoltore, aratore, masaro di biade’ (FerrR. 71); **1650** *çiftci* (ciftgi) ‘bifolco, che ara la terra’ (CarrR. 108);

1677 *çiftici* (ciftigi) 'aratore, buttero, bifolco' (MascVoc. 16, 23) – **1611** *çift[ç]ilik* (*ciftilic) 'agricoltura' (FerrR. 71); **1650** *çiftcilik* (ciftgilich) 'agricoltura' (CarrR. 108) – **1533** *çiftlük* (ciftluch, cifttluch) 'possessione, podere' (ArgAd. 160, ArgR. 71); **1587/88** *çiftlük** (*tsichstlut) 'Mairhof' (LubAd. 39).

– **1533** *çiftle-* (ciftlenmisc) 'appaato' (ArgAd. 160, ArgR. 71); **1611** *çiftle-* (tschiftlemek) 'arar' (RJTMajd. 182).

Phr. – **1611** *çift tek* (cift təc) 'pari et dispari' (FerrR. 71).

– **1641** *çift sapanı* (cift sapanı) 'aratro' (MolDitt. 208); **1677** *çift sepanı* (cift sepanı) 'aratolo' (MascVoc. 16) – **1650** *çift yolu* (cift ioli) 'solco' (CarrR. 108).

– **1641** *çiftinden ayır-* (ciftinden airmak) 'scompagnare' (MolDitt. 386) – **1650** *çift et-* (cift ederum) 'giungere, accoppiare' (CarrR. 108) – **1650** *çift ol-* (cift olmisc) 'giunto, accoppiato' (CarrR. 108) – **1533** *çift sür-* (cift surérum) 'aro', (cift surdurúrum) 'fo arare' (ArgAd. 159–160, ArgR. 71); **1611** *çift sür-* (cift surérum) 'arare, cultuiar la terra' (FerrR. 71); *ca.* **1630** *çift* sür-* (*chiffer surmak) 'arare' (MontR. 71); **1677** *çifti sür-* (cifti surmech) 'arare, coltiuare', (cifti suren) 'bifolco, aratore, buttero', (cifti surmisc) 'coltiuato' (MascVoc. 16, 22, 30) – **1641** *çift sürüci* (cift surugi) 'coltiuatore' (MolDitt. 111); **1677** *çifti sürici* (cifti surigi) 'coltiuatore' (MascVoc. 36).

• < Pers. *ğuft* 'yoke, couple, pair; even number'. – N. 110 (XIII); P. 65 (XIII/XIV).

88. **çirkef** (1641) – **1677** *çirkef* (circhief) 'scafa' (MascVoc. 182).

Phr. – **1641** *sehir çirkefi* (sehir cirkefi) 'scolatoio della città' (MolDitt. 385).

• < Pers. *çark-âb* 'dirty water; hog-wash'. – N. 112 (XIV); P. (–).

89. **çoban** (1553) – **1533** *çoban* (ciobán) 'chapraro, pastore, pecoraro' (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 72); **1540** *çuban* (czubanow [Pol. gen. pl.]) ['pastuch wołow; pastuch owiec'] (StachSHET. 114; this Turkism has become a loanword in Polish as *czaban*); **1611** *çuban* (ciubán) 'pastore d'armenti' (FerrR. 72); *ca.* **1630** *çoban* (chioban) 'pastor' (MontR. 71); **1650** *çoban* (cioban) 'capraro; pastore d'animali' (CarrR. 109); **1677** *çoban* (cioban) 'pastore, guardiano di bestiame, pecoraio' (MascVoc. 119, 121).

Phr. – **1650** *şığır çobanı/çoban* (segher ciobani, sighir cioban) 'guardiano d'armenti, bouaro' (CarrR. 109).

• < Pers. *şübân* 'shepherd, pastor, herdsman'. The Pers. form *çobân* may be a backborrowing from Turkish (TMEN 3: 108–109). – N. 112–113 (XIII); P. 65 (1332).

90. **çoha** (1544/48); **çoa** (1584), **şoha** (1611), **çua** (1611), **coka** (1650), **çoga** (1677) – **1533** *çoha* // *çoka* (ciochá) 'panno' (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73); **1543** *czuha* [Pol. spelling] (StachSHET. 134); **1574** *çoha* // *çoka* (zocha) 'panno' (VNAd. 63); **1575** *çoha* (tsoha) 'drap; panum' (PostelInstr.); **1584** *çoa* (chioa) 'drap' (PalBern. 321); **1587/88** *çoha* (tschoha) 'Tuch' (LubAd. 39); **1611** *çoha/şoha* (tschoha) 'pañó', (schohà) 'panno' (RJTMajd. 182, 226); **1611** *çua* (ciuá) 'panno di lana' (FerrR. 72); *ca.* **1630** *çoa* (chioa) 'pannus' (MontR. 71); **1650** *çoha* (ciocha) 'panno' (CarrR. 109); **1672** *çuha* (csuha) 'pannus' (HarsHaz. 96–97); **1677** *çoga* (ciogà) 'panno' (MascVoc. 117).

Der. – **1533** *çohacı* // *çokacı* (ciochaggí) 'pannaiuolo' (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73); **1672** *çuhacı* (csuhagsia [+ dat.]) 'institores panni' (HarsHaz. 96–97).

Phr. – **1650** *baklık çoka* (bachlich cioqa) ‘pannaccio’ (CarrR. 73) – **1650** *ışlanmış çoka* (aşlanmisc gioca) ‘razzi, panni di razza’ (CarrR. 109) – **1533** *enli/yassı çoha // çoka* (enli ciochá, jassí ciochá) ‘panno largo’ (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73) – **1533** *ensiz çoha // çoka* (ensís ciochá) ‘panno stretto’ (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73) – **1533** *yassı çoha // çoka* see above *enli çoha // çoka*.

• < Pers. *čūxā* ‘woollen garment; a monk’s garb; a kind of tunic; a sort of overcoat or cloak’. – N. 114 (XIV); P. (-).

91. **çohadar** (*çokadar* 1546); **çuadar** (1548), **çuhadar** (1672) – **1548** “[One of the Sultan’s servants] è chiamato *civadar* [= *çuadar*], & è quello che cõtinuamente gli dà da beuere & sempre è seco portandogli le veste che per la pioggia gli facessino di bisogno” (MenTratt. 121); **1608** “*Ciuadar* einer auß seinen [= of the Sultan] vertrautesten Leibjungen (...) der eine tregt oder führt ihm allezeit en güldene Flaschen nach mit Wasser in einem Futeral” (SchwSt. 230).

Phr. – **1668** “the *Ciohadar-Aga*, he who carries his [= of the Grand Signior] cloak or vest for rainy weather” (RycautPSt. 28); **1672** *çuhadar ağa* (csuhadar aga) ‘conservator, vel Dominus vestium regiarum’ (HarsColl. 332).

• < Pers. *čūxā* (see the previous entry) + *dār* ‘having, keeping’. Word coined in Ottoman (TietzePAbl. 177). – N. (-); P. (-); TETTL 1: 537 (1599).

93. **çorba** (1544/48); **çorva** (1533), **çorfa** (1611), **çurba** (ca. 1565), **sorba** (1608) – **1533** *çorva* (cioruá) ‘brodo, minestra, peuerada’ (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73); **1553/55** “*czorba*, das ist suppendt speyse” (DernBab. 123); **ca. 1565** “mehrteils von *Cschurba* oder Rais gekocht” (J. von Betzek: SchweickTurk. 11); **1575** *çorba* (tsorba) ‘brouet; ius’ (PostelInstr.); **1587/88** *çorba* (czorba) ‘Suppen; Reis in der Suppe; gekochter Reis aus der Suppen von Schaffleisch’ (LubAd. 39); **1598** “la minestra, che chiamano *Tzorba*” (SorOtt. 33); **1603** “auch ungezügets Muß welches *Schorba* genandt” (P. Villinger: SchweickTurk. 11); **1608** “*sorbà*, cioè minestra” (O. Bon: SchweickTurk. 11); **1611** *çorfa* (tschorfà) ‘caldo, bouillon’ (RJTMajd. 182); **1633/1641** *çorba* (ciorba) ‘strawa cesarska co sobotnia dla Janczarow’ (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 132); **1650** *çorba/şorba* (ciorba, sciorba) ‘brodo di carne, minestra’ (CarrR. 110); **1660** “potage qu’ils appellent *Tzorba*” (P. D’Avity: SchweickTurk. 12); **1672** *çorba* (csorba) ‘iusculum’ (HarsColl. 188); **1677** *çorba* (ciorba) ‘minestra’ (MascVoc. 96).

Der. – **1533** *çorvacı* (cioruaggi) ‘quello che dà il brodo, quello che fa la minestra; un grande maestro o padrone, un padrone et gran maestro’ (ArgAd. 161, ArgR. 73); **1622** *çorbaşı* (Zorbaschi) [‘Titel eines Ortsvorstehers’] (WennStach. 599–600); **ca. 1630** *çorbacı* (chiorbagi) ‘ut apud it. sergente’ (MontR. 71); **1633** *çorbacı* (ciorbadzije [Pol. pl.]) ‘praesides ciorby cesarskiej’ (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 133); **1650** *çorbacı* (ciorbagi) ‘colonnello’ (CarrR. 110); **1668** “their (= of the Janissaries) *Tchorbagees* [Engl. pl.] or Captains” (RycautPSt. 197); **1672** *çorbacı* (csorbagsi) ‘iusculi potitator; *csorbagsii* [Lat. pl.] sunt Colonelli, suntque totidem quot Aulae Jenicseriorum domus’ (HarsColl. 188) – **1650** *çorbalı* (ciorbali) ‘brodoso’ (CarrR. 110).

Phr. –**1650** *yımurta çorbası* (iemurta ciorbasi) ‘brodetto’ (CarrR. 110); → 434. *pirinç*.

- < Pers. *šurbā* ‘broth, soup, gruel’. – N. 113 (XIII); P. 244 (1/XV).

95. **çuval** (1680); **çual** (1611), **şual** (1630 ca.), **çoval*** (1650) – **1533** *çiuval* (ciuuál) ‘saccho’ (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 74); **1611** *çiuval* (tschuwhal) ‘valija’ (RJT Majd. 182); **1611** *çual* (ciuál) ‘bisaccia, sacco’ (FerrR. 72); **ca.** **1630** *şual* (sciual) ‘saccus’ (MontR. 182); **1641** *çiuval* (ciuuál) ‘sacco da portar grano’ (MolDitt. 367); **1677** *çual* (cual) ‘sacco da portar grano, o altre cose’ (MascVoc. 173).

Der. – **1677** *çualcık* (ciualgich) ‘sacchetto, piccolo sacco’ (MascVoc. 173).

– **1641** *çuvalla-* (ciuuallamak) ‘insaccare’ (MolDitt. 216); **1677** *çuvalla-* (ciuual-lamach) ‘insaccare’, (ciuuallamisc) ‘insaccato’ (MascVoc. 72) – **1650** *çuvallacı* (ciuuallagi) ‘insachatore’ (CarrR. 111).

Phr. – **1677** *bogday çualı* (bogdai ciuali) ‘sacco di grano’ (MascVoc. 173) – **1677** *saman çualı* (saman ciuali) ‘saccone, pagliericcio’ (MascVoc. 173).

– **1650** *çovalcı* (= *çoval ucu*) (ciualgi) ‘pedicino di sacco’ (CarrR. 110).

– **1533** *çuvala koy-* (ciuuálá choiárum) ‘insaccho’, (ciuuálá choidurúrurum) ‘fo insaccare’ (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 74).

- < Pers. *ğuwāl* ‘sack, bag’. – N. 114 (XIV); P. (–).

96. **çuvalduz** (1680); **çuvaldız** (1533), **çualdız** (1611) – **1533** *çiuvaldız* (ciuualdıs) ‘sagrato, ago’ (ArgAd. 162, ArgR. 74); **1611** *çiuvaldız* (tschualdis) ‘gros nadel für balle’ (RJT Majd. 182); **1611** *çualdız* (ciualdıs) ‘aco saccora[.]’ (FerrR. 72); **1650** *çiuvaldız* (ciuualdiz) ‘ago da basti’ (CarrR. 111).

- < Pers. *ğuwāl-düz* ‘large packing-needle’. – N. 115 (XIII); P. (–).

Abbreviations

abl. = ablative	It. = Italian
acc. = accusative	Lat. = Latin
add. = see Introduction, 3)	loc. = locative
Ar. = Arabic	Mong. = Mongolian
Arm. = Armenian	Osm. = Osmanlı
cf. = compare	Pers. = Persian
com. = comitative	phr. = phrase(s)
dat. = dative	pl. = plural
der. = derivative(s)	Pol. = Polish
dial. = dialect(al)	poss. = possessive
Fr. = French	prob. = probably
Engl. = English	Sp. = Spanish
G. = German	stand. = standard
gen. = genitive	suff. = suffix
Gr. = Greek	T. = Turkish

References

- ArgAd. = Adamović M.(ed.). 2001. *Das Türkische des 16. Jahrhunderts. Nach den Aufzeichnungen des Florentiners Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Göttingen.
- ArgR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2007. *Ricerche sulla lingua osmanlı del XVI secolo. Il corpus lessicale turco del manoscritto fiorentino di Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Wiesbaden.
- ArvAdd. = Arveiller R. 1999. *Addenda au FEW XIX (Orientalia)*. Tübingen.
- BassR. = Rocchi L. 2006. Esotismi nell'italiano cinquecentesco. Il corpus alloglotto dell'opera di Luigi Bassano da Zara. – *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia* 8: 57–84.
- BodrogPVCC = Bodrogligeti A. 1971. *The Persian vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*. Budapest.
- BVenON. = Venetiano B. 1580. *Opera Nova de Vocaboli Turcheschi, & Gregheschi (...)*. Venezia.
- CardonaVOr. = Cardona G.R. 1969. Voci orientali in avvisi a stampa romani del '500. – *Lingua Nostra* 30: 5–9.
- CarrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2011. *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)*. Trieste.
- ClausonED = Clauson G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford.
- COED = *The compact Oxford English dictionary*. 1991². Oxford.
- DankoffArm. = Dankoff R. 1995. *Armenian loanwords in Turkish*. Wiesbaden.
- DankoffEÇGl. = Dankoff R. 1991. *An Evliya Çelebi glossary. Unusual, dialectal and foreign words in the Seyahat-name*. Boston.
- DeiCr. = Dei B. 1984. “Cronica”, a cura di R. Barducci. Firenze.
- DELI = Cortelazzo M., Zolli P. 1979 – 1988. *Dizionario Etimologico della Lingua Italiana*. [vol. 1–5]. Bologna.
- DernBab. = Babinger Fr. (ed.). 1923. *Hans Dernschwams Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55)*. München, Leipzig.
- DValCard. = Cardini C. (ed.). 2001. *La Porta d'Oriente. Lettere di Pietro Della Valle: Istanbul 1614*. Roma.
- ErenTDES = Eren H. 1999. *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- ÈSTJa = Severtjan È.V. et al. 1974–2003. *Ètimologičeskij Slovar' Tjurkskih Jazykov*. [vol. 1–7]. Moskva.
- FerrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2012. *Il “Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca” di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)*. Trieste.
- GeorgHeff. = Heffening W. (ed.). 1942. *Die türkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544–1548*. Leipzig.
- GIITR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). [forthcoming]. Il glossario italo-turco contenuto in un codice fiorentino del XVI secolo. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*.
- GUngSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1995/6, 1997. Das Türkische Sprachgut im “Tractatus de Moribus, Conditionibus et Nequicia Turcorum” (1481) des Georg von Ungarn. – [1] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14: 39–78; [2 (Lautgeschichtliches)] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15: 89–118.
- GülensoyKBS = Gülensoy T. 2011. *Türkiye Türkçesindeki Türkçe Sözcüklerin Köken Bilgisi Sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–2]. Ankara.
- HaimFarh. = Haim S. 1953. *Farhang Moaser Persian-English dictionary*. Tehran.
- HarffSt. = Stumme H. 1914. Das Arabische und das Türkische bei Ritter Arnold von Harff. – (n. ed.). *Festschrift für Ernst Windisch*. Leipzig: 127–137.

- HarsColl. = Nagy de Harsány J. 1672. *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina* (...). Coloniae Brandeburgicae.
- HarsHaz. = Hazai Gy. (ed.). 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány*. Budapest.
- IllNém. = Németh J. (ed.). 1970. *Die türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. [Edition of the Illésházy-Codex (1668)]. Amsterdam, Budapest.
- ITSprAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1975. Ein italienisch-türkisches Sprachbuch aus den Jahren 1525–1530. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 67: 217–247. [A copy of → LupisON with a few variations].
- JunkerAlaviW. = Junker H.F.J., Alavi B. 1965. *Wörterbuch Persisch-Deutsch*. Leipzig.
- LettBomb. = Bombaci A. (ed.). 1939/1949. Una lettera turca in caratteri latini del dragomanno ottomano Ibrāhīm al veneziano Michele Membre (1567). – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 15: 129–144.
- LubAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1977. *Das osmanisch-türkische Sprachgut bei R. Lubenau*. München.
- LupisON. = Lupis P. ca. 1520. *Opera Nova de M. Pietro Lupis Valentiano. La qual insegna a parlare Turchesco*. Ancona.
- MachDisc. = Machiavelli N. 1984. *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio. Premessa al testo e note di Giorgio Inglese*. Milano.
- MancT. = Mancini M. 1990. Turchismi a Roma e a Venezia. – Poli D. (ed.). *Episteme. In ricordo di Giorgio Raimondo Cardona*. Roma: 75–112.
- MascVoc. = Mascis A. 1677. *Vocabolario Toscano e Turchesco*. Firenze.
- MegILLT. = Megiser H. 1612. *Institutionum Linguae Turcicae Libri Quatuor*. Lipsiae.
- MegThP. = Megiser H. 1603. *Thesaurus Polyglottus vel Dictionarium Multilinguae* (...). Francofurti ad Moenum.
- MenTratt. = Menavino G.A. 1548. *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*. Firenze.
- MinHist. = Minadoi G. 1587. *Historia della guerra fra Turchi et Persiani*. Roma.
- MolDitt. = Molino G. 1641. *Dittionario della lingua Italiana, Turchesca*. Roma.
- N. = Nişanyan S. 2009. *Sözlerin Soyağacı. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimoljik Sözlüğü*. [4th edition]. İstanbul.
- NicQLivr. = de Nicolay N. 1568. *Les quatre premiers livres des navigations et pérégrinations orientales*. Lyon.
- P. = 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.
- PalBern. = Palerne J. 1991. *D'Alexandrie à Istanbul. Pérégrinations dans l'Empire Ottoman 1581–1583*. [Introduction et annotations d'Yvelise Bernard]. Paris. [Palerne's manuscript dates back to 1584].
- PalPD. = Palerne J. 1606. *Peregrinations* (...). *Plus est adiousté un petit dictionnaire en langage françois, italien, grec vulgaire, turc, moresque, ou arabesque, & esclauon* (...). Lyon. [See PalBern].
- PaszStach. = Stachowski M. 2013. Marcin Paszkowski's Polish and Turkish dictionary (1615). – *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8: 45–55.
- PostelInstr. = Postel G. 1575. *Instruction des motz de la langue turquesque les plus communs*, put as an introduction (without page numbering) to the book by the same author *Des Histoires orientales et principalement des Turkes ou Turchiques* (...). Paris.
- PostelRepT. = Postel G. 1560. *De la Republique des Turcs* (...). Poitiers.
- PostelTPart. = Postel G. 1560. *La tierce partie des Orientales Histoires* (...). Poitiers.

- RambLibT. = Ramberti B. 1539. *Libri tre delle cose de Turchi*. Venezia.
- RamNav. = Ramusio G.B. 1550. *Delle Navigationi et Viaggi*. Venezia.
- RäsänenVW. = Räsänen M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk-sprachen*. Helsinki.
- RelAlb.I = Alberi E. (ed.). 1840. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol 1]. Firenze.
- RelAlb.III = Alberi E. (ed.). 1855. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol. 3]. Firenze.
- RelPedF. = Pedani-Fabris M.P. (ed.). 1996. *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al Senato. Volume XIV. Costantinopoli – Relazioni inedite*. Padova.
- RJTMajd. = Majda T. (ed.). 1985. *Rozwój języka tureckiego w XVII wieku (rękopis z 1611 r., ze zbiorów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu, sygn. M. 1529)*. Warszawa.
- RycautPSt. = Rycaut P. 1668. *The present state of the Ottoman Empire (...)*. London.
- SchwSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1987. Das türkische Sprachmaterial in Salomon Schweiggers Reisebuch (1608). – *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41.2: 217–266.
- SchweickOsm. = Schweickard W. 2011. Osmanismen in den europäischen Sprachen. Vorüberlegungen zu einem vergleichenden historischen Wörterbuch. – *Lexicographica* 27: 221–239.
- SchweickStrat. = Schweickard W. 2011. La stratificazione cronologica dei turchismi in italiano. – *La Lingua Italiana. Storia, Strutture, Testi* 7: 9–16.
- SchweickTurk. = Schweickard W. 2013. *Turkisms in Italian, French and German (Ottoman period, 1300–1900). A historical and etymological dictionary*. [http://www.uni-saarland.de/lehrstuhl/schweickard/turkisms.html].
- SchweickTW. = Schweickard W. 2014. Türkische Wortgeschichte im Spiegel europäischer Quellen. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 130.2: 815–832.
- SorOtt. = Soranzo L. 1598. *L'Ottomanno*. Ferrara.
- SpandSath. = Spandugnino Patritio Constantinopolitano Th. 1890. *De la origine de li imperatori ottomani, ordini della corte, forma del guerreggiare loro, religione, rito, et costumi della natione*. – Sathas C.N. (ed.). *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*. [vol. 9]. Paris: 133–261.
- StachSHET. = Stachowski S. 2014. *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny turcyzmów w języku polskim*. Kraków.
- StachWMong. = Stachowski M. 2012. Written Mongolian čamča 'shirt' and its etymological counterparts in Europe. – Hyytiäinen T. et al. (eds.). *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue*. Helsinki: 445–451.
- StanWSPA = Stanisławski J. 1994. *Wielki słownik polsko-angielski / The great Polish-English dictionary*. Warszawa.
- Steingass = Steingass F. 1892. *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*. London.
- TETTL = Tietze A. 2002, 2009. *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati/Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Türkei-Türkischen*. [vol. 1: A–E]. İstanbul,Wien; [vol. 2: F–J]. Wien.
- TietzePAbI. = Tietze A. 1964. Persische Ableitungssuffixe im Azerosmanischen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 59–60: 154–200.
- TLIO = (n. ed.). 1997-. *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini*. [http://www.tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/].
- TMEN = Doerfer G. 1963–1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. [vol. 1–4]. Wiesbaden.

- TS = (n. ed.). 1963–1977. *XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklariyle tarama sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–8]. Ankara.
- UrbanTTet. = Urban M. 2015. *The treatment of Turkic etymologies in English lexicography. Lexemes pertaining to material culture*. Kraków.
- VNAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1976. *Vocabulario nuovo* mit seinem türkischen Teil. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38: 43–69.
- WennStach. = Stachowski M. (ed.). 2015. Osmanisch-Türkische Appellativa im Reisebuch von Adam Wenner (1622). – Ragagnin E., Wilkens J. (eds.). *Kutadgu Nom Bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: 593–607.

LUCIANO ROCCHI
University of Trieste
lrocchi@units.it

ADDENDA FROM PRE-MENINSKI TRANSCRIPTION TEXTS TO STANISŁAW STACHOWSKI'S "OSMANLI TÜRKÇESİNDE YENİ FARŞÇA ALINTILAR SÖZLÜĞÜ". PART IV

Keywords: Ottoman-Turkish, New Persian, lexical borrowing, transcription texts

Abstract

Stanisław Stachowski wrote a series of articles devoted to studies on the New Persian loanwords in Ottoman-Turkish, which were published in *Folia Orientalia* in the 1970s and later republished in 1998 as a single volume. Since then, however, a good number of editions of new Ottoman texts have appeared, especially transcription texts dating from before Meninski's *Thesaurus* (1680), which provide much new lexical material. Within this material there are many Persianisms – predictably enough where Ottoman-Turkish is concerned. This paper aims to supplement Stachowski's work with words of Persian origin taken from pre-Meninski transcription texts. It is divided into two parts, the first including data to be added to entries already recorded by Stachowski (eight articles), the second containing data that constitute new entries (three articles). A short historical-etymological note on the words dealt with also features at the end of each entry.

98. **dar** (1680); **tar** (1587/88).

Phr. – **1533** *dar ağac/ağacı* (dar aghággi/aghággi) 'forche' (ArgAd. 166, ArgR. 76); **1587/88** *tar ağacı* (taragatschi) 'der Galgen' (LubAd. 59); **1641** *darağacı* (daraghagi) 'forca doue si ampicca; patibulo' (MolDitt. 152, 294); **1677** *darağacı* (daragagi) 'forca' (MascVoc. 52).

• < Pers. *dār* 'wood; gallows, gibbet'. – N. 119 (XV); P. 68 (XIII/XIV).

102. **defter** (*tefter* 1533); **däfter** (1503), **tifter** (1584) – **1503** "*dafter* significa libro de conto" (M. Sanudo: MançT. 98); **1560** "*Defter*, qui est a dire quittance ou libelle"

(PostelTPart. 66); **1576** “messo il *tefter* nel Casnà del Signore” (G. Soranzo: RelPedF. 221); **1584** *tifter/tefter** (tifter [PalBern.], *tester [PalPD.]) ‘livre’ (PalBern. 321, PalPD. 528–529); **ca. 1630** *tefter* (tefter) ‘registrum, liber/libri rationum’ (MontR. 187); **1641** *defter* (defter) ‘catalogo’ (sic) (MolDitt. 84); **1650** *defter/tefter* (defter, tefter) ‘catalogo, cedola, indice di libro, lista, inuentario, tauola’ (CarrR. 117); **1672** *defter* (defter) ‘liber, regestum’ (HarsColl. 268–69); **1677** *defter* (defter) ‘inuentario, nota di robe’ (MascVoc. 74).

Phr. – **1539** “vno *defteremin*, che è sopra gli timari, il quale tiene registro delli timarati” (RambLibT. 17r).

– **1650** *tefter et-* (tefter ederum) ‘inuentariare’; *eskeri tefter et-* (eschieri tefter ederum) ‘assoldar soldati’ (CarrR. 316) – **1650** *tefter ol-* (tefter olmisc) ‘inuentariato’ (CarrR. 316) – **1650** *tefterden yaz-* (tefterden iazmisc) ‘assoldato’ (CarrR. 117).

• < Pers. *daftar* ‘book, record, register, journal’. – N. 123 (XIV); P. (–).

103. **defterdar** (1546); **tefterdar** (1533), **tefteder** (1548), **defterder** (1560), **tefterdar** (1630 ca.), **tefterdar** (1633), **teftedar** (1668) – **1510** *defterdar* (M. Sanudo: MancT. 98; the word occurs in Sanudo’s *Diarii* about fifty times with various adaptations, the oldest of which dates back to 1499 in the Italian plural *defterderi* [SchweickTW. 827]); **1533** *tefterdar* (tefterdár) ‘quello che tiene il libro [di conti]’ (ArgAd. 272, ArgR. 238); **1534** “due *tefterdar* che governano le pubbliche entrate” (D. de Ludovisi: RelAlb.I 14); **1548** “el Re ha ordinato duoi suoi thesaurieri (...), de quali l’vno se chiama *tefteder*” (MenTratt. 168; see also Menavino’s passage quoted at → 370. *nišan*); **1553** “*tefterdar*, ovvero tesoriere” (B. Navagero: RelAlb.I 58); **1553/55** “*Teffterdar*, das ist kançler, secretari, buchhaltter” (DernBab. 139); **1554** “*tefterdar*, che sono come appresso di noi li camarlinghi di comune” (D. Trevisano: RelAlb.I 118); **1560** “Mareschus du regne *Defterderler*, ou generaus”; “nous parlerons (...) des finances, desquelles y en a en Constantinopoli continuellement deus generaus qui s’appellent *Defterderler*” (PostelTPart. 29, 66); **1587** “*Defstardar*, voce Turchesca, da noi Thesoriere, & Camerlingo” (MinHist. unnumbered page); **1622** *defterdar* (Deffterdar) [‘Finanzbeamter’] (WennStach. 600); **ca. 1630** *tefterdar* (tefterdar) ‘praefectus rationum’ (MontR. 187); **1633** *tefterdar/tefterdar* (tefterdar, tewterdara [Pol. gen.]) [‘podskarbi (wielki); skarbnik cesarski’] (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 141); **1668** *teftedar* (teftedar) ‘praeses camerae’ (IllNém. 200); **1668** “the *Tefterdar* or Lord Treasurer” (RycautPSt. 57); **1677** *defterdar/tefterdar* (defterdar) ‘camarlingo’, (tefterdar) ‘questore’ (MascVoc. 24, 146).

Der. – **1677** *deffter]darlık* (*defdarlich) ‘camarlingato’ (MascVoc. 26).

Phr. – **1668** “the *Tefterdar Pascha* or Lord Treasurer” (RycautPSt. 204); **1672** *defterdar paša* (defterdar pasa) ‘Imperii totius Thesaurarius, qui proventus Imperii percipit, & in regestum refert, ac in Principis aerarium infert’ (HarsColl. 268–269).

• < Pers. *daftar-dār* ‘high treasurer, intendant of the finances, chancellor of the exchequer; keeper of records’. – N. 123 (XVI); P. (–).

104. **derbent** (1591); **dervent** (1533) – **1533** *dervent* (deruéntt) ‘selua’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 80); **1622** *derbent* “ein vestes Schloß (...) / welches die Türcken *Derbent*: das ist / deß engen Paß (...) nennen” (WennStach. 600); **1633** *derbenty* [Pol. pl.] ‘baszty’ (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 146).

Phr. – **1668** “the *Montes Haemi*, call’d by the Turks *Capi Dervent* [= *dervent kapi(st)*], which is as much as the Gate of the narrow way” (RycautPSt. 211).

• < Pers. *dar-band* ‘narrow and difficult pass through mountains’. – N. 128 (XIV); P. 71 (1332).

[Note: In my opinion, Osm.-T. *dere* ‘brook’ does not come from Pers. *daryā* (see below 112.), as advocated by RäsänenVW. 133 and accepted by Stachowski, but is the same word as *dere* ‘valley’ with a common semantic development. Thus, entries 105. and 106. are here put together].

- 105.–106. **dere** (‘brook’ 1591, ‘valley’ 1641) – **1533** *dere* (deré) ‘fiume; fossato; ripa; ualle’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 79); **1603/1612** *dere* (dere) ‘valles, vallis’ (MegThP. 2: 670; MegILT.); **ca. 1630** *dere* (derre) ‘riulus aquae’ (MontR. 76).

Der. – **1533** *derecik* (deregích) ‘ripa, ualle’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 79).

• < Pers. *dara/darra* ‘valley (especially between hills through which a stream flows)’. – N. 128 (XIV); P. 72 (1489).

109. **derman** (XIII) – **1533** *derman* (dermán) ‘misericordia; prouedimento; rimedio’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 79); **1611** *derman* (dermán) ‘remedio’ (FerrR. 75); **ca. 1630** *derman* (derman) ‘remedium’ (MontR. 77); **1650** *derman* (derman) ‘medicina’ (CarrR. 120); **1677** *derman* ‘remedio, rimedio’ (MascVoc. 152).

Der. – **1650** *dermanlı* (dermanlı) ‘medicinale’ (CarrR. 120).

– **1677** *derma[n]la-* (*dermalamisc) ‘rimediato’ (MascVoc. 157).

Phr. – **1641** *dermani kabil* (dermani kabil) ‘medicabile’ (MolDitt. 249).

– **1611** *derman et-* (dermán edérum) ‘remediare’ (FerrR. 75).

• < Pers. *darmān* ‘medicine, remedy’. – N. 129 (XII); P. 72 (XIII).

110. **derd** (1544/48); **tert** (1603) – **1533** *dert* (dert, derdum, derdi) ‘passione; pena; timore; maninconia’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 79); **1603/1612** *dert/tert* (dert, tert) ‘dolor’, (tert) ‘poena’ (MegThP. 1: 445, 2: 285; MegILT.); **ca. 1630** *derd/dert* (derd, dert) ‘molestia, afflictio, dolor’ (MontR. 76); **1677** *dert* (dert) ‘indisposizione’, (derti [+ poss.]) ‘pena, dolore’ (MascVoc. 62, 122).

Der. – **1533** *dertli* (derttlj) ‘passionato; timoroso’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 79); **1677** *dertili* (derttili) ‘infermo’ (MascVoc. 68) – **ca. 1630** *der(d)daş* (derdas) ‘socius afflictionis’ (MontR. 71).

• < Pers. *dard* ‘pain, ache, trouble, disease, grief, affliction’. – N. 118 (XIV); P. 71 (XIII).

111. **derviş** (1544/48); **dravis** (1487 ca.), **dervis** (1517/18), **derbiş/dirbiş*** (1557), **darvis** (1576), **drevis** (1588), **dreviş** (?) (ca. 1630), **devriş** (1641) – [Attestations in Italianised forms such as *dervisi* (MenTratt. 63) have been not taken into account] – **1481**

*derviş** (*dermschler, *dermscher, *derivischler [+ pl.]) ['Mönche'] (GUnSt. 49); **ca. 1487** "molti di quelli *dravis*" (G. Barbaro: SchweickTW. 823); **1496/1501** *derviş* (derwizler [+ pl.]) '(jako tu u nas) mniszy' (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSH-ET. 149); **1517/18** "uno *dervis*, sacerdote turchesco" (MachDisc. 474); **1533** *derviş* (deruisc) 'heremita, romito' (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 80); **1539** "gli *Deruis*, che sono heremiti, ouer santoni" (RambLibT. 28r); **1545** "Quello che noi chiamiamo (...) Monacho, Eremita, loro chiamano (...) *Deruis*" (BassR. 71); **1554** "plusieurs Turqs (...) lesquelz ils appellent *Dervisar*" (A. Thevet: ArvAdd. 80); **1557** *derbiş/dirbiş** (derbiszami, dirbiszowie [+ Pol. morphs]) 'mniszy tureccy' (E. Otwinowski: StachSHET. 149); **1560** "Il y a là vn infini peuple de caymans, & sont de quatre noms & sectes (...). Tous en vn compris sont appellés *Deruiss*, ou saints" (Postel-RepT. 107); **1568** "secte des religieux Turcs, appelés *Deruis*" (NicQLivr. 115); **1576** "Les premiers qui sont entre eux [= Turkish monks] de regle & profession plus estroite, sont appelez *Daruisses* [French pl.]" (J. de Lavardoin: ArvAdd. 79); **1580** *dervis* (deruis) 'prete' (BVenON. 1); **1587** "*Dreuis*, & *Deruis*, voce barbara, da noi Heremita" (MinHist. unnumbered page); **1587/88** "viel *Dervis* oder turckische Heilige" (LubAd. 40); **1608** "Viererley Orden finden sich bey den Mahometanern / die werden genennt *Deruißler* (...)" (SchwSt. 230); **1611** *derviş* (deruisc) [without translation] (RJTMajd. 183); **1611** *derviş* (deruisc) 'peregrino' (FerrR. 75); **ca. 1630** *drevis* // *dreviş* (dreuis) 'monaci turcae' (MontR. 81); **1641** *devriş* (deurisc) 'eremita, romita' (MolDitt. 134, 362); **1672** *derviş* (dervis) 'monachus' (HarsHaz. 186–87); **1677** *derviş* (deruisc) 'eremita, romito' (MascVoc. 45, 169).

Der. – **1611** *dervişlik* (deruisclic) 'peregrinaggio' (FerrR. 75).

Phr. – **1611** *dervişlik et-* (deruisclic edérum) 'peregrinare' (FerrR. 75).

• < Pers. *darviş* 'poor, indigent; dervish, monk'. – N. 129 (XIII); P. 73 (XIII/XIV).

112. **derya** (1641); **tere** (1584) – **1584** *tere* (there) [perhaps contaminated with → 105.–106. *dere*] 'la mer' (PalBern. 319); **1611** *derya* (deriá) 'vastità' (FerrR. 75); **ca. 1630** *derya* (deria) 'mare, profundum, *accipit(ur) pro mare*' (MontR. 77); **1672** *derya* (derja (kenarlerinde)) '(ad ripam) maris', (derjade [+ loc.]) 'mari' (HarsHaz. 142–143); **1677** *derya* (deria) 'mare' (MascVoc. 89).

• < Pers. *daryā* 'sea, ocean'. – N. 129 (XIII); P. 74 (1368).

114. **deste** (1680); **teste** (1533) – **1533** *teste* (testé) 'dozina; quinterno, quinterno di carte, quaderno di fogli' (ArgAd. 275, ArgR. 242).

Phr. – **1533** *teste ağacı/çıbuğı* (testé aghaggi, testé cibughí) 'traucello' (ArgAd. 275, ArgR. 242).

• < Pers. *dasta* 'handle; handful'. – N. 130 (XIV); P. 75 (1445).

115. **destur** (1641); **testir** (1533), **tester** (1611), **testur** (1677) – **1533** *testir* (testír) 'licentia' (ArgAd. 275, ArgR. 243); **1611** *tester* (testér) 'licenza' (FerrR. 75); **ca. 1630** *testir* (testir) 'venia' (MontR. 190).

Der. – **1533** *testircik* (testirgích) 'licentia' (ArgAd. 275, ArgR. 243).

Phr. – **1611** *tester al-* (testér alérum) ‘licentiarsi’ (FerrR. 75); **1677** *testur al-* (testur almach) ‘togliere la licentia’ (MascVoc. 248) – **1533** *testir ver-* (testír uerúrum) ‘licentio, dò licentia ad uno’, (testír uerderúrum) ‘fo licentiare’ (ArgAd. 275, ArgR. 243); **1611** *tester ver-* (testér uerérum) ‘licentiare’ (FerrR. 75); **ca. 1630** *testir ver-* (testír uermek) ‘veniam praeberere’ (MontR. 190) – **1650** *destur verici* (destur verigi) ‘licentiatore’ (CarrR. 121).

• < Pers. *dastūr* ‘leave, permission, licence’. – N. 130 (XIII); P. 75 (XIII/XIV).

116. **dev** (1641) – **1533** *dev* (dew) ‘gigante’ (ArgAd. 168, ArgR. 80); **1650** *dev* (deu) ‘centauro’ (CarrR. 121); **1677** *dev* (deu) ‘gigante’ (MascVoc. 56).

Phr. – **1650** *dev sureti* (deu sureti) ‘colosso’ (CarrR. 121).

• < Pers. *dīv* ‘devil, demon, genius, spirit’. – N. 131 (XIV); P. 80 (XIII/XIV).

118. **dilbaz** (1680) – **1611** *dilbaz* (dilbás) ‘losingatore, parlatore, adulatore’ (FerrR. 76); **1641** *dilbaz* (dilbaz) ‘lenguacciuto’ (MolDitt. 231); **1650** *dilbaz* (dilbaz) ‘audace’ (CarrR. 121); **1677** *dilbaz* (dilbas) ‘lenguacciuto, linguacciuto’ (MascVoc. 80).

Der. – **1611** *dilbazlık* (dilbaslíc) ‘losinge’ (FerrR. 76); **1650** *dilbazlık* (dilbazlich) ‘audacia’; (dilbazlich ileh) ‘audacemente’ (CarrR. 121).

Phr. – **1611** *dilbazlık çäl-* (dilbaslíc cielárum) ‘losingare’ (FerrR. 76).

• < Pers. *dil-bāz* ‘eloquent; verbose; juggler’. – N. (-); P. (-).

120. **divan** (1533); **tifan** (1608) – **1529** “a la Porta, zoè chiamato in loro lenguazo al *divan*” (M. Sanudo: DELI 2: 356; Sanudo himself also records the Italianized form *divano*, which is in general more common than *divan* in Italian sources and already attested by A. Gritti in 1503: RelAlb.III 35); [add.] **1533** *divan* (diuán) ‘audientia’ (ArgAd. 170, ArgR. 83); **1540** “au *Divan*, c’est-à-dire à l’audience publique” (A. Rincon: ArvAdd. 85); **1545** “nella vdienza publica, la quale è detta da essi *Diuan*” (BassR. 71); **1557** “rada i sądy, (...), co tam *Dywanem* [+ Pol. morph]) *zowią a loco*” (E. Otwinowski: StachSHET.159); **1560** “vne sale mediocre ou se tient tous les jours d’audiance, la court ou conseil nommé *Diuan*” (PostelRepT. 21); **1575** “le siege des Iuges que les Turcs appellent *Diuan*” (F. de Belleforest: ArvAdd. 85); **1576** “Stano tutti questi bassà (...) in un logo deputato per questo, che se chiama *Divan* del Signore, et è nel proprio Seraglio” (B. Antelmi: RelPedF. 198); **1587/88** *divan* (divan) ‘Rathstube’ (LubAd. 41); **1608** *tifan* (tiphan) [‘Ratsversammlung der osmanischen Regierung’] (SchwSt. 251); **1611** *divan* (diuan, diwan) ‘la corte, pallatiū iglicia’ (RJT Majd. 184); **1612** *divan* (diuan) ‘synedrion’ (MegILT.); **1622** *divan* (Divan) [‘Ratsitzung’] (WennStach. 600); **ca. 1630** *divan* (diuan) ‘consilium’ (MontR. 79); **1633/1641** *divan* (dywan) ‘sala senatorska, albo dla porady’ (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 159); **1650** *divan* (diuan) ‘tribunale’ (CarrR. 125); **1668** “the *Divan* or place of Judicature” (RycautPSt. 43); **1672** “qui sunt in *Divan*, seu collegio intimorum consiliariorum”; “ad locum justitiae & consilii, seu *Divan*’ (HarsColl. 247, 293); (divanda [+ loc.]) ‘pro tribunali’ (HarsHaz. 142–143).

Phr. – **1573** “fu fatto *aiacco Divano* [Italianised form] in ver sera per determinare le cose della guerra” (Anonymous: RelPedF. 173); **1608** “*Aiaktiphan* (= *ayak*

divani) ist so vile ein Reichßtag /welcher allein in schweren vnd gefehrlichen Fällen fürgenommen wird” (SchwSt. 223).

– **1672** *divan efendisi* (*divan effendişi*) ‘qui negotia in externo consessu proponit, & conclusa notat’ (HarsColl. 266) – **1650** *divan kovıcı* (*diuan quouigi*) ‘cortigiano’ (CarrR. 125) – **1538** “uno che si dimanda *divanjazizi* (= *divan yazıcı*) (...) et a questo li Bassa dicono tutto quello che il Signore ha comandato, et esso lo pone in memoriale, et accadendo lo ricorda” (SpandSath. 224) – **1677** *divan* yeri* (**diuanè ieri*) ‘uditorio, luogo d’vdienza’ (MascVoc. 263).

• < Pers. *dīwān* ‘royal court; tribunal of justice or revenue; council of state, senate’. – N. 138 (XI); P. 8o (XIII/XIV).

121. **divane** (1641) – **1538** “Li *Divani* [It. plural?] sono religiosi, che anchora loro vanno con li capelli longhi et barbe, et vestono anchora essi di pelle di castrati col pelo di fuori, et con anelli di ferro alle orecchie, et ferro atorno al collo” (SpandSath. 247); **1611** *divane* (*diuanhe, diuane*) ‘badajo, bobo, fol’ (RJT Majd. 184); **1650** *divane* (*diuane*) ‘balordo, sciocho, forsennato, insano, pazzo’ (CarrR. 125); **1677** *divane* (*diuane*) ‘farnetico, matto sciolto, pazzo’ (MascVoc. 48, 91).

Der. – **1650** *divanlı* (*diuanli*) ‘fatuo, stolto’ (CarrR. 125) – *ca.* **1630** *divanlık* (*diuanlık*) ‘stultitia’ (MontR. 79); **1650** *divanilik* (*diuanilich*) ‘furia, pazzia, stoltitia’, (*diuanilich ileh*) ‘stoltamente’ (CarrR. 125); **1677** *divanelik* (*diuanelich*) ‘mattezza’ (MascVoc. 91).

Phr. – **1650** *divane ol-* (*diuane olurum*) ‘freneticare’ (CarrR. 125); **1677** *divane ol-* (*diuane olunmisc*) ‘mattuto, amattuto’ (MascVoc. 91).

• < Pers. *dīwāna* ‘foolish, insane; mad, furious’. – N. 138 (XIII); P. 8o (1430).

122. **divanhana** (1668) – **1533** *divanhana* (*diuán chaná*) ‘il loco oue si ode et dà audientia; residentia regale’ (ArgAd. 171, ArgR. 83); **1587/88** *divanhane* (*divan hane*) ‘Rathaus’ (LubAd. 41); *ca.* **1630** *divanhane* (*diuan hane*) ‘sala, cubiculum consilij’ (MontR. 79).

• < Pers. *dīwān-xāna* ‘hall of audience’. – N. (–); P. (–).

123. **dizdar** (1641) – **1496/1501** *dizdar* (*disdar* [with variae lectiones]) [‘burgrabia’] (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSHET. 152); **1503** “emin e *disdari* [It. pl.] di Santa Maura” (A. Gritti: RelAlb.III 12); **1533** *dizdar* (*disdár*) ‘chastellano’ (ArgAd. 171, ArgR. 83); **1677** *dizdar* (*disdar*) ‘castellano’ (MascVoc. 25).

• < Pers. *dīz-dār* ‘governor of a castle of fort’ – N. 140 (XIV); P. (–).

124. **dolab** (1680); **dulab** (1611), **dolap** (1650) – **1611** *dulab* (*dulab*) ‘la fortuna’ (RJT Majd. 185); **1641** *dolab* (*dolab*) ‘armario, guarda robba; torchio, torcolo da calcare vua; trama, inganno’ (MolDitt. 59 passim); **1650** *dolab/dolap* (*dolab, dolap, dolabi* [+ poss.]) ‘credenza da pane, liuello, *istrumento*; ripostiglio, scanzia; torchio, stringitoio; girandola’ (CarrR. 127); **1677** *dolap/dolab* (*dolap*) ‘armario, guarda roba’, (*dolab*) ‘argano, macchina; saluarobba; trama, inganno’ (MascVoc. 16 passim).

Der. – **1677** *dolabcı* (dolabgi) ‘machinatore, ingannatore’ (MascVoc. 85–86).

Phr. – **1641** *esbap dolabı* (esbap dolabi) ‘salua robba’ (MolDitt. 370) – **1641** *gemi dolabı* (ghiemi dolabi) ‘argano, machina’ (MolDitt. 58) – **1641** *su dolabı* (su dollabi) ‘rota di cauar acqua’ (MolDitt. 364).

– **1641** *dolab kur-* (dolab kurmak) ‘machinare qualche inganno, tramare’ (MolDitt. 239, 462); **1677** *dolab kur(u)-* (dolab curumach) ‘machinare, ingannare, tramare’ (MascVoc. 84, 252) – **1677** *dolab ol-* (dolab olunmisc) ‘machinato, ingannato’ (MascVoc. 85).

• < Pers. *dül-âb* ‘wheel, especially for raising water to overflow fields; store-house, pantry, buttery, locker; trick, fraud, machination; profit; commerce’. – N. 141 (XIV); P. 81 (2/XV).

125. **dost** (1591) – **1533** *dost* (dost) ‘amico’ (ArgAd. 172, ArgR. 86); **1567** *dost* (dost-larumden [+ pl. poss. abl.]) ‘degli amici miei’ (LettBomb. 139–143); **1603** *dost* (dost) ‘amicus’ (MegThP. 1: 78); **1611** *dost* (dost) ‘amigo’ (RJTMajd. 185); **1611** *dost* (dóst) ‘amico’ (FerrR. 77); *ca.* **1630** *dost* (dost) ‘amicus’ (MontR. 81); **1672** *dost* (doßt) ‘amicus’ (HarsHaz. 134–35); **1677** *dost* (dost) ‘amico’ (MascVoc. 12).

Der. – **1533** *dostluk* (dostlúch) ‘amicitia’ (ArgAd. 172, ArgR. 86); **1567** *dostluk/dosluk** (dostlügümüz [+ poss.], dossluga [+ dat.]) ‘amicizia’ (LettBomb. 139–143); **1603** *dostluk* (dostlük) ‘amicitia’ (MegThP. 1: 77); **1611** *dostlık* (dostlik) ‘amistad’ (RJTMajd. 185); **1611** *dostlık* (dostlíc) ‘amicitia’ (FerrR. 77); **1622** *dosluk* (Dosluk) [‘Geschenk, Präsent’] (WennStach. 600); **1650** *dostluk* (dostluch) ‘amicitia’ (CarrR. 129); **1672** *dostluk* (doßtluk) ‘amicitia’ (HarsHaz. 48–49); **1677** *dostuluk* (dostuluch) ‘amicizia’, (dostulughile) ‘amichevolmente’ (MascVoc. 12).

– **1611** *dostlan-* (dostlanérum) ‘inamicarsi’ (FerrR. 77); **1533** *dostlaş-* (dost-lascírum) ‘ho amicitia’, (dostlascsterúrum) ‘fo hauere amicitia’ (ArgAd. 172, ArgR. 86).

Phr. – **1641** *sıkca dost* (skgia dost) ‘amico stretto’ (MolDitt. 129); **1650** *sıkca dost* (schgia dost) ‘amicissimo, amico stretto’ (CarrR. 129) – **1650** *uzun dostluk* (vzun dostluch) ‘amicitia lunga’ (CarrR. 129); → 709. *bahane*.

– **1611** *dost ol-* (dost holúrum) ‘amicarsi, far amicitia’ (FerrR. 77); **1650** *dost ol-* (dost olurum) ‘amicarsi, farsi amico’ (CarrR. 129).

– **1650** *dostluđı al-* (dostluchi alerum) ‘pigliar amicitia’ (CarrR. 129) – **1641** *dostluđı boz-/bozuş-* (dostlughı bosmak/bozusc=mak) ‘rompere l’amicitia, ò disfare l’amicitia’ (MolDitt. 41); **1650** *dostluđı boz-* (dostlughı bozarum) ‘romper l’amicitia’ (CarrR. 129) – **1650** *dostluk et-* (dostluch ederum) ‘amicarsi, far amicitia’ (CarrR. 129) – **1641** *dostluđden geri dur-* (dostlughden gheri durmak) ‘ritirarsi dall’amicitia, tralasciare l’amicitia’ (MolDitt. 42) – **1641** *dostluđe kabul et-* (dost-lughe kabul etmek) ‘accettare per amico, amicarsi, fare amicitia’ (MolDitt. 8, 41) – **1641** *dostluđı sakla-* (dostlughı saklamak) ‘mantenere l’amicitia, conseruare l’amicitia’ (MolDitt. 41, 42).

• < Pers. *düst* ‘friend; lover’. – N. 143 (XI); P. 81 (1291–1312).

126. **dostane** (1680) – **1672** *dostane* (doštane) ‘amica’ (HarsHaz. 132–133).
 • < Pers. *dūstāna* ‘friendly, affectionately’. – N. (–); P. (–).
127. **duvar** (*divar*, *duar* 1612); **dovar** (1533), **tuvar** (ca. 1630) – **1533** *duvar/dovar* (duuár) ‘muro’, (cial douara) ‘battilo nel muro’ (ArgAd. 173, ArgR. 87); **1587/88** *duar* (duar) ‘Wandt’ (LubAd. 41); **1603** *duar*, *divar* (duar, diuuar) ‘murus’ (MegThP. 2: 93); **1611** *duar* (duár) ‘muraglia, muro’ (FerrR. 78); **ca. 1630** *duvar/tuvar* (duuar, tuuuar) ‘murus’ (MontR. 81); **1650** *duar* (duar) ‘pariete’ (CarrR. 125); **1672** *divar* (di-varina [+ poss. dat.]) ‘parietibus’ (HarsHaz. 184–85); **1677** *divar* (diuar) ‘muraglia’ (MascVoc. 102).
 Der. – **1677** *divarcığaz* (diuargigas) ‘murello (MascVoc. 102) – **1677** *divarcık* (diuargich) ‘muretto’ (MascVoc. 102).
 – **1677** *divarla-* (diuarlamach) ‘murare’, (diuarlanmisc) ‘murato’ (MascVoc. 102).
 Phr. – **1533** *asar duvar* (assár duuár) ‘mura delle città’ (ArgAd. 139, ArgR. 36); **1650** *hisar duarı* (hissar duari) ‘muraglia di città’ (CarrR. 125) – **1587/88** *şehir duarı* (scheherduarij) ‘Stadtmaur’ (LubAd. 41).
 – **1641** *duvar çatlağı* (duuar ciatlaghi) ‘sfessura del muro’ (MolDitt. 401) – **1677** *divar(i) yüksekligi* (diuari iuchsechlighi) ‘sommità delle muraglie’ (MascVoc. 212) – **1650** *divar yüzi* (diuar iusi) ‘facciata di muraglia’ (CarrR. 361).
 – **1650** *dovar çevir-* (douar ceuirirum) ‘serrar di mura’ (CarrR. 106) – → 273. *lacivert*.
 – **1677** *divarlık et-* (diuarlich etmech) ‘muramento’ (MascVoc. 102).
 • < Pers. *dīwār* ‘wall’. – N. 146 (XIII); P. 81 (XIV).
128. **dülger** (1641); **düliger** (1533), **dülker** (1677) – **1533** *düliger* (dulighiér) ‘legnaiuolo’ (ArgAd. 174, ArgR. 88); **1611** *dülger* (dulger) ‘carpintero’ (RJTMajd. 186); **1611** *dülger* (dulghér) ‘maestro d’ascia’ (FerrR. 79); **1650** *dülger* (dulghier) ‘falegname, marangone’ (CarrR. 133); **1677** *dülger/dülker* (dulghier) ‘falegname, legnaiuolo’, (dulchier) ‘marangone’ (MascVoc. 49, 89).
 Phr. – **1677** *dam dülgeri* (dam dulghieri) ‘acconcia tetti’ (MascVoc. 5).
 • < Pers. *durūdgar* ‘carpenter’. – N. 131 (XIV); P. (–).
129. **düşmen** (*duşman* [or rather *düşman*] 1533) – [add.] **1533** *düşman* (duscimán) ‘nimico’ (ArgAd. 175, ArgR. 89); **1611** *düşman* (duscmán) ‘inimico, nemico’ (FerrR. 79); **ca. 1630** *düşman* (dusman) ‘inimicus’ (MontR. 82); **1630** *düşman* (duszman) [‘nieprzyjaciel’] (A. Piaseczyński: StachSHET. 157); **1650** *düşman/düşmen* (duscman, duscmen) ‘hoste, hostile, inimico, nemico’ (CarrR. 134); **1672** *düşmen* (düsmen) ‘hostis’ (HarsHaz. 132–133); **1677** *düş(i)man/düş(i)men* (dusciman) ‘contrario; inimico’, (duscimen) ‘nemico, nimico’ (MascVoc. 33, 71, 105).
 Der. – **1533** *düşmanluk/düşmanlık* (duscimanlúch, duscimanlích) ‘nimitia’ (ArgAd. 175, ArgR. 89); **1567** *düşmenlik** (dussmenliga [+ dat.]) ‘inimiticia’ (LettBomb. 139–143); **1611** *düşmanlık* (duscmanlíc) ‘inimiticia, nimiticia’ (FerrR. 79); **1650** *düşmanlık* (duscmanlich) ‘controuersia, hostilità’, (duscmanlich

ileh) 'contrariamente' (CarrR. 134); **1672** *düşmenlik* (düşmenlik) 'hostilitatem' (HarsHaz. 132–33); **1677** *düşmanlık* (duscmanlich) 'inimicizia, nemicizia' (MascVoc. 71, 105).

– **1650** *düşmenle-* (duscmenlerum) 'nemicarsi' (CarrR. 135).

Phr. – **1650** *düşmanlık et-* (duscmanlich ederum) 'contrariare' (CarrR. 134) – **1650** *düşmanlık edici* (duscmanlich edigi) 'contrariante' (CarrR. 134) – **1650** *düşmanlık ol-* (duscmanlich olmisc) 'contrariante' (CarrR. 135).

• < Pers. *duşman/duşmān* 'enemy, foe, adversary'. – N. 149 (XI); P. 83 (1332).

131. **efsun** (1680); **avsun** // **avsum** (1533), **hafisum** (ca. 1630) – **ca. 1630** *hafisum* (hafissum) 'somnialetus, piger' (MontR. 99).

Der. – **1533** *avsumcı* // *avsunçı* (avsumgı) 'jncantatore' (ArgAd. 141, ArgR. 39).

– **1533** *avsul(l)a-* (ausulárum) 'jncanto', (ausulatterúrurum) 'fo incantare', (ausulamách) 'jncanto' (ArgAd. 141, ArgR. 39).

• < Pers. *afsūn* 'incantation, fascination, verses used in spell'. – N. 153 (XI); P. 86 (1368).

132. **eğer** (1455/56) – **1533** *eger* (eghiér, eghér) 'se' (ArgAd. 176, ArgR. 90); **1574** *eger* (egier) 'si' (VNAd. 61); **1603/1612** *eger* (eger) 'si' (MegThP. 2: 512), 'si, siquidem, nisi' (MegILT.); **1630 ca.** *eger* (egher) 'si, cum' (MontR. 84); **1677** *eger* (egher) 'se' (MascVoc. 195).

Phr. – **1650** *eger *başler* (= *baz(en)ler*) (eghier bascler) 'se qualche volta' (CarrR. 76).

• < Pers. *agar* 'if; although'. – N. 154 (XI); P. 86 (XIII).

134. **ejder**, **ejderha** (*eşterha* 1603); **ajdağa** // **azdağa** (1533), **ajderha** (1553/55), **ejdra** // **ezdra** (1611); **azder** (?) (ca. 1630), **aşder** (1677) – **1533** *ajdağa* // *azdağa* (asdaghá) 'drago' (ArgAd. 143, ArgR. 30); **1553/55** *ajderha* (aschderha) 'draco' (DernBab. 205); **1611** *ejdra* // *ezdra* (esdrá) 'serpente' (FerrR. 81); **ca. 1630** *ajder* // *azder* (asder) 'draco' (MontR. 53); **1677** *aşder* (asc=der) 'basilisco' (MascVoc. 20).

• < Pers. *aždahā, aždarhā* 'dragon'. – N. 155 (XIV); P. 87 (XIII).

136. **encümen** (1680); **neman** (?) (ca. 1630) – **ca. 1630** *neman* (neman) 'congregatio' (MontR. 152).

• < Pers. *anğuman* 'company, assembly, congregation, congress'. – N. 162 (XVII Meninski); P. 88 (2/XV).

138. **endam** (1680) – **1533** *endam* (endám, emdám) 'factione, foggia, garbo; bella forma, buono garbo; proportione' (ArgAd. 179, ArgR. 94); **1612** *endam* 'corporis forma seu status' (MegILT.); **ca. 1630** *endam* (endam) 'corporis forma, status' (MontR. 86).

Der. – **1533** *endamlı* (emdanmlj) 'proportionato, garbato' (ArgAd. 179, ArgR. 94) – **1533** *endamlice* (endanmliggie) 'proportionato, garbato' (ArgAd. 179, ArgR. 94).

• < Pers. *andām* 'body; stature, figure, form (of the body)'. – N. 163 (XI); P. 88 (XIII/XIV).

139. **endaze** (1641); **endaz*** (1677) – **1533 endeze** (endesé) ‘forma di berrette, scarpe et simili, di legno; misura, picco da misurare’ (ArgAd. 179, ArgR. 94); **1677 endaz*** (endasile [+ com.]) ‘a braccia’ (MascVoc. 3).
 • < Pers. *andāza* ‘ell, yard; measure, quantity, dimension’. – N. 163 (XIII); P. 88 (1430).
143. **ergävānī** (1680); **argavani** (1533) – **1533 argavani** (arghauani) ‘rose secche, colore’ (ArgAd. 138, ArgR. 35).
 • < Pers. *argāvānī* ‘red, purple’. – N. (-); P. (-).
145. **ezber** (1680) – **1533 ezberden** (exberdén) ‘all’improuista’ (ArgAd. 182, ArgR. 97); **1567 ezber** ‘a memoria’ (LettBomb. 140–144).
 Der. – **1533 ezberle-** (exberlérum) ‘dichiaro, interpreto uno uocabulo d’un libro, jnterpreto’ (ArgAd. 182, ArgR. 97); **1641 ezberle-** (esberlemek) ‘imparare a mente’, (esberlenmek) ‘a mente, hauere in mente’ (MolDitt. 41, 194).
 Phr. – **1641 ezberinde dut-** (esberindhe dutmak) ‘tenere a memoria’ (MolDitt. 451); **1677 ezberden dut-** (esberden dutmach) ‘tenere a memoria’ (MascVoc. 244) – **1641 ezberden oku-** (esberden okumak) ‘recitare a mente’ (MolDitt. 339).
 • < Pers. *az bar* ‘by heart’. – N. 176 (XIV); P. 90 (1451).
147. **fāḡfuri** (1680) – **1533 farfuri** (farfurj) ‘porcellana, terra’ (ArgAd. 182, ArgR. 99).
 • < Pers. *faḡfūrī* ‘royal, imperial, belonging to the emperor of China; china-ware’. – N. (-); P. 91 (1525–1526).
149. **farsi** (1641) – **1533 farsi** (farsi) ‘grammatica, latino’ (ArgAd. 182, ArgR. 99).
 • < Pers. *fārsī* ‘Persian, Persic’. – N. (-); P. (-).
152. **ferište** (1544/48); **feliste*** (1496/1501), **feriste** (1533) – **1496/1501 feliste*** (felhister [with variae lectiones; + pl.]) ‘anioły’ (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSH-E.T. 188); **1533 feriste** (feristé) ‘angelo, cherubino’ (ArgAd. 183, ArgR. 100); **1575 feriste** (feriste) ‘ange; angelus’ (PostelInstr.); **1603/1612 ferište** (ferischte) ‘angelus’ (MegThP. 1: 88; MegILT.); **1611 feriste** (feristé) ‘angelo, spirito cieleste’ (FerrR. 84); **ca. 1630 feriste // ferište** (feriste) ‘angelus’ (MontR. 90); **1677 ferište** (ferisc=te) ‘angelo’ (MascVoc. 13).
 • < Pers. *firišta* ‘angel’. – N. 184 (XI); P. 94 (XIII/XIV).
153. **ferman** (1680) – **1611 ferman** (fermán) ‘comandamento’ (FerrR. 84).
 • < Pers. *farmān* ‘mandate, command, order, or royal patent’. – N. 158 (XIV); P. 92 (1368).
156. **feryad** (*feryat* 1672); **firḡaz** (1641), **firyaz** (1677) – **1533 feryat** (feriätt) ‘lamento’ (ArgAd. 183, ArgR. 100); **1641 firḡaz** (firghas) ‘esclamazione; lamento’ (MolDitt. 135, 226); **1677 firyaz** (firias) ‘esclamazione; lamento’ (MascVoc. 45, 77).

Der. – **1641** *firğazlı* (firğhasli) ‘lamenteuole’ (MoDitt. 226); **1677** *firyazlı* (firiastli) ‘lamenteuole’ (MascVoc. 77) – **1641** *firğazlık* (firğhaslik) ‘lamentatione’ (MolDitt. 226); **1677** *firyazlık* (firiastlich) ‘lamentazione’ (MascVoc. 77).

– **1650** *firğazla-* (firğhaslarum) ‘lamentarsi’ (CarrR. 154).

Phr. – **1533** *feryat et-* (feriát edérum) ‘lamento’, (feriát etterrúrum) ‘fo lamentare’ (ArgAd. 183, ArgR. 100): **ca. 1630** *feryat et-* (feriath etmek) ‘lamentarsi’ (MontR. 90); **1641** *firğaz et-* (firğ(h)as etmek) ‘proclamare; strillare’ (MolDitt. 320, 437).

• < Pers. *faryād* ‘exclamation, cry for help; lamentation, complaint’. – N. 184 (XIII); P. 92–93 (1368).

161. **Frankistan** (1553/55); **Frengisten** (1587/88), **Frenkisten** (1584) – **1574** *Frenkistan* (*frencistan) ‘Italia’ (VNAd. 63); **1584** *Frenkisten* (frenquistendan [+ abl.]) ‘Italie’ (PalBern. 319); **1587/88** *Frengisten* (frengisten) ‘Welschlandt’ (LubAd. 41); **1603/1612** *Frenkistan* (frencistan) ‘Italia’ (MegThP. 1: 752; MegILT.); **1611** *Frengistan* (frenghistán) ‘Italia’ (FerrR. 85); **1617** “*Frenchistàn* (...) significa la Franchia, cioè l’Europa, il paese de’ Franchi” (P. Della Valle: SchweickTW. 824); **ca. 1630** *Frenkistan* (frenkistan) ‘Italia’ (MontR. 91).

• < Pers. *Frangistān*, *Firingistān* ‘Italy, France, or the country of the Franks; Europe’. – N. (-); P. 94 (1489).

162. **frengi** (1680); **frenti** (?) (1533), **frängi** (1584) –? **1533** *frenti* (frentti) ‘duchato’ (ArgAd. 184, ArgR. 102); **1584** *frängi* (frangi) ‘Francs ou Latins’ (PalPD. 522–523; [*frangil (PalBern. 319)]).

Phr. – **1548** “quelli [= the ducats] de Venetiani chiamati da loro *frengiflori*” (MenTratt. 162).

• < Pers. *frangī* ‘French; Italian; an European Christian’. – N. 196 (XIII); P. (-).

163. **frenk** (1546; 1553/55); **freng** (ca. 1520) – **1587/88** *freng* (freng) ‘Welsch’ (LubAd. 412).

Phr. – **1611** *freng gâ(v)ur* (fréng ghiaúr) ‘italiano’ (FerrR. 85) – **ca. 1520/1525/30** *freng yuzı* (= *frenk uyuzu*) (frengiusi) ‘mal franzoso’ (LupisON. 3b; ITSprAd. 238); **1611** *freng uzı* (frenghusi) ‘bubas, uerole’ (RJTMajd. 189).

• < Pers. *farang*, *firing* ‘Frank, Italian, European’. – N. (-); P. 94 (XIII/XIV).

165. **geda** (*gida* 1570/90) – **ca. 1630** *geda* (geda) ‘it. huomo da bontempo’ (?) (MontR. 93); **1677** *geda* (ghieda) ‘sconoscente, ingrato’ (MascVoc. 190).

• < Pers. *gadā* ‘poor, indigent; beggar’. – N. (-); P. 97 (XIII/XIV).

166. **gerdan** (*gârdan* 1641) – **ca. 1630** *gerdan* (gierdan) ‘gula’ (MontR. 94); **1650** *gerdan* (ghierdan) ‘nodo del collo’ (CarrR. 160); **1677** *gerdan* (ghierdan) ‘collo’ (MascVoc. 30).

• < Pers. *gardan* ‘neck’. – N. 207 (XIV); P. (-).

168. **girdab** (1641) – **1677** *girdab* (ghirdab) ‘labyrinth’ (MascVoc. 77).

• < Pers. *gird-āb* ‘whirlpool, abyss, gulf, vortex’. – N. 210 (XV); P. 102 (1430).

169. **girift** (1533); **girif** (1677).
 Phr. – 1533 *girift et-* (ghiríft edérum) ‘frodò’, (ghiríft etterúrum) ‘fo frodare’ (ArgAd. 188, ArgR. 106); 1677 *girif et-* (ghirif etmech) ‘confiscare’ (MascVoc. 32) – 1677 *girif/girifti ol-* (ghirif/ghirifti olunmisc) ‘confiscato’ (MascVoc. 32, 35).
 • < Pers. *girift* ‘capture, seizure, detention, sequestration; fault, sin, crime’. – N. 210 (XIV); P. (–).
171. **gonçe** (1680) – 1533 *konca* (chongíá) ‘boccia di fiori’ (ArgAd. 222, ArgR. 153).
 • < Pers. *gunğal/gunča* ‘rose-bud’. – N. 212 (XIV); P. 103–104 (2/XV).
172. **gül** (*d’ül* 1570/90); **yül** (ca. 1520) – ca. 1520/1525/30 *yül* (iul) ‘rosa’ (LupisON. 3a; ITSprAd. 222); 1533 *gül* (ghiúI) ‘rosa; matassa o scagna [*scagno* in ArgR. is an error] di seta’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109), 1611 *gül* (gul, gùl) ‘rosas’ (RJTMajd. 192); 1611 *gül* (ghiúI) ‘rosa, fiore’ (FerrR. 89); ca. 1630 *gül* (giul) ‘rosa’ (MontR. 96); 1650 *gül* (ghiul) ‘rosa’ (CarrR. 166); 1677 *gül* (ghiul) ‘rosa, fiore’ (MascVoc. 169).
 Phr. – 1587/88 *yül bayram* (juhlbayram) ‘Rosenfest’ (LubAd. 44) – 1611 *gül macun* (ghiúI magiún) ‘conserua di rose’ (FerrR. 89) – 1533 *gül suyı* (ghiul suı) ‘acqua rosa’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109); 1611 *gül su* (ghiulsú) ‘acqua rosa’ (FerrR. 89); 1677 *gül suyı* (ghiul sui) ‘acqua rosa’ (MascVoc. 6) – → 534. *sirke*, 810. *gülişefteli*.
 • < Pers. *gul* ‘rose; flower’. – N. 218 (XII); P. 106 (1291–1312).
- [174. **gülgüli** (1641); **gülyeli** (1587/88) – 1587/88 *gülyeli* (guil jelij) ‘röselt oder rosinfarb’ (LubAd. 44).
 • According to Stachowski < Pers. *gulgulı* ‘hellrosa; rosenfarben, rosenfarbig’, but this word does not appear in Persian dictionaries. Perhaps it is an assimilated variation of the next entry. – N. (–); P. (–).]
175. **gülgün** (1680) – 1533 *gülgüni* (ghiulghiunf) ‘jncarnato’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109).
 • < Pers. *gul-gün* ‘of a vermilion colour’. – N. (–); P. 107 (2/XV).
176. **gülistan** (1641) – 1533 *gülistan* (ghiulistán) ‘rosaio’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109).
 • < Pers. *gulistān* ‘rose-garden, flower-garden’. – N. (–); P. 107 (XIII).
178. **günah** (*küneh* ca. 1450); **güna** (1611) – 1533 *günah* (ghiunách) ‘pecchato’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109); 1587/88 *günah** (*tgunahtur [+ copula]) ‘es ist Sunde’ (LubAd. 16); 1611 *güna* (gunā) ‘delito’ (RJTMajd. 193); 1611 *güna* (ghiuná) ‘peccato’ (FerrR. 89); ca. 1630 *günah* (giunah) ‘vitiü, peccatü’ (MontR. 97); 1677 *günah* (ghiunah) ‘iniquità, peccato’ (MascVoc. 71, 121).
 Der. – 1677 *günahsuz* (ghiunahsus) ‘innocente’ (MascVoc. 71).
 Phr. – 1533 *günah et-* (ghiunách edérum) ‘peccho’, (ghiunách etterúrum) ‘fo pecchare’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109); 1611 *güna et-* (ghiuná edérum) ‘peccare’; ca. 1630 *günah et-* (giunah etmek) ‘peccare’ (MontR. 97) – 1611 *günalar (i)krar et-* (ghiunalár crár edérum) ‘confessar li peccati’ (FerrR. 100).
 • < Pers. *gunāh* ‘sin, crime, error, vice, fault’. – N. 218 (XIV); P. 109 (XIII).

179. **günahkâr** (1641); **güna(h)ker** (1533), **güne(h)kâr** (1603) – **1533** *güna(h)ker* (ghiunacchiér) ‘peccatore’ (ArgAd. 191, ArgR. 109); **1603/1612** *güne(h)kâr* (giunekkiar, giunekhiar) ‘peccator’ (MegThP. 2: 222; MegILT.); **1611** *güna(h)ker* (ghiunacchiér) ‘peccatore’ (FerrR. 89); **1630 ca** *günahkâr* (gunahchiar) ‘peccator’ (MontR. 97); **1677** *günahkâr* (ghiunah-chiar) ‘iniquo, maligno; pec[c]atore’ (MascVoc. 71, 121).
• < Pers. *gunâhgâr* ‘sinner’. – N. (-); P. 109 (1430).
180. **hafta** (*havta* 1544/48) – **1533** *hafta* (chaaftá) ‘settimana’ (ArgAd. 193, ArgR. 112); **1574** *afta* (afftha) ‘settimana’ (VNAd. 61); **1575** *havta* (hauta) ‘sepmaine; septimana’ (PostellInstr.); **1584** *afta* (afta) ‘sepmaine’ (PalBern. 324); **ca. 1630** *hafta* (haftta, hafta) ‘hebdomada’ (MontR. 99); **1672** *hafta* (haftaiadak [+ dat. terminative]) ‘per aliquot hebdomadas’ (HarsHaz. 184–185); **1677** *afta* (afta) ‘settimana’ (MascVoc. 202).
Phr. – **1672** *haftadan haftaya* (haftadan haftaia) ‘hebdomatim’ (HarsHaz. 128–139) – → 194. *her*.
• < Pers. *hafta* ‘week’. – N. 222 (XIII); P. 111 (1430).
183. **ham** (1680); **kam** (1650) – **1533** *ham* (cham) ‘acerbo’ (ArgAd. 194); **1611** *ham* (ham) ‘agrio’ (RJTMajd. 194); **1611** *ham* (hám) ‘acerbo, nõ maturo’ (FerrR. 92); **1641** *ham* (cham) ‘acerbo, non maturo’ (MolDitt. 13); **1650** *ham/kam* (chham, qam) ‘aspro, brusco, garbo; crudo, immaturo’ (CarrR. 170).
Der. – **1641** *hamlik* (chamlik) ‘agrezza, asprezza di frutti non maturi’ (MolDitt. 27); **1650** *hamlik/kamlik* (chhamlich, qamlich) ‘asprezza di vino etc.; crudezza’ (CarrR. 170); **1677** *hamlik* (hamlich) ‘agrezza’ (MascVoc. 9).
Phr. – → 215. *ibrişim*, 875. *kükürt*.
• < Pers. *xâm* ‘raw, undressed, crude; unripe, immature’. – N. 225 (XIII); P. 112–113 (XIII).
184. **han** (1658); **kan** (1455/57), **kân** (1641) – **1455/57** “une maison qu’ils appellent *Kan*” (B. de la Broquière: ArvAdd. 304); **ca. 1579** “une grand maison, nommée *Chan*” (C. de Pinon: ArvAdd. 304); **1595** “ce *Cam* est un maison destinee pour loger à couuert tous les passans” (Villamont: ArvAdd. 304); **1641** *kân* [perhaps a result of the influence of *mekân* ‘place, abode’] (kian) ‘habitalo, stanza, habitatione’ (MolDitt. 173, 174); **1643** “w *chanach* [Pol. loc.] perskich” (St. Oświęcim: StachSH-ET. 104); **1668** “*Chans* [Engl. pl.] or Inns, which are receptacles for travellers at night” (RycautPSt. 166); **1677** *han* (han) ‘albergo; casa; ricetta’ (MascVoc. 10, 154).
Der. – **1650** *hanacı/hancı* (hhanagi = hngý) ‘alloggiatore’ (CarrR. 170); **1677** “chaque *Han* a son directeur ou *Hangy*” (de La Magdaleine: ArvAdd. 306).
Phr. – **1622** *Nemşi Han* (Nemschi Han) ‘das Teutsche Hauß’ (WennStach. 604).
• < Pers. *xân* ‘house’. – N. 226 (XIV); P. 114 (XV).
185. **hane** (1641) – **1533** *hana* (chaná) ‘chasa; ogni stanza et loco’ (ArgAd. 194–195, ArgR. 114).
Phr. – → 3. *abhana*, 52. *cebhane*, 122. *divanhana*, 221. *kâgıdhane*, 257. *keşiş*, 279. *leke*, 585. *tâbihhâne*, 607. *terzi*, 615. *timarhana*, 769. *davulhane*, 777. *devlethane*, 788.

edebhane, 855. *kasabhane*, 866. *kitabhane*, 891. *mektebhane*, 903. *müsafirhane*, 927. *puthane*, 936. *salhana*.

• < Pers. *xāna* ‘house, dwelling, habitation’. – N. 226 (XIII); P. 114 (1445).

187. **harman** (1641); **arman** (1611) – **1533** *harman* (*charmanaiá) ‘[aia]; bicha di grano’ (ArgAd. 195, ArgR. 115–116). According to Adamović Argenti’s strange form comes from the wrong uniting of *charman* + It. *aia* ‘threshing floor’, a meaning of the Turkish word; **1603/1612** *hirmen* (hirmen) ‘ventilabrum’ (MegThP. 2: 684; MegILT.); **1611** *arman* (armán) ‘aia doue si batte il grano; campo doue [...] seminati; seminato, lauori di biade’ (FerrR. 93); **ca. 1630** *hirmen* (hirmen) ‘ventilabrum’ (MontR. 105); **1677** *arman* ‘aia’ (MascVoc. 10).

Der. – **1677** *harmancı* (harmangi) ‘chi batte il grano all’aia’ (MascVoc. 10).

• < Pers. *xarman/xirman* ‘harvest; reaped corn, but unthreshed, and piled up in a large circular stack’. – N. 229 (XV); P. 124 (XIII/XIV).

188. **hasta** (1544/48); **asta** (1611), **kasta** (1650) – **1533** *hasta* (chastá) ‘ammalato, jnfermo, malato’ (ArgAd. 196, ArgR. 116); **1575** *hasta** (*hatsta) ‘malade; aeger’ (Postel-Inst.); **1611** *asta* (astá) ‘ammalato’ (FerrR. 93); **ca. 1630** *hasta* (hasta) ‘aegrotus’ (MontR. 102); **1650** *hasta* (chhasta, chastah) ‘cagionoso, indisposto, malato’ (CarrR. 172); **1672** *hasta* (hařta) ‘aegrum’ (HarsHaz. 150–151); **1677** *hasta/asta* (hasta) ‘indisposto’, (asta) ‘infermo’ (MascVoc. 67, 68).

Der. – **1533** *hastalık/hastaluk* (chastalích, chastalúch) ‘jnfermità, malattia’ (ArgAd. 196, ArgR. 116); **1611** *astalık* (astalíc) ‘ammalattia, infermità’ (FerrR. 93), **1650** *hastalık* (chastalich) ‘malattia’ (CarrR. 172); **1672** *hastalık* (hařtalikta [+ loc.]) ‘morbo’ (HarsHaz. 180–81); **1677** *astalık* (astalich) ‘infermità, malattia’ (MascVoc. 68, 87).

Phr. – **1677** *astaler odası* (astaler odasi) ‘infermeria’ (MascVoc. 68).

– **1533** *hasta et-* (chastá edérum) [without translation], (chastá etterúrum) ‘fo ammalare’ ArgAd. 196, ArgR. 116). – **1533** *hasta ol-* (chastá olúrum) ‘ammalo’ (ArgAd. 196, ArgR. 116), **1587/88** *hasta ol-* (hasta olmek) ‘krancksein’ (LubAd. 45); **1611** *hasta ol-* (hastà olmak) ‘caer infermo’ (RJTMajd. 195); **1611** *asta ol-* (astá holúrum) ‘ammalarsi’ (FerrR. 93); **ca. 1630** *hasta ol-* (hasta olmak) ‘esse aegrotum’ (MontR. 102); **1650** *hasta/kasta ol-* (chasta/qasta olurum) ‘ammalarsi, infermarsì’, (chastah, qastah olmisc) ‘ammalato’ (CarrR. 172); **1672** *hasta ol-* (hařta oldugi) ‘morbo detinetur’ (HarsHaz. 148–149); **1677** *asta ol-* (asta olmach) ‘ammalare, rinfermarsì, ricascare ammalato’, (asta olunmisc) ‘ammalato’ (MascVoc. 12, 158).

– **1650** *buğaz hastalığı** (bughas chasta *ileh) ‘scaranzia’ (CarrR. 172) – **1650** *terleme hastalığı* (terleme chastalechi) ‘letargo’ (CarrR. 172).

• < Pers. *xasta* ‘wounded; sick, infirm’. – N. 230 (XIII); P. 116 (1368).

189. **havan** (1680); **avan** (1611), **evan** (1677) – **1533** *havan* (chauán) ‘mortaro’ ArgAd. 196, ArgR. 117); **1587/88** *havan* (hawan) ‘Mörser’ (LubAd. 45); **1611** *avan* (aguán) ‘murtaro, mortaro’ (FerrR. 93); **1650** *havan* (hauan) ‘mortaro’ (CarrR. 173); **1677** *evan* (euan) ‘mortaio, mortaro’ (MascVoc. 100).

Phr. – **1650** *havan demeri* (hauan demeri) ‘pestello’ (CarrR. 173) – **1611** *avan ellik* (aguán ellíc) ‘pistone del mortaro’ (FerrR. 93)

- < Pers. *hāwan* ‘mortar’. – N. 232 (XIV); P. 117 (1/XV).

190. **hem** (1455/56) – **1567** *hem* (chem) ‘sia’ (LettBomb. 139–143); **1574** *em* (em) ‘et’ (VNAd. 62).

Phr. – **1533** *em artík* (em arttích) ‘più tosto’ (ArgR. 93). – **1533** *em yeg* (em jegh) ‘più tosto’ (ArgAd. 291, ArgR. 93).

- < Pers. *ham* ‘also, likewise’. – N. 236 (XI); P. 118 (XIII).

191. **hemän** ((*h*)*aman* 1455/56); **emen** (1533) – **1533** *emen* (ehemén) ‘solamente’ (ArgAd. 197, Arg.R. 93); **1587/88** *hemen* (hemen) ‘nur’ (LubAd. 45); **1650** *hemen/emen* (hemen, emen) ‘a spada tratta, in un tratto, ad un tratto, immantimente, subito’ (CarrR. 175); **1677** *aman/haman* (aman) ‘immantimente’, (haman) ‘quanto prima’ (MascVoc. 63, 144).

- < Pers. *hamān* ‘only, solely’. – N. 236 (XIV); P. 119 (XIII/XIV).

193. **hemşire** (1668); **hemşira** (1641), **emşira** (1677) – **1641** *hemşira* (hemsc=ira) ‘sorella’ (MolDitt. 413); **1677** *emşira* (emscirà) ‘sorella’ (MascVoc. 214).

- < Pers. *ham-šira* ‘foster-brother; sister (by the mother only, or a foster-sister)’. – N. 237 (XVII); P. 120 (1451).

194. **her** (1450 ca.) – **1611** *her* (her, hēr) ‘cada’ (RJT Majd. 196); [add.] **1611** *er* (ér) ‘ogni’ (FerrR. 94); **1650** *her* (her) ‘ogni, ciascheduno’ (CarrR. 175); **1672** *her* (her) ‘omnes’ (HarsHaz. 34–35).

Phr. – **1611** *er ay* (ér ái) ‘ogni mese’ (FerrR. 57); **1641** *her ay* (her ai) ‘ogni mese’ (MolDitt. 280) – **1677** *er azden* (er asden) ‘a ogni poco’ (MascVoc. 15) – **1533** *er birisi* (er birisi) ‘ciascuno, ognuno’ (ArgAd. 198, Arg.R. 95); **1611** *her bir/birisi* (hēr bihr, her biresi) ‘acada uno, cada uno’ (RJT Majd. 196); **1611** *er bir(i)si* (ér birsi) ‘ogniuno, vno per uno, ciascheduno’ (FerrR. 94); **1672** *her birisi* (her biriði) ‘quilibet’ (HarsHaz. 72–73); **1677** *er birisi* (er birissi) ‘ogni ciascuno’ (MascVoc. 111) – **1641** *her cinsden* (her ginsden) ‘sorte per sorte’ – **1650** *her darac* (her darag) ‘a ogni momento’ (CarrR. 115) – **1650** *her dirahem* (her dirahem) ‘a oncia’ (CarrR. 124) – **1533** *er gün* (er ghiún) ‘ogni giorno’ (ArgAd. 198, 258); **1587/88** *her gün* (her ghiun) ‘teglich’ (LubAd. 45); **1611** *er yün* (ér iún) ‘ogni giorno’ (FerrR. 89); **ca. 1630** *er gün* (ergiu) ‘quotidie’ (MontR. 87); **1641** *her gün* (her ghiun) ‘ciascun dì, ogni dì’ (MolDitt. 89, 279); **1650** *er gün* (her ghiun) ‘giornale’ (CarrR. 166); **1672** *her gün* ‘quotidie’ (HarsHaz. 48–49); **1677** *er gün* (er ghiun) ‘ciascun dì’ (MascVoc. 29) – **1611** *er avta* (ér autá) ‘ogni settimana’ (FerrR. 91); **1672** *her hafta* (her hafta) ‘singulis hebdomatibus’ (HarsHaz. 128–130); **1677** *er afta* (er afta) ‘ogni settimana’ (MascVoc. 110) – **1641** *her keres* (her keres) ‘ogni volta’ (MolDitt. 280); **1651** *her keret* (her chieret) ‘a ogni guisa o modo’ (CarrR. 211) – **1677** *her kez* (her chies) ‘ogni volta’ (MascVoc. 110) – **1533** *er kim* (er chím) ‘ciascuno; qualunque’ (ArgAd. 198, ArgR. 95); **1587/88** *erkim* (erchim) ‘welcher’ (LubAd. 45); **1672** *her kim* (her kim)

'quicunque' (HarsHaz. 62–63) – **1641** *her kimesne* (her kimesne) 'chiunque, qualunque, ciascuno' (MolDitt. 89); **1677** *her/er kimse/kimesne* (her chimse) 'chiunque', (her/er chimesne) 'ciascuno, qualunque' (MascVoc. 28, 144) – **1672** *her kişi* (her kisinün [+ gen.]) 'quisque' (HarsHaz. 50–51) – **1533** *er neste* (ernesté) 'ogni cosa' (ArgAd. 198); **1603/1612** *her neste kadir* (herneste kadir) 'omnipotens' (MegThP. 2: 166; MegILT.); **ca. 1630** *er neste kadir* (er neste kadir) 'omnipotens' (MontR. 120) – **1641** *her sahat* (her sahat) 'ogn'ora'; *her sahate* (her sahathe) 'a ogn'ora' (MolDitt. 280, 52); **1677** *er sahatte* (er sahatte) 'ad ora' (MascVoc. 7) – **1672** *her şey* (her sej) 'omnia' (HarsHaz. 34–35) – **1533** *er tarafta* (er taraftá) 'da ogni banda' (ArgAd. 198, ArgR. 235) – **1587/88** *her türlü* (herturlu) 'mancherle' (LubAd. 45) – **1533** *er vakt* (eruácht) 'ogni hora, sempre' (ArgAd. 198, ArgR. 95); **1650** *her vakt* (her uaqt) 'a ogni momento' (CarrR. 338); **1672** *her vakte* (her vakte) 'semper' (HarsHaz. 78–79) – **1641** *her veçile* (her vecilhe) 'in tutto, per tutto, ad ogni modo, ad ogni guisa' (MolDitt. 220, 19, 52); **1677** *her veçile* (her veccile) 'ad ogni modo' (MascVoc. 7) – **1611** *er yandan* (ér iandán) 'd'ogni parte' (FerrR. 158) – **1533** *er yerde* (er hierdè) 'jn ogni loco'; *er yerden* (er hierdén) 'di ogni loco' (ArgAd. 198, ArgR. 266); **1641** *her yerde* (her ierde) 'in ogni luoco, per tutto'; *her yerden* (her ierden) 'di qualunque loco' (MolDitt. 215, 302, 120); **1672** *her yerde* (herjerde) 'ubique'; *her yerden* (her ierden) 'undequaque' (HarsHaz. 46–47, 62–63); **1677** *her yerden* (her ierden) 'di qualunque luogo' (MascVoc. 41) – **1611** *er yıl* (ér ghil) 'ogni anno' (FerrR. 161); **1641** *her il* (her il) 'ciascun'anno, ogn'anno' (MolDitt. 89, 280); **1672** *her ül* (her ül) 'quotannis' (HarsHaz. 38–39); **1677** *er il* (er il) 'ciascun anno' (MascVoc. 29) – **1611** *er zaman* (ér szamán) 'eternamente, perpetuamente, sempre' (FerrR. 163); **ca. 1630** *er zaman* (er zaman) 'semp(er), totum tempus' (MontR. 87); **1672** *her zeman* (her zeman) 'semper' (HarsHaz. 66–67) – → 831 *her daim*, 832. *her dem*.

• < Pers. *har* 'every, all; each; any'. – N. 237 (XII); P. 121 (XIII).

197. **hiç** (*iç* 1533); **heç** (1641) – [add.] **1533** *iç* (jccı) 'mai; nulla, punto, niente' (ArgAd. 198–199, ArgR. 126); **1611** *hiç* (hitsch) 'nada' (RJTMajd. 196); **1611** *iç* (icc) 'niente' (FerrR. 95); **ca. 1630** *iç* (ich) 'nihil penitus' (MontR. 110); **1641** *heç* (hecz) 'mai; niente' (MolDitt. 240, 270); **1650** *hic* (hic) 'mai' (CarrR. 177); **1677** *iç* (ic) 'niente' (MascVoc. 105).

Der. – **1611** *hiçle-* (hitschlemek) 'aniquilar' (RJTMajd. 196).

Phr. – **1641** *heç bir neste* (hecz bir neste) 'nulla, niente' (MolDitt. 274); **1677** *iç bir neste* (ic bir neste) 'nulla, niente' (MascVoc. 107) – **1650** *hiçbir yerde* (hic bir ierdeh) 'in nessun luogo' (CarrR. 177) – **1650** *hiçbir zamanda* (hic bir zamanda) 'in nessun tempo' (CarrR. 177) – **1533** *iç kimpse* (jccı chimpse) 'nessuno' (ArgAd. 217, ArgR. 126); **1641** *heç kimse/kimesne* (hecz kimse/kimesne) 'nessuno, veruno' (MolDitt. 270, 478); **1650** *hiç himse* (hic himse) 'nessuno' (CarrR. 177); **1677** *iç kimse/kimesne* (ic chimsè/chimesne) 'nessuno, niuno, nissuno' (MascVoc. 104, 105).

– **1641** *heç et-* (hecz ederum) 'annullare, solveere, disfare' (MolDitt. 52, 410) – **1641** *heç ol-* (hecz olmak) 'suanire, riuscire in niente' (MolDitt. 438) – **1611** *hiç ül-* (hicc vlmés) 'immortale' (FerrR. 128).

• < Pers. *hiç* 'nothing; never; not any, none'. – N. 241 (XI); P. 124 (XIII).

198. **hoca** (1548/53); **oca** (1608) – **1533 hoca** (chooggiá, choggiá) ‘maestro di scuola; mercante’ (ArgAd. 199, ArgR. 120); **1545** “i preti che non son dottori domandansi *chozà*” (BassR. 69); **1560** “vieux *Hogea* ou docteurs”; “ils ont des vieux Philosophes qu’ils appellent *hogea* en Turc” (PostelRepT. 21, 120); **1608** “*Odscha* das seyn Schulmeister, oder die das Ampt vnd Gebet in der Kirchen verrichten” (SchwSt. 242); **1611 hoca** (chhógia) ‘maestro di scola’ (FerrR. 95); **1633 hoca*** (chodzie [Pol. pl.]) [‘niższy duchowny muzułmański’] (S. Twardowski: StachSHET. 228); **1646** “preceptor cesarski, rzeczony *Odzia*” (Sz. Starowski: StachSHET. 228); **1672 hoca** (hogsa) ‘magistrum’ (HarsHaz. 94–95); **1677 oca** (ogia) ‘maestro di scuola, pedante, pedagogo’ (MascVoc. 86, 121).

• < Pers. *xwāğā* ‘man of distinction; rich marchand; doctor, professor, teacher, preceptor; school-master’. – N. 244 (XII); P. 126 (XIII).

199. **horos** (1603); **horoz** (?) (1533), **koros** (1677) – **1533 horos** // **horoz** (chorós) ‘gallo’ (ArgAd. 200, ArgR. 121); **1611 horos** (chorōs) ‘gallo’ (RJT Majd. 198); **1650 horos** (choros) ‘gallo’ (CarrR. 178); **1677 koros** (coros) ‘gallo’ (MascVoc.55).

Der. – **1650 horoscik** (horosgich) ‘galletto’ (CarrR. 178).

Phr. – **1677 horos saçağt** (horos saciaghi) ‘cresta’ (MascVoc. 35).

• < Pers. *xurūs* ‘dung-hill cock’. – N. 246 (XIII); P. 127 (XIII/XIV).

200. **hoş** (1615 *hoş gel-*; 1672); **oş** (1611) – **1533 hoş** (choosc, chosc) ‘contento; sano; horsu, orsu; uolentieri’ (ArgAd. 200, ArgR. 122); **1611 hoş** (hoschther [+ copula]) ‘bueno’ (RJT Majd. 196).

Der. – **1611 hoşlık*** (see below).

Phr. – **ca. 1630 eyi, oş** (ei, os) ‘sanus, letus’; *eyi misen, oş misen* (eimisen, osmisen) ‘bene ne uales? hilariterne uales’ (MontR. 88).

– **1641 hatrı hoş** (chatri hosc) ‘contentato’; *hatrı hoş dut-* (chatri chosc dutmak) ‘ristoro, conforto’; *hatrı hoş et-* (chatri chosc etmek) ‘contentare, piacere’; *hatrı hoş et-* (chat(h)rini chosc etmek) ‘satisfare, sodisfare, contentare’; *hatrı hoşlığı* (chat(i)r choss=lighi) ‘satisfazione, sodisfazione’ (MolDitt. 105 passim) – **1650 hatrı hoş edici** (chatri hosc edigi) ‘compiacente’; *hatrı hoş ol-* (chatri hosc olurum) ‘contentarsi’, (chatri hosc olmisc) ‘contentato’ (CarrR. 172).

– **1611 oş et-** (ósc edérum) ‘confortare’; *va(k)tı oş et-* (vaté ósc edérum) ‘arrichire’ (FerrR. 95, 155) – **1533 hoş gel-** (chosc ghiełúr) ‘ho caro’, (chosc ghielderúrum) ‘fo hauere caro’ (ArgAd. 200, ArgR. 122); **1611 hoş gel-** (hosch geldin) ‘soys bien uenudo’ (RJT Majd. 196) – **1533 hoş gör-** (chósc ghiorúrum) ‘degnó’, (chosc ghiordurúrum) ‘fo degnare’ (ArgAd. 200, ArgR. 122) – **1611 va(k)tı oş ol-** (vaté ósc holúrum) ‘arricchirsi’ (FerrR. 155).

– **1611 hoşlığım yok** (hoschligim iok) ‘soy enfermo’ (RJT Majd. 196).

• < Pers. *xwus* ‘good, sweet, pleasant; happy, well, pleased; willingly’. – N. 204 (XI); P. 127–128 (XIII).

201. **hoşaf** (1553) – **1615** “to picie *hosaph* zowa” (M. Paszkowski: StachSHET. 229); **ca. 1630 hoşaf** (hosaf) ‘potus ex uuis passis’ (MontR. 106).

• < Pers. *xwuš-āb* ‘freshy, juicy, full of water; water in which grapes, figs, prunes, or dried apricots are boiled together’. – N. 247 (XV); P. 128 (1482).

202. **hoşamed** (1641); **hoşamet** (1650), **koşamet** (1650).

Der. – **1641** *hoşamedci* (chosc=amedgi) ‘adulatore’ (MolDitt. 21); **1677** *hoşametci* (hosc=ametgi) ‘adulatore’ (MascVoc. 7) – **1641** *hoşamedciük* (chosc=amedgiük) ‘adulationcina’ (MolDitt. 21) – **1677** *hoşametlik* (hosc=ametlich) ‘adulazione’ (MascVoc. 7).

Phr. – **1677** *hoşamet et-* (hosc=amet etmech) ‘adulare’ (MascVoc. 7) – **1650** *hoşamet/koşamet edici* (qosciamet [cosciamet = ḥšāmt] edigi) ‘adulatore, lusin-gheuole’ (CarrR. 178); **1672** *hoşamet edici* (hosametidigsi) ‘adulator’ (HarsHaz. 80–81).

• < Pers. *xwuš-āmad* ‘flattery; welcome; gratification’. – N. (-), P. (-).

203. **hoşçe** (1672); **hoşça** (1641), **oşça** (1677) – **1533** *hoşçe* ((eiggié) choscié(misin)) ‘(stai tu) bene’ (ArgAd. 200).

Phr. – **1650** *hoşçe hava* (chhosceh hhaue) ‘aria temperata’ (CarrR. 173) – **1641** *hoşça sade* (chosc=cia sade) ‘melodia, canto suaue’ (MolDitt. 251); **1650** *hoşça sade* (choscia sade) ‘concerto di musica, melodia’ (CarrR. 178); **1677** *oşça sade* (oscia sade) ‘melodia, canto suaue’ (MascVoc. 93).

• Possibly < Pers. *xwušča* ‘prettily’, but the word may be also a Turkish derivative (TETTL 2: 328). – N. (-); P. 127 (1451, under the entry *hoş*).

205. **huda** (1641); **uda** (1677) – **ca. 1630** *huday* (hudai) ‘Deus’ (MontR. 106); **1672** *huda // huday* (khudaia, khudaje [+ dat.]) ‘Deo’ (HarsHaz. 42–43, 52–53); **1677** *uda* (vda) ‘Dio’ (MascVoc. 39).

• < Pers. *xudā* ‘God’. – N. (-); P. 130 (1430).

[Note: Stachowski’s entries 206. and 214. are here put together because they very likely share the same etymon, see TETTL 2: 332].

206. **hudavendigâr** (*hodavendikâr* 1591); **hondikâr** (1533) = 214. **hünkâr** (*ungâr* 1546); **honker // hönker** (1496/1501), **honkâr** (1533), **hünçar** (1611), **unkâr // ünkâr** (1611), **inkâr** (1611) – **1496/1501** *honker // hönker* (honker [with variae lectiones]) ‘ksiażę Tureckie’ (Constantine of Ostrovica: StachSHET. 231); **1533** *hondikâr/honkâr* (condicchiâr, chonchiâr) ‘re, signore’ (ArgAd. 199, ArgR. 120); **1545** “danno poi vn’altro nome [to the Sultan] che mai il danno ad altri, cioè *Cumchierà*, che significa Imperador Cesare”; “*ottéa ottéa, stè Chunchierà Gellur*, cioè fa-teui à dietro, ecco il Signor che viene” (BassR. 69, 76); **1557** “E per tutto il suo imperio in diverse lingue lo [= the Sultan] chiamano (...) nella turca *Cunchiar*, (...) che (...) in lingua nostra v[uol] dire imperator” (A. Erizzo: RelAlb.III 139); **1603/1612** *hunkâr // hünkâr* (hunkiar) ‘imperator’ (MegThP. 1: 676; MegILT.), *ungâr // üngâr* (vngiar) ‘maiestas’ (MegThP. 2: 10; MegILT.); **1611** *hunkar // hünkar, hunçar // hünçar* (hungkar, huntschari [+ acc.]) ‘re, rey’ (RJTMajd. 197); **1611** *hunkar // hünkâr, unkâr // ünkâr* (hvnchiâr, vnchiâr) ‘imperadore, re’ (FerrR. 96);

ca. 1630 *unkâr // ünkâr* (vnchiar) 'imperator, maestus, Turcici imp(erato)ris maestas' (MontR. 194); **1677** *hunkâr // hünkâr* (hunchiar) 'impadore' (MascVoc. 63).

Der. – **1650** *hunçarlık // hünçarlık* (hunciarlich) 'principato' (CarrR. 179).

Phr. – **1611** *inkâr çauşı* (inchiâr ciausci) 'ambasciador del Re' (FerrR. 70).

• < Pers. *xudāvand-gār* 'Creator of the world; king, great man', *xwand-kār*, *xwand-gār* 'the Turkish emperor; a king, lord', *xwan-kār* 'a title of the Grand Turk', *xunkār* 'an emperor'. – N. 250 (*hünkâr* XV); P. 130 (*hudāvendgâr* XIII/XIV).

209. **hurma** (1641 [but Molino writes *ghurma = ġurma* (L. R.)]); **kumra*** (?) (1584); **hurma** (1611), **kurma** (1611) – **1533** *hurma* (churmá) 'dattero' (ArgAd. 201, ArgR. 122); **1584** *kumra** (?) (*couonra [recte coumra?]) 'dattes' (PalBern. 323); **1611** *hurma/hurma* (churmhá, chrumhá) 'datili, datilos' (RJTMajd. 198); **1611** *kurma* (curmá) 'dattilo, frutto' (FerrR. 96); **ca. 1630** *hurma* (hurma) 'dactili' (MontR. 106); **1677** *kurma* (curma) 'dattero' (MascVoc. 36).

Phr. – **1650** *kuru hurma* (churu chhurma) 'dattilo secco' (CarrR. 179) – **1650** *taze hurma* (taze chhurma) 'dattilo verde' (CarrR. 179).

– **1611** *kurma ağaç* (curmá agácc) 'dattilo, palma' (FerrR. 96); **1641** *kurma ağacı* (kurma agagi) 'palma, albero noto' (MolDitt. 290).

• < Pers. *xurmā* 'date'. – N. 248 (XIII); P. 132 (1332).

210. **hüma** (1680).

Phr. – **1650** *hüma kuşı* (hhumah qusci) 'armellino' (?) (CarrR. 179).

• < Pers. *humā* 'bird of Eastern fables; bird of paradise, phoenix, large royal eagle, or pelican'. – N. (-); P. 133 (XIII/XIV).

211. **hüner** (1641) – **1533** *hüner* (chunnér) 'saccente' (ArgAd. 201, ArgR. 123); **1677** *hüner* (huner) 'prodezza; strattagemma, astuzia militare; temperanza, virtù' (MascVoc. 138, 233, 242).

Der. – **1533** *hünerlük* (chunnerlúch) 'saccenteria' (ArgAd. 201, ArgR. 123).

• < Pers. *hunar* 'skill, science, knowledge, art, industry'. – N. 250 (XI); P. 134 (1368).

214. → 206.

Abbreviations

abl. = ablative	der. = derivative(s)
acc. = accusative	dial. = dialect(al)
add. = see Introduction, 3)	Fr. = French
Ar. = Arabic	Engl. = English
Arm. = Armenian	G. = German
cf. = compare	gen. = genitive
com. = comitative	Gr. = Greek
dat. = dative	It. = Italian

Lat. = Latin	Pol. = Polish
loc. = locative	poss. = possessive
Mong. = Mongolian	prob. = probably
Osm. = Osmanlı	Sp. = Spanish
Pers. = Persian	stand. = standard
phr. = phrase(s)	suff. = suffix
pl. = plural	T. = Turkish

References

- ArgAd. = Adamović M.(ed.). 2001. *Das Türkische des 16. Jahrhunderts. Nach den Aufzeichnungen des Florentiners Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Göttingen.
- ArgR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2007. *Ricerche sulla lingua osmanlı del XVI secolo. Il corpus lessicale turco del manoscritto fiorentino di Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Wiesbaden.
- ArvAdd. = Arveiller R. 1999. *Addenda au FEW XIX (Orientalia)*. Tübingen.
- BassR. = Rocchi L. 2006. Esotismi nell'italiano cinquecentesco. Il corpus alloglotto dell'opera di Luigi Bassano da Zara. – *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia* 8: 57–84.
- BodrogPVCC = Bodrogligeti A. 1971. *The Persian vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*. Budapest.
- BVenON. = Venetiano B. 1580. *Opera Nova de Vocaboli Turcheschi, & Gregheschi (...)*. Venezia.
- CardonaVOr. = Cardona G.R. 1969. Voci orientali in avvisi a stampa romani del '500. – *Lingua Nostra* 30: 5–9.
- CarrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2011. *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)*. Trieste.
- ClausonED = Clauson G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford.
- COED = *The compact Oxford English dictionary*. 1991². Oxford.
- DankoffArm. = Dankoff R. 1995. *Armenian loanwords in Turkish*. Wiesbaden.
- DankoffEÇGl. = Dankoff R. 1991. *An Evliya Çelebi glossary. Unusual, dialectal and foreign words in the Seyahat-name*. Boston.
- DeiCr. = Dei B. 1984. “Cronica”, a cura di R. Barducci. Firenze.
- DELI = Cortelazzo M., Zolli P. 1979 – 1988. *Dizionario Etimologico della Lingua Italiana*. [vol. 1–5]. Bologna.
- DernBab. = Babinger Fr. (ed.). 1923. *Hans Dernschwams Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55)*. München, Leipzig.
- DValCard. = Cardini C. (ed.). 2001. *La Porta d'Oriente. Lettere di Pietro Della Valle: Istanbul 1614*. Roma.
- ErenTDES = Eren H. 1999. *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- ÈSTJa = Sevortjan È.V. et al. 1974–2003. *Ètimologičeskij Slovar' Tjurkskih Jazykov*. [vol. 1–7]. Moskva.
- FerrR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). 2012. *Il “Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca” di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)*. Trieste.
- GeorgHeff. = Heffening W. (ed.). 1942. *Die türkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544–1548*. Leipzig.

- GIITR. = Rocchi L. (ed.). [forthcoming]. Il glossario italo-turco contenuto in un codice fiorentino del XVI secolo. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*.
- GUngSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1995/6, 1997. Das Türkische Sprachgut im “Tractatus de Moribus, Conditionibus et Nequicia Turcorum” (1481) des Georg von Ungarn. – [1] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14: 39–78; [2 (Lautgeschichtliches)] *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15: 89–118.
- GülensoyKBS = Gülensoy T. 2011. *Türkiye Türkçesindeki Türkçe Sözcüklerin Köken Bilgisi Sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–2]. Ankara.
- HaimFarh. = Haim S. 1953. *Farhang Moaser Persian-English dictionary*. Tehran.
- HarffSt. = Stumme H. 1914. Das Arabische und das Türkische bei Ritter Arnold von Harff. – (n. ed.). *Festschrift für Ernst Windisch*. Leipzig: 127–137.
- HarsColl. = Nagy de Harsány J. 1672. *Colloquia Familiaria Turcico Latina* (...). Coloniae Brandeburgicae.
- HarsHaz. = Hazai Gy. (ed.). 1973. *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány*. Budapest.
- IllNém. = Németh J. (ed.). 1970. *Die türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. [Edition of the Illésházy-Codex (1668)]. Amsterdam, Budapest.
- ITSprAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1975. Ein italienisch-türkisches Sprachbuch aus den Jahren 1525–1530. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 67: 217–247. [A copy of → LupisON with a few variations].
- JunkerAlaviW. = Junker H.F.J., Alavi B. 1965. *Wörterbuch Persisch-Deutsch*. Leipzig.
- LettBomb. = Bombaci A. (ed.). 1939/1949. Una lettera turca in caratteri latini del dragomanno ottomano Ibrāhīm al veneziano Michele Membre (1567). – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 15: 129–144.
- LubAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1977. *Das osmanisch-türkische Sprachgut bei R. Lubenau*. München.
- LupisON. = Lupis P. ca. 1520. *Opera Nova de M. Pietro Lupis Valentiano. La qual insegna a parlare Turchesco*. Ancona.
- MachDisc. = Machiavelli N. 1984. *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio. Premessa al testo e note di Giorgio Inglese*. Milano.
- MancT. = Mancini M. 1990. Turchismi a Roma e a Venezia. – Poli D. (ed.). *Episteme. In ricordo di Giorgio Raimondo Cardona*. Roma: 75–112.
- MascVoc. = Mascis A. 1677. *Vocabolario Toscano e Turchesco*. Firenze.
- MegILLT. = Megiser H. 1612. *Institutionum Linguae Turcicae Libri Quatuor*. Lipsiae.
- MegThP. = Megiser H. 1603. *Thesaurus Polyglottus vel Dictionarium Multilinguae* (...). Francofurti ad Moenum.
- MenTratt. = Menavino G.A. 1548. *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*. Firenze.
- MinHist. = Minadoi G. 1587. *Historia della guerra fra Turchi et Persiani*. Roma.
- MolDitt. = Molino G. 1641. *Dittionario della lingua Italiana, Turchesca*. Roma.
- N. = Nişanyan S. 2009. *Sözcülerin Soyağacı. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimoljik Sözlüğü*. [4th edition]. İstanbul.
- NicQLivr. = de Nicolay N. 1568. *Les quatre premiers livres des navigations et pérégrinations orientales*. Lyon.
- P. = Pomorska M. 2013. *Materials for a historical dictionary of New Pérsian loanwords in Old Anatolian and Ottoman Turkish from the 13th to the 16th century*. Kraków.

- PalBern. = Palerne J. 1991. *D'Alexandrie à Istanbul. Pérégrinations dans l'Empire Ottoman 1581–1583*. [Introduction et annotations d'Yvelise Bernard]. Paris. [Palerne's manuscript dates back to 1584].
- PalPD. = Palerne J. 1606. *Peregrinations (...). Plus est adiousté un petit dictionnaire en langage françois, italien, grec vulgaire, turc, moresque, ou arabesque, & esclauon (...)*. Lyon. [See PalBern].
- PaszKStach. = Stachowski M. 2013. Marcin Paszkowski's Polish and Turkish dictionary (1615). – *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8: 45–55.
- PostelInstr. = Postel G. 1575. *Instruction des motz de la langue turquesque les plus communs*, put as an introduction (without page numbering) to the book by the same author *Des Histoires orientales et principalement des Turkes ou Turchiques (...)*. Paris.
- PostelRepT. = Postel G. 1560. *De la Republique des Turcs (...)*. Poitiers.
- PostelTPart. = Postel G. 1560. *La tierce partie des Orientales Histoires (...)*. Poitiers.
- RambLibT. = Ramberti B. 1539. *Libri tre delle cose de Turchi*. Venezia.
- RamNav. = Ramusio G.B. 1550. *Delle Navigationi et Viaggi*. Venezia.
- RäsänenVW. = Räsänen M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk-sprachen*. Helsinki.
- RelAlb.I = Alberi E. (ed.). 1840. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol 1]. Firenze.
- RelAlb.III = Alberi E. (ed.). 1855. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. [Serie 3, vol. 3]. Firenze.
- RelPedF. = Pedani-Fabris M.P. (ed.). 1996. *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al Senato. Volume XIV. Costantinopoli – Relazioni inedite*. Padova.
- RJTMajd. = Majda T. (ed.). 1985. *Rozwój języka tureckiego w XVII wieku (rękopis z 1611 r., ze zbiorów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu, sygn. M. 1529)*. Warszawa.
- RycautPSt. = Rycaut P. 1668. *The present state of the Ottoman Empire (...)*. London.
- SchwSt. = Stein H. (ed.). 1987. Das türkische Sprachmaterial in Salomon Schweiggers Reisebuch (1608). – *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41.2: 217–266.
- SchweickOsm. = Schweickard W. 2011. Osmanismen in den europäischen Sprachen. Vorüberlegungen zu einem vergleichenden historischen Wörterbuch. – *Lexicographica* 27: 221–239.
- SchweickStrat. = Schweickard W. 2011. La stratificazione cronologica dei turchismi in italiano. – *La Lingua Italiana. Storia, Strutture, Testi* 7: 9–16.
- SchweickTurk. = Schweickard W. 2013. *Turkisms in Italian, French and German (Ottoman period, 1300–1900). A historical and etymological dictionary*. [http://www.uni-saarland.de/lehrstuhl/schweickard/turkisms.html].
- SchweickTW. = Schweickard W. 2014. Türkische Wortgeschichte im Spiegel europäischer Quellen. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 130.2: 815–832.
- SorOtt. = Soranzo L. 1598. *L'Ottomanno*. Ferrara.
- SpandSath. = Spandugnano Patritio Constantinopolitano Th. 1890. *De la origine de li imperatori ottomani, ordini della corte, forma del guerreggiare loro, religione, rito, et costumi della natione*. – Sathas C.N. (ed.). *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*. [vol. 9]. Paris: 133–261.
- StachSHET. = Stachowski S. 2014. *Słownik historyczno-etymologiczny turcyzmów w języku polskim*. Kraków.

- StachWMong. = Stachowski M. 2012. Written Mongolian *čamča* 'shirt' and its etymological counterparts in Europe. – Hyytiäinen T. et al. (eds.). *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue*. Helsinki: 445–451.
- StanWSPA = Stanisławski J. 1994. *Wielki słownik polsko-angielski / The great Polish-English dictionary*. Warszawa.
- Steingass = Steingass F. 1892. *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*. London.
- TETTL = Tietze A. 2002, 2009. *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı/Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Türkei-Türkischen*. [vol. 1: A–E]. İstanbul,Wien; [vol. 2: F–J]. Wien.
- TietzePAbl. = Tietze A. 1964. Persische Ableitungssuffixe im Azerosmanischen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 59–60: 154–200.
- TLIO = (n. ed.). 1997–. *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini*. [<http://www.tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/>].
- TMEN = Doerfer G. 1963–1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. [vol. 1–4]. Wiesbaden.
- TS = (n. ed.). 1963–1977. *XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklariyle tarama sözlüğü*. [vol. 1–8]. Ankara.
- UrbanTTet. = Urban M. 2015. *The treatment of Turkic etymologies in English lexicography. Lexemes pertaining to material culture*. Kraków.
- VNAd. = Adamović M. (ed.). 1976. *Vocabulario nuovo* mit seinem türkischen Teil. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38: 43–69.
- WennStach. = Stachowski M. (ed.). 2015. Osmanisch-Türkische Appellativa im Reisebuch von Adam Wenner (1622). – Ragagnin E., Wilkens J. (eds.). *Kutadgu Nom Bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: 593–607.

ALEXANDER ANDRASON
Stellenbosch University
aleksand@hi.is

GRAMMATICALIZATION PATHS AND CHAOS: DETERMINISM AND UNPREDICTABILITY OF THE SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT OF VERBAL CONSTRUCTIONS (PART 1 – CHAOS IN MATHEMATICS)

Keywords: Grammaticalization paths, verbal semantics, Chaos Theory, Cognitive Linguistics, semantic maps

Abstract

This paper demonstrates that by applying Chaos Theory to the modeling of the evolution of verbal forms and verbal systems, it is possible to view classical grammaticalization paths as universal, and conceal this deterministic assumption with the unpredictability of concrete grammatical developments. The author argues that such an explanation is possible because traditional grammaticalization paths do not represent realistic cases of grammatical evolutions, but rather correspond to abstract and non-realistic deterministic laws which codify the order of the incorporation of new meanings to the semantic potential of a gram. Therefore, from a synchronic perspective, they can be used to represent the semantic potential of a form as a map or a state. In contrast, a realistic development emerges as a trajectory connecting such maps or states. Consequently, the cross-linguistic typological model of realistic evolutionary processes of a certain type corresponds to a state-space – it is a cluster of all possible trajectories the grams of a certain class can travel. In this article – the first of the series of three papers – the main tenants of Chaos Theory will be discussed.

1. Introduction

Various empirical studies have shown that, in languages of the world, components of verbal systems evolve by following certain principles. Given their common graphical representation as unidirectional trajectories, scholars have referred to these principles

as “paths.” In general terms, a path provides a model of the semantic growth of grammatical forms belonging to a certain taxonomical class. It depicts an ordered evolution of verbal constructions of a determined type from lexical, semantically transparent and possibly iconic periphrases to core, untransparent, grammatical categories, such as aspect, taxis, tense or mood (Heine, Claudi, Hünemeyer 1991ab; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994; Dahl 2000b; Hopper, Traugott 2003; Heine, Kuteva 2006, 2007; Narrog, Heine 2011).¹

Paths have been induced from extensive empirical studies in which numerous languages of divergent families have been analyzed. Given the impressive amount of data supporting certain clines, paths have been viewed not only as typological strong tendencies but also as *quasi* universal (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 14–15; Hopper, Traugott 2003: 99–100). This *quasi* universality is implied by two substantial characteristics of the theory of verbal grammatical paths (Path Theory),² as posited by Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca (1994: 11–14), namely by their source determination and unidirectionality. According to the former, the source meaning determines the grammaticalization path of a gram. According to the latter, a grammaticalization path is a cline of consecutive stages and is “travelled” exclusively in one direction. Both properties predict that evolutions of typologically similar inputs are also similar topologically – that is, they are expected to follow an analogous pathway. Put differently, the theory postulates a great cross-linguistic similarity (or convergence) in the trajectories of similar sources. However, although Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994) use the term “universal path” when referring to posited representations of verbal developments, they typically mean ‘greatly or commonly similar paths’. Most importantly, the “universality” does not prohibit divergences from canonic scenarios, motivated by language-specific idiosyncrasy, but uniquely proposes a great resemblance in grammatical evolution of verbal forms whereby certain trajectories are “well-travelled” (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 14–15, 23, 27, 104).

If Path Theory is understood in this “classical” manner, two problems arise. On the one hand, if evolutions are quasi universal in the sense that their universality and, hence, determinism are only statistically true (which accounts for a large majority of cases, albeit not for all of them; cf. Newmeyer 1998: 275; Traugott 2001: 3), one may question – or, at least, have some reservations about – the epistemological value of the posited clines. As already explained, paths are typically comprehended as inductive generalizations built on the available empirical evidence. In this manner, they constitute hypotheses about robust tendencies (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 104–105; Traugott 2001: 1). If they are viewed as mere propensities devoid of any rule-like status, their explanatory power is weak. Since in the construction of paths

¹ Obviously, the development of grammatical formations does not cease here, but continues until a construction is either lost or recycled in new locutions.

² The summation of such evolutionary scenarios that schematize a semantic and functional development of verbal constructions will be referred to as Path Theory. Of course, the term itself is an artificial *ad hoc* invention and does not exist as such. It is used in this article to encompass a group of the most prominent linguists that work in the area of verbal evolutionary typology or the semantic and functional development of verbal grams.

an immense fragment of reality is ignored, it can be argued that the statistics on which such paths have been built uniquely reflect a minimal portion of real-world data and, hence, their relevance is almost insignificant. To be exact, as paths have been derived from evidence available in approximately one hundred languages, the vast majority of linguistic systems have been ignored. Moreover, and even more importantly, there is no certainty that, future and past data – either currently lost or still unavailable – will confirm the proposed clines. Consequently, since a great (if not infinite) portion of the evidence is ignored, nothing prohibits the statistical universality of paths to drastically change in light of new data. Without an inductive move whereby limited evidence is upgraded to the status of a law, the significance of any generalization is rather minimal.

On the other hand, if someone understands the paths as *absolutely* universal – and hence deterministic – he or she likewise faces several problems. In general terms, three major objections may be formulated against a strict deterministic view of paths. First, various irregular evolutionary cases have been reported. For instance, scholars have already noticed that other elements of the system may importantly modify the strictly linear orientation of universal trajectories, leading to outcomes that, in extreme cases, are not expected by the path model (cf. Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 14–15, 90–91; Dahl 2000a: 10–11). Second, if the development of a gram were universal and the laws were deterministic, one would expect that each single modification of the system would equally be absolutely determined and, thus, the system itself, in its integrity, would be subject to a deterministic evolution. However, in contrast to this alleged deterministic nature of paths, the predictability of concrete grammatical evolutions seems to be much weaker. In fact, the exact behaviour of a linguistic cannot be estimated with an absolute or even relative certainty. Lastly, third, if the entire evolution were to be strictly deterministic and linear (thus leading to infallible predictions) constructions deriving from the same original input (i.e. from an initial periphrasis that emerged in the mother language) should not acquire different properties at later stages of their independent evolutions in daughter languages. If the input locution follows a deterministic evolution, the development should be not only similar but also identical everywhere, i.e. in all dialects and languages, once the original vernaculars have been emancipated as independent linguistic systems.

Consequently, by adopting either a *quasi* or *absolutely* universal position, linguists face two different problems. On the one hand, if clines are taken as *quasi* (i.e. statistically) true, their epistemological value is weak: they are merely (accidental) generalizations without any rule-like force.³ They can possibly be revoked if, for instance, future evidence contradicts them for any reason. There is nothing *per se* that prohibits future data from pointing to different tendencies. On the other hand, if paths are understood deterministically as *absolutely* universal, various

³ This does not have to be an exaggeration. Since such laws are understood as purely inductive, they are sensitive to the criticism in the spirit of Popper. Since they are statistical, if the sample of items under study changes, the statistic outcome may likewise be affected.

contradictions appear: grams sometimes do not follow the expected trajectory and the predictability of grammatical evolution (both as far as the past and future states of a language are concerned) is impossible. As scientists, we would like the paths to be free of the weaknesses of the two readings: they should be *absolutely* universal but this *absolute* universality should not contradict the unpredictability of realistic grammatical developments and the existence of certain non-canonical evolutionary cases. Accordingly, linguistic laws would operate in the same manner as any laws of empirical sciences such as biology, physics or chemistry.

In the present paper, I will demonstrate that a solution to the above-mentioned problems can be provided by resorting to the narrative of Chaos Theory, that is if one understands linguistic evolutionary processes as being prototypically chaotic. I will show that neither instances of deviations from the predetermined developments posited by Path Theory nor the impossibility of a precise linguistic prediction/reconstruction contradict or nullify the determinism of posited paths and their universality. All such irregularities and the general unpredictability may be fully rationalized within the chaos framework, which *states* the following: although laws governing a system are deterministic, the system's exact and long-term evolution is impossible to be predicted. I will argue that such an explanation is possible because traditional paths do not represent realistic and concrete cases of grammatical evolutions. Trajectories established by Path Theory are abstract and non-realistic deterministic laws that codify the orderliness of the incorporation of new meanings during the evolution of grams. In contrast, they fail to represent realistic developments of grams. They do not portray real-world evolutionary processes, which are sequences of *states* or modifications of the semantic potential of a gram, acquired and organized in accordance with the paths. These facts will enable me to sketch a more adequate model of realistic evolutionary processes, portraying them as a state-space (i.e. paths of "path-states") in the spirit of Chaos Theory.

Due to its length this study will be divided into three papers. The first article will analyze the phenomenon of chaos in mathematics (and nature). The second article will propose a principled application of mathematical Chaos Theory to linguistics. It will also discuss where and how classical laws of Path Theory may be used alternatively. Lastly, the third article will design a chaotic model of grammaticalization and postulate a new family of realistic evolutionary paths of grams.

2. Chaos Theory – mathematical (and philosophical) preliminaries

Chaos Theory is a field of research in modern mathematics. This purely mathematical theory, however, has frequently been applied to elucidate phenomena of the realistic world, from physics to economics, social sciences and cultural studies, through biology, neurology and climatology. This has been achieved by using precise mathematical models or by resorting to narrative. Such an analogical extension of a mathematical model to real experimental facts and less formal sciences, even though defensible, cannot be executed without care, for example by merely using

imprecise metaphors or over-generalizing statements. If one claims that a given physical or social system – in our case, the semantic evolution of verbal grams – is chaotic, he or she is required to explain in what manner.

Without doubt, verbal constructions and their development cannot *a priori* be equaled with numbers and mathematical equations because grammatical objects are not identical to mathematical objects. Consequently, chaos in linguistics does not imply exactly the same thing as it does in mathematics. As a result, one must provide a specific definition of chaos which could be appropriate for linguistic research. In order to offer a characterization of chaos applicable to the semantic growth of grams, it is essential to first introduce the mathematical model of chaotic system and its properties.

In this section, I will provide a detailed introduction to the phenomenon of chaos by presenting its general explanation (2.1), standard definitions (2.2.), and specific properties and implications (2.3).

2.1 Chaos in mathematics – general explanation

In general and non-formal terms, Chaos Theory is a mathematical model which describes the **unpredictable** behaviour of **non-linear dynamic** systems that, albeit governed by **deterministic** rules under the form of dynamic equations, are highly **sensitive** to initial conditions (Auyang 1998a: 1, 1998b; Smith 1998: 17–20). Below, I will explain these properties (highlighted with bold type) in detail.

Non-linearity in mathematics signifies that a system does not satisfy the superposition principle. That is, the functioning of a system cannot be described by equations of the first degree as the outputs do not vary in direct proportion to the inputs (i.e. they are not directly proportional). In other words, non-linear systems correspond to problems where the solved variables cannot be represented as a linear combination of independent components (Auyang 1998b: 178, 234; Smith 1998; Bishop 2011: 107; Hooker 2011: 21–22).⁴

The notion “**dynamic**” can be understood as a synonym of non-stasis or evolution in time. In mathematics, a dynamic model represents the time dependence of a phenomenon. In a dynamic representation, the state of a system at a time (*t*) corresponds to a collection of its characteristics at that moment. The state is codified in a number or a set of numbers which can be pictured geometrically as a point. The dynamic process constitutes a sequence of such points representing states, which is schematized as a trajectory. The sum of all the states and trajectories which the system in question may possibly achieve and travel along is referred to as a state-space (Auyang 1998a: 5).⁵ The dynamics of a given organization consists of its state-space and the evolutionary equations which describe how solutions develop in it (Werndl 2009: 197).

⁴ Non-linearity may also be defined “negatively” as the absence of linearity. A system or relation is linear if an output is directly proportional to its input. Non-linear problems are frequently envisaged in physics and engineering. For instance, the weather is a non-linear phenomenon.

⁵ An alternative label is “phase space”.

The development of “normal” or standard (non-chaotic) dynamic systems is governed by precise rules that predict the future states of such systems will be, given their current condition(s). The organization is thus deterministic, especially within a short time interval (Auyang 2000: 168–170). To determine the state of all possible future moments, one reiterates the rule each time, calculating the state of the system at a later point. This iteration corresponds to solving or integrating the system. When the system has been solved, the following can be argued: once we know this system’s initial state, we are able to determine all its future positions symbolized by geometrical points in the state-space and represented together as a deterministic trajectory (Auyang 2000: 166–168).

The **deterministic** character of laws underlying the system and its processes signifies that the evolution of systems is controlled by dynamical equations and that for every stage in the process the equation predetermines a unique successor phase. Put differently, “given an initial condition [...], the [...] equation predicts the system’s behavior” (Auyang 1998a: 2). As already mentioned, with respect to standard dynamic processes, the calculation of the immediate value x (given the initial condition x_0) is iterative, advancing the result to the next step each time (Auyang 1998a: 3). Generally, in a deterministic model, there is no place for randomness – if we know the initial settings of the system we will always predict the same output. This entails that regular (non-chaotic) dynamic systems are predictable, although certainly with an error margin. What is important is that this error bund is similar to the error assumed within initial conditions (Auyang 1998a: 2). Chaotic systems are also deterministic. They are governed by dynamic rules that determine a unique successor for each single stage in an analogous manner as in regular dynamic processes (Auyang 2000: 170).

The concept of **sensitivity** is commonly referred to as the butterfly effect. Because of sensitivity, the behaviour of chaotic organizations is unpredictable, although laws governing such organisms are deterministic. In other words, the long-term future shape of a system cannot be predicted even if each single change were explicable and the laws that direct the development of this system were themselves deterministic in principle (Gleick 1987; Strogatz 1994; Alligood, Sauer, York 1997; Elaydi 1999: 117). Sensitivity implies that the smallest fluctuation of initial data may affect the outcome of a process in a drastic way. That is, even the least significant differences in the input conditions may cause the two systems, almost equal at the beginning, to acquire highly dissimilar states after a large interval of time (Auyang 1998a: 1–4; Werndl 2009: 203–204). In other words, supposedly trivial or irrelevant differences in initial data – for instance, errors assumed by rounding off in numerical computation – render long-term predictions impossible, although the systems are deterministic, i.e. with no random elements involved. This means that the deterministic essence of these organizations does not make them predictable for extended spans of time. As far as mathematical chaos is concerned, the sensitivity principle should be understood as an *exponential* divergence of processes issuing from neighbouring (or identical within an error margin) initial states (Auyang 2000: 169; Bishop 2011: 119–127; Hooker 2011: 25).

Unpredictability is closely related to the above-discussed problem of sensitivity to initial conditions and exponential error inflation in the case of dynamic chaotic systems, it signifies that “any bundle of initial conditions spreads out more than a specific diameter representing the prediction accuracy of interest (usually of larger diameter than the one of the bundle of initial conditions)” (Werndl 2009: 202). In other words, although we can determine, to a certain degree, exact initial conditions of a system, the long-term prediction for this system is so imprecise that it practically becomes impossible to foresee its future state even with a small accuracy (*ibid.*). Contrary to regular dynamic systems, in a prototypical chaotic organization, the error spreads exponentially. As a result, after a given moment, it expands the span of interest and the equation loses its predictive potency (Auyang 1998a: 3). This long-term unpredictability – and the chaos itself – is an emergent property of such dynamic processes (Auyang 2000: 170; see also Bishop 2011; Bickhard 2011; Hooker 2011).⁶

Chaos is frequently understood as prototypical of **complex** systems (Auyang 1998a: 1–2, 2000).⁷ Among various features, complexity implies that a system includes an extremely high or infinite number of components (also known as high cardinality) and that these elements enter into an endless or entirely uncontrollable amount of relations (such relations are typically non-linear).⁸ Complexity is nowadays perceived as one of the principal properties of real-world systems, be they physical, chemical, biological or socio-cultural (Prigogine 2009: 222–223; see also Cilliers 2007a, 2007b). In the realistic universe, the constituents of any system are either too numerous to be treated in their totality or their number is simply infinite. Furthermore, each constituent somehow interacts with all the remaining elements of the system (from the most microscopic to the most macroscopic ones), rendering the network of relations that exist in this organization immeasurable and, untreatable (Cilliers 1998, 2005; Bishop 2011; Hooker 2011; Cilliers et al. 2013; Andrason 2016).⁹

Having explained a general and intuitive comprehension of chaos in mathematics, I will now proceed to a more difficult task, *viz.* enclosing the phenomenon of chaos into a more formal definition.

⁶ Emergent properties fail to be “qualitatively similar to the properties of its constituents” and their explanation cannot “be given by approximately microanalyzing the system into independent parts with distinctive characters such as that it is the sum or average of the characters of the parts, where the microanalysis includes independent-individual models, the superposition principle, and other means” (Auyang 1998b: 178–179, 342–343). Put differently, in contrast with resultant traits, modularization and additivity, emergent properties are not directly derivable from the microscopic or atomic characteristics.

⁷ Nevertheless, non-complex systems may also be chaotic.

⁸ To be precise, a system is complex if it displays some or all of the following properties: it is open, situated, boundary-free and replete with unstable individuals; “infinitively” cardinal, uncontrollable and uncertain; dynamic, metastable and path-dependent; non-linear, sensitive to initial conditions, exponentially amplifiable and, in regions, chaotic; emergent, non-additive, non-modularizable, irreducible and organizationally intricate. It is also self-organizing and adaptive (Cilliers 1998, 2005, 2007ab; Schindwein, Ison 2007: 232; Wagensberg 2007: 12, 27, 56–62; Bishop 2011: 112; Hooker 2011: 20–21, 40; Cilliers et al. 2013: 2–4; Andrason 2016).

⁹ In order to be treated in models, real-world systems must be isolated, approximated and simplified.

2.2 Chaos in mathematics – definitions

Even though a vast amount of literature has been published on chaos, there is no agreement among mathematicians (as well as among physicists and philosophers) on how to define it precisely. Due to the limited scope of this paper and its linguistic and not mathematical or philosophical objective, I cannot discuss this highly complicated question in detail. Instead, I will restrict myself to providing most commonly accepted definitions proposed by Devaney (1989), Strogatz (1994) and Smith (1998).

According to the standard – but not unanimously acclaimed – mathematical definition proposed by Devaney (1989), a dynamic chaotic system fulfills the following properties: it is **sensitive** to initial conditions; it is topologically transitive (being characterized by **mixing**); and its periodic orbits are **dense**.

The concept of sensitivity has been introduced above. In the chaos framework, it is numerically specified by the Lyapunov exponent, which determines how rapidly trajectories departing from a shared initial region (as well as their values) diverge. In an intuitive terminology, topological mixing – which constitutes the central part of Devaney’s definition (consult also Werndl 2009: 209) – corresponds to the fact that “any bundle of solutions spreads out in phase space like a drop of ink in a glass of water” (Werndl 2009: 204). In a more formal language, given any open set U round the point u and an open set V round the point v , during the evolution of the system some orbits starting in the set U will visit the set V (Smith 1998: 169). Lastly, the idea of the density of periodic orbits means that periodic points are dense on the attractor (the term attractor will be introduced below). In other words, there are periodic points in every neighborhood of the attractor, or any point in the state space is approached closely by periodic orbits (Smith 1998: 168–169).

In 1994, Strogatz proposed that although no definition of the term chaos had been unanimously accepted, scholars seemed to coincide in three components when formulating their definitions: “[c]haos is aperiodic long-term behavior in a deterministic system that exhibits sensitive dependence on initial conditions” (Strogatz 1994: 323). The aperiodic long-term character implies that the system does not achieve a state where nothing moves, or where it repeats itself, but rather displays an erratic behaviour similar to that observed in the case of the Lorenz attractor.

Arguing that being chaotic under the definition provided by Devaney (1989) is rather a consequence of chaos and not its proper condition, Smith (1998: 177) proposes three alternative codifications of the phenomenon. The first one is based on the stretching and folding characteristic of chaotic systems – f is chaotic if f^k has a horseshoe for k .¹⁰ The second one draws from the idea of sensitive dependency

¹⁰ A horseshoe map is “any member of a class of chaotic maps of the square into itself” (Ivancevic, Ivancevic 2008: 35). The process goes as follows: a given “space is stretched in one direction, squeezed in another, and then folded.” If the process is reiterated, it delivers something that could be compared to “a many-layered pastry dough, in which a pair of points that end up close together may have begun far apart, while two initially nearby points can end completely far apart” (Ivancevic, Ivancevic 2008: 35). The horseshoe map enables us to construct an attractor: the operation includes stretching, which triggers sensitivity to initial conditions, and folding, which yields the attraction (Ivancevic, Ivancevic 2008: 37). As a result, most points will leave the square under the action of the map moving to the side caps (Ivancevic,

and involves the concept of positive entropy – a map is chaotic if it has positive topological entropy (Smith 1998: 178).¹¹ And the third proposal again quantifies sensitive dependency, by specifying the Lyapunov exponent and, thus, by measuring the exponential error inflation (Smith 1998: 178–179).

Consequently, mathematics does not work with a single and – entirely accepted – formal definition of chaos even though scholars intuitively capture the essence of the phenomenon specified as the deterministic, sensitive, aperiodic and unpredictable behaviour of non-linear dynamic (frequently complex) systems. Having discussed the mathematical definitions of chaos – both general (intuitive) and standardized (formal) – I will now describe the main properties of chaotic systems and their models.

2.3 Properties of the mathematical chaotic model

Despite the name itself, Chaos Theory is not about disorder but quite the reverse. It detects and explains a *universal* behaviour of systems that comply with the definitions provided in the previous section. Chaos Theory enable us to discover generalizations, be they tendencies or rules, because chaos – even though locally unbalanced – is globally stable (Auyang 1998a: 4, 6–8). Put differently, chaos is explicable and chaotic systems show certain regularities. In order to observe them, “we need to expand the scope of generalization to include various initial conditions and the divergence between various processes. This is possible only from a high-level perspective where we can grasp and compare different processes as wholes” (Auyang 1998a: 4). Such a higher-level view has been achieved in modern dynamics by treating initial conditions as theoretical variables, present in the state-space representation. In this manner, new concepts such as attractors, basins and bifurcations emerge. These concepts profoundly *regularize* the behaviour of chaotic systems (Auyang 1998a: 6). In other words, Chaos Theory, having expanded its scope of interest from individual developments to evolutions where a number of possible initial conditions and changeable parameters are included, discovers common properties and regularities in a class of superficially disordered dynamic systems. In the subsequent part of this section, I will present such typical traits of chaotic structures in detail.

Chaotic systems are organized along attractors. An **attractor** can be defined as a set towards which a dynamic, not necessarily chaotic, system evolves within a given interval of time. Put differently, it represents a value or a set of values to which the trajectories – representing processes initiating from different initial

Ivancevic 2008: 36). There, under iteration, they will converge to a fixed point in one of the caps. By iteration, the points remaining in the square deliver a fractal set, being part of the invariant set of the map (Ivancevic, Ivancevic 2008: 37). For a detailed explanation of the concept of horseshoe in topology, see Smith (1998: 176–177), Casselman (2005: 518–519), Shub (2005: 516–517), Ivancevic, Ivancevic (2008: 35–40).

¹¹ The term “entropy” makes reference to the dissipated potential of gradients of energy distribution. The minimization of gradients implies a maximization of entropy. In all physical and biological processes entropy is positive. As the entropy increases so does the system’s disorder (Schrödinger 2008: 112–115; Schneider, Sagan 2009: 76–77; Wagensberg 2010: 67–88).

conditions – approach (Auyang 1998a: 7).¹² Geometrically, an attractor of a dynamical process may be a point, a curve, a surface, a sphere, or a manifold. If the attractor is a complex set characterized by an infinitively intricate structure, it is referred to as “strange”. In chaotic organizations, trajectories or orbits which originate from a large set of initial conditions will converge towards a certain region. However, given the principles of sensitivity and aperiodic density, they will both spread and fold back on themselves in order to be kept within bounds (Smith 1998: 20). This stretching-folding behaviour is typical of chaotic systems. That is, even though the exact values of later states are exponentially inflated, the relevant states are confined within certain bounds. In other words, aperiodic trajectories never repeat themselves – they are confined inside a fixed region, visiting neighborhoods of their previous positions infinitively often and with an infinite density. Such a great intricacy is typical of fractals or objects that display self-similarity on all scales. Thus, one may conclude that, in contrast to fixed-point or limit-cycle attractors, strange attractors that appear in chaotic organizations exhibit a **fractal** structure (Auyang 1998b; Smith 1998).

Let us furthermore assume that during a determined interval of time, a dynamic system evolves towards a certain attractor *a*. If the evolution depends on a parameter *p*, the structure of the phase space will similarly be contingent on the parameter in question. A change in initial conditions, however, will not lead to any qualitative modification in the state-space, as all the trajectories will tend towards the mentioned attractor *a*. Nevertheless, at a given point (where a minimal change is made to the parameter values), the state-space of the system undergoes a sudden and profound qualitative change – the topological behaviour of the state-space is modified (Blanchard, Devaney, Hall 2006: 96–111). At this moment, the dynamic system undergoes a **bifurcation** and its trajectories spread towards two (or more) distinct attractors (Auyang 1998a: 8). In other words, a bifurcation corresponds to a qualitative alteration of the structure of attractors depending on a small variation in control parameters. It is during the bifurcation where the system is able to create new structures or to develop organizational novelties (Auyang 1998b: 237–239).

Trajectories that tend towards a given attractor form a **basin**. This means that a chaotic attractor attracts points in the basin of its attraction (Smith 1998: 14).¹³ Due to the condition of topological transitivity, it is possible to design a picture of the attractor as has, for instance, been done for the Lorenz attractor, one of the best-studied chaotic system diagrams. Dynamic systems may exhibit various attractors in case they bifurcate due to the modification of a parameters’ setting. In these instances, the state-space of the system splits into basins of different attractors. Consequently, processes that converge on a different attractor belong to a different basin. Such dissimilar basins are separated by “separatrices” (Auyang 1998a: 8; Smith 1998: 14–15).

¹² In more formal language, the attractor *A* must satisfy three conditions: it is invariant under the dynamics; there is a neighborhood *U* including *A* such that all trajectories beginning in *U* are attracted towards *A*; and *A* is minimal (there is no subset of *A* which would fulfill the two previously introduced conditions (Smith 1998: 14).

¹³ In more precise terms, the basin of the attraction of the attractor *a* is the largest set *U* including all and only points initiating trajectories attracted by *a* (Smith 1998: 14).

The relevance of attractors, bifurcation and basins cannot be overemphasized. Attractors determine the long-term stable behaviour of dynamic systems. Accordingly, they represent higher-level mathematical truths and/or constants with respect to chaotic evolutions. By increasing the generalization level and extending the scope of analysis (i.e. by taking into account a variable representing initial conditions and control parameters, and studying all possible developments conditioned by those factors), chaos becomes controllable (Auyang 1998a: 8).¹⁴ One may regard modern dynamics as a theory that models systems of multiple levels of organization. Such levels are connected in a synthetic manner which excludes both parochialism and reductionism. In the synthetic study the connection between the levels is “inexact” and yields **emergent properties** (Auyang 1998a: 2). As has already been mentioned, chaos (as described above) and its prototypical long-term unpredictability are emergent properties of dynamic processes achieved by expanding the scope of analysis from an individual evolution to the level where the behaviours of various processes are compared. Chaos becomes perceptible if one employs a long-term interval of study, and if processes have accumulated a significant number of phases. In other words, the emergent chaos matters for compositionally large and temporarily long-running systems (Auyang 1998a: 4; Hooker 2011: 28; Bickhard 2011: 93–96; Bishop 2011: 113–114, 127–129).

3. Interim

This paper has discussed chaos in mathematics. First, it has familiarized the reader with a general and non-formal view on chaos in mathematics – chaos being an unpredictable behaviour of non-linear dynamic systems that, albeit governed by deterministic dynamic equations, are highly sensitive to initial conditions. The article has also introduced three formal classifications of chaos in mathematics: Devaney’s definition, Strogatz’s definition, and Smith’s definition. Lastly, a number of specific properties exhibited by chaotic system have been presented: attractors, fractal structure, bifurcations, basins, and emergence.

Having explained the mathematical theory of chaos, the question of its possible transposition to other fields of science (in this case to linguistics) emerges.

¹⁴ To clearly perceive such an increase in generalization one must note that there are three levels in dynamics: a trajectory of an individual dynamical process, a set of trajectories depending on initial conditions (one generalizes over initial conditions making them theoretical variables), and a representation of evolution taking into account not only changing conditions but also fluctuation of the parameter(s) (one treats initial conditions and parameters as variables, Auyang 1998a: 9). In correspondence with the amplification of the extent of analysis, new patterns and regularities in chaotic developments appear. At the second level of generalization, the chaos itself and the attractors are discovered, while at the third level, one distinguishes the phenomena of bifurcation and basins of attraction. At that topmost stage we are no longer concerned with consecutive phases of a single process – now we perceive a particular process as a unit which can and should be compared with other processes that a system can possibly undergo, given determined conditions and parameters (Auyang 2000: 167–168).

Only a principled application of Chaos Theory – in which reductions and simplifications imposed by modelling are overtly acknowledged and controlled – can warrant an adequate use of chaos narrative in linguistics. The next paper in the series will deal with the issue of modelling by proposing a principled manner of applying Chaos Theory to linguistics and, thus, of dealing with chaotic phenomena in languages. This will subsequently enable us to analyze Path Theory from a new and, arguably, more appropriate perspective.

References

- Alligood K., Suaer T., York J. 1997. *Chaos: An introduction to dynamic systems*. New York.
- Andrason A. 2016. *A complex system of complex predicates: Tense, taxis, aspect and mood in Basse Mandinka from a grammaticalization and cognitive perspective*. [PhD Diss., University of Stellenbosch]. Stellenbosch.
- Auyang S. 1998a. How science comprehends chaos. [Paper presented at the Department of the History of Science Harvard University. February 23, 1998; www.creatingtechnology.org/essays/chaos.htm].
- Auyang S. 1998b. *Foundations of complex-system theories*. Cambridge.
- Auyang S. 2000. *Mind in everyday life and cognitive science*. Cambridge.
- Bickhard M. 2011. Systems and process metaphysics. – Hooker C. (ed.). *Philosophy of complex systems*. Amsterdam: 91–104.
- Bishop R. 2011. Metaphysical and epistemological issues in complex systems. – Hooker C. (ed.). *Philosophy of complex systems*. Amsterdam: 105–136.
- Blanchard P., Devaney R., Hall G. 2006. *Differential equations*. London.
- Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago.
- Casselmann B. 2005. Picturing the horseshoe map. – *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 52.5: 518–519.
- Cilliers P. 1998. *Complexity and postmodernism: Understanding complex systems*. London.
- Cilliers P. 2005. Complexity, deconstruction and relativism. – *Theory, Culture and Society* 22.5: 255–267.
- Cilliers P. (ed.). 2007a. *Thinking complexity*. Mansfield.
- Cilliers P. (ed.). 2007b. *Reframing complexity*. Mansfield.
- Cilliers P. et al. 2013. Complexity, modeling, and natural resource management. – *Ecology and Society* 18.3: 1–12.
- Dahl Ö. 2000a. The tense and aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective. – Dahl Ö. (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: 3–25.
- Dahl Ö. (ed.). 2000b. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin.
- Devaney R. 1989. *An introduction to chaotic dynamical systems*. Redwood City.
- Elaydi S. 1999. *Discrete chaos*. Boca Raton.
- Gleick J. 1987. *CHAOS: Making a new science*. New York.
- Heine B., Claudi U., Hünnemeyer F. 1991a. From cognition to grammar. Evidence from African languages. – Traugott E., Heine B. (eds.). *Approaches to grammaticalization*. [vol. 2]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 149–187.
- Heine B., Claudi U., Hünnemeyer F. 1991b. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. Chicago.
- Heine B., Kuteva T. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford.
- Heine B., Kuteva T. 2007. *The genesis of grammar: A reconstruction*. Oxford.

- Hooker C. 2011. Introduction to philosophy of complex systems: A. – Hooker C. (ed.). *Philosophy of complex systems*. Amsterdam: 3–90.
- Hopper P., Traugott E. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge.
- Ivancevic V., Ivancevic T. 2008. *Complex nonlinearity: Chaos, phase transitions, topology change, and path integrals*. Berlin.
- Narrog H., Heine B. (eds.). 2011. *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford.
- Newmeyer F. 1998. *Language form and language function*. Cambridge.
- Prigogine I. 2009. *¿Tan solo una ilusión?* Barcelona.
- Schindwein S.L., Ison R. 2007. Human knowing and perceived complexity: Implications for system practise. – Cilliers P. (ed.). *Thinking complexity*. Mansfield: 229–238.
- Schneider E., Sagan D. 2009. *La termodinámica de la vida* [Into the cool: Energy flow, thermodynamics, and life, 2006, Chicago]. Barcelona.
- Schrödinger E. 2008. *¿Qué es la vida?* Barcelona.
- Shub M. 2005. What is ... a horseshoe? – *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 52.5: 516–517.
- Smith P. 1998. *Explaining chaos*. Cambridge.
- Strogatz S. 1994. *Nonlinear dynamics and chaos: With applications to physics, biology, chemistry, and engineering*. New York.
- Traugott E. 2001. Legitimate counterexamples to unidirectionality. [Paper presented at Freiburg University, October 17th 2001; <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/traugott.html>].
- Wagensberg J. 2007. *Ideas sobre la complejidad del mundo*. Barcelona.
- Wagensberg J. 2010. *Las raíces triviales de lo fundamental*. Barcelona.
- Werndl C. 2009. What are the new implications of chaos for unpredictability? – *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 60: 195–220.

