

## Mongol \*da “two” And Its Derivatives

### Монгол \*да “хоёр” ба түүний үүсмэл үгс

*Csaba Gáspár*

ELTE University Budapest

Inner Asian Department

gcsaba73@student.elte.hu

#### Abstract

The following article delves into the hypothetical root \*da, which is the basis of several formations in the Mongolic languages. My assumption is that this stem bears the meaning “two”, although it is not attested in this form anymore, only its various derivatives. The goal of this article is to shed light on these formations and to analyze their morphology and etymology.

**Keywords:** Mongolic morphology, Mongolic etymology.

#### Abbreviations

Alt	Altai Turkic
Bashk	Bashkir
Bur	Buriat
CM	Common Mongol
Dag	Daghur
Ev	Evenki
Eyu	Eastern Yugur
Kalm	Kalmyk
Kh	Khalkha
MgrH	Mongghul (Huzhu Monguor)
Mo	Mongol
MMo	Middle Mongol
Tung	Tungusic
Ord	Ordos
Osm	Osman
OTu	Old Turkic
Tu	Turkic
WM	Written Mongol

#### Dictionaries and sources:

Ch	Cheremisov: Buryat-Mongol - Russian Dictionary
DOT	Краткий дагурско-русский словарь

EB	Enkhbat: Dayur kelen-ü üges
HY	Hua-Yi Yiyu
K	Ramstedt: Kalmükisches Wörterbuch
L	Lessing: Mongolian-English dictionary
M	Mostaert: Dictionnaire ordos
Muq	Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб
SH	Secret History of Mongols

## Introduction

The affiliation of words like *dabqur* “double, dual”, *dabquča* “double” and *dabta-* “to repeat” was already noticed by Ramstedt (K 80) one may however draw broader conclusions by extending the scope of semantically related words and analyzing their common root. Róna-Tas also consulted on the root \**dab* and came to the conclusion that \**dab* and *daya-* might belong together (Róna-Tas 2011:838).

My assumption is that \**dab* goes back to a root \**da* whose meaning was something like “two ~ second ~ twice”, and served as a base for another bundle of words with a semantical shift “(being) second” > “to follow”, “after” etc.

The root \**da* was first proposed by Poppe in relation with *daya* “to follow” (see later 1.2), and the semantically connected words that could have gone back to this root are:

- dabqur* “double, dual”,
- dabquča* “double”
- dabta-* “to repeat”,
- daki-* “to repeat”,
- daya-* “to follow”,
- daraya* “next following”,
- dayaya(n)* “two years old foal”.

The above words will be analyzed in the following sections by identifying their constituting morphemes.

### 1. *daya-* “to follow”

The various Mo forms always reflect an *ivc.* -G<sup>1</sup>, the following examples (and further references for MMo) are from Nugteren’s collection (Nugteren 2011:311): MMo SH *daqa-*, HY *daqa-*, WM *daya-* Kh *dagax*, Bur *dagaxa*, Kalm *daxx*, Dag *day-*, EYu *dağa-*, *tağa-*, MgrH *dağa:-*, MgrM *dağa-*, BaoD *dəğa-*, *ndəğa-*, BaoÑ *dağa:-*, Kgj *dağa-* ~ *dəğa-*, *dəğa-*, Dgx *dağa-*.

Regarding the Tu affiliations, as Doerfer noted, (1985:142) it is not clear if the original Mo form was with -q- or -γ-, while the various Tung forms are all with -x-: Spoken Manchu: *dahə-*, Literary Manchu: *daḡa-*, Jurchen: *tai-xa*, Ulcha: *daḡaḡ-*, Orok: *daḡuri-*, Nanai: *daḡa-*, Oroch: *daḡu-* (Tsintsius 1975:192). Poppe also listed Ev. *daga* “nahe, neben”, probably in order to support a common Altaic root (see 1.1); this connection needs more investigation.

<sup>1</sup> The *ivc.* -G- in back vocalic words was rather voiceless in MMo (and very likely also in the earlier stages), it was transcribed with q in the P’ags-pa script and Ar sources, see e.g. Poppe 1987:149

The Altaists tried to find a Tu relationship, first this theory will be examined.

### 1.1. Turkic affiliation

Ramstedt (K 72) proposed a Tu relationship with OTu yak- “to approach, to be near”.

Due to Mo phonotactical rules strong stops and affricates in word final or coda position were not allowed. Considering that the two series of stops and affricates were distinguished by aspiration and not voicing (Svantesson 2005:120, Poppe 1987:96) probably already at very early stages in Mo, it seems logical that OTu unvoiced stops were replaced by their weak unaspirated pair in Mo<sup>2</sup>:

- Mo bulay “spring” – Tu bulak id.
- Mo keseg “a piece” – Tu kesek id.
- Mo čečeg “flower” – Tu çeçek id.
- Mo üjüg “pen” / üsüg “letter, script” – Uig üzük “a written character”
- Mo qurud “dried curd” – Tu kurut id.

In some cases, a vowel epenthesis occurred:

- Mo irge “wether” – Tu irk “ram”
- Mo ürge- “to become alarmed, frightened” – Tu ürk- “to be startled”

This is however not without exceptions, cf. Mo berke “difficult, hard” – Tu berk “firm, stable”.

In case of verbs rather a vowel was added<sup>3</sup>:

- Mo uqa- “to understand”- Tu uk- id.
- Mo siqa- “to press, to squeeze” - Tu sık- id.
- Mo qata- “to dry, to become hard” - Tu kat- “to be hard, firm, tough”

In *ivc.* position Tu -K corresponds to Mo -K:

- Mo böke “wrestler” – Tu böke id.,
- Mo jaqa “edge, border” – Tu yaka “the edge or border of sg, collar”,
- Mo teke “male of mountain goat” – Tu teke “he goat”
- Mo baqa “toad”, Tu baka id.

On the other hand, Tu -G remained unchanged:

- Mo sürüg “flock, herd” – Tu sürüg id.
- Mo inay “beloved, lover” – Tu mağ “friend”

Conclusion: according to these correspondences a Mo verbal form \*daka- seems more likely for Tu yak-, indeed this was the proposed form of Poppe (see 1.2).

### 1.2. Internal development

Poppe’s approach (Poppe 1960:22) of an Altaic root \*da “two, twice, second” from which Tu yak- and Mo \*daka- > daɣa- evolved would rather support an internal development in both languages. The contradiction of Mo -G vs. Tu -K could be resolved by supposing that these are different suffixes in both languages.

<sup>2</sup> It is of course not straightforward, that each of these words were copied by Mo from Tu, it does not change the picture though, if we would want to establish regular sound correspondences between the common vocabulary.

<sup>3</sup> Verbs ending in a velar stop are very rare, an exception is ög- “to give”.

In Mo we have a Den.V. suffix *-ya* mentioned also by Kempf as *-KA* (Kempf 2013:138) e.g. *jolya-* “to meet, to greet” < *jol*, *andaqa-* “to swear” < *anda* “oath”, and its allomorph *-ya:* *qubiya* “to distribute, to divide” < *qubi* “part, share”.<sup>4</sup> Its function is not completely clear, nevertheless it is often used to create verbs from adverbs: *tege* “to do like that” < *\*te*, cf. *ter* “that”, *inggi-* “to do like this” < *\*in* ~ *\*en*, cf. *ene* “this”, *julyaya-* “to pluck, tear off” < *julya* “off”, *delge-* “to spread, lay out” < *\*del* cf. *delbe* “asunder, apart”, *eyige-* “to do like this” < *\*eyi*, cf. *eyin* “this way, like this”, *nirge-* “to strike, to rumble” < *nir* (onom.) “rumbling, roar”, *nürge-* “to bang, to boom” < *nür* (onom.) “the sound of boom”.

It is however also possible that not all verbs with the suffix *-GA* have the same historical origin, i.e. the verbs *jolya-* and *andaqa-* can be also compared with Tu *yoluk-* and *andık-*, which might be internal developments with the Tu Den. V. suffix *-(X)k*, while the suffix *-gi* might go back to *-ki* in verbs like *inggi-*, *eyige-*.<sup>5</sup>

Anyhow a standalone root *\*da* would be also supported by *daki-* “to repeat” (see 6.), where *-ki* is a known Den.V. suffix.

On the Tu side we may find in the Etymological Dictionary (Левитская 1989:81) that “*yak* derived from the generative stem *\*ya* [...] with the affix *-k*, cf. also *ya:n* ‘close’”.

From the Tu data we might deduce that *\*ya* meant something like “near, close”, the Mo derivatives however rather suggest a meaning like “second or to be second”, see the points 2-6.

Summarizing the above said, we can assume the following options:

- an ancient match of Tu *\*ya* ~ Mo *\*da* with the meaning “side”, from which Tu “approach, to be near” and Mo “to follow” independently evolved;
- Mo *daya-* was borrowed from Tu *yak-* (putting aside the phonological considerations);
- Mo *\*da* is a different word meaning “two, second, twice”: it would be supported by the other forms (in detail see later), from which *daya-* was created. A meaning shift from “second” to “to follow” is not necessarily a farfetched assumption, one may find examples in other languages, e.g. Lat. *secundus* < “following, next in time or order,” from PIE *\*sekw-ondo-*, participial form of root *\*sekw-* “to follow”<sup>6</sup>.

## 2. *\*dab-* “(to be) double, dual, second”

Analyzing the words of *dabqur* (3.) and *dabquča* (4.) and *dabta-* (5.) confirms the assumption that *\*dab-* must have been a verb or noun-verb, meaning “(to be) double, dual, second”; however, the hypothetical suffix *-b* needs investigation. The PMo form *\*dap* is also supported by the Ew.N. form *dapkur* (Poppe 1976:466). Clauson’s assumption, that it is related to OTu *yap-* “to build, to shut (a door), to cover” is semantically problematic: the primary meaning of Mo *dabqur* (see 3.) is “double, dual”, the secondary meanings “layer, story, level” are probably derivatives.

<sup>4</sup> I am not sure whether *jiryä-* “to be joyful, rejoice” belongs here, since its hypothetical root *\*jir* cannot be found in the historical and present Mo languages.

<sup>5</sup> Hans Nugteren (personal correspondence)

<sup>6</sup> Although the direction is reversed here. Ref.: <https://www.etymonline.com/word/second>

Acc. to Ramstedt daB has an onomatopoeic meaning in Kalm to express “repeating”: daB daB gedž “unaufhörlich” (K 71). Since this standalone form of dab is not attested in other dialects, it can be a result of back-formation from dabta- (see 5.), or less likely, a trace of \*dab.

It would be reasonable to assume that -b is a variant of -GA, while both are reflexes of \*-p > β, since *ivc* -G- was retained if it originated from a stop, while it was dropped when it goes back to a spirant \*p > β > γ, as in among others (Janhunen 1999:115-131):

- \*tap > \*taβ > tayatai “happy, pleasant” vs tab “pleasure, content”;
- \*qap > \*qaβ > qaya- “to close” vs qabqay “cover, lid”;
- \*dep: debji- “to develop”, debsi “to advance, make progress, step up” < \*deb < \*de(?) “up, on” > \*dege > degedü “upper, top”, degere “on, above”, degebüri “roof”.<sup>7</sup>

### 2.1. dabqur “double, dual”

MMo SH dabqur, HY dabqur, Muq dabqur, WM dabqur, Kh dawxar, Ord dawχur, daχur, Bur dabxar, Kalm davxr, Dag dabkur, EYu dayqur „times”, dayχguar „double”, MgrH tağur, MgrM yigə təğər „for a while”, Bao---. Dgx---. Mog--- (Nugteren 2011:310)

Róna-Tas gave a fairly detailed analysis on the possible origin of the suffix -qur (Róna-Tas 2011 p. 838), concluding that “[...] -kur is not a suff, or at least not a suff with clear morphological and functional features.” The author gathered a few examples with this suffix, and it seems likely, that it is an allomorph of the Dev.N. -γur, cf. arčiyur “shawl, towel” < arči- “to wipe, cleanse”, elgügür “peg, rack” < elgü- “to hang (up), suspend”.

The suffix -GUr is probably a compound of -GU + \*-r: the word dabquča (see next par.) would also support it.

-GU is a Dev.N. (Poppe 1987 p.258), while the role of \*-r is manifold and rather obscure, it was described by Poppe as an “Altaic suffix of verbal nouns”, for example in -GARAI (Prescriptive) < -GA + \*-r + -ai (Poppe 1987 p.254) or in -rUn (Converbum Praeparativum) < \*-r + Gen (Poppe 1987 p.279).

### 2.2. dabquča “double (layer, garment etc.)”

MMo SH -, HY -, Muq -, WM dabquča “double garment” (L. 214), also dabquca- (tr. and intr.) „to put one upon another, to double, to become doubled”, Kh dawxats (Kara), Bur. dabxasa “double, dual” (Ch. 197), Kalm. dawxatsə “paar, doppelt” gerin ~ „das obere Stockwerk“ (R. 80), Ord dawχutši “pair, double” (M 130).

Just as for dabqur, we can reconstruct a compound structure of Dev.N. -GU + -ča.

-ča is a frequently used Dev.N. suffix, cf. sayuča “flat” < sayu- “to sit, dwell”, niyuča “secret” < niyu “to hide” and it also formed verbs from verbal roots, as pointed out by Kempf (Kempf 2013 p.184). I could hardly find examples where it is appended to a noun: bayča “batch, pack, stack”, boyča “bag, pack”, maybe qurča “quick, smart” from a hypothetical root \*qur, cf. qurdan “fast”; and čoyča “pile, set, structure” (although the root cannot be traced any more) also belongs here.

<sup>7</sup> This development is still not without exceptions: one may find words where the *ivc* -G- was dropped in one Mo dialect, while it has been kept in another one, e.g. Kh. de:l ~ Kalm dewl, Bur degel < WM debel ~ degel “gown, deel”, or Kh egəm ~ Oir, Bur e:m < WM egem.

### 2.3. dabta- “to repeat” (trans.)

MMo SH dabtaqsan, HY-, WM dabta- (L 213), Kh dawta- (Kara), Bur dabta- (Cher. 196.), Kalm dapta- (K 77), Ord da<sup>k</sup>χin dabtan “many times” (M 110) Dag dabt- ~ dart- (EB 272), EYu dapta- (Nugteren 2011:310)

The suffix -t needs an explanation. My assumption is that dab\* was a noun-verb that can be found abundantly in the Mo languages (see i.e. Kara 1997), in this case the very productive Den.V suffix -d and its allomorph -t would be an obvious conclusion: e.g. daγuda- “to call” < daγu “sound”, buruγuda- “to be wrong” < buruγu “error, mistake”, and after word final consonant we get -t: kebte- “to lie (down)” < \*keb, cf. kebeyi- “to incline, slant”, kebegei “incline, slope”, čabta- “to split, to crack” < čab “rift, crack”.

Alternatively, if \*dab was merely a verb, then we can think of the obscure Dev.V. suffix that was described by Kempf et.al. (Kempf 2013:137) with the following examples: (h)ülüt- ~ ülit- “to remain” < WM üle- “to be left over, to remain”, üderit- “to make halt to rest” < üderi- “to stop for lunch”, sögöt- “to kneel (down)” < sög “a command to make camels kneel down”. It would be reasonable to assume, that -t had a weak allomorph -d:

- the WM forms of the above examples are with -d, and Kempf also noted that these forms are preserved with -d in Kh and Bur: ülede-, sögdö-, üilde- etc.
- Other MMo monuments show similar forms: Phags-pa (Tömörtogoo 2010): üiled-, Muq üiledükci etc.
- The alternation t ~ d can be observed in the SH also at the passive form: ökte- / ökde- “to be given”, abta- / abda- “to be taken”.

The following two words: *daki-* and *daraya* are apparently semantically related to the previous bundle, their construct can be explained however only from \*da.

### 3. daki- “to repeat”

MMo SH -, HY -, WM daki- (L 223), Kh daxi- (Kara), Bur daxi- (Ch 207), Kalm dak<sup>i</sup> (K 73), Ord da<sup>k</sup>xi- (M 113), Dag dagi- (EB 273), EYu -, MgrH -, MgrM , BaoD , BaoÑ , Kgj, Dgx -.

Supposing an original root \*da it seems logical that daki- is a compound of \*da + -ki, where the latter is simply the verb ki- “to make, to do”. Such compositions are frequent in Mo, e.g. amuski- “to rest a little” < \*amu cf. amura- “to have a rest”, duyki- ~ duy ki- “to doze, take a nap” < duy “nap, slumber”, etc.

### 4. daraya “next, following”

MMo SH -, HY -, WM daraya (L 231), Kh daraa (Kara), Bur daraa (Ch 204), Kalm darān (K 77), Dag -, EYu -, MgrH -, MgrM , BaoD , BaoÑ , Kgj, Dgx -.

The suffixes appended to \*da can be explained as follows:

-rA: a known Den.V. suffix, analyzed in detail by Kempf (Kempf 2013:69). In some of the examples listed by the author we can detect the same function that would be suggested by a hypothetical verb \*dara- “to be second, to follow”: SH quši'ura- “to be in the front” < qosiyun “snout, beak”, SH utura- “to go first, to lead” < utu- “the ends of the chain of hunters in a battue”, and very likely also γar-, see in the next §.

- GA: supposing that \*dara- is a verb, this suffix must form nouns from verbs. Indeed, -GA is a very productive Dev.N. suffix, we can find plenty of examples: onоγa “score, point” < ono- “to hit the target”, sabay-a “stick, bat” < saba- “to beat, hit”, etc. Another case that supports the previous suffix as well, is γаруγa “start, kick-off” < γar- “to go off, exit, arise” < \*γa “out” cf. γадана “outside”, γаdaya “outside, outward”, γадар “surface, outer, outside”, γајар “ground, soil, land”.

Acc. to Poppe it is simply a Nomen imperfecti (Poppe 1927:94) but it seems to have a much broader function, and in certain cases it behaves differently on the phonological surface, cf.: Kh т᠔ᠪᠲᠤᠯᠦᠭ WM dobtulγa “attack (noun)” vs. т᠔ᠪᠲᠤᠯᠦ WM dobtulγa “the one that attacks”, or Kh тарᠭ (WM daruγa) “chief, head” vs tara (WM daruγa) “the one that pushes”.

## 5. dayaya(n) “two years old foal”

MMo SH da’aqan H30, HY-, YY dā-hā, Muq da:γan P139b. WM dayaya(n) L216a, daya(n) L216a. Kh daaga(n)<sup>8</sup>, Ord dāga (M 111), Bur daaga(n) (Ch 194), Dag daag (DOT 51) Tung: Ev. Nerčinsk dayakan, Man’kovo da:kan, Solon (Khingän dial.) da:kan, Manchu daxan

### 5.1. Turkic affiliation

The general assumption – probably first proposed by Ramstedt (K 81) – is that Mo dāgan ~ Kalm dāγ<sup>n</sup> “two years old foal” is related with OTu yapaqu (Ramstedt’s version OTu “yabaya”, while Poppe compared it with Osm yapaq (Poppe 1960:47) “Fohlen”).

About OTu yapa:ku we find in the EDT that “morphologically obscure (-ku is not a recognized Suff.), but obviously connected w. yap- and 2 yap [...], it seems originally to have meant ‘matted hair, or wool’ (cf. yapgut) and hence ‘an animal whose hair has grown long and matted’ and, more specifically, ‘a colt’”. Moreover, that it is a First Period loanword in Mo (Clauson 1972:874). Róna-Tas pointed out (Róna-Tas 2011:367) that the Tu word should be decomposed as yap “wool and refuse of wool” + agu while the form yapaku is “contaminated form” (moreover a hapax), thus “it has no connection with Mo daga- ‘to follow’”, nevertheless it is related to Mo dagagan.

At this point we need to note that there is another Mo word dayaki “matted hair”, “molt hair of animals” and “the hair of newborn infant”, about which Clauson only noted that “The connection w. Mong dayaki ‘a tangle or mass of hair’ is obscure.” Róna-Tas has probably right, that Mo dayaki “matted hair” is an early loanword from Tu yapagu providing that his segmentation yap + agu is tenable.

The Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages (Левитская 1989:125) collected the various theories about “ЙАПАК”<sup>9</sup>, however, did not provide a satisfactory internal etymology for “colt” or “foal”.

It appears clearly that the words yabak ~ yabag (and their other variations) in the meaning “colt, foal” are widespread in the NE, NW Tu languages (Shcherbak 1961), although the exact connotation varies from language to language, e.g.: Alt jabaga “foal up to two years”, Bashk jabag, jабak “foal born in autumn to spring of next year”, Kazakh jabagi “foal from six months to a year” etc.

<sup>8</sup> Nugteren (2011) p.309

<sup>9</sup> 1. шерсть (овечья) “wool (of sheep)”, свалывшаяся, сбившаяся шерсть “felled, strayed wool”; 2. пушистый, косматый (об овце) “fluffy, shaggy” (sheep); 3. шерсть-линька (у животных) “wool-molt (of animals)”; 4. старая шерсть “old wool” (Chuv.);

Considering the above said there are couple of striking uncertainties:

- the areally restricted distribution of Tu *yapaqu* in the meaning “foal”. Poppe referred to Osm *yapaq*, nevertheless in Osm there is another word used for foal: cf. OTu *tay*; (Clauson 1972:566)
- the constrained development from “matted hair” to “colt”;
- morphological considerations: in my opinion Mo *dayaγa(n)* should be analyzed as *daya* + *γa(n)*; a suffix apparently widely used (among others) for animals (see 8.2.3), otherwise the word final
- *q* still needs to be explained. The expected Mo form would be *\*dayaγ* for Tu *yapak* or *\*dayaqu* ~ *dayaki* for Tu *yaku* (see 1.1), and this is exactly the Mo form of *dayaki* “matted hair”.
- semantical differences: it seems that while the descendants of *yapaqu* mean “foal” in various ages in the Tu languages, it is only used for foals exactly in their second year throughout in the Mo languages. Cf. Ord “poulain dans sa seconde année” (M 111), Bur “двухлетний жеребёнок” (Ch 194), Kalm “Füllen im zweiten Jahre” (R 81) etc. It also means “second year” cf. Kh дааган тором “camel in his second year” (Монгол хэлний их тайлбар толь 2016<sup>10</sup>)

If the distribution of this word is really confined to the NE and NW Tu languages, then it would rather suggest a borrowing from Mo than the other way around. Its reconstructed form could be *daβaG<sup>a</sup>* ~ *dabaG<sup>a</sup>*, for the development of *ivc. \*p* see e.g. Mo *qaya-* < *\*qaba* < *\*qap* ~ Tu *\*kap-* “to close, cover”.

## 5.2. Internal development

### 5.2.1. *dayayan* or *dayan*?

In WM we find both *dayaya(n)* and *daya(n)*, while SH has *da'aqan* and Muq *da:yan*. From these forms it seems likely that the MMo pronunciation was probably *da:yan*. Although it is true that the WM spelling does not always consequently denote long vowels, as pointed out by Nugteren et al. (Nugteren 2011:165): there are cases when the deducible pronunciation points to a long vowel, but we find a simple vowel instead of a -VCV- segment: e.g. WM *aγa*, CM *\*haaga* “bran, chaff”, WM *čayan*, CM *\*čagaan* “white”, CM *\*agaar*, WM *aγar* “air” etc.

On the other hand, one may notice examples for artificially created WM forms, replacing a single long vowel with a -VGV- structure – probably due to an assumption that every long vowel originates from the loss of an intervocalic G: in this group we find words that might be loans from Tu, e.g. WM *uγuča* CM *\*uuča* cf. OTu *uça* “the loins, haunches, rump”, WM *buγurčaq*, CM *\*burčaq*, cf. OTu *burčaq* “pea”, WM *egür*, CM *\*ür*, OTu *ür* “forever eternal”. This group is however relatively uncertain, almost all these examples have an obscure relationship, and it is hard to determine the direction of borrowing. It can be assumed that the artificial -VCV- segment was used for loan words or to distinguish two similarly sounding words, e.g. CM *\*ür* WM *egür* “forever” vs WM *üür* / *ör* “dawn”.

Nevertheless, in our case we can accept the argumentation of Nugteren: “[...] the modern forms such as Kh *daaga(n)*, EYu *da:ğan*, MgrH *da:xa*, Dag *da:γ* point to a CM form *\*daagan*. Thus, the short spelling *dayan* reflects neither etymological reality nor the pronunciation, while *dayayan* is correct within the Written Mongol spelling rules, with the first *γ* now denoting vowel length, and the second still pronounced.” (Nugteren 2011:166)

<sup>10</sup> <https://mongoltoli.mn/dictionary/detail/28645>

**5.2.2.** Assuming the above original form, a development from a hypothetical root \*da or dayā- in the meaning “second ~ following” seems conceivable, also because it would fit semantically well in the naming terminology, where the name of three- and four-year-old foals unequivocally refers to the number of years, cf. гуна ~ yunaġin “three years old foal / calf / camel” and дөнен ~ döneġin “four years old foal / calf / camel”.

### 5.2.3. The suffix -GAn

This diminutive suffix is widespread and productive in the Mo languages (Poppe 1973:225), and many of the names of the livestock took up this ending: unayan “newborn foal”<sup>11</sup>, imayan “goat”, üniye(n) < ünige(n) “cow”, temegen “camel” etc. As Poppe noted it is not always clear if we face the suffix -GA or GAn, because “the final n happens easily to be dropped” (Poppe 1926:94), anyway, it is obvious that -GAn is a derivative of -GA.<sup>12</sup> The development of -G is not clear, as it remains in some cases while disappears in others, cf. WM unayan > Kh un<sup>a</sup>g, WM botoyan > Kh pöt<sup>a</sup>g, but WM imayan > Kh

This suffix was also used in Tu languages, although definitely not that often as in Mo (s. Erdal 1991:85).

On the other hand, we have a homophone Dev.N. suffix, too, cf. uqayan “wit, intellect” <- uqa- “to understand”, ulayan “red” <- \*ula- “to be red” cf. ulayi- “to become red”, čayan “white” <- \*ča- “to be white” cf. čayi “to dawn, grow light”, časun “snow”, yabuyan “pedestrian” <- yabu- “to go”.

For the first sight it seems logical that dayayan is a compound of dayā- “to follow” + the Dev.N. -GAn, (“the follower, the second one”) however the expected current form would be \*daGaG without dropping the ivo -G.

In my opinion, it is more likely, that the root of our word is \*dayā “the second”, where -ya is the reflex of an original -p (see 2. \*dab) and this root was suffixed with the diminutive -GAn as the other livestock terms. (This would also explain, why this ivo -γ was dropped, see qaya ~ qab.)

## 6. Conclusions

The inferred developments from the hypothetical root: \*da “second, double” look as follows:

\*da + -ki „to do“ = “to repeat”

\*da + Den.V. -ra + Dev.N. -GA = “next, following”

\*da + Den.V. -GA = “to follow”

\*da + Den.V. \*p -> \*dap “to be second, to follow, to repeat”

\*dap -> \*dab + -ta “to repeat”

\*dap -> \*dab + -qu + -r “double, dual”

\*dap -> \*dab + qu + ča “double (layer, garment etc.)”

\*da + Den.N. -GA + -GAn / da + Den.V. -GA + -GAn “two years old foal”

<sup>11</sup> Street (1957) p. 57 etymologized it from unu- „mount a horse”, I guess it will be unuy-a “cart, vehicle” that derives from it

<sup>12</sup> Its variant -GAnA “denotes mostly such plants (or animals) which occur in large numbers in one place and are relatively small and difficult to separate from each other [...]” (Poppe 1981:385): balčirjana “heracleum dissectum”, salajana “chorispora”, kökergene “isatis” etc.

## References

- Черемисов, К.М.: Бурят-Монгольско - Русский Словарь, Государственное Издательство Иностраннных и Национальных Словарей, Moscow 1951
- Clauson, G.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century*, Oxford At The Clarendon Press 1972
- Doerfer, G.: *The Older Mongolian Layer in Ancient Turkic*, Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları 1993, p. 79-86
- Doerfer, G.: *Mongolo-Tungusica*, Otto Harrassowitz Wiesbaden 1985
- Древнетюркский словарь, Институт языкознания (Академия наук СССР) "Наука," Ленингр. отд-ние, 196
- Этимологический словарь тюркских языков, Общетюркские и межтюркские основы на буквы Ж – Ж – Й, ed. Л. С. Левитская, Наука Moscow 1989
- Janhunen, J.: *Laryngeals and pseudolaryngeals in Mongolic*, in: *Central Asiatic Journal* Vol. 43, No. 1, 1999.
- Kara, Gy.: *Mongol-Magyar Szótár*, Terebess Kiadó, Budapest 1998
- Kara, Gy.: *Nomina-Verba Mongolica in: Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol. 50, No. 1/3 (1997), pp. 155-162 Published By: Akadémiai Kiadó
- Kempf, B.: *Studies in Mongolic Historical Morphology: Verb Formation in the Secret History of the Mongols*, Harrassowitz Verlag 2013
- Erdal, M.: *Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon 1-2*. Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1991
- Erdal, M.: *On the Altaic relationship by marriage*, in: *Kutadgu Nom Bitig, Festschrift für JENS PETER LAUT zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2015 Harrassowitz Verlag Wiesbaden
- Mostaert, A.: *Dictionnaire ordos*, Seconde Édition, Johnson Reprint Corporation, New York - London 1968
- Mukkadimat al-adab database (Database compiled from the Mongolian part of Arab-Farsi-Turk-Mongolian dictionary of 15th century)
- Nugteren, H.: *Mongolic Phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu Languages*, Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics, Utrecht 2011
- Поппе, Н.: *Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб*, Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1938. (Муq)
- Poppe, N.: *Die Nominalstambildungssuffixe im Mongolischen*, in: *Keleti Szemle* Vol 20, 1923-27, pp. 89-126.
- Poppe, N.: *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1954
- Poppe, N.: *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki 1987
- Poppe, N.: *On Some Suffixes of Plant Names in Mongolian*, in: *Zentralasiatische Studien* 15, Sonderdruck 1981.
- Poppe, N.: *Über die Bildungssuffixe der mongolischen Bezeichnungen der Körperteile*, in: *Uralaltaische Jahrbücher* Band 45, 1973
- Poppe, N.: *Vergleichende Grammatik Der Altaischen Sprachen, Teil 1, Vergleichende Lautlehre*, Otto Harrassowitz Wiesbaden 1960
- Poppe, N. (1976) *Ancient Mongolian*, in: *Tractata Altaica*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden *Vergleichende Lautlehre [= Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie 4]*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rachewiltz, I. de: *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*, Indiana University 1972
- Ramstedt, G.J.: *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki 1935

- Róna-Tas, A. -Berta, Á: West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian 1-2. Harrasowitz Verlag 2011, Wiesbaden
- Tömörtogoo D.: Mongolian monuments in ‘Phags-pa Script, ed. by Tömörtogoo, Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica Taipei, Taiwan 2010
- Цинциус В. и др.: Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков, Leningrad 1975-1977
- Щербак, А. М.: Названия домашних и диких животных в тюркских языках, in: Историческое развитие лексики тюркских языков, Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 1961 Moscow
- Street, J.C.: The Language of The Secret History of the Mongols, American Oriental Series, Vol. 42. New Haven 1957.
- The Turkic Languages, ed. É. Á. Csató and Lars Johansson, Routledge 1998