

- Miles, George C. "The Iconography of Umayyad Coinage," Ars Orientalis. no. 3, 1959.
- Mitchiner, Michael. The World of Islam. London: Hawkins Publications, 1977.
- Phillips, John. The Reformation Of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Sahas, Daniel J. Icon and Logos Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Walker, John. A Catalogue Of The Arab-Byzantine And Post-Reform Umayyad Coins. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956.
- Whitting, P.D. Byzantine Coins. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973.

EUGEN HELIMSKI, MAREK STACHOWSKI

TURCO — SAMOIEDICA

O. Introduction; 1. 'to strive, to aspire'; 2. 'to lie (down)'; 3. 'fat'; 4. 'as, like'; 5. 'sagging ice'; 6. 'thigh'; 7. 'snow-storm'; 8. 'joint'; 9. 'power, craft'; 10. 'mountain (wooded)'; 11. 'single, unmarried'.

O. Introduction

The Turkic-Samoyedic comparisons presented below result from independent etymological research by each of the two authors, followed by mutual cross-checking of the material (the opportunity of the team work has been provided by the Free University Berlin and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). Our purpose was to enlarge the collection of etymologies which can be found in the monumental work by A. J. Joki (Joki LSS) and in later contributions to the topic (e.g. Márk Nény 19-20: 243-252; Janhunen MSFOu 158: 123-129; Tenišev MSFOu 158: 235-239; Róna-Tas CIFU-5 III: 377-385; Terent'ev PÈËISN; Helimski JSFOu 81: 54-103; Róna-Tas UL 742-748; Filippova Diss.; Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).

In the treatment of the historical and cultural circumstances of the language contacts between Proto-Turkic (and its descendants) and Proto-Samoyedic (and its descendants) the authors follow the conception outlined e.g. in Joki LSS 33ff. and Helimski JSFOu

83: 257-267. The approach advocated e.g. in the works by A. Róna-Tas (see above) or in Janhunen JSFOu 82: 287-297 differs primarily in the postulation of a strong Bulgar-Turkic impact upon the peoples of Southern Siberia.

A significant part of the etymologies below is restricted, on the Samoyedic side, to the data of a single language – Selkup. The special position of this language in regard to Turkic influences (various from the viewpoint of chronology and sources) is well-known; see the detailed discussion in Filippova Diss. (a shortened version is Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).

1. 'to strive, to aspire'

Selk. Taz (OSYa 2: 100) *antalpi-*, *antalimpi-* 'to strive, to aspire to; стремиться', *antaltj-* 'to compete; соревноваться, соперничать', *antjtti-* 'to argue; спорить'.

Etym.: < Turk., cf. esp. Kzk. *antala-* 'иметь сильное желание', Kirg. *antala-* 'стремиться'.

The forms in other Turk. languages (see ÈSTYa I: 653 ff.) reflect (I) *imtil-*, *umtul-*, *umtil-*, *imtir-*; (II) *inta-*, *intil-*, *intik-*, *intir-*; (III) *amat-*, *antala-*; the meanings are 'to strive, to aspire, to rush forward, to attack' etc.

The Selk. forms can be best accounted for from a non-attested reflex in one of the Siberian Tatar dialects (e.g. in Baraba), which could be phonetically especially similar to the Kzk. and Kirg. reflexes – *antala-* or *antal-*. The direct borrowing from Kzk. into Selk. hardly seems likely. The geographic considerations prevent us from looking for the source of Selk. forms in Chuv. *āntāl-* 'to strive', and the phonetic ones make the borrowing from Alt. *amat-* id. equally improbable. The phonetic relationship between the Turk. forms cited above is not completely clear; one may think of the primary verbal root **umt-*, with the following developments: (I): **umt-* > **imt-*; (II): **umt-* > **imt-* > **int-*; (III): **umt-* > **imt-* > **imt-* ~ **int-* > **amt-* ~ **ant-* > **amat-* ~ **ant-*.

The suffixes *-pi-*, *-mpi-* (durative) and *-tj-* (transitive) are typical of Selkup and often occur with borrowed verbal stems. The verb *antjtti-* (with suffixal *-tti-*) may be derived from Turk. **anta-*

(non-attested, but cf. Kzk. Kirg. *inta* 'стремление, инициатива, усердие') or result from analogical derivational processes in Selk. (*antalpi-*, *antalimpi-* vs. *antjtti-*, like *kekcalpi-*, *kekcalimpi-* 'to be tortured, to undergo sufferings' vs. *kekjtti-* 'to suffer').

The verbs in question occur in Taz Selkup relatively rarely, therefore the absence of data from other Selk. dialects (the lexical stock of which has not been sufficiently studied) does not prove that the Turk. word has been actually borrowed only into one dialect. Anyhow, the borrowing could have occurred only before the 17th century (when the ancestors of Taz Selkups lost contacts with their Turkic neighbours and with speakers of Southern Selkup).

2. 'to lie (down)'

Selk. Taz (Mat.) *č'atj-mpi-*, *č'ātj-mpi-* 'to lie'. Unlike Selk. Taz *ippi-* id., this word is used only when speaking of persons, and is not applied to inanimate objects. Parallels from other Selk. dialects or other Sam. languages remain unknown, but in principle the word may go back to Selk. **t'atə-* (or even to Sam. **jətə-*).

Etym.: < Turk. **jat-* 'to lie (down)' (VEWT 192; Clauson 884; ÈSTYa IV: 156ff.); cf. Khak. Shor *čat-*, Chul. *čat-* (~ *jat-*), Alt. Brb. *jat-* id.

Nothing definite can be said about the chronology of borrowing. As long as the Turk. word is genuine, it is possible to think of **jat-* > Sam. **jət-* (cf. Turk. **tar+* [e.g. Ott. *tara-*, Tuv. *dīra-* 'to comb', Yak. *tarān-* = Dolg. *tarban-* (< **targan-*) 'to comb one's hair', Old Turk. *targak* = Yak. *tarāx* 'comb'] > Sam. **tər* 'hair', see Róna-Tas UL 744, Stachowski GJV 55, § 5.10e) or > Selk. **t'at-* (where *t' < *j*). The restricted dialectal occurrence of the Selk. word may be, however, treated as an indication of a later borrowing from one of the adjacent Turk. dialects (e.g. from Chul. *čat-* ~ *jat-*). The addition of *-j-* before the durative suffix *-mpi-* (typical formative of stative verbs), as well as the positional lengthening of *a*, are probably Selk. developments.

3. 'fat'

Sam. (Janhunen SW 50) **jür* 'fat (n.)': Nen. (L) T *jur*², F *jur* / En. (KP No. 364) F *d'u*² (*d'ur-*) / Ngan. (C) *jir*, (Mat.) *d'ir* / Selk. (CL 24) OO *yyr*, Tschl. K NP Jel. B Tas Kar. *yr*, MO *ör*, N *yr*, *ür*, *ör* 'Fett, besonders von Fischen', Taz (OSYa 2: 192) *ür* / Kam. (D) *t'ur*, *d'ur* / Mator K (Pallas, see Helimski JSFOu 81: No. 658) *dzschur* 'жир топленный', M (Sp.) *джюръ* 'сало'.

Etym.: < Turk. **ür* (**ür*) > **üz* (**üz*) 'fat': Old Turk. *öz* ~ *üz* (DTS 395, 629) ~ *üz* (Clauson 278f.), Alt. Tel. Tuv. Sag. Koyb. (Radl.) *üs* 'geschmolzenes Fett, Talg, Butter'. We are faced with certain problems in distinguishing the Old Turk. attestations of this word from those of **öz* (Clauson 278) 'center, middle; valley; the interior, pith, pulp, marrow; spirit; self; life' (< **ör*' > Chuv. *var* '1.center; 2.pith, heartwood') = MKašg. *öz* 'heartwood', Yak. *üös* '1.center; 2.pith, heartwood', Dolg. *üös* 'Mitte' (Stachowski DW 252), Trkm. *ōδ* 'selbst', Khal. *īez* id.; cf. also Old Yak. **ōzäg* > Modern Yak. *ōhüō* 'ein Balken im Holzgerüst der Jurte' (Stachowski GJV 65, § 8.5); **jözäk* (< **ōzäk*) > Brb. *jüzök* 'heartwood' (Tekin 183). Cf. also Gombocz (KSz 13: 4) Khak. Tat. *üzäk* 'das innere, [...] der bauchteil des felles [...] ~ Mong. *ürü* 'l'intérieur; das innere oder inwendige einer sache'. — From the semantic viewpoint the connection between **üz* (**üz*) and **öz* is very likely. Cf. the semantic duality 'pulp, insides' ~ 'fat' in Lat. *pinguis* '1.fat; 2.flesh (soft parts of body, as distinct from bones and gristles)' and the wide-spread derivational pattern 'to live; life' → 'fat', as in Slav. **ži-tb* 'to live' vs. **ži-rb* 'fat'.*)

*) It seems that an almost exact analogy — with the same phonetic problem — is provided by the word pair: Turk. **ör* vs. **üz* 'oberer Teil' (cf. **örü* > Yak. *ürüt* 'Oberfläche', **üzük* > Brb. *üzük* 'Dach', see Stachowski FO 30: 198f.). In view of Mo. *ürgä* 'tente; zelt' which Z. Gombocz (KSz 13: 5, No. 7) connected with Brb. Kirg. *üzük*, it seems to be possible to trace the stem back to **ür* or even **ür*, and this could then be for its part a phonetic variant of **ör* < **ör*'. If one day a proof for the original identity of **ör* and **üz* is found, a reinterpretation of Yak. *ürüt* 'Oberfläche', *ürdük* 'hoch', *ürdä* 'sich erheben; hoch werden' (Stachowski FO 30: 198) according to E. Helimski's (ST 1986/2: 40-50) rules will probably be practicable (in this case, the likely proto-form for *ürüt* should be **ört* [< **ör* 't'] rather than **örü*).

The suggested etymology raises doubts mainly from the "Wörter und Sachen" viewpoint: the borrowing of the word for 'fat' seems pointless, inasmuch as this substance was obviously well known and widely used long before the contacts between Samoyeds and Turks started. Phonetically, however, the comparison creates little or no problems:

(a) For Sam. **r* ~ Turk. **r*' (> *z*) see e.g. Helimski JSFOu 83: 262-263 (where the etymology under consideration is cursorily mentioned).

(b) There are two possibilities to account for the presence of **j*- in Sam.:

— In a recently published paper, T. Tekin demonstrated the sporadic appearance of a pre-vocalic prothetic **j*- in Turk. (Tekin TDA 4: 51-66). One of his examples is of direct relevance, because the *j*-prothesis appears in a possibly distantly related word: Brb. *jüzök* 'heartwood (ağaç özü)' < **özäk* (ibid. 63, No. 23); the latter is attested with the meanings 'pulp; insides', see ESTYa I: 509, and is derived from **öz*. Thus, the borrowing from a Turk. source with a prothetic **j*- (**jör*) may be assumed, too.

— There are only very few stems with an initial **ü*- or **ö*- reconstructable for Proto-Sam., and these vowels occur in an open syllable only (**ü*- 'to drag', **ükâl*- id., **ücä* 'small', **ö* or **öä* 'door'; see Janhunen SW 29-31; for the prothetic *j*- in Sam. see also Joki LSS 387). We may therefore assume a phonetic rule:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \text{ö} \\ \text{ü} \end{Bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{jü} / \# _ \begin{Bmatrix} \text{C\#} \\ \text{CC} \end{Bmatrix}$$

which accounts for Turk. **ür*' (**ür*', ? **ör*') > Early Sam. **ür* > Sam. **jür*.

4. 'as, like'

Selk. Taz (Mat.) *kēpi*, *kēpi* 'as big as, like (Postp.)', *ukkir kēpi* 'equal (in size)' (*ukkir* 'one').

Etym.: < **kēpi* *‘its form’ (> Ott. *gibi* ‘as, like’) < **kāpi* < **kāp* > Yak. *kiäp* ‘Form, Gestalt’ = Trkm. *gāp* ‘Puppe in Form eines Kalbes oder Kamelfohlens, die – falls das Kalb oder das Kamelfohlen verendet ist – beim Melken an die Kuh bzw. die Kamelein gestellt wird’ (Stachowski GJV 70, § 10.3).

While *kēpi*, *kēpi* is presently used only as a postposition, the construction *ukkiṛ kēpi* (where the word is supplied with an adjectival suffix and preceded by a numeral) permits to view it historically as a noun (‘size, form’), cf. similar constructions *ukkiṛ mōnti* ‘equal (in quantity), simultaneous’ (← *mōnti* ‘measure’), *ukkiṛ č’ari* ‘equally thick’ (← *č’ari* ‘thickness’).

Selk. *ē* may reflect the long vowel in the Turk. source or be the result of internal development (lengthening of short vowels in open syllables before a voiceless consonant, cf. No. 11, *ūpil* < Turk. *uvil*). The borrowing most certainly occurred during the separate existence of the Selk. language (as long as Sam. **k-* > Selk. **š-* before a front vowel), but a more exact dating of it hardly seems possible.

It is worth mentioning that Turk. **kēp* > Hung. *kép* ‘picture, portrait, appearance’, with its derivative *képpen* (~ *képp*) being used as a postposition (‘like, as, in the way of’) and then as a case formative of the “formalis” case: *csodaképpen* ‘in a wonderful way’, *példaképp* ‘for example’, etc. (EWUng. 730-733).

The similarity between PUr. **ki(t)* ‘shadow; form’ (Helimski DVSyAp 95-97) and Turk. **kāp* ‘form’ (Stachowski GJV 70, § 10.3) deserves being mentioned; the possibility of the two forms being connected requires, however, further research.

5. ‘sagging ice’

Selk. Taz (Mat.) *qoqqa* ‘sagging ice on river or lake (separated with a hollow from the water surface)’, *qoqqira* ‘sagging ice-crust (with snow melted under it)’. The earlier forms of these words may be reconstructed as Selk. **qoṇqa*, **qoṇqara* (cf. Sam. **poṇqa* ‘fishing net’ > Selk. **poṇqā* > Taz *poqqi* etc.).

Etym.: ~ Yak. (Slepcev) *xōṇku*, *xōṇkura* ‘ice with no water under it; лед, из-под которого ушла вода’.

Both Selk. and Yak. words may be qualified as descriptive. For Yakut cf. Kažužynski RO 42/1: 33 (“от звукоподражательного корня *xoṇ* – звук от удара (стука) по предмету, имеющему пустоту; *xoṇkur* – глухой звук от падения пустого внутри металлического предмета”).

Related onomatopoetic forms are found in many neighbouring languages. Cf. e.g. Nen. T (L) O *xīṇkā* ‘graben (eine Grube in die Erde), hohl aushauen, aushöhlen’, *xīṇgana* ‘geschlossene Schele, Glöckchen’, (Ter.) *xuṇgybā* ‘долбить, выдалбливать’, *xyṇg* ‘емкость, полость, дупло’, *xyṇḡr* ‘углубление, внутренняя часть’, En. T (Mat.) *kugaxa* ‘hollow’; Ngan. (Mat.) *kūṅgūr-mā* ‘cavernous, full of pits’; Mong. (Lessing) *xonggil* ‘hollow; cave; narrow ravine, gorge; narrow dell’, *xongxu* ‘bell’, *xongxur* ‘a hollow, cavity, pit, dent, cavern; depression, gully; dented’; Evk. (TMS I: 411) *koṇki* P-T N U, *kōṅgurōk* U, *kōṇri* Uchr. ‘полость; дупло; отверстие; полый, пустой’ (see also TMS I: 410f., 433, 450f. for numerous other forms from Tung.).

Filippova Diss. 92-94 tentatively treats Selk. Taz *kuṇkīra* ‘погремущка’, obviously belonging to the same set of descriptive forms, as a borrowing from Turk. (cf. also Selk. Taz *qoṇkīr* ‘hollow of a tree’ in comparison with Mong. *xongxur*). See also Joki LSS 194f.

Anyhow, the most exact terminological parallelism between Selk. *qoqqa*, *qoqqira* and Yak. *xōṇku*, *xōṇkura* permits to single these forms out of the whole descriptive lexical set. Perhaps an influence of Yak. upon Selk. (or vice versa) cannot be excluded; it is more probable, however, that the exactness of the parallel is due to the presence of the same meaning (‘sagging ice’) in Evk. *koṇki*, *kōṅgurōk* or in a related Evk. form – even if this terminological meaning remained unattested in TMS.

6. ‘thigh’

Northern Sam. **monsokki* ~ **monsoṇki* ‘thigh’: Nen. T (L) O *mōncāṇk* ‘oberer Teil des Oberschenkels (wenigstens an der Außenseite), Hüfte’, (Ter.) *монзаṇg* ‘ягодица; холка’ F (L) Nj. *mōnsōk* ‘Hüfte’, (Porova) *monšo•k* ‘ягодица’ / En. T (Mat.)

mod'uki ~ mod'ugi 'thigh, croup', (KP 122) *mod'uggi* 'Lende des Wildrentiers' / Ngan. (Mat.) *munsuəḁə* 'thigh'. It is very probable that Ngan. (Mikola NyK 72: 83) *mund'ukə*, (Mat.) *mund'ukəə* 'lame' also belongs here and goes back directly to **monsokki(-)* (the innate dislocation of thigh-bone being the typical cause of lameness among the Arctic peoples).

Etym.: < (or ~) Turk. **mončak* (possibly from original **mončok*), preserved only (?) as Tat. *munčak* 'thigh'.

The reconstruction of **mončak* 'thigh' finds an exact phonetic analogy in Tat. dial. *munčak* 'necklace' < Volga-Kipch. **mončak* (Berta LTD 181). Pay attention also to Ott. (Radl.) *mīngik* 'Pfote', which may go back to **mončik ~ *mončuk*, a formation parallel to **mončak* or an alternative outcome of **mončok* (> **mončak ~ *mončuk ~ *mončik*). The origin and morphological structure of **mončolak* remain unclear; while either **-olak* or **-čolak* may be suffixal, the initial segment cannot be identified with any Common Turk. stem. In particular, the derivation from **maŋ* 'step', **maŋ-* 'to walk' (ATG 346b; Clauson 767a) is not likely, because:

(a) The original **a* is expected to result in Tat. *o* rather than in *u*;

(b) It would then be necessary to reconstruct the proto-form with **-ŋč-*, and this cluster could hardly develop into Tat. *-nč-*. Cf. **aŋ-čī* > Tat. (Lit.) *aučī* 'hunter' ~ (Sib.) *aŋci* (Tumaševa 25); cf. also Tat. (Lit.) *iŋsā* 'shoulder' < **äŋsā* (see **änil* id., Stachowski GJV 108, § 30.3).

The comparison of Tat. *munčak* with Ott. *pača* (< Pers. *pājča*) 'der untere Teil des Beines oder der Pfote' (VEWT 377a, with a question mark) is phonetically unacceptable.

The vocalism of the Northern Sam. forms supports the reconstruction of Turk. **o* in the first, eventually also in the second syllable. The phonetic shape of the medial clusters favours the idea of borrowing from Turk. into Sam.: while the substitution of Sam. **-ns-* for Turk. **-nč-* looks quite normal (cf. Ural. **-ñč-* > Sam. **-ns-*), Sam. **-ns-* could be expected to be preserved in Turk. (if the direction of borrowing were the opposite). Still, it cannot be excluded that the historical relationships between Sam. and Turk. forms were more complicated.

In Ngan. *munsuəḁə* the original **-k(ki)* has been replaced by the suffix *-(ə)ḁə* – exactly as in *sūsüəḁə* 'finger joint' < Old Yak. **süsüök*, see No. 8.

7. 'snow-storm'

Selk. Taz (Irikov) *pusqa* 'snow-storm; буря, вьюга, метель, пуря', (Mat.) *pusqattimpa* 'the wind is driving the snow', *pusqatɕlpa* 'a snow-storm arose'.

Etym.: < Turk. **buskak* or **buskan*, cf. Alt. *buskan* 'пуря' (OyrRS 36), Tuv. *biskan* 'мелкий снег' (TuvRS 131), Tel. *piskak* 'Reif; Schneeflocke' (Radl.), Shor *puskak* 'Reif' (Radl.). These forms are probably derived from **bus* 'mist, fog, vapour' (ĖSTYa II: 277f.; occasionally also with the meanings 'haze', 'gloom', 'overcast weather', 'dew', 'hoar-frost') and possibly from **bis* (+ dimin. suffix *-kan*); for the latter stem (a variant of **bus* ?) cf. also Tofa *bī's* (Rassadin 167) 'fresh-fallen snow; снег-пороша' (as distinct from Tofa *bus* 'mist above open water in winter; туман над полыней в зимнее время'), Tat. *bəs* 'hoar-frost'. Additionally, one must take into consideration the possibilities of semantic (and partly phonetic) contamination < **bīr* (~ **bur*) 'dust, smoke, vapour' (ĖSTYa II: 306f.; Stachowski GJV 123), **bur-* 'to whirl' (ĖSTYa II: 264-267), and possibly also < Mong. **boroyan* 'snow-storm' (borrowed into many Turk. languages) and from Russ. (< Finn.) *nyrpa* id. An example of such contamination may be Kirg. (Radl.) *burkak* 'ein kleines Schneewehen'.

8. 'joint'

En. T (Mat.) *śušuoḁo* 'finger joint, knuckle', *soborego śušuoḁo* 'fist knuckle' (*soborego* 'five') / Ngan. (KS) *śušuoḁody* 'Finger, Zehengelenk', *śušūda* 'Finger', (Katzschmann No. 24384) *ḁüḁō-za-gata-tu* 'finger (El.Sg., 3.Sg.)', (Mat.) *sūsüəḁə* 'finger joint, (figuratively) finger'.

Etym.: < Old Yak. **süsüök* (> Modern Yak. *sühüöx*, Dolg. *hühüök* 'Gelenk') < Turk. **jüzgäk* or (?) **jüşgäk* (Stachowski

GJV 66, § 8.6c; Stachowski DW 115). Another possible source is a non-attested Old Yak. *süsüö (< 3.Sg. *süsüöyā < *süsüök, on -VYk vs. -VY in Yak. see also Stachowski JSFOu 85: 186, § 14e).

The Yak. word must have been originally borrowed into Ngan., with a substitution of the nominal stem-formative suffix -δə in place of *-k (as in several other Ngan. words; cf. Ngan. *munsuəδə* 'thigh' ~ Turk. **mončVk*, No. 6) and with semantic specialization ('joint' → 'finger joint'). The En. word (attested only in the Tundra dialect, closely affiliated to Ngan., but not in En. F) is probably a Ngan. loan. The reconstruction of a common NSam. source for En. *śusuoδo* and Ngan. *śüsüəδə* is hardly possible.

9. 'power, craft'

Selk. Taz (OSYa 2: 175-176) *šay* 'strength, power; craft (of a shaman)', cf. also *šankiṭil* 'powerless', *šansimil* 'powerful, mighty'.

Etym.: < NE Turk., cf. Kacha (D) *šay* 'Kraft' (> kam. (D) *šay* 'Kraft, Stärke', Joki LSS 280), (Radl.) Shor, Kacha, Kaz. *šak* 'Zeit; Kraft', Sag. Koib. *sā* id., Oir. Leb. Tar. *čak* 'Kraft, Tätigkeit'. In other Turk. languages (as well as in Mong.) *čak usually means 'time'. For the Turk. reconstruction see VEW 95, Stachowski UAJb.NF 10: 103, No. 6 and Stachowski GJV 47, § 4.11c.

Concerning Selk. -η in place of Turk. -k (-q, -γ) see No. 10.

The borrowing must have occurred after the introduction of š into the phonological system of Selkup (Selk. š usually from Sam. *k before a front vowel) and the transition *č > š in a number of NE Turk. idioms (Turk. *č would have been reflected as Selk. *č or *t', resp. as Selk. Taz t or č), but certainly before the ancestors of Taz Selkups lost contact with their former Turkic neighbours (that is, before their northward migration in the 17th century). The borrowing of the same word into Kamassian must have occurred independently (see in this connection Joki LSS 36-37).

The semantic evolution of the word was as follows: 'time' > 'the right/convenient time or moment' > 'maturity' > 'strength, power' (all the meanings are known from the Ott. lexicology).

10. 'mountain (wooded)'

The following important comparison, suggested by T. Márk in 1975-1976 (Márk NéNy 19-20: 252), is not mentioned in later works, including the most comprehensive list of Turk. loans in Selk. (Filippova JSFOu 85: 41-70).

Selk. *tāη: (CL 108) OO *tang*, Tsch. *taa* 'Berg', MO *tang* 'hoher Berg', N *taa* (Gen.Sg. *ta^cgat*) 'Berg', B Tas Kar. *taang* 'Berg-rücken, хребет', (Pápai, after Hajdú NyK 54: 173) *tak* 'mountain', Taz (Helimski LFSB 185) *tāη* or *tāη* ~ *tāk* ~ *tā* 'wooded ridge of hills, taiga on a high place'.

Etym.: < Turk. *tāg 'mountain, esp. wooded mountain'.

The word seems to be unknown to other Sam. languages. Selk. *η (~ -k ~ -Ø) may go back to a velar stop, as in Vx1Sg. subj. conj. -η ~ -k < *-k (Helimski DVSYaP 80), in *kaη* ~ *kak* 'as' < Russ. *kak* id. (Castrén Gr. 605) or in KeM *kūññāη* 'kurzer Pelz aus Rentierfell', KeO *kūññāη* id. from Turk. *kūjnāk*, *kūñnāk* (= Ott. *gömläk*), etc. 'shirt' (Joki LSS 215). The semantic development in Northern Selkup ('wooded mountain' > 'taiga on a high place') is related to the natural conditions of the lowlands in the Taz river basin.

11. 'single, unmarried'

Selk. *ūpəl: (CL) N *úubəl* 'frei und ledig', B Tas *uubel* 'id.; unverheiratet, einfach (wenn man allein reist, ohne Haus und Familie)', Tas Kar. *úubel-kum* 'unverheirateter Mann', N *úbêl* 'reitend (вепхом)', K *uubal*, *uubêl* id., (Mat.) Taz *ūpīl* 'free, single, living alone', *ūpīl qum* 'bachelor'.

Etym.: < Turk., cf. esp. Brb. (Dm. 192) *uvīl* 'son; fellow, unmarried young man' < *ogīl 'son; fellow' (with Turk. *o > Brb. u, Turk. *-g- > *-γ- > Brb. -v-).

The substitutions u > ū (in an open syllable before a non-resonant), v > p are characteristic of (relatively recent) loanwords in Selkup, cf. e.g. Selk. Taz *rūšīl* 'Russian (adj.)', *ruš* 'Russian (n.)' < Ostyak *rūš*, *ruš*; Selk. Taz *šipīñč'a* 'pig, swine' < Russ. *свинья* (OSYa 1: 13; DEWOS 1288-1289).

The Siberian (Baraba) Tatar word must have been borrowed into Selkup in its special meaning 'fellow, unmarried young man' (> 'bachelor'). This assumption is supported by the fact that the Turk. word has the meaning 'son' only if it has a possessive suffix, i.e. for instance *uvli* (3.Sg.), while Selk. **ūpəl* obviously reflects the non-possessive form of the word. The further semantic development in Selkup (> 'riding') may look bewildering, but it has an absolutely exact parallel in the neighbouring Ostyak language: Ostyak J *wāləy* 'ledig, unverheiratet' ~ *wālyān* 'reitend, rittlings, верхом', cf. also DN *welə* 'ledig, unverheiratet' ~ *welə-tāw* 'Reitpferd' (*tāw* 'Pferd'), see DEWOS 1587-1588. The likely semantic development was the following one: 'single, free' > 'travelling/running freely (i.e. without a sledge)' > [1] 'riding', [2] 'saddle horse'.

References

- ATG = Gabain, A. von: *Alttürkische Grammatik*, Wiesbaden 1974.
 Berta LTD = Berta, Á.: *Lautgeschichte der tatarischen Dialekte*, Szeged 1989.
 C = Castrén, M. A.: *Wörterverzeichnisse aus den samojedischen Sprachen*, St. Petersburg 1855.
 Castrén Gr. = Castrén, M. A.: *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*, St. Petersburg 1854.
 CIFU-5 = *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*, Turku.
 CL = Castrén, M. A. / Lehtisalo, T.: *Samojedische Sprachmaterialien* (= MSFOu 122), Helsinki 1960.
 Clauson = Clauson, Sir G.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford 1972.
 D = Donner, K.: *Kamassisches Wörterbuch*, bearb. und hrsg. von A. J. Joki, Helsinki 1944.
 DEWOS = Steinitz, W.: *Dialektologisches und etymologisches Wörterbuch der ostjakischen Sprache*, Lfg. 1-15, Berlin 1977-1993.
 Dm. = Дмитриева, Л. В.: *Язык барабинских татар (Материалы и исследования)*, Ленинград 1981.
 DTS = Наделяев, В. М. et al. (red.): *Древнетюркский словарь*, Ленинград 1969.

- ĖSTYa = Севортян, Э. В.: *Этимологический словарь тюркских языков*, vol. I-, Москва 1974-.
 EWUng = Benkő, L. (ed.): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*, Lfg. 1-, Budapest 1992-.
 Filippova Diss. = Филиппова, Т. М.: *Тюркские заимствования в селькупском языке*. Дисс. [...] канд. филол. наук (Рукопись), Новосибирск 1991.
 FO = *Folia Orientalia*, Kraków.
 Helimski DVSJaP = Хелимский, Е. А.: *Древнейшие венгерско-самодийские языковые параллели*, Москва 1982.
 Helimski LFSB = Helimski, E.: *The Language of the First Selkup Books*, Szeged 1983.
 Irikov = Ириков, С. И.: *Словарь селькупско-русский и русско-селькупский*, Ленинград 1988.
 Janhunen SW = Janhunen, J.: *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemein-samojedische Etymologien*, Helsinki 1977.
 Joki LSS = Joki, A. J.: *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen* (= MSFOu 103), Helsinki 1952.
 JSFOu = *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, Helsinki.
 Katzschmann = Katzschmann, M.: *Nganasanisches Wörterverzeichnis*, 1990 (Privatausgabe).
 KP = Katzschmann, M. / Pusztay, J.: *Jenissej-Samojedisches (Enzisches) Wörterverzeichnis*, Hamburg 1978.
 KS = Kortt, I. R. / Simčenko, Yu. B.: *Wörterverzeichnis der nganasanischen Sprache*, vol. I, Berlin 1985.
 KSz = *Keleti Szemle*, Budapest.
 L = Lehtisalo, T.: *Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch*, Helsinki 1956.
 Lessing = Lessing, F. D. (ed.): *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, Los Angeles 1960.
 Mat. = Field materials from contemporary Samoyedic languages (Selkup, Nenets, Enets, Nganasan) collected and/or processed by E. Helimski.
 MSFOu = *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, Helsinki.
 NéNy = *Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány*, Szeged.
 NyK = *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, Budapest.
 OSYa = Кузнецова, А. И. и др.: *Очерки по селькупскому языку: Та-зовский диалект*, ч. 1-2, Москва 1980, 1993.
 OyrRS = Баскаков, Н. А. / Тоцакова-Грекул, Т. М.: *Ойротско-русский словарь*, Москва 1947.
 Porova = Попова, Я. Н.: *Ненецко-русский словарь: Лесное наречие*, Szeged 1978.

- Radl. = Радлов, В. В.: *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий*, vol. I-IV, Санкт-Петербург 1893-1911.
- Rassadin = Рассадин, В. И.: *Фонетика и лексика тофаларского языка*, Улан-Удэ 1971.
- RO = *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, Warszawa.
- Róna-Tas UL = Róna-Tas, A.: *Turkic Influence on the Uralic Languages*. — Sinor, D. (ed.): *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences*, Leiden et al. 1988: 742-780.
- Slepcev = Слепцов, П. А. (red.): *Якутско-русский словарь*, Москва 1972.
- Sp. = Spasskij, G. I.: cited after Potapov JSFOu 59: 57-103 and Helimski JSFOu 81: 104-106.
- ST = *Советская тюркология*, Баку.
- Stachowski DW = Stachowski, M.: *Dolganischer Wortschatz*, Kraków 1993.
- Stachowski GJV = Stachowski, M.: *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków 1993.
- TDA = *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, Ankara.
- Tekin = Tekin, T.: *Türk dillerinde birincil uzun ünlüler* (= TDA Dizisi 13), Ankara 1995.
- Ter. = Терещенко, Н. М.: *Ненецко-русский словарь*, Москва 1965.
- Terent'ev PEËISN = Терентьев, В. А.: *Древнейшие заимствования из тюркских языков в самодийские. — Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории самодийских народов: Тезисы [...] по лингвистике*, Омск 1983: 67-72.
- TMS = Цинциус, В. И. et al.: *Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков*, vol. I-II, Ленинград 1975, 1977.
- Tumaševa = Тумашева, Д. Г.: *Словарь диалектов сибирских татар*, Казань 1992.
- TuvRS = Тенишев, Э. Р. (red.): *Тувинско-русский словарь*, Москва 1968.
- UAJb.NF = *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge*, Wiesbaden.
- VEWT = Räsänen, M.: *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Helsinki 1969.

IZABELA JARUZELSKA

'AMASYAH — PRÊTRE DE BÉTHEL — FONCTIONNAIRE ROYAL (ESSAI SOCIO-ÉCONOMIQUE PRÉLIMINAIRE)

Amos s'adresse à plusieurs reprises aux officiers royaux habitant la montagne de Samarie (3, 9-11. 12b-15; 4, 1-3; 6, 1-14), et cela dans le contexte d'une violente critique. Le prophète condamne leur mode de vie excessif¹. Cependant dans son blâme, il ne mentionne pas quels étaient leurs moyens de subsistance? Vivaient-ils des propriétés foncières privées? Recevaient-ils des lots de terre en récompense de leurs services (fiefs)? En revanche, le lecteur apprend que le gain malhonnête (3, 11) et l'oppression des gens dépourvus (4, 1) allait de pair avec ce grand luxe.

Bien qu'il nous faille chercher l'information au sujet de ces propriétés dans d'autres textes de la Bible, et dans des sources extra-bibliques, Amos nous révèle un phénomène capital, à savoir le lien étroit existant entre la détention du pouvoir et la possibilité d'en tirer un revenu par l'extorsion. C'est ainsi qu'une charge officielle pouvait servir de moyen d'acquisition de biens supplémentaires. Le phénomène n'a rien d'étonnant en soi. Selon l'opinion commune, il semble être caractéristique autant du monde antique que de la société moderne. Cette opinion se fait aussi sentir dans l'exégèse. Certains auteurs ont tendance, dès qu'il est question dans les textes bibliques de transgressions contre le droit de propriété ou d'autres abus semblables, à les imputer aux "dirigeants" ou à la "classe dirigeante"².

Cependant, Amos lui-même n'associe pas toujours le pouvoir à la possibilité d'acquisition de biens supplémentaires. Il semble qu'Amasyah, le prêtre de Béthel, pourrait servir d'exemple en tant que fonctionnaire royal exerçant son autorité sans nécessairement en tirer un supplémentaire profit car Amos annonce le malheur à 'Amasyah pour d'autres raisons que le gain malhonnête (cf. *infra*). La sensibilité d'Amos, en ce qui concerne la "justice sociale", paraît justifier ce point de vue: s'il avait vu que le prêtre de Béthel abusait de son poste pour s'enrichir, il l'en aurait certainement accusé comme il l'a fait dans le cas des habitants de la montagne de Samarie.

Les détails concernant, d'une part, les fonctionnaires royaux vivant dans la capitale et, d'autre part, le prêtre de Béthel, débouchent sur le problème de la différenciation socio-économique au sein d'une collectivité définie communément par le terme d'"officiers royaux". En vue de prendre position face à cette question, il est nécessaire de compléter nos données sur

* Les recherches que j'ai menées et qui m'ont conduit à la publication de cette étude ont été soutenues par la „Fundatio Lanckoroński” à laquelle je dois toute ma gratitude.

Cette étude a, en outre, bénéficié des remarques précieuses de M. André Lemaire, Directeur d'études à l'EPHE, „Sciences historiques et philologiques”, à Paris, auquel va ma plus vive reconnaissance. Je reste, cependant, seule responsable des hypothèses avancées.

Je tiens également à exprimer tous mes remerciements à l'équipe d'accueil universitaire de l'EPHE „Langues, textes et histoire du monde ouest-sémitique ancien”, ainsi qu'aux membres de l'Unité de Recherche, d'Etudes Sémitiques (URA 1062) associée au CNRS, et enfin à la bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Etudes Sémitiques du Collège de France, pour leur chaleureuse hospitalité et tous leurs conseils.

¹ Le mot "économique" met en relief cet aspect de la différenciation sociale qui est fondé sur les différences des rapports de propriété à l'égard des sources d'acquisition des moyens de subsistance. Cette remarque semble nécessaire étant donné qu'il y a plusieurs types de différences sociales qui peuvent être considérés, p. ex. différences d'âge, de sexe, de race, etc...

² J'ai consacré à ce problème mon article précédent dans "Rocznik Orientalistyczny" 1994, sous presse.

³ Les exemples de ce type d'interprétation dans mon article: "Folia Orientalia" 30 1994, sous presse; cf. l'opinion semblable: J. M. Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*, London 1986, p. 312: "In short, Amos's oracles presuppose a social and legal situation in which even the governmental and judicial officials, those allegedly committed to preserving justice, were the very ones contributing to what the prophet considered an ungodly social imbalance"; Y. Aharoni, *Ostraca de Samarie, dans: Eretz Israel in the Biblical Period*, Jerusalem, 1987, p. 277-284, (Hébr.), p. 281.