Remarks on the etymology of Hung. hajdú ‘herdsman’ and Tkc. haydamak ‘brigand’
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0. Numerous attempts have been made at explaining the origin of the Hungarian word hajdú. In this paper another attempt is made to add – where it is possible – new data to its etymology.

The origin of the discussed word is quite a complex and extraordinary case. A few years ago, besides the Hungarian etymology, another suggestion was proposed by M. Ivanics, who showed us a possibility of deriving hajdú from Turkic, namely the Kipchak-Turkic *haydəq. Consequently, in our work we would like to compare these two suggestions. We will also consider how such words as Pol., SCR., Hung., &c. hajdik, Ott. haydut – haydul, Pol., Ukr., &c. hajdamaka cor-

---

2 In our paper we would like to concentrate first and foremost on the data presented in Ivanics 1995, since it is the newest article on the word hajdú and, besides, it is the only work dealing with the possible KTkc. origin.
relate with the Hungarian word and whether it is possible to derive these words from *hajdú*.

1. In all major etymological dictionaries of Hungarian (namely: SzófSz, TESz and EWU) the word in question is considered to be a derivate from the Hungarian verb *hajt* ‘to drive, to drive (sth, sb) away (Germ. *treiben*)’, i.e. from the present participle form *hajtó* ‘driving, driving (sth, sb) away; driver (Germ. *Treiber*)’, which, according to the opinion of Hungarian etymologists, yielded *hajdú*, after voicing the *-t-* to *-d-* and the change of the final *-ó* [-ō] to *-ú* [-ū].

The authors of the etymological dictionaries are, however, doubtful about the possibility of the *-jt-* > *-jd-* change, since only a few examples are to be found in Hungarian to document such a consonant voicing.

1.1. A number of authors tried to point out similar *jt* > *jd* shifts in other languages (De Bartolomeis, Sulán) to confirm the plausibility of the same phonetic change in Hungarian. With regard to the *-jt-* > *-jd-* voicing in Hungarian, however, in our opinion these arguments fail to be conclusive, since the evidence to corroborate, or to refute, such a consonant shift should be traced within Hungarian, or in sources which would ensure us that they reflect the real phonetic characteristics of the Hungarian word. From a purely phonetic point of view a voicing process of an unvoiced consonant surrounded by a vowel and a voiced consonant is highly possible. Consequently, concerning the *-jt-* > *-jd-* change, in Kiss/Pusztai one can read as follows: “[…] Előreható részleges hasonulás: R.: *hajtó* > *hajdú*, […] a zöngéleten *t* a *j* hatására zöngéstül *d*-vé.”

The same process can be observed in Hung. *hajtan* > *hajdan* ‘erewhile’; *majt* > *majd* ‘later (on), some time’ (see e.g. Kiss/Pusztai ibid.), cf. the dialectal forms of *majd* ‘schon, bald, später’: *májD* ~ *májt* ~ *majtég* (Gálffy/Márton 312; also Szinnyei 1386: *majt* id. (Transilvania),

3 In Kiss/Pusztai 343 one can read that the final diphthong *-ou* could also yield *-ü*. Among the enumerated examples also *hajdú* figures, but since a form *hajdó* is also attested, it is inferred that in the case of *hajdú* the final *-ou* became monophthongized first into *-ó* and then into *-ú*. This is also to be confirmed by another example *lábou* (1267: *Aramlabou*) > *lábo* (1416: *Sarlabo*) > *lábú* (*-ú* adj. for *láb* ‘foot’, see MNyT 174). The final *-ó* > *-ü* change seems to be corroborated by other Hungarian examples, cf. *aszó* > *aszú* ‘muscatel’; *háboró* > *háború* ‘war’ &c. (see TESz II 24). Also orthographical evidence concerning *hajdú* corresponds with the presumed *-ó* > *-ú* change; in Hungarian documents: (1553) *hajdótáncot* ‘acc. of *hajdó* -dance’ (TESz II 23), in sources written in German: e.g. *Hayto*, *Heydo* (Ivanics 396), or in the dictionary of Oriental languages compiled by F. Meninski, where one can read as follows: “*hajdūd, hajdü*, ex. Hung. Miles, pedestrís Hungaricus, vulg. *Haido* […]” (Meninski I 1824). The lack of a form *hajút* suggests the chronology of the phonetic changes: *hajtó* > *hajdó* > *hajdú*. The change of the final vowel is highly possible, also in the light of the coexistence of forms *hajtó*, *hajdó* and *hajdú* with the same meaning in written sources.

4 Transl. = Partial progressive assimilation: arch. *hajtó* > *hajdú*, […] the unvoiced *t* due to the impact of *j* is voiced to *d*. (Kiss/Pusztai 110).
Let us go on to examine the case of Ott. haydut ~ hayduq. Our goal is to prove its Hungarian provenance. Basing on philological evidence one can say that the word appears in 1559/1560 for the first time in the Ottoman Empire’s written sources (Ivanics 394) as hayduq. At the same time (already in 1559/1560) this form starts to alternate with haydut [-t] ~ haydut [-t]. For the alternation of -k ~ -t another example is to be found, namely Ott. uškod ~ uskok ‘insurgent, soldier against the Turkish rule on the Balkans in the 16th century’.

We believe that a borrowing of both the accusative and the plural form of Hung. hajdú into Ottoman is rather unlikely (i.e. nom. pl. hajdúk, acc. hajdút) – first of all in light of the fact that the Serbo-Croatian (or South-Slavic) sources do not show such an alternation of hajdut ~ hajduk. 6 Let us, however, discuss another possible explanation of the final consonant alternation:

The Ottoman historiographer Tālikizāde at the end of the 16th century explains the meaning of haydut with the following words: “[…] haydut gelüb hay tut diyince memleket alïr” (Ivanics 397) [transl. = […] the Heyducks come and while saying [shouting] hey grab [it]: they take the land]. Such a folk etymology indicates that the word was not understood morphologically. It could have happened that, after presuming that it is not a native word, the final -k was changed analogically to Arabic loans with a similar -ut ending (cf. terāfud ‘mutual help’ (Redhouse 526: /afii62765/afii62780/afii62782/afii62790), terassud ‘an observing, observation’ (Redhouse 534: /afii62765/afii62780/afii62790/afii62782), sayūd ‘clever at hunting’ (Redhouse 1203: /د afii62829/afii62832/afii62790) &c.). 7 Also, if one turns to De-

5 According to TESz II 819, majt is derived by the -i latative and the -t locative suffix from a demonstrative pronoun stem preserved also in Hung. más ‘other’, ma ‘today’ &c., thus the form with -jt- must be the older one.

6 In our opinion if hajdú was borrowed into Ottoman, it could have happened only through a Serbo-Croatian mediation, in the light of the fact that most of the loanwords of (originally) Hungarian origin entered Ottoman through the Serbo-Croatian channel and because of the fact that hajduk-movement gained ground first and foremost on the Balkans.

7 The etymological dictionary of the Turkish language seems to corroborate such a presumption (Eren 176): “[…] Macarca’dan alınmış […] Türkçe’de Sırpça hajdut, Bulgarca xajdik biçimlerinin sonundaki -k sesinin -t’ye çevrilğini görece çarşaf yarım. Osmanlı sözlükçülerin haydut’un Arapça bir altını saydıkları görüyoruz. Son olarak, Sikirić […] de haydut’un Arapça’dan geldiğini yazmıştır. […]” [transl. = […] A Hungarian loanword […] The change of the final -k of the Serbian form hajdik and Bulgarian xajdik into -t in Turkish is conspicuous. We can see that the Ottoman lexicographers thought haydutto be an Arabic loan. Recently, also Sikirić […] wrote, that hajdut came from Arabic.]. The only weak point of such an etymology is that Arabic loanwords with -uk in auslaut are to be found in Turkish as well. Bulg. hajdut, hajdutin seem to be a loan from Ottoman; hajdutin additionally received a Slavic
such an explanation can be corroborated: "hayâdîd (a[rabic]. n[omen]. pl[ural].: hayâdîd): bandit living in mountains [the origin of the word is Hungarian]]. The fact that the Ott. haydut had a plural form built up according to the Arabic grammatical rules (hayâdîd) appears to be evidence that the word could have been interpreted as an Arabic loan.\(^8\) The form uškod (beside uskok with final -d) could be built analogically to haydut since it had the meaning of a similar group of insurgents, especially since we know that "in den Dokumen-
ten werden sie [die Uskoken] oft zusammen mit den Heiducken erwähnt […]")(Ivanics 394).\(^9\)

1.3. Let us take a closer look at the duplicate forms hajdú and hajduk (nom. sg.) in Hungarian. The usage of Hung. hajdukok (from 1527) for the plural nominative form is seemingly (for Hungarian native speakers) an example of a double plural added to the stem, i.e. hajdî-k-ok. We also agree with the author, that it may give evidence that hajduk (the singular form of hajdukok) was not treated as a native word. We believe, however, that Hung. hajdúk is to be explained from SCr. hajdjuk as a Rückwanderer, i.e. Hung. hajdû ‘Viehhirt, Fußsoldat’ > SCr. hajduk ‘insurgent, soldier against the Turkish rule on the Balkans’ > Hung. hajduk id. This scheme would appear to be corroborated by the following:

First of all let us emphasize that it is highly possible that Hung. hajdi did yield SCr. hajdk, with a -k added on Serbo-Croatian ground to help its adaptation to the Serbo-Croatian declensional system. This argument seems to be highly persuasive – even more so as another example of such a change is to be found, namely Hung. fajdi ‘bastard’ > SCr. facuk id.\(^10\)

On the other hand, the fact that Hung. hajduk is a Rückwanderer corresponds with the chronology of the appearance of hajdû and hajduk and with the meaning of these words as well. Hajdû occurred for the first time around 1500-10

---

\(^8\) We could not find the word attested in Arabic.

\(^9\) The examples which were enumerated by Ivanics 394 to support a -k ~ -t alternation (ekmek ~ etmek and pamuk ~ pamut) seem to be unreliable: etmek ~ etmek is irrelevant in this case since the alternation does not effect the final position; concerning pamuq ~ pamut we are unable to find in Turkish sources the form with final -t; forms which we have found show always a -k, e.g. pamuq (Redhouse 452: pamuq, Sami 347, LO 306, LL 533, Zenker 210, Radloff IV 1211-1212), pamuq, pamaq (TS IV 638, Redhouse 453: pomuq, Sami 347, Zenker 210), pamuq (TS III 575, Redhouse 436: pomuq, Sami 347, Radloff IV 1212). The only language where a final -t appears is Hungarian where: (1631) pomuq, (1654) pamaq &c., thus the change -k > -t happened in Hungarian (cf. szamak > zamut ‘aroma, flavour’, see TESz III 78-79; also EWU 1106). In Hungarian dialects hajdút does not appear.

\(^10\) Cf. Skok 502: "[…] posudencika iz mađarskoga dobila je suglasnički završetak na -k, […] da može ući u našu deklinaciju na -o" [transl. – the Hungarian loanword got a -k consonantal ending, […] to be able to enter our -o declension].
in Hungarian written sources, as a proper name Haydo. Shortly after, in 1514, it was attested as an appellative in the meaning ‘herdsman’ (Lat. bubulcus) (MÖklSz 333) and, in the same year, due to the role of hajdús in the insurrection in 1514 it gained another meaning of ‘infantryman’. Hung. hajduk appeared later, first in 1553 in the meaning of ‘Räuber’ and additionally received (1554, cf. Ivanics 395) the meaning of ‘a South-Slavic, Moldavian &c. insurgent in the period of the Ottoman rule’ (1865), both due to the hajduk-movement on the Balkans. By contrast, hajduk does not bear the meaning of ‘Viehhirt’.  

1.4. In one of the Crimean Tatar annals from 1561 one can find hayduča ‘auf Heiducken Art’ (after Ivanics 395). Let us shortly refer to the history of hajdús to answer the question of how, from a chronological point of view, a Hungarian word appeared within such a period of time in Crimean Tatar. When the Southern territories of Hungary in the 16th century were overtaken by the rule of the Ottoman Empire, the cattle trade started to weaken and in consequence a certain number of hajdús started to deal with soldiery and plunderage. They also formed numerous arrays fighting against Turkish rule (or against the Habsburgs in the 17th century). Thus one can say that the so called hajduk-movement (cf. SCR hajduk), gained ground in the Balkans as a military and plundering movement; consequently, both the Ottoman Empire and Christian Europe took interest in hajdús. Seen in this light it is highly possible that this word could have spread (by South-Slavic mediation) within approximately thirty years (i.e. between 1527, the first attestation of Hung. hajduk, and 1561, the date when the word appears in Crimean Tatar). In addition, one can see that the word appears in the same time – concerning the non-Balkan languages – also in Italian, Polish, German, Russian and French sources: Ital. aidoni (1552) ‘herdsmen’ (De Bartolomeis 457), aidoč (~aiducco) (16th century) ‘Hungarian infantryman’ (Battisti/Alessio 101), Pol. hajduk (1564) 1. ‘soldier of the Hungarian infantry’; 2. ‘servant dressed in Hungarian manner serving on the courts of the nobility’ &c. (Wołosz 255-256), Germ. Heiduck (the 2nd half of the 16th century) ‘a member of mercenary armies in the 15-16th centuries, member of irregular troops defending Austria against the Turks’ (Kluge 289), Russ. gaøjduk” (1600) ‘member of the Polish and Hungarian light infantry’ (Barchudarov IV 8), Fr. heiduque (1605) ‘Hungarian infantryman; insurgent in the period of the Ottoman rule on the Balkans’ (DÉF 318).

When seen in this light, an Ottoman mediation is, as regards CTat. hayduča, highly possible. 12 Given the fact that after the conquer of the Crimea in 1475 by Sultan Mehmed II a strong Ottoman influence was exerted on the peninsula, it is not surprising that also hayduč occurred in Crimean Tatar. Phonetic evidence also

---

11 For other meanings, which evolved later, cf. e.g. TEsz II 23-24 and the following paragraphs of our paper.

12 As an argument against the possibility of explaining CTat. hayduča by Hung. hajdú, it could be mentioned that in the meaning of ‘auf Heiducken Art’ hajdú appears in Hung. relatively late, in 1683. One should remember, however, that the suffix -ča is quite productive in Crimean Tatar (Jankowski 124-125).
seems to corroborate our presumption: that is to say the initial \( h \)- rarely occurs in native Crimean Tatar words (with the sole exception of some subdialects of the central dialect), it appears only, by contrast, in loanwords.\(^{13}\)

1.5. From these facts one can conclude that Hung. \( \text{hajdú} \) is possibly derived from the Hungarian verb \( \text{hajt} \) and, on the other hand, that the etymon of SCr. \( \text{hajduk} \), Ott. \( \text{hayduk} \) – \( \text{haydú} \) – \( \text{haydut} \) and CTat. \( \text{haydú} \) is Hung. \( \text{hajdú} \). Still to be examined is whether a KTkc. form could have yielded Hung. \( \text{hajdú} \).

2. To make our work perspicuous, let us shortly outline the proposed Turkic etymology of the word, and consequently our reflection connected to it. As we have already mentioned above, according to Ivanics, a KTkc. \*\( \text{haydaw} \) yielded Hung. \( \text{hajdú} \), not directly however, but (most likely) through Rom. \*\( \text{haydaw} \) or \*\( \text{haydow} \) (\( \gg \) Rom. \( \text{haidău} \)).\(^{13}\)

2.1. The verb \( \text{ayda-}, \text{hayda-} \) ‘treiben’ is widely spread in Turkic languages. It can be found in great majority of Kipchak, Oghuz, Turki and in some South-Siberian languages.\(^{14}\) There is a general consensus that KTkc. \*\( -aģ \) \( > \) \*\( -aw \),\(^{15}\) thus consequently one can say that – according to Ivanics 1995 – KTkc. \*\( \text{haydaw} \) should have yielded \*\( \text{haydaw} \). Phonetically, such a form unquestionably could have been loaned into Hung. as \( \text{hajdó} \) since it is generally accepted that Hung. \(-a\) \( \gg \) \(-ou\) \( \gg \) \(-ó\) (cf. Kiss/Pusztai 343, MNyT 174).\(^{16}\) Basing on these facts one could sketch the following scheme: KTkc. \*\( \text{haydaw} \) \(-\text{haydaw} \) \( > \) Rom. \( \gg \) Hung. \( \gg \) Hung. \( \gg \) Hung. \( \gg \) Hung. \( \gg \) Hung. \( \gg \) Hungarian (Ivanics 400, 401).

2.2. We believe, however, that such a conception is doubtful. The MK. suffix \(-ġ \) was first and foremost used to derive \textit{nomen actionis}\(^{17}\) not \textit{nomen actoris}. This seems to be corroborated by the lexical material, namely: to gain the meaning of \textit{nomen actoris} the widely used Tkc. suffix \(-çï \) has to be added to the \textit{nomen actionis}-form (i.e. ‘Treiben’ + \(-çï \) \( \rightarrow \) ‘Treiber’): e.g. Kmk. \( \text{haydav} \) \( \rightarrow \) hay-

---

\(^{13}\) See Jankowski 18. Although, in CTat. also \( \text{aydumbäxına} \) ‘auf Heiducken Art’ and \( \text{aydut} \) ‘Räuber’ (without initial \( h \)) do appear, \( \text{haydúća} \) points to the possibility of Ottoman influence. The CTat. form with the initial \( a \)- must have appeared later due to the phonetic adaptation of the word.

\(^{14}\) Cf. Bšt. \( \text{aydäü} \) (BaškRussS 813), KTp. \( \text{aydäü} \) (ṬatRussS 726), CTat. \( \text{ayda} \) (CTatRussS 15), Kyrk. \( \text{aydar} \) (KirgRussS 30), Klkn. \( \text{aydar} \) (KklpRussS 25), Kzk. \( \text{ayda} \) (Ivanics 399), Nog. \( \text{ayda} \) (NogRussS 29), Kmk. \( \text{hayda} \) (RussKmkS 153), KarK. \( \text{hayda} \) (KRPS 606); Gag. \( \text{hayda} \) (Ivanics 399), Ott. \( \text{hayda} \) (Zenker 938). Trkm. \( \text{hayda} \) – ‘bystro delat čto-l.’ (TurkM RussS 681); ETurk. \( \text{hayda} \) (Shaw 188), Uzb. \( \text{hayda} \) (UzbRussS 649), Uyg. \( \text{haydi} \) (RussUjgS 203); Oir. \( \text{ayda} \) (Ölmez 144).

\(^{15}\) Cf. e.g. Berta 1996: 524-525.

\(^{16}\) Also KTkc. (or Rom.) \( \text{haydaw} \) could have been – from phonetic point of view – the etymon of the Hung. word since we know, that in Hung. \(-o\) \( > \) \(-ő\) (cf. e.g. Kiss/Pusztai 302).

\(^{17}\) See: Berta 1994: 166.
Another question which makes the KTkc. etymology even less probable is the case of Rom. *haidău. The duplication of word forms in Romanian, namely *haidău ‘Ochsentreiber’ and *haidıc ‘Art ungarischer Soldat, Räuber’ – according to Ivanics 401 – was another evidence to corroborate the KTkc. etymology: *haidău << KTkc. *haydaḡ and *haidıc < SCr. hajduk. On the one hand it is doubtful for the semantic reason argued above, on the other hand Rom. *haidău can be easily derived from Hung. hajdó (hajdú), since in the absolute majority of Hungarian loanwords in Romanian the -ő is reflected by the diphthong -ău. We believe that SCr. hajduk ‘valorous brigand, warrior for freedom in the age of Turkish rule’ > Rom. *haidıc 1. ‘Art ungarischer Soldat’; 2. ‘Räuber’ ↔ Hung. hajdú.

Finally, let us focus on the KTkc. form *haydaḡ itself. It seems reasonable to postulate (h)ayda- as an original Turkic form on the basis of the phonetic marks of its etymological equivalents reflected in the present-day Turkic lexicon; while Oghuz and Turki languages show (mostly) forms with an initial *h-, in Kipchak dialects, by contrast, these forms occur almost regularly without it. When seen in this light, however, it appears to be more apposite for KTkc. to reconstruct *aγe- (and consequently *ayda-) rather than *hayde-. Ergo, if so, the KTkc. form could not have yielded Hung. hajdó.

2.5. From the previous discussion it would seem that basing on philological evidence one is confronted with a – sit venia verbo – phonetic stalemate as regards the Turkic and Hungarian etymology. The former appears to be less probable for semantic and morphological reasons mainly; the arguments which corroborate the Hungarian origin cannot be treated as evidence against the Turkic one. Considering the phonetic similarity of the derivatives of the Hung. and Tkc. verb meaning ‘treiben’ (or the Tkc. interjection hayde! ‘wohlan!, los!’) the possibility of a contamination cannot be disregarded, e.g. a KTkc. *haydawčï

---

18 For the same reason also the possibility of the borrowing of KTkc. *haydaḡ > SLav. *hajdak ~ *haydak is rather doubtful.
19 Cf. e.g. főgdófr ‘Wirtshauss’ < fogadó ‘Gasthaus’ (Tamás 318); haitóu 1. ‘Treiber’; 2. ‘Ochsenhirt’ < Hung. hajtő ‘Treiber’ (Tamás 398), &c.
20 The possibility of the contamination (Rom. *haidıc ↔ Hung. hajdó) shows us the meaning of words; Tamás 396-397: *haidıc […] 3. ‘Polizist, Gefängniswächter’, cf. Hung. hajdú – among other meanings also ‘Schutzmann, Polizist (besonders vor 1848)’ (TESz II 24).
21 With the sole exception of KarK. hayde- (which most probably belongs to the layer of Ott. loanwords as in Halich and Troki dialects it does not appear) and Kmk. hayde- (where Oghuz influence is also possible).
22 It is true that in Kipchak sources the form aγe- outnumbers hayde-, yet it remains a fact that the KTkc. form *aγe- is purely a hypothetical one; especially as the (weakly pronounced) initial *h-, in this case, did not disappear regularly in the Turkic languages. Consequently, we do not treat this argument as a conclusive one, merely as supportive.
‘Treiber’, *haydaw ‘Treiben’, and the well known and widely spread interjection hayde could have had an influence on the -jt- > -jd- change in Hungarian.

3. The question of the etymology of Hung. hajdi leads us to the problem of the formally and semantically similar word haydamak 1. ‘Ukrainian insurgent against the Poles in the 18th century’; 2. ‘brigand’.

3.1. The word appears first and foremost in some Kipchak, Oghuz and Slavic languages used in the region of the Crimea and in its neighbourhood.23 Its meaning developed due to the role of haydamaks in the Ukrainian insurrection led by M. Zaliznjak and I. Honta against the Poles in the 18th century.

Unquestionably, the etymon of the Ukr. hajdamaka is Tkc. haydamak ‘treiben’; as it displays the initial h-, it was visibly the Ott. form. Morphologically the word is a suffixed form: hayda- + -mak (a suffix building in Turkish a grammatical category similar to the Indo-European infinitive form) ‘to drive, drive away; driving, driving away’. The verb (h)ayda- seems to be a derivative from the onomatopoeic stem hayda ‘come on! (to spur someone on)’. Thus the original meaning of haydamak was ‘to shout hayda’ and developed into ‘to shout hayda driving someone / something away’. In Ott. or CTat., however, this verb could have gained another meaning of ‘to shout hayda while chasing after / pursuing someone or something’24 and finally ‘to chase, to pursue’. The change of the meaning ‘to chase, to pursue’ → ‘chaser, pursuer’ → ‘insurgent’25 could have happened in Ukrainian due to analogy to semantically similar group of nouns with the same -ak(a) ending: e.g. huljáka ‘crouser’ (Fedčenko 201), pyjak(a) ‘drunkard’ (Fedčenko 761), rozbyšaka ‘brigand’ (Fedčenko 1040) &c. The meaning of ‘brigand’ of hajdamak(a) attested in several languages developed accordingly to those, against whom the hajdamaks fought.26

23 KTkc.: CTat. aydamak ‘razbojnik’ (CTatRussS 15), KarK. haydamak id. (KRPS 606); Ogh.: Gag. haydamak id. (Ivanics 399), Ott. haydamak id. (de Meynard I 850); Slav.: Pol. hajdamaka ‘brigand’ (SEJP 167), Russ. gajdamak 1. ‘hist. participant in the Ukrainian insurrection against the Poles’; 2. ‘brigand’ (Vasmer I 251), Ukr. hajdamaka ‘hist. insurgent, participant in the Ukrainian insurrection against the Poles in the 18th century’ (Melnyčuk I 453; Melnyčuk I 452: Ukr. gajdabura ‘brigand’). In Hung. it appears only as a historical term: hajdamák ‘insurgent against the Poles in the 18th century’.

24 Cf. a similar semantic and morphologic development in Hung.: hajl ‘onomatopoeia’ → hajkás ‘to drive away; to chase, pursue’, hajkurász ‘to chase, to pursue’ (EWU 513).

25 Cf. Redhouse 2156: Ott. haydamak ‘a cattle-lifter, marauder’; only in Tksh. the verb hayda- has the meaning of ‘to assault, to plunder’ besides ‘treiben’ (cf. TurRussS 240, de Meynard I 850). We believe that the latter was the original meaning; after emerging the hajdamak-movement the verb gained the additional meaning ‘to assault, to plunder’.

26 Only in Tksh. the verb hayda- has the meaning of ‘to assault, to plunder’ besides ‘treiben’ (cf. TurRussS 240, de Meynard I 850).
The word entered Slavic languages and Romanian. Consequently, Russ. *gajdamak* entered also Bashkir, Kazan Tatar, Kirghiz (as *gaydamak*), thus in these Turkic languages *gajdamak* is not a native word, although ultimately derived from a Turkic stem. This thesis can be ascertained for semantic reasons, and in the light of the initial *g*-.

The KarK. *haydamak* is seemingly a loan from Ottoman in the light of its initial *h*-. Thus, from these facts one can conclude that, although Ott. & c. *haydamak* and *haydut* have the same meanings, they have etymologically different roots. 27

4. The previous discussion attempted to prove that the Hungarian etymology of Hung. *hajdú* cannot be neglected. In its present form the KTkc. origin cannot be accepted. On balance, however, it can cast some valuable light on the problem. Hopefully, future works will provide more conclusive evidence on the discussed matter.

5. We believe that a general sketch of the borrowing routes of the derivatives of Hung. *hajt* ‘to drive (away)’, Tkc. *(h)ayda*- id. and KTkc. *haydaŋ* mentioned in our paper is as follows: 28

---

27 It remains to be seen whether MTat. *aydar* ‘einem Räuber ähnlicher Mann’ (Kakuk 115: “*aydar* [...] – Vgl. osm. *haydar* ‘Löwe’; fig. ‘eim mutiger, verwegener, toll-kühner Mensch’ [...]) is to be connected with the word in question, cf. Zenker 938: “[...] هَايداماك [... ] Vb. act. Aor. haidalar, haidar [... ]”. Cf. also Devellioglu 412: *haydar* 1. *‘lion’*; [...] 3. *‘brave, stouthearted young man’ [...].

28 To distinguish the derivatives of Hung. *hajt* we used bold and underlined letters, to display the derivatives of KTkc. *haydaŋ* we underlined them and wrote them in italics.
General sketch of the borrowing routes of the derivatives of Hung. *hajt* 'to drive (away)' and Tkc. *hayda*-id.

B = ‘brigand’; F = ‘Fußsoldat’; H = ‘herdsman’; I = ‘insurgent against the Turkish rule’; P = ‘to plunder’; S = ‘servant on courts’; T = ‘Treiben’; Tn = ‘treiben’

---

Błk. *ąybăi* Tn
Kır. *ayğa* Tn
Kklp. *aydaj* Tn
Kmk. *haydav* Tn
Kzk. *aydav* Tn
Nog. *aylak* Tn

Błk. *ąybăițe* T
Kır. *ayğaț* T
Kklp. *aydajț* T
Kmk. *haydavț* T
Kzk. *aydavț* T
Nog. *aylakț* T

Hun. *hajdú* H, F, S (*hajdús* - pl.)

Rom. *hajdău* H
Scl. *haiduck* F, S
Pols. *hajduk* F, S

Ukr. *gajduk* F, I, S

Russ. *gajduk* B, F

Błk. *gajdą* B
KazT. *gajdąk* B

---

Scl. *hajduk* I, F, B, S

Bulg. *hajdak* B, I
Bulg. *hajdut(in) B, I

Rom. *haiduc* I, B, F

---

Ott. *haydug* B
Ott. *haydut* B

KTkt. *ąyda* Tn
KTkt. *ąydaț* Tn

---

Błk. *ąybăi* Tn
Kır. *ayğa* Tn
Kklp. *aydaj* Tn
Kmk. *haydav* Tn
Kzk. *aydav* Tn
Nog. *aylak* Tn

Błk. *ąybăițe* T
Kır. *ayğaț* T
Kklp. *aydajț* T
Kmk. *haydavț* T
Kzk. *aydavț* T
Nog. *aylakț* T
Abbreviations


References

Kakuk, Zs.: Mischärtatarische Texte mit Wörterverzeichnis (= Studia Uralo-Altaica 38), Szeged 1996.
Kiss/Pusztai = Kiss, J. / Pusztai F. (eds.): Magyar nyelvtörténet, Budapest 2003.
Redhouse, J. W.: A Turkish and English Lexicon, Constantinople 1921.
Sami, Š.: Kamis-i Türkî, İstanbul 1318 [after Higra = 1900].
SEJP = Brückner, A.: Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego, Kraków 1927.
Shaw, R. B.: A sketch of the Turki language as spoken in Eastern Turkistan (Kashgar and Yarkand.), Calcutta 1880.