MAREK STACHOWSKI

ETYMOLOGICAL STUDIES ON KHAKAS FOOD NAMES

The publication of a small, but very interesting book Национальные блюда хакасов [= Khakas national dishes] (Abakan 1994, 32p.) by V. Ja. Butanaev was an important stimulus for the present author to make a modest attempt at an etymological study on some food names presented there.

asxyldym ‘sour spice for soups’ (But. 20, Nr. 4) < *aškyltym < *akšylytym (but see below) < *akšy ~ *ākši > Ott. ākši, Krim-Kar. ākši ~ āxši ‘sour’ (ESTJa I 259; KRP 658, 672). — The main problem in this etymology is that ākši ‘sour’ and ākši- ‘to become sour’ are normally attested in Oghuz and Kipchak languages only, but not in Siberia. — Cf. also Bšk. āškylčim ‘bitterish’ ~ āškylt ‘sourish’, Tat. āčkylčim ~ āčkylt ‘sourish’ ~ ač-kylčim ‘bitterish’ (Šč. MI 115f.). — Since the Volga Tatars migrated eastwards as early as in the 17th century and their migration increased considerably after they had received special trade privileges in the second half of the 18th century (Kapp. 35f.), by 1990 over 27,000 Volga Tatars lived in different Siberian colonies (Fors. 196), and they played an important role in the cultural life east of the Urals (Fors. 300; for Tat. influence in Middle Asia see also Bald. passim). Therefore, it seems...
quite legitimate to treat the Kh. word as a loan from Tat., maybe, connected with Tat. trade activities in the 18th and 19th centuries. However, in view of Kh. -sx- < *-sk- < *-ks- (cf. Kh. tassax ‘Regal (-brett-fach)’ < *tašak < *tak-čak, see StachM EChE), the modern Tat. form аšкылтым cannot possibly have been the direct source of Kh. ашкылдым, because it would have yielded a form like *ашкылдым rather (cf. Kh. xaračxaj ‘swallow’ with -čx-). Thus, the following treatment is plausible: Kh. ашкылдым < Older Tat. (18th c.? ашкылым ( <*ашкылым) > Modern Tat. ашкылым.

чабах ‘flat cake made of leaven and “ayran”-yoghurt’ (But. 18, Nr. 9) < *jalmak < *jalma- (< *jal- > Ott. jala- ‘to lick’) > Kirg. ғалма- ‘to take into one’s mouth, to eat greedily, to feed, to stuff’; cf. Trk.dial. jalma-č ‘fodder made of flour and bran’ (ЕSTJa IV 95). — Concerning Kh. -b- < *-m- see чарба below.

чарба, in: чарба үгра ‘meat soup with pearl barley’ (But. 7, Nr. 18). — The original meaning of чарба was *'minced meat', *'something minced' or the like, cf. Tuv. чарба ‘Hacksel für Vieh’ (> Yak. *чарба > barča ‘1.Zerstückeln; 2.Schutt’) < * jáрма < *jär- ‘to split, to chop’ (StachM PEJ 110f.; Tekin 175). — Note the different reflexes of the suffix *-ma in чарба and in xyjma (see below). The reason for the different evolution of the original *-m- lies in the phonetic position. As can be seen in Kh. чалбах (see above) < *jalmak and Kh. чарба < * jáрма, the rule was: *-rlm- > -rlb-. This is the reason why we cannot accept the assumption that Selk. both чарба ~ оарба ‘barley’ (with the word-initial diphthong reflecting Tu. *ə) and арма ~ арма id. go back to Tu. арбa (Fil. 75) < *арпа [cf. Hungarian арpa id.]. Apart from the inner-Tu. evolution (11) * jáрма > *jarma > *jarba > Kh. Tuv. чарба), we are faced with two different Tu. etyma, as far as the Selk. forms are concerned: [2а] * jáрма ‘something minced’ > *арма ( > Selk. арма ‘barley’, Fil. 75) > *арма (> Selk. арма id., Fil. 75); [2б] *арпа ‘barley’ (> Old Uig. арpa ‘1.Gerste, Gerstenkorn; 2.Gersten-’, Uig.Wb. 3: 201) > *арба (> Southern Selk. чарба, оарба id., Fil. 75) > Кača-Kh. арба id. Fil. 75 cites also “tuba arma” after SIGF 320 where, however, no source is given; in any case, no Tu. forms like арma can be found in ESTJa I 176f.

(s.v. арpa) and Russ. ЛФТ 155-158. This is why we have every reason to suspect that “tuba arma” is a ghost-form and that Selk. арба and арма cannot possibly reflect one and the same Tu. word арба. The j-m variants (like Brb. jarma, Kirg. жарма ‘pearl barley’) are clearly results of the semantic evolution of *жарма and should not be connected with *аrpa (contra Fil. 113f.). — See also порча below.*)

Itpăk see итпăк.

Itpăk ‘brown bread’ (But. 21, Nr. 6) ~ итпăк ‘bread’ (КHR 67b) = Chul. итвăk ~ итпăк ‘bread’ (Bir. 34) = Tat. итмăк id., Tat.dial. итмăк ~ итпăк id. (Тум. 61, 229) = Alt. итпăк ‘roll’ (Тыд. 158). Leb.-Alt. итпăк ‘bread’ (Bask. 219) = Krim Tat. итмăк ‘bread’ (Jank. 378) = Ott. атмăк ‘bread’ = МТу. атмăк ~ атпăк ‘bread’ (МК Comp. 29. – Contra ЕSTJa I 254: “в словаре М. Карпинского приводится лишь одна форма епмек” < *атмăк < *ат- > Tat. итпăк, Бск. итпăк ‘bread’ (ЕSTJa, l.c.). — For итпăк as a Tu. loan in Kamass see Veen. 283 and Hel. TMV 70, Nr. 162. — Because of Tat. итпăк, Бск. итпăк < *-п-, the original word-medial cluster must have been *-pm-, not *-tm- (contrary to Joki 138f.). — The labialization of the word-initial vowel results from the influence of the original *-p-: Alt. итпăк (~ итпăк) < *отмăк ( > Krim Tat. итмăк) < *отмăк < *отмăк.

Комăчăк ‘flat cake made of unleavened dough with milk, spread with milk cream or fat and baked in ashes’ (But. 17, Nr. 6) < *комăч ( > Brb. комăч ‘roll’ [Дм. 161], Uig.dial. комăч ~ комăч ~ кömăч ‘bread baked in ashes’ [Ten. 96]) < кöm ~ кём- ‘to bury (in earth, ashes, etc.)’ (Ten. 96).

Миăрăк ‘kind of dumpling, stuffed with meat and onions [= Russ. pel’men’]’ (But. 19, Nr. 14) = Sh. пăраk ‘pie [= Russ. пирог]’ (РШ 53 s.v. пирог) = Чул. пурăк ‘pie’ (Bir. 55). — This word seems to be unknown in other Tu. languages of Siberia; for some (not very numerous) records from non-Siberian Tu. languages see ESTJa II 219 (the existence of Ott. бăраk id. excludes the possibility of Slavic [cf. Russ. пирог] origin of the

*) I am very much indebted to E. Helimski for his comments and the discussion on this and some other words in this paper.
Tu. word), where, however, the Siberian data are lacking; cf. also TMEN II 331, Nr. 781: “Da das Wort innerhalb der Türk­sprachen nur in einem begrenzten Gebiet erscheint (fehlt u.a. südsibir., jak.) […]”. — It is generally accepted that m- occurs sometimes in place of b- in words with a nasal as the following consonant (as in bân ~ mân ‘I’, etc.), but there is no nasal in the second syllable of mirâk. This phenomenon recurs over and over in different Tu. languages, as it seems, rather chaotically, cf. for instance Siberian Tat. mirâk = Literary Tat. bîrtâk ‘sick, disable’ (Tum. 152), Brb. mic [-c = -ts] ‘stove, oven’ (Dm. 165) < Russ. peč’ id., Leb.-Alt. môrû ‘wolf’ (Bask. 178) < *bôrû (StachM GJV 91, § 22.4), Leb.-Alt. môtik ‘cock’ (Bask. 178) < Russ. petûx id., Ott. meçê ‘Eiche’ = Anatolian Trk.dial. méçê id. < Pers. bîša ‘forest, wood’ (Pom. 110), Ott. bahane ‘Vorwand, Scheingrund’ = Anatolian Trk.dial. mahâna id. < Pers. bahâna id. (Pom. 95) and so on; for the word-medial m < b cf. also Ott. (1591) séçmen ‘Hundewärter, Janitschar’ = Anatolian Trk.dial. séçmen id. < Pers. sag-bân ‘dog-keeper’ (Stach. PL V 101, Nr. 490; Pom. 117); see also potxy and tâ­max (in this study) and Hitch 138f. The p-/b- > m- change cannot be explained here but the existence of the b- ~ m- alter­nation itself is evident. — Another difference between the Kh. word mirâk and its counterparts in the other Tu. languages lies in the vowel of the first syllable. Before continuing this reflection, let us take a look at etymologies proposed so far. — One finds four etymologies of bôrâk in ÉSTJa II 219: [1] < bôr- ~ bûr- ‘to fold, to pleat, to put/stick/pull together’ [= Ott. bûz- ‘to tie, to pull together’] (L. Z. Budagov); [2] < Pers. (J. Th. Zenker); [3] c cognate with bôrk ‘cap’, bôrt- ‘to swell’ (M. Rasa­nen); [4] < bûrû- ‘to cover, to wrap up’ (G. J. Ramstedt). Ê. V. Sevortjan accepts Budagov’s etymology as the most reliable. — Now, the problem arises, how -i- in Kh. mirâk can best be explained. In ÉSTJa II 219, the phonetic variants bôr- and bûr- are given side by side as equal stems, but the fact is that bôr­does not exist except in one Ott. record: bôz- (Zenker), along­side with the usual bûz- (ÉSTJa II 294). The reduction of ü in the Tat. and Bsk. form bûr- (ÉSTJa, l.c.) also points to an original ū, not ô (see Berta 182: Volga Kipchak *bûrûľ*-; Berta

**mûn** ‘soup, broth’ (But. 24, Nr. 2) = Tuv. Tof. Alt. Chul. Sh. mûn id. = Yak. mûn id., Dolg. mûn id. (StachM DW 179) ~ mûn id. (Fuj. 267) = Leb. mûn ~ mûn id. (Bask. 177) = MTu. mûn ~ mûn ~ bûn ‘soup, noodles’ (MK Comp. 120). — Neither the at­tempts to treat Tu. mûn ~ bûn as a loanword from Proto-Sam. *weûs nor the assumption of Proto-Sam. *weûs being loaned from Tu. are satisfactory due to phonetic shortcomings. If we accept the Tu. etymology of Proto-Sam. *weûs, the Tu. bû- > Proto-Sam. we- change remains inexplicable, “because PS [= Proto-Sam.] had both wû- (cf. wût ‘water’) and pû- (cf. pût ‘to spoon’)” (Rôna-Tas 746, Nr. 19). If we treat the Tu. word as a loan from Proto-Sam., we can explain the dropping of the original word-final vowel in *weûs, but the different treatment of *-û in *weûs (> Tu. -n) and in Tu. *kôn ‘sheep’ (> Tu. -jûn) remains unclear (for *kôn see Rôna-Tas 747, Nr. 27). As E. Helmski rightly says, “it would be much better to see here an accidental and, besides, only partial resemblance” (Hel. Nr. 12). Consequently, A. J. Joki’s idea of Chin. origin of both the Sam. and the Tu. word still deserves our attention (Joki 229: [1] Tu. mûn < Chin. *mûn; [2] Chin. compound *mûn + *jûk ‘fluid, juice’ > *mûn-jû > *mûnû > Sam.).

**naspax** ‘pearl barley mixed with boiled potatoes or fat’ (But. 17, Nr. 5) = Tuv. časpâk id. (ibid.) = Tat.dial. jasmak ‘lentil’ (ÉSTJa IV 154, where the Kh. and Tuv. examples are lacking).
Cf. Sal. jasmus ‘pea’ (ESTJa IV 154) = Old Uig. jasmuk ‘millet’ (DTS 245), etc. — Of the two etymological models ([1] < jas- ‘to make flat, to flatten’; [2] < jasy ‘flat’) presented in ESTJa IV 154, only [1] can be taken into consideration here, because -mak produces deverbal nouns. As far as -mak words are concerned, the second proposal cannot be excluded. — The Tuv. variant contributes to the reconstruction of the relative chronology of the Tuv. phonetic evolution: as -š- developed from -s- under the influence of the initial č-, the latter must have developed <j- earlier than -s- became -š-, i.e. (1) j > č; (2) *č-s > č-š (but see below *jāšpāk). Another chronological chain can be reconstructed for Kh. naspax: *nasmak < *jasmak (= Tat.dial. jasmak, see above), i.e. (1) *j (-m) > n (-m); (2) *-s- > -(s)-. — Because of semantic differences, it is not quite clear whether Kam. něšpāk < něšpāk < nešpāk ‘dick, great’ also belongs to the same word family. Joki 243 tried to connect it with Salbin-Koyb. t’yš ‘dick’ and the like, but in that case the identification of the second syllable of the Kam. word with Tu. *-māk is impossible because, *-māk is a deverbal formative. Moreover, the word t’yš seems to have no counterparts in the other Tu. languages so that Joki (I.c.) says finally: ‘[...] die Etymology ist also franglig’. Phonetically, the Kam. word can be traced back to Tu. *jāšpāk (< *jasmak), with the palatalization resulting from the influence of -j-) which, possibly, was a phonetic variant of Old Tuv. *jaspak (cf. first of all Kam. něšpāk). Unfortunately, no direct trace of *jāšpāk could be found in the Tu. languages of Siberia.

nemyrt ‘bird cherries, mixed with boiled milk cream or melted butter and groats’ (But. 21, Nr. 8-9) [= Chul. jumurt (Bir. 35) < ciumurt (Bir. 74) ‘bird cherry’, Sh. nybyrt id. (ŠŘ 34b) = Siberian Tat. jomyrt (Tum. 82) = jumurt (Tum. 86) < šomrot (Tum. 251) id., Literary Tat. šomyrt id.] *jimurt (< *jumurt (< *jomyrt) *globule, something globular (?) > *jumyrtka Old Uig. jumurda > ‘Ei’ (Zieme BSU 247a), Trkm. jumurtqa ‘egg’, Ott. jumurta id., Tuv. čirga id. — One finds a lot of phonetic variants of *jumyrtka in ESTJa IV 250f. (cf. also Kh. nemyrxa ‘egg’), but *jumyrt itself is missing there. See also Joki NT 57, where Tu. jumurt is connected with Ur. *dōme > Fi. tuomi ‘Traubenkirschaum, Ahlbaum, Prunus padus’.

örämä ‘sour milk cream’ (But. 9, Nr. 7) ~ örämä ~ ürämä ~ ürämä ‘cream, sour cream, milk film’ (Rass. MBZ 37) = Sag.-Kh. ürämä ‘saure Sahne’ (Radl. I 1834) ~ ürämä ‘Rahm, Sahne, saure Sahne’ (ibid. 1834) ~ örämä ‘cream’ (ŠŘ 133a) = Tuva. Tof. örämä, Alt. örömö ‘milk film’ (Rass. MBZ 27) = Yak. örämä ~ örämä ‘Rahm, Haut auf Flüssigkeiten’ (Kal. MEJ 19) < Mo. örämä id. (Kal. MEJ 19; Rass. MBZ 27). — The -g/-ų- variants occur only in Kh. and Sh. It was probably a southern dialect of Kh. (or Sh.?) which inserted the un-etymological -g/-ų- before the original -m- of the Mo. etymon; cf. Kh. (Beltir) poromaj ‘Sperling, Spatz’ < *poromaj < *porobaj < Russ. vorobej id. (StachM ECh E s.v. porójaj). We have at any rate to distinguish between Kh. örämä and örämä ~ ürämä ~ ürämä.

poğa see poza.

porča ‘dried meat, mixed with cooked groats’ (But. 3, Nr. 3) = Kz. borša, Yak. puorsa ‘Trockenfleisch, -fisch’, ultimately < Sam. *por-sã (Janh. passim). — For the connections between porča and čarba see also StachM PEJ 110f.

potxy ‘dish made of cooked grains or groats, soup of pearl barley’ (But. 8-10, 14-16, 19, 21-23) ~ Kača-Kh. (18th/19th century) botksa id. (Sp. 139) = Alt. botko ~ potko ~ motka id. (ESTJa II 201) ~ Leb.-Alt. motka id. (Bask. 178) [for m- instead of b-, p- see mirāk above] ~ Sh. motka ‘Brei aus Gerstenmehl mit saurer Sahne’ (Joki 104) = Brb. pōtka ‘soup of pearl barley’ (Dm. 177) = Siberian Tat. potka id. (Tum. 176b). — Etym.: < *bot(a)- ~ *but(a)- *to stir’ (ESTJa II 201). — The word is relatively well attested in all Tu. language groups with the exception of the extreme East and North (Tuva., Tof., Yak. and Dolg.). Yenisei seems to be its eastern border. This fact points possibly to a Western channel of borrowing (in all probability, through Brb. and Siberian Tat. dialects, see the data above). — As long as *-ky (instead of *-ka) occurs in Kh. only (cf. also Yak. butugas ‘Grütze’ < *bukutac < *buk-č; see Kal. IM 110; StachM GJV 116, § 35.2), it would be plausible to speak of the -a -y change rather than of two different suffixes (con-
The precise meaning of these words is unclear, cf. poga 'hymal hemp' (= alcoholic beverage) (But. 25, Nr. 6); poga 'barba (= distillery refuse, dregs)' (But. 26); poga = poga 'dregs' (Khr 155, 159). — The ultimate source of both words seems to be Pers. boza 'rice beer' > Tu. boza > [a] Kh. poza; [b] Mo. boğa (Vlad. 332, Nr. 8) ~ boğal (Khr 155, 159). — The opposite loan direction (i.e. Pers. < Tu.) would, however, also be possible, but poza has no unequivocal etymology on the Tu. ground. For a discussion (without any solution) see TMEN II 337-341. — In any case, the Kh. form poğa is (because of -ğa) a loan from Mo.

poza ~ poğa. — The precise meaning of these words is unclear, cf. poza 'hymal hemp' (= alcoholic beverage)' (But. 25, Nr. 6). poğa 'barba (= distillery refuse, dregs)' (But. 26); poza = poga 'dregs' (Khr 155, 159). — The ultimate source of both words seems to be Pers. boza 'rice beer' > Tu. boza > [a] Kh. poza; [b] Mo. boğa (Vlad. 332, Nr. 8) ~ boğal (Khr 155, 159). — The opposite loan direction (i.e. Pers. < Tu.) would, however, also be possible, but poza has no unequivocal etymology on the Tu. ground. For a discussion (without any solution) see TMEN II 337-341. — In any case, the Kh. form poğa is (because of -ğa) a loan from Mo.

tärtpäk 'pie or dumpling made of a round piece of dough' (But. 18, Nr. 8, 13) < *tägirmäk < *tägirt < *tägir- < *tägär- (? *tägär- < *tägär-, see below Tuv. tögär-ik) 'to roll' > Tat. dial. tägäräc 'wheel' (ESTJa II 172), Brb. tägärek 'round' (Tum. 206), Siberian Tat. tigärček 'wheel' (Tum. 209), Alt. tägärärk 'round; circle' (RAS 267a); cf. Old Uig. tägir-ik-lä- (< *tägir-ik-lä-) 'to surround' (ESTJa II 172). — Kh. tärpäk 'round' is either the next step in the phonetic evolution of Kh. tärtäpäk or another morphological form (< *tägir-, not < *tägir-t.). For the *ägi > ā change see also Kh. ālgāk 'biersam' < *ägil-čäk < *ägil- > Kh. āl- 'sich biegen' (StachM EChE). — The exact phonetic relation between Tuv. dárák 'circle' and Tuv. tögärük 'round' remains unclear. — Chul. tärmač 'iron stove' (Bir. 63) is probably another derivative (< *tägirmäč) of this verb; the change of meaning is possibly due to the round form of traditional iron stoves.

tom, in: tom xalas 'a kind of roll of wheat flour' (But. 18, Nr. 12). — The second component of the compound is etymologically clear (see below xalas) but the first is not. V. Ja. Butanaev (l.c.) refers to Mahmud al-Kāšyārī’s item top in DTS 575: ‘кушанье, приготовляемое из пшеницы и овсяной муки’ (should this word be identified with [MK Comp. 197] töp 'boiled wheat'?), but it does not appear very convincing because of different final consonants. See also MK Comp. 195 töp 'ball', which al-Kāšyārī interprets as a contraction < topy; the editors of MK Comp. rightly put a "sic" to this interpretation; töp is the original base of numerous derivatives, such as *topy, see e.g. StachM GJV 83, § 16.6, with further refer-

tra ESTJa II 201: *bot- + *-ka, *bot- + *-ky), even more so if potxy ~ hotxu is (in view of its geographical distribution, see above) an inner Tu. loanword in Kh., which indicates to -a as the original final vowel. — However, the reconstructed stem *bot(a) ~ *bul(a) - along with its meaning *'to stir' (ESTJa II 201) are purely hypothetical, so that a borrowing from a non-Tu. source cannot be excluded either.

poza ~ poğa. — The precise meaning of these words is unclear, cf. poza 'hymal hemp' (= alcoholic beverage)' (But. 25, Nr. 6). poğa 'barba (= distillery refuse, dregs)' (But. 26); poza = poga 'dregs' (Khr 155, 159). — The ultimate source of both words seems to be Pers. boza 'rice beer' > Tu. boza > [a] Kh. poza; [b] Mo. boğa (Vlad. 332, Nr. 8) ~ boğal (Khr 155, 159). — The opposite loan direction (i.e. Pers. < Tu.) would, however, also be possible, but poza has no unequivocal etymology on the Tu. ground. For a discussion (without any solution) see TMEN II 337-341. — In any case, the Kh. form poğa is (because of -ğa) a loan from Mo.

pörsax 'a kind of pastry made of milk cream, milk, fat and eggs' (But. 18, Nr. 10) = Alt. bürzak ~ borsok, Kirg. borsok 'little cake baked in sheep fat', etc. (ESTJa II 22) < bagyrsak > Ott. bagyrsak ~ bäyrsak 'entails, guts' (ib.). — It is not quite clear which type of food exactly made the semantic change from 'entails' to 'pastry, cake' possible. It may have been a kind of guts stuffed with paste, cf. Fr. pâte, Engl. paste, pasta, pastry, Ott. pasta.

tamax 'food', as in: ax tamax (But. 7f.) 'milk food, dairy products'; as-tamax (Khr 33 s.v. as) 'food (stuffs)'. — In all likelihood, the same as Kh. tabax '1. plate, bowl; 2. food, dish' [cf. Khr 211b: tabax 'табака, блюдо'; Khr 65a: блюдо (= кушияе) [...] as-tamax], ultimately < Ar. tabaq 'plate, bowl' (StachM APS 255, Nr. 3.18). — The semantic ('food' ~ 'plate') and phonetic (-m- ~ -b-) distinctions between tamax and tabax indicate that these two words belong to different layers of Ar. loans in Kh. Both the semantic and the phonetic features of tamax (1. 'food'; 2. -m- ~ -b-) are unequivocally older than their counterparts in tabax. Consequently, tamax is an older loanword and tabax a newer one. — At some risk, we may accept Mo. in the period between the thirteenth (Genggiz Khan) and the end of the sixteenth century (the Russian conquest of Siberia) as the most probable direct source of borrowing for Kh. tamax ~ tabax (for Tuv. and other South Siberian parallels see StachM APS Nr. 3.18), so that a fair division of the period into two subperiods (13th – 14th century for tamax and 15th – 16th century for tabax) would be quite acceptable, but for the time being nothing more can be said on the chronology of both words. — For the m ~ b alternation see miräk above.

tärtpäk 'pie or dumpling made of a round piece of dough' (But. 18, Nr. 8, 13) < *tägirmäk < *tägirt < *tägir- < *tägär- (? *tägär- < *tägär-, see below Tuv. tögär-ik) 'to roll' > Tat. dial. tägäräc 'wheel' (ESTJa II 172), Brb. tägärek 'round' (Tum. 206), Siberian Tat. tigärček 'wheel' (Tum. 209), Alt. tägärärk 'round; circle' (RAS 267a); cf. Old Uig. tägir-ik-lä- (< *tägir-ik-lä-) 'to surround' (ESTJa II 172). — Kh. tärpäk 'round' is either the next step in the phonetic evolution of Kh. tärtäpäk or another morphological form (< *tägir-, not < *tägir-t.). For the *ägi > ā change see also Kh. ālgāk 'biersam' < *ägil-čäk < *ägil- > Kh. āl- 'sich biegen' (StachM EChE). — The exact phonetic relation between Tuv. dárák 'circle' and Tuv. tögärük 'round' remains unclear. — Chul. tärmač 'iron stove' (Bir. 63) is probably another derivative (< *tägirmäč) of this verb; the change of meaning is possibly due to the round form of traditional iron stoves.

tom, in: tom xalas 'a kind of roll of wheat flour' (But. 18, Nr. 12). — The second component of the compound is etymologically clear (see below xalas) but the first is not. V. Ja. Butanaev (l.c.) refers to Mahmud al-Kāšyārī’s item top in DTS 575: ‘кушанье, приготовляемое из пшеницы и овсяной муки’ (should this word be identified with [MK Comp. 197] töp 'boiled wheat'?), but it does not appear very convincing because of different final consonants. See also MK Comp. 195 töp 'ball', which al-Kāšyārī interprets as a contraction < topy; the editors of MK Comp. rightly put a “sic” to this interpretation; töp is the original base of numerous derivatives, such as *topy, see e.g. StachM GJV 83, § 16.6, with further refer-
ences. — We are rather inclined to connect Kh. *tom with Uig. dial. *tom ‘round’ (Ten. 168), cf. especially the usage of the word in the Uig. dial. syntagma *tom jaʔ ‘жир в комках’ = ‘fat in (round) lumps’ (op. cit.). — Three problems arise in this context. In the first place, one may ask if there actually exists no connection between (Kh.) *tom ‘round’ and (MK) *töp ‘ball’. The question is quite legitimate, because the meanings and the phonetic forms show a great resemblance, especially if one considers the shortening of long vowels in Kh. which enables us to posit hypothetically an older Kh. form *töm. Now, the further analysis is possible due to Kh. gerunds like tâp < *tab­yp < tap- ‘to find’, sâp < *sab-yp < sap- ‘to strike, to hit’ (Iskh. 26). If Kh. ä < *aby, then possibly Kh. ò < *oby (or *öby), which means that Kh. *tom may go back to *tömk < *töbym < *töpym, and the latter is then a derivative < *töp in the same way as *töpyk. — The difference between the reflex of *töbym and that of *tabyp is that *tom has a short vowel and tâp a long one. This feature seems to point to a different chronology of both formations. In his lecture on the analogy in the Turkic languages (Berlin, Autumn 1994), Professor A. M. Ščerbak (St.-Petersburg) suggested that the so-called Kh. locative suffix with directive function (-ta) is in reality only secondarily identical with the actual locative suffix -ta and that it goes back to *tä < *taba (< tap-a, which was used as a directive postposition in Old Tua.). The shortening of (*töbym >) *tömk > *tom is then parallel to that of (*taba >) *tä > ta, and both *tom and -ta belong to an older layer, whereas verbal forms like tâp and sâp belong to a younger one. — Another question concerns the relation between (Old ?) Kh. *töm and Yak. *tuom in *tuomtä- ‘einen Knoten machen’ (StachM GJ 77, § 13.5). At first sight, *töm and *tuom seem to fit perfectly to the well-known equation: Yak. *u)< = Old Yak. / Proto-Tu. *ö. The problem is that a derivative like *töm-lä- would in any case yield *tuomnä- in Yak., not the really existing *tuomtä-. There is only one possibility to explain a combination “voiced consonant (A) + voiceless consonant (B)” in Yak.: (B) became voiceless under the influence of another voiceless consonant which stood originally between (A) and (B). That is why Yak. *tuomtä- is to be traced back to *tömktä- < *tömuktä- < *tömuklä- < *tömuk, and the latter goes back to *töpyk or is a secondary derivative < *töm (= (Old ?) Kh. *töm). — The third problem to be mentioned here is the existence of Kh.dial. (Radl. III 1234: Kača; KhR 231b) *tom ‘medicine, medicament’ and Eastern Tu. (Radl. III 1234) *tom ‘dick, dickflüssig (hauptsächlich von Drogen gesagt)’. It appears to us quite plausible to accept a semantic evolution *‘something round, ball’ to *‘pill, tablet’ and further to *‘medicine (generally)’. This would at the same time mean that *tom in the syntagma *tom xalas may be interpreted in its original meaning as *‘something round, ball’, so that *tom xalas means literally ‘round roll’. It is hard to say whether the Eastern Tu. meaning ‘thick (-flowing)’ is a next step in the same semantic evolution, e.g. ‘medicine (generally)’ > *‘syr-up’ > ‘thick’. — An interesting conjecture was proposed by E. Helimski who thinks that the whole phrase *tom xalas is a Kh. equivalent of Russ. *томский калач ‘xalas-roll/loaf of Tomsk’. Really, the older Kh. form of the town name Tomsk was Tom (KhR 346a), and *томский калач fits the Russ. pattern of naming cakes and loafs quite well (cf. тульский пряник, рижский хлеб). But it is, regretfully, not clear if there ever existed a *томский калач. Another problem is the absence of the possessive suffix (xalas, not xalazy), but an analogy can perhaps be found in phrases like Kh. xakas kizi ‘Khakas’, tadar kizi ‘Tatar’ (KhR 78b), although this analogy is not quite reliable (formations like kizi-zi may easily lead to haplology [kizizi > kizi] or phonetic changes like the loss of the middle syllable in a three-syllabic word [kizizi > *kizizi] and next to the facilitation of the pronunciation of the unusual geminate -zz- [kizizi > kizi]; nothing like this could occur in xalazy). A further problem is why *томский (калач) did not yield *томскай (xalas) rather than *tom (xalas).

uyba ‘blend of ground roots and barley, used as an ingredient for soups or milk foods’ (But. 20, Nr. 3) < *ugma < *ug- ‘Kh. uy- ‘to rumple, to crumple’ = Chul. ug- ‘to break’ (Bir. 67), Tuv. *ug- ‘to crush, to break’. — The verb *ug- seems to be unknown from other Tu. languages of Siberia (cf. ESTJa I 401 where Kh. and Tuv. verbs are only cited). — The Kh. meaning
‘to rumple’ is – according to the data in ÝSTJa I 402 – probably secondary, the original meaning apparently being ‘*to rub’. — The voiceless -k- in Uzb.dial. ukala- ‘to pulverize, to grind’ (ÝSTJa I 204) results from a long consonant in *ukkala- < *ugkala- < *ug-. Ýugrá ‘soup’ (But. 7, Nr. 18) = Sag.-Kh. üğrá ~ ürgä id. (Pat. SD 37) = Leb.-Alt. ürgä id. (Bask. 219) < *ůgrá (< *ůgürä [Koyb.-Kh. üğürä id.] < *ůgür- ‘*to rub, to crush’) > Old Uig. üğrä ‘Brei’ (Zieme BSU 241b) = Tat. iigra ‘Graupensuppe’ (Schön. 248), Kar.LH iwre ‘kasha, kasza’ (KRP 192b) = Yak. üördä id. (StachM GJV 133, § 41.3).

Xalas ‘a kind of roll or small round loaf’ (see above tom) < Russ. kalač id. (> Sh. Alt. kalaš id., Brb. kalač id.) > kalač-ik, Dimin. (> Tuv. kalačyk id., Yak. kalāčyk id., Dol. kalāčyk id.).

Xyjma ‘a kind of sausage, stuffed with minced meat, horse fat, onions and pepper’ (But. 6, Nr. 16) < *kýjma (*< *kyj- ‘*to chop, to mince, to hack’). — Note the different reflexes of the suffix *-ma in xyjma and in čarba (see above). — Concerning the popularity of food names with *-ma in the Tu. languages cf. the possibility to attach this suffix even to foreign and nominal stems, as in Anatolian Trk.dial. muxlama ‘*to pulse, die zubereitet wird, indem man Kase im Fett brät’ (Pat. SD, 676p.).
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