The Vocabulary of Inanimate Nature as a Part of Turkic-Mongolian Language Commonness

Valentin Ivanovich Rassadin

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Department of the Kalmyk language and Mongolian studies
Director of the Mongolian and Altaistic research Scientific centre, Kalmyk State University
358000, Republic of Kalmykia, Elista, Pushkin street, 11

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s2p126

Abstract

The article deals with the problem of commonness of Turkic and Mongolian languages in the area of vocabulary; a layer of vocabulary, reflecting the inanimate nature, is subject to thorough analysis. This thematic group studies the rubrics, devoted to landscape vocabulary, different soil types, water bodies, atmospheric phenomena, celestial sphere. The material, mainly from Khalkha-Mongolian and Old Written Mongolian languages is subject to the analysis; the data from Buryat and Kalmyk languages were also included, as they were presented in these languages. The Buryat material was mainly closer to the Khalkha-Mongolian one. For comparison, the material, mainly from the Old Turkic language, showing the presence of similar words, was included; it testified about the so-called Turkic-Mongolian lexical commonness. The analysis of inner forms of these revealed common lexemes in the majority of cases allowed determining their Turkic origin, proved by wide occurrence of these lexemes in Turkic languages and Turkologists’ acknowledgement of their Turkic origin. The presence of great quantity of common vocabulary, which origin is determined as Turkic, testifies about repeated ancient contacts of Mongolian and Turkic languages, taking place in historical retrospective, resulting in hybridization of Mongolian vocabulary.
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1. Introduction

The problem of Turkic-Mongolian linguistic connections is not new. From the XVIII century, it is being discussed in the scientific literature together with the hypothesis of the genetic affinity of so-called Altai languages, which involve, apart from Turkic and Mongolian languages, Tungus languages as well. The history of Altai investigations has a vast scientific literature, devoted to different aspects of this hypothesis, as the Turkic and Mongolian languages show the closest relations to each other from all the languages of Altai family, i.e. their commonness usually forms the basis of Altai hypothesis. Due to the fact, that there was insufficient material on Turkic and Mongolian languages in the period from XVIII to XIX and the beginning of XX centuries, and mainly Turkic sources of Arabic writing and Mongolian sources in Old Written Mongolian language were in scientists’ disposal, they were far from vivid specific Turkic and Mongolian languages, then it was difficult to expect deep investigations of this problem. The native science, the same as the world one, still cannot answer the question up to the end: if the Altaic proto-language really existed, or it is a myth and the languages of inhabitants of the Central Asia became closer in high antiquity as a result of various contacts.

From the end of XIX and the beginning of XX century, the situation of previous study of Turkic and Mongolian languages became to change significantly; a lot of investigations on grammar and vocabulary of different vivid Turkic and Mongolian languages and their dialects appeared, providing a possibility to present this hypothesis from a new angle.

The investigations of such great Altai-scientists, as Ramstedt (1957a), Kotwich W. (1953), Poppe N. (1960; 1965), Doerfer G. (1963), Räsanen M. (1965) appeared in the world science; there are the works of Vladimirtsov B.Ya. (1911) in Russian science. When a number of investigations of Foreign Altai scientists was published in Russian translation, it became possible to discuss the Altai hypothesis widely. Such works, as "Introduction to Altai Linguistics" by G.I. Ramstetd (1957b), "The Investigations on Altai Languages" by V.L. Kotvich (1962), the article of A. Ron-Tash "General Heritage or Borrowing?" (To the Problem of Relations of Altai Languages)" (1974), a monograph of M. Ryasyanen (1955) and a number of other investigations were published in Russian and became available to wide mass of native Turkologists and Mongolists. From the native scientists, this problem was studied by the Mongolist G.D. Sanzheev (1947; 1971; 1973), the Turkologists A.M. Shcherbak (1959a; 1959b; 1960; 1977; 2005), N.A. Baskakov (1981).
The Leningrad Department of the Linguistics Institute of AS USSR organized the sector of Altaic languages, the members of which published the results of different investigations on the history of Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus and Korean languages. A question about more close relation of Turkic and Mongolian languages was raised and began to be developed, as well as the problem of existence of hypothetic Turkic-Mongolian proto-language. The Altaï studies began to develop two opposite viewpoints on the kinship problem of not only Turkic and Mongolian languages, but also the relation of these languages with the other Altaic ones. Thus, for instance, some scientists, following G.I. Ramstedt, considered, that all revealed grammatical and lexical similarities between Altaic languages present the heritage of general Altaic proto-language. Other Altaïists, following V.L. Kotwich, come to the conclusion that the Altaic grammatical and lexical commonness appeared mainly in the process of historical development of the Altaic languages due to various contacts of these languages and penetration of different mutual borrowings.

From other native investigators of Turkic-Mongolian problem, it is necessary to mention the works of such Turkologists, as Sydýkov (1966; 1983), Suyunchev (1977). The article “Turkic Elements in Mongolian Language” by B.Ya. Vladimirtsov, published in 1911, was a sample for native investigators of Turkic-Mongolian linguistic problem. In connection with Turkic-Mongolian linguistic problem, it is necessary to mention our studies, devoted to the development history of Turkic-Mongolian linguistic commonness, by the example of study of both Turkic influence on the vocabulary of Mongolian languages (2007), and the Mongolian influence on some Turkic languages (2008), and also the revelation of correlation of Turkic and Mongolian grammatical elements, included to the Turkic-Mongolian linguistic commonness (2012). However, despite different studies of the interrelation problem of Turkic, Mongolian and Altaic languages in whole, they were mainly concerned with phonetics and grammar of these languages, and separate sides of vocabulary, at that, the vocabulary, being the brightest indicator of the Altaic languages, was not subject to total investigation in order to reveal all general lexical correlation between these languages. By the present moment, the native science has a lot of new investigations on the vocabulary of Turkic and Mongolian languages, providing an opportunity to reveal the Turkic-Mongolian lexical commonness at the higher level. On the part of Turkic-Mongolian languages, apart from “Old Turkic Dictionary” (1969), several volumes of “Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages” by E.V. Sevortyan and his followers (1974; 1978; 1989; 1997; 2003) appeared at the scientists’ disposal, as well as the “Comparative Grammar of Turkic Languages. Vocabulary” (2001); besides, the whole range of new more complete dictionaries on many Turkic languages also appeared. On the part of Mongolian languages, when revealing general Turkic-Mongolian vocabulary, apart from generally known dictionaries of Old Written Mongolian language, such as “Mongolian-Russian-French Dictionary” by O. Kovalovsky in three volumes (1844-1849), “Mongolian-Russian Dictionary” by K.F. Golstunsny (1894-1898), “Mongolian-English Dictionary” by F.D. Lessing (1960), it is also helpful to refer to the “Large Academic Mongolian-Russian Dictionary” (2001-2002), which provides, apart from the forms of modern Khalkha literary language, corresponding words from the Old Written Mongolian language. The material on Buryat language is taken from the “Buryat-Russian Dictionary” by K.M. Cheremisov (1973); the material on Kalmyk language is taken from the “Kalmyk-Russian Dictionary” (1977).

Thus, it is possible to say, that there are new opportunities to collect factual comparative material from Turkic and Mongolian languages, in order to determine their lexical commonness.

Our preliminary studies of this problem show, that it is not all that simple and clear here. Modern Turkic languages are heterogeneous as for the presence of vocabulary, correlated with the Mongolian one. The major part of vocabulary, correlated with the Mongolian languages, is presented in Siberian Turkic languages, which, in virtue of historical reasons, reflect the closest relations of these languages not only with the Medieval ones, but also, later, with modern Mongolian languages and dialects, and some of these languages still continue interacting with Mongolian ones. Thus, the major part of lexical correlations with the Mongolian languages was revealed in Yakut and Tuvin languages. Little less correlations with the Mongolian languages is presented in Altaic, Khakas, Shor, Tofalar, Soyat languages, the languages of Chulym Turki and Siberian Tatars. The languages of Uigur-Tsaatan and Uigur-Uryankh, of Mongolian Kazakh are still in close contact with the Mongolian languages, and Soyots of Buryatia - with Buryat language. From Turkic languages of other areas, it is necessary to mention the Kirghiz language and the language of Kypchak group - Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogai, also having many correlations with the Mongolian languages in their vocabulary. There are also the Mongolian correlations in the language of Tatar and Bashkir, as well as in the language of Kumyk, Karachay, Balkar. The languages of Karłuk group - Uzbek and Uigur - also have Mongolian correlations. At that, the languages of Uigur, living in Sintszyan-Uigur autonomous territory of P.R. China still contact directly with modern Mongolian languages, mainly, with the language of Oyrat. The least quantity of vocabulary, common with Mongolian one, is presented in Chuvash language and in the language of Oguz group: Azerbaijani, Turkish, Turkmen and Gagauz. At that, as the Turkmen live in Central Asia, and they are historically connected with Kypchak and other Central Asian tribes, then, their language has more Mongolian correlations, than the other Oguz languages. The language of monuments of Old Turkic Writing, judging by the Old Turkic dictionary, has a lot of vocabulary, correlating with Mongolian languages, at that, the detailed consideration of
general Turkic-Mongolian vocabulary showed, that many words of this group, presented in Mongolian languages, have firm Turkic etymology and cannot be explained from other languages; such words can be definitely referred to Turkic borrowings in Mongolian languages, penetrated in different historical periods. As these words are presented both in the language of ancient monuments, and in modern Turkic languages, and bear generally Turkic character, then they testify about more ancient relations of Mongolian languages with the Turkic ones, taking place long before the XIII century, the epoch of Mongolian emancipation, when the impact of Mongolian languages on Turkic ones was intensified.

On the other hand, the presence in some Turkic languages of some words, etymologized on the basis of Mongolian languages, allows assuming their Mongolian origin, due to definite features, characterizing these words; their penetration into different Turkic languages is connected with the impact of both Medieval and modern Mongolian languages in different historical periods. At the same time, there are some words without clear definiteness concerning their origin. In relation to semantics, this vocabulary is heterogeneous and presents different thematic groups, bearing evidence of the diversity of life situation, resulting in Turkic-Mongolian language contacts. The study of definite thematic groups of vocabulary allows specifying both character of Turkic languages, from which the borrowings were taken, and the character of region, where the contacts of Turkic and Mongolian ethnic groups took place.

2. Main Part

In this case, we are interested in the vocabulary of inanimate nature, having the Turkic parallels, the majority of which are of Turkic origin. Let us study these words more thoroughly below.

The Mongolian word yortönc “world, universe, space, macrocosm; light, nature” (Old Written Mongolian jirìnču, Buryat yurtemse) have the Old Turkic parallel jirìnču with the same meaning “world, universe”, as this lexeme was presented in Old Uiyur texts of Buddhistic content; then, obviously, it came to Mongolian language together with the translation of Uiyur Buddhistic texts into Mongolian language in the period, when Buddhism was outspread among early Mongolian tribes long before the epoch of Chenghis Khan, i.e. somewhere in the VII-VIII centuries A.D., in the bloom period of Uighur Kaganate of the Central Asia.

The Mongolian word delkhii “world, earth, light, universe” (Old Written Mongolian delekei, Buryat delkhii, Kalmyk delká) has constrained circulation in Turkic languages, mainly, in Siberian ones, comparing, for instance, Altaic, Shor delekei, Tuvinian delegei, it is possible to assume confidently its Mongolian origin in these languages.

The Mongolian languages are characterized by the presence of great quantity of landscape vocabulary with Turkic equivalents of clearly Turkic origin. In any case, both these words themselves and their deriving roots are recorded in Old Turkic language. Thus, the Mongolian word uul “mountain, mountains, range of mountains” (Old Written Mongolian ayula, Buryat uula, Kalmyk uul id) is not etymologized on the Mongolian basis; it is possible to try to interpret its archetype *ayula, recorded in Old Mongolian language, as lambdoiding variant of Old Turkic word form ayıš “hill, rise”, which dates back to the Old Turkic verb ay= “to raise (up), to ascend; to climb up; to uplift, to climb, to raise”. It is possible to assume, that the Old Mongolian word ayur “steam” was also formed from this word; it is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing, giving origin to modern Kh.-Mongolian uur “steam, vapor, gases, air, atmosphere, spirit, breath, climate” (Buryat uur, Kalmyk uur id), although its parallel is not presented in Old Turkic language.

A Mongolian word tag “plato; mesa plate”, recorded in Old Mongolian Writing, as tay with the meaning of “table land; flat topped mountain” has the Old Turkic parallel tay “mountain”, widely spread in all modern Turkic languages with the same meaning (see “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 94, for the occurrence of this lexeme in Turkic languages and its vermicularity); this word is not recorded in other modern Mongolian languages, that is why it is possible to assume confidently the Turkic origin of this lexeme. There is a word sarıday in the Mongolian language, meaning “a mountain with permanent snow cover; bald mountain”, which is recorded as sarıday in the same meaning in Old Written Mongolian language. This word is presented in Buryat language in the form kharîdag and means "bald mountain, treeless mountain peak". There is the highest mountain with permanent snow cover in Tunkinsk region of Buryatia through the Tunkinsk mountain range; its name is Munkhe-Sarıdag, in Buryat Munkhe-Kharîdag. The peculiarity of this mountain range is that its peaks are made of yellow rock, that is why the Turkic origin of this word becomes quite clear. The constituents of this Mongolian lexeme sarıday are presented by two elements - sarı "yellow", day "mountain". Thus, the Mongolian sarıday was initially a Turkic sarıday "yellow mountain", what is proved by the peculiarity of this realia. If to refer to the languages of Old Turkic monuments, we can see, that they have the word combination menkû qaja "eternal rock, monument with writings" (Old Turkic Dictionary, p. 343), then the Old Turkic combination menkû sarıday "eternal yellow mountain" becomes quite admissible; it gave origin to the Buryat Munkhe-Kharîdag, Munkhe-Kharîdag.

The Mongolian khad “rock, cliff, stony mountain” (Old Written Mongolian qada, Buryat khada id) can be compared
with the Old Turkic qaja “rock”, which is widely spread in modern Turkic languages in the same meaning (see “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 96, for the occurrence of this lexeme in Turkic languages and its hypothetical Mongolian origin). The intervocalic -j- in this Turkic word form can be quite acceptable as a variant in the chain of Turkic alternations j-d-z-r, generally known in the system of Turkic languages in this position. Compare, for instance, Turkic ajaq - adaq - azaq - ura “leg”, here in the case with qaja, it is not quite clear, why the variant with c-j-? became so wide spread. Thus, the Tuvinian language is d-language, and “rock” is also named khaya, the Khakas language is z-language, and “rock” is also named khaya, as well as kaya in Altai language, which belongs to j-languages.

The Mongolian khyar “spine (of hill), mountain range, foothill” (Buryat khyara “mountain edge”) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as qir-a, the archetype of which is qira, what is quite comparable with the Old Turkic qir “plateau, dam”. (See the “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 95-96, for the occurrence in Turkic languages). In modern Turkic languages, qir is known more as “the mountains with aiguilles, mountain range”.

The Mongolian boom “cusp, projecting rock” (Buryat боомо язар, Kalmyk боомо язар “heavy-going place”) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as boyum with the same meaning. It is possible to assume, that this Mongolian word is formed from the Mongolian verb boyu “to obstruct, to block, to cut the road, to impede”, which has also a meaning “to tie, to tie up, to wrap, to pack”. The second meaning of this Mongolian verb can be compared with the Old Turkic boy- “to strangle, to squash”. It is possible, that the Old Turkic boyum/boyiım “knot, joint, articulation (of fingers, reed)” is derived from it. The word boom “narrow, high mountains along the shores of mountain river, as if clenching its stream”, presented in some Siberian Turkic languages, can be considered as coming from the Mongolian language.

The Mongolian bulš “burial mound; tomb, cemetery, graveyard, tomb mound” (Buryat bulaša “burial ground, burial mound, tomb; cemetery”, Kalmyk bulış “tomb; vault; cemetery”) was recorded in Old Mongolian Written language as bulaš with the same meaning. The inner form of this word consists of the components bula and ši, where the component ši is neither more nor less than simple verbal word-formative general Mongolian affix, and the component bula can be identified with the Mongolian verb bula (the modern Mongolian bulakh, Buryat bulakhka “to embed, to bury, to cover, Kalmyk bulkh “to cover, to bury, to embed, to entomb”), meaning “to bury, to cover, to embed, to fill up, to throw in”, what is presented in the semantics of Mongolian bulš. This Mongolian verb can be compared with the Old Turkic bulä “steam, stew (about food)”. If to take into consideration, that ancient nomads-cattle breeders, both Turki and Mongolians, widely practiced stewed meat dishes, digging them into the ground under the fire, then, the use of this Turkic verb becomes also clear in creation of the burial mound that obviously took place long ago, when the ancient Turki overruled in the steppes of Central Asia.

The Mongolian tovon “prominence” (Buryat dobuun “elevated place, hill, hillock; mound”, Kalmyk dovun “hillock, prominence, elevated place”) is recorded in Old Written Mongolian language as tobung with the same meaning. It is possible to compare with the Old Turkic топу “crown, top; head; peak”, compare, for instance, Old Turkic сумир таин tопусинта “on the top of Sumeru mountain”. Here is clear, that the meanings of Mongolian and Turkic words are within the limits of one semantic field, although there are slight differences.

The Mongolian žalýa “coomb, hollow, narrow log, stria, valley; creek valley, dike; gully; cavity” (Buryat žalýa “valley, stria; coomb, hollow, log, creek valley, dike”, Kalmyk žalýy “hollow, valley”) is recorded in the Old Written Mongolian language as jil-a with the same meanings, which archetype can be *jilýa. The are two components: *jil and ya. If to assume, that -ya is a word-forming suffix, then the element *jil cannot be explained on the Mongolian basis. It can be compared with the Turkic verb jil-ılfî, which is traced, for instance, in the Old Turkic words jilân “snake” jilyun “tamarisk”, jildiz “root” and means “to wriggle”. The Tatar elya, Bashkir jilya “river”, based on the same Turkic verb jil-ı, can be compared with the Mongolian jilý-a. The similarity of meanings of Mongolian and Turkic words is in the fact, that externally and visually “the coomb, the valley” and “the river with its channel” present basically similar objects of nature. The coombs of steppe Mongolia are presented as deep serpentine grooves, along the bottom of which can flow the spring. Essentially, these grooves are formed by the rain or spring water that is why their similarity with the river is obvious.

The Mongolian tal “field, steppe, open space; side, place” (Buryat tala “field, steppe, plain, open space, Kalmyk tala “open space, field; plain”) is recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as tal-a with the same meaning. It can be compared with the Old Turkic tala “steppe” (see the “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 99, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages).

The Mongolian cceqleg “flower garden, garden” (Buryat seseqleg “bloomy”, Kalmyk cceqil “flower garden”) is recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as cceqqil (id.). This word consists of two components: the root cceq and affix ilg. This root means the flower, and it is widely presented in modern Mongolian languages – Kh.-Mongolian cceq, Buryat seseg, Kalmyk cceq id. Both Mongolian components have Turkic origin. The word cceqek is widely spread in modern Turkic languages, and it is presented in the language of Old Turkic monuments in the form čečák “flower”. Its genesis has
the Turkic verb čez= (see the “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 120-121, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages and its Turkic etymology), recorded in Old Turkic language with the meaning “to disperse, to spread”. The Turkic affix -liq/-lik is also generally known; it serves to form the word čezčalik “flower garden” in the Old Turkic language, which became the prototype for the Mongolian čezčegliğ. Obviously, the Mongolian cecerleg “garden, hotbed; flower garden” and Buryat selerig “flower garden, rarely “flower bed” are connected with these Turkic components.

The Mongolian otor “distant pasture; cattle grazing on distant pastures; fresh grass in spring; spring round-up” (Buryat otor “summer shed, hunters lodge; summer farm; remote pasture”, otorloko “go to summer shed with cattle”, Kalmyk otor “distant pasture”) is given in Old Mongolian Writing as otur id. This word can be compared with the Turkic otor “pasture” (see Sevortyan..., 1974, p. 488, for the Turkic character of this word and its Turkic etymology), derived from the generally Turkic word of “grass” (see the “Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...”, p. 119-120; Sevortyan..., 1974, p. 481, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages).

The Mongolian cöl “desert; desolate, unpopulated” (Buryat “sül desolate, sül yazar, sül gübi “desert”, Kalmyk cöl “desert”) is recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as čöl with the same meaning and can be compared with the Old Turkic čöl “desert”.

The Mongolian oi “forest (usually on plain)” (Buryat oi “forest”, Kalmyk ø “forest”) is recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as oi “forest”. Its correspondence in Old Turkic language is the word oi, means “valley” (see Sevortyan..., 1974, p. 425, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages and its Turkic origin). Unconformity of meaning of Mongolian and Turkic lexemes can be explained by metaphorical adjacent shift, as in the Mongolian language, this word is referred to the forest, growing on the plain, usually in the floodplain; the hilly forest is named in another way.

The Mongolian taiya “taiga, thick forest” (Buryat taija) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as tayiy-a in the same meaning. Its correspondence in many Turkic languages is the word taiga, meaning either “thick, deep forest” or “hilly forest”, as in Siberian Turkic languages. Meanwhile, it is difficult to say something definite about the origin of this word, as it was not recorded in the language of Old Turkic monuments. The presence of khvče in the Mongolian language, meaning “hilly forest”, allows assuming, that the lexeme taiya can come to Mongolian and Buryat from Turkic languages.

The Mongolian word cavčlān “fire-break in the forest” (Buryat sabšalān “mowing”, Kalmyk cavčllkh “to cut, to chop”), recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as čapčlān in the same meaning, is formed on the Mongolian basis by means of affix from the Mongolian verb čabč “to cut”, which can be compared with the Old Turkic čap= “to cut”, being widely spread in Turkic languages.

The Mongolian tarālān “tilleage, field, cornfield, sowing” (Buryat tarialān “tilleage”, Kalmyk tārīn “seeding, sowing; cornfield, field, tillage”), recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as tarijalang with the same meaning, having the archetype *tarijalang, where the components *tariy and -alang are traced. At that, the component -alang presents a word-formative affix -alang and the inserted vowel -a-, used, if there is the final consonant of the deriving stem. The component *tariy can be compared with the Old Turkic word tariy “grain, corn, bread; millet; farming, agronomy”, which genesis has the Old Turkic verb tarī= “to sow”.

The Mongolian khiaят yazar “the place, overgrowing with wheat grass” (compare, Buryat khiayaят yazar id.), is given in the Old Mongolian Writing as qijaytu yaʃar with the same meaning. The component qijaytu, having the archetype *qijaytu, which consists of two elements *qijay and -tu. Here –tu presents the general Mongolian affix with the semantics of possession of any subject, property, feature; the component *qijay is presented in modern Mongolian language as khiaят, in Buryat - as kihay with the meaning “wheat grass”, being nothing more than the borrowing of the Turkic word qiyaq “wheat grass”, presented in some Turkic languages, as, for instance, Bashkir qiyaq, Kirghiz qiyaq “wheat grass” and derived from the Turkic verb qiy= “to cut on the slant”. The use of verb with this semantics is conditioned by that feature of the wheat grass, that it has sharp, cutting edges.

It is necessary to include the names of roads, paths etc. to the landscape vocabulary. The Mongolian jöröг “path, footpath; walk, pathway” (Buryat jürge “walk, pathway”) is recorded in the Old Mongolian Writing as jörig with the same meaning. It is impossible to interpret this word on the Mongolian basis, at the same time, it can be etymologized on the Turkic basis, dating back to the Old Turkic verb jüri- “to go, to move around”. This Turkic verb is also connected with the Mongolian jöröг “passing place, bifurcation; (road) cross” (Old Written Mongolian jörilge id.) and jöril “cross road” (Old Written Mongolian jörilte id.).

The Mongolian belčir “waters meet; cross-roads; crotch” (Buryat belšer id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as belćir in the same meaning, the archetype of which we can reconstruct as *belțir, as in the development history of sound structure of the Mongolian languages, the syllable *ti developed into či, as a rule, it was in case of borrowing of Turkic words. This Mongolian word in Old Turkic language has a corresponding form belțir “waters meet”, well survived in
Siberian Turkic languages (see the "Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...", p. 98, for the existence of this word in Turkic languages).

The vocabulary of inanimate nature involves the names of soils, stones etc. Here it is necessary to consider the Mongolian term čuluu "stone" (Buryat šuluun, Kalmyk čolun id), which can be compared with the Chuvash word čul "stone". At the first sight, this comparison seems to be reasonable, but the etymological analysis shows the ambiguous picture. Thus, the Mongolian word is recorded in the Old Writing as čīlayun, the archetype of which is *tilayun, the element-un here is the suffix, finalizing the nominal stems in Mongolian languages, and *tilay – is the root. The modern Chuvash čul consistently dates back to the archetype *tul, what is the Bulgar lambdoiding form of the Turkic word taš. Here the Turkic root vowel -a- is consistently replaced by the Bulgar –u-. If to consider, that stone is the oldest material, from which the ancestors of Altaic nations produced their work equipment, then, we can easily assume, that similar names could be survived in Altaic languages, what is indeed so. Thus, the Tungus languages use the word d'oloy to name the stone, and the Korean language uses the word tol. Thus, there is the chain taš/*tul/*tilay/d'oloy/tol, which testifies about closeness of Altaic languages, relating to the Stone Age epoch (see the "Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...", p. 638, for the occurrence of the word taš in Turkic languages and its origin).

The Mongolian bilüü "bar, hone-stone, grinder, grindstone (finely grained grindstone)" (Buryat bülüü "grinder, grindstone, bar, hone-stone", Kalmyk bülü i.d.) is given in the Old Mongolian Writing as bilegüü, coinciding with the archetype. This word is not etymologized on the Mongolian basis. At the same time, it shall be compared with the Old Turkic bilägü "grindstone", which is formed from the Old Turkic bilä "to grind", what, in its turn, is the derived verb from the Old Turkic bi "blade". See Sevortyan, 1978, p. 142-143, for the occurrence of the form bile in Turkic languages and its Turkic etymology.

The Mongolian khayiryä "gravel; pebble, broken stone; sand place; large grindstone, grinder, bar" (Buryat khayir "pebble, broken stone, sandbank, sand spit", Kalmyk khär "shoal, shallow (water)") is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as qajiru with the same meaning. This word form falls into two elements: suffix –yu and root qajir, which, the same as Buryat khayir and Kalmyk khär is nothing but the borrowed Old Turkic word qajir "sand", survived in different modern Turkic languages as qajir with the meaning "sand, fallow land, soil with pebble" (see the "Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic languages...", p. 97; Sevortyan, 1997, p. 217, for the connection of these Turkic and Mongolian word forms, and about their Turkic origin), the verb qajir "to grind on rough stone" is derived from the Turkic root by means of the Turkic affix -a; it produced the derived noun qajraq "rough grind stone", see E.V. Sevortyan (1997, p. 205; the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 97).

The Mongolian khom (obsolete) "sand; sandy" (Kalmyk khum rarely "sand, dust") is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as qum (qum? id). This word obviously corresponds to the Old Turkic qum "sand", which is also widely presented in modern Turkic languages (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 102). The modern Mongolian qumay "earth; sand grain" and Old Mongolian qumay id., as well as Mongolian khumkhi "sand grain, dust particle; finest particles; molecule, atom; sandy", Buryat khumkhi "dust; sand grain, dust particle", and also Old Mongolian qumaki id. They all date back to the variant qumak of this generally Turkic root (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 102).

The Mongolian sair "pebble, small, shivery stone; granitic subsoil" (Kalmyk sāir "stony plateau") is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as sair id. It can be compared with the Old Turkic saj "volcanogenic stony place; desert plain", survived in some modern Turkic languages with the meaning "pebble place, blind creek, covered with pebble" (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 93, for the occurrence of this native word in Turkic languages).

The Mongolian toos "dust" (Buryat. tooyon, Kalmyk toosn "dust; dust particle") is given in Old Mongolian Writing as toyusun id., coinciding with the archetype. This word form has two components: toyu and -sun. The component -sun is the general Mongolian affix, formalizing the nouns of not only Mongolian origin, but also borrowed ones, especially from Turkic languages. The component toyu is not etymologized on the Mongolian basis, but coincides well with the Old Turkic toy “dust”. When being borrowed, the suffix –sun was added to it through the inserted vowel -u-, producing the Old Mongolian word form toyusun.

The Mongolian tooqoy “ash, dust, cinder, powder” (Buryat toboroy “ash, dust”, Kalmyk toqor “dust particle”) is presented in Old Mongolian language as tobyray id. This word can be compared with the Old Turkic topraq “earth, ash, dust”, which is the derivative from the Old Turkic verb topra “to wither, to dry” (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 99, for the occurrence of this word in modern Turkic languages and its Turkic etymology).

The Mongolian balsiq “dog, fen, moor, mud, slit” (Buryat balsiq “mud; sludge; puddle”), Kalmyk balsiq “slush, mud”) is given in Old Mongolian language as balsiq id. This word does not have the etymology on the Mongolian basis. It can be correlated with the Old Turkic balčiq, recorded in the Old Turkic language as a part of the pair word balčiq baliq “silt and
mud" (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 374-375, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages). The Turkic word *balıq/bałuq* "city" is the single-rooted with the Turkic *balıq*, as the ancient Central Asian cities were built up from clay; the associative semantic connection of mud and clay mortar is obviously traced here. Besides, some modern Turkic languages have the word *balıkaš /balıkaš* "slush" (compare, Balkhash lake), which is formed from the root *bal*, the same as the abovementioned words (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 374; Sevortyan, 1978, p. 59, for the Turkic root *bal* "clay, slush").

The Mongolian *čiig* "dampness, moisture, humidity" (Buryat šiig “dampness, moisture, humidity”, Kalmyk čiigta “damp, humid, wet”) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *čiig id*. This word can be compared with the Old Turkic *či* "dew; damp, humid" and with the Old Turkic *čiig* = “to damp, to get wet”.

This category of vocabulary involves the names of different water bodies.

The Mongolian *dalaʃ* "sea, ocean" (compare, Buryat dalai “sea, ocean; large lake”, Kalmyk dalâla/ dala "sea, ocean") is recorded in Old Mongolian language as *dalaʃ id*. It is well compared with the Old Turkic *talui* in the meaning "sea, ocean". In some modern Turkic languages, mainly Siberian, for instance, Tuvinian, Tofalar, Soyot, the word form *dala* "ocean, sea" is presented, where this word, judging by the phonetic structure, is, likely, a mongolism (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 89, for the Chinese origin of Turkic word form *talui*).

The Mongolian *tengis* "sea" (Buryat *tengis* in combination with *tengis* dalai "sea" Kalmyk *tengis* id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *tengis* and can be compared with the Old Turkic *teŋiʃ* "sea” with devocalization of the final -z.

This general Turkic word is presented in modern Turkic languages in different sound structure, for instance, *tengis* //deniz/dingez/tines etc. (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 89 for the Turkic character of this word).

The Mongolian *mûren* "stream" (Buryat *mûren* id, Kalmyk *mûrm obsolete "a river that runs into the sea") is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *mûren* b in the same meaning. In the language of Old Turkic monuments, it has a corresponding word *mûran* "river". It is given in the Old Turkic dictionary with the mark Mongolian (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 92, for the Turkic character of the word *mûran* and nostratic origin of its root).

The Mongolian. yol “river” (Buryat qol, Kalmyk yol id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *yol* id and can be compared with the Old Turkic qol "valley" (See the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., p. 91-92, for the occurrence per nostratic languages).

The Mongolian bulaq "spring, well, water source" (Buryat bulay "well, water source, spring", Kalmyk buly "well, water source") is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *bulay* in the same meaning and can be compared with the Old Turkic *bulaq* "spring, water source"; this word is not etymologized on the Mongolian basis. At the same time, it can be compared with the general Turkic *bulut* "cloud"; it is possible to assume the origin of these Turkic words from some root *bul*- with the semantics "to heave". The image of bubbling spring from under the ground and the image of curling clouds are connected with this semantics (See Sevortyan, 1978, p. 262-264, for the wide occurrence of the word *bulan* in Turkic languages and its Turkic etymology).

The Mongolian khaday "well; pit" (Buryat khaday "well", Kalmyk khudy id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *quduy* in the same meaning. This word is not etymologized on the Mongolian basis, but it can be compared with the Old Turkic *quduy* "well". This word form correlates with the word forms *quðuy* and *quyj* "well", presented in different Old Turkic languages. The form *quduy* dates back to the Old Turkic d-language, represented by the Old Uigur and Old Oguz languages. It is based on the Old Turkic verb *qud* = “to pour”, which is based on the consonant -d/-, alternating with -z/-j/-r- in Turkic languages (compare, Old Turkic *quð*, *qyj* = “to pour”).

The Mongolian aday "delta, inflow, lower reach, domain", having also the meaning "end, bottom line; low; extreme, uttermost, worse, useless, bad (in quality)" (Buryat aday "end; inflow; figurative the last, the worse, bad" Kalmyk ady id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *adag* with the same meanings. The same as with the Mongolian khaday, this lexeme shall be compared with the Old Turkic *adag* "foot; leg; support; bottom part, foundation; inflow", which has a consonant -d/- in its stem in the place of -z/-j/-r- of other Turkic languages. This feature allows referring this word to Old Uigur or Old Oguz (compare in other Old Turkic languages *adag, aqaj*); see Sevortyan, 1974, p. 104-105, for the occurrence of this lexeme in Turkic languages and its original character).

The Mongolian aral "island" (Buryat aral, Kalmyk ari id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *aral* id. This word can be correlated with the Turkic aral "island", where the general Turkic root *ara* "interval, space between" can be traced; it explains the position of island among the water bodies (see Sevortyan, 1974, p. 167, for the existence of this word in Turkic languages and variants of its etymology).

The Mongolian oltrig "archipelago, island, islet" (Buryat oltrig id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as *oltrig* id, and can be correlated with the Old Turkic *otruj* "island".
The inanimate nature also involves natural phenomena, elements, nature, downfall, time, celestial sphere etc. Let us consider Mongolian terms, included into this group, more thoroughly.

The Mongolian oč "spark" (Buryat ošon, Kalmyk ocn id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as očin id, dating back to the archetype *oṭin through the form *oṭin; it is not explicable on the Mongolian basis. However, this word can be decomposed into two constituents: the element o and in, which can be interpreted as the indicator of the nominal stems, also joined to the borrowed words, and the element o is nothing but the borrowed Old Turkic word ot “fire”. This word is the general Turkic one, and it is wide spread in all modern Turkic languages. The association of flying sparkles of the burning fire with the fire itself makes this presupposition probable (see Sevortyan, 1974, p. 483-484, for the wide occurrence of this word in Turkic languages).

The Mongolian ʒali “flame, shine” (Buryat sog ʒali “fervency”, ʒali tümer “coal tongs”, Kalmyk zali “flame”) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing as jalín id, having the archetype *jalín, which can be correlated with the Old Turkic jalín “flame”, derived from the Old Turkic verb ja-l “flash, inflame”. This Turkic word was also included to the Old Mongolian language with the initial consonant ž- instead of ž-; we can see it is some modern Turkic languages, such as Kirghiz, Kazakh and some Siberian (see Sevortyan, 1989, p. 106-107, for the wide occurrence of this word in Turkic languages and its etymology).

The Mongolian cog “gleed; fever, cinder” (Buryat sog “smouldering coal”, Kalmyk cog “fever”) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing in the form of <TSource id, corresponding to the Old Turkic <TSource “glitter, shine; flame, fever”.

The Mongolian salkhin “wind” (Buryat khalkhin, Kalmyk salkn id) is recorded in Old Mongolian Writing in the form of salkin id, having the archetype *salqin. In Old Turkic language, it has a corresponding word form salgün “coolness, cold”, wide spread in this meaning in modern Turkic languages (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., 2001, p. 36-37).

The Mongolian kharankhui “darkness; obscurity, dark” (Buryat kharakhii, Kalmyk kharnyu id) is recorded in Old Mongolian language as qaranqyid, corresponding to the Old Turkic qaranqyu id. Undoubtedly, the Mongolian and Turkic forms here are derived from the Turkic-Mongolian root qara “black”, widely spread both in Mongolian and Turkic languages (see the Etymological Dictionary of Turkic languages, 1997, p. 286-288, 299-301, for the occurrence of this
word and its etymology in connection with kara).

The Mongolian cag “time; period; hour; clock” (Buryat sag “time, period”, Kalmyk cag “time, period”) is recorded in Old Mongolian language as ṣaγ id, what is quite corresponding to the Old Turkic çaq “time, period”. This word is widely spread in modern Turkic languages in the same meaning (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., 2001, p. 67-68, for the occurrence of çaq in Turkic languages and its connection with the Mongolian çaγ).

The Mongolian zähl “year” (Buryat ʒel, Kalmyk ʒil id) is recorded in Old Mongolian language as ḳil id, the archetype of which is įl, corresponding to the Old Turkic įl “year”. This word is widely spread in modern Turkic languages as yiil//yil//il//Кil//Кiil//þil etc. (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., 2001, p. 79-71; Sevortyan, 1989, p. 275, for the occurrence of this word in Turkic languages and its Turkic character in Mongolian language).

The Mongolian tenger “sky, heavens, heavenly sphere” (Buryat tengeri, Kalmyk teŋgr «sky, heavens”) is recorded in Old Mongolian language as tnerg id, corresponding to the Old Uigur orthography of this word. In the language of Old Turkic runic monuments, it has a corresponding form tәŋr “sky; god, deity; godlike; sovereign, lord”, which is presented in many modern Turkic languages either with the meaning sky, or with the meaning deity; there is also a hypothesis about its origin from the Old Turkic verb teŋ= “to dominate, to raise, to fly up” (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., 2001, p. 59), although it is replaced by the word asnman “sky” in Turkic nations with Muslim religion.

The Mongolian colmon “Venus” (Buryat Кон定律 id) is recorded in Old Mongolian language as ọlmon id, corresponding with the Turkic word ọlpan “Venus”, which is presented in many modern Turkic languages (see the Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages..., 2001, p. 50-51, for its occurrence in Turkic languages and its Turkic origin).

3. Conclusions

The Mongolian terms of inanimate nature, considered above, having the Turkic parallels mainly in Old Turkic language, the monuments of which are many centuries older, than the monuments of Old Mongolian language, speak about the fact, that these terms existed in Mongolian languages long before the decay of Mongolian ethnic community and formation of Buryat, Khalkha-Mongolian and Oyrat areas. Turkic etymologies, in many cases, provide an opportunity to assume easily the Turkic origin of these Mongolian terms, characterizing this place, its landscape peculiarities, soil type, specificity of climate, atmospheric phenomena, celestial sphere etc.; as these terms obviously have the Turkic etymology, then it testifies about originality and inclusion of the whole layer of Turkic words to the vocabulary system of Mongolian language; apparently, they refer to the substrate language, which replaced the language of local Turk; such mixture processes of Turkic and Mongolian ethnic groups took place repeatedly during the historical development of Turkic and Mongolian nations.

4. Summary

Thus, this lexico-semantic group, including the variety of obvious originally Turkic words, testifies about complex composition of vocabulary of modern Mongolian languages and its hybrid character.
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