

WORD-PAIRS IN TOKHARIAN AND OTHER LANGUAGES

PENTTI AALTO

In A-Tokharian texts we find numerous combinations of two synonymous words or words expressing nearly related – or, in some cases, opposite – conceptions. The meaning of such a binomial obviously approaches that of a dvandva. It is, however, most frequently used as a kind of hendiadys to translate a single Sanskrit word. Most often we meet combinations of two substantives of which only the latter is usually declined.¹ In some cases a Sanskrit substantive is thus combined with its Tokharian equivalent, e.g. *nam poto* 'bow-reverence', *gaurap ynāñmuneyo* 'esteem-respect', *sāmudrā lyām* ~ B *lyam samudrā* 'ocean-sea', or in inverse order *lame āṣām* 'seat-chair.' A combination of two Tokharian synonyms, however, represents the most frequent type. Besides pairs of substantives there occur several combinations of two adjectives, and sometimes even pairs of verbs (present indicatives and more rarely preterites or participles) are to be found: *ārtantrā pālantrā* '(they) eulogize-praise', etc. Most of the pairs occurring in the A texts are listed by Schulze-Sieg-Siegling in their Grammar (p. 221, § 358 ff.). Similar combinations occur also in B-Tokharian texts.

Several scholars have tried to explain the origin and propagation of these expressions as being due to the influence of some foreign language. Thus Sapir² considered them translation loans in imitation of Tibetan expressions. In Tibetan, for example Buddhist technical terms are often translated by pairs of words, e.g. *Buddha* by *Saṅs rgyas* "Der Erwachte-Aufgeblühte". Sapir shows that in Tibetan e.g. *thugs* and *sñin* 'heart' and *yid* 'soul' are used in combination with other substantives in the same way as Tokharian *āriñc* 'heart' (cf. below). It appears, however, that Buddhism was spread among the Tokharians earlier than in Tibet, and

¹ "Gruppenflexion", Krause-Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960), p. 91, § 83 f.; Schulze-Sieg-Siegling, *Tocharische Grammatik* (Göttingen, 1931), p. 205, § 338 ff.

² *Language*, XII (1936), p. 259 ff.

that in Tokharian there are almost no Tibetan loan words, while loans from Sanskrit and Iranian are numerous. W. Schulze³ illustrated these Tokharian expressions with Hungarian parallels quoted from Szinnyei's works, and referred also to materials from other Finno-Ugric languages published by Lewy. W. Krause, too, quotes⁴ Finno-Ugric combinations, such as Ostyak *ńot-sēm* "nose-eye" = 'face', Estonian *sū-silmad* "mouth-eyes" = 'face' as possible prototypes of Tokh. *akmal* "eye-nose" = 'face'. Finno-Ugric instances of this type can easily be found, cf. e.g. Vogul *ńol-tus* "nose-mouth" ~ *ńol-sam* "nose-eye" = 'face', Hungarian *arcz* 'face' (= *orr* 'nose' + *száj* 'mouth'), Ziryene *ńjr-vom* "nose-mouth" Votyak *jm-ńjr* "mouth-nose" = 'face'; compare also Hung. *szem-fül* "eye-ear" = 'curious (about something)', Votyak *śin-pel* "eye-ear" = 'witness', Vogul *sam-pəl-tal* "eye-ear-less" = 'blind', *pal-ńol-tal* "ear-nose-less" = 'deaf', etc.⁵; cf. further Chuvassian *pit-kuś* "face-eye" = 'face'.

On the other hand we must bear in mind that binomials which are very similar to the Tokharian combined expressions have existed in neighbouring languages, viz. in Turkic⁶ and Mongolian,⁷ since their earliest known phases. Like the Tokharian pairs the Turkic and Mongolian expressions usually inflect only the second component. Moreover, the pairs in these languages are often composed of words corresponding exactly to those used in Tokharian, e.g. Tokharian A *ńom klyu* ~ B *ńem kálywe* = Old Turkic and Uigurian *at kü* = Mongolian (SH etc.) *nere aldar* "name-fame" = 'renown', all translating Sanskrit *yaśas* in Buddhist texts; cf. Hungarian *ńır név* "fame-name" = 'renown'⁸; Tokh. A. *yātlune parnoreyo* = OT Uig. *čoy yalın* = Mong. *čoy ńali* "ardour-splendour" = 'majesty' (= Sanskrit *tejas* or *śrī*), in Mongolian also *čoy*

³ *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, 7 (Berlin, 1927), p. 168ff., and *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1934), p. 255.

⁴ *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 69 (1951), p. 197f.

⁵ Finno-Ugric instances quoted in this paper are taken from Ö. Beke, *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 42 (Budapest, 1913), p. 342ff.; E. Lewy, *Zur finnisch-ugrischen Wort- und Satzverbindung* (Göttingen, 1911), *passim*, *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 50 (Budapest, 1921), p. 93; *Tscheremissische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1922), p. 92; A. Penttilä, *MSFOu*, LII (Helsinki, 1924), p. 191ff.; A. Kannisto, *Virittäjä*, 37 (Helsinki, 1933), p. 417f., M. Zsirai, *Finnugor Rokonságunk* (Budapest, 1937), p. 73; D. R. Fokos-Fuchs, *Rolle der Syntax in der Frage nach Sprachverwandtschaft* (= *Ural-Altäische Bibliothek*, vol. XI) (Wiesbaden, 1962), p. 71f.

⁶ A. von Gabain, *Altürkische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1950), p. 161, § 365.

⁷ N. Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian* (Wiesbaden, 1954), p. 120f., § 426

⁸ OT Uig. probably to read *kū*; Uig. also *kū suruy* "fame-renown", Mong. *aldar čab* "fame-fame", where *čab* is a loan word from Uigurian.

ĵibqulang (= Sanskr. *tejas*);⁹ Tokh. A *nati tampe* "force-might" ~ *nati wärşşalyo* "force-strength" = OT Uig. *küč küsün* ~ Uig. *ärk türk* ~ Coman. *erk qun* "force-strength" ~ OT Uig. *iş küč* "deed-force" = Mong. (SH etc.) *auya*¹⁰ *küčün* "strength-force" ~ *erke küčün*¹¹ ~ (HI) *küčün omoy* "force-might" = 'power' (= Sanskrit *vīrya*).

An interesting instance of this combining method seems to be *burqan*, the OT Uig. Mong. word for *Buddha* and also for "deity, idol" in general. It has been explained as *bur* < Old Chinese **b'iuət* (< Sanskr. *Buddha*) + OT Uig. Mong. *qan* ~ *ġan* 'king'. Since we, however, have in Tokharian an exactly corresponding combination, viz. A *ptāñkät* ~ B *pudñäkte* = A *pta* ~ *put* (e.g. in *puttišparäm* 'Buddha-dignity', cf. SSS § 34 and § 363) ~ B *pud* 'Buddha' (cf. further Soghd. *pwt* id.) + A *ñkät* ~ B *ñäkte* 'majesty, god', it appears to be possible to derive Uig. Mong. *bur* from Tokharian and regard *ptāñkät* ~ *pudñäkte* as the prototype of *burqan*.¹² As to the parallel Uig. Mong. *bursang* used in the binom *bursang quwaray* = Sanskr. *saṅgha*, we have Tokh. AB *sañk*, B *sañ*, Soghd. *snk* (e.g. A *pis sañk* = Sanskr. *bhikṣusaṅgha*).

Further instances are: Tokh. A *waste pärmañk* 'refuge-hope' = Uig. *umuy inay* 'hope-refuge', Tokh. B *sam waste* = Mong. *itegel abural* 'protection-refuge' (= Sanskr. *śaraṇa*); Tokh. A *yetwe wampe* ~ *wampe yetwe* = Uig. *itig yaratıy* "trinket-outfit" ~ Mong. *ĵasal čimeg* "outfit-trinket" = 'ornament'; Tokh. A *yärk poto* ~ *yärk ynāñmune* ~ *gaurap ynāñmuneyo*, B *yarke peti* = Uig. *tapıy uduy*, Coman. *syj tabuġ* = Mong. *kündülel takil* ~ *takil tabıy* 'reverence-respect' (= Sanskr. *satkāra* ~ *pūjā*).

Uigurian pairs expressing a mental state have often the word *köñül* 'heart' as their second component, e.g. *ög köñül* 'intelligence', *qorqinč köñül* 'fear', *öpkä köñül* 'anger', *köñül saqinč* 'sentiment', *köñül bilig* 'knowledge' (= Sanskr. *vijñāna*).¹³ These seem to imitate the Tokharian constructions with A *āriñc* ~ *āriñci* ~ *āriñçi* 'heart', e.g. *āriñc päłtsäk* "heart-thinking" = 'intelligence', *āriñçi ākāl* 'wish'. In Mongolian we meet at least (SH) *örü ĵirüke* "heart-heart", perhaps = 'sentiment', in Finno-Ugric languages e.g. Ziryene *şelem mus* "heart-liver" = 'intestines', while the interpretation of Vogul *sim-por* 'soul' as *sim* 'heart' + *por*

⁹ In Mongolian *čoy jali* and *suu jali* seem to be to a certain extent synonymous and interchangeable; as to *suu* cf. Kotwicz, *Rocznik Orjentalistyczny*, X (Lwów, 1934), p. 145ff.

¹⁰ *auya* is in my opinion an Iranian loan word.

¹¹ A Turkic **erk küč* has been suggested as etymon of Hung. *erkölcs* 'virtus', cf. Ligeti in *Nyk*, 49 (1935), p. 220f.

¹² See Mironov in *RO*, VI (1928), p. 162f.; Cleaves, *HJAS*, 17 (1954), p. 91f.

¹³ Also with adjectives, e.g. *yarlıqančuči köñül* 'misericordia', *qorqinčsüz ayančsüz köñül* 'fearlessness', (cf. Gabain, *ATG* § 401).

'liver' by Munkácsi (*Keleti Szemle*, VI, p. 72) seems to be uncertain, cf. Paasonen, *JSFOu*, XXVI, 4, p. 2, and Liimola, *JSFOu*, 57, 1, p. 15, as well as Kannisto and Liimola, *MSFOu*, 114, p. 532f.

In the Uigurian pairs with *tjri* 'god, majesty' as the second component we have close parallels of the Tokharian expressions with *ñkät* 'god, majesty': Tokh. *A kom ñkät* ~ Uig. *kün tjri* "sun-god" = 'sun', Tokh. *mañ ñkät* ~ Uig. *ay tjri*¹⁴ "moon-god" = 'moon' (cf. Uig. *kün ay tjri iki yaruq ordular* 'sun and moon (are) two bright palaces'), Tokh. *tkem ñkät* ~ Uig. *tjri yir* 'earth'; in Finno-Ugric languages at least Mordvin *kov-pas* ~ *kov-pavas* 'moon-god' = 'moon', *tši-pas* ~ *ši-bavas* 'sun-god' = 'sun', *niške-pas* ~ *ški-pas* ~ *skabavas* "god-god" = 'the supreme god' (Paasonen, *Mordwinische Chrestomathie*, Helsinki, 1909, sub 307, 519, 1031, 1041), where *pas* ~ *pavas* (~ *bavas*) < Iranian *baya* 'lord, god'.

Combinations of two adjectives are in all languages less usual, cf., however, Tokh. *añumäski weyeñ* 'wonderful-astonishing' ~ *wiyu trikū* ~ *weyeñ trekeñ* 'astonishing-confusing' = Uig. *tañlančy muñadīnčy* 'wonderful-astonishing'. In Uigurian we meet also a verbal binomial *muñad-adiñ-* '[to] wonder-[to] marvel'.

It is a known fact that Buddhist works were translated into Uigurian from Tokharian and then from Uigurian into Mongolian. The Tokharian translations themselves seem to derive either directly or through Soghdian intermediaries from Sanskrit (or Prakrit) originals. Tokharian and Soghdian loan words and Sanskrit loan words in their Soghdian and Tokharian form as well as translation loans are therefore to be found in Uigurian and Mongolian Buddhistic texts. We thus find numerous pairs of the above kind in the Uigurian version of the *Āṭavaka-avadāna*.¹⁵ In my paper "Zum *Āṭavakāvadāna*"¹⁶ I have tried to prove that the A-Tokharian fragment No. 401 belongs to a Tokharian version of the same *Avadāna* and that it shows a certain similarity to the Uigurian text. This relationship is probably reflected also by the binomials of the latter, though we do not always know their exact Tokharian prototypes.

On the other hand, Sanskrit originals of Buddhistic works already tend to enumerate all the possible synonymous expressions for an important conception in order to cover the subject as completely as possible, e.g. (P)

¹⁴ W. Bang (*Muséon*, 44 [1931], p. 15) considered this Uig. expression to be an imitation of Soghdian *γwyr βγ*, cf. Winter, "Tocharians and Turks" (*Aspects of Altaic Civilization*, The Hague, 1963), p. 245.

¹⁵ Published by Tadeusz Kowalski and A. von Gabain, *Türkische Turfantexte*, X (Berlin, 1959).

¹⁶ *Studia Orientalia*, 28:13 (Helsinki, 1964).

satkrto gurukrto mānitaḥ pūjito 'rcito yācayitas 'honoured-esteemed-respected-venerated-adored-worshipped'. Often enough, however, Uigurian or Mongolian texts are still more circumstantial. It is possible that the translation is in such cases based on an oral or written commentary, e.g. Mong. (P) *karsa kiged šamdab degel-iyen emüscü batir ayayaban bariju* 'having put on the *karsa* and *šamdab* clothes and taken the *batir* bowl' renders *pātracivaram ādāya* 'having taken the robe and the bowl' of the Sanskrit original; Mong. (B) *aylay orod* = Sanskrit *viveka* 'solitariness' is in the Commentary (dated 1312) explained *aylay oron saγurin* 'solitary places-seats', *ger-tečegen γaruysad* (= Sanskrit *pravrajitāḥ*) likewise by *ger tergen-iyen talbiju* 'having left their houses-wagons'.¹⁷

In Uigurian again we find word-pairs even in the Manichaean and Nestorian texts which have probably been translated from Soghdian (e.g. the *Xvāstvānēft*) or Syriac. The IX fascicle of the "Türkische Turfan-texte" (Berlin 1958) is a partially bilingual Manichaean text in B-Tokharian and Uigurian. In this text only one pair is preserved completely in both languages: B Tokh. *mrās tarne ne* = Uig. *baš töz töpülärintä* 'on the heads(*baš*)-crowns of the heads (*töz töpülär*)'; in A Tokharian we find the combinations *mrāc lap* ~ *mrāc špālyo* 'head-head'.

As a specimen of a Buddhist text with binomials I quote a passage from the Uigurian *Ṭiṣastvustik* edited by Radloff¹⁸ (18b) ... *äd tawariγ¹⁹ kör* (19a) *kitdäči ol yer orun kuzätzün sizlärnin amraq isig özünküzlärni. qorqinčsüz ayinčsüz enčin äsänin äriñlär. aγi barim äd tawar ärk türkünjüzlär²⁰*

¹⁷ Cf. Cleaves, *HJAS*, 17 (1954), p. 102.

¹⁸ *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XII, (St.-Petersburg, 1910).

¹⁹ OT Uig. *äd tawar* ~ Mong. *ed tabar* 'goods, property', e.g. (B) *dayuqali-ügei ed tabar-tan boltuγai* = Sanskr. *bhavantu akṣayakośāḥ* 'may they be possessing an inexhaustible property'; Cleaves quotes (*HJAS*, 17 [1954], p. 73f.) Chinese glosses rendering this expression with a single word *ts'ai* or *huo*.

²⁰ *ärk türk* is of course a binom occurring also in other texts and even in Kalmuck (*erk³ türk^ü* 'power, might'). Radloff's translation "ihr ... mächtige Türken" is thus to be corrected.

In the Uig. Pratīyasamutpāda-series (Müller, *Uigurica*, II, p. 10 l. 15) we find *azunlar-qa* (?) *äd tawar-qa ärkä türkä azlanmaq turur*, which must render Sanskrit *kāma- bhava- vibhava-tṛṣṇā* = Pali *kāma- bhava- vibhava-taṇhā* translated by Foucher (*La vie du Bouddha*, Paris, 1949, p. 201) "la soif de plaisir, la soif d'existence, la soif de puissance". *bhava* is in general interpreted as 'birth, existence, being, life' (= Uig. *bolmaq*), but e.g. Apte and Andersen translate it also 'well-being, prosperity'. Also translations of *vibhava* are varying: 1° Monier Williams "wealth", Andersen "development, prosperity, power, wealth" (°-*taṇhā* 'thirst for prosperity'), Apte "might, power", Neumann 'Wohlsein', Dutoit 'Macht', Deussen 'Machtentfaltung', Mayrhofer 'Macht, Herrschaft'. 2° PTS Dictionary 'power, wealth, prosperity' but also 'non-existence, cessation of life, annihilation', and the latter interpretation which is based on exegetic speculations is favoured by Childers, Seidenstücker, Pischel, Oldenberg, Kurt Schmidt. The Uigur translator seems to have adopted less known interpretations (especially *azun-*

ašılmaqı bolzun. alqu çoy yalınlıy iş küçüñüzlär bütmäki bolzun. arıy silik aš ičküñüzlär aši(19b)lip... Radloffs translation reads as follows (with some corrections): "... Der den Reichtum zeigende möge dieses Gebiet behüten, euch selbst im Wohlsein leben lassen. Seid ohne Schrecken im Frieden. Euer Besitz, Reichtum, Kraft möge zunehmen. All eure majestätische Macht möge vollständig sein. Eure reine Speise und Getränk sich vermehrt habend ...".

Tokharian literature is known only from a limited number of very fragmentary remains. Our Old Turkic and Uigurian sources are also scarce and for the most part fragmentary. The Mongolian Buddhistic literature is very large but most works have been preserved only in later versions translated from Tibetan or have been adapted to conform with the canonical Tibetan versions. We can in any case suppose that many more pairs in these three languages have had parallels in the others than we can at present find. I quote below some expressions which seem to have a close parallel at least in one other language: Tokh. *wsāl rkälyo* "cloth-cloak" = 'clothes' ~ Mong. *degel qubčan* "garment-clothing" (Cleaves, *HJAS* 14 [1951], p. 90, *ibid.* 17 [1954], p. 105) = Sanskr. *civara* 'monk's robe'; as to the formation of this binomial some Finno-Ugric expressions can be compared: Ostyak *saχ-poχ* "fur-fur" ~ *ñir-kūs* "boot-fur" ~ Ziryene *paš-kem* "fur-boot" ~ Cheremis *tugor jolakš* "shirt-trousers" = 'clothes'. Tokh. *šwätsi yoktsi* ~ Uig. *aš ičkü* ~ Mong. *idegen umdayan*²¹ "eating-drinking" = 'food'; here, however, also Sanskrit uses a dvandva *annapāna* or *pānabhojana*;²² cf. further Chuvash *äškä-siGä* "drinking-eating" = 'feast', in Finno-Ugric languages correspondingly Vogul *tänä äinä* 'food', Cheremis *katškeš-jüş* 'food', Votyak *šion-d'uon* 'feast'. Tokh. *lame äšām* 'seat-chair' ~ Mong. *sirege sandali* id., cf. Chuvash *kəreGe-teŋGelli* "table-bench" = 'chair'. Tokh. *ciñcär kāwälte* 'lovely-beautiful' ~ Mong. *youa üjšekülengtü* id. = Sanskr. *prāsādika*. Tokh. *want swase* 'wind-rain' ~ Mong. *kei qura* id.²³ Tokh. *klyom äštär* 'noble-pure', *äštram ciñcram* 'pure-lovely', *sne wars äšträm* 'spotless-pure' ~ Uig. *arıy turuy* ~ *turuy süzüg* ~ *arıy silik* 'pure-clean' ~ Mong. *ariyun čayan* 'pure-white', *ariyun čeber* 'pure-clean'. Tokh. *rse mänthlune* 'hatred-anger' ~ Mong. (SH) *aγur*

lar looks problematic). Clauson (*Németh Armağani*, Ankara, 1962, p. 101) translates the above Uig. passage "desire for rebirth, for material possessions, inanimate and animate, for freedom of the will and for the prime of life".

²¹ In Mongolian we find also (B) *idegen qoyolai* "eating-throat" = "food".

²² In a similar way Mong. (P) *oron sayurin* 'place-seat' = Sanskr. *bhūmipraṭiṣṭhāna*.

²³ Cf. Cleaves, *HJAS*, 17 (1954), p. 126.

kiling 'rage-anger'. Tokh. *wārcetse taloṣ* 'the imperfect-miserables' ~ Uig. *ägsüklüg yazuqluy* 'imperfect-culpable', cf. also Mong. (SH) *eremdeg jemdeg* 'mean-bad', *qatar mao'ui* 'low-bad'; etc.

An interesting Mongolian combination of this type is *kereg jaray* 'necessities' (Haenisch translates SH 281 "wichtige (Staats)sachen"), in Buddhistic texts (P) *bügiüde kereg jaray* = Sanskr. *sarvāṇi karyāṇi* 'all matters', (S) *qamuγ k. ḡ.* = Sanskr. *sarvopakarāṇa*, (D) *k. ḡ.* = *pariṣkāra* = Tib. *yo byad* 'tools, implements, chattels, household furniture, necessities' (Jäschke). In Codex Cumanicus we find the corresponding Turkic combination *kerek yarov* = Latin *materia*.²⁴

A-Tokharian *ārkišoṣi* 'world' seems to be a compound of *ārki* 'bright' with *šoṣi* ~ B *saiṣṣe* 'men, mankind, world', perhaps based on an etymology of Sanskrit *loka* "the bright place"; Turkic and Mongolian use in this function a binomial: OT Uig. *yir sub* "earth-water" = 'country, world' and *yirtinčü*²⁵ *yir sub* 'world' ~ Mongolian *yaḡar usun* "earth-water" = 'country, world'. The corresponding combination occurs also in Chuvash as *śar-śiv* and it has parallels in Uralic languages too: Vogul *mā-ut* "earth-water" = 'country, world', cf. Finnish *maailma* "earth-air" = 'world', Kamassian Samoyede *bu d'un ejet* (Sg. or Pl.?) 'the Genius of the water-earth' = 'the G. of the world' is very nearly like the Mongolian expression (SH) *yaḡar usun-u ejed qad* "the Genii of the country (or of the world)",²⁶ cf. further Ostyak *mégèn jinket iga* 'the Genius of the earth-water'.

The above Tokharian verbal hendiadys *ārtantrā pālantrā* seems to have an exact parallel in Uig. *ögä yīwa tur-* 'to be eulogizing-praising', *ögüp yīwip ti-* 'to say...?'

Another type is represented by pairs of words with opposite meaning, e.g. Tokh. A *yärk erkāt* 'respect-disregard' and *kāryap pārko* 'loss-profit'. These cases seem to be comparable with those Turkic and Mongolian pairs in which the components are of opposite meaning

²⁴ Neither Grønbech nor Poppe seems to consider this expression to be a loan from Mongolian, cf. Poppe "Die mongolischen Lehnwörter im Komanischen", *Németh Armağani* (Ankara, 1962).

²⁵ *yirtinčü* 'world' occurs as a loan word also in Mongolian. In Turkic Nestorian epitaphs this word is written *yār tünči*, which Ramstedt interpreted as "earth-soil" considering this to be the original meaning of *yirtinčü*. The relation between this Uig. Mong. word and Tibetan 'ḡig rten' 'world' is still problematic. In Buddhist Sanskrit 'world' is *sahālokadhātu*, in Mongolian this is perhaps reflected by *sab yirtinčü*, where *sab* seems to be = *saba* 'receptacle'.

²⁶ Some binoms seem to imitate Chinese prototypes, e.g. Mong. (HI etc.) *ebesün usun* "grass-water" = 'pasture' is according to Cleaves (*HJAS*, 14 [1951], p. 76) = Chin. *shui ts'ao*. The modern expression энх тайван 'peace' is a combination of Mong. *engke* 'peace' with Chin. *t'ai p'ing* 'deep peace'.

and which correspond to an abstract substantive, cf. e.g. Tokh. *A tsopats mkälto* 'big small' ~ Uig. *uluŷi kičigi* (-i is here the possessive suffix of the 3rd singular, the so called "article") ~ Mong. *yeke baŷa* "big-small" = '(the) size'. Gabain compares the Turkic expressions with the Chinese type *ch'ang-tuan* 'length' (ATG, § 365; cf. Poppe, *GWM*, § 426 Mong. *urtu boŷoni* 'length'). I have not found any such instances quoted from the Finno-Ugric languages.

Compound expressions of these types are still to day current and popular in Turkic and Mongolian dialects (cf. e.g. Ramstedt, *MSFOu*, 104:2, p. 253f.). Similar turns meet us also in Tungusian languages. They can therefore belong to the common heritage of these members of the Altaic language family. Some of the instances quoted above can also be literary translation loans in imitation of Tokharian expressions. It is not impossible that in some cases they are meant to be special honorific expressions instead of the plain words of the colloquial language.

According to Grønbech the components of a Turkic hendiadys are still both declined in the Orkhon inscriptions while the usage of inflecting only the latter component originates in the Yenisei inscriptions and spreads further in Uigurian texts. Thus *ät'öz* 'body', *ilig bäg* 'king', *yir suw* 'country', *yirtinčü yir suw* 'world' inflect only the latter substantive. This rule has, however, never been very strictly observed: there is obviously no essential difference between the locatives *äw barqta* and *äwdä barqta* '(in) house and home' (*Der türkische Sprachbau*, p. 123f.). It is possible that at least in some cases both components were declined in order to retain the rhyme, cf. e.g. *äd tawarqa* but *ärkkä türkkä*. Even in Tokharian we find a similar freedom as to the application of the group flexion (*SSS*, § 351 ff.).

The Tokharian binomials are clearly to be classed among the non-Indo-European elements of this language. The obvious similarity between them and the compound expressions of the Altaic languages perhaps suggests that they are originally due to the influence of a (Proto)Turkic sub- or adstratum (cf. Krause, *l. c.*, p. 192). On the other hand also those Uralic and Finno-Ugric languages in which expressions of this type are more common are or have previously been in contact with Turkic languages. Fokos-Fuchs (*l.c.*) considers the great similarity of the Uralic and Altaic hendiadys expressions to be an additional syntactic proof of the genetic relationship of these two language groups.

It is not impossible that the Tokharians had during their migrations been in contact with Finno-Ugric peoples. On the other hand peoples of the Ugric branch now living in north-western Siberia seem to have ear-

lier lived farther to the south. They are probably mentioned in the Old Turkic inscriptions (Tonyuquq epitaph line 45) as *mančud* side by side with the Tokharians (*toqar*). Perhaps also the tribe *Oγraq* (= *Ograg* of the Tibetans) living according to Kashgari in *Qara Yīyač* is to be connected with the Ugrians.

Schulze, in the paper quoted above, also mentions Caucasian parallels given by Lewy²⁷: Ossetian *čäs-kom* ~ Avarian *ber-kal* "eye-mouth" = 'face' ~ Thushian *morl-bal'i* "nose-mouth" = 'face' (cf. Tokh. *ak-mal* above). Interesting parallels are perhaps most easily found in Georgian where we meet pairs of substantives, in which only the latter is declined, e.g. *xel-p'eχi* "hand foot" = 'extremities', *da-dzma* "sister bother" = 'Geschwister', *dšama-sma* 'eathing drinking', etc.; groups of this kind can also contain a copulative conjunction, e.g. *χeli da p'eχi*, but even in such cases only the latter substantive follows the declension of the substantives while the former is inflected like an adjective and only in some case forms: an obvious parallel of the Tokharian principle of the "group flexion" (SSS, § 338 ff.);²⁸ cf. further such Georgian instances as *bed-iybali* "fate-portion" = 'fate, lot', *qop'a-tšxovreba* "being-life" = 'existence', *ayzrda-sdsavleba* "upbringing-instruction" = 'education', *ayeb-mitsema* "take-give" = 'trade', etc. (quoted by B. T. Rudenko, *Gramm. gruz. jaz.*, 1940, p. 269 f.) Moreover, Georgian also possesses traces of subdivision into classes (see Vogt, *NTS*, XII, 1942, p. 251 ff.) similar to that still identifiable in Tokharian (SSS § 60) as well as double case suffixes like the Tokharian "secondary cases" (SSS, § 63; Krause, *l.c.*, p. 194). Double inflexion of substantives is, however, to be found also in Mongolian, and certain class principles are to be noticed in the declension of the substantives in Turkic and Mongolian (cf. Grønbech, p. 106, § 149; Poppe, p. 69, § 260 ff.).

The word-combinations in Turkic and Mongolian often have an alliterated and/or rhymed form, e.g. OT *bay bar* 'rich-wealthy', Uig. *qa qadaš* 'consanguinity-affinity', *iš tuš adaš qudaš* 'comrade-friend-acquaintance-relative', Coman. *yarγu yarmaq* 'regimentum', Mong. *jöb tab* 'real-true', *yasu hüsi* "bone-hair" = 'body', *qari širi* 'tools-utensils', etc. Pairs of this type obviously approach the so-called echo-words which are a popular feature in these languages, cf. e.g. Turkic (OQ) *čalaŋ bulaŋ*-

²⁷ *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 50 (1921), p. 93.

²⁸ A. Dirr, *Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der modernen georgischen (grusinischen) Sprache* (Wien u. Leipzig, s.a.), p. 11 f.; *Einführung in die kaukasischen Sprachen* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 86; H. Vogt, "Esquisse d'une grammaire du géorgien moderne", *NTS*, IX (Oslo, 1938), p. 38 ff. and p. 112 ff.; Kita Tschenkéli, *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*, I (Zürich, 1958), p. 49 ff.

din qoruq-maz turur rendered by Bang "er fürchtete weder Gott noch Teufel".²⁹

Such echo-words are, however, common also in Caucasian and Uralic languages, e.g. Georg. *uzar mazar* 'enormous',³⁰ Hung. *öröm böröm* 'joy',³¹ etc.

In all future research into the origin and possible prototypes of the Tokharian word-pairs attention will have to be paid to the corresponding expressions in all these language groups.

Helsinki

B = Bodhicaryāvatāra by Śāntideva (*Bibl. Buddhica*, XXVIII [Leningrad, 1929]).

D = *Glossary of the ... Daśabhūmika-sūtra* by J. Rahder (Paris, 1928).

HI = Hua-i I-yü ed. by Lewicki and Haenisch.

OQ = Oγuz Qayan ed. by Bang – Rahmati (SBAW 1932).

P = The Mongolian translation of the Pañcarakṣā.

SH = The "Secret History" cited according to the edition of Haenisch.

²⁹ As to the Turkic formations of this type see Foy, *MSOS*, II (1899), p. 105ff.; the Mongolian expressions are investigated by Bese in *AOH*, VII (1957), p. 199ff.

³⁰ Dirr, *Georg. Gramm.*, p. 12; Vogt, "Esquisse", p. 112.

³¹ Lewy, *Zur finnisch-ugrischen Wort- und Satzverbindungen*, p. 72ff.