

# BEEKEEPING AMONG THE TURKS

A historical and linguistic evidence

BY

EDWARD TRYJARSKI

Warsaw

## I

We know rather little about the beekeeping and the consumption of honey among the Turkic peoples. Scanty, and dispersed references found from time to time in sources of various type were undoubtedly the reason why the problem has not yet received the attention and the monographic elaboration that it deserves. The only paper entirely consecrated to this subject is, to my knowledge, that of A. Samojlovich discussing the beekeeping in the Crimea in the 14th–17th centuries.<sup>1</sup> This paper was published more than thirty years ago and rests on the evidence of some khan jarlyqs. It mentions such terms as: *bal* (in two meanings), *šahd*, *qovan*, *četen* and some others. Important are observations on beekeeping among the Bashkirs made by S. I. Rudenko.<sup>2</sup> The remarks which follow, far from pretending to exhaust the vast topic, are intended to summarize our historical knowledge in this field and to point to some new references. In the second part, I try to discuss the problem from the linguistic point of view and to present main Turkic vocabulary related to beekeeping. It is obvious that the deepening of the subject would demand cooperation of historians, ethnographers and philologists.

<sup>1</sup> A. Samojlovich, *Beiträge zur Bienenzucht in der Krim im 14.–17. Jahrhundert*, Festschrift Georg Jacob zum siebzigsten Geburtstag 26. Mai 1932 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern. Herausgegeben von Theodor Mentzel. Leipzig 1932, pp. 270–275. The same in: "Zapiski Instit. Vostokov. Ak. N.", Vol. 1.

<sup>2</sup> S. I. Rudenko, *Bashkirij. Istoriko-etnograficheskiye očerki*, Akad. N. SSSR. Bashkirskij filial. Moskva-Leningrad 1955, pp. 96–103.

The main difficulty is not only in various crossing aspects (biological, economical, ethnographical, technical, etc.) of the problem, but also in its geographical and chronological extent. It is generally known that the honeybee (*Apis sp.*) lives in vast areas of the world, many parts of Asia and Europe included, and that the beekeeping belongs to the most ancient occupations of the man.

On the other hand, it seems to be obvious that the nomadism and the pastoralism of the Turkic peoples at the early stage in their history, their animal husbandry and consequently their way of food-preparing were something decisively opposite to beekeeping and rendered it practically impossible. This is true, but at the same time, we should not a priori exclude the possibility of consumption of honey produced by wild bees, or honey imported from other areas, especially as neither primitive beliefs nor religious prescriptions forbade the Turks to consume it. On the contrary, the Moslem Turks might have been encouraged in this respect by the Koran itself which not only mentions bees, but also praises honey as "healing for men".<sup>3</sup>

An important rôle must have been played by the climate itself. Our first impression is that not only the beekeeping does not fit the traditional picture of nomadic life, but the bio-geographical conditions of the Mongolian and other steppes and deserts also fail to solve the problem. It should be remembered, however, that the primitive habitats of the Turkic tribes were not deprived of forests, rocks or flowery meadows; that there are colonies of bees living in the forests of actual Mongolia; that the Turks must at last have become familiar, in this area or another, with bees and the art of domesticating them as evidenced by such a basic, and probably pure Turkic word, as *bal* 'honey'. This word is also found in Mongolian (cf. *khalkha*, *buriat bal*, *ordos bal* id.), but it can not be excluded that there it might be a word borrowed from some Turkic language.

It is reasonable to suppose that such information as methods of gathering honey, its application as remedy, using of wax etc. might have been acquired already by the Orkhon Turks from other peoples: from India, China or from Iranian area. It is to

<sup>3</sup> Sura XVI, 70-71.

be noticed that India is, to a certain degree, the fatherland of the honeybee: of its four species three (*Apis dorsata*, *Apis florea* and *Apis indica*) are native to India and southwestern Asia.<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to learn that—according to E. V. Sevortjan—we could not exclude the possibility of an etymological relationship between *arī* 'bee' and Middle Indian *aliḥ* of the same meaning.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, in this case, like in many others, equal attention should be given to the possibility of Chinese influence.

It will be observed that the beekeeping and its products have been known in China from time immemorial. The honeybees were domesticated there, and kept in great number already during the reign of the first three dynasties. In time of hunger they served as additional food in most the literal sense, since the Chinese also used to consume the pupae of bees. The Chinese scholars distinguished between many kinds of bees according to their colour, form, manners and the place in which they lived; however, some of these scholars usually named only three species: domesticated bees, forest bees and rock bees, the latter living on the seashore. The first plantations of sugar-cane, founded in the southern provinces of China at the end of the 3rd Century, considerably diminished the consumption of honey.<sup>6</sup> There is a reference to this particular period of the contact between the Orkhon Turks and the Uighurs with the Chinese. It is, namely, a notice saying that under T'ang (619–907), in China, two methods of bleaching wax<sup>7</sup> existed.

It is needless to add, that the foreign influence on the Orkhon Turks in this respect might, at best, merely be a well founded hypothesis, since no inscription in the Runic script provides us with linguistic proofs.

A different, and more clear situation, seems to have existed in the areas in which in following centuries the Uighur and the Karakhanid states were founded. The hot climate of oases and

<sup>4</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. "beekeeping".

<sup>5</sup> E. V. Sevortjan, *Probnye stal'i k «Etimologicheskomu slovarju tjurkskikh jazykov»*, Moskva 1966, s.v. *arī*.

<sup>6</sup> *Chine moderne ou description historique, géographique et littéraire de ce vaste empire d'après des documents chinois*. Seconde partie par M. Bazin. Paris 1853, pp. 572–4 (Première partie par M. G. Pauthieur. Paris 1844).

<sup>7</sup> O.c., p. 574.

fertile valleys was propitious to abundant vegetation. Especially suitable conditions for cultivating plants existed in the Turfan valleys and in the oases of Kashgharia where wheat and other cereals ripened twice a year, where wine was cultivated and silk-worms bred. The fruit trees were growing there from time immemorial. These biological conditions are reflected in respective terminology: *bay* 'orchard', *borluq* 'vineyard', *čäčäklär* 'flower garden', etc.<sup>8</sup> It is reasonable to suppose that those areas were also well suited for beekeeping, and that it is merely a result of bad chance that we have not succeeded in finding references to bees, honey or wax in the Uighur juridical documents.<sup>9</sup>

As a matter of fact, these general conjectures are clearly corroborated by direct linguistic evidence, viz. by the tracts on folk medicine of the Uighurs. In the second part of the prescriptions against different diseases, edited by Rahmeti Arat,<sup>10</sup> as a universally acknowledged remedy honey is used 24 times! There are two words, both of foreign origin, which were used to designate 'honey': *mür/mir* (A. v. Gab., *Altürk. Gram.*: *mir*) and *panit*. The first is used 18 times, the second 4 times. Furthermore, in one instance, both words are used side by side in a combination *mür panit*, possibly as synonyms, in order to reinforce the meaning, or perhaps, by mere chance. In addition, a phrase *panit suwı* 'honey water' is used. A. von Gabain was probably the first to draw attention to a possible relationship between uig. *mür* and chin. *mí* id. (ib.). It is to be added that M. Vasmer reconstructs an ancient Chinese ("urchines.") form provided with a consonant element: *\*mil* (*Russ. etym. Wl.*, II, p. 110). An old Chinese name for 'honey' has survived in actual common Chinese: *fyngmi* and *mitan* 'honey' and *mifan* 'bee' (Chen' Chan-Khao

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. I. Tikhonov, *Khozajstvo i obshchestvennyj stroj uigurskogo gosudarstva*. Moskva-Leningrad 1966, p. 70.

<sup>9</sup> So far as I could state it, there are no terms on beekeeping neither in W. Radloff, *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler. Materialien nach dem Tode des Verfassers mit Ergänzungen von S. Małow herausgegeben*. Leningrad 1928, A. von Le Coq, *Handschriftliche Uigurische Urkunden aus Turfan*, "Turan" 1918, nor in *Analytischer Index zu den fünf ersten Stücken der türkischen Turfan-Texte* von W. Bang und A. von Gabain, Berlin 1931.

<sup>10</sup> *Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren II* von Dr. G. R. Rachmeti. Sitzungsber. der Preussischen Akad. der Wissensch. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, XXII. Berlin 1932.

—A. G. Dubrovskij—A. V. Kotov, *Russko-kitajskij slovar'*, Moskva 1951).

Here, we come to other important text references; three entries noted by Kāshgharī in his *Divān*: *arī* 'honeybee' and two words for 'honey': *bal* and *arī yayī*.<sup>11</sup> Precious are his indications related to the distribution of these last words. According to him, *bal* is used by the Suvarīn, Kipchak and Oghuz (*Tuzz*) while in other languages *arī yayī* is used. Unfortunately, we do not know much about the Suvarīn, but a wide extension of beekeeping in the areas traditionally ascribed to the Kipchak and Oghuz is sufficiently corroborated by some later data.

As pointed out by A. Samojlovich, the existence of beekeeping in the Crimea in the 14th–17th Centuries is clearly evidenced both by literary works and official documents. Moreover, the Crimean honey had a good reputation far beyond the peninsula, in eastern parts of the Golden Horde, and it was exported as far as Khwarezm.<sup>12</sup> It was an object of trade probably practised by such non-Moslem merchants, as Jews, Khazars or Karaims. Mengli Girej, in his *jarlyq* of 1485 (published by V. D. Smirnov), exempts a certain Abraham from taxes which were usually levied upon such products as wine, salt, colours and honey.<sup>13</sup> The words *bal* 'honey' and *šarab* for 'mead' are used.

Already many years ago, attention was drawn to the fact that the Volha Bulgars and the Khazars were chief producers of honey and wax.<sup>14</sup> Most important in this respect is Ibn Fadlan's evidence. There are two main passages of his relation about the Volha Bulgars informing of this occurrence. In one of them, Ibn Fadlan

<sup>11</sup> Besim Atalay, *Divanü Lügat-il-Türk Dîzîni "Endeks"*, Ankara 1943, pp. 31–32. Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarîs Divān Luyāt al-Turk*, Budapest-Leipzig 1928, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> "Auf dem Krim spielte die Imkerel und der Honig eine bedeutende Rolle (er wurde bis nach H̱rizm ausgeführt", B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Rußland 1223–1502*, 2nd ed. Wiesbaden 1965, p. 421. Vague information on honey in Asia Minor in the Middle Ages is given in: W. Heyd, *Geschichte des Levant Handels im Mittelalter*, Vol. II. Stuttgart 1879, p. 673.

<sup>13</sup> Samojlovich. o.c., p. 271.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. Zajęczkowski, *Ze studiów nad zagadnieniem chazarskim. Études sur le problème des Khazars*, Kraków 1947, p. 68, note 3, where the reference to G. Jacobs study is given.

states: "There is in their forests, in the places in which they live, plenty of honey and they know them (those places) and they go there to gather it . . ." <sup>15</sup> In another passage, Ibn Fadlan also mentions mead which is served for guests. <sup>16</sup> It is more than possible that here we should admit a Finno-Ugrian inheritance, a possibility of learning main methods of beekeeping from the forefathers of the Mari, Udmurt or Mordvin who had started breeding and multiplying bees at a very early time (cf. Section II). <sup>17</sup>

As far as the Khazars are concerned, the tradition goes very far back to the fabulous period of their history. A Persian historiographer, Mirkhand (Mīr Khwānd, who died in Herat in 1498), presents a genealogical legend about the origin of the Khazar people. The legend says that Khazar, one of Yaphet's sons wandered northwards till he reached the banks of Etil. His descendents were the first to find the bees. Having found honey in a cavern, they made sweets of it. <sup>18</sup> Another Persian writer, Gardīzī (11th Century), also states that there is a plenty of honey in the land of the Khazars, and that it is from there that some excellent sorts of wax are imported. <sup>19</sup> According to some Arabic authorities, honey and wax were exported from Khazaria to Persia. <sup>20</sup>

The interest of the Karaims for beekeeping was often mentioned in literature. The tradition is supposed to be very ancient, and to be continued up to present time. Thus, for instance, B. Janusz, in his study published in 1927, says that the Karaims of Luck deal in such articles as linen, tabac and wax. <sup>21</sup> In another publication, we read that the Karaims of Troki, also, kept honeybees up until the period preceding World War I. <sup>22</sup> A historical attempt

<sup>15</sup> *Puteshestvie Ibn-Fadlana na Volgu. Perevod i kommentarij.* Pod redakcją akad. I. Ju. Krachkovskogo. Moskva-Leningrad 1939, p. 74.

<sup>16</sup> L. c., p. 73, f° 206 b.

<sup>17</sup> *Tatary srednego Povolzh'ja i Priural'ja.* Ed. N. I. Vorob'ev- G. M. Khisamutdinov. Moskva 1967, p. 68.

<sup>18</sup> I cite from Zajęczkowski, *Ze studiów*, p. 68 and P. Smirnov, *Voltz'kij shljakh i starodavni Rusi.* Kiev 1928, p. 84.

<sup>19</sup> A. Zajęczkowski, *Ze studiów*, p. 68.

<sup>20</sup> A. Zajęczkowski, *Khazarian Culture and its Inheritors.* Acta Orient. Hung. XII, 1-3 (1961), p. 300.

<sup>21</sup> B. Janusz, *Karaimi w Polsce.* Kraków 1927, pp. 67-8.

<sup>22</sup> J. Krywko, *O ogórku trockim,* Wilno 1926, p. 8.

at clearing up the problem was made by A. Zajączkowski, who is inclined to see in this interest of the Karaims for beekeeping, and in the rest of their respective terminology, one of the elements of the ethnic and cultural inheritance of the Khazars. The author emphasizes the existence of words for 'bee,' 'honey,' 'wax' and 'hive.'<sup>23</sup>

There is a long tradition among the Volha Tatars that the beekeeping, which is very popular among them up to present day, had been known and still practised in Bulghar times. The Volha Tatars and the Mishars have reputation for always being eager to keep honeybees. Earlier, they used to gather the honey of wild bees, but already in quite remote times, they made use of sections of hollow logs or bee gums. As shown by statistic data and results of field research, beekeeping in Tataria in various places has slightly different features. Thus, in the regions situated before the Kama River (Predkam'e), only a few farmers possessed more or less large apiaries in the forests, while in nearly every middle-size farm there were—sometimes in pretty large orchards—several (up to ten or more) beehives with which the farmers were busy during their leisure time, regarding it as a favourite occupation. In the regions situated on the other side of the Kama River (Zakam'e), and on the right bank of the Volha and also among the Mishars, bees were kept by the farm houses in a considerably less number, but extensive apiaries existed in the forests. For some farmers, beekeeping was their only occupation. Honey and wax were used partly in the households and partly sold. The continuity of this tradition is corroborated by modern data: in 1920, each Tatar beekeeper owned 4,8 beehives.<sup>24</sup>

Owing to S. I. Rudenko, we have at our disposal detailed and first-hand material on the beekeeping of the Bashkirs. Trustworthy information on historical, ethnographical and technical aspects of this problem is contained in his monography on the Bashkirs.<sup>25</sup> According to this scholar, Bashkiria was a classical land of beekeeping in all its forms, and already in Bulgar times jasaq was paid in honey. One of Russian historical sources,

<sup>23</sup> Zajączkowski, *Zc studiów*, pp. 68–70.

<sup>24</sup> *Tatary*, ut supra, p. 68.

<sup>25</sup> O. c., pp. 96–103.

dating from 1627, says that the Bashkirs "consume honey, animals and fish."<sup>26</sup> There are several references to beehives in hollow trees in Bashkiria forests, in the documents of the 18th Century. One of them, dating from 1716, mentions 600 such hives in the hands of one proprietor;<sup>27</sup> the other source, from 1762, relates that there are Bashkirs who possess 2000 or more of such hives.<sup>28</sup> In the first half of the 18th Century, the price of a hive of the type mentioned was 10 copecks and the price of a hive with bees was 1 rouble.<sup>29</sup>

At the time of Rudenko's expedition to the Bashkirs in 1908-9, the beekeeping was slightly reduced, as a result of forests being cut out, but it was still very popular among such groups as: Burzjan, Kipchak, Tam'jano-tabyn, Jurmatyn, Kataj, Ajlin, Kudej, Bol'shekushchin. In South Ural, the beemasters possessed, on the average, 50-80 bee gums. The Bashkir name for 'hive' *soloq* designated (like in Old Rus') each old tree in the hollow of which the bees lived (In Belorus', and in Ukraina, the sections of hollow logs fastened to the trees were meant.) The Bashkirs used to gather honey from such hollow trees, but long before they had already started building artificial hives in the trees. It was a turning point from which the keeping of bees really started. It probably took place in the first quarter of the 18th Century. The other stage of the development of beekeeping consisted in fastening sections of hollow logs to the trunks of trees growing in one place. The next stage was that of placing these logs on the ground, thus forming so-called *utar* or *umartaliq*. The fastening of the logs to tree trunks was still practised by the Bashkirs in the beginning of our century. We may assume that this scheme, adopted from Bashkirs, was probably repeated in many other places of the Turkic area.

Rudenko describes the most typical occupations of a Bashkir beemaster. Very interesting are the measures taken for protecting the bees and honey from cold, from bears, from bad men and from evil spirits. In winter, the hives in the trees were protected

<sup>26</sup> O. c., p. 96.

<sup>27</sup> Ib.

<sup>28</sup> Ib.

<sup>29</sup> Ib.

from cold by means of mats made of twigs or bast under which some dried grass was put. Domesticated bees from the colonies established near the house were placed in a special basement or underground, cool room. There were three ways of protecting swarms from bears. One of them consisted in binding a slippery bast all around the lower part of the trunk, thus making it difficult for a bear to climb up. The second in fastening small trees with sharpened stems to the trunk. The third in constructing a platform of boards just beneath the entrance to the hive.

Protecting hives in the forests from other people consisted in putting tamghas in each tree. In later times, the hives, concentrated in one place and installed on the ground, were sometimes fenced in. On the other hand, in connection with the necessity for defending a proprietor against a false accusation of stealing honey, a custom arose which lead him to invite some of his neighbours or relatives to accompany him while gathering honey.

In order to protect apiaries from evil spirits, and to drive them away, horse skulls were placed on the fences or on neighbouring trees.

It should be added that we also have at our disposal some important references to beekeeping in the areas occupied by the Turks of the Southern Group. A relative passage is found in the celebrated *Hudūd al-Ālam*. In a section headed: "Discourse on the Provinces of Ādharbādhagān, Armīniya, and Arrān, and their Towns," we read: "These three provinces are adjacent to each other . . . The region is very prosperous and pleasant, with running waters and good fruit . . . It produces crimson (*qirmiz* > "kermes"), trouser-cords (*shalvār*-[band]), woolen stuffs, madder (? *rūdīna*), cotton, fish, honey, and wax."<sup>30</sup>

It would be a tempting, but rather a hard task, to write an outline of the history of beekeeping in the Ottoman Empire; however, my intention does not go as far as this. Incidentally, I should like to point out an important evidence provided by the "Code of Common Law," based on a newly found manuscript

<sup>30</sup> *Hudūd al-Ālam* 'The Regions of the World'. A Persian Geography 372 A.H.—982 A.D. Translated and explained by V. Minorsky. With the Preface by V. V. Barthold translated from the Russian. London 1937, p. 142, f° 32 b.

and recently edited by N. Beldiceanu.<sup>31</sup> This Code, composed between 1477 and 1481, lists and describes the taxes, tithes and other duties of various groups of the population of Rumelia and Anatolia, mentions several times, also, those which are levied upon beekeepers, as: 'öšr-i qovan, 'öšr-i 'asel, qovan haqqı or qovan [*resmi*]. This bears evidence of a wide distribution of beekeeping in the Ottoman Empire. Some other linguistic material may also be traced, since the text contains several repetitions of such words as: *aru*, 'asel, *bal*, *balğı*, *qovan* (the latter also having the meaning of 'honey'), *qouğı*, *ayač delügi* and *qaya*. Three final words tell about the gathering of honey from bees living in the hollows of the trees, and probably also in the bee gums, and from rock bees.<sup>32</sup>

It may be of interest to draw attention to the evidence of the Turkish folklore. In the Turkish folk fairy tales contained in the book by A. Eberhard and N. Boratav, the bee is mentioned three times, the honey—four, and wax—six times.<sup>33</sup> It is generally known that bee and honey are abundantly represented in many Turkic, but perhaps especially in Ottoman proverbs.<sup>34</sup> An extensive vocabulary on beekeeping (popular names for 'drone' and 'bee' included) is found in Anatolian dialects.<sup>35</sup> A new contribution to the actual state of this vocabulary in Roumanian Dobroudja is contained in Section III.

It seems that the distribution of beeking and consumption of honey finally depends, not only on suitable climatic conditions,

<sup>31</sup> *Code de lois coutumières de Mehmed II "Kitāb-i Qavānīn-i 'ürfiyye-i 'osmānī"* Ed. N. Beldiceanu. Wiesbaden 1967. Index, pp. 25–39. I am indebted to Professor A. Zajaczkowski for having drawn my attention to this edition.

<sup>32</sup> Unfortunately, some entries in the Index (e.g. *delüg*) are missing.

<sup>33</sup> W. Eberhard-P. N. Boratav, *Typen Türkischer Volksmärchen*. Wiesbaden 1953. It would also be useful to list and analyze main references to bees and honey in the literary works of the Turkic peoples like those of Khwarezmī *ağiq šahdī qırīm šahdīğa oğşar* (quoted by Samojlovich o.c., p. 271; I cite T. Gandjei, *II "Muhabbat nāme" di Hōrazmī* in "Annali dell'Inst. Univer. Or. di Napoli", New series, Vols. VI–VII. Roma 1958, p. 150) or that of Quṭb: *iḥib ōzi šarāb ōzgā nūkār bal* (Samojlovich, ib., Zajaczkowski, *Najstarsza wersja*, III, p. 26).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. for instance, Ömer Asim Aksoy, *Ata sözleri ve deyimler*, Ankara 1965, or Y. Kerimof-B. Şişmanoğlu, *Ata sözleri ve özlü sözler*. Sofia 1960.

<sup>35</sup> See *Türkiyede Halk Ağzından söz derleme dergisi*, A. Caferoğlu's dialectological Anatolian studies, etc.

but also on some customs in connection with animal husbandry and a model of consumption in general. It may be useful to cite the example of the Yakuts. Continuing certain traditions of nomadic life on their march northwards, and in their actual habitats, they seem never to have learnt beekeeping on a larger scale. W. Sieroszewski, who was making his observations on the land and life of Yakuts at the end of 19th Century, mentions neither bees nor honey.<sup>36</sup>

On the other hand, we know that nice, white honey was sold at the beginning of the 18th Century as far as Siberia. Its price was 70-80 copecks for one Russian pud and seems to be low. This makes me think that it was not imported from distant regions. This information has been handed down by none other than a trustworthy expert, well known to all Turkologists, Ph. Jak. Strahlenberg.<sup>37</sup>

## II

In what follows, I will try to discuss eight basic words of the Turkic vocabulary on beekeeping. It is an attempt at explaining the origin and sketching their prevalence in the past and present. The problem of their more precise dating would demand further research.

Honeybee. The traditional Turkic names for 'bee' are: *arī* with its labial variant *arū* (for example in *Bulγ. al-mušt.*, *Al-Qāvanīn*, etc.) and *qurt*, *χurt*, *qort*, etc. (apart mo. *zögiy* [žögej] or [rare] *ketegene*; ordos *ge't'egene* id., Mostaert, *Dict. ordos*). The prevalence in space and time of these two words marks a rather capricious isoglotic line, and, as rule, we are not able to establish their exact chronology. Side by side with these two words there exist some others, most probably of later origin and mainly of descriptive, phraseological character. Some of them will be discussed below. The etymology of t. *arī* has not been established definitively and suggestions are made to see in it either an Arabic (ar. عَسَل 'honey', cf. also in Persian) or an

<sup>36</sup> W. Sieroszewski, *12 lat w kraju Jakutów*. Warszawa 1900.

<sup>37</sup> *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia . . .* von Philipp Johann von Strahlenberg. Stockholm 1730, p. 373. On the beekeeping in Russia and Lithuania at that time cf. p. 333.

Indian loan-word (< m. ind. *aliḥ* id., Sevortjan, *Probnje slati*, p. 96). As far as *qurt* is concerned, it is an unquestionably genuine Turkic word.

The literature in the Runic script has not yet revealed a word for 'bee' or 'honey', but even in this case precaution should be advised in drawing a final conclusion *ex silentio*.

On the other hand, the word *arī* occurs in the Uighur Khāqānī literature. It is namely to be found in a manuscript written in Uighur and Arabic scripts and dated by S. E. Malov as early as 12th or even 10th Century. It is a moral and didactic work written by Ahmed of Yugnek, a locality probably situated in the district of Samarkand (Malov, *Pamjat. drevnet. pis.*, pp. 316, 321). In the line 446 we read: *asal qayda bolsa bila āriši* 'honey is only where the bee is.'

In Kāshgarī we find *arī* 'Biene.' We also find *qurt*, but there is no indication showing whether this word should denote 'bee' or only 'insect, worm'.<sup>38</sup> This latter meaning is evidenced, however, in *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*.<sup>39</sup> It is generally known that up to present day, the problem of the double meaning of *qurt* has not found its final solution.<sup>40</sup> The word *arī* is also listed in Zamakhsharī (ed. Poppe, p. 402). It should be observed, however, that this entry has no Mongolian translation. As far as I know, we cannot explain this and many other cases of omitting Mongol words in this dictionary. My guess is that it was more difficult for the author to cite *ad hoc* an adequate equivalent.

A number of Turkic languages had abandoned their old names for 'bee', and replaced them wholly or partly by new loan-words. The first case is that of Armeno-Kipchak in which a Polish word

<sup>38</sup> Besim Atalay, *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk Dizini "Endeks"*, Ankara 1943, pp. 31-2 and 383. C. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kāshgarī Divān Luḡāt al-Turk*, Budapest-Leipzig 1928, pp. 10 and 165.

<sup>39</sup> *qamay qurtlarnīng qunquzlarnīng tırgını* 'an agglomeration of all worms and beetles', S. Çagatay, *Altun Yaruk'tan iki parça*, Ankara 1945, p. 84. Malov, *Pamjat. drevnet. pis.*, p. 175.

<sup>40</sup> It is possible that we could explain this curious phenomenon of calling by the Oghuz a wolf (*bōri*) a worm (*qurt*) as an euphemism, a tender, or humouristic, name introduced to common use of the tribe by hunters as a result of a tabu on *bōri*; after a paper Bang's in *Kōr. Cs. Arch.*, XII, cf. lately G. Clauson, *Turks and Wolves*, *Studia Orientalia* XXVIII, 2, Helsinki 1964, p. 4.

*pčola/pičola* (< pol. *pszczola*) is used in the texts examined so far (e.g. *ešak pčolası osa; at čibini osa pčola at tenindan etilgan*, Tryjarski, *Dict.*). The second is that of Khakas *möttlig ar*, the first word being a loan-translation of Russian медовый (*möt* 'honey' + *-lig*). Here, one of the Yakut phrases cited below also belongs.

There is no sufficiently abundant material for determining if and what species of bees (this common name is used for any of 20,000 species of insects, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964, s.v. "bee") distinguished the early Turks. Nor, is it easy to establish this for a later period. Here and there, we find terms like Chuvash *hura hurt* 'черная пчела' (Ashm.), or in the Northern group *söl ar* 'die Feldbiene' and *laiya ar* 'die Waldbiene' (Radloff, *Wb.* I, 244). But it is commonly known that both the Turks and the Mongols, in the early period, were not able to distinguish precisely not only between a 'worm' and 'bee', but also between a 'bee' and 'wasp', an 'ox-fly' or 'bumble-bee', etc. Instructive examples are given by the Yakut (see below), and the Mongol languages. On the other hand, such phrases as чув. *vără hurt* (*horah hort*) 'a thief-bee' ('пчела-воровка', Ashm.; cf. common t. *oyrī*, Ramstedt, *Studies in Kor. Etym.*, p. 176. I owe this reference to Doc. Dr. S. Kalużyński) seem to belong rather to the folk literature.

A number of Turkic languages specify the meaning of the words *arī* and *qurt* preceding them by adjectival attributes or making use of izafet construction. This usage is probably of practical importance, especially in the case of *qurt*, since using the main word only must have occasioned some danger of misunderstanding. But I do not believe that this danger might be really a great one. In this connection, words meaning 'honey' and 'hive' are applied: kaz. tat. *umarta qortī* or *bal qortī* (Bálint), bšq. *umarta qorto* or *bal qorto*, qaz. *bal ara*, qırq. *bal arışi*, tkm. *bal arışi*, osm. *bal arışi*, khak. *möttlig ar*, uzb. *asalarī* (cf. ordos *Balıř Ge'f'egene* id., Mostaert, *Dict. ordos*). This procedure closely resembles the usage of some European languages, or even a modern scientific terminology, (cf. for instance neo-lat. *Apis mellifera*, engl. *honeybee*, germ. *Honigbiene*, etc.), but we could assume the influence of the international (more precisely: Russian) terminology in rare cases of the youngest languages

only because the majority of these phrases seem to be of earlier date.

Apart from above mentioned, there are, in the Turkic languages, some other names for 'bee.' One group of them is founded on a qualified name of fly, and is represented both in the Western and, to a certain degree, also in the Central Group: kar. H. L. *balcibin* (Mard.), qrč.-balq. *bal čibin*, qmq. *balğibin* (*balžibin*), nog. *bal šibin*.

As far as Chuvash is concerned, we find forms which do not differ much from those in other languages. Thus we have: *hurt*, *hort* (Ashm.), *pīl hurčē* and *vēlle hurčē*. *hurčē* is neither listed by Ashmarin as a separate entry, nor explained by Egorov in his Etymological Dictionary. It seems, however, that we have to do with a possessive-personal (or diminutive?) suffix, added to the common root. *vēlle* is a well assimilated Russian word улей 'hive' (cf. Räsänen, *Tschuv. Lehnw. im Tscher.*, p. 120).

Interesting is evidence of Karakalpak and Neo-Uighur forms for 'bee': qqlp. *bal žärresi* or *žärre* (Baskakov, *Karakalp. jaz.*, I, pp. 137, 392), neo-uig. *härä*, *bal häräsi* (*Russ.-uig. sl.*). The explication of this word is rather troublesome. There are, perhaps, two possibilities: one is to see in this word the product of native development (prothetic *h-*, reduplication of *-r-*), the other, to assume foreign influence. The first solution seems to be suggested by Radloff, (*Wt.* II, 1787) who puts a sign of equality with *arī*, the second, to be corroborated by a long list of entries in both languages beginning with *h-* which, as a rule, are of foreign origin.<sup>41</sup>

Excentric names for 'bee' are found in Yakut. A basic word is *ījirīa* 'бортевая или дикая пчела', the phrases are: *toyon ījirīa* and *müötlāḡ ījirīa* (cf. russ. медовый and the Khakas form cited above) 'пчела, медунка.' The etymological basis of this word is rather clear since we know some undoubtedly related words like *īj* 'звукъ мычанія, мыкъ', *ījir-* 'звать (позвать), пригласять, вызывать'; *ījiran-* 'о скоте: мычать постоянно издавая звукъ "īj", мычать тихонько, не открывая рта, черезъ носовую полость', etc. (Pekar. *Sl.* III, 3802-3). All this shows that we have to do

<sup>41</sup> I am indebted to Doc. Dr. S. Kalużyński for having drawn my attention to this fact.

with an onomatopoeic basis, with imitating voices of some bovines enlarged subsequently on buzzing of insects. A similar basis for a name of 'bee' is—so far as I know it—peculiar to Yakut. Ethnological observation shows that the Yakuts were not great beemasters, if at all. (Cf. Section I). This is corroborated by a linguistic evidence. A half century ago, the Yakuts did not distinguish between a 'bee,' a 'drone' and a 'queen'—as shown by a text published in 1895 or 1900 (Pekar. *Sl. ib.*). Moreover, they used the same word for 'wasp' (*tigär* or *tigār* [*tiger*] *igirä*) and for a bumble bee (cf. above).

A presumed name for 'bee,' namely, *kar. čulu* listed by Radloff for Troki (Wt. III, 2176), probably has a wrong meaning (as shown by A. Zajaczkowski<sup>42</sup>) and should be translated as 'hive' (like *kar. L. H. culu* 'Bienenstock', *Mard.*), and has its corresponding form in Kazan Tatar and in Bashkir (cf. Appendix). The word *č'uluv* 'abeille; ruche' exists also in the Armenian dialect of the Polish Armenians, and no doubt is of Turkic origin.<sup>43</sup> It should be remembered that the shifting of meaning: hive → swarm → bees → bee is very probable, since this has been observed in other languages.<sup>44</sup>

Queen. In spite of some poetical charm which this word has in a number of European languages, it is, in fact, a rather technical term confined to a limited circle of beemasters. A respective traditional name in the Turkic area is *bey*, e.g. *osm. arı bey* which evidently neglects, however, the biological rôle this individual plays in the bee society. As a rule, the Turkic languages do not seem to distinguish between a virgin queen and the mother of a swarm. Consequently, this latter function is emphasized in a series of similar names as: *uzb. ona asalari*, *qaz. ana ara*, *qırq. ene arı* (also *arınin urgāčışi*), *čuv. hurt (hort) ami* or *hort amäšë* (*Ashm.*), etc. Exceptionally we find in *tuv. kis arı* lit. 'maiden bee.'

Yakut makes no difference between a queen, a drone and a worker bee.

Worker bee. The use of this term is undoubtedly the result

<sup>42</sup> *Ze studiów*, p. 70, note 2.

<sup>43</sup> E. Słuszkiewicz, *Remarques sur la langue turque des Arméniens et sur les emprunts turcs de l'arménien*. III. R. O. Vol. XV, pp. 282-3.

<sup>44</sup> *Ib.*

of a keener insight into the bee society, and must necessarily be of recent date, especially since earlier dictionaries, Radloff's included, do not list it. So far as Turkic languages of the Soviet Union are concerned, it must have been modelled on Russian рабочая пчела, cf. bšq. *ešse qort*, čuv. *eš'eken hurt* (Ashm.) also qaz. *žsmišši ara*, qırq. *žumušçu* (*bal žiynōču*) *ārī*, tkm. *išči bal ariši*, etc.

Drone. It seems natural that the names for 'drone,' in the Turkic languages, are of a considerably later date than those for 'bee.' The existence of this much specified word is conditioned not only by a keener biological observation, but also by a higher level of beekeeping. We may assume, therefore, that this word was unknown to the Turkic tribes at the nomadic stage of their development which is directly corroborated by the fact that it is found in no earlier authority. This is also evident from the Yakut language which makes use of one word, *iyirā*, for both (cf. Pekar. *Krat. russ.-jak. sl.*, pp. 163 and 216, see also above). Not distinguishing a drone and the rôle it plays in the bee society from other bees, the Turks must have come very recently to the idea of ascribing to it a metaphorical sense of a parasite or an idler, as many European languages do. This concerns even a language so well developed and so greatly influenced by foreign elements as the Ottoman is (cf. *erkek arī* but: *tembel adam*, *tufeyli*, etc.). Some exceptions, for instance, in Kazan Tatar and in Bashkir, are rare.

The first group of names consists of those languages which had possessed no name of their own for 'drone,' and were obliged to borrow it from other languages, mainly from Russian. The examples of Khakas and Nogai *truten'* < russ. *трутень* id. can be cited before others. About certain languages we have no similar information, e.g. about Karaim, Karakalpak or Armeno-Kipchak.

Most numerous is the second group comprising those Turkic languages which have created such a name, and which probably did so in our time. It is, as a rule, a phrase based on the distinction of the biological function of the drone which consequently, leads to marking a grammatical gender and accepting the model: "he-bee." Once established, this model was afterwards repeatedly and mechanically imitated. In order to render the first cle-

ment, the word *erkek*, or rarely, *er* are used, while the second is a respective name for bee. As a result we have: osm. *erkek arı*, tkm. *ärkek bal arıſı*, qaz. *erkek ara*, qrč.-balq. *erkek bal čibin*, uzb. *erkak asaları*, tuv. *är arı*, etc. Another type of nominal construction present qırq. *ärinän ärkegi* and neo-ug. *bal härisinig ärkigi*.

We find still another phrase in kaz. tal. *sorı qort*, bšq. *horo qort*, čuv. *hort särri* (Ashm.), *sără hurt* (Egorov); its literally meaning, based merely on external appearance, is 'grey (bšq.: brown) bee.'

Besides, in Kazan Tatar we find *šepšä* 'hereméh/Bruthiene, Drohne' (Bálint) which seems to be very rare, if not peculiar, to this language.

Among the Ottoman Turkish folk names for 'drone' in Anatolian and Rumelian dialects, there is a word *saka* 'erkek arı' (SDD, 3, 1180), of not quite clear etymology, still in use in Dobroudja (see Section III). One could point, however, to CC *saqa* 'Stieglitz—cardarina' and Kazan Tatar *saqa* 'Stieglitz' (Radloff Wl. IV, 242). An allusion made to the patch of yellow on the wing of the bird?

Hive. The names for 'hive' are numerous in the Turkic languages, but it is apparent that this is mainly the result of insufficient precision in designating the specific object, since different ideas of hive, depending on its local situation, shape and function come into the question. Especially important are two last elements. Most troublesome for a lexicographer is a common practice of many Turkic languages not to discern between a bee tree, a hollow tree in which wild bees live (russ. бортъ, pol. *baré*, czech. *brt*), a section of hollow log fastened to the tree or standing separately on the ground and a special shapely case being an invention of modern times which appeared in Asia, probably not earlier than our century.

Still more complicated is a situation in those languages which up to the present day make no distinction between a 'nest' and a 'hive,' e.g. qqlp. *bal žärrenig uyası*, uzb. *asaları uyası*, neo-ug. *bal härisinig uvısı*, khak. *är uyazı*.

A number of Turkic languages of the Soviet Union make use of the Russian loan-words: улей or ящик. They often exist side by side with native phrases, e.g. tkm. *bal arılarınig yaščigi* (or

*bal arılarınıñ öğzügi*), qmq. *balğibin yaščik* (or *balğibin četen*), tuv. *uley* (or *arī ð*, *arī bažijī*). Also russ. колода occurs, e.g. in khak. *ār kolodasi*.

Relatively rare is a type of "bee-house" or "house of bees" in which the word for 'house' happens to be borrowed, e.g. tuv. *arī ð* (cf. bur. [zügin] *gār*) or uzb. *arizona* (also *quvi*, *asalari yašigi*).

The word *qovan* occurs, according to Radloff, in osm. *qovan*, *arī qovanī* and in Chagatai.

Rather widely spread, also beyond the Turkic area, are kaz. tat. *umarta*, bšq. *umarta/omarta*, qaz. *omarta*, *aranıy omartası*, čuv. *marta/marda* 'улей; рой пчел' (Ashm.) < kaz. tat. *umuru-* 'отламывать, отламать, разламывать, разломать' (*Tat.-russ. sl.*), qırq. *omur-* 'разворотить, разрушить' (Jud.), qaz. *omır-* '1. to break off. 2. to dismember, to divide in parts (a carcass)' (Shnit.), tel. *omur-* 'abbrechen (tr.) (vom Rande)' (Radloff, *Wt.* I, 1168). This word has been borrowed by Cheremiss/Mari (*omarta* 'Bienenstock; in Perm dialect 'ausgehöhlter Baumstamm [für Bienen oder Vögel]'), and by Votyak (*umarta*) (Räsänen, *Die tatar. Lehnw. in Tsch.*, p. 43).

A Kirghiz name for 'hive' evidently makes allusion to the shape of the object, and also, probably, to its sweet contents: *bal čäläk*; *čäläk* 'a wooden (in the southern dialect also metal) pail' (Jud.), osm *čäläk* 'Eimer' (Radloff, *Wt.*, III, 2140).

A special type of hive, namely a skep twisted of twigs, etc. is meant by *četen/šeten*: nog *bat šeten*, qmq. *balğibin četen*, qrč.-baq. *bal četen*, cf. osm. *čay.*, neo-ug. *čit* 'fence' < osm. *čit-* 'zusammenbinden, verflechten, vereinigen' (Radloff *Wt.* III, 2140). Attention should be given to the phrase used in the Crimea as early as 17th Century: *qovan-četen* ('Bienenstock-Korb' as rendered by Samojlovich, *Beiträge*, p. 271). It should be added that *qurt sepet* for 'hive' was heard by Samojlovich in Bakhchiseraj (ib.).

Interesting is an evidence of the Karaim possessing a rare word *čulu* (cf. also kar. H. L. *solak* 'Honig' (Mard.)). Radloff (*Wt.* III, 2140) was probably wrong to explain it as 'die Biene' (see in paragraph "Honeybee"). This term, existing also in Bashkir: *soloq*, is recently re-evidenced by Rudenko (see Appendix). It is also evidenced for Ossetin (as observed by A. Zajaczkowski):

*sul* 'поевирик—Bienenschwarm' (Miller, *Osset.-russ.-deutsch. Wt.*, 1057). With a double meaning, it also occurs in the Armenian dialect of Polish Armenians: *č'uluv* 'abeille; ruche'. According to E. Sluszkiewicz (*Remarques*, pp. 282–3), it must be here a Turkish loan-word ("... toujours est-il que *č'uluv* remonte à un mot turc").

There is another name among the Karaims of Łuck and Halicz, constructed by means of a suffix *-lik*, namely *balcibinlik*, but one must be careful in analyzing it, since the object itself is not clearly defined. Mardkiewicz translates it by Polish 'pasieka' (= 'beegarden') and by German 'Bienenstock' (= 'hive'), but there is too obvious a difference between both of them.

Honey. A basic name used for 'honey' viz. *bal*, which belongs to very popular words, has been widely spread in time and in space, and those languages which have replaced it by other terms are rare. This monosyllabic word cannot be subjected to any further sensible morphological analysis, and it is generally considered to be a native Turkic name. On the other hand, it is clearly evidenced, also in early Mongolian (to cite Zamakhsharī where it occurs five times); but some historical and ethnographical data seem to persuade us to see in *mo. bal* a possible Turkic loan-word.

The oldest evidence for *bal* is that of Kāshgharī (see Section I), but it should be remembered that the same author also lists its phraseological equivalent *arī yayī* lit. 'bee-grease.'

*Bal* is widely represented in the Western and Central groups of the Turkic languages: CC *bal*, *Al-Qavānīn bal* (*aru balī*), *Bulγ. al-mušt. bal*, *LATr. bal*, *arm.-kipch. bal, bay*, *kar. bal*, *kaz. tat. bal*, *qm̄q. bal*, *qaz. aranīy balī*, *qq̄lp. pal*, *nog bal*, *bšq. bal*, *uzb. bol*, *qiry. bal*, also *Arab filol. bal*, *az. bal* (*arī balī*), *tkm. bal*, *osm. bal*, *gag. bal*, *čuv. pīl* (*pīl-hurt*).

As mentioned above (see Section I), the Uighurs, in their written language of a group of medical texts remaining under Indian influence, used two loan-words for honey: *panīl* (presumably more rarely) < Sanskrit *phāṇīla*, and *mīr/mir* which may be borrowed from Chinese, but which also seems to be related to Sanskrit *madhu* 'Honig, Meth' (Vasmer, *Russ. etym. Wt.*) or *mīṭhái* (Prasād Miśr, *Triling. Dict.*, p. 492).

It should be observed that a number of languages make use of the Arabic word (also Persian) e.g. neo-uig. *häsäl* id., az. *esel* id., etc.

Only a few Turkic languages distinguish between certain kinds or sorts of honey, depending on its consistence and colour, state of preparation for consuming or the date it had been gathered. This practice bears witness to a level of beekeeping or an intensified interest for honey in respective areas. Before all others, distinction (not absolutely consistent) is made between a fermented or boiled honey for drinking, i.e. a mead and a raw honey in combs or liquid form for eating. Such a raw honey is called in kar. T. 'čyǵ-bal 'Honig, roher Honig', 'čyǵbal 'Speisehonig' (Kowalski, *Texte*, pp. XXXII, 164, 179), *cijbal* 'Honig' (Mard.), arm.-kipch. *čibal*, *čibal* 'miel vierge' (*prasnŭy čibal*; *biširgan ašlŭ čibal bila*; *čibal šakar ki čibaldan da tuvudan tuzalır*; *prasnŭy čibal plastır*, Tryjarski, *Dict.*; *čibal* Deny-Tryjarski). In this meaning some languages use an Arabic word شَهْد or شَهْدَة e.g. az. *šehd* 'šan balı'.

Honey in combs is named in kaz. tat. *käräzle bal* 'lépesméz — Scheibehonig' (Bálint 48), čuv. *karastä pıl* 'сотовый мед' (Sirot.). For its etymology see paragraph "Comb."

It is interesting to note that already in Zamakhsharī (ed. Poppe) the word *bal* occurs five times, always in important contexts. We find there *quyuq bal* 'рысый мед' and *mumluq bal* 'мед с воком.' Other examples say about the gathering of honey and its use for consumption: *balnı terdi* 'собирал мед', *bal bila yasaqan gül* 'розы, приготовленные с медом' and *talqannı bal birle bulıyadı* 'замесил толокно медом'.

Lime honey of particular reputation has special names in such languages as: bšq. *yukä balı*, qaz. *žöke balı* and tkm. *lipa balı* (< russ. липа 'lime tree'), čuv. *šäka pılč*. It is evident, however, that some of the phrases are brand-new, modelled under foreign influence.

In Karaim, a Hebraic loan-word for 'honey' or 'comb' has two slightly different meanings: *nobat* means in kar. T. 'Honigseim, Süßigkeit, Nektar' (Kowalski, *Texte*), while in kar. L. H. the same word *nowad* is translated as 'Honigscheibe' (Mard.).

Finally, osm. *oyul arıŭı* 'der Honig junger Bienen' (Radloff,

Wl. I, 266) and *oyul balı* 'weisser Honig' (Radloff, Wl. I, 1015) should be mentioned.

It may be useful to have some insight into various names for 'mead' which clearly show that, already in ancient times, the Turks were well acquainted with this liquid. Some of the Turkic languages use one word for 'raw honey' and for 'mead,' e.g. *Ĥusrāv u Šır. bal* 'miód (pitny),' bšq. *bal*, both meanings. Kar. H.L., who possesses a separate word for 'raw honey', uses *bal* to denote 'mead': 'Trinkhonig' (Mard.). Many other languages dispose of two different names for them, but, at the same time, they compare it to other beverages better known to them, as wine, beer or even liqueur: *Ĥusrāv u Šır. čaqır bal* 'miód pitny' (*čaqır* 'wine'), qaz. *bal sira* 'мед (паниток)' (*sira* 'beer', Shnit), qırγ. *ačıtqan bal* 'мёд (пчкилик)' (*ačıt-* 'to boil [well], to brew'), tkm. *baldan üdilen šerep*, uzb. *asaldan tayyarlangan šarob*, qırγ. folk. *broga*, *medovoe pivo*, etc.

Wax. In the Turkic area, there are two old names for 'wax': *avus*, *uvus*, *uus*, etc. and *mum*, both evidenced already in Khāqānī: *Qutaḍyu Bilig* denotes *mum* (Vienna 394, Malov. *Pamjat. drevnet. pis.*) while Khashgharī *avus* 'Harz' (more correctly: 'wax'?; Brock.). The existence of a Persian word in Khāqānī seems to be of consequence, since it might prove that the product was imported from the Iranian area, or by means of Iranian merchants. The origin of t. *avus* and its relation to the Indo-European word is a real crux of etymologists. The reason is that, respectively, both words belong to very old origins and that in both cases, opposite directions of possible borrowing cannot be excluded. Supposition was made (cf. *Bulγ. al-mušt.*, s.v. *uus*) that t. *avus* might be of Slavic origin (cf. russ. воск, ukr. *visk*, pol. *wosk*, bulg. воск, Lithuanian *vāškas*, Latvian *vasks*, Albanian *vashtinë*, etc.). This is quite possible from the ethno-historical point of view, since the Slavs were reputed for keeping bees and producing mead, but linguistic evidence still seems to demand final arguments.

Widely distributed, mainly in the Western Group, is a phrase, *bal-avuz*, which occurs already in Codex Cumanicus: CC *balavuz*, *balauur* 'Wachs — cera', kaz. tat *balauız* (Bálint), nog. *balavız*, qrč.-balq. *balauuz*, qmq. *balayuz*, Abu Hayyān *balavus*, *Bulγ.*

*al-mušt. uuš* (*uvuš*) 'cire, bougie, cierge', kar. L. H. *balawuz*, qaz. *balauiz*, etc.

Chuvash is slightly excentric: *hurl äväsě* (Ashm.) or *karas* (Sirot.).

The line of *Qutaḍyu Bilig* has been continued by such languages as: qırγ. *mum*, qqlq. *aq mum*, uzb. *mum*, tkm. *mum*, neo-uig. *mum*.

Some of the editors note both words as if they were being used with slightly shifted meanings, e.g. *Buly. al-mušt. mum* 'cire, bougie' and *uuš* 'cire, bougie, cierge.'

There is still another word for 'wax' in qırč. *balq. qauuz*, nog. *kaviz*, but its meaning is rather 'comb' (cf. nog. *kaviz* 'мелыха проца' (*Nog.-russ. sl.*). These must be contracted forms, but nothing definite can be said about the first element.

Some languages of the Northern Group have directly borrowed the Russian name, e.g. khak. *vosk*, tuv. *vosk* (*arī ḡniñ čuğu*). The same loan-word we find in Buriat.

Comb. There is a number of names for 'comb,' or rather 'combs,' since many modern Turkic languages make use of a Plural form, being influenced in this respect by Russian (russ. *соты*).

Some of the Turkic languages make no distinction between 'combs' and 'wax,' using one word for both, e.g. qaz. *balauiz*, qqlp. *bal auiz*, nog. *balaviz* (also: *kaviz*) (cf. also above). For the same model, words borrowed from Persian may be used: uzb. *asal mumi* (also: *asalari ini*; in 'nest, hollow'), neo-uig. *häsäl mumu*.

Kaz. tat. *käräz* 'mézlép — Honigscheibe' (Bálint), bšq. *käräd*, čuv. *karas*, pıl *karasě*, *hurl karasě* (Ashm.), pıl-*karas* 'мед и вошница' (Sirot.) are indoubtedly in close relationships to Finno-Ugric neighbouring languages (cf. cheremis/mari *karas* 'Honigscheibe', votyak *karas*, mordvin *k'är'äs*), but some details and, to a certain degree, also the very direction of the borrowing, are still unclear. M. Räsänen's opinion is that Chuvash and Tatar forms are borrowed from Finno-Ugric languages (having influenced them phonetically), but also that Old Iranian influence (\**kāras*) is possible (*Die Tschuw. Lehnw. im Tscher.*, p. 245; cf. also Egorov, *Etimol. sl. chuv. jaz.*, p. 90).

It is worth mentioning khak. *könekter* (Pl.) (*Chak.-russ. sl.*), which is not quite clear, however, from the semantic point of view (*könek* 'ведпо' — small pails or vessels?).

Excentric is qřč.-balq. *bal taraqlı* which evidently makes allusion to the appearance of the object (cf. osm. *taraqlı* 'gestreift (von Stoffen)', etc., Radloff Wt. III, 840). Another idea is presented in tkm. *arınıñ öyžükleri* (*öyžük* 'small hole, cell').

Some of the Turkic languages have either forgotten or never possessed a word for 'comb.' Thus, in the texts published so far, arm.-kipch. makes use of pol. *plastır* (actually *plaster*) 'comb' (cf. the example quoted in paragraph "Honey"). On the other hand, the Tuva, having felt the need for this word, borrowed it from Russian: tuv. *sofi* (*arıñ öñün ütteri*) < russ. *соты*.

It will be noted that the above mentioned items are most typical but, of course, not all words of the rich Turkic nomenclature related to beekeeping. I should like to point to such other terms as: 'beekeeper': kar. L. H. *balcibinci*, qřč.-balq. *bal čelenči* (*bal čibinči*), qaz. *araşı* (*ara bayuşı*), uzb. *asalariči*, neo-ug. *härä baquči*, qırğ. *arı bagüču* (*bal čelekeči*), trk. *balči* (*arıčilik işi bilen meşgullayan*), khak. *arılar körčetken kizi* (*pčelovod* < russ. *пчеловод*) or 'swarm' (commonly meant as a 'bee nest' or 'colony of bees'): arm.-kipch. *royu pčolarnıñ* (pol. *rój* 'swarm'), qřč.-balq. *üyür* (*bal čibin üyürü*), kaz. tat. *küč*, qaz. *aralardıñ omartası* (*aranıñ üyası*), uzb. *oila* (*in, yuž-yuž asaları* — onomatopoeic reduplication), neo-ug. *bal härisiniñ uvisi*, qırğ. *arının uyugu*, khak. *roy* (< russ. *рой*), tuv. *ör arı*, osm. *arı sürüsü*.

#### Works Cited in Abbreviation.

- Abu Hayyān, *Kitāb al-İdrak li-lisān al-Atrāk*. Ed. A. Caferoğlu. İstanbul 1931.
- Akabirov S. F. — Magrufova Z. M. — Khodjakhanova A. T., *Uzbeksko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva 1959.
- Ashmarin N. I., *Thesaurus linguae Tschuwaschorum*. Kazan — Cheboksary 1928–1950.
- Bálint G., *Kazán-Tatar nyelvtanulmányok*. Budapest 1875–7.
- Bang W. — von Gabain A., *Analitischer Index zu den fünf ersten Stücken der türkischen Turfan-Texte*. Berlin 1931.

- Baskakov N. A., *Karakalpakskij jazyk*. Moskva 1951–2.
- Baskakov N. A. — Inkizheкова-Grekul A. I., *Khakassko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. N. A. Baskakov. Moskva 1953.
- Bashkirsko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. Akhmedov K. Z. — Baishev T. G. — Bikmurzin A. M. — Kajumova U. M. — Sajagalcev B. S. — Teregulova R. N. Moskva 1958.
- Brockelmann C., *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī's Divān Luḡāt al-Turk*. Leipzig 1928.
- Chen' Chan Khao — Dubrovskij A. G. — Kotov A. B., *Russko-kitajskij slovar'*. Moskva 1951.
- Chuvashsko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. M. Ya. Sirotkin. Moskva 1961.
- Deny J. — Tryjarski E., «*Histoire du sage Hikar*» dans la version arméno-kiptchak. R. O. Vol XXVII, 2, pp. 7–61.
- Egorov V. G., *Etimologičeskij slovar' chuvashskogo jazyka*. Cheboksary 1964.
- von Gabain A., *Alltürkische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Leipzig 1950.
- Grønbech K., *Romanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus*. Kopenhagen 1942.
- Iliev A. — Kibirov Sh. — Ruziev M. — Tsunvazo Yu., *Russko-ujgurskij slovar'*. Ed. Rakhimov. Moskva 1956.
- Judakhin K. K., *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva 1965.
- Karakalpaksko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. R. Rakhimov. Moskva 1956.
- Kowalski T., *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*. Kraków 1929.
- Makhmudov Kh. — Musabaev G., *Kazakhsko-russkij slovar'*. Alma-Ata 1954.
- Malov S. E., *Pamjatniki drevnetjurskoj pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovanija*. Moskva-Leningrad 1951.
- Mardkowicz A., *Karaj Sez-Bitigi*. Luck 1935.
- Melioranskij P. M., *Arab filolog o turetskom jazyke*. Sanktpeterburg 1900.
- Miller W., *Osetisch-Russisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Ed. Freiman. Leningrad 1927–9.
- Mongol oros tol'*. Ed. A. Luvsandendeв. Moskva 1957.
- Mostaert A., *Dictionnaire ordos*. Peking 1941–4.
- Nogajsko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. N. A. Baskakov. Moskva 1963.
- Pekarskij E. K., *Kratskij russko-jakutskij slovar'*. Petrograd 1916.
- *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka*. St. Petersburg 1907–1930. Photo-mechanical reprint 1958–9.

- Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Ed. J. Deny – K. Grønbech – H. Schell – Z. V. Togan. Vol. I. Wiesbaden 1959.
- Poppe N. N., *Mongolskij slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*. Moskva-Leningrad 1938–9.
- Prasád Miśr, *Trilingual Dictionary* (a copy s.a. and s.l.).
- Radloff W., *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte*. St. Petersburg 1893–1911. Photomechanical reprint 1960.
- Räsänen M., *Die Tatarischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen*. Helsinki 1923.
- *Die Tschuwassischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen*. Helsinki 1920.
- *Studies in Korean Etymology*. Helsinki 1949.
- Russko-burjat-mongolskij slovar'*. Ed. Ts. B. Tsydendambaev. Moskva 1954.
- Russko-chuwashskij slovar'*. Ed. N. K. Dmitrievna. Moskva 1951.
- Russko-karachaevo-balkarskij slovar'*. Ed. Kh. Sujunchev – I. Kh. Urusbieva. Moskva 1965.
- Russko-kazakhskij slovar'*. Ed. N. T. Sauranbaev. Moskva 1954.
- Russko-kirgizskij slovar'*. Ed. K. K. Judakhin. Moskva 1957.
- Russko-kumykskij slovar'*. Ed. Z. Z. Batmanov. Moskva 1960.
- Russko-khakasskij slovar'*. Ed. D. I. Chankov. Moskva 1961.
- Russko-nogajskij slovar'*. Ed. N. A. Baskakov. Moskva 1956.
- Russko-turkmenskij slovar'*. Ed. N. A. Baskakov – M. Ya. Khamzaeva. Moskva 1956.
- Russko-tuviniskij slovar'*. Ed. A. A. Pal'mbakh. Moskva 1953.
- Russko-uzbekskij slovar'*. Ed. Abdurakhmanov. Moskva 1954.
- Safiev S., *Russko-karakalpakskij slovar'*. Ed. A. T. Turabaev. Moskva 1962.
- Sevortjan E. V., *Probnye stat'i k «Elimologicheskomu slovarju tjurkskikh jazykov»*. Moskva 1966.
- Shnitnikov B. M., *Kazakh-English Dictionary*. With a preface by Nicholas Poppe. London – The Hague – Paris 1966.
- Tatarsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva 1966.
- Telegdi S., *Eine türkische Grammatik in arabischer Sprache aus dem XV. Jhdt.* Kör. Cs. Arch. 1937. Ergänzungsband. 3 Heft, pp. 282–326.
- Tryjarski E., *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*. Vol. I. Fasc. 1–3. Warszawa 1968–9.

- Tsydendambaev Ts. – Imakhanov M. N., *Kratkij russko-burjalskij slovar'*. Moskva 1962.
- Türkmen dilining sözlügi*. Ed. M. Ja. Khamzaev. Moskva 1962.
- Vasmer M., *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg 1953–8.
- Zajączkowski A., *Zc studiów nad zagadnieniem chazarskim. Études sur le problème des Khazars (avec résumé français)*. Kraków 1947.
- *Vocabulaire arabe-kiptchak de l'époque de l'État Mamelouk Bulğat al-müşlāq fī luğat al-Turk wa-l-Qifžāq*. I-ère partie. Le nom. Warszawa 1958.
- *Najstarsza wersja turecka «Husrāv u Šīrīn» Quḷba*. Part III. Dictionary. Warszawa 1961.
- Zajączkowski W., *Vocabulaire gagauze-français*. Folia Or., Vol. III, 1966, pp. 29–73.

The transcription system of Turkic names, and the abbreviation system of names of languages are in the main those of *Phil. Turc. Fund.*, Vol. I. In preparing this paper I made use of a valuably *Słownik terminów pszczelarskich angielski-francuski-niemiecki-czeski-polski-rosyjski z indeksem łacinskim-Dictionary of Beekeeping Terms with Allied Terms. Volume III giving translations from and into English-French-German-Czech-Polish-Russian with Latin Index*. Ed. E. E. Crane. Warszawa 1964.

## APPENDIX

### Bashkir Beemaster Terminology.

The list contains, in Latin transcription and in alphabetical order, all terms on beekeeping found in S. I. Rudenko's book (*Bashkiry*, pp. 96–103).

*ayas ayaq* – a support for feet, a piece of wood fastened to the trunk.

*ana qort* – a queen.

*ana qort sillek* – a queen-cell.

*arqatau* – a rope or string for lifting up a *batman*.

*äryä, moḍya, qort tubat* – a device for gathering and transporting a swarm, a skep for taking swarms.

- bayau* – a hatchet furnished with a bent lame and a long handle, usually carried in a case made of horn.
- balauïð* – honeycomb.
- bal qalaq* – a small shovel made of wood for cutting out honeycombs.
- balta* – a hatchet furnished with a long handle for cutting out a hollow in the trunk.
- balta qîn* – a birch bark case for a hatchet.
- batman* – a vessel for honeycombs.
- bað* – a basement, an underground cool room where bee swarms are placed for winter.
- bîsaq* – a knife (of a beemaster).
- böröð* – an iron chisel, usually carried in a case made of horn.
- keyä* – a square opening, an entrance for bees in a hive.
- keyä qalayï* – a wooden cleat or wedge protruding outside, placed in the opening of the hive.
- kiräm* – a belt, 5 cm. broad and ca. 5 m. long made of braided horse leather straps or of bast for climbing the trunk.
- küðlek, küðelderek* – a net.
- küðelderek* – see *küðlek*.
- moðya* – see *äryä*.
- qapqas, qapqaq* – a bar made of wood for closing the entrance of the hollow.
- qaşïq* – a small bucket or ladle made of bark, furnished with a long handle for gathering swarmed bees.
- qîn* – a knife case.
- qolaq* – a loop by means of which a hive is fastened to the trunk of a tree or to a pale.
- qort harïyïs* – see *qort qarasqihï*.
- qort qarasqihï, qort harïyïs* – ‘receivers,’ small plates of bast, or pieces of bark, placed on four pegs in an inclined position for the swarmed bees to alight on.
- qort seprüge* – a linen stuff for binding up a swarm box.
- qort simüldiyï* – a small linen tent for the queen, a queen cage.
- qort tubal* – see *äryä*.
- rütä, tayarau* – one of two or three bars inside the hive for supporting combs.
- sîraq* – a piece of rotten wood for smoking bees.

*sīrpī* – a mat made of twigs or bast for covering the logs.

*soloq* – a bee tree, each tree in the hollow of which wild bees are living.

*sōy* – a peg for fastening a *qapqaq*.

*layarau* – see *rālā*.

*taḍyaq* – a platform, built all around the trunk, for securing the hive from bears.

*tamya* – a property sign made on a bee tree.

*terpe* – a hive tool, like a bent rasp for cleaning a hollow or a hive.

*lirma* – small wooden ‘rakes’ inside the upper part of the hive for supporting combs.

*umarta* – hive, log.

*umarta aṭlī laši* – a stone stand put on the ground on which a log is placed.

*umartalīq, utar* – a real apiary in the forest.

*utar* – see *umartalīq*.

*yīšqī* – a tool like a spokeshave, furnished with a curved lame and two handles.

### III.

During my dialectological expedition to Roumanian Dobroudja, organized by the Centre for Oriental Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences in 1965, and owing to the help received from the Linguistic Institute of the Roumanian Academy of Sciences and its Section for Oriental Languages,<sup>45</sup> I had a good occasion to visit, among others, Baş Pınar (rum. Fintină Mâre), a village exclusively inhabited by the Turkish population which, chiefly as a result of its secluded geographical situation, has preserved many old customs of dress, architecture, etc.

My informant was Mr. Iskender Ağa, an inhabitant of that village, a many-sided artisan (chiefly a carpenter), who also had a reputation for being an experienced beekeeper. In his remarks, which I reproduce below after the tape recording, my collocutor presents his views on what modern beekeeping is like, adding detailed information on the life of bees, on some technical occupations of a beekeeper and on various sorts of honey.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. “Przegląd Orientalistyczny” 1(57), 1966, pp. 83–4; E. Tryjarski, *Zagłada Ada Kale*, “Przegląd Orientalistyczny” 3(59), 1966, pp. 251–4.

Disregarding its brevity and natural incompleteness, the text enables us, not only to gain insight into some grammatical peculiarities of the Osmanli dialect spoken in this region<sup>46</sup>, but also to detect a few technical terms on beekeeping in actual use among the Turks of Dobroudja. From this point of view, it presents an interesting contribution to the problems discussed in the two previous sections.

I am indebted to Prof. Hasan Eren, University of Ankara, for having revised my transcribed text after the tape recording. I should also like to acknowledge here the help which I received from Mr. Vladimir Drimba, Roumanian Academy of Sciences, in noting down a few words.

#### Text.

<sup>1</sup>\**evel zamanda kuyancılık primitiv sepetler içinde demek bâdan*  
<sup>2</sup>*örmä sepetler içinde yapırlıs bizim yetiştîmis yakultta demek* <sup>3</sup>*sepet-*  
*ler içinde. şimdi kuyannar modifikâl oldu. şimdi sistemâlık* <sup>4</sup>*sandık-*  
*lar yapılyı, onnara güzel râma yapılyı, "o onun içine tutuluy*  
<sup>5</sup>*kuyannar, onun içinde tâ güzel işlêyler. bir kuyan demek ül vermä*  
<sup>6</sup>*başladıktan sonra "o ilkin ilk bey evini kapadıktan söra "o kart*  
<sup>7</sup>*bey çıkıyı yaurularınnan demek dışarı, onun yerine başka bey*  
*çıkıyı. ikinci* <sup>8</sup>*âlda çıkıyı tâ çok bey, üş dört tane bey birden çıkıyı,*  
*onu tutuysu* <sup>9</sup>*tutarlar, onu sandâ koyduktan söra "o üş dört tane*  
*beyden bir tanesini* <sup>10</sup>*ayırıp bırakırlar. söna öbürlerini öldürür*  
*arılar, bir bey bırakır sâde.* <sup>11</sup>*söna "onda – bis sâka deris (iki*  
*çeşint arı vardır: birisi saka birisi* <sup>12</sup>*bal yapan soyu, işleyân soyu)*  
*– "o sâka dedikleri onnar yânnıs beyler* <sup>13</sup>*çşlenmek için. "o ü*  
*verdikten söra ne zaman uçuyı "o yakıt "o* <sup>14</sup>*bey eşleniye dışarda,*  
*söna gelip giriye sepede. söna o tırıntorları* <sup>15</sup>*demek onnar öldürüy-*  
*ler. ağustos ayı gâldikten söra onnar kıra gidip* <sup>16</sup>*bal getirmey,*  
*onnar hazırda yiler sâde. bir saka günde bir arının* <sup>17</sup>*demek bir*  
*sakanın yedini on arı yiyi demek o kadar bal yiyebiliy bir* <sup>18</sup>*saka.*

<sup>46</sup> E. Tryjarski, *La terminologie des artisans lures en Roumanie* in: Proceedings of the I International Congress on Balkan and South-Eastern Studies. Sofia 1965. Sofia 1968, pp. 161–173.

\* The numbers in the text indicate the original line-numbering. (Ed. rem.)

onnar çalışmadı zebebi için onnar tutup tutup öldürüy onnar <sup>19</sup>dışarı sâka mâka bırakmayı iç. sôna bittâ arılar, çalışkan arılar <sup>20</sup>kalıyor orda, onnar bal yapıylar ramalara. "o ramalar dolduktan sôra <sup>21</sup>çıkariysın ramayı, koyısın çentrifukta, balı çıkariysın. balı çıkardıktan <sup>22</sup>sôra "o ramayı gene getirüp koyısın orayı, "o gene duruy bal <sup>23</sup>orayı, sôna gene ordan çıkariysın, gene koyısın orayı, böylelikle. <sup>24</sup>ama şimdi evelki gibi ül yapılmayı, şindicik ül artifiçyel <sup>25</sup>yapılıy lâ hiş dışarı çıkmadıktan sôra demek ne zaman sandıktan <sup>26</sup>bey evi koyıyı. bey evini koydıktan sôra onu kuşancı gözlediği bey <sup>27</sup>evini koydıktan sôra ne zaman bey evini kapayacak "o yakıt "ondan artifiçyel <sup>28</sup>yapılıy bir kuşandan iki tane üş tane de yapabili demek "o beyli ramayı <sup>29</sup>alıy sôna yardımınarı imparçıt edî demek onnara bir de bir ramada <sup>30</sup>beylik koyıyı "o kendi kendine çıkıyı orada, kendi kendine sôna <sup>31</sup>eşleniy, geliy orayı. böyle yapıly demek şindiki zamanda, artifiçyel <sup>32</sup>yapılıy, yapılmayı evelki gibi ül versinde takışecan <sup>33</sup>arkasına, tulacan ya tulacan ya tulaymacan o kaçıp gidiy, o sinek o. <sup>34</sup>şimdi böyle yapılyı kuşancılık. <sup>35</sup>balın olur iki üç çeşindi. bal en isl'â demek bal olur bu <sup>36</sup>kıral çiçânde, sôna bir de uslanbûr çiçânde, bir de gündöndüde, ama <sup>37</sup>gündöndüde demek en isl'â ballar, en isl'â temiz bal demek kıral <sup>38</sup>çiçânnen uslanbur çiçânde olur.

#### Translation.

In early times we did beekeeping in primitive baskets (skeps), that is to say, made of [straw-] bands, in the time we are grown up, that is to say, in the baskets (skeps). At present, the hives have been modified, at present shapely (standard) boxes are made, fine frames are made for them, hives (swarms) are kept inside and they work very well. Having started on making a hive, that is to say a swarm, at first the former queen closes its cell (*ev*). After this the old queen, just after having laid (or: with its young bees?), gets out, that is to say, outside, and another queen emerges in its place. In the second swarm also many queens emerge, three or four at a time. They are seized and after their placing in a box out of these three or four queens, one is selected and left (to live). Next, the others are killed by the bees, only one queen is left (to live). Next—we call it 'drone' (there are two

kinds of bees: one is a drone, the other a honey manufacturing kind, a working kind)—those which we call drones are only for mating with the queens. Being admitted to the swarm, the queen, whenever she flies, mates outside and then comes back to the basket (skep). Next those drones are killed. When August comes, they do not go in the field nor bring honey, they only eat out of what is ready. A drone eats (as much as) a bee (worker) (is able to gather), that is to say, what a drone eats is a portion of ten bees, that is to say a drone so much honey can eat. Since the drones do not work, they (i.e. the workers) seize them, (carry) out and kill all of them, they leave none. Next, having come to an end, the bees, the working bees, remain inside and manufacture honey into frames. When the frames are filled up, you take out the frame, you put it into a honey extractor and you take out the honey. Having taken the honey out, you bring that frame again and you place it there. It is filled up with honey again, you take it out from there, you place it again and so on in the same way. At present, however, a swarm is not made in the same way as it was before. Nowadays a swarm is made artificially—quite without getting out, that is to say, each time the queen's cell (*ev*) is placed in the box. After the queen's cell (*ev*) is placed, the beekeeper watches for it. Each time the queen closes its cell (*ev*) out of one, two or three hives (swarms) can be made artificially, that is to say, he (the beekeeper) takes that frame with the queen, next divides the larvae, that is to say, he places again a [queen-] cell (? *beylik*) into a frame. It gets out there on its own, next mates, flies there and this is made this way. That is to say, in our times this is made artificially. This is made not as it was before when in making a swarm you (had to) pursue it—you seize, you seize and you are not able to seize this "fly" which is flying away. At present the beekeeping is done this way.

There are two to three kinds of honey. The most genuine honey is that (found) in acacia. Next comes that which is in lime-tree flowers, another kind is also found in sunflowers, yes, in sunflowers. That is to say, the most genuine honey (Pl.), the most genuine, pure honey is, that is to say, that which is found in acacia flowers and in lime-tree flowers.

## Glossary.

*ağustos* 'August' 15; TS.

*al-* 'take' 29; HRhod. *al-* 'enlever'.

*ama* 'but, still' 24, 36. N. *a'ma* 'aber'. HRhod. *eme* 'mais, toutefois'.

*arı* '(honey-) bee' 10, 11, 16, 17, 19; TS (*Apis mellifica*).

*arka* 'back, back part' 33; TS.

*artifiçyel* 'artificial' 24, 27, 31. < rum. *artificial* '1. искусственный. 2. неестественный, сделанный. ...', Rum.-russ. 58.

*ay* 'month' 15; N. *ay* 'Mond, Monat'.

*ayır-* 'separate, set apart' 10; N. *ayır-* 'trennen'. HRhod. *ayır-* 'séparer'.

*bā* 'bundle, straw-band' 1; TS *bağ*. Cf. N. *bagli* 'gebunden'.

*bal* 'honey' 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 35, 37; TS.

*başka* 'other, another, different' 7; N. *başqa*.

*başla-* 'begin' 6; N. *başla-*.

*bey* 'bee-queen' 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 26, 27; TS *arı beyi* 'her kovanda bir tane bulunan ana arı'.

*beyli* 'having (possessing) a bee-queen' 28.

*beylik* 'queen's nest, queen cell, queen's excluder'? 30.

*birak-* 'leave, abandon' 10, 19; N. *braq-* (seltener *biraq-*, *barq-*) 'verlassen'. HRhod. *brak-* 'laisser'.

*bir* 'one, a' 5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 28, 29; *birisi* 'one of them' 11; *bir de* 'once more' 29, 36; *birden* 8; N. *bir* 'eins', *biri*, *birisi*; *bir-da* 'noch einmal'.

*bis* 'we' 11; HRhod. *bis* 'nous'; TS *biz*.

*bizim* 'our' 2.

*bit-* 'finish, come to an end' 19; TS *bitmek*.

*bu* 'this' 35; TS.

*büyle* 'such; so, thus' 31, 34; N. *boyle*, *bole*, TS *böyle*.

*büylelikle* 'in this manner' 23; TS *böylelikle*.

*çalış-* 'to work' 18; *çalışkan arılar* '(bee-)workers' 19; TS *çalışmak*. *çentrifuk* '(honey-) extractor'; *çentrifukta* 21; < rum. *centrifugă* 'центрифуга', Rum.-russ. 148.

*çeşint* 'sort, variety' 11, 35; TS *çeşit*.

*çık-* 'go out, get out, emerge' 7, 8, 25, 30; N. *çık-*, *çiq-* 'hinausgehen'; HRhod. *çik-* 'sortir'.

*çıkār-* 'take out, remove' 21, 23; HRhod. *çikā-* 'enlever'.

*çiçek* see *kıral, uslanbur*.

*çok* 'many, numerous' 8; HRhod. *çok* 'beaucoup'.

*de-* 'say, tell' 11, 12; N. *de-* (*y-* Präs. *dey*) 'sagen'. HRhod. *de-* 'dire'.

*demek* 'that is to say, that means' 1, 2, 5, 7, 15, 17, 25, 28, 29, 31, 35, 37; HRhod. *demek* 'done'.

*dışarı* 'out, outside' 7, 19, 25; *dışarda* 'outside' 14; N. *dışarda* 'draußen'; *dışari* 'hinaus'.

*dol-* 'fill, become full, be completed' 20; HRhod. *dol-* 's'emplir'.

*doldur-* 'fill, complete' 22; N. *doldur-* 'füllen'. HRhod. *doldur-* 'remplire'.

*dört* 'four' 8, 9; N. *dort* 'vier'. HRhod. *dört* 'quatre'.

*en* 'most' 35, 37. N. *en* beim Superlativ.

*eşlen-* 'to mate' 13, 14, 31 Radloff *üşlän-* 'sich paaren'.

*ev* 'cell?, nest' 6, 26, 27; cf. Moran *ev* 'pigeon-hole'.

*evvel* 'former; earlier' 1; HRhod. *evvel* 'd'abord, auparavant'.

KKaz. *evvel*, *evvel* 'premier, commencement, avant'.

*ewelki* 'first, former' 24, 32; N. *ewelki* 'in alter Zeit gebraucht, altmodisch (in gutem Sinne)'.

*gel-, gäl-* 'come' 14, 15, 31; N. *g'al* 'kommen'. HRhod. *gel-* 'venir'.

*gene* 'again' 22, 23; N. *gene* 'wieder, aber'.

*getir-* 'bring, gather' 16; *getürüp* 22; N. *getir-* 'bringen'.

*gibi* 'similar, like' 24, 32; TS.

*gir-* 'go into, enter' 14; N. *gir-* (Aor. *gırer*) 'eindringen'. HRhod. *ger-* 'entrer, pénétrer'.

*git-* 'go, go on, go away' 15, 33; N. *git-* 'genug sein, dauern'.

*gözle-* 'to watch for, to keep an eye on' 26; TS. Cf. N. *göz* 'Auge'.

*gün* 'day' 16; N. *gün* 'Tag'.

*gündöndü* 'sunflower' 36, 37; N. *gün-dundi* 'Sonnenblume'. SDD *gündöndi*.

*güzel* 'nice, pretty; good, fine, nicely' 4, 5; N. *güzâl, güzâl, güzel* 'schön'. HRhod. *güzel* 'beau'.

*hazır* '(this what is) ready or prepared' 16; cf. TS *hazır*, *hazırlık*.  
*hiş*, *iç* 'not at all, nothing, no, none' 19, 25; HRhod. *hiç* 'rien'.  
 TS *hiç*.

*ımparçıl et-* 'divide' 29; < rum. *împărŭŭt* '1. разделившийся, разделённый. 2., разпределённый', Rum.-russ. 433.

*iç* see *hiş*.

*için* 'for, in order to, on account of' 13, 18; N. *için* 'für, wegen, usw'.

*içinde* 'inside, within' 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; N. *için* 'für, wegen, usw.'

*iki* 'two' 11, 28, 35; TS.

*ilk* 'first, initial' 6; Cf. N. *ilk-yaz* 'Frühling (im Lied)'.

*ilkin* 'first, in the first place' 6. TS.

*ikinci* 'second' 7; TS.

*isl'a* 'good, true, genuine' 35, 37; N. *isla*, *islah* 'gut, richtig, ja'.

*işle-* 'to work, to function' 5, 12. HRhod. *işle-* 'travailler'.

*kadar* see *o kadar*.

*kal-* 'remain' 20; TS *kalmak*. HRhod. *gal-* 'rester'.

*kapa-* 'shut, close' 6, 27; HRhod. *kapa-* 'fermer'.

*kart* 'old, former' 6; TS.

*kendi* 'self'; *kendi kendine* 30; N. *kendi* 'er selbst'; ihn selbst, dich selbst; gewöhnlich *kendini*, seltener *kendini*; 'mich selbst': *kendimi*, *kendimi*.

*kır* 'field, country' 15; HRhod. *gür* 'champ; tout lieu situé en dehors de la maison'.

*kıral* 'acaccia'; *kıral çiçānde* 36, 37–38; SDD *kıral* 'akasya ağacı'.

*koy-* 'put, place' 9, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30; N. *qo-* (Aor. *qor*) und *goy-* 'legen'. HRhod. *go-* 'mettre, placer, *goy-* 'mettre, placer'.

*kuşan* '(bee-)hive' 3, 5, 28; KKaz. *kuan* 'ruche'. HRhod. *guvan* 'banne, panier, ruche à panier'.

*kuşancı* 'bee-keeper, apiarist' 26.

*kuşancılık* 'beekeeping' 1, 34.

*modifikat ol-* 'to be modified' 3; < rum. *modificat* '1. видоизменённый, изменённый. 2. исправленный', Rum.-russ. 545.

*ne* 'what, what?' 13' N. *ne* 'was, was?'.

*ne zaman* see *zaman*.

- o, "o 'he, she, it; that' 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 20, 22, 28, 30, 33; *onun* 4, 5, 7; *onu* 8, 9, 26; "onda 11; "ondan 27; *onnar* 12, 15, 16, 18, 20; *onnara* 4, 29.
- o *kadar* 'as much as' 17; N. *oq(q)adar*, o *qadà'r* 'so ein; sehr groß, kolossal'.
- ol- 'be, become, happen'; *olur* 35; N. *ol-* 'sein'.
- on 'ten' 17; HRhod. *on* 'dix'.
- orada*, *orda* 20, 30; 'there'; *orayı*, *orayı* 22, 23, 31 'to that place, thither'; *ordan* 'from there' 23.
- öbür* 'other' 10; RHhod. *öbür* 'l'autre'.
- öldür-* 'kill' 10, 15, 18. N. *uğdur-* 'töten'. HRhod. *öldür-* 'tuer'.
- ör-* 'twist', make; make (baskets)' 2; N. *ur-* 'flechten'.
- primitiv* 'primitive' 1; < rum. *primitiv* '1. примитивный; первобытный. 2. примитивный, простой', Rum.-russ. 675.
- rama* 'frame' 4, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29; < rum. *ramă* 'рама, рамка', Rum.-russ. 698.
- sade* 'simple; merely, just' 10, 16; N. *sade*, *sàde*; *sade git-* 'nur sollst du dich entfernen'.
- saka* 'male bee, drone' 11, 12, 16, 17, 18; SDD *saka* 'erkek arı'.
- saka maka* 'all drones' 19.
- sandık* 'box, chest' 4, 9, 25; N. *sandıq* 'Truhe (zum Aufbewahren der Kleider)'; HRhod. *sandık* 'caisse'.
- sepet* 'skep, basket' 1, 2, 3, 14; HRhod. *sebet* 'corbeille'; TS *sepet* 2. *ince dallardan örtülerek yapılmış: sepet sandık*.
- sinek* "'fly", female bee' 33; N. *sinek* 'Mücke, Fliege'; TS *sinek* *çiftekanallılardan, altı ayaklı birtakım uçucu böceklerin genel adı*'.
- sistematik* 'shapely, standard' 3; < rum. *sistematic* '1. систематический, систематизированный', Rum.-russ. 777.
- sōna*, *sonra* 'after, afterwards, next' 10, 11, 14, 19, 23, 29, 30, 36; *sōra* 6, 9, 13, 15, 20, 22, 26; N. *sora*, *sōra*, *sōra* 'nach'. HRhod. *sōra* 'après, plus tard'.
- soy* 'kind, sort, race' 12; TS.
- şindi* 'now' 3, 24, 34; N. *şindi* 'jetzt'. HRhod. *şindi* 'maintenant'.
- şindicik* 'this very moment, now' 24; N. *şindicek* 'jetzt'; HRhod. *şindidzik* 'juste maintenant'.

*şindiki* 'actual, contemporary, modern' 31; TS *şimdiki* 'şimdi olan'.

*tā* 'so, so that; and' 5, 8, 25; Mor. *ta* 'and'.

*takiş-* 'persue, follow' 32; TS *takışmak* 'birbirine takılmak'.

*tane* 'piece, a single piece' 8, 9, 28; N. *tane tâne* 'Stück'. HRhod. *tâne* 'piece'.

*temiz* 'clean, pure, genuine' 37; N. *temiz, temis* 'rein, neu gekauft'.

*tırıntor* 'male bee, drone' 14; < rum. *trintor* id., *Dicţionarul limbii române moderne*, 1958.

*tut-* 'catch, seize' 8, 9, 18, 33; HRhod. *tut-* 'prendre, attraper'.

*tutul-* 'be caught, be seized' 4; TS.

*vakıt* 'time' 2, 13, 27; N. *vaqıt* 'Zeit, Gebetzeit, Vermögen'; HRhod. *vakīt* 'temps'.

*uç-* 'to fly' 13; TS.

*uslanbur* 'lime-tree'; *uslanbur çiçānde* 36, 38; TS *ıhlamur* '... (Tilia)'. HRhod. *ohlāmūr* 'tilleul'; KKaz. *īlambur* 'tilleul'.

*üş* 'three' 8, 9, 28; *üş çeşindi* 35; N. *uç* 'drei'. HRhod. *üč* 'trois', Caf. Kuzey-Doğu *üş* 'üç'.

*ül* 'swarm (of bees)' 5, 7, 13, 24, 32; Hony *arı oğulu* 'swarm of bees'; *oğul arısı* 'young bee'.

*var* 'there is, there are' 11; HRhod. *var* 'il y a'.

*ver-* 'give, produce' 5, 13, 32; N. *ver-* 'zulassen, erlauben'. HRhod. *vir-* (*ver-*, *vér-*) 'donner'.

*ya ... ya ...* 'either ... or' 33; N. *ya — ya* 'entweder — oder'. *yannıs* 'error' 12; TS *yanlış*; HRhod. *yalnış* 'erroné'.

*yap-* 'do, make, construct' 12, 20; N. *yap-* 'machen, tun'. HRhod. *yap-* 'faire'.

*yapıl-* 'to be done, to be made, to be constructed' 2, 4, 24, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34. HRhod. *yapıl-* 'se produire, être produit, construit'.

*yardım* 'larva' 29; SDD *yardım* 'beyaz kurt şeklinde olan yavru arı'.

*yaurula-* 'bring forth young' 7; N. *yawrila-* 'Junge werfen'.

*yetiş-* 'reach, have lived enough to have seen' 2; TS.

*yer* 'ground, place, space' 7; N. *yer* 'Erde, Boden, Stelle, Heimat, Art und Weise. HRhod. *yer* 'endroit'.

*yî-* 'eat, feed, consume' 16, 17; *yîyebil-* 17; N. *ye-* 'essen'. HRhod.  
*yî-* 'manger'. KKaz. *yî-*, *yê-* 'manger'.

*zaman* 'time, period' 1, 13, 31. *ne zaman* 25, 27; N. *zeman*, *zemân*,  
*zaman* 'Zeit'.

*zebep* 'reason, cause' 18; Cf. TS *sebep*.

#### Works cited in Abbreviation.

- Caf. Kuzey-Doğu – Caferoğlu A., *Kuzey-Doğu İllerimiz Ağızlardan Toplamalar*. İstanbul 1946.
- Hony – *A Turkish-English Dictionary* by H. C. Hony with the Advice of F. İz. 2nd ed. Oxford 1957.
- HRhod. – Hazai G., *Textes turcs du Rhodope*. AOH, Vol. X, 2 (1960), pp. 185–229.
- KKaz. – Kakuk S., *Textes turcs de Kazanlyk II*. AOH, Vol. VIII, 3 (1958), pp. 241–311.
- N. – Németh J., *Die Türken von Vidin. Sprache, Folklore, Religion*. Budapest 1965.
- Rum.-russ. – *Rumynsko-russkij slovar'*. Ed. Adrianova B. A. and Mikhal'chi D. E. 2nd ed. Moskva 1954.
- SDD – *Türkiyede Halk Ağzından Söz Derleme Dergisi*. İstanbul 1939–57.
- TS – *Türkçe sözlük*. 4th ed. Ed. M. A. Ağakay and N. Artam, H. Eren, S. Sinanoğlu, F. Devellioğlu. Ankara 1966.

