

EARLY HUNGARIAN–TURKIC LANGUAGE CONTACT

Klára AGYAGÁSI*

Language contact between Turkic languages and Hungarian dates back to the early stages of the history of the Hungarian people and language. It likely began after the ancestors of the Hungarians separated from the Ugric community and established the Proto-Hungarian language system by gradually developing their own features in their homeland.¹ Archaeology has most recently posited the Hungarian homeland in the forested steppe zone of northwestern Siberia, beyond the Urals.² Leaving the ancient homeland may have been a longer historical process, with the transition from a pastoralist-hunter lifestyle to a nomadic one, taking place during the migration from the forest steppe zone to the southwest, but before the encounter with the steppe nomads. The 5th century was the time when, according to Byzantine sources, Turkic groups (various Ogur and Bulgar tribal alliances) appeared in Europe.³ The prehistoric Hungarian population, already nomadic, may have appeared in the Black Sea foothills after the migration of the Ogur tribes to the Caucasus foothills, but before the arrival of the Khazars.⁴ It cannot be ruled out that the first loose forms of Hungarian–Turkic contact had already begun in the early stages of the southwestern migration of the Hungarians.⁵ How-

* University of Debrecen, Institute of Slavistics, Debrecen, Hungary. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6449-5618; agyagasi.klara@arts.unideb.hu

¹ For a comparison of the historical periodization of the Hungarian language from the perspectives of linguistic history, archaeology and social history, see Zimonyi, 2014, 23–27.

² Makkay, 2005, 369–391; Klima, 2021.

³ Moravcsik, 1930 (1942), 294–302.

⁴ The Hungarians living along the Maeotis were called *Onogur* by Slavic sources in the 7th century (Róna-Tas, 1996, 217–221). This can be explained by the fact that the ancestors of the Hungarians may have occupied the area that the Onogurs lived in before they left for the Balkans in the 7th century. The Slavic-mediated version of the name Onogur became the exonym of the Hungarians, as shown by the data of the Western European annals of the 5th–9th centuries, cf. Király, 2006, 146–163.

⁵ Róna-Tas, 1996, 246–250.

ever, the intense Hungarian–Turkic historical and language contact took place after the first stage of migration was completed, following the settlement between the Don and Kuban rivers, in the vicinity of the Khazar Empire.⁶ From then on, relations continued uninterrupted during the migration to Etelköz, and even during the Conquest and the Árpád-period, until the Mongol invasion.

The Ogur tribal communities involved in the language contact were representatives of the *r*-Turkic branch of Turkic languages,⁷ of which Chuvash is the only modern representative. The classification on the Khazar language within the Turkic language family has changed several times in the course of historical linguistic investigations.⁸ According to the initial view, represented by Vámbéry, Gombocz, and Németh, the Khazar language itself could only be *z*-Turkic because of the consonant *z* in the ethnonym. This view was overturned by the discovery of the form *qasar* in several runic inscriptions in 1981. Various attempts have been made to explain the etymology of the word (by Pelliot, Róna-Tas, and Ciociltan), but the explanations are so varied that they have only led to the conclusion that the ethnonym does not provide a basis for categorizing the language of the Khazars. In the meantime, Golden published a collection of Khazar glosses preserved in various sources.⁹ Based on the meaning of the prefix ‘white’ in the Khazar town names *Sarigšin* and *Šarkel*, Ligeti classified the Khazar language as being of the Chuvash type. Erdal, however, disputed the correctness of Ligeti’s posited morphological structure of the name *Šarkel*, and concluded from his study of the Khazar glosses that there is more evidence to argue that Khazar is not a Chuvash-type language.¹⁰ Finally, the debate has only recently been settled by the inclusion of Turkic loanwords in Hungarian in the investigation, see below.

⁶ Historical contact between the Khazars and Hungarians was reported by a later source, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, cf. Kristó, 1980, 81–144.

⁷ Historical sources record the existence of the *z* : *r* opposition, and thus of the two linguistic branches, in the names *Oghuz* : *Ogur* as early as the Old Turkic period. From the point of view of the history of the sound system, rotacism (the result of the *z* > *r* change) is a change of the late Proto-Turkic period, documented by extensive literature. For the most recent summary, see Róna-Tas–Berta, 2011, 1107–1114; Agyagási, 2019, 37–38.

⁸ For details of the debate see Zimonyi, 2014, 82–85.

⁹ Golden, 1980.

¹⁰ Erdal, 2007.

Since the first half of the 18th century, a number of scholars have discussed Turkic–Hungarian language contact and certain Turkic–Hungarian lexical parallels. At this early stage of investigations, at the beginning of the emergence of the comparative method of historical linguistics (hallmarked by the activities of Ármin Vámbéry, Antal Reguly, József Budenz, and Bernát Munkácsi), a common belief was prevalent in linguistic studies. At the end of the 19th century, this belief sparked one of the most significant debates in Hungarian linguistics, which went down in the history of science as the “Ugric–Turkic War”, and which took place mainly between Vámbéry and Budenz as well as their students.¹¹ The subject of the debate was the question of the origin of Hungarians, which the participants in the debate sought to prove by using linguistic evidence. The decisive argument for the Finno-Ugric origin of the language was put forward by Budenz, who refuted Vámbéry’s proposal for a Turkic origin¹² with reference to phonology-based arguments.¹³ Later research clearly proved that the results of the comparative method based on linguistic data are valid only within historical linguistics.¹⁴

The first monographic study of the Turkic elements of the Hungarian language, by Zoltán Gombocz, interprets the Turkic elements of the Hungarian vocabulary as the result of early language contact.¹⁵ In his work *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, Zoltán Gombocz laid the methodological foundations for the study of Turkic loanwords for a long time. This work is the starting point for the classification of the Turkic loanwords of the Hungarian language into three chronological strata (early, i.e. pre-Conquest; middle, i.e. Kuman-Kipchak; and late, i.e. Ottoman Turkish), where the chronological classification also points to the specific source language. Zoltán Gombocz identified the Bulgar Turkic language as

¹¹ Vásáry, 2017; Maticsák, 2020, 104–107.

¹² Vámbéry, 1869.

¹³ Budenz, 1871.

¹⁴ The distinction between the history of the language and that of the ethnic group was recognised by linguistic and historical research already in the mid-20th century and is the basis of linguistic research on linguistic stratification. An outstanding example of such research is the monograph by Wolfgang Veenker, who illustrated linguistic assimilation and its consequences by using the example of certain ethnic groups originally speaking Finno-Ugric languages, thus demonstrating the difference between linguistic and ethnic history (Veenker, 1967). Later, Veenker’s results were confirmed by historiography (see Kappeler, 2004). Today, human genetics provides the evidence for the need to separate language and ethnic history.

¹⁵ Gombocz, 1912.

the source of the early layer because phonological criteria (the presence of the consonants *r* and *l* in the Volga Bulgarian tomb inscriptions in place of *z* and *š* in all other Turkic languages) provide a basis for this. In order to prove early language contact on the basis of phonological criteria, he gave a prominent role to the only modern descendant of Bulgar Turkic, Chuvash.

The next major advance in the comprehensive study of the topic is the work of Lajos Ligeti, who made it his task to sketch the Turkic historical and linguistic geographical background of each Hungarian word under study (together with their possible Altaic connections). He published etymological case studies of each word in various journals between 1933 and 1952, which he collected in two volumes in 1977 and 1979.¹⁶ In these publications, after presenting the source data, Ligeti processed the very abundant literature available to him from both Eastern and Western scholarship, considered the probable source-language phonological forms, but did not undertake an exact source language reconstruction.

From the early 1960s, in parallel with Lajos Ligeti's research, the *Historical-Etymological Dictionary of the Hungarian Language* (referred to as TESz, using the Hungarian acronym of the title) was prepared for publication and then published in three volumes. Lajos Ligeti was responsible for the professional supervision of the work on the vocabulary of Turkic origin in Hungarian. As a result of the preparatory work, an extremely rich database was created, which included all the hitherto known Turkic data of all the loanwords of Turkic origin that had been discovered in the mean-time, and which was supplemented by historical and dialectal data of the Hungarian forms, i.e. a parallel Hungarian database. This abundance of data made it possible to reconstruct the source forms, and revealed the surprising fact that the vast majority of Turkic loanwords do not carry Chuvash phonological criteria. It can be interpreted as a consequence of this situation that in his next major monograph Ligeti placed the emphasis on the historical background, chronology and convergent development of the phonetic history of Turkic and Hungarian by defining further criteria (the probability criterion, antiquity criterion, cultural criterion, and linguistic-geographical criterion) that support the early borrowing from other Turkic languages (Oghuz and

¹⁶ Ligeti, 1977; 1979.

Kipchak), which emerged as source languages alongside Proto-Chuvash.¹⁷ The work published in 1986 brought a new approach to the dating of the borrowings: Ligeti extended the chronology of the borrowings to the Árpád era. Despite all his efforts, however, Ligeti was unable to determine the exact source language.

The Turkic loanwords of the Hungarian language are also included in the German-language revised edition of TESz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen* I–III (EWUng), published between 1993 and 1997. Despite the enormous progress made, by then, in historical Turkic studies, the study of the Bulgar-Turkic branch, and in contact linguistic methodology, EWUng was only updated to the level of the contemporary etymological literature. Thus, at the end of the 20th century, despite the publication of five seminal works on the subject of early Hungarian–Turkic language contact from 1912 onwards, fundamental questions remained unanswered, and important international research findings remained untapped. These circumstances justified the launching of new basic research at the turn of the millennium, which is capable of answering all the old questions left open by historical linguistics and new questions raised by contact linguistics in the context of Hungarian–Turkic language contact at the international level of 21st century linguistics.

The new research findings of András Róna-Tas and Árpád Berta were published in a monumental monograph of 1,494 pages titled *West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*, in 2011 in Wiesbaden, Germany. The linguistic corpus of the monograph (hereafter WOT) is essentially based on the vocabulary included in TESz and EWUng. However, the authors of WOT included in their research not only literary words previously determined to be of certain or probable Turkic origin, but also words of disputed origin, words of unknown origin, archaisms and regional words which, because of their geographical distribution, were likely to be of Turkic origin. As regards the Turkic material in the database, a new feature of WOT is the emphasis on Old Turkic data. The authors cite data from three different scripts (Runic, Uighur and Arabic) from Eastern Old and Middle Turkic sources, and developed a transcription system to represent these, which allows the interpretation of the multiple scripts as linguistic data within a single phonological framework. On the Hungarian side, they used Old Hungarian written

¹⁷ Ligeti, 1986.

source material, assigning literary headings to the Old Hungarian written sources with the date of occurrence, and interpreting the spelling as linguistic data. This procedure made it possible to reconstruct the correspondences between source and recipient languages on the basis of Old Turkic and Old Hungarian linguistic data existing at approximately the same time.

Since the collected linguistic corpus contained many words without Chuvash phonological criteria, the authors of WOT did not organize the data according to the phonological criteria of a predefined Turkic language type. Instead, they sought to identify the source language type on the basis of the features reconstructed from Old Hungarian historical linguistic data from the Old Turkic period. András Róna-Tas published his working hypothesis¹⁸ before the research started, in which he proposed to define the question of the source language on a chronological and geographical basis, avoiding the trap of possibly misclassifying words without phonological criteria under an Old Turkic ethnonym in the sources. Therefore, he called all the language varieties that were present in Eastern Europe at the time of Hungarian–Turkic contact (between the 7th and 13th centuries) and could be considered as potential source language varieties, Western Old Turkic. Lars Johanson’s theory of code copying, published in 1992, was used as a suitable theoretical framework for such a linguistic study. Code copying, as defined by Johanson, is the process whereby the active reproduction apparatus (linguistic code) of a source language, operating concurrently, is partially or completely copied and reproduced in the target language. Thus, the phonological, morphophonetic and lexicological subsystems of the Old Turkic language code of Western Old Turkic, which were typical at the time of the language contact, can be represented through the source language reconstruction of the Old Turkic words of the Hungarian language. All the lexical elements in Hungarian are copies of the Western Old Turkic denotations and abstractions of the Old Turkic period, which can be used to map the social, economic, cultural and belief system characteristics of the source language communities, as well as to display information on the geographical location of the language contact, the flora and fauna, and the duration of the contact situation.

¹⁸ Róna-Tas, 1998.

The linguistic analysis carried out in this monograph established that early Turkic–Hungarian language contact involved the Ogur branch of Western Old Turkic and the Kipchak branch of Turkic, in contact with Proto-Hungarian and early Old Hungarian. According to Róna-Tas, the Ogur language was the language of both the Khazars and the Bulgars,¹⁹ as 246 (64%) of the 384 Western Old Turkic words (most of which are without phonological criteria) that are considered to be certain in Hungarian have reflexes in Chuvash. This shows that there could not have been any substantial difference between Bulgar and Khazar in the 7th through the 9th centuries. Accordingly, Western Old Turkic consists of two phonological subsystems, the Ogur and Kipchak phonemic systems and their regional variants. Thus, the form of the Western Old Turkic language variant which can be deduced from Hungarian was in itself a heterogeneous historical unit.

However, the Ogur phonological subsystem is subdivided into further geographical and chronological subsystems. A good example of the existence of geographical subsystems is the representation of the Proto-Turkic word-final **ŋ* in the Hungarian equivalents, where three geographically different developments of this phoneme are shown in the Hungarian data in the same period:

WOT **täŋ-* (cf. EOT *täŋ-*) → Hu. *teng-*, *tengődik* (WOT 887) ‘languish’

WOT **joŋ* (cf. EOT **yoŋ*) > **jom* → Hu. *gyom* (WOT 397) ‘weed’

WOT **buŋ* (cf. EOT *buŋ*) > *buγ* → Hu. *bú* (WOT 179) ‘sorrow’

The chronological subdivision is shown by the correspondences of the Western Old Turkic **j-* in Hungarian:

(a) (Proto-Turkic **y-* >) WOT *j-* → Proto-Hu. *j-* > *d'*, *d*:

WOT **jīŋjū* ‘pearl’ (cf. EOT *yinčü*) → Proto-Hu. *jīŋjū* > **jīŋj* > *jūŋj* > Hu. *gyöngy* (WOT 402) ‘pearl’

WOT **jīγay* ‘walnut’ (cf. EOT *yagak*) → Proto-Hu. **jīγay* > **jīwo* > *gyió* > Hu. *dió* (WOT 294) ‘walnut’

(b) WOT *j-* > *č-* > *ć-* > *ś-* → Proto-Hu. *ś* > *s*

¹⁹ Róna-Tas, 2011, 1176.

WOT **ǰel* > **čel* > *čel* > *šel* ‘wind’ → Proto-Hu. *sěl*, Hu. *szél* (WOT 784) ‘wind’

WOT **ǰeley* > **čeley* > **čeley* > **šeley* → Proto-Hu. **šeley* > Hu. *szőlő* (WOT 818) ‘grape’

In the examples listed under (a), in one of the Old Turkic varieties, *ǰ* was preserved throughout the entire Old Turkic period and copied by Old Hungarian into its own system in an unchanged form; while the examples in (b) show a four-step change of the phoneme *ǰ*, which marks four chronological planes. The different representations of each of the intermediate steps are not the result of theoretical reconstruction but are representations of real, existing forms transferred from Volga Bulgarian into Permic languages.²⁰

Among the semantic subsystems, some words indicating social elites stand out. In these, names of ranks/positions formed from common names became personal names, in some cases the names of Árpád rulers:

WOT **buyla* > *bila* ‘name of rank/position’ → ‘name of King Béla I’ (WOT 1169) (reigned: 1060–1063)

WOT **ǰabyu* > *ǰewü* ‘name of a rank/position’ → Hu. *ǰeü-ča* ‘name of King Géza I’ (WOT 1174) (reigned: 1074–1077)

WOT **yelley* ‘name of rank/position’ → *Yeley* ‘name of Árpád’s 2nd son’ (WOT 1170)

The words copied in Hungarian from Western Old Turkic show the organisation of public life in the source language society:

WOT **birug* ‘judge’ (cf. EOT *biruk*) → Hu. *bíró* (WOT 130) ‘judge’

WOT **biläčäk* ‘shackles’ (cf. EOT *biläk* ‘wrist’) → Hu. *bileček* > **bilinček* > *bilinč* (WOT 128) ‘handcuffs’

WOT **tanilč* ‘advice, council’ (cf. EOT **tanuš*) → Hu. **tanilč* > Hu. *tanács* (WOT 846) ‘advice, council’

WOT **tanuy* ‘witness’ (cf. EOT *tanuk*) → Hu. **tanu* > *tanú* (WOT 848) ‘witness’

²⁰ Cf. Róna-Tas, 1988, 760–766.

WOT **törüyän* ‘law’ (cf. EOT *törü*) → Hu. **türüyen* > *türven* > *törvény* (WOT 944) ‘law’

The two basic components of farming are animal husbandry and crop production. Neither the animal-husbandry nor the crop-production terminology copied into Hungarian shows the typical features of farming in nomadic societies with large herds. In the terminology of animal husbandry, the traditional animals (such as ‘bull’, ‘ox’, ‘calf’, ‘heifer’, ‘ram’, and ‘goat’) are joined by ‘pig’ and ‘chicken’, and the tools of animal husbandry include the ‘fold’ and the ‘sty’.

WOT **bīqa* ‘bull’ (cf. EOT *buka*) → Hu. *bika* (WOT 127) ‘bull’

WOT **ūkür* ‘ox’ (cf. EOT *öküz*) → Hu. *ökör* (WOT 663) ‘ox’

WOT **tana* ‘calf’ (cf. EOT **tana*) → Hu. *tinó* (WOT 909) ‘calf’

WOT **inäy* ‘cow’ (cf. EOT *ingäk*) → Hu. *ünő* (WOT 978) ‘cow’

WOT **burayu* ‘calf’ (cf. EOT *buzagu*) → Hu. *borjú* (WOT 151) ‘calf’

WOT **koč* ‘ram’ (cf. EOT *koč*) → Hu. *kos* (WOT 576) ‘ram’

WOT **käčäkä* ‘goat’ (cf. EOT *keči*) → Hu. *kecske* (WOT 518) ‘goat’

WOT **jasnay* ‘pig’ (cf. EOT *yasnag*) → Hu. *disznó* (WOT 296) ‘pig’

WOT **tiyuk* ‘hen’ (cf. EOT *takigu*) → Hu. *tyúk* (WOT 965) ‘hen’

WOT **koram* ‘sheepfold’ (cf. EOT *korum*) → Hu. *karam* (WOT 497) ‘fold’

WOT **ayul* ‘sheepfold’ (cf. EOT *agil*) → Hu. *ól* (WOT 632) ‘sty’

And the vocabulary of crop cultivation points to horticulture and fruit growing in addition to the cultivation of arable crops.

WOT **arpa* ‘barley’ (cf. EOT *arpa*) → Hu. *árpa* (WOT 77) ‘barley’

WOT **buḡday* ‘wheat’ (cf. EOT *bugday*) → Hu. *buza* (WOT 186) ‘wheat’

WOT **burčay* ‘pea’ (cf. EOT *burčag*) → Hu. *borsó* (WOT 154) ‘pea’

WOT **kumlay* ‘hops’ (cf. EOT *kumlak*) → Hu. *komló* (WOT 556) ‘hops’

WOT **kändir* ‘hemp’ (cf. EOT *käntir*) → Hu. *kender* (WOT 524) ‘hemp’

WOT **turma* ‘radish’ (cf. EOT *turma*) → Hu. *torma* (WOT 920) ‘horse-radish’

WOT **kärtä* ‘garden’ (cf. Os. *kärt* ← IE. **garda*) → Hu. *kert* (WOT 535) ‘garden’

WOT **alma* ‘apple’ (cf. EOT *alma*) → Hu. *alma* (WOT 62) ‘apple’

WOT **jīyaγ* ‘walnut’ (cf. EOT *yagak*) → Hu. *dió* (WOT 294) ‘walnut’

WOT **čeleγ* ‘grape’ (cf. EOT **yeglek*) → Hu. *szőlő* (WOT 818) ‘grape’

WOT **jemilč* ‘fruit’ (cf. EOT *yemiš*) → Hu. *gyümölcs* (WOT 417) ‘fruit’

WOT **kökän* ‘blackthorn’ (cf. EOT *köken*) → Hu. *kökény* (WOT 581) ‘blackthorn’

WOT **čum* ‘cornel’ (cf. Os. *cym*) → Hu. *som* (WOT 737) ‘cornel’

WOT **bor* ‘wine’ (cf. EOT *bor*) → Hu. *bor* (WOT 147) ‘wine’

WOT **sür-* ‘to filter’ (cf. EOT *süz-*) → Hu. *szűr-* (WOT 831) ‘filter’

The above linguistic data convincingly attest that a long period of time, several centuries, must have elapsed between the departure of the Hungarians from their ancestral homeland and their arrival in the Carpathian Basin, during which time the Hungarian population maintained contact with Turkic ethnic groups speaking different varieties of the Western Old Turkic language. The migration was halted in several places, and at each stopping place they led a nomadic lifestyle for a longer period of several generations, combining their way of life with crop cultivation, alternating between winter and summer camps. One of these stopping places can be localised by linguistic data to the Don-Kuban region. In Hungarian, there are plant names indicating Hungarian–Turkic–Alanian language contacts. The direction of the linguistic borrowing is different in the case of these, as there are tree names of Alanian origin in Hungarian (*tölgy* ‘oak’), *som* ‘cornel’ and *komló* ‘hops’ of Alanian origin but transmitted to Proto-Hungarian via Turkic, and finally *kóris* ‘ash’, *kökény* ‘blackthorn’, *körte* ‘pear’, *gyékény* ‘typha’ and probably *mogyoró* ‘hazel’ are of Turkic origin in Hungarian and Alanian.²¹ The direct Hungarian–Turkic–Alanian language contact may have taken place in the area of the Don-Kuban region, the area where the Alans were settled.

²¹ Róna-Tas, 2005, 207–209.

Recent archaeological research²² has challenged the assumed timeline of the linguistically based Proto-Hungarian–Old Turkic language contact and the linguistically based reconstructed route of migration of the Hungarians, based on the material of new sites attributed to Proto-Hungarian. I address the linguistic implications of the archaeological argument in a separate article.²³

Abbreviations

EOT	Eastern Old Turkic
Hu.	Hungarian
WOT	Western Old Turkic
Os.	Ossetian
OH	Old Hungarian

References

- Agyagási, K. (2019). *Chuvash historical phonetics: An areal linguistic study*. Turcologica 117. Wiesbaden.
- Agyagási, K. (2025). New insights in the research of West Old Turkic Loanwords of the Hungarian language. *Turkic Languages* 29(2), 174–189.
- Budenz J. (1871). Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar–török szóegyezéseiről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 10, 67–135.
- Erdal, M. (2007). The Khazar Language. Golden, P. B. – Ben-Shammai, H. – Róna-Tas, A. (Eds.), *The world of the Khazars: New Perspectives Selected Papers from the Jerusalem. 1999 International Khazar Colloquium hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute*. Leiden–Boston, 75–108.
- EWUng (1993–1997). Benkő, L. (Ed.), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*, Band I–III. Budapest.
- Golden, P. B. (1980). *Khazar Studies: An historico-philological inquiry into the origins of the Khazars*, Vol. I–II. Budapest.

²² Komar, 2018; Türk, 2023.

²³ Agyagási, 2025.

- Gombocz, Z. (1912). *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 30. Helsinki.
- Johanson, L. (1992). *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Stuttgart.
- Kappeler, A. (2004). *Die Geschichte Russlands im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert aus der Perspektive seiner Regionen*. Forschungen zur osteuropäische Geschichte 63. Wiesbaden.
- Király, P. (2006). *A honalapítás vitás eseményei: A kalandozások és a honfoglalás éve*. Nyíregyháza.
- Klima, L. (2021). A magyar őstörténet hajnalán, Nyugat-Szibériában. Klima, L. – Türk, A. (Szerk.), *Párhuzamos történetek. Interdiszciplináris őstörténeti konferencia a PPKE Régészettudományi Intézetének szervezésében Budapest, 2020 november 11–13*. Budapest, 213–227.
- Komar, O. (2018). *A korai magyarság vándorlásának történeti és régészeti emlékei – Istoriâ i arheologiâ drevnih mad'âr v èpohu migracii*. Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensia 11 – Magyar Őstörténeti Témacsoport Kiadványok 5 – Őmúltunk Tára 14. Budapest.
- Kristó, Gy. (1980). *Levedi törzsszövetségétől Szent István államáig*. Budapest.
- Ligeti, L. (1977). *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van*, I. kötet. Budapest.
- Ligeti L. (1979). *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van*, II. kötet. Budapest.
- Ligeti L. (1986). *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*. Budapest.
- Makkay, J. (2005). The secondary homeland of the Proto-Hungarians in Western Siberia. *Research on the prehistory of the Hungarians: A review. Papers presented at the meetings of the Institute of Archeology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. 2003–2004*. Varia Archeologica Hungarica XVIII. Budapest, 369–391.
- Maticsák, S. (2020). *A magyar nyelv eredete és rokonsága*. Budapest.
- Moravcsik, Gy. (1930). Az onogurok történetéhez. *Magyar Nyelv* 26, 4–18.
- Moravcsik, Gy. (1942). *Byzantinoturcica*, Band I. *Die Byzantinische Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker*. Budapest.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1988). Turkic influence on the Uralic languages. Sinor, D. (Ed.), *The Uralic languages*. Leiden–New York–København–Köln, 742–780.

- Róna-Tas, A. (1996). *A honfoglaló magyar nép*. Budapest.
- Róna-Tas, A. (1998). Western Old Turkic. Johanson, L. (Ed.), *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. August 3–6, 1994*. Wiesbaden, 619–626.
- Róna-Tas, A. (2005). Turkic–Alanian–Hungarian Contacts. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 58, 205–213.
- Róna-Tas, A. – Berta, Á. (2011). *West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*, Vol. I–II. *Turcologica* 84. Wiesbaden.
- TESz (1967–1976). Benkő, L. (Ed.), *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*, I–III. kötet. Budapest.
- Türk, A. (2023). Régészeti eredmények a magyar őstörténet kutatásában, lehetséges nyelvészeti vonatkozásokkal. *Magyar Nyelv* 119, 385–402.
- Vámbéry, Á. (1869). Magyar és török-tatár szóegyezések. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 8, 109–189.
- Vásáry, I. (2017). Bilim Adamı Ármin Vámbéry. *Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2(1), 112–123.
- Veenker, W. (1967). *Die Frage des finnougriſchen Substrats in der russischen Sprache*. Bloomington.
- Zimonyi, I. (2014). *A magyarság korai történetének sarokpontjai: Elméletek az újabb irodalom tükrében*. Budapest.

Erken Dönem Macar–Türk Dil İlişkileri

Geniſletilmiş özet

Bugünkü bilgilerimize göre, Macar dilinin söz varlığında 419 Eski Türkçe alıntı sözcük bulunmaktadır; bunlar Eski Türkçe döneminde (7–13. yüzyıllar) Macarcaya girmiştir. Bu sözcüklerin önemli bir bölümü, Macarların Karpat Havzası’nı yurt edinmesinden (896) önce ve bu havza dışında alınmıştır. Bu nedenle çalışmanın giriş bölümünde, yazar erken temasların olası başlangıcına ilişkin sorunları ve bunların mekânına dair arkeolojik ve tarihsel kaynakları ele almaktadır. Makale, bu sözcük varlığı katmanına ilişkin Macar Türkolojisinin bilim tarihi açısından önemli üç dönemini gözden geçirmekte ve 21. yüzyılda elde edilen sonuçları tanıtmaktadır. İlk dönemin temsilcileri (Ármin Vámbéry, Antal Reguly, József Budenz) Macar dilinin kökenini araştırmış, ancak 1871’de Budenz’in sesbilimsel kanıtlara dayanan argümanları,

Macarcadaki Türkçe unsurların dil akrabalığının değil, alıntıların sonucu olduğunu açıkça ortaya koymuştur.

İkinci dönemin önde gelen bilim insanı Zoltán Gombocz'dur. Gombocz, 1912 tarihli monografisinde (*Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*) erken Türkçe sözcük katmanını, Volga Bulgar mezar yazıtlarının dil özellikleriyle (rotasizm ve lambdasizm) örtüşmesine dayanarak Bulgar-Türk kökenli olarak değerlendirmiştir. (Volga Bulgar yazıtlarının dil özelliklerine ilişkin bilgiyi N. I. Aşmarin'in *Bolgarı i çuvaşi* adlı, 1902'de Kazan'da yayımlanan eserinden edinmiştir.) Gombocz, söz konusu çalışmasında Türkçe alıntı sözcüklerin incelenmesi için uzun süre belirleyici olacak yöntemsel temelleri atmıştır. Bu eserle birlikte, Macarcadaki Türkçe alıntıların üç kronolojik katmana (erken, yani yurt tutuş öncesi; orta, yani Kuman-Kıpçak ve geç, yani Osmanlı dönemi) ayrılması anlayışı yerleşmiş; bu kronolojik sınıflandırma aynı zamanda somut kaynak dilin belirlenmesine de işaret etmiştir.

Sonraki dönemi Lajos Ligeti'nin çalışmaları temsil eder. Ligeti, 1933 ile 1952 yılları arasında çeşitli dergilerde çok sayıda Türkçe etimolojik inceleme yayımlamış, bunları 1977 ve 1979'da iki cilt hâlinde toplamıştır. Bu çalışmalarda yalnızca Macarcaya geçmiş Türkçe alıntılar için mevcut Türkçe verileri bir araya getirmekle kalmamış, aynı zamanda bu sözcüklerin Altay dilleriyle olan bağlantılarına da dikkat çekmiştir. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* I–III (1967–1976) adlı eserin Türkçe kökenli söz varlığına ilişkin maddeleri üzerinde çalışırken, erken alıntıların yalnızca küçük bir bölümünün Gombocz'un belirlediği Bulgar-Türk/Çuvaş tipi ses ölçütlerini taşıdığını fark etmiştir. 1986 tarihli kitabında (*A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*) erken alıntıları destekleyen ek ölçütleri (olasılık ölçütü, eskilik ölçütü, kültürel ve dil coğrafyası ölçütü) tanımlamış, ancak alıntıların kaynak dilini kesin olarak belirleyememiştir.

András Róna-Tas ve Árpád Berta, 2011'de yayımlanan çalışmalarında (*West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*), Macar-Türk dil ilişkilerinin mekânını Karadeniz'in kuzeyi ile Etelköz bölgesine yerleştirmiştir. Yazarlar, bu temaslarda rol oynayan Türk dilini Eski Batı Türkçesi olarak tanımlar. Bu dil, Avarların, Ogurların, Bulgarların ve Hazarların Ogur tipli, ayrıca Kumanların Kıpçak türündeki dil değişikliklerini kapsar ve Anadolu Türkçesinden farklıdır. Hazar dilinin Türk dilleri içindeki yeri uzun süre tartışmalı olduğundan, makale bu tartışmanın başlıca görüşlerini ve Ogur sınıflandırmasını destekleyen kanıtları da sunmaktadır.

Róna-Tas, alıntılama sürecinin bilimsel açıklamasında, Macarcadaki Eski Türkçe alıntıları Lars Johanson'un 1992'de geliştirdiği "kod kopyalama" kuramı çerçevesinde değerlendirir. Buna göre, Eski Batı Türkçesinin Macarcada korunmuş sözvarlığı, bu dilin yaşayan bir dilsel kaynağı olarak ele alınır. Bu yaklaşım, söz konusu sözcüklerin Eski Batı Türkçesindeki türetim süreçlerinin, Eski Doğu Türkçesi karşılıklarıyla karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesini de içerir. Makale, Türkçe

alinti szóvarlágjának coğrafi ve kronolojik katmanlaşmasını ortaya koymakta; toplumsal elitin adlandırılması, kamusal düzen terminolojisi, hayvancılık ve araçları ile bitki ve meyve yetiştiriciliğine ilişkin szóvarlágından örnekler sunmaktadır.

Erken Macar–Türk dil ilişkileri araştırmalarına ilişkin başlıca kaynaklar şunlardır: Vámbéry Ármin: Magyar és török-tatár szóegyezések. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 8 (1869), 109–189; Budenz József: Jelentés Vámbéry Ármin magyar-török szóegyezéseiről. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 10 (1871), 67–135; Zoltán Gombocz: *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 30 (1912), Helsinki; Moravcsik Gyula: Az onogurok történetéhez. *Magyar Nyelv* 26 (1930), 4–18; Gyula Moravcsik: *Byzantinoturcica I. Die Byzantinische Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker*. Budapest, Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1942; Benkő Loránd (Szerk.): *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*, I–III. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1967–1976; Ligeti Lajos: *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van*, I–II. kötet. Kőrösi Csoma Társaság, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Budapest, 1977, 1979; Peter B. Golden: *Khazar Studies. An historico-philological inquiry into the origins of the Khazars*, Vol. I–II. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1980; Ligeti Lajos: *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1986; Marcel Erdal: *Old Turkic word formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*, Vol. I–II. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1991; Lars Johanson: *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1992; Loránd Benkő (Hrg.): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*, Band I–III. Budapest, 1993–1997; András Róna-Tas: Western Old Turkic. Johanson, L. (Ed.), *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. August 3–6, 1994. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1998, 619–626; András Róna-Tas: Turkic–Alanian–Hungarian Contacts. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 58 (2005), 205–213; András Róna-Tas – Árpád Berta: *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*, Vol. I–II. Turcologica 84. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden. 2011; Zimonyi István: *A magyarság korai történetének sarokpontjai. Elméletek az újabb irodalom tükrében*. Balassi Kiadó, Budapest, 2014; Klára Agyagási: *Chuvash historical phonetics. An areal linguistic study*. Turcologica 117. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2019; István Mándoky Kongur: *Newcomers from the East. Hungarians and Kipchak-Turks in Europe. Second, enlarged, improved edition*. Molnár & Kelemen Oriental Publishers, Uppsala–Budapest, 2021.

