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Introduction

In about A.D. 370, a nomadic people called the Huns invaded Eastern Europe. Coming from the East, and having subjugated the Ostrogothic realm of Hermanarich, they established a nomadic empire which soon stretched to the Roman Danubian limes. The Hunnic empire reached its apex under the leadership of Attila (444-453). In 451, however, Attila was defeated in the “Catalaunian fields” in Gaul by the united forces of the Romans and the Visigoths. His sudden death two years later was followed by an internal power struggle among his sons during which the empire’s subjugated peoples — mainly the Germanic Gepidae,
Ostrogoths, and Heruli—revolted successfully. A great battle fought in 455 on the still unidentified Pannonian river Nadao put an end to the Hunnic empire’s unity and greatness.

But some time later, as we learn from Jordanes, groups of Huns returned to their “inner” territory on the river Vär ( = Dnieper) in the Ukraine. There they reorganized on a smaller scale, and still held control over the Danubian Scythia Minor (modern Dobrudža). Unfortunately, sources for that period are very taciturn about Hunnic developments, but the Huns continue to be mentioned, if sporadically, until at least the middle of the sixth century.

It was one of the originators of French sinology, Joseph Deguignes (1721-1800), who in 1748 first put the question of the ethnic origin of the Huns on a scholarly level. Since that time, historians, philologists, and, later, also archaeologists and ethnographers have continued the discussion. Nonetheless the question remains unresolved. Since the character of the Hunnic language has consistently held a central place in that debate, reexamination of the language is a requisite for any resolution of it.

The Hunnic problem is of importance in Ukrainian scholarship not just as an interesting academic topic. Not only did the Huns rule over the Ukraine for at least two hundred years (ca. 375-560), but also they apparently merged with successive nomadic waves in that area and had a part in Ukrainian ethnogenesis.

In 1829, a Carpatho-Ukrainian scholar working in Moscow, Jurij Huca-Venelin (1802-1839), developed a theory about the Hunnic origin of the Slavs. His theory found many supporters, including such eminent Russian scholars as the historian Dmitrij Ivanović Ilovajskij (1832-1920) and the ethnographer Ivan Egorević Zabelin (1820-1908). According to Zabelin, the Huns were the retinue (druzina) of the northern Slavs who were invited by the southern Slavs to help fight against the Goths. In 1858, A. F. Vel’tman identified the name Huns (via the form Kwäre) with the name Kievans and proposed to call Attila “the autocrat of all Rus’.”

---


† A recent bibliography is given in fn. 1, below.

‡ Drevnie i nyneśnie Bolgare, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1829).


¶ Istoria russkoj žizni, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1876), pp. 218-360.

‖ This astounding identification was made in his Attila i Rus’ v IV-V vekax (Moscow, 1858).
The reader will understand then, why, after having studied the Hunnic problem for over thirty years, I venture to present the results of my investigations in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies.*

* * *

A. The Sources

The works of Greek writers (especially Priscus, d. ca. 472) and Latin writers (especially Jordanes, A. D. 551, based on the work of Cassiodorus, fl. ca. 530) contain the names of some twenty-five persons among Attila’s immediate kin and eight names of their close associates— together thirty-three names over a period of some one hundred and eighty years (ca. 375-555). One can assume that all these persons spoke the same idiom. It is reasonable, then, to use this onomastic material to determine the language of the ruling clan of the so-called European Huns.¹

Although contemporaneous sources include many more names of “barbarians” than the thirty-three selected here, for the time being one can dismiss these as uncertain, in consideration of the multiethnic character of any steppe empire.²


The thirty-three names selected here are divided into two groups:
(1) names of actual members of the dynasty (nos. 1-25), which seem to be either personal names or titles;
(2) names of close associates of the dynasty (nos. 26-33), which frequently represent office titles, appellations, epithets, or even nicknames.

The Hunnic material to be analyzed here belongs to four periods: (1) ca. A.D. 375—the time of the first name, that of the epic Hunnic ruler who allegedly entered the East European Ostrogothic realm then, as recorded by Jordanes from the Hunnic epic tradition; (2) ca. 390-420—the time of names 2 to 6, which are historical, although the relationship of their bearers to Attila (and to each other) remains unknown; (3) ca. 420-480—the names in this subdivision, including 7-21 and 26-33, are taken from the surest historical and genealogical information; (4) ca. 536-555—the fully historical names, 22-25, are of actors in the Hunnic epilogue.

The Hunnic names that have come down to us are transmitted mostly in the works of fourteen contemporary (5th-6th century) Greek and Latin writers. Six Greek and two Roman writers lived in the fifth century, whereas three Greek and three Roman writers were from the sixth century. Also, four works (two Greek and two Roman) were written between the seventh and ninth century by authors who had at their disposal rich sources since then lost. We have no serious reason to question the accuracy of their data.

The majority of the Hunnic names (20 of the 33) were recorded by the intelligent politician and historian Priscus of Panium in Thrace (d. after 472), who spent some time at Attila’s court (448-449) as the Byzantine ambassador to the Hunnic realm. In fact, thirteen, or more than one-third, of the names are known to us only from Priscus’s notations: Άδάμει, Άτακάμ, Βασίχ, Βέριχος, Έδέκων, Έσκάμ, Ζέρκων, Ησλαν, Κουρσίχ, Κρέκαν, Μάμα, Σκότας, Ωηβάρσιον.

An earlier Byzantine ambassador to the Huns, Olympiodorus of Thebae in Egypt, visited the Hunnic rulers in 412. In his historical writings he mentions two names unknown in other sources: Δονάτος and Χαράτων. The history of Justinian I’s reign by Agathias (fl. 556) mentions two more otherwise unrecorded names: Έλμίγγειρος and Έλμινζούρ.

A later but nonetheless reliable chronicler, Theophanes Byzantius (752-818), who incorporated materials from many lost sources in his work, also saved one Hunnic name: Γίεσμου.
Three church historians of the first half of the fifth century transmitted several names: Socrates of Constantinople (d. 440), Sozomen of Ghazzah in Palestine (d. ca. 450), and Theodoret of Antioch (d. 451). Of the Greek authors, only Sozomen and the secular historian Zosimus (who wrote after 498) mentioned the name Οὐλδιν ~ Οὐλδης, and Socrates notes the name Οὐπταρος.

The “Chronicon paschale,” compiled by an unknown cleric during the reign of Heraclius I (610-641) sometime shortly after 628, contains variants of two names: Βλίδας and Δινζίριχος.3

First among the Latin authors is Jordanes, a pro-Roman Ostrogoth who in 551 (probably in Ravenna) wrote his “Getica,” or history of the Goths (and Huns). In composing the work he made use of a very important (now lost) Gothic history by the Roman senator Cassiodorus (ca. 490-585), as well as of Gothic and Hunnic popular traditions.

Jordanes includes thirteen Hunnic names in his work. Six of them also appear in the work of Priscus (Attila = 'Αττίλας, Bleda = Βλήδας, Dintzic = Δεγγιζίχ, Hernac = 'Ηρνάχ, Mundzucο = Μουνδίουχονας, Roas = 'Ρούγας), one in the work of Sozomen and Zosimus (Huldin = ΟҮλδιν ~ ΟҮλδης) and two in the work of Socrates (Octar = ΟΥπταρος, Roas = 'Ρούγας). Jordanes himself preserved four Hunnic names for posterity: Balamur, Ellac, Emnetzur, and Vltzindur.

Several names already known from the Greek and other Latin sources occur in the historical apology for Christianity by the Spaniard Paulus Orosius (fl. 414-417), as well as in the “Gallic Chronicle of 452,” the “Gallic Chronicle of 511,” and, especially, in the Chronicle by Marcellinus Comes (534). The last work gives five Hunnic names: Attila, Bleda, Denzic- = Δινζίχ, Huldin, and Mundo.

Two Hunnic names survived in Latin works: Laudaricus in the “Gallic Chronicle of 511” (mentioned above), and Hunigasio in the (older) “Vita Sancti Lupi” (probably compiled in the 5th c.; the saint [ca. 383-479] was bishop of Troyes in France).4


4 Editions of the Latin sources are the following: “Anonymus Ravennas,” ed. O. Cuntz,
In order to facilitate use and comparison, the source data is presented on p. 434 in parallel Greek and Latin columns, arranged in two parts: (1) names of members of the dynasty, given chronologically (nos. 1-25); and (2) names of the leading Hunnic statesmen and officers from ca. 448-449, arranged alphabetically (nos. 26-33).

B. Analysis of the Onomastic Material (nos. 1-33)

I. Names of Members of the Dynasty

1. Balamur, Balamber. This name occurs three times in the work of Jordanes (551); it has come down to us in five variants, which can be systematized into three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balaber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balambyr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balamur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balamir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form Balaber is undoubtedly a corruption of Balamber, resulting from the omission of -m-. The forms with the second -b- (Balamber, Balambyr) seem to evolve from a dittography (b-b); -mir, in the variant Balamir, is certainly secondary and owes its existence to the Gothic onomastic “suffix”-mir/-mer. Therefore I regard Balamur as the only original Hunnic form of the name. The word recalls the appellative attested in Mongolian (SH balamut ~ WMo balamud ~ balamad), meaning “savage, wild, reckless, venturous, dashing, crazy.”

Danube-Bulgarian had the suffix /mA/, with the same meaning as the Middle Turkic suffix /mA/ 'the greatest among': DBulg dval+ma 'horse herdsman' (originally, 'the greatest among the horseherd') = MTü qoy+mat 'shepherd' (originally, 'the greatest among the sheepherd'). This Turkic suffix consists of two elements: /mA/ and the pluralive suffix /At/.

---

5 Getica, ed. Skržinskaja, Jordan, p. 152, l. 3 (§130); p. 170, l. 40 (§248); p. 171, l. 2 (§249); and fn. 390 on p. 280.

6 See Schönfeld, Wörterbuch, 43 (s.v. Ballomarius) and “Etymologischer Index,” p. 304.

7 SH, ed. Haenisch, §§129, 248, 249. See also Haenisch, Wörterbuch, p. 12.

8 Lessing, Dictionary, pp. 78-79.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date in Hunnic History</th>
<th>Author/Title of Work</th>
<th>Greek Source</th>
<th>Latin Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td>a) Names of Members of the Dynasty</td>
<td>Jordanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ca. 395-410</td>
<td>Sozomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Olympiodorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ca. 410-412</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ca. 412-420</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ca. 420-430</td>
<td>Theophanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d. 430</td>
<td>Sozomen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ca. 430-433</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d. 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>453-444</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>433-453</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d. 433</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>d. 435</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d. 455</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>d. 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>d. 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>fl. after 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>fl. after 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>fl. after 469</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5th-6th century</td>
<td>Theophanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>d. 536</td>
<td>Procopius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>fl. 556</td>
<td>Agathias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>fl. 556</td>
<td>Agathias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ca. 448-449</td>
<td>Priscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Mongolian the suffix has two variants /mAd/ and /mUd/; cf. WMo bala+mad ~ bala+mud. As to usage, see WMo aqa+mad ‘senior, elder’ (originally, ‘the oldest among the brothers’), from aqa ‘older brother, senior, older’; yeke+med ‘the highest (official); the elder men, elders or seniors, important people’, from yeke ‘great, big, large’. Since in Hunnic the suffix /r/ appears in place of the Mongolian /d/ ~ /t/ (see Emnetzur, no. 20), one may assume that Hunnic /mUr/ = /mU/ł/r/ corresponds to the Turkic /тА/Ч-Д/ (~/тА/ + /с/) and Mongolian /mA/i/d/ ~ /mU/ł/d/.

The now obsolete noun bala had been preserved in WMo in a periphrastic rendition: bala bol- ‘to lose one’s memory from intoxication, senility, or illness; to become stupid’.

Hence the Hunnic bala+mur must have had the meaning “the greatest among the venturous, daring”—surely a reasonable designation for a conquerer and empire builder.

2-3. Басич and Курсич. Both names have the denominal nominal suffix /siG/ which in Turkic (e.g., OT) has the adjectival meaning “like something.”

2. In the Hunno-Bulgarian languages /t/ within a consonantic cluster tends to disappear, e.g.: DBulg σεκτεμ ~ шехтемь ‘the eighth’ < *sikdrtdm; VBulg اتی ~ ātī ‘he was’ < *är-di > *ärti; Čuv idā ‘added number’ < *artuq. On the other hand, there is a tendency in Turkic (and also partly in Hunnic; see no. 26) to avoid geminatae. Therefore, I propose the following etymology: Басич = *bas′ığ < *bars+siğ ‘feline-like.’ The word bars ‘feline’ also occurs in another Hunnic name discussed here: Ⴅеныбыг Oy bars (see no. 10).

3. The root of Курсич is attested in both Hunnic and Turkic: Bulg Hun *kürä (i.e., kür+ä) = Tü kür. In Hunnic the word occurs in the Danube-Bulgarian tribe name кургир kūr+gir (<*kürä+gir). Karl

11 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 78.
12 ed. de Boor, EL, p. 141, l. 13.
13 ed. de Boor, EL, p. 141, l. 13 = Byz Tur, 2: 169.
14 See von Gabain, ATG, p. 66, §80; Brockelmann, OTG, pp. 136-137, §89.
15 Pritsak, Fürstenliste, pp. 58, 74; Farid S. Xakimzjanov, Jazyk épitafi j volkskix Bulgar (Moscow, 1978), p. 125, pl. 12, l. 8 (ح), p. 105, pl. 2, l. 7 (ح).
16 Egorov, ESCTJ, p. 344.
18 Cf. the change in New Uighur rs > s: bars > bäs ‘feline,’ Sevortjan, ESCTJ, 2: 68.
Menges established for the "Altaic" kür ~ kür+ä the meaning "brave, noble, powerful; universal"; cf. the Peceneg ruler s.a. 972: Kypha Kūrā (Kūr+ā).19

Because of Bang’s law ("Mittelsilbenschwund") the form *kür+ä+sig (> *kurasisig) became kürsig. The name meant: "brave-like, noble-like, universal-like"; cf. Attila, no. 13. Incidentally, a dangerous expedition (to Iran) was headed by two Dioscuri-like members of the dynasty, Basiğ and Kürsig.21

4. Oüldης, Uldin23 ~ Huldin.24 As the Latin forms (already in Orosius, fl. 414-417) show, the name had /n/ and not /s/ in its Auslaut. Also see Vltzin+dur, no. 21.

The root of the ety whole is the verb öl-, which survives in Mo (SH) olje ~ ol-jei25 ~ WMo öl-jei26 ‘auspice, favourable omen, happiness, good luck’.

The suffix /je/ ~ /jei/ < */di/-I-/ge/, since every Mongolian j is originally *di.27

This concept is supported by the Mongolian (SH) form oljige = *öl-jige (< *öl-dige; > *öljē > ölje) with the meaning “front part.”28

This word also appears in Mongolian (SH) as oljigetai (=öl-jige+tei) in the phrase oljigetai tergen ‘wagon with a front part, i.e., protected wagon’; the Chinese equivalent is 甚wei ‘ce qui sert a protéger.’29

In Hunno-Bulgarian there was also a tendency toward the development of di > ti > či, as the tribal name Oültinčoup (öl-tin + čiir) and the personal name Vltzindur (öl-čin+dür; see no. 21) indicate.

20 See Räsänen, Laugeschichte, p. 45.
21 On this myth, see Pritsak, OR, 1: 141, 154, 163, 165, 169-70.
24 Marcellinus Comes, Chronicon, ed. Mommsen, p. 69 > Jordanes, Romana, ed. Mommsen, p. 321. The initial h-, which was not present in Orosius’s notation (see fn. 23), should be regarded as a sixth-century fashion; see, e.g., Jordanes, Getica (ed. Skržinskaja): Alani (pp. 156, 162-164, 173, etc.) ~ Halani (pp. 144, 151), Alaricus (pp. 156, 157) ~ Halaricus (pp. 153, 158), etc.
27 See Poppe, MCS, pp. 265-66.
28 SH, ed. Haenisch, §55.
In place of the Mongolian suffix /ge/ ~ /ge+i/ the Hunnic has the suffix /n/. Hence *ool’δηn is *ool-di+n. In Mongolian the word oölje+i > oölje+i with the adjectival suffix /tu/ appears as the name of one Ilkhan, i.e., the Mongolian ruler in Iran (1304-1316): Oöljeitü (= oöl-je+i+tü), literally, “auspicious, happy, lucky, fortunate.”

The Hunnic *ool-din (= oöl-di+n) apparently had a similar meaning.

5. Δονάτ-.

The word *donát corresponds to the Turkic generic word for horse, yonat ~ yont, yund, etc.; see OT Inscr. yont, OT Brahmi yunt ~ yund, MTÜ Käsg. yond. Qipçaq/Golden Horde (ca. 1342-1357) yott (έντα γάτα ‘in the horse year’). Some Middle Turkic (Abū Haiyān, 1312) and older Ottoman texts spelled the word dissyllabically, the latter with the vowels written plene: یونات yonat. The initial consonant, in Greek spelled with δ, was probably d. The initial d- is attested in Danube-Bulgarian, e.g., δογγά- (dögä-) ‘to finish.’

Horses played (and still play) a central role in the life and cult of nomads. Horse sacrifice and eating of horsemeat were common expressions of that special role. Each Hunno-Turkic language had at least two terms for “horse,” one of which was used as a designation for the “horse year” in the twelve-cycle calendar. Concerning other Hunnic designations for “horse,” see Χαράτων (no. 6) and Έλμίγγειρ-, etc. (nos. 24-25).

6. Χαράτων.

The first component of this name is surely the “Altaic” word xará (= qara; phonetically with initial spirantization: q > [x-]), which had two meanings: (1) ‘black’ and (2) ‘great; northern’. Spirantization in the initial position (q- > x-)—as well as in the final position (see no. 7)—seems to be a typical Hunnic phonemic feature.

The second element, tön (cf. Turkmen dön), is apparently the Śaka loanword in both Hunnic and Turkic: thauna > *taun > tön ‘garment, clothing’. The compound name, qaratön, therefore, had the meaning...
“black-clad; with black coat.” It must have had some significance and currency among the Huns, since the name was popular among their progeny, the Old Chuvashians. Chuvash villages are usually named after their owner, and several villages still bear the name Xaratum (< xaratöri). Also, the Chuvash cult seems to include ancestral beings (kiremet) called Xoratom kiremet.40

The word qara-tôn seems to have been an elliptical designation for “horse.”

In Anatolian dialects and in the Ottoman literary language the word don (< tôn) has still another meaning: “the coat of a horse” (“die Pferdefarbe”).41

Evliyâ Çelebi, the great Ottoman traveler (fl. 1640-1684), describes the funeral ceremony of Mürâd IV (d. 9 February 1640) in the following way: Cemi'-i ümmet-i Muhammad mâtene düşüb. At-Meydânında siyâh dönlü atlarda mâtémd etdiler;42 “All Muslims (lit. 'the community of Muhammad'), falling into the funeral procession, went into mourning at the At Meydân (Hippodrome) on horses having black coats.” The concept of a “horse with a black coat” is expressed here by siyâh dönlü at, where siyâh ‘black’ is an Arabic loanword used for “black par excellence” in opposition to qara which can mean “dark in general.” Like siyâh dön, the compound qara-tôn (lit. 'black coat’) may be used elliptically for *siyâh dönlü at = *qara tônli at 'black-coated horse'.

In this connection I note that the Hunnic Xara-Tôn was the successor of Donat43 (“Horse”). Apparently the elliptical use of the word for “horse” in the title of the successor of a ruler called “Horse” was intentional, especially if we take into account Hunnic totemism.

7. Μουνδίουχ-44/ Mundzuc-45 ~ Μουνδιό-46. The name of Attila’s father has come down to us in two variants, one ending with -x and the

41 See Radloff, Wb, vol. 3, col. 1710 (don Osm. Krm. 2. "die Pferdefarbe"); Hamit Zübeys [Koşay] and Ishak Kefet, Anadilden derlemeler ([Ankara], 1932), p. 107: don (G. Antep, Maraş)... 2. renk, atının donu kırdır (“coat; the coat of a horse is gray”). My friend Dr. Şinasi Tekin assured me that the word don has that particular meaning in different parts of Anatolia, especially the Bursa region. Under the item don in his etymological dictionary, E. V. Sevortjan only quotes Radloff, without any further discussion of the meaning “coat of the horse” (ÈSTJ, vol. 3 [1980], p. 263).
44 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 581, l. 84 = Byz Tur, 2: 194.
46 Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 102, l. 15 = Byz Tur, 2: 194.
other lacking it. The majority of scholars connected this word with the Turkic bunčuq, munčuq, munžuq, münžaq, bonžuq, mončuq, etc., and with either of its two meanings, "jewel, pearl, bead" or "flag." The Turkic etymon has two variants of the initial affricate of the second syllable: voiced ęż and unvoiced ęż.

But careful study of Greek and Latin usages makes it clear that these two languages distinguished between the two affricates. The voiceless ęż was rendered in Greek by ζ and in Latin by τζ, e.g., δεγγίζιχ : dintzic. On the other hand, precisely in our name Greek had δί and Latin had dz: μουνδίου, μουνδίουχ: mundzuc; see also μουνδο = m undo, when the letter ι was omitted (probably erroneously) in the source in question; significantly enough, the voiced д : d remained.

Based upon these considerations, I propose to read μουνδίουχ/ mundzuc and μουνδίου ~ μουνδό/mundo as munguq and munğu ~ mungu.

Aulis J. Joki suggested that the Turkic word was a borrowing from a Chinese synonym-compositum: men (Arch Chin *mwen, GSR 183f) ‘red gem’ and chu (Arch Chin *tiu, GSR 128e) ‘pearl’. According to him, the second component was later falsely identified with the Turkic diminutive suffix /ÇA/, and was then replaced by its Turkic synonym with the final -K (=q, k): /ÇUK/ ~ /ÇAK/.

The existence of two variants of the Hunnic ruler’s name, with and without -K, corroborates both Joki’s etymology and the connection of Hunnic Μουνδίουχ ~ Μουνδιο with munguq ~ munğu.

The word belongs to the sphere of "Altaic" religious and royal symbolism. The two meanings given above are interconnected. As in China, so also in the Altaic steppe (as confirmed by Kushan, Old Turkic,

---

48 On munžuq, etc., see Clauson, EDT, p. 349; Räsänen, EWT, p. 340; Doerfer, TMEN, 4: 24-27.
49 L. Ligetis’s observation (apud Maenchen-Helfen, Huns, p. 410) that there is a clearcut distribution in the Turkic languages: Oghuz б-ʒ (bonžuq) versus other Turkic languages: м-́ (e.g., Özb. munçoq, Kirg. monçoq) has no validity, since Azeri (an Oghuz language) has munžuq and Turkman (also an Oghuz language) has monșuq; in both cases there is an initial m.

In any case, the Turkic situation has no validity for Hunnic, which belonged to a separate Altaic group.
50 Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen (Helsinki, 1952), pp. 242-43 (s.v. munzo`). That word, with the meaning “flag,” penetrated into Ukrainian and from there to Polish and Russian (bunčuk); see Max Vasmer, Rew, 1: 145.
and Old Uighur art forms) a pearl called *munčuq* represented the sun and the moon. In artistic representations it was put in the mouth of a dragon. The *munčuq* gem was usually surrounded by an aureole of flame, and one of its special uses was as a finial on the imperial flagpole.\(^{51}\) This term, having so much symbolic value, is also often attested as a personal name, e.g.: *Qizil Munčuq*, a Mongolian commander in Afghanistan (ca. 1223);\(^{52}\) *Munčuk Iičiikeev*, a Bashkir leader (ca. 1761);\(^{53}\) *Mončak ~ Bunčak ~ Puncuk*, a Kalmuk (Torgaut) leader (first half of the seventeenth century).\(^{54}\)

I conclude that the Hunnic name should be reconstructed as *munžu ~ munžuq* 'jewel, flagpole' (phonetically having a spirantization of the final stop: \(q = [x]\)). Note also the name Moőńdo- (no. 23).

8. *Octar*. This name of an uncle (d. ca. 430) of Attila has been transmitted in two forms: by Socrates (ca. 380-440) as Oųπταρος,\(^ {55}\) and by Jordanes (A.D. 551), in the "Getica," as *Octar*.\(^ {56}\) The second form is undoubtedly the correct one. The form with \(-pt-\) has been rightly recognized by M. Schönfeld as Gothic,\(^ {57}\) and the change from \(-ct-\) to \(-pt-\) is one of the characteristic features of Balkan-Latin.\(^ {58}\)

There occurs in Turkic (e.g., *QB*, A.D. 1069)\(^ {59}\) and Mongolian (e.g., Kalmuk)\(^ {60}\) the word *öktem* with two sets of meanings: (1) "strong, brave, imperious, impetuous," and (2) "proud, boastful; pride." The etymon is the verb *ökte-* (*oktä-*) in Turkic known until now only from Chagatai (*Wb*): "to encourage, put heart into (someone)," as was rightly stressed by Sir Gerard Clauson.\(^ {61}\) In Mongolian, *ökte-* occurs in *MA* (fifteenth century): *hanışgäin üstini ökte-be = Čag qašın tüketi boldi*.\(^ {62}\)

---

51 Details in Emel Esin, "Tös and moncuk: Notes on Turkish flagpole finials," *CAJ* 16 (1972): 14-36, 9 pl.; and M. Fuad Köprülü, "Bayrak," *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (Istanbul, 1949), pp. 401-420. Kalğarî did not know (or ignored) the religious and symbolic meaning of the word, defining it simply as "bead, trinket.... Anything that is hung to a horse's neck, such as gems, lion's paws, or amulets" (Käsgan/Dankoff, 1: 354).


59 e.g., *QB F*, p. 59, l. 3; *QB H*, p. 157, l. 8.

60 Ramstedt, *KWh*, p. 294.

The deverbal nominal suffix /m/ is known both in Turkic and Mongolian. In the latter language, it alternates with the suffix /ri/, e.g., Kalmuk bō- (< bogu-) ‘zu-
schnüren’ which has two synonyms (deverbal nouns), one with the suffix /m/ and the other with the suffix /ri/: bō-m and bō-ri ‘Engpass.’ The Turkic correspondence of Mongolian /ri/ is /z/, e.g., bog-az ‘throat’, from bog- (Mongolian bogu-) ‘to strangle, choke’.

Here we have the following correspondences:

Tü /m/ = Mo /m/;
Tü /z/ = Mo /ri/.

Typical of all Hunnic languages is their rhotacism. Therefore the corresponding Hunnic suffix must have been /r/.

Octar/ođσταav- simply transmits the Hunnic appellative Öktär (*öktä-r), most probably with the meaning “strong, brave, imperious” Of special importance to our investigation of the language of Attila’s Huns is the very clearly documented rhotacism in this name.

9. 'Poiyya-/Roaa-. The name of Attila’s second paternal uncle and predecessor (d. A.D. 433) is attested in three variants: Socrates (A.D. 439) ’Poiygaǭ ("Gallic Chronicle 511," Ruga) = Priscus (A.D. 472) ’Poou- (= Jordanes Roas) = Theodoret (ca. 393-451) ’Poivlaǭ (Lat. variant in “Gallic Chronicle 452,” Rugila). The ’Poua- variant is secondary, reflecting the sound change ouγa- > ova. The final -ς is a Byzantine masculine suffix; the forms in /ila/ are Gothic—or, better, Gothicized—variants.

I consider this name to be a composite form.

The second element, ouγa (~ oũa), renders the Altaic title ōgä, well known from Old Turkic. If it is a genuinely “Altaic” word, rather than a

63 For Turkic, see Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 133; for Mongolian, Szabó, Szóképzés, p. 45 (§109).
64 On /ri/ see Szabó, Szóképzés, p. 46 (§113).
65 See Ramstedt, Einführung, 2: 143.
66 On Hunnic rhotacism, see Pritsak, “Ein hunnisches Wort” (fn. 1), pp. 124-35.
67 On Hunnic ō in the non-first syllable, see below, fn. 198.
71 Getica, ed. Skrżinskaja, p. 159, l. 42 (§180).
72 ed. Scheidweiler, p. 340, l. 7.
74 The circumflex in Priscus’s rendering may reflect Hunnic vocalic length. See also p. 469.
borrowing, it probably derived from ō- (see OT ō- ‘to think’);\(^{73}\) as to the
suffix /GA/, see, e.g., OT bil-gā ‘wise’ (from OT bil- ‘to know’).\(^{76}\)

The Greek [rh] at the beginning of the name was used to render the Hunnic *hr-.
The latter goes back to *her, which in an unstressed position lost its vowel. The process can be reconstructed as follows:*hër ōgā > * hër ōgā > hrögā; note the Greek accents: ρούγα-, ρούκα-.

The word hēr corresponds to the Old Turkic Brahmī hār ~ Runic ār(ē), etc., meaning “man,”\(^{77}\) which often occurs as the first component of names or titles, e.g., Er Böri, Er Buğa, Er Toŋa, Er Toğmiš.\(^{78}\)

In Danube Proto-Bulgarian, the second component, ōgā, occurs as a tribal name with the collective suffix /in/: øугаинъ (ōgā-iri).\(^{19}\)

10. 'Oηβάρσ-.\(^{80}\) This personal name of Attila’s paternal uncle (d. 449) also has two components, distinguished in the manuscript of Priscus by having two accents: 'Oη and βάρς. The second element is the “young Altaic” word bars (< Iranian pars), the common name for a large feline, e.g., leopard.\(^{81}\) It often occurs as a personal name in the Bulgarian and Turkic worlds. As to the first element, Willy Bang-Kaup insisted that it should be connected with Turkic oy (< öy), a word meaning “color of a horse’s coat,” rather than with the Turkic ay ‘moon’.\(^{82}\) Now there is better documentation available with regard to öy; although definitions vary, they point mainly to “dun,” thereby corroborating Bang’s thesis: öy-bārs = “a dun feline.”

11. 'Εσκάμ.\(^{84}\) The first element of this composite Hunnic word is es/ās ‘great, old’, which is discussed below (nos. 13 and 30).\(^{85}\) The second

\(^{73}\) On ōgā and its etymology, see Clauson, EDT, p. 101; Doerfer, TMEN, 2: 614.
\(^{74}\) See also Brockelmann, OTG, pp. 102-103 (§30).
\(^{75}\) See Clauson, EDT, p. 192; Sevortjan, ESTJ, 1: 321-22; Räsänen, EWT, p. 46. Cf. also G. Doerfer and Semih Tezcan, Wörterbuch des Chaladsch (Budapest, 1980), p. 129.
\(^{76}\) See Nadeljaev, DTS, p. 175.
\(^{77}\) See Pritsak, Fürstenliste, pp. 47-48.
\(^{78}\) Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 148, 1. 18 = Byz Tur, 2: 350. The initial 'Oη probably stands for ρούγα-, cf. fn. 24.
\(^{81}\) Clauson, EDT, p. 266. I do not share Maenchen-Helfen’s doubt about óη = óy; see his Huns, pp. 418-19. I can also add that Priscus had reason to use the letter omega /ö/ with a circumflex in recording the Hunnic word with the vocalic length: óy.
part stands for the “Altaic” qäm 'sorcerer, pagan priest'; the latter word also occurs in the name *Atakûμ (=%a qäm, see no. 14). *Es qäm alone meant “the great priest.” Apparently, Attila’s father-in-law was a great priest among the Huns, as Teb Tenggri was among the Mongols of Chinggis qa’an (see SH §§244-246).

The initial q- in *qaq qäm had remained a stop (plosive); apparently, in Hunnic spirantization was limited to the absolute initial (see no. 6) and final (see no. 7) positions of the word. The initial consonant of the second component was treated just like a medial, i.e., [-s]+[x-] > sq-.

12. Bлηδα-. For this name Priscus gives the form Βλήδας (=“Chronicon paschale,” 7th c.: Βλίδας), whereas Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes, not surprisingly, use a form without the Greek suffix -ς, i.e., *Bleda. In 1916 Willy Bang-Kaup wrote: “Ein Verbalnomen auf -ta, -da kennen wir nun bisher nicht; ich glaube aber annehmen zu müssen, dass ein solches auch dem koib. Imperative auf -dåq, -dąk < -da-q, -dą-k zugrunde liegt.” With the publication of Carl Brockelmann’s “Glossary” to Käsgari in 1928, the deverbal nominal suffix /DA/ was well established, see e.g., *bük- ‘to bend, bow’, and *büg-dä (> *bëg-dä) ‘crooked, bent [knife], dagger’; kiiy- ‘burn’: kuy-dä ‘furnace’; čaqir- ‘to call’; čaqir-ta (< čaqirda) ‘envoy’.

Hence we must interpret Bïda as a deverbal noun in /dA/. In the root, bli-, it is easy to recognize the typical Hunno-Bulgarian vocalic metathesis bli- < *bil-. The verb bil- is well attested in Old Turkic and in all Turkic languages with the meaning “to know.” The Hunnic titlename *bildä (> *bildä) was apparently synonymous with the Old Turkic (already in the inscriptions) bilgä (bil-gä) ‘wise; sovereign’.

86 Clauson, EDT, p. 625; Räsänen, EWT, p. 228; Doerfer, TMEN, 3: 403-406. The Greek stress probably reflected the vocalic length; cf. also fn. 83.
87 Priscus, EL, ed. de Boor, p. 121, l. 19; 122, l. 20, 131, l. 32, 132, l. 33, 133, l. 12, 145, l. 7 = Byz Tur, 2: 91-92.
88 Chronicon paschale, ed. Dindorf, p. 583, l. 15.
89 Marcellinus Comes, Chronicon, ed. Mommsen, p. 81 (s.a. 442, ch. X, 2; s.a. 445, ch. XIII, 1); Cassiodorus, Chronicla, ed. Mommsen, MGH AA, vol. 11, p. 156; Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skříňskaja, p. 159, l. 44; p. 160, l. 2.
91 Brockelmann, OTG, p. 96 (§35), p. 140 (§118a); Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 119.
93 Clauson, EDT, pp. 330-31.
Hunnic (non-productive?) suffix /DA/ had the same meaning as the Old Turkic non-productive suffix /GA/.

13. Ἀττίλα/Attila. In 1955 I showed that Ἀττίλας/Attila should be analyzed as a composite title consisting of *es ‘great, old’, *t4l· ‘sea, ocean’, and the suffix /a/. The stressed back syllabic til (= t'ill) assimilated the front member es, so it became *as. The consonantic sequence s-t (as til-) became, due to metathesis, t-s, which by assimilation resulted in tt. In 1981 I was able to establish a Danube-Bulgarian nominative-suffix /A/ from the consonantic stems. Recalling that Danube-Bulgarian was a Hunnic language, I can now add to the data in the article of 1955 the following: the Hunnic title attila is a nominative, (in /A/) form of attil- (< *etsil < *es til) with the meaning “the oceanic, universal [ruler];” cf. the title of the Pećeneg ruler Куря, i.e., Күр+ä, meaning “universal” (cf. no. 3).

14-15. Άτακάμ and Μάμα. These two members of the Hunnic royal dynasty had fled to the Romans in wartime. When a treaty was concluded in 435, the Romans handed over to the Huns the defectors’
sons. They were later crucified in Carsum, a Thracian fortress, for their fathers’ transgression.

14. The first name, Atakam (= ata qäm), is readily analyzed: ata is comparable to Old Turkic (and Common Turkic) ata ‘father’,\(^\text{102}\) about qäm ‘pagan priest’, see no. 11.

15. Mămă is apparently a popular version of the well-known Greek Christian name Mămăς (~ Măma?),\(^\text{103}\) and suggests that its bearer was a Christian—a circumstance which would probably have facilitated his defection to the Romans. It is remarkable that the names of both fugitives relate to religious matters: Ata-qäm may have been the former chief priest (also a proselyte?), whereas Mămăς was most probably a Christian convert.

16. Laudaricus. The “Gallic Chronicle of 511” noted under the year 451 the death of a relative (cognatus) of Attila named Laudaricus, who was killed in the battle at Lacus Mauriacus.\(^\text{104}\) The second part of this name is certainly the Gothic word -ric ‘king’. Assuming that the first part, Lauda-, has been transmitted properly, M. Schönfeld suggested a Gothic etymology for the entire name: Lauda reiks.\(^\text{105}\)

But it is possible, at least theoretically, that the source of the chronicle (or its compiler) “Gothicized” the name. He might have had before him *Valda- ~ Velda (< *Belda > Bleda), which he “corrected” into Lauda, or copied with a metathesis (Lau- for *ual-); cf. no. 18: χιρ > ριχ.

17-19. Ellac, Δεγγίζιχ, and Ηρνάχ/Hernac, the names of the three oldest sons of Attila, must have had symbolic meanings.

17. The term ĕl > il (the etymon of Ellac)\(^\text{106}\) was the designation for the nomadic steppe pax in the Old Turkic inscriptions of the first half of the eighth century found in Mongolia.\(^\text{107}\) One can assume that the same term, with the same meaning, also existed in the Hunnic language.

Old Turkic has the (denominal) suffix /1AG/, going back to the

\(^{102}\) I do not agree with Doerfer (CAJ 17 [1973]: 21; cf. also his TMEN, 2: 5-7) when he states that there is no sure evidence of ata prior to the eleventh century. To the data from the Uighur Buddhist texts from the eighth century quoted by Clauson (EDT, p. 40), one can add several other appearances of ata in the eighth-century Maitrisimit; see Şinasi Tekin, Maitrisimit nom bitig, vol. 2 ([East] Berlin, 1980), p. 17.

\(^{103}\) On St. Mamas, see, e.g., A. Maraba-Xatzenikolau, ‘Ο άγιος Μάμας (Athens, 1953).

\(^{104}\) ed. Mommsen, Chronica Minora 1, p. 66, l. 615.

\(^{105}\) Schönfeld, Wörterbuch, p. 277.

\(^{106}\) Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 173, l. 28.

denominal verbal suffix /[^1]A/, enlarged by the deverbal nominal ending /[^G]/, e.g., OT baś ‘head’: baś+la- ‘to begin’: baś+la-[^g] ‘beginning’. One can assume a comparable situation for the Hunnic: *[^e]l ‘realm’: *[^e]l+[^l]a- ‘to rule’: *[^e]l+[^l]-[^g] ‘the rule’. Also, in this word the final e in the Latin notation must represent the final Hunnic -[^g].

18. Δεγγίζίχ[^109] has the abbreviated variant Διν[^γ]ίζιχ[^110] > Den[^gi]zic.[^111] Din[^gi]tizic.[^112] The word has the denominal suffix /[^ć]i[^G]/ (see OT /[^ć]i[^G]/ ~ /[^si]G/ and Hunnic /[^si]G/, no. 2), meaning “like.”[^113] Before this suffix (in Priscus’s notation) the final /[^r]/ of the stem was dropped.[^114] But this /[^r]/ was retained in the Greek notation of Marcellinus Comes (A.D. 534) and taken over (with some change) by the “Chronicon paschale” (ca. 628):

Marcellinus (p. 90 b, l. 5) Διν[^ći]ξίρος (cf. his Latin form Denzic; p. 90a, l. 7);


As we can readily see, the order of syllables in Marcellinus was disturbed. I propose to treat his Greek -[^ći]χ in the same way as his Latin -[^z]ic-, i.e., as a suffix, and to transfer it to the end of the name (the Greek suffix -[^o]ς, must, of course, be disregarded). The result is the form *[^di]ν[^i]ρ[^į]χ[^i]χ. In Marcellinus’s Latin notation the middle syllable -[^gi]- was missing (see above), whereas to the Greek notation only γ must be added. The restored form, then, is *[^di]ν[^i]ρ[^į]ρ[^į]χ[^i]χ. The name should be reconstructed as den[^i]r +[^i]g > den[^i]ć[^i]g (cf. OT ten[^i]z ‘sea’ and OMo [[^hp]ags-pa] d[^e]g[^i]r ‘heaven’),[^115] with the meaning “ocean-like.” Hence the name of the son belongs to the same semantic field as that of the father (Attila; see no. 13). The form *[^de]ni[^i]r is remarkable because of its rhotacism.

[^109] Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 588, ll. 6, 24, 28 = Byz Tur, 2: 117.
[^111] Marcellinus Comes, Chronicon, ed. Mommsen, p. 90, a, b.
[^112] Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skržinskaja, p. 175, l. 28.
[^113] See von Gabain, ATG, p. 66 (§ 80); Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 111.
19. Attila’s beloved youngest son was by his queen Krekän. It was this son that soothsayers prophesied would restore the Hunnic realm to greatness. Three variants of his name appear in the sources: Ἡρνάχ, Ирнихъ, and Hernac. It has been suggested that the name should be connected with the Turkic ernäk ~ ernäk ‘finger, thumb’. Some time ago I expressed another opinion: the etymon here is erän, the “irregular” plural of ēr ‘man’, with the meaning “real man, a man squared, hero.” But there is actually no problem here, since ernäk ~ ernäk is a diminutive of erän (er + ån): erän + diminutive suffix /G Ak/ or /AK/: er + ån + gäk > ernäk: ar + ån + aḵ > ernäk). The word erän must have had two oppositional meanings: “real man, hero” and “small man.” The latter meaning is found in Kāšgārī’s dictionary: through a denominal suffix the verb erän+ge- was created, in which the noun in /u/ erän+gä-yü had the meaning “a very small (short = Arab. qasir) man, two cubits tall.” But erängäyü also had the meaning “a man with six fingers (Arab. lahu sitta aşäbi),” which probably also meant “lucky man.”

The “Altaic” etymology of the Turkic word ernäk (< erän+gäk) ~ ernäk (< erän + diminutive suffix /AK/), as elaborated by N. Poppe, proves that the word in fact goes back to ēr ‘man’, since originally it had h- in the initial position (like er < här, her, etc.): MMo heregai ‘thumb’ (cf. Mo ere ‘man’ = tü. ěr id.), Manchu ferxe ‘id’, Orók pero(n-) ‘id’, etc.

Since Jordanes writes the name of Attila’s third son with an initial h- (Hernac), the spiritus lenis of the Greek form should be corrected into a spiritus asper, i.e., ē into ή. The name hërmk, having the oppositional meanings “hero” and “little [i.e., lucky?] man,” was especially fitting for Attila’s beloved son.

20. Emnetzur, *Ελμίγγειρος, Έλμινζούρ. These three

---

116 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 588, l. 8 = Byz Tur, 2: 132.
117 Pritsak, Fürstenlisten, pp. 36-37.
118 Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skrżinskaja, p. 174, l. 20.
119 See, e.g., Franz Altheim, Attila und die Hunnen (Baden-Baden, 1951), p. 155. On ernäk ~ ernäk, see Clauson, EDT, p. 234; Rääsänen, EWT, p. 46; Sevortjan, ÕSTJ, 1: 299.
121 von Gabain, ATG, p. 62 (§§ 59 and 57).
125 Agathias, ed. Dindorf, p. 275, l. 8 = Byz Tur, 2: 123.
126 Agathias, ed. Dindorf, p. 314, l. 31; p. 315, l. 7 = Byz Tur, 2: 123.
names belong together, although they refer to two different persons: Emnetzur (no. 20) and Vltzindur (no. 23) were consanguinei, or brothers, of Attila’s son Hernac, i.e., sons of Attila; 'Ελμιγγειρ- (no. 24), also called 'Ελμινζούρ (no. 25), was a progeny of Attila’s dynasty who was active in 556. Two suffixes in the three names can easily be determined:

-tzur = -ζουρ [cür] and -γειρ [gir]. The latter is known in Danube-Bulgarian, where it appears as a suffix in tribal names: e.g., Κουριγήρ (=küri+gir).

The suffix /+ćUr/ can be compared with the Mongolian collective suffix /+ćiUr/ (= /си/Ц-ДІ/), where /d/ is the plural affix, in Hunno-Bulgarian having the correspondence /r/; see Balamu+r (no. 1).

The etymon is *elmin (elmin + čūr) with its variant *enmin (< *emlin > *enmin > emn[a]n) [ > emn[a]+ćūr > enmo+ćūr] ‘horse’ (in the twelve animal cycle; also a tribal name), known from the Danube Proto-Bulgarian.129 In Volga-Bulgarian and in Chuvash the cluster -ńč- is often simplified into š, e.g., altiši130 (< *altinči). Therefore, the form emnečūr goes back to *enmen+ćūr; cf. elmin+ćūr.

The persons in question apparently also bore their clan name as a personal name: Elmin+ćūr > Emnečūr, or the tribal name Elmin+gir. The nameforms were obviously interchangeable, since both the form ‘Ελμιγγειρ (elmin+gir) and ‘Ελμινζούρ (Elmin+ćūr) (occurring in A.D. 556) seem to relate to one and the same person, as the editors (Niebuhr and Stein) of Agathias’s work — where the two forms appear — have suggested.131 See also the name Đovár-, above, no. 5.

21. Vltzindur.132 This name contains another clan (tribal) suffix, /DUr/, parallelling the suffix /ćiUr/; the latter is also attested in the name Oültinćōũr (öltin+ćūr).133

The etymon is the Hunnic ruler’s name discussed above: őldin (see no. 4). In the notations under discussion, the change ld > lt > lč had already taken place; the parallel development is known from the Volga-

---

129 Pritsak, Fürstenliste, pp. 67-68.
131 On this, see Maenchen-Helfen, Huns, p. 402.
132 Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skrzinskaja, p. 174, 1. 22.
Bulgarian inscriptions, e.g., bolēi (< bolii < bol-di), elti > elēi ‘lady’. The name has to be interpreted, therefore, as ölčindür.

The very fact that the known tribal clan suffixes occur only with the names Öldin and Elmin may suggest that the European Huns designated themselves by the names of two ancestors, Öldin and Elmin (~ Donát). This brings to mind the two ancestors of the Türküt-Turks as they are styled in the Orkhon inscriptions: Buman qağan and Istāmi qağan.

22. Г̣е̣сь̣м- According to Theophanes’s chronicle (ca. 814), this person was the father of Mundo (no. 23), who in turn is characterized as a descendant of Attila.

There was initially a g- in the Hunno-Bulgarian languages: e.g., the Danube-Bulgarian ruler’s name Gostun, Old Bulgarian > Hungarian: görény ‘polecat’, etc. Therefore, in my view the word γе̣сь̣м- should be interpreted as having the initial Hunnic g-, that is, *gėṣm.

My thesis here is that in this word the Hunnic g- corresponds to the Turkic-Chuvash-Mongolian k- in kes/kās ( > Ćuv kas), where, due to regressive dissimilation in the sequence *g-s (*ges), it was replaced by the voiceless k- (= g-s > k-s).

Mongolian has a term kesig, for which Ferdinand D. Lessing’s dictionary gives the following meanings: [1] “grace, favor, blessing”; [2] “good luck or good fortune”; [3] “turn (one’s place, time, or opportunity in a scheduled or alternating order).” To this one should add [as 4] “gift, present.”

The Yakuts borrowed this Mongolian word in the form kāsi (< kesig) with the meaning [4] “small gift, present not requiring a gift in return,” and the word entered (via Yakut?) the majority of the

---

134 Xakimzjanov (see fn. 130), p. 135 (pl. 17), l. 7.
135 Xakimzjanov (see fn. 130), p. 91.
136 Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 218, l. 32 = Byz Tur, 2: 113-14.
137 Pritsak, Fürstenliste, pp. 15, 35.
139 On the sporadic disagreements between Volga-Bulgarian, Turkic, and Mongolian, such as voicing versus devoicing of consonants in the initial position, see Róna-Tas (fn. 138), pp. 126-27 and esp. fn. 24 (on p. 127).
140 The numeration is mine—O.P.
141 See the derivation kesig + le- in Lessing’s Dictionary, p. 460: “to give presents; to confer favors; to do in turns.” Cf. also Poppe, Vgl Gr Alt, p. 65.
142 Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1061.
The Mongolian word is a deverbative noun in /g/ from the Proto-Mongolian root *kesi- (144) which ultimately goes back to the noun kes, which (as will be shown below) also left traces in Turkic and Chuvash. The “Altaic” verb *gesi- > *kesi- (= *kes + i—) (145) can be established on the basis of Ottoman (dialectal) kesimis (= käs+i—miš) (4) “wedding present (göttür müs)”. The deverbal suffix /miš/ goes back to an expansion of the deverbal noun /m/, that is, /miš/ = /m/ + /iš/ (147).

On this basis, we can accept—theoretically, at least—that from the verb käsi-, in addition to the derived form in /g/ there was also a derived form in /m/.

While there are no traces of the deverbal form in /g/ from käsi- in the Turkic languages or in Chuvash—the Bashkir (Bašk 254) käsî (< *käsî) in kisîllike (semantically, a response to meanings [1, 2, 4]) ‘reverence’ is certainly a borrowing ultimately from Mongolian kesi—all of the Ottoman and the dialects) does have the anticipated form kesim (= käs+i—m) with the meaning “deal; agreement (pazarlık; anlaşma)” (148). Apparently, agreement between two parties was originally based on the exchange of gifts (meaning [4]).

In Chuvash culture there is a ceremonial wedding soup—apparently bestowing “blessing” [1] and “good luck” [2]—called kasmak jaški (149). The first component of the Chuvash term corresponds exactly to the Ottoman ((dialectal) kesme aş/kesme çorbası (150) (Çev jaška, and Ottoman aş and çorba mean “soup”). Both forms, Chuvash kasmak (= käs+mâk < käsî-mâk) and Ottoman kesme (= kes-me < käs-mek < *kési-mâk), go back to the verb kesi-, augmented with the suffix /mAK/.

---

144 On the suffix /g/, see Szabó, Szóképzés, p. 43, § 105.
147 On the deverbal suffix /miš/ see Ramstedt, Einführung, 2: 106.
149 Ašmarin, Thesaurus 6 (1934): 128, where the Chuvash word is treated as inexplicable.
150 Derleme sözlüğü, 8: 2764.
~ /mA/;\textsuperscript{151} the originally three-syllable word (*kesimäk) lost its middle syllable, which was unstressed (Bang's "Mittelsilbenschwund"), and became: *kesmäk (\textgreater \textit{Čuv kasmâk}).

Since the deverbal suffix /mAk/- like the suffix /miś/- consists of two elements: /m/ and /Ak/, the data presented here confirm further the occurrence of the deverbal suffix /m/ with the root *kesi- in both Turkic and Chuvash.

The root kes, a term which — as its semantic fields indicate — derived from the religious and social life of the Eurasian steppe, has survived (if somewhat limited or transformed in semantics) in the Karakhanid language (11th century), Old Ottoman (and in Turkey in Turkish dialects), Yakut, Chuvash, and Written Mongolian.

The Karakhanid meanings encompass three groups, the semantics of which are clearly influenced by the Islamic religion and Bedouin customs. So, obligatory ablution has influenced the semantic change käs — [Arab] an-nubla, that is, "a piece of dried clay ([Arab] al-madâra) with which one cleans oneself [after passing water],"\textsuperscript{152} certainly in order to be ready to receive [1] "grace, favor, blessing."

Because of meanings [1] and [2] ("good luck and good fortune"), a person was käs ‘quick-minded, expeditious’,\textsuperscript{153} and because of [4] ("gift, present"), one was full of käsgû (\textit{= käs+gü}) 'praise';\textsuperscript{154} cf. the Bashkir data above.

Two words in particular should be regarded as resulting from meaning [4]: käs ‘a piece’ (originally ‘of a gift’?)\textsuperscript{155} and kästänt (käs+täm) ‘an entertainment with drinks, other than a formal banquet, which a man gives to visitors at night’.\textsuperscript{156}

In Old Ottoman (15th century), probably due to the influence of despotic rule, semantics concentrate on the agent of the meanings [1-4]. There kes is "owner; protector, helper (sahip, hamî, yardımci),"\textsuperscript{157} and

\textsuperscript{151} On these suffixes see Ramstedt, \textit{Einführung}, 2: 106, and Räsänen, \textit{Morphologie}, pp. 133-35.
\textsuperscript{152} Kasgarï/Dankoff, 1: 262.
\textsuperscript{154} Semantic interpretation of this word is based on the meaning of the word \ögdü 'praise', with which the Ferghana manuscript of the \\textit{Qutadgu Bilig} (facsimile ed. [Istanbul, 1943], p. 30, l. 5) replaces käsgû of the Herat manuscript of \textit{QB} (facs. [Istanbul, 1942], p. 18, l. 23). Concerning the denominal suffix /GU/, see von Gabain, \textit{ATG}, p. 62 (§60). There was still another word, kâsgû 'piece', in the Karakhanid language, but it does not belong here, because it is a deverbal noun /GU/ from käs- 'to cut', as Kasgarî correctly explains. Kasgarî/Dankoff, 1: 75.
\textsuperscript{155} Kasgarî/Dankoff, 1: 262.
\textsuperscript{156} Kasgarî/facs., p. 244. Cf. Kasgarî/Dankoff, 1: 360.
\textsuperscript{157} \textit{Tarana sözlüğü}, 4: 2443.
then he is "decisive." On the other hand, the object of this active element is kes as with the meaning "dumbfounded, confused"; hence, also the abstraction käs 'confusion'.

The Ottoman and Chuvash dialects have a depreciated meaning already influenced by agricultural practices: kes or käs+bik (= Çuv käs+pik) 'huge [pressed] straw and fire made of it' [as a gift?—O.P.]. The word occurs already in the Old Ottoman texts (15th-18th centuries), in the forms kesmik ~ kesmük (= kesi-m + /Uk/), with the following four meanings: "bounded huge straw (boğumlu iri saman)"; "ears of grain, remaining apart during the harvest because of insufficient threshing (harmanda fena dövülmekten taneli kalmış başak)"; "end of the threshing season (harman sonu)"; "dog collar made of wood (ağaçtan yapılan köpek halası, tok, tasma)."

In Yakut the term was recorded in three instances: käs+kil [2] "good-luck, fate; commandment, rule"; käs, as the result of ("grace, favor, blessing"), means "sacred, intimate." Meaning [4] ("gift") is apparently responsible for käs, as an attribute to Ĳпах 'cow', acquiring the meaning "calved cow," that is, "cow with a gift."

The Mongolian and Chuvash meanings of kes ( > käs) are semantically connected with kesig's third meaning, "turn": Written Mongolian kes 'advance abruptly, in a decisive manner; suddenly; off (with verbs meaning breaking or tearing)'; Chuvash käs 'part, stripe, segment of time'.

In the "Altaic" languages deverbal nouns in /g/ usually designate the results of action, whereas in Turkic and Chuvash the suffix /m/ is used for abstracta or an agent of action, for instance, Turkic öl-uğ 'dead' and öl-üm 'death', al-ig 'duty' and al-im 'debt'.

The original meaning of the Hunnic *gesm < *gésam ( < *ges+i-m)
was probably “protector, bestower of favor, blessing, good-fortune, etc.” This was certainly a suitable name for a Hunnic prince still cognizant of his family’s high origin and exceptional historical role.

23. Μούνδο-169/Mundo.170 This name is, in my opinion, the “abbreviated” form of the designation of Attila’s father, discussed above (no. 7). While Μουνδιόυχ *Munţiţ was already the “Hunnicized” version of the Chinese loanword, the form Μούνδο- (see also the variant Μουνδĩo, no. 7) better reflects the original *münţi (see no. 7).

It is remarkable that one of the last known members of Attila’s clan bore the name of Attila’s father.


II. Names of Leading Hunnic Statesmen and Officers ca. A.D. 448-449.

26. 'Aδάμις.171 When the Roman embassy came to the court of Attila (ca. 449), its members were all also invited by Krekãn, the Hunnic queen, to dine at the home of 'Aδάμεια, who was described by Priscus as the steward in charge of the queen’s affairs. Since in medieval Eurasian societies such a position was usually held by an eunuch, we can speculate that the “name” 'Aδάμ- was actually an appellative meaning “eunuch.”

A Turkic word already known from Käşgari’s “Dictionary” (1077) occurs there without any other relatives: atan, meaning “a gelded camel.”172 The word and its meaning were later borrowed into Mongolian.173

Since some Turkic languages use atan as an attribute to a word meaning “camel”—e.g., Kïrg 79 atan tô (tô ‘camel’), Nog 52, KKlp 59 atan tüyya (tüyya ‘camel’)—atan only elliptically acquired the meaning “a gelded camel”: originally it was doubtlessly an adjective meaning “gelded.” This interpretation is also given by Èrvand V. Sevortjan in his Turkic etymological dictionary.174

---

170 Marcellinus Comes, Chronicon, ed. Mommsen, p. 96, l. 23: p. 103, l. 5; Jordanes, Getica, ed. Skrźniakowa, p. 180, ll. 8, 11, 12.
171 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 146, l. 8 = Byz Tur, 2: 56.
172 Käşgari/Dankoff, 1: 114. On Turkic atan see Clauson, EDT, p. 60; Räännen, EWT, p. 31; Sevortjan, ESTJ, 1: 202-203.
173 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 58: ata(n) ‘castrated camel’; Ramstedt, KWb, p. 17; see Clauson, EDT, p. 60. Ramstedt’s etymology—Mo ata(n): tü at— is certainly wrong; see his Einführung, 1: 153 and 2: 120.
174 Sevortjan, ESTJ, 1: 202-203.
Only the manuscripts of Ibn Muhannâ (14th century) have two other forms, atğân and atâğân, for "a gelded camel." Sevortjan explains all three forms — atan, atğân, and atâğân — as derivations from the hypothetical verb at- ‘to geld, castrate’. This etymology requires some elaboration and correction.

In Yakut there is a verb attâ-, meaning “to put, lighten, castrate, geld.” The word is a denominal verb in /DA/ (~ /LÄ/) from the unattested nominal stem *ad. The form atan had the following history, in my view.

Old Turkic developed a strong dislike for geminatae, for example, dd, presuming the first d was the ending of the stem and the second d was the initial letter of the suffix. In such a case, the following happened: d-d > *dt > t, e.g., (IS12, I E7, II E7, II N14) it'i ‘he sent’ (< *id-di); (II E40, To 33, To 52 etc.) it'i‘sm ‘I sent’ (< *id-dom); the verbal root was id- ‘to send’.

Hence the form atan should be explained as a deverbal noun in /n/ from the verb *ad+da-: *adda-n > atan.

Later (in the 14th century) atan was interpreted (due to the popular etymology) as an “Oghuz Turkic” participial form in /An/, and two Qipçaq Turkic corresponding forms were created in which the given suffix had an initial gutural /GAN/ or /AGAN/. I interpret the forms in the manuscripts of Ibn Muhannâ’s work in the following way.

In Turkic the deverbal nominal suffixes /n/ and /m/ were often used interchangeably in the same function (verbal abstracta or adjectiva), e.g., igr-in = igr-im 'act of twisting, whirlpool'.

Apart from the common Turkic denominal verbal suffix /dA/ ~ /A/, there also existed, in the same function, the suffix /A/.

---

176 Sevortjan, ESTJ, 1: 202.
177 Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 195. In Yakut the root final -d developed into -t, e.g., Old Turkic ad-aq ‘foot’ (= Ottoman etc. ay-aq, Yakut at-ax); see Räsänen, Lautgeschichte, pp. 162-64.
178 On the suffix /DA/, see von Gabain, ATG, p. 69 (§102), Brockelmann, OTG, pp. 216-17, 223; Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 145; cf. /DA/ in Mongolian, Szabó, Szóképzés, pp. 36-37 (§77).
179 On the deverbal suffix /n/, see Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 138.
180 Brockelmann, OTG, p. 129 (igri-n), p. 124 (igri-m), from egir- ‘to surround, encircle, twist, spin’ (Clauson, EDT, p. 113). On /n/ and /m/ suffixes in Mongolian, see Szabó, Szóképzés, p. 45 (§§109, 110).
From these data I conclude that in both Turkic and Hunnic, there was a verb with the meaning "to castrate, geld" from the nominal base *ad.

In Turkic the denominal verbal suffix /dA/ and the deverbal nominal suffix /n/ were used to convey the meaning "castrated; gelded" (*ad+da-n > atan).

Hunnic used, for the same purpose, the denominal verbal suffix /A/ and the deverbal nominal suffix /m/. The result was *ad+a-m = adam.

The Hunnic dignitary in charge of the queen's household was, indeed, a eunuch, as his "name"—i.e., official title—corroborates. His position could be compared to that of the qizlar ağası in the Ottoman empire.

Establishment of the Hunnic word adam with the medial -d- is of great significance, because this illustrates one of the basic distinctive features in Turkic and Altaic language classifications. It is apparent that the change -d- > -r- was late; hence it was not Hunnic, but Bulgarian (first attested in the 9th century). See also no. 28, 'Едоцков.

27. Берихоц. He was an important logas, or minister (ca. 449), of Attila who was also of high Hunnic origin.

Since the Hunnic final -q and -k had a tendency toward spirantization (see nos. 6, 7), the name should be interpreted phonologically as *bérík. This same form is suggested by É. V. Sevortjan as the original for the very popular Turkic adjective and name berk 'fine, stable, solid, strong'.

The form berik is also attested in the glossary of Ibn Muhanná (14th century) and in the legend of Oghuz Qagan (13th century). The word was borrowed into Mongolian, where it became berke, since in the final position of a stem Mongolian allows no voiceless stops.

The Mongolian loanword (which, incidentally, entered into Chuvash as parka < berke) was also used as a personal name, e.g., Berke, the second khan of the Golden Horde (1257-1266), who converted to Islam.

The appellation berik 'strong' is certainly a reasonable one for a responsible Hunnic leader.

---

181 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 143, l. 25; p. 147, ll. 10, 21; p. 147, l. 28; p. 148, ll. 1, 8 = Byz Tur, 2: 89-90.
182 Sevortjan, ESTJ, 2: 116-20, esp. 119.
183 ed. Melioranskij, Arab filolog (see fn. 175), p. 80.
186 See Egorov, ÈSCJ, p. 143.
28. 'Edēkōv. This Hun was one of “Attila’s most powerful lieutenants” and served as ambassador to the Roman emperor in 449.

The second part of his name, -kōv, derives from the deverbal noun /GUN/ (like -kōv of Zerepidkōv); the initial -k of this suffix indicates that originally the stem ended in /t/ which is also responsible for the change of *g- into k- (as in Zerepidkōv): /r-g/ > /r-k/ ~ /k/.

In this way we arrive at the verbal root edär-, which is well known in Turkic from the eighth century on, usually with -d- already developed into -y- (> -g-, etc.). The verb’s basic meaning was “to pursue, to follow.”

Several Turkic languages use derivational forms of this verb. These are grouped below according to their suffixes:

(a) /GUći/: NUig 76 ägäs-küci190 ‘adherent’;
(b) /GUe/: Kzk 143, Kklp 195 yer-giş191 ‘dependent, compliant, unsteady’;
(c) /Gći/: Tkm 777 eyär-işi ‘follower’, Tat 184 iyär-üwe ‘follower, devotee’, iyär-üwëlilik ‘imitation’; Bašk 678 eyär-lwsȋ ‘follower, imitator’;
(d) /GćAn/: Tat 184 iyär-üwčân ‘imitative’, iyär-üwčânlık ‘imitation’;
(e) ĞAn/ ~ /ćin/: Tkm 777 eyär–žân ‘fellow-traveler’; Bašk 679 eyär–sîn ‘adherent, follower’; Tat 184 iyär–cîn ‘fellow-traveler, follower, confederate’;
(f) /inći/: Tuv 576 edär-inči ‘fellow traveler’;
(g) /mA/: Tat 184 iyär–mâ ‘retinue’; NUig 76 ägäs–mâ ‘following’.

Interestingly enough, Chuvash has the same suffix /GUn/ (< -GU + n) as Hunnic does; but there the original stem was replaced by a Turkic one of the Kazakh type: jer-kân ( /kân/ < /GUn/) ‘lover’.

187 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 122, l. 28; p. 123, ll. 1, 20, 29, 31, 34; p. 124, ll. 2, 5, 6, 8, etc. = Byz Tur, 2: 121.
188 Danube Proto-Bulgarian of the ninth century has documented the change r-d > t: borse-toynü dügä-tügi < *dïger-dügi; see Pritsak, Fürstenliste, p. 88. To the Turkic change r-g > rk, see, e.g., Kâsg. tergi ‘a portable table’; CC tirki, Kâsg. tergü ‘saddle-strap’; Old Ottoman terki (data in Clauson, EDT, p. 544). To the Turkic change rk > k, see, e.g., er-kân > Ottoman åken, data in Clauson, EDT, pp. 224-25. On devoicing after r, l, n, see no. 31.
189 See Clauson, EDT, p. 67; Rääsänen, EWT, p. 36; Sevortjan, EŠTJ, 1: 242-45.
189 New Uighur special development: edär- > eyär- > eyäs- (cf. Lobnor eyäs- ‘to follow’; Sergej E. Malov, Lobnorski jazyk [Frunze, 1956], p. 107). See also Kumanu åš- ‘to follow’ (Nikolai A. Baskakov, Dialekt Kumanincev [Moscow, 1972], p. 276) < egäs-.
190 Kzk, Kklp. form yer- developed from iyär- < edär-.
191 Aśmarin, Thesaurus, 4: 285-86.
Our conclusion is that the Hunnic “name” was actually an appellative derived from the deverbial noun *edâkün (< *edär-kiün). The meaning of the word was very probably “follower, retainer.”

29. Ζέρκων. The bearer of this name—or, better, title—was not a member of the dynasty of Attila, but a Moorish dwarf and buffoon of the king Blida. From Priscus’s stories it is clear that Ζέρκων was not his real name, but a sobriquet given to the clown by his capricious master. The final /n/ is the “plural of quantity,” comparable to Mongolian (e.g., Urdus) /n/ in tribal names. Without the suffix /n/ the word occurs in a Danube-Bulgarian name list in Latin script from 869-870 as zerce. It has long been recognized as an abbreviated variant of the Danube-Bulgarian title ήτζιργου icirgii ‘the inner [residence] official’, i.e.,

In this way, Blida jokingly named his buffoon čerkün, or “the inner [residence] official.”

30. Ησλα. This Hun was an experienced diplomat who served first Ruga (Hrögä) and later Attila. The first element of his name, or title, is es ‘great, old’ (see nos. 11, 13); the vowel e is rendered here by η; in the title es qam the same word was written with ε.

+λα is the denominal suffix /Λ/; in Old Chuvash another suffix /Λ/ < /HG/, having a similar meaning, was added to the same stem: as-lä < *äs+lig ‘old, great’.

The Hunnic appellation ėsla apparently meant “the great, old (gentleman)”; this was probably the way the Huns referred to their elder statesmen.

31. Κρέκαν. As shown by Otto Maenchen-Helfen, the name of Attila’s wife has a final /n/.

193 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 145, l. 4 = Byz Tur, 2: 130.
194 Poppe, MCS, p. 176.
196 See Belevliev, Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften, pp. 169-70.
197 Ησλα, see Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 121, ll. 7, 14; p. 128, l. 21; p. 130, l. 28; p. 149, l. 15; = Byz Tur, 2: 133.
198 On the denominal nominal suffix /Λ/ see Brockelmann, OTG, p. 117 (§73); Räsänen, Morphologie, p. 104. The Greek letter α in Ὅσλα doubtlessly stands for /ä/, for which there was no letter in the alphabet.
199 Ašmarin, Thesaurus, 2: 106-107; aslā ‘magnus, amplexus, latus, spatiosus, maior natu, maximus, summus, illustris’. Egorov’s etymology of aslā is certainly wrong: Egorov, ESCJ, p. 35.
200 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 139, l. 22; p. 146, l. 7 = Byz Tur, 2: 173.
201 Maenchen-Helfen, Huns, p. 408.
attractive Turkic etymology for it. According to him, the lady’s name was *Aρεκαν, i.e., *ariqan < *ariğ qan 'the pure princess'. However, his pretty proposition can no longer be defended, since κρε- (or, for that matter, ηρε-) cannot possibly stand for the Turkic arığ 'pure'. In 1955 Pavel Poucha made another suggestion: he connected the Hunnic name with the Mongolian appellation for “wife,” gergei, without giving any elaboration. I came to the same conclusion independently, and my reasons (presented here in print for the first time) are as follows.

In Mongolian there exist two variants of the word in question: SH gergai and WMo gergen. Regarding the form with the final +n Nicholas Poppe writes: “In Written Mongolian the form gergen ‘wife’ from gergei id. is still used. The form gergen was originally a plural, but it has become a singular semantically, in the same manner as Khalkha exxanær ‘woman’ morphologically is a plural form of exxa ‘mother’.”

The Hunnic form also has a final /n/: κρέκαν = krēkān like WMo gergei.

The Turcik word for “wife,” already existing in the Karakhanid language, was eblig, that is, “possessing a house” = “living at home.” Eb is the word for “house,” whereas /lig/ is the suffix of the possessor.

The Mongolian word for house, which is the root ger, is augmented by the “class-suffix” /GA/, to which at an early time was added either the singulative suffix /i/ or the collective suffix /n/, in the sense described in my “Stammesnamen.”

The connection between the semantic fields “house,” “family,” and “wife” can readily be illustrated in the Yakut language:

The word kärğän (the root kär is comparable to the Mongolian ger; +gän is also comparable to the Mongolian suffixes /GA/+n/) means “family; house; all persons living in one house; member of a family; member of household.” Accordingly, kärğän- (= kärğän +/LĀ/)
has the meaning “to marry,” and kärgännaux (kärgän + /LÁG/) that of “married.”

The Hunno-Bulgarian vocalic metathesis mentioned above (no. 12) is responsible for the change of *ker into kre-. The k- in the initial position of the suffix /GAN/ is the result of Hunno-Turkic (e.g., Chuvash, Old Turkic) devoicing after r, l, n. Apparently *kerkän developed from the older *kergän. It is impossible to say whether the older Hunnic also had g- in the initial position of the word (like Mongolian ger + ).

The “name” of this primary wife of Attila, as noted in our sources, was not a personal name at all, but rather the Hunnic appellative krékän meaning “wife,” since she was the Hunnic ruler’s consort or “wife par excellence.”

32. Όνηγήσιος/Hunigasion 213 (today also the title of Mongolia’s official newspaper, namesake and imitator of the Russian Pravda) must be regarded as a deverbal noun from the unattested root *üne-, which was of Mongolo-Turkic origin. That conclusion is based on the fact that in Mongolian the suffixes added to this reconstructed root *üne-, are either of Mongolian or of Turkic origin:

(a) Turkic /msi/: 216 üne-msi- “to believe, or accept as true, trust”;
(b) Turkic /nči/: 218 üne-nči ‘honest, faithful, truthful, loyal’;
(c) Mo /ГАр/: 220 üne-ker ‘truly, really, indeed; very much, extremely’.

The deverbal suffix /mla/ can be either of Turkic or Mongolian origin, since it consists of the deverbal noun /m/, and the very productive

211 Piekarski, vol. 1, col. 1048.
212 See no. 22.
213 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 123, l. 14; p. 127, ll. 11, 15, 18 etc. = Byz Tur, 2: 218.
215 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 1009.
216 von Gabain, ATG, p. 81 (5157).
217 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 1008.
218 von Gabain, ATG, pp. 73-74, §125; Brockelmann, OTG, pp. 130-32.
219 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 1009.
220 Szabó, Szóképzés, p. 49 (6127).
221 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 1008.
denominal verbal suffix /IA/. But the form with the root üne- occurs only in Mongolian: üinemle- ‘to certify, testify, attest’.222

According to Käsgari (ca. 1077) there was a Turkic Oghuz deverbal noun in /Äsi/, which corresponded to the Karakhanid suffix /Gu/, e.g., bar-äsi yer = bar-ğu yer ‘a place of going’.223

Judging by the available historical data, the forms /Äsi/ ~ /Äs/ and /GÄs/ must originally have been two variants of the suffix of nomen futuri (necessitatis), e.g., Käsgari bič-gäš ‘a contract, or covenant’.224

In Hunnic the word apparently had a final -i, like the Oghuz form /Äs+i/, i.e., its form was */GÄsi/. The name or epithet of the Hunnic leader was, therefore, *üne-gäši, meaning “honest, faithful, truthful, loyal.”

33. Σκόττας.225 According to Priscus, this person was a prominent noble of Hunnic origin and brother of Όνηγήσιος. In our source he is depicted as a hotspur and a blusterer.

One of the typical features of the Hunno-Bulgarian linguistic group is a cluster in the word initial position. Such clusters developed—as mentioned above—due to vocalic metathesis, e.g., blidä < *bildä (see no. 12), krēkän < *kerkän. (see no. 31). In the same way skō- in σκόττα-skōttā- developed from the original *sökit-tā.

The etymon sök- means “to tear apart, pull down, break through (an obstacle)”; sök-it- is formally the causative, attested as hapax in Old Turkic;226 sök-it- > *sokat-; the vocalic metathesis in the stem resulted in skōt-.

The root sök- had special importance in Turkic military parlance. According to Käsgari (1074), sökmän (/mÄn/ is a deverbal nominal suffix) was “a military title, meaning ‘he who breaks the battle line (Arab kāsr saff al-harbi)’.”227

In *sökattā (> sköttā) there is the deverbal suffix /DA/, which was also recognized in the name blida (< *bil-dä) (see no. 12).

One can assume that sköttā (< *sökattā = *sök-it-), apparently having the same meaning as verbum simplex, was used, like sökmän, as a title or nickname meaning “hotspur.”

---

222 Lessing, Dictionary, p. 1008.
223 Käsgari/Dankoff, 1: 75, 86.
225 Priscus, ed. de Boor, EL, p. 125, ll. 25, 27; p. 127, ll. 11, 26, 34 = Byz Tur, 2: 279.
226 Clauson, EDT, pp. 819, 820.
227 Käsgari/Dankoff, 1: 334.
## C. Linguistic and Philological Scrutiny

### I. Orthography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α/a</td>
<td>= a: ἀδαμ, ἁττίλα/attila; +βαρσ-, βασίχ, βάλμορ, δοντ, χάρα +,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>= ā: καμ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/a</td>
<td>= A: αδμμ, αττίλλα/attila, βληδά/bleda, ησλα, ελλαε, ήρναχ/hernac, κρεκαν, ουπταρ/octar, ρουγ, σκουτα,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-/d-</td>
<td>= b: παλμορ, + βαρσ-, βασίχ, βληδά/bleda, βεριχ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/g</td>
<td>= g: δουγα, δέγγιζιχ, ουννήσει/hunigasi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γι</td>
<td>= g-: γιζεμ-,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γγ</td>
<td>= ng (g): δέγγιζιχ, ελμηγειρ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ/Δ</td>
<td>= d: δοντ-τ, δέγγιζιχ/δεντις; αδαμ, εδεκων; βληδά/bleda, ουλδην/uldin, vltzin dur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δι, δdz</td>
<td>= ζ: μουνδό-, μουνδιουχ/mundzuc-, μουνδο/mundo-,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/e</td>
<td>= e: εδεκων, εσκαμ, ελμηγειρ, ελμινζουρ/emnetzur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ/τζ, [+]z</td>
<td>= ζ: ζερκον; δέγγιζιχ/δεντις, ελμινζουρ/emnetzur, vltzin dur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή[&lt; η]he</td>
<td>= he: ήρναχ/ hernac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η/i</td>
<td>= e: ησλα; ουνησι/hunigasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η/ιε</td>
<td>= i: βληδα, βλιδα/bleda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η/ι</td>
<td>= I: ουλδην/uldin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η/a</td>
<td>= A: ουνησι/hunigasi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>= γ: ωηβαρσ-,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι/ιε</td>
<td>= e: δινζιχ/δεντις, δινζιριχ-,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι/ι</td>
<td>= i: αττίλα/attila, ελμηγειρ, ελμινζουρ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι/ι</td>
<td>= I: βασίχ, βεριχ, κουρσιχ, δέγγιζιχ/δεντις, vltzin dur; ουνησι/hunigasi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ/κ</td>
<td>= k: κρεκαν, κουρσιχ; σχοτα, οιταρ; εδεκων, ζερκων; herlac,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>= g: ελλαε,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
λ/ι = l: ellac, elμιγγειρ, elμινζουρ, ουλδην/hulδin, vltzindur, balamur, βληδα/bleda; αττιλα/attila, ηηλ,
μ/μ = m: μουνδιουχ, μουνδιο, μουνδο/mundo; emnetzur, elμιγγειρ, elμινζουρ, balamur; αδαμ, ατακαμ, 
εσκαμ, γιεσμ,
v/n = n: δογατ, ονηγησι/hunigasi, diγtзic, emnetzur, μουνδιουχ, μουνδο/mundo, vltzindur, elμινζουρ; 
ηρναχ/хернас; εδεκων, ζερκων, κρεκαν, ουλδην/hulδin, οldι, χαρατων,
ο/ο = o: δογατ-
ο/υ = o: δογατ-; σκρετα,
ο/-υ = i: ονηγησι/hunigasi,
-ν/-o = -U: μουνδο/-mundо,
ου/υ = u: μουνδιουχ, μουνδο/mundo,
ου/-υ, v- = õ: ουλδην/hulδin, οldι, vltzindur, υμπταρ,
ου/υ = õ: δογαγα/roas, υμπταρ/οктα,
ου = õ: κουρσιχ,
ου/υ = U: elμινζουρ/emnetzur, vltzindur,
[<'] ρ/-ηρ/-/ερ- = hr: δογαγа, ήρναχ (< ήρναх)/хернас,
ρ/τ = r: βεριχ, ζερκων, κρεκαν, κουρσιχ, χαρατων, ήρναχ/хернас; ημπαρς; balamur, υμπταρ/οктα,
emnetzur, elμινζουρ, elμιγγειρ, vltzindur,
σ/σ = s: σκρετα; εσκαμ, ηηλα; βασιχ, κουρσιχ,
ονηγησι/hunigasi; γιεσμ; ημπαρς,
τ/τ = t: χαρα+των; ατ+τιλα/attila, σκοτσα, ατακαμ, 
υμπταρ/οктα; δονατ-
χ- = q: χαρατων,
-χ/-c = -q: μουνδιουχ/mundzuc,
-χ/-c = -k: βεριχ, ήρναχ/хернаς,
-χ = -q: βασιχ,
-χ/-c = -g: δεγγιζιχ/dintziχ, κουρσιχ,
ω = o: δημπαρς-; χαρα+των,
ω = U: εδεκων, ζερκων.
II. Phonology

1. Consonantism in General

Seventeen consonantic phonemes are attested:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kq} & \quad \text{t} & \quad \text{č} & \quad \text{s} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{g} & \quad \text{d} & \quad \text{ʒ} \\
\text{m} & \quad \text{ŋ} & \quad \text{n} \\
\text{l} & \quad \text{r} & \quad \text{y} \\
\text{h} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

There was, at the very least, a clear distinction between the front and back \( k \) and \( q \), and the latter (\( q \)) was pronounced, in absolute initial and final positions, like a spirant \( x \); see the Greek notations: χαράτων \([\text{karátōn}]\) and μουνδίουχ- \([\text{munzúχ}]\) for \( \text{karátōn} \) and \( \text{munzúq} \), and εσκάμ \( \text{eskám} \). Since \( qám \) was not in absolute initial position, its \( q- \) was not spirantized.

A tendency towards spirantization can also be observed with the final -ğ and possibly -k and -g: βερίχ- \(/\text{bêtik}/\) and βασίχ \(/\text{basig}/\) and κουρσίχ \(/\text{kuršig}/\).

One can regard the presence of the initial \( h- \) as a specific feature of Hunnic consonantism: ἥνακ \(/\text{hernák}/\), ᾱρώγα \(/\text{hróga}/\).

The compound \text{attila} \( (< *es + tila) \), with initial \( a \) from original \(*e\) but with middle front \( i \), indicates that there was a consonantic palatal harmony in Hunnic, comparable to that in Old Turkic. Therefore I interpret \( \text{tila} \) as having the back consonantic phonemes \( t \) and \( l \). Unfortunately, the limited material does not support any far-reaching conclusions.

As to their morphonemic occurrences, the Hunnic consonantic phonemes can be grouped according to their positions within the root (stem) and the suffixes. Here, it must be stressed, our data is very incomplete, but even so it can help us understand the operational structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stems (first syllable)</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple consonants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{kq} ) \ t č s</td>
<td>\č s \ G D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{b} ) \ g \ d</td>
<td>( \text{m} ) \ l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{m} ) \ ŋ n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{l} ) \ r y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{h} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clusters
bl  hr  kr  sk

**Final position**

simple consonants
kq  t  s  k
d  g
m  n  m  n
l  r  y  r
clusters
rs  sm(?)

2. **Consonantic medial clusters** (often at the morphonological juncture)

-kt-  : öktär;
-nt-  : attila (< *etsila < *es+t'il'a); sköttä
-mm-  : enmecür (< *-lm-);
-ng-(η)  : elmingir (< elmin+gir);
-nd-  : ölčindür (< ölčin+dür);
-ng-  : ölținčür (< ölțin+čür), elminčür (= elmin+čür);
-nj-  : münju (< *mun+ju) > munʃuq;
-lč-  : ölčindür (< *ölč-in < *öl-dān);
-lm-  : ölğän (< öl-dān);
-lm-  : elmin, elminčür etc.;
-ll-  : elļäg (< el+lāg);
-rk-  : čerkün (< *ičir-gün); cf. krékän < *ker+gā+n (possibly < *ger+gān)
-rs-  : kürsig (< kür+sig < *kür+sig < *kürä+sig);
-rn-  : hernäk (< *her+än+āk);
-sl-  : èslä.

3. **Vocalism**

(a) First syllable

Seven vocalic phonemes are certainly attested: three back (a, o, u), three front (e, ō, ū), and the neutral (although phonetically front) i. The same system of vocalism is attested in Old Turkic. I may add that the phonemically neutral /i/ is also typical for Old Chuvash and Mongolian.
The quantity was phonemic, since of the total of seven vowels, four long vowels are reconstructable from the limited data available to us.\(^{228}\)

The vocalic system can be presented graphically as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{Simple Vowels} & \text{Long Vowels} \\
\text{i} & \ddot{\text{u}} & \text{u} \\
\text{e} & \ddot{\text{e}} & \ddot{\text{o}} \\
\text{a} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{228}\) Instead of assuming that writers in the first half of the fifth century had already disregarded the vocalic quantity, I believe that it was not accidental that Olympiodorus in A.D. 425 writes \(\chi\alphaρ\tauων\) by means of the omega (των) — this for a word which had a vocalic length (τόν). The same principle applies to the very exact notations of Priscus, who writes \(\'\Omega\nu-βαρσ\) (= \(\dot{\text{o}}\nu\)), \(\'\Piναχ\) (= \(\dot{\text{h}}\nu\)), etc.

\(^{229}\) The only pair of Hunnic phonemes that the Greek and Latin authors had difficulty distinguishing clearly and rendering systematically were the labial front vowels \(\ddot{o}\) and \(\ddot{u}\):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Greek} & \text{Latin} \\
\ddot{o} & \ddot{u} \\
\text{Greek} & \text{Latin} \\
\ddot{o} & \ddot{u} \\
\end{array}
\]

Greek \(\ddot{o}/\text{Latin} \ddot{u}: \text{o}νταρ, \text{σκοτα} \\
\text{Greek} \ddot{o}/\text{Latin} \ddot{u}: \text{κρυ}πτα \\
\text{Greek} \ddot{o}/\text{Latin} \ddot{u}: \text{γ}λύ\ddot{d}ην/\text{γl}υ\ddot{d}ην \\
\text{Greek} \ddot{o}/\text{Latin} \ddot{u}: \text{γ}νη\ddot{g}α/\text{γ}νη\ddot{g}α \\
\text{Greek} \ddot{o}/\text{Latin} \ddot{u}: \text{ρ}γ\ddot{g}α/\text{ρ}γαs.

(b) Second or Succeeding Syllable

In the suffixes appear the two archphonemes \(A\) (its realization was \(a\) or \(\ddot{a}\)), \(U\) (= \(u\) or \(\ddot{u}\)) and the neutral phoneme \(i\), which in closed syllables has a tendency to become a schwa (\(\ddot{a}\)) or to disappear (but under stress develops to \(\ddot{e}\)):

\(I\) (= \(i/\ddot{e}/\ddot{a}\))

\(A, \ddot{A}\)

The attested realization of the suffixed vocalism is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
/\ddot{i}/ & : +\dot{a}, +\dot{e}r \ (< *+i+r); +\ddot{d}G, +sG, -Din \ (> -tin), +Gir, \\
/\ddot{A}/ & : +A, +\dot{A}K, +An; -DA, -GA, +GAn, +IA, +IA-, +LAG, \\
/\ddot{A}/ & : -G\ddot{A}si, \\
/\ddot{U}/ & : +\ddot{e}Ur, +DUr, -GUn, +mUr. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here, as in Old Turkic, the vocalic phonemes appear singly, rather than in clusters.

There is a clear palatal harmony: \(a, o, u; q, \ddot{g}\) versus \(e, \dot{e}, \ddot{u}; k, g, \text{e.g.}, \text{mun}\ddot{g}uq\) and \(\text{hernako}\).

But no labial harmony or labial attraction can be detected, \text{e.g.}, \(\text{donat}, \ddot{\text{dg}u}, \text{kursig}\).
On the other hand, the labiality of the suffix archphoneme is kept, regardless of the non-round stem, e.g., balamur, elminčūr, öltinčūr, čérkūn.

III. Phonemic Changes

1. Vocalism

Vocalic metathesis
*bildā > bldā;
*sökittā > *skottā
*kerkān > krēkān;

Mittelsilbenschwund
*kūrā+sig > kūrsig; *sōkūtā > skōttā;
*her+ān+āk > hernāk;

Vocalic reduction in the word-initial position
*ičirgün > čērkūn;

Vocalic changes: transitions into stressed and non-stressed position
-i- > -ē-: *ičirgün > čērkūn;
-i- > -ə-: *elmin + > émnə[n]+;

Assimilation
e > a: es+t’il’a > attila.

2. Consonantism

Reduction of sonors being the first element of a cluster
nc > ĉ: *emnenčūr > emnečūr;
rč > ĉ: deničig > deničig;
rg > k: *edārgūn > edākūn;
rss > s: *barssig > basig.

3. Consonantic assimilations

Metathesis
*st > *ts > tt: *esrīlą > *etsīlą > atrīla;
*ml > im: *emnīn > elmin;
[*ml > ] lm > mn: *elmin > emnə[n];

Devoicing
*rg > rk: *kergān > *kerkān > krēkān; *ičirgün > čērkūn;
*ld > lt: öldän > öltin;
*td > tt: *sökiddä > sköttä;

Sporadic palatalization
lt (< ld) > lë: öltin- (< öldän) > ölöin-.

IV. Materials to a Hunnic Grammar

1. Stems

Nouns
One-syllable
*ad
bars
él
es
ges
hër
*ker (< *ger?)
qäm
öy
*t'el'
tön

Two-syllable
ata
bala
bërık
*denir
donát
elmin (< *emlin > *emnen)
estä
krëkan (< *kërkän)
*kürä
qará
mûnçu
mûnçûq

Composite nouns
ata qäm
qará töön
Verbs

One-syllable
bli- (< *bil-)
ölt-
ö-
sköt- (< *sökit-)

Two-syllable
adä-
*edär-
ellä-
*gési- (> *gész-)
*ič+i-r- (> čér-)
óktä-
üne-

2. Suffixes

Denominal nominal
/A/: attila, *kürä
/An/+/AK/ > /nAK/: hërñák
/ćiG/: den[r]ćig
/ćiUr/: elminčür (> emnačür), öltincür
/DUr/: ölündür
/GAn/: krékän
/Gir/: elmíngır
/K/: munšuq
/IA/: ěslâ
/IAg/: ěllâg
/mUr/: balamur
/siG/: bal[r]sîg, kürsîg

Denominal nominal affixes
/n/: krékän, öldîn, čerkün
/ř/: balamur

Deverbal nominal
/DA/: blidä, skōttä
My premise here is that the Middle Greek accentuation of foreign names can be treated seriously. Based on this hypothesis, one arrives at the following conclusions:

(a) Two-syllable words that were not clear etymologically to the speakers had the stress on the ultima: *adám, donát, qará, mungúq* (but, interestingly enough, *munğü*).

(b) Two-syllable words that were transparent, rightly or not, to the speaker had the stress on the penúltima (stem): *ögdä* (*< ö-*), *öldin* (*< öl-*), *bérik, öktär, gésam* (or *gesm*?), *münžü* (*< Chinese loanword*).

(c) Suffixes were divided into two groups: (1) stressed and (2) non-stressed.

(d) Stressed suffixes: (1) denominal nominal: /ÁK/: hernäk; /ćiG/: denirćig; /ćiG/: basıg, kürsīg; /ćiG/: elminćur; (2) denominal verbal: /Á/ : *adám*; (3) deverbal nominal: /GÄsi/: ünegäsi;

(e) Non-stressed suffixes: (1) denominal nominal: /ΙΑ/: ésla, /Gir/: elmingir; /Gän/: krékän; (2) deverbal nominal: /DA/: blidä, sköttä; /Din/: öldin; /GUn/: čérkün, edékün.

(f) Composite nouns had the stress placed either on each component, e.g., *őy bärś*, or on their second component; if the latter had two syllables, stress was placed on the penultima: *es qâm, ata qâm; hor-őgä*, *attila*.

The only exception to this rule was *qará tön*, which had the stress on the ultima of the first component. Apparently *qará tön* was not yet considered to be a true composite noun.
D. Concluding Remarks

Our detailed analysis of the Hunnic onomastic material, together with examination of it from the point of view of Altaistic linguistics, has yielded very positive results indeed. It has proved that it is possible to determine the character of the Hunnic language.\(^{230}\) It was not a Turkic language, but one between Turkic and Mongolian, probably closer to the former than the latter. The language had strong ties to Old Bulgarian and to modern Chuvash, but also had some important connections, especially lexical and morphological, to Ottoman and Yakut.

Hunnic vocalism, consisting of seven vowels with quantitative opposition (long: short) but with the singular high-front vowel \(i\), is comparable to Old Turkic and Old Mongolian vocalism. However, it seems not to have included diphthongs.

Hunnic had a palatal harmony (probably syllabic), but neither labial harmony nor labial attraction.

As to consonantism, its initial position in Hunnic was in agreement with Old (and Middle) Mongolian rather than with Old Turkic: \(h\)-, as well as the voiced stops \(d\)- and \(g\)-, were allowed to occur. But like Proto-Bulgarian, Hunnic possessed clusters in the initial position. The medial \(-d\)- in the stem is of great significance, since it is different from the Proto-Bulgarian and Chuvash.

Also, Hunnic shared rhotacism with Mongolian, Old Bulgarian, and Chuvash.

It is highly probable, however, that Hunnic had a palatal correlation of its consonantism, of the Old Turkic type.

\[\ast \quad \ast \quad \ast\]

When I decided to experiment with the thirty-three Hunnic names in an effort to determine their linguistic relationship, I did not have any preconceptions about what the results would be, that is, whether the

\(^{230}\) The last contribution to deal with the language of the Huns was Gerhard Doerfer's article, "Zur Sprache der Hunnen," published in *CAJ* 17, no. 1 (1973): 1-50. Alas, it is a very disappointing and unproductive study. Contrary to the addage he himself there notes, "zuviel Skepsis ist unkritisch" (p. 32), the author overindulges his scepticism, and, naturally enough, arrives at a completely negative conclusion. Instead of examining the Hunnic onomastic material in a detailed structural analysis, based on knowledge of Old Bulgarian, Chuvash, Yakut, Old Turkic, and Old Ottoman material, Professor Doerfer wasted the greater part of his study on magisterial theorizing and on pun-etymologies.
reconstructed language would prove to be Altaic, Iranian, Ugric, or anything else. I simply wanted to ascertain definitely whether or not the existing onomastic material was adequate for such a quest, i.e., whether it would show the required structural uniformity. I did not treat each onomastic item in isolation, thereby creating “phonemic laws” *ad hoc*, but rather constantly checked to see whether or not any clear and convincing structural pattern of morphonemics for the entire body of data would emerge. Also, I carefully avoided changing a single letter in my sources so as to benefit my “ingenious” reconstructions and constructs.

The results have been more than satisfying. Not only did a clear structural pattern in the Hunnic language emerge, but also it was possible to reconstruct the language’s morphonemic system almost in its entirety, and even to establish its accentuation patterns.

The deciphering of meanings of the reconstructed words (which were not provided with translations) and forms (derivations) found corroboration in the realia of Hunnic history and culture. This was especially true with reference to the “names,” or, better still, the designations of offices/professions, epithets, and nicknames of the Hunnic leaders from a specific time, A.D. 448-449.

I hope that the experiment described and reproduced here will be judged successful by scholarship and that the mystery of the character of the Hunnic language will be regarded as solved.

*Harvard University*
## Indices

1. Index verborum*

| *ad 26 | elmin 20, 24, 25 | munjâq 7, 23 |
| *ada- 26 | elminčür 25 | *øy+ 10 |
| adam 26 | elmingir 24 | øy+bârs 10 |
| *ata+ 14 | emncčür 20 | *ô- 9 |
| ata+qâm 14 | *es+ 11, 13, 30 | *ogâ 9 |
| attila 13 | es+qâm 11 | *ôktâ- 8 |
| *bala 1 | *es+tîlî+ 13 | öktâr 8 |
| balamur 1 | élstâ 30 | *öl- 4, 21 |
| *+bars 2, 10 | *ges 24 | öltindür 21 |
| basis 2 | *gest- 22 | öldin 4 |
| bérôk 27 | gesam (or gesm) 22 | öltincür 21 |
| *bit-, see bli- | *hêr+ /hr+ 9, 19 | *sköt- 33 |
| *bli- 12, 16(?) | hërnâk 19 | skottâ 33 |
| biltâ 12, 16(?) | hr+ôgâ 9 | *sök- 33 |
| *çer- 29 | *iêr- see cér- | *sökît-, see sköt- 33 |
| cérkün 29 | *kerkân, see krêkân | *+tîlî 13 |
| *deñir 18 | krêkân 31 | *+tôn 6 |
| deñirçig 18 | *kür 3 | *üne- 32 |
| donât 5 | *kürâ 3 | ünegäsi 32 |
| *edûr- 28 | kürsîg 3 | | Non-Hunnic names |
| edäkün 28 | +qâm 11, 14 | | budaricus? 16 |
| *êl 17 | *qarâ+ 6 | | laudaricus? |
| *êltâ- 17 | qarâ+tôn 6 | | mámas (~mama) 15 |
| ëlläg 17 | münjû 7, 23 | | | 

2. Index of Suffixes

| +A- 26 | +Dûr 21 | +K 7 |
| +A 3, 13 | -èr-, see *-ir- | +IA 30 |
| +An+ 19 | -G 17 | +IA- 17 |
| +An+AK 19 | -GA 9 | +IA-G 17 |
| +AK 19 | -GAN 31 | -m 22, 26 |
| +ÇûG 18 | -Gäsi 32 | +MU+r 1 |
| -çî+n+, see -Di+n | +Gîr 24 | +n 4, 21, 28, 29, 31 |
| -çî+n+Dûr 21 | -GU+n 28, 29 | +r 1 |
| +çûr 20, 21, 25 | +i- 22 | -r 8 |
| -DA 12, 16(?), 33 | *-ir- 29 | +siG 2, 3 |
| -Di+n 4, 21 | *-it- 33 |

* The numbers correspond to the paragraphs in section B, *The Analysis of the Onomastic Material*; + denotes denominal suffixes, and - denotes deverbal suffixes.
**APPENDIX: The Genealogy of Attila’s Clan**

**Stage I**
1. Balamur, *fl.* 375

**Stage II**
2. Bάσιχ, *fl.* ca. 395
3. Κουροίξ, *fl.* ca. 395
4. Ούλδην/Uldin, *fl.* ca. 395-410
5. Δονάτ (successor of Ούλδην), ca. 410-412
6. Χαράτσον (successor of Δονάτ), ca. 412-420

**Stage III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N. n.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Μουνδίουχ/Mundzuc</td>
<td>ca. 420-430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Octar/Октар</td>
<td><em>fl.</em> ca. 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ροΐγα/Roa</td>
<td>ca. 430-433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ωηβάρς</td>
<td>ca. 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Έοικαμ</td>
<td><em>fl.</em> 448-449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bλήδα/Bleda</td>
<td>433-444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 'Αττίλα</td>
<td>444-453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 'Ατακάμ</td>
<td>N. n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Μάμας</td>
<td>d. 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Laudaricus</td>
<td>d. 433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage IV**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Μονόδο/Mundo</td>
<td>d. 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ελμίγειρος, <em>fl.</em> 556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Έλμινζούρ, <em>fl.</em> 556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

(a) Publications


CAJ = Central Asiatic Journal.

CC = *Codex Cumanicus, in Faksimile herausgegeben ...* von Kaare Gronbech (Copenhagen, 1936); K. Gronbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* (Copenhagen, 1942).
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*Nog = N. A. Baskakov, ed., Nogajsko-russkij slovar' (Moscow, 1963).*

*NUG = Emir Nadzipović Nadžip, Ujgursko-russkij slovar' (Moscow, 1968).*


Redhouse = Sir James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople, 1890).


Sevortjan, *ÈSTJ = Èrvand Vladimirovic Sevortjan, Ètimologîceskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov* (Moscow, 1974+).

Szabó, Szöképzés = Szabó Terész Mária, A Kalmük szöképzés (Budapest, 1943).
Tarama Sözlüğü = XIII yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklarıyla Tarama Sözlüğü, ed. by Türk Dil Kurumu, 2nd ser. (Ankara, 1963-).
Tat = Tatarsko-russkij slovar' (Moscow, 1966).
Tkm = N. A. Baskakov et al., eds., Turkmensko-russkij slovar' (Moscow, 1968).
Tuv = Aleksandr Adol’fovic Pal’mbax, Tuvinsko-russkij slovar’ (Moscow, 1955).

Note: The Old Turkic Inscriptions are quoted according to the established system: I = Kül Tigin, II = Bilgä Qagan (both after the Finnish Atlas: Inscriptions de l’Orkhon [Helsinki, 1892]); To = Tonyuquq (after the edition of G. J. Ramstedt — Pentti Aalto, Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, vol. 60 [Helsinki, 1958]). The appropriate abbreviation is followed by a specific designation (e.g., N = North, S = South, etc.) and the line number.

(b) Languages

| Arabic | Mo = Mongolian |
|------------------------------------------|
| Arch Chin = Archaic Chinese | MMO = Middle Mongolian |
| Baš = Bashkir | MTÜ = Middle Turkic |
| Bulg = Proto-Bulgarian | OT = Old Turkic |
| Çuv = Chuvash | Özb = Özbek (Uzbek) |
| Čag = Chaghatai | TÜ = Turkic |
| DBulg = Danube Proto-Bulgarian | VBulg = Volga Proto-Bulgarian |
| Hun = Hunnic | WMo = Written Mongolian |
| Kirg = (New) Kirgiz | |

|