The cited examples prove, if any evidence is necessary, that so long human beings are living, so long their language is changing and developing. Only a few things are constant in language. Becoming and dying are - like in the sansâra 'the wheel of life' - the main characteristics of any language. However, the change and development in language are not linear. Bringing to mind Einstein's famous thesis about "mass bending the space" one may say that a system of language (~ the linguistic consciousness of speakers" - "spirit of language", no matter what it is called) causes the changes that are inevitable in language to be in the form of a spiral roller than a straight line. The spirit of language bends its line of development. The language, its units, forms and constructions return to the same (initial) point but on another, higher level. And in this way the linguistic "wheel of life" is turning and turning.
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Kerleviût in the Crimea and the historical ethnic name Kürleviût ~ Kürlü'üt

Abstract

Kerleviût ~ Kürleviût is the name of six villages known from the pre-Russian Crimea. This oikonym is certainly of ethnic origin. So far a similar ethonym has only been attested in two historical documents, Rashid ad-Din’s chronicle and Abulghazi Bahadur Khan’s Genealogy of Turks, where the Kürleviût are mentioned among Mongol tribes. In this paper, an attempt is made to identify the Crimean Kerleviût ~ Kerleviût with the historical Kürleviût ~ Kürlü'üt from outside the Crimea. For this purpose all the extant documentary attestation is presented and an etymology of the name Kürlü'üt and Kerleviût is proposed.

Kerleviût in the Crimea

Evidence for this hypothetical ethnic name is only provided by the names of Crimean habitation places. Among the most frequent Türkic ethnic names in the corpus of Crimean oikonyms in Jankowski (forthcoming), Kerleviût, with six occurrences, ranks thirteenth after Qypçaq (23 occurrences), Qoynat (19 occurrences), Qojat (18 occurrences), Najman (14 occurrences), Miy (12 occurrences), Qaq and Tama (11 occurrences each), Keneges and Üşün (9 occurrences each), and Qypyl ~ Qphyl and Qoaj (7 occurrences each).

Evidence for the oikonym Kerleviût is furnished by the first Russian administrative documents relating to the Crimea. Muxin’s map of 1816, published in 1817 (Muxin 1817), shows the following villages which bear the name Kerleviût ~ Kerleviût: Kerleviût (g) Kerleviût (p) Kerleviût (c), Kyrleviût (g), Kyrleviût (h) and Kyrleviût (n).1

1 Round brackets enclose grid references to Muxin’s map in Jankowski (forthcoming).
Evidence from outside the Crimea

As said above, there are only two historical sources known so far which mention the Kerleity. Raisad ad-Din calls them a Mongolian people Kervlevit (RA 216) qum kwa'ai, i.e., qum-i Kervlevit, in other copies kwwh-wet, i.e., Kervlevit. They are said to have been closely connected with the Qyparyat, Elqishin and Burqai who used the same language. In Raisad ad-Din's opinion originally they were not Mongols (RA 82). Abulghazi Bahadur Khan in his Genealogy of Turks makes a short mention of the Mongol people Kervlevit, kwwh-wet, who beside the Burqai or Barqai were closely related to the Qyparyat (Otemez 2003: 59, 213).

In contrast to most ethnonyms reflected in Crimean habitation place names, which are shared with other Turkish peoples, basically Kychaks, such as Noghais, Kazakhs, Karakalpaks and the ethnically mixed Kirghiz and Uzbeks, but also others, e.g., Altai, the ethnonym Kerleity is not attested to, see the Noghai ethnonyms (Baskakov 1940; Baskakov ed. 1963; Kerejtov 1999; Trepavlov 2001) and oikonyms (Bulgarova 1999), Kazakh ethnonyms (Qudajberdiuly 1991; Amantzolov 1997; Szeirze 1997; Toyleyev 1990), Kirghiz ethnonyms (Abramson 1980; Attoqurov 1995; Qaratayev 2003), Uzbek ethnonyms (Vambyry 1885), Bashkir ethnonyms (Kuzeev 1960) and oikonyms (Xismetdinova 1991, 1992), Alai ethnonyms (Baskakov and Toşakova 1947) and oikonyms (Molchanova 1979), and Khakass ethnonyms (Butanaev 1994, 1999) and oikonyms (Butanaev 1985).

The single genealogical study which lists this ethnonym is Qudajberdiuly's genealogy. He gives this ethnonym in the form Kerlevit (in a new edition of his book spelt Kerlevit), but identifies it with the Qurbag (Qudajberdiuly 1991: 19), which is wrong (for the Mongol form of this ethnonym derived with the suffix +t see below).

Apart from the two sources indicated above, we could not find any evidence for the ethnonyms Kerleity in other sources (e.g., Secret History, see SH and Kaluzhynski 1970) and studies relating to the Mongols (Shastina 1975; Kaluzhynski 1983; Njambu 1992). It is also absent from Mongolian toponyms (Haltod 1966).

The etymology of Kürülüüt and Kerleity

The spelling of this oikonym in Crimean Tatar historical documents is kerliyt (e.g. in 1668, SSSM 10,13) which may be read Kerleity or Kerlevit, the former being commoner. The modern Crimean Tatar pronunciation is also [kerleity] (e.g. k-1EA). Therefore, the basic form should be read Kerleity. Had we accepted the relationship between this oikonym Kerleity and the historical ethnic name Kürülüüt, we should establish the original form of this oikonym as Kerlevit. The unrounding of a round vowel in the first syllable after the consonant k- is attested to in the Crimea in some other oikonyms, e.g., Kereš → Kedze and Keneck → Keneck. Therefore, the change -iū → -iu is also possible. As for the change ker- → kir-, it may be attributed to the instability of this vowel or other reasons as in the case of Kerljat → Körjat.

The form Kürülüüt may easily be explained as derived from *Kürüljū with the plural suffix +t, which according to Mengers (1995: 111) is evidenced in such Mongol ethnonyms as Muryaj, Marjuyt, Qiyaat, Kürüljū and Quryyat, all being common among Turkish peoples. To these names we can probably add Quryyat, Merjek, Qiyaat and Quryyat, the problem with this explanation is that the plural suffix +t (+d) in Mongol languages is attached to the stems with the final -y (e.g., -yn), -i, and -r which are dropped when this suffix is attached (Sechenbantur 2003: 26-27). However, there is evidence for the formation derived from stems ending in -G in ethnonyms, i.e., the Mongol form Qurbag = Qurbät of the well-known Turkic ethnonym Qurbag (SH 198; Poppe 1977: 166). In Old Turkic, the suffix +t was normally attached to the stems ending in -n, sometimes also in -
The hypothetical name *Kürlük ~ Kürlük should be explained from the word kūr which occurs in both Turkic and Mongol languages with various meanings, derived with the well-known suffix +ül (or +ul). For Written Mongol, kūr is glossed as the phrase kūr ɣi xe ulus as 'the whole great people' (Lessing 1960: 503), for Kalmuk as 'thick, fat' (Ramstedt 1976: 246). Kūr first appears in Karakhanian Turkic. It is translated as 'brave, bold' (DTS 328) or 'strong, proud' (Dankoff and Kelly 1985: 115). Naturally, a word with such a meaning would perfectly be suitable for a name. It may also be sought in the well-known Qara Qbiši title qūran ~ qūran (for more on the meanings, distribution and etymology see ESFLA III 106-105).

The form Kürlevit should be explained in a different way. It resembles a well-known Turco-Mongol etymon Bajayz ~ Bajayz → Bajazut (Sharfina 1975: 242), also evidenced in the Crimea, which most probably reflects the common Old Turkic noun bajayz, derived from baj ‘rich; wealthy; a rich man’ with the suffix +AGUL. Erdal (1991: 76-83) has found five formations derived with the suffix +AGUL in Old Turkic which he calls a ‘class marker’: agavut, bagavut, (ba) basagut, (uc) szagut and (kadun) kazagut (the last also evidenced in the Crimea as Qajnavut).

If this is the case, it should be supposed that Kürlevit has emerged from the former *Kürlevit as a result of a regular Kipchak change g ~ γ ~ v. Unfortunately, this form cannot be etymologised from any genuine Turkic word. For Mongol languages, we have evidence for a word from which *Kürlevit could have been derived. It is kūr ‘bronze’ (Lessing 1960: 504), a word of unclear etymology, discussed in detail by Rybatsky (1994: 228-229), borrowed into south Siberian Turkic languages in the forms kūer ~ Güer etc. Although there are many anthroponyms derived from metal terms, some of which have become ethnonyms, a derivation from the Mongol kūr with the Turkic suffix +AGUL is highly unlikely.

Therefore, a more reasonable source for Kürlevit is *Kürül (or +ul), and the form Kürlegit ~ Kürlevit should be regarded as secondary, emerged from the phonetic association with such ethnonyms as Bajayz → Bajazut and Qajnavut → Qajnavut.

Conclusion

Crimean oikonyms contain more than sixty ethnic names, most of them are the names of Turkic or Turkicised tribes. These ethnonymous once occurred in the steppe areas of the Crimea, but some (e.g. Aryn, Najman and Tama) penetrated as far southwards as the central mountainous part of the peninsula, to the south of the town Qarasu Bazar. Many of these ethnonyms are shared by other Turkic peoples, such as the present-day Noghaits and the Turkic peoples of Central Asia, the Kazakhs, Karakalpaks and Uzbeks.

2 Note the homonymous OT kūr in the doublet rev kūr ‘deception; trick’ (DTS 328), which is rather unrelated to this name.
3 Kūr is attested to in one toponym, it is the Mongol name Kūr enqčul of a mountain (Haltod 1966: 104).
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**Glowing Beautiful Sunshine: A Mongolian “Long Song”**

**Abstract**

Old style solemn songs of the genre *urtin duu* ‘long-song’ of Buddhist content were still heard in the Mongolian countryside in the middle of the twentieth century. The words of such a song titled *Durjarsal saitran* were recorded by the author in the late spring of 1957 in the province of Gobi-Alta, Southwestern Mongolia. The text is discussed, compared with several other variants and analysed in this paper. It is not a folk song in the usual sense of the term, but one written for a feast by a poet, a learned monk or a man of letters. The text bears bookish forms (once used even by illiterate people who, in order to give their words an elegant archaic air, emulated the reading style pronunciation of Classical Mongolian), its strophic structure is unusual for a folk song, it has literary phrases, an ornate style, and Buddhist philosophical background. Some light is shed on the origin of the rare word *durjarsal* and its cognates found in classical and pre-classical monuments.

It is noteworthy that old style solemn songs of the genre *urtin duu* ‘long-song’

3. Elenjül chamar or Soviet text ‘Five Offerings’, ed. D. Tsagaan, p. 22, see also Bawden’s English translation (Mongolian Traditional Literature, pp. 695-696, *The Supreme Qualities or Five Sensuous Offerings*).