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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ham(m)am</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seraglio</td>
<td>serai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serail</td>
<td>serail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yali</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Romanization

In each entry in the section entitled Etymology, where information from the English etymological dictionaries is quoted/summarized, all forms are cited in their original shape as provided by the authors. In all other cases, the following rules apply.

Ottoman Turkish and other Turkic forms originally written in the Perso-Arabic script are quoted in this form as well as in their modern Latin orthography, with the following exceptions:

- š and ç are substituted with š and č respectively to make clearer the correspondences in the case of Perso-Arabic borrowings into Ottoman;
- ĉ [dʒ] is substituted with ĝ;
- the circumflex ̂ is never used given its inconsistent application in Modern Turkish orthography to mark vowel length on some occasions, or unexpected palatalization of the preceding velar or lateral on others, or both; instead vowel length and palatalizations (whether predictable or not) are marked using the IPA whenever relevant;
- the opposition between front /k̄/ and /q̄/ vs. back /k/ and /q/ is marked with a dot accompanying the latter, i.e. k, g vs. ḳ, ḡ; these will variously correspond in modern Turkish orthography to k, g, or ḡ.

Modern Turkish forms are always quoted in their modern Latin orthography.

Arabic forms are quoted using both the Arabic script orthography and in romanized form according to the DMG system, with the difference that the vocalic value of ِ is always transliterated as ī and not ı. The reason is the desire to maintain a consistent distinction between the vowel qualities ı and ı, whether
long or short. For the same reason the substitution is always employed when copying transliterated Ottoman forms from English etymological dictionaries.

Persian forms are quoted in both the Perso-Arabic script and in simplified DMG transcription. In the latter, all diacritics are removed which do not have bearing on the actual pronunciation and their only function is to show notation via a different letter.

Russian forms are quoted in the Cyrillic. Other European language forms are quoted in their respective orthographies.

Other language forms originally written in non-Latin scripts are quoted in their standard transliterations.

In all the above cases, whenever phonetic nuances are relevant, the IPA is used.

2. Symbols

< = etymologically comes from (either through inheritance or borrowing)
> = etymologically develops into (either through inheritance or borrowing)
← = is derived through regular morphological processes from
→ = develops through regular morphological processes into
? = questionable derivation
* = unattested/reconstructed form
× = etymological merger
I. Introduction

1. Aims, scope, sources

1.1. Aims

The primary aim of the current thesis is twofold: (1) to analyse critically the etymological information found in a number of dictionaries of English concerning lexical items of (alleged) Turkic origin or due to (alleged) transmission via Turkic; and (2) to fill the missing data whenever possible. As far as (1) is concerned, the more detailed goal is to verify Liberman’s diagnosis concerning English etymological dictionaries (e.g. Liberman 1994, 2009) with respect to the aforementioned area of vocabulary. As far as (2) is concerned, the more detailed goals are: (2a) to fill gaps in documentation; (2b) to trace the transmission routes of various attested forms of the English lexemes; (2c) to verify, correct and complement the Turcological information so far as it helps clarify the English forms or their immediate etymons.

1.2. Scope

In order to make the scope of the work managable, the decision was made to choose a sample of the vocabulary in question. The study focuses on lexemes pertaining to secular, non-military material culture arranged in the following semantic categories: 1. Buildings; 2. Coins; 3. Costume; 4. Cuisine; 5. Entertainment; 6. Handicraft; 7. Musical instruments; 8. Naval terminology. The categories themselves, as well as the entries in each category, have been arranged alphabetically.

Beyond the scope of the current work remain lexemes related to the areas of religion, politics, and natural environment. The reason for omitting these
items was the desire to focus on material artifacts produced and/or transmitted by Turks, which had the potential to influence the culture in Europe, and especially the English-speaking world.

While Islam is admittedly one of the most prominent cultural phenomena associated with the Ottoman Empire, inclusion of religious vocabulary would boost the size of the work considerably, without any substantial change in the overall picture of the contact situation. The reason is that the Islamic religious culture in the Ottoman Empire was directly related to Perso-Arabic influence, which makes the origin of such vocabulary largely predictable. The occurrence of these words in English is usually due to parallel transmission – frequently through one or more European languages – from Ottoman, Persian and Arabic, with the last of these languages being the ultimate source in the majority of cases. Non-religious vocabulary which nevertheless shares similar past is still richly represented in the present study, therefore it was considered reasonable to omit religious lexis so as not to overrepresent this etymological type in our corpus.

On the other hand, unlike products of material culture, which can spread with fashion and/or through trade, administrative nomenclature and military terminology spreads with conquest. Excluding British colonies, there has never been any Anglo-Turkic contact of this type, which largely limits the potential influence of this type of vocabulary. Furthermore, the names of local flora and fauna or atmospheric phenomena are also inextricably bound up with the context they are used in. In other words the use of this kind of vocabulary is usually spatially limited to the lands to which it applies.1

1.3. SOURCES OF MATERIAL

The following dictionaries constituted the source of material for the present study (in the chronological order):

(c) German: Müller 1 (1865–7), Müller 2 (1878–9).

1 Of course, the actual degree to which these are successfully transplanted into new territory depends on the extralinguistic circumstances involved and has to be assessed on a case to case basis.
While the tradition of English etymology goes back to the early 17th century (Considine 2009: 123), only a subset of the relevant dictionaries are included in the present study. A comment is needed concerning this selection.

As Liberman puts it, “modern English etymological lexicography begins with Skeat” (2009: 279). Indeed it was Skeat (especially in the fourth edition of his dictionary) along with the editors of OED1 who first made full use of the advances that comparative linguistics had made in the course of the 19th-century. Consequently, the decision was made to focus on the major etymological dictionaries beginning with Skeat (three editions), and including Weekley, ODEE and Klein. Of Skeat’s predecessors two strictly etymological works, Wedgwood (three editions) and Müller (two editions) were chosen to represent earlier scholarship.

Added to these are two other kinds of dictionaries which offer etymological information but nevertheless could not be classified as etymological dictionaries of English. One includes studies devoted to more restricted areas: Anglo-Indian vocabulary (Yule1, 2), the foreign element in general (Stanford) and borrowings from Arabic (CannA) and Persian (CannP).

The second category are large monolingual dictionaries which give etymological information. Here British lexicography is represented by OED1-2-3, which is more than enough, given the scope of this dictionary. The sources focusing on American English are represented by Webster-Mann (W-M), two editions of Webster’s New International Dictionary (W2 and W3) and two editions of The American Heritage Dictionary of English (AHD3 and AHD4).4

Of the larger dictionaries of English bearing the word etymological in the title the only ones that are not included are Robert K. Barnhardt and Sol Steinmetz’s

---

Arguably, both Müller (Müller1) and Mahn (W-M) recognize these developments in their works, at least to some extent. However, Skeat was far more prolific and bolder in his writings, which made him more prominent on the scholarly scene. The fact that the other two scholars were not English might have further contributed to the relative obscurity of their names.

The third edition of Skeat’s dictionary was regrettably inaccessible, but according to Liberman (2009: 280) there were few changes between the first and third editions. In accordance with his conclusion the present study has revealed no substantial differences in the relevant entries between Skeat1 and Skeat2.

The choice of these particular editions is justified in the following way. Of the 19th-century general dictionaries of American English, W-M is arguably the most valuable as far as etymological commentaries are concerned. W3 is included because it features a considerable number Turkic/Turkish etymologies, whereas W4 is meant to represent more recent American lexicography, as are AHD3 and AHD4. The fifth edition of AHD was unavailable to me at the time of the collection of the material.
The Barnhart dictionary of etymology (1988) (as well as its later incarnations under the title Chambers dictionary of etymology) and Yoshio Terasawa’s The Kenkyusha dictionary of English etymology (1997), neither of which was available to me. Based on Liberman’s opinion (2005: 295–6, fn. 35), their absence seems to have little bearing on the final results.

Moreover, deliberately excluded are commercial dictionaries aimed at the lay reader, like Eric Partridge’s Origins: a short etymological dictionary of English (1958) and John Ayto’s Dictionary of word origins (1990), as they display no pretence to originality.

1.4. Collection of material

Wedgwood (three editions), Müller (two editions), Skeat (three editions), Yule (two editions), Stanford, Weekley, ODEE and Klein were searched manually. OED₂ and OED₃ were searched electronically based on the CD-ROM and online editions respectively and the results were then checked against the print edition of OED₂, as well as compared with OED₁ and OED₅. None of the post-1933 supplement or additions volumes, which are included both on the CD-ROM and online, were consulted in print format. Webster’s dictionary was searched electronically based on the CD-ROM edition and the results were then checked against the print editions of 1934 (W₂) and 1961 (W₃) in order to take into account any possible changes. AHD₄ was searched electronically based on the CD-ROM edition and the results were checked against the print edition of 1992 (AHD₃).

Finally, the search results were checked against the lists provided by Gatenby (1954) and Cannon (2009) in order to minimize the risk of omissions.

2. Previous scholarship

The problem of words transmitted into English from or through Turkic has never been the focus of a systematic etymological study as far as the lexicography of English is concerned. The relevant Turkic lexemes and their European (including English) reflexes have been included to varying degrees in studies of two kinds: (a) dictionaries of English that are the source of material for and one of the topics of this study; (b) articles focusing specifically on Turkisms in English.
2.1. **Dictionaries of English**

Here only a few general comments follow. For a more detailed assessment see section 7 below.

Liberman’s diagnosis that all major etymological dictionaries of English reflect 19th-century scholarship is largely true with respect to the treatment of Orientalisms. This is less so, however, with the more recent editions of large monolingual dictionaries, i.e. W3, AHD4 and OED3. Especially the revision of OED currently underway, where more up-to-date and more accurate sources are utilized, appears to be very promising.5

2.2. **Articles on Turkisms in English**

The following articles deal specifically with our topic. Perhaps with the exception of Cannon’s contributions, the originality of these works is limited, as they are rarely more than compilations.

2.2.1. **Serjeantson (1936)**

Despite its shortcomings Mary S. Serjeantson’s study is still quoted as the standard account of foreign elements in the history of English (Liberman 2005: 280, Durkin 2010).

The words taken over from Turkic “dialects” are discussed on pp. 231–3. Serjeantson lists 45 such words, among them 13 included in the present study (**bergamot**, **caftan**, **caïque**, **caviar(e)**, **chibouk**, **coffee**, **dolman**, **fez**, **kiosk**, **koumiss**, **macramé**, **salep**, **turban**). She identifies two Turkic sources, Ottoman and Tatar, although the latter label is not systematically defined.

The varying transmission routes are taken into account to some extent. The author first lists words that were transmitted indirectly (mostly through French, sometimes through Slavic) and then proceeds to direct loanwords, arranged by the century, based on the date of first attestation.

Apart from the section devoted to Turkic words, Turkish is mentioned as an intermediary in the transmission of six words of Persian origin – their English forms being: **Khedive** (227), **giaour**, **jackal**, **serai** (cf. **sergalio**), **spahi** (all four on p. 228), and **pilaff** (230) a variant of **pilau** (cf. **pilaf**) – as well as a possible transmitter of **sherbet** from Arabic (219). One word, **uhlan** analysed by the author as ultimately Turkic, is listed as a borrowing from German (181).

5 On the methodological issues encountered in the revision of the etymological entries in OED, see Durkin (1999) and, more broadly, (2009).
Serjeantson’s account is useful as an introductory overview, but it is doubtless outdated. One reason is the fact that while Serjeantson’s main source was OED\textsubscript{1}/OED\textsubscript{S}, the subsequent editions, OED\textsubscript{2} and especially OED\textsubscript{3}, offer numerous antedatings, which would probably rearrange the author’s account.

2.2.2. Gatenby (1954)

As the author himself admits, this is “[not] much more than a fairly complete collection of words of Turkish origin found in the Oxford English Dictionary and its Supplement” (85). Indeed, the list in question constitutes the majority of the article. Each entry is a summary of the corresponding entry in OED featuring the explication of meanings, the earliest date of attestation and a summary of the word’s etymology and/or reference to another entry. The quotations provided in OED are omitted. The etymological information is usually extracted from the dictionary without any major changes. Needless to say, the sources were, again, OED\textsubscript{1} and OED\textsubscript{S}.

The most innovative section of Gatenby’s work is his brief introduction in which he formulates a series of suggestions for future research. The most enduring are his comments concerning the necessity of investigating transmission routes in his items c) and d).

Gatenby’s list is a good starting point for the study of words transmitted into English from or via Turkic, but his treatment of the material is inconsistent. He divides the vocabulary into three sections: 1. From Turkish; 2. Words coming into English from Turkey, or through their use in Turkey, but not of Turkish origin; 3. Miscellaneous. While the last of these discusses words whose relation to Turkic is dubious or indirect, the division of the first two categories is ambiguous: no explanation is offered as to what the labels “from Turkish” and “from Turkey, or through use in Turkey” mean and how they actually differ. A form taken from Turkey or based on use in Turkey is very likely transmitted via Turkish, unless what Gatenby means is indirect transmission through the use by dragomans (see section 6.4.1), but this is not explicitly stated. Furthermore, the criteria of the assignment of particular words to either category are unclear. For example, sorbet and serai are both listed in the first category, although the former is explained as ultimately Turkish, but transmitted indirectly (i.e. \(<\text{French}\ <\text{Italian}\ <\text{Turkish}\), whereas the latter is derived directly from Turkish, although it is classified as ultimately Persian. On the other hand, seraph (“French seraph, corruptly from Turkish sharif”) is listed in the latter category, although it seems to reflect French corrupt usage rather than directly the Turkish form.
2.2.3. **Cannon (2000)**
The study is not strictly etymological and offers an overview of the documentation of the use of Turkish and Persian words in English literature. No systematic distinction is made between the two kinds of lexemes.

2.2.4. **Cannon (2008–9)**
This is Cannon’s preliminary survey of the Turkish element in English. The article falls into two sections. The first of these (pp. 163–78) features a number of methodological remarks as well as a historico-statistical outline of the Turkish influence on English from a variety of perspectives. This includes the assessment of the extent of this influence in various semantic fields, in particular centuries, in works by particular authors, as well as comparisons with the influence of other languages. This is accompanied by methodological considerations concerning the treatment of borrowings in general, including such aspects as spelling variation, the degree of nativization, participation in native word-formation. Observations based on the Turkish material are compared to the results of Cannon’s two earlier studies of Arabic (1994 CannA) and Persian (2001 CannP) words in English.

The second section (179–84) of Cannon’s article is comprised of three lists:
(a) Turkish loans in English (325 items; each headword in the list is accompanied by the date of the earliest attestation, followed by the degree of nativization determined according to Cannon’s scale)
(b) Non-Turkish loans conveying Turkish elements (84 distant loans, “too changed from the Turkish form and/or meaning by the mediator to be considered Turkish”; the headword is followed by the identification of the mediating language)
(c) First known uses by fourteen literary figures (an alphabetical list of writers who introduced at least one of the Turkish words in the first list; cf. Cannon 2000).

Cannon’s contribution lies predominantly in the systematic collection and preliminary analysis of his material as well as the identification of some problem areas related to its study. Especially important are his remarks regarding the treatment of various transmission routes, and his insistence on accounting for all attested variants that scholars have access to, which may reflect independent borrowing from multiple sources (173). Closely related is his emphasis on the study of the chronology itself, including antedating and the identification of orthographic variants not yet recorded in dictionaries. Even if some details of his formulations may be controversial, the general conclusions he draws are valid.

---

6 Thus, for example his claim that the orthography *khanjar* ‘a kind of Oriental dagger’ explicitly points to transmission through Arabic or Persian as opposed to *hanjar* which
2.2.5. Şirin User (2009)
The bulk of the article is an extraction from Yule. The author lists 36 lexemes, including the following that fall within the scope of the present study: alleja (see elatcha), arrack, rack (cf. raki (A)), caique (see caîque), CHOGA, CHUPKUN, COPECK, kiosque (see KIOSK), and TANGA.

The study is a useful extraction, but does not offer new etymologies. The author’s occasional contribution is to suggest the Turkic etymon if Yule limits himself to indicate Turkish or Turki(c) origin. For example s.v. chupkun, Şirin User offers T cepken as a possible etymon.

3. Structure of entries

3.1. Headword

The selection of headwords depends on the most typical English spellings and tends to become more arbitrary in the case of words of lower frequency. Because the entries are grouped according to semantics, an index of all English orthographic variants is given at the end of the study.

3.2. Pronunciation

British English pronunciation is always given before American English pronunciation.

British English pronunciation is given based on OED (which usually reflects the state of the art at the turn of the 20th century). American pronunciation is provided following W2 (published 1934) and W3 (1961). In those rare cases when this is possible, information on modern pronunciation in both British and American English is provided based on LPD and/or OED3.

Pronunciation is always transcribed using the IPA.

suggests Turkish is perhaps an oversimplification. The Turkish pronunciation in [h] is indeed different from the Perso-Arabic [x]. However, the fact that an author spells the word in kh- may potentially point to his being influenced by the traditional transliteration/transcription of the Arabic script and because Ottoman Turkish was written in this script, this does not necessarily determine the source being non-Turkish.