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**Written Mongolian čamča ‘shirt’ and its etymological counterparts in Europe**

Seventy five years ago G. J. Ramstedt wrote on the origin of Kalmyk *tsamtso* ‘shirt’ as follows: “viell. *samča* zu ma. *samsu* ‘hanfgewebe’, kor. *sam* ‘hanf’” (KW 421b).1 Approximately a decade later, in 1947, Leonardo Olschi suggested that the Written Mongolian word čamča ‘shirt’ possibly reflected a Greek etymon and was connected with French *chemise* and Italian *camicia* id. (cited after de Rachewiltz 2004: 309). Two years later, G. J. Ramstedt repeated his opinion that this word is a reflex of a proto-form *samča*, being a derivative of a *sam* in the proto-language, attested only in Korean. Thus, *sam (> Kor. *sam* ‘hemp’) > *samča > Mo. čamča ‘shirt’ (~ Ma. *samsu* ‘thin hencloth’) > Ma. Nan. čamči ‘shirt’ (SKE 222).

Neither Ramstedt nor Olschi explained the sound changes and morphological problems involved. In this situation, readers had at their disposal no precise arguments for or against Ramstedt and Olschi. It could thus be expected that some of them preferred the European etymology and others the Altaic. Indeed, this was the case.

Pavel Poucha (1956: 47sq.) devoted a discussion of some length to this Mongolic word. However, some of his formulations are not really clear and unequivocal or easily acceptable:


There can be no question that Ramstedt’s task when publishing his SKE was to show the Altaic genetic unity, rather than Chinese loanwords in Korean and Mongolic.

(2) “Obwohl Ramstedts Etymologie verführerisch aussieht, so ist doch zu erwägen, daß dieser gemeinmongolische2 Ausdruck dem europäischen ‘Hemd’ sehr nahe kommt: neugriech. *(ὑπο) κάμισσον* aus

1. Ramstedt used the sign (,) to indicate that the preceding part of a word is a nominal stem. Thus, his *samča* is what we would today write *sam+ča*, in contrast to the deverbal derivative *sam-ča*. However, in the fragment cited after Poucha below, the word is traditionally transcribed *sam-ča*.

2. Poucha (l. c.) adduces the following Mongolic forms: Dürbet-bejse *sams(e)*, “udschumtsin” (= Üjümčiν) čamči(i), “dschastu” (= Ǯasagtu) *sami*, Ordos čamča ‘shirt’ and Dagur chanči ‘overall, coat’. The modern Khalkha form *camc*, Buryat *samsa* and Kalmuk *camc* ‘shirt’ (mentioned as *camca* in Poucha l.c.) are to be added here.
dem Romanischen, spanisch camis(o)la, franz. chemise aus vulgärlat.
hemidi > nhd. Hemd) [...]. Und so wäre es nichts Außerordentlichen,
wenn man annehmen wollte, was ich anzunehmen geneigt bin, näm-
lich, daß das mongolische Wort čamča letzten Endes mit deutschem
‘Hemd’ verwandt ist [...]” (Poucha l.c.).
Poucha, like Olschi, does not explain the sound differences
observed here, nor does he settle the order of transitional languages.
One cannot even determine what specific European word is to be
regarded as the etymon of the Mongolic word.

In 1969, Martti Räsänen (VEWT 98a) continues, as was only to be expected, the
“Altaic tradition” in that he repeats Ramstedt’s suggestions, albeit in a somewhat
more cautious way and without reconstructed forms: “mo. [...] čamča ‘Hemd’
(> ma. čameči ‘Weiberhemd’) ~ ma. samsu ‘Hanfgewebe’ ~ kor. [...] sam ‘hemp’”
(VEWT 98a). The real relationship between these forms remains unclear.

In the early 21st century Igor de Rachewiltz (2004: 309) derived the Mong-
olic word – with a question mark – from Chinese shan-tzu ‘woman’s dress,
shirt’, and this explanation was accepted by V. Rybatzki (2006: 307b). Thus, a
third etymological suggestion emerged.

An element common to all these explanations is the fact that Turkic data
are always reported to be loans from Mongolic. This does not of course mean
that words like Oyr., Leb. čamča ‘Hemd’, Tel. čamča ‘Rock’, Brb. camca ‘Kleid’,
Eastern Tkc. čamča ‘hemdartiges Kleidungsstück’, Saryg-Uyg. čamža ‘καφταν,
верхняя одежда’, Čag. čumča ‘Hemd’ (VEWT 98a); Sal. čamčja ‘surtout simple
des femmes; chemise; pèlerine’ (Drimba 1976: 418) have not been borrowed
from Mongolic. They certainly have. Nevertheless, the opposite borrowing di-
rection seems possible as well, if one is ready to consider one further source of
the Mongolic word, namely the word čamašyr ‘underwear’,3 present in numer-
ous Turkic languages, i.e. Turkic > Mongolic > Turkic.

The Uygur language with its y > i palatalization4 and loss of word-final
r (čamašyr > ơčamaši)5, as well as vowel raising (čamaši > ơčamiši)6 seems to

3. For the semantics cf. Fr. chemise and its English reflex chemise.
4. In Turkic words, the letter oy stands for the velar counterpart of i (i.e. = Tksh. i, Russ. о), often ren-
dered also by ӧ in other Turkological works. In non-Turkic examples, oy = i.
5. A degree symbol (º) is used to signal that a form is a modern and perfectly possible, although unre-
corded variant, rather than a protolinguistic reconstruction (see Anikin 1997).
6. Both phenomena can easily be observed in the Uygur name of the desert in the Xinjiang Uygur
Autonomous Region in China: (Täklimakan < and ~) Taklimakan < *Taklaman < *Taklarmakan, lit. ‘place
of arches’ (< taklar ‘arches’ [pl. < tak ‘arch archit.’] + makan ‘place’) because winds occasionally blow the
sands away and expose some remains of old buildings, namely arches jutting out of walls (Jarring 1997: 447).
The modern pronunciation Taklî... (instead of Taklī...) results from a secondary vocalic harmonization. It
cannot possibly be interpreted as the result of the so-called “Uygur umlauting” because this process does
not work “before an i that is the result of raising” (Hahn 1991: 51). Even if one assumes that i in Taklî... was,
at some stage, no longer perceived as secondary (easily imaginable in an old compound), was no longer ety-
mologically transparent and used only as a geographical name, the umlauting would yield an e – i sequence
(as in *baš ‘head’ + -im ‘my’ > Uyg. bešim ‘my head’), rather than ā – i (Hahn l.c.).
best fit into the imaginable borrowing channel and the train of sound changes, because the subsequent syncope of a narrow vowel in the second syllable of a three-syllable word, usually called Mittelsilbenschwund in Turkic linguistics (‘ćamişi > ćamšı) is quite a regular tendency on the brink of being a rule. The frequent alternation -a ~ -ı (> -i) makes the occurrence of ćamšı and ćamša side by side quite possible. The only problem is that neither ćamšı nor ćamişi could actually be found in Uygur. On the other hand, Eastern Turkic (“turc oriental”) forms like ġum ġar (Zenker 375a: ġum ġar راج موج ‘chemise, vêtement / Hemd, Kleid’) and ġum ġah (Zenker 365b: ġum ġah راج موج ‘chemise / Hemd’) seem to support our conjecture about the existence of a former Persian-Turkic form ćamašı(r) ~ ćamša or the like.

Provided that we accept this etymological possibility for the time being, we may go a step further back because the Turkic word ćamašır ‘underwear’ is a loan from Persian. Interestingly enough, most sources adduce only Pers. ǰāmašuy ‘laundress’ as the source of the Turkic word (the non-trivial semantic change has probably never been explained or at least discussed). A. Tietze (2002: 471) even resorts to an inorganic (i.e. non-etymological) r that as hyper-correction occurs after a vowel and refers to the Turkish word pair alengilli ~ alengirli (argot) ‘distinguished, noble’. Some mistakes have to be corrected here:

(3) In his Turkish formulation (“inorganik bir /r/” = ‘an inorganic /t/’), Tietze, for unknown reasons, uses a phonological notation /t/, which certainly is incorrect in this context. As a matter of fact, an etymologist does not care whether an inserted unetymological consonant is a phoneme or an allophone in the given linguistic system.

(4) In case of alengilli ~ alengirli one should invoke a dissimilation (ll > rl) or assimilation (rl > ll), i.e. focus on the consonant cluster, rather than the postvocalic position of the r. Besides, there is no “inorganic r” in alengirli, even if this variant really goes back to alengilli.

(5) Since the etymology of alengilli ~ alengirli remains unknown, one cannot decide whether -r- actually is secondary here (cf. Tietze 2002: 149ab).8

Additionally, the assumption of a hypercorrect insertion of r is, in point of fact, totally unnecessary. The Persian word consists of ǰāma ‘clothes, dress; clothing, apparel’ and šuy, the present tense stem of šustan (~ šostan) ‘to wash’. But this stem has, in reality, three forms: šu, šuy and šur (PRS 2: 101), so that one can expect ǰāmašuy to have two other variants as well. Indeed, Pers. ǰāmašur ‘laun-
dress’ is attested too (PRS 1: 425; this form is also given in PLOT). The only form I could not find is the variant ‘ǯāmašu but this seems to be nothing more than a phonetic variant of ǯāmašuy.

It is of no great importance whether we take Pers. ǯāmašur, ǯāmašuy or ǯāmašu as our starting point. The Uygur reflex would have probably always been ºchestra, and this would in its turn change, according to rules of the Turkic vowel harmony, into ºchestra. The further phonetic evolution of the word is suggested above.

In view of these data, Germ. Hemd ‘shirt’ cannot be considered a European cognate of Mo. čamča id. This does not, however, mean that no correspondence of čamča is known in Europe. Another Persian derivative of ǯāma ‘clothing’ is ǯāmadan ‘1. wardrobe; 2. portmanteau, suitcase’. This word was borrowed into Russian as чемодан ‘portmanteau, suitcase’, probably via some Turkic language(s). Thus, čem- in the Russian word чемодан is the European etymological counterpart of čam- in the Written Mongolian word čamča.

On the other hand, Pers. ǯāmadan was also borrowed into Manchu as čamda ‘portmanteau, suitcase’ (Anikin 1997, 2000 s.v. чемодан), so that this language has reflexes of two derivatives of Pers. ǯāma ‘clothing’:

Russ. чемодан = Ma. čamda ‘suitcase’ < Pers. ǯāmadan id. < ǯāma ‘dress’ > ġasma(y) ~ ǯāmašur ‘laundress’ > various Turkic languages čamašy ‘underwear’ ~ Uyg. čamašu (~*čamašy > čamaşi ~ čamaša > čamişi ~ čamiş > čamişu (> Ma. samsu ‘hemp fabric’) ~ čamši (> Üjümüčin čamči(ı), ǯasagto šamži, etc.) ~ čamša (> Written Mo. čamča ‘shirt’ > Khamnigan Evenki camca id. [Janhunen 1991: 104]).

Yet another trace of Pers. ǯāma is hidden in English pyjamas ~ pajamas, a word borrowed – via Urdu – from Pers. pāǯāma (PRS 258a) ~ pāyǯāma (PRS 271a) ~ payǯāma (PRS 321a) < Pers. pāy(ı) ~ pay ‘foot; leg’ + ǯāma ‘clothing’.10 Since this English word was afterwards borrowed into numerous languages, an etymological counterpart of Mongolic čamča can easily be found virtually all over Europe.

An additional problem to be solved in the future is whether the Siberian Turkic forms like Oyr. čamča ‘shirt’ should be better derived directly from Uyg. čamša or via Mongolic čamča. At least the č – č sequence in Oyrot etc. seems to point towards Mongolic mediation.

Yet another problem is whether both the phonetic form and the meaning of Ma. samsu ‘hemp fabric’ actually were influenced by Kor. sam ‘hemp’ – a question that I do not feel competent to answer.

9. I would like to warmly thank Andzej Pisowicz (Kraków) for directing my attention to this reflex of the Persian word.

10. The fact that Pers. pāy+ǯāma originally was a piece of clothing that covered legs, i.e. a sort of trousers is also reflected in the structure of Engl. pyjama+s like trouser+s, drawer+s, breech+es.
In any case, if these words are cognates in an Altaistic spirit, the word-initial s- is original, and the č- of all other variants must be explained. If they are not, the origin of the Manchu s- is to be explained because Manchu does tolerate a word-initial č-, and this appears to be a case more complicated than the former one.

Furthermore, there exists a homonym čamča (≈ čömče) ‘spoon, ladle’ in Turkic, attested also in Persian (čumča id.). The etymology and the conduits of transmission (TMEN 3: 95 Nr. 1121; Doerfer 1968–69 Nr. 68: Ar. čimča) are not ultimately settled, and two aspects are possibly of special importance to čamča ‘shirt’. One is the phonetic shape of the word: Can our understanding of one čamča word be effectively used in order to explain the origins and evolution of the other čamča word? The other aspect is of contactological nature: Is it possible that these words affected each other, e.g. in phonetic terms?

All in all, I do not actually think that the Persian-Turkic word čamašy(r) is the only source of the Mongolic word čamča. Rather, čamašy(r) was one of the forms involved, and the whole word family of Siberian čamca ~ samsa ~ čamži and so on, is arguably to be viewed as the result of blending of different words¹¹ whose more detailed analysis requires further research (although it is not certain that this etymological knot can ever be ultimately untied).¹²

Even if Mongolic čamča and its counterparts in other languages are no Oriental reflexes of German Hemd and French chemise, they build a set of phonetic and semantic variants that certainly merit our attention.

¹¹ This concerns both the genesis of the Mongolic word and the precise establishing of a source of its reflexes in Turkic. It is thus easily understandable that V. Drimba (1976: 426) adduces Sal. čumža in the context characterized in the following way: “Il existe un assez grand nombre de mots qui ne nous permettent pas de préciser à quelle langue mongole ils ont été empruntés […]”.

¹² A good example of such a special blending (fortunately, a solved one) is the semantic history of Siberian words with the meaning ‘1. Russian; 2. monster’ or, sometimes, ‘1. monster; 2. Russian’ (Janhunen 1997).
Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brb.</td>
<td>Baraba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čag.</td>
<td>Chagatay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leb.</td>
<td>Lebéd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kor.</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma.</td>
<td>Manchurian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Mongolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan.</td>
<td>Nanay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyr.</td>
<td>Oyrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.</td>
<td>Salar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel.</td>
<td>Teleut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkc.</td>
<td>Türkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tksh.</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyg.</td>
<td>Uygur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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