

UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLOŃSKI
INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL PHILOLOGY

presents a new series

STUDIA TURCOLOGICA CRACOVIENSIA

edited by Stanisław Stachowski

Vol. 1: [Collected Essays], Kraków 1995

Vol. 2: Stanisław STACHOWSKI, *Historisches Wörterbuch der Bildungen auf -ici // -ici im Osmanisch-Türkischen*, Kraków 1996

Vol. 3: Ewa SIEMIENIEC-GOŁAŚ, *The Formation of Substantives in XVIIth Century Ottoman-Turkish*, Kraków 1997

and

Vol. 4: Gundula SALK, Mambet TURDU, *The "Fu-Yu Gırgıs" According to the Present-Day Situation and the Legendary Past*, Kraków 1998, big8*, pp. 116 (+1), colour illustrations in the text. Paper. ISBN 83-7188-201-7.

EACH VOLUME USD 29.00 / DM 45.00

Available from:

Księgarnia Akademicka Sp. z o.o., ul. św. Anny 8, 31-008 Kraków, Poland

E-mail: ksakadem@adm.uj.edu.pl ;

Http://www.ch.edu.pl/ksiegarnia.html

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
VOL. 34 1998
PL ISSN 0015-5675

MAREK STACHOWSKI

A NOTE ON PROTO-TURKIC *Cč, *čC CLUSTERS AND PROTO-ALTAIC SOURCES OF š AND č IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

1. Talat Tekin is surely right when establishing at least three sources of š in modern Tkc. languages: (1) < *l' [> Chuv. l/]; (2) < *č [> Chuv. š]; (3) < *lč, *lč̣ [> Chuv. š] (Tekin 1969: 78)¹. Whereas (1) can now relatively easily be established by comparison with the Chuv. and Mo. counterparts of the respective Tkc. words, (2) and (3) cannot. Tekin 1969: 79 divides his examples into two groups: A (š < *č) and B (š < *lč, *lč̣). One cannot, however, immediately understand why Chuv. *anăș* 'sunset; west' = Tkc. *äniš* (~ *iniš*) 'going down' (ibid. 79) belongs to A, and Chuv. *šapăș-* 'to fight' = Tkc. *čapyš-* id. (ibid. 80) to B. It is a Mo. criterion that the division is based upon: if the Chuv. reciprocal suffix -š- has its counterpart in Mo. -lčä-, then Chuv. *šapăș-* belongs, of course, to B. It is evident that this criterion cannot be applied to substantives, so that Chuv. *anăș* had to be placed in group A but the fact alone that Chuv. *anăș* has no reciprocal suffix is

actually not sufficient to exclude the word from group B (cf. the **lč* possibility: *āniš* < **ānilč*, see § 3). Two problems arise in this context: (1) the lack of an inner-Tkc. criterion; (2) an inconsistent use made of reconstructed Mo.-Tkc. proto-forms. Let us begin our explanations with the latter problem.

2. Chuv. *kěšen-* 'to neigh' = Tkc. *kišnā-* id. can be traced back to PT **kičān(-ā)-*, for which, by comparison with Mo. *in-kilča-ka-* id. (Tekin 1969: 80, where the initial *in-*, however, is not explained), a still older form can be reconstructed: **kilčānā-* (ibid.; we would rather prefer: **kilčānā-*). Another example is Tkc. *kašy-* 'to scratch' ~ Chuv. *xyš-* id. = Mo. *kalči-* 'to remove unevenness, to scrape off' (ibid. 79).

Now, OT *kabyš-* 'to come together, to assemble' < **kab-y-č-* (Tekin 1989: 342) can equally well be compared with Mo. *kab-il-du-* 'to come close, to approach' and, then, derived from **kabyłčā-* < **kab-yl-č* < **kab-yl-* (as to Mo. *-l-du-* see Poppe 1972: 134–136; Ramstedt 1952: 166). If so, OT *kabyš-* belongs to group B, rather than to A (against Tekin 1989: 342: < **kab-y-č-*)². Exactly this is the case also with Tkc. *uruš-* 'kämpfen' ~ Chuv. *vārs-* id. < **urulč-*, cf. Mo. *uruldu-* 'wetteifern' (Poppe 1974: 140), the only difference being that no Chuv. *ś* counterpart of OT *kabyš-* can be shown which is, however, no sufficient counterargument against a **lč* etymon of OT *kabyš-*.

3. The most problematic case is that of an inner-Tkc. criterion. However, assimilations in consonant clusters (chiefly in Chuv. and Yak.) can be used, at least in some words, as valuable hints.

Let us at first examine the phonetic development of two PT words in VBulg. One of them is PT **ič-i-nā* which became first **ičnā* and then VBulg. *išnā* (> Chuv. *āšne* 'in, within'), i.e. PT **čn* > VBulg. *šn* (Tekin 1989: 343), see below [1]. Another word is VBulg. *bačna* 'at the beginning' which was traced back to **bačina* by the same author (Tekin 1975: 8). This, however, cannot possibly be correct for the reconstruction contradicts the well founded **čn* > *šn* change. The only reasonable solution to the contradiction seems to be the assumption that the etymon was not **bačina* but **balčina* rather, i.e. PT **balč-i-n-a* or **balč-y-n-a* (< PT **balč(V)* > Chuv. *puś* 'head')³ > **balčna* > VBulg. *bačna*⁴. Thus:

[1] PT **-Včn-* > VBulg. *-Všn-*

[2] PT **-lčVn-* > **-lčn-* > VBulg. *-lčn-*.

The fact that **balč* remained as *bač* in *bačna* shows unequivocally that the word **ba(l)čna* was lexicalized as an adverb before **balč* > *puś*.

Other examples of two different clusters which point to different etyma can be found in Yak. Reliable cognates in other Tkc. languages permit us to reconstruct the original form of Yak. *kymñy* 'whip' as **kamčyg* (Stachowski 1993: § 27.2), e.g. PT **-mč-* > Yak. *-mñ-* (see below [3]). This process runs then parallel to the development of PT **-nč-* and **-nğ-* which

become *-nñ-* (sometimes *>* or *~ -ñ-*) in Yak., as in Yak. *sinñigās* 'dünn' < **jinčikāč* (Stachowski 1995: 178); Yak. *u(n)ñuj-* 'herabhängen' < Mo. *unği-* id. (Kałużyński 1961: 64; D'jačkovskij 1977: 60); see below [4].

In this situation we cannot accept a **mč* reconstruction of Yak. *symnaṛas* 'soft' (= Chuv. *šamša ~ šemše* id.), i.e. < PT **jymčak-ač* < **jym(y)čak* > Tkc. *jym(y)šak* id. (Tekin 1969: 79; 1989: 344f.) because of Yak. *-mn-* (not *-mñ-*, see below [3]). We would instead be inclined to assume, by analogy with **jāmilč* > Chuv. *šimes* 'food; fruit' (as to this word, see now e.g. Ceylan 1997: 138), a PT form **jymyš* < **jym-ylč* (< *√*jym* > Yak. *sym* 'der weiche Teil, Krume', Stachowski 1995: 177), i.e. Yak. *symnaṛas* 'soft' < PT **jym(y)lčakač* < **jymylč* (> Tkc. **jymyš*) < *√*jym*. In view of Chuv. dial. *šamša* (~ lit. *šemše*) 'soft' < **jym-ylč-a* (~ **jim-ilč-ä*), we may accept Chuv. *-mš-* as a reflex of PT **-m(V)lč-*. Thus:

[3] PT **-mč-* > Yak. *-mñ-*

[4] PT **-nč-*, **-nğ-* > Yak. *-nñ-* (sometimes *>* *-ñ-*)

[5] PT **-m(V)lč-* > Chuv. *-mš-* ~ Yak. *-mn-* ~ Tkc. *-mš-*.

The Chuv. (*-mš-*) and Tkc. (*-mš-*) reflexes seem to argue against a Chuv.-Yak. community, postulated many years ago by Gy. Németh (1914: § 8; cf. also Stachowski 1993: § 1.9b); otherwise, there are also examples in favour of Németh's hypothesis.

4. For the Yak. reflex *-mn-* the following changes could be assumed: PT **-m(V)lč-* > Proto-Yak. **-mnč-* > ? **-mnñ-* (cf. [4] above) > Yak. *-mn-*. The difference in the development of PT **-m(V)lč-* between Chuv. and Tkc. on the one hand and Yak. on the other should be noticed as particularly striking here. We would therefore tend to differentiate the change [5] chronologically as follows:

[6] EPT (or PA ?) **-m(V)lti-* (> Proto-Yak. **-mnti-* > **-mnñ-* > Modern Yak. *-mn-*)
> LPT **-m(V)lč-* > Chuv. *-mš-* ~ Tkc. *-mš-*.

Theoretically, the process in [4] could be altered along the same lines as follows: PT **-nti-* (> Proto-Yak. **-nni-* > Modern Yak. *-nñ-*) > Tkc. *-nč-*. However, Yak. *u(n)ñuj-* < Mo. *unği-* (see above) evidently displays the *-nğ-* > Yak. *-nñ-* change, and it seems to us reasonable to accept both **-nti-* and **-nč-* as possible sources of Yak. *-nñ-*. Should an intrinsic criterion for distinguishing **-nti-* > *-nñ-* and **-nč-* > *-nñ-* words from one other be found one day, we would be able to identify the former as an older stratum than the latter:

[7a] EPT (or PA ?) **-nti-* (> Proto-Yak. **-nni-*) > LPT **-nč-* (→ Proto-Yak. **-nč-*)
> Tkc. *-nč-*

[7b] Proto-Yak. **-nni-*, **-nč-* > Modern Yak. *-nñ-*

In this case, both the genuine Yak. phonetic development (EPT [or PA ?] > Proto-Yak.) and the inner-Tkc. borrowing process (LPT → Proto-Yak.) were at issue.

One of the problems which still remain unclear is whether *š too can be a source of the modern Tkc. š (as, maybe, in Tkc. *iš-bu* ~ *oš-bu* = Yak. *subu* 'exactly this').

Notes

1. Cf. also Tkc. *š* < **l(V)b*, as in Tkc. *kašuk* 'spoon' ~ Mo. *kalbaga* [~ *kalbuga*] id. (Ramstedt 1952: 123), Tkc. *eš* 'dig, row' ~ Mo. *selbi-* 'to row a boat' (Street 1980: 296), Tksh. *loš* 'dark, gloomy' [< **još*] ~ Tg. *dolbo* 'at night' (Ölmez 1991: 182).
2. Street 1985: 638, fn. 8 admits also the possibility of **lt/di* > Tkc. *š*, so that Tkc. *kabyš-* could thus go back directly to **kabyldu-* ~ **kabylti* which corresponds fairly well with O. Pritsak's (1964: 344) **lti* > *š* explanation. Cf. note 3.
3. Cf. Street 1985: 647, fn. 56: «pA [= proto-Altaic] **balčV* or more probably **baldī* 'head'»; the form **baldī* (= **baldy*) which is clearly older than **balčV* should rather be reconstructed in a non-harmonic way, i.e. **baldi* (or **balti*) because it was *i* rather than *y* [= *i*] which caused

the palatalization of **t/d*. On **balčV* see also Miller 1984: 159f. and Stachowski 1996: 92f. On **balč* < **bal+ti* see now Miller 1996: 164f. In this context, it seems possible that PA **byč-* 'to cook, boil' (> Tkc. *byš-* ~ *biš-* id., Chuv. *piš-* id. [e.g. Tekin 1969: 79]) can in view of Middle Kor. *pti-* id. (> Modern Kor. *čči-* id. [e.g. Lee 1977: 238]) :: preOJ *puti* 'kitchens (esp. of a monastic building-complex)' (Miller 1989: 249, Nr. 14) be traced back to still an older form like **byti-*. On *ti* > *č* in 17th century Kor. see Lee 1977: 236f. Cf. also note 2.

4. Consequently, there is no need to assume a form like **bač* (Nauta 1985: 126) in order to explain *bačna*.

Abbreviations

Chuv. = Chuvash; **dial.** = dialectal; **EPT** = Early Proto-Turkic; **Kor.** = Korean; **lit.** = literary; **LPT** = Late Proto-Turkic; **Mo.** = Mongolian; **OJ** = Old Japanese; **OT** = Old Turkic; **PA** = Proto-Altaic; **PT** = Proto-Turkic; **Tg.** = Tungus; **Tkc.** = Turkic; **Tksh.** = Modern Turkish; **VBulg.** = Volga-Bulgarian; **Yak.** = Yakut; **Yen.** = Yenisseian.

References

- Ceylan 1997 = Ceylan, E.: *Çuvaşça çok zamanlı ses bilgisi*, Ankara.
- D'jačkovskij 1977 = D'jačkovskij, N. D.: *Zvukovoj stroj jakutskogo jazyka*, č. II: *Konsonantizm*, Jakutsk.
- Kałużyński 1961 = Kałużyński, S.: *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*, Warszawa.
- Lee 1977 = Lee, Ki-Moon: *Geschichte der koreanischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden.
- Miller 1984 = Miller, R. A.: Korean and Altaic. – *Journal of Korean Studies* 5: 143–171.
- Miller 1989 = Miller, R. A.: Innovation and adaptation in a symbolic system: Altaic elements in the original language of Japanese Buddhism. – Sagaster, K. / Eimer, H. (eds): *Religious and lay symbolism in the Altaic world and other papers* (PIAC 27), Wiesbaden: 239–256.
- Miller 1996 = Miller, R. A.: Trk. $*l_2$, $*r_2$ and Korean. – Berta, Á. / Brendemoen, B. / Schö-nig, C. (eds): *Symbolae Turcologicae* [Festschrift L. Johanson], İstanbul: 157–167.
- Nauta 1985 = Nauta, A. H.: Lambdazismus im Tschuwassischen: Gtu. $\check{s}$ = Tschuw. / und $\acute{s}$. –

- Jarring, G. / Rosén, S. (eds): *Altaistic studies* (PIAC 25), Stockholm: 123–144.
- Németh 1914 = Németh, Gy.: Az ősjakut hangtan alapjai. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 43: 3–81.
- Ölmez 1991 = Ölmez, M.: Ana Altayca Sözbaşı $*d-$. – *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* [1]: 167–190.
- Poppe 1972 = Poppe, N.: Über einige Verbstammbildungssuffixe in den altaischen Sprachen. – *Orientalia Suecana* 21: 119–141.
- Poppe 1974 = Poppe, N.: Zur Stellung des Tschuwassischen. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 18: 135–147.
- Pritsak 1964 = Pritsak, O.: Der "Rhotazismus" und "Lambdazismus". – *Ural-altaische Jahrbücher* 35: 337–349.
- Ramstedt 1952 = Ramstedt, G. J.: *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. II: *Formenlehre*, Helsinki.
- Stachowski 1993 = Stachowski, M.: *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków.
- Stachowski 1995 = Stachowski, M.: Urtürkisch $*m\check{c}$, $*n\check{c}$ und das jakutische Ordinalsuffix. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 49/2 [Festschrift E. Tryjarski]: 177–183.

- Stachowski 1996 = Stachowski, M.: Über einige altaische Lehnwörter in den Jenissej-Sprachen. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 1: 91–115.
- Street 1980 = Street, J. C.: Proto-Altaic **-l(V)b-* > Turkic *š*. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 24: 285–303.
- Street 1985 = Street, J. C.: Japanese reflexes of the Proto-Altaic lateral. – *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105/4: 637–651.
- Tekin 1969 = Tekin, T.: Zetacism and Sigmatisation in Proto-Turkic. – *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hung.* 22/1: 51–80.
- Tekin 1975 = Tekin, T.: On Volga-Bulgarian *bačna*. – *PIAC Newsletter* 10: 8.
- Tekin 1989 = Tekin, T.: Inner-Turkic evidence for the correspondence Turkic /š/, Chuvash /ś/ and Mongolian /č/. – Heissig, W. / Sagaster, K. (eds): *Gedanke und Wirkung* [Festschrift N. Poppe], Wiesbaden: 341–345.

MAREK STACHOWSKI

A MINIMAL PROBABILISTIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL OF PROTO-TURKIC E-TYPE VOWELS

1. As far as *E*-type vowels in Tkc. languages are concerned, one has to distinguish between two groups of languages: (a) those with an open *ä* alone and (b) those with an open *ä* and some other *E*-type vowel(s). It is not always possible to establish precisely how many *E*-type vowels in group (b) possess the status of a phoneme, the main reason for which being the often inaccurate description of the Tkc. vowel systems we have at our disposal. In any case, there can be no doubt that some Tkc. languages (as e.g. Kirg. and Tuv.) have only one *E*-type phoneme (i.e. an open *ä*) while others have additionally another phonemic *E* vowel, namely a closed *e*.

The problem of one or more than one *E*-type vowels is one of the oldest questions of Turkic linguistics. It was already Vilhelm Thomsen (1916: *passim*) who first assumed the existence of *e*, as opposed to *ä*, in Orkhon Turkic, and then was able to prove his assumption after having identified a Yenissei Turkic rune, which was missing from the Orkhon runic alpha-