MAREK STACHOWSKI

KOREAN-TURKIC STUDIES

I. The $š \sim l$ alternation

1

One of the most intriguing puzzles in the Kor. historical phonology is that MNKor. words whose PA etyma had a $*l_2$ show l whereas their older, i.e. OKor. counterparts have, in the same position, a Chin. phonogram being "an orthographic device for writing s or $š$" (Miller 1991, p. 181; since the s pronunciation scarcely seems to be possible, we write $š$ alone in what follows). If we were actually dealing with a phonetic change here, its notation would look somewhat surprising: PA $*l_2$ > OKor. $š$ > MNKor. l. It is quite clear that such a zigzag development arouses astonishment and interest.

R. A. Miller tried to solve the problem by assuming a Tung. influence and a subsequent "re-Altaicization" of the OKor. pronunciation: "[...] the Old Korean sibilant s or $š$ became /l/, reverting to a form similar in manner of articulation to the original Altaic $*l_2$ whence it derived. This postulated re-Altaicization must have been the result of contact with Tungusic languages to the north" (Miller 1991, p. 182). The solution does not, however, appear fully convincing and this is why we would like to present another interpretation of the data.

2

The starting point for us is the observation that we also have some confused notations in OTkc., e.g. the use of the $<s^2>$ and $<š>$ runes with the phonetic value of l. At the same time, everything indicates that the $<š>$ rune was a late Tkc. innovation, as well as that it was created by adding a special diacritical mark to the $<l^2>$

rune. It was the same mark which, some time earlier, has been used to create a new <ń> rune, based on <n>, i.e. <n> + diacritical mark = <ń>. Hence it is fully legitimate to say that the mark used in OTkc. was a palatalization mark, and thus <š> in reality = l_2 = [l']. In other words: what we today read (in accordance with all the non-Chuv. Tkc. languages) as š, was in actual fact read [l'] in the OTkc. time (for further details see Stachowski 1999, passim), but see § 4, too.

3

Now, our thesis is that the existence of OKor. š in opposition to MNKor. l is in reality more a graphic problem than a phonetic one, as well as that the problem can be (successfully, as we hope) solved on the analogy of the situation in OTkc., as sketched above.

An interesting fact that makes the analogy all the more possible is that the OTkc. and the OKor. periods cover approximately the same space of time, viz. the period from the 7th till the 10th century (neither Turkologists nor Koreanists are fully agreed about dating the end of the period in question; for OTkc. cf. Poppe 1965, p. 67, § 1.344 [10th c.] vs. Róna-Tas 1991, p. 29, 30 [13th c.]; for OKor. see Lee 1977, p. 65sq. [10th c.] vs. R. Kono, cited in Poppe 1965, p. 75 [the middle of the 15th c.]; anyway, since nobody denies that the period of the 7th-10th c. belongs to the OTkc. resp. OKor. epoch, the problem need concern us no further).

4

In the history of Altaistics two different phonetic values were supposed to be represented by the letter $*l_2$ which nowadays is the most usual transcriptional symbol of the consonant out of which the non-Chuv. Tkc. š developed. Whereas G. J. Ramstedt reconstructed it as a palatal [l'], N. Poppe believed instead that it rather was "ein spirantisches, stimmloses l (ähnlich dem ostjakischen λ)", spelled also ľ (Ramstedt 1957, p. 103; Poppe 1927, p. 110; VGAS 76). The analysis of the OTkc. runic and phonological systems (š [< l'] written as <l²> + palatalization mark) indicated toward Ramstedt's [l'] as the actual phonetic value of $*l_2$.

Now, the situation becomes somewhat more complex (however, for a moment only) if we try to maintain that it was exactly the same sound which, in OKor., was written as š. Really, it cannot readily be accepted that a nation decided to use <š> in order to write [l'].

But another proposal of phonetic sounding the PA l_2 was Poppe's voiceless spirant [λ]. It occurs in Ost., strictly speaking in some Ost. dialects, whereas other dialects have a usual l (or t) at this position (Honti 1988, p. 172).

Moreover, the Ost. [λ] has also a palatal variant: [λ'], which was, to the best of my knowledge, never metioned by Poppe. And it is exactly this consonant that seems to be the best solution to the problem. The phonetic scenario could thus be as follows:

[4a]   The Altaic proto-language had two l-type consonants: a l and a λ', the difference being of a double nature: spirantic and palatal pronunciation of λ'.

[4b]   In the OTkc. runic script a special rune, based on the <l²> rune, was introduced in order to mark λ'.

[4c]   At approximately the same time, OKor. authors thought of using the Chin. phonogram for š in order to mark λ'.

[4d]   In the Tkc. languages (apart from the Chuv.) λ' > š, and this is why Turkologists used to read the new, <l²> based rune as š.

[4e]   In MNKor. λ' > l and this is why a discrepancy in the phonetic interpretation of OKor. and MNKor. words came into being.

5

The most important advantage of the interpretation presented above is [5.1] that the parallel phonetic development and the parallel spelling problems of OTkc. and OKor. cannot possibly be viewed as results of a mutual influence, if only because of the geographical distance between the OTkc. and the OKor. linguistic area. Another important moment is [5.2] that in this way, a Kor. linguistic and orthographical phenomenon could be explained on the analogy of its Tkc. counterpart, i.e. by means of the Altaistic perspective. Still another essential point is [5.3] that asterisks before λ' can now be omitted for, in the event, this consonant is attested both in OTkc. and OKor.

Of less importance is another advantage which mainly concerns more or less subsidiary, technical elements of Altaistics:

[5.4] the acceptance of λ' suggested by the Korean data renders the reconciliation between Ramstedt's l' and Poppe's λ possible and understandable.

6

As far as the chronology is concerned one may infer from what has been hitherto said that the λ' > Tkc. š change called sigmatism occurred as a matter of fact later than it was generally supposed, i.e. in the 7th/8th c. it was not yet completed. In consequence, the existence of λ' words in a Tkc. source or language can no longer be readily used as a decisive argument for the Bulg.-Chuv. character of the word. Presumably, the same holds also true for the $*r_2$ (? $*\acute{r}$) > Tkc. z change (the analysis of the <z> rune shows that it, too, was created according to the same principle as the <š> rune, see Stachowski 1998, passim).

Now, if P. B. Golden has well-advised objections to the suggestion that the Khaz. river name Οὐκρούχ = ukkẽr-uk < ükkẽr (= CTkc. ögüz 'river') is a word of Bulg. type because in that event one would rather expect the prothetic v- in this word, i.e. *vukkẽruk (Golden 1980, I, p. 253), we may now say that the initial segment of Khaz. Οὐκρούχ, i.e. Οὐκρ- actually corresponds to the CTkc. ögüz. and at the same time explain the lack of the prothetic v- by a non-Bulg. origin of the word, the latter having been primarily assumed on account of r (not z) in Οὐκρ-.

II. The S ~ t alternation

1

A well-known fact is that the CTkc. *s* sometimes corresponds to Yak. *t*. A few scholars tried to formulate a rule, explaining the phenomenon or at least rendering it predictable. The newest[*] study of the problem is Tekin 1976 where also a survey of older statements is offered. However, Tekin's solution cannot be accepted as final, either. The entire problem seems to be rather manifold and complex. Tekin's model is in principle correct and it probably covers a large number of involved examples. Nevertheless, some formations require further inspection. The rule in question can be summarized as follows (Tekin 1976, p. 113):

[1.1] PTkc. *-s(-) > Yak. -t(-)

[1.2] PTkc. *-č, *-š, *-z > Yak. -s

Some words and affixes, however, depart from the rule, in that they have final *-z or *-š corresponding not to Yak. -s, but to Yak. -t instead. According to Tekin 1976, p. 113sq., "[t]hese exceptions can be explained easily and satisfactorily." For instance, it is assumed that *-z in some cases had become voiceless and was then treated as *-s, i.e. changed > -t (e.g. CTkc. *otuz* 'thirty' = Yak. *otut* id.). At first sight, the solution appears quite reasonable. We are, however, somewhat sceptical about the fact that the unexpected early devoicing of z established by Tekin can always be brought into play whenever a Yak. word deviates from his own [1.2] rule.

Also examples for the medial -t- < *-s- are not all of the same character because Tekin's list contains both -t- < *-s- and -t- < *-sC-, *-Cs- words. In case of Yak. *itiär-* 'to warm' < *isgär-, Yak. *ytyar-* 'to lift, raise' < *asgar-, Yak. *sütük* 'thimble' < *jügsük (Tekin 1976, p. 111sq.), one has to reckon with the *-sg- > *-tg- and the *-gs- > *-gt- assimilation (i.e. *isgär- > *itgär- > Yak. *itiär-*; *asgar- > *atgar- > Yak. *ytyar-*; *jügsük > *jügtük > Yak. *sütük*) which distinguishes these words very much from examples like Yak. *kütär* 'water-rate; mole' < *küsär (ibid. 112). The conjecture about the influence of assimilatory tendencies is additionally supported by the Yak. verbal stem *syttä-* 'to put pillows' < *jastä- in which the consonant next to the *-s- did not disappear in modern Yak.; see also [2.11] and § 3.

The more one deals with the problem, the more one is convinced that a few different rules have to be established in order to explain all examples of the S ~ t alternation (the symbolic S standing for *s, z, š, č*). Also in the present study no synthetic solution can be offered. Our only aim is to present a somewhat unusual model which can be applied first of all in case of the š ~ t alternation.

---

[*] In the meantime, an article by G. D. S. Anderson (*On Proto-Yakut* *ϑ*, "Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher", Neue Folge 15 [1997/1998], p. 170-172) was also published, but it offers no deeper insight into the problem.

2

From what has been said so far it can be infered that of all the Trkc. languages Yak. is the only one of which the S ~ t alternation is typical. In reality, however, quite the opposite is true. Since we are not going to analyse all aspects of the problem, we would like to confine ourselves to giving only some examples involving also languages other than Yak. Most examples concern the auslaut:

[2.1] Uyg. *kät* ~ *käd* 'end' vs. Uyg. *käs-rä* 'jenseits' (Bang 1917, p. 7sq., fn. 3; Lewicki 1938, p. 5). – According to Bang (ibid.) the root was *kä ~ *ki, and thus: *käsrä* < *kä-si-rä [possessive Directive] 'zu seiner Rückseite'), *kät* < *kä + nominal suffix -t (cf. Tkc. *al-t* 'lower part', *üs-t* 'upper part', *ar-t* 'hinder part, back' and the deverbal Yak. *bult* 'bag; Jagdbeute' < *bul- 'to find, gain, obtain'). Practically, it would be possible to include this word under the rule we are going to propose for the š ~ t alternation (with the assumption of an early syncope: *käsirä > käsrä, before *si > š), see § 4 below, but this would then leave CTkc. *kärü* 'zurück' unexplained, so that Bang's etymology appears more reliable to us. – It would be very interesting to examine whether the root *kä ~ *ki 'rear' (see also Miller 1991, p. 197sq.) can be put together with *kö in PTkc. *köt (> Ott. *göt* 'bottom, backside; Hintern [vulg.]'; cf. Uzb. *kät* 'end; tail') > *kötgä > OYak. *ködī > NYak. *ködö* 'dick(bäuchig)' (in GJV 66, § 8.6b, *köt was viewed as a PTkc. root; it would, however, be equally imaginable that *köt is an old derivative [a plural formation?] < *kö). The vocalic difference between *kä ~ *ki on the one hand and *kö on the other still requires an explanation.

[2.2] Oyr. *künät* 'hot weather, heat' (Baskakov 1985, p. 172) = CTkc. *künäs* 'sun; heat'. – According to Berta 1997, p. 27: < *kün 'sun' + *jaš(y) *'shine, flash (?); heat (?)', so that the correspondence with our rule appears quite possible; see § 5.

[2.3] Tof. *sät* 'gum mastic' (Rassadin/Šibkeev 1990, p. 76) = CTkc. *sagyz* id.

[2.4] MTkc. (Kašgari) *kyz* 'rare, scarce' = Ott. *kyt* id. (Tekin 1976, p. 114 thinks of two different suffixes here).

[2.5] Lobnor-Uyg. *bot* 'grey' = CTkc. *boz* id. (ÈSTJa II 172).

Examples for an- and inlaut are less numerous:

[2.6] CTkc. *ton* 'dress, article of clothing, pair of drawers' = Yak. *son* 'outer garment, coat'.

[2.7] PTkc. *jōr- > Yak. *suor-* 'schneiden, abhobeln' = Oyr. *tōr-* 'schnitzeln' (GJV 81, § 16.2).

[2.8] CTkc. *üšī- ~ *üšü- 'to freeze, be cold' vs. Anat. *ütük ~ ütäk* 'sensitive to cold' (ÈSTJa I 644).

[2.9] Ott. *-msy ~ -mty-rak*, inferior intensification suffixes, as in *kyzyl-y-msy ~ kyzyl-y-mty-rak* 'reddish' (with the old Comparative suffix *-rak*).

In quite a few examples, the Yak. and the Dolg. possess both *s* and *t* variants (or else exclusively the *s* variant) which go back either to a *s* or to a *t* etymon:

[2.10] The Yak. intensifying reduplication suffix is *-bys* (not *-ys* [against GJa 159, § 250], e.g. Yak. *tymnỹ* 'cold' → *ty-bys-tymnỹ* 'very cold', *kurānax* 'dry' → *ku-bus-kurānax* 'quite dry'). – The same holds true for Dolg., but here, there are also *-byt* variants: *čä-bis-čälkä* 'perfectly white, snow-white' (Artem'ev 1992, p. 122) ~ *čä-bit-čälkä* id. (DW 73) < *čälkä* ~ *čälkä* 'white'.

[2.11] Dolg. *kurupasky* 'partridge' (FM) < Russ. *kuropatka* id. – If our earlier conjecture about the *-tk-* < *-sk-* [< *-sg-*] (as in Yak. *itiär-*, *ytyar-*, *sütük* in § 1; cf. also *öskür-* in § 3) is right, we may then think of a hypercorrect change of Russ. *-tk-*, perceived as resulting from the *-sk- > -tk-* assimilation, into the "original" (and hence "correct") *-sk-*. Uncertain, cf. Russ.dial. *kuropaška* id.

[2.12] Yak. *urtüt* ~ *urtüs* 'mercury, quicksilver' (Slepcov 1967, p. 110, 114) < Russ. *rtut'* id.

[2.13] Yak. *tümäči* ~ *sümäči* 'candle' (Slepcov 1967, p. 110) < Russ. *sveča* id.

[2.14] Yak. *sāppas* 'west wind' = Dolg. *häppat* 'West' < Russ. *zapad* 'West'.

The phenomenon of the Russ. *s > Tkc. *t* change is attested in other Tkc. languages, too, although far more scarcely:

[2.15] Tof. *ovjōt* 'oats' (Rassadin/Šibkeev 1990, p. 74) < Russ. *oves* id.

3

Strange as it may seem, the problem of the origin and the real nature of the *S ~ t* alternation has never been investigated at large. However, it is worth mentioning that at the beginning of this century, W. Bang assumed the *S ~ t* alternation already for the PTkc. period, so e.g. in case of the root reconstruction of Azerb. *öskür-*, Ott. *öksür-* 'to cough' = Kipč. *ötür-* id. = STkc. *jötkür-* ~ *jütkür-* id. (Bang 1919, p. 4, § 1b: "Neben **ös* scheint ein gleichwertiges **öt* gestanden zu haben, das durch *y-* Prothese zu **yöt* werden konnte"; just in these examples, however, a usual assimilation **-sk- > -tk-* seems to be a simpler solution) or else in the event of Yak. nomina agentis suffix *-čyt* < **-čy* + poss. *-si* (Bang 1921, p. 13, § 28). The topic has never been thoroughly discussed, but the phenomenon itself has been observed by different scholars. È. V. Sevortjan, for instance, accepted it likewise in his PTkc. reconstructions, e.g. in assuming **(j)āz- ~ **(j)āt-* as the original root of Tkc. *āz-* 'to lose one's way, get lost' (ESTJa I 95). In Miller/Naumann 1994, p. 77-79 the phenomenon is backdated into the PA epoch (cf. also Poppe 1927, p. 100: Kipč. *tatymal* 'bejahrter, erfahrener Mann' = Mo. *dasu-* 'sich gewöhnen').

4

Interestingly enough, Kor. has developed a morphonological pattern that can be used as an explanatory model for Tkc. languages. In NKor. there exist numerous words in *-t ~ -sV* whose Old and Early MKor. counterparts have had *-t* alone; but also words with the original *-s* undergo the same alternation model (e.g. NKor. *put*

~ *pusV* 'writing brush' < Chin. *pi̯ĕt* [Miller 1992, p. 233, 234; Miller/Naumann 1994, p. 76; cf. also Ramstedt 1939, p. 7f.]; NKor. *kat* ~ *kasV* 'hat' [Ramstedt 1939, p. 25, § 57]; NKor. *set* ~ *sesV* 'three' and *tasyt* ~ *tasysV* 'five' [ibid. 55]). Moreover, the model applies also to recent loanwords like NKor. *aut* ~ *ausV* < Engl. *out* (Miller 1992, p. 233).

Remarkably, the same rule can, as it seems, be also applied to the Yak. *-t* ~ CTkc. *-š* alternation:

[4.1] **/-s/ = **[-t] > Yak. *-t*

[4.2] **/-s/ + poss. suffix **/-i/ > **/-si/ = **[-śi] > CTkc. *-š* (cf. also Chuv. and Mo. **si > š*, Ramstedt 1957, p. 69).

Examples:

[4.3a] the Past Participle suffix **/-mys/ = **[-myt] > Yak. *-byt*; as to **m > b*, also this problem deserves more attention and a synthetic study; for our purpose, it is enough to say that the suffix initial Tkc. *m-* = Yak. *b-* = STkc. *b-* ~ *v-* correspondence is regular and well-attested.

[4.3b] **/-mys/ + 3.sg. possessive suffix **/-i/ > **/-mysi/ = **[-myśi] > CTkc. *-myš*.

[4.4a] **/ulus/ = **[ulut] > Yak. *ulut* 'people, nation'.

[4.4b] **/ulus/ + 3.sg. possessive suffix **/-i/ > **/ulusi/ = **[uluśi] > CTkc. *uluš* 'id.; settlement, town'.

In both examples the added *-i* can be reasonably interpreted as the 3.sg. possessive suffix. This would at the same time explain, why Yak. *-t* often corresponds to CTkc. *-s* (not *-š*), viz. for the evolving of *-š < */-si/ = **[-śi], the lexicalization of the 3.sg. possessive formation of the given substantive was absolutely necessary which is, as everybody knows, a sporadic and irregular phenomenon.

Probably, the pronunciation **[-myśi] was not yet totally obsolete in the OTkc. period. This seems to be suggested by records with the <-ms²> runic sequence. I myself thought until now that they should be read as [-myś] or simply [-myš]; in the latter case, the writing <-ms²> could be interpreted as historical spelling, invented originally for the pronunciation like **[-myś] or even **[-myśi] (for this latter, the spelling **<-ms²i> seems, however, more realistic) and left without modifications after the real pronunciation had changed into [-myš]. In the present situation I can only quote my earlier positive opinion of R. Giraud's conception: "Giraud IBT [= Giraud 1961] 47f. hat vermutlich vollkommen recht, wenn er in bezug auf die Schreibung <-ms²> von einer »graphie traditionelle« spricht" (Stachowski 1998, § 4). One cannot help admiring Giraud's knowledge and intuition.

In the light of what has been said until now it becomes still more understandable why it was precisely the <s²> rune that was used to write this suffix and that, against the general opinion, its use has in reality "nichts mit der Qualität des vorangehenden Vokals zu tun" (ibid.).

5

Now, let us return to the [2.2] example: Oyr. *künät* 'hot weather' < **kün jaš(y)*. The use or' lack of the 3.sg. possessive suffix **-i ~ *-y* seems to have been subject to different rules in different periods. Be that as it may, its use was in any case more restricted in the OTkc. than it is today. Also Berta 1997, p. 27 leaves the question of the possessive suffix open. Hence we think of two interrelated etyma to explain the *t ~ š* variants in Tkc. (which, however, compels us to accept **jas*, not **jaš*, as the PA reconstruct of the word for 'shine, flash'):

[5.1] PA **kün* 'sun' (GJV 132) + **jas* 'light' > **künjäs* > **künäs* > **/künäs/* = **[künät]* > Oyr. *künät* 'hot weather, heat'.

[5.2] PA **kün* + **jas* + 3.sg. poss.suff **-i* > **/künjäsi/* = **[künäši]* > **[künäš]* > modern Tkc. languages: *künäš ~ künäš ~ küjäš* etc.

6

We are perfectly aware of the fact that the explanation proposed above does not solve the entire *S ~ t* alternation problem in Turkology. On the other hand, however, our proposal is, as we hope, a step forward on the way toward a better understanding of the reasons for and the phonological mechanism of the *S ~ t* alternation in general. Even if the Kor. alternation is a relatively young (Late MKor.) phenomenon and the Trkc. alternation a relatively old one, the Kor. model may serve, as we think, as a possible conception of how sound rules may possibly have worked in Altaic languages.

It seems in any case evident that the problem cannot be finally solved by means of one (and universal) rule only.

7

The acceptance of ** λ'* seems to require a new inspection of old Altaistic equations and, in the first place, that of their reconstructs. Can, for instance, the *-lš-* cluster in OKor. †*mu'alši* 'shaman' and the *-lč-* cluster in its Hung. (< Bulg.) reflex <bölcs> *bölč* 'sorcerer; wise man' (Miller 1996, p. 162sq.) be interpreted as a graphic rendering (*mu'alši*) and a phonetic development (*bölč*) of the original PA spirantic **λ'?* What is the real relation between the **λ'* and the **-lC-* clusters that has been postulated many times in literature since Pritsak's well-known article?

8

In the light of what has been suggested so far, a differentiation between the Tkc. participle suffix *-myš* and the derivational nominal suffix *-myš* appears inevitable. The identification of *jämiš* 'fruit; food' = Chuv. *šimёš* id. (Egorov 1964, p. 214; Fedotov 1992, p. 115; the word is missing from Fedotov 1996) as a substantivized participle (< *jä-* 'to eat') with the original meaning 'something, anything that one eats, or that is eaten' (Miller 1981, p. 329) encounters serious difficulties.

First of all, *-myš* formations are active past participles, so that *jämiš* can only mean 'someone who has eaten [something]', the Tkc. passive present participles being *jä-n-än* (< *jä-n-* 'to be eaten') '[something] that is being eaten' (sometimes

also: 'that has been eaten') and more generally *jä-n-ir* '[someting] that [normally] is eaten'.

Another problem is of phonetic nature. The comparison of *jämiš* with its Hung. reflex *gyümölcs* points to a proto-form like **jämiλ'* (with **λ'* >> Hung. *lč*; for older reconstructions cf. Fedotov 1992, p. 115; Ceylan 1997, p. 138; Ligeti 1986, p. 17), so that we have to distinguish between:

[8.1] the participle suffix **-mys* (> Yak. *-byt*) ~ **-mys-i* (> CTkc. *-myš*) and

[8.2] the derivational nominal suffix **myλ'* > CTkc. *-myš* (missing from Yak.).

The same [8.2] suffix appears maybe also in CTkc. *altmyš* 'sixty' = Chuv. *utmäl* id. (Levitskaja 1976, p. 44) and CTkc. *jätmiš* 'seventy' = Chuv. *šitmёl* id. (Levitskaja 1976, p. 44), though, here, the derivational base is nominal (CTkc. *alty* 'six', *jäti* 'seven'). Both numerals are listed under the denominal nominal suffix *-myš* in Clauson 1972, p. xlii ("a common Conjugational [!] Suff."), where, the suffix is, as can be seen, identified with the participle suffix *-myš*, despite the fact that *altmyš* and *jätmiš* are no participles and that their base is not a verbal one.

9

Above, two parallels between Kor. and Tkc. were presented. However, both languages seem to show some other similarities, as well. An example which still needs further investigation is the NKor. initial affricate *ⁿd-* (or *ⁿl-?*, see Ramstedt 1939, p. 12, § 28) which can perhaps be compared with Tkc. word pairs like CTkc. *nä* 'what?' ~ **to* (in **to* + intensifier **ok* > **tök* > Yak. *tuox* id.; for another explanation for *nä* and **to* see Ramstedt 1922-23, p. 34, repeated in Ramstedt 1952, p. 77, but omitted in VGAS 32 s.v. *jayun*) that suggest a PA **ⁿt-* or **ⁿd-* (this would thus be a good parallel to **ᵐb-* > CTkc. *m- ~ b-*, see Ramstedt 1957, p. 74). To investigate all Kor.-Tkc. parallels of this sort (of course, under consideration of their varying importance because e.g. the resemblance of the *s ~ h* alternation in Kor. and in Yak. appears to be a mere coincidence) seems to be one of the most interesting tasks in Alatistic researches nowadays.

Abbreviations

Anat. = Anatolian; Azerb. = Azerbaijani; Bulg. = Bulgar-Turkic; Chin. = Chinese; Chuv. = Chuvash; CTkc. = Common Turkic [= non-Chuvash Turkic]; dial. = dialect(al); Dolg. = Dolgan; Engl. = English; Hung. = Hungarian; Khaz. = Khazar; Kipč. = Kipchak; Kor. = Korean; MKor. = Middle Korean; MNKor. = Middle and New Korean; Mo. = Mongolian; MTkc. = Middle Turkic; NKor. = New Korean; NYak. = New Yakut; OKor. = Old Korean; Ost. = Ostyak; OTkc. = Old Turkic; Ott. = Ottoman ~ Turkish; OYak. = Old Yakut; Oyr. = Oyrot; PA = Proto-Altaic; PTkc. = Proto-Turkic; Russ. = Russian; STkc. = Siberian Turkic; Tkc. = Turkic; Tof. = Tofalar; Tung. = Tungusic; Uzb. = Uzbek; Uyg. = Uygur; Yak. = Yakut.

Literature

DW   = Stachowski M., *Dolganischer Wortschatz*, Kraków 1993.

ÈSTJa   = Sevortjan È. V., *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskich jazykov*, vol. I: Moskva 1974; vol. II: Moskva 1978.

FM   = Fieldwork materials of the present author.

GJa   = Ubrjatova E. I. et al. (ed.), *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Moskva 1982.

GJV   = Stachowski M., *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków 1993.

VGAS   = Poppe N., *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen*, Wiesbaden 1960.

Artem'ev N. M. 1992 – *Dolganskij. fol'klor*, [in:] *Fol'klor i ètnografija narodov Severa. Mežvuzovskij sbornik naučnych trudov*, ed. Ju. A. Sem, S.-Peterburg, 115-126.

Bang W. 1917 – *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen. Vorarbeiten zu einer vergleichenden Grammatik des Türkischen* (1. Mitteilung), "Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse" (Berlin) Jg. 1917, Nr. 6, 3-62.

Bang W. 1919 – *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen. Vorarbeiten zu einer vergleichenden Grammatik des Türkischen* (2. und 3. Mitteilung), "Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse" (Berlin) Jg. 1919, Nr. 5, 3-79.

Bang W. 1921 – *Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen. Vorarbeiten zu einer vergleichenden Grammatik des Türkischen* (4. Mitteilung), "Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse" (Berlin) Jg. 1921, Nr. 2, 3-26.

Baskakov N. A. 1985 – *Dialekt lebedinskich tatar-čalkancev (kuu-kiži). Grammatičeskij očerk, teksty, perevody, slovar'*, Moskva.

Berta Á. 1997 – *Künäš und quñaš*, "Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia", 2, 23-31.

Ceylan E. 1997 – *Çuvaşça çok zamanlı ses bilgisi*, Ankara.

Clauson G. 1972 – *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*, Oxford.

Egorov V. G. 1964 – *Ètimologičeskij slovar' čuvašskogo jazyka*, Čeboksary.

Fedotov M. R. 1992 – *Materialy k istoriko-ètimologičeskomu slovarju čuvašskogo jazyka*, Čeboksary.

Fedotov M. R. 1996 – *Ètimologičeskij slovar' čuvašskogo jazyka*, t. I-II, Čeboksary.

Giraud R. 1961 – *L'inscription de Baïn Tsokto*, Paris.

Golden P. B. 1980 – *Khazar studies. An historico-philological inquiry into the origins of the Khazars*, vol. I-II, Budapest.

Honti L. 1988 – *Die ob-ugrischen Sprachen*, [in:] *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences*, ed. D. Sinor, Leiden etc., 147-196.

Lee Ki-Moon 1977 – *Geschichte der koreanischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden.

Levitskaja L. S. 1976 – *Istoričeskaja morfologija čuvašskogo jazyka*, Moskva.

Lewicki M. 1938 – *Przyrostki przysłówkowe -ra ~ -rä, -ru ~ -rü, -rï ~ -ri w językach ałtajskich*, Wilno.

Ligeti L. 1986 – *A maygar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*, Budapest.

Miller R. A. 1981 – [Review of:] Ōno Susumu (ed.): *Nihongo no keitō* [= The genetic relationship of Japanese], [in:] "The Bulletin of the International Institute for Linguistic

Sciences (Kyoto Sangyo University)" 2/4 [= Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Genetic Relationships of the Japanese Language], 319-345.

Miller R. A. 1991 – *How many Verner's Laws does an Altaicist need?*, [in:] *Studies in the historical phonology of Asian languages*, ed. W. G. Boltz, M. C. Shapiro, Amsterdam, 176-204.

Miller R. A. 1992 – *Turkic qut, Korean kut: Problems of an Altaic comparison revisited*, [in:] *Altaic religious beliefs and practices* [= PIAC 33], ed. G. Bethlenfalvy et al., Budapest, 229-238.

Miller R. A. 1996 – *Trk. *l₂, *r₂ and Korean*, [in:] *Symbolae Turcologicae. Studies in honour of Lars Johanson*, ed. Á. Berta, B. Brendemoen, C. Schönig, Istanbul – Uppsala, 157-167.

Miller R. A., Naumann N. 1994 – *Altaische schamanistische Termini im Japanischen*, Hamburg.

Poppe N. 1927 – *Altaisch und Urtürkisch*, "Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher", 6, 94-121.

Poppe N. 1965 – *Introduction to Altaic linguistics*, Wiesbaden.

Ramstedt G. J. 1922-23 – *Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen*, "Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne", 38/1, 1-34.

Ramstedt G. J. 1939 – *A Korean grammar*, Helsinki.

Ramstedt G. J. 1952 – *Einführung in die altaische Sprachewissenschaft*, vol. II, Helsinki.

Ramstedt G. J. 1957 – *Einführung in die altaische Sprachewissenschaft*, vol. I, Helsinki.

Rassadin V. I., Šibkeev V. N. 1990 – *Syltysčyk. Kniga dlja čtenija v 1-m klasse tofalarskich škol*, Irkutsk.

Róna-Tas A. 1991 – *An introduction to Turkology*, Szeged.

Slepcov P. A. 1967 – *Russkie leksičeskie zaimstvovanija v jakutskom jazyke (dorevoljucionnyj period)*, Jakutsk.

Stachowski M. 1998 – *Zwei alttürkische Konsonantenwechsel (š ~ s, š ~ l), die Runik und die Altaistik*, [in:] *Bahşı Ögdisi. Festschrift für Klaus Röhrborn anläßlich seines 60. Geburtstags*, ed. J. P. Laut, M. Ölmez, Freiburg – Istanbul 1998, 391-399.

Tekin T. 1976 – *The representation of Proto-Turkic medial and final /s/ in Yakut*, "Central Asiatic Journal" 20 (1976), 110-114.