

ISSN 1226-4490

*International  
Journal of  
Central  
Asian Studies*

Volume 2 1997

**Editor in Chief  
Choi Han-Woo**

**The International Association of Central Asian Studies  
Institute of Asian Culture and Development**

# On Some Evidences of the affinity of Turkic and Korean

by  
Choi Han-Woo  
Hoseo University

In the past century, there have been a lot of endeavor to find common elements or common glossaries among Altaic languages, i.e., Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus, and Korean. In addition to the findings of both Ramstedt and Poppe, followers such as Aalto, Räsänen, Menges, Miller, etc found more additional evidences and by this way strengthened the Altaic theory. During the last two decades, researchers contented merely to cite or repeat the evidences which had been founded by these senior scholars in the past, rather than to propose new evidences in discussions of the Altaic theory.

In this circumstance, many scholars tend to spend their times in interpreting these evidences in relation with the Altaic theory or Altaic affinity, while some scholars are engaged in reviewing methodologies applied until now.

However, in order to come to any conclusion regarding the problem of the affinity of Altaic languages, we need not only to exert more intensive researches of individual languages, but also continue to pursue comparative studies concentrating on finding cognates or common elements among the related languages.

Recently I wrote several articles in which suffixes or endings such as case forms, denominal suffixes, deverbal suffixes and plural suffixes of Korean and Altaic languages were compared. In these articles, many new evidences were presented, which not only increased the probability of the Altaic affinity of Korean but also strengthen the Altaic theory. In this article, I would like to present additional evidences to relate Korean with Turkic by comparing particles of Korean and Turkic.

## 1. Trk. äng // Ko. an (negative)

In Chuvash which is regarded as a descendant of the pre-Turkic, Volga Bulgarian, there is a particle *an* meaning negation. This particle is used only in imperative sentences: *an yula* "don't read!", *an yulär* "let's not read", *an yulätär* "let him not read", etc.

This particle is also found in the form of *äng* in the Kashgarli Mahmud's dictionary in the 12th century. According to the dictionary, the word *äng* meaning "no, not" was used in Oğuz dialect: *äng äng* "no!, no!" (MK I: ), *ang* "no" (MK32, Dankoff)

In Middle Korean, there are two forms, *ani* and *ani-* which are supposed to be derived from the morpheme *\*an* meaning negation. The former one *ani* meaning "no" which is an adverb is made of *\*an* and the denominal adverb suffix *-i*, an suffix rendering an adverb: *ani hä-* "not to do". The latter one *ani-* which is an adjective consists of *\*an* and the designative verb *i-* meaning "to be". This designative suffix *i-* is one and the same as the Turkic verb *i-* "to be". On the other hand, in both Modern Korean and dialects the original form *an* is widely used; *an ka-* "not to go", *an ka-ni?* "not to go?"

## 2. Trk. yu // Ko. ko (interrogative)

In Orkhon Turkic there is an interrogative particle *yu ~ gü*. This particle is used only two times in the Orkhon inscriptions: *azu bu sabimda igid bar yu* "or, is there any falsehood in these words of mine?" (KT S 10), *bödkä körügmä bäglär gü yangiltači siz* "you lords, you who have so far been obedient to the throne, are you going to betray?" (KT S 11). As is seen in these examples, the particle *yu* has an emphatical aspect of interrogation. In this respect there is a difference between this particle and the other interrogative particle *mu ~ mü* which was widely used in the ancient Turkic.

This Turkic particle probably has the same origin of the Korean word *ko*. In Korean there are two interrogative particles *ko* and *ka* which are similar to each other in terms of both its form and function. However, they are slightly different in use; The particle *ko* is always used together

with interrogative pronouns such as  $\text{ənĩ}$  "which",  $\text{nugu}$  "who",  $\text{muəs}$  "what", etc., while the particle  $\text{ka}$  is alone used without any interrogative pronoun.

### 3. Trk. $\text{gu}$ / Ko. $\text{ku}$ (interrogative)

In Ancient Turkic the interrogative pronoun  $\text{nägü}$  appears. This consists of two morphemes,  $\text{nä}$  and  $\text{gü}$ . The former one meaning "what" is an interrogative pronoun which is very common in both historical and modern Turkic languages. The latter one is used here in the function of an denominal noun suffix. This suffix occurs in the interrogative suffix  $\text{nägül}$  "how". This consists of three different morphemes,  $\text{nä}$ ,  $\text{gü}$ , and  $\text{l}$ . The suffix  $-\text{l}$  which is never found in other places, is an denominal noun suffix. The morpheme  $\text{gü}$  also occurs in the word  $\text{nägülük}$  "how, why" which consists of three morphemes,  $\text{nä}$ ,  $\text{gü}$ , and  $\text{lük}$ . The morpheme  $-\text{lük}$  is a very productive denominal noun suffix in Turkic languages. Besides these, another interrogative suffix  $\text{nägüdä}$  "why" appears in an Uygur script. In the word,  $-\text{dä}$  is locative-ablative suffix. This is compared to the word  $\text{nädä}$  in the same meaning.

On the other hand, this morpheme appears too in Mongolian in the form of  $\text{gün}$ , in the pronouns such as  $\text{kegün}$  "who"  $\langle *ke + gün$ ,  $\text{yagun}$  "what"  $\langle *ya + gün$ ,  $\text{kegüme}$  "anything"  $\langle *ke + gün + me$ . In Buriat, there is the word  $\text{yüme}$  meaning "thing". This came out from the process of development,  $\text{yüme} \langle *ye + gü + me \langle *ye + gün + me$ .

From the examples in Turkic, we can see the fact that the morpheme  $\text{gü}$  is always used with the interrogative pronoun  $\text{nä}$  meaning "what". In Mongolian, the variant form of  $\text{gü}$  also is always used with pronoun or the like. This fact gives us a hint that the morpheme  $\text{gü}$  has something with interrogatory form of word. In my opinion, this suffix is originally developed from the Altaic interrogative particle  $*gu \sim ku$ .

From this point of view, the Korean pronoun  $\text{nuku}$  "who" is very interesting. This consists of two morphemes, the interrogative pronoun  $\text{nu}$  "who" and  $\text{ku}$ . In this word, the morpheme  $\text{ku}$  is used as a denominal noun suffix. The morpheme  $\text{ku}$  which is unknown so far, in my opinion, is

one and the same as the Turkic suffix *gu*. Being originally an interrogative particle, it remains fossilized only in the pronoun *nuku*.

#### 4. Trk. *kök* // Ko. *kok* (intensive)

In the Orkhon inscription, there is *kök* which is the particle expressing intensiveness: *ol bizni ölürtäči kök* "he will definitely kill us" (TI N6), *yolta yämä ölti kök* "he certainly died on the road too" (TI S8), *ölürtäči kök tir män* "I say, he will kill definitely" (TI S3-4).

Interestingly, in Korean there is the adverb *kkok* meaning "absolutely". I think this has the same origin with the Turkic word.

#### 5. Trk. *mu* // Ko. *mu* (interrogative particle)

The most popular interrogative particle in Turkic is *mu* or its variants. In Ancient Turkic, the two forms *mu* and *mü* are used according to the rule of vowel harmony. In Middle Turkic the forms such as *mu*, *mü*, *mī*, and *mi* is used. In Chuvash which is considered as Pre-Turkic, there are interrogative pronouns such as *měn* "what", *miše* "how much", *měšěn* "why". The word *miše* goes to the Common Turkic *\*mičä*, for Chuvash /š/ corresponds to Common Turkic /č/. The reconstructed form *mičä* consists of two morphemes, *\*mi* and *-čä*. The former one is an interrogative particle and the latter one is a comitative suffix. The word *měšěn* "for what, why" consists of *\*mi* "what" and *ičün* "for". I think that the two morphemes *mu* and *\*mi* go to the same origin.

On the other hand, according to Ramstedt, *-m* and *-mä* which occurs in some pronouns of Ancient Turkic such as *käm* and *nämä* probably have something with the particle *mu*.

In Korean, there are interrogative pronouns which have the syllable *\*mu* : *muə*s "what" < *\*mu* + *ə*s, *mu*sə)s "what" < *\*mu* + *sə*s, and *mu*sik "what" < *\*mu* + *sik*. In addition to these, there are another interrogative pronouns meaning "which" in Modern Korean : *mu*s'in < *\*mu* + *s'in*. Besides this, in Modern Korean the word *muə* "what" is found. From this

form, we can extract the morpheme \*mu in the above examples. In my opinion, \*mu in these pronouns has the same origin with the interrogative particle mu in Turkic.

### References

- Choi, H., Türkçe ile Korecenin Karşılaştırmalı Morfolojisi. 1989.  
Poppe, N. G., Vergleichende Grammatika der altaischen Sprachen. 1960.  
Ramstedt, G., Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft Formenlehre. 1952.  
Tekin, T. Grammar of the Orkhon Turkic. 1968.