

CAS 20, 1976

THE REPRESENTATION OF PROTO-TURKIC MEDIAL AND FINAL /S/ IN YAKUT

by
TALÂT TEKİN
Ankara

The representation of Proto-Turkic medial and final /s/ in Yakut is one of the unsolved problems of Turkic linguistics. Altaicists and Turkologists who dealt with or touched the problem have arrived at different conclusions. Ramstedt, *Laut.*, 99 and 100, stated that the original -s- and -s- are both represented by /t/ in Yakut. Räsänen, *Laut.*, 176, holds the view that Proto-Turkic /s/ in non-initial positions has regularly preserved itself in Yakut (in Yakutsk -s- > -h-), although he also speaks of a sound change *s > *z > t in certain suffixed and a few individual words. Poppe, *Fund. I*, 678, states that Proto-Turkic /s/ in final position is now converged with /ʃ/, /t/ and /z/ in Yakut, and all these phonemes are now represented by /s/; that the same phoneme in intervocalic position is represented by /t/. He also states that Proto-Turkic final /s/ and /z/ in stems of two or more syllables and in suffixes are often represented by /t/ in Yakut: -bit < *-mis, otut < *otuz, 1st p. pl. poss. suffix -bit < *-miz. Poppe, *Verg.*, 64, contrary to his previous view, maintains that Altaic (hence Proto-Turkic) -s- has changed to -h-, and Altaic -s- to -t in Yakut. Finally, Kalużyński, *Mong. Elem.*, 49, holds the view that the Mongolian /s/ in medial and final positions has, in Yakut, the same representation as Turkic, i.e., it is either /s/ or /h/ (the latter being in intervocalic position).

Of these various views, that of Räsänen is contradictory (preservation of /s/ on the one hand, the change from /s/ to /t/ on the other hand), and that of Kalużyński is incorrect. As for Poppe's two opposite views stated with an interval of only two years, neither is completely correct. This leaves us with Ramstedt's view which is the only correct statement on the representation of Proto-Turkic medial and final /s/ in Yakut. To prove Ramstedt's view and to solve the problem once and for all, I have collected thirty and odd

examples by combing Pekarski's dictionary. In this paper I will present these examples and deal with the few exceptions to this phonetic change.

1. bat- "to cover, copulate with a cow (of a bull)" < *bas-, battā- "to press, oppress" < *baslā- (freq.).
2. bōlōn "chest of a bird; breastbone, sternum (in birds)" < *bōsān; cf. Tuv. bōsák "chest (of a bird)", Chuv. pēseze "crop, craw (of a bird)" < *bōsākā (= Mo. beteg id., Zam. 123 böteke id.; Tat. bütükä, Bash. bütügä, Nog. bütügä, Turkm. peteke id. < Mo.).
3. dt- iät "alas!, what a pity!" < *ás, *ás-; cf. Old Turkic (OT) ásiz id., Uig. ásirkā- "to pity, have mercy" < ás-irkā-.
4. dtäppäy "safely, safe and sound" < *ásängü < ásän-gü; cf. Uig. ásäyü "health, good health", ásän "healthy".
5. iät- "to give milk (of a cow), to be full of milk (of teats)" < *ás-; cf. Khak. is- "to give milk (of a cow)", Tuv. ázindi "milk remained in the teat of a cow after suckling the calf" < *ásinti, Kaz. isin- "to hold milk (of a mare or cow unwilling to give her milk)" < *ásin-, Kkpl. iysin- id., Kirg. iysin- id. (cf. Mo. esiq "mare's milk, kumiss made of mare's milk").
6. itin- "to go up, ascend, climb up" < *asin-, itiar- "to lift, raise" < *asyar-; cf. Uig. asin-, asun- "to hang to attach oneself up".
7. itir- "to bite" < *isir-; Uig., MK isir- id.
8. iürja, itarja "earring(s)" < *isirqa; Khak. ižirja, Uzb. isirja, Turkm. isirja id.
9. iürüt-, itüt- "to sneeze" < *asurt-; cf. MK asur- "to sneeze", asurt- (caus.).
10. it- "to ferment, turn sour" < *is-; cf. Mo. is- id., iske- (caus.), Khal. es-, esge- id.; cf. also äksig "sour", Osm. TS äski id. > Turkish ekşi.
11. itägäs "deficiency; deficient, defective, lacking" < *isükäč, ägsükäč (or, -áz); cf. MK isil- "to grow less, decrease", ägsü- id., ägsük- "deficient; lacking; defective".
12. itin- "to make oneself warm" < *isin-, itit- "to warm" < *isit-, itiar- id. < *isgär-, iti "warm, hot" < *isig, itigäs id. < *itigäč (or, -áz), itigä- "to find it warm or hot" < *isigirkü-.
13. itir- "to become drunk" < isir-, itirik "drunk" < *isruk; cf. Uig. äsür- "to become drunk", MK äsürt- (caus.), äsrük "drunk".
14. xatırık "shell, peel, skin, bark of a tree" < *qasırıq; cf. MK qäs-, qaz "bark", Koib. qäs id., Tel. qäza "birch bark", Sag. Kach.

Koib. *qasta-* “to shell, husk”, Khak. *xasta-* id., Uig. Gab. *qasıq* “shell”, Nuig. *qazdıq* “bark of a tree”.

15. *xotuo-* “vomiting; vomit” < **gosōč* < **qusay*, *xotuos* “who vomits frequently” < **gosōč* < **qusyat*; cf. Com. Turk. *qus-*, Turkm. *gus-*, Chuv. *xăs-* id. < **qus-*.

16. *kitax* “pinch” < **qisaq*, *kitayas* “pincers, pliers” < **qisayač*; cf. MK *qisayač* “pincers, pliers”, *qis-* “to squeeze, compress, tighten”, Turkm. *gis-* id., Chuv. *xes-* id. < **qis-* (= Mo. *kisa-* “to shorten, constrict, confine, hamper”).

17. *kitarax* “barren, sterile” < **qisiraq*; cf. Tuv. *qiziraq* “young mare”, Khak. *xizirax* id. < MK *qisraq* id. < MK *qisir* “unfruitful, barren, sterile” (see *kitit*).

18. *kitit* “young mare” < **qisit*; cf. MK, etc. *qisir* “barren, sterile”, Turkm. *jisir* id., Chuv. *xesér* id. < **qis-* (see above).

19. *kurtax*, *kultax* “stomach, belly; crop of a bird” < **qursaq*; cf. MK *quruyaq* id., Uig. *quruyaq*, *quyursaq* id., Kirg. etc. *qursaq* “stomach”, Turkm. *garsaq*, Turk. *kursaq* “crop of a bird, stomach”.

20. *kültär* “water-rat; mole” < **küsär*, **küsür*; cf. MK *küsürkä* “field mouse”, *küsürkän* “a kind of mole”, Tuv. *küsükä* “mouse”, Khak. *küsxä*, Tat. *küse* “rat”, Tob. Tölös *kiski* id.

21. *sittä-* “to put something under one's head, put pillows” < **yaslä-*, *sittan-* “to lean against” < **yastan-*, *sittik* “pillow” < **yas-tug*; cf. MK *yasta-* “to lean against, rest against”, Khak. *časta-* id., MK *yastug* “pillow”.

22. *sältük* “thimble” < **yügsük*; cf. MK *yügsük* id., Tuv. *čüstük* čüsük < **yügsük* (with metathesis), Turk. *yüksük*, Az. *ıskük* id., < **yügsük*, Turkm. *yüvse* id. < **yügse*; cf. also Hung. *gyüszü* id. < Bulg. **yügsüg*.

23. *utat-* “to become thirsty” < **usat-*, *utax* “thirst” < **usaq*; cf. MK *usay* “thirst”, *us-* “to become thirsty”, *usaq*- id., *usit-* “to make thirsty”, Nuig. *ussač* “thirst”, *ussuzluq* id., *usu-* “to become thirsty”, *ussuluq* “thirst, thirstiness”, dial. Jar. *usuz* “thirsty”, *usuzluq* “thirst”, *usa-*, *ussa-* “to thirst, be thirsty” < **usa-*.

24. *üt-* “to grow, increase” < **ös-*, *ütügän* “sufficient, enough” < **öskän*; cf. Uig. *ös-* “to grow”, Com. Turk. *ös-* id., Chuv. *üs-* id., Tat. (= Mo. *ös-* id.).

PT /s/ in Suffix-initial Position

1. 3rd. p. sing. poss. suffix *-ta/-ta*, etc. < *-si/-si.
2. 3rd. p. sing. imp. suffix *-tin/-tin*, etc. < *-sun/-sün.

3. Conditional suffix *-tar/-tar*, etc. < *-sar/-sar.

4. Denominal verbal suffix *-tiy/-tiy-*, etc. < *-si/-si-: *ästiyy-* “to become white” < **äz-si-* (cf. äs “white, gray (of horses)”, *tästiyy-* “to be petrified” < **täb-si-*, *kihiliyy-* “to become a man” < **kiši-si-*, *ätyuy-* “to become watery” < **suw-si-*, *bögötüy-* “to become strong” < **bökä-si-* (< Mo. *böke* “strong”), etc. etc.

5. Adverbial suffix *-tl/-ti* “like” < *-siy/-sig: *atasti* “in a friendly manner” < **adaš-si-*, *atlsitl* “like a merchant” < *salıčit-si-*, etc.

6. Deverbal verbal suffix *-mtiy/-mtiy-*, etc. < *-msi/-msi-: *abar-imtiy-* “to be rather angry” < **abar-imsi-* (cf. *abar-* “to become angry”), etc.

7. Deverbal nominal suffix *-mtia/-mtiä*, etc. < *-msay/-msäg: *sütämä* “who likes to lie down” < **yat-imsay*, *biärimtiä* “who wishes to give” < *bär-imsäg*, *külümä* “cheerful” < **kül-imsäg*, etc., etc.

8. Denominal nominal suffix *-mtia/-mtiä*, etc. < *-msäy/-msäg: *kihilimtiä* “reddish” < **qızıl-imsay*, *sahilimtiä* “yellowish” < **yäşil-imsay*, etc.

As is seen in the above-given examples, Proto-Turkic /s/ in medial and final position is systematically represented by /t/ in Yakut. Proto-Turkic /č/, /š/ and /z/ on the other hand, have become /s/ in final position: *äs-* “to become hungry” < **äč-*, *biäč-* “5” < **bač-*, *kia-* “daughter” < **qiz*. It is only this secondary /s/ that is represented by /h/ in intervocalic position: *ahi* “sour, bitter” (dial. *asi*) < **äčiy*, *kihi* “man, person” (dial. *kisi*) < **kiši*, *kihil* “red” (dial. *kısil*) < **qızıl*. There are some exceptions, however, to the sound changes -č- > -s and -z- > -s in Yakut. These exceptions are:

- 1) Present participle suffix *-bat/-bät*, etc. = OT *-maz/-mäz*,
- 2) 1st p. pl. possessive suffix *-bit/-bit*, etc. = OT *-maz/-miz*,
- 3) 2ns p. pl. possessive suffix *-git/-git*, etc. = OT *-yiz/-yiz*,
- 4) The numeral *otul* “30” = OT *otuz*,
- 5) Denominal verb *kitar-* “to become red” = OT *qizar-*,
- 6) Past participle suffix *-bit/-bit*, etc. = OT *-mis/-mís*,
- 7) The noun *ulut* “people” = OT *ulus* “town, settlement; people”.

These exceptions can be explained easily and satisfactorily: The phoneme /z/ in the Old Turkic participial suffix *-maz/-mäz* had become voiceless already in the Karakhanid Turkic of the XI century. The suffix occurs as *-mas/-mäs* in Mahmûd Kâşyâri’s

dictionary. Such an early devoicing of /z/ must have occurred in a larger scale also in Old Yakut: -maz/-máz > -mas/-mäs, -miz/-miz > -mis/-mis, -yiz/-yiz > -nis/-nis, and otuz > otus.

As for the phoneme /t/ in Yakut *kitar* “to become red”, it is in all likelihood primary, because devoicing of /z/ also in intervocalic position in Old Yakut is impossible. The phoneme /t/ in *kitar*- is probably a different morpheme having the same function as /z/ in *qzar-* (cf. MK, Old Anatolian Turkish *qız* “rare, scarce” Turk. *kit*, Az. *güt* id.).

The phoneme /t/ in Yakut particiipial suffix -bit/-bit must have developed not from Proto-Turkic /š/, but from Old Yakut /s/. As is known, the suffix -mis/-mís is often spelt -ms^a in the Orkhon inscriptions. Therefore, it is very likely that the final phoneme of the suffix -máš/-mís was /s/ or /š/ in Orkhon Turkic and it certainly was /s/ in Old Yakut.

As for the Yakut noun *ulut* “people”, it is in all likelihood a loan-word borrowed from Mongolian, or to be more exact, from Buryat. As is known, Proto-Mongolian /s/ in final position is represented, in all Buryat dialects, either by /d/ or by /t/: Mo. *bos* “to rise, to get up” > Bur. *bod*-, Mo. *bös* “cotton textile” (< Turk. *böz*) > Bur. *bid*, Mo. *ös* “to increase in number” > Bur. *id*-, Mo. *ulus* “people, nation” > Bur. *ullot*, *ulot*, etc. (Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, pp. 121, 122).

ABBREVIATIONS

- Fund. I* = Poppe, Nikolaus, „Das Jakutische“, *Fundamenta I*, Wiesbaden 1959, pp. 671–684.
Laut. = Ramstedt, G. J., *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft I*, Lautlehre, Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Pontti Aalto, MSFOu 104: 1, Helsinki 1957.
Laut. = Rässänen, Martti, *Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen*, StOF 15, Helsinki 1949.
Mong. Elem. = Kalużyński, Stanisław, *Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache*, Warszawa 1962.
Verg. = Poppe, Nikolaus, *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen*, Teil I: *Vergleichende Lautlehre*, Wiesbaden 1960.
Zam. = Poppe, N. N., *Mongol'skiy Slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*, Moskva-Leningrad 1938.

REVIEWS

А. М. Щербак: «Сравнительная фонетика тюркских языков». Ленинград, 1970, объем 204 стр. = 19 арт. листов.
 (Рецензия имеет объем 174 стр. в пересчете на два интервала, поэтому ниже приводятся лишь извлечения).

ИЗВЛЕЧЕНИЯ

Сравнительное исследование тюркских языков и диалектов в нашей стране имеет большую историю и здесь в первую очередь должны быть упомянуты «Сравнительная фонетика северно-туркских языков» и другие фундаментальные и известные тюркологам труды выдающегося языковеда академика В. В. Радлова, являющегося основателем русской тюркологии и представляющего в ней научное направление, — в отличие от миссионерского направления, представленного в известной «Алтайской грамматике» 1869 г., в статьях протоисер Ефима Малова и др., которые по признанию самих их сторонников, как напр., В. Смирнова, предсказывали не научные цели, а практические задачи распространения христианства среди «инородцев».¹

История русской тюркологии знает много ценных исследований и описаний, касающихся отдельных языков, причем нередко учёные, описывая тот или иной конкретный язык, проводили одновременно сравнительное исследование этого языка с другими родственными языками. Примером такого рода обобщающих работ является и известный фундаментальный труд профессора Казанского университета Н. Ф. Катаanova «Опыт исследования урванчайского языка с указанием главнейших родственных отношений

¹ См. рецензию В. Смирнова на известную «Фонетику...» В. В. Радлова в журнале Министерства Народного Просвещения 1884 г. СПБ, стр. 1, отд. отт.