

CAJ 28, 1989

KOREAN AND ALTAIC –
A PRELIMINARY SKETCH*by
K. H. MENGES
Wien

It is only during the last 15–20 years that research in the history of the Korean language begins to develop, and that an ever increasing number of Middle-Korean texts have become known, while also more has been learned about the several varieties of

*Note on Transcription

Inasmuch as I use for all languages the same transcription, mine diverges from LEE's and in some minor points also from RAMSTEDT's as follows:

\dot{a} = LEE's Λ ,
 \dot{e} = LEE's \circ , RAMSTEDT's ϕ ,
 \dot{y} = LEE's i , RAMSTEDT's j ,
 \circ = LEE's \circ , $\dot{\circ}$ = LEE's $\dot{\circ}$, in
 some instances rendered as \dot{a} , \dot{e} .

$\dot{\sim}$ = LEE's \sim , in some cases intermedially rendered as γ , while LEE's $\dot{\sim}$, $\dot{\sim}$, and $\dot{\sim}$ are not differentiated here since their phonetical and phonological qualities have not yet exactly been established.

$\dot{a}j$, $\dot{o}j$ etc. = LEE's ae , oe etc.,
 \dot{x} = LEE's and RAMSTEDT's h ,
 \dot{c} = LEE's c , RAMSTEDT's \dot{c} ,
 $\dot{\zeta}$ = LEE's c , RAMSTEDT's ζ ,
 \dot{b} = LEE's β , RAMSTEDT's ν ,
 \dot{j} = LEE's y , RAMSTEDT's j .

The aspirated stop is marked with $\dot{\cdot}$: \dot{p} , \dot{t} , etc. = LEE's p^h , t^h , etc., RAMSTEDT's ph , th , etc.

The specifically Korean laryngeal ("glottalized") occlusives, rendered by LEE and RAMSTEDT as geminates, are marked with the sign of glottalization, $\dot{\cdot}$, as \dot{k} , \dot{t} , \dot{p} , \dot{c} , etc.

Since in Mongol, Chinese and many other languages, also in Korean, the basic phonological opposition, determining the distribution of the occlusives (stops) and the affricates is that of fortis vs. lenes, not that of unvoiced vs. voiced, the lenes and the affricate \dot{c} are fully voiced only in intervocalic

language preserved in the long-known, but until recently barely studied, corpus of Old-Korean texts. Not only Korean and Japanese scholars who grow up with good knowledge of Chinese, but also Western scholars increasingly engage in research in this vast and complex field. Text studies presuppose a solid acquaintance with the Chinese language and its history, the latter being a domain of Chinese philology and linguistics for which the solid foundation laid by KARLGREN's work serves as the departure point. Thus, it is quite natural that primordially the Sinologists and Japanologists engaged in Korean research. The Altaicists who have no Sinological training – and this is the majority of them – are from the very beginning in an disadvantageous position, and this was the main reason for a certain neglect of Korean – in spite of RAMSTEDT's work and POPPE's support –, as a consequence of which there still is some doubt whether or not Korean is a member of the Altaic language family. In the Far East where the linguists are initially better equipped, as mentioned, research has for a long time centered upon either the Korean language proper or its relationship to Japanese, while the relationship of the latter to the other Altaic languages has remained problematic until the studies of Roy Andrew MILLER and Shichirō MURAYAMA appeared in print. Research in problems of these two Far Eastern languages, also in genetic problems was undertaken by Samuel MARTIN, JOHN STREET, Bruno LEWIN and others, in Korea specifically by LEE Ki-Moon (LI Ki-Mun), a number of whose studies were also published in Western languages, while most Korean and much Japanese work is published in Korean and/or Japanese only, and therefore remains inaccessible to many Western scholars, including the author of these lines.

The material serving as the basis of this sketch has been gathered from RAMSTEDT's work as well as from the first historical treatise of Korean, LEE Ki-Moon's "Geschichte der Koreanischen Sprache. Deutsche Übersetzung, herausgegeben von Bruno LEWIN" (326 pp., Wiesbaden 1977, containing a very instructive

position, also in sandhi; but as they have no graphic expression in the Korean writing system, they accordingly are rendered by LEE with the sign for the unvoiced sounds, while in RAMSTEDT's and the present transcription the phonetical principle is applied. In the samples quoted from LEE's "Geschichte . . .", however, the form as rendered by him is preserved. Inconsistencies may occasionally occur; they are either the author's or found in the sources.

critical bibliography, pp. 289–309), with the intension to present an attempt at a comparative treatment of some basic Altaic features of Korean.

Recently, in the Korean journal *Han-gul* (No. 177, 1982) a short article "Is Korean related to Tungusic?" by Juha JANHUNEN and KHO Songmoo appeared in which the two authors tend toward the denial of this question. The entire tenor of the article in which statements are generally made with many "apparently", "seemingly", "seem" and synonyms of this semantic category of dubitation, has as its departure point the principal questioning of the existence of the Altaic language family, and together with this, almost "logically" also that of genetic relationship of languages in general. Along these lines, the two writers castigate what they call, after the famous example of DOERFER, "omnicomparativism" as the source of all evil, leaving with this out of sight the fact that the cognition of the existence of large language families or groups presupposes a considerable amount of this accursed "omnicomparativism": dealing with the "well-established" families such as Indo-European, even Uralic or Semitic – how could the relationship of all the various languages constituting, as was later discovered, a relationship, and for this, a genetic relationship, have been established without any "omnicomparativism"? Without "omnicomparativism" it would never have been possible to determine the position of Xittite, K'art'uli, Basque, Samojedic, Tibetan, and many other languages, and only the "omnicomparativist" approach might ultimately solve the problems of e.g. Etruscan and the pre-Indo-European Mediterraneo-Anatolian languages, Elamite, Burušaski, for naming only a few of the still "unclassified languages" of Eurasia. It was due to a good deal of "omnicomparativism", that Korean, Japanese, and Rjū-Kjū could finally be recognized as members of the Altaic family, forming, as I call it, the Outer Circle or rather group of Altaic, the inner being Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungus. It is to be expected that Tungus as the easternmost of the Inner Circle would have preserved a greater amount of isoglosses with the Outer Circle than Mongolian or Turkic. This question can be solved with "inner-Altaic" means, internal reconstruction within Altaic, but "omnicomparativism" comes into the picture when particular features unknown in the other, inner-Altaic languages arise, in order to detect whether they are

archaic relics in Altaic or whether they are adopted foreign elements, influences due to contact resulting in borrowing. Incredible, but true – this latter feature is the only one which the Anti-Altaicists within their narrow, self-imposed limitations want to recognize. In this vein it is, of course, impossible to explain identical features found e.g. in Turkic as well as in Japanese, 3–7000 km distant from each other, but missing in the languages spoken in between these two: thus, the parallel development of the proto-Altaic $*l_2(*l)$ to a sibilant, s in Turkic except *ṭavaš* and *s/s* in Japanese, first established by Roy A. MILLER – as in proto-alt. **dal-* "to cover (up), conceal", Tung. Ew. *dal-*, Ma. *dali-* "id.", Mo. *dalda* "secretly", Tk. Uj. *jaš-ur-* "to cover, conceal", O.-Jap. *jasi-* in *jasi-rō* "enclosure for worship of native deities, etc.", New-Jap. *jaši-ro* "a (Shinto) shrine, temple", and many further examples (MILLER, "JOAL", 114ff. During his further research, MILLER found this development of $*l_2$ also in the Old-Korean languages of Kogurjō and Silla as evidenced by the usage of Chinese²⁰ *si*, Middle-Chin. *si*: cf. J-1 of Japanese Studies, II, No. 1, 1975, pp. 200ff. and in later work, cf. his "Old Korean and Altaic" in *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, vol. LI, 1979, p. 3ff.). As this certainly cannot be explained as due to contact or borrowing, and as it is one of the basic phonological supports for establishing the genetic relationship of Japanese with Altaic, the two authors declare MILLER's discovery simply as "absurdity" – which is no argument, but simply an insult. One wonders how these two coryphees would do away with other "absurdities", such as e.g. NE *four*, NHG *vier* = NPers. *čahār*, or with NFr. *aller*, It. *andare*, Lat. *ambulare*, and the like . . . Mutatis mutandis, the same could be said about the authors' invective against Bruno LEWIN's absolutely cogent thesis on Old-Kogurjō – the authors' view could easily be refuted on Altaic grounds as well as by comparison: the genetic relationship of New-English and Lithuanian which probably differ much more than Japanese and Korean in any phase of their known history.

Not going into further detail regarding that article, I thought it necessary to single out a number of correspondences between Korean and the other Altaic languages, the great majority of which are due to genetic relationship, not to contact and borrowing. In his above-mentioned book, LEE makes the unmistakable statement that Korean is a member of the Altaic language family and

names 6 categories in which Korean agrees with Altaic: 1. Existence of vowel-harmony, 2. Restrictions on the consonant-system in word-initial position, 3. Agglutination, 4. No vowel or consonant alternation, 5. No relative pronouns, no conjunctions, 6. Existence of converbs (p. 14). Here, a few additional remarks are in order: Under 3, agglutination, it should have been added that in all Altaic languages there is agglutination by suffixes only, prae- and infixes not occurring, and sub 5 that this means the non-existence of grammatical (syntactic) subordination, as in all Altaic languages (and Dravidian). Inasmuch as ablaut is concerned (LEE's No. 4), there are well-recognizable traces of ablaut all over the Altaic languages. When mentioning that the Uralic languages share, with Altaic, most of the above 6 categories, LEE (sub 6) says that they do not possess any "converbs", while, in reality, they do have deverbal verbal nouns in adverbial position or function, i.e. gerunds, "converbs", as well as adnominal verbal nouns, i.e. participles. These two categories are also known in Indo-European which against LEE's statement p. 16 does use them especially in the older languages, e.g. in pre-classical and classical Latin, Greek, Old-Church-Slavic, and Sanskrit (and the later Indo-Arian languages). But 4 more categories are to be added: 7. A number of common declension suffixes, 8. A number of common conjugation suffixes, 9. common suffixes for nominal derivation and verbal nouns, i.e. gerunds and participles, and 10. Manifest relics of common pronouns. These 10 points substantiate the genetic relationship of Korean with Altaic and help to clarify the position of Korean within Altaic. Whether there is a particularly close relationship of Korean with Tungus, as the historical and geographical circumstances would suggest, still remains to be seen. In any case, if Korean is Altaic, it is related to Tungus, too.

As I have emphasized in other places, the most important linguistic category for the comparison with other languages or even language families is that of the morphology, because it is the morphology that preserves itself most tenaciously through all kinds of interior as well as exterior influences; neither the phonology nor the syntax, least of all the lexical material offer any resistance to change which might be compared to that of the morphology. Thus, in the following, only a few phonological features will be considered.

PHONOLOGY. Vocalism. A clear-cut oppositio velar, or rather, non-palatal vs. palatal in the vocalism of the suffixes — apart from other evidence — is especially recognizable in Middle-Korean and even still lives on in modern Korean. In vocalism, the ubiquitous deelarization of the *y, which has best been preserved in Turkic, however not in all Turkic languages, is also typical of Korean, and this further leads toward the decomposition of the entire sound-harmony (exactly evaluated by LEE, p. 244f.) and its inceptive abolition (as in Özbek, probably also in North-Tungus). As the Altaic languages do not tolerate more than one consonant in initial position — occurrences of 2 consonants in initial position are due to secondary syllable reduction (as e.g. Tk. *braq* "to let go, leave" < *byraq*, *tla-/klä* < *til-ä* "to wish, beg"), the occurrence in Old- and Middle-Korean of 2 or 3 initial consonants as in *psy* "to write", *sta* "earth", *peäk* "the one of a pair", *pskym* "empty space" must be of secondary origin after loss of syllables as in the instance of the occlusivae with laryngeal constriction, written as initial geminatae as in *ssy* < *psy* "to write". This remains to be investigated furtheron. Striking is the great number of dulled (reduced ?) vowels, corresponding to full-grade vowels in the other Altaic languages.

Consonantism. A feature quite common in the Eastern Altaic languages is the palatalization of the sound groups *ty/dy//ti/di > či/či (also či/či), shared by Mongol, South-Tungus, South-Korean, and Japanese.

The far-reaching disappearance of r, usually, but not always, in intervocalic position, typical of the Southeast-Tungus languages starting from Negidal and reaching into Nānāj and Udi, can in Korean be noticed from the Silla language on. LEE (p. 80) gives the following examples: O.-Kor. **muryx* "water", **narix* "river", **nūri* "world" > Late Middle-Kor. *majx/majx*, *najx*, *naj* besides *nuri*, cf. Tung. Ew. etc. *bira* "river" > Negd. *bija*, Oroči *biaka*, dim. "creek", Udi *be'äsa*, dim. < **bira-qa-cän*, but Olča, Nānāj *bira*; oron "reindeer", Ngd. *ojon*, but everywhere else *oron*; pron. demonstr. *tari*, Ngd. *taji*, Oroči *tēji*, Olča *ti* (< **ti* < *tēi*), Nā. *tēj*; pron. demonstr. *ēri*, Ngd. *ēji*, Oroči *ēj*, Udi *ēji*, Olča, Nā. *ēj*; suff. partic. aor. -ri: *gēnēri* "идущий, coming", Ngd. *gēnēji*, Olča, Nā. *gēnēj*; sporadically, it occurs in Tungus also in position before the

occlusivae *k, g*: Nā. *-rk-* > *-jk-*, *-rg-* > *-jg-* (cf. CINCIUS, § 78, p. 245f.), similarly, in Middle-Kor. *korp'a-* "to hunger, starve" > *kop'y-*, *'arp'a-* > *'ap'y-* "to be painful" (LEE, 178). Since in the Čukči languages the disappearance of intervocalic *-r-* is due to a phonological rule (cf. K. BOUDA, "Tungusisch und Ketschua", I, p. 30, n. 5, p. 35, in ZDMG) it might be assumed that this development is originally alien to Altaic where it took place on the easternmost fringe, and due to a Čukči substratum. Sporadic cases of *r*-loss in Mongolian as in the position before *s*, M.-Mong. *jesün* "9" < **jersün*, cf. *jiren* "90" (cf. POPPE, 1960, p. 32) certainly are of different causation.

Problems of the consonant clusters in initial position and the subsequent origin of initial laryngalized consonants, are not discussed here as they have no parallels in the other Altaic languages. This development in Korean seems to be due to extra-Altaic influences, and it is natural to point to Nivx (Giljak) with its great variety of initial consonant clusters. While nothing is known about the history of Nivx, its phonology in the present state of the language would suggest a type of initial consonant clusters that differs essentially from that of Korean. But a certain inherited predisposition of the speakers of Korean might have originated on the basis of a Giljak or Giljakoid substratum.

MORPHOLOGY. As to the morphology of the *noun*, Korean exhibits a number of particular features in which it differs from the Inner Altaic languages, being in this similar to Japanese, however, with a greater variety of case suffixes. As in Japanese, it is in some instances not clear what are true, genuine case suffixes and what are postpositions while, in contradistinction to traditional Japanese terminology, the case suffixes are not misstyle as "particles". The development of socially distinctive formations, not only in the domain of personal pronouns, but also in that of all nouns, has brought about new forms which are unknown in the Inner Altaic languages. Those honorative formations are not sufficiently clear insofar as their etymology is concerned. Since some of them do not undergo the rules of vowel-harmony, they are considered as postpositions, also by LEE, and thus are of the nature of case-enclitics, like Tk. *-čal-ža*, *-dägl-daj*, *-myñan*, *-ilä* which are found in transition to true case-suffixes. A case in question is the

Korean suffix of the dative, *-këj*, occurring either independently or in combination with *-yj* as enclitic (or "postposition", as LEE calls it, e.g. p. 259) — on this later.

In some respects, Korean shows innovations in comparison to the other Altaic languages. Those are due to a higher speed of development causing a great potential of linguistic change. This is particularly recognizable in the nominal as well as the verbal morphology. As to the former, Korean has developed away from the general situation in the Altaic languages with their typical strict agglutination of the suffixes without any accompanying sound changes taking place when suffixes with consonant initial are attached to stems or roots with consonant final. The parallel case of suffixes with vowel initial to stems or roots with vowel final are rare and of lesser significance. In these instances, in Korean various forms of the stem or root originate — for the ensuing sound changes in Middle-Korean cf. LEE, p. 160f. — that can be considered as the first step toward the development of flexivity and therewith of various declension and conjugation classes. At first, there appears the bipartition into vocalic and consonantic stems, and as the next step, subdivisions arise according to the quality of the given phonemes. The first step of this development has taken place in the majority of the Tungus languages, principally those of the South, and in some of them, similarly in Korean, features of a further development are recognizable. Only traces of this development exist in Mongolian and Turkic, similarly in Japanese. With its particular development, the inflections of Korean, in comparison with those of Turkic, Mongolian and Japanese, less so of Tungus, appear in certain cases as irregular. In the further development to modern Korean, the "irregularities" typical of Middle-Korean, are generally straightened out. Although there does not yet exist any comparative-historical treatise of the Korean inflections, the material offered by RAMSTEDT ("A Korean Grammar", §§ 80ff., pp. 34ff.) and, with much greater detail on historical Korean, by LEE (op. cit., pp. 170ff., 246ff.) is already of great value.

The origin of various stem forms leads to vacillations, "irregularities", in the declension. LEE speaks therefor of "automatic" and "non-automatic changes of the nominal stem" in Middle-Korean (p. 180). To the automatic ones apparently belong the great

majority of the nouns, namely those with stems ending in *-p'*, *-t'*, *-s*, *-č'*, *-z* and consonant clusters except *-rk* and *-rp*, furthermore the stems in *-x*; for the latter, LEE quotes the example of *tor*, *torx* "stone" which only in its isolated form (casus indefinitus) has *tor*, but in all other case forms *torx*: nom. *torx-i*, acc. *torx-ār*, etc. The "unautomatic change" in stems with ancient final *-k* (RAMSTEDT: γ p. 89, § 39) which has disappeared in the casus indefinitus and left traces in a vocalic shape, as e.g. *namo*, *namu* "tree" < **namau* < **namag* (RAMSTEDT: **nāmāg*) while the declension stem is *namk-*, nom. *namk-i*, acc. *namk-ār* (LEE, 181). With this, there is present in Korean an opposition of rectus vs. obliquus stem, as found in certain Tungus languages, too. While it is hardly possible to arrange the nominative with the casus obliqui, the nominative in *-i* has been treated in analogy with the cases marked by suffixes; on the other hand, RAMSTEDT is probably right in considering (p. 38) the nominative in *-i* not as a case but as the possessive 3-rd pers. in *-i* as it is completely regular in Tungus and in Turkic — here also in an anaphoric, deictic sense — and in relics in Mongolian, too. Thus, the form in *-i*, the original possessive of the 3-rd person, had not been limited to any particular case function.

Enclitics, postpositions and particles are still not clearly separated, neither functionally, nor etymologically. In contradistinction to traditional Japanese grammar, where usually only "particles" are mentioned, even when their function is that of case markers, it is so far not possible to recognize the historical origin and original function of many of them. In one instance, LEE mentions the postposition *-n* for the "thematization" which originally was probably the form of the genitive of the pron. pers. of the 3-rd person (22, 204f.). LEE is certainly right when he assumes its original identity with this pronoun, defective in all Altaic languages except in Mančzu, but while comparing it to Mongolian, he fails to find it also in Tungus and Turkic, in those two latter in the function of the possessive — absolutely necessary with preceding genitive attributes — and in Turkic not seldom with that of determination as expressed by the definite article in Indo-European, Semitic and other languages. LEE's examples illustrate this very well: *kagsaj-n-i-n* "the long life; as to the long life", *xan-ap-i-n* "the old man, as to the o. m.", *ētin-i-n* "the wise man, as to the w. m."

But this is no postposition, at the most it might be classed with the enclitics — which the possessive suffixes in the proto-language-period must have been. LEE gives no examples for the "thematization" with the help of the "postposition" *-n*. If it does form declension stems in *-n*, a problem in the Mongolian and Tungus languages, it might then be assumed that the *n*-stems in Mongolian and Tungus which in certain languages serve as secondary stems for the formation of the obliquus-stems, i.e. of the stems to which the suffixes of the casus obliqui are attached, originate from an early suffixation of the pronomen pers. 3-rd person and its subsequent fusion with the stem or root, which means of a pronominal stem in *-n*. The obliquus-stem of the pronouns, primordially of the personal pronouns, always ends in *-n*. LEE's above-quoted examples show the same sequence of suffixes as in Tungus: Korean, nominal stem + case suffix (*-i*, nom). + *-n* (possessive, "thema"), Tungus, nominal stem + case suffix(es) + possessive suffixes while, according to LEE (203f.), the Korean postpositions rule either genitive or accusative, those ending in *-n* cannot be considered as having been formed in accordance with the same rule as mentioned by LEE.

These secondary declension stems in Korean remind a similar situation in Dravidian, likewise an agglutinative language family which has evolved features of flexibility.

Of case forms with non-automatic change, LEE quotes (181, end) *'azā* "jüngerer Bruder": nom. *'az'i* (in the text misprint "*'azi*"), gen.-loc. *'az'āj*, acc. *'az'ār*, comit. *'aza'oa* (= *'azayoa*); they must correspond to the nouns with different stem forms in Tungus, such as Ew. *asī* "girl, wife", pl. *asa-l* where the singular stem *asī* must go back to an earlier formation such as **asa-i*, the *-i* being a suffixum singulativum rather than a possessivum, exhibiting the singular stem *asī*, but the unchanged original stem *asa* in the plural; cf. with these the Mongolian nouns of the type *noqaj* "dog", not yet contracted as in Tungus, but the pl. *noqa-s*, JČ'BS (Middle-Mong.) *noqa-n*, or in P'ags-ba texts the partic. prs. *jabu-quj* "ходящий", pl. *jabu-qun* "ходящие" etc., also here the *-j* < *-i* being the singulativum.

As long as the various stem formations of the Korean noun are historically not clear, the question arises whether or not an ancient heteroclisis might be present in the one or other of these stems. Of

those, first of all the Korean declension stems, i. e. obliquous stems in *-a* come to mind inasmuch as they have a counterpart in Tungus with certain South-Tungus nouns exhibiting likewise an obliquous stem in a post-palatal *-ɣ/-g-* which I consider as unmistakable relics of an ancient heteroclisia (in "Problems of Tungus Linguistics", *Anthropos* 73, 1978, pp. 374ff.), e. g. Nānāj cas. indef. *děré-l* "upper part, surface, face", obl.-stem *děré-g-*, acc. *děré-g-bě*, *pěré-l* "lower part, bottom, ground", dat. *pěré-g-du-li*, *puri-l* "child, children", abl. pl. *puri-g-žiě-ži*, or in Nā. *žō* "yurt, house, hut", acc. *žō-g-ba*, allat.-loc. poss. 1-st sg. *žō-g-do-la-ji* "to my house" which latter is gradually going over to orthoclisia with regular, in this case, more recent formations, e. g. acc. *žō-wa*, allat.-loc. *žō-la*, etc. Like the case suffixes, the possessive suffixes are attached to the obliquous stem: Nā. *puri-k-ci*, poss. 3. pl., casus indefin., "their children" <**puri-g-t-in*, *žō-g-bi*, 1. sg. "my house". This Tungus heteroclisia is an Altaic archaism of great age as evidenced by parallels in other Altaic languages, Dravidian, Uralic, and Indo-European (1. c., *Anthropos* 73, p. 375).

As in Japanese, the plural formation in Korean is an underdeveloped category. RAMSTEDT (§ 82, p. 35) says, "Korean has no articles and no numbers", which even for modern Korean is an exaggeration, for, modern Korean also has the distinction of plural, suff. *-tyl/-tyry*, however, not always expressed morphologically, resembling in this Turkic, esp. the older texts. In Middle-Korean the form was *-tārx* (LEE, 173) which, like the majority of the Altaic plural suffixes, is a compound, of *-ta* + *-ra/-rx*, i. e. the plural suffix *-ta*, *-t* and a further element which is the equivalent of either the Altaic collective *-r*, *-ra* as in Tk. *-t-ar* or Mong. *-na-r*, or of the Tungus plural suffix *-la*, *-l*. The *-x* is the suffix of the obliquous stem; in New-Korean it became *-tyrx* (LEE, 248), the obliquous stem of *-tyr* < M.-Kor. *-tār*. RAMSTEDT is probably not right when he considers the plural suffix as the attached original noun *tyl* "all, several, together" (ib.).

The distinction made in Korean between animate and inanimate apparently recorded rather early in history before the one between higher and lower in social position had as consequence a certain system of differentiation in speech terms. This primordial affected the pronouns and with them certain verbal formations. Except for Japanese, nothing like that has developed in any other

Altaic language. The distinction of animate vs. inanimate has found its reflex in the declension where the genitive suffix *-yɟ* and the dative suffix *-ɟkɟɟ* has hitherto been used throughout with nouns only that designate living beings; as late as in the modern period, *-yɟ*, less so *-ɟkɟɟ*, is also used for inanimates (LEE, 279).

Case suffixes. In Old-Korean (LEE, 84f.) the nominative has suffix *-i*, being originally the Altaic possessive of the 3-rd person, in deictic, anaphoric function as mentioned above. The genitive had suffix *-ɟɟ/-ɟɟ* (ɟ is a very open o-sound, almost = d) which in M.-Kor. developed to *-aɟ/-yɟ*, in New-Kor. to *-yɟ/-y*. This is probably identical with the Mongolian *-aɟ/-aɟ*, mostly occurring in Buřat and Qalmyq in the place of common-Mongolian *-un/-ün/-ul/-ü*. It is hardly possible to separate Old- and Middle-Korean *-ɟɟ/-aɟ* from Mong. East-Buřat and Qalmyq *-aɟ* (> *-ä*) so that it is not necessary to assume, as done by POPPE ("Introduction to Mong. Comp. St.", p. 190), this Mongolian suffix *-aɟ* to have originated from **-i*, the genitive of *-n*-stems plus the attached adjectival ending *-yaj* as found in the pronomina possessiva *ma-n-u-qaj* "our, noster". The other Old-Kor. genitive suffix, *-s*, used in M.-Kor. for inanimates, but also for animates in the honorative form (LEE, 183), might perhaps be compared with the Tungus directive suffix *-si/-ši*, very much alive with the nomina loci et temporis, in the North usually occurring in combination with other directives, as e. g. Ew. *-s-ki*, in the South also freely, e. g. Ew. *awaski* "whither?", Nā. *haosi*, Ma. *absi* "id.", Ew. *čä-s-ki* "thither", Nā. *tao-si*, Ma. *ča-si* "id.", Ew. *dī-s-ki* "bergauf, uphill, hinauf", Nā. *duj-si*, Udi *dī-xi* "id.". This might mean that the genitive which in some Altaic and Uralic languages is of adessive origin had been, in Korean, of directive origin, as the genitive *-s* with the postposition *-kăčag* (originally a noun, "extreme point") conveys a terminative meaning, "until, up to, bis - hin" (LEE, 205). In New-Kor., *-s* has lost its case function (LEE, 251, 279). But this entire construction may very well be erroneous, because if Chinese [1] (LEE, 84) is a phonetic reading for the Old-Kor. genitive suffix, the original form of the suffix must have had *č*, *č* or *t* as initial, cf. KARLGREN, Gr. Ser. No. 400 e: modern Chin. *č'i*, Middle-Ch. *č'jēt*, Ancient-Ch. **č'jēt* ("to revile"), so that an "exact reconstruction" of the Old-Kor. form would suppose **-čēt*, probably **-čēr* which might be a compound of

a directive *-čl-t* (like Tung. Ew. *-ti* in the allative-directive *-tikt*, *-tki*), originally having, in Old-Kor., an ablative-elative meaning underlying that of the genitive.

The Middle- and New-Korean instrumentalis-directivus in *-ro* (LEE, 184) which serves also as plain locative is RAMSTEDT's instrumental (§ 96, p. 43f.). It is identical either with the locative in *-lā*, *-la* of all Tungus languages, or with the directivus in *-ra/-ru* of the Turkic languages.

For the dative as the case of the indirect object as well as for directive expressions, there exists in Altaic the element *-q/-k-* in the suffix Turkic *-qa/-ya* etc. which has its cognate parallels in Uralic and Dravidian, i.e. it is East-Nostratic. In Dravidian, the suffixes *-kku*, *-ku*, *-kke*, *-ge*, *-k* as in Turkic designate the dative, while in Uralic as in Altaic except Turkic, *-k*, *-ka*, *-kta*, *-ks* serve for various lative cases, thus, in Lit.-Mongolian the compound of dat. *-q/-k-* + directive *-si/ši* as in *de-ge-k-ši* "hinauf", Tg. Ew. *solo-ki* "upstream", Udi *solo'i-xi* "id.", in the directive-allative, Ew. *-tikt*, *-tki*, loc.-allat. *-klā* < **-qy-lā*, ablat. *-duk* < **-du-qy*, etc. In Middle Kor., the element *-kěj* functioned as the dative, styled in the grammars, also by LEE, (203, 259), "postposition". As *-kěj* in M.-Kor. was usually attached to the genitive in *-čj* it there was grammatically treated like a denominal postposition, the deverbal postpositions ruling the accusative (LEE, 203), for, solely on Korean grounds it still cannot be decided which "postpositions" really are originally independent nouns. If *-kěj* was a noun as some later postpositions might have been, this would represent an archaism of great age. In any case, the semantic diversity of this case suffix **-qV/-kV* from an older postpositional particle in Nostratic points to its function, in the proto-Altaic period, as such a postposition which only later in the period of the origin of the individual Altaic languages began to assume, with or without further case elements, its historical functions, in Turkic and Dravidian that of the dative, in Korean that of dative and locative. In Korean, the old dative suffix *-kěj* is limited in its usage, while in general it is attached to that of the genitive in *-čj/-yj* which is nothing unusual in the Altaic languages; this latter combined case formation is at present the usual one for the dative, Modern-Korean *-yj/-kěj*, limited to living beings (cf. RAMSTEDT, "Einführung . . .", II, pp. 31 ff., 27). The Modern-Korean "honorative" dative in

-skěj might possibly go back to an older formation from the genitive in *-s*, in analogy to that in *-čj/-kej* from *-čj/-yj*. In West-Nostratic this same element exists as directive post- and prepositional particle in the same evolutionary state as in East-Nostratic (cf. ILLIC-SVITYČ, I, No. 245, p. 368).

In the Middle-Korean suffix *-čr/-yr* after numerals for indicating an amount of days, LEE (175) sees underlying the appellativum *xārd* "day" < **hārcr*, an accusative in *-čr/-yr*. It might, however, be a parallel to the equivalent form in Tungus, Ew. *-lla* (Ćumykan *-lra*), e.g. *žūr* "2", *žūr-l-lē* "2 days, biduum", *ilan* "3", *ila-l-la* "3 days, triduum" (cf. VASILEVIČ 1958, p. 768). The Tungus suffix seems to consist of a collective formation, its second component being a collective in *-sa*, replaced by a plural in Nānaj and Olča, *-r-ta*.

While during the historical period some Korean numerals were gradually replaced by apparently more recent formations or Chinese, in early Middle-Korean *on* "100" and *čymyn* "1000" did still exist (LEE, 88, 118; RAMSTEDT, § 109ff., p. 54ff.), the former being identical with Tk. *on*, *ōn* "10", the latter with Tk. and Mong. *tümān* "10000", Tg. Ew. *Nerča tuman* "1000", but in the Ew. dialects of Manžurja "10000" (ŠIROKOGOROV, II, 19); *čymyn* goes back to **tymyn*, provening from one of the forms of the Toxarian or ancient East-Iranian *tuman* "10000". A further parallel to Tungus is "2", modern Kor. *tul*, *tuwul*, North-Kor. *tūur* which LEE reconstructs as Ancient Kor. **tūpər*, **tūβər* (87f.), rendered in a Japanese transcription as an early Middle-Kor. *tufuri* (LEE, 101 bottom), the only one of the cardinals 1–10 which has a correspondent in another Altaic language. This **tūvər* is equivalent to the Tg. Ew. etc. *žūr-r* < **žō-r* (or **žōv-er*), the *-r* being the suffix of the nomina dualitatis as in Tk. *-z*, and it corresponds with secondary initial palatalization to IE **dā/-dvo-* etc. and extra-Nostratic equivalents, e.g. Malai *du*, Ainu *tu*. Apart from those, there is only M.-Kor. *sujn* "50" (LEE 174) with a clear Tungus parallel, Šurčen *susaji*, *susaj*, Ma. *susaj*, Nā. *sosaji*, *sosaj*, *sosi*, Olča *susaj* and Solon *susai* (< Ma.) "50" (TgWB II, 131), a derivative of Ma. *sunža*, Šč. *šunža* "5", in all other Tg. languages *tunja*, *tuŋña* etc. (TgWB II, 214f.), the element *-saj* perhaps going back to **sāj/-saj* < **sā-jy* "number" < "dizaine, δεκάς", from the common-Altaic root *sā/-sa-* "to count, think, know", the complex being thus

a semantic parallel to řč., Ma., Nā., Olča, Oroki, Sol., Ngd. *taggu* "100" (TgWB II, 163) < *tag-gu* "number, figure" of *tag-* "to count, zusammenzählen" (TgWB II, 161f.), cf. Ew. *tag-ū* "number, amount", Lamut *tag-un*, Mong. *toya(n)* "id.", all these being unwarrantedly separated in the TgWB. This numeral is in Tungus one of the few examples of alternation *t-/s-/š-* in initial position. RAMSTEDT (Kor. Gr., p. 56, "Einführung", II, 64) wants to connect Ma. *sunža* "5", Kor. *suŋn* and Ma. *susaj* "50" with words for "hand" (Kor. *son*) and "fist" (Tg. *sō-lto* – TgWB II, 109, only in Ew.!), but in the same vein Tg. *tugña* etc. "5" with Sino-Korean *toŋ* "a group of 5 houses", the Chinese character not being adduced, but this assumption is erroneous chiefly because the Tungus numeral is older than Sino-Korean loanwords, i.e. earlier Chinese loanwords in Middle- and Old-Korean.

The suffix of the ordinalia, M.-Kor. *-č'axil-č'axil-č'aj/-č'aj* (LEE, 174, 205f., 260) is to be compared with the Tungus equivalent e.g. Nā. *-čial/-čiel*, one of the ordinal formations (AVRORIN, I, 239f., K. H. MENGES, "Die Tung. Spr.", p. 191f.) which goes back, as evidenced by the Nānaj diphthong, to an ancient length, probably *-čā/-čē* < **čyral-čige* < **tyral-tigā*.

The numeral "5", *tasās* (< *ta-sās*, cf. *jesās* "6") cannot be separated from Mong. *tabun* "5" (*tabin* "50"), but the majority of the Korean numerals still remain enigmatic. For further speculations cf. RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr., p. 56. There might be relations with some Nostratic families, as e.g. of *sēsjs* "3" with IE *tre-, tri-* and SH' Arab: *p l p* etc.; or of *nēsjs* "4" with Uralic Suomi *neljä*, Xanty *noda*, Hung. *néd'*, Samojed. *Neneč t'et*, Sölq. *tēt, tiet* (cf. CASTREN, Samojed. Gram §§ 356ff., pp. 191ff.), Dravid. Tamil *nālu, nāl*, Kann. *nāl-ku*, Kūṛux *nā-x*, etc. (Orbis XIII, 1964, p. 83).

For the best comparative treatment of the numerals of the Inner Altaic Languages reference must be made to Eric P. HAMP's article "On the Altaic Numerals" in the HATTORI-Festschrift, "Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics", Tokyo, 1970, pp. 188–197.

Some word formation suffixes notwithstanding, in Korean there is as in the other Altaic languages no separate morphological category of the adjective, so that the adjectival quality of a noun is determined solely by its position before the noun, substantive, by which it is governed. There is also no grammatical agreement.

Of the pronomina, the personalia are, as in Japanese, a category which in the historical period has been suppressed in favor of an intricate system of polite circumlocutions, the well-known honorative formations (cf. RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr., § 100ff., pp. 46ff.). This development has obscured the relationship of the Korean and Japanese personalia with those of the other Altaic languages which represent a more compact unit with easily recognizable, well-preserved Nostratic and extra-Nostratic parallels.

According to LEE (85), the Old-Korean written expression of the Pron. pers. 1-st person sg. in the Hjaŋ-č'al and Idu texts is [2] and [3] which in the reading of the Ji (Li) epoch would sound *yj* and *yjndaj*, the true pronoun being represented by the first character *yj* < **čj*.*) In LEE's opinion (ib.) it is uncertain whether this corresponds to Altaic *bi*. This **čj* might very well go back to **wēj* – cf. the anlaut alternation *o-/wo-*, *ū-/we-* in South-Tungus – itself being from **bi*, *bi*, pron. pers. 1. sg. In the Hjaŋ-ga texts, Chinese [4] (modern) *wu* is used for the 1-st pers. sg. (LEE, ib.); it is read in Sino-Japanese *go*, modern Jap. *wa-re* "I", in Old-Jap., *wa-*, *wa-re* being the 1-st pers. pl. inclus. (Roy A. MILLER, JOAL, 157); this is from Middle-Chin. **quo* (KARLGREN, Anal. Dict. No. 1280) < Anc.-Ch. **go* (KARLGREN, Gramm. Ser., No. 58f: "we, my, our"), the 1-st pers. pl. being rendered as [5] = *ū-ri* (LEE, ib.) formed with the pl.-suff. *-ri*, exactly corresponding to the Turkic pronominal pl. in *-z*, *bi-z* "we". The pron. pers. 2-nd sg. is written [6], in Sino-Jap. reading *šo, ŋo*, genuinely Jap. *nanži* "thou", Chin. *zu*, Kanton *ü*, < M.-Ch. *ŋjo* (Gram. Ser., 94 j) < Anc.-Ch. **nčjwo* (Anal. D., 675, but Gram. Ser. 94 j *ŋjo*); for this latter, LEE gives no Old-Korean reading, but a form with *n-* or *ŋ-* might well be assumed which in M.-Kor. and later exists as *nē*, *něj* (LEE, 185). The Old-Jap. pron. 2-nd pers. sg. is *si*, obl. *sōn-*, closely related to

* Professor Roy Andrew MILLER kindly calls my attention to the fact that, in accordance with the Old-Korean graphic methods, in the form written with two characters the first one is the phonogram, modern Chinese *i, ji* < *ji* (KARLGREN, Grammata Ser., 976 l, "[the ancient *ji* is irregular, we would expect a *i*], final particle" – cf. with this modern *ji* < M.-Chin. *i* < Anc.-Ch. **džg* "me", ibidem, 976 p – s, "I" in A.-Chin. –), while the second character is the semantogram meaning "foot soldier, adherent, follower, servant; people", Gramm. Ser., 62 e: mod. *t'u* < M.-Ch. *d'uo* < A.-Ch. **d'o*. LEE does not give the reasons for his reading *nāj*.

Tungus and Turkic (MILLER, ib.). The ancient pron. pers. 1-st sg. was replaced, from Middle-Korean on by *na*, *naŋ* (LEE, 185, 220), a root which in Altaic underlies one of the obliquous stems in Mongolian, *na-*, *na-m(a)-* (cf. POPPE, "Introduction . . .", p. 210ff.); this same stem is one of the stems of the Indo-European Pron. pers. 1-st pl.: Lat. *no-*, *nō-*, Skt. *nas*, Old-Church-Slavic *na-* < **nō-*, etc. (cf. K. BRUGMANN, "Kurze vgl. Gr.", § 513, p. 407), likewise in Dravidian, Old-Kannaḍa 1-st pl. inclus. *nāwunam*, Old-Tamil 1-st pl. inclus. *nām/nam-*. The Old-Jap. pron. pers. 1-st pl. is *wa-*, *ware* for the inclusive, and *marō*, *warō* for the exclusive where the inceptive confusion of these two categories is noticeable, the *-r* being the pronominal plural suffix as the Tk. *-z* (cf. e.g. the 2-nd pers. pl. *na*, *na-re*, *ta*, *ta-re* [MILLER, ib.]). The Korean pronoun of the 2-nd person sg. might go back, by inconspicuous assimilation, to an Altaic stem **sn̄d-/tn̄d-* < **sin-ä-/tin-ä-* (as assumed in 1975, p. 70), but it might also have been due to a development as ROY A. MILLER had supposed it for Old-Jap. *na*, *na-re* (op. cit., 172); like the latter, it might be a cognate of the Dravidian pron. 2-nd pers. sg.: Old-Tamil, Malajälam, Kota, Toda *nī*, Kann. *nīm*, *nīn(u)*, Kodagu *nīny*, etc., as mentioned in 1975, p. 67f. Cf. further Elamite *n-*, *ni-*, *nin*, Chin. *nī*³ for the 2-nd sg. — which like Kor. *nē* might go back to older forms with **t-*, **s-*.

The demonstrative, M.-Kor. *ky*, *kyŋŋj* (LEE, 204; *ky*: RAMSTEDT, § 103, p. 49) has a parallel in Jakut, *kini* "he, she, it" which supplements the ancient pron. 3-rd pers. sg. **i-n-*, probably another one with Japanese, *kana-ta* "that direction, place over there" (MILLER, op. cit., 174). RÄSÄNEN, Etym. Wb., 252, puts Jakut *kini* to Old-Turkic *kāntū*, else *kāndi*, *gāndi* (Osm., Az.) "self" and Mong. *gendün* "male". Sary-Ujyur *ko*, *ku* and *ṭavaš ku*, *ku-n-* "that, ЭТОТ" belong here. MILLER, op. cit., 174f. along with RÄSÄNEN puts Jap. *kanata* to Tk. *kāntū*.

The later Middle-Korean interrogativum *mysy*, *mysyk* (LEE, 182) > modern Kor. *muōs* "which? который?" is a derivative of the Nostratic interrogative root ***mi* "what? which?" (ILLIC-SVITYC, op. cit., No. 380), occurring in Altaic as Tk. Qumandu *mi*, *ṭavaš mēn* < **min-*, and Uralic Suomi, Hung. *mī*, Lapp. *mī*, *mā*, etc. (cf. K. H. MENGES, 1975, p. 90f.). The Middle-Korean pronomen indefinitum *nu*, *nuj* "some, somebody" (LEE, 185) serves with the enclitics *-ko*, *-ku* as interrogativum, *nu-ko*, *nu-ku* "who?"

and is a cognate of Tung. *gŋ*, *gŋj* "who? what?" and Turk. *nā/ne/ni* "what?" (MENGES, 1975, pp. 82–84).

Traces of the distinction of exclusive and inclusive forms are found with the verb only (cf. infra).

The Middle-Korean correlative *iri* "hither", *kyri*, *tjēri* "thither", 2-nd and 3-rd pers. (LEE, 179, 204; RAMSTEDT, § 106, p. 52) should be mentioned, as they are formed from the demonstrative roots *i-*, *ky-* and *tjē-* which can be put to Tung. demonstr. *i-*, Turk. *ki-n-/ku-n-* and *tigi-n-*, Mong. *teg-ün-*, nom. *te-re*. The suffix *-ri* corresponds to that of the Tungus prosecutive *-li*, *-li*, as also LEE thinks (22) who adds *keli* "when?", the same in Middle-Kor. *'amāri*, *amuri* "somewhere, irgendwohin". On the Altaic interrogative *i-*, cf. K. H. MENGES, 1975, pp. 71ff., 84. In modern Korean, such correlative formations are possible with plain nouns, as e.g. *kēt* "thing, piece", *tā* "time" M.-Kor. < *ptai*, *tja* (< Chin.) "person", nom. "fellow", etc. (RAMSTEDT, § 103, p. 48f.). In another context, RAMSTEDT considers those same correlative as "converbs", erroneously contradicting his former statement.

VERBUM. In the Altaic languages, the inflexion of the verb has reached an approximation to true conjugation in Turkic and Tungus only, in some individual languages as a consequence of certain phonological rules typical of those languages; the sporadic development of flexivic formations is seen, as e.g. in some Siberian Turkic languages and in Nānāj, while the majority of the Mongolian languages and, in Tungus, Manṣu, do not have any true conjugation. While in Mongolian this seems to be an archaic relic, in Manṣu it must have been due to a loss of an originally well-developed system as it is typical of all Tungus and Turkic languages. This is likewise the situation in the three Outer Altaic groups, Korean, Japanese, and Rjū-Kjū. Here, the verbal inflexion has not gone beyond the development of verbal nouns, i.e. participles and gerunds which in the sentence are also to function as predicate, absolutely impersonal forms, lacking any indication as to person, even the possessive suffix of the 3-rd person. If formations undetermined as to person are used as predicate in the other Altaic languages, they designate by their nature the 3-rd person, while the first and second persons are to be expressed by the appropriate suffixes, personal or possessive. Thus, in the Outer Altaic

languages the predicate of a sentence when it refers to the 1-st or 2-nd person, must be determined by the respective personal pronoun which may be omitted in Tungus and Turkic or in the Indo-European languages of the older classical type.

As generally in Altaic, also in Korean and the other Outer Altaic languages, a variety of verbal nouns developed to serve in aspectual, temporal and modal function wherewith aspect and tense can often not clearly be delimited, here, too, the tense being a more recent category than the aspect. In a similar way, mood can often not be clearly separated from aspect, this especially in the Outer Altaic languages, but also in Mongolian, less so in Tungus and Turkic, the mood always carrying an imperative, optative or desiderative connotation. Inasmuch as the necessary comparative and historical research still is lacking, it is impossible to reach a conclusion as to whether the loss of the personal pronouns in the earlier historical phases of both Korean and Japanese was a reason for the deficiency of the personal expression with the verbal nouns or whether, inversely, this latter fact was instrumental in the loss of the personal pronoun. The primordial reason for the loss of the personal pronoun in both Korean and Japanese was a social one: the desire, or rather, the social compulsion for basic distinction, not only in literary expression, but in formal and informal speech as well, of the existing class or, better, caste differences in the respective Oriental or early feudal societies of the Far East. Looking at Korean and Japanese from the viewpoint of general Altaic, one would presuppose for both families a complete system of personal pronouns – relics of which were still extant during the early literary periods of both languages – and therewith, of course, the morphological expression of person with the verbal nouns, so that one would hold the social conditions responsible for the complete decay of the personal forms in these two languages.

As soon as the peoples speaking proto-Korean and Proto-Japanese had settled down in the countries and on the islands they still inhabit today, they had been exposed to unceasing political and cultural influences, at time to pressure, on the part of as compact and great a complex as China. This meant not only the influx of a great amount of words, the majority of which have during the times become loanwords and therewith elements firmly rooted in the Korean and Japanese native lexical possession, but it also

meant the influx of other linguistic features which with the time progressing acted upon and modified certain genuine Korean and Japanese features, be they true Altaic or of different origin. Certain changes and even decay in genuine Korean and Japanese morphology, a certain attrition as e.g. the loss of personal expression with the verb, even in predicative function – which can likewise be observed in Manchu and Literary Mongolian – is unthinkable without Chinese influence.

The proximity to the Chinese complex brought about, in Korean and Japanese, an accelerated process of linguistic development which resulted in the formation of nominal and verbal classes, as a consequence of sound changes arising with the stem finals and the suffix initials, a development which ultimately leads to the various distinct declension and conjugation classes such as typical of Indo-European. Approximations to such formations are found in Mongolian and Tungus too, also in Uralic and Dravidian. Within Altaic, Korean and Japanese have in this respect gone the longest way as they show a much higher speed of development than any other Altaic language does. The verbal inflexion, particularly the conjugation, is genetically later than the nominal one, the declension. Thus, it might very well be assumed that at the time when the Koreans and the Japanese had settled down in their present habitat, their verbal inflexions had not yet reached a state of development as it has become known in the historically documented Altaic languages and that, therefore, an ever increasing Chinese influence could prevent the general-Altaic development to take place in the category of the verb, so that a verbal inflexion that ultimately would have led to conjugation, could not take place or, where it had taken place, it was gradually corroded.

As the verbal inflexions are evolutionally younger than the nominal ones, and since they here in the Far East were inhibited or even built down, it is quite natural that there are fewer features in the verbal morphology which connect Korean and the other Altaic languages.

As said on earlier occasions (e.g. in "Japanisch und Altajisch", 1975, p. 122f.), influences from other languages than Chinese in the proto-Korean and early historical Korean language must be taken into consideration which were those from peoples who had been living in and near the historical habitat of the Koreans, the

Korean Peninsula, and in Southern Mančuria in a larger sense, comprising the upper Ussuri region up to the Pacific littoral. The Tungus peoples living there at present in small, scattered groups, immigrated there coming in successive groups from the West and Northwest later than the Koreans, into an area more sparsely inhabited than the later historical homelands of the Koreans. As this is rather far from, and uninteresting to, the Chinese, there is extremely little in Chinese sources to draw any conclusions from as to peoples and languages. It is impossible so far to neatly separate some presumably proto-Korean peoples from those of different origin. These vast lands were very sparsely inhabited, chiefly along the rivers and the sea-coast, by peoples some of whom survive as the present day Nivx (Giljak), Ajnu, these latter probably along the sea-coast only, and the early Čukči (or Čukčō-Kamčadalian peoples) who had been pushed back farthest to the Northeast by the Altaians, most probably the Tungus. Of those, it were the Nivx who for the longest time had remained in areas somewhat nearer to the Koreans than the other two groups. But these are only the peoples of whom we know historically, inclusive of their languages. In the Chinese records some peoples in the Northeast of Korea are mentioned, called *Dun-hu* ("East barbarians"), usually characterized in rather short passages as to their outward appearance and customs, but nothing can be said so far about their language, history and origin. In the pertaining chapters of his "Kultur und Siedlung der Randvölker Chinas", W. EBERHARD has made an attempt at a classification of those peoples from an ethnological view-point; this is as far as one can go until now (cf. also my "Tungusen und Ljao", 1968, p. 9ff.). The pre-T'ang Chinese sources concerning those Northeastern peoples are still not sufficiently well-known to permit further conclusions. It is not to be lost out of sight that those peoples, or, at least, their majority, had in pre-T'ang times been living farther to the South, south of Korea in present-day Northeastern China and near the sea. But for not going too far afield now, a fact which for the discussion of the great losses Korean has suffered in its verbal morphology is of importance is the deficient expression of person with the Nivx verb showing the distinction of person in the imperative only. As predicate, the Nivx verb has the suffixes *-ta/-da* and *-ra*, *-ta/-da* as suff. 1. ps. sg. and of all persons in the plural, while *-ra* is the suffix of

the 2-nd and 3-rd ps. sg. (cf. PANFILOV in *Jazyki Narodov SSSR*, V, pp. 421f.). If this absorption of proto-Nivx tribes by the proto-Koreans was one that permitted cultural exchange and not one intended to destroy foreign ways and characteristics, the proto-Giljak language could have had a certain influence upon proto-Korean, not to be compared, however, with that of Chinese. The proto-Giljak influence had probably come to its end during the transition from the pre-historical to the historical period of Korean, at a time when the Chinese influence began to penetrate Korean social, cultural and political life. A further question imposes itself at this point: were the proto-Giljaks immediate, close neighbors of the Chinese and did they, thus, undergo the same influences as later the proto-Koreans and the Koreans of the historical period? It is also impossible to state whether Giljak had, in its pre- or early historical period, the same deficient expression of person with the verb as it does now, i.e. during the last 150–200 years.

While the most essential elements of the verbal morphology, i.e. true conjugation, namely the suffixes denoting person, are lacking in Korean, the verbal expression in its function as predicate or merely as attribute is always a plain verbal noun which can fulfil the task of a verbal substantive, a verbal attribute to a noun, substantive or other, as participle, that of a verbal attribute to a verb or verbal expression, as a verbal adverb, i.e. gerund (by some, also RAMSTEDT and LEE, called "converb"), a feature typical of the outer Altaic languages, but shared by Mančzu and some Mongolian languages such as Literary Mongolian. In contradistinction to this, Tungus and Turkic have their conjugation showing, in some instances, forms of a flexivie type with which they come very close to the classical Indo-European conjugation. The verbal expression of Korean, i.e. the verbal noun, consists as in all Altaic languages of the verbal root or stem to which the suffixes of aspect which includes the genera verbi, medium and passivum, and/or tense (often both those of aspect and tense) and those of participles or gerunds are attached; the latter may imply participial or gerundial quality. With this ends the form of the verbal expression in Korean, Japanese, Mančzu and some Mongolian languages, while in the Tungus and Turkic languages elements denoting person are attached, the enclitical personal pronouns, or the

possessive suffixes. In some languages, some of these formations are subjected to some phonetical changes, contractions and fusions of various kinds so that an approximation at, and in some instances an identity with, the flexiv type arises. If this latter development takes place, with the progress of time, in the entire verbal system, a conjugation of the classical Indo-European type is achieved.

In the Korean verbal expression the basic three time levels, praesens, praeteritum, and futurum, can be distinguished, but from the formation distinguishing them their relatively recent origin can easily be detected. Very often, the aspect is more important a category than the tense as expression of the time level of an action, a feature common to all Altaic languages. Apart from some basic morphemes, in the Korean language a rather great number of compound suffixes have evolved to express the modal, i.e. aspectual, and temporal circumstances of an action. Their number has considerably increased, since it had become necessary to express in the written and spoken language the basic social differences, so that a verbal noun not rarely has five and more suffixes, some of which consist of verbal nouns of auxiliary verbs such as *i-*, *i-s-*, nom. verbale *itta* < **i-s-ta* "being, existing". As in some Siberian Turkic languages, the verbal complexes undergo contractions and fusions so that their original nature can only be detected by comparison with Ancient or Middle Korean forms if they had existed. With this system, Korean is absolutely in line with the other Altaic languages, however, the material with which this system is built differs widely from the other Altaic languages.

In the nominal morphology a certain loss of case suffixes has caused their replacement, partly by enclitics and postpositions, and the origin of suffix compounds – this particularly with the suffixes denoting circumstances of location or movement and of time which in the Altaic and Uralic languages are rendered in great detail –, suffix clusters which usually have undergone considerable fusion by contraction so that their true origin can only be detected in Middle Korean, in rare cases also in Old Korean. A development of the same nature has taken place in the morphology of the verb in which suffixes consisting of one element only are rare, in the new language almost an exception. The basic nominal suffixes are generally of genuine Altaic origin, while the great

majority of the verbal suffixes are of later, local, Korean origin, a situation very similar to that in Japanese, facts which evidence the early separation of the Outer Altaic languages from Common or even Proto-Altaic. The morphology of the Korean verb is quite rich in suffix compounds, of two and often more elements, those in final position not seldom being case suffixes, but very often enclitics consisting of postpositions or anaphoric, deictic particles. To those often are furthermore added short nouns, some of Chinese origin, denoting time, place, direction or other circumstances of an action that follow after the verbal noun in the suffixless casus indefinitus with the function of genitive. In Korean, this has developed in place of the suffixes of verbal nouns having in the other Altaic languages an aspect or tense character. This matches, in a certain semantic sense, the great riches of the Tungus languages in those aspect formations which express the circumstances of an action, but structurally being different inasmuch as the Tungus suffixes cannot function as verbal nouns but only as stems, while the Korean formations are those of verbal nouns, i.e. gerunds, participles or verbal substantives. The same is the situation in Japanese. The minute distinction of the various shades of polite speech necessitated a corresponding amount of appropriate verbal forms. Those latter are by far less differentiated in Japanese.

Of the aspect suffixes the following have their cognates in other Altaic languages: verbs of state or continuativa, intransitiva, modalia are formed with the suffix M.-Kor. *-b-*, *-ab-*, *-kab-* (LEE, 178, 187; probably < *-ka-b-*) which is to be put together with the Tungus passive suffix *-w/-u-* and the rather rare Turkic passive in *-u/-ü-*, cf. M.-Kor. *norra-* "to frighten", *norra-b-* "to be frightened, terrified", Tungus Ew. **ḡl̥l̥-w-* > *ḡl̥l̥-u-*, Aldan, Totto "to be afraid", the same suffix in composition: (XVIII-th cent.) *-syre-b-*, indicating a state, e.g. *uēnsju-syre-yn nom* "an inimically minded fellow" (LEE, 249), where the suffix *-syre-* exactly corresponds to Turkic *-syra/-sird-*, as in Ča., Ozb. *gumān-sy-ra-* "to suspect" (of N.-Pers. *gumān* "suspicion; mind"). There is a M.-Kor. causative-passive in *-o/-u-* (LEE, 151, m.) which apparently goes back to an older *-yo/-yu-* and a M.-Kor. intentionalis in *-o/-u-* (LEE, 151) which differs from the former **-yo/-yu-* since it does not seem to have had initial consonant. The causative-passive in *-o-* < **-yo-*, whether it is one or consists of two elements, *-γ-* and

-o/-u-, seems to be related to the Tungus passive in -w/-u-. This causative-passive in *-yo/-yu- > -o/-u- might have some relation to the Nānāj suffix -wo/-wu-, discussed by me in *Anthropos* LXXIII, 1978, pp. 394ff., but on both sides, Korean as well as Nānāj, pertaining research is still to be expected. There are M.-Kor. transitive-causatives in -xi- (LEE, 175f.) and -ba/-by- (LEE, 176), the latter having their Tungus reflex in the above-mentioned causative-passive suffix -w/-u-, the former particularly in the Turkic suffix -q/-k-, always compounded with one of the suffixes -ar-, -yr- or -yz- in -qar-, qyr-, qyz-.

Nomina verbalia. The common-Altaic suffix of the nomen aoristi -ra exists here too: -r-, -ri-, the latter being a fusion with a gerund of the auxiliary 'i-, i-s- "to be, exist" (LEE, 23, 193; RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr., § 215, p. 106f., "future participle"). The fact that in Middle-Korean the nomina verbalia, e.g. those in -n and -r-, could have the function not only of participles, but also that of ordinary verbal nouns such as verbal substantives, is not at all "eigentlich (peculiar or odd)", as LEE (214, bottom) says, but absolutely in line with the Altaic rules as seen in all Altaic languages. The following have also a temporal connotation: present -nā- (LEE, 193), not used without further suffixes, belongs with the common-Altaic and Indo-European durative (>) presentic -n-, -n-, for Altaic first recognized by BANG in his "Études Ouralo-altaïques", pp. 1ff.; Le Muséon, 1891; with preterital, often perfectic connotation -kē-, -a-, -ē- and -lē- which except for -a- occur in Turkic and Tungus, too, in combinations also in Mongolian. Of the plain gerundial formations, the Middle and New Korean gerund in -a/-ē- (LEE, 196, no. 3; RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr. § 173, p. 89f., "converbium perfecti"), often used with a secondary suffix -m or -k-, has its exact counterpart in Turkic where it is quite common, both independently and in verbal composition. The gerund in -a plus ensuing verbal composition is in Korean more recent than the old composition of verbal stem plus verbal stem (LEE, 172). The gerundium futuri in -ke/-ge- (RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr., p. 91f., "Einführung", II, p. 91; LEE, p. 199, no. 13) might be put to Turkic -qa/-qaj-, optative-future. The M.-Kor. gerundium concessivum in -na may well have its counterpart in North-Tungus (Ew.) -na for the action preceeding on the same time level or of the mood (modality), or in -nā-, the gerun-

dium hypotheticum (VASILEVIĆ, 1958, p. 777). M.-Kor. -mjē (RAMSTEDT, Kor. Gr., p. 108f., "conv. dumtemporale"), designating actions occurring on the same time level and being the verbal noun in -m + postpos. -jē (LEE, 196, 210; Old-Kor. -mjē, LEE, 55) corresponds to the Tungus gerunds in (Ew., North-Tg.) -mī, šūr-čen -maj/-mej (according to VASILEVIĆ 1958, p. 773 "indefinite-causal"; Nānāj "actions on the same time level"); it is common-Tungus (VASILEVIĆ, *ibid.*). The "postposition" in Korean may in reality have been an ancient case suffix which also is inherent in the -i of the Tungus suffix that seems to go back to an older diphthong, *-aj/-ej, as preserved in šūr-čen. The supinum in -rja// -ra/-ro consists, in RAMSTEDT's analysis, of this suffix from the "future participle in -l(-r)" and the gerundium perfecti of the auxiliary i- "to be", i-ē, i-jē — which is nothing else but the above nomen aoristi. LEE's statement (198, no. 8), calling this "converbal ending of intention, Konverbalendung der Absicht" (RAMSTEDT: "conv. destinationis"), according to which in Middle Korean this suffix was always preceded by that of the aspect in -o might be an argument against its originally supinal nature, as assumed by RAMSTEDT.

Under "Verba finita; The Affirmative Indicative" RAMSTEDT (Kor. Gr., pp. 70ff.) lists three forms of verbal nouns which occur in the function of the predicate, i.e. they have the function of the verbum finitum in languages with true conjugation, but in their morphology, they, too, are verbal nouns, no verba finita. These three forms have suffixes of -t- plus vowel: the "declarative" in -t'a/-ta/-da, the "regressive" in -t'ē/-tē/-dē, and the "indecisive" in -t'ī/-tī/-dī (in North-Kor. the older -t'ī/-tī/-dī). The -t- of this suffix is Altaic (even earlier, Nostratic: Uralian, Dravidian, and Indo-European; cf. K. H. MENGES, *Anthropos* LXXII, 1977, 164f., 170) and its original function must have been that of a definitive (>) perfective action, from which later, at the beginning of the historical epoch, certain tense connotations evolved, thus in Turkic and Tungus that of past, i.e. generally perfectum. The vowel was of secondary origin and seems to have designated tense levels of the definitive (>) perfective action as evident from Korean: -a for presentic and aoristic, -ē for preterital, and -i for futuric actions. No other Altaic language shows this paradigmatic distribution of vowels. In Turkic, the -t- is limited to the function of definitive (>)

perfective action and of the perfect tense, however, with certain instances of plain perfective action regardless of time level which latter may be presentic or futuric (cf. K. H. MENGES, 1968, p. 130). Only relics of this *-t-* are extant in Mongolian and Tungus; in the latter, the North-Tungus *-čā* of the perfectum might be from a proto-Alt. **-tyja/-tjā*. RAMSTEDT is hardly right when he puts Kor. *-ta* etc. to the Tungus supinum in *-dā* (plus possessive-reflexive suffixes) as in his "Einführung", II, p. 120, or the Kor. *-ti*, futurum, later > potentialis, to the Lamut futurum in *-di* where the forms with *-t-* are due to preceding voiceless consonants; the Turkic forms in *-ti* without any preterital connotation, quoted by RAMSTEDT (ib., 128) are pure perfective forms as mentioned above. The New-Korean gerund in *-ča*, RAMSTEDT's "conv. momentanei" (Kor. Gr., § 205, p. 103f.), may be put to North-Tungus *-čā*, nomen perfecti, and the "nomen resultativum" in *-ča* in Mongolian, as done by RAMSTEDT, but not to the nomina verbalia in *-Vš* of Turkic. Whether the Middle Kor. optatives in *-kora* and *-kopita* (LEE, 200, classifies them with the imperatives in a larger sense) are compounds with an element *-ko-* which might be compared with the Turkic optative/futurum *-qa/-qaj* cannot be decided as yet, but this latter has its closest counterpart in Kor. *-kaj/-kěj*, RAMSTEDT's "conv. futuri" and "precativ" ("Einführung", II, § 54, p. 91, Kor. Gr., § 179; LEE, 199, no. 13; 255).

RAMSTEDT states (Kor. Gr., § 172, p. 88f.) that "the particle *nin* (attached to the gerund. praes. in *-ko*) . . . marks an opposition between the two actions, and the translation is then usually "if" (cf. his exx.). This reminds of concessive, limitative expressions in Ewenki with the help of the enclitic suffix *-nun/-nün* that usually serves as the suffix of the casus comitativus, cf. Ew. *ila-lla-wa-nun ēnū-čē-n* "he was sick for only three days" (VASILEVIČ, 1958, p. 783).

LEE (253f.) quotes the interesting case of the gerund in *-ē* of M.-Kor. *sky-* "to take", *sky-ē* which when preceding as a gerundial attribute another verb becomes *skē* and thus "takes over the function of a prefix". Such a formation has equivalents in the Turkic verbal compositions of the type e.g. Čayataj *jybar-, jibār-, Qazaq jibār-* "to send, let go, etc." < **jā-d-a-ber-* where the first link in the composition, the verb in the gerund in *-a*, gradually develops to a verbal prefix (cf. "Japanisch und Altajisch", 1975, pp. 3ff.).

Similar functionally identical formations from the gerund in *-p* are more common in Turkic: *appar-* < *at-yp-bar-* "to take along", *appār-* < *at-yp-ber-* "to bring along", *akkāl-, apkāl-, ākpāl-* "to fetch, holen" < *at-yp-kel-*. In this way, the possibilities for a verbal prefixation have been given.

RAMSTEDT's "converbum futuri" or "posterioris" (Kor. Gr., § 179, pp. 91ff., "Einführung", II, § 54, p. 91) was in Middle Kor. *-kyj/-kāj/-kěj* (LEE, 199, no. 13) and corresponds to the Turkic fut. -optative in *-qaj/-kāj* (II-*qa/-kā*). The Tungus Ew. imperat. 1-st ps. pl. inclus. *-ḡāt/-yāt*, quoted by RAMSTEDT ("Einf.", II, 91) may belong here, as RAMSTEDT thinks, but the other suffix, Ew. *-ka/-kē-* which according to RAMSTEDT is "probably the optative *-gai, -kai*" (ib.), is the suffix of an aspect, not one of gerund or another verbal noun. VASILEVIČ's text, a little song from the Sym river, has (VASILEVIČ, 1936, p. 141, no. 9) *ēpkērēyil ginilikkēsun*! "You, dry stems, are shaking (in the wind)" and *taktakayjil kogrilkošun* "You, cedars, you become black"; there occur two more examples in *-kē-šun*, and none seems to have any optative connotation as RAMSTEDT thought. VASILEVIČ also translates it as a plain statement (in the "indicative"). RAMSTEDT has in both instances *-kē-šun, -kō-šun*, with *s*, as if it were from a different dialect. VASILEVIČ lists the suffix *-ka/-kē-* as one "of a secondary verbal stem" (VASILEVIČ, 1958, p. 758), i.e. without recognizable semantic qualities. The conjugational form above is that of the rare ancient praesens in *-n* which at present seems to be used in the oratio recta only (VASILEVIČ 1958, p. 721, § 114).

Of the suffixes for deverbal nouns, i.e. mostly verbal substantives, the Middle Kor. suffix *-ām, -ym, -m* (LEE, 173) exactly corresponds to Turkic *-Vm, -m*, also those in *-n, -r, -ki* (LEE, 195) have exact Turkic counterparts in *-Vn, -Vr*, and *-qy/-ki*, where Kor. *r* may also stand for **r₂* = Turkic *z*, and for **l₁* and **l₂*, i.e. Turkic *-t/-l* and *-š*, depending on the respective etymon. Whether the suffix *-n* which can be attached to the gerundia temporis in the Middle-Korean forms *nā-n, -tē-n, -kē-n, -ri-n* is the same above-mentioned suffix *-n* as LEE (195) thinks, cannot be decided here as sufficient material on its use is lacking, but from a general Altaistic point of view this is to be negated since suffixes forming deverbal nouns cannot be attached to nomina verbalia, i.e. to already

existing verbal nouns. Analogical, secondary formations, however, cannot be entirely excluded, but in this *-n* an ancient lative suffix may have survived.

The verbal compositions in Korean, usually of two, seldom of more than two verbs, are of the same formal and functional type as in Turkic (cf. e.g. *Philologiae Turcaeae Fundamenta*, I, 477 ff.), the main verb being in the form of a gerund, in Korean as in Turkic, of that in *-d/-ē*, Tk. *-a/-ā*, followed by the main verb. In Korean, the same gerund can be constructed with the auxiliary *xa-* "to do, make" which otherwise is profusely used with Chinese loanwords, in the same manner as in Turkic *et-* and *qyt-* "id." occur with foreign nouns, especially Arabic and Persian; but apart from *xa-* the auxiliary *i-*, *is-* "to be, exist" can be attached to the gerund in *-a* and thus serve as formal expression of a preterital tense, yielding in New Korean the suffix *-as/-ēs* (LEE, 255) for the plusquamperfectum. Those could be compared to the Turkic formations with the auxiliaries *ä(r)-* and *tur-*, *jat-* which, however, serve in imperfective and durative function. In the Korean formations with *is-*, no suffix of gerund or participle after the stem *is-* is extant any more; it was lost as in the well-known Mančžu *-bi* < **bi-si*, **bi-rē* of the nomina verbalia praes. in *-m-bi* < **-n + bi*, or in Turkic formations of the type *-dyr/-dur* < *tur-ur*, (Sib.) *-tā* < *jat-yr*, and the like.

The *verbum negativum* is a particular Altaic feature, shared by Uralic and Dravidian as well. In none of these three large families the *verbum negativum* has been preserved intact, but occurs in some languages of these families in relics only, in some it even does not exist any more. In Altaic, traces are found in Mongolian and Turkic – in the latter it underlies the entire formation of the negative "aspect" in *-ma/-mä-* (cf. K. H. MENGES, 1968, p. 144f.) – while in North-Tungus languages the ancient East-Nostratic *verbum negativum* **e-* has been very well preserved. An intermediary position with this regard is held by South-Tungus, Korean and Japanese.

In Altaic two *verba negativa* are historically extant, the one **ä-*, *e-*, is shared with Uralic *e-*, while the other one, **a-*, **a-n-* has its cognate counterpart in Dravidian, *a-*, *-ā-*, *-a-*, *al-*. In Mongolian, traces of *e-* are left, which for Turkic can be reconstructed from the form of the aforementioned "negative aspect", but Tungus and

Korean have both, North-Tungus *ē-* in almost complete formations while **a-*, **a-n-* occur in relics only in both North and South-Tungus, Korean and Japanese. As proto-Altaic **ä*, **e*, and **a* have coincided in *a* in Japanese (cf. Roy A. MILLER, JOAL, p. 153f., 306) – and correspond to Dravidian *a-*, the traces of the two *verba negativa* are not clearly discernible. For the questions concerning the Altaic *verba negativa* I principally refer to my "Japanisch und Altajisch", 1975, pp. 96–110. Neither RAMSTEDT nor LEE devoted to the *verba negativa* a special section. In SKE, p. 10, RAMSTEDT lists *an*, *ani*, *äni* "not" and puts it with a question mark – but correctly – to Nānaja *ana* "not" and assumes a connection with the negative verb **a-* in Ma. *aqu*, 3rē. *asu* "not"; he lists the Korean derivative of Altaic **e-*, *ē-* under *ēpta* (: *ēpsə* : *ēpsəin* : *ēpsəin*) "to be lacking, not existing" and analyses *ēps-*, *-i* < **ēp bisi*, **ēp isi* connecting this with the wrong parallels as mentioned in "Japanisch und Altajisch", p. 100, and he fails to recognize its identity with Tungus *ē-* and Uralic *e-*. LEE mentions both etyma within various contexts. He says that *'ani-* was in Middle Korean a noun – on p. 214, end, however, he writes it *'ani*, i.e. as a verb – and that it in predicative function demanded the copula (280, mid), but from the XVII-th/XVIII-th cts. onward it begins to go over into the verbal category, finally being treated as a verb (ib.). He quoted *'animjēn* (< *'ani-mjēn*) "if not . . . be/are" from a Middle Korean text (209, mid), but much more important is his statement (214f.) that (M.-Kor.) *'ani* and *'ēps-* were used with the verbal noun in *-r*, i.e. the Altaic nomen aoristi, which preceded the *verbum negativum*: e.g. *syrp'-yr-s* *'ēpsi* "not, without, being sad", in the M.-Kor. genitive in *-s* of the nomen aoristi, *ta'ärs* (< *ta'ä-r-s*) *'ēpsyni* "as there is no end(ing)", *'anirs* (< *'ani-r-s*) *'animjē* (< *'ani-mjē*) "not that there were not, be not" (215, top). In these Middle-Korean constructions the genitive in *-s* is used instead of the participle which is the rule in North-Tungus with the nomina negativa such as Ew., Ngd. *äčyn*, Lamut *äčča*, *atqan*, Sol. *äši*, Udi *anči*.

Since Roy A. MILLER has proved the existence of the opposition *inclusive* : *exclusive* in Japanese (JAOL, p. 176ff.), this category can be considered as a genuine Altaic category, shared by Dravidian. In Japanese, it has been preserved in the personal pronoun, but began to be effaced during the pre-literary period. Likewise,

Mongolian still does maintain this distinction in the pronomina personalia only, while in Turkic it has survived in the verb with the forms of the 1-st pers. pl. imperative. Apparently, this situation prevails also in Korean, for, when treating of the imperative, LEE (200f.) mentions a number of suffixes, mostly compounds, none of them without having any apparent cognates in other Altaic languages, he adduces *-čjē* and *-sagita* as "orders to the 1-st pers. pl. with the meaning of an exhortation for joint action". Apart from *-sagita*, there is also the imperative suffix *-čigita*, evidently without having the inclusivic connotation. Older forms are not mentioned by LEE, likewise, there is no attempt at an analysis of those forms. Inasmuch as the pronominal as well as the imperative forms of the inclusivus generally do contain elements designating the 2-nd person – outside of the Nostratic languages cf. e.g. the great similarity in the formal structure of the 1-st ps. pl. inclus. and the 2-nd ps. dual in Mundā (cf. K. H. MENGES, 1964, p. 87, 1977, p. 162f.) – the question ought to be raised whether the last part of the compound, *-sagita*, might not be the one designating the 2-nd person, as e.g. in Mongolian and Turkic the suffix expressing the 2-nd person usually stands in the second or in the last place of those suffix compounds. Similarly, *-čjē* of which the anlaut goes back to ancient or proto-Korean **t-* might be an element of the 2-nd person. RAMSTEDT calls the imperative form in *-ča* that continues the Middle-Korean *-čjē*, "cohortative" (Kor. Gr., § 162, p. 84) and describes it as "an exhortation addressed either to myself or all persons present to do something". Whatever the etymology of these Middle-Korean suffixes, the inclusivic character of those two imperatives is an important Altaic feature.

The *syntactic* of Korean throughout its historical phases is as Altaic as seen in the overwhelming majority of the single Altaic languages from Turkic to Japanese and Rjū-Kjū. Therefore, nothing special is to be said in this place on the syntax of Korean. Any one of the many text samples adduced by LEE and RAMSTEDT – for quoting only these two sources – taken at random could serve as a typical sample of a Korean sentence. It should not be left unmentioned that at the very beginning of the exploration of the Altaic languages this particular feature of the syntactical structure was noticed by scholars such as W. SCHOTT, A. BOLLER, Heinrich WINKLER, W. BANG and others so that it became to be

regarded, and rightfully so, as the model of Altaic syntax. Certainly, the Altaic syntactical rules are not in all Altaic languages equally strict; thus, e.g. Tungus in its northern representatives shows a certain amount of freedom, because its morphological system is as rich as to permit a less strict word order in the sentence, as found in a number of Uralic languages and in Indo-European. But the Altaic syntax seems to have been typical of the older and archaic stages of all the three East-Nostratic groups of which Dravidian is almost as strict as Altaic, only Uralic showing some farther digressions which seem to be due to contact with Indo-European in older as well as in more recent epochs. In West-Nostratic, Indo-European languages of a more archaic syntactical type such as pre-classical Latin share some basic syntactical rules with East-Nostratic, particularly Altaic and Dravidian.

The *etymology* of the Korean *lexicon* may be illustrated with the following examples.

In the following I greatly benefited from Roy A. MILLER's comments and suggestions concerning O.-Silla *jiŕri* "star", O.-Jap. *kēbur* "smoke", *kiFasi* "being beautiful", *kuzi* "chestnut", O.-Kogurjō **kunš* "script", Kor. *ilgop* "7", Kogurjō *nuami* "sea", Jap. *ba* "place, etc.", O.-Jap. *Fatakē* "field", Kor. *saj*, A.-Ch. **cidi* "border", Kor. *sān* "account", O.-Jap. *uFē* "top".

1. 'am, M.-K. "♀ animal", L 181; New-Kor. *am* only in tatpuruša-composition with animal names for the designation of its female; SKE, 9; Old Pajkčē **omo* "mother, cf. R. A. MILLER, "Some Old Paekche Fragments", Journal of Korean Studies, I (Seattle, 1979), p. 52, where it is put to O.-Jap. *omo* < **ōmō* "id."; may be put to Mo. *eme* "mother" as an ablaut variant of *ēmē* which exists also in Kor. (SKE, 54), along with North-Kor. *amā* "mother" (SKE, 9). The vacillation *a/ē* is found in many instances, as RAMSTEDT points out; he further compares Ket *ām* "woman", pl. *ām-ēp*. With a question mark RAMSTEDT compares *am* with the Turkic suffix *-ym/-um* in cases such as *xan-um*, *beg-um* which is rather the poss. 1-st sg., as PELLIO had assumed. Tāv. *arym* "married woman" is < Ar. *haram*, in Turkic "id." < "forbidden, secluded". But closer is the Uralic sib: Suomi *emä* "mother (esp. of animals)" and all the other Uralic forms, including Jukagir *emej*, *emē*, with the paren-

latter assumption is acceptable for Št. and the Ew. forms only, but a borrowing in South-Tungus from Jakut is problematic. POPPE, 106, considers, in view of Tk. *šr, Tkm. šr, Jakut šrdā as a borrowing from Mo., but this is not absolutely cogent as there are vacillations in both the quality and the quantity of the root vowel (cf. SEVORTJAN, 302ff., 369ff.; not in RAS.). Tk. > Kamaš. erte, erte "id." (JOKI, 127, with detailed quotation of the known forms). SKE, 69 sub il; no borrowing assumed.

13. Old Silla *jirri "star", L 68. He sees, as I think, correctly, in the name of a mountainous locality, [8] Sino-Kor. sŏŋ san, Ch. šig san, "Star Mountain", the meaning, and in [9] *jit-lji (<*nit-ljad), resp. [10], Sino-Kor. ri san, Ch. li san, the reading, or a variant of the reading of the native form. Lee would reconstruct *irri for Old Silla, but the Chinese phonogram orthography speaks rather for *jirri. Lee also suggests that the underlying etymon is inherent in New Kor. irinaj "the Milky Way" (which otherwise in New Kor. is ynxaasu < Chin. [7] jin-ho-šuej "silver-river-water", Jap. ginga "id., galaxy" (lit. "silver river", KENK., 380), but the juxtaposition is unlikely: New Kor. irinaj is only a dialect form, which seems to describe the Milky Way as a "way", naj, of iri "soft roe, milt" (MARTIN et al., K-E Dict., p. 1327b, for iri), and so if the Old Silla term indeed meant "star", which seems to have been the case, it most likely has nothing to do with irinaj. There is here further the question of astronomical anachronism: did any genuinely early culture realize (and thus describe) the Milky Way as consisting of stars? More usual seem to have been descriptive-interpretative designations, e.g., "Milky Way", [7] jin-ho-šuej, irinaj, etc., none of which incorporate words for "star". Silla *jirri might be compared to Tk. jyldyz as deriving from a common root *yl-il-/jyl-/jil- "to flame, twinkle, shine, etc." with the suffix -dy-z in Tk. and -ly-γ in Kor. The initial j- is probably original as the initial of the root *jar-jyr-/jyl-, the latter in Tk. *jyltyra- "to twinkle, sparkle, be bright, shine" (RAS., 189, 201). Tk. jyldyz etc. which has undergone a number of variant formations, either by force of popular etymology or tabu, would thus not be isolated any more within Altaic. The underlying root is very

probably Nostr. (ILLIC-SVITYC, n. 145, hardly to be separated from no. 148). M-Kor. pjēr, L 158, New Kor. pjöl "star" (Russ-KorSl., 231) must go with a quite separate etymon.

14. *isi-, is-, M.-Kor. "to be, exist", L 188, 206, 254, New-K. issta < *isi-da, SKE, 68 sub i-da, put to Tg. bi- and Mo. bū- "to be", as in "Einf.", II, 91, further to Tk. bir "1", which is hardly to be maintained, even if for isi- an earlier *wi-si- = Tg. bi-si- would be supposed. Notwithstanding the phonological obstacle, *bi-si- > *isi-, RAMSTEDT's etymology would presuppose for Kor. a form identical with the Tung. aorist formations in -si- which cannot serve as the basis of the entire paradigm. The -s- belongs to the root, *is- of which there is a stem formation i-s-i-, which is the Altaic representative of the Nostr. root ***esA- "to be, exist, live, dwell, etc.", IE *es- (POKORNY, 340ff.) < *hes-, furtheron found in Sem.-Ham., Uralic, and K'art'velian (*s-), cf. ILLIC-SVITYC, no. 132, where this Kor. etymon is to be added as the Altaic form.
15. k'al "sword; knife", SKE, 133, where as the only Altaic parallel Ma. ḥal in ḥalmari "a short bladelike sword (sic) worn by the shaman", (after ZAXAROV, 390), listed in the TgWB I, 365, kalbin "large, broad", also "flat"; in Ma. there are words with ḥ- and with q-. The Ma. word is compared with Lit.-Mo. xatba-yan "spoon" which may well be one etymon with Tg. kalbin "broad", to which also Tk. qabyyq "spoon" belongs. As long as the element -mari in ḥalmari is unknown, the etymology remains unclear. The older form of k'al is kalz- ("Einf.", I, 44, 83) with the stem-element -x-. But Kor. k'al belongs together with Samojed Neneč kar, zar "knife", mentioned in SKE, 133, and with Tk. qytyč "sabre, sword" of which forms with a in the root occur in Siberia: Šor, Soj. qatyš et varr. (cf. in detail JOKI, 154, where also reference to all the above forms is found, sub Kamaš. katyš "id."). JOKI considers qytyč/qatyš as Altaic since he says that in Samojed there are found two reflexes of this Altaic sib, once the one as represented by Tk. qytyč and the other that of Kor. k'al, Neneč zar, kar, and he continues pointing to another sib in Samojed represented by Motor kuro, kura, Tajgy kurru, Jenisej kuru, kolu to which he further puts Suomi kuras "id., maze". Kottic kales, kališ is a loan from Tk. (so also JOKI, l.c. and his "Uralier und Indogermanen",

MSFOu, v. 151, p. 275f., no 65). But there is still another occurrence in Altaic: OJap. *kari* "cutting tool, knife" (cf. RAHDER in Monumenta Nipponica, X, 155ff., listed within an enormous group of heterogeneous etyma), found in New Jap. only in compounds such as *kari-komu* "to cut, clip", *kari-komi* "cutting, clipping", KENKY., 854. Tk. *qylyč* is a secondary derivative formation from an older **qyl*, **qal* which is identical with the Old-Japanese, Korean and Neneč forms. The South-Samojed and Suomi words are secondary formations, too, and moreover have ablaut in the root syllable. Nevertheless, it is uncertain whether there is an Altaic-Uralic genetic relationship, or whether the Uralic words are originally borrowings from Altaic, as JOKI thinks. There is great probability that, as HOBSON-JOBSON, 212, had supposed, Tk. *qylyč*/**qalyč* is the source of Hindi *kirič*, Bengali *kirič*, Panžabi *kirač* and Malaĵ *kriś*, *kirts*, *kres* (< Javanese). The DED does not contain this etymon. The etymology of this term or these terms is obumbrated by the fact that they belong to the sphere of cultural terms and thus have migrated far, i.e. been borrowed, — but this not exclusively. On the Nostratic base, some connection with the IE root **qel-* "to cut, split, sting, etc." might exist, cf. Lat. *culter* "knife", but as the original IE form is **(s)qel-*, the Nostr. prototype had initial **c-* so that ILLIČ-SVITYČ assumes ***calu-* "to cut, slice, etc.", no. 33, and this comprises Alt. *čal(u)-*, Uralic **šale*, K't'v. *cel-*, S-Ĥ *s l-*. POK., 924, is not certain whether Lat. *culter* belongs here as a variant with the loss of the *s-*, in other words, he considers the possible provenience from another root in IE, **qel-qol-* which would have cognates in Nostr. with initial guttural. Thus, only IE etyma with **q-* can be considered as cognates as derivatives of **qel* "to cut, sting" (cf. **kol-to*), Irish *colyn* "prick, sting", of **qel-* "to beat, smash", **qolo-* "beaten", Lith. *kalū*, *kāliti* "to beat, smith, forge", AChSl. *koljŭ*, *klati* "to beat, slaughter, sting" etc., POK. 545ff., "the separation of **qel-* 'to sting' and **qel-* 'to cut' is hardly possible", as seen in the Slavic samples (545). Kor. *k'al* and Tk. *qylyč* etc. are to be put to these two latter IE etyma **qel-*.

16. *kag-ač* "young of a dog, welp", *kag* "dog", M.-Kor., L 173,

New-K. *kagaži* "welp", *kā* "dog", in SKE, 84f. *kā* reconstructed as **kañi*, in view of Mo. *gani* "wild, masterless dog" and Tk. *qan-čyq* "bitch"; *-ač*/*-ač* is the suffix for the young of animals. RAMSTEDT further compares Samoĵed Sölqup *qanaq*, *qanaq* "dog" (CASTRÉN, Wvz., 287) and Nivx *qan* "id.", as "possibly" Tk. *tajqan*, *tajyan* "hound", Mo. *tajyan* "id."; the etymology of the latter two is not yet certain. In the Paralip., 66, Qalm. *gañay* "young of a badger" is added, < **gani-sun*. The Tg. word is *ginakin* < **gyna-kyn/gyna-qyn* and might be an ancient cognate of *qan*, etc. with ablaut in the root and a secondary stem- and suffix-formation. In the TgWB I, 661f., OTk. *yt*, reconstr. as **ynta* (totally unwarranted: cf. MENGES in UAJbb, III, 1984, 105ff.), Čukčt *yt'tyn* and Kofak *hythyn* "id." are improbable, while only Jap. *inu* might be considered (as < **gynu*). Within the large IE sib of **kon-*, **kun-*, Latin *canis* is striking; POKORNY, 633, designates it as "entirely unclear" and thinks it might be due to a commixtion with a word corresponding to M.-Irish *cano*, *cana* "young of a wolf", Kymric *cenaw* (= *kenau*) "young dog or wolf", with a reference to the Lydian person name *Kav-δαύλης* "κυνάγλης, dog-strangler" — if an IE etymology is warranted. WALDE-HOFMANN, LatEtWb., I, 153, consider all explanations of *canis* as "uncertain", ERNOUT-MILLET, s.v. as "arbitrary". — The Latin word might very well be due to an interference from an extra-Indo-European language, designating a special kind or race of dog. The problem of Chin. (New) *č'üan*, (Ancient) **č'uen* "dog" could not be excluded from this discussion (cf. my "Oriental Elements . . .", 102ff.).

17. *kēmēr*, Kogurjō, M.-Kor. *kēm-* "black", L 38, Silla *kymāl* "id."; in SKE, 105f. *kēmŷj* "dark spots on the face", *kēmŷjžag*, *kēmžag* "soot", "to v. *kēm-da*" which is not listed; compared with Jap. *kemuri* "smoke", besides there exist also *kemu* and *kemuru* "id." (KEN., 910f.); O Jap. has *kēburi* "smoke", and *kēbur* "smoke arising, smoking"; the vacillation between *-b* and *-m* forms in these words (cf. New Jap. *kemuri* etc.) is common but unexplained. The Kor. words belong to one group with Tung. *kognorin*, *kognomo*, etc. "black" (TgWB I, 43 — no comparisons), Tk. *qoqur* and Mo. *qoggor* "darkbrown, -grey" (RAS., 280f.).

18. Since some features of the historical phonology as well as morphology of Korean are not clear as yet (at least to me), it is difficult to determine the exact position of M.-Kor. *két-, kěnně-* and *két-ni-*:

két-, M.-Kor., "to walk on foot", L 172, is to be put to Tk. *ket-, kit-, git-* "to go (away, thither), leave" (RÄS., 258). In SKE, 109, *két-* (*két-ta, kěr-ě, kěr-yn*) "to go on foot, to walk", in view of the stem *kěr-*, is correctly equated with Tk. *káz-, gáz-* "to walk, around, to stroll" and Mo. *kerü-, ker-* "id.". If these are no secondary Korean rhotacistic forms they can only be put to Tk. *káz-, gáz-*, Mo. *kerü-*; but there is in M.-Kor. also a stem *két-* (L *ibid.*), so that it might be put to Tk. *ket-* and to OJap. *k-u-* < **ku-* as done by MILLER (JOAL, 731., with further discussion) which would suggest a proto-Alt., probably already East-Nostratic root **kV-* with the derivatives **kV-r-*, **kV-l-*, and **kV-t-*, cf. e.g. Drav. Tamil *keṭu* "perish, decay, etc.", DED 1614. In view of this Dravidian etymon, profusely occurring in the Dravidian languages, there was either a proto-Alt. **ket-/kit-* or a **ke-t-/ki-t-* with an already East-Nostratic suffix *-t-* with aspect function (probably intensivum). With the suffix *-ni-*, there exists M.-Kor. *két-ni-* "to go, walk, on foot", L 172 where it is analysed as a composition of two verbal stems, *két-* and *ni-* "to go". As said in the morphological section, in these cases the first composition link must originally have been in the form of a verbal noun, a gerund, in this case one in a vowel (e.g. M.-K. *-a/-ě* = Tk. *-a/-ä*) in which since the formation of these compositions and their usage as complete new verbs, "lexicalization" as those developments occasionally are called, the weakly stressed intermediary vowel of the gerundial suffix undergoes complete reduction, as e.g. in Turkic formations of the type Qazaq *ǵıǵır-* "to let go" < **ǵıǵ-a-ber-*, or Sayaj *keltä* "is coming, on the way" < *kel-ä-jat-yr*. Then, there is in M.-Kor. an apparently different etymon, *két-ně-/kěnně-* "to cross a river", L 160, = *kěnně-* "to cross over, to go to the other side - of water etc.", SKE 75, New-Kor., put by RAMSTEDT tentatively to Tg. Ew. *gěně-* "to be in motion" (not exact in SKE), Mo. *köndülen* "across, horizontal". The question is to be asked whether *kěnně-/kěnně-*, formed with a suffix *-ně-* which does not seem to be identical, or cognate with, the

above *-ni-*, should not be put to Tk. *kăě-/găě-* "to cross a river, stream, pass over".

19. *ki'ur-*, M.-Kor., "to be oblique, bent, schief sein", L 179, *ki'uru* "bent, crooked; schief" < **ki'ur-* < **qy'ur-* = Tk. *qygyr* "id." (RÄS., 264). New *kiur-* "biegen, to bend" ("Einf.", II, 192), *kiurëjin* "kocok" (RussKorSl., 299), *kiu-, kiul-* Paralip., 82 (to Tk. *quj-*, a cognate of *qygyr*).
20. *koḥ-*, M.-Kor., *kop-*, New-K. "to be pretty, beautiful", L 169, 273, New-Kor. *kop* < *ko-b* "id.", SKE, 124 where comparison with Mo. *yoa*, Qlm. *ǵō*, Buř. *ǵoxox*, Qojba *qōas* and Kamaš *kuwas* "id." is made. As JOKI, 214, has shown, Lit.-Mo. *yoa*, (*yova, yuva* "beautiful, beauty; elegant, stately", LESSING, 370) is an ancient loan from Chin. *hua* "beautiful, pretty, flowerlike". The word occurs already in the Jüan-C'ao *Bi-Šy* (cf. HAENISCH, Wb., 64), *xoa*, which apparently rather early was borrowed by Korean, functioning there as verbal base only, the word for "beautiful, beauty" being the derivative noun in *-yn, ko-un*. If Chin. *hua* had been borrowed by Korean directly, it would have preserved the form *hwa*, as in Annamite (cf. GILES, no. 5005). According to Paralip. 90, Kor. *kōp* goes back to *kō āp-* "to be beautiful". Since RAMSTEDT did not see in Mo. *yoa*, Kor. *koḥ-* a Chinese loan, his further attempts at comparison, in Paralip., 90, can be dismissed. O Jap has the adjective *kuFa-s-i* "being beautiful", in the early language used of the beauty of natural features (mountains, lakes, flowers) as well as women, but from the end of the Old Japanese period on becoming increasingly, specialized to mean "beauty, esp. of something delicate, refined, minute in structure or form", and eventually resulting in New Jap. *kuwašii* "detailed, minute; precise" (KENK., 1126). RAMSTEDT's comparison of Qojb. *qōs* "id." with Kam. *kuwas* and Kottic *koas* (CASTRÉN, Koib. u. Karag. Spr., 96) to which JOKI, l. c. refers, does not explain the final *-š, -s* in the Siberian forms which has JOKI doubt their provenience from Mo. *yoa*, *xoa* and thus from Chin. *hua* so that he considers, as had been done earlier by CASTRÉN or SCHIEFNER resp. (cf. the latter's Preface to CASTRÉN's above-mentioned book, p. XIII), Pers. *xoš, xwaš* as a possible source of the Siberian words with final *-š, -s*. The WB lists the following: *qās*, Soj., *qača* "all dressed up; foppish;

dandy", *qōs*, Tel., Leb., Sa., Qojb. "beautiful, beauty; dandy" (in Tel., and Leb. this is a loan from Sayaj and Qojbal or any other Abaqan language), *quas*, Kūārik "beautiful", Baraba, "dandy-like, foppish" (in Baraba it is a loan from the Abaqan languages), there also derivatives, Qazaq *qos* "good, well, nice, pretty, agreeable, lucky", *qōš*, Qyryyz, Baraba, Qoman "id.", *xōš*, Qrym, Osman. "id.". While *qōš*, *qos* and *xōš* go back to Pers. *xōš*, *xvaš*, the other words, *qōs*, *quas* and *qās* evidence the contamination of both, Pers. *xōš*, *xvaš*, and Mo. *yoa*, *xoa*, in form as well as meaning, the latter in some instances showing a strong pejorative inclination which seems to be absent in both Korean and Mongolian. In Baraba, *xōš* is well represented by *qōš*, but the contamination with Mo. *yoa*, *yuva* is seen in *quas* and its pejorative meaning, both borrowed from Abaqan. JOKI, l.c., speaks of "fashion-adjectives" which may spread very far and a sample of which might well be present in Kamaš *kuwas*, and he might have added that contaminations are not rare in those instances. The Turkic forms and Kamaš *kuwas* are listed in RÄS., 295, and all derived from M.-Pers. *xvašš* (sic) because he apparently misunderstood a passage of JOKI's (p. 215). A loan from M.-Pers. is not cogent, and Firdūsi was already early New-Persian. [19] has in N.-Pers. no length: *xvaš*, *xōš*, *xuš* (cf. e.g. STEINGASS, Pers.-Engl. D., 485; RAHIMI & USPENSKAJA, Tǎǰik-Russ. D., 432.).

21. Early M.-Kor. *koraj* (= *kāraj*) "walnut", L 113; the word has apparently been lost and replaced by New-Kor. *jolmā* (Russ-KorSl., 477) and some loans from Chinese such as *xodo* (< *ha-t'ao*), *kapdo* (< *k'ag-t'ao*) and *xado* (< *ha-t'ao*), cf. LAUFER, "Sino-Iranica", 275. According to a geographical work of the Ming-Dynasty, mentioned by LAUFER, op. cit. in the corresponding chapter, pp. 254-275, walnuts are a product of Korea, but the Koreans themselves have a tradition that they had been introduced there from China in the time of the Silla Realm (ib., p. 275). In Ewenki-Tungus, there is Birarčēn *korekta* "cedar-nut" (ŠIROKOGOROV, II, 59) and Nānāj *korekta* (not *qoreqta*), quoted by DMITRIJEVA, 1972, p. 175, sub шиш-ка "pine-, cedar-cone" where also Ma. *huri* is listed which ŠIROKOGOROV had correctly compared with Bir. *korekta*. In the TgWB II, 478, besides Ma. *huri* also Žūrčēn *hū-li* and 'ā-

hū-li "id." is listed while Nā. *korekta* appears separately as an isolated word (TgWB II, 417), but is lacking in ONENKO's Nānāj Dictionary. The provenience of the Nānāj word is not indicated but vaguely referred to as being from dialects; it thus is impossible to determine the exact phonetic form. Ma. *huri* is velar, "cone of coniferous trees" (cf. also NORMAN, 140). This etymon seems to have no further cognates in Tungus and none in Mongolian. Its Japanese equivalent is (New Jap.) *kurumi* "juglans regia; walnut" (KENK., 1117). We also have one aberrant Old Jap. form *kuzi* "chestnut" that may be of relevance to this discussion. R. A. MILLER, Origins of the Japanese Language, pp. 140, 202. In the West, this etymon is represented by Turkic *qoz*, Ča., Osm., Az., Qrm, Qom. "nut" (WB II, 628; for Old-Osm. cf. Tarama Sözl., p. 2686 ff.), with the derivatives *qozaq* "spruce-cone, beech-nut", *qozalaq*, Osm., "id., small round container, box" (WB II, 629 f.; Old-Osm. also "cypress-nut, plane-tree-nut, etc."), Tar. Sözl., 2689), and Türkmen *ğoda* "шишка, cone"; *quzuq*, Ča., Baraba, Alt., Tel., Leb., Šor, Sa., Qojb., Qč., Kūārik "cedar-nut", Šor with an ellipsis "cedar", and derivatives; Qojb. *quzuq* "cedarnut"; of those latter, Baraba is < *qozuq*, Ča. probably also, thus to be read *qozuq* while the *u* of the first syllable in all the other languages is original, and thus, *quz* exactly corresponds to Jap. *kurumi* and Ma. *huri* while O.-Kor. *kāraj* and Tg. *korekta* have in the root *o* instead of *u*. Kāšyari *quşy* "hazel-nut" is < **quşsy* < **quz-sy-y* "being like a (wal)nut". Qazan *qezēq* "cedar-nut" (WB II, 684) clearly points to ancient *quzuq*, but a vacillation is found in Qazan *qezāq* besides *quzaq* "pod, husk" (WB II, 1018, 684), the former being from *quşyq*, the latter from *qozaq*. Baš-qyrt *qudaq* is from *qozaq*, "id.". Semantically, the latter two are secondary after the picture of a tree-fruit hanging down and dangling. In the Turkic Southwest, *qoz/quz* is represented by *qoz* which has early been contaminated with an Iranian, probably Middle-Iranian loanword, *gauz* "nut, walnut, kernel" (STEINGASS, 1102), itself being an etymon with a complex West-Asiatic background, probably of Anatolo-Caucasian origin, which in the contracted form, *gōz*, was introduced into Turkic, *qoz* (Türkmen *xōd*, XAMZAJEV, Türkm. D. Szl., 715), with the ancient contraction length still preserved), where it

easily was confused with the genuine Turkic *qaz*, while in Qaraqalpaq *göz* and Qumyq *köz* this coalescence did not take place (as yet) and the Iranian word remained a stranger, as such having gone over into the palatal series; probably those two forms are more recent borrowings. At some later date, the Iranian etymon was borrowed into Turkic again, this time via Arabic in its Arabized form, *šawz* > Osm. *šāwiz* "nut", Qrym *šāwiz*, *šāwiz* "walnut" (WB IV, 90f.), Osm. (REDHOUSE) "walnut" (688), as loan from Persian, *gāwz* "the walnut, fruit of *juglans regia*" (REDHOUSE, 1591). — RÄSÄNEN, 285 where only *qosaq* is listed, is to be amended in this way. — This etymon is also found in Dravidian: Tamil *kuru* "nut", Mal. *kuru* "kernel, nut, esp. of jackfruit", Kodagu *kuru* "seed (esp. of jackfruit)"; *nally kuru* "rice with husk, paddy", DED, 1483; further, Ta. *kurumpai* "immature coco-nuts or palmyra-nuts, fruit buds, young coco-nut", Mal. *kurumpa* "tender, young coco-nut", Kannaḍa *kurube*, *kurumbe* "id.", DED, no 1491, separated from the ones in no. 1483, might also belong here or, somehow similarly to Tk. *qoz/quz*, have undergone contamination. — In IE, there is Gr. *καρύον* "nut", *καρύα* "nut-tree" (cf. BOISACQ, *DictÉtLgGr.*, 417), Kymr. *ceri* (= *keri* < **karto-*) "kernel of fruit", listed by POKORNY, 531, sub **qar-* "hard, rough", semantically a rather disparate sib; the question might be asked whether the apparently Nostratic etymon with labial root-vowel was in IE assimilated to words derived from **qar-* "hard" which latter even might have been a very ancient Mediterranean loan in IE (cf. POKORNY, l.c.). — The etymon for "cone, nut, walnut" is common-Altaic, **qut*/**qor* and cannot be considered a migratory culture term; within Nostratic, it seems to have only one cognate, Drav. *kuru* etc., and so far it cannot definitely be considered as common-Nostratic. As long as the original and mutual relationship of the West-Asiatic terms such as Iran. *gauz*, *gōz*, and some related forms as Armen. *yngoiz*, Oset'i *āngūz*, *āngōzā*, Gruz. *nigozi* and Hebrew *'ēgōz*, etc., is unknown, only the common-Altaic and Dravidian origin of this etymon can be stated. Armen. *guz* "id.", brought by ABAJEV into the discussion about the Oset'i term, is a loan from Persian or Turkic, and Armen. *angušat* is "semantically improbable", as ABAJEV says, but not because it

means "fragrant resin" (ABAJEV), but — and only this supports his argument — "asa foetida", as evidenced by LAUFER, op. cit., 361. — Cf. HEHN,³ p. 341ff., SCHRADER & NEHRING, s. vv.

22. M.-Kor. *kyru'er* "Schrift; writing", L 184, belongs to a far-flung Nostratic sib with i.a. Tung South *giri-*, North *gir-* "to clip, cut out, carve; shorten" (TgWB I, 153f.), Tk. *qyr-* "to scrape off, tear off; beat asunder, smash; annihilate, etc." (WB II, 734ff., 861), L.-Mo. *kira-* "to cut into small pieces, mince" (LESSING, 473), Jap., O.-Jap. *kir-* "to cut, chop, hash, etc." (KENK., 974f.), Uralic Suomi *kirja* "stroke, scratch", *kirjoitan* "to write", Liv. *kēra*, *kiri* "writing; figure", etc., Drav. Tamil *kiri-* "to scratch, draw lines, write", Telugu *gīra* "line", *gīruku* "to scribble", etc., DED, no. 1352, and IE *(s)qer- "to cut (off), scratch, scrape, etc." (POKORNY, pp. 938–947) which is discussed in my contribution to the LIGETI-Festschrift, Acta Or. Hung., XXXVI, pp. 375ff., 1982. Old Kogurjō **kunš* "written character, script" is reconstructed and discussed in R. A. MILLER, "Some Old Paekche Fragments", pp. 14–15, no. 13.
23. *mal-* (*mara*, *mān*) "to stop, refrain from, cease, shun, avoid", SKE 138f., where it is put to Ma. *mara-* "id."; TgWB I, 532 sub *mari-* compared with L.-Mo. *maryu-* "to dispute, reject" which seems to be an ablaut variant of L.-Mo. *mēlže-* "id." > Ew. *mēlžē-*, Ew. *Ňerča mēl-* (VAS., "58" "id.", but the etymon is genuine-Tg.; preserved in its cooperativum *mēlžē-lāi-* "to compete", in the simplex in Oroči, *mēnžē*, *mēnžēku*, Nā. and Ma. *mēlžē-* (TgWB, I, 566, where the two lexemes unwarrantedly are separated). As to *Ňrč. mēl-*, it is not certain whether this is the Tg. simplex, or whether this is due to secondary development in the dialect of the *Ňerča* valley.
24. M.-Kor. *myr-/myl* "water", L 114, New *mul* "water; liquid, juice". The Old-Kor. *Pajkkē* word for "water" is [17], reconstructed by DOH Sou-Hie as **mar* (i.e. **mēr*), mentioned by Bruno LEWIN in his article "Sprachkontakte zwischen Paekche und Yamato in frühgeschichtlicher Zeit", Asiatische Studien XXXIV, 1980, p. 172, — although the Middle and Ancient Chinese vocalism alike contains a labial element: M.-Ch. *mjuot*, A.-Ch. **mjuot* (KARLGREN, *Grammata Ser.*, no. 503 a–g). According to ROSEN; no. 32, "Middle-Kor. *mīl* > Mod.-

K. *mul* 'water', there is no evidence to show that *mul* coexisted with *mil* in Early Middle-Kor. North-Kor. *mur*, *myr*, in SKE, 154, compared with Jap. *mi* 'id.' ("< *mi-ntu*"), furtheron with "kitan-sjenbi" *muri* (after SHIRATORI) and Ajnu *mintu-ti* "a water-nymph" which at least in the first component must be a loan from Jap., "water" in Ajnu being *wikka* (HATTORI, p. 94, no. 26); *myr*/*myl* is equated with Mo. *mören* "river" and Tg. *mü*, Ma. *mukê* "water" ("ke is an ending"). Mo. *mören* could be considered identical with *myr*/*myl* if the stem or root is *mör*-, Tg. *mü*, *mukê* stand apart but belong to the same etymon, **mü*-, **mü-r*-, the derivative elements not being clear as yet. It is also unknown whether Ma. *mukê* is original or secondary, for, the length in *mü* of the majority of the Tg. languages (cf. TgWB I, 548) might go back to an ancient diphthong as still preserved in Nā. and Olča *muê* while the latter two might also be the result of a complete reduction of intervocalic -*q*/-*k*- to zero, having taken place at an earlier epoch than the regular development as described by CINCUS, § 68, pp. 218ff. Ma. *mukê* which thus would be a very archaic form, has an intriguing parallel in Eskimo: (Alaska) Ekögmüt, Unaligmüt *muk*, Čugáčigmüt, Kuskusógmüt *mik*, *mok*, Máhlemüt *immik*, Kaviágmüt *immuk*; SW-Alaska *muk*, *moq*, W.-Greenland *iméq* (cf. W. H. DALL, "Alaska and its Resources", Boston, 1870, pp. 548f., 564; for the latter three: THALBITZER, HAIL, I, 995), in NE-Siberia and islands *myq*, pl. *myryt* (RUBCOVA, Esk.-Russk. Sl., 1971, p. 333). In Altaic, this etymon for "water" seems to be a very ancient loan from the Northeast.

25. Kogurjō *nanēn* "seven", L 28, 39, is a close relative of Tg. *nadan* (TgWB I, 576f.) "id." and Jap. *nana* "id." (MILLER, JOAL, 222, 244f.). This numeral has been replaced in New-Kor. by *ilgop*, North-K. *nirgup*, SKE, 167, to be explained, as in JOAL, p. 244, as *jöl* "10" plus **γu* "3" *ōps* "minus" = "7" (a connection with Tg. *ilan* "3", as proposed in SKE, is out of the question). The relationship of O.-Kor. *nanēn*, Jap. *nana*, and Tg. *nadan* is characterized by assimilations and dissimilations; borrowings are not to be assumed (on the numerals cf. R. A. MILLER, JOAL, 219ff., K. H. MENGES, Jap. u. Alt., 92ff.).
26. M.-Kor. *narax* "land", L 180, SKE, 161 "id.", North-K. *narag*

"land, state" where the suff. *-rag* is equated with the Tk. *-laq*, Mo. *-lag*; the comparison with Tg. *na* is given; cf. TgWB I, 573 *na*, Nā. *nā* "id.". Tg. has no derivatives; SKE adduces Buř. *na-ta* "to get a footing on, to trust" and Ma. *nashun* "occasion, opportunity" which belong to another etymon, but OJap. **na* "earth" in *naje* "earthquake" and Rjū-Kjū *nē*, both < *na* + *aje* "earth" + "tremor", belong to Kor. *narax*. In the TgWB, l. c. a comparison with Eskimo *na*, pl. *nyt* "place" is listed. Definitely related is the Altaic etymon with Drav. Tamil *nātu* "land, home, state", Ka. *nādu*, Telugu *nādu*, (inscript.:) *nāndu* "id.", etc. (DED, 3012 and Suppl.).

27. M.-Kor. *njēx* "to put (in), place inside", L 160; SKE 164f. *nē-t'a* (*nēlx*, *nēxyn*) "id." (< **nēy-t'a*), equated with Tg. *nē* "id., to put, place" (TgWB I, 614f.); the Kor. form suggests a proto-Tg. **nēy*/*nēyē*-, therefore the comparison as made in SKE 165 with Mo. *nerē* "id." is erroneous as against that in TgWB with Mo. *nōgd* "to preserve, spare, put in store, etc.". The one given ib. with Nivx *lyv-d* "id." is made on the assumption that Tg. *n*- may correspond to Nivx *l*- and Tg. *-y*/*-g*- to Nivx *-v*, which remains to be substantiated. In Tg., older forms are apparent in Udi *nēyi*/*nēye* "to put" where a root-enlarging ("wurzelerweiternd") form coexists in *nē-dē* "id., to put aside", else in Lamut *nē-d*, Oroči *nē-dē* (TgWB I, 614f.).
28. M.-Kor. *nip* "leaf, Blatt", L 154, New-K. *ip* (< **jip*? — not a Chin. loan < **djāp* > New-Ch. *jā* "id."), apparently in ablaut with *nap* in New-Kor. *nabakti* "breadth", *nāpčak* "broad, flat", SKE 160 where the equation with Tg. *nap-ta* "to lie flat on the ground", Mo. *nab-ta*-*ji* "to be flat", Tk. *japraq*, *japryaq* "leaf" is given; Tg. has also the older Ew. (Ilimpija) *lap-ta-kta* "smooth, flat, plain" (TgWB I, 584 sub *napta*). This etymon is Nostratic: ILLIC-SVITYČ, no. 256; DOLGOPOLSKIJ in "Etimologija 1967", p. 297f. Kor. *nap*- is no variant of *nāp*/*nēlp*- "to be flat and thin" against RAMSTEDT, but a different, semantically close etymon, having its counterpart e.g. in Tk. (Kās.) *jalby* "flat, plain", Qazaq *žatpaq* "id.", etc. (RÄSÄNEN, EtWb 183 sub **žatpa*). ROSEN is hardly right when assuming a development of *nāpčak* from *nālpčak* (l. c., no. 36).
29. M.-Kor. *norra* "to frighten, terrify", *norra-b*, med.-pass. "to be frightened, fearsome, timid", L 178, < **nol-ra*- (?), New-

Kor. *nolla*-, intrans., *nollu-u*-, trans., *nolla-m*-, nomen verbale, "fear, horror", can be put to Tg. *gêlê* "id.", intrans. "to be afraid, fearful", TgWB I, 667ff., *gêlê* "fear, horror", cf. the Ewenki forms from the apocoped stem such as *gêldûit-gêl-dûc-//gêllûit-gêllûc* "to watch out, be afraid" and their derivatives, furtheron the Lamut aberrant form *gêrgên* "timid, fearful, cowardly; coward, poltroon", found in 6 dialects (ib., 668b). Along with *gêlê*-, Ma. has a velar variant, *golo*-, the same *žc. gôlê*; = Mo. *gelma*- (POPPE, 25, 106), and OJap *kôr*-(*kêr*-) "to become prudent by experience". Besides *gêlê*-, Oroki has the variant *gêllê*-; these secondary formations most closely resemble Kor. *norra*-. They originated on morphological grounds.

30. Kogurjô **nuami* "pond, sea" = Tg. *lamu*, *namu* "sea, ocean", L 38f., written [11] having in Chinese the sound values of **nuwob* > *nuwô/nuûi/nei* (KARLGREN, no. 695 e-g), **miêr* > *miei* > *mei* (KARLGREN, no. 598 a-e) respectively. The reconstruction as given by LEE is not consistent with the phonogram orthography upon which it is based; apparently he has chosen **nua* with the view of equating an ancient diphthong for the length in Tg., but the Chinese rendering of the second syllable, while indeed pointing to a non-labial vowel, for which there is no evidence in the Tg. languages (cf. TgWB I, 490f.), *lamu* "ocean", Lamut, Udi, Olča, Oroki and Manžu having *namu* exclusively, both forms occurring in Oroči, and Ewenki (with great preponderance of *l*-), while the Armañ dialect of Lamut with *l*- is with DOERFER to be considered as a language, appears to have been postulated by LEE with one eye on Old Jap *nami* "wave", cf. Old Jap *nada* "dangerous spots in a navigable sea route; coastal waters". The relationship of Old Jap *nami* to the forms under discussion is yet another matter, and it may well be that the Old Kogurjô word under discussion had a final vowel something along the same lines; but the Chinese phonograms hardly permit the reconstruction **nuami*. Unfortunately the first character in this phonogram orthography is used for a Chinese word that has itself had a vexing phonological history (KARLGREN, Analytic Dict., Introduction, p. 30), and this makes the entire writing highly problematical in phonetic, resp. phonological terms. So far, no cog-

nates had been known outside of Tg. For Pajkčê LEWIN (l.c., p. 172) quotes **namu* (**nami*) "Meer, ocean", written there with a different character which also is used for **nam*- "übrigbleiben, to remain over, be left over" = New-Kor. *nêm*-, Mo. *neme*- (SKE, 163f.). POPPE reconstructs (74, 150) a proto-Tg. **namu*. But in view of the Nostratic parallels initial *l*- and the vowel *a* of the 1st syllable have the priority: cf. ILLIČ-SVITČ, no. 263: *LaHm/u* with the basic meaning of "swamp", then, "small lake".

31. Kor. *nun* "eye", L 277; also M.-Kor. *nun* (ROSEN, no. 43); in SKE, 172, put to Mo. *nidün* "id.", with question mark to Tg. Ew. *nundun* "id.", correctly considered as Mo. loan, and compared with Ajnu *nu kara* "to see" where *kara* "to do". In Paralip., 132, it is compared with Tg. Ew. *ñugñi* "to show", occurring also in Lamut, Negidal, and Oroki (TgWB I, 612 *ñugñi*- where comparison is made with Nivx *ñu*-, *ñuñu* "to look (at, through)", *ñu-gu*-, caus., "to show"). POPPE (39) considers Mo. *nidün*, Kor. *nun* and Ew. *nundun* as cognates, not loans, deriving them from **nündün*; RAMSTEDT sees in *-dün* a derivative suffix. In the TgWB I, 646 Ew. *nundun* is considered as Mo. loan because it is limited there to the North-Bajkal dialect, in closest proximity to, and receding before, the Burať. While there are apparently no cognates in other Altaic languages, some connection with *ñugñi*- etc., Nivx *ñu*- and Ajnu *nu* cannot be excluded entirely. If *-dün* is a derivative suffix as RAMSTEDT assumed, Kor. *nun* might be a stem form in *-n* of a root **nu*/**nü* < (?) **ny*/**ni*-.
32. M.-Kor. *nün* (with old rising length), New *nun*, in diall. *nün*, "snow", L 170, 277; in SKE, 172f. *nün* is put equal to Tg. Ew. *luñê*, *ñuñê* "first snow; wet, thawing snow"; the further suggestions in Paralip., 132, are improbable, or erroneous. The Tg. etymon (WB I, 510) is limited to Ew. and Negidal where it is present in all dialects, but it seems to be lacking in the other Tg. languages. The original anlaut is *l*- which regularly is represented by *n*- in Kor. (and by inconspicuous assimilation in some Ew. dialects and in Lamut).
33. o- "to come", L 257f.; in SKE, 174 put to Tg. ô- "to become; to make" (TgWB II, 1f.); as to the semantics, cf. Frç., Provençal, Span. *devenir*, Ital. *divenire* "to become" < Late Lat. *dē-ven*-

tre "id." of *venire* "to come" (M.-L., 2612) while *venire* in its later forms is used for the formation of the passive in It., Rhaeto-Rom. Engadin. and Surselv., sporadically in Spanish (M.-L., 9200). The further suggestions with Tk. *u-* are wrong, and those in Paralip., 133f., are probably erroneous.

34. M.-K. *oj-* "to bore; to investigate, search after", *oj-p'a-* "to carve (wood), engrave", L 262, are identical with Tk. *oj-*, Türkmen *oj-*, Táv. *váj-* (> OChSl. *vajati* "id.") "id." cf. RAS., 359, SEV., 425ff. The suffix *-p'a-* has its counterpart in Tk. *-pa/-ba-*.

35. M.-K. *orä-* "to move upward, climb, ascend", L 187, 199, New-K. *ory-*, *oru-* "to enter" are to be put, as with RAMSTEDT, SKE 178, to Mo. *oro-*, *oru-* "id.", while Tg. Ew. *oro-* (not *oru-*) "to climb in, into" occurs in the dialect of Barguzin only (VASILEVIĆ, "58, p. 327) and is there a loan from Burat *oro-*; the suggestions in Paralip., 139f. are to be dismissed. The etymon does not seem to be indigenous in Tg. and Tk. — GÜNTERT (l.c., 22) had compared the Kor. etymon with Lat. *orior* "to rise, arise, originate" and Gr. *ὀρνυμι* "id.", to be lifted, raised, excited", which belongs to the far-flung IE root **er-*: **or-*: **r-* (POK., 326ff.) having basically the same meanings; it is possible to link with the palatal variant the Altaic equivalent found in Tk. *ör* "the upper part; top", *ör-* "to rise, move upward" so that Kor. and Mo. *oro-* are cognates of Tk. *ör-*. The palatal sib has cognates in Uralic and Dravidian.

36. *pa* "place, point, side, object", "Kor. Gr.", p. 118, no. 21, compared in SKE, 179f. with Ajnu *pa*, *-p* "thing", Jap. "emphatic particle" *wa* "as to, as for", which can be dismissed, but with Ma. *ba* "place, thing" and the suffixal element *-ua* in e.g. Olča *ha-wa-si* "whither? to what place?" which occurs in other Tg. languages, too, e.g. in Nā., *ha-wa-g-ki* "from where (originating)?" further in the ethnicon *ēwēŋki* < *ē-wē-n-ki* "(the people) of this place", the same in *ēwēn* (for the Lamuts), deriving those expressions from the pron. interrogat. *ha-* (= Tk. *qa-*) or the pron. dem. *ē-*, *ē-rē*, resp. This analysis of RAMSTEDT's is probably correct. His further comparisons, with Mo. **-wa* > *-a*, *-e* and Tk. *-a* remain to be verified, or rejected. But an important parallel was forgotten: Jap. *ba* "place, site, ground, spot, resort, space, room; seat, chair; scene, occasion, sur-

roundings" (KENK., 72). Jap. *ba* is troubling in more than one way; if anything, its semantic, resp. syntactic employments in the language are so extremely similar to the use of, e.g., Ma. *ba*, as to cause concern for the facts of its history; furthermore, an inherited form in initial *b-* is, for Japanese, highly unlikely if not impossible, since earlier, pre-Jap. and Proto-Altaic **b-* regularly yields Old Jap *w-*. The semantic range of the form hardly speaks for the probability of loan relationships, but the phonology and closeness of semantic employment on the other hand do. In Tg., this etymon *ba* still does exist, but has been submerged by *buya* with which it does not only share phonological features, but particularly close semantic ones so that these two originally different etyma cannot always be clearly separated from each other: *ba* which apparently had original length, *bā*, is listed for Lamut, "background, field, region, space, horizon" (TgWB I, 60 where reference to *buya*), in Ew. dialect of Baunty *bā*, considered there as a phonetic variant of *buya* with which it shares the meaning: "locality, land, earth; world, kosmos, universe; homeland; heaven, sky, firmament; weather; spirit (ghost), God; icon; devil" (TgWB I, 100), Oroč. *bā* "locality, land, earth; universe; homeland; heaven, sky, weather, nature; God", Olča *bā* "id.", Nā. *bā* "id.", and Ma. *ba* "locality, land, district, place, (nomad) camp; boundary, frontier, divide; lot (of ground); trading place; measure of distance, ca. ¼ km", is being used just as Kor. *pa* after verbal nouns for the expression of modalities of an action. All these forms, except the one from Lamut, are listed in the TgWB sub *buya*, and there, the form *bā* is understood as contraction although the sound group *uya* would as a rule yield *ō*, not *ā*, as in Oroki *bō*; all the other languages either have *ā*, *a*, or the uncontracted sound group *oa/ua*, in other words, of the monosyllabic forms only *bō* goes back to *buya* while *bā* and *ba* descend from pr. Alt. **bā/*ba* which survives in Tg. *bā*, *ba*, in Kor. *pa* and in Jap. *ba*. The semantic equality of the variants in Tg., as in Ew. *buya/bā/bua*, Lam. *buy*, *bok*, *bu*, *buw*, Oroči *buwa/buyā/bua/bā*, Olča *bā/bua/boa*, Nā. *bā/boa* illustrates the complete convergence of these two etyma. The TgWB refers to Kor. *pa* and Jap. *ba*, but also to Mo. *bojda/bujda* "remote, desolate" (quoted as *bojd/bujd*), which is erroneous.

37. Early M.-Kor. *paj* "ship" (XII-th ct. ?), L 113; in SKE, 181f., New Kor. *pä* "id.", put to M.-Mo. *haj* in *hajžuya* "id." < *paj*, and Jap. *he* in *hesaki* "head, bow, prow, stem of a boat" (KENK., 481), OJap. *faj* < **paj* (cf. R. A. MILLER, "The Japanese Language", 81; in his JOAL, 67, tab. 5, no. 18, this etymon is put together with OJap. *funé* and MARTIN's proto-Kor.-Jap. reconstruction **ponye* which is more than doubtful since these are two different etyma, **paj* and **punaj* (or a similar form). The Tg. (Ew.) *ha* in *hamagda* "willow-wood for boats" which RAMSTEDT quotes after an older article in Mél. Asiat. VIII, 354, has so far not been found elsewhere and therefor not been taken into the TgWB. The words for various baskets, adduced by RAMSTEDT, belong to a different etymon.
38. *par* "foot", L 277; SKE, 184, *pal* correctly put to Tg. Ma. *falaggu*, Ew. *halgan* etc. "palm of the hand; foot, leg", TgWB II, 312 with comparison with M.-Mo. *hataqan*, etc., Kor. *pal* and *p'al* "arm", this latter after SKE, 213. GÜNTERT wanted to link the Kor. *pal* with IE *ped-/pod-* "foot" (i. e., 18) while a comparison with IE **pela-*, **plā-* to which also Lat. *palma* belongs (POK., 805f.) would be more appropriate, Kor. *p'ar*, however, being a different etymon.
39. *pat* "field", L 279; SKE 192f. puts it to Jap. *hatake*, Rjū-Kjū *pataki*, *fataki* "id.", while there also exists *hata* (< **pata*) "id." (KENKYUSHA, 460), furtheron to Tk. *atyž* "id." and Mo. *atar* "fallow, field", correctly emendating BROCKELMANN's reading of Kāš. *at jir* "plain surface" to *at jir* with the root form *at*. The "fit" of Old Jap *Fatakē* "field" with Kor. *pat* is excellent; since Old Japanese had no velar spirant, the -*k*- of the Old Japanese form corresponds to the aspiration of the Korean, exactly as happened in Old Jap *Fōtōkē* "the Buddha", where the -*k*- also ultimately represents aspiration, the -*ʔ*- of -*dd*-, through the intermediary of some unknown Old Korean borrowing from Indic. Cf. also R. A. MILLER, JOAL, 67, no. 79, and K. H. MENGES, JapAlt., 27. GÜNTERT (i. e., 18) wanted to compare *pat* with Gr. *πέδον* "bottom, ground" and Skt. *padām*, but this is a completely different etymon (POK., 790ff.: IE **ped-/pod-* "foot"; - also Nostratic).
40. M.-Kor. *pār-k* "to be bright, brilliant, clear", L 157; in SKE, 186 (with ?) put to Tk. *batqy* "id." (WB IV, 1499), Osm. also

- batq*-, while SKE, 189, the comparison with (New-K.) *mal-k* "id." is given without the question mark; cf. SEVORTJAN, II, 56f. where the Tk. etymon is considered as onomatopoeitic and reference to the above Korean etymon is made, further to Tg. Ew. *bilkini* "id." and Oroki *bilkima* "gilt". The two Kor. words are ablaut variants of one and the same etymon which might also be the case with the two Tg. forms quoted; in the TgWB I, 82, they are listed together with Sol. *bilxu*, *bulxu* "mirror", Nā. *buluku* "id., glass; shaman's mirror", and Ma. *bulg'a* "to gild", *buleku* "mirror, glass", and Šč. *bu-lug-k'u* "mirror". The mutual relationship of these Tg. words is not clear at all; Ew. *bilkini* and Oroki *bilkima* may be ablaut forms of the above stem *batqy-/palk-*, but apart from *buleku*, *buluku* for "mirror" the position of Ma. *bulg'a* "to gild" remains uncertain. The Ma. or Nā. words are loans in Sol. and in Ew. Xingan *biliku* and Birarēn *buluku* "mirror", noted by ŠIROKOGOROV (II, 28). Tk. Qn., Qq., Qy. *batqy*-, "to become soft, liquid, liquified" belongs to a different, rather large etymological sib to which also Qq. *batqaš* "swampy, morassy area", *batqyq* Osm., Qrm., Qn. "loam, clay; dirt", Qq. *batšyq* "id." belong, being probably derivatives of **bal* "kneadable earth, clay, mud" (WB IV, 1505f.).
41. M.-, New-Kor. *pori* "rye, wheat, barley", L 266, in SKE 206 put to Tk. *boraj*, Qn. *buraj*, Tāv. *puri* "spelt, buckwheat, furze". This is a very ancient loan in Altaic of a term that belonged to an IE-Semito-K'art'velian etymological sib and has early undergone contamination with Tk. *buydaj*, Mo. *buydaj*, itself being a loanword from early M.-Chin. (cf. JOKI, 106ff.). For the IE forms cf. POK., 850 to which according to VASMER (RussEtWb., s. v. pyrėj) Skt. *pūras* "a cake" can be added. VASMER rightly rejects in Slavic a loan from Altaic. On Tāv. *pēri*, *pāri* cf. SEVORTJAN, 234f. and K. H. MENGES, Orient. El., p. 133, n. 174. Kor. *pori* belongs to the ancient Altaic lexical stock of the Korean language. The IE parallels of *pori* have been noted by GÜNTERT, p. 18.
42. M.-Kor. *pori* "glass", L 266, homophonous with the preceeding, written [12] is apparently a loan from this Chinese word but it might be a direct loan from Central Asia via Ancient Turkic which has it, like e. g. Osm. *billür* (WB IV, 1770), from

NPers. *billūr* originating like or together with Gr. βήρυλλος < AInd. *vaidārja* / *vēlārja* and ultimately from a derivative of the Drav. root. *vel-* "to be white, shining, etc." (DED, no. 4524). Cf. also HOBSON-JOBSON, p. 67; not in LAUFER, "Sino-Iranica". New-Kor. has only *juri* (according to Palalip. 164f. < Sino-Kor. *rjul*, like Mo. *riñu*, *örül* "pellet" < Tib. *ri-bu*). There might be some relationship between this etymon and *žč. bulugku* and Ma. *buleku* "mirror" (cf. supra sub *pälk-*). – The Western origin of Chin. *ho li* has been assumed for some time (cf. GILES, nos. 9333, 9411, and 6944; probably because of its foreign origin, it is not in KARLGREN). Lit.-Mo. has *botor*; as direct loan from Skt. it is in Ujyur, *vajdury*.

43. *pul*, North.-K. *pur* "fire", *pur* "id." L 113, 243, SKE, 208, read L 41 *pör* (i.e. *pör*) for Silla [13], modern-Ch. *huò* (GILES, 5326), M.-Ch. *xuà* < A.-Ch. **xwōr* "id." (KARLGREN, Gr. Ser., no. 353), written in M.-Kor. [14], red by LEE *pyr* (113), > *pur* since the end of the XVII-th cent. (248), the Chinese being *ho* < M.-Ch. *b'wōt* < A.-Ch. **b'wōt* (KARLGREN, Gr. Ser., 491 a-f) so that this could phonetically also mean M.-Kor. **pür*. In SKE it is correctly put together with Tg. Ew. *huri-*, *huri-gi-* "to dry or smoke (meat or fish) on the fire; to dry on the fire" (VASILEVIČ, Wb "58, p. 498), identical with *hult-* "id." and "to warm (up)", TgWB II, 345, occurring in nearly all Tg. languages. For unknown reasons, the Ew. forms with *-r* which are the older ones, were suppressed in the TgWB, the only form with *-r* quoted there being Oroči *xurikilē* "smoked, dried meat". A separation of two verbs *hult-*, as done in the TgWB, is not warranted at all, notwithstanding some semantic shades. RAMSTEDT furtheron compares *pul/pur* with Tk. *ör-t* "fire, prairie fire", *ör-t-ä-* "to burn (the steppe)", "to set fire on" and Mo. *ör* "the flames and heat of fire" which all presuppose together with the above forms from Tg. and Kor. a proto-Ait. **pör* "fire" which is cognate with IE **pewōr*, *pär*, gen. **pu-n-ēs*, loc. **puwēni* "id.", a heteroklitikon that proves of the great age of the etymon in IE, in parallelism with the Altaic one. For its great age also testifies its occurrence in Hittite, *pahhur*, *pahhuwar* (cf. POK., 828). The etymon can be considered as Nostratic. For the Tk. forms cf. RÄS., 375, SEVORTJAN, I, 550f.; the comparison of Tk. *ör-* with Hitt. *ur-*,

uar- "to burn (intr.)" quoted after F. FRIEDRICH, "Hethit. Wb.", 1952, pp. 235, 244, is wrong. It is easily recognizable that the Hitt. etymon belongs together with e.g. Slav. *var-ě*, *var-i-ti* "heat", "to heat, boil, cook" to the IE root **wer-* "to burn (trans. et intr.); blacken", cf. POK., 166. The Korean-IE relationship was already recognized by KOPPELMANN and GÜNTERT (l.c., 18).

44. *purk-ta*, nom. verbale, "to be red", L 244, stem *purg-/pulg-* (cf. also ROSEN, no. 66), is the counterpart of Tg. Ew. *hula-ma*, *hula-rin* "red", Sol. *ulari*, *xulán* "id.", Lam. *hulañä*, *hulati* "id.", Ngd. *xolajin* "id.", Oroči (only) *xolomukta* "(wild) grapes", Udi *xulaligi* "red", little-known in Nā., only Bikin *folgä/forgä*, (GRUBE) *folgen* "id." (lacking in PETROVA, ONENKO), Ma. *futahun/futahun*, *fulgan* (< **put-a-gijan*) "id.", *žč. fula-gan* and the loan from Mo. *huo-la-hu* "id.", all with numerous derivatives (exc. for Oroči and Nā.), so Kor. *pulg-yn* "id.", *pulg-ö-ži-* "to become red, to redden", and the Mo. equivalents of M.-Mo. *hulayan*, Lit.-Mo. etc. *ulayan* "red" with derivatives (TgWB II, 344 – the reference there to SKE, 206 where Kor. *pōra* "a reddish color, a light purple color" is compared i. a. with the above Tg. forms is probably erroneous, be it that Kor. *pōra* is as **por-a* an ablaut form of **pul* in *pulg-/purg-*, a hitherto unsolved question). The problem of the existence of this etymon in Tk. hinges on the explanation of *ulas* in the expression *ulas köz* which RAMSTEDT found in Kāšyari, translated by BROCKELMANN (p. 229) as "schwimmendes Auge, wie das eines Trunkenen, watering of the eye as that of a drunk, inebriated". RAMSTEDT thought of reddened eyes so that he assumed a Turkic *ula-s* (better: *ula-z* with desonorization of the *-z* before the *k-* of *köz*) which would be absolutely acceptable. The Taškent edition has p. 301 the Özbek translation "*uzilgan jâqimli köz, xumâr köz*", in Russian simply as *тёмные глаза* – wrong, since this ought to be *томные глаза* "languid, yearning, passionate eyes" while the Özbek passus entirely reads: "coquettishly blinking, nice eyes, languid eyes", but another translation is found in the DrTKsI, 383, sub *öläs* which there is preferred instead of *ulas*: also *öläs köz* "languid eyes", while in the other passus quoted from the Suvarnaprabāṣasūtra *kün tāgri . . . öläs boldy* the meaning is

given as "dim, gloomy; мрачный" which certainly is etymologically different from the first *ölaz* (so to be read), the first one being, according to the interpretation in the DrTkSl. from *öl* "humid", **öl-ä-z* "being h.", the second one from *öl-* "to die", also *öl-ä-z* "fading away; moribundus". But if *ulas*, i. e. *ulas* is to be considered as the original form, it admits of another derivation, namely from *ula-* "to unite, connect, tie together, etc." and this in connection with *köz* might have had various meanings that were lost with the time. It might have meant "eyes, connected by the eye-brows so painted and drawn out", as was at times fashionable. Thus, RAMSTEDT's sagacious assumption (cf. SKE, 206, "Einf.", I, 53, 143, II, 143, 190) is not completely assured. — Since in Proto- and Common-Altai there is no free alternation between *l* and *r*, a derivation of the lexemes for "red" from the etymon of "fire" is not to be assumed. — The Kor.-IE comparison has been made by GÜNTERT, 18.

45. Late M.-Kor. *pyj* < **puj*- "to cut", L 244, is in view of the later development of *yj* to *i* as mentioned by LEE (ib.) to be seen in New-K. *pi*-, SKE, 200, "to cut as with a sickle", *pygak*, North-K. *pygak* "sickle", compared with Ma. *fe*- "to mow (hay, etc.)"; as this is however completely isolated in Tg and limited to Ma., it might very well be a Korean loan, the anlaut *p*- being replaced by the corresponding Ma. *f*-. Another word for cutting, probably being a different etymon, is *péxi* > *péj* > *pé*- "to cut, to sever", SKE 196, considered there as "the factitive verb of a primary" **péx*-, traced back to **pés*- or **pég*-, both the latter forms being given question marks, and this **péx*-, whatever its origin, is considered as a Korean loan in Tg. Ew. *péhi-t* "to tear off, to loosen", *péhi-rgé* "to become torn off". As to the Tg. word, Ew. *pési-t*/*péhi-t*/*pési-t* "to tear, tear off, asunder", *pési-gé*/*péhi-gé* "to cut down, to pieces", *pési-rgé* "to be torn (off, asunder)" has in the TgWB II, 48, so far only two parallels in South-Tg., Oroki *pésit-ci* "to tear" (trans.), and in Ma. the onomatop. *pés*, picturing the tearing, breaking apart, etc. Since words with initial *p*- in Ewenki are loans or plain foreign words, this is either a Southern loan, or it is onomatopoeitic here too with the initial conditioned by the onomatopoeitic character. But the Tg. lexeme has hardly any-

thing to do with the Korean etymon whose basic form is *péxi*; it cannot go back to **péxi*- since -VsV- is preserved in Korean. Moreover, Kor. *péxi*- might originally have the form of the causative in -xi-, *pé-xi*-, the root being *pé*- "to tear, cut (apart, asunder)" being the source of Ma. *fe*- rather than Kor. *pi*- < *puj*- < **puj*-. This is open to further discussion.

46. *saj*, South-Kor. *sa'i* and *sä* "interval, space" is in SKE, 218f. put together with Tg. *saja*, Ew., Ngd., Oroki, Olča, Nā. "space (between the fingers); toe; the cleavage of the cloven-footed (as reindeer)" and with Tk. *saj* "seasonally dry bed of a torrent, creek, river; detritus fan; shallowness, sand-bank" (WB IV, 219f.; Qyry. *sajrön* "sandbank; ford", JUDAXIN, 622, < **saj-ra-yun*; RAS., 394 has no etymology) which shows rather divergent semantics. But Chinese [18], Middle Chin. **cjāi*, Karlgren, Analytic Dict., 1052, "border, junction, meeting; juncture" is semantically and phonetically so close to the Kor. forms that one wonders if either borrowing or contamination has not been operative here.
47. *sän* "count, account, counting, accounting" was put by POPPE, 29 to the derivatives of the Altaic root **sä*- "to count, consider, think, know", e.g. Tk. TkM. *sä-n* "number, figure", *sä-n-a* "to reckon, think", Tg. Lam. *hän* "knowledge", M.-Mo. *sa-n-a* "to think". According to ROSEN, no. 70, this is a Chinese loan in Korean, [15] *suän*, M.-Ch. *suän* < A.-Ch. **suän* (KARLGREN, no. 174 a; GILES, no. 10378) which in later and modern Kor. regularly appears with length: *sän*. Nevertheless, the probability of an ancient coalescence of this Chinese loan with the almost homophonous genuine Alt. **sä-n*/**sa-n* should not be ruled out completely. The same Chinese word has been borrowed into Japanese, too, KENK., 1568, *san* (written with the above Chinese *suän*) "counting, reckoning, calculation". Japanese also borrowed Chin. [16] *su* "number" (GILES, no. 10075) as Sino-Japanese *sū* (KENK., 1826); but in Japanese this loan did not drive into extinction the inherited Japanese words *kazu* "number" and *kazoeru* "to count, to number" (KENK., 889). In SKE, 223, Tk. *san* etc. and Mo. *sana*- etc. are erroneously considered as loanwords from Sino-Kor. *sän*.
48. *soi*, *swē*, *sō* "iron", L 276, in SKE, 239, is put equal to Go. (= Nā.) -so in *geri-so*, *ger-so*, *geaso*, "knife", furtheron to Sol.

sôgâj "coat of mail" as being "< *sô 'iron', just as *sêldi* 'coat of mail' < *sêlê* 'iron', and with Dahur *kasô* "iron, steel", "< Sk. *kaŋ* 'steel' + *soi*". Of these, only Sol. *sôgâj* could be compared with the Korean word, because -so in the Nâ. forms is a deverbal suffix for nomina instrumenti, here derived from *gêl* < **gi*- or *giri* < **gyry*-, resp. (TgWB I, 147 and 154). The origin and formation of Sol. *sôgâj* remains unknown; there are some derivatives of *sêlê* "iron" denoting "coat of mail" as the above Sol. *sêldi*, Oroki, Olča, Nâ. *sêlê-su(n)*, "id.", Lamut Oxotsk *hêlêr-gun* "armoured man", Ew. *sêlli*, *holmi*, *hêlmi*, *hênmä* "coat of mail", in Northern and Eastern dialects "adorned breast-cloth" (part of the Tg. national attire), similarly Oroki *sêltê* "bride's breast-cloth with silver adornments" (TgWB II, 140), the suffixes -*di*-, -*ji* and -*tê*-, however, being rarely met with. Sol. *sôgâj* appears to be a compound, the second part being completely unknown, the first one seemingly containing either *sêlê* "iron" in which the *ê* has yielded *ô* while the origin of this *ê*/ *ô* is not at all clear, or Kor. *soi/swê/sô*. Since there are in Tungus or generally in Altaic no contractions of sound groups of the type *VIV* > *V̄*, the element *sô* in the Solon lexeme might go back to **soi* as in the Korean *soi/swê/sô*; thus, there is some probability that Sol. *sôgâj* is a Korean loanword. The same must be the case of Qalm. *cô*, L.-Mo. **ôôj*, **ôôji*, as RAMSTEDT supposes (Paralip., p. 184), and its various forms in Turkic, but Kor. *soi* cannot go back to Mo. or Tk. **ôôj*, **ôôj* and similar forms except by borrowing through so far unknown intermediaries, as RAMSTEDT, l.c., asks. The comparison of the Korean word with Tg. *sêlê* is considered by RAMSTEDT (ibidem) as "uncertain". The further suggestion of a connection with Oroki, Olča -*su* as the above Nâ. -*su* is out of question. For discussion of the terms for iron in Altaic and their derivatives cf. CINCIUS' and BUGAJEVA's article on terms for metals and their alloys in "Issledovanija v oblasti etimologii altajskix jazykov", Leningrad 1979, pp. 18-52, on iron: 37ff.; K. H. MENGES: "Etymologika zu den altajischen Bezeichnungen von Metallen, Haustieren und Gewächsen", UAJbb N. F., III, 1984, pp. 35ff., on iron: 57ff.

49. M.-Kor. *têb*- "to be warm", L 187, Pajkkê **tap/tep* "warm", reconstructed by DOH Sou Hie (cf. Bruno LEWIN, *Asiat.*

Stud., 2, 1980, p. 172f.), New-K. *têp-/têv*-, caus. *têp-xi*- "to heat up" (RussKorSl., 535 sub нечъ; in SKE, 263, comparison is made, with a question mark, with Tk. *târ*, *ter* "sweat" which is erroneous, the same as in Paralip., 204. The stem is as the M.-Kor. form shows, *têb-/têv*-, but not **têb*-, as said in SKE, 263. The Korean etymon belongs to a Nostratic sib, **tep*- etc., and it is the only Altaic representative of this sib which has become known so far. It is IE, e.g. Lat. *tep-ê-re* "to be warm", OChSl. *tepъjъ*, adj. "warm", *top-i-ti* "to warm up, heat", OInd. *tâpati* "id.", 3. sg. prs. act., OIrish *ten*, *tene* < **tepnet*- "fire", Hitt. *tapašša* "feaver, heat", IE root **tep*- (POKORNY, 1069f.); K'art'velian Gruz. *tp*-, *t'b*- "to warm up" (trans), *t'b-ili* "warm, mild", T'bilisi, name of the city of T'bilisi/Tiflis, "Warm Springs", *t'b-un*- "to isolate (windows) against cold, to protect houses against cold" and many derivatives (cf. TSCHENKELI, p. 467f.).

50. M.-Kor. **ux* (< **u-x*) "upper part, top, surface", New-Kor. *we*, *wi*, *û*, *uj*, *û*, *u* "id.", L 180, 276, ROSEN no. 82; Old-Pajkkê **oko* "id." (R. A. MILLER, "Some Old-Paekche Fragments", *Journal of Korean Studies*, I, Seattle 1979, p. 49f.) < **o-ko*; in SKE, 284f. it is put to the entire Tungus group of e.g. Ew. *uyi* (< **u-gt*) etc., Lam. *ôj*, *uj*, Nâ. *ujê*, etc., Ma. *wê*- (in *wê-si*- "to get up, ascend"), *žê*, *wosi* "on top" etc., all being derivatives of the basic noun **u* "top surface, etc." (TgWB II, 245). Since the vowel *u* in Korean as a rule corresponds to Tk. and Mo. *ô* (cf. POPPE, 149, bottom; DOERFER, "Urtungusisch ô" in *Tungusica*, I, 1978, pp. 66ff., speciell p. 88f.), RAMSTEDT further compares Lit.-Mo. *ôgede* "up, upwards", *ôg-se*- "to ascend" and Tk. *ôkdi* (ought to be *ôg-di*) "praise" which is not, as RAMSTEDT asks, from **ôg-k*-, but from *ôg*- "to praise, laud" (A. v. GABAIN, *Gramm.*, 322; DrTkSl., 379 - not in SEVORTJAN), basically "to lift", semantically like Lat. *extollere*, therefrom also *ôg-ün*- "to brag"; it is cognate, according to R. A. MILLER, with O.-Jap. *ôkôr*- "to arise, elevate (intr.)" and *ôkôs*- "to lift up, elevate (trans.)", i.e. *ôkô-r*- and *ôkô-s*- resp., New-Jap. *okor*- and *okos*- "id." (KENKYUSHA, 1426ff.). RAMSTEDT compares it further with side. **u* in *ue* "upper side, top, over, about" which he analyses as being from **u* + *pai*, i.e. through the intermediary **u-he*, not specified by him. New Jap. *ue* 'top'

is from Old Jap *uFē* < **uFia*; are the similarities in form and meaning between this word and Udihe *ujē-ŋ-fē* "oben" etc. (K. H. MENGES, *Die Tung. Spr.*, p. 147) able to be ignored? This latter is very common in the genitive, *ue-no*, meaning "upper, superior". In this root, Japanese shows the same vacillation (or ablaut ?) *ō/ū* as will be seen in Turkic. Thus, apart from Tk. *ög-*, the Korean etymon is to be compared with the Tk. derivatives of the root **ū* "top, upper part, etc." which is an ablaut form or one of the numerous cases in which there is an ancient and common-Turkic vacillation *o/ū*, *ō/ū*, as it occurs in other Altaic languages, too, but seems to be more wide-spread in Turkic; it is found e.g. in the derivative noun *üst* (in many languages, cf. RAs., 523; SEVORTJAN, 638f.), "upper part, top, etc.", originally being in the ancient locative in *-t* and probably the directive in *-s* (= Tg., Mo. *-si/ši*), *ū-s-t*, having with the time, like *at-t*, *ar-t*, *as-t* (or **a-s-t* ?), lost its locative-directive meaning and begun to function as a new noun, additionally assuming case and possessive suffixes: *üst-ū-n-dā*, *-dā-n*, *-ā*, etc.). There is a verbal derivative in *-z*, *ū-z* "to be upon", the gerund in *-a* of which, Ujyur *üzä*, means "about, over, for", as A. v. GABAIN correctly assumed (in SBAW, 1938, no. 24, p. 1812), and can on its part take on directive suffixes as e.g. in Osm. *ū-z-ä-ri*, *ū-z-ä-rä*, *ū-z-ä-r*; a plain deverbal noun in *-Vn* is *ū-z-ün*, underlying Siberian Turkic forms like Soj. *üstündä* "above, over; higher than" < **ū-z-ün-ū-n-dā*, *üsti* < **ū-z-ün-ū*, possess. 3. sg.; QarTrokki *üsenü* "on, upon, above" (WB I, 1880) is not "instead of *üstü*", as RADLOFF says, but from **ū-z-ün-ū* or **üstnü* < *üst-ün-ū* from (Ujy., Osm.) *üst-ün* (WB, ib.), an ancient lative case in *-Vn*, found also in Qn. *ššen* (WB I, 1345; cf. MENGES, "Die Süd-Sibir. Türk-Spr.", III), CAJ IV, 112ff., V, 97ff.). SEVORTJAN correctly sees an ancient Turkic vacillation *ō/ū* in this root, pointing out the alternate Jakut forms *üöšä* along with *üsä*, "above, on, high" (p. 623), — there is also Jak. *üöšä*, *üsä* "upper, superior; top, height" (PEKARSKIJ, col. 3156f., put to Tk. *üst*, *üs* — so that this might be the older Turkic and Altaic form (there is no counterpart in Türkmén which has only *üst*). Both, RASÄNEN (523f.) and SEVORTJAN (622, 638f.) list *üzä* and *üst* separately although they are derivatives of one and the same etymon. Qazaq, Teleut *üs* "upper

part" (WB I, 1877f.) might be due to secondary abstraction made of *üsü* < **üssü* < **üst-ü*. A derivative of the ancient noun **ū* is e.g. Osm. *üzä* (XIV-th ct., Tarama Szl., 4057) < **ü-ä*, **ü-žä*, later Osm., Qrm *jüzä*, in a Mamlük-Qypčaq text (ZAJĄCZKOWSKI) and with Abū Hājjān *jüčä* "high" which, after having assumed the prothetic *j-* easily became contaminated with derivatives of another etymon, **jü-* "to load upon, put upon (as load)" which has not been noticed by RASÄNEN, 212. This root *jü-* is found in Ujyur, Käsýari, etc. *jü-k* "burden, load", in Ujyur *jü-tür-ük* "loaden with, burdened" < *jü-tür-ük* or *jü-t-ür-ük*, ptc. pf. pass. in *-q-k* of the causative which might also be *jü-d-tür-* of (Uj.) *jü-d* "to load upon", and New-Ujyur *jü-t* "id." (RAs., 212 where reference to SKE, 31, Kor. či-, North-K. čigi- "to carry on the back, be laden", put there together with Tk. *jü-* "id." and Mo. *žüge-*, JČBŠ *žü-ä*, *žö-ä* "id.", cf. also POPPE, 28, 111). Thus, Tk. *jüzä* "high" and *jük-säk* "id., located high up", Osm., Čayataj ptc. pf. (pass.) of (Uj.) *jüksä-* "to be high, elevated", and derivatives (WB IV, 592f.) go back to older **ü-k-sä-*, **ü-k-sä-k*, from *ü*, not from *jü-*. The contamination is facilitated or even promoted by the semantics of Tk. *jü-*, *jü-d* "to load upon" as this implies movements upwards.

As to the suffix in Pajkkč **oko*, it is not possible as yet to decide whether it is the Altaic suffix of the nomen loci Tk., Mo. *-qyl/-ki*, Tg. *-gi*, or whether it rather corresponds to an alternate element as in Tg. *-γil/-γi* for derivative locative nouns, in both instances with labial vowel through assimilation. In its formation Tk. *ög-* "to praise" would be a verbal derivative in *-g-* of the noun *ō/ū* "top, upper part", this formative *-g* not being identical with the locative suffixes *-qy* and *-γt*, thus differing morphologically as well as semantically from Old-Pajkkč **oko* and Old-Jap. *ökör-* and *ökös-* < **ö-k-ör-* and **ö-k-ös-*. A further derivative of *ū* in Turkic is the New-Ujyur noun *ū-z* "upper part, top" in *ögüzi* < *ög ü-z-i* "roof of the house", functioning as a new complex so that further suffixes may be attached, as e.g. possessive 3. ps. *ögüzi-si* "its, his, roof" (cf. KATANOV-MENGES, "Volkskundl. Texte aus Ost-Türkistan", II, chapter LXXXIV, no. 230, p. 120; reprint, Leipzig, 1976). This could easily undergo contamination with *jüz* (occasionally

= *üz*) "face, surface, upper part", as in *pičaq üzi* etc., "Glossar", s. v., p. 136. Another Turkic noun, **ük* "upper, superior", **ü-k*, may very well be present in the Proto-Bulgarian title *YK BATAINON*, *Ük Bayajnu* "Upper, Superior, Baya-Inu" of which an interesting parallel occurs with BHPH "upper, higher, superior", a derivative of BHP = *ŭvaš vir* < common-Tk. *ör* "upper part, top, etc." (cf. JEGOROV, *ŭvEt-Dict.*, 54; not in RÄS.). On this cf. Gy. MORAVCSIK, "Byzantinoturcica", II, 90 and 331, "in connection with titles"; no explanation is given.

Thus, Kor. *u*, *ü* and Jap. *u* has its closest Altaic counterpart in Tk. *ü* and Tg. *ü* with their numerous derivatives.

The etyma in this list, altogether 50, were in their majority culled from LEE's "Geschichte der Koreanischen Sprache" (Deutsche Übersetzung herausgegeben von Bruno LEWIN), Wiesbaden 1977, some from RAMSTEDT's "Studies in Korean Etymology", MSFOu, XCV, 1949, SKE, "A Korean Grammar", MSFOu LXXXII, 1939, the "Russko-Korejskij Slovar'" of 1952, and other sources, some of them used many years ago, such as GÜNTERT, KOPPELMANN, and others. Although there are in the foregoing no special references to it, P. AALTO's "Korean and Altaic, Lexical Relations" in Papers of the I-st International Conference on Korean Studies, The Academy of Korean Studies, Seoul, Republic of Korea, May 15, 1980, pp. 932-947, should be mentioned in this place. It goes without specifically stating that many more lexemes could have been listed here.

Of the above, nos. 3, 5-7, 9-14, 17-19, 22-29, 43, 44, 46, 47, and 50 have cognates in the other Altaic languages, nos. 2 and 49 have cognates in IE only, nos. 11, 13 (?), 14, 22, 28, 43 have cognates in Nostratic, no. 14 has cognates only in some Nostratic languages, nos. 4, 6, 8, 45 are etymologically unclear, nos. 15, 17 (?), 21 (?), 41, 42, 48 are loanwords, mostly cultural terms, and nos. 1, 15, 16, 21 (?), 24, 26 have cognates also outside of Nostratic.

Uralic and Dravidian are not specifically mentioned, because they are subsumed by Nostratic.

- | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| [1] 叱 | [6] 歎 | [11] 内米 | [16] 數 |
| [2] 矢 | [7] 銀河水 | [12] 玻璃 | [17] 勿 |
| [3] 矢走 | [8] 星山 | [13] 火 | [18] 際 |
| [4] 吾 | [9] 一利 | [14] 掌 | [19] خوش |
| [5] 醒 | [10] 里山 | [15] 算 | [20] P |