

A New Classification of the Turkic Languages

Talat Tekin
(Ankara)

One of the unsolved problems of Turkic linguistics is the classification of the Turkic or, to be more exact, 'Chuvash-Turkic' languages. There are several classifications of these languages today, but 'none of them can be regarded as fully satisfactory', as Poppe pointed out before giving his own classification (1965: 33). Unfortunately, however, the same can be said about his classification of the languages belonging to the Turkic branch of the 'Chuvash-Turkic' languages (see below).

Speaking of the shortcomings of most classifications, Poppe has made the following remarks: 'Their main defect lies in the fact that their authors wanted them to be applicable to both the presently spoken languages and those spoken in ancient times. A classification can, however, be either synchronous or a diachronous one, but it cannot be both at the same time. It is obvious that a classification of presently spoken languages cannot include languages of the past' (1965: 33).

I fully agree with Poppe on this view of his. Samoilovich and his followers are indeed mistaken by classifying, for example, the Old Turkic (Orkhon Turkic and Uighur) linguistic material in one group together with Tuvinian in which Old Turkic /d/ has been preserved. It goes without saying that there is a time gap of more than a thousand years between Old Turkic and Tuvinian, and while the Old Turkic /d/ has preserved itself as such in Tuvinian (and also in Khaladj as we now know), in the course of time, it became /t/ in Yakut, /z/ in Khakas and Yellow Uighur, and /y/ in most of the Turkic languages. In the same way, Németh is mistaken by classifying the Old Turkic linguistic material together with the presently spoken Turkic dialects (his term) in one group which he calls the *y*-group, simply because the Old Turkic initial *y*- became, in the course of time, *d*- in Altay, *j*- in Kirghiz, Karakalpak and Karachay, *ž*- in Kazakh, *č*- in Khakas and Tuvinian, and *dz*- in Balkar.

Another important defect found in most classifications is that their authors did not fully apply the phonetic criteria they used to classify the Turkic languag-

es. Thus, Samoilovich took the various developments of Old Turkic /d/ in *adaq* 'foot' as a criterion; yet he classified Yakut (an *atax*-language) together with Tuvinian (an *adaq*-language) in one and the same group. It goes without saying that /t/ and /d/ are two different sounds and Yakut is distinguished by many other features not only from Tuvinian but also from the rest of the Turkic languages.

A third defect found in some classifications arises from the lack of a sufficient knowledge about certain less-investigated dialects or languages spoken in remote areas. Thus, for example, Benzing and Menges are mistaken by classifying the dialect of the Yellow Uighurs (an *azaq*-language) together with Uzbek and New Uighur (*ayaq*-languages) in one and the same group.

All the earlier classifications of the Turkic languages and a general review of them are found in Arat 1953. But Arat's own classification and the classifications made after that date have not yet been discussed. In this paper, first I would like to review these recent classifications and then to offer a new classification of the Turkic languages. I will begin with Arat's classification.

*Arat's Classification (1953)*¹

Arat, my professor at the University of İstanbul from 1947 to 1951, offered the following classification for the presently spoken Turkic languages (his term: *Türk şiveleri*, i.e., 'Turkish dialects'):

- A. Turkish dialect groups (*Türk lehce grupları*):
 - I. The *r*-group, i.e., Chuvash (*r ~ z, l ~ s, s ~ y*)
 - II. The *t*-group, i.e., Yakut (*t ~ d, s ~ y*)
- B. Turkish sub-dialect groups (*Türk şive grupları*):
 - I. The *d*-group (*adaq, tağ, tağlıq, kalğan*): Sayan
 - II. The *z*-group (*azak, tağ, tağlıq, kalğan*): Abakan
 - III. The *tav*-group (*ayak, tav, tavlı, kalğan*): North
 - IV. The *tağlı*-group (*ayak, tağ, tağlı, kalğan*): Tom
 - V. The *tağlıq*-group (*ayak, tağ, tağlıq, kalğan*): East
 - VI. The *dağlı*-group (*ayak, dağ, dağlı, kalan*): South

Arat's classification can be criticised as follows:

1. It is not correct to group Chuvash and Yakut together under the term of *Türk lehce grupları* (Turkish dialect groups); because Chuvash and Yakut are not *dialects*, but they are two *languages* differing greatly both from each other and from the rest of the Turkic languages.

1 R.Rahmeti Arat, "Türk şivelerinin tasnifi", *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, X (İstanbul 1953), pp. 59-138.

2. Although Chuvash and Yakut may be considered close to each other in the treatment of the initial *y-* (= Chuvash *š-*, Yakut *s-*) they differ greatly from one another in many respects, especially in respect of the sound correspondences *r:z* and *l:š*. In other words, Chuvash, the only *r-* and *l-*language, is separated from all the other languages including Yakut, for Yakut, too, is a *z-* and *š-*language.

3. The term *şive grupları* for the rest of the Turkic languages is not appropriate, because *şive* means 'accent' in Turkish of Turkey and implies only 'difference in pronunciation', e.g., *Türkçeyi Karadeniz şivesiyle konuşmak, İngilizceyi Alman şivesiyle konuşmak*, etc. Consequently, the term *şive* 'accent' cannot be used in language classifications.

4. The *tav-*group contains many languages. Two of these languages, i.e., Kirghiz and Altay, do not fit the group; for Kirghiz is a *tō-*language and Altay is a *tū-*language.

5. Finally, for the languages belonging to the second group, i.e., the *z-*group, Arat uses only the name Abakan, i.e., Khakas. It is known that the dialect of the Yellow Uighurs spoken in the Kansu province of China is also a *z-*language (Khakas *azaç*, Yellow Uighur *azaq*).

Benzing's Classification (1959)²

Benzing who follows Samoilovich in his classification, divides the Turkic languages into the following five groups:

I. The Bolgar group (the language of the Volga Bolgar inscriptions; Chuvash);

II. Southern Turkic (the Oghuz group): 1. Osmanli Turkish of Turkey with Anatolian and Rumelian Dialects, Crimean Osmanli); 2. Azerbaijani with Kashkay in Southern Iran); 3. Turkmen, Trukhmen.

III. West Turkic (the Kipchak-Koman languages): 1. The PontoCaspian group (Karaim, Karachay and Balkar, Kumük), 2. The Ural group (Tatar, West-Siberian and Crimean Tatar, Bashkir), 3. The Aralo-Caspian group (Kazak with Karakalpak, Nogay, Kirghiz).

IV. East Turkic (the Uighur group): 1. Uzbek, 2. New Uighur (Taranchi, dialects of Kashgar, Khotan, etc.); Sari-Uighur.

V. North Turkic:

1. The Aral-Sayan group:
 - a) Altaic (Oïrot, Teleut)

² Johannes Benzing, "Classification of the Turkic Languages", *Fundamenta I* (Wiesbaden 1959), pp. 1-5.

b) Shor (Abakan Turkic) and Khakas,

c) Tuva

2. The North Siberian group: Yakut (and Dolgan).

3. Old Turkic (language of the Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions)

As is seen, Benzing has taken the classification by Samoilovich as a basis for his classification. He has also been influenced by Radloff's geographical classification. Benzing's classification can be criticised as follows:

1. It would be wrong to classify Yakut together with Altay, Shor-Khakas and Tuvian in one and the same group. In reality, Yakut is very different from all these languages and it should be classified as an independent group. The same is true of Altay (southern dialects), Khakas and Tuvian.

2. It is wrong to regard Yellow Uighur as a dialect of New Uighur, for it is an *azaq*-language.

3. It is wrong to regard Old Turkic, the language of the Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions, as the historical material of only the North Turkic group.

4. In the classification no mention is made of Salar.

Menges' Classification (1959, 1968)³

In 1959, the Turkic languages were classified also by Karl H. Menges. He gives the same classification in his *The Turkic Languages and Peoples* (pp. 59-66). His classification is as follows:

A. The Central and Southwest Asiatic languages:

I. The Central Asiatic group:

1. Old Turkic (Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions, Old Uighur).

2. Languages of the Middle Turkic period; the dictionary of MK, Karakhanide Turkic, dialect of Khwarezm (XI th/ XII centuries).

3. Chagatay (later and modern). Uzbek (the Iranized dialects).

5. New Uighur with Taranchi and other dialects; Sari-Uighur and Salar (may be considered as very close to New Uighur dialects).

6. Qırız.

II. The Southwest or Oghuz group:

1. Old Anatolian and Old Osman

2. Osman with its various dialects, Gagauz, Azerbaijanian (with dialects, as those of Iran, Kashkayi)

3. Türkmenian.

³ Karl H. Menges, "Classification of the Turkic Languages", *Fundamenta I*, pp.5-8; *The Turkic Languages and Peoples*, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 60-61.

- B. The Northwest or Qipčaq division:
- III. Old Northwestern of the "Middle Turkic" period:
1. Qomanian, the language of the Codex Cumanicus and the Qomans (or Polovcy), and Qipčaq;
- IV. Ponto-Caspian languages: 2. Karaïm, 3. Qaraçay and Balqar, 4. Qrım Tatar, 5. Qumıq.
- V. Volga-Kama-West-Siberian languages: 6. Qazan-Tatar, with Teptär, Mišär and Kasimov-Tatar, 7. The West-Siberian dialects: Turalı, Tümänli, Tobollı, İšimlı, Qurdaq, İrtiŝlı; 8. Baraba; 9. Küärik; 10. Baŝqurt.
- VI. Aralo-Caspian languages: 11. Qazaq with Qaraqalpaq; 12. (non-iranized or Qipcaq-) Uzbek; 13. Noyay; 14. Qiryz.
- C. VII. Oyrot (in the Altay Mountains) and its dialects: Altay-Kiži, Tälänät, Lebed' (Qū-Kizi) and Yış-Kiži (or Tuba).
- D. VIII. The Central-South-Siberian, Abaqan or "Xakas" group:
1. Šor, 2. Abaqan, comprising the dialects of Sagay, Qoybal, Qaça, Qizıl, and Bältir.
- IX. The East or Tuva group (in Taḡnū-Tuva or Ufanxay): 1. Karagas, 2. Soyon (Tuba, Tuva, Tyba, or Ufanxay language).
- E. X. The Northeast, East-Siberian, or Yakut group. The Yakut (Saḡa) Language and the dialects of the Dolgans, the Yakutized Nanasan (Tavgy-) Samoeds.
- F. The Volga-Bulgarian or Hunno-Bulgarian division:
- XI. Volga-Bulgarian
- XII. Čuvaš or Țävaš.

As is seen, Menges' classification of the Turkic languages is quite complex and complicated. This classification can be criticised as follows:

1. It would be wrong to classify the languages of the past together with the presently spoken languages. Old Turkic is not the ancestor of only Uzbek, New Uighur and the languages belonging to the Oghuz group.

2. Kirghiz is listed twice in the classification, first in the Central-Asiatic group together with Uzbek and New Uighur, secondly in the Northwest or Kipchak group as one of the 'Aralo-Caspian' languages. In reality, Kirghiz does not belong to any of these groups. It is an independent language forming the *tölü*-group by itself (see below).

3. It is wrong to regard Yellow Uighur and Salar as dialects of New Uighur. The first is an *azaq*-language and should be classified together with Khakas; the latter is a *taḡli*-language forming an independent group by itself (see below).

*Poppe's Classification (1965)*⁴

The most recent attempt to classify the Turkic languages has been made by Nicholas Poppe. Poppe, who rightly calls these languages 'Chuvash-Turkic', divides the Turkic branch into the following five groups:

- I. Yakut (*ataχ < adaq, tia < taγ, -i < -iγ*)
- II. Tuva-Khakas (*adaq/azaq, taγ, -iγ*)
- III. Kipchak (*ayaq, taw/tu, -i*)
- IV. Chagatay (*ayaq, taγ, -iq*)
- V. Turkmen (*ayaq, daγ, -i*)

Poppe, following the suggestions made by Pritsak, further divides the Kipchak group into the following four subgroups:

1. Karay, Karachay-Balkar and Kumuk (*aγ > aw*);
2. Tatar and Bashkir (*aγ > aw, o > u, ö > ü, u > ö, ü > ö, ä/e > i, i > ë*);
3. Nogay, Kazakh, Karakalpak *č > š, š > s* and the occurrence of suffix-initial /l/ as *n/d/t* depending on the nature of the preceding consonant);
4. Kirghiz and Altay (secondary long vowels, labial attraction and the change of the /m/ of the negative suffix *-ma-* into *p/b*).

Poppe's classification can be criticised as follows:

1. It would be wrong to classify Tuvinian which is an *adaq*-language together with Khakas which is an *azaχ*-language.
2. The development *taw/tu* given as a characteristic feature of the Kipchak group is incomplete and misleading; because the sound group /aγ/ has resulted in three different forms in this group, i.e. *taγ > taw, tō* and *tū*.
3. In the classification no mention is made of Yellow Uighur and Salar.

*Doerfer's Classification (1971, 1987)*⁵

Doerfer who rediscovered Khaladj in Iran in 1968 has proved that it is an independent Turkic language with many archaic features and not a dialect of Azerbaijani as generally thought to be. One of the archaic features of Khaladj is the preservation of the ancient /d/ as in Tuvinian, e.g., OT *adaq* 'foot' = Tuv. *adaq* id. = Khal. *hadāq, hadaq* id., OT *adīr* 'to separate' = Tuv. *adīr* id. = Khal. *hadur* id., etc. One might think that because of this common feature the two languages, i.e., Tuvinian and Khaladj, could (and perhaps, should) be classified in one group.

4 Nicholas Poppe, *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*, Wiesbaden 1965, pp. 33-36.

5 Gerhard Doerfer, *Khaladj Materials*, Bloomington 1971, pp. 175-181; "Maḥmūd al-Kāšyānī, Arḡu, Chaladsch", *UJb* (1987), p. 105.

But, as Doerfer has pointed out, Khaladj has many other archaic features not shared by Tuvinian, e.g., the preservation of an ancient initial *h-*, the preservation of Proto-Turkic primary long vowels either as such or as diphthongs, the development of the phoneme /ń/ into /n/, etc. Because of all these characteristic features, Doerfer rightfully regards Khaladj as an independent Turkic language and simply adds it as a separate group to the generally accepted six groups, i.e., Oghuz (e.g., Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkmen), Kipchak (e.g., Kazan Tatar, Kazakh), Uighur (e.g., Uzbek, New Uighur), South-Siberian (e.g., Altay Turkish, Tuvinian), Yakut and Chuvash.

As is seen, even the most recent classifications of the Chuvash-Turkic languages are not 'fully satisfactory', i.e., they too are incomplete and have some methodical defects. In addition to this, the rediscovery of Khaladj by Doerfer as a Turkic language with many archaic features has made things more complicated so that a new and more or less complete classification of the Turkic languages has become an urgent necessity.

Of the phonetic features so far used to classify the Turkic languages only the following four have proved to be functional:

1. The correspondences $r = z$ and $l = \tilde{s}$ (Chuvash *tăχχăr* = CT *toquz* '9', Chuv. *χěl* = CT *qĩš* winter)
2. The developments of the phoneme /d/ as in OT *adaq* 'foot';
3. The developments of the sound group /aγ/ in monosyllabic words as in OT *taγ* 'mountain';
4. The developments of the sound group /tγ/ at the end of polysyllabic words as in OT *taγlĩγ* 'mountaineer; mountainous'.

These four features, however, are not sufficient today to classify the presently spoken Turkic languages. In the first place, a fifth feature is needed to separate Salar from both New Uighur and the Oghuz (Turkmen) group, for it is a *taγlĩ-*language, not a *taγlĩq-* or *daγlĩ-*language. This feature could be the preservation or voicing of the initial *t-*. Secondly, to include Khaladj in the classification and to separate it from the other language groups we need a sixth feature. Such a feature could be the preservation or loss of the ancient initial *h-*.

Thus, the phonetic features which I will use to classify the presently spoken Chuvash-Turkic languages are, in their proper order, the following:

1. The correspondences $r = z$ and $l = \tilde{s}$ as in Chuvash *r* and *l* versus Common Turkic *z* and *š*;
2. The preservation or loss of the initial *h-* as in Khaladj *hadaq* 'foot' versus *adaq/ataχ/jazaq/ayaq* of the other languages;
3. The developments of the phoneme /d/ as in Old Turkic *adaq* 'foot';
4. The developments of the sound group *-tγ* at the end of polysyllabic words

as in OT *taɣliɣ* 'mountaineer; mountainous';

5. The developments of the sound group *-aɣ* in monosyllabic words as in OT *taɣ* 'mountain';

6. The preservation or voicing of the initial *t-* as in *taɣli* ~ *daɣli* 'mountaineer'.

If we apply the first and most archaic phonetic feature, the Turkic languages are divided into two unequal branches: I. the *r-* and *l-* branch (Chuvash), II. the *z-* and *ʃ-* branch (other Turkic languages).

To classify the *z-* and *ʃ-* languages we must first use the second phonetic feature, i.e., the preservation or loss of the initial *h-*, because it is the second most archaic feature in the history of Turkic languages.

When we apply this feature the *z-* and *ʃ-* languages, too, are divided into two unequal groups: 1. The *h-* or *hadaq-* group (Khaladj), 2. the *ϕ-* or *adaq|ataɣ|azaɣ|ayaq* group.

In order to classify the remaining languages in which the initial *h-* has become *ϕ-* we can use the third phonetic feature, i.e., the developments of the ancient phoneme /d/ in medial and final positions. By using this feature as a criterion we get four different groups: 1. The *t-* or *ataɣ-* group (Yakut), 2. the *d-* or *adaq-* group (Tuvinian, together with Karagas), 3. the *z-* or *azaɣ|azaq-* group (Kha-kas, Yellow Uighur, etc.), 4. the *y-* or *ayaq-* languages (remaining languages).

The *ayaq-* languages can, in its turn, be classified into five different groups by using the fourth phonetic feature, i.e., the developments of the sound group *-iɣ*: 1. The *iɣ-* group (northern dialects of Altay, etc.), 2. the *u-* group (Altay literary language), 3. the *ū-* group (Kirghiz), 4. the *iq-* group (Uzbek, New Uighur), 5. the *i-* group.

By applying the fifth feature we can divide the *i-* languages into the following two groups: 1. The *aw-* group (Kipchak languages), 2. the *aɣ-* group.

Finally, the languages and dialects belonging to the *aɣ-* group can be divided into the following two groups on the basis of the sixth feature, i.e., the development of the initial *t-*: 1. The *taɣli-* group (Salar), 2. the *daɣli-* group (Oghuz or Turkmen group).

Thus, on the basis of the above-given six features the Chuvash-Turkic languages are divided into twelve groups. All these groups can, with their phonetic features, be illustrated by the following table:

No.	Features												
1	r,l	z,š											
2	ø-	h-	ø-										
3	r	d	t	d	z	y							
4	-ä	-uy	-i	-iy			-u	-ū	-iq	-i			
5	u/äv	ay	ia	ay			ū	ō	ay	aw	ay		
6	t-			d-	t-							d-	
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	

Using the features *r-* and *l-* (versus *z-* and *š-*) and the key words *hadaq/adaq* 'foot' and *tayliγ* 'mountaineer; mountainous' we can name these groups as follows:

- I. The *r-* and *l-* group: Chuvash (literary language)
- II. The *hadaq*-group: Khaladj
- III. The *ataχ*-group: Yakut (literary language); Dolgan
- IV. The *adaq*-group: Tuva or Tuvian (literary language); Karagas
- V. The *azax/jazaq*-group: Khakas (literary language); the Middle Chulym, Mrass and Upper Tom dialects; Yellow Uighur
- VI. The *tayliγ*-group: Northern dialects of Altay (Tuba, Kumandy, Chalkan-du); the Lower Chulym, Kondom and Lower Tom dialects
- VII. The *tulu*-group: Altay (literary language)
- VIII. The *tölu*-group: Kirghiz (literary language)
- IX. The *tayliq*-group: Uzbek, New Uighur (literary languages)
- X. The *tawli*-group (Kipchak): Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogay, Kumuk, Karachay-Balkar, Karay or Karaim, Crimean Tatar (literary languages), the dialect of Baraba Tatars, the Khwarezm-Kipchak dialects of Uzbek
- XI. The *tayli*-group: Salar
- XII. The *dayli*-group (Oghuz): Turkmen literary language), Trukhmen, Khorasani, Khwarezm-Oghuz dialects of Uzbek, Azeri or Azerbaijani (literary language), the Kashkay, Eynallu, Kerkuk and Erbil dialects, Turkish or Turkish of Turkey (literary language), Gagauz (literary language).

As is seen, the V., IX., X. and XII. groups contain more than one languages and dialects. The languages and dialects belonging to these groups can further be

divided into subgroups by using additional phonetic features.

The V. group

To classify the languages and dialects belonging to this group the following phonetic criteria can be used: 1. The treatment of the initial *y-*, 2. the developments of the medial *-š-*. By using Common Turkic *yāšil* 'green' as a key word we can divide this group into the following three subgroups:

1. The *čazil*-subgroup: Khakas (literary language);
2. The *čazil*-subgroup: Middle Chulym, Mrass and Upper Tom dialects;
3. The *yasil*-subgroup: Yellow Uighur.

The IX. group

The Uzbek and New Uighur literary languages forming this group are distinguished from each other by many features. The most important phonetic features separating these languages from each other are the following: 1. The labialization of the vowel /a/ in Uzbek, 2. the existence of the *i-*, *u-* and *ü-*Umlauts in New Uighur, 3. the reduction of /a/ of the medial syllable in New Uighur, etc.

1. Uzb. *âyz* 'mouth', NUig. *eγiz*, Uzb. *âyr* 'heavy', NUig. *eγir*, Uzb. *yirâq* 'far', NUig. *ziraq*, etc.
2. Uzb. *âciq* 'open', NUig. *očuq* (< OT *ačuq*), Uzb. *âriq* 'lean', NUig. *oruq* (< OT *aruq*), etc.
3. Uzb. *etik* 'boot', NUig. *ötük* (< OT *ätük*), Uzb. *temir* 'iron', NUig. *tömür* (< MK *tämür*), Uzb. *teşik* 'hole', NUig. *töšük* (< MK *täšük*), etc.

The X. group

The languages and dialects belonging to this group may further be subdivided by the following features: 1) The treatment of the vowel /o/ of the first syllable, 2) treatment of the phoneme /š/. If we take the verb *qoš-* 'to unite', as a key word we get the following three subgroups:

1. *quš-* subgroup: Tatar and Bashkir;
2. *qos-* subgroup: Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogay; Halic dialect of Karaim;
3. *qoš-* subgroup: Karachay-Balkar, Kumuk, Troki dialect of Karaim, dialect of Baraba Tatars, Crimean Tatar, Khwarezm-Kipchak dialects of Uzbek.

Tatar and Bashkir which form the first subgroup are separated from each other by many features:

1. The word- and suffix-initial /s/ is preserved in Tatar, but it changes to /h/ in Bashkir: Tat. *sari* 'yellow', Bšk. *harï*; Tat. *sul* 'left', Bšk. *hul*; Tat. *bulsa* 'if it happens', Bšk. *bulha* etc.
2. The phoneme /č/ is preserved in Tatar, but it changes to /s/ in Bashkir:

Tat. *čap-* 'to run', Bšk. *sap-*, Tat. *čalgı* 'sickle', Bšk. *salgı*, Tat. *öcin* 'for', Bšk. *ösön* etc.

3. The phoneme /z/ in medial and final positions is preserved in Tatar, but it changes to interdental fricative /d/ in Bashkir: Tat. *süz* 'word', Bšk. *hüδ*, Tat. *büz* 'gray', Bšk. *buδ*, Tat. *sızıq* 'line', Bšk. *hıdıq* etc.

4. The phoneme /s/ in medial and final positions is preserved in Tatar, but in changes to voiceless interdental fricative /θ/ in Bashkir: Tat. *sası* 'stinking', Bšk. *haθı*, Tat. *yası* 'flat', Bšk. *yaθı*, etc.

5. Bashkir has labial attraction: Tat. *yoldız* 'star' = Bšk. *yondoδ*, Tat. *yöriy* 'he is walking' = Bšk. *yöröy*, etc.

The *qoš-* subgroup can further be divided into three divisions on the basis of the treatment of the initial *y-* as in Common Turkic *yās* 'young':

1. The *žas-*division: Kazakh
2. The *jas-*division: Karakalpak
3. The *yas-*division: Nogay, Halic dialect of Karaim.

Although a literary language since the October Revolution, Karakalpak can be regarded as a dialect of Kazakh, for it is very close to it.

Finally, the *qoš-* subgroup of the X. group can further be divided into two divisions on the basis of the initial *b-* as in Common Turkic *bēs* '5':

1. The *pās-*division: The dialect of the Baraba Tatars.
2. The *beš-*division: Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Troki dialect of Karaim, Crimean Tatar, Khwarezm-Kipchak dialects of Uzbek

By using additional criteria one can further subdivide the *beš-*division and arrive at individual languages and dialects.

The XII. group

The languages and dialects belonging to the *daylı-*(Oghuz) group can be divided into four subgroups on the basis of the following features: 1. The treatment of the initial *q-*, 2. the preservation or shortening of Proto-Turkic long vowels. If we use Proto-Turkic **qāl-* 'to remain' as a key word we get the following subgroups:

1. The *qāl-*subgroup: Khwarezm-Oghuz dialects of Uzbek;
2. The *gāl-*subgroup: Turkmen literary language, Trukhmen dialect of Turkmen, Khorasan dialect of Turkmen or Khorasani;
3. The *gal-*subgroup: Azeri or Azerbaijani (literary language), Kashkay and Eynallu dialects, Tabriz dialect, Kerkuk and Erbil dialects, East Anatolian dialects of Azerbaijani;
4. The *kal-*subgroup: Turkish or Turkish of Turkey (together with Anatolian and Rumelian dialects); Gagauz literary language.

SOME REMARKS ON CHUVASH, KHALADJ AND SALAR

Chuvash. The characteristic features of Chuvash are well known: *täxxär* '9' < **toqur*² (= CT *toquz*), *χəl* 'winter' < **qil*² (= CT *qış*), *ura* 'foot' < **adaq* (= CT *adaq*, Khal. *hadaq*), etc. Speaking of the correspondence CT /š/ = Chuv. /l/, it should be reminded that CT /š/ corresponds in Chuvash not only to /l/, but also to /š/ in some cases. In such cases, Chuvash /š/ goes back to an older /č/ and /lč/ e.g., *puś* 'head, beginning' < Volga Bulg. *bač* 'beginning' < **balč* (= CT *baš*),⁶ *χiš-* 'to scratch' < **qač-* < **qalč-* (= CT *qaš-* = Mo. *qalči-* 'to scrape off'), *šipaś-* 'to stick, adhere' < **yapič-* (= CT *yapış-*, but MK *yapşur-* ~ *yapçur-* 'to stick, paste, glue, QB 401, 1409 *yapçur* 'it clings' < *yapič-ur*), *vārs-* 'to fight against' < **ürič-* (= CT *ürüş-*, but Middle Turkic *urçur* 'he fights'),⁷ etc.

The existence of /t/ versus CT /z/ and the existence of /l/ and /š/ versus CT /š/ are among the most archaic features of Chuvash, going perhaps as far back as the beginning of our era.⁸ Because of these features Chuvash goes back not to Proto-Turkic, but it goes back to Proto-Chuvash or Proto-Bulgarian which obviously was a *r-* and *l-* (and *č-l*) language. It follows then that Chuvash and the Turkic Languages are not the so-called 'sister languages', but they are descendants of two sister languages originating from a single proto-language. Such a proto-language may be called Proto-Chuvash-Turkic, or simply Pre-Turkic (Gerim. *Vortürkisch*).⁹

Khaladj. Khaladj has many archaic features as Doerfer has shown and proved beyond any doubt.¹⁰ The most archaic one of these features seems to be the systematic preservation of an ancient initial *h-* which is lost with a few exceptions in the Turkic languages including Chuvash, e.g., MK *arq* 'excrement' = Khaladj *harq* (= Mo. *argal* id. < MMo. *hargal*), MK *üt, üd* 'hole' = Khal. *hüt* id. (= Mo.

6 Talat Tekin, "On Volga Bulgarian *bačne*", *PIAC Newsletter*, No. 10, p. 8; "Once more Zetacism and Sigmätism", *CAJ XXIII*: 1-2 (1979), p. 131.

7 Talat Tekin, "Inner-Turkic evidence for the correspondence Turkic /š/, Chuvash /š/ and Mongolian /č/", *Gedanke und Wirkung*. Festschrift zum Geburtstag von Nikolaus Poppe, heraus. von Walter Heissig und Klaus Sagaster (Wiesbaden 1989), 341-345.

8 Andras Róna-Tas, "Turkic Influence on the Uralic Languages", *The Uralic Languages*, ed. by Denis Sinor, Leiden etc. (1988), pp. 743-780.

9 Nicholas Poppe, *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*, Wiesbaden 1965, p. 33.

10 Gerhard Doerfer, "Das Chaladsch-eine archaische Türksprache in Zentralpersien", *ZDMG* 118:1 (1968), 79-112; *Khaladj Materials*, Bloomington 1971; "Altertümliche türkische wörter im Chaladsch", *Bilimsel Bildiriler*, TDK Yayınları, Ankara 1972, 255-260; "Khaladj and its Relation to the other Turkic Languages", *TDAY* 1977, 17-33; "Maḥmūd Kāşğari, Argu, Chaladsch", *UAJb* (1987), 105-114, etc.

ütügün 'vulva' < MMo. *hütügün*), MK, etc. *ürk-* 'to be frightened, startled' = Khal. *hirk-* id., Chag. *ürk-*, *hürk-*, Az. *hürk-*, Uzb. *hurk-*, NUig. *hürkü-*, *ürkü-* (= Mo. *ürgü-* id. < MMo. *hürgü-*), etc. Doerfer maintains that Khal. *h-* comes from PT initial *p*.¹¹ Poppe, on the other hand, assumes that Khaladj *h-* goes back to the Altaic initial *p*.¹² I agree with Poppe on this assumption of his, because I believe that there is sufficient evidence to assume that PA *p-*, which is preserved as such in Nanay (Goldi) and Korean, developed into *h-* in Proto-Chuvash and Proto-Turkic as it also did in Middle Mongolian and Evenki, but became *Null* in Old Chuvash and Old Turkic with the exception of Old Khaladj, e.g., MK, etc. *ürk-* 'to be frightened, startled' < **hürk-* > Khal. *hirk-* (Az. *hürk-*, Uzb. *hurk-*, NUig. *hürkü-*) = Mo. *ürgü-* id. < MMo. *hürgü-* = Evk. *hurkujehin-* 'to jump up', spring, start', Nan. *puyku-* id. < **pürkü-*, Trkm. *öt* 'fire', Yak. *uot* id. < **höt* > Khal. *hüt* id. = Mo. *očin* 'spark' < MMo. *hočin* < **pōtin* = Evk. *hōsin* id., Nan. *posin*, Ulcha *posikta* id.,¹³ MK *arq* 'excrement' < **harq* > Khal. *harq* = Mo. *argal* id. < MMo. *hargal* = Ma. *fajan* id. < **fargan* < **parkal* = Ko. *park* id., MK *üt*, *ūd* 'hole' < **hūt* > Khal. *hüt* = Mo. *ütügün* 'vulva' < MMo. *hütügün* = MKo. *poji* id. < **puti* < **püti*.

Salar. This language was first regarded by Korsh and Samoilovich as a dialect belonging to the northern (= northeastern) group of the Turkic languages and classified by them together with Tuva or Tuvinian because of the expression *yalaŋ adax* 'bare-footed' occurring in Potanin's material.¹⁴ Poppe has shown that *yalaŋ adax* is a unique example in Salar, the regular Salar word for 'foot' being *ayaχ*.¹⁵ Studying the material collected by Potanin, Poppe came to the conclusion that Salar is a language very close to New Uighur or even a dialect of the latter. This view of Poppe has been accepted by many scholars (Menges, Pritsak, K. Thomsen, Baskakov and others). Malov, on the other hand, regarded Salar as a dialect belonging to the *taŋli-* or Kipchak-Turkmen group of the classification by Samoilovich.¹⁶ Tenishev who investigated Salar and compiled a grammar of this language maintains that it is a Kipchakised Oghuz dialect influenced by Chi

11 "Khaladj and its Relation to the Other Turkic Languages", p. 2

12 Nikolaus Poppe, "Chaladsch und die altaische Sprachwissenschaft", *CAJ* 27: 1-2, 112-120.

13 *ibid.*, the Korean examples in the last two equations are taken from Dr. Han Woo Choi's unpublished M.A. dissertation entitled *Türkçe ile Korecenin Karşılaştırmalı Fonetikolojisi* (Ankara 1986), pp. 110 and 116.

14 See Arat 1953, pp. 94 and 100.

15 Nicholas Poppe, "Remarks on the Salar Language", *HJAS* XVI: 3-4 (1953), 438-477.

16 S. E. Malov, "Drevnie i novye tjurkskie jazyki", *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otd. literatury i jazyka*, XI, 1952, vyp. 2, pp. 135-143 (after Drimba 1968).

nese and Tibetan.¹⁷ Finally, Drimba who published an important article on Salar regards it as an independent language belonging to the same subgroup as Eastern Turki, i.e., New Uighur.¹⁸

In my opinion, Salar can not be regarded as a dialect belonging to the same group as the Khwarezm-Kipchak dialects of Uzbek, because it is not a *tawli*-dialect or language. On the other hand, Salar cannot be considered a language belonging to the same subgroup as New Uighur, for it is a *tayli*-language, not a *tayliq* language. As a matter of fact, Salar is the only language in which Old Turkic *tayliŷ* has become *tayli*. It follows then that Salar is an independent language forming by itself the *tayli*-group of the Turkic languages.

The main characteristic features of Salar separating it from the Chagatay, Kipchak and Oghuz groups are the following:

1. The development of the final sound group *-iŷ/-ig* in polysyllabic words into *-i/-i*: *tayli* 'mountainous', *aji* 'bitter' < **aciŷ*, *sari*, *sari*, *sare* 'yellow' < **sariŷ*, *ulli*, *ulli*, *uli* 'big, great' < *uluŷ*, *kuŷli* 'powerful' < **kuclicug*, *tuxli* 'wollen' < **tuklicug* 'youth, youngster', *kici* < *kicig*, etc.

2. The preservation of the sound group *aŷ*, *tay* 'mountain', *baŷla-*, *paŷla-* 'to tie', *yaŷ-* 'to rain' *aŷi-* 'to pain', etc.

3. The preservation of the so-called 'pronominal *n*' after the 3rd p. poss. suffix: *tasiinda* 'outside of', *iŷinda* 'in, within', *yanina* 'to the side off', *ilinda* 'in front of', *susinten* 'from its water', etc.

4. The preservation of the voiceless *t* and *c* occurring after long vowels: *putaŷ*, *putaŷ* 'branch', *totaŷ*, *totaiŷ*, *totiŷ*, *totiŷ* 'lip', *otun* 'wood', *aciŷ-*, *aciŷ-* 'to get hungry', *ocaŷ*, *ociŷ*, *ociŷ* 'hearth', etc.

5. The preservation of the initial *t*:- *tay*, *toqos* '9', *temur* 'iron', *teŷuŷ*, *teŷuŷ* 'hole', *tova* 'camel', etc.

17 E. R. Tenishev, *Salarskij jazyk*, Moskva 1963, pp. 9, 46, 47.

18 Vladimir Drimba, "Sur la classification de la langue salare", *UJb* (1968), 200-213.