

## Some thoughts on the Proto-Turkic palato-velar nasal

Marek Stachowski  
(Kraków)

The proposal to reconstruct a palato-velar nasal \**ɲ*' in Proto-Turkic was initially introduced by Martti Räsänen (LTS 200-203) in 1949. Twenty years later he used this consonant in some reconstructions presented in VEWT (1969). From that point on, however, no one else seems to have raised the issue again, let alone to address it in a more systematic way. This situation prompted me to examine to what extent the existence of \**ɲ* is realistic, and whether the correlation between its modern reflexes would be possible. I am not going to present clear-cut, simple and coherent solutions, because we still seem to be far from formulating regular correspondences. Nevertheless, I hope that the presentation of some observations will help to find the comprehensive solution.

Let us first see a selection<sup>1</sup> of the material in VEWT.<sup>2</sup>

### 1. \**ajáč*

(VEWT 7b s.v. *ayač*)

A. Old Uyg., Middle Tkc. *jygač* 'Baum'

B. Ott. *agač* id.

---

<sup>1</sup> The letter <e> stands for wide *ä*; the letter <è> – for narrow *e* (if the distinction – irrelevant in our context – is at all possible on the basis of VEWT). – All reconstructions with \**ɲ*' found in VEWT are cited here. The word 'selection' means the lexical material supporting the reconstructions, not the number of reconstructions themselves.

<sup>2</sup> I divided the material from VEWT presented here into seven groups: **A** = Old and Middle Turkic; **B** = Oguz; **C** = Kipchak; **D** = Karluk; **E** = South Siberian Turkic; **F** = Yakut; **G** = Chuvash. – I only cite the material here, without correcting or supplementing it.

- C. Kar. *agac*; Kzk. *agaš*; Kirgh. *žygač* id.  
 D. Uyg. *jagač*; SUyg. *jigaš* id.  
 E. Leb.-Oyr. *agyš*; Tuv. *iješ* ~ *yjaš*; Tuba *naš*; Tof. *najš* id.  
 F. ? Yak. *mas* id.  
 G. Chuv. *jyváš* ~ *jäváš* ~ *jüs* id.

## 2. \*eŋ'

(VEWT 45b)

- A. Middle Tkc. *eŋ* ~ *aŋ*; Chag. *iŋ* 'yanak, Wange'  
 B. Az. *eŋg* 'die Seiten des Unterkiefers'  
     **Der.:** Ott. *ene(k)* 'çene'  
 C. Kzk. *iek* 'Kinn'; Tat. *ijek* ~ *ějek* id.  
 D. ———  
 E. Oyr., Khak. *ēk* 'Kinn'  
     **Der.:** Shor *īgī* 'Kiefer'  
 F. ———  
 G. Chuv. *janax* ~ *ana* 'Kinn'

## 3. \*baŋa

(VEWT 62a)

- A. Old Uyg. *baja* 'früher, ehemals erwähnt'  
     **Der.:** Chag. *baj-ri* ~ *baj-ru* 'lange gedient habend'  
 B. **Der.:** Trkm. *baja-k*  
 C. Tat. *baja* 'letztthin, vor einiger Zeit'  
     **Der.:** Kzk., Tat. *baja-gy*; Kirgh. *bajr-gy*  
 D. Eastern Tkc. *baja*; SUyg. *peja* 'letztthin, vor einiger Zeit'  
 E. Khak., Oyr.-Tel. *paja*; Kmnd.-Oyr. *pyja*  
 F. Yak. *mā*  
     **Der.:** Yak. *mājy* ~ *māŋy*  
 G. ? Chuv. *paj-zār* ~ *pažār* 'vor kurzem, soeben'

## 4. \*beŋ'

(VEWT 70a)

- A. KB *meŋ* 'Gesichtsfarbe, das Äussere'  
     **Der.:** KB<sup>3</sup>, Chag. *meŋiz* 'Antlitz'; Koman. *mejiz* id.; Middle Tkc.  
     (H) *megiz* id.; Chag. *beŋ-z-e-* ~ *meŋ-iz-e-* 'ähnlich sein'

<sup>3</sup> The philological sources cited here are: **AH** = *Kitâbü'l-idrâk li-lisânü'l-Etrâk* by Abû Hayyân (14th century); **CC** = *Codex Comanicus* (13th century); **El-Idr.** = *El*

- B. **Der.:** Az. *beñiz* ‘Antlitz’; Trkm. *beñ-z-e-* ‘ähnlich sein’; Ott. *benze-* id.
- C. **Der.:** Kzk. *meñiz* ‘Antlitz’
- D. **Der.:** Uyg. *menz-i* ‘Wange’
- E. **Der.:** Küär. *megis* ‘Gesicht’
- F. ———
- G. Chuv. \**pañ* (→ Votyak *bañi* ~ *bam* ~ *ban* ‘Wange, Gesicht, Seite’)

5. \**beñi*

(VEWT 70 ab)

- A. Middle Tkc. *meñi*; Chag. *mije* ‘Gehirn’
- B. Ott. *bej(i)n*; Trkm. *bejn-i* ~ *mejn-i*; Az. *bejin*
- C. Uzb. *mija*; Tat., Kzk. *mij* ~ *myj* (→ Mator *muj* ‘Mark’, see Joki 1952: 231sq.)<sup>4</sup>; Kirgh. *mē*
- D. Eastern Tkc. *miñe* ~ *mije*; Uyg. *meje*
- E. Tuv. *mē*; Leb.-Oyr. *pē*; Kača-Khak. *pē*  
**Der.:** Shor *mī-s*
- F. Yak. *mej(i)* ‘Kopf, Gehirn’
- G. Chuv. *mime* ~ *mine* ~ *nime* ~ *vime* (→ Cherem. *memek* ‘Mark im Bein’)

6. \**boj* ~ \**moj*

(VEWT 80a)

- A. Old Uyg. *bojun*; Chag. *boj* ‘Hals’
- B. ———
- C. Kzk. *mojn*; Kirgh. *mojun*; Tat. *mujān*  
**Der.:** Sart.-Uzb. *mojnča* ‘Kummet’
- D. **Der.:** Uyg. *bojnturuk* ‘Halsstange der Pferde beim Pflügen’
- E. **Der.:** Tuv. *mončar* ‘ošejnük’, *mojunduruk* (→ Kamass. *mojtruk*, Joki 1952: 230)
- F. Yak. *moj* ~ *mōj* ~ *mojun* ‘šeja, vyja; šejka, gorlyško, perexvat’
- G. Chuv. *māj* ~ *myj* ~ *muj* ‘Hals’

---

*Idrāk Haşiyesi* by Abū Hayyân (14th century); **H** = Houtsma’s dictionary (14th century); **IM** = Ibnī Mühennâ (14th century); **KB** = Kutadgu Bilig (11th century).

<sup>4</sup> For somewhat skeptical comments on the Kipchak etymology of the Mator word see: Helimski 1997: 309sq.

7. \**jaŋak*

(VEWT 187a)

- A. Old Tkc., Old Uyg., Chag. *jaŋak* ‘Wange, Kinnbacken’; Koman. *jaŋak* ~ *jaak* ~ *jaax* ~ *jāk*; Chag. *jaŋag* ~ *janak*  
 B. Ott. *jaŋak* ~ *janak* ‘Wange, Kinnbacken’  
 C. Tat. *žaŋak* ~ *jaŋak*; Misher-Tat. *žejek*; Kmk. *jajak*; Kirgh. *žāk*  
 D. SUyg. *jaŋak* ~ *jyŋak* ~ *jinak*  
 E. Tuv. *čaŋak* ~ *čāk* ‘ščeká’, Oyr. *jāk*  
**Der.:** Kmnd.-Oyr. *nāgy*  
 F. Yak. *syŋāx* ~ *syŋyax* ~ *sygax*  
 G. ———

8. \**jiŋčke*

(VEWT 203b)

- A. Old Uyg. (*j*)*inčke*; Chag. *inčke*; Middle Tkc. *jinčke* ‘fein’  
 B. Ott. *inže*  
 C. Tat. *něčke* (→ Cherem.); KarT, Kmk. *inčke*; Karach. *iŋŋičke* ~ *inčxe*; Kklp. *žiŋiške*  
 D. Eastern Tkc. *jinč(i)ke* ‘dünn, fein’; Uyg. *inčike* ‘schmal, schlank, fein’  
 E. Shor *čiš(k)e*; Tuv. *čiŋge*, Khak. *niske*  
**Der.:** Sag.-Khak. *iŋzek*  
 F. ———  
 G. Chuv. *sinže* ‘dünn, fein’

9. \**kaj-*

(VEWT 233a)

- A. Koman. *kaj-* ‘ausgleiten, gleiten’  
**Der.:** Middle Tkc. *kaj-yš-* ‘sich zuwenden’  
 B. Ott. *kaj-* ‘gleiten, hindurchschlupfen’  
**Der.:** Ott. *kajak* ‘Schneeschuhe, Schlitten’  
 C. ———  
 D. Suyg. *kaj-* ‘plyt’  
 E. Tel.-Oyr. *kaj-* ‘gleiten; sich zurückwenden’; Tuv. *xaj-* ‘obxodit’, *projti mimo*  
**Der.:** Khak. *xaj-yl-* ‘tajat’, *plavit’sja*; Tel.-, Kmnd.-Oyr. *kaj-ala-* ‘auf der Oberfläche schwimmen’; Tuv. *xāk* ‘lyža’  
 F. ———  
 G. ———

10. \**kaɲuk*

(VEWT 233a)

- A. Middle Tkc. *kajyk* (C. Brockelmann: *kayyk*) ‘Kahn’; ? IM *kangak* ‘büyük gemi’  
 B. Ott. *kajyk* ‘Kahn, Boot’; Tat. *kajyk* ‘großes Boot, Fähre’  
 C. Kzk., Balk., Karach. *kajyk* ‘Kahn, Boot’  
 D. ———  
 E. Oyr. *kajyk* ‘Ruder’  
 F. Yak. *xajyk* ~ *xajȳk* ~ *xojuk* ~ *xojūk*  
 G. ———

11. \**keɲe-*

(VEWT 253a)

- A. KB *keɲe-* ‘um Rat fragen, sich beraten’; Middle Tkc. *kejɲe-* ‘beraten’  
 Der.: Old Uyg. *kiɲgeš-* ‘ratschlagen’; Middle Tkc. *kejɲeš-* ‘sich beraten’; AH *keneš-*  
 B. ———  
 C. Der.: Kzk. *kəɲese-* ‘1. einen Rat geben; 2. um Rat bitten’; KarĻ *kənes* ~ KarT *keñeš* ‘Rat, Beratung’  
 D. Der.: Eastern Tkc. *keɲeš-* ‘1. einen Rat geben; 2. um Rat bitten’, *keneš* ‘Rat, Beratung’  
 E. ———  
 F. ———  
 G. Chuv. *kanaš* ‘Übereinkunft, Vertrag’ (→ Cherem.)

12. \**köɲlek*

(VEWT 290sq.)

- A. Middle Tkc. *köɲlek* ‘Hemd’; H *könlek*; DK [= ?]<sup>5</sup> *köɲlek* ~ *göɲlek* ~ *göjnek*; AH *könlek*; Koman. *köülek* [= -öü-]  
 B. Ott. *gömlek*<sup>6</sup> ~ *köjnek*; Crimean Tkc. *gölmek* ~ *kölmek*; Trkm., Az. *köjnek*  
 C. Tat. *külmek*; Uzb. *kojnak* ~ *kojlak*; Kirgh. *köjnök* ~ *könök*; Kzk., Kklp. *köjlek* ~ *köjlök*

<sup>5</sup> The abbreviation is not explained in VEWT.

<sup>6</sup> Since every *k*, *g*, *l* is palatalized before and after a front vowel, the palatalization usually remains unmarked in script. Consequently, these words should be written either *gömlek* ~ *köjnek* or simply *gömlek* ~ *köjnek*.

- D. Eastern Tk. (Le Coq) *könlek*; Uyg. *könnek*  
 E. Shor *küjnek* (→ Kamass. *küjnek*, Joki 1952: 215); Kondoma-Shor *könnek*; Sag.-Khak. *kügnek*; Küär. *künek*; Tuv. *xöjlen*  
 F. ? Yak. *könjügäs* [ɔ: *könüges*] ‘starinnoe nazvanie doxi’  
 G. —

### 13. \**könjül*

(VEWT 291)

- A. Old Tk., Old Uyg., Chag. *könjül* ‘Sinn, Gemüt, Herz, Geist’  
**Der.:** Old Uyg. *könj-e-* ‘nachsinnen’  
 B. Ott. *gönül*;<sup>7</sup> Crimean Tk. *gönjül*; Trkm. *gönjil*; Az. *gö(j)ül*  
 C. Tat. *künjäl*; karT *kölün*; Blk., Karach. *köl* ‘Herz, Seele, Sinn’; Kmk. *gönj* ‘Sinn, Gefühl, Sorge’<sup>8</sup>  
 D. —  
 E. Khak. *köl* (3.Sg.: *könj-i*) ‘nastroenie, čuvstvo, ljubov’; Tuv. *xön* (3.Sg.: *xönjü*)<sup>9</sup> ‘nastroenie, želanie’  
**Der.:** Khak. *köl-že* ‘medlennyj, tixij’  
 F. —  
 G. Chuv. *kämäl* ‘Absicht; Barmherzigkeit; Gunst’ (→ Cherem.).

### 14. \**kyj*

(VEWT 264sq.)

- A. Old Uyg. *kyn* ‘sheel’; Middle Tk. *kyjyr* ‘sheel; schielend’; Chag. *kiñir* ‘schief, steil’  
**Der.:** El-Idr. *kyj-kaš* ‘gözü kaymış, şaşı’  
 B. Crimean Tk. *kyjyr* ‘schief, krumm, gebogen’  
**Der.:** Ott. *kyjgač* ‘krumm’; Trkm. *kyjšyk*  
 C. Tat., Kzk. *kyjyr* ‘schief, krumm, gebogen’; Kar. *kyjgyr*; Kmk. *kyjnyr*  
**Der.:** Kzk. *kyjyk*; Bshk. *kyjyš-*; Kirgh., Kmk. *kyjšyk*  
 D. Uyg. *kiñir* ‘schief, steil; tapfer [!]’  
 E. Sag.-Khak. *kyjyr*; Oyr. *kyjr*  
 F. —  
 G. —

<sup>7</sup> See the previous footnote.

<sup>8</sup> Is the Kumyk word a modern reflex of the Proto-Turkic root \**könj* (or alike)? Maybe more realistic possibility is: modern Kmk. *gönj* < \**gönjü* < \**könjli*, 3.Sg. < \**könjül*.

<sup>9</sup> Tuv. *xön* < \**xönün* < \**könjül*.

## 15. \*kyŋrak

(VEWT 265a)

- A. Middle Tkc. *kyŋrak* ‘zweischneidiges Messer’  
 B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 C. \_\_\_\_\_  
 D. \_\_\_\_\_  
 E. Tel.-Oyr. *kyŋrak* ‘ein Messer mit zwei Schneiden...’  
 F. \_\_\_\_\_  
 G. \_\_\_\_\_

## 16. \*muŋ ~ \*buŋ

(VEWT 344b)

- A. Old Tkc., Chag. *buŋ* ‘Grenze, Beengung’; Middle Tkc. *muŋ* ‘Mühe, Not’; IM *mun* ~ *bun* ‘eksiklik’  
 B. Ott. *bön* ‘töricht’  
 C. Tat. *məŋ* ‘Qual, Leiden’  
     **Der.:** Tat. *muj-aj-* ~ *mun-aj-* ‘traurig sein’  
 D.     **Der.:** Uyg. *muj-gā* ‘störrisch’  
 E. Kmnd.-Oyr. *myŋ* ‘Mühe, Sorge’  
     **Der.:** Khak. *mug-an-* ~ *mux-an-* ‘mučit’sja’  
 F. \_\_\_\_\_  
 G. \_\_\_\_\_

## 17. \*pāŋa &gt; \*(h)āja

(VEWT 10b)

- A. Old Uyg., Middle Tkc., Chag. *aja* ‘Handfläche’  
 B. Trkm. *āja*  
 C. Kmk. *aja*  
 D. SUyg. *xaja(n)*  
 E. \_\_\_\_\_  
 F. \_\_\_\_\_  
 G. \_\_\_\_\_

## 18. \*süŋük

(VEWT 437a)

- A. Old Tkc., Middle Tkc. *süŋük* ‘Knochen’; DK [= ?] *söŋük* ~ *söŋek* ~ *sögek*; AH *süŋük* ~ *süwük*; Chag. *süjek*  
 B. Ott. *sömük* ~ *söjük*; Trkm. *süŋk* ~ (Radloff) *süjek*; Az. *sömük*

- C. Tat. *sějek*; Tobolsk-Tat. *süek*; Misher-Tat. *süwek*; karT *süwek* ~ *śuvák*; Kmk. *süjek*; Kzk. *sü(j)ök*; Kirgh. *sök*
- D. ———
- E. Oyr. *sök*
- F. Yak. *uŋuox* ~ *umuox*
- G. Chuv. *šamá* ~ *šömö* ~ *šană*

## 19. \*syŋ'

(VEWT 418a)

- A. KB, Koman. *syn* 'das Äussere, die Gestalt; Steinbild'
- B. ———
- C. Kzk. *syn* id.; Tat. 'Götze'  
**Der.:** Kzk., Kirgh. *syjak* 'das Äussere, das Aussehen'
- D. ———
- E. Tel.-Oyr. *syn* 'das Äussere, die Gestalt'
- F. ———
- G. ———

## 20. \*syŋ'-

(VEWT 418a)

- A. Old Uyg., Middle Tkc. *syg-* 'hineinpassen, hineindringen'; Koman. *sī-* 'hineingehen, hineinpassen'; Chag. *siŋ-* 'hineinpassen'  
**Der.:** Old Tkc. *sygys* 'Keil'
- B. Ott. *syg-*
- C. Tat. *syj-* ~ *sī-*; Kzk. *syj-* ~ *siŋ-*; Kirgh. *syj-*
- D. SUyg. *syg-*
- E. Shor *syŋ-*  
**Der.:** Leb.-, Kmnd.-Oyr. *sygys* 'Keil'; Khak. *sīŋ-čax* 'Keil'
- F. ———
- G. Chuv. *šan-ăs-*

## 21. \*toj'

(VEWT 488b)

- A. AH, Chag. *toj* 'Gastmahl, Zecherei, Hochzeit'  
**Der.:** AH *dügün* 'evlenme meclisi'<sup>10</sup>
- B. Ott. *toj*  
**Der.:** Ott. \**doj-gün* > *dügün* ~ *düjün* 'Hochzeit'

<sup>10</sup> See also Ölmez 1997: 273.

- C. Kzk., Bshk. *tuj* (→ Chuv. *toj* ~ *tuj*)
- D. Uyg. *toj*
- E. \_\_\_\_\_
- F. Yak. *toj*
- G. Chuv. – see C

## 22. \*toŋur

(VEWT 488b)

- A. Old Uyg., Middle Tkc., Koman., Chag. *toŋuz* ‘Schwein’
- B. Ott. *doŋuz* ~ *domuz*; Trkm. *doŋyz*
- C. Tat. *duŋyz*; Kzk., Kmk. *doŋuz*
- D. Uyg. *toŋus*; SUyg. *toŋys* ~ *toŋys*
- E. Oyr. *toŋys*
- F. \_\_\_\_\_
- G. Chuv. – see C

## 23. \*turuŋa

(VEWT 501ab)

- A. KB *turna*  
     **Der.:** Old Uyg. *turuŋaja* ‘Kranich’
- B. Ott. *tyrna*; Trkm *durna*
- C. Tat. *tørna*; Kzk. *tyrna*; Kirgh. *tur(u)na*
- D. \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Tuv. *tujurā* (< *turuŋa*) ~ *duŋjā*; Koyb.-Khak. *turna*
- F. Yak. *turjuja*
- G. Chuv. *tārna* ~ *tərne* (→ Cherem. *turna*)

## 24. \*tüŋ-lük (? < \*tüŋlük)<sup>11</sup>

(VEWT 505a)

- A. Middle Tkc., Chag. *tüŋlük* ‘Dceke des Rauchloches’; ? Old Tkc. *tügünük* ‘vent of smoke’
- B. Trkm. *tüjnük* ~ *tüjnək*
- C. Tat. *tönlök* ~ *tönnök* (→ Cherem. *tülək* ~ *tühək*); Kzk. *tündük*
- D. Uyg. *tüŋnik* ‘Rauchloch’
- E. Oyr. *tünük* [ɔ: -nük]; Khak. *tünük*; Shor *tündük*; Koyb.-Khak. *tümdük*
- F. Yak. *tünnük* ‘okno, okoško’
- G. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>11</sup> For discussion of this word see Ölmez 1997: 273.

25. \**tyrǵa-* (or \**tyrǵa-*)

(VEWT 479a)

- A. Middle Tkc. *tyrma-* ‘kratzen’  
**Der.:** Middle Tkc. *tyrǵak* ‘Nagel’; KB, AH *tyrnak*
- B. **Der.:** Ott. *tyrma-la-* ‘harken, eggen, kratzen’; Trkm. *dyrnak*
- C. Tat. *tyrma-*; Kmk. *tyrna-*
- D. \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Leb.-Oyr. *tyrba-*  
**Der.:** Oyr. *tyrmak*; Leb.-Oyr. *tyrbak*; Sag.-Khak. *tyrgak*; Tuv. *dyrgak*<sup>12</sup>; Khak. *tyrbos* ‘grabli’
- F. **Der.:** Yak. *tynyrax* [sic!] (< \**tyryǵax*) ‘kogot’, nogot’
- G. **Der.:** Chuv. *čěrne*

26. \**yǵyr*

(VEWT 166a)

- A. **Der.:** CC *jyǵyr-čak*
- B. \_\_\_\_\_
- C. **Der.:** Tat., Kzk. *yǵyr-čak* ‘Packsattel; Holzgestell des Sattels’; ?  
 Kzk. *yǵyršak* ‘Mähre, ein mageres, abgetriebens Pferd’
- D. Uyg. *liǵir-ak* [certainly a misprint for *iǵ-* or *jiǵ-*]
- E. Oyr. *yǵyr-čak*
- F. Yak. *yǵyr* ~ *yǵyr* ‘sedlo’
- G. Chuv. *ěner* ~ *jener* id.  
**Der.:** Chuv. *jěnerčěk* ‘Kummetpolster’

Let me summarize now the possible reflexes of the PTkc. \**ǵ*:

<sup>12</sup> The meanings of words are given inconsistently in VEWT. For Tuvinian two words have to be taken into consideration here: *dyrgak* ‘tarak || Kamm’ and *dyrbak* ‘tarnak; tirmik || (Finger-) Nagel, Klaue; Schramme, Harke’ (TW 139). – On Yak. *tarāx* ‘Kamm’, a cognate of Tuv. *dyrgak*, and Yak. *tarān-* ~ *taran-* ‘sich kämmen’ see GJV § 5.9d, 5.10e.

Table 1

No	Reconstruction	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	*aŋač ‘tree’	g	g	g	g	g, ŋ, j, ń	? m	v, ø
2a	*eŋ ‘jaw’	ŋ	n	—	—	—	—	n
2b	*eŋek ‘jaw’	ŋ, n	ŋ	j, ø	—	g, ø	—	n
3	*baŋa ‘ealier’	j	j	j	j	j	j, ŋ	? j, ø
4	*beŋ ‘complexion’	ŋ, j, g	ŋ, n	ŋ	ŋ	g	—	*ŋ
5	*beŋi ‘horn; antler(s)’	ŋ, j	j	j, ø	ŋ, j	ø	j	m
6	*boŋ ‘neck’	j	—	jn	jn	jn, j, n	j	j
7	*jaŋak ‘jaw bone; cheek’	ŋ, g, ø	ŋ, n	ŋ, j, ø	ŋ, n	ŋ, ø, g	ŋ, g	
8	*jiŋčke ‘thin; fine’	n	n	ŋ, n	n	ŋ, ø	—	n
9	*kaŋ- ‘to glide, to slip’	j	j	—	j	j, ø	—	—
10	*kaŋjuk ‘boat’	?ŋ, j, ?g	j	j	—	j	j	—
11	*keŋe- ‘to ask for advice’	ŋ, jŋ, n	—	ŋ, n	ŋ, n	—	—	n
12	*kōŋlek ‘shirt’	ŋ, j, ø, ü	n, m, j	m, j, ø	ŋ, n	jn, j, g, ø	? ń	—
13	*kōŋül ‘heart’	ŋ	ŋ, n, j	ŋ, ø	—	ø	—	m
14	*kyŋ ‘crooked, lop- sided’	ŋ, n, j	ŋ, j, ø	ŋ, j	ŋ, j	j	—	—
15	*kyŋrak ‘double-edged knife’	ŋ	—	—	—	ŋ	—	—
16	*muŋ ~ *buŋ ‘limit; suffering’	ŋ, n	n	ŋ, j	j	ŋ, g, x	—	—
17	*pāŋa ‘palm of the hand’	j	j	j	j	—	—	—
18	*süŋük ‘bone’	ŋ, g, j, w	ŋ, j, m	j, v, w, ø	—	ø	ŋ, m	m

19	*syŋ 'appearance, form'	<i>n</i>	—	<i>n, j</i>	—	<i>n</i>	—	—
20	*syŋ- 'to fit (into)'	<i>ŋ, g, 0</i>	<i>g, 0</i>	<i>ŋ, j</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>ŋ, g</i>	—	<i>n</i>
21	*toŋ 'wedding'	<i>j, g</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>j</i>	—	<i>j</i>	—
22	*toŋúr 'pig'	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>ŋ, m</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>ŋ, v</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	—	<i>x</i>
23	*turuŋa 'crane (bird)'	<i>ŋ, n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	—	<i>ń, j</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>ń</i>
24	*tüŋlük 'smoke hole; skylight'	<i>ŋ, g</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>ŋ, n</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>n, m</i>	<i>n</i>	—
25	*tyrŋa- (? *tyrŋa-) 'to scratch'	<i>ŋ, n</i>	<i>n, m</i>	<i>n, m</i>	—	<i>g, m, b</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>n</i>
26	*yŋŋyr 'saddle'	<i>ŋ</i>	—	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>n</i>
		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>

Some of these words can be combined in pairs, namely No 2a + 2b, No 9 + 10, No 12 + 13, since they are based on the same lexical roots.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, the number of examples at our disposal decreases, but the remaining twenty plus words are sufficient to support a reconstruction of a separate Proto-Turkic consonant \*ŋ.

In some other cases one can hardly guess why M. Räsänen decided to reconstruct their protoforms with \*ŋ, which has three important features: nasality, velarity and palatalization. Namely, there is:

- no nasality in the reflexes of No 21;
- no velarity in the reflexes of No 6, 19;
- no nasality and no velarity in the reflexes of No 9, 17;
- no palatalization in the reflexes of No 8, 15, 23, 25, 26.

Some other reconstructions still require comments:

No 1: \*aŋač. – The usually accepted etymology goes as follows: modern Tkc. *agač* 'tree' < \*ygač < \*y 'vegetation, bush' (Clauson 1) + *gač* (> Yak., Dolg. +*gas*, see DWB 12). – Either this etymology is correct, and the reflexes with *ŋ, j, ń* (in group E) are secondary, which demands explanation, or – just to the contrary – the reflexes indicate

<sup>13</sup> The situation is somewhat more complicated with No 19 + 20. Both words, too, could form a pair. However, significant discrepancies between the two groups of their modern reflexes, as well as their meanings, with their cognacy not being quite self-evident, call for caution.

- \*ŋ* and the generally accepted etymology is wrong. – In any case, the Yakut word *mas* certainly does not belong here, because it cannot be a Yakut cognate of the Common Turkic word for phonetic reasons, and probably is a loanword from Tungusic (see Stachowski 1995).
- No 2a: *\*eŋ*. – The Yakut cognate *iŋ* ~ *im* ‘Wange’ should be at least added to this word family (GJV § 7.7). – Assuming that the vowel length in Trkm. *ēŋ* (which hitherto remained unexplained) represents a secondary development from an earlier diphthong *\*ej*,<sup>14</sup> one can interpret this as evidence for the existence of a PTkc. *\*ŋ*, i.e. Trkm. *ēŋ* < *\*ejŋ* < PTkc. *\*eŋ*. In this case we have to add a *\*jŋ* to the reflexes in the group B here.
- No 8: *\*jiŋčke*. – Yak. *si(ń)ńe* ‘langes Haar unter dem Hals des Rentiers’ should be added to the group F (GJV § 8.2). The Yakut reflex is the *(ń)ń* which is of great importance, since it involves a palatal element among the reflexes where the absence thereof seemed to disqualify this word family as a valid etymology. If Yak. *(ń)ń* < *\*ńń* < PTkc. *\*ŋč*, then the modern Yakut reflex of the PTkc. *\*ŋ* is just *ń* in this case.
- No 16: *\*muŋ* ~ *\*buŋ*. – Both phonetic and semantic discrepancies make the reconstruction (and even the comparison itself) extremely uncertain.
- No 18 *\*süŋük*. – The consonant between two palatal vowels could certainly be palatalized to a certain degree. There is, however, an argument against the phonemic status of this palatalization (or rather: ‘palatalizedness’<sup>15</sup>): The protoform of this word is often reconstructed as *\*süŋük*. Some years ago, I tried to show that the correct reconstruction is *\*sōŋ+gek* or *\*sōŋ+gök* according to both philological and comparative data. The *\*ŋ* could not at any rate be palatal, since it has triggered the velarization of the root vowel in PYak. *\*sōŋ* (> modern Yak. *uoŋ*, attested in: *uoŋ arȳta* ‘bone marrow’, lit. ‘bone butter’) → *\*sōŋ+gak* or *\*sōŋ+gok* > *\*oŋuok* (> Dolg. *oŋuok* ‘bone’) > *\*uŋuok* (> Yak. *uŋuox* ‘bone’), see Stachowski 1994: 205sq.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Trkm. /*ü*/ (actually pronounced [*ü*<sup>1</sup>] ~ [*ü*<sup>1</sup>]), and also Kirg. *köjnök* ~ *könök* in No 12, group C here.

<sup>15</sup> I hesitate to call the phenomenon ‘palatalness’ which could suggest a stable, i.e. phonemic feature.

Thus, the revised table looks as follows:

**Table 2**

No	Reconstruction	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2a	*e $\eta$ 'jaw'	$\eta$	$\eta$ , * $j\eta$	—	—	—	$n, m$	$n$
2b	*e $\eta$ ek 'jaw'	$\eta, n$	$n$	$j, \emptyset$	—	$g, \emptyset$	—	$n$
3	*ba $\eta$ a 'ealier'	$j$	$j$	$j$	$j$	$j$	$j, \eta$	? $j$ , $\emptyset$
4	*be $\eta$ 'complexion'	$\eta, j$ , $g$	$\eta, n$	$\eta$	$\eta$	$g$	—	* $\eta$
5	*be $\eta$ i 'horn; antler(s)'	$\eta, j$	$j$	$j, \emptyset$	$\eta, j$	$\emptyset$	$j$	$m$
7	*ja $\eta$ ak 'jaw bone; cheek'	$\eta, g$ , $\emptyset$	$\eta, n$	$\eta, j$ , $\emptyset$	$\eta, n$	$\eta, g$ , $\emptyset$	$\eta, g$	
8	* $j\eta$ čke 'thin; fine'	$n$	$n$	$\eta, n$	$n$	$\eta, \emptyset$	$\acute{n}$	$n$
9	*ka $\eta$ - 'to glide, to slip'	$j$	$j$	—	$j$	$j, \emptyset$	—	—
10	*ka $\eta$ uk 'boat'	? $\eta$ , $j, ?g$	$j$	$j$	—	$j$	$j$	—
11	*ke $\eta$ e- 'to ask for advice'	$\eta$ , $j\eta, n$	—	$\eta, n$	$\eta, n$	—	—	$n$
12	*k $\eta$ lek 'shirt'	$\eta, j$ , $\emptyset, \ddot{u}$	$n$ , $m, j$	$m, j$	$\eta, n$	$jn$ , $j, g$ , $\emptyset$	? $\acute{n}$	—
13	*k $\eta$ ül 'heart'	$\eta$	$\eta, n$ , $j$	$\eta, \emptyset$	—	$\emptyset$	—	$m$
14	*k $\eta$ 'crooked, lop- sided'	$\eta, n$ , $j$	$\eta, j$	$\eta$	$\eta, j$	$j$	—	—
20	*s $\eta$ - 'to fit (into)'	$\eta, g$ , $\emptyset$	$g, \emptyset$	$\eta, j$	$g$	$\eta, g$	—	$n$
23	*tu $\eta$ a 'crane (bird)'	$\eta, n$	$n$	$n$	—	$\acute{n}, j$	$j$	$\acute{n}$
24	*t $\eta$ lük 'smoke hole; skylight'	$\eta, g$	$j$	$\eta, n$	$\eta$	$n, m$	$n$	—
		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>

I left here the word pair No 9+10, because it is possible, at least tentatively, to accept it as a single etymology with two groups of reflexes of the same root that allows us to reconstruct a protoform with \**ŋ*'.

No 19 was excluded from the revised table since its reflexes differ considerably from those of No 20 (whereas the reflexes of No 9 and No 10 are almost identical).

Still, multiple irregularities among the reflexes remain in the revised chart. One has, however, to bear in mind the two following factors:

[a] Up till now, language groups rather than specific languages were discussed (group A is especially heterogeneous because it comprises various languages from different centuries);

[b] Some inconsistencies may result from interdialectal borrowing among different Turkic languages.

The most appropriate initial strategy seems to be the concentration on groups (and subsequently on separate languages) displaying the highest degree of resemblance.

Words with back vowels should, as it seems, have priority in the discussion because they exclude a possibility of \**ŋ*' being secondarily palatalized by surrounding front vowels. These are: No 7 \**jaŋak*, No 9 \**kaŋ-*, No 10 \**kaŋuk*, No 14 \**kyŋ*, No 20 \**syŋ-* and No 23 \**turuŋa*.

The most astonishing examples among them are No 9 and No 10, which demonstrate almost identical reflexes. If there were no *ŋ* in group A of No 10, no reflex would point to an original nasal. However, this *ŋ* appears here because of one example only: IM *kangak* 'büyük gemi', which probably represents a scribal mistake: the letter *nun* < ن > instead of the correct *ye* < ي >. If it is so, the notation should be read as *kajgak*, and this in its turn means that No 9 and 10 actually have one reflex only: \**j* (leaving aside the secondary contraction of \**VjV* > *ø* in Tuv. *xāk* 'ski'). Thus, there cannot be any doubt that the traditional reconstruction is right: \**kaj*-<sup>16</sup> In short: the reconstruction of \**ŋ*' in No 9 and 10 is certainly incorrect.

<sup>16</sup> Ščerbak 1970: 194 proposes a \**kāj-* [with *ā-*] in his list of reconstructed roots. However, the reason for reconstructing a long vowel here is not completely clear to me. Yak. *xāj-* '1. to drive the cattle into the corral; 2. to bar one's way' cannot be easily identified with PTkc. \**kāj-* 'to glide, to skim, to slide' because of the semantics, so it does not support the long *-ā-* in the protoform. On the other hand, the short vowel in Yak. *xajyk* ~ *xojuk* 'great boat' (which is the regular cognate of Tksh. *kayik* 'boat') does not prove that the original root vowel was short, either; because the shortening of the originally long vowel in the first, closed syllable in

The two reflexes: *jɣ* (No 2a: Trkm.; No 11: Middle Tk.) and *jn* (No 12: Shor) actually seem to indicate original *\*ɣ'* (cf. also *\*n' > jn ~ nj* in GJV § 1.19a). However, the Shor *jn* is isolated among the Shor reflexes. This is why it should rather be assumed that Shor *jn* < *\*ɣ'*, and Shor *küjnek* < *\*küñnek* < *\*küñlek* < *\*köñlek* > Kzk., Kklp. *köjlek*. The secondary shift to back vowels in Uzb. *kojnak* ~ *kojlak*, was also triggered by *\*ɣ* rather than by *\*ɣ'*.

\*   \*  
\*  
\*

The possibility of the existence of the primary PTkc. *\*ɣ'* looks generally realistic. It appears to be the best solution to recurring sequences of reflexes like *ɣ ~ n ~ g ~ j ~ ø*. The main problem is the correlation of data from different languages, as in many other cases in the Turkic phonetic history.

Furthermore, some additional facts and questions should be born in mind:

- [a] One finds *\*tyrña-* or *\*tyrñá-* ‘to scratch’ in VEWT 479a, and the entry *\*kyñrak* (VEWT 265a) has a reference to *\*kññ* (VEWT 264b). What criteria can be used to distinguish between *\*ɣ'* and *\*n'*? I failed to find other *\*n'* reconstructions where modern reflexes have a velar element like *ɣ* or *g*. This problem remains unsolved for the time being.
- [b] Twenty years before the publication of VEWT, M. Räsänen also suggested *\*ɣ'* for the comparison of Old Tk., Kzk. *siñli* ‘jüngere Schwester’ with Kmnd.-Oyr. *sīni* ~ *syjyn* = karT *siñli* id.<sup>17</sup> (LTS 202), but it is not included in VEWT.
- [c] The juxtaposition of Uyg., Chag. *siñ-* ‘in die Erde einziehen (vom Wasser)’ with Yak. *yñyr-* ~ *yñyr-* ‘schlucken’ (LTS 202)<sup>18</sup> is

---

the derivational process leading to opening of the syllable was virtually regular in the Yakut phonetic history, i.e., both *\*kāj-uk* and *\*kaj-uk* would yield PYak. *\*kajuk*. The other two phonetic variants of this word, namely Yak. *xajyk* and *xojük* id. reflect the Russian accentuation: < Russ. *kajúk* id. < Tk. *kajuk* id. (GJV § 39.6).

<sup>17</sup> The *ɣ'* in the Karaim form is secondary and does not reflect the Proto-Turkic stage.

<sup>18</sup> Räsänen (LTS 202) considered *siñ-* ‘in die Erde einziehen (vom Wasser); eindringen lassen; verschlingen’, *syñ-* ‘hineinpassen, -gehen’ and *suñ-* ‘tauchen’ as three separate verbs.

especially important. Turcologists usually derive Yak.  $\bar{j}$  < Ptkc.  $*\acute{n}$ , as in Yak.  $i\bar{j}e$  ‘mother’ < PTKc.  $*e\acute{n}e$  (GJV § 7.13). If one could prove that the above comparison is correct, as well as that the protoform had a  $*\acute{\eta}$ , we had to accept two sources of the modern Yak.  $\bar{j}$ , i.e. PTKc.  $*\acute{n}$  and  $*\acute{\eta}$ .<sup>19</sup>

- [d] There are some commonly accepted  $*\eta$  reconstructions. Can a minimal pair involving  $*\eta : *\acute{\eta}$  be found? Or maybe a minimal pair involving  $*\acute{n} : *\acute{\eta}$ ? Is  $*\acute{\eta}$  a palatalized velar nasal or a velarized palatal nasal or both?
- [e] Has the Uyg. verb  $e\eta ir-$  ‘spinnen’ (combined by Räsänen with Kmnd.-Oyr.  $egir-$  id., Ott.  $ejir-$  id., Chag.  $egir-$  ‘1. id.; 2. drehen, wenden’, VEWT 37b)<sup>20</sup> any relevance for the reconstruction of  $*\acute{\eta}$ ?
- [f] If  $*\acute{o}\acute{c}+ak$  ‘Feuerstelle’ actually goes back to  $*\acute{o}t$  ‘feuer’ (LTS 181; VEWT 356b), the inevitable phonetic intermediate stage must have been  $*\acute{o}t'ak$ . This fact alone puts new questions (e.g., how should the palatality of  $*t'$  be explained?)<sup>21</sup>, and, at the same time, opens up new research perspectives: namely, if /n/ : /ń/, /ŋ/ : /ň/, /t/ : /t'/ were separate phonemes in Proto-Turkic, the palatalization seems to have been more than a sporadically occurring phenomenon, marked merely by a diacritic in the Old Turkic runic script.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Phonetically cf. Scottish Gaelic  $cuing$  [kuiŋg] ~ [kũ] ‘yoke; asthma’,  $aingeal$  [aŋgəl] ~ [ãŋgəl] ‘angel’ (Gillies 1993: 156).

<sup>20</sup> I am not really sure that Räsänen is right when he considers this verb to be identical with Uyg.  $egir-$  ~  $e\eta ir-$  ‘folgen, verfolgen, belagern’ (ibidem).

<sup>21</sup> One of the possibilities is the situation before the appearance of the vowel harmony, namely, at the time when each suffix had only one form. Originally, there was a form like  $*\acute{o}t+ek$ . Next, when the vowel harmony was developing, the suffix  $*+ek$  obtained its [+back] variant  $*+ak$ . Moreover, two additional scenarios are possible: [a]  $*\acute{o}t+ek$  was an old formation, and its  $*t$  was palatalized by  $*e$  before  $*+ak > *+ak$ ; [b]  $*+ek$  changed into  $*+ak$ , leaving, however, a trace of its original front vowel as a palatalization of the preceding consonant. In either case the result was emergence of  $*t'$ . One more possibility is to assume an original  $*t'$ , i.e.  $*\acute{o}t'$  (not just  $*\acute{o}t$ ), and its further evolution:  $*-t'\# > *-t\#$ ,  $*-t'V > *-čV$ . Consequently, words with  $-tV$  instead of  $-čV$  are younger formations and go back to the time after the vowel harmony has developed.

<sup>22</sup> Even if H. Galton’s (1997) idea concerning the possible Altaic influence on the Slavonic palatalization has a poor chance of being proved, the hypothesis of a phonemic opposition of palatal and non-palatal consonants in Proto-Turkic actually makes them resemble the Proto-Slavonic sound system. It is certainly too

## References

- Clauson = Clauson, Sir Gerard: *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*, Oxford.
- DWB = Stachowski M.: *Dolganische Wortbildung*, Kraków 1997.
- GJV = Stachowski, M.: *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków 1993.
- LTS = Räsänen, M.: *Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen*, Helsinki 1949.
- TW = Ölmez, M.: *Tuwinischer Wortschatz, mit alttürkischen und mongolischen Parallelen / Tuvacanın sözvarlığı, Eski Türkçe ve Moğolca denkleriyle*, Wiesbaden 2007.
- VEWT = Räsänen, M.: *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Helsinki 1969.
- Galton H. 1997: *Der Einfluß des Altaischen auf die Entstehung des Slavischen*, Wiesbaden.
- Gillies W. 1993: Scottish Gaelic. – Ball M. J. / Fife J. (ed.): *The Celticlanguages*, London – New York: 145-227.
- Helinski E. 1997: *Die matorische Sprache. Wörterverzeichnis – Grundzüge der Grammatik – Sprachgeschichte*, Szeged.
- Joki A. J. 1952: *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen*, Helsinki.
- Ölmez M. 1997: Review of *DWB*. – *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 7: 271-276.
- Ščerbak A. M. 1970: *Sravnitel'naja fonetika tjurkskich jazykov*, Leningrad.
- Stachowski M. 1994: Über zwei Namen für 'Knochen' in den Türksprachen. – *Folia Orientalia* 30: 203-207.
- 1995: Jakutisch und dolganisch *mas* 'Baum'. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 39/2: 270-274.

---

early to discuss the true origin of this resemblance today. Nevertheless, this observation provides another interesting perspective for future research.