

G. J. RAMSTEDT AND ALTAIC LINGUISTICS

by
PENTTI AALTO
Helsinki

The genetic affinity of the languages now called Finno-Ugric was originally proposed on the basis of very superficial observations. On similar grounds, Johannes Schefferus (1621-79) in his work *Lapponia* (1673) tried to connect the Finnish and Lapp languages with the then very little known Samoyed. The Berlin professor Wilhelm Schott (1802-89) studied the languages called Altaic and regarded them as relatives of the Finno-Ugric languages. At that time the results of the Finno-Ugric studies by the Hungarian scholar Sámuel Gyarmathi (1751-1830) represented a really advanced achievement in their method, which relied on grammatical comparisons for instance. The Danish philologist Rasmus Rask (1787-1832), who actually detected the principle of the laws of historical phonetic developments, combined a great number of languages of the Old World in a large linguistic family.

The comparative method of Franz Bopp (1791-1867), the founder of Indo-European comparative linguistics, was well known in Finland when M. A. Castrén (1813-1852) published his first dissertation in 1839. A younger contemporary of the latter, Herman Kellgren (1822-1856), studied Sanskrit in Germany, and in 1846 presented a paper "On the Formation of the Plural in the Altaic languages" before a congress of German philologists in Iena.¹

M. A. Castrén was also interested in the possible relationship of the Finnish language with Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungus, but considered actual knowledge of all of them insufficient: "Up to now we have not even known the character and the laws governing the Finnish family of languages: how would it be reasonable to compare

¹ This lecture was published in the *Jahresbericht der DMG* 1846 and in an enlarged draft separately under the title *Die Grundzüge der Finnischen Sprache mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Ural-Altäischen Sprachstamm* (Berlin 1847).

this *x* with the Mongolian *z*” he wrote in a letter to J. W. Snellman (cf. further *NRF* II pp. 163–164). A couple of years earlier, however, he had told the same person of his aim to show that “we Finns are not a lonely people outside world history, but related to at least a sixth part of mankind.” The mixing of linguistic with anthropological affinity seems to have been a very common mistake. The migrations of languages are in general explained as migrations of peoples, and thus Castrén later wanted to place the “cradle” of the Finns in the Altai area. In his professorial dissertation *De affixis personalibus linguarum Altaicarum* (Helsinki 1850) and in his academic lectures, Castrén regarded the affinity of Finno-Ugric and Samoyed with the Tungus-Mongol-Turkic group as proven. However, he had acquired this conviction with most arduous labour in the course of his great journeys in Northern Russia, Siberia and Mongolia in 1841–49. In order to clear up the relationships between Finnish and Mongolian, Castrén worked systematically through the interlying languages. Having investigated the eastern Finno-Ugric languages, he came to the Samoyeds and established the relationship of their language with Finno-Ugric. When he investigated the Turkic languages in the Yenisei area, he regarded them as related to Samoyed, and being the very first scholar to have studied spoken Mongolian and Tungus, he considered it possible to connect these languages with the Turkic ones.

Castrén’s successors to the chair of Finnish at the Helsinki University also showed interest in Turkic languages. Thus August E. Ahlqvist (1826–89) investigated Kazan Tatar and Chuvash, though he did not publish his material. He seems in any case to have approved of the suggested affinity between the “Uralic” and the “Altaic” groups of languages. In the same way Arvid Genetz (1848–1915) in his Kazan Tatar grammar states that the Finno-Ugric and Turko-Tatar languages, together with Samoyed, Mongol and Manchu-Tungus, form the “Altaic” family of languages.

Otto Donner (1835–1909) studied Indo-European linguistics in order to apply its methods to the study of Finno-Ugric. During his stay in Germany he published a treatise on *Das Personalpronomen in den Altaischen Sprachen I, Die Finnische Sprache* (Berlin 1865). Later, as lecturer and professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology he pleaded especially for the intensification of Finno-Ugric and Altaic studies: the terminology was still rather vague. Through the efforts of Donner the Finno-Ugrian Society was founded in 1883

to organize and support all branches of the Finno-Ugric and Altaic studies initiated by Castrén. In 1893 he proposed to the Society that a Finnish scholar should be sent to Turkestan and Mongolia to study the local languages and to carry out archaeological investigations, above all to look for ancient inscriptions.

It was 1897, however, before Donner was able to find a fitting person for these tasks, his former pupil Gustaf John Ramstedt (1873–1950). Ramstedt had originally studied Theology and Oriental Languages but early enough changed to Sanskrit, Swedish (his mother tongue), and other philological subjects. After taking his degree in 1895, he worked as teacher of Swedish in the Swedish Lyceum in Turku, his home town. Donner invited Ramstedt to Helsinki, and there, financially supported by Donner, Ramstedt began to prepare himself for the planned journey of exploration to Mongolia. In particular, he studied phonetics, Finno-Ugric languages, and Russian. In order to exercise himself in the field methods developed by the Finno-Ugric scholars, Ramstedt in 1898 investigated the language of the so-called Mountain Cheremis on the Middle Volga. Since most Finno-Ugric peoples at that time were still totally lacking in literatures, language studies had to be concentrated on the spoken languages, and special methods, together with very exact phonetical transcription systems, had been developed for the purpose of noting down linguistic materials. The Kalevala had proved the great importance of folklore to knowledge of the original national culture of peoples, as well as of their original and pure languages. The explorers studying native languages therefore always paid special attention to the folkloric traditions of the peoples concerned. Ramstedt's Cheremis studies resulted in a publication,² to which he gave the final touches during a stay of some weeks in Kazan. Here he also acquainted himself with the Kazan University, one of the foremost seats of oriental scholarship in Russia and in Europe. He had originally planned to start his Mongol studies with old Literary Mongolian, but Professor N. F. Katanov, the famous Turkologist of the University, who also knew Mongolian, persuaded him that the literary language would be of no real use and that it was therefore most practical to start learning spoken Mongolian immediately. Ramstedt had intended to study Turkic

² *Bergtscheremissische Sprachstudien* (MSFOu XVII, Helsingfors 1902, xii + 219 pp.).

languages in Kazan, but now he decided to concentrate on Mongolian, until Katanov had first published his rich Turkic collections.³ In the winter Ramstedt thus travelled with his family to Urga, where a Norwegian missionary, O. S. Naestegaard, helped him to acquaint himself with the population and its language. In a very short time Ramstedt acquired a practical command of the Khalkha dialect, which very much differs from the written Mongolian of the old literature. While collecting Mongolian words for an exhaustive dictionary he soon became aware of the necessity of being able to draw on Turkic and Manchu-Tungus materials for etymological purposes. In a letter to Donner (Urga, Jan. 21, 1900) he asked for a copy of Radloff's dictionary, and for all available sources for Manchu-Tungus. As soon as he received the dictionary he wrote (May 5, 1900) that it had already fully proved its usefulness for explaining Mongol words. After wide journeys in the country, during which he gathered a large amount of linguistic and folkloristic materials, Ramstedt was compelled to leave Mongolia on the outbreak of the Boxer Uprising. He settled in Troitskosavsk, where he continued his studies and also visited the neighbouring Buriats.

In a letter to Donner (Troitskosavsk, December 11, 1900) Ramstedt points out that the oldest religious terminology in Mongolian is clearly Turkic and even contains words of Iranian origin. These must also have come through Turkic. On the other hand, the oldest vocabulary in Turkic and Mongolian shows very many common features. The farther back in time one goes, the less difference there seems to be between the two languages.

When Ramstedt started his journey home he sent his collections by goods train, for the sake of economy, with the result that they were stolen. The Siberian railway authorities paid an indemnity, but the scientific loss was of course beyond repair. According to his letters Ramstedt had already in Troitskosavsk started to describe the verbal derivation and flexion of Mongolian. After recovering from the depression caused by the loss of his invaluable material, he wrote his doctoral dissertation *Ueber die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen* (MSFOu XIX) in 1902 on the basis of some notebooks and with the help of his phenomenal memory. Comparing the forms of the spoken dialects with those of old literary Mongolian Ramstedt tried to reconstruct the ancient "Common Mongolian"

³ Letters from Kazan to Donner on Sept. 16, and to Setälä on Oct. 13, 1898.

forms and then to compare them with the Turkic and Manchu-Tungus forms which in his opinion could be regarded as etymologically related. Some of these identifications were to be found in earlier works by Boehtlingk, Radloff, Katanov and others (Ramstedt in a letter to Donner, August 22, 1901). In a later letter (June 30, 1902) Ramstedt described it as noteworthy that it was expressly the oldest Mongolian suffixes that seemed to be quite similar to the older Turkic forms, while most of the similarities in Manchu looked like older or younger loans from Mongol dialects. He therefore did not yet dare to express any definite stand as to the Mongol-Manchu affinity problem. As the list of the literature used by Ramstedt shows (o. c. p. xxii ff.) he had had several of the more important Turkological appliances at his disposal, in addition to his practical knowledge of Turkic. For the Tungus languages there were only Castrén's grammar and vocabulary, and Zakharov's Manchu grammar and dictionary. Ramstedt himself had in Siberia met and interviewed some Tungus-speaking persons.

In the Introduction to the dissertation Ramstedt (p. vii) summarizes his standpoint at that time as follows:

Es kann dem kritischen Leser überaus dreist erscheinen, wenn ich das mongolische mit den türkisch-tatarischen Dialekten und auch mit dem mandschurischen zusammenstelle, ehe die Lautgeschichte dieser Sprachen „endgültig“ bearbeitet worden ist. Ich habe aber bei den grossen Übereinstimmungen, die ich gefunden, nicht anders verfahren können, trotz des skeptischen Standpunktes, den ich gegen „Ursprachen“ und „Urgemeinschaft“ überhaupt einnehme. Ich sehe also eine Menge augenscheinlicher Ähnlichkeiten, die wegen der geringen Kenntnisse der hierhergehörigen Sprachen mir im Grunde immer unklar geblieben; ob es Entlehnungen sind und dann in welcher Richtung, vermag ich nicht zu sagen – darum die unbestimmten Ausdrücke: „mongolisch-türkisch“, „mongolisch-mandschurisch“ usw. Wenn die hochasiatischen Nomadenvölker, die durch keine feste Grenzen, bestimmte Bauplätze u. ähnl. von einander zu trennen sind, Jahrtausende hindurch zusammen gelebt und gestritten und währenddessen, sagen wir, z. B. 99% Lehnwörter hin und wieder aufgenommen, ist das schon eine gemeinsame „Ursprache“? Ich denke, dass die Konjugation einen wichtigen Bestandteil der Sprache ausmacht; wenn also diese im türkisch-tatarischen und mongolischen in so hohem Grade, wie ich es glaube gezeigt zu haben, gleiche Formen aufweist, sind wohl jedenfalls die Völker auch einander näher zu stellen, als man es bisher gethan. Über die Stellung des tungusischen zum mongolischen kann ich noch weniger ins Klare kommen, weil das tungusische überhaupt gar zu dürftig untersucht ist. Dagegen kann ich die Übereinstimmungen zwischen dem mandschurischen und dem mongolischen in den meisten Fällen als ältere oder jüngere Entlehnungen aus dem letzteren erklären.

In his review of Ramstedt's work, published in the Hungarian journal *KSz* (IV, 1903, p. 111 ff.) Willy Bang criticized his method

of speaking of conjugation in spite of the clearly nominal character of the Mongol verb: "Warum nicht lieber die ganze Suffixlehre des Khalkhassischen auf einmal vor unseren Augen entrollen?". Ramstedt's second paper *Das Schriftmongolische und die Urganmandart phonetisch verglichen* (*JSFOu* XXI, 2, 1903), the manuscript of which he had mailed home from Urga, was of fundamental importance for the historical study of Mongolian. Practically no attention at all was paid to the outer relationships of Mongolian in this. Though Ramstedt had originally aimed his studies at the investigation of Mongolian, the facts themselves had made him to turn his attention to the relationship problem. However, even when he continued his studies he concentrated on Mongolian. The University granted Ramstedt a scholarship for a journey through Afghanistan, Ladakh, Tibet, Outer and Inner Mongolia and Manchuria to the Buriats on the Lena, due to take three years. His aim was primarily to visit the Mongol tribes which were very little known or totally unexplored. In March 1903 he started his studies among the Kalmucks on the Volga, gathering grammatical, lexical and folkloric materials. These Kalmuck studies were meant to be a preparation for his planned journey to the Mongols of Afghanistan, since the language of the latter was known to show a closer relationship with Western Mongolian, i. e., Kalmuck, specifically. When it proved impossible to enter Afghanistan proper, Ramstedt travelled to the fortress Kushka on the Russo-Afghan frontier. By a lucky chance he found two workers from the Afghan side who spoke the Moghol language. In spite of many difficulties, Ramstedt in four days succeeded in writing down some 200 phrases containing about 500 different words. Having caught a very severe bout of malaria, however, he had to send his teachers home and return to Helsinki. Notwithstanding the limited material, Ramstedt's publication *Mogholica* (*JSFOu* XXIII, 4, 1905), resulting from this journey, was the basis of our knowledge of that language for more than fifty years. In his vocabulary Ramstedt quotes the corresponding forms of Written Mongolian and notices the Persian loan words. References to other languages are scarce.

In April 1904 Ramstedt had recovered so much that he was able to start his second journey to the Kalmucks. Living in Sarepta, he made excursions to the Baga-Chokhor and Don Kalmucks. In the autumn he visited Caucasia, investigating the languages of the Turkic Nogais and Kumyks. In a letter to Setälä from Atšikulak

dated October 20, 1904, he says: "I would never have guessed that a closer investigation of the Tatar language would so much illustrate the history of Mongolian as has now proved to be the case. The Nogai language is very close to Kazan Tatar, a little more conservative and somewhat like Kirghiz perhaps. Radloff in St. Petersburg stated that Tatar had not been investigated from the point of view of Mongolian, since no Turkologist – not even Radloff himself – knows Mongolian more than nominally. He therefore thought that I would have the greatest use of this journey. That is true, indeed. There are already so many etymologies that I am not able to account for them. Every second word filed by me here seems to be an old acquaintance. Little by little I have detected all kinds of phonetic laws and criteria which prove previously unclear correspondences to be loans (more often from Mongolian into Tatar than the other way round) or older similarities. E.g., the Tatar dialects do not possess any initial *n*-, but where Mongolian shows an *n*-, Tatar has a *y*-. Even in an intervocalic position there is sometimes in Mongolian *-n*-, in Tatar *-y*-, thus originally *-ń*- or a nasalized *-y*- as in Yakut as far as I remember . . ." Since the Russo-Japanese war made it impossible to go to Mongolia Ramstedt proceeded via Omsk and Semipalatinsk to East Turkestan arriving at Chuguchak in May 1905. Here he studied the Onkor Solon dialect spoken only by some ten people at the Manchu garrison. However, his material, has not yet been published.⁴ In Shiho and Urumchi Ramstedt then investigated the dialect spoken by the local Torguts, which turned out to be very closely related to that of the Volga Kalmucks. In October 1905 he wrote to Setälä on the margin of a letter "The Turco-Mongolian relations are continuously clearing up." His servant Arsha being a very good teacher and story-teller, Ramstedt in a very short time acquired a mastery of Torgut. His journey home was a most adventurous one because of the chaotic situation in Siberia resulting from the defeat in the war against Japan. At home in the summer of 1906 Ramstedt revised his Kalmuck materials with the aid of two native Kalmucks, Sanji Bayanov and Nokhai Ochirov, invited to Finland for that purpose. As a result of his Kalmuck studies Ramstedt later

⁴ In 1907–08 the young Russian scholar Fedor V. Muromskij, a pupil of Wł. Kotwicz, investigated the same language. His lexical collection was published by St. Kałużyński in 1971 in *RO XXXI*, 1 pp. 39–77, 2 pp. 15–56.

published *Kalmückische Märchen I-II* (*MSFOu* XXVII 1-2, 1909-1919).⁵

On the basis of his studies, Ramstedt in December 1906 - January 1907 gave a number of lectures on the historical phonetics of Turkic and Mongolian at the University of St. Petersburg before an auditorium consisting of teachers and students of the Oriental Faculty and of several members of the Academy of Sciences.

The very first time Ramstedt seems to have treated comparative Turko-Mongol morphology is to be found in an appendix to his short paper on the Mongol pronominal system (*JSFOu* XXIII, 3, 1904-05). Here he proposes a somewhat intricate identification of the Mongol plural suffixes *-s* and *-t* with the *-s- ~ -t-* elements in the Turko-Yakut third person possessive suffixes. Räsänen seems not to have discussed the origin of the Turkic *-s- ~ -t-* in his comparative grammar. According to Menges (*The Turkic Languages and Peoples* p. 114) Yak. *-t-* would be of demonstrative pronominal origin.

The Indo-European languages usually serve as the model for linguistic affinity. It seems, however, that they in fact reflect an exceptionally favourable incidental case. E.g., the relationship between their numerals is far more thoroughgoing and clear than in other language families. Even Ramstedt's statement in his paper "Ueber die Zahlwörter der altaischen Sprachen" (*JSFOu* XXIV, 1, 1907) p. 1, that the Finno-Ugric numerals were a clear proof of the affinity of the languages, is exaggerated. As Collinder has pointed out (*Hat das Uralische verwandte?*, Uppsala 1965, p. 112), the Finno-Ugric languages have only the cardinals 'two' - 'six' in common, and of these only 'two' has a correspondence in Samoyed. Consequently, in the Altaic languages the common word for 'four' (Turkic *tört*, Chuv. *tšvat*, Mo. *dörben*, Tung. *digin*, *duin*, Kor. *turi*, NKor *nduin ~ nei*, all < **dö-*) should thus constitute sufficient proof. In his paper, Ramstedt presents some critical notes about certain previous explanations of the "Altaic" (mainly Turko-Mongol) numerals, and discusses the various words met with in this function. He is, for example, convinced of the identity of Mo. *ikires* 'twins' with the Turkic *ikiz* but cannot decide whether this results from a genetic affinity or whether it is a loan. In his own copy of this paper

⁵ The rest of his Kalmuck and Torgut materials were published posthumously in *JSFOu* 58, 2, 1956, and 63, 1, 1962 and 67, 3, 1966.

he has later erased the latter alternative. In Ramstedt's opinion the numerals in the Altaic languages were based on finger reckoning and often even periphrastic "code" expressions (§ 14 p. 9ff.). A secret reckoning with the fingers is known in India, too, and it might thus be of Central Asiatic origin. In his later lectures and hand-outs Ramstedt developed his theory further, and these results were gathered together by me in the third chapter (pp. 62-67) of the Morphology in Ramstedt's *Einführung*. The Korean comparisons taken into account there seem to provide possible explanations for some of the unclear numerical expressions of the other Altaic languages: Turkic Khalaj *hottuz* 'thirty' (not quoted by me in the above connection) seems to speak in favour of Ramstedt's comparison of Turkic *otuz* with Kor. *pottari* 'bundle.' It is a recognized fact that the earliest Proto-Indo-European system of numeration was obviously quinary and thus based on finger reckoning.⁶ Even Ramstedt's pupil Räsänen, in his *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen* (SO XXI, 1957, p. 76), seems not to have considered the finger reckoning principle and thus cannot understand Ramstedt's etymologies. It seems that Kor. *tasqt* 'five' and Mo. *tabun* 'five' and Manchu *tofo* in *tofo-χon* 'fifteen' go back to an expression for 'closed hand,' while Kor. *jel* 'ten,' Mo. *arban* 'ten' would be 'opened hand,' just as Finnish *kymmenen* 'ten' must belong to *kämmen* 'opened hand.' Räsänen's explanation (l.c.) of Ma. *χon* through Kor. *pom* 'year' and the Altaic words for 'ten' *on* etc. through a supposed Turkic **hon* seems to be lacking in support, since Khalaj, which has preserved *h-* as the representative of the original **p-* shows *oun*. In Samoyed the possible counterpart of Finnish *viisi* 'five' means 'ten'!

The most important of Ramstedt's works on Kalmuck is his dictionary *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch* (LSFOu III) which he worked on ever since his first visit to the Kalmucks. In a letter to Setälä, Ramstedt in 1912 said that there are "impossibly many" words common to Mongolian and Turkic. In Turkic he was able to distinguish at least two different historical stages, the older one being

⁶ O. Szemerényi, *Studies in the Indo-European System of Numerals*, Heidelberg 1960, passim. E. Polomé, "The Indo-European Numeral for 'Five' and Hittite *panku* 'All,'" *Pratidānam Kuiper*, The Hague 1968, pp. 98-101. An important detail was explained by W. B. Henning in his paper "*oktō(u)*" in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1948, p. 69: Avestan *ašti* 'four fingers' breadth, palm' is derived from **ašta* (< **okto-*) with the same suffix as 'fist,' OSL. *pešti*, AS *fjst*, OHG *fūst*.

contemporaneous with Pre-Mongolian while the latter one was characteristically Turkic. Mongolian shows no traces of the latter except naturally in loan words of Turkic origin. The first sheets of the dictionary were given to the printers in 1917, but the work did not appear in print until 1935. Since Ramstedt went on working on the latter parts of the manuscripts until the thirties, they contain, for instance, more references to Korean correspondences than the beginning of the book.

In 1909, with the money paid by the Siberian railway authorities for Ramstedt's stolen luggage, the Society again sent him to Mongolia, accompanied by the archaeologist Sakari Pälvi. The expedition paid special attention to archaeological studies. First of all the Old Turkic inscriptions of the Tonyukuk monument in the Nalaikha valley and the Uigur inscription at Sūdži, discovered by Ramstedt during his first stay in Mongolia, were thoroughly investigated and photographed. Near Shine-Usu the expedition succeeded in finding a long, though fragmentary, Uigur inscription of special historical importance. Both of the Uigur inscriptions were published by Ramstedt in the Castrén Memorial Volume (*JSFou* XXX, 1913-18).

In 1912 Ramstedt again visited Mongolia together with the phonetician Arvo Sotavalta. In addition to his archaeological investigations, Ramstedt further supplemented his lexical materials of the Khalkha dialect and collected folklore.

In an article entitled "Zu den samojedisch-altaischen Berührungen" (*FUF* 12, 1912, pp. 156-7) Ramstedt supposed that the word for 'dog' in Samoyed **wenδ* might be connected with Tungus 'dog' *yen* < **yenδ* and further with Mo. *gendü* 'male.' The latter identification was based on the Finnish parallel *koira* 'dog,' *koiras* 'male.' When he sent his manuscript to Setälä, then the editor of the *FUF*, Ramstedt pointed out that his etymology was obviously very daring "but now and then one must dare." In the *Festschrift für Vilhelm Thomsen* (Leipzig 1912) pp. 182-7 Ramstedt published a paper "Zur Geschichte des labialen Spiranten im Mongolischen." In the Russian translation of his above study on the historical phonology of Mongolian (*Sravnitel'naya fonetika mongol'skago pis'mennago yazıka i xalxasko-urginskago govora*, St. Petersburg 1908, p. 19f.) he had explained the secondary long vowels in Mongolian as being due to a disappeared intervocalic -*γ*-. This is often proved by the Tungus and Turkic correspondences. A comparison with these

latter shows, however, that in other cases Mongolian originally had an $*-\eta-$ or $*-w- \sim *-\beta-$, which has also been lost and yielded similar secondary long vowels. In this article Ramstedt now investigated instances with an original $-w-$. However, in his material, only one case with a Tungus counterpart seems to occur (p. 184): Mo. *nege-* 'to open,' Tung. *nī-*, Ma. *nei-*, while numerous Turkic correspondences are quoted. Ramstedt assumed (p. 186) that an original $*w-$ occurred in the reflexive suffix Mo. *-ban* \sim *-iyan* \sim *-yan* $< *wan >$ Tung. *mēn* 'self, own,' for which he quotes even Samoyed, Ket and Kot parallels. At the end of his paper, Ramstedt points out that Mongolian was much more conservative with regard to the vowels of the non-first syllables and preservation of initial consonants like *d-*, *ǰ-*, *y-*, *n-*, *ń-*, all of which have in Turkic conglomerated into *y-*. In the "Einführung," however, the whole question of an original $*w$ seems to have been passed in silence. Instances like (p. 186) Mo. *keüreg*, *kebereg*, Kalm. *kūræg*, Kh. *ǰewrək*, Turkic Osm. *güvräk*, Kirg. *küirök* 'brittle, rotten' are now (*Einf.* I p. 145) connected with Tung. *kepul-* 'to break,' *kepume* 'tender,' Kor. *kebejeb-* etc. 'to be light' (a still further explanation in *SKE* p. 82 s.v. *kabajapta*) etc. Ramstedt has probably regarded the $*w$ as a secondary representative of an older labial clusile, a possibility to which he already refers in his above paper, p. 187.

For his own studies on the Uralic consonantal gradation Setälä had asked Ramstedt to supply Altaic parallels. In a letter from Lahti dated March 15, 1912, Ramstedt refers to the above paper and quotes additional items showing alternations like $g \sim \gamma \sim \emptyset$ (e.g. Mo. *žegü-*, Kalm. *zū-* 'to dress, to put on' \sim Turkic *yäk-* 'to harness'), $\eta \sim \emptyset$, $m \sim \emptyset$, $m \sim \eta \sim \emptyset$ (e.g. Yak. *ǰomurduos* 'beetle' \sim Turkic *qoǰuz* 'id.' Alt. *qōs* 'id.' \sim Tung. *kaǰer* 'id.' \sim Mo. *qour* 'id.'; Mo. Turkic. *qoǰǰur* 'brown' \sim Tu. $*qour >$ Alt. *qōr* \sim Chuv. *ǰâmâr*, Russ. *коурный* \sim *каурный* 'brown, reddish'; Mo. Kalm. *ōtšŋ* 'inner side of cheek' \sim Turkic. Osm. *avurt*, Tel. *ūrt* $< *oǰurtin$). The alternation $b \sim m$ seems to be at least partially dependent on the following nasals (Mo. *bi* 'I': *minu* 'my,' *ebür* 'fore, front side': *emüne* 'before, in front of,' etc.).

Since 1906, Ramstedt, who worked in the country town Lahti as a school teacher, had also been a lecturer in Altaic Philology at the University, though he often had leaver of absence for his journeys and to prepare his material for print. In his lectures, he treated Tungus and the comparative morphology of Turkic and

Mongolian in addition to Mongolian. As a result of his more intensive investigations, he was able, in a paper entitled "Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen" (*JSFOu* XXVIII, 3, 1912), to present 18 suffixes occurring in both language groups. The Turkic material was taken from Radloff's dictionary, from his *Einleitende Gedanken zur Darstellung der Morphologie der Türk-sprachen*, and from Gronbech's *Forstudier til tyrkisk lydhistorie*, Thomsen's *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, and the works of Ashmarin, Katanov, Boehtlingk, Yastremskiy, and Melioranskiy. Sometimes, Manchu-Tungus examples are also quoted from Castrén's and Zakharov's works.

In a paper called "Egy állítólagos török-mongol hangtörvény" (*NK* XLII, 1913, pp. 69-74) Ramstedt criticized Gy. Németh's article "Egy török-mongol hangtörvény" (*NK* XLI, 1911-12, p. 401ff.). According to Ramstedt, only one of Németh's proposals was possible, i.e., the correspondence Turk. *ti-* ~ Mo. *či-*. The equation Turkic *taš* 'stone' = Chuv. *t'syl* = Mo. *čilayun* < **tilayun* (Németh p. 404, Ramstedt p. 70) presumes, of course, an additional hypothesis like **t'al* > *taš*, which Ramstedt did not yet present here. He also mentions the explanations **š* > **ž* > *l* and **z* > *r* of the Turkic "lambdaicism" and "rhotacism" given by Gombocz and Németh without any closer examination.

Ramstedt also refers to Németh's paper "Die türkisch-mongolische Hypothese" (in *ZDMG* 66, 1912, p. 551ff.). Here Németh on p. 565f. compares a number of words, i.e., designations for universal concepts like parts of body, etc. in all the three language families. Though admitting the triviality of the method, Németh pointed out that it is in any case remarkable that there are hardly any clear-cut similarities even between two of the groups. To a certain extent the explanation, as the author notes, is that "einige türkische Wörter sind mit anderen mongolischen Wörtern in Verbindung zu setzen." A more thorough experiment of the same kind was carried out by the late Sir Gerard Clauson ("A Lexicostatistical Appraisal of the Altaic Theory," *CAJ* XIII, 1969, pp. 1-23), who used the basic vocabulary proposed by the glottochronologists. Because, however, he extracted his material only from the oldest available sources, which are both fragmentary and in many respects very limited and thus not representative, his method and, consequently, his results, too, seem open to criticism. On the other hand, Knut Bergsland and Hans Vogt, in their paper "On the Validity of

Glottochronology" (*Current Anthropology* 1962), have shown that the method does not work. Also Itkonen^{6a} states the same (p. 390) regarding Finnish and Ziryen as well as Finnish and Lapp. In my opinion, Németh's and Clauson's experiment should, nevertheless, be renewed using all the available lexical material. In the same paper (p. 569), Németh states of the affinity hypothesis "Wir brauchen eine tiefgehende Explikation der einzelnen Fälle, die mit Hilfe der Lautgesetze vor sich gehen soll." His belief that even suffixes can be loaned "ohne Ende und ohne Grenze" seems however to lack support from the known language groups.

In another paper "Az η hang a mongolban és a törökben" in the same volume of *NK* (pp. 229–238) Ramstedt treated the developments he had sketched out in his letter to Setälä referred to above. Incidentally, Tungus correspondences also are quoted, such as Tung. $\eta\epsilon\epsilon$ 'to be frightened,' Ma. *gelme-*, Mo. *gelme-lže-* 'id.'^{6b} For the most part the paper discusses the corresponding cases in Mongol and Turkic and their further special developments like (p. 232) Mo. *moŋɣul*: Chag. *moɣul*: Ury. *mōl*, or (p. 234) Turkic *köŋül* 'heart, breast': Chuv. *kâmâl* 'heart': Sag. *kō* 'id.': Mo. *kömüldürge* 'breast strap'; Mo. *kümün* 'man': Kalm. *Ölöt kümŋ*: Kalm. *kün*: SH *ku'un*: Kh. *χuyŋ*. Tungus forms are also compared when the intervocalic cases are discussed (p. 233), e.g., Chag. *büjüz* ~ *müyüz* 'horn', Kirgh. *müjüz*, Alt. *mūs*, Yak. *muos* 'bone': Kalm. *mōrsŋ*, OMo. *mögōrs*: Tung. C *münōrsün*; Tung. C *tiŋän* ~ *tygen* 'breast,' Ma. *tunŋen*: Mo. *čigeŋi*, Kh. *tš'ēdžŋ* 'breast'; Tung. C *siŋiksō* ~ *söŋuwra*: Mo. *sigüderi* 'dew'; Tung. C *simŋun*, Go. *siŋmō* 'shadow': Mo. *següder*, Kalm. *südr* 'id.'

In *KSz* XV, 1914–15, pp. 134–150, Ramstedt published a paper "Zur mongolisch-türkischen Lautgeschichte" (I and II) investigating above all the representations of \check{c} and \check{j} in various positions in both language groups. There seems to be a clear correspondence between both groups except regarding Mo. $\check{c}i < *ti$ and cases in which secondary distance assimilations or dissimilations have taken place. In some cases Ramstedt was able to quote parallels from the Tungus languages, too. As to Mo. \check{j} , in Ramstedt's transcription \check{z} , the situation is rather complicated, since Mo. $*di > \check{j}i$ and on the other hand in Turkic $\check{j} \sim d \sim y \rightarrow y$. In most cases, however, he was able to clear up the relations and at the same time to correct certain

^{6a} Erkki Itkonen, *Kieli ja sen tutkimus*, Helsinki 1966.

^{6b} The Hungarian translations of certain Altaic words seem to be less reliable.

explanations of Radloff and Németh. Ramstedt's own explanations are often so laconic that it is not easy to understand his real meaning, e.g., (p. 140) "In Fremdwörtern findet sich im Mongolischen bisweilen š statt č, z.B. kh *tš'awgonts'v* 'Nonne,' schriftspr. *šibaganča* < Sogd.; kh. *tš'ixxər* 'Zucker,' kalm. *šikr* 'id.' < *šiker* (<? P.). Im allgemeinen jedoch č, z.B. *čagarig* 'Rad des Dachringes'": in the first case č- is, of course, a Mongolian renovation instead of the correct š. The complicated etymology of the Turkic *y*-made it simpler to discuss it in the light of the Mongolian correspondences. This was done by Ramstedt in the third part of his study published in *KSz* XVI, 1915-16, pp. 66-84. References to Manchu-Tungus are here rather exceptional. On the other hand, the Mongol and Turkic correspondences are often so close to each other that it seems impossible to decide whether they represent genetically related forms or loans, cf. e.g., Mo. *yara* 'wound': Turkic *yara*, Mo. *yala* 'punishment': Turkic *yala*. However, as e.g., Itkonen points out (p. 89) old loan words which obey the phonetic laws can also be regarded as competent proofs of these and even of linguistic affinity (e.g. the Finno-Ugric representatives of the Aryan *sata*). In the works of Ramstedt, loanwords of this type have often been used side by side with words of "Altaic" origin.

Since Finland and Hungary were on opposite sides in the First World War, the publishing of scholarly papers in Hungary was a rather complicated procedure which was made possible by the *bona officia* of Danish and Swedish scholars.

Already, Otto Donner⁷ had pointed out that the similarities in the material used to prove the affinity of the so-called "Altaic" languages were in fact too obvious, while the lawful regularity of the phonetical correspondences between non-similar words and forms is a much stronger proof of an original genetic affinity. When investigating the Manchu-Tungus languages more thoroughly, Ramstedt was able to detect an obviously regular correspondence between the words of different languages. Wilhelm Grube, in his *Goldisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis* in 1900, had already noticed that a *χ*- ~ *h*- or *ZERO* in some Tungus languages corresponded to a *p*- in others. In the specimens of Dagur published by A. O. Ivanovskiy (*Mandjurica* I, St. Petersburg 1894) Ramstedt found words with an initial *h*-, which also occurs in some of the oldest literary monuments of

⁷ *Öfversikt af den Finsk-Ugriska språkforskningens historia*, Helsingfors 1872, p. 108f.

Mongolian, e.g., SH (available to him in the sample published by Pozdneev), Ibn Muhanna, Kirakos etc., while Classical Literary Mongolian and other living dialects have totally lost **p-* and its reflexes. No remnants of an original **p-* in the Turkic languages were known at that time. In his study "Ein anlautender stimmloser Labial in der mongolisch-türkischen Ursprache" (*JSFOu* XXXII, 2, 1916–20) Ramstedt presented 43 etymologies, but only 8 also extended to the Turkic languages.

In *JA* 1925, pp. 193–259, Paul Pelliot published a paper entitled "Les mots à *h* initiale, aujourd'hui amuie dans le mongol des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in which he stated (p. 194): "L'article de M. Ramstedt sur l'existence d'une ancienne labiale sourde initiale en turco-mongol commun est une contribution importante à la phonétique comparée des langues altaïques." In addition to the sources used by Ramstedt, Pelliot also took into account the whole of the *Secret History*, the *Hua-i i-yü*, Ibn Muhanna, Mannerheim's and Potanin's material on the Shera-yögür and Shirongol languages as well as P. Schmidt's and D. Shirokogoroff's Tungus vocabularies. Pelliot presents ninety six instances from the oldest Mongolian sources in which the initial *h-* < **p-* has been preserved. However, not all of these have clear-cut correspondences in Manchu-Tungus, and Turkic correspondences are relatively scarce. When Antoine Mostaert and A. de Smedt published their fundamental studies about the Monguor language, spoken by the Mongols in Kansu, in the thirties, it became clear that there the original **p-* was represented by an *f-*. Ramstedt's pupil Martti Räsänen was able to show (*UJb* 19, 1939, p. 101ff. and *Materialien* I p. 21 and p. 167) that even in Turkic reflexes of the phase *h-* of the development from **p-* to *Ø-* seem to be found.

Ramstedt's later studies on the Altaic affinity of Korean revealed that in this language, too, the original **p-* has been preserved, e.g. Kor. *pul-li-* 'to steep': Tung. Ol. *puri-* 'to dive,' Jurchen *furiši* '(to the) West,' Mo. SH HI *hörene* ~ *höröne* 'West,' Turkic *ördäk* ~ *hördäk* 'duck'; Kor. *phul-* 'grass': Tung. *huli* 'childhood,' Mo. *öle* 'fresh,' Turkic *öl* 'id.', *ölän* 'meadow,' Chuv. *valem* 'an armful of hay'; Kor. *phul-* 'to rub, to grind': Ma. *furu-*, Mo. SH *hürü-*, Mo. L *ürü-* 'to whet,' Turkic *üz-* 'to break to peaces'; Kor. *pil-* 'to pray': Ma. *firu-*, Tung. *hiruge-* 'id.', *hiruri* 'shaman,' Mo. Q *hirü'e-*, Mo. L *irüge-* 'to pray'; etc. In the Turkic dialect of the Khalaj, especially in the subdialect Kondurud, we meet an *h-* which in many cases seems to occur expressly in those words which, according to the

testimony of the other Altaic languages, have or have had a *p*- (see V. Minorski, "The Turkish Dialect of the Khalaj," *BSOAS* X, 1940-42, p. 418ff.). It seems that Khalaj has been able to preserve the *h*- in its phonological system, probably due to the influence of Persian, and that this sound then spread even into words with original initial vowels: the French adjective *haut* is a school instance of this generally known phenomenon.

Ramstedt's explanation of the development *p*- > *f*- > *h*- > \emptyset has not, however, convinced all scholars. Clauson, for instance, admitted that the words in question no doubt belong together but denied their value as arguments for the affinity theory. In his opinion we have to start from the ZERO: "In certain circumstances an initial vowel became aspirated and . . . the aspirate in due course became an *f* and the *f* a *p*" (*JRAS* 1956 p. 211 and *BSOAS* 24, 1961, p. 304). A similar development seems to be suggested by Doerfer (*JSFOu* 65, 4 p. 6) "*f* vor Labialen wie in *fuguor* 'Ochs' . . . ist eher . . . sekundäre Assimilation des im Mittelmongolischen entstandenen *h*- an den folgenden Labial." Pelliot had in fact retorted to this kind of argument in his above study (p. 251 fn. 1): "La généralité du phénomène, pour les mêmes mots et pour eux seuls, sur l'ensemble des langues mongoles et toungouses, oblige à accepter que les changements se soient produits dans l'ordre indiqué par M. Ramstedt et par moi." In a later paper "Zwei wichtige Probleme der Altaistik" (*JSFOu* 69, 4), however, Doerfer refutes the opinion of Clauson and defends Ramstedt's law, but states: "die Formen mit *h*- sind im Türkischen erst nach der Mongolenzeit belegt, also in einer Zeit, wo das Türkische schon zahlreiche arabische, persische und mongolische Lehnwörter mit *h*- aufgenommen hatte und ein *h*- also jedenfalls in seinem phonologischen System hatte." In a lecture to the Conference of German Orientalists in 1968 (publ. in *ZDMG Suppl.* I, Wiesbaden 1969, p. 721) he stated that the *h*- is "urtürkisch" and has been preserved in Khalaj. In his paper about Khalaj in *ZDMG* 118, 1968, p. 105, Doerfer again declares that "Urtürkisch" has had **p*-, which later disappeared through **f*- and **h*-, and that all the forms in the other languages are loans from this "Urtürkisch": his instances, like Türkic *oyma* 'feltsocks' = Mo. *hoyima-sun* = Ma. *fomon*, allegedly borrowings from an "urtürkisch" **poyma*, could often be enlarged with additional material, e.g. here with Samoyed *hema* 'boot,' *peiima* (Adelung und Fischer in *Mscr.*, see Joki p. 134) 'gaiters'; Turkic

Tat. etc. *ariš*, Tu. Chag. Özb. *haral* 'plow,' Az. *harava* 'wagon,' ETu. *harao* 'sledge,' Mo. *aral* 'pole (of a vehicle),' Ma. *fara* 'id., sledge,' Go. *pāra* 'sledge,' Kor. *palgo* 'id.,' etc. According to Doerfer, the older Turkic loan words in Mongolian show dialectal features characteristic of Bulgarian (*IF* 71, 1966, p. 115): a hypothesis which seems to involve several historical and geographic difficulties, too.

In Doerfer's opinion (l.c. p. 112), the Mongol loan words in Manchu-Tungus represent a very old period since they show the "urmongolisch" *p-*: "So im Mandschu *fulgiyan* 'rot' (dschürtschen *fulagian*; im Nanaischen entspricht dem *f-* ein *p-*, das direkt urtungusisch ist) = mong. *hula'an* (< **pulayan*). Diese ältere Schicht dürfte aus einer Zeit vor dem 13. Jahrhundert stammen." It remains unclear whether he means that the Proto-Tungus *p-* has also been loaned from Mongolian, and if that be so, at what time. Doerfer refers to Ligeti's paper "Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou" (*AOH* X, 1960, pp. 231-248). Here Ligeti (p. 237) makes a clear-cut distinction between original Manchu words and words loaned which both show an *f-*, as Jurchen words already did, while those of the Kin times still had a *p-*. Ligeti therefore proposes that the "Mongol" loans have been taken explicitly from Kitan into Jurchen as *p-*, but have then under the Ming given an *f-* both in Jurchen and Manchu. In Mongol the initial *p-* had thus been alive much later than it has generally been understood. However, I cannot see that Ligeti's theory would support Doerfer's explanation of the Turkic origin of the words concerned.

A kind of dating of the development *p- > f- > h-* in Tungus might be found in the handling of the Chinese loanword *p'ao* 'gun, rifle,' in Tungus *hō ~ huō* but in Mongol *bū*.

In the Indo-European languages we meet a quite similar series of instances: e.g. Gr. *πατήρ*, Lat. *pater*, Sanskr. *pitar-*, Goth. *faðar*, Osset. *fað*, Arm. *hayr*, Old Irish *athir* 'father': the explanation that the other cases were loans from Irish taken at various stages of the development *p- > Ø-* would hardly gain any supporters.

In a paper entitled "Suomalais-ugrilaisen komparatiivin alkuperä" published in the Finnish review *Virittäjä* (21, 1917, pp. 37-39), Ramstedt explained the Finno-Ugric comparative in *-m-pa- ~ -em-pa-* as a participle of a verb in *-em-*, comparing it to the Turkic comparative in *-raq* which is a verbal noun from a secondary (denominal) verb in *-ra-* and which corresponds to the Mongol diminutive adjectives in *-ray*, cf. Turkic *kök* 'blue' (*kögär-*), *kökräk* 'bluer':

Mo. *köke* 'blue,' *kökereg* 'bluish.' In his article in *ZDMG* 66, 1912, p. 574, Németh had denied the existence of a Suffix *-rag* in Mongolian. This suffix had, however, been treated by Ramstedt in the *Verbstammbildungslehre* § 43 p. 35 (cf. *Einf.* II p. 199).

In 1917, Ramstedt was nominated Professor Extraordinarius of Altaic Philology at Helsinki University. However, before he had a chance to use his financially secure position to prepare his planned publications, he was in 1919 appointed Finnish Chargé d'Affaires in Tokyo. The German publisher of the Sammlung Göschen had somewhat earlier asked Ramstedt to write a comparative grammar of the Altaic languages for this collection. The inflation in Germany and Ramstedt's appointment to Tokyo prevented the fulfilment of this plan. The archives of the Finno-Ugric Society contain a mscr. by Ramstedt entitled *Grundriß der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachgeschichte*, which is probably a sketch for such a comparative grammar.

In Japan, where he stayed until 1930, Ramstedt very soon acquired an extensive command of Japanese and started to study Korean with the aid of some Koreans living in Tokyo. At the very beginning of his Korean studies, he noticed that the word *aguri* 'mouth' seemed to correspond exactly to the hypothetical original form of the Turkic *ayüz* 'mouth,' which he had reconstructed some years earlier. This observation led him to compare Korean with Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus, and soon he was able to discover a number of words which Korean seemed to share with the "Altaic" languages. E. g., several Korean words with an initial *p*- seemed to fit very well into the pattern of the phonetic development of the Altaic *p*-.

The language of the Chuvash living on the Volga as neighbours of the Cheremis is very complicated in phonological development. The people are anthropologically closely related to the neighbouring Finno-Ugrians, and even the language was believed by some earlier scholars to belong to the Finno-Ugric group. August Ahlqvist investigated Chuvash during his journeys in 1856-59 and came to the conclusion that the language was obviously a Turkic one. In a paper "Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen" (*JSFOu* XXXVIII, 1, 1922-23), prepared before his appointment to Tokyo, Ramstedt tried to elucidate certain problems of the historical phonology of this language. He succeeded in proving that the force of the phonetic laws had obviously been temporally limited, and as a result of this, what were originally the same phonemes in Chuvash words and in words loaned at various times from neighbouring

Turkic languages have developed in quite different ways (p. 8 etc.). One of Ramstedt's aims was to find some better explanations for certain problems of the historical phonology of the Turkic and Mongol and Chuvash languages than those proposed by Németh in his paper "A török-mongol *a*-féle hangok fejlődése a csuvasban" (*NK* XLII, 1913, pp. 75-85). According to Németh, there must have been two *a* vowels, designated by him a_1 and a_2 in the Turco-Mongol proto-language: a_1 : Turkic *a*, Chuv. *i*, Mo. *a*; a_2 : Turkic *a*, Chuv. *y*: Mo. *i*, *ü*, *e*. There is, of course, no value in discussing all of Németh's and Ramstedt's etymologies in detail here, and I shall just present Ramstedt's treatment of the cases in which Németh wanted to see the a_2 : (Németh l.c. p. 83) Turkic *taş* 'stone' ~ Chuv. *t'syl* ~ Mo. *cilayun* < **tial*'-; Turkic *yaş* 'tear' ~ Chuv. *şyl* ~ Mo. *nilbusun* 'saliva' < **nial*'-; Turkic *saz* 'pale' ~ Chuv. *şyr*- 'become white' ~ Mo. *şira* 'yellow'; Tu. *san*- 'to think' ~ Chuv. *şyn*- 'to hope, to wish' ~ Mo. *sana*- 'to think'; Tu. *bir* 'one' ~ Chuv. *pır* 'all' ~ Mo. *büri* 'all'; Tu. *yalin* 'flame' ~ Chuv. *şylm* ~ Mo. *şali*; Tu. *tat*- 'to taste' ~ Chuv. *tudâ* ~ Mo. *tači-ya*- < **tati*'-; Tu. *saz* 'swamp' ~ Hung. *sár* 'steppe' ~ Chuv. *şyr* 'swamp' ~ Mo. *şiruyai* 'earth, dust.' Special attention was paid by Ramstedt to the words which in Turkic show *ş* or *z* while the Chuvash correspondences have an *l* or *r*, respectively. In the other Altaic sub-groups, too, we find *l* and *r* in the corresponding words. Ramstedt suggested that there had originally been two different phonemic sets in Altaic which had then either coincided or developed in different directions, viz.

$$\begin{array}{ll} *l > l & *l' > l \sim \text{Turkic } \check{s} \\ *r > r & *r' > r \sim \text{Turkic } z \end{array}$$

Ramstedt's examples, like Turkic *siş*, Yak. *is* 'lynx': Ma. *silun*, Mo. *silegüsün* 'id.' Turkic *buz* 'ice,' Chuv. *pâr*: Mo. *burum* 'sugar,' are scarce and not very good. He also says (p. 27) that he will present his material on this problem in another paper. This has never been published, however.

Ramstedt's opinion about the position of Chuvash among the Altaic languages is clearly formulated at the end of the study: "Es genügt hier klargelegt zu haben, daß das Tschuwassische eine regelrechte Entwicklung der Türk-Sprachen ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen." It is therefore somewhat puzzling to read, e.g. in the *Einführung* by Benzing (p. 128): "... "andere (besonders Ramstedt) haben die Auffassung vertreten,

daß das Tschuwassische ein zwischen dem Türkischen und Mongolischen stehendes selbständiges Glied der altaischen Sprachfamilie sei."

In *UJb* 1929 p. 89f. J. Markwart published a number of Turkic words occurring in Byzantine sources of the second half of the sixth century A.D., which in his opinion prove the correctness of Ramstedt's theory: Χερχίρ = Old Turkic inscriptions Qırqız; 'Ογώρ = OTu. Oγuz; Οὐννουγοῦροι = OTu. Onoγuz; Κουλουβρος = OTu. *qolayuz*. A similar development can in my opinion be seen in the Turkic name *Sämizkänd* of Samarkand = Μαράκανδα (< **Smarakanda*) Strabo XI 11, 4, Arrian. anab. III 30, 6, IV 3, 6, 6, 3. 16, 2. In loan words Chuvash shows a great variety of developments but no certain case of $r < z$. Chuv. *ernε* 'week' < Pers. *āđina* has parallels, e.g., in Finnish dialects where the original δ can be represented by $d \sim r \sim l \sim t \sim j \sim \emptyset$. Examples of zetasism from various languages have been presented e.g. by Jespersen (*Language*, London 1922, Ch. XIII § 6). A development $l > \check{s}$ seems to be rare: the classical instance may be Lat. *planus* > Span. *llano* ~ Port. *chão*.

Ramstedt's opinion regarding the originality of the ($*l >$) l and ($*r >$) r of the other languages and the secondary character of the Turkic \check{s} and z was further supported by the evidence he found in Korean, e.g., Kor. *aguri* 'mouth': Tu. *ayiz*, Kor. *kal-* 'to dig,' Mo. *garu-* 'id.': Tu. *qaz-* 'id.'; Kor. *iray* 'the ridge of a furrow,' 'border line,' Chuv. *jōran* 'border furrow,' Manchu, Goldi *irun* 'id.': Tu. *izay* 'id.'; Kor. *pal* 'foot,' *palmak* 'shoe': Tu. *baš-maq* 'shoe'; Kor. *kjeil* ~ *kjeul* 'winter,' Chuv. *χəl* 'id.': Turkic *qış* 'id.'; Kor. *tił-* 'to enter': Turkic *tüş-* 'id.' etc.

A special feature of the Altaic languages – and one which they share with the Uralic and Dravidian families – is the expression of the negation by verbs. The negative verbs have a defective conjugation but their verbal character is nevertheless quite obvious. In a paper entitled "Die Verneinung in den altaischen Sprachen" (*MSFOu* LII, 1924, pp. 196–215) and based on a lecture before the Society in 1919, Ramstedt described the negations in the Mongol, Turkic and Tungus groups. His main point was that the negative verbs in themselves seem to have originally possessed the (positive) meaning 'to be,' 'to remain,' etc., which then in certain turns has come to express the contrast of an action. Thus Tung. *a-* 'not to . . .' is in itself identical with Mo. *a-* 'to be,' Tung. *e-*, Praes. *esi-* 'not to . . .' again with Mo. *ese*. In Turkic the negative forms of the verbs are formed with a suffix *-m-a-* in which Ramstedt wanted to see either

of the verbs *a-* ~ *e-* after a nominal form in *-m* of the main verb (§ 18 p. 210f.). Räsänen again (II p. 232) sees in the Turkic negation verb *e-* a correspondence of the Finno-Ugric negative verb *e-*. In the *Einführung* the negation was not presented in a separate chapter. Ramstedt obviously still regarded the above paper as sufficient. In the *Einführung* II p. 87, Ramstedt presented the explanation *-maz* < **-m-är* 'to be' (referred to in passing in "Verneinung" p. 212f.). Räsänen (*l.c.*) regards this as improbable.

In many connections Ramstedt had pointed out the scarcity of practicable materials from the Manchu-Tungus languages. While he was in Tokyo, he tried to arouse the interest of Japanese linguists in investigation of the Tungus languages and dialects. In a lecture delivered in 1922 before the Mongolian Society in Tokyo, for instance, he stressed how important it was for Tungus, Gilyak, Korean and Ainu studies to include the investigation of the words loaned in various directions.

As the first fruit of Ramstedt's Korean studies a paper called "Remarks on the Korean Language" (*MSFOu* LVIII pp. 441-453) appeared in 1928. In it, he gave a short phonological description of this language and discussed the morphology briefly, giving comparisons of the flecational and derivational elements with Altaic ones. Some etymological comparisons with Altaic words were also given: Kor. *māl* ~ *mār* < **mor*: Mo. *mori* 'horse'; *mul* ~ *mīl* < **mīl* 'water': Mo. *mören* 'river'; *tīl* ~ *tīl* 'prairie': Go. *dul* (cf. the corrected forms in *SKE* p. 266); *tto* ~ *pto* 'again': Tung. *hata*, Sol. *hata-ma* 'again'; *keru* 'boat' < **keray*: Go. *gela* ~ *gella* 'a large boat' (not in other publications); *tol* ~ *tor* 'stone': Go. *žollo* ~ *žolo*, Proto-Turkic **t'al* > Turkic *taš* ~ Chuv. *t'sul* (cf. *SKE* p. 272); *pul* ~ *pur* 'fire,' *pulkta* 'to be red hot,' *pulgin* 'red' (in later publications these two words are separated): Mo. *ulayan* < **pulayan*, Ma. *fulgiyan*; *čelmegi* 'younster, child' < *žermegi*: Mo. ('still to be found in NW Mongolia') Turkic *žermeg* > Hung. *gyermek* 'child' (cf. *SKE* p. 28 *čjelmda*); *ērūsin-nē* 'the old man' < *ērū-*: Turkic *örü-* 'to be old' (?) and *nai* 'man, homo': Go. *nai* ~ *ne* ~ *ni* 'man, homo'; *al* in Loc. *arā* ~ *are* 'under': Turkic *al-* 'under'; *ū* < **uh* (< **ög* ~ **üg*) 'over': Tung. *ug* 'over' (cf. *SKE* p. 284f. with larger material).

Ramstedt never seems to have noticed that the eminent Soviet scholar E. D. Polivanov published a paper in 1927 (*IAN*, Ser. VI vol. XXI, 2, p. 1195ff.) on the Altaic affinity of Korean. Polivanov's arguments are for the most part the same as Ramstedt's. However,

there also are some minor differences, e.g., Polivanov compares Turkic *küz* 'autumn,' Chuv. *kər* with Korean *kjeul* 'winter' while Ramstedt connects this Korean word with Turkic *qış*, Chuv. *χəl* 'winter,' which Polivanov again identifies with Kor. *kaıl* 'autumn.' As to Kor. *kōl* 'valley,' Polivanov seems to connect it only with Ma. *golo* (written *xolo*) without mentioning the Mo. and OTu. correspondences (*Einführung* I p. 48). When treating the Altaic *r*: Kor. *r/l*, Polivanov also compares the Turkic plural suffix *-lar* ~ *-ler*, Yak. etc. *-tar* ~ *-dar*, Mo. *-nar* and Kor. *-tal* ~ *-dal* (*-tar* ~ *-dar*): as Korean plural suffixes, Ramstedt (*KGr.* § 80, *SKE* p. 266) quotes only *-tıl* ~ *-dıl*, NKor. *-ter* ~ *-tir*. The Korean form *niram* 'name' connected by Polivanov with Mo. *nerē* does not occur in Ramstedt's material, and the same seems to be the case with Turkic *turna*: Kor. *turun* 'crane' (cf. Räsänen *TEW* p. 501). Polivanov further compares Kor. *mil* 'wheat' with Ma. *mere* 'millet' while Ramstedt quotes Ma. *bele* 'millet.'

In the *Festschrift J. J. Mikkola* (*AASF:B* XXVII, 1932, pp. 239-251), Ramstedt published an article called "Die Palatalisation in den altaischen Sprachen." The paper was based mainly on Tungus and Korean material, and aimed to show that in the historical development of the Altaic languages a "palatalisation," i.e., the occurrence of an *i* between a consonant and a vowel or between vowel and consonant, has given rise to special phonetic developments. In Tungus and in Buriat we meet palatalized and non-palatalized forms side by side. Even an *-i* after a vowel can influence the foregoing consonant, cf. Kor. *nai* 'smell': Go. *nā-* 'to rot'; consonantal clusters before an *-i* have been palatalized through the influence of the latter: 1. *rg* > *řg* > *ig* > *ǰ* ~ *ǰ̣*: Tung. C *urgä* 'difficult,' Go. *xud'go* ~ *xuigö*, Negd. *uigögdī* 'heavy,' Or. *ugösi*: Ma. *užen*, Ol. *χužösi*; 2. *rk* > *řk* > *ik* > *č* ~ *c*: Tung. C *urkä* 'door,' Negd. *urkö* ~ *uikö*, Go. *ut'ku*, Or. *ukö*: Ol. *učö*, Ma. *uče*; 3. *lg* > *lž*: Go. *χolgokta* ~ *olgokta* 'weed,' Ma. *ulxu* 'id.': Ol. *χolžokta*, cf. Mo. *qulusun*, Kor. *kōl*; 4. *lk* > *lč*: Go. *silku-* 'to wash,' Tung. *selko-*, Or. *siki-*: Ol. *silču-*, Ma. *silgije-*, Kor. *siri-žę-* (*SKE* p. 230 *sjerižę*). A development of this kind can be assumed for Mo. *qalbaya* 'spoon,' Ma. *χalfıyan* 'flach, Fläche': Turkic *qaşıq* 'spoon.' In Proto-Turkic *l*, *ř*, and *n* were strongly palatalized which resulted in the later *š*, *z*, and *y* respectively. A peculiarity of Mongolian is the development **ti* > *či*, **di* > *ži*, *si* > *ši*; the similar development in Manchu *ti* > *či*, *di* > *ži* is late.

In his academic teaching in the thirties, Ramstedt lectured several times on the comparative grammar of the Altaic languages (including Korean) on the basis of a typed hand-out. His personal research work was concentrated on Korean. In a short paper "The Nominal Postpositions in Korean" (*MSFOu* LXVII, 1933, pp. 459-464) he presented Korean nouns used in one or more case forms after a case form of a noun. Altaic correspondences are quoted for most of these. Cf. e.g. Nr. 7 Kor. *kkit* 'end, aft, tail': Mo. *kitai*, Kalm. *kitä* 'rectum,' Go. *kitta* ~ *kita* 'stern,' Turkic *köt* 'back, posterior' (*SKE* p. 119 with partially different correspondences); Nr. 11 **jep* (not in *SKE*): Tung. *äptilä* ~ *öptilö* 'rib,' Go. *ökölö* 'near, close to' (<**ëbkä*?), Turkic *öfkä*, *öpkä* 'lungs' > 'temper' (*SKE* p. 210 to Kor. *pup-*), Mo. *ebcigün* 'breast'; Nr. 12 *mit* 'base, bottom, sole': Turkic *but* 'foot,' Tung. *bugde* ~ *begdi*, Ma. *betxe*, Jurchen *budihe* 'leg, foot,' Mo. Kalm. *mötkē* 'the blade of the foot' (*SKE* p. 148 with partially different correspondences).

Ramstedt had done his university studies at a time when the view that the suffixes originated from independent postpositionally used words was in sway among linguists. The Finno-Ugric languages indeed present several clear-cut instances of such a development. Ramstedt was therefore always looking for etymologies of suffixes based on this principle. In Korean, which has so long been under the strong influence of a monosyllabic language like Chinese, many stems seem to have been preserved as independent words which in other Altaic languages have been degraded to inflectional or derivational suffixes.

In a lecture "About the Origin of the Turkic Language," delivered before the Finnish Academy of Sciences on April 4, 1935, published in the *Proceedings* 1935, pp. 73-80, Ramstedt sketched out the oldest stages of Turkic based on a comparison with Korean. The original habitat of the peoples less explicitly called Altaic must, according to him, have been situated in southern Mongolia and in southern Manchuria in the immediate neighbourhood of the early Chinese, since Turkic shows not only words related to their Korean counterparts but also Chinese loan words which stand so close to the Sino-Korean words that they, too, must, in his opinion, have come through Korean. In cases like Kor. *pal* 'foot,' *palmak* 'shoe': Turkic *bašmaq* 'shoe'; Kor. *payahiro* 'some moment ago': Turkic *baya-qi* 'earlier,' we must in my opinion either suppose Kor. *p-* < **b-*, or that the Turkic word is so young a loan word that a *b-* has been

substituted for the *p*-. The problem of the Chinese loan words is a more complicated one. Since the sixth century A. D., Korean has been under strong Chinese cultural influence. This can be seen in the great number of Chinese loans, the oldest of which reflect the actual pronunciation of the time. These Sino-Korean words are thus of great importance for the reconstruction of the older phases of Chinese phonology. On the other hand, even Korean was long written with Chinese hieroglyphs, which, in the usual Chinese manner, were as far as possible chosen to render both the phonemic shape and the meaning of the Korean word in question at the same time. In his above paper, Pelliot had already pointed out that Ramstedt had been too eager to see Chinese loan words in obviously good Altaic words which had been preserved in Chinese sources. Among the allegedly Sino-Korean words in Ramstedt's writings there are therefore probably several originally Altaic words only because of their Chinese transliteration (cf. the Chinese rendering *yin-tek* of Latin *index*). In the same centuries as those in which Korean was receiving the bulk of the latest Chinese loan words, the mighty T'ang Dynasty carried Chinese political and cultural influence far beyond the frontiers of the Empire. The Turkic languages, especially, seem to have adopted numerous loans, and these thus reflect the same stage of phonetic development as those taken into Korean. In my opinion, these Chinese loan words do not mean we must think that the Turks and the Koreans were at that time neighbours or that the words in question had passed through Korean. In any case, the loan words are far too young to be used as arguments in discussing the problem of the "original home" of the Altaic peoples. The share of the "Altaic" peoples in the confederation named after the Huns ~ Hiung-nu nowadays seems more problematic than it was for Ramstedt, who was ready to identify early Turks or Proto-Turks with the Huns. According to him, the fundamental phonetic developments in Turkic were 1) **p*- > \emptyset , 2) *d*- ~ *ǰ*- ~ *y*- ~ *n*- > *y*- ~ *d'*-. As to the development *d*- to *y*- the name of the river Ural has been taken by some scholars as an example. It should, however, be noticed that the oldest known form of the name $\Delta\alpha\lambda\tilde{\xi}$ is most probably Iranian and the Turkic influence is met with only in the orthography $\Gamma\epsilon\eta\chi$ occurring in the Byzantine sources and then in the modern form *Yaiq*. The earliest morphological peculiarities of Turkic were according to Ramstedt 1) the development of the negative conjugation, and 2) the development of the possessive

suffix out of the enclitic genitives of the personal pronouns. Ramstedt further presented some 25 Korean words which seem to have correspondences in Turkic only, e. g., Kor. *tam* 'wall': Tu. *tam*, Osm. *dam*; Kor. *čam-* 'to put into water': Tu. *čom-* 'to dive' (cf. *SKE* p. 21); Kor. *son* 'guest': Tu. Uig. *son* 'friend' (*SKE* p. 241 only Middle Turkic *sun* 'friendly,' with an uncertain vocalism); Kor. *čob-* 'to be narrow,' *čopkai* 'narrow': Tu. *yuvqa* 'narrow' (cf. *SKE* p. 40); Kor. *il* 'work': Tu. *iš* 'id.' (see *SKE* II p. 57 Addenda to p. 69); Kor. *al* 'corn': Tu. *aš* 'corn, food' (see *SKE* p. 6f.); etc.

In the twenties, Tungus material began to increase, mainly due to the activity of Soviet scholars. In a lecture before the Finno-Ugric Society on Dec. 2, 1935, (*JSFOu* XLVIII, 5 pp. 9-16), Ramstedt still deplored the scarcity of serviceable materials from the Tungus languages. At the same time, he reported on the newly created literature languages of the various Tungus tribes, and stressed out the value of the publications of the *Institut Narodov Severa*. He also praised the important grammar and dictionary published by G. M. Vasilevich. As an example of the important details which the publications of the kinds mentioned contain, Ramstedt quoted the word *gule* 'house, building' with the derivative *guleseg ~ guleken* 'village' which corresponds to Bolgar *kil* 'house, town,' Chuv. *kil* 'house' (*Eskil* 'Old Town'), and which seems even to have a counterpart in Finnish, viz. *kylä* 'village.'

In the same volume of the *Journal*, Ramstedt published a paper entitled "Koreanisch *kes* 'Ding, Stück.'" The word in question was explained by Gale in his *Korean-English Dictionary* (Yokohama 1911) p. 44 "*kes* 'a thing, an affair, an object' - a word much used with present and past participial adjectives to express a subordinate clause in a noun form." Under this heading, Ramstedt presents the most important phonemic laws established by him, which connect the four language groups of the Altaic family. He then describes the use of *kes* as an auxiliary word in Korean, and discusses the concept of adjective in Korean. On the basis of the close parallelism between Korean and Tungus verbal forms, he also is inclined to see a component like the Kor. *kes* in certain Tungus forms. Ramstedt's aim was to prove that the Tungus dialects are descendants of a Tungus-Korean linguistic unity and that Korean as well as Sino-Korean material has later penetrated into all the Tungus dialects as borrowings.

Ramstedt presented his theory of the relationship of Korean with

the Altaic languages in a lecture delivered in April 1939 before the Berlin Academy of Sciences. The lecture was supposed to be published in the Proceedings of the Academy but the outbreak of World War II prevented this, and the lecture did not appear in print until Ramstedt's posthumous papers were published in *JSFOu* 55, 2, 1951, pp. 47-58. If this article had been published in time before the war in that authoritative series, we would perhaps have been spared a lot of useless later discussion. In 1939 Ramstedt's *Korean Grammar* was published in print (*MSFOu* LXXXII). In it, the structure of the language was adequately analyzed for the first time.

During his stay in Japan, Ramstedt had already lectured on ways of connecting Japanese with the Altaic languages. The lecture was then published under the heading "A Comparison of the Altaic languages with Japanese" in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* (II, 1, 1924). In 1942, before the Finnish Academy of Sciences, he lectured upon the history of Japanese (published in the *Proceedings* 1942, Helsinki 1944, pp. 133-140). In this lecture, he pointed out the great structural similarities between Japanese and the Altaic languages and presented a number of etymologies based on phonological reconstructions of older forms of Japanese words. It is interesting to read the opinion of a specialist like Samuel E. Martin (in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 12, 1967, 951): "Comparative study indicates that Japanese is probably related to Korean, which has a remarkably similar grammar; the two languages are possibly related also to the Altaic group of languages (Tungus-Manchu, Mongolian and Turkic families) and perhaps to Ainu and Gilyak."⁸

Having retired from the University in 1943, Ramstedt lectured during the spring term, 1946, at the Upsala University on Altaic comparative grammar, using a larger hand-out. Otherwise he devoted his time to his etymological studies of Korean. Some 1500 etymologies are thus discussed in the *Studies in Korean Etymology* (*MSFOu* XCV, 1949). His health had long been deteriorating and he was, consequently, unable to put the finishing touch to this work.

⁸ In a paper "Ist das Japanische mit den altaischen Sprachen verwandt?" (*ZDMG* 124, 1974, pp. 103-142) Doerfer polemizes especially with the work *Japanese and the Other Altaic Languages* (Chicago-London 1971) by Roy Andrew Miller, but at the same time the whole relationship principle.

It appeared without the introduction, though this was ready in a manuscript form, and without all indexes. These were later published as a second volume.

Ramstedt was well aware that knowledge of modern Korean was insufficient for the purpose of historical comparison of Korean with the Altaic family, and he often stressed the need for a careful investigation of the older stages of the language, viz. "Middle" and "Old" Korean. Studies on these lines have later been carried out by other scholars as Ki-Moon Lee,⁹ and they seem to corroborate Ramstedt's theories.

Because he wanted to present his arguments and proofs for his theory regarding the Altaic affinity of Korean before putting the finishing touch to his outlined comparative grammar of the Altaic languages, Ramstedt had postponed the preparation of the latter until the *SKE* had come out. The grammar was meant to be the synthesis of his lifelong studies, but his rapidly deteriorating health did not permit him to finish his work. Since the drafts of the morphology were in his opinion more mature, Ramstedt started the final revision from these. At the time of his death (Nov. 2nd, 1950) only about half of the manuscript had been revised and typed for print. With the aid of his manuscript drafts, earlier published papers and with the kind help of various scholars, I prepared the latter half, and the morphology was issued in print in 1952 (*Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*, II, *Formenlehre*, *MSFOu* 104: 2). The first volume, presenting the historical phonology, appeared in print five years later in 1957 (*Einführung . . .*, I, *Lautlehre*, *MSFOu* 104:1). Since Ramstedt's drafts of this part were older, I had to try to revise the text more thoroughly. As far as possible, older etymological material covering only two of the four languages were replaced with material covering at least three languages. This was made possible by the recently published new studies of Turkic by Räsänen, on Tungus languages by Cincius, and on the Mongol languages by Poppe, as well as by the material contained in Ramstedt's *SKE*. The whole of the revision work was very difficult because of Ramstedt's habit of quoting from memory and very

⁹ "A Comparative Study of Manchu and Korean," *UJb* XXX, 1958, pp. 104-120, gives some 300 comparisons, of which 236 are classified as most probable. In a further study Lee treats the Mongolian loan words in Middle Korean (*UJb* XXXV, 1964, pp. 188-197).

rarely mentioning his sources.¹⁰ The sources are always quoted for the materials added by me.

Because the bulk of the studies concerning the original quantity oppositions of the vowels in the various Altaic languages have been carried out and published after Ramstedt's death, quantity problems are discussed rather briefly and superficially (§ 81). Several other details also remained merely outlined. A third volume comprising the complete registers of the two text volumes as well as *Addenda* and *Corrigenda* to them, appeared in 1966. Of course, only clear mistakes, misprints and editorial errors were corrected, in so far as they had been noticed during the preparation of the indexes.

The *Einführung* which should have summarized the lifelong toil of Ramstedt in the study of the Altaic languages thus eventually remained a sketch. Even so, it might be characterized as the end of the beginning in Altaistics.

The known Finno-Ugrist and comparatist Björn Collinder expressed the opinion that Ramstedt had definitely established the genetic affinity of the Altaic languages beyond any reasonable doubt in his *Einführung* ("Remarks on Linguistic Affinity," *UAJb* 27, 1955, p. 2): "There are, or there have recently been, altaists who do not think that the Altaic languages have a common origin. After the appearance of Ramstedt's *Altaic Morphology*, this negative attitude should perhaps be called sceptical rather than critical." In a recent paper entitled "Indo-Uralisch oder gar Nostratisch?" (*Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 12, Innsbruck 1974, pp. 363-375) Collinder states (p. 365): "Die gegenseitige Verwandtschaft des Türkischen, des Mongolischen und des Tungusischen kann wohl nach den Forschungen von Ramstedt und Poppe als bewiesen gelten."

Ramstedt once pointed out the peculiar fact, that while Mongolists in general were ready to accept the genetic affinity of the Altaic languages, Turkologists were much more sceptical. However, though Németh's affinity theory differs from that of Ramstedt, even in his opinion the Turkic and the Mongolian languages are related. Jean Deny, again, states in *Les langues du monde*, Paris 1952, p. 319f.:

¹⁰ A. Sauvageot, in his review of the *Lautlehre* (*BSL* 54, 1959, especially blames the negligence of Ramstedt (or his editor) in not naming certain scholars in his exposé. In his foreword, however, Ramstedt expressly accounts for his principle in this respect. But who reads forewords?

“Les trois groupes des langues turques, mongoles et tOUNGOUZES présentent assurément des ressemblances frappantes . . . C’est en multipliant des rapprochements entre morphèmes qu’on pourra, espérons-le, établir rigoureusement la parenté suggérée. Entre turc et mongol, elle semble déjà assurée.”

But there are not only sceptical and-or totally negative opinions, some scholars have even tried to prove the contrary, i.e., that the languages in question are not related. Collinder has shown that there are cases of quite certain genetic affinity which cannot be proved by any positive material (sample: Modern Swedish and Modern Greek). A fact is, it is impossible to prove that two languages are not related.

In his Obituary of Ramstedt before the Finnish Academy of Sciences (published in the Proceedings 1951, Helsinki 1952) the Turkologist Martti Räsänen, a pupil of Ramstedt, a supporter of the Altaic affinity, and a protagonist of the Uralo-Altaic relationship, criticizes Ramstedt (p. 78): “Die Etymologien sind oft kühn: während er starr an den Lautgesetzen festhielt, erwecken die semasiologischen Freiheiten oft Zweifel an der Richtigkeit der Etymologien (und auf Grund derselben auch der Lautgesetze).” I believe that Räsänen was chiefly thinking of the etymologies of the numerals, referred to above. No phonetic law can, of course, be founded on one etymology only, and the semantic changes presumed must be kept within the limits established in comparative linguistics.

In his *Turkish and Mongolian Studies* (RAS, Prize Publication Fund, Vol. XX, London 1962) the late Sir Gerard Clauson, an antagonist of the Altaic theory, regarded mutual intelligibility as the criterion of the affinity of two languages. This is, however, a very rare case in linguistics. He further denied in principles the existence of any “phonetic laws.” In Sir Gerard’s opinion (*CAJ* II, 1956, p. 185) no words or other elements attested later than c. 1200 A. D. in Turkic or c. 1240 (the dating of the *Secret History*) in Mongolian, can be used as arguments “since it can never be proved that one or other of the words involved is not a loan word. By parity of reasoning I presume that similar arguments relating to Tungus must be equally invalid. . . While comparing the languages before the above dates there seem to occur far too few common words or they occur in “wrong” sections of the vocabulary.” He characterized the obviously common features as Turkic loans in Mongolian. The intricacy of the phonological correspondences (e.g., Mo. *y*-, *ǰ*-, *d*-, *n*- against Turkic *y*-)

was explained by Sir Gerard through a supposed temporal stratification of these loans: 1° before the eight century, 2° between the eight and twelfth century, 3° thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. The loans of the first stratum were taken from an unknown and inaccessible Turkic language, which had obviously passed through the development $z > r$ and $\check{s} > l$ (but the above words attested in Greek sources clearly speak in favour of an opposite trend of development). The loans of the second stratum, again, were taken from another unknown language of the Northern Turkic type. The passage of these loans into Mongolian is all the more intricate since they have not come directly but through an unknown language related to Mongolian. It seems to me that any linguistic affinity can be refuted with so many and such complicated *ad hoc* explanations.

According to Gerhard Doerfer (*TMEN* I p. 64), the first condition for accepting a linguistic affinity is "ähnlich klingende Wörter." It was, however, precisely the too great similarity between the words in the various Altaic languages which Otto Donner and Ramstedt found troublesome. It is not the existence of "similarly sounding" words but taut regulariness between outwardly different sounds in words which is the most stringent proof of the affinity: cf. e.g., Engl. *wheel* and Hindi *cahr* are truly related, like the languages themselves, and the same word in Finnish *kaula* 'neck' is a form borrowed from Lithuanian: the semantic difference is remarkable (cf. Räsänen's opinion quoted above). Further, what Doerfer *o.c.* states about the use of the mathematical probability by Collinder seems not to be based on the Collinder paper in question ("La parenté linguistique et le calcul des probabilités," *UuAs* 1948), since Collinder does not operate with words at all but rather with grammatical elements (suffixes, pronominal stems). Doerfer's dice parallel should perhaps rather be formulated as follows: you cast two dice at the same time, and thirteen times in succession you get the same number on both.¹¹ Doerfer further (p. 83ff.) stresses the differences in the nominal and verbal flexions in the Altaic languages; What about the differences in flexion e.g., between Sanskrit and Hindi, not to mention Swedish and Greek? Concerning Doerfer's objection (p. 88) that if the older stage of Mongolian, viz. that represented by the *Secret History*, had been known earlier, there would hardly have

¹¹ However, I personally regard it as problematic whether and when successivity exists in any linguistic material.

been any reason to regard Turkic and Mongolian as genetically related, one might notice that the first 96 paragraphs of the *Secret History* were published by Pozdneev in 1897. This edition was already used by Ramstedt in his first publication, the doctoral thesis of 1902. The text of the *Secret History* is responsible for several of his most important viewpoints in all his later activity. In time he also received a copy of the complete edition by Haenisch, and still later one of the edition of Kozin. From 1902 onwards, Ramstedt also used the Mongolian quadratic inscriptions on the basis of Russian editions. On the other hand, the language of Mongolian classical literature represents in several respects an older phase of the phonetical development of the language than that of the *Secret History* or of the inscriptions: that of the two latter has therefore been called Middle Mongolian.

Doerfer admits the existence of the "phonetic laws", but, like Sir Gerard, he explains the phonologically comparable elements in Turkic and Mongolian as loans from the former into the latter (cf. *TMEN* I, pp. 51-105 and his paper "Zur Verwandtschaft der altaischen Sprachen," *IF* 71, 1966, pp. 81-123). He, too, propounds several strata of these loans and attributes the two oldest to the hypothetical stages "Urtürkisch" and "Frühtürkisch." In practice, Doerfer's Proto-Turkic comes to correspond to the Proto-Altaiic language of the supporters of the affinity theory, as did the oldest unknown and unaccessible Turkic proto-language assumed by Sir Gerard.¹²

Ramstedt himself often expressed his admiration for the Turkish language because of the extreme regularity and perspicacity of its grammar and vocabulary. In his opinion, Turkish would be the ideal international language - Ramstedt was interested in Esperanto, too. He also pointed out the interesting fact that the languages of the nomadic Turks seem to be very conservative while those of the settled-down agricultural tribes seem to have been subject to many alterations. In the Semitic family, it is the language of the Bedouins which is the most regular, looking at the same time much more archaic than the Accadian language attested millennia ago.

¹² Doerfer states in *CAJ* XI, 1966, p. 229 "Ich sage selbst, daß ich nicht etwa urtürkische Formen rekonstruiere, sondern Formen eines alten türkischen Dialekts, älter als die ältesten Belege aus dem 7./8. Jahrh., der dem Mongolischen (belegt seit dem 13. Jahrhundert) einmal Lehnmaterial geliefert hat."

But as in Arabic so too in Turkic, the regularity may be the fruit of long development and not anything "original".

Among the Soviet scholars, too, there happens to be a Turkologist, A. M. Ščerbak, who has expressed the strongest doubts concerning the genetic affinity of the Altaic languages (e.g. "Ob altajskoj gipoteze v jazykoznanii," *Vo. Ya.* 1959, 6, pp. 51-63, and "Soderžanie uralo-altajskoj gipotezy, ee obosnovanie i ocenka," *IAN Azerb. SSR*, 1968, Nr. 1, pp. 62-70). According to L. Sternberg,¹³ Radloff had also been sceptical regarding the Turko-Mongol relationship, but had later changed his mind and spoken clearly in favour of Castrén's theory.

The founders of comparative Indo-European philology regarded as their ultimate aim the reconstruction of the Indo-European mother language. It can, however, be proven that it is impossible, for instance, to reconstruct Latin on the basis of its daughter languages. Though the whole linguistic system of Proto-Indo-European cannot thus be reconstructed, the reconstructions of words and forms must in principle be considered valid since early loan words, e.g., in Finno-Ugric, often enough correspond exactly to such reconstructions. The conception of the proto-language is, however, useful as the theoretical frame of our reconstructions. The late Paavo Ravila once formulated the principle that the value of a proto-language for our reconstructions lessens the farther back in the time the proto-language must be dated (*JSFOu* 60, 6, 1958, p. 6f.). Though, for instance, the genetic affinity of the Uralic languages is established beyond any doubt and is generally accepted, the actual number of reliable-looking reconstructions is still rather limited, and even they are for the most part a fruit of investigations into the history of Uralic vocalism during the last few decades. It seems that a comparable number of plausible reconstructions would be possible in the Altaic family too. Their operational value was already evident to Ramstedt as he was able to understand and explain large parts of the Mongol (as well as later the Korean) vocabulary only with the aid of Turkic and Manchu-Tungus comparisons.

Since the protagonists of the Altaic theory have, in my opinion, followed the fundamental principles of comparative linguistics more faithfully than their adversaries, I presented the main lines of the

¹³ See his paper "M. A. Castrén als Altaist und Ethnograph," transl. in German by Hands Findeisen in the *Ethnologische Studien* I, Halle 1931, p. 177.

problem at a meeting of Indo-Europeanists in Münster in 1965. The summary was then published under the heading "Verwandtschaft, Entlehnung, Zufall" in the *Kratylos* X, 1965, pp. 123-130. In my presentation of the problem I expressed the wish that even non-Altaist linguists like Indo-Europeanists would familiarize themselves with the controversies and comment on them. In a way this wish came true in the form of the Conference of linguists in various fields which met in Leningrad in 1969. The lectures delivered there were published in print in the *Problema obščnosti altajskix jazykov* (Leningrad 1971). Its contents were later summarized by Poppe in his paper "A new Symposium on the Altaic Theory" (*CAJ* XVI, 1972, pp. 37-58). It is especially interesting to see that in the opinion of the Soviet Indo-Europeanists who contributed to the conference, the methods applied by the Altaists, as well as the conclusions drawn by them, are to be regarded as reliable. Important questions are also answered in the *Očerki sravnitelnoj leksikologii altajskix jazykov*, ed. by V. I. Cincius (Leningrad 1972).

When Otto Donner enlisted Gustaf J. Ramstedt into the study of the Altaic languages, the clearly expressed aim was that he should continue the work begun by M. A. Castrén. Castrén, again, had already come to the conclusion not only that there was a Uralic and an Altaic family of languages, but also that these families represented an older community, viz. the Uralo-Altaic. However, though consciously continuing the investigations started by Castrén, Ramstedt, basically a sceptic, did not adopt any ready made theory from him. As we learn from Ramstedt's works, private notes, and letters, it was only when he was compelled by the linguistic facts themselves that he finally came to conclude that the Altaic languages must be genetically related.