1. Talat Tekin is surely right when establishing at least three sources of $\text{S}$ in modern Tkc. languages: (1) $< *l' | >$ Chuv. $l'$; (2) $< *c | >$ Chuv. $s$; (3) $< *l\&, *l\| | >$ Chuv. $s$ (Tekin 1969: 78). Whereas (1) can now relatively easily be established by comparison with the Chuv. and Mo. counterparts of the respective Tkc. words, (2) and (3) cannot. Tekin 1969: 79 divides his examples into two groups: A ($s < *c$) and B ($s < *l\&, *l\|$). One cannot, however, immediately understand why Chuv. anâ$\text{S}$ 'sunset; west' = Tkc. âni$\text{s}$ ($\sim$ ini$\text{s}$) 'going down' (ibid. 79) belongs to A, and Chuv. sap$\text{S}$- 'to fight' = Tkc. čapys$\text{S}$- id. (ibid. 80) to B. It is a Mo. criterion that the division is based upon: if the Chuv. reciprocal suffix $-s-$ has its counterpart in Mo. $-l\text{ca}-$, then Chuv. sap$\text{S}$- belongs, of course, to B. It is evident that this criterion cannot be applied to substantives, so that Chuv. anâ$\text{S}$ had to be placed in group A but the fact alone that Chuv. anâ$\text{S}$ has no reciprocal suffix is
actually not sufficient to exclude the word from group B (cf. the *lę possibility: ḍniś < *ānilę, see § 3). Two problems arise in this context: (1) the lack of an inner-Tkc. criterion; (2) an inconsistent use made of reconstructed Mo.-Tkc. proto-forms. Let us begin our explanations with the latter problem.

2. Chuv. kēšen- 'to neigh' = Tkc. kišnä- id. can be traced back to PT *kičän(-ā)-, for which, by comparison with Mo. in-kišča-ka- id. (Tekin 1969: 80, where the initial in-, however, is not explained), a still older form can be reconstructed: *kičānā- (ibid.; we would rather prefer: *kičānā-). Another example is Tkc. kašy- 'to scratch' ∼ Chuv. xyś- id. = Mo. kalči- 'to remove unevenness, to scrape off' (ibid. 79).

Now, OT kabyś- 'to come together, to assemble' < *kab-y-č- (Tekin 1989: 342) can equally well be compared with Mo. kab-il-du- 'to come close, to approach' and, then, derived from *kabylčā- < *kab-yl-č < *kab-yl- (as to Mo. -l-du- see Poppe 1972: 134–136; Ramstedt 1952: 166). If so, OT kabyś- belongs to group B, rather than to A (against Tekin 1989: 342: < *kab-y-č-)². Exactly this is the case also with Tkc. uruš- 'kämpfen' ∼ Chuv. vārš- id. < *urulę-, cf. Mo. uruldu- 'wetteifern' (Poppe 1974: 140), the only difference being that no Chuv. ś counterpart of OT kabyś- can be shown which is, however, no sufficient counterargument against a *lę etymon of OT kabyś-.
3. The most problematic case is that of an inner-Tkc. criterion. However, assimilations in consonant clusters (chiefly in Chuv. and Yak.) can be used, at least in some words, as valuable hints.

Let us at first examine the phonetic development of two PT words in V Bulg. One of them is PT *ič-i-nā which became first *ičnā and then V Bulg. išnā (> Chuv. ašne 'in, within'), i.e. PT *čn > V Bulg. šn (Tekin 1989: 343), see below [1]. Another word is V Bulg. bačna 'at the beginning' which was traced back to *bačina by the same author (Tekin 1975: 8). This, however, cannot possibly be correct for the reconstruction contradicts the well founded *čn > šn change. The only reasonable solution to the contradiction seems to be the assumption that the etymon was not *bačina but *balčina rather, i.e. PT *balč-i-n-a or *balč-y-n-a (< PT *balč(V) > Chuv. puš 'head')3 > *balčna > V Bulg. bačna4. Thus:

[1] PT *-čn- > V Bulg. -čn-

The fact that *balč remained as bač in bačna shows unequivocally that the word *ba(l)čna was lexicalized as an adverb before *balč > puš.

Other examples of two different clusters which point to different etyma can be found in Yak. Reliable cognates in other Tkc. languages permit us to reconstruct the original form of Yak. kymńv 'whip' as *kamńyg (Stachowski 1993: § 27.2), e.g. PT *-mč- > Yak. -mń- (see below [3]). This process runs then parallel to the development of PT *-nč- and *-ńg- which
become -nn- (sometimes > or ~ -ň-) in Yak., as in Yak. sinňigăs 'dün' < *jinečkăč (Stachowski 1995: 178); Yak. un(n)jui- 'herabhängen' < Mo. unği- id. (Kalużyński 1961: 64; D'jačkovskij 1977: 60); see below [4].

In this situation we cannot accept a *mc̄ reconstruction of Yak. symnăras 'soft' (= Chuv. šamśa ~ šemše id.), i.e. < PT *jymčak-ăč < *jym(yla)čak > Tkc. jym(y)šak id. (Tekin 1969: 79, 1989: 344f.) because of Yak. -mn- (not -m̱n-, see below [3]). We would instead be inclined to assume, by analogy with *jamič > Chuv. šimč 'food; fruit' (as to this word, see now e.g. Ceylan 1997: 138), a PT form *jymyš < *jym-ylč (< */jym > Yak. sym 'der weiche Teil, Krume', Stachowski 1995: 177), i.e. Yak. symnăras 'soft' < PT *jym(y)čakač < *jymylč (> Tkc. *jymyś) < */jym. In view of Chuv. dial. šamśa (~ lit. šemše) 'soft' < *jym-ylč-an (~ *jim-ilč-a), we may accept Chuv. -ms̄- as a reflex of PT *-m(V)ılč-. Thus:

[3]  PT *-mč- > Yak. -m̱n-
[5]  PT *-m(V)ılč- > Chuv. -ms̄- ~ Yak. -mn- ~ Tkc. -ms̄-.

The Chuv. (-ms̄-) and Tkc. (-ms̄-) reflexes seem to argue against a Chuv.-Yak. community, postulated many years ago by Gy. Németh (1914: § 8; cf. also Stachowski 1993: § 1.9b); otherwise, there are also examples in favour of Németh's hypothesis.
4. For the Yak. reflex *mn* the following changes could be assumed: PT *-m(V)l* > Proto-Yak. *-mn*- > ? *-mnn*- (cf. [4] above) > Yak. *mn*- The difference in the development of PT *-m(V)l* between Chuv. and Tkc. on the one hand and Yak. on the other should be noticed as particularly striking here. We would therefore tend to differentiate the change [5] chronologically as follows:

[6] EPT (or PA ?) *-m(V)l* ( > Proto-Yak. *-mnt* > *-mnn* > Modern Yak. *mn*) > LPT *-m(V)l* > Chuv. *m*- ~ Tkc. *m*-.

Theoretically, the process in [4] could be altered along the same lines as follows: PT *-nti* ( > Proto-Yak. *-nni* > Modern Yak. *n*) > Tkc. *n*- However, Yak. *n* (see above) evidently displays the *n*- > Yak. *n*- change, and it seems to us reasonable to accept both *-nti* and *-n*- as possible sources of Yak. *n*- Should an intrinsic criterion for distinguishing *-nti* > *n*- and *-n*- > *n*- words from one other be found one day, we would be able to identify the former as an older stratum than the latter:

[7a] EPT (or PA ?) *-nti* ( > Proto-Yak. *-nni*) > LPT *-n* ( > Proto-Yak. *-n*) > Tkc. *n-

[7b] Proto-Yak. *-nni*, *-n* > Modern Yak. *n-
In this case, both the genuine Yak. phonetic development (EPT [or PA ?] → Proto-Yak.) and the inner-Tkc. borrowing process (LPT → Proto-Yak.) were at issue.

One of the problems which still remain unclear is whether *š too can be a source of the modern Tkc. ř (as, maybe, in Tkc. is-bu ~ oš-bu = Yak. subu 'exactly this').

**Notes**


2. Street 1985: 638, fn. 8 admits also the possibility of *lt/ði > Tkc. š, so that Tkc. kabyš- could thus go back directly to *kabyldu- ~ *kabylți which corresponds fairly well with O. Pritsak’s (1964: 344) *lti > š explanation. Cf. note 3.

3. Cf. Street 1985: 647, fn. 56: «pA [= proto-Altaic] *balćV or more probably *baldı 'head'»: the form *baldı (= *baldy) which is clearly older than *balćV should rather be reconstructed in a non-harmonic way, i.e. *baldi (or *baltı) because it was i rather than y [= i] which caused
the palatalization of *t/d. On *balëV see also Miller 1984: 159f. and Stachowski 1996: 92f. On *balë < *bal+ti see now Miller 1996: 164f. In this context, it seems possible that PA *byê- 'to cook, boil' (> Tkc. byşi- ~ bişi- id., Chuv. pişi- id. [e.g. Tekin 1969: 79]) can in view of Middle Kor. pti- id. (> Modern Kor. çêti- id. [e.g. Lee 1977: 238]) : preOJ puti 'kitchens (esp. of a monastic building–complex)' (Miller 1989: 249, Nr. 14) be traced back to still an older form like *byti-. On ti > č in 17th century Kor. see Lee 1977: 236f. Cf. also note 2.

4. Consequently, there is no need to assume a form like *bač (Nauta 1985: 126) in order to explain bačna.

**Abbreviations**

Chuv. = Chuvash; dial. = dialectal; EPT = Early Proto-Turkic; Kor. = Korean; lit. = literary; LPT = Late Proto-Turkic; Mo. = Mongolian; OJ = Old Japanese; OT = Old Turkic; PA = Proto-Altaic; PT = Proto-Turkic; Tg. = Tungus; Tkc. = Turkic; Tksh. = Modern Turkish; VBulg. = Volga-Bulgarian; Yak. = Yakut; Yen. = Yenisseian.
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