

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC RELATIONSHIP

O. SAPASHEV*
A. SMAILOVA**
B. ZHAKSYMOV***

Abstract: *Scientists recognize the difficulties associated with final and perfect solution of the problem of origin of the Altai community. The most important issue according to their opinion is a difficulty in differentiation of elements of a possible genetic commonality, the traces of which can be found in all Altaic languages, from the secondary elements of community, developing in different periods of close contacts of various Altaic peoples for at least of two millennia period. Mutual lexical borrowings of not only from single Altaic languages, but also borrowings from non-Altaic languages (the phenomenon of the substrate or super stratum) led to a significant lexical generality of secondary order and gave the reasons for establishment of various kinds of correspondences not relating to common Altaic protolanguage heritage that creates a large difficult to apply comparative-historical method.*

Keywords: *Altaic, macro-system, genetic kinship, language typology, the rudiments*

Altay Makro Sistemi Dillerinin Farklılıkları ve Onların Genetik İlişkilerine Dair Konular

Özet: *Altayistik çalışan araştırmacıları, Altay toplumun kökeni sorununun nihai ve mükemmel bir çözümüyle ilişkili olan zorluklar bekler. Araştırmacıların görüşüne göre en önemli konu, olası genetik ortaklık unsurlarının ve Altay dillerinde bulunabilecek izlerin farklılaşması zorluğudur. Bu zorluklar, toplumun ikincil unsurlarından kaynaklanır ve farklı zamanlarda çeşitli Altay topluluklarının en az iki bin yıllık yakın ilişkiler sonucu gelişmiştir. Sadece Altay dilleri ve Altay dilleri dışındaki dillerden karşılıklı sözcük alışverişi (altkatman ve üstkatman olgusu) ikincil seviyede önemli sözcüksel genellemeler ortaya çıkardı ve tarihi-karşılaştırmalı metodun uygulanmasını zorlaştıran ortak proto Altay dil mirasıyla ilgili olmayan bir yapının oluşmasına neden oldu.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Altay, makrosistem, genetik akrabalık, dil tipolojisi, rudimentler*

* Prof. Dr., Head of TURKSOY Department, Al-Farabi KazNU.

** Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and General Linguistics of Al-Farabi KazNU.

*** Research officer, Institute of Human and Animal Physiology of the MES RK.

Research in Altaic and Turkic studies was based on Indo-European linguistics. We should not speak so much of it this time, since the problem had already been clarified in the late twentieth century, when the scientists faced some intractable problems in Altaic studies, such as the difficulty of reconstruction of pre-Altaic language, diversity in phonetic parallels, an inability to find common Altaic lexical units in terms of genetic relatedness. At present, neoaltaist scientists are trying to approach this problem from the other hand in their research, completely abandoning application of the system of studying Indo-European languages through Altaic languages, and it should be noted that they have moved forward with this matter in terms of a comprehensive study within the Altai family.

Indo-European linguists especially consistently held the view of impossibility of establishing a remote relationship between languages. They explained their position by the fact that while the divergence of Indo-European languages occurred 6 - 8 thousand years ago, the separation of Indo-European languages, even from the closest language family (if it ever took place), happened in a much more distant time (some linguists assumed that this event could occur 1 - 2 million years ago). They argued that changes occurred in that time in phonetics, grammar and vocabulary, were so huge that it wiped out all traces of genetic affinity.

However, the material accumulated by the early 20th century on comparative linguistics allowed some of the most far-sighted and courageous linguists to come to the conclusion on the possibility of determining more distant genetic relationship. Among these scholars, here should be noted the Englishman Henry Sweet, the Italian Alfredo Trombetti and especially the Dane Holger Pedersen, who in 1903 put forward the hypothesis of a distant relationship between a broad group of languages spoken in Europe, North and West Asia and North Africa: Indo-European languages, Semitic-Hamitic languages and the so-called Ural-Altaic languages (in those days there was a view of a relatively close relationship between Uralic and Altaic languages, which was subsequently rejected). H. Pedersen called this large language group as Nostratic languages.

The question of family relations between Indo-European languages remained open for a long time. Scientists have noted some lexical and structural parallels between the Indo-European languages, on the one hand, and the Finno-Ugric, Altaic, Afro-Asiatic languages, on the other. However, a truly scientific theory was not created until the 1960s, when a so-called Nostratic hypothesis occurred (from Latin - noster "our"). The honor of its development belongs primarily to V.M. Illich-Svitych.

According to his hypothesis, the Indo-European languages are part of large suprafamily of Nostratic languages. In addition, Nostratic languages include the following language families:

1. Afrasic (or Semitic-Hamitic). Includes six groups:
 - a) Semitic (Arabic, Amharic, Syrian, Akkadian, Hebraic and other languages);
 - b) Egyptian (ancient Egyptian and as its continuation Coptic language);

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

c) Berberian (languages spoken in the mountains and deserts of North Africa: Kabylean, Shilha, Rifian and etc.);

g) Chad (Hausa, Angas, Bauchi and several other languages spoken by population of the West Africa in sub-Saharan Africa);

d) Cushitic (languages of East Africa, the most significant of them - Somali, Bedja, Sidamo, Gallium, Irakv and etc.).

e) Omotian (languages of Southwest Ethiopia: Gimirra, Ari-Banna, Kaffa, Volamo, Ometo and etc.).

2. Kartvelian, which includes four languages: Georgian, Chadian, Mingrelian and Svan.

3. Dravidian, including four large languages (Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam) and a number of small (Cota, Toda, Gondi, Brahui and other) languages spoken in India, partly in Pakistan, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

4. Uralic. Includes three groups:

a) The Finno-Permian (Finnish, Estonian, Sami, Mari, Mordovian, Komi, Udmurt and other languages);

b) Ugric (Hungarian, Khanty and Mansi languages);

c) Samoyed (Nenets, Enets, Selkup, and Nganasan languages).

5. Altaic. Includes five groups:

a) Turkic (Turkish, Azeri, Turkmenian, Crimean-Tatar, Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Chuvash, Tuva, Khakassia, Sakha and other languages);

b) Mongolian (Mongolian, Buryat, Kalmyk, Dagur et al.);

c) Tungus (Manchu, Evenki, Even, Nanai, Udeghe et al.).

g) Korean (Korean language);

e) Japanese (Japanese, Ryukyuan and a number of other languages spoken in Japan and typically qualifying for sociolinguistic reasons as Japanese dialects). V.M. Illich Svitych. Problems of Indo-European linguistics, Moscow, 1964.

The Altaic family includes Turkish, Mongolian and Tungus-Manchurian and, probably, Eskimo-Aleut languages. Some also include isolated Ainu and Nivkh languages. While it is not clear, the Eskimo-Aleut and the Ainu languages conventionally were combined within Paleo-Asian (in other words – Paleo-Siberian) territorial grouping. According to its grammatical structure, all "classic" Altaic languages are the agglutinative nominative languages. If the Altaic community is expanded due to a number of Paleo-Siberian languages, many of which are ergative, then the grammatical structure of latter will be considered, obviously, as of substrate origin. In addition, the expanded Altaic family can already be called as para-Altaic macro family, which is early separated from para-Nostratic (i.e., Nostratic in the broadest sense - with Afro-Asiatic branch), but later from the Afrasiatic (more divergent) languages. Well, if the the Nivkh with the Ainu languages entered para-

nostratic group, we can assume then that para-Altaic group separated earlier than Afrasiatic. The collapse of the Altaic language community (family) occurred, presumably in 6-5 thousand BC (according glottochronology - 17 matches in the 100-word Swadesh list). The Altai language family also includes Japanese and Korean, which we will consider later.

Method of lexicostatistics or glottochronology proposed to establish absolute dating and American linguist Morris Swadesh suggested it. (Svodesh 1951) Glottochronology uses the technique of exact sciences and, in particular, has much in common with the method of dating archaeological findings by determining the carbon content within them.

Glottochronology method of M. Swadesh can be carried out based on four assumptions:

1. A certain part of vocabulary of all languages is relatively stable and forms basic lexical core. This basic lexical kernel includes pronouns, numerals, and names of body parts, geographical phenomena and so forth.

2. Persistence degree of main elements of lexical nucleus is constant at all times. Therefore, by setting a certain number of words in main core, we can be sure that a certain percentage of these words will remain unchanged in equal periods of time (e.g., first, second and the third millennium).

3. The percentage of loss of words in main core is approximately the same in all languages (inverse relationship).

4. If one know the actual percentage of survived genetically close elements of the main lexical core of any pair of related languages, it is possible to calculate the time elapsed from the moment when these languages have begun the process of divergence (divergence).

However, it should be noted that methodology conducted by M.Svodish does not always correspond to all languages as a universal. For example in relation to Altaic languages it can be noted that in view of long-standing discrepancy of Altaic languages, it is very difficult to argue without sufficiently thorough data that the loss or total reservoir of preserved words amenable to analysis, since the peoples of the Altaic language macro system were very mobile and exposed to intensive assimilation. The history of each language has unique features, even closely related languages, dating back to the same proto-language. Tribe or nation, separated from the main body of an ethnic group enters into various contacts with surrounding nations. Change in religion, shape of life, habitat, etc. has a great influence.

It should be also noted that the dating procedure developed by M. Swadesh applies only to one pair of closely related languages.

At this time, there are two sensitive issues in the Altaics: the definition of kinship of languages that are included in this great macro family, and a genetic and typological. Great researcher of Altaic S.A. Starostin noted the following requirements regarding this issue:

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

1) Existence of regular phonetic correspondences between these language systems;

2) Presence of a sufficiently large number of matching basic vocabulary, and mentioned regular phonetic correspondences were performed on the set of it;

3) Also the presence of a sufficiently large number of matching grammatical morphemes is desirable, on the set of which regular phonetic correspondences are also performed (Svodesh 1951).

Wellknown altaist V.L. Kotvich, one of the founders of comparative linguistics in Altaic, concluded that the basis of the Altaic language family make no genetic links, and typological similarities. For example: "In any case, the existence of a common language should be attributed to the very distant past. At least to the beginning of the first millennium of B.C. Completely separate Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus languages, with different lexical fund and morphology similar to each other only typologically, already existed in the age of Huns (beginning of the IV- III centuries, B.C.) (Kotwicz 1962: 351).

Therefore, if one will not touch more clearly nihilistic attitude to the issue of Altai community origin and Altaic in general, then among supporters of modern Altai comparative linguistics it is easy to see significant differences in assessment of status and prospects of development of this branch of language science. According to some Altaists, genetic relationship (even very distant) between the main groups of the Altaic languages is an indisputable fact proven by current and ongoing experience of creating comparative historical lexicology and grammar of these languages. For others - Altaic, including the relationship of the Altai languages is very likely useful theory, without consideration and development of which practically impossible to make in-depth comparative-historical study of individual groups of the Altaic languages such as Turkish, Mongol, Manchu-Tungus and some other (Sunik 1976:11).

N.N. Poppe in terms of unfounded evidence of kinship within Altaic languages indicates that the comparison of vocabulary and establishment of sound correspondences is not enough to completely and perfectly prove kinship of Altaic languages, since "theoretically any words can be borrowed" (Poppe 1973: 119).

In any diachronic study, we should not necessarily rely only on phonetic parallels, as phonology is much more dynamic and committed to change. We can apply for kinship within Turkic languages based on phonological alternation, as they are closer and existed compactly. However, all recognized classification of Turkic languages on the basis of phonology still cause controversy when grouping by similarity of languages, there is a question about areal linguistics, since the methods of areal linguistics study are not sufficiently involved in the study of the Altaic languages. In this regard, it is appropriate to recall the observation of a great scientist of Nostratic languages V.M. Illich-Svitych. Unlike some Altaists, he emphasized the "very distant" relatives of three Altai groups - Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-

Tungus, considering that the question of relation of the Korean and Japanese languages to the Altaic family has not yet been resolved.

While agreeing with conclusion of the scientist, we note that the study of kinship of languages is not enough in terms of evidence of community representatives of Altaic macro family peoples. Only a comprehensive study of genetic relationships based on biological anthropology may shed light in terms of proof of common roots.

It is no secret that any language can be a takeover; therefore, in Altaic we should conduct complex research at the junction of biological anthropology and archeology. Very complex ethnic processes took place within thousands of years in Eurasia. We have to admit a large percentage of Iranian component in the ethnic composition of the Turks. We still have not reached a consensus on role of the East Iraq components in composition of Turkic ethnic groups. There is a huge gap between the Altai and Hun epochs in periodization of Turkic languages. Saki element has completely dropped out of the picture. Türkologists do not want to recognize the role and place of the East-Iranian tribes, such as Saks, Massagets, Issedones, Alans, Sarmatians, correlating them to pre-Turks. Since the so-called "pre-Turkish language" is still not renovated, not speaking of the distant pre-Altaic language because of complexity of ethnic mixing of tribes in the Eurasian continent. At this time, we notice that Tungus-Manchurian community unite a common group of Mongols, Tungus-Manchurian peoples and Koreans. Japanese ethnic roots, and Ryukue and Aini have not yet been sufficiently studied, although Japanese language on some option has been recently introduced in the Altaic macro system. However, the Japanese scientists do not deny the affinity of Japanese language with the Altai, for example Egami Nomio, wrote "The deeper we look into the history, the clearer and closer ties of Japan with the Asian continent."

Based on the above, I would prefer to call prehistoric languages not as proto-Turkish or proto-Iranian, this also applies to other "proto-language", but it would be much more objective to use the term "paleolinguistics". I have not seen anywhere else the term, but I think it is more relevant to the role and object of study of prehistoric languages.

It is clear that in a variety of processes we should not proceed only based on language elements in the Altaic when considering genetic and typological relationship. Recent surveys show that the technique of Nostratic studies along with genetic connection provide a more productive outcome in the study of Altaic macro system languages. Danish linguist H. Pedersen, became the author of the hypothesis of the Nostratic languages in 1903. He was the first to make provision about relationship of Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic and Ural-Altaic languages. The term "Nostratic languages" was offered for these languages (from the Latin. Noster - ours). Currently, the Nostratic includes Indo-European family, Kartvelian, Uralic, Dravidian, Afro-Asiatic and Altaic languages. In the early 1960s, Moscow Slavist V.M. Illich-Svitych has developed Nostratic theory significantly. Supporters of the

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

Nostratic hypothesis assume that Nostratic parent language belonged to the European race and lived in Eastern Europe, and possibly in adjacent areas of Asia.

Research in Altaic and Turkic languages was based on Indo-European linguistics. We should not speak so much of it this time, since the problem had already been clarified in the late twentieth century, when the scientists faced some intractable problems in Altaic studies, such as the difficulty of reconstruction of pre-Altaic language, diversity in phonetic parallels, an inability to find common Altaic lexical units in terms of genetic relatedness. At present, neoaltaist scientists are trying to approach this problem from the other hand in their research, completely abandoning application of the system of studying Indo-European languages through Altaic languages, and it should be noted that they have moved forward with this matter in terms of a comprehensive study within the Altai family.

At this time, there are two sensitive issues in the Altaics: the definition of kinship of languages that are included in this great macro family, and a genetic and typological. Great researcher of Altaic S.A. Starostin noted the following requirements regarding this issue:

- 1) Existence of regular phonetic correspondences between these language systems;
- 2) Presence of a sufficiently large number of matching basic vocabulary, and mentioned regular phonetic correspondences were performed on the set of it;
- 3) Also the presence of a sufficiently large number of matching grammatical morphemes is desirable, on the set of which regular phonetic correspondences are also performed (Svodesh 1951: 2).

Well-known altaist V.L. Kotvich, one of the founders of comparative linguistics in Altaic, concluded that the basis of the Altaic language family make no genetic links, and typological similarities. For example: "In any case, the existence of a common language should be attributed to the very distant past. At least to the beginning of the first millennium of B.C. Completely separate Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus languages, with different lexical fund and morphology similar to each other only typologically, already existed in the age of Huns (beginning of the IV- III centuries, B.C.) (Starostin 1951:351).

Therefore, if one will not touch more clearly nihilistic attitude to the issue of Altai community origin and Altaic in general, then among supporters of modern Altai comparative linguistics it is easy to see significant differences in assessment of status and prospects of development of this branch of language science. According to some Altaists, genetic relationship (even very distant) between the main groups of the Altaic languages is an indisputable fact proven by current and ongoing experience of creating comparative historical lexicology and grammar of these languages. For others - Altaic, including the relationship of the Altai languages is very likely useful theory, without consideration and development of which practically impossible to make in-depth comparative-historical study of individual

groups of the Altaic languages such as Turkish, Mongol, Manchu-Tungus and some other (Kotwicz 1962:11).

N.N. Poppe in terms of unfounded evidence of kinship within Altaic languages indicates that the comparison of vocabulary and establishment of sound correspondences is not enough to completely and perfectly prove kinship of Altaic languages, since "theoretically any words can be borrowed" (Poppe 1973:119).

In any diachronic study, we should not necessarily rely only on phonetic parallels, as phonology is much more dynamic and committed to change. We can apply for kinship within Turkic languages based on phonological alternation, as they are closer and existed compactly. However, all recognized classification of Turkic languages on the basis of phonology still cause controversy when grouping by similarity of languages, there is a question about areal linguistics, since the methods of areal linguistics study are not sufficiently involved in the study of the Altaic languages. In this regard, it is appropriate to recall the observation of a great scientist of Nostratic languages V.M. Illich-Svitych. Unlike some Altaists, he emphasized the "very distant" relatives of three Altai groups - Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus, considering that the question of relation of the Korean and Japanese languages to the Altaic family has not yet been resolved.

While agreeing with conclusion of the scientist, we note that the study of kinship of languages is not enough in terms of evidence of community representatives of Altai macro family peoples. Only a comprehensive study of genetic relationships based on biological anthropology may shed light in terms of proof of common roots.

It is no secret that any language can be a takeover; therefore, in Altaic we should conduct complex research at the junction of biological anthropology and archeology. Very complex ethnic processes took place within thousands of years in Eurasia. We have to admit a large percentage of Iranian component in the ethnic composition of the Turks. We still have not reached a consensus on role of the East Iraq components in composition of Turkic ethnic groups. There is a huge gap between the Altai and Hun epochs in periodization of Turkic languages. Saki element has completely dropped out of the picture. Türkologists do not want to recognize the role and place of the East-Iranian tribes, such as Saks, Massagets, Issedones, Alans, Sarmatians, correlating them to pre-Turks. Since the so-called "pre-Turkish language" is still not renovated, not speaking of the distant pre-Altaic language because of complexity of ethnic mixing of tribes in the Eurasian continent. At this time, we notice that Tungus-Manchurian community unite a common group of Mongols, Tungus-Manchurian peoples and Koreans. Japanese ethnic roots, and Ryukue and Aini have not yet been sufficiently studied, although Japanese language on some option has been recently introduced in the Altai macro system. However, the Japanese scientists do not deny the affinity of Japanese language with the Altai, for example Egami Nomio, wrote "The deeper we look into the history, the clearer and closer ties of Japan with the Asian continent."

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

It is clear that in a variety of processes we should not proceed only based on language elements in the Altaic when considering genetic and typological relationship. Recent surveys show that the technique of Nostratic studies along with genetic connection provide a more productive outcome in the study of Altaic macro system languages. Danish linguist H. Pedersen, became the author of the hypothesis of the Nostratic languages in 1903. He was the first to make provision about relationship of Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic and Ural-Altaic languages. The term "Nostratic languages" was offered for these languages (from the Latin. *Noster* - ours). Currently, the Nostratic includes Indo-European family, Kartvelian, Uralic, Dravidian, Afro-Asiatic and Altaic languages. In the early 1960s, Moscow Slavist V.M. Illich-Svitych has developed Nostratic theory significantly. Supporters of the Nostratic hypothesis assume that Nostratic parent language belonged to the European race and lived in Eastern Europe, and possibly in adjacent areas of Asia.

Attempt to reconstruct pre-Altaic language will not succeed, since this macro family proved only typological affinity, for instance as we have said earlier that Mongolian language typology is much closer to the Tungus-Manchurian and Tungus languages adjacent Korean, more rigorous studies show that Turkic languages in this system are very distinct. From a genetic point of view, Turks possess noticeable Eastern Iranian components, as well as the Hungarians.

The possibility of lexical borrowings between Turkic and Mongolian languages is considered very often, first, as a possibility of interpreting the general Turkic-Mongolian lexical fund as borrowed from Turkic languages to Mongolian. At this, the problem of contacts between Turkic languages and Indo-European is "enabled", since from the assumptions concerning the borrowing a number of Turkic words in ancient Indo-European languages, in particular, of the Tocharian, logically follows their exclusion from the common Altaic comparisons as well as the decision that their Mongolian parallels present early borrowings of Tocharians from Turkic (Dybo 2007:3).

It is noticeable even with an unaided eye that all three language groups: Mongolian - Tungus-Manchurian - Korean lie in the same geographical location and migration dynamics within this zone was not as strong compared to Turkic languages.

Originally, Finnish scientist Tabbert Strallenberg founded the Altaistic on the base of a comparative study of the Mongolian language. Then the system of studying of Altaic languages was sufficiently developed, and the method of studying of Indo-European languages was used.

A bright opponent of the Altaic Linguistics G. Doerfer rejects the methods used by Altaicists, stating that these methods developed by the "thrice holy Indo-European", in fact do not apply to the study of the Altai language community (Doerfer 1972:3).

German scientist Henry Winkler in 1879 started to research the Altaic languages, including Japanese. Concerning the comparison of lexical material, the scientist selected 400 basic words on Altaic and of these about 100 words juxtaposed at the level of primary bases or roots. We can talk about the inner relationship of primary elements in cases where the languages of these basic elements are the same and differ only in the words of other distinctive features. He considered this as a proof of kinship of languages in the distant past.

G. Winkler recognized the existence of early and profound differences between the Altaic languages, explaining by that: "every branch of the Altaic languages at all points of grammar went on its way." (*Die altaische Volker und Sprachenwelt*). Note that Winkler, considering the safety of the Altaic languages, was skeptical about the idea on reconstruction of Proto-Altaic, like reconstructing of Proto-Indo-European, produced by A. Schleicher. It can be observed also in the works of D. Sinor, who abandoned reconstruction and chose to compare these suffixes of living language without involving hypothetical types, which associated with increased risk comparisons (Sinor D. *Tanulmanok*. C. 55). This conclusion was reached by Soviet turcologist A.N. Samoylovich: "Living dialects may be more archaic than literary monuments of the very old languages of the same family" (A.N. Samoylovich "Turkish numerals." P. 138).

We can also mention the German scientist, sinologist B. Schott, who believed that languages have a common lexical material and common grammatical forms, appear as diverging branches of the same root. In his observations, Abel-Remusat, wrote that the discrepancy between words that express the most essential thing does not yet show any close relationship between languages. So in related Indo-European languages, some kinship terms, names of body parts, the phenomena of nature, food items, and so on is not always the same (as an example, he cited the meaning of the words "son", "daughter", "sister", "wife", "sky", "earth", "Sun", "head", "mouth", "stone", "tree", and so on). Therefore, it is necessary, by allowing the dynamics of values and phonetic transitions, not to match the concepts and their designations, but look for the relevance in languages throughout their lexical structure, especially the roots. This position, expressed more than a half century ago, has not lost its relevance for today, as analytical expressions based on a comparison of similar words. B. Schott, "The problem of generality of Altaic languages." Leningrad, 1971.). Generally, B. Schott categorically opposed assumption that the relationship of the Altai languages could arise due to prolonged contact of the Altai peoples: "It is impossible that these circumstances have caused the relationship of languages that were previously unrelated."

B. Schott widely compared the Altaic languages, including Japanese in historical and linguistic studies.

Austrian Altaist Sanskrit Anton Boller offered a series of works in the middle of the last century. It is believed that he was one of the first researchers who attempted

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

to prove relationship of Japanese language to the Altaic (A / Boller "Nachweis, dass das Japanische zum ural-altaischen Stamme gehört"). A. Boller, following the ideas of G. Steinthal and V.Gumbaltda, pays special attention to the ratio of formal parameters, assuming that the unity of the material elements that embody similar linguistic representation, speaks of unity and languages. "Those languages that represent similar phenomena with a same sound complex, express relations on the basis of a single view of the phenomenon, and using the identical exponent should be considered as a same with their formation, and the match of shapes can be seen as development of the once unified form."

There is another opinion, which states that Altaic languages are kindred languages, but the current state (or more ancient state) was the result of such a "special and irregular" evolution and their relationship cannot be proven according to known models of Indo-European languages. If Altaic languages are kindred languages then their relationship can be proved only by irregular way, like an irregular development of these languages. ("Soviet Turkology". Baku, № 5. 1971 S. 130).

Now, we are turning to a comprehensive study, which we have stipulated above. In this regard, we have basic research scientists, which prove the validity of such studies.

The problem of origin of the Altaic language family peoples should be considered based on the existing data of archaeological science. In other words, not on lingvo- and ethno genesis, but on the basics of cultural genesis, which, however, cannot be separated from historical processes of this kind. Independence of archaeological materials from linguistic and written sources is well known. However, the peculiarity of our sources falls for the task of reasonably relating of scientific archeology and Altaistic and this task has been set for the first time in our days (Kzlasov 2008: 88-101).

Archaeology states, for example, that ancient culture, which corresponds to the Proto-Uralic language, came to the Ural Mountains from the South, perhaps from the area of the Aral Sea. This provision was confirmed by observations of pre-Ural dictionary. For example, the pre-Ural name of elk "teve" originates from ancient name of camel (preserved in Turkic: tebe "camel") ... The language of ancient peoples of Altai has a lot of words from the languages of the Eastern and Northern parts of the Near East: from Elamite (kick "sky" gives Turkish kek "sky"), from Sumerian (dingir "God" gives Turkic tengiri, tengri "God", "sky", the Mongolian tengri "sky"), etc. This fact, together with many others, for example, with the data anthropological analysis of the skulls of the ancient inhabitants of Southern Siberia and Western Mongolia which turned out to be Europeans - aliens from the West, makes believe that the carriers of Altaic languages lived not far from the Near East, namely in Central Asia at some time in antiquity.

Archeology stands on the side of those linguists who capture in the closeness of languages the processes of old and prolonged influence of initially diverse cultures, which eventually led to the addition of "specific Turkic-Mongolian language community of contact type" that has nothing to do with genetic relationships in its content (Sherbak 1994:157).

Attempt to reconstruct pre-Altaiic language will not succeed, since this macro family proved only typological affinity, for instance as we have said earlier that Mongolian language typology is much closer to the Tungus-Manchurian and Tungus languages adjacent Korean, more rigorous studies show that Turkic languages in this system are very distinct. From a genetic point of view, Turks possess a noticeable Eastern Iranian component, as well as the Hungarians.

The possibility of lexical borrowings between Turkic and Mongolian languages is considered very often, first, as a possibility of interpreting the general Turkic-Mongolian lexical fund as borrowed from Turkic languages to Mongolian. At this, the problem of contacts between Turkic languages and Indo-European is "enabled", since from the assumptions concerning the borrowing a number of Turkic words in ancient Indo-European languages, in particular, of the Tocharian, logically follows their exclusion from the common Altaiic comparisons as well as the decision that their Mongolian parallels present early borrowings of Tocharians from Turkic (Sunik 1976:3).

It is noticeable even with an unaided eye that all three language groups: Mongolian - Tungus-Manchurian - Korean lie in the same geographical location and migration dynamics within this zone was not as strong compared to the Turkic languages.

Originally, Finnish scientist Tabbert Strallenberg founded the Altaistic on the base of a comparative study of the Mongolian language. Then the system of studying of Altaiic languages was sufficiently developed, and the method of studying of the Indo-European languages was picked up.

A bright opponent of the Altaiic Linguistics G. Doerfer rejects the methods used by Altaiicists, stating that these methods developed by the "thrice holy Indo-European", in fact do not apply to the study of the Altai language community (Doerfer 1973:3).

Now, we are turning to a comprehensive study, which we have stipulated above. In this regard, we have basic research scientists, which prove the validity of such studies.

The problem of origin of the Altaiic language family peoples should be considered based on the existing data of archaeological science. In other words, not on lingvo- and ethno genesis, but on the basics of cultural genesis, which, however, cannot be separated from historical processes of this kind. Independence of archaeological materials from linguistic and written sources is well known. However, the peculiarity of our sources falls for the task of reasonably relating of scientific archeology and

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

Altaistic and this task has been set for the first time in our days (Kzlasov 2008:88-101).

Genetic memory of ethnicity able to remember and keep only the events of near future. Archaeology clarifies the gaps of history, clarifies the relative chronological dates, fixes common cultures and origins, respectively clarifies the chronological date, and fixes common origins and cultures of origin. However, without linguistics it presents only silent witnesses of past eras. Language of people is immortal vowel source of historical information, but it is flexible as any antiquity, influenced by time. Ethnic contacts, change in religions, rituals, and e.g. can be seen on it as all layers can be seen on a geological cut of the Earth.

The question is what the primordial layer is and which serves as a layer, and by what laws the main core was formed.

Archaeology states, for example, that ancient culture, which corresponds to the Proto-Uralic language, came to the Ural Mountains from the South, perhaps from the area of the Aral Sea. This provision was confirmed by observations of pre-Ural dictionary. For example, the pre-Ural name of elk "teve" originates from ancient name of camel (preserved in Turkic: tebe "camel") ... The language of ancient peoples of Altai has a lot of words from the languages of the Eastern and Northern parts of the Near East: from Elamite (kick "sky" gives Turkish kek "sky"), from Sumerian (dingir "God" gives Turkic tengiri, tengri "God", "sky", the Mongolian tengri "sky"), etc. This fact, together with many others, for example, with the data anthropological analysis of the skulls of the ancient inhabitants of Southern Siberia and Western Mongolia which turned out to be Europeans - aliens from the West, makes believe that the carriers of Altaic languages lived not far from the Near East, namely in Central Asia at some time in antiquity.

Archeology stands on the side of those linguists who capture in the closeness of languages the processes of old and prolonged influence of initially diverse cultures, which eventually led to the addition of "specific Turkic-Mongolian language community of contact type" that has nothing to do with genetic relationships in its content (Sherbak 1994:157).

The proponents of Nostratic hypothesis also believe concerning the biological relationship of Altai macro family peoples that the ancient European Turks (creators of Afanasiev and Andronov cultures) in the Neolithic period moved to the steppes of southern Siberia and Mongolia from historical homeland in the territory of Frontier Asia.

Currently ongoing research in stages of gene pool formation of Turkic peoples of Altai and Tien Shan shows that the population of different regions of Eurasia formed this. It is based on an ancient West Eurasian (paleo-European) substrate marked by R1a1a haplogroup. Ancient north-Eurasian component (N1b, N1c1, Q) goes back to the indigenous population of Western Siberia and the Urals. Later stages of gene pool formation associated with gradual penetration of the Eastern Eurasian (Mongoloid)

component labeled by C haplogroup. The link with other regions of Eurasia is very slight: with Eastern Europe on haplogroups of R1b1b2, and I with Tibet on haplogroup D2, with East Asia on haplogroup A.

Geographical trends in variability of gene pools shows that distribution of Eastern Eurasian component in the study population is geographically uneven, it is significant in populations of southern foothills of the Altai Kazakhs, Kyrgyz and southern Altai, but almost does not reach the northern Altai, Khakas and Shor. The frequency of "Siberian" haplogroups (N1b, Q) is reducing from North to South and an overall diversity of haplogroups spectrum is increasing. Geographically peripheral Kirghiz occupy in genetic space an intermediate position between the two main clusters - "Altai-Sayan" and "steppe", reflecting the original ethno genetic connection with Kyrgyz Southern Siberian tribes and the subsequent influence of steppe peoples.

Indicators of inter population diversity is brightly shown. The differences between "small nationalities" (Kumandins and et al.) confirm both their genetic reality and conventionality of their traditional association in ethno-territorial groups on a geographical basis (the "northern Altai", "southern Altai").

Phylogenetic analysis reveals a number of haplogroups clusters STR haplotypes relevant to certain ethnics and their groups. R1a1a haplogroup outlines specific clusters of northern and southern Altaics. Separation in N1c1 haplogroup can be done only by the level of the "European" and "southern Siberian" clusters. N1b haplogroup also characterized by a clear distinction between "European" and "Asian" clusters. Genetic dating of the detected clusters specify peculiarities in ethno genesis of the peoples studied and point out the important role of genetic drift (founder effect) in formation of their gene pools.

Genetics confirmed the frontier Asian origin of pre-Turks. European haplogroup R1a1 also have been found in almost all modern Turkic peoples: Coton (Mongol language Uighurs) – 82.0%, Kirgiz - 63.0%, Shorts-58.8%, Altayts- 53.0%, Tatars- 34.1%, Chuvash-31.6%, Uzbek-30.0%, Uygur- 28.6%, Khakas - 28.3%, Karachay - 27.54% Bashkir- 26, 3%, Balkars - 25.74%, Azeri - 19.0%, Karakalpak-18.2%, Tuvinian - 14, 0%, Kумыk-13.2%, Gagauz - 12.5%, Meskhetian - 6.9% ,Turkmens - 6.7%, Kazakhs - 4.0%, Yakuts - 3.2%.

Moreover genetics have revealed that the "East Asian" haplogroup (N, O, C), which are peculiar to mongoloid peoples, were not found in the "Western" Turkic peoples (Azeri, Turks, Turkmens, Gagauz, Karachai, Balkars, Kумыks). (Gumbatov 2014).

From the foregoing, it should be noted that this article serves only as an introductory part for the following complex studies, and this material marks nodal directions, and here one can involve some other complex sciences as we as can develop general method for studying of Altaic, which is independent of the Indo-European linguistics, based on common methodology of linguistics, archeology, history and biological anthropology

CONCLUSION

The question on origin of the Altaic linguistic community remains open for supporters of the Altai comparative linguistics, who did much for its development. Although the Altaic theory (the theory of genetic relationship of the Altaic languages) was not only rejected, but also recognized as a very useful, and deserving every attention and further development theory, since it seems "very likely" and it is widely used by supporters of the Altaistic in their research work.

Scientists also recognize the difficulties associated with final and perfect solution of the problem of origin of the Altai community. The most important issue according to their opinion is a difficulty in differentiation of elements of a possible genetic commonality, the traces of which can be found in all Altaic languages, from the secondary elements of community, developing in different periods of close contacts of various Altaic peoples for at least of two millennia period. Mutual lexical borrowings of not only from single Altaic languages, but also borrowings from non-Altaic languages (the phenomenon of the substrate or super stratum) led to a significant lexical generality of secondary order and gave the reasons for establishment of various kinds of correspondences not relating to common Altaic protolanguage heritage that creates a large difficult to apply comparative-historical method. "There is no doubt - wrote L. Ligeti - that in our comparative historical studies in the field of Altaic we should rely only on the linguistic material, which in some languages can be seen as a direct continuation of the basic Altaic language".

The opponents of the Altaic theory and Altaistic as a whole, give completely different estimations to this branch of science on language. Here we would like to consider some principal objections to the Altaistic of comparatists G. Dërfer, one of the most persistent, though not wholly consistent opponent of Altai theory, not stopping in objections of linguists, who poorly versed in comparative linguistics, or simply do not believe in the relationship of various Altaic languages that are little known to them and, in particular, that is why finding Altaic as unnecessary burden, both for themselves and for those who is engaged on studying it.

G. Dërfer, who repeatedly declares, without any convincing arguments, conclusions (or assumptions) that genetic relationship between certain groups of the Altaic languages is absolutely untenable, and that the so-called "old Altaic" is not only useless, but harmful (destructive), in one of his articles devoted to methodology of comparative phonetics of the Turkic languages and presenting essentially a review for "The comparative phonetics of Turkic languages" by A.M. Sherbak (who is also one of the opponents of "Altaic hypothesis in linguistics"), once again proposed to abandon the methods used by Altaists, finding that these methods developed by Indo-European, in fact do not apply to the study of the Altai language community.

G. Dërfer praised the courage of the author of "Comparative Phonetics of Turkic Languages", which left, according to the reviewer, "overused and dead-end path of the old Altaic", but at the same time said that the "new way" chosen by A.M

Shcherbak, is also "largely false," for that "It is impossible to reconstruct Proto-Turkic language through only modern Turkic languages." Linguistic parallels are not complete without involvement of complex materials, such as ethnographic, archaeological, historical, that trace the intersection of cultures of Altai peoples, as well as general parallels that are stored not only in the rudiments of language, but also exist in general archaic cultural layers.

Ethnography science has the examples of studies in changes of ethnic culture and ethno-cultural contacts based on the analysis of various sources: archaeological, folklore, arts and crafts and folk knowledge, material culture and economy. Domestic and foreign researchers have not studied the specific problem of research in a complex of beliefs and rituals, besides language parallels of Altai macro system within ethno-cultural interaction. Meanwhile, the history of humankind is the history of contact of people, which differs by its culture (Bromley, 1981, p. 129). Therefore, the studies of the culture will always be relevant.

The shape of the archaic worldview, some aspects of which recorded in the culture of the Altai macro system, has still not been fully investigated.

The peoples of Altai macro system have absorbed many elements of another ethnic culture and they have passed a certain historical stage since the second half of the XIX century to present day that requires rethinking. In recent years, some borrowed forms, especially those associated with the socialist rituals, quickly disappeared from the culture. It is necessary to compare the original and borrowed cultural elements and show autochthonous and universal aspects of spiritual culture. Currently, indigenous peoples are undergoing complex social changes and this requires exploration and presentation of current state of cultural institutions as well. The transformation of complex of beliefs and rituals is associated with a gradual but irreversible change of the whole way of life, change of generations, natural disappearance of culture-bearers and with the processes of ethno-cultural interaction and other ethnic influences, specific to the ethnic history of indigenous peoples. Global changes of our time, the collapse of a multi-ethnic Soviet state, a surge of ethnic problems, exacerbation of ethnic identity, changes in outlook and ritual culture, transformation of cultural forms require fixation and comprehension. It is necessary to examine the process of searching by the indigenous peoples of new social and personal values, forms beliefs, cults and festivals.

In addition, the project examines genetic and biometric data of the Altai macro system representatives.

The classical research in anthropology, archeology, linguistics and ethnography, which made important contributions to the study of history and diversity of peoples of the world in the twentieth century, have been enriched with new historical source - population genetic studies.

After having analyzed the obtained estimates of scientists on the level of genetic diversity (heterogeneity) at different levels of hierarchical organization of the Turkic-

DIVERGENCE OF ALTAI MACRO SYSTEM LANGUAGES AND ISSUES OF THEIR GENETIC
RELATIONSHIP

speaking populations of the Sayan-Altai Mountains and Central Asia, we have looked through high inter-population differences between small peoples of Southern Siberia.

The scientists, based on a comparative analysis of the haplogroups Y chromosome through the methods of multivariate statistics and cartographic analysis, have revealed the gene pools conditions of indigenous peoples of the Altai and the Tien Shan among regional gene pools and a dual effect of the mountain systems under investigation on the structure of gene pool in the role of not only as a "barrier" for intensive gene flow as well as a "refugium", i.e. conservative "relic", which retains traces of ancient population over the ages.

A number of clusters of haplotypes that are specific to individual nations and for related ethnic groups have been found for the first time ever thanks to the analysis of a large amount of data by the scientists based on a single large panel of STR markers. Genetic dating of these clusters allowed specifying key moments in ethno genesis of a number of peoples of the region under study.

A DNA collection, accompanied by detailed information on the ancestry of an individual, his ethnic and geographical identification, lay the foundation for the large-scale studies based on other genetic systems, including genome-wide analysis.

The database on distribution of 17 STR marker panels of Y chromosome (a set of Y-filer), which is used in forensic analysis, can be applied in forensic-medical examination as a reference base for identification and definition of areas of potential origin of unknown haplotypes of the Y chromosome.

Identification of a powerful effect of a founder for a number of nations is a forecast of increased frequency of hereditary diseases caused by the accumulation of mutant alleles of the founder, and it justifies the need for a focused medical genetic screening and counseling for these populations.

The total information obtained about the structure of gene pool of the peoples under investigation, the database and cartographic atlas ensure the implementation of genetic and demographic monitoring, including prediction of changes in the gene pool because of the ongoing mass migration and intermarriage.

The obtained results are important for understanding the formation of indigenous peoples of Northern Eurasia, the issues of original settlement of America and ethno genesis of the peoples of Russia. They will be useful for specialists in related fields of science: anthropologists, archaeologists, linguists, historians, ethnographers in reconstruction of a complete history of the population of Eurasia. The work results will be widely used in educational and pedagogical processes.

Moreover, received new information about the ethno genesis of Turkic peoples is important for most of the indigenous population of region under investigation, in a situation of increasing ethnic identity, strengthening and development of national culture, language, the growing interest in history of own people. Many peoples of the Altai-Sayan region have the status "of Indigenous Peoples" (Resolution of the

Government of the Russian Federation on March 24, 2000. №255 “On the single list of Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation”), and the results of thesis will be used for the preservation of the cultural heritage of Russia.

Physical features of local inhabitants 4 thousand years ago had a mezocranial shape of skull (cranial index, 77.8), low (69.9 mm), but a broad face (138.1 mm), strongly profiled in a horizontal plane (nazomalar angle - 138,00, zigo-maxillary angle-127.00), sharply protruding nasal bones (the angle of the nasal bones, 31.10), fang recessed pits and other indicators of the cranium and facial part of skull which have a high taxonomic significance. These figures indicate that ancestral forms of population in ancient Kazakh land in anthropological terms had only a single European foundation, on which physical traits and gene pool of modern Kazakh population gradually formed over four millennia.

Thus, without the use of an interdisciplinary approach to the complex periodization of such a long, complex and unique history of the peoples of a single macro system, any mechanical breakdown of the chronology and differentiation of historical development into separate periods will remain one-sided, subjective and not promising for the knowledge of their own history by future generations.

References:

- KOTWICZ, W. (1953). *Studia nad Językami Altajskimi*, Krakow.
- POPPE, N. (1972). “A new symposium on the altaic theory”, *Central Asiatic Journal*, XVI, 1: 43.
- SVODESH, M. (1951). “Diffusional Cumulation and Archaic Residue as Historical Explanations”. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. Vol. 7, No. 1: 1–21.
- ГУМБАТОВ, Г. (2014). “Генетика против алтайской теории”. © Copyright: Гахарман Гумбатов, Свидетельство о публикации №214041501939.
- ДЁРФЕР, Г. (1972). “Можно ли проблему родства алтайских языков разрешить с позиций индоевропеистики?”, *Вопросы языкознания*, N 1, Москва: 89 -97.
- ДЫБО, А.В. (2007). “Лингвистические контакты ранних тюрков. Лексический фонд. Пратюркский период”. Москва, <http://altaica.ru/Articles/sunik.pdf>
- КЗЫЛАСОВ И, Л. (2008). “Новые поиски в алтаистике. I. Разработки лингвистов-тюркологов”. *Изучение историко-культурного наследия народов Южной Сибири*, Сборник №7. Горно-Алтайск: 88-98.
- КОТВИЧ, В. (1962). *Исследование по алтайским языкам*. Москва.
- СТАРОСТИН С. А (1991). *Алтайская проблема и происхождение японского языка*. Москва: Наука.
- СУНИК О. П. (1976). “К актуальным проблемам алтаистики”. *Вопросы языкознания*. №1: 16-31.
- ЩЕРБАК, А. М. (1994). *Введение в сравнительное изучение тюркских языков*. СПб.: Наука.