World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Vol:6, No:11, 2012

Turkic - Indian Lexical Parallels in the Framework of the Nostratic Language's Macrofamily

Z. E. Iskakova, B. S. Bokuleva, B. N. Zhubatova, and U. T. Alzhanbayeva

***Abstract*—**From ancient times Turkic languages have been in contact with numerous representatives of different language families. The article discusses the Turkic - Indian language contact and were shown promise and necessity of this trend for the Turkic linguistics, were given Turkic - Indian lexical parallels in the framework of the nostratic language's macro family.

The research work has done on the base of lexical parallels (LP) - of Turkic (which belong to the Altaic family of languages) and Indian (including Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages).

***Keywords*—**Language communications, lexical parallels, Nostratic languages, Turkic languages.

Open Science Index, Humanities and Social Sciences Vol:6, No:11, 2012 publications.waset.org/4062/pdf

I. Introduction

NOSTRATIC languages belong to the macrofamily which joins Afro-Asian, Indoeuropean, Kartvel and Ural languages. The first statement on the relationship of the family of languages, but not couple of them, namely the Ural-Altaic, Indoeuropean and Afro-Asian was formulated by H. Pederson [1]. It was him who proposed the term "Nostratic languages" in 1903 (from Latin "noster" – "our").

Summarization of the material and reconstruction of the Nostratic ancestor language was carried out by V. M. Illich - Svitych [2]. According to his theory Nostratic languages are subdivided on Eastern-Nostratic (Ural, Dravidian, Altaic) and Western–Nostratic (Afro-Asian, Indo-European and Kartvel). The brunch division is connected with the fate of common Nostratic vocalism in languages descendants: Eastern - Nostratic languages preserved stable primary root vocalism; Western ones developed the system of vocalic interchange - ablaut [3].

The targets of our investigation are common words the so called lexical parallels (LP) of Turkic (which belong to the Altaic family of languages) and Indian (including Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages). As soon as the Altaic family of languages (which also includes modern Turkic languages) has been widely investigated in home linguistics we are going to pay special attention to the second source of our parallels to Indian languages.

Z.E.Iskakova is with the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 480078, Kazakhstan as senior lecturer of Department Turkology and Indology (GSM: +7 7778011308; e-mail: zaure_india@mail.ru).

B. S. Bokuleva is with the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 480078, Kazakhstan (GSM: +7 7071308181; e-mail: aknazar0909@mail.ru)

B. N. Zhubatova, Prof. Dr., is with the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 480078, Kazakhstan as Dean of Department of Oriental Studies (GSM: +7 7051301081; e-mail: bjubatova@mail.ru).

U. T. Alzhanbayeva, Prof. Dr., is with the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 480078, Kazakhstan (GSM: +7727 2438342; e-mail: ulbala_77@mail.ru).

II. Discussion

The ancient period of the Indian language's development is represented by the Veda language (the language of cult and cult literature "Veda" which tentatively functioned since XII century B.C) and Sanskrit in some epic variants (widely spread since the first millennium B.C. in Northern India. Sanskrit was early recognized as a literary prestigious language (they call it "divine"), it was characterized by strictly regulated and unified grammar system. The word Sanskrit ("Sam-skrita") means "constructed, drawn up", i.e. perfectly improved in form. Many religious, philosophical and legal texts were written in Sanskrit. Belles-lettres books were especially developed. In India Sanskrit is used as a language of humanitarian sciences and cult. In the narrow circle of scientists and Brahmans. Sanskrit is used as a colloquial language. The discovery and study of Sanskrit gave birth to the comparative and historical linguistics (the end of XVIII century) [4].

Lexically Sanskrit is based on languages of three families: 1) dominating Indo-Aryan which identifies the typology of Sanskrit as an ancient Indian language; 2) Dravidian (in the sphere of lexica and partially in syntactic constructions); 3) Australasian (in separate ancient lexical borrowings). While investigating Sanskrit in cultural description A.S. Barkhudarov states: "The Dravidian (in general) component of the Sanskrit lexica is represented by naturalized borrowings from the Dravidian languages (Middle Indo-Aryan language period and, in some rare cases, even from the, New Indian language period). All Proto-Dravidians borrowings of the Ancient Indo-Arian period, which transfer to Sanskrit in the process of its establishment, also etymologically belong to the Dravidian component [5]. As far as we are concerned about Turkic-Indian LP, mainly represented in Turkic-Sanskrit - Dravidian LP, we shall pay special attention to the Dravidian languages. Dravidian languages [6] - are the family of languages used in the territory of South Asian (Indian) 'subcontinent. _That are mainly spread in India, especially' in Southern states, and also in Pakistan, South Afghanistan,

Open Science Index, Humanities and Social Sciences Vol:6, No:11, 2012 publications.waset.org/4062/pdf

Eastern Iran (the language of Brahui), partially in Sri Lanka, some countries of South-Eastern Asia, in the islands of Indian and oceans and in South Africa. M.S.Andronov [7] subdivides Dravidian languages on 7 groups, the main languages are Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, Telugu, Munda, Tulu (those are written languages, spoken by the absolute majority of the population of the Dravidian language region). Ethnic genesis of Dravidians, their primary migrations, historical development of some Dravidian languages and their groups have not been thoroughly' investigated. Majority of scholars recognize the existence of Proto-Dravidian language system, which destruction, according to the data of glottochronology (M.S.Andronov) started in IV c. B.C. They suppose that the migration of Dravidians to the, territory' of the Indian subcontinent took place earlier than the migration of other Indian language bearers (Indo-Arian in particular). M.F.Albaum in his book "Proto-Indian Civilization" says: "The South of India became the final destination of the historical migration of' Dravidians, or to be more precise Dravidian speaking peoples. The earliest available appearance of Dravidians in the territory of Hindustan is associated with the Proto-Indian civilization. Hind and Five Rivers basins in prehistoric times could be' the hearth of the big Dravidian speaking peoples unity, which gradually includes different ethnic elements" [8]. There are two known historic events of Dravidians existence before our era: one, more distinct point occurred when at the border of our era Dravidians inhabited the south of India and the second, less obvious, when they lived in the South-West of Hindustan in III-II millennium B.C. [9]. So the issues of Dravidians' genesis, of their supposed ancestor motherland and their departure from it, possible contacts (genetic relationship?), including language, ties with our peoples are still under continuous discussion between scholars. According to the latest hypothesis Dravidians, or to be more precise Proto-Dravidians came to the Indian subcontinent from the West or North-West [10]. M. S. Andronov assumes that "among other hypothesis the most attractive theory is based on the vast linguistic material which states some connections or even far kinship between Dravidian languages on the one hand and Ugric-Finnish on the other one" [11]. K. M. Musaev supports this idea saying that "if Finnish-Ugric languages had connections with the Dravidians, then it was carried out through Turkic (Altaic) languages taking into account the territorial location of those languages since ancient times to the present" [12]. Further on K. M. Musaev states: "We can make a hypothesis that Dravidian languages, which tracks are still preserved in the territory of Afghanistan, and Turkic languages or to be more exact their ancestors had direct contacts, or possibly common basis, not later than 4000 years ago, i.e. not later than II millennium B.C. Thus 3500 years ago before the invasion of Indo-Arians bearers of Turkic and Dravidian languages lived in close neighborhood, which had been destroyed by the inflow of Indo-Arians, who had broken those ties. Possibly contacts took place in the territory of Central Asia, Ural - Trans-Volga and the Caucasus" [13]. Observations prove that several Indian roots correspond to the live basis of, modern Turkic languages. That is a reflection of ancient contacts (in the framework of the Nostratic theory - genetic kinship) between Indian and Turkic languages. Genetic relations of Nostratic languages (in particular Turkic, Dravidian and Indo-Arian) prove the existence of the big corpus of related (genetically similar) morphemes both roots and affixes (about 1000). The corpus of root morphemes includes roots of the basic vocabulary and covers main elementary notions (parts of a body, blood ties, main natural events, names of animals and plants, space relations, elementary actions and processes, basic characteristics. Ancestor languages which gave birth to 6 families (including Turkic, Dravidian and Indo-Arian) joined by the Nostratic macro-family, reveal genetic similarity of the most stable parts of the grammar morphemes system (including derivational and word-changing). First of all it refers to the system of demonstrative, interrogative and personal pronouns (and also affixes of conjugation which originate from them). The significant numbers of primary derivational affixes are also genetically common. Due to the Nostratic theory of genetic relationship of languages Turkic-Sanskrit-Dravidian LP attract great attention. Some parallels are provided in the books of the mentioned above authors. For example [14]: skr. anala 'fire', tam. anal 'fire', mal. anal 'fire, heat', kan. analu 'hot', turk. alaw 'heat, fire'. Skr. katu 'sharp, harsh, caustic'; katu 'strict, hard', mal. katu 'extreme, swift, furious'; kan,. tel., tulu kadu 'strict, tense'; turk. qattu 'firm, hard, sharp'. Skr. kala 'black'; tam. kar 'black'; turk. qara 'black' (in Dravidian languages rotacisms which is typical for Turkic languages is preserved, lambdacisms is more typical for Sanskrit).

Skr. kuta 'pot'; tam., mal. kutam; kan. koda - the same; turk. qutu, quty 'pot, can, box'.

Some words of Proto-Dravidian origin, which have Turkic analogues, are recognized in Rig-Veda itself (collection of songs and anthems, XY - XI c. B.C.). Those are Sanskrit words which later on became classical, such as bala 'strength, power'; kunda 'trough, well'; katu 'sharp" and others.

As we have already mentioned Sanskrit lexis is complicated, the total number of borrowings from Pre-Arian languages of India is big. Dravidian languages were one of sources of such borrowings. Taking it as a scientifically proved fact" and also due to the lack of Dravidian material (dictionaries and texts), in our work we investigate only Turkic - Sanskrit [15] LP (but not Turkic-Sanskrit-Dravidian which 'would be no doubt more illustrative and attractive).

Talking on Turkic-Indian LP K.M.Musaev says that "from the point of view of methodology it would be more reasonable to compare the Dravidian languages da'ta with the 'material of those Turkic languages' which had' been less influenced by Ural and Finn-Ural languages on the one hand and Indo - Arian and Iranian on the other hand. Those languages are first of all Kazakh, Karakalpak and Kyrgyz [16].

As soon as Kazakh is one of modern Turkic languages which is less moved away from the ancient ancestor state, we think it is possible in this article to represent Turkic

component of the provided LP by Kazakh only (our collected lexical material also comprises other Turkic languages including ancient Turkic).

According to the statement of K.M.Musaev says: "The comparative investigation of Dravidian and Turkic languages lexis on certain lexical-semantic groups is very important" [17].

The collected lexical material (about 800 words) we have divided on the following lexical-semantic groups.

TABLE I
LEXICAL-SEMANTIC GROUP

Sanskrit	Kazakh
1. Human being and related notions	
bhag 'happiness, well-being' baqyt 'happiness'	baq 'fate, luck'
bala 'youthful, young child'	bala 'child'
balika 'girl'	kyz bala 'girl'
ul bala 'boy'	
buyan 'beneficial action', 'merit'	bay 'rich'
gan 'singing', 'song', 'anthem'	an 'song' 'jety-gen', '7-string musical instrument'
lap' speak', 'whisper'	lep 'breath'
lapit 'chatter', 'noise'	lebiz 'word', 'opinion'
bal 'strength, power, might'	baluan 'strong'
durbal 'weak', 'strongless'	balbal tas 'stone monument
jasu 'exhaustion (of strength, soil)'	jasu 'to be exhausted, tired' jasuri 'weak, strongless, exhausted'.
2. Ethnonims, geographical terms, flora & fauna	
su 'press, squeeze'	su'water'
sartha 'rich, having', 'group, caravan'	sart 'name of a settlement in Central Asia, mainly merchants, traders
sthan 'staying, disposition', 'location, place	stan in the staff of ethnonims Kazakhstan, Kyrgystan and other
sthan-paty 'ruler of the land, territory' (exactly «father of the land»)	sva-sthan 'one's own place', 'house, dwelling', 'motherland'
tala 'plain, valley', 'surplice, flatness'	dala 'steppe, field, plain', 'sole of the foot'
asman'stone, rock', 'sky, cloud', 'lightning clap'	aspan 'sky'
masak 'moskito'	masa 'moskito'
3. Items of material culture	
tamra 'cupper, dark metal'	temir 'iron'
chatra 'tent, umbrella'	shatyr 'tent', kol shatyr 'umbrella'
di- 'light, shine'	dinar' golden coin'
din 'day'	Dinara 'name' tamga
(tagma)'medal, order'	'decoration, badge' tamga, tanba 'seal, mark'
un 'wool', 'small, partly, insignificant'	jun 'wool'
un 'flour'	untaq 'small, change'
4. Food	
madhu 'sweet, pleasant', 'charming',	bal 'honey', 'sweet beverage', 'honey, milk, nectar', 'spring, first spring month', madhukar 'bee' (ex. making honey)
dudha 'milk'	sut 'milk'
sura 'sura, intoxicating beverage', grain wine'	syra 'beer'
sur 'sun'	sur 'salty-dry', 'long keeping'
su-raksit 'well preserved'	sur boydak 'old bachelor' (in general, prefix su- has the meaning of
asan 'food, meal'	as 'food, meal', 'funeral repast'
as-navayanta 'hunger'	ash 'hungry'
as-naya 'hunger'	ash-tyk 'hunger'
5. Word, created by onomatopoeia	
ghuk 'owl'	uki 'owl, owl's beather' ullu 'owl, brown owl'
kag, kaga 'raven, crow'	karga 'crow'
taral 'shaky, shivering'	diril-deu 'shiver'
khas 'itch, mange'	kasy-nu 'mange' khasr-na 'scratch, to scratch one's body'
muk 'mute, silent'	mylkau 'mute, silent' maokya 'muteness, silence'
kok, kokil 'cuckoo'	kokek 'cuckoo'
bhek 'frog'	baka 'frog'

III. CONCLUSION

Summarizing the results of our preliminary investigation it IS appropriate to refer to A.Meyne statement: "One of the most rude and frequent mistakes is the belief that word of Sanskrit,' Greek, German or other languages, which were not borrowed from the languages we know, should be European, nobody directly proclaims this absurd principle, but to look for the Indo-European explanation for every and each word means to accept this principle" [18].

Comparative study of multiple Turkic-Sanskrit-Dravidian LP reveals ancient historic relations of Turkic languages, with the Indian ones. It would' not be fair to treat those parallels as a pure influence of Sanskrit on Turkic languages. Collected vast material on parallel lexical data on Turkic and Indian languages, to our mind, is a sufficient obvious illustration for the Nostratic theory of the genetic relationship of different world languages including Indian and Turkic.

*This article was written based on the research project of the Ministry of Education and Science of Kazakhstan "Turkic world and the Orient: the cultural and linguistic contacts (diachronic aspect)".

Open Science Index, Humanities and Social Sciences Vol:6, No:11, 2012 publications.waset.org/4062/pdf

REFERENCES

[1] Linguistically Encyclopedia (editor-in-chief V.N.Vartsev). V., 1990. P.339
[2] Illych-Svitych V. M. Materials for the Comparative Dictionary of Nostratic Languages (Indo-European, Altaic, Ural, Dravidian, Cartel, Semitic-Hermitic) //Etymology. 1965. M., 1967; the Experience of Nostratic Languages Comparison. Comparative Dictionary (vol. 1 - 3). M., 1997-1984.
[3] Ablaut (germ.) is a variant of vowels interchange, which is not phonetically stipulated and express (independently or with affixes) word 0 changing or derivational meaning. Linguistically Encyclopedia. M., 1990. P. 9.
[4] Baskakov N.A. Introduction to the Turkic Languages Study. M., 1962. Historical and Typological Study of Turkic Languages. M., 1974; Sevortyan E. V. Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. M., 1974-1990; Musaev K.M. Lexicology of Turkic Languages. M., 1984; Kaidarov A.T. The Structure of Monosyllabical Roots and Stems in Kazakh. Alma-Ata, 1986; Kazhybekov E. Z. Verbal and Nominal Correlation of Homogenious Roots and Stems in Turkic Languages (the notion of syncretism). Alma-Ata, 1986.
[5] Barkhudarov A.S. The Development of Indo-Arian Languages and Ancient Indian Cultural Tradition. M., 1988. P. 114.
[6] Zograf G.A. Languages of India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Nepal. M., 1961; Andronov M. S. Dravidian Languages. M., 1965. Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages. M., 1978; Burrow T. Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics. Annamalainagar, 1968 and others.
[7] Andronov M. S. Dravidian Languages. M., 1965. Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages. M., 1978.
[8] Andronov M. S. Mentioned work.
[9] Albaum M. F. Proto-Indian Civilization. Essays on Culture. M., 1994. P.
[10] Albaum M. F. Mentioned work.
[11] Andronov M. S. Dravidian Languages. M., 1965. P.99.
[12] Musaev K. M. Lexicology of Turkic Languages. M., 1984. P. 149.
[13] Musaev K. M. Mentioned work. P. 153.
[14] Burrow N. The Sanskrit Language. L. 1955; Musaev K. M. Lexicology of Turkic Languages. M., 1984. P. 149 and others.
[15] Sanskrit material is given from: Kochergina A.V. Sanskrit-Russian Dictionary (Appendix: Grammatical Essays on Sanskrit by Zaliznyak A.A.). V., 1978.
[16] Musaev K. M. Lexicology of Turkic Languages. M., 1984. P. 151.
[17] Musaev K. M. The same work.
[18] Meye A. Introduction for the Comparative Study of Indo-European Languages. M.-L., 1938. PP. 437-438
[19] Kumar B.B. Central Asia: The Indian Links // Dialogue. – 2002. Vol.3 №4.
[20] Nuri M.N. India and Central Asia: Past, Present and Future // Regional Studies. 1992-1993. – Vol. 11, №1.
[21] Foltz R.C. Mughal India and Central Asia: Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1998. – 220c.

Open Science Index, Humanities and Social Sciences Vol:6, No:11, 2012 publications.waset.org/4062/pdf