

LINGUISTICS

KISAMOV, Norm

Türkic Substrate in English

Turkism (or Turkizm) is a word in any language that comes from Türkic languages, directly or indirectly. The adjective Turkic/Türkic applies to the whole linguistic family, not to an individual language. The complementary terms Türkic and Türk are used as collective designations.

A concept was formulated and substantiated that the non-Indo-European substrate of the Germanic branch was rooted in the Türkic (Proto-Türkic) linguistic field. Archeological and genetic works demonstrated migrations, amalgamations, and replacement of populations in the Western Europe, where the Germanic branch of the Indo-European (IE) languages occupies a prominent place. Linguistic works demonstrated that Germanic branch contains a substantial layer of non-Indo-European substrate. The English language is a prominent member of the Germanic branch. The sources of the Germanic substrate remain debatable, with numerous candidates explored and rejected. Archeology and genetic provided insights, and their converging contention is that until the middle of the 1st millennium BC, the Türkic (Proto-Türkic) linguistic field dominated the whole Eurasia reaching the Atlantic Ocean on one end and Pacific Ocean on another end. The groundwork for the linguistic concept has already been established, the concept is a necessary corollary of the positively proved migratory flows. The concept explores the Türkic-English morphological and lexical correspondences, and finds substantial traces of the Türkic substrate in English, potentially exceeding 30% of the English words used in the daily life. Of the English suffixes, 63% descend from the Türkic origin and remain morphologically active in forming English words. The concept touches on the substantial trace of the Türkic-Latin-English correspondences, linguistically corroborating the thesis that the Kurgans' circum-Mediterranean path via the Pyrenees to the Continental Europe brought about the Beaker Culture, ancestral to the Pra-Celts and Pra-Italics.

The Türkic substrate concept is based on the accumulated knowledge on the movement of the Kurgan people in the pre-historical and historical times, it is consistent with the findings of the archeology, genetics, and historical records. Moreover, it corroborates their findings, adding linguistic aspect to the body of the multi-discipline evidence. The linguistic survey, on the example of the English and Latin languages, provides a salient amount of linguistic evidence in their favor. The substrate-derived English lexis is consistent with the migrations outlined by the archeology and genetics, it carries the marks of the migrations, and in some cases allows to draw suggestions about location and time of their earlier presence. Within the framework of the "Indo-European homeland", such cases allow to corroborate postulations of the "Circumpontic" hypothesis (Merpert, 1974, 1976) and "Kurgan theory" (Gimbutas, 1964, 1974, 1977, 1980) about the importance of the Eastern Europe in the evolution of the Indo-European languages, with evolutionary perspective on the migratory processes that had the Eastern Europe as one of the staging stations on the way from Asia to the Atlantic. The horse was domesticated in the Northern Kazakhstan, the wave that brought domesticated horse to the Eastern Europe created conditions underlying the Gimbutas' "Kurgan theory" and the "Anatolian" (or Neolithic Gap") theory

(Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, 1980, Renfrew, 1987, Safronov, 1989, Gray and Atkinson, 2003) as specific episodes of the parallel paths from the Eastern Europe, the overland path to the Central Europe, and circum-Mediterranean path traversing Anatolia to reach the Balkans and Iberia

At their core, the leading hypotheses on the substrate of the English language, and by extension of the Germanic languages as a group, turned out to lead nowhere. They were not able to demonstrate continuity in the morphological and lexical aspects, they were not able to attest continuity in the phonological aspect, and they were not able to present instances where the English and suggested substrate language use the same word in the same grammatical function and the same semantics. The concept of the Türkic substrate does all of the above. In addition, it supports the existence of genetic connection between the Futhark alphabet and the Türkic alphabets, although its mechanism is yet to be analyzed, it demonstrates the common Türkic origin of the Latin and English linguistic building blocks, and it reflects the known development of the English language.

Morphologically, the review of the modern English suffixes demonstrated a trend consistent with the known development of the English language, from the Old English to the Modern English that proportion had fell from 69% to 63% of the suffixes inherited from the Türkic substrate; it confirms that the Modern English is a product of perpetual creolization, pidginization, and blending of linguistically incompatible mother languages, which in turn were products of perpetual creolization, pidginization, and blending. The loss of the substrate morphological structure is expressed in the reduction and contraction of the morphological elements, and in concomitant increase in the number of lexemes required to fill in the semantical void created by the morphological contraction.

The review of the word usage frequency in modern English demonstrated that about 1/3 of the passage spoken or written in modern English ascends to the Türkic substrate; counting the Türkic-derived morphological units in the same text would quite significantly boost that rough estimate.

The review of the modern English lexical units versus the Latin and the Türkic demonstrated that the Türkic substrate is present in both the Latin and English, while the phonetic differences point to separate and independent paths leading to the Latin and English. The Latin cultural influence brought over for absorption or reawakened Turkisms of the English substrate, adding to the body of active Turkisms in the modern English. Numerous Turkisms in English are attributed to the Latin borrowings from the Germanic languages. their origin is usually denoted as Late Latin. The Norman cultural influence brought over some Turkisms that entered French In English, the Latin Turkisms conflated and superimposed on the English Turkisms, in the end producing modern English words with roots in Old English, Latin, Latin via French, and ultimately in Türkic.

The unabridged version, including photos and tables is published as a supplement to this issue. — Ed.

