

Regularity and Obligatoriness in Sakha (Yakut): A Contrastive Analysis with Tyvan

EBATA, Fuyuki
Niigata University

This paper examines the differences in phonology and morphosyntax between the two cognate languages, Sakha and Tyvan. It is concluded that the two languages differ in a consistent way. First, Sakha exhibits high regularity in its (morpho-)phonological rules (the nasal alternation of suffix-initial consonants, the accent rule, and the vowel harmony rule), while Tyvan demonstrates some exceptions under the apparently same rules. In other words, the regularity in Sakha phonological rules is interpreted as “leveling.” Secondly, Sakha grammatical elements tend to be explicit or obligatory in such morphosyntactic properties as 3rd person plural subject marking, dative marking for goal NPs, use of the adverbializing suffix, accusative marking for direct objects, marking for coordinating noun phrases, and use of the existential predicate. It is likely that the regularity in Sakha phonology and the obligatoriness in Sakha morphosyntax were obtained through language contact with the neighboring Tungusic languages and subsequent koineization.

Keywords: Turkic, Sakha, Tyvan, descriptive linguistics, contrastive linguistics

1. Introduction
2. Contrastive analysis in phonology and morphophonology
3. Contrastive analysis in morphosyntax
4. Concluding remarks

1. Introduction

This paper makes a contrastive analysis of two Turkic languages, Sakha and Tyvan, in terms of phonology, morphology, and syntax.¹ According to Johanson (1998a) and Shogaito (2002), there are relatively slim differences between the Turkic languages and their basic language structures are similar. Both Sakha and Tyvan, the target languages of this paper, are classified into the North-East (or Siberian) group in the subclassification of

Fuyuki Ebata. 2019. “Regularity and obligatoriness in Sakha (Yakut): A contrastive analysis with Tyvan”. *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics* 13. pp.67–80. <https://doi.org/10.15026/92951>.

* This paper is based on the presentation read at the 153rd meeting of Linguistic Society of Japan (at Fukuoka University on Dec. 2016). The linguistic data of Sakha and Tyvan are collected from the corpus compiled by the author containing online newspaper articles and through my fieldworks, which are financially supported by MEXT Kakenhi (No. 26704004 and No. 17H04773). I am very thankful to Dr. Arzhaana Syuryun and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and corrections.

¹ Sakha, also known as Yakut, is a Turkic language spoken mainly in the Sakha Republic with approximately 450,000 speakers. Tyvan is also a Turkic language spoken mainly in the Tyva Republic with approximately 280,000 speakers.

the Turkic language family.² Consequently, they are expected to have a similar language structure. This paper, however, focuses on the difference between Sakha and Tyvan.

It is natural to point out the presence or absence of particular grammatical forms as differences between two languages in general. In fact, Sakha and Tyvan demonstrate such differences, with Sakha, for example, lacking the genitive case suffix that all other Turkic languages have, while Sakha newly obtains the present/future distinction in the imperative mood (Shogaito 2002: 16). This paper focuses not on such overt differences but on cases where the two languages use the same grammatical forms but demonstrate differences in their use. The contrastive analysis reveals that Sakha remarkably demonstrates the regularity in its (morpho-)phonology and obligatoriness in the marking of grammatical forms.

2. Contrastive analysis in phonology and morphophonology

This section provides a contrastive analysis of the phonology and morphophonology of Sakha and Tyvan. Although the two languages have seemingly similar rules in terms of suffix alternation, accent, and vowel harmony, only those of Sakha are totally regular and there is no or few exceptions to these rules.

2.1. Alternation of suffix-initial consonants

In both Sakha and Tyvan, suffixes in general have a number of allomorphs due to the vowel harmony rule and the alternation of the suffix-initial consonant. The alternation of the suffix-initial consonant can be predicted from the phonological conditions. Take the case of the Sakha plural suffix, for instance; the suffix has an initial /l/ after a vowel while /t/ appears after a voiceless consonant as in (1). Similar voiceless alternation is also found in Tyvan (2).

Sakha

(1) *börö-lör* ‘wolf-PL’ *taas-tar* ‘stone-PL’

Tyvan

(2) *börü-ler* ‘wolf-PL’ *daš-tar* ‘stone-PL’

The alternation rule of the two languages, however, differs in cases where a suffix follows a nasal consonant. In this condition, the suffix-initial of almost all the Sakha

² Both Sakha and Tyvan fall into the North-East group in Johanson’s (1998b) subclassification of Turkic languages. Benzing (1959) names this group “North Turkic.” On the other hand, Menges (1959) and Poppe (1965) consider the Sakha and Dolgan languages as a single subgroup. Nevertheless, it remains true that Sakha is relatively closer to Tyvan than to other Turkic members.

suffixes must be a nasal consonant (3).³ On the contrary, only some of the Tyvan suffixes are nasal-initial while the other suffixes have a non-nasal consonant in the suffix initial (4).

Sakha

(3)	<i>miin-ner</i>	<i>miin-neex</i>	<i>miiŋ-ŋe</i>	<i>xon-nu-m</i>
	soup-PL	soup-PROP	soup-DAT	spend.night-PST-1SG

Tyvan

(4)	<i>mün-ner</i>	<i>mün-nüg</i>	<i>mün-ge</i>	<i>xon-du-m</i>
	soup-PL	soup-PROP	soup-DAT	spend.night-PST-1SG

The situation of Sakha and Tyvan nasal/non-nasal alternation is summarized in Table 1. In Sakha, all the suffixes regularly undergo nasal alternation. In Tyvan, contrastively, not all the suffixes have a nasal allomorph and nasal alternation is partly conditioned by the position of articulation of suffix-initial consonants. All the labial-initial suffixes undergo nasal alternation; only some of the alveolar-initial suffixes have nasal alternation; and no velar-initial suffixes have nasal alternation.⁴

Table 1 Nasal alternation in Sakha and Tyvan

	Labial-initial	Alveolar-initial	Velar-initial
Sakha Nasal alternation	<i>xom-mot</i> spend.night-NEG.PTCP <i>ilim-mit</i> net-POSS.1PL	<i>miin-ner</i> soup-PL <i>xon-nu-m</i> spend.night-PST-1SG	<i>miiŋ-ŋe</i> soup-DAT <i>ilim-ŋit</i> net-POSS.2PL
Tyvan Nasal alternation	<i>xon-mas</i> spend.night-NEG.PTCP <i>öören-mišaan</i> learn-SML	<i>mün-ner</i> soup-PL <i>bežen-ne</i> fifty-VBLZ	—
Tyvan Non-nasal alternation	—	<i>saazin-da</i> paper-LOC <i>xon-du-m</i> spend.night-PST-1SG	<i>mün-ge</i> soup-DAT <i>xon-gan</i> spend.night-PTCP.PST

³ One of the relatively few exceptions is the ablative suffix *-(t)ten*. Geminate *-tten* appears after a vowel stem and *-ten* after a consonant stem (the /t/ is never assimilated even after a nasal stem as in *ayan-tan* ‘travel-ABL’). The other exceptions are the three non-productive suffixes with /č/ initial.

⁴ The labial-initial suffixes of Tyvan comprise the negative suffix *-be* (including several negative verb forms) and the simultaneous suffix *-bišaan*. Alveolar-initial suffixes with nasal alternation comprise the plural suffix *-ler*, the proprietive suffix *-lig*, and the verbalizing suffix *-le*. The rest of the alveolar-initial suffixes do not have nasal alternation, including the locative suffix *-de*, the ablative suffix *-den*, the directive suffix *-že*, the causative suffix *-dir*, and the conditional suffix *-ze*. Although the accusative suffix *-ni* and the genitive suffix *-niŋ* also have an initial nasal, neither demonstrate the nasal alternation; namely, /n/ appears even after a vowel, and therefore they are of the third type with an underlying initial-nasal.

2.2. Position of the accent

Turkic languages in general have a word-final accent system. In Sakha, this accent rule is applied exhaustively.⁵ In Tyvan, on the other hand, there are several types of deviation from the word-final accent rule. First, the negative suffix always bears the accent, and therefore no other suffixes can be accented after the negative.⁶ Secondly, the accent is always put on the syllable preceding the ablative suffix.⁷ The difference in accent of Sakha and Tyvan are shown in the following contrastive pairs of examples.

Sakha

- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| (5) <i>kel-lí-m</i> | ‘I has come.’ | <i>kel-be-tí-m</i> | ‘I has come.’ |
| come-PST-1SG | | come-NEG-PST-1SG | |
| <i>itii-ttén</i> | ‘from the hotness’ | <i>kuorat-tún</i> | ‘from the city’ |
| hot-ABL | | city-ABL | |

Tyvan

- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| (6) <i>kel-dí-m</i> | ‘I has come.’ | <i>kel-bé-di-m</i> | ‘I has come.’ |
| come-PST-1SG | | come-NEG-PST-1SG | |
| <i>izíg-den</i> | ‘from the hotness’ | <i>xooráy-dan</i> | ‘from the city’ |
| hot-ABL | | city-ABL | |

2.3. Vowel harmony rule

Both Sakha and Tyvan have the vowel harmony rule, which prohibits front and back vowels from cooccurring in a single word. However, they exhibit a difference in how strictly the vowel harmony rule applies.

One difference is found in the harmony between the stem and the suffix. Vowels in the suffixes of both languages must alter according to the vowels in the stem due to the vowel harmony rule. Sakha strictly applies this rule to all suffixes without exception.

Tyvan, on the other hand, has a few suffixes that are not (partially) affected by the vowel harmony rule. One such suffix is the directive suffix, which invariably includes a front vowel /e/ regardless of the stem vowels (note also that the suffix-initial consonant undergoes voiceless alternation). Another example is the simultaneous suffix, the first

⁵ Very few words, which historically originated in a combination of two words, have a non word-final accent, for example *uónna* ‘and’ (< *ol* ‘that’ + *kenne* ‘after’; see Ubrjatova et al. (1982: 53) for detail). However, speakers often place the accent on the word-final of these words in present-day colloquial speech.

⁶ The negative suffix affects the position of the accent in other Turkic languages. The Khakas negative always bears the accent, similar to the Tyvan case (Anderson 1998: 5). In Turkish, Turkmen, and Tatar, the preceding syllable of the negative suffix bears the accent (Lewis 2000: 21, Clark 1998: 45, and Poppe 1968: 14).

⁷ In addition, the two Tyvan directive suffixes *-že* and *-diva* are never accented (Sakha does not have a corresponding case suffix). In Tyvan, the simultaneous suffix *-bišaan* and the limitative suffix *-giže* have their accent on the penultimate syllable.

vowel of which alters due to vowel harmony while the following vowel always remains a back long vowel /aa/.⁸

Tyvan

- | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| (7) <i>erik-če</i> | ‘to the bank’ | <i>baški-že</i> | ‘to the teacher’ |
| bank-DIR | | teacher-DIR | |

Tyvan

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| (8) <i>kör-büşaan</i> | ‘while looking’ | <i>čun-mušaan</i> | ‘while washing’ |
| look-SML | | wash-SML | |

Another difference is the case of compounds, which originated in a combination of two independent words, although the two languages demonstrate very low creativity of this type of compound.

In the Sakha compounds in (9), some vowels have changed in accordance with the vowel harmony rule. Similarly, the first two examples of Tyvan compounds (10) are coincident to the vowel harmony rule. However, there are also non-harmonic compounds like the last two examples in Tyvan compounds (note that in both examples the initial consonant /č/ of the second element appears as voiced /ž/ in the course of the compounding process).⁹

Sakha

- | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---|---------------|------------|-----------------|---------|
| (9) <i>bügün</i> | ‘today’ | < | <i>bu</i> | ‘this’ | + <i>kün</i> | ‘day’ |
| <i>itigirdik</i> | ‘like that way’ | < | <i>iti</i> | ‘that’ | + <i>kurduk</i> | ‘like’ |
| <i>sarsiarđa</i> | ‘morning’ | < | <i>sarsin</i> | ‘tomorrow’ | + <i>erde</i> | ‘early’ |

Tyvan

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|
| (10) <i>bögün</i> | ‘today’ | < | <i>bo</i> | ‘this’ | + <i>xün</i> | ‘day’ |
| <i>bežen</i> | ‘fifty’ | < | <i>beš</i> | ‘five’ | + <i>on</i> | ‘ten’ |
| <i>emgežok</i> | ‘innumerable’ | < | <i>emge</i> | (no individual use) | + <i>čok</i> | ‘no’ |
| <i>argažok</i> | ‘have no way’ | < | <i>arga</i> | ‘way’ | + <i>čok</i> | ‘no’ |

2.4. Summary of the section

The morphophonological properties discussed in this section are summarized in Table 2.

⁸ These non-harmonic suffixes are considered to have developed historically from an independent word (Anderson and Harrison 1999: 17, Johanson 1998b: 117, the origin of the directive suffix *-že*, however, is not certainly attested). Sakha also has suffixes that have developed from independent words but they must follow the vowel harmony rule.

⁹ Although the last example *argažok* ‘have no way’ has only back vowels and seems to obey the vowel harmony rule, it is contrary to the Tyvan additional constraint on vowel serialization in the vowel harmony rule that vowels /o/ and /ö/ cannot occur on and after the second syllable of a word. Chapter 4 of Harrison (2000) also examines Tyvan non-harmonic compounds, although it indiscriminately takes up dialect forms, borrowed words, and free variations in colloquial speech. Sakha also has decimal numbers containing two numerals; for example, *bies uon* ‘fifty’ (< *bies* ‘five’ + *uon* ‘ten’). The author regards this type of number expression to be a combination of separate words.

Table 2 Morphophonological properties in Sakha and Tyvan

	Sakha	Tyvan
Nasal alternation	all suffixes	only some suffixes
Word-final accent rule	applied consistently	with exceptions
Vowel harmony rule	applied consistently	with exceptions

3. Contrastive analysis in morphosyntax

This section provides a contrastive analysis of the morphology and syntax of Sakha and Tyvan. Although the two languages have semantically equivalent strategies in several aspects of grammatical marking, only Sakha forms exhibits obligatoriness in their use.

3.1. Third person plural marking in the predicate

Both Sakha and Tyvan have subject marking suffixes or clitics indicated in the predicate. In Sakha, the third person plural marking is obligatory when the subject is in the third person plural.¹⁰ In Tyvan, on the contrary, the third person plural marking is optional (rather seldom marked) on the same condition.

Sakha

- (11) *kiniler* *kel-li-ler* (**kel-le*)
 3PL come-PST-3PL come-PST:3SG
 ‘They have come.’

Tyvan

- (12) *olar* *kel-di-(ler)* (*kel-di*)
 3PL come-PST-(PL) come-PST:3
 ‘They have come.’

3.2. Dative marking for goal NP

Both Sakha and Tyvan can express a goal of the transitional verbs in the dative NP. Sakha must employ the dative suffix for the goal NP. Tyvan, on the other hand, can omit the dative suffix and use the bare nominative for the goal NP.

Sakha

- (13) *čurapčĭ-ga* *bar-bīt-īŋ =duo*
 PLN-DAT go-PST-2SG =Q

¹⁰ According to Baek (2016), North Tungusic (Evenki, Even, and Negidal) is also considered to be obligatory distinct type in the third person plural marking.

‘Have you ever been to Churapchy?’

Tyvan

- (14) *bariīn xemčik* *bar-gan =sen =be*
 PLN go-PST =2SG =Q
 ‘Have you ever been to Baryyn Xemchik?’

3.3. Adverbial use of adjectives

Both Sakha and Tyvan have a word class for property concepts such as ‘good’, ‘long’, ‘warm’, and so on. This paper calls these words adjectives for the sake of expediency, although it is not easy to determine what parts-of-speech they actually comprise.

In Sakha, adjectives cannot be used adverbially unless combined with an adverbializing suffix. Therefore, example (15) becomes ungrammatical when the adverbializing suffix *-nik* is removed. In Tyvan, on the other hand, adjectives can be used adverbially; in other words, no additional suffix is required for them to modify a predicate.¹¹

Sakha

- (15) *nuuččalīi* *türgen-nik* *üören-er*
 in.Russian fast-ADVLZ learn-PRS:3SG
 ‘She learns Russian immediately.’

Tyvan

- (16) *aṅaa* *orus* *dil-ga* *dürgen* *öören-ip* *al-ir*
 3SG:DAT Russia language-DAT fast learn-CVB take-AOR:3
 ‘She will learn Russian immediately.’¹²

3.4. Accusative marking for direct objects

Both Sakha and Tyvan have two types of marking for direct object: one is nominative (without overt case marking) and the other is accusative (with an accusative case suffix).¹³ In the following three cases, the Sakha accusative is necessarily attached to the direct object but the Tyvan accusative is omissible.

The first case occurs when the direct object bears a plural marking. In Sakha, a direct object with a plural suffix must take an accusative suffix and example (17) becomes

¹¹ Adjectives of Turkic languages in general have an adverbial function (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 49, Schöning 1998: 270, Poppe 1968: 105). According to Kazama (2003: 293), adjectives of Tungusic languages cannot be used as adverbial phrases without an instrumental suffix.

¹² Note that in Turkic linguistics, the term “aorist” is used for the verbal form that has a present/habitual meaning. In Tyvan main clauses, the aorist form is used for the future tense.

¹³ Sakha has a partitive case suffix for another marking for the direct object. See Ebata (2014) for detailed information.

ungrammatical if one removes the accusative suffix. Contrastively, Tyvan allows plural-marked objects without an accusative suffix when the direct object is non-referential (18).

Sakha

- (17) *kün aajī kinige-ler-i aak-a-bīn*
 day per book-PL-ACC read-PRS-1SG
 ‘I read books every day.’

Tyvan

- (18) *nayīral dugayīnda nom-nar nomču-du-m*
 peace about book-PL read-PST-1SG
 ‘I read books about peace.’

Tyvan

- (19) *čaraš nom-nar-nī čirik-če ün-dür-gen*
 beautiful book-PL-ACC light-DIR let.out-PST:3
 ‘The beautiful books were printed out.’

The second case is that the direct object is marked by a possessive suffix of the first or second person. Similar to the previous case, an accusative suffix is obligatory in Sakha. However, the direct object is not necessarily attached in Tyvan, particularly when the direct object comprises a body part of a possessee of the subject (21).

Sakha

- (20) *(min) ilii-bi-n suu-n-nu-m*
 1SG hand-POSS.1SG-ACC wash-REFL-PST-1SG
 ‘I washed my hands.’

Tyvan

- (21) *(men) xol-um ču-p al-dī-m*
 1SG hand-POSS.1SG wash-CVB take-PST-1SG
 ‘I washed my hands.’

Tyvan

- (22) *ol kiži meej xol-um-nu tut-tu*
 that person my hand-POSS.1SG-ACC catch-PST:3
 ‘That person caught my hand.’

The third case is that the direct object consists of a so-called “possessive compound” and is marked by a possessive suffix of the third person singular. Turkic languages often employ possessive compounds, which are structurally constructed by juxtaposed two nouns with a third person singular possessive, i.e., ‘X’s Y’, and express a single concept. One typical example from Sakha is *inax et-e* ‘beef’, literally ‘cow’s meat’, a combination of *inax* ‘cow’ and *et* ‘meat’ connected by a third person possessive *-e*.

When the direct object is a possessive compound, the Sakha accusative suffix is again obligatory. In Tyvan, a possessive compound is not marked in the accusative when the direct object is non-referential (24).

Sakha

- (23) *saxa-lar* *inax* *et-i-n* *siil-ler*
 Sakha-PL cow meat-POSS.3SG-ACC eat:PRS-3PL
 ‘Sakha people eat beef.’

Tyvan (Takashima 2008a: 57)

- (24) *tiva-lar* *öškü* *ed-i* *či-ir*
 Tyva-PL goat meat-POSS.3SG eat-AOR:3
 ‘Tyvan people eat the meat of goats.’

Tyvan

- (25) *inek* *ed-i-n* *sad-ip* *a-ar =bis*
 cow meat-POSS.3SG-ACC sell-CVB take-AOR =1PL
 ‘We would like to buy the beef.’

Thus, we can summarize the rule of accusative marking to the direct object in Sakha and Tyvan. In Sakha, accusative marking is morphologically conditioned and obligatory when the direct object contains a plural or possessive suffix, regardless of the other factors such as pragmatic function and semantic property. In Tyvan, the condition for the accusative marking is not solely morphological; it is also conditioned by semantic or pragmatic factors.

3.5. Marking in coordinating noun phrases

In Sakha, each of the coordinating noun phrases must take a morphological element. Therefore, each of the possessive and case suffixes in (26) and (27) is obligatory.

Sakha

- (26) *saa-bi-n* *ikki* *xoġor-bu-n* *süg-en* *tönn-öörü*
 gun-POSS.1SG-ACC two bean.goose-POSS.1SG-ACC carry-CVB return-CVB
 ‘I came back carrying my gun and the two bean geese on my shoulder, and ...’

Sakha

- (27) *īye-ti-ger* *ežīiy-i-ger* *eriy-en*
 mother-POSS.3SG-DAT elder.sister-POSS.3SG-DAT make.call-CVB
xanna *bar-bīt-in* *tuhunan* *surah-a-kīn*
 where go-PST-3SG about ask-PRS-2SG
 ‘Make a call to his mother and to his elder sister and ask where he went.’

In Tyvan, one can place a single marker for the whole of coordinating noun phrases (so-called group marking or suspended affixation, Kabak 2007).¹⁴ In (28), there is only one accusative marking for both objects *aŋ* ‘animal’ and *kuš* ‘bird’. Similarly, the second person singular possessive suffix of (29) covers three coordinating nouns.

Tyvan (Takashima 2008b: 105)

- (28) *ol* *ījaš-tar-nī =daa* *aŋ* *kuš-tu =daa*
 that tree-PL-ACC =CLT animal bird-ACC =CLT
uzutka-p *ka-ap-kan*
 destroy-CVB put-PRF-PST:3
 ‘That [forest fire] has destroyed trees as well as animals and birds.’

Tyvan (Takashima 2008a: 65)

- (29) *šugum* *balaaš* *kīdīraaž-iŋ* *sumka-ga* *četčele-p* *al*
 ruler eraser notebook-POSS.2SG bag-DAT fill-CVB take:IMP.2SG
 ‘Put your ruler, eraser, and notebook into the bag.’

3.6. Predicate of existential sentences

In Sakha existential sentences, the nominal predicate for existence *baar* as in (30) and (31) is obligatory. In Tyvan existential sentences, on the other hand, the equivalent predicate *bar* is not necessary in (32) and (33). The subject marking copula directly follows the locative phrase *mīnda* ‘here’ of (32).¹⁵

Sakha

- (30) (*bihigi*) *manna* *baar-bīt*
 1 PL here existent-COP.1 PL
 ‘We are here.’

¹⁴ According to Kazama (1994), Tungusic languages do not allow group marking at all.

¹⁵ The Tyvan existential predicate is necessary when the predicate is not a locative expression; *mende solun nom bar* ‘I have an interesting book.’ (1SG-LOC interesting book existent).

Sakha

- (31) *aʁa-m* *ʒie-ti-ger* *baar*
 father-POSS.1SG house-POSS.3SG-DAT existent:COP.3SG
 ‘My father is at home.’

Tyvan

- (32) (*bis*) *minda =bis*
 1PL here =COP.1PL
 ‘We are here.’

Tyvan

- (33) *ača-m* *baži-in-da*
 father-POSS.1SG house-POSS.3SG-LOC
 ‘My father is at home.’

In non-existential sentences, however, the nominal predicate for absence *suox* or *čok* is obligatory in both languages. This contrast reinforces the fact that the locative phrase plus subject marking *minda =bis* in (32) has a connotation of existence without an existential element.

Sakha

- (34) *bihigi* *üs* *küŋ-ŋe* *suox-put*
 1PL three day-DAT absent-COP.1PL
 ‘We are absent for three days.’

Tyvan

- (35) *bažiŋ-da* *čok =bis*
 house-LOC absent =COP.1PL
 ‘We are not at home.’

3.7. Summary of the section

The morphosyntactic properties discussed in this section are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Morphosyntactic properties in Sakha and Tyvan

	Sakha	Tyvan
3PL subject marking	obligatory	omittable
DAT for goal NP	obligatory	omittable
Adverbial use of adjectives	impossible	possible
ACC for direct object	obligatory (morphologically conditioned)	omittable due to semantic or pragmatic factors
Marking on coordinating NPs	obligatory for each element	group marking possible
Existential <i>baar / bar</i>	obligatory	omittable

4. Concluding remarks

This paper has conducted a contrastive analysis between Sakha and Tyvan, focusing on their differences in (morpho-)phonology and morphosyntax. As a result, it has been found that there lies a consistent difference between the two Turkic languages. In short, Sakha demonstrates high regularity in (morpho-)phonology and obligatoriness in morphosyntax.

Sakha exhibits high regularity in its phonological and morphophonological rules (the nasal alternation of suffix-initial consonants, the accent rule, and the vowel harmony rule) while Tyvan allows some exceptions under the apparently same rules. In other words, the regularity in Sakha phonological rules is interpreted as “leveling.”

Sakha grammatical markings tend to be obligatory or explicit (3rd person plural subject marking, dative marking for goal NP, obligatory use of the adverbializing suffix, morphologically conditioned accusative marking, obligatory marking for coordinating noun phrases, and obligatory existential predicate) while Tyvan grammatical markings may be omitted in a certain condition.

Ebata (2017) has claimed that some of these morphosyntactic properties of Sakha, i.e., third person plural subject marking, obligatory adverbializing suffix for the adverbial use of adjectives, and respective markings for each element of coordinating NPs, are parallel to those of Tungusic languages, not to Turkic ones. Johanson (2006: 10) points out that Sakha has a Tungusic substratum. Johanson (2002: 149–150) attributes the high regularity and simplicity of Turkic language structures to leveling due to koineization. It is very likely that the regularity in Sakha (morpho-)phonology and the obligatoriness in Sakha morphosyntax have been obtained through language contact and koineization with the neighboring Tungusic languages.

* This paper is a product of the ILCAA joint research project “Typological Study on “Altaic-type” Languages.”

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	PLN	place name
ACC	accusative	POSS	possessive
ADV LZ	adverbializing	PRF	perfect
AOR	aorist	PROP	propriative
CLT	clitic	PRS	present
COP	copular	PST	past
CVB	converb	PTCP	participle
DAT	dative	Q	question
DIR	directive	REFL	reflexive
IMP	imperative	SG	singular
LOC	locative	SML	simultaneous
NEG	negative	VBLZ	verbalizing
PL	plural		

References

- Anderson, Gregory David. 1998. *Xakas*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Anderson, Gregory David and K. David Harrison. 1999. *Tyvan*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Baek, Sangyub. 2016. “Third person marking on finite indicative forms in Tungusic from the perspective of areal typology”. *Northern Language Studies* 6. pp.53–71. [in Japanese]
- Benzing, Johannes. 1959. “Classification of the Turkic languages”. Jean Deny, et al. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*. pp.1–5. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Clark, Larry. 1998. *Turkmen Reference Grammar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ebata, Fuyuki. 2014. “Core argument marking in Sakha, Tyvan, and Turkish”. *Northern Language Studies* 4. pp.33–42. [in Japanese]
- . 2017. “The linguistic status of Sakha: A contrastive analysis with Turkic and Tungusic languages”. Fuyuki Ebata and Tokusu Kurebito (eds.) *Linguistic Typology of the North* 4. pp.53–66.
- Göksel, Asli and Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Harrison, K. David. 2000. “Topics in the Phonology and Morphology of Tuvan”. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Johanson, Lars. 1998a. “The structure of Turkic”. Lars Johanson and Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. pp.30–66. London: Routledge.
- . 1998b. “The history of Turkic”. Lars Johanson and Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. pp.81–125. London: Routledge.
- . 2002. *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts*. Richmond: Curzon.
- . 2006. “Turkic language contacts in a typology of code interaction”. Hendrik Boeschoten and Lars Johanson (eds.) *Turkic Languages in Contact*. pp.4–26. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kabak, Barış. 2007. “Turkish suspended affixation”. *Linguistics* 45(2). pp.311–347.
- Kazama, Shinjiro. 1994. *On ‘Agreement’ in Nanay*. Sapporo: Faculty of Letters, Hokkaido University. [in Japanese]
- . 2003. “Do the three groups of the ‘Altaic’ languages (Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic), as well as Korean, really resemble Japanese grammatical structure?: An attempt at a contrastive grammar analysis”. Alexander Vovin

- and Toshiki Osada (eds.) *Perspectives on the Origins of the Japanese Language*. (Nichibunken Japanese Studies Series 31). pp.249–340. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies. [in Japanese]
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 2000. *Turkish Grammar* [2nd edition]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Menges, K. H. 1959. “Classification of the Turkic languages”. Jean Deny, et al. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*. pp.5–8. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Poppe, Nicholas. 1965. *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1968. *Tatar Manual* [Second revised edition]. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Schönig, Claus. 1998. “Turkmen”. Lars Johanson and Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. pp.261–272. London: Routledge.
- Shogaito, Masahiro. 2002. “Language contact in Central Eurasia: The case of Turkic languages”. *Ex Oriente* 6. pp.1–50. [in Japanese]
- Takashima, Naoki. 2008a. *Basic Tyvan Grammar*. Fuchu: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. [in Japanese]
- . 2008b. *Textbook of the Tyvan Language*. Fuchu: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. [in Japanese]
- Ubrjatova, E. I., et al. (eds.). 1982. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.