

TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 117

2019

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Klára Agyagási

Chuvash Historical Phonetics

An areal linguistic study

With an Appendix on the Role of Proto-Mari
in the History of Chuvash Vocalism

2019

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The publication of this work was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and TÁMOP4.21/B-09/1KONV-2010-0007 project.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2019

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743

ISBN 978-3-447-11163-8

Contents

Foreword	IX
I The predecessors of the Chuvash in the Volga region	1
1.1 Defining the Volga Bulgarian dialects	1
1.2 Sources of the Chuvash historical phonetics	10
1.2.1 Sources of the Proto-Turkic period	12
1.2.1.1 Loans from Proto-Turkic in Mongolian, loans from Proto-Mongolian in Proto-Turkic	12
1.2.1.2 Loans from Tokharian in Proto-Turkic	13
1.2.1.3 Proto-Turkic loans in Proto-Samoyedic and Southern Samoyedic	14
1.2.1.4 Loans from Old and Middle Iranian in Proto-Turkic	14
1.2.2 Sources of the Old Turkic period	14
1.2.2.1 Loans from Chinese in West Old Turkic	15
1.2.2.2 West Old Turkic loans in Ancient Hungarian	15
1.2.2.3 Sources from Danube Bulgarian	18
1.2.2.4 Khazar sources	19
1.2.2.5 The language of the Avars as possible source of the history of Chuvash	19
1.2.2.6 Loanwords from West Old Turkic in Ossetic, loans from Alanic in West Old Turkic	20
1.2.2.7 East Slavic and Old Russian loanwords in Volga Bulgarian, Volga Bulgarian loanwords in Old Russian.	20
1.2.2.8 Loans from Arabic and Persian in the Volga Bulgarian dialects	22
1.2.2.9 Loans from Volga Bulgarian in Proto-Permic and Proto-Votyak, loans from Proto-Permic and Proto-Votyak in Volga Bulgarian	22
1.2.2.10 Loans from Volga Bulgarian in Mordvin	23
1.2.3 Sources of the Middle Turkic period	23
1.2.3.1 The Volga Bulgarian glosses and epitaphs	24
1.2.3.2 Loans from Volga Bulgarian in Middle Chuvash	25
1.2.3.3 Loans from Middle Mongolian in Middle Chuvash	25
1.2.3.4 Loans from Middle Bulgarian in the Mari dialects, loans from Proto-Mari in Middle Chuvash	26
1.2.3.5 Substratum elements in the Middle Chuvash language	26
1.2.3.6 Loans from Middle Kipchak in Middle Chuvash	27
1.2.3.7 Loans from Middle Russian in Middle Chuvash	28
1.2.4 Sources of the Modern Chuvash period	28
1.2.4.1 18 th century written sources of the Chuvash language	28
1.2.4.2 Sources from dialect history	29
1.3 Methodological foundations	29

II Oppositions in the Oguric consonant system	
(Proto-Turkic And Old Turkic period)	35
2.1 Proto-Turkic inheritance: rhotacism and lambdacism.....	37
2.1.1 Rhotacism: (<i>*z</i> > <i>*r</i>).....	37
2.1.2 Lambdacism: <i>*š</i> > (<i>*ś</i>) > <i>l</i>	41
2.1.3 The <i>*y</i> > <i>*j</i> change in Proto-Turkic.....	43
2.2 Global and regional changes in the WOT/Oguric consonant system.....	45
2.2.1 The (<i>*y</i> - >) <i>*j</i> - > <i>*č</i> - > <i>*ś</i> - and <i>-VjV</i> - > <i>-VvV</i> - change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	45
2.2.1.1 The (<i>*y</i> >) <i>*j</i> - > <i>*č</i> - > <i>*ś</i> - change in Volga Bulgarian.....	45
2.2.1.2 The <i>-VjV</i> - > <i>-VvV</i> - and <i>-Vj</i> > <i>V</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	51
2.2.2 The <i>č</i> > <i>j</i> > <i>ś</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	52
2.2.3 The <i>si</i> > <i>ši</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	55
2.2.4 Changes of the WOT/Oguric <i>b</i>	58
2.2.5 Changes of the West Old Turkic <i>g</i>	62
2.2.5.1 The reflection of the <i>γ</i> > <i>θ</i> change in different phonetic positions.....	63
2.2.5.2 The reflection of the <i>γ</i> > <i>w</i> change in different phonetic positions.....	67
2.2.6 Changes of <i>k</i> in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	69
2.2.6.1 The <i>q</i> > <i>χ</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	70
2.2.6.2 The <i>k/q</i> > <i>γ</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	76
2.2.7 The <i>n</i> > <i>m</i> change in WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	79
2.2.8 Changes of the WOT/Oguric <i>η</i>	81
2.2.9 Changes of the WOT/Oguric <i>ń</i>	84
2.2.10 Changes of the WOT/Oguric <i>-d</i> -.....	85
2.2.11 Changes of <i>*t</i> - in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/Volga Bulgarian.....	89
2.2.11.1 The Oguric <i>t</i> > <i>š</i> change.....	89
2.2.11.2 The Volga Bulgarian <i>tī</i> > <i>t'i</i> (> <i>čī</i>) change.....	89
2.3 Language varieties in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/VB language territory on the basis of changes in the consonant system.....	91
III Oppositions in the WOT/VB vowel system	97
3.1 Global and regional changes in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/VB vowel system.....	99
3.1.1 Changes of the long vowels.....	99
3.1.1.1 The shortening of long vowels.....	100
3.1.1.2 Processes of diphthongization of long vowels.....	103
3.1.2 Changes of the short vowels.....	110
3.1.2.1 The representation of Proto-Turkic <i>*a</i> in the WOT/Oguric language territory.....	114
3.1.2.2 The representation of Proto-Turkic <i>*o</i> in the Volga Bulgarian language territory.....	122
3.1.2.3 The representation of Proto-Turkic <i>*u</i> in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/VB language territory.....	126

3.1.2.4 The representation of Proto-Turkic * <i>ɪ</i> in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/VB language territory	130
3.1.2.5 The representation of Proto-Turkic * <i>ä</i> in the Volga Bulgarian language territory	133
3.1.2.6 The representation of Proto-Turkic * <i>ö</i> in the WOT/Oguric and WOT/VB language territory	141
3.1.2.7 The representation of Proto-Turkic * <i>ü</i> in the WOT/Oguric language territory	145
3.1.2.8 The representation of Proto-Turkic * <i>i</i> in the WOT/Oguric and Volga Bulgarian language territory	149
3.1.3 The representation of the Proto-Turkic reduced vowels in the Old Turkic period	153
3.2 The dialects of Late Old and Early Middle Bulgarian	160
3.2.1 The WOT/VB ₁ dialect.....	161
3.2.2 The WOT/VB ₂ dialect.....	168
3.2.3 The WOT/VB ₃ (Late Old Chuvash) dialect	180
IV Changes in the Middle Chuvash period	185
4.1 Changes in the Middle Chuvash consonant system	185
4.1.1 The secondary voicing of consonants	185
4.1.2 The positional softening of consonants.....	187
4.2 Changes in the Middle Chuvash vowel system.....	195
4.2.1 Changes in the Early Middle Chuvash vowel system	196
4.2.1.1 The reduction of vowels.....	200
4.2.2 Changes in the Late Middle Chuvash vowel system.....	220
4.2.2.1 The closing of the open vowels.....	220
4.2.2.2 The monophthongization of word-medial and word-final secondary diphthongs.....	239
4.2.2.3 Changes in the reduced vowels in the Late Middle Chuvash period.....	241
Summary	245
Appendix	247
A The Cheremis in the Volga region	247
A.1 The Cheremis habitat before the Mongol invasion	247
A.1.1 The theory of Cheremis autochthony	247
A.1.2 The ethnonym <i>Cheremis</i> in the early written records	249
A.1.3 The ethnonym <i>Cheremis</i> in linguistic records.....	250
A.1.4 Archaeological sources of Cheremis ethnogenesis	254
A.1.5 Loanwords in Mari dialects as sources for the reconstruction of Cheremis ethnogenesis.....	255
A.2 The interpretation of the topos <i>Cheremis</i> after the Mongol Invasion: indigenous people + new settlers	258

A.2.1 The name <i>Cheremis</i> in medieval sources	259
A.3 Linguistic heritage of the Lower Cheremis population	264
A.3.1 Baltic groups in Eastern Europe	265
A.3.3 Etymological identification of the West Baltic substratum elements: possibilities and limitations	267
A.3.4 Etymological study of the West Baltic substratum elements in Mari and Chuvash dialects	269
A.3.4.1 West Baltic <i>*aĩdamas</i> ‘*wood in logs’ < <i>*aĩdy-</i> ‘*cleave-’	270
A.3.4.2 West Baltic dial. <i>*dub-</i> ‘*grow with an empty space inside’	272
A.3.4.3 West Baltic <i>*jũos-</i> ‘*gird’	274
A.3.4.4 West Baltic dial. <i>*kum̃p-</i> ‘bend’	275
A.3.4.5 West Baltic dial. <i>*lẽk-</i> ‘*fly’	276
A.3.4.6 West Baltic <i>*lẽpš-</i> ‘*wither’	278
A.3.4.7 West Baltic dial. <i>*pũćio-</i> ‘*suffocate, stifle’, ‘*blow up’	280
A.3.4.8 West Baltic dial. <i>*popliaũ-</i> ‘*chat, gossip’	281
A.3.4.9 West Baltic dial. <i>*su-stó-</i> ‘*stop, combine, unite’	283
A.3.4.10 West Baltic dial. <i>*tur-</i> ‘rotate, revolve’	285
B The vocalism of the Late Proto-Mari	289
B.1 The Late Proto-Mari vocalic system	289
B.1.1 Strucutral types of bisyllabic words in Late Proto-Mari	290
B.2 Instances of Proto-West Mari dial. <i>*o > a</i> in first syllable	291
B.3 Copies of Early Middle Chuvash structures containing only labial reduced vowels in some Mari dialectal varieties	293
B.3.1 Labial reduced phonetic copies in monosyllabic words	294
B.3.1.1 Monosyllabic words with <i>*-u</i> . MČ <i>ũ</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ</i>	294
B.3.1.2 Monosyllabic words with the vowel <i>*-ü</i> . MČ <i>ũ</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ</i>	294
B.3.2 Phonetic copies of labials in bisyllabic words	295
B.3.2.1 <i>u-ə</i> structures. MČ <i>ũ-ũ</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ-ũ</i>	295
B.3.2.2 <i>ü-ə</i> structures. MČ <i>ũ-ũ</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ-ũ</i>	297
B.3.3 Phonetic copies of labials in trisyllabic words	297
B.3.3.1 <i>u-ə-ə</i> structures. MČ <i>ũ-ũ-ũ</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ-ũ-ũ</i>	297
B.3.3.2 <i>u-ə-a</i> structures. MČ <i>ũ-ũ-a</i> ⇒ Mari <i>ũ-ũ-a</i>	298
Literature	299
Abbreviations	321
Indices	323

Foreword

The aim of historical linguistic research – no matter what language is subjected to historical study – is twofold. Its primary task is to determine, describe and set up a chronological order of the processes that, affecting a subsystem of any linguistic system, have led from an earlier point of departure to the present state of a language, or the other way round: starting from the present state of a language and using appropriate methodology, the researcher can reconstruct an earlier stage with their help. These requirements being met, the results thus achieved are made use of within the subdisciplines that study linguistic activity and phenomena.

The other task of historical linguistic research is to act as an auxiliary discipline of the historical science and, employing the existing correlations between language and ethnic community, to provide arguments for historical conclusions through the interpretation of linguistic data available in the historical sources.

The present thesis with its historical linguistic topic has been designed to meet both of the above aims. On the one hand, the author, by interpreting data of written historical records and comparing them with other sources, aims to widen the scope of the ethnic and linguistic constituents that are known to have existed in the Middle Volga region prior to the Mongol invasion. On the other hand, by making use of all the data of Ogur Turkic linguistic history hitherto disclosed and, applying the historical comparative method, she also makes an attempt to reconstruct the stage of language simultaneous with the late Old and Middle Chuvash sound system and marked it off from all the other Volga Bulgarian dialects. The changes in the history of sounds and other structural alterations generated by Mari-Chuvash linguistic contact also will then be presented in comparison with that stage.

Naturally, there have been earlier attempts to compose a history of Chuvash phonetics. Each author who has dealt with this topic has had to face the dilemma of how the phonetic history of a language with only a small number of written records can be described as a process. In theory, there may be three solutions to this problem.

The first of these is a model of linear descent based on a merely theoretical method of reconstruction and on the family tree theory. Its aim is to grasp the specific changes typical of the language in question that have occurred in it since it became separated from the protolanguage, following exclusively linguistic considerations of systems theory. This solution, with only slight modifications, was applied by Mudrak in his reconstruction of Chuvash (Mudrak 2002: 677–89). Since the antecedent of Chuvash separated from the Proto-Turkic language somewhere in South Siberia in the late Proto-Turkic period probably in the first centuries AD, Mudrak specifies the Proto-Turkic set of sounds by taking parallel South Siberian sound changes into account. Parallel sound changes originating from the common basis shared by the antecedent of Chuvash and South Siberian languages is a working hypothesis treated by Mudrak as one of certainty without, however, actually proving it, which makes his theoretical reconstruction of later periods following Late Proto-Turkic rather instable.

Another possibility is the presentation of sound changes of Chuvash in the context of sound changes that have taken place in all the branches of the Turkic language family. Although this approach does not allow grasping the process of changes but it can highlight