L. Fejes

VOWEL HARMONY IN THE VOLGA-KAMA REGION: AN AREAL PHENOMENON?

Abstract. Vowel harmony is typical for the languages of the Volga-Kama area. As both Turkic and Uralic proto-languages exhibited vowel harmony, we could suggest that the existence of vowel harmony in the area follows from the historical heritage and is a mere coincidence. However, we know that at least some of the vowel harmonies do not originate from the proto-languages, but are new phenomena. In these cases, we cannot exclude that the development of these new harmonies was influenced by another language.

Kewwords: areal linguistics, typology, phonotactics, vowel harmony, language contacts, Volga-Kama language area.

Л. Фейеш

ГАРМОНИЯ ГЛАСНЫХ В ЯЗЫКАХ ВОЛГО-КАМЬЯ: АРЕАЛЬНЫЙ ФЕНОМЕН?

Аннотация. Гармония гласных типична для языков Волго-Камского ареала. Гармония гласных имела место и в тюркском, и в уральском праязыках, и поэтому можно предположить, что существование этого явления является языковым наследием или просто случайностью. При этом, однако, некоторые типы гармонии гласных не возводятся к праязыковым состояниям, а представляют собой новые феномены. В последних случаях мы не можем исключить, что их появление обусловлено влиянием других языков.

Ключевые слова: ареальная лингвистика, типология, фонотактика, гармония гласных, языковые контакты, Волжско-Камский языковой союз.

It seems to be undebatable that vowel harmony is typical for the languages of the Volga–Kama area. If we look at the grammars or course-books of Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir, the Mordvinic languages, Hill or Meadow Mari, we will find information on vowel harmony. Vowel harmony is present even in some dialects of Udmurt.

However, by areal phenomena we usually mean linguistic features which are common innovations of languages spoken in a given area, which are results of language contact and usually wide-spread multilingualism. A classic example for linguistic areas is the Balkan area (Sprachbund): Greek, Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serb, Romanian etc., which has features such as the merger of genitive and dative cases, postposed definite markers developed from demonstrative pronouns, analytic future tense with an auxiliary developed from a verb meaning 'want', the loss of infinitive (structures like *I want that I (would) go* instead of *I want to go*) etc. These features were not typical for the ancestors of these languages, they are a common innovation: sometimes we can find the source in one language or another, but different features come from different sources.

The languages of the Volga–Kama area are either of Turkic or Uralic origin. Both proto-languages exhibited vowel harmony, therefore we could suggest that the existence of vowel harmony in the area follows from the historical heritage (inside language families) and is a mere coincidence (the meeting of two groups of languages exhibiting vowel harmony). However, we know that at least some of the vowel harmonies do not originate from the proto-languages, but are new phenomena. In these cases, we cannot exclude that the development of these new harmonies was influenced by another language (or other languages), and consequently, we can speak about an areal phenomenon in the tighter sense.

Bereczki [Bereczki, 1983, p. 213] states that palatovelar harmony in Hill Mari, Eastern (Birsk) Mari and some Udmurt dialects spoken in Tatarstan or Bashkortostan developed due to the influence of Turkic languages – but without any argument or reference to arguments on the influence. (The only exception is for the Tatyshly dialect of Udmurt, see below.) Since vowel harmony can emerge even without foreign influence, it is not self-evident that we have to presume foreign influence.

In the following, I present the vowel systems and vowel harmonies of the different languages of the area. I use the International Phonetic Alphabet since there are considerable differences between the alphabets and transcriptions between the different languages, therefore the comparison would be unnecessarily complicated in any other way. Next, I will enumerate the features which occur in the harmonies of the languages of the area and demonstrate the most important differences. At the end, I will consider to what extent the harmonies in different languages could influence each other.

1. Vowel harmonies in the Volga-Kama area

Speaking about vowel harmony, it is a fundamental question what kind of vowel inventory the given language has. The vowel system of a language seems to determine what kind of vowel alternations due to vowel harmony are possible in the language; however, sometimes we find alternations which are not predictable from the vowel system, while some possible or even probable alternations never occur.

The description of a phoneme system is always a result of analysis of complex phonetic phenomena and alternations of morphology; therefore, the result is always subject to debate. Not just the analysis of vowel harmony must be based on the vowel system, but the analysis of the vowel system must also be based

on vowel harmony. Here I have no possibility to give a deep analysis of the phonology of the given languages, but I have to draw attention to the cases when the description of the vowel system is in conflict with the description of vowel harmony.

Today, all of the languages discussed here are highly influenced by Russian, in some cases there are phonemes which occur exclusively in Russian loanwords. Presenting the vowel systems, I will ignore these phonemes. Because of the lack of data, I will not examine the role of these foreign phonemes in these languages systematically.

1.1. Turkic languages

There are three Turkic languages spoken in the area: Chuvash, Tatar and Bashkir. Tatar and Bashkir belong to the Kipchak group of Turkic languages, they are quite closely related to each other, and they are in a strong contact: there are some transitional (tatarized Bashkir and bashkirized Tatar) dialects. Chuvash is the only living language of the remote Oghuric branch, distinguished from all the other contemporary Turkic languages.

1.1.1. Tatar

Tatar has a vowel system of 9 vowels:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	**Rounded**	**Unrounded**	**Rounded**
High (Long)	i	y		u
Mid (Short)	ɪ	ʏ	ŭ̃	ʊ
Low	a		ɑ	

The difference between the high and mid vowels can be analyzed as a difference in length or as a tense/lax opposition: in that case we can count with two heights. Since the characteristics of this distinction play no role in vowel harmony, we do not deal with it. Although /ɑ/ is analyzed as an illabial vowel, it is realized as a labial vowel in the first syllable and slightly labialized in the further syllables. The low black vowel /ɑ/ is labial in the first syllable and slightly labialized in the following syllables except for the last (stressed) one (e. g. Zakiev, 1997, p. 359–360), in recent literature it is analyzed as a phonologically illabial vowel. In Dmitriev [Dmitriev, 1948, p. 7–8], we find that it is round, although he adds that its labialization was not typical for the Mesher dialect and the old dialect of Kazan.

Tatar has palatovelar harmony: front first vowels are followed by front vowels, back first vowels are followed by back vowels. Beside alternations /ɪ/ ~ /ŭ̃/, /ʏ/ ~ /ʊ/ and /a/ ~ /ɑ/, there seems also to be an alternation /i/ ~ /ŭ̃ɪ̯/, which is probably better to analyze as an /ɪɪ̯/ ~ /ŭ̃ɪ̯/ alternation. (However, if we accept this analysis, it is questionable whether /i/ is necessary in the vowel inventory, and should not we count with just 8 vowels. Another possibility is to suppose a high unrounded back vowel /ɯ/, which is realized as a diphthong /ŭ̃ɪ̯/. In that case, we have to count with 10 vowels.) There is no /u/ ~ /y/ alternation, since /u/ and /y/ do not occur in non-first syllables (and therefore in suffixes).

Mid vowels also trigger labial vowel harmony of other mid vowels (/ɪ/ ~ /ʏ/, /ŭ̃/ ~ /ʊ/), but high vowels do not [Bálint, 1877, p. 7; Litvinov, 1998, p. 37; Safiullina–Fatkhullova, 1999, p. 389; Safiullina, 2001, p. 7; Zakiev, 1997, p. 361]. Mid labialized vowels in non-first syllables of stems can only occur when they follow other mid labialized vowels. High labialized vowels only occur in the first syllables of stems.

Poppe [Poppe, 1963, p. 16] states that there is no labial harmony in Tatar, but probably he was misled by Tatar orthography, which uses letters otherwise marking illabial vowels in non-first syllables when the labiality of the vowels is predictable from the labiality of the vowels in the first syllable. It seems that Poppe was not fully aware of the specifics of marking vowels in Tatar orthography, since he writes that the soft sign indicates that *табигать* 'nature, character' is suffixed by palatal allomorphs, although it also signals that the last vowel is palatal (/tɑbigat/ – cf. Safiullina–Fatkhullova, 1999, p. 378), and it is the reason that it gets palatal suffixes. (However, his statement may be true for other cases, see below.) As the example shows, loanword stems can be exceptional to vowel harmony.

1.1.2. Bashkir

The Bashkir inventory of vowels and vowel harmony highly resemble those of Tatar. Dmitriev [Dmitriev, 1948, p. 7–8] analyzes the low back vowel as round and says we find the same vowel in Tatar. According to Yuldashev [Yuldashev, 1981, p. 41], /ɑ/ in non-stressed (non-last) syllables is not so clearly formed, which gives the illusion of labiality.

In some other cases it is also questionable whether the difference is between the languages or between the descriptions. I could not find an example for the /i/ ~ /ŭ̃ɪ̯/ alternation in the descriptions Bashkir, and only

some sources mention it in Tatar [Litvinov, 1998, p. 31; Safiullina, 2001, p. 17]; however, Zakiev [Zakiev, 1997, p. 361] does not mention this alternation in the description of vowel harmony, but he includes a diphthong-like high unrounded back vowel into the vowel system in paranthesis.

Dmitriev [Dmitriev, 1948, p. 39] states that the velar allomorph of suffixes occurs also after foreign stems with front vowels when they end in a non-palatalized consonant (in Bashkir, as in Tatar and Chuvash, consonants are palatalized when they precede or follow front vowels): /benzin-dŭn/ 'petrol (gen.)' (instead of */benzin-dın/), /teχnik-tɑr/ 'mechanics, technicians' (instead of */teχnik-tar/). He states the use of the velar allomorph in this position is typical for spoken language, while in writing harmonic forms are used. He also states that labial harmony does not work in foreign words either: /motor-θŭn/ 'motor (gen)' instead of */motor-θʊn/. However, the reason here can be that /o/, which occurs exclusively in foreign (Russian) words, is phonetically different from /ʊ/. I found no similar data on Tatar in the literature; however, I found the form plural genitive form *бензиннарның* /benzinnɑrnuı̆ŋ/ in Tatar Wikipedia, which shows that the phenomenon is present in Modern Tatar.

1.1.3 Chuvash

The Chuvash vowel inventory consists of 8 vowels. Krueger [Krueger, 1961, p. 70] suggests the following system:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded	Unrounded	Rounded
High (Long)	i	y	ɯ	u
Low	e	œ	ɑ	ɔ

Low rounded vowel are shorter and are dropped or pronounced as a schwa many times in fast speech (therefore they are called reduced). The roundedness of /ɔ/ is based on the fact that it is rounded when stressed [Krueger, 1961, p. 71], which seems to be a good argument at first sight. Krueger [Krueger, 1961, p. 72] also states that /œ/ has labial allophones, but it remains unclear in which circumstances. However, in most of the cases these phonemes are realized as unrounded. There are other arguments against the analysis of these vowels as labial by default. First of all, there is no reason why a low rounded vowel should be realized shorter than other ones. Moreover, there are dialects where there are two different front phonemes, one of which is realized as rounded, the other as unrounded – the latter has no place in the table above. Nonetheless, there is a „full" (never reduced) /o/ in Russian loanwords, the status of which can be analyzed as phonemic in Chuvash, which has no place in the table above either. Krueger's analysis does not account for the reduction and delabialization of the vowels given as low back here. Therefore, it seems that the analysis of Andreev [Andreev, 1997, p. 482] is better:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded	Unrounded	Rounded
High	i	y	ɯ	u
Mid	ə, e		ɤ	
Low			ɑ	

However, there is no clear reason of putting /ə/ and /e/ into the same cell: in that case, we find no phonemic difference between the two vowels. The /e/ ~ /ɑ/ alternation due to vowel harmony is also a good argument to put them into the same row, therefore I suggest the following system:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded	Unrounded	Rounded
High	i	y	ɯ	u
Mid	ə		ɤ	(o)
Low	e		ɑ	

Nonetheless, the difference between mid and low vowels seem to be rather in a tense/lax opposition than in height, therefore we can suggest that there is a rounded/unrounded opposition among high vowels and a tense/lax opposition between low vowels (with the exception of /o/, which is a real mid vowel).

In most of the cases, there is a stem internal palatovelar harmony in native stems. In suffixes, usually there is a palatovelar alternation due to the vowels of the stem between low vowels (/e/ ~ /ɑ/, /ə/ ~ /ɤ/), although there are also suffixes which are always used with a palatal low vowel (e. g. /-ə/ 3rd person singular possessive suffix, /-sem/ plural suffix). The latter are always opaque (followed by palatal variants of alternating suffixes). I have found only one suffix with high vowel (/-u/ ~ /-y/ 2nd person singular possessive suffix), which is usually not mentioned in the description of vowel harmony in the grammatical sketches of Chuvash [Krueger, 1961, p. 74; Landmann, 2014, p. 3] but it is mentioned in Andreev [Andreev, 1997, p. 483]. Since /ɯ/ does not occur in non-first syllables of words [Andreev, 1997, p. 482], we cannot find /i/ ~ /ɯ/ alternation in suffixes. However, I could not find any suffixes either with a non-alternating /i/.

As in Tatar and Bashkir, Chuvash consonants are usually palatalized before and after (and, of course, between) palatal vowels. However, it is not the case in loanwords. For example, Krueger [Krueger, 1961, p. 77] mentions that foreign words like /teχnik/ 'technician' are suffixed by the velar variants of the suffixes alternating due to vowel harmony (unlike /stɑrik/ 'old man', an older loanword, which ends in a /k/ palatalized by /i/). However, he mentions only words with a word final /k/, therefore one can suggest that /benzin/ will never be suffixed with the palatal variants of suffixes. Nonetheless, in Chuvash Wikipedia we find instrumental forms like *бензинпа* /benzin-pa/ and not *бензинпе /benzin-pe/. In Andreev [Andreev, 1997, p. 485] we find a dative form *бригадира* /brigadʲir-a/ instead of *бригадире /brigadʲir-e/ (which we would expect based on the vowels). Moreover, in Chuvash Wikipedia we find dative forms of *словарь* /slovarʲ/ 'dictionary' *словаре* /slovarʲ-e/, not *словаря /slovarʲ-a/, which shows that in these cases the last consonant of the stem triggers vowel harmony, independently of the qualities of the vowels in the stem.

We can also find palatalized consonant phonemes /lʲ/, /nʲ/, /tʲ/ in native Chuvash words. When they stand at the end of the stem, the palatal allomorph of suffixes alternating due to vowel harmony follow them: dative form *супăне* /supɤnʲe/ (*супăня /supɤnʲa/) of *супăнь* /supɤnʲ/ 'soap' [Sergeev, 2007].

1.2. Uralic languages
All the Uralic languages spoken in the Volga–Kama area belong to the Finno-Permic branch of the Finno-Ugric group of Uralic languages. Udmurt belongs to the Permic branch with Komi (Komi-Zyryan and Komi-Permyak): although Udmurt and the Komi are not mutually intelligible, their resemblance is unambiguous. Mari is more closely related to Erzya and Moksha than the Permic languages, but Erzya and Moksha are more closely related to Finnic languages (as Finnish or Estonian) and Saami than Mari. Mari is considered to be one language with two standards, Hill Mari and Meadow Mari: in fact, the two standards are based on two dialects of the dialect continuum. Even the two ends of the continuum preserved a relatively high degree of mutual understandability. The Mordvinic languages, Erzya and Moksha are considered to be closely related but different languages: earlier they were considered variants of the Mordvin language. They are mutually intelligible at a certain degree, and there are even transitional dialects between them, but their speakers identify themselves as members of different communities. Despite the relatively close relatedness of the Mordvinic, Finnic and Saami languages, they are not mutually understandable at all.

The Mordvinic, the Mari and the Permic languages are relatively distantly related, and they exhibit very different kinds of harmony. These differences are quite great not just among, but also inside the different groups, or even between dialects of the same language.

1.2.1. Erzya
Erzya has just five vowels:

	Front	**Back**
High	i	u
Mid	e	o
Low		ɑ

All vowels trigger alternation /e/ ~ /o/, which means that it is not clear whether it is a case of labial or palatovelar harmony. Since the unrounded back /ɑ/ is followed by rounded back /o/, we can conclude that it is a case of palatovelar harmony. Moreover, even (stem final) palatalized consonants can trigger the selection of /e/, which is another argument for having palatovelar harmony in Erzya.

However, in Erzya, we cannot speak about vowel harmony: we should rather speak about complex CV harmony. We have seen that in the Turkic languages of the region consonants can influence vowel harmony.

There these cases are quite peripheral, solely occurring in foreign words. In Erzya, however, these phenomena are more widespread, even native words are affected.

In Erzya, there is a phonemic distinction between palatalized and non-palatalized coronal consonants. When a front vowel follows a non-palatalized consonant, the vowel is pronounced somewhat retracted (as Russian *ы*, but not just the high but also the mid vowel). Back vowels can follow palatalized consonants, but there is no considerable advance in their pronunciation in this case. Non-coronal consonants are never palatalized phonemically, but are palatalized phonetically in the neighborhood of front vowels.

The complexity of CV harmony can be demonstrated with the following cases (based on Keresztes, 1990, p. 37):

- both triggers and targets are vowels: /kudo-so-nzo/ 'in his/her house': /velʲe-se-nze/ 'in his/her village';
- both triggers and targets are consonants: /kɑl-t/ 'fish (plural)': /kɑlʲ-tʲ/ 'willows';
- triggers are vowels but targets are consonants: /kudo-t/ 'houses': /velʲe-tʲ/ 'villages';
- triggers are vowels and targets are both vowels and consonants: /kudo-vtomo/ 'without (a) house': /velʲe-vtʲeme/ 'without (a) village';
- triggers are consonants and targets are both vowels and consonants: /kɑl-do/ 'from (a) fish': /kɑlʲ-dʲe/ 'from (a) willow'.

There are some suffixes with non-alternating vowels: /i/, /ɑ/ and even /e/. In Standard Erzya, /u/ is very rare in non-first syllables, and it never emerges in suffixes. However, there are dialects, where we find an /i/ ~ /u/ alternation instead of the /e/ ~ /o/ alternation of Standard Erzya. In other dialects, there is no harmony at all: instead of non-first syllable Standard Erzya /e/ and /o/, we find a schwa-like vowel.

In some dialects of Erzya, we can find another kind of harmony beside the palatovelar one: height harmony [Cyganov, 1959, p. 71–72]. There are two kinds of height harmony: progressive and regressive. In some dialects spoken along the river Sura and its tributaries, we find /i/ ~ /u/ alternation as default, but /e/ ~ /o/ alternation after /e/ and /o/. This is a kind of progressive assimilation. In some other dialects, /e/ ~ /o/ alternation is the default, but there is /i/ ~ /u/ alternation before /a/. Cyganov speaks about regressive assimilation. Although it is certainly regressive, it should rather be considered dissimilation: it increases the difference between the vowels following each other.

1.2.3. Moksha
Moksha has 7 vowels:

	Front	Back
High	i	u
Mid	e	o
Low	a	ɑ
Reduced	ə	

In Moksha, we find no /e/ or /o/ in non-first syllables: where we find these vowels in Standard Erzya, we find /ə/ in Moksha. In non-first syllables of stems we find /u/ only before /f/ and /v/, /i/ only before /j/ (which can be deleted at the end of the stem). In non-first syllables, we usually find low or reduced vowels. In suffixes, there are palatovelar alternations /a/ ~ /ɑ/ and /i/ ~ /u/, but they can be triggered exclusively by consonants: /kɑl-gɑ/ 'by/along (a) fish' : /kɑlʲ-ga/ 'by/along a willow'; /kud-u/ 'into (a) house' ~ /velʲ-i/ 'into (a) village'. The reduced vowel /ə/ also has back and front allophones, but its quality depends on the consonants next to it, not on the other vowels in the word.

We can conclude that there is no vowel harmony in Moksha.

1.2.4. Hill Mari
In the Standard Hill Mari vowel inventory we find 10 vowels:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded	Unrounded	Rounded
High	i	y		u
Mid	e	ø		o
Low	a		ɑ	
Reduced	ə		ɣ	

In Hill Mari we find palatovelar harmony. In native stems we have only back vowels (/u/, /o/, /ɑ/ and /ɤ/) or front vowels (/y/, /ø/, /a/ and /ə/). Two vowels, /i/ and /e/, which are phonetically front, play a kind of neutral role: they can also follow back vowels. However, they can be followed exclusively by front vowels (including /i/ and /e/) even in cases when they follow back vowels: they are opaque for vowel harmony [Alhoniemi, 1985, p. 21].

In suffixes we find two kinds of alternations due to vowel harmony: /a/ ~ /ɑ/ and /ə/ ~ /ɤ/. Although the alternation of rounded vowels would also be possible, these vowels do not occur in suffixes. There are only a few exceptions when we find non-alternating /a/, /ɑ/ or /ɤ/ in suffixes (see: Alhoniemi, 1985, p. 22).

1.2.5. Meadow Mari
Standard Meadow Mari has 8 vowels:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	**Rounded**	**Unrounded**	**Rounded**
High	i	y		u
Mid	e	ø		o
Low			ɑ	
Reduced	ɤ			

If we compare the Meadow Mari vowel inventory with that of Hill Mari, we see that the two missing vowels are the ones which take part in alternation due to vowel harmony in the two alternating pairs of Hill Mari. Therefore Meadow Mari cannot have such vowel harmony as Hill Mari has, we find a completely different kind of word harmony here.

The target of this vowel harmony is always a word final vowel (it can be either stem final or suffix final), which word internally always emerges as /ɤ/. In a word final position it always emerges as a mid vowel. As a result of a complex labio-palatovelar harmony, it can be /e/ (after unrounded vowels /i/, /e/ or /a/), /o/ (after rounded back vowels /u/ or /o/) or /ø/ (after rounded front vowels /y/ or /ø/). If the word final vowel is preceded by another /ɤ/, the nearest preceding vowel will count (and the quality of /ɤ/ or /ɤ/s between the last full vowel and the word final vowel will not change): /kudo/ 'hut' : /kudɤ-ʒo/ 'his/her house' or 'the house' : /kudɤ-ʃto/ 'in (a) house' : /kudɤ-ʃtɤ-ʒo/ 'in his/her house' etc. If there are no other vowels but /ɤ/ in the word, the word final vowel will be /e/: /jɤlmɤ-ʃtɤ-ʒe/ 'in his/her language'. Since stress falls on the last syllable containing a (non-alternating) full vowel, the domain of harmony is always begins with the stressed vowel and ends with the final vowel of the word, and only /ɤ/s can stand between them (Sebeok–Ingemann 1961, 10–11). However, in foreign words stress can fall on other vowels, and then the vowel of the last and not the stressed syllable will determine the quality of the word final vowel: /ˈawgust-ɤʃto/ 'in August', /ˈpolʲe-ʃte/ 'on a (football) field', /ˈtartu-ʃto/ 'in Tartu' [Isanbaev, 1975, p. 25, Riese et al., 2017, p. 40].

1.2.6. Mari dialects
Standard Hill Mari is based on the dialects spoken around Kozmodemyansk and Standard Meadow Mari is based on the dialects spoken around Morki and Shernur. Dialects located between the dialects of the two standards, spoken around Yoshkar-Ola, lack vowel harmony [Bereczki, 1990, p. 12–14]. (The minimal differences in the phoneme inventories of dialects do not play a considerable role in harmony, thus these are not discussed here.)

In the Northwest dialect (which is quite similar to the dialect the Standard Hill Mari is based on), spoken mostly outside of the Mari El, we also find labial harmony resembling that we find in Meadow Mari. The only considerable difference is that /ɤ/ and /ə/ do not change into /e/ after illabial vowels. However, between these two areas we find the dialects which completely lack vowel harmony (Ivanov–Tuzharov 1970, 51–54). Since it seems to be unlikely that labio-palatovelar harmony has been lost in the territory in between (and probably in Hill Mari), we have to suppose that it is a result of independent development in the two different dialectal territories.

Northwest	Yoshkar-Ola	**Central**	**Vyatka**–*Ufa*
Hill(–Forest)			

A scheme of main Mari dialects (based on: Bereczki, 1990, p. 16). Italics: dialects with palatovelar harmony; bold: dialects with labial harmony.

In the Eastern dialects (spoken in Northwest Bashkortostan and the neighboring territory) we also find both kinds of vowel harmony. Moreover, labio-palatovelar harmony targets not only the final vowel, but also the /ɤ/s (and /ə/s) in-between and vowels in closed syllables: however, they change into /u/ (and not /o/) after /u/ and /o/ and into /y/ (and not /ø/) after /y/ and /ø/. It seems that reduced vowels remain unchanged after

illabial vowels. In the Eastern dialect /i/ can be followed by /a/ (/witʃa/ 'bread') (c.f. Galkin et al., 1960, p. 18; Isanbaev, 1975, p. 22) or /ɤ/ (/kiʃkɤm/ 'snake (acc.)' – Beke, 1961, p. 280). Since there is much less information available on dialects and dialectal variations than on standard variants, I will ignore Mari dialects in the following.

1.2.6. Tatyshly Udmurt

In most variants in Udmurt, we find no vowel harmony (which is also true for other Permic languages: Komi-Zyryan, Komi-Permyak and Komi-Yazva). According to Kelmakov [Krlmskov, 1998, p. 72–73], pala-tovelar vowel harmony can be found in the Tatyshly, Krasnoufimsk and Tashkichi subdialects (govors) of the so-called Peripheral Southern dialect of Udmurt. Peripheral Southern dialect is spoken outside Udmurtia, in Mari El, Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Perm and Sverdlovsk oblasts. Peripheral Southern dialect has about nine subdialects – Kelmakov [Kelmakov, 1998, p. 42–43] lists seven of them, but we can also speak about the unmentioned Tashkichi and Shagirt dialects –, spoken far from each other, having different features on all the levels of linguistic description. However, they share some commons features, and they are all highly influenced by other languages: their speakers are usually multilingual, beside Udmurt and Russian they also speak other local languages (mostly Mari and/or Tatar).

Tatyshly and Krasnoufimsk dialects are reported to have vowel harmony has 10 vowels [Kelmakov, 1998, p. 61]:

	Front		Back	
	Unrounded	**Rounded**	**Unrounded**	**Rounded**
High	i	y		u
Mid	e	ø		o
Low	a		ɑ	
Reduced	ə		ɤ	

Kelmakov [Kelmakov, 1998, p. 72–73] describes only Tatyshly vowel harmony based on his on article [Kelmakov, 1975]. According to this, we find neither /ø/, /u/ or /y/ occur in non-first syllables. In stems, the vowels of the first syllable may determine the quality of the following vowel at different degrees:

First syllable	Second syllables
ɑ, o, u, ɤ, e	ɑ, ɤ
ø	ɑ, ə ~ ɤ
i	a ~ ɑ, ə ~ ɤ
y	a ~ ɑ, ə
a, ə	a, ə

• back vowels and /e/ are consequently followed by back variants of low and reduced vowels;

• non-high, non-low labial front vowel /ø/ determines the backness of low vowel, but allows free alternation of the reduced vowels;

• high illabial /i/ vowel allows free alternation of both low and reduced vowels;

• high labial front vowel /y/ determines the frontness of reduced vowel, but allows free alternation of low vowels;

• front low and reduced vowels /a/ and /ə/ are consequently followed by front variants of low and reduced vowels.

However, Kelmakov [Kelmakov, 1975, p. 36] adds that /a/ is usually followed by /a/ in Tatar loanwords and just exceptionally in native Udmurt words, where usually /a/ is followed by /ɑ/ rather than /a/. Cases when /ə/ follows /a/ or /ə/ are very few and it always happens in Turkic loanwords. Moreover, tendencies of vowel harmony can be disturbed by consonants: instead of an expected /ɑ/, /a/ can occur after or before palatal con-sonants and after /r/ [Kelmakov, 1975, p. 37].

There are some suffixes with /ə/ ~ /ɤ/ alternation, but there are some others which are always used with /ɤ/. In suffixes /ɑ/ never alternates with /a/ due to vowel harmony [Kelmakov, 1975, p. 39].

Since vowel harmony plays a very restricted role in morphophonology, and most of the cases which show traces of vowel harmony in the first two syllables of stems appear in Turkic loan stems, Kelmakov [Kelmakov, 1975, p. 41–42) emphasizes that we can only find some elements of vowel harmony in the Tatyshly dialect, but it functions in a very limited way.

22

As for the Krasnoufimsk dialect, its most extensive description (Nasibullin 1978) does not contain anything on vowel harmony. Since this dialect is extinct in all probability, we have to rely on very restricted remaining material on it in the future.

2. Typological features

Below, I give an overview of the most important features which show the differences between the vowels harmonies of the Volga–Kama region. Only those features are taken into account which are distinctive between at least two languages of the region. For example, as in Hill Mari, *i* and *e* kind vowels can be combined with back vowels in the stem, similarly to Finnish and Hungarian. However, in Finnish, if *i* and/or *e* follows back vowel(s), the back allomorph of the suffix will be used (some foreign words can be exceptions, where alternation is allowed: partitive singular *adverbia ~ adverbiä*). In Hungarian, however, the situation is much more complicated, but in some cases back, in some other cases front allomorphs are used, and many times we find alternations. This is an important difference between the similar phenomena of Hill Mari, Finnish and Hungarian, but is not reflected in the following table, because there is no similar difference between the languages of the region.

My aim is to explore whether there are or there are no similar vowel harmonies which could have emerged due to language contact. Therefore:

• I summarize the data in a table, the comments and explanation to which come after it. This way it is easier to notice differences and similarities.

• Since the aim is the comparison of vowel harmonies, I ignore languages lacking vowel harmony (Moksha, Mari dialects without vowel harmony, Standard Udmurt and most of the dialects). Dialects are ignored for the lack of detailed description of vowel harmony in them. The only exception in Tatyshly Udmurt, of which we have a relatively thorough description and which is extremely interesting from the point of view of language contact. Mari dialects would be also worth considering; however, they show just varieties of the phenomena present in the examined standards. Erzya dialects deserve extreme attention for height harmony, but since this phenomenon is not reported in any other languages of the area, it is out of the scope of my interest. Since Tatar and Bashkir vowel harmony shows no considerable difference (except for the /i/ ~ /ŭ̯/ alternation in Tatar, not reported for Bashkir) and their similarity is due to common heritage, not contact, I will take them as one language.

• To present the possibilities of contact, I will enumerate languages in the table not due to origin but from West to East. Of course, any order is quite inadequte, since language territories overlap, they changed over time (today Chuvash and Udmurt territories are far from each other but earlier there was strong contact between the two languages) and for example all the languages were influenced by Tatar. My compromise solution is this order: Erzya, Chuvash, Hill Mari, Tatar-Bashkir, Meadow Mari and Tatyshly Udmurt.

In features when I count vowels, I ignore vowels which occur exclusively in new (Russian) loanwords. Abbreviations are resolved in the text below the table.

Language / feature	Erzya	Chuv.	H. Mari	Tat./Bash.	M. Mari	Tatyshly Udm.
1. LH	!	–	–	+	+	–
2. LH triggers				m	hm	
3. LH targets				m	m	
4. LH pairs	0/0	0/2	0/2	2/3	1/2	0/2
5. LH same height constraint				(+)	(–)	
6. LH/PH dominance				–	LH	
7. PH triggers	5/5	8/8	10/10	9/9	4-7/8 (4/4)	6-8/10
8. PH targets	m	ml/rl	rl	a	m	r
9. PH pairs	1/0	2/4	2/4	3(4?)/4	1/2	1/4
10. PH in stems	–	+	+	+	–	–
11. Consonants in PH	*	+	–	(+)	–	–

2.0. Palatovelar (front/back) harmony (PH)

All languages in the area exhibiting vowel harmony exhibit front/back harmony, therefore the lack or presence of palatovelar harmony is not included in the table as a feature. However, it is worth mentioning, because it connects the languages of the area.

2.1. Labial (roundness) harmony (LH)

Contrary to palatal harmony, labial harmony occurs just in some of the languages of the area: Tatar/Bashkir and Meadow Mari: – means the absence, + the presence of vowel harmony. Erzya is a special case, since the /e/ ~ /o/ alternation could also be the result of labial harmony, but it is triggered by the palatality/velarity of vowels (and palatalization of consonants). Empty cells show that the feature is not interpretable in the language: in this case, because of the lack of labial harmony.

2.2. Triggers of labial harmony

Not all the vowels must trigger labial harmony even in languages where this kind of harmony exists. In the table, **m** stands for mid vowels, **h** for high vowels.

2.3. Targets of labial harmony

Not all vowels alternate due to labial harmony. Here **m** stands for mid vowels again. However, we have to remember that Tatar/Bashkir mid vowels are shorter than the other vowels of the language (which is not true for Meadow Mari), therefore they can be analyzed also as reduced (lax?) vowels. Therefore the same value in the cells may be misleading.

2.4. Pairs in labial harmony

This feature presents the last phenomenon from another point of view: how many of the potential alternating pairs of the vowel system really show alternation. Potential alternating pairs are the vowels which show difference exclusively in labialization. In Tatar/Bashkir, we find three such pairs: /y/~ /u/, /ɪ/ ~ /ɣ/ and /ŭ/ ~ /ʊ/, but only the last two show alternation. In Meadow Mari, we find two such pairs: /y/~ /u/ and /ø / ~ /o/, but only the last alternation is attested. (In Eastern dialects both are attested but in different position: /ø / ~ /o/ alternation in the word final position and /y/~ /u/ alternation inside the word. This feature can also be interesting for languages lacking labial harmony: Chuvash, Hill Mari and Tatyshly Udmurt have two-two pairs of vowels which could alternate due to vowel harmony, but they do not. On the contrary, Erzya lacks labial harmony since there are no two vowels which would differ only in labiality. (However, the causal relation is questionable here since Erzya also lacks vowels which would differ only in frontness/backness, but does not lack alternation due to frontness/backness.)

2.5. Same height constraint in labial harmony

This feature refers two the last three features from a new point of view: do vowels trigger labial harmony if and only if the trigger and target vowels are of the same height? For Tatar/Bashkir (+) stands since the alternation of the mid vowels is triggered exclusively by mid vowels (however, alternation of high vowels is not triggered by high vowels: in this case, the feature would be +.) For Meadow Mari, (–) is based on the fact that both high and mid vowels trigger of alternation of mid vowels; however, the alternation of high vowels cannot be triggered either by high or mid vowels. If both high and mid vowels would trigger the alternation of both high and mid vowels (as in Hungarian), the value would be –.

2.6. The dominance of labial or palatovelar harmony

In some cases, labial and palatovelar harmony can contradict each other. For example, in Meadow Mari, when /ɑ/ is followed by a mid vowel, labial harmony requires /e/ and palatovelar harmony requires /o/. In this case, labial harmony is dominant: *ola-ʃte* (**ola-ʃto*) 'in (a) city/town'. In Hungarian, in a very similar alternation, the case is the opposite: *ház-hoz* (**ház-hez*) 'in a house'. The difference can be interpreted that in Meadow Mari, labial harmony is dominant while in Hungarian palatolabial harmony is dominant. (This kind of dominancy independent of the frequency or number of kinds of alternations due to the different kinds of vowel harmony. Beside /ø/ ~ /o/ and /y/ ~ /u/, Eastern Mari also exhibits alternations /a/ ~ /ɑ/ and /ə/ ~ /ɤ/ due to palatovelarity, but just /e/ ~ /o/ and /e/ ~ /ø/ due to labiality: four vs. two alternations. However, labial alternation is dominant in the presented sense even in Eastern Mari.)

Since we have a four way alternation /ɪ/ ~ /ŭ/ ~ /ɣ/ ~ /ʊ/ in Tatar/Bashkir, where the two kinds of alternations do not conflict, we cannot speak about the dominancy of any of the two alternations.

2.7. Triggers in palatovelar harmony

Contrary to labial harmony (2.2), other features play no strict role in determining the list of vowels triggering palatovelar harmony: therefore it is easier to count them. In most of the languages, all vowels trigger vowel harmony: front stem vowels are followed by front vowels, back stem vowels are followed by back vowels in suffixes alternating due to harmony. (In some languages, the same constraint pays also in stems, see 2.10.)

Meadow Mari is a complicated case. Velar /ɑ/ clearly does not trigger vowel harmony, since it is followed by palatal /e/ in alternating suffixes (remember the example *ola-ʃte* (**ola-ʃto*) 'in (a) city/town'). Palatal /e/ seems to trigger harmony since it is followed by palatal /e/ in alternating suffixes; however, not because it is

palatal but because it is illabial. In the case of /ɤ/, it is not easy to decide whether it is a palatal or a velar vowel, since it is not palatolabial contrast, its pronunciation highly depends on the surrounding consonants and many time strongly reduced, even dropped. It seems reasonable to count only those vowels which trigger labializing, and all of them also trigger palatovelar harmony.

Tatyshly Udmurt is also a complicated case, but for another reason. Velar vowels /ɑ/, /o/, /u/, and /ɤ/ are always followed by velar vowels /ɑ/ and /ɤ/, palatal vowels /a/ and /ə/ are always followed by palatal vowels /a/ and /ə/, therefore these six vowels clearly trigger vowel harmony. Palatal vowel /e/ is always followed by velar vowels /ɑ/ and /ɤ/, therefore it is clearly a vowel not triggering vowel harmony. The remaining three vowels do not belong to such clear categories, and they are also different from each other. The palatal vowel /y/ triggers vowel harmony of reduced vowels, since it is followed by /ə/, not /ɤ/; however, it can be, but not necessarily followed by low palatal /a/, it can be followed also by low velar /ɑ/. The palatal vowel /ø/ does not trigger the harmony of low vowels, since it must be followed by /ɑ/, not /a/; on the other hand, it can be, but is not necessarily followed by reduced palatal /ə/, it can also be followed by low velar /ɤ/. The palatal vowel /i/ does not trigger either harmony or antiharmony in any case. So, among the ten vowels, six trigger harmony, one triggers antiharmony, and three of them are ambiguous: one of the three rather triggers harmony (/y/), one rather triggers antiharmony (/ø/), and one (/i/) does not trigger either harmony or antiharmony, but simply allows both of them. However, since /ɑ/ ~ /a/ alternation is not attested in suffixes and their harmonicity seems to be controversial inside stems. Therefore it is enough to take the /ə/ ~ /ɤ/ alternation into consideration: in that case /y/, /ø/ and /i/ are ambiguous in the same way.

2.8. Targets in palatovelar harmony

In Tatar/Bashkir, all vowels are targets of palatal harmony. However, /u/ and /y/ do not occur in non-first syllables, and in Tatar /i/ (/ɪ/?) alternates with /ŭɪ̯/, therefore one can argue that there is no alternation between high vowels.

In Erzya and Meadow Mari only mid vowels can be targets. However, there are Erzya dialects where only high vowel can be targets or where both high and mid vowels can be targets (depending on different circumstances). Chuvash and Hill Mari are similar in that both reduced and low vowels can be targets: however, while in Hill Mari there is a clear opposition between mid and reduced vowels, Chuvash reduced vowels can be analyzed as mid vowels. This means that if we analyze these vowels as reduced, we cannot say that mid vowels do not take part in vowel harmony (since in that case there are no mid vowels in Chuvash). In Tatyshly Udmurt, only reduced vowels are real targets of vowel harmony.

2.9. Pairs in palatovelar harmony

In Tatar/Bashkir we find 4 potential alternations, but there is no alternation /u/ ~ /y/, and at least in Tatar there is an alternation /i/ ~ /ŭɪ̯/, which is not obvious due to the vowel system. In most of the cases, just about the half of the potentially alternating stems alternate, in Tatyshly Udmurt, just the quarter. Erzya is interesting since the alternating pair is potentially non-alternating, since they also differ in labiality. (If we analyze the low velar Tatar/Bashkir vowel as labial, we find a similar problem.)

2.10. Palatovelar vowel harmony inside stems

In all the examined languages we can find a common phenomenon: at least some of the suffixes alternate according to the vowels inside the stem: the suffix must contain (a) vowel(s) belonging to the same category as the vowels (or at least one prominent vowel) of the stem. In some of these languages there is also a strong tendency that the vowels of the stem must belong to the same class: the exceptions are mostly foreign words. This tendency is clear for the Turkic languages and Hill Mari, but not for the others. However, this is rather a gradual than a binary phenomenon.

2.11. The role of consonants in palatovelar harmony

As we have seen, the palatalization of consonants plays an important role in the Turkic languages of the area. In Tatar/Bashkir, palatalized consonants are just allophones of non-palatalized ones which occur in words with front vowels. If we observe exclusively native words, we do not have to count with these allophones, we do not have to consider that they play any role in vowel harmony (similarly to Hungarian or Finnish). However, if we consider the behavior of foreign words, where palatalization is not an automatic process, we have to notice that palatalized consonants play an important role in spreading palatality (palatality agreement of neighboring elements, licensing palatality etc. depending on the theoretical frame). Since their role is obvious only from cases not typical for the language, it is marked by (+).

In Chuvash, we find the same phenomenon also with native words, since although palatalization of consonants is automatic in the neighborhood of front vowels, palatalized consonants also occur in the neighborhood of back vowels (they are phonemes). This case is marked by +.

In Erzya, we find automatic palatalization only with non-coronal consonants. Coronal non-palatalized consonants not just stay non-palatalized, but vowels following them are velarized. However, palatalization through vowels can be triggered by a palatalized consonant phoneme (as in *kaľ-ďe* 'from (a) willow'), but vowel harmony can "go through" non-palatalized consonants (as in *veľe-se-nze* 'in his/her village'). This case is marked by *.

In other languages, there are no reported cases where consonants interact with vowel harmony. (Tatyshly Udmurt could be a case like this, but there are no clear rules there.)

3. Potential influence

In the case of vowels harmonies in the Volga–Kama area, we have to take into consideration the influence of Turkic languages on the Finno-Ugric ones. Not simply because the Turkic languages were the more prestigious ones and usually these influenced the others (influences of the opposite direction are also known), but because it is undisputable that Turkic languages have strongly preserved the vowel harmony of the proto-language. This is true first of all to Tatar and Bashkir. In Chuvash, old Turkic front vowels have developed into back vowels, compare Chuvash *вăкăр* /wɤkɤr/ 'bull', Tatar *үгез* /ygɪz/ 'bull', Bashkir *үгеҙ* /ygɪð/ 'bull, ox'; however, Hungarian *ökör* 'ox', an *r*-Turkic loanword shows that the Bulgaric branch also had front vowel in the word.

According to Keresztes [Keresztes, 2011, p. 34], Pre-Mordvinic non-first syllable *a* (/ɑ/) had developed into /ɤ/ and Pre-Mordvinic *ä* (/a/) had developed into /ə/, and later these developed into /o/ and /e/ (in dialects /u/ and /e/), respectively. He also states that Moksha preserves the state with /ɤ/ and /ə/; nonetheless, he counts it as one phoneme with two allophones, the quality of which only depends on the neighboring consonants ([Keresztes, 2011, p. 17]; cf. also: Keresztes, 1990, p. 23–24), which is certainly not true for Erzya /e/ and /o/. Bartens [Bartens, 1999, p. 60] states that there exists an irregular Moksha form /pizⁱɤl/ 'rowan' (Erzya /pizⁱol/). If it were true, we had to differentiate /ɤ/ and /ə/ as phonemes. Nonetheless, the word is /pizⁱɤl/ according to Juhász [Juhász, 1961, p. 124]. However, taking everything into account, Keresztes states that Erzya vowel harmony, although in a changed form, is inherited from Proto-Uralic vowel harmony.

Cyganov [Cyganov, 1959, p. 72] states that dialects having /u/ ~ /i/ alternation preserved the original Proto-Mordvin vowel harmony, and all other kinds of vowel harmonies (and the lack of vowel harmony) has developed from that type. Neither Keresztes nor Cyganov argue for their own version of development. I cannot see any reason for accept this or that supposition.

As we have mentioned above, Bereczki [Bereczki, 1983, p. 213] states that palatovelar harmony in Hill Mari and Eastern Mari developed due to the influence of Turkic languages – however, he does not argue for it. One could also imagine that Hill Mari preserved Proto-Uralic vowel harmony in a modified form. An argument for it can be if in words of Uralic/Finno-Ugric origin, most of Hill Mari front vowels corresponded to Proto-Uralic/Finno-Ugric front vowels, back vowels to back vowels. This can be checked with the help of the database published in Csúcs et al. (1991). For comparison, we make the same statistics for Finnish and Hungarian (which certainly preserved vowel harmony) and Udmurt (which certainly lost it). We also make the same statistics for Erzya. For Hill Mari, we chose the Kozmodemyansk (Hill) dialect, for Udmurt, the Sarapul dialect, since these are the closest to the modern standard. Hungarian and Erzya dialects are not separated. The percentages in the table show how many stems preserved backness/frontness. Numbers in parentheses show the exact number of the cases (remained/changed). Cases when recent forms have both front and back variants are ignored.

	Finnish	Hungarian	Erzya	Hill Mari	Udmurt
a	97 % (64/2)	60 % (15/10)	93 % (40/3)	86 % (32/5)	89 % (25/3)
ä	93 % (28/2)	100 % (36/0)	100 % (22/0)	84 % (22/4)	44 % (14/18)
e	100 % (39/0)	97 % (45/1)	100 % (27/0)	100 % (22/0)	23 % (9/31)
ẹ	–	–	0 % (0/1)	0 % (0/1)	0 % (0/2)
i	100 % (35/0)	95 % (19/1)	87 % (21/3)	100 % (17/0)	63 % (12/7)
o	100 % (50/0)	84 % (38/7)	94 % (33/2)	92 % (23/2)	86 % (31/5)
u	100 % (60/0)	94 % (53/3)	100 % (37/0)	90 % (30/3)	85 % (29/5)
uncertain back	100 % (15/0)	84 % (21/4)	100 % (14/0)	80 % (16/4)	71 % (27/11)
uncertain front	100 % (37/0)	97 % (35/1)	84 % (26/5)	90 % (29/3)	20 % (7/27)

	Finnish	Hungarian	Erzya	Hill Mari	Udmurt
2nd syll. *a (*e/*a)	91 % (83/8)	100 % (1/0)	92 % (54/5)	46 % (13/15)	50 % (1/1)
2nd syll. *ä	100 % (44/0)	–	87 % (27/4)	100 % (15/0)	50 % (1/1)
Total	97 % (455/12)	90 % (263/27)	93 % (301/23)	86 % (219/37)	58 % (156/111)

It seems that Hill Mari preserved the frontness/backness of vowels in inherited words almost to the extent Hungarian did (and Erzya even better than Hungarian). The only change which seems to be systematic is that *a is reflected with an *e* in most of the cases in contemporary Hill Mari (and other Mari dialects). Although /e/ is a neutral vowel in Hill Mari in the sense that it can follow even back vowels (and does not take part in alternation due to vowel harmony), it can be followed only by front vowels. Anyway, the vowel harmony in Hill Mari could not collapse so drastically as in Udmurt (and generally in Permic). We could suppose that vowel harmony once was lost in (Proto-)Mari like in Estonian, by the neutralization of the vowels in non-first syllables (*a, *ä > a; *u, *ü > u etc.), and later it developed again due to the influence of Turkic languages. However, it is difficult to prove if it is not documented; and it is unnecessary to suppose loss and emergence of a phenomenon if we can suppose that neither happened.

Moreover, there are other arguments against that Mari palatovelar harmony has developed under Turkic influence. As we have seen above, consonants play a certain role in Chuvash, Tatar and Bashkir vowel harmony, but we found no trace of that in Mari. (However, although consonants interact with vowel harmony in a rather different way in Erzya (and Moksha) harmony, it is possible that Chuvash or Tatar influence played some role in the emergence of this phenomenon.) Moreover, it is also present in the Northwest dialect of Mari, which had the weakest contact with Turkic languages, while it is absent from dialects which had stronger contact with Chuvash and Tatar. Nonetheless, we cannot exclude the possibility that the more intense vowel harmony in Eastern Mari dialects is not completely independent of Turkic influence.

Kelmakov [Kelmakov, 1975] has demonstrated convincingly that the elements of vowel harmony in Tatyshly Udmurt have developed as a result of Turkic (Tatar) influence. Anyway, we have to emphasize that this fact does not mean that Tatyshly Udmurt has adopted Tatar vowel harmony, the two harmonies are quite different from each other.

4. Conclusion

We have to claim that vowel harmony is not an areal feature of the Volga–Kama region. Although we can find palatovelar harmony at least in some dialects of all languages in the region (except for Moksha, but it also has a related phenomenon), these vowel harmonies fundamentally differ from each other. Where we find similarities, they are the result of common heritage (especially between Tatar and Bashkir, and partially Chuvash). In some cases, we can suppose some kind of influence (Tatar, Chuvash → Erzya, Moksha; Tatar, Bashkir → Eastern Mari; Tatar → Tatyshly Udmurt, Eastern Mari → Krasnoufimsk Udmurt), but it never means the adaptation of the vowel harmony of the other language, but rather an interference in phonotactics caused by the neighboring language.

To investigate the possibility and the way of such influences, we have to compare the neighboring dialects of different languages. Anyway, the result will hardly change our general conclusion that vowel harmony is not an areal feature of the Volga–Kama area.

References

Alhoniemi, Alho (1985): Marin kielioppi. Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.

Andreev (1997): Андреев И. А.: Чувашский язык. In: Языки мира. Тюркские языки. Издательство «Индрик», Москва, 480–491.

Bálint (1877): Szentkatolnai Bálint Gábor: Kazáni-tatár nyelvtan. MTA, Budapest.

Bartens, Raija (1999): Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys. Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki.

Beke Ödön (1961): Mari szövegek. IV. kötet. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Bereczki Gábor (1983): A Volga–Káma-vidék nyelveinek areális kapcsolai. In: Areális nyelvészeti tanulmányok. Szerk. Balázs János. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó. 207–236.

Bereczki Gábor (1990): Chrestomathia ceremissica. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Csúcs, Sándor – Honti, László – Salánki, Zsuzsa – Varga, Judit: Statistik der Uralischen Lautentsprechungen. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézete.

Cyganov (1959): Цыганов, Н. Ф.: К вопросу классификации диалектов эрзя-мордовского языка. In: Совещание по вопросам исторической грамматики и исторической диаелектологии финно-угорских языков. Академия Наук СССР, Институт языкознания, Москва. 70–72.

Dmirtiev (1948): Дмитриев, Н. К.: Грамматика башкирского языка., Издательство Академии Наук СССР, Москва–Ленинград.

Galkin et al. (1960): Галкин, И. С. – Исанбаев, Н. И. – Пенгитов, Н. Т. – Барцева, З. Ф.: Современный марийский язык. Фонетика. Марийское книжное издательство, Йошкар-Ола.

Isanbaev (1975): Исанбаев, Н. И.: Гармония гласных и ее виды в марийском языке. In: Вопросы марийского яызыкознания. Сборник статей к 60-летию со дня рождения профессора Н. Т. Пенгитова. Марийский научно-исследовательский институт, Йошкар-Ола.

Ivanov–Tuzharov (1970): Иванов, Н. Г. – Тужаров, Г. М.: Северно-западное наречие марийского языка. Марийское книжное издательство, Йошкар-Ола.

Juhász Jenő (1961): Moksa-mordvin szójegyzék. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Kelmakov (1975): Кельмаков, В. К.: Элементы палатальной гармонии гласных в татышлинском диалекте удмуртского языка. Советское финно-угроведение XI/1, 33-42.

Kelmakov (1998): Кельмаков, В. К.: Краткий курс удмуртской диалектологии. Издательство Удмуртского университета, Ижевск.

Keresztes László (1990): Chrestomathia morduinica. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.

Keresztes László (2011): Bevezetés a mordvin nyelvészetbe. Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen.

Krueger, John R. (1961): Chuvash Manual. Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 7. Indiana University – Mouton & Co., Bloomington – The Hague, The Netherlands.

Landmann, Angelika (2014): Tschuwaschisch Kurzgrammatik. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.

Litvinov (1998): И. Л. Литвинов: Я начинаю говорить по-татарски. Издательство «ГранДан», Казань.

Nasibullin (1978): Насибуллин, Р. Ш.: Наблюдения над языком красноуфимских удмуртов. In: О диалектах и говорах южноудмуртского наречия: сборник статей и материалов. НИИ при Сов. Мин. Удм. АССР, Ижевск. 86–151.

Riese, Timothy – Bradley, Jeremy – Yakimova, Emma – Krylova, Galina (2017): Оҥай марий йылме: A Comprehensive Introduction to the Mari Language. Department of Finno-Ugric Studies, University of Vienna.

Safiullina–Fatkhullova (1999): Ф. С. Сафиуллина – К. С. Фатхуллова: Татарский язык (интенсивный курс). «Хэтер», Казань.

Safiullina (2001): Ф. С. Сафиуллина: Татарский на каждый день. Казань, «Хэтер».

Sebeok, Thomas A. – Ingemann, Frances J. (1961): An Eastern Cheremis Manual. Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 5. Indiana University – Mouton & Co., Bloomington – The Hague, The Netherlands.

Sergeev (2007): Япала ячё (Морфологи, СЛПЧЧС, 2-мёш пай) Л.П. Сергеевăн «Чăваш чёлхи» справочникён пайё (2-мёш пайё, 1-мёшё кунта). goo.gl/mXJ6Ka (Downloaded: 25. 4. 2018.)

Usmanova (2006). Усманова М. Г.: Грамматика башкирского языка для изучающих язык как государственный. Уфа, Китап. https://goo.gl/Nkmuab

Yuldashev (1981): Юлдашев А.А.: Грамматика современного башкирского литературного языка. Москва, Наука.

Zakiev (1997): Закиев М. З. Татарский язык. In: Языки мира. Тюркские языки. Москва, Издательство «Индрик». 357–372.

И. С. Насипов

О ТИПОЛОГИИ ТАТАРСКО-ФИННО-УГОРСКИХ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ КОНТАКТОВ В ВОЛГО-КАМСКО-УРАЛЬСКОМ РЕГИОНЕ

Аннотация. В сообщении на основе исследований авторитетных лингвистов по типологии языковых контактов и на основе результатов изучения длительного взаимодействия татарского и марийского, удмуртского, мордовских (эрзя, мокша) народов, определены следующие типы татарско-финно-угорских языковых контактов в Волго-Камско-Уральском этнолингвистическом регионе: прямые (проксимальные), устойчивые (перманентные), частично внешние (маргинальные), неродственные, двусторонние, междиалектные, разнопрестижные.

Ключевые слова: языковые контакты, тюркские языки, татарский язык, финно-угорские языки, марийский язык, удмуртский язык, мордовские (мокша, эрзя) языки.

I. S. Nasipov

TYPOLOGY OF TATAR-FINNO-UGRIC LANGUAGE CONTACTS IN THE VOLGA-KAMA-URAL REGION

Abstract. In the message, based on studies of language authorities on the typology of language contact and based on the results of a study of a long interaction the Tatar and the Mari, the Udmurt, the Mordovian (Erzya, Moksha) peoples, the following types of the Tatar-Finn-Ugor contacts in the Volga-Kama-Ural ethno-linguistic region can be distinguished: 1) direct, i.e. proximate; 2) stable, i.e. permanent; 3) partially outer, i.e. marginal; 4) non-relative; 5) bilateral; 6) interdialectal; 7) unequivalent.

Keywords. The Language contacts, the Turkic languages, the Tatar language, the Finno-Ugric languages, the Mari language, the Udmurt language, the Mordovian (Erzya, Moksha) languages.

Сложность вопроса языковых контактов и актуальность изучения их результатов для истории языка и необходимость поиска новых методов решения таких задач в контексте внутренних и внешних факторов развития языка, а также достаточно обширный круг источников позволяют выделить в современном языкознании специальную отрасль – лингвистическую контактологию. Современный период в ее развитии определяется наличием различных лингвоконтактологических направлений на основе традиционных сравнительно-исторического и сравнительно-типологического языкознания с широкой исследовательской проблематикой с охватом билингвологии, социолингвистики, когнитивистики, лингвокультурологии, межкультурной коммуникации и др. [Лабунец, 2007].

В татарском языкознании проблемам языковых контактов уделяется большое внимание. В частности, различные аспекты были затронуты в изучении татарско-русского двуязычия (Л. К. Байрамова, С. Г. Васильева, Р. А. Вафеев, Р. С. Газизов, М. З. Закиев, А. З. Закиров, З. А. Исхакова, З. Н. Кириллова, Ф. К. Сагадеева, Н. Х. Шарыпова, Р. А. Юсупов), тюркизмов в русском языке (К. Р. Галиуллин, Р. Г. Гатауллина, Г. Х. Гилязетдинова, Р. А. Юналеева), лингвокультуралогии (Р. Р. Замалетдинов), ономасиологии (Л. Ш. Арсланов, Ф. Г. Гарипова, Г. Ф. Саттаров, А. Г. Шайхулов). Широкий охват контактологических проблем наблюдается в татарской диалектологии (Х. Ч. Алишина, Л. Ш. Арсланов,