Bayarma Khabtagaeva Mongolic Elements in Tuvan

2009 Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ISSN 0177-4743 ISBN 978-3-447-06095-0

Contents

Preface	1
Introduction	3
The topic of the study The database and structure of the book Notes on transcription	3 4 6
The Tuvan language	6 6 7
Tuvan dialects in the Tuvan Republic	9 14 14
The Soyot variety	15 16 17
Mongolic–Tuvan relations 2	21
Tuvan–Mongolic bilingualism 2 The Mongolic variety in Southeast Tuva 2 The role of the Mongolic writing system 2 Buddhism 2 Previous studies on Mongolic–Tuvan linguistic relations 2	21 22 23 24 25
Phonology	27
Vowels	27 28 28
Short vowels 2 a 2	28 28 30
<i>o</i>	31 32
<i>u</i>	33 37

Long vowels	
The development of long vowels in Mongolic and Tuvan	
Early layer	
Late layer	
Transitional layer	
Consonants	
The consonant system in Mongolic languages	
Labial consonants	
b	
<i>m</i>	
Dental and alveolar consonants	
<i>t</i>	
<i>d</i>	
<u>č</u>	
Ĭ	
<i>S</i>	
$\check{s} < si$	
The palatal consonant	
<i>y</i>	
Velar consonants	
<i>q</i>	
k	
γ	
g	
Liquids	
1	
r	
Nasals	
n	
η	
Consonant clusters	
Voicing	
Unvoicing	
Preservation	
Metathesis	
Changing	
Criteria characterizing the different layers	
Early layer	
Later layer	
Transitional layer	
Elision	
Words borrowed twice by Tuvan	

The borrowing of word classes	129
Nouns	
Adjectives	
Verbs	
Adverbs	
Numerals	
Pronouns	
Conjunctions	
Postpositions	
Particles	
Interjections	
Change of the original word classes	
Original Tuvan words with Mongolic suffixes	
{+sUn}	
{- <i>I</i> }	
{-IGA}	
{-ltA}	
{-mAG}	
{-mAl}	
{-mji}	
{+rKA-}	
Lexicology	151
Nouns	151
Inanimate nature	
Metals, minerals and substances	
Plants	
Wild animals, birds, fishes and insects	
Domestic animals	
Human and animal body parts	
Designations of people	
Kinship terminology and titles	
Occupations and expressions denoting social position	
Human characteristics	
Administrative units and institutions	
Buddhist and shamanistic terms	
Terms pertaining to mythology and folk religion	
Military terminology	
Harness and means of conveyance	
Buildings and their parts	
Household equipment and tools	
Clothing, materials and jewellery	
Food	
Medicine	

Art, writing, science and entertainment	212
Commerce and finance	
Measurement	222
Time and space	223
Abstract nouns connected with human life	224
Adjectives	236
Colour names	236
Directions	237
Measurement	238
Qualitative adjectives	
Adjectives denoting abstract ideas	241
Physical peculiarities of humans and animals	243
Characteristic features of humans:	246
Verbs	251
Transitive verbs	251
Intransitive verbs	258
Change in semantics	264
Etymology	267
The etymology of Mongolic loanwords of ultimately Turkic origin	267
Phonetic criteria	267
Morphological criteria	269
Semantic criteria	271
Compound words	272
Hybrid words	272
Compound hybrid words	273
Synonyms	274
Conclusion	277
List of Mongolic suffixes in Mongolic loanwords in Tuvan	279
Denominal noun suffixes {NN}	279
Deverbal noun suffixes {VN}	284
Denominal verb suffixes {NV}	
Deverbal verb suffixes {VV}	
Bibliography	293
Index of the Tuvan words	311
Index of the Literary Mongolian words	325

Introduction

The topic of the study

In this book I will explore the nature of the linguistic links between Mongolic languages and Tuvan. Tuvan is one of the archaic Turkic languages, but it experienced a strong Mongolic influence and contains more Mongolic elements than other Turkic languages. In this study I set out to demonstrate the strong Mongolic influence on Tuvan and to establish what criteria are available to characterize and classify the loanwords. The topic of my study I conceive as part of the Altaic Studies.

In general, Altaic Studies deals with the culture, history, ethnography and languages of the Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic people. In a narrow sense, it deals with the question of the genetic relationship between members of the Altaic language family. Ramstedt (1949; 1953) and Polivanov (1927) broadened this family with Japanese and Korean. Since that time, the question of the Altaic origin of Japanese and Korean has remained open. The problem of the genetic affiliation of the Altaic languages cannot be regarded as having been resolved. Some researchers think that they are genetically related (Ramstedt 1946–1947; 1952; 1957; Poppe 1960; Kotvič 1962; Miller 1971; 1991; Tekin 1979; 1986; Menges 1984; Starostin, Dybo & Mudrak 2003; Robbeets 2005), while others think that they are not (Clauson 1956; 1964; Doerfer 1963: 51–105; Sinor 1963; Róna-Tas 1974; 1991: 15–17; Ščerbak 1970: 9–12; Vovin 2005). Resolving the disputed problems of Altaic Studies will only be possible if we first examine the loanwords, and separate them from their possible original identities.

In the view of the current research, most of the similarities between Altaic languages are indisputably due to the results of intensive linguistic interactions. In recognition of Mongolic elements in Tuvan I used the historical-comparative method. The borrowing of a certain word may involve two possibilities: either the word preserved the shape it had in the source language or, on entering it, changed its shape according to the phonetic rules of Tuvan. One purpose of my study, therefore, was to determine the laws of adaptation. A further question concerns the role of these Mongolic loanwords in solving some problems of Turkology, and of course, of the Tuvan language. Such problems are the changes *a > i, *u > i, and the inexplicable sporadic change *y - > s - when, according to the rules of Tuvan, the expected shift would be *y - > c -. These problems also include the sporadic voicing of the Proto-Turkic initial *t -.

4 Introduction

This book discusses not only issues in Turkology, but also helps to resolve some problems of Mongolic Studies, such as the problem of the regressive assimilation called the breaking of *i, the chronology of the *si > ši change, the fate of the Mongolic $*\check{c}$, the chronology of the spirantization of q etc.

The database and structure of the book

The lexical material analyzed in my research was collected from the *Tuvan–Russian Dictionary* edited by Tenišev and published in Moscow in 1968. This source is still the best representation of the Tuvan lexical material. Dialectal forms were not considered. The Russian meanings of the Tuvan words were translated into English, it will be more convenient for the reader.

Every Tuvan word cited has a reconstructed Mongolic form and the morphological structure of the Mongolic word is given. Curly brackets are used to indicate the number of the Mongolic suffix, listed in the appendix *List of Mongolic suffixes in Mongolic loanwords in Tuvan*, where the function of the suffix, basic literature and examples are given as well. I list some comparative data from the Middle Mongolic sources, the Literary Mongolian and some Modern Mongolic languages.

After the Mongolic data, the origin of the Mongolic word is indicated. The detailed morphological structure and more detailed etymological data are found in the section on lexicology. In this chapter also I give the bibliographical references of Poppe (1968), Tatarincev (1976; 2000; 2002; 2004), and Rassadin (1980), who specifically dealt with the Tuvan–Mongolic linguistic connections.

The origin of a Mongolic word may be Mongolic, Turkic, Persian, Chinese, Tibetan, Manchu, Russian or Sanskrit. If the Mongolic loanword is of Turkic origin, I cite the Old Turkic form and if possible the Tuvan form inherited from the original Turkic stock. The Old Turkic forms are taken from the Clauson dictionary (1972), while the Old Uighur forms are collected from Ligeti (1966), Kara & Zieme (1978) and the Old Turkic Dictionary published in 1969 in Leningrad (DTS). The Persian data were collected from the Steingass dictionary (1930), the Tibetan words from the reprinted Tibetan–English dictionary by Das (2000), Manchu forms from Hauer's Manchu–German dictionary (1952) and Sanskrit data from Monier-Williams' dictionary (1997). The Chinese data were taken from *The Chinese–English Dictionary* (1979), but if some words are absent from this source I used Mathews's Chinese–English Dictionary published in 1931 (Mathews). These forms were checked against *The transcription of the Chinese words and names* handbook (Csongor & Ferenczy 1993).

Below is a list of the most important Middle Mongolic sources according to the writing systems with which they were noted down:

Preclassical documents written in Uighur Mongolian script (Precl.Mo.): sources from the 13th to 15th centuries belong here. The material was cited from Ligeti (1963; 1965a; 1967) and Tumurtogoo (2006);

- The Secret History of the Mongols. Mongqol-un ni'uča tobčiyan (MNT): the earliest Mongolic text compiled in the 13th century (probably 1228 and 1240) and later, at the time of the Ming dynasty, transcribed with Chinese characters. The meanings of the words cited from Ligeti's transcription (1964; 1971) are drawn from the Haenisch dictionary (1939);
- Hua-yi yi-yu (HY): the Middle Mongolian text in Chinese transcription from 1389 was compiled and published during the Ming dynasty. The material was taken from Mostaert (1977), but checked in two other publications as well (Haenisch 1957; Lewicki 1959);
- Zhiyuan Yiyu (ZY): the Middle Mongolian text in Chinese transcription from 1699. The material was taken from Kara (1990);
- 'Phags-pa material ('Phags-pa): the Mongolic inscriptions written in the square script, invented in 1269 and used until the collapse of the Yuan dynasty in 1368.

 The material is cited from Ligeti's transcription (1973) but the meanings are drawn from the book by Poppe (1957);
- The Persian-Mongolic and Arabic-Mongolic glossaries from Leiden (Leiden): the Mongolic manuscripts are dated to 1343, the material was taken from the edition by Poppe (1927a);
- The Arabic-Mongolic dictionaries of Ibn-Muhanna and the Mukaddimat al-Adab (Ibn-Muh. and Muq.): these Mongolic sources were noted down by Moslem scholars in the 14th century and written in Arabic script. The material was cited from Poppe (1938);
- The Mongolian Dictionary from Istanbul (Ist.): the Mongolic source written in Arabic script at the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th centuries. The material was published by Ligeti (1962);
- The Armenian-Mongolic glossary of Kirakos (Kirakos): this glossary was written in 1270, the material was cited from Ligeti (1965b).

Today, the Literary Mongolian language is the written language of all Mongols of Inner Mongolia. It was used in Buryatia until the 1930s and until the 1940s in Outer Mongolia, where it was replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet. Literary Mongolian is the "link" between the various Mongolic languages. Literary Mongolian forms (LM) were taken from the Mongolian–English dictionary by Lessing (1996). If any form was not found there, I used the Mongolian–Russian–French dictionary by Kowalewski (Kow.) and the Mongolian–Hungarian dictionary by Kara (1998).

From the forms of modern Mongolic languages, I chose Khalkha, Buryat, Oirat and Kalmuck, as the people who speak these languages most probably had contacts with Tuvan people in the different historical periods:

- Khalkha is the central, non-archaic Mongolic language, the literary language of Mongolia. The material was taken from the dictionaries by Bawden (1997), Luvsandendev (1957), Amarjargal (1988) and Kara (1998);
- Buryat is the northern, non-archaic Mongolic language, the literary language of Buryatia. The material was taken from the dictionary by Čeremisov (1973),

6 Introduction

- while the data from the Lower Uda Buryat (West Buryat) and Sayan Buryat dialects were collected from Rassadin (1999; 1996);
- Oirat is the western, non-archaic Mongolic language. It includes the Kalmuck language of Kalmykia and the Oirat dialects of Mongolia. The Kalmuck material was taken from the dictionary by Ramstedt (1935), while the Oirat data were drawn from Coloo's dictionary (1988).

Notes on transcription

The Cyrillic orthographic forms of Tuvan and modern Mongolic languages have been transcribed into Latin characters. I use the traditional transcription system, which is used in most publications on Mongolic close to the transcription used in Turkic Studies (see Deny et al. 1959: xiv–xv; Johanson & Csató 1998: xviii–xxii).

In Turkology and Mongolic Studies the letter $\langle g \rangle$ is used for the palatal allophone of $\langle g \rangle$. But the varied marking of the velar allophone causes problems. Usually it is marked with \dot{g} in Turkology and γ in Mongolic Studies. I followed this tradition.

The other problem I faced was the designation of $d\mathbf{z}$ for its occurrences in Khalkha. As this phoneme recently came to be marked by j, I accepted that method in this book.

Pharyngealization/glottalization is marked with the sign ^f.

The sign * was used for reconstructed forms.

The Tuvan language

The speakers of Tuvan

The self-designation of the Tuvan people are $tuva \sim t\ddot{v}va \sim t\ddot{v}va$. With their variants $to^c fa \sim tu^c fa \sim t\ddot{v}^c fa \sim to^c pa \sim d\ddot{v}va \sim d\ddot{v}ba$ and $du^h ha$ these are also the basic designations of some other Sayan Turkic groups.

The ethnonym *tuva* with its variations was recorded in the Middle Mongolic source *The Secret History of the Mongols* of the 13th century as *tubas* with the Mongolic plural suffix. The origin of this ethnonym was discussed by Tatarincev (1990).

The speakers of the Standard Tuvan language live in the Tuvan Republic of the Russian Federation. They number approximately 200,000 (Artem'jev 1999: 24). The Tuvan Republic is situated in South Siberia, in the upper Yenisei region (*Ulug xem*). In the south it borders Mongolia, in the west the Altai Republic, in the north the Khakas Republic and the District of Krasnoyarsk, in the northeast the Irkutsk region, and in the west the Republic of Buryatia. The capital is Kyzyl. The Tuvan Republic is a country of great variety with every type of landscape: high mountains, green taiga, steppes, springs and lakes.