УДК 81.11

Sergey BELYKH
Udmurtia State University
Universitetskaya 1, 426004 Izhevsk, Russia
email: bibulus@e-izhevsk.ru

WORDS OF THE MIDDLE MONGOLIAN ORIGIN IN THE PERMIC LANGUAGES

Among many hundreds Turkic (Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir) loan-words in the Udmurt and Komi languages there is a number of words of the Middle Mongolian origin. It is beyond doubt that all these words penetrated into the Permic languages through the Turkic languages of the Volga-Ural region. Most of them as well as other Turkic borrowings are present only in Udmurt, especially in its southern dialects and are absent in Komi. Examples:

Udm. *makta-* 'to mock, to sneer; to approve, to praise' < Tat. *maqta-* 'to approve, to praise' < MMo. *mayta-* 'to praise';

Udm. *nįgįt* 'firm, hard, stable' < Tat. *nə̂q* 'firm, hard' < MMo. *niγ* id.;

Udm. *ńukto* 'недоуздок, Halfter' < Tat. *nuqta* id. < MMo. *noγta* id.;

Udm. *sukįr* 'blind' < Tat. *suqə̂r* id. < MMo. *soqur* id.;

Udm. *telʹbugo* 'rein(s)' < Tat. *dilbəgä* , *tilbigä* id. < MMo. *delbege*;

Udm. *uram* 'street' < Tat. *uram* id. < MMo. *horam* 'trace, way' [1], etc. (about 30 words in all).

Nevertheless, several words of Mongolian origin can be revealed in both Udmurt and Komi (Komi-Zyrian and / or Komi-Permiak):

Udm. *ćeber* 'beautiful'; Perm. dial. *ćebęr* 'boaster, boastful; beautiful; proud' [2], Perm. lit. *ćebęr* 'proud; wilful, wayward' < Turk.: Tat. *čibär* , Bash. *sibär* , Chuv. *čiBer* 'beautiful' < MMo. *čeber* 'clear, beautiful' [3];

Udm. *ćida(l)-* 'to suffer, to endure, to bear, to tolerate'; Perm. dial. *ćid-* 'to be angry; to take offence; to resent'; Perm. lit. *ćid-* 'to worry, to be upset'; Yaz. *ćidęm* 'offence feeling, resentment' [4]; Zyr. *ćid*: (Skr.) *ćidję-vadję voliį*, (UVych.) *ćidję-vadję šedlini* 'to live in poverty; to be/get in/to a hopeless situation' (where *voliį* 'to be, to live', *šedlini* 'to get into') [5] < Turk.: Tat. *čə̂da-*, Bash. *sə̂δa-*, Chuv. *čăt* 'to tolerate, to endure, to suffer' < MMo. *čida-* 'to be able, to be capable of defeating' [6];

Udm., Zyr., Perm. *ďugdį-* 'to stop, to cease, to end' < (?) Turk.: Tat., Bash. *tuqta-*; Chuv. *tăχta* 'id.' < MMo. *toγta-*, *toqta-* 'id.' (on the Mongolian origin of the Turkic word s.: [7]);

Udm. *kuńan* 'calf'; ? Zyr. (UVych.) *koń-koń*, *końe-końe* (call-word for calf) [8] < Turk.:

© Сергей Константинович Белых, 2007

Bash. *qŏnan* ‘a three-year-old stallion’, Tat. *qŏnna-* ‘to foal’ < MMo. *gunan* ‘three-year-old (about cattle)’ [9].

The first two parallels are practically doubtless, as for the third and the fourth, there are some remarks to be done. In fact the origin of the Udmurt and Komi *ďugdi̯-* ‘to stop, to cease, to end’ is still unclear. Although the authors of SKES suggested another etymology for this word drawing a parallel between the Permic stem and some Baltic-Finnish words, their etymology didn’t seem to be quite convincing even for themselves [10]. So I dare to suggest my own way to solve this problem connecting the Permic stem with the above-mentioned Turkic and Mongolian words, while understanding my etymology to be also debatable: the reflection of the voiceless *t* and *q* as voiced *d* and *g* are not normal for the Turkic loan-words in the Permian languages, though just possible from the point of view of their historical phonetics.

The connection between the Komi *koń-koń*, *końe-końe* on the one hand and Udm. *kuńan* with the corresponding Turkic and Mongolian words on the other hand may be considered as dubious too. Suggested by Yevgeniy Gulyaev [11], this parallel was rejected by Sándor Csúcs [12], who considered the Komi word as onomatopoeic and having no relation to the above-mentioned Udmurt, Turkic and Mongolian words. The main reason of the Csúcs’s conclusion was just the Mongolian origin of this stem in the Turkic (resp. — Udmurt) languages. In the Csúcs’s opinion, it could penetrate into the Volga Turkic languages and, consequently, into Udmurt much later than the ancestors of the Komis and Udmurts separated from each other (as a result of the alleged migration of the Proto-Komis to the north) and the Proto-Permic community disintegrated. This way of argumentation is however unacceptable, because in this case a historical hypothesis (on the disintegration of the Proto-Permian community) is used against accepting a probable linguistic fact.

The so-called «migration theory» of the dissolution of Proto-Permian suggested for the first time in the beginning of the 20th century by Yrjö Wichmann [13] has become very popular and is widely adopted in Finno-Ugristics nowadays. The supporters of the «migration theory» consider that the migration of Proto-Komis in about 8-10th centuries from the Proto-Permian homeland to the north destroyed the Common Permian unity. After that the ancestors of the Komis supposedly stopped any contacts with the Proto-Udmurts and their southern neighbours — the Turks [14].

However, it should be noticed that the Wichmann’s hypothesis hasn’t been corroborated with any historical, ethnological, anthropological, archaeological etc. evidences, contradicts some linguistic material and obviously should be revised. In 1980s Eugen Helimski suggested a new solution of the problem of the Proto-Permian disintegration [15], in which way the hypothesis was later developed by some other researchers [16].

According to this point of view, the dissolution of the Proto-Permian community wasn’t purely a result of a total migration of the Komis’ ancestors to the north, but the process of the disintegration of the Proto-Permian unity lasted many centuries and had complicated reasons and history. As far as we can judge at present, the migration of Proto-Zyrians from the Kama basin to the Vychegda and Pechora was not a momentary action, but a gradual and prolonged for several centuries process, which could not itself lead to the breaking-off of relations between the Proto-Komis and Proto-Udmurts [17]. Moreover, it must be emphasized that another group of the Komis — the Komi-Permiaks — have never left their homeland and have never lost connec-

tions with their southern neighbours — the Udmurts. As a result of migrations of the Permians, by the beginning of the 2nd millennium they had occupied vast territories: almost whole Kama basin, banks of the rivers Vychegda, Vym', Sysola, Luza, Pechora etc. Of course, under these circumstances the Common Permian language stopped to exist as a monolithic and compact organism, but nevertheless the Proto-Permian unity was not yet completely destroyed. This unity passed to a new stage of its evolution and continued its existence in the form of Common Permian dialectal continuity, in the frames of which the dialects most remote from each other already seriously differed, but any neighbouring or adjacent dialects were still similar and close.

The former existence of this continuity has been proved to be true by presence of so-called «*particular relations*» (Russ. «*особые отношения*» by Eugen Helimski) between the southern Komi dialects and the Udmurt language on the one hand and between the northern Udmurt dialects and the Komi languages on the other hand. It is well-known that the northern Udmurt dialects are slightly closer to Komi than other ones, as well as the southern Komi dialects have some features in phonetics, morphology and vocabulary, which are absent in the northern dialects of Komi, but are present in the Udmurt language [18].

According to the prevailing in Finno-Ugristics conception of language bifurcation, the Proto-Permic language first divided into Proto-Komi and Proto-Udmurt, then Proto-Komi divided into Proto-Zyrian and Proto-Permiak, and Proto-Udmurt divided into Proto-Northern Udmurt and Proto-Southern Udmurt and so on. Proceeding from such an assumption the above-mentioned «particular relations» are considered as either archaisms retained only by some of the Permian dialects from Proto-Permic or even Pre-Permic epochs or as merely loans from one Permic language to another. [19].

However, it should be said that sometimes even some of supporters of this obviously too simplified scheme of the Proto-Permian dissolution begin to doubt about it and express various «seditious» ideas, as e.g. on the linguistic unity between the Udmurts and the Permiaks been preserved longer than between the Udmurts and the Zyrians, and on no fundamental difference between late Proto-Permian and early Udmurt etc. [20]. But as a rule, these very interesting and symptomatic ideas are set aside and flatly rejected by the absolute majority of scholars [21].

Nevertheless, the analysis of the southern Komi-Udmurt and northern Udmurt-Komi linguistic parallels let us make a conclusion that these «particular relations» are not a result of late contacts between already separated Udmurts and Komis, and so they cannot be explained merely as borrowings from Komi into Udmurt and vice versa, as it is traditionally supposed. In this case we deal with traces of the Common Permic epoch (the period of the Common Permic dialectal continuity) when pre-northern Udmurt dialects were in immediate contact with pre-southern Komi dialects [22].

It should be noticed that the traces of the Common Permic continuity can be revealed not only by linguistic methods, but also with help of historical, archaeological and anthropological data, which illustrate in the most unambiguous manner that there was no territorial gap between the Proto-Komis and Proto-Udmurts until the Slavs (the Russians) began to penetrate into the Permian lands and gradually settled there beginning since 11th–12th centuries [23].

It is necessary to pay attention to the very significant fact of rather late appearance of the Udmurts in Russian written sources. The first reliable mention about the «Votyak land» (*Вотятцкая земля*) in them is dated at 1469. Such a late appearance of the Udmurts in the written sources has a quite simple and logical explanation: originally the Russians did not distinguish the northern and southern Permian groups and called both the Udmurts and Komis by the name *Пермь*, that is until the 15th century the ancestors of the Komis and Udmurts were considered by their Russian neighbours as something one and indivisible [24].

These and other similar facts hardly conform with the above-mentioned «migration theory» prevailing in Finno-Ugristics till nowadays.

On the contrary, the materials of archaeology, anthropology, ethnology, written sources, as well as the data of the Komi and Udmurt dialects evidences that the migrations of Permian groups and the expansion of the Common Permian area could not constitute the direct reason for the disintegration of the Permian unity. As it was already said, the Permian unity should be better considered as merely entering the new stage of its evolution and continuing to exist in the form of Common Permic dialectal and ethnocultural continuity on the territory of the European North-East.

Dissolution of this continuity and, consequently, of the Permian unity occurred as a result of its northern and southern parts beginning from about 11th–12th centuries to gravitate towards different political and cultural poles: the northern Permians (Proto-Komis) by and by joined the social and economical structure of the Rus' principalities and later the Moscow state, while the southern Permians (Proto-Udmurts) were in the sphere of strong political, economical, cultural etc. influence of Volga Bulgharia and later the Kazan Khanate. Conversion of the Komis to Christianity in the 14th–15th centuries in fact led to the integration of the Zyrian and Permiaks into the forming Great Russian nation and drew a boundary-line between them and the Udmurts (who were formally converted to Christianity only in the 18th century, but really for the most part adhered to their old pagan believes till the beginning of the 20th century) in ideological and religious sphere. So, the period of the dissemination of Christianity among the Komis should be considered as the date of the end phase of the prolonged process of the disintegration of the Proto-Permian community [25].

Returning to the main theme of this article, it is necessary to note that the existence of the 2 (or even 4) common Permic words of the Mongolian origin in Udmurt and Komi makes the «migration theory» still more doubtful. The thing is that Mongolian borrowings could not in any way penetrate into the Volga-Ural Turkic and Permic languages earlier than in the 13th century — the epoch of the Mongolian conquest of the Eastern Europe. There is a very well-grounded, provable and conclusive point of view according to which the Turkic languages had had practically no Mongolian loanwords until the end of the 12th century, and only beginning from the 13th century, when the Mongols got the supremacy in the Eurasian steppe zone, the Turks began to borrow Mongolian words and grammatical elements into their languages [26].

Thus, the words of the Middle Mongolian origin can serve as a supplementary reason to reconsider the time estimation of the disintegration of the Proto-Permic unity and even the very approach to this estimation. First of all, on the basis of the aforecited material the following unavoidable conclusion should be done: the process of the disintegration of the Proto-Permic community was not completed until at least the middle of the 13th century. According to some other data (see above) this complicated and long

process came to its end probably even later. So, the traditional approach to the problem of disintegration of the Proto-Permian community is obviously antiquated and must be put aside. In order to solve this problem successfully it is necessary to use all sum of data of several sciences: comparative-historical linguistics, archaeology, ethnology, physical anthropology, history and so on. Only in the case of a complex analysis of this material obtained results can be considered trustworthy and reliable.

Abbreviations:

Bash. — Bashkir; Chuv. — Chuvash; dial. — dialectal; Perm. — Komi-Permiak; Yaz. — Komi-Yaz'va dialekt; Zyr. — Komi-Zyrian; lit. — literary; MMo. — Middle Mongolian; Russ. — Russian; Skr — Syktyvkar dialect of Komi-Zyrian; Tat. — Tatar; Turk. — Turkic languages; Udm. — Udmurt; UVych — Upper Vychegda dialect of Komi-Zyrian.

Notes:

1. Csúcs S. Die tatarischen Lehnwörter des Wotjakischen. Budapest, 1990. S. 238, 244, 245-246, 263, 284, 300.

2. Лыткин В.И. О древнетюркских элементах в лексике пермских языков // Вопросы финно-угорского языкознания. Вып. IV. Ижевск, 1967. С. 136.

3. Csúcs S. Die tatarischen Lehnwörter…, S. 143; Древнетюркский словарь. Ленинград. 1969. С. 142; Федотов М.Р. Этимологический словарь чувашского языка. Т. 2. Чебоксары. 1996. С. 419-420.

4. Лыткин В.И. О древнетюркских элементах…, С. 138.

5. Лыткин В.И. О древнетюркских элементах…, С. 138-139; Сравнительный словарь коми-зырянских диалектов. Сыктывкар, 1961. С. 410; Лыткин В.И., Гуляев Е.С. Краткий этимологический словарь коми языка. Москва, 1970. С. 304-305.

6. Räsänen M. Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türkschprachen. Helsinki, 1969. S. 106-107; Róna-Tas A. Loan-words of ultimate Middle-Mongolian origin in Chuvash // Studies in Chuvash etymology I — Studia Uralo-Altaica, 17. Szeged, 1982. P. 88-89; Csúcs S. Die tatarischen Lehnwörter…, S 145; Федотов М.Р. Этимологический словарь…, С. 405-406; Щербак А.М. Введение в сравнительное изучение тюркских языков. Санкт-Петербург, 1994. С. 175; Он же. Ранние тюркско-монгольские языковые связи (VIII-XIV вв.). Санкт-Петербург, 1997. С. 202.

7. Щербак А.М. Введение в сравнительное изучение…, С. 211; Он же. Ранние тюркско-монгольские…, С. 211.

8. Лыткин В.И., Гуляев Е.С. Краткий этимологический…, С. 133.

9. Csúcs S. Die tatarischen Lehnwörter…, S. 229; Räsänen M. Versuch…, S. 300-301.

10. Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja, IV. Helsinki, 1969. S. 1247.

11. Лыткин В.И., Гуляев Е.С. Краткий этимологический…, С. 133.

12. Csúcs S. Die tatarischen Lehnwörter…, S. 229.

13. Wichmann Y. Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter in den permischen Sprachen. Helsingfors, 1903. S.145.

14. Itkonen E. Die Vorgeschichte der Finnen aus der Perspektive eines Linguisten // Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, 32 (1-2). Wiesbaden, 1960. S. 18; Décsi Gy. Einführung in die finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft. Wiesbaden, 1965. S. 183, 185; Основы финно-угорского языкознания. Марийский, пермские и угорские языки. Москва, 1976. С. 98-99; Хайду П. Уральские языки и народы. Москва, 1985. С. 49, 60, 200.

15. Хелимский Е.А. Древнейшие венгерско-самодийские языковые параллели. Москва, 1982. С. 25-26.

16. Насибуллин Р.Ш. К вопросу о времени распада общепермской языковой общности // Congressus septimus internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Debrecen, 1990; Он же. Булгаризмы и их отношение к вопросу о времени распада общепермской языковой общности // Вордскем кыл. № 2. Ижевск, 1992; Белых С.К. Следы общепермского праязыкового континуума в удмуртском и коми языках // Финно-угроведение. № 2. Йошкар-Ола, 1995; Он же. К вопросу о локализации прародины пермян // Пермский мир в раннем средневековье. Ижевск, 1999.

17. Жеребцов Л.Н. Историко-культурные взаимоотношения коми с соседними народами. X – начало XX в. Москва, 1982. С. 45.

18. Жилина Т.И. О говоре села Слудка // Историко-филологический сборник. Коми филиал АН СССР. Вып. 3. Сыктывкар, 1956. С. 84; Она же. Марийские и удмуртские соответствия в лексике лузско-летского диалекта коми языка // Вопросы лексикологии коми языка. Сыктывкар, 1979. С. 30-33; Серебренников Б.А. Теория волн Иоганна Шмидта и явления языковой аттракции // Вопросы языкознания. № 4. Москва, 1957. С. 8-9; Он же. Общеязыковедческие аспекты теории волн Иоганна Шмидта // Ареальные исследования в языкознании и этнографии. Ленинград, 1977. С. 32, 37; Тепляшина Т.И. Общие элементы языка коми и северных удмуртов в связи с их расселением // Ленинская национальная политика в действии (тез. докл. и сообщ. на зональной научной конференции, посвященной 50-летию Коми АССР). Сыктывкар, 1971. С. 200; Она же. Лексические коми-удмуртские соприкосновения // Вопросы финно-угроведения. Языкознание. (Тез. докл. на XVI Всесоюзн. конф. финно-угроведов. Т. 1. Сыктывкар, 1979. С. 122.

19. Тепляшина Т.И. Общие элементы…, С. 200; Кельмаков В.К. К вопросу о «двух «*о*» в праудмуртском языке // Советское финно-угроведение. № 1 (XIV). Tallinn, 1978. С. 25-26; Атаманов М.Г. Расселение удмуртов по данным этнотопонимии // Проблемы этногенеза удмуртов. Устинов, 1987. С. 95.

20. Лыткин В.И. О древнетюркских элементах…, С. 136, 141-142.

21. See e.g. Rédei K., Róna-Tas A. A bolgár-török-permi érintkezések néhány kérdése // Nyelvtudományi Közlemények. 77/1. Budapest, 1975. O. 37; Кельмаков В.К. К вопросу о «двух «*о*»…, С. 32.

22. Хелимский Е.А. Древнейшие венгерско-самодийские…, С. 25-26; Белых С.К. Следы общепермского праязыкового континуума…

23. Луппов П.Н. Северные удмурты в XVI–XVII веках // На удмуртские темы. Ученые записки НИИ народов Советского Востока при ЦИК СССР. Вып. II. Москва, 1931. С. 115; Он же. Удмурты в XV-XVII вв. Документы по истории удмуртов XV-XVII веков. Ижевск, 1958. С. 192–195, 198–205; Голдина Р.Д. Проблемы этнической истории пермских народов в эпоху железа (по археологическим материалам) // Проблемы этногенеза удмуртов. Устинов, 1987. С. 17; Макаров Л.Д. Славяно-русское заселение бассейна р.Вятки и исторические судьбы удмуртов Вятской земли в XII-XVI веках // Материалы по истории Удмуртии (с древнейших времен и до середины XIX в.). Ижевск, 1995. С. 80–81; Хартанович В.И. Новые материалы к краниологии коми-зырян // Новые коллекции и исследования по антропологии и археологии. Санкт-Петербург, 1991.

24. Фотеев Г.В. К истории становления удмуртско-русских этнокультурных отношений // Материалы к ранней истории населения Удмуртии. Ижевск, 1978. С. 83.

25. Белых С.К. О времени и причинах распада прапермской этнолингвистической общности // Узловые проблемы современного финно-угроведения. Материалы I Всероссийской конференции финно-угроведов. Тезисы докладов и сообщений. Йошкар-Ола, 1995; Он же. Фактор христианизации в этнической истории пермских народов // Коми-пермяки и финно-угорский мир. Тезисы докладов и выступлений на международной конференции в г. Кудымкаре 26–28 мая 1995 г. Сыктывкар, 1995. Belykh S.K. The disintegration of the

Proto-Permian community. On the history of studies // Finnisch-ugrische Mitteilungen. Hamburg, 2002.

26. Clauson G. The earliest Turkish loan words in Mongolian // Central Asiatic Journal, IV, 3. Wiesbaden, 1959. P. 177–178; Clark L.V. Mongol elements in Old Turkic? // Mémories de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, LXXV. Helsinki, 1977. P. 125–126; Щербак А.М. 1997. Ранние тюркско-монгольские…, с. 13-14, 92-93.

Сергей Белых
Удмуртский государственный университет
ул. Университетская 1, 4260004 Ижевск, Россия
email: bibulus@e-izhevsk.ru

Лексика среднемонгольского происхождения в пермских языках

В пермских языках к сегодняшнему дню выявлено некоторое количество слов монгольского происхождения. Особенно много их в южных диалектах удмуртского языка (до 30 слов). Среди этой лексики существует группа из 2–4 слов, которая характерна и для удмуртского и для коми языков, и посему, по мнению автора статьи, может быть причислена к общепермскому лексическому фонду. В статье показано, что данные слова могли быть заимствованы пермянами никак не ранее середины XIII века — времени монгольского завоевания Восточной Европы.

Такой вывод служит еще одним дополнительным аргументом в пользу уже высказывавшегося ранее автором положения о необходимости пересмотра принятой сегодня в финно-угорском языкознании и ставшей уже традиционной датировки распада прапермской этнолингвистической общности VIII–X веками в сторону её омоложения. Кроме того, в статье подчёркивается необходимость комплексного подхода к решению проблемы распада общепермского единства с привлечением данных нескольких смежных дисциплин: сравнительно-исторического языкознания, археологии, физической антропологии и др. Автор пытается доказать, что сам факт существования общепермских слов монгольского происхождения указывает на то, что общепермское единство в какой-то мере сохранялось самое меньшее до середины XIII века, а некоторые другие данные позволяют относить дату окончания процесса распада прапермской общности к еще более позднему времени — XIV–XV вв.