

# TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 103

2015

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

# Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics

Edited by  
Deniz Zeyrek, ıgdem Sađın ŐimŐek, Ufuk AtaŐ,  
and Jochen Rehbein

2015

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

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

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

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

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2015  
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission  
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies  
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage  
and processing in electronic systems.  
Printed on permanent/durable paper.  
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743  
ISBN 978-3-447-10523-1

## Contents

Editorial note and acknowledgement.....	xi
Preface.....	xiii

### PHONETICS & PHONOLOGY

A devoicing analysis of vowel [i] in voiceless consonant surroundings.....	2
Sıla Ay, İpek Pınar Bekâr	
Buffering, linking or latent consonant deletion? .....	12
Marcel Erdal	
Acoustic correlates of focus in Turkish.....	20
Senka İvoşević, İpek Pınar Bekâr	
Information structure in Turkish yes/no questions .....	27
Beste Kamali	
Compound stress in Turkish is phrase stress .....	40
Beste Kamali, Didem İkizoğlu	
Türkçe'deki ötümsüz sürtünmeli ünsüzlerin akustik özellikleri.....	52
Mehmet Akif Kılıç	

SYNTAX & MORPHOLOGY

Island constraints in Turkish: A grammaticality judgement study.....	68
Sinan akır	
Transitive verbal reflexives in Turkish: Synchronic and diachronic perspective .....	76
Mevlüt Erdem	
Copular structures as (non)phases .....	87
Atakan İnce, Gülşat Aygen, Özgür Aydın	
Processing Turkish relative clauses in context .....	98
Barış Kahraman	
Nominalization morphemes are underspecified participial markers .....	110
Meltem Keleşir	
Structural variation in Turkish complex predicates .....	121
Gregory Key, Deniz Tat	
Two types of free relatives in Turkish in disguise: One is headed, the other a correlative .....	132
Jaklin Kornfilt	
A paradigm within process morphology.....	151
Aysun Kunduracı	
Linearization in Turkish and minimality in binding .....	163
A. Sumru Özsoy	
Possessive-free genitives in Turkish.....	189
Balkız Öztürk, Eser Erguvanlı Taylan, Karl Zimmer	
Spell-out of the combined predicate structures in Turkish: A nano-syntactic analysis .....	204
Yağmur Sağ	

## FIRST &amp; SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

The vowel epenthesis and deletion errors of Japanese students of Turkish .....	216
Sıla Ay	
An investigation of maternal input within the framework of Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive domain .....	225
Özge Cengiz, Hamide Çakır	
Production of Turkish vowels by Swahili speakers .....	236
Selma Elyıldırım, Güven Mengü	
Acquisition of Turkish alongside a secret twin language .....	247
F. Nihan Ketrez	
Early vocabulary size in Turkish: Twins vs. Singletons.....	257
F. Nihan Ketrez, Funda Kamiloğlu, Aslı Özkul, Esra Yıldız	
Complementation and acquisition: The case of Turkish.....	267
Mine Nakipoğlu, Esra Yıldız	
Acquisition of modality in Turkish.....	277
Treysi Terziyan, Ayhan Aksu Koç, Eser Erguvanlı Taylan	
Developmental relations between reference to characters in narratives and theory of mind .....	291
Burcu Ünlütürk, Ayhan Aksu Koç	

## DISCOURSE, SEMANTICS &amp; PRAGMATICS

Referring expressions in communication through line graphs: A comparative analysis of verbal descriptions .....	306
Cengiz Acartürk	
Multi-word units in imaginative and informative domains .....	316
Mustafa Aksan, Yeşim Aksan	
Bu'nun sözcenin düzenlenişindeki rolü.....	329
Başak Alango	

The relationship between figure/ground and frontness/backness: Evidence from Turkish .....	339
Engin Arık, Beril T. Arık, Esen Büyüksökmen, Bade Dalahmetoğlu	
An experimental approach to new and old information in Turkish locatives and existentials .....	345
Engin Arık, Pınar Öztop, Esen Büyüksökmen	
Dictionary word definitions versus corpus-based word definitions .....	353
Gülsüm Atasoy	
A contrastive study of the rhetorical structure of Turkish and English research article abstracts .....	367
Hamide Çakır, Özden Fidan	
Some preliminary observations on restitution in Turkish .....	379
Mine Güven	
Şu or bu/o: Turkish nominal demonstratives with concrete referents .....	389
Tooru Hayasi, A. Sumru Özsoy	
Preparing a translation corpus for raising awareness on translation errors .....	402
Celile Eren Ökten, Duygu Çandarlı	
<b>LANGUAGE CONTACT &amp; SOCIOLINGUISTICS</b>	
Günlük söylemlerde yer alan eleştiriler .....	412
Seyyare Duman, Gönül Karasu	
Code-switching among Bulgarian Muslim Roma in Berlin .....	420
Barış Giray	
Syntactic complexity in Turkish dialect spoken by Muslim Roma in northeast Bulgaria .....	431
Hristo Kyuchukov	
Lexical borrowings and code-switching in Turkish varieties of Western Thrace .....	440
Maria Petrou	

(How) will Turkish survive in Northwestern Europe? 50 years of migration, 35 years of research on sociopolitical and linguistic developments in diaspora Turkish .....	453
Carol W. Pfaff	
Converbs in monolinguals' and bilinguals' Turkish.....	493
Jochen Rehbein, Annette Herkenrath	
Intergenerational acculturation orientations of Turkish speakers in the USA .....	514
Kutlay Yağmur, Gülcan Çolak Bostancı	
TURKIC LANGUAGES	
The Urum ('Pontioi') of Cyprus: A multi-lingual minority.....	530
Christiane Bulut	
Hypercorrect orthographic forms in the Pagan Oğuz-nāmā: A phonetic analysis.....	543
Balázs Danka	
Valency retention in Sakha (Yakut) derivational nominalization.....	555
Fuyuki Ebata	
Palatalization in the Mishar dialect of Kazan Tatar.....	562
Arman Eleusin	
Copied passives in Southern Azerbaijani, Northern Azerbaijani and Turkish.....	573
Hossein Hashemi Zarajabad	
So close and yet so distant ... On Turkic core structures, genealogical and typological grouping of varieties, and mutual intelligibility.....	583
Lars Johanson	
Causative/anti-causative alternations in Turkish, Old Turkic and Khalaj .....	593
Yuu Kuribayashi	
On the causative-marked passive clauses in Old Turkic .....	604
Eszter Ótött-Kovács	
Multi-application of grammatical suffixes in Tyvan .....	614
Arzhaana Syuryun	



Derivation from plural stems in Tyvan and Sakha ..... 622  
Arzhaana Syuryun, Fuyuki Ebata

PROSPECTIVE IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

Prospective in Turkic Languages..... 630  
Irina Nevskaya

The Prospective in Modern Uyghur..... 637  
Aminem Mentimin

Expressions for prospective and avertive in Turkish and Gagauz ..... 647  
Astrid Menz

The category of prospective in Modern Kazakh..... 658  
Irina Nevskaya, Saule Tazhibayeva

Prospective, intention and avertive in Dzungar Tuvan ..... 667  
Monika Rind-Pawłowski

# Palatalization in the Mishar Dialect of Kazan Tatar

## 1. Introduction

The subject of the present paper is palatalization in Mishar Tatar, the Western Tatar dialect. The phenomenon to be discussed is present in all Mishar sub-dialects, even in the Sterlitamak and Baykibash sub-dialects, which are spoken further East, in the domain of Bashkir and the central dialect of Tatar. Consonant palatalization is not a typical phenomenon for Turkic languages. In the area where the Mishar dialect was and is spoken, it is the characteristic of the Mordvinian languages Erzya and Moksha and of Chuvash, a Turkic language diverging from the surrounding Kypchak languages. Due to geographical proximity and the ensuing language contact, these languages and the Tatar dialects constitute a linguistic convergence area.

Aside from Mishar Tatar and Chuvash, consonant palatalization takes place also in other Turkic languages, Gagauz, Trakai Karaim and Crimean Tatar; but especially in Mishar Tatar this phenomenon has obtained a specific development. A partial description of the palatalization phenomenon as a result of ‘monophthongization’ can be found in Maxmutova’s publication (1978: 52ff.), which was espoused by other scholars in subsequent works.

This paper tackles the issues of the features of this palatalization, the phonetic processes and circumstances leading to it and its consequences in the Mishar dialect, taking into consideration the following matters:

- the phonetic environment of palatalization and the consonant classes involved;
- the function of palatalization;
- its impact on morphology and word structure.

In order to find out possible reasons for this phenomenon in the Mishar dialect, we will compare palatalization mechanisms and their functions in other Turkic languages, both within this contact area and outside it.

The research is based on text sources of Mishar sub-dialects as well as on audio recordings. The target group consisted of such native speakers who experienced little or no influence of Standard Tatar through education, mass media or professional occupation.

## 2. Phonetic and phonological features of palatalization

Stadnik (2002) defines palatalization as a secondary modification of the primary articulation of consonants which consists of an additional move of the dorsum towards the palate. The secondary modification and the primary articulation occur simultaneously (see Fig. 1).

In many languages, palatalization has a word distinguishing function. The classical example for this is Russian, where almost every consonant has its palatalized counterpart. The palatalization serves here also for the differentiation of lexical and grammatical meanings, e.g.:

Russian:	[brat]	‘brother’	–	[bratʲ]	‘to take’;
	[ˈbro.sit]	‘(he/she) will throw’	–	[ˈbro.sitʲ]	‘to throw’.



the pronunciation of  
non-palatalized [t]

the pronunciation of  
palatalized [t]

**Figure 1: The pronunciation of non-palatalized and palatalized [t]**

### 3. Palatalization in the Mishar dialect

Except for allophonic palatalization, there is palatalization of dental consonants and of the lateral /l/ occurring under the following circumstances:

1. adjacent etymologic /j/;
2. the result of the vowel change /front/ > /back/;
3. palatal harmony reorganization in words of Arabic and Persian origin;
4. the adoption of loanwords with palatalized consonants;
5. the result of the consonant change /ʃ/ > /sʲ/;
6. proper name abbreviations before front vowels.

The palatalization level never reaches that of the palatalized consonants of Russian, Mordva (Erzya and Moksha) or Chuvash because the raising of the dorsum towards the palate is not as high as in these languages.

#### 3.1 Allophonic palatalization

The velar plosives /k/, /g/, the fricatives /f/, /s/, /z/, the lateral approximant /l/ and the dental trill /r/ are palatalized in the neighbourhood of front vowels:

Mishar:	[kʲirʲ]	‘to enter’	–	[kir]	‘field’
	[mi.ˈʃæɾʲ]	‘Mishar’	–	[a.ˈʃar]	‘he/she will (probably) eat’
	[kiylʲ.ˈmæki]	‘dress’	–	[at.ˈma]	‘apple’
	[ab.ˈziʲj]	‘uncle’	–	[ab.ˈzar]	‘stable’

This kind of palatalization is allophonic. All other consonant phonemes remain relatively neutral to vowel harmony, unlike Chuvash, Trakai-Karaim and Gagauz where the palatalization is strongly bound to the environment of front vowels:<sup>1</sup>

Eleusin, A. (2015): Palatalization in the Mishar dialect of Kazan Tatar, in: Zeyrek, D., Şimşek, Ç. S., Ataş, U., Rehbein, J. (Hrsg.). *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. 562-572

Gagauz:	[ko.'puk] ‘disrupted’	–	[kʰø.'pʲykʲ] ‘foam’
Chuvash:	[pur] ‘there is’	–	[pʲyrʲ] ‘pus’
Trakai-Karaim:	[at.ʎa.ri.'miz] ‘our horses’	–	[itʲ.ʎe.ri.'mʲizʲ] ‘our dogs’

### 3.2 The consonant change /jC/ > /Cʲ/

Another factor leading to palatalization is adjacent etymological /j/. The dentals /t/, /d/, /n/, /r/, /s/, /z/ and the lateral approximant /l/ which etymologically follow the palatal approximant /j/ in the first syllable within a word stem are palatalized; the approximant /j/ disappears, giving up its palatal features to the consonant following it: (C)VjC > (C)VCʲ or, due to vowel syncope, (C)VjVC > (C)VCʲ; e.g. *katʲ* ‘(to) come back’ < *qayt, bunʲ* ‘neck’ < *buyʲin*. A similar development turns up in the palatalization of dentals followed by a word-initial /j/ within a noun phrase:

*un* ‘ten’ + *yaš* ‘year (age)’ > [unʲaʃ] ‘(age of) ten years’,  
*un* ‘ten’ + *yidiš* ‘seven’ > [unʲidiš] ‘seventeen’.

This kind of palatalization is typical for all Mishar sub-dialects, although less regular in the Sterlitamak and Baykibaš sub-dialects, and is almost limited to the following stem lexeme list:

Palatalization process	Mishar-Tatar	Meaning	Etymologic form
aCʲ < aj+C <sub>[+dental]</sub>	[katʲ] [ka.nʲa.'na] ~ [kanʲ.'nʲa] [ka.'nʲar]	‘to return’ ‘mother-in-law’ ‘hot’	< [qajt] < [qajnana] < [qajnar]
	[sa.'lʲa] [a.'rʲan] [ka.'rʲak] [ba.'tʲak] [ka.'sʲi]	‘to choose; to elect’ ‘ayran’ ‘sharpening stone’ ‘quite a few’ ‘which’	< [sajʎa] < [ajran] < [qajraq] < [bajtaq] < [qajsi]
uCʲ < oj+C <sub>[+dental]</sub>	[u.'nʲa] [u.'lʲa]	‘to play’ ‘to think’	< [ojna] < [ojla]
uCʲ < oj+C <sub>[+dental]</sub>	[bunʲ] ~ [munʲ] [kunʲ]	‘neck’ ‘bosom’	< [bojun] < [kojun]
uCʲ < uj+C <sub>[+dental]</sub>	[ku.'rʲik] ~ [ki.'rʲik]	‘tail’	< [qujrʲuq]
iCʲ < ij+C <sub>[+dental]</sub>	[ki.'nʲa]	‘to beat’	< [qijna]

An exception is *kayʲin* ‘birch’: the fact that the last stem consonant of this word traces back to the velar nasal /ŋ/ was obviously the reason for the prevention of palatalization in this word.

The process does not take place before the non-dental consonants: [kaj.'mak] ‘cream’, [kaj.'gʲi] ‘worry’, [ʃæjkæ] ‘to flush’. Palatal consonants which follow the etymological [j] also remained unchanged, although the palatal approximant /j/ disappears: [ka.'ʃʲi] < [qaj.'ʃʲi]

‘scissors’, [sy.ˈlæ] < [søj.ˈlæ] ‘(to) speak’. The loss of the approximant /j/ does not lead to consonant palatalization in an environment of front vowels:

[ʃæ.ˈnæ] < [ʃaj.ˈna] ‘to chew’; [æ.ˈtæm]~[a.ˈtʰam]<sup>2</sup> < [aj.ˈtam] ‘I say’;  
 [bæ.ˈræm]~[ba.ˈrʰam] < [baj.ˈram] ‘feast’; [æ.ˈdæ]~[a.ˈdʰa] < [aj.ˈda] ‘come on!’.

Notably, in Erzya and Moksha Mordvinian, mainly dental consonants can be palatalized.

The consonant change /jC/ > /Ci/ and the reduction of the /j/ took place also in Chuvash: [vu.ˈlʰix] ‘cattle’ < \*vǎjtǎx, [vu.ˈlʰa] ‘to play’ < \*vǎjǎta, [xy.ˈre] ‘tail’ – cf. Common Turkic *quyruq*. Maxmutova (1978: 54) gives some other examples for this phenomenon in standard Chuvash and in its dialects: *xun’asa* ‘father in low’, *xun’ama* ‘mother in low’, *xir’a* ‘to sharpen’, *ur’an* ‘ayran’, *ur’äm* ‘separate’ among others.

Generally, palatalization is limited to the inner boundaries of a stem – there is no palatalization of the suffix-initial consonants which follow the stem-final /j/:

[kuj.ˈdʰim] ‘I have placed’ (< *kuy* ‘to place’), [kuj.ˈlar] ‘sheep (pl.)’ (*kuy* ‘sheep’).

The cases of palatalization beyond morpheme borders are relatively rare. In the course of fast connected speech, the suffixation with root stems ending with /j/ can lead to the palatalization of suffix-initial consonant and to the loss or the weakening of the root approximant:

[baj] ‘rich’ + *-LAR* {PL} > [ba.ˈlar] ~ [baj.ˈlar] ‘the riches’;  
 [baj] ‘rich’ + *-nIKI* {POSS} > [ba.nʰi.ˈki] ~ [baj.nʰi.ˈki] ‘of the rich (man)’;  
 [tuj] ‘wedding ceremony’ + *-nI* {ACC} > [tu.ˈnʰi] ‘wedding ceremony (ACC)’.

Causing the emergence of some minimal pairs, this palatalization type is distinctive:

[a.ˈtʰa] ‘he/she says’ vs. [a.ˈta] ‘he/she shoots’;  
 [ba.ˈrʰam] ‘feast’ vs. [ba.ˈram] ‘I go’;  
 [sa.ˈlʰa] ‘choose’ vs. [sa.ˈta] ‘he/she lays’.

### 3.3 Palatalization in consequence of the vowel shift $V_{/+front/} > V_{/+back/}$

Palatalization can likewise be triggered by the vowel shift [front] > [back] in a word, i.e. the vowel opposition front : back is replaced by the dental consonant opposition palatalized : non-palatalized:

$(V_{/+back/})C_i(V_{/+back/})$	<	$(V_{/+front/})C_{[+dental]}(V_{/+front/})$
[kin.ˈdʰik]	<	[kʰin.ˈdʰik] ‘navel’
[kir.ˈka]	<	[kyr.ˈkæ] ‘turkey’
[a.ˈlʰi]	<	[æ.ˈlʰi] ‘still’
[sɔ.ˈlʰok]~[si.ˈlʰik]	<	[sy.ˈlyk] ‘leech’
[ku.rʰa.ˈga]	<	[ky.ræ.ˈgæ] ‘plum’

Accordingly, the development has a reverse effect – vowel frontness can be understood as an alternative for consonant palatalization as seen in the previous section, where consonants palatalized by the consonant change /jC/ > /Ci/ are de-palatalized by the vowel shift [back] > [front]:

[æ.ˈtæ] < [a.ˈtʰa] < [aj.ˈta] ‘he/she says’; [bæ.ˈræm] < [ba.ˈrʰam] < [baj.ˈram] ‘feast’.

However, the de-palatalization never occurs in the neighbourhood of etymologically uvular sounds and is limited to the vowel opposition /a/ : /æ/:

\*[y.ˈnæ] < [u.ˈnʰa] ‘to play’, \* [kæ.ˈnær] < [ka.ˈnʰar] ‘hot’.

Eleusin, A. (2015): Palatalization in the Mishar dialect of Kazan Tatar, in: Zeyrek, D., Şimşek, Ç. S., Ataş, U., Rehbein, J. (Hrsg.). *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. 562-572

In this manner, non-palatalized consonants combined with front vowels can be substituted by palatalized consonants with back vowel environment and vice versa. The documented Mishar demonstrative adverbs [a.'nʲa] 'there', [mʊ.'nʲa]~[mʲi.'nʲa] 'here' have possibly developed through the stages [æ.'næ] and [mʲi.'næ] (cp. Standard Tatar *änä, mʲinä* or Kazakh *äne, mʲine*): [a.'nʲa] < [æ.'næ] < [a.'na].

Note that this occurrence is not regular and does not lead to the absolute neutralization of the vowel opposition to one vowel phoneme in favor of the consonant palatalization distinctivity, as e.g. in Moksha and Erzya Mordvinian, where back vowels mostly appear instead of originally front vowels while the preceding consonant gets palatalized:

Moksha: /æ - a/ > /a/: [prʲat] 'heads' < [præt]  
[pʲak] 'very' < [pæk] (of Turkic origin)  
[bʲa.'bʲa] 'baby' < [bæ.'bæ]~[bæ.'bæj] (of Turkic origin)

Moksha and Erzya: /y - u/ > /u/: [tʲu.'ʃak] 'feather bed' < [ty.'ʃæk] (of Turkic origin)  
[tʲus] 'color' < [tys] (of Turkic origin).

Similar onsets can be detected in Crimean Tatar as well:

Crimean Tatar: [ozʲ] < [øz] 'self'      [kunʲ] < [kyn] 'day'  
[bolʲ] < [bøl] 'to divide'      [o.'lʲum] < [ø.'lym] 'death'  
[dʒurʲ] < [dʒyr] 'to go'      [bulʲ.'bulʲ] < [byl.'byl] 'nightingale'

An analogous development is also registered in Gagauz and Trakai Karaim:

Gagauz: [bʲan] < [bæn] 'I'  
Trakai Karaim: [kjoz] < [køz] 'eye'

### **3.4 Palatal harmony reorganization in words of Arabic and Persian origin**

Palatalization phenomena can also be observed in Arabic and Persian loanwords. The adoption of foreign lexemes conforms to vowel interpretation rules. Generally, consonant features of the donor language are reinterpreted into vowel features – vowel allophones are classified as separate phonemes, e.g. all Persian short vowels in the presence of a /k/ or /g/ are interpreted as front (Johanson 1986: 188f.). According to those rules, short /a/ is realized as front vowel /æ/ and, in absence of /k/ and /g/, labial vowels are classified as back. It can lead to the emergence of structures with breach of vowel harmony by the appearance of front and back vowels within one word. Tending to reproduce foreign structures, Standard Tatar allows the occurrence of front vowels in the direct neighbourhood of uvular consonants, e.g. [bæ.'χʲit] 'happiness', [qæ.'læm] 'pen', whereas in Mishar Tatar, etymologically uvular consonants and the velar fricative /x/ function as restraining factor for the palatal interpretation of an adjacent vowel.

Mishar Tatar has a tendency towards the phonetical assimilation of loan elements. In case of incompatibility between interpretation rules and vowel harmony, consonant palatalization comes into play. If a vowel interpreted as front could contradict vowel harmony within a word, vowel frontness in the particular syllable is restructured so that it consists of a palatalized onset and/or coda and a back vowel. For instance, to avoid the breach of vowel harmony in the possible interpretation of the Persian-origin word [ru:.ʲze] 'fasting (during the month of Ramadan)' as [ru.'zæ], vowel frontness in the second syllable is replaced by consonant palatalization in form of [ru.'zʲa]. However, the interpretation rule of *alif* as a back vowel has a higher priority than vowel harmony. An example for it is the realization of the

word [ki.'ta:b] 'book' as [ki.'tʌp]: the vowel interpretation in the second syllable as front [æ] in accordance with vowel harmony as Kazakh [kɨ.'tæp]<sup>3</sup> is hindered by the necessity to interpret the Arabic *alif* as a back vowel [a]. The conflict situation is solved by palatalization not for the benefit of synharmony: [kita:b] > \*[kitæp] > [kitʌp]. The words [xisʌp] 'calculation' and [islʌm] 'Islam (proper name); islam' follow the same pattern. This palatalization type, which is used in conflict situations between vowel interpretation rules and vowel harmony, involves dental consonants and the lateral approximant /l/ conjunct with the back vowels /a/ and /i/.

Restructured palatality can be exemplified by comparison with Standard Tatar forms:

Mishar Tatar	Standard Tatar	Meaning in Mishar Tatar
[ki.'tʌp] ~ [ki.'tap]	[ki.'tap]	'book'
[sʌ.'at] ~ [sʌ.'atʃ] ~ [sæ.'æt]	[sæ.'kæt]	'hour'
[xa.'zʌr]	[χæ.'zʌr]	'now'
[ka.'dʌr]	[qæ.'dʌr]	'value'
[a.'zʌp]	[kæ.'zap]	'suffering'
[xi.'sʌp]	[χi.'sap]	'calculation'
[a.'lʌm]	[kæ.'læm]	'world' / 'all people'
[ka.'lʌm]	[qæ.'læm]	'pen'
[is.'lʌm]	[is.'lʌm]	'Islam'
[xalʃ]	[χæl]	'condition'
[xa.'lʌlʃ]	[χæ.'læl]	'according with religious rules'
[a.'lʌm]	[kɔ.'lim]	'scholar; wise'
[ka.'tʌm] ~ [xa.'tʌm]	[χɔ.'tim]	'reading of the whole Qur'an'
[dʌ.'ru] ~ [dæ.'ry]	[da.'ru]	'medicine'
[rʌ.'xatʃ]	[ræ.'χæt]	'comfortable'
[sʌ.'wap]	[sæ.'wap]	'spiritual merit'
[xam.'zʌ]	[χæm.'zæ]	'Hamza'
[xa.'sʌn]	[χæ.'sæn]	'Hasan'

Beside cases where the interpretation of *alif* only as a back vowel leads to a breach of vowel harmony as it was described above, there are other cases of impaired vowel harmony in Mishar sub-dialects which include syllables with the velar fricative /x/. The fricative /x/ prevents the appearance of a front vowel in its immediate proximity:

Mishar Tatar	Standard Tatar	Meaning in Mishar Tatar
[gʃ.'nʌx]	[gɣ.'nah]	'sin; crime'
[xʌzʃ.'mæt]	[χʌz.'mæt]	'service'
[bæ.'xʌtʃ]	[bæ.'χʌtʃ]	'happiness'
[ni.'kʌx]	[ni.'kaχ]	'marriage'

### 3.5 The adoption of loanwords with palatalized consonants

Numerous Russian words which are used in parallel to the native words remain unchanged with regard to the palatalization of dental consonants and the lateral-approximant /l/:

Eleusin, A. (2015): Palatalization in the Mishar dialect of Kazan Tatar, in: Zeyrek, D., Şimşek, Ç. S., Ataş, U., Rehbein, J. (Hrsg.). *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. 562-572

[rad.'nʲa] ‘relative(s)’, [nʲi.'vis.ta] ‘bride’, [ka.lʲu.'sa] ‘wheel’, [ma.'nʲit] ‘coin’ etc.

The infinitive forms ending in /tʲ/ belong to this type:

[par.ka.'vatʲ] ‘to park’, [za.nʲi.'matʲ] ‘to occupy’, [in.ti.ri.sa.'vatʲ] ‘to interest’ etc.

The palatalization of non-dental consonants in Russian is generally replaced by vowel frontness in the syllable:

Mishar Tatar	<	Russian
[mæʃ]	<	[mʲaʃ] ‘ball’;
[mæ.'ʃyk]	<	[mʲi.'ʃok] ~ [mʲa.'ʃok] ‘bag’;
[pæ.'syk]	<	[pʲi.'sok] ~ [pʲa.'sok] ‘sand’.

Further suffixation complies with the stem vowels as in the following examples:

[mæʃ] + -LAR {PL}	>	[mæʃ.'lær] ‘balls’
[mæ.'ʃyk] + -DA {LOK}	>	[mæ.'ʃuk.'tæ] ‘in the bag’

### 3.6 The result of the consonant change /tʲ/ > /sʲ/

In some Mishar sub-dialects, the palatalized dental fricative /sʲ/ may replace the etymological affricate /tʃ/ chiefly as syllable coda:

/sʲ/	<	/tʃ/
[kisʲ.'kir]	<	[kʲitʃ.'kir] ‘to shout’;
[nʲisʲ.'kæ]	<	[nʲitʃ.'kæ] ‘fine’;
[ʏsʲ]	<	[ʏtʃ] ‘three’;
[ʃsʲ]	<	[ʃitʃ] ‘to drink’;
[tisʲ.'kan]	<	[titʃ.'kan] ‘mouse’;
[bar.'gasʲ]	<	[bar.'gatʃ] ‘after going there’.

Similarly, the affricate /dʒ/ or its allophone /zʲ/, the voiced counterpart of /tʃ/, can be represented by the palatalized voiced dental fricative /zʲ/ in all positions:

/zʲ/	<	/dʒ/ ~ /zʲ/
[ba.'zʲa]	<	[ba.'zʲa] ‘the husband of one's wife's sister’;
[u.'zʲim]	<	[u.'zʲim] ‘winter seed’;
[azʲ.da.'xi]	<	[adzʲ.da.'xa] ‘dragon’;
[ʃn.'zʲi]	<	[ʃn.'zʲi] ‘pearl’;
[mæʳ.'zʲæn]	<	[mæʳ.'zʲæn] ‘coral’;
[mʲir.'zʲa]	<	[mʲor.'zʲa]~[mʲir.'zʲa] ‘chimney’.

The Mordvinian languages Moksha and Erzya behave very similarly to the Mishar dialect, replacing the affricates /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ (~/zʲ/) of Turkic loanwords with the palatalized dental fricatives /sʲ/ and /zʲ/:

Moksha <sup>4</sup>	<	Turkic
[ba.'zʲa]	<	[ba.'zʲa] ‘the husband of one's wife's sister’

Eleusin, A. (2015): Palatalization in the Mishar dialect of Kazan Tatar, in: Zeyrek, D., Şimşek, Ç. S., Ataş, U., Rehbein, J. (Hrsg.). *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. 562-572



[pak.'sja] ‘field’	<	[bak.'tʃa] ‘garden’
[ar.'zja]	<	[ar.ʒja] ‘chest’ (from Chuvash)
[ko.'zja] ‘rich’	<	[xo.'ʒja] ‘master; owner’
[zʲib.'lik]	<	[tʃi.bił.'dik] ‘curtain’
[ʲsʲio.kaj]	<	[tʃuk] ‘tassel’
[tsin.'zjer]	<	[zin.'ʒir] ‘chain’
Erzya	<	Turkic
[us.'kir]	<	[itʃ.'kur] ‘drawstring’;
[sʲu.'ge]	<	[tʃy.'gæ] ‘sterlet’.

### 3.7 Name shortenings before front vowels

Similar to Chuvash, personal names can be shortened in the Mishar dialect by adding the suffixes *-uk* and seldom *-kaj* or *-uʃ* to the onset of the second syllable. Consequently, the dental onset consonant which is followed by a front vowel in the full name gets palatalized:

Short name	<	Full name
[ka.'dʲuk]	<	[ka.di.'tʃa] ~ [xa.di.'tʃa]
[ʃa.'riuk]	<	[ʃa.ri.fuł.'ta]
[xa.'nʲuk]	<	[xa.ni.'fa]
[zar.'kaj]	<	[za.'rif]
[di.'bʲuk]	<	[di.læf.'ruz]
[a.'zʲuk]	<	[a.zi.'zæ]

There is no palatalization in shortenings of names when the onset consonant of the second syllable is followed by a back vowel in the full name:

Short name	<	Full name
[ib.'ruk]	<	[ib.ra.'jim]
[ab.'duk]	<	[ab.duł.'ta]

Non-dental consonants do not get palatalized even if followed by a front vowel in full names:

Short name	<	Full name
[ka.'muk]	<	[ka.mi.'læ]
[xa.'buk]	<	[xa.bi.buł.'ta]

### 3.8 Unsolved palatalization cases

Some palatalization cases need more investigation. The reasons for the development of the examples mentioned below are still to be ascertained: [ki.tʲik.'ta] (< [ki.tik.'ta] ‘to tickle’), [a.'dʲaʃ] (< [a.'daʃ] ‘to loose one’s way’), [ju.'gatʲ] (< [ju.'galt] ‘to loose’), [ji.'gʲitʲ] (< [ji.'gitʲ] ‘to knock over’), [a.xi.'riʲ] (< [a.xi.'ri] ‘possibly’), [dʲi.'wa] (< [di.'wa]~ [di.'ja] ‘invocation, prayer’), [kar.'tʲuk] (< rus. [kar.'to.fil]/[kar.'toʃ.kaj] ‘potato’).

### 3.9 The effect on morphology and palatal harmony

The palatalization does not affect the suffixation; in other words, suffix vowels are still defined by stem vowels:

[bunʲ] ‘neck’ > [bu.nʲi.ˈma] ‘to/on my neck’  
 [kisi.ˈkir] ‘to shout’ > [kisi.ki.ˈram] ‘I am shouting’

Even if there is a vowel shift [back] > [front] due to assimilation in the stem syllable preceding the suffix, the word preserves its palatal features for suffixation:

[kurʲik] ‘tail’ > [kurʲikʲi] ‘having a tail’  
 [salʲa] ‘chose; vote’ > [salʲitar] ‘they choose; they vote’

The palatality of the last stem consonant can be transferred to the consonants following it:

[katʲ] ‘come back’ + *-DI* {PAST} > [katʲi] ~ [katʲi] ‘he/she/it came back’  
 [bunʲ] ‘neck’ + *-nI* {ACC} > [bunʲnʲi] ‘neck (ACC)’  
 [kanʲ] ‘in-law’ + [ana] ‘mother’ > [kanʲnʲa] ‘mother-in-law’.

Apart from allophonic palatalization, dental consonants are palatalized only in the neighbourhood of back vowels. Accordingly, they obtain suffixes with back vowels:

[u.ˈnʲa] ‘to play’ + *-DI* {PAST} > [u.nʲa.ˈdi] ‘he/she played’;  
 [a.ˈlʲam] ‘everybody’ + *-nIn* {GEN} > [a.lʲam.ˈnin] ‘of everybody’;  
 [ʃa.ˈrʲuk] ‘Scharyuk’ + *-GA* {DAT} > [ʃa.rʲuk.ˈka] ‘to Sharyuk’;  
 [pin.ˈzʲa] ‘Penza (city)’ + *-DAn* {ABL} > [pin.zʲa.ˈdan] ‘from Penza’.

In some cases, there are variations of vowel and palatality interpretation that can differ from one village to another affecting the further suffixation:

[xalʲ] ‘condition’ > [xa.ˈlʲim] ~ [xa.ˈlʲim] ‘my condition’;  
 [xam.zʲa] ‘Hamza’ > [xam.zʲa.ˈnin] ~ [xam.zʲæ.ˈnʲin] ‘of Hamza’;  
 [xazʲir] ‘now’ > [xa.zʲir.ˈga] ~ [xa.zʲir.ˈgæ] ‘at present’;  
 [atʲ] ‘to say’ > [a.ˈtʲa.lar] ~ [a.ˈtæ.lær] ~ [æ.ˈtæ.lær] ‘they say’.

## 4. Conclusion

Being limited to few consonants, the allophonic palatalization in Mishar differs from the one in Chuvash, Gagauz and Karaim. The reduction of the approximant /j/ leads to the palatalization of the dental consonants which are originally following it, but not in the environment of the front vowel. This kind of palatalization has a distinctive function. A similar change is documented for Chuvash.

A syllable with a palatalized consonant and a back-shifted vowel is understood as a replacement of a syllable with a front vowel and vice versa. Therefore, the palatalized consonants are generally combined only with the back vowels as a replacement of non-palatalized consonants paired with front vowels. Similar developments exist in Mordvinian languages and in Crimean-Tatar. The interchangeability of the combinations [palatalized consonant + back vowel] and [non-palatalized consonant + front vowel] is used for the phonetic restructuring of loanwords where vowel interpretation rules and vowel harmony come into conflict. This structural reorganization does not always favor vowel harmony. The allophonic transformation of affricates into palatalized fricatives follows the Mordvinian pattern.

Consonant palatalization within a word does not impact vowel harmony: the suffixation conforms to the quality of the stem vowel even if the suffix-initial consonants are palatalized by assimilation with preceding palatalized consonants.

The functionality of palatalization in Mishar Tatar bears a strong resemblance to the one of the geographically closest languages, prominently Moksha and Erzya Mordvinian.

Since palatalization is not an original characteristic of Turkic languages and mainly exists in contact areas of Eastern Europe, the development of palatalization in Mishar Tatar is highly likely to be a phenomenon caused by contact.

## References

- Bajazitova, F. 2003. *Tatar-mišär ruxi mirası* [The spiritual heritage of Mishar Tatars], Saransk.
- Berta, Á. 1998: ‘West Kipchak Languages’, in: Johanson, L. & Csató, E. 1998: *The Turkic Languages*, London, 301-317.
- Butylov, N. 1998. *Tjurkskie zaimstvovanija v mordovskix jazykax* [Turkic loanwords in Mordvinian languages], [Ph.D. dissertation, Mordvinian State University, Saransk.]
- Clark, L. 1998. Chuvash, in: Johanson, L. & Csató, E. 1998. *The Turkic Languages*, London, 434-452
- Johanson, L. 1986. ‚Reproduktion, Widerstand und Anpassung: Zur lautlichen Iranisierung im Türkischen‘, in: Schmitt, R. & Skjærvø, P. O. (eds.) *Studia grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. München: Kitzinger, 185-201.
- Maxmutova, L. (ed.) 1969. *Tatar telenej dialektologik süzlege* [Dialectological dictionary of the Tatar language], Kazan.
- Maxmutova, L. 1978. *Opyt issledovanija tjurkskix jazykov. Mišarskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka* [An attempt at researching the Turkic languages. The Mishar dialect of the Tatar language], Moscow.
- Musaev, K. 1964. *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka* [A grammar of the Karaim language], Moscow.
- Ramazanova, D. & Xajretdinova, T. (eds.) 2008. *Tatar xalıq söyläşläre* [Tatar folk dialects], Kazan’.
- Stadnik, E. 2002. *Die Palatalisierung in den Sprachen Europas und Asiens*, Tübingen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Even in those languages, some consonants can behave neutrally, e.g. the postalveolar consonants /ʃ, ʒ, ʝ, dʒ/ and the dentals /t, d/ in Gagauz: Their realization does not depend on vowel environment.

<sup>2</sup> Forms like [a.ˈtäm] and [æ.ˈtæm] ‘I say’, [a.ˈlan] and [æ.ˈlæn] ‘to turn’ can exist one beside the other even in one sub-dialect.

<sup>3</sup> In Kazakh, the spelling standard is *kıtap*.

<sup>4</sup> The translation of Mordvinian lexemes is given only if their meaning differs from that of the source language.