

Werk

Titel: The stressing of Russian loanwords in Ašmarin's Materialy (1898)

Autor: Dobrovolsky , Michael

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1998

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002 | LOG_0027

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

The stressing of Russian loanwords in Ašmarin's *Materialy* (1898)

Michael Dobrovolsky

Dobrovolsky, Michael 1998. The stressing of Russian loanwords in Ašmarin's *Materialy* (1898). *Turkic Languages* 2. 198-214.

An examination of the words borrowed from Russian into Chuvash found in Ašmarin's 1898 *Materialy* shows that some borrowings are insensitive to the phonetics of the Russian source words and show only the alleged "default" margin stress typical of Chuvash reduced vowel words, while other forms show a greater sensitivity to Russian phonetics in that they treat Russian reduced unstressed vowels as analogous to the reduced vowels of Chuvash. It is proposed that these borrowings with their diverse stress patterns do not necessarily reflect a chronological order of entry into Chuvash but at least reflect diverse sources of borrowing.

Michael Dobrovolsky, Linguistics Department, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4.

Introduction

This paper presents an analysis of the stressing of certain Russian loanwords in Chuvash.* Unless otherwise indicated, the data are from the list of Russian loanwords into Chuvash found in Ašmarin (1898: v-vi). Further loanwords have been gathered from examples illustrating other phenomena throughout the first section of the same work, and from sev-

- * Research leading to this paper was made possible by a Senior Fellowship at the Calgary Institute for the Humanities during 1996 and 1997. I would like to acknowledge the Institute's generosity and support here. This paper has also benefited from input received at oral presentations, as well as from the helpful observations and corrections by an anonymous reviewer for this journal. All opinions and remaining errors of fact are my own.

eral other sources, in particular Fedotov (1990). When drawing examples from the latter source, I have avoided loanwords that are obviously of a more recent provenance, such as contemporary technological terms.

Ašmarin's main list of borrowings is organized by subject—government, religion, farming, etc.—so any generalization about stress patterning is initially obscured. Even when organized by location of stress placement, the stressing of these borrowings does not at first appear to be consistent. A number of forms match the stress of the Russian source words as expected, e.g., Russ. *obéd* > Chuv. *apát* 'dinner'.¹ However, some forms show final stress in Chuvash despite the fact that they are non-finally stressed in Russian, e.g., Russ. *cérkov'* > Chuv. *čirkú, čürkú* 'church,' Russ. *starósta* > Chuv. *starastá* 'elder,' etc. A number of other forms show sensitivity to vowel reduction in Russian; in these forms, unstressed and reduced Russian vowels are treated as if they were Chuvash reduced vowels and so excluded from stress, e.g., Russ. *vóbla* > Chuvash *óbál* (fish species). Finally, there is at least one disyllabic form in Chuvash with initial stress where the Russian loan source shows final stress, e.g., Russ. *ovín* > Chuvash *ávăn* 'barn.'

In this paper, I will suggest that the Chuvash metrical adaptation of the Russian loanwords shows different degrees of sensitivity to Russian phonetics on the part of the borrowers. This diversity of adaption is consistent with the words' entry into Chuvash at different time periods, from different Chuvash dialects, and from different social sources. The paper focuses strictly on stress patterns in the loanwords. It does not deal with such complex and controversial issues as the shift of Russian vowels to their Chuvash counterparts, although understanding such processes contributes to the loanword dating process. The paper is also emphatically not an etymological study, though some etymologies are discussed insofar as they help sort out the appearance of certain stresses on loanwords. The paper is organized as follows. In section 1., I present the two major stress rules of Chuvash; in section 2., the loanwords by

¹ Note also the partial phonetic adaption of the Russian form: The unstressed reduced Russian /o/ is assimilated as [a], which is its pronunciation in Russian, and the final devoiced /d/ is pronounced [t] as in Russian. In standard Chuvash pronunciation, non-geminate obstruents are lax and frequently voiced intervocally. Thus the phonetic adaption of Russian *obéd* in Chuvash is [aɓát] or [abát].

stress grouping, and in section 3., I offer some further observations and conclusions.

1. The Chuvash stress rules

The description of Chuvash stress presented in Ašmarin is consistent with the stress pattern of Anatri or Lower Chuvash speech:

“Stress in Čuvaš ... is usually on the final syllable when it is long, or when the entire word consists of short syllables: *tāmān* — *snowstorm*, *kabān* — *rick*, *tivlēt* — *abundance*, *šüremellē* — *one must go*, *kēmēl* — *silver*, *tātāmār* — *we stood*, *čäpärkkä* (B.) — *whip*.²

Stress falls on the penultimate syllable of a word when it is long and the final syllable is short: *kārāk* — *grouse*, N. *türä* — *bay* (color of horse), *tèrēm* — *I said*, *šāmṛāk* — *young*.

Stress is usually on the third syllable from the end when it is long and the following syllables are short: *šäprämār* — *we hit*, *šîrēkēn*, alder (Gen. case). In this way, stress falls on the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh syllable from the end if these syllables are long (full) and the following short: *ilētēmēr* — *we would take*, *kālätämār* — *we would say*, *pärätämärččē* — *we would give*, *sävänätämärččē* — *we would be happy*, *šäväränätämärččē* — *we would turn*.” (p. 19)

In other words: Stress falls on the last full (i.e., unreduced, short) vowel of a word; if a word does not contain any full vowels (i.e., contains only the “reduced” vowels *ě* and / or *ǎ*), stress falls on the last vowel of the word.³ The phonological status of the “full” and “reduced” vowels appears to parallel long and short vowels in other languages. In current mora theory (e.g. Reynolds 1994) it is possible to view the full vowels

² Ašmarin provides more examples, as well as further details on the stressing of certain affixes as well; this has been omitted here. He abbreviates dialect names with capital letters; here and elsewhere in this paper, B. = Bujinskij (dialect), K. = Kormyšskij.

³ As has been pointed out to me by an anonymous reviewer, Ašmarin’s description of Chuvash stress is consistent with the middle or transitional Chuvash dialect as well, as evidenced in the recently published material of Joseph Pápay, which was also collected in 1898 (see bibliography).

as bimoraic and the short vowels as monomoraic. However, Jakovlev (1987: 50) observes that the qualitative differences between the two sets of vowels could just as well serve as a stress cue.

When literary Chuvash was established, the stress pattern of the Viryal or Upper Chuvash dialect was selected as the standard. Current normative Chuvash stress is therefore as follows: Stress falls on the last full (i.e., unreduced, short) vowel of a word; if a word does not contain any full vowels (i.e., contains only the "reduced" vowels *ě* and / or *ǎ*), the *first* vowel of the word is stressed. In some contemporary metrical analyses, e.g. Hayes (1995), this type of stress pattern, which is allegedly found in other, unrelated languages, is labeled a "default left" pattern; this implies that the stressing of final full vowels is a special case and initial stress is the other or "elsewhere" option.⁴ Of course, as was shown above, in the Anatri dialects of Chuvash described by Ašmarin, the "elsewhere" option is final stress—a "default right" stress pattern. This paper assumes that the Anatri "default right" stress described by Ašmarin forms the basis for stressing the majority of the loanwords he cites. However, only the "default" or right-edge stressing portion of the rule was initially employed by speakers to all loanwords. Viryal "default left" will be seen to play a role in some loanwords. Since stress placement in Chuvash is predictable in either dialect, I will not indicate it in the transcriptions which follow. Stress marks have been added to Russian words to facilitate comparison.

2. Stress groupings in the loanwords

This section breaks down Ašmarin's presentation of loanwords by stress type. I have omitted monosyllables from the list; in many cases, Russian monosyllabic words appear as disyllabic in Chuvash due to epenthesis (e. g. *mixě* < *mex* (Russ. dial.) 'bag' = Standard Russian (SR) *mešók*, but cf. Chuv. *mǎjǎx* in 2.3.); other signs of phonological adaption are also found, e.g., Russ. *krest* > Chuvash *xěres* 'cross,' Russ. *vsex* > Chuvash *vośśax* 'entirely.'

⁴ I think this stress rule for Viryal Chuvash should be revised in certain critical details; it is my view that Chuvash is a mixed pitch-accent / stress system, and the reduced vowel "stress" at the beginning of Viryal forms is a high-low pitch accent that can be found on all forms irrespective of their vowel content (Dobrovolsky, forthcoming). At this time, I have no opinion on Anatri stress.

As I shall show, one set of forms, probably early borrowings into Anatri dialects, shows consistent application of Chuvash final vowel stressing irrespective of vowel type in the source words; a second set of forms shows sensitivity to the phonetics of the Russian source words; and a third consists of words that in all likelihood entered Chuvash through the Viryal dialect.

2.1. Final stress in Russian = final stress in Chuvash

In this subset, final unreduced vowels in Russian are stressed finally in Chuvash.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>apat</i>	<i>obéd</i>	'dinner'
<i>karap</i>	<i>korábl'</i>	'ship'
<i>karttus</i>	<i>kartúz</i>	'powder bag'
<i>kolač, kulaś</i>	<i>kaláč</i>	'white bread'
<i>koršak</i> (K)	<i>goršók</i>	'pot' (Ašmarin 1898: 29)
<i>kěpěrne</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province' (cf. 2.4., 2.6.)
<i>kosar</i>	<i>kosýr'</i>	'planing knife'
<i>lupas</i>	<i>labáz</i>	'shed'
<i>mišavaj</i>	<i>meževój</i>	'land surveyor'
<i>mušik</i>	<i>mužík</i>	'muzhik'
<i>pila</i>	<i>pilá</i>	'saw' (tool)
<i>Pukrav</i>	<i>Pokróv</i>	Feast of the Protection
<i>putret</i>	<i>podr'ád</i>	'contract'
<i>saltak</i>	<i>soldát</i>	soldier
<i>sappan</i>	<i>zapón</i>	'apron'
<i>saśśom</i>	<i>sovsém</i>	'entirely'
<i>saxxot</i>	<i>zaxód</i>	'latrine' {'stop-over'}
<i>suxa, soxa</i>	<i>suxá</i>	'wooden plow'
<i>śonat</i>	<i>senát</i>	'senate'
<i>truba</i>	<i>trubá</i>	'pipe'
<i>tiječuk</i>	<i>d'jačók</i>	'sacristan, sexton'
<i>vitre</i>	<i>vedró</i>	'bucket'
<i>xěresnatte</i>	<i>krestnyj otéc</i>	'godfather'
<i>xupax, xobax</i>	<i>kabák</i>	'tavern' (obs.)

2.1.1. Observations

Though the stress correspondence is straightforward in these forms, it must be emphasized that the Russian stressed vowels are exactly the ones which would be stressed according to the Chuvash stress rule cited by Ašmarin: “stress the last full vowel of a word”. In other words, these words are in all probability stressed as a matter of rule and not in mere imitation of Russian stress.

Russian *kosýr* ‘planing knife’ can also be stressed on the first syllable, but the *Slovar’ russkix narodnyx govorov* (SRNG) (15: 94) cites the form with final stress as the one used in the (former) Simbirsk province, which encompassed Chuvashia in Tsarist times.

2.1.2. Additions

The following words can be added to this set.

<i>jantar</i>	<i>jantár</i>	‘amber’	‘glass’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>matrus</i>	<i>matróš</i>		‘seaman’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>patak</i>	<i>batóg</i>		‘walking-stick’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>pěrene</i>	<i>brevnó</i>		‘log’ (Fedotov 1990: 210)

2.2. Non-final stress in Russian = final stress in Chuvash

In the next set of forms, unstressed final vowels in the Russian source words are finally stressed in Chuvash, irrespective of Russian phonetics.

By “irrespective of Russian phonetics,” I mean: Russian unstressed /e/ and /o/ are neutralized thus: /e/ → /i/ and /o/ → /a/. Unstressed /a/ (including those /a/’s that evolved from unstressed /o/) is phonetically [ʌ] when immediately preceding a stressed vowel, and is reduced to [ə] two or more positions before a stressed vowel or following it (Russ. *akan’e*). Thus, Russian /moloko/ ‘milk’ is phonetically [məlʌkó], /knjiga/ ‘book’ is [knʲi’gə]. It should be noted, though, that /o/ → /a/ neutralization is not found consistently in the Russian dialects of the Central Volga region, where Russian and Chuvash speakers interacted. The area is a transitional zone between Russian dialects that show this phonological development and those that do not (Matthews 1967 (1960), Vlasto 1986). It is therefore possible that some borrowings may have entered Chuvash from neutralizing dialects, and others from dialects without this neutralization. We should thus not necessarily expect

all Russian /o/'s to neutralize to /a/ and its respective allophones in borrowings.

Given words that do show (standard) Russian *akan'e*, we might well expect Chuvash speakers to interpret final unstressed and reduced vowels in Russian as being analogous to Chuvash reduced vowels, and thus exempt them from stress. However, in the following borrowings, Chuvash final stress is applied to the unstressed and sometimes even reduced final vowel of the Russian sources. Chuvash speakers at the time of these borrowings, in other words, were insensitive to the phonetic characteristics of Russian, and applied the "default" final stress of Anatri Chuvash to all loanwords.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čirkü, čürkü</i>	<i>cérkov'</i>	'church'
<i>čitnaj</i>	<i>sítnyj xleb</i>	'loaf from sifted flour'
<i>juka</i>	<i>v'júga</i>	'blizzard'
<i>kěnege</i>	<i>kníga</i>	'book'
<i>kěreple</i>	<i>grábli</i>	'rake'
<i>laša</i>	<i>lóšad'</i>	'horse' (Ašmarin 1898: 23)
<i>matka</i>	<i>mátka</i>	'woman' (Čeboksary uezd)
<i>papaś (K)</i>	<i>(povival' naja) bábka</i>	'midwife'
<i>páraśnik</i>	<i>prázdnik</i>	'day off' (cf. 2.4.)
<i>pervej, pervaj</i>	<i>pérvyj</i>	'at first'
<i>pičěke, pičke</i>	<i>bóčka</i>	'barrel'
<i>pul'a</i>	<i>púl'a</i>	'bullet'
<i>salat</i>	<i>sólod</i>	'malt'
<i>sappon</i>	<i>zápon</i>	'apron' (but cf. 2.2.1.)
<i>šapa</i>	<i>žába</i> [toad]	'frog'
<i>šelep, šelepke,</i>	<i>šl' ápa</i>	'hat'
<i>tol'a</i>	<i>dól'a</i>	'portion'
<i>upli</i> (but cf. <i>obāl</i>)	<i>vóbla</i>	(fish species)
<i>xitre</i>	<i>xíttryj</i>	'beautiful' {< cunning, subtle}

Polysyllabic Russian forms:

Penultimately stressed in Russian

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>Kārkoři (K)</i>	<i>Grigórij</i>	Gregory (Ašmarin 1898: 44)
<i>Kášal'n'i</i>	<i>Kreščénie</i>	'baptism'

<i>kupāsta, kopsta</i>	<i>kapústa</i>	'cabbage'
<i>munčala</i>	<i>močálo</i>	'bast'
<i>ośmuxxa</i>	<i>vos' múška</i>	1/8 of a pound
<i>pātavkka</i>	<i>pudóvka</i>	one-pood (measure of weight)
<i>starasta</i>	<i>starósta</i>	'elder'
<i>varinkke</i>	<i>vorónka</i>	'funnel' (Ašmarin 1898: 29)
<i>xašat</i>	<i>gazéta</i>	'newspaper' {loss of final V}

Antepenultimately stressed in Russian.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kěpěrne, kupir</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province'

Initially stressed in Russian.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>mačča</i>	<i>mática</i> "joist"	'ceiling'
<i>müttarn'äk</i>	<i>mýtar' (nik)?</i>	'horse dealer' (from Russian colloquial speech. Ašmarin 1898: v)
<i>kěrepenkke</i>	<i>grívenka</i>	monetary unit (ten-kopek piece)
<i>kěrenkke</i>	<i>grívenka</i>	monetary unit (ten-kopek piece)
<i>šaluna, šalu</i>	<i>žálovan' e</i>	'salary'

As the subsections of this class show, the Chuvash borrowings are finally stressed even when the Russian polysyllabic words have antepenultimate or initial stress.

2.2.1. Observations

Chuvash *čirkü, čürkü* < Russ. *cérkov'* 'church' can be explained as the Chuvash alternation *-ěv ~ -ü / -äv ~ -u* found in the short list of commonplace words like *tu ~ täv* 'mountain', where the full-vowel word is the citation form and the longer stem the oblique form. This is a productive alternation in Chuvash and probably influenced the borrowed form in that Russian *cérkov'* was interpreted as an oblique stem. Ašmarin notes:

"Nouns ending in "u, ü" in the singular Gen. and Dat./Acc. cases change these sounds to "äv, ěv": (*iv, ěv*) *šu* — *fat*, *čirkü* — *church*, Gen. *šävän, čirkěvën*, {Dat.} *šäva, čirkěve*. The same phenomenon occurs when these nouns bear the

possessive pronoun suffixes: *šäväm* — *my fat*, *šävă* — *your fat*, *šävě* — *his fat*, *čirkěvēm* — *my church*, *čirkěvē* — *your church*, *čirkěvē* — *his church*, and so on. But in the Dat./Acc. singular, the same nouns revert to the sounds “u, ü” with the 2nd and 3rd person singular suffixes: *čirküne* — *your, his church* {Acc.}, *to your, to his church*; *šuna* — *your fat* {Acc.}; *to your fat šune* — *to his fat, his fat* {Acc.}.” (p. 30)

Chuvash *müttarn’āk* < Russ. *mýtar* ‘horse dealer’, or probably Russ. *mýtar’nik*. Stress has shifted to the final vowel of the source word root.

Russian *zapón* ~ *zápon* is listed with both final and non-final stress in SRNG. Whichever the source form was, the word has come into Chuvash with final stress.

Russian *grívenka* ‘ten-kopek piece’ appears to have entered Chuvash as *kěrepenkke* via Tatar *gräbänkä*. I claim this on the basis of the Chuvash medial /p/, which directly corresponds to the Tatar phoneme, as well as on the vowel correspondence and the final stress, which is found in Tatar. Ašmarin provides the Tatar form (as well as forms in several Ugric languages, which do not match up well with the Chuvash form) without comment

Chuvash *kěrenkke* ‘ten-kopek piece’ is *kěrepenkke* with partial syllable loss due, I suggest, to the little discussed presence of rhythmic stress in Chuvash, leading to a pre-loss pronunciation *kěrèpenkké*. I have observed such rhythmic stress in Chuvash speech; from the perspective of foot-based metrical theory (Hayes 1995), forms like *kěrèpenkké* and rhythmic alterations such as *Šùpaškár* ~ *Šupàškartá* ‘Čeboksary ~ in Čeboksary’ suggest that Chuvash builds right-headed rhythmic feet that apply (in the formal sense) from right to left.

2.2.2. Additions

To this list we may add:

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kašni</i>	<i>kážny</i>	‘every’
	(dial. = <i>káždyj</i>)	
<i>kělenče</i>	<i>skl’ánka</i>	‘bottle’ (Fedotov 1990: 139 [sic = 193])
<i>papka</i>	<i>bábka</i>	‘mandrel’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>taram</i>	<i>dárom</i>	‘free, in vain’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>čilaj</i>	<i>célyj</i>	‘a lot’ (Fedotov 1990: 275)
<i>šăpka</i>	<i>zýbka</i>	‘cradle’ (Fedotov 1990: 222)

<i>šurka</i>	<i>škúrka</i>	'hide, skin' (Fedotov 1990: 281 provides this form but questions its being a loanword.)
--------------	---------------	---

The form *săpka* exhibits a characteristic of the next class as well, in that the (Chuvash) unstressed vowel is reduced.

2.3. Russian final stress = Chuvash final stress; Russian vowel reduction appears in some positions in Chuvash

In these borrowings, final unreduced vowels in Russian are stressed, as expected, but the reduced or weakly stressed non-final vowels of Russian are reduced in Chuvash. In other words, these forms indicate a phonetic sensitivity to the Russian reduced or weakly stressed vowels and so may reflect a later, more sophisticated stage in the assimilation of loans.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čălxa</i>	<i>čulók</i>	'stocking'
<i>kěrpe</i>	<i>krupá</i>	'groats'
<i>kěsle</i>	<i>guslí</i>	'psaltery'
<i>mălatuk</i>	<i>molotók</i> [mələtók]	'hammer' [Note the fine-tuned replication of standard Russian pronunciation; the substitution of /u/ for Russ. /o/ is also consistent.]
<i>păršovoj</i> (K.)	<i>birževój</i> (izvoščik)	'carrier; cabman' (SRNG 2: 293)
<i>pășal</i>	<i>piščál'</i>	'(hand)gun'
<i>săvāk</i>	<i>sovók</i>	'shovel, scoop' (Ašmarin 1898:29) ⁵
<i>tălăp</i>	<i>tulúp</i>	'sheepskin coat' (Ašmarin 1898: 32)

2.3.1. Observations

The initial back reduced vowel of the K. form *măjăx* = Russ. *mešók* 'bag' may well have developed through phonetic assimilation to the final (here, stressed) vowel. Note that this word appears twice in the list, and that its other form is non-assimilated (section 2.).

⁵ Ašmarin (1898: 29) has *savāk*, but this appears to be a misprint, as that word means 'joy'.

2.3.2. Additions

The following may be added to this set.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kěsel</i>	<i>kisél'</i>	'blancmange, kissel' (Fedotov 1990: 194)
<i>čālan</i>	<i>čulán</i>	'storeroom' (Fedotov 1990: 272)

2.4. Non-final stress in Russian = non-final stress in Chuvash

These forms accurately reflect the Russian source word stress, in contrast with those cited in section 2.2. Recall that forms like Russ. *v'júga* > Chuvash *juka* 'blizzard' showed an insensitivity to the reduced final vowel of the Russian source word: Chuvash stress applied to the rightmost vowel. The following forms are different from the ones in section 2.2: The final reduced or unstressed vowel of Russian is treated like a Chuvash reduced vowel and taken into account, i.e., exempted, when Chuvash stress is applied. In other words, the *entire* stress rule of Chuvash is consistently applied here, not merely the default portion. Thus, these forms, like those in section 2.3., show a sensitivity to Russian phonetics that is analogized in Chuvash stress.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čaškă</i>	<i>čáška</i>	'cup'
<i>jaščăk, ješčěk</i>	<i>jáščik</i>	'wicker vehicle' (box wickers)
<i>kuperčă</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province' (cf. 2.1., 2.6.)
<i>lešnitsă</i>	<i>lesníčij</i>	'forestry officer'
<i>părašn'ăk</i> (K)	<i>prázdnik</i>	'day off' (cf 2.2.)
<i>pěreměk</i>	<i>pr'ánik</i>	'spice cake'
<i>sastăp</i>	<i>zástup</i>	'spade'
<i>saxxăr</i>	<i>sáxar</i>	'sugar'
<i>smilă</i> (K)	<i>smélyj</i>	'bold'
<i>săpaššipă</i> (K)	<i>spasíbo</i>	'thanks' (Ašmarin 1898: 44)
<i>tijakkăn</i>	<i>d'jákon</i>	'deacon'
<i>tikět</i>	<i>déget'</i> (dial.) ⁶	'tar' (= Standard Russian <i>děgot'</i>)
<i>obăl</i> (cf. <i>upli</i>)	<i>vóbla</i>	(fish species)
<i>vulăs, volăstă</i>	<i>vólost'</i>	'provincial government'

⁶ Thanks to an anonymous referee for providing this donor form.

It could be argued that these forms reflect the full Viryal stress rule and are borrowings from this dialect. But since all of these forms show only one or two reduced vowels following the single full vowel in the word, the stress placement would be the same in either dialect. The important point is that no matter what the borrowing dialect, the Russian reduced vowels are treated like Chuvash reduced vowels when stress is applied.

2.5. Russian final stress = Chuvash non-final stress

Ašmarin's list provides one initially puzzling instance of a word in whose stress in Chuvash flatly contradicts the stress of the Russian source word. In this form, the final Russian *stressed* vowel is transferred to Chuvash as a reduced vowel, and the first vowel of the word is stressed.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>avăn</i>	<i>ovín</i>	'barn'

2.5.1. Observations

Chuvash *avăn* 'barn' is an interesting case. Though Ašmarin includes it in the list of words borrowed from Russian, Gordeev (1979) (cited in Fedotov 1990: 167) claims that Russian *ovín* is a borrowing from Bolgar, i.e., Ancient Chuvash. In this view, Chuv. *avăn* = Tatar *ävan* ultimately derives from Ancient Turkic *äv* 'house'. So the problem may not be that the Chuvash stress is anomalous, but rather that the Russian stress requires an explanation.

2.5.2. Additions

To this set the following may be added.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>dăvăl</i>	<i>d'ávol</i>	'devil' (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>jamšăk</i>	<i>jamščík</i>	'coachman' (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>suntăx / sontăx</i>	<i>sundúk</i>	'trunk, chest' (Fedotov 1990: 227)

Russ. *d'ávol* > Chuv. *dăvăl* is only anomalous if it is assumed to be a borrowing into the right-stressing Anatri dialect. If it is a borrowing into Viryal, then its initial stress is normal.

The simplest explanation for these forms is the assumption that they entered the language through Viryal speakers, who simply applied the default (left) stress rule in all cases irrespective of vowel quantity or quality—just as the forms in section 2.2. show that Anatri speakers at one time applied the default (right) stressing rule across the board.

Further speculation is always possible. For example, note that all of these forms have the typical Viryal initial stress and that in some cases, their first vowels are relatively sonorous in comparison with the Russian stressed vowels: *a* versus *i* in Russ. *avín* and *jamščík*, and *a* versus *u* in Russ. *zastúp*. It is possible that Viryal speakers interpreted these vowels as stressed because of their high sonority thus reinforcing the application of the Viryal default left-stress pattern.

The Russian form *sundúk* enters Chuvash as *suntăx* / *sontăx* (the *u* / *o* variation is dialectal). Ašmarin notes (1898: 29):

“The change from “u (o)” to “a” in the words *kăšal*, *măntarăn* arises from the fact that Čuvaš in general does not tolerate the appearance of two “u”s or “o”s in a root ending in a consonant. This is noticeable in a number of borrowings from Russian:

Russ.	goršok	voronka	sovok
Čuv.	koršak (K.)	varinkke	săvăk” (see footnote 5)

In this case, Chuvash (Viryal) speakers may have reacted to the rounded vowel constraint by applying the default left-edge stressing and consequently reducing the following vowel.

2.6. Forms showing loss or addition of final vowel or syllable

2.6.1. Loss

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kanvit</i>	<i>konfěkty</i> [stress?]	‘bakery sweets’
<i>kupir</i>	<i>guběrnija</i>	‘province’
<i>kăran</i>	<i>granica</i> “boundary, edge”	‘boundary’
<i>kurpun</i>	<i>gorbátyj</i>	‘hunchback(ed)’
<i>săvaj</i>	<i>svája</i>	‘pile’
<i>šelle</i>	<i>žalěj < zhalějka</i>	(folk music instrument)
<i>xal’ar</i>	<i>xoléra</i>	‘cholera’

All but one of the forms above appear to have resulted from morphological analysis of the Russian forms by Chuvash borrowers in that the lost syllables are all inflectional endings (usually nominative singular, but nominative plural in the case of Russ. *konfekty*). It is significant, though, that these endings are all weak and occur immediately following a stressed syllable. As is clear from the preceding sections, in most instances this position does not result in the deletion of the Russian vowel or syllable. In the case of Russ. *žalěj* < *žalějka* > Chuv. *šelle*, a final weak diminutive suffix has been dropped (or perhaps was absent on the original borrowed form).

3. Discussion

Before drawing any conclusions, we must consider the possibility that these loanwords were simply stressed as in Russian, but that Ašmarin did not record this detail. This is unlikely for two reasons. First, Ašmarin is very careful with his transcription. For example, he makes a point of noting that while double letters in Chuvash orthography reflect geminate consonants in native words, they do not do so in the Chuvash pronunciation of Russian loanwords (in his phonetic transcription, Ašmarin uses the superscribed breve to indicate a short vowel):

“In words borrowed into Čuvaš from Russian, doubled consonants are written only to indicate voiceless pronunciation: Jakku (pron. Jaku) — Jakov, pätavkka (pron. pidavka) — pudovka; Kurm. saxxär (pron. saxir) — *sugar*.” (p.44)

Ašmarin does not make a parallel observation about stress on loanwords.

Second, there is evidence that transcribers who recorded Chuvash speech in a standard orthography (or, the competing orthographies of the time) deliberately spelled borrowed words in a way that indicates their stress as pronounced by Chuvash speakers. In some instances, Ašmarin's own phonetic transcriptions support this view, as in the example above, where he transcribes Russian *sáxar* ‘sugar’ > Chuv. K. *saxxär* phonetically according to Chuvash pronunciation as [saxir], the shortened second vowel clearly paralleling the reduced vowel transcription. (On the same page, Ašmarin also provides Chuvash *pätavkka* [pidavka] < Russian *pudovka* ‘unit of weight’).

The application of stress to the loanwords in Ašmarin's list is consistent when viewed as primarily reflecting Anatri stress patterns, but in one layer of the borrowings it shows a general insensitivity to Russian phonetics. This suggests that in an initial period of loanword adaptation an Anatri type of Chuvash stress was applied across the board, irrespective of Russian vowel quality. This process of loanword adaption is typical of early stages in the assimilation of a second-language phonology. In a second stage, greater sensitivity is shown to Russian vowel quality—which apparently parallels Chuvash bimoraic vowel *quantity*. Such sensitivity does not directly reflect acquisition of the Russian stress pattern—it is after all the Chuvash stress pattern that emerges. But it can be argued that the emergence of the more fine-tuned application of Chuvash stress occurred when speakers of Chuvash became more sensitive to the phonetic details of Russian stress and its segmental phonetic fall-out. The stress pattern of another set of loanwords indicates that they were borrowed via the Viryal dialect.

A striking feature of these adaptations is their insensitivity to syllable weight. Stress placement in both the “earlier” and “later” borrowings is unaffected by the structure of word-internal Russian syllables; the presence of codas that make for heavy syllables does not effect stress placement, for example. What the Chuvash stress rules are in fact sensitive to is vowel quantity. When Russian final reduced vowels are interpreted as Chuvash “short / weak / reduced” vowels (i.e., monomoraic vowels in some views, as noted) they are excluded from the first part of the Chuvash stress rule. I have argued elsewhere (Dobrovolsky 1998) that Chuvash phonology in general does not reflect a sensitivity to syllable structure; these borrowed forms are in line with that claim.

A second noteworthy characteristic of this data is the way in which it reflects the two parts of the Chuvash stress rule—or perhaps the two stress rules of Chuvash. Dobrovolsky (1990) speculates that the Chuvash stress rule is not a single rule with a special portion (“stress the last full vowel of a word”) and a default / elsewhere portion (“stress the last (Anatri) / first (Viryal) vowel of a word with only reduced vowels”). Rather, it was proposed that these two patterns are two separate entities. As remarked in footnote 4, I believe that the “default” rule of Chuvash stress is more akin to a pitch accent, while the last full vowel of a word is made prominent by extending its length. If edge “stress” in Chuvash is a pitch accent that extends across two syllables, there are two phonetic results we might expect. First, this accent may not be as salient as stress-

through-length on full vowels. This appears to be the case. Ašmarin writes that "in words consisting exclusively of short vowels, stress is scarcely noticeable." (p. 19, footnote 1). Jakovlev (1987: 51) confirms this fact, and adds that the first vowel's loudness and length are quite variable. Secondly, we might well expect the left-edge or right-edge accent to occur in *all* forms, irrespective of whether they contain full vowels or not. This means that the either / or formulation of Chuvash stress is incorrect, and that in finally stressing borrowed forms such as those in section 2.1., Chuvash speakers were not so much applying a default *stress* but rather producing the expected *pitch accent* on the right edge of the word.

Finally, we may well ask if the generalizations made in this paper about relative times of borrowing find any support in other analyses. Of course, linguistic idealizations capture overall patterns without necessarily reflecting the complex borrowing process. It may well be that many of these words entered Chuvash at nearly the same time, but through different intermediaries, such as popular speech, school teachers, journalists, missionaries, and thus in different forms; the idea of an easily identifiable progression from one stage of borrowing to the next may be illusory. However, the patterned groupings of borrowing types are not—they reflect various kinds of adaption of loanword stress.

Further questions arise. Does this greater sensitivity to phonetics indicate more sophisticated, or bilingual speakers? An increasing influx of Russian loans? Only a detailed study of the times of entry of each word into Chuvash speech—a difficult task in light of the paucity of written sources for early Chuvash—will enable us to state with certainty the origins of each item's stress. Nonetheless, we are still very fortunate to have available the sophisticated transcriptions of linguistic pioneers like Pápy and Ašmarin.

References

- Agyagási, Klára (ed.) 1997. *Der tschuwaschische Nachlaß von Joseph Pápay. Tagebuchfragment, tschuwaschisches Wörterverzeichnis.* (Bibliotheka Pápayensis, Band VII.) Debrecen.
- Ašmarin, N. I. 1898. *Materialy dlja izslědovanija čuvaškago jazyka. Čast' pervaja. Učenie o zvukax.* Kazan': Tipo-Litografija Imperatorskogo Universiteta. [Microfilm.]
- Dobrovolsky, Michael 1990. On Chuvash stress. In: Brendemoen, B. (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the*

- Permanent International Altaistic Conference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 113-124.
- Dobrovolsky, Michael 1998. Chuvash without syllables. In: Johanson, Lars (ed.) *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 3-27.
- Fedotov, M. R. 1990. *Čuvaško-marijskie jazykovye vzaimosvjazi*. Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Universiteta. Saranskij filial.
- SRNG = Filin, F. P. (ed.) 1965. *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Hayes, Bruce 1995. *Metrical stress theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jakovlev, P. J. 1987. Slovesnoe udarenie v čuvašskom jazyke. In: Pavlov, I. P. & Gorškov, A. E. & Fedotov, M. R. (eds.) *Voprosy fonetiki, grammatiki i onomastiki čuvaškogo jazyka*. Čeboksary: Naučno-issledovatel'skij Institut jazyka, literatury, i ékonomiki pri Sovete Ministrov Čuvaškoj ASSR. 48-53.
- Matthews, W. W. 1967 (1960). *Russian historical grammar*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Reynolds, Bill 1994. Trochaic feet in the morphology of a language with unbounded feet: The case for Chuvash. [MS, paper presented at the Chicago Linguistic Society, 1994.]
- Vlasto, A. P. 1986. *A linguistic history of Russia to the end of the eighteenth century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.