

SOME VOLGA BULGARIAN WORDS IN THE VOLGA  
KIPCHAK LANGUAGES<sup>+</sup>

by

A. RÓNA-TAS

It is a well-known fact that there are Volga Kipchak (VK) i. e. Tatar and Bashkir loan-words in Chuvash<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, practically no attention has been paid to the Volga Bulgarian layer of the VK languages<sup>2</sup>. I would like to present here some preliminary results of a study on the latter.

The Proto-Turkic (PT)  $\check{y} \sim y$  and  $\check{c}$  sounds developed in Chuvash into  $\acute{s}$ . It is a debated and yet unsolved question whether we are concerned with a development  $\check{y} > \acute{z} > \acute{s}$  or with  $\check{y} > \check{c} > \acute{s}$ , i. e. the relative chronology of devoicing and spirantization is uncertain. It is clear, however, that as early as the 8th-9th centuries there already existed an Old Bulgarian dialect which had spirant consonants in place of earlier  $\check{y}$ -, because Hungarian borrowed a few words from this dialect: Hung. szél [sél] 'wind' ← OB <sup>+</sup>śél Chuv. > śil; Hung. szőlő [söllő] 'grapes' ← OB <sup>+</sup>śedley > Chuv. śirla; Hung. szűcs [šűč] 'tailor' ← OB <sup>+</sup>śeuči > Chuv. śevěšē (Cf. Proto-Turkic <sup>+</sup>yəl 'wind', <sup>+</sup>yedlig 'berry', <sup>+</sup>yevci 'tailor'). The bulk of the OB loan-words in Hungarian shows a  $\check{y}$ -dialect as Hung. gyümölcs [d'ümöč] 'fruit' ← OB <sup>+</sup>yemilč > Chuv. <sup>+</sup>śiměš, Hung.

<sup>+</sup> First published in: Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh. Ed. by Gy. Káldy-Nagy, Budapest, pp. 169-175.

gyűrű [d'ūrū] 'ring' ← OB †jūrtū > Chuv. †šerē,  
 Hung. gyertya [d'ert'a] 'candle' ← OB †jarta > Chuv.  
šurta etc. (Cf. PT †yemiš 'fruit', †yūzūk 'ring' and  
†yarta 'torch, candle').

The existence of the two Bulgarian dialects can be well demonstrated by the help of the oldest Bulgarian loan-words in Proto-Permian (PP): Zyrian kiś 'slay, weaver's reed', Votyak kiś 'id.' < PP †kiś ← VB †yis (< †qilč) > Chuv. †yēs; Zyrian †šil 'wind', Votyak šil 'id.' < PP †sil ← VB šil (< †yēl) > Chuv. šil; but Zyrian čarla 'sickle' < PP †čarla ← VB čarla ~ šarla → Votyak †šarlá > šurlo, Cf. Chuv. šurla, Hung. sarló [šarlō]; Zyrian kuže 'forest-spirit, lord', Votyak kužo, kuzo 'id.' < PP kuža ← VB xuža ~ xuža ← Persian xwaja, Cf. Chuv. †xuša and Russian hozja-nin<sup>3</sup>.

We have to exclude the possibility that we are dealing here with two chronologically different layers. The loan-words in Hungarian are surely earlier than the end of the 9th century while in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions<sup>4</sup> we still find †j-, and this means that the †j-dialect existed at least until the middle of the 14th century<sup>5</sup>.

The existence of the two dialects can be demonstrated even in Chuvash itself, because such words as čakan 'bulrush' instead of the expected šakan (~ PT yākān Cf. Hung. gyékény [d'ēkēn]) can be explained only as

a loan in Chuvash from the other VB dialect (VB ĵākān → Chuv. ĉākān > ĉakan).

Now having sure and independent evidence for the existence of a ĵ- and an ś-dialect of VB, we are forced to pose the question: how are these dialects reflected in the VB layer of the VK languages?

It is extremely difficult to demonstrate loan-words coming from the ĵ VB dialect into the VK languages because ĵ - is now common in the central Tatar dialects, while the Misher dialects and Bashkir have y-. In most cases the central Tatar dialects borrowed a ĵ-word without any change and Misher and Bashkir substituted y- for ĵ-<sup>6</sup>. I would quote only two cases where such a borrowing seems probable:<sup>7</sup>

1. Ĵar in Ĵaĵal Ĵ. 'mednyj kuporos' (TD) ← VB ĵār (< PT yez > Tat. ĵiz → Chuv. yēs) → Mordvin śerę, Zyrian śir (in śir-iś, Cf. Paasonen 1953, p.124, Lytkin 1967, pp.134-135).
2. yozorok 'fist' (TatB) ← VB ĵuĉurux (< PT yudruq > Tat. yodrik)<sup>8</sup>. It is easier to find traces of the ś-dialect where the regular Tatar correspondence is ś-<sup>9</sup>.
3. Ĵara in Ĵarak agaĉ 'gladkoe, bez vetvej derevo' (TD), Ĵārā 'golyj, bez ŗersti' (TatP, O Cf. Räsänen 1920, p.186) ← VB śārā (< ĉārā) >

Chuv. śara 'golyj' → Cher. sārā. The form <sup>+</sup>čārā is also attested in Cher. čara, čārā (Räsänen 1920, p. 189). The word cannot be connected with PT taz as Fedotov (1965, p. 116) supposed<sup>10</sup> and its ultimate origin remains unclear.

4. šimran, šomran 'suslik' (TD), šomoran 'id.' (TP) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šumran (< PT yumran > Tat. yomran → Chuv. yämran)<sup>11</sup>.
5. šil in šilyaq 'skolzkij' (Bashk.) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šil- (< PT yil- Cf. yilan 'snake', Bashk. yilan and Chuv. śēlen).
6. širpi 'zanoza, spička' (T, Bashk) ← VB <sup>+</sup>širpi (< PT čirpi > Tat. čirpi (Mahmutova 1955, p. 142), Tat. širpi → Chuv. šěrpä, Cher. šârpâ (Räsänen 1920, p. 25).
7. šomar in šomarčuk 'vid griby' (TD) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šumar (< PT yajmur 'rain') > Chuv. śumär 'rain', see also Russian šomorluk 'ženskaja verhnjaja od'ežda' (Dobrodomov 1969, p. 234, Fasmer, IV p. 466) according to me VB → Tat. → Russian and not VB > Chuv. → Russian because of the final -k.
8. šomirt 'čeremuha' (Tat.), šomort 'id.' (Bashk.) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šumirt (< PT yumirt) > Chuv. śēmërt

- also → Kazakh šomirt, Uzbek šumurt<sup>12</sup>.
9. šura 'sovet' (T archaic) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šora (< PT yara-q > Tat. yarau 'being in accord etc.' → Chuv. yura- 'to be satisfied') > Chuv. šura-š- 'to agree with somebody'.
10. Ästerxan 'Astrahan' (Tat.) ← VB Aštarxan (← Haĵ + tarqan<sup>13</sup>) > Chuv. Aštarxan, Aštärxan.
11. käšä, käšäkä 'kljuška' ← VB <sup>+</sup>käšä(kä) ~ <sup>+</sup>käčäkä 'goat' → Tat. käjä, Chuv. kača, kačaka, Zyrian keć, Votyak keć and also Hung. kecske [káčkä]<sup>14</sup>.
12. poši (Tat), pīši, pöšöy, mīši, moši (TD) 'los', mīši 'id.' (Bashk) ← VB <sup>+</sup>pūši ← Proto-Permian <sup>+</sup>pūčey > Votyak pužey. Cf. Chuv. pāši<sup>15</sup>.
13. kušman 'red'ka' (TD) ← VB <sup>+</sup>yošman (← Proto-Vogul <sup>+</sup>kočm3n) → Zyrian kušman, Cher. ušman, Mordvin kušman, Chuv. käšman, Votyak kušman<sup>16</sup>.
14. šort 'house' (TB) ← VB <sup>+</sup>šurt (< PT yurt > Tat. yort) > Chuv. šurt,
15. köpšä 'dulo, stvol, trubačnyj stebel', truba' (Tat., Bashk.) ← VB <sup>+</sup>küpše (< PT küpček > Tat. köpčäk) > Chuv. kěpše.
16. šüre 'spulka, cevka' (Tat., Bashk.) ← VB šürü (< PT yüzük 'ring' > Tat. yözek, Bashk. yözök 'kol'co, peresten'') > Chuv. šěře 'ring', Cf.

Tat. → Chuv. dial. šurǎ, šurě 'cevka', also Baraba šörö (Radlov) etc.

The words cited above are only a fragment of the more than hundred VB words which can be documented in the VK languages. Even this small sample shows how complicated the ethnogenetical processes in the Volga-region are and how they are reflected in the lexical stock of the Volga languages. We can distinguish among the following types:

1. The VB word has been borrowed by VK and Chuvash has the regular corresponding form (3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15).
2. Finno-Ugric words have been borrowed by VB, from VB into VK and from VK into Chuvash (12, 13).
3. The VB word has been borrowed by VK while Chuvash lost it and then borrowed the regular Tatar form (1, 4).
4. The VB word has been borrowed by VK, preserved by Chuvash, but at the same time Chuvash borrowed the regular cognate from Tatar (9).
5. The VB word has been borrowed by VK, preserved by Chuvash, but later Chuvash borrowed the VK word of VB origin too (16).
6. The VB word has been borrowed by VK while

Chuvash has lost it and then borrowed the VK word of VB origin (6).

7. Chuvash borrowed directly from the other VB dialect and so did Tatar from both VB dialects (11).

The very complicated interrelationships among the Volga languages are well-reflected even in the above sample - a fragment of the entire material. From the many problems left open I would like to deal here only with one. The quoted Tatar words are in most cases dialectal and it could be argued that we are concerned here with recent Chuvash loan-words. This would of course not question the existence of ś-loan-words in Tatar but raises the problem of chronology and admits a doubt in the synchronous existence of the two dialects in the Volga-region.

This doubt can be, however, eliminated. Those examples themselves, which show that Chuvash had reborrowed or simply borrowed ś → ŷ forms from Tatar, point to a relatively high age of the Tatar words in question. Moreover there are some phonological arguments in favour of the relatively early borrowing from VB.

The first argument is ambivalent. In the VK languages there occurred a relatively late change in the vowel-system. The originally open vowels (<sup>+</sup>o, <sup>+</sup>ö, <sup>+</sup>ä, <sup>+</sup>e) became closed o > u, ö > ü, ä, e > i, while the closed (<sup>+</sup>u, <sup>+</sup>ü, <sup>+</sup>i, <sup>+</sup>ı) became reduced which is not marked by the recent Tatar

ortography  $\underline{u} > \underline{o}$  [ $\underline{\ddot{u}}$ ],  $\underline{u} > \underline{\ddot{o}}$  [ $\underline{\ddot{ö}}$ ],  $\underline{i} > \underline{e}$  [ $\underline{\ddot{e}}$ ],  $\underline{i} > \underline{\ddot{i}}$  [ $\underline{\ddot{ï}}$ ]. Most of the quoted Tatar and Bashkir words show this change. The VK change can be dated surely after the 14th-15th century<sup>17</sup> most probably after the 16th century and this would mean that those words which show this development (Nos 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15) are earlier than the 16th century. Unfortunately a similar development occurred also in Chuvash. Thus, e.g. Chuv. kěpše has a form in the Viryal dialect köpse which is phonetically the exact counterpart of Tatar köpšä in regards to the vowel of the first syllable. Thus this argument can be used only in case if we have other arguments.

From such arguments I would quote the case of Chuv. šéměrt (No. 8) where the development was: yumirt > ŷumirt > šumirt > šimirt > šimirt > šéměrt and VK shows the phase šumirt with the later VK  $\underline{u} > \underline{o}$  development. In cases on Nos 10, 11 the borrowing was earlier than the Chuvash  $\underline{\ddot{a}} > \underline{a}$  development. In case No. 9 the borrowing occurred after the VB  $\underline{\ddot{a}} > \underline{o}$  or before the VK  $\underline{a} > \underline{\ddot{a}}$ .

Fortunately we have an independent and safe data for the existence of VB  $\underline{\ddot{y}} \sim \underline{\ddot{ä}} \rightarrow$  Tat.  $\underline{\ddot{y}}$  from as early as the end of the 13th century. The untimely deceased and well-known Tatar scholar G. V. Jusupov published in 1972 a VB tombstone from Tatarskoe Šapkinö, Kujbiševskij rajon (not to be confused with the Kujbiševskij oblast' the



former is the region of the old capital Bolgari, the latter is much souther). The peculiarity of this stone is that there are two inscriptions on its both sides respectively and a few lines on the smaller edges. The first of the two inscriptions is written in Arabic with the tult characters. This inscription is not dated and Jusupov gives tentatively the 14th century. It has escaped Jusupov's attention that this inscription shows a very close connection with another one dated on the 5th June 1291 published by many authors, among them also by Jusupov<sup>18</sup>,

The inscription of 1291 is dedicated to a lady named Sabar Ilji, daughter of Būrāš beg. The first inscription of Šapkino contains the name of the deceased as Šeker Ilji, daughter of <sup>c</sup>Utmān al-Bulğāri. This name was read by Jusupov as Šakar-ilči. The first name can be only front vocalic, because according to the orthographic rules of the VB inscriptions the Arabic letter keph is used only in front vocalic words. In case of ilči, Jusupov's reading is correct; he gives however no explanation for it. The name is written with aleph, lam, Jim and ya; this would allow a lot of other readings, but the inscription of 1291 has aleph, ya, lam, Jim and ya which ensures the reading of the initial vowel. The reading -č- of Jim is also possible because the VB inscriptions did not use the three dotted Jim for č. I retain as transliteration -j-

with the notion that its phonetic value could be ǰ (though after -l- an original ǰ could be pronounced also as ɟ and in this case we would have phonemically a ǰ but phonetically a ɟ).

On the other side of the tombstone of Šapkino we find an inscription in the kufi style, also in Arabic:

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. <sup>c</sup> Utman eǰūke             | 1. Osman uncle's                      |
| 2. hīr-i Husayn kiyēli                  | 2. daughter, Husayn's daughter-in law |
| 3. mārīhum ǰeker                        | 3. the deceased ǰeker                 |
| 4. ilti ziyarat-ī rahmatu               | 4. ilti's tomb. The mercy             |
| 5. -l-lahi <sup>c</sup> alayha rahmatun | 5. of God be upon her with mercy      |
| 6. wāsi <sup>c</sup> at                 | 6. abundant                           |

Leaving aside some problems of the second inscription<sup>19</sup>, one thing is clear, and this has been also recognized by Jusupov that we are concerned here with the same person who figures as Šeker ilǰi in the first inscription and as ǰeker ilti (according to Jusupov elti) in the second inscription.

The first vowel of ilti is written in the same way as that of ilǰi, i. e. only with aleph without kesra or ya, thus in both cases we can read i-, but this reading is not binding in the second case. The corresponding -ǰi ~ ti is of great importance. Recently it has been argued

by F.S.Hakimzjanov (1974) that in the inscriptions three dialects are reflected. One of them would be a y- and -z-, -š- dialect, the two other would be -r-, -l- dialects and the main difference between the latter two would be that the syllable -ti is preserved in the one and is represented by -či in the other<sup>20</sup>. It is a well-known fact that the cluster ti- has developed into č- in present Chuvash<sup>21</sup> but that the Hungarian loan-words do not reflect this development<sup>22</sup> and we have therefore to suppose  $\tau$  in spite of the fact that Mongolian has a similar development - that ti > či is relatively young<sup>23</sup>. It is possible that the ti > či development did not occur in all VB dialects and in all words in the same time. I would be however cautious and hesitate to classify the VB dialects according to the occurrence or non-occurrence of the ti > či development. In a time when this development was in its initial phase the inscriptions reflect an uncertainty<sup>24</sup>. In any case ilči and ilti are perfect equivalents.

For sake of correctness we have to add that the reading č in čeker is also only one of the two possible readings, the second being čeker. But this does not influence the conclusion that we have a clear case from the end of the 13th century that what was č- (or č-) in one of the VB dialects was rendered with č- by a language which was spoken - as the name of the father of the deceased lady shows - in Bulghar.

The first authentically edited and dated inscription which is not in VB but in a literary language showing the influences of the Kipchak language is dated from 1311/12. It is very interesting that also this inscription<sup>25</sup> shows many common traits with the first inscription of Šapkinö, the main difference is only that the date is given in Turkic: The lady Fatima-ilči daughter of Ayyub, son of Muhammed, son of Yunus al-Bulğari died in her twentysecond year (yigirmī iki yašında) and the date of her death was according to Hegira in the month rabi<sup>c</sup> u-l-ahar of 711 (wafat boldī rabi<sup>c</sup> u-l-ahar<sup>c</sup> ermišdē hiğratdā yeti yūz on bīrdē).

From this fact we can conclude that the people who erected the inscriptions of 1291, 1311/12 and the first inscription of Šapkinö, all families living in Bulğhar, spoke another language than VB and this could be most probably a Kipchak language. And if this is so, than the name Šeker reflects a Kipchak pronunciation of a VB dialectal form of the VB name Ĵeker.

#### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> See Ramstedt (1922-23); N. Poppe (1924, pp. 775-782, 1925, pp. 409-427, 1927, pp. 151-167). The connections between the VB and Kipchak languages have a long history. The earliest connections began in those times when the dialects of Proto-Turkic had not yet been finally formed. There are a lot of interesting isoglosses from these times such as e.g. Kipchak quyaš 'sun' Bulgarian quyal > Chuv. xěvel in front of Oguz etc.

küneš. These isoglosses show that the formation of the dialects, which became later the Kipchak and Bulgar languages respectively, took place in an area where these proto-dialects existed near by. The second period of the connections between the Kipchak and Bulgar-Onogur languages occurred while the latter had their home-land in the South. After the migration of the later Volga Bulgars to the Middle Volga-region, the contacts did not cease with the Kipchak tribes living East and South of them (Pechenegs, Cumans etc.). The fourth period began with the intrusion of the Kipchak tribes into the Middle Volga-region, the occupation of the territory of the Volga Bulgarian Khanate. During the times of the Golden Horde and the Kazan Khanate the character of the connections changed, but not their importance. It will be an important task to distinguish among the several Kipchak layers in Chuvash. I would like to remind the reader that, in addition to the type mentioned above (guyaš ~ guyal), we can distinguish e. g. among three different representations of the syllable qa- of Kipchak origin: Tat. qa → Chuv. xu: qašqa 'white spot on the head of animals' → Chuv. xuška, Tat. qa- → Chuv. xa-: Tat. qapqa 'door' → Chuv. xapxa and Tat. qa- → Chuv. ka-: Tat. qarčiq 'old man or woman' → Chuv. karčäk.

- 2 Cf. Räsänen's short remark (1920, p. 31) and that of L.S. Levitskaja (1967). Scattered remarks can be found in works dealing with the etymology of words of the Volga languages.
- 3 On the early VB loan-words in PP see Rédei--Róna-Tas 1972 and 1975.
- 4 Cf. A. Róna-Tas -- S. Fodor, 1973.
- 5 Attempts have been made to read the letter Yim as š or the like (e. g. by Katanov, 1972, p. 112 and Fedotov 1972, p. 112) but this is impossible. The letter Yim renders Y- in Arabic words and in Tatar inscriptions. The latest dated VB inscriptions are from 1357.

- 6 It is very probable that the ŷ- i.e. the 'ŷokanie' of the central Tatar dialects is of VB origin.
- 7 In the study of the VB loan-words of the VK languages the excellent publication of the Tatar colleagues was of great help. This group of authors was headed by L. T. Mahmutova (Cf. TTDS). I also used Bálint, 1875-77 (TB) and Paasonen's material published by Kecskeméti, 1965 (TP) The literary languages of the Volga-region are quoted by their standard dictionaries.
- 8 This word goes to an earlier <sup>+</sup>yumdu ruq, a derivation from the root yum- 'to clench the fist, to press together etc.', yumruq and yudruq are two developments of it. The Chuvash word čämăr 'ball, fist' is also a loan from another VB dialect (← yumur) as čakan. The late preservation of the spirant -d- in these type of words will be the object of a forthcoming paper of L.V. Clark so I shall not go into details here.
- 9 Räsänen (1920, p. 31) was the first, to call attention to the correspondence Tat. š ~ Chuv. ś. He quoted the words Nos 3, 8, 15, 16 and Tat. (Radlov) širāp 'fest, stark' ~ Chuv. śirēp ~ Mari sirēp. The origin of this latter word is not clear to me.
- 10 Fedotov also connected the word with archaic Hung. szár [sār] 'bald' which is also impossible because of the vocalism and the vocalic word-end of the VB word. His reference to Tat. šārā is correct.
- 11 The form somorān quoted by Paasonen (TP p. 37) is either a misprint or a secondary š > s development, as in Ästerxan.
- 12 The PT form of this word can be reconstructed with the help of Kumandu Kiži d'imirt (Baskakov), Khakass nimirt etc., regular corresponding forms to PT †yumirt.

- 13 The first component of the word is of Arabic origin. The second is the well-known title tarqan.
- 14 This crook (kljuška) is used in ball games and resembles a goat's horn, hence its name. The Chuvash word has both meanings according to Ašmarin. There is also a dialectal word in Tatar kāzā 'kozly dlja raspilka drov ili dosok' i.e. goat-footed trestle for sawing.
- 15 It is not entirely impossible that this word was directly borrowed by Chuvash from PP. The development of PP ey in VB and Chuvash to i is regular, Cf.: PT buydai 'wheat' > Chuv. pāri, PT turʔai 'lark' > Chuv. tāri, PT sičʔai 'mouse' > Chuv. šāši etc.
- 16 On kušman see K. Rédei-- Róna-Tas 1976.
- 17 According to Doerfer (1971, col. 329) these changes occurred later than the end of the 17th century. Doerfer quotes Russian sources from the time of the Kazan Khanate (1445-1552) where names of Kazan Tatars have the earlier form as Temūr instead of the modern timer. I fully agree with Doerfer that the Russian sources have to be used as sources on the history of the Turkic languages. I am however sure that he also will agree with me that here some caution will be appropriate. Such well-known names as Temir are not necessarily noted in the dialect of their owner. In any case the Middle Mongolian loan-words of Tatar (see Róna-Tas 1971-1972, 1973-1974) show that all of them took part in the change in question. This is a clear argument in favour of the fact that the change of the Tatar vowel system is later than the 14th century.
- 18 G. V. Jusupov, 1960, No. 4 with earlier bibliography. I have republished this important inscription in: Róna-Tas 1973, pp. 48-49 and had the opportunity to study

the stone itself in 1973. The Arabic text of the Šapino inscription is a shortened variant of the text of the 1291 stone.

- 19 On the interesting words eŷuke (ečŷuke) Cf. Chuv. ěśkey 'brother-in-law, appellative used by women to address married men elder than their husband' and kiyēli (kieli) ~ PT kelin 'bride, daughter-in-law' I shall comment at another place.
- 20 To tell the truth, Hakimzjanov formulated his criteria more complicated. According to him there were a ŷ-dialect, a y-dialect and a t-dialect. But the ŷ-dialect and the t-dialect differ only in the fact that in the first we find ŷi- (Hakimzjanov does not pay the necessary attention to the fact that this is the case only before -ŷ/-i-) - while the t-dialect has t. From this fact itself it has to be clear that the ŷim in all cases where it is paralleled by t- in the other inscriptions has to be read phonemically as [č].
- 21 Cf. PT tiz 'knee' > Chuv. čěr (kuśsi), til 'tongue' > Chuv. čělxe, tirnaq 'nail, claw' > Chuv. čěrne, yēti 'seven' Chuv. šičě etc.
- 22 Cf. Hung. tér-d 'knee' ← OB tīr (-d is a Hung. dimin. suffix), tyuk, tik 'hen' < OH \*tiuuk ← OB tīquq Cf. Chuv. čăx(đ), etc.
- 23 This rule is still applicable, e. g. the very young Russian loan-word in Chuvash sad 'garden' has its form with the possessive suffix i > ě: sačě [sačě] as such original Chuvash words as yat 'name' yačě or šurt 'house' šurčě.
- 24 That Hakimzjanov's classification is unacceptable can be seen from the fact that we find in one and the same inscription -ti and -ŷi [-či] forms as: ŷiyēti 'seven' but tūweŷim 'fourth' instead of tūwetim (1353-54, Ašit, Epigr. Bulg. No 26), ŷiyēti 'seven' but



eji instead of eti < erti 'has been' (1323 Atrajsy, Epigr. Bulg. No 18), while in other inscriptions (as 1338 Tat. Kirmeni, Epigr. Bulg. No 20, 1340 Nižnie Jaki Epigr. Bulg. No. 39) we find jiyeji and even jije. To this I have to add that in present Chuvash PT yēti is šičě but tūwātīm 'fourth' (see above tūwejim) törtim is tāvatām, and not tāvačām.

25 G. V. Jusupov 1960, No. 10.