

# RAMSTEDT'S NOGHAY TEXTS IN KOTWICZ'S COLLECTION<sup>1</sup>

**Henryk Jankowski,**

Adam Mickiewicz University (Poznań, Polska),  
al. Niepodległości 24, Poznań, 61-714, Polska,  
henko@amu.edu.pl.

The aim of this paper is to present another copy of Ramstedt's Noghai texts which were found in Kotwicz's collection in Cracow in addition to a master copy edited by Harry Halén in Finland<sup>2</sup>. The author carries out a comparative study of Noghai or Noghay Tatar with other Turkic languages of the Aralo-Caspian group and, on the basis of both copies he discusses the phonetic features and phonological processes typical of Noghay. Conclusions are made about the features of the Noghai spoken language which were not previously documented in a classical study of N.A.Baskakov. The paper notes the fact that Ramstedt failed to master the Noghai language at the appropriate level which caused certain inaccuracies and misinterpretation of words. The text contains examples illustrating the differences in the interpretation of linguistic phenomena in the analyzed copies.

**Key words:** Kotwicz's collection, Ramstedt's Noghai texts, Noghay Tatar, Halén's edition, phonetic features, long vowels, rounded-unrounded vowel harmony, consonant lenition.

### 1. Ramstedt's Noghay materials

As Halén [1: 105] shows, Ramstedt recorded Noghay texts between 6 and 20 November 1904. He stayed in the Noghay village Achikulak (Ašiqu-laq) in the Noghay steppe in Stavropol district from 7 October to 24 November. He also visited two other Noghay settlements, Karatöbe (Qaratöbe) and Mahmud-aul, now Mahmud Mek-teb. According to Halén [2: 114], Ramstedt's Noghay materials consist of nine fairy tales and 14 songs, though Ramstedt recorded more tales. Ramstedt also collected Noghay words and gathered around 4,000 lexical entries; his file in Finnish archives comprises 1850 slips. All these materials were published in a volume together with Kumyk materials gathered after the work with the Noghays<sup>3</sup>. The fairy tales (Nogajische Märchen) preceded by a foreword, are on pages 103–140, then there are the songs [Nogajische Lieder, 140–148] and the glossary [Nogajisches Wörterverzeichnis 149–172]<sup>4</sup>, also preceded by a short introduction.

Ramstedt's informant and Noghay language teacher was Biybulat Muslimov. Naturally, in such a short time Ramstedt could not master a new language, though he wrote that he was able to under-

stand it. Therefore, some words were rendered inaccurately and some misunderstood [1: 149]. This is evident not only in the glossary, but sometimes also in the texts. However, as a whole Ramstedt's materials are valuable; he was an excellent scholar with very good hearing and good linguistic intuition. Most mistakes have been corrected by Halén's careful edition.

The editor stresses that he rendered Ramstedt's texts as close to the original as possible, though he unified diversified notations. The recorded forms were quite unstable because of the admixture of Kumuk and "other dialect forms", e.g. *baš* ~ *bas* [1: 106] 'head'. Ramstedt also pointed to such alternating forms as *dž/j*, *q/x*, *jetpege/jetmege*, *qart-pənan/qart-bənan*, etc.

### 2. Ramstedt's Noghay materials in Kotwicz's collection

Halén does not provide details on the manuscript of Ramstedt's Noghay texts, but he does this for the glossary [1: 149], so it is natural to admit that they are housed in the archives of the Finno-Ugrian Society in Helsinki, Finland. Quite interestingly, another copy of Ramstedt's Noghay fairy

<sup>1</sup> This article was published by Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, Jan Rogala, Filip Majkowski (eds). 2014. A window onto the other. Contributions on the study of Mongolian, Turkic and Manchu-Tungusic peoples, languages and cultures. Dedicated to Jerzy Tulisow on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Warszawa: Elipsa, 2014, P. 146–154.

<sup>2</sup> see color insert to the article – G.J.

<sup>3</sup> Kumuk material was edited by Gürsoy-Naskali, while Noghay was edited by Halén. Henceforth it is referred to as Halén 1991.

<sup>4</sup> Halén has published only those words which are absent from dictionaries or differ in form and meaning from standard forms.

tales and one Kumyk tale was discovered by Jerzy Tulisow in Cracow in the archives of the Cracow Branch of the Polish Academy of Sciences [3]<sup>5</sup>. The texts are written in a notebook of 32 pages, the last 11 pages being blank (shelf mark K III-19, 60, now 135). According to Tulisow, there are 12 texts in the notebook: 11 Noghay fairy tales and one Kumyk tale<sup>6</sup>. In fact, there are only 10 texts, since one text is mistakenly numbered xi instead of ix, i.e. Noghay texts have the numbers i-viii and xi. Putting aside numerous minor differences in the notation of vowels and consonants, punctuation, etc., as well as different numbering, the Cracow texts are identical to Noghay fairy tales in Halén's edition [1: 114-140]. Tulisow [3: 97] assumed that the author of the texts in Kotwicz's collection was Ramstedt, although he did not see Halén's edition of 1991, nor his bio- and bibliographical work on Ramstedt [2]. After the comparison of the two manuscripts, I could confirm Tulisow's assumption with absolute certainty. The handwriting of the manuscript from the Kotwicz archives is identical to the letters in Ramstedt's handwriting seen in photograph 27 in Halén [2], thus it is certain that Ramstedt not only collected the fairy tales, but he also wrote them down in the notebook<sup>7</sup>.

It is unknown when, why and how Ramstedt's notebook with a variant of Noghay texts passed to Kotwicz. After Kotwicz's death, the notebook along with Kotwicz's other materials was donated by his daughter to the academy archives in Cracow [3: 98].

### 3. Differences between Halén's edition and the Cracow copy

To indicate the similarities and differences between the two copies, I will present the initial parts of all nine texts.

<sup>5</sup> My best thanks go to Prof. Jerzy Tulisow for sending me a copy of these texts. The texts were previously the subject of an unpublished MA thesis by Magdalena Piędel (1993) *Język nogajski w bajkach Nogajyw ze Stawropolskiego Kraju* ‘The Noghay language in the fairy tales of Stawropol Noghays’ (Cracow, supervised by Prof. Marek Stachowski). Noghay texts are preserved in the Archive of Science of PAN and PAU in Cracow, K III-19, 135.

<sup>6</sup> The Kumuk fairy tale (page 21a) is short, it is called “Ein kumyckisches marchen” and begins with *bar turna-Яut-ta bar jimSrtea Яaštö bolyan*. It corresponds to tale 1 in Gursoy-Naskali's edition (1991: 16) in the same volume.

<sup>7</sup> Ramstedt's hand was confirmed by Harry Halén in personal communication, for which I owe him a debt of gratitude.

The corresponding numbering in Halén's edition and the Cracow copy is as follows:

Halén	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Kotwicz	i	V	vi	Vii	iv	viii	xi	ii	iii

K<sup>8</sup> I (1a-2b) *bär kedeiolaq bar eken-* H<sup>9</sup> 1 (114) *bär kedejülaq bar eken* ‘Das brave Zicklein’.

K II (2b-5a) *erteertezamanda, esäge bärtezamanda -* H 8 (133-135) *erteertezamanda, esäge börtezamanda* ‘Sechs Dummköpfe und der Schlaukopf’.

K III (5a-8a) *bär qannâyüşülə bar eken-* H 9 (137-138) *bär qannâyüşülə bar eken* ‘Prüfungen der drei Khanssöhne’.

K IV (8a-9a) *erteertezamandabär jayatbolyan-* H 5 (127-128) no difference ‘Der Drachentöter’.

K V (9b-10b) *börən bär öksəz jašbolyan-* H 2 (116) *bürün bär öksəz jašbolyan* ‘Der Weisenjunge’.

K VI (10b-13b) *erteertezamanda, eškebärtezamanda-* H 3 (117-119) no difference ‘Das Geschenk des Kranich-Reichen’.

K VII (14a-17b) *erteertezamanda esägebörtezamanda-* H 4 (122-124) *erteertezamanda, esägebörtezamanda* (Motivvermischung).

K VIII (17b-19a) *bär alašaboldā, bär jayattəŋqolānda boldā-* H 6 (129-130) *bär alasaboldā, bär jayattəŋqolānda boldā* ‘Die Wunderarznei’, Version 1.

K XI (19b-21a) *erteertezamanda, esägebörtəzamandabär qojsəbolyan-* H 7 (131-132) *erteertezamanda, esägebörtəzamandabär qojsəbolyan* ‘Die Wunderarznei’, Version 2.

As can be seen, some differences such as the lack of diacritics, e.g. *kedeifor kedej* ‘poor’, *ülə* for *ülā* ‘hisson’ in K stem from rapidly taken dictation or the conditions of fieldwork. Mistakes of this type were either corrected by Ramstedt in the later copy or by the editor. In some words the lack of diacritical signs for front vowels may be caused by omission, e.g. (K 1a) *jur;* *bär nešegunnensonj,* (H 114) *jür!;* *bär nešegünnönsonj* ‘come on; after a few days’; (K 1a) *borə* (one occurrence, the remaining occurrences being correct, i.e. *börö*, (H 114) *börü* ‘wolf’. It is less likely that Ramstedt heard them as non-front, central or back vowels, for identical words are sometimes written correctly

<sup>8</sup> K – all samples from *Copy of Ramstedt's Noghay fairy tales in Kotwicz's archives*

<sup>9</sup> H – all samples from Halén H. Emine Gürsoy-Naskali. Cumucica & Nogaica. // G.J.Ramstedt's Kumyk materials edited and translated by Emine Gürsoy-Naskali & G.J.Ramstedt's Materialien bearbeitet und übersetzt von Harry Halén. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Suera [= Mémories de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 208], 1991.

on the same pages, e.g. (K 1a) *jürdöler* ‘they walked’.

It is possible that the lack of diacritic signs reflects varying pronunciation, which is especially known in the case of loanwords, e.g. (K 1a) *sälämäläkom*, (H 114) *sälämälükəm* ‘how are you?’, the reply being (K 1a) *alikomsaläm* ~ *älükomsaläm* ‘And how are you?’. Another case of pronunciation variants may be demonstrated by a converb suffix which has either the form *-p* or *-b*, e.g. (K 1a) *qajtəpand* *qajtəb* ‘when turning back’.

The K copy and the edited texts also differ in rendering Noghay [ʊ]<sup>10</sup>, written in modern orthography as *y*, e.g. (K 1a) *ozon*, though various notations also occur even in the same copy, e.g. (K 1a) *olak*, (K 2a) *əlaq* ‘kid’.

There are frequent cases of replacing Noghay [ɪ] with *a* and even *e*. This vowel, in modern standard written as *u*, is pronounced more central and retracted, and this feature has not escaped Ramstedt’s attention, e.g. (K 1a) *keldəler*, (H 114) *keldələr* ‘they came’.

There are also evident mistakes, probably corrected by Halén, e.g. (K 1a) *juyarap*, (H 114) *juyurup* ‘when running’, (K 3a) *tælegennansonj*, (H 134) *tælegennensoy* ‘after he wished (that)’, (K 3b) *qoian dajoq*, (H 134) *qoian dajoq* ‘neither hare was there’, (K 3b) *as-*, (H 114) *as-* ‘to cook’.

It is possible that in the later copy Ramstedt removed some words typical of a more learned language, e.g. (K 2a) *ɥaberə*, but (H 114) *ana bərə* ‘that one of them’.

#### 4. Some phonetic features and phonological processes

Despite inconsistencies and obvious mistakes, Ramstedt’s careful notation exhibits some phonetic features and phonological processes absent from normative descriptive works on Noghay.

##### 4.1. Long vowels

Long vowels do not normally occur in Noghay in a similar way to other languages of the Aralo-Caspian group, i.e. Kazakh and Karakalpak, but they may appear in some conditioned cases. These include the position before approximants [j, w]. As a result, the following long vowels appear:

1. *ū*, e.g. (K 4b, H 135) *sū* ‘water’ ← *suw*, (K 1a, H 114) *sūya* ‘water’ ← *suwya*. In one case *ū* appears as a result of lenition of [γ] between two

[u], e.g. *uwul* → *ūl* ‘son’, see above. This process was observed by Baskakov (1940: 14).

2. *ī*, e.g. (H 114) *dīdə* ‘he says’ ← *deydi*, but (K 2a) *deidə*, see also *älükom* ~ *älükäm*, above.

3. *ű*, e.g. (K 5b, H 137) *sűdə* ‘he wanted (to do sth)’ ← *süydi*.

Sometimes the lengthening of a vowel also occurs when [i] is preceded by [j] before another vowel, e.g. (K 3b, H 134) *keteīm* ‘let me go away’ ← *keteyim*, (K 4a, H 134) *bereīm* ‘let me give’ ← *bereyim*.

A long vowel may appear from the contraction of two identical vowels, as in

4. *ē*, e.g. (K 4a, H 135) *nētəp* ‘doing what’ ← *ne etip*.

It is unknown if long vowels were really preserved in Arabic and Persian loanwords, as (K 1a) *salām* suggests (part of the greeting, see above), since in the published texts this word appears as *saläm* (H 114).

##### 4.2. Rounded-unrounded vowel harmony

Modern Noghay Cyrillic writing does not mark rounded-unrounded vowel harmony (henceforth R-U harmony). This orthography is inherited from old Arabic script. However, Noghay grammars give evidence of this rule though saying that, it is restricted. For example, Baskakov [4: 11, 5: 505] claims that R-U harmony works after a round vowel if it is followed by high [i i] and low [e] (phonetically mid, HJ), the latter being more common. We shall add that the latter case is mostly valid after front round vowels. However, Baskakov provides examples only for *e* → *ö*, e.g. *iÿi* + *-ler* → *iÿlör* ‘houses’, *kün* + *-ler* → *künlör* ‘days’, while in other cases he shows in fact the lack of R-U harmony, e.g. *iÿimiz* (*иыйимиз*) ‘our house’, *közimiz* (*коъзимиз*) ‘our eye’. In his earlier study, Baskakov stresses that R-U harmony does not show any regularity and one word may be differently pronounced by the same and various language speakers.

Ergönенç Akbaba [6: 39] does not recognize this process at all. She says that [o, ø] occur only in the first syllable, while [y] may also be found in the second syllable, but not in the final. However, her example *bügün* ‘today’ is incorrect, since it is a compound, ← *bu* + *kin*. As for [ʊ] (u), she does not discuss the distribution. Therefore, it is clear that her arguments are based on orthography, not phonetics.

In Ramstedt’s texts R-U harmony is noted very often, though inconsistently. It is stronger after [ø, y] in both stems and suffixes, e.g. (K 4a) *köttörənən*, (H 134) *köttörənnən* ‘from their buttocks’; (K

<sup>10</sup> Ramstedt’s spelling is retained throughout in his examples, while in linguistic analysis a Turkological transcription is employed. However, in brackets IPA symbols are given.

4b) *körsöttö*, (H 135) *körsöttə* ‘(he) showed’; (K 3a, H 137) *öigö* ‘to the house; home’; but it also occurs quite often after [o, u], e.g. (K 1a) *ozon*, (H 114) *uzun* ‘long’; (K 5a) *tørəsanj*, (H 135) *turusuŋ* ‘you stay’; (K 6a) *bolor*, (H 137) *bolūr* ‘(it) will be’; (K 4a) *ošəp*, (H 135) *ušüp* ‘when flying’.

Although there are many unrounded cases after all round vowels, the lack of R-U harmony is more frequent after back [o, u], e.g. (K 4b, H 135) *boləp* ‘being’, (K 5b, H 137) *boldəlar* ‘(they) were’, some suffixes, e.g. accusative *-nI* and locative *-dA* being always unrounded, e.g. (K 5b, H 137) *qoznə* ‘nut ACC’, (K 1a, H 114) *jolda* ‘on the road; during the journey’. However, some identical words in identical passages in K and H are different, e.g. (K 4a) *joloqto* ~ (H 135) *joləqtə* ‘(he) encountered’, (K 5a) *bolep* ~ (H 135) *boləp* ‘being’.

The approximant [w] has a fronting impact on further vowels, e.g. (K 5a) *bərəyö*, (H 135) *bəreyü* ‘one of (...)’ ← *birewi*.

It must be said that these tendencies are very similar to Kazakh and Karakalpak.

### 4.3. Consonant lenition

The lenition of stops in intervocalic position is a characteristic feature of many Turkic languages. In many cases Ramstedt wrote  $\beta$  where standard dictionaries and grammars have *b*. This notation demonstrates a second degree of lenition of [p], i.e. from a strong bilabial stop to a fricative, e.g. (K 7a) *aβam* ‘my mother’ (translated by Halén 1991: 139 ‘mein Vater’), see standard Noghay *aβa* [9; 19] ← *apa*; (K 6b) *taβarməs*, (H 138) *taβarməz* ‘we will find’, standard Noghay *tabarmız* ← *taparmız*; in other cases we see a first degree of lenition, e.g. (K 3a, H 134) *jəβeremen* ‘I will send’ ← *yiberemen*.

In Ramstedt’s texts the change *b* →  $\beta$  also occurs after [r], e.g. (K 4a, H 134) *arβa* ‘cart’ ← *arpa*, standard Noghay *apða* [9: 45]. Dictionaries and grammars do not show this process.

In one case Ramstedt notes a third degree of lenition, it is (K 1a) *töwöloyön* (sic!), (H 114) *töyölöyön* ‘(they) hit (him)’, the standard Noghay being *töbelegen* (*төбөлөгөв*) [9: 59]. This form is yielded by the following change: \**töpölögön* → *töbölögön* → *töwölöyön*, by which the strong consonant shifts to an approximant<sup>11</sup>.

### Conclusion

Although Ramstedt was not a pioneer in documenting spoken Noghay, his texts (Sample 1) evidence some characteristic phonetic and phono-

logical features not indicated in other early records, e.g. Ümerof [7] (who applied traditional Arabic writing), but some are not reported even in the classical study by Baskakov [4] on Noghay and its dialects (see critical remarks on this study in Jankowski [8]). Despite many cases of instability, also shown by nearly all linguists who dealt with Noghay, we can see some tendencies from Ramstedt’s texts, such as vowel rounding and consonant lenition. The value of Ramstedt’s recordings is diminished by the fact that he could not master Noghay in the course of just one and a half months, and inevitably committed some mistakes<sup>12</sup>. One of the evident errors in Ramstedt’s notation is *esäge* (K 2b, H 133) for *эшкү* ‘goat’, cf. standard Noghay *эшкү* [9: 443], which may suggest a further step in lenition from Turkic *ečki*. It is known that Turkic č changes into š in Noghay, Kazakh and Karakalpak, but this process does not go further in these languages, in contrast to Bashkir and Yakut. Therefore, this is an evident mistake. In addition, the same word is spelled in Ramstedt’s texts in a more correct form *eške* (K 10b, H 177).

### Sample 1.

#### Sample of the Noghay story from the Archive of Władysław Kotwicz, K III-19, 135 of the Archive of Science of PAN and PAU in Cracow noyai jomaqlar

[1] *I bər kedei olaq bar eken.* (xalqnan bezeren sâyaryan [2] xalq anâ töwöloyön) *soŋ olaq oilanyan hem ketken ozon* [3] *ot tənəq sūya.* *barayan-da aja joləqqan qozə qoşqar.* ‘säläm [4] älikom qozə qoşqar’ ‘yalikom saläm, olaq teke! qajda barasan [5] olaq teke?’ ‘ozon ot, tənəq sūya.’ ‘al, men-de baraïm!’ ‘jur!’ [6] *soŋ ketteler.* kördä tana buya dä. ‘säläm älikom tana buya!’ ‘älî- [7] kom saläm olaq teke! qajda barasəz?’ ‘ozon ot tənəq sūya!’ ‘al [8] men-de baraïm. ‘soŋ ketteler üşöwä, bardəlar ozon ot, tənəq sūya. [9] soŋda jürdäler ber neše gün qozə qoşqar aijtə: ‘men qaitaman’ [10] dedə. ‘qajtsan jaqşə jolga bar!’ *jolda joloqtə aja börə.* ‘säläm [11] älikom qozə qoşqar!’ ‘alikom saläm börə ayai!’ ‘qajda barasan?’ [12] eləme qajtəp baraman. ‘başəñdayâ ne zat?’

<sup>12</sup> Despite the fact that Ramstedt is known as the founder of the Altaic hypothesis, he could not study Turkic languages regularly in his country, as there were hardly any courses in Turkic provided in Finland at that time. In fact, he started learning Altaic languages when he set off on his journey to the Volga and Mongolia in 1898, but he mainly focused on Mongol languages, his first language of study being Cheremis.

<sup>11</sup> Ergönenç Akbaba [6: 155] observes this shift in such forms as *tabip* → *tawip* ‘finding’.

'mūzōm' *botoñdayâ* [13] *ne zat?* 'eneý,əm!' 'eneý,ənen alâp anâ börä ašadâ. *bär neše* [14] *gunnen soy tana buya* 'men qajtaman' dedâ. 'qajtsan jaqşâ [15] *jolya bar!*' oya da börä jolokta. 'säläm älikom, *tana buya!*' 'äli [16] kom salâm borâ aya!' 'qajda barasan?' 'elâme qajtâp baraman.' [17] *başâñdayâ ne zat?* 'mūsön [!]' *botoñdayâ ne zat?* 'eneý,əm' *eneý,ənen* [18] *alâp anâ börä jedâ. soy olaq tekey,e altâ börä bär tulkâ* [19] *keldâler. juçarap olaq teke tereknâj beşâna mändâ mändâde jâr* [20] *ladâ: altâ borâ bär tonnâq,-*

#### Remarks:

1. ä is very similar to ø; k to κ.
2. Diacritical signs are variable in form, e.g. ñ and s, ī and į, ã and ã.
3. In many words diacritical signs are omitted, e.g. i for į, ä for â, ã for ã.

#### English translation

There was a poor kid (baby goat). He was ill-treated and beaten by people. He pondered and went where there was high grass and transparent water. While he was walking, he met a ram lamb. 'How are you, ram lamb?' 'Fine, and how are you, goat? Where are you going?' 'To the high grass and transparent water'. 'Well, I also want to go there'. 'Come along'. And they kept on going. It [i.e. the goat] saw a young bull. 'How are you, young bull?' 'Fine, and how are you, goat? Where are you going?' 'To the high grass and transparent water'. 'Well, I also want to go there'. So they kept on going all three heading for the high grass and transparent water. After they had walked for a few days, the ram lamb said, 'I want to turn back'. 'If you turn back, have a nice walk'. Then he met a wolf. 'How are you, ram lamb?' 'Fine, and how are you, uncle wolf?' 'Where are you going?' 'I am returning to my country'. 'What do you have on your head?' 'It is my horn'. 'And what do you have between your legs?' 'These are my bollocks'. The wolf snatched his bollocks and ate. After a few days the young bull said, 'I want to turn back'. 'If you turn back, have a nice walk'. It also met the wolf. 'How are you, young bull?' 'Fine, and how are you, uncle wolf?' 'Where are you going?' 'I am returning to my country'. 'What do you have on your head?' 'It is my horn'. 'And what do you have between your legs?' 'These are my bollocks'. The wolf snatched his bollocks and ate. Afterwards

six wolves and a fox came to the goat. As they rushed to him, he climbed on a tree and sang: 'Six wolves for a [...].'

#### References

1. Halén H. Emine Gürsoy-Naskali. Cumucica & Nogaica// G.J.Ramstedt's Kumyk materials edited and translated by Emine Gürsoy-Naskali & G.J.Ramstedt's Materialien bearbeitet und übersetzt von Harry Halén. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Suera [= Múmoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 208], 1991. (in German)
2. Halén H. Biliktu Bakshi. The Knowledgeable Teacher. G.J.Ramstedt's Career as a Scholar. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Suera [= Múmoires de la Société Finno-Ugrienne 229], 1998. (in English)
3. Tulisow J. Turcica in the Władysław Kotwicz Archives: Tadeusz Majda (ed.)// Symposium organised on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey (28.10.1923–28.10.1998). Warszawa: Dialog, 1998. Pp. 97–101. (in English)
4. Baskakov N.A. Nogaškiy yazyk i ego dialekty. Grammatika, teksty i slovar'. Moskva, Leningrad. Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1940. (in Russian).
5. Baskakov N.A. Ocherk grammatiki nogayskogo yazyka (Fonetika, morfologiya, sintaksis): Kalmykova, S.A. (et. al.), Baskakov, N.A. (ed.). Nogaysko-russkiy slovar'. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarey, 1963. S. 495–561. (in Russian).
6. Ergönenç Akbabâ, Dilek. Nogay Türkçesi Grameri. Ses Şekil Bilgisi. Ankara: Grafiker, 2009. (in Turkish)
7. Ümerof A. (ed.). Noğay cırları. 1-nçi Bölek: Astrakanü: Tipografiya T-go D-ma A. Umerov" i Ko. [title page only in Arabic script], 1912. (in Turkish)
8. Jankowski H. Baskakov's Classification of Noghai Dialects Revisited // *Folia Orientalia*, 2000. № 36. Pp. 149–157. (in English)
9. Kalmykova S.A. (et. al.), Baskakov N.A. (ed.). Nogaysko-russkiy slovar'. Okolo 15 000 slov. S prilozheniem grammaticeskogo ocherka nogayskogo yazyka, sostavленного N.A.Baskakovym. Nogaysha-oryssa so'zlik. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarey, 1963. (in Russian).

#### List of illustrations

5. Sample of the Noghay story.

## РАМСТЕДТНЫң КОТВИЧ КОЛЛЕКЦИЯЛӘРЕНДӘГЕ НУГАЙ ТЕКСТЛАРЫ<sup>1</sup>

Генрик Янковский,

Адам Мицкевич университеты (Познань, Польша),  
Польша, 61-714, Познань ш., Ниеподлеглоски ур., 24 нче йорт,  
henko@amu.edu.pl.

Краковта Котвич коллекцияләрендә табылып, Финляндиядә Гарри Хален редакциясендә басылган төп документны тулыландырган Рамstedt нугай текстларының тагын бер нөсхәсен тәкъдим итү элгә хәзмәтнең максаты булып тора<sup>2</sup>. Автор нугайлар яисә нугай татарлары телен Арап-Каспий төркеменең башка төрки телләре белән чагыштырма планда тикшерә, ике нөсхәгә нигезләнеп, нугай теленә хас фонетик үзенчәлекләр һәм фонологик процессларны карый. Н.А.Баскаковның классик тикшеренүләрендә урын алмаган нугай сейләм теле үзенчәлекләре турында нәтижә ясала. Хәзмәттә, Рамстедтның нугай телен кыска вакыт эчендә житәрлек дәрәҗәдә үзләштерә алмавы сәбәпле, текстта кайбер сүзләрнен мәгънәләрендә төгәлсезлекләр һәм тел хatalары булуы искәртелә. Тикшерелә торган нөсхәләрдә лингвистик күренешләрне аңлатуда аермалыklарны күрсәткән мисаллар да мәкаләдә урын ала.

**Төп төшөнчәләр:** Котвич коллекциясе, Рамстедтның нугай текстлары, нугай татарчасы, Хален редакциясе, фонетик үзенчәлекләр, озын сузық, сузыклар гармониясе, иренләшкән-иренләшмәгән сузыклар, тартыклар үзгәреше.

### Иллюстрация исемлеге

5. Нугай кульязмасы үрнәге.

---

<sup>1</sup> Элеге мәкалә «Башкага тәрәзә. Монгол, төрки, тунгус-маньчжур халыкларын өйрәнүүгө өлеш. Телләр һәм мәдәниятләр. Ежи Тулисовның тууына житмеш ел тулуга багышлана / Ред.: Агата Барея-Стажинска, Ян Рогала, Филип Майковски. Варшава: Элипса, 2014, С.146 – 156» китабында басылды.

<sup>2</sup> Мәкаләгә иллюстрацияне төслө күшымтадан кара – Г.Я.

## НОГАЙСКИЕ ТЕКСТЫ РАМСТЕДТА ИЗ КОЛЛЕКЦИИ КОТВИЧА<sup>1</sup>

Генрик Янковский,  
Университет Адама Мицкевича (Познань, Польша),  
Польша, 61-714, г.Познань., ул.Ниеподлеглоски, д.24,  
henko@amu.edu.pl.

Цель данной работы – представить еще один экземпляр ногайских текстов Рамстедта, найденных в коллекции Котвича в Кракове и дополняющих основной документ под редакцией Гарри Халена в Финляндии<sup>2</sup>. Автор проводит сопоставительное исследование ногайского, или ногайского татарского, с другими тюркскими языками арабо-каспийской группы и на основе обоих экземпляров рассматривает фонетические особенности и фонологические процессы, характерные для ногайского языка. Делается заключение об особенностях ногайского разговорного языка, не отмеченных в классическом исследовании Н.А.Баскакова. В работе отмечается тот факт, что Рамстедт не сумел в короткий срок овладеть ногайским языком на достаточном уровне, что стало причиной некоторых языковых погрешностей и ошибок в понимании ряда слов. Текст статьи содержит примеры, иллюстрирующие различия в интерпретации лингвистических явлений в исследуемых экземплярах.

**Ключевые слова:** коллекция Котвича, ногайские тексты Рамстедта, ногайский татарский, редакция Халена, фонетические особенности, долгие гласные, гармония гласных, округленные-неокругленные звуки, лениция согласных.

### Список иллюстраций

5. Образец Ногайских рассказов.

---

<sup>1</sup> Данная статья опубликована в книге: Окно в другое. Вклад в изучение монгольских, тюркских и тунгусо-маньчжурских народов. Языки и культуры. Посвящена семидесятилетию Ежи Тулисова / Ред.: Агата Барея-Стажинска, Ян Рогала, Филип Майковски. Варшава: Элипса, 2014, С.146-156.

<sup>2</sup> См. иллюстрацию к статье на цветной вклейке – Г.Я.