

Tatar and Bashkir

Both Tatar (more precisely Kazan Tatar) and Bashkir belong to the Northwestern group of Turkic languages. This group is also often referred to as the Kipchak branch, with languages such as Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kumyk, Noghay, Karachay-Balkar, Crimean Tatar, Karaim and, with certain reservations, Kirghiz. Certain Kipchak languages spoken in Europe as far as I know were discussed here by Professors Csató and Johanson some days ago, whereas we shall now consider the most significant features of Kazan Tatar and Bashkir.

Kazan Tatar and Bashkir are very closely related. They are also referred to collectively as the Volga Kipchak languages, indicating their geographic location close to the Volga River. The term Volga Kipchak will be used in the present lecture in discussing linguistic features shared by both of these languages.

Speakers of Kazan Tatar live in the territory of the Russian Federation in autonomous republics (primarily in Tatarstan, Bashkiria and Chuvashia), in Siberia and in Kazakhstan. They may total some 4 million.

Bashkir speakers live primarily in Bashkiria (Başqortostan). Their total number is estimated at 2 million.

The vast majority of Kazan Tatar and Bashkir speakers (more precisely, their ancestors) arrived in the territory they occupy today relatively late, during the 13th century. This era was the Mongol period, when the great Empire of the Mongols was expanding westwards and thus pushing the Kipchak-speaking Turkic communities from East to West, somewhat rearranging the map of Eastern Europe. Although no precise data are available regarding population changes in those times, it seems that it was during the Mongol period that the ancestors of the communities that speak the Volga Kipchak languages settled in the areas they now occupy. These areas, however, were not uninhabited at the time. They were most likely occupied by people speaking Finno-Ugric, although groups that had formerly spoken one or more Turkic languages could also be found here. A highly diverse group of people lived here, one that was far from ethnically homogeneous. They had once belonged to the former Volga Bulghar Empire and spoken an R-Turkic language, one which became separated from the other Turkic languages relatively early on. The only living language descended from it today is Chuvash,

the language discussed by Prof. András Róna-Tas earlier today. This ethnically divided group may have had speakers of other languages among its members. These would primarily have been Finno-Ugric speakers, and groups using Indo-Iranian languages may also have lived in these areas.

In researching the history of Kazan Tatar in the 1980s, I became convinced – and I still am today – that the group of Volga Kipchak speakers must also have found a community speaking Common Turkic in this region in the thirteenth century. The descendants of the speakers of this old Common Turkic language today speak the so-called Nokrat subdialect of Kazan Tatar in the region of the River Vyatka in the northern territory of the Kazan Tatar linguistic area. This dialect maintains a number of archaic features, which are well worth researching in future. Perhaps a young Turkologist among you here may find a study of Nokrat Tatar an interesting research project.

The dialects of Kazan Tatar and Bashkir can be covered only very briefly here. Kazan Tatar is considered to have three larger dialects: (1) the Mishar or Western dialect; (2) Kazan Tatar proper, which is also often

called the Central dialect; and (3) the West Siberian or Eastern dialect.

Similarly, Bashkir also has three main dialects: (1) the Mountain or

Eastern dialect; (2) the Steppe or Southwestern dialect; and (3) the

Northwestern dialect. It is significant to note, however, that these larger

contemporary dialects are relatively late developments. Today, for

example, the Central dialect of Kazan Tatar includes the Nokrat

subdialect, which, as I pointed out earlier, may be assumed to reach back

to a language used in the Volga region before the thirteenth century.

However, the West Siberian or Eastern dialect of the Kazan Tatar is a

recent development. On the basis of archival records, it is relatively easy

to reconstruct the various migrational processes through which various-

sized groups of Kazan Tatar speakers began to move ever farther to the

East as of the sixteenth century, but their arrival in the West Siberian

territories only became significant as of the eighteenth century. Here the

new settlers arriving from the West mixed with a Kipchak-speaking

population that was already living here, one whose language did not have

the specific linguistic features shared by the Volga-Kipchak languages, a

fact that I will discuss in detail later. When we talk about a West

Siberian or Eastern dialect of the Kazan Tatar, we must be aware that

this is a variation which became a true Kazan Tatar dialect relatively late, during the nineteenth century and even into the twentieth. This was in the period in which the Tatar literary language centred in Kazan came to enjoy an increased influence, through the spread of literary works written in this language, of daily papers as well as of radio and television broadcasting. Of course, this was preceded by an earlier linguistic influence from Kazan: all the teachers in West Siberia actually received their education in Kazan.

The dialects of the Bashkir language are also relatively late developments. Its Northwestern dialect is especially exciting as it includes a number of features very similar to the those of the Central dialect of the Tatar language.

The phonetics of modern literary Kazan Tatar is based on the Central dialect, whereas its morphology is based on the Western or Mishar dialect. The modern Bashkir written language is based on the so-called Mountain dialect.

This afternoon, during which I would like to analyse parallel Kazan Tatar and Chuvash texts from a number of aspects, we may examine

these texts in terms of language history as well, and then I can also elaborate on some of the key historical changes which occurred not only in Kazan Tatar and Bashkir, but are also related to the changes detected in Chuvash, a language in a distinct position, yet also spoken in the same Volga region as Tatar and Bashkir.

I cannot go into detail regarding the early sources of Kazan Tatar and Bashkir, but permit me to mention a few words about them. These are sources written in Arabic script in a Volga Turkic literary language which was actually quite close to Chagatai. The number of this type of source is relatively small and they are regarded as Middle Turkic sources in terms of historical chronology. They range from substantial literary works to tomb inscriptions which contain Common Turkic linguistic elements and began to appear in the Volga region in the fourteenth century.

The earliest Volga Turkic linguistic source is probably *Kisekbaš kitabi* ‘The book of the severed head’, the best edition of which is by Axmetgaleeva [Ja. S. Axmetgaleeva, *Issledovanie tjurkojazyčnogo pamjatnika “Kisekbaš kitabi”* . Moskva, 1979. Nauka]. This fourteenth-

century work written in the Middle Turkic literary language already contains – even if sporadically – linguistic features which are reminiscent of certain characteristics peculiar to the Volga Kipchak languages. Tomb inscriptions, distinct from the Volga Bulghar inscriptions, showing Common Turkic or Old Kipchak features, are also considered early sources for the Kazan Tatar language. Such inscriptions are known from the work of Jusupov and Xakimzjanov, and they, as I pointed out previously, cannot be identified with the inscriptions showing Chuvash features which were discussed by Jusupov, Róna-Tas and, most recently, Marcel Erdal. A monograph on a quite significant group of the early Tatar sources including various orders and deeds of gift was completed by Mirkasim Usmanov (*Žalovannye akty Džučieva ulusa XIV–XVI vv.* Kazan 1979). The language of eighteenth-century Tatar legal documents was examined in a book written in Tatar by Fähimä Xisamova (*Unsigez yözdäge tatarça eş kăgaz'läreneñ tel üzenčälekläre.* Kazan 1981). A collection similar to this work was published in Russian in Kazan in 1982 (*Starotatarskaja delovaja pis'mennost' XVIII veka*). Another volume is a collection of old Tatar literary sources by Mostafa Nogman: although this work was primarily designed to be used in higher

education, it offers a great collection of useful materials for researchers (*Iske tatar yazuı ürnäkläre*. Kazan 1971). A very important source was recently published in Szeged, *Ĵingiz-nāmä*, written in the Volga Turki language and dated to the end of the seventeenth century, in which a number of linguistic features may be observed which we may regard as specific to the Volga Kipchak languages (Mária Ivanics — Mirkasym A. Usmanov, *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende. Däftär-i Ĵingiz-nāmä*. Szeged 2002).

The early sources for both Bashkir and Tatar were written in Arabic script in a Volga Kipchak language which only sporadically demonstrates linguistic features of a spoken language. A specific group of sources characteristic of Bashkir is that of the *šäĵärä*. The word *šäĵara* is of Arabic origin and means ‘family tree’. These sources contain the origins and family trees of the Bashkir tribes and clans; they are therefore not only linguistic documents, but also historical ones. Kuzeev, whose findings have been published in a number of volumes, is the most outstanding scholar of the wealth of *šäĵärä* literature. Tomorrow afternoon, I believe that we are going to visit the University Library next

door, whose Eastern Collection contains several šäjärä editions which we may view.

I would also like to talk briefly about another old Tatar work which is considered a linguistic source today. It is very special for a number of reasons. This is the material collected by Gábor Bálint de Szentkatolna, a Hungarian Orientalist. He visited Kazan in 1871, where he collected material at a Christian Tatar school. Tatars embracing Christianity can be divided into two groups. One is the group of so-called old Christians, whose ancestors converted to Christianity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because they apparently considered this as one option for survival after the fall of Kazan. (As we know, Ivan the Terrible captured the Kazan Khanate in 1552). We must bear in mind that when Kazan was conquered and destroyed by the armies of Ivan IV in 1552, the very existence of its people as a distinct national, cultural and religious entity was under threat. This threat was nowhere better illustrated than by a statement made by Ivan IV himself: “Let the unbelievers receive the True God, the subjects of Russia, and let them with us praise the Holy Trinity for ages unto ages.” Tatars who

converted to Christianity at the time enjoyed certain privileges granted to them by their Russian colonisers. There was also a later wave of Tatars that converted in the eighteenth century, comprising the group of so-called new Christians. The vast majority of the Tatar population, however, maintained their original faith and did not become Eastern Orthodox. The community of Muslim Tatars expelled the Christian Tatars. A relatively compact Christian Tatar community has survived up to this day around Layiš, a town near Kazan. Their members number total approximately forty thousand.

The fact that Christian Tatars lived in isolation from the Muslim Tatars; the fact that they also had no close ties to the Russians, since, although regarding themselves as Christians, they did not learn Russian and therefore could neither truly practise their religion, nor attend church; and the fact that because they were Christians their language was untouched by Arabic and Persian influences present in the language of the Muslim faith all resulted in the fact that the Christian Tatar population managed to preserve its original Tatar language to a greater extent than the Muslim community.

This is the reason Gábor Bálint de Szentkatolna was gathering material in one of their schools: he knew well that the language of the Christian Tatars was a great deal more archaic than that of the Muslim Tatars. He published the material he collected in Hungary in 1875-76. I double-checked his collection letter by letter in Kazan in 1978, and then re-published it with my comments and a German translation in 1988 (*Wolgatatarische Dialektstudien. Textkritische Neuauflage der Originalsammlung von G. Bálint 1875-76*. Budapest).

If anyone would like to study relatively modern, authentic spoken Tatar material, I can wholeheartedly recommend the collection by Bálint. I do so partly because the material he collected presents no orthographic difficulties as he recorded the materials using the Latin alphabet.

The literary language of Tatar was written in Arabic script until 1927, then it used a writing system based on Latin letters, and finally they introduced the modified Cyrillic alphabet in 1939 which is still in use. However, the small group of Christian Tatars were already using a modified Cyrillic alphabet at the end of the nineteenth century. Literary Bashkir was written in Arabic script up to 1928, then in a modified Latin

script between 1928 and 1940, when a modified Cyrillic script was introduced, one which is rather different from the Tatar script.

There are recent initiatives in both the Tatar and Bashkir territories aiming at introducing either an Arabic- or a Latin-based script to replace the currently used Cyrillic alphabet.

And now let us turn to a discussion of the most significant features of the two Volga Kipchak languages, Tatar and Bashkir. As I have already noted, I use the name Volga Kipchak in reference to features which appear in both Tatar and Bashkir.

Sound systems

Both Volga Kipchak languages have nine vowel phonemes. They have four back vowels, *ï*, *a*, *u* and *o*, and five front ones, *i*, *e*, *ä*, *ü* and *ö*. The vowels listed may also be classified in other ways. Of the nine vowels here, four are so-called reduced vowels, *ï*, *o*, *e*, and *ö*, while the others are fully formed. The vowels *ï*, *o*, *e*, and *ö* differ from the others not primarily because their formation time is shorter, but because they are

laxer than the others. They are therefore regarded as lax vowels, and the others as tense vowels. The mode of articulation is far more defined in the case of tense vowels while it is quite uncertain in the case of lax vowels. Therefore, lax vowels are somewhat hazy. Their length in pronunciation depends on whether they are in a stressed syllable or not.

Fully articulated tense vowels may be either low or high, while lax vowels may be either mid or high.

Fully articulated tense vowels:

Script	Transliteration	of the phoneme	Transcription of the vowel
а	/а/		[â] or [a]
ә	/ä/		[ä]
у	/u/		[u]
ү	/ü/		[ü]
и	/i/		[i] or [iy]

Loosely articulated lax vowels:

Script	Transliteration	of the phoneme	Transcription of the vowel
o	/o/		[ö]
ө	/ö/		[ö]
e	/e/		[ě]
ы	/i/		[ĩ]

Some notes must be added here to supplement the system outlined above.

1. The phoneme /a/ has a slightly rounded variant [ã] in Tatar occurring in first syllables and in syllables after [ã], e.g. *баш* *baš* [bãš] ‘head’, *бала* *bala* [bãlå] ‘child’. The phoneme /a/ has an unrounded variant, e.g. *урам* *uram* [uram]. After initial Ё y- when it is marked by Я, it is usually not a labial. In Bashkir, labialisation is much stronger than in Tatar, and thus appears even in the third or fourth syllables, e.g.

балаларға *balalarğa* [bålålårgå] ‘to the children, for the children (Dat.)’, while in Tatar the corresponding forms are *балаларга* *balalarga* [bålålarga].

2. Unstressed reduced or lax vowels alternate with zero in colloquial speech, e.g. *Кешә* *keše* [kěšě] ~ [kšě] ‘person’, *Беләм* *belem* [bělěm] ~ [blěm] ‘knowledge’.

3. The vowel [u] appears in the first syllable; when it occurs elsewhere, it is always a nomen actionis suffix, e.g. *Урам* *uram* [uram], *Алу* *alu* [ålu] ‘buying, taking’. In Bashkir, [u] in such cases is always signified by *ӱ* *ü*. The Bashkir orthography is more precise in terms of language history than the Tatar, since in these cases the vowel [u] marks the historical cluster **(X)g > iw*, e.g. *aliġ > aliw > alu*.

4. The phoneme /ü/ is used in parallel with the phoneme /u/. It may occur in the first syllable, and as a nomen actionis suffix in non-first-syllable

positions, e.g. *ҮЛӘН* *ülän* [ülän] ‘gras’, *КҮРҮ* *kürü* [kürü] ‘seeing’.

This latter case is marked by *әҮ* in Bashkir, e.g. *КҮРӘҮ* ‘seeing’.

5. The vowel *И* *i* may appear in all positions. It is pronounced [i], but in word-final, and often syllable-final, positions it is pronounced with the diphthong [iY], which is unmarked in Tatar orthography. Bashkir orthography, however, indicates the diphthong in pronunciation by marking *И* with the letters *әӢ*, for example Тәтәр *ирәк* *irek* [irək] ‘freedom’, *әби* *äbi* [äbiY] ‘grandmother’, Bashkir *ирк* *irk* [irk], *әбәй* *äbey* [äbëY].

6. Reduced [ö] and [õ] may appear in any syllable in Volga Kipchak, but appears in a non-first syllable only if it is preceded by a syllable with either [õ] or [ö]. A difference in Tatar and Bashkir orthographies also appears in this case. Tatar marks [ö] in a non-initial syllable with *Ӣ* *ï*, and [õ] with *ә* *e*. In Bashkir, however, reduced labial vowels are marked by *о* *o* and *ө* *ö* in all syllables; for example, Tatar *болӢн* *bolin* [bölön]

‘meadow’, КӨМӨШ *kömeš* [kǒmǒš] ‘silver’; Bashkir БОЛОН *bolon* [bǒlǒn] ‘meadow’, КӨМӨШ *kömöš* [kǒmǒš] ‘silver’. As I have already mentioned, it is significant to remember that the reduced sounds [ǒ] and [ǒ̃] may only occur in the non-first syllable in the Volga Kipchak languages only if the preceding syllable also contains the vowels [ǒ] or [ǒ̃]. If a word shows something to the contrary, it must be a secondary compound. That explains why the self-identification of the Bashkirs, the word БАШКОРТ *bašqort* [bǎšqǒrt] must be seen in the same way.

Although this ethnonym has occurred in various forms for a very long time (*bašgird*, *bāšjird* etc.), the contemporary name is surely not a derivative of these forms, but is in fact a compound word.

7. The reduced illabial [ǣ] and [ǣ̃] may appear in all phonetic positions, but never follow [ǒ] or [ǒ̃], for example Volga Kipchak БЕР *ber* [bǣr] ‘one’, Tatar КЫШЫН *kışin* [qǣš̃in] ‘in winter’, Bashkir КЫШЫН *qışin* [qǣš̃in] ‘in winter’. It is important to note that Volga Kipchak orthographies use the letter Э ТО ИНДИЧАТЕ [ǣ] in word-initial

position, e.g. Tatar **ЭШ** *ěš* [ěš] ‘work’, Bashkir **ЭҖӘР** *ěyär* [ěyär] ‘saddle’.

8. Finally, one more phenomenon must be mentioned in relation to the orthography of Volga Kipchak vowels. When a vowel follows /y/ in the Volga Kipchak languages, it is indicated in special ways in a number of cases. The following characteristic features must be considered in such cases:

A) The alternation of word-initial *y-* ~ *ǰ-* in Tatar colloquial speech is not reflected in the orthography, but standardised according to the quality of the vowel that follows. In native words, the consonant is written as **Ж** - *ǰ-* [dž] before **И** *i* [i], e.g. Tatar **ЖИМӘШ** *ǰimeš* [džiměš] ‘fruit’. In Bashkir, Turkic word-initial *y-* is never marked by **Ж** - *ǰ-*, only by *y-*, as illustrated by the word **ЙЕМӘШ** *yemeš* [yěměš] ‘fruit’.

B) The alternating word-initial *y-* ~ *ǰ-* in Tatar is standardised mostly as **Й** *y-* [y] before [a, ä, ö, ɵ, u, ü], and as **Й** *y-* [y] or **Ж** - *ǰ-* [dž] before [ě] and [ĩ]. Syllable-initial [yě] and [yĩ] are rendered with **Ә** in

Tatar; Bashkir [yǐ] is rendered with ЫӢ. Tatar [ya] and [yä] are rendered with Я, Bashkir [yä] is rendered with ЫӘ. In some cases where the value of the Tatar graphemes Ә, Я, Ю is ambiguous, Ъ is used to mark the frontness of the vowel, e.g. ЯШЪ *yäš'* [yäš] 'young', ЮНЪ *yün'* [yün] 'cheap', whereas the absence of Ъ implies a back vowel, e.g. ЯЛ *yal* [yal] 'rest', ЯК *yak* [yaq] 'side'. In Bashkir, Ъ has the same function with the grapheme Ю, e.g. ЮНЪ *yün'* [yün] 'cheap'.

The vowel system of the Volga Kipchak languages has other phonemes as well, namely /o/, /e/ and /i/. These, however, appear only in — primarily more recent — Russian loanwords, e.g. ВАГОН *vagon* [vagon] 'wagon' (but in dialects [*bãgun*]).

I have only provided you with a brief outline of the development of the Volga Kipchak vowel system. This afternoon, when we analyse and compare two parallel Tatar and Chuvash texts, we may be able to devote more time to it.

The Volga Kipchak vowel system has been shaped by two major phonetic changes.

In the course of one, the original closed vowels in Common Turkic / Old Kipchak, namely *u, *ü, *i and *i > became reduced (more precisely, lax): *uzun > özön ‘long’, kümüş > kömöš ‘silver’, qir > qır ‘meadow’, bir > bër. In the course of the second change the originally open vowels of Common Turkic / Old Kipchak *o, *ö, *e and *a > became more closed: *otuz > utüz ‘thirty’, *öküz > ügöz ‘ox’, *ber- > bir- ‘to give’, *qal- > qâl- ‘to remain’. A new phoneme has also appeared in the vowel system, /ä/, which replaced the historical vowel *a. The vowel change *a > ä occurred under certain conditions. The sound *a is replaced by ä if the original *a sound appeared in a word which also contained any of the sounds y, č, or I, such as yaš > yäš ‘young’.

Sometimes it is not obvious why *a was not replaced by ä in words which do not seem to fit into this category. An example of this is the Tatar word äz ‘few’ which developed from the form *az ‘few’, in which case *a was not an adjacent y, č, or i. A condition, however, was met in

this case as well. The word *üz* ‘few’ is most probably a back formation from the comparative adjectival form *üzäräk* < **azıraq* ‘fewer’, that is, the sound *ü* appeared in the original form. This example also illustrates the possibility of change in the vowel harmony, from [back] to [front] and from [front] to [back], in tandem with the vowel changes in the Volga Kipchak languages.

The consonants of the Volga Kipchak languages can be discussed only briefly now. First, I would mention the phonemes which are shared, that is, can be found in both Tatar and Bashkir, and which also appear in original Turkic words:

/b/, /w/, /g/, /d/, /y/, /k/, /l/, /m/, /n/, /ñ/, /p/, /r/, /s/, /t/, /f/, /x/ and /š/.

The following phonemes appear only in Tatar: */z/, /č/ and /j/*. Only Bashkir has the phonemes */ð/, /θ/ and /h/*.

Loanwords in literary Tatar also contain */v/, /ž/, /c/ and /h/*. In loanwords in Bashkir */v/, /ž/, /z/, /c/ and /č/* are also attested. In both languages, */šč/* is only found in borrowings from Russian.

The following observations may be made regarding the consonant system:

In native words, /k/ is realised as a velar *k* in front syllables, and as a postvelar *q* in back syllables. The corresponding front variant of /g/ is a velar voiced stop *g*, whereas the back variant is a postvelar voiced fricative *ɣ* or stop *ḡ*. The variants of Tatar /č/ and /j/ stretch from the palatalised affricates [tʃʲ] and [dʒʲ] to the palatalised fricatives [ʃʲ] and [ʒʲ].

The phonetic differences between Tatar and Bashkir mainly concern their consonant systems.

The most prominent differences are:

1. Turkic and Old Kipchak word-initial *s*- and word-internal *-s*- have been preserved by Tatar, but replaced by laryngal *h*- and *-h*- in Bashkir, e.g. Tatar **сИИ** *sin* [sin] ‘you’ 2nd P. Sg. — Bashkir **hИИ** *hin* [hin] ‘you’ 2nd P. Sg.; Tatar **Яса**- *yasa-* [yasa-] ‘to make’ — Bashkir **Яһа**- *yaha-* [yaha-] ‘to make’. Tatar *-s* at the end of words or syllables is also a

preserved sound, as it goes back to the Old Kipchak sound –s, is indicated by an interdental voiced fricative, the sound [θ] in Bashkir, e.g. Tatar **б̄аҫ**- *bas*- [bås] ‘to press’ — Bashkir **б̄аҫ**- *baθ*- [båθ] ‘to press’, Tatar **т̄өҫ** *tös* [tös] ‘colour’ — Bashkir **т̄өҫ** *töθ* [töθ] ‘colour’.

2. As we can see, both Tatar and Bashkir have the phoneme /s/. The difference between them is significant in terms of language history.

While, as the examples above illustrate well, the Tatar phoneme /s/ can be found in place of Turkic and Old Kipchak */s/, the Bashkir phoneme /s/ derives from a historical phoneme */č/, e.g. Tatar **чык**- *čik*- [tšiq] ‘to go out’ — Bashkir **сик**- *siq*- [sʲiq] ‘to go out’; Tatar **аҫ**- *ač*- [åtš] ‘to open’ — Bashkir **ас**- *as*- [ås] ‘to open’; Tatar **б̄аҫкыч** *baskič* [båsqitš] ‘stairs’ — Bashkir **б̄аҫкыс** *baθqis* [båθqis] ‘stairs’.

3. Tatar *z* corresponds to Bashkir *ḏ*, e.g. Tatar **зур** *zur* [zur] ‘big, great’ — Bashkir **ḏур** *ḏur* [ḏur] ‘big, great’; Tatar **озин** *ozin* [özön] ‘long’ —

Bashkir **ОҒОН** *ođon* [ođõn] ‘long’; Tatar **КІЗ** *kiz* [kǐz] ‘girl, daughter’

— Bashkir **КІҢ** *qiđ* [qiđ] ‘girl, daughter’ etc.

And finally a few words regarding stress:

Though the stress is usually on the last syllable, there are some exceptions to this. The first syllable of verbs in the second-person imperative is stressed, e.g. Tatar **БАШЛА** *bášla!* ‘Begin!’ — Bashkir **УЛТЫРЫҢЫЗ** *últıřıǵıđ!* ‘Sit down!’. Copular suffixes such as first-person singular *-mIn* are unstressed. The negative suffix *-mA* is unstressed, and the preceding syllable stressed, e.g. *bárma!* ‘Do not go!’ Postpositions and enclitics are unstressed, e.g. Tatar *baltá-bělán* ‘with the axe’, Bashkir *táw-ǒstõndä* ‘on the mountain’. The first component of compounds is stressed, e.g. Tatar *xatıřn-kız* ‘women’.

