Comparative Phonology of Historical Kipchak Turkish and Urum Language[*]

Tarihî Kıpçak Türkçesi ve Urumcanın Karşılaştırmalı Ses Bilgisi

Сравнительная фонетика древне-кыпчакского и урумского языка

Hülya KASAPOĞLU ÇENGEL[**]

Özet: *Bugünkü Kıpçak lehçelerinin tarihsel biçimlerini araştırmak için başvurulacak ana kaynaklardan biri, Ermeni harfli Kıpçakça belgeler; diğeri ise Codex Cumanicus'tur. Ayrıca, Mısır Memlûk sahasında yazılmış gramer ve sözlüklerde Kıpçakça olarak belirtilen malzeme de bu inceleme alanı için kaynak niteliğindedir.*

Bu yazının amacı, tarihî Kıpçak Türkçesinin geç dönemini temsil eden Ermeni harfli Kıpçakça ile bugünkü Ukrayna (Kuzey Azak) Urumlarının dili arasında tipik ünsüz özellikleri bakımından bir karşılaştırma yapmaktır. Codex Cumanicus ile Memlûk Kıpçakçasına ait dil malzemesi de bu incelemeye dâhil edilmiştir. Urum dilinin gramer özellikleri 1980'li yıllarda Garkavets ve Podolsky tarafından ele alınmakla birlikte (1981: 46-58; 1986: 99-112) bu çalışmalar, konuyla ilgili tarihsel bir karşılaştırma içermemektedir. Bu yazıda Urumcanın dil malzemesi, Urum sözlüğü ile Urum metinlerinin (Garkavets 1999; Garkavets 2000) taranması suretiyle elde edilmiştir. Ermeni harfli Kıpçak Türkçesi ile bugünkü Urum Kıpçak diyalektlerini tipik ünsüzler bakımından karşılaştırırken 16.-17. yüzyılda Batı Ukrayna'da yaşayan Kıpçak dilli topluluklar ve bugünkü Ukrayna Urumları hakkında genel bilgiler de verilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Kıpçakça konuşan topluluklar, Tarihî Kıpçakça ve Ermeni harfli Kıpçak Türkçesi, Ukrayna Urumları ve dilleri, karşılaştırmalı ses bilgisi, ünsüzler*

Abstract: *One of the main references of historical characteristics of living Kipchak languages are the Kipchak documents in Armenian letters and the other one is Codex Cumanicus. In addition, Kipchak materials in the grammars and dictionaries of the Egyptian Mamluk are also considered to be a reference for this field.*

This study aims at drawing a comparison in terms of typical consonant features among Kipchak in Armenian letters representing the late period of historical Kipchak Turkish and living language of Ukrainian (North Azovian) Urums. Language materials belonging Codex Comanicus and Mamluk

Kipchak were also included in this study. The grammatical features of Urum language were studied in the articles by Garkavets and Podolsky (1981: 46-58; 1986: 99-112); however, these researches do not include historical comparison. In this study, the linguistic material of Urum language was collected by scanning the Urum dictionary and related texts (Garkavets 1999; Garkavets 2000). Moreover, it was given some general information about the Kipchak-speaking communities living in the western Ukraine of 16th and 17th centuries and the Urums in Ukraine in this comparative paper on Kipchak Turkish and the living Urum Kipchak dialects related to typical consonants.

Key words: Kipchak-speaking communities, Historical Kipchak and Kipchak in Armenian scripts, Ukrainian Urums and Urum language, comparative phonology, consonants

Аннотация: Кыпчакские документы написанные армянскими буквами и «Codex Cumanicus» (Кодекс Куманикус) являются одним из основных источников исследования исторических форм современных кыпчакских языков. Кроме этого, сведения указанные как кыпчакские в грамматиках и словарях написанных Мамлюками на территории Египта служат источником в качестве материала для этой области исследования.

Целью данной статьи является сравнение типичных особенностей согласных армяно-кыпчакского языка (кыпчакский язык написанный армянскими буквами), которая является поздним представителем исторического кыпчакского языка с кыпчакским диалектом урумского языка которая известна как одна из современных кыпчакских языков. Лингвистические материалы Codex Cumanicus'a и мамлюко-кыпчакского языка добавлены в статью. В 1980-е года Гаркавец и Подольский исследовали грамматические особенности Урумского языка (1981: 46-58; 1986: 99-112), но эти исследования не содержат в себе историко- сравнительных особенностей. Языковой материал урумского языка исследованной в данной статье собран спомощью урумского словаря принадлежащей Азовским Урумам Украины и отбора урумских текстов (Гаркавец1999; Гаркавец 2000). Вместе с типическим сравнением согласных кыпчакского языка написанного армянскими буквами и современного урумского кыпчакского диалекта, даются общие сведения о кыпчакоязычных народах проживающих в Украине в 16-17 века и о современных урумах также проживающих в Украине посей день.

Ключевые слова: Кыпчакоязычные народы, древний кыпчакский язык и кыпчакский язык написанный армянскими буквами, Урумы Украины и ихние языки, сравнительная фонетика,согласные

INTRODUCTION

Some researchers (*Jean Deny, Tadeusz Kowalski, Aleksander Garkavets etc.*) have pointed out that the similarity of Kipchak in Armenian letters and *Codex Cumanicus* with the Kipchak dialects of the Urum language, the dialects of the Tatar language and the Trakai dialect of the Karaim language; but that this similarity was not taken into consideration (Garkavets 1979: 1; Garkavets 1999: 13; Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 586-587). The reason we chose the Urum language is to draw the attention of Turkology circles to this language, which is spoken in the north area of the Black Sea and the coasts of the Azak Sea. Daşkeviç, who claimed that the written heritage of Kipchak in Armenian letters was not studied in detail, added that the language of the western Ukranian Armenians (in Poland), which did not have the same privileges as the Karaim and the Mamluk Kipchaks in the Turkic world, was not studied as much as Mamluk Kipchak and *Codex Cumanicus* (Daşkeviç 1981: 90). It

is certain that the studies on Armeno-Kipchak inside and outside Turkey have not reached the required level. The investigations outside Turkey are generally in the form of the translations and transcriptions of several manuscripts (Russian and Polish). We made use of the research done by Deny (1957), Grunin (1967: 345-423). and Garkavets (1987) for the grammatical structures of Kipchak; however, we also scanned the recent texts published by Garkavets (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001; Garkavets 2002; Garkavets and Sapargaliyev 2003) and the dictionary of Tryjarski (Tryjarski 1968) in this paper. In addition to this, we made references to the glossary of the texts co-authored by Daşkeviç and Tryjarski (1970: 94-99; 1975: 45; 1977: 109-121; 1978: 61-65; 1979: 69-74) to the dictionary of the texts published by Schütz (1962: 296-309) and to the *Algış Bitigi* by N. Chirli (2005: 133-215) which is the latest research in the field.

Kipchak-speaking communities and Kipchak Turkish in Armenian letters

After the demolition of the city of Ani, the capital of the state of Armenian Bagratid, by the Seljuks in the 11th century, a great majority of Armenians migrated to Crimea (Lewicki and Kohnowa 1957: 153; Pritsak 1959: 81; Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 587; Daşkeviç 2001: 358) The Turkish-speaking Armenian colonies first appeared in Galitsk-Podolsk, Ukraine, in the 14th century, otherwise known as the Mongolian Period or the time of Golden Horde. After the conquest of the city of Kefe, Crimea, by the Ottomans at the end of the 15th century, the Armenians of Crimea migrated to their coreligionists in Galitsia and Podolia, especially to their respective centers, Lviv and Kamenets-Podolsk (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 586; Garkavets 2002: 6)[1] In addition, Kiev, Lutsk and Vladimir attracted settlements of Armenian colonies. By the end of the 15th century, a big colony existed in Kamenets-Podolsk (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 588; Pritsak 1959: 81; Daşkeviç 2001: 362).

Garkavets, who reports that Armenians were in close contact with Kipchaks when living in Armenia, also reports that they later became neighbors with Kipchaks in Don, Crimea and Bessarabia, learned their language, and that Kipchaks accepted the Armenian Gregorian Christianity, as is evident in documents. According to the epigraphic data investigated by G. Alisşan, R. Açaryan and E. Hurşudyan, the village of Arich near the town of Artiksk in the area of Armenian Shiraksk had the name of Kipçag. In the 12th century, a monastery with the name of *Xpçaχavank* was found in that village and it is still undestroyed (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 587; Garkavets 2002: 7). While Doerfer and Menges do not mention the problem of ethnos of the Kipchak-speaking Armenians (Daşkeviç 2001: 369; Doerfer 1968: 250-252;

[1] Garkavets narrates this information from the book *Türki ix movi ta literaturi* published in 1930 by A. Krımskiy and adds that the world of science has taken the first information from that book.

Menges 1972: 298-332). Clauson states that the language known as Armeno-Kipchak was the language of the Kipchaks whose ethnic identities were not known, who accepted the Armenian Gregorian religion at an unknown time and who recorded their own language only in Armenian scripts (Daşkeviç 1983: 94).

Garkavets reports that the Kipchaks, who converted to the Armenian Gregorian religion and composed the Kamenets-Podolsk and Lviv manuscripts of the 16th and 17th centuries, generally considered themselves to be Armenians and only occasionally Kipchak; however, Dashkevich does not agree with Garkavets and finds his statement that the Ukranian Armenians never call themselves *Xıpçax* mistaken (Daşkeviç 2001: 363; Daşkeviç 1983: 96).

Are the people who made the Kamenets-Podolsk and Lviv manuscripts the Kipchak-speaking communities or the Kipchaks who converted to the Armenian Gregorian religion? We only gave information about this issue here, but it seems that the question will be under discussion for a long time.

Many documents printed in Armenian scripts but written in Turkish in 16th-17th centuries are the remains of those Western Ukrainian (Polish) Armeno-Kipchaks; and they prove the type of language the Armeno-Kipchaks of Kamenets-Podolsk spoke, wrote and prayed in those days. This literature is generally a record of the Armenian Court. Beside this there are religious works, sermons, prayers and chronicles. *Algış bitigi* (the prayer book) that was printed in Lviv in 1618 is very important in terms of the fact that it was the first book printed in Turkish (Kipchak) (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: IX, 593).[2] The book was first introduced to scientific circles by E. Schütz (Schütz 1961: 123-129; Schütz 1998).

In the works of Kipchak Turkish in Armenian letters, this language was referred to by its speakers in three ways. The oldest expressions are *Xıpçax tili, bizim til, Tatarça.* The term *Tatar* is said to have been spread by translators of Crimean Tatar (Garkavets 1988: 114; Garkavets 1993: 11; Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 594). According to Deny, the fact that Armeno-Kipchak communities use the term *'bizim til'* indicates their desire to distinguish their language from Polish and Ukranian and avoid being mistaken for non-Crimeans (Deny 1957: 9). The historical development of this language is said to have three stages (Daşkeviç 1983: 92): 1. The period when Armenians used Kipchak as a spoken language (the end of the13[th] to the 15th century). 2. The period when the language was used as a written language (the 16th century to the first half of the 17th century). 3. The period when use of the language declined and disappeared (the second half of the 17th century)

---

[2] One of the most important factors in the history of Kipchak-speaking communities is that a printing company that published books in Kipchak at the turn of 17th century in Lviv continued their publications for a few years. The founder of the publishing house was Yovannes Karmadanets. *Algış bitigi* was published there.

The last writer who tried to insist on keeping this language is Vartaped Anton. Anton's collection of sermons, which consists of three books, is currently being transcribed to the Latin alphabet by A. Garkavets. It can be said that the Armeno-Kipchak had its golden age when it was used as a written language, that is, in the West Ukraine in 16th and 17th centuries.

Daşkeviç who claims that the period of Armenianization that began in the first half of 16th and 17th centuries could not be a reason for Kipchak's declination and disappearance, reports that Kipchaks' marriages into neighboring communities-despite linguistic, religious and cultural barriers-resulted in the reduction of language use and a distancing from traditions. The long duration of Polishization and Latinization resulted in the complete assimilation of some colonies in the middle of the 18th and by the beginning of the 19th century. This assimilation and the tides of migration were accelerated by internal and external politic events made it difficult for the Armeno-Kipchak to survive in the 18th century (Daşkeviç 1983: 103-104). The Armenians we speak of today do not speak Turkish any more but they speak Ukranian, Russian and Polish like these languages' native population (Daşkeviç 2001: 362; Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: 586).

Kipchak-speaking Urum people and Urum language

The two ethnic orthodox groups who are known as Greko-Tartar (Garkavets 1981: 46) and Greek Tartar (Podolsky 1985: vii) in Russian and Western literature, and who are also known as Mariupolskie Greki 'Mariupol Greeks' (Muratov 1997: 450) in the world of science, are living in the area of north Azak today. These are the Turkish-speaking Urums and Greek-speaking Rumeys. They were forced to migrate from Crimea to the middle and north areas of the Ukraine in the years 1778-1779; but, they later chose to settle on the coasts of the Azak Sea. It is claimed that the Urums came to this region together with Armenians, Greeks, Georgians and Turkish-speaking 'Gagavuzlar.' However, it is not known where Georgians and Armenians (a total of 68 persons) were forced to migrate from and where they were settled. The second migration is reported to have taken place from Trabzon, Giresun, Erzurum and Kars to the Tselka district of Georgia between 1821 and 1825, and from there to Crimea, Donetsk and Dniyepropetrovsk between 1981 and 1986 (Garkavets 1981: 46; Muratov 1997: 450; Garkavets 1999: 5).

The first written documents of this language were found in the 18th and 19th centuries; and first research was done by S. N. Muratov (1963: 178-191), Tenişev (1973: 92-96) and Garkavets (1981).

The Kipchak dialects of the Urum language are uninterrupted versions of the Kipchak Turkish spoken in the Lviv and Kamenets-Podolsk regions of the Ukraine in the 16th and 17th centuries and *Codex Cumanicus* (Garkavets 1999: 13-14).

Garkavets classifies the dialect of the language in a range from the dialect dominated by Kipchak elements to the dialect with increasing elements of Oghuz (Garkavets 1988: 4): He divides it into two dialects, Kipchak and Oghuz. He lists the following subdialects of the Kipchak dialect: 1. The Kipchak-Polovts dialect, spoken in Velika Novosilka (Yanisol), Starobeşeve (Beşev), and Perşotravneve (Manguş) 2. The Kipchak-Oghuz dialect, spoken in Staromlinovka (Kermençik), Bogatır and Ulaklı. The Oghuz dialect, too, is further divided in two: 1. The Oghuz-Kipchak dialect, spoken in Granitne (Karan), Starolaspa, Komar and Starognativka (Gürji). 2. The Oghuz dialect, spoken in Mariupol and Stariy Krim.

It is certain that there is a similarity between *Codex Cumanicus* and modern Kipchak languages. This has been proven by researchers; however, it should be pointed out that in addition to CC, the written heritage of Kipchak in Armenian letters is another indispensable reference for modern Kipchak Turkish.

The written heritage of Kipchak is written in Armenian letters. This script was used by the Ottoman Empire and originally by Armenian citizens living in Turkey as well as by the Armenians of Western Ukraine (Tekin 1984: 6).

The Armenian alphabet does not fully display the vowel system of Turkish. The same is partially true for consonants (Garkavets and Khurshudian 2001: XXVI), Deny, Schütz (Schütz 1961: 139-161), Tryjarski and Daşkeviç read the scripts as a transliteration of the Armenian alphabet, but Garkavets reads them as a Turkish transliteration and transcription.

The case of vowels is a little complicated and must therefore be the subject of a different paper; however, if we are to cite some of the very typical characteristics of the orthography of Kipchak in Armenian letters vowels with the same symbol, we see that there is no separate symbol for /ä/ *bermädilär* 'they didn't give' (DPY, 213), *berma* 'not give' (Deny 1957: 127), *emgak* 'effort, trouble' (DAK, 236), Garkavets seperated /a/ and /ä/ in the transcription: *edilär* 'they were'(AKP, 139), *kendiläriniŋ* 'of their own' (AKP, 121). As it is seen in the examples, there is a separate symbol for closed /e/. Different letters are used for /ı/ and /i/. There is no symbol for /ö/ and /ü/. These vowels are written in the letters /o/ and /u/: *koz* 'eye' (DPY, 347), *koz* (Deny 1957: 61), *koz* (DAK, 422), *közlär* (AKP, 109); *yurak* 'heart' (DPY, 396). Grunin gave the transcription of these words also in the form of *yüräk*. *yurak* (DAK, 357), *yuraklan-* 'to be courageous' (Deny 1957: 83). Deny found three words with /ü/ in a script

belonging to the year 1575: *yürak, tügül* 'not', *üzum* 'my face' (Deny 1957: 19).[3] He claims that this is a special case stemming from the influence of Turkey Armenians.

CONSONANTS

I will now try to compare the consonants of main Kipchak sounds in Kipchak Turkish with their counterparts in Kipchak-dominated Urum dialects and explain the similarities. The examples of KA and Urum were collected from Tryjarski's dictionary and Garkavets' dictionary of Urum; however, the origins of the examples from other texts are given in parantheses. The examples from the *Codex Cumanicus*, Mamluk grammars and dictionaries to the modern Kipchak languages have taken the place in the the footnotes in order to support the examples about sound changes. Loan words have been excluded from the paper and Garkavets' transcription was taken as basis for the punctuation rules of the words.[4]

The fact that initial /b/, /k/, /t/ are retained in the Kipchak field is not a typical characteristic. This is a common case in all the other Turkic languages (Northwest, Northeast, Southeast), except Southwest Turkic languages.

/b/ sound

The initial /b/ is generally retained in Urum Kipchak: *barmaχ* 'finger' (SB, P) *bol- ~bo-* 'to be' (VN, SB); *bar* 'there is' (VN, SB, U); *bar-* 'to go, arrive' (SB, VN, B, U); *bin~biŋ* 'thousand'; *ber-* 'to give' (VN, U, B); *bax-* 'to look' (SB, VN); *baş* 'head' (SB, SG etc.) *beg* 'sir'; *bile, ble, bilen* 'with'.

The first person singular pronoun is generally used with /m/: *ben* 'I' (VN); *maŋa* (VN, U); *mana* (G, K); *maa* (SB, SM, G). Apart from this, the change b->m- exists in the following examples: *min-* 'to ride' (VN, SM, P); *moyun* 'throat' (VN). *bıyıχ* 'moustache'(U); *mıyıχ* (SM, SB).

There is b>p devoicing initially in a few examples: *bıçaq > pıçax ~ pçax* 'knife' (SB, P; UN, 50). *bütür- > pitir-* 'to finish' (UN, 50).

The final /b/ changes into /v/ in KA, and changes into /y/ in Urum Kipchak dialects but sometimes the so-called /y/ disappears: KA *söv-* 'to love', in Urm. *süy-* (VN, P), *sü-* (SB); KA *öv* 'home', Urm. *üy* (VN, SB); *ü* (SB).[5]

---

[3] Pritsak mentioned the special case either (Pritsak 1959: 83).

[4] For the Arabian and Persian laon words in KA, see Tryjarski 2000: 301-326.

[5] The forms with /y/ are given in *Et-Tuhfetü'z-Zekiyye Fi'l-Lügati't-Türkiyye* written in Mamluk field and exemplify the Kipchak characteristics most: *öy* (TZ, 14), *söydi* (TZ, 11).

/g/ and /γ/ sounds

While /g/ and /γ/ is sometimes kept in the middle and final position, it changes into /v/ in some examples. The unsystematic *g>v* change is one of the most important features of Kipchak Turkish.[6] This typical feature which is observed in KA and Urum Kipchak dialects is also common in other Kipchak languages:[7] KA *kiyov (< küdegü)* 'bride-groom', Urm. *küyev* (G, K); KA *övrän-* 'to learn', Urm. *ögren-* (NB, SM), *örgen-* (UN, 75); KA *ög-* 'to praise', *övün-* 'to boast'; KA *ögüt, övüt* 'advice' (Deny 1957: 66), Urm. *ögüt* (G); KA *tüzöv (<tüzüg)* 'organize', Urm. *tüzüv*.

/γ/ is retained in some examples of KA. It, however, changes into /v/ in the Kipchak dialects of Urum. KA *aγız*, 'mouth', Urm. *avuz* (VN, SB, U); KA *aγır* 'heavy', Urm. *avur* (VN, SB, U); KA *aγrı-* 'to become ill', Urm. *avur-* (SB); KA *aγrıχ (<aγrı-γ)* 'pain', Urm. *avru* (VN); KA *sovuχ (<soγuq)* 'cold', Urm. *sovuχ* (UN, 50); KA *yuvuχ (<yaγuq)* 'near'; KA *bızov (<buzaγu)* 'calf', Urm. *buzov* (SB); KA *taγ* 'mountain', Urm *tav* (VN); KA *yazov (<yazıγ)* 'letter', Urm. *yazuv* 'writing' (SB).

/γ/, is kept medially in the Oghuz-Kipchak dialect of Urum: *aγız, aγır-, aγır* (G, SL, SG).[8]

The suffix in which this change is extensively seen in KA is *–vUçI* eki[9] ve *–(O)v*

---

[6] The forms with /g/ and /v/ are used together in *Codex Cumanicus*: *oγul, ovul* 'son' (CC, 173), *toγru, tuvra* 'correct' (CC, 258), *boγum, buvun* 'segment' (CC, 63), *küyegü, küyöv* 'bride-groom' (CC, 158), *ög-, öv-* 'to praise, to boast', (CC, 185), *övren-, üren-* 'to learn' (CC, 185). There are a good many of examples about this change in *Et-Tuhfetü'z-Zekiyye Fi'l-Lügati't-Türkiyye: övren-* (TZ, 16-17), *övüt* (ET, 33), *yüvürdi <yügürdi* 'he ran', (TZ, 22), *avur <aγır* 'heavy' (TZ, 9), *bovaz <boγaz* 'throat' (TZ, 23), *uvru < oγrı* 'thief' (TZ, 23), *tav < taγ* 'mountain' (TZ, 20), *sav < saγ* 'alive' (TZ, 46). In addition, *töv- < tög-* 'to beat' (Kİ, 40), *uvu < aγı* 'poison' (Kİ, 26), *ovlaq <aγlaq* 'antelope' (Kİ, 21) etc. In most of these samples, the form with /g/ and /γ/ are reported to be Turkmen in origin. See Atalay 1945; Caferoğlu 1931.

[7] In Karaim, however, /g/ which is word-final and intervocalic in many words is converted into /v/: *uvul* 'son', *bavur* 'bosom', *suvux* 'cold', *avur* 'heavy', *tav* 'mountain', *yav* 'enemy', *yüvür-* 'to run' etc. Musayev 1964: 86. Kar. *kiyow, küyew* and other forms with phonological variants (KarRPS, 318). *ögretüv (<ögret-i-g)* (KarRPS, 437). *bavla- (< baγla-)* 'to tie up' (KarRPS; 94). The dialects of Kırghız display the fricativization stage of this development in Kırghız literary language: *tow* 'mountain', *baylow* 'to tie up', *cazuw* 'to write', *külüw* 'to laugh' etc. Yunusaliyev 1985: 118-119. It is possible to observe this change in Nogai, Kazakh and Karakalpak either. See Menges 1959: 449-451.

[8] In Crimean Tatar, too, the forms with /g/ and /v/ occur together: *aγır~avur* 'heavy', *aγız~avuz* 'mouth' KTaRS, 12-13. See Doerfer 1959: 377-378.

[9] We can observe the three allomorphs of the morpheme ending in a vowel in some verbs: *χıynavuçi, χıynavçi, χıynuçi* 'one who obliges' (DEK, 478) When we think that the form *–(U)v+çI (aluvçu, körüvçi, yılavçu, saqlavçu)* attaches to the verbs ending in a vowel and consonant (See Kowalski 1929: XXXIII; Musayev 1964: 119); the vowel /u/ that comes after /v/attaching to the verbs ending in a vowel in KA can be explained as vowel addition. Otherwise, it is possible to speak of the allomorph *–GUçI* in these examples. In the samples we have, scanned, the allomorph is formed as *–UçI < {(X)gçI}* after the verbs ending in a consonant: *bilüçi* 'one who knows', *buzuçi* 'one who spoils', *yazuçi* 'one who writes', *körüçi* 'one who sees' etc. For more detailed information about the suffix, See Berta 1996: 592-596.

{<(X)g}[10] which makes nouns out of verbs. KA *saχlavuçi* 'one who keeps', *izdävüçi* 'one who seeks', *işlävüçi* 'one who works', *yıγlavuçi* 'one who cries', *alγışlavuçi* 'one who prays' etc. The similar examples are also seen in Urum: *başlavucu* 'one who starts' *aŋlatıvçı* 'one who explains'.

The examples about *-(O)v*: KA *boyov (<bodu-γ)* 'paint', *aruv (<arı-γ)* 'pure, clean', *çızov (<çızıγ* 'line', *ayovsuz (<ayaγsız)* 'without protection', *tutovlu (<tut-uγ-luγ)* 'in the habit of', *yetövsüz (<yet-ig-siz)* 'inaccesible, endless' etc. Urm. *bavla- (<baγ-la-)* 'to tie' (SB); *başlav (<başla-γ)* 'start' (SB); *aŋlav (< aŋla-γ)* 'understand' (SB), *açuv (< açı-γ)* 'anger', *bav (<ba-γ)* 'tie' (VN, U).

It is seen that the final /γ/ in KA changes into /χ/ becoming voiceless: *aγrıχ* 'ağrı'.[11]

The examples about the change of *g, γ>y*, [12] which is a Kipchak feature, are not seen abundantly in KA:[13] KA *tiy- (<teg-)* 'to touch', Urm. *tiy-* (VN); KA *biy* 'sir' (Deny 1957: 47) *(<beg),* Urm. *beg* (G); KA *baγla-, bayla-* 'to tie', Urm. *bavla-~bayla-* (SB); KA *yıγ-* 'to pile up', Urm. *cıy-* (SB); KA *sıγır* 'cattle', Urm. *sıγır* (VN, B), *sıyır* (VN, U). In Urum some of the examples displaying this change are as follows: *tüy- (<tög-)* 'to beat, to hit' (VN); *tüyme (<tügme)* 'button' (SB, SM); *sıγ-, sıy-* 'to fit into' (SB).

The fact that /g/ and /γ/ drops is also an important Kipchak feature.[14] We could provide examples only from Urum Kipchak dialects: Urm. *ine* 'needle' (VN); KA *oγlan* 'boy', Urm. *oγlan* (SB, SM), *olan* (VN, SB); KA *yıγla-, ıγla-* 'to cry', Urm. *cıla-* (VN).

/k/ and /q/ sounds

/g/, which is found initially in the Southwest dialects of Turkish, is found as /k/ in all other Turkish dialects. /k/ of KA changes into /g/ in some words. Grunin ties this fact to the impact of the Southwest Turkish dialects (Grunin 1967: 352). While /k/ is sometimes kept in the Kipchak dialects of Urum, it is changed into /g/ under the effects of Oghuz dialects; it is also transformed into palatal /d'/ and /t'/ or completely into /y/, /c/ and /ç/. The palatal consonants /k/ and /g/ change into /t'/ and /d'/ and gradually into /c/ ve /ç/, the examples of which are encountered in Trabzon and Rize

---

[10] See Erdal 1991: 173-223.

[11] The same phonological feature is also seen in CC: *aγrıq, aγrıx, aγırıx* (CC, 29).

[12] We also come across this change in the dictionaries and grammars of Mamluk field: *teg-, tey-* 'to touch' (CC, 238), *tiydi* (TZ, 43), *iyne* 'needle' (TZ, 8), *täyirmän* 'mill' (Kİ, 41), *bayladı* (TZ, 34), *bayla-* (KK, 34), *yıydı* (TZ, 44). In Karaim *bayla-* (Musayev 1964: 86).

[13] Grunin gave only two examples about this change in his study based on the limited texts: *tiyirman, tiy-* (Grunin 1967: 352).

[14] The loss of this sound is a feature observed in the works belonging to CC and Mamluk field: *yıγla-, yıla-* (CC, 272), *buγday, boday* (CC, 62), *tura <toγru* 'true' (TZ, 57).

dialects of Anatolia.[15] The typical *y>c* transformation which is a Kipchak characteristic (See /y/ sound) in the modern Kipchak languages (Kırghız, Kazakh, Karakalpak etc.) is not recorded in KA texts but there is a reverse situation in Urum *(k>d'>c>y)*. This change is found next to /e/ and /i/ vowels but the so-called palatalization next to /ö/ and /ü/ does not take place except for a few cases. KA *kelin* 'bride', Urm. *kelin, yelin* (SB); *d'elin* (VN, K, SG); *t'elin* (VN, K). KA *kün, gün* (DPY, 390)'day, sun', Urm. *kün* (VN, SB), *gün* (VN, K). KA *kök, gök* (DPY, 390) 'sky, blue'; Urm. *kök* (SL, SB); KA *kör-, görgüz-* (DPY, 390) 'see-cause to be seen', Urm. *kör-, gör-* (VN, K).

The medial /k/ gets voiced in some examples: KA *tügäl (< tükel)* 'complete, entire', Urm. *tügen- (< tüken-)* 'be exhausted, finish' (G).

In addition to *q>χ* fricativization which is common in KA, the *k>χ* change is also seen in three environments. The final /k/ of the nominal suffix of *–mäk* and the /k/ of the 1st person plural used with the suffix of past simple change into /χ/:[16] KA *körmäχ* 'to see' (TB, 289), *titrämäχ* 'to tremble' (AKP, 3/2-11), *yüräklänmäχ* 'to take courage' (AKP, 8/6-8), *bermäχ* 'to give' (DAK, 129), *keçikmäχ* 'to be late' (TB, 281), *berdiχ* 'we have given' (DPY, 351), *yeberdiχ* 'we have sent' (DPY, 351), *ettiχ* 'we have done' (DPY, 225), *tölediχ* 'we have paid' (KY, 172). Besides, Garkavets gave the clear vowel variant of the 1st person plural imperative as with /k/ and /χ/.[17]

One of the most typical features of KA and Urum Kipchak dialects, is that /q/ changes into /χ/, being fricative in every position in the word. This change is reflected in the Trakai dialect of the Karaim language:[18] KA *χadar* 'until, how much', Urm. *χadar* (VN, P); KA *χaçan* 'when', Urm. *χaçan* (VN, SB, SM); KA *χayγu* 'anxiety', Urm. *χayγı* (SB, U); KA *χara* 'black', Urm. *χara* (VN, P, SB); KA *χardaş* 'sibling', Urm. *χardaş* (VN, SB, P); KA *χaçχın* 'deserter', Urm. *χaçχın* (SM); KA *aχça* 'asper (a

---

[15] In Trabzon dialect, the alveo-palatal /k/ and /g/ are used before back vowels in borrowed words: *hik'aye, g'avur* etc. This change, however, appears initially before /o/ and /u/ and semi-front vowels in Turkish words and is common in the regions of Sürmene-Arakli-Yomra: *g'ätımiᵃş* 'he has brought', *g'österemem* 'I can not show', *k'esmiş* 'he has cut', *k'öpek* 'dog', *g'ol* 'lake', *k'opri* 'bridge' (Brendemoen 2002: 97-98, 177-179). This transition that begins with fronto-palatal voiced /g/ and voiceless /k/ take place in two stages such as /g/ >/ĝ/, /ć/; /k/ > /k̲/, /ç/ in the Rize dialect. /g/ and /k/ are fronted partially losing their plosiveness and becoming semi-fricative. /ĝ/ and /k̲/ are more common and /ć/ and /ç/ are used in the regions of Pazar, Ardeşen and Fındıklı. A language known as Laz language and spoken as a second language is assumed to have influence on the formation of this phonological change in the vicinity of the so-called area. Some examples are: *ĝelin* 'bride', *ik̲i* 'two', *pek̲i* 'all right', *ćit-* 'to go', *çimse* 'no body', *peçi* 'all right', *haçim* 'judge' etc. (Günay 2003: 88) The change that is parallel in both the dialects of Mariupol Greeks and the dialects of Erzurum, Rize, Trabzon was also reported by Tenişev who stated that the transition /k'/, /g'/ > /t'/, /d'/ took place before the vowels /ä/, /e/, /ö/, /ü/ and /i/ (Tenişev 1973: 95).

[16] See Garkavets 1987: 171-172; Grunin 1967: 351.

[17] *-(y)elik/ -(y)eliχ; -äyiχ/-(i)yiχ* (Garkavets 1987: 161).

[18] In the Kipchak dialects, this feature is observed initially and finally in Turkish words of the Trakai dialect of Karaim: *toχtarbız* 'we will stop', *aχsaχ (< aqsaq)* 'lame', *aχ (<aq)* 'white' (Musayev 1964: 71).

monetary unit)', Urm. *aχça*; KA *başχa* 'other', Urm. *başχa~baχşa* (SB, G); KA *aχsaχ* 'lame', Urm. *aχsaχ*. KA *ayaχ* 'foat', Urm. *ayaχ* (VN, SB); KA *açlıχ* 'hunger', Urm. *açlıχ* (SB).

/t/ sound

Although the /t/ sound appears initially in all Turkish dialects except for the Southwest Turkish dialects, it is generally retained in KA and Urum Kipchak dialects, but sometimes changes into /d/. We can even come across the same word with pronunciations of /t/ and /d/. [19] KA *tap-* 'to find', Urm. (VN, SB) *tap-*; KA *tiy-* 'to touch', Urm. *deg-* (SB, SM, G); *diy-* (SB); *tiy-* (VN, K, SM); KA *til* 'tongue', Urm. *til* (VN, U, SM); KA *toγ-* 'to be born', Urm. *doγ-* (VN, SB, NK), *toγ-~ tuw-* (SB); KA *toy-* 'to fill up', Urm. *toy-* (P, SB); KA *tart-* 'to pull', Urm. *tart-* (VN, SM); KA *tügül, dügül* 'is not', Urm. *tügül* (P), *dügül* (SB, SM); KA *tamar, tamur, damar* 'vein', Urm. *tamar* (G), *tamur* (SB), *damar* (G, SG).

It is possible to add to these examples. Moreover, some words have their forms only with /d/: KA *deli* 'mad', *dilänçilik* 'begging', *dolaş-* 'to turn around', *donat-* 'to provide', *döndür-* 'to turn', *dört* 'four'. Urm. *döndür-* (G, SG), *dolaş-* (U, G, K, SG), *donat-* (SG), *dört* (VN, SB) etc. It is possible to think of the impact of Southwest languages in examples with initial /d/ in KA, but Grunin proposes another approach. He claims that these cases may also stem from the spelling because /t/ and /d/ are used in the same place in old Armenian scripts (Grunin 1967: 353). We assume that the so-called /d/ which appears in the Kipchak dialects of Urum is formed under the effect of Oghuz dialects.

/y/ sound

The initial *y>c* change in KA, which we could not find in the texts scanned, is a typical phonological change of Kipchak and is common in Kazakh and Kırghız, which are living Kipchak languages today. This phonological change is rare in Kipchak-Oghuz dialects and especially in the Kipchak-Polovets dialects of Urum: *cıy- ~ciy-* (< *yıγ-*) 'to pile up' (SB); *cılıv* (< *ılıγ*) 'warm' (B); *coy-* (<*yod-*) 'to lose' (VN, SB); *carat-* (<*yarat-*) 'to create' (VN); *cay-* (<*yay-*) 'to spread, scatter; to put an animal out to pasture' (VN, SB); *yigit* 'brave' (SB,VN), *cigit* (SM, K); *cet-* (< *yet-*) 'to arrive, reach' (VN, SB, P); *cel* (< *yel*) 'wind' (VN); *cez* (<*yez*) 'copper' (SL).

---

[19] The initial /d/ also occurs in some examples of CC and Karaim. Some examples in CC are: *daγı, daγın* 'too' (CC, 80-81), *degri, deyri* 'until' (CC, 82), *deyin* 'until' (CC, 82), *dört* (CC, 83). Some Karaim examples: *daγı, daγın* 'too' (KarRPS, 168), *damar* 'vein' (KarRPS, 169), *daş* 'stone' (KarRPS, 170), *dört* (KarRPS, 180), *dilek* (KarRPS, 177), *dügül* 'is not' (KarRPS,182).

CONCLUSION

Although several researchers have pointed out the grammatical (phonological and morphological) similarities between Kipchak in Armenian letters, the *Codex Cumanicus* language collected from Kipchaks in the north of the Black Sea in 13th and 14th centuries, the dialects of Crimean Tatar, and the Kipchak dialects of Urum, the investigations related to the research in question are not at the required level. I have tried to point out some very typical qualities of KA and Kipchak-dominated Urum dialects in terms of consonants. The changes *g, γ>v, g, γ>y* and *q>x* which are common in both languages are important clues for the research field of Kipchak languages. The written heritage of Kamenets-Podolsk communities who spoke, wrote and prayed in Kipchak Turkish four centuries ago has become a very important source for the historical and linguistic studies on 16th and 17th century Armeno-Kipchak colonies. The written heritage of Kipchak in Armenian letters and *Codex Cumanicus* are the two important references that can be used to determine the historical forms of current Kipchak languages (Tatar, Crimean Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Kırghız, Noghay, Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar etc). First of all, it should be pointed out that all the material available should be analyzed in order to lay down the phonological and morphological features of KA completely. Second, detailed linguistic studies of these texts and comparative linguistic studies between KA and modern Kipchak languages are further required. In this way, a back ground can be established to point out the connections among the Kipchak languages, both in themselves and in their historical perspectives.

ABBREVIATIONS

B	Bogatir	SL	Starolaspa
G	Granitne (Karan)	SM	Staromlinivka
K	Komar	U	Ulakli
KA	Kipchak in Armenian letters	Urm.	Urum language
NB	Novobeşeve	UN	*Urumi Nadazov'ya.* See GARKAVETS (1999).
P	Perşotravneve (Manguş)		
SB	Starobeşeve (Beşev)	VN	Velika Novosilka (Yanisol)
SG	Starognativka (Gürji)		

REFERENCES

AKP= See GARKAVETS, A. and KHURSHUDIAN, E. (2001).

ATALAY, B. (1945), *Ettuhfet-üz-Zekiyye fil-Lûgat-it-Türkiyye,* İstanbul: Türk Dil Kurumu.

BERTA, Á. (1996), *Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Turkischen,* Turcologica 24, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

BRENDEMOEN, B. (2002), *The Turkish Dialects of Trabzon, Their phonology and historical development,* V. I: Analysis, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

CAFEROĞLU, A. (1931), *Abû Hayyan, Kitâb al-İdrâk li-lisân al-Atrâk,* İstanbul: Evkaf matbaası.

CC= GRØNBECH, K. (1942), *Komanisches Wörterbuch: Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus,* Monumenta Linguarum Asiæ Maioris, Subsidia 1, Kopenhagen: Munksgaard.

CHİRLİ, N. (2005), *Algış Bitigi, Ermeni Kıpçakça Dualar Kitabı (An Armeno Kipchak Prayer Book),* Haarlem-Netherlands: SOTA Türkistan ve Azerbaycan Araştırma Merkezi.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. (1981), "Armyano-kıpçakskiy yazık XV-XVII vv. v osveşçenii sovremennikov: ob ispolzovanii ekstralingvistiçeskix dannıx dlya istorii tyurskix yazıkov", *Voprosı yazıkoznaniya,* No: 5, 79-92.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. (1983), "Armyano-Kıpçakskiy yazık: Etapı istorii", *Voprosı yazıkoznaniya,* No: 1, 91-107.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. (2001), "Who are Armeno-Kıpchaks?", *Armenia and Ukraine,* Lvıv-New-York: Edition M. P. Kots', 357-416.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. and TRYJARSKİ, E. (1970), "Armyano-kıpçakskie predbraçnıe dogovorı iz L'vova (1598-1638 gg.)", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XXXIII, Z. 2, Warszawa, 67-107.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. and TRYJARSKİ, E. (1975), "Drevneyşiy armyano-kıpçakskiy dokumant iz L'vovskix kollektsiy (1583 g.) i izuçenie bilingv predbraçnıx dogovorov l'vovskix armyan", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XXXVII, Z. 2, Warszawa, 33-47.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. and TRYJARSKİ, E. (1977), "Pyat' armyano-kıpçakskix dokumentov iz l'vovskix kollektsiy (1599-1669 gg.)", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XXXIX, Z. 1, Warszawa, 85-132.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. and TRYJARSKİ, E. (1978), "Armyano-kıpçakskie denejnie dokumentı iz L'vova (konets XVI v.-1657 g.)", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XL, Z. 1, Warszawa, 49-69.

DAŞKEVİÇ, Ya. R. and TRYJARSKİ, E. (1979), "Tri armyano-kıpçakskix zapisi L'vovskogo armyanskogo duxovnogo suda 1625 g.", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XLI, Z. 1, Warszawa, 57-84.

DEK= See TRYJARSKİ, E. (1968).

DENY, J. (1957), *L'arméno-coman et les 'Éphémerides' de Kamieniec (1604-1613).* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

DOERFER, G. (1959), "Das Krimtatarische", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta,* T. I, Wiesbaden, 367-390.

DOERFER, G. (1968), "Literatur zum Armeno-Kiptschakischen", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher,* Bd. 40, H. 3-4, 250-252.

DPY= See GRUNİN, T. I. (1967).

ERDAL, M. 1991. *Old Turkic Word Formation, A Functional Approach to the Lexicon.* V. I-II, Turcologica 7, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

GARKAVETS, A. (1979), *Konvergentsiya armyano-kıpçakskogo yazıka k slavyanskim v XVI-XVII vv.* Kiev: Naukova dumka.

GARKAVETS, A. (1981), "O proisxojdenii i klassifikatsii urumskix govorov Severnogo Priazov'ya", *Sovyetskaya tyurkologiya,* No: 2, 46-58.

GARKAVETS, A. (1987), *Kıpçakskie yazıki: kumanskiy i armyano-kıpçakskiy,* Alma-ata: Nauka.

GARKAVETS, A. (1988), *Tyurkskie yazıki na Ukraine,* Kiev: Naukova dumka.

GARKAVETS, A. (1993), *Virmeno-kıpchatski rukopisi v Ukraıni, Virmeniı, Rosiı,* Katalog-Kiıv: Ukraınoznavstvo.

GARKAVETS, A. (1999), *Urumi Nadazov'ya, İstoriya, mova, kazki, pisni, zagadki, prisliv'ya, pisemni pam'yatki,* Alma-Ata: Ukraınskiy kul'turniy tsenter.

GARKAVETS, A. (2000), *Urumskiy slovnik.* Institut sxodoznavstva i mıjnarodnix vıdnosin 'Xarkıvs'kiy kolegıum', Alma-ata: Tsenter Evrazıys'kix Doslıdjen 'Deşt-ı Kipçak'.

GARKAVETS, A. (2002), *Kıpçakskoe pismennoe nasledie: T. I. Katalog i tekstı pamyatnikov armyanskim pis'mom,* Almat: Deşt-i-Kıpçak.

GARKAVETS, A. and KHURSHIDIAN, E. (ed.) (2001), *Armenian-Qıpchaq psalter written by deacon Lussig from Lvıv 1575/1580,* Almatı: Desht-i Qıpchaq.

GARKAVETS, A. and SAPARGALİYEV, G. (2003), *Töre Bitigi: Kıpçaksko-pol'skaya versiya armyanskogo sudebnika i armyano kıpçakskiy protsessualnıy kodeks, L'vov, Kamenets-Podol'skiy 1519-1594,* Almatı: Deşt-i-Kıpçak, Baur.

GRUNİN, T. I. (1967), *Dokumentı na polovetskom yazıke XVI v. (sudebnıe aktı kamanets-podol'skoy armyanskoy obşçinı)* transkriptsiya, perevod, predislovie, vvedenie, grammatiçeskiy kommentariy i glossariy T. I. Grunina, pod redaktsiey E. V. Sevortyana, stat'ya Ya. R. Daşkeviça, Moskva: İzdatel'stvo nauka.

GÜNAY, T. (2003), *Rize İli Ağızları,* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

KarRPS = BASKAKOV, N.A. (Red.) (1974), *Karaimsko-russkiy-pol'skiy slovar',* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "russkiy yazık".

KK = TOPARLI, R. (1999), *El-Kavânînü'l-Külliye Li-Zabti'l-Lügati't-Türkiyye,* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

KTaRS = ASANOV, Ş., GARKAVETS, A., USEİNOV, S. M. (Red.) (1988), *Krımskotatarsko-russkiy slovar',* Kiev: 'Radyans'ka şkola'.

Kİ = CAFEROĞLU, A. (1931).

KOWALSKİ, T. (1929), *Karaimische Texte im dialekt von Troki,* Warszawa-Kraków: Nakładem Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności,

KY= See GARKAVETS, A. (1987).

LEWICKI, M. and KOHNOWA, R. (1957), "Le version turque-kiptchak du Code des lois des Armeniens polonais d'apres le m. No 1916 de la Bibliotheque Ossolineum", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny,* T. XXI, Wiesbaden, 153-300.

MENGES, M. (1959), "Die aralo-kaspische Gruppe", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta,* T. I, Wiesbaden, 434-488.

MENGES, M. (1972), "Zur Etymologie des Armeno-Kiptschakischen", *Der Islam,* Bd. 48, H. 2.

MURATOV, S. N. (1963), "Materialı po govoram tyurkoyazıçnıx grekov (Urumov) Donetskoy Oblasti USSR", *Yazıkoznanie,* Kratkoe Soobşeniya Instituta Narodov Azii, No: 72, Moskva, 178-191.

MURATOV, S. N. (1997), "Urumskiy yazık", *Yazıki mira tyurkskie yazıki,* 'Kırgızstan', Bişkek: İzdatel'skiy Dom, 450-455.

MUSAYEV, K. M. (1964), *Grammatika karaimskogo yazıka, fonetika i morfologiya,* Moskva: İzdatel'stvo 'nauka'.

PODOLSKY, B. (1985), *A Greek Tatar-English Glossary, An Urum-English Glossar,* Mediterranean Language and Culture Monographs Series, V. I, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

PODOLSKY, B. (1986), "Notes on the Urum language", *Mediterranean Language Review* 2: 99-112.

PRITSAK, O. (1959), "Armenisch-Kiptschakisch", *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta,* T. I, Wiesbaden, 81-85.

SCHÜTZ, E. (1961), "On the transcription of Armeno-Kipchak", *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae XII,* 139-161.

SCHÜTZ, E. (1962), "Armeno-Kıpchak Texts From Lvov (A. D. 1618)", *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae XV,* 291-309.

SCHÜTZ, E. (1998), *Armeno-Turcica Selected Studies,* Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series V. 164, Bloomington-Indiana: Indiana University, Research Institute for Inner Asien Studies.

TB= See GARKAVETS, A. and SAPARGALİYEV, G. (2003).

TEKİN, T. (1984), "Ermeni Alfabesiyle Türkçe", *Tarih ve Toplum,* C. 1, S. 4, İstanbul: İletişim, 246-249.

TENİŞEV, E. R. (1973), "Govor Urumov sela praskovmevki" *Sovetskaya tyurkologiya,* No: 1, Baku, 92-96.

TRYJARSKİ, E. (1968), *Dictionnaire Arméno-Kiptchak,* d'aprés trois manuscrits des collections Viennoises. Tome I, Fascicule I-IV, Warszawa: Panstwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.

TRYJARSKİ, E. (2000), "Arabic and Persian Loan Words in Armeno-Kipchak", *Hasan Eren Armağanı*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 301-326.

TZ = See ATALAY, B. (1945).

YUNUSALİYEV, B. M. (1985), *Tandalgan Emgekter,* Frunze: İlim basması.