ON DIALECTAL DIFFERENTIATION OF
ARMENO - KITAPCHAK

EDWARD TRYJARSKI

In 1957, the editors of the "Code of Laws of the Polish Armenians" in Armeno - Kipchak version M. Lewicki and R. Kohn made a hypothesis supposing that the Armeno - Kipchak was dialectically differentiated. According to this hypothesis there should be distinguished, in the texts analyzed up to the date indicated above, two dialects, one of which contains evidence of its being influenced by Ottoman[1]. The authors adduced no proofs in support of their presumption. M. Lewicki's premature departure cut short his newly begun studies and the above hypothesis was met neither with acceptance nor rejection. In particular no rules on what distinction could be theoretically justified were accepted and no real special features which might enable it were pointed out. Notwithstanding some thirty years elapsed from that date, the question is still actual and should be given our undivided attention. The more so that it is an excellent departure for the genesis of the language in question and for its relation to other Turkic languages.

The idea of two Armeno - Kipchak dialects, incidentally, coincides with early observed existence of two or even three dialects of the "Codex Cumanicus". This hypothesis, supported unfortunately by only few examples, was discussed by A. v. Gabain[2] and lately accepted and deepened by L. Ligeti.[3] The actual state of the research gives us, however, no ground for

---

[1] "Les monuments dont il est question ici sont rédigés dans deux dialectes dont l'un paraît avoir subi l'influence de la langue turque osmanlie", M. Lewicki - R. Kohnowa, La version turque - kiptchak du "Code des lois des Arméniens polonais" d'après le ms. No 1916 de la Bibliothèque Ossolineum, RO XXI, 1957, p. 157. Ya. R. Daşkeviç, "Armyano-kıp-çakskiy yazık: etapı i istorii", Voprosı Yazıkoznaniya, 1983/1, s. 101.

[2] A. von Gabain, Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus, in : PhTF, I, 1959. pp. 46–47.

[3] "The double distribution of the Coman language of the Codex Cumanicus clearly proves that the dialects were spoken in two diffarent regions; the first in territories in direct contact with the Italian colonies, and the second by the Comans /Tatars/ among whom the Franciscan missionaries worked"; "Roughly speaking, the material of the Codex can be divided into two major dialects", L. Ligeti, Prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus, in : Codex Cumanicus Edited by G. Kuun. . ., Budapest 1981. Budapest Oriental Reprints, Series B 1, pp. 20, 24.

combining the dialectal differentiation of both languages in question. The less so that according to new arguments lately presented by Y. R. Dash-kevych,[4] the relation between those languages are not as close as they seemed to have been. On the other hand, the example of the Karaim language, clearly divided into three dialects, invites us to intensify the research work in this domain.

A researcher of the problem of dialectal differentiation of Armeno - Kipchak is confronted by serious difficulties. Some of them have more a theoretical charecter, the others are the result of our still unsufficient know-ledge of Armeno - Kipchak manuscripts, the probable majority of which has not been edited so far.

Speaking about "dialects" we are automatically confronted by a much disputable and rather scholastic question of the mutual relation between a "dialect" and a "language". So far as the Armeno - Kipchak is concerned, most researchers' opinion is that owing to its own phonomorphological pe-culiarities, its own vocabulary and its use of the alphabet in which multiple and various texts had been written down and even printed, Armeno - Kipchak merits the name of a "language". From this point of view an attempt to detect its presumble dialects is formally motivated. But even here an opposite opinion is admitted provided we put aside the envelope of the alphabet, of loan words, calques etc. and analyze the pure linguistic Turkic material in its oldest layer. Then F. v. Kareelitz - Greifenhorst's opinion, presented in 1912 and determining Armeno - Kipchak as a "dialect",[5] may be considered true.

Another kind of difficulty is connected with features usually attributed to dialects themselves. Defining dialect as a variety of a nationwide language standing out of the last by its special phonological and lexical, exceptionally also morphological and syntactical features we locate it a rule on a terri-torial, and only in exceptional cases also on a social plane. In the case of Armeno - Kipchak, the territorial element is difficult to formulate, and even empty. As a matter of fact, we are still unable to prove that Armeno-Kipchak speakers in, let us say, Luck or Zamost spoke a different variety of speech than those from Kamenets or Lvov. In this connection it is more reasonable to speak about a linguistic differentiation of certain Armeno - Kipchak speakers before their settling in the Ukraine.

Here we come to the problem of a social and individual differentiation of Armeno - Kipchak. It has been observed that there are differences

---

[4] Daşkeviç, op. cit.; the same, "Codex Cumanicus-voprosı vozniknoveniya", *Voprosı Yazıkoznaniya*, 1985/4, pp. 72–83.

[5] "... bisher noch nicht behandelten tatarischen Dialekt der Armenier in Polen...";
"... das tatarischen Idiom....", F. v. Kraelitz – Greifenhorst, *Sprachprobe eines armenisch - tatarischen Dialektes in Polen*, WZKM, XXVI, 1912, pp. 308–309.

between the language of respective manuscripts depending on their contents : various styles are used in the texts of a judical, historical, religious or linguistic character. This common phenomenon belongs, however, to the inner evolution of the language and has nothing to do with a dialectal problem. Consequently we suppose that for the time being, speaking of Armeno-Kipchak dialects in its fundamental, i. e. territorial meaning, practically confined to several colonies in big and small cities in which this language was used, has no ground and that all eventual endeavours to trace some isophones, isomorphs or isolexes in accordance with the dialect geography are unjustyfied or, in the best case, premature. There are several reasons for this. First, the time in which Armeno - Kipchak evolved in the Ukraine and which is generally approximated to two hundred years was probably too short to produce — according to the "wave theory" — new consistent and seizable facts. Second, there should have existed a considerable mobility of Armeno - Kipchak speakers : not only still new groups flew from remote places, but also migrations of families and individuals from one colony to another must have been frequent.

All said above does not mean, however, that the problem of dialectal differentiation of Armeno - Kipchak does not exist at all : it does but it demands a solution put on another plane, viz. in its diachronic aspect or, more precisely, in a formula synthesizing both, i. e, territorial and diachronic planes, in the frames of historical dialectology.

When the question is of a diachrony, two subsequent periods should be distinguished : (1) a period before the settlement in the Ukrainian - Polish territory which is beyond our actual knowledge, and (2) a period after the settlement which we have a good but not fully explored opportunity to analyse. Notwithstanding all existing studies and text editions, the evolution of this language starting from its oldest manuscripts up to the newest ones has not been sufficiently investigated so far. One of the reasons for this is that Armeno - Kipchak has already at the monument of its appearance and throughout the period of its existence a character of a stabilized and quite mature formation. Admittedly we are able to indicate some of its features both of its prime and decline concerning its snytax and vocabulary and originated under the Slavonic environment, but respective studies are still unsatisfactory.

Some interesting facts, listed lately by Y. R. Dashkevych, should be recalled here. Namely it has appeared that Armeno - Kipchak was, in one way or another, also during the second period known and used outside Ukraine — in İstanbul, Edirne, Lublin — as evidenced by some commercial and juridical documents and letters written in those places. Some records in this language, made by the archbishop N. Torosovich, or on his behalf,

were taken down in Rome. In Jerusalem, in 1619 a colophon and, in 1620, a small dictionary were written in this language. [6]

In a paper written in 1969 it was proved that one of the documents, dated 161 8, had been written in istanbul and that the language of this document had been influenced by Ottoman. [7] In fact, we find there such forms as : *tiurk* [= *türk*], *diugul* [çfr. Osm. *değil*], *giumruk'* [= Osm. *gümrük*], etc. Also in the domain of morphology we find *ben* and *benim* instead of common Kipchak forms *men* and *menim*. In the vocabulary we find *alla*~ 'Allah', instead of the Old Turkic and Kipchak *t'engri* 'God', also *ve*, instead of the usual *da* 'and'. One of the contracting parties was a Jew of İstanbul. [8]

But even the above cited and analogical cases like appearing of some Osmanli words in the "Chronicle of the Turkish Wars", to cite *halallaşmak* 'mutual forgiving of all that has been unjustly done (usually performed before battle)' or *Zapici* 'kapudshi (officer of the Sultan, messenger in state affairs)', [9] used along with a common Armeno - Kipchak *ZapuZci*, seem to be used as citations and are too accidental to prove the existence of a dialect.

Thus in search for dialectal differentiation we should rather turn back to the first period. It seems quite possible that the Armenian emigrants, living for a shorter or longer time in the Crimea and in the Dniestr or Don areas, [10] had a good apportunity to learn the Kipchak speech from various dialectally differentiated Turkic groups. The roots of this differentiation go deep in the past of the Western group of Turkic languages. The demonstration of such contacts, especilaly in regard to concrete ethnical units would be of importance both for the elucidation of the genesis of Armeno-Kipchak and some aspects of the historical dialectology of Turkic languages as well. Unfortunately, we are still far from reaching this aim. The problem is important and should be rediscussed each time that the textual basis becomes broder. It cannot however, be solved separately from hypotheses concerning place, time and the givers of the Kipchak speech to the Armenians.

Historical studies of the last years lead to the conclusion that some more durable contacts of Armenian emigrants with the Turks speaking

[6] Daşkeviç, "Armyano-kıpçakskiy yazık: etapı i istorii", p. 101.

[7] Ya. R. Daşkeviç-E. Tryjarski, "Armyano-kıpçaksikiy dokument iz Konstantinopolya 1618 g., *Folio Orientalia*, XI, 1969, pp. 123–137.

[8] Named Jakub Bičaqči = Iakub Nozownik, Daşkeviç-Trijarski' op. cit., pp. 124, 125, 127.

[9] E. Schütz, *An Armeno - Kipchak Chronicle on the Polish - Turkish Wars in* 1620–1621, Budapest 1968.

[10] "'Mıy sçitayem, çto protsess yazıkovoy kıpçakizatsii oḫvatil dispersno vse armyanskoe naselenie Krima, Povol'jya i Podnestroviya, a poiski konkretnogo tsentra projivaniya armyan-kıpçakofonov v Krimu ne mogut uvençat'sya uspehom", Daşkeviç, Armyano-kıpçakskiy yazık: etapı i istorii, p. 93.

what we actually call "Kipchak languages" were established in Crimea and that most probably also the borrowing of the language in question took place there. E. Schütz in a paper, published in 1976, studied in detail the circumstances in which, in one of the Crimean towns, this reception might have taken place. He pointed to Solzat, earlier : Eski Krim, in which the Coman - Kipchak language has generally been used.[11] Just the inhabitants of Solzat, the Kipchak speakers, should have been those who peopled the Polish - Ukrainian centers. A special role played in this process by the inhabitants of the Crimea was equally emphasized earlier by other specialists.[12] J. Dashian supposed that some of the manuscripts kept in Vienna collections could have been written in Crimea. This concerned mainly two manuscripts : Ms. No. 311 of the Mekhitarists collection containing an "Armeno - Kipchak Dictionary", and Ms. No. 143 of the same collection containing a "Brevier and prayers of the Armenian Church"[13]. But J. Dashian's supposition has been lately declared false by Y. Dashkevcyh.[14] His reservation seems to be correct, additionally corroborated by hundreds and hundreds of Polish and Ukrainian loan words which can be found in the mentioned "Dictionary" such as :

beséda, biegunkʻa, bidlo, bistriy, bla. (plaha), bilisk(a-niesi, bliskʻiy, blisçitçia bol-, blizna, blušnirça and

other to limit our list to the letter "B" only.[15] Though it has been known that the influence of the Ukrainian - Russian and Polish languages reached Crimea, as evidenced e. g. by the Slavic Words existing in the "Codex Cumanicus", the supposition that such a great number of mainly Polish words could be listed by Armenians in Crimea goes too far and seems to be nonsense.[16]

---

[11] E. Schütz, *Armeno - kiptschakisch und die Krim*, in : *Hungaro - Turcica. Studies in honour of Julies Németh*, Budapest 1976, p. 201.

[12] F. Macler, J. Deny, T. Kowalski, M. Lewicki and others.

[13] J. Dashian, *Catalog der armenischen Handschriften in der Mechitharisten - Bibliothek zu Wien*, Wien 1895, pp. 78, 162.

[14] "No soobşçeniya Taşnyana i Maklera postroeni v znaçitelnoy mere na nedorozumehaḥ", Daşkeviç, Armyano-kıpçakskiy yazık; etapı i isterli, p. 94. "However, part of the suppositions made by Tašyan and Macler as well as other references in various catalogues and reviews of manuscripts, have not yet been checked", the same, *Who are Armeno - Kipchaks? (On the Ethnical Substrate of the Armenian Colonies in the Ukraine)*, "Revue des Etudes Armeniennes", N. S. XVI, 1982, p. 392.

[15] E. Tryjarski, *Dictionnaire armeno - kiptchak d'apres trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*, I, Varsovie 1968–1972, fasc. 1.

[16] On the Coman - Slavic linguistic contacts see well-known studies by K. H. Menges, N. A. Baskakov and A. Zajaczkowski.

A similar case is probably the case of Ms. No. 143. Its partial analysis, embracing 54 final pages of the manuscript, has demonstrated the existence of such Polish words as :

hetman, mur, podpora, potop, riçér, rosa and one Ukrainian - Russian word *uruh* 'lesson, study',[17]

The above examples corroborate the opinion that the problem of dialectal differentation of Armeno - Kipchak can be solved through an inner linguistic analysis. Let us have a closer look at the problem.

The main difficulty here is to point to just such features which might be considered as relevant from a dialectal point of view. But it must be observed in this point that the phonological interpretation of the text in question breaks down on the border line between the Armenian graphic system and the Turkic phonetics. The fact is that in many a case one cannot be sure of an approximate but genuine value of a phonem rendered by an Armenian graphic sign which, in addition, used to be arbitrarily applied by different authors and copyists. Quite perplexing here are problems regarding the vocalism. It has been known that the Armenian alphabet has the possibility of rendering the common Turkic *ö* and *ü* by means of two signs (to[o] and ...), but in Armeno - Kipchak texts just this ststem of writing is used only exceptionally. So in this important point as well as in other problems connected with the vocal harmony the picture remains unclear.[18]

A considerable long list of vocalic alternances should be observed :

−a− ∼ −è−	*(har ∼ hér; yaniçèri ∼ yèniçeri; bazirgan ∼ bèzirgan)*
−a− ∼ −o−	*(zatun ∼ zotun; maydan ∼ meydan; aldawuçi ∼ aldo-wuçi)*
−e ∼ −i−	*(bér− ∼ bir−)*
e− ∼ è−	*(èt− ∼ it−)*
e− ∼ ie−	*(.....)*
−i− ∼ −i−	*(zizil ∼ zizil)*
i− ∼ i−	*(zotinli ∼ zotinli)*
−i− ∼ −u−	*(džift ∼ džuft)*
−i ∼ −u	*(uçunçi ∼ uçunçu; buni ∼ bunu; zuti ∼ zutu)*
−o− ∼ −u−	*(yol ∼ yul; zol ∼ zul; toz ∼ tuz)*

[17] E. Tryjarski, *The Story of Holy Mariane in the Kipchak Language of the Polish Armeni-* (in print).

[18] The question was often discussed by Kraelitz - Greifenhorst, Dent, Kowalski, Pritsak, especially by Ö. Schütz, *On the Transcription of Armeno - Kipchak*, AOH, XII, 1-3, 1961, pp. 139–161.

-u- ∼ -a-   (yuzov ∼ yazov ;   džuvap ∼ džavap)

-u- ∼ -i-   (altun ∼ altïn ;   zatun ∼ zatun ∼ zatïn;   sučsuz ∼ sučsiz)

-u- ∼ -o-   (buyruz ∼ boyruz).[19]

The using of two o– signs (.. and O) has most probably no pronological background. It is clearly visible that, on one hand, the Armenian alphabet is able to render nearly all basic phonems of Western Turkic languages and, on the other, it possesses some signs in excess for the same purpose. This last circumstance enabled the writers and copyists to use some signs alternatively in a quite individual manner. This corncerns mainly the consonants. As a good example may serve here the way in which the signs denoting the Armenian aspirates were applied to render Turkic phonems in which the aspiration has most probably never existed : ata ∼ atʻa 'father'. Our guess is that a difficulty to catch subtle sonic varieties of a Turkic speech and the excess of Armenian signs for the affricates produced such doublets as džuhut džuvut and even çhut, oruc and orud, tamzaçi and tamzadži.

We would like to recall here a most complicated picture of Armeno - Kipchak stops. In their case the common Turkic alternances b ∼ p, d ∼ t, k ∼ g were confronted by the Armenian phonological opposition b ∼ p, d ∼ t, k ∼ g which originated from the 10th century and divided Middle Armenian into two linguistic branches which exist up to the present day : eastern and western. [20] It is to be feared that the application of the Armenian graphic signs, denoting alternatively in two different areas two series of stops standing in a phonological opposition, just to render the Kıpchak explosive and implosive consonants makes a phonogical recontruction of the last practically impossible.

We give hereafter a list of frequent consonant alternances :

t- ∼ d-   (tiftar ∼ diftar ;   tayfa ∼ dayfa ;   tugul ∼ dugul)

-t- ∼ -d-   (keltir- ∼ keldir-

-t ∼ -d   (na.t ∼ na.d)

-b ∼ -p   dzuvab ∼ dzuvap)

b- ∼ m-   (bunung ∼ munung ;   bunu ∼ munu, etc.

g- ∼ k-   (gel- ∼ kel-)

-k ∼ -g   (yuk ∼ yug)

q- ∼ z-   (zan ;   zašuz)

---

[19] These and following examples have been mainly taken from the texts edited by Lewicki - Kohnowa (Code...), Kraelitz - Greifenhorst (Sprachprobe = Psalm 50 [51]), Tryjarski, (Dictionnaire).

[20] Cfr. for instance J. Karst, Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch - Armenischen..., Strassburg 1901, p. 1, 75 ff. In reality, this process was very complicated cfr. A. Pisowicz, Le développement du consonantisme armenien, Wroclaw - Warszawa - Krakew - Gdansk 1976.

$-q \sim -z$	*(zasuz)*	
$-z- \sim -\gamma-$	*(azča $\sim$ aγča ; sazlan- $\sim$ sazlan-)*	
$-h- \sim -v-$	*(džuhut $\sim$ džuvut)*	
$-l- \sim -n-$	*bular $\sim$ bunar)*	
$-m- \sim -n-$	*(zaramγu $\sim$ zaranγu)*	
$ng \sim -n-$	*(songra $\sim$ sonra)*	
$-f- \sim -v-$	*(ufak $\sim$ uvak)*	
$-v \sim -f$	*(aruv $\sim$ aruf)*	
$-dž- \sim č-$	*(džuvap $\sim$ čavap)*	
$-dž- \sim -č-$	*(toradži $\sim$ torači)*	
$-dž \sim -č$	*(orudž $\sim$ oruč*	
$-š- \sim -z-$	*(ošta $\sim$ ozta)*	

etc.

Phonetic changes along with a surplus of Armenian alphabetical signs have lead to the polymorphism of Armeno - Kipchak words like : *zaramzu $\sim$ zaranγu $\sim$ zarankγu $\sim$ zaranzu* or *iiltrim $\sim$ iertrim* and others.

In the Armeno - Kipchak shows also such well known phonetic phenomena as : assimilation and dissimilation *(sossuz < sozsuz; bittir- < bit- dir-)*, metathesis *(baryam < bayram)*; *zanča < začan)*, elision of vowels *(zz < ziz; vozsa < vozesa)* and of consonants *(idži < indži ; išan < nišan ; bi < biy ; karvasara < karvansaray)*, intercalation of additional or parasite phonems *(biznim < bizim ; čivit < čift)*, etc. Some of these phenomena have a common character and can be observed in other Turkic languages, the others are individual and were used more or less consequently by a given writer or copyist. It cannot be excluded that some of them could serve as discriminants in a dialectal analysis.

In the future the most desired edition of all existing Armeno-Kipchak texts and a possible application of computerized calculations will surely make the picture of this language more clear. My quess is, however, that even then the problem by which we are confronted today, namely that of a choice of relevant features applicable for dialectal analysis, will remain as a perpetual crux for the researchers.