

Sonderdruck

# Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher

Internationale Zeitschrift für uralische und altaische Forschung  
International Journal of Uralic and Altaic Studies  
Journal International des Études Ouraliennes et Altaïques  
Международный журнал урало- и алтаеведения

Im Auftrage der Societas Uralo-Altaica  
herausgegeben von  
Hans-Hermann Bartens - Klaus Röhrborn  
Klaus Sagaster - Eberhard Winkler

Neue Folge

Band 21

2007

In Kommission bei  
HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG

Die Zeitschrift erscheint jährlich in einem Band von ca. 20 Druckbogen.  
Bestellungen werden in jeder Buchhandlung angenommen.

Es wird gebeten, Manuskripte, Rezensionsexemplare, Dissertationen usw.  
direkt an die Herausgeber der betreffenden Fachgebiete zu senden.

Die Verfasser von Aufsätzen erhalten 20 Separata und  
die Mitarbeiter am Berichts- und Besprechungsteil 10 Separata kostenfrei.

Anschriften und Fachgebiete der Herausgeber:

Dr. Hans-Hermann Bartens (Finnougristik, Finnopermistik)  
Finnisch-ugrisches Seminar der Universität Göttingen  
Theaterstraße 14, D-37073 Göttingen

Prof. Dr. Klaus Röhrborn (Turkologie)  
Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde der Universität Göttingen  
Waldweg 26, D-37073 Göttingen

Prof. Dr. Klaus Sagaster (Mongolistik, Tungusologie, Koreanistik, Altaistik)  
Institut für Orient- und Asienwissenschaften,  
Abteilung für Mongolistik und Tibetstudien der Universität Bonn  
Regina-Pacis-Weg 7, D-53113 Bonn

Prof. Dr. Eberhard Winkler (Uralistik, Ugristik, Samojedistik)  
Finnisch-ugrisches Seminar der Universität Göttingen  
Theaterstraße 14, D-37073 Göttingen

Informationen über die Societas Uralo-Altaica e. V., Göttingen,  
und ihre Publikationen finden Sie unter:

<http://www:s-u-a.de>

77. **pür ay** 'January'; cf. Chin. 一月 *yi-yue* 'id.' ("one-month")
78. **igi ay** 'February'; cf. Chin. 二月 *er-yue* 'id.' ("two-month")
79. **uš ay** 'March'; cf. Chin. 三月 *san-yue* 'id.' ("three-month")
80. **turt<sup>h</sup> ay** 'April'; cf. Chin. 四月 *si-yue* 'id.' ("four-month")
81. **piš ay** 'May'; cf. Chin. 五月 *wu-yue* 'id.' ("five-month")
82. **alt<sup>h</sup>i ay** 'June'; cf. Chin. 六月 *liu-yue* 'id.' ("six-month")
83. **č<sup>h</sup>it<sup>h</sup>i ay** 'July'; cf. Chin. 七月 *qi-yue* 'id.' ("seven-month")
84. **sigis ay** 'August'; cf. Chin. 八月 *ba-yue* 'id.' ("eight-month")
85. **toyis ay** 'September'; cf. Chin. 九月 *jiu-yue* 'id.' ("nine-month")
86. **on ay** 'October'; cf. Chin. 十月 *shi-yue* 'id.' ("ten-month")
87. **on bür ay** 'November'; cf. Chin. 十一月 *shi-yi-yue* 'id.' ("eleven-month")
88. **on igi ay** 'December'; cf. Chin. 十二月 *shi-er-yue* 'id.' ("twelve-month")
- 
- čagan sara* or in formal style *terigün sara*. The solar months are designated by the ordinal numbers, so that January is *nigedüger sara*, etc.) (LESSING 1960: 674a).  
*γurban sara* 'March; three months' (LESSING 1960: 674a).  
*dörben sara* 'April' (LESSING 1960: 268b).  
*tabun sara* 'the fifth month, May' (LESSING 1960: 674b).  
*jiřgugan sara* 'June; sixth month' (LESSING 1960: 1059b).  
*dolugan sara* 'seventh months, July' (LESSING 1960: 260a).  
*nayman sara* 'August; the eighth month of the lunar year; eight months' (LESSING 1960: 559a).  
*arban sara* 'October; tenth month (lunar); ten months' (LESSING 1960: 49b).  
*arban nigen sara* 'November; eleventh month (lunar)' (LESSING 1960: 49b).  
*arban qoyar sara* 'December; twelfth month (lunar); twelve months' (LESSING 1960: 49b, 955b).

## Some notes on Modern Kipchak Turkic (Part 1)

by CLAUS SCHÖNIG, Berlin

### 0 Introduction

The aim of this article is to present a proposal for an internal linguistic division of Modern Kipchak Turkic (in short: Kipchak), which at the same time contributes to the understanding of the historical development of this language group and helps to fix its position within Turkic. An internal division of Modern Turkic including an internal division of Kipchak has already been proposed in SCHÖNIG (1999). Here, I shall try to strengthen the previously given division lines by adding new features, some of which are also useful for the internal division of whole Modern Turkic. At the same time, I shall present some other features, which only partly fit the given model, but point to developments, which have not been discussed yet. Anyhow, this article has only an explorative character. A more or less complete investigation of Kipchak must take into account the immense amount of all available dialect materials (here mainly written languages and a very limited number of dialectal materials, which have been used thus far, are treated). But even if this article is full of generalizations, I hope that it is a helpful contribution to a better understanding of the internal structures of Modern Kipchak.<sup>1</sup>

### 1 Kipchak as Norm Turkic

According to the definition given in SCHÖNIG (1999) Kipchak Turkic is Norm Turkic, since it has lost the Ancient Turkic word-initial *\*h-*<sup>2</sup> it has

<sup>1</sup> When no other bibliographical information is given, the data are cited according to the standard grammars, dictionaries or articles in YN and PTF about the languages in question; the ("standard") data for Baraba are given according to DMITRIEVA, for Tomsk Tatar according to TUMAŠEVA, for Salar according to TENIŠEV 1974a, and for Sarygh Yughur according to TENIŠEV 1974b. In general, these standard works are only mentioned in the text if the data are of more than of general interest.

<sup>2</sup> In this context it is of some interest that Arabic and Persian words with initial *b-* and *h-*, which probably were borrowed quite early, have lost their initial consonant, see, e. g. Fu-yü Turkic *ič* ← *hič* 'no(t)/nothing/nobody (at all) (with negative predicate)', Tatar *äzër* 'ready' (beside *xäzër* 'now'), *äräm* 'in vain, useless', Altay Turkic *urmat* 'good luck; success; reputation'.

kept the distinction *\*č* : *\*y-* in word-initial position, it shows a nominal plural suffix +*LAr*, it possesses a gerund in *-p*, it further displays cognates of the conditional suffix *-sAr*, and has a third person imperative suffix going back to *-ZUn*.

Besides, Kipchak (like most of other Turkic languages) shows a lot of other features, which may be called Norm Turkic or even Common Turkic,<sup>3</sup> e. g. the use of designations for certain things, activities etc. like (not taking into account the probable vowel length) *\*adaq* 'foot', *\*qol* 'arm', *\*sün(g)äk* 'bone', *\*bäni* ~ *\*bäni* 'brain', *\*büñiz* ~ *\*büñiz* 'horn', *\*sač* 'hair', *\*äv* 'house', *\*tağ* 'mountain', *\*tamğa* 'mark, seal', *\*tilkü* 'fox', *\*tağnaq* 'chicken', *\*buqa* 'bull', *\*höküz* '(castrated) bull; ox', *\*yultuz* 'star', *\*bäg* '(a title)', *\*alton* 'gold', *\*baqır* 'copper', *\*balčiq* 'mud',<sup>4</sup> *\*sariğ* 'yellow', *\*aq* 'white', *\*qara* 'black', *\*yaşıl* '(a type of) green', *\*bütün* 'all; whole', *\*al-* 'to take', *\*bar-* 'to go to', *\*ber-* 'to give', *\*uč-* 'to fly', *\*tur-* 'to stand (up)', *\*yat-* 'to lie (idle, down)' etc. Some of these widespread features can only be noted in a more abstract way, e. g. *\*VzAyV* 'stirrup', *\*tAy(V)r(V)* 'heaven; god', *\*hVğaç* 'tree', *\*yWr(I)-* 'to go, move', *\*o(I)(t)ur-* 'to sit (down)', *\*hVğla-* 'to cry', *\*bit-* ~ *\*büit-* 'to come to an end' etc. The same holds true for the numerals with intervocalic consonants, which clearly go back to the same roots, even if we are not able to reconstruct the exact basic form; anyhow, Kipchak exhibits the Common Turkic set of numerals. On the morphological level, Kipchak uses cognates of the impersonal interrogative pronoun *\*ne(mä)*, the personal interrogative *\*KVm*, the personal pronouns *\*bän* : *\*sän* :: *\*biz* : *\*siz*, possessive suffixes going back to *\*+(I)m* (pl. +*Iz*)/*\*+(I)ŋ* (pl. +*Iz*)/*\*+(s)l*. Kipchak has a pro-

<sup>3</sup> According to SCHÖNIG (1999) a feature is called Common Turkic if it is attestable in all Turkic languages, or if its loss in one, some or most of them is explicable, i. e. "Common Turkic" is used in the sense of German *Gesamttürkisch* and not in the sense of *Gemeintürkisch* designating phenomena in all Turkic languages except Bulghar Turkic. Since Norm Turkic and Common Turkic are statistically defined units, such features are not necessarily of Turkic origin, but may be borrowed from other languages.

<sup>4</sup> Today the word for 'mud' is *\*balčiq* in Central Turkic and Chuvash (Crimean Tatar, Tatar, Caucasus Kipchak, Kirghiz *balčiq*, Krymchak *balčix*, Karaim *balčiq*, *balčiq*, *balčix* etc., Noghay, Central Kipchak *balsiq*, Siberian Tatar and Chulym Turkic (R IV 1172 Baraba, Küärik) *palčiq*, Chuvash *pilčäk*, Bashkir *balsiq*, Uzbek *balčiq*, Turkmen, Azeri *palčiq*, Turkish *balçık*), *\*balčaq* in Yakut (R IV 1172 *čalbak* 'Schmutz; Sumpf'; YAKRS 507 *čalbas* 'puddle'), and metathetical *\*balğas* < *\*balğaç* < *\*balčaq* < *balčiq* in Sayan Turkic and Altay Turkic; in Yenisey Turkic (= Khakas and Shor) we find *\*balčaq* ~ *\*balğaç* (e. g. R IV 1169 Täläut, Kumanda, Altay Kizhi *palğas* 'Schmutz, Schlamm, Erde, Lehm', 1170 Chalkandu, Shor, Altay Kizhi *palğas* 'id.', Saghay, Koybal *palğas* 'id.', R IV 1172 Saghay, Koybal, Kacha *palčaq* 'Schmutz, Sumpf', 2042 Shor, Saghay *malčaq* 'id.'). For Kazakh ("Kir.") RADLOFF gives R IV 1506 *balšiq* 'Lehm, Schmutz' and 1499 *balğas* 'ein sumpfiges, mit Grashügeln bedecktes Land; der Sumpfhügel'; the latter must be a borrowing from some South Siberian vernacular used as a landscape term. See also CLAUSON (1972, 333) *balčiq* 'mud'.

nominal *-n-* in the oblique forms of the third person possessive suffix and of the demonstrative pronouns, it possesses a demonstrative pronoun of proximity *\*bu* (*\*bo*) (not in Bulghar Turkic), case-marked forms of *\*qaño*: 'which' to ask for places, directions etc., *\*+nčl*-ordinals, a denominal adjective suffix *\*+llG*, an agent noun in *\*+čl*, a locative in *\*+DA*, an ablative in *\*+DAn*, a preterite in *\*+DI*, a perfect form formally based on a participle, a negative aorist in *\*-mAz*, and formally renewed present tense forms of the type *vocalic gerund* + (*\*o(l)(t)ur-*, *\*tur-*, *\*yat-*, *\*yWr(l)-*) + *aorist*. Kipchak uses the demonstrative pronoun of distance *\*ol* as the personal pronoun of the third person. Like in most Turkic languages word-initial *\*b-* is changed to *\*m-*, if a nasal consonant appears at the end of the first syllable; for Karaim see 7. Furthermore, Old Turkic *ń* has developed to *y*. One may even include features such as postpositional use of cognates of *tüb* 'root; bottom part' (see SCHÖNIG 2005a), of biverbs with *\*bašla-* to express 'to begin to ...' and of *\*et-* for denominal verb derivation into the set of modern Norm Turkic and Common Turkic features of Kipchak. Kipchak, like the remainder of non-(Western)-Oghuz Norm Turkic, has preserved cognates of Old Turkic *-GUr*-causatives besides newly developed *-GVz-* and *-GVt-*forms (see SCHÖNIG 2004a)<sup>5</sup>, but has lost the Ancient Turkic opposition between the positive and negative participles *-mİš*, *-DOK* : *-mADOK* (different from Yakut, Dolgan, and Gagauz).<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, it uses *tap-* for 'to find' and has lost *bul-* 'id.' (different from Yakut, Dolgan and Turkish), uses *bar-* meaning 'to go to', and *bol-* 'to be, become' (unlike Western Oghuz with *ol-*; for Crimean Tatar *ol-* ~ *bol-* see DOERFER (1959, 379), for Krymchak *ol-* see REBI 156)). Like most of non-Sayanic Norm Turkic, Kipchak uses *\*čiq-* for 'to go out (up)' (Old Turkic *tašiq-*).

## 2 Kipchak as Central Turkic

Kipchak is one of the three main branches of Central Turkic, i. e. it knows the sound change of Ancient Turkic *-d(-)* > *-y(-)*, forms of the personal interrogative pronoun reconstructable as *\*kim*, cognates of the verbs *\*toğ-* 'to give birth ~ to be born'<sup>7</sup> and *\*ket-* 'to go away', forms of the type *\*o(l)tIr-* to

<sup>5</sup> Azeri *durğuz-* 'to cause to stand' is perhaps a borrowing from non-Oghuz Turkic. Gagauz *durğut-* 'id.' may be derived by the help of a suffix *\*-KIt-*, which is perhaps derived from the old causative of *kör-*, see SCHÖNIG 2004a).

<sup>6</sup> Even Turkmen still exhibits a system, in which the successor of *-miš*, the perfect participle in *-An* < *-GAn*, still shows a negative counterpart *-mAdIK* (see AZIMOV (1966, 102) and TKMGR 355ff.).

<sup>7</sup> Karachay-Balkar has a form of *\*yarat-*, which reminds one of the use of *šura-* < *\*yara-* in Chuvash (perhaps by mere coincidence).

designate 'to sit (down)', the privative suffix *+sIz*, and replacement of the first person plural ending *+(l)mIz* by *+K* in the *DI*-preterite and the conditional (except Altay Turkic, which shows both forms). The old postvocalic *-yUr*-aorists are changed to *-r*-forms; thus the formal correspondence between the *-yUr*-aorists of the vocalic gerund *-yU* has dissolved. Instead of Old Turkic *ay-* 'to speak', Central Turkic uses the causative form *ayt-* (originally 'to ask') with the same meaning.<sup>8</sup> Nearly all Central Turkic languages exhibit cognates of *\*yartım* 'help'. In Central Turkic (including most dialects of Altay and Chulyum Turkic), the form of the word for 'stirrup' shows the labial initial vowel, i. e. it is of the type *\*üzängü*; of Kipchak, only Karaim with *özängü* ~ *äzingä* (< *\*izängä* or *\*üzängü* ?) and Baraba with *izängü* exhibit forms with illabial initial vowel (like Chuvash, Sarygh Yughur, and Northeast Turkic, except Altay Turkic).<sup>9</sup> Most of Central Turkic (including Southern Altay Turkic) together with Khalaj use *\*sigir* for 'cow'.<sup>10</sup> Different from Northeast Turkic (i. e. Lena Turkic and South Siberian Turkic) and Chuvash, Central Turkic has developed a causative form *kör-sät-* 'to show' < *kör-* 'to see' (in Western Oghuz in the metathetical form *\*köstär-*; for Far Western Kipchak see 7).<sup>11</sup> As in Central Turkic (and Kipchakoid South Siberian consisting of Altay Turkic, Chulyum Turkic, Shor, and Khakas), in Kipchak the verb *et-* is used for denominal verb derivation.

The root element *\*il* 'before, first; front side etc.' and its derivations are common in Central Turkic (including Küärik, but rare in South Siberian); in Kipchak they are only absent in Caucasus Kipchak and Noghay. Chuvash *ëlëk* 'ran'še, prežde, nekogda' and *ëlëxi* 'staryy, davniy' (ČuvRS 100) are borrowings from Tatar. Other derivations of *\*il* with different meanings can be found in Yakut, Dolgan, and Salar.

Central Turkic (including Küärik) and Chuvash exhibit *\*tağnq* < *\*taquq* (*\*ta:quq?*) for 'chicken, hen',<sup>12</sup> *\*täñiz* for 'sea',<sup>13</sup> and *\*sävv-* for 'to love'.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cognates of *ay-* 'to speak' have survived in Border Turkic, e. g. Sarygh Uyghur *ay-* 'id.' and Khalaj *ha:y-* 'id.' (DOERFER; TEZCAN 1980, 127); cognates of *ayt-* 'to ask' we find, e. g., in Chuvash *iyt-* 'id.', Yakut *iyt-* 'id.', and Dolgan *iyit-* 'id.' (< *iy-* 'to say, speak').

<sup>9</sup> In Shor we find *\*ü-* ~ *\*i-* ~ *\*ä-zängä*, in Northern Altay Turkic Kumanda *\*i-* ~ *\*ä-zängä* ~ *\*üzängü*. Of course, the form in Baraba may be also explained by a vowel metathesis of *\*üzängi*.

<sup>10</sup> Salar (TENIŠEV) has *sibir* 'bull' < *\*sigir*.

<sup>11</sup> Khalaj *kärsät-* (DOERFER; TEZCAN 1980, 148) may be borrowed from Western Oghuz; see SCHÖNIG 2004a.

<sup>12</sup> Chuvash has *čäx(ä)* < *\*tiğnq* (RÓNA-TAS 1971, 394) < *\*tağnq*; South Siberian (including Altay Turkic) mostly shows the contracted form *\*ta(:)q* (often in competition with Mongolic *takiya*). Khalaj *kitik* 'hen' resembles Tatar *kētäk* 'id.' probably only by coincidence (see DOERFER; TEZCAN 1980, 154).

Central Turkic, Chuvash and Kipchakoid South Siberian have developed renewed present tense forms (etymologically consisting of a gerund and an auxiliary verb, see 1) to suffixes. Central Turkic (except Turkish) and Chuvash use forms consisting of a gerund and *bil(-mä)-* to express the (im-)possibility to perform an action. Most parts of Central Turkic except Turkish employ cognates of Old Turkic *qadit-* 'to return' (except Altay Turkic and Salar, which employ cognates of Old Turkic *\*yan-*) and reflexive pronouns based on *öz+* (except Karachay-Balkar and Altay Turkic,<sup>15</sup> see 5.2). Most Central Turkic languages (including Salar, but not Turkish) do not use direct cognates of Old Turkic *udī-* for 'to sleep' (like non-Central Northeast Turkic and Turkish), but derivations of the type *\*udī-* + deverbal noun suffix + denominal verbal derivation suffix, see 3. In Central Turkic except Altay Turkic ((most of) Kipchak, Southeast Turkic, and Oghuz),<sup>16</sup> we mainly find *\*qor(ğa)ş(un)* for 'lead'.<sup>17</sup>

### 3 Kipchak as -GAn-Turkic

The Central Turkic sub-branches Kipchak and Southeast Turkic together with the languages of the South Siberian area form the -GAn-Turkic area. Eastern Oghuz Turkmen and Salar have a transitory position and exhibit at least some features of this grouping; sometimes even Azeri and Chuvash are associated. The main feature of this area (including Turkmen and perhaps Chuvash), the use of the perfect participle in -GAn instead of -mlš in finite and attributive positions, is shared by all Kipchak languages.<sup>18</sup> The same

<sup>13</sup> This word is replaced by *\*dalai* (← Mongolic) in South Siberian; Altay Turkic and Khakas show both forms.

<sup>14</sup> In Volga-Ural Kipchak cognates of *\*yarat-* are used alternatively and have been borrowed into Chuvash (*yurat-*).

<sup>15</sup> Standard Altay Turkic uses the cognate *boy ~ poy* of Old Turkic *\*bod* 'shape' as the base of the reflexive pronouns; such forms are attested for all its dialects except Tölös in my materials, too. Besides at least Täläut, Tuba, and Kumanda also use forms of *\*öz*. Chulym Turkic mainly uses cognates of *\*öz*; here mainly Küarik uses *poy* (see R IV 1262).

<sup>16</sup> In Modern Uyghur as *qorǵusul* (TMEN III 453, according to MENGES); for the short forms in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Tobol Tatar, and Baraba see 5.2. Oghuz has *\*qorşun*, which was borrowed to Crimean Tatar; in Karaim *\*qorǵosun ~ \*qorşun* the latter form goes back to Oghuz influence. See also SCHÖNIG 2005b.

<sup>17</sup> Mainly in Northeast Turkic this word is replaced by *\*qorgolşun* ← Mongolic ← Bulghar Turkic.

<sup>18</sup> This does not automatically exclude that cognates of -mlš are also used, e. g., in complex verbal forms, in special sorts of texts, in non-finite position etc. For non-finite -mlš in Western Siberian Tatar see *qaytmışlarinta* 'qaytqanda; kogda vernulsya', *yevärměšlärěndä* 'jibärgändä; kogda poslali, ...' (АХАТОВ 1963, 156). For -mlš as a derivational suffix, e. g., in

holds true for the preservation of syllable initial *G* after the first syllable border (in Turkmen sporadically), postvocalic -y-forms of the vocalic gerund (< -yU), a common negative counterpart *\*-mAy(In)* of both the gerund in -p and the vocalic gerund in syntactically free use (Turkmen also *-mAn*, besides *-mAzdan*; like Uzbek *-masdan*).<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, there are common subject marking strategies in relative clauses, the headword of which is not referentially identical with the subject of the relative clause. Kipchak like most -GAn-Turkic languages – together with Turkmen and Chuvash – exhibits many biverbal constructions expressing *Aktionsarten* built according to identical patterns. In the same languages *\*qodan* is used for 'hare' (Kipchak *\*qoyan*); Chuvash *quyan* looks like a borrowing from Volga-Ural-Kipchak, whereas the Turkmen form may be a loanword from non-Oghuz Central Asian Turkic. Furthermore, modern -GAn-Turkic together with Turkmen, Chuvash, and Yakut exhibit cognates of the Old Turkic verb *i:d-* 'to send' and/or of its derivation *i:du ber-* 'id.' (Kipchak *\*yibär-*, Uzbek *yubär-*)<sup>20</sup> and normally do not employ *\*-DOK*-participles in the predicates of relative clauses. To express 'cartilage', today *\*kämircäk* is used in Central Turkic -GAn-Turkic (Kipchak (including Southern Altay Turkic) and Southeast Turkic) as well as in Chuvash (and as an alternative form in Turkmen and

Eastern Bashkir dialects see МАКСЮТОВА (1976, 50; 111–2; 190; 267–8). For the sporadic use of -mlš in the Southern Bashkir dialect of Ik-Sakmar see МІРЖАНОВА (1979, 68).

<sup>19</sup> Analogized forms of gerundial negation (e. g. *\*-mAp* or *\*-mAyIp* for the gerund in -(Ip) are very rare in Northern Turkic members of -GAn-Turkic (e. g. in Kirghiz *-BApItr*, the negative counterpart of *-pItr*) (see 6.2) and seem to exist mainly in Oghuz, Misher Tatar, and Southeast Turkic; in Uzbek they seem to be limited to biverbal constructions and to aspectotemporal forms like in Kirghiz. The suffixes of the negative gerunds show a wide range of variations, the distribution of which does not follow other known patterns. Thus a form in *\*-mAy* appears in Crimean Tatar, Kumyk, Noghay, Karakalpak, and Volga-Ural Kipchak (as in Modern Uyghur). In Karachay-Balkar *\*-mAy* appears besides *\*-mAyIn*, which dominates in Altay Turkic and remaining South Siberian; from this form a suffix in *\*-mAyInčA* is derived, which appears, e. g., in Kirghiz (besides *\*-mAy* and *\*-mAyIn*) and Karaim (besides *\*-mAyIn*). There is also *\*-mAyčA*, which is used, e. g., in Tatar; the dialects of Tatar and Siberian Tatar show, e. g. central dialect of Tatar *\*-mAy(čV)*, *\*-mAyInčV*, *\*-mAyčAn*, Misher *\*-mAy(In)(čV)*, *\*-mAp*, *\*-mAy(čA)*, Orenburg Tatar *\*-mAy*, *\*-mAy(In)(čV(K))*, Tobol-Irtysh Tatar *\*-mAy(čV)*, *\*-mAy(In)(čV)*, and Baraba *\*-mAy*, *\*-mAyčV*, *\*-mAyIn(čV)* (see YUSUPOV 1985, 159).

<sup>20</sup> The distribution of the cognates of the Old Turkic verb *i:d-* 'to send' (in Baraba, Kirghiz, Kazakh, Karaim, and Karachay-Balkar besides *i:du ber-*, in South Siberian exclusively) : *i:du ber-* 'id.' (Kipchak, (parts of) Southeast Turkic, and Turkmen) may point to an Northern Turkic archaic border feature, s. 6.2. Turkmen *iber-* connects this language with the Central Asian area; but as an auxiliary verb *goyber-* < *\*qod-u ber-* is employed in Turkmen, perhaps an (Old) Oghuz equivalent to *\*idu ber-*. Modern Uyghur has *ävät-* (even as an auxiliary verb). Ottoman *ver(i)bi-* 'to send' (see TS VI 4167) is probably developed from *\*verip iy-* < *\*berip i:d-*.

Azeri, and also in Ottoman Turkish).<sup>21</sup> Mainly in Central Turkic *-GAn-Turkic* (including Turkmen dialects), cognates of *ald* ‘in front of exist, whereas *alt*-forms meaning ‘under; below’ are missing (see SCHÖNIG 2005a); the latter appear at the borders of the Turkic area (in most of Border Turkic South Siberian, in Sarygh Yughur, Western Oghuz, and non-Norm Turkic). For ‘to resemble’ we have *\*W(g)ša-* in nearly all Central Turkic *-GAn-Turkic* (including Salar (TENIŠEV) and Azeri,<sup>22</sup> but not Turkmen).

Most of Central Turkic *-GAn-Turkic* (and Chuvash) have not preserved direct cognated of Old Turkic *udī-* ‘to sleep’. Thus Kirghiz has *uqta-* < *\*uqla-* (? < *\*nyuqta-* or *\*yuqla-*) (like Southeast Turkic, Salar (TENIŠEV) *uxla-*, Täläüt of Bachatsk *uqta-*, Chulym Turkic *uqla-*, and Turkmen *uqla-* (← Southeast Turkic)). A form *\*nyuq+LA-* exists in Altay Turkic (*nyuqta-*) and Kazakh (*uyiqta-*). Karakalpak has kept a cognate *uyqila-* to Chaghatay *uyqula-*, i. e. a form derived from the old verbal noun *uyqu* ‘sleep; the Noghay form *uyqta-* may stem from *uyqula-* as well as from *nyuqta-*. Western Kipchak and Baraba exhibit *\*yuqla-* (? < *\*nyuqta-* or *\*yuqula-*; Karachay-Balkar *juqla-*, Kumyk *yuxla-*, Crimean Tatar *yuqla-*, Karaim *yuqla-*, *yuxla-*, Baraba, Tatar, Bashkir *yoqla-*).<sup>23</sup> Most probably this feature developed in the context of the West : East division, see 6.1.

<sup>21</sup> In Kipchak we find *kämircäk* in Karaim, Crimean Tatar, Karachay-Balkar, Kirghiz, and Baraba (R II 1210 *kämirdzäk*), *kimerçäk* in Tatar (R II 1404 *kimircäk* tat. ‘Knorpel’, tob. *kimircäk*), *kimersäk* in Bashkir, *kämircäk* (!) ‘cartilage; auricle’ in Krymchak, and *käbirçäk* (R II 1196) ~ *kämircäk* (R II 1210) in Täläüt and the dialect of the Altay-Kizhi; of Southeast Turkic, Uzbek has *kemircäk*, whereas Modern Uyghur has *kömüçäk* (for the drop of *r* before consonants see also fn. 111). Chuvash has *kämärçäk*. Turkmen exhibits *gemirček* besides *kekirdevük*; the latter reminds of back vocalic forms like Turkish *kıkırdak* (for Ottoman Turkish see TS IV 2173 *kakırdak*, *kıırdak* ‘kuyruk, iç yağı gibi maddelerin yağları sızdırıldıktan sonra kalan posası, kıkırdak’) and Gagauz *kıkırdak* (~ *kıırdak*). Azeri has *gigirdag* and *xämirçäk* besides *xirtänäk*; for Ottoman Turkish see R II 1207 osm. *kämärtlik* = *kämärçik* ‘Knorpel’. There are forms showing assimilation of the initial consonant to the fricative in Noghay, Karakalpak (*šämirsäk*), and Kazakh (*šemiršek*, R IV 1020 *šämirsäk*), i. e. Noghay and Central Kipchak. In Northern Altay Turkic Chalkandu we find *kävircäk* ‘throat, Adam’s apple’, Kumanda has *käbärçäk*, *käbiräk*, *käbirçä*, *kämircäk* ‘cartilage’. The remaining South Siberian Turkic uses something like *\*käçir* (> *käjir* etc.) for ‘cartilage’.

<sup>22</sup> These two Oghuz languages (see DWYER 1998) may have gained or preserved this verb by *-GAn-Turkic* areal influence. Even Sayan Turkic Uryangkay (KATANOV) has *oqša-*, *oşqa-*. In Sayan Turkic Tuvan the verb has survived in the postposition *işqaş*, in Khakas in *osxas* (R I 1141 Kacha *osqis*, Saghay *osqas* ‘ähnlich, gleich’) with the typically South Siberian metathesis *-Kš- > -šK-*; in Baraba we find *okšaš* ‘id.’

<sup>23</sup> Direct cognates of Old Turkic *udī-* ‘to sleep’ have survived only in Northeast Turkic (except Altay Turkic, but including Sarygh Yughur) and Turkish. Azeri *yuxu* (in *yuxusu käl-* ‘to fell asleep’) may be connected with the Western Kipchak form, if it has not developed independently. Chuvash *šivär-* points to a form with initial *\*y-*, perhaps *\*yuqu*, with intervocalic sonorized *\*-q-*, which later became *-v-*; the final *-r* must be a denominal verbal suffix.

Non-Sayanic *-GAn-Turkic* (Southeast Turkic, Kipchak, and Kipchakoid South Siberian; including Turkmen) has postconsonantal forms *-A* of the vocalic gerund, whereas after vowels *-y* (< *-yU*) is employed. In the same area and additionally in Turkmen we find *\*taşla-* for ‘to let, give up, leave behind, throw’, see also 7. In non-Sayanic *-GAn-Turkic* (including Azeri and Sonqori) we find forms of *\*tilkü* ‘fox’ going back to a regressively labialized *\*tülkü*.<sup>24</sup> Together with Chuvash (← Volga-Ural-Kipchak?), non-Sayanic *-GAn-Turkic* sometimes uses forms of the noun *\*boluš* ‘help, aid’ (in Kipchak only in marginal areas, e. g. in (parts of) Altay Turkic (Täläüt, Altay Kizhi, Kumanda, Tuba) and Karaim, and in Caucasus Kipchak and Tatar), see 5.2. For the replacement of Central Turkic *\*-V/\*-p* *başla-* by *\*-V/\*-p* *ägälä-* in Sayan Turkic see below. Most of non-Sayanic *-GAn-Turkic* (Shor, Chulym Turkic, most of Kipchak including Siberian Tatar and Kirghiz Kipchak (but not Crimean Tatar and Krymchak), Southeast Turkic, and Turkmen dialects) uses *al* ‘in front of’; for Kirghiz see 5.1. Cognates of *töbän* ‘lower part etc.’ (not Old Turkic, but Middle Turkic: R III 1271 *töbän* Chaghatay, Kuman ‘unten, herab’, Kuman *töbängi* ‘unterer, unten befindlich’, III 1273 *tömän* Chaghatay ‘Boden, Grund’) mainly exist in non-Oghuz non-Sayanic *-GAn-Turkic* (Kipchak,<sup>25</sup> Southeast Turkic, Kipchakoid South Siberian), see also 5.4.

Central Turkic *\*qor(ga)š(un)* ‘lead’ appears as *\*qorğaš(un)* in non-Oghuz Central *-GAn-Turkic* except Altay Turkic; in more or less the same grouping cognates of *\*yartim* ‘help’ (s. 2) appear as *\*yArdAm* (except Far Western Kipchak and parts of Caucasus Kipchak, see 5.2), *-GAr* ~ *z*-causatives of *öt-* ‘to pass’ are preferably used in most of Kipchak (in Karaim, Volga-Ural Kipchak, Kumyk, Noghay, Central Kipchak, Baraba, Kirghiz), Küarik, and Southeast Turkic, and *aldin* ‘in front of’ exists in postpositional use (in Crimean Tatar, Volga-Ural Kipchak, Kumyk, Noghay, Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Siberian Tatar, and Southeast Turkic; for Karachay-Balkar see 5.2). The verb *\*yWR(I)-* ‘to go, move’ has (at least alternatively) a front vocalic form

The Old Turkic form of the verbal noun contained in these verbal derivations is *uyqu*, see CLAUSON (1974, 46b–47a).

<sup>24</sup> E. g. Khakas *tülgü*, Altay Turkic, Kirghiz *tülkü*, Tatar *tölké*, Modern Uyghur *tülkä*, Uzbek *tulki*. Of Oghuz only the Iranian part of Western Oghuz has labialized forms (Sonqori *tölki* (DOERFER; HESCHE 1989, 505), Azeri *tülkü*). The remaining Oghuz languages have delabialized forms (Turkish *tilki*, Turkmen *tilgi*) like Sayan Turkic (*dilgi*); in Krymchak we find *tilki*, in Crimean Tatar *til’ki*, probably inspired by Ottoman Turkish, see also 7. Thus the regressive labialization in this word looks like a Central Turkic feature, the non-labialization like a Border Turkic feature.

<sup>25</sup> In Karaim, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, Noghay, Central Kipchak, Siberian Tatar, Kirghiz Kipchak.

\**yür(i)*- in non-Oghuz Central Turkic -*GAn*-Turkic including Salar, Altay Turkic and Border Turkic Fu-yü-Turkic.<sup>26</sup>

Non-Oghuz -*GAn*-Turkic uses \*-*A tur-* to mark intra-terminality on participles (\*-*GAn* : \*-*A turgan*) and present tense forms (-*(V)r* : \*-*A turur*) and case-marked \**qay*-stems to ask for places, directions and the like. It uses \**çortan* for 'pike'<sup>27</sup> and front vocalic \**tAŋ(V)r(V)* (originally) 'god; heaven' (see TMEN II, 577–85; Oghuz and Chuvash have back vocalic \**taŋri*; for Crimean Tatar, Krymchak, and Karaim see 5.2), see 5.1 and 5.2. Cognates of *burun* are used as spatial and/or temporal expressions<sup>28</sup> in non-Oghuz -*GAn*-Turkic and in Chuvash (? ← Tatar), i. e. they are mostly absent in Yakut, Khalaj, (Western-)Oghuz<sup>29</sup> (except some Anatolian data),<sup>30</sup> and Kumyk; its absence in Kumyk (and Krymchak?) may be inspired by Western Oghuz influence, see 7. Most of non-Oghuz -*GAn*-Turkic uses forms of

<sup>26</sup> Southeast Turkic shows a whole set of variants of the type \**yWrV-* ~ \**yUr-* (Uzbek *yur-*, Modern Uyghur dialects *yur-*, *yür-*, *yürä-*, *yüri-*, *yörü-*, *yürü-*, Lobnor Turkic *jur-*, Taranchi (RADLOFF) *yür-*, Modern Uyghur standard language *žür-*). As to the vowel in the first syllable of \**yWr(V)*-, Oghuz as well as the Northeastern border languages Sayan Turkic, Yenisey Turkic, Chulym Turkic, and Sarygh Yughur seem to prefer low vowels. Sarygh Yughur has \**yOr-* (*yor-*, *for-* ~ *yör-*), Sayan Turkic has \**yor(I)*- (~ \**yörI-*). In Oghuz we find \**yÖrI-* (often > \**yWrI-* ~ \**yVrV-*); but for Oghuz we have to take into account that the original verb \**yorī* became an auxiliary verb and often was replaced by *yürü-* or amalgamated forms. Yakut has illabial *sirit-* with the enlarged structure \**yrl-t-*. Salar exhibits \**yürI-* ~ \**yVr-*.

<sup>27</sup> This word seems to be lost in modern Oghuz, but see the Ottoman data in R III 2021 *çortan* 'outdated' eel'.

<sup>28</sup> See CLAUSON (1974, 366) *burun* lit. 'the nose' (of a human being or an animal), 'the beak' (of a bird) and the like /.../ and by a further development, 'preceding in times, previous'; the latter exists in Old and Middle Turkic, but seemingly not in Ottoman. For *burun* in Ottoman meaning 'nose, snout, cape etc.' see TS I 714ff; for Turkish see fn. 29. See also KD 203a 13 and 211d 13. For further phonetic and semantic developments see SCHÖNIG 2002 and 2005b.

<sup>29</sup> In Turkmen I only could find *burun* meaning 'before' in older sources, see R IV 1822f. *burun* Turkmen 'earlier, before'; see also LI 1998, 147ff. Turkish has *burun* 'nose, point, tip; beak; cape, headland, promontory; pride, arrogance', see HONY; Iz (1992, 86).

<sup>30</sup> See, e. g., the Yakut *murun* 'nos' (YAKRS 246), Dolgan *munnu* (< *murn+u*) 'Nase' (STACHOWSKI 1993, 182), Khalaj *burin* 'Nase' (DOERFER; TEZCAN 1980, 95), Kumyk *burun* 'nos; ugol, mys' (KMKRS 87), Krymchak 'nos; kljuv; mys' (REBI 83). For Ottoman, I could find derivations of *burun* meaning 'before' only in TS I 714 *burunduğın* 'iptidadan, önceden, başlangıçta' (in *Kelile ve Dimne* from the sixteenth century), which is an instrumental form of *burunduq* (= *burunduruyq* 'nose ring; reins', s. also TS I 714ff.); in addition, the whole passage seems to be misunderstood and does not have the meaning given in TS, see ZAJĄCZKOWSKI 1934. There are only some instances in DS pointing to *burun* meaning 'before' in Anatolia: *burun* 'pekmez yapmak için kaynatılan şıranın ilk suyu' (Af., Çr.), 'dutan, kaynatılarak elde edilen ilk şıra' (Gr.), 'yün taranırken tarak dışından ilk alınan yün' (Ank.), *burunağzi* 'ineklerin ilk üç günlük sütü' (Ank.), *burun çayı* 'demlikten bardağa ilk konulan çay' (Ama.) oder *burun şerbeti* 'üzümün ilk alınan suyu' (Gaz.), see DS II 803f.

\**kämä* for 'ship' (first attested in Middle Turkic); Oghuz has *gämi* (like Old Turkic *kämi*, Chuvash *kimē*); for Crimean Tatar, Karaim and Krymchak, see 7. Different from Oghuz and Khalaj, non-Oghuz-*GAn*-Turkic shows a biverbal form -*A/-p al(-ma)*- to express the (im-)possibility of performing an action.<sup>31</sup> Different from Oghuz and Chuvash, it normally does not exhibit biverbal forms for 'to begin to x' consisting of a verbal noun in -*mA(K)* of the verb meaning 'x' and *başla-* 'to begin'; instead it uses forms of the type \*-*V/\*-p başla-* (except Sayan Turkic, which uses *ägälä-* 'id.' instead (← Mongolic)). Dative-marked forms of other verbal nouns can be found e. g. in Tatar -*(V)r* + *GA kërēš-/totin-* or in Modern Uyghur -*(I)š* + *GA başla-*. Different from Oghuz (including Salar), Khalaj, Sarygh Yughur and some of South Siberian Border Turkic, *GAn*-Turkic has \**qol* for both 'hand' and 'arm' and does not use cognates of \**älig* 'hand' (except Crimean Tatar and Krymchak, see 7), it has not preserved long vowels (not even reflexes of them), and has lost the feature of *nasality* of the Ancient Turkic *ń* (see 1). The same holds true for \**ärin* for 'lip' and \**kindik* for 'navel', but cognates of both words exist in Khalaj; for Krymchak and Crimean Tatar see 7. Different from Oghuz (and perhaps Yakut) most of non-Oghuz-*GAn*-Turkic has not preserved the negative aorist in -*mAz* and uses -*mAs* instead;<sup>32</sup> different from Oghuz and Yakut, \*-*ŋ* is normally not employed to designate the imperative of the second person plural (as do Turkmen and Yakut exclusively). Other than Oghuz (and at least Chuvash, Khalaj, Yakut (except the accusative), and Salar (except the dative)), non-Oghuz-*GAn*-Turkic has not preserved suffixes of the structure +(C)V... (e. g. a genitive suffix in +(n)Iŋ as in Old Turkic); all case suffixes show a stable suffix-initial consonant by an analogization of the type +CV...

#### 4 Modern Kipchak

In addition to the features already mentioned, all modern Kipchak languages exhibit cognates of Old Turkic *i:d(-u ber)-* 'to send' of the form \**yibär-*. In of modern Kichak (except Crimean Tatar and Krymchak, see 7) the Old Turkic *tag* 'mountain' has developed to \**taw*,<sup>33</sup> \**säv-* 'to love'

<sup>31</sup> It also appears in Salar, South Siberian, and perhaps in Chuvash (Chuvash -*ay-* < \*-*A al-* (?); see BENZING (1959a, 721) and LEVITSKAYA (1976, 54f.). Lena Turkic has a suffix -*(A:)yA-*. Besides, in many units, forms like -*A/p bol-* exist, see SCHÖNIG 1987.

<sup>32</sup> Chuvash has preserved this form only in the negative present tense copula *mar* < *ärmaz*. The Lena Turkic -*BAt*-forms may also have developed after the sound change -*z* > -*s*. For Karachay-Balkar see 5.2, for Crimean Tatar and Krymchak see 7.

<sup>33</sup> But the sound change -*ğ(-)* > -*w(-)* did not always take place consistently in Siberian Tatar, see, e. g., Baraba *agis* 'mouth' (R I 82) < *agiz* > Modern Kipchak \**awiz*.

became \**süy-*, \**äv* ‘house’ normally appears as \**üy* (for Karaim and Misher, see 5). Central Turkic \**taguq* ‘chicken, hen’ has become \**tavüq* (\**tawüq*) in most of Kipchak. Kipchak did not preserve any traces of the feature of *nasality* of the intervocalic consonant of \**süŋ(g)äk* ‘bone’ (for Crimean Tatar and Krymchak see 7).<sup>34</sup> The word for ‘brain’ has a common basic form \**mäyä* (except in Crimean Tatar, see 5.1 and 7). The spontaneous sound change of the word-initial *b- > m-* without *-n-* at the end of the first syllable, appears at least sporadically in most of Kipchak (see SCHÖNIG 2002). Most Kipchak languages exhibit the Northern Turkic (see 6.2) cognate \**čac* of Old Turkic *sač* ‘hair’<sup>35</sup> and has preserved the old third person possessive accusative suffix *+(s)In* (as Northern Turkic and Khalaj), but see 7. Different from Eastern Turkic (see 6.1), Kipchak normally does not use the passive suffix *-(l)l-* on verbs ending in *l* and (like Oghuz, Chuvash, and Altay Turkic) has not preserved the Ancient Turkic word pair *yiltiz : yultuz* ‘root’ : ‘star’ (as did Southeast Turkic, Lena Turkic, Saryg Yugur, and some Northeast Turkic languages, see SCHÖNIG 1999); in most of the modern units the word for ‘root’ has vanished. Furthermore Kipchak like Oghuz and Uzbek has changed *-lt-* to *-ld-* (except Tüman Tatar *jiltis* (R III 488) (and Northern Altay Turkic Tuba *d’ildis ~ d’iltis*).<sup>36</sup>

In most Kipchak languages (including Siberian Tatar and Altay Turkic) cognates of \**sigir* ‘cow’ mainly appear as \**siyir*; Noghay has front vocalic *siyir* (like Modern Uyghur). Only Far Western Kipchak (*sigir*) together with Uzbek (*sigir*) follows Oghuz in preserving *-g-* (e. g. Turkish *sigir*, Turkmen *sigir*). Most of Kipchak (including Kirghiz Kipchak), Southeast Turkic, Küarik, Western Oghuz and Chuvash have direct cognates of \**tamga* ‘mark, seal’, whereas metathetical forms of the type \**tagma* appear in Turkmen (*tagma*), Kazakh, and most of the remaining South Siberian (\**tanma*). Many Kipchak languages use finite forms in *-mAK(čl)* to express a kind of future, optative or necessitative (for a comparable form in Turkmen see TKMGR 308). Together with Uzbek, Kipchak has an agent noun of the type \**-(U)wčl* (except Crimean Tatar, see 7); Chuvash exhibits a resembling form *-Avs.Ā*. Beside the development of *tag > \*taw* (Chuvash *tu/täv+*) another common

<sup>34</sup> Western (and Khorezmian) Oghuz (and some Modern Uyghur dialects) together with non-Norm Turkic Yakut and Chuvash demonstrate a clear tendency to preserve the feature of *nasality*, e. g. \**süŋäk* ‘bone’ > Azeri *sümük*, Turkmen *sünk*, Chuvash *sämä*, Yakut *uŋuox*; some Modern Uyghur dialects have *sönäk*.

<sup>35</sup> Modern Uyghur units show *čac* (lit. language) and *sač*, while Standard Uzbek has *sáč* like Khalaj and Oghuz *sač*.

<sup>36</sup> Different from Modern Uyghur, Saryg Yugur, Yenisey Turkic and Yakut; the latter has produced *silis : sulus*. For Sayan Turkic we find *siltis* ‘star; root’ in CASTRÈN (1857) and RTOfS, whereas RASSADIN (1971, 229) gives *sildis*. Tuvan has *sildis* ‘id.’, Toja *di’ldis* ‘star’ (ČADAMBA 1974, 48), Soyot (RADLOFF) has *yiltis* ‘root’ (R III 488).

Chuvash-Kipchak feature is the second person singular imperative particle noted as *čU* or *sU* in KĀŠĠARĪ’s dictionary (today sometimes reduced to *-č* or *-š*); in addition to Chuvash (*-čā*), it is attested at least in Kirghiz, Noghay, Caucasian Kipchak, Bashkir, Tatar dialects, Crimean Tatar, and Uzbek, see SCHÖNIG (1987, 206). Especially Lena Turkic and Kipchak weaken *p* and *K* while they retain *t* in the intervocalic position (not in Altay Turkic) and (like Uzbek and Altay Turkic) show cognates of the type *biy* of the old title \**bäg* (e. g. Yakut *bi*: ‘elder brother’); as a result of Chagatay or Ottoman influence we sometimes find the old form \**bäg* besides *biy* in one and the same language.<sup>37</sup> Most of Kipchak (including Altay Turkic and Kipchakoid South Siberian) uses the personal marker *+K* of the first person plural also in the imperative (like Azeri and Yakut).<sup>38</sup> As to the question, which word-final sounds initiate what type of change of suffix-initial consonants (see 6.2), Yakut shows some structural similarities with the Kipchak languages (see SCHÖNIG 1993). Kipchak (including Altay Turkic) like Turkmen and (most of) Sayan Turkic has cognates of Old Turkic *bādük* ‘big, great, high’ with an illabial vowel in the first syllable (different from Western Oghuz, Southeast Turkic, and (most of) Khakas and Shor).<sup>39</sup>

Cognates of *alin* ‘forehead’ are used as spatial expressions in postpositional use meaning ‘in front of’ in most of Kipchak (Siberian Tatar, Tatar dialects, Bashkir, Karaim, Karachay-Balkar, RADLOFF’s Kirghiz and Kazakh, Altay Turkic), of Kipchakoid South Siberian, and in Turkmen. In Kipchak, together with Oghuz (including Salar) and Kipchakoid South Siberian, the verb *et-* is dominantly used for the denominal verb derivation; in Southeast Turkic the old verb *qil-* is still widely in use.<sup>40</sup> Oghuz (including Salar) and Kipchak (like Chuvash and Yakut) did not preserve the final *G*-sounds of the second and further syllables.

<sup>37</sup> Thus Kirghiz has *biy* ‘(traditional) judge’ ~ *bäk* ‘(a title)’, Crimean Tatar exhibits *bäy ~ bäk* (USEINOV 41), Krymchak has *bäy* ‘pravitel’, *gospodin*, but *biyağa* ‘brat muža’ (REBI 2004, 77f.).

<sup>38</sup> The oldest *K*-form of an imperative is *-AIK* in the *Codex Cumanicus*, which is also attested in Kirghiz, Altay Turkic, Täläut of Bachatsk, Tuba, Shor of Kondoma, and Kyzyl; for other *K*-forms, see SCHÖNIG 1987.

<sup>39</sup> Tatar *böyök* ‘velikiy’ must be a loanword from (Ottoman) Turkish (like Krymchak *buyuk* and Crimean Tatar *büyük*); the inherited form is *biyök* ‘vysokiy, vysotnyy’.

<sup>40</sup> The old auxiliary *qil-* is now restricted mainly to contexts of dignity in Oghuz and Kipchak. Mostly in Oghuz – but with, e. g., some Tatar evidence – the verb *ädlä-* has survived in the West and is frequently used in Azeri. The frequent use of *qil-* in Southeast Turkic may be regarded as a Chaghataizm.



## 5 The internal segmentation of Modern Kipchak Turkic

Modern Kipchak consists of Western-Central Kipchak and Kirghiz Kipchak; the latter consists of Kirghiz and (Southern) Altay Turkic. Western-Central Kipchak consists of Western Kipchak and Central Kipchak. Western Kipchak consists of Far Western Kipchak (Karaim, Crimean Tatar, and Krymchak), Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (Tatar,<sup>41</sup> Bashkir (= Volga-Ural Kipchak), Karachay-Balkar and Kumyk (= Caucasus Kipchak)). Crimean Tatar and Krymchak are Far Western Kipchak languages under strong Ottoman Turkish influence; Misher Tatar is perhaps a Far Western Kipchak language under (Kazan) Tatar influence. Noghay is a transitory language between Western and Central Kipchak. Central Kipchak consists of Karakalpak and Kazakh. Siberian Tatar, which later became subject to South Siberian Turkic influence, seems to be a mixed group of the Central Asian and the Volga-Ural Kipchak type; it may be divided into a Western Siberian Tatar (Irtysh, Ishim, Tara, Tobol, Tura, Tümen etc.), a central group (Baraba), and an Eastern group (Tomsk). Additionally, there are Kipchak(oid) elements in South Siberian Turkic. Thus, sound groups of first syllables consisting of a palatal vowel and a weak consonant, of which at least one element is labial (e. g. \*(-)äv-, \*(-)üy(-) etc.), have normally converged into *üy*. In Volga-Ural Kipchak they have become (graphically) *öy*, in parts of Siberian Tatar *üy* ~ *äv*; Far Western Kipchak shows variants with a sometimes unetymological *-w* (see BERTA 1989), e. g. in Misher Tatar *üy* ~ *ü(w)* (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 58) (if not preserved under Western Oghuz influence, see 7). Kirghiz Kipchak uses *üy* besides contracted forms with long labial vowels. Uzbek behaves like Western-Central Kipchak and Modern Uighur, but Uzbek has not consistently changed *äv* to *üy* (like Siberian Tatar; see also Misher Tatar *tävä*, Tatar *döyä* ~ *tävä* 'camel'). In the case of \**äv* some Altay Turkic dialects show, besides *öy* ~ *üy*, forms with final *-B*, in which labiality still has not crossed over to the vowel (such as in Yenisey Turkic (= Shor and Khakas), Chuvash, Khalaj and Western Oghuz).

It seems that some basic traces of the internal divisions of modern Kipchak have developed within the framework of the Golden Horde and its successor states from the thirteenth until the sixteenth centuries. Within this framework, many linguistic interactions took place (between Kipchak languages, but also with other Turkic and non-Turkic languages). These interactions are responsible for the numerous oscillations of the borderlines between the subgroups of Kipchak. Thus the word for 'stirrup' survived in its Central Turkic shape \**üzängü* in Kirghiz Kipchak and Kazakh, but also in

<sup>41</sup> Dialects like Astrakhan Tatar, Orenburg Tatar, and Yurt Tatar are only mentioned, if they exhibit special features deviant from the standard language.

Volga-Ural Kipchak. Here, Karakalpak is separated from Kazakh and goes together with Noghay by using \*(*ü*)*zängü*. Caucasus Kipchak developed a form \**özängü* with initial *ö-*, which cannot be explained by regular sound changes; perhaps the initial *ü-* was assimilated to the low vowel of the second syllable (see below the Kumyk form of the verb \**W(q)ša-* for 'to resemble'). One of the variants *özängü* ~ *üzängü* in Karaim exhibits the same phenomenon. Baraba *izängü* with initial illabial vowel is perhaps a trace of Border Turkic influence on this language, see 2. The forms of the verb \**W(q)ša-* 'to resemble' (see 3) are another interesting phenomenon. The verb appears as \**oqša-* in Kirghiz Kipchak (Kirghiz, Tälüt (RADLOFF), Kumanda (RADLOFF) *oşqo-*) Krymchak, and Karaim (*oxša-*, beside others, see below), i. e. at the margins of the Kipchak area (as in Southeast Turkic (Uzbek *üxša-*, Modern Uyghur *oxša-*) and Azeri (*oxša-*)).<sup>42</sup> Volga-Ural Kipchak shows *oqša-* (graphically), which points to \**uqša-* (unless one assumed that this represented a case in which the characteristic Volga-Ural Kipchak sound change of *u* of the first syllables had not occurred for some reason). Tatar exhibits *oxša-* with a fricativization *K > x*, which does not appear very often in this language. A basic form \**uqša-* is also attested in Central Kipchak (*uqsa-*). Thus \**uqša-* may be called the Western-Central Kipchak form. Karakalpak as well knows a form *usa-* pointing back to \**uša-*, which is the basic form in Noghay (*usa-*), Karachay-Balkar (*uša-*), and according to RADLOFF parts of Siberian Tatar (Tara Tatar *uša-*) and Chulym Turkic (Küarik *uša-*); even Tatar and Karaim (both according to RADLOFF) exhibit *usa-*. The Kumyk and Crimean Tatar forms *oša-* belong here, too; the initial *o-* may be the result of an assimilation to the low vowel of the second syllable (as perhaps in the word for 'stirrup', see above); perhaps the fact that Far Western Turkic, Kumyk, and Azeri exhibit *o-* forms points to Kipchak-Oghuz areal contacts, see 7. As to Oghuz borrowings, Karaim exhibits Oghuz *bänzäy-* besides *uša-* and *oxša-*, Crimean-Tatar has *bänzä-* besides *oša-*, Krymchak shows *bänzä-* and *oxša-*, see also 7. In the case of \**oqša-* ~ \**uqša-* ~ \**uša-* we can not rule out that two different lexemes have fused into one. For the verbs for 'to sleep', see 3.

The Kipchak present tense suffixes (going back to \*-*A turur*)<sup>43</sup> are shortened to *-A* (postvocaliv *-y*) in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Kumyk, and Crimean Tatar, i. e. in most of Western Kipchak except Karaim and Karachay-Balkar; Misher Tatar and Orenburg Tatar have *-A* ~ *-Adlr* (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 140-41; SADYKOVA 1985, 65). Karaim shows the whole range of longer forms

<sup>42</sup> Like Sayanic Uryangkhai (KATANOV) *oqša-*, *oşqa-*, Shor (RADLOFF) *oşqa-*, see also fn. 22.

<sup>43</sup> In SCHÖNIG (2004b, 8) instead of \*-*A turur* the form \*-*A turgan* is erroneously given as the protoform.

employed in Kipchak (Karaim (T) *-Adlr, -At*, Karaim (H) *-Adlr, -Adl, -Ad*), Karachay-Balkar has *-Adl*, which also appears in Noghay, Central Kipchak, and Uzbek. A comparable variety of forms can be found in Siberian Tatar vernaculars (*-A*,<sup>44</sup> *-At, -Adl, -Adlr*) and in the Altay Turkic dialect community (*-At, -Adl, -Adlr*). The form *-Adlr* can also be found in Southern Kirghiz, whereas Standard Kirghiz has *-At*. Krymchak shows *-(ly)* (REBI 16), perhaps a result of analogization processes, during which the postvocalic form *-y* (see above) took the position of the present tense marker. But it is also possible that we are confronted with an extremely shortened form of a present tense in *\*-A yorir*, i. e. a present tense form of Oghuz shape, see also 7.

The distribution of the different designations for ‘island’ are of some interest, too. Cognates of the word *\*a:tağ* ‘island’ have mainly survived in the West (e. g. in Oghuz as *ada* and in Chuvash as *utā*). Their Kipchak form *ataw* is used in Karakalpak, Tatar, and Kumyk (in the latter perhaps supported by Western Oghuz influence). Karaim, Krymchak, and Crimean Tatar employ loanwords from Western Oghuz (*ada*); perhaps the *\*a:tağ*-area is to be connected with the *\*-AGAn/\*-AčAK*-area, see 7. Besides Karaim, Crimean Tatar exhibits cognates of *\*o(l)t(i)rağ* for ‘island’, which is the form of modern cognates of Old Turkic *otruğ*. This word looks like a derivation of *\*olor- ~ \*o(l)tur-* ‘to sit (down)’. This is not very probable,<sup>45</sup> but at least in Western Kipchak the cognates of *\*o(l)t(i)rağ* seem to have been analogized to the cognates of this verb, e. g. in Crimean Tatar (*oturuş : otur-*), Karaim (*ot-raš, -lač, -rač, -rač, -ura/w/iš, oñriš : otur-*) and Volga-Ural Kipchak (*utraw : utir-*). Chuvash *utraw* may be a loanword from Volga-Ural Kipchak. Furthermore, we find cognates of *\*o(l)t(i)rağ* in Tara Tatar (*utrau ~ otrau*), Kumanda (*odru., odra, ottirağ*), and Chulym Turkic (*otirağ, otiraw, odirač; Küärik utrau*).<sup>46</sup> In Noghay, Kazakh, and Kirghiz we find cognates of the Mongolian loanword *aral* (as in Southeast Turkic, Shor and Kumanda), perhaps as a result of a substitution during Oirat rule.

Some distributions may be in part owed to Tatar influence on other developing Kipchak literary languages. Thus the cognates of Old Turkic *\*yartim* ‘help’ appear as *\*yardäm* in Central Kipchak and Tatar, most of

<sup>44</sup> This form is perhaps a late import from Volga-Ural Kipchak during the time of Tatar emigration to Siberia and/or Soviet cultural policy.

<sup>45</sup> CLAUSON (1974, 65b) *otruğ* ‘island’ that it is “too old to be a Dev.N. fr. *otur-* ‘to sit’”.

<sup>46</sup> There is also a Chulym Turkic form *odirač*. The forms *in-ač ~ -ač ~ -ač* may go back to an older *otrač*, see CLAUSON (1974, 65b): “a Dim. f. (?) *otrač* was current in Kom. and Kip. (Id., Bul., Tuh.), survived in NW kar. T., Kow.”. Karaim *otura* is perhaps a metanalytical derivation from *otrač*.

remaining Kipchak has *\*yardam* (e. g. Bashkir *yardam*; Southeast Turkic *\*yardäm*); for Crimean Tatar and Krymchak see 7. A comparable problem exists with the distribution of *\*otur-* and *\*oltur-* for ‘to sit (down)’ in Modern Kipchak Turkic, which does not follow any known pattern.<sup>47</sup> Today we find *\*otur-* in Tatar (*utir-*), Krymchak (*otir-*), Crimean Tatar (*otur-*), and Central Kipchak (*otir-*); this form is also present in Uzbek (*ütir-*) and in Oghuz (including Salar). The remaining Kipchak languages (and Modern Standard Uyghur) exhibit *\*oltur-* (Caucasus Kipchak *oltur-*, Noghay *oltir-*, Bashkir *ultir-*). Kirghiz has *oltur-* and *otur-*, Baraba shows *otir-, oltir-, oltir-, utir-* etc. (DMITRIEVA 1981; TUMAŠEVA 1968), and Karaim exhibits *otur- ~ otir-* and *oltur-*. The situation in Kirghiz may have been caused by a dialect mixing of Central Kipchak dialects (*\*otur-*) and Kirghiz Kipchak dialects (*\*oltur-*) during the genesis of Modern Standard Kirghiz or due to influences from Uzbek and Modern Uyghur. The situation in Karaim may point to Ottoman influence on an originally “*oltur-Turkic*” Karaim. It is remarkable that within Kipchak mainly the “smaller” languages exhibit *\*oltur-*-forms. Perhaps the use of *\*otur-* in some Kipchak languages and Uzbek goes back to Ottoman influence and has nothing to do with the comparable situation in some South Siberian Turkic languages,<sup>48</sup> see also 7. Ottoman influence may first have occurred in the literary languages (Late) Chagatay and Türki (*Törëki töl*, in the Tatar sphere) and then jumped over to spoken languages, which developed in close connection with them, i. e. mainly Tatar and Uzbek, and from there to Central Kipchak. In the “small” Kipchak languages the *\*oltur-* form survived, because they developed later and were in stronger isolation from influences of the literary languages. This, however, deserves further investigation.

### 5.1 Kirghiz Kipchak and Western-Central Kipchak

Kirghiz Kipchak exhibits many features, which deviate from Western-Central Kipchak. The cognates of Old Turkic *tagliğ* ‘mountainous’ appear as *\*tawli* in Western-Central Kipchak, whereas Kirghiz Kipchak has *\*to:lu:* (both < *\*tawliw*). The intermediary position of Uzbek between Kipchak and Southeast Turkic is illustrated by its (literary) form *tagli*, which points to

<sup>47</sup> According to CLAUSON (1974, 150–1), we find *\*otur-* besides *\*oltur-* already in the Karakhanid *Tefsir*; in Middle Turkic *\*otur-* is the typical Western Oghuz (Ottoman) form, but also appears besides *\*oltur-* in Khorezm Turkic sources and in the Mamluk Kipchak *Tuhfat*, but not in Chagatay and in Kuman, which only have *\*oltur-*.

<sup>48</sup> We find *\*otur-* in Uryangkhai (KATANOV 1194 *odur-*, 1197 *olur*), Soyot, Bay-Tayga Tuvan (partly palatalized), and Khakas (*odur-*). Chulym Turkic and Altay Turkic show *oltur-* (>) ~ *ottur-* (>) ~ *otur-* with preservation of *-t-*; Shor has *ottur- ~ odur-*.

proto-Western-Central Kipchak *\*tagli*. The final *G*-sounds of second and following syllables became *zero* in Western-Central Kipchak (like in Chuvash), but remained *\*-w* in Kirghiz Kipchak and fused with the preceding vowels to long labial vowels. Furthermore, Kirghiz Kipchak exhibits features in the field of phonotactical rule sets, which are different from those of other Kipchak languages, see 6.2. In view of other features, Kirghiz Kipchak goes together with at least parts of Western-Central Kipchak, see, e. g. the words for ‘stirrup’ and ‘goat’, see 5 and 5.2.

Most of Western-Central Kipchak (Siberian Tatar, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, Noghay, and Central Kipchak) together with Southeast Turkic and Turkmen exhibits *\*ald* ‘in front of’, see SCHÖNIG 2005a.<sup>49</sup> In Kirghiz Kipchak *ald* meaning both ‘in front of’ and ‘under’;<sup>50</sup> Altay Turkic (and Shor) additionally exhibits *alt* ‘under’ : *ald* ‘in front of’, see SCHÖNIG 2005a. Western Oghuz influence may be responsible for the similar situation in Crimean Tatar (*alt* ‘lower part, below; under’ (R I 400) and *ald* ‘in front of’ (LI 1998, 491f.)), RADLOFF’s Tatar, and Karaim (RKARS 160 ‘pered’ *ald*, KARPRS 64 *ald* ‘in front of; front part’, and RKARS 149 ‘niz’ *alt*), but we cannot exclude Kuman heritage; as we can see all “mixed languages” showing *alt* ‘under’ and *ald* ‘in front of’ are located at the margin of the Modern Kipchak area.

In Kirghiz Kipchak (as in Sarygh Yughur and Lena Turkic) ‘copper’ can be expressed by *\*baqir* (as in Western-Central Kipchak, Oghuz) and by *\*jäs* (← Mongolic ← Turkic) (as in most of South Siberian).<sup>51</sup>

In the framework of Kipchak, the spontaneous sound change of word initial *b* > *m*- reaches a maximum in Kirghiz Kipchak. The same holds true for the word-internal change *-b* > *-m*- at the first syllable border before *-n*- at the end of the second syllable in the framework of Northeast Turkic; before other consonants at the end of the second syllable, the sound change *-b* > *-m*- displays a minimum in Kirghiz Kipchak in the Northeastern context (see SCHÖNIG 2002). Kirghiz Kipchak has taken part in the development of Northeast Turkic, during which it gained some Northeastern features, e. g.

<sup>49</sup> Siberian Tatar *alt* ‘in front of’ probably is a form of *ald*, the *-d* of which is secondarily desonorized in syllable-initial and syllable-final position. Only Baraba has, according to TUMAŠEVA (1992, 23), *alt* ‘as; niz’ and *alt*-form meaning ‘under’, but see DMITRIEVA (1981, 222) *alt* ~ *al* ~ *alin* ‘peredniy, peredn. čast’’, 126 *alt* ‘peredn. čast’, peredniy’ (see also R I 375).

<sup>50</sup> See KRGRS 42 *al s. ald*, 48 *ald*, *aldı* ‘pered; peredn. čast’; niz, nizn. čast’. Analogically, in Kirghiz forms of *as(t)* ‘under’ sometimes designate ‘in front of’. For (Southern) Altay Turkic, see R I 419 Altay Kizhi, Täläut *aldındağı* ‘unten bzw. vorn befindlich’, VERBICKIY 19 (Täläut) *aldındağı* ‘naxod. vperedı’, *aldında* ‘vnizu’, *aldındağı* ‘naxod. na nizu’.

<sup>51</sup> At least in the South Siberian context the use of Kirghiz Kipchak to designate ‘North’ by derivations of *\*tün* ‘night (> midnight)’ and *\*tüš* ‘noon’ seems to be unique.

the category of *participium nondum facti* (see BENZING 1959b), which also exists in Northeast Turkic (except Tofa), and some of Siberian Tatar.<sup>52</sup> Yakut with *-A ilik* and Kirghiz with *-A elek* show a common form of this participle different from South Siberian *-GALAK* and Fu-yü Turkic *-GALAs*.<sup>53</sup> The fact that Kirghiz and Lena Turkic are bound closer together may be owed to their location at the margin of the area in question and they have thus kept ancient forms of this etymologically enigmatic suffix. Perhaps the extensive labial harmony in Lena Turkic and Kirghiz Kipchak has a common root, too. In Kirghiz Kipchak (as in Noghay, Central Kipchak, and Northeast Turkic) initial {M} has become recategorized as {B}, but has *not* kept variants with initial *m* after word-final nasal as in the other languages. It has at least alternatively a Northeast Turkic feature by showing *\*toğ-* ~ *\*törä-* ‘to give birth ~ be born’.

The word *\*bäni* ~ (? <) *\*bäni* ‘brain’ survived in two-syllabic forms pointing to *\*mäyä* without an intervocalic nasal consonant<sup>54</sup> in Baraba (*miyä*), Uzbek (*miya*), Karachay-Balkar (*mıyı*), and Bashkir (*mäyä*). Somehow irregularly developed forms of the type *\*miy* ~ *\*mıy* appear with front vowels (as in Baraba, Bashkir, and Uzbek) in Karaim, Tatar, and Central Kipchak, and with back vowels (as in Karachay-Balkar) in Noghay, Krymchak, and in RADLOFF’s Tatar and Kazakh; Kumyk has *miy* ~ *may*. In full accordance with the regular sound laws, *\*mäyä* has developed into *\*mä:* (sometimes > *\*mä* or *\*mi:*) in Kirghiz Kipchak (as in Northeast Turkic). Only Crimean Tatar with *mänj* has preserved the feature *nasality* of the old intervocalic consonant, which now stands in the word-final position. The form looks like the form *mänj* of the *Codex Cumanicus* and has survived perhaps under Ottoman Turkish influence; it is monosyllabic like the Tatar form, but ends in a nasal consonant like the Turkish form.

An Eastern Turkic feature (see 6.1) of Kirghiz Kipchak (as of Sarygh Yughur and Modern Uyghur) is the preservation of *\*ud* ‘bovine’. The old numeral for ‘fifty’ (replaced by analytical forms in most of Altay Turkic and in the Lena-Sayan area) appears in a strong form *\*allig* mainly in Western-

<sup>52</sup> According to TUMAŠEVA (1968, 19 and 68) we find *-GALAK* in Baraba, but not in Tobol-Irtysh Tatar; in Tomsk Tatar it is about to vanish.

<sup>53</sup> Yusupov (1985, 81–2) assumes that the suffix *-GALAK* is used to derive adjectives in Tatar dialects, e. g. *qačqalaq* ‘ubegayuščiy’, *taygalaq* ‘skol’zkiy’, *köygäläk* ‘bespokoynyy’. These forms, however, are derived by use of the detensive-frequentative suffix *-GALA-* plus the deverbal adjectival suffix *-(I)K*; for the latter see ERDAL 1991.

<sup>54</sup> Yakut, Chuvash, Khalaj, Oghuz (including Salar (TENIŠEV)), and sporadically Modern Uyghur have preserved the feature *nasality* of the intervocalic consonant of *\*bäni* ~ *\*bäni* ‘brain’ (Dolgan *mäni:* ~ *mäni*, Yakut *mäyin* (with nasal *y*); Chuvash *mimä*; Khalaj *meyn*; Turkish, Azeri *beyin*, Turkmen *bäyni*, Salar *meyes* ~ *menze* u. *menzi* ~ *menzi* ‘forehead’, Modern Uyghur *meji* ~ *miyä* ~ *miyä*).

Central Kipchak (and Oghuz), the weak form *\*älig* is used in Kirghiz and RADLOFF's Täläüt (*öli*) (as in Yenisey and Chulym Turkic);<sup>55</sup> Siberian Tatar has strong forms, for the most part only KATANOV renders a form *äli* for Baraba. Southeast Turkic (like Khalaj) has generalized the strong forms, Sayan Turkic the weak forms. In Kirghiz Kipchak (and Bashkir) the verb for 'to cry' is *iy-la-* < *\*igla-*, which matches South Siberian forms like Yenisey Turkic *ilga-* and Sayan Turkic *igla-*. Western-Central Kipchak (except Bashkir (see above), Krymchak, and Crimean Tatar (see 7)) have *\*yigla-*, e. g. Tatar *yila-*, Karachay-Balkar *jila-*, Kazakh *zila-* (Uzbek has *yigla-*, Modern Uyghur *jigla-*). Western-Central Kipchak, Chuvash, Altay Turkic, remaining Kipchakoid South Siberian, and Oghuz (including Salar) use cognates of Western Turkic *\*(h)agač* for 'tree', whereas Kirghiz *jigač* (like Lobnor Turkic *yigač* and Saryg Yugur *yigaš*) goes back to Eastern Turkic *\*higač* > *yigač* (like, e. g., Sayan Turkic); Southeast Turkic languages have as an intermediary form *\*yagač*. But for 'thousand' Kirghiz has a Western Turkic palatal form *miŋ*, Altay Turkic has Eastern Turkic velar *muŋ* with Northeast Turkic labialization, see 6.1.

The cognates of *\*yultuz* 'star' have kept a labial vowel in the first syllable in most of Western-Central Kipchak (except some Karaim data and Crimean Tatar (R III 491f.) under Oghuz influence, see 7) and some parts of Siberian Tatar (as in Turkmen dialects, Khorasan Turkic, Southeast Turkic, Khalaj, and Yakut); most of Kirghiz Kipchak and other parts of Siberian Tatar has illabial *\*yildiz* (like Oghuz and most of South Siberian).<sup>56</sup> In the case of sound groups consisting of a vowel and a weak consonant, Kirghiz Kipchak sometimes exhibits besides a Western-Central Kipchak form a contracted South Siberian variant, e. g. *\*süŋ(g)äk* > *süyäk* ~ *sö:k* 'bone', *\*täbä* > *tüyö* ~ *tö:* 'camel', *\*säv-* > *süy-* ~ *sü:-* 'to love', see also 5; Siberian Tatar has a comparable behaviour. Kirghiz Kipchak like most of South Siberian does not use cognates of *\*ärti* as the past tense copula regularly, see below. At least in Kazakh, Siberian Tatar, and Kirghiz Kipchak (as in the remainder of South Siberian) we find an *\*öŋ*, which besides the meaning 'front part' (but not used as a spatial expression in postpositional use) has a second meaning 'colour, shape etc.'; Siberian Tatar exhibits a semantically deviant *öŋ*, e. g., *ö:nrö:* (Umar) 'yugari; vverxu' (TUMAŠEVA 1992, 165).

Kirghiz Kipchak together with Kipchakoid South Siberian uses personal suffixes of the type first person singular +*\*mIn* and second person singular

<sup>55</sup> This is more or less the same area in which the analogization of case suffix-final nasal consonants has taken place, see 5.1.

<sup>56</sup> E. g. Kirghiz *jildiz*, *jildis*, Altay Turkic *d'ildiz* 'Stern', Chalkandu, Täläüt *yildis* (R III 490), Tuba *d'ildis* ~ *d'iltis*; Baraba *yildis* 'Stern' (R III 490), Tüman Tatar *jiltis* (R III 488).

(plural)\*+*sIn(LAr)*.<sup>57</sup> This grouping plus Siberian Tatar dialects exhibits amalgamated forms of the first and second person of finite *-GAN* of the type *-GAm*, *-GAŋ* etc.<sup>58</sup> and shows internal analogization of suffix-final nasal consonants of the genitive +*nIn* and ablative +*DAn*, see below. The first person singular imperative suffix *-AyIK* is typical for most of Western-Central Kipchak languages (and of Azeri), whereas Kirghiz Kipchak together with Shor and Kyzyl has kept *-AIK* (in Kirghiz after vowels *-yLIK*, neg. *-BAyLIK*) (first attested in Kuman).

In some aspects, Kirghiz and Altay Turkic have developed in different directions. Thus the modern Kipchak (and Uzbek) agent noun in *\*-Uwēl* has become *\*-U:ēl* in Kirghiz, but is replaced in Altay Turkic by the Northeast Turkic *-A(:)ēl* (← Mongol *\*-GAčē*). Both branches of Kirghiz Kipchak have developed the suffixes of the first person plural imperative partly different, see SCHÖNIG 1987. Whereas in Kirghiz the personal plural marker +*z* has only entered into competition with +*LAr* in the second person in the framework of the paradigms of politeness, it has become completely replaced there in Altay Turkic and the remaining South Siberian, see 6.1. In the case of amalgamated forms of the first and second person of finite *-GAN* of the type *-GAm* etc., in Kirghiz – different from Altay Turkic – only the first person is affected, see above and fn. 58. In the case of the analogized suffix-final consonants of the genitive +*nIn* and the ablative +*DAn*, the final nasals became *n* in Kirghiz and *ŋ* in Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic. The dative of the first person singular pronoun is *maŋa* ~ *mağa* in Kirghiz, whereas Altay Turkic shows *mägä*, *ma:*, *mä:*, see below; see also 5.3 and fn. 91. In the case of the verb *\*boluš-* 'to help' at least Kumanda of the Upper Biryusa (VERBICKIY) goes together with Kirghiz (like Kazakh, Southeast Turkic, and Khakas). For verbs denoting 'to sleep' (Kirghiz, Täläüt of

<sup>57</sup> In Chulym Turkic we sometimes find +*men* for the first person singular, Siberian Tatar dialects mostly use +*mIn* for the first person, but +*sIn* and +*sls* for the second persons singular and plural. Mainly in the Altay-Chulym Turkic dialects we find pronominal forms, replaced by possessive suffixes. KATANOV 328ff. attests a second person plural pronoun *sis* ~ *silär* for Kirghiz like *sis* (~ *sinlär*, *sislär*) in Siberian Tatar (Ishim, Tobol, Tara, Tura, Tüman) except Baraba, which has *silär* (like Sayan Turkic, Khakas, Küarik, and Altay Turkic). But TUMAŠEVA (1968, 104) also gives *sis* besides *silärlär*, *siläri*, *sislär*, and *silär* for Baraba. For the *Eušta-Čat* vernacular of Tomsk Tatar she only gives *silär* (the form *siz* clearly is an import from Standard Tatar) (1968, 152); the Kalmak vernacular has *silär*, too (1968, 164).

<sup>58</sup> Kirghiz exhibits first person singular forms of the perfect in *-GanIm* ~ *-GAmIn* ~ *-GAm* (KRGGR 283); the latter forms also appear in the *Eušta-Čat* and Kalmak vernaculars of Tomsk Tatar (TUMAŠEVA 1968, 142 and 160–1), in Khakas (XKSGR), and Shor (DYRENKOVA 1941, 182); different from Altay Turkic (DYRENKOVA 1940, 174; NIKOLAEVA 1985), Baraba (TUMAŠEVA 1968, 63), and Chulym Turkic (DUL'ZON 1966, 455) the second person is not affected by the amalgamation in Kirghiz.

Bachatsk \**uqla-*, remaining Altay Turkic \**nyuqla-*), see 3. The semantic opposition ‘ox’ : ‘bull’ is expressed by \**höküz* : \**buqa* in Kirghiz together with at least parts of Western-Central Kipchak, whereas \**buqa* seems to be replaced by \**čar* in at least some dialects of Altay Turkic. In the same way, Kirghiz goes together with parts of Western-Central Kipchak, e. g. in the case of \**kömäk* ‘help’ (like in Central Kipchak, Noghay, Kumyk, Wolga-Ural Kipchak; Southeast Turkic, Ottoman, and Khalaj, see also 6.3) and \**müyüz* ~ \**miyiz* ‘horn’ (as in Siberian Tatar, Central Kipchak, Noghay, and Caucasus Kipchak; for Crimean Tatar see 7); Altay Turkic has \**mü(:)s* (~ \**mu(:)s*) ~ \**mü(:)s* ~ \**mi(:)s*). As to the negative copula ‘is not’, Kirghiz has preserved \**tägül* besides *ämäs* (like Kazakh), whereas Altay Turkic only has \**ämäs* (< \**ärmäz*), for \**yWr(I)*- Southern Altay Turkic exhibits \**yür-*, whereas Kirghiz shows *jürü-* and *jür-* (like Krymchak, see REBI 112), i. e. in both cases Kirghiz takes middle ground between Crimean Tatar (USEINOV 346), Central Kipchak, Southeast Turkic, and Southern Altay Turkic (\**yür-*, \**ärmäz*) on the one side, and Western Kipchak and Noghay (\**yüri-*, \**tägül*) on the other, see also 6.1. Kirghiz has back vocalic forms of the numeral for ‘twenty’ (like Central Kipchak), Altay Turkic (like Western Kipchak, Siberian Tatar, and the other members of Kipchakoid South Siberian) has front vocalic forms. As to \**tAη(V)r(V)* ‘heaven; god’ Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Kumanda, and Sarygh Yughur \**tänir(i)* (Kirghiz *täniri* ~ *tänir*, Kazakh *täniri*, Karakalpak *tänir*; RADLOFF has Kazakh and Kirghiz *tä:ηri*, Kumanda has \**tänir*, \**tägri*, \**tänri*, \**tänäri*, Sarygh Yughur \**tänir*, \**tänri*), whereas Altay Turkic (except Chalkandu) exhibits forms like *tänäri* (Täläut *tänärä*, Tuba *tänäri* ~ *tänärä*) (← Mongolic); see also 5.2.<sup>59</sup> For the verb for ‘to sleep’ see 3, for the numeral for ‘thousand’ see 6.1, for expressions for ‘with’, demonstratives with final *-l* different from \**ol*, and demonstratives containing \**š* see 5.3. For the words for ‘tree’, and the forms of the *participium nondum facti* see above.

Southern Kirghiz exhibits *tavışqan* for ‘hare’ (besides forms of \**qodan*). This form has been remarkably resistant to change by preserving a trisyllabic structure like \**tabiřgan*, which has only survived in Khakas, and in Yakut dialects; Oghuz (and its Far Western Kipchak satellites and Kumyk, see 7) and Southeast Turkic (together with Southern Kirghiz) exhibit bisyllabic forms, see also 7 and fn. 129. Another hint to some connection with Khakas (and thus perhaps with Ancient Kirghiz) is the sound change *-s* < *-š*, which otherwise may go back to a relatively late Kazakh influence. For Southern

<sup>59</sup> We also find Mongolic \**tenggeri* in Yakut (*tanara*, probably velarized under the influence of *-ŋ* after being borrowed, see *nyuox* ‘bone’ < \**sün(g)äk*, see also fn. 72), and perhaps in Kumyk (see 5.2).

Kirghiz *daraxt* ‘tree’, see 6.3, for the present tense form, see 5, for special causative forms like in Uzbek, see below and SCHÖNIG 2004a.

Kirghiz sometimes takes an intermediary position between subgroups of Kipchak; but the materials do not allow to connect this behaviour with the North-South-division of Kirghiz. In the case of the dative forms of the singular personal pronouns, the old forms of the type \**baŋa* survived in Crimean Tatar, Krymchak, parts of Siberian Tatar (Baraba, Tara, Tobol, Ishim, according to KATANOV) (in both as *maŋa*), and Karaim (G *mana*, T *maya* ~ *ma:*). Kirghiz has *maŋa* ~ *mağa*, and thus leads over to the \**mağa*-group consisting of Kumyk, Ak-Noghay, Central Noghay, and the Kalmak vernacular of Tomsk Tatar with *mağa*, Kara-Noghay with *mağar* and Central Kipchak with *mağan*. Altay Turkic with *mägä*, *ma:*, *mä:* shows typically South Siberian forms; in all \**mAGA...*-languages, (most of) the demonstratives show resembling forms derived from the nominative form (see 5.3 and fn. 91). Volga-Ural Kipchak and parts of Siberian Tatar have \**mäŋa* < \**bän+ga* (analogized to the nominative stem); it appears as non-harmonic *miŋa* in Tatar and the Ėuşta-Čat vernacular of Tomsk Tatar, as *ma’ŋa* ~ *mäŋa* in Misher Tatar (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 43) (like Uzbek *menga*), as *maŋa* ~ *mëŋä* in Baraba (DMITRIEVA), as palatalized *miŋä* in Bashkir and Baraba (TUMAŠEVA), and as *miŋä* ~ *miyä* in Orenburg Tatar. Tura Tatar (KATANOV) with *maŋa* ~ *mäŋä*, Tümen Tatar (KATANOV) with *maŋa* ~ *mäŋä* ~ *miŋä*, and Karachay-Balkar with *maŋ(ŋ)a* (~ *männä* ~ *mäŋä*) (see PRITSAK 1959a, 358) stand between the \**baŋa*-group and Volga-Ural Kipchak. For the forms of \**yWr(I)*- the negative copula, see 6.1, for the forms of \**o(I)(t)ur-* see 5, for the word for ‘cap’ see fn. 111. In the case of the verbs for ‘to return’ (see 2) Kirghiz with *qayt-* ~ *jan-* (< *yan-*) stands between Kipchak on the one side and South Siberian, Modern Uyghur, and Salar on the other; most probably the preservation of cognates of Old Turkic *yan-* has to be considered as an Eastern Turkic feature.

Like Chuvash and Fu-yü Turkic, Kirghiz uses the cooperative suffix *-(I)š* instead of *+lAr* as the plural sign of the third person in verbal forms, e. g. *bariřti* instead of *bardiŋlar* ‘they went (to)’.<sup>60</sup> Kirghiz together with Fu-yü Turkic has preserved the long vowels in *ba:rsi* ‘all’ and *ira:q* (Fu-yü Turkic *iri:x*) ‘far (away)’, which have short vowels in remaining Kipchak and Altay Turkic. Kirghiz (like Ottoman sources) uses the derivation *astı* of *as(t)* with the enlarged meaning ‘below; in front of’<sup>61</sup> (s. KRGRS 75 *astıga sal-* ‘pustit’

<sup>60</sup> In Kyzyl and Chulyum Turkic we find the cooperative suffix as a plural sign in the first two persons of the imperative, e. g. Kyzyl *-Alls* (first person) : *-(I)s* (second person), Chulyum Turkic Küärik (KATANOV) *-Alls* (first person), Chulyum Turkic *-(I)š* (second person) (BIRYUKOVİČ 1981, 69); see also SCHÖNIG 1987.

<sup>61</sup> KRGRS 75 *ast* (bez prityaž. affiksa teryaet konečnyy t; osnovoy dlya kirgizskogo yazyka,

pered soboy *ili* gnat' vperedi sebya') as in the case of *ald*, *aldī* 'in front of'.<sup>62</sup>

Especially in Kirghiz we find besides the regular short and extended forms *iy-* and *jībār-* (see KRGRS 253b) of *\*i:d(u ber-)* 'to send' a deviant form *ir-*, see fn. 116. Further special features of Kirghiz are, e. g., the past tense in *-čU* (in some vernaculars of the Eastern Yssyk Köl area *-čUK*, see GADŽIEVA 91–3), a genitive suffix *+nIn*, the forms *altimīš* and *jätimīš* instead of *\*altmīš* 'sixty' and *\*yetmīš* 'seventy', and the impersonal interrogative pronoun *ämnä* beside *nä*. The demonstrative of distance is *al* (by analogization to the plural *alar*). Instead of cognates of Old Turkic *arti* especially Standard Kirghiz uses *älä* as a past tense copula (KRGGR 156; see also the imperfect in *-(A)r älä*, KRGGR 292–3).<sup>63</sup> Kirghiz often shows causatives, which can not be found in other Kipchak languages and languages of the Central Asian Turkic area; Southern Kirghiz has some special forms in common with Uzbek, see SCHÖNIG 2004a.

## 5.2 Volga-Ural Kipchak and Caucasus Kipchak

Features of Volga-Ural Kipchak are, e. g., the change of *\*äv > üy >* (graphically) *öy*, a present participle in *-A torġan*, a non-harmonic dative form of the singular personal pronouns of the type *\*mäŋa* (see 5.1), and a palatalized form *\*čäč* (Tatar *čäč*, Bashkir *säs*; like Chuvash *sūs* < *\*šus* < *\*čac* < *sač*) of the Northern Turkic (see 6.2) cognates of Old Turkic *sač* 'hair'.<sup>64</sup> In Volga-Ural Kipchak (as in Chuvash, Yakut, and Turkmen) the word for 'ox' is made of an expression for 'bull' and a lexical element expressing the castrate state; besides, the expression *\*iš öküzü* is used for 'ox' (see 6.1).

In Volga-Ural Kipchak the so-called present participle appears in forms very close to the assumed basic form *\*-A turġan*, i. e. as *-A torġan*.<sup>65</sup> Other

vidimo, budet ne *ast*, a *astī*) 'niz, nižn. čast'; pered, peredn. čast' (etwa *astīna* 'pod'); načalo', see SCHÖNIG 2005a.

<sup>62</sup> KrgRS 48 *aldī* 'pered; peredn. čast'; niz, nižn. č.', 49 *aldidaġi*, *aldīqi* 'tot, kto vepredi, peredniy; predstoyaščiy', see SCHÖNIG 2005a.

<sup>63</sup> The form *älä* formerly appeared in Northern and Northwestern vernaculars, *ädä* in Southwestern and Southern vernaculars in epics. Today Northern Kirghiz only exhibits *älä*, whereas Southern Kirghiz exhibits *älä*, *ädä*, and *ädi* (according to GADŽIEVA (1975, 162)). For *ädä* in Täläut see ILMINSKIY 213 and 256–258.

<sup>64</sup> Siberian Tatar also has a form *čäč* besides *čac* and *čac*. The same holds true for Chulyum Turkic, where the materials collected by N. SHIROBOKOVA (Novosibirsk) exhibit *čäč*, *čac*. The front vocalic form of the word in Tofa is quite young and has developed independently, as is attested by CASTRÉN (1857, 144), where we still find a velar form *taš* (= *čac*).

<sup>65</sup> For other forms of the present participle in the vernaculars of this region (often limited in use), see, e. g., MAXMUTOVA (1978, 180) and SADYKOVA 80.

Kipchak languages have more contracted forms of the type *\*-AtVGVn*, e. g., Karakalpak dialects *-Atuġun*, *-AtUGUn*, *-AtIGIn* etc., Noghay *-AtAGAn*, and Karaim *-Adoġon* (like Southeast Turkic;<sup>66</sup> Turkmen dialects *-Aduġan* ← Southeast Turkic). Ak Noghay has *-AtA:n*, whereas *-AtIn* appears in Kazakh and Karakalpak dialects; the Siberian Tatar vernaculars show a whole variety of forms.<sup>67</sup> Of causative suffixes with initial *G*, Volga-Ural Kiptchak seems to prefer *-GAz-* for *kör-* 'to see', whereas the remaining Kipchak and Southeast Turkic languages (and South Siberian) show at least *-Glz-* as an alternative.

Many Kipchak languages (together with Southeast Turkic), but not Volga-Ural Kipchak and Altay Turkic, use at least alternatively an Iranian word for 'tree', which appears as *\*däräk* in the Western Kipchak part of this grouping (Noghay, Caucasus Kipchak, Crimean Tatar *täräk*, Karaim *däräk*), whereas the Central Asian part has *\*daraq(t)*, see 6.3. For 'goat', Western-Central Kipchak (including Krymchak, but except none Volga-Ural Kipchak and Crimean Tatar), Kirghiz Kipchak (Kirghiz, Altay Kizhi, Täläut, Chalkandu), Western Siberian Tatar, Baraba, and Uzbek employ a direct cognate *\*äčki* of Old Turkic *\*äčkü*.<sup>68</sup> Volga-Ural Kipchak has Tatar *käjä*, Misher (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 42), Bashkir *käzä*, which obviously belong somehow to Oghuz *\*käčü*, Crimean Tatar *käci* (← Ottoman Turkish), and Chuvash *kačaka*. Since the Volga-Ural Kipchak forms exhibit *ä* instead of *i* in the first syllable, they must be considered as borrowings, probably of the same basic form, which also appears in Chuvash.

Of Volga-Ural Kipchak features, the at least alternatively used "short form" *\*qorġaš* of the word for 'lead' also appears in Siberian Tatar, e. g. Tobol Tatar, Baraba (both R II 941), Bashkir *qurġaš*, Tatar *qurġaš(in)*. As a cognate of *\*tAŋ(V)r(V)* 'heaven; god' the front vocalic form *\*täŋri* exists in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Siberian Tatar (as in Southeast Turkic, Chulyum Turkic, Kumanda (~ *\*täġri*, *\*täŋir*, *\*täŋäri*), and Sarygh Yughur (~ *\*täŋir*)<sup>69</sup>. Kara-

<sup>66</sup> Uzbek *-Adigan*, *-Ayotgan*; Modern Uyghur *-Adigan* etc., Lobnor Turkic *-Atuġan*, for the latter two, see PRITSÄK 1959b.

<sup>67</sup> Tomsk *-AdAGAn*, *-AtAGAn*, *-AtKIn*; Baraba *-AtIGAn*, *-AtAGAn*, *-AtIGIn*, *-AtAn*, *-AtKIn*; Tobol *-AtAn*, *-AtIGIn* (*-ADIGAn*); Tara *-AtAGAn*, *-AtAn*, *-AtA:n*; Tevriž *-AtKAn*, *-AtKIn*; Ishim *-ADIGAn*; Tüman *-AtIGAn*, *-AtIGIn*; Tura *-AtIGAn*.

<sup>68</sup> AXATOV (1963, 106) gives *yčkä*. In RADLOFF's Baraba in the metathetical form *ičkä*. The form *\*äčkü* is also attested in (Lower) Kondoma-Shor (VERBICKIY) and Tofa (in the latter with the deviant meaning 'female musk deer'); Salar (TENIŠEV) has *ešku*. The remainder of South Siberian together with Sarygh Yughur exhibits *\*öčkü* ~ *\*öčkä*; Modern Uyghur has *öčkä*.

<sup>69</sup> *\*täŋir* also exists in Fu-yü-Turkic and Saghay (RADLOFF); for Tuvan see the designations *Tavŋiŋ Täŋir Bäš-Dä:r* 'pyat' nebes' and *dä:r-däŋär* 'sky'. Normally Sayan Turkic has *\*täCrV* (Tofa *de:ri* ~ *te:rä* etc.) and *\*täCir* (Tuvan *dä:r*). A development *\*täŋri > \*täġri* is also

chay-Balkar *täyri* probably goes back to *\*tägrī*; Kumyk *təñəri* may be inspired by Mongolian, but may also go back to *\*täyri* or *\*täñir(i)* (for the latter and for Central Kipchak and Kirghiz, see 5.1). Karaim has *tänri ~ tänri ~ tändri ~ tanri ~ tañri* (KARRPS 565), Crimean Tatar and Krymchak show *tañri* (USEINOV 243 and REBI 181); ← Western Oghuz), see also 7. The regular cognate *kimä* of *\*kämä* ‘ship’ (see 3.) is given by TATRS only as a dialectal form meaning ‘boat etc.’; Standard Tatar has instead a form *köymä*, which at the same time means ‘kibitka, kareta; carriage, coach’;<sup>70</sup> in the latter meaning *köymä* appears in Bashkir, whereas Noghay has *küymä arba*. For ‘boat etc.’ Bashkir exhibits *kämä* with *ä* instead of *i* in the first syllable. Parts of Volga-Ural Kipchak (and partly Crimean Tatar, see DOERFER 1959, 378) are characterized by the reorganization of the system of vowels in the first syllables, which can be shortly described as a raising and closing of the low vowels and an opening and reduction of the high vowels. Thus we get the changes *ä, e > i* and *i > ě*, and graphically *Ö > Ü* (closed), *Û > Ö* (graphically for an open and reduced *Û*).<sup>71</sup> At the same time, we find the development *-Ay > -Iy* in word final position (partly in Crimean Tatar, see DOERFER 1959, 378); for further details, see BERTA (1989). For the developments in Mishar Tatar, see MAXMUTOVA (1978), for Siberian Tatar, see AXATOV (1963), DMITRIEVA (1966 and 1981), and TUMAŠEVA (1968).

The cognates of *\*büniz* (? >) ~ *\*büniz*<sup>72</sup> ‘horn’ are a special case. As the only modern Kipchak languages (placed at the margins of the Kipchak area), Karaim (*münüz*), Krymchak (*muñuz*), and some Siberian Tatar vernaculars (with *mönös, mögös, möyös, müs* etc.) have preserved the feature *nasality* of the intervocalic consonant, see 1 and 4. We find *\*münüz > \*mügüz* in

attested in Chalkandu, Shor, the Shor dialect of Khakas, Kumanda, and Saghay (RADLOFF).

<sup>70</sup> For Tatar *köymö* RADLOFF (II 1325) only gives ‘Verdeck (hood)’, *köymölä* ‘etwas von oben mit einer bogenartigen Decke versehen’, *köymöli* ‘bogenförmig, mit einem Verdecke versehen, verdeckt (vom Wagen)’; the genesis of *köymä* remains to be investigated.

<sup>71</sup> This sound changes do not regularly appear in Mishar Tatar. For Bashkir see BENZING (1959c, 422).

<sup>72</sup> CLAUSON (1974, 352a–b) has *\*bünüz* ‘horn’ (Türküt *münüz, muñuz*; Uyghur *müyüz, miñiz, müñüz*, Khakani *münüz*, Chaghatay *bünüz, buynuz, müñüz*, Kuman *müz*, Kipchak *buynuz, müyüz*). To me it seems attractive to assume an original form *\*büniz*, which in some Turkic languages became *\*bünüz > \*bünüz ~ \*münüz*, whereas in others *\*büniz* survived. Kuman *müz* most probably goes back to *\*müyüz*. Of the other modern languages, Oghuz has *boynuz ~ buynuz*, Salar (TENIŠEV) *moñus ~ moñas* etc., Modern Uyghur *münüz*, Uryangkhai (KATANOV) *müñis < \*münüz*, Tuba *münüs ~ mü:s*, Sarygh Yughur *moñus ~ muñis ~ mois ~ mu:s*. Chuvash with *mäyra* and Yakut with *muos* (<*\*münüz ~ \*mügüz*) show no overt reflex of nasality. Contracted forms *\*mü(:)s (~ \*mu(:)s ~ \*mi(:)s ~ \*mi(:)s*) dominate in South Siberian and exist at least alternatively to other forms in Sarygh Yughur and Siberian Tatar.

Volga-Ural Kipchak (Tatar *mögöz*, Bashkir *mögöd*) and Siberian Tatar (as in Uzbek *muguz*, Shor *mügüs ~ mü(:)s*, and perhaps Yakut *muos*, for the backing of the vowel, see fn. 59). I suspect even the modern forms of the type *\*müyüz ~ \*müyiz* not to go back to a form *\*mühüz*, but to *\*mügüz*. We find these forms in Siberian Tatar (*möyös, möyis*), Kirghiz (*müyüz*), Central Kipchak (Kazakh *müyiz*, Karakalpak *müyiz, müyüz*), Noghay (*müyiz, müyüz*), and Caucasus Kipchak (Karachay-Balkar *müyüz*, Kumyk *müyiz, müyüz*). I assume a development *\*müyiz < \*mügiz*, because the *\*müyüz*-languages fill the space between *\*münüz*- and *\*mügüz*-languages. Of course, one may also assume that in the area of these languages both forms *\*münüz* and *\*mühüz* co-existed. Then, at the borders of this area *\*münüz > \*mügüz* was dominant, whereas *\*mühüz* became the basic form in its central part. Here, Altay Turkic like the other Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic languages, has contracted forms of the type *\*mü(:)s (~ \*mu(:)s ~ \*mi(:)s*).

Bashkir has a lot of special features, which point to a still unknown substrate.<sup>73</sup> Within the framework of this attempt of an internal division of Turkic, the differences between the two components of Volga-Ural Kipchak can be described as follows: Tatar and Bashkir use different forms, e. g., in the case of the word *\*yArdAm* ‘help’, of the words for ‘brain’, ‘seven’, ‘to sit’, ‘to cry’, the expressions for ‘with’, the dative forms of the singular personal pronouns, the demonstratives ending in *-l*, and the demonstratives containing *-š*, the use of *qanday* and *nindäy* for *\*qa:ño täg* ‘how? like which?’, and in a limited sense for the word for ‘lead’ (see 5.3). Tatar seems to be free of *\*m(Vn)A(n)*-forms for ‘with’, see 5.3. On the phonetical level Bashkir belongs to the languages exhibiting special phonotactical rule sets

<sup>73</sup> In the *Secret History of the Mongols*, § 239, we find beneath the “forest peoples” (*boy-in irgen*) of South Siberia the *Bajigit*. In §§ 262, 270 and 274 (describing the Mongol campaign in the Volga area) we also meet some *Bajigid* (always together with the *Kibča’ut*, most probably the precursors of the modern Kipchak). Since the latter *Bajigid* may be identical with the precursors of the Bashkir, some scholars identify the Siberian *Bajigid* with the Bashkir (e. g. GOLDEN 1992, 412). This is possible, but far from being proven. The modern self-designation of the Bashkir is *Bašqort*; older forms like *Bašjird, Bašgird, Bašqird* can be found in the works of pre-Chinggisid travellers and historians, and in the work of KÄŠGARĪ, see SCHÖNIG 2005d. Thus the name *Bajigid* of the Volga region may be a Mongol substitution of a local name, which is based on the name *Bajigid* of a Siberian people. On the other hand, the modern Bashkir are called *Istäk ~ Istäk* etc. by the Kazakh and Kirghiz (GOLDEN 1992, 263 and 397–9; see also SARKISYANZ 1961), a designation connected to the Russian designation *Ostyak* for, e. g., Ob-Ugrians; this is paralleled in the Khakas designation *Ästäk ~ Ästäk* for the Sölkup (BUTANAEV 1999, 232). Perhaps here lies a key to the understanding of the ethnogenesis and glottogenesis of the modern Bashkir, perhaps in the sense that these designations are used by Turks for Ob-Ugric or Samoyed peoples; see also SCHÖNIG 2005c.

(see 6.2), whereas Tatar does not.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, in Bashkir, initial \*č- has developed to a sibilant (see 6.2), has changed initial *s-* to *h-*, and shows (like Turkmen) lisping, e. g. in the case of sibilants within and at the end of a word (see above the word for ‘horn’).<sup>75</sup> Especially in the case of the differences between the Tatar and Bashkir written languages we know that they came into existence by deriving the base of the Bashkir written language as far away as possible from that of Standard Tatar,<sup>76</sup> which itself was produced as a compromise between different Tatar dialectal groups, i. e. the differences were stressed by reasons of a traditional dissonance between the two linguistically closely related groups.<sup>77</sup>

Volga-Ural Kipchak has some features in common with Caucasus Kipchak. Thus Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (including Mishar Tatar and parts of Siberian Tatar) has a second person plural possessive suffix *+(I)GIz* instead of *+(I)ŋIz* (like Lena Turkic and comparable to Altay Turkic *+(I)GAR*), perhaps due to the quite frequent sound change *ŋ > G* in the Northern Turkic area, see 6.2. The other Kipchak languages (including southern Tatar dialects like, e. g., Astrakhan Tatar) have retained *+(I)ŋIz*; for Kirghiz *+(I)ŋAr* see fn. 125, for Karaim see 7, for the first person plural possessive suffix *+(I)blz*, see 6.2. Caucasus Kipchak and Tatar exhibit forms of \**boluš* ‘help, aid’ enlarged by *+LIK* (Caucasus Kipchak *bolušluq*, Tatar *bulış(liq)*), Karachay-Balkar additionally uses *bolušuw*, a verbal noun of \**boluš*.<sup>78</sup> Together with Noghay and Chuvash, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak exhibits a strong tendency to use *-(I)t-*causatives of \**yWr(I)-* and \**o(I)(t)ur-*. As to cognates of *töbän* ‘lower part etc.’, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, parts of Siberian Tatar, Shor, Khakas, and Southeast Turkic have a non-nasal labial consonant (*-b-*), whereas Noghay, Central Kipchak, Kirghiz Kipchak, Tobol Tatar, and Chulym Turkic have a nasal one (*-m-*). A “mixed group” consists of the Northern Altay dialects Tuba, Chalkandu, and Kumanda.

Caucasus Kipchak seems to use less causative suffixes with initial *-G-* than Volga-Ural Kipchak. Aside from Caucasian and Oghuz influences absent in

<sup>74</sup> Here, Bashkir exhibits an individual feature by showing obstruentic instead of clusilic dissimilation, see fn. 92.

<sup>75</sup> An idea mentioned by my colleague L.V. CLARK.

<sup>76</sup> According to BENZING (1959c, 422) the dialects (more exactly *Mundarten*) of Kuvakan and Yurmaty near Sterlitamak; see also YULDAŠEV (1966, 173).

<sup>77</sup> The German readers of this article may understand this phenomenon at once, if they recall the Prussian-Bavarian relations.

<sup>78</sup> This noun was perhaps borrowed from Kipchak into Chuvash (*puläšu*). In addition we find Chuvash *puläšni*, a Chuvash derivation of the verb *puläš-*, which itself may be a Kipchak borrowing.

(most) other Kipchak languages, Caucasus Kipchak has some special features, which only sporadically appear in other Kipchak languages. Thus the word \**baq(q)ür* ‘copper’ appears as *baqür* in Kirghiz Kipchak (Täläut *paqür*, as in Küärik; Kyzyl *paxür*), Central Kipchak, Noghay, Far Western Kipchak, and Volga-Ural Kipchak (as in Uzbek), whereas Caucasus Kipchak has *bağür* (like Baraba *pağür*).<sup>79</sup> Cognates of *as(t)* ‘under’ can be found in Kipchak including Siberian Tatar (as in Turkmen, Khalaj, and Southeast Turkic) except Caucasus Kipchak (like Northeast Turkic and Western Oghuz literary languages).<sup>80</sup> The Central Turkic root element \**il* ‘before, first; front side etc.’ and its derivations<sup>81</sup> seem to be absent in Caucasus Kipchak and Noghay; for other common features with Noghay, see 5.4. For Caucasus Kipchak (and Karaim) *özängü* ‘stirrup’ and Kumyk (and Crimean Tatar) *oša-* ‘to resemble’, see 5. For the velar forms of \**bi(r)lä(n)* in Caucasus Kipchak, see 5.3.

Special features of Karachay-Balkar are, e. g., the use of *müyü* for ‘brain’ (see 5.1), a form *täyri* for \**tAŋ(V)r(V)* (see above and 5.1), a vingesimal system of the tens beside a multiplicative system, use of *alğün* ‘snačala, prežniy’ (KRČRS 48; perhaps a contamination of *alğü* (< \**al* + *KI*) and *aldün*, see 3 and SCHÖNIG 2005a), intermediary dative forms of the pronouns of the first and second person singular (see 5.1), a reflexive pronoun *käs* (see 2),<sup>83</sup> absence of demonstratives containing \**š* (as in Azeri and South Siberian including Altay Turkic, see 5.3), a form *tül ~ tüyül* of the negative copula (see 6.1), a negative Aorist in *-mAz* instead of *-mAs* (see PRITSAK (1959a, 361) and KRČBLKGR 211; like Crimean Tatar and Krymchak, see 7), and a (kind of) future in \**-(V)rLIK* (see PRITSAK 1959a, 363). Karachay-Balkar seems to be free of \**m(Vn)A(n)*-forms for ‘with’, see 5.3.

More or less individual features of Kumyk are a numeral *yätti* ‘seven’ pointing to a strong protoform with doubled consonant (as in Altay Turkic, see 6.1), a numeral *yigirma* ‘twenty’ (beside *ägirmi ~ ägärmü*), dative forms of the type \**mağa* of the first and second person singular pronouns (as in No-

<sup>79</sup> This causes some problems. Since Kipchak and South Siberian normally have *-K- > -G-* in intervocalic position, the forms with *-q-* may point to an original form with strong or doubled \**-q-*.

<sup>80</sup> But we find *ast* in Ottoman and in some modern Anatolian dialects, see CLAUSON (1974, 242) and SCHÖNIG 2005a.

<sup>81</sup> See CLAUSON (1974, 140) “ilk ‘first’ in order of time and space” and SCHÖNIG 2005a.

<sup>82</sup> See PRITSAK (1959a, 356): *ñyürma* ‘twenty’, *ñyürma bla on* ‘thirty’, *äki ñyürma* ‘forty’, *äki ñyürma bla on* ‘fifty’ etc. (vingesimal system); *bir on* ‘ten’, *eki on* ‘twenty’, *üč on* ‘thirty’ etc. (multiplicative system). The multiplicative system of Karachay-Balkar developed independent of that in Northeast Turkic languages.

<sup>83</sup> According to XABIČEV (1966, 221) this goes back to Kuman forms like *känsi* etc. (only in the German part of the *Codex Cumanicus*, see GABAIN 1959, 64).



ghay), a form *miy* ~ *may* of the word for brain, a form *tānāri* of *\*tAn(V)r(V)*, and within the Kipchak framework *\*-š*-demonstratives of the type *šovvu*, *šo:wu* < *\*šn.bu*, see 5.3; especially Khaydak Kumyk has *ša* (~*šu*).<sup>84</sup> The dative forms of the demonstratives are derived by adding the cognate of the old directive suffix to the nominative form, see 5.3 and fn. 91.

### 5.3 Central Kipchak

Features of Central Kipchak are, e. g., forms *uqsa-* < *\*uqša-* ‘to resemble’ (as in Southern Altay Turkic) and *\*yür-* of the verb *\*yWr(I)-* ‘to go, move’ (as in Crimean Tatar and Southern Altay Turkic), a dative form of the type *\*magan* of the singular personal pronouns, and a form *šaš* < *čáč* < *sač* of the word for ‘hair’ (see 6.2).

The use of *-Glz*-causatives of *bil-* ‘to know’ seems to be mostly limited to Central Kipchak and Kirghiz. Central Kipchak and Noghay show forms of the type *\*šämirsäk* for ‘cartilage’ (most probably derived from *\*kämirčäk* by assimilation of the initial consonant to the fricative *č* (> *š*); see fn. 21 and 3). A Central Kipchak-Bashkir-Noghay grouping exhibits the development of initial *\*č* not to an affricate but to a sibilant (see 6.2). As to the expressions for ‘with’ of the type *\*m(Vn)A(n)*, we find non-enclitic, always front vocalic forms *\*mänän* in (most of) Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, and Bashkir (and sometimes in Crimean Tatar).<sup>85</sup> Of the harmonical forms we find *\*mAn* in Noghay (standard language),<sup>86</sup> Northeastern dialects of Karakalpak (MENGES 1959, 467), Western Siberian Tatar (AXATOV 1963, 153), and Karaim (as in Chuvash *pA(n)*, Beltir *BAŋ*; Mras-Shor *BA*), *\*mInAn* ~ *\*mAn* in Crimean Tatar (besides *minän*, *nAn*), Orenburg Tatar (SADYKOVA 1985, 95), Mishar (MAXMUTOVA 1978), and parts of Siberian Tatar (Baraba; Ishim, Tara, Tobol, Tura (KATANOV)) (as in Kyzyl *M(In)an*), ILMINSKIY *mInAn*, *män*, *mInAn*) and *\*mInAn* in Southern Kazakh (see AMANŽOLOV 1959, 253) and Altay Turkic dialects (*mInAn*, Täläut of Bachatsk *minan*; as in Kacha, Koybal *BInAn*); for the back vocalic forms *munan* ~ *mulan* in Kumyk, see also below. It seems that of Kipchak only Karachay-Balkar and Standard Tatar are free of *\*m(Vn)A(n)*-forms.

<sup>84</sup> Khaydak Kumyk may be considered as a separate Caucasus Kipchak language, but this can not be discussed here.

<sup>85</sup> Thus we have *\*mänän* in Karakalpak (standard language) and Kirghiz, *\*mänän* ~ *män* in Kazakh, *\*minän* (> *mänän*) in Bashkir and in Crimean Tatar. Most probably the forms with a low vowel in the first syllable were developed from *\*minän* by assimilation to the vowel of the second syllable.

<sup>86</sup> According to MENGES (1959) Kipchak Uzbek and Noghay also show harmonical *\*mVnAn*-forms.

In analogy to *\*ol*, demonstrative pronouns of the types *\*bu* (*\*bo*) and *\*šV* have developed forms ending in *-l* in the Central Kipchak-Kirghiz-Bashkir grouping together with Western Siberian Tatar, Noghay, Kumyk, and Karaim. Thus in Kirghiz we find forms with or without final *-l* (KRGGR 187–8: *bu(l)*, *ušu(l)*, *ošo(l)*, *tigi(l)*, *tätigil*; YUNUSALIEV (1966, 493) additionally has *šol*, *šul*); Western Siberian Tatar has *šu*, *ša*, *šal* (AXATOV 1963, 159), Bashkir of Argayash has *ša(l)*, *šo(l)*, *ši(l)*, *so(l)* (MAKSYUTOVA 1976, 123),<sup>87</sup> Kumyk has *bu(l)* (BENZING (1959d, 402)), and Karaim (T, G) shows *bu(l)* (MUSAEV (1966, 268) and (1977, 41)). A stable final *-l* appears in Standard Bashkir and some dialects (*bil*, *šul*) and Central Kipchak (*bul*, *sol*). For Noghay I have BASKAKOV (1966a, 285) and SIG 320 *bul*, *sol*, but RNOGS 721 ‘étot’ *bu*, 627 *sol*.

Cognates of *\*qa:ño täg* ‘how? like which?’ show *\*qan*-stems in Kirghiz Kipchak (~ *qalay* in Southern Kirghiz and in the neighborhood of Kazakhs, KRGRS 329), Central Kipchak (~ *qalay*), Uzbek (~ *qalay*), Tomsk Tatar, Standard Bashkir (BTH I 629 *qanday* = 617 *qalay*), and in the Southern Bashkir dialect of Ik-Sakmar (*qanday*, *qalay* ‘kakoy’ MIRŽANOVA 1979, 61) (as in Modern Uyghur and Sayan Turkic); Noghay employs a *\*qay*-stem *qayday* (RNOGS 242 ‘kakoy’, *qalay* RNOGS 241 ‘kak’) (like Shor *qaydä*, *qaydi*, *qaydiğ* and Khakas *xaydi*, *xaydağ*). Cognates of *\*ne(n)täg* are attested in Western Kipchak (Crimean Tatar *näday* ‘kakoy’ SEVORTYAN 1966, 244), Bashkir *nindäy*, Tatar *nindi*, Karaim (T) *niñdi*, (H) *nändi*, and in Baraba (*nëndäw*);<sup>88</sup> Krymchak has *nas* (‘kak, kakoj’, REBI 23; ← Ottoman *nasil*?). The use of *\*qalay* ‘kak (~) kakoy’ seems to be typical of Kirghiz, Central Kipchak (including Uzbek), Noghay, Bashkir, and Karachay-Balkar (*qallay*); the same grouping exhibits *\*yäti*-protoforms for ‘seven’ (see 6.1).

As to demonstratives containing *\*š*, we find *\*šWl* in Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Bashkir, Noghay, the Kalmak vernacular of Tomsk Tatar (see TUMAŠEVA 1968, 164), and Tatar of the late nineteenth/early twentieth centuries (as in Old Ottoman, Yakut (*sol*), and Dolgan (*bol*)). If we look for forms of the type *šW(l)*, Baraba (*šu(l)* ~ *šol*), Kumyk (MAGOMEDOV (1966, 201): *šu*, *šo*; BENZING (1959d, 402): *šu(l)*, *šo(l)*), and Turkmen (*šu*, *šol*, *šo*) can be added to this grouping. The type *šW* is present in Crimean Tatar and Krymchak (*šu*) (as in Turkish (including Gagauz), Southeast Turkic, and Sarygh Yughur; see 7), whereas *\*šA* additionally appears in Khaydak Kumyk (*šu*, *ša*, see BENZING 1959d, 402). A comparable distribution can be found in

<sup>87</sup> In the Kyzyl dialect of Bashkir the analogization went the other way, i. e. here the demonstrative *\*ol* lost its *-l* and became *u* ~ *i* in analogy to *bi* and *šu* (see MAKSYUTOVA 1976, 272). The Southern dialects of Bashkir seem to be more or less free of *\*bul-* and *\*šVl-*forms, see MIRŽANOVA (1979).

<sup>88</sup> Hereon, as well as on the existence of *qan-* as well as an *qay*-stem in one and the same language, see SCHÖNIG 1995.

the case of the demonstratives of the type \*W3V(l), which at least exist in Kirghiz (*ušu(l)*, *ošo(l)*, KRGR 187f.), in Karaim (T *ošol*, G *osol*, see MUSAEV 1966 268), Krymchak (*ošol*, REBI 160), and, as \*W3V, in Baraba (TUMAŠEVA (1992, 104): *ošo* (rare)), Bashkir (*ošo*), Central Kipchak (Karakalpak *usī*, Kazakh *osī*), and Uzbek (*üşa*).<sup>89</sup> There are other complex demonstratives containing \*-š- like Kumyk *šovvu* (MAGOMEDOV (1966, 201), *šo:wu* (BENZING (1959d, 402)) < \**šu.bu* (?), Tatar *šusī*, the Southern Bashkir dialect of Ik-Samar *šošo* (MIRŽANOVA 1979, 60), and Noghay *sosī* (< \**šoši*).<sup>90</sup> Forms of the type \*W3bu can mainly be found at the margins of the Kipchak area, e. g. in Karaim ((T) *ušpu*, (G) *uspu*, see MUSAEV (1966, 268) and Uzbek (*ušbu*).

Dative forms of the demonstrative pronouns derived from the nominative instead of the oblique stem can be found in Bashkir, Kumyk, Noghay, Central Kipchak, Kirghiz-Kipchak (as in Kipchakoid South Siberian and Sarygh Yughur),<sup>91</sup> i. e. this phenomenon cannot be observed in the Western part of Western Kipchak. In the remaining western part of Kipchak (except Crimean Tatar and Krymchak), but also in Kumyk and Kara-Noghay, cognates of the old directive suffix instead of the dative suffix are used (at least sporadically) with demonstrative pronouns in Tatar (*moŋa*, *moŋar(ġa)* etc., see TATGR), Karaim (*bunar*, *munar* (PRITSAK 1959a, 333)), Kumyk (see fn. 91), and Balkar (alternatively *munyar*, see PRITSAK (1959a, 359)); in Kara-Noghay, the directive suffix appears not only on demonstratives, but also on singular personal pronouns (see fn. 91). The use of the directive suffix with demonstratives is already known from Kuman (e. g. *munar*, *aŋar* ~ *aġar* ~ *a:r* ~ *aŋa*, see GABAIN 1959, 63).

<sup>89</sup> Chuvash *leš* ~ *lešē* goes back to metathetical forms of \*W3VI. Because of the -š- they are probably borrowed from Kipchak.

<sup>90</sup> See also Yakut *subu* < \**šu.bu*, Chuvash *šak*, *šakā* < \**šu.ku*, *šav*, *šavā* < \**šu.bu* (?) (with \*š > ś like in the case of the cooperative suffix?), and Modern Uyghur *mošu*, *üşu* etc. For combinations of other deictic elements see, e. g., Balkar *inol*, Kumyk *o:wu*, Turkmen *hol*, Karaim *etol* (< Russian *eto*, see MUSAEV (1966, 268) and (1977, 42)), Krymchak (*anavu*, REBI 22) Modern Uyghur (*monu*, *ävu*) etc.

<sup>91</sup> Bashkir has *biġa*, *šuġa*, *uġa* (< *bil*, *šul*, *ul*); for *ošo* we find *ošoġa* in BENZING (1959c, 431), but *ošoŋa* in YULDAŠEV (1966, 182). Ak-Noghay and Central Noghay have *buġa*, *soġa*, *oġa*, Kazakh and Karakalpak exhibit *buġan*, *soġan*, *oġan* (MENGENS 1959, 469), i. e. forms resembling the dative forms of the singular personal pronouns, see 5.1. The same holds true for Kara-Noghay, which uses cognates of the old directive suffix instead of the dative suffix for the singular personal pronouns and the demonstratives (*maġar*, *saġar*, *oġar*, *buġar*, *soġar* (MENGENS 1959, 469). Kumyk displays the same tendency by using the directive suffix only with the demonstrative pronouns (*buġar*, *šoġar*, *oġar* (*aġar*), see BENZING (1959d, 402)). In Kirghiz, the practice to derive case forms of demonstratives from the nominative has spread out onto some ablative forms, e. g. *buġa*, *ošoġo*, *ošondon* ~ *ošodon*, *ušundan* ~ *ušudan*, *tigigä*, *tigindän* ~ *tigidän* (KRGR 192).

In Kirghiz, Central Kipchak, and Noghay, suffixes with initial {M} are affected by clusilic dissimilation<sup>92</sup> (as in South Siberian Turkic). On this and on dissimilation phenomena with suffixes with initial {D}-, {L}- and {N}-morphophonemes in Bashkir, Kazakh, and Kirghiz Kipchak (and sometimes in Noghay and Karakalpak) see also 6.2.

The gerund in \*-GAč is present in Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, Karaim (-*Adoġoč*, T -*GAčox*, G -*GAčox*), Western Siberian Tatar (only in *torġač*, see AXATOV 1963, 176), Tomsk Tatar and Baraba (-*GAč+tAn*, +*In*), Southeast Turkic, and Sayan Turkic;<sup>93</sup> the Altay Turkic gerund in -*GAčIn* probably consists of the gerund in \*-GAč and the old instrumental suffix, see above the case of Baraba. This gerund does not exist in Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Noghay, Crimean Tatar (according to DOERFER (1959, 386) -*GAč* exists only in ancient documents), Krymchak, and Täläut (like most of Yenisey Turkic and in Oghuz).

Direct cognates of \**bi(r)lä(n)* 'with' seem to be absent in Kirghiz Kipchak, Central Kipchak (except the southwestern dialects of Karakalpak with *bilä*), Noghay, and Kipchak Uzbek, see also MENGENS 1959. Of Kipchak, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (including Misher), Karaim, Crimean Tatar, and Baraba (like Southeast Turkic, Sarygh Uyghur, parts of Kipchakoid South Siberian, Chuvash, and some Anatolian dialects) use cognates of \**bi(r)lä(n)* 'with'. Crimean Tatar (like Uzbek) uses the form *bilän* 'with' besides +*ilä(n)* 'id.'; the latter appears as *ilän* in Krymchak, see also 7. In Caucasus Kipchak and Baraba (as in Salar and Chuvash dialects) we find oscillation between (postpositional and enclitic) \**b*-forms with and without final *n*. Caucasus Kipchak and Karaim have back vocalic forms, e. g. Kumyk *bulan* (and enclitic variants +*mulan* and +*munan*, see BENZING 1959d), Karachay-Balkar literary language *bla* (~ +*blA*), spoken Balkar *bila(n)* ~ *bila* ~ *bilä*, spoken Karachay *bila*, Karaim *bila*.

Within the framework of my attempt of an internal division of Turkic the differences between the two components of Central Kipchak can be described as follows. In the case of the word for 'stirrup', Kazakh with \**üzängü* behaves like most other Kipchak languages, whereas Karakalpak goes together with Noghay (\**(ü)zängü*, see 5). The extent of clusilic dissimilation seems to be lower in Karakalpak than in Kazakh, see 6.2; see also the different forms of \**tAŋ(V)r(V)* (see 5.1), the present tense participles (see

<sup>92</sup> Clusilic dissimilation means that a sequence of two non-clusiles (non-plosives) has to be dissolved into a sequence of a non-clusile and a clusile; in the case of Bashkir we better speak *mutatis mutandis* of obstruentic dissimilation, SCHÖNIG 1993.

<sup>93</sup> For the Siberian Tatar vernaculars see, e. g., TUMAŠEVA 1968, for Täläut see UBRYATOVA 1985; according to PATAČAKOVA (1984, 102) cognates of \*-GAč are rarely used in Khakas dialects, mainly in Kyzyl and in Kacha of the White Iyus.

5.2), the \**W̃V(I)*-demonstratives (see above), and of the words for 'twenty' (see 6.1) and for 'horn' (see 5.1). In the case of the word for 'to resemble', Karakalpak uses \**uša-* (like Noghay, Caucasus Kipchak, Tara Tatar, and RADLOFF's Tatar and Karaim) besides \**uqša-*. Kazakh (according to my materials) only has \**uqša-* (comparable to Kirghiz Kipchak, Karaim, and Volga-Ural Kipchak, see 5). In Central Kipchak, a cognate of \**a:tağ* 'island' is attested in my materials only in Karakalpak, but not in Kazakh, see 5; the same can be observed for the participle in \*-*AčAK* (for this and for the participle in *-AsI* see 7) and the present tense form in *-mAKtA* (see 6.2), i. e. there exist some verbal forms in Karakalpak, which can also be found in Oghuz.

## Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica

Herausgegeben von Cornelius Hassel-  
blatt und Klaus Röhrborn

66: Eugen Helimski, Ulrike Kahrs,  
Monika Schötschel (Hg.)

### Mari und Mordwinen im heutigen Rußland

Sprache, Kultur, Identität

2005. XXIII, 563 Seiten, 22 Abb., gb  
ISBN 978-3-447-05166-8  
€ 120,- (D) / sFr 203,-

67: Heinrich Werner

### Die Jenissej-Sprachen des 18. Jahrhunderts

2005. VIII, 348 Seiten, gb  
ISBN 978-3-447-05239-9  
€ 76,- (D) / sFr 129,-

68: Michael Geisler

### Vokal-Null-Alternation, Synkope und Akzent in den permischen Sprachen

2005. 320 Seiten, br  
ISBN 978-3-447-05256-6  
€ 68,- (D) / sFr 116,-

69: Heinrich Werner

### Die Welt der Jenissejer im Lichte des Wortschatzes

Zur Rekonstruktion der jenissejischen  
Protokultur

2006. XII, 200 Seiten, 2 Abb., 3 Karten, br  
ISBN 978-3-447-05431-7  
€ 58,- (D) / sFr 99,-

70: Hendrik Fenz, Petra Kappert (Hg.)

### Turkologie für das 21. Jahrhundert Herausforderungen zwischen Tradition und Moderne

Materialien der 4. Deutschen  
Turkologen-Konferenz  
Hamburg, 15.-18. März 1999

2006. 309 Seiten, 2 Abb., br  
ISBN 978-3-447-05435-5  
€ 68,- (D) / sFr 116,-

71: Abdurishid Yakup

### Dišastvustik

Eine altuigurische Bearbeitung einer  
Legende aus dem Catusparišat-sūtra

2006. VIII, 176 Seiten, br  
ISBN 978-3-447-05252-8  
€ 44,- (D) / sFr 76,-

72: Mehmet Ölmez

### Tuwinischer Wortschatz mit alttürkischen und mongolischen Parallelen

Tuvacanın Sözvarlığı  
Eski Türkçe ve Moğolca Denkleriyle

2007. XII, 516 Seiten, gb  
ISBN 978-3-447-05499-7  
€ 128,- (D) / sFr 217,-