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77. pîr 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. turtb 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. alti ay 'June'; cf. Chin. 六月 liu-yue 'id.' ("six-month")

83. čitï ay 'July'; cf. Chin. 九月 qi-yue 'id.' ("seven-month")

84. sigïs ay 'August'; cf. Chin. 八月 ba-yue 'id.' ("eight-month")

85. toyïs ay 'September'; cf. Chin. 九月 jiün-yue 'id.' ("nine-month")

86. on ay 'October'; cf. Chin. 十月 shì-yue 'id.' ("ten-month")

87. on bîr 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")

Some Newly Identified Words in “Fuyu Kirghiz” (1)
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[Note: "tagan sara" or in formal style teriğïn sara. The solar months are designated by the ordinal numbers, so that January is nigeñïgïn sara, etc.] (Lessing 1960: 674a).

yurkañ sara 'March; three months' (Lessing 1960: 674a).

dörbeh sara 'April' (Lessing 1960: 268b).

tahud sara 'the fifth month, May' (Lessing 1960: 674b).

firdügïn sara 'June; sixth month' (Lessing 1960: 1059b).

dohurgan sara 'seventh months, July' (Lessing 1960: 260a).

meyman sara 'August; the eighth month of the lunar year; eight months' (Lessing 1960: 559a).

arben sara 'October; tenth month (lunar); ten months' (Lessing 1960: 49b).

arben nigen sara 'November; eleventh month (lunar)' (Lessing 1960: 49b).

arben goyar sara 'December; twelfth month (lunar); twelve months' (Lessing 1960: 49b, 955b).
Some notes on Modern Kipchak Turkic (Part 1)

by Claus Schöning, 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 Schöning (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 dialectal 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.¹

1 Kipchak as Norm Turkic

According to the definition given in Schöning (1999) Kipchak Turkic is Norm Turkic, since it has lost the Ancient Turkic word-initial */b̪̪/² it has kept the distinction */č/ : */y/-word-initial initial, it shows a nominal plural suffix */-Ar/, it possesses a gerund in */-p/, it further displays cognates of the conditional suffix */-Ar/, and has a third person imperative suffix going back to */-ün/.

Besides, Kipchak (like most of other Turkic languages) shows a lot of other features, which may be called Norm Turkic or even Common Turkic,³ e.g. the use of designations for certain things, activities etc. like (not taking into account the probable vowel length) */daγ/ 'foot', */gol/ 'arm', */swiŋ/ 'bone', */bán/ */-báŋ/ 'brain', */bún/ */-bün/ 'horn', */sáŋ/ 'hair', */àv/ 'house', */tag/ 'mountain', */tamš/ 'mark', */sé/ 'wax', */tikä/ 'fox', */taŋ/ 'chicken', */bunä/ 'bull', */böküz/ (castrated) bull; */ox, */yulust/ 'star', */bág/ (a title), */alton/ 'gold', */báqır/ 'copper', */balıq/ 'mud', */sarış/ 'yellow', */aq/ 'white', */qara/ 'black', */yasıl/ (a type of green), */bütün/ 'all; whole', */al/-'to take', */bar/-'to go', */ber/-'to give', */xu-/ 'fly', */tuz/-'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. */Ve/go V*/stirrup', */iAy/ri*/V*/(V)*/'heaven; god', */hVgä'/tree', */yWl*/'to go, move', */o(l)/3*/- to sit (down)', */hVgä'/ 'to cry', */b1/ */- bút/-'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 */më/ (always in */më+/V*/), the personal interrogative */Km*/ the personal pronouns */bàn/ */sän/ */b1/ *siz/ possessive suffixes going back to */+(l)m/ (pl. */+1z/)+l(l)y/ */+z/ */+(z)/ (pr. */+1z/)). Kipchak has a pro-

¹ 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 Dzurêša, for Tomsk Tartar according to Tumlëv, 1974A, and for Saryx Yughur according to Tumlëv 1974B. In general, these standard works are only mentioned in the text if the data are of more than general interest.

² In this context it is of some interest that Arabic and Persian words with initial */b/ and */b/, which probably were borrowed quite early, have lost their initial consonant, see, e.g. Fu-u-Ü Türkic ič = */b1/ 'not/anything/nobody (at all) (with negative predicate)', Tatay äzir 'ready' (beside xät 'now'), ärim 'in vain, useless', Altay Türkic urmat 'good luck; success; reputation'.

³ According to Schöning (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 Gesamtösterreichisch and not in the sense of Gemeindeösterreichisch designating phenomena in all Turkic languages except Bughar 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.

⁴ Today the word for 'mud' is */balıq/ in Central Turkic and Chuvash (Crimean Tartar, Tartar, Caucaus Kipchak, Kirghiz balıq, Krymsch balıq, Kara Tatische balıq, etc., Noghay, Central Kipchak balıq, Siberian Tartar and Chulym Turkic (R IV 1172 Baraba, Kùärik) balıq, Chuvash piläc, Bashkir balıq, Uzbek balıq, Turkmen, Azeri piläc, Turkish balıq), */balıq/ in Yakut (R IV 1172 balıq 'Schmutz'; Sumpf, *YaRS 501 balıq 'puddle'), and metathetical */balıq*/ */balıg/ */balıq/ balıq in Sayan Turkic and Altay Turkic; in Yenisey Türkic (= Khakas and Shor) we find */balıq/ = */bolq/ (e.g. R IV 1169 Talaut, Kumanda, Altay Kizi, piläg 'Schmutz', Schlamm, Erle, Lehmi, 1170 Chalkandu, Shor, Altay Kizhi piläq 'id.', Saghay, Koybal piläg 'id.', R IV 1172 Saghay, Koybal, Kacha piläg (Schmutz, Sumpf, 2042 Shor, Saghay piläq 'id.'), for Kazakh ("Kür") RALIPE gives R IV 1506 bolg 'Lehm, Schmutz' and 1499 bolq 'ein sumpiges, mit Grashügel bedecktes Land; der Schmutzhügel'; the latter must be a borrowing from some South Siberian vernacular used as a landscape term. See also Clauson (1972, 333) balıq 'mud'.
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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 Bulgar Turkic), case-marked forms of *gai: 'which' to ask for places, directions etc., +nll-ordinals, a denominative adjectival suffix +IIG, an agent noun in +c, a locative in +DA, an ablative in +DAm, 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 + (*ol()t)ur-, *tur-, *yat-, *Wu(r)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 *h has developed to y. One may even include features such as postpositional use of cognates of tib 'root; bottom part' (see Schöning 2005a), of biverbs with *baular- 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 -Gtv-forms (see Schöning 2004a), but has lost the Ancient Turkic opposition between the positive and negative participles -miL, -DOK : -mADO (different from Yakut, Dolgan, and Gagauz). Moreover, 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 Dörfper 1959, 379, for Krymchak ol- see Rem 156). Like most of non-Sayanic Norm Turkic, Kipchak uses *či: for 'to go out (up)' (Old Turkic tanqa-).

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 -ʌ(ʌ) > ʌ(t), forms of the personal interrogative pronoun reconstrucetable as *kim, cognates of the verbs *toko: 'to give birth ~ to be born' and *ket- 'to go away', forms of the type *ot()lr- to designate 'to sit (down)', the privative suffix +slz, and replacement of the first person plural ending +(f)mlz 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 ay- (originally 'to ask') with the same meaning.8 Nearly all Central Turkic languages exhibit cognates of *yartim 'help'. In Central Turkic (including most dialects of Altay and Chulym Turkic), the form of the word for 'stirrup' shows the labial initial vowel, i. e. it is of the type *uzangü; of Kipchak, only Karaim with ʊzangä ~ ʊzængä (< *uzangä or *uzanggi) and Baraba with ʊzangä exhibit forms with illabial initial vowel (like Chuvash, Saryg Yughur, and Northeast Turkic, except Altay Turkic).9 Most of Central Turkic (including Southern Altay Turkic) together with Khalaj use *sığir for 'cow'.10 Different from Northeast Turkic (i. e. Lena Turkic and South Siberian Turkic) and Chuvash, Central Turkic has developed a causative form kor-sat- 'to show' < kor- 'to see' (in Western Oghuz in the metaphorical form köstür; for Far Western Kipchak see 7).11 As in Central Turkic (and Kipchakoid South Siberian consisting of Altay Turkic, Chulym 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 Kürkä, but rare in South Siberian); in Kipchak they are only absent in Caucasus Kipchak and Noghay. Chuvash elık 'ranse, predő, nekogda' and elëksi 'starry, davnii' (CuvRS 100) are borrowings from Tatar. Other derivations of *il with different meanings can be found in Yakut, Dolgan, and Salar.

Central Turkic (including Kürkä) and Chuvash exhibit *taqgu < *taq(i) (*ta:qgu) for 'chicken, hen',12 *tayiz for 'sea',13 and *säv- for 'to love'.14

---

8 Cognates of ay- 'to speak' have survived in Border Turkic, e. g. Saryg Yughur ay- 'id.' and Khalaj bay- 'id.' (Dörfper; Tezcan 1980, 127); cognates of ayt- 'to ask' we find, e. g., in Chuvash iyit 'id.'; Yakut iyit- 'id.', and Dolgan iyit- 'id.' (< iy- 'to say, speak').
9 In Shor we find *üz- ~ i- *uzangä, in Northern Altay Turkic Kumanda *i- ~ ızangä ~ ızangü. Of course, the form in Baraba may be also explained by a vowel metaphor of *üzangi.
10 Salar (Tenişev) has sibir 'bull' < *sığir.
11 Khalaj kensär (Dörfper; Tezcan 1980, 148) may be borrowed from Western Oghuz; see Schöning 2004a.
12 Chuvash has elık(d) < *taq(i) (Röna-Tas 1971, 394) < *taqgu; South Siberian (including Altay Turkic) mostly shows the contracted form *taiq(g) (often in competition with Mongolic takgi). Khalaj kitiş 'hen' resembles Tatar kitiş 'id.' probably only by coincidence (see Dörfper; 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 *hili(-n)* 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 *dż-* (except Karachay-Balkar and Altay Turkic, see 5.2). Most Central Turkic languages (including Salar, but not Turkish) do not use direct cognates of Old Turkic *uti-* for 'to sleep' (like non-Central Northeast Turkic and Turkish), but derivations of the type *suti-* + deverbal noun suffix + nominal verbal derivation suffix, see 3. In Central Turkic except Altay Turkic (most of) Kipchak, Southeast Turkic, and Oghuz, we mainly find *qor(qa)(un)* for 'lead'.

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 -*mîl* in finite and attributive positions, is shared by all Kipchak languages. The same

---

13 This word is replaced by *dalai* (= Mongolic) in South Siberian; Altay Turkic and Khakas show both forms.

14 In Volga-Ural Kipchak cognates of *yarat-* are used alternatively and have been borrowed into Kipchak (see 5.2). In the same source (Altay), the term *yarat-* is used to refer to a person's birth. It is also used in the languages of the South Siberian area, but not in the languages of the Central Asian area.

15 Standard Altay Turkic uses the cognate *hay-* *poy* of Old Turkic *həd-* 'shape' as the base of the reflexive pronouns; such forms are attested for all its dialects except Tōlōš in my materials, too. Besides at Taliat, Tuba, and Kumanda also uses forms of *ās* Chulym Turkic mainly uses cognates of *ās*; here mainly Kürük uses *po* (see R IV 1262).

16 In Modern Uyghur as *qogosul* (Temen III 453, according to Mansour); for the short forms in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Tobol Tatar, and Baraba see 5.2. Oghuz has *qorun*, which was borrowed into Crimean Tatar; in Karaim *qorstan* = *qorun* the latter form goes back to Oghuz influence. See also Schöning 2005b.

17 Mainly in Northeast Turkic this word is replaced by *qogosul* = Mongolic = Bulgar Turkic.

18 This does not automatically exclude that cognates of -*mîl* are also used, e.g., in complex verbal forms, in special sorts of texts, in non-finite position etc. For non-finite -*mîl* in Western into Chuvash (yurat) see *qogosul* *qayqanda*; kogda vemulyša, *yebetmêlietereňa* *tibârganda*; kogda postali, ... (Axevov 1963, 156). For -*mîl* 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 -*mîy(n)* of both the gerund in *p* and the vocalic gerund in syntactically free use (Turkmen also *mîn*, besides *mîxân*; like Uzbek *masdan*). Furthermore, there are some 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 bivalent constructions expressing *Aktionarten* built according to identical patterns. In the same languages *qodan* is used for 'hare' (Kipchak *qoyan*); Chuvash *qyan* 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 *yibär*) and normally do not employ -*DOK-participles in the predicates of relative clauses. To express `cartilage', today *kämiriçek* 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 Maksyuta (1976, 50; 111–2; 190; 267–8). For the sporadic use of -*mîl* in the Southern Bashkir dialect of Ił-Sakmar see Mirzanova (1979, 68).

19 Analogized forms of gerundial negation (e.g. *-mîy* or *-mîy* for the gerund in *îp* are very rare in Northern Turkic members of -GAN-Turkic (e.g. in Kirghiz -*Api*, the negative counterpart of *-piti* (see 6.2) and seem to exist mainly in Oghuz, Meruj, Tatar, and Southeast Turkic; in Uzbek they seem to be limited to bivalent constructions and to aspect-temporal 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 -*mîy* appears in Crimean Tatar, Kumyk, Noghay, Karakalpak, and Volga-Ural-Kipchak (as in Modern Uyghur). In Karachay-Balkar -*mîy* appears besides -*mîy*, which dominates in Altay Turkic and remaining South Siberian; from this form a suffix in -*mîyA* is derived, which appears, e.g., in Kirghiz (besides -*mîy* and -*mîy* and Karaim (besides -*mîy*). There is also -*mîy* which is used, e.g., in Tatar; the dialects of Tatar and Siberian Tatar show, e.g. central dialect of Tatar -*mîy* (V), -*mîy* (V), Misher -*mîy* (IV), -*mîy* (IV), and Karaim -*mîy* (IV). In the same source (Altay), the term *qogosul* (see Yusufov 1985, 159).

20 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 *i:ber-* connects this language with the Central Asian area; but as an auxiliary verb *goyber-* *qo:u ber-* is employed in Turkmen, perhaps an (Old) Oghuz equivalent to *i:du ber-* Modern Uyghur has *du:be* (even as an auxiliary verb). Ottoman *ebe* (`to send' (see TS VI 4167) is probably developed from *erip i: < *erip i:*d.*)
Non-Sayanic -Gan-Turkic (Southeast Turkic, Kipchak, and Kipchakovoid South Siberian; including Turkmen) has postconsonantal forms -A of the vocaсal gerund, whereas after vowels -y (< - uç) is employed. In the same area and additionally in Turkmen we find *tala- for 'to let, give up, leave behind, throw', see also 7. In non-Sayanic -Gan-Turkic (including Azeri and Sonqori) we find forms of *tilki 'fox' going back to a regressive labialized *tilkū. 24 Together with Chuvash (← Volga-Ural-Kipchak?), non-Sayanic -Gan-Turkic sometimes uses forms of the noun *boluk 'help, aid' (in Kipchak only in marginal areas, e.g. in (parts of) Altay Turkic (Tălăt, Altay Kizhi, Kumanda, Tuba) and Karaim, and in Caucasus Kipchak and Tatar), see 5.2. For the replacement of Central Turkic *-Vi/-p bašla- by *-Vi/-p ağala- in Sayan Turkic see below. Most of non-Sayanic -Gan-Turkic (Shor, Chulyum 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 töbân 'lower part etc.' (not Old Turkic, but Middle Turkic: R III 1271 töbān Chaghatai, Kumān 'unten, herab', Kuman töbāngi 'unterer, unten beifendingi', III 1273 tömān Chaghatai 'Boden, Grund') mainly exist in non-Oghuz non-Sayanic -Gan-Turkic (Kipchak. 25 Southeast Turkic, Kipchakovoid South Siberian), see also 5.4.

Central Turkic *qor(ğa)hun 'lead' appears as *qorgaš/kun in non-Oghuz Central -Gan-Turkic except Altay Turkic; in more or less the same grouping cognates of *yarim 'help' (s. 2) appear as *ær/ær'm (except Far Western Kipchak and parts of Caucasus Kipchak, see 5.2). -Gær = r-causatives of ôto 'pass' are preferably used in most of Kipchak (in Karaim, Volga-Ural Kipchak, Kumyk, Noghay, Central Kipchak, Baraba, Kirghiz), Küürük, and Southeast Turkic, and aldun '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 *yW(t)- 'to go, move' has (at least alternatively) a front vocalic form.
*yū[r] in non-Oghuz Central Turkic -GA-n-Turkic including Salar, Altay Turkic and Border Turkic Fu-y¨u-Turkic. Non-Oghuz -GA-n-Turkic uses *-A tur- to mark intra-terminality on participles (*-GAln: *-A tur[tar]) and present tense forms (*Vr: *-A tur tur) and case-marked *gay-stems to ask for places, directions and the like. It uses *tor-tan for ‘pikes’ and front vocalic *tap(V)(V) (originally) ‘god; heaven’ (see TMEN II, 577-85; Oghuz and Chuvash have back vocalic *ta[pri; 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 in non-Oghuz -GA-n-Turkic and in Chuvash (? ← Tatar), i.e. they are mostly absent in Yakut, Khala‘, (Western-)Oghuz (except some Anatolian data), and Kumyk; its absence in Kumyk (and Krymchak) may be inspired by Western Oghuz influence, see 7. Most of non-Oghuz -GA-n-Turkic uses forms of

28 Southeast Turkic shows a whole set of variants of the type *y’orV, *-y’ur- (Uzbek yar, Modern Uyghur dialects yar- yar- yirˇ, yiri- yiri- yiri- yiri- Lobnir Turkic yar- yar- yar- yar- yar- (RADOV) yar, Modern Uyghur standard language t¨ar). As to the vowel in the first syllable of *y’orV, Oghuz as well as the Northeastern border languages Sayan Turkic, Yeniye Turkic, Chuylum Turkic, and Saryg Yughur seem to prefer low vowels. Saryg Yughur has *yor- (yor- jor- yor-), Sayan Turkic has *yor(j)- (~*yor-). In Oghuz we find *yor(f)- (often > *yorV- ~ *yorV-); but for Oghuz we have to take into account that the original verb *yor- became an auxiliary verb and often was replaced by yˇar- or amalgamated forms. Yakut has illatal stems with the enlarged structure *y’et. Salar exhibits *yor- ~ *yorV-

29 This words seems to be lost in modern Oghuz, but see the Ottoman data in R III 2031 ‘(outdated)ool’.

28 See CLAUSON (1974, 366) burun lit. ‘the nose’ (of a human being or an animal), ‘the beak’ (of a bird and the like) and a ‘mouth and a ‘feeding situation, preceding in ‘times, previous’; the latter exists in Old and Middle Tataric, but seemingly not in Ottoman. For burun in Ottoman meaning ‘nose, snout, cape etc.’ see TS I 7142; for Turkish see fn. 29. See also KD 2075 21 and 2112 13. For further phonetic and semantic developments see SCHÖNG 2002 and 2005b.

29 In Turkmen I only could find burun meaning ‘before’ in older sources, see RI 1822f. burun Turkmen ‘earlier, before’; see also LI 1998, 147ff). Turkish has burun ‘nose, point, tip; beak; cape, headland, promontory; pride, arrogance’, see HORV (1992, 86).

30 See, e.g. the Yakut munus ‘nus’ (YAKS 246), Dolgan munus (< munus) ‘Nasse’ (STACIOWSKI 1993, 182), Khala‘ burun ‘Nasse’ (DÖHRER, TEZCAN 1980, 95), Kumyk burun ‘nus’, ugul, mys’ (KES 857), Krymchak ‘nus; kljov; mys’ (REŠ 83). For Ottoman, I could find derivations of burun meaning ‘before’ only in TS I 714 1 burunlata ‘pidtadan, ˙önceden, başlangıçta’ (in Kele ve Dinme from the sixteenth century), which is an instrumental form of burundurq (~ burunduq ‘nose ring; reins’, s. also TS I 7144f; in addition, the whole passage seems to be misunderstood and does not have the meaning given in TS, see ZAMJCEWSKI 1934. There are only some instances in DS pointing to burun meaning ‘before’ in Anatolia: burun ‘pekmez yapmak için kaynatlan ˇıranan ilk suyu’ (*Af, Ç˘r, ‘dutan, kaynatlabek edilen ilk sira’ (Gr), ‘yın taranlk terak dişgın alan ilkin yın’ (Ank), burunlata ‘meclikler ilk üç günlik süttü’ (Ank), burun ˇça˘y ‘demlikten bazıla ık konulan ˇça˘y’ (Am˘a) oder burun ˇserbeti ‘üzümün ilk alinan suyu’ (Gaz), see DS II 803f.

*kãmà for ‘ship’ (first attested in Middle Turkic); Oghuz has gãmì (like Old Turkic kãmi, Chuvash kime); for Crimean Tatar, Kazaim and Krymchak, see 7. Different from Oghuz and Khalaj, non-Oghuz-GAn-Turkic shows a biverbal form -A-p all- 'ma' to express the (im-)possibility of performing an action.31 Different from Oghuz and Chuvash, it normally does not exhibit biverbal forms for ‘to begin’ or ‘begin’. Instead it uses forms of the type *-V’-p barrla ‘(except Sayan Turkic, which uses ägala˘-id.’ instead (→ MONGOLIC)). Dative-marked forms of other verbal nouns can be found e.g. in Tatar (*Vp + GA kble˘-töussed or in Modern Uyghur (*Vp + GA ba˘lha. Different from Oghuz (including Salar), Khalaj, Saryg Yughur and some of South Siberian Border Turkic, GAn-Turkic has *gol for both ‘hand’ and ‘arm’, and does not use cognates of *di˘g ‘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 h (see 1). The same holds true for *arim 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;32 different from Oghuz and Yakut, *-n 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)Ve. (e.g. a genitive suffix in *+(C)Ve 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 *at- (ber) ‘to send’ of the form *yibär. In of modern Kipchak (except Crimean Tatar and Krymchak, see 7) the Old Turkic *aga ‘mountain’ has developed to *taw,33 *saw- ‘to love’

31 It also appears in Salar, South Siberian, and perhaps in Chuvash (Chuvash -ag- < *-A al(-); see BENZING (1959a, 721) and LÊTVISHKA (1976, 546). Lena Turkic has a suffix (*-A) y-A. Besides, in many units, forms like -Ap b- exist, see SCHÖNG 1987.

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

33 But the sound change *g > *-e-* did not always take place consistently in Siberian Tatar, see, e.g., Baraba a˘g˘e˘ ‘mouth’ (R I 82) < a˘g˘e˘ > Modern Kipchak *awt. 

Some notes on Modern Kipchak Turkic (Part 1)
became *sîy-, *sâv 'house' normally appears as *sîy (for Karaim and Misher, see 5). Central Turkic *tæqıq 'chicken, hen' has become *tawıq (*tawıq) in most of Kipchak. Kipchak did not preserve any traces of the feature of nasality of the intervocalic consonant of *sîy(s)ıqık 'bone' (for Crimean Tatar and Krymchak see 7). 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 Schöning 2002). Most Kipchak languages exhibit the Northern Turkic (see 6.2) cognate *tæč of Old Turkic säč 'hair' and has preserved the old third person possessive accusative suffix +(s)ın (as Northern Turkic and Khalka), but see 7. Different from Eastern Turkic, Kipchak normally does not use the passive suffix -(f)ıl- on verbs ending in ı and (like Oghuz, Chuvash, and Altay Turkic) has not preserved the Ancient Turkic word pair yıltız : yımız (‘root’ : ‘star’) (as did Southeast Turkic, Leni Turkic, Sary Yurug, and some Northern Turkic languages, see Schöning 1999); in most of the modern units the word for ‘root’ has vanished. Furthermore Kipchak like Oghuz and Uzbek has changed -le- to -ıl- (except Tüman Tatar jılılı (R III 488) and (Northern Altay Turkic Tuba d’ıldıl ~ d’ilılı). 36

In most Kipchak languages (including Siberian Tatar and Altay Turkic) cognates of *siqıgır 'cow' mainly appear as *siyır; Noghay has front vocalic siyır (like Modern Uyghur). Only Far Western Kipchak (siqir) together with Uzbek (siqır) follows Oghuz in preserving -ı (e.g. Turkish sığır, Turkmen sığır). Most of Kipchak (including Kirghiz Kipchak), Southeast Turkic, Kükük, Western Oghuz and Chuvash have direct cognates of *tànga 'mark, seal', whereas metathetical forms of the type *tağma appear in Turkmen (tagma), Kazakh, and most of the remaining South Siberian (*taqma). Many Kipchak languages use finite forms in -mAK(lf) to express a kind of future, optative or necessitative (for a comparable form in Turkmen see TRMR 308). Together with Uzbek, Kipchak has an agent noun of the type -(l)ıpći (except Crimean Tatar, see 7); Chuvash exhibits a resembling form -Kıvı. Beside the development of tag > *taw (Chuvash tul taw+) another common

34 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. *sîqıqık ‘bone’ > Azeri siqıq, Turkmen sıyk, Chuvash sımdı, Yakut ayıq; some Modern Uyghur dialects have sıykı.

35 Modern Uyghur units show lâč (lit. language) and sæč, while Standard Uzbek has sæl like Khalaj and Oghuz sæl.

36 Different from Modern Uyghur, Saryq Yughur, Yeniçey Turkic and Yakut; the latter has produced sildıq : sildıq. For Sahar Turkic see the Sadık (1857) and RTOs, whereas Rassass (1971, 229) gives sildıq. Tuvan has sildıq ‘ld.’, Toja di̇ldıq ‘star’ (CADAMBA 1974, 48), Soyoq (RADLOFF) has yildıq ‘root’ (R III 488).

Chuvash-Kipchak feature is the second person singular imperative particle noted as ğû or ğûn in Kâşdar’s dictionary (today sometimes reduced to -ç or -ç); in addition to Chuvash (-ça), it is attested at least in Kirghiz, Noghay, Caucasian Kipchak, Bashkir, Tatar dialects, Crimean Tatar, and Uzbek, see Schöning (1987, 206). Especially Lena Turkic and Kipchak weaken p and K while they retain i in the intervocalic position (not in Altay Turkic) and (like Uzbek and Altay Turkic) show cognates of the type biy of the old title *bağ (e.g. Yakut bi: ‘elder brother’); as a result of Chagatay or Ottoman influence we sometimes find the old form *bağ besides biy in one and the same language. 37 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). 38 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 Schöning 1993). Kipchak (including Altay Turkic) like Turkmens and (most of) Sayan Turkic has cognates of Old Turkic bədək ‘big, great, high’ with an illabial vowel in the first syllable (different from Western Oghuz, Southern Turkic, and (most of) Khakas and Shor). 39

Cognates of alìn ‘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 qıl- is still widely in use. 40 Oghuz (including Salar) and Kipchak (like Chuvash and Yakut) did not preserve the final G-sounds of the second and further syllables.

37 Thus Kirghiz has biy (‘traditional judge’) ~ bāk (‘a title’), Crimean Tatar exhibits bāy ~ bāk (USENOV 41), Krymchak has bāy ‘pravitel’, gospodin’, but bīyağ ‘brat muža’ (RABI 2004, 77f).

38 The oldest K-form of an imperative is AILK in the Codex Cumanicus, which is also attested in Kirghiz, Altay Turkic, Tüllüt of Bachuts, Tuba, Shor of Kondoma, and Kryz; for other K-forms, see Schöning 1987.

39 Tatar bıyık ‘velicity’ must be a loanword from (Ottoman) Turkish (like Krymchak bıyık and Crimean Tatar bıyık); the inherited form is bıyık ‘yoskis, yosomny’. The old auxiliary qıl- is now restricted mainly to contexts of dignity in Oghuz and Kipchak. Mostly in Oghuz – but with, e.g., some Tatar evidence – the verb adlıl- has survived in the West and is frequently used in Azeri. The frequent use of qıl- in Southeast Turkic may be regarded as a Chaghataizm.
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-Caucasian Kipchak (Tatar, Bashkir (= Volga-Ural Kipchak), Karachay-Balkar and Kumyk (= Caucasian Kipchak)). Crimean Tatar and Krymchak are Far Western Kipchak languages under strong Ottoman Turkish influence; Mishir 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 Turkish 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 (Irtish, Ishim, Tara, Tobol, Tura, Tumen 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. *-aw-, *-ip-, etc.), have normally converged into iy. In Volga-Ural Kipchak they have become (graphically) iy, in parts of Siberian Tatar ity ~ aw; Far Western Kipchak shows variants with a sometimes unetymological -w (see Berti 1989), e.g. in Mishir Tatar ity ~ (aw) (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 58) (if not preserved under Western Oghuz influence, see 7). Kirghiz Kipchak uses iy besides contracted forms with long labial vowels. Uzbek behaves like Western-Central Kipchak and Modern Uighur, but Uzbek has not consistently changed aw to iy (like Siberian Tatar; see also Mishir Tatar täw, Tatar dövän = täw ‘camel’). In the case of *aw some Altay Turkic dialects show, besides iy ~ iy, 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 *üzüngü in Kirghiz Kipchak and Kazakh, but also in Volga-Ural Kipchak. Here, Karakalpak is separated from Kazakh and goes together with Noghay by using *üüzüngü. Caucasian Kipchak developed a form *üzüngü 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)la for ‘to resemble’). One of the variants üzüngü ~ üzüngü in Kumyk exhibits the same phenomenon. Bábara üzüngü with initial illabial vowel is perhaps a trace of Border Turkic influence on this language, see 2. The forms of the verb *W(q)la ‘to resemble’ (see 3) are another interesting phenomenon. The verb appears as *qola- in Kirghiz Kipchak (Kirghiz, Tállát (Radloff), Kumanda (Radloff) olgo) Krymchak, and Karaim (oxta- beside others, see below), i.e. at the margins of the Kipchak area (as in Southeast Turkic (Uzbek úxta- Modern Uyghur oxta-) and Azeri (otxta-).) Volga-Ural Kipchak shows qola-(graphically), which points to *qola- (unless one assumed that this represented a case in which the characteristic Volga-Ural Kipchak sound change of ü of the first syllables had not occurred for some reason). Tatar exhibits oxta- with a fricativization K > x, which does not appear very often in this language. A basic form *qola- is also attested in Central Kipchak (oxta-). Thus *qola- may be called the Western-Central Kipchak form. Karakalpak as well knows a form ústa- pointing back to *ulta-, which is the basic form in Noghay (ústa-), Karachay-Balkar (ulta-), and according to Radloff parts of Siberian Tatar (Tara Tatar ústa-) and Chylum Turkic (Küürük ústa-); even Tatar and Karaim (both according to Radloff) exhibit ulta-. The Kumyk and Crimean Tatar forms ola- belong here too, the initial o- may be the result of an assimilation to the low vowel of the second syllable (as in the word for ‘stirrup’, see above); perhaps the fact that Far Western Turkic, Kumyk, and Aseri exhibit o-forms points to Kipchak-Oghuz areal contacts, see 7. As to Oghuz borrowings, Karaim exhibits Oghuz bänzä- besides ulta- and oxta-, Crimean-Tatar has bänzä- besides ota-, Krymchak shows bänzä- and oxta-, see also 7. In the case of *qola- ~ *qola- ~ *ulta- we can not rule out that two different lexemes have fused into one. For the verbs ‘sleep’, see 3.

The Kipchak present tense suffixes (going back to *-A turra3) are shortened to -A (postvocalic -y) in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Kumyk, and Crimean Tatar, i.e. in most of Western Kipchak except Karaim and Karachay-Balkar; Mishir Tatar and Orenburg Tatar have -A ~ -Adr (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 140-41; SADYKOVA 1985, 65). Karaim shows the whole range of longer forms

4) Dialects like Astrakhan Tatar, Orenburg Tatar, and Yurt Tatar are only mentioned, if they exhibit special features deviant from the standard language.

42 Like Sayanian Uryanghay (KATANOVA) olqa-, ola-, Shor (Radloff) olga- see also fn. 22.

43 In SCHOÖNG (2004a, 8) instead of *-A turra the form *-A turya 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,44 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 (Iy) (Rusi 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 confronted with an extremely shortened form of a present tense in "A porir, 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:taq 'island' have mainly survived in the West (e.g. in Oghuz as ada and in Chuvash as utä). 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:tag- area is to be connected with the *AGAN/*ALK-area, see 7. Besides Karaim, Crimean Tatar exhibits cognates of oltur (or tag) for 'island', which is the form of modern cognates of Old Turkic otrāg. This word looks like a derivation of *ol-ur, or *ol-tur 'to sit down'. This is not very probable,53 but at least in Western Kipchak the cognates of oltur (or tag) seem to have been analogized to the cognates of this verb, e.g. in Crimean Tatar (oltur: oltur), Karaim (ot-ur, -na, -ra), and Volga-Ural Kipchak (otrā: otrā). Chuvash utraw may be a loanword from Volga-Ural Kipchak. Furthermore, we find cognates of oltur (or tag) in Tāra Tatar (utrα - otrα), Kumandia (odra; odra, otnir), and Chulym Kipchak (otir, otnir, odir, Kūrikir otn). In Noghay, Kazakh, and Kirghiz we find cognates of the Mongolian loanword oral (as in Southeast Turkic, Shor and Kumandia), 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 yardam in Central Kipchak and Tatar, most of remaining Kipchak has yardam (e.g. Bashkir yardam; Southeast Turkic yardam); for Crimean Tatar and Krymchak see 7. A comparable problem exists with the distribution of *ol tur and *ol tur-for 'to sit (down)' in Modern Kipchak Turkic, which does not follow any known pattern.47 Today we find *ol tur in Tatar (utr), Krymchak (otir), Crimean Tatar (otir), and Central Kipchak (otir); this form is also present in Uzbek (itur) and in Oghuz (including Salar). The remaining Kipchak languages (and Modern Standard Uyghur) exhibit *ol tur (Caucasus Kipchak ol tur, Noghay ol tur, Bashkir ul tur). Kirghiz has ol tur and otur, Baraba shows olt, olit, olit, utur, etc. (Dmitrieva 1981; Tumaseva 1968), and Karaim exhibits otur - oitur and otur. The situation in Kirghiz may have been caused by a dialect mixing of Central Kipchak dialects (*otur) and Kirghiz Kipchak dialects (*ol tur) 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 *ol tur-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,48 see also 7. Ottoman influence may first have occurred in the literary languages (Late) Chatagay and Türk (Törekî têl, 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 *ol tur-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 tagÄg 'mountainous' appear as *tawâ in Western-Central Kipchak, whereas Kirghiz Kipchak has *to:la: (both < *tawâtu). The intermediary position of Uzbek between Kipchak and Southeast Turkic is illustrated by its (literary) form tagli, which points to

44 This form is perhaps a late import from Volga-Ural Kipchak during the time of Tatar emigration to Siberia and/or Soviet cultural policy.
45 CLAUSON (1974, 65b) otrāg 'island' that it is "too old to be a Dev. N. fr. ur- 'to sit'.
46 There is also a Chulym Turkic form otrir. The forms in -al ~ -al ~ -al may go back to an older otrir, see CLAUSON (1974, 65b): "a Dim. f. (?) otrir was current in Kom. and Kip. (id., Bul., Tuh.), survived in NW kar. T., Kow. Karaim otrir is perhaps a metanalytical derivation from otrir.

47 According to CLAUSON (1974, 150–1), we find *otur besides *ol tur already in the Karakhanid Tefîr; in Middle Turkic *otur is the typical Western Oghuz (Ottoman) form, but also appears besides *ol tur in Khorezm Turkic sources and in the Mamluk Kipchak Tufât, but not in Chatagay and in Kumän, which only have *otur.
48 We find *otur in Uryangkhay (Kataev 1194 odur, 1197 olur), Sotoy, Bay-Tayga Tuvan (partly palatalized), and Khakas (odur). Chulym Turkic and Altay Turkic show ol tur- (> ) - otur- (> ) - otur- with preservation of -; Shor has otur- odur.
proto-Western-Central Kipchak *taqlı. The final G-sounds of second and following syllables became zero in Western-Central Kipchak (like in Chu-
vash), 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.49 In Kirghiz Kip-
chak ald meaning both 'in front of' and 'under';50 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 Cri-
mean 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 Kip-
chak area.

In Kirghiz Kipchak (as in Saryg Yughur and Lena Turkic) 'copper' can
be expressed by *haqir (as in Western-Central Kipchak, Oghuz) and by *fis
(→ Mongolic ← Turkic) (as in most of South Siberian).51

In the framework of Kipchak, the spontaneous sound change of word ini-
tial -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.

49 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 Bara has, according to
TUMASHEVA (1992, 23), alt 'as; niz' and alt-form meaning 'under', but see DMITRIEVA (1981,
222) alt ≈ al ≈ aln 'perednyi, peredny. čast', 126 alt 'peredn. čast, perednyi' (see also R I
375).

50 See KURS S 42 al s. ald, 48 ald, ald 'pered; peredn. čast'; niz, nižn. čast'. Analogically,
in Kirghiz forms of aš(ı) 'under' sometimes designate 'in front of'. For (Southern) Altay
Turkic, see R I 419 Altay Kızılı, Tălăut aldăndagı 'between b/w. vorn behind', VERBIEST 19
(Tălăut) aldăndagı 'na/axad. vperedi', aldănda 'nizu', aldăndagı 'na/axad. na nizu'.

51 At least in the South Siberian context the use of Kirghiz Kipchak to designate 'North'
by derivations of *taw 'night' (> midnight) and *ini '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.52 Yakut
with -Al ilik and Kirghiz with -Al elek show a common form of this participle
different from South Siberian -GALAK and Fu-yü Turkic -GALAT.53 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~*törd- 'to give
birth ~ be born'.

The word *bäi ~ (? <) *bägi 'brain' survived in two-syllabic forms point-
ing to *mäyä without an intervocalic nasal consonant54 in Baraba (miyä),
Uzbek (miya), Karachay-Balkar (miyi), and Bashkir (mäyä). Somehow irregular-
ly developed forms of the type *miy ~ *miy 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 RAD-
LOFF's Tatar and Kazakh; Kumyk has miy ~ may. In full accordance with
the regular sound laws, *mäyä has developed into *mä: (sometimes > *mä or
*mä:) in Kirghiz Kipchak (as in Northeast Turkic). Only Crimean Tatar with
mäy has preserved the feature nasality of the old intervocalic consonant,
which now stands in the word-final position. The form looks like the form
mäy 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 Saryg Yu-
ghur and Modern Ughur) 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 *allğ mainly in Western-

52 According to TUMASHEVA (1968, 19 and 68) we find -GALAK in Baraba, but not in
Tobol-Irysh Tatar; in Tomsk Tatar it is about to vanish.

53 YUSUPOV (1985, 81–2) assumes that the suffix -GALAK ist used to derive adjectives
in Tatar dialects, e. g. qaqlaq 'ubegayükşi', taygalaq 'skul'ziği', köylär 'bespokomyyy'.
These forms, however, are derived by use of the distinctive-frequentative suffix -GA-
LA plus the deverbal adjectival suffix -Q; for the latter see ERDAL 1991.

54 Yakut, Chuvash, Khalaq, Oghuz (including Salar (Tensövi)), and sporadically Modern
Ughur have preserved the feature nasality of the intervocalic consonant of *bäi ~ *bägi
'brain' (Dolgan mài: – mài, Yakut màiyn (with nasal j); Chuvash mìa; Khalaq mëya;
Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkishmen ñayîni, Salar meneg – meneg 'synchronous', Modern
Ughur mëya – mìyâ – mìyä.}
Central Kipchak (and Oghuz), the weak form *alig is used in Kirghiz and Radlopp's Tülüät (ölü) (as in Yenisey and Chulym Turkic). Siberian Turk has strong forms, for the most part only Katnov renders a form ali 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 izla- < *žigla-, which matches South Siberian forms like Yenisey Turkic izła- and Sayan Turkic ižlä-. Western-Central Kipchak (except Bashik, see above), Krymchak, and Crimean Turk (see 7) have *žigla-, c. g. Tatar  yıla-, Karachay-Balkar yıla-, Kazakh  yıla- (Uzbek has yıgla-, Modern Uyghur żyğa-). Western-Central Kipchak, Chuvash, Altay Turkic, remaining Kipchakoid South Siberian, and Oghuz (including Salar) use cognates of Western Turkic *sagac for 'tree', whereas Kirghiz žigac (like Lobnor Turkic ıyığac and Saryg Yugur ıyıɡač) goes back to Eastern Turkic *bişäč > łyğac (like, e. g., Sayan Turkic); Southeast Turkic languages have an intermediary form *yağac. But for 'thousand' Kirghiz has a Western Turkic palatal form miy, Altay Turkic has Eastern Turkic velar my with Northeast Turkic labialization, see 6.1. The cognates of *yuluz 'star' have kept a labial vowel in the first syllable in most of Western-Central Kipchak (except some Karaim data and Crimean Turk (R 3 491f)) under Oghuz influence, see 7 and some parts of Siberian Turk (as in Turkmen dialects, Khorasan Turkic, Southeast Turkic, Khalaj, and Yakut); most of Kirghiz Kipchak and other parts of Siberian Turk has illabial *yylid (like Oghuz and most of South Siberian). 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. *süy(g)ák > süyák ~ sü:k 'bone', *täba > täyö ~ tö: 'camel', *sav > süv ~ sü: ~ 'to love', see also 5; Siberian Turk has a comparable behaviour. Kirghiz Kipchak like most of South Siberian does not use cognates of *artı as the past tense copula regularly, see below. At least in Kazakh, Siberian Turk, and Kirghiz Kipchak (as in the remainder of South Siberian) we find an *øy, which besides the meaning 'front part' (but not used as a spatial expression in postpositional use) has a second meaning 'colour, shape etc.'; Siberian Turk exhibits a semantically deviant ɵy, c. g., ə:ır#: (Umar) 'yuğari; 'vexuru' (Tumaševa 1992, 165).

Kirghiz Kipchak together with Kipchakoid South Siberian uses personal suffixes of the type first person singular +*mln and second person singular (plural)*+ny(LAr). This grouping plus Siberian Tatar dialects exhibits amalgamated forms of the first and second person of finite *GAn of the type *GAm, *GAY etc. and shows internal analogization of suffix-final nasal consonants of the genitive +ny and ablative +DAAn, 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 Kyzylyl has kept -AIIK (in Kirghiz after vowels -yll, neg. -BAIYIK) (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 *-Urel has become *-Urel in Kirghiz, but is replaced in Altay Turkic by the Northeast Turkic *-erel (→ Mongol *-GAt). Both branches of Kirghiz Kipchak have developed the suffixes of the first person plural imperative partly different, see Schöning 1987. Whereas in Kirghiz the personal plural marker +z has only entered into competition with +Iar 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 +ny and the ablative +DAAn, the final nasals became n in Kirghiz and y in Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic. The dative of the first person singular pronoun is maña ~ mağa in Kirghiz, whereas Altay Turkic shows mağa, maː; maː, see below; see also 5.3 and fn. 91. In the case of the verb *bolus 'to help' at least Kumanda of the Upper Biryusa (Verbicky) goes together with Kirghiz (like Kazakh, Southeast Turkic, and Khakas). For verbs denoting 'to sleep' (Kirghiz, Tālāut of

55 This is more or less the same area in which the analogization of case suffix-final nasal consonants has taken place, see 5.1.
56 E. g. Kirghiz jildi, jildi, Altay Turkic d’ilde ‘Stern’, Chalkandu, Tālāut yildi (R 3 490), Tuba d’ilde – d’il; Baraba yildi ‘Sterne’ (R 3 490), Tūmān Tātār jilti (R 3 488).

57 In Chulym Turkic we sometimes find +men for the first person singular, Siberian Turk dialects mostly use +mln for the first person, but +Iin and +Is for the second persons singular and plural. Mainly in the Altay-Chulym Turkic dialects we find nominal forms, replaced by possessive suffixes. Katnov 328ff. attests a second person plural pronom inse ~ sildar for Kirghiz like inse (~ sildar, sildar) in Siberian Turk (Ishim, Tobol, Tara, Tura, Tūmān) except Baraba, which has sildar (like Sayan Turkic, Khakas, Kūrik, and Altay Turkic). But Tūmān (1968, 104) also gives inse besides sildar, sildar, sildar, and sildar for Baraba. For the Eüsta-Cat vernacular of Tomsk Tatar the only gives sildar (the form inse is clearly an import from Standard Tatar) (1968, 152); the Kalmak vernacular has sildar, too (1968, 164).
58 Kirghiz exhibits first person singular suffixes of the perfect in -GAmn ~ *GAmn ~ *GAm (Kroger 283); the latter forms also appear in the Eüsta-Cat and Kalmak vernaculars of Tomsk Tatar (Tūmān 1968, 142 and 160–1), in Khakas (Xus&Gr), and Shor (Dyrenkov 1941, 182); different from Altay Turkic (Dyrenkov 1940, 174; Nikolayev 1985), Baraba (Tūmān 1968, 63), and Chulym Turkic (Dulzon 1966, 455) the second person is not affected by the amalgamation in Kirghiz.
Bachatsk *ugla-, remaining Altay Turkic *uyugla-, see 3. The semantic opposition 'ox' : 'bull' is expressed by *boqyz : *bouq in Kirghiz together with at least parts of Western-Central Kipchak, whereas *bouq seems to be replaced by *sr 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 *kwm 'help' (like in Central Kipchak, Noghay, Kumyk, Wolga-Ural Kipchak; Southeast Turkic, Ottoman, and Khalaj, see also 6.3) and *myiz ~ *myyz 'horn' (as in Siberian Tatar, Central Kipchak, Noghay, and Caucasus Kipchak; for Crimean Tatar see 7); Altay Turkic has *mu:s (~ *mu:s) ~ *mi:s. As to the negative copula 'is not', Kirghiz has preserved *tgab besides amas (like Kazakh), whereas Altay Turkic only has *amaz (~ *aramaz), for *yWr(-) Southern Altay Turkic exhibits *yr-, whereas Kirghiz shows jur- and jir- (like Krymchak, see RBL 112), i.e. in both cases Kirghiz takes middle ground between Crimean Tatar (USENOV 346), Central Kipchak, Southeast Kipchak, and Southern Altay Turkic (*yr-, *aramaz) on the one side, and Western Kipchak and Noghay (*yr-, *tga) on the other side, see also 6.1. Kirghiz has back vocalic forms for 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 *LaY(V)N(V) 'heaven; god' Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Kumanda, and Saryg Yughur *taqir(i) (Kirghiz *taqir ~ taqir, Kazakh *taqir, Karakalpak *taqir; RADLOFF has Kazakh and Kirghiz *taqir, Kumanda has *taqir, *tqir, *taqir, *taqir, Saryq Yughur *tqir, *tqir), whereas Altay Turkic (except Chalkandak) exhibits forms like tåqir (Tâlät tåqir, Tuba tåqir ~ tåqîr) (~ Mongolic); see also 5.2.59 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 *f see 5.3. For the words for 'tree', and the forms of the participium nondum facti see above.

Southern Kirghiz exhibits tavösgan for 'hare' (besides forms of *qodan). This form has been remarkably resistant to change by preserving a trisyllabic structure like *tavösgan, which has only survived in Khakas, and in Yakut dialects; Ughuz (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 -sr < -s, which otherwise may go back to a relatively late Kazakh influence. For Southern

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 *baqya survived in Crimean Tatar, Krymchak, parts of Siberian Tatar (Bara, Tat, Tobol, Ishim, according to KATANOV) (in both as maqya, and Karam (G ma, T maqya ~ maq). Kirghiz has maqya ~ maqya, and thus leads over to the *maqa-group consisting of Kumyk, Ak-Noghay, Central Noghay, and the Kalmak vernacular of Tomsk Tatar with maqga, Kara-Noghay with maqga and Central Kipchak with maqan. Altay Turkic with maqga, maq: maq: 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 *maqya < *hynq + ga (analogized to the nominative stem); it appears as non-harmonic mina in Tatar and the Eusta-Čat vernacular of Tomsk Tatar, as maqya ~ maqya in Misser Tatar (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 43) (like Uzbek mang, as maqyc ~ maqya in Baraba (DMITRIEVA), as palatalized minyq in Bashkir and Baraba (TUMAEVA), and as minyq ~ minyq in Orenburg Tatar. Tur Tatar (KATANOV) with maqya ~ maqya, Tümen Tatar (KATANOV) with maqya ~ maqya ~ minyq, and Karachat-Balkar with maqya (~ maqyq: ~ maqya) (see PRTSAK 1959, 358) stand between the *baqya-group and Volga-Ural Kipchak. For the forms of *yWr(-) the negative copula, see 6.1, for the forms of *o(ł)Ur see 5, for the word for 'cap' see fn. 111. In the case of the verbs for 'to return' (see 2) Kirghiz with gaqyt ~ yan (< 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)f instead of +IAr as the plural sign of the third person in verbal forms, e.g. baritsi instead of bardilar 'they went (to)'.60 Kirghiz together with Fu-yü Turkic has preserved the long vowels in baris 'all' and irriq (Fu-yü Turkic irriq) 'far (away)', which have short vowels in remaining Kipchak and Altay Turkic. Kirghiz (like Ottoman sources) uses the derivation asi of as(ı) with the enlarged meaning 'below'; in front of61 (s. KGRS 75 ašta sal- 'pustik

---

59 We also find Mongolic *tengger in Yakut (tanara, probably verbalized under the influence of -p after being borrowed, see nuywx 'bone' < *nuy(q)ah, see also fn. 72), and perhaps in Kumyk (see 5.2).

60 In Kzyyl and Chulym Turkic we find the cooperative suffix as a plural sign in the first two persons of the imperative, e.g. Kzyyl-All (first person) : -(I)f (second person), Chulym Turkic Kżyjr (KATANOV) -All (first person), Chulym Turkic -I/( second person) (BIRUKOVIČ 1981, 69); see also Schöne 1987.

61 KGRS 75 aš (bez prityž. afikska tertyat konečnyj t; osnovoy dlya kirgizskogo yazyka,
pered soboy ıli gnat’ vperedи sebya’) as in the case of alıd, aldı ‘in front of’.\(^62\)

Especially in Kirghiz we find besides the regular short and extended forms iy- and jibar- (see KrgRS 253b) of *i:da (u ber*) ‘to send’ a deviant form ir-, see fn. 116. Further special features of Kirghiz are, e.g., the past tense in -EU (in some vernaculars of the Eastern Yskyl Köl area -EUK, see GADŻEVA 91-3), a genitive suffix +nln, the forms aľtimım and jätimım instead of *aľtimis ‘sixty’ and *jätimis ‘seventy, and the impersonal interrogative pronoun amnä beside nä. The demonstrative of distance is at (by analogy to the plural alar). Instead of cognates of Old Turkic ąrtı especially Standard Kirghiz uses älå as a past tense copula (KrgGr 156); see also the imperfect in -(A)r ālå, KrgGr 292-3).\(^63\) Kirghiz often shows causatives, which can 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 Caucasian Kipchak

Features of Volga-Ural Kipchak are, e.g., the change of *dəv > āy > (graphically) iy, a present participle in -A torgan, a non-harmonic dative form of the singular personal pronouns of the type *mänä (see 5.1), and a palatalized form *čál (Tatar chúl, Bashkir sás; like Chuvash šáš < *šás < *čál < sæl) of the Northern Turkic (see 6.2) cognates of Old Turkic sæl ‘hair’.\(^64\) 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 castrated state; besides, the expression *ıỉ oküzü 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 torgan, i.e. as -A torgan.\(^65\) Other

vidimo, budet ne ast, a ast) ‘niz, nižn. čast’; pered, peredn. čast’ (etwa astiya ‘pod’); načalo’, see SCHÖNIG 2005a.

KrgRS 48 alıd ‘pered; peredn. čast’; niž, nižn. č.’, 49 alıddagi, alıdgi ‘tot, kto vpeprdi, perednij; predotoyačči’, see SCHÖNIG 2005a.

The form alı formerly appeared in Northern and Northwestern vernaculars, ala in Southwestern and Southern vernaculars in epics. Today Northern Kirghiz only exhibits ală, whereas Southern Kirghiz exhibits alá, ală, and adí (according to GADŻEVA (1975, 162)). For adă in Tăluq see ILMINSKI 213 and 256-258.

Siberian Tatar also has a form čăl besides čăl and čal. The same holds true for Chulym Turkic, where the materials collected by N. SHROBOKOV (Novosibirsk) exhibit čáļ, čal. The front vocalic form of the word in Tofa is quite young and has developed independently, as is attested by CASTRÉ (1857, 144), where we still find a velar form tăi (≈ čăl).

For other forms of the present participle in the vernaculars of this region (often limited in use), see, e.g., MAXMUTOVA (1978, 180) and SADKOVA 80.

Kipchak languages have more contracted forms of the type *-ƏtvGvₜn, e.g., Karakalpak dialects -At tüg, -AtGvₜn, -AtGvₜn etc., Noghay -AtAGAn, and Karam -Adögön (like Southeast Turkic;\(^66\) Turkmen dialects -Aduğan ≈ Southeast Turkic). Ak Noghay has -Atʇn, whereas -Atnı appears in Kazakh and Karakalpak dialects; the Siberian Tatar vernaculars show a whole variety of forms.\(^67\) Of causative suffixes with initial G, Volga-Ural Kipchak seems to prefer -Gaz- for kor- ‘to see’, whereas the remaining Kipchak and Southeast Turkic languages (and South Siberian) show at least -Giz- 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 *dărăk (in the Western Kipchak part of this grouping (Noghay, Caucasian Kipchak, Crimean Tatar tüřük, Karam dărāk), whereas the Central Asian part has *daráq(ı), see 6.3.) For ‘goat’, Western-Central Kipchak (including Krymchak, but except none Volga-Ural Kipchak and Crimean Turkic), Kirghiz Kipchak (Kirghiz, Altay Kizhi, Tăluq, Chalkandu), Western Siberian Turkic, Barbara, and Uzbek employ a direct cognate *ätze of Old Turkic *zähl.\(^68\) Volga-Ural Kipchak has Tatar kajä, meshi (MAXMUTOVA 1978, 42), Bashkir kază, which obviously belong somehow to Oghuz *kälti, Crimean Tatar kälti (≈ Ottoman Turkish), and Chuvash kăča. Since the Volga-Ural Kipchak forms exhibit ā 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 *qurğal of the word for ‘lead’ also appears in Siberian Tatar, e.g. Tobol Tatar, Barba (both R II 941), Bashkir qurğal, Tatar qurğal(ın). As a cognate of *tAz(ı)(ı) ‘heaven; god’ the front vocalic form *tâyri exists in Volga-Ural Kipchak, Siberian Turkic (as in Southeast Turkic, Chulym Turkic, Kumanda (≈ *tâyri, *tâyī, *tâyă), and Saryg Yughur (≈ *tâyir(ı)). Kara-

\(^62\) Uzbek -Adığan, -Așoglan; Modern Uyghur -Adığan etc., Lobnor Turkic -Ațoglan, for the latter two, see Pazar 1989b.

\(^63\) Tomsk -AțAGAN, -AțAGAN, -AțKın; Barba -AțuGan, -AțAGAN, -AțGın, -AțAn, -AțKın; Tobol -AțAn, -AțGın (-AțGın), Taran -AțAGAN, -AțAn; Tewrix -AțKın, -AțKın; Ishim -Adığan, Tımân -AțuGan, -AțGın; Tura -AțAGAN.

\(^64\) OKTOV (1963, 106) gives yčči. In RADLOFF’s Barba in the metathetical form ičča. The form *ičča is also attested in (Lower) Kondoma-Shor (VUR+pIC) and Tofa (in the latter with the deviant meaning ‘female musk deer’); Salar (TENKOV) has ȅčča. The remainder of South Siberian together with Saryg Yughur exhibits ȅčča ≈ ȅčča; Modern Uyghur has ȅčča.

\(^65\) *tâyir also exists in Fu-yu-Turkic and Saghay (RADLOFF); for Tuvan see the designations Tavıg Tâyir Bâk-Dâr ‘pryat’ bebes’ and Dâr-tâyir ‘skyy’. Normally Suyan Turkic has *tâ hô (Tofa di:ri ≈ te:ri etc.) and *tâ Cır (Tuvan di:ı). A development *tâyri > *tâyri is also

\(^66\) Uzbek -Adığan, -Așoglan; Modern Uyghur -Adığan etc., Lobnor Turkic -Ațoglan, for the latter two, see Pazar 1989b.

\(^67\) Tomsk -AțAGAN, -AțAGAN, -AțKın; Barba -AțuGan, -AțAGAN, -AțGın, -AțAn, -AțKın; Tobol -AțAn, -AțGın (-AțGın), Taran -AțAGAN, -AțAn; Tewrix -AțKın, -AțKın; Ishim -Adığan, Tımân -AțuGan, -AțGın; Tura -AțAGAN.

\(^68\) OKTOV (1963, 106) gives yčči. In RADLOFF’s Barba in the metathetical form ičča. The form *ičča is also attested in (Lower) Kondoma-Shor (VUR+pIC) and Tofa (in the latter with the deviant meaning ‘female musk deer’); Salar (TENKOV) has ȅčča. The remainder of South Siberian together with Saryg Yughur exhibits ȅčča ≈ ȅčča; Modern Uyghur has ȅčča.
Volga-Ural Kipchak (Tatar möğüz, Bashkir mööd) and Siberian Tatar (as in Uzbek müğüz, Shor mügüs = mūqı́), and perhaps Yukut muos, for the backing of the vowel, see fn. 59). I suspect even the modern forms of the type *mıyüz ~ *miyız not to go back to a form *mïňüz, but to *mûgûz. We find these forms in Siberian Tatar (mûgüz, mûyış), Kirghiz (mûyış), Central Kipchak (Kazakh mûyız, Karakalpak mûyız, mûyûz), Noghay (mûyûz, mûyûz), and Caucasus Kipchak (Karakch-Balkar mûyûz, Kumyk mûyûz, mûyûz). I assume a development *mûyûz < *mûgûz, because the *mûyûz-languages fill the space between *mûyûz- and *mûgûz-languages. Of course, one may also assume that in the area of these languages both forms *mûyûz and *mûňûz co-existed. Then, at the borders of this area *mûyûz > *mûgûz was dominant, whereas *mûňûz 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 *mû(s): (~ *mû(s): ~ *mï):.

Bashkir has a lot of special features, which point to a still unknown substrata. 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 *y.ArAm '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 -e, the use of qanday and nildây for qaːno tãg 'how like which?'; and in a limited sense for the word for 'lead' (see 5.3). Tatar seems to be free of *m(VN)/(Ny)-forms for 'with', see 5.3. On the phonological level Bashkir belongs to the languages exhibiting special phonotactical rule sets...
(see 6.2), whereas Tatar does not. Furthermore, in Bashkir, initial *č* has developed to a sibilant (see 6.2), has changed initial *r* to *b*, and shows (like Turkmen) lipping, e.g. in the case of sibilants within and at the end of a word (see above the word for 'horn'). 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, 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.

Volga-Ural Kipchak has some features in common with Caucasian Kipchak. Thus Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (including Missher Tatar and parts of Siberian Tatar) has a second person plural possessive suffix *(I)Glz instead of *(I)yHz for Lena Turkic and comparable to Altay Turkic *(I)GAr, perhaps due to the quite frequent sound change *y > 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)yHz for Kirghiz *(I)yAr see fn. 125, for Karaim see 7, for the first person plural possessive suffix *(I)h Hz, see 6.2. Caucasian Kipchak and Tatar exhibit forms of *bolui 'help, aid' enlarged by +LIK (Caucasus Kipchak boluluy, Tatar bolui(luy), Karachay-Balkar additionally uses bolulun, a verbal noun of *bolui. Together with Noghay and Chuvas, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak exhibits a strong tendency to use *(I) causatives of *y Wr(I) and *(I)l(I)l(I)ur. As to cognates of *toban 'lower part etc.', Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, parts of Siberian Tatar, Shir, Khakas, and Southeast Turkic have a non-nasal labial consonant (*b), whereas Noghay, Central Kipchak, Kirghiz Kipchak, Tolbol 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 (most) other Kipchak languages, Caucasian Kipchak has some special features, which only sporadically appear in other Kipchak languages. Thus the word *baqgar* 'copper' appears as *baqgar* in Kirghiz Kipchak (Talaqt paxta, as in Küräik; Kyzyl paxtar), Central Kipchak, Noghay, Far Western Kipchak, and Volga-Ural Kipchak (as in Uzbek), whereas Caucasian Kipchak has *baqar* (like Baraba *paqar*). Cognates of ast('t 'under' can be found in Kipchak including Siberian Tatar (as in Turkmen, Kalafti, and Southeast Turkic) except Caucasian Kipchak (like Northeast Turkic and Western Oghuz literary languages). The Central Turkic root element *čil* 'before, first; front side etc.' and its derivations seem to be absent in Caucasian Kipchak and Noghay; for other common features with Noghay, see 5.4. For Caucasian Kipchak (and Karaim) özgün 'stirrup' and Kumyk (and Crimean Tatar) ola- 'to resemble', see 5. For the velar forms of *baqgar* in Caucasian Kipchak, see 5.3.

Special features of Karachay-Balkar are, e.g., the use of *miyi for 'brain' (see 5.1), a form *tayri for *tayi(V)l(V) (see above and 5.1), a vingesimal system of the tens beside a multiplicative system, use of algin 'snačala, preniżiy (KæRS 48; perhaps a contamination of algii (< 'al + KI) and aldin, see 3 and Şiönü (2005)), intermediary dative forms of the pronouns of the first and second person singular (see 5.1), a reflexive pronoun kâs (see 2), absence of demonstratives containing *s (as in Azeri and South Siberian including Altay Turkic, see 5.3), a form tâl ~ tâyîl of the negative copula (see 6.1), a negative Aorist in -mAz instead of -mAs (see Pritsuak (1959a, 361) and KæBlkgr 211; like Crimean Tatar and Kryymchak, see 7), and a (kind) of future in *-yV)lIK (see Pritsuak 1959a, 363). Karachay-Balkar seems to be free of *m(V)l(An)s-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 yiyirmi 'twenty' (beside ayirmi ~ ayirmi, dative forms of the type *maqa of the first and second person singular pronouns (as in No-
ghay), a form *miy ~ may of the word for brain, a form *tayāri of *tAḥ(y)V(ā)V, and within the Kipchak framework *-A-demonstratives of the type *suVon, *suvon < *saV.bus, see 5.3; especially Khaydak Kumyk has *la (~la). 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 *ugqa- < *ugla- ‘to resemble’ (as in Southern Altay Turkic) and *yur- of the verb *yWR(l)- ‘to go, move’ (as in Crimean Tatar and Southern Altay Turkic), a dative form of the type *maγan of the singular personal pronouns, and a form *tāl < *tāl < *tal of the word for ‘hair’ (see 6.2).

The use of -Giz-causatives of bit- ‘to know’ seems to be mostly limited to Central Kipchak and Kirghiz. Central Kipchak and Noghay show forms of the type *sāmiršāk for ‘cartilage’ (most probably derived from *kāmiršāk by assimilation of the initial consonant to the fricative Č (> Č); 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-elicited, always front vocalic forms *mānān in (most of) Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, and Bashkir (and sometimes in Crimean Tatar).85 Of the harmonical forms we find *mAn in Noghay (standard language).86 Northeastern dialects of Karakalpak (MENGES 1959, 467), Western Siberian Tatar (AXATOV 1963, 153), and Karaim (as in Chuvash pA(n), Beltr BAY; Mars-Shor B A), *mAn < *mAn in Crimean Tatar (besides mānān, nAn), Orenburg Tatar (SADYKOVA 1985, 95), Mishet (MAMUTOVA 1978), and parts of Siberian Tatar (Baraba; Ishim, Tura, Tobol, Tura (KATANOV)) (as in Kyzyk M(I)nay), ILMINSKIĬ mānān, mān, mān/Ag) and *mānAn in Southern Kazakh (see AMANOLOV 1959, 253) and Altay Turkic dialects (mān/Ag, Tālāūt of Bachtsys mānay; as in Kacha, Koybal Bin/Ag); for the back vocalic forms mānān = mūlan in Kumyk, see also below. It seems that of Kipchak only Karachay-Balkar and Standard Tatar are free of *m(Vn).A(n)-forms.

In analogy to *ol, demonstrative pronouns of the types *bu (*bo) and *fV 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 (KACGR 187-8: bu(l), usul, oso(l), tigl(l), tātigl; YUNUSALEV 1966, 493) additionally has sol, sol); Western Siberian Tatar has su, sa, sal (AXATOV 1963, 159), Bashkir of Argayash has sa(l), sol(l), s(l), sol(l) (MYSKUTOVA 1976, 123), Kumyk has bul(l) (BENZING 1959d, 402), and Karaim (T, G) shows bul(l) (MUSAYEV 1966, 268) and (1977, 41). A stable final -l appears in Standard Bashkir and some dialects (bul, sol) and Central Kipchak (bul, sol). For Noghay I have BASKAKOV (1966a, 285) and SIG 320 bul, sol, but RNOSC 721 ‘erōt’ bül, 627 sol.

Cognates of *qa:no tāg ‘how? like which?’ show *gan-stems in Kirghiz Kipchak (~ qalay in Southern Kirghiz and in the neighborhood of Kazakhs, KECR 329), Central Kipchak (~ qalay), Uzbek (~ qalay), Tomsk Tatar, Standard Bashkir (TTH I 629 qanday = 617 qalay), and in the Southern Bashkir dialect of Ik-Sakmar (qanday, qalay ‘kakoy’ MIRZANOV 1979, 61) (as in Modern Uyghur and Sayan Turkic); Noghay employs a ‘gän-stem qaday (RNOSC 242 ‘kakoy, qalay RNOSC 241 ‘kak’)’ (like Shor qaydā, qaydi, qaydiq and Khakas xaydi, xayday). Cognates of *n(en)tag are attested in Western Crimean Tatar (naday ‘kakoy’ (SEVORTYAN 1966, 244), Bashkir nindāy, Tatar nindī, Karaim (T) nindī, (H) nindī), and in Baraba (nendāw).87 Krymchak has nas ‘(kak, kakoy), Rebi 23; ← Ottoman nasit). The use of qalay ‘kak (~) kakoy’ seems to be typical of Kirghiz, Central Kipchak (including Uzbek), Noghay, Bashkir, and Karachay-Balkar (qalay); the same grouping exhibits ‘yätti-protoforms for ‘seven’ (see 6.1).

As to demonstratives containing *f, we find *fW in Central Kipchak, Kirghiz, Bashkir, Noghay, the Kalmak vernacular of Tomsk Tatar (see TUMASEVA 168, 164), and Tatar of the late nineteenth/early twentieth centuries (as in Old Ottoman, Yakut (sol), and Dolgan (böl)). If we look for forms of the type *fW(l), Baraba (su(l) ~ sol), Kumyk (MAGOMDEOV 1966, 201): su, so; BENZING (1959d, 402): su(l), sol(l), and Turkmen (su, sol, so) can be added to this grouping. The type *fW is present in Crimean Tatar and Krymchak (su) (as in Russian (including Gagauz), Southeast Turkic, and Sarygh Yughur; see 7), whereas *fA additionally appears in Khaydak Kumyk (su, sa, see BENZING 1959d, 402). A comparable distribution can be found in

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

85 Thus we have *mānān in Karakalpak (standard language) and Kirghiz, *mānān < *mān in Kazakh, *mānān (> mūnān) in Bashkir and in Crimean Tatar. Most probably the forms with a low vowel in the first syllable were developed from *mānān by assimilation to the vowel of the second syllable.

86 According to MENGES (1959) Kipchak Uzbek and Noghay also show harmonical *m(Vn).A(n)-forms.
the case of the demonstratives of the type *WōV(l), which at least exist in Kirghiz (utul(l), ool(l), KrcGr 187e), in Karaim (t ool, G ool, see Musaeu 1966 268), Krymychak (ool, Reb 160), and, as *WōV, in Baraba (Tumāšev 1992, 104): ool (rare), Bashkir (ool), Central Kipchak (Karalpak uai, Kazakh ooi), and Uzbek (ūla).98 There are other complex demonstratives containing *-l- like Kumyk suwu (Magomedov 1966, 201), to:wa (Benzing 1959d, 402) < *tə:bu (?), Tatar suši, the Southern Bashkir dialect of Iksamar sošo (Mirzanov 1979, 60), and Noghay ooi (< *ōoli).99 Forms of the type *Wību can mainly be found at the margins of the Kipchak area, e. g. in Karaim (T) owpn, (G) owpn, see Musaeu (1966, 268) and Uzbek (oolu).

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 Uyghur),93 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 Krymychak), but also in Kumyk and Kara-Noghay, cognates of the old dative suffix instead of the dative suffix are used (at least sporadically) with demonstrative pronouns in Tatar (moja, mon'a) etc., see TatGr), Karaim (nuur, nnumăr (Pratask 1959a, 333), Kumyk (see fn. 91), and Balkar (alternatively nūynur, see Pratsak (1959a, 359)); in Kara-Noghay, the dative suffix appears not only on demonstratives, but also on singular personal pronouns (see fn. 91). The use of the dative suffix with demonstratives is already known from Kuman (e. g. mun'ar, aanar = aagar – a:n ~ a:n, see Gabain 1959, 63).

98 Chuvash let ~ leti goes back to metathetical forms of *WōV. Because of the -r- they are probably borrowed from Kipchak.

99 See also Yakut suwu < *tə:bu, Chuvash šak, suši < *tə:bu, šav, šauš < *tə:bu (?) (with *l- like in the case of the cooperative suffix?), and Modern Uyghur matsu, ätu etc. For combinations of other dative elements see, e. g., Balkar inoI, Kumyk owa, Türkmen boI, Karaim etol < Russian eto, see Musaeu (1966, 268) and (1977, 42)), Krymychak (anawu, Reb 22) Modern Uyghur (moona, äto) etc.

Bashkir has būga, sağa, uga (< bili, bili, ulu); for ool we find ooga in Benzing (1959c, 431), but ooga in Yulnav (1966, 182). Ak-Noghay and Central Noghay have būga, ooga, oga, Kazakh and Karalpak exhibit būgan, oğan, oğan (Menges 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 dative suffix instead of the dative suffix for the singular personal pronouns and the demonstratives (muazar, sauqar, ojari, būgar, sauqar (Menges 1959, 469). Kumyk displays the same tendency by using the dative suffix only with the demonstrative pronouns (būgar, sauqar, ojari, sauqar) (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. būga, oloko, olo'don – olo'don, uisändan – uisündän, tīgīda, tīgīndan – tīgīdan (KrcGr 192).

In Kirghiz, Central Kipchak, and Noghay, suffixes with initial {M} are affected by clusitic dissimilation 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 Karalpak) see also 6.2.

The gerund in *GAC is present in Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak, Karaim (-Adogol, T -GAlax, G -GAlux), Western Siberian Tatar (only in torgan, see Arazov 1963, 176), Tomsk Tatar and Baraba (*GAC+I.An, +In), Southwest Turkic, andSayran Turkic;94 the Altay Turkic gerund in *GAC probably takes the gerund in *GAC 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 Dorfer (1959, 386) *GAC exists only in ancient documents), Krymychak, and Tălăut (like most of Yenisey Turkic and in Oghuz).

Direct cognates of *bi(r)lān (n) with (without) are to be absent in Kirghiz Kipchak, Central Kipchak (except the southwestern dialects of Kipchak with bila), Noghay, and Kipchak Uzbek, see also Menges 1959. Of Kipchak, Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (including Mishir), 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)lān(n) with (without) Crimean Tatar (like Uzbek) uses the form bila'n with besides ili(n) 'id.'; the latter appears as tiłan in Krymychak, see also 7. In Caucasian Kipchak and Baraba (as in Salar and Chuvash dialects) we find oscillation between (postpositional and enclitic) *b-forms with and without final n. Caucasian Kipchak Kipchak and Karaim have back vocative forms, e. g. Kumyk bulan (and enclitic variants +mualan and +munan, see Benzing 1959d), Karachay-Balkar literary language bla (~ bulA), spoken Balkar bila (n) ~ bila ~ bila, 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 'stirrup', Kazakh with *üzāngū behaves like most other Kipchak languages, whereas Karakalpak goes together with Noghay (*üzāngū, see 5). The extent of clusitic dissimilation seems to be lower in Karakalpak than in Kazakh, see 6.2; see also the different forms of *tAAp(V)(V) (see 5.1), the present tense participles (see

92 Clusitic dissimilation means that a sequence of two non-clusibles (non-plosives) has to be dissolved into a sequence of a non-clusible and a clusible; in the case of Bashkir we better using mutatis mutandis of obstructive dissimilation, Schöning 1993.

93 For the Siberian Tatar vernaculars see, e. g., Tumšev 1968, for Tălăut see Ubraytova 1985; according to Patarkačova (1984, 102) cognates of -GAC are rarely used in Khakas dialects, mainly in Kyzył and in Kacha of the White Ilyus.
5.2), the *WîV(l)-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 *nst’a- (like Noghay, Caucasian Kipchak, Tara Tatar, and Radloff’s Tatar and Karaim) besides *nysta-. Kazakh (according to my materials) only has *nysta- (comparable to Kirghiz Kipchak, Karaim, and Volga-Ural Kipchak, see 5). In Central Kipchak, a cognate of *a:tag ‘island’ is attested in my materials only in Karakalpak, but not in Kazakh, see 5; the same can be observed for the participle in *-mAIAK (for this and for the participle in -Ašl see 7) and the present tense form in -mAIA (see 6.2), i.e. there exist some verbal forms in Karakalpak, which can also be found in Oghuz.