ACTA ORIENTALIA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

ADIUVANTIBUS

K. CZEGLÉDY, A. DOBROVITS, L. FEKETE, J. NÉMETH, S. TELEGDI

REDIGIT

L. LIGETI

TOMUS XII FASCICULI 1—3

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ BUDAPEST

1961

ACTAO RIENT HUNG.

ON THE TRANSCRIPTION OF ARMENO-KIPCHAK

BY

E. SCHÜTZ

Nearly half a century has passed since the first publication of Kipchak literary records in Armenian script[1] yet it was only later that J. Deny stressed their fundamental importance for comanistic studies. J. Deny's paper[2] aroused the interest of scholars, and this resulted in the publication, in recent years, of several Armeno-Kipchak texts that could be found in different countries.[3]

Following this impetus, increased attention has been devoted to the significance of Armeno-Turcica, it will be, therefore, perhaps not without interest to make a cursory survey, from the Armenistic point of view, of the relevant and still up-to-date text editions and treatises.

The first report of scientific value in the Armenistic literature on our subject was written by the Venetian Mekhitarist, Minas Bzhshkiants[4] whose work has conserved fundamental and unique data concerning the scattered and assimilated Armenian colony of Podolia. M. M. Bzhshkiants wished to acquaint the dispersed Armenians with the history of the destruction of Ani[5] and the dispersion of the Armenians, and in this connection he gave a detailed description, based on investigations on the spot, of the Armenian colonies in Eastern Europe. In 1808, he visited the Armenians of Transylvania, Moldavia, Bolgaria, in 1820 he went to Galicia, Tataria Minor (Novo-Rossia) and Tauria (Crimea).

Speaking of the Armenian cultural monuments, M. Bzhshkiants describes the Armenian magistrative-judicial, ecclesiastical-administrative and religious

[1] The historical and linguistic background of the question was outlined by F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst as early as 1912 who also gave the Armeno-Kipchak translation of a psalm for a sample (*WZKM* XXVI, pp. 307—324). He pointed out the close relation of Armeno-Kipchak to the Coman (*op. cit.* pp. 312—313), but the major work he planned to write on this subject has never been published.

[2] *JA* July—Sept. 1921, pp. 134—135.

[3] The works of T. I. Hrunin, J. Deny, M. Lewicki and R. Kohnowa.

[4] The vicar of Tauria.

[5] = Bagratid Armenia.

documents written in the "Tatar" language which he came across in Lvov and Kamenets and even publishes excerpts from some of them. This rich Armeno-Kipchak material has since passed, in its major part, into libraries in Poland, to Kiev, into the libraries of the Mekhitarists of Vienna and Venice, the Bibliothèque Nationale and other libraries. We are still far from knowing all the documents in the public libraries all over the world and in private possession. M. Bzhshkiants himself complaints that many codices have been lent to readers and have never been restored.

These codices have been repeatedly mentioned in Armenistic literature, for the most part with reference to M. Bzhshkiants, but the Armeno-Kipchak linguistic documents have been looked upon by Armenian philologists rather as some sort of curiosities and were considered beyond the limits of Armenistics in the strict sense of the word.

While editing the well-known law-book of Mekhitar Gosh compiled in the 12th century and widely used during the subsequent centuries, V. Zh. Bastamiants was concerned also with the Paris manuscript of the Armeno-Kipchak translation[6] but, as he writes in the preface to the critical edition, his knowledge of Azerbaijani helped him precious little in coping with this language, nor was the assistance of an Armenian student from Constantinople with his knowledge of Osmanli any more useful, because of the "corrupt style" of the text.

V. Zh. Bastamiants ignores M. Bzhshkiants' reports and believes that the translation of the law-book was meant rather for the Crimean Armenians living in Tatar environment.[7]

H. K. Kushnerian who in 1883 went on a pilgrimage to the famous image of the Virgin at Kamenets, in his report on the journey mentions the Tatar language of the Podolian Armenians (of Kamenets): "From the end of the 16th century... until 1625 (sic!) they exchanged their smooth Armenian language for the rude language of the Tatars who ravaged and destroyed their

[6] *Datastanagirk' Hayoc'*, Vałaršapat 1880 pp. 48—50.

[7] Kh. Samuelian also seems to share this opinion. See Армянский судебник Мхитара Гоша. Yerevan. 1954. p. XXXIV. note 1.

Hitherto there is but *one* Armenio-Kipchak linguistic document figuring as of "Crimean" origin, the one obtained from Crimea by abbé François Sevin collecting oriental manuscripts in 1728—1730 in Constantinople for the Paris royal library (Sevin's letter of Dec. 2, 1729, to the minister Maurepas, *apud:* Fr. Macler, *Catalogue* p. XIV). Since the codex is not included in Macler's catalogue, it cannot be ascertained whether it was originally written in Crimea or obtained from Podolia. This question can hardly be solved until the whole Armeno-Kipchak material is collected, the material known so far comes at any rate from Podolia. Neither Bzhshkiants nor Kushnerian makes mention of such records either from Crimea or from among the codices the Armenians settled in 1778 in the Yekaterinoslav province had taken along, though both of them visited these Armenian colonies.

homes".[8] Judging by these words, H. K. Kushnerian must have had rather superficial information on the Kipchak language of the Podolian Armenians which he regarded as that of the Mongol-Tatars.

One of the principal works in Armeno-Kipchak research for the Armenologists is Gh. Alishan's edition of sources.[9] This contains the annals of Kamenets-Podolsk in Armenian from 1430 to 1611, in Armeno-Kipchak from 1611 to 1624 and again in Armenian from 1649 until 1652, as well as the relevant colophons written in the Podolian Armenian colonies and the pastoral letters of the Armenian Catholicoses. It is to Alishan's credit that he took the greatest care in publishing this linguistic material which was but partly intelligible to him. He was well aware of the historical value of the text, and in one of his comments refers even to the necessity of a translation: "For those knowing Turkish this language is not unintelligible if no Polish and [other] foreign words are mixed with it ; yet if someone is versed in both [languages], he can easily translate it into our language or any known European language".[10] The Armenian material of the *Kamenits* was indeed made use of in works on the dispersion of the Armenians, yet the Armeno-Kipchak part has not yet been given a comprehensive linguistic treatment as a whole. J. Deny did make an attempt to make up for this deficiency but his above-mentioned edition relies only on the fragmentary Paris manuscript.[11]

The catalogues of Armenian manuscripts are important aids in the investigation of Kipchak texts. Owing to the abundance of Armeno-Kipchak texts in Vienna, as well as to the scientific description of the codices, foremost importance should be attributed to H. Y. Tashian (Dashian)'s catalogues covering the manuscripts of the Vienna Hofbibliothek (Vienna 1891) and of the Mekhitarist library (Vienna 1895).

For the description of Armenian manuscripts in some European libraries and private collections we are indebted to Fr. Macler. His lack of knowledge in Turkology, however, impeded him in giving a thorough description of the Kipchak material ; for his catalogue of the Armenian manuscripts kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale he borrowed the short descriptions of the Kipchak documents from abbé Martin's hand-written catalogue. Fr. Macler was the one to call attention to the only extant Armeno-Kipchak printed book known so far, a prayer book published in 1618 in Lvov, the *Alyyš bitiki*.[12]

[8] *Patmutʿiwn gatʿakanutʿean Xrimu hayocʿ* (The history of the Crimean Armenian colony). Venice 1895 p. 197.

[9] *Kamenicʿ, Taregirkʿ hayocʿ Lehastani ew Ṙumenioy* (Kamenits, the Chronicle of the Armenians of Poland and Rumania), Venice 1896.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 67.

[11] In his publication J. Deny never refers to Gh. Alishan's edition of the complete Venice manuscript.

[12] Prepared for publication by the author.

Macler's catalogue of Armenian manuscripts compiled in 1925 in Lvov registers a period of transition.[13] Some of the items listed can be found in the manuscript collections of different libraries in Poland.

K. Roszko has recently given a good description of the Armenian (including Armeno-Kipchak) manuscripts in Poland.[14] The list in volume XXI of the *RO* (p. 156) may be regarded as a supplement to it for the Armeno-Kipchak material.

Furthermore, the exploitation of the Armeno-Kipchak manuscripts requires a thorough study of the contemporary cultural conditions of the Podolian Armenians. In this field N. Akinian has made important contributions having written the biography of the most significant notary of the Armenians in Lvov, Minas Tokhatetsi, and having published the philological edition of the "Travels" of scribe Simeon of Poland.[15]

The study of the history of the Podolian and Moldavian Armenians has recently gathered considerable impetus in the Armenian SSR. A department for the relations with the countries of people's democracy has been organized in the Institute of History of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.[16] Quite a number of papers have already been published on the Podolian Armenians in the journals of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.[17] Disregarding no w, in compliance with the purpose of our review, the papers based on the Russian—Polish material, among the treatises in Armenology we mention L. Khachikian's paper[18] giving a good survey of the cultural life of the Podolian Armenians. He refers, among others, to the Kipchak part of the annals of Kamenets (pp. 73—74) but makes no mention of other monuments of the Kipchak language. Thus it remains an open question whether or not there are Armeno-Kipchak texts among the codices that had come from Podolia to the Matenadaran.

[13] *REA* VII. p. 94 *et seq.*

[14] *Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens et géorgiens*, Warszawa 1958.

[15] *Hing panduxt tałasacʿner* (Five emigrant poets), Vienna 1921. — *Simèon dpri Lehacʿwoy ułegrutʿiwn* (The travel accounts of scribe Simeon of Poland), Vienna 1936.

[16] [An important event right at the beginning of the activities of the department was the conference of Armenian and Ukrainian historians and philologists held in Yerevan (Oct. 23 to 26,1959.). Only brief reports have so far reached us on the discussions having paramount importance for our subject: Вопросы истории, 1960 no. 2. p. 220, Український історичний журнал, 1960 no. 1. pp. 143—145, Tełekagir, 1959 no. 11—12. pp. 129—133.]

[17] *Tełekagir* (Известия АН Арм. ССР) and the *Patma-banasirakan Handes* (Историко-филологический журнал) started in 1958.

[18] *Haykakan gałtavayrerə Ukrainayum XVI—XVII darerum* (The Armenian colonies in the Ukrain in the 16th and 17th centuries), in *Tełekagir* 1954 no. 4, pp. 45—80.

The recently published Russian version of Hovhannes Kamenitsatsi's contemporary chronicle in a great help is studying the Kamenets chronicle.[19]

*

The rendering of a text with the characters of another language is necessarily a compromise, in which the phonetic system of the transcribed language can only be approximated to a certain degree. In case of the Kipchak texts in Armenian script the conditions of transcription are rather favourable since the differentiated system of the Armenian alphabet is more or less suitable for rendering the sounds occurring in the Kipchak language. Owing to the considerable amount and volume of the texts we may have good hopes of threshing out the problems in the orthography of the Armeno-Kipchak texts. The material published so far is in itself sufficient to permit a preliminary survey.

It is common knowledge that the Armenian orthography is particularly conservative and has changed but slightly since the 5th century to our days. Yet as a result of this conservatism the phonetical changes that have taken place during the past fifteen centuries have remained hidden, and in Armenian texts these deviations can be traced only by considering certain fluctuations in the spelling and the behaviour of the loan words.

The most important change that has taken place in the phonetic system of the Armenian language over part of the speech area is the "second Armenian Lautverschiebung". This is the most essential difference between the literary language of the Armenian SSR and the literary language of the Armenians who have fled west since the 11th century. From the standard language of the medieval Cilician Little Armenia there is an unbroken line leading to the phonetic system of the modern, so-called West Armenian literary language. Hence the Armeno-Kipchak texts of the 16th and 17th centuries represent an important stage between the two extremities of development and may prove useful in studying the development of the so-called West Armenian phonetic system.

On the other hand, viewed from the side of Turcology, the "second Lautverschiebung" (having affected the sets of explosives and affricates) as well as the phonetic system of the contemporary West Armenian literary language offer a possibility for the reconstruction of the phonetism of the Armeno-Kipchak linguistic documents. This fact was recognized at the earliest stage of research by the Turcologists studying the Armeno-Kipchak texts and was duly considered when creating the transcription systems used in text editions published so far.

[19] *Xot'ini paterazmi patmut'iwnə* (History of the Khotin war) in *Patma-banasirakan Handes* 1958 no. 2, pp. 258—286; for the relation of the two chronicles see E. Tryjarski's paper: *Przegląd Orient.* 1959 pp. 211—214.

Nevertheless, in some publications we come across phonetic values differing from the norms of "western" pronunciation. In the following we shall make an attempt at elucidating these cases.

In his fundamental publication, the only edition of texts of the spoken language so far, T. I. Hrunin adopts the above principle. In his phonetical comments of the text, however, he fails to give an unequivocal picture of some problems. He states, for instance, that ц is rendered by дца, дза, цо in the texts.[20] This should obviously be understood to mean that *j (dz)* is rendered by ȝ while ȝ and ȡ are used for *c (ts)*. This is not very significant for the Kipchak because these sounds occur in the Ukrainian, Polish and Armenian words only. There might arise some misunderstanding from his remark that ча and че are used for denoting ч.[21] T. I. Hrunin in all probability refers to the phonetic values of ȥ and ȣ. In the latter case the generalization may be restricted to saying that the sound *č* is generally rendered by ȥ; while ȣ might almost be regarded as a lapsus calami.[22]

Owing to the mixed use of the classical and modern western denominations of the Armenian letters, T. I. Hrunin's comments on the rendering of the sound *k* are again somewhat ambiguous as far as transcription is concerned. As he states *k*, in words with front vowels is represented by ȹ.[23] This statement does not seem to be corroborated by the other linguistic documents where ȹ and ȸ occur both without distinction. Nor is it unimportant that in the Polish words with back vowels *k* is denoted only by ȸ.[24]

As to the transcription system of the *Eph.* J. Deny inserts the sounds not reflected in the script, and omits the aspiration of *k* and *t*. — Since there is no facsimile in his edition, it seems indicated to draw attention to a few misspellings liable to suggest false conclusions. E. g. the sign of the plural: *rïtşerleri* 3[4] (recte: *-lari)*; *keçirdiler* 7[11] (r.: *-lar)*; radical ending in voiceless consonant + initial consonant in inflectional ending: *kokda* 7[3], *hlïçdan* 7[10], *boluşgay* 9[12] (r.: *kokta, h[ï]llïçtan, boluşkay)*; χ: *haçtï, haçïp* 4[13, 14] (write *h* for *h)*; verb forms: *edip şlatip* 2[19] (r.: *etip işlatip), edi* 9[20] (r.: *edir), edir* 11[16] (r.: *etip), etti edi* 10[5] (r.: *etip edi), olturur edi* 18[2] (r.: *olturup edi), angar* 5[3] (r.: *angdi), bar edi* 16[7],

[20] p. 95.

[21] Probably these Armenian denominations of letters reflecting no exact phonetic values may have prompted the editors of the *Dat.* to confound the phonetic values of the affricates.

[22] See below. — This phenomenon has been pointed out already by F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, *op. cit.* p. 312.

[23] T. I. Hrunin, *op. cit.* p. 95.; — Вопросы языкознания 1958 no. 6. p. 114.

[24] The above-mentioned regularity would among others make it advisable to distinguish the tenues and the tenuis aspirates in transcription which would also be useful as far as the history of Armenian orthography (and phonetical development) is concerned. Text editions in general neglect the aspiration. In the *Dat.* it is marked, though not with complete consequence.

20^{11} (r.: *baredir)*; inflectional ending, possessive personal suffix: *etkan songra* 3^{6} (r.: *etkandan songra), pohrebda* 5^{8} (r.: *-ga), tayfasï* 13^{6} (r.: *-sïn), dinsizin* 15^{19} (r.: *dinsizni), ayïna* 16^{19} (r.: *ayïnda), kunlarina* 19^{12} (r.: *kunlarinda), babaslar* 19^{13} (r.: *-larï), yandan* 20^{2} (r.: *yanda da), songğun* 20^{4} (r.: *songğusun), kişilar* 20^{10} (r.: *-lari),* etc.

Among those who have hitherto published texts, M. Lewicki and R. Kohnowa have come up against the greatest difficulties in transcription because of all the Armeno-Kipchak documents the orthography of the *Dat.* adheres the most strictly to the classical Armenian spelling. The spelling system here adopted is not a very fortunate blend of transliteration and transcription. The reading is made rather difficult by the Armenian transcription uncommon in Turcology. Thus, for instance, the letter ե having the phonetic value of *j (je)*[25] is rendered by *e*, the letter ը by *ə*, while the sound *y*, when not reflected in the original (which is particularly frequent in this text), is not transliterated. Inadequate letters are frequent in the transcription, though of no serious consequence thanks to the excellent facsimile. The Armenian letters are tabulated alphabetically[26] for the most part with their Western Armenian phonetic values in Meillet's system. It would have been advisable to include ֆ *(f)* and օ *(o)* which have belonged to the alphabet since the Middle-Armenian period and to mark the different phonetic values some letters have in different positions. The authors ignore the "second Lautverschiebung" of the affricates. The erroneous transcription of ծ and ձ is not particularly disconcerting because the sounds *c* and *dz* do not occur in Kipchak words (but e. g. in Armenian words: ՀերձուածոՑ 177v2, 9 = *herjowacoy*; recte: *hercvajoy*). The rendering of ճ by *č* is, however, somewhat misleading. The transcribed form of ճաև, for instance, is throughout *čan* instead of *ǰan*. The letter ջ exceptionally occurring in some cases (and standing for *č*) is incorrectly rendered by *ǰ*: Աւնունջի *(Awununǰi,* recte: *Onunči)* 156v22; ևէջիք (r.: *nečik)* 160v15, 166r6; ոէջնիք ('rzecznik') 190v13; ջխար- (r.: *čyχar-)* 190v16.

*

A pecularity in the social-cultural life of the Podolian Armenians of the 16th and 17th centuries is that their standard language is the Kipchak. We know this from scribe Simeon's report concerning the first decades of the 17th century: "The Armenians of Lvov do not know the Armenian language but speak Polish and Kipchak, i. e. Tatar language".[27] This is supported by

[25] In my transcription I use K. Grønbech's symbols. — The meanings of Kipchak words are not quoted, unless they fail to figure in J. Deny's comprehensive glossary or in case of ambiguity.

[26] *Dat.* p. 253.

[27] N. Akinian, *Simèon*, p. 346.

Alembek's chronicle (1603—1605): „[Armeni] sacra in Ecclesia nativo sermone semper peragunt, domi semper Tartarorum lingua utuntur".[28] But not only their spoken language is Kipchak; this is the language in which their official documents (protocols, minutes at tribunals), even the ecclesiastic ones (marriage and birth certificates, wills *[diatʿik < διαθήκη]*, marriage contracts *[grorenkʿ])*, are drafted. Kipchak is used in ecclesiastic matters not only on account of the population's requirements but also because the priests themselves have but a scanty knowledge of Armenian. A satirical poem known as the „Vipasanutʿiwn Nikolakan" says: "[The priests in Lvov] do not know the Armenian language and do not understand what they read".[29] This is corroborated by Vardan Hunanian (in a letter of his written to the Armenians of Tokat in 1703): ". . .in those times the priests were very unlearned in erudition and inexperienced in the Armenian language, as the people themselves".[30]

Though this picture is characteristic of most priests of local birth, but it cannot be generalized. However different the value of our Kipchak texts is, they all testify to the fact that their scribes and translators mastered both Armenian and Kipchak relatively well, and offer a fairly complete picture of Kipchak phonetics.

In the Armeno-Kipchak texts of the 17th century that we had the opportunity to examine certain letters generally denote the same sound in whatever position they stand, a fact that indicates the standardization of the Armeno-Kipchak orthography. On the other hand, in the script of the *Dat.* we find several phonetic forms unusual in Armeno-Kipchak texts. Most of these forms reveal no Kipchak linguistic properties but are rather characteristic of Armenian orthography. The discrepancies of spelling in the linguistic documents are mainly due to the different degree in which the scribes mastered the Armenian language, i. e. orthography.

In the following we wish to point out a few orthographical properties deriving from the classical Armenian orthography (letters and letter groups)[31] which will permit the exclusion of phonetic forms incongruent with the Kipchak pronunciation, from the texts transcribed.

ւ (աւ, եւ, ոլ, իւ)

In the early days of Armenian written literature the sign ւ was presumably used to denote the semivocal *u̯ (w)* and formed diphthongs with vowels. At any rate there could be no great difference between the phonetic value of

[28] *RO* XXI p. 158.

[29] Gh. Alishan, *Kamenicʿ*, p. 202.

[30] *Ibid.* p. 127.

[31] The term "letter group" I apply to two characters closely linked historically. The two letters had earlier represented a closer phonetic unit (e. g. diphthong), the pronunciation of which was later modified, yet the letter group has survived.

ւ and that of վ because, beside the combinations աւ, եւ (և) and իւ, to ո the letter վ was joined. (The letters ու were used for *u* on the model of the Greek *ου*.) When not in preconsonantic position the pronunciation of ւ must have become the same as that of վ at a very early stage. In the period having now our attention the letter ւ in intervocalic and final position had the same value as վ which shows that its use is but an orthographical peculiarity.

աւ | In the Armeno-Kipchak texts the intervocalic and final աւ denotes *av*. This is the symbol for *av* throughout the *Dat.* (with the rare exception *Հանավար [ǰanavar]* 167v[3, 5, 7]). In the *Eph.* the letter group ավ is more frequent: beside *ալբաւուտ (alpavud)* 11[21], *ալբավուտ* 22[12]; *ավալ (aval)* 9[2]; but *šayavat* invariably with աւ, *սդանիսլաւ (Stanislav)* 13[17]. The trend towards the standardization of the spelling shows up even in Armenian words: instead of *դաւիթ* ('David') we find *թավիթ* 4[19]. — In the *AB* the word *avaz* is written *աւազ* in seven instances and *ավազ* in one. (Since late Middle Armenian the sign *թաւ (t'aw)* ՝ has been used to stress the value *v* of ւ in manuscripts and later in print. Hence: *աՒազ* 21[7]. In the Kipchak texts we have examined, the sign t'aw occurs in a few cases only.) The word *šayavat* (the basis and in derivatives) is written nine times with աւ, seven times with ավ.

In preconsonantic position the pronunciation of աւ became short open *o* as early as the end of the first millenium, and in Middle Armenian texts աւ and the new sign օ are used alternately. In the transcription of foreign words and names, for instance: *կաւսուաՒֆրէ* ('Godfried Bouillon') *HChr.* 56[8, 17]; *Ա՛ւդՒ, Ա՛ւդուՒ* ('Otto, German emperor') *ibid.* p. 53 & *passim*. In words other than Armenian it occurs in initial position and in uncial writing only: *Dat. Ա՛ւԼ (Ol)* 168r[17], 181r[12], 181v[4], 183v[11, 19]. (In the transcription erroneously: *O;* the authors were probably disconcerted by the sign ° used to stress the pronunciation of Ա՛ւ as *o*, a sign common in medieval Armenian texts.) But we have a correct transcription in *Ա՛ւշդայ (Ošta)* 159r[9], 163v[3]; *Ա՛ւՀանՒէս (Ohannes)* 211r[20] is missing in the transcription. — This sign in the uncial writing is maintained throughout the *AB* too: *Ա՛ւթուզ (Otuz)* 90[3], *Ա՛ւղլու (Oγlu)* 113[11], *Ա՛ւթ (Ot)* 89[3], *Ա՛ւթԼու (Otlu)* 118[6] (but with a minuscule letter: *օթԼու ibid.), ԴԱՒՂՐՈՒ (TOΓRU)* 150[2].

եւ(և) | Of the letters for *e* only *և* occurs in connection with ւ in the Armenian script (in case of minuscule letter in ligature և). In the Kipchak material open *e* + *v* have the sign էվ: *evet* in both *Dat.* and *AB էվէդ passim; Eph. Kevorovic քէվօրովԼից* 1[19], 5[2]. The ligature և is used regularly in the Armenian words, in Kipchak words we find it seldom, e. g. in the *Dat.: տև (dev)* 167v[9, 11], 177r[22]. (This form of writing was probably suggested by the Armenian word դև of the same meaning [and origin].) In the phrase *պաշևուՀու (baš-ev-učᵘ,* erroneous transcription: *bašlovuču) 169r[12]* we have the Armenian conjunction

և (ew, jew) 'and'. In Kipchak hendiadyses the conjunction *ու (u)* 'and' is frequent. In our example *ու* is replaced by *և* in order to avoid cacophony. The pair *ու — և* permits the inference that in the mentioned hendiadyses we have to do with the Armenian conjunction *ու*.[32]

ով | In Kipchak texts the regular sign for *o* is *օ* though sometimes even *ո* occurs, without phonemic difference. The latter we come across most frequently in *ov*, but this is due to the close orthographical link between the elements of the letter group *ով* in Armenian orthography. In the *Dat.* it is frequent in the suffix groups *-ovuču, -ovlu* and also in *jixov* which is always written *եիխով*; further *jovuχ եովուխ, Krakov* ('Cracow') *քրաքով, Ilov* ('Lvov') *իլով, tolov թօլով*; in Kipchak morphologic pairs with *u — o : սուվ (suv* 'water') and *սով (sov), սուվ-* (suv- 'to love, like') and *սով- (sov-)* etc.

In the language of the scribes the pronunciation of *ո* in initial position was obviously *vo* (as in the New Armenian literary language) because this letter does not occur in this position. An exception to this is the case when — in compliance with the orthography of the Armenian literary language[33] — *ո* is followed by *վ*; in this case the initial *ո* is pronounced *o*. Accordingly, we find *ով* for *ov* also in initial position in the *Dat.: ով (ov), ովրանչիք (ovrančik), ովրան- (ovran-), ովրագ-, ովրաթ- (ovrat-)*, yet the sign *օվ* also appears: *օվրաթ- (ovrat-)* 158r[21].

In the *Eph.* too the letter group *ով* is still frequent: *իլով (Ilov* 'Lvov') 1[11], 4[6], 20[21];[34] *եիխով (jyχov)* 21[2], but: *չօվրա (čovra)* 13[3], *մօսքօվ (Moskov)* (six times).

In the *AB*, where an advanced standardization of the orthography can be observed, the letter group *օվ* is used in the overwhelming majority of the cases. In initial and medial position its use is almost exclusive: *օվ (ov), օվրանչիք (ovrančik), օվրագ-, օվրաթ- (ovrat-), օվուն- (ovun-), չօվրա (čovra), սօվ- (sov-), սօվաք (sovak), սօվուք (sovuk), սօվուն- (sovun-), սօվունչլուք (sovunčluk)*; but *govda կովսա* ('body, corps') 135[15]. The same is found in the suffix groups *-ovlu, -ovsuz, -ovuči*. In final position, however, *ով* occurs still rather frequently: *պըխով (byχov)* 93[4], but *պըղով* 105[1], *իլով (Ilov)* frontp.[12], *juχov* ('church') is written five times with *ով* and five times with *օվ*; *jyγov ('id.')* twice with *ով* and once with *օվ*.

[32] Though in such hendiadyses even initial *ու* is generally preceded by the conjunction *ու*, this fact does not contradict the possibility of Armenian origin of this conjunction, because for the conjunction 'and' *ու* is used exclusively from Middle Armenian on. — For another interpretation see J. Deny, *Eph.* pp. 77—78.

[33] That is, without the restriction as in Polish Armenian: Hanusz, p. 22; Acharian, p. 38. Cf. Karst, p. 21, note 4.

[34] In 1[11] the transcription *Ilav* is a misspelling for *Ilov*, whence the conclusion drawn therefrom *(Eph.* p. 88) is void.

The alternate occurrence of the Kipchak *ov* ~ *uv* (e. g. *suv* ~ *sov, ovran-* ~ *uvran-*) may suggest the assumption that the use of the letter group of *ու* would perhaps indicate a shift of the pronunciation toward *uv*,[35] yet on realizing that also the unequivocal *ov* is often rendered by *ու*, further that this letter group occurs in any position and that the standardization of orthography entails a preference for *ով*, it becomes obvious that this phenomenon should be looked upon only as an Armenian orthographic peculiarity.

Should the dialectal pronunciation of a preconsonantic *ու* happen to be something like *ov*,[36] this does not necessarily mean the decomposition of the letter group *ու*, but merely indicate that the first element in the sound group is but an inserted vowel. Thus the word *նուիրակ Eph.* 4[19], *novirag* in the glossary should be read rather *n(ə)virag*. The correct reading of *սիմէոն ու աննայ (Simeon Ovanna) Dat.* 179v[14] is *Simeon u Anna* ('S. and A.'). *Čowap* 157r[11], *čuvap* 169v[12], *čovap* 175v[2] standing in the transcription of the *Dat.* for *ճուար* should be corrected into *ǰuap* pronounced with a hiatus (cf. CC *joap*).

իւ The letters *իւ* in Old Armenian must have denoted originally the sound group (diphthong) *iw*. In the course of the development of the language — with the coincidence of the values of *ւ* and *վ* — in prevocalic and final position it has conserved its pronunciation *iv* up to our days. Before consonants (i. e. in closed syllable also at the end of the words) it turned into a rising diphthong *i̯u*.

The history of the pronounciation of *իւ* has not yet been worked up, and their value in Middle Armenian deduced by Karst[37] cannot be regarded as covering all possibilities. This sound group i. e. diphthong has generally become monophthongal *(u, e, i)*. The pronunciation *ü* beside *u* may be regarded as proven, though the example *կիւռն* is not nonclusive because it may be an earlier borrowing with sound replacement, its medieval re-adoption being *կիր*, on the basis of the contemporary Greek pronunciation.[38] The picture ignores the "traditional" pronunciation *ju* which can presumably be traced as far back as this period, and it is highly probable that many *իւ* signs conceal a *ju* with sound replacement.

In modern West Armenian literary language the preconsonantic *իւ* is pronounced *ju, ʲu, jü, ü*.[39]

In the Armeno-Kipchak texts here investigated *իւ* (occurring only in preconsonantic position) denotes *ju*. In the *Dat.* the phonetic value *ju* is ren-

[35] For Middle Armenian cf. Karst, p. 21.

[36] Cirbied, *Gramm. arm.* p. 651.

[37] Op. cit. pp. 22, 66, 118.

[38] Hübschmann, *Arm. Gramm.* p. 357.

[39] F. Feydit, *Manuel de langue arm.*, Paris 1948. p. 13.; A. Abeghian, *Neuarm. Gramm.*, Berlin—Leipzig 1936, p. 21.

dered by իւ in the majority of the cases. In the second syllable *ju* is invariably written իւ: *bujur-* 27 times պուիւր-, *bujurul-* twice պուիւրուլ- (but cf. p. 154 *bujruχ:* պույրուխ). The same applies also to the initial position in most cases: իւրաք *(jurak)* 161r[8], 190v[2], իւզլու *(juzlu)* 170r[13]. The situation is, however, complicated by the inclination of the copyist to use ե for the initial *j-*. This has yielded the following variants, in which the sound *j* has a double representation: եիւք *(jjuk)* 187r[17], եիւխու *(jjuχu)* 160v[15], եիւկունի- *(jju-gun-)* 175v[20]. The frequently recurring word *juz* appears three times as իւզ and four times as եիւզ. The fluctuation of orthography becomes obvious when the two different kinds of spelling occur in one and the same line: եիւզտայ իւզ *(jjuzda juz* 'face to face').

Beside the standardized form նուվ- *(juv-)* (4th line) in Kraelitz's publication we find իւրաք *(jurak* lines 13 and 20), իւզ *(juz* line 14). In the *Eph.:* նուզ *(juz)* 9[13]. In the *AB* — in course of the orthographical standardization — we find almost invariably նու in initial position and յու in medial position for *ju : juban- :* նուպան- 27[4], *juχla- :* նուխլա- three times, *juχov* always with նու-, նուխու *(juχu* 'dream') 27[1], *juk* and derivative forms: նուք(-), *juv-* five times նուվ-, *juz* 12 times նուզ. In medial position: *bujur-* invariably պույուր-. On the other hand, *juru- :* նուրու- 121[8], 135[10], but իւրու- 47[2], *jurak* 23 times plus its derivatives: նուրաք(-) but իւրաք 146[15].[40]

It follows from our examples that in the above cases իւ cannot be read *ü* (which would yield *ürak, üzlu, üz*).[41] Hence this cannot be judged by the same standard as the renderings իւ = *ü* to be attributed to the influence of the Armenians of Turkey.[42]

ը

The Kipchak velar *i* (*y* in our transcription) is rendered by the closest related ը. But in the first syllable, in some suffixes and inflectional endings in writing it is often omitted. The problem of the representation of this sound varies with the different texts. In the texts tending toward "phonetic" transcription and thus departing from the classical Armenian orthography most of the *y* sounds are represented (by ը), except mostly in cases when one of the sounds in the first or last syllable is a liquid (e. g. խլիչ ; -լխ, -ռը). In these cases the editors of these texts fail to give an equivalent to *y* in transcription, except for J. Deny who marks it by *(ı)* or without brackets or, in some cases,

[40] As we have seen in other connections, the classical orthography was conserved latest by the uncial writing.

[41] *Eph.* p. 83 sub: *yuz.* — Consequently, it is rather an orthographical feature than a phonetic development in Armeno-Kipchak, as is assumed in *Phil. Turc. Fund.* p. 83.

[42] J. Deny does not distinguish these two phonetic values though is plausible in supposing that also the latter should be reckoned with. *Eph.* p. 19.

omits it.[43] In the orthography of the *Dat. y* is often absent, nor is it rendered by any sign in the transcription of the text, in accordance with the system of transliteration of the authors.

In Armenian ը is a mid-vowel assuming the timbre of its environment, pronounced with different intensity in different positions yet generally weakly, whence the tradition of neglecting it in writing. Under the impression of the written form of the words in which it occurs, the descriptive grammars generally treat it as being a euphonic inserted sound. In many cases it can be demonstrated to derive from the reduction of vowels having full sonority (*ի*, *ու*) when these find themselves in unstressed position in consequence of inflection or word composition. In Armenian the consonant groups are no real clusters since there is in most cases some sound there reduced to *ə* (ը) which is not reflected in writing. This phenomenon can not always be grasped etymologically, yet can at any rate be demonstrated already in Old Armenian.[44] In syllables originally containing *ի* or *ու* having become unstressed the reduction of the vowels to *ə* (ը) is a phenomenon still surviving. (Reduction must be distinguished from the cases in which the sound simply falls out at the syllabic limits. See e. g. in Middle Armenian the dropping of *ա* in the medial position.) Reduction, however, often affects other sounds as well in Middle Armenian[45] and is a frequent phenomenon in dialects. In Podolian Armenian, for instance, any of the five principal vowels may be reduced to *ə*.[46] As to the group containing consonant + *r* in final position in this dialect, H. Acharian describes it as a local peculiarity,[47] though these forms were recorded by J. Hanusz most probably under the influence of the written forms, and we are inclined to think that we have to do with a sound group containing: consonant + *ə* + *r*. (Cf. Armeno-Kipchak *-ыр* (*-dyr* 'is').

Further arguments in favour of the consonant clusters being merely orthographical are as follows: at the point of separation ը is inserted even if originally absent in script; in poetical works ը always forms a syllable even if not marked; medieval authors often use in writing ը even in prose texts. For Armenian words occurring in Kipchak texts the classical orthography is used in most cases, but in the *AB* the inserted letter ը often appears also in Armenian words, e. g.: *սըր|բուհի* ('The Holy Lady') 109[2], *մկրըբտանլ* ('baptize') 131[11], *նըշան* ('sign') 166[9].

On the basis of spelling of CC *iarlga*, etc. *l* and *r* in these cases are supposed to be voiced consonats in Cumanian. The above quoted Armeno-

[43] The unwritten *y* was, in his opinion, "sometimes, probably" not pronounced. *Eph.* p. 19.

[44] Hübschmann, *Chronologie*, p. 157; *Esquisse*, p. 53.

[45] Karst, pp. 55, 39.

[46] Hanusz, p. 93.

[47] Acharian, p. 32.

Kipchak examples seem to be of similar nature. It must, however, be remembered that in our texts the omission of *y* occurs also with other consonants, e. g.: *alγyš* and derivates in *Dat.* always *ալղշ*, (but *saγyš* and deriv. *սաղշ*), *jalγyz* always *եալղզ*, *χysχa* once *խըսխա*, once *խսխա*, *tynčsyzlyχ թնչսզլխ* 164r[20], etc. In the standardized spelling of the *AB* the *y* (*ը*) is rendered in the majority of cases. But *-lyχ* is represented by *-լխ* in some 30 per cent of the cases; further *čyχar-* 8 times *չըխար-* twice *չխար-*, *jazyχ* 10 times *եազըխ*, 4 times *եազխ*.

Most of the examples seem to point rather to an Armenian orthographical phenomenon, but on basis of a certain consistency in omission we are inclined to think that the sonority of *y* in certain clusters was perhaps reduced (*ʸ*).

յ — *j̇*, *j*

Most of the orthographical, i. e. phonetical problems are connected with the letters used for *j̇*, *j*, and the pronunciation of the letter յ. In Old Armenian *j̇*, *j* were usually represented by յ. This use, however, was discontinued as early as prior to the Middle Armenian period.

յ- | Losing its sonority and intensity the initial *j̇* gradually turned into *h*. In Meillet's opinion the traces of the beginning of this process have been conserved in the initial յ of *յիսուն* 'fifty' and the initial *h* of *հինգ* 'five'.[50] The value *h* of initial յ in Middle Armenian is attested by cases of double orthography.[51] This seems to be supported by the fact that in medieval texts *h* is sometimes found as a tentative spelling of the sound *j̇* in foreign words, e. g.: in the chronicle of Grigor Akantsi[52] *jasaχ* : *հասախ* II[21], but *յասախ* XII[25], [43] or *ասախ* IV[44], XII[4]; *jarlyχ* : *հառլախ* VII[20]; *jaryučі* : *արղուչի* XII five times. The omission of *j̇* shows that the common nouns that had soon become loan words shared the fate of the Armenian initial յ, i. e. its transformation through a weak *h* into a very weak, unmarked aspiration. (Since the Middle Armenian period յ, and sometimes ζ, have been used also for denoting the secondary weak aspiration occurring before the original initial *ա* and *ո*.)

We find the same result in Podolian Armenian where the initial յ is pronounced either *h* or *ϕ* (here and there secondary aspiration also appears).[53] According to Acharian, the initial յ = *ϕ* in the Podolian and neighbouring dialects, while the words with an initial *h* (written) are literary adoptions.[54]

This յ is often left unrepresented even in the Armenian words occurring in Kipchak texts, e. g.: *ովան(ն)էս (Ovan[n]es) Dat.* 180v[1, 4, 20], *Ա°ՀաննէՏ*

[50] *Esquisse*, p. 30.
[51] Karst, p. 34.
[52] *HJAS* XII/3—4.
[53] Hanusz, p. 69.
[54] Acharian, p. 91.

(Ohannes) Dat. 211r[20]. In contemporary Armenian texts too, e. g.: *աբհ-ազական (apetʿagan* 'Japhetide'), *այսմաւուրք (ajsmawurkʿ* 'martyrologium').[55] That is why it may seem to be more correct to denote the initial *յ* in the Kipchak texts by *h*, or by ʿ or to omit it altogether, that is to transcribe e. g. *Eph. յունվար, յունիս, յովանէս, յակոբ* as *hunvar, hunis, (H)ovanes, (H)agop* and not with an initial *j; Dat. յարութիւն* 177v[15, 19] should be transcribed rather *harutʿj(un)* than *yarutʿi(v)n*.

The contemporary initial *j* is represented by *հ*. For instance, in Minas dpir's colophon of 1565 the name of the papal legate sent to Lvov is written *Ֆրանցիսքոս Յօհան(էս)*[56] 'Franciscus Johannes'.

-յ | The final *յ* was no longer pronounced in Middle Armenian and was therefore often omitted in writing as well.[57] Yet under the influence of the classical orthography — in proportion to the scribe's knowledge of it — it was adopted as a rule of spelling that final *ա* and *ո* (often even other vowels) might not stand without a final (mute) *յ* in foreign words either. Since in Armenian there was no *j* pronounced at the end of polysyllabic words, the problem of rendering the pronounced final *j* never arose. In case of loan words ending in *j* the scribe had no other alternative than to use the letter *յ* which, however, was not pronounced. This accounts for the fluctuation in the spelling of the foreign words ending in *j*. The *յ* was now used now omitted, yet of these cases no conclusion can be drawn as to the pronunciation of the final *j* in a foreign word. For instance the Mongolian name *Čaγataj* is written *Չաղաթա* by Kirakos Gandzaketsi[58] and *Չաղաթայ* by Grigor Akantsi.[59] The two different ways of spelling cannot be regarded as a reasonable ground for the conclusion — as F. W. Cleaves states — that the ending represents a Mongolian *-ā*,[60] because what we are up against is nothing more than a characteristic feature of medieval Armenian orthography.

The use of the final mute *յ* is rather general in our Kipchak texts so that it coincides with the use of the *j* pronounced. The editors of the texts solve this problem by not transliterating the mute *յ*. This, however, may lead to many a controversy in transcription. Thus in the *Dat.* the mute *յ* is often represented while the pronounced *յ* is omitted. This is particularly embarassing in the case of the neg. opt. *-մախայ (-magaj)* and the supine *-մախայ (-maga)*. If in the original the pronounced *յ* is not written as, e. g. the opt. *-կա* in the *Eph.*,[61] it should be put down to mere inaccurateness in spelling.

[55] Akinian, *Hing*, pp. 155—156.
[56] *Ibid.* p. 65.
[57] Karst, pp. 22, 25, 60, 62—63.
[58] Ed. Venice 1865, Name Index.
[59] *HJAS* 1949, Name Index.
[60] *Ibid.* p. 418.
[61] *Eph.* p. 21.

The scribe of the *Dat.* (and other monuments) sometimes compensates the muteness of the final յ by writing two յ letters, e. g.: այդմակայյ *(ajtmagaj)* 178r[17], պօլմակայյ *(bolmagaj)* 162v[10], etc. but sporadically only.

ոյ, օյ | In Old Armenian the diphthong *oi̯* was represented by ոյ. This situation changed when in Middle Armenian the ո became more closed.[62] The combination ոյ assumed a new phonetic value before consonants,[63] such as, for instance, in foreign words: պաղտոյն ('Baldouin'), Լոյս (Louis').[64] When in the 12th century the օ was introduced to denote the open *o*, it became possible to write the diphthong *oi̯* in foreign words as օյ.

The *oj*, *oi̯* is represented by օյ also in the Armeno-Kipchak linguistic monuments with "standardized" orthography, invariably in every position i. e. either before vowel or before consonant, e. g.: in the *AB boj* : պօյ, *χoj* ('sheep') խօյ, *χoj-* ('to put') խօյ-, *ojan-* օյան-. In the *AB uj* and *ui̯* are represented by ույ (before both vowel and consonant), e. g.: *ujat-* ույաթ-, *bujruχ* պույրուխ, *bujruχči* պույրուխչի.

In the *Dat.*, however, *oj* is more often written ոյ as against օյ, e. g.: *χoj-* proportionally 26 times խոյ and 7 times խօյ; *boj* four times պօյ and twice պոյ, *χojči* խոյչի 179v[12]. The two ways of spelling in these cases are purely orthographical variations, the use of ոյ showing a conservative attachment to the accustomed letter group.

On the other hand, *bujruχ* is written ten times պոյրուխ in the *Dat.* which should obviously be read with *uj* (according to the modern literary pronunciation), and not with *oj*. The fact that *χoj-* is spelt now խոյ- now խօյ-, seems to contradict our opinion, but — as we think — no absolute consistency may be expected from a 16th century scribe. His style is characterized by the struggle of the traditional Armenian orthography with the standardizing tendency of adaptation to a foreign phonetic system.

The reading *bujruχ* is supported by several facts: *a)* in the *Dat.* itself we find once պուրուխ (164v[22]), *b)* the verbal stem is *bujur-*, *c)* the *AB* is unanimous in giving the reading *bujruχ*.

-j-, | The weakening of initial, but mainly of final յ was not (or but partly) shared by the յ in medial position, having conserved its value *j*, *i̯* up to our days.

Most of the Kipchak *j* and *i̯* sounds are represented medially by յ, e. g.: այախ *(ajaχ)*, այդ- *(ajt-)*, Հայպաթ *(hajbat)*, խայդ- *(χajt-)*; in falling diphthongs throughout.

[62] Karst, p. 21.

[63] At the end of polysyllabic words the letter յ became mute while in monosyllabic nouns the traditional pronunciation is *oj*.

[64] Karst, p. 25.

Of the rising diphthongs the *i̯a* is, however, often written *ա*, e. g. *dunja* almost throughout *տունիա*; *eja* in the *Dat.* *էիա* (but in the *AB* *էյա*). This is presumably due to the early diphthongization of medial *ա* in Armenian. The representation is not consistent: *Dat.* *օյադ-* *(ojat-)* 160v[14], but *ուիադ* *(ujat)* 175r[6].

There is a fluctuation of spelling in the sound combination *i̯i̯a*, e. g.: *Dat. bijan-* is throughout *պիյան-*, *tijar* is *դիյար* seven times and once *թիար*. *Tijasi(dir)* 'должно, soll' is represented by *դիյասի*, *թիյասի* nine times, by *դիասի* once and occurs nine times as *դիասի*, *թիասի*; or *nijat* (ﻧﯩﺠﺎﺕ) is twice *նիաթ* and three times *նիաթ*. The missing of the *յ* does not necessarily involve the absence of *j* or *i̯*. In Armenian orthography the glide is not marked at the limit of compounds ending in *i*, e. g.: *ձիաւոր* *(ci[i̯]avor* 'horseman'), *միամիտ* *(mi[i̯]amid* 'simple-minded'). In monographs on dialects the *i̯* is usually marked. The forms *ciavər, miamid* of these words were recorded by J. Hanusz and H. Acharian from the Podolian dialect obviously under influence of the written forms.

The glides in such groups of sounds as *i̯i̯y, y i̯i*, etc. is problematical. Inconsistent orthography may perhaps be due to varying pronunciation. E. g. *Dat.* *խըյն* *(χyjn)* 178r[23], but *խիյընլը* *(χijynly)* 162v[3]; *AB* *խըյն* *(χyjn)* 47[7], but *խըյընի* *(χyjyn)* 50[9] and six times *խըյինի* *(χyjin)*. In addition to this, it would be important to investigate the question in connection with the present ending in *-ըիր, -իըր* (or *-իիր, -ըըր*). (But we find also: *եաղըյեիրպիզ* 192r[22] 'we write'.) The frequent dissimilation of *y*, resp. *i* makes the problem even more involved.

Thus, the spelling might be regarded as Armenian orthographical peculiarity. But not always. There might be a fluctuation in pronunciation as indicated by the script in the above examples. (Further cf. CC *yar, xian).*

The double representation of *j*, *i̯* also occurs, e. g.: *Dat.* *գեթխոյեա* *(-ըրխ)* *(kɛtχoja-lyχ)* 162r[9], 170v[7], 297r[17]; *գարպիյ|եադ* *(tarbijat)* 182v[14] (but nine times — *իյադ*). In these cases there is, not by all means gemination; the fluctuation is rather an orthographical one, a border case of representing the falling and rising diphthongs.

j-, je- | The initial *j* in our Armeno-Kipchak documents is represented invariably by *ե* (except for the initial *ju-)*. The initial *ե* in preconsonantic position, however, stands for *je-*. This corresponds to the pronunciation in the modern Armenian literary language.[65]

For denoting initial *je-* the *Dat.* uses the traditional Armenian spelling, i. e. *ե*, e. g.: *jeng-* *եևկ-* *(եև-)*, *jengil-* *եևկիլ-*, *jer* *եր*, *jerga* *երկա*. In the other texts the standardized representation prevails, e. g.: *Eph. jer* three times *եր* but

[65] In Podolian Armenian the initial *ե* is pronounced *je* under stress only, i.e. in monosyllabic words, otherwise it sounds *e*.

three times *եէր*, *jeber-* twice *եպէր-* but twice *եէպէր*; in *AB je-* ('eat') is represented by the following spelling variants: *է-* once, *եէ-* twice; *jel* *ել* twice, *եէլ* once; *jer* ten times *եր*, 26 times *եէր*; *jetiš-* once *եդիշ-* and once *եէդիշ-*.

The use of *եէ* beside the orthographical *է* is found even in Armenian words in the *AB*, e. g.: *եէրորդութիւն* ('trinity') 65[6], 110[14], 168[7]; *եէրուսաղէմ* ('Jerusalem') 67[9], 149[5].

Some remarks on palatalization

Palatalization is indicated by the frequent use of *է* or *եէ* after *k* (*գ*, *ք*) instead of the *է* that one might expect. The use of *է* was observed also by J. Deny in different texts[66] who has included three of such cases in his glossary: *keç- (kəç-), kel- (kəl-), kətχoya*. In our texts this phenomenon is quite common.

In the *Dat.* we have, for instance, *keč-* three times as *գէչ-*, *քէչ-* and three times as *գէչ-*; *kečmiš* *գէչմիշ* 190v[14] but *kečir-* *գէչիր-* 163r[14]; *kel-* 17 times *գէլ-* (*քէլ-*) but 16 times *գէլ-* (*քէլ-*); *keltir-* four times *գէլդիր-* (*գէլթիր-*) but three times *գէլդիր-*; *kerak* is throughout (38 times) *գերաք* (*գերաք*); *keri* is invariably (four times) *գերի* (*քերի*); *kez* is always written *քեզ* (eight times). At the same time *e* in the syllable *ken-* is consistently written *է*, e. g.: *kendi* (48 times) *քէնի*, *գէնի*; *kensi* (three times) *գէնի*; *kengaš, -li* (six times) *քէնկաշ, -լի*.

In the first part of the *AB* *k* (*գ*, *ք*) is followed now by *է* now by *է*. Beginning from page 63 a third spelling (*եէ*) alternates with the previous two, e.g. *keča* twelve times *գէչա* (*քէչա*), but *գէչա* 163[6] and *գեէչա* 110[7]; *kečir-* six times *քէչիր-* (*գէչիր-*) but *քեէչիր-* 163[13]; *kel-* nine times *գէլ-* (*քէլ-*) but five times *գեէլ-*; *keltir-* five times *գէլդիր-* (*քէլդիր-*) but *քեէլդիր-*, *գեէլդիր-* 67[3], 138[8]; *kerak* *քերաք* 5[11] and *գեէրաք* 122[4]; *keraksyz* *գեէրաքսըզ* 113[5]; *keri* three times *քէրի*, but twice *քերի* and four times *քեէրի*; *kez* throughout *քեզ*.[67] In the *AB* even the spelling of the syllable *ken-* is fluctuating: *kendi* 33 times *քէնի* five times *քեէնի* and seven times *քեէնի*.

The use of *եէ* can be attested even in Armenian words: *kero(v)pe* ('cherub') *քերովբէ* 128[5], *քէրովբէ* 157[1], but *քեէրօբէ* 75[10].

It is a question open to doubt whether to regard the phonetic value *je* of the alternating spelling, i. e. the palatalization of the *k* as generally valid for all cases, or to see a fluctuation of the pronunciation in the fluctuating spelling. We are inclined to believe that the latter alternative is more probable.

Here is the conclusion J. Deny has drawn from the above phenomena of orthography, resp. pronunciation: "Cette observation est importante parce

[66] There is no example for this in the *Eph*.

[67] The uniform written form of *kez* may have been influenced by the spelling of the Armenian word *քեզ* ('to you').

qu'elle permet de supposer que la mouillure était tout de même plus développée en arméno-coman que ne l'indique l'orthographe générale de cette langue".[68] In this assumption of J. Deny's a considerable part must have been played by the possibility of a parallel with the palatalization in the Karaim. On the problem of velar, resp. palatal vocalism in Armeno-Kipchak I wish to comment on another occasion. All I wish to say here is that the orthography of the texts here investigated does not permit any inference as to the general validity of this phenomenon. Thus the origin of this, in our opinion peculiar, phenomenon should be investigated in itself beyond the limits of the Kipchak language.

The first obvious possibility that suggests itself is to look for some explanation in Armenian. Palatalization is a characteristic common to many an Armenian dialect (Van, Qarabaγ, Hadrutʿ, Maraγa, Agulis, Urmia, Karčevan, Meγri, etc.). It is conspicuous that in the dialects palatalization affects in the first place the sounds *g*, *k* and *kʿ*. But one must not be misled by this resemblance, because other sounds are also subject to palatalization, such as *t* and *tʿ*, and even unvoiced affricates, not only in initial but also in medial and final position. In addition to this, palatalization occurs not only before palatal but also before velar vowels. Thus the origin of this phenomenon must be looked for somewhere else.

Considering the masses of Armenian immigrants into Podolia from territories under Ottoman Turkish rule, one might be inclined to attribute palatalization to Osmanli influence. This explanation, however, does not seem to be probable because palatalization is not restricted to *k* in Osmanli either where it occurs also before velar vowels.

This phenomenon may more probably be ascribed to Polish influence because *k* before *e* is always palatalized in Polish. This assumption seems to be supported by the fact that in the Polish sound group *k* + ę no palatalization occurs, as can be observed in the material of the *Dat.* in the syllable *ken-*. (In the *AB* compensation, on the one hand, and the fluctuation of the spelling, on the other, has become general.)

In a few words J. Deny mentions another kind of palatalization illustrated by five examples.[69] He quotes the plural *bilyar* from T. I. Hrunin's first sample of texts. It must, however, be remembered that such "palatalized" forms abound in T. I. Hrunin's texts. J. Deny includes into the glossary of his *Eph.* more of them, at least those in which palatalization occurs before vowel: *kla- (klya-), bila (bilya), Ilov (Ilyov)*. By quoting these examples J. Deny wishes to support the assumption that in Armeno-Kipchak the palatalization was more developed than is indicated by the general orthography of the

[68] *Eph.* p. 19.
[69] *Ibid.* p. 20.

language. It must, however, be realized that T. I. Hrunin uses the ль in order to distinguish the sound from the Slavic velar *l*, which shows that from these data no conclusion can be made concerning palatalization. Hence the form of the above mentioned *bilyar* in normal transcription would be *bilar*.[70] J. Deny's other example, *çyeyrek*[71] is transcribed in the *Eph.* as *çyeryek* (22[6]) while the manuscript has չէրէք which deprived this form of its conclusive value. As to the examples *otlyaş* and *bağişlyagin*, I was not in a position to check them. (The latter is not included in the glossary.) The ւ (?) in *dyortunçi* in all probability cannot be accounted for in the Kipchak.

At any rate, this question requires a more detailed examination with due regard to the individual data ; a few sporadic data, as we have seen, can hardly be regarded as sound basis for general inferences. In the *Dat.*, for instance, the consequently recurring ւ in the words *zera* and *heč* (զիրայ, հիչ) seems to suggest palatalization. The only support we have in accounting for the tonality of the vowel is the ى in the original of these words (زیرا, هیچ). [It might be a similar orthographical phenomenon as the transcription of closed *é* by ի in Middle Armenian texts, e. g. լիկաթ oFr. légat, սինիշհալ sénéchal (Karst, p. 19.).] This, however, hardly entitles us draw general conclusions because at the same time the words *peša* (پشه) and *pešakar* are written with է: բէշա, -քար). In the *AB* both above-mentioned words occur with է: զէրա, հէչ.

ստ, շտ

The Armenian sibilant + unvoiced stop were closely linked as early as in Old Armenian. No euphonic sound could separate them but in initial position they preceded them (in pronunciation but not in spelling). That, for instance, ստանալ was pronounced *əstanal* can be concluded from the conjunctive aorist.[72] This property of the group sibilant + tenuis has been conserved up to our days. In the sound group ստ and շտ the տ has remained a tenuis in spite of the "second Lautverschiebung" in Middle Armenian, that is ստ and շտ were used to render the *st* and *št* of foreign words, respectively. Examples: Շաստել (Old French *chastel*), մայստռ *(maistre)* ;[73] Կիլամ Պաստառտ ('Guilleaume Bastarde') *HChr.* 49[40] ; տուխ Տաւս տը Ինչ ('duc d'Austriche') *HChr.* 60[34], 63[26].[74]

In most of the dialects of the western type, this pronunciation has been conserved in every combination of *s, š* + *p, t, k*. This phenomenon can be

[70] The form *bi* of *bij* occurs in the text of the *Eph.* itself too: *anyng biliki* (— ալի-լիքի 'his Highness') 9[8] which J. Deny, however, transcribes into *biyliki*.

[71] *Eph.* p. 20.

[72] *Esquisse*, p. 53.

[73] Karst, p. 33.

[74] Owing to the incorrect division of the sequence of letters the denomination of rank was interpreted as a French proper name and included in the Index as *Dos de Riche*.

observed in the Suceava Armenian dialect as well, though *ստ* is sometimes pronounced *sd*. H. Acharian, however, attributes this — with good reason — to the influence of the literary language.[75] This pronunciation has been conserved in Podolian Armenian too and without exception at that: *վաստակ vastàg, աստուձ astvàdz, Հրիշտակ hrištàg, դաշտ tašt*.[76]

Following the western Armenian literary pronunciation the editors of our Kipchak texts write *sd, šd* for *ստ, շտ* resp. instead of *st, št*, e. g.: Kraelitz line 10 *ուստումա* (recte: *ustuma)*.[77] This orthographical phenomenon (occurring also in the orthography of Turkish speaking Armenians) Kraelitz erroneously regards as a "Konsonantenwandel".[78] Examples from the *Dat.*: *աստիճան (astiǰan)* 170v[18], *ուստալխ (-լըք) (ustalyχ)* three times, *ուստ- (ust-)* with different possessive suffixes occurs 24 times; *քրիստան (kristan)* 25 times; *ֆրիշտա (frišta)* five times; *ստորժ (storož)* 180r[15]. Nor is *սպ* pronounced *sb* but *sp*: *սպրաւովադսայ (spravovatsa)* 173v[5].

The use of *սդ, շդ* for *st, št*, resp. is gaining ground with the standardization of the orthography. In the *Dat.* we already find *ուսդադ (ustat)* 173v[21]; *ֆրիշդայ (frišta)* 167v[10], 182v[23]; *սդօլմիսդր (stolmistr* 'magister stabuli') 295v[19]; *սդարօսդա (starosta)* four times. In the *Eph.* the signs *սդ, շդ* prevail: *ժըվնօսդ (žyvnost)* 2[21]; *սդարոսդա (starosta)* 2[10]; *ուսդ (ust)* 4[9], 13[13]. (In the forms *sdaranyesi* 2[17] and *ṣdurmovat* 3[3] the *d* is a misspelling in the transcription since the original is *սդարանիէսը* and *շդուրմօվադ*.) Besides, *st* and *št* were sometimes rendered by the letter group *սթ* and *շթ*, e. g.: *քաշթալան (kaštalan* 'castellanus') 6[3], 9[1].

The letter group *ստ, շտ* in initial position represented originally *əst* and *əšt*, respectively. It cannot be ascertained for sure whether the above examples were pronounced with or without a prosthetic sound. The chances are that both pronunciations were current. The name *Stecko* in the *Eph.* is written *սդէչքօ* 1[8], with M. Bzhshkiants *Ըստեչքո*.[79] The readings *Sdĭmbol, Sdmbol* in the *Eph.* (p. 92.) would be correctly: *Stĭmbol* (or with an undistinctly pronounced prosthetic sound). In Armenian texts we find different spellings of 'Stambul', but anyway *st* is rendered, here too, by *ստ*; in Abraham Ankiwratsi's and Arakel Baγishetsi's 15th century jeremiads on the fall of Byzantium we find: *Ըստամպոլ, Ըստըմպոլ* and *Ըստըմպօլ*. In scribe Simeon's travel accounts: *Յստամպօլ, Յստըմպօլ*. Also the initial letter group *սկ* allows of two possible readings: *Սկուտար Skudar* or *əskudar; սկէլէ, սքալա* (اسكله) *(ə)skele, (ə)skala*.

In the *AB* both spellings occur: *ոսդ (dost)* 15[10], *խաստա, -լըխ (χastalyχ)* three times. The signs *ստ, շտ* have proved most persistent in the words

[75] *Op. cit.* pp. 108—109.
[76] Hanusz, p. 41.
[77] In brackets I give the *correct* pronunciation only.
[78] *Studien zum Armenisch-Türkischen*, p. 20.
[79] *Op. cit.* Document A. D. 1463: p. 87.

kristan, ust, frišta : քրիստանլիք (kristanlik) 133[7], *ust* 16 times ուստ and 8 times ուսդ ; *frišta* eight times with շտ and five times with շդ. The conservatism of the orthography of *kristan* and *frišta* has possibly been enhanced by their resemblance to their Armenian equivalents: քրիստոնեայ *(kʿristonya)* and Հրեշտակ *(hreštag ;* from the same root as *frišta).*

To sum up it may be said that *st* and *št* could be rendered either by ստ resp. շտ or by սդ resp. շդ without difference in phonetic value.

*

The orthography of our Armeno-Kipchak texts is essentially a uniform, "phonetical" system of spelling which suggests the idea of applying a uniform system of transcription to it. In our analysis above we wished to draw attention to cases in which certain features of this spelling system mix with certain properties of the classical Armenian orthography. Since the "traditional" representation of certain sounds or sound groups is not consistent, the transcription systems employed so far have sometimes ignored these "exceptions". The transliteration of these orthographical "exceptions", however, is liable to disintegrate the general picture of the Armeno-Kipchak phonetic system and arouses doubt as to the possibility of an unequivocal interpretation of the sounds.

As to the basis of the transcription system, we would like to desist from the Armenian system of transcription because it is the phonetic system of the Kipchak that is to be represented. The Armenian script enables us in most cases to ascertain the Kipchak phonetic value of the letters. Hence the application of the Turcological transcription seems to be more adequate. J. Deny's system lies close at hand but the diacritical signs entail printing difficulties. That is why I have adopted here K. Grønbech's signs (supplemented for foreign words).

Owing to the orthographical properties of Classical Armenian, the transliteration does not give, as we have seen, an adequate picture of the Kipchak phonetic system. A compromise seems therefore to be indicated consisting in the adoption of the literal transcription with the amendment of italicizing the letters representing phonetic values differing from the usual orthography, as e. g. b*uj*ruχ, bu*j*ur-, fri*š*ta, etc. (In these examples I have italicized *two* letters because we are faced with the traditional spelling or letter groups.) This method can, unfortunately, be applied for running texts only, for quotations of single words the use of the original characters is anyway advisable.*

ABBREVIATIONS

Hrunin — Т. И. Грунин: *Памятники половецкого языка XVI века.* In: *Академику В. А. Гордлевскому к его семидесятипятилетию. Сборник статей.* M. 1953. pp. 90—97.

Kraelitz — F. v. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst: *Sprachprobe eines armenisch tatarischen Dialektes in Polen.* In : *WZKM* XXVI. p. 307—324.

Eph. — J. Deny: *L'Arméno-Coman et les "Ephémérides" de Kamieniec* (1604—1613), Wiesbaden 1957.

Dat. — M. Lewicki, R. Kohnowa: *La version turque-kiptchak du "Code des lois des Arméniens polonais" d'après le ms. no. 1916 de la Bibliothèque Ossolineum.* In: *RO* XXI. pp. 153—300.

AB — *Ayotʿkʿ hasarakacʿ kʿristonèicʿ — Alyyš Bitiki.* Ilov 1618.

HChr. — Hethum, Seigneur of Coricos: Relation of Chronicles . . . In: V. A. Hakobian, *Manr žamanakagrutʿyunner XIII—XVIII dd.* [Short chronicles of the XIII—XVIII centuries, vol. II. Yerevan 1956. pp. 37—80.]

Esquisse — A. Meillet: *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique,* 2. ed. Vienne 1936.

Karst — J. Karst: *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen.* Strassburg 1901.

Hanusz — J. Hanusz: *Lautlehre der polnisch-armenischen Mundart von Kuty in Galizien.* Wien 1889. (Sonderabdruck aus *WZKM* Bd I—III.)

Acharian — H. Ačarian: *Kʿnutʿyun Ardiali barbari.* [The dialect of Kuty, Suceava and Transylvania] Yerevan 1953.