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1. Although there have been significant improvements in the solution of the problems related to vowels in Turkic languages studies, it is hard to say that as yet any comprehensive solution accepted by all Turkologists has been put forth as regards certain problematic issues. For instance, there is no unanimous agreement as to which criteria should be adopted to classify the vowel phonemes of Turkic languages as well as about the number of these vowel phonemes. There are several views as regards the fact that there are 8, 9; 16, 18; 50, 60 vowels in PT. Apart from finding out the number of vowels, the study of vowels in terms of quality and quantity has always been of great importance in casting light over many other dark points concerning the history of Turkic languages.¹

2. One of the main problems of Turkology is PT primary long vowels, whose existence became well established by Otto Böhtlingk in 1851 through Yakut. Primary long vowels is a very important phonetic characteristic of the PT period, is considered to be a scientific fact proven by many circles in Turkology. Turkologists such as Radloff, Foy, Grønbech, Németh, Räsänen, Ligeti, Pritsak, Tuna, Korkmaz, Doerfer and Tekin have done valuable research on material identification and the source of primary long vowels.

¹ For example, Doerfer stressed that there are long, short and diphtongized long vowels (see Khl. al- ‘nehmen’, āγız ‘Mund’, āt ‘Name’), not 2 (short, long) in PT, after studying the vowel lengths in historical and modern sources (1971: 233-234).
Primary long vowels have been so comprehensively studied first by Tekin within the framework of the materials in ancient and modern sources (passim. Tekin 1975, 1995). Also included in these studies are a small number of materials found in various sources about vowel lengths in Kipchak languages.\(^2\)

3. As it’s known, PT long vowels have been systematically preserved in modern Turkic languages such as Turkmen, Yakut and Khaladj as well as in a small number of words in Harezm Oghuz dialect; Chuvash, Kirghiz, Gagauz and Turkish etc. The long vowels of PT have been eventually shortened and become one and the same as short vowels, leaving various phonetic traces in many sources that have reached up to the present.

3.1. The alteration in the quantity of the vowels, that is to say, the shortening of long vowels in the PT period have produced sound changes (linguistic phenomena) like palatalization, anaptyxis, gemination, diphtongization, voicing, prothesis, epanthesis, epithesis, pharyngealization, glottalization etc.\(^3\) Sound changes that result from

---

\(^2\) In this study, the term Kipchak stands for Kazakh, Karakalpak, Noghay, Karaim Halich dialect; Tatar, Bashkir; Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Karaim Trakai (and Karaim Crimean) dialects, which are included in Tekin’s classification X. tawlı group (Kipchak) (Tektin 1991: 13).

The works named as historical Kipchak sources are as follows: 

For the purpose of narrowing down the subject, only the dictionaries komanisches wörterbuch (Grønbech 1942), ein türkische-arabisches glossar (Houtsma 1894), kırthane bir listesi bir-attrık (Caferoğlu 1931), et-tuhfetü‘z-zekîyye f̓ ǧ̣ lügati‘l-türkîyye (Atalay 1945), dictionnaire armeno-kiptchak (Tryjarski 1969-1972) have been used.

\(^3\) Among these are examples of other striking phonetic traces in Tuva in which laryngealized vowels correspond to short vowels and normal vowels correspond to long vowels in Yak. and Tkm.:

PT *át >> Yak., Tkm. ā‘t ‘name’, Tuv. at id.; but, PT *at >> Yak., Tkm. at ‘horse’, Tuv. a‘t id.
the shortening of long vowels can be considered to be the result of quantity harmony, or in other words, balancing (Tuna 1960:276).

3.2. With the words in which sound changes effects are seen with the shortening of long vowels, it becomes difficult to identify the real cause of sound changes if there are other phonetic factors that might cause the same sound change.

4.2. Whether a voiceless consonant following a long vowel is voiced or remains unchanged may bring out some semantic differences.

4. In historical Kipchak sources, primary long vowels have been preserved in few words and have left non-systemically phonetic traces in a small number of words.

\[ PT \ast \ddot{a}t \gg \text{Yak., Tkm. } \ddot{a}t \text{ ‘fire, Tuv. } ot \text{ id.; but, } PT \ast \ddot{a}t \gg \text{Yak., Tkm. } \ddot{a}t \text{ ‘grass, her, weed’, Tuv. } o’t \text{ id. (Şcerbak 1970: 165)} \]

4 For example, in Kar. T. the word oçax ‘stove; fire place’ has come to mean ‘association, organization’ by changing into odjak [ocak]. Likewise, in Krč.Blk various phonetic developments have led to semantic differences in the word PK *y-ми ‘fruit’. Accordingly, while the meaning of ‘fruit’ is preserved in cemiş, the form with short vowel, that is, in the word ceymiş, the diphtongized form has come to mean ‘food; feed’. In a sense, this can be considered to be the consequence of an unexpected development resulting from long vowels, taking on a different meaning. Many examples with short or long vowels can be given for this function, such as *y-ми >> Kkp. Çeddî ‘Capricon’ but ceti ‘seven’; *yüşar- >> TT yüşar- ‘1. to become wet 2. to become fresh’ but yeşer- ‘to become green; bloom’, *biçq >> TT biçki ‘cross-cut sow’, but biçki ‘cutting out of clothes etc.’; Az. neçe ‘how many/much’, but nece ‘how?’ etc.

5 The long vowels have been demonstrated in spelling since the Orkhon, Uighur and Karakhanid periods. The vowels lengths in various sources such as MK, written in Arabic alphabet, are demonstrated with al-madd ‘The three long vowels, lengthening letters’ elif (?), vav (ğ) and ye (ğ) (Tekin 1975: 97). Similarly, al-madd were used in Hou. and Tuh. from historical Kipchak scripts in the demonstration of long vowels. For example, the initial ā is shown generally with double elif; whereas the a, which is short in PT, is shown with only one elif.

In Old Uig. and CC written in Latin alphabet, similar written techniques were used. However, the fact that the short vowels in the spelling systems of Hou. and Tuh. can be shown with elif and vav proves that these works cannot be the only reliable sources in determining the lengths.
4.1. While there is no primary long vowel preserved in modern Kipchak written languages, there is a considerable number of long vowel remainders which can also be found in historical sources. There is no record in modern Krč-Blk. about the primary long vowels claimed by Pritsak to have been preserved in 10 words in Balkar (1958).

4.2. Phonetic traces arising from the shortening of PT and PK long vowels might have been preserved in part of Kipchak languages, and sometimes only in one language.

II

1. Sound Changes Related to the Vowels

There is 3 words with long vowels in CC: āy (~ ay), yā (~ ya), ōdaq (~ totaq) (Tekin 1995: 119). PT hāy ‘moon’ > CC āy (~ ay) [ay/aay], Tuh. āy id. (cf. Tkm., MK āy id., Khl. āhūy id.). The long vowel in PT ōdaq is shown with two vowels in CC and with a vav (א) in other historical sources: *ōdaq (~ todaq) ‘lip’ (cf. Tkm. dōdaq id.; Hou. dīdaq id., Tuh. tōder id.). However, this word corresponds to erin in Kipchak vocabulary. In this case, it can be admitted that the ōdaq (~ totaq) example in CC can be said to be the result of an internal borrowing between Turkic dialects or this word became obsolete in Kipchak languages.

PT yā ‘bow’ >> CC yā (~ ya) [yaa/ya] (cf. Tkm. yāy id.; MK, Hou., yāy id.; but, Tuh. ya id.)

In PT yā(y) example, the long vowel is preserved in CC; however, a final /y/ emerged as it is shortened in other sources.

But, in the Crimean dialect of Karaim, the long /ā/ in (yā ‘bow’) can be primary. Another phonetic trace of the PT and PK long vowel in yā is the palatalization of the word in Tat. and Baš. yāyā. But the palatalization of back vowels coming after /y/ (>ι/), which occurs at the beginning of utterances in Bashkir. and Tatar is another common phonetic feature.


For instance, while the long vowel /ā/ in PT yāq ‘yok’ has been shortened and the last phoneme has been preserved in modern Kipchak languages, it has changed into yo ‘no’ in Kar.H. and Kar T., similar to the utterance in TT. This must have been the result of the *yāq > *yoy > *yo. While the semi-vowel γ drops, it brings about a length of compensation in utterance in the vowel that precedes it. In modern Kipchak written languages there are many other examples that illustrate this point.
Among the causes of sound changes are the interaction between vowels in terms of their features, changes in the quality of vowels brought about by consonants, and the effect of changes in the quantity of vowels on vowels and consonants etc. Studies on long vowels have concentrated particularly on the first syllable, which can be attributed to the fact that vowels outside the root syllable are subject to the root syllable, in accordance with the rule of vowel harmony in Turkic in phonetic phenomena. The lengths in other syllables, on the other hand, are fewer in number, but of a more problematic nature.

1.1. Palatalization

In modern languages, there is a large number of examples of palatalization that occurs as a result of adjacent consonants. That some words with PT and PK long vowels is seen with front vowels in modern languages can be accounted for partly by the effect of /c, č, j, š, y/. While secondary lengths occurring as a result of vowel combinations and contractions sometimes become shorter, they can sometimes become palatalized as in such words Kzk., Nog. as äkel- (< al-ip + kel-) ‘to bring; cause to reach’, Kzk. äket- (< al-ip + ket-) ‘to take away, carry off”, Kzk. äper- (< al-ip + ber-) ‘to obtain, get hold of; take; give’; ‘Nog. bättir (< *bättir << Mo. bagatur) ‘hero; young’ etc.

Below are some examples of palatalization occurring as a consequence of the shortening of long vowels:

1.1.1. /ā/ > /ä/: During the developing of the Kipchak languages a number of palatalization processes took place. While the PT /ā/ has become shorter in Kipchak languages, it has become palatalized particularly in Tat. and Baš. However, one must be cautious about the claim that these phonetic traces have originated from the effect of long vowels. Because the Tat. words with short vowels (PT saç >>) çaç ‘hair’, (PT saç- >>) çaç- ‘to scatter, to strew; sow…’ and the vowels in Baš. in words säs id. saš- id. have become palatalized by the effect of /ç/. There are many examples of palatalization in similar forms.
However, there is no other explanation than that of the long vowels in Tat. äz (~ az) ‘little, few’, Baš. að (~ að) id.

/iā/ >> /ā/, /e/ examples are as follows:

1.1.1.1. *āz >> Tat. āz (~ az) ‘little, few’, Baš. að (~ að) id. (cf. MK, Tkm. āz id.)


1.1.1.3. ? > *aŋraŋla- > Kzk. aŋirende- (~ aŋraŋda-) ‘to cry out, yell; speak loudly’; but, Kkp. aŋraŋla- id.

1.1.1.4. *ālda- > yalda- > Kar.T. yelda- ‘to deceive’ (cf. Tuh. yalda- id., Tkm. ālda- id.)

1.1.1.6. *hāra >> (?) Kzk. āre-dik ‘occasionally, rarely, scarcely’ (cf. Tkm., Yak. āra ‘interval’, Khl. hā’ra id.). The Kzk. āredik must be related with PT ār- ‘to pass through; make one’s way through’.


The diphtongisation as in CC and the palatalization in the second syllable in Krč.Blk and Arm.K. may be related to the vowel length.

1.1.1.8. *bār-ı >> Kzk., Kkp., Nog. bari ‘all, the whole’; but, Kkp. bar(-coyı) id. (cf. Tkm., Yak. bār ‘exists’, Khl. bā’r id.)

1.1.1.9. *hārı (~ *hāra) >> Kkp. hārre ‘bee’; but, Kzk. ara id. (cf. Gag. ārı id., Khl. hā’r; but, Tkm. ara id.)

9 āke can be thought to be a result of such a development as ata-ke > *ateke >> āke, that is regressive vowel assimilation, in these languages (Sevortyan 1974: 122).
1.1.1.10. *qārī >> Kzk. kārī ‘old, elder’; but, Kkp. qarrī ~ garrī id. (cf. Tkm. garrī id., Tat. qarrī ~ qarī id.).


The reason for the palatalization in Kmk. sērlik must have been due to the form of PT sārī. The primary long vowels may affect the vowels in syllables other than the first syllables.


1.1.1.15. It becomes difficult to claim that the palatalization was caused by the existence of the effect of the primary long vowel, when /y/ (> /c/, /ç/, /ş/) consonant appears in the word with the primary long vowel.

Some examples are as follows:

1.1.1.15.1. *yāyın >> Kzk. jāyın (~ jayın) (KTTS: 225) ‘sheat-fish’; Tat. cāyın id., Baš. yāyın id. (cf. Tkm. yāyın id.)

1.1.1.15.2. *bāla-q-ay >> Baš. bālaqāy ‘child’; but, Kkp., Tat. balagay id. (cf. Tkm. bāla id., Khl. bāla, bāla id.).


10 cf. Ir. yār ‘friend’
1.1.15.4. *yär*n >> Baš. yärän-geh ‘belonging to next year’; Kzk. jarn id., Kkp. carn id. (cf. Hou. yär*n ‘tomorrow’; MK, Tuh. yär*n id.)


1.1.2. /i/ > /i/ (> /ĕ/)


1.1.2.2. *șși >> Tat., Baš. şși ‘spindle’; Nog., Kar.H. sis id. (cf. MK sși id.; Kzk. șstık id.; Kkp. șsık id.; Kmk. șșiık id.)

1.2. Vowel Epenthesis:

One of the phonetic outcomes of shortening the long vowels is vowel epenthesis in one -(closed) syllable words.11 In some words, {-I} may be thought as 3rd singular person possessive suffix.

1.2.1. āq >> Krč.Blk aya12 ~ aq ‘white’ (cf. MK, Hou., Tuh. āq id.)

---

11 Some examples appearing in historical sources are as follows: Tuh. acı ‘hungry’ (cf. Çuv. vsı, vüd id.); CC yali ‘mane’. The yali form in CC may have come from yalı in MK (Clauson 1972: 916).

12 The probability that the /i/ in aya in Krč.Blk is a third singular person possessive is also very strong. Nevertheless, this word, as an entry in the dictionary, corresponds to ‘white’ in Russian language and the sentence ‘alan ~ n menhe ber.’ has been shown as an example. {-n} accusative suffix has been used in the sentence. In this case, /i/ is supposed to be a possessive suffix.
1.2.2. *ān >> Krě.Blk ən (~ ən) ‘conscience, mind; intelligence’ (cf. Tkm. ən id.)

1.2.3. *qy >> Krě.Blk qy ‘dung, manure’ (cf. MK, Hou. qy id.)

1.2.4. *āñ >> Tat. āñ (~ qm) ‘sheath’ (cf. Tkm. āñ id.; Yak. qm id.; Čuv. vēnē id.; MK qm id.; Mo. kuy < qum(n) (Tekin 1995: 158).

1.2.5. Ir. (Clauson 1972) >> *qōz >> Tat. quz ‘wallnut’ (cf. Tkm. xōz id.)


1.2.7. *b̥g (~ *b̥y) >> Kzk. bũy ‘scorpion’, Tat. bũy ‘spider’, Baš. bũy id.; but Nog., Kar. K. bũy id. (cf. Tkm. mũy id.; MK b̥g ~ b̥y id., CC bũy id., Hou. bũy id., Tuh. bew id.)

1.2.8. Baš. ısq ‘dew’; but, Kzk. şq id.; Tat. çq id., Krě.Blk çq id. (cf. Tkm., MK çq id.)

1.3. Diptongisation’ (Triphtongisation)

13 for a/o > a, cf. VB wān ‘10’; (cf. Čuv. vat, vatā < ə ‘gall, bile’; Čuv var ‘middle; center’ (< ə ‘own, essential; self’) (Ceylan 1997: 175, 180)

14 A major part of the diptongs in Kipchak languages date back to PT and PK periods.

ā: *āz̃n >> Tuh. avuzun ‘freaked out, furious’ (cf. MK āz̃n id.)

ī: *q̃īn– >> CC q̃īn– (~ qn–) ‘to torture’

ō: *t̃lI >> CCTÜlu (~ Tlu) [TÜlu/Tlu] ‘full’ (cf. Tkm. dōl id.); *ỹl >> CC yœul (~ yœul) ‘road’

ū: *ušaq >> CC ušax ‘slander’; *ušaqçi >> CC ušaxçi ‘slanderer, calumniator’ (~ ušaqçi ~ ušaxçi); *ỹu– >> CC yœut– ‘to swallow’; *ỹu– >> CC yœw– (~ yœ) ‘to wash’, Arm. K. yœw– id. (Tkm. yœw– id.); *uœn >>Arm. K. œvn (~ œn) ‘flour’ (cf. Tkm. œn id., Čuv. œnœ id.)

ē: *çerig >> CC çeyri (~ çeri) ‘soldier’; *k̃kir– >> Tuh. keykir– ‘to burp, to belch’ (cf. Tkm. gēgir– id.)

ĕ: *ç̃k >> CC çiyik (çiyik?) [çiyq] ‘raw, uncooked’ (cf. Tkm. ç̃q id.)
1.3.1. /ā/ > (?) aγa


The aq + ās > aγaz development for Krč. Blk. can be considered. However, the āz having adjective in front of it meaning ‘white’ may not be a logical explanation.

1.3.2. /ā/ > aw

*aγu >> Kar. K. awγu15 ‘hot, bitter’; but, Nog. ayuw ‘venom’, Baš. ayuw id. (cf. Tkm. āwi id., KB aγu ~ ayu id., MK, Hou. ayu id., Tuh. aγu ~ awu id.).

1.3.3. /ā/ > ay; ay-a (> āy-ā)

†: *tˆrö >> CC töwre [tora, toura] ‘the main corner of the tent’, Hay. tòwër ‘the main corner of the house’ (cf. Tkm. t̀r id., but tōre ‘high class man before October Revolution’; *t >> Arm. K. awt ~ ot ‘poison’ (cf. Tkm. ‘t id., Ćuv. vat ‘gall, bile’); *gùn >> CC ögyûnç (~ ögûnç) ‘praise’; *ʒ >> Tuh. øyûs bol ‘to get wet’; *s’n- >> Tuh. sòwûn-dûr ‘to extinguish’; Hou. sâûûndûr- id.; *ʒ >> Arm. K. awç ‘revenge’ (cf. Tkm. ‘s’ id.);

‡: *y’n >> Tuh. ýûûn ‘wool’ (cf. Tkm. ýûû id.) (Tekin 1995: 125, 126).

Tekin states that the examples of diphtongization in CC are phonetic variations and that words like toulu and toura are not mispellings but are diphongized forms of /ō/ and /’/ long vowels in PT (1987a: 295).

15 ayu and its variations, as seen in modern languages, are not Kipchak forms. As can be seen in the examples in Kzk. izgi ‘worth of respect, venerable’ and iygi ‘good, well’ (< Orh. edgi ‘good, well’); etc., Kipchak and borrowed forms may appear together. The diphongization seen in the second syllable in Nog. and Baš. may be related with ayûla- in MK.

1.3.4. /i/ > iy(1), iyi, iy, ey


1.3.4.5. *qīqur- >> Kzk. qyyur- ‘to call, invite, Kkp. qyyur- ‘to cry, shout’. (cf. Čuv. yhär- to call out, call’; Tkm. qyur- id., Tuv. qırqıra- id. MK qı ‘exclamation of address’) (Tekin 1995: 127)

1.3.4.6. *qīqūla- >> Kzk., Kkp. qyyuwlə- ‘to produce a loud sound as in chorus’ (cf. MK qı ‘exclamation of address’).


16 The qyn form of the word can be seen in modern languages. /I/ can be thought to be a shortened form of /iy/. However, *qin > *qyın can be conceived of (see Räsänen 1969).


1.3.4.10. *qīr >> Kzk. qyur\(^{17}\) 1. far off, distant 2. frontier; border’ (qyur ‘hill, high ground’; Kkp. qyur (~ qyr ‘mountain range, border...’ id.); Krč.Blk qyur (qyr) id.; but, in Kar.H. kūr ‘moor”; Tat., Baš. qyr I ‘edge, border’ (qyr II ‘moor, field”), Kmk. qyr id. (cf. MK qyr ‘an isolated mountain; the high lofty mountain”; Tuh. qīr ‘moor’)

1.3.4.11. *iš (~ ʾiš) >> Krč.Blk., Kmk. iyis\(^{18}\) ‘smell’, but Kzk., Kkp., Nog. is id.; Baš. yēθ ‘scent, aroma’, Tat. is id. (~ is ‘smoke’) (cf. yās ‘smoke”; Az. his id.; Yak., Tkm. ʾis id.; Arm. K. is id.)

1.3.5. /ō/ > (ou >) uw (uwı)

1.3.5.1. *sōr- > *sour- > Tat. sur- ‘to suck, to absorb’, but Kzk., Kmk. sor- id., Baš. hur- id. (cf. MK, Tkm. sōr- id., Hou. sor- id.)

---

\(^{17}\) The vowel in MK qyr ‘open area’ is short. The ʾair in Tkm. meaning ‘a rocky area which is empty in some parts and and hilly in some others’ is very close to the one in MK and is similarly with short vowel. qyr in Kzk. and in Kkp. have similar meanings. ʾair in Tkm. with a long vowel is an adjective indicating a colour and is not connected with the first word in meaning. In this case, there is nothing in modern languages to explain the gemination in qyur. However, Clauson pointed that the word originally means ‘a high ground’ etc., however, it also means qyr, ‘edge, border’ in modern languages, stating that this can be a semantic extension (1972: 641). There is no evidence that qyr and qyur are different words.

There is no evidence in historical sources relating to length and *qīr in PT can be said to have developed in two different ways from a phonetic perspective. In the first one the vowel was shortened and in the second one it was diphtongized. The original meaning of the word was retained in Kkp. The diphtongized form means ‘the border’.

\(^{18}\) MK yiḥ + is >> ? iyis
1.3.5.2. *yōrt- > yourt- > Tat. yu(w)irt- ‘to gallop’ (cf. MK yōrt- ‘to walk’) (Tekin 1995: 125)

1.3.6. /ü/ > uw/iw, uwu/uwu


1.3.6.2. *ūq (~ ūγ) >> Kzk., Kkp. uwaq ‘the mast that keeps the tent stand upright’ (cf. TT huγ ‘A hut made of reeds or rushes’ (Clauson 1972: 76); Tkm. ūq id., MK ūγ id.)


1.3.7. /œ/, /ɛ/ > ey, iy, ōy


1.3.7.2. *ēsin- >> Kzk., Kkp. iysin- ‘(animal) to milk, to give milk at times’

1.3.7.3. *kēme (~ kēmi) > kāyme > Tat. köymâ ‘ship’ (dia.) (cf. Ostyak kōmâ id., Sinor 1990: 172; Tkm. gēmi id., MK kāmi ~ kemi id.).

The vowel in the root syllable of the word, which exists in Tatar dictionary but alleged to be a dialect, may have been rounded because of the regressive effect of /m/ at the beginning of the second syllable after being diphongised.

1.3.8. /ɔ/ > iy(i)
1.3.9. /i/ > üwü, iwi, uv’u; üyê, öyü


2. Sound Changes Related to the Consonants

2.1. Voicing

2.1.1. /ç/ > /c/

2.1.1.1. *bçek > (?) Tat. böcäk ‘bug’. Preservation of /õ/ indicates that this word could have been taken from an Oghuz type dialect.


2.1.1.3. *hoçuçq >> Kar.H. oðzak (~ otsaq) ‘the fire place’; Kmk. oçaq ‘room’ but oçaq ‘the fire place’; Kar.T. ocax ‘unity, organization’; but, oçaq ‘the fire place’; Kré.Blk oçaq id.

---

19 There are /ç/ > /ç/, /p/ > /b/ examples in historical sources. Words such as ac ‘hot, bitter’, ‘sour’; aci ‘bitter yoghurt’; aci ‘hungry’; acim ‘to feel pity’; buçaq ‘corner’ etc. in Tuh.; CC tüb ~ tüp ‘the bottom’, Arm. K. tib ~ tib? id.

Tuh. ada ‘island’ does not reflect the characteristic of Kipchak. The form in Tuh. would be expected to be ataw ~ atow.

Other examples: Tuh. ada-(n)- (~ atan-) ‘to name, to be named’; Tuh. adım (~ atlam) ‘pace’; Tuh. budar- ‘to prune’; Hou. odun ‘wood’; CC tödaq (~ totaq) ‘lip’; Hou. dodaq id.; Tuh. dudag (~ t?) id.; Tuh. âd (~ i?) ‘gall, bile; bitterness’, Tuh. yedi ‘7’
2.1.1.4. *ĥ̬çe > Kkp. öces- ‘to quarrel’ (cf. Khl. ĥ̬čaš- ‘to take revenge’ MK, CC, Müh. öcaš- ‘to compete’, Tuh. öçče- id.)


2.1.1.5. *tūç > Kar.H. tuc ‘bronze’ (cf. TT tuc (TS V) ~ tunç id.; Az. tunç id.; cf. MK tūç id., CC tuç id.)

2.1.2. /p/ > /b/, /w/

2.1.2.1. *qāp > Krč.Blk qab ‘plate; case, box’ (cf. MK qāp id.)


2.1.2.3. *tāp20 > Krč.Blk tab ‘scar’; but Tat., Baš., Kzk., Kkp., Nog. tap ‘smear, spot, trace’ (cf. MK tāp ‘marks left from injury’, CC tap id.)


In words with short vowels such as Krč.Blk sab ‘handle’, tob ‘ball’ and the /p/ > /b/ examples with adverbial suffixes reduces the probability that this voicing is directly related to the quantity of the vowel.

2.1.3. /t/ > /d/!

2.1.3.1. *āt > Kar. H., Kar.T. ad (~ at) ‘name’ (cf. MK ät id.)

20 According to Clauson (1972: 434), this word in modern language vocabularies may have been borrowed from Fr. tāb ‘furrow’, or it may have been mixed up with tüp with Turkic origin.
2.1.3.2. *āta- >> Kar. H., Kar.T. ada- (∼ ata-) ‘to name’; but Kkp., Nog., Tat., Baš., Krč.Blk at- id., Km. at- ‘to allocate’ (cf. Tuh. ada-(n-) ~ atan- ‘to be given a name’)

2.1.3.3. *ātdaş (cf. *āt) >> Kzk., Kkp., Nog. adas ‘namesake, of the same name’, Tat. adaş id., Baš. adiş id.; but Krč.Blk atdaş id. (cf. CC atdaş id.; Tkm. ātdaş id., Tuv. adas id.)


2.1.4. /q/ > /γ/

*āq >> Blk. āγ (~ aq, ax), ‘white’; but, Blk. āγ- ‘to flow’ (~ aq-, ax- (Pröhle 1914-15: 200)

2.2. /y/ (> /c/, /j/) Prothesis

Primary long vowels have caused the prothesis at early stages in the words below:


21 In historical sources:

/w/: Tuh. wayna- (< *woyna- < *űyna-) ‘to play’ (cf. Čuv. văyă ‘play’; Tuh. waynaş- ‘to play with one another’; Hou. wuçaq (!) (~ oğluq) ‘fireplace’; Hou. wūr- (~ ur-) ‘to hit’; CC wurçq ‘spindle’

/γ/: Hou. yăki ‘2’; Hou. yăkindü (Tkm.) ‘midafternoon’; Hou. yekiz ~ yikiz ‘twins’; Hou. yunçq- ‘to sprain’; Hou. yık ~ iyık ‘spindle’; Kkp. iyık id.); Tuh. yaldá- ‘to cheat’; Tuh. yīla- (~ yīlā~ yīla- ‘to cry, to weep’; Arm. K. yīlā- (~ yīla-) id.; Tuh., Arm. K. yīlā- (~ yīlā-) ‘to sing’; Hou., Tuh. yrmq ‘river’; Tuh. yuleşır (~ ulerşir-) ‘to distribute in equal shares’ (cf. Čuv. vales- ‘to share, go shares’), but, as in yuşq ‘knuckle bone’ in Tuh. /γ/ before short vowels can appear.

2.2.3. *īr- >> Tat., Baš. ıır- to split; cleave, cut through; excavate’ (cf. MK ıır- id.) (Tekin 1994: 53)

2.2.3.1. *ĭrmag >> Tat., Baš. ıırmag ‘groove, trench; irrigation canal’; Kmk. ıırmag ‘river’ (ES: 664) (cf. Čuv. īrmıa id., Tuh. ıırmag id.) (Tekin 1994: 54)

2.2.3.2. *īra >> Kzk. ğira ‘flood line; valley’

2.2.3.3. Nog. ııramanag ‘a deep narrow rocky hole’; Baš. ııramanag id.


2.2.5. *āltə- >> Kar.T. ıelda- ‘to cheat, to deceive’ (cf. Tuh. ıylda- id., Tkm. ıelda- id.)

2.2.6. *īm (?) >> Kzk. ıım (~ *ım) ‘trace’; Kmk. ıım ‘signal’ (cf. Tkm. ıım id.; MK ıım ‘password’)

This word appears with a short vowel in Tkm.


Kar. /y/ can be seen before short low vowels as in Kar.H. *iç- > *yits- ‘to drink’.

2.3. Gemination

While PT or PK primary long vowels are shortened, the consonants next to them can be geminate (doubled). There are many examples of gemination caused by primary long vowels in Kipchak sources. However, /γ/ and /g/ in the end of PT multi-syllable words must be causing a secondary length while they are dropped in nouns. In this case, it becomes rather difficult to decide whether the gemination has been caused by the primary long vowel or secondary long vowel.

2.3.1. āç >> açç

*aççig >> Kzk., Kkp. aşši ‘bitter'; Kmk. aççı id.; but, Nog. aşı id., Kar.H. atšı id., Krč.Blk., Kar.T. açı id. (cf. Tkm. aşı id., Uzb. aççığ id., N. Uig. aççığ id.; Čuv. yiššē, yiš ‘bitter; sour'; MK aç-‘ to be bitter; to be painful’).

2.3.2. āq >> aqq

ēk > ekki CC ekki (~ ekki) ‘2’; MK ikki (~ ıkki) id.; Tuh. ıkki id.; Tuh. ikkiz ‘twin’; ikkindi ‘mid afternoon’ (cf. MK ekkindī ~ ikkindī < *ekinti id.). Doerfer (1971: 292) thinks that the original form of this word was ekki or ıkki.

āl >> all: CC allıda (~ *al-i-da) (~ almda) ‘in front of’

ār >> arr: CC arrı (~ arı ~ arov) ‘clean, pure’; MK arrı (~ arrı) id.

āş >> aşı: CC [aşsow] (~ [ası]) ‘benefit’ Hou. assı id.; Tuh. assı ~ ası id.

ēt >> ett: CC yetı (~ yetı) ‘seven; week’; MK yetı id.


22 ēk > ekki CC ekki (~ ekki) ‘2’; MK ikki (~ ıkki) id.; Tuh. ıkki id.; Tuh. ikkiz ‘twin’; ikkindi ‘mid afternoon’ (cf. MK ekkindı ~ ikkindı < *ekintı id.). Doerfer (1971: 292) thinks that the original form of this word was ekki or ıkki.

āl >> all: CC allıda (~ *al-i-da) (~ almda) ‘in front of’

ēt >> ett: CC yetı (~ yetı) ‘seven; week’; MK yetı id.
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Mo. >> *āqa >> Krč.Blk aqqa ‘grandfather’; but Kzk., Kkp., Nog., Kmk. aya ‘old; elder’ (cf. CC aya id.)

2.3.3. āl >> all

*āl >> (*āl – t > ?) Krč.Blk alli ‘the beginning’; but, Tat., Baš. al ‘the front’ (cf. CC alli id., Kzk., Kkp. *ald < *all < āl, Tkm. ālm id.)

2.3.4. āp >> app (amm)


Because of the fact that the syllable is emphasized, the gemination may have emerged. While ap-aq means ‘white’ in Tat. and Baš., appayım with 1st singular person possessive suffix, which expresses ‘love, compassion’.


2.3.5. ār >> arr

2.3.5.1. *qâr ã > Kkp. qarrı ~ garrı ‘old, elder’; but Kzk. kâr i id., Tat. qary id. (cf. Tkm. garrı id., MK, CC, Hou, Tuh qari id.)

2.3.5.2. *hâr (~ hâra) >> Kkp. hürre ‘bee’; but, Kzk. ara id. (cf. Tkm. arı id.; but Gag. ārı id., Khl. hârı id.)

24 “words of this form, connoting various terms relationship abound in modern Turkish languages with meaning as (1) ‘ancestor’; (2) ‘grandfather’; (3) ‘grandmother’; (4) ‘father’; (5) ‘mother’; (6) ‘paternal uncle’…” (Clauson 1972: 5)
2.3.6. āt >> att


2.3.6.2. *âta ? >> Kar. H., Kar.T. itta (~ ata) ‘father; grandfather’; Tat. âṭi id. (~ ata id.); Nog. ata ~ atay id.; (cf. MK atâ id; Tuh. āta, but, Tkm. ata id.)

2.3.7. üç >> uçç

2.3.7.1. *buçqaq >> Kmk. buççaq ‘corner’ (MK bucçąq ‘angle’, CC bucçąq id., Hou. bucçāq ~ bucçąq) id., Arm. K. bucçax id.)

2.3.8. āt > tt (~dd)

2.3.8.1. *Yeti >> Kmk. yetti ‘7’, Kkp. ceddi ‘Capricorn’ (but ceti ‘7’) (cf. MK yetti ~ yeti id., CC yetti ~ yeti id., Hou. yeti id., Hay. yedi ~ yeddî id., Tuh. yedi id.). If Kumyk yetti had been borrowed from Az., it would have been yeddî.

2.3.9. ḗç > usş

*s’çig >> Kzk. tuşši ‘meal without salt, unspoiled ayran, the yoghurt drink, and horse milk’, Kmk. duşši ‘sweet; saltless’ (cf. Tkm. sùyçî id., MK s’çig id.)

2.4. Epenthesis, Epithesis25

2.4.1. r

*höççaq >> Nog. orçag (~ oçaq) (dia.) (Baskakov 1940) ‘hearth, fireplace’; but Kzk., Kkp., Nog. oçaq id., Kar.H. otsaq id., Tat. uçaq id.,

25 /l/: Tuh. şilbq ‘tree, stick, rod’; /r/: Arm. K. ort’ak (~ otax ~ ot’ax) ‘room, section’
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2.4.2.  

2.4.2.1. *bārs*27(?) >> Kar.H. *bars*28 ‘leopard’; but Kar.T. *bars* id. (cf. MK, Hou. *bars* id.; *Pārs* ‘one of Iranian peoples and their homeland)

2.4.2. 2. Kar.H. *yøxt* (?<< *yāq* + *turur*) (~ *yo* ~ *yok*) ‘no, not’, Kar.T. *yøxt* ~ *yøx* ~ *yo* ~ *yok* id.

2.4.2. 3. Kar. H., Kar.T. *bart* (< ? *bār* + *turur*) ‘there is, it exists’

Conclusion
Proto Turkic long vowels are partially preserved in Proto Kipchak. Historical Kipchak and Oghuz are closely related is mentioned in MK. Naturally, it is possible to talk about Oghuz influence on Kipchak sources to a certain degree. In other words, it can be claimed that some of the words with long vowels may have been borrowed from Oghuz dialects. However, the main part of the traces related to primary long vowels are peculiar to Kipchak languages. In this case, long vowels in many sources or their phonetic traces are supposed to have come from a single source.

In the event that the long vowels are a characteristic stemming from pronunciation, they will absolutely not demonstrated in writing. For this

26 In the above mentioned words in Kar.H. and Kar.T. dialects there is a final *t*. There are two arguments as whether this *t* sound is the remain of a suffix or epenthesis. Therefore, *t* is what remained of *tur*-ur. As *yøxt* and *bart* are taken into consideration this becomes a reasonable explanation. However, there is no need for a copula in the word ‘bars’. While the long vowels are shortened they generally leave behind phonetic traces. No other example has been spotted where a *t* has derived because of long vowels. Therefore, it is more probable that *t* is the remain of a suffix. With the same token, *yøxtur* is included as an entry in SKRP.

27 According to Clauson: ‘a very early Iranian loan word, but from which Iranian language it was taken is uncertain’ (1972: 368).

28 cf. English *sack*, German *Sekt* id. (Hartmann, Stork 1972).
reason, the remains of primary long vowels in Kipchak languages can only be defined through a survey or an audio study.

Abbreviations

Alt. Altay
Ar. Arabian
Arm. K. Armenian Kipchak
Az. Azeri
Baš. Bashkir
CC Codex Cumanicus
cf. Compare
CT Common Turkic
Čuv. Chuvash
dia. Dialect
ES Etymologičeskiy Slovar’ Tyurkix Yazkov
Gag. Gagauz
Hay. Hayyan (kitḥbu’l idrɪk li-ỉişni’l-attrık)
Hou. Houtsma (ein türkische-arabisches glossar)
Id. Same
Ir. Iran languages
Karg. Karagas
Kar. H. Karaim Halich dialect
Kar. C. Karaim Crimean dialect
Kar. T. Karaim Trakai dialect
KB Kutadgu Bilig
Khl. Khaladj
Kkp. Karakalpak
Kmk. Kumyk
Krč-Blk. Karachay-Balkar
Krg. Kirghiz
Kzk. Kazakh
MK Mahmoud Kashgari (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)
Mo. Mongolian
Müh. Dictionary of İbn-i Mühenna
N. Uig. New Uighur
Nog. Noghay
OB Old Bulgarian
Orh. Orkhon Turkic
PK Proto Kipchak
PT Proto Turkic
SKRP Słownik Karaimsko-Rosysko-Polski
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Tat.  Tatar
Tkm.  Turkmen
TLS  Türk Lehçeleri Sözlüğü
Trans.  Translator
TS  Tarama Sözlüğü
TT  Turkish
Tuh.  Et-tuhfetü’z-zekîyye fi’l lûgati’t-türkîyye
Uig.  Uighur
Uzb.  Uzbek
VB  Volga Bulgarian
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