

BAKI DÖVLƏT UNIVERSİTETİ
İLAHİYYAT FAKÜLTƏSİNİN

ELMİ
MƏCMUƏSİ

№ 13 APREL (NİSAN) 2010

SOME NOTES ON THE HISTORY, THE CULTURE AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE MEDIEVAL QIPCHAQ - CUMAN TURKS

Gökçe Yükselen Abdurrazak Peler*

1. The Ethnonyms Cuman and Qipchaq.

The Cuman – Qipchaqs had been designated with several names in different sources. They had been named as *Qipchaq*, *Qiphchaq* or *Xiphshaq* by Islamic sources, as *Kumanus*, *Kumanoi*, *Cumanus* or *Komani* by Byzantine and Latin sources, as *Polovets* by Old Russian sources, as *Falben*, *Falones*, *Valani*, *Valwen* or *Pallidi* by German or German orientated sources, as *Xarteshk* by Armenian sources and as *Qun* by Hungarians (Kafesoğlu 1984: 185). The ones apart from the name used by the Islamic sources are all to do with the colour “yellow” and traditionally are regarded to be related with their complexion (Kurat 1992: 71). The denomination *Qipchaq*, used by Islamic sources is always related to “hollow of a tree” in Turkic sources like the Old Uighur Oghuz Qaghan Epic, the Oghuz-names and *Shajara-i Tarākema va Turkî* (Kirzioglu: 1992: 1-14). On the other hand Kafesoğlu (1984: 186) notes that it means “an angry person”¹.

However Pritsak (1982: 321-324) referring to the same ethnonyms comes up with a different explanation. Without denying the correspondence between them² he divides the abovementioned names into two groups as native names³ and foreign names, placing Qipchaq, Cuman and Qun in the

* Lecturer, Girne American University.

¹ Hazai (1986a: 125b) thinks the connection between the Sagai word *qipčaq* ‘irate, hot-tempered’ and the proper name *Qipčaq* is conjectural.

² He also quotes the passage “Commani qui dicuntur Capthat (=Qipchaq), a Teutonis vero dicuntur Valani (i.e. Falani) et provincia Valania (i.e. Falania) from William of Rubruck as an evidence for this correspondence.

³ The biggest problem with this classification is the fact that whilst the ethnonym Qipchaq is present among Bashkirds, Uzbeks, Karakalpaks, Kazakhs, the Kyrgyz, the Turkic peoples of Altai, Nogais and Crimean Tatars as a tribal or clan name, Cuman is unknown among the Turkic peoples of today (Golden 1992: 272).

former group and the rest into the latter. He notes that the denomination Qipchaq was used by other Turks and in Islamic geographical and historical literature after the 8th century, in the Mongolian texts as *qibčaq* after 1240⁴ (borrowed from Turkic) and in the Chinese texts as *k'im-ča(q)* after the 13th century (borrowed from Mongolian). The original Chinese⁵ form was *K'in-ch'a*⁶.

The ethnonym Cuman mainly appeared in Byzantine sources after around 1080 and very infrequently in the Old Russian, Oriental and Latin texts⁷.

The name Qun is the name used by the Hungarians to designate the Cuman – Qipchaqs and it is first attested to in 1086. However it also appeared in some Islamic geographical works after 1029⁸.

As for the foreign names, *Polovets* appeared in Old Russian texts after 1055, *Pallidi* was used by Adam of Bremen in his *Gesta* (1072-1076), *Valwen* and its variants were used in Middle Low German (and Latin) sources in the first half of the 13th century and *Xarteshk* in the work of Matthios of Edessa written in Armenian around 1050.

Pritsak (1982: 324) also divides these names into two groups on chronological basis, grouping *Qipchaq* and *Polovets* (or *Polovci*) together as the earlier period and the rest under the grouping of later period. Additionally, instead of connecting the name *Polovci* both with *Qipchaq* and

⁴ It is first attested to in the Secret History and later appears in the Mongolian chronicle *Altan Tobči* as *qabčayut*. Golden (1995-97: 101) also reports on the Mongolian form *kimčag* and its plural *kimča'ud*.

⁵ Additionally Golden (1995:101) notes the Chinese forms like *ch'im-ch'a*, *k'o-fu-ch'a*, *k'opi-chao*. This ethnonym is also identified with the Ch'ü-she of the Chinese sources, who were conquered by Mao-tun of the Hsiung-nu (Golden 1992: 270).

⁶ Apart from these a Qivč'aq-i is present in Georgian sources (Golden *ibid.*: 101).

⁷ The earliest attestation to the name Cuman in Byzantine sources is in the work of Michael Attaleiates. The three occurrences of it in the Old Russian texts are in 1096, in 1223 and as a personal name around 1103. In oriental sources it was first used by Idrīsi in 1154 as *al-Qomāniya* and the Syriac writer Patriarch Mar Michael used *Qoman* in his chronicle in 1196. The name also appeared in the 13th century Latin texts written by Franciscans like Plano Carpini, Benedictus Polonus and William of Rubruck, by French crusaders and Dominican Fathers (Pritsak 1982: 322).

⁸ The first Islamic work, which the name *Qun* appeared in is al-Bīrūnī's *Kitāb at-Tafhīm* written in 1029. The other Islamic work, which *Qun* appeared in is Marwazī's *Tabā'i' al-Hayawān* written around 1120 (Pritsak 1982: 323).

Cuman, which traditionally had been the case, he prefers the equations based on his chronological grouping.

The word *qipchaq* was used in Karakhanid texts together with the word *qobi* (>*qowi*⁹) in a hendiadys relation as *qiwčaq qōbi*¹⁰ (Arat 1946: 512), meaning “the transitory world”. Pritsak (1982: 326) claims that these words used for expressing the idea of ‘hollowness’ and ‘transience’ originally meant a ‘hollow – treeless (steppe / desert) in the language of the nomadic society’¹¹. Therefore he suggests that *Qipchaq* as an ethnonym means ‘the desert people’. Additionally he notes that the Old Russian word *Polovci* has been connected with the Slavic word *polov* ‘pale, pallid’, whereas it should have been connected with the Old Russian *pol* ‘open, hollow’. Accordingly he claims that the Old Russian form *Polovci* is the exact translation of the Turkic word *Qipchaq*.

The appellative *Qipchaq* meaning ‘steppe / desert people’ is from Uighur origin. In the inscription of the Uighur Qaghan Il-Itmish (746-749) the Eastern Turks are referred to as *tür[ük] [qi]bčaq ālig yil olırmis* ‘when the Turk Qipchaq ruled over us for fifty years...’¹² Pritsak (1982: 326-327)

⁹ *qowi* was used as *qowi yigach* in Kashgari and explained as a “hollow tree” (Atalay 1985-86 v. 3: 225-226).

¹⁰ The full verse is as: *bu qiwčaq qōbi dınyā káčki āžün / tālim bāg qarıt(t)ı, qarımās öžün* ‘This temporal world, the transitory one, has made many rulers old, but itself does not become old’ (couplet 5133). However Clauson (1972: 581) suggests that the hendiadys means ‘unlucky’ and translates this as ‘this unlucky world is an old world, however much it makes *begs* aged, it does not age itself’. Although Clauson seems to be doubtful about the meaning of this hendiadys and the word *qiwčaq* with the meaning ‘unfortunate’ he translates couplet 2639 *yalawač yawuž bolsa qiwčaq qobi / sižiksiž tükär anda bāglār suwi* (Arat 1946: 277) as ‘if an ambassador is bad and unlucky, undoubtedly his masters’ honour is impaired’. Recently Kljaštornyj (1988: 87-88) as well has etymologized the word as “unfortunate, unlucky” suggesting that this name came to be associated with them after a series of defeats. On the other hand Hazai (1986a: 125b) regards this explanation to be conjectural and goes along with the traditional explanation as ‘hollow tree trunk’. Pritsak’s suggestion that the hendiadys is the Turkic translation of the Arabic expression *fānī dınyā* is congruent with couplet 5133, but how he explains it in the context of couplet 2639 is unclear as he does not mention this couplet.

¹¹ Pritsak backs up his suggestion by referring to Bang (1912: 340), who also notes this meaning of the word in one of the riddles of Codex Cumanicus. However Tietze (1966: 512) insists that the meaning is ‘hollow’ in this particular riddle. This is disputed by Pritsak. Pelliot (1930:281) also thinks that the word means ‘steppe’ or ‘desert’ in this particular riddle.

¹² Ramstedt (1913: 13, 44) notes that it is possible to read the missing parts of the fourth line of the northern face of the Shine Ušu Inscription as *tür[k] [qy]bčaq*. Kljaštornyj (1988: 74)

claims that the Uighurs, who regarded themselves as the 'forest people' saw the Eastern Turk, who dwelled in the steppe as 'the desert people'¹³.

Pritsak (1982: 328-331) puts forth a similar etymology for the appellatives Cuman and Qun as well. He relates both names to the Khakas – Altai word *quba*¹⁴ 'pale, pallid yellowish' and bases his claim on Menges' assertion that an uncontracted and a contracted form as *quba* and *qū* co-existed. He believes (like Menges) that from these forms the derivatives *Quman*¹⁵ and *Qun* were established with the collective suffix *-an / -än*. The Byzantine authors used the more ancient and therefore the 'correct' form, i.e. the uncontracted form, whereas in Hungary and Central Asia, where many Turkic peoples resided in, the more natural and colloquial, i.e. the contracted form was used.

He also relates the meanings of these two appellatives to the steppe rather than to the complexion of the people, since he claims, distinguishing people on racial basis was a common practise in sedentary societies but was not applied among the nomadic societies. Additionally quoting Radloff's *Wörterbuch* he notes that the word *quba* exists in Teleut with the meaning 'grey steppe'. Therefore *Quman* and *Qun* meant 'the people of the steppe' rather than 'the pale people'.

On the other hand he agrees with the tradition that *Pallidi*, *Valven* and *Xartesh* meant 'pallid, pale or blond people' (1982: 331).

2. The Origin of the Cuman – Qipchaqs

The Cuman – Qipchaqs have a very complicated and problematic early history. Their origin has been a matter of discussion since the beginning of the twentieth century; however an agreed origin for them is still to be established. In spite of all the controversy on their origin, most of the

notes that Ramstedt interpreted the line as "... when the Turk Qipchaq ruled over us for fifty years..." in the Russian translation of the inscription. Pritsak also is making a reference to this Russian version.

¹³ In an earlier work Pritsak (1968: 161) claims that the name *šar-* is given to the same Turkic group, i.e. Eastern Turk by the Mongolian Kitans living in the Manchurian forest region. This word is also to do with the yellow colour and is linked to the steppe by Pritsak.

¹⁴ This word exists in Kashgari as *quba* at 'horse with a colour between red and yellow' (Atalay *ibid.* v. 3: 217).

¹⁵ The *b > m* change is a common occurrence before a nasal in many Turkic languages. For detail see Räsänen 1949: 170.

discussions circulate around the Kimek, the Qun, the Qay and the Shari people.

Kafesoğlu (1984: 187) as an exception tries to link them with the Wu-suns (or U-suns) of the 2nd century B.C., who resided on the northern slopes of the T'ien Shan Mountains and around Lake Issiq. The reason, which led Kafesoğlu to come to this conclusion, is the racial features of the Wu-suns mentioned in the Chinese sources. Eberhard (1942: 104-105) notes that Wu-suns had red hair and blue – green eyes¹⁶.

Togan (1970: 159-160) regards Qipchaq, Qangli, Kimek and Qun to be all sub-divisions of a wider Qipchaq group. He also notes that Cuman derived from Qun with the *-man* particle, like Turk and Turkmen, and must have designated the two groups of the same tribe. He regards the steppes between the Altai and the Ural Mountains to be their natural habitats but referring to Plinius he also notes that the Kimeks, the Cumans and the Qanglis together with the Pechenegs used to live in Transoxiana during the early periods of the Christian era¹⁷. Togan considers the *Coamani* mentioned by Pomponius Melae living between the Sogdians and the *Dahea* as well to be Cumans. He also like Kafesoğlu mentions the Wu-sun rulers called Qunbak (or Qun-bi) but unlike him he thinks only the ruling class of the Wu-suns was from the Quns. He takes *K'ang-chü*¹⁸, which was the Chinese name

¹⁶ Kafesoğlu also notes that Wu-suns had a ruler named *Kun-mo* or *Kun-mi*, which he tries to translate as *Kun-beg* or *Kun-bi*. Kafesoğlu additionally emphasizes that they belonged to the Hsiung-nu race and cultural sphere and had the wolf legend, which was exclusive to the Turkic peoples. Kafesoğlu's emphasis on the Turkic or Hsiung-nu features of the Wu-suns must be because Wu-suns are regarded to be from Indo-European origin by some Western scholars. For instance recently Frye (1996: 123 and 165) has claimed them to be a part of the Sarmatian Confederacy and the same people as the As and Alans of the Western sources, therefore the ancestors of the modern Ossetians and from Iranian stock. However, interestingly they sided with the Hsiung-nu against both the Yueh-chih (Frye 1996: 122) and the Chinese (Yu 1990: 131-133). In the race to win over the Wu-suns, the Chinese sent a Han 'princess' to marry the Wu-sun ruler Kun-mo in 195 B.C. The Hsiung-nu ruler sent his own daughter as a response. Kun-mo made the Han princess the Right-princess and the Hsiung-nu princess the Left-princess. The Wu-suns like the Hsiung-nu sanctified the left (Yu 1990: 133).

¹⁷ Togan translates the *Pasiak* as Pecheneg, *Camac* as Kimek, *Coman* as Cuman, *Cam* as Qang(li), *Khun* of Eastern Europe and *Phun* of Central Asia as Qun.

¹⁸ The region named *K'ang-chü* by the Chinese sources of the pre-Christian (from 2nd c. B.C.) and the Early Christian eras laid north of the Middle Sir Darya, i.e. the Oxus, on the southern border of the Kazakh Steppe and in the Chu Valley. Its inhabitants were the Āsi people until the first century A.D. The region was settled by the Hsiung-nus twice. First

of Sogdiana, and the place name Qipchaq in the vicinity of Kashgar reported by Kashgari¹⁹ as further evidences to the early presence of Cuman – Qipchaqs in the region.

Karamanlioğlu (1962: 175) notes that the Cumans and the Qipchaqs were two different and separate peoples. Cumans started to migrate towards west after 1017 with the pressure of the Kara-Kitays and established themselves in Eastern Europe around 1050. They were dispersed and replaced by the Qipchaqs, who also came from the east, after they were defeated in 1103 by the Rus'. Cumans were subjugated by the Qipchaqs and the two peoples unified under the Qipchaqs; however they were continued to be called Cumans in Europe and the two names, i.e. Cuman and Qipchaq, became to designate the same people after the 12th century. He also mentions the relation of the Qipchaq Confederacy to the Kimeks and (Y)imeks, but states that this relation and whether the latter two are the same people or two different peoples are controversial (Karamanlioğlu: 176).

Arat (1950: 713b-714b) also treats Cumans and Qipchaqs as two separate people. He also notes that the Cumans came to the Ukrainian Steppes earlier than the Qipchaqs and were replaced by the latter after they were destroyed by the Rus'. Reference is made by Arat to the historical

they established a short-lived state in Eastern K'ang-chü between 43-36 B.C. and second time was in 91 A.D., when the Hsiung-nu was fleeing westwards from Inner Asia. It is possible that the Huns, who invaded Europe in 370 A.D., are the descendants of this Hsiung-nu group. (Czegledy 1983: 32-33). In Avesta a nomadic state is mentioned in the same region under the name *Kangha* (Czegledy 1983: 45). Czegledy also identifies the region with the great Turanian foe of the Persians in the period between 129-128 B.C. and 60 A.D. (1983: 123). After 350 A.D. K'ang-chü was occupied by the Ting-lings. The southern Ting-ling tribes appear in the Chinese sources also as the *Kao-chü* (Ting-ling) "the High Wagon (Ting-ling)". (Czegledy 1983: 35-36). This is important because the ethnonym Qangli (the people, who constituted the eastern wing of the Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy in the later periods) is attributed to wagons in the Turkic legendary tradition and this name is given to them by Oghuz Khan as they invented the wagon (Pelliot 1930: 337-338). Interestingly Marquart (1914: 164) locates the homeland of the Qangli in the Chu Valley. On the other hand Clauson (1972: 638) thinks that the people gave the name to 'wagon' as they were the first ones among Turks to use wagons rather than receiving the name as they had invented it. By the 7th Century the name K'ang-chü started to designate Sogdiana, which laid south to the Sir Darya and the name *Kang* had been used by Sogdians themselves since the 6th century (Czegledy 1983: 35).

¹⁹ Kashgari (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 474) notes a place name as Qipchaq in the vicinity of Kashgar.

sources mentioning the Qipchaq and Kimek / Yimek connection without stating whether the two are the same people or two separate peoples.

On the other hand Hazai (1986a: 126a) after listing references made to the Qipchaq – Kimek relation in oriental historical sources²⁰ concludes that a loose polity of Turkic tribes, including the Kimeks existed in West Siberian Steppes under the name Qipchaq²¹ in the 10th – 11th centuries and these tribes moved to the Russian steppes in the middle of the 11th century, becoming the dominant power of the area in 1064. On the Cuman – Qipchaq problem he suggests that the Cumans were a dominant tribe of the Qipchaqs and in the West were identified with the whole of the Qipchaq Confederacy. However he (1986b: 373a) also states that the Cumans' forefathers are the Shari²² people who were forced to migrate westwards at the beginning of the 11th century by the Quns, who were displaced by the Kitays. This westwards migration of the Sharis and the Quns brought these two tribes in contact with the Kimeks and the Qipchaqs, leading to the establishment of a new confederation. Hazai thinks that it must be this period, when the Shari was

²⁰ Ibn Xurdādbih mentions Qipchaqs and Kimeks as two separate peoples in the mid ninth century (de Goeje 1889: 31). Gardīzī noting that the Kimeks were originally a branch of the Tatars (i.e. Mongols), places the Qipchaqs and the Imeks under them as two of their seven adopted, inferior tribes and locates them on the Irtysh (Martinez 1982: 120). However in *Hudūd al-Ālam* (Minorsky 1937: 101, 316-17), which is written in an earlier period (982 A.D.) reference is made to a later stage of the history of the Qipchaqs. They are located further west to the north of the Pechenegs. They are considered to be separated from the Kimeks, but it is also noted that their ruler was ruling on behalf of the Kimeks. Cahen – Deverdun – Holt (1986: 1107a) give a contrasting information stating that in the 10th century the Kimeks were regarded to be a branch of the Qipchaqs by the Arab geographers. On the other hand Bosworth (1986: 108a) ascribing to the adduced data regards Qipchaqs to have sprung from the Kimeks and sees this as the main significance of this remote people. Kashgari located the Yimek on the Irtysh as a branch of the Qipchaqs (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 325) but later he notes that the Qipchaqs regard themselves to be a separate people (Atalay 1985-86 v. 3: 29).

²¹ Marquart (1914: 137) states that this Qipchaq 'Kingdom' was established by people, who fled from Manchuria after the rise of the Jurchens (Chinese Kin Dynasty). For a detailed account of the Manchurian origins of the early Qipchaqs also see Pelliot 1920.

²² Hazai (1986b: 373a) thinks that the Shari people are identical with the Yellow Uighurs. Marvazi locates a group of Shari in the Sha-chou region noting that they came to the region fleeing from Islam (Minorsky 1942: 19). Minorsky (1942: 100) notes that this group of Sharis seems to be connected with the Yellow Uighurs of the Kan-su region. He also reports that a greater group of the Sharis migrated to the west. Hazai must be referring to this group.

given the name Cuman by the other Turkic tribes because of their physiognomy.

Pritsak (1982: 331) is in agreement with Hazai on that the name Cuman / Qun were given by other Turkic peoples. However he thinks that it was given by the Qipchaqs to their masters Kimeks,²³ who left the forest region and settled in the steppe. The Qipchaqs, who were a section of the Eastern Turks, were driven out of Mongolia by the Uighurs in 744 and settled in the steppes between the River Volga and Lake Issiq, where they became the neighbours of the Kimeks inhabiting the Irtysh Basin, who also came to the region in the second half of the ninth century from Manchuria²⁴ fleeing Kitays (Kitans or Qitans). The Kimeks incorporated the Qipchaqs into their confederacy as a right wing. However, the Qipchaqs, who had the strong

²³ Pritsak (1982: 331-332) regards the Kimeks to be a Proto-Mongolian people. He identifies them with the *K'umo* of the *K'umo Hsi*. The *K'umo Hsi* (the *Tatabi* of the Orkhon Inscriptions) together with the *Ch'i-tan* (*Kitay* or *Kitan*) formed the *Liang Fan* 'the two barbarians' of the Chinese sources. He states that the *K'umo Hsi* was formed of two peoples as well. He considers *K'umo* to be the Chinese version of the Mongolian tribal name *Quomay* and therefore a self-designation, while Kimek was the Turkic designation. He identifies the *Hsi* with the Qay people. The hypothesis that the Kimeks had Mongolian origins starts with Marquart (1914: 95-97) and is improved by Pelliot (1920: 150-51). However Kafesoğlu (1984: 186) objects to this hypothesis and accuses Western scholars with not being able to distinguish Turks from Mongolians culturally and racially. He emphasizes that the racial features of the Cumans had nothing to do with that of the Mongolians and they were closer to the white race. These racial features inspired Grønbech (1959: 24) to consider them to be a turkified Indo-European tribe probably from the Altai or Upper Yenisei. Togan (1970: 164) also attributes the physiognomical features of the Cuman - Qipchaqs to their contact with Indo - European peoples from very early times. Kafesoğlu (1984: 186) also states that there are no Mongolian elements in the language of the Cuman - Qipchaqs. However Poppe (1962: 331-345) has come up with some Mongolian loanwords, antedating the Mongolian invasion, in Codex Cumanicus. Even it is possible to put forth a Qipchaq < Mongolian shift as g > w (v). Additionally Pelliot (1944: 73-101) attributes the occasional loss of initial q- (k-) in some Turkic languages, Cuman - Qipchaq in particular, to the influence of Mongolic. However Halasi-Kun (1950: 45-61) regards this consonantal event to be an internal development of Turkic languages. Intriguingly his strongest argument is to do with the ethnonym Kimek / (Y)imek. He takes the existence of the Yimek form as a solid proof to his claim (1950: 51-52) as the y- prosthesis is a much earlier event of Turkic (Räsänen 1949: 137).

²⁴ The Ölberli clan of the Kimeks did not leave Manchuria at this stage and remained in the region until the nineties of the 11th century (Pritsak 1982: 339-340). A detailed account of the Ölberli clan is provided by Golden (1986: 5-29).

political and cultural traditions of the Turk Empire turkified the Kimeks²⁵, whom they called Cuman / Qun. After 1031, when the Uighur State was destroyed by the Tanguts in Kan-su, the leadership in Western China was assumed by the Mongolian Qay²⁶, who formerly formed the *K'umo Hsi* (Tatabi) in Manchuria together with the Kimeks. Following a series of unsuccessful confrontations with the Karakhanids, the Qay was pushed into the steppe triggering a chain of migrations. The Qays displaced the Qun or Cuman / Kimeks, who in turn pressured the Qipchaqs pushing them towards the land of the Oghuz / Uz / Torki, who in turn moved into the land of the Pechenegs in the southern Russian and Ukrainian Steppe region. The Qipchaqs appeared in the former Pecheneg Steppe as early as 1055 and conquered the region from the Uzes, giving their name to the steppe²⁷. But shortly afterwards the Qays also appeared in the former Pecheneg Steppe and took over the government centres from the Turkic Qipchaqs in the sixties of the 11th century. However in the nineties of the 11th century the *Ölberli* clan of Kimek / Cuman (Qun) origin left Manchuria for the steppes. After a short period of instability peace was secured in the Qipchaq Steppe around 1116 / 1117 and the *Ölberli* and Qay clans shared the power. The

²⁵ If we regard the Yimeks and the Kimeks to be the same people (or the former as a subdivision of the latter) Kashgari (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 30) notes that they were speaking only a Turkic language by the middle of the 11th century.

²⁶ Kashgari (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 28) mentions the Qay as well among the twenty tribes of the Turks. However he also notes that although they knew Turkish very well they had a separate tribal language (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 30), i.e. they were bilingual. Therefore we can assume that the Qay was turkified or at an advanced stage of the process of assimilation by the 11th century. For a detailed account on the Qay people see Eberhard 1947.

²⁷ Although Baihaqi reports Qipchaqs to be neighbours of Khwarezm in 1030 (Morley 1862: 91) and Kashgari (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 28) locates them second after the Pechenegs from the Byzantine realm, both Arat (1950: 714b) and Hazai (1986a: 126a) note that the first attestation of the name *Dasht-i Qipchaq* 'the Qipchaq Desert / Steppe' for the former *Mafāzat al-Ghuzz* mentioned by Istakhri (de Goeje 1870: 227-28), is in the *Dīwān* of Nāsiri Khusraw. Both Arat and Hazai refers to Browne (1902: 31) as their source. However such an entry does not exist in Browne neither does Khusraw report anything on *Dasht-i Qipchaq*. The word *Qipchaq* exists in the *Dīwān* of Khusraw in two places (Taqavi 1304-1307: 102 and 329) and only in one occasion (p. 329 line 11) he mentions the Guzz and the Qipchaq living together around *Ceyhūn*, i.e. Jaxartes. The proof that the *Mafāzat al-Ghuzz* and the *Dasht-i Qipchaq* are the same place comes from Qazwīnī, who states in *Nuzhat-al-Qulūb* that the Qipchaq Desert is the same place as the Khazar Desert (Le Strange 1919: 230). The Old Rus' chroniclers also used the term *Pole Poloveckoe*, which is the exact translation of *Dasht-i Qipchaq*, to designate the Pontic Steppe (Pritsak 1982:340-41).

chief of the *Ölberli* clan became the supreme ruler and the head of the Qay clan his co-regent. After the steppe was taken from the Uzes a confederacy was established bordering Hungary, Byzantium, Rus' and China. This empire was divided into two by the Ural River and the Kimek²⁸ was constituting the eastern wing (Pritsak 1982: 336-340).

Although finding Pritsak's philological and historical arguments extremely complex and conjectural (1991: 143), Golden (1995-97: 101) notes that the Cuman – Qipchaqs have a very complicated ethno-genesis, which developed far from the horizons of the sedentary world, and involved a range of Inner Asian peoples. They were merged with other peoples on their way during their migration and were also joint by others, who left Inner Asia migrating westwards in the later periods. This complex process, which evolved over centuries, has resulted in a variety of names in different sources. In spite the fact that he considers Pritsak's reconstruction as Proto-Mongolian K'umo-hsi > Turkic Kimek – Qay to be highly problematic, he notes that the Mongolian connection cannot be ignored. The chain migration caused by the instability and internecine strife in the Qitan / Liao Empire brought new tribal and ethnic elements in the Kimek Union entailing the ethno-political developments, evolving around the Qays, the Quns, the Sharis, the Kimeks and the Qipchaqs and giving birth to the Cuman – Qipchaq confederation (Golden 1995-97: 102-104).

Additionally Kljaštornyj (1988: 73-90) has identified the Qipchaqs with the Sir people of the Orkhon Inscriptions and the Hsieh (*siet) / Hsieh-yen-

²⁸ Pritsak (1982: 340) notes that the Kimek wing of the Qipchaq Confederation changed its name to Qangli during the Mongolian period. William of Rubruck clearly states that the Cumans, Qipchaqs and the Qangli were one people: "*Commani qui dicuntur Capchat*" "*Cangle quidam parentela Commanorum.*" (Golden 1991: 133). They are also mentioned by Carpini as *Cangiate* (Bosworth 1978: 542b). Golden (1992: 277-78) names this later period of the confederation as the Cuman – Qipchaq – Qangli Union and divides it into three subdivisions: the Cuman Confederation in the West, the Qipchaq – Qangli in Central Asia and the Qipchaqs in Western Siberia. Unlike other associated Turkic peoples the Qanglis are not mentioned by the Muslim geographers of the 9th – 10th centuries (Bosworth 1978: 542a), but Kashgari (Atalay 1985-86 v. 3: 379) notes 'Qangli' to be the name of a prominent Qipchaq. The Qanglis are repeatedly referred to in the sources pertinent to the century preceding the Mongol invasions. A great proportion of them were massacred by the Mongols as they were constituting a significant part of the Khwarezmian army. The remaining Qangli population melted into the Turkic hordes of the Mongols (Bosworth 1978: 542a-542b).

to of the Chinese sources. This hypothesis is found very appealing by Golden (1995-97:100-101) as well.

3. Tribal and Political Organisation of the Cuman – Qipchaqs

Regardless of all the complexity of its evolution the Cuman - Qipchaq Confederation is still regarded to be the successor and the heir of the Kimek Qaganate, but with a very important difference. The Qipchaqs unlike the Kimeks lacked the qaganal institution²⁹ and lived in a loose confederacy of tribes and clans (1995-97: 103). This nomadic confederacy, which stretched from the Danube to the steppes surrounding the Central Asian oasis cities in the south and into Western Siberia in the north, was divided into various geographically marked sub-confederations. These subdivisions of the Cuman – Qipchaq polity, which included Mongolic and Iranian elements as well, were the Central Asian – Kazakhstan Group, the Ural – Volga Group, the Don River Region Group, the Dnieper River Region Group and the Danubian Group (Golden 1991: 134). On the other hand Pritsak (1982: 342-368) claims establishing evidence for the existence of at least twelve groups, which namely are the Volga Group, the Don Group, the Donec' Group, the Left Bank of the Dnieper Group, the Dnieper Meadow group, the Azov Group, the Crimean Group, the Right Bank of the Dnieper Group, the Kiev – Korsun' / Xerson Group, the Bug Group, the Lukomor'e Group and the Danube Group, in Western Eurasia alone. Undoubtedly, the diversity³⁰ of the peoples constituting the Qipchaq union must have played an important role in their non-unified situation. Additionally it is possible that the influence of their sedentary neighbours, the Federation of the Eastern Slavic Principalities ruled by the Rjurikids had contributed to this statelessness. The involvement of the Cumans - Qipchaqs and the *Cherny Klobuki* 'Black Hoods'³¹ in the internal struggles of the Rjurikids as auxiliary forces,

²⁹ Golden (1992: 202-205) tries to explain the formation of the qaganal institution among the Kimeks with their involvement in the international fur trade, which required a sophisticated form of political organization.

³⁰ Archaeological sites on the Lower Volga confirms the multi-layered ethno-linguistic structure of the Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy as the eastern groupings display more Mongoloid elements and the western groupings display a more Europoid character (Golden 1992: 278).

³¹ The *Cherny Klobuki* 'Black Hoods' were composed of the residues of the Ghuzz / Uzes / Toriki, Pechenegs and lesser groups like the Berendei, Kui / Kovui, Turpei and Kaepichi

prevented any fraction of the dynasty from ascending over others. Consequently engagement of different Cuman – Qipchaq groups in the internecine strife of the dynasty as allies of the different branches of the Rjurikids hampered any centrifugal tendencies among them (Golden 1979-80: 296).

In the documents of the Old Rus' from the second half of the twelfth century, a distinction is made between the Cuman – Qipchaqs, who attended the conference with the princes of the Kievan and Perejaslav lands, and the ones, who did not, naming the latter the *Polovci Dikii* 'Wild Cumans'³² (Pritsak 1967: 1615). Scholars like Pritsak and Golden adopted this term and hence invented the name Non-wild Cumans for the former group. Pritsak regards the Middle Dnieper and the River Molochna to be the border between the two groups (1967: 1615) whereas Golden (1979-80: 297-98) notes that the Non-Wild Cumans were based on the Middle and Lower Dnieper whilst the 'wild' ones were based in the east along the Don and Donec' Rivers, ranging as north as the Rjazan' Region and to Tmutorokan in the south³³. This classification is a Kiev-centred perspective as the only Rus' faction, which the Wild Cumans did not enter into agreements with was the Kievan Princes and they had long and stable alliances with the other groups. However, when power in Kiev was seized by any of these groups the hostilities did not cease to exist as the *Cherny Klobuk* Confederation, which constituted the main auxiliary force of Kiev was in constant engagement with the Wild Cumans (Golden 1979-80: 297).

(Qay-opa/oba) (Golden 1979-80: 297). Some of the Uzes and Eastern Pecheneg tribes were absorbed by the Cuman – Qipchaqs (Rasonyi 1939: 404-05).

³² Golden (1979-80: 297) does not dismiss the possibility that this might be the Russian translation of a Cuman self designation. He argues that Cumans, who retreated to Georgia and the North Caucasian Steppes after their catastrophic defeat by Vladimir Monomax, might have used this name as an indication of their defiance of the Kievan Rus' – Non-wild Cuman symbiosis.

³³ Golden (1979-80: 298) identifies the Non-wild Cumans with "White Cumania" of al-Idrisi and with "*Comanorum Alborum terra*" of the medieval Hungaro-Latin sources, whereas the Wild Cumans with the "Black Cumania" of the former and the "*Nigrorum Comanorum terra*" of the latter. Pritsak (1967: 1623), who also touches on the issue of White Cumania, states that the tribal group constituting the western part of the general Cuman – Qipchaq system was called white as it was the lower ranking western, i.e. right, wing.

Despite the fact that Cuman – Qipchaqs did not have a centralised state, the traditional Turkic bipartite state structure was clearly observable among the Non-wild Cumans as they were divided into two groups. Both groups were based on the Middle and Lower Dnieper; the Burchevichi / Burchogli and the Ulashevichi / Ulashogli on the left bank and the Itogli / Itoba and Urusovichi / Urusoba on the right bank³⁴ (Golden 1979-80: 297-98). The Burchevichi and the Itogli were the two ruling clans of this group, however as the Cuman – Qipchaqs had an eastern orientation the one on the left bank, i.e. the Burchevichi was ranking higher than the one on the right bank, i.e. the Itogli (Pritsak 1967: 1621-22).

On the other hand the Wild Cumans were closely linked with the house of Jurij Dolgorukij, the Ol'govichi and the Davydovichi branches of the Rjurikids (Golden 1979-80: 298). The two ruling clans of the Wild Cumans were the Ölberli(g) and the Toqsoba, the former being ruled by the House of Bonjak / Bõñek and the latter by the House of Sharuqanids. In the early thirteenth century the Rus' chronicles describes the Yurgi of the Sharuqanids as the greatest of all Cumans and was on the verge of ascending over all Cumans, but was killed at the Battle of Kalka, fighting against the invading Mongols (Golden 1991: 134). Contrastingly Pritsak (1982: 368-69) notes that the Sharuqanids were the ruling clan of the Ölberli / Olperljujevy and the Bonjakids of the Qay / Kajepichi (Kaj-opa)³⁵. He also reports that the 'wild' and the 'non-wild' all Cuman – Qipchaq groups were subject to these two supreme dynasties and this dual rule endured until the end of the Cuman – Qipchaq history. Therefore Old Rus' chroniclers reporting from the battle fields always recorded two Cuman commanders; in 1174 Konchak Sharukanevich and Kobjak Karlyevich, in 1185 Konchak Sharukanevich and Koza Burnovich, in 1222 Jutij Konchakovich and Danylo Kobjakovich.

³⁴ In the *Hypatian Chronicle* the ones based on the left bank are called the Perejaslav Polovtsians as they were bordering the Principality of Perejaslav and the ones on the right bank the Russian Polovtsians as they were bordering the Kievan Principality of the Russian region (Pritsak 1967: 1615-16).

³⁵ Golden (1992: 277-78) claims that the Qay did not join the Qipchaqs and appear to have been hostile towards them. He does not accept the connection established by Pritsak (1982: 335, 338-39) between the Ay-opa and the Kay-opa. He rather locates them under Rus' service and lists them among the peoples of the Cherny Klobuky (Golden 1979-80: 297).

The Cuman – Qipchaqs had three important political and economic centres and all three were positioned in the Sivers'kyj Donec' Basin, in the vicinity of present day Xarkiv. The supreme capital was Sharuqan (also known as Cheshuev) and the second-rank capitals were Balin in the east and Sugrov in the west. Additionally the port of Sudāq (Sugdaia) played an important role in the Cuman – Qipchaq economy as it was the centre of mutual trade between the Cuman – Qipchaqs and the Islamic lands, where Ukrainian and Russian slaves and furs were sold in return to imports from the Islamic countries (Pritsak 1982: 371).

The names of the Cuman – Qipchaq Tribes and the tribal groupings preserved in the Rus' and Mameluke sources are Ayopa, Badach, Barat / Beret / Baraq (?), Baya(w)ut, Burchogli (Rus'. Burchevichi, Hung. Borchol), Bzāngî (?), Chaghraq / Choghraq / Chaghrat, Chitey(ogli, Rus'. Chityevichi), Chirtan / Chortan / *Ozur Chortan (Hung. Chertan), Durut / Dört / Dörüt (?), Enchogli / *Ilanchuqli (Hung. Ilonchuk), It-oba, Qitan-opa, Knn (?), Kücheba / Kuchoba (Rus'. Kouchevichi), Küchet, Kor / Qor (Hung. Koor?), Qara Börüklü, Qol-oba / Qul-oba (Rus'. Kolobichi / Kulobichi), Qmngû / *Qumanlu (?), Qonghurogli (Hung. Kongur), Mekrüti / Bekrüti / Bekürte, Mingüzogli, Orungqu(t), Ölberli(g) / Ölperli(g) (Rus'. Olperlyueve / Olb'ri / Olberi, Chin. Yü-li-pai-li / Yü-li-pei-li, Lat. "reges Uilperitorum"), Ören / Uran, Pechene (< Pecheneg), (Chin.) Shan-mie Ku-ma-li, Targhil (Rus'. Targolove), Terter / Teriter-oba (Rus'. Tertrobichi), Toqsoba (Rus'. Toksobichi), Tg Yshqût (*Tagh Bashqurt?), Ulashogli (Rus'. Ulashevichi, Hung. Olaas), Urusoba (Rus'. Ourusoba), Yimek / Yemek (Rus'. Polovtsi Yemyakove), Yughur (< Uyghur) (Golden 1992: 278-79), Altun-opa, Arslan-opa, *Chenegir-apa / * Chengir-apa (Rus'. Chenegrepa), Tarew (?) (Golden 1995-97: 108-121)³⁶.

³⁶ Some of these names are clearly Mongolic. e.g. Qitan-opa < Qitañi, Orunqut < Mong. *oronggu* "small, brown-coloured gazelle", Ölberli(g) < Mong. *ölöbür* "ill, infirm" (Golden 1992: 279). For detail on each of these tribes see Golden 1995-97 and for a detailed history of the Ölberli clan including both before its absorption by the Kuman – Qipchaq Confederacy and the aftermath of the Mongol invasion see Golden 1986.

4. A Brief History of the Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy

4.1. The Borders of the Cuman – Qipchaq Realm

After they pushed the Ghuzz / Uzes / Oghuz out of the Pontic Steppes around 1050-1060, the Cuman – Qipchaqs established a vast confederacy bordering Hungary, Byzantium and the Rus' lands in the west and China in the east.

The boundary between the Cuman - Qipchaq lands and the land of the Rus' was to the south of the region separating the forest zone from the steppe. It stretched from the Southern Ural Mountains, throughout the length of the Samara River, and continued along the upper and the middle courses of the Rivers Sura, Moksha, Vorona, Cna and the right bank of the River Pronia. After crossing the Kulikovo Steppe the border maintained its course along the Bystraja Sosna, Upper Sejm, Upper Psel, and from there to the south of Kursk and southeast of Vyr'. Then it stretched along the River Psel down to its mouth joining the Dnieper. The river-line Udaj-Psel-Goltov was the most active march between the Rus' and the Cuman – Qipchaqs. The region was fortified with walls by the former against the constant attacks of the latter. The frontier went from the south of the town of Perejaslavl' along the right bank of the Rivers Tjasmin, Upper Vys', Middle Boh, Dniester, and Prut stretching down to the Carpathian Mountains. In the south-western edge of the Rus' realm the border was in the region between Upper Prut and the mouth of the River Seret on the Dniester (Pritsak 1982: 340-41).

4.2. The Early Stages of the Cuman – Qipchaqs in the Pontic Steppe

The new tribal union, which came into existence as a result of disturbances in Manchuria (started in 1018) and chain migrations in its aftermath, established itself in Western Siberia in the early years of the forties of the 11th century, becoming the prevailing force in the Eurasian Steppes by the seventies of the same century (Golden 1992: 276).

The Qipchaqs are reported to cause disturbances at the frontiers of the Khwarezmshas as early as 1030's and are documented in the Rus' chronicles for the first time in 1055³⁷, when they appeared on the land of Perejaslavl' under a commander called Bolush, but left after they were offered a peace treaty by Prince Vsevolod. It is possible that this was a reconnaissance as

³⁷ Marquart (1914: 162) dates the appearance of the Quns in Europe between 1030 and 1049.

they returned in 1061, this time raiding and defeating Vsevolod (Golden 1992: 277).

The Cuman – Qipchaqs are reported to take part in the internal struggles of the Rus' Principalities as early as 1078, when they were called in by Oleg of the House of Ol'govichi against his foes (Golden 1979-80: 299). In the period between 1061 and 1120 the Cuman – Qipchaqs established strong economic ties with the Khwarezmshas and continuously raided the lands of the Rus' (the Perejaslavl Principality in particular), Byzantium and Hungary.

4.3. Temporary Setback

In 1068 they were defeated by combined Rus' forces under the Vladimir II Monomax (became Grand Prince of Kiev, 1113-1125). The Rus' campaigned into Cuman – Qipchaq lands in 1103 and a series of invasions followed in 1109, 1111, 1113 and 1116. This forced some Cuman – Qipchaqs under Sharuqanid Äträk / Ötrök to take refuge in Georgia, but Ötrök returned to the steppe after the death of Monomax, the Rus' unity disintegrated again and various contestants started to struggle for the Kievan Grand Principality (Golden 1992: 280).

4.4. Recovery

The disintegration of the Rus' unity once more left the initiative in the hands of the Cuman – Qipchaqs. Nomads constantly raided into Rus' lands, often as allies of different branches of the Rjurikids, but the Ol'govichi in particular. Occasionally Rus' forces campaigned into Cuman – Qipchaq territory with unimportant results. Cuman – Qipchaqs remained as the allies of the Ol'govichi until 1080, but the latter joined the other Rus' forces in this year in anti-Cuman campaigns. In 1171 Wild Cumans of Könchäk and non-Wild Cumans of Kobjak Karlyevich united under Könchäk and forayed into the Rus' in 1176 and 1179. Their involvement in internal Rus' struggles, with the invitation of the Ol'govichi once more, in 1180-81 led to a major Cuman – Qipchaq offensive in 1184 as some prominent Cuman – Qipchaq dignitaries were either killed or captured. The result of this assault was catastrophic for the nomads. Kobjak and his two sons, Izai Biljukovich, Sidvak of the Quloba (Kolobich), Bashkird and other major Cuman notables were taken prisoners.

The following year Könchäk brought a Muslim specialist in Greek fire in order to burn down Rus' cities, but the Rus' princes were warned by Rus'

merchants returning from the Cuman – Qipchaq realm. They surprised Kōnchäk by an attack and drove him back into the steppe capturing his youngest wife and the Muslim specialist. However, in the aftermath the forces of Igor' Svjatoslavich, the Ol'govichi prince of Novhorod-Sivers'kyj, were heavily defeated by a massive Cuman – Qipchaq force and the prince himself was captured. Yet Kōnchäk could not follow up on his victory as there was disagreement on the Cuman – Qipchaq side on where to strike next. It was impossible to agree on a common target as different Cuman – Qipchaq groups had longstanding alliances with various Rus' princes.

After 1180 the Ol'govichi intensified their aggression toward the Cuman – Qipchaqs as the Svjatoslav Vsevolodich was sitting on the Kievan throne (1176-1180, 1181-94). Consequently the Cuman – Qipchaqs changed their allegiance to the House of Monomashich from 1195 helping Rjurik Rostislavich to take Kiev and in 1203 Kōnchäk and Kobjak's son Daniil sacked Kiev. Kōnchäk's successors Kotjan and Somogur Sutoevichi remained as Rjurik's allies and became prominent figures in the history of the South-western Rus' and Hungary (Golden 1979-80: 299-309).

4.5. The Mongol Invasion and Destruction

By the time of the Mongol invasions the Ölberli tribe / clan had established itself as the leading tribe of the Cuman – Qipchaqs inhabiting the Volga – Ural mesopotamia (i.e. Eastern Qipchaqs/ Qanglis /? Black Cumania). The first contact between the Ölberli and the Mongol forces was in 1219 when the former provided sanctuary to the Merkit chieftain and army remnants, fleeing from the Mongols. The Ölberli forces were defeated but the Mongols did not remain and returned to their camps (Allsen 1983: 7-9).

The Mongols returned in the early years of the twenties of the 13th century and defeated joint Rus' – Cuman-Qipchaq forces at the Battle of Kalka in 1223³⁸. Major confrontations occurred between the Mongols and the Eastern Qipchaqs (Qanglis) in the early years of the 1220's, which resulted in the destruction of many Qipchaqs. Finally the Eastern Qipchaqs

³⁸ Mongol stratagem was able to persuade Cuman – Qipchaqs to break off from their Alan allies. As a result each of them was defeated separately. However the ties between the Rus' and the Cuman – Qipchaqs were too strong and Mongol proposals were turned down by the Russian princes (Pritsak 1982: 372-73).

were captured and they were incorporated into the Mongol armies (Allsen 1983: 10-14)

The Mongols renewed their incursions in order to bring the Volga region under control in 1229, causing a panic among the population. The Qipchaqs fled, taking refuge in the Bulghar lands and were followed by the Mongols resulting in the destruction of the Volga Bulgars. However not all of the population fled or submitted to the Mongols, but some of the Eastern Qipchaqs continued to resist under Bachman, an Öberli notable. Soon Bachman became a symbol of anti-Mongol feelings and were joined by members of other Qipchaq tribes as well as Alans. Bachman remained to be a problem for the Mongols in the steppe until 1236, when he was crushed with the arrival of Mongol reinforcements with the aim of invading the Western Qipchaq lands permanently³⁹. In the 1240's the remaining Qipchaqs under Baltuchaq joined the armies of Mongke in the North Caucasus (Allsen 1983: 15-21) and the Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy ceased to exist (Pritsak 1982: 373).

4.6. Aftermath of the Mongol Invasion

Mongol offensives caused a great devastation and chaos in the Volga – Ural region. Scores of the population were either slaughtered or sold into slavery and a great proportion of the remaining inhabitants dispersed in pursuit of refuge (Allsen 1983: 20-21). Karamanlioğlu (1962: 176) even claims the Mongol campaigns to be the reason for the disappearance of the Cuman – Qipchaqs as a separate people. The only Cuman – Qipchaq group, which was not affected by the disastrous consequences of the Mongol invasion, was the Crimean group as they were already sedentarized. They mingled with the other ethnic groups of the peninsula and turkified them establishing the bulk of the population of the Crimean Khanate (Kurat 1992: 99-100).

³⁹ For detailed information on the defeat and killing of Bachman see Bretschneider 1888: 310-12. The resistance of Bachman has been immortalised in the Kazan Tatar tale *Baçman hām anı ülterü turında xikâya* (Bachman and the Tale of his Killing), which is contained by the 17th century Kazan Tatar *Daftar-i Çingiz-Nâme* (Golden 1986:28-29). Additionally, the *Bushman / Busman* clan of the Bashkirs can be traced back to the followers of Bachman, who fled north after the death of their leader (Allsen 1983: 21).

4.6.1. Cuman – Qipchaqs in Hungary

In the early forties of the thirteenth century a group of Cuman – Qipchaqs⁴⁰ under the leadership of Kotjan (Kotjan Sutoevichi of the Rus' sources) of Terter-oba took refuge in Hungary (Pritsak 1982: 373)⁴¹. They converted to Christianity and were allowed by the Hungarian king to resettle there. However, this action provoked the Mongols as Kotjan fought against them before he fled and this constituted one of the main objectives of the Mongol campaigns into Hungary (Kurat 1992: 96-97). Rasonyi (1939: 412) reports on a second Cuman – Qipchaq migration into Hungary from the environs of Dniester, which occurred in 1470 during the reign of King Matyas.

The Cuman – Qipchaqs adapted to the Hungarian society without a difficulty and subsequently were able to play an important role in the history of the host nation⁴². This rather easy acceptance and adaptation was a result of the nature of nomadic societies, in which bilingualism was not regarded to be a problem⁴³ (Halasi-Kun 1986: 32).

There are two hypotheses on the settlement process of the Cuman – Qipchaqs in Hungary. The first group of scholars believe that in spite of giving up pastoral way of life, traditions of the nomadic winter residence survived until the second half of the 20th century in Kunsag⁴⁴. On the other

⁴⁰ According to Kurat (1992: 97) more than 40.000 horsemen. Vasary (2005: 65) repeats the same number as the population of all of the Cuman – Qipchaqs, who took refuge in Hungary. Can we assume that this Cuman – Qipchaq population was made up of males only?

⁴¹ Vasary (2005: 65) dates this event and the baptism of Kotjan by King Bela IV as 1239.

⁴² Cuman - Qipchaqs left everlasting imprints on the Hungarian society with their impact on its leading dynasties and policies.

⁴³ However, religion seems to be a vital criterion in the Hungarian society of the period since asylum was only granted after the Cuman – Qipchaqs converted to Christianity. On the other hand there is no doubt that this conversion was only superficial. In 1278 there was a preparation for a crusade on the Cuman – Qipchaqs of Hungary as they constituted a threat to the Christian identity of Hungary. This preparation forced Cuman – Qipchaq chiefs *Uzur*, *Alpar* and *Tuhun* to come to an agreement with King Ladislav IV the Cuman, who was Kotjan's grandson from his maternal side, on re-organising Cuman – Qipchaq social life. They had to sedentarize and Christianize to a full extend. However, traces of their native religion still existed among them in the 15th century (Rasonyi 1939: 412).

⁴⁴ The two regions settled by Cuman – Qipchaqs in Hungary are Greater Cumania (Nagykunsag) and Lesser Cumania (Kiskunsag) (Golden 1991: 149). These two regions were situated in the middle of Hungary and constituted one third of the country (Rasonyi 1939: 412).

hand the second group of scholars claim the opposite, insisting on that the 15th and 16th century Cuman villages were exactly the same as contemporary Hungarian villages (Selmeczi 1976: 255-56).

4.6.2. Cuman – Qipchaqs in Bulgaria

Cuman – Qipchaqs started to resettle in Bulgaria in 1150's, and they led the Wallachian – Bulgarian revolt against the Byzantines, which resulted in the establishment of the second Bulgarian Kingdom in 1185⁴⁵ (Pritsak 1982: 373). However, there is no record of Cuman – Qipchaq settlement or migration in the Balkans in great numbers before 1237. The Cuman – Qipchaq presence in the region prior to this date was constituted of military leaders with their retinue. As a result of the major Mongol assault on Eastern Europe in 1236 a big wave of Cuman – Qipchaqs appeared on Bulgarian soil in the summer of 1237. The Bulgarian king Ivan Asen II, could not stop them and he had to let them march towards south through Bulgaria plundering and pillaging whole of Thrace as far as Hadrianoupolis. These same Cuman – Qipchaqs were requited by the Latins of Constantinople in 1240 and this is the last information on this group of Cuman – Qipchaqs (Vasary 2005: 63-65).

The second large wave of Cuman – Qipchaqs came in 1241, this time from the direction of Hungary. Kotjan's assassination⁴⁶ in Pest provoked Cuman – Qipchaqs and they started to plunder the countryside, moving southwards. After crossing the border into Bulgaria they settled in Vidin and Branichevo⁴⁷. The two Bulgarian boyar families, the Shishmans in Vidin and the Dormans in Branichevo, were from these Cuman – Qipchaqs (Vasary 2005: 65). It is beyond doubt that these two Cuman – Qipchaq waves must have caused havoc amongst the contemporary inhabitants of Bulgaria, but

⁴⁵ For detailed information on the Cuman – Qipchaq presence in the region prior to 1186 see Vasary 2005: 17-22.

⁴⁶ Presence of Cuman-speaking cavalymen (who were from the Cuman – Qipchaq groups incorporated into the Mongolian hordes) among Mongol captives supported Babenberg Fridrik's claims that Kotjan was a Mongol spy. Hungarians provoked by German propaganda revolted and killed Kotjan. This caused Cuman – Qipchaqs to break off from the Hungarians leaving them alone against the Mongols at the battle of Mohi, where they were destroyed (Rasonyi 1939: 411).

⁴⁷ Rasonyi (1939: 411) notes that a great proportion of these Cuman – Qipchaqs returned to Hungary after the Mongols withdrew as King Bela IV, who was in urgent need of manpower against the threats of Babenberg Fridrik, invited them.

still the most important impact of the Cuman – Qipchaqs on the Bulgarian society is the first three dynasties of the Second Bulgar Kingdom from Cuman – Qipchaq origin: the Asens (1185-1280), the Terters (1280-1323) and the Shishmans (1323-1396)⁴⁸.

4.6.3. Cuman – Qipchaqs in Serbia

The appearance of Cuman – Qipchaqs in Serbia for the first time was in 1276 at Gacko⁴⁹ as the auxiliary forces of the Hungarian king Stephen V, who was supporting his son in law Stefan Dragutin⁵⁰ against his father King Stefan Urosh I (Vasary 2005: 100).

The second important appearance of the Cuman – Qipchaqs on the Serbian scene is with the destruction of the city of Zhidcha⁵¹ by them around 1292. The Cuman – Qipchaq forces, who entered Serbia as auxiliaries in the 1270's, remained in the region afterwards fighting on the sides of the different fractions of the Serbian internecine strife. Like any nomadic force they plundered and pillaged at will devastating the countryside and the city of Zhidcha received its share as well. The city remained in ruins for many years until it was renovated by King Stefan Urosh II sometime before 1309. However the city had never been able to recover fully (Vasary 2005: 100-101).

4.6.4. Cuman – Qipchaqs in Georgia

The first emergence of Cuman – Qipchaqs in Georgian history on a greater scale was in 1118, when Davit' II Aghashenebeli decided to call in the Cuman – Qipchaqs against the advancing Seljukids. A massive Cuman – Qipchaq population under the leadership of Sharuqanid Äträk / Ötrök, who

⁴⁸ For detailed information on the Cuman – Qipchaq origins of the Asenovich dynasty see Vasary 2005: 38-42. For claims on the Wallachian or Bulgarian origins of the same dynasty see Vasary 2005: 34-38. For the origins of the Terterovich and Shishmanovich dynasties see Vasary 2005: 65-66. Rasonyi (1939: 422) adds *Eltimirs* as well to the list of Bulgarian dynasties from Cuman – Qipchaq origin.

⁴⁹ Gacko, today known as Gacko or Gatachko Polje, was an important commercial centre of the period, in Hercegovina on the Dubrovnik – Focha route (Vasary 2005: 100).

⁵⁰ Stefan Dragutin was married to King Stephen V's daughter Catherine, who was Cuman – Qipchaq from her maternal side. Catherine's mother Elisabeth was the daughter of the Cuman – Qipchaq chief Seyhan. After the death of King Stefan V, his son Ladislav IV the Cuman sat on the Hungarian throne and continued to support his brother-in-law Dragutin (Vasary 2005: 99-100).

⁵¹ Zhidcha had been the see of the Serbian Church until 1253, when it was transferred to Pec by Archbishop Arsenije.

was the father-in-law⁵² of the Georgian King, moved into Georgia as a result of this decision (Golden 1984: 57-58). This was a rather convenient situation for the Cuman – Qipchaqs too since the state of affairs was rather grim in the steppe as well (see section 4.3.). A population of 200-225,000 people with a 40,000 strong army moved into Georgia⁵³ (Golden 1984: 62), but as it is stated above Ötrök returned to the steppe after the death of Monomax. However, Ötrök's horde returned to Georgia to help the Georgian kings whenever they were needed (Golden 1984: 77-78).

A second wave of Cuman – Qipchaqs appeared in Georgia as a result of the Mongol assaults on the steppe. However, this time their request of land to settle in was refused by the Georgian King Giorgi IV Lasha, as there already was a surfeit of Cuman – Qipchaqs⁵⁴ in service. They moved to Ganja, but were not left unchecked by the Georgians. The first Georgian attempt to defeat this Cuman – Qipchaq group had failed, but they were defeated at the second time. Many of them were captured and sold into slavery. The remaining part broke into small bands and scattered (Golden 1984: 85).

The Cuman – Qipchaqs, which remained in Georgia were dispersed and settled in various places in small groups. This brought their rapid Christianization and Georgianization. Their assimilation was to an extent

⁵² King Davit' was married to Ötrök's daughter Guaranduxt. This must be her Georgian throne name as it is from Iranian origin. There is no information in the sources how this marriage came to be. But it is known that the Georgian kings had a long standing tradition of establishing marital bonds with significant groups of the North Caucasus with political reasons (Golden 1991: 148).

⁵³ The aim of the Georgian King by inviting the Cuman – Qipchaqs into Georgia was not only to check the Seljukids. Manpower was vital for devastated and depopulated areas of Georgia as a result of recurrent Turcoman incursions as well as for a force, which would be loyal to the Georgian throne against the troublesome aristocracy. Therefore Cuman – Qipchaqs were an essential need for the Georgian royalty against both the foreign and domestic enemies (Golden 1984: 59).

⁵⁴ Not all Cuman – Qipchaqs in the horde of Ötrök returned to the steppe with their leader. Some of their herds were captured or destroyed by the Rus' before they retreated to Georgia. Additionally they may have lost some more of their herds in the course of their flight. In both cases they became impoverished in nomadic standards and these economic circumstances dictated to some of the Ötrök's tribesmen to sedentarize and settle in Georgia. Moreover, as mounted warriors they occupied a privileged status in Georgia. Another group of Ötrök's tribesmen, who did not return to the steppe, migrated to Eastern Anatolia (Golden 1984: 71-72).

that, unlike the settlements in Hungary, they left no traces at all (Golden 1984: 63-64).

4.6.5. Cuman – Qipchaqs in Egypt and Syria

The Ayyubid rulers of Egypt and Syria started to import slaves originating from the Cuman – Qipchaq Steppe in the 12th century. This flow of Turkic slaves, who were called *Mamluks*, boosted during the reign of Sultan al-Malik as-Sālih (d. 1249) as he decided to establish an elite army⁵⁵ of them. However they seized the power as early as 1250 and secured their grasp over authority in Egypt and Syria with their victory over the Mongols at ‘Ain Jālūt⁵⁶.

They did away with their population disadvantage and ensured their existence by perpetuating the flow of Turkic and Circassian slaves into Egypt and Syria as they maintained good relations with the Golden Horde, which was established on the lands of the former Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy. They ruled over Egypt and Syria until 1517, when they were conquered by the Ottomans (Pritsak 1982: 371-72). Cuman – Qipchaqs constituted a great proportion of the notables even during the Ottoman era (Kurat 1992: 99).

4.6.6. Cuman – Qipchaqs in India

In 1193 Delhi was captured by Qutb ad-Dîn Aybek, who was a Turkic gulam of Sultan Muhammad Ghuri, ruler of the Ghurid State and Aybek, establishing the Delhi Sultanate, started to rule the Indian realms of the Ghurid State after Sultan Muhammad was assassinated in 1206. The tribal affiliations of Sultan Aybek are unknown, but he was succeeded by a Cuman – Qipchaq, his son-on-law El-tutmish Ölberli. The presence of Turkish soldiery in Delhi was reinforced by refugees fleeing from Central Asia and Eastern Europe before the Mongols and they were transformed into a feudal bureaucracy by El-tutmish. His line⁵⁷ sat on the Delhi throne for some time

⁵⁵ Detailed information on this army can be found in Ayalon 1953a: 203-228; 1953b: 448-476; 1954: 57-90 and Latham 1969: 257-267.

⁵⁶ For a recent account of Mamluk conception of sultanate and its administrative structure see Levanoni 1994: 373-392.

⁵⁷ One of the most interesting events regarding El-tutmish's line is the ascension of his daughter Jalālat ad-Dîn Radiyya (1236-1240) to the Delhi throne. The rise of a woman to the throne is a clear indication to the preservation of the steppe culture. However, she was

but was replaced by another Ölberli line, that of al-Khaqan al-Mu'azzam Bahā'l-Haqq wa'l-Dīn Ulugh Khan Ghiyās ad-Dīn Balban (1266-1287). However, Balban's line did not survive long after him and was replaced by another Turkic dynasty, the Khaljīs, in 1290 (Golden 1986: 26-27).

5. *The Cuman – Qipchaq Language*

Reference is made to the (Cuman –) Qipchaq language in detail by Kasghari and he makes it clear that there was striking phonological similarities between Qipchaq Turkic and Oghuz Turkic, when compared to later periods (Atalay 1985-86 v. 1: 29-34). Karamanlıoğlu (1962: 177) explains this proximity with the very early stage of the formation of the Turkic languages and ascribes the later differences between the two branches to migration of Cuman – Qipchaqs and Oghuz / Turcomans into separate directions.

The language of the Qipchaq sources dating from the period between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries are known as Middle Qipchaq and are written in three different scripts originating from two geographically and culturally distinctive regions of the world. Sources written in the Arabic script are from the Near East, where they came into being under the Mamluks. The second group including both the Roman and Armenian script originated from the Russian Steppes⁵⁸ (Berta 1998: 158). Interestingly none of the sources originating from the lands of the Cuman – Qipchaq Confederacy, i.e. the ones written in Roman and Armenian scripts, are left by the Qipchaqs themselves. It might be this fact that forced Golden (1986: 7) to come to the conclusion that there was no literacy among the Cuman – Qipchaqs. Indeed it is an intriguing fact that there is no evidence that the Cuman – Qipchaqs had used the Turkic Runic Script. On the other hand there is evidence that the Runic Script was used by the Kimeks (Golden 1992: 205), who had played an important role in the formation of the Cuman – Qipchaq ethno-genesis. Additionally Nemeth (1971: 1-3) notes that the Runiform inscriptions found at Nagy-Szent Miklos are written in an old dialect of the Qipchaq language and have either a Pecheneg or Qipchaq

deposed by the Turkic elite and replaced with her brother Bahrām Shāh, when she tried to neutralise the Turkic soldiery by making use of Tajik elements (Golden 1986: 27).

⁵⁸ Berta (1998: 158) also notes sources written in the Cyrillic script without giving any information on them. These also must be from the Russian steppes.

origin. Moreover, the Cuman – Qipchaq population, which fled to the Bulghar lands before the Mongols (see section 4.5.), Qipchaqized the local population causing the gradual extinction of the Bulghar language (Kurat 1992: 97). We know from the inscriptions left by these Bulghars that literacy existed among them. Therefore at least these Qipchaqizing populations should have transferred their literacy to the Qipchaq language. It is strange to assume that literacy existed in the two edges of the Cuman – Qipchaq world, whereas it was non-existent in the centre. It is possible that the lack of such sources is a result of mass-destruction during the turbulent years of the steppe. Indeed Golden (1992: 282) warns the scientific world to be prepared for such findings as a result of archaeological studies.

There is one universally known Middle Qipchaq source written in the Roman script. The so-called Codex Cumanicus, which is constituted of two parts and is thought to be put together for Italian traders and German missionaries⁵⁹. It is regarded to be a proof for the socially high status of the Cuman – Qipchaq language in the steppe at the time of its compilation (late 13th c. – first third of the 14th c.) (Berta 1998: 158). Additionally Ligeti (1981: 3) reports on a Coman Lord's Prayer together with a few other short prayers from Hungary, where the language survived until the end of the 18th century.

The language of the Middle Qipchaq sources written in the Armenian script is known as Armeno-Qipchaq. These sources are produced mainly in the 16th and 17th centuries by the descendants of an Armenian community from Crimea, who migrated to Ukraine and Poland (Berta 1998: 158). The identity of this community is a very controversial matter. It is an un-solved problem whether they are Qipchaqs, who adopted Armenian type of Christianity or Armenians, who adopted the Qipchaq language⁶⁰. The

⁵⁹ Vasary (1988: 268-69) notes that there is a big possibility that Orthodox parallels of Codex Cumanicus written in the Greek alphabet were compiled in Crimea as the existence of an Orthodox mission based in Sudaq and a thriving Orthodox Cuman – Qipchaq community has been proven by the information provided in the Sudaq synazarion. This community was absorbed by Greeks in the second half of the thirteenth century and it is possible that they became Greco-phone or at east bilingual at an earlier date (Vasary 1988: 270-71).

⁶⁰ It is a known fact that Armenians existed in Crimea in the 12th and 13th centuries. Halperin (2000: 234) notes that this colony was established by Armenians fleeing the Seljukid Turks. On the other hand majority of the population of the peninsula was constituted of Cuman – Qipchaqs (Clauson 1971: 7). Clauson rather convincingly puts forth with linguistic,

language is deeply penetrated by Polish and Ukrainian Slavonic both syntactically and lexically. However, bulk of the vocabulary and the whole of declension and conjugation are Qipchaq (Clauson 1971: 7). The language contains four layers of Turkic words (Old Turkic, Karakhanid, Khwarezmian and a small layer pure Turkic words exclusive to Armeno – Qipchaq), a very small layer of Mongolian words, a layer of Armenian vocabulary, which is mostly religious terminology, a very large component of Slavonic words, mainly Polish or Ukrainian. Additionally there is a large component of Persian words, which is controversial whether they entered Armeno – Qipchaq through Armenian or directly from Qipchaq. When the Armenian and Slavonic components of this language are removed the remaining part is the spoken Qipchaq language of the 12th and 13th centuries with the Persian loanwords, which entered the language through the written Khwarezmian language (Clauson 1971: 11-12). The Armeno – Qipchaq speakers lost their Turkic speech in the second half of the 17th century (Schütz 1966: 99).

Despite the fact that Golden (1992: 282) regards them to be acculturated, the Mamluk Qipchaqs of the Near East retained their Turkic language and a Turkic literature flourished under the patronage of Mamluk sultans. Although some Mamluk sultans could speak the Arabic language a great proportion of them were monolingual in Turkic. Consequently the Qipchaq language attained an important status as the language of the ruling class. Turkic dictionaries were compiled in order to facilitate the learning of the Turkic language, original Turkic works were written or translations were made from Arabic and Persian, and important Turkic works written in the other parts of the world were copied⁶¹. Accordingly a lively intellectual connection was established with different parts of the Turkic world and scholars from Turkestan and the Golden Horde were delivering lectures in the Madrasah of Cairo, which was established by Emir Soyurgatmish in the 14th century (Eckmann 1963: 304-05). However, the Qipchaq language

historical, sociological and religious proofs why Armeno – Qipchaq speakers should be regarded from Cuman – Qipchaq descent with small Armenian elements. However, Dachkevitch (1982) disputes fiercely every claim connecting Armeno – Qipchaq speakers to Turkic descent. Vasary (1988: 269) regards Dachkevitch's views to be extremist and notes that they should be discarded.

⁶¹ Some scholars classify the language of the steppe and the language of the Mamluks separately naming the former Cuman and the latter Qipchaq (Karamanlioğlu 1962: 177-78).

started to experience a gradual Oghuzification from the beginning of the 15th century and was replaced entirely by Anatolian Turkish at the end of the century (Eckmann 1964: 36)⁶².

5.1. Qipchaq Languages of Today

Cuman – Qipchaqs played an important role in the ethno-genesis of many Turkic peoples. Linguistically this has resulted in a group of modern Turkic languages, which are classified as the Qipchaq branch of the Turkic languages⁶³. The Turkic languages classified under this group are Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Tatar, Bashkir, Nogai, Karaim, Balkar, Karachay and Kumyk. The latter four are regarded to be the closest languages to that of Codex Cumanicus (Golden 1984: 86).

⁶² For detailed information on the grammar of the language of Codex Cumanicus see Gabain 1959 43-79, on the grammar of Armeno – Qipchaq see Pritsak 1959: 81-7, on the syntax of the Qipchaq language see Drimba 1973, and on the morphology of Middle Qipchaq see Berta 1996.

⁶³ Doerfer (1965: 121-127) saw a Qipchaq substrate even in Gagauz, which is a Western Oghuz language. Geographical location of the speakers of this language poses a possibility for this connection as modern Gagauzia lays in the Western Cumania of the medieval times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allsen, Th. T., 1983. "Prelude to the Western Campaigns: Mongol Military Operations in the Volga – Ural Region, 1217-1237." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 3: 5-24.

Arat, R. R., 1946. *Kutadgu Bilig I, Metin*. Istanbul.

Arat, R. R., 1950. "Kıpçak." In *İslam Ansiklopedisi* 6. Istanbul. Pp. 713a-717b.

Atalay, Besim, 1985-86. *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk Tercümesi I-IV*. Ankara.

Ayalon, David, 1953a. "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army I." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 15: 203-228.

Ayalon, David, 1953b. "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army II." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 15: 448-476.

Ayalon, David, 1954. "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army III." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 16: 57-90.

Bang, Wilhelm, 1912. "Über das Rätsel des Codex Cumanicus." *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 12: 334-353.

Berta, Arpad, 1998. "Middle Kipçak." In Johanson, L. & E. A. Csato, eds., *The Turkic Languages*. London and New York. Pp. 158-165.

Berta, Arpad, 1996. *Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Türkischen*. Wiesbaden.

Bosworth, C. E., 1978. "Kanghli." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 4. Leiden. Pp. 542a-542b.

Bosworth, C. E., 1986. "Kimäk." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 5. Leiden. Pp. 107b-108a.

Bretschneider, E., 1888. *Medieval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources I*. London.

Browne, Edward G., 1902. *A Literary History of Persia*. London.

Cahen, Cl. – G. Deverdun – P. M. Holt, 1986. “Ghuzz.” In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2. Leiden. Pp 1106b-1111a.

Clauson, Sir Gerard, 1971. “Armeno-Qipčaq.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*. 34: 7-13.

Clauson, Sir Gerard, 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford.

Czegledy, K., 1983. “From East to West: The Age of Nomadic Migrations in Eurasia.” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 3: 25-125.

Dashkevych, Ya. R., 1982. “Who are Armeno-Kipchaks?” *Revue des Études Arméniennes*. N.S. 16: 357-416.

De Goeje, M. J., 1870. *Viae Regnorum Descriptio Ditionis Muslimanicae. Auctore Abu Ishāk al-Fārisī al-Istakhrī*. Leiden.

De Goeje, M. J., 1889. *Kitāb al-Masālik wa'l-Mamālik. Auctore Abu'l-Kāsim Obaidallah ibn Abdallah ibn Xurdādhbeh et Excerpta e Kitāb al-Kharādj Auctore Kudāma ibn Dja'far*. Leiden.

Doerfer, Gerhard, 1965. “Zur kiptschakischen Schicht des Gagusischen.” *Central Asiatic Journal*. 10: 121-127.

Drimba, Vladimir, 1973. *Syntaxe Comane*. Leiden.

Eberhard, Wolfram, 1942. *Çin'in Şimal Komşuları*. Ankara.

Eberhard, Wolfram, 1947. “Sinilogische Bemerkungen über den Stamm der Kay.” *Monumenta Serica*. 12: 204-223.

Eckmann, Janos, 1963. “The Mamluk-Kipchak Literature.” *Central Asiatic Journal*. 8: 304-319.

Eckmann, Janos, 1964. “Memluk Kıpçakçasının Oğuzcalaşmasına Dair.” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*. 35-41.

Frye, Richard N., 1996. *The Heritage of Central Asia. From Antiquity to the Turkish Expansion*. Princeton.

Gabain, A. von, 1959. “Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus.” In J. Deny et al., eds., *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*. Wiesbaden. Pp. 46-73.

Golden, Peter B., 1979-1980. “The Polovci Dikii.” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 3/4: 296-309.

Golden, Peter B., 1984. “Cumanica I: The Qipčaq in Georgia.” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 4: 45-87.

Golden, Peter B., 1986. "Cumanica II: The Ölberli (Ölperli): The Fortunes and Misfortunes of an Inner Asian Nomadic Clan." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 6: 5-29.

Golden, Peter B., 1991. "The Qipčaq of Medieval Eurasia: An Example of Stateless Adaptation in the Steppes." In Seaman, G. & D. Marks, eds., *Rulers from the Steppe: State formation on the Eurasian Periphery*. Los Angeles. Pp. 132-157.

Golden, Peter B., 1992. *An Introduction to the History of Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. Wiesbaden.

Golden, Peter B., 1995-97. "Cumanica IV: The Tribes of the Cuman – Qıpçaq." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 9: 99-122.

Grønbech, Kaare, 1959. "The Steppe Region in World History II." *Acta Orientalia Copenhagen*. 24: 15-28.

Halasi-Kun, T., 1950. "Orta-Kıpçakça q-, k- > 0 Meselesi." In Eren, H. & T. Halasi-Kun, eds., *Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar I*. Ankara. Pp. 45-61.

Halasi-Kun, T., 1986. "Some Thoughts on Hungaro-Turkic Affinity." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 6: 31-39.

Halperin, Charles J., 2000. "The Kipchak Connection: The Ilkhans, the Mamluks and Ayn Jalut." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 63: 229-245.

Hazai, G., 1986a. "Kıpçak." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 5. Leiden. Pp. 125b-126b.

Hazai, G., 1986b. "Kumān." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 5. Leiden. Pp. 373a-373b.

Kafesoğlu, İbrahim, 1984. *Türk Milli Kültürü*. Istanbul.

Karamanlıoğlu, Ali Fehmi, 1962. "Kıpçaklar ve Kıpçak Türkçesi." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*. 12: 175-184.

Kirzioğlu, Fahrettin, 1992. *Yukarı-Kür ve Çoruk Boylarında Kıpçaklar*. Ankara.

Kljaštornyj, S. G., 1988. "Die Kiptschaken auf den runischen Denkmälern." *Central Asiatic Journal*. 32: 73-90.

Kurat, Akdes Nimet, 1992. *IV. – XVIII. Yüzyillarda Karadenizin Kuzeyindeki Türk Kavimleri ve Devletleri*. Ankara.

Latham, J. D., 1969. "Notes on Mamluk Horse-Archers." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 32: 257-267.

Le Strange, G., 1919. *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulûb Composed by Hamd-Allâh Mustavfi of Qazwîn in 740 (1340)*. Leiden.

Levanoni, Amalia, 1994. "The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 26: 373-392.

Ligeti, Louis, 1981. "Prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 35: 1-54.

Marquart, J., 1914. "Über das Volkstum der Komanen." In Bang, W. & J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*. Berlin. Pp. 25-238.

Martinez, A. P., 1982. "Gardîzî's Two Chapters on the Turks." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 2: 109-217.

Minorsky, V., 1937. *Hudûd al-Ālam 'The Regions of the World'. A Persian Geography 372 A.H. – 982 A.D.* Oxford.

Minorsky, V., 1942. *Sharaf al-Zamân Tâhir Marvazî on China, the Turks and India*. London.

Morley, W. H., 1862. *The Tārîkh-i Baihaki Containing the Life of masoud, Son of Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznin. Being the 7th, 8th, 9th and Part of the 6th and 10th vols. Of the Tārîkh-i āl-i Sabuktakeen by Abu'l Fazl al-Baihaqi*. Calcutta.

Nemeth, J., 1971. "The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklos and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe." *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 21: 1-52.

Pellot, Paul, 1920. "À Propos des Comans." *Journal Aisatique, series XI*. 15: 125-185.

Pelliot, Paul, 1930. "Sur la Légende d'Uruz-Khan en Écriture Ouigoure." *T'oung Pao Archives*. 27: 247-358.

Pellot, Paul, 1944. "Les Formes avec et Sans q- (k-) Initial en Turc et en Mongol." *T'oung Pao Archives*. 39: 73-101.

Poppe, N., 1962. "Die mongolischen Lehnwörter im Komanischen." In *Nemeth Armağanı*. Ankara. Pp. 331-345.

Pritsak, Omeljan, 1959. "Armenisch-Kiptschakisch." In J. Deny et al., eds., *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta 1*. Wiesbaden. Pp. 81-87.

Pritsak, Omeljan, 1967. "Non-'Wild' Polovtsians." In *To Honour Roman Jakobson 2*. The Hague – Paris. Pp. 1615-1623.

Pritsak, Omeljan, 1968. "Two Migratory Movements in Eurasian Steppe in the 9th-11th Centuries." In *Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi 1946*, v. 2. New Delhi. Pp. 157-163.

Pritsak, Omeljan, 1982. "The Polovcians and Rus'." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. 2: 321-380.

Ramstedt, G. J., 1913. "Zwie uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei." *Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne*. 30: 10-63.

Räsänen, Martti, 1949. *Materialen zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen*. Helsinki.

Rasonyi, Laszlo, 1939. "Tuna Havzasında Kumanlar." *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten*. 3: 403-422.

Schütz, E., 1966. "Re-Armenisation and Lexicon from Armeno – Kipchak Back to Armenian." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 19: 99-115.

Selmeczi, L., 1976. "The settlement Structure of the Cumanian Settlers in the Nagykunsag." In Kaldy-Nagy, Gy., ed., *Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh*. Budapest. Pp. 255-262.

Taqavî, Nasrallāh, ed., 1304-1307 A.H. *Dīvān... Nāsir-i Khusrav. Persian Text*.

Tietze, A., 1966. *The Koman Riddles and Turkic Folklore*. Berkeley – Los Angeles.

Togan, A. Zeki Velidi, 1970. *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*. 2nd Edition. Istanbul.

Vasary, Istvan, 1988. "Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th – 14th Centuries." *Central Asiatic Journal*. 32: 260-271.

Vasary, Istvan, 2005. *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185-1365*. Cambridge.

Yu, Ying-shih, 1990. "The Hsiung-nu." In Sinor, Denis, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge. Pp. 118-150.