

THE CUMANS IN PAPHLAGONIA

*Dimitri KOROBEINIKOV**

*In memoriam of Professor E.A. Grunina
(1926-2012), my teacher of Ottoman Turkish*

ABSTRACT

The Turkish population of Asia Minor comprised two large ethnic groups, the Oğuz, who were a majority, and the Kıpçaks. The latter received lesser attention from modern scholars, yet their presence is still visible in the local Turkish dialects of Paphlagonia. It seems that sometime from 1242 the province suffered a migration of the Cuman population which came from the Balkans and the Crimea. Contrary to what one might have expected, the traces of the Kıpçak population that came to Asia Minor from Central Asia were extremely obscure. The new coming Kıpçaks served in the Byzantine army, simultaneously settled on the Seljuk territory across the Byzantine border, and later formed military detachments under the Çobanoğulları.

Keywords: Cumans, Kıpçaks, Crimea, Caffa, Paphlagonia, Turkish dialects, Byzantine history, Seljuk history, Hüsâm al-Dîn Çoban-bey, Kastamonu.

PAFLAGONYA'DAKİ KUMANLAR

ÖZ

Asya'daki Türk nüfus Oğuzlar ve Kıpçaklar olmak üzere iki büyük etnik gruptan oluşmaktadır. Oğuzlar hakkında Faruk Sümer'in eseri önemli bir boşluğu doldururken Kıpçaklar üzerine henüz yeterince araştırma yapılmamıştır. Kıpçaklar Bizans eliyle Trakya'dan,

* *Prof. Dr.*, University at Albany, State University of New York, Department of History, Social Science 145H 1400 Washington Avenue Albany, NY 12222. e-mail: dkorobeynikov@albany.edu

Gürcüler aracılığıyla Kafkaslar üzerinden Anadolu'ya getirilmiştir. Kıpçaklar, Kafkasların güneyi ile Azerbaycan'ın yanı sıra Anadolu'nun değişik bölgelerinin Türkleşmesinde Oğuzlardan sonra ikinci derecede önemli rol oynamışlardır. XI. yüzyıl gibi erken bir tarihte Kıpçakları Anadolu'da görmekteyiz. Bu makalede Paphlagonia Bölgesi'ndeki Kuman-Kıpçak etkisi incelenmiş; konu daha çok Türk lehçeleri açısından ele alınmıştır. Zira Karadeniz kıyılarındaki Türk lehçeleri Bendereği'den Samsun'a kadar Kıpçak etkisi altındadır. Söz konusu etki altında birçok ses değişimi meydana gelmiştir. Kıpçakların Karadeniz kıyılarına olan göç hareketinin boyutu tam olarak bilinmemekle birlikte bölgedeki yerleşim yerlerinin dilini derinlemesine etkileyecek ölçüde olduğu açıktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kumanlar, Kıpçaklar, Kırım, Kefe, Paflagonya, Bizans tarihi, Selçuklu tarihi, Kastamonu, Türk lehçeleri.

The Turkish population of Asia Minor comprised two large ethnic 'streams', the Oghuz,¹ who were a majority, and the smaller groups of the Kıpçaks. Modern scholarship has concentrated primarily on the Oghuz, and the monograph of Faruk Sümer Demirtaş is probably the best known example of such a comprehensive study of how the Oghuz tribes settled in Anatolia. Compared to the Oghuz, the Kıpçaks were fewer and accordingly received little consideration. So far nothing comparable to Sümer's book has been written in relation to the Kıpçaks; moreover, it was the linguists and not the historians who noticed the elusive Kıpçak presence in the Turkish dialects of Asia Minor.²

The Kıpçaks might have appeared in Asia Minor as early as in the eleventh century, during the great Seljuk conquests, as the Oghuz confederation, a springboard of the Seljuks, initially included some Kıpçak

¹ F. Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri, Boy Teşkilatı, Destanları*, İstanbul 1992.

² Z. Korkmaz, "Die Frage des Verhältnisses der anatolischen Mundarten zu ihrer ethnischen Struktur" in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols (Ankara, 1995), ii, p. 188; *eadem*, "Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu", in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 179; B. Brendemoen, "Greek and Turkish language encounters in Anatolia", in *Language Encounters Across Time and Space*, eds. B. Brendemoen, E. Lanza, E. Ryen (Oslo, 1999), p. 238; Э.А. Грунина, [Параграф 2.7.0] "Диалекты", in А.Н. Кононов "Турецкий язык", in *Языки мира. Тюркские языки*, под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой, В.М. Солнцева, Н.И. Толстого (Moscow, 1997), p. 410-411; *eadem, Историческая грамматика турецкого языка* (Moscow, 1991), pp. 170-171.

tribes.³ Of all the Turkish dialects, the vernacular of the former Byzantine province of Paphlagonia on the Black Sea shore from Bendereği to Samsun, was under the Kıpçak influence. The most notorious were the dialects of Bartın⁴ (Parthenia⁵) and, to the lesser extent, the dialect of Kastamonu.⁶

The modern dialect of Kastamonu has clear Kıpçak features.⁷ These are:

1) vocalization k- → g-: *garşısında* instead of *karşısında* (“the opposite one”), *galbur* instead of *kalbur* (“a sieve”);

2) transformation -ğ- → -v-: *bovurmak* instead of *bağurmak* (“to cry”), *çuvurmak* instead of *çağurmak* (“to call”);

3) transformation -ñ → -y (in affixes): *padişahiy* (Gen.) instead of *padişahin* (“of a padishah, padishah’s”), *napacasay* instead of *ne yapacaksan* (“what [will] you like to do”).⁸

4) in grammar, the progressive verb form is *-a (-la)*, corresponding to the *-jor* of literature Turkish. Thus, *geliya* goes instead of *geliyor*, and *çuvuryala* substitutes *çağırıyorlar*.⁹

The form *-a (-la)* is most likely identical to the Turkmen Present Progressive, which, contrary to the Turkish form *-jor*, has a wide vowel: the Turkmen *gelyar* corresponds to the Turkish *geliyor*.¹⁰ The vocalization k- → g- should be attributed to the common Oghuz stratum, as the phonetic change takes place in a majority of the Turkish dialects of Anatolia.¹¹ Far more interesting are the transitions -ñ → -y and -ğ- → -v- as these can be explained by Kıpçak influence¹². Where were these early evidences of this Kipchak influence first apparent? Was it in Central Asia, where the Oghuz and the

³ Э.А. Грунина, “Огузский язык”, in *Языки мира. Тюркские языки*, p. 89.

⁴ Z. Korkmaz, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızları Üzerine”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 129-133; *eadem*, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 162-164, 170-174, 177-178; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızları Üzerindeki Araştırmaların Bugünkü Durumu ve Karşılaştığı Sorunlar”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 206; *eadem*, “Anatolian dialects”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 258.

⁵ K. Belke, *Paphlagonien und Honorias* [Tabula Imperii Byzantini, 9] (Vienna, 1996), pp. 258-259.

⁶ Д.А. Коробейников, *Северная Анатолия в XI-XV вв.: наследие Византии в эпоху тюркских завоеваний* [PhD dissertation] (Moscow, 1997), pp. 550-554.

⁷ А.П. Векилов, *Турецкая диалектология* (Leningrad, 1973), i, p. 81, text N 42.

⁸ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, p. 20

⁹ Векилов, *Турецкая диалектология*, p. 81.

¹⁰ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, p. 158.

¹¹ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, p. 25.

¹² Korkmaz, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses”, p. 188; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, p. 179; *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker. Protokollband der XII. Tagung der Permanent International Altaistic Conference 1969 in Berlin*, eds. G. Hazai and P. Zieme [Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, Band 5] (Berlin, 1974), p. 341.

Kıpçak still formed a unity in the tenth century, and whose common tribal remains might have survived in Paphlagonia, after so many migrations? Or can one suggest the influence from across the Black Sea, the Crimea and the Dasht-i Kıpçak, inhabited by the Cumans, or western Kıpçaks, from the eleventh century onwards?

According to Korkmaz, the tribes of Kayı, Kınık, Avşar, Salur, Çepni, Bayındır, Bayat, Alayuntlu and Eymir formed the core of the Oghuz dialects in Asia Minor.¹³ However, she focuses only on the Kınık, the Avşar, and the Salur. Meanwhile, of these nine tribes, the Kayı, the Bayat, the Alayuntlu and the Çepni settled in Western Pontus and Paphlagonia,¹⁴ but, save the studies of Bryer on the Çepni,¹⁵ little is known about the others. In reality, the picture of the Oguz migrations and settlements was much more complex. The tribes, or more precisely the small nucleotides of the tribes, might have formed or influenced local dialects, but, as the toponymy of Asia Minor suggests, no single tribal unity survived after the great Turkic migrations of the Grand Seljukid era. What we have is a chaotic mosaic of the dispersed tribes. For example, the Salur was scattered across Asia Minor and its traces can be found in southern Anatolia, namely in Koçhisar, Konya and Niğde. Can we speak of the Salur ‘entity’ from Koçhisar to Niğde? The correct answer is ‘no’ as the same tribe was also attested in northern parts of the peninsula, in particular in Küre near Kastamonu, Çankırı, Sinop and Bolu.¹⁶ If we look at the toponymic picture of Anatolia, we discover that no fewer than five tribal names of the nine most influential tribes can be found in Paphlagonia. This alone points to the high density of the Turkish settlements there, and can be confirmed by the evidence of the Byzantine historian Nikephoros Gregoras (d. between 1358 and 1361). Gregoras mentioned two former Byzantine provinces, Paphlagonia and Pamphylia, as Turkish melting-pots that served as springboards for the Turkish conquests of Byzantine Asia Minor at the end of the thirteenth and the

¹³ Korkmaz, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses”, p. 191; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, p. 182.

¹⁴ Korkmaz, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses”, pp. 190-198; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, pp. 182-187; *eadem*, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, pp. 175-178.

¹⁵ A. A. M. Bryer, “Greeks and Türkmens: the Pontic Exception”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975), pp. 125, 132-133, reprinted in *ibidem*, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos* [Variorum Reprints Series] (London, 1980), article V; A. A. M. Bryer and D. Winfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*, 2 vols. (Washington DC, 1985), i, pp. 140-141.

¹⁶ Korkmaz, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses”, pp. 195-197; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, pp. 185-186; *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker*, pp. 349-350.

beginning of the fourteenth century.¹⁷ Ibn Sa'īd and Abū al-Fidā' likewise suggested large numbers of the Turks in Paphlagonia in the 1280s and the 1320s respectively.¹⁸ The validity of these statements can be attested by the overall ethnic picture. By nature, a melting-pot should have offered little chances for the continuing existence of the Greek population, and indeed Paphlagonia is one of the few places where the native Anatolian Greeks, the descendants of the conquered Byzantines, did not survive. Even the detailed cadastral surveys of the late Ottoman period did not mention them. The nineteenth century census of the *vilayet* of Kastamonu listed 992,679 Muslims and only 21,507 Christians, of whom the Greeks were just a majority. To compare the drastic proportion, one should mention Nikomedeia (İzmit), conquered by the Ottomans in 1337. According to the same census, the city had 129,715 Muslims and 40,795 Christians, most of whom were quite predictably the Greeks.¹⁹ One may suggest continuous infiltration of the Greek population from the Balkans who settled in İzmit during the long centuries of Ottoman rule but the geographical picture of the extant Greek dialects does not confirm this. Richard Dawkins, who made a survey of the Greek dialects of Asia Minor before the First World War, had noticed an obscure vernacular in Bithynia which was of Anatolian, and not Balkan, ancestry. The vernacular, akin to the autochthonous Greek speech of Cappadocia, was spoken in the villages Herakleion/Iraklion (Gürekli), Demirtaş, Abuliond and Başköy near Bursa.²⁰ Not the least trace of such dialects can be found in Kastamonu and Sinop. Here, in comparison with other Anatolian provinces, the Greeks formed the smallest proportion of the population. Even the large territory of the Pontic Greeks to the east did not contribute to the Greek population of Paphlagonia.

Given the number of Oghuz tribal names that have survived in the Paphlagonian toponymic map, the melting-pot should predictably be described as Oghuz. From this point of view, the survival of the Kıpçak features in the local dialects can hardly be explained by the common Oghuz-Kıpçak ancestry.

¹⁷ Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, eds. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1829-1855), i, pp. 137-138; P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jahrhundert* (İstanbul, 1934), pp. 17-18; D. A. Korobeinikov, "The Revolt in Kastamonu, c. 1291-1293", *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 28 (2004), pp. 115-117.

¹⁸ Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsa ibn Sa'īd al-Maghribī, *Kitāb al-Juḡhrāfiyā* (Beirut, 1970), pp. 185-186; *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, ed. M. Reinaud (Paris, 1840), p. 393.

¹⁹ S. Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971), p. 447.

²⁰ R. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1916), p. 37; D.A. Korobeinikov, "How 'Byzantine' were the early Ottomans? Bithynia in ca. 1290-1450", in *Османский мир и османистика. Сборник статей к 100-летию со дня рождения А.С. Тверитиновой (1910-1973)*, изд. И.В. Зайцев и С.Ф. Орешкова (Moscow, 2010), pp. 215-216.

On the other hand, the Kıpçak forms can be attested before the Ottoman conquests and thus cannot be explained by the means of the later ethnic migrations in the Ottoman Empire. There is a commentary on the Koran which was composed in Sinop during the reign of ‘Abū al-Faṭḥ Isfandiyār’, which means Mubārīz al-Dīn Isfandiyār (1391-1440), son of Bayazid Kötürüm (1361-1385) Candaroğlu, the *bey* of Sinop and Kastamonu.²¹ The commentary has the diacritical marks, which allow restoration of the vernacular. The contractions (e.g. *n’oldı* instead of *ne oldı*, نولدى²²) suggest that the text reproduced the spelling, rather than the written, forms. However, the grammatical forms of the commentary are antiquarian even for a Turkish vernacular of the fifteenth century. Let me list the most important elements:

1) The Future tense *-IsAr*: *alısar* – “he will (certainly) take”, *gideser* (گدسر) – “he will (certainly) come”.²³ This (i.e. the form of the future tense) was frequently used in the Kıpçak documents of the Golden Horde. In the fifteenth or sixteenth century the form was extinct and survived only in isolated local communities, such as the Armeno-Kıpçaks of Lviv and Western Ukraine of the sixteenth century.²⁴

2) The Future Participle *-AsI*: *gelesi zamanda* (گلسی زمانده) – “in the moment which will come; in the future”.²⁵ The form was seldom in use in the Oghuz dialects of Turkey but was common in Turkmen and Azeri.²⁶

3) The Aorist, first person singular, had the form *-Am*: *ederem* (ادرم) – “I will be”; *varuram* (واررم) – “I go (I will go)”.²⁷ The form was attested in eastern Anatolia, and is still in use in Azeri.²⁸

Overall, even the incomplete analysis of the commentary shows the presence of eastern Oghuz (Turkmen) and Kıpçak traces in the dialect of Kastamonu in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. As the similar features, also both Kıpçak and Turkmen, can be found in the modern dialect of Kastamonu, one should suggest the early date of the emergence of the vernacular that continues to exist nowadays, obviously only lightly touched by the later migrations under the Ottomans. The future tense *-IsAr* might have pointed to the possible *terminus a quo* – the thirteenth century when the form

²¹ C. Huart, “Un commentaire du Qorân en dialecte turc de Qastamoûni (XV^{ème} siècle)”, *Journal Asiatique* 18, XIe série (1921), pp. 180-181.

²² *idem*, p. 180.

²³ *idem*, p. 181.

²⁴ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, pp. 170-171.

²⁵ Huart, “Un commentaire du Qorân”, p. 182.

²⁶ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, pp. 134-135.

²⁷ Huart, “Un commentaire du Qorân”, p. 181.

²⁸ Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка*, p. 165.

was common in the Golden Horde. So the roots of the Kıpçak influence in Paphlagonia can be traced back to the pre-Ottoman period.

Kastamonu was conquered by the Seljuks circa 1143.²⁹ The conquest divided Paphlagonia. Its Byzantine part, with the cities of Amastris and Herakleia Pontike, enjoyed remarkable longevity: while the bulk of the remaining Byzantine possessions in the peninsula had been lost by 1307, Herakleia Pontike (Bendereğli) was surrendered to the Turks (who were not the Ottomans) only on 4 July 1360.³⁰ It seems that Amastris (and Bartın nearby) ceased to have been Byzantine at approximately the same time.³¹ However, the city, no longer Byzantine, did not turn Turkish, as sometime between 1374 and 1378 the Genoese established their trade colony in Amastris, which they called Samastro, according to the *Massaria di Caffa* (1381). The Genoese colony might have existed before 1363, as there is a Genoese inscription found in Amastris, which bears the coat of arms of the Doge Simone Boccanegra, whose years of office were 1339-1344 and 1356-1363.³² This suggests that the city, *de jure* under a local Turkish emir,³³ was *de facto* Genoese from 1360 to 1459.

The Kıpçak traces in the Turkish dialects of Paphlagonia were attested in both the Byzantine and the Seljuk part of the province – in Bartın, so close to the Byzantine and then Genoese Amastris, and Kastamonu. The differences between the two parts of the province must have outlived both Byzantium and the Seljuk sultanate of Rūm as both states had disappeared from the political

²⁹ Korobeinikov, “The Revolt in Kastamonu, c. 1291-1293”, pp. 90-94.

³⁰ Belke, *Paphlagonien und Honorias*, p. 211; S. P. Lampros, Ἐνθουμήσεων ἤτοι χρονικῶν σημειωμάτων συλλογή πρώτη, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημίων* 7 (1910), p. 143, § 66.

³¹ Belke, *Paphlagonien und Honorias*, p. 163.

³² M. Balard, *La Romanie Génoise (XII^e – début du XV^e siècle)*, 2 vols (Rome and Genoa, 1978), i, p. 130. Cf. С.П. Карпов, *Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII-XV вв.: проблемы торговли* (Moscow, 1990), pp. 71-72. Карпов prefers 1378 as the date of the foundation of the Genoese trade factory in Amastris.

³³ Клавихо Рюи Гонсалес (Clavijo Ruy Gonzales), *Дневник путешествия ко двору Тимура в Самарканде в 1403-1406 гг.* (*Itinéraire de l'Ambassade Espagnole à Samarkande en 1403-1406*), изд. И.И. Срезневский [Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности РАН, Т. 28] (Sankt-Petersburg, 1881), p. 109. The evidence of Chalcocondylas and the chronicle of Pseudo-Sphrantzes (attributed to Macarios Melissenos, d. 1585) concerning a certain Amastris in Colchis and the tribe of the Çepni nearby cannot be applied to our Amastris in Paphlagonia. The Çepni had their pastures in the eastern part of the Pontos, and the ‘Colchis Amastris’ was taken by the Sultan Bayazid I Yıldırım (1389-1402) in circa 1400 during his campaign in Eastern Anatolia. Laonicus Chalcocondylas, *Historiarum demonstrationes*, ed. E. Darcó, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1922-1927), ii, p. 59; Georgios Sphrantzes, *Memorii 1401-1477. În anexă Pseudo-Phrantzes: Macarie Melissenos, Cronica 1258-1481*, ed. V. Grecu (Bucharest, 1966), pp. 220-222; Коробейников, *Северная Анатолия в XI-XV вв.*, pp. 562, 565-566, 572-578; *idem*, “Восточные источники Лаоника Халкокондила. Эпизод 1: Походы Баязида I Йылдырыма в Малой Азии”, in *Византийские Очерки* (Moscow, 1996), p. 152-168.

map of Asia Minor by the beginning of the fourteenth century. These dialects were not identical. According to Korkmaz, the Turkmen ‘stratum’ in the dialect of Bartın was caused by the later migrations from Kastamonu. This means that the Kıpçak influence over Bartın preceded the Turkmen one.³⁴ The historical data confirms Korkmaz’s linguistic conclusions.

In the autumn of 1459 the army and navy of Sultan Mehmed II Fâtih (1444-1446; 1451-1481) forced Amastris to surrender.³⁵ A majority of the city-dwellers were sent to Istanbul, to settle among the already numerous Christian population of the capital city. Amastris was re-peopled by the Turks from the depth of Paphlagonia, in particular Eflâni.³⁶ As we have seen, these Turks spoke the vernacular influenced by Turkmen; and their ethnic migration can perfectly explain the presence of the Turkmen features in the dialect of modern Bartın.

It is unlikely that the ‘Turkmen’ population of Kastamonu moved to Bartın before 1459. Otherwise the Genoese documents would mention the newcomers. Moreover, there is a Latin manuscript from Munich, dated to the beginning of the fifteenth century, which was entitled “The lands of the present Greeks and their spiritual and secular possessions” (“*Terre hodierna Grecorum et dominia secularia et spiritualia ipsorum*”). According to the manuscript, the city-dwellers of Amastris spoke Greek and “Tatar, like in Caffa”; the characters of both languages they used in writing were however Greek: “*Tamen locuntur grecum et thartarescum, sicut in Capha, litteras*

³⁴ Korkmaz, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, p. 177.

³⁵ Ibn Kemal, *Tevârih-i âl-i Osman: VII Defter (Tenkidli transkripsiyon)*, ed. Ş. Turan (Ankara, 1957), p. 177-179; Mehmed Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ (Neşri Tarihi)*, eds. F. R. Unat and M.A. Köymen, 2 vols (Ankara, 1987), ii, p. 738-741; Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, eds. H. İnalçık and R. Murphey (Minneapolis, Chicago, 1978), pp. 44-45. All the Ottoman sources mention AH 863 (8 November 1458 – 27 October 1459) or AH 864 (28 October 1459 – 16 October 1460) as the date when Amastris was taken by Mehmed II Fâtih. The correct date (September 1459) can be found in the short Byzantine chronicle: E. Mioni, “Una inedita cronaca bizantina (dal. Marc. gr. 595)”, *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi* 1 (1981), p. 77, § 59; Карпов, *Итальянские морские республики*, p. 76; *idem*, *История Трапезундской империи* (Sankt-Petersburg, 2007), p. 431. Other Greek chronicles suggest that Amastris fell between September 1460 and the summer of 1461: *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, ed. P. Schreiner, 3 vols (Vienna, 1975-1979), i, pp. 476 (16), 536 (46), 581 (12).

³⁶ Chalcocondylas, *Historiarum demonstrationes*, ii, pp. 217-218; Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, ii, pp. 740-741; *Die altosmanische Chronik des Âşikpâşâzâde*, ed. F. Giese (Leipzig, 1928, reprint: Osnabrück, 1972), pp. 146-147; Critobuli Imbriotae *Historiae*, ed. D.R. Reinsch (Berlin and New York, 1983), p. 131; G.T. Zoras, *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων κατὰ τὸν Βαρβαρίνον ἐλληνικὸν κώδικα 111* (Athens, 1957), p. 103.

greca habentes".³⁷ The term 'Tatar' in the fifteenth century doubtlessly meant 'the descendants of the Cumans', as was attested in the *Codex Cumanicus*. In the first part of the *Codex*, composed circa 1294, and copied by 11 June 1303, the Kıpçak language was labeled as *comanicum* or *chomanico*. The second part of the *Codex* named the same language as the *tatar til*.³⁸ The comparison with Caffa evidently alluded to its population which was largely Tatar before the Ottoman conquest 6 June 1475.³⁹ West of Caffa, there was the city of Soghdāq (Sougdaia, Soldaia, Sourozh, Sudak) whose Tatar population likewise used the Greek characters, as was attested by the Greek *Synaxarion of Sougdaia*, which contained so many Kıpçak names.⁴⁰

All the data suggested a Kıpçak settlement in the Byzantine part of Paphlagonia. It is unlikely that the settlement appeared before the thirteenth century and that these Kıpçaks came from the Sultanate of Rūm. The mountainous terrain of Paphlagonia hardly allowed any massive migration from the east. More likely, the Kıpçak of Amastris, who employed Greek characters and were thus hardly Muslims, might have been settled by the Byzantines. If so, the migration took place during the reign of John III Batatzes (1221-1254) in 1237, when a Kıpçak horde, which was pursued by the Mongols (who had just conquered Volga Bulgaria⁴¹), crossed the Danube and entered Thrace. They devastated the lands along the Hebrus (Evros, Maritsa).⁴² John III managed to convince them to enter Byzantine service. He

³⁷ N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des Croisades au XV-e siècle. IV-ème série (1453-1476)* (Bucharest, 1915), p. 34; Карпов, *Итальянские морские республики*, p. 71.

³⁸ *Codex Cumanicus*, MS Marc. lat. 549, Fondo antico, Coll. 1597, fol. 1 (1.5), 35v (1.2), 61v (1.25), 81v (1.32); *Codex Cumanicus*, Ed. G. Kuun, with the prolegomena by L. Ligeti (Budapest, 1981), pp. 1, 77, 160, 229 (pp. 1, 69, 122, 162); А.Н. Гаркавец, *Кыпчакские языки: куманский и армяно-кыпчакский* (Алма-Ата, 1987), pp. 14-18.

³⁹ Л.А. Пономарев, "Территория и население генуэзской Каффы по данным бухгалтерской книги - массарии казначейства за 1381-1382 гг.," in *Причерноморье в Средние века* (Moscow, Sankt-Petersburg, 2000), pp. 317-443.

⁴⁰ M. Nystazopoulou, *Ἡ ἐν τῇ Ταυρικῇ Χερσονήσῳ πόλις Σουγδαία* (Athens, 1965), pp. 119-137; I. Vásáry, "Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries", *Central Asiatic Journal* 32 (1988), pp. 266-271.

⁴¹ The Mongols had conquered Volga Bulgaria by the end of AH 634, which was 23 August 1237: Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. M. Rawshan, M. Mūsawī, 4 vols (Tehrān, h.sh. 1373 / 1994), i, p. 668; Rashududdin Fazlullah, *Jami'u't-tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles*, trans. W.M. Thackston, 3 vols (Harvard, 1998-1999), ii, pp. 326-327; Рашид ад-Дин, *Сборник летописей*, пер. А.К. Арендса, Л.А. Хетагурова, О.И. Смирновой, Ю.П. Верховского, 3 vols (Moscow and Leningrad, 1946-1960), ii, pp. 37-38.

⁴² Georgius Acropolites, *Opera*, eds. A. Heisenberg and P. Wirth, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1978), i, pp. 53-54; Георгий Акрополит, *История*, пер. П.И. Жаворонкова (Sankt-Petersburg, 2005), p. 72; George Akropolites, *The History*, trans. R. Macrides (Oxford, 2007), pp. 199-200; I. Vásáry, *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental military in the pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185-1365* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 63-64, 67.

then settled them in Thrace and Macedonia, but a considerable number of those Kıpçaks also received lands in Asia Minor, in particular in Phrygia and along the Maeander (Büyük Menderes) circa 1242.⁴³ It seems that the Kıpçaks settled more extensively as their presence was attested in the environs of Smyrna and the *theme* of Thrakesion.⁴⁴ The Kıpçaks of Amastris might have been part of that *exodus* of 1237-1242. The Greek authors mentioned no other Kıpçak migrations to the Byzantine Asia Minor.

As to the Kıpçaks of Kastamonu, we are faced with the same problem as with the Kıpçaks of Amastris. Despite Kastamonu's location on Seljuk territory and its relatively easy connections with the chief Seljuk centres, the Kıpçaks of Kastamonu seemingly did not come from Central Asia. After the death of the last Kh^wārazm-shāh Jalāl al-Dīn Mankburnı (1220-1231) the commanders of what remained of his army under Ḥusām al-Dīn Kır-khān took service under the Sultan of Rūm 'Alā' al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I (1219-1237). He granted them a large administrative *iqṭā'*. Kır-khān received Erzincan, his deputy Barakat-khān got Amasya, other commanders Kushlū (Küçlü) Senggum and Yılān Nūghū were appointed to Laranda and Niğde respectively.⁴⁵ All those centers (Erzincan, Amasya, Laranda/Larende and Niğde) were distant from Kastamonu. Kay-Qubād I's successor, Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II (1237-1245) expelled the Kh^wārazmians to Syria (where they were finally defeated by the Ayyūbides in 1246),⁴⁶ but he soon changed his policy and invited them to return.⁴⁷ Despite the Sultan's bad faith, some Kh^wārazmian Kıpçaks indeed returned, and the Kıpçak elite troops and mercenaries (*mafārida wa ijrā'-i kh^wār*), 'who had come back from Syria' (...*Qıfjāq ki az ṭaraf-i Shām rūy ba-dīn mamālik nihāda būdand*), were mentioned in 1249.⁴⁸ But we do not know where these Kıpçaks were settled.

⁴³ Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, i, pp. 36-37; A. Savvides, Οἱ Κομάνοι (Κομάνοι) καὶ τὸ Βυζάντιο (11^{ος} – 13^{ος} αἰ. μ.Χ.), *Byzantina* 13 (1985), pp. 949-954.

⁴⁴ Д.А. Коробейников, "Кыпчаки на восточных границах Никейской (Византийской) империи в XIII в.," in *ПОЛЕМОЛОГОС. Сборник статей памяти профессора В.В. Кучмы*, сост. Н.Д. Барабанов (Volgograd, 2012), pp. 343-358.

⁴⁵ Ibn Bībī, *Histoire des Seldjoucides d'Asie Mineure, d'après l'abrégé du Seldjouknāmeḥ d'Ibn-Bībī: texte persan*, ed. M.T. Houtsma [Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides, iv] (Leiden, 1902), pp. 190-192; H.W. Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 183-184; Ibn-i Bībī, *El-Evāmīrū'l-'Alā'īyye fī'l-umūri'l-'Alā'īyye*, önsöz ve fihristi hazırlayan A.S. Erzi (Ankara, 1956), pp. 433-436.

⁴⁶ Ibn Bībī, *Histoire des Seldjoucides*, pp. 209-211; Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī*, pp. 201-202.

⁴⁷ Ibn Bībī, *Histoire des Seldjoucides*, pp. 220-221; Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī*, pp. 211-212.

⁴⁸ Ibn Bībī, *Histoire des Seldjoucides*, p. 264; Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī*, p. 338; Ibn-i Bībī, *El-Evāmīrū'l-'Alā'īyye*, p. 584.

The only primary source which mentioned the Crimea as a springboard for the Kıpçak immigration to Paphlagonia was the Ottoman translation of the chronicle of Ibn Bībī by Yazıcıoğlu Ali (Yāzījīoġhlū ‘Alī), or Yazıcızāde Ali, which he made for Sultan Murad II (1421-1451). The translation was by no means an exact reproduction in Ottoman Turkish of the difficult Persian text of Ibn Bībī. On the contrary, it included much additional data. One of those additions was the encomium which described the *amīr* Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban, the eponymous Seljuk military commander under the Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I, who attacked the Crimea and conquered Soghdāq sometime in 1221-1222, 1225 or 1227.⁴⁹ The text of Yazıcıoğlu Ali reads:

“Then there was the *beylerbeyi* of the right wing⁵⁰ Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban (let Allah have mercy upon him!) who was from the Kayı [tribe]. There was no *bey* greater and mightier, [who had so many] *nökers*... From all the four sides of the world the sages, poets, artists, heroes (*alp*), *bahādurs* and *yigits* came to his palace (lit. – ‘Porte’, *kapu*), hoping for his generosity and gifts. His benefices and grants were [equally] distributed among the noble and the profane [people]. He gathered the mighty *yigits* (warriors) from the [tribes of] Kayı and Bayat together with the Kıpçak slaves, and he ordered them to study (*t’alim etirirdi*) martial arts. Begging the Lord, he sent them to the holy war (*ghāzā*). He himself constantly led the *ghāzā* war in the boundary zone (*uc*). Every year he sent as alms all [the booty] from the *dār al-ḥarb*⁵¹ to Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, to the descendants of ‘Alī (*sādāt*),⁵² the Sufis (*mutaşawwifa*) and the *mujāwirs*⁵³. Until recently his descendants, whose

⁴⁹ A.C.S. Peacock, “The Saljūq Campaign against the Crimea and the Expansionist Policy of the Early Reign of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 16/2, Series 3 (2006), pp. 133-149.

⁵⁰ Here, Yazıcıoğlu Ali meant the traditional division between the right and the left wings of the Turcic tribes’ army. As the Seljuks came to Asia Minor from the eastern direction, the right wing meant the armies of the northern territories of the Sultanate, with Paphlagonia as its center.

⁵¹ The *dār al-ḥarb* was the land of war, where the laws of Islam were prohibited and which was to be conquered. As such, the term meant the lands beyond the *dār al-ṣulḥ*, the land of truce, where the non-Islamic communities and states signed an agreement with the Muslim community, and the *dār al-Islām*, the land of Islam. A. Abel, “Dār al-Ḥarb”, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, 11 vols., (Leiden, London, 1960-2002), ii, p. 126; *idem*, “Dār al-Islām”, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ii, pp. 127-128; *Ислам. Энциклопедический словарь*, под ред. С.М. Прозорова (Moscow, 1991), p. 56.

⁵² The *sādāt* were the descendants of the fourth Righteous Caliph ‘Alī (656-661) from all his wives save Fāṭimah bint Muḥammad, the daughter of the Prophet. J.W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon, Shewing in English the Significations of the Turkish Terms* (Constantinople, 1890, reprinted Istanbul, 2006), p. 1026.

⁵³ “Those incessantly praying, who live near a mosque or a prophet’s shrine”: D.Kélékian, *Dictionnaire turc-français* (Constantinople, 1911), s.v. *mujāwir*; Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, p. 1745.

beylik was Kastamonu, followed the great ways of their forefathers and [likewise] showed benevolence (*iltizām*)⁵⁴.

The description of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban-bey as a pious Muslim ruler had some important statements. First, it connected the genealogy of Çoban-bey with the Ottomans via the tribe of Kayı. Secondly, Yazıcıoğlu Ali is very precise in what he is saying about the ethnic situation in Paphlagonia. Here, he fully supported the modern scholars' suggestion that the population of Kastamonu had strong Oghuz/Turkmen (the Kayı and Bayat in Yazıcıoğlu Ali) and Kıpçak strata. However, according to Yazıcıoğlu Ali, those Kıpçaks were the slaves captured in the Crimea during the victorious campaign of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban-bey. We do not know how massive was the Kıpçak migration to Seljuk Paphlagonia, but two observations are in order. First, the Kıpçak slave trade, so extensive in the second half of the thirteenth century, sustained the growth of the Mamluk military power in Egypt. Should this trade have also influenced Paphlagonia, whose ports were located at the shortest distance to the Crimea? Secondly, the text of Yazıcıoğlu Ali per se lacks historical preciseness. As an Ottoman courtier of the fifteenth century, he might have known of the origin of the Kıpçak population in Paphlagonia, as the ethnic differences were more apparent in his day. It would however be a mistake to think that those Kıpçaks of Kastamonu, so numerous as they influenced the dialect of the whole province, came from the Crimea just after the campaign of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban-bey. They undoubtedly settled more extensively during the larger time-span of the thirteenth and the fourteenth century.

⁵⁴ *Histoire des Seldjoucides d'Asie Mineure d'après Ibn-Bībī: texte turc*, ed. M.Th.Houtsma [Recueil des textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides, iii] (Leiden, 1902), pp. 320-321; Yazıcızâde Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk (Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Tarihi)*, ed. A. Bakır (Istanbul, 2009), pp. 443-444.

REFERENCES

- ABEL, A., “Dār al-Ḥarb”, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, 11 Vols, (Leiden, London, 1960-2002), ii, p. 126.
- , “Dār al-Islām”, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ii, pp. 127-128.
- ACROPOLITES, Georgius, *Opera*, eds. A. Heisenberg and P. Wirth, 2 Vols (Stuttgart, 1978), I.
- АКРОПОЛИТ, Георгий, *История*, пер. П.И. Жаворонкова (Sankt-Petersburg, 2005).
- AKROPOLITES, George, *The History*, trans. R. Macrides (Oxford, 2007).
- BALARD, M., *La Romanie Génoise (XII^e – début du XV^e siècle)*, 2 Vols (Rome and Genoa, 1978), I.
- BELKE, K., *Paphlagonien und Honorias* [Tabula Imperii Byzantini, 9] (Vienna, 1996).
- BRENDEMOEN, B., “Greek and Turkish language encounters in Anatolia”, in *Language Encounters Across Time and Space*, eds. B. Brendemoen, E. Lanza, E. Ryen (Oslo, 1999), pp. 353-378.
- BRYER, A. A. M., “Greeks and Türkmens: the Pontic Exception”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975), pp. 113 – 149, reprinted in *ibidem*, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos* [Variorum Reprints Series] (London, 1980), article V; A. A. M. Bryer and D. Winfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*, 2 Vols. (Washington DC, 1985).
- CHALCOCONDYLAS, Laonicus, *Historiarum demonstrationes*, ed. E. Darcó, 2 Vols. (Budapest, 1922-1927), II.
- Codex Cumanicus*, MS Marc. lat. 549, Fondo antico, Coll. 1597, fol. 1 (l.5), 35v (l.2), 61v (l.25), 81v (l.32).
- Codex Cumanicus*, Ed. G. Kuun, with the prolegomena by L. Ligeti (Budapest, 1981), pp. 1, 77, 160, 229 (pp. 1, 69, 122, 162).
- Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. D. R. Reinsch (Berlin and New York, 1983).
- DAWKINS, R., *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1916).
- Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, ed. P. Schreiner, 3 Vols (Vienna, 1975-1979), i, pp. 476 (16), 536 (46), 581 (12).
- Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Āṣīkṗāšāzāde*, ed. F. Giese (Leipzig, 1928, reprint: Osnabrück, 1972).
- DUDA, H.W., *Die Seltshukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī* (Copenhagen, 1959).
- ГАРКАБЕЦ, А. Н., *Кыпчакские языки: куманский и армяно-кыпчакский* (Алма-Ата, 1987).
- Géographie d'Aboulféda*, ed. M. Reinaud (Paris. 1840).
- GREGORAS Nicephorus, *Historia Byzantina*, eds. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, 3 Vols. (Bonn, 1829-1855), I.
- ГРУНИНА, Э.А., [Параграф 2.7.0] “Диалекты”, in А.Н. Кононов “Турецкий язык”, in *Языки мира. Тюркские языки*, под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой, В.М. Солнцева, Н.И. Толстого (Moscow, 1997), pp. 394-411.

- , “Огузский язык”, in *Языки мира. Тюркские языки*, pp. 81-89.
- , *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка* (Moscow, 1991).
- Histoire des Seldjucides d'Asie Mineure d'après Ibn-Bîbî: texte turc*, ed. M.Th.Houtsma [Recueil des textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjucides, iii] (Leiden, 1902).
- HUART, C., “Un commentaire du Qorân en dialecte turc de Qastamoûni (XV^{ème} siècle)”, *Journal Asiatique* 18, XIe série (1921), pp. 161-216.
- IORGA, N., *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des Croisades au XV-e siècle. IV-ème série (1453-1476)* (Bucharest, 1915).
- Ibn BĪBĪ, *Histoire des Seldjucides d'Asie Mineure, d'après l'abrégé du Seldjouknāmeḥ d'Ibn-Bîbî: texte persan*, ed. M.T. Houtsma [Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjucides, iv] (Leiden, 1902).
- , *El-Evāmîrû'l-'Alā'iyye fî'l-umûri'l-'Alā'iyye*, [önsöz ve fihristi hazırlayan A.S. Erzi], (Ankara, 1956).
- Ibn KEMAL, *Tevâriḥ-i âl-i Osman: VII Defter (Tenkidli transkripsiyon)*, ed. Ş. Turan (Ankara, 1957).
- Ibn SA'ĪD al-MAGHRIBĪ, *Kitāb al-Jughrāfiyā* (Beirut, 1970).
- Ислам Энциклопедический словарь*, под ред. С.М. Прозорова (Moscow, 1991).
- КАРПОВ, С.П., *Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII-XV вв.: проблемы торговли* (Moscow, 1990).
- , *История Трапезундской империи* (Sankt-Petersburg, 2007).
- KÉLÉKIAN, D., *Dictionnaire turc-français* (Constantinople, 1911), s.v. *mujāwir*; Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*.
- КЛАВИХО, Рюи Гонсалес., (Clavijo Ruy Gonzales), *Дневник путешествия ко двору Тимура в Самарканде в 1403-1406 гг. (Itinéraire de l'Ambassade Espagnole à Samarkande en 1403-1406)*, изд. И.И. Срезневский [Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности РАН, Т. 28] (Sankt-Petersburg, 1881).
- KORKMAZ, Z., “Die Frage des Verhältnisses der anatolischen Mundarten zu ihrer ethnischen Struktur” in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 Vols (Ankara, 1995), ii, pp. 188-198.
- , “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 179-187.
- , “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızları Üzerine”, in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 128-149. -----, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 162-178.
- , “Anadolu Ağızları Üzerindeki Araştırmaların Bu Günkü Durumu ve Karşılaştığı Sorunlar”, in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 199-248.
- , “Anatolian dialects”, in *eadem, Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 249-273.
- КОРОБЕЙНИКОВ, Д.А., *Северная Анатолия в XI-XV вв.: наследие Византии в эпоху тюркских завоеваний* [PhD dissertation] (Moscow, 1997).

- , “Кыпчаки на восточных границах Никейской (Византийской) империи в XIII в.”, in *ΠΟΛΕΜΟΛΟΓΟΣ. Сборник статей памяти профессора В.В. Кучмы*, сост. Н.Д. Барабанов (Volgograd, 2012), pp. 343-358.
- KOROBENIKOV, D. A., “The Revolt in Kastamonu, c. 1291-1293”, *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 28 (2004), pp. 87-118.
- , “How ‘Byzantine’ were the early Ottomans? Bithynia in ca. 1290-1450”, in *Османский мир и османистика. Сборник статей к 100-летию со дня рождения А.С. Тверитиновой (1910-1973)*, изд. И.В. Зайцев и С.Ф. Орешкова (Moscow, 2010), pp. 215-239.
- LAMPROS, S. P., Ἐνθυμήσεων ἤτοι χρονικῶν σημειωμάτων συλλογή πρώτη, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημῶν* 7 (1910).
- MIONI, E., “Una inedita cronaca byzantina (dal. Marc. gr. 595)”, *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi* 1 (1981), pp. 71-87.
- NEŞRİ, Mehmed., *Kitāb-ı Cihān-nimā (Neşrī Tarihi)*, eds. F. R. Unat and M.A. Köymen, 2 Vols (Ankara, 1987), II.
- NYSTAZOPOULOU, M., *Ἡ ἐν τῇ Ταυρικῇ Χερσονήσῳ πόλις Σουγδαία* (Athens, 1965).
- PEACOCK, A.C.S., “The Saljūq Campaign against the Crimea and the Expansionist Policy of the Early Reign of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 16/2, Series 3 (2006), pp. 133-149.
- ПОНОМАРЕВ, Л.А., “Территория и население генуэзской Каффы по данным бухгалтерской книги - массарии казначейства за 1381-1382 гг.”, in *Причерноморье в Средние века* (Moscow, Sankt-Petersburg, 2000), pp. 317-443.
- RASHĪD al-DĪN, *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*, ed. M. Rawshan, M. Mūsawī, 4 Vols (Tehrān, h.sh. 1373 / 1994), I.
- RASHUDUDDIN, Fazlullah, *Jami’ u’ t-tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles*, trans. W.M. Thackston, 3 Vols (Harvard, 1998-1999), II.
- РАШИД АД-ДИН, *Сборник летописей*, пер. А.К. Арендса, Л.А. Хетагурова, О.И. Смирновой, Ю.П. Верховского, 3 Vols (Moscow and Leningrad, 1946-1960), II.
- REDHOUSE, J.W., *A Turkish and English Lexicon, Shewing in English the Significations of the Turkish Terms* (Constantinople, 1890, reprinted Istanbul, 2006).
- SAVVIDES A., Οἱ Κομάνοι (Κουμάνοι) καὶ τὸ Βυζάντιο (11^{ος} – 13^{ος} αἰ. μ.Χ.), *Byzantina* 13 (1985).
- SPHRANTZES, Georgios., *Memorii 1401-1477. În anexă Pseudo-Phrantzes: Macarie Melissenos, Cronica 1258-1481*, ed. V. Grecu (Bucharest, 1966).
- , “Восточные источники Лаоника Халкокондила. Эпизод 1: Походы Баязида I Йылдырыма в Малой Азии”, in *Византийские Очерки* (Moscow, 1996), pp. 152-168.
- Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker. Protokollband der XII. Tagung der Permanent International Altaistic Conference 1969 in Berlin*, eds. G. Hazai and P. Zieme [Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, Band 5] (Berlin, 1974).

- SÜMER, F., *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri, boy teşkilatı, destanları* (İstanbul, 1992).
- TURSUN BEG, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, eds. H. İnalçık and R. Murphey (Minneapolis, Chicago, 1978).
- WITTEK, P., *Das Fürstentum Mentesche. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jahrhundert* (İstanbul, 1934).
- VÁSÁRY, I., “Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries”, *Central Asiatic Journal* 32 (1988), pp. 260-271.
- , *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental military in the pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185-1365* (Cambridge, 2005).
- БЕКІЛІОВ, А.П., *Турецкая диалектология* (Leningrad, 1973), I.
- VRYONIS, S. Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971).
- YAZICIZADE Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk (Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Tarihi)*, ed. A. Bakır (Istanbul, 2009).
- ZORAS, G. T., *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων κατὰ τὸν Βαρβερῖνον ἑλληνικὸν κώδικα 111* (Athens, 1957).