Christianity among the Cumans

Roger Finch

1. The Origin of the Cumans

The question of where the Cumans originated has been the object of much study but a definitive answer to this cannot yet be given. The Cumans are known in Russian historical sources as Polovtsy and in Arabic sources generally as Kipchak (Qipchak), although the Arabic author al-Marwazi (writing about 1120) referred to them as Qûn, which corresponds to the Hungarian name for the Cumans, Kun. The Russian name for these people, Polovtsy < Slav. polovyi ‘pale; pale yellow’ is supposedly a translation of the name Quman in Turkic, but there is no word in any Turkic dialect with this meaning; the only word in Turkic which at all approximates this meaning and has a similar form is OT qum ‘sand’, but this seems more an instance of folk etymology than a likely derivation. There is a word kom in Kirghiz, kaum in Tatar, meaning ‘people’, but these are from Ar. ⲀAlexander qaum ‘fellow tribesmen; kinfolk; tribe, nation; people’. The most probable reflexes of the original word in Turkic dialects are Uig., Sag. kun ‘people’, OT kun ‘female slave’ and Sar. Uig. kun (~ kun) ‘slave; woman’ < *kūmūn (~ *qumun), cf. Mo. kūmūn, MMO. qu’un, Khal. xun ‘man; person; people’, and this is the most frequent meaning of ethnonyms in the majority of the world’s languages.

The Kipchaks have been identified as the remainder of the Türküt (or Türk) Empire, which was located in what is the present-day Mongolian Republic, and which collapsed in 740. There are inscriptions engraved on stone monuments, located mainly in the basin of the Orkhon River, in what has been termed Turkic ‘runic’ script; these inscriptions record events from the time the Türküt were in power and, in conjunction with information recorded in the Chinese annals of the time about them, we have a clearer idea of who these people were during the time their empire flourished than after its dissolution.

According to some historians, who maintain that the Kipchak and the Cumans were two distinct tribes, the Kipchak gradually migrated west and at first occupied the steppe between
the Ob and Irtysh Rivers in western Siberia, but they were pushed aside by the Cumans and forced to move on, one group entering the south Russian steppes and spreading along as far as the region between the Ural and Volga rivers north of the Caspian Sea, another group moving down toward the Syr Darya that flows from the southeast into the Aral Sea. It has also been surmised that the Cumans together with the Pechenegs are separate Kipchak tribes (or branches of the same Kipchak tribe). To the same Turkish ethnicity as the Kipchaks also belong the Uigurs, including altogether fifteen tribes, one of which was the Kun (or Qûn) and if the identification of the Kun as Cuman is correct, then the Kipchak and Cumans are distinctly different tribes, in spite of what Arabic sources would seem to indicate.

2. Westward Migration of the Cumans

By the end of the eleventh century the Cumans had rejoined the part of the Kipchak tribe who had settled in the south Russian steppes and it was these people who came to be known as ‘Cumans’, the westernmost group of a loosely associated tribal confederation, which in time came to extend from areas along the Danube River in Europe eastward to an ill-defined area in the Kazakh steppe and western Siberia. The Pechenegs, who preceded the Cumans in the general westward migration of these various Turkic tribes, had arrived in the Syr Darya region at some point early in the 8th century but were pushed out by the Oghuz Turk tribes later in that century and moved toward the same south Russian steppe area where the Kipchak were living. In time they exerted control over the area, but were swept aside in turn by the Cumans, who settled there and subjected neighboring Slavic principalities to constant raids and attacks.

The Cumans are often referred to in conjunction with other Turkic tribes, beside the Pechenegs, who inhabited the southern reaches of the Volga River, in particular the Bulgars, the Khazars, and the Oghurs (identified with the present-day Chuvash.) Our information regarding the political history of the Volga Bulgars comes almost exclusively from the annals of the various Rus’ principalities. In 985, the Rus’ under Vladimir I, in alliance with the Oghuz, raided Volga Bulgaria. The following year the Bulgars are reported to have sent emissaries to Vladimir enjoining him to embrace Islam, and to the neighbors of the Volga Bulgars these people had come to symbolize an Islamic state. The Bulgars must have been in this same region and in the area around the Sea of Azov as early perhaps as the 6th
century because by 679 one group of Bulgars had crossed into the northeastern Balkans and conquered the local Slavic population there. The name Khazar appears, in conjunction with the name Türk, as early as the Türk period (568–650) and by 630 they began to appear as a distinct group, at war with their neighbors, the Bulgars, which lasted until some time in the 670s. As for the Oghur tribes, their homeland was in western Siberia and the Kazakh steppes and their westward migration followed in the wake of the Huns; by about the middle of the fifth century they had settled in the steppes north of the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. First mention of the Cumans in western sources is in 1117, in an account of an attack by the Cumans against the Bulgars, under the leadership of their khan (ruler), Ayepa, who was the father-in-law of the leading Rus’ (Russian) prince of the north, Yuri Dolgorukii.

As for the Pechenegs, they were pushed both westward and south into the lands of Islam by the Cumans during the course of the 11th century. The growing enmity between the Byzantines and the Pechenegs led the former to an alliance with the Cumans who now controlled the Pontic steppes. In April 1091, a joint Byzantine-Cuman force dealt a disastrous defeat to the Pechenegs, and this broke much of the Pecheneg power. A last attempt on the Byzantine Balkans was repulsed (probably not with the help of the Cumans), again amidst great loss of life, and thereafter the Pechenegs faded from the pages of history as a distinct group, blending with and indistinguishable from other Turkic groups. According to the Arabic historian al-Bakri (d. 1094), the Pechenegs up to the year 1009/10 were “followers of the religion of the Magi,” which may indicate some Zoroastrian or Manichaean influences; or, in fact, it may even refer to a shamanistic cult.

3. Religious Conversions of Various Turkic Tribes

Of particular interest is the attitude of these various Turkic tribes toward religion. As they moved gradually westward and came in contact with sedentary populations of Eastern Europe and the Near and Middle East, they appear to have converted rather easily from their original animistic beliefs to various religions of their new neighbors, probably more in an effort to assimilate Western culture than due to any strong religious convictions.

The most notable example of this is perhaps that of the Khazars: in spite of welcoming the Christian missionary Constantine (or Cyril) sent by the Emperor in Constantinople in 851 to convert the people, the khan together with his court adopted Judaism as their official
religion instead, though there is no evidence that Judaism became the state religion of the Khazar nation; and not long afterward, around 965, they renounced this faith in favor of Islam.

The majority of the Turkic tribes who migrated to the west, however, adopted Islam, as they settled near neighboring Islamic countries to the south, although the Bulgars who were living along the Volga north of the Kipchaks were converted to Islam around 922 by Ibn Fadlan, who was sent there by the Khalif of Baghdad for that purpose. In 989 Prince Vladimir of Russia was converted to Christianity and this marked the institution of that religion as the official faith of the Russian people, as a whole. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the Chuvash, whose language is similar to that of the Bulgars, though nominally Christian, are in fact still Muslim, their religion preserving, however, some pagan (animistic) elements, or whether at least part of the population belong to the Russian Orthodox Church.

The other exception to the tendency of Turkic tribes migrating to the west to adopt Islam are the Cumans, certain groups of which became Christian. As the Cumans moved across the steppe they settled in five different areas: 1) the Central Asian-Kazakhstan region; 2) the Volga area; 3) the Don River region; 4) the Dnieper River region; and 5) the Danubian river region, and early Cuman settlements in Hungary date from probably around 1070.

The Cumans in time became masters of the entire southern Russian steppe zone. This empire collapsed suddenly, however, when in the winter of 1238-39, the Cumans were attacked by the Mongols ruled by Khan Batu and were soundly defeated. Following this event, part of the Cuman population, under Khan Küten, fled to Hungary, where the earlier Danubian Cuman groups had settled, and Küten sought refuge for himself and his people from the king of Hungary, offering to convert to Catholicism, a proposition which was received eagerly by the king, Andras. Early in the thirteenth century Hungary, with encouragement from the Pope, had become very interested in Cuman affairs. Already the diocese of Milkovia had been created in Moldavia, a historic region in present-day Rumania bordering on the Black Sea, the jurisdiction of which extended to the region where the Cumans had been living, and the Archbishop of Esztergom was named papal legate in ‘Cumania’ to follow up on earlier successes of Dominican monks in converting the Cumans to the east of Hungary.

Welcomed in this way to Hungary, the Cumans spread out along the Danube, but when
their khan was assassinated in 1241 by a group of Hungarians and Germans in concert, apparently alarmed by their rapid incursion into the country, they went on a rampage of burning and bloodshed equal to that which Europe had not experienced since the incursions of the Mongols. However, in time most of the Cumans remained in Hungary, not entirely assimilated culturally, but in separate ethnic communities. Converted to Catholicism and gradually adapting to the ways of their host country, these people have contributed their own racial characteristics to the complex make-up of the present-day Hungarian people.

The second conversion of Cuman people occurred during the following century in the land from which this refugee group under Khan Küten had fled. As a result of Italian commercial expansion on the north shore of the Black Sea during the 14th century and the evangelizing activities of Franciscan monks in this region among the Cuman Turks, at least a portion of the population was converted to Roman Catholicism. It even appears that these missionary activities were encouraged by Özbek, the khan of the Golden Horde himself, in spite of the fact that he had been converted to Islam, and in 1338 he made a gift of land in this area, designated to be used as a site for the building of a monastery.

4. The Codex Cumanicus

The Codex Cumanicus, a text preserved in a single manuscript in the Biblioteca Marciana (the library of the Cathedral of San Marco), is a work begun by certain Franciscan monks who followed in the wake of expansion of Italian commercial activities along the north shore of the Black Sea toward the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the following century, with the view to converting the Cuman Turks residing there to Christianity.

The Codex consists of two parts: two glossaries in Latin with equivalents in Persian (which was a lingua franca of the Near and Middle East at that time) and Cuman, the first glossary arranged according to subject and the second in alphabetic order; the second part is a translation of Christian texts, most of them part of the ecclesiastical liturgy (such as the Pater Noster and the Credo), in prose and in verse. The first part, the grammatical treatise, was written toward the end of the 13th century by Italian colonists, possibly in Crimea, as an introduction to the language of the people they were in trade with, and then recopied, in 1303, at the convent of St. John, located probably at Saray, on the Volga river, then copied again between 1330 and 1344. About ten years later certain Franciscan
monks from Germany added glosses in German to some of the words in the lists in the first part and composed the second part. This manuscript was acquired later by some Italian merchants who were residing in the area, and it eventually made its way to Venice. It is the sole extant copy of this work and, if it was the only copy the fact that it was available for purchase suggests that missionary activities had ceased in this area. There is a story that the manuscript at one point belonged to the famous Italian poet Petrarch (1304–1374), but there is no foundation to this story in fact.

A facsimile of the Codex Cumanicus was published in 1936 in Copenhagen under the direction of Kaare Grønbech, a Danish scholar of Turkish languages. The manuscript contains 82 folios (pages), written on both sides; the first part consists of 55 folios, the second part consists of 27 folios. The first part begins with the conjugation of the Latin verb audiō ‘to hear’ in Latin, followed by the corresponding forms in Persian and Cuman Turkish, and then a list of Latin verbs together with nouns derived from the same verbs (for example, auditus ‘hearing; sense of hearing’ from audiō) in alphabetic order; a list of adverbs; a table showing the declension of nouns and pronouns; and finally a list of nouns grouped according to category, such as terms pertaining to religion, colors, parts of the body, vegetables, and mammals. The second part begins with several pages listing words in Cuman with German glosses and this is followed by texts; these include not only prayers, sermons, and religious hymns (some with music notation of the ninth through fourteenth century, called ‘neums’), but also riddles, additional notes on the Cuman language, and short lists of other vocabulary occurring in the preceding prayers and hymns.

Following the publication of this facsimile, Grønbech published, in 1942, a dictionary listing all the words occurring in the Codex Cumanicus, with German definitions. Translations of some of the riddles and other texts in the Codex Cumanicus had already been published by Willy Bang and other scholars of the Turkic languages, between 1910 and 1930, but it was not until 1973 that a complete translation, in French, of all the texts in the second part of the manuscript, finally appeared.

5. Evidence of Christianity among 15th-Century Tatars

As a footnote to the history of this manuscript, it may be noted that a ‘Tatar’ version of the Pater Noster (Lord’s Prayer) was recorded in the account of the travels of Johann Schilt-
berger in Turkey and areas around the Black Sea between 1396 and 1427. Schiltberger, who was born in Bavaria in 1381, was taken prisoner in 1396 in the battle of Nicosia against the Ottoman Turks, and accompanied Suleiman, the eldest son of the sultan, Bayazet, back to Turkey, where he was employed as a personal attendant to the sultan, particularly in the capacity of ‘runner’ or messenger. According to one early annalist, Schiltberger was spared by Suleiman from the general massacre of prisoners on account of his good looks, but this is rather a fanciful interpretation on the part of the author because it is clearly asserted in Schiltberger’s account that none of the prisoners under twenty years of age was executed and he “was scarcely sixteen years old” (Tefler, p. 5).

Subsequently, upon the defeat of Bayazet by Timur at the battle of Ankara, July 20th, 1402, Schiltberger was again captured, together with the sultan himself, and it was while he was in the service of Timur that he was sent first through Armenia, Georgia, and through Samarkand to Persia and later, upon the death of Timur in 1405, he was dispatched by Shah Rukh, Timur’s son and successor, together with four other Christians, to escort “the Tatar prince Tchekre, recalled to assume the supreme power in the Golden Horde,” whom they accompanied as far as “Anjak, at one time a port on the Caspian, near Astrahan.” (op. cit., xxiii), for though Shah Rukh would have naturally taken over the throne, Chegre (= Tchekre) appears to have been considered the Khan of the Golden Horde in the period of political unrest following the death of Timur (Spuler: 1965, 140-41).

It was presumably during Schiltberger’s travels through ‘Great Tatary’ that he heard the Pater Noster recited in the Tatar language and must have committed it to memory, for the fact that he was illiterate is well attested; not only was the account of his life dictated and recorded by someone else (it is not mentioned by whom), he was unable to correct the names recorded in the written text because he could not read (op.cit., xviii). This is unfortunate because some time must have elapsed between the occasion when Schiltberger heard the prayer and when it was set down, and though he would have had to learn Ottoman Turkish in the service of Sultan Bayazet, he may not have understood the Tatar text well enough to recall it entirely and accurately when he dictated it, for a careful study of the prayer as it was recorded reveals a number of mistakes and it is difficult to reconstruct the original from what was written. In the present edition of Schiltberger’s memoirs, first published by the Hakluyt Society, a modern version of the Pater Noster in Tatar has been included in the notes but, although this helps to some extent to elucidate Schiltberger’s
version, it differs notably from the former. Finally, an Ottoman Turkish version of the *Pater Noster*, published in 1842, together with notes, is also given here for the sake of comparison.

### 6. The *Pater Noster* in Three Turkic Languages

The text of the *Pater Noster* in Latin, as part of the Roman Catholic liturgy, is presently, as it appears in the Maryknoll Missal, as follows:

*Pater noster, qui es in caelis:*
*Sancificietur nomen tuum.*
*Adveniat regnum tuum.*
*Fiat voluntas tua, sicut in caelo, et in terra.*
*Panem nostrum quotidium da nobis hodie:*  
*et dimitte nobis debita nostra,*  
*sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*  
*Et ne nos inducas in tentationem;*  
*Sed libera nos a malo. Amen.*

The usual rendering in English of this prayer is:

“Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.” The French version of this same prayer is (as given by Vladimir Drimba):

“Notre Père, qui est aux cieux, que ton nom soit sanctifié! Que ton règne arrive; que ta volonté soit faite sur la terre comme au ciel! Donne-nous aujourd’hui notre pain quotidien! Et pardonne-nous nos péchés, comme nous pardonnons à ceux qui nous ont fait du mal. Et ne nous induis pas dans la tentation du diable, mais délivre-nous de tout mal. Amen.”

What is of note in both of these translations is first that *sicut in caelo, et in terra* literally is “as in heaven, so on earth,” and that *et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et dimittimus debitorimus nostris* is sometimes rendered as “and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors,” which follows more closely etymologically the original Latin but misses the meaning, which in fact should be better expressed, “forgive us for our sins even as we forgive those who have sinned against us.” The presumably Latin word *tentatio* is in fact
not the original Latin form, which is *temptatio*, but is based either on the Italian derivative *tentazione* or the French *tentation*; in the French translation, “la tentation du diable” is more specific in specifying this sin as originating from the Devil rather than from another human being and he renders *libera nos a malo* not simply “délivre-nous de mal” but “délivre-nous de tout mal.”

**The Pater Noster in Cuman**

*Atamız kim köktä sen, alyişli bolsun seniŋ atiş!*

*Kelsin seniŋ xanlıxiŋ, bolsun seniŋ tilemegiŋ nečik kim köktä alley yerdı!*

*Kündegi ötmäkimizni bizgä bugün bergil!*

*Dayı yazuqlarımızni bizgä boșatqıl nečik biz boșatırbiz bizgä yaman etxenlergä.*

*Dayı yekniŋ sıナamaqına bizni kûwûrmagıl,*

   *Basa barça yamandan bizni qutxargıl. Amen!*

A lexical and grammatical analysis of this translation from Latin, with the various morphemes rearranged according to the order of the corresponding morphemes in the original Latin version, will serve to illustrate the characteristic features of the Cuman text:

**Pater Noster qui e-s in cael-is sancti-fic-etur nomen tuum.**

*Ata- -miž kim sen –tä kök(-tä) alyişli bolsun at(ıŋ) sen-iŋ*

*Adven-iat regnum tuum. Fi-at voluntas tua*

*kel- -sin xanlıxi(ıŋ) seniŋ bol-sun tilemeg(ıŋ) seniŋ*

*sicuit in cael-o et in terr-ä.*

*nečik kim –tä kök(-tä) alley -dä yer(-dä)*

**Pan- -em nostrum quotidianum d-a no-bis Hodie.**

*Ötmek--.ni -imiz- kündegi ber-gil biz-gä bugün*
In his edition of the Cuman translation of the Latin texts in the second part of the *Codex Cumanicus*, Vladimir Drimba gives the word *superstantialem* for the original Latin text in the phrase *Panem nostrum superstantialem* (1973, 259), but the corresponding Cuman translation of this part of the text as *Kündegi ötmäkimizni* with the word *kündegi* proves that the text from which this was translated had *quotidium* here.

**The Tatar Pater Noster**

Neither the ‘Tatar’ *Pater Noster* collected by Schiltberger in the course of his travels nor that contributed by Hakhoumoff to the English translation and edition of Schiltberger’s account of his travels is fact in what may be termed, strictly speaking, the Tatar language, the present-day language of the people living mainly in the Autonomous Tatar Republic and adjacent areas of the Volga region, as well as in scattered places in Western Siberia. The name ‘Tatar’ is also applied to a language, more specifically referred to as ‘Crimean Tatar’ formerly spoken in the Crimean peninsula; that is, until this population was relocated during World War II to Central Asia, the remnants of which are now residing in the Üzbek Republic (Poppe: 1965, 44–45). The source of this misnomer is the fact that during the course of history the name ‘Tatar’ has been applied loosely to any number of Turkic peoples, in particular to those tribes coming into close contact with European nations, often in the course of their invasions.

A close examination reveals that the language of the prayer recorded by Schiltberger’s annalist is essentially the same as that of the *Codex Cumanicus*. Though the vocabulary of this version of the *Pater Noster* is in places of difficult reconstruction due to the erratic or-
thography, the majority of words are recoverable, if not from Cuman Turkic, then from other Turkic languages; these are *qay-* ‘turn away; turn aside’ (here with an extended sense of ‘forgive’); *qoy-* ‘allow, permit; put, place; set’; *ve* ‘and; also, too’ (not found elsewhere in the Cuman texts); and a *hapax logomenon, gündelik* (not *kündelik*), the equivalent of Tk. *gündelik* ‘daily’. The only word in this text which might in fact cast doubt upon the classification of this language as Cuman is *ver-* ‘give’ (< OT *ber-*), since the passage of initial *b-* > *v-* is restricted to only two Turkic languages: Azeri and Ottoman Turkish. But this may be the result of interpretation by Schiltberger, since he was obviously a speaker of the latter language. The rest of the vocabulary is to be found in the word list for the Cuman version of this prayer; it should be noted that there is some difference in word order and syntactic constructions between these two versions.

Hakhounoff’s ‘Tatar’ version turns out, upon comparison of Tatar vocabulary with corresponding forms in several other possible languages, to have been written in the Azeri language, spoken in Azerbaijan, in the transcaucasian area, which is divided into five distinct groups of dialects: 1) eastern (on the shore of the Caspian Sea); 2) western (in the north-west of the general region); 3) northern (in the northern part of the Azerbaijan Republic); 4) southern; and 5) central; the language is also spoken in Persian Azerbaijan, situated in northern Iran (Poppe: 1965, 52). The crucial features that distinguish the language of this version of the Pater Noster as Azeri are: *ver-* ‘give’, which, as mentioned above, distinguishes Azeri and Ottoman Turkish from all other Turkic languages, which have forms with initial [b-]: *ber-* or *bir-*; and *ol-* ‘be; become’ rather than *bol-* or *bul-*, the form without the initial [b-] again a salient characteristic of the same two languages. There is one word, *gög* ‘heaven’ in the text which does not correspond to the form *göy* in standard Azeri, but the former appears to be an earlier form from the original Turkic *kök* (or *gök*). It is also to be noted that this Lord’s Prayer (Our Father) pertains rather to the Protestant liturgy and in the analysis of the text the parallel glosses are given here in English.
Schiltberger’s ‘Tatar’ Pater Noster

(Original text with normalized text)

Аtha wysum chy chockta sen algusch ludur senung adung kil-sin senung hanluchûg
ата bizim kim kök-tä sen alyqš- b-dir senîn at-η kel-sin senîn xantal-η

belsun senung archung aley gier da wk achtä wer wisum gundaluch otmak chumusen
bol-sun senîn arzu-ŋ alay yer-dä ve kök-tä. Ver bizim gündâlik ötmâk- imiz-in

wougû.
bügün

Kay wisum iasochni alei wis dacha kayelle nin wisû iasoch lamasin
Qay bizim yazuq-ų alay biz daɣı qayıl-(?) bizim yazuq-lar-ımzu-ın

dacha koina wisni sunamacha illa garta wisni gemandan.
daɣı qoy-mâ bizni sinamaq-â illa qutxar bizni yamandan

Hakhoumoff’s ‘Tatar’ Pater Noster

(Original text with normalized text)

Byzum athamuz ky ghyogdasan pyr olsun sanun adun ghyalsun sanun padshalygun
Bizim ata-miz ki gög-do søn pir ol-sun sønîn ad-ın gol-sın sønîn padşalık-ın

Olsun sanun stadygun nedja ky geogda ella da dûnîyada ver byza gyounluk georagymuz
Ol-sun sønîn istek-in nøčø ki gög-do ılî da dûnîy-da da ver bizø günîlk çörek-imiz

Va bagushla byzum tahsurlarumuz nedja ky byz baghishlûruh byzum tahsurlulara
Vø bâyišla bizim tahsurlarımız nøčø ki biz bâyişluyuk bizim tahsurlaları

Goîma byzy gedah sheïtan ıluna amma pakh ela byzy pyslugden
Goy-ma bizi get-e şeytan yol-ın-a amma bax ılø bizi pislig-døn
Tchounky sanunkidr padshalus ihtiar va hiurmat ta diunianun ahruna.

The ‘Tatar’ (Azeri) *Pater Noster* with parallel text in Latin (ending in English):

Pater Noster qui es in caelis: santi-fic-etur nomen tuum.

*Ata bizim...-miz ki sΩn -dΩ gög(dΩ) pir ol- sun ad(in) sΩnin...-in*

Adven-iat regnum tuum. Fi-at voluntas tua

*Göl- sin padšalıık(in) sΩnin...-ın ol-sun istek(in) sΩnin...-ın*

sicut in cael-o et in terra.

*nəčə ki –də gög(da) ile da –da dünya(da)*

Panem nostrum quotidiam da no-bis hodie.

*Čörek -imiz günlük ver biz-ə -----*

Et dimitte nobis debit -a nostra sicut et

*Və bəyişla ----- tahsur-lar(imiz) bizim...imiz nəčə ki*

nos dimitt- i-mus debi- tor-i-bus nostris.

*biz bəyiş-lu- yuk tahsur-li- lar-a bizim*

Et ne nos inducas in temptation- em Sed libera nos a malo.

*-- -ma bizi goy(ma) get-e şaytan yol-in -a amma...ile bax bizi -dən pislig(dən)*

For thine is the kingdom (and) the power and the glory

*Čünkî səninki-dir padšalık ixtiyar va hürmet*

even until the end of the world.

*Ta -a axır(in-a) -nin dünya(nın)***
The *Pater Noster* in Ottoman Turkish

(As given by Charles Boyd in his grammar, *The Turkish Interpreter*, p. 299)

Ai geuklerdeh olan babañuz, ismiñ moocades olsoon.

*Ay gök-ler-de ol-an baba-ţız, is-miţ mukaddes ol-sun*

Mélekiootooñ guelsooon, geujdeh muraduñ nidjeh iseh yerdeh.

*Melekût-uj gel-sun gök-de murad-uj nije ise yerde*

Dakhi beuileh olsoon. Hehr guiunkih etmekimizy bizeh boo guiun vir:

*Daki böyle ol-sun her gün-ki etmek-imiz bize bugün ver*

Vé bize sootchlarimizy baghishla, nidjehkih biz daki bizeh sootcly olanlareh

*Ve bize suč-lar-imiz-ı bagıšla nije ki biz daki bize sučlu olan-lar-a baghishlariz.*

*bagıšla-r-iz*

Hem bizy ighvaya salma, illa bizy khabisdan coortar; tchun mélek ve coovah

*Hem bizi iyva-ya sal-ma illâ bizi habis-den kurtat çun melekût ve kuva*

ve izzet ebbed senuñ dir. Amin.

*ve izzet ebbed seniş-dir, âmin*

7. **Vocabularies**

**Abbreviations**

AG  *Alttürkisches Wörterbuch*

CM  *Chagatay Manual*

DE  *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*

DTL  *Dictionary of the Turkic Languages*
Cuman Vocabulary

alay (~ alley) ‘so; auf diese Weise’ (ita) [et] (KW 34). OT ayla (alay) ‘thus; like that’:
Kom. alay (~ allay) ‘thus’ (ED 272; 154b)
alğıšši ‘healing; geheiligt’ (sanctus; benedictus). OT alqış (~ alqa-) ‘praise; blessing’:
Kom. alqış (~ alğaš) ‘blessing’ (ED 137b)
at ‘Name’ (nomen) (KW 44). OT ât (âd) ‘name’: Kom. at ‘name’ (ED 32b–33a)
atâ ‘Vater’ (pater) (KW 44). OT ata (atâ) ‘father’ (ED 40a)
barça ‘all, ganz’ (omnis; totus) (KW 50). OT barça ‘all’ (ED 356b)
basa ‘und; dann auch, ferner; daher’ (etiam; ergo; set = séd ‘d’autre part, mais,’ DE 609b)
(KW 52). OT basa ‘and; also, in addition; once more’ (ED 371b)
bergil ‘gib!, Imper. of ber- ‘geben’: Uig. bérgil ‘give (me)!’ (ED 354b)
biz ‘wir’ (nos): bizgâ (bizge), Dat. of biz (~ = nobis) (KW 61–2). OT (Yen.) bizkâ;
bizinjä AG 92); bizni, Acc. of biz ‘wir’ (~ = nos). OT bizni (Acc.) (AG 92)
bol- ‘werden’ (fieri) (KW 63). OT bol- ‘become’: Kom. bol- ‘become; be’ (ED 331);
bolsun (Optative or Hortative) ‘let him be; may he be’.
bošat- ‘vergeben, verzeihen (absoluere); yâzuqlarımız-ni bizge bošatqil ‘vergib uns unsere
Schuld’ (KW 65–6) [dimittere ‘envoyer dans des sens opposes, renvoyer,’ DE 408a].
OT bošut- ‘release; renounce; purge’ (ED 378)
/-DA/ Locative (KW 80). OT -/DA/ id. (AG 88)
dağî (~ tâğî) ‘auch; jedoch; und’ (et) (KW 80). OT taqî (daqî) ‘and; furthermore; also
(ED 466)
/-Dan/ Ablative (ab, de) [ab ~ a ‘en s’éloignent, en partant de, depuis, de,’ DE 1a]
et- ‘tun’ (facere). OT et- (ét-, èd-) ‘put in order; create; make; do’ (ED 36a)
etxen < et- ‘tun’ + /-GAn/: OT /-GAn/, Pres. Ptcpl. (ED xliv); bizge yaman etxenler ‘die
tenigen, die Böses gegen uns tun; unsere Schuldiger’ (KW 95)
Az. epmek) (ED 60a)
/-GIl/ Imperative (SC 11). OT /-GIl/ (AG 110) < qil- ‘do; make’
/-I)/ 2nd pers, sg. Possessive [taus]: OT /-I)/ (AG 97)
kel- ‘kommen’ (venire) [advenire] (KW 136). OT kel- (gel-) ‘come (back)’: Kom. kel-
‘come’ (ED 715b)
kim ‘der’ (qui) (KW 143): atamız kim kökte-sen ‘Vater unser, der du bist im Himmel’
(KW 144). OT kim ‘who’: Kom. kim ‘id.’ (ED 720b~721b)
kök ‘Himmel’ (cel(l)um = caelum ‘ciel’, later coelum, celum, DE 83b) (KW 150). OT
kök (gök) ‘sky’: Kom. kök ‘id.’ (ED 708b~709a)
kündegi ‘täglich’ (cotidianum = quotidianum, DE 561b) (KW 159) < kün ‘Tag’ (dies)
(KW 158). OT kün (gün) ‘sun; day’: Kom. kün ‘id.’ (ED 725)
küvür- (< *kİgür-) ‘einführen’ (inducre ‘mener, conduire dans; tromper’, DE
186a): simamaqna bizni küvürmegil ‘führe uns nicht in die Versuchung (des Teufels)’
(KW 160). OT kügür- (Caus. < kir-) ‘bring in; introduce’ (ED 712b); kir- (gîr-) ‘enter’
(ED 735b)
/-mA-/ Vb. Negative [ne ‘forme de negation,’ DE 432b]. OT /-mA-/ Negation of Verb Stem
(AG 81)
/-I) mlz/ ‘our’ [noster]. OT /-(I) mlz/ ‘id.’ (AG 97)
neçik ‘wie’ (sicut) [sicut et]: bolsun seni\ñ tilemegi\ñ neçik kim kökte alay yerde ‘dein
wille geschehne, wie im Himmel so auf Erden’ (KW 170). OT neçük ‘how? why?’
(ReI.) ‘how;
why?’ (ED 775b~776a)
neçik kim: neçik ‘wie’ (sicut) (KW 169); neçik kim ‘Leitet temporale Nebensätze ein; als
neçik kim eßtittel, neçik kim eßtitter ‘audires’ etc. (KW 171). OT neçük ‘how; why’:
Kom. neçük (~ neçik) ‘as; like’ (ED loc. cit.); cf. näçük ‘wie?’ (AG 100)
qutxr- (~ qtxar-) ‘befreien; erlosen’ (liberare ‘libérer, délivrer,’ DE 355a]:
barça yamandan bizni qutxar\ñl ‘erlose uns von allem Übeln’ (KW 205). OT qutxr-
‘rescue’; qurtul- ‘be rescued’ (<*qurt-); /-GAr-/ is not a regular Causative Suffix (ED
649b), but cf. /-GAn-/ (Denom. Vb.), e.g. köçi\ñkär- ‘durchdenken’ < kö\ñül ‘Hertz’
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(AG 67); for *qurt- cf. Mo. qoru- ‘diminish, decrease; wane; lessen; die’.

sen ‘du’ (tu) (KW 217). Used also alone as copula for 2 pers. Sg.: sen = erür sen [es], cf.

ata-miz kim köktä-sen ‘notre Père qui es aux cieux’ (SC 17)

senîj: Gen. of sen ‘du’ (tu) = (tuus) (KW 217). OT sen ‘thou’; Kom. sen/seni (Acc.)

/senîj (Gen.)/sana (Dat.) (ED 831a–832b)

sinamaq ‘Versuchung’ (_____ < sina- ‘erproben’ (probare) (KW 228). OT sina- ‘test’ (ED 835)

/-sUn/ Optative (SC 10). OT /-zUn/ (~ -çUn/) (AG 110)

tilemek ‘Wille (voluntas) < tile- ‘wünschen; erbitten’ (velle) (KW 244); ‘geschehen’ (KW 170). OT tile- (dile-) ‘seek; desire’; Kom. tile- ‘ask for’ (ED 492)

xanîq (qanîq) ‘Königtum; Königreich’ [regnum]. OT xanîq ‘kingdom’; Kom. qanîq (~ xanîx) < OT xan ‘ruler’; Kom. qan (~ xan) ‘emperor; king’ (ED 630)

yaman ‘schlecht, böse, übel; Übel’ (malus): yaman et- ‘Böses tun; schlecht handeln (KW 112). OT yaman ‘bad; evil’ (ED 937a)

yaman etxen [dêbitor ‘dèbiteur’, DE 165b] < yaman et- ‘Böses tun, schlecht handeln (KW loc.cit.)

yazuq (~ yazîq) “Sünde; Schuld” (culpa; peccatum) [dêbîta, DE 165b] (KW 119–20). OT

yazuq ‘sin; failing; defect’ (ED 985b)

yek ‘Teufel; teufflich, böse’ (_____ (KW 121). OT yek (yêk) ‘demon; evil’ (< ? Prak.

yakka < Skr. yaksâ ‘demon’) (ED 710): yekniñ sinamaq [temptâtiô ‘tentation,’ DE 681b)

yer ‘Erde’ (terra): kök yer ‘Himmel und Erde’ (KW 122). OT yer ‘ground; earth; land’:

Kom. yer ‘earth; ground; place’ (ED 954)

Azeri Vocabulary

/-A/ Imperfect Gerund (Converb), e.g, al-a ‘by taking’. One use is to indicate purpose or

aim: meni köra keldi ‘he came to see me’ (CM 141-42)

ad, Tat. isem ‘name’ (DTL 98); but cf. at in atsz ‘namenlose’ (WTD 1.440); Tk. ad

‘name’: OT åt (åd); Chag. at, Kip. ad (ED 32b–33a): pir olsun sänin adın (PN 1–2)

‘holy be thy name

alay (~alây), Kom. ‘so, auf diese Weise’ (KW 34)

amma, Tat. ämma ‘but’ (DTL 23); Tk. (< Ar.) amma ‘but’
arzu, Kom. ‘wish; desire; request’ in arzula- ‘begehren, zu besitzen wünschen’ (KW 42)
ata, Tat. ata ‘father’ (DTL 56); Tk. (arch.) ata ‘father’: OT ata; Chag. ata, Kip. ata (ED 40): bizim atamız (PN 1) ‘Our Father’
axir, Tat axir ‘Letzte, Ende’ (WTD 1.132); Tk. (< Ar.) ‘end; at the end; at (the) last’:
Chag. axir ‘daarauf; nachher; der Letzte’ (WTD 1.134)
bağışla-, Tat. gafu it- ‘forgive’ (DTL 61); Tk. bağışla- ‘forgive’ : OT bağışla- ‘give’ (< ba giş ‘gift’); Chag. bağışla- ‘give; forgive’ (ED 321b)
bağışlu ‘forgiving; possessing forgiveness’ : Kom. bağış ‘Geschenk’ (donum) (KW 47);
Kom., Tat. bağış ‘Geschenk; Gabe’ (WTD 4.1453)
bax-, Tat. kara- ‘look’ (DTL 88); Tk. bak- ‘look; look after, take care of; treat (=cure’) ;
Kom. bak- (~bax-) ‘look (at/after)’ (ED 311)
biz, Tat. bez ‘we’; Tk. biz ‘we’; Az. bizə (Dat.) ‘to us’ (DTL 164); Tk. bize ‘to us’; Az.
bizi, Tat. bezne ‘us’ (DTL 160); Tk bizi ‘us’; Az. bizim, Tat. bezney (Gen.) ‘our’
(DTL 105); Tk. bizim ‘our’
çörek, Tat. ikmäk ‘bread’ (DTL 21); Tk. (prov.) çörek ‘bread; ring-shaped bread’;
Tkm. çörek ‘bread’ : OT etmek (~ötmek); epmek ‘bread’; Chag. ötmek, Kip. epmek
(~ etmek); (SW) Az. epmek (~epmek), NC, SW dial. ekmek (ED 60a; 12a): ver bizə
günlük çörek-imiz (PN 4) ‘give to us our daily bread’
çünkî, Tat. çünkî ‘because’ (DTL 15); Tk. (< Pers.) çünkî ‘because; for’
da, Tat da ‘also’ (DTL 6); Tk. da ‘too; also’ ; Krm., Osm. daha ‘noch, wieder; auch’
(WTD 3.1615); Tat., Kom., Kaz. taγi ‘auch; noch’ (WTD 3.798)
/-DA/ Enclitic Particle = ‘too; also’ (as in Tk.); cf. Kom. daγi (~ taγi) ‘auch; doch’;
Chag. daγi ‘and; also, too’ (CM 287)
/-Dir/ Aux. Vb. ‘to be’ (CM 134); Tk. /-Dir/ ‘is (indeed)’
duńya (<Ar.), Tat. dün’ ya ‘world’ (DTL 168); Tk. (< Ar.) duńya ‘world; Earth’
gel-, Tat. kil- ‘come’ (DTL 32); Tk. gel- ‘come’ : OT kel- (~gel-); Chag. kél- (~kel-), Kip.
kel-, (SW) Az. kel- (ED 715b)
get-, Tat. bar- ‘go’ (DTL 66); Tk. git- ‘go on, continue’ : OT kéť- (~gét-) ‘go’; Chag. kéť-
(~git-), Kip. ket- ‘go (away)’; (SW) Az. ket- (ED 701a)
gög, Az. göy (<*gög), Tat. kük ‘sky; heaven’ (DTL 136); Tk. gök ‘sky; heaven’ : OT kök
(gök); Chag. gög, Kip. kük; Tkm. gök (ED 708b-709a): bizim atamız ki gögdə sən (PN
1) 'Our Father, who art in Heaven'
gündəlik = günlük, cf. Tk. günlük 'daily'; OT künlük (gündük) 'period of a day'; Khak. 
künlük 'daily' (ED 732); Kar. künlük 'einen Tag habend' (WTD 2.1442); for gün-də + 
/-lIK/, cf. OT küntmek 'daily' (ED 731a)
hürmet: Tk. (<Ar.) hürmet 'respect; honor; dignity'; Kom. xormat 'Ehre' (KW 103) 
/-yIK/ 1 pers. pl. of Substantive Verbs ( = 'we are') : Tk. (obs.) /-yIK/ for /-yIZ/ 
(GLT 386, table). Given the form baghishöluru of the text, the most likely analysis is 
baʒəš- lu-yuk 'we are forgiving' (PN 6) rather than baʃəšla-r-tz 'we forgive' 
ilə, Tat. belän 'with' (DTL 167); Tk. ile 'with; and': OT birle 'with'; Chag. birle 'with'; 
bile 'likewise', Kip. bile; (SW) Az. ile (ED 364b–365a)
istiadık (?) for istiade, cf. Tk. (<Ar.) istiade 'asking; desiring' or Tk. istek 'wish; desire'
OT isteg 'seeking; desire'
ixtiyar (ixtiyar), Az. 'Auswahl, Wahl' (WTD 1.1357); Tk. (<Ar.) ihtiyar 'choice; free 
will': Chag. ihtiyar 'choice; option' (CM 296)
ki, cf. Tk. (<Pers.) 'who; that': Chag. ki 'which; that' (CM 298)
/-KI/ Denom. N. 'forms adjectives with the sense of belonging to (especially of places and 
times)' (CM 55)
nəčə, Tat niček 'how' (DTL 75); Tk. nije 'how?' : OT neče 'how (many)'? ; Chag. nèče 
'how much'? ; neše (nije) 'because'; (SW) Az. nije (ED 775)
nəčə ki 'as', cf. Kom. nečik kim 'wie': olsun sənin istəgın (istiadan) nəčə kim gögdə ilə 
da dünyada (PN 3–4) 'thy will be done as in Heaven, so on earth': Kom. bolsun seniŋ 
tile meği nəčik kim kökte aláy yerde (126.28) 'dein Wille geschehe, wie im Himmel so 
auf Erden'
ol-, Tat. bul- 'be; exist' (DTL 14); Tk. ol- 'be; exist': OT bol- 'İd.' ; Chag. bol- (~ ol-), 
Kip. bol-; (SW) Az. ol-
ötmek, Kom. 'breathe'; cf. etmek
padşahlık (padşahlık), cf. Tk. padişahlık 'kingdom': Osm. padişahlık (< padişah) 'Souverän-
ität, Regierung' (WTD 4.1182): gəlsin sənin padşaların (PN 2) 'Thy kingdom come' 
pir 'der Heilige; der Herrscher': Kar., Krm. 'İd.' (WTD 4.1331); Tk. (<Ar.) bir 'the 
mercy and grace of God'
pislik "Schlechtigkeit, Bosheit' (WTD 4.1352); Tk. pislik 'filth; filthiness; obscenity'; 
Az., Osm., Chag. pis 'usahaer; schmutzig, schlecht' (WTD 4.1350)
qayıl- Passive < qay- ‘turn away/back’ : Tk. kay- ‘slide, slip’; but cf. kayɣıı ‘anxious, worried’ < kayɣı ‘anxiety, grief’; here = ‘be forgiven’ (cf. Kom. boşat- ‘cause to release’ (= ‘cause to forgive’)
qay-: OT qay- ‘turn away/back’; Osm. kay ‘turn aside/away’
ʢıı= bošat- ‘release’
ʢıı= cause to forgive

qoy- (γoy-), Tat. kuy- ‘put’ (DTL 118); Tk. koy- ‘let go; leave; put, place; permit’; OT kôd- ‘put down; give up; put’; Chag. koy- ‘abandon; relinquish’, Kip. koy- ‘let go, release; put down’; Osm. koy- ‘abandon; allow’ (ED 596a), Cum. qoy- ‘allow, permit; put, place’ = küvür- ‘lead; bring in; conduct, introduce (to); lead into’

sen (sən), Tat. sin ‘you (sg.), thou’ (DTL 169); Tk. sen ‘you (sg.); thou’: OT sen; Az. sonin, Tat. sineq (Gen.) ‘your (sg.), thy’; Tk. senin ‘your (sg.), thy’

səninkı ‘yours (sg.), thine’ < sənin

sınamaq, Kom. ‘Versuchung’ (temptation) (KW 228), sına- ‘erproben’ (‘try’ = ‘attempt’)

šeytan, Tat. šaytan ‘Satan’ (DTL 128); Tk. şeytan ‘Satan; devil’
ta (< Pers.) ‘even until’; Tk. ta ‘even until/unto; as far as’

tahsır = ‘trespass’; Tk. (< Ar.) ‘a causing to suffer loss; ruining’

və, Tat. hâm ‘and’ (DTL 7); Kom. ‘and’ : Tk. (< Ar.) ‘and; also, too; or; nut’

ver-, Tat. bir- ‘give’ (DTL 66); Tk. ver- ‘give’ : OT bér- ‘give’; Chag. bér- (vér-), Kip. ber- (~bér-); (SW) Az. ver- (ED 354b–55a)

yol, Tat. yol ‘road’ (DTL 125); Tk. yol ‘path; way’ : OT yol ‘road; way’; Chag. yol, Kip. yol ‘road’ (ED 917)
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