

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICON IN THE SECOND CHAPTER OF BULGHATIL MUSHTAQ AND TARJUMAN TURKI

Ganiyeva Barchinoy

PhD Student Namangan State University

ganiyeva1011@gmail.com

### Abstract

This paper presents a comparative linguistic analysis of the second chapters of two Mamluk-Kipchak manuscripts: *Bulghatil Mushtaq* (hereafter BM) by Jamal ad-Din at-Turki and *Tarjumon Turkiy* (hereafter TT). Both manuscripts, compiled in the 14th–15th centuries during the Mamluk era, reflect the widespread use and prestige of the Kipchak language in the military, administrative, and cultural contexts of Egypt and Greater Syria. This study focuses on the lexical classification of words in the Second chapter of both manuscripts including words related to natural geography, plant life, and urban terminology, revealing both structural parallels and distinctive stylistic features. The analysis shows that while the manuscripts share core vocabulary, their approaches to semantic elaboration, translation strategy, and terminological precision differ significantly. The research highlights how TT adopts a more didactic, explanatory style, while BM favors concise, dictionary-like definitions.

**Keywords:** Mamluk-Kipchak, *Bulghatil Mushtaq*, *Tarjuman Turki*, lexical analysis, Turkic philology, historical linguistics, Kipchak language, comparative study.

### Introduction

The state of Mamluks (1250-1517) was a country in which warrior-slaves ruled in the lands of Egypt and Greater Syria and they were of Turkic and Caucasian background. If we are to stop on the origin of the word “mamluk”, it was related to “white slaves”, who played a major role in the history of Islam. This word in Arabic “malaka”, is a participle of passive voice of verb that means “to own”, “to rule”. Word “Mamluk” initially had meaning “property owned by someone”, “property which has an owner”, then depending on the historical conditions of that time and the sphere of use acquired a second meaning - “white slave” (Abdulfattah, 1976, 1). Concerning the origin of Mamluks, A. Quryshjanuly writes: “From ethnic composition point of view, Mamluks were representatives of different countries. Many cohorts of tribes, clans and people who were captured were always sold into slavery. Among them there were many valiant citizens of clans and nationalities from “Polovetsian” valley (Altai and the Dnieper, and further until Dniester and Danube rivers) at that time.

Along with the slaves, there were also those who voluntarily joined Mamluk Guards (Kipchaks, Turks, Turkmens, Georgians, Slavs, Europeans and Caucasians etc.), but they collectively obeyed the central rule of Kipchak government and spoke one language – only in Kipchak language (officially)"(Quryshjanuly 2007, 17-18). Thus, A. Quryshjanuly came to conclusion, that Mamluks had been speaking in the Kipchak language, and highly appreciated the role of Kipchak language in the Egyptian society during the rule of Mamluks. The correspondence of Mamluk sultans with the kings of the Golden Horde in Arabic and Turkic-Kipchak languages and the dictionaries and grammatical works in the Arab-Kipchak languages written at that time can be used as backing of Scholar's words. Because Kipchak language during the rule of Mamluks had been widely used and its' influence was very strong, and we can notice it from preserved Turkism which assimilated into Arabic language. Medieval Arabic sources mention that the Mamluks who ruled in Egypt for nearly three centuries, spoke between themselves in Kipchak language. During Middle Ages, in Egypt and Greater Syria there was a great interest in the Kipchak language. As result literary, religious, grammatical, lexical, equine and military related written manuscripts were born in Mamluk Kipchak language (in Arabic sources it is used as Halis Turkic language). Study of such manuscripts in Mamluk-Kipchak language has a significant role within the wider research of social, ethnographic, political-social, literary-cultural, linguistic history of present Turkic people, particularly, of the people belonging to the Kipchak language group. The written manuscripts written in Mamluk-Kipchak language during XIII-XV centuries under the rule of Mamluk can be categorized as follows:

- 1) Dictionaries and grammatical works;
- 2) Religious works;
- 3) Works relating to the equine and military art;
- 4) Literary

The two manuscripts – *Bulghatil Mushtaq* and *Tarjuman Turki* were written as dictionaries and grammar books during the Mamluks period in Egypt in 14<sup>th</sup> century. These written monuments used as a guidance for Arabic speaking people to learn Turkic language and for different nations living together these books were used as a tool to learn different dialects.

### Materials and Methods

The author of the work which consists of 88 pages named "Kitab al-Bulghatil mushtaq fil-lugat at-turk val qipchaq" was Jamal ad-Din Abu Muhammad Abdullah At-Turk. It was determined that this grammatical work written in Arabic-Kipchak language had been compiled in the Greater Syria not later than 1451. Only one version of the work had been preserved in the National Library of Paris. G.R. Gainutdinova illustrated to us the structural, phonetic and morphological features of the manuscript in her work named "Istoriko-lingvisticheskiy analiz turko-tatarskogo pismennogo pamyatnika XIV v. Jamal ad-Din at-Turki "Kitab bulgat al-mushtaq ua fi lugat at-turk ua-l-qifchaq" ("Historical-

linguistical analysis of written Turkic-Tatar manuscript of XIV c. of Jamal ad-Din At-Turki "Kitab al-Bulgati al-mushtaq ua fil-lugati atturk ua-l-qibdjaq"). Sh. Fayzullaeva studied the grammatical and lexical features of this manuscript and made its translation (Aubakirova 580).

The *Tarjumon Turki* manuscript is preserved in the Leiden Library in the Netherlands under the catalog number 517. R.Dozy(1851) has mentioned that two other copies of this work also exist in Oxford. However, the manuscript housed in the Leiden Library is considered a rare copy(YunusovA., 1980, 5p.). This particular version originates from the collection of Levin Warner (ca. 1618 – 22.VI.1665), an orientalist and ambassador of the Ottoman Empire in the Netherlands(Vroljik A., Schmidt J., etc., 2012, 5p.).

### Analysis

The second chapters of the BM and TT manuscripts bear almost identical titles, differing only by a single word in the subtitle that reflects the semantic content of the entries. In TT, the word *Fasl* is used instead of *bob* ("chapter"), which likewise conveys the meaning of a thematically structured section. The title of this chapter in TT is: "The Second chapter. About the earth and the things and places on it." In comparison, the corresponding chapter in BM is titled: "The Second chapter. About the earth and the things and minerals on it." The titles in both manuscripts are nearly identical in both structure and meaning. However, two minor differences can be observed: the use of *bob* versus *fasl*, and the substitution of words like *places* in TT with *minerals* in BM. A more precise comparative analysis can be made by examining the words included in the second chapters of these two manuscripts. In the second chapter of BM, the words can be conditionally classified into the following semantic categories:

1. Types according to the degree of water and dryness of the land: *Yer* – earth, *Yazi* – desert, *Yobon* – desert, *Qir* – hill, *Iqriq* – land(arid), *Tabiz* – Saline land, *Qüquz* – Lowland, a watery area with many trees, *Çeman* – meadow, *Örmon* – Forest, *Alaq* – Marshy area or pond, *Ata* – A dug-out channel for water;
2. Classification according to the relief of the land: *Toğ* – Mountain, *Üyük* – Large hill, *Tepa* – Hill, *Sirt* – Highland, mountain ridge, *Yar* – Valley, ravine, depth, *Ayri* – Road between mountains, *Oya* – Cliff;
3. Natural elements and vegetation on the land surface: *Toş* – Stone, *Derak* – Tree, *Yubildurak* – Leaves, tree foliage, *Yapraq* – Leaf, foliage, *Tomir* – Root, *Natartaka* – Tree trunk, *Qobiq* – Peel (of fruit), rind, *Butoq* – Branch, *Çizbi* – Twigs, tree roots, *Töpaloq* – Rosalind plant, *Yakun* – Reed plant, *Yulderak* – Reed seed;
4. Urban terms: *In* – Nest, *Zilak* – Hole, *Öriiv* – Cellar (for storing grain), *Topa* – Plug, cover (for grain cellars), *Sirt* – Mountain ridge, road, *Saban* – Shovel, *Xirmon* – Threshing floor, *Bör* – Gypsum, *Yöl* – Tracks and traces on the ground, *Qorğan* – Fortification wall, *Qorğun* – Dome-shaped mound over a grave, *Kirpiç* – Brick, *Devor* – Wall, *Kent* – Village,

*Şaar* – City, *Evril* – Erbil (name of a city), *Köpri* – Bridge, *Kalki* – Shady cool place, *Kervan sara* – Caravanserai, *Kervan* – Caravan, *Çahon* – World.

In TT, the words in this chapter can also be conditionally classified according to their meaning as follows:

1. Types according to the degree of water and dryness of the land: *Yer* – earth, *yazi* – desert, *quru* – dry land;
2. Classification according to the relief of the land: *Toğ* – mountain, *qoya* – cliff, *yar* – ravine, *Uçurum* – rocky hill, steep bank, *oy* – valley, gorge, *qol* – river branch, *Yokuş* – steep ascent, *Eniş* – descent, slope, *Täpä* – hill; also referred to as *üyük* in Turkmen, and this word is linked to *yük*, meaning load or heavy load;
3. Natural elements on the land surface: *Topraq* – soil, *Qum* – sand, *Qayir* – stone, *Taş* – stone;
4. Urbanism-related terms: *In* – nest, cave, *yöl* – road, *yurt* – homeland, *Kervan sara* – Caravanserai, *äv* – house, *divar* – wall, *Tam üsti* – roof covering, *Ağınçaç* – staircase, *Qapu* – door, also called *äşik*, *Açkuç* – lock, also called *kilit*, which has a Persian root (کلید *kelid* – ‘key’), *Säkü* – raised clay platform in front of the house, bench, *Qorğan* – stable, also referred to as *azbar* and *aður*, both of Persian origin, meaning stable or manger; *Issi su* – hot water, *yili su* – warm water, *Teyirmen* – mill, *Köpri* – bridge, *Su ävi* (eyvi) – water house, meaning bathhouse; also called *ävriz* – literally "place where water is poured", meaning 'water outlet or drainage'; this is also of Persian origin. *Furun* – oven, *Sin* – grave; additionally, it means idol (in idol worship); also called *qorğan*, *Qorğan* – fortress; also referred to as *hissar* [hişār], which is a modified form of the Arabic word *hişār* (حصار), widely recognized. *Kerman* – city; also called *şähär*, of Persian origin and widely used. *Känt* – village; also called *köy* in Turkmen. *Bucağ* – corner (in the home or elsewhere), *Oçağ* – hearth.

In both manuscripts, the first word *yer* – land, place (BM 9b/1.1) is presented in the same form and meaning. In BM, the translation of this word is conveyed using a single word, while in TT, its additional meanings are also explained: *yer* – land, location, and it also denotes *place* (TT 6a/5.1). Although the brief annotation given in *Tarjumon Turkiy* clarifies the extended meaning of the word, in terms of content, both works attribute the same fundamental meaning to it. The key difference is that BM attempts to express the translation of a word using only one equivalent, whereas in TT the opposite is observed: each word is explained in detail, with the intention of making it comprehensible for the general public.

*Yazi* – desert is given identically in both manuscripts, but their Arabic equivalents differ. In TT, it is translated as *As-Sahrā'* (الصَّحْرَاءُ), meaning *desert*, while in BM, the word *Al-Falāḥ* (الْفَلَاهُ) is used in the sense of *desert*, and these two Arabic terms differ in stylistic nuance. The term *As-Sahrā'* is a widely used geographical term that refers to a natural

territorial unit. In contrast, *Al-Falāh* is characteristic of literary style and more strongly conveys the meanings of “a place untouched by humans” or “desolation.”

Additionally, the synonym of the Turkic word *Yazi* is given in both manuscripts as *Yobon* – desert, with the Arabic equivalent *Al-Barriyya* (الْبَرِّيَّةُ) used in both works. This Arabic term also differs stylistically from the previous two, as it is used primarily in religious and literary contexts.

The meaning of *dry land* is expressed differently in the manuscripts. In TT, *quru* – dryness, dry weather, dry land is used, while in *Diwan Lughat at-Turk*, *quru* appears with the meaning *thorn* (in *Kipchak*). In BM, the word *iqriq* – dry land is attested, which does not appear in other sources.

The following words are found only in BM and not in TT: *Tabiz* – saline land, *Qüquz* – lowland, a watery place with many trees, *Alaq* – marshy land or pond, *Ata* – a place dug for a water canal.

The word *Örmon* – forest, which appears in the second chapter of BM, is found in TT in a different chapter: *Chapter Four. A chapter on trees and plants*.

The word *Çeman* – meadow appears in TT in a subsection of Chapter Four: *On vegetables and garden-related plants*.

The words *Toğ* – mountain, *Yar* – ravine, *Üyük* – large hill, and *Tepa* – hill are presented in both manuscripts with identical form and meaning. In TT, additional detailed commentary is also provided, for example: *Täpä* – hill; also called *üyük* – this is the term in Turkmen, and it is also related to the word *yük*, meaning load or heavy load.

This explanation provides us with a wealth of information: the origin of the word, its synonym, and the meaning of its homonymous form. Thus, *TT* is structured not only as a dictionary but also as a learning aid designed to facilitate language acquisition. The word *Sirt* – mountain ridge, hill also appears in BM with the meanings of *hill* or *mountain range*, and it is used twice within the second chapter of this work—once meaning *mountain range*, and once meaning *road*.

In TT, there are additional words that do not occur in BM but also convey the meaning of *hill*, such as: *Uçurum* – rocky hilltop, steep bank, *Oy* – valley, ravine, *Yokuş* – steep ascent. The word for *cliff* appears as *Qoya* in TT and as *Oya* in BM, which may be due to regional dialectal differences.

*Toş* – stone appears identically in both manuscripts, while in TT, its synonym *Qayir* – stone is also provided.

Words relating to plants are found in the second chapter of BM, while in TT, such words are categorized into a separate chapter or *fasl*. For example, *Yubilduraq* – leaves, tree leaves, and *Yapraq* – leaf are found in Chapter Four of TT, and in BM these words are given in the same form and meaning. The word *Yubilduraq* in TT appears in a slightly different form in BM as *Yulderak*.

The word *Derak* – tree in BM corresponds to *Ağaç* – tree in TT, which appears in Chapter Four.

*Tomir* – root in BM conveys the meaning *tree root*, whereas TT provides the equivalent *Tip* – root in the chapter on trees.

*Butoq* – branch appears in both works in the same form and meaning and, like the other plant-related terms above, occurs in Chapter Four of TT.

The word *Çizbi* – twigs, tree roots appears in BM, and its equivalent in TT is *Çibiq*, with slight variation in form.

Words such as *Töpaloq* – rosalin plant and *Yakun* – reed plant appear only in BM and are not found in TT.

The following words: *In* – nest, cave, *Yöl* – land and its traces, road, *Kervan sara* – caravanserai, *Köpri* – bridge, *Känt* – village, *Devor* – wall, *Qorğan* – fortress, are all presented with the same form and meaning in both manuscripts and are included within the same chapter. Among them, the word *Qorğan* appears in two different forms in both manuscripts and functions as a pair of paronyms with distinct meanings. In BM, the terms *Qorğan* – fortress wall and *Qorğun* – dome-shaped mound over a grave are used. TT also includes this word in two forms. One is *Qorğan* – stable, with a note that it is also called *azbar*, or *ağur* – both of which are Persian loanwords, meaning *stable*, *feeding trough*, etc. The second variant is explained as follows: *Qorğan* – fortress; also called *hissar* [hişār], which is a variant form of the Arabic word *hişār* (حصار), and is widely recognized. The meaning of *fortress* or *fortified structure* is consistent in both manuscripts, while the meanings *dome-shaped grave mound* (BM) and *stable* (TT) differ. Moreover, TT provides explanatory notes for such words, indicating their synonyms and the language from which they were borrowed.

The word *Yurt* – homeland appears in BM within a different chapter titled "*On the military, its weapons, and other items. Words related to the homeland.*"

Words such as *Äv* – house, *Bucağ* – corner, *Qapu* – door, *Säkü* – a platform in front of a house, a clay bench, bench, are included in The Second chapter of TT, while in BM these terms are listed in the chapter of Adverbs.

The term denoting *city* shows slight variation across the manuscripts. Specifically, in TT the word *Şähär* is used, while in BM the variant *Şaar* appears. Additionally, TT contains the word *Kerman* – city, which has the same meaning, and notes that *Şähär* is a Persian loanword and a widely used variant.

Words not found in BM but present in the Second Chapter of TT include: *Issi su* – hot water, *Yili su* – warm water, *Teyirmen* – mill, *Su ävi* (eyvi) – water house, used in the sense of *bathroom*; also called *ävriz*, literally “a place where water is poured,” i.e., a place where water flows or a drainage area; this word is also of Persian origin, *Furun* – oven, *Sin* – grave, which can also mean *idol* (in the context of idolatry/statues used in pagan worship).

Additionally, BM contains a comment concerning place names, noting that Evril – Erbil and the names of other countries remain unchanged.

## Results

The comparative analysis of the second chapters of BM and TT reveals both lexical parallels and distinctive semantic patterns. Core geographical terms such as *yer*, *toğ*, *yar*, and *tepa* appear in both manuscripts with identical forms and meanings, reflecting a shared Kipchak lexicon. However, BM includes rare and manuscript-specific terms such as *iqriq* (dry land), *tabiz* (saline land), *qūquz* (lowland), and *töpaloq* (rosalin plant), which are not attested in TT. TT, on the other hand, introduces additional explanatory entries such as *yokuş* (steep ascent), *uçurum* (rocky hill), and *täpä* with etymological annotations (e.g., *üyük* in Turkmen, related to *yük* meaning “load”). TT also provides Arabic and Persian loanwords with glosses (e.g., *açkuç* from *كَلِيد* *kelīd*, *qorğan* = *hişār*), while BM offers more concise definitions. Plant-related vocabulary appears in BM within general environmental sections, whereas TT categorizes them in a separate chapter, emphasizing thematic organization. This suggests TT was designed with an educational and user-oriented focus, while BM adopts a more compact, lexicographic format.

## Conclusion

The comparative study of the second chapters of *Kitab al-Bulghat al-Mushtaq* and *Tarjumon Turkiy* reveals not only a shared linguistic heritage rooted in Kipchak Turkic but also divergent textual strategies shaped by differing pedagogical goals. *Tarjumon Turkiy* serves as a more accessible guide for language learners, offering extended semantic fields and cultural context, whereas *Kitab al-Bulghat* reflects a compact, perhaps more scholarly lexicographic tradition. This duality enhances our understanding of Turkic lexicography in the Mamluk period and affirms the significant role of the Kipchak language as a tool of governance and cultural exchange in the medieval Islamic world.

## References

1. Al-Turk, G. (2012). A linguistic analysis of “Kitāb Bulğat al-Muštāq fī Luğāt at-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq”. Master’s Thesis. Gazi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
2. Atalay, B. (2006). *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*, Vol. III. Ankara: TDK Publications.
3. Dozy, R. P. (1851). *Catalogus codicum Orientalium Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno-Batavae*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
4. Fayzullaeva, Sh. (1969). A study of the language of the 14th-century monument “Kitāb Bulğat al-Muštāq fī Luğāt at-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq” by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Turkī. PhD diss., Tashkent.
5. Garkavets, A. N. (2019). *Kitāb-i Majmū‘-i Tarjumān-i Turki wa ‘Ajamī wa Mughālī wa Fārsī*. Almaty: Baur.

6. Gaynutdinova, G. (2005). Historical and linguistic analysis of the 14th-century Turkic-Tatar manuscript by Jamal al-Din al-Turki: “Kitāb Bulġat al-Muštāq fī Luġāt at-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq”. Kazan.
7. Houtsma, M. T. (1894). Ein Türkisch-Arabisches Glossar. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
8. Jafarov, B. (2021). On the compilation “Tarjumān Turki wa ‘Ajāmī wa Mughālī wa Fārsī”. Bulletin of Namangan State University, (11), 354–358.
9. Kuryshzhanov, A. (1970). Research on the vocabulary of the 13th-century Old Kipchak monument – The Turkic-Arabic Dictionary. Almaty: Nauka Publishing House.
10. Melioransky, P. M. (1900). An Arab Philologist on the Turkish Language. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences.
11. Quryshjanuly A. (1998). Kitāb ad-Durrat al-muddiya fil-lugati at-turkiya ual-kamal. In E. Aryn (Ed.), Encyclopedia of The Kazakh language (Vol. 1, pp. 170-171). Almaty: «IDK-TIPO»
12. Saito, Y. (2006). The Mongolian Words in Kitāb Majmū‘ Tarjumān Turki wa ‘Ajāmī wa Mughālī: Text and Index. Kyoto: Shoukadoh.
13. Salan, M., & Karagözlü, S. (2022). Imām Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdullāh al-Turkī, Kitāb Bulġat al-Muštāq fī Luġāt al-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq (Kastamonu Manuscript): Introduction, Analysis, Facsimile, Transcription, Index. Ankara: Paradigma Akademi.
14. Vrolijk, A., Schmidt, J., & Scheper, K. (2012). Turcksche boucken: The Oriental collection of Levinus Warner, Dutch diplomat in 17th-century Istanbul. Eindhoven.
15. Yunusov, A. (1973). A study of the 14th-century monument “Tarjumān Turki wa ‘Ajāmī wa Mughālī” (Morphology, Lexicon, Dictionary, Translation). Tashkent.
16. Yunusov, A. (1980). “Tarjumon” – A 14th-century manuscript. Tashkent: Institute of Language and Literature named after A. S. Pushkin, Fan Publishing House.
17. Zajączkowski, A. (1954). Vocabulaire Arabe-Kiptchak de l’époque de l’État Mamelouk: Bulġat al-Muštāq fī Luġāt at-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq. Vol. II: Verbs. Warsaw.
18. Zajączkowski, A. (1958). Vocabulaire Arabe-Kiptchak de l’époque de l’État Mamelouk: Bulġat al-Muštāq fī Luġāt at-Turk wa’l-Qifchāq. Vol. II, Part 2: Nouns. Warsaw.