

On some unclear, doubtful and contradictory passages in Maḥmūd al- Kāšyarī's "Dīwān Luḡāt at-Türk"

Claus Schönig
(Istanbul/Berlin)

0. A close look at Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī's Dīwān reveals that he is one of the most important medieval philologists. But this does not mean that his Dīwān does not contain unclear or contradictory passages, errors, mistakes and other deviations from reality or truth. A part of these mistakes, errors, etc. may be due to the fact that we only possess a later copy of the Dīwān, which was completed in 1266.¹ In this small article, I shall discuss some of these problematic passages. As for to the text of Kāšyarī's Dīwān and its translation, I will rely on the edition of DANKOFF/KELLY (= DK)² and the facsimile of the KÜLTÜR BAKANLIĞI 1990.

1. The use of the term *Türk* in the Dīwān is ambiguous. Firstly, *Türk* is used to designate the Turkic peoples as a whole. Secondly, in remarks on the Oğuz dialect, *Türk* designates the non-Oğuz Turkic peoples, the dialect(s) of which do not exhibit Oğuz features focused within his remarks (see some examples in 7).³ Thirdly, *Türk* seems to be describing a part of the core population of the Karakhanid state, i.e. the Čigil.⁴ The term *Türk* also appears in the list of

-
- 1 See DK I 10; according to TEKELI (1985, 5, and 1986, 5) the copyist did not know Turkic well and could not master Arabic.
 - 2 If transliterations of Turkic expressions and transcriptions of the Arabic text are not of direct interest, they are omitted.
 - 3 See also DK I 4: "The word 'Turk' is spelled 'Türk' where it is used to indicate a dialect group (generally as opposed to Oğuz = Türkmā:n)."
 - 4 According to DK 4-5 "the language described [*sc.*: in Kāšyarī's Diwan] is called 'Turkiyya' (here translated 'Turkic'); it is basically the dialect of the important Čigil tribe, belonging to the Karakhanid confederation. ... In particular, Kāšyarī gives equal weight to two main dialect groups: that of the 'Turks' (including Čigil, Tuxsi, etc.), and that of the 'Turkmā' or Oğuz' ...".

dialects of Turkic tribes which Kāšyarī claims to have known. Thus he writes: "I have traveled throughout their cities and steppes, and have learned their dialects and their rhymes; those of the Turks, the Turkman-Oğuz, the Čigil, the Yayma, and the Qırqız" (K 3/DK I 70). If the translation of DK is correct, *Türk* is used in a sense different from a simple "non-Turkman-Oğuz" and "Karakhanid-Čigil".

2. According to Kāšyarī, the name *Türk* is given to the ancestors of the Turks by no one less than God himself. Thus we find under the heading *Türk*: "Name of the son of Noah.⁵ ... I state that *at-Turk* is the name given by God. This is on the authority of the venerable Shaykh and Imam, al-Ḥusayn Ibn Khalaf al-Kāšyarī, who was told by Ibn al-Gharqī, who said: It was transmitted to us by the Shaykh, Abū Bakr al-Muḥīd al-Jarjarā'ī, known as Ibn Abī-d-Dunyā, in his book *On the End of Time (al-mu'allaf fī āxir az-zamān)*, with his chain of transmission going back to the Prophet, God bless him and give him peace, who said: "God, exalted and mighty, says, 'I have a host whom I have called *at-Turk* and whom I have set in the East; when I am wroth over any people I will make them sovereign above them.'" This is an excellence of theirs above the rest of created beings; that He the most high took it upon himself to name them; that He settled them in the most exalted spot and in the finest air on Earth; that he called them his own army. Not to mention their other virtues, such as beauty, elegance, refinement, politeness, reverence, respect for elders, loyalty, modesty, dignity and courage, all of which serve to justify their praises unnumbered." (K 176f./DK I 273f.). From a canonical Islamic point of view, such a tradition does not exist. The same holds true for the book of Ibn Abī-d-Dunyā mentioned by Kāšyarī. According to DK I 274, fn. 1, the name of this book "is not found among the works of the famous Ibn Abī-d-Dunyā."

Furthermore, in the introduction of the *Dīwān*, we find a non-existing Hadith (K 2f./DK I 70). Kāšyarī is careful enough to ascribe this Hadith to hearsay going back to anonymous religious authorities of Bukhara (one of the centers of medieval Islamic theology). According to this Hadith, the Prophet

5 Besides we have: "They all trace back to Turk, son of Japhet, son of Noah, God's blessing be upon them — they correspond to the children of Rūm, son of Esau, son of Isaac, son of Abraham, God's blessing be upon them." (K 20/DK I 82). This contradiction may be solved, if we assume that "son of Noah" in the passage cited in the text simply means "offspring of Noah".

Muhammad himself had announced the coming of the Oğuz and encouraged the study of their language.⁶

These passages reveal a special aspect of Kāşğarī's Dīwān: it is not only a dictionary and encyclopedia of Turkic languages and peoples, but also a kind of political text, in which the author tries to legitimize the ruling position of the Turkic newcomers (Seljuks and Karakhanids) in the Islamic world and to give them an appropriate and legitimate place between the Muslim and non-Muslim peoples of this time.⁷ Even the "infidel" enemies of Islam, the Rūm (the Byzantines), have—according to Kāşğarī—such a genealogy: they are said to be the offspring of Esau, son of Isaac (see fn. 5). If we accept the idea

6 "When I saw that God most High had caused the Sun of Fortune to rise in the Zodiac of the Turks, and set their Kingdom among the spheres of Heaven; that He called them "Turk", and gave them Rule; making them kings of the Age and, placing in their hands the reins of temporal authority; appointing them over all mankind, and directing them to the Right; that He strengthened those who are affiliated to them and those who endeavor on their behalf; so that they attain from them the utmost of their desire, and delivered from the ignominy of the slavish rabble; — [then I saw that] every man of reason must attach himself to them, or else expose himself to their falling arrows. And there is no better way to approach them than by speaking their own tongue, thereby bending their ear, and inclining their heart. And when one of their foes comes over to their side, they keep him secure from fear of them; then others may take refuge with him, and all fear of harm be gone. I heard from one of the trustworthy informants among the Imams of Bukhara, and from another Imam of the people of Nishapur: both of them reported the following tradition, and both had a chain of transmission going back to the Apostle of God, may God bless him and grant him peace. When he was speaking about the signs of the Hour and the trials of the end of Time, and he mentioned the emergence of the Oğuz Turks, he said: "Learn the tongue of the Turks, for their reign will be long." Now if this hadith is sound — and the burden of proof is on those two — the learning it is a religious duty; and if it is not sound, still Wisdom demands it." (K 2f./DK I 70).

7 According to TEKELI (1986, 5) these passages show that Kāşğarī "was a scientist who believed firmly in what he set out to do, and admirer of Turks and a patriot"; this is the English translation of TEKELI (1985, 5), where we find "... Kaşğarlı Mahmut, vatansever, Türklere hayran, yaptığı işe yürekten inanan bir bilim adamıdır". In the same sense DK 5 states that "All of this [*sc.* information given in the Dīwan] is prime data on medieval Turkdōm, collected on the spot by an expert 'field investigator' who was convinced of the supremacy of the Turks in God's design ..." This does not contradict the assumption that the Dīwān had also propagandistic function. It is interesting to see that TEKELI (1985 and 1986) does not make any critical remarks to the obviously wrong citation of Ibn Abī-d-Dunyā and the non-existing Hadiths.

of a (perhaps only secondary) kind of propagandistic function of the text, the mentioning of mythical genealogies and the doubtful or non-existing Hadiths are not errors or mistakes, but rather rhetorical tricks and orations to please the Turkic ruling classes and to impress their Arabic and Persian speaking subjects. It is likely that Kāšyarī himself did not believe in each and every one of these citations. Especially in the case of the Hadith, he himself has some reservations concerning its correctness. But the citation not only stresses the special position of the Turks among all other peoples and additionally helps to underscore the special position of the Oğuz among the Turks. This could be from a strategic stands, since Kāšyarī lived in Baghdad, which was ruled by the Seljuks, a sub-group of the Oğuz. Despite the fact that Kāšyarī does not consider their language as being the "most correct" and "most elegant" of the Turkic languages, it is this language that receives preference in the Hadith (see 5). Thus the majority of dialectal remarks are concerning Oğuz Turkic, and Kāšyarī only gives a detailed list of the sub-branches of the Oğuz ("along with the brands of their cattle, since people need to know them", K 20/DK I 82).

3. According to Kāšyarī's introduction to the *Dīwān*, the Turks consist of twenty tribes, each of them having many sub-tribes (K 20/DK I 82). He claims to name only the main tribes without their sub-branches (except in the case of Oğuz-Türkmān). But the given number of twenty is not in accordance with the number of Turkic tribal names we find in the *Dīwān*. In the introduction, we find two lists of names; each of these lists contains ten tribes. But in other parts of the *Dīwān*, Kāšyarī remarks that some of these tribes do not speak Turkic at all, while some possess Turkic as a second language. Beside the two lists in the introduction, there appear names of other tribes in the dictionary which are said to be Turks. These "dictionary tribes" are not described as sub-tribes of the "list tribes"—and as in the case of the "list tribes" some of them do not even speak Turkic. And even if we—different from Kāšyarī—consider speaking Turkic as a criteria for being Turk, I see no way to reach Kāšyarī's claim that there are twenty Turkic tribes.

3.1 Let us first examine the two lists of names that appear in the introduction and their representation on the map added to the *Dīwān* (K 22-3/in DK I between pp. 82 and 83). The first list mentions ten Turkic peoples living from West to East between Rūm (Byzantium) and Šīn (China) (K 20/DK I

82): *Bäčänäk* - *Qifčāq* - *Oγuz* - *Yemäk*⁸ - *Bašγirt* - *Basmil* - *Qāy* - *Yabāqu*⁹ - *Tatār* - *Qirqiz*. The second list gives ten tribes "middling between South and North" (K 21/DK I 82): *Čigil* - *Tuxsī* - *Yaγmā*¹⁰ - *Oγrāq* - *Čaruq* - *Čömül* - *Uiγur* - *Taγut* - *Xitāy* ("which is *Šin*") - *Tawγāč* ("which is *Māšīn*").¹¹ In contradiction to Kāšyarī's promise to show all the tribes on the map, many of them are missing. Of course this—as all the other problematic and contradictory phenomena connected with the map—may be due to an incorrect copying of the map as well as of the text.

3.1.1 More or less in the north eastern quadrant of the map we find from West to East—in accordance with the order of the first list—*Bäčänäk* (West of, e.g., *Rūs* and a large lake which we must consider as a hybrid of the Caspian Sea and Lake Aral, named *baħr Ābiskūn*),¹² *Qifčāq* (at both sides of this lake), and *Oγuz* (a part of them together with the eastern part of *Qifčāq*).¹³ Farther to the East there are the deserts of *Basmil* and *Tatār*. According to the list, both tribes should be much farther to the East. The

8 For the *Kimäk*-*Yemäk* problem see, e.g., GOLDEN 1993, 202ff.

9 According to GOLDEN (1993, 164) "probably, *Yapāqu*".

10 Different from DK, I prefer to write *Tuxsī* and *Yaγmā* with *-ī* and *-ā*, because they are written with *yā*³ and *alif* in word-final position.

11 From my point of view the designations *Šin* and *Māšīn* can best be explained as a special kind of Arabic (Semitic) paranomasia (*muzāwaḡa*, see, e.g., EI 823) called *itbā'*. The same type we meet with the biblical peoples *Gog* and *Magog* which are also mentioned in the *Dīwān* in the form *Yāḡūḡ* and *Māḡūḡ* (K 24/DK I 83). Most probably their names became a model for *Šin* and *Māšīn* which probably are to be interpreted as 'China and something like China'. My thanks to Manfred Kropp for the Arabic technical terms.

12 They are most probably identical with the Pechenegs. At the same time *Bäčänäk* is the name of one of the 22 tribes of the Oghuz, see K 42/DK I 104.

13 One part of the Oghuz is located West of *ḡabal Qarāḡuq* in *bilādu'l-Ġuzziyya*, the other part is East of this mountain region in *maskan Qifčāq va'l-Ġuzziyya*. This may reflect the fact that the Oghuz broke off in the tenth century into two groups, one group (led by *Säljūk* and his successors) moving to the Middle and Near East to develop to modern Western Oghuz, the others remaining with the *Kipchaks* to become the modern *Türkmen*. On the other hand we hear about the *Turkmän* that they consisted of 22 sub-tribes, see also 3.2.1. If these sub-tribes are identical with the sub-tribes of the *Oγuz*, the dissolution of the *Oγuz* must have affected each and every of their sub-tribes. Then the tribal organization of the modern *Türkmen* should have developed later. But it is also possible (and perhaps very probable) that the information given by Kāšyarī contains some truth, but needs further interpretation.

Basmil are shown to live West of an triangular lake, which may be Lake Balkhash, because the River Ili (*wādī ilā*) flows into it. The Tatār are shown somehow South of the Basmil at the western banks of the River Ili.¹⁴ East of them, at the eastern banks of the River Ili, and close to the triangular lake, the Bašyirt are shown. The map of the Dīwān incorrectly shows the River Irtysh (*Ārtiš*) to flow into Lake Balkhash (according to my estimation). Farther to the East, on the western banks of the upper part of the River Irtysh, we find the Yemäk. This is a discrepancy since their position in the list between Oγuz and Bašyirt differs from their position on the map. East of the Bašyirt, at the western banks of a river, for which no name is given, we find the Qāy. Among the tribes of the West-to-East list Yabāqu and Qirqiz unfortunately do not appear on the map. Despite this, on the map, we find the River *Yamār*, which according to the dictionary passes through the steppes of the Yabāqu (K 456/DK II 161). Therefore, we know roughly where to place them on the map. If the combination of the dictionary data and the map is correct, they should have lived East of the Qāy. This is in accordance with their place in the list. If this was the case, they would have lived East of the Tatār. However, this is in contradiction to their position in the list, which—according to the author—the tribes "are listed in order [from West] to East" (K 20/DK I 82). The differences between the positions of the tribal names in the list and their configuration on the map can be demonstrated as follows:

Bäčänäk - Qifčāq - Oγuz - Yemäk - Bašyirt - Basmil - Qāy - Yabāqu - Tatār - Qirqiz

Bäčänäk - Qifčāq - Oγuz - Basmil/Tatār - Bašyirt - Yemäk - Qāy - Yabāqu (position reconstructed by the help of the River *Yamār*) - (Qirqiz is not on the map.)

Among the names of the second list of tribes "middling between South and North" we only find Čömül and Māšīn on the map. The Čömül are

14 The name of the River Ili is given as *Ilā*, "name of a river [the Ili]. On its banks camp two tribes of the Turks, namely *Yağma* and *Tuxsi*, and a group of *Čigil*. It is the 'Jayhūn' (the "Oxus") of the Turk country" (K 58/DK I 125). The tribes mentioned here belong to the second list of names; they are not given on the map. It is interesting that *Kāšyarī* calls the River Ili the "Oxus of the Turk country". Perhaps he considered the region of the River Oxus (in his times at least partly controlled by Seljuks and Karakhanids) not as part of the original "Turk country". If in the "Turk country" the River Ili plays the role of the River Oxus in *Mawarannahr*, for *Kāšyarī* the (original) "Turk country" seems to be identical with the lands of the former Western Turks, the *Türgäš*, and the *On Oq*.

placed North East of the "deserts of Yemäk" (*fayāfi Yemäk*) and the *Ötükän* and South East of the Qāy at the western shores of the unnamed river which flows into the triangular lake (see above). The Māšīn are according to the map in the far East, separated by a bay from the land of the Uiyurs and opposite to the island of *Ĵabarqā*, i.e. Japan. This could be alluding to the fact that Māšīn is some way connected with Korea and Manchuria, but this can not be confirmed by the map. The region of the Uiyur and four of their five towns¹⁵ are located West of Māšīn, and South of the Čömül. The Yaymā, Tuxsī, and a part of the Čigil live according to the dictionary on the River Ili (K 58/DK I 125, see fn. 14) close to where the Basmil, Tatār and Bašyirt are shown on the map. If this is correct, the Yaymā, Tuxsī, and a part of the Čigil may have lived as far North as the Čömül but West of them.¹⁶ We learn about the Oyrāq from the dictionary which explains that they live in an undefined "frontier district" called *Qarā Yigāč* (K 72/DK I 144); unfortunately, we can not place it on the map. The Čaruq "inhabit: *Barčuq* the city of Afrāsiyāb, in which he imprisoned *Bīzan* son of Nebuchadnezzar" (K

15 Sulmī, Qōčō, ĵanbaliq and Bēšbaliq, but not Yaŋi Baliq; for the towns of the Uiyur see K 69/DK I 140.

16 Čigil is the "name for three groups (*tawā'if*) of the Turks. The first is a nomadic people inhabiting: QUYA'S *Qayās*, a small district beyond Barsyān" (K 198–199/DK I 301). On the map we find Barsyān (BRSQ'N) in the southwestern corner of the inner rectangular of the central mountain complex. Under the heading *Qayās* we find: "name of the country of Tuxsi and Čigil. It is three fortresses." (K 520/DK II 238); perhaps the location of these three fortresses is symbolized on the map by three unnamed points east of Barsyān. The second meaning of Čigil is said to be "a small district near Ṭarāz. It is the original referent of this name. Thus: When *Dū-l Qarnayn* came to the land of Arġu the clouds loosed their founts and the road became muddy, and this caused him difficulty. He said in Persian: *m Čigil ast* meaning 'What is this mud (*mā hādā t-ṭīn*) — there's no escaping it!' So he ordered a building to be constructed in that spot, and they built the fortress (*hišn*) that is called *Čigil* to this day. The place was called by that name; then the Turks who settled there were called: *Čigilī* and this name spread after that. Now the Oyuz, since their lands bordered on this fortress, used to fight the Čigil continually — the enmity between the two peoples persists to the present — and so these called all Turks who dressed in the manner of the Čigil by that name. That is to say, the Oyuz called all the Turks from the Jayhūn (Oxus) to Upper Šīn: *Čigil* — but this is an error." It remains unclear whether "dressing in the manner of the Čigil" has to do with the *qiymač bōrk* 'a white cap of fine goats-hair worn by the Čigil' (K 522/DK II 240). The third use of *Čigil* is to designate a group of villages near Kāšyar (K 198–199; DK I 301).

191/ DK I 292) which can not be found on the map. The realm of the Taŋut and Šīn can be somehow localized on the map by the help of information given under the heading *sīn* 'stature, height; grave' (K 504/DK II 218). There we find *Qātūn Sīnī* 'a city between Taŋut and Šīn'. *Qātūn Sīnī* can be found on the map East of the Uighur region and West of the Māšīn peninsula. Thus we may conclude that Taŋut and Šīn also were East of the Uighurs (and probably West of Māšīn), which is in accordance with our knowledge about the geographical location of the historical Tangut and Qitań (Šīn = Xitāy = Liao) (see 3.1.2). In any case we can not assume that the second list is a South-to-North list in the strict sense of the word. The tribes given at the beginning of the list (Čömül, Yaǵmā, Tuxsī, and a part of the Čigil) are located farther North than those at its end; only the Barsyan and Kāšyar Čigil are at more or less the same geographical height as Uiŋur and Māšīn, perhaps also like Taŋut and Šīn. The expression "middling between South and North" has to be taken in a much broader sense and appears from my point of view only as an analogical counterpart to the West-to-East order of the first list.

Of course one should approach the map added to the *Dīwān* cautiously. Obviously, one need to ask how should a correct map of Eurasia and parts of Africa have been drawn in these times? Needless to say though, it is remarkable that we find many discrepancies between the data given in the text and on the map, which was added to the text for explanatory reasons. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know whether some of the contradictions date back both to the copying of the map and the text in the thirteenth century.

3.1.2 The Taŋut, Xitāy ("which is Šīn") and Tawŷāč ("which is Māšīn") are designated as Turkic tribes. But as we know, the historical Xitāy (Qitań) and Tawŷāč spoke a (Para-)Mongolic¹⁷ language, and the language of the Taŋut is still unknown.

3.1.2.1 According to Kāšyarī, the Taŋut claimed "to be of Arab origin" (K 602/DK II 334). While I have not found evidence to confirm this, it somehow connects them to the *Tübüt*, the Tibetans.¹⁸ Kāšyarī writes that the

17 See JANHUNEN 2003.

18 As a consequence of later political developments *Tanggut* became one of the designations for the Tibetans and their country in Written Mongolian, see LESSING 1960.

Tübüt trace their roots back to a Arab from Yemen named Tābit. Kāšġarī tells us: "A large tribe (*jīl ... kaḷīr*) in the lands of the Turks. ... They are the descendants of Tābit. He was a man from Yemen who committed a crime, then took fright and fled by sea to Šīn. He found those regions to his liking and settled there. His children multiplied to such an extent that they took over 1500 parasangs from the lands (*arāḡī*) of the Turks. They are bordered on the East by Šīn, on the West by Qišmīr, on the North by Uighur, and on the South by the Indian Sea. In their language, one still finds some Arabic words, such as 'UMA' *uma* 'mother' (*umm*) and 'ABA' *aba* 'father' (*ab*)" (K 179/DK I 276). While this genealogy is incorrect, at least they are not designated as a Turkic tribe by Kāšġarī, but only living in the lands of the Turks.¹⁹ The latter remark again ties Taḡut and Tübüt closer together. In the introduction of the Dīwān, Kāšġarī tells us: "The second class are such as Khotan, Tübüt and some of Tangut—this class are settlers in the lands of the Turks." (K 24/DK I 83). As mentioned above, the language of the Taḡut is still unknown. That the Taḡut are listed among the Turkic tribes should not be taken as a sign that their language was supposedly of so-called Altaic type as has been assumed in the past (even if there is a small chance that it is possible; see also 4.1). As we can see from the Tübüt example, Kāšġarī's linguistic knowledge was of medieval type. It may be doubted that categories like agglutination, one of the main characteristics of the Altaic morphology, or even more sophisticated categories of modern linguistics played a role for him. If he includes speakers of languages of so-called Altaic type like Xitāy and Tawḡāč in his list of Turkic tribes, it most probably is by pure coincidence from the linguistic point of view. Most likely there were special common traces of lifestyle, social and military organization, and perhaps special relations to the Turks proper which made peoples worthy of becoming entitled as Türk by Kāšġarī. Taking in account what is said about

19 As to their language, Kāšġarī tells us in the introduction that they have a language of their own (K 24/DK I 83). According to Klaus SAGASTER (information by e-mail, 27.11.2003), Kāšġarī is right with the word for 'father', which in Tibetan written language is *a-pha* (modern pronunciation *aba*; in classical literary texts *pha*). The word for 'mother' is *a-ma* in Tibetan written language (modern pronunciation *ama*; in classical literary texts *ma*). Thus Klaus SAGASTER thinks that the form *uma* given by Kāšġarī may go back to a mishearing or misspelling or is (not so probable) an obscure dialect form.

the use of the designation Čigil by the Oγuz (see fn. 14) it may also have been a characteristic of clothing.²⁰ The same considerations hold true for the Tatār, Qāy, Basmil, Čömül, Xitāy and Tawγāč.

3.1.2.2 The Xitāy are without a doubt identical with the (Para-)Mongolic Qitañ, which still at Kāšyarī's times ruled Northern China and were known as the Liao dynasty. Tawγāč (= Māšīn) is according to Kāšyarī "the name of Māšīn. It lies beyond Šīn a distance of four months' travel." There follows some information about Šīn, which I shall relate to below. Kāšyarī continues: "Tawγāč - the name of a tribe of the Turks who settled in in those regions" (K 228/DK I 341); "those regions" must be a part of Šīn. The Tawγāč of Kāšyarī may have been direct successors of the ancient Para-Mongolic Tavγāč, which ruled Northern China as Northern Wei dynasty from the fourth to sixth centuries. But until now, I have no hint that they have more in common other than their name.

As we have seen, Kāšyarī associates Xitāy with Šīn. Additionally, he gives Xitāy as the 'name of Upper Šīn' (K 550/ DK II 274), Barxān is the 'name of Lower Šīn. It is a fortress (*hišn*) on a mountain top near Kāšyar.' (K 219/DK I 329). The latter matches the information given under the lemma *känd*. There he states 'Kāšyar is called *ordu känd* meaning 'city of residence, since Afrāsiyāb used to reside there because of its fine air; it is Lower Šīn.' (K 173/DK I 270). Under the lemma Tawγāč (K 228/DK I 341), we find some further information about Šīn. Šīn was "originally threefold": in the East "Upper Šīn", which is Tawγāč; in the middle is Xitāy; and Lower Šīn is Barxān, "the vicinity of Kāšyar. But now Tawγāč is known as Māšīn, and Xitāy as Šīn, i.e. a shift in the usage of the names. The derivation Šīnī of Šīn also appears here in connection with Tat Tawγāč "meaning Uiγur (which is Tat) and Šīnī (which is Tawγāč)",²¹ i.e. here he obviously implements the

20 That dressing manners could be used to identify at least some of the tribes becomes clear, e.g., by the remark on *kämäk* 'a fabric (*nasīj*) of cotton, embroidered and striped, used for mantles and, by the Qifčāq, for raincoats' (K 197/DK I 300, in the index of proper names in DK III 241 wrongly given as K 187). See also fn. 16.

21 It should be mentioned that the use of *Tawγāč* for *šīnī* is in accordance with the use of the name Tavγāč for "Chinese" in the Orkhon inscriptions. The memory of the Tavγāč/Northern Wei has also survived in some expressions given by Kāšyarī: "Any manufactured item that is ancient and imposing (*idā kāna qadīman 'ašīman*) is called *tawγāč üdi* ... The word is also used for kings: *tawγāč xān* meaning "of great and inveterate rule (*'ašīm al-mulk wa-qadīmuhu*)" (K 228/DK I 341).

previous meaning "Upper Şīn" for Tawḡāč, but leaving out the "Upper". After having discussed some compounds containing Tawḡāč (see fn. 21) he returns to Tat Tawḡāč and reports: "by 'Tat' they mean 'Persian (*al-fārisī*)', and by 'Tawḡāč' they mean 'Turk.'" In my opinion, the more correct usage is what I have mentioned [above]. The latter is used in the lands of Islam; the former in that place. Both are correct".

Here the information given by Kāšyarī is not contradictory, but given incoherently and distributed to different parts of the dictionary. If we summarize all the information, we can say that during Kāšyarī's time Xitāy is Upper (← "Middle") Şīn, Barxān/Kāšyar is Lower Şīn, Tawḡāč is Māşīn (← Upper Şīn). Tawḡāč may also be called Şīnī in opposition to Uiyur which may also be called Tat in the "Şīn regions". At the same time farther to the West, in the Muslim regions, Tat is also used for "Persian", Tawḡāč for "Turk".

3.2. Besides the names of twenty "Turkic" tribes given in the introduction, we find some more so-called Turkic tribes mentioned in the Dīwān.

3.2.1 There are the *Qarluq*, of which Kāšyarī gives us some dialect materials, but no geographical information; neither do they appear on the map. The Qarluq are characterized as follows: "a tribe of the Turks. They are nomads, not Oḡuz, but they are also Turkmān." (K 238/DK I 353). The Oḡuz are designated as *Oḡuz-Türkmān* already in the introduction (K 20/DK I 82). Under the heading *Oḡuz* we find: "a tribe of the Turks; the Türkmān" (K 40/DK I 101); vice versa we find under *Türkmān*: 'they are the Oḡuz.' (K 622/DK II 362). Thus the Türkmān should (at least) contain the Qarluq and the Oḡuz. Unfortunately we do not get any further information about their relation to each other. Furthermore, we hear that the Türkmān originally consisted of 24 tribes, but the two tribes of the *Xalač* are different from them and separated in mythical early times (K 624/DK II 363). The 22 Türkmān tribes could be identical with the 22 tribes, the names of which appear under the lemma *Oḡuz* (because Türkmān and Oḡuz are identical), but see fn. 13. If so, the question arises, if the Qarluq are a group of the Türkmān, why are they not included in the list.

3.2.2 In relation to the *Xalač*, we do not get any essential information; their land is not marked on the map. Therefore we can not say anything about a

connection with the people of *Ar̄yu*, which are according to DOERFER (1987), the precursors of the modern non-Oghuz Khalaj in Central Iran (they may also to be connected with the Oghuz Khalaj groups in modern Iran). There is no direct connection between the people of *Ar̄yu* and *Xalač* mentioned by *Kāšyarī*. Geographical notes on the Land of *Ar̄yu* helps to place it on the map between *Ṭirāz* and *Balāsāyūn* (K 76/DK I 151). Interpreting *Kāšyarī*'s *Dū-l-Qarnayn* story on the ethnogenesis of the *Türkṁān* and *Xalač* (K 623–25/DK II 362–3), DOERFER (1987, 113f.) comes to the conclusion that *Ar̄yu* and *Xalač* are the same people—like "*türkṁān = oγuz*". DOERFER may be correct in his analysis, but different from the case of *Oγuz-Türkṁān*, *Kāšyarī* does not provide us with any information about the relation between the two groups.

3.2.3 Far in the West, we hear about two other sources of Turkic linguistic materials — *Suvār* (under *Saxsīn*, "a city near *Bulγār*. It is *Suvār*.", K 220/DK I 330) and *Bulγār* ("a well known city of the Turks", K 229/DK I 343). Both places are marked on the map north of *baḥr Ābiskūn*.

3.2.4 Furthermore we find the Turkic tribes *Ādgiš ~ Āgdiš* in *Özjānd* in the Ferghana Valley (K 61/DK I 129), *Arāmūt* 'a tribe of the Turks near Uighur' (K 81/DK I 159), *Küčāt* 'a tribe (*jīl*) of Turks, who have been settled (*uskīnu*) in Khwārizm (K 180/DK I 277), and *Bulāq* or *Ālkä Bulāq* perhaps somewhere in the *Qifčāq* region or close to them.²²

3.2.5 The *Kānčäk* are also designated as 'a tribe of the Turks' (K 241/DK I 357). But in the introductory part *Kāšyarī* tells us about them: "You do find *hā*' in the speech of *Khotan*, since it is of Indian origin; and in the speech of *Kānčäk* as well, since it is not Turkic" (K 7/DK 73). This information warns us again ascribing any (modern) linguistic value to *Kāšyarī*'s remarks. Especially in this case, we most probably have to interpret this remark in a socio-political or a very common cultural way.

4. Let us now take a look at *Kāšyarī*'s remarks on the languages of the

²² See K 191/DK I 291: *Bulāq* 'A tribe (*jīl*) of the Turks. The *Qifčāq* took them captive, then God (may He be exalted) caused them to be released and they came to be called *Ālkä Bulāq*. The vowel is long or short'; see also K 77/DK I 152: *Ālkä Bulāq* 'a tribe of the Turks'.

"Turkic" tribes in the Dīwān. Of the Kānčāk, we already heard that they did not speak Turkic but a language "of Indian origin".

4.1 Among the tribes and regions mentioned in the introduction, in the two lists, we learn about Māšīn (Tawḡāč) and Šīn (Xitāy): "The people of Māšīn and of Šīn have a language of their own, although the sedentary population knows Turkic well and their correspondence with us is in the Turkic script. Perhaps this Turkic speaking sedentary population is to be connected with some Uighur groups which fled to the Qitañ after the Uighur steppe-empire was crushed by the Ancient Kirghiz around 840. The nomadic Čömül have a "gibberish (*raṭāna*) of their own, but also know Turkic." Each of the Qāy, Yabāqu, Tatār, and Basmil "has its own language, but they also know Turkic well" (K 25/DK I 83). At these times the Qāy, and Tatār probably still spoke (Para-)Mongolic languages (see, e.g., GOLDEN 1992, 164); this may also be true for the Yabāqu (GOLDEN 1992, 230). While I have little information about the languages of the Čömül and Basmil, their names seem to be derived with the same suffix *-mil*, so they might have had languages of a similar type — but this is mere speculation.²³ The language of the Taḡut is still unknown. Probably it was not a Turkic language. Otherwise the attempts to decipher their texts should have been more fruitful.

Thus about 40 % of the so-called Turkic tribes listed in the introduction were linguistically not Turks, even if they, or at least parts of them, spoke more or less good Turkic. The question remains, which concept of being Turk or being a Turkic tribe is used by Kāšgarī. Was it a question of speaking an agglutinative language? Most likely, it was a political-cultural concept, which could be applied even on non-Turkic tribes, if they had somehow found a place in the Turkic cultural system, see also 3.1.2.1.

4.2 Among the groups of which we know that they spoke a kind of Turkic, the Uiyur are said to speak pure Turkic. In addition, they speak another language among themselves.²⁴ The Qirqiz, Qifčāq, Oḡuz, Tuxsī, Yaymā, Čigil,

23 Perhaps the name *Basmil* has survived in the name of the mythical *Musmal* or *Mosmal* mentioned by BUTANAEV (1999, 64), see SCHÖNIG (forthcoming).

24 TEKELI (1986, 7) erroneously writes that "the Uygurs spoke Turkish and used the Turkish alphabet, but they also had different dialects like Comul [*sic!*], Hay [*sic!*], Yakubi [*sic!*], Tatar and Basmil." More correct in TEKELI (1985, 6): "... Uygurlarının öztürkçe [*sic!*] konuşuklarını, Comil [*sic!*], Hay [*sic!*], Yakunbi [*sic!*], Basmil'lerin de ayrı bir ağızları olduğunu vurgulamıştır".

Oyrāq and Čaruq spoke "a pure Turkic, a single language"; the languages of Yemāk and Bašyirt are close to these (K 25/DK I 83). Probably they spoke medieval Norm Turkic.²⁵ The languages of Buljār, Suvār and of the Bāčänäk are "Turkic of a single type, with clipped ends"²⁶ (K 25/DK I 84). They seem to have been medieval Bulgar Turks (see also DOERFER 1987). It is not clear from the few examples in the Dīwān what "clipped ends" means. But with respect to modern Chuvash, we may assume that at least some word final elements had been lost in their language. Medieval Bulgar Turkic probably had—contrary to the other Turkic languages—a stress on the first syllable, which in comparison to other Turkic languages gave the impression of weakened (or zero) pronunciation of the last syllables.

Kāšyarī does not provide very much information about the Turkic of the Türkmān, Xalač und Qarluq. But if his information about the internal relations of these tribes are of any linguistic value, we may assume that at least the Türkmān spoke Oğuz (because they are identical with them). The Qarluq may have spoken a kind of Oğuz (because they are said to be Türkmān), but perhaps they were only a political or cultural part of them and had a language of their own (because they were at the same time not Oğuz). The Xalač may have spoken a language of their own, because they were different from the Türkmān, but this is uncertain since a connection with the Oğuz is never mentioned.

4.3 As for the Ädgiš ~ Ägdīš, Arāmūt, Küčät and (Älkä) Bulāq, we can not say anything, because Kāšyarī gives no dialect materials and does not comment on their language. Perhaps they did not even speak Turkic, even though Kāšyarī designates them as Turkic tribes — as in the case of the Kānčäk!

5. It is also interesting to take a look at Kāšyarī's personal judgements on the qualities of the various Turkic dialects, some of which are based on linguistic criteria. Thus the Oğuz speak the "lightest of the dialects". Yaymā and Tuxsī, together with those who dwell on the rivers Ili (according to the map (a group of) Čigil and the originally non-Turkic speaking Tatār, see 3.1.1), Irtyš (according to the map the Yemāk, see 3.1.1), Yamār (according to information in the dictionary the originally non-Turkic speaking Yabāqu; no other tribe is

25 For the expression "Norm Turkic" see SCHÖNIG 1999.

26 For different translations of *maḥdūfa al-aṭraf' alā namaṭ wāḥid* see DK I 84, fn.3.

mentioned to live there, see 3.1.1) and *Ätil* (Volga) (according to the map the Qifčāq)²⁷ "as far as the country of Uiyur", speak the "most correct" dialects.²⁸ It is interesting that — if my interpretation of Kāšyarī's data is right — we find among the tribes which speak "most correct" dialects, besides original Turkic speakers like Yaḡmā, Tuxsī, Čigil, Yemāk, Bašyirt and Qifčāq tribes, which had an own language—Tatār and Yabāqu. Of course my interpretation may be wrong, but perhaps these two tribes became simply Turkicized under the influence of "most correct" speakers.

The *Xāqānī* kings "and those who associate with them" speak "most elegant" (K 25/DK I 84). At first, it is somehow astonishing that "correct" is not an attribute of the language of the *Xāqānī* rulers, therefore "most elegant" may be of higher value and includes "correctness".²⁹ The concept of elegance is explained in another way by the following statement of Kāšyarī: "The most elegant of the dialects belong to those who know only one language, who do not mix with Persians, and who do not customarily settle in other countries" (K 24/DK I 83), i.e. those of the Turks who have retained their nomadic lifestyle. Here (according to DK I 46) Kāšyarī in analogy applies the methods and standards of Arabic philologists who assumed the Bedouin usage of Arabic as more conservative and original. Does this mean that the *Xāqānī* kings spoke the same way the nomadic Turks did? I think we have to assume that Kāšyarī's concept of "elegance" is a compound one: the *Xāqānī* kings spoke "most elegant", because for him their court was setting the standard; at the same time the nomadic Turks spoke "most elegant" because of their remoteness and isolation from others "untouchedness" (according to the standards of Arabic philologists).

The language of Kāšyarī's Oğuz sponsors had no chance to achieve the attribute "correct". About Oğuz Turkic, we learn under the lemma *örän* 'bad

27 Even if Suvār and Bulḡār are—according to the map—also close to River *Ätil* (River Volga), we may exclude them from the circle of speakers of "most correct" dialects, because their Turkic had "clipped ends", see 4.2.

28 TEKELI (1985, 6) wrongly translates that "en iyi Türkçenin Oğuzlar, ... konuştuğunu vurgulamıştır". This became even more incorrect in the English translation: "Mahmud concluded that the best Turkish was spoken by Oğuz and Yağma tribes (TEKELI 1986, 7); at least the passage on Tuxsi and Yağma was correct in TEKELI (1985, 6): "... en doğrusunu Toki [sic!] ve Yağmaların konuştuğunu vurgulamıştır".

29 According to DK I 44 "in practice the judgment of 'correctness' and 'elegance' often go together ...".

(*radī*): "When the Oğuz mixed with the Persians they forgot many Turkic words and used Persian instead." (K 51/DK I 115). Under *turma* 'radish' we find in connection with the Oğuz word *gäšür* for 'radish' ("which they borrowed from the Persians"): "When they mixed with the Persians they forgot some of their own language and used Persian in its place"; there follow some examples (K 217/DK I 326). Not without reason—perhaps to equilibrate the disadvantage of Persification—he goes on: "Know that the Oğuz are refined. They use nouns and verbs in isolation that the Turks use only in paired expressions, as a branch or subordinate is joined to its root. For example, the Turks say to mean 'he mixed two things': *qatti qardi* — *qatti* is the root in the matter of mixing two things; *qardi* is subordinate to it. The Oğuz say: *qardi* for mixing two things, leaving off the root. Similarly, the Turks say *ädgü yawlāq* — *ädgü* is 'good'; — *yawlāq* is 'bad' and is used paired with *ädgü* not alone. The Oğuz use it alone." Thus the language of the Oğuz may not be "most correct" or "elegant", but the "lightest" and are additionally "refined"³⁰ so that the relation between the Karakhanids, the rulers of Kāšyarī's homeland, and the Oğuz Seljuks, his new rulers, is equilibrated.

6. To learn something about Kāšyarī's attitude towards Persians, one can take a look at the use of the word *Tat*. As I have previously mentioned, we find under *Tawγāč* the expression *Tat Tawγāč* 'Uighur (which is *Tat*) and Šīnī (which is *Tawγāč*'); *Tat* also means 'Persian', *Tawgāč* is 'Türk' (K 228/DK I 341). Under *Tat* we also find the meanings 'Persian (*fārisī*)—among most of the Turks' and 'Uighur infidels (*kafara uyğur*)—among the *Yağma* and *Tuxsi*' (K 406/DK II 103) (i.e. tribes speaking most correct). There we also find the saying *Tatiγ kōzrā tikānīg tüprā* '(strike) the Persian on the eye, (cut) the thorn at its roots'. After having mentioned the original meaning of *Tat Tawγāč* 'Uighurī and Šīnī', Kāšyarī states: "The proverb [above] also originally refers to them, because they lack loyalty; just as the thorn should be cut at its root, so the Uighurī should be struck on the eye". (K 406/DK II 103). There follows another proverb which—or the interpretation of which—exhibit *Tat* exclusively in the meaning 'Persian': *tatsiz türk bolmās bašsiz bōrk bolmās* 'there is no Persian except in the company of a Turk, (just as) there is no cap unless there is a head to put it on' (K 407/DK II 103), i.e. with

30 Of course, one may ask why it is refined to "use nouns and verbs in isolation."

a wrong translation.³¹ The same proverb also appears under *börk* (K 176/DK I 273),³² where it is translated as: 'A Turk is never without a Persian (just as) a cap is never without a head'. Without a doubt, the second translation, which is more positive towards the Persians than the Turks, is the correct one. The right translation appears under the "unpolitical" lemma *börk*, whereas the incorrect, "anti-Persian" translation appears under the "political" lemma *Tat*. Perhaps this proverb goes back to a time when relations between Persians and Turks were better and the Turks were more self-ironical. Maybe the proverb is coined not on Turks in general but on those who mix with the Persians (e.g. the *Oyuz*). Perhaps Kāšyarī (or the copyist) has produced the anti-Persian translation of the proverb to harmonize it somehow with the proverb which he cites under a second lemma *tat* 'rust that appears on a sword, or other' (K 407/DK II 103) following the *Tat* discussed above. The proverb says *qilič tatiqsa iṣ yunčir är tatiqsa ät tinčir* 'When rust overtakes a sword, the condition (of the warrior) suffers, (just as) when a Turk assumes the morals of a Persian his flesh begins to stink'. Here he again gives an incorrect translation: for *är* he translates 'Turk' instead of 'man'. Of course the wrong, tendentious translation of the proverb and the wrong translation of *är* may be mistakes of the copyist. But what we can clearly see is the anti-Persian attitude of Kāšyarī which he had most probably imported from his Karakhanid homeland. Before the *Oyuz* came to power the Karakhanids had to struggle with the rulers of Ġaznā, which were Turks, but adopted the Persian culture of the majority of their subjects. Firdawsī's *Šāh-nāma* which is said to be sponsored by Maḥmūd von Ġaznā, can be considered as a piece of propaganda art reminding its readers to the mythical fights between Iran (now represented by the rulers of Ġaznā) and Turan (the Karakhanids). The Karakhanids did not hesitate to join this game and adopted the name of Afrāsiyāb, the leader of Turan.³³ Thus, despite the fact that his new Seljuk

31 See also DK II 103, fn. 1: "Thus the Arabic: *lā yakūnu l-fārisī illā wa-yuxāliḡu t-turka* should be reversed to accord with the Turkic."

32 Here we find a different notation *tātsīz türk bolmās bāšsīz börk bolmās*.

33 In the *Dīwān* we find, e.g., *tārim* 'the title by which one addresses princes (*takākīn*) and those princesses (*xawātīn*), and others, great or small, who descend from Afrāsiyāb. This term is used only for the sons of Khāqānī kings, and for no one else, however great. One says *altun tārim* when addressing princesses.' (K 199/DK I 302), *tegīn* 'slave (*abd*) ... Then this word became a title pure and simple for the sons of the Khāqāniyya. ... The reason why this name was transferred from the

masters are somehow "infected" by the "Persian disease", for him as a Turk of noble Karakhanid offspring a Persian is as bad as an infidel Uighur, both are Tat.

7. There are also some problems in the dialect materials. Here I shall discuss only some selected problems in the field of phonetics. Whereas some of the problematic notations and formulations may go back to the later copyist, problems on the systemic level most probably go back to Kāšyarī himself.

7.1 The tendency to change initial *b-* to *m-*, if a nasal stands at the first syllable border, already appears in the early Old Turkic period. Kāšyarī tells us, that "the Oγuz, Qifčāq and Suvārīn change every initial *mīm* to *bā*" (K 26/DK I 85), i.e. he considers the more frequent but secondary *m-*forms as the basic forms—perhaps also because they are used by the tribes of the Karakhanid state. He goes on with examples, in which forms like *män bardim* 'I went' and *mün* 'broth' are ascribed to "the Turks", whereas Oγuz, Qifčāq and Suvār say *bän bardum* and *bün*. Under *bän* 'I' the form is designated only as "Oγuz dialect" (K 169/DK I 267). Besides we find *män* 'I' in "Turk dialect" (K 171/DK I 268); there follows *mün* 'soup' without any hint to a *b-*form (K 171/DK I 268). The explanation for the occurrence of *b* in Oγuz, Qifčāq and Suvār where other Turkic dialects have *m-* is very short and needs some interpretation by the reader. As I said before, Kāšyarī's explanation only covers constellations with initial *b-* before a nasal at the first syllable border. Otherwise no initial *m* would exist in the three dialects in question. Besides, Kāšyarī has noted cases, in which especially Oγuz has *m-* before nasal consonants, e.g. *mandār* 'a plant which winds around trees and causes them to dry up — "bindweed (*ašaqa*)." Oγuz dialect' (K 230/DK 343) and *miṅār* 'spring of water (*ayn al-mā*). Oγuz dialect ' (K 608/DK II 342) ~ *miṅar* (K 603/DK II 335; see also K 567/DK II 294, sub *čoqra-*).

slaves to the sons of Afrāsiyāb is simply that ... (K 208f./DK I 314), and *qāz* 'name of the daughter of Afrāsiyāb. She is the one who built the city of Qazvīn. The root-form of this is *Qāz oyni* meaning "Qāz's playground (*mu'ab*)", since she used to live there and play. For this reason some of the Turks reckon Qazvīn within the borders of the Turk lands. Also the city of Qum, since *qum* in Turkic is "sand (*raml*)" and this daughter of Afrāsiyāb used to hunt there and frequent it. Others of them reckon [the borders] from Marv aš-Šāhijān since her father *Toḡa Alp Är* — who is Afrāsiyāb — built the city of Marv, ...' (K 509f./DK II 225).

Even if Kāşyarī is incorrect in his analysis, I believe only tried to describe the situation with genuine Turkic words. The words with initial *m-* in Oġuz seem to be loanwords. In cases, in which he only wants to point to a special form or meaning of a Turkic word in Oġuz different from its form or meaning in other Turkic languages, he perhaps kept the "regular" notation with *m* (see DOERFER 1987, 107). The example *ol māni aṅār salturdi* 'he ordered the credit to be transferred to me and charged against him (*amara bi-l-iḫāla lī 'alayhi*)' (K 360/DK II 55) is such a case — it shows *māni* instead of expected Oġuz *bāni*, but is designated as "Oġuz dialect".

Kāşyarī has also noted data of *b-* ~ *m-* changes before nasals farther back than the first syllable border. Thus we find for Oġuz *büküm ätüük* 'boot worn by women'. He continues: "Others say *mükim* or *mükin*, changing the *bā*' to *mīm* and the final *mīm* to *nün*; I think this is not genuine; nevertheless, the Qifčāq and other crude peoples use this word." (K 199/DK I 302). Here he again contradicts his own rule that Oġuz, Qifčāq and Suvār have *b* instead of *m* by citing a *m*-form which is designated as Qifčāq.

7.2 Furthermore Kāşyarī states, that "the Oġuz and those who follow them change every *tā*' to *dāl*" (K 26/DK I 85); unfortunately he does not say who these followers are. The examples he provides are the Oġuz words *dāvā* 'camel' (see also K 544/DK II 267)³⁴ and *ūd* 'hole', where the Türk (whatever that means in this context, see 1) say *tewe* and *ūt* (see also K 34/DK I 93). He continues: "[However,] most *dāls* among the genuine Turks correspond to *tā*' in Oġuz dialect." Examples for this counter rule are Turkic *bögdä* 'dagger' (see also K 210/DK I 317) and *yigdü* 'service tree' (see also K 457/DK II 162) versus Oġuz *bögtä* and *yigtä*. As we can see the rules given by Kāşyarī do not take into account the different positions within a word or a syllable of the sounds in question. Like in the case of *b* and *m* these rules demand further interpretation.

The correspondence "word-initial Oġuz *d-* = Türk *t-*" covers a large percentage of cases from Old Anatolian Turkic on up to modern times. In the initial position of the second syllable, for which Kāşyarī gives examples for the counter rule, we find some exceptions in his own materials. Examples are the cognates of early Old Turkic causative forms in *-tXz* (see ERDAL 1991), e.g. *ol maṅa iş bildüzdi* 'he informed me to find the thing' (K 368/DK II 63).

34 For the graphical variants of this word see DK III 188; for questions connected with this variations see DOERFER (1987, 107).

Here he comments: "This is Oγuz and goes against the rule; it is not used by the Turks". But we do not know, whether he means that the use of a *d*-form or the use of the causative suffix *-tXz* is "against the rule". The example *ol tawar alduzdi* 'he [let his property be taken; it was] plundered or stolen (*huriba, suliba*)' (K 312/DK II 9) is introduced by the remark that "the Oγuz sometimes have *zāy* instead of *rā*", i.e. he explains the causative suffix *-tXz*- as a side form of the suffix *-DUR*-. Thus we may assume that in the case of *bildüz*- he also means that the use of *-tXz*- is "against the rule". On the other hand he does not comment on *bulduz*-, which precedes *bildüz*- in the dictionary (K 368/DK II 63). Thus this question remains open.

7.3 For early Old Turkic *-d(-)* Kāšyarī states that "the Yaγma, Tuxsi, Qifčāq, Yabāqu, Tatār, Qāy, Čömül and Oγuz all agree in changing every dotted *dāl* to *yā*'. They never pronounce it *dāl*." (K 27/DK I 85) His examples are *qadiñ* 'birch tree' and *qadīn* '... in law', which are pronounced as *qayin* and *qayin* in the dialects in question. Furthermore he says that the *d* of the Čigil and other Turks (whatever that means, see 1) "is changed to *zāy* by some of Qifčāq, Yemäk, Suvār and Bulγār and those [in the area] stretching to Rūs and Rüm" (K 27/DK I 85). His examples are *adaq* ~ *azaq* 'foot' and *qarin tođti* 'his belly was full' ~ *tozdi*. He underscores the general validity of this rule with the words: "You may form the other nouns and verbs by analogy with these examples." Of course there is a problem with the Qifčāq, which are listed among the "y-Turks", whereas at least some of them are said to be "z-Turks". But this may be not really a problem of Kāšyarī's reliability. The Qifčāq lived in a huge area. Judging from later and modern data they should have been y-Turks, but their most western exponents might have been under influence of neighboring z-Turkic groups of Suvār and Bulγār (and perhaps Bāčänäk, in his times "stretching to Rūs and Rüm"?). This is stressed by DOERFER (1987, 106, fn. 5) who points to the fact that one part of the Qifčāq is located close to the Suvār on the map. There is even another possibility, if we keep in mind that there is a connection between Qifčāq and Yemäk. Kāšyarī tells us about the Yemäk: "a tribe of the Turks; they are considered by us to be Qifčāq, but the Qifčāq Turks reckon themselves a different party." (K 456/DK II 161). As mentioned before, the Yemäk pronounced *z* instead of *y*. Thus we may assume that there had been a closer connection between Qifčāq (at least the "z-Qifčāq") and the Yemäk which was denied by the Qifčāq for some unknown reasons in Kāšyarī's times. In these times the

Yemäk settled at River Ärtiš. The only recent z-Turks, the Yenisey-Turks (the Khakas (including the Fu-yü Turks) and the Shor) and the Yellow Uighur, live farther East. Perhaps at least parts of the Yemäk played some role in the glottogenesis of languages of these groups. DOERFER (1987, 113) classifies the Yemäk as "(echtes) Qifčaq" [real Qifčaq] despite the fact that they are "z-Turks" (according to Kāšyarī), but he gives no reason for this classification.

In the case of the before mentioned *toḍ-* the entrance in the dictionary has the example *mānig qarın tōḍti* 'my belly is full (*šabi'a*)' (K 633/DK II 375). Under *toy-* we find: "*qarın toydi* 'the belly was satiated (*šabi'a*)'. Its root-form is: *toḍti*—the *da:l* is changed to *ya:ʹ* as we mentioned; colloquial (? *luḡa al-qawm*)." (K 552/DK II 277) The question arises, whether dialects, which normally had *ḍ*, in colloquial language at least sometimes used *y*. Other examples for *toḍ-* and its derivations do not exhibit *y*-forms. Another entrance in the Dīwān which again breaks Kāšyarī's own rules is *aḍruq*. Kāšyarī writes: "a word meaning 'other (*ḡayr*)' in Oḡuz dialect. The Turks say *aḍin* for 'other'" (K 62/DK I 130); in addition, he gives *ayruq* "a variant meaning 'other'" (K 69/DK I 140), without saying whether it is Oḡuz or whatever. We may assume that Kāšyarī in the case of Oḡuz *aḍruq* put the stress on the structure of the word, and not on the single sounds. Thus he kept the *ḍ* which for him was the normal, original sound, see his general remark on *ḍ > y* given above. But what about *ayruq* then? Was it a "colloquial" variant of *aḍruq* as was *toy-* of *toḍ*?

8. I hope that I was able to demonstrate that the data in the Dīwān of Kāšyarī must be treated very carefully and with interpretation. Once this is done, mistakes and unclear passages arise. Further, we witness types of cultural and political propaganda or other deviations from reality. But, in general, we should not accuse Kāšyarī of being careless, uninformed or purposely lying. He put together a book of linguistic and folkloristic knowledge, which is unique not only in the Islamic world, but throughout the Medieval world. He lived in the Middle Ages, without all the knowledge of data and methods of which we can use today. And he was a human being with the natural right to make mistakes and the tendency to tell a personal version of reality and truth, whenever it seems to be necessary. Additionally, we have to keep in mind that some of the mistakes may be attributed to mistakes in reproducing the text. Despite the errors, contradictions, and deviations from reality, his Dīwān remains one of the most important sources of Turkic language history.

Literature

- DK = DANKOFF/KELLY = DANKOFF, ROBERT; KELLY, JAMES = MAHMŪD AL-KĀŞĠARĪ, *Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)*. Turkish Sources VII. Part I-III. Harvard: Harvard University Printing Office 1982–1985.
- DOERFER, G., 1987, Maḥmūd al-Kāşyarī, Arġu, Chaladsch. -- *UJb N.F.* 7, 105-114.
- EI = *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. New edition. Ed. by C.E. BOSWORTH e.a. Vol. VI. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1991
- ERDAL, M., 1991, *Old Turkic word formation*. Vol. I + II. Turcologica, Bd. 7. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GOLDEN, P. B., 1992, *An introduction to the history of the Turkic peoples*. Turcologica, Bd. 9, Wiesbaden.
- JANHUNEN, J., 2003 = *The Mongolic languages*. Edited by Juha JANHUNEN. Routledge Language Family Series 5. London, New York: Routledge. 2003
- KÜLTÜR BAKANLIĞI 1990 = KAŞGARLI MAHMUD, *Dīvānū lūgati't-türk*. Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları/1205, Klasik Eserler Dizisi/11. Ankara.
- LESSING, F.D., *Mongolian-English dictionary*. Compiled by M. HALTOD, J.G. HANGIN, S. KASSATKIN and F.D. LESSING. Berkeley and Los Angeles. 1960.
- SCHÖNIG, C., 1999, The internal division of Modern Turkic and its historical implications. — *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* Vol. 52 (1), 63–95 (1999).
- , (forthcoming), Südsibirisch-türkische Entsprechungen von Völker- und Stammesnamen aus der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen.
- TEKELI, S., 1985, *İlk Japon haritasını çizen Türk Kaşgarlı Mahmud ve Kristof Kolomb'un haritasına dayanarak en eski Amerika haritasını çizen Türk amiralı Pîrî Reis*. — *Türk Kültüründen Görüntüler Dizisi*, sayı 6. Ankara.
- , 1986, *The oldest map of Japan drawn by a Turk Mahmud of Kashgar : The map of America by Pîrî Reis*. — *Türk Kültüründen Görüntüler Dizisi*, sayı 6. Ankara.