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0. A close look at Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī's Dīwān reveals that he is one of the most important medieval philologians. 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. In this small article, I shall discuss some of these problematic passages. As for the text of Kāšyarī's Dīwān and its translation, I will rely on the edition of DANKOFF/KELLY (= DK) 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 Oγyz dialect, Türk designates the non-Oγyz Turkic peoples, the dialect(s) of which do not exhibit Oγyz features focused within his remarks (see some examples in 7). Thirdly, Türk seems to be describing a part of the core population of the Karakhanid state, i.e. the Čigil. The term Türk also appears in the list of

---

1. See DK 1 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 1 4: "The word 'Turk' is spelled 'Tirik' where it is used to indicate a dialect group (generally as opposed to Oγyz = Türkmen)."

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 'Turkmän or Oγyz'...".
dialects of Turkic tribes which Kāṣyārī 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-Öyüz, the Čigil, the Yağma, and the Qırıq." (K 3/DK I 70). If the translation of DK is correct, Türk is used in a sense different from a simple "non-Turkman-Öyüz" and "Karakhanid-Čigil".

2. According to Kāṣyārī, 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: "Narre of the son of Noah. ... 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-Kāṣyārī, who was told by Ibn al-Gharqî, who said: It was transmitted to us by the Shaykh, Abū Bakr al-Muṭḥid 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 Kāṣyārī. 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). Kāṣyārī 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 Ḫūz and encouraged the study of their language.6

These passages reveal a special aspect of Kāšyarī'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 Kāšyarī—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 Ḫūz 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 TEKELİ (1986, 5) these passages show that Kāšyarī "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 TEKELİ (1985, 5), where we find "... Kaşgarlı Mahmut, vatansıver, Türklerle hayran, yaptığı işe yu okreten inanan bir bilim adamıdır". In the same sense DK 5 states that "All of this [sic. information given in the Diwan] is prime data on medieval Turkdom, 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 Diwan had also propagandistic function. It is interesting to see that TEKELİ (1985 and 1986) does not make any critical remarks to the obviously wrong citation of Ibn Abī-d-Dunya 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 Kašyarī 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 Oγuz among the Turks. This could be from a strategic standpoint, since Kašyarī lived in Baghdad, which was ruled by the Seljuks, a sub-group of the Oγuz. Despite the fact that Kašyarī 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 Oγuz Turkic, and Kašyarī only gives a detailed list of the sub-branches of the Oγuz ("along with the brands of their cattle, since people need to know them"), K 20/DK I 82).

3. According to Kašyarī'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 Oγuz-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, Kašyarī remarks that some of these tribes do not speak Turkic at all, while some possess Turkic as a second language. Besides 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-branches 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 Kašyarī—consider speaking Turkic as a criterion for being Turk, I see no way to reach Kašyarī'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 Şin (China) (K 20/DK I
82): Bäčänäk - Qifčaq - Oγuz - Yemäk8 - Başyirt - Basmil - Qäy - Yabäqu9 - Tätär - Qirqiz. The second list gives ten tribes "middling between South and North" (K 21/DK I 82): Çigil - Tuxşi - Yäymä10 - Oγraq - Çaruç - Çömül - Uïjur - Taňut - Xităy ("which is Şin") - Tawyač ("which is Mäšin").11 In contradiction to Käşyarin'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., Rüs and a large lake which we must consider as a hybrid of the Caspian Sea and Lake Aral, named baḥr Ābiskün),12 Qifčaq (at both sides of this lake), and Oγuz (a part of them together with the eastern part of Qifčaq).13 Farther to the East there are the deserts of Basmil and Tätär. 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, Yaşpuq".
10 Different from DK, I prefer to write Tuxşi and Yaşma with -ı and -ä, because they are written with ya and alif in word-final position.
11 From my point of view the designations Şin and Mäšin can best be explained as a special kind of Arabic (Semitic) paranomasia (muzawga, see, e.g., El 823) called itbäd. The same type we meet with the biblical peoples Gog and Magog which are also mentioned in the Diwän in the form Yağığ and Mäğguğ (K 24/DK I 83). Most probably their names became a model for Şin and Mäšin 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 şabal Qaragüq in bilâdul-Guzziyya, the other part is East of this mountain region in maskan Qifčaq va'il-Guzziyya. This may reflect the fact that the Oghuz broke off in the tenth century into two groups, one group (led by Säljük 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 Türkmän 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 Käşyarin 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 (wāḏī īlā) flows into it. The Tatār are shown somehow South of the Basmil at the western banks of the River Ili. 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 (byterian) 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 Yemāk. This is a discrepancy since their position in the list between Oyuz 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 Yabāq 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 Yabāq (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:

Bāčanāk - Qifčaq - Oyuz - Yemāk - Bašyirt - Basmil - Qāy - Yabāq - Tatār - Qirqiz

Bāčanāk - Qifčaq - Oyuz - Basmil/Tatār - Bašyirt - Yemāk - Qāy - Yabāq (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 llā, "name of a river [the Ili]. On its banks camp two tribes of the Turks, namely Yāyma 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 Türgüş, and the On Oq.
placed North East of the "deserts of Yemāk" (fāyāfī Yemāk) and the Ḫūtkān and South East of the Qāy at the western shores of the unnamed river which flows into the triangular lake (see above). The Māṣīn are according to the map in the far East, separated by a bay from the land of the Uīyar and opposite to the island of Ḫabarqā, i.e. Japan. This could be alluding to the fact that Māṣīn is some way connected with Korea and Manchuria, but this can not be confirmed by the map. The region of the Uīyar and four of their five towns are located West of Māṣīn, and South of the Čöümīl. The Yaṃmā, Tuxsū, and a part of the Čigil live according to the dictionary on the River Ili (K 58/DK 1 125, see fn. 14) close to where the Basmīl, Tatār and Başyīrrt are shown on the map. If this is correct, the Yaṃmā, Tuxsū, and a part of the Čigil may have lived as far North as the Čöümīl but West of them. We learn about the Əyṛąq from the dictionary which explains that they live in an undefined "frontier district" called Qarā Yigāč (K 72/DK 1 144); unfortunately, we can not place it on the map. The Čarq "inhabit: Barçuq the city of Afrāsiyāb, in which he imprisoned Bīzan son of Nebuchadnezzar" (K

15 Sulmī, Qōdō, Janbaliq and Bēsbaliq, but not Yaṃq Balaq; for the towns of the Uīyar see K 69/DK 1 140.

16 Čigil is the "name for three groups (tawāfīf) of the Turks. The first is a nomadic people inhabiting: QUYA'S Qa'yās, a small district beyond Barsyān" (K 198–199/DK 1 301). On the map we find Barsyān (BRSG'N) in the southwestern corner of the inner rectangular of the central mountain complex. Under the heading Qavyās 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 Tarāz. It is the original referent of this name. Thus: When Dā-l Qarnayn came to the land of Arqū the clouds loosened their fountains and the road became muddy, and this caused him difficulty. He said in Persian: in Čigil ast meaning 'What is this mud (mā hādā t-šīn) — there's no escaping it!' So he ordered a building to be constructed in that spot, and they built the fortress (šīn) that is called Čigil to this day. The place was called by that name; then the Turks who settled there were called: Čigili and this name spread after that. Now the Əyuz, 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 Əyuz called all the Turks from the Jaylūn (Oxus) to Upper Şīn: Čīgil — but this is an error." It remains unclear whether "dressing in the manner of the Čigil" has to do with the əyamač bork '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 Şīn 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 Qāṭūn Šīnī 'a city between Taŋut and Şīn'. Qāṭūn Šīnī can be found on the map East of the Uighur region and West of the Māsin peninsula. Thus we may conclude that Taŋut and Şīn also were East of the Uighurs (and probably West of Māsin), which is in accordance with our knowledge about the geographical location of the historical Tangut and Qitari (Şīn = 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, Yağmā, Tuxsi, 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 Uīyur and Māsin, perhaps also like Taŋut and Şīn. 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 Şīn") and Tawyāč ("which is Māsin") are designated as Turkic tribes. But as we know, the historical Xitāy (Qitari) and Tawyāč spoke a (Para-)Mongolic 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 Tūbt, the Tibetans. Kāšyarī writes that the
Tübüt trace their roots back to a Arab from Yemen named Täbit. Käšyari tells us: "A large tribe (jil ... ka[tır]) in the lands of the Turks. ... They are the descendants of Täbit. He was a man from Yemen who committed a crime, then took fright and fled by sea to Şin. 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 (arâdî) of the Turks. They are bordered on the East by Şin, on the West by Qıșmir, 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 1 276). While this genealogy is incorrect, at least they are not designated as a Turkic tribe by Käšyari, but only living in the lands of the Turks.19 The latter remark again ties Taňut and Tübüt closer together. In the introduction of the Dîwân, Käšyari 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 1 83). As mentioned above, the language of the Taňut is still unknown. That the Taňut 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, Käšyari’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 Xitây and Tawgäč 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 Käšyari. Taking in account what is said about

19 As to their language, Käšyari tells us in the introduction that they have a language of their own (K 24/DK 1 83). According to Klaus SAGASTER (information by e-mail, 27.11.2003), Käšyari 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 Käšyari 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 Oγυz (see fn. 14) it may also have been a characteristic of clothing. The same considerations hold true for the Tatār, Qāy, Basmil, Čömül, Xitāy and Tawyāč.

3.1.2.2 The Xitāy are without a doubt identical with the (Para-)Mongolic Qītań, which still at Kāşyāri's times ruled Northern China and were known as the Liao dynasty. Tawyāč (= Māşīn) is according to Kāşyāri "the name of Māşīn. It lies beyond Şīn a distance of four months' travel." There follows some information about Şīn, which I shall relate to below. Kāşyāri continues: "Tawyāč - 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 Şīn. The Tawyāč of Kāşyāri may have been direct successors of the ancient Para-Mongolic Tawyāč, 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, Kāşyāri associates Xitāy with Şīn. Additionally, he gives Xitāy as the 'name of Upper Şīn' (K 550/ DK II 274), Barxān is the 'name of Lower Şīn. It is a fortress (hişn) on a mountain top near Kāşyār.' (K 219/DK I 329). The latter matches the information given under the lemma kānd. There he states 'Kāşyar is called ordu kānd meaning 'city of residence, since Afrāsiyāb used to reside there because of its fine air; it is Lower Şīn.' (K 173/DK I 270). Under the lemma Tawyāč (K 228/DK I 341), we find some further information about Şīn. Şīn was "originally threefold": in the East "Upper Şīn", which is Tawyāč; in the middle is Xitāy; and Lower Şīn ist Barxān, "the vicinity of Kāşyār. But now Tawyāč is known as Māşīn, and Xitāy as Şīn, i.e. a shift in the usage of the names. The derivation Şīnī of Şīn also appears here in connection with Tat Tawyāč "meaning Uiyur (which is Tat) and Şīnī (which is Tawyāč)", 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 kämük 'a fabric (naisij) of cotton, embroidered and striped, used for mantles and, by the Qitčaq, 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 Tawyāč for Şīnī is in accordance with the use of the name Tawyāč for "Chinese" in the Orkhon inscriptions. The memory of the Tawyāč/Northern Wei has also survived in some expressions given by Kāşyāri: "Any manufactured item that is ancient and imposing (idā kāna qadīman 'ażīman) is called tawyāč ādī ... The word is also used for kings: tawyāč xān meaning "of great and inveterate rule ('ażīm al-mulk wa-qadīmuhi)" (K 228/DK I 341).
previous meaning "Upper Şin" for Tawγač, but leaving out the "Upper". After having discussed some compounds containing Tawγač (see fn. 21) he returns to Tat Tawγač and reports: "by 'Tat' they mean 'Persian (al-fārisī)', and by 'Tawγač' 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 Kāṣyarī 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 Kāṣyarī's time Xitay is Upper (← "Middle") Şin, Barxān/Kāṣyar is Lower Şin, Tawγač is Māşīn (← Upper Şin). Tawγač may also be called Şini in opposition to Uiyur which may also be called Tat in the "Şin regions". At the same time farther to the West, in the Muslim regions, Tat is also used for "Persian", Tawγač 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 Kāṣyarī 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 Oyuz, but they are also Turkmān." (K 238/DK I 353). The Oyuz are designated as Oyuz-Turkmān already in the introduction (K 20/ DK I 82). Under the heading Oyuz we find: "a tribe of the Turks; the Turkmān" (K 40/ DK I 101); vice versa we find under Turkmān: 'they are the Oyuz.' (K 622/ DK II 362). Thus the Turkmān should (at least) contain the Qarluq and the Oyuz. Unfortunately we do not get any further information about their relation to each other. Furthermore, we hear that the Turkmān 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 Turkmān tribes could be identical with the 22 tribes, the names of which appear under the lemma Oyuz (because Turkmān and Oyuz are identical), but see fn. 13. If so, the question arises, if the Qarluq are a group of the Turkmān, 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 Arğu, 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 Arğu and Xalač mentioned by Kāšyārī. Geographical notes on the Land of Arğu helps to place it on the map between Tiráz and Balāsāyūn (K 76/DK I 151). Interpreting Kāšyārī’s Dū-i Qarnayn story on the ethnogenesis of the Türkman and Xalač (K 623–25/DK II 362–3), DOERFER (1987, 113f.) comes to the conclusion that Arğu and Xalač are the same people—like "türkman = oğuz". DOERFER may be correct in his analysis, but different from the case of Oğuz-Türkman, Kāšyārī 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 Bulğār. It is Suvār.", K 220/DK I 330) and Bulğār ("a well known city of the Turks", K 229/DK I 343). Both places are marked on the map north of bahr Ābiskūn.

3.2.4 Furthermore we find the Turkic tribes Ādgiš ~ Ādgiš 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 (jūl) of Turks, who have been settled (uskīnu) in Khwārizm (K 180/DK I 277), and Bulāq or Ālkā Bulāq perhaps somewhere in the Qifčāq region or close to them.22

3.2.5 The Kānčāk are also designated as ‘a tribe of the Turks’ (K 241/DK I 357). But in the introductory part Kāšyārī tells us about them: "You do find hā in the speech of Khotan, since it is of Indian origin; and in the speech of Kānčāk as well, since it is not Turkish" (K 7/DK 73). This information warns us again ascribing any (modern) linguistic value to Kāšyārī’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 Kāšyārī’s remarks on the languages of the

---

22 See K 191/DK I 291: Bulāq ‘A tribe (jūl) 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 Ālkā Bulāq. The vowel is long or short'; see also K 77/DK I 152: Ālkā Bulāq ‘a tribe of the Turks’. 

"Turkic" tribes in the Dīwān. Of the Kānāk, 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 Māsīn (Tawyāc) and Šīn (Xitāy): "The people of Māsīn 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 Ğomūl have a "gibberish (raţāna) of their own, but also know Turkic." Each of the Qāy, Yabāşı, Tatār, and Basmīl "has its own language, but they also know Turkic well" (K 25lDK 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 Yabāşı (GOLDEN 1992, 230). While I have little information about the languages of the Ğomūl and Basmīl, their names seem to be derived with the same suffix -mīl, so they might have had languages of a similar type — but this is mere speculation.23 The language of the Tājut 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 Kāšyarī. 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 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 Qırqız, Qifcāq, Oyuz, Tuxsī, Yaılmā, Ğigail,

23 Perhaps the name Basmīl has survived in the name of the mythical Mūsmal 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 Comūl [sic!], Hay [sic!], Yakubī [sic!], Tatar and Basmīl." More correct in TEKELI (1985, 6): "... Uyghurunun özürtçete [sic!] konuştuklarını, Comūl [sic!], Hay [sic!], Yakunbī [sic!], Basmīllerrin de ayni bir ağizları olduğunu ... vurgulamıştu".
Oyräq and Čaruq spoke "a pure Turkic, a single language"; the languages of Yemäk and Başyirt are close to these (K 25/DK I 83). Probably they spoke medieval Norm Turkic.\(^{25}\) The languages of Bulyär, Suvär and of the Bäčänäk 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 Diwān 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.

Käšyarī does not provide very much information about the Turkic of the Türkmen, 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 Türkmen spoke Oyuz (because they are identical with them). The Qarluq may have spoken a kind of Oyuz (because they are said to be Türkmen), 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 Oyuz). The Xalač may have spoken a language of their own, because they were different from the Türkmen, but this is uncertain since a connection with the Oyuz is never mentioned.

4.3 As for the Ādgiš ~ Ādıš, Arämüt, Küçät and (Äłkä) Buläq, we can not say anything, because Käšyarī gives no dialect materials and does not comment on their language. Perhaps they did not even speak Turkic, even though Käšyarī designates them as Turkic tribes — as in the case of the Känčäk!

5. It is also interesting to take a look at Käšyarī's personal judgements on the qualities of the various Turkic dialects, some of which are based on linguistic criteria. Thus the Oyuz speak the "lightest of the dialects". Yağmä and Tuxsî, together with those who dwell on the rivers Ili (according to the map (a group of) Çigil and the originally non-Turkic speaking Tatār, see 3.1.1), Irtysh (according to the map the Yemäk, see 3.1.1), Yamär (according to information in the dictionary the originally non-Turkic speaking Yabâqu; no other tribe is

\(^{25}\) For the expression "Norm Turkic" see SCHÖNIG 1999.
\(^{26}\) For different translations of *mahdafa al-utrāf alā namaṯ wāḥid* see DK I 84, fn.3.
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mentioned to live there, see 3.1.1) and Ätil (Volga) (according to the map the Qifčaq)27 "as far as the country of Ujyar", 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 Yalmä, Tuxsī, Çigil, Yemāk, Baṣyīr and Qifčaq 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 Xaqānnī 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 Xaqānnī 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 Xaqānnī 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 Xaqānnī 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 Oyuz sponsors had no chance to achieve the attribute "correct". About Öyuz Turkic, we learn under the lemma örän "bad

27 Even if Suvār and Bulyar 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, ... konuştığını 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 doğruşunu Toki [sic!] ve Yağmaların konuştuğun vurgulamıştır ".

29 According to DK I 44 "in practice the judgment of 'correctness' and 'elegance' often go together ...".
(radi): "When the Oyuz 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 Oyuz 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 Oyuz 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 qardı — qatti is the root in the matter of mixing two things; qardı is subordinate to it. The Oyuz say: gardi for mixing two things, leaving off the root. Similarly, the Turks say ädıği yawlāq — ädıği is 'good'; — yawlāq is 'bad' and is used paired with ädıği not alone. The Oyuz use it alone." Thus the language of the Oyuz may not be "most correct" or "elegant", but the "lightest" and are additionally "refined" so that the relation between the Karakhanids, the rulers of Kāšyarī's homeland, and the Oyuz 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 Tawrāc the expression Tat Tawrāc 'Uighur (which is Tat) and Şini (which is Tawgāc)'; Tat also means 'Persian', Tawgāc is 'Türk' (K 228/DK I 341). Under Tat we also find the meanings 'Persian (fārisi)—among most of the Turks' and 'Uighur infidels (kafāra uyyūr)—among the Yayma and Tuxsi' (K 406/DK II 103) (i.e. tribes speaking most correct). There we also find the saying Tattā kāznā tikāniq tiūprā '(strike) the Persian on the eye, (cut) the thorn at its roots'. After having mentioned the original meaning of Tat Tawrāc 'Uighuri and Şini', 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': tattāz tiur būlmās baššiz 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
a wrong translation. The same proverb also appears under börk (K 176/DK I 273), 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 Kası'arî (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 qiltıq tatiqsa toı yuncır är tatiqsa åt cinčır '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 Kası'arî 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 Ğaznā, which were Turks, but adopted the Persian culture of the majority of their subjects. Firdawsī's Šah-nāmā which is said to be sponsored by Maḥmūd von Ğaznā, can be considered as a piece of propaganda art reminding its readers to the mythical fights between Iran (now represented by the rulers of Ğaznā) and Turan (the Karakhanids). The Karakhanids did not hesitate to join this game and adopted the name of Afrāsiyāb, the leader of Turan. 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-yuvašitu t-turka should be reversed to accord with the Turkic."

32 Here we find a different notation tǎtsız türk bolmās bəşsız börk bolmās.

33 In the Diwân we find, e.g., tārim 'the title by which one addresses princes (takākin) and those princesses (xawātin), 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 altan tārim when addressing princesses.' (K 199/DK I 302), tegın 'slave (‘abd) ... Then this word became a title pure and simple for the sons of the Khāqānīyya. ... 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 Kāšyārī 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. Kāšyārī tells us, that "the Oyuz, Qifčaq and Suvārīn change every initial mīm to bān" (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 mān bardim 'I went' and mūn 'broth' are ascribed to "the Turks", whereas Oyuz, Qifčaq and Suvār say bān bardum and būn. Under bān 'I' the form is designated only as "Oyuz dialect" (K 169/DK I 267). Besides we find mān 'I' in "Turk dialect" (K 171/DK I 268); there follows mūn 'soup' without any hint to a b-form (K 171/DK I 268). The explanation for the occurrence of b in Oyuz, Qifčaq and Suvār where other Turkic dialects have m- is very short and needs some interpretation by the reader. As I said before, Kāšyārī'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, Kāšyārī has noted cases, in which especially Oyuz has m- before nasal consonants, e.g. mandār 'a plant which winds around trees and causes them to dry up — "bindweed ('ašaqa)." Oyuz dialect' (K 230/DK 343) and miǰār 'spring of water (′ayn al-mā'). Oyuz dialect ' (K 608/DK II 342) ~ miǰār (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 (muṭab)", 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 (rāmlf)" and this daughter of Afrāsiyāb used to hunt there and frequent it. Others of them reckon [the borders] from Marv aš-Šāḥijān since her father Tōṣa Alp Ār — who is Afrāsiyāb — built the city of Marv, ...' (K 509f./DK II 225).
Even if Kāṣyārī is incorrect in his analysis, I believe only tried to describe the situation with genuine Turkic words. The words with initial m- in Oyuz seem to be loanwords. In cases, in which he only wants to point to a special form or meaning of a Turkic word in Oyuz 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 anār salturdi 'he ordered the credit to be transferred to me and charged against him (amara bi-l-iḥāla lī 'alayhi)' (K 360/DK II 55) is such a case — it shows māni instead of expected Oyuz bāni, but is designated as "Oyuz dialect".

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

7.2 Furthermore Kāṣyārī states, that "the Oyuz 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 Oyuz words dāvā 'camel' (see also K 544/DK II 267) and ād 'hole', where the Türk (whatever that means in this context, see 1) say tewe and āt (see also K 34/DK I 93). He continues: "[However,] most dāls among the genuine Turks correspond to tā' in Oyuz dialect." Examples for this counter rule are Turkic bögdä 'dagger' (see also K 210/DK I 317) and yigdä 'service tree' (see also K 457/DK II 162) versus Oyuz bögtä and yigtä. As we can see the rules given by Kāṣyārī 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 Oyuz 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 Kāṣyārī 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 maŋa tš 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 aldüzdi 'he [let his property be taken; it was] plundered or stolen (hursta, sulba)' (K 312/DK II 9) is introduced by the remark that "the Oγuz sometimes have zäy instead of rä"", 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 bulcluz-, which precedes bildüz- in the dictionary (K 368/DK II 63). Thus this question remains open.

7.3 For early Old Turkic -d(–) Käs̄yārī states that "the Yaγma, Tuxsi, Qifčaq, Yabāq, Tatār, Qäy, Çömül and Oγuz all agree in changing every dotted dāl to yā'. They never pronounce it dāl." (K 27/DK I 85) His examples are qadin 'birch tree' and qadin '... in law', which are pronounced as qayin and qayin in the dialects in question. Furthermore he says that the d of the Çigil and other Turks (whatever that means, see 1) "is changed to zäy by some of Qifčaq, Yemāk, Suvār and Bulyār and those [in the area] stretching to Rūs and Rūm" (K 27/DK I 85). His examples are adaq ~ azaq 'foot' and qarin tođtī 'his belly was full' ~ toźdi. 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 Qifčaq, 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 Käs̄yārī's reliability. The Qifčaq 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 Bulyār (and perhaps Bācänāk, in his times "stretching to Rūs and Rūm"?). This is stressed by DOERFER (1987, 106, fn. 5) who points to the fact that one part of the Qifčaq 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 Qifčaq and Yemāk. Käs̄yārī tells us about the Yemāk: "a tribe of the Turks; they are considered by us to be Qifčaq, but the Qifčaq Turks reckon themselves a different party." (K 456/DK II 161). As mentioned before, the Yemāk pronounced z instead of y. Thus we may assume that there had been a closer connection between Qifčaq (at least the "z-Qifčaq") and the Yemāk which was denied by the Qifčaq for some unknown reasons in Käs̄yārīs times. In these times the
Yemäk settled at River Ärtiš. The only recent ç-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) Qiföaq" [real Qiföaq] despite the fact that they are "ç-Turks" (according to Käs1ari), but he gives no reason for this classification.

In the case of the before mentioned tod- the entrance in the dictionary has the example mänig qarin tödzi 'my belly is full (şabi'ä)' (K 633/DK II 375). Under toy- we find: "qarin toydi 'the belly was satiated (şabi'ä)' as we mentioned; colloquial (? ëya al-qawm)." (K 552/DK II 277) The question arises, whether dialects, which normally had d, in colloquial language at least sometimes used y. Other examples for tod- and its derivations do not exhibit y-forms. Another entrance in the Dïwän which again breaks Käsýari's own rules is adruq. Käsýari writes: "a word meaning 'other (gayr) in ëyz dialect. The Turks say adin 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 ëyz or whatever. We may assume that Käsýari in the case of ëyz adruq put the stress on the structure of the word, and not on the single sounds. Thus he kept the d which for him was the normal, original sound, see his general remark on d > y given above. But what about ayruq then? Was it a "colloquial" variant of adruq as was toy- of tod?

8. I hope that I was able to demonstrate that the data in the Dïwän of Käsýari 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 Käsýari 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 Dïwän remains one of the most important sources of Turkic language history.
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