ACTA ORIENTALIA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

ADIUVANTIBUS

B. CSONGOR, K. CZEGLÉDY, G. KARA, J. NÉMETH, S. TELEGDI

REDIGIT

L. LIGETI

HOC VOLUMEN REDEGIT

G. KARA

TOMUS XXV

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST

1972

Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XXV, pp. 355—367 (1972)

ISLAMIC TERMS IN EASTERN MIDDLE TURKIC

BY

A. BODROGLIGETI

1. At first sight the most striking feature of the Eastern Middle Turkic language is the composite character of its vocabulary. Foreign elements, dialectal words and archaic forms in a body of originally Eastern Turkic lexicon are the main components of the lexical system of this language.

In the history of Turkic scholarship there have been various attitudes shown toward this linguistic situation. For a long time, only the purely Turkic elements were dealt with while the rest of the vocabulary was dismissed as not belonging to the Turkic language or, at best, as evident and explainable from Arabic and Persian lexicographic sources (P. de Courteille). Some scholars, however, extended their range of interest to include foreign words with Turkic derivational suffixes, disregarding the «unmarked» elements as being unintegrated with the Turkic vocabulary (A. Zajączkowski). At a later stage all lexical elements were considered integral to the Eastern Middle Turkic lexicon (A. K. Borovkov, E. Fazilov), but scholars still regarded the vocabulary as a mere inventory of words rather than as a system.

In our judgement lexicographic works in general and those dealing with Eastern Middle Turkic in particular should be guided by definite lexicological principles which lead to a deeper understanding of the lexical system as a whole as well as its constituents as organic members of this system. To meet this requirement, structuralists would look for the distribution of lexical elements, whereas content-oriented linguists would seek to determine the interdependence of words in semantic fields.[1]

2. The major factor in the development of Eastern Middle Turkic was the influence of Arabic and Persian. The basic core of the new idiom was the language of the Karakhanide court literature with a considerable influx of local dialectal elements. The interference of Arabic and Persian with the Turkic

[1] The representation of the vocabulary as a homogeneous and self-sufficient system has been the main issue in the various concepts of field theory. (For a concise description and critical assessment of field theories proposed by Porzig, Trier and Weisgerber see S. Öhman, *Theories of the Linguistic Field*: *Word* 9 (1953), 123 sqq.

core occured at various socio-linguistic levels, in different ways and to varying degrees at each. The differences in social levels are not very apparent in the written records that have been handed down to us. From this point of view we can treat the linguistic result of this interference as a homogeneous language. The differences in the manner and degree of the interference on the other hand affected the form and content of the language more deeply and added to the particular features of the Eastern Middle Turkic language.

3. The interference of Arabic and Persian with the Turkic language in the Middle period marked the developing literary idiom in both its grammatical system and its lexicon. The traces of this interference are deep and significant. They may be duly considered as one of the basic characteristics of Eastern Middle Turkic.

There is one particular point that should be stressed with regard to the influence of Persian and Arabic on Eastern Middle Turkic: the two foreign languages did not equally influence the formation of the new Turkic standard literary language. The distribution of foreign features in Eastern Middle Turkic shows that as far as the grammatical system was concerned it was exclusively Persian that affected the language of Middle Turkic documents, while in the lexicon, on the other hand, both languages have left their imprint.

In the analysis of the literary idiom in question we attribute substantive importance to this fact, not exlusively because it affords a deeper insight into the grammatical structure and the lexical system of the Turkic languages of the Middle Turkic historical stage but rather because it leads us to theoretical conclusions based on the linguistic situation reflected in these literary documents.

4. Concerning the grammatical system, the effect of Classical Persian on Eastern Middle Turkic was unusually pervasive. It affected different aspects of the structure and contributed much to the formation of the Middle Turkic in general. Let us cite some major examples of this interference: in the verbal inflection, under Persian influence, the use of finite forms in *-sa/-sä* was extended. This is duly regarded as an essential innovation in the Turkic literary standard language. Nominal inflection followed the Persian in applying suffixes not only to stem forms but also to word groups.[2] In the field of syntactic structures the Persian modification structure called *izāfat* partially but significantly

[2] In Old Turkic, case endings were added to a nominal root, simple or derivate, as base. The inflected form, then, was a single word. Cf. *nä ärsär asïγqa tusuqa kirmädi* «there came nothing to be of use and advantage» where the words *asïγqa* and *tusuqa* are dative case forms governed by the verb *kir-* «to enter».

This solid cohesion between root and case ending was given up in Eastern Middle Turkic. Beginning with the Karakhanide documents there are more and more examples to prove that case endings were also applied to word groups, e.g. *maḥall ū makān ū zamāndïn fārïγ* «free from place, space and time» (MM 178r: 14).

penetrated the Eastern Middle Turkic language. The same applies to structures of coordination linked together by means of the Persian conjunction *u*. Furthermore, under the influence of Classical Persian, the range of word formation types was greatly enlarged in Eastern Middle Turkic: of the four main types, the one based on structures of complementation led to significant changes in the vocabulary as well. In syntax the use of clauses on Persian patterns resulted in a definite shift in the traditional sentence patterns.[3]

By contrast with the pervasive and lasting effect of Classical Persian on Eastern Middle Turkic, Arabic had practically no influence on the Turkic grammatical system. Elements of Arabic grammar, inflectional forms or syntactic structures, occur in isolation and, insofar as they seem to be borrowings (versus alien elements in occasional use), they join the vocabulary either as independent items (Arabic accusative case forms in adverbial function) or set expressions (e.g. prepositional groups). In all cases the Arabic elements were treated as integral units, unanalyzable from the point of view of Turkic grammar, that is to say, Arabic formations were not remodelled with Turkic constituents, nor did Turkic words become constituents of an Arabic structure.

5. The gradual penetration of Persian elements antedates that of Arabic elements and occurs at various language levels, a phenomenon consistent with the known historical situation. Thus the Turkic dialect that served as a basis for the early formation of the Eastern Middle Turkic literary idiom must already have contained a certain number of Persian elements. This, however, is of secondary importance from the point of view of our present investigation. Most important is the fact, that, as we have seen above, the Eastern Middle Turkic grammatical system resisted the influence of the Arabic grammar but its lexicon was open to both the Persian and Arabic languages.

To explain this situation will require evidence on the distribution of Arabic and Persian elements in Eastern Turkic vocabulary. Here it is not the degree and manner of the domestication of foreign elements on which we focus our attention but rather the position of these elements in the semantic fields of Eastern Middle Turkic. In clearly defined fields that lend themselves to such an analysis, the ratio of Persian to Arabic words may be strikingly different, showing the predominance of Persian terms in one field and that of Arabic terms in another. Thus, for example, among the terms relating to Islamic court literature, we find more Persian elements[4] than in the field of religion where Arabic elements prevail.

[3] Cf. the various patterns of final clauses in the Introduction to *A Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Saʿdī's Gulistān*, p. 24.

[4] I have compared the lexicon of Sayf's Turkic translation of Saʿdī's *Gulistān* with the vocabulary of the Persian original. The result of this collation has been summed up and analyzed in the Introduction, pp. 12—17. The above statement is based on the result of this analysis.

6. At the dawn of the formation of the Eastern Middle Turkic literary language Arabic had a highly developed lexical system to cover the semantic field of religion in the articulation peculiar to Islam. Arabic terms pertaining to religion had precisely defined meanings and as a result of more than six hundred years' development, their interdependence and their relationship within this semantic field as a whole was well established. In other words Islamic terms already formed a network which in its own way covered and articulated its assigned share of human experience and which thus determined the content of its members.

Islamic terms, then, were lexical elements of Arabic belonging to a particularly articulated semantic field. A single term beyond its individual value was to a great extent dependent on its relationship to other terms in the same semantic field on the one hand and to the entire field on the other.

The impact of Islam on Turkic culture in general and the influence of Arabic on Turkic in particular confronted the Turkic lexicon, among others, with this well-established and solid semantic field in the Arabic language. The result was a linguistic process that shed light on some important aspects of the question of interference of lexical systems.

7. There are three different sources for the study of the treatment of Islamic terms in the Eastern Middle Turkic language: (a) interlinear translations of Arabic works,[5] (b) adaptations of Arabic works,[6] and (c) original works in Eastern Middle Turkic.[7] Interlinear translations contain more Turkic words as equivalents for Arabic terms. In adaptations the number of Turkic elements is also high but there is a tendency toward consistency in the choice of words for Islamic terms. Original works in Eastern Middle Turkic on the other hand contain more Arabic terms, sometimes in alternation or parallel with Turkic and Persian ones.

8. The majority of Eastern Middle Turkic literary documents of the early period is constituted by interlinear translations of Arabic works. In them, as pointed out above, one can observe a definite effort to render Islamic terms by Turkic lexical means.[8]

[5] The most valuable interlinear translations of Arabic works into Eastern Middle Turkic are the *Iršādu'l-mulūk va's-salāṭīn* (The Guidance of Kings and Sultans) from 1387 and the early Eastern Turkic Koran translations, described by Eckmann in his *Eastern Turkic Translations of the Koran: Acta Orient. Hung.* (forthcoming) and *Two Fragments of a Koran Manuscript with Interlinear Persian and Turkic Translations: CAJ* (1969), pp. 287—290.

[6] Such as Rabġūzī's *Qiṣaṣu'l-anbiyā* (Stories about the Prophets) from 1310 and Maḥmud b. ʿAlī's *Nahcu'l-farādīs* (The Way to Paradise) from 1358.

[7] A typical example of independent compositions in Turkic is Islām's *Muʿīnu'l-murīd* (The Helper of the Novice), a religious-didactic treatise completed in December 1313.

[8] Speaking of an early Eastern Middle Turkic interlinear translation of the Koran (Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi No. T 73), Eckmann states: «This translation contains very

(a) Turkic words for Arabic Islamic terms came partly from the traditional Eastern Turkic word stock, but the majority of Islamic terms in Turkic owes its existence to various types of word formation (mostly derivation, in a few cases composition).

(i) Turkic terms from the original word stock already had a certain tradition behind them; they are attested in contemporary non-religious works as well as in written records from earlier historical stages. Almost all of them have three features in common: (1) in their original usage they cover a wider range of meanings, (2) their adaptation to Islam was either by restriction of their notional range to a particular aspect or, by extension of their notional range so as to include additional value, (3) to a great extent they were words with concrete meaning.

Here is a representative list of Turkic terms belonging to the above category. They are given with their non-Islamic value on the one hand and with their Arabic equivalents as they occur in our sources on the other.

alqïš «salutation» for/in the sense of Ar. تَحِيَّة (Bor.[9] 49, MM[10] 176: 12). Cf. Old T. *alqïš* «Segen» (ATG[11] 293b), Kāšġ.[12] *alqïš* «Lobpreis» (Brock. 7).

ažun «world» for/in the sense of Ar. دُنْيَا (Bor. 40, MM 199v: 1). Cf. Old T. *azun*, *ažun* (<Sogd.) «Leben, Existenzform» (ATG 297b), Kāšġ. *ažun* «Welt» (Brock. 17).

bačïġ «covenant, promise» for Ar. عَهْد (Bor. 93, Eckm. RKor.[13] 28/3b: 2). Cf. Kāšġ. *bačïġ* «Vertrag» (Brock. 28).

bitig «writing» for/in the sense of Ar. كِتَاب (Bor. 104, Eckm. RKor. 26/22a: 3, MM 196v: 3). Cf. Old T. *bitig* «Schrift, Geschriebenes, Buchstabe, Brief, Testament, Buch» (ATG 303b), Sino-Uigur *bitig* «livre, oeuvre littéraire» (Ligeti,[14] 143), Kāšġ. *bitig* «Schreiben, Schrift» (Brock. 38).

bulġaq «temptation; trouble, disorder» for Ar. فِتْنَة (Bor. 110, Eckm. RKor. 28/85b: 2). Old T. *bulġaq* «Verwirrung, Aufruhr» (ATG 305a), Kāšġ. *bulġaq* «Verwirrung» (Brock. 42).

---

few Arabic and Persian words. Obviously the translator endeavoured to render everything with Turkish words, imitating in this respect the makers of the first Persian translation of the Koran» (*Eastern Turkic Translations of the Koran: Acta Orient. Hung.*, forthcoming).

[9] A. K. Borovkov, *Leksika sredneaziatskogo tefsira xii—xiii vekov*. Moscow 1963.

[10] A. Bodrogligeti, *A Religious-Didactic Treatise in Khwarezmian Turkic from the Fourteenth Century: Islām's Muʿīnu'l-murīd* (forthcoming).

[11] A. von Gabain, *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Leipzig 1950.

[12] C. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkisches Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarīs Dīvān Luγāt at-turk*. Budapest 1928.

[13] J. Eckmann, *The Middle Turkic Glossary of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation* (forthcoming).

[14] L. Ligeti *Un vocabulaire sino-ouigour des Ming: Acta Orient. Hung.* xix (1966), pp. 117—316.

buyruq «order, command» for/in the sense of Ar. أَمْرٌ (Bor. 110, MM 196r: 7, IM[15] 2r: 5, Eckm. RKor. 26/50: 2). Cf. Old T. *buyruq* «Befehlshaber, Minister» (ATG 306a), CCum. *buyuruq*, *buyruḳ* «Befehl, Vorschrift, Gebot» (Grönb.[16] 68), Sayf *buyruq* «command» (Bod.[17] 236a).

čïġay «poor» for Ar. مِسْكِينٌ (Bor. 358, Eckm. RKor. 32/9b: 1). Cf. QB *čïġay* «arm, elend» (Radl.[18] iii, 2062).

idi «Lord» for/in the sense of Ar. رَبٌّ (Bor. 122, Eckm. RKor. 31/14b: 1, MM 177r: 2). Cf. Old T. *idi*, *iyä* «Herr, Besitzer» (ATG 310a), Kāšġ. *iḍi* «Herr» (Brock. 64), Quṭb *idi* «lord, God» (Zaj.[19] 56), Sayf *idi* «lord» (Bod. 271b), BAY[20] *iyä* «possessor, owner» (3r: 3).

ortaq «associate» for/in the sense of Ar. شَرِيكٌ (Bor. 238, Eckm. RKor. 30/40b: 2—3, MM 195v: 17, IM 3r: 5). Cf. Kāšġ. *ortaq* «Genosse» (Brock. 128), CCum *ortaq* «Genosse» (Grönb. 179).

ögdi ~ *ögdü* «thanksgiving» for/in the sense of حَمْدٌ (Bor. 241, MM 176v: 8). Cf. Old T. *ögdilig* «lobenswert» (ATG 322b).

ökünč «regret, sorrow» for/in the sense of Ar. حَسْرَةٌ (Eckm. RKor. 28/84a: 1, MM 193r: 3). Cf. Old T. *ökün-* «bereuen» (ATG 323a), Kāšġ. *ökünč* «Jammer, Reue» (Brock. 133), Chag., QB *ögünč* «die Reue» (Radl. I, 1197).

saw «tradition» of Ar. حَدِيثٌ (Bor. 256). Cf. Old T. *saw*, *sab* «Wort, Rede, Sprichwort, Nachricht, Angelegenheit, Ruhm» (ATG 33a), Kāšġ. *sav* «Wort, Sprichwort, Geschichte, Botschaft, Ruhm, Ruf» (Brock. 174).

sawčï «prophet» for Ar. نَبِيٌّ (Bor. 257). Cf. Old T. *sawčï*, *sabčï* «Bote, Dolmetscher» (ATG 333a), Kāšġ. *savčï* 1. «Prophet», 2. «Zwischenträger» (Brock. 174).

sezik «doubt» for Ar. رَيْبٌ (Bor. 266), in the sense of Ar. ظَنٌّ (MM 184a: 6). Cf. Old T. *sizik*, *säzik* «Zweifel» (ATG 334b), Kāšġ. *sizäk*, *sizik* «Vermutung» (Brock. 182).

tamuġ «hell» for/in the sense of Ar. جَهَنَّمُ (Bor. 284, Eckm. RKor. 28/84a: 2, MM 186r: 13). Cf. Old T. *tamu* (< Sogd.) «Hölle, Höllenbewohner» (ATG 337b), Kāšġ. *tamu* «Hölle» (Brock. 194), CCum *tamu*, *tamuq*, *tamuḳ* «Hölle» (Grönb. 233), Sayf *tamuġ* «hell» (57v: 9).

[15] From our *Glossary to the Turkic Translation of the Iršādu'l-mulūk va's-salāṭīn* (on cards).

[16] K. Grønbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch, Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* Kopenhagen 1942.

[17] A. Bodrogligeti, *A Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Sa'dī's Gulistān*, Budapest 1969.

[18] W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. 4 Bde. Petersburg 1893—1911.

[19] A. Zajączkowski, *Najstarsza wersja turecka Ḫusraw u Šīrīn Quṭba*. Part iii: *Glossary*. Warszawa 1961.

[20] From our *Glossary to the Kitāb Bayṭaratu'l-vāžiḥ* (on cards).

tuš «like, equal» for Ar. كُفْؤٌ (IM 3r: 8). Cf. Old T. *tuš* «Gefährte, begegnender, passender, Eignung» (ATG 344b), Kāšġ. *tuš* 2. «Gefährte, ebenbürtig» (Brock. 220), Quṭb *tuš* «equal, equivalent, fellow» (Zaj. 187).

učmaq «paradise» for/in the sense of Ar. جَنَّةٌ (Bor. 334, MM 189r: 14). Cf. Kāšġ. *učmaq* «Paradies» (Brock. 227), CCum «Paradies» (Grönb. 263).

uquš «understanding» for/in the sense of Ar. فَهْمٌ (Bor. 325, MM 196r: 1a). Cf. Kāšġ. *uquš* «Klugheit» (Brock. 231).

yalawač «prophet» for Ar. رَسُولٌ (Bor. 137). Cf. Old T. *yalawači*, *yalawač*, *yalabač* «Bote, Gesandter» (ATG 351a), Kāšġ. *yalavač* «Bote» (Brock. 74).

yäk «devil» for/in the sense of Ar. اِبْلِيسُ (Bor. 150). Cf. Old T. *yäk* «Fresser, Dämon» (ATG 354a), Kāšġ. *yäk* (< Prakrit *yakka*) «böser Geist» (Brock. 84), CCum *yäk* «Teufel; teuflisch, böse» (Grönb. 121).

yätür- ~ *yätkür-* «to fulfil, complete» for Ar. تَمَّمَ etc. (Bor. 153, MM 181v: 14). Cf. CCum *yätkir-* «gelangen lassen, führen» (Grönb. 123), Sayf *yetkür-* «to send, cause to arrive» (140v: 7 for Pers. *rasān-*) and *yätür-* «to bring; send, cause to reach, turn into» (Bod. 438a), BAY *yetkür-* «to cause to reach» (31v: 2).

(ii) Where the original Turkic word stock did not provide appropriate lexical elements for Arabic terms, translators into Turkic had recourse to derivation or the use of inflected forms, especially verbal, as new lexical items.

(1) The new derivatives are in the majority of cases abstract nouns: agentive or concrete nouns obtained by derivation are fewer and, furthermore, they occur in more specific meanings.

(2) The ways and means of derivation are those of traditional Turkic grammar. The bases for derivation are elements of the Turkic lexicon.

The following is a selective list of Turkic derivatives substituting for Arabic Islamic terms:

aŋ͡gmaq «admonition» < *aŋ͡g-* «to remember»; cf. LA *aŋ͡g-* «sich erinnern» (H.[21] 51), Quṭb *aŋ͡g-* «to remember» (Zaj. 9), Sayf *aŋ͡g-* 1. «to remember», 2. «to mention» (Bod. 199b), for/in the sense of Ar. ذِكْرٌ (Bor. 55, MM 186r: 11, IM 2v: 3).

azġunlïq ~ *azġunluq* «error, mistake» < *az-* «to lose one's way»; cf. Old T. *az-* «irren, sich verirren» (ATG 297b), Sayf *az-* «to go astray» (Bod. 209b), for Ar. ضَلَالٌ (Bor. 42) and ضَلَالَةٌ (Sayf 75r: 13).

äsänlik «peace, safety» < *äsän* «sound»; cf. Old T. *äsän* «gesund, Frieden» (ATG 299b), Kāšġ. *äsän* «gesund» (Brock. 24), MM *äsänä-* «to correct» (185b: 10), Bashkir *iθänlək* «health, prosperity» (Ahmerov et al. 217b), for Ar. سَلَامٌ (Bor. 61, Eckm. RKor. 30/44a: 1).

barlïq «existence» < *bar* «existent»; cf. Old T. *bar* «vorhanden, das Vorhanden-Sein, alle, stattfindend, es gibt» (ATG 301a), Sino-Uigur *bar* «il est, il

[21] M. Th. Houtsma, *Ein Türkisch-Arabisches Glossar*. Leiden 1894.

existe» (Ligeti, 138), Sayf *bar* «existent, there is, it is» (Bod. 220a), in the sense of Ar. وُجُودٌ (MM 199a: 11).

oqïġu «Kuran» < *oqï-* «to read»; cf. Old T. *oqï-* «rufen, herbeirufen, anrufen, rezitieren, lesen» (ATG 321b), Sino-Uigur *oqï-* «lire (à haute voix), réciter» (Ligeti, 186), Sayf *oqï-*, *oqu-* «to read, recite, say a prayer» (Bod. 332a), for Ar. قُرْآنٌ (Bod. 236, Eckm. RCom. 30/85a: 1).

otruš «sitting position in prayer» < *otur-* «to sit»; cf. Old T. *oltur-* «sitzen» (Brock. 127), CCum *oltur-* «sitzen» (Grönb. 177), Sayf *oltur-* «to sit» (Bod. 331b) ~ *otur-* id. (333b), MM *oltur-* «to sit» (194v: 3) ~ *otur-* id. (182v: 9), for/in the sense of Ar. قَعْدَةٌ (MM 183r: 16)

tüzlük «justice» < *tüz* «even»; cf. Old T. *tüz* «gleichmässig, eben, gleich, gelassen; ebensoviel, vollkommen, Edler» (ATG 346a), CCum *tüz* «flach, eben; Steppe, gerade, richtig; Berichtigung, Ausbesserung» (Grönb. 261), IM *tüz* «even, smooth» in *tüz yolï* «the even path» (=Ar. طَرِيقَةٌ), Sayf *tüz* «flat, straight» (Bod. 411a), BAY *tüz* «plain, even, flat» (3b: 15), for Ar. عَدْلٌ (Bor. 317).

uluġsülïq qïl- «to behave with insolence» < *uluġ* «great»; cf. Old T. *uluġ* «gross, Grosser, Vorgesetzter» (ATG 347a), Sino-Uigur *uluġ* «adulte, devenu grand» (Ligeti 274), Sayf *uluġ* ~ *ulu* «great» (Bod. 412a) for Ar. اِسْتِكْبَارٌ (Bor. 327).

yaratġan «creator» < *yarat-* «to create»; cf. Old T. *yarat-* «bereiten, schaffen, organisieren, ausstatten, schmücken, erschaffen» (Grönb. 115), BAY *yarat-* «to create» (1b: 11) for/in the sense of Ar. خَالِقٌ (IM 2b: 5, MM 176v: 13).

yarlïqaġan «merciful» < *yarlïqa-* «to have mercy on someone»; cf. CCum *yarlïġa-* «sich erbarmen» (Grönb. 116), LA *yarlaġa-* «sich erbarmen» (H. 105), Sayf *yarlïġa-* «to have mercy on someone» (Bod. 433b) for Ar. رَحِيمٌ (IM 1b: 1).

yïġaq «prohibition» < *yïġ-* «to prevent from»; cf. KCom. *yïġ-* «to remove, decline, prevent from» (Bor. 155), Quṭb *yïġ-* «to decline, prevent from, keep back» (Zaj. 89), TT[22] *yïġ-* «to keep back» (36r: 7) in the sense of Ar. مَنْعٌ (MM 179r: 7, glossed by *yïġmïš*).

yïġġan «preventer, prohibitor» < *yïġ-* «to prevent» (see *yïġaq*) in the sense of Ar. مَانِعٌ (MM 180r: 8).

yoqluq «nonexistence» < *yoq* «nonexistent»; cf. Old T. *yoq* «nicht vorhanden, nichtig, Tod, elend» (ATG 356a), Sino-Uigur *yoq* «non, sans, depourvu» (Ligeti, 286), CCum *yoq*, *yoḫ* «das Nichtvorhandensein» (Grönb. 126), in the sense of Ar. عَدَمٌ (MM 199r: 11).

yunuġ «ablution, ritual purification» < *yun-* «to wash»; Old T. *yun-* «sich waschen» (ATG 257a), Kāšġ. *yun-* «sich waschen» (Brock. 97) in the sense of Ar. طَهَارَةٌ (MM 181r: 5), or *uluġ yunuġ* in the sense of Ar. غُسْلٌ (MM 181v: 16).

[22] An Old Anatolian Turkic translation of ʿAṭṭār's *Taẕkiratu'l-auliyā* (cf. L. Rásonyi, *Feriduddin Attar «Tezkeretü'l-Evliya» nın Budapeşte yazması*, and A. Bodrogligeti, *Farīdūn ʿAṭṭār Taẕkiratu'l-avliyā adlı eserinin ilk Türkçe tercümesi hakkında*, both papers in *xi. Türk Dil Kurultayında okunan bilimsel bildiriler*, Ankara 1968, pp. 83 sqq.

(b) The correspondence of the Turkic words, both traditional and newly formed, with their Arabic counterparts as observed in particular cases is not always of the same degree. Along with many cases of *complete coverage* of the Arabic terms by the Turkic words there are even more instances where the correspondence is more or less incomplete. A comparative analysis of particular cases shows that some Turkic terms consistently render one and the same Arabic term whereas others very often stand for two or even more Islamic terms of the Arabic lexicon. We will refer to cases of the latter type as *overlapping coverage*.

(i) In the case of complete coverage, the Turkic term does not require further modification to render its Arabic equivalent: e.g. *bitig* for Ar. كِتَابٌ, *buyruq* for Ar. أَمْرٌ, *otruš* for Ar. قَعْدَةٌ, *ökünč* for Ar. حَسْرَةٌ, *saw* for Ar. حَدِيثٌ, *yalawač* for Ar. رَسُولٌ, etc.

(ii) Turkic words which correspond only in part with their Arabic equivalents are specified by Arabic or Turkic lexical means so as to render their use unambiguous and their meaning complete. In such cases the Turkic terms occur in a syntactic structure either as the head of a modification structure or as a constituent of a structure of coordination with or without connective elements. E.g. *bačïġ* «agreement, covenant, compact» (Bor. 93, Eckm. RKor. s. v.), occurs as *bärk bačïġ* for Ar. مِيثَاقٌ «firm covenant» (Eckm. RKor. s. v.), *vaʿda bačïġ* for Ar. عَهْدٌ (Bor. 93) in the sense of «time» (cf. Penrice, *Dict.*[23] 120a referring to the same Koran verse); *čïġay* «poor, needy» for/in the sense of Ar. مِسْكِينٌ and فَقِيرٌ (Eckm. RKor. s. v.), occurs as *čïġay żaʿïf* (Bor. 358) for Ar. مَسَاكِينُ (Kor. xviii. 79) here, obviously, to emphasize plurality «all kinds of poor people»; *osal* «inattentive, heedless» (cf. Sino-Uigur *osul* «paresseux, négligent») for/in the sense of Ar. غَافِلٌ (MM 198r: 11) occurs as *ġāfil osal* «heedless and careless» (Eckm. RKor. s. v.); *tuš* «like, equal» renders Ar. كُفُؤٌ as *teŋg tuš* (IM 3a: 8); *yäk* «devil» for/in the sense of Ar. شَيْطَانٌ occurs as *yäk yaʿnī Iblīs* (Bor. 150).

(iii) In many cases, one and the same Turkic term stands for several Arabic terms occurring in various contexts. This group is especially relevant for the difference between the lexical system of Arabic and that of Turkic. Cf. the following selective illustrations: *arïġlïq* «purity» for/in the sense of Ar. زَكَوٰةٌ (Bor. 57/Kor. 18.81, MM 181v: 10) and for Ar. سُبْحَانَهُ (IM 3r: 8, Eckm. RKor. 31/14a: 2); *bodun* «people» for Ar. قَوْمٌ (Bor. 109/Kor. 19.97, Eckm. RKor. 37/61a: 2), أَهْلٌ (Bor. 109/Kor. 19.55, Eckm. RKor. 25/2b: 1), نَاسٌ (Eckm. RKor. 25/26a: 2); *könilik* «truth, justice» for Ar. حَقٌّ (Bor. 184, Eckm. RKor. 26/27b: 3), قِسْطٌ (Eckm. RKor. 27/49b: 1), عَدْلٌ (Eckm. RKor. 26/29b: 2), هُدًى (Eckm. RKor. 37/14b: 3); *sezik* «opinion, doubt» for Ar. ظَنٌّ (Bor. 266/Kor. 48.12, Eckm. RKor. 34/27a: 3), for and in the sense of Ar.

[23] J. Penrice, *A Dictionary and Glossary of the Koran*. London 1873.

رَيْبٌ (Bor. 266/Kor. 18.21, MM 184r: 6), لَبْسٌ (Eckm. RKor. 37/72b: 2); *törütgän* «creator» for Ar. خَالِقٌ (Eckm. RKor. 35/65b: 1) and قَاطِرٌ (Eckm. RKor. 33/63b: 1); *ündägüči* «summoner, caller» for Ar. دَاعٍ (Eckm. RKor. 31/85a: 3) and مُنَادٍ (37/81a: 1).

9. Adaptations of Arabic works and original works in Eastern Middle Turkic differ in many ways from Turkic interlinear translations. The difference lies, among other things, in the treatment of Arabic terms:

(a) In these documents there is a clear tendency toward standardized use of terms, Arabic and Turkic, now more consistently applied to one and the same notion in various contexts. This was the case with Turkic terms which completely covered their Arabic equivalents within a given semantic field, such as *barlïq* «existence», *yoqluq* «non-existence», *ortaq* «compeer» etc., or, with Arabic terms which were borrowed into the Turkic language because of their specified meanings, e.g. *ḥalāl* «permitted, lawful», *ḥarām* «forbidden, unlawful», *iḥrām* «the beginning of the holy month», etc. as a result of leveling in the choice of words.

(b) Arabic elements occur in definitely greater numbers in these documents with an obvious restriction of Turkic terms in both quantity and range of application.

(i) In the case of direct borrowings, some of the Arabic terms are explained in Turkic. The explanation is descriptive and relates to the content of the term. Cf. the definition of *lāḥiq* denoting a worshipper who joins the prayer after waking up: *namāz qïldï niyyat uyudï ulam uyandï Imām bermišindä salām munung atï lāḥiq* «he who stated the intention of his prayer and then fell asleep and awoke at the moment when the Imam finished his concluding salutation, is called *lāḥiq*» (MM 185r: 10i) or the definition of *ma'zūb* «attracted by divine grace»: *murād buldï ammā yolïn bilmädi munung atï ma'zūb* «he who found the aim but did not know the way to it, is called *ma'zūb*» (MM 185r: 8). After the explanatory passage the Arabic term is used as a full-fledged member of the lexicon.

(ii) Sometimes Turkic terms are used parallel with their Arabic equivalents. The parallelism may be within the vocabulary of a document, i.e. Arabic and Turkic words with the same semantic coverage may occur in alternation within the same texts. Cf. *ḥamd* «praise» (MM 176v: 2) and *ögdü* id. (MM 176v: 8), *qurbān* «sacrifice» (MM 188r: 11) and *yuluġ* id. (MM 186v: 3) in the text of the *Muᶜīnu'l-murīd*. The occurrence of Turkic terms is less frequent and, as equivalents to the Arabic terms, they very often need specification, e.g. for Ar. *qirbān* MM has Turkic *yaqïnlïq tiši birlä* lit. «closeness to a female» (MM 186v: 12). Parallelism may occur within one and the same sentence. These and similar cases admit two interpretations. Either the Arabic terms were explained by Middle Turkic equivalents, or, the Middle Turkic terms were insufficient to provide an unambiguous and/or full coverage. Lexicological con-

siderations speak in favour of the latter view, which is supported by a few examples from *Muʿīnu'l-murīd*, e.g. *käsilmäk öngin māsivâ yönidin* «to be cut off from beings other than God» (MM 183r: 2) where *māsivâ* forms a doublet *öngin*, or, *agar artuq alsa ḫarām ot ribā* «if he takes more it is a usury» (MM 191v: 10) with the pair *ḫarām ot* lit. «forbidden pasture» and *ribā* «usury». Since the Turkic words show a restricted distribution as compared with their Arabic counterparts, I regard them as less capable of providing the adequate semantic coverage.

10. It is instructive to look at the present status of Eastern Middle Turkic Islamic terms in Modern Turkic languages such as Uzbek and Bashkir. The reason for this choice is that Uzbek to a certain extent derives from the Eastern Middle Turkic literary language, whereas Bashkir continues one of the local dialects. Uzbek has a long and uninterrupted literary tradition behind it whereas Bashkir has been elevated to a literary standard only in the last three or four decades.[24] These are the results of the survey:

Of the Arabic-Turkic doublets of the Eastern Middle Turkic literary documents the Uzbek vocabulary preserved, in the great majority, the Arabic terms. Most of them are in exclusive use in Modern Uzbek with complete loss of the equivalent terms of Turkic origin. Thus it has *adl* (< *ʿadl*) «justice» (vs. *tüzlük*), *aḥd* (< *ʿahd*) «agreement» (vs. *bačiġ*), *aql* (< *ʿaql*) «understanding» (vs. *uquš*), *dunyå* «world» (vs. *ažun*), *žahannam* (< *cahannam*) «hell» (vs. *tamuġ*), *fidå* «sacrifice» (vs. *yuluq*), *fitna* «intrigue» (vs. *bulġaq*), *ḫadīṣ* «traditions of the Prophet Muhammad» (vs. *saw*), *ḥamd* «praise» (vs. *ögdi*), *kitåb* «book» (vs. *bitig*), *man* (< *manʿ*) «prohibition» (vs. *yïġaq*), *måsuvå* in *måsuvå bol-* «to lose» (vs. *öngin*), *miskin* «poor» (vs. *čïġay*), *qådir* «capable» (vs. *uġan*), *rasūl* «prophet» (vs. *yalawač*), *salåm* «greeting» (vs. *äsänlik*), *šaytån* «devil» (vs. *yäk*), *tahårat* «ablution» (vs. *yunuġ*), *takabbur* «proud»[25] (vs. *uluġsïlïq*). In a few cases Uzbek has both the Arabic and the Turkic terms, e.g. *amr* «command» ~ *buyruq* id., *žannat* (< *cannat*) «Paradise» ~ *učmåḫ* id., *ḫasrat* «grief, sorrow» ~ *ökinč* «regret», *nabī* «prophet» ~ *såvčï* «matchmaker», *šarīk* «partner» ~ *ortaq* «friend», *vužūd* (< *vucūd*) «creature» ~ *bårlïq* «existence». There is only one term in our list where Uzbek makes exclusive use of the Turkic term, i.e. *yoqlïq* «non-existence» (vs. *ʿadm*).

Bashkir, on the contrary, preserved more genuine Turkic elements from the Eastern Middle Turkic vocabulary. Here we also find most of those Turkic terms which did not survive in the Uzbek lexicon, e.g. *iθänlək* (< *äsänlik*)

[24] Cf. Juldašev's paper *Baškirškij jazyk* (The Bashkir Language) in *Mladopisjmennye jazyki narodov SSSR*. Moscow—Leningrad 1959, pp. 56—72.

[25] It is not infrequent in Eastern Middle Turkic that Arabic nouns (mostly verbal nouns) occur as adjectives or adverbs (cf. *farāġat* «quietly» in Sayf 165r: 6, *ḫaqīqat* «true» in MM 179r: 11, etc.). For *takabbur* «pride», however, I have no examples. MM attests *takabbur* «haughtiness» (180r: 5) and *takabburlïġ* «haughty» (180r: 8).

«health, welfare», *bətəv* (< *bitig*) «amulet», *bolǧaq* ~ *bola* «disorder», *ultïrïš* «session» (cf. *otruš*), *tamuq* «hell», *töðlök* (< *tüzlük*) «straightness (of something)», *yolov* (< *yuluq*) «escape». Arabic terms are fewer and they are adapted to the Bashkir phonemic system,[26] e.g. *kitap* «book», *fətna* «revolt», *yahannam* «hell», «*fiða*» «sacrifice», *tähärät* «ablution».

11. The linguistic situation analyzed above can be evaluated as follows:

(a) As interlinear translations show, Middle Turkic possessed sufficient lexical potential (in the form of lexemes and derivational means) to translate Arabic terms pertaining to Islam. We must note, however, that in executing an interlinear translation, the translator was faced in each case with a *particular situation*. He had to translate Arabic terms occuring in a given context. This situation has two implications. The sentence in which a term occured was someone else's creation and the choice of words for that sentence was someone else's act. The translator had a ready sentence before him in which all elements were specified by the context. His task was to provide the Turkic rendering of this sentence substituting Turkic equivalents for ready-made Arabic terms in concrete situations. His choice of words was conditioned by these two aspects which, in turn, account for the frequent occurrence of cases of incomplete and overlapping coverage of Arabic terms by Turkic words.

(b) In spite of this lexical potential, the Turkic lexicon was not able to completely replace Arabic Islamic terms. Most of the words introduced by the interlinear translations were never used in documents of other types or were very soon abandoned in favor of the original Arabic terms.

Since words occurring in concrete sentences do not display their entire relationship in their semantic fields, their replacement by Turkic equivalents was an easier task as it had less direct bearing on the lexical system itself. A specified, context-bound word requires a narrow and simple coverage and words from the original stock or new derivations proved sufficient to perform this task. The situation was completely different in adaptations or original Islamic works in Eastern Middle Turkic. There the *direct* or *unbound* word choice of the individual using the Turkic language played a greater role and involved the entire lexical system in a more immediate fashion. The result was a consistency in the use of Turkic terms and an increasing return to Arabic ones.

[26] The main phonemic changes of Arabic and Persian loans in Bashkir are: (a) loss of length as distinctive feature in the vowel system (cf. *tähärät* < *ṭahārat* «ablution»; *yän* < *cān* «soul»; (b) substitution of phonemes (cf. /ʿain/ by /ġ/ as in *ġälämät* < *ʿalāmat* «sign», /c/ by /y/ in initial, and by /ž/ in medial and final positions as in *yaza* < *cazā* «punishment», *xaž* < *ḥacc* «pilgrimage», *ġäžäp* < *ʿacab* «wonderful, strange»); (c) disjunction of final consonant clusters, (cf. *ġäyəp* < *ʿayb* «sin, fault»); (d) sound changes peculiar to Bashkir (cf. /d/ < /ð/ as in *ġäðät* < *ʿādat* «custom, habit», /s/ < /θ/ as in *variθ* < *vāriṯ* «heir», etc.)

(c) Languages that derive their lexicon more or less directly from Eastern Middle Turkic have preserved the Arabic terms for the most part. The parallel occurrence of Arabic and Turkic terms in modern Turkic dialects shows either a complete semantic identity or a complete split into terms of non-religious and religious implications.

This lexical fact is in full harmony with the field aspect of Islamic terms in the Arabic language and with its effect on the Turkic lexical system. Cases of semantic identity of parallel Arabic and Turkic terms exhibit a double coverage of the same field-element in different social layers of the language. Their split into terms of religious and non-religious content, on the other hand, shows that they pertain to two or more different semantic fields.

12. In summary, I have tried to show that terms belonging to a historically established and specially articulated semantic field in one language cannot be arbitrarily replaced by the lexical means of another language. Occasional substitutions in concrete situations (as those in the interlinear translations indicated above) do not necessarily mean substitutions in the semantic field. Even the total of all attested *occasional* substitutions does not necessarily result in a change of the network of terms belonging to a well-established linguistic field. It is this homogeneous lexical formation as a whole with its constant interaction with reality that in the last analysis determines the position and the role of a new term in the lexical system.

The concept of the interference of lexical systems — the basic working principle applied in the above lexical analysis — and the investigation of the semantic field aspect of the linguistic situation resulting from such an interference mark a new approach to field theory both as a method of detecting semantic fields and as a means of studying their dynamics. They seem to be instrumental in amending the basic definition of field theory and in eliminating conceptual difficulties in minor questions.[27]

[27] The exact definition of the field theory and the detection of semantic fields are still among the most debated questions of modern lexicology (cf. H. Schwarz, *Leitmerkmale sprachlicher Felder. Ein Beitrag zur Verfahrensweise des Gliederungsforschung* in H. Gipper (ed.) *Sprache: Schlüssel zur Welt. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber*, Düsseldorf 1959, pp. 245—256, and G. Kandler, *Die Lücke im Sprachlichen Feld*: *ibid.*, pp. 256—270).