

THE MEDICAL TERMINOLOGY IN THE KITĀB BAYṬARAT
AL-VĀZĪH, A FOURTEENTH CENTURY MAMLUK-KIPCHAK
TREATISE ON VETERINARY MEDICINE

by

A. BODROGLIGETI

1. The *Bayṭarat al-vāzīh* (the Easily Understood Book of Farriery), a hip-pological work, was a product of 14th century Egypt. At the time of its writing, a hundred years had already elapsed since the Mamluks had seized power from the hands of their Ayyubid masters. These Mamluks, mainly Kipchak and Cir-cassian slaves who had been employed as royal body guards, proved themselves strong rulers, excellent organizers, and successful statesmen.

It was under their rule that the majority of the Arab people were united in a solid state formation and that Arabic-Islamic culture achieved its greatest surge¹.

2. The Mamluks spoke three dialects : Kipchak, Turkman, and Old Ana-tolian. In the first half of the period of Mamluk rule (from 1250 to 1400), the ma-jority used Kipchak, an Eastern Turkic dialect from Southern Russia, the original homeland of most Mamluks. Only a minority spoke Turkman. In the second half of the Mamluk period (to 1517), Old Anatolian was also spoken.

The literary language of the Mamluks differed considerably from the col-loquial tongue. It had developed in Khorazm at the turn of the 13th century, and came to the Mamluks through the area of the Golden Horde and the Crimea, and is referred to as the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language².

3. We find traces of a literary life among the Mamluks as early as the second half of the fourteenth century³. The Mamluk Sultans encouraged science

1 Cf. Haarmann, U., *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit*. Freiburg 1970, p. 2.

2 Cf. Bodrogligeti, A., «*A Grammar of Mameluke-Kipchak*». *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, pp. 89 - 102.

3 Cf. Eckmann, J., «*The Mamluk-Kipchak Literature*». *CAJ* viii (1963), pp. 304 - 319; Bodrogligeti, A., «*Notes on the Turkish Literature at the Mameluke Court*»: *Acta Orient*, Hung. xiv (1962), pp. 273 - 282.

and literature. At their command Arabic and Persian literary works were translated, and Turkic works from various cultural centers were copied or adapted. Scholars and men of letters from the Golden Horde and Turkestan sought their fortunes at the Mamluk Court.

And yet only a few documents written in the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language have come down to us. Among the main ones we find the *Iršādu'l-mulūk va's-salāṭīn* (A Guide for Kings and Sultans)⁴, an interlinear translation of an Arabic *fiqh* book, the translation of Sa'dī's *Gulistān*⁵, an anthology of poems collected by Sayf-i Sarāyī⁶, and the topic of our present discussion, the *Kitāb Bayṭarat al-vāziḥ*. The work was first made known to the public by Saadet Çağatay in her paper «Eine osttürkische Handschrift: Bayṭaratu'l-vāziḥ», delivered at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of Orientalists in München⁷.

4. While the title of the Arabic original was probably *Bayṭarat* and was followed by its author's name⁸, the Turkic translation was given a new title by the translator. In the introduction he writes: «I have named this book *Bayṭarat al-vāziḥ*» (2r: 14-15). By adding the word *vāziḥ* he obviously meant to suggest that the Turkic work would be more comprehensible to his readers than the original. Although the Turkic translation is not dated and does not contain the names of its author or its translator, indirect evidence reveals that it dates from the last decades of the fourteenth century.

The *Bayṭarat* is the only Eastern Middle Turkic written record that deals with veterinary medicine. It is an indispensable source book both for the description of Mamluk-Kipchak⁹ and for research into the history of the Turkic lexicon in ge-

4 The lexical material of this Mamluk-Kipchak document has been included in the Middle-Turkic and English Dictionary which is in preparation at the Near Eastern Center, the University of California, Los Angeles.

5 Bodrogligeti, A., *A Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Sa'dī's Gulistān*. Budapest 1969, pp. 450.

6 Bodrogligeti, A., «A Collection of Turkish Poems from the Fourteenth Century». *Acta Orient. Hung.* xvi (1963), pp. 245-311.

7 Published in *Akten des Vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses*. (Wiesbaden, 1959), pp. 602-604. For further literature see Eckmann, «The Mamluk-Kipchak Literature». *CAJ* VIII (1963), 304-309.

8 MS: *bu bayṭara aṭliḡ kiiāb* «this book, named Bayṭara» (2r: 7). The author's name is not given.

9 It has been used as one of the major sources for the description of the Mamluk-Kipchak Literary language. Cf. the preliminary notes on my forthcoming Mamluk-Kipchak Grammar in *Studia Turcica*, Budapest 1971, pp. 89-102.

neral¹⁰. Secondly, it is one of those rare Islamic medical works which discusses formulas for the individually described diseases, gives practical advice on their application, and reports on veterinary experience with various drugs and diseases.

Furthermore, being a translation of an Arabic work from a special field, it is an important source for studies in the interference of the Arabic and Turkic lexical systems.

5. There are two MSS of the *Baytarat*. The complete version is in Istanbul in the Topkapı Palace Museum, (Revan Köşkü, no. 1965). It consists of 69 folios¹¹. The second MS (the language of which is slightly different) is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Blochet, i. p. 249)¹².

6. The translation of the Arabic work was made at the behest of a certain *Tolu Beg*, a courtier in the service of the Circassian Mamluks¹³. The introduction relates how the order was given. The translator says: «He (i.e., *Tolu Beg*) summoned me, the poor and miserable one, into his presence and commanded: 'Translate this book entitled *Baytara* from Arabic into Turkic'. Since he was so insistent (*inğün ragbat bilâ talab qıldı*), I the poor and miserable servant, was astonished and unable to disobey his command. So I obeyed him and set out to write this book with all the power I had within me, with all my mental faculties and with all my perseverance» (2r: 6-12).

7. The author of the work is not known. Nor was it possible for me to find the Arabic work that served as the basis for the Turkic translation. Some internal evidence suggests the following concerning the author and his work:

(a) The author was a learned veterinarian (*ustâ*) who himself practiced veterinary medicine. This is apparent from his comments on a formula (No 46) recommended as a cure for general weakness in a horse (*'azal*). He remarks: «This is a formula (*'ilâc*) I have seen in books, but I have not used it and have had no experience with it (*isti'mâl qılmadım taqî tacriba qılmadım*)» (33r: 11-12).

(b) The author was acquainted with Abū Yūsuf al-Kindī's medical works¹⁴

10 It has been included as a basic source for the Eastern Middle Turkic and English Dictionary mentioned in Note 3.

11 Karatay, F.E., *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi türkçe yazmalar kataloğu*. Vol. I (Istanbul 1961), p. 591, No. 1823.

12 Cf. Eckmann, J., «*Memlûk kıpçakçasının oğuzcalaşmasına dair*» TDAYB 1964, pp. 35-41.

13 Cf. Eckmann, J., CAJ viii (1963), p. 316.

14 Cf. M. Levey, *The Formulary or Aqrâbâdhûn of Al-Kindî*. Madison, Milwaukee and London, 1966.

on the treatment of the ailments that afflict men and applied several of his formulas in the treatment of horses. In one place he recommends a formula (No 16) for treating the chapped skin of a horse's leg (*'aran*). In another, he comments on a formula (No 246) for reducing swellings, saying: «This formula (*davā*) is one of the formulas of Abū Yūsuf. It has been proved effective (*mucarrab*) for swellings» (69v : 9).

(c) The author of the Arabic original of the *Baytārat* believed in the value of scientific medicine and was fully aware of the responsibility of his profession. He disapproved of ignorant practitioners whose only aim in treating horses was to accumulate wealth. He says: «There are very many veterinarians (*baytārlar*) who sit by the roadside and prepare formulas for horses and make money thereby (*aqça hāşil qılır*). Many horses perish in their hands, but they do not care. Beware of such ignorant veterinarians» (23r : 16-19).

(d) The original work seems to have been an abridged version of a longer one. The version used for the Turkish translation does not contain all the information the author promises. For example, while he mentions that there are 249 diseases that afflict horses (16v : 11-12), he actually discusses only 107. In another place he admits that he has not told all that he knows about horses : «People would get lost (*ğarq bol-*) in all this detail. In addition, he who knows what we have said above, will not need (to know) more. To know this much is enough» (11r : 23-25).

8. The *Baytārat* consists of ten chapters. Chapter I is the introduction. Chapter II relates the duties of horsemen. Chapter III tells us what points to look for when selecting a horse. Chapter IV enumerates the main characteristics of horses. Chapter V deals with desirable and undesirable physical characteristics. Chapter VI tells us how to determine the behaviour and capacity of a horse on the basis of its physical characteristics. Chapter VII is devoted to the differences between the physical features of a stallion and those of a mare. Chapter VIII provides additional information on mares, especially those with foals. Chapter IX lists the unsoundnesses and stable vices of the horse. The last, Chapter X deals with the diseases that afflict horses and recommends formulas for treating them.

9. The last chapter is the longest and most important. It discusses 109 diseases and describes 246 formulas, making mention of 315 items of *materia medica* as ingredients of the formulas.

From the figures above it is clear that the work provides more lexical data concerning *materia medica* and diseases than either of the other two works from the same period : the Khorazmian Turkic version of the *Muqaddi-*

*matu'l-adab*¹⁵ and the Turkic-Persian glossary of the Codex Cumanicus¹⁶.

10. The sections devoted to each disease exhibit the following structure: First the name of the disease (*ağrîğ*) is mentioned, mostly in Arabic, sometimes in Turkic or in Persian. Then its symptoms (*'alāmat*) are described as they may be recognized in the behavior of the horse. This section is especially important for Arabic, Persian and Turkic lexicography because of the valuable information it contains. The Persian word *hunām* or *hunnām* for example, is only vaguely defined by lexicographers. According to Steingass¹⁷ it is «a disease to which horses, asses and mules are subject.» From the *Bayṭarat* we learn that *hunām* is «a flatus on the horse's leg» (48r: 5) and, of course, we also learn how this condition should be treated.

The third part of the section discusses the prognosis of the disease. Here we find remarks such as «Very few horses recover from this disease» (42v: 3), or, «This is a very bad defect. A horse so afflicted cannot be used for anything but turning mills» (39r: 11). After this, one or more formulas are given. The ingredients are enumerated, specified, and measured. The method of preparing the medication (*'ilāc*) is carefully described with suggestions for substitutes when rare ingredients are not available. The method of applying the medication is explained. This is the main part of the section. It is followed by a description of the results that may be expected from the treatment. If the horse does not improve, further medication (*taqī bir 'ilāc*) is recommended, or the case is declared hopeless: «This horse cannot be cured, he will die» (38v: 22) or «There is no other remedy (*özgā čāra yoq turur*)» (26r: 3) or «You should put him to the watermill or slaughter him and eat him» (32v: 15).

11. Here in its entirety is a typical section. It deals with madness: «Another disease the horse is subject to is madness (*cunūn bolmaq*). Its symptoms (*'alāmat*) are that the horse opens his nostrils wide, hangs his head down, walks to and fro and cannot remain in one place. He does not eat his fodder and does not drink.

«To prepare a medication, the brain and the bile of an owl (*ükü quş*) and the fat from the intestine of an eagle (*qara quş*) are taken, each in the amount of one *mişqāl*. They are mashed together and mixed with the urine of a hog (*toñguz*). The hog should be a domesticated one and a male».

«The drug is poured into the horse's nostrils. When a human being (*ādam*

15 Cf. Eckmann, J., *Die kiptschakische Literatur*. Ph. T. F. II, p. 294.

16 The Turkish and Persian lexical material of the *Codex Cumanicus* is available in the following publications: Gronbech, K., *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus*. Copenhagen 1942; Monchi-Zadeh, D., *Das Persische im Codex Cumanicus*. Uppsala 1969; Bodrogligeti, A., *The Persian Vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*. Budapest, 1971.

17 Steingass, F., *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. London, 1892.

oğlı) goes mad (*macnün bolsa*), the same medication is applied. It is effective, God willing».

12. In this paper I will focus attention on to the technical vocabulary of the *Baytarat*.

In dealing with written records in Turkic, my interest goes beyond the formal analysis of the expression and is mainly focused on the content of the language at a given historical stage. This is in full agreement with the view that a language is in all stages a self-sufficient system and, as a means of articulating reality, is the result of a historical process.

In such a content-oriented analysis, lexical items from stable and coherent semantic fields (such as those of religion, medicine, etc.) play an important role because they reveal the language community's knowledge and understanding of the areas of reality covered by them¹⁸.

It is from this point of view that I will treat the technical vocabulary of our Mamluk-Kipchak document.

13. Of the 109 terms for diseases in the *Baytarat* 90 are Arabic, only 19 are Turkic none are Persian. Two of the Arabic terms are given with their Turkic equivalents. This raises the number of Turkic terms to 21.

The majority of Turkic terms for diseases are descriptive, rather than appellative. In form, the descriptive terms are syntactic structures: (a) Structures of modification as *qarın ağrığı* (XXXVI) «stomach ache» (40r : 23), *sığır ağrığı* (X1) «cow's disease» (42r : 1), *ma'da* (Ar. *mi'da*) *agrığı* «stomach ache» (58r : 16), *öwkä ağrığı* (LXXXI) «pain in the lungs» (58v : 14), *tuyağ ağrığı* (XCV) «disease of the hoof» (64r : 6), *böğrük ağrığı* (CI) «disease of the kidney» (65v : 20), *qarında yel* (LXXXII) «air in the [horse's] stomach» (59v : 23), *qursağda qarğa* (LXXXIV) «a boil in the stomach» (60v : 18). (b) Structures of predication such as *qulağı işitmämäk* (XXVI) «deafness» (35r : 21), *dimägi fäsüd bolmaq* (XXXVIII) «disease of the brain» (41r : 25), *yılan yä 'aqrab urğan* (LXXVII) «bite of a serpent or scorpion» (57v : 18), *qawuq tutulmaq* (CVIII) «strangury» (69r : 13), *ağ yaş hıtmı yer* (L) «the horse eats fresh marsh-mallows» (46r : 15), *qurtlar bolur atnıñ qarına* (LXXVIII) «the horse has maw-worm» (58r : 5), *zakarı salınur* (LXXV) «the horse's penis hangs down» (61r : 3), *qulağ içində cibän çıqar* «boils appear in the horse's ear» (66v : 20). (c) Structures of complementation such as *cünün bolmaq* (XXXIV) «madness» (42r : 16), *tavuq tezäkin yemäk* (LXXX) «the horse has eaten of the dung of hens» (58v : 6).

18. Cf. Bodroglıgeti, A., «The Formation of the Turkic Literary Language: The Problem of the Interference of Lexical Systems.» *Tatarica* (forthcoming) and «Islamic Terms in Eastern Middle Turkic». *Acta Orient. Hung.* XXV (1972), 355-367.

There are only two Turkic terms of the appellative type, both consist of a single word. One is the rather broad term *sisik*¹⁹ (CIX) «swelling» (69v: 10), the other, given with its Arabic equivalent (*hunān*), is *mañḡqav* «glanders»²⁰ (35v: 5).

The Arabic terms, on the other hand, are mostly (80 of a total of 90) appellative and are single words. They are names of the disease in the proper sense of the word, e.g., *mašaš* (I) «swelling» (17v: 5), *intišār* (II) «swelling in the tendons» (20r: 9), *sirtān* (VII) «cancer» (27r: 17), *'uqqāl* (XV) «lameness» (31r: 24), *qama'* (XVIII) «swelling, tumour» (32r: 21), *namla* (XXIV) «a crack on the horse's hoof» (33r: 19), *naḡḡa* (XXXI) «hernia» (39r: 13), *bavāsir* (XIV) «fistulas» (42v: 14), *qamla* (XLV) «lice infested» (45r: 5), *rubuvv* (LXI) «asthma» (50v: 10), *baraṣ* (LXXXVIII) «leprosy» (61v: 19), *nikab* «being slip-shouldered» (63r: 8), *yaraqān* (XCVIII) «jaundice» (65r: 1), *carab* (CVII) «scab, itch» (68r: 18), etc.

Nine of the Arabic terms are structures of modification of the HEAD < MODIFIER type. Some of them have the classical vocalization, such as *vaca'u'l-asr* (LXX) «pain caused by the retention of urine» (55v: 1), *vaca'u'l-qalib*²¹ (LXVIII) «pain in the heart» (54r: 21), *qarḡatu'l-ḡaili* (LVII) «pimple on a horse» (49r: 9), *mirratu'l-hā'icat* (XXXIV) «irritated bile» (39v: 2), whereas others occur in low Arabic phonemic forms such as *mirra yābisa* (XXXVII) «dry bile» (40v: 18), *vaca' kabid* (LXVI) «pain in the liver» (53r: 24), *rīḡ cimāl* (LXV) «flatus on a camel» (53r: 7), *rīḡ hā'ica* (XLIII) «malignant flatus» (44v: 2).

14. Of the 315 terms for *materia medica* occurring in the *Bayṭarat* 234 are Arabic, 74 Turkic, and 7 Persian.

Most of the Turkic terms in this category (46 in number), like those for diseases, are descriptive. They are structures of modification (simple or complex possessive structures or adverbial constructions). Some of them include Arabic or Persian constituents such as *ās yaḡi* «myrtle oil» (42v: 22), *aq fulful* «white pepper» (57v: 22), *gulāf suwī* «rose water» (66v: 5), *ḡamir sirkasī* «wine vinegar» (47v: 7), *nabīl qamīš* «Nabathean reed» (51r: 8), *zaytūn suwī* «the sap of the olive tree» (62v: 14). Others consist of native Turkic elements, for example *aq yūzūm* «white grapes» (36r: 1), *ečki yaḡi* «goat fat» (50r: 13), *ič yaḡi* «lard» (48r: 11), *kümüš boḡi* «silver dross» (65v: 6), *qara qušniñḡ ič yaḡi* «fat from an eagle's

19 Bashkir *šešek* «swelling» (Ahmerov et al. 658a). Mn. Turkish has *siğ*.

20 Bashkir *mañqa* «snotty» (Ahmerov, et al. 377b). Cf. Mn. Turkish *mankafa* 3. «suffering from chronic glanders (horse)». (Redhouse, 730b).

21 Final consonant clusters in Arabic words are mostly disjoined in Mamluk-Kipchak by a prosthetic vowel.

intestine» (42r : 21), *sarı yağ* «clarified butter» (40r : 12), *tekāniñg yağı* «fat from a he-goat» (62v : 8).

The appellative terms in Turkic for *materia medica* - more numerous than those for diseases - are common everyday terms. They are words for animals, agricultural products, food, parts of the body, plants and their fruit, and spices, for example : *arpa* «barley» (56r : 11), *bal* «honey» (48v : 11), *buğday* «wheat» (40v : 10), *buz* «ice» (18r : 4), *çağır* «wine» (47r : 24), *kül* «ashes» (22r : 13), *mamuağ* «cotton» (47r : 4), *qan* «blood» (20v : 8), *qapuğ* «bark» (49v : 9), *qara* «soot» (29r : 10), *qaymaq* «cream» (67r : 16), *quyruğ* «tail fat» (34v : 2), *sarımsaq* «garlic» (64r : 13), *sıçqan* «mouse» (43v : 19), *soğan* «onion» (55v : 3), *süt* «milk» (43r : 18), *yağ* «oil» (31r : 15), *yogurt* «yogurt» (48r : 2), *yumurtğa* «egg» (20v : 6), *yüzärlük* «cress» (63v : 14). There is not a single Turkic appellative term that would be used in a medical sense only.

The great majority of the Arabic terms, like those for diseases, are appellative. They consist of single words, mostly native, and also of a few of Greek and some of Persian origin. Words from the two latter groups follow the Arabic phonemic structure. Along with everyday words we find technical terms for *materia medica*, e.g., *adas* «lentil» (56v : 9), *afirbiyün* «euphorbium» (31v : 11), *alüc* «elecampane» (52r : 11), *anzarüt* «sarcocol» (24r : 6), *bağım* «turpentine grain» (35r : 22), *bavraq* «borax» (65r : 11), *cāvšir* «opoponax» (58r : 8) from Persian *gāvšir*, *fütunc* «aquatic mint» (36v : 9) from Persian *pūdina*, *ğār* «sweet bay» (68v : 15), *hamāmā* «stone parsley» (36v : 13), *isfizāc* «white lead» (51v : 3) from Persian *sapīd āb*, *kibrīt* «sulphur» (68v : 8), *marzancūs* «marjoram» (67v : 3) from Persian *marzangōš*, *murdāsang* «litharge» (25r : 4) from Persian *murdār sang*, *nūra* «quicklime» (21v : 11), *qasnī* «galbanum» (51v : 24), *rāziyānac* «fennel» (51v : 1) from Persian *rāziyāna*, *zancabıl* «ginger» (46v : 1), *zarnīğ* «arsenic» (46v : 9), *zaybağ* «mercury» (48v : 21).

Some of the Arabic terms are structures of modification of the possessive and adjectival types. They occur mostly in the low Arabic form, though structures with classical vocalization also occur, e.g., *buğur maryam* «hog's fennel» (45r : 8), *aşulu's-sūs* «licorice root» (24v : 16), *dam al-ağvāin* «dragon's blood» (20v : 5), *fağāğ al-ağğar* «the flower of the bog-rush» (36v : 12), *karğas cabālī* «mountain parsley» (36v : 10), *nağit asvad* «black naphtha» (68v : 6), *qışsa ħimār* «wild cucumber» (60r : 2), *sūsān barrī* «wild lily» (50r : 14), *zanib 'aqrab* «scorpion's tail» (38v : 8).

Those Persian terms which have not been modified according to the Arabic phonemic structure may be loan elements in the Turkic and Arabic vocabulary, e.g., *bīr* «the fruit of the jujube tree» (48r : 14), *ğurmā* «date» (21r : 20), *nāñğwāğ* «bishop's weed» (67v : 15), *rāvānd* «rhubarb» (36r : 4), *zāc* «vitriol» (32r : 18).

15. The first thing that strikes one's eye in this lexical survey is the poverty of Mamluk-Kipchak in technical terms of Turkic origin. Such poverty was certainly not characteristic of the Turkic languages. It is true that abstract terms had not developed to the extent they had in Semitic or Indo-European languages. It is also a fact that in a new semantic field, such as that dealing with the religion of Islam, the Turkic vocabulary was not always able to provide native terms and therefore borrowed Arabic elements. Lexical interference also prompted such an influx. But what we see in Mamluk-Kipchak, is more than what could be explained by such lexical borrowing. Beyond the introduction of new terms for new notions, we witness a giving up of old, traditional Turkic words in favor of Arabic ones.

In order to show that even terms of Turkic origin attested in contemporary or earlier Turkic languages are missing in the *Bayṭarat*, let us compare a group of Khorazmian terms with their equivalents in our Mamluk-Kipchak document. I take the list of plants in the Khorazmian version of the *Muqaddimatu'l-adab*²² and compare them with what we find in our list of terms for *materia medica*.

Khor. *yasmuq* «lentil», BAY *'adas* (56v : 9); Khor. *kāčirā* «safflower», BAY *'asfūr* (49r : 20); Khor. *bandu* «rocket», BAY *carcīr* (37r : 8); Khor. *būrlügäč* «ivy», BAY *lablāb* (61v : 12); Khor. *kāčirā uruği* «safflower seed», BAY *qirṭim* (65r : 10); Khor. *boya* «fennel flower», BAY *šüniz* (68v : 7); Khor. *yulğun* «tamarisk tree», BAY *ṭarfā* (55r : 11); Khor. *qizil čečäk* «red rose», BAY *vard aḥmar* (58v : 2).

In all these examples original Turkic words in Khorazmian Turkic are represented in our Mamluk-Kipchak document by Arabic terms.

16. Not only were Turkic terms replaced by Arabic ones: the Persian terms which had already been integrated into Khorazmian Turkic were also replaced. The following illustrations, again from the *Muqaddimatu'l-adab*, demonstrate this clearly:

Khor. *bōstān-afrūz* «sweet basil», BAY *afranc-müşik* (41v : 8); Khor. *turpa* «radish», BAY *facal* (44r : 24); Khor. *kasnī* «endive», BAY *hindibā* (66r : 24); Khor. *šipandān* «mustard», BAY *ḥardal* (68v : 24); Khor. *bēd-ancīr* «castor-oil plant», BAY *ḥirva'* (33r : 13); Khor. *bādām* «almond», BAY *lüz* (65v : 10); Khor. *pūdina* «mint», BAY *fütunc* (58r : 19).

Here, too, we can observe a definite tendency toward the Arabization of the vocabulary of the *Bayṭarat*. But this is not an isolated case. Other Mamluk-Kipchak documents reveal the same thoroughgoing Arabization.

22 I used A.K. Borovkov's posthumously published paper «*Nazvanija rastenij po buxarskomu spisku Muqaddimat al-adab*» in *Tjurkskaja leksikologija i leksikografija*. Moscow, 1971, pp. 96-111.

Let us take the chief representative of Mamluk-Kipchak court literature: the translation of Sa'dī's *Gulistān*²³. The translator, Sayf, from Sarāy, the capital of the Golden Horde, instead of translating the Persian words of the original with purely Turkic terms, preferred to render them with Arabic equivalents. He has *durrāc* «partridge» (64r: 2) for *kibkān*; *faẓīhat* «disgrace» (176r: 12) for *sarzanīš*; *fuqur* «poor» (49r: 6) for *darvīšān*; *fulūs* «small coins» (101v: 9) for *pašiz*; *vabāl* «sin» (46v: 7°) for *gunāh*, etc.

17. Two factors may account for the Arabization of the Mamluk-Kipchak vocabulary. One of them was the fact that the Mamluk-Kipchak language, both on the colloquial and literary levels, was in a secondary position from an ethnic as well as a cultural point of view. The speakers of this language were surrounded by the Arabs whose language was the carrier of a different and higher culture. In such a situation Mamluk-Kipchak served rather as a means of adopting the Arab culture than as a medium for creating its own values. This, in turn, led to the bilingualism of the Turks in Egypt with the predominance of Arabic, the prestige language, and the secondary role of the native Turkic tongue.

18. The other factor responsible for the Arabization of the Mamluk-Kipchak lexicon was the fact that fourteenth century Mamluk-Kipchak literature was an importation. Its poets and authors were not natives of Egypt but had come from the Golden Horde, Crimea, and Khorazm. In the new atmosphere this literature could only be appreciated by a small section of the Mamluk elite. It had no homogeneous language community at its base.

This literature was not able to give birth to original works. The literary documents of this period consist only of adaptations from Persian, translations from Arabic, and *nazīras* (parallel poems) on Khorazmian and Old Anatolian poems. The unproductive character of Mamluk-Kipchak literature was the result of the stagnation of the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language.

19. In conclusion I wish to sum up the linguistic outcome of this lexical survey. I mentioned at the beginning that Mamluk-Kipchak branched off from Khorazmian, the literary language of the Turks in Khorazm and the Golden Horde.

Turcologists have focused their attention on delineating the differences between these two Turkic languages. They have, however, restricted their observation to the phonemic and morphological features of these languages and have,

²³ Cf. the lexical analysis in the Introduction to «*A Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Sa'dī's Gulistān*», pp. 12-17.

as a result, established a limited list of deviations in the phonemic and morphological systems. On the basis of their conclusions, it appears that Khorazmian and Mamluk-Kipchak actually do not differ significantly and may indeed be considered as one and the same language.

But that would be a gross mistake. For if we extend our comparison to the lexical systems as we have done with the technical terms for diseases and *materia medica*, we find decisive differences between the two languages.

Lexical evidence shows that the vocabulary of Khorazmian Turkic was more homogeneous, more systemic - betraying a language in constant activity and with genuine accomplishments. Mamluk-Kipchak, on the otherhand, had a disorganized and decaying lexical system. It succumbed to Arabic, gave up its traditional content, and ceased to create new values of its own.

20. Regarded on the basis of a lexical, rather than a structural analysis, we may understand why these languages developed as they did. Khorazmian, with its creativity ensured by a solid lexical system and a firm ethnological basis, became the language of the Central Asian renaissance, the vehicle of the extremely rich and original Chagatay literature. It flourished for more than four centuries and has to a certain extent survived in the Modern Uzbek language.

Mamluk-Kipchak, on the other hand, flourished for only a short time. By the first decades of the Fifteenth Century it had already gone out of use. From then on literary works in the Mamluk Court would be produced in Old Anatolian Turkic²⁴.

24 Instructive is Eckmann's paper on how Old Anatolian Turkic took the place of Mamluk-Kipchak in the early decades of the 15th century. Cf. TDAYB 1964, pp. 35 - 41.