
TEXTUAL FEATURES OF THE WORK “DĪWĀN LUGHĀT AL-TURK”

Zilola I. Sattorova

Phd Student Tashkent State University Of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

Qudratulla Sh. Omonov

Scientific Supervisor, Doctor Of Philology, Professor Tashkent State University Of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT: This article analyzes the textual characteristics of Mahmud Koshgari’s “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” manuscript based on the manuscript. It is also considered that the work is a rich philological source and attempts of Turkologists to perfect the interpretation of the text.

KEYWORDS: Text, interpolation, textological analysis, translation, basmala, colophon, poygir.

INTRODUCTION

Only one copy of Mahmud Koshgari’s “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” has survived to this day. This copy was copied from a copy written by Koshghari by a scribe named Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr Damascus of Damascus on the 27th of Shawwal 664 (August 1, 1266) after Sowa, almost two hundred years after the writing of the Diwan. The existence of this copy is related to a Turkish lover of ancient books named Ali Amiri. He revealed a new history of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”.

The text of the manuscript has been preserved in its entirety. There is taalif, basmala, parts of praise, colophon, but no punctuation. DLT is structured in such a way that even without a race, it is not difficult to replace detached pages. The size of the manuscript is 23.9x16.5 cm, the size of the text is 17.5x11.5 cm. Novvot is written on thick oriental paper. In the 10th century, it was copied in a script that was used instead of Kufic. At the beginning of the last century, the sheets were digitized by the staff of the foundation by writing in the upper left part of the pages. Then there are 319 pages in total, the front part is considered to be a page, and the back part is considered to be page b. However, the numbers 55-56-57 are written in the bottom corner, not the top, and the number 239 is written after 231 pages. 233 was added instead of 239. Since this error would cause inconvenience during the research, each page with Arabic numerals has been renumbered. It reached 638 pages in total.

Although the manuscript is well-preserved, there are places where the pages are darkened by moisture and the edges of the pages are frayed. From line 9 to line 15 of the first page, some words have faded to the point of being illegible. There are lateral, inverted, horizontal inscriptions

in the margins. These are mostly corrections and stuck positions. Once the source was found, the unframed parts of the pages were re-papered around the edges and reinforced (from the beginning to page 40). The leather covering and restoration also belong to the last century. Each page of the manuscript contains 17 lines of text. Written in black, red and light brown script. The main body of the text is in black, some headings are written in larger bold black ink, and when closed, ink marks have also been transferred to the opposite page.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

In the dedication to the Caliph [1,3], in the words used in Turkic languages and out of use [1,5], the combination of Turkic letters, i.e. Uyghur letters, Arabic alternatives [1,6], which comes before the poetic lines وَقَالَ va:qala, and before proverbs الْمَثَلُ al maṣal sentences, tribal marks [1.40-41], names of Turkic tribes, Arabic transliteration of three words written in Uyghur script, copied in red ink.

Also, a red line is drawn over Turkish examples. For the reader's convenience, Koshgari also used a number of conventional symbols in red and black: "ha", four dots, and leaf symbols. The poet put a red dot between the lines and separated the borders of the proverbs with dotted circles. We observed that pages 25-200 of the text were corrected by an unknown person in light brown ink, that is, damma, fatha, kasra, sukun, tashdid, tanvin and letter dots were added. For example, in the Arabic text of 30 pages and 11 lines, the word given as جَزْر was corrected by Tanvin fatha at the end and a silence sign was added. On page 32, three dots were placed in light brown ink above the 6 ك written in a clerical pen. This correction ensured that voiceless o ك in these Turkish words is pronounced as voiced كْ. This ink holder has been extensively used in the above pages. He changed the vowels in some words by crossing them out. Here the difference is felt not only in the color of the ink, but also in the form of the writing. Unlike the Damascus, the later introduced light brown suk is set with an open top ُ, while the scribe's suk is set with ُ in a round shape. So it seems that someone else edited the manuscript after it was finished. Denkoff-Kelly conducted a research on this issue and estimated that the manuscript had the pen of 15 people including the secretary and Khatib Darayya and showed it with examples [2,15]. It can be added in a certain sense. We think that there may be other handprints of the secretary, Ahmad Daraya, the owner of the light brown edition. Because, some headings in red ink (8 pages, 14 lines) and actions in dark black in Arabic places. In this line, the red title is covered with a bolder and more flat stop in dark black ink, unlike the scribe's pen. This damma mark is also not similar to the "damma" of the light brown ink holder. In another case, the writings in the margins of pages 3-9-10-12 are also not the signature of the secretary. Slightly more inclined to the right.

Denkoff-Kelly, a Devonian researcher, reported that the brown ink was added later by an assistant scribe in Damascus or Cairo in the late 14th century [2,10]. To clarify these assumptions, it is necessary to perform laboratory analysis on the records. The researcher also noted that it is possible to get relative information about the composition of inks and the period of their use.

However, it is difficult to agree with all the assertions of Denkoff and Kelly. Because the characteristics of the light brown hand appear in black ink in places other than pages 25-200. If we understand that this is a different hand than the owner of the ink in terms of the style of writing the letters, it is a little controversial that scholars say that there are traces of more than ten other owners of the tin. This is because it is natural for ink to run out and change when writing a large work. Perhaps the scribe himself edited in a different ink. Later changes made with black ink are more difficult to detect.

The first page of the manuscript has additions in a different hand at the top and right. In the upper margin it is written “Muhammad ibn Ahmad Khatib belongs to Daraiya (may God forgive them). Then comes the signature of this person: the date, Cairo and the year 803 are written. Then comes the book title and description: “Kitābu dīvāni luġati-t-türki” [“Book of Turkish words”]. Translation: Mahmud bin al-Husayn bin Muhammad al-Koshgari (may God have mercy on him). The Koshgari ratio does not appear in the DLT text. After that, the 15-line introduction is finished. According to him, this book is not suitable for Turkmen, he wrote that his father asked people from Turkic countries about this book. They also come to this country in their youth and do not understand the content of the book because they do not know their language well. This description was written with a scribe's pen. In black ink, but the size of the writing is smaller. None of the entries on this page are attributed to Mahmud Koshgari, meaning they are not in the original that we have seen. This interpretation is based on the description given in the 15-line DLT. After that, the 15-line introduction is finished. According to him, this book is not suitable for Turkmen, he wrote that his father asked people from Turkic countries about this book. They also come to this country in their youth and do not understand the content of the book because they do not know their language well. This description was written with a scribe's pen. In black ink, but the size of the writing is smaller. None of the entries on this page are attributed to Mahmud Koshgari, meaning they are not in the original that we have seen. This is based on the description given in the description and 15-line DLT.

From the second page, in the text of Mahmud Koshgari, after the basmala comes the following praise: “Praise be to God Almighty, who is the owner of perfect art!...He sent the Qur’an, which clearly and clearly explains right and wrong, to Muhammad, peace be upon him, through Gabriel...May peace and blessings be upon Muhammad, peace be upon him, and all his family who were leaders” [3,14]. At the end of the book comes the scribe’s colophon: Poor servant of the Great God Muḥammad bin Abu Bakr bin Abulfath as Sāvasī cŷnr ad-Damašqī, May God forgive him, he completed the work of copying this book from the copy written by the author’s own hand on Sunday, the twenty-seventh of Shawwal 664. I quote exactly the passage at the end of the author’s manuscript: “I started writing the book at the beginning of 464 AD. It was rewritten and edited four times, and finished on the twelfth of Jumodiu-l-Okhir, 466”. The work ends with the following words of the scribe: Strength and power are with the great God; He is enough for us; what a beautiful protector she is. The book is finished.

“Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” consists of two parts. 1. The author divides the introductory part into the following rules: Letters used in the structure of Turkish words, Nouns formed from verbs, Structure of words, Additives in nouns, Verbs and their structure, Order of words, Adjectives that are not mentioned in Devon, Infinitives that are not mentioned, What is said in the book and Unsaid things, description of Turkic classes and tribes, description of features of Turkish language, differences in dialects are described. It provides valuable information about the methods and methods used by Koshgari, description of Turkic tribes, dialects and their linguistic features, and Turkic script. 2. Mahmud Koshghari writes that he limited DLT to eight main books and their names. These eight books comprise the bulk of the text, the glossary. On pages 22-23, there is a map drawn by Koshgari and called “circle”. It shows the location of all Turkish cities and Turkish tribes.

It is known that by the 20th century in Europe, linguo-geographical linguistics was formed as a separate branch. In fact, the founder of this is Mahmud Koshghari [4,27].

Several studies have been conducted on the textual characteristics of the manuscript of the work. First, Rifat of Kilis edited and prepared the printed copy. K. Rifat worked on the text for more than three months. He restored the places where the letters had fallen, where the letters had faded, so he changed the approaches of M. Koshgari in some places. Most Turkologists consider this inappropriate. To some extent, one can agree with these points. M. Koshgari elaborates on his principle in the introduction and at the end of the chapters. It also provides important phonetic, orthographic and morphological information along the way. However, without Koshgari’s comments, one can see two different moving words throughout the text. In this case, K. Rifat takes one of two actions. However, M. Koshgari may have indicated some variants of the word, dialectal elements.

B. Atalay, who translated “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” into Turkish for the first time, made some revisions on the text. In the process of translating DLT into Turkish, he edits a number of words. Let’s look at one of these. On page 454 (227,b) of the manuscript, in the section Another type of middle-movement words, it is explained that the seed of a different plant, which is like a sesame seed, but redder than it, whose oil is used to light a lamp [3, 330] جيم jim the word is actually in print or manuscript جيم jitim it is reasonable to be [5,24]. B. Atalay says that this word is still used in the form of جيم in the Kuzau tribe.

A comparison with the manuscript reveals that this word is the first word in line 11 of that page, and does not consist of ي م letters as in current editions, but has one letter in the middle with the dots dropped. The manuscript has 446 pages and 10 lines, جيم words. Yem (yem) is interpreted in Uzbek as fragrant medicinal herbs [3,325]. In publications, the form of these two words (except for their actions) is exactly the same. However, the next word in the manuscript is just a combination of ي and م , meaning there is no letter symbol in between.

If we pay attention to the fact that in many cases the dots of ta' marbuta are dropped [6,18], it seems that the scribe forgot to put the dots of ت itself. B. Atalay's approach to the issue in this regard turns out to be correct that the word يم jim is actually ييم jim. In the research of Erjilasun and Z. Akkayunli, this word is translated as "yitim - keten tohumu 454", i.e. "flax seed" [7,978]. According to the manuscript, it is like flaxseed and sesame seed (1,454).

B. Atalay gives a wide explanation that the word يُبَاغُو appearing in K. Rifat's edition should actually be بُيَاغُو. Comparing with the manuscript, it was found that B. Atalay's explanation is correct [1,459/15]. However, it appeared for the first time in the publication of S.Mutallibov.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion is that most of the studies on the text of "Dīwān Lughāt al-Türk" have not been studied on the basis of the manuscript and caused different interpretations due to the interpolation of other hands in the text. However, today, with the creation of quality facsimile editions of the manuscript, some errors are being corrected, and new editions of the text are correcting such errors.

REFERENCES

1. Mahmud bin al-Husayn bin Muhammad al-Kashg'ari. Kitâbu dîvânu lug'âti't-türk. Tipkibasim-Türkçe Sözcükler, Özel Adlar Dizini. Yayına hazırlayan Şaban Kurt. İstanbul, 2008. 319 s.
2. Mahmud al-Käsyari. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (DTwän Luyät at-Türk). Edited and Translated with Introduction and Indices by Robert Dankoff in Collaboration with James Kelly. Parts I—III. Harvard, 1982-1985
3. Mahmoud Koshgari. "Dīwān Lughāt al-Türk"- T.: 2017. Preparer for publication Sadikov.Q B.475
4. Abdiev M, Joraev Sh. Mahmud Koshghari - the founder of comparative linguistics // Linguistic heritage of Mahmud Zamakhshari, Mahmud Koshghari and Alisher Navoi and its place in the study of Turkic languages, materials of the international scientific conference, Samarkand. 2018.B.27
5. Atalay Besim. Divanü Lügat-it-Türk Tercümesi. Ankara, 1939-1941. C.III
6. Rustami Salima. Linguistic terms in "Dīwān Lughāt al-Türk". T. 2006. p.18
7. Erjilasun, A. B., Akkoyunlu, Z. (2014). Kâşgarlı Mahmud Dîvânu Lugâti't-Türk (Giriş - Metin - Çeviri - Notlar - Dizin), Ankara: TDK Yayınları. S.1120