

Gulsevin G.¹, Ilyassova N.B.²,

¹Director of the Turkish Language Institution, Doctor of Science, Professor, Turkey, Ankara,

²doctoral student of al-Farabi Kazakh national University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,

e-mail: gurergulsevin@gmail.com, nazgul_ilyass@mail.ru

PHONETIC, MORPHOLOGICAL, SEMANTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE VOCABULARY OF «HIBAT-UL-HAQAYIQ» AND KAZAKH LANGUAGE

In this article, we have found that when comparing equivalents of all words in «Hibat-Ul-Haqayiq» by Ahmed Yugneki (XII) and in the modern Kazakh language significant part of them have identical similarity while most of them show phonetic, morphological, and semantic differences.

Besides, it clarifies linguistic differences due to the peculiarities of the Karakhan state and its ethnic diversity between the Karluk, Chigil, Argu, and Yagma tribes reflected throughout the work.

Key words: monument, Karakhanids, Cumans, comparison, differences.

Гүлсевин Г.¹, Ильясова Н.Б.²,

¹Түрік тілі қоғамының директоры, профессор, ф. ф. д., Түркия, Анкара қ.,

²әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің PhD докторанты, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,

e-mail: gurergulsevin@gmail.com, nazgul_ilyass@mail.ru

«hibat-ul haqayiq» тілі лексикасының қазақ тілі лексикасынан фонетикалық, морфологиялық, семантикалық айырмашылықтары

Мақалада, Ахмед Йүгінекидің «hibat-ul haqayiq» (XII ғ.) ескерткіші тілі мен қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі барлық сөздердің баламаларын өзара салыстырғанда олардың едәуір бөлігінде айна-қатесіз ұқсастық болса, үлкен бөлігінде фонетикалық, морфологиялық, семантикалық айырмашылықтар бар екендігін анықтадық.

Сол дәуірде өмір сүрген Қарахан мемлекеті, олардың халқының этникалық құрамы әр түрлі болғандықтан, қарлұқ, чығыл, аргу, яғма тайпаларының тілдік ерекшеліктері шығармада көрініс тапқандығы айқындалды.

Түйін сөздер: ескерткіш, Қарахан, қыпшақ, салыстыру, айырмашылық.

Гүлсевин Г.¹, Ильясова Н.Б.²,

¹Директор Института тюркского языка, д. ф. н., профессор, Турция, г. Анкара,

²докторант PhD Казахского национального университета им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы,

e-mail: gurergulsevin@gmail.com, nazgul_ilyass@mail.ru

Фонетические, морфологические, семантические различия лексики языка «hibat-ul haqayiq» от лексики казахского языка

В статье мы установили, что при сравнении эквивалентов всех слов в языке работы Ахмеда Йүгінеки «hibat-ul haqayiq» (XII в.) и в современном казахском между значительной частью из них имеется идентичное сходство, тогда как в большинстве случаев встречаются и фонетические, морфологические, семантические различия.

Вместе с тем уточняются языковые различия между племенами карлуков, чигилов, аргу, яғма, нашедшие отражение в произведении, в силу особенностей существовавшего в ту эпоху Караханидского государства и многообразия этнического состава его населения.

Ключевые слова: памятник, караханиды, кипчаки, сравнение, различия.

Introduction

In the cultural history of the Turkic peoples the Karakhan state takes a significant place. As per historical guess, this state dates to 932-1165. It possessed a part of East Turkestan, Zhetysu, Shash, and Fergana. By the end of the X century, the Karakhans conquered Bukhara and Samarkand by bringing into complete subjection the whole territory of the ancient Sogdiana region.

Although the whole country was ruled from the single centre by a certain leader, local anarchy and segregation were strong. Nevertheless, favorable conditions for the growth of culture and literature were created with evolving large cultural centers in cities like Kashkar, Balasagun, and Uzgen. These cities concentrated writers, poets, and scholars. It influenced many valuable works.

The greatest monuments of that time are «Qutadghu biligi» by Yusuf Balasaguni, «Divanu Lughat-it turk» by Mahmud Kashgari, and «Hibat-Ul-Haqaiq» by Ahmed Yugneki.

B. Sagyndykuly after studying ancient monuments and their language claims that «The accurate information about Ahmed Yugneki is not preserved in the history. Some of the information that we know about can be found in appendixes attached by other people (copyists) at the end of the «Hibat-Ul-Haqaiq» monument and in some of Yugneki's poem lines» (Sagyndykuly, 2002: 57). It gives a brief overview that Ahmed Yugneki was blind since birth, thirst after knowledge from his early age, educated in madrassa, well-grounded in Islam, his father's name was Mahmud, poet was born in Yugneki and wrote his work in Kashgar language.

But these facts do not give enough information about the life and environment of Ahmed Yugneki.

Experiment. Phonetic Differences

Most of the words used in the monument are slightly different from the modern language in terms of manifestation. The main of them are:

iv vs i. *elik-elik, eskir-eskir, deniz-teñiz, bir-bir, bilin-bilin, esiz-essiz etc.*

438 Qaza birla ılınur tuzaqqa **elik**

Qaza kelse, **elik** tuzaqqa ilinedi

[If marked to die, a roe deer shall fall into a trap]

195 Iğıt hoja bolur ıańy **eskirúr**

Jas qartayady, jańa **eskiredi**

[Youth ages; new gets old]

sh vs s. The sound **sh** in root-words with single or sometimes two syllables corresponds to the sound **s** in the Kazakh language. For example, ush-

aq-usaq, bash-bas, *ısh-is, tash-tas, túsh/tús, sókúsh-sógis etc.*

60 Sanar mu ediz qum **ushaq tash** sany

Túir qum men **usaq tastyn** sany esepteuge kele me?

[Can anyone count sand and pebbles?]

136 Ietar **bashqa** bir kún butıl boshlýgy

Tilinniń zhúgensizdigi bir kún **basynajedi**

[Spoiled tongue troubles head]

137 Hiradlyq mu bolur tılı bosh **kıshı**

Tilin tartpağan **kisini** aqyldy deuge bola ma?

[Can a man unable to hold his tongue be called wise?]

i vs j. The word-starter sound **i** corresponds to Kazakh **j**. For example, *ıu-ju, ıum-jum, ıazuq-jazyq, ıańy-jańa, ıańyl-jańyl, ıaran-jaran, ıoq-joq etc.*

406 Iúz evrúp kecharlar **ıumup** kózların

Júzinburyp, kózin **zhumypótedi**

[Passing by, turns his face away and closes his eyes]

197 Bý kún bar ıaryn **ıoq** bý dúnia neńi

Bul dúnienniń zaty búgin bar bolsa, erteń **ıoq**

[Anything in this world is here today and gone tomorrow]

These phonetic phenomena pull the language of medieval monuments away from the modern Kazakh language. Instead, the words grouped according to the mentioned feature in the modern Turkic languages belonging to the Karluk-Uyghur and Oguz groups sound just like in the monument.

Known Turkologist A. Scherbak in his monographic work «Comparative Phonetics of Turkic Languages» proves the voiceless pronunciation of root words in ancient Turkic languages (Scherbak, 1961: 22). If to believe this is correct, the Kazakh language is close to its ancient prototype. The words, such as *bas* (head), *tas* (stone) are pronounced voicelessly in the Yakutian language. Based on sound symbols *sh/s* and *i/j*, modern languages can be conditionally divided into voiced and voiceless. A number of languages have preserved voiceless pronunciation of root words like in the prototype language while others made them voices in line with their own development patterns.

d vs i. The sound **d** the second or third syllable of root words encountered in the monument corresponds to Kazakh **i**. For example, *adaq-ıraq, ıdı-re, adar-aryr* etc. A. Scherbak believes that the preservation of **d** could be influenced by literary tradition.

121 Bılıg birla bilmur tóratqan **ıdı**

Jaratýshy táńiri de bilim arqyly tanyladı

[The Creator is also learned through knowledge]

105 Bılıglıg bılıgnı **ıdargan** bolur

Bilimdi kisi bilimniń parqyn aıradı

[The educated person can distinguish between knowledge]

ch vs sh. The sound **ch** in the first, second, and third syllables corresponds to **sh**. For example, *sachshash, chal-shal, chyq-shyq, ých-úsh, óch-ósh, ach-ash, ichi-ishi, achyq-aschy, kichik-kishi* etc.

221 Nıqab qótrır azhýn birar kóz **achar**

Iazar qol qúshar deg iana tark **qachar**

Perdesin kóterip dúmre birer kózin ashady,

Qushatýn sıyaqty qolyn zhazyp, sosyn tez qa-shady

[Raising the curtain, the world opens its eyes,

Stretches its arms as if to hug to quickly run away afterwards]

In a number of roots of words, consonants *g, k, q, r* in the middle and end of the word are preserved in the monument but lost in modern Kazakh language: *qatyǵh-qatty, kichik-kishi, achyq-aschy, erdi-edietc.*

169 **Qatyǵ**kızla razyn kishi bilmasın

Syryndy kisi bilmesin, berik saqta

[Do not let anyone know your secret, keep it safe]

«Hibat-UI-Haqaiiq» has sound replacements like: **d-r**: *edǵú-eigú* (*igi, jaqsy, izgi – kind, good, virtuous*), **d-t**: *dórt-tórt* (*four*), **d-z**: *qodyn-qozy* (*tómen, tómen qarai – down, downwards*), **ǵ-q**: *qatyǵ-qatyq* (*qatty – very*), **m-n**: *ıama-iana* (*zháne, taǵy, qaitadan – and/again*), **n-r**: *qanda-qarda* (*where*), **s-z**: *almas-oialmaz* (*unamendable*).

According to E. Najip, there are two main reasons for such phonetic diversity:

1. In the written language, there is a trace of dialects that existed at that time.

2. In each century, copyists introduced dialect elements they spoke (Najip, 1959, 46).

Morphological differences. «Hibat-UI-Haqaiiq» is significantly different from in the morphological modern Kazakh language. This feature is especially noticeable when comparing the core root and the derived root. The words cognate with modern Kazakh have basically one or two syllables.

The verb root **bil** (*to know*) makes **bilig** in the monument and **bilim** – in Kazakh.

The common root **kór** (*to see*) gave birth to **kóruımlıg-kórikti**.

The conclusion is that the words preserved in modern languages has ancient endings in the monument. Also, there is also a contrary phenomenon: an ancient word that is not present in the modern language has living ending. For example: *borch-sharap satushý* (*winermerchant*), *ýnarcha-shama* (*as best one can*) etc.

395 Kim ol **borchý**ersa kishuig ol

Kim sharap satushý bolsa, kisiniń táyiri sol

[Whoever is a wine merchant is a good man]

4 **Ýnarcha**ııaıayn ıary ber meıa

Shamam kelgenshe aıtayn, maǵan zhárdem ber

[I will say as best as I can, help me]

Here, the suffixes **-chy**, **-cha** are often used in Kazakh as **-sha**, **-shy**.

In the Middle Ages, words that are considered to be derivative are roots in the modern language. For example, in the monuments, the root *aıcan* make *ait*, an imperative verb (*say*). In the Kazakh language, the main root was forgotten with the derivative root assuming the core root meaning.

119 Bılıgsız ne **aiısa** aıyr ýqmadın

Bilimsiz ne aıtsa uqpai túsinbei aıtady

[Whatever a man of little culture says, he says not realizing or understanding]

«Hibat-UI-Haqaiiq» uses suffixes deemed ancient exaggerations in the context of modern languages. For example, *tanýǵ* (witness), *ýlýǵ*, *qýrýǵ* (free), *qyldachy* (doer), *belgúlúg*, *ıatyban* (lying), *ýlamaı* (backed), *artaǵ* (excess), *erdam* (art, heroism), *ańar* (him/her, it), *keńrú* (visitor) etc., here, *-ýǵ*, *-dachy*, *-gúlúg*, *-ban*, *-ai*, *-aǵ*, *ýt*, *-dam*, *-ar*, *-rú*, *-úg*, *-dýǵýńsha* are defunct suffixes now.

202 Eri bardy qaldy **qýrýǵ**teg ıeri

Adamdary óldi. Jeri qańyrp bos qaldy.

[Its people are dead. Its land left blank desert]

239 Tırdııylamsyz **ýlamaı**bolıp

Jomarttyq arqasynda / qorǵansyzdar jaqsy ómúr keshti

[Thanks to generosity / unprotected people lived a good life]

Semantic differences. It is proved by many facts that all the words in the lexis of the monument-compared to its equivalent in the modern Kazakh is substantially different not only in terms of their meaning, but form. First, we come to the question whether a particular language element is used or not in the era of our existence: a variety of words are not found in our modern language. Such words can only be understood through historical dictionaries or by a specific context. In regard to the modern Kazakh language, the following is considered as archaism: *ajýn* (world), *edız* (high), *arqysh* (camp, caravan), *asyǵ* (benefit), *ýlamsýz* (unsupported), *otala* (heal), *ótún* (worship, beg pardon), *úchúz* (cheap), *úrúń* (white), *ýsan* (negligent), *ýǵan* (god), *óg* (cotton), *ókúsh* (many), *ýl* (bind), *esh* (companion, friend), *eńg* (face), *bodýn* (people), *baıat* (god), *bıla* (together), *taba* (towards), *tark* (quick), *tońa* (batyr), *tıshi* (woman), *súchúg* (sweet), *qamýǵ* (welfare), *ıaryn* (tomorrow) etc.

The meaning-related difference between the words in the monument and their equivalent in the

modern language is that many words in the monument having multiple meaning were forgotten in the modern Kazakh language. Or meaning appeared later are not found in the monument. The meaning of some words narrowed or broadened. There are also meaning tones that are defined in the context only.

87 Bilıǵıǵ bilıǵsız qachan teń bolıǵır
Bilimdi bilimsizben qashan teń bolar
[Hardly educated be equal to uneducated]

88 Bilıǵlı tıshı er jahıl er tıshı
Bilimdi áiel – er, bilimsiz erkek – áiel

[An educated woman is a man, a uneducated man is a woman]

The word «bilıǵ» (knowledge) found in these lines is a broad lexical unit used in the modern Kazakh as «science.» On the contrary, the meaning of «bilim» is narrow, for example, it is used in the sense that «knowledge of a particular person.»

On the contrary, the meaning of «ton» (fur coat) in the monument means any clothing. In the modern Kazakh language, it is only a certain garment.

168 Keim ton tolısy kónilik tony
Kiim-keshektiń kóriktisi ádildik kiimi

[The beauty of clothing is justice]

297 Aıǵırsán ketim ton sharab ash kerák
Aıtarsyn kiim ton sharap as kerek

[Tell there that you need clothes, fur coat, wine, and meals]

If the word «kónúl» is used in the monument in a broader meaning of «heart, soul», kónúl baǵla – pay sincere attention, kónúlal – please wholeheartedly, kónúl týt – express sincere attitude, its meaning in the Kazakh language is narrow. That is, limited to «human mood».

371 Sevunch ersa kedın **kónúl** týt ańa
Súinishtiis bolsa, oǵan keim kónıl qoi
[If it is pleasant, pay attention to it later]

There are two meanings of **kók** in the monument – «root» and «pedigree».

338 Adayat **kókini** qazyp kes kóchúr

Dushpandyqtyń **tamyryn** tereń qazdaqy kesip alyp tasta

[Dig the **roots** of hostility out of the deep and cut it away]

317 Kókı kórklúǵ ol

Tegi asıl adamnyń minezi de súkimdi

[A noble man has a beautiful character too]

In our current language, both were forgotten. **Kók**, meaning seedlings and blue color, must be derivative.

195 Igit hoja bolır iańy eskirúr

Zhas qartayady, jańa eskiredi

[Youth ages; new gets old]

The word *igitin* these lines means «young», which differs from *young man* in our language. Despite *jigit* in the modern Kazakh language does not mean «young», the semantic link can be clearly seen. For example, *jigit* refers to a young man rather than an adult man.

Results and discussion

Turkish scientist R. Arat states that «Historical data and language materials confirm that the Turkic peoples were divided into two major groups. Such classification took place twice. For the first time – in the first century AD, when the Hung Empire divided into two. Like the division into West and East Hung Empire in the VII-VIII centuries, the Turkic Khaganate was divided into western and eastern parts. Thus, the classification of Turkic languages to western and eastern groups began in the early years of our era and can be regarded as fully established in VII-VIII centuries. Today’s Turkic peoples and Turkic languages were formed as part of these western and eastern groups» (Arat, 2006: 37).

It is not mistaken to assume that any type of literature written in XI-XVI centuries, was written in ancient Turkic literary language. It is illogical to treat the «ancient literary language» from the modern literary language’s point of view. The problem is that one literary tradition, one literary language had a variety of colors at different times in different regions with its peculiarities. More specifically, there were several streams or variants of the ancient Turkic literary language. For example, Oguz-Kipchak, ancient Turkmen, ancient Uzbek, Kipchak-Oguz and others considered as literary language are various streams or manifestations of the ancient Turkic literary language formed on the Volga River, in Central Asia and in Kazakhstan. Their dialectics basis is the language of a particular tribe. The literature of the Karakhan state was based on the languages of Arǵy and Chyǵyl tribes. This statement is voiced in reliance to the information provided by Mahmud Kashgari. In his vocabulary, he put a lexical sign against a lot of words to show tribal reference, that is, no other tribe had such a word in its speaking assets. The Karakhan literature was proven to have commonly used words belonging to Arǵy, Chilgil tribes. *úrún* (white), *ajýn* (world), *ıarlıq* (decree), *múch* (cat), *oń* (not left) belonged to the Chyǵyl, while *baıat* (god), *tarhan* (a position’s title), *qanı* (which), *chyǵan* (poor) etc. – to the Arǵy

B. Sagyndykuly claims that: «Depending on the place and era of monuments’ origin, they should be called the Kypchak version of the ancient Turkic lit-

erary language, Oghyzversion of the ancient Turkic literary language, Turkic version of ancient Turkic literary language» (Sagyndykuly, 2002:43).

Conclusion

Any written monument survived our time had been through many copyists' hands. It is highly prob-

able that a copyist could misinterpret, ignore, render and amend unclear spots. For this reason, there are significant differences between the versions written by the author and versions made by copyists. These differences will be determined by textology researches.

We have just mentioned the phonetic, morphological, and semantic differences between the monument and Kazakh language in this article.

Литература

- Сағындықұлы Б. «Ғибат-ул хақайық» – XII ғасыр ескерткіші. Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2002. – 184 б.
Щербак А.М. Сравнительная фонетика тюркских языков. – Ленинград: Наука, 1970. – 204 с.
Наджиб Э.Н. Мухаббат-наме. Хорезми. Критический текст, транскрипция, перевод, лексико-грамматический очерк и словарь. – Москва: Издательство восточной литературы, 1961. – 224 с.
Арат Р.Р. Atebetü'l-Hakayik. – Анкара: Института тюркского языка, 2006. – 163 с.

References

- Arat R.R. (2006). Atebetü'l-Hakayik [Atebetul-Hakayik]. Ankara: Turkish Language Institution, 163 p. (in Turkish)
Nadzhip E.N. (1961). Muhabbat-name. Khorezmi. Kriticheskiy tekst, transkriptsiya, perevod, leksiko-grammaticheskiy ocherk i slovar [Muhabbat-name. Khorezmi. Critical text, transcription, translation, lexico-grammatical essay and dictionary]. Moskva, Izdatelstvo vostochnoi literatury, 224 p. (in Russian)
Sagyndykuly B. (2002). «Hibat-Ul-Haqaiq» – XII ғасыр ескерткіші. [«Hibat-Ul-Haqaiq» – Monuments of XII century]. Алматы: Қазақ Ұниверситеті, 184 p. (in Kazakh)
Shcherbak A.M. (1970). Sravnitel'naya fonetika tyurkskikh yazykov [Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages]. Leningrad: Nauka. 204 p. (in Russian)