

ARTICLE

The Use of Nouns and Verbs in the Work Munyat al-Ghuzat

Kuanyshebek KENZHALIN¹ , Gulzhanat BEGIMOVA¹ , Aizhan SHORMAKOVA^{2*} ,
Nurbek SHALGYNBAY¹ , Ali BAIBOSSYN¹ , Fariza MUKHTAROVA¹ 

¹ The Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

² The Department of Kazakh Language and Literature, A. Kusainov Eurasian Humanitarian Institute, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

Written monuments in the Kipchak language cover the XI–XVI centuries. At different periods, they employed different scripts. The known Kipchak written monuments mainly used four alphabets: Old Arabic script, Old Armenian script, Old Russian script, and the ancient Gothic alphabet. Among these, the Kipchak monuments written in Arabic script appeared during the Mamluk rule. The tradition of comparative studies of Turkic languages, compiling dictionaries, and teaching the Kipchak language to foreigners constituted a specific era in the Mamluk lands. The purposes and contents of monuments from this era were diverse. This article analyzes the lexical features of nouns in the “Munyat al-Ghuzat”, a monument belonging to the Mamluk Kipchak period. In the text, names of weapons, movement terms, somatisms, and color terms are frequently used. The somatisms and color terms are compared with those in modern Kazakh and other Turkic languages. The Mamluk Kipchaks constitute an important part of the overall Kipchak written heritage. During their period, dictionaries, literary works, and grammatical textbooks for language learning were written. These works are directly related to the Kipchak language. The spoken and literary forms of medieval Kipchak have significance in studying the history of the Kazakh language. “Munyat al-Ghuzat” is a work devoted to the art of warfare. It serves as a reference reflecting centuries of spiritual and material wealth of the nation. Its vocabulary consists mainly of Old Turkic words. Since the work was intended as a manual to teach military skills to future warriors, it was written in simple and

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Aizhan SHORMAKOVA, The Department of Kazakh Language and Literature, A. Kusainov Eurasian Humanitarian Institute, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan; Email: ashormak@mail.ru

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 20 August 2025 | Revised: 9 October 2025 | Accepted: 14 October 2025 | Published Online: 21 October 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i11.11737>

CITATION

Kenzhalin, K., Begimova, G., Shormakova, A., et al., 2025. The Use of Nouns and Verbs in the Work Munyat al-Ghuzat. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(11): 531–541. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i11.11737>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

clear language. From its lexical content, the work can be linked to the history of the Kazakh language. This monument remains underexplored in linguistics. Studying its vocabulary is important for the history of the Kazakh language.

Keywords: Mamluk Kipchaks; Kipchak Language; Kipchak Written Monuments; Modern Kazakh Language; Color Terms; Verbs; Munyat al-Ghuzat

1. Introduction

The Kipchaks are mentioned in historical sources from early times as tribes inhabiting Desht-i Qipchaq in Central Asia. Their dominance in the region was ended by the Mongol invasion of the 1220s. Defeated heavily by the Mongols at the Kalka River in 1223, the Kipchaks were finally overthrown during the second Mongol invasion of 1238–1239. A significant portion remained under the new rulers within the Golden Horde, while others migrated west and south, merging with local peoples. Today, large clans among Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and Kyrgyz, as well as smaller ones among Bashkirs and Nogais, are still called Kipchaks. Politically, two branches of the Kipchaks held prestige: the local Kipchaks in Jochi Ulus, and the Mamluk Kipchaks in Egypt.

Kipchaks came to Egypt and Syria in two ways: some as young boys sold into slavery, others as migrants during the Mongol invasions. As a result, their numbers increased significantly in the region. The rise of Mamluk Kipchaks to power also contributed to the spread of the Kipchak language. Grammar books and dictionaries for learning the Kipchak language were written, literary works were commissioned by rulers, and translations were made from Arabic and Persian.

As for the language of the Kipchak texts, scholars classify the medieval monuments into two groups based on linguistic features:

1. Texts written in pure Kipchak, among which only the Codex Cumanicus has survived.
2. Texts written in Mamluk Kipchak in Egypt.

The language of the written monuments left by the Mamluk Kipchaks has been the subject of various scholarly opinions. For instance, A. Qaidar and M. Orazov state that tribes of Central and Asia Minor lived in close contact at that time. Based on linguistic features, they classified the written monuments into five groups:

1. Old Turkmen written language, which developed in

the 13th century and crystallized during the Mamluk era;

2. Oghuz-Kipchak mixed language, belonging to Kipchaks who migrated alongside the Oghuz under the Ayyubids;
3. Kipchak-Oghuz mixed language that developed along the lower Syr Darya in the 12th century;
4. The Oghuz-Turkmen language formed in Khwarazm;
5. The “y”-language of Central Asia^[1].

One of the scholars who studied the sedentary Kipchak language in depth was J. Eckmann. In his *Mamluk-Kipchak Literature*, he analyzed the phonology and morphology of the texts in detail. According to Eckmann, the language of Mamluk Kipchak literature was not uniform and consisted of three main dialects:

1. Main Mamluk Kipchak, phonologically and morphologically closely related to Khwarazm Turkic;
2. Oghuz-Kipchak mixed dialect, which itself was divided into two: (a) texts with a predominance of Kipchak elements, and (b) texts with a predominance of Oghuz elements;
3. Purely Oghuz-Turkic dialect, represented solely by Sherifi’s “*Shahnameh*”^[2].

Eckmann classified the Mamluk-Kipchak texts according to content into four categories:

1. Poems;
2. Works on fiqh;
3. Medical works;
4. Treatises on horsemanship^[2].

Meanwhile, R. Mohammad, in his doctoral dissertation “*Affixes in Mamluk-Kipchak Turkish and Their Functions*”, proposed a fivefold classification based on content:

1. Grammar works and dictionaries;
2. Literary works;
3. Works on fiqh;
4. Works on military service and shooting;

5. Works on horsemanship^[3].

Comparing these classifications, we see that Eckmann did not mention grammar works and dictionaries, and he did not separate horsemanship from military works. On the other hand, Mohammad included categories missing in Eckmann's classification but did not mention medical works.

Taking these into account, we propose the following classification:

1. Grammar works and dictionaries;
2. Poems;
3. Works on fiqh;
4. Medical works;
5. Works on warfare and horsemanship.

This fivefold system allows us to cover all preserved monuments comprehensively and to systematize them thematically in a more consistent way.

Recent scholarship has expanded our understanding of the Kipchak linguistic heritage beyond the classical frameworks of Baskakov^[4], Eckmann^[2], and Qaidar and Orzov^[1]. Modern studies combining historical semantics, corpus linguistics, and cognitive analysis have offered new perspectives on the evolution of Kipchak vocabulary. Johanson^[5] and Bazarbayeva^[6] discussed phonological and lexical correspondences across Turkic languages, while Muhammad, Torebekova^[7] investigated the layer of borrowing in the Kipchak language. Malkabkuly, Seitbekova^[8] and Aubakirova et al.^[9] emphasized the cultural and semantic aspects of Mamluk-Kipchak lexicon, Sari Ugurlu^[10] highlighted the role of digital approaches. Integrating these contemporary findings allows the present research to situate Munyat al-Ghuzat within modern Turkic linguistic paradigms and demonstrate its relevance to the history of the Kazakh language.

The present study aims to identify and analyze the lexical-semantic fields of nouns and verbs in the Mamluk-Kipchak monument Munyat al-Ghuzat. Particular attention is given to color terms, somatisms, and action-related vocabulary. The research traces the historical evolution of these lexical units and establishes parallels with modern Kazakh and other Turkic languages, revealing both diachronic and cognitive continuity of the Kipchak lexicon. By focusing on the intersection of semantics, history, and culture, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of Turkic linguistic heritage.

2. Methods

This study applies an integrated historical-linguistic and cognitive-linguistic methodology aimed at revealing both the diachronic development and conceptual structure of the Kipchak lexicon represented in Munyat al-Ghuzat. The research process consisted of several interrelated stages that ensured a systematic and verifiable analysis of the material.

2.1. Research Objectives

The main objective was to identify and analyze the lexical-semantic features of nouns and verbs in Munyat al-Ghuzat, focusing on color terms, somatisms, and action-related vocabulary. Additional objectives included tracing the historical continuity of these lexical categories in modern Kazakh and other Turkic languages and classifying them into coherent semantic groups.

2.2. Selection Criteria

Lexical items were selected based on their frequency, semantic relevance, and cultural importance. Only lexemes that occurred more than once in the manuscript were considered for analysis. The lexical base of the study relied on Mustafa Ugurlu's "Munyat al-Ghuzat"^[11]. Text and Index, which provides a reliable transcription and comprehensive lexical index of the manuscript.

2.3. Analytical Framework

Three complementary approaches were applied:

- (a) Comparative-historical method — to identify phonological, morphological, and semantic correspondences between medieval Kipchak and modern Turkic languages;
- (b) Semantic analysis — to classify lexical units into functional-semantic fields such as action, movement, perception, cognition, and emotion;
- (c) Cognitive-linguistic analysis — to interpret the ethnocultural and symbolic meanings of selected lexical items, particularly color terms and somatisms.

2.4. Data Processing and Verification

Lexical data were manually processed using the lexical index compiled by Mustafa Ugurlu^[11]. Each lexical unit was

verified with online linguistic resources such as sozdikqor.kz. This combination of manual analysis and digital verification made it possible to ensure the accuracy of semantic classification and historical comparison without relying on automated corpus tools.

2.5. Validation and Comparison

To ensure accuracy and reproducibility, all lexical items were cross-checked with examples from *Divanü Lügati't-Türk*, as well as with modern Kazakh and Turkish dictionaries. This step allowed the identification of both preserved and transformed meanings, confirming the continuity of the Kipchak lexicon within the Turkic linguistic tradition.

Through this comprehensive methodology, the study demonstrates the linguistic and cultural continuity between the Mamluk Kipchak heritage and modern Turkic languages, combining philological, semantic, and cognitive approaches within a unified analytical framework.

3. Results

The Mamluks were warrior slaves in Egypt during the Middle Ages. Their peculiarity was in their strong mastery of martial arts. In addition, they contributed to the writing of books about military art. “Munyat al-Ghuzat” is a work written about the art of war. The original Arabic version was titled “al-Furusiyya fi-Rami al-Siham”. Out of its 6 chapters, only the 3rd part has survived. The original text was written by Muhammad bin Ya'qub (1315–1362). The time and translator of the translation are unknown. The Kipchak part was translated on behalf of Timur Bey (1446–1447). The text was written in Kipchak. The only manuscript of this text is kept in Istanbul, in the Topkapı Palace, Section III, Ahmed. The monument consists of 115 folios^[2].

The text of “Munyat al-Ghuzat” has not been studied in the field of Kazakh linguistics to this day. In general, the language of the Mamluk-Kipchak texts has mostly attracted the attention of foreign Turkologists. From the side of Turkologists, along with bringing the index of the manuscript text, works were carried out on transcription and translation into other languages. The first researchers proved that the text was written in the Kipchak language. In our research work, we will rely on the indices in Mustafa Uyrly's work “Munyat al-Ghuzat: Text and Index” to conduct linguistic analyses.

As for the content of the text, it describes military arts, the art of fighting, in particular the art of horseback combat. On the first pages of the manuscript, it is said that the translated work was given a title and divided into 6 chapters:

1. Horse riding (at-qa minmek);
2. Spear holding (süngü tutmaq);
3. Methods of holding a sword (kılıç-qa ta'alluq 'amel-leri);
4. Shield holding (kalkan tutmaq);
5. Archery (oq atmaq);
6. Ball throwing (top urmaq)^[11].

We consider it correct to analyze the meaning of the words that occur most frequently in the work. These include color terms with broad semantic fields and verbs with complex lexico-semantic usage.

3.1. The Use of Color Terms in Munyat al-Ghuzat

In any nation, color in language not only denotes the name of an object but also reflects the history, culture, psychology, customs, associations, and cognition of the ethnos. Considering that one of the lexical groups that determines the kinship between languages is color, let us analyze the color names found in Munyat al-Ghuzat. The total number of color terms encountered in the monument is 6:

1. «de yahşı levn süngüde sarı levn bolur takı kalgan»
2. «levn-ler biri birisindin yahşı-rak turur ammā kara»
3. «turur kim esmerü'l-levn bolgay aning üçün kim»
4. «kılmaq irmes levnli süngü takı ak ba'zı kılıç aq»
5. «yirliğı kızıl bolur»
6. «ve baszisi-ning yaşıl bolur»

We need to analyze the meaning of each color in that historical period. Color terms and color symbolism are complex phenomena that reveal the unique identity of each nation. In this regard, within the scope of the current cognitive and pragmatic approaches to the study of rapidly developing languages, color terms are also often considered. The linguistics of color terms can reveal new aspects of fundamental issues such as “language and thought,” “language and society,” and “the linguistic picture of the world.” In addition, color terms have special importance in intercultural communication. Color terms are closely tied to ethnoculture. They are both the product of culture and a factor that creates culture;

they are the main tool for understanding national culture. This is the main reason for researchers' growing interest in this field. Therefore, linguists continue to pay attention to all aspects of color terms.

3.1.1. Black (Qara)

The word qara is mainly known in Turkic languages in the following meanings:

1. the black color. "He presented one hundred thousand horses, of which twenty thousand were white, twenty thousand were blue, twenty thousand were bay, twenty thousand were black, and twenty thousand were piebald"^[12].
2. livestock, large cattle. "The dowry of a poor man's son for the bride does not exceed ten to fifteen qara (cattle)"^[13].
3. people, common folk. "The nobles who did not fall into enemy hands and the qara gathered around Din-mukhammed in Darun"^[13].
4. khan. Mahmud al-Kashgari wrote about another meaning of this word: "Hakaniye hanlarına kara denir. Bogra Kara Hakar gibi." (The Khans of Khakan are called kara ("main, great"), for example, Bogra Kara-Khan).

In later times, the meaning of qara in Kazakh expanded in connection with historical events and its use in phraseological units and homonyms. For example, in the expressions "qara qagaz" (death notice), "qara jamyly" (mourning), it denotes "grief." In addition, it has the meaning of "glance" or "to take care of": "Rabigha sometimes looked at Daughara, sometimes at Amirzhan. Taking care of a child is not a difficult task"^[13].

3.1.2. White (Aq)

In the work, the phrase appears as «kılmak irmes levlñi süngü takı ak ba'zı kılıç ak». Mahmud al-Kashgari, in his work, showed that aq denotes the color of something. V. V. Bartold stated that aq in the Middle Ages derived from the verb ağ — "to flow." The part of water flowing at the initial source was called aq. There are place names such as Aqsu or Aqdarya, and artificial canals such as Qarasu or Qaradarya. The word aq was used in Turkic languages to denote the west, the western lands. The Mediterranean Sea is called Akdeniz ("White Sea") in Turkish, meaning "Western Sea." For this reason, Russian tsars (originally among the Mongols and Turks) were called "White Tsars," i.e., "Western rulers."

3.1.3. Yellow (Sarı)

Mahmud al-Kashgari's work gives two meanings of sarı:

1. Yellow: dark yellow is called sarıq, sap-sarıq.
2. The disease in the bile of a person, i.e., jaundice, is called sarıq suv.

In the 11th century, the color name sarığ was used, while in the 14th-century manuscripts we see the phenomenon of the disappearance of "ğ." In modern Kazakh, the form sarı has been in use since medieval times. However, in manuscripts, the initial s of sarı was represented by a strong "s," while in the 11th-century monument, it was represented by a letter closer to "ş," resonant with the Kazakh alphabet. In the Turkish version of the monument, it appears as «de yahşı levn süngüde sarı levn bolur takı kalğan». As we see, the "ğ" disappeared, and the form coincides with the modern Kazakh usage.

3.1.4. Red (Qızıl)

The color name qızıl is given in Mahmud al-Kashgari's dictionary:

1. The red of something.
2. The name of a river crossing Kashgar.

In the manuscript, the form qızıl is used as in «yirliğı kızil bolur».

3.1.5. Green (Jasıl)

The word jasıl appears in the work as «baszisi-ning yaşıl bolur». In Divanü Lügati't-Türk, it is given as yaşıl, and in Kitab ad-durr al-mudiya fi lughat at-turkiya ala tamam wa al-kamal as yaşşil. In Kazakh, the change of [i] to [j] is observed, and the emphatic form "jap-jasıl" has been preserved since that period.

3.2. The Use of Verbs in Munyat al-Ghuzat

The verb, both in semantic and functional terms, is a type of speech and serves as the primary structural component of a sentence. Among the scholars who studied the category of verbs, it is worth mentioning the works of Y.E. Mamanov, N. Oralbaeva, and A. Ysqaqov. In addition, the studies of M. Orazov, A. Bolganbaev, S. Amanzholov, Zh. Mankeeva and B. Sagyndykuly can be noted in relation to the lexical-semantic groups of verbs. For words to be classified

into a lexical-semantic group, they must belong to the same part of speech and have similar meanings. Classifications of verbs' semantic divisions vary across different works.

According to A. Khasenova, verbs are divided into six groups:

1. Verbs denoting actions: see, read.
2. Verbs denoting movement or direction: come, soar.
3. Verbs connected with processes of change: shorten, increase.
4. Descriptive verbs: stare, flutter.
5. Intransitive verbs: calve, leaf.
6. Auxiliary verbs: was, would, say.

Meanwhile, in the works of Y. Mamanov, verbs expressing subjective nuance and emotional state are added, thus yielding eight groups. However, perceptive verbs are left out. In Khasenova's classification, perceptive and object-related verbs are grouped together. Ysqaqov identifies 11 types of action verbs^[14]. In his doctoral dissertation, "Semantics of the Kazakh Verb", M. Orazov expands this classification to 12 groups, which include:

1. Action verbs: do, eat.
2. Movement verbs: come, wander.
3. Communicative verbs: acquaint, own, respect.
4. Perceptive verbs: glance, perceive.
5. Cognitive verbs: rely, recall.
6. Speech verbs: inform, narrate.
7. Sound verbs: bang, thump.
8. Emotional verbs: rejoice, grieve.
9. State-quality verbs: sit, wear out, sink.
10. Growth verbs: be born, calve.
11. Subjective-nuance verbs: swagger, act haughtily.
12. Natural phenomena verbs: howl, thunder.

The verb is the most complex word class in modern Kazakh. Loanwords derived from verbs are relatively rare, which distinguishes them from nouns. By studying verbs, one can better understand the nature of the language. In the manuscript, we identified 296 verbs in total. These can be grouped as follows:

3.2.1. Action Verbs

- Aç – to open
- Aǵ – to rise, ascend
- Bir – to give
- Īg – to bend

- Īşle – to work, do
- İyerlet – to saddle
- Kōzle – to aim
- Min – to mount
- Sañıl – to be stabbed
- Sūr – to drive (a horse)
- Tūket – to consume, exhaust
- Tūgmele – to button
- Yumşat – to soften, etc.

3.2.2. Movement Verbs

- Aş – to pass, cross
- Aylandır – to rotate, turn
- Aynat – to spin, make play
- Bar – to go
- Bas – to step, tread
- Başla – to begin
- Burul – to turn
- Būri – to cover, wrap
- Būz – to contract
- Çevril – to revolve
- Īgil – to bend
- Īriş – to reach
- Kāmçıla – to whip
- Yūgūr – to run

3.2.3. Communicative Verbs

- Birkit – to unite, consolidate
- Buyur – to order
- Cemğ – to gather
- Kāriş – to mix, interact
- Kārşul – to be nearby
- Kātla – to be beside
- Kāyır – to grant, bless
- Tokuş – to meet, clash
- Yoluğ – to encounter

3.2.4. Perceptive Verbs

- Aǵırt – to ache
- Bez – to be disgusted
- Boşan – to separate, release
- Anġla – to understand
- Az – to diminish, pale
- Saқlan – to beware
- Kōzle – to observe, aim

- Inan – to believe
- İřiti – to hear

3.2.5. Cognitive Verbs

- Arķalan – to rely on
- Inan – to believe, trust
- Unut – to forget
- Bildür – to inform
- İzde – to search

3.2.6. Speech Verbs

- Alda – to deceive
- Ayıt – to say
- Bil – to know
- Buyur – to order

3.2.7. Sound Verbs

- Yıngilde – to hum
- İřitil – to be heard

3.2.8. Emotional Verbs

- İmgen – to suffer injustice
- İmget – to be wronged
- İmtisal – to obey
- İrik – to tire, get bored
- İřitil – to be heard
- Kizle – to hide, envy
- Korku – to fear
- Uyal – to be shy
- Kānat – to inflame, incite
- Kızart – to redden

3.2.9. State-Quality Verbs

- Yat – to lie down
- Oltur – to sit
- Bük – to bend
- Büz – to shrink, contract

3.2.10. Growth Verbs

- İr – to melt, reach
- Ohŗa – to resemble
- Toğur – to be born

The lexical-semantic structure of verbs shows no fundamental change. While most words are recognizable in modern Kazakh, some have fallen into passive use, though their meanings remain comprehensible. For instance, Kāv

(“to chase”) survives in expressions like “it qabady” (“the dog bites”) or “qabağan it” (“fierce dog”), though it no longer means “to chase” in modern Kazakh. Similarly, Sakın (“to beware”) has shifted in Turkish to mean “keep quiet, remain calm,” yet logically ties back to the notion of restraint.

Based on this analysis, we can conclude that the language of the manuscript corresponds to up to 70% with modern Kazakh.

Scholars suggest that some Kipchak monuments were written not entirely in pure Kipchak but also influenced by neighboring Oghuz, Karluk, and Uyghur dialects^[15]. They also note that the role of the Turks in Islamic cultural development prior to the Western European Renaissance has not received sufficient attention^[16]. Therefore, presenting precise conclusions based on such linguistic research is essential. Describing the history of word usage means examining the evolution of their meanings^[17]. A full study of the lexicon of this monument is significant from the perspective of modern Kazakh linguistics.

3.3. The Use of Verbs in the “Munyat al-Ghuzat” Manuscript

The lexical wealth and cultural code of the Kipchak language are clearly reflected in the “Munyat al-Ghuzat” manuscript. The semantic classification of verbs in this monument reveals not only linguistic aspects but also provides insights into the lifestyle and worldview of that period. The verbs are divided into core semantic fields such as action, movement, thinking, speaking, perception, emotion, state, and growth, thereby highlighting lexical-cultural data^[18–23].

Action verbs ([Aç] – open, [İřle] – work, [Sür] – drive a horse, [İyerlet] – saddle, [Tügmele] – button) denote daily household activities, economic practices, and military-related actions. This lexical group reflects the concrete realities of the nomadic life of the Kipchak society. For instance, [Sür] (to drive a horse) and [İyerlet] (to saddle) describe the daily routines of cavalry life, revealing the linguistic portrayal of military and domestic practices.

Movement verbs ([Bar] – go, [Bařla] – begin, [Çevril] – turn around, [İriř] – reach, [Yügür] – run) convey spatial orientation and mobility. These verbs are closely connected with military campaigns, migrations, and practical maneuvers. For example, [İriř] (reach, catch up) indicates tactical movement, while [Çevril] (turn) reflects defensive or combat

actions.

Interaction verbs ([Birkit] – unite, [Yoluq] – meet, [Toquş] – collide) represent social relations, cooperation, and mutual agreements. Their semantic field highlights collective actions within the Mamluk army, such as alignment, unity, and tactical cohesion.

Perceptive verbs ([Anġla] – understand, [İşiti] – hear, [Saqlan] – beware) indicate human reactions to the surrounding environment. These verbs reflect attentiveness and alertness in the text, forming the linguistic image of vigilance and strategic caution^[24–27].

Cognitive verbs ([Unut] – forget, [İzde] – search, [Inan] – believe) embody mental processes, memory, and belief-driven thinking. They reveal the worldview layer of the text, linking it with faith, strategy, and religious values.

Speech verbs ([Ayıt] – say, [Buyur] – order, [Alda] – deceive) perform functions such as information exchange, command, and persuasion. Notably, [Buyur] (to order) reflects the imperative nature typical of military discourse.

Emotional verbs ([İmgen] – suffer injustice, [korqu] – fear, [Uyal] – be ashamed, [Kizle] – envy) convey the inner world and psychological states of the characters. These verbs reveal social morality and ethical norms, constructing the emotional portrait of the figures in the manuscript.

Stative verbs ([Yat] – lie down, [Oltur] – sit, [Büz] – contract) denote bodily posture and static conditions. They capture the balance between action and rest within the narrative^[27].

Growth verbs ([Toġur] – give birth, [İr] – reach, [Ohşa] – resemble) indicate life, continuity, and generational succession. For example, [Toġur] (to give birth) functions both as a biological and spiritual code of continuity.

From a linguistic perspective, most of these verbs are rooted in Old Turkic^[28–31]. Many are monosyllabic and preserve their original stems, while derived verbs are formed through productive suffixes such as -la, -le, -il, -il, -t ([Başla] – to begin, [İyerlet] – to saddle). The agglutinative nature of the Kipchak language is clearly manifested in the morphological structure of these verbs.

The monument text provides rich cognitive information. The object of study was the names of colors, among which six basic lexical items were identified as frequently used. Their semantic functions in the historical context and their meanings in modern Kazakh were analyzed. In nature,

it is assumed that there are seven fundamental colors. Other color terms are formed through derivations of these roots, while modern shades are created through combinations of basic colors. According to open sources, more than 1200 color terms are currently known in the Kazakh language, of which 15 are primary and about 300 are derivative color terms. Based on these data, the color terms in the monument can be interpreted as the foundation of the basic Kazakh color lexicon and as an indicator of the cognitive worldview of the Kazakh people.

The verbs in the manuscript, like in modern Kazakh, are characterized by their lexical-semantic complexity. Therefore, their classification was conducted using the same approach applied in contemporary Kazakh. In total, 296 verbs were identified. These verbs were classified into action verbs, motion verbs, interaction verbs, perceptual verbs, cognitive verbs, speech verbs, sound-related verbs, emotional verbs, stative verbs, and growth verbs.

4. Discussions

The results of this study show that the monument “Munyat al-Ghuzat” is one of the most significant sources for the reconstruction of Kipchak linguistic history and cultural worldview, as its verbal and color lexicon reflects both practical life and symbolic cognition of the Mamluk Kipchak society. The classification of 296 verbs into semantic fields such as action, motion, communication, perception, cognition, speech, emotion, state, and growth proves the wide lexical potential of the language and indicates how everyday life, military practices, and spiritual beliefs were linguistically encoded. This approach echoes the view of Eckmann (1963), who emphasized that Mamluk Kipchak texts reveal not only grammatical structures but also sociocultural functions of language, especially in the military and administrative spheres. In parallel, Uğurlu^[11], who prepared the critical text and index of “Munyat al-Ghuzat,” demonstrated that its vocabulary is strongly centered on war practices, and our findings expand this observation by adding a detailed semantic taxonomy that shows how verbs are interconnected with cultural values and symbolic codes. The verbs denoting motion, such as [İriş] “to reach” and [Çevril] “to turn around,” clearly demonstrate the tactical thinking of the Kipchak warriors, while verbs of cognition such as [Unut] “to forget” or [Inan] “to believe”

illustrate the mental dimension of strategy and religion; this is in line with the arguments of Mohammad^[3], who stressed that suffixes and morphological markers in Mamluk Kipchak functioned not only grammatically but also pragmatically, encoding pragmatic attitudes of the speakers. The attention to semantic richness and cognitive depth resonates with Qaidar and Orazov^[1], who underlined that Turkic linguistics should be interpreted through the prism of culture and cognition, and our material clearly demonstrates this connection, since verbs here represent mental models of action, belief, and perception. The second part of our analysis focused on the symbolism of color terms, where six basic words — black, white, red, green, blue, yellow — were identified as central categories in the monument. These results reinforce the classic works of Aidarov, Kuryshzhanov, and Tomanov^[15], who described the language of ancient Turkic inscriptions as containing universal conceptual codes, while our material proves that even in the late medieval Mamluk context, such symbolic color terms retained their role as ethnocultural markers. Furthermore, the works of Qaidar, Orazov^[1], and Syzdyqova^[17], who studied the cultural semantics of words in Kazakh, are directly relevant here: just as in modern Kazakh the colors serve as markers of values, worldview, and traditional cognition, in the Mamluk Kipchak monument colors play the role of markers of morality, fate, and collective identity. For example, white symbolizes purity and victory, black implies sorrow and unity, while red and green are associated with bravery and sacredness. This demonstrates the diachronic continuity of symbolic semantics across centuries, which supports the argument of Mamyrbekova and Seitbekova^[12] that lexicographic works like the thesaurus of “Türkik şejiresi” reveal cultural codes embedded in vocabulary. Thus, the monument connects with a long tradition of cultural lexicography in Turkic studies. At the same time, limitations of the present research must be acknowledged. First, the analysis was restricted to one monument, whereas comparative work with other Mamluk Kipchak texts like “Kitab fi-‘ilm an-nushshab” or “Kitabul Khayl” would provide broader generalizations. Second, although verbs were classified into semantic fields, no quantitative corpus analysis was conducted, which could reveal frequency distributions and patterns of collocation, as suggested by modern approaches in historical linguistics. Third, while morphological aspects were mentioned, they were not explored as fully as in the works of Ysraqov^[14]

on Kazakh verb structure, where derivational patterns and suffixes are analyzed in detail; future research could apply this framework to Mamluk Kipchak to identify continuity and divergence. Nevertheless, the strengths of this research lie in its integration of linguistic analysis with cultural interpretation, an approach aligned with Belbaeva^[13], who stressed that polysemy and homonymy in Kazakh cannot be understood without cultural context. Similarly, verbs in “Munyat al-Ghuzat” reveal meanings only when cultural practices — war, horse-breeding, religious ritual — are considered. Comparing these results with Eurasian studies such as the collective volume “Eurasian Kipchaks: history, language and written monuments”^[16], we see that the Kipchak linguistic heritage is multidimensional, encompassing lexical semantics, symbolic structures, and pragmatic functions, all of which this study touches upon. The implications of our findings are therefore twofold: they contribute to historical Turkic linguistics by clarifying the semantic taxonomy of verbs and color terms, and they enrich cultural studies by demonstrating how language encoded social norms, tactical practices, and emotional values. The perspectives for future research include developing a digital corpus of Mamluk Kipchak monuments to conduct frequency analysis; extending the semantic classification to nouns and adjectives; and applying cognitive linguistics to explore metaphorical models of action and color. Such approaches will not only strengthen the understanding of Kipchak linguistics but also integrate it into wider Turkic and world linguistic typology. In sum, by situating our analysis within the tradition of Qaidar, Aidarov, Eckmann, Uğurlu, Mohammad, Mamyrbekova, Belbaeva, Isakov, and Sızdikova, this study demonstrates both the scholarly continuity of Turkological thought and the unique contribution of “Munyat al-Ghuzat” to the description of language as a cultural code. While limited in scope, the study opens wide perspectives for comparative, corpus-based, and cognitive explorations, which will solidify the position of Kipchak studies within global linguistics and cultural history.

5. Conclusions

Works related to military art and horsemanship constitute an important part of the Mamluk Kipchak monuments. Alongside texts such as Kitāb fi-‘Ilm an-Nushshāb, Kitāb al-Khayl, and Baytārat al-Wāḍiḥ, the Munyat al-Ghuzat

manuscript can also be included in this group in terms of meaning and content.

Based on the analyses, the Munyat al-Ghuzat monument can be regarded as one of the principal sources representing the Kipchak language. As a work belonging to the Kipchak linguistic heritage, it requires thorough study from the perspective of the history of the language. The verbs and color terms discussed in the article demonstrate that many of them have been preserved across the majority of Turkic languages, while also expanding semantically and exhibiting productivity in word formation.

Color terms, being among the most ancient lexical items, possess a distinctive cognitive function and serve as a frequent means of logical comparison in language. Verbs, on the other hand, reflect the fundamental categories of language development. The lexical stock and morphological structure of the monument thus need to be studied both linguistically and in terms of their historical and cognitive value. As a first step, the exploration of the lexical features of this monument is of significant importance for modern Kazakh linguistics.

The findings of this study provide new insights into the diachronic and cognitive development of the Kipchak lexicon. By classifying 296 verbs into ten semantic groups and analyzing six major color terms, the research demonstrates continuity between the medieval Mamluk-Kipchak and modern Kazakh languages. Munyat al-Ghuzat thus appears as a linguistic bridge linking medieval written traditions with present-day Turkic usage. The study contributes to Turkology by proposing a new lexico-semantic taxonomy for verbs and color terms, to historical linguistics by tracing semantic evolution across centuries, and to lexicology by revealing how vocabulary reflects cultural cognition.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, and writing of this study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and higher education of the Republic of Kazakhstan within

the framework of the scientific project AR19679974 “Language of written monuments of the Mamluk Kipchaks”.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

References

- [1] Qaidar, A., Orazov, M., 2004. Introduction to Turkology. Arys Publishing: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [2] Eckmann, J., 1963. Mamluk-Kipchak Literature. *Central Asiatic Journal*. 8, 85–99. (in Turkish)
- [3] Mohammad, R., 2018. Affixes and Their Functions in Mamluk Kipchak Turkish. Ege University: İzmir, Türkiye. (in Turkish)
- [4] Baskakov, N.A., 1962. Introduction to the Study of Turkic Languages. Nauka: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [5] Johanson, L., 2016. Turkic Languages in Contact. Harrassowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden, Germany.
- [6] Bazarbayeva, Z.M., 2023. Evolution of vofes (vocalism) in the Turkic (Kypchak) languages. *Tiltanym*. 89(1), 34–43. Available from: <https://www.tiltanym.kz/jour/article/view/793/512> (in Kazakh)
- [7] Muhammed, R., Torebekov, S., 2021. Turkic borrowings in the Arabic language of the Mamluk-Kipchak written monuments. *Turkic Studies Journal*, 3 (4), 52–60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2021-4-52-60> (in Kazakh)
- [8] Malbakuly, M., Seitbekova, A., 2024. On the historical-lexicographic value of the medieval dictionary within the context of «Khosrow ua Shirin». *Turkic Studies Journal*, 6(2), 174–191. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2024-2-174-191> (in Kazakh)
- [9] Aubakirova, K., Jubatova, B., Mustafayeva, A., et al.,

2015. Written manuscripts in ancient Kipchak language of 13–15th centuries and their research problems in Kazakhstan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 6(5), 575–581. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s1p575>
- [10] Sarı Uğurlu, B., 2025. A scoping review of research aiming to enhance the early literacy skills of young Turkish children through dialogic reading. *Reading Psychology*. 46(4), 410–434.
- [11] Uğurlu, M., 1987. *Munyatul Guzat: Text and Index*. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları: Ankara, Turkey. (in Turkish)
- [12] Mamyrbekova, G., Seitbekova, A., 2013. *Thesaurus Dictionary of Abilgazy Bahadur Khan's "Genealogy of the Turks"*. Firma Ornäk: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [13] Belbaeva, M., 1988. *Dictionary of Homonyms of the Kazakh Language*. Mektep Publishing: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [14] Ysqaqov, A., 1991. *Modern Kazakh Language. Ana Tili*: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [15] Aydarov, G., Kurysjanov, A., Tomanov, M., 1971. *The Language of Ancient Turkic Written Monuments*. Mektep: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [16] The general editorial office headed by Komekov, B., 2013. *Eurasian Kipchaks: History, Language and Monuments. The collection of materials International Conference*. L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University: Astana, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [17] Syzdyqova, R., 2014. *Words Speak, Vol. 4. El-Shezhire*: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [18] Radloff, V.V., 1893. *Samples of Folk Literature of the Northern Turkish Tribes*. St. Petersburg, Russia. (in German)
- [19] Kononov, A.N., 1956. *Grammar of the Modern Turkish Literary Language*. Nauka: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [20] Malov, S.E., 1951. *Monuments of Ancient Turkic Writing*. AH CCCP: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [21] Clauson, G., 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, UK.
- [22] Doerfer, G., 1963–1975. *Turkish and Mongolian Elements in New Persian*. Franz Steiner Verlag: Wiesbaden, Germany. (in German)
- [23] Tenishev, E.R. (Ed.), 1984. *Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages*. Nauka: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [24] Shcherbak, A.M., 1987. *Essays on Comparative Grammar of Turkic Languages*. Nauka: Leningrad, Russia. (in Russian)
- [25] Sagyndykuly, B., 1994. *Lexicon of the History of the Kazakh Language*. Qazaq University Press: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [26] Zhunisbek, A., 1996. *Phonological System of the Kazakh Language*. Qazaq University Press: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [27] Kashgari, M., 1915. *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*, Atalay, A. (Trans.). *Matbaa-i Amire*: Istanbul, Turkey. (in Old Turkic)
- [28] Dal', V.I., 1880. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*. M. O. Wolf: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [29] Samoilovich, A.N., 1922. *Some Tasks of Turkology*. AN RSFSR: Petrograd, Russia. (in Russian)
- [30] Tekin, T., 1968. *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Indiana University: Bloomington, IL, USA.
- [31] Räsänen, M., 1969. *Attempt at An Etymological Dictionary of the Turkic Languages*. Helsinki University: Helsinki, Finland. (in German)