Article

Researching Ibn Muhanna's dictionary in terms of linguistic features

Khuraman Asgarova

Faculty of Education, Azerbaijan University of Languages, AZ 1014, Azerbaijan; eskerovakhuraman@gmail.com

Abstract: In many linguistic studies, many studies have been conducted on the work "Hilyetü'l-insan" and "Halbetü'l-lisan", which was mentioned as Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary, whose real name was revealed when the Istanbul copy was found, and which belongs to Jamaladdin Ibn Muhanna. In the middle of the century, the Persian, Turkic and Mongolian languages gained influence and were widely used in Iraq as well as in the entire Elkhanid territory. Ibn Muhenna wrote his dictionaries "Hilyetü'l-insan" and "Halbetü'l-lisan" in this scientific environment. It is estimated that it was written in Meraga or Baghdad in the second half of the century. Despite the fact that the official language of the Elkhanid state is Turkic, Ibn Muhanna wrote his work in Arabic based on the main features of these three languages, considering that Arabic, Persian and Mongolian languages are also used in cultural, administrative, commercial and public life. According to the Istanbul copy of the introduction and the three-part dictionary, pages 5–111 were devoted to Persian, pages 113–310 to Turkic, and pages 311–371 to Mongolian. The part of the work related to the Persian language consists of an introduction and twenty-eight chapters where general grammatical rules are explained. In this research study, we will try to compare the linguistic features of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary.

Keywords: Ibn Muhanna dictionary; Turkic language; Istanbul version; official language; Mongolian language; language features

1. Introduction

Seyid Jamaleddin Ibn Muhanna's work *"Hilyetü'l-insân ve Helbetü'l-lisân"* ("The adornment of man and the field of language") is common to all Turkic peoples and covers all Turkic languages. It is extremely valuable as one of the medieval dictionaries that has an exceptional role in the study of the history of all Turkic languages. It is estimated that the work was written in the late 13th century or early 14th century. Ibn Muhenna wrote his work in Arabic and divided it into three parts. The first part of the work is in Persian; The second part is devoted to Turkic and the third part is devoted to Mongolian. This ancient dictionary contains rich material related to all Turkic languages, and the outstanding academic orientalist and Turkological researcher Platon Melioranski expressed his attitude to these phonetic, lexical, and morphological materials based on the work *"Arab filolog o turetskom yazık – "Arab philologist on the Turkic language"*.

In Turkology, there are controversial, probable ideas about the history of the creation of this dictionary. Melioranski made the first clarification about this and showed that "this work was probably written no later than the 14th century, or even at the end of the 13th century, in north-western Iran during the Hulaki period" (Hajiyev, 2007).

Tofig Hajiyev notes that this opinion of the researcher is convincing (Alişanlı, 2006). The dictionary was created in the presence of languages with different

systems, covering Persian, Turkic, and Mongolian languages. So, the author of the dictionary created his work at the level of linguistic culture, and the science of linguistic culture as a field of theoretical linguistics has just started to be formed in Azerbaijan. It is known from history that the current Northern and Southern Azerbaijan were under the rule of the Mongols in the XIII-XIV centuries. Melioranski considers Azerbaijan to be the place of creation of the dictionary, and as a result of his analysis, he puts forward the following scientific thesis: "The history of the Turkic language has not been worked out so well that it is possible to determine the location and date of writing of the work we have on pure linguistic grounds. However, in this case, there are events that give the right to consider that the work was created in present-day Azerbaijan. There is no event that would make my account impossible" (Ibrahimov, 2023).

Hajiyev (2007) relies on the ideas of Melioranski throughout the work and clarifies the history and place of creation of the dictionary. There have been different opinions in Turkology about which language or which Turkic material the dictionary was written on. Turkologist claims that "the dictionary was written in Turkistan Turkic, and more specifically, based on the material of the Uighur language".

2. Literature review

In the research article B. Gul and F. Aghja (2014), very important information about the phonological and morphological features of the Turkish language is given. In the article, information was given about these features, and the importance of the features in terms of historical Turkic language studies was emphasized.

Also, Ahmadzadeh (2019) approached Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary from another aspect, that is, Yusif Balasagunlu's "Qutadgu-bilik" from the Turkological context and conducted a comparative analysis.

Another important aspect of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary is the study of features specific to the Azerbaijani language in its Istanbul copy. Heydarova (2022) in her research article "Features specific to the Azerbaijani language in the Istanbul copy of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary" gave examples of the similarities between Turkistan Turkic and several words in the Azerbaijani language.

Ibrahimov (2023), who suggests that one way of the idea of a common spoken language for Turkic languages is common historical works, dictionaries, epics, shows this more concretely in his article entitled "Language Policy in Turkic States and Societies Historical Aspect". Ibrahimov notes that Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary will play a big role in the formation of common dictionaries.

Kaymaz (2014) "How Many Words Are There in Ibni Muhenn's Dictionary?" In his research article entitled, Ibn Muhanna noted the vocabulary of the dictionary and the number of words used in it. This is very important from the point of view of studying Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary.

In addition, Yapiji (2016) identified specific findings related to Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary and showed them in a comparative way.

In our research article, we have set ourselves the goal of comparative analysis of the language features of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary based on the sources whose names we have mentioned above and which we have given in the literature list.

3. Methodology

Six copies of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary, one of the first works written in Turkic, are known. One of them is in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum Library, three in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, one in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek, and one in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. The work was introduced to the world of science for the first time by Platon M. Melioranskiy, who prepared a doctoral thesis by comparing five copies except the Istanbul copy.

Since our main goal in our research article is to study the grammatical features of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary, we have used more historical-comparative, comparative, descriptive, and statistical methods. Because when talking about the grammatical features of the dictionary, it is necessary to use comparative methods.

Considering that Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary has typological structures, Turkic languages are considered a foreign environment for borrowed words. From this point of view, of course, the changes in Arabic words that took place in a foreign environment are of interest. These changes are manifested at all levels: phonetic, lexical, morphological, grammatical. It is more interesting in terms of the number of phonetic and lexical changes. There are many points to be involved in the investigation of lexical changes, and several aspects stand out when talking about them.

In this regard, many researchers (Hajiyev, Erjilasun, Gul and others) clarify the structure of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary and show that the dictionary consists of two parts: Arabic-Persian dictionary; Arabic-Turkic dictionary and Arabic-Mongolian dictionary. This dictionary was interpretive in nature, phonetic, morphological, lexical terminological analyses were preferred. The words taken from the Mongolian language are translated into Arabic in the dictionary. Taking into account what we mentioned, we will try to investigate the grammatical features of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary using historical-comparative, historical-typological, contrasting and descriptive methods. These methods will be used more specifically than the historical comparative method. This is very important from the point of view of studying the grammatical features of the dictionary.

4. From the history of vocabulary learning

T. Hajiyev identifies the reasons why the dictionary has a mixed nature and differences in copies, and logically correctly explains what these reasons are related to. The explanations given by the author to the teaching purpose of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary at the time it was written, and its use for teaching, also seem completely reasonable. Until now, the issue of the nationality of the author of the dictionary has remained in the dark in Turkology, T. Hajiyev tried to realize the doubtful ideas put forward by P. Melioranski, he made clarifications that Seyid Ahmad ibn Muhanna was born in the village of Abadli in Urmiya in the territory of Azerbaijan, that he wrote the dictionary here, and that he was an Azerbaijani by nationality. Referring to P. Melioranski, T. Hajiyev also clarified the structure of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary and shows that the dictionary consists of two parts: Arabic-Persian dictionary; Arabic-Turkic dictionary; Arabic-Mongolian dictionary. It is clear from the scientist's comments that this dictionary, intended for the teaching process, had the

nature of commentary, phonetic, morphological, and lexical terminological analyses were preferred. Words of the corresponding language in the dictionary - Persian, Turkic. Mongolian words have been translated into Arabic.

T. Hajiyev focuses on the phonetics, morphology, and lexical sections of the dictionary and pays special attention to the problems of expressing Turkic sounds with the Arabic alphabet. In the section on morphology, it explains the information given about certain categories, the place of development of morphological indicators, and their role in grammatical semantics. In the vocabulary section, comparisons and parallels are made to show the different aspects of words. T. Hajiyev also clarifies the question of what sources Seyid Jamaladdin Ibn Muhanna used when writing the dictionary and notes that "we see two facts in the dictionary: the author takes into account living spoken language, that is, his subject is not the language of books, the language of books, not the language of poetry for learners, teaches the living Turkic language, the second is that this living language is a dialect language that is the basis of the literary language, a normal language" (Alişanlı, 2006).

T. Hajiyev considers P. Melioranski's copy reliable because this edition was compiled based on the comparison of 5 copies of the dictionary. Based on P. Melioranski's edition, T. Hajiyev approaches the vocabulary of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary from all levels and has systematically and comprehensively investigated their main historical trends from a theoretical point of view. This research work of the scientist also has a strong impact on Azerbaijani linguistics (Ahmedzadeh, 2009).

The work is especially important in terms of Turkic and Mongolian cultural history, with materials taken from the vernacular and material and spiritual cultural elements being given ample space. It is understood that the Turkic spoken in this region, which has a mixed ethnic structure in the 19th century, was mixed with other elements. The work, which the author describes as "Turkistan Turkic" and Hakaniye (Kashgar) Turkic, as well as Azerbaijani literary Turkic, which he calls "our homeland Turkic", draws attention to the fact that it mentions the Turkmen dialect as well as it is important in terms of stating the existence and characteristic features of Azerbaijani Turkic (Caferoğlu, 1974).

Abdullah Battal prepared the index of the Turkic part based on the Istanbul copy published by Kilisli Rıfat and published it in 1934 under the name Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary. According to Taymas, the total number of words here is 2191. A. Battal also wrote an important article about the indecipherable words in the work in the book Researches on Turkic Language and History published in 1950 (Yapıcı, 2016).

One of the publications related to the Turkic part of the work was made by T. Hajiyev. In this work called *"Hilyetü'l-insân ve Helbetü'l-lisân"*, which was published in Baku in 2008, Seyid Ahmad Jamaladdin Ibn Muhanna, the Arabic part was translated, and the words from the publications of Melioransky and Abtullah Battal were brought together in the dictionary part (Kaymaz, 2014).

Ahmet Jaferoghlu, who devoted a lot of space to Ibni Muhenna in his book *"History of the Turkic Language"*, wrote his work *"Hilyetü'l-insân ve Helbetü'l-lisân"* in terms of the history of the Turkic language, which summarizes his period best and is the "Common Middle-Asian Turkic" It is the only work that sheds light on the Turkic culture, indicating its achievements in the field of Iran" (Caferoğlu,

2001).

Abdulkadir Inan, in the 13th-15th centuries he made some observations about the Oghuz-Turkmen and Kipchak dialects in Egypt during the centuries and Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary in his article "*Halis Türkçe*". Inan says the following in his aforementioned work: "Ibn Muhenna, as Melioransky correctly predicted, wrote his work in the country ruled by the Mughals, in Azerbaijan or Iraq. In this work, the word "Kipchak" is not shown and the word "Turkmen" is mentioned only in two places (p. 83 and 101). For this author, since there is only one real "Turkic", it must have been considered unnecessary to record the dialects and dialects separately" (Inan, 1953).

However, according to T. Hajiyev (2007) "Melioranski is the author of the opinion that the monument is in Azerbaijani Turkic, and therefore prefers the Azerbaijani pronunciation in transliteration".

In this work, T. Hajiyev compares the transliterations of P. Melioranski and A. Battal and gives preference to the forms of transliteration read by Russian Turkologists. Looking at all critical editions of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary, T. Hajiyev gives preference to P. Melioranski's edition and connects this logical reliance with clarifications in this prose (Hacıyev, 2007).

5. Learning vocabulary from a grammatical point of view

Until recently, studies related to Ibn Muhenna's Dictionary were mostly limited to the dictionary part, and the grammar part of this work, which contains very important information in terms of the history of the Turkic language, was not much emphasized. Bulent Gul, who drew attention to this topic, in his work entitled *"The Place and Importance of Ibni Muhenna's Lugati in Turkic and Mongolian Language Studies"* evaluated the information in Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary in terms of Turkic and Mongolian studies in two parts. Expressing that the part of the work devoted to Turkic has been neglected, Gul (2010) has neglected the part that talks about the features of sound and image knowledge, and listed the features of sound and image knowledge that are emphasized in this work and exemplified through variable shapes as follows: "Ibn Muhenna, on the spelling of the Turkic language, especially on the spelling of famous sounds, after giving some information, he made important observations about the phonological features of other Turkic dialects with the time and environment he lived in, and more importantly, he exemplified his observations through various forms" (Gül, 2010).

(1) According to Ibni Muhenna, the most known sound variation in the Turkic language is between the consonants /d ~ t ~ y/.

(2) The change of word-initial /t-/ > /d-/ is one of the features that Ibni Muhenna drew attention to by stopping at the examples of til ~ dil, tish ~ tis, tirig ~ dirig. The initial /t-/ > /d-/ change, which Kashgarlı Mahmud explains in DLT as one of the important sound changes that distinguish the Oghuz dialect from other Turkish dialects, is also explained by Ibni Muhenna as til ~ dil, tiş ~ tooth, tirig ~ is one of the features he draws attention to based on dirig examples (IM 79).

(3) Ibni Muhenna said that "Turks in our country replace the letter "mim" with the letter "be", perhaps accepting the common form among other Turkic dialects as

the correct form, he accepted the change of m- > b-: men ~ ben, miŋ~ biŋ "bin", mun ~ bun "defect" (IM 80). Ibni Muhenna, in addition to the variability of word-initial /b-/ ~ /m-/, also identified the dissolution of the element /b-/ at the beginning of words among Turkic dialects and presented examples on this topic: ne boldi ~ ne oldi, ne bolgay ~ ne olgay (IM 80).

(4) Ibni Muhenna points out the lack of unity with the binary examples he gave about whether the past participle (-DI) appearing after verbs ending in a consonant should be /d/ or /t/: açdı ~ açıt, bakdı ~ baktı, kopdı ~ koptı (IM 79).

(5) The change of intra-word and end-of-word palatal /k/ > /h/ is one of the changes identified by Ibni Muhenna in the time and context of belonging: siktadi ~ sikhtadi "wept for the dead"; akru ~ ahru "slow", toklı ~ tohlı "lamb" (IM 80).

(6) Another of the important consonant changes mentioned by Ibni Muhenna is the change /z/ > /s/, which mostly appears in the form of negative broad tense (-mAz > -mAs): kelmes ~ kelmez, nagraj ~ nairamas, izder ~ ister (IM 80). In Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary, morphological features are also mentioned in addition to the above phonological features, which are very important for the classification of the historical Turkic language.

(1) According to Ibni Muhenna, one of the suffixes that varies between Turkic dialects is the diminutive suffix added to nouns. Stating that the diminutive suffix in the Turkic language is +kInA (saraykına, evkine, öküzkine), Ibni Muhenna gives the examples of saraykına and öküzkine saying that "Turkmens add the suffix "cim" and "gayn" to the end of the word they want to reduce" (IM 82-83).

(2) Ibni Muhenna gave the suffixes -gAn and -(X)glI, which are part of present tense adjective-verb suffixes of historical Turkic language texts and vary between Turkic dialects, under the heading "Fail/Subject". According to him, either -gAn suffix or -(X) glI suffix is used to convert any verb into a subject: agıngan agıngan, ingen, bargan; yaratıglı, barıglı, külüglü etc. (IM 88) (Rose, 2010).

Bulent Gul thinks that the sound and image features expressed by Ibni Muhenna may belong to the Oghuz-Kipchak-based Turkic language domain based on the features listed above.

B. Gul states his findings in his work entitled "The Place and Importance of Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary in Turkic and Mongolian Language Studies" as follows:

(1) One of the variations mentioned by Ibni Muhenna is that "thickened ze" (three dots under ze in Arabic letters) has been replaced by the consonants /c/, /ç/, /sh/ and /s/ (IM 79): azun ~ acun "world", arju ~ arşu "back", küzek ~ küsek "zülüf, sarkan saç - fuzzy, hanging hair".

(2) According to Ibni Muhenna, there is also variation between /-v-/ and /-w-/ consonants in Turkic dialects. As we know in Turkic runic inscriptions, the words that have /-b-/ consonants vary between /-v-/ and /-w-/ consonants according to Ibni Muhenna: aw ~ av, çaw ~ çav, sefinç ~ (sewinç) ~ sevinç, awınç ~ avınç (IM 79). Although it is not possible to state with certainty which Turkic dialects this change is between, in the light of the information given in DLT, the examples with /w/ given by Ibni Muhenna represent Central Asian Turkic, and the examples with v represent Oghuz Turkic.

(3) Another important information given by Ibni Muhenna is related to the use of suffixes +lXg, +An and +mUk. as in the examples of tonlug "mallı", biliglig

"bilgili", saçlug "saçlı", altunlıg "altınlı", the suffix +lXg adds the meaning of "sahiplik" to the word to which it is added. According to Ibni Muhenna, the suffixes +An and +mUk also correspond to the meaning of "sahiplik" expressed by the suffix +lXg: ton "elbise", tonan "giyimli"; kün "baht", künan "bahtlı"; tonmuk "giyimli", atmuk "atlı, at sahibi".

(4) In his dictionary, Ibni Muhenna informs that the preposition teg is used in similes around the Turkic written language, to which he also belongs: "tili kılıç teg, bu süçük bal teg" (IM 96). When it is taken into account that the preposition of simile is kibi (>gibi) in the field of Oghuz Turkic language, it can be said that the environment in which Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary was written is close to the Central Asian Turkic literary language in terms of simile.

(5) Ibni Muhenna, that in adjectives, the expression of comparison and degree of superiority is met by the suffix de +rAk, eδgü "iyi" eδgürek "daha iyi"; yaman "kötü", yamanrak "daha kötü" examples (IM 97).

(6) Another noteworthy feature in Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary is the analytical form formed by the singular 3rd person verb of request/command together with the past participle. It has been known for a long time that in the historical periods of the Turkic language, some expressions of time and mood were formed with analytical forms formed by additions and auxiliary verbs in addition to known affixes.

(7) One of the most important information given by Ibni Muhenna in terms of the morphological characteristics of the Turkic language is about plural forms in the Turkic language. Ibni Muhenna stated that the plural form of nouns is met with +lAr suffix, and he showed with examples that the plural form of verbs varies between Turkic dialects. According to this, it can be seen that the plural 2nd person form given by Ibni Muhenna on the morphology of the verb tense and case tense is dual in the form of -(X)ngXz (geldingiz) and -(X)nglAr (gelmedingler) among Turkic dialects.

(8) Ibni Muhenna, in the "Tenth Chapter" named "kök", defined verb and noun root forms by separating them from each other. According to him, in the Turkic language, verbs have the root -mAk (kalmak, katmak, barmak; kötürmek, keçmek, külmek etc.); in nouns, it is met with +lXk (alplik, alp kişi, alpligi ile öldürür) suffixes" (Gül-Ağca, 2014).

In his article titled "Some Determinations on Ibn Muhenna's Dictionary", A. Yapıjı states the main findings related to Ibn Muhenna's dictionary as follows:

(1) One of the important issues expressed by Ibni Muhenna is the change of word-initial /k- />/g-/. ne úılur>ne àılur, ne úıldıng>ne àıldıng (IM 80). Other than these two examples, examples of /k- />/g-/ change can also be found in the grammar and dictionary sections of the Turkic section. It can be understood from the fact that the transitive examples seen especially in the front palatal /k/ sound were not taken into account by A. Battal, who made the index of the work. If you carefully examine the work called Kitâb Hilyetü'l-insân ve hulbetü'l-lisân prepared by Rifat of Kilis, it will be seen that the letter "kef" with three dots under it corresponds to the /g/ sound.

Zeki Kaymaz also evaluated such words in their past tense forms in the work mentioned above: gün "sun" görmek (İM 89), geçmek (İM 89), geldim (İM 92), görküzdi (İM 103), gérü erdi (İM 106), güldi (İM 111), güyegü "damat" (İM 144), gön "deri" (İM 158), göl (İM 181). It is seen that the words like are used in

inexorable forms. In this regard, Ibni Muhenna reflected the voice preferences representing the Karluk-Kipchak and Oghuz dialects with the help of variable shapes. The voiced forms here must be a characteristic of the Oghuz group dialects, and contrary to popular belief, they clearly show that the /k-/ > /g-/ change existed in Oghuz before the 13th century (Yapıcı, 2016).

(2) One of the things that draw attention in Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary is the case of the initial /y/ sound. In the work, *yéş "zevce, eş"* (İM 77), *yısırmaú "ısırmak"* (İM 122), *yılıdı "ılıdı"* (İM 131), *yılıttı "ılıttı"* (İM 131), *yinçke "ince"* (İM 153), *yigneçi "iğneci"* (İM 154), *yırlayıcı "şarkıcı"* (İM 157), *yigne "iğne"* (İM 159), *yignelik "iğnelik"* (İM 159), *yip "ip"* (İM 169), *yılıú su "ılık su"* (İM 181) *éş "zevce, eş"* (İM 76), *ısırdı "ısırdı"* (İM 112), *ırladı "şarkı söyledi"* (İM 113), *inçe "ince"* (İM 143), *ır "şarkı, nağme"* (İM 161), *inçe "ince"* (İM 143), *ır "şarkı, nağme"* (İM 161) and some words without consonant derivative. The variable shapes seen in these examples also show that different dialect speakers coexisted in the region where the author lived. Because, Mahmut of Kashgar noted in "Dîvânu Lugâti't-Türk" that Oghuz and Kipchaks, unlike Hakaniye Turkic, change the /y/ sound at the beginning of the word to "*hemze*", that is, they pronounce it by dropping the /y/ sound at the beginning (Korkmaz, 2005).

(3) Ibni Muhenna, in the first chapter where he gave information about the sounds of Turkic, while explaining the /i/ sound (the letter "*ya*"), said that it is pronounced in three ways and gave the following examples for the second of them: *éş "zevce, eş", kéş, "ok mahfazası, sadak", béz "beze, vücutta meydana gelen şişlik", bér "ver"* (IM 76). In the information he gave on page 74, the author stated that he would put the signs *"mim"* and *"kef"* under the letter *"ya"* to show this sound that has been converted into an esre, and he applied it in the above examples as well. The author explained and explained the closed sound /é/, which is known to exist in Turkic, but which was changed to /i/ or /e/ in various periods of the language. Timur Kojaoghlu, in his study on the issue of closed /é/ in Turkic, based on Ali Şir Nevâyî's work Muhâkemetü'l Lugateyn, discusses the discussions on this issue in the 15th century. He stated that it could be traced back to the century (Kocaoğlu, 2003). Nevâyî's explanation and examples on this subject are parallel to the explanation and examples in Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary. Just like Ibni Muhenna, he said that there are three types of /i/ vowels (the letter "*ya*") in Turkic and gave the examples of *biz "biz", béz "bez, salgı oluşturan organ, gudde"* and *bîz "bez, sancak, bayrak"*. 15th It would be appropriate to say that it was built by Ibni Muhenna, not in the 19th century, but approximately two centuries before this date (Yapıcı, 2016).

(4) Ibni Muhenna, under the heading of nehy, nefy and jahd (negation) for the negative form of the verb *kelumedim, kelemedim, baramadım, açamadım*, after giving the examples, after giving the examples of the words kelumedim, barumadim, it is also pronounced as *kelemedim, baramadım, achamadım* as a result of the conversion of the ötre in the words *kelumedim*, barumadim under the influence of the negation suffix. In the same argument, Ibni Muhenna, who gave examples of *kelmes* and *barmas*, stating that the suffix *-mas / - mes*, which appeared as a result of introducing the letter *"sin"* after the negation suffix, also expressed *kelmes, barmas* that this suffix is also used in the negative forms of the verb of competence with the examples of *kelümes* and *barumas*. (IM 136). As it is known, there are auxiliary

verbs *bil-, al-* and *u-* for the expression of competence in Turkic. In the historical process, the verb *al-* has become an auxiliary verb of competence in the Karluk-Kipchak groups, and the verb *bi-* in the Oghuz groups. While the Oghuz group is used as a verb in positive forms in written Turkic languages, the auxiliary verb *u-* is used in negative forms. However, in Azeribaijan Turkic, the verb *bil-* is preferred even in the negative forms of the verb of competence. In addition, it is known that the *-mas / -mes* suffix in the examples of *kelümes, barumas* is preferred in Karluk and Kipchak dialects. Based on this information, the examples given for the verb of competence in Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary clearly show that groups belonging to different ages coexisted in the region and continued to use their own language characteristics (Yapıcı, 2016).

(5) After giving the examples of *kelmegey* and *barmaàay* for the negative conjugation of the future tense under the headings of *nehy*, *nefy* and *jahd*, Ibni Muhenna said that the same verbs can be conjugated in the form of kelmedeçi, barmadaçi with the suffix *-daçi, -deçi* (IM 136). As stated by Mahmut of Kashgar in "Dîvânu Lugâti't-Türk", the forms *-daçı, -deçi* are future tenses used by the Oghuz (Korkmaz, 2005). Ibni Muhenna, by paying attention to the variable forms in this case, pointed to the tendency of dialectication in that period (Heyderova, 2022).

(6) Very important information is given in the section of Ibni Muhenna's Dictionary where the future tense is explained in Turkic. Ibni Muhenna, who says that the future tense in Turkic is made by adding the letters "*gayın*", "*elif*" and "*ya*" to the verb root, stating that sometimes the letter "*gayın*" can be pronounced close to the letter "*kef*", *úonàay* "konacak, yerleşecek", *köçàay* "göç edecek", *kelgey* "gelecek", *bargey* "gidecek", *köçgey min* "göç edeceğim", *úongey min* "konacağım". At the bottom of the explanation, he stated that *úonge* is also pronounced as *úonge, köçge*, with the dropping of the */y/* sound at the end of the suffix. In the same argument, after saying that the letter "*ra*" brought to the root of the verb is also used to express the future tense, examples of *úonar úonar* "kanacak", *úonar min* "kanacağım", *úonar sin* "konacaksın" are given. It clearly shows that the structure of *{verb + adverb-verb suffix + yorı- + r}*, which is the previous form of the suffix *-yor* in Turkey Turkish, was used even before the samples of the Oghuz-based Turkic written language in the Anadolu region: *"gelüyorır, baruyorır, aluyorır, satuyorır"* (Yapıcı, 2016).

6. Major findings

Characteristics specific to the Azerbaijani language in the Istanbul copy of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary.

Both European and Istanbul copies of the work written in the Elkhan state make comparisons between "Turkistan Turkic" and "our country's Turkic" (Azerbaijani Turkic) in the same way (Ibrahimov, 2020). Differences such as suffixes and sound changes are even indicated. Bekir Chobanzade shows that comparisons are given in 72 places on pages 78-90 of the Istanbul copy (Chobanzade, 2007).

Khadija Heydarova (2022) shows the following as an example of these in her study Features specific to the Azerbaijani language in the Istanbul copy of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary:

Table 1. Special features in the Azerbaijani language in the dictionary of Ibn Muhannah.

Turkistan in Turkic	Azerbaijani Turkic	Meaning
ايذى ايدى izi idi اذى	ايتى iti	sahib
أذكو أنكوetkü əzkü	ايكو eykü	yaxşı
أذاق azaq أداق adaq	اياق ayaq	ayaq, qədəh

(Istanbul edition).

Special attention paid to the Turkistan dialect in Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary indicates that the speakers of this language were influential in that period (Heydarova, 2022).

Sergey Malov rightly thinks that the scholar Melioransky related the European copies to the Azerbaijani language. However, he insists on the idea that the Istanbul copy is in the Uyghur language. Disagreeing with this idea of Bakir Chobanzade Malov, who proved with fifty principles that Azerbaijani Turkic is included in the existing dictionary, he made a hand-to-hand bet, and in the autumn of 1936, he made this bet. He received support from professor Sergey Yefimovic (Çobanzadeh, 200).

Abdullah Battal, repeating S. Malov's opinion, expresses his certainty that the European copies of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary correspond to the ancient Azerbaijani language, but the Istanbul copy is in Eastern Turkic, Kashgar and Uyghur languages (Battal, 1997).

7. Results and discussion

Ahmet B. Erjilasun, in addition to showing the title of the work as *"Hilyetü'l-Lisân ve Hulbetü'l-Beyân"*, refers the last copy to the section *Works Pertaining to Kharezm Turkic* and states that it is in Kharezm Turkic. As the reason, he points to facts such as y>d (dişarası) substitutions in Turkic words in the work, preservation of *g* in cases of falling in words with more than one syllable. At the same time, he notes that examples with d in the dictionary are Oghuz characteristics. But there are more examples with f (Ercilasun, 2004).

We confirm the opinions of Chobanzadeh and believe that the Istanbul copy is a manuscript that mostly reflects Azerbaijani Turkic. In Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary, it is possible to see the following features specific to our language (Azerbaijani language):

1) The analysis of the spelling in Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary shows that in the spelling of the Arabic alphabet, extensions are applied at the end of Turkic words.

2) Melioranski (1900) notes that, unlike Turkistan Turkic, words in Azerbaijani Turkic end with voiced consonants. It is also reflected in the dictionary that the word ending with a jingling consonant takes a jingling consonant suffix.

In the light of modern thinking, providing a scientific interpretation of the linguistic features of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary on the basis of Turkology and comparing the word materials of that dictionary with other publications are among the most important factors that condition the scientific analysis of the dictionary with innovations. Based on the examples mentioned above, we can say that Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary is still relevant for the science of linguistics today. Examining the dictionary both in the past (Çobanzadə, 2007) and today (Kaymaz, 2014),

conducting scientific-theoretical judgments and analyses about it are important innovations that serve the development of the science of Turkology.

Moreover, the grammatical analysis of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary shows that extensions were applied at the end of Turkic words written with the Arabic alphabet. These graphical features give the basis for saying that the dictionary reflects Azerbaijani Turkic. We saw this in the samples we gave in the Istanbul copy.

8. Conclusion

From the mentioned comments, it is clear that this dictionary intended for the educational process had the nature of commentary, phonetic, morphological, and lexical terminological analyzes were preferred. Mongolian words are translated into Arabic in the dictionary. T. Hajiyev focuses on the phonetics, morphology, and lexical sections of the dictionary and pays special attention to the problems of expressing Turkish sounds with the Arabic alphabet. In the section on morphology, it explains the information given about certain categories, the place of development of morphological indicators, and their role in grammatical semantics. In the vocabulary section, comparisons and parallels are made to show the different aspects of words.

In this work, which he wrote to meet the needs of his time, Ibn Muhenna provided important information about the Turkic language of that period. When we look at the overall work, it will be clearly seen that the Turkic depicted is basically Turkistan (Khakaniye/Kashgar) Turkic, but predominantly Oghuz and partly Kipchak dialect features are slowly starting to penetrate into the written language. Ibni Muhenna not only stated the basic features of the Turkic written language of that period, but also sometimes made a comparative dialect study by mentioning the dialect characteristics of the groups belonging to different tribes in the region where he lived.

Naturally, the work was based on Turkistan (Hakaniye) Turkic, which was the representative of the Turkic written language at that time. However, Ibni Muhenna, who also touches upon the pronunciation of Turkic communities speaking different dialects of Turkic due to the geography he lives in, also gives important clues about the demographic structure of the Turkic tribes in that geography with some examples and explanations. When comparing the phonetic and morphological features of the written language with the Turkic spoken in the region, it is seen that the Oghuz dialect features are dominant. Accordingly, it is possible to say that groups belonging to the Oghuz tribes are dominant in terms of population in the region in question, but groups belonging to the Kipchak or Karluk tribes also live side by side with the Oghuz groups or in nearby areas. Considering that Ibn Muhenna died in 1280, this work, which must have been written in the middle of the 13th century, sheds light on some issues that have not yet been elucidated in terms of following the historical course of the Turkic language. In this respect, it also has an important place in the history of the Turkic language. Based on the findings made about the work, we can easily state that Oghuz and Kipchak characteristics began to be reflected in the written language in this period and that the geography where the author lived was an important center in the process of separating Turkic into different written languages.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Alişanlı, Ş. (2006). Tarixi poetika və ədəbiyyatşünaslığın müasir mərhələsi. Historical poetics of Azerbaijani literature (Turkish). Bakı: Elm.

Battal, A. (1997). Ibn Mughanna Linguistics (Turkish). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Caferoğlu, A. (1974). History of Turkish Language (Turkish). İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.

Caferoğlu, A. (2001). History of Turkish Language (Turkish). İstanbul-Bursa: AlfaYayınları.

Çobanzadə, B. (2007). Seçilmiş əsərləri. Bakı: Şərq-Qərb.

Ercilasun, AB. (2004). History of Turkish Language from the Beginning to the Twentieth Century (Turkish). Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

Əhmədzadə, O. (2019). Seyid Cəmaləddin İbn Mühənnanın "Hilyətül-insan və Həlbətül-lisan" lüğətlərinin və Yusif Balasaqunlunun "Qutadqu-bilik" əsərləri Tofiq Hacıyevin türkoloji baxışlarında (Turkish). Endless Light in Science, 9 (14), 336–340.

Gül, B., Ağca, F. (2014). The place and importance of Ibni Mühenna's dictionary in historical Turkish dioli studies (Turkish). Türk Kültürü, 1, 21–29.

Hacıyev, Tİ. (2007). Yusif Xac Nacib. Qutadqu-bilik. Bakı: Elm.

Heydərova, X (2022). Characteristics specific to the Azerbaijani language in the Istanbul copy of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary (Turkish). Azərbaycan Milli Elmlər Akademiyası Filologiya və Sənətşünaslıq, 1, 173–179.

İbrahimov, E. (2016). Alphabet and Spelling Problems in Creating a Common Spoken Language in the Turkic World (Turkish). Gazi Türkiyat, 18, s.213–220.

İbrahimov, E. (2020). Azerbaijan Xalq Republic of Azerbaijan language policy (Turkish). Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi, 9(4), 1411–1424.

İbrahimov, E. (2021). Azerbaycan'da dil politikalarının toplumdilbilimsel paradigmaları. Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 27–41. https://doi.org/10.21563/sutad.858086

İbrahimov, E. (2023). Türk Devlet ve Topluluklarının Dil Politikalarına Tarihsel Bakış. Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 60, 327–352. https://doi.org/10.21563/sutad.1405537

İnan, A. (1953). XIII-XV. Yüzyıllarda Mısır'da Oğuz-Türkmen ve Kıpçak Lehçeleri ve 'Halis Türkçe'. Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten, 34, 53–72.

Kaymaz, Z. (2014). How Many Words Are There in Ibn Muhenna's Dictionary? (Turkish). Türk Kültürü, 1, 31-46.

Kilisli, R [İM]. (1340). Kitâb Hilyat al-insân wa Helbet al-lisân (Turkish). İstanbul.

Korkmaz, Z. (2005). Kâshgarlı Mahmud and Oghuz Turkish (Turkish). Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar, C. I, 241–253.

Malov, S. (1928). İbn Muhanna o tureçkom yazıke. Zapiski Kollegi Vostokvedov. Leningrad: Akademi Nauk.

Melioranski, PM. (1900). Arab-philologist he tureçkom yazıke (Turkish). Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.

İhsan, Yapici, A. (2016). Some Observations on Ibn Mühenna's Dictionary (Turkish). Journal of Turkish Studies, 11 (20), 617–617. https://doi.org/10.7827/turkishstudies.9464