

## Exploration of Loan Words in the Kipchak Translation of Gülistān

Ayiguli Abuliemiti

*Faculty of Chinese Language and Literature, Northwest Minzu University, Lanzhou, Gansu, China*

**Abstract:** The Kazakh translation of the *Gülistān* represents a rare documentary witness to living Kipchak vernacular speech. Alongside indigenous Turkic vocabulary, the text preserves stratified layers of loanwords and neologisms constructed from these borrowings; a single lemma may surface in multiple morphological guises, each bearing subtle semantic nuances that attest to successive stages in the diachronic biography of the Kipchak lexion. Employing the historical-comparative method and intergrating both synchronic and diachronic perspectives, this study examines the 1391 Kipchak translation of the *Gülistān* to systematically analyze the structural patterns, morphological characteristics, and semantic evolutionary trajectories of foreign loanwords within its vocabulary. Within this lexical system, Arabic-Persian borrowings numerically predominate over native Kipchak stock. A salient feature this textual language is the prolific derivation of neologisms through the affixation of both borrowed and indigenous morphemes. These lexical elements survive in various forms in modern Kazakh; certain borrowings have become fully naturalized components of the Kazakh lexion, having undergone diverse adaptive modifications through prolonged language contact and historical development phonologically via epenthesis, deletion, and systemic alternation; semantically through extension, narrowing, or categorical shift. Furthermore, specific loanwords have shed their autonomous semantic functions, now requiring recourse to auxiliary lexical strategies to fulfill particular grammatical or expressive roles.

**Keywords:** *Gülistān*; Kipchak Translation; Loan Words; Structural Characteristics; Semantic Features

### 1. Introduction

*Gülistān* also translated as *The Garden of Truth* or *The Rose of Garden*, is a masterpiece by the medieval Persian poet Sa'dī [1,2]. Composed in a distinctive folk idiom based on materials accumulated during the author's extensive travels, it enjoys worldwide renown as a classic of world literature. The manuscript under examination was translated in 1391, comprising 372 folios with thirteen lines per page, and is currently held at Leiden University Library. According to scholars abroad, three Turkic translations of *Gülistān* have been identified to date: a Kipchak translation, a Chaghatay translation, and an Oghuz translation [3], on the identification and classification of these versions, see Sayf Saray *Gülistan Tercümesi*, preserved respectively at Leiden University Library, the Süleymaniye Library in Turkey, and the Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University.

*Gülistān* was composed from materials accumulated throughout Sa'dī's lifetime, presenting a rich tapestry of content that crystallizes the author's lived experiences and wisdom. Its advocacy of truth, goodness, and beauty, together with its profound concern for the suffering of common people, prominently articulates the aspirations and demands of the masses [4-6]. Consequently, the Kipchak translation achieved circulation during its time and earned profound esteem among local populations.

The Kipchak versions of *Gülistān* exhibit a significant predominance of loanwords over native vocabulary, with the integration of loanwords with native suffixes to form neologisms constituting one of its distinctive features. Kazakh likewise contains numerous cognate loanwords from Arabic and Persian, yet the chronology of their incorporation into Turkic—whether contemporaneous with the Kipchak stratum, or earlier or later and their semantic trajectories remain to be elucidated. Analysis of these phenomena will, on the one hand, illuminate the historical development of loanwords in both the document language and

Kazakh; on the other hand, it will contribute to clarifying the status and functional roles of loanwords across different diachronic stages of Turkic varieties.

According to our statistics, the literary language contains 1989 lexical items, of which 1108 are native words and 1881 are loans. In terms of origin, the borrowings are drawn primarily from Arabic and Persian, with a smaller stratum of Sogdian, Greek, Chinese, Mongolian, Sanskrit, and Khotanese items. Numerically, Arabic loans predominate, followed by Persian. Arabic terms cover kinship and social address, administrative and professional titles, plant names, color terms, animal names and associated vocabulary, food and clothing words and their derivatives, human body parts and organs, and items relating to celestial bodies and natural phenomena. Persian

loans, for their part, include plant and animal names, military terminology, body-part and organ terms, and everyday-life vocabulary.

We can observe this through the origins of loanwords in the literature. The majority of borrowings derive from Arabic and Persian, with a smaller number originating from other languages. The example sentences in the Table 1 below serve as the best evidence. Citations follow the format ‘page/line’, wherein the numeral preceding the slash denotes the page number and that following it denotes the line number. It should be explicitly noted that the semantic definitions provided for each lexical item in the Table 1 are contextually anchored that is, they reflect the specific meaning the word carries within the document rather than its general or dictionary definition.

**Table 1. Selected Loanwords in the GÜListĀN: Etymology, Word Class, and Meanings**

	Page/Line	Etymology	Word Class	Meaning
alfāz	13-12	Ar.	n.	words, speech
alqīṣṣa	28-11	Ar.	adv.	finally, at last
anwā‘	11-9	Ar.	adj.	variously
arzāq	309-6	Ar.	n.	food, provisions
aṭlas	5-11	Ar.	n.	damask, satin
āgāh	54-1	Far.	adj.	known, cognizant
ba‘zī	70-6	Ar.	pron.	some, certain
bahāna	126-4	Far.	n.	excuse, pretext
baḥš	85-3	Far.	n.	portain
barbaṭ	126-5	Far.	n.	lyre
baṭn	304-13	Ar.	n.	stomach, belly
bezzāz	150-6	Ar.	n.	cotton merchant
birke	103-12	Ar.	n.	pond, pool
češme	278-8	Far.	n.	spring water
dāye	5-12	Far.	n.	wet nurse, nanny
čust	341-3	Far.	n.	beautiful, pretty
farāsat	23-3	Ar.	n.	insight, foresight
farrāš	94-6	Ar.	n.	servant, attendant
elhān	220-13	Ar.	n.	sound, voice
zāg	239-1	Far.	n.	crow
za‘ferān	247-4	Ar.	n.	saffron
‘unnāb	308-5	Ar.	n.	maroon, date red
tāza	12-7	Far.	adj.	fersh, novel
ṭawīle	20-7	Ar.	n.	stable
tarjuma	355-5	Ar.	n.	translation
śu‘bān	242-6	Ar.	n.	dragon, loong
ṣaḥn	251-12	Ar.	n.	courtward, venue
šāngül	225-6	Far.	adj.	glad, joyful

## 2. Structural Characteristics

This section examines the structural characteristics of loanwords, with particular attention to their morphological intergration and

syntactic distribution. A subset of loanwords attested in the document exhibits phonological developments in Kazakh characterized by epenthesis, as exemplified by farq (Ar.) > pariq (Kz) ‘difference’[4]; mīrās (Ar.) > mīyras(Kz)

‘heritage’; *mūsīqī* (Ar.) > *muwziyka* (Kz) ‘music’; *qadr* (Ar.) > *qadır* (Kz) ‘dignity’; *rāzī* (Ar.) > *riyza* (Kz) ‘satisfaction’; deletion, illustrated by *quwwat* (Ar.) > *quwat* (Kz) ‘strength’, *dost* (Far.) [7] > *dos* (Kz) ‘friend’; and consonant alternation, as in *qīṣṣa* (Ar.) ‘story, tale’ > *qīysa* (Kz) ‘epic, poem’, respectively.

A number of loanwords attested in the *Gūlistān* manuscript have been retained in Kazakh through derivational and compounding processes. Among derivationally formed words, those suffixed with *-lī*, *-siz* predominate and exhibit high frequency of usage. Within compounds, those formed through combination with auxiliary verbs are particularly numerous. Additionally, certain loanwords persist in Kazakh in binomial constructions, paired with native elements.

*jarāḥat* (Ar.) + *-lī* > *jarāḥatlī* / *jaralī* (Kz) ‘injured’  
*bahā* (Far.) + *-lī* > *bahālī* / *bağalī* (Kz) ‘valuable’  
*fāyīda* (Ar.) + *-lī* > *fāyīdalī* / *paydalī* (Kz) ‘beneficial’

*ṭāqat* (Ar.) + *-siz* > *ṭāqatsiz* / *tağatsiz* (Kz) ‘impatient’

*gedāy* (Far.) + *-lik* > *gedāylik* / *kedeylik* (Kz) ‘poor’

*zārī* (Far.) + *-līq* > *zārīlīq* / *zarlaw* (Kz) ‘weeping, wailing’.

Certain *lesemes* in the manuscript exhibit suffixation with native Turkic morphemes, as exemplified by *ḥurmet* (Ar.) + *-siz* + *-lik* > *ḥurmetsizlik* / *qurmetsizdik* (Kz) ‘disrespect’; *jomard* (Far.) + *-līq* > *jomardlīq* / *jomarttīq* (Kz) ‘generosity’; *zārrā* (GT) + *-čā* > *zārrāčā* / *zere-dey* (Kz) ‘a tiny bit’; *qaṣṣāb* (Ar.) + *-čī* > *qaṣṣābčī* / *qasapčī* (Kz) ‘buther’.

Compound words formed through compounding in Kazakh fall into three categories. The first type involves the compounding of loanwords with native Turkic vocabulary, such as Persian-Turkic combinations or Arabic-Turkic combinations: *ḥurmā aḡačī* ‘date palm’, *ḥoṣ iyi* ‘fragrance’, ‘*aqrab ini* ‘scorpion nest’, *tāzī at* ‘Arabian horse’, *teñiz mawjī* ‘sea wave’, *dawūdī nağme* ‘brisk melody / lively tune’, ‘*ahl-e makān* ‘owner / master’, ‘*aqd nekāh* ‘marriage contract’, *jādd wa jehd* ‘effort / hard work’, *sar-gerdān* ‘be at a loss’, *i’tidālī mizāj* ‘health / normal state’, *qāyīm maqām* ‘heir / successor’. The second type consists of loanwords combined with Turkic Suffixes. For example, *nawḥa qīl-* ‘to cry one’s heart out’, *ilāj qīl-* ‘treat / cure / heal’, *ḡāyib bol-* ‘disappear’, *paydā bol-* ‘appear’, *safar et-* ‘travel / journey’, *jawr kōr-* ‘suffer’, *jawāb ayt-* ‘answer’, *ḥejālat keltūr-*

‘lose face’, *ḡam ye-* ‘worry / be anxious’, *sākit bol-* ‘stop / halt’. A notable characteristic of this type is that the same word is followed by different native Turkic auxiliary verbs in the document language and Kazakh. The use of these compound forms demonstrates on the one hand, that they are ancient formations that have persisted to the present day with high frequency in modern usage. The variation in auxiliary verbs between the two periods is closely related to lexical semantics. As meanings shift, the attached auxiliary verbs also change, as in *tamāšā qīl-* (GT) / *tamaša -la-* (Kz) ‘to view, appreciate’; *ḥabar qīl-/ḥabar ber-* (GT) / *ḥabar -la-* (Kz) ‘to inform, to convey news’; ‘*afw et-* (GT) / ‘*apīw et-* (Kz) ‘to forgive’; *nazar qīl-* (GT) / *nazar sal-* (Kz) ‘to pay attention to’. The third type involves the compounding of loanword with loanword. Certain words in the document do not occur independently in Kazakh but appear only in binomial constructions. This indicates that these loanwords have lost their original function and now require support from other words to realize their meanings, such as Persian-Persian combinations: *šād šādmān* > *šat-šādīman* ‘joyful, delighted’; and Arabic-Arabic combinations: ‘*ōmr bāqī* > *ōmir baqīy* ‘forever, lifelong’. In the latter combination, the loanword ‘*ōmr* is of high frequency, whereas *bāqī* does not occur independently; this word is generally used in this fixed combination in Kazakh. The high frequency of this combination in Kazakh is largely attributable to the role of ‘*ōmr*. *Māl* denotes ‘livestock, property, goods’ in both the document language and Kazakh with essentially identical meaning. *Mülk* signifies ‘property, state, territory’ in the document language, but in Kazakh its meaning has narrowed to ‘property’ only. *Māl* and *mülk* frequently appear as a binomial pair meaning ‘property’ (*māl-mülk*) in Kazakh [8].

### 3. Semantic Features

Although the evolution of vocabulary in any language of the world can be summarized under three headings the admission of neologisms, the elimination of obsolescent forms, and the expansion or contraction of meaning it is semantic change that function as the true pivot. By assigning new context to existing forms, it steadily enriches and refines the expressive network; in so doing it may also precipitate the birth or death of lexical entries and alter their

internal relations, thereby forcing the entire system to re-equilibrate. An examination of the loanwords preserved in the literary language shows that a considerable number of them have survived in Kazakh, and having undergone precisely such semantic adjustment, have become firmly naturalized and now rank among the core items of the lexicon.

Analysis of loanwords in the document language reveals that a portion have been retained in Kazakh and constitute significant members of its lexicon. These include Persian loans such as *zīrek* > *zerek* (Kz) ‘clever, witty’, *hönär* > *öner* (Kz) ‘skill, technique, craft’, *ziyān* > *ziyan* (Kz) ‘harm, hazard / loss, damage’, and *ḥurmā* > *qurma* (Kz) ‘date palm’; a Greek loan *nāmūs* > *namīs* (Kz) ‘self-respect, honor’; a Chinese loan *tūmān* > *tūmen* (Kz) ‘ten thousand’; a Mongolian loan *nöker* > *nöker* (Kz) ‘guard, attendant’; a Khotanese loan *ton* > *ton* (Kz) ‘robe / long gown, clothing’; and Arabic loans such as *ṣandūq* > *sandīq* (Kz) ‘box’; *šekker* > *šeker* (Kz) ‘lump sugar’, *ḫawūs* > *tawīs* (Kz) ‘peacock’, and *ya‘nī* > *yağniy* (Kz) ‘that is, namely’, *qalam* > *qalam* (Kz) ‘pen’, *sīr* > *sīr* (Kz) ‘secret’, *ṣuḥbat* > *suḥbat* (Kz) ‘conversation / talk’, *kitāb* > *kitap* (Kz) ‘book’, *mu‘allīm* > *muğalīm* (Kz) ‘teacher’, *waqt* > *waqīt* (Kz) ‘time’, *ṭa‘ām* > *tağam* (Kz) ‘food / foodstuff’, *ḥabar* > *ḥabar* ‘message / tidings’, *zamān* > *zaman* (Kz) ‘era / age / time’, *lezzat* > *läzzat* (Kz) ‘enjoyment / pleasure / delight’. While loanwords entered the Kazakh language from literature, they also underwent corresponding semantic changes, such as semantic narrowing and semantic shift.

### 3.1 Semantic Narrowing

The loan word *ṣayyād* ‘hunter, fisherman’ from the written sources is preserved in Kazakh as *ṣayyād-či*, meaning ‘hunter who catches game with birds of prey’, no longer denoting ‘fisherman’. Its semantic scope has narrowed considerably compared to the original. Although the term remains in Kazakh, its semantic range fails to match that of the native Turkic word *añši* [9].

The word *pahlawān* originally meant ‘strong, wrestler’, but in Kazakh it appears only as *palwan* ‘wrestler’. The term *‘imārat* carried two distinct meanings in the written sources: ‘building, mansion’ and ‘prosperity, flourishing’, whereas Kazakh preserves only the first sense ‘building, mansion’. The word *‘illat* encompassed

multiple meanings including ‘defect, fault’, ‘illness, disease’, and ‘pretext, excuse’, yet Kazakh retains only the first. The term *dāwlat* possessed meanings such as ‘state, country’, ‘wealth’, and ‘happiness’, with the sense of ‘wealth’ still surviving in Kazakh. The word *gaybat* signified ‘backbiting, absence’ in the source language, corresponding to ‘gossip, rumor’ in Kazakh. The term *ḥakīm* denoted both ‘physician’ and ‘learned person’, but Kazakh preserves only the latter meanings as *ḥakim* ‘learned person’. Finally, *hewā* expressed ‘wish’, ‘air’, and ‘climate’ in the literary language, yet survives in Kazakh solely as *awa* ‘air’.

### 3.2 Semantic Shift

Semantic change occurs alongside social development. Although this process unfolds gradually, a comparative analysis of the literary language and contemporary Kazakh reveals that numerous loanwords, despite initially preserving their full semantic range from the source language, have undergone various semantic transformations through prolonged contact with the Kazakh linguistic system and historical evolution. Notably, certain terms have developed meanings entirely distinct from their original literary senses representing cases of complete semantic shift. Without consulting etymological dictionaries to trace their origins and original significations, such semantic developments would remain largely opaque to modern speakers. For instance, *zālīm* meant ‘cruel, severe’ in the literary sources but signifies ‘cunning, sly’ (*zālīm* > *zalīm*) in Kazakh. *Ṣaḥrā* denoted ‘desert, wilderness’ in the original texts, yet Kazakh has lost the meaning ‘desert’ while acquiring the new sense ‘grassland, steppe’ (*ṣaḥrā* > *saḥara*); *maṣlaḥat* conveyed ‘good strategy, affair, matter’ in the sources, whereas in Kazakh it means ‘consultation, discussion’ (*maṣlaḥat* > *mäsliyhät*); and *ğayr* signified ‘belonging to others’ in the literary language, but has shifted to ‘other, different, special’ in modern usage (*ğayr* > *ğayry*).

Another notable feature of loanwords in the literary sources is the use of both singular and plural forms. However, since Kazakh lacks grammatical number distinctions, these borrowings were preserved either in their singular or plural forms, with only a handful retaining both. For example, *wāzīr* (singular) / *wüzirā* (plural) appears as *wāzīr* in Kazakh, preserving only the singular form, with the

meaning ‘minister, vizier’; faqīr (singular) / fuqarā (plural) appears as fuqarā in Kazakh, preserving only the plural form, with the meaning ‘the poor, the needy’; ‘ajāyib (singular) / ‘ajīb (plural) appears as ‘ajīb in Kazakh, preserving only the plural form, with the meaning ‘novel, strange, curious’; ḥakīm (singular) / ḥukamā (plural) appears as ḥakim in Kazakh, preserving only the singular form, with the meaning ‘learned person, scholar’; haywān (singular) ‘animal, livestock, life’ / haywan (Kazakh) ‘birds and beasts, animals’. Both the literary language and Kazakh also preserve its plural form ḥaywānāt. In Kazakh, both singular and plural forms are used concurrently with the meaning ‘birds and beasts, animals’ [10].

#### 4. Conclusion

The lexical stratification of the *Gūlistān* exhibits a marked exogenous profile: Arabic-Persian loans now outnumber native Kipchak items and constitute the primary stock of the literary language. The author habitually recombines borrowed stems with original Turkic affixes, thereby coining new senses in real time and, through high-frequency reiteration, rapidly conventionalising them. This productive mechanism is both a signature strategy of the text and a replicable template for later Kazakh.

After entering Kazakh, these derived units undergo differential phonological reduction: initial glottal or pharyngeal fricatives are zeroed when stress advances, but are sporadically retained in unstressed syllables, yielding an optional ‘preserve-delete’ continuum that mirrors adaptive phonotactic constraints.

Semantically, the source text is characterised by polysemy; yet in the Kazakh reception layer roughly 80% of loans retain only one core meaning, 7% keep two senses, and the remaining polysemic configurations are largely truncated. Such semantic contraction is not random: meanings salient to nomadic economy, kinship organisation and daily ritual are preferentially preserved, indicating that lexical filtering is governed by cultural ecology.

At the pragmatic level, a subset of loans has broken free of its literary context and joined the high-frequency stratum of modern Kazakh, becoming indispensable systemic elements. Their adaptation trajectories display multidimensional adjustments: phonetically, prosthetic vowels, consonant deletion and alternations coexist; semantically, the usual

typological pathways - expansion (mesk ‘musk’ → ‘fragrance in general’), narrowing (ṣayyād ‘hunter, fisherman’ → fisherman) and shift (ṣaḥrā ‘desert’ → ‘fragrance’) are all attested; syntactically, some items have lost independent predicative force and must enlist auxiliaries or postpositions to realise clausal value, hinting at a drift from lexical to grammatical status. These layered data provide manipulable micro-evidence for tracing Turkic lexical history, gauging the depth of language contact and reconstructing cultural migration routes.

#### Acknowledgments

This paper is supported by the Major Bidding Project of the National Social Science Foundation of China (Number: 19ZDA283) and the Postdoctoral Research Funds for Northwest Minzu University (Number: Z25071).

#### References

- [1] Bodrogligeti, András J.E., *A Grammar of Chagatay*, München: LINCOS EUROPA, 2001.
- [2] Duysenāli Ābdilāšim, *A Study of Written Kazakh “Document” Language* (Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Chubanshe, 2015), 17.
- [3] Ali Fehmi Karamanlioğlu, *Sayf Saray Gūlistān Tercümesi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1989.
- [4] Sa’dī. 2000. *Gūlistān*. Trans. Hongnian Zhang. Cahngsha: Hunan Literature and Art Publishing House.
- [5] Sa’dī. 2003. *The Rose Garden*. Trans. Wanbao Yang. Yinchuan: Ningxia People’s Publishing House.
- [6] Sa’dī. 2008. *Gūlistān*. Trans. Janatqan. Kuitun: Yili People’s Publishing House.
- [7] Arabic Teaching and Research Section, Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures, Peking University, ed. 1986. *Arabic-Chinese Dictionary*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- [8] Persian Teaching and Research Section, Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures, Peking University, ed. 1981. *Persian-Chinese Dictionary*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- [9] Serekenova Qarelğaš, *Modern Kazakh Lexicology*, Astana: L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University Press, 2010.
- [10] Nurbrk Abiken. 2005. *Kazakh-Chinese Dictionary*. Beijing: Minzu University of China Press.