A Semantic Study of the Military Terms in Ötämiš Ḥājī's *Čingiz-nāma*

Yerbol Munai[a]*, Nurila Shaimerdinova[b]

a PhD Candidate, Department of Turkology, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, 010000. Email: erbol.munay@gmail.com

b Doctor of Philology, Professor, Department of Turkology L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, 010000. Email: nurila1607@mail.ru

Abstract

Čingiz-nāmä, 'Book of Čingiz Khan' written by Ötämiš Ḥājī in the 16th century, has gained increasing attention among scholars in recent years. The manuscript, which is in Chagatay, a Turkic literary language of Central Asia, preserves oral traditions and the Kipchak linguistic features. The current study aims to collect and analyze the military terms in this historical text from three dimensions: lexical meaning, etymologies, and semantic relations. A qualitative research design guided this study, wnabling the probe of 42 words of the military terminology, divided into several groups viz., soldiers, military officer, military equipment, military organization, military operation and military construction. The study uncovered the historical and etymological origins of these terms, tracing their evolution within the Turkic linguistic framework, and shedding light on the internal structure of the Turkic military vocabulary system of the 16th century. Additionally, the study discerned patterns within the historical evolution of Central Asian Middle Turkic military terminology, offering insights into the cultural and linguistic phenomena of the medieval Turkic language. Through careful analysis, the research not only mapped out the semantic landscape of military terminology but also revealed the reasons driving its historical evolution.

Keywords: Military Terms, Semantics, Etymology, Middle Turkic, Central Asia, *Cingiz-nama.*

Introduction

The Mongol invasion initiated by Genghis Khan and his offspring in the 13th century significantly impacted the landscape of old Turkic languages by breaking up social structures and rearranging ethnic geography (Erdal, 2004). Among the Genghis states, the Kipchak people were mainly ruled by the Golden Horde, also called as the Ulus of Jochi, was established by Genghis Khan's first son and his successor Batu Khan. The territory of the Golden Horde stretched from Central Asia to the southern Russian steppes and largely overlapped with the former Kipchak Khanate. Despite the Mongolian origin of Jochid rulers, the ruling class was eventually assimilated by the enormous local Kipchak-speaking groups in a century. Nevertheless, the Kipchak language had been dramatically changed due to intensive language contacts, and the Genghisid rulers had profoundly embedded the new political system and military structure into Central Asian society. However, the Golden Horde only left a few fragmented descriptions by contemporary outside sources, i.e., Russia, Mamuluk Sultanate, and Timurid Dynasty, (Ḥājī, 2008; Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). The situation brings difficulties for scholars in studying the Middle Kipchak language and Golden Horde. Nevertheless,

later, in the successor states of the Golden Horde, there were historical works with original information. Among them, Cingiz-nama is undoubtedly one of the most outstanding for its unique character in linguistics and history. Ötämiš Haji, the author of the chronicle, served at the court of Ilbars I. Khan bin Büräkä of the Khiva Khanate (Göncöl, 2020). The sole reliable information available about Ötämiš Haji during this period indicates that he dedicated himself to collecting ancient tales (*qarï söz*) concerning the rulers of the Golden Horde, gaining notable recognition. Due to his proficiency in history and the growing fascination with historical writing among the Shaybanid rulers, he found a new patron in the form of Iš Sultān. Summoned to the court, Ötämiš Haji was eventually entrusted with the task of compiling unwritten histories into a chronicle by Iš Sultān (Göncöl, 2020).

Cingiz-nama as a chronicle of the Jochid lineage records several wars that the Golden Horde declared on other states, including the expedition to Russia, the conquest of the Caucasian region, the conflict with the Ilkhan Khanate, and the battles between Toqtamish Khan and Urus Khan. Those detailed descriptions of wars and battles provide sufficient vocabulary related to military affairs and allow us to analyze those military words in terms of semantics. Meanwhile, the analysis can also offer us an insight into the military system and culture of the Golden Horde. Unlike in sedentary civilizations, the boundary between civilian and military life is indistinctive in a nomadic society; for instance, every adult man was a potentially skilled soldier and hunted to obtain subsistence nourishment as a military practice. The phenomenon has been thoroughly observed and recorded by their neighbors from China to the Middle East and the West (Sinor, 1981). Thus, there is no doubt that military affairs played an important role in the Golden Horde's society. This study aims to depict this aspect of this society by conducting a semantic analysis of the military terms.

Literature Review

Cingiz-nama has gained increasing attention among scholars in recent years. Its academic value was first recognized by scholars like E. F. Kal, V. V. Bartold, and A. Z. Validov (Yudin, 2005). In the current times, only two manuscripts of *Cingiz-nama* are preserved in two places. The first copy of the *Cingiz-nama* is held in Tashkent at the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, known as the "Tashkent manuscript." The initial release of the facsimile version of the Tashkent manuscript, featuring a Russian translation and Cyrillic alphabet transcription was published in 1967. The second manuscript originated in Orenburg, Russia, and was then relocated to Istanbul, which is referred to as the 'Istanbul manuscript.' (Göncöl, 2020). Besides Yudin's publication of the transcription and translation of *Cingiz-nama* (Yudin, 2005), Japanese scholars Kavaguchi and Nagamine, too, transcribed the text into the Latin alphabet and prepared an introduction along with notes. Göncöl (2020), in his work *Remarks on the Cingiz-nama of Ötämiš Hajji,* investigates the time of the completion of *Cingiz-nama* and discusses other scholars' views on the date of *Cingiz-nama*. Anyhow, it is certain that the book was written in the 16th century.

As for linguistic studies, there are a few works available. For instance, Rentzsch (2015) investigated the complement clauses in Cingiz-nama. Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a, 1997b) collected and compiled many military words in his dictionary, *Dīwān Lughāt at-Turk*, covering military systems, management, equipment, and the art of war. The English translation of *Dīwān Lughāt at-Turk* classified military terms into different groups, such as disagreement and fighting, troops and tactics, weapons and armor, and archery (Maḥmūd, Robert, & James, 1982). In 1950, Russian historians Grekov & Yakubovsky (1998) published their historical monograph, *The Golden Horde and Its Downfall*. In its sixth chapter, "Political Structure of Golden Horde", the scholars studied the political and military system of the Golden Horde. They discussed and analyzed several Turko-Mongolian military official titles (Grekov & Yakubovsky, 1998). The Hungarian scholar, István Vásáry wrote several articles analyzing the military terminology of the Golden Horde, including *daruga, bökevul* (Vásáry, 1976, 1995). Meanwhile, studies of military terms have also been carried out on other historical Turkic sources. For example, the Chinese ethnic Uyghur researcher, Abduqïrïm Abulǧazï or Abudukelimu Abulizi, wrote a postgraduate thesis on the topic "A study on the Military Words in Compendium of the Turkic Dialects", focusing on the morphological and semantic analysis of the military terms which occur in Makhmut & Yegeubay's Dīwān Lughāt at-Turk (1997a, 1997b). Csiky (2006), too, conducted linguistic research on military terms with Turko-Mongolian origin in the historical document Tuzükät-i Tîmûr. A recent study Göncöl (2023) attempted a redaction of the Cingiz-nama manuscripts, particularly the Istanbul manuscript.

Methodology

Research Design

In a qualitative research design framework, this research probes into a comprehensive analysis of military terminology found in the *Cingiz-nama*, embarking on a meticulous collection, classification, and statistical examination of military terms. Central to this investigation is the semantic elucidation of each military word, aiming to provide a thorough understanding of their meanings. Beyond mere definitions, the study also uncovers the historical and etymological origins of these terms, tracing their evolution within the

Turkic linguistic framework. By examining the distribution and frequency of these terms, the research sheds light on the internal structure of the Turkic military vocabulary system as it existed in the 16th century.

Data Collection

Based on *Cingiz-nama*, the study collected 42 words of the military terminology. Inspired by the classification of Sattorova & Omonov (2022) with regards to *Dīwān Lughāt at-Turk*, we divided the terms into several groups: soldiers, military officer, military equipment, military organization, military operation and military construction.

Data Analysis

One of the primary objectives of this study was to elucidate the evolution of Turkic military terminology and compare and analyze it with the modern Kazakh language. Additionally, the study discerned patterns within the historical evolution of Central Asian Middle Turkic military terminology, offering insights into the cultural and linguistic phenomena of the medieval Turkic language. Through careful analysis, the research not only mapped out the semantic landscape of military terminology but also revealed the reasons driving its historical evolution. Ultimately, the research endeavored to better understand medieval Central Asia's military culture and organizational systems under Chinggis regimes. By illuminating the linguistic nuances and historical tracks embedded within the *Cingiz-nama's* military terms, the study contributes to a richer comprehension of the region's martial heritage and socio-political landscape.

Results and Findings

In this section, military terms from the text of *Cingiz-nama* are described and analyzed. All text is quoted from Ötämiš Ḥājī's *Čingīz-Nāma* edited and translated by Takushi Kawaguchi and Hiroyuki Nagamine and published Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). This section discusses military terms in 6 categories, viz., soldiers, military officers, military equipment, military organization, military operations, and military construction. Each category lists several terms that are semantically related to one another and collectively form a vocabulary of this old Turkic corpus.

Soldiers

– **Är** 'warrior.' This word is an ancient Turkic word and initially only means 'a human male.' *Är* was first recorded in the Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *inim Kül Tegin er at bulti.* 'my younger brother Kül Tegin received his adult name,' as stated in the inscription of Kül Tegin, on the east side); *bay är* 'a rich man' or *Irk Bilig* (Clauson, 1972). Its plural form was *ärän,* which was rarely used in the later period. In the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk*, Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a) refers to *är* as 'a human being, man.' As time advanced, the semantic breadth of *är* progressively extended. In Ottoman Turkish, this word indicates 'a human male; a husband (of a wife); a brave man; an apt man; a clever man.' (Redhouse, 1890). Apart from the meanings above, in the Central Asian middle Turkic, *är* also indicates the meaning of 'hero, warrior.' *Är* was also used as an honorific title; this word only appears once in *Cingiz-nama*, being a respectful title rather than meaning 'warrior,' i.e., *qïlič čapġan yurt ačġan är Šïbannïŋ oġlanlarï dur* 'They are the sons of Är Šïban who wielded the sword and established a *yurt*.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). The semantics of *är* is 'male; husband; human being; hero, warrior.' (Iskakov, 2011g)

– **alp** 'warrior, hero, brave.' According to Clauson, *alp* originally meant 'tough, resistant, hard to overcome,' and 'brave' is to describe persons and 'tough, hard' to objects (Clauson, 1972). This word was first seen in the 8th century Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *ädgü bilgä kišig, ädgü alp kišig yortmaz ärmiš* 'They do not let wise men and brave men amount something' (Shimin, 2005). This term was attested in the Turkic sources of 11th century as well. For instance, there is a proverb recorded in the *Diwān Lughat Al-Turk*: *alp yaġïda alčaq čoġïda* 'bravery is seen in war, modesty is seen in disputes.' (Makhmut & Yegeubay, 1997b). In *Cingiz-nama*, *alp* also indicates the meaning of warrior and is juxtaposed with *atġučï*, e.g., *alp-atġučï* 'a warrior archer.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). In modern Kazakh, the semantics of *alïp* stands for 'huge, great,' e.g., *alïp adam* 'great man.' (Iskakov, 2011g).

– **bahadïr** 'warrior, hero.' Bahadïr has many variants among different periods, sources, and peoples, e.g., *bahadur*, *batur*, *batïr*, *batar*, etc. *Bahadïr* has a long history and has been spread broadly in Altaic languages from Manchu to Ottoman Turkish. Clauson considers that this word can be traced back to the Xiongnu era and was a loanword borrowed from Mongolian at the early stage. The Turkic equivalent of Bahadïr is *alpaġut*. (Clauson, 1972). Bahadïr originally referred to 'brave man, courageousness;' its meaning evolved into 'warrior' and became a name, an honorific title. In *Cingiz-nama*, the context implies that *Bahadïr* is in the sense of 'warrior,' e.g., *bir jama'at bahādïrlarïnï ol yolġa ta'yīn qïlïp tururlar* '(He) sent a group of warriors into that way.' *Bahadïr* is *batïr* in Kazakh and possesses various meanings, such as as 'hero,' 'an honorific title,' and 'warrior or skilled soldier' (Iskakov, 2011g).

– **qarawïl/qarawul** 'guard.' *Qarawïl* is a derivative of the Mongolian verb *qara-* 'to look, to watch' with the Mongolian deverbal suffix *-AġUl*, conveying the meaning of 'a group of reconnaissance, riding patrol.' (Doerfer, 1963). This word occurs only twice in *Cingiz-nama*, e.g., *ol yürüšdä Šïban Hanġa otuz mïŋ kiši*

qošup qarawïl yibärdi 'Sayin Khan (Batu Khan) sent three thousand men with patrols' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). In other sources, *qarawïl* can be attached with the Turkic suffix *-čI*, e.g., *bir qarawulčïsï bar edi* 'he used to have a guard' (Ivanics & Usmanov, 2002). *Qarawïl* and *qarawïlčï* both exist in modern Kazakh and indicate the meaning of 'guard.' (Iskakov, 2011a).

–   ***newkär*** 'royal guard.' *Newkär* is a Mongolian loanword, *nökör*, borrowed into Turkic. The word's original meaning is 'companion, friend, comrade.' (Doerfer, 1963). During the Mongol Empire, the term consistently delivered the meaning of military servants to Khans or royals, and they were close and faithful to the Khans. In *Cingiz-nama*, *newkär* appears up with the word *qul* 'slave' sometimes, e.g., *newkärlik, qulliq etemiz…., qara kisigä qul-newkär bolup…* 'became slave-servant to a ordinary person.' (Iskakov, 2011g). However, it does not mean *newkär* is a synonym for *qul* 'slave'; it is more likely to emphasize its servant function. Moreover, the duties of *nökör* or *newkär* varied under different circumstances. They were company when Khan went out hunting in peacetime, took charge of the security of the Khan at war, and also committed other military missions, like being a military leader (Cosmo, Frank, & Golden, 2009). Generally speaking, *newkärs* work as military escorts or guards, and *newkär* can be a synonym for *yasaq* 'soldier' in Turkic. (Yudin, 2005). In modern Kazakh, *nöker* is an archaic word meaning of 'the royal guard of a Khan or a noble.' (Iskakov, 2011b).

–   ***atġučï*** 'archer.' This word gives the meaning of 'archer.' This word is a derivative of the Turkic verb *at-* 'shoot' with the deverbal suffix *-gU* attached with the suffix *-čI*. The Mongolian counterpart of *atġučï* is *märgän*, and they were most of the time interchangeable. However, *märgän* does not appear in *Cingiz-nama,* and a*tġučï* occurs twice in the text. *Atġučï* is *atuwšï* in Kazakh and preserves its original meaning. Meanwhile, *atġučï* also designates, in some dialects of Kazakh, the people in charge of the explosion at the mine site.

–   ***qowġïn*** 'pursuing force.' This word is a derivative of the Turkic verb *qov-* 'to chase' combined with the formative *-GXn*. The term *qowġïn* is always followed with the verb sal- 'to put' in the text, e.g., *…özi bu ellär soŋin qowġïn saldï…* 'he dispatched a pursuing force to those tribes' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). *Qowġïn* is preserved in Kazakh as *quwġïn* and keeps the same meaning (Shimin, 2005).

Military Officer

–   ***beg*** 'chief, lord.' The word is an ancient Turkic title with a long history, and first seen in old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *bägläri yämä bodunï yämä tüz ärmiš ärinč* 'both the tribe leaders and people were loyal.' (Shimin, 2005). Clauson (1972), too, considers that this word is a loanword from the ancient Chinese word 伯 (*pak/p'ɒk/po*), which is convincing. Similarly, Karlgren (1957) in his work, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, denotes the Chinese word 伯 (*pak/p'ɒk/po*) as feudal lord or chief. The semantics of (*pak/p'ɒk/po*) is coordinated with the Old Turkic *Bäg* 'the head of a clan, or tribe, a subordinate chief.' (Clauson, 1972) In the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk*, Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a) notes that *beg* has a metaphoric meaning of 'a wife's husband' because 'a husband is like a *beg* in a family.' In the Golden Horde era, a *beg* was not only a ruling lord, but also a military duty in the army. *Beg* was an honorary title that was both inherent and obtainable. There are also a few military officer titles related to *beg* which do not occur in *Cingiz-Nama*, e.g., *yüzbegi* 'centurion/ an officer of a hundred soldiers', *miŋbegi* 'an officer of a thousand soldiers', etc. In those cases, *beg* is more of a military leader than a clan chief. In the later Kazakh language, the word survives as *biy* due to phonetic changes, and its semantics have also varied. In the pre-modern time of Kazakh society, a *biy* was more like an eloquent judge who thoroughly knew the customs and traditions (Iskakov, 2011c).

Military Equipments

–   ***at*** 'horse.' This is an ancient Turkic word. It was first recorded in the 8th century Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *kültigin bašgu boz binip tägdi*. 'Kültigin rode a white horse and attacked'; *ädgü özlük atïn, qara kišin, kök täyäŋin sansïz kälürüp qop qottï* 'They sacrificed countless good horses, black sables, blue mice.' (Clauson, 1972). The term also frequently occurs in other old Turkic documents, e.g., *atïn yolïn yaġma lumčïsi iki yorïtdï* 'He sent two armies to conquer yaġma lumčïsi'. *At* is also noticeable in the *Diwan Lughaī Al-Turk*, e.g., *qïqrïp atiġ kämšälim, qalqan süŋün čomšalïm*. 'They rush their horses in bursts of killing and kill the enemies with shields and spears.' (Clauson, 1972). In *Cingiz-Nama*, *at* more likely implies 'a riding horse' or 'war horse,' and its synonyms also occur in the text, e.g., *yïlqï* 'horse' (most collectively), *biyä* 'mare,' *baytal* '2-4 years old mare,' *dönän* '3-4 years old stallion' (< Mongolian) (Csáki, 2006). It is noticeable that *at* played an important role in Turkic societies and is always connected with the war in the text, for horses are indispensable equipment in nomadic life. Cavalries are nomadic states' most advantageous military unit compared with other neighboring political powers. In modern Kazakh, *at* specifically implies a gelding, i.e., a castrated horse (Iskakov, 2011a). Meanwhile, *jïlqï* is the general name for horses. Meanwhile, its synonyms also mostly exist, e.g., *biye, baytal, dönen* 'one-year-old horse,' etc.

–   ***böydä*** 'dagger.' This word is an ancient Turkic word. *Bögdä* can be found as *bügde* in the Old Turkic documents of the 8th century, and its semantics was 'iron whip,' e.g., *süŋü qïlič bögdä* 'The saber and the iron whip.' (Clauson, 1972). Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a) recorded the meaning of *bügde* as 'dagger' *Böydä* occurs twice in the text of *Cingiz-nama*, e.g., *Böydä birlä sančïp tašġaru alïp čïqdïlar* '(He) stabbed (the head) with the dagger and went outside.' This word has been generally replaced by the Persian word *qanjar* in modern Kazakh.

- *bïčaq* 'knife.' *Bïčaq* is an ancient Turkic word, derived from the verb *bïč-* 'to cut' attached with -AK. It was first seen in the Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *yiti bičäkin* 'his sharp knife.' (Clauson, 1972). The word also appears in the Hakani language of the 11th century. M. Kashgari recorded the word as 'knife.' (Clauson, 1972). *Bïčaq* survives as *pišaq* in modern Kazakh and has little semantic changes (Iskakov, 2011a).
- *yaraġ* 'weapon.' *yaraġ* is an ancient Turkic word and a derivative of the verb *yara-* 'to be successful, beneficial, useful.' Its original meaning was 'opportunity; suitability, opportuneness.' (Clauson, 1972). *Yaraġ* kept the same meaning in the Xakani language of the 11th century. In the *Chagatay* language, *yaraġ* had semantic change into 'instrument, implement, weapon; worthy.' *Yaraġ* occurs frequently in *Cingiz-Nama* designating the meaning of 'weapon', e.g., *yaraġ qïl-* 'preparing weapons.' In Kazakh, *yaraġ* survives as *jaraġ* and means 'weapon; necessary items.' (Iskakov, 2011d)
- *jebä* 'armour.' This word is a Mongolian loanword meaning 'armour.' (Boeschoten, 2022). This word is not seen in modern Kazakh.
- *jawšan* 'chainmail.' *Jawšan* is a Persian loanword designating the meaning of 'chainmail.' According to Vásáry (2016), *jawšan* was a kind of lamellar chainmail with large breast-scales. This word does not survive in modern Kazakh.
- *qïlïč* 'sword.' *Qïlïč* is an ancient Turkic word that was first seen in the Old Turkic literature, e.g., *altun quruġsaqïmïn qïlïn käspän* 'Cutting my golden stomach with a sword.' (Tekin, 1993). This word also occurs in the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk*, e.g., *qoš qïlïč qïnqa sïġïmas* 'two swords cannot fit in one sheath.' (Makhmut & Yegeubay, 1997a). *Qïlïč* occurs five times in *Cingiz-Nama*, and there is an interesting phrase involved with this word written in the text, which is *qïlïčsïz ġïlaf, yaqasïz köŋläk* 'a sheath without a sword and a shirt without a collar.' This phrase expresses the metaphoric meaning of 'the state has no leader, and the women have no men (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). This word survives in modern Kazakh and has little semantic change.
- *qamčï* 'whip.' *Qamčï* is an ancient Turkic word, and Clauson (1972) considers that this word is a derivative of the verb *qam-* 'to flog.' *Qamčï* was first recorded in the 8th century Old Turkic literature, e.g., *qamčï yep* 'having been flogged.' Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a), too, records the original meanings and its extended meaning as 'the penis of a horse, bovine, camel.' This word occurs only once in *Cingiz-Nama* and is attached with the denominal suffix -LA being a verb *qamčïla-* 'to flog with a whip.' This word survives in modern Kazakh and has little semantic change.
- *qalqan* 'shield.' This word first appeared in the Xakani language, and its original meaning has mostly stayed the same since Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a) recorded it in the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk*, which states that *qalqan* is in one of the dialects. This word occurs three times in *Cingiz-Nama*, e.g., *qapsïz qalqan,* 'a shield without leather.' In modern Kazakh, *qalqan* preserves its original meaning and has semantically developed into 'shelter' and the metaphorical meaning 'earlobe.' (Iskakov, 2011a).
- *tolġa* 'helmet.' *Tolġa* is a loanword from the Mongolian word *doġulġa*. Gerhard, Doerfer (1975: 285) defines it as 'an iron helmet which the soldiers put on their heads.' (*eiserner Helm, den die Soldaten am Schlachttage aufs Haupt tun*). The old Turkic word for 'helmet' was *yusuq,* which has been largely replaced by *tolġa/dulġa. Tolġa* survives in Kazakh as *duwïlġa* and has the semantics are barely changed.
- *oq* 'arrow.' *Oq* is an ancient Turkic word that was first seen in Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *yüz artuq oqun urtï* (Shimin, 2005). *Oq* also designated the social organisation of Turkic society, sub-tribe, in the Old Turkic period, e.g., *on oq. Oq* occurs once in *Cingiz-Nama* and appears with *sadaq*. The semantics of *oq* is extended to 'bullet' in modern Kazakh.
- *sadaq* 'quiver.' Gerhard (1975) considers that *Sadaq* is a loanword borrowed from the Mogolian word *saġadaq* 'quiver.' The Turkic equivalence is *oqluq*, which has been largely replaced by *sadaq* among the Kipchak languages. What is more, the semantics of *sadaq* varies among the Kipchak languages, e.g., Tatar: *sadaq* 'quiver for the bow and arrows'; Kazakh: *sadaq* 'bow'; Kirghiz: *saadak* 'bow', *haġïðaq* 'wasp.' (Csáki, 2006).

Military Organisation

- *yüz* 'a unit of a hundred men.' *Yüz* is an ancient Turkic numeral word; its original meaning is 'a hundred', and it is sometimes roughly used for 'a great many.' (Clauson, 1972). In *Cingiz-Nama, yüz* is used for a military unit that consists of a hundred soldiers, e.g., *Hannïŋ qašïnda kiši az qaldï, iki yüz kiši köp bolsa üč yüz kiši bolġay erdi* 'There are very few people around Khan, probably only two hundred or three hundred at most.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). *Yüzbašï* was the commander of a unit of a hundred men, but it does not occur in *Cingiz-Nama. Yüz* survives in modern Kazakh as *jüz* and preserves its original meaning but no longer functions as a military unit.
- *ming* 'a unit of a thousand men.' *Ming* is an ancient Turkic numeral; its original meaning is 'a thousand.' During the Golden Horde era, *ming* designated a military unit consisting of a thousand soldiers. *Yüz* survives in modern Kazakh as *jüz*. It preserves its original meaning but no longer functions as a military unit.
- *tümän* 'a unit of ten thousand men.' This word was originally a numeral indicating 'ten thousand' and also used for 'an indefinitely large number.' *Tümän* has been seen at the early stage of Turkic history. Clauson (1972) considers this word to be borrowed from Tokharian. In the Chiggisid states, *tümän* was always a military unit for ten thousand men. Also, it functioned as an administrative organisation for the region, which could provide ten thousand soldiers (Cosmo et al., 2009). *Tümän* survives in modern Kazakh but as an archaic word that also lost the function of military units (Iskakov, 2011c).

- *qošun* 'a type of military unit.' Doerfer (1963) considers that *qošun* is of Mongolian origin and means 'fighting unit.' The original Mongolian form was *qosiġun*, which was 'advance guard', which semantically changed to 'smaller military unit.' It is also possible that *qošun* stemmed from the Turkic verb *qoš-* 'to gather, collect' attached with *-n*. (Csiky, 2006). *Qošun* survives in modern Kazakh as *qosïn,* and its original meaning of a military unit has been archaic; instead, *qosïn* designates 'military camp.' (Iskakov, 2011e).
- *yasal* 'phalanx.' *Yasal* is a Mongolia loanword that is derived from the verb *jasa-* 'to arrange.' Doerfer (1963) records it as 'Order of battle, phalanx.' This word appears time in the text. *Yasal* does not survive in modern Kazakh.
- *qol* 'a wing of an army; squad; army.' *Qol* is an ancient Turkic word. The original meaning of *qol* is 'the upper arm', and its metaphoric meaning is 'a wing of an army.' (Levitskaya, Dybo, & Rassadin, 2000). In *Čingiz-nama*, *ong qol* 'ring wing' and *sol qol* 'left wing' occur several times, e.g., *ong qolnï Qïyat Mamay alïp el-gün birlä Qïrïmġa ketdi*. 'Qïyat Mamay took the right wing and went to Crimea with his tribes.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). The Mongolian synonyms are *baranġar* 'right-wing' and *javanġar* 'left-wing.' Apart from that, *qol* also means '*squds*' or simply '*army*', e.g., *qol qol bolïp kelür erdilär* 'they came with a big army.' *Qol* preserves both its original meaning and metaphorical meanings in modern Kazakh (Iskakov, 2011g).
- *čerig* 'army.' This is an ancient Turkic word, and M. Kashgari considers *čerig* is stemmed from *čär* 'opposite.' (Makhmut & Yegeubay, 1997b). However, Clauson (1972) denies this speculation in terms of morphology. *Čerig* was first seen in the Old Turkic inscriptions, e.g., *šüŋüš bolsar, čärig ätär ärti*. 'he was leading an army at a battle.' In the 11th century Xakani language, the semantics of *čerig* was extended to designate 'battle line, battlefield', e.g., *alp čärigdä bilgä tärigda*. 'The hero is tested on the battlefield' (Makhmut & Yegeubay, 1997b). *Čerig* appears six times in *Cingiz-Nama*, and sometimes appears together with *yaraġ*, i.e., *čerig yaraġ* 'army and weapon.' *Čerig* survives in modern Kazakh as *šerik*; *šerik* generally means 'crowd', and the meaning of 'army' has become archaic (Iskakov, 2011f).
- *laškar* 'army.' *Laškar* is an Arabic loanword meaning 'army', and it is the most frequently used military term in *Cingiz-Nama*.

Military Operation

- *uruš* 'war, battle.' This word is an ancient Turkic word derived from the verb *ur-* 'to hit' attached with the deverbal *-Xš*. *Uruš* first appeared in the Old Turkic inscriptions of the 8th century, e.g., *äbkä tägdüküm, uruš qïlïp* 'I came back home after the battle' (Shimin, 2005). It also occurs in the Xakani language of the 11th century, Makhmut & Yegeubay (1997a) defines *uruš* as 'fight; quarrel.' In *Cingiz-Nama*, *uruš* appears after *qabap*, meaning 'besiege.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008). *Uruš* is always followed with the verb *sal-* 'to put'; *uruš sal-* means 'to wage a war, to start a battle.' *Uruš* survives as *urïs* in Kazakh and has little semantic change.
- *yürüš* 'conquest.' *Yürüš* is derived from the Old Turkic verb *yori-* whose semantics are 'to walk, march' (Clauson, 1972). It is attached with the deverbal suffix *-Xš*. However, the occurrence of *yürüš* is relatively late. *Yürüš* occurs only once in *Cingiz-Nama*. The modern Kazakh equivalence of *yürüš* is *jorïġ*.
- *turuš* 'confrontation.' This word is an ancient Turkic word that is derivative of the verb *tur-* 'remain, stay' with the deverbal suffix *-Xš*. *Turuš* first appeared in Old Turkic inscriptions in the 8th century, e.g., *turuška barma* 'do not enter into confrontations.' This word occurs only once in *Cingiz-Nama*, i .e., *Bular ham turuš bermäy uluġlarï qačtï.* 'They also could not confront, and the seniors fled.' *Turuš* survives as *turïs* in modern Kazakh, but the semantics are utterly different. *Turïs* describes the state that remains at one spot (Iskakov, 2011f).
- *fath* 'conquest.' *Fath* is an Arabic loanword whose original semantics was 'conqueror.' However, *fath* in *Cingiz-Nama* means 'conquest' according to the context, e.g., *anï fath qïldï* '(he) conquered it.' (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008).
- *ilġar* 'attack.' This word is a loanword of Mongolian origin. Doerfer (1963) records *ilġar* as 'an attack on the enemy with the mounted elite' (*ein Überfall auf den Feind* or *meist auf eine Stadt* or *mit berittene Elite*). This word does not survive in modern Kazakh.

Military Construction

- *qal'a* 'fortress; castle.' *Qal'a* is an Arabic loanword meaning 'fortress, castle.' *Qal'a* survives as qala in modern Kazakh, meaning 'city.'
- *qalqa* 'fortress; castle.' Another variant of the above mentioned *qal'a*.

Other Military Terms

- *tutqun* 'captive.' This word is a derivative of the Old Turkic verb *tut-* 'seize, hold' attached with the deverbal suffix *-GXn*. *Tutqun* was first seen in the 11th century Xakani language, M. Kashgari recorded this word into the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk* and gave the definition of 'captive.' (Yegeubay, 1997). *Tutqun* appears only once in *Cingiz-Nama*. This word exists in all modern Turkic languages (Clauson, 1972) and its synonyms are *asïr* and *yesir* in the text. *Asïr* is a loanword from the Arabic أسير (ʔasīr), and *yesir* is another variation of asïr. *Tutqun* survives in modern Kazakh and preserves the same semantics.

- **tüšken kiši** 'captive.' This phrase comprises the deverbal adjective *tüšken* 'fallen' and the noun *kiši* 'person', which conveys the meaning of 'captive.' This phrase occurs once in the text, and such an expression does not exist in modern Kazakh.
- **yaġï** 'enemy, hostile.' This word is an ancient Turkic word and first occurred in the Old Turkic inscriptions of the eighth century, e.g., *tört buluŋ qop yaġï armïš* 'all four quarters of the world were hostile.' In the eleventh century, *yaġï* preserved its original meaning as recorded in the *Diwan Lughat Al-Turk*. (Yegeubay, 1997). There is a Persian loanword, *dušman*, equally used as *yaġï*, but relatively less frequent. *yaġï* appears ten times in the text, and *dušman* occurs three times. In modern Kazakh, *yaġï* turns into *jaw* due to the sound changes. *Jaw* preserves the meaning of 'enemy' and actively appears in various phrases and proverbs, e.g., *ata jaw* 'blood feud'; *jaw jetti, el köšti* 'the enemies came, the tribe moved,'* this proverb is an expression of an unrest state (Iskakov, 2011d).
- **dušman** 'enemy.' This word is a Persian loanword and a synonym for *yaġï*. Clauson (1972) points out that in the modern south-eastern and south-western branches of the Turkic language family, *dušman* has generally replaced *yaġï*. However, *yaġï* occurs more frequently than *dušman* in *Cingiz-Nama*. *Dušman* survives in modern Kazakh as *dušpan* and has little semantic change.

Table 1 summarizes these military terms in the form of a glossary.

Table 1: *The Glossary of The Military Terms.*

No	Military terms	Translation	Page Nos of Cingiz-Nama (Kawaguchi & Nagamine, 2008)
1	*är*	warrior	69/11
2	*alp*	warrior, hero, brave	88/4; 90/19
3	*bahadïr*	warrior, hero	72/24; 90/19
4	*qarawïl / qarawul*	guard	70/19; 75/24; 97/16
5	*newkär*	royal guard	71/11; 83/13, 24; 84/3; 91/22; 92/6; 94/25; 96/20; 100/7, 8
6	*atġučï*	archer	88/4; 90/19
7	*qowġïn*	pursuing force	96/15; 97/12
8	*beg*	chief, lord	69/23; 70/12 (twice), 22; 71/15; 73/15; 75/26; 77/8; 78/14, 23; 79/20; 81/13; 82/18, 24; 83/6, 10,13; 89/13; 91/24; 93/12
9	*at*	horse	68/5; 73/18; 76/7, 9, 15, 16; 78/6; 90/9 (twice); 91/10, 18; 94/6, 21; 96/9; 97/14, 19; 98/6, 8, 14, 18, 26; 99/9, 15, 22.
10	*böydä*	dagger	83/16; 92/19
11	*bïčaq*	knife	91/10
12	*yaraġ*	weapon	70/17, 25, 26; 71/3, 6, 13, 18; 74/16; 92/17; 96/9; 97/1, 7, 18
13	*jebä*	armour	70/25; 86/5, 6 (twice), 8, 17
14	*jawšan*	chainmail	70/25
15	*qïlïč*	sword	69/11; 71/16; 73/16; 84/5; 99/6
16	*qamčï*	whip	76/7
17	*qalqan*	shield	75/8, 11, 12
18	*tolġa*	helmet	71/15; 75/8, 11, 13
19	*oq*	arrow	90/11; 98/ 18
20	*sadaq*	quiver	90/11
21	*yüz*	a unit of a hundred men	70/20; 75/1, 2; 82/2; 97/15 (twice)
22	*ming*	a unit of a thousand men	70/18; 71/22; 72/1 (twice); 75/2; 81/13, 14; 84/11
23	*tümän*	a unit of ten thousand men	81/13
24	*qošun*	a type of military unit	69/10; 71/15; 84/2, 8; 89/3
25	*yasal*	phalanx	76/5; 76/15
26	*qol*	a wing of an army; squad; army	70/13, 14; 76/4, 5; 83/7; 88/12, 13; 94/5; 98/17; 100/12
27	*čerig*	army	70/17; 78/19 (twice); 78/22
28	*laškar*	army	68/4; 70/23, 24; 71/ 7, 23; 72/19; 73/ 18, 19; 75/4, 5, 6, 20; 76/3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22; 94/3; 100/3, 4
29	*uruš*	war, battle	66/11; 67/7; 68/17; 72/7, 8, 23; 73/5; 94/5; 98/21; 98/21; 100/4
30	*yürüš*	conquest	70/18
31	*turuš*	confrontation	71/14
32	*fath*	conquest	73/4, 6
34	*ilġar*	attack	70/22
35	*qal'a*	fortress; castle	72/20; 72/21; 73/1 (twice), 2
36	*qalqa*	fortress; castle	72/6, 11, 13, 15, 19, 23
37	*tutqun*	captive	73/7
38	*asïr*	captive	76/10
39	*yesir*	captive	70/25
40	*tüšken kiši*	captive	98/17
41	*yaġï*	enemy	71/14, 16; 75/14, 25; 76/1, 7; 84/6; 97/22, 23; 99/18
42	*dušman*	enemy	77/19, 21; 82/3

Discussion

Čingiz-nāma, a 16th-century Turkic chronicle written in *Chagatay*, records historical events and presents detailed military affairs with high research value. In this research, through statistics and semantic analysis, the military terms were divided into various groups to describe them and examine their semantics in detail. A few distinctive characteristics were obtained. Out of the total 42 military terms, 25 words are of Turkic origin, 09 are of Mongolian origin, and 08 are of Arabic-Persian origin. Therefore, it was observed that in the 16th century, Turkic words still occupied a predominant position in military terms (60%). Most Turkic military terms were rooted in Old Turkic, which reflects that the ancient Turkic military culture significantly contributed to the 16th-century Central Asian Turkic society. A large number of Turkic military words are still preserved in modern Kazakh, with small semantic changes in most cases. Meanwhile, Mongolian loanwords take a large portion in military terms (21%). That indicates the profound impact of the Mongol Empire's military system and culture on Central Asian society. Some Mongolian-origin military words survive in modern Kazakh and other Kipchak languages. Nevertheless, the military terms of Arabic-Persian origins are not negligible (19%). That reflects that since the initiation of the Islamization of the Golden Horde, Arabic-Persian culture and languages have continuously influenced Central Asian Turkic-speaking people.

Military terms in *Čingiz-nāma* have quite many synonyms. On the one hand, some synonyms come from different languages due to language contact. For example, *čerig* and *laškar* are synonyms for the meaning of 'army,' but the former is of Turkic origin, and the latter is of Arabic-Persian. On the other hand, the richness of synonyms is also the result of the development of the military culture of the Turkic people. Using a large number of synonyms increases the richness of expression, conveys the different senses more accurately, and enhances the vividness of the narrative. For instance, both *qarawïl* and *newkär* signify 'guard,' yet the former is a guard within a camp or a fortress, while the latter refers to the personal guards of a khan or nobles. And *är*, *alp*, and *bahadïr* all possess the meaning of 'warrior,' yet they exhibit subtle semantic differences in various contexts. The use of military synonyms in different situations shows that the Golden Horde had a detailed classification of the scale of war and tactics. For example, when describing warfare, there are distinct terms like *uruš*, *yurus*, and *turuš* used in different contexts. By analyzing military equipment words in *Čingiz-nāma*, we can have a better understanding of the armament traditions of the Golden Horde and its successor khanates. In *Čingiz-nāma*, weapons are collectively referred to as *yaraġ*. The main attacking weapons include *böydä* 'dagger,' *bïčaq* 'knife,' *qïlïč* 'sword,' *qamčï* 'whip,' *oq* 'arrow,' *sadaq* 'quiver,' etc. Defensive equipment includes *qalqan* 'shields,' *tolġa* 'helmets,' *jebä* 'armor,' etc. At the same time, we can also observe that *at* 'horse' is the most frequently appearing military equipment term in the text, reflecting the cavalry's significant position in the Golden Horde.

From the analysis of military terms of *Čingiz-nāma*, we can also learn about the military system and culture of the Golden Horde and the subsequent Turkic people in the 16th century. The military affairs and political power in the Golden Horde are closely linked, reflected in the integration of military, political, and economic affairs. For example, *beg* is not only a tribal leader but also is responsible for being as military leader. The military system of the Golden Horde is a decimal system constructed from *yüz*, *ming*, and *tümän*. *Newkär* is the personal guard around the Khans and a vital part of the Golden Horde system. They protect the security of the Khans in peacetime and accompany the army in wartime. In some cases, they are also military commanders.

Conclusion

Čingiz-nāma was written in *Chagatai* by Ötämiš Ḥājī, who was the chronicler of the successor Khanate of the Golden Horde. It is a work of great linguistic and historical value. The analysis and study of the military terminology provide us with material for understanding the military culture and outlining the military system of the Golden Horde. The findings provide specific knowledge of the status of military terminology in Central Asian Turkic languages during the sixteenth century. At the same time, the military terms of Čingiz-nāma were compared with modern Kazakh and it was observed that the inheritance of its military culture exists until today.

References

Boeschoten, H. (2022). *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*. Leiden: Brill. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004525191

Clauson, G. (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cosmo, N. D., Frank, A. J., & Golden, P. B. (2009). *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age*. Cambridge University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/CHO9781139056045

Csáki, É. (2006). *Middle Mongolian Loan Words in Volga Kipchak Languages*. Otto Harrassowitz Verlag. Retrieved from https://z-lib.io/book/14992912

Csiky, G. (2006). The Tuzūkāt-i Tīmūrī as a Source for Military History. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 59*(4), 439-491. doi: https://doi.org/10.1556/aorient.59.2006.4.3

Doerfer, G. (1963). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* (Vol. I). Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Erdal, M. (2004). *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047403968

Gerhard, D. (1975). *Türkische Und Mongolische Elemente Im Neupersischen* (Vol. IV). Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Göncöl, C. (2020). Remarks on the Čingiz-nāmä of Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī. In I. Zimonyi (Ed.), *Ottomans–Crimea–Jochids*. Szeged: University of Szeged, Department of Altaic Studies. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/44142263

Göncöl, C. (2023). Redactions and Dates of the Compilation of the Čingiz-nāmä of Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī. *Golden Horde Review, 11*(3), 582-591. doi: https://doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2023-11-3.582-591

Grekov, B. D., & Yakubovsky, A. Y. (1998). *The Golden Horde and Its Downfall*. Moscow and Leningrad, USSR Academy of Sciences Press.

Ḥāǰī, Ö. (2008). *Čingīz-Nāma. Edited and translated by Takushi Kawaguchi and Hiroyuki Nagamine. Studia Culturae Islamicae 94*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Iskakov, Z. (2011a). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. II). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011b). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. XI). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011c). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. III). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011d). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. VI). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011e). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. X). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011f). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. XV). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Iskakov, Z. (2011g). *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language* (Vol. I). Almaty: "Arys" Publishing House.

Ivanics, M., & Usmanov, M. A. (2002). Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende I. *Studia Uralo-altaica, 44*, 1-324. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/dce2c957e1c6f67b5d716d6680e67a5b

Karlgren, B. (1957). *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.

Kawaguchi, T., & Nagamine, H. (2008). *Čingīz-Nāma, (Studia Culturae Islamicae No. 94)*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. Retrieved from http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/en/publications/islamicae

Levitskaya, L. S., Dybo, A. V., & Rassadin, V. I. (2000). *Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages: General Turkic and Inter-Turkic Foundations for the Letter "K"*. Moscow: Indrik.

Maḥmūd, K. s., Robert, D., & James, K. (1982). *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Lughat Al-Turk)*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Print.

Makhmut, K., & Yegeubay, A. K. (1997a). *Turkish Dictionary (Dīwān Lughāt Al-Turk)* (Vol. I). Almaty: "KHANT" Publishing House.

Makhmut, K., & Yegeubay, A. K. (1997b). *Turkish Dictionary (Dīwān Lughāt Al-Turk)* (Vol. III). Almaty: "KHANT" Publishing House.

Redhouse, J. W. (1890). *A Turkish and English Lexicon: Shewing in English the Significations of the Turkish Terms*. Constantinople/Istanbul: American Mission.

Rentzsch, J. (2015). *Modality in the Turkic Languages: Form and Meaning from a Historical and Comparative Perspective*. De Gruyter. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112209189

Sattorova, Z. I., & Omonov, Q. S. (2022). Textual Features of the Work "Dīwān Lughāt Al-Turk". In *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences* (pp. 212-216). Retrieved from https://www.orientalpublication.com/index.php/iscrc/article/view/835

Shimin, G. (2005). *A Study of Old Turkic Inscriptions*. China Minzu University Press, Beijing.

Sinor, D. (1981). The Inner Asian Warriors. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, 101*(2), 133-144. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/601755

Tekin, T. (1993). *Irk Bitig: The Book of Omens*. Turcologica 18, Leipzig: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Vásáry, I. (1976). The Golden Horde Term Daruġa and Its Survival in Russia. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 30*(2), 187-197. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23657271

Vásáry, I. (1995). Mongolian Impact on the Terminology of the Documents of the Golden Horde. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 48*(3), 479-485. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/43391245

Vásáry, I. (2016). Medieval Russian Terms for 'Armor' of Oriental Origin. In I. Zimonyi & O. Karatay (Eds.), *Turcologica Series: Central Eurasia in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of Peter B. Golden* (pp. 435-445). Leipzig: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Yegeubay, A. K. (1997). *Turkish Dictionary (Dīwān Lughāt Al-Turk) Volume I*. Almaty: "Khant" Publishing House.

Yudin, I. P. (2005). *Chingiz-Name*. Almaty: Dyk-Press.