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1. The Bayṭarat al-vāzīḥ (the Easily Understood Book of Farriery), a hippo-
logical work, was a product of 14th century Egypt. At the time of its writing,
a hundred years had already elapsed since the Mamluks had seized power from
the hands of their Ayyubid masters. These Mamluks, mainly Kipchak and Cir-
cassian slaves who had been employed as royal body guards, proved themselves
strong rulers, excellent organizers, and successful statesmen.

It was under their rule that the majority of the Arab people were united in
a solid state formation and that Arabic-Islamic culture achieved its greatest surge1.

2. The Mamluks spoke three dialects: Kipchak, Turkman, and Old Ana-
tolian. In the first half of the period of Mamluk rule (from 1250 to 1400), the ma-
majority used Kipchak, an Eastern Turkic dialect from Southern Russia, the original
homeland of most Mamluks. Only a minority spoke Turkman. In the second half
of the Mamluk period (to 1517), Old Anatolian was also spoken.

The literary language of the Mamluks differed considerably from the col-
loquial tongue. It had developed in Khorazm at the turn of the 13th century, and
came to the Mamluks through the area of the Golden Horde and the Crimea, and
is referred to as the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language2.

3. We find traces of a literary life among the Mamluks as early as the sec-
ond half of the fourteenth century3. The Mamluk Sultans encouraged science
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and literature. At their command Arabic and Persian literary works were translated, and Turkic works from various cultural centers were copied or adapted. Scholars and men of letters from the Golden Horde and Turkestan sought their fortunes at the Mamluk Court.

And yet only a few documents written in the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language have come down to us. Among the main ones we find the Iḥšādʿl-mulāk vaʿs-salāṭīn (A Guide for Kings and Sultans), an interlinear translation of an Arabic fiqh book, the translation of Saʿdī's Gulistān, an anthology of poems collected by Sayf-i Sarāyī, and the topic of our present discussion, the Kitāb Bayṭārat al-vāżīḥ. The work was first made known to the public by Saadet Çağatay in her paper «Eine osttürkische Handschrift: Bayṭāratu'l-vāżīḥ>, delivered at the Twenty-Fourth Congress of Orientalists in München.

4. While the title of the Arabic original was probably Bayṭārat and was followed by its author’s name, the Turkic translation was given a new title by the translator. In the introduction he writes: «I have named this book Bayṭārat al-vāżīḥ» (2r: 14-15). By adding the word vāżīḥ he obviously meant to suggest that the Turkic work would be more comprehensible to his readers than the original. Although the Turkic translation is not dated and does not contain the names of its author or its translator, indirect evidence reveals that it dates from the last decades of the fourteenth century.

The Bayṭārat is the only Eastern Middle Turkic written record that deals with veterinary medicine. It is an indispensable source book both for the description of Mamluk-Kipchak and for research into the history of the Turkic lexicon in ge-

4 The lexical material of this Mamluk-Kipchak document has been included in the Middle-Turkic and English Dictionary which is in preparation at the Near Eastern Center, the University of California, Los Angeles.


8. MS: bu bayṭāra aşlığ kitāb «this book, named Bayṭara» (2r: 7). The author’s name is not given.

9 It has been used as one of the major sources for the description of the Mamluk-Kipchak Literary language. Cf. the preliminary notes on my forthcoming Mamluk-Kipchak Grammar in Studia Turcaica, Budapest 1971, pp. 89-102.
neral. Secondly, it is one of those rare Islamic medical works which discusses formulas for the individually described diseases, gives practical advice on their application, and reports on veterinary experience with various drugs and diseases.

Furthermore, being a translation of an Arabic work from a special field, it is an important source for studies in the interference of the Arabic and Turkic lexical systems.

5. There are two MSS of the Bayṭaraṭ. The complete version is in Istanbul in the Topkapı Palace Museum, (Revan Köşküt, no. 1665). It consists of 69 fołios. The second MS (the language of which is slightly different) is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Blochet, i. p. 249).

6. The translation of the Arabic work was made at the behest of a certain T olu Beng, a courtier in the service of the Circassian Mamluks. The introduction relates how the order was given. The translator says: «He (i.e., Tolu Beg) summoned me, the poor and miserable one, into his presence and commanded: ‘Translate this book entitled Bayṭara from Arabic into Turkic.’ Since he was so incontinent (iṅgān rağbat biłā tałab ʿqillī), I the poor and miserable servant, was astonished and unable to disobey his command. So I obeyed him and set out to write this book with all the power I had within me; with all my mental faculties and with all my perseverance» (2r: 6-12).

7. The author of the work is not known. Nor was it possible for me to find the Arabic work that served as the basis for the Turkic translation. Some internal evidence suggests the following concerning the author and his work:

(a) The author was a learned veterinarian (ustād) who himself practiced veterinary medicine. This is apparent from his comments on a formula (No 46) recommended as a cure for general weakness in a horse (ʿażal). He remarks: «This is a formula (iʿlāc) I have seen in books, but I have not used it and have had no experience with it (istiʿmal qilmadım taqi tacriba qilmadım)» (33r: 11-12).

(b) The author was acquainted with Abū Yusuf al-Kindī’s medical works.

---

10 It has been included as a basic source for the Eastern Middle Turkic and English Dictionary mentioned in Note 3.
on the treatment of the ailments that afflict men and applied several of his formulas in the treatment of horses. In one place he recommends a formula (No 16) for treating the chapped skin of a horse's leg (caran). In another, he comments on a formula (No 246) for reducing swellings, saying: «This formula (davâ) is one of the formulas of Abû Yusuf. It has been proved effective (mucarrab) for swellings» (69v : 9).

(c) The author of the Arabic original of the Bayṭarat believed in the value of scientific medicine and was fully aware of the responsibility of his profession. He disapproved of ignorant practitioners whose only aim in treating horses was to accumulate wealth. He says: «There are very many veterinarians (bayṭâlar) who sit by the roadside and prepare formulas for horses and make money thereby (aqčâ hasîl qîlûr). Many horses perish in their hands, but they do not care. Beware of such ignorant veterinarians» (23r : 16-19).

(d) The original work seems to have been an abridged version of a longer one. The version used for the Turkish translation does not contain all the information the author promises. For example, while he mentions that there are 249 diseases that afflict horses (16v : 11-12), he actually discusses only 107. In another place he admits that he has not told all that he knows about horses: «People would get lost (gârq bol-) in all this detail. In addition, he who knows what we have said above, will not need (to know) more. To know this much is enough» (11r : 23-25).

8. The Bayṭarat consists of ten chapters. Chapter I is the introduction. Chapter II relates the duties of horsemen. Chapter III tells us what points to look for when selecting a horse. Chapter IV enumerates the main characteristics of horses. Chapter V deals with desirable and undesirable physical characteristics. Chapter VI tells us how to determine the behaviour and capacity of a horse on the basis of its physical characteristics. Chapter VII is devoted to the differences between the physical features of a stallion and those of a mare. Chapter VIII provides additional information on mares, especially those with foals. Chapter IX lists the unsoundnesses and stable vices of the horse. The last, Chapter X deals with the diseases that afflict horses and recommends formulas for treating them.

9. The last chapter is the longest and most important. It discusses 109 diseases and describes 246 formulas, making mention of 315 items of materia medica as ingredients of the formulas.

From the figures above it is clear that the work provides more lexical data concerning materia medica and diseases than either of the other two works from the same period: the Khorazmian Turkic version of the Muqaddi-
10. The sections devoted to each disease exhibit the following structure: First the name of the disease (agəği) is mentioned, mostly in Arabic, sometimes in Turkic or in Persian. Then its symptoms (aləmat) are described as they may be recognized in the behavior of the horse. This section is especially important for Arabic, Persian and Turkic lexicography because of the valuable information it contains. The Persian word ḫunām or ḫunmān for example, is only vaguely defined by lexicographers. According to Steingass\textsuperscript{17} it is «a disease to which horses, asses and mules are subject.» From the Bayṭarāt we learn that ḫunām is «a flatus on the horse’s leg» (48r : 5) and, of course, we also learn how this condition should be treated.

The third part of the section discusses the prognosis Le of the disease. Here we find remarks such as «Very few horses recover from this disease» (42v: 3), or, «This is a very bad defect. A horse so afflicted cannot be used for anything but turning mills» (39r: 11). After this, one or more formulas are given. The ingredients are enumerated, specified, and measured. The method of preparing the medication (‘ilāc) is carefully described with suggestions for substitutes when rare ingredients are not available. The method of applying the medication is explained. This is the main part of the section. It is followed by a description of the results that may be expected from the treatment. If the horse does not improve, further medication (taqi bir ‘ilāc) is recommended, or the case is declared hopeless: «This horse cannot be cured, he will die» (38v: 22) or «There is no other remedy (ţozgā čara yoq turur)» (26r : 3) or «You should put him to the watermill or slaughter him and eat him» (32v : 15).

11. Here in its entirety is a typical section. It deals with madness: «Another disease the horse is subject to is madness (cunun bolmaq). Its symptoms (aləmat) are that the horse opens his nostrils wide, hangs his head down, walks to and fro and cannot remain in one place. He does not eat his fodder and does not drink.«To prepare a medication, the brain and the bile of an owl (iuki quş) and the fat from the intestine of an eagle (qara quş) are taken, each in the amount of one məqəl. They are mashed together and mixed with the urine of a hog (toŋğuz). The hog should be a domesticated one and a male.»

«The drug is poured into the horse’s nostrils. When a human being (aadam

\textsuperscript{17} Steingass, F., \textit{A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary}. London, 1892.
oğlı) goes mad (macnûn bolsa), the same medication is applied. It is effective, God willing».

12. In this paper I will focus attention on to the technical vocabulary of the Baytarat.

In dealing with written records in Turkic, my interest goes beyond the formal analysis of the expression and is mainly focused on the content of the language at a given historical stage. This is in full agreement with the view that a language is in all stages a self-sufficient system and, as a means of articulating reality, is the result of a historical process.

In such a content-oriented analysis, lexical items from stable and coherent semantic fields (such as those of religion, medicine, etc.) play an important role because they reveal the language community's knowledge and understanding of the areas of reality covered by them18.

It is from this point of view that I will treat the technical vocabulary of our Mamluk-Kipchak document.

13. Of the 109 terms for diseases in the Baytarat 90 are Arabic, only 19 are Turkic none are Persian. Two of the Arabic terms are given with their Turkic equivalents. This raises the number of Turkic terms to 21.

The majority of Turkic terms for diseases are descriptive, rather than appellative. In form, the descriptive terms are syntactic structures: (a) Structures of modification as qarin ağrığı (XXXVI) «stomach ache» (40v: 23), siègir ağrığı (X1) «cow’s disease» (42r: 1), ma’dâ (Ar. mi’dâ) ağrığı «stomach ache» (58r: 16), öwük ağrığı (LXXXI) «pain in the lungs» (58v: 14), tuyaq ağrığı (XCV) «disease of the hoof» (64v: 6), bögrük ağrığı (CI) «disease of the kidney» (58v: 20), qarninda yel (LXXXII) «air in the [horse’s] stomach» (59v: 23), gursaqda qarhâ (LXXXIV) «a boil in the stomach» (60v: 18). (b) Structures of predication such as qulaqî ışitimâk (XXVI) «deafness» (35v: 21), dimâğî ışsal bolmaq (XXXVIII) «disease of the brain» (41r: 25), qâlan ya ‘aqrâb urjân (LXXVII) «bite of a serpent or scorpion» (57v: 18), gawug tutulmaq (CVIII) «strangury» (69r: 13), aq ya ‘hiîmî yer (L) «the horse eats fresh marsh-mallows» (46r: 15), qurtlar bolur ağrîlg qarrîna (LXXVIII) «the horse has maw-worm» (58r: 5), zâkari salînur (LXXV) «the horse’s penis hangs down» (61r: 3), qulaq iêndî cîban cîqar «boils appear in the horse’s ear» (66v: 20). (c) Structures of complementation such as çunûn bolmaq (XXXIV) «madness» (42r: 16), tavuq tezâkin yemîk (LXXX) «the horse has eaten of the dung of hens» (58v: 6).

There are only two Turkic terms of the appellate type, both consist of a single word. One is the rather broad term sisik¹⁹ (CIX) «swelling» (69v: 10), the other, given with its Arabic equivalent (jünän), is maňqav «glanders»²⁰ (25v: 5).

The Arabic terms, on the other hand, are mostly (80 of a total of 90) appellate and are single words. They are names of the disease in the proper sense of the word, e.g., maňš (I) «swelling» (17v: 5), intišär (II) «swelling in the tendons» (20r: 9), sirjân (VII) «cancer» (27r: 17), 'uqqâl (XV) «lameness» (31r: 24), qama' (XVIII) «swelling, tumour» (32r: 21), namla (XXIV) «a crack on the horse's hoof» (33r: 19), naţha (XXXI) «hernia» (39r: 13), bavâsîr (XI)  şiţulas» (42v: 14), qamla (XLV) «lice infested» (45r: 5), rubuvv (LXI) «asthma» (50v: 19), xarâq (LXXXVIII) «leprosy» (61v: 19), nikab «being sîp-shouldered» (63r: 8), yarâqân (XCII) «jaundice» (65r: 1), carab (CVII) «scab, itch» (68r: 18), etc.

Nine of the Arabic terms are structures of modification of the HEAD < MODIFIER. Some of them have the classical vocalization, such as vacca'ul-asr (LXX) «pain caused by the retention of urine» (55v: 1), vacca'ul-qalîb (LXVIII) «pain in the heart» (54r: 21), xarîbat-ul-hâšî (LVII) «pimple on a horse» (49r: 9), mîrrat-ul-hâšîcam (XXXIV) «irritated bile» (39v: 2), whereas others occur in low Arabic phonemic forms such as mirra yâbisa (XXXVII) «dry bile» (40v: 18), vacca' kabi (LXVI) «pain in the liver» (53r: 24), rîf cimâl (LXV) «flatus on a camel» (53r: 7), rîf há'ica (XLIII) «malignant flatus» (44v: 2).

14. Of the 315 terms for materia medica occurring in the Baytârat 234 are Arabic, 74 Turkic, and 7 Persian.

Most of the Turkic terms in this category (46 in number), like those for diseases, are descriptive. They are structures of modification (simple or complex possessive structures or adverbial constructions). Some of them include Arabic or Persian constituents such as āş yağı «myrtle oil» (42v: 22), au fulful «white pepper» (57v: 22), gulaj suwî «rose water» (66v: 5), ḥamîr sirkaşi «wine vinegar» (47v: 7), nabîy qamîş «Nabatean reed» (51r: 8), xaytân suwî «the sap of the olive tree» (62v: 14). Others consist of native Turkic elements, for example aq yüzâm «white grapes» (36r: 1), eči yağı «goat fat» (50r: 13), ič yaığı «lard» (48r: 11), kümîş boqî «silver dross» (65v: 6), qara quşnînég ič yağı «fat from an eagle’s

¹⁹ Bashkir šešek «swelling» (Alumov et al. 658a). Mn. Turkish has şeq.
²¹ Final consonant clusters in Arabic words are mostly disjoined in Mamluk-Kipchak by a prosthetic vowel.
intestine» (42r: 21), _sarî yağ_ «clarified butter» (40r: 12), _tekâni ng yağı_ «fat from a he-goat» (62v: 8).

The appellative terms in Turkic for _materia medica_ - more numerous than those for diseases - are common everyday terms. They are words for animals, agricultural products, food, parts of the body, plants and their fruit, and spices, for example: _arpa_ «barley» (56r: 11), _bal_ «honey» (48v: 11), _bügday_ «wheat» (40v: 10), _buz_ «ice» (18r: 4), _çaqır_ «wine» (47r: 24), _küll_ «ashes» (22r: 13), _manuq_ «cotton» (47r: 4), _qan_ «blood» (20v: 8), _qapuq_ «bark» (49v: 9), _qara_ «soot» (29r: 10), _qaymaq_ «cream» (67r: 16), _quryuq_ «tail fat» (34v: 2), _sar rîmsaq_ «garlic» (64r: 13), _sîgân_ «onion» (55v: 3), _süt_ «milk» (43r: 18), _yağ_ «oil» (31r: 15), _yogurt_ «yogurt» (48r: 2), _yumurtâ_ «egg» (20v: 6), _yüzyürlük_ «cress» (63v: 14). There is not a single Turkic appellative term that would be used in a medical sense only.

The great majority of the Arabic terms, like those for diseases, are appellative. They consist of single words, mostly native, and also of a few of Greek and some of Persian origin. Words from the two latter groups follow the Arabic phonemic structure. Along with everyday words we find technical terms for _materia medica_, e.g., _'adas_ «lentil» (56v: 9), _afîrbiyân_ «euphorbium» (31v: 11), _alûc_ «elecampane» (52r: 11), _'anczarît_ «sarcoccol» (24r: 6), _baftim_ «turgeon grain» (35r: 22), _bavraq_ «borax» (65r: 11), _câvîr_ «oponax» (58r: 8) from Persian _gâvîr_, _fîtunc_ «aquatic mint» (36v: 9) from Persian _pûdîna_, _gûr_ «sweet bay» (68v: 15), _hanamâ_ «stone parsley» (36v: 13), _isfîzâc_ «white lead» (51v: 3) from Persian _sapîd êb_, _kibrît_ «sulphur» (68v: 8), _marzancâs_ «marjoram» (67v: 3) from Persian _marzangös_, _murdâsang_ «litharge» (25r: 4) from Persian _murdâr_ sang, _nûra_ «quicklime» (21v: 11), _qasnî_ «galbanum» (51v: 24), _raçiyânac_ «fennel» (51v: 1) from Persian _raçiyânâ_, _zancabil_ «ginger» (46v: 1), _zarnîb_ «arsenic» (46v: 9), _zaybaq_ «mercury» (48v: 21).

Some of the Arabic terms are structures of modification of the possessive and adjectival types. They occur mostly in the low Arabic form, though structures with classical vocalization also occur, e.g., _bûhur maryam_ «hog’s fennel» (45r: 8), _aşûlu’s-sûs_ «licorice root» (24v: 16), _dam al-ahvain_ «dragon’s blood» (20v: 5), _faqât al-azhar_ «the flower of the bog-rush» (36v: 12), _karjas cabâli_ «mountain parsley» (36v: 10), _nafît asvad_ «black naphtha» (68v: 6), _qişqa hîmâr_ «wild cucumber» (60r: 2), _sûsan barrî_ «wild lily» (50r: 14), _zânîb ‘aqrâb_ «scorpion’s tail» (38v: 8).

Those Persian terms which have not been modified according to the Arabic phonemic structure may be loan elements in the Turkic and Arabic vocabulary, e.g., _bîr_ «the fruit of the jujube tree» (48r: 14), _hurmâ_ «date» (21r: 20), _nânhwâh_ «bishop’s weed» (67v: 15), _râvand_ «rubarb» (36r: 4), _zâc_ «vitriol» (32r: 18).
15. The first thing that strikes one's eye in this lexical survey is the poverty of Mamluk-Kipchak in technical terms of Turkic origin. Such poverty was certainly not characteristic of the Turkic languages. It is true that abstract terms had not developed to the extent they had in Semitic or Indo-European languages. It is also a fact that in a new semantic field, such as that dealing with the religion of Islam, the Turkic vocabulary was not always able to provide native terms and therefore borrowed Arabic elements. Lexical interference also prompted such an influx. But what we see in Mamluk-Kipchak, is more than what could be explained by such lexical borrowing. Beyond the introduction of new terms for new notions, we witness a giving up of old, traditional Turkic words in favor of Arabic ones.

In order to show that even terms of Turkic origin attested in contemporary or earlier Turkic languages are missing in the Baytarat, let us compare a group of Khorazmian terms with their equivalents in our Mamluk-Kipchak document. I take the list of plants in the Khorazmian version of the Muqaddimatu’l-adab and compare them with what we find in our list of terms for materia medica.

Khor. yasmuq «lentil», BAY ‘adas (56v: 9); Khor. kāčirā «safflower», BAY ‘asfar (49r: 20); Khor. bandu «rocket», BAY carcîr (37r: 8); Khor. būrlügič «ivy», BAY lablāb (61v: 12); Khor. kāčirā urugī «safflower seed», BAY qirţim (55r: 10); Khor. boya-«fennel flower», BAY şuntuz (68v: 7); Khor. yulqun «lifian-rsk tree», BAY tarjā (55r: 11); Khor. qızıl čečêk «red rose», BAY vərd oğmar (58v: 2).

In all these examples original Turkic words in Khorazmian Turkic are represented in our Mamluk-Kipchak document by Arabic terms.

16. Not only were Turkic terms replaced by Arabic ones: the Persian terms which had already been integrated into Khorazmian Turkic were also replaced. The following illustrations, again from the Muqaddimatu’l-adab, demonstrate this clearly:

Khor. böstân-afruz «sweet basil», BAY afranc-mûšik (41v: 8); Khor. turpa «radish», BAY faical (44r: 24); Khor. kasnî «endive», BAY hindibû (66r: 24); Khor. sipandân «mustard», BAY hardal (68v: 24); Khor. bêd-ancîr «castor-oil plant», BAY hîrva’ (33r: 13); Khor. bûdêm «almond», BAY lûz (65v: 10); Khor. pûdina «mint», BAY jûtunc (58r: 19).

Here, too, we can observe a definite tendency toward the Arabization of the vocabulary of the Baytarat. But this is not an isolated case. Other Mamluk-Kipchak documents reveal the same thoroughgoing Arabization.

Let us take the chief representative of Mamluk-Kipchak court literature: the translation of Sa'di's *Gulistan*. The translator, Sayf, from Saray, the capital of the Golden Horde, instead of translating the Persian words of the original with purely Turkic terms, preferred to render them with Arabic equivalents. He has *durrāc* «partridge» (64r: 2) for *kibkān*; *jažīhat* «disgrace» (176r: 12) for *sarzaniš*; *fuqur* «poor» (49r: 6) for *darvīşān*; *julus* «small coins» (101v: 9) for *pažiz*; *vahāl* «sin» (46v: 7°) for *gunāh*, etc.

17. Two factors may account for the Arabization of the Mamluk-Kipchak vocabulary. One of them was the fact that the Mamluk-Kipchak language, both on the colloquial and literary levels, was in a secondary position from an ethnic as well as a cultural point of view. The speakers of this language were surrounded by the Arabs whose language was the carrier of a different and higher culture. In such a situation Mamluk-Kipchak served rather as a means of adopting the Arab culture than as a medium for creating its own values. This, in turn, led to the bilingualism of the Turks in Egypt with the predominance of Arabic, the prestige language, and the secondary role of the native Turkic tongue.

18. The other factor responsible for the Arabization of the Mamluk-Kipchak lexicon was the fact that fourteenth century Mamluk-Kipchak literature was an importation. Its poets and authors were not natives of Egypt but had come from the Golden Horde, Crimea, and Khorazm. In the new atmosphere this literature could only be appreciated by a small section of the Mamluk elite. It had no homogeneous language community at its base.

This literature was not able to give birth to original works. The literary documents of this period consist only of adaptations from Persian, translations from Arabic, and *naqīras* (parallel poems) on Khorazmian and Old Anatolian poems. The unproductive character of Mamluk-Kipchak literature was the result of the stagnation of the Mamluk-Kipchak literary language.

19. In conclusion I wish to sum up the linguistic outcome of this lexical survey. I mentioned at the beginning that Mamluk-Kipchak branched off from Khorazmian, the literary language of the Turks in Khorazm and the Golden Horde.

Turcologists have focused their attention on delineating the differences between these two Turkic languages. They have, however, restricted their observation to the phonemic and morphological features of these languages and have,

23 Cf. the lexical analysis in the Introduction to *A Fourteenth Century Turkic Translation of Sa'di's Gulistan*, pp. 12 - 17.
as a result, established a limited list of deviations in the phonemic and morphological systems. On the basis of their conclusions, it appears that Khorazmian and Mamluk-Kipchak actually do not differ significantly and may indeed be considered as one and the same language.

But that would be a gross mistake. For if we extend our comparison to the lexical systems as we have done with the technical terms for diseases and *materia medica*, we find decisive differences between the two languages.

Lexical evidence shows that the vocabulary of Khorazmian Turkic was more homogeneous, more systemic - betraying a language in constant activity and with genuine accomplishments. Mamluk-Kipchak, on the other hand, had a disorganized and decaying lexical system. It succumbed to Arabic, gave up its traditional content, and ceased to create new values of its own.

20. Regarded on the basis of a lexical, rather than a structural analysis, we may understand why these languages developed as they did. Khorazmian, with its creativity ensured by a solid lexical system and a firm ethnological basis, became the language of the Central Asian renaissance, the vehicle of the extremely rich and original Chagatay literature. It flourished for more than four centuries and has to a certain extent survived in the Modern Uzbek language.

Mamluk-Kipchak, on the other hand, flourished for only a short time. By the first decades of the Fifteenth Century it had already gone out of use. From then on literary works in the Mamluk Court would be produced in Old Anatolian Turkic.

---

24 Instructive is Eckmann's paper on how Old Anatolian Turkic took the place of Mamluk-Kipchak in the early decades of the 15th century. Cf. TDAYB 1964, pp. 35-41.