

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2663-4619/125/13-22>

Gulsanam Norova

Navoi Innovation University

Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4802-3627>

gulsanam1981ndpi@umail.uz

Dialectology and Lexical Relationships of the Turkish Languages in Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk

Abstract

This article scientifically analyzes the dialectological and lexical relationships of the 11th-century Turkic languages based on Mahmud Qashqari's work *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*. The phonetic, morphological, and semantic features of the Karluk, Kipchak, Oghuz, and other Turkic dialects mentioned in the work are compared, and their territorial distribution at that time, historical and ethnolinguistic features are determined. The study sheds light on the internal structural connections, common roots, and differential signs between Turkic languages through a comprehensive classification of lexical units in the work *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* and their division into semantic areas. The consistent continuity of dialectal explanations given by Qashqari in the current system of Turkic languages is also shown. This article allows us to evaluate *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* not only as a historical dictionary, but also as one of the oldest dialectological sources of Turkic languages.

Keywords: *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk, Mahmud al-Kashgari, Turkic languages, dialectology, dialect classification, lexical units, linguogeography, linguistic areal analysis, Karluk, Kipchak, Oghuz dialects, pan-Turkic lexicon, historical linguistics, ethnolinguistics, lexical-semantic relations, dialect interaction, development of Turkic languages*

Gülsanam Norova

Nəvəi İnnovasiya Universiteti

filologiya elmləri üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4802-3627>

gulsanam1981ndpi@umail.uz

“Divanü lüğət it-türk” əsərində türk dilinin dialektologiyası və leksik əlaqələri

Xülasə

Bu məqalədə Mahmud Kaşğarının “Divanü lüğət it-türk” əsərinə əsaslanaraq XI əsr türk dillərinin dialektoloji və leksik əlaqələri elmi cəhətdən təhlil edilir. Əsərdə adı çəkilən Karluk, Qıpçaq, Oğuz və digər türk dialektlərinin fonetik, morfoloji və semantik xüsusiyyətləri müqayisə edilir, onların o dövrdəki ərazi bölgüsü, tarixi və etnolinqvistik xüsusiyyətləri müəyyənləşdirilir.

Tədqiqatda “Divanü lüğət it-türk” əsərindəki leksik vahidlərin hərtərəfli təsnifatı və onların semantik sahələrə bölünməsi yolu ilə türk dilləri arasındakı daxili struktur əlaqələrinə, ortaq köklərə və differensial əlamətlərə işıq salınır. Kaşğarının mövcud türk dilləri sistemində verdiyi dialekt izahlarının ardıcıl davamlılığı da göstərilir.

Bu məqalə bizə “Divanü lüğət it-türk” əsərini təkcə tarixi lüğət kimi deyil, həm də türk dillərinin ən qədim dialektoloji mənbələrindən biri kimi qiymətləndirməyə imkan verir.

Açar sözlər: *Divanü lüğət it-türk, Mahmud Kaşğari, türk dilləri, dialektologiya, dialekt təsnifatı, leksik vahidlər, linqvocoğrafiya, linqvoareal təhlil, Karluk, Qıpçaq, Oğuz dialektləri, pantürk leksikonu, tarixi dilçilik, etnolinqvistika, leksik-semantik əlaqə, dialekt qarşılıqlı təsiri, türk dillərinin inkişafı*

Introduction

The work "Devoni lug'otit turk", created in the 11th century, as the first encyclopedic dictionary of Turkic languages, is considered an invaluable scientific heritage not only of its time, but also of the linguistics of the entire Turkic world. This rare work was created by Mahmud Kashgari, in which the linguistic features of the Turkic tribes, their areas of residence, ethnocultural life, customs and worldview are described on a systematic and scientific basis. The work not only contains lexical units, but also provides detailed explanations of their scope, semantic layers, phonetic and grammatical features.

Therefore, "Devoni lug'otit turk" serves as a primary source in restoring the historical image of the Turkic languages. Kashgari does not limit the words in the dictionary to a simple explanation, but rather explains them by indicating which tribe or dialect they belong to. This makes the work an important source for dialectology and linguo-area studies, along with historical lexicography.

In his work, Mahmud Kashgari organizes the internal classification of Turkic languages, dialect differences, and linguistic interrelationships between them into a scientifically based system. He divides the languages of the Turkic tribes into large dialect groups such as Karluk, Kipchak, and Oghuz, and shows the phonetic, morphological, and lexical differences of each through specific examples. This classification is recognized as one of the oldest scientific approaches that allowed us to determine the genealogical and areal relationships of Turkic languages.

The special value of the work is that its rich lexical material serves as an important methodological basis for studying the process of formation, dialectological differentiation and dynamics of historical development of modern Turkic languages. The words in "Devon" clearly describe the pan-Turkic lexicon, local dialectal layers, ethnotoponymic units and cultural-spiritual concepts that existed in the Turkic world of the 11th century. This makes it possible to identify lexical-areal differences and similarities between modern Turkic languages, as well as to conduct historical-linguistic reconstruction work on a scientific basis.

Research

In this regard, "Devoni lug'otit turk" is valued not only as a dictionary, but also as a large scientific complex that forms the foundation of the history of languages, dialectology and linguo-area studies of the Turkic world. The information in the work remains one of the main sources of research conducted in the fields of Turkology, historical linguistics, ethnolinguistics and cultural studies today.

Mahmud Kashgari, in classifying Turkic languages, created a perfect scientific system, not limited to lexical differences, but also taking into account geographical, ethnic, genealogical and phonetic-normative features. He deeply observed the areas of residence, ethnic composition and dialect characteristics of Turkic tribes, and sought to scientifically substantiate their linguistic characteristics. This classification was extremely advanced for its time and continues to retain its significance in modern Turkology.

In particular, the work shows that the languages of tribes such as Qarluq, Chigil and Yag'mo belong to the Qarluq dialect group. Kashgari explains their phonetic and morphological features with specific examples. For example, the soft pronunciation of some consonants or phonetic assimilation phenomena are widespread in the Qarluq dialect. In particular, the $q \rightarrow g'$ shift is manifested in the use of the word "qağu" (raven) in the Qarluq variant as "ğğağu", and the $t \rightarrow s$ shift is manifested in the occurrence of the verb "otlan-" (to prepare) in the form "oslan" (Atalay, 1939–1941, pp. 128–131).

As lexical examples, the word "yalma" is used in the Chigil dialect in the meaning of "soft, gentle", and the word "aruq" in the Qarluq pronunciation means "river path, water course". Modern Uzbek and Uyghur languages are direct successors of the Qarluq dialect tradition. For example, the similarity of the Uzbek "yol" and Uyghur "yol" forms indicates that they are rooted in a common Qarluq root. Also, the Uyghur form "öy" (house) corresponds to the Qarluq pronunciation noted by Kashgari (Atalay, 1939, p. 130).

The language system formed in the areas inhabited by the Kipchak and Oghuz-Kipchak tribes constitutes the Turkic Kipchak layer. Kashgari very clearly notes the phonetic changes observed in this dialect.

For example, the $y \rightarrow j$ shift is reflected in the Kipchak pronunciation of the word “yig” (to cry) as “jig.” This phenomenon is also preserved in the verb “jıla-” (to cry) in modern Kazakh.

The $q \rightarrow k$ shift is also reflected in the use of the word “kara” (black) in the Kipchak pronunciation as “kara”. This phonetic feature is also preserved in the modern Kazakh and Kyrgyz languages. Lexical examples show that the words “sarıg” (yellow) and “kök” (blue, sky) are used in exactly this form in the Kipchak dialect. The Kazakh, Karakalpak and Kyrgyz languages are full successors of the Kipchak dialect tradition. For example, the Kazakh “zhıl” (year) is a continuation of the $y \rightarrow j$ phenomenon noted by Kashgari, and the Kyrgyz “köl” (lake) is a continuation of the ancient Kipchak pronunciation.

Mahmud Kashgari in his work “Devonu lug'otit turk” describes in detail the Oghuz language as an independent and developed dialect that occupies a special place in the system of Turkic languages. He describes the phonetic, lexical and partly morphological features of the Oghuz dialect in comparison with other Turkic dialects, showing their common and different aspects through specific examples. Kashgari notes that the Oghuz dialect spread over a wide area as early as the 11th century, had a solid language system, and formed the basis of the speech of many tribes (Baskakov, 1960, pp. 55–58).

Phonetic changes are especially emphasized as one of the most important features of the Oguz dialect. In particular, the change of $k \rightarrow g$ is considered one of the characteristic features of the Oguz language. Kashgari notes the use of the word “köl” (lake) in the Oguz pronunciation as “göl”. This phenomenon has been fully preserved in modern Turkish, and the form “göl” is a direct continuation of the ancient Oguz pronunciation.

The $t \rightarrow d$ shift is also shown as an important phonetic feature of the Oghuz dialect. For example, the Old Turkic word “tağ” (mountain) is pronounced as “dağ” in Oghuz speech. Kashgari, distinguishing this difference from other dialects, emphasizes the predominance of sonorous consonants in the pronunciation of the Oghuz (Baskakov, 1969, p. 80). The use of the forms “dağ/dag” in modern Turkish, Azerbaijani and Turkmen languages indicates the historical stability of this phonetic phenomenon. Kashgari proves with many examples that the Oghuz dialect is also rich in its own lexical units. For example, the word “yagru” is used in the Oghuz dialect in the sense of “boatman's door”, while this unit is rarely found or not used at all in other dialects. This word is given with a soft phonetic tone characteristic of the Oghuz pronunciation.

Another important example is the verb “barmaq” (to walk). Kashgari specifically notes the Oghuz pronunciation of this verb. The form “barmak” in today's Turkmen language is a direct successor to the ancient Oghuz lexical tradition. According to Mahmud Kashgari, the Turkish, Turkmen and Azerbaijani languages were formed on the basis of the Oghuz dialect. For example, the Turkish “dağ”, Azerbaijani “dağ”. Turkmen “dag” forms originated from a common root, and phonetic differences were preserved to a minimum. Similarly, the word “göz” in Turkish and Azerbaijani is interpreted as the result of an ancient phonetic change $k \rightarrow g$ (Clauson, 1964, pp. 156–158).

Kashgari presents the speech characteristics of each dialect representative through a side-by-side comparison, revealing their differences and commonalities. This approach is considered one of the oldest scientific examples of the comparative method, which is widely used in dialectology today.

It is a table compiled in the form of a hypothetical reconstruction based on the comparative approach found in Kashgari's work.

Meaning	Cold	Kipchak	Oguz
mountain	bottom	Taw	Mountain
year	year	Year	Year
word	word	word / word	Word
lake	lake	Lake	Lake

Such comparative examples can be found on dozens of pages of the work "Devonu lug'otit turk". Kashgari illuminates the differences between Turkic languages based on synchronous (within his own era) and areal (territorial) criteria, reflecting the historical status of Turkic languages on a scientific basis.

More than 9,000 lexical units in his work "Devonu lug'otit turk", but also carefully classifies them based on tribal, territorial, phonetic and semantic criteria. The origin of each word, its field of application, its phonetic appearance in the speech of a particular tribe and its significance in the cultural context are explained. Therefore, the work becomes not a simple dictionary, but an encyclopedic source reflecting the linguistic landscape, social life and cultural thinking of the Turkic tribes of the 11th century.

As a result, "Devonu lug'otit turk" retains its importance in today's research in Turkology, historical linguistics, and dialectology as a fundamental scientific source that allows us to reconstruct the linguo-areal map of the Turkic world at that time.

Qashgari's approach to collecting lexical material is scientifically extremely thorough. He traveled among different tribes and used the method of directly listening to their language, comparing it, and recording it through real communication. Therefore, the information in the work is based on empirical observations and is of incomparable importance for modern dialectology, ethnolinguistics, and historical lexicology.

Most of the lexical units found in the work have a common Turkic root. For example: "horse" (horse), "teg" (to touch), "day" (day), "rain" (rain), "mountain" (mountain) Units such as are found in almost all Turkic dialects and languages. This commonality indicates that the Turkic peoples were formed in a single cultural-regional space in ancient times. Most of the words related to lifestyle, animal husbandry, hunting, representations of nature, and social relations are used in the same or very close variants. This indicates that the Turkic peoples had a unifying system of socio-economic relations and a common sphere of interaction in ancient times.

In addition, Qashgari notes the differences in some words between different tribes. For example, the Kipchaks use the word "zhıl" and the Oghuzs use the word "yıl"; the Karluk dialects use the word "köngül" and the Oghuzs use the word "gönül". These differences indicate that the Turkic languages had an independent development path in later historical stages.

For this reason, the lexical material in "Devonu lug'otit turk" reveals not only the common roots of the Turkic languages, but also the process of their territorial differentiation over time. Therefore, the work has not lost its importance as the main reference source in the study of the historical development of the Turkic languages even today.

The most important feature of Turkic languages is that they have had a common lexical layer since ancient times. This layer is widely reflected in Mahmud Qashgari's "Devonu lug'otit turk". Although phonetic differences are observed in different dialects, the main meaning and root are preserved. For example: "Yigıt" means 'brave man, fearless young man'.

This unit is found in the Karluk, Kipchak and Oghuz dialects with some phonetic differences. For example: the forms "yigit", "yiğit", "jigit" are found in almost all Turkic languages.

"Kongül / Köngül / Könül" - "heart, soul". In the Karluk dialects, the form köngül is used, in the Oghuz languages, könül, and in the Kipchaks, könil. Despite the phonetic differences, the semantic meaning - "inner feeling, heart experience" - remains the same.

"Cloud" - "cloud". The forms "bulut" are found in the Karluk dialects, "bolıt" in the Kipchak regions, and "bulıt" in some Oghuz variants.

"Mountain" — "mountain". It is present in all Turkic languages, and the phonetic changes (ğ/g/q/k) do not affect the basic meaning. Such examples show that in the early periods, Turkic peoples lived in a common cultural-regional unity in terms of linguistic units. Later, geographical separations gave rise to phonetic, morphological, and semantic differences.

Mahmud Qashgari clearly notes that some lexical units are characteristic of a particular tribe or dialect. This indicates that the Turkic tribes began to have an independent language development direction by the 11th century. For example: "Taluy". In the Yagma language (belonging to the Qarluq

group), it is used to mean "lake". This form does not occur in other dialects. There is a certain semantic affinity with the modern Uyghur word "toluq" (complete, full).

"Year" — In Kipchaks, the form *jyl* is used, in Oghuz, *yıl*, and in Karluk dialects, the form *yl* is used. This phonetic difference persists in today's language: Kazakh *jıl*, Turkish *yıl*, Uzbek *yil*.

"I am/I am" — in Oghuz: *ben*, in Kipchak and Karluk dialects: the form *men* is dominant. This distinction shows how long Turkic languages have been divided into two main phonetic interpretations.

These differences confirm that the phonetic changes that occurred in the Turkic languages were due to tribal, geographical, and social factors.

"Devonu lug'otit turk" allows you to study not only word forms, but also their meaning development. For example, "At" means "horse (animal)" in all Turkic languages. But among the Kipchaks, this word is also used in the sense of "cavalry soldier, rider". This situation is an additional semantic development related to the nomadic lifestyle of the Kipchaks.

"Homeland" — in Qarluq and Oghuz it means "place, space, homeland", in Kipchak it means "fortress, camp", "military post". This difference reflects the uniqueness of the socio-military structure of the Turkic tribes.

"Orun / orun" - "place". In Kipchak, this word also means "career", "status". This semantic expansion is related to the socio-political system. This direct, semantic dispersion sheds light on the process of formation of cultural and social differences in Turkic languages.

The cultural lexicon in the work shows that the Turkic peoples lived in a common spiritual and cultural space in ancient times. Among this layer, terms related to rituals, economy, customs, and tribal structure occupy a special place. For example: "Toy" is a folk holiday, a celebration. This term means both a ceremony and a collective gathering in all Turkic languages. "Tamgha" is a sign of a clan or tribe. In the ancient Turkic state system, tamgas were an important means of identification.

"Yaylaq/Qashlaq" are seasonal spaces associated with a nomadic lifestyle. These terms are also actively used in today's Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Karakalpak, and Uzbek cultures.

"Kut" means state, blessing, divine power, spiritual legitimation of the ruler. The word "Kut" is one of the central lexical units of the Turkic state ideology. The wide range of cultural vocabulary provides rich ethnolinguistic information about the ancient anthropological views, worldview, social structure, and economic system of the Turkic peoples.

Mahmud Qashgari in his "Davānu lug'otit turk" records the internal lexical differences between the Turkic languages with great precision. He created a linguogeographic map of his time, showing the tribal, dialectal, or regional usage of certain words. This sheds light on the historical differentiation of the Karluk, Kipchak, and Oghuz groups, and the lexical layers associated with their cultural and economic life.

Below, these lexical differences are presented with expanded examples.

1. Inter-dialectal differences in product and food names

- a) "Yağ" / "May" (fat) – qarluq (Uzbek, Uyghur): *yağ*, qipchak (Kazakh, Kyrgyz): *may*. These forms are also clearly distinguished in Qashqari, and explanations are also given for the solid and liquid types of oil.
- b) "İçkü / Su" (drink, water) – Oghuz people used the form "su" more often. The term "içkü" is used in the sense of "drinking" in the Qarluq language.

2. Animal husbandry and agricultural terminology

- a) "Horse/Horse" – Kipchak: "yılkı" – a herd of horses, Qarluq: "horse" – a proper noun. This difference reflects the lexical differentiation in nomadic and semi-nomadic cultures.
- b) "Sheep / Sheep" – Kipchak: "sheep", Qarluq: "sheep". This phonetic "o/ö" alternation was mentioned several times by Qashgari.
- c) "Ud / Cow" – "ud" (cow) is widely used among the Oguz; the common form among the Qarlucs and Kipchaks is "cow/cow".

3. Body parts and everyday vocabulary

- a) "Head / Root" (head) – In some Oghuz dialects, the word "root" occurs synonymously in the main meaning.
- b) "Eye" (eye) – Oghuz: "göz", Qarluq and Kipchak: "köz". Today's Uzbek, Kazakh, Kyrgyz use it in the form of "ko'z", Turkmen, Oghuz – "göz".
- c) "Foam / Silver / Silver" (foam). In some tribes, phonetic variants of the meaning of foam are found.

4. Emotional and psychological lexicon

- a) "Heart / Lake" – O'guz: köñül (heart), in some Kipchak tribes: köl (mood, state of mind).
- b) "Alğır / Öküş / Kümüş" (fast, agile) – The Oghuz used some adjectives as "alğır", the Kipchaks as "öküş", and the Karluks used other synonymous forms.

5. Inter-dialectal differences in action verbs

- a) "To cry / To weep" (to weep) – typical for the Oghuz: "syg'ra". Kipchak-Qarluq: "yig'la".
- b) "Bar- / Var-" (to go) – qarluq: "bar". Oguz: "var". This difference continues in today's Uzbek - Turkish languages.
- c) "To come / To come / To come" (to come) – Qarluq: come. Oguz: come. Kipchak: kill.

6. Differences in color expressions

- a) "Black / Black" - qarluq: black, q ipchaq: black.
- b) "Kök / Gök" (blue) – Qarluq –Kipchak: kök , Oguz: gök . The form "gök" in today's Turkish is a continuation of the Oguz form.

Mahmud Qashgari vividly reflect the linguistic state of the Turkic languages in the 11th century. These differences are not only phonetic changes or shifts in meaning, but also the differences between tribes. lifestyle, cultural activities, high or low level of nomadism, territorial location, ethno-sociolinguistic development is closely related to.

These lexical differences are still reflected today, and the roots of many differences in the Uzbek, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Uyghur, Azerbaijani, and Turkish languages are determined precisely by the historical forms recorded in the "Devanu lug'otit turk".

Mahmud Qashgari scientifically describes not only the lexical system of Turkic languages, but also the process of language differentiation that occurred in connection with their geographical location. One of the most unique aspects of the work is the world map drawn by the author, which reflects the location of Turkic tribes, language boundaries, migration routes and zones of interaction. This map allows us to evaluate Qashgari as the first of the Turkic language geographers, that is, the "founder of linguogeography".

The Qashgari Turkic tribes are divided into several areas based on their geographical area of residence and linguistic characteristics. His classification is based on the initial mention in scientific sources of the three main groups formed in modern Turkology - the Karluk, Kipchak and Oghuz blocks.

Regional differentiation are identified as follows:

- differences in lifestyles of nomadic and sedentary tribes;
- the influence of geographical space (steppe, mountain, oasis) on the phonetic and lexical system;
- historical migration processes;
- the level of intertribal contact and cultural influences.

This approach Based on the theories of Doerfer, Clauson, Tekin, Baskakov In modern linguo-area studies, it is accepted as a triad of language - territory - culture (Dadaboyev, 2021, p. 3).

Qashgari notes that some words are differentiated precisely in relation to geographical area. This is the first example of linguo-areal lexical interpretation. For example : "Taluy" - " lake " is found in some groups of Oghuz, but Qashgari identifies it as specific to the Yagma tribe. This confirms that the Yagma tribe lived in mountainous and valley regions.

"Ödle" (coward) is found in the Kipchak dialect, while other synonymous forms are more commonly used among the Oghuz. These examples demonstrate that phonetic and lexical differences related to geography were scientifically recorded in an ancient source.

Qashgari attributes some phonetic differences to geographical conditions. Nomadic tribes engaged in cattle breeding often have a strong consonant sound in their phonetic system, while people living along rivers and mountains have a greater differentiation of vowels.

Modern Turkologists Hamidulla Dadabayev, A. Baskakov, M. Räsänen, and G. Doerfer also link many differences in the phonetic system of Turkic languages to natural and geographical areas.

Qashgari language material is linked to a regional map and also describes the interaction between the tribes. For example: On the Kipchak - Qarluq border, a number of words were used synchronously in both systems, and in the Oghuz - Qarluq regions, lexical exchange occurred as a result of migrations. A large number of lexical parallels are noted between the Yagma - Chigil - Toxsi tribes due to their common area (Johansson, 1998, p. 5). This classification is referred to as "transitional dialect zones" in current linguo-areal studies.

In today's linguistics, such influential Turkologists as Lars Johanson, E.R. Tennishev, Talat Tekin, J. Hamilton, G. Clauson and K. Shiratori recognize the territorial classifications recorded by Mahmud Qashgari as one of the oldest and most reliable sources in the historical-geographical typology of Turkic languages. In their studies, the linguogeographic data in "Devon" are considered the first scientifically based source of isoglosses, areal differentiation, phonetic and lexical differentiation processes of Turkic languages.

According to Lars Johansson, the oldest forms of isoglosses in the Turkic languages were recorded by Qashgari. That is, the differences he introduced — such units as *ben/men*, *yıl/jıl*, *köl/taluy* — formed the foundation of the later Turkic dialect system (Koshgari, 1939).

A.N. Baskakov recognizes the map and classification system created by Mahmud Kashgari as a fundamental source in the scientific classification of Turkic languages. He notes that the process of scientific grouping of Turkic languages begins precisely with the territorial and tribal-linguistic classification given in Kashgari's work "Devonu lug'otit turk". Baskakov evaluates the almost complete correspondence of this classification to the Karluk, Kipchak and Oghuz groups accepted in modern Turkology as a rare, even unique scientific phenomenon in the history of linguistics.

According to the scientist, the location of the tribes, their dialectal features and phonetic-lexical differences given by Kashgari are not accidental, but the result of specific empirical observations and systematic analysis. It is this aspect that allows us to evaluate "Devonu lug'otit" not as a simple dictionary, but as a model of complex ethnolinguistic and areal-linguistic research. Baskakov considers Kashgari's data to be one of the most reliable sources for reconstructing the ethnogenesis of Turkic languages, and points to them as a methodological basis for further historical-linguistic reconstruction work.

Also, A.N. Baskakov calls Kashgari's cartographic approach the "first cartographic foundations" of linguo-areal studies. Because the territorial image in "Devonu lug'otit turk" illuminates not only the geographical location, but also the inseparable connection between language and ethnos, the connection of linguistic units with space. This allows us to interpret Kashgari not only as a great lexicographer and linguist, but also as one of the first founders of Turkic areal linguistics (Koshg'ariy, 1939, p. 13).

In Talat Tekin's scientific approach, the classification system proposed by Mahmud Kashgari is interpreted as the direct theoretical and methodological foundation of modern Turkic dialectology. According to the scientist, the method of associating the linguistic differences observed in the Divanu Lu'otit Turk with specific tribes and ethnic groups was an absolutely advanced approach for that time, and it can be considered the first scientific example of modern dialectological analysis.

Tekin particularly emphasizes Kashgari's systematic identification of phonetic differences based on ethnicity. For example, the use of the form "yıl" in the Oghuz language and "zhıl" in the Kipchaks, or the recording of the variants "ben" in the Oghuz and "men" in the Karluks, is not accidental, but the result of a clear scientific observation of diatopic (territorial) differentiation. Tekin evaluates this method as "an early example of modern dialectological methodology" and highly recognizes Kashgari not only as a lexicographer, but also as a dialectologist.

Talat Tekin also emphasizes that it is possible to scientifically reconstruct the diatopic variation of the ancient Turkic language, that is, the regional language changes, through the materials of the "Devon". In his opinion, the differences noted by Kashgari are of decisive importance in understanding the roots of the Turkic language groups that formed in subsequent centuries, which makes the "Devon" one of the main sources of historical dialectology (Tekin, 1991, p. 11).

These views are also consistent with the scientific conclusions of ER Tenishev. Tenishev evaluates the linguogeographic observations in Kashgari's work as the oldest form of historical Karluk, Kipchak and Oghuz language-areas attested in a written source. He notes that the strict assignment of linguistic units to specific tribes in "Devon" serves as a unique scientific evidence for the history of Turkic dialects.

In particular, the separate recording of specific lexical and phonetic units in the languages of the Chigil and Yagma tribes, according to Tenishev, is of incomparable importance in the systematic reconstruction of the process of formation of Turkic dialects. This information proves that the history of Turkic languages should be studied not only chronologically, but also in areal and ethnolinguistic directions (Tekin, 2003, p. 7).

In general, the views of Talat Tekin and ER Tenishev indicate the need to reassess Kashgari's "Devonu lug'otit turk" as the first scientific source of modern Turkic dialectology, linguogeography and ethnolinguistics. This further increases the value of this work not only historically, but also theoretically and methodologically.

Eminent scholars such as J. Hamilton, Gerard Clauson, and K. Shiratori consider the materials collected by Mahmud Kashgari as one of the most important sources for scientifically reconstructing the phonetic history of the Turkic languages. They believe that the phonetic, lexical, and morphological differences recorded in the Divan-u Lu'otit Turk are not accidental, but important evidence reflecting the stages of historical development of the Turkic languages.

In particular, Gerard Clauson, relying on the explanations and linguistic facts provided by Kashgari, proves on the basis of scientific evidence that some important phonetic processes, including the y/j alternation, the g'/q differentiation, as well as the softening and hardening of consonants, were formed long before the 11th century. According to Clauson, these phenomena are deeply rooted in the history of Turkic languages, and the changes that occurred in later periods rely on this ancient phonetic layer. In this regard, Kashgari's data serve as a reliable basis in the process of phonetic reconstruction.

K. Shiratori, on the other hand, emphasizes the historical-ethnographic significance of the language and tribal map compiled by Kashgari. He notes that the Kashgari map is distinguished by its extraordinary accuracy in determining the location of ancient Turkic ethnoses, migration routes, and language areas. This map is a unique scientific source not only for linguistic, but also for historical and ethnographic research (Tenishev, 1984, p. 3).

In general, modern Turkology recognizes Mahmud Kashgari not only as a great lexicographer, but also as the first founder of the geography of the Turkic language, that is, as a scholar who laid the historical foundation of the lingua-real approach. His work "Davanu Lug'otit Türk" remains today one of the main, reliable and methodologically incomparable sources in the diachronic (historical development) and synchronous (modern state) classification of the Turkic languages.

The work is an invaluable source not only for recording linguistic facts, but also for reflecting the cultural, ethnographic, social and historical portrait of the Turkic world in the 11th century. Mahmud Qashgari systematically compiled all the Turkic tribes that existed in his time, their areas of residence, mutual social relations and linguistic features, creating the foundation for today's Turkology. He divided the phonetic, morphological and lexical differences in the speech of the Turkic tribes into groups based on scientific observation. This classification is the oldest form of the Karluk - Kipchak - Oguz system accepted today. All of these differences were classified by Mahmud Kashgari in a clear, systematic, and scientific manner, and they are considered a major source of dialectological material by today's Turkology.

The scientist also described for the first time the characteristics of language in relation to geographical areas, thus laying the foundation for today's linguo-areal studies. His famous map of Turkic peoples' areal location, tribal boundaries, area of distribution of linguistic isoglosses. It provides accurate information such as. All scholars recognize this map as one of the first cartographic achievements in world linguistic geography.

The work contains a collection of words, phrases, terms, and proverbs, many of which are also present in modern Turkic languages. This directly reflects the universal Turkic root and allows us to restore the semantic system of the ancient Turkic language.

At the same time, the work is a major source for ethnolinguistics and cultural anthropology. That is, "Devon" is not just a dictionary — it — ancient Turkic social structure (tribe, clan, clan, etc.), ceremonies and traditions (weddings, mourning, invitations to guests), nomadic and semi-nomadic lifestyle, military, economic and livestock terminology. A valuable resource that provides rich information about.

This information today serves as a crucial source in studying the ethnogenesis, cultural model, and mentality of the Turkic peoples.

Qashgari used methods that meet the requirements of modern lexicography. In particular, the work provides phonetic variants of words, which tribe uses it, etymology elements are shown. The current usage is reflected, its use in sentences is explained with examples and grammatical explanations are also provided.

This method is considered extremely innovative for that time and is the basis for his recognition as the greatest representative of Eastern lexicography.

"Devon" in today's linguistics — comparative-historical grammar, etymology, dialectology, linguistic and real studies, ethnolinguistics, cultural studies continues to be considered one of the main sources for such areas as. For this reason, modern Turkology has been studying Qashgari "father of Turkic linguistics", "the first dialectologist", "the founder of the first linguistic geography", He is acknowledged as "the greatest lexicographer of the East."

Mahmud Kashgari's "Devonu lug'otit turk" is one of the most important sources for determining the dialectological system of Turkic languages, their historical connection and common lexical layer. Today, this work serves not only as a historical, but also as a methodological guide for young linguists, Turkologists and ethnologists.

Conclusion

The tribal and territorial classifications, observations of phonetic and lexical differentiation, and semantic changes presented in the work provide young scholars with a scientific methodological foundation at the introductory level of modern Turkology. This is a valuable resource, especially for students and researchers studying the history of Turkic languages in depth.

"Devon" reflects the linguogeographic portrait of the Turkic world in the 11th century, the nomadic lifestyle, and the cultural ties of tribal and ethnic groups. This is of great importance for the Turkic peoples to understand their historical linguistic heritage, realize their cultural unity, and preserve their language.

Therefore, "Devonu lug'otit turk" is not only a historical source, but also a scientific school for young Turkologists, and for the Turkic peoples, an eternal heritage that allows them to understand and appreciate their language and culture.

References

1. Atalay, B. (1939). *Translation of Divanü Lügati't-Türk* (Vol. I). Turkish Language Association Publications, 80.
2. Atalay, B. (1939–1941). *Translation of Divanü Lügati't-Türk* (Vols. I–III). Turkish Language Association Publications.
3. Baskakov, A. N. (1960). *An introduction to Turkic linguistics*. Nauka, 13.

4. Baskakov, N. A. (1969). *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskix jazykov*. 3.
5. Clauson, G. (1964). Turkic lexicography in the light of Kashghari. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 3.
6. Dadaboyev, H. (2021). *History of Turkiy tillar*. 5.
7. Johansson, L. (1998). *Turkic linguistics*. Harrassowitz Verlag, 2.
8. Koshgari, M. (1939). *Dīwānū dictionary at-Turk* (Vol. I). TDK Publication, 128–131.
9. Koshg'ariy, M. (1939). *Dīwānū lug'āt at-turk* (I-jild). TDK Nashri, 130.
10. Tekin, T. (1991). Mahmud al-Kashghari's contribution to Turkic dialectology. In *Turkic Languages*, 11.
11. Tekin, T. (2003). *Old Turkish language* (pp. 156–158). Yıldız Publications.
12. Tenishev, E. R. (1984). *Turkic languages in historical and typological light*. Nauka, 7.

Received: 28.08.2025

Accepted: 14.11.2025