HÜSEYİN DURGUT

LINGUISTIC FEATURES
OF MIRAJNAME TEXTS IN MANUSCRIPTS
OF THE LITHUANIAN TATARS

INTRODUCTION

The topic of *Miraj* (Prophet Mohammed's ascension to heaven) became widespread in Turkish literature after the acceptance of Islam by Turks. In the classical Turkish literature (Divan literature) and Turkish folk literature, a lot of authors and poets mentioned *Miraj* in their works. Along with pieces mentioning *Miraj*, works concentrated on the topic were also written. Short poems telling the story of Prophet Mohammed's ascension to heaven are called *mirâciye*, and poems giving the detailed picture are called *mirâcnâme*. *Mirâciye* can be found in various divans or as part of such books as *siret, mevlid, hilye, mesnevi* and *mucizatnâme. Mirajname's*, on the other hand, are independent pieces of literature, giving a detailed description of the *Miraj* miracle. Such poems were usually written in the *mesnevî* or *kasîde* verse. There were also mirajnames written in prose[1].

The first piece of Turkish literature concerning the miraj and not belonging to the Anatolian tradition is thought to be a mirajname written in the 12th century by Kul Suleiman. Another Mirajname, not belonging to the Anatolian tradition, is a mirajname supposedly composed in the 14th–15th century (the text itself is written in the Uyghur script)[2].

In Anatolia itself, a lot of pieces concerning the topic of miraj were written in the period spanning from the 14th to the 20th century. Most of them are original pieces, some of them being part of a larger compilation and some being an independent mirajname.

The text of Mirajname in the tradition of Lithuanian Tatars can only be found in *Kitab* manuscripts. From the 181 manuscripts we have now, 27 belong to the Kitab tradition[3]. Ten of those 27 Kitabs have mirajname as part of them. Five of those ten are written in Turkish, with interlinear translation into Slavic languages. In other manuscripts, only a Slavic text can be found. Those are the Kitab manuscripts having Turkish mirajname texts:

---

[1]   *Akar M*. Türk Edebiyatında Manzum Mi'râc-nâmeler. Ankara, 1987, s. 7–61.
[2]   *Courteille A. P.* Mi'radj-nameh (Resul Aleyhisselamın Mi'racka Barganı). Paris, 1882.
[3]   *Mişkiniene G.* Litvanya Tatarlarına Ait El Yazmalarında Bulunan Miraçname // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi (HÜTAD). 2011 Bahar (14), s. 227.

1. Kitab of Ivan Luckevic (IL): this manuscript, belonging to the 18th century, can be found in the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Library (f. 21–84)[4]. The mirajname text can be found on pages 107b–135a. This version, consisting of 494 couplets, misses the ending part;

2. London Kitab (LK): this manuscript, which is thought to be written in the middle of the 19th century, can be found in the British Library in London (Or. 13.020)[5]. The mirajname text can be found on pages 87a–102b. Like in the other versions of this manuscript, the verse is broken in the first pages, and from 89b the text is written completely in prose. Because of that we cannot give the number of couplets in this manuscript;

3. Kitab of Ibrahim Hasanevic (IH): this manuscript, written in 1832 is found in the Belarus State Library (11 Pk 438MT9)[6]. The text of the mirajname can be found on pages 94–119, and it consists of 509 couplets;

4. Kitab of Abraham Koricki (AK): this manuscript, written in the 19th century can be found in Vilnius University Library (F3-391)[7]. The mirajname can be found on pages 249–305. This manuscript, having a lot in common with the Kitab of Ivan Luckevic, consists of 508 couplets. One couplet, found in other manuscripts, is missing;

5. Kitab of Abrahim Hasanevic (AH): this manuscript, written in 1861 can be found in the Belarus State Library (11Rk 1000)[8]. The mirajname can be found on pages 84a–106b. This version, consisting of 509 couplets, is almost identical to the Kitab of Ibrahim Hasanevic. Mistakes in the Turkish texts are the same in most places.

From the linguistic perspective, the mirajname found in the Kitab of Ivan Luckevic is considered to be the oldest and the most similar to mirajnames written in Old Turkey Turkish. The mirajname in the Kitab of A. Koricki is more similar to the one found in the Kitab of I. Luckevic. The mirajname in the Kitab of A. Hasanevic is similar to the mirajname in the Kitab of I. Hasanevic. The mirajname in the London Kitab is different from all others.

The composition of all five versions is the same because of the *mesnevi* style they are written in. Like all other *mesnevis*, they begin with praising God. The poet then

---

4   *Miškinienė G., Namavičiūtė S., Pokrovskaya J.* Каталог арабскоалфавитных рукописей литовских татар. Vilnius, 2005, c. 39.

5   *Akiner S.* Religious Language of a Belarusian Tatar Kitab. Wiesbaden, 2009, p. 81.

6   *Miškiniene G.* Litvanya Tatarlarına Ait El Yazmalarında Bulunan Miraçname // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi (HÜTAD). 2011 Bahar (14), s. 228.

7   *Miškinienė G., Namavičiūtė S., Pokrovskaya J.* Каталог арабскоалфавитных рукописей литовских татар. Vilnius, 2005, c. 55–58.

8   *Mişkiniene G.* Litvanya Tatarlarına Ait El Yazmalarında Bulunan Miraçname // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi (HÜTAD). 2011 Bahar (14), s. 228.

starts telling the story of Prophet Mohammed's ascension to heaven, using the *rivaye* of Ibn-i-Abbas as a source of reference. Later on, he tells how Mohammed met Gabriel and how Gabriel was the harbinger of the miraj. After that, *Burak*, who was used to transport Mohammed, is described. Some interesting descriptions and motifs can be found in the Mirajname. Names of all seven layers of heaven are mentioned, describing their properties.

The scene where Mohammed meets God is thoroughly described. Heaven, hell, houris, angels, the *Tuba* tree, the river of heaven, sea and other creations all have long descriptions. In the last part of the mirajname, the return of Prophet Mohammed to Mekka and his meeting with the four Caliphs is described. In the end of the piece, the poet writes that the story of the miraj should be accepted by Muslims. He also mentions who wrote the text.

The research of Eastern European manuscripts of mirajname dates back to 1815. The first researches can be attributed to such names as A. Boldyrev, J. Stankevich, M. Taureva, V. Lastouski, V. Volskij, J. Szynkiewicz, M. Aleksandrowicz, and S. Kryczynski[9]. In later periods, such scholars as P. Borawski, A. Dubinski, V. P. Demidchik, M. Dziekan, A. Drozd, T. Majda, G. Miskiniene, and S. Akiner have contributed to this field of research. In Turkey, there are almost no published materials concerning this topic. They consist of articles by A. Dubinski[10] and G. Miskiniene[11].

In this paper, we want to give some examples of the linguistic features of Turkish texts in the manuscript of Lithuanian–Polish–Belarusian Tatars. Revealing all the linguistic features would require a much more thorough study, so in this paper I focus only on the morphological features. Some spelling, phonetic, lexical and semantic features will also be mentioned.

DECLENSION IN THE MIRAJNAME

Plural suffixes. Plural suffixes in the Mirajname are +lAr: *enbiyā+lar*, *ʿaẕāb+lar*, *kişi+ler*, *ferişte+ler*.

Possessive suffixes. The possessive suffixes used in the analyzed Mirajname texts are parallel to the ones of Old Turkey Turkish.

 First person possessive suffixes. The first person singular possessive suffix in the analyzed texts is usually *+(Um)*, while the first person plural possessive suffix is *+(U)mUz*. The possessive suffix having a rounded vowel in the first person is a feature of Old Turkey Turkish. Examples*: ʿaḳl+um* (İL, AK 237), *cān+um* (108), *ten+üm*

---

[9]   Ibid., s. 228–229.
[10] *Dubinski A.* Polonya-Litvanya Tatarlarının Yazılı Metinlerde Kullandıkları Türkçe // Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1988. Ankara, 1996, s. 265–294.
[11] *Mişkiniene G.* Litvanya Tatarlarına Ait El Yazmalarında Bulunan Miraçname // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi (HÜTAD). 2011 Bahar (14), s. 225–239.

(İL, AK 195), *meñz+üm* (İL, AK 299), *sulṭān+umuz* (İL, AK 184), *cān+umuz* (İL, AK, 184), *kimü+müz* (İL, AK 113), *üst+ümüz* (31), etc. There are, however, examples of unrounded vowels in first person possessive suffixes: *süñükler+im* (İL, AK 136), *meñz+im* (236), *gözler+im* (412), *ḳullar+ım* (428).

Second person possessive suffixes. The second person singular possessive suffix is *+(U)ñ*, while the second person plural possessive suffix is *+(U)ñUz*. Examples: *cān+uñ* (42), *aḳl +uñ* (72), *ümmet+üñ* (90), *ḳısmet+üñ* (125), *göñlü+ñiz* (393), *tañrı+ñız* (105). However, there are some examples without the nasal "n": *gūr+inizde* (390), *tañrı+nız* (AK, 105).

Third person possessive suffixes. The third person singular possessive suffix is *+(s)I* or *+lArI*. Examples: *nūr+ı* (118), *dost+ı* (174), *cümle+si* (214), *ḳamu+sı* (256), *yaru+sı* (157), *ad+ları* (206), *ṭon+ları* (272), *iç+leri* (277), *zikir+leri* (352).

Cases. The case suffixes in the analyzed texts are very similar to the standard Old Turkey Turkish. Aside from that, old and new forms of some case suffixes can be found in different manuscripts.

Genitive. The suffix showing this case in Old Turkey Turkish is *+(n)Uñ* (with a rounded vowel). Along with this form, in some manuscripts the nasal *ñ* in the end of the suffix is depicted with the Arabic letter "*nun*": *çalab+un* (İH, AH 159) < *çalab+uñ* (İL, AK, 159), *ma ʿrifet-ün* (AK, İH, AH 7) < *ma ʿrifet-üñ* (İL 7), *oġlanları+nuñ* (151), *ṭamu+nuñ* (248), etc. There are also some examples of the usage of unrounded vowels: *muṣṭafā+nıñ* (AK, İH, AH 8, LK 7) < *muṣṭafā+nuñ* (İL 8). In some places, the usage of the full *+nIñ* form after a consonant is interesting: *kim+nüñ* (210), *bular+nıñ* (290), *allāh+nıñ* (411). This form is not a feature of Old Turkey Turkish. The genitive case suffix in Old Turkey Turkish for first person pronouns is *+Um*. Although this rule is respected in the analyzed texts, we can also find examples of *+Iñ*. For example: *ben+üm* (İL, AK, İH, AH 323). In one place it is written *ben+üñ* (İH, AH 199), and in the other *men+iñ* (LK 37). The inflection of other pronouns: *seniñ, anıñ*.

Accusative. The accusative case suffix is always *+(y)I*, the vowel being unrounded: *ṭon+ı* (İL, AK 50), *söz+i* (İL, AK 10), *ṭamu+yı* (İL, AK 298), *ḳapu+yı* (İL, AK, İH 141). The accusative case of *kapu* and *tamu* in some manuscripts is written with a *hamza* (ˀ): *ḳapu+ˀ ı* (İH, AH 142), *ṭamu+ˀ ı* (İH, AH 298). The usage of the *hamza* in Turkish words and suffixes is an interesting linguistic feature of these texts.

Starting from Old Turkish, the accusative case suffix after possessive suffixes is *+n*. In Mirajname, it is used after the third person possessive suffixes: *ḳapusı+n* (İL, AK 124), *adları+n* (383), *namāzı+n* (12).

The accusative inflection of the pronouns *beni, seni, anı, bizi, sizi, anları*.

Dative. The dative case suffix in Mirajname is the same as in Old Turkey Turkish: *+(y)A*: *ṭaş+a* (İL, AK 21), *ḳamumuz+a* (37), *gözüm+e* (52), *uyḳu+ya* (18), *ḳamu+ya* (150), *ḳarşu+ya* (İL, AK 117), *nebī+ye* (240), *ḳubbe+ye* (İL, AK 494).

The dative forms of pronouns are identical to the ones in Old Turkey Turkish: *baña, saña, aña, bize, size, anlara, onlara*. The usage without the *nasal "n"* in the singular pronouns of the first and second person is quite interesting: *bana* (İH, AH 143), *sana* (İH, AH 39).

Locative. The locative form is *+DA*. For example: *dünyā+da* (273), *söz+de* (İL, AK 480), *gök+de* (492), *aramız+da* (410), *elin+de* (53), *üstin+de* (190), *gök+te* (309). Locative forms of pronouns are identical to the ones in Old Turkey Turkish: *bunda* (116), *anda* (117).

Ablative. The ablative case suffix in Mirajname is the same as in Old Turkey Turkish *+DAn*. For example: *nūr+dan* (341), *ḳapu+dan* (İL, AK 147), *od+dan* (157), *gök+den* (494), *ḳullarım+dan* (428), *ṣolın+dan* (301), *ḳulaḳların+dan* (281). In one line, the suffix was used with a close vowel: *+DIn*. This form is specific of Old Turkish and Eastern Turkish. *ṣalavātımuz+dın* (İL, AK, 356). These are examples of ablative forms of pronouns: *benden* (İL, AK 320), *senden* (418), *andan* (483), *anlardan* (438).

Equative. The equative case suffix in the analyzed texts is *+CA*: *dünyā+ça* (346), *saġışın+ça* (231), *bunça* (269). In one line it performs the function of the *+lAyIn* suffix: ʿ*osmān+layın* "Like Osman" (AK, İH, AH 507).

Instrumental. There has been found one case of the archaic instrumental form (*+In*) in the Mirajname: *bir gez+in* "bir kez" (63). The instrumental case formed by the auxiliary *ile* is still in use. For example: *emri+le* (172), *elüm+ile* (216), *ṣıdk+ıla* (505), etc.

Along with this short analysis of inflections, we also want to show some examples of some spelling and understanding problems.

SPELLING PROBLEMS

Paratdı (AK, 3) < yaratdı (İL, LK, İH, AH 3). In this case, the letter *ya* (ﻴ) was written with an extra dot, turning it into the letter *pe* (ﭙ);

ṣoġar (İH, AH 5) < *ṭoġar* (İL, AK, LK 5). In this case, the letter *tı* (ﻁ) was written as the letter *sad* (ص);

yatar (İH, AH 5) < *batar* (İL, AK, LK 5). In this case, the letter *ba* (ب) was written with an extra dot, turning it into the letter *ya* (ﻴ).

Examples of misspelled words

Dıḳlaġıl zönüm (İH, AH 18) < *diñleġıl sözüm* "listen my word" (İL, AK, LK)

bu ẕikr-ile uyḳuya vardı gözüm / ibnü ʿabbās *dıḳlaġıl* uşbu *zönüm* (İH, AH 18)

bu fikr-ile uyḳuya vardı gözüm / ibnü ʿabbās *diñleġıl uşbu sözüm* (İL, AK 18)

nebüm-ile (İH 45) < *benüm-ile* (İL, AK, AH 45)

dünyā ṭonı gerekmez seniñ ile / buyruġ ver calasun *nebüm-ile* (İH 45)

dünyā ṭonı gerekmez seniñ ile / buyruġı var çalabuñ *benüm-ile* (İL, AK, AH 45)

mekā'il (İL, AK, İH, AH 148, LK 99) < *melā'ik* (İÜ 147).

In the five analyzed manuscripts, we can see that the word *mekā'il* should be written as *melā'ik.* We can see this if we compare the text with the manuscript written in Old Turkey Turkish, which is found in the Library of the Istanbul University[12]:

anda gördüm bir *mekā'il* oturur / yedi yüz biñ ferişte ḳarşu durur (İL, AK, LK, İH, AH)

anda gördüm bir *melā'ik* oturur / yedi yüz biñ ferişte ḳarşu durur (İÜ 147)

belürem (İH, AH 215) < *ḳıluram* "I do." (İL, AK 215)

ṣañra cānların ben aluram / ḥaḳ ne kimen buyurdısa anı *belürem* (İH 215)

ṣañra cānların ben aluram / ḥaḳ ne kin buyurdıs anı *belürem* (AH 215)

ṣoñra cānların ben aluram / ḥaḳ ne kim buyurdısa anı *ḳıluram* (İL, AK 215).

SEMANTIC PROBLEMS

Melek "angel" (İH, AH 4) < *felek* "firmament" (İL, AK, LK 4). It should be *felek.*

geteş (İH, AH 4) < *güneş* "sun" (İL, AK, LK 4)

yasruḳ (İH, AH 5) < *buyruḳ* "order" (İL, AK, LK 5)

ʿ*uyar* (LK 7), ʿ*uya* (AK 8), ʿ*āyār* (İH, AH 8) < *uyar* "warn" (İL 8).

The Turkish verb *uyar-* is written properly in the Kitab of I. Luckevic, unlike in the other manuscripts. The letter "ayn" (ع) cannot be used in Turkish words because of the lack of such a sound. In four of the analyzed manuscripts, this verb is written with an "ayn" (AK, LK, İH, AH), and only in the İL it is written properly: with an *alif* and *waw.*

ḳılġıl pazaḳ (AK 8) < *ḳılġıl yaraḳ* (İL, LK 8); *fılgil yuraḳ* (İH, AH 8). The Old Turkish verb *yarak ḳıl-* meaning "to prepare" is written properly in İL and LK manuscripts, whereas in other manuscripts the word cannot be understood because of mistakes.

One of the features of the analyzed manuscripts is the usage of folk language, as well as some Turkish analogues of Islamic terminology (for example, *Tañrı, uçmak, tamu,* etc.) and the usage of some words and suffixes archaic for the Old Turkey Turkish. For example, the second person imperative suffix –*GIl* is quite widespread in old texts: *ḳılġıl, dutġıl, dınlaġıl, virgil, yarlıḳaġıl,* etc. As we see in the examples of *allāh-nıñ, diñiz-nüñ, ḳasır-nuñ,* in the genitive case sometimes the –*nIñ* form is used after consonants. The usage of such words as *ḳanı, bizemek, yayaḳ, süçi, yalanġaç, yalançaḳ, ulalmaḳ, uçmaḳ, ḳamu, yigrek, saġışınça, süñük, meñiz* is also one of the important features of this piece.

---

12   *Develi H.* Eski Türkiye Türkçesi Devresine Ait Manzum Bir Miracnâme // İÜEF Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. 1988. S. XXVIII, s. 81–228.

Hüseyin Durgut / Linguistic Features of Mirajname Texts in Manuscripts of the Lithuanian Tatars

CONCLUSION

These are some of the conclusions we came at after a comparative analysis of the Turkish texts of Mirajname found in the manuscripts of Lithuanian Tatars.

The Turkish Mirajname texts can only be found in *kitab* manuscripts. Five kitab manuscripts known to researchers have the Turkish Mirajname. The Mirajname text found in the Kitab of I. Luckevic is considered to be the oldest and the closest to the original Mirajname.

The Mirajname texts must have been written using some version of the Mirajname written in Anatolia in the period of Old Turkey Turkish. The texts written after a long period of time by people already forgetting Turkish have some interesting differences. On the one hand, the texts preserve the archaic Turkish morphology, but on the other they show the influence of local dialects. We can assume that the authors of the mirajnames written in the 19th century did not know Turkish and Turkish grammar very well. This can be especially noted of the London Kitab Mirajname written down in prose. There is another possibility that the text of the Mirajname was orally transferred through generations up to the late period. We can assume that a much more thorough analysis by specialists in Turkic and Slavic linguistics should reveal much more solid results.