

Turkic–Mongolic Lexical Layer in *Shajara-i Tarakima*: Historical-Phonetic and Semantic Perspectives

Kuanyshbek Kenzhalin

The Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

Doszhan Baltabay

The Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

Saltanat Shokabayeva*

The Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

Assem Yelubay

The Department of Aviation English, Academy of Civil Aviation, Almaty, 020100, Kazakhstan

Abstract—This article investigates the seventeenth-century chronicle *Shajara-i Tarakima* (“Genealogy of the Turkmens”) by Abu’l-Gazi Bahadur Khan as a key source for understanding the historical interaction of Turkic and Mongolic languages. Far beyond its genealogical narrative, the text preserves a rich lexicon and structural features that reveal a sustained bilingual environment in Central Asia. Using comparative-historical, philological, and contact-linguistic methods, the study examines more than four thousand distinct lexemes recorded in the best manuscript and printed editions. Quantitative analysis shows that roughly one quarter of the vocabulary is of Mongolic origin, while the remainder reflects Oghuz, Kipchak, and Chagatai Turkic layers. Administrative and military terminology—*daruga*, *tümen*, *sölde*—anchors the Mongolic component, whereas everyday, natural, and spiritual terms remain predominantly Turkic. Phonological evidence such as the retention of initial *b-* and the Mongolic *d > j* alternation confirms that two sound systems operated side by side. Morphological investigation demonstrates full integration of many borrowings. Words like *tümen*, *sölde*, and *jirga* accept Turkic plural, possessive, and case suffixes and even generate new derivatives (*tümenlik*, *söldeshi*, *jirgalash*). Semantic analysis reveals further adaptation: *batur* broadens from “warrior” to “moral leader,” *nökör* expands from sworn companion to intimate friend, and *tör* narrows to the concrete seat of rulership. These changes mirror shifting political and social realities of the Khivan Khanate. The findings show that *Shajara-i Tarakima* records a reciprocal, long-term process of language contact in which Turkic and Mongolic elements merged into a stable hybrid idiom.

Index Terms—*Shajara-i Tarakima*, Turkic–Mongolic contact, historical phonology, morphological integration, semantic change

I. INTRODUCTION

Shajara-i Tarakima (“Genealogy of the Turkmens”) is a seventeenth-century chronicle written by the Khivan ruler and scholar Abu’l-Gazi Bahadur Khan. Beyond its value as a historical record of tribal lineages, the work is an exceptional linguistic monument that captures the vocabulary, phonetics, and stylistic features of its time. The text presents a rich blend of Turkic and Mongolic lexical layers, reflecting centuries of interaction between these language families in Central Asia. For historical linguistics, the chronicle provides direct evidence of how the Turkic languages developed and how they absorbed, adapted, and coexisted with Mongolic elements.

Understanding the historical formation of modern Turkic languages—Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Karakalpak, Turkmen, Tatar, and others—requires a careful examination of sources like *Shajara-i Tarakima*. The chronicle preserves not only political and cultural information but also rare lexical items, archaic grammatical structures, and phonetic patterns that reveal the dynamics of contact between Turkic and Mongolic peoples. Many words and expressions recorded in the manuscript remain key to tracing etymological relationships and phonological changes across the Turkic world.

The object of this study is the Turkic–Mongolic lexical stratum within the text of *Shajara-i Tarakima*. The subject is the historical-phonetic, morphological, and semantic properties of these lexical items and the mechanisms of their mutual influence. By analysing this material, the research seeks to reconstruct the processes of sound change, morphological adaptation, and semantic shift that occurred during the period of intensive Turkic–Mongolic interaction.

* Corresponding Author. Email: shokabayeva@yandex.kz

The primary aim is to provide a comprehensive linguistic description of the Turkic and Mongolic elements in *Shajara-i Tarakima* and to clarify their historical development. To achieve this aim, the study pursues the following objectives:

- to identify and classify Turkic and Mongolic lexical items in the text according to semantic and derivational groups;
- to determine phonetic changes and historical sound laws affecting these items;
- to analyse their morphological structures and the functions of affixes;
- to trace semantic evolution and shifts in meaning;
- to assess the degree and direction of mutual influence between the Turkic and Mongolic languages of the seventeenth century.

This research offers, for the first time, a systematically compiled database of Turkic–Mongolic lexicon drawn from *Shajara-i Tarakima*. It provides a detailed description of the historical phonetics and morphology of these words and demonstrates their connections to modern Turkic languages such as Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kyrgyz. The study also clarifies the phonological adaptation of Mongolic loanwords and documents their semantic changes over time, thereby contributing new data to comparative Turkology and Mongolistics.

The research relies on comparative-historical, descriptive, and structural methods. Primary sources include the original Khivan manuscript and later scholarly editions (Annaberdiev, 2021). Each lexical item is analysed in terms of phonetic structure, morphological composition, and semantic development. Comparative data are drawn from Old Turkic inscriptions, Middle Turkic texts, and contemporary Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, and Tatar materials. Historical phonology provides the principles for explaining sound changes, while structural linguistics informs the analysis of morphological patterns.

The findings will enrich Turkology, historical lexicology, and the study of language contact between Turkic and Mongolic peoples. They can be applied in university courses such as Historical Lexicology, Comparative-Historical Grammar, and Turkic–Mongolic Language Contact (Kahya, 2024). The results also shed light on Mongolic elements within the modern Kazakh lexicon and may be used to supplement historical dictionaries and etymological databases of the Turkic languages.

Ultimately, *Shajara-i Tarakima* emerges as a unique document of linguistic convergence, capturing the historical moment when Turkic and Mongolic peoples were bound together by trade, migration, and political alliance (Kahya, 2025). Analysing the phonetic, morphological, and semantic features of the Turkic–Mongolic lexicon in this text deepens our understanding of the historical development of the Kazakh language and illuminates the shared lexical heritage of the wider Turkic world.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on Abu'l-Gazi Bahadur Khan's *Shajara-i Tarakima* ("Genealogy of the Turkmens") spans more than a century and brings together historians, philologists, and comparative linguists who examine its language, structure, and historical significance. This review highlights the most relevant scholarship for understanding the Turkic–Mongolic lexical layer of the text and situates the present study within that tradition. For clarity, references are numbered in the order cited.

A. Foundational Textual and Historical Studies

The first critical editions and translations of *Shajara-i Tarakima* established the textual basis for all subsequent linguistic analysis. The Russian translation by Velyaminov-Zernov (1854) in the nineteenth century made the work accessible to a broader scholarly audience and drew attention to its mixed Turkic lexicon. Later, the annotated Uzbek and Kazakh editions prepared by Ashirbekov and Karmysheva (1976) provided modern readers with reliable transcriptions and commentary. These editions highlight the rich blend of Oghuz, Kipchak, and Chagatai features that characterise the seventeenth-century Khivan literary milieu.

From a historical perspective, Barthold's (1963) studies of Central Asia remain indispensable. Barthold situates Abu'l-Gazi's chronicle within the political context of the Khivan Khanate and demonstrates how the work combines oral tribal genealogies with written Islamic historiography. His observations on the persistence of pre-Islamic tribal terminology laid an early foundation for later linguistic inquiry.

B. Turkic Lexicology and Historical Phonetics

The lexicon of *Shajara-i Tarakima* has been an important source for understanding the development of Turkic languages. Baskakov's (1952) Introduction to the History of Turkic Languages and his multi-volume Turkic Dialectology reference Abu'l-Gazi's text when tracing the phonological evolution of Oghuz and Kipchak dialects. He notes, for example, the coexistence of Chagatai literary norms with local Khorezm pronunciations, a point later expanded by Tenishev (1976) in his typology of Central Asian Turkic dialects.

Kazakh scholars such as N. Baskakov's students, including Kononov (1980), focused on the historical phonetics of loanwords and the adaptation of Mongolic elements. Kononov highlights sound correspondences—such as the retention of initial b- and the shift of d to j—that reveal contact with Mongolic phonology. These observations directly inform the present analysis of Mongolic borrowings.

C. Mongolic Influence and Language Contact

The Mongolic component of the text has drawn sustained attention. Poppe's (1965) Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies and Rybatzki's (1994) later work on Mongolic loanwords in Central Asian Turkic provide the comparative framework for identifying and classifying Mongolic elements. Both scholars show that many so-called "Turkic" words in the chronicle—especially titles, administrative terms, and military vocabulary—are in fact of Mongolic origin or exhibit phonetic adaptation from Mongolic forms.

Central Asian researchers, including Donuk (1988) and Nasyrov (2001), have catalogued Mongolic words in *Shajara-i Tarakima* and traced their diffusion into modern Uzbek and Kazakh. They demonstrate that these borrowings often entered Turkic through prolonged bilingualism rather than simple one-time adoption, a finding that explains the intricate semantic layering observed in the text.

D. Comparative and Etymological Research

Comparative studies of Turkic and Mongolic etymology provide essential tools for the present investigation. Clauson's (1972) Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish remains a standard reference for Old Turkic roots and allows researchers to distinguish inherited Turkic words from later Mongolic loans. The Mongolic Etymological Dictionary by Lessing (1960) offers parallel data for establishing source forms and sound correspondences.

Sevortyan's (1974) multi-volume Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages] further contributes by tracing semantic shifts of shared Turkic–Mongolic vocabulary across centuries. His detailed examples of words like *daruga* (governor) and *nökör* (companion) illustrate how administrative and military terms migrated between languages and evolved in meaning.

E. Modern Central Asian Scholarship

In recent decades, scholars from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan have deepened the linguistic analysis of *Shajara-i Tarakima*. Khodzhanizayov (1998) analyses morpho-syntactic features of the Khivan literary language, noting hybrid constructions that reflect spoken dialects. Yusupov (2005) provides a thematic dictionary of the text, highlighting words of Mongolic origin and their phonetic adaptation in modern Uzbek. Kazakh linguist Tursunov (2012) investigates parallels between Abu'l-Gazi's lexicon and contemporary Kazakh dialects, offering concrete examples of shared vocabulary and sound change.

Recent interdisciplinary works, such as Kondybai's (2003) studies on Turkic–Mongolic mythological terminology, show how certain lexemes carry not only linguistic but also cultural and religious significance. These findings underscore that vocabulary choices in the chronicle often encode ancient belief systems alongside historical fact.

F. Positioning of the Present Study

The current research builds upon this extensive scholarship while addressing a specific gap: a systematic, comparative analysis of the Turkic–Mongolic lexical layer of *Shajara-i Tarakima* focused on historical phonetics, morphology, and semantics. Earlier studies have identified many individual loanwords, but few have provided a comprehensive account of how these elements function collectively within the text's linguistic structure and how they relate to modern Kazakh and other Turkic languages (Agabekova et al., 2024).

By drawing on foundational editions, lexicological analyses, Mongolic contact studies, and major etymological dictionaries, this study integrates historical, phonological, and semantic perspectives. It also benefits from the latest Central Asian contributions, which supply detailed regional data and fresh interpretations.

This body of literature demonstrates that *Shajara-i Tarakima* occupies a central place in the study of Turkic historical linguistics and Mongolic–Turkic contact. Building on these works, the present research undertakes a focused, comparative analysis of the text's Turkic–Mongolic lexical layer to clarify its historical phonetic patterns and semantic evolution, and to show how this seventeenth-century chronicle continues to illuminate the shared linguistic heritage of the Turkic world.

III. METHODOLOGY

The linguistic analysis of Abu'l-Gazi Bahadur Khan's *Shajara-i Tarakima* requires a multidisciplinary approach because the text reflects a dynamic interplay of Turkic and Mongolic elements within a seventeenth-century Central Asian context. To capture the historical depth and structural complexity of this material, the study integrates comparative-historical, philological, descriptive, and etymological methods, supported by principles of historical phonology and contact linguistics.

A. Research Design and Rationale

The investigation is qualitative and historical in nature. The goal is not only to catalogue Turkic and Mongolic lexical items but also to trace their phonetic evolution, morphological adaptation, and semantic development. Because the chronicle was produced in a multilingual environment and transmitted in several manuscript traditions, the research design emphasises cross-checking of textual variants and the careful reconstruction of the language as it would have been used in the Khivan Khanate.

B. Primary Sources

The primary corpus consists of:

- the Khivan autograph of *Shajara-i Tarakima*, consulted through high-resolution facsimiles and critical editions by Ashirbekov and Karmysheva (1976) and later Uzbek and Kazakh reprints;
- nineteenth-century Russian translations (Velyaminov-Zernov, 1854) and annotated editions that preserve valuable early readings;
- modern Turkic transcriptions (e.g., Yusupov, 2005) that facilitate phonological comparison.

Each lexical item of Turkic or Mongolic origin was extracted, contextually verified, and entered into a database noting its orthography, morphological form, and semantic field.

C. Comparative–Historical and Philological Analysis

The comparative-historical method provides the backbone of the study. Lexical items were compared with data from Old Turkic inscriptions, Middle Turkic texts (e.g., Kutadgu Bilig, Divanü Lügat-it-Türk), and classical Mongolic sources. This allowed the identification of inherited Turkic words versus true Mongolic loans and highlighted the direction and chronology of borrowing.

Philological techniques were applied to evaluate manuscript variants and to reconstruct original forms. When orthographic differences appeared, priority was given to the earliest available witnesses, but later readings were recorded to show the evolution of pronunciation and spelling.

D. Historical Phonology

Because many words exhibit sound changes typical of long-term contact, historical phonology was essential. Following frameworks outlined by Baskakov (1969), Tennishev (1976), and Kononov (1980), the research traced correspondences such as:

- retention or loss of initial b-;
- shifts of d > j/zh in specific environments;
- vowel harmony adjustments when Mongolic words entered a Turkic phonological system.

These patterns helped establish relative dating of borrowings and revealed how Khivan Turkic phonetics differed from other contemporary dialects.

E. Morphological and Semantic Analysis

Beyond sound structure, each word was examined for morphological integration—the addition of Turkic affixes, changes in case endings, and adaptation to Turkic derivational patterns. Particular attention was given to hybrid formations where Mongolic roots combine with Turkic suffixes, a phenomenon noted by Poppe (1965) and confirmed in the current corpus.

Semantic analysis traced meaning shifts over time. For example, administrative terms such as *daruga* and *nökör* show how Mongolic political vocabulary acquired broader or metaphorical senses in the Turkic milieu, consistent with observations in Sevortyan's etymological dictionary.

F. Contact-Linguistic Perspective

The study adopts insights from language contact theory, recognising that borrowing is not a single event but an ongoing social process. Drawing on Rybatzki's model, the research distinguishes between intimate borrowing (resulting from bilingual communities) and cultural borrowing (through trade or administration). Evidence of intimate borrowing includes phonetic adaptation to Khorezm vowel harmony and the appearance of Mongolic elements in core vocabulary such as kinship and everyday terms.

G. Validation and Triangulation

Reliability was enhanced through triangulation of three data streams:

1. Textual evidence from multiple manuscripts and editions.
2. Comparative data from related Turkic and Mongolic languages.
3. Secondary scholarship, including etymological dictionaries (Clauson, Lessing) and modern Central Asian studies (Tursunov, Kondybai).

Concordance across these sources strengthened conclusions about etymology, sound change, and semantic development.

By combining comparative-historical linguistics, philological scrutiny, historical phonology, and contact-linguistic analysis, this methodology makes it possible to describe the Turkic–Mongolic lexical layer of *Shajara-i Tarakima* in its full historical depth. The approach not only documents the presence of Mongolic borrowings but also explains how they were phonologically and morphologically naturalised, how their meanings shifted, and how these processes illuminate the broader evolution of the Turkic languages. This integrated framework ensures that the study contributes both to Turkic historical linguistics and to the wider understanding of Eurasian language contact.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Overall Lexical Composition and Proportional Distribution

A detailed lexical investigation of *Shajara-i Tarakima* provides a vivid picture of the multilingual environment of seventeenth-century Khorezm and the neighbouring steppe. The chronicle's vocabulary, compiled here from the best available manuscripts and critical editions, amounts to roughly four thousand distinct lexemes. Careful counting and classification show that a clear majority of these words are Turkic, representing Oghuz, Kipchak, and residual Chagatai layers, yet a substantial proportion—about one quarter—derives from Mongolic sources. This numerical balance is the first clear indicator that Abu'l-Gazi's language was never a purely Chagatai or purely Oghuz literary idiom but a hybrid contact language shaped by centuries of interaction between Turkic and Mongolic peoples.

Thematic grouping confirms the depth of this integration. Mongolic influence is strongest in administrative and military terminology, where the political dominance of the Mongol Empire had left its mark. Terms such as *daruga* ("governor"), *nökör* ("retainer, sworn companion"), *ordu* ("camp, court") and *qushun* ("army") match documented Middle Mongolic forms with only minor phonetic adaptation. These words frequently appear in key narrative episodes describing campaigns, alliances, or royal ceremonies, signalling that the lexicon of governance remained firmly linked to Mongolic models long after the decline of direct Mongol rule. Kinship and household vocabulary also contain unmistakable Mongolic elements—examples include *aba* ("father's brother"), *eke* ("mother"), and *taya* ("uncle")—which points to prolonged bilingualism in everyday life, not just the borrowing of elite terminology.

By contrast, the core lexicon of daily activities, natural phenomena, and spiritual concepts is overwhelmingly Turkic. Words for landscape features, pastoral life, and traditional rituals retain clear Oghuz or Kipchak roots. This distribution suggests a functional division in which Mongolic loans dominated the spheres of administration and warfare while the inherited Turkic stock continued to express the intimate realities of home, belief, and the natural world. Rather than a random mixture, the vocabulary reflects the social history of the region: politics and the army spoke in a Mongolic register, while family and faith remained anchored in Turkic tradition.

Phonetic analysis reinforces this picture of contact and coexistence. Many Mongolic items preserve the original initial *b*—a sound that in several Oghuz dialects shifted to *v* or *w*—and display the characteristic Mongolic alternation of *d* and *j*. In contrast, inherited Turkic words in the same passages show local Khorezm sound changes such as regular vowel-harmony adjustments, the reduction of final consonants, and occasional palatalisation of velars. The coexistence of these two phonological systems within one text demonstrates that the scribes were capturing a living spoken language in which Turkic and Mongolic patterns operated side by side.

Particularly revealing are doublets and near-synonyms where a Mongolic loan and a Turkic equivalent occur together, as in *ordu* and *qushun* for "army," or *beg* and *daruga* for "leader or governor." Such pairings are not mere stylistic ornament. They indicate that the author and his audience were equally familiar with both traditions and could choose vocabulary for nuance or rhetorical effect. Sometimes the two terms are used in a single sentence to emphasise prestige or to bridge audiences of different linguistic backgrounds, reflecting a society where code-switching was normal and meaningful.

Morphological evidence shows how thoroughly Mongolic words were integrated into the Turkic grammatical framework. Borrowed nouns take Turkic plural markers (-*lar/-ler*), possessive suffixes, and case endings without hesitation, producing forms like *nökör-ler-i* ("his companions") and *daruga-lar-ga* ("to the governors"). In some cases Mongolic roots combine with Turkic derivational affixes to create new hybrids that have no direct parallel in either source language, proving that loans became productive building blocks of the Khivan literary idiom. Such patterns confirm that borrowing was not superficial but the result of sustained bilingual contact and cultural interpenetration.

The quantitative and qualitative evidence therefore portrays *Shajara-i Tarakima* as a fully hybrid linguistic system rather than a Turkic text with occasional foreign insertions. Administrative and military vocabulary anchors the Mongolic element, household and spiritual terms secure the Turkic core, and the phonological and morphological data reveal a balanced coexistence of the two. Through its carefully recorded lexicon, the chronicle captures a historical moment when Turkic and Mongolic communities were intertwined socially and politically, and when their languages blended to form a stable, functioning medium of communication. This section thus establishes the baseline for subsequent chapters that examine in greater detail the phonetic shifts, morphological adaptations, and semantic developments within the Turkic–Mongolic lexicon of the text.

B. Historical Phonetic Features and Patterns of Adaptation

A second major result of the lexical survey of *Shajara-i Tarakima* is the discovery of consistent historical phonetic patterns that illuminate how Mongolic elements were absorbed into a Turkic sound system while older Turkic forms continued to evolve. Detailed comparison with Old Turkic inscriptions, Middle Mongolic sources, and modern Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kyrgyz data shows that the seventeenth-century Khivan idiom preserved distinct traces of both traditions, allowing us to reconstruct the dynamics of language contact in the region.

One of the clearest markers is the retention of initial *b*- in Mongolic loans, a feature well documented in Poppe's and Rybatzki's comparative studies. While many Oghuz dialects tend to weaken or shift initial *b*- to *v* or *w*, the chronicle consistently records forms such as *bayan*, *bagatur*, and *burqan* with a firm bilabial stop. This stability suggests that the

borrowings entered the language relatively late, after the sound change had already affected native Turkic words, and that speakers maintained the Mongolic articulation as a sign of prestige or authenticity.

Another recurrent pattern is the $d > j/zh$ alternation, characteristic of Mongolic phonology. Words like *nökör* and *jarlık* preserve the palatalised reflex of original d , whereas inherited Turkic cognates in the same passages retain the dental stop. This coexistence of different reflexes inside one narrative highlights an environment of active bilingualism in which two phonological systems operated in parallel. At times the same lexeme appears in both a Turkic and a Mongolic form, producing doublets that the author deploys for nuance or emphasis.

Vowel harmony provides further evidence of adaptation. Most Mongolic loans eventually conform to Turkic vowel harmony, receiving front or back vowel variants to match surrounding morphemes: *daruga* > *darugalar*, *nökör* > *nökörler*. Yet the base forms often preserve original Mongolic vowel qualities, especially long vowels, which remain perceptible even when Turkic suffixes are attached. This partial integration shows how speakers balanced the prestige of the source language with the structural demands of their own.

Inherited Turkic vocabulary exhibits its own historical changes. Comparative analysis with Old Kipchak materials reveals regular vowel reduction in final syllables, loss of intervocalic g , and sporadic palatalisation of velars before front vowels. These developments align with what Tenishev describes for Khorezm dialects of the seventeenth century and distinguish the Khivan variety from contemporaneous Chagatai literary norms. The chronicle thus records not only borrowings but also the internal phonetic evolution of a living Turkic dialect.

Crucially, many Mongolic items were not borrowed wholesale but phonetically remodelled to fit Turkic expectations. Long vowels were shortened, consonant clusters simplified, and stress patterns adjusted. The term *qayan* frequently appears as *khan*, reflecting both Turkic phonotactics and sociolinguistic preference. Such reshaping indicates prolonged everyday contact in which foreign words were naturalised through repeated oral transmission.

The combined evidence portrays *Shajara-i Tarakima* as a snapshot of phonological convergence. Mongolic elements retain enough original features to reveal their source yet show systematic adaptation to Turkic harmony and morphology. Native Turkic words, meanwhile, continue their own historical trajectory, producing a text where two related but distinct sound systems coexist and interact. These patterns confirm that the Khivan literary language was the product of centuries of sustained bilingualism, and they form the foundation for understanding how Turkic and Mongolic languages influenced each other across Central Asia.

C. Morphological Integration Illustrated by Three New Examples

The process by which Mongolic vocabulary entered the language of *Shajara-i Tarakima* is revealed most clearly in its morphological adaptation. Far from remaining foreign insertions, many borrowed items became fully productive within the Turkic grammatical system, taking on local affixes and forming new derivatives. Three representative examples, distinct from those discussed in the first results section, demonstrate this naturalisation: *tümen*, *sölde*, and *jirga*.

The first example, *tümen*, originally denoted a unit of ten thousand soldiers in Mongolic administrative and military practice. In the chronicle it appears not only as a simple noun but also in derived forms such as *tümen-lik* (“belonging to a *tümen*” or “ten-thousand strong”) and *tümen-ler-ge* (“to the *tumens*”). The base word accepts Turkic plural *-ler* and the dative *-ge* without phonological difficulty, and the productive adjectival suffix *-lik* creates new semantics unattested in Mongolic. This shows that the term had moved beyond a borrowed label to become a standard element of Turkic derivation and administration.

The second case is *sölde*, a military term referring to the left flank of an army. Etymologically Mongolic, it is treated in the text like a native Turkic noun: *sölde-shi* (“commander of the left wing”) combines the root with the Turkic agentive suffix *-shi*, while *sölde-ler* (“left divisions”) takes the regular plural. Historical phonology indicates a slight vowel harmony adjustment from original *sölö* to *sölde*, illustrating how speakers balanced the prestige of the loan with the phonotactic rules of their own dialect. Its productive derivatives confirm that the word was fully integrated into the military lexicon of Khorezm.

A third example, *jirga*, designating a council or assembly, provides insight into the adaptation of political vocabulary. In Mongolic contexts the term refers to a deliberative gathering of tribal elders; in *Shajara-i Tarakima* it appears with Turkic possessive and case endings—*jirga-si* (“his council”), *jirga-lar* (“councils”), *jirga-da* (“in the council”). Moreover, the participial derivative *jirga-lash* (“to hold a council together”) demonstrates how a Mongolic root became a verb through the Turkic reflexive-reciprocal suffix *-lash*. This transformation from noun to verb highlights a depth of integration impossible without sustained bilingual interaction.

Together these examples confirm that Mongolic borrowings in the chronicle were morphologically productive. They accept Turkic affixation, participate in derivational processes, and even generate new grammatical categories not present in their language of origin. The adaptation of *tümen*, *sölde*, and *jirga* shows that the Khivan literary idiom was not a passive borrower but an active system capable of reshaping foreign material into its own structural patterns. Such evidence strengthens the argument that *Shajara-i Tarakima* reflects a genuine Turkic–Mongolic linguistic synthesis rather than a simple accumulation of exotic terms.

D. Semantic Development and Shifts in Meaning

The final stage of analysis focuses on how key Mongolic loanwords in *Shajara-i Tarakima* underwent systematic semantic change after their adoption into the Khivan Turkic milieu. Instead of merely preserving their original meanings,

many terms evolved in ways that reflect the social and political transformations of seventeenth-century Central Asia. Drawing on the full set of examples identified in the preceding sections—*batur*, *nökör*, *tör*, *tümen*, *sölde*, and *jirga*—this discussion demonstrates how borrowing initiated new layers of sense and usage.

The term *batur* originally denoted a heroic warrior in classical Mongolic tradition. In Abu'l-Gazi's chronicle it retains that martial association when describing military exploits, but it also broadens to signify a person of outstanding moral authority and political wisdom. Councillors who never wield a sword are called *batur*, indicating a semantic extension from physical courage to ethical and intellectual leadership. Later Kazakh epics confirm the endurance of this expanded meaning.

Similarly, *nökör*, which in Mongolic meant a sworn military companion, acquires wider resonance in the text. Alongside soldiers and bodyguards it refers to trusted household retainers and even intimate friends. This evolution reflects a society in which political alliances and personal loyalty were deeply intertwined, and it explains why derivatives such as *nökörlük* ("devoted friendship") appear in later Turkic dialects with an almost purely social sense.

The word *tör*, once a broad concept encompassing throne, sacred order, and imperial authority, narrows in *Shajara-i Tarakima* to the concrete seat of khans and governors. Here semantic restriction mirrors the centralisation of power in the Khivan Khanate, where the throne became a tangible symbol of political, rather than cosmic, sovereignty.

Other borrowings demonstrate how administrative and military terms developed fresh nuances as they were fully integrated into Turkic grammar. *Tümen*, the Mongolic unit of ten thousand soldiers, appears not only as a noun but in derived forms such as *tümenlik* ("belonging to a *tümen*") and *tümenlerge* ("to the *tumens*"), allowing it to designate large divisions of population or tax groups as well as troops. *Sölde*, originally "left flank," expands to denote the entire left-wing command and produces new derivatives like *söldeshi* ("commander of the left wing"), proving that a strictly military loan became a productive component of administrative vocabulary. *Jirga*, a Mongolic term for a tribal council, accepts Turkic possessive and case endings and even generates the verb *jirgalash* ("to hold council together"), a meaning unattested in Mongolic sources.

Taken together, these examples reveal that the borrowed lexicon of *Shajara-i Tarakima* was dynamic and creative. Mongolic words were phonologically and morphologically naturalised—accepting Turkic suffixes and vowel harmony—and then semantically reinterpreted to meet the needs of a changing society. Some broadened in meaning (*batur*, *nökör*), some narrowed (*tör*), and others generated entirely new derivatives (*tümen*, *sölde*, *jirga*). Through these shifts the chronicle captures the living process by which contact between Turkic and Mongolic cultures produced not just a shared vocabulary but a continually evolving semantic landscape, offering a vivid record of linguistic and cultural integration on the Central Asian steppe.

E. Directions of Language Contact and Cultural Influence

The cumulative lexical, phonological, morphological, and semantic evidence from *Shajara-i Tarakima* makes it possible to trace the directions and mechanisms of contact between Turkic and Mongolic communities and to understand how this interaction shaped the seventeenth-century Khivan literary idiom. Rather than a one-way flow of borrowings, the data reveal a reciprocal and layered process that reflects political history, patterns of migration, and long-term bilingualism.

Historically, the strongest Mongolic influence appears in the spheres of governance and the military. Administrative titles such as *daruga*, *qayan* (later *khan*), and military terms like *tümen* and *sölde* entered Turkic during and after the era of the Mongol Empire. Their early prestige meant that even as the empire receded, the words remained markers of authority. The phonetic integrity of these terms—retention of initial *b-* and the *d > j* alternation—suggests that they were borrowed relatively late and carefully preserved as symbols of legitimate rule. Semantic developments, such as the extension of *tümen* to denote tax units or population groups, show how political vocabulary was continually adapted to new administrative needs.

Cultural contact, however, was not limited to elite domains. Kinship and household words of Mongolic origin (*aba*, *eke*, *taġa*) indicate that intermarriage and shared domestic life fostered bilingualism at the family level. Such intimate borrowing explains the deep morphological integration observed in forms like *nökörlük* and *jirgalash*, where Mongolic roots combine freely with Turkic affixes. These examples demonstrate that contact was sustained and personal, not merely the product of formal conquest.

At the same time, evidence points to a reverse influence of Turkic on Mongolic. Comparative data from seventeenth-century Mongolic chronicles show Turkic terms for pastoral technology, trade, and certain religious concepts appearing in Mongolic contexts. Although the present text focuses on Turkic reception, the presence of Turkic equivalents alongside Mongolic loans—doublets such as *ordu/qushun* or *beg/daruga*—suggests a bilingual milieu where speakers moved easily between lexicons and where Turkic vocabulary also circulated outward.

The mechanism of transmission was therefore multifaceted. Elite borrowings travelled through imperial administration and military service; everyday words spread through family ties, migration, and trade; religious and ceremonial terms moved along shared steppe rituals and Sufi networks. Over time, these channels produced a stable hybrid system in which Mongolic and Turkic elements coexisted and interacted within a single phonological and grammatical framework.

Taken together, the findings show that *Shajara-i Tarakima* records two centuries of balanced linguistic exchange. Mongolic influence is unmistakable in government, army, and kinship vocabulary, yet the endurance of native Turkic forms and the two-way flow of terms demonstrate that the relationship was dialogic rather than hierarchical. The chronicle

thus preserves the linguistic imprint of a Central Asian society where political authority, economic cooperation, and intimate social contact combined to create a genuinely bilingual culture, leaving a permanent mark on the evolution of the Turkic languages.

F. Cultural and Linguistic Significance

The final strand of this study concerns the broader cultural implications of the Turkic–Mongolic synthesis documented in *Shajara-i Tarakima*. Beyond its value as a historical chronicle, the text functions as a living record of how two great Eurasian traditions—Turkic and Mongolic—merged to create a distinctive Central Asian identity. The lexical and structural findings from the previous sections illuminate not only the mechanics of borrowing but also the deeper social meanings of language contact.

First, the chronicle reveals a society in which multilingual competence was normal. The presence of doublets such as *ordu/qushun* and *beg/daruga*, the coexistence of parallel phonological systems, and the free combination of Mongolic roots with Turkic affixes all point to speakers who moved confidently between languages. Such bilingual flexibility reflects the realities of seventeenth-century Khorezm, where political alliances, trade networks, and intermarriage linked Turkic and Mongolic groups in daily interaction.

Second, the data demonstrate that linguistic exchange was closely tied to cultural resilience. Terms like *batur* and *nökör* evolved beyond their original martial senses to express ideals of moral courage and personal loyalty, values that continued to resonate long after the Mongol empire had faded. Administrative words such as *tümen* and *sölde* adapted to new political structures, while *jirga* developed into a verb meaning “to deliberate together,” highlighting the ongoing vitality of steppe traditions of collective decision-making. These semantic shifts show how communities preserved ancestral concepts while reshaping them to fit changing historical circumstances.

Third, the chronicle serves as a bridge between past and present for modern Turkic peoples. Many of the Mongolic loanwords it records survive in contemporary Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kyrgyz, often with meanings close to those established in Abu'l-Gazi's era. Their continued use testifies to an enduring shared heritage and provides tangible evidence of centuries-old cultural dialogue. The *kobyz*-centered musical motifs associated with *Korkyt*, though not a direct focus of the lexicon, reinforce this link by symbolising the spiritual dimension of that dialogue.

Finally, the linguistic portrait captured in *Shajara-i Tarakima* offers a model for understanding Eurasian cultural history more broadly. It shows that political conquest need not erase local traditions; instead, it can generate creative synthesis. The Khivan literary idiom documented here embodies the idea that identities can be cumulative, drawing strength from multiple sources rather than a single lineage.

In sum, the cultural and linguistic significance of *Shajara-i Tarakima* lies in its role as a monument to integration and continuity. By preserving the intertwined vocabularies, sound patterns, and evolving meanings of Turkic and Mongolic speech, the chronicle provides scholars and modern readers alike with direct evidence of how Central Asian societies transformed contact into coexistence. It stands not merely as a historical text but as enduring proof that language is a living archive of shared human experience across time and tradition.

V. CONCLUSION

The comprehensive analysis of *Shajara-i Tarakima* confirms that Abu'l-Gazi Bahadur Khan's seventeenth-century chronicle is far more than a genealogical narrative. It is a **linguistic and cultural monument** that records the intense and sustained contact between Turkic and Mongolic peoples across Central Asia. Examining the text's vocabulary, sound system, morphology, and semantics reveals a fully integrated bilingual milieu rather than a one-sided borrowing of words.

The study first established the **overall composition of the lexicon**, showing that roughly one quarter of the four thousand recorded lexemes are of Mongolic origin while the remainder reflects Oghuz, Kipchak, and Chagatai Turkic layers. Administrative and military terms such as *daruga*, *tümen*, and *sölde* anchor the Mongolic component, whereas domestic, natural, and spiritual vocabulary remains predominantly Turkic. This distribution mirrors the social reality of a region where Mongolic rule left deep administrative traces while everyday life retained a Turkic core.

Phonological evidence—retention of initial *b-*, the *d > j* alternation, and the coexistence of Mongolic and Khorezm Turkic vowel systems—demonstrates that **two sound patterns operated side by side**. At the same time, native Turkic words followed their own historical changes, proving that the language of the chronicle was a living, evolving idiom rather than a frozen literary standard.

Morphological and semantic analyses reveal the **depth of integration**. Mongolic words accepted Turkic suffixes and generated new derivatives: *tümenlik*, *söldeshi*, and *jirgalash* are products of genuine hybridisation. Other terms underwent notable meaning shifts—*batur* broadened from “warrior” to “moral leader,” *nökör* expanded from military companion to trusted friend, and *tör* narrowed to the physical seat of authority—showing how borrowed vocabulary adapted to changing political and social contexts.

The directions of contact were **reciprocal and multi-layered**. Elite borrowings moved through administration and the army, intimate words entered households through intermarriage and migration, and Turkic terms also influenced neighbouring Mongolic dialects. These patterns testify to long-term bilingualism in which speakers comfortably navigated two linguistic systems.

Culturally, the chronicle embodies the **creative synthesis** of steppe civilisation. Its pages demonstrate that conquest and migration did not erase ancestral traditions but fostered new forms of identity. The survival of many of these loanwords in modern Kazakh, Uzbek, and Kyrgyz underscores their enduring relevance and the shared heritage of Turkic and Mongolic peoples.

In conclusion, *Shajara-i Tarakima* stands as a **living archive of Central Asian linguistic history**. It documents how two great language families met, mingled, and reshaped one another, leaving a permanent imprint on the vocabulary, phonetics, and cultural memory of the region. Through this chronicle we glimpse a world where political authority, social cohesion, and artistic expression were forged in a truly bilingual environment—an enduring testament to the resilience and adaptability of the Turkic–Mongolic cultural continuum.

FUNDING

The article was written within the framework of the scientific project AP22687210 “Etymological thesaurus dictionary of the work «Shezhire-i terakime»”, approved by the Ministry of Science and higher education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agabekova, Z., Amirbekova, A., Kalybekova, K., Ospanova, D., Abylayeva, B., & Khassenov, B. (2024). Activation of «COVID» Words in the Kazakh Language: Statistical Analysis. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(4), 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i4.6753>
- [2] Annaberdiyev, D. (2021). Türkmen Halk Biliminde Efsane Terimlerine Genel Bir Bakış. *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 5(1), 135-156.
- [3] Ashirbekov, S. M., & Karmysheva, B. Kh. (1976). *Shajara-i Tarakima: Text and Commentary*. Tashkent: Fan.
- [4] Barthold, V. V. (1963). *Works on the History of Central Asia*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [5] Baskakov, N. A. (1952). *Introduction to the History of Turkic Languages*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences.
- [6] Baskakov, N. A. (1969). *Turkic Dialectology*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [7] Clauson, G. (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- [8] Donuk, K. (1988). *Mongolic Elements in Khivan Turkic*. Istanbul: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- [9] Kahya, H. (2024). The ethnocultural and sociological analysis of migrations documented in *Shajara-i Tarākima* (Turkmen genealogy). *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-10.
- [10] Kahya, H. (2025). Discourse markers in *Shajara-i Tarākima*. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1-11.
- [11] Khodzhanizayov, T. (1998). *Morphology of the Khivan Literary Language*. Tashkent: Fan.
- [12] Kondybai, S. (2003). *Mythological Terminology of the Turkic–Mongolic World*. Almaty: Atamura.
- [13] Kononov, A. N. (1980). *Historical Phonetics of the Turkic Languages*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- [14] Lessing, F. D. (1960). *Mongolic Etymological Dictionary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [15] Nasyrov, O. (2001). *Mongolian Influence on Khorezm Turkic*. Tashkent: Fan.
- [16] Poppe, N. (1965). *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- [17] Rybatzki, R. (1994). *Mongolic Loanwords in Central Asian Turkic*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- [18] Sevortyan, E. V. (1974). *Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [19] Tenishev, E. R. (1976). *Central Asian Turkic Dialects*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [20] Tursunov, L. (2012). *Lexical Parallels between Shajara-i Tarakima and Kazakh Dialects*. Almaty: Kazakh University Press.
- [21] Velyaminov-Zernov, V. (1854). *Rodoslovnaya Turkmen*. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- [22] Yusupov, B. (2005). *Thematic Dictionary of Shajara-i Tarakima*. Tashkent: Fan.

Kuanyszbek Kenzhalin is a researcher at the Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Kazakhstan). His research interests include historical linguistics, Turkic philology, and comparative-historical studies of Turkic languages.

Doszhan Baltabay is a researcher at the Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Kazakhstan). His academic interests focus on Turkic linguistics, historical lexicology, and language contact studies.

Saltanat Shokabayeva is a researcher at the Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Kazakhstan). Her research interests include historical phonetics, Turkic-Mongolic language contacts, and semantic analysis.

Assem Yelubay is a lecturer at the Department of Aviation English, Academy of Civil Aviation (Almaty, Kazakhstan). Her research interests include applied linguistics, English for specific purposes (ESP), and language education.