

Artykuły / Articles

HENRYK JANKOWSKI

(Poznań, Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2576-1204 

A Southeastern Turkic Liturgical Poem in two Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatar Manuscripts: The Link to Aḥmad Yasavī Tradition

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to edit a poem of the *zīkr* genre found in two Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatar manuscripts critically and to demonstrate that it belongs to the Aḥmad Yasavī tradition. Among the Turkic *zīkrs* which have so far been identified in this literature, this is the only one which exhibits Southeastern Turkic or Chaghatay features. However, at the same time it also reveals Turkish traits. The article tries to explain this diversity of features. The Chaghatay source of this poem was found in a *ḥikmat* collection published in Istanbul in 1881/1882 attributed to Aḥmad Yasavī. There is also indirect evidence for the existence of this *zīkr* in a manuscript held in a private collection in Central Asia, but it is unavailable for research and was published in a popular book. The article also discusses the questions of language, literature and style relating to this poem. Attempt was also made to show that there is no evidence for any Sufi activity among Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatars in the past and that the Sufi elements were transplanted through Turkic manuscripts without any intentional endeavour to adopt Sufism as a doctrine.

Keywords: Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatar, liturgical poem, Yasavī tradition, *zīkrs*, *ḥikmats*



To the memory of Rayhan Aktayeva, my sister-in-law, who helped me find the owner of a *ḥikmat* manuscript in Sayram

1. Introduction

Tatars have been settled by Duke Vytautas in Lithuania which included almost the whole territory of present-day Belarus in the fourteenth century, thus the most proper historical term for them is Lithuanian Tatars. However, to begin with 1385, the Grand Lithuanian Duchy was bound with the Polish Kingdom with a few pacts, and in 1569 both states were united into one state as Poland-Lithuania which existed until 1795 and the Tatars were then also called Lithuanian-Polish or Polish or Lithuanian, but in the sense of belonging to the Lithuanian part of the commonwealth. After the emergence of new states in 1918, the Tatars have been called Lithuanian, Polish and Belarusian depending on where they lived. Therefore, the most correct name, although lengthy, is Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatars, henceforth also LPB Tatars or just LPBT.

Although the Turkic language of the LPB Tatars fell in disuse in the 16th century, the LPB Tatars left hundreds of manuscripts with mostly religious literature, copied from various manuscripts written in Arabic and Turkic languages, and they often translated different works into Polish and Belarusian. This literature is known since 1838 when Henricus Orthobius (Heinrich Leberecht) Fleischer described a 16th-century prayer book and more widely since 1857 when Antoni Muchliński published samples of four texts.¹ The first attempt to classify the LPB literature was made in 1935 by Jakób Szynekiewicz.² Further types and objects containing texts were added in 2000 by Andrzej Drozd, Marek Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, and documents (legal, congregational and private correspondence) were added in 2003 by Henryk Jankowski.³ We have also a few catalogues of LPBT manuscripts⁴ and texts edited critically.

¹ H.O. Fleischer, '179. Codex arabicus, tataricus, polonicus [...]'], in: *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*, ed. Ae.G.R. Naumann, Grima 1838, pp. 450–451 and A. Muxlinskij, *Izslédovanie o proisxoždenii Litovskix Tatar*, Sanktpeterburg 1857, pp. 62–70.

² Jakób Szynekiewicz, 'Literatura religijna Tatarów litewskich i jej pochodzenie', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), pp. 138–144.

³ Andrzej Drozd, 'Piśmiennictwo Tatarów polsko-litewskich (XVI–XX w.). Zarys problematyki', in: Andrzej Drozd, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry Tatarów polsko-litewskich. Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich. Tom III*, Warszawa 2000, p. 12; Henryk Jankowski, 'Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatar Documents', *Materialia Turcica* 24 (2003), p. 115.

⁴ Andrzej Drozd, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry*; Galina Miškinene, Sigita Namavičjute and Ekaterina Pokrovskaja, *Katalog arabskoalfavitnyx rukopisej litovskix tatar*, Vil'nius 2005; M.U. Tarëłka and A.I. Citavec, *Rukapisy tatarau Belarusi kanca XVII – pačatku XX st. z dzjaržaunyx knigazboraŭ krainy. Katalog*, Minsk 2011; M.U. Tarëłka, *Rukapisy tatarau Belarusi XVIII – pačatku XXI stogodzja z dzjaržaunyx i gramadskix knigazboraŭ krainy. Katalog*, Minsk 2015; M.U. Tarëłka, *Tafsiry, kitaby i xamaily z pryvatnyx knigazboraŭ Belarusi*, Minsk 2020.

2. *Zikr* as a literary genre of Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatar literature and its liturgical recitation

The Arabic *dikr* is defined as ‘the act of reminding, then mention of the memory, especially tireless repetition of an ejaculatory litany, finally the very technique of this mention’.⁵

In the religious literature of the LPB Tatars, *zikr*, LPBT *ziker*, is a well-known genre. At the same time, it is one of the best attested and best preserved forms of traditional Tatar rituals and part of liturgy. In his classical monograph on Lithuanian Tatars, Stanisław Kryczyński described the *zikr* in the following way:

On the first Friday of each lunar month and on each Friday in great congregations, the Tatars celebrate services in mosques which contain recitation the Qur’an lead by a Mullah (Imam) and choral singing of a beautiful hymn called *zikr* which means ‘remembering, glory, salutation.’ This is a type of litany in which the Muslims greet most esteemed prophets of the Old Testament, the prophet Jesus and the prophet Muhammad. In some communities, the Tatars know several *zikrs* by heart, since there are a few kinds of these hymns, and they perform a *zikr* depending on the circumstances. The melodies of these hymns should be examined, since they probably go back to the Kipchak past of the present-day Lithuanian Tatars.⁶

It is a pity that nobody studied the melody of *zikrs* before World War II and the Soviet regime that followed it, which brought an end to the traditional life of many Tatar communities. Then Kryczyński cited Ali Woronowicz’s unpublished description of a *zikr* performance in Daubutishki:

The gentle melody in which the vanity and insignificance of man in relation to God is reflected affects the performers and the listeners so greatly that during singing of a *zikr* women weep and men’s eyes shine with tears. The performance is similar to the mystery of dervishes.

Kryczyński added that the Friday service was long and lasted about two hours and reported that the *zikr* was one of the components of the show organized at the completion of the course in religion attended by Lithuanian Tatar children.⁷

Kryczyński was right when he said that there were several types of the *zikr*, since it is evident from the analysis of LPB Tatar literature. One type is a kind of Arabic litany

⁵ L. Gardet, ‘*Dhikr*’, in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Volume II*, Leiden 1991, p. 223.

⁶ Stanisław Kryczyński, ‘Tatarzy litewscy. Próba monografii historyczno-etnograficznej’, *Rocznik Tatarski* 3 (1938), p. 179.

⁷ Ibidem, p. 216.

in which four Muslim archangels and twelve prophets from Adam to Muhammad are recalled with the recurring refrain *Lā ilāha illā 'llāh* 'There is no god but God', as shown in Drozd, Dziekan, and Majda's catalogue⁸ and as present in many LPB Tatar prayer books or *hamails*,⁹ but also in larger manuscripts called *kitabs*.¹⁰ Another type includes longer Turkic, mostly Turkish religious hymns of diversified contents, e.g., devoted to God and the Prophet Muhammad,¹¹ recounting the merits of the reading of the Qur'an, glorifying holy months, etc. Some of these *zikrs* consist of Turkic texts only, but some are accompanied by Belarusian, Polish or mixed Belarusian-Polish translation, as observed already by Woronowicz.¹²

If the *zkr* has a refrain which is often the case in both type one and type two, the main performer sings it, and the other male participants of the ritual sing the refrain. Ali Smajkiewicz who included a well-known *zkr* that begins with the words *Muhammed ümmeti olan zinhār namāz, kılğıl namāz* 'Beware, O Muhammad's community, perform the prayer!' in his prayer book for Polish Tatars, gave a good instruction how to perform it: "one member of the congregation who pray recites the *zkr* out loud and the others repeat after him the recurring fourth verse *zinhār namaz kılğıl namaz* of each stanza."¹³

There is also a third, mixed type of the *zkr*. The basic text of the poems of this kind is Arabic, but some copyists add Turkish words to it, e.g. *Sen Kerîmsen* (correctly *Kerîmsin*) 'You are Generous'.¹⁴

The knowledge and the tradition of reciting *zikrs* has disappeared in Poland and Lithuania, and reportedly also in Belarus, with the death of the last believers educated by their local spiritual leaders. The author of these lines had an opportunity to watch and listen to the *zkr* ceremonies in the 1990s and early 2000s.

⁸ Andrzej Drozd, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Pis̨miennictwo i muhiry*, plates 134 and 135.

⁹ LPBT *hamail* (*chamail*) is not the Ar. *ḥamā'il* and the Tur. *hamail* 'a Qur'an or similar book, or a charm, or amulet, carried suspended in its case over one shoulder' (James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon. Shewing in English the Significations of the Turkish Terms*, Constantinople 1890, p. 805), but a handwritten liturgical book with Arabic and Turkic prayers, and Slavic instructions to them, as well as chapters devoted to the Islamic calendar, healing diseases, amulets against spells and charms, etc., see Jakób Szynekiewicz, 'Literatura religijna', p. 139 and Henryk Jankowski, 'Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatar Documents', p. 56.

¹⁰ LPBT *kitab* is not the Ar. *kitāb* and the Tur. *kitab* (> *kitap*) 'book' (James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, p. 1523), but a kind of handwritten religious book of diversified contents, for literature in English, see Shirin Akiner, *Religious Language of a Belarusian Tatar Kitab. A Cultural Monument of Islam in Europe*, Wiesbaden 2009.

¹¹ Ali Woronowicz, 'Szczątki językowe Tatarów litewskich', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), p. 366.

¹² Ali Woronowicz, 'Kitab Tatarów litewskich i jego zawartość', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), p. 386.

¹³ Ali Smajkiewicz, *Zbiór modlitw do wykonania obrządków azanu, nikiachu, dżenazie i składania ofiary „kurban”*, Gdańsk 1970, p. 133.

¹⁴ Folio 127a of the undated *hamail* copied in the mid-nineteenth century kept in the State Museum of Religion History in Hrodna/Grodno, Belarus, shelf mark ČZ 1814, for a description, see M.U. Tarëłka and A.I. Citavec, *Rukapisy*, pp. 110–115.

3. The study on the Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian Tatar *ziks*

For the first time, a *zīkr*, although called by the editor just a piece of poetry, was presented by Aleksander Dubiński in 1988 from a manuscript dated to the nineteenth–twentieth centuries.¹⁵ It was the *zīkr* that begins with the words *Her kim kıılır tañ namāzın, Allāh kıılır kabūl sözün* ‘God will accept words of him who performs the morning prayer,’ but the author of the publication added to this *zīkr* two distichs of another *zīkr* that begins with the words *Miskin adam oğlanı* ‘O, poor man’s son.’ The poem *Her kim kıılır tañ namāzın* with the copyist’s Polish translation was also published by Jankowski from one of Mustafa Szahidewicz’s *kitab*s copied in the nineteenth century.¹⁶ This *zīkr* consists of twelve eight-syllabic rhyming distichs AA BB CC, etc., which tell the benefits from performing five daily obligatory prayers.

The next *zīkr* beginning with the words *Dertlülerniñ tabībi* ‘Healer of the sufferers’ from another manuscript copied by Mustafa Szahidewicz in 1852 was published by Jankowski¹⁷ and later by the same author from six manuscripts with Polish translations.¹⁸ This is a hymn to Muhammad, a longer poem consisting of eighteen quatrain stanzas of the AAAB CCCB rhyme scheme and eight syllables in each line, with the last word Muhammad in the fourth line of each stanza, though all versions are defected.

The third *zīkr* that begins with the words *Qur’ān okı, Qur’ān okı* ‘Recite the Qur’an, recite the Qur’an’ edited from seven manuscripts, some with Polish and one with Belarusian-Polish translations, was also published by Jankowski.¹⁹ It consists of thirteen quatrain stanzas of a somewhat irregular rhyme pattern ABXB CCXB, of which B is the word *ola* ‘(it) will be,’ and eight syllables in each line.

So far ten *ziks* have been identified in the LPB Tatar manuscripts. All are contained in one of the oldest manuscripts, Jan Jezufowicz’s *hamail* of 1765.²⁰

¹⁵ Aleksander Dubiński, ‘Polonya–Litvanya Tatarlarının Yazılı Metinlerde Kullandıkları Türkçe’, in: *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1988 (26 Eylül–3 Ekim 1988)*, Ankara 1996, p. 269.

¹⁶ Henryk Jankowski, ‘Teksty turkijskie i ich polskie tłumaczenia w *kitabie* Mustafy Szahidewicza KMSzah3’, in: *Święte księgi judaizmu, chrześcijaństwa i islamu w słowiańskim kręgu kulturowym. Prace dedykowane Czesławowi Łapicowi. Tom 1. Księga wyznawców islamu. Kitabistyka*, eds. Monika Krajewska, Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska and Arleta Szulc, Toruń 2016, pp. 189–191.

¹⁷ Henryk Jankowski, ‘A Polish Tatar *Ziker*’, *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 48/3 (1995), pp. 405–420.

¹⁸ Henryk Jankowski, ‘A *ziker* of Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatars in Turkish and its Polish translation by Mustafa Szahidewicz’, in: *Turkologu za učast! Zbornik radova povodom 70. rođendana Ekrema Čauševića. In Honor of the Turkologist! Essays Celebrating the 70th Birthday of Ekrem Čaušević*, eds. Tatjana Paić-Vukić et al., Zagreb 2022, pp. 55–80.

¹⁹ Henryk Jankowski, ‘*Zīkr* turecki *Qur’ān okı* “Czytaj Koran” w modlitewnikach litewsko-polsko-białorusko-tatarskich z przekładem białorusko-polskim i polskim’, in: *Działalność społeczno-kulturalna jako czynnik wzmacniający tożsamość Tatarów. Próba bilansu i perspektywy. XXV lat Letniej Akademii Wiedzy o Tatarach*, ed. Artur Konopacki, Warszawa 2023, pp. 147–191.

²⁰ Henryk Jankowski, ‘Teksty turkijskie’, p. 188.

4. The Southeastern Turkic *zīkr Yazuqumnī yarlıqa, Ğaffār atlıġ İlāhīm* in the manuscripts and the link to Aḥmad Yasavī tradition

This is the fourth *zīkr* among ten in Jezufowicz's *hamail* (260b–262a). Apart from this, it was found in only one manuscript, i.e. Stefan Bohuševič's *hamail* of 1834.²¹ There is one feature that makes this *zīkr* different from the others, it is its language. All other poems of this type known so far are either Turkish, i.e. written in a Southwestern Turkic language, though with a deal of archaic and non-Turkish features which can be attributed to both northwestern or Kipchak and southeastern or Khwarezmian, later Chaghatay influence. It is certain that the Tatars of Poland-Lithuania did not compose Turkic poetry themselves, but copied it from Turkey, Crimea and other areas, although all routes have not been established yet. As is supposed, Tatar was replaced with the local languages in Poland-Lithuania, i.e. the language of the Western Rus, predecessor of modern Belarusian, and Polish, in the sixteenth century. However, some passive knowledge of Tatar and—especially in the written form—Turkish among educated men and the Mullahs is evident from the documents.²²

The evident Southeastern Turkic provenience of this poem directs the reader to Central Asia. Moreover, it can be assumed that the subtitle *Ziker hukmet/hükmet* in Jezufowicz's *hamail* (ChJ Jez 260b), correctly *Zīkr-i ḥikmet* 'remembering wisdom' in Turkish and in unvocalized Turkish-Slavic *Ziker ḥikmet to jest* 'this is the remembrance of wisdom' in Bohuševič's *hamail* (ChSBah 369) as well as *Ziker ḥikmet budur* or *Zīkr-i ḥikmet budur* at the beginning of the poem *Ḳur'ān oḳı Ḳur'ān oḳı* in another manuscript (PKitM)²³ from the eighteenth century,²⁴ and some other *zīkrs* in many manuscripts, is a real link to Aḥmad Yasavī tradition.²⁵

The story of Aḥmad Yasavī (Tur. Ahmet Yesevi) and his *ḥikmats* (Tur. *hikmets*) to which a hint has been found is long and complicated. Firstly, it is because there are many manuscripts, but only a few were critically edited with facsimiles or contain facsimiles. Secondly, the number of publications of *ḥikmats* is high, but most of them are popular. Thirdly, the literature on Aḥmad Yasavī and his *ḥikmats* is so extensive that it may only be very shortly overviewed in an article. Despite this it is essential to point to some important studies.

²¹ Naturally it is possible that further copies will be discovered, but the quest is not easy, since many manuscripts are in private collections or the collections to which access is difficult. Their identification in the existing catalogues of LPB Tatar manuscripts is difficult, because some catalogues ignore the Oriental texts, some provide only general information 'ziker' without citing the incipits or initial lines. It is sometimes the case that a catalogue indicates only one *zīkr*, but in fact there are more of them, as in the description of Jezufowicz's manuscript in Galina Miškinene, Sigita Namavičjute and Ekaterina Pokrovskaja, *Katalog*, p. 76.

²² Henryk Jankowski, 'Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatar Documents', pp. 128–129.

²³ This is an undated semi-*kitab* kept in the Central Library of the Belarusian Academy of Sciences, shelf number P16–18/NR 2, formerly R97; for a description, see M.U. Tarėlka and A.I. Citavec, *Rukapisy*, pp. 30–34.

²⁴ Henryk Jankowski, 'Zīkr turecki', pp. 152 and 181.

²⁵ However, it is important to stress that other LPBT *zīkrs*, despite the subtitle, do not reveal any features of Aḥmad Yasavī tradition.

One of the first in Europe who has mentioned Aḥmad Yasavī and his *ḥikmats* was Herrmann Vámbéry.²⁶ In chapter vi of his Chaghatay studies, he presented four *ḥikmats* in Arabic script and in a German translation.²⁷ In the introduction, he noted that ‘Ahmed Jesevi’ wrote a book called *Hikmet* which demonstrates features of the Kokandian language and which, although little understood due to the foreign influence in it, is much read.²⁸ Although Vámbéry did not hesitate to attribute the *ḥikmats* to Aḥmad Yasavī, he was aware of its late language, especially if he understood ‘chokandisch’ in the political terms, as the language of the Khanate of Kokand, which was established at the beginning of the 18th century.

In one of the first serious studies on Aḥmad Yasavī that appeared in 1919, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü admitted that he could find no good, reliable *ḥikmat* manuscript.²⁹ To the best of Köprülü’s knowledge, the oldest extant manuscript of Aḥmad Yasavī’s (probably d. 1166/1167) poems was copied in 1693/1694, but he did not see it.³⁰ According to Köprülü, the manuscript he used may contain both Aḥmad Yasavī’s *ḥikmats* and the *ḥikmats* of another poet called Aḥmad from the fifteenth or the sixteenth century who belonged to the Yasavī order.³¹ He said that it is a pity that there are no reliable early copies of *ḥikmats* and the extant ones exhibit the language of the later Chaghatay period, since in his opinion these poems are the oldest pieces of Turkic Islamic literature in which mystical thoughts are expressed in the genuine Turkic poetical forms of folk literature.³² However, we can assume that Yasavī’s *ḥikmats*, if they really existed, have not been written down in Aḥmad Yasavī’s lifetime and were transmitted orally for a few centuries, thus the search for ‘old, good, reliable manuscripts’ is a vain hope, see Hofman and DeWeese’s objections, below.

Another important contribution to this question is Aleksandr Borovkov’s study from 1948. After the analysis of *ḥikmats* known from publications and manuscripts, Borovkov has come to the same conclusion as Köprülü, that is at least some *ḥikmats* may not belong to Aḥmad Yasavī.³³ Borovkov provided six proofs for this, quoted later by H.H. Hofman in English in 1969.³⁴

It is important to cite here Hofman’s view about Yasavī’s poetry: ‘This dervish of preponderant personality wrote in the old T. syllabic metres and the old T. vernacular

²⁶ Herrmann Vámbéry, *Čagataische Sprachstudien enthaltend grammatikalischen Umriss, Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch der čagataischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1867.

²⁷ Ibidem, pp. 115–123.

²⁸ Ibidem, pp. 36–37.

²⁹ M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, Ankara 2012, p. 136.

³⁰ Ibidem, p. 137.

³¹ Ibidem, p. 140.

³² Ibidem, pp. 135–136.

³³ A.K. Borovkov, ‘Očerki po istorii uzbekskogo jazyka (opredelenie jazyka xikmatov Axmada Jasevi)’, *Sovetskoe jazykoznanie* 5 (1948), pp. 243–245.

³⁴ H.H. Hofman, *Turkish Literature. A Bio-Bibliographical Survey. Section III. Part I. Vol. 6: T–Z*, Utrecht 1969, pp. 112–113.

of his days poetry intended to propagate his doctrines and his disciplines.³⁵ At the same time Hofman stressed that the attribution of *hikmats* to Aḥmad Yasavī may and must be considered ‘as the fact no less certain and established’ and should be the object of modern criticism.

As for the manuscripts, Hofman mentions one relatively old manuscript found in Moscow dated to the sixteenth century.³⁶ According to Hofman, in Europe the manuscripts are kept in the collections in Berlin, Cambridge, Paris and Uppsala.³⁷ This not a full list, for three manuscripts are found in Budapest, one from 1712, another undated, and the third incomplete,³⁸ and one in Manchester.³⁹ Hofman also presented manuscripts from Turkish and Soviet collections which were described in later studies in more detail.

Before continuing the survey of the study on Aḥmad Yasavī and the *hikmats* in Turkey and Central Asia, attention should be paid to Devin DeWeese’s evaluation of Köprülü’s contribution, published in the foreword to the publication of Köprülü’s monograph in English in Great Britain. In the foreword to this edition, DeWeese assessed Köprülü’s merits and shortcomings.⁴⁰ His general opinion of Köprülü’s work is that his approaches of 1918 are dated and need revision.⁴¹ DeWeese divided Köprülü’s shortcomings into two types, one resulting from lack of access to important sources and the underdeveloped stage of research, the other from his own mistakes and views. DeWeese stressed that in fact Köprülü did not ask if *Dīvān-ı Hikmat* is indeed Aḥmad Yasavī’s work.⁴² According to DeWeese, it cannot be regarded as such, because *Dīvān-ı Hikmat* has a compilative character, is written in Chaghatay, and because it includes verses by many poets and anachronistic references to Aḥmad Yasavī’s shrine. He added that the idea of Aḥmad Yasavī’s authorship appeared in the 19th century, in contrast to Ḥakīm Ata.⁴³ At this point it must be noted that the researchers should not ignore the oral transmission of liturgic songs and poetry from master to master. For example, LPB Tatar *zikrs* were learned and recited by heart independently of written transmission which also was practised. DeWeese acknowledged that Köprülü distanced Aḥmad Yasavī from the *Dīvān-ı Hikmat* and argued that not all poems can be ascribed to Aḥmad Yasavī. With regard to the subsequent research in Turkey, it is important to stress DeWeese’s assertion that Köprülü’s work ‘helped to cement a tendency to view Central Asia through an Anatolian prism’.⁴⁴

³⁵ Ibidem, p. 111.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 119.

³⁷ Ibidem, pp. 119–121.

³⁸ İsmail Parlatur, György Hazai and Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*, Berlin 2007, pp. 184–186.

³⁹ Kemal Eraslan (ed.), *Ahmed-i Yesevi. Divân-ı Hikmet’ten Seçmeler*, Ankara 1993, p. 41.

⁴⁰ Devin DeWeese, ‘Foreword’, in: Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature* (translated, edited and with an introduction by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff, foreword by Devin DeWeese), London 2006, pp. viii–xxvii.

⁴¹ Ibidem, pp. ix and xv.

⁴² Ibidem, p. xx.

⁴³ Ibidem, p. xxi.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, p. viii.

In fact, the question which *hikmats* if any are really Aḥmad Yasavī's works and which pertain to Yasavī's followers, is not important for this article. What is important is to confirm that the poem *Yazuqumñi yarlıqa, Ğaffār atlığ İlāhīm* 'Forgive my sin, my God, the Forgiver' known from the LPB Tatar manuscripts belongs to Aḥmad Yasavī tradition.

After Köprülü, the study on Aḥmad Yasavī and his *hikmats* in Turkey was continued by Kemal Eraslan.⁴⁵ Eraslan has drawn the same conclusions as his predecessors, but mostly repeated what Köprülü established earlier, i.e. asserting that a scholarly edition of *hikmats* is lacking because there are no reliable old manuscripts.⁴⁶ However, at the same time Eraslan stressed that *hikmats* which are known from the collections called *dīvān-ı hikmat* were collected by Aḥmad Yasavī's followers centuries after their master's death with addition of *hikmats* by other authors.⁴⁷ Eraslan said that he had collected two hundred and fifty *hikmats* from manuscripts, publications and handwritten collections attributable to Aḥmad Yasavī, but decided to publish only seventy of them.⁴⁸ Eraslan used nine manuscripts, eight preserved in Turkey and one in the Rylands Library in Manchester, and three printed editions, Kazan 1295/1878, Tashkent 1314/1897 and Istanbul 1299/1882.⁴⁹ According to Eraslan, the oldest manuscript may be dated to the sixteenth or the seventeenth century. Eraslan's publication is not a critical one. The *hikmats* are provided in a transcription based on modern Turkish pronunciation of the Arabic and Persian words with the parallel Turkish translation. However, Eraslan publication as the first one in Latin script had a great impact in the Turkic world. It was used as the basis for later popular publications in Turkey, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, e.g. İbrohim Haqqulov's 1991 publication,⁵⁰ Hayati Bice's 1993 book in which there are 144 *hikmats*,⁵¹ and Mustafa Tatcı's publication of 2016 in which the number of *hikmats* amounts to 251, also in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

Before the interest in modern Turkic studies started with Köprülü in 1919, Aḥmad Yasavī *hikmats* had been published in Arabic script many times in Kazan, Istanbul, and Tashkent. As we learn from N.F. Katanov, the first four printed editions (first – 1878, second – 1887, third – 1893, and fourth – 1896) were prepared from manuscripts by Iosif Feodorovich Gotvald (Joseph Gottwald), a Russian Orientalist of German descent, a graduate and doctor of the German Breslau University (today Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Poland).⁵² All these publications are different, but according to Katanov, the best is the

⁴⁵ Kemal Eraslan (ed.), *Ahmed-i Yesevi*; this study was published in 1983, but in this article the second edition of 1993 is used; there are only some minor differences between the two editions.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, p. x.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, p. ix.

⁴⁸ Ibidem, p. x.

⁴⁹ Ibidem, pp. 40–41.

⁵⁰ İbrohim Haqqulov (ed.), *Ahmad Yassaviy: Hikmatlar*, Toshkent 1991; although the editor admits that Eraslan's publication was the basis for his edition (p. 40), there are differences between them and the Uzbek publication contains seventy-six *hikmats*.

⁵¹ Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi. Divan-ı Hikmet*, Ankara 1993, p. 183.

⁵² N.F. Katanov, *Imperatorskago Kazanskago universiteta početnyj člen, professor i bibliotekar 'Iosif Feodorovič Gotval'd. I. Biografija, portret i spisok ego sočinenij i izdanij. II. Katalog knig i rukopisej [...]*, Kazan' 1900, p. viii.

last one which contains 148 *hikmats* in 277 pages, while the third edition contains 134, and the first one 67.⁵³ The *hikmats* were published also later after Gottwald's death, at least three times (1901, 1904, and 1912).⁵⁴ It seems that not much has been added to these three latest printings, for the last one, also printed in the Kazan University Printing Office, contains 149 *hikmats* and has 262 pages. They were transcribed from Arabic script into Cyrillic in the Uzbek standard and republished by Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov in 1992.⁵⁵ These publications do not contain the *hikmat* which is the object of this article, either.

As far as the Uzbek publications of *hikmats* in Arabic script from the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries are concerned, Vüsale Musalı points out eight, of which six were printed in Tashkent (1894, 1900, 1902, 1909, 1910, and 1913), and two in Bukhara (1907 and 1908).⁵⁶

From the Turkish publications, it is the best to use Şeyh Süleymân Efendi's 1299 (1881/1882) first edition, shortly presented by Köprülü,⁵⁷ and used by Eraslan.⁵⁸ According to Köprülü, Şeyh Süleymân Efendi's publication contains much more poems than other publications but like other editions the editor also added works by other Central Asian authors.

It is difficult to establish the number of all publications of *hikmats* prior to 1917. Gözel Amangulyyewa listed thirty-five printings that appeared between 1878 and 1915, but including the poems published by Vámbéry in 1867, to which she added a further

⁵³ As Köprülü has established, the third edition also contains a short, one-page extract from Gülâm b. Muḥammad b. Muftî's Persian biography *Ḥazīnat al-Aşfiyā'* and a long introduction in Chaghatay, also included in later editions, see M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında*, p. 147.

⁵⁴ Some Uzbek, e.g. Mahmud Hasaniy in Abdushukurov (see Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoni hikmat. Faqrnoma. Hikmatlar*, Toshkent 1992, p. 6), and Turkish authors, e.g. Bice (in: *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. vii) and Vüsale Musalı (in: 'St. Petersburg Doğu Yazmaları Enstitüsü'nde Bulunan Divân-ı Hikmet Nüshaları', *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 96 (2020), p. 299), refer to an alleged Kazan publication of Aḥmad Yasavî *hikmats* printed in 1836, but it is likely that it is Mahmud Hasaniy's mistake repeated by Bice and Musalı. Also Köprülü (in *Türk Edebiyatında*, p. 137) says that the *hikmats* were published in Kazan for the first time in 1295 (1878/1879), not in 1836; Gözel Amangulyyewa maintains that this book was printed eight times between 1878 and 1912, see *Türkmenîñ hikmet eyesi*, p. 148.

⁵⁵ In the preface to this publication, the Kazan edition of 1836 is mentioned (Mahmud Hasaniy in Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, p. 6); the comparison of this Uzbek edition with the last printing in Kazan from 1912 shows that there are only minor differences between them.

⁵⁶ Vüsale Musalı, 'St. Petersburg', p. 295. With no access to most of these publications, it is impossible to determine the relation between them and the Kazan printings. I have only one Uzbek publication at my disposal. It is undated, prepared for publication by Hoja Molla and printed in the Kāgān printing house, 126 pages, probably one of those said to be published in Bukhara in 1907 and 1908, as Musalı asserted. The *hikmats* are unnumbered, but very similar to those in the Kazan publications of 1904 and 1912. Moreover, the long introduction is also almost identical, with minor differences only. Therefore, it is very likely that the Uzbek publications are based on the Kazan editions.

⁵⁷ M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında*, p. 137.

⁵⁸ Kemal Eraslan (ed.), *Ahmed-i Yesevi*, p. 41.

list of printings whose publication places and years she could not determine. Therefore, her list amounts to fifty-three.⁵⁹

After Eraslan, the number of the editions of *hikmats* ascribed to Aḥmad Yasavī in Turkey and post-Soviet states grew so that it is impossible to discuss all in an article. Therefore, only a few notes will be made. Regarding Uzbekistan, there is no critical edition, and no edition contains a facsimile. It is a pity, since some Uzbek researchers used manuscripts to which they refer. After the publication of *hikmats* based on Eraslan, Haqqulov – under the name of Haqqul – prepared a new publication co-authored with Hasan in 2006 with 142 *hikmats*, followed by another in 2018 and 2022 with 215 *hikmats* from many sources.⁶⁰ In addition, they separately published seventy-three *hikmats* shown as newly discovered.⁶¹

There are also popular editions in Turkmenistan. Amangulyýewa published 167 *hikmats* in 2004 from ‘the most valuable and complete manuscripts’, as she says.⁶²

In Turkey, the one of the best-known popular publications is that by Bice, mentioned above, followed by a few updated editions. Bice says that he used the 1836 Kazan edition, which is probably a mistake, see above, and the modern editions by Abdushukurov of 1992, verified with the 1904 Kazan edition, as well as Eraslan edition of 1993.⁶³

Fortunately, there are also a few critical editions and editions with facsimiles in Turkey, Russia and Kazakhstan. The first is Anna Öwezow and Atageldi Öwezow’s edition of a manuscript dedicated to the 1st anniversary of the independence of Turkmenistan and published in 1992.⁶⁴ There are 130 numbered *hikmats* in this publication, in fact 132, since in the transcription there are poems 68a and 68 and two different poems are numbered 128. The poems in the manuscript begin without any incipit or subtitle, but the text is not continuous and the beginnings and ends of individual verses are clearly seen. In contrast to most of *dīvān-i hikmat* collections, the word *hikmat* is not used. The attribution of the poems to Aḥmad Yasavī is evident from the Persian colophon: *Tamām šod in kitāb-i Hōḡa Aḥmad Yasavī* ‘This is the end of the book of Ahmad Yasavi’. The date of the copying of the manuscript is shown according to the duodecennial animal cycle

⁵⁹ Gözel Amangulyýewa, *Türkmeniň hikmet eýesi*, pp. 150–158.

⁶⁰ Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniý hikmat (Yangi topilgan namunalar)*, Toshkent 2004; Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniý hikmat*, Toshkent 2006; Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniý hikmat*, Toshkent 2018; Ibrohim Haqqul and Nodirxon Hasan (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy. Hikmat eshitib yig‘lamag‘on odam emas..., O‘zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi*, Toshkent 2022.

⁶¹ Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, 2004.

⁶² Gözel Amangulyýewa (ed.), *Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy. Hikmetler*, Aşgabat 2004, p. 2.

⁶³ Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, pp. xvii–xviii.

⁶⁴ Anna Öwezow and Atageldi Öwezow, *Medinede Muhammet, Türküstanda Hoja Ahmet. Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy: Hikmetler*, Moskva 1992 (the second edition of this publication appeared in print in 2001, see Gözel Amangulyýewa, *Amangulyýewa, Gözel, Türkmeniň hikmet eýesi – Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy (Ylmy-publisistik monografiya)*, Aşgabat 2021, p. 192); the details of the manuscript including its whereabouts are not provided; the pages that contain the facsimile are unnumbered and the original manuscript is neither foliated nor paginated; my best thanks for a copy of this publication go to my colleague Tagandurdy Bekjýew from Ashgabat.

as *dar mäh-i ‘aqrab sāl-i hūk tamām šod* ‘completed in the month of Scorpio (October/November) of the Pig Year’. This edition, however, is adapted to Modern Turkmen, see such forms as *gulak* ‘ear’ or *girdim* ‘I have entered’,⁶⁵ including the forms of the suffixes, e.g. *kānidin* ‘mine-3POSS-ABL’ is transcribed as *kāniden*.⁶⁶ The *hikmat Yazuqumni yarliqa, Ğaffār atliġ Ilāhīm* is not present among them.

The second edition with a facsimile is Rābiġa Sızdıqova’s publication of 2004 in which she has edited a manuscript from the Salemann collection in Petersburg (shelf number B-286). This publication consists of the text in a Cyrillic transcription according to the Kazakh alphabet but in Chaghatay reading leaf by leaf and additionally arranged in a strophic alignment, the facsimile and a long study on the language. Sızdıqova regards this manuscript as the oldest one dates it to the sixteenth century,⁶⁷ but Musalı dates it to the eighteenth century.⁶⁸ The number of *hikmats* is from seventy-two to seventy-six (the text is continuous, not separated into stanzas or distichs, thus its division into *hikmats* is problematic). Other editions and related studies were published in Turkey.

The first in order is an article by Ercan Petek and Serdar Daġıstanlı of 2017 in which they published a few folios from a newly discovered manuscript in Kökşetaw, Kazakhstan, which they date to the sixteenth century.⁶⁹ The whole manuscript was published by Senbek Utebekov. According to him, the Kökşetaw manuscript may be dated to the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, but language features point to a later period.⁷⁰ There are fifty-seven *hikmats* in this manuscript of which thirteen are not found in Eraslan and other Turkish editions. Some *hikmats* in the Kökşetaw manuscript are in the form of the *gazel*, some of strophic poems, called *koşma*. Utebekov, like Eraslan, transcribed Arabic and Persian words in Ottoman Turkish forms, ignoring their Southeastern Turkic origin. Our *hikmat* is absent from this manuscript, too.

A few folios of a new manuscript kept in Iran were published by Rezaei in 2021. Rezaei says that there are sixty *hikmats* attributed to Aḥmad Yasavī in this manuscript of which sixteen are absent from other manuscripts.⁷¹ Our *zıkr* is also missing in it.

One of the recent and very important critical editions in Turkey is Tulum’s publication of 2019 (2022). The manuscript he edited was copied in 1650 in Central Asia but is

⁶⁵ Anna Öwezow and Atageldi Öwezow, *Medinede Muhammet*, p. 10; note that even in the scholarly publications in modern Turkmenistan, there is a tendency to Turkmenize most Turkic names, words and titles used in references in citations, e.g. İnan’s *Türk destanlarına genel bir bakış* ‘A general look at the Turkic epos’ is provided as *Türk dessanlarına genel bir bakış*.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, p. 7.

⁶⁷ Rābiġa Sızdıqova, *Yasawıy hikmetleriniñ tili*, Almatı 2004, p. 3.

⁶⁸ Vüsale Musalı, ‘St. Petersburg’, p. 312.

⁶⁹ Ercan Petek and Serdar Daġıstanlı, ‘Dīvân-ı Hikmet’in Yeni Bir Nüshası “Kökşetav Nüshası”’, *Türk Dünyası* 43 (2017), p. 210.

⁷⁰ Senbek Utebekov, *Dīvân-ı Hikmet’in Kökşetav Nüshası. Giriş – Gramer Özellikleri – Metin – Dizin*, Çanakkale 2021, p. 59.

⁷¹ Mehdi Rezaei, ‘Dīvân-ı Hikmet’in Bilinmeyen bir Yazmasında Bulunan Yeni Hikmetler. An Unknown Copy of Dīvân-ı Hikmet and New Wisdoms in it’, *Folklor Edebiyat* 106 (2021), p. 562; this is the edition of a few pages only.

preserved in Egypt. It contains forty-nine *hikmats* of which thirteen are unknown from other versions and five were not composed by Yasavī but by his followers, as the author argues.⁷² Tulum is a rare example of Turkish researchers who transcribed the Arabic and Persian words not in Turkish, but in the Chaghatay standard, although in many cases his reading is difficult to accept, e.g. *haram* for *ḥaram* ‘disgusting’, including Turkic words, e.g. *étiban* for *etibān* ~ *étiben* ‘doing’.⁷³ Again, our *zīkr* is also missing in it.

There are also general articles and articles that overview the research so far. For example, Musalı described twenty-three manuscripts from the collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg that she examined and, referring to another study, said that there are 175 manuscripts in Tashkent.⁷⁴ However, all manuscripts she examined are not earlier than the eighteenth century.⁷⁵ Amangulyýewa provides shelf numbers of twenty-three manuscripts dated to the 17th–20th centuries among the holdings of the Institute of Language, Literature and Manuscripts of the Turkmen Academy of Sciences.⁷⁶

After the negative result of the search for the poem *Yazuqumñi yarlıqa*, *Gaffār atlıg İlāhīm* in all editions described above except the Turkish edition by Şeyh Süleymān Efendi of 1299 (1881/1882) which was inaccessible to me, I started to look for it in popular publications in Central Asia and finally I found it. It was the publication of Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli/Mirxoldor oʻgʻli, edited by Metin Akar.⁷⁷ This publication contains fifty-five so far unknown *hikmats* attributed to Aḥmad Yasavī and *hikmat* 54 is identical, if we ignore minor differences, partially related to a different reading.⁷⁸ In the preface, the author recounted the whole story of his discovery and the background of the publication. As a regionalist, journalist and historian, he searched for regional antiquities in Sayram, southern Kazakhstan, now a district of Shymkent, where he lived and worked. Mirhaldarogʻli was an ethnic Uzbek like the majority of the residents of Sayram, the city in which Aḥmad Yasavī was born and where his parents were buried. During one of his explorations, Mirhaldarogʻli found a thick manuscript of mixed content at Atahan Azlarogʻli (Otaxon Azlar oʻgʻli/Azlarxon).⁷⁹ Atahan Azlarogʻli was said to be Aḥmad Yasavī’s descendant in the thirty-ninth or fortieth generation.⁸⁰ The manuscript that Azlarogʻli owned contained, among others, over 200 *hikmats* attributed to Aḥmad Yasavī, including those unknown before. According to Mirhaldarogʻli, this manuscript

⁷² Mehmet Mahur Tulum (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi. Divân-ı Hikmet. Hikmetler Mecmuası Mısır Nüshası – 1650*, İstanbul 2022, pp. 14 and 20.

⁷³ Ibidem, p. 192.

⁷⁴ Vüsale Musalı, ‘St. Petersburg’, pp. 293 and 295.

⁷⁵ Ibidem, pp. 312–313.

⁷⁶ Gözel Amangulyýewa, *Türkmenîñ hikmet eýesi*, pp. 6, 122; the author describes many of these manuscripts, pp. 123–147.

⁷⁷ Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli (authored) and Metin Akar (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi’nin Yeni Bulunan Hikmetleri*, İstanbul 2001.

⁷⁸ Ibidem, pp. 94–95.

⁷⁹ For a photograph of Azlarogʻli, see Mirxoldor oʻgʻli, Mirahmad, *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: shajarai saodat, karomatlari, hikmatlari*, Chimgent 1992, p. 26.

⁸⁰ Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli and Metin Akar, *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 10.

was copied approximately 200 years ago, i.e. around 1700. Mirhaldarogʻli selected those fifty-five newly discovered *hikmats*, transcribed into Cyrillic Uzbek script and tried to publish them in Uzbekistan.⁸¹ As he reported, his edition was sent to the reviewers, but the publishers refused to publish it.⁸² As a result, his work was published by Metin Akar in Turkey. It is to note that Akar has not transliterated Mirhaldarogʻli's Cyrillic transcription into Latin script, but modified it according to the Modern Uzbek pronunciation, though rather inconsistently, which resulted in a mixed character of the text published.

After learning all this I started to look for a copy of the original manuscript, since Mirhaldarogʻli's edition was a popular one. Getting the information that Akar does not have a copy of Azlarogʻli's manuscript, and both the owner and the editor died,⁸³ I travelled to Tashkent in April 2024 to contact Nodirxon Hasan who reportedly was one of Mirhaldarogʻli's reviewers. Although in Hasan's book co-authored with Haqqul the author confirmed the use of Azlarxon's manuscript,⁸⁴ he did not help me, and our meeting resulted in nothing.

After the unsuccessful trial to find a copy of the manuscript in Uzbekistan, I went to Kazakhstan and contacted Mirhaldarogʻli's son, Miralim (Mirolim) Mirhaldarogʻli in Sayram⁸⁵ who carried me to one of Atahan Azlarogʻli's sons who allegedly inherited the manuscript. Regretfully, the son of the late owner refused to give any information to us.

In short, it is certain that the manuscript with *hikmats* edited by Mirhaldarogʻli and Akar was once in Atahan Azlarogʻli's possession, and it is very likely that our poem was found in it. However, it is now unavailable for research. Fortunately, I have finally gained access to Şeyh Süleymān Efendi's Turkish edition in which our *hikmat* was found.⁸⁶ After the comparison of this *hikmat* in Mirhaldarogʻli and Şeyh Süleymān Efendi, it turned out that they are identical.

Therefore, for the time being the only manuscripts that contain the Southeastern Turkic poem *Yazuqumni yarliqa*, *Ğaffār atliğ İlāhīm* are two LPBT manuscripts, preserved far away from Central Asia in Eastern Europe.

⁸¹ For a photograph of one page of his typewritten transcription with *hikmat* 34, see *ibidem*, p. 111, for two photographs of two openings of the manuscript, one showing pp. 99–100 with two fragments of poems corresponding to *hikmat* 11: 3.2–9 and *hikmat* 12: 1:1–2.2, see pp. 109–110.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 12.

⁸³ I am indebted to my colleague Ümit Qıdırbayeva from Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, for her help with clarifying these questions. Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli was born in 1937 and died in 2017.

⁸⁴ Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, 2004, p. 133.

⁸⁵ I could not have found Miralim (Mirolim) Mirhaldarogʻli and contact him without Rayhan Aktayeva's help. He said that his father had no opportunity to work with the manuscript and worked with a copy. He must be right, for the photographs of the two openings of the manuscript (Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli and Metin Akar, *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, pp. 109–110) clearly show a copy, not the original. However, even from these low-quality photographs one can have a general idea of the manuscript. It is a neatly written manuscript in *ta'liq* script typical of Central Asia.

⁸⁶ I owe a debt of gratitude to Metin Akar for his suggestion that I can find some *hikmats* edited by Mirhaldarogʻli and himself in this edition.

5. The language and style of the *zıkr*

5.1. The language

Aḥmad Yasavī lived in the eleventh–twelfth centuries, but the earliest extant manuscripts with works attributed to him are dated to the seventeenth century and exhibit language features of fifteenth–seventeenth century Middle Turkic and not Karakhanid Turkic which was the literary Turkic language in the eleventh–twelfth centuries.

The LPB Tatar manuscripts that contain the *zıkr* discussed here reveal both southeastern or Chaghatay and southwestern or Turkish features. The former features which differ from the latter ones are the following:

1. Preservation of the final -y in the suffix -LIG,⁸⁷ changed into -LI in southwestern and northwestern branches of Turkic, retained in Chaghatay and changed into -LIQ in Modern Uzbek and Uyghur. It manifests in only one word *atliḡ* ‘called; named’ in the *zıkr* but this word occurs thirteen times. Note that the corresponding Old and Middle Turkish form has not only different suffix, but also a different consonant in the stem, i.e. *adlu*.⁸⁸
2. The ablative suffix -dIn in three words, *dilümdin* ‘from my tongue’ (manuscript A has -den), *eldin* ‘from the people’, spelled in the corrupt form ‘ladyin, which, however, clearly shows the form -din in both LPBT manuscripts, and *hikmetindin* ‘from your wisdom’. This form of the suffix is characteristic of Karakhanid Turkic, Khwarezmian Turkic, and Chaghatay,⁸⁹ though in Uzbek it was replaced with -dAn. The form -dAn is also evidenced in three occurrences (*başdan*, *hātīrumdan*, and *qahrīndan*).
3. The Turkic word *yazuq* in the meaning ‘sin’ is known in Old and Middle Turkic languages⁹⁰ and exists in the modern Turkic languages of Central Asia, e.g. Uzbek, Turkmen, Kazakh, Karakalpak and Kirghiz. It was also common in Turkish from the 14th century to the 17th century, but later it was replaced with the Persian loanword *gunah* ~ *gūnah*.⁹¹ Therefore, *yazuq* may be regarded as either a Turkish archaism or Southeast Turkic.
4. The use of Persian *hem* as an additive particle ‘also, too,’ i.e. *öz qahrīndan hem saqla* ‘protect from your anger’, more exactly ‘also protect from your anger,’ although it is ignored in our translation for style. Persian *hem* was used as early as Karakhanid

⁸⁷ A.K. Borovkov, ‘Očerki’, p. 249.

⁸⁸ Ömer Asım Aksoy and Dehri Dilçin (ed.), *Tarama Sözlüğü III. E–İ*, Ankara 1967, p. 20.

⁸⁹ In fact, the form -dAn was also used alternatively to -dIn in Chaghatay, but the basic form was -dIn, see János Eckmann, *Chagatay Manual*, Bloomington 1966, pp. 94–95 and András J.E. Bodrogligeti, *A Grammar of Chagatay*, Muenchen 2001, p. 42.

⁹⁰ Sir Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, London 1972, p. 985 and Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*, Leiden 2023, p. 406.

⁹¹ Sir Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary*, p. 985 and Ömer Asım Aksoy and Dehri Dilçin (ed.), *Tarama*, pp. 4461–4464.

and Early Middle Turkic, but as the conjunction ‘and’,⁹² while its use as the particle is typical of Chaghatay,⁹³ and it is continued in Modern Uzbek⁹⁴ and Turkmen.⁹⁵

There are also non-Turkish features which are common to Northwest and Southeast Turkic: (1) the accusative suffix -nI, (2) the form *maña* ‘to me’, as well as (3) two words, *čīn* ‘true’ and *yahši* ‘good’. Note that these words are present in some Southwest Turkic languages, e.g. the former in Turkmen and the latter in Azeri.

It is to note that Southeastern Turkic traces are known in LPB literature since 1951 when Zajączkowski published a short magic text with evident southeastern language features, although he called this language Old Uyghur.⁹⁶ Anyway, the suffix -LIG is evidenced in this text in the doubled adjective *türlüg türlüg* ‘various, of all kinds’. Southeastern Turkic traces are also shown in LPBT *niyyets* ‘intentions’.⁹⁷

There are also some typical Turkish features in the LPB Tatar manuscripts. They either point to the Turkish medium or to scribal changes, i.e. the changes made by a Tatar copyist or copyists who were skilled in Turkish and changed Southeastern Turkic forms to the Turkish equivalents, e.g. (1) A and B *eyeleyüb* ‘when doing’, which is Turkish, versus Southeastern Turkic *eyleb*, like in I and Mir; (2) *giden* ‘who goes (away)’, which should be *ketken* (or *ketkän*); regrettably, this stanza is absent from I and Mir; (3) *dilüm* ‘my tongue’, though with the archaic suffix -*din* in manuscript B, opposite to Southeastern Turkic *tilim*.

The vocalization is also more typical of Turkish than Chaghatay. Therefore, in this edition the Turkish reading of loanwords is preferred to Chaghatay, e.g. *hem* and not *ham* ‘too’ or *hikmet* and not *hikmat* ‘wisdom’.

5.2. The style and the features of poetics

Some expressions are hackneyed phrases and clichés found in other *hikmats* of Yasavī tradition, e.g. *Qahhor otlig* ‘qahringdin’ ‘from the subjugation to the Subduer’ and *Rahmon otlig* ‘rahmingdin’ ‘from the mercy of the Merciful’;⁹⁸ *İlah a hacetlerimni sen reva kıl*,

⁹² János Eckmann, *Middle Turkic Glosses of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation*, Budapest 1976, p. 126 and Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary*, p. 139.

⁹³ Carl Brockelmann, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasien*, Leiden 1951, pp. 225 and 276, and Hendrik Boeschoten, ‘Chaghatay’, in: *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson and Éva Ágnes, London and New York 2022, p. 170.

⁹⁴ A. Xolmuradov and R. Azizov, *English-Uzbek Uzbek-English Dictionary. Inglizcha-O‘zbekcha O‘zbekcha-Inglizcha Lug‘at*, Toshkent 2005, p. 262.

⁹⁵ Oskar Hanser, *Türkmençe Elkitabı*, Zühal Kargı Ölmez (transl.), İstanbul 2003, p. 92.

⁹⁶ Ananiasz Zajączkowski, ‘Tzw. chamail’, p. 311.

⁹⁷ Henryk Jankowski, ‘Modlitwy za członków rodziny w chamailach i turkijskie nijety “intencje” do nich’, in: *Ród – rodzina – wspólnota jako element przekazu dziedzictwa kulturowego Tatarów*, ed. Artur Konopacki, Białystok 2024, pp. 165–187.

⁹⁸ Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, p. 54; Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 47; Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, 2022, p. 175.

Kerimsen lutfile derdim deva kıl ‘O God, meet my needs, You are Generous, cure my troubles’;⁹⁹ *Sattor egam, aybim yobsang* ‘My Lord, the Veiler, if you cover my sin’.¹⁰⁰

In contrast to other LPBT *zikrs*, the rhyme of this poem is regular and free of defects. The rhyme pattern is ABAB, CCCB, DDDb, etc. The fourth line of each quatrain stanza ends in *atliḡ ilāhīm* ‘my God (called)’ but the word *atliḡ* forms the foot with the preceding alternating word of the same syllabic structure which is the Arabic loanword from so-called God’s most beautiful names (*al-asmā’ al-ḥusnā*): *Qahhār*, *Ġabbār*, *Sattār*, *Ḥakīm*, *‘Alīm*, *Rahīm*, *Ḥallāq*, *Razzāq*, *Mannān*, *Raḥmān*, *Subḥān* and *Allāh*, for the meanings, see the translation.

There are seven syllables in each line with three deviating lines which have eight syllables in A, two in B, and none in I and Mir. The first is *Ledün ‘ilmīne ‘ināyet* (A), but *Ledün ‘ilmin ‘ināyet* (B and I), and *Leden ilmi inayet* (Mir), thus the correct form must be established as *Ledün ‘ilmin ‘ināyet*. The second is the next line in the same stanza, *Eyleyüb qılḡil hidāyet* (A and B), but *Eyleb qılḡil hidāyet* (I) and *Eyleb kılḡil hidayet* (Mir). If we amend the evidently Turkish form *eyleyüb* to *eyleb* as in I and Mir, the metre will be correct. The third deviating line is *Güristān qurbet ‘izzetin* (A and B), absent from I and Mir.

The form of this poem is very popular in Turkic folk literature, it is called *koşma* in Turkish and *qo‘shiq* in Uzbek. It is simple and far from flowery, ornate forms copied from Persian and Arabic poetry. Although full of Arabic and Persian words, these borrowed lexical units have become part of the common Islamic religious vocabulary and were not felt alien.

Before critical edition of the large corpus of Aḥmad Yasavī’s poetry and stylometric analysis, it is premature to answer the question to whom this poem may be attributed. However, it must be said that there is nothing in it which would give testimony to the language not even of the eleventh–twelfth-century Karakhanid period, but Early Middle Turkic of the fourteenth century. It is likely that this poem was added to the collections of *ḥikmats* in the seventeenth century at the earliest. Since the year 1765 as the date of the copying of Jezufowicz’s *hamail* is the *terminus ante quem*, the preliminary dating may span the period between the beginning of the seventeenth and the middle of the eighteenth century.

6. The relationship between *zīkr* and *ḥikmat*

Southeastern Turkic *ḥikmat* (Tur. *ḥikmet*) hails from Ar. *ḥikma* ‘wisdom’, also ‘philosophy’, in the Qur’ān also ‘wisdom’ but which implies knowledge of high spiritual truth.¹⁰¹ In the Islamic mysticism, *ḥikmat* means ‘knowledge of divine secrets and reality,

⁹⁹ Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 49.

¹⁰⁰ Ibrahim Haqqul and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, 2022, p. 265.

¹⁰¹ A.M. Goichon, ‘Ḥikma’, in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Volume III*, Leiden 1986, p. 377.

comprehension of the aims of existential entities, discovering the role of divine will and the relationship between the cause and the effect'.¹⁰²

As said above, *zıkr* was principally the act of reminding and loud recitation of hymns in the liturgy. In the Yasavî order, it was performed as *zıkr-i cehrî* (Uz. *jahriy zıkr*) 'loud reminding' which developed to so-called *zıkr-i erre* (Uz. *zikri arra*) 'sawing reminding', i.e. a kind of loud recitation which resembles the voice of a saw.¹⁰³ It is known that some *hikmats* were performed in this way.¹⁰⁴ This may be the reason why the term *zıkr* was combined with the term *hikmat*, later in LPB Tatar manuscripts mistakenly read *hükmat*. However, the two terms should not be equated, since not every *zıkr* is *hikmat* in the sense of Yasavî tradition, and *hikmats* were also recited in a non-*zıkr*-like way, see the beginning of several *hikmat* collections, e.g. *Bismi'llāh dep bayān äyläy hikmat aytıp | Tāliblārgä durr u gavhar saçtım mänä* 'When I tell the *hikmat* in the name of God | I sow gems and jewels to those who desire'.¹⁰⁵

Despite this the terms *zıkr* and *zākir* 'who remembers, who performs *zıkr*' appear frequently in the *hikmats*, e.g. the same *Hikmat* (no. 1): *Uşal vaqtda miñ bir zıkrin qıldım tamām* 'I performed a thousand and one *zıkr* then';¹⁰⁶ in *Hikmat* 3: *Här şubḥ-i dām nidā keldi qulağimğa | Zıkr ayt dedi, zıkrni aytıp yürdüm män-ä* 'Every morning a voice came to my ear | 'remember', and I walked remembering',¹⁰⁷ etc.

Whole *Hikmat* 104 in the Qazan 1912 print,¹⁰⁸ corresponding to *Hikmat* 103 in Abdushukurov's,¹⁰⁹ *Hikmat* 60 in Bice's¹¹⁰ and *Hikmat* 21/XXXVIII in Tulum's editions,¹¹¹ is devoted to *zıkr*, e.g. *Zākirlarğa va'da qıldı qādir Xodā | Gör içindä 'atā qıldı hur ü liqā | Zākirlarni turar ğāyni dār ul-baqā | Keliñ, yiyiliñ, zākir qullar zıkr aytalıq* 'Almighty God promised to those who remember | to grant them beautiful faced houris in the grave | so that the place of those who remember will be eternity | Come along, remembering servants, we shall recite a *zıkr*'.

¹⁰² Mustafa Kara, 'Hikmet: Tasavvuf', in: *İslam Ansiklopedisi. 17. Cilt*, İstanbul 1998, pp. 518–519.

¹⁰³ M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında*, p. 134.

¹⁰⁴ Razia Sultanova, 'Female Sufism in Central Asian Music: From Court to Folk Traditions', in: *Musik im Orient: Zwischen Maqām und Epengesang. Ringvorlesung, Mainz 2006*, eds. Hendrik Boeschoten and Reinhard Wiesend, Mainz 2012, p. 209.

¹⁰⁵ No editor, *Dīvān-i Hikmāt-i Ḥazrāt Sultān āl-'arīfīn Hoğa Aḥmād bān Ibrāhīm bān Maḥmūd bān İftihār Yasavī [...]* *nči märtäbä basıluvı*, Kazan' 1912, p. 18; Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, p. 20; Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁶ *Dīvān-i Hikmāt-i Ḥazrāt*, p. 20; Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, p. 21; Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁷ *Dīvān-i Hikmāt-i Ḥazrāt*, p. 25; Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, p. 25; Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁸ *Dīvān-i Hikmāt-i Ḥazrāt*, pp. 179–181.

¹⁰⁹ Rasul Muhammad Abdushukurov (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy*, pp. 143–145.

¹¹⁰ Hayati Bice (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, pp. 80–81.

¹¹¹ Mehmet Mahur Tulum (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, pp. 166–170.

7. *Zikr, hikmat and Sufism*

The practice of performing *zikrs* and *hikmat* poetry is a characteristic feature of Islamic mysticism or Sufism. Therefore, a question of the existence of Sufi components in the Islam practised among LPB Tatars inevitably arises. However, no ethnological or religious study evidences existence of dervish or Sufi orders among the Tatars in the form as they are known in Turkey, the Balkans or Central Asia.¹¹² The reason is simple: the LPB Tatars were too a small community at the periphery of the Islamic world to be able to sustain a few schools or varieties of Islam. The single exception is Ananiasz Zajączkowski who on the basis of a prayer called *Modlitwa bajramowego dnia* ‘A prayer for the holiday’ from a *hamail* in which some Bektashi revered and holy men appear assumed the missionary activity of Turkish religious orders among the LPB Tatars.¹¹³ Naturally elements of Sufism are present in most Islamic countries and areas. They infiltrated the areas of the orthodox or Sunni Islam and through it were absorbed by some LPBT learned people and communities. It is very likely that the Tatars practised some rituals like the *zikr* described above or had recourse to *Riğāl al-Ġayb* ‘The men of the Unseen’ in need or an important matter.

The LPBT manuscripts give us more evidence of various non-Sunni texts. Before surveying them, it must be stressed that the texts of this sort constitute a small percentage of the LPBT manuscripts. The first published text is a chapter of *Riğāl al-Ġayb*, edited by Tarėlka and Synkova.¹¹⁴ This text is Slavic with Arabic phrases and praying formulae for *Riğāl al-Ġayb*. The next is a prayer for the Twelve Imams, i.e. a Shiite text, also edited by Synkova and Tarėlka,¹¹⁵ found in six *hamails* which goes back to a common proto-text.¹¹⁶ It is a very short prayer in Polish with Belarusian components. However, this prayer is not purely Shite, since after the name of the Twelve Imams, the prayer also glorifies the Four Rightly-guided Caliphs. The third is a Turkish prayer for various revered people of Islam, including the Four Rightly-guided Caliphs, some Turkish Sultans, but also some Alevi and Bektashi virtuous men, published by Sevrük.¹¹⁷ This prayer is identical to the prayer described but not edited by Zajączkowski, mentioned just above. Both texts mention

¹¹² E.g. Julian Talko-Hryncewicz, *Muślimowie czyli tak zwani Tatarzy litewscy*, Kraków-Dębniaki 1924, pp. 16–21 and 74–76; Stanisław Kryczyński, ‘Tatarzy litewscy’, pp. 172–209 and 241–258; Piotr Borawski and Aleksander Dubiński, *Tatarzy polscy: Dzieje, obrzędy, legendy, tradycje*, Warszawa 1986, pp. 187–207; Artur Konopacki, *Życie religijne Tatarów na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XIX wieku*, Warszawa 2010.

¹¹³ Ananiasz Zajączkowski, ‘Tzw. chamail tatarski ze zbioru rękopisów w Warszawie’, *Sprawozdania z Czynności i Posiedzeń PAU* 52/4 (1951), p. 313.

¹¹⁴ Mixas’ Tarėlka and Iryna Synkova, ‘Tëkst sufijskaga paxodžannja z belarуска-tatarskaga xamaila’, in: *Aktual’nyja problemy palanistyki 2005*, eds. Siargej Važnik and Ala Kožynova, Minsk 2006, pp. 31–36.

¹¹⁵ Iryna Synkova and Mixail Tarėlka, ‘Šyickaja malitva ŭ rukapisax belaruskix tatarau’, *Belarucki gistoryčny časopis* 10 (2010), p. 34.

¹¹⁶ Ibidem, p. 35.

¹¹⁷ Dmitry Sevrük, ‘A “Bektashi” Prayer from a Private Collection of Lipka Tatar Manuscripts’, *Tiurkų istorija ir kultūra Lietuvoje. Turk’s History and Culture in Lithuania. Istorija i kul’tura tjurkov v Litve*, eds. Tamara Bairašauskaitė and Galina Miškinienė, Vilnius 2014, pp. 293–296.

the following Turkish Sultans: Mustafa, Suleiman, Ahmed and Osman.¹¹⁸ The revered or holy men in Zajączkowski are Qoyun Baba, ‘Alī Qoğa Baba and Hağī Bektaş,¹¹⁹ while in Sevrük they are Koyun Baba, Ali Koç Baba and Haji Bektash.¹²⁰ Note that Sevrük has not referred to Zajączkowski. Lastly, Seürük who edited two stories of Ali from three LPBT manuscripts, admitted a possibility of its transfer from Shiite circles of Turkish Anatolia.¹²¹ However, these texts cannot be regarded as evidence for Shia and Sufism among the LPB Tatars. Synkova and Tarèlka are right when they say that the existence of a Shiite text in manuscripts is not a proof for the existence of the Shia in the same way as the existence of a Sufi text is not a proof for Sufism among the LPB Tatars.¹²² At least some of these texts could have been copied from Sunni manuscripts which some Alevi and Sufi components reached. As a matter of fact, *Riğāl al-Ġayb* is known in the manuscripts of mainstream Islam in Turkey. Zajączkowski’s claim that Turkish religious orders were active among the LPB Tatars is just a conjecture.

Naturally it cannot be argued that the *hikmat* from the Yasavī tradition directly arrived in Poland-Lithuania. As some Turkish features show, the *hikmat* in question could have been accessed from Turkey or through the Turkish medium, but the route across the Crimean Khanate and the northern Caucasus where the Yasavī orders also existed is also likely. The Turkish influence does not invalidate this route, since it was also present in those areas.

8. The *zīkr* in transcription and English translation

The text of the *zīkr* is provided in the Turkological transcription which slightly differs from the transcription employed in the editions of Turkish texts. Different letters are *č* for *ç*, *ğ* for *c*, *ı* for *ı*, *q* for *k*, *ş* for *ş* and the capital *I* for *İ*. As a rule, corrupt words were corrected and the forms in the manuscript were provided in the footnotes. If corruption is major or changes the sense of the word, the corrected form is placed in the brackets [] and the form from the manuscript is transliterated in the footnote. To distinguish between transliteration and transcription, the former is given in the normal font, the latter in *Italics*.

Because of the obvious Turkish influence, the Arabic and Persian words are transcribed according to the Turkish rules, e.g. *zebūn*, not *zabūn*, ‘weak’ and *Ġebbār*, not *Ġabbār* ‘Compelling’. This is because the sign *fatha* was mostly pronounced by the LPB Tatars as *e*.

¹¹⁸ Ananiasz Zajączkowski, ‘Tzw. chamail’, p. 312 and Dmitry Sevrük, ‘A “Bektashi” Prayer’, pp. 302–303.

¹¹⁹ Ananiasz Zajączkowski, ‘Tzw. chamail’, p. 313.

¹²⁰ Dmitry Sevrük, ‘A “Bektashi” Prayer’, p. 303.

¹²¹ D. Seürük, ‘Geraičnyja apovesti pra Ali ibn Abi Taliba ũ rukapisax belaruskix tatarau’, in: *Z rukapisnaj spadčyny tatarau VKL. Těksty i dasledavanni*, eds. I.A. Synkova and M.I. Tarèlka, Minsk 2022, p. 84.

¹²² Mixas’ Tarèlka and Iryna Synkova, ‘Těkst sufijskaga paxodžannja’, p. 41.

8.1. The sources

1. ChJJez, folios 261b–262a, manuscript A. This is one of the oldest LPB Tatar manuscripts, copied by Jan Jezufowicz from Niemież (Lithuanian Nemėžis) in 1765, described in two catalogues.¹²³ The manuscript is kept in the collection of the National Museum of Lithuania, shelf number R-13.029.¹²⁴ As all the ten *zikrs* in this manuscript, this one is also vocalized. It starts after the Tur. title *Ziker hukmet/hükmet budur*, in correct Turkish *Zikr-i hikmet budur* literally ‘this is remembering of the wisdom’. The text is written continuously without dividing its portions into stanzas in brownish ink which originally was probably black. However, the distichs, with several omissions, are separated from each other with a great red dot. The letter *h* in the recurring word *Ilāhim* ‘my God’ is also written red and in addition this word is marked with the superscribed letter-like two joined semicircles, also in red ink. The handwriting is typical of LPB Tatar manuscripts. No translation is given in the manuscript.

2. ChSBah, folios 187a–188a, paginated as 369–371, manuscript B. This is a *hamail* copied in 1834 by Stefan Bohuševič, described by Tarėlka and accessible on a CD disc appended to this publication.¹²⁵ The manuscript is kept in a private collection in the Minsk province, Belarus. The text is preceded by the unvocalized Turkish-Polish title *Ziker hikmet to jest* ‘this is the remembrance of wisdom’, in which *to jest* is the Polish translation of the Tur. *budur*, written in red ink in the centre of the line. The poem has been copied in the pattern of Oriental distichs, each half of a distich, both within the line and at the end of the line separated by a large dot in red ink. As other *zikrs* in this manuscript, each pair of distichs, which corresponds to a stanza, is numbered with the Hindu-Arabic numerals, from 1 to 12 in red ink. The text is written in black ink by a skilful hand in another style than manuscript A but also typical of LPB Tatar manuscripts.

3. Şeyh Süleymān Efendi’s edition of 1299 (1881/1882), referred to as I. It contains 276 pages. Our *zikr* is found on page 187. The text is unvocalized. Each poem in this print is preceded by the word *hikmat*. The relation of this edition to the Sayram manuscript is unknown. However, the poems before our *zikr* and after it are different from those prepared for print by Mirhaldaroglu and edited by Akar. In comparison with manuscripts A and B, some words are more correct, but there are also evident errors like that in the first word of the poem. Süleymān Efendi was a leader of an Uzbek dervish convent in Turkey, the author of the Chaghatay-Turkish dictionary, an outstanding expert of Chaghatay in the Middle East, and he certainly knew the rituals of the Yasavī order very well.

¹²³ Andrzej Drozd, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry*, pp. 54–55 and Galina Miškinene, Sigita Namavičjute and Ekaterina Pokrovskaja, *Katalog*, pp. 72–77.

¹²⁴ My best thanks go to the National Library of Lithuania for the copies of parts of manuscript A and the permission to reproduce them.

¹²⁵ M.U. Tarėlka, *Tafsiry; kitaby i xamaily*, pp. 73–82; I also owe a debt of gratitude to Mihail Tarėlka for making manuscript B accessible in his publication and its anonymous owner in Belarus who generously agreed to share it with the readers.

4. Mirhaldarogʻli's transcription of the poem called *Hikmet 54* from the unavailable manuscript discovered in Sayram, edited by Akar, abbreviated Mir.¹²⁶ The editor transcribed Mirhaldarogʻli's Cyrillic transcription of the poems into Latin script in the Turkish standard basing on the contemporary Uzbek pronunciation.

In Şeyh Süleymān Efendi's (1881/1882) and Mirhaldarogʻli's (2001) editions one stanza from manuscripts A and B is lacking.

8.2. The *zīkr*

[A 260b] *Zīkr-i hikmet budur*¹²⁷

A 261a, B 369 *Yazuqumni yarliqa*,¹²⁸

Ġaffār atliġ Ilāhīm,¹²⁹

Öz qahrından hem saqla,¹³⁰

Qahhār atliġ Ilāhīm.

Forgive my transgression,

My God, O Forgiving God,

Protect from your anger,¹³¹

My God, O Subduing God.

[*Zebūn*] *eyle*¹³² *kibrimni*,

Baġışlaġil [ġürmümni],¹³³

Hem arturġil şabrīmni,¹³⁴

Ġebbār atliġ Ilāhīm.

[Weaken] my haughtiness,

Forgive [my crime],

Enhance my patience,

My God, O Compelling God.

*Qılma {ya}*¹³⁵ *dünyāda 'itāb*,

*Ahiretde*¹³⁶ *hem 'azāb*,

Başdan ayaq 'aybum yap,¹³⁷

Settār atliġ Ilāhīm.

Blame not in this world,

Nor torment in the afterworld,

Conceal my fault from tip to toe,

My God, O Veiling God.

¹²⁶ Mirahmad Mirhaldarogʻli and Metin Akar, *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*, pp. 94–95.

¹²⁷ A *Zīker hükmet budur* in which *zīker* is the LPBT name for the *zīkr*; in B the first two words are unvocalized *zkr hkmt*, the two next ones are Polish *to jest* 'this is', so that a possible LPBT reading could also be *Zīker hikmet*.

¹²⁸ I 187 *Yaz qavmini yarliqa*, Mir 94 *Yaz kavmini yarleke*; both forms are erroneous.

¹²⁹ A Written 'lhm without vocalization, B *Ilāhum*, passim; Mir 94 *Gaffar atliġ ilāhīm*.

¹³⁰ A *saqlar*, B *saqla*, I 187 *Öz qahrından saqlaġil*, Mir 94 *Öz kahriñdin saklagil*; I and Mir are better, but the rhyme disappears in this form; the change *η* → *n* in *qahrından* (A and B) may be affected by Turkish, but this consonant is retained in some other words, e.g. *vaşluña* joining-2-POSS-DAT, i.e. 'to you'.

¹³¹ Ar. *qahr* has a few meanings, e.g. 'vanquishing, subdual, subjection, subjugation; force', etc., see Hans Wehr (authored) and J. Milton Cowan (ed.), *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, London 1980, p. 794, but in Uz. *qahr* means 'anger, rage', see Xolmuradov and R. Azizov, *English-Uzbek Uzbek-English Dictionary*, p. 364.

¹³² A, B *zebūr*, probably mistakenly associated with the Tur. *zebūr* 'the Psalms of David' (NRTED 1276); I 187 *zebūn eyle*, Mir 94 *Zebun eyle*, cf. Tur. (← Per.) *zebūn* 'I. weak, helpless, exhausted, worn up' (NRTED 1276), which is the correct form.

¹³³ A, B *ġibri mnyi*, I 187 *ġürmimni*, Mir 94 *cürmimni*, cf. Tur. (← Ar.) *cürm* > *cürüm* 'crime, guilt' (NRTED 234).

¹³⁴ A *arturġil şibri mnyi*, B *arturġil şabrīmni*, I 187 *artuġil şabrīmni*, Mir 94 *arturġil şabrīmni*.

¹³⁵ A *qılma yā*, B *qılmaya*, written with the unnecessary *yā* ~ *-ya*, which breaks the metre; the correct form is established basing on I 187 *qılma* and Mir 94 *Kılme*.

¹³⁶ A Written with an unnecessary *sukūn* above *r*, B 'āḥir'atdan.

¹³⁷ A *bā'sdan ayaġa*, B *başdan ayaqqa*, which is correct, but does not fit the metre; corrected basing on I 187 *başdın ayaġ 'aybīmni* and Mir 94 *Başdın ayag aybīmni*; A *p* in *yap* written in an untypical form resembling *r*, B *yab*.

B 370 *Hikmetindin*¹³⁸ *naşīb ét,*
*Meni [eldin] lebīb ét,*¹³⁹
*Öz vaşluña*¹⁴⁰ *qarīb ét,*
Hakīm atliğ Ilāhim.

Give a bit of your wisdom,
 Make me wiser [than the people],
 Move me close to you,
 My God, O All-Wise God.

*Ledün 'ilmin 'ināyet,*¹⁴¹
*Eyle{yü}b qilğil hidāyet*¹⁴²,
*Her işimni kifāyet,*¹⁴³
 A 261b *Alīm atliğ Ilāhim.*

Make mysticism a favour,
 Show the right path,
 (Make) all my deeds sufficient,
 My God, O Omniscient God.

İnşāf maña 'aṭā qil,
*Her derdüme devā qil,*¹⁴⁴
Hāgetümni revā qil,
Rahīm atliğ Ilāhim.

Grant me justice,
 Give remedy to all my pains,
 Fulfil my needs,
 My God, O Merciful God.

*Hulqumuznī hob etkil,*¹⁴⁵
*Fî'lumuznī*¹⁴⁶ *yaḥşî qil,*

Make our character good,
 Make our deeds good,

¹³⁸ A Incorrectly vocalized as *hikmatnadan*, B *hikmitindin*; I 187 *hikmetindin*, Mir 94 *Hikmetiñdin*.

¹³⁹ A, B erroneously 'ladyin; the amendment is based on I 187 *eldin lebīb ét* and Mir 94 *eldin lebīb ét*, in which *eldin* means 'from the people', e.g. EMT *el* '1. country, realm. 2. district, province. 3. city. 4. people', etc., see Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary*, p. 53; Tur. *lebīb* 'intelligent' (NRTED 707) ← Ar. *labīb* 'understanding, reasonable, sensible, intelligent', see Hans Wehr, *A Dictionary*, p. 854, see also Per. ← Ar. *labīb* 'prudent, intelligent, wise, sagacious, acute; industrious, attentive, assiduous, who sticks to his work', see F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, London 1892, p. 117.

¹⁴⁰ B Mistakenly *ol vaşluna*.

¹⁴¹ A ladyin 'ilmine, B *ledün 'ilmin*, I 187 *ledün 'ilmin 'ināyet*, Mir 94 *Leden ilmi inayet*; see Tur. *ledün* 'consciousness of God' (NRTED 707) and *ilm-i ledün* 'Allah'ın sırlarına âit mânevî bilgi, gayb ilmi', Ferit Devellioğlu, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat. Eski ve Yeni Harflerle*, Aydın, Ankara 2006, p. 546, i.e. 'spiritual knowledge of God's secrets; mystic knowledge' ← Ar. '*ilm al-ladunî* 'knowledge imparted directly by God through mystic intuition (in Sufism)', see Hans Wehr, *A Dictionary*, p. 863; the form in I is the best, and both I and Mir fit the metre.

¹⁴² A Mistakenly *hedāyet*, B 'âlhiudāyat, I 187 *eyleb qilğil hidāyet*, Mir 94 *eyleb kılğil hidayet*; in this line, I and Mir *eyleb* is correct, for it fits the metre; the form *eyleyüb* in A and B was undoubtedly affected by Turkish.

¹⁴³ A Mistakenly *har. i'nimda ... yait*, while B and Mir 94 are correct; I 187 *Her işimni kifāyet*, Mir 94 *Her işimni kifāyet*.

¹⁴⁴ A *dar.dama raw'a*, the first word with *r* written below a corrected and erased letter, B *dimah*; although *revā qil* is correct, cf. Per. *rewā kardan* 'to approve, to adjust', see F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive*, p. 590, from which it is calqued, the correct reading is *Her derdime devā qil*, as in I 187 and, in a similar way, in Mir 94 *her derdimge deva kıl*, since *devā* is 'remedy, medicine, cure' (NRTED 289) and this phrase is very common in literature and even in the colloquial language, i.e. *derdime deva* 'remedy to my pain, sorrow'.

¹⁴⁵ B *hulqumuznyi*, Mir 94 *Hulkımızni hup kıl*; this quatrain in I 187 and Mir 94 comes after the quatrain that starts as *Öziñni yar eylegil*; in B, the Tur. ← Ar. *hulk* 'moral quality, nature, character, habit' (NRTED 492) was replaced with Tur. ← Ar. *halk* 'the common people, folk', etc. (NRTED 440).

¹⁴⁶ B *fā'lumuznyi*.

*Hem [özüñe vâşıl qıl],¹⁴⁷
Hallâq¹⁴⁸ atliğ İllâhîm.*

And [bring me to you],
My God, O Creating God.

*[Özüñni]¹⁴⁹ yâr eylegil,
Maña ğamh̄ôr¹⁵⁰ eylegil,
Rüzî dîdâr¹⁵¹ eylegil,
Rezzâq¹⁵² atliğ İllâhîm.*

Make [yourself] a friend to me,
Take care for me,
Give provisions to me,
My God, O Supplying God.

*Maña qoyma özümmi,
Çîn eyle her sözümni,
Münevvir qıl yüzümni,
Mennân¹⁵³ atliğ İllâhîm.*

Leave not me,
Make all my words true,
Make my face bright,
My God, O Supporting God.

*Güristân qurbet 'izzetin,¹⁵⁴
Mü'min giden¹⁵⁵ devletin,
İki ğihân^[262a] ni 'A 262a metin,¹⁵⁷
Raḥmân atliğ İllâhîm.*

(Give) dignity in the grave,
(Give) prosperity to the departing believer,¹⁵⁶
(Make) the two worlds a strong (fundament),
My God, O Compassionate God.

*Hâṭîrumdan [fıkrüñni],¹⁵⁸
Ketürmegil şükrüñni,¹⁵⁹*

(Take not away) [the idea of You] from my
memory,
Take not away your reward,

¹⁴⁷ A *vaşluğa qıl vâşıl*, B *vaşluğa qıl vaşıl*; corrected basing on I 187 *Hem öziñe* ('wzk') *vâşıl qıl*, Mir 94 *Hem öziğe vâşıl kıl*.

¹⁴⁸ A, B *Hallâq*.

¹⁴⁹ A Mistakenly *özü niya*, B also mistakenly *'waḡaynyi*; corrected basing on I 187 *özüñni* and Mir 94 *öziñni*.

¹⁵⁰ A *ğumh̄wur*, B *gamh̄wur*, I 187 *ğamh̄ôr* (*ğm̄hw'r*), Mir 94 *gamhar*, cf. Per. *gham-kh̄wār* with the meanings, among others, 'condoling, pitying; an intimate friend (as partaking in another's feelings)', see F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive*, p. 895, Uz. *g'amxo'r* 'careful, thoughtful, solicitous' and Kaz. *qamqor* 'who thinks of another's troubles and takes care of him', see T. Januzaqov (ed.), *Qazaq tiliniñ tüsindirme sözdigi*, Almaty 2008, p. 468.

¹⁵¹ A *dilyaza'r*, B *dyizâ'r*, amended basing on I 187 *dîdâr* and Mir 94 *didar*; the second word is Tur. (← Per.) *dîdâr* 'sight, look, face, countenance' and 'visible, seen', see James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, p. 933, see also EMT *dîdâr* '1. countenance. 2. God's countenance', see Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary*, p. 123.

¹⁵² A Defectively *raḡḡa*.

¹⁵³ A Defectively *minna*.

¹⁵⁴ This quatrain is lacking in I and Mir.

¹⁵⁵ A, B *kidan*; the reading like Tur. *giden* 'who goes' is tentative, and the sense of the whole line is not quite clear.

¹⁵⁶ The sense of this line is not entirely clear.

¹⁵⁷ A Mistakenly *ğih'ar ta' matyit*, B is more correct with *ğihân na'metin*.

¹⁵⁸ A, B *hâṭîrumdan fıkrümmi*, amended basing on I 187 *hâṭîrîmdin fıkrüñni* and Mir 95 *haturımdın fıkrîñni*.

¹⁵⁹ A *kidermegil*, which may be read in a Turkish way as *gidermegil*, and *şükrüñni*, B *ketürmegil şükrîñni* 'Take not away my secret knowledge', I 187 *ketermegil* (kt'rmkyl) *şükrüñni*, Mir 95 *kötermegil şükrîñni*; A *şükrüñni* should be established for LPBT, for it is confirmed by I and Mir; *şükr* is not only the well-known 'thank', but also 'God's showing acceptance by rewarding a righteous man for his deeds' (NRTED 1068) or 'conferring favours (God)', see F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive*, p. 752.

B 371 *Hem dilümdin [zikriñni],*¹⁶⁰
Subhān atliḡ Ilāhīm.

And [remembering You] from my tongue,
 My God, O Glorious God.

*Kul [Aḥmedī] nevāsın,*¹⁶¹
*Tüzgil dāyım arasın,*¹⁶²
Qabūl eyle du'āsın,
Allāh atliḡ Ilāhīm.

(Sing) Kul [Ahmadi's] melody,
 Always straighten his relations,
 Accept his prayer,
 My God, whose name is God.

Lā ilāha illā'llāh, lā ilāha illā'llāh, lā ilāha illā'llāh 'There is no god but God'.¹⁶³
İmā[n] vèrgey Bir Allāh 'Oh One God, give the faith'.¹⁶⁴

Conclusion

In conclusion we can say that the literature and codex culture of LPB Tatars can disclose many interesting facts, also important for the Central Asian Turkic studies. In this article, a little-known religious poem attributed to Aḥmad Yasavī found in two Tatar manuscripts has been shown and discussed. The linguistic features of this poem are mixed, both Southeastern (Chaghatay) and Southwestern Turkic (Turkish). Therefore, we have another evidence for the traces of Southeast Turkic in LPB Tatar manuscripts. So far, this poem has only been known from a 19th-century Turkish publication of Aḥmad Yasavī's *ḥikmats* and a popular book published basing on a Central Asian manuscript which is currently unavailable. This fact also shows how important the study of *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasavī tradition is. However, it also demonstrates the importance of LPB Tatar literature and manuscripts.

Despite the clear facts showing Sufi elements in LPB Tatar manuscripts, Sufi practices, rituals and ideas cannot be postulated as a conscious doctrine and no activity of Sufi adepts or spiritual leaders is attested historically. Most probably the Sufi and Bektashi elements were copied from Turkic manuscripts and became part of quite differentiated literature which cannot be divided into Sufi and Sunni.

¹⁶⁰ A Mistakenly *zılumdan zikrümni*, B *dilümdin zikrümni*, I 187 *tilimdin zikriñni*, and Mir 95 *tilimdin zikriñni*; in this line the 2nd possessive suffix is also better, as it expresses 'remembering you'.

¹⁶¹ A 'abwudyi na.aw'sil, B 'abwudyi nevāsın, I 187 *Kul Aḥmadī nevāsın*, Mir 95 *Kul Ahmedi nevasın* '(Sing) Ahmedi's melody', see above; the writing of the first word in A and B makes its reading 'Abūdī which is utmost unlikely, therefore, basing on I and Mir, it was amended to *Aḥmadī*, Tur. *nevā* '1. tune, melody. 2. Or. mus. a very simple *makam*', etc. (NRTED 881) ← Per. *navā* 'voice, sound, melody; riches, affluence, plenty, opulence', see F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive*, p. 1431.

¹⁶² B *dā'im atasın*, I 187 *aygıl dā'im şenāsın*, Mir 95 *eygıl daim senasın*; A and B have a different verb at the beginning, it is *tüz-* 'to arrange, to put in order, to compose', see Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary*, p. 364, which may cooccur with *ara* as in A, which also means 'relation'; I and Mir have different words meaning 'always praise him', which is better, but it was decided to retain A and B's forms.

¹⁶³ Repeated three times; A and B *Lā ilāha illā'llāh. {a}Lā ilāha illā'llāh. Lā ilāha illā'llāh.*

¹⁶⁴ A This formula is unvocalized, B *İmān vergey bir Allāh.*

The survey of the study of Aḥmad Yasavī tradition and the poems mostly known from multiple collections called *dīvān-i ḥikmat* shows how this question is complicated and how much should be done in the future. As far as the modern Turkic editions of Aḥmad Yasavī's *ḥikmats* are concerned, they are hardly suitable for the phonetic comparison with the LPB Tatar poems. The Turkish authors transcribe the Old and Middle Turkic texts, especially Arabo-Iranian loanwords, to the modern Turkish standard based on the high Ottoman style. A similar tendency is seen in the editions of Turkmen authors who transcribe both the Arabo-Iranian lexicon and genuine Turkic words according to the present-day Turkmen spelling rules, which, however, does not reflect the real pronunciation. Uzbek transcription habits are more suitable, for the consonant inventory is almost identical to Chaghatay and the transcription of vowels is like a transliteration which leaves room for interpretation. There is no uniform system of the edition of Chaghatay texts in Kazakhstan, but most Kazakh researchers employ transcription mixed with translation basing on the Kazakh Cyrillic alphabet.

Abbreviations

(1) Sources and publications

A – ChJJez 1765, see 6.1.

B – ChSBah 1834, see 6.1.

I – Şeyḥ Süleymān Efendi, *Dīvān-ı Belāgat*-

Mir – Mirhaldaroglu and Akar, *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi*

NRTED – Alkim et al. (ed.), *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük*

(2) Languages peoples

Ar. – Arabic

EMT – Early Middle Turkic

Kaz. – Kazakh

LPB(T) – Lithuanian-Polish-Belarusian (Tatar)

Per. – Persian

Tur. – Turkish

Uz. – Uzbek

Editorial symbols

. – invisible or indistinct letter

... – text ignored in transliteration or transcription

{ } – unnecessary text

[] – corrected text

() – additions in translation

| – end of line

> – changed to

< – changed from

← – borrowed from

References

- Abdushukurov Rasul Muhammad (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniý hikmat. Faqrnoma. Hikmatlar*, Gʻafur Gʻulam nomidagi Nashriyot-matbaa birlashmasi, Toshkent 1992.
- Akiner Shirin, *Religious Language of a Belarusian Tatar Kitab. A Cultural Monument of Islam in Europe*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2009.
- Aksoy Ömer Asım and Dehri Dilçin (ed.), *Tarama Sözlüğü III. E–İ*, Türk Dil Kurumu, Ankara 1967.
- Alkim U. Bahadır, Nazime Antel and Robert Avery et al. (ed.), *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük. New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, Redhouse Yayınevi, İstanbul 1991.
- Amangulyýewa Gözel (ed.), *Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy. Hikmetler*, Miras, Aşgabat 2004.
- Amangulyýewa Gözel, *Türkmeniň hikmet eýesi – Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy (Ylmy-publisistik monografiýa)*, Ylym, Aşgabat 2021.
- Bice Hayati (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi. Divan-ı Hikmet*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara 1993.
- Bodrogligeti András J.E., *A Grammar of Chagatay*, Lincom Europe, Muenchen 2001.
- Boeschoten Hendrik, ‘Chaghatay’, in: *The Turkic Languages*, eds. Lars Johanson and Éva Ágnes, Routledge, London and New York 2022, pp. 160–173.
- Boeschoten Hendrik, *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*, Brill, Leiden 2023.
- Borovkov A.K., ‘Očerki po istorii uzbekskogo jazyka (opredelenie jazyka xikmatov Axmada Jasevi)’, *Sovetskoe jazykoznanie* 5 (1948), pp. 229–250.
- Brockelmann Carl, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens*, Brill, Leiden 1951.
- Clauson Sir Gerard, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford University Press, London 1972.
- Devellioglu Ferit, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat. Eski ve Yeni Harflerle*, Aydın, Ankara 2006.
- DeWeese Devin, ‘Foreword’, in: Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature* (translated, edited and with an introduction by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff, foreword by Devin DeWeese), Routledge, London 2006, pp. viii–xxvii.
- Drozd Andrzej, ‘Piśmiennictwo Tatarów polsko-litewskich (XVI–XX w.). Zarys problematyki’, in: Andrzej Drozd, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry Tatarów polsko-litewskich. Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich. Tom III*, Res Publica Multiethnica, Warszawa 2000, pp. 12–37.
- Drozd Andrzej, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry Tatarów polsko-litewskich. Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich. Tom III*, Res Publica Multiethnica, Warszawa 2000.
- Dubiński Aleksander, ‘Polonya–Litvanya Tatarlarının Yazılı Metinlerde Kullandıkları Türkçe’, in: *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1988 (26 Eylül–3 Ekim 1988)*, Türk Dil Kurumu, Ankara 1996, pp. 265–294.
- Eckmann János, *Chagatay Manual*, Indiana University, Bloomington 1966.
- Eckmann János, *Middle Turkic Glosses of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1976.
- Eraslan Kemal (ed.), *Ahmed-i Yesevî. Dîvân-ı Hikmet’ten Seçmeler*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara 1993 [first published in 1983].
- Fleischer H.O. ‘179. Codex arabicus, tataricus, polonicus [...]’, in: *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*, Ae.G.R. Naumann (ed.), J.M. Gebhardt, Grima 1838, pp. 450–451.

- Gardet L., 'Dhikr', in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Volume II*, eds. B. Lewis, Ch. Pellet and J. Schacht, Brill, Leiden 1991, pp. 223–227.
- Goichon A.M., 'Hikma', in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Volume III*, eds. B. Lewis, Ch. Pellet and J. Schacht, Brill, Leiden 1986, pp. 377–378.
- Hanser Oskar, *Türkmençe Elkitabı*, Zühal Kargı Ölmez (transl.), Kebikeç, İstanbul 2003.
- Haqqul Ibrahim and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniy hikmat (Yangi topilgan namunalar)*, Movarounnahr, Toshkent 2004.
- Haqqul Ibrahim and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniy hikmat*, Movarounnahr, Toshkent 2006.
- Haqqul Ibrahim and Hasan Nodirxon (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: Devoniy hikmat*, Navruz nashriyoti, Toshkent 2018.
- Haqqul Ibrohim and Nodirxon Hasan (ed.), *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy. Hikmat eshitib yig'lamag'on odam emas...*, O'zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi, Toshkent 2022.
- Haqqulov Ibrohim (ed.), *Ahmad Yassaviy: Hikmatlar*, G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti, Toshkent 1991.
- Hofman H.H., *Turkish Literature. A Bio-Bibliographical Survey. Section III. Part I. Vol. 6: T–Z*, The Library of the University of Utrecht, Utrecht 1969.
- Xolmuradov A. and R. Azizov, *English-Uzbek-Uzbek-English Dictionary. Inglizcha-O'zbekcha O'zbekcha-Inglizcha Lug'at*, G'afur G'ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi, Toshkent 2005.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'A Polish Tatar Ziker', *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 48/3 (1995), pp. 405–420.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatar Documents', *Materialia Turcica* 24 (2003), pp. 113–144.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'Teksty turkijskie i ich polskie tłumaczenia w kitabie Mustafy Szahidewicza KMSzah3', in: *Święte księgi judaizmu, chrześcijaństwa i islamu w słowiańskim kręgu kulturowym. Prace dedykowane Czesławowi Łapiczowi. Tom I. Księga wyznawców islamu. Kitabistyka*, eds. Monika Krajewska, Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska and Arleta Szulc, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń 2016, pp. 185–195.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'A ziker of Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatars in Turkish and its Polish translation by Mustafa Szahidewicz', in: *Turkologu za učast! Zbornik radova povodom 70. rođendana Ekrema Čauševića. In Honor of the Turkologist! Essays Celebrating the 70th Birthday of Ekrem Čaušević*, eds. Tatjana Paić-Vukić, Azra Abadžić-Navaey and Marta Andrić et al., FF Press, Zagreb 2022, pp. 55–80.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'Zikr turecki *Kur'ān oki* 'Czytaj Koran' w modlitewnikach litewsko-polsko-białorusko-tatarskich z przekładem białorusko-polskim i polskim', in: *Działalność społeczno-kulturalna jako czynnik wzmacniający tożsamość Tatarów. Próba bilansu i perspektywy. XXV lat Letniej Akademii Wiedzy o Tatarach*, ed. Artur Konopacki, Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne, Warszawa 2023, pp. 147–191.
- Jankowski Henryk, 'Modlitwy za członków rodziny w *chamailach* i turkijskie *nijety* 'intencje' do nich', in: *Ród – rodzina – wspólnota jako element przekazu dziedzictwa kulturowego Tatarów*, ed. Artur Konopacki, Białystok Wydawnictwo Ekonomia i Środowisko, Związek Tatarów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej Oddział Podlaski, 2024, pp. 165–187.
- Januzaqov T. (ed.), *Qazaq tiliniñ tüsindirme sözdigi*, Dajk Press, Almaty 2008.
- Kara Mustafa, 'Hikmet: Tasavvuf', in: *İslam Ansiklopedisi. 17. Cilt*, ed. Azmi Özcan, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İstanbul 1998, pp. 518–519.
- Katanov N. F., *Imperatorskago Kazanskago universiteta početnyj člen, professor i bibliotekar' Iosif Feodorovič Gotval'd. I. Biografija, portret i spisok ego sočinenij i izdanij. II. Katalog knig i rukopisej [...]*, Tipolitografija Imperatorskago Kazanskago Universiteta, Kazan' 1900.
- Konopacki Artur, *Życie religijne Tatarów na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XIX wieku*, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2010.
- Köprülü M. Fuad, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, Akçağ, Ankara 2012 [twelfth updated edition of the original 1919 edition].
- Kryczyński Stanisław, 'Tatarzy litewscy. Próba monografii historyczno-etnograficznej', *Rocznik Tatarski* 3 (1938), pp. 1–318.

- Ma'rufov Z.M. (ed.), *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. I–II*, Rus tili nashriyoti, Moskva 1981.
- Mirhaldaroglu Mirahmad (authored) and Metin Akar (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevi'nin Yeni Bulunan Hikmetleri*, Hoca Ahmed Yesevi Vakfi, İstanbul 2001.
- Mirxoldor o'g'li, Mirahmad, *Xoja Ahmad Yassaviy: shajarai saodat, karomatlari, hikmatlari*, Chimkent 1992.
- Miškinene Galina, Sigita Namavičjute and Ekaterina Pokrovskaja, *Katalog arabskoalfavitnyx rukopisej litovskix tatar*, Izdatel'stvo Vil'njusskogo Universiteta, Vil'njus 2005.
- Musalı Vüsale, 'St. Petersburg Doğu Yazmaları Enstitüsü'nde Bulunan Dîvân-ı Hikmet Nüshaları', *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 96 (2020), pp. 293–318.
- Muxlinskij A., *Izslédovanie o proisxoždenii i sostojanii Litovskix Tatar*, Sanktpeterburg 1857.
- Öwezow Anna (transcribed) and Atageldi Öwezow (ed.), *Medinede Muhammet, Türküstanda Hoja Ahmet. Hoja Ahmet Ýasawy: Hikmetler*, Lexica, Moskva 1992.
- Parlatır İsmail, György Hazai and Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin 2007.
- Petek Ercan and Serdar Dağıstanlı, 'Dîvân-ı Hikmet'in Yeni Bir Nüshası "Kökşetav Nüshası"', *Türk Dünyası* 43 (2017), pp. 207–233.
- Qazan 1896 = No editor, *Dîvân-ı Hikmât-i Ğavs al-Vâşîlîn Hazrât Sultân âl- 'arifîn Hoğa Ahmâd bân İbrâhîm bân Mahmûd bân İftihâr Yasavî. Törtinçi märtâbâ*, Tipo-litografiya Imperatorskago Universiteta, Kazan' 1896.
- Qazan 1912 = No editor, *Dîvân-ı Hikmât-i Hazrât Sultân âl- 'arifîn Hoğa Ahmâd bân İbrâhîm bân Mahmûd bân İftihâr Yasavî [..t]nçi märtâbâ basılıvî*, Tipo-litografiya Imperatorskago Universiteta, Kazan' 1912.
- Redhouse James W., *A Turkish and English Lexicon. Shewing in English the Significations of the Turkish Terms*, A.H. Boyajian, Constantinople 1890.
- Rezaei Mehdi, 'Dîvân-ı Hikmet'in Bilinmeyen bir Yazmasında Bulunan Yeni Hikmetler. An Unknown Copy of Dîvân-ı Hikmet and New Wisdoms in it', *Folklor Edebiyat* 106 (2021), pp. 561–580.
- Seŭruk D., 'Geraičnyja apovești pra Ali ibn Abi Taliba ŭ rukapisax belaruskix tatarau', in: *Z rukapisnaj spadčyny tatarau VKL. Těksty i dasledavanni*, eds. I.A. Synkova and M.I. Tarėlka, Belaruskaja navuka, Minsk 2022, pp. 57–85.
- Sevruck Dmitry, 'A "Bektashi" Prayer from a Private Collection of Lipka Tatar Manuscripts', *Tiurkų istorija ir kultūra Lietuvoje. Turk's History and Culture in Lithuania. Istorija i kul'tura tjurkov v Litve*, eds. Tamara Bairašauskaitė and Galina Miškinienė, Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla, Vilnius 2014, pp. 289–304.
- Sızdıqova Răbiġa, *Yasaviy hikmetleriniñ tili*, Sözdik-Slovar', Almatı 2004.
- Smajkiewicz Ali, *Zbiór modlitw do wykonania obrządków azanu, nikiachu, dżenazie i składania ofiary „kurban”*, Gdańsk 1970 [136 pp., typewritten].
- Steingass F., *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, Routledge, London 1892.
- Sultanova Razia, 'Female Sufism in Central Asian Music: From Court to Folk Traditions', in: *Musik im Orient: Zwischen Maqām und Epengesang. Ringvorlesung*, Mainz 2006, eds. Hendrik Boeschoten and Reinhard Wiesend, Are Edition, Mainz 2012, pp. 201–224.
- Synkova Iryna and Mixail Tarėlka, 'Šyickaja malitva ŭ rukapisax belaruskix tatarau', *Belaruski gistaryčny časopis* 10 (2010), pp. 32–37.
- Szynkiewicz Jakób, 'Literatura religijna Tatarów litewskich i jej pochodzenie', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), pp. 138–144.
- Şeyh Süleymān Efendi, *Dîvân-ı Belāgat- 'unvān-ı Sultānū'l- 'arifîn Hoca Ahmed Yesevî*, İstanbul 1299 (1881/1882).
- Talko-Hryniewicz Julian, *Muslimowie czyli tak zwani Tatarzy litewscy*, Orbis, Kraków-Dębni 1924.
- Tarėlka M.U., *Rukapisy tatarau Belarusi XVIII–pačatku XXI stagodzja z dzjaržaŭnyx i gramadskix knigazboraŭ krainy. Katalog*, Belaruskaja navuka, Minsk 2015.
- Tarėlka M.U., *Tafsiry, kitaby i xamaily z pryvatnyx knigazboraŭ Belarusi*, Belaruskaja navuka, Minsk 2020.
- Tarėlka M.U. and A.I. Citavec, *Rukapisy tatarau Belarusi kanca XVII–pačatku XX st. z dzjaržaŭnyx knigazboraŭ krainy. Katalog*, Belaruskaja navuka, Minsk 2011.
- Tarėlka Mixas' and Iryna Synkova, 'Těkst sufijskaga paxodžannja z belarуска-tatarskaga xamaila', in: *Aktual'nyja problemy palanistyki 2005*, eds. Siargej Važnik and Ala Kožynova, VTAA Prava i ěkanomika, Minsk 2006, pp. 29–54.

- Tatçı Mustafa (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî. Divân-ı Hikmet*, Hoca Ahmed Yesevi Üniversitesi, Ankara 2016.
- Tulum Mehmet Mahur (ed.), *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî. Divân-ı Hikmet. Hikmetler Mecmuası Mısır Nüshası – 1650*, Ketebe, İstanbul 2022 [second updated edition; first edition in 2019].
- Utebekov Senbek, *Divân-ı Hikmet'in Kökşetav Nüshası. Giriş – Gramer Özellikleri – Metin – Dizin, Paradigma*, Çanakkale 2021.
- Vámbéry Herrmann, *Čagataische Sprachstudien enthaltend grammatikalischen Umriss, Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch der čagataischen Sprache*, F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1867.
- Wehr Hans (authored) and J. Milton Cowan (ed.), *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, MacDonald and Evans Ltd., London 1980.
- Woronowicz Ali, 'Szczątki językowe Tatarów litewskich', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), pp. 351–367.
- Woronowicz Ali, 'Kitab Tatarów litewskich i jego zawartość', *Rocznik Tatarski* 2 (1935), pp. 376–394.
- Zajączkowski Ananiasz, 'Tzw. chamał tatarski ze zbioru rękopisów w Warszawie', *Sprawozdania z Czynności i Posiedzeń PAU* 52/4 (1951), pp. 307–313.



Fig. 1. Manuscript A (ChJJeZ) 260b–261a courtesy of the National Library of Lithuania



Fig. 2. Manuscript A (ChJJe2) 261b–262a courtesy of the National Library of Lithuania



Fig. 3. Manuscript B (ChSBah) 186b-187a (368-369), M.U. Tarêlka, *Tafsiry, kitaby i xamaily*, supplement



Fig. 4. Manuscript B (ChSBah) 187b-188a (370-371), M.U. Tarêlka, *Tafsiry, kitaby i xamaily*, supplement