

---

Open Access Article

## “CODEX CUMANICUS” - ANCIENT TURKIC MANUSCRIPT

**Dr.Botir Jafarov**

Assistant professor of Namangan State University (Uzbekistan)

**Dr.Olimjon Dadaboev**

Assistant professor of Namangan State University (Uzbekistan)

**Annotation:** One of the challenges facing modern scholars is to pass on the rich cultural heritage of our ancestors to future generations. This article is devoted to study of the Codex of Cumanicus manuscript written by translators in latin script on the Golden Horde in the early 14th century, and its secrets. The article presents, as far as possible, the scientists who are still involved in the study of manuscripts, as well as their research and conclusions. Scientists from all over the world have gathered thoughts about the time of discovery and the date when it was written. All of their studies were fully analyzed with generalized conclusions. History, language, literature and typology have been analyzed in detail. The article analyzes the similarities and differences in the sources of manuscript collections, and their ethnic origin in the Uzbek people, as well as materials collected by orientalists from around the world. This article will be an important and valuable resource for researchers interested in studying the Codex of Cumanicus or “Ancient cuman manuscript with cover”.

**Key words:** *Codex Cumanicus, Golden Horde, Kipchak, manuscript, cuman, Latin, calligrapher, history.*

### INTRODUCTION

A number of written monuments created on the historical stage are common for all Turkic peoples. They served as the basis for the development of literature of the Turkic peoples. Among such monuments in Turkology there are two great monuments of the 11th century: “Qutadgu bilig” by Yusuf Hos Hajib and “Devonu lug'at it-turk” by Mahmud Kashgari. In addition, there is the Codex Cumanicus, another Turkic literary heritage, created in the XIV century.

The Codex Cumanicus was created at the beginning of the XIV century, and its original name was “In hoc libra continentur Persicum et Comanicum per alfabetum”. This work has been known to the world scientific community since the 1880s under the name Codex Cumanicus.

The word "codex" in the title of the manuscript in the Russian-Uzbek dictionary is defined as an ancient manuscript with a cover [Russko-uzbekskiy slovar 2013]. Therefore, it would be advisable to translate the above heading as "Ancient Cuman Manuscript with Cover."

The Codex Cumanicus has been extensively studied by literary critics, linguists, translators and historians around the world, and the process is still ongoing. However, more than seven centuries after its discovery, researchers in Uzbekistan largely ignored it.

All of this shows how important it is to study the Codex Cumanicus.

Received: June, 18, 2022 / Revised: July ,27, 2022 / Accepted: 31, July, 2022 / Published: 23, August, 2022

About the authors : Dr.Botir Jafarov

Email:

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

World Turkologists have made a great contribution to the study of the Codex Cumanicus, a comprehensive analysis of its linguistic aspects and features of words, the study of graphic features and lexical features of words in a work. In this regard, researches done by J.Klaproth, G.Kuun, W.Radliff, W.Bang, J.Németh, A.Samoilovich, D.Rasovsky, S.Malov, K.Grønbech, G.Györfy, A.Qurishjanov, A.Gabain, A.Tietze, D.Monchi-Zadeh, A.Bodrogligeti, V.Drimba, A.Chechenov, D.Drüll, L.Ligeti, A.Piemontese, A.Garkavets, M.Argunşah., G.Güner, M.Salan , F.Schmieder deserves special attention.

Today, despite a number of serious studies in world Turkology, the study of the Codex Cumanicus manuscript remains one of the most urgent and leading topics. In recent years, a number of studies of manuscripts have been carried out in Uzbekistan. In particular, among them are M.Juraeva [Curayeva 2011, 25-32], Sh.Abdinazimov [Abdinazimov 2014, 30-33] and works published by one of the authors of this article [Jafarov 2017, 638-643].

However, the study of the components and content of the work, its comparative analysis with other Turkish monuments is one of the most important issues on the agenda today.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

The article uses research and analysis methods, such as comparative historical, retrospective and extrapolation (dissemination or application of conclusions from the observation of one part of an object or an event in another part).

On the basis of these research methods, some confusion was clarified associated with the history of the discovery and study of the manuscript, as well as the historical facts associated with its discovery in Italian libraries.

The activities of several calligraphers who participated in the writing of the first part of the work, but were still ignored, and the reasons for some errors and omissions in the manuscript were proven based on new facts.

## **DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

It is no coincidence that this manuscript has been the focus of attention of Turkic scholars and historians for centuries. The reason for this attention is the scientific value of the rich cultural heritage left by our ancestors in the past. Of course, we are always proud of this. But life itself requires that they be studied more seriously and comprehensively. All this shows the relevance and importance of the problem we are studying. The Codex Cumanicus is one of the rare monuments in the history of the Turkic peoples. The Cumans are the historical name of a separate tribe belonging to the ancient Turkic peoples. This nation, like all Turkic peoples, is directly related to modern Uzbeks.

“It is known from historical sources that the steppes stretching from the upper reaches of the Syr Darya and the western slopes of the Tengri Tagh (Tian Shan) ranges to the lower reaches of the Dnieper, Danube, Don and Volga rivers are called Dashti-Kipchak in the Arab and Persian sources of the 11th and 15th centuries. The population of Dashti-Kypchak is called in eastern sources - Kypchaks, in Russian chronicles - Polovtsy, in Byzantine chronicles - Cumans, in Hungarian sources - Huns. When

at the beginning of the 13th century the territory of Dashti-Kipchak was occupied by the troops of Genghis Khan, they were transferred to the eldest son of Genghis Khan, Jochi Khan. The state of the Golden Horde will be created within the Jochi Khan ulus (which includes the North Khorezm oasis). However, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, due to the struggle for the throne between the descendants of Jochi Khan and Genghis Khan, it split into two independent states (the Blue Horde and the White Horde, historically known as the Golden Horde).

The eastern regions of Dashti-Kipchak are referred to in historical sources as “the land of the Uzbeks” and “the people of Uzbeks” since the second half of the XIV century”[Askarov 2015, 493]. Ibn Battuta, who at that time witnessed Dashti Kipchak, showed that the Kipchaks, Circassians, Russians and Byzantines also lived in the country [Ibn Battuta 2012, 76].

The following comments in the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan can be taken as a general basis: “The Kipchaks are one of the largest tribes of the Turkic peoples; one of the main components of the ethnic composition of the Uzbek people. The Kipchaks played an important role in the formation not only in the ethnogenesis of the Uzbek people, but also in a number of other Turkic peoples - Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Karakalpaks, Turkmens, Tatars, Bashkirs, Altai and some peoples of the North Caucasus (Nogai, Kumik, Karachai, etc.)”[Uzb.mil.ents. 2015].

In Dobrodomov's article gives very interesting and valuable information about the origin of the terms Polovtsian, Kipchak, Cuman and Huns and their characteristics. In particular, it is argued that the term "Polovets" means "yellow", "pale", which, in turn, is associated with their appearance, body color or hair. This term is found in Russian sources as a Polovets, in Polish - as Plavchi, in Hungarian - as Polocz). Until now, it is believed that the term Polovets means field (steppe)”.

The term quman, found in Russian chronicles, is found in Latin sources as Cuman, Coman. According to V. Barthold, the name Cuman did not appear in Muslim literature until the twelfth century. Scientists such as Adelung, Bretschneider and I. Berezin recognized that the ethnonym quman is a hydronym associated with the name of the river Cuma. P.Golubovsky believed that the word Cuman in Turkic means kun "sun" + *mān* "similar". According to D.Ilovaisky, the qumans are steppe people, which is the exact translation of the Russian term Polovets. The term “qum” is the same name for the peoples inhabiting the Tatar sandy steppe. J.Németh said that quman is an ethnic name, and among other Turkic peoples it has been preserved as quvan and quman”[Dobrodomov, 1978, 108-114].

It should be noted that the monument we are studying was created in this environment. This book is a dictionary of Latin-Persian-Cumam and Cuman-German words, Cuman-Latin words of the early 14th century, as well as a religious hymn and prayer translated by Christian monks into Cuman, and a manuscript of the most ancient Turkic mysteries.

This monument is the only one of the ancient Turkic manuscripts written in Latin (all other manuscripts were written in Arabic and Persian). Samples of 47 ancient Turkic riddles, written on it, also enrich the manuscript not only with lexicography, but also with the theory and practice of folklore with new facts and texts. It is important to note that they are rare and cannot yet be found in any source. They are also important because they represent a large group of Turkic riddles that are reflected in the written literature.

According to the language and graphic features, the manuscript consists of two parts, "Italian part" (Interpreters Book) and "German part" (Missioners Book): the first part consists of a three-column Latin-Persian-Cuman dictionary. The second part consists of German-Cuman dictionaries, Cuman translations of Christian prayers and hymns, and the most ancient Turkic mysteries mentioned above. The original manuscript is kept now in the San Marco Library in Venice under catalog number DXLIX (# 549).

It is called "In hoc libra continentur Persicum et Comanicum per alfabetum".

The manuscript was first reported by the Italian scholar Jacobus Philippus Tomasini. In his work "Life and Works of Petrarch", published in 1635, he claims that among the literary legacies left by Petrarch, he found "an alphabetical Persian-Cuman and Latin dictionary written on July 11, 1303" and publishes the first 9 lines.

According to Ph. Tomasini, the manuscript was donated to the Venetian library in 1362 by the famous Italian Renaissance poet Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374). He received this information from Abbot Ulmo, one of the writers of the history of St. George's Church [Radlov, 1984, 4].

It is worth mentioning an interesting phenomenon in the monograph by Ph. Tomasini, which is associated with the introduction of the manuscript into scientific discussion. All scholars who studied the Codex Cumanicus, for some reason, provided different information about the date when Ph. Tomasini was first mentioned in this manuscript. In particular, Julius Klaproth [Klaproth 1828, 520] and Aldo Gallotta [Gallotta 1992, 269] have suggested that it was made public in 1650 and Lajos Ligeti in 1656 [Ligeti 1981, 11]. However, research has shown that the monument was not made public by Ph. Tomasini in 1650 or 1656, but in 1635, as we noted above. The discovery of this manuscript was reported in the monograph in «D. Maria in Vantio Canonici Sacularis Petrarcha Redivivvs» [Tomasini MDCXXXV], published in 1635 by Jacobus Philippus Tomasini.

More than a hundred years after Ph. Thomasini announced the discovery of the work, scholars became interested in studying the manuscripts. Leibnitz discovered the manuscript in the catalogue of the Venice Library in 1768. In 1769 Daniel Cornides of Hungary, secretary to Count József Teleki sought out the Codex Cumanicus in Venice and copied its first 22 pages. Later, in Hungary he informed Pray about the manuscript with reference to the on-going controversy concerning the Coman Lord's prayer. [Ligeti 1981,4].

Research on the manuscript will be suspended for some time after the date announced to Budapest librarian George Prey.

By 1828, the first part of the manuscript was published by the German orientalist Julius Heinrich Klaproth with French commentaries, Arabic transcriptions and additions. This publication, in turn, served as the main source for many subsequent studies. Julius Klaproth carried out this study in about 4 years. He noted that one of the main reasons for the study was not the reading of Persian and Cuman words in the manuscript, but vocabulary and scientific collaboration with the Venetian librarian, Mr. Salvi. He was able to obtain a copy of the manuscript of an unknown calligrapher in November 1824 thanks to the efforts and invaluable services of Mr. Salvi [Ligeti 1981, 29].

Then, in 1880, the Hungarian scientist Gomes Geza Kuun published a work on the study of this written monument, which still plays an important role in world Turkic studies with its scientific value. Geza

Kuun's study was significant in the sense that it covered both parts of the manuscript and was published in Latin. Interestingly, at that time, according to L. Ligeti, the publication of books in foreign languages was prohibited by law in Hungary. It turned out that at that time Latin was not a foreign language for the Hungarians. Another important reason for the publication of the work in Latin was that it was not intended for Hungarian readers [Ligeti 1981, 13].

Geza Kuun's research was first published in a manuscript history entitled *Codex Cumanicus* [Kuun 1980]. Because the manuscript was called under different names from the time of its creation until the time of Kuun's study. For example, from the moment of the creation of the manuscript to its transfer to the Venice Library by Francesco Petrarca it was named «**In hoc libro continentur Persicum et Comanicum per alfabetum**» ("Alphabetic Persian and Cumanian Books"), almost 100 years from the discovery of the manuscript by Ph.Tomasini among the books of Francesco Petrarca until his numbering of the catalog in 1741 by the Venetian librarian Antonio Zanetti it was named «**Petrarca Codex**» ("Codex of Petrarch"), from the time Antonio Zanetti wrote down the catalog number on the manuscript to the study of Julius Klaproth it was named «**Codex DXLIX in 4o, chartaceus, foliorum 82, Saeculi XIV. Lexicon latinum, persicum et comanicum. Initio legitur: MCCCIII. die XI. Julii**» ("Latin-Persian and Cuman Dictionary, 82 pages, written July 11, 1303, number 549"), from the study of Klaproth to the study of Kuun the manuscript was under the name «**Vocabulaire latin, persan et coman de la bibliothèque de Francesco Petrarca**» ("Latin-Persian and Cuman dictionary in the library of Francesco Petrarca").

The monograph published by Geza Kuun served as the basis for several subsequent studies, and this tradition continues to this day. For example, in 1881, the Hungarian scientist P.Hunfalvy published an article about the study of the manuscript and the meanings of the words contained in it, entitled "Der kumanische oder Petrarka-Codex und die Kumanen" [Hunfalvy 1981].

Four years later, in 1884, W.Radloff (based on the materials of the report on the meeting of the Department of the Historical and Philological Faculty of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences on September 13, 1883) published a work entitled «O yazike Cumanov po povodu izdaniya Kumanskogo slovary» (On the language of the Cumans regarding the publication of the Cuman dictionary) [Radlov, 1884]. This publication is devoted to the phonetic and phonological study of the manuscript. The publication also highlighted vowel syngharmonicities in the *Codex Cumanicus* and its characteristics. W.Radloff researched the manuscript a lot. In 1887 he published an article titled "Das türkische Sprachmaterial des Codex Cumanicus" [Radloff 1887]. He was one of the first Turkic scholars and translators to complete a complete translation of riddles. However, this study remained unpublished, and this article was found by S.Malov in the Museum of the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1929 and published in 1930 [Malov, 1930].

In 1891, the Italian scientist E. Teza referred to the judgment of the scientific community in an article devoted to the study of manuscripts and hymns in manuscripts [Teza, 1891].

By the early twentieth century, many scholars were taking the *Codex Cumanicus* seriously. For example, in 1910 the Estonian scientist C.Salemann published an article "Zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus" [Salemann 1910], in 1911 the French scientist S.Salaville "Un manuscrit chrétien en dialecte turc, le Codex Cumanicus" [Salaville, 1911], in 1912 the German scientist W.Bang "Über die

Rätsel des Codex Cumanicus" [Bang 1912], and a year later another German scholar, J.Németh published "Die Rätsel des Codex Cumanicus" [Németh 1913]. It is worth mentioning the studies carried out by two German scientists W.Bang and J. Németh. There was one flaw in W.Bang's research on riddle translations. Not all 47 riddles in the manuscript have been translated. Therefore, a year later, J.Németh translated the riddles into German. The scientist not only translated the riddles, but also tried to reveal the peculiarities of W.Bang's translation in his research.

In 1916, an article by the Turkic historian and turkologist N.Asim "Kipçak Türkçesine dair" [Asim 1916] was published.

In 1924, the Russian scientist A.Samoilovich gave a lecture at the Russian Academy of Sciences entitled "History and Critique of the Codex Cumanicus" [Samoilovich 1924].

In 1929, at a conference in Prague, the Russian historian D.Rasovsky took part in his scientific lecture "The Creation of the Codex Cumanicus " [Rasovsky 1929].

In 1930, the Russian scientist S.Malov published an article entitled "Criticism and history of the Codex Cumanicus." The study included translations of the above-mentioned manuscripts into Russian. The peculiarity of this study was that the scientist tried to identify the peculiarities of the translation of riddles from a scientific point of view, comparing not only the translations of W.Bang and J.Németh, but also the translations of W.Radloff and analyzing riddles by category.

In 1942, the Hungarian scientist G.Györfy published an article "Autor du Codex Cumanicus", and in 1950 the article entitled "Do historii Kodeksu Kumańskiego: Termin «talaşman»" by the Polish scientist A.Zajęczkowski was published.

In 1966 the Austrian scientist A.Tietze published a monograph entitled "Cuman Riddles and Turkic Folklore". This monograph was important not only because of the English translations, but also because of the study of German translations by W.Bang, J.Németh, W Radloff and the riddles of other Turkic peoples and their comparative analysis. The 160-page monograph by A.Tietze was the first English translation of riddles in the history of the Codex Cumanicus.

In 1969, the Iranian scientist D.Monchi-Zadeh published a monograph entitled "Das Persische im Codex Cumanicus". In 1971, the Californian orientalist A.Bodrogligeti published a monograph entitled "The Persian Vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus", and in 2000 the Romanian scholar V.Drimba published monograph "Codex Comanicus: Édition diplomatique avec fac-similés". This monograph is the second to be published in French, and differs from Klaproth's researches in French in that the scholar covered both parts of the manuscript and provided the first French translations of the riddles.

In 1979, the German scientist D.Drüll published a monograph entitled "Der Codex Cumanicus: Entstehung und Bedeutung". This monograph was the first comprehensive historical study of the Codex Cumanicus. For this reason, the study has not lost its prestige and status in world Turkic studies. Since she compared the historical dates of the manuscript with the names of the months given in the manuscript, studied its paleographic aspects, determined the number of scribes in the second part of the manuscript, and made initial assumptions about the number of calligraphers involved in its creation.

Another philological study of Codex Cumanicus was carried out in 1981 by the Hungarian scholar L.Ligeti. This study was in fact a reprint of a study created by J. Kuhn a century ago. Only the title has a perfect introduction in English [Ligeti 1981].

The studies of the Ukrainian scientist A.Garkavets on the Codex Cumanicus is also distinguished by its weight and scientific value. His monograph "Kypchak languages: Cuman and Armenian-Kypchak languages", published in Almaty in 1987, is devoted to the phonetic and phonological study of the manuscript. The 2006 monograph "Codex Cumanicus: Hymns, Prayers and Cuman Riddles in the XIII and XIV Centuries" is devoted to Russian translations of Christian prayers, hymns and riddles in the second part of the manuscript.

In addition, a number of articles on the composition, content, language and graphic features of the Codex Cumanicus have been published in world Turkic studies. In particular, the following articles can be considered the most influential of the works performed: A. Gabain's article "Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus" published in 1959, A.Qurishjanov's "Study of the cumin riddles" published in 1960, Y. Dashkevich's "Questions about the Codex Cumanicus" published in 1985 [Dashkevich 1985].

In Turkic studies a number of scholars have defended their Ph.D. and doctoral dissertations on the Codex Cumanicus. For example, in 1920 the Tatar scientist B.Choponzoda defended his doctoral dissertation on the topic "Violation of vowel syngharmonicity in the Codex Cumanicus" at the University of Budapest, in 1956 Kazakh scientist A. Qurishjonov wrote his Ph.D. thesis on the topic "Form and content of adverbs in the Codex Cumanicus." In 1973 he wrote his doctoral dissertation on "Written Monuments of the Ancient Kypchak Language in the XIII-XIV Centuries". Another Tatar scientist A. Chechenov in 1979 wrote his Ph.D. thesis "Codex Cumanicus and its connection with Western Kypchak languages". In 2017 B.Jafarov defended his Ph.D. thesis "Codex Cumanicus - written monument of the Turkic peoples".

Facsimile copies of the manuscript were published by K.Grønbech in Copenhagen in 1936 and V.Drinba in 2000 in Bucharest. In the 21st century the "Codex Cumanicus" was published in the form of a four-volume book by the Ukrainian scientist A. Garkavets [Garkavets 2015].

Turkish scientists S.Chigatay, U. Tafkul, O.Sertkaya, A.Karakhan, M.Argunşah and G.Güner conducted serious studies of the Codex Cumanicus. In 2015 a monograph by M.Argunşah and G.Güner "Codex Cumanicus" was published in Turkey. This study was a major work that included Persian and Cuman words in manuscripts, as well as Turkish transliteration of texts.

On December 5, 2016, when we visited the National Library of Marciana in Venice to conduct textual and source studies on the authenticity of the manuscript, a list of world scholars studying the original manuscript caught our attention. Scholars who have studied the monument's authenticity are:

April 2, 1906 - Horoldo J. Brown, October 27, 1930 - Karl Sherges, June 4, 1935 - Joseph Schacke, July 18, 1936 - Unknown photographer from Copenhagen, August 19, 1942 - György Györffy, September 25, 1951 - Kaare Grønbech, 1955 May 31 - Luiz Guni, June 26, 1956 - Brigitte Kleinsorge, April 9, 1963 - Niels Danielson, April 27, 1965 - Andreas Titze, June 3, 1972 - Fidaexo Giorio, September 18, 1975 - Wolfgang Gindecca, June 18, 1976 March - Vladimir Drimba, June 19, 1976 - Davoud Monchi-Zadeh, March 22, 1977 - Dagmar Drüll, September 29, 1980 - Mahmut Şakiroglu,

December 4, 1983 - Valery Stoyanow, September 10, 1985 - Rojei Jinol, July 14, 1990 - Giulietta Voltolua, January 12, 1995 - Francesco Fenlin, September 21, 1998 - Hamars Dolente, October 9, 1998 - Timur Kocaoglu, January 19, 2001 - Peter Schreiner December 31, 2001 - Sonja Breulger, November 29, 2002 - Gilola Olaulov, September 10, 2008 - G.N. Kuaues, December 5, 2016 - Botir Jafarov.

A number of other scholars who studied the manuscript used an electronic copy prepared for researchers at the San Marco Library or other publications of the manuscript, not the original.

The place where the Codex Cumanicus was written, the date of its creation, as well as the views and studies of its authors are one of the most pressing issues that remain unresolved to this day.

The text on page 78b of the manuscript has been the focus of scholars around the world for almost seven centuries, and research on this text is still the subject of much controversy and controversy.

The words «*ant de Zinale*» in the first line and “*ant*” in the fourth line are read by G.Kuun as “Antonius de Finale” and “Antonius”. G. Kuun is trying to prove that above-mentioned "Antonius de Finale" was one of the authors or users of the monument and it was at his disposal for some time [Kuun 1880, 218]. K.Frati argues that the name in the text on this page is not “Antonius de Finale”, but “Antonio de Ziuale or Zinale” [Frati 1909, 7].

A. Pimonteza states that the title on page 78b of the monument belongs to “Antonio de Cividale” and that the inscription on this page should read “Antonio de Cividale” and not “Antonio de Ziuale or Zinale”.

In our opinion, the text on page 78b of the manuscript is not really a word associated with the name "Antonius" or "Antonio", but the word "ante", which serves as a comparative reference in the text above and that translates to "as previous." The first line of the text is translated as "This sacred book will forever remain as the previous ones." Unsurprisingly, the writer called the Codex Cumanicus a sacred book such as the Psalms, Torah, and the Bible. No wonder this book is given such a quality, because the religious prayers and hymns in it are translated from the holy books of Christians into the Cuman language.

The second hypothesis about the authors of the manuscript is connected with the text on page 56b of the manuscript and lines 1-7 of page 59a which, according to G.Kuun, presumably belonged to Francesco Petrarca.

In his research, G.Kuun makes the following comments on these texts: “On page 112 of the Codex Cumanicus, we see that two different types of texts of the same type are written. The first is a 20-degree slant, which is very difficult to read written with a pen without ink, and the second is the same text rewritten in ink” [G.Kuun 1880, 142].

W.Radloff also quotes G.Kuun, who said that “Antonius de Finale is one of the authors of the manuscript” and claims that the manuscript was in the possession of Antonio de Finale for some time, and Petrarch may have taken it from him, and that the authors of the manuscript were the two people named above. He also claims that the inscription on these two pages is not only written, but also graphically identical to the signature of Petrarch [Radlov 1884, 9].

A. Piemontese claims that Petrarch received the Codex Cumanicus from his close friend – Giovanni Colonna, Cardinal of Pope Benedict XII, in 1334 [Piemontese 2002, 324].



During our textual research of the original manuscript, we were able to determine that the text on this page was written by two people. This, in turn, indicates that there are 14 lines on this page, which, according to G.Kuun, presumably belonged to Petrarch. However, the text written by another calligrapher on this page without an ink pen is 20 lines instead of 14 lines. The original text, that is, the part written without an ink pen, belongs to other calligraphy.

The text of the manuscript, written by a calligrapher with a pen without ink, consisted of the following words:

- (1) Per due piaxer me vog(...)
- (2) (...) de la vita in breue
- (3) per la partita greue
- (4) del dolce loco ouel mio cor laso
- (5) partome lasso con lanima trista
- (6) la desperanza che poy me conforta
- (7) de li ochi dolce lamorossa vista
- (8) per chi suspendio (.....)
- (9) (.....)
- (10) (.....) d'aytarme
- (11) (.....) darne
- (12) socorimi anci che passi esto passo
- (13) No fo ioiossa si may la mia vita
- (14) inel conspeto de li ochi ridenti
- (15) che non dogliossa piu per la partita
- (16) (...) s (...) con piu graui tormenti
- (17) li quali me serano piu pongenti
- (18) in fin a lultima ora
- (19) de la mia vita ognora
- (20) se amor no me n ayta a questo passo

The ink text on this page contains the following words:

- (1) Per piaxer me vog (...)
- (2) E de la vita in breue per la partita greue
- (3) del dolce loco oue lo core laso partome lasso con (...)
- (4) lanima trista e la desperanza che piu me conforta
- (5) de liochi dolce lamorosa vista χ per chi suspendio me (...)
- (6) da ancor la morte ayne sdegno amor chi de
- (7) tal sorte prometesti daitarme y tzoimbre darne
- (8) socori me anci che e passe esto passo
- (9) No fo ioyossa si may la mea vita
- (10) nel conspeto de liochi spiandenti oasay dogliosa

- (11) per questa partita piu non remagna con graui tormenti  
 (12) Li quali me serano piu pongenti in fino alultim ora  
 (13) de la mia vita one hora samor no me n aita a questo  
 (14) passo.

A text of 20 lines written without ink contains 14 lines in a second text written with ink. The letters in the words in both texts differ in some respects. This indicates that these texts belong to different calligraphers.

However, in order to clarify the hypothesis that these texts were written by Petrarch, it is necessary to appoint a text expert to compare other manuscripts written by the Italian poet.

A study of the number of calligraphers in the Codex Cumanicus shows that the variety of calligraphic handwritings in a piece differs not only in ink, but also in the degree of inclination of the letters and the graphic style of each calligrapher.

The determination of the number of handwritings in the first part of the manuscript, The first part of the manuscript is an important factor in determining or justifying the number of calligraphers involved in composing or copying this part of the manuscript, as well as correcting some of the words in it. To do this, we divided the manuscripts into pages and lines and found that the first part of the Codex Cumanicus was written in four different manuscripts.

Dagmar Drüll, who conducted a study of the Manuscript's "Missioners Book", also relied on the same methodology, that is, tilt, verticality, ink color change and writing style, comparing its features, and she concluded that there were 16 manuscripts and that 16 calligraphers were involved in writing the German part of the manuscript. These are:

First handwriting: texts on page 56a;

Second handwriting: texts on page 57a;

Third handwriting: texts in lines 1 and 33 in the left column of page 57b;

Fourth handwriting: texts in lines 1 and 30 in the right column on page 57b;

Fifth handwriting: texts on lines 34-40 in the left column of page 57b and on lines 35-36 in the right column;

Sixth handwriting: texts on page 58a;

Seventh handwriting: text on lines 3 and 11-14 on page 58b;

Eighth handwriting: texts on line 22 on the right side of page 59a;

Ninth handwriting: texts on page 80b;

Tenth handwriting: text on page 81a (excluding line 23);

Eleventh handwriting: Texts on lines 7-8 on page 81b;

Twelfth handwriting: line 23 on page 81b, lines 11-36 on the second page, lines 1-40 on the right column and line 23 on page 81a, lines 1-29 on page 82a, left column on page 82b 23 texts in lines -24 ;

Thirteenth handwriting: texts in lines 30-34 of the left column and lines 1-11 and 28-32 of the right column on page 82a;

Fourteenth handwriting: text on lines 12-26 of the right column on page 82a;

Fifteenth handwriting: left column on page 82 b texts on lines 1-22;

Sixteenth handwriting: the left column of page 82b is reflected in the inscriptions on lines 27–31 [Drüll 1980, 24].

It turns out from the above that a total of twenty calligraphers were involved in the process of compiling the manuscript. Four of them contributed to the “Interpreters’ Book” and sixteen, as Dagmar Drüll points out, contributed to the “Missioners’ Book”.

Scholars of Turkic studies differ in the structure of the manuscript, and such views are still held. In particular, G. Kuun suggested that the first “Italian part” of the manuscript was written by the Genoese. Bratianu and Drüll support this view. L. Ligeti claims that the authors of the first part of the manuscript were Italian merchants, therefore the monument was brought to Venice by them.

In the course of our research, we found it necessary to refer to “La Pratica della mercatura” (The Practice of Commerce), written by the Florentine merchant and politician Francesco Balducci Pegolotti between 1335 and 1343, in order to clarify the above contradictions.

“The first address,” writes Pegolotti, “is from Tana (on the left bank of the Azov, the Don River) to Astrakhan (formerly Gittarkhan), at least 25-day travel in a cart with a bull and a ten-or fifteen-day travel in a cart with a horse. A one-day trip from Astrakhan to Saray (Saray was then the capital of the Golden Horde, we got there through the Volga), a seven-day trip from Saray to Saraichik (located on the right bank of the Ural River). These roads will pass through land and water, and waterway is cheaper for traders than land.

It was 20-day trip by caravan from Saraichik to Urgench. It was convenient for all traders to travel to Urgench, because trade in the city was always good. 35-40-day camel ride from Urgench to Otrar, but 50-day trip from Saraichik to Otrar. It was easier for a trader who did not have goods to trade to go to Urgench. 45-day trip from Otrar to Almalyk (Almalyk, a city between the Tianshan mountains and the Ili river) on a loaded donkey. 45-day journey from Almalyk to Gansu (Gansu province in northwest China) on horseback to the river. 30-day trip from Gansu to Hanbalik (one of the historical names of the Chinese capital Beijing).

Here's what traders need to do: First, you need to grow a beard and not shave at all. In Tana, you must hire a translator who is fluent in the Cuman language. But you don't even have to think about saving money when hiring a translator, because instead of a good translator, you may hire someone who doesn't know the language well. In addition to the translator, you will also have to hire two servants who are fluent in the Cuman language. In Tana it was possible if the merchant agreed to take with him a woman who knew the Cuman language. Because it was convenient for the traders of that time to have a woman with him, because she was as familiar with the Cuman language as men” [Pegolotti 1936, 21-22].

In Pegolotti's memoirs, we are interested in thoughts about translators and servants who know the Cuman language, and thoughts about a companion who knows this language well. Translation was a very well paid profession at the time, and even the maid and accompanying woman had to be fluent in Cuman. Now the question is (why?). Scholars who have studied the Codex Cumanicus unanimously stated that the manuscript was written by people who knew little of the Cuman language, and this theory remains unchanged to this day.

There is a good reason why we begin our inferences about the origins of the Codex Cumanicus and its structure based on scientific reasoning and data from Pegolotti's memoirs. More precisely, this situation raises some questions for us. For example, why the translators who accompanied the merchants on the trade routes starting with Tana could not be the creators of this rare manuscript?! In our opinion, the authors of the manuscript were translators who knew the Cuman language well, and these translators knew not only Cuman but also Persian and Latin.

Although a number of scientific opinions were expressed in the Turkic studies at the date of writing the manuscript, an unambiguous conclusion has not yet been reached.

In his research Lajos Ligeti counted the years in which Ramadan and Eid al-Adha are celebrated in the Latin Christian calendars and the Arab-Persian Muslim calendars, the first part of which appears in the manuscript. The months of Eid al-Adha correspond to the years 1259-1261 in the previous years, 1292-1294 in the period when the manuscript was written, and the following in 1324-1326, which means that the date of writing the manuscript began in 1294, and its date completion was 1330. He claims that the date July 11, 1303 written on the first page of the manuscript means the beginning of the copying. [Ligeti 1981, 8].

According to Ligeti, the manuscript has several copies, and the manuscript now held in the National Library of Marciana in Venice was copied on 11 July 1303 and completed in 1330.

G.Györffy who studied the paleographic features of the site and its elements, came to the conclusion that the "Italian part" of the manuscript was written in 1330, and the "German part" - in 1340-1356 [Györffy 1942, 18]. W.Bang points out that the "Italian part" of the manuscript was written in 1294–1295 [Bang 1913, 19], A. Samoilovich believes that this part was written in 1294. A number of other scholars have commented on the date of this part of the manuscript. In particular, S.Malov stated that the first part of the manuscript was written in 1295–1296, L.Bazin - in 1293–1294, and D.Monchi-Zadeh - in 1325.

The German scholar D.Drüll concluded that the "Interpreters' Book" was written between 1292 and 1295, based on evidence of the paper on which the manuscript was written and the date of its appearance in Italy, as well as watermarks on the paper. According to the scientist, the manuscript was written on two types of paper. The first part of the monument, "Interpreters' Book", is written in "Realle", and the second part, "Missioners' Book", is written in "Reçute". "Realle" paper appeared in Italy in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, and "Reçute" paper in 1310. Pages 60, 61, 63, 67, 70, 80 and 82 of the manuscript have a watermark "bull" and page 77 "bell" [Drüll 1980, 23].

Turkish scientists M.Argunşah and G.Güner, in their monograph, published in 2015, supported the views of V.Drimba and A.Samoilovich. They claim that Ramadan was celebrated on August 28, 1291, August 16, 1292, and August 5, 1293. From this, it should be assumed that the manuscript was written in one of these years [Argunşah, Güner 2016, 22].

Such conflicting opinions of world scholars about the date of the manuscript were not just speculations. Some of them tried to determine this date based on the paleographic symbols given in the manuscript, the names of the months in it, while D.Drüll came to the above conclusion based on the period of appearing of the paper in which the manuscript was written.

## CONCLUSION

The Cumanicus Codex stands out among our ancient literary monuments for its extraordinary originality, rarity and uniqueness. The facts and information contained in it are still rare and important objects for many disciplines. Studying the monument such famous scientists as J.Klaproth, G.Kuun, W.Radliff, W.Bang, J.Németh, A.Samoilovich, D.Rasovsky, S.Malov, K.Grønbech, G.Györfy, A.Qurishjanov, A.Gabain, A.Tietze, D.Monchi-Zadeh, A. Bodrogligeti, V.Drimba, A.Chechenov, D.Drüll, L.Ligeti, A.Piemontese, A.Garkavets, M.Argunşah., G.Güner, M.Salan , F.Schmieder, have done some serious work.

However, experts say there is still much research to be done on the site. The handwriting in the manuscript is fluent and fluid. It still takes a lot of effort to read some of the passages according to the original and in a suitable way.

The first researchers of the work, J.Klaproth, W.Radliff, W.Bang, J.Németh, G.Kuun, L.Ligeti, A.Galotta, did a great job in this direction. Their research is still valid and relevant today. Of course, it is natural for them to think and draw conclusions based on the facts and materials they know. There are also some problems with misreading and misinterpreting the text of the manuscript. For example, the reading of a common noun in the Latin text as a proper name in the form "Antonio de Ziuale or Zinale" gave rise to the name of the author that did not exist. A textual examination carried out during the study made it possible to reconsider this fact.

The study also corrected views on the number of calligraphers who were directly involved in the creation of the manuscript. The differences between the four writing styles, which have so far been ignored, provided a logical basis for expanding these findings.

Also, new conclusions were made regarding the date of writing the manuscript. Until now, experts have been of the opinion that the monument was painted in the late 13th and early 14th centuries. Comparing Christian and Muslim calendars provides a good basis for determining the date of the calendar as 1326. It should be noted that this date only refers to the first part of the manuscript. Observations and research in this regard should be continued.

The Codex Cumanicus is the only written monument in the history of the Turkic languages, created by the Latin script and language. It is also the first example of a multilingual dictionary.

For the first time in the dictionary, words are classified into subject groups. The monument is also notable for its collection of some commentaries on Turkic grammar, which he intends to convey to Latin-speaking experts and fans. The second part of the manuscript consists of religious prayers and hymns. This section is of great scientific importance, as it allows us to present an overall picture of the Turkic language in the fourteenth century. However, the presentation of ancient mysteries in this section made the monument a rare source not only for written literature, but also for folklore sources. The oldest riddles included in the manuscript enrich the understanding of the genesis and historical development of the mystery genre in the literature of the Turkic peoples, its scope and poetics.

For the first time, these riddles have been translated into the Uzbek language.

The phonetic and graphic features of the work have been studied as a leading problem in the research of many Turkic scholars. However, the collection of graphics in the Codex Cumanicus has not been fully explored. For this reason, the study emphasizes the need to identify the features of each graphic

symbol in the manuscript. As a result, it turned out that there is a special system of graphic symbols for each sound; the differences between the symbols are mainly a result of the compiler's signature, as well as the speed of the writing process.

In some cases, the deletion, correction and filling of these words in the manuscript was observed. It can be assumed that most of these changes were made by a professional philologist. This is especially true when distinguishing between thin and thick vowels in corrected regions.

The work on Codex Cumanicus is very varied, both in terms of scale and science. However, many specialists in this field, especially historians, linguists, literary scholars, folklorists and ethnographers, have a huge task in connection with this monument. There are many problems that need to be solved, especially by our text and source researchers. All this awaits specialists capable of solving the extremely pressing problems facing our science. This will of course be a part of our future plans.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Pier Giorgio Borbone, professor at the University of Pisa, Italy, Giamperio Belengeri, professor at Ca'Foscari University, Venice, Dagmar Drüll, professor at the University of Heidelberg, Germany, Mustafa Argunşah, professor at the university, and Galip Güner, associate professor at this university, as well as the officials persons of the Erasmus Plus program of the European Union.

### LITERATURE

Abdinazimov Sh. (2014) «Kodeks Kumanikus» yesteligi ham onin qaraqalpaq tiline qatnasi // Ajiniyoz nomidagi Nukus davlat pedagogika instituti. Fan va Jamiyat ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali. – Nukus, – 30-33 betlar.

Asqarov A.(2015) *O‘zbek xalqining kelib chiqish tarixi*. – Toshkent, “O‘zbekiston” NMIU, – 680 b.

Garkavets A.N. (2006) *Codex Cumanicus: Polovetskie molitvi, gimni i zagadki XIII-XIV vekov*. – Moskva: Rus. derevnya, – 89 s.

Garkavets A.N. (2015) *Venetsianskaya rukopis Codex Cumanicus, yee novoe prochtenie i izdanie*. – Astana, Kaz. nats. akad. biblioteka, 4 tom.

Grekov B., Yakubovskiy A. (1985) *Oltin O‘rda va uning qulashi*. – Toshkent, 1956. – 370 b.

Dashkevich Ya.R. *Codex Cumanicus – voprosi vozniknoveniya*. Izv. AN SSSR. Otd. gumanitarnykh nauk, – 72-84 s.

Dobrodomov I.G. (1975) *O polovetskix etnonimax v drevnerusskoy literature* // Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik, – Moskva. – 102-129 s.

Ibn Battuta. (2012) *Sayohatnoma*. – Toshkent, “Sharq” nashriyoti. – 687 b.

Qurishjanov A.K. (1973) *Yazik starokipchakskix pismennix pamyatnikov XIII-XIV vv.:* Avtoref. dokt. diss. – Alma-Ata.

Malov S.E. (1930) *K istorii i kritike Codex Cumanicus* // Izv. AN SSSR. Otd. gumanitarnykh nauk. – 347-375 c.

Radlov V. (1884) *Yazik Cumanov po povodu izdaniya Cumanskago slovarya* – Sankt-Peterburg. – 1-53 s.

- Russko-uzbekskiy slovar. (2013) «*O‘zbekiston milliy entsiklopediyasi*» Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti. – Toshkent. II tom. – 895 b.
- Samoylovich A.N. (1924) *K istorii i kritike Codex Cumanicus* / Dokl. Ros. Akad. nauk. – 86-89 c.
- Rasovskiy D.A. (1929) *O proisxojenii Codex Cumanicus* // Seminarium Condacovianum. – Praha, t. III.
- Chechenov A.A. (1978) *Yazik pamyatnika «Codex Cumanicus» (14 v.): V arealnom osvechenii*. – M., – 55 s.
- O‘zbekiston Milliy Entsiklopediyasi. (2005) «*O‘zbekiston milliy entsiklopediyasi*» Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti. – Toshkent.
- Asim N. (1916) *Kipçak Türkçesine dair* // Darülfünün Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuasi. D. 1, b. – 4 381-383 s
- Argunşah M., Güner G. (2015) *Codex Cumanicus*. – Istanbul. – 1038 s.
- Bang W. (1911) *Beiträge zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus* // Bull. Acad. Belg. – Belgium, – T. 1. – 13-40 p.
- Bang W. (1912) *Über die Rätsel des Codex Cumanicus* // Sitzungsberichte Preus. Akad. Wiss. Phil.-hist. – Klasse, – 334-353 p.
- Bodrogligeti A. (1971) *The Persian Vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*. – Budapest. – 235 r.
- Curayeva M.(2011) “*Kodeks Cumanikus*”ta bilmeceler ve Özbek folkloründeki şekilleri. Türk Dünyası Dncelemeleri Dergisi / Journal of Turkish World Studies, XI/1, – 25-32 s.
- Drimba V. (2000) *Codex Comanicus: Édition diplomatique avec facsimilés*. – Bucarest: Editura Enciclopedica.
- Drüll D. (1980) *Der Codex Cumanicus: Entstehung und Bedeutung*. – Stuttgart, – 143 r.
- Fрати C. (1909) *Versi italiani nel codice "Cumanico" della Marciana e F. Petrarca*. Il Libro e la stampa: Bullettino ufficiale della Società bibliografica italiana. – 7 r.
- Gabain A., von. (1959) *Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus* // Philologiae Turcicae Fundementa. – Wiesbaden. – T. 1. – 46-73 p.
- Gallotta A. (1992) “*Codex Cumanicus'in yani bir nüshasi*”. Uluslararası türk dili kongresi (26 eylül 1992-1 ekim 1992) – Ankara. – 269 s.
- Grønbech K. (1936) *Codex Cumanicus: Cod. Marc. Lat. DXLIX in Faksimile herausgegeben mit Einleitung von...* – Kopenhagen.
- Györfy G. (1942) *Autor du Codex Cumanicus* // *Analecta Orientalia memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Körös dedicata*. – Budapest, – T. 1. – 3-30 r.
- Hunfalvy P. (1881) *Der Cumanische oder Petrarka-Codex und die Cumanen* // *Hungarische Revue*. – 602-632 s.
- Jafarov B. (2017) *History of the second seal or the other copy of the «Codex Cumanicus»* // *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi* Sayı: 6/2 . s. 638-643, – Türkiye.
- Klaproth J. (1828) *Vocabulaire latin, persan et coman de la bibliothèque de Francesco Petrarca* // *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie, contenant des recherches historiques et philologiques sur les peuples de l'Orient*. – Paris: SAINT-LOUIS, Tome troisieme. – 520 p.

- Kuun G. (1880) *Codex Cumanicus bibliothecae ad templum Divi Marci Venetiarum*. – Budapestini: EDITIO SCIENT. ACADEMIAE HUNG., – 398 p.
- Ligeti L. (1981) *Prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus // Codex Cumanicus / Ed. by Geza Kuun*. – Budapestini, – 1-54 r.
- Monchi-Zadeh D. (1969) *Das Persische im Codex Cumanicus*. – Uppsala univ., – 220 p.
- Németh J. (1913) *Die Rätsel des Codex Cumanicus // Ztschr. Deutsch.. – Morgenland Gesell*, – 577-608 p.
- Piemontese A.M. (2001) *Le glosse sul vangelo persiano del 1338 e il Codex Cumanicus*. In *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae VIII*, – 313-349 p.
- Piemontese A.M. (2002) *Il codice cumánico e il suo mondo*. Atti del colloquio internazionale Venezia, 6-7 dicembre. – 181-198 r.
- Pegolotti F.B. (1936) *La Pratica della Mercatura/The mediaeval academy of America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. – 21-22 r.
- Radloff W. (1887) *Das türkische Sprachmaterial des Codex Cumanicus*. – SPb.
- Salan M. (2016) *Codex Cumanicus ve ermeni harfli kipçak türkçesinde fiil yapımı*. Gazi üniversitesi. – Temmuz. – 1024 s.
- Salemann C. (1910) *Zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus // Izv. Akad. nauk*. –942-957 s.
- Salaville S. (1911) *Un manuscrit chrétien en dialecte turc, le Codex Cumanicus // Echos d'Orient*. – T. 14. 278-286 r.
- Schmieder F. (2002) *The World of the Codex Cumanicus – the Codex Cumanicus in Its World*. Atti del colloquio internazionale Venezia, 6-7 dicembre. – 2-11 r.
- Teza E. (1891) *Gli inni e le preghiere in lingua cumánica: Revisione del codice veneciano // Rediconti Accad.* –Lincei. Cl. scieze morali, storiche e filologiche. – T.7, 1 sem. / 12. – 586-596 r.
- Tietze A. (1966) *The Koman Riddles and Turkic Folklore*. – Berkeley. – 160 p.
- Tomasini J.P. (MDCXXXV) *Petrarcha redivivus, integram poetae celeberrimi vitam iconibus aere caelatis exhibens*. – Lavre. – 210 r.